New Structures and Algorithms for Length-Constrained Expander Decompositions

Bernhard Haeupler^{*} ETH Zürich & Carnegie Mellon University D Ellis Hershkowitz Brown University Zihan Tan[†] DIMACS, Rutgers University

Abstract

Expander decompositions form the basis of one of the most flexible paradigms for closeto-linear-time graph algorithms. Length-constrained expander decompositions generalize this paradigm to better work for problems with lengths, distances and costs. Roughly, an (h, s)length ϕ -expander decomposition is a small collection of length increases to a graph so that nodes within distance h can route flow over paths of length hs with congestion at most $1/\phi$.

In this work, we give a close-to-linear time algorithm for computing length-constrained expander decompositions in graphs with general lengths and capacities. Notably, and unlike previous works, our algorithm allows for one to trade off off between the size of the decomposition and the length of routing paths: for any $\epsilon > 0$ not too small, our algorithm computes in close-to-linear time an (h, s)-length ϕ -expander decomposition of size $m \cdot \phi \cdot n^{\epsilon}$ where $s = \exp(\operatorname{poly}(1/\epsilon))$. The key foundations of our algorithm are: (1) a simple yet powerful structural theorem which states that the union of a sequence of sparse length-constrained cuts is itself sparse and (2) new algorithms for efficiently computing sparse length-constrained flows.

^{*}Partially funded by the European Union's Horizon 2020 ERC grant 949272.

[†]Supported by a grant to DIMACS from the Simons Foundation (820931)

Contents

1	Introduction		
	1.1	Length-Constrained Expanders and Expander Decompositions	1
	1.2	Our Contributions	1
		1.2.1 Overcoming Challenge 1: Union of Sparse Length-Constrained Cuts is Sparse	3
		1.2.2 Overcoming Challenge 2: Sparse Flows for the Spiral	5
2	Ap	plications of Our Work	6
3	Add	ditional Related Work	7
	3.1	Applications of Expander Decompositions	7
	3.2	Parallel Work on Well-Connected Graphs	8
	3.3	Routing in Expanders	8
4	Not	cation and Conventions	9
5	\mathbf{Pre}	liminaries	11
	5.1	Classic Expanders and Expander Robustness	11
	5.2	Length-Constrained Cuts (Moving Cuts)	12
	5.3	Length-Constrained Expanders	13
	5.4	At Most Length-Constrained Expanders	14
	5.5	Length-Constrained Expander Decompositions	15
	5.6	Routers, Power Graphs and Expander Power Graph Robustness	15
	5.7	Neighborhood Covers	17
	5.8	Length-Constrained Expansion Witnesses	17
6	Ma	in Result Restated: Length-Constrained ED Algorithm	18
7	Len	gth-Constrained Expanders as Embedded Expander Powers	18
	7.1	Formalizing the Embedding via the Neighborhood Router Demand	19
	7.2	Proving Length-Constrained Expanders are Embedded Expander Powers	21
8	Roł	oustness of Length-Constrained Expanders	26
9	Uni	on of Sparse (Classic) Cut Sequence is Sparse	27
	9.1	Warmup: When the Source Component is Not a Witness Component	28
	9.2	Proving the General Case for (Classic) Cuts	29
10	Uni	on of Sparse Moving Cut Sequence is Sparse	31
	10.1	Low Arboricity Demand Matching Graph via Parallel Greedy Spanners	32

	10.2 Matching-Dispersed Demand	33
	10.3 Proving Union of Sparse Moving Cuts is a Sparse Moving Cut	36
11	Equivalence of Distances to Length-Constrained Expander	37
	11.1 Weighted Sparse Cut Sequence (3) at Most Largest Cut (1)	39
	11.2 Largest Cut (1) at Most Largest Expander's Complement (4) $\ldots \ldots \ldots \ldots$	41
	11.2.1 Projected Down Demands	41
	11.2.2 Proof Of Largest Cut At Most Largest Expander's Complement $\ldots \ldots \ldots$	42
	11.3 Largest Expander's Complement (4) at Most Weighted Sparse Cut Sequence (3)	43
	11.4 Largest Expander's Complement (4) at Most Smallest Expander Decomposition (5)	46
	11.5 Largest Cut (1) at Most Largest Cut Sequence (2) $\ldots \ldots \ldots \ldots \ldots \ldots \ldots$	46
	11.6 Largest Cut Sequence (2) at Most Largest Weighted Cut Sequence (3) $\ldots \ldots$	46
	11.7 Smallest Expander Decomposition (5) at Most Largest Cut Sequence (2)	47
	11.8 Proof of Equivalence of Distance Measures (Theorem 11.1)	47
12	Algorithm: Sparse Flows and Cutmatches	48
	12.1 Rounding Flows to Blaming Flows	49
	12.2 Blaming Flow Sequences	52
	12.3 Blaming Near-Lightest Path Blockers	53
	12.4 Sparse Flows and Cutmatches via Blaming Near-Lightest Path Blockers	54
13	Algorithm: Demand-Size-Large Sparse Cuts from EDs	55
	13.1 (Preliminary) Algorithm: Cut Strategies from Expander Decompositions	57
	13.2 Algorithm: Demand-Size-Large Sparse Cuts from Cut Strategies	58
14	Algorithm: EDs from Demand-Size-Large Sparse Cuts	74
15	Algorithm: Length-Constrained EDs from "The Spiral"	78
16	Maintaining Extra Properties (Theorem 1.1 with Linkedness)	84
	16.1 Proof of Theorem 16.1	85
	16.2 Achieving Linkedness in Theorem 1.1.	87

1 Introduction

Over the past few decades, expander decompositions have come to form the foundation of one of the most powerful and flexible paradigms for close-to-linear-time algorithms [CGL⁺20, vdBLN⁺20, Li21, SW19]. Informally, expander decompositions separate a graph into expanders, allowing algorithms to make use of the structure of expanders on arbitrary graphs. One of the key properties of expanders—and, indeed, a way in which they are often defined— is that any (reasonable) multicommodity flow demand can be routed with low congestion [GKS17, GL18, GRST21, BFU92, PU87, KR96, Val90, LR99, LMR94]. However, while this property makes the expander decomposition paradigm very useful for algorithms dealing with flows, congestion and cuts, it is less useful for quantities like lengths, distances and costs.

1.1 Length-Constrained Expanders and Expander Decompositions

Motivated by this, [HRG22] introduced the idea of length-constrained expanders. Informally, a length-constrained expander is a graph in which any (reasonable) multi-commodity flow can be routed over short paths. More formally, a demand $D: V \times V \to \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$ is *h*-length if D(u, v) > 0 implies that u and v are at distance at most h and unit if no vertex sends or receives more than its degree in demand. Then, an (h, s)-length ϕ -expander is a graph where any h-length unit demand can be routed by a multi-commodity flow with congestion $\tilde{O}(\frac{1}{\phi})$ over length hs-length paths. s is called the length slack. If $hs \ll O(\frac{\log n}{\phi})$, a graph which is an (h, s)-length ϕ -expander may not be a ϕ -expander. For example, a path is an (h, 1)-length $\Omega(1)$ -expander for constant h but not an $\Omega(1)$ -expander; henceforth, we use classic expander to refer to (non-length-constrained) expanders.

In order to better bring the expander decomposition machinery to bear on problems that deal with lengths, distances and costs, [HRG22] introduced the idea of an (h, s)-length ϕ -expander decomposition: a collection of $(\kappa \cdot \phi m)$ total edge length increases that make the input graph an (h, s)-length ϕ -expander. Here, κ is called the *cut slack*.

Length-constrained expander decompositions greatly extend the problems for which the expander decomposition paradigm is suitable. For instance, length-constrained expander decompositions give a simple tree-like way of routing demands that is $n^{o(1)}$ -competitive with respect to *both* congestion and flow path length [HRG22]. Furthermore, these routings are oblivious: the flow for each pair is fixed without knowledge of the demand. In turn, these routings give (1) compact routing tables that allow nodes to perform $n^{o(1)}$ -competitive point-to-point communication and (2) universally-optimal distributed algorithms in the CONGEST model of distributed computation, bypassing $\Omega(\sqrt{n}/\log n)$ lower bounds [PR00, DSHK⁺11] on networks with $n^{o(1)}$ time algorithms.

1.2 Our Contributions

In this work, we provide a deeper theory of length-constrained expanders and significantly more powerful close-to-linear time algorithms for computing length-constrained expander decompositions.

We begin by describing our new algorithm for computing length-constrained expander decompositions. Our algorithm is based on the notion of (h, s)-length ϕ -sparse cuts which generalizes the classic notion of ϕ -sparse cuts (a.k.a. moving cuts) [HRG22]. An (h, s)-length ϕ -sparse cut is a collection of length increases such that there is a large h-length unit "witness" demand whose support pairs are made at least hs-far apart by these length increases. Our algorithm will simply repeatedly cut length-constrained sparse cuts where "cutting" such a cut just consists of applying its length increases to the graph.¹

It is known that a graph is a length-constrained expander iff it contains no length-constrained sparse cuts [HRG22] and so, if one repeatedly cuts (h, s)-length ϕ -sparse cuts until none exist, the union of all such cuts gives a length-constrained expander decomposition. Of course, if these cuts are always very small in size (e.g. only a single edge has its length increased) then such an algorithm would have no hope of running in close-to-linear time. In order to avoid this, we require that our cuts be (approximately) largest among all length-constrained sparse cuts (for a suitable notion of "large"). Summarizing, we have the following (conceptually simple) rough outline of our algorithm:

 $\label{eq:Until none exist:} Until none exist: \\ Cut \ a \ (\approx h, \approx s) \ length \ (\approx \phi) \ sparse \ (approximately) \ largest \ cut.$

The only technical caveat to the above outline is what is hidden by the " \approx "s above. Specifically, our algorithm proceeds in epochs in order to deal with the slacks that occur in the length-constrained setting where after each epoch we relax the cuts we look for by appropriately increasing the length slack s and decreasing the length h and sparsity ϕ . A more formal version of the above algorithm is given in Algorithm 2.

Appropriately instantiating the above approach gives us the main result of our work. We state the formal result below; some of the precise definitions are left to Sections 4 and 5. Informally, though, the "node-weighting" A specifies the subset of our graph we would like to be (h, s)-length expanding and our decomposition is "witnessed" in the sense that it comes with an embedding which shows how to route with low congestion over low length paths in the graph after applying the decomposition. We discuss $(\leq h, s)$ -length below and make use of standard work-depth models of parallel computation (see, e.g. [Ble96]); for sequential algorithms work is equivalent to time.

Theorem 1.1. There is a constant c > 1 such that given graph G with edge lengths and capacities, $\epsilon \in \left(\frac{1}{\log^{1/c} N}, 1\right)$, node-weighting A, length bound $h \ge 1$, and conductance $\phi > 0$, one can compute a witnessed $(\le h, s)$ -length ϕ -expander decomposition for A in G with cut and length slack respectively

$$\kappa = n^{\epsilon}$$
 $s = \exp(\operatorname{poly}(1/\epsilon))$

and work and depth respectively

$$\mathsf{W}_{\mathrm{ED}}(A,m) \le m \cdot \tilde{O}\left(n^{\mathrm{poly}(\epsilon)} \cdot \mathrm{poly}(h)\right) \qquad \mathsf{D}_{\mathrm{ED}}(A,m) \le \tilde{O}\left(n^{\mathrm{poly}(\epsilon)} \cdot \mathrm{poly}(h)\right)$$

The above improves over the previous algorithms for length-constrained expander decompositions of [HRG22] in several major ways.²

¹For the case of length-constrained expanders, "cutting" necessarily involves increasing lengths (possibly fractionally) rather than (integrally) deleting edges since the length-constrained setting is known to exhibit large flow-cut integrality gaps [HWZ20].

 $^{^{2}}$ We also note that our algorithm is considerably conceptually simpler than that of [HRG22] which relied on an intricate "expander gluing" framework.

- 1. Trading Off Between Slacks: Our algorithm allows one to trade off between length slack and cut slack. In particular, by increasing the cut slack κ , one can decrease the length slack sand vice-versa. Notably, for suitably small constant parameter, the above allows us to achieve length slack s = O(1) and cut slack n^{ϵ} in work $m^{1+\epsilon} \cdot \text{poly}(h)$ and depth $n^{\epsilon} \cdot \text{poly}(h)$ for any small constant ϵ . The previous approach of [HRG22] computed length-constrained expander decompositions with $\kappa = s = \exp(\log^{1-\delta} n)$ for a fixed δ slightly less than 1 and so could not produce such decompositions. Crucially, all of the applications of our results (discussed in Section 2) will make use of a constant length slack of s = O(1).
- 2. General Lengths and Capacities: Our algorithm is the first (close-to-linear time) algorithm for computing length-constrained expander decompositions on graphs with general lengths and general edge lengths. The algorithm of [HRG22] only worked if one assumed that both the capacity and length of every edge is 1. Even in the classic setting, efficient algorithms for expander decompositions for general capacities are significantly more difficult than those in the unit capacity setting [Li21]. All of our applications will make use of general lengths and capacities and implementing the above approach for general lengths and capacities—particularly, for general capacities—presents significant difficulties; discussed below.
- 3. Stronger Routing Guarantees: The routing guarantees provided by our algorithm are significantly stronger than those of [HRG22] in two ways. First, our decomposition is what we call a ($\leq h, s$)-length expander decomposition (as opposed to an (h, s)-length expander decomposition). In particular, after applying our decomposition we provide the guarantee that any *h*-length demand can be routed by a low congestion multi-commodity flow where the flow paths between vertices u and v at distance $d \leq h$ have length at most $d \cdot s$ as opposed to $h \cdot s$ as in (h, s)-length expander decompositions. Notably, if $d \ll h$ (i.e. the two vertices are very close initially) then we route between u and v over paths whose length is proportional to d.

Second, the expander decomposition output by our algorithm is "strong" in the sense that after applying the decomposition to graph G to get G', any *h*-length demand in G' can be routed with low congestion over low-length paths in G'; that of [HRG22] was "weak" in that *h*-length demands could only be routed over low-length paths in G.

Showing that the above approach works requires overcoming two significant challenges:

Challenge 1: How can we show that cutting large length-constrained sparse cuts quickly yields a length-constrained expander decomposition?

and

Challenge 2: How can we efficiently compute large length-constrained sparse cuts?

In what follows, we discuss these challenges and how we overcome them.

1.2.1 Overcoming Challenge 1: Union of Sparse Length-Constrained Cuts is Sparse

We discuss how we show that cutting large length-constrained sparse cuts quickly yields a lengthconstrained expander decomposition. **The Classic Approach.** Repeatedly cutting large sparse cuts in order to compute classic expander decompositions is a well-studied approach [SW19]. In the classic setting the "largness" of a cut is its balance, namely, the volume of the side of the cut with smaller volume.³

In the classic setting, this approach hinges on the fact that the "union of sparse cuts is itself a sparse cut." In particular, if C_1, C_2, \ldots are a series of cuts where each C_i is a ϕ -sparse cut after C_j for j < i has been cut, then $\bigcup_i C_i$ is itself a $O(\log n \cdot \phi)$ -sparse cut.

Thus, if each C_i is a ϕ -sparse cut whose size is within an α factor of the largest $O(\log n \cdot \phi)$ -sparse cut and we cut about α of these cuts then we know that after cutting all of these cuts we must have substantially reduced the size of the largest $O(\log n \cdot \phi)$ -sparse cut (otherwise $\bigcup_i C_i$ would be a $O(\log n \cdot \phi)$ -sparse cut whose size is larger than the largest such cut).

The above union of cuts fact in the classic setting is easily shown. In particular, because we are measuring the size of the cut in terms of the smaller volume side and each time we apply a cut the smaller volume side has at most half of the total volume, we get a depth of $O(\log n)$, leading to the $O(\log n)$ in the above sparsity. In the interest of completeness, we give a proof of this fact in Section 9.

Issues in the Length-Constrained Setting. However, showing a comparable fact for the length-constrained setting is significantly more challenging. In particular, there is no clear notion of the "side" of a cut in the length-constrained setting since we are applying length increases, not fully deleting edges. Thus, a proof of the sparsity of the union of sparse length-constrained cuts cannot appeal to a tidy recursion where each time one recurses, one side of the cut reduces by a constant. Further, it is not even clear what the appropriate notion of the "size" of a cut is in this setting since, again, there is no "smaller side" whose volume we can measure.

In fact, given the definition of an (h, s)-length ϕ -sparse cut, one might not think that the union of a sequence of (h, s)-length ϕ -sparse cuts should be sparse. In particular, recall that an (h, s)length cut C_i is ϕ -sparse iff there is some large witnessing demand D_i that is h-length and unit such that after C_i is applied every pair in the support of D_i is at least hs-far apart. However, if we take the union of (C_1, C_2, \ldots) as $C_1 + C_2 + \ldots$, then we cannot witness the sparsity of $C_1 + C_2 + \ldots$ by $D_1 + D_2 + \ldots$: the resulting demand can be arbitrarily far from being unit!

Result. Nonetheless, for the length-constrained setting we show that, somewhat surprisingly, the union of a sequence of (h, s)-length ϕ -sparse cuts is itself an (h, s)-length $O(\phi \cdot n^{O(1/s)})$ -sparse cut (with some slack in h and s). More generally, we show that, the union of cuts in a sequence of length-constrained sparse cuts is at least as sparse as the (appropriately-weighted) average sparsity of its constituent cuts. The following gives our formal result (we again defer some of the technical definitions to later sections).

Theorem 1.2 (Union of Sparse Moving Cuts is a Sparse Moving Cut). Let (C_1, \ldots, C_k) be a sequence of moving cuts where C_i is an (h, s)-length ϕ_i -sparse cut in $G - \sum_{j < i} C_j$ w.r.t. nodeweighting A. Then the moving cut $\sum_i C_i$ is an (h', s')-length ϕ' -sparse cut w.r.t. A where h' = 2h, $s' = \frac{(s-2)}{2}$ and $\phi' = s^3 \cdot \log^3 n \cdot n^{O(1/s)} \cdot \frac{\sum_i |C_i|}{\sum_i |C_i|/\phi_i}$.

³The volume of a set of vertices is the sum of their degrees.

Techniques. Our result for the length-constrained setting is based on an intriguing connection to parallel algorithms for greedy spanner constructions. In particular, we show that the witnessing demands in a sequence of (h, s)-length ϕ -sparse cuts are analogous to a parallel process for greedily computing a spanner. Recent work [HHT23] showed that such parallel processes produce a graph with low—namely about $n^{O(1/s)}$ —arboricity. We then make use of the low arboricity of such graphs to decompose the demands of a sequence of length-constrained sparse cuts into forests and then use each tree in this forest to "disperse" the corresponding demand. The result is a demand that can be used to witness the sparsity of the union of (C_1, C_2, \ldots) : in particular, it is of approximately the same size as the sum of the D_i and still separated by the union of (C_1, C_2, \ldots) but it is actually unit, unlike the sum of the D_i . These results are discussed in Section 10.

By making use of the above union of cuts fact for the length-constrained setting and defining an appropriate notion of the size of a length-constrained cut—a notion we call the "demand-size" of a cut—we are able to extend the above approach to the length-constrained setting. In particular, we show that that repeatedly cutting an (h, s)-length ϕ -sparse cut which is approximately demand-size-largest quickly yields a length-constrained expander decomposition.

1.2.2 Overcoming Challenge 2: Sparse Flows for the Spiral

Having discussed how it suffices to show that repeatedly cutting large and sparse length-constrained cuts quickly yields a length-constrained expander, we now discuss how to compute these cuts.

Classic Approach. In the classic setting, a well-studied means of cutting large sparse cuts is by what we call "the spiral." In particular, it is known that one can compute large sparse cuts using "cut matching games." Cut matching games, in turn, can be efficiently computed by computing expander decompositions. By the above-mentioned arguments, expander decompositions can be computed using large sparse cuts. In order to avoid a cycle of dependencies, one turns this cycle into a "spiral." In particular, the algorithm is set up so that each time one goes around the cycle of dependencies the input size significantly decreases.

Issues in the Length-Constrained Setting. A recent work of [HHG22] provided a cut matching game that is suitable for our purposes and so, in light of our discussion above, one might hope to implement a similar approach in the length-constrained setting. However, here, the fact that we are interested in general capacities significantly complicates our problem.

In particular, in the spiral we recurse on graphs produced by cut matching games. Each edge of these graphs, in turn, corresponds to a flow path in the flow decomposition of a flow we computed on our input graph. Thus, if we want to guarantee that when we recurse the input size has significantly gone down, it must be the case that the flows we construct for our cut matching game have low support size; i.e. the flow can be decomposed into a small number of flow paths.

This is easy to do in the classic setting but, to our knowledge, prior to our work no such result was known for the length-constrained setting for general capacities. In the length-constrained setting, the relevant notion of flow is *h*-length flows (i.e. flows whose flow paths have length at most *h*). Prior work [HHS23] showed that one can compute *h*-length multi-commodity flows but with support size $\tilde{O}(b \cdot \text{poly}(h) \cdot m)$ where, roughly, *b* is the number of commodities. Using this result would lead to a multiplicative blowup of poly(*h*) in the total number of edges of our graphs which, unfortunately, cannot be made to work with the spiral.

Result. To solve the above issue, we give the first sparse flow algorithms for the length-constrained setting, improving the above sparsity to $\tilde{O}(|E|+b)$ and, notably, so that it does not depend on h. Specifically, we show the following (again, see later sections for relevant technical definitions).

Theorem 1.3. Given a graph G = (V, E) with capacities U, lengths ℓ , length constraint $h \ge 1$, $0 < \epsilon < 1$ and b-batchable source, sink pairs $\{(S_i, T_i)\}_i$, one can compute a feasible h-length flow cut pair (F, C) of $\{(S_i, T_i)\}_i$ that is $(1 \pm \epsilon)$ -approximate in (deterministic) depth $\tilde{O}(b \cdot \operatorname{poly}(\frac{1}{\epsilon}, h))$ and work $m \cdot \tilde{O}(b \cdot \operatorname{poly}(\frac{1}{\epsilon}, h))$ where

$$|\operatorname{supp}(F)| \leq \tilde{O}(|E|+b).$$

Furthermore, $F = \eta \cdot \sum_{j=1}^{k} F_j$ where $\eta = \tilde{\Theta}(\epsilon^2)$, $k = \tilde{O}\left(\kappa \cdot \frac{h}{\epsilon^4}\right)$ and F_j is an integral h-length S_i - T_i flow for some i.

Techniques. In order to show the above result, we make use of a novel "blaming" argument. The rough idea is to construct a near-optimal flow where each path in the support of the flow can uniquely point to an edge whose capacity was mostly used up when flow along this flow path was added to our solution. We discuss and prove the above result in Section 12.

Combining the above flow algorithms with the spiral and our union of cuts fact shows that the above strategy quickly yields a length-constrained expander decomposition. As a corollary, we get efficient algorithms for large length-constrained sparse cuts (since these algorithms form a subroutine of the spiral). While we feel the above are the main contributions of our work, we note that building up to them requires developing several new ideas and techniques for the length-constrained setting, including proofs of the robustness of length-constrained expanders to edge deletions and the equivalence of several notions of a graph's "distance" from being a length-constrained expander.

2 Applications of Our Work

In this section we discuss applications of our work; both those in subsequent work and some corollaries of our results. We note that the first two results directly use the algorithms from this work.

Application 1: O(1)-Approx. MC Flow in Close-To-Linear Time (Subsequent Work). A recent work of [HHL⁺24] gave the first close-to-linear time algorithms to compute an O(1)-approximate k-commodity flow in almost-linear-time. These algorithms run in time $O((m+k)^{1+\epsilon})$ for arbitrarily small constant $\epsilon > 0$ [HHL⁺24]. Roughly speaking, these algorithms make use of the "boosting" framework of Garg and Könemann [GK07] wherein solving multi-commodity flow is, by way of multiplicative-weights-type techniques, reduced to problems on graphs with arbitrary capacities and lengths. Thus, the fact that our algorithms work for arbitrary capacities and lengths are crucial for this later work. Likewise, this work also makes use of our sparse flow algorithms. Lastly, we note that this work uses the fact that our algorithms can output length-constrained expander decompositions with s = O(1) to compute "low-step multi-commodity flow emulators" which are, roughly, low-diameter graphs which represent all multi-commodity flows. Application 2: Distance Oracles (Subsequent Work) Another recent work [HLS24] makes use of our algorithms for length-constrained expander decompositions to give new distance oracle results. Specifically, this work shows that in a graph with general edge lengths one can maintain a data structure with n^{ϵ} worst-case update time which can answer distance queries between vertices that are $\exp(1/\epsilon)$ -approximate in $\operatorname{poly}(1/\epsilon) \cdot \log \log n$ time. Crucially, this work makes use of the fact that our algorithms for length-constrained expander decompositions can trade off between cut and length slack (the ϵ in their work and ours are roughly analogous). The previous best result along these lines is that of Chuzhoy and Zhang [CZ23] which gave a $(\log \log n)^{2^{O(1/\epsilon^3)}}$ -approximate fully-dynamic deterministic all-pair-shortest-path distance oracle with *amortized* n^{ϵ} update time using the below-mentioned well-connected graphs.

Application 3: Capacitated Length-Constrained Oblivious Routing. Lastly, we note that we obtain the first close-to-linear time algorithms for length-constrained oblivious routing on graphs with general capacities (with constant length slack). Specifically, in length-constrained oblivious routing the goal is to fix for each pair of vertices a flow over h'-length paths so that for any demand the induced flow is always congestion-competitive with the minimum congestion flow over h-length paths routing this demand. We refer to h'/h as the length competitiveness of such a routing scheme. [GHZ21] proved the existence of length-constrained oblivious routing schemes that simultaneously achieve poly log n length and congestion competitiveness (not using lengthconstrained expander decompositions). However, this result did not provide an efficient algorithm for computing such a scheme. [HRG22] addressed this by observing that one can use lengthconstrained expander decompositions to compute length-constrained oblivious routing schemes in time $m^{1+o(1)}$ that simultaneously achieve $n^{o(1)}$ length and congestion competitiveness.

Applying the techniques of [HRG22] and our algorithms for length-constrained expander decompositions, it follows that for any $\epsilon > 0$ (not too small as in Theorem 1.1) one can compute in time $m^{1+\epsilon}$ an oblivious length-constrained routing scheme that achieves length and congestion slack $\exp(\operatorname{poly}(1/\epsilon))$ and $n^{O(\epsilon)}$ respectively. Note that setting $\epsilon = 1/\sqrt{\log n}$ generalizes the [HRG22]. More importantly, since our algorithms for length-constrained expander decompositions work for the general capacities case, so too do our oblivious routing schemes unlike those of [HRG22]. Furthermore, if $\epsilon = O(1)$ then we achieve constant length competitiveness with sub-linear congestion competitiveness. Not only is this the first efficient algorithms for such a routing scheme, but even the existence of routing schemes with the stated competitiveness was not known prior to our work.

3 Additional Related Work

We give a brief overview of additional related work.

3.1 Applications of Expander Decompositions

We start by describing some additional work on the applications of expander decompositions.

Areas of use include linear systems [ST04], unique games [ABS15, Tre05, RS10], minimum cut [KT18], and dynamic algorithms [NSWN17]. Some of the long-standing-open questions which have recently been solved thanks to expander decompositions include: deterministic approximate balanced cut in near linear time (with applications to dynamic connectivity and MST) [CGL⁺20],

subquadratic time algorithms for bipartite matching [vdBLN⁺20], and deterministic algorithms for global min-cut in almost linear time [Li21].

3.2 Parallel Work on Well-Connected Graphs

A parallel and independent series of works by Chuzhoy [Chu23] and Chuzhoy and Zhang [CZ23] develops notions similar to (h, s)-length ϕ -expanders, sparse moving cuts, and cut-matching games for length-constrained expanders.

In particular, the concept of (ν, d) -well-connected graphs (proposed after the length-constrained expanders of [HRG22]) is similar in spirit to (h, s)-hop ϕ -expanders when restricted to graphs with diameter less than h. By way of their parameters, both types of graphs provide separate control over congestion (ν for well-connected graphs and $\frac{1}{\phi}$ for length-constrained expanders) and length (d for well-connected graphs and hs for length-constrained expanders) of routing paths, but there are some technical differences. Like the focus on small or constant s in this paper and [HRG22], the well-connected graphs of [Chu23] are particularly interesting when guaranteeing routing via very short sub-logarithmic paths.

One important difference between well-connected graphs and length-constrained expanders seems to be that (h, s)-length expanders are an expander-like notion that applies to arbitrary graphs with (potentially) large diameter, unlike well-connected graphs. In particular, they provide low congestion $(\tilde{O}(\frac{1}{\phi}))$ and low length (hs) routing guarantees for every unit demand between hclose nodes where h and hs are both independent and potentially much smaller than the diameter of the entire graph. On the other hand, well-connected graphs provide routing guarantees between all nodes and, as such, seem to correspond more closely to what we call routers in this work; see Definition 5.23. Overall, it is unclear if the notion of a length-constrained expander decomposition of a general graph that stands at the center of this paper relates in an immediate way to the notions of [Chu23] and [CZ23].

3.3 Routing in Expanders

As much of our work deals with finding good routes in (length-constrained) expanders, we briefly review some work on routing in expanders.

As mentioned earlier, expanders admit low congestion good multi-commodity flow solutions [LR99]. A closely related problem is that of finding edge-disjoint paths. [PU87] showed given any $\Omega(1)$ -expander and n^{ϵ} pairs for some small constant $\epsilon > 0$, it is possible to find edge-disjoint paths between these pairs in polynomial time. This was later improved by [Fri01] to $\Theta(\frac{n}{\log n})$ edge-disjoint paths in regular expanders. Many other works have studied this problem [BFU92, KR96, Val90, LMR94].

Along similar lines, [GKS17] introduced the notion of "expander routing" which allows each node v to exchange deg(v) messages with nodes of its choosing in the CONGEST model of distributed computation in about $n^{o(1)}/\phi$ time on ϕ -expanders. Using this approach, [GKS17] showed that a minimum spanning tree (MST) can be constructed in poly(ϕ^{-1}) $\cdot n^{o(1)}$ distributed time in ϕ -expanders, bypassing the earlier-mentioned $\Omega(\sqrt{n}/\log n)$ lower bound [PR00, DSHK⁺11] for small ϕ networks. This was later extended by [GL18] to a much wider class of optimization problems.

What use are expander decompositions for routing in graphs that are not expanders? [GRST21]

showed that expander decompositions can be used to route arbitrary demands in a tree-like, oblivious and $n^{o(1)}$ -congestion-competitive manner. There is also a great deal of related work on related "tree flow sparsifiers'; see, e.g. [Rac02].

4 Notation and Conventions

Before moving on to a more formal description of our results we introduce the notation and conventions that we use throughout this work.

Graphs. Let G = (V, E) be a graph with n := |V| vertices and m := |E| edges. By default, G is undirected, and allowed to have self-loops but not parallel edges. For each vertex $v \in V(G)$, we denote by $\deg_G(v)$ the degree of v in G. For $S \subset V$ we let the volume of S be $vol(S) = \sum_{v \in S} \deg_G(v)$. $E(S, V \setminus S)$ gives all edges with exactly one endpoint in S. We drop G subscript when it is clearly implied. We use standard graph terminology like adjacency, connectivity, connected components, as defined in, e.g. $[W^+01]$.

Edge Values and Path Lengths We will associate two functions with the edges of graph G. We clarify these here.

- 1. Capacities: We will let $U = \{U_e\}_e$ be the capacities of edges of E. These capacities will specify a maximum amount of flow (either length-constrained or not) that is allowed over each edge. Throughout this work we imagine each U_e is in $\mathbb{Z}_{>0}$.
- 2. Lengths: We will let $\ell = {\ell_e}_e$ be the *lengths* of edges in E. These lengths will be input to our problem and determine the lengths with respect to which we are computing lengthconstrained expanders and length-constrained expander decompositions. Throughout this work we imagine each ℓ_e is in $\mathbb{Z}_{>0}$. We will let $d_\ell(u, v)$ or $d_G(u, v)$ or just d(u, v) when G or ℓ are clear from context give the minimum value of a path in G that connects u and v where the value of a path P is $\ell(P) := \sum_{e \in P} \ell(e)$. We let $\text{ball}(v, h) := \{u : d_G(v, u) \leq h\}$ be all vertices within distance h from v according to ℓ_G . Prior works primarily used length-constrained expanders in the context of unit-length graphs and talked about h-hop expanders and h-hop expander decompositions. We deal with general lengths and use "length" instead of "hop" where appropriate.

Polynomial Size Objects (N). All objects (e.g. graphs with self-loops) defined in this paper are assumed to be of size polynomial in n, i.e., for a fixed large enough constant c_{\max} we assume that all objects are of size at most $N < n^{c_{\max}}$ where n is the number of vertices in the underlying graph. This polynomial bound on object sizes in this paper also allows us to treat logarithmic upper bounds in the sizes of these objects as essentially interchangeable, e.g., for any constant bases b, b'we have that $\log_b n \leq \log_{b'} n^{c_{\max}} = \Theta(\log_{b'} N)$. Throughout the paper we therefore use $O(\log N)$ without any explicitly chosen basis to denote such quantities. That is, all O-notation depends on c_{\max} . We use \tilde{O} , $\tilde{\Omega}$ and $\tilde{\Theta}$ notation to hide poly(N) factors. **Graph Arboricity.** Give graph G, a forest cover of G consists of sub-graphs F_1, F_2, \ldots, F_k of G which are forests such that for $j \neq i$ we have F_i and F_j are edge-disjoint and every edge of G occurs in some F_i . k is called the size of the forest cover and the *arboricity* α of graph G is the minimum size of a forest cover of G.

Flows. A (multicommodity) flow F in G is a function that assigns to each simple path P in G a flow value $F(P) \ge 0$. We say P is a flow-path of F if F(P) > 0. The value of F is $val(F) = \sum_{P \in F} F(P)$. We let $F(e) := \sum_{P \ni e} F(P)$ be the total flow through edge e. The congestion of F on an edge e is defined to be

$$\operatorname{cong}_F(e) := \sum_{P:e \in P} F(P)/U_e,$$

i.e., the total flow value of all paths going through e divided by the capacity of e. The *congestion* of F is

$$\operatorname{cong}(F) := \max_{e \in E(G)} \operatorname{cong}_F(e).$$

The *length* (a.k.a. dilation) of F is

$$\operatorname{dil}(F) = \max_{P:F(P)>0} \ell(P),$$

i.e., the maximum length of all flow-paths of F. The (maximum) step of F is

$$\operatorname{step}_F = \max_{P:F(P)>0} |P|,$$

i.e., the maximum number of edges in all flow-paths of F. Given $S, T \subseteq V$ we say that F is an S-T flow if each path in its support is from a vertex in S to a vertex in T. Given source, sink pairs $\{S_i, T_i\}_i$, we say that F is an $\{S_i, T_i\}_i$ flow if each path in its support is from a vertex in some S_i to a vertex in T_i . We say that F is feasible (with respect to capacities U) if $\operatorname{cong}(F) \leq 1$.

Demands. A demand $D: V \times V \to \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ assigns a non-negative value $D(v, w) \geq 0$ to each ordered pair of vertices in V. The size of a demand is written as |D| and is defined as $\sum_{v,w} D(v, w)$. A demand D is called *h*-length constrained (or simply *h*-length for short) if it assigns positive values only to pairs that are within distance at most h, i.e., D(v, w) > 0 implies that $d_G(v, w) \leq h$. We call a demand integral if all D(v, w) are integers and empty if |D| = 0. Given a flow F, the demand routed by F is denoted by D_F where, for each $u, v \in V$, $D_F(u, v) = \sum_{P \text{ is a } (u,v)\text{-path }} F(P)$ is the value of (u, v)-flow of F. We say that a demand D is routable in G with congestion η and dilation h iff there exists a flow F in G where $D_F = D$, $\operatorname{cong}_F \leq \eta$ and $\operatorname{dil}(F) \leq h$. We say that demand D is routable with dilation inflation s if there is a flow F that routes D and for every u and v in the support of F, every path in the support of F has length at most $s \cdot d(u, v)$. We say that an α fraction of D is routable if there exists a flow F with $\operatorname{val}(F) \geq \alpha \cdot |D|$ where the flow F sends from u to v is at most D(u, v) for every $u, v \in V$. **Graph Embeddings.** We will adopt the convention of an embedding of one graph into another being a mapping of each edge to a flow. Specifically, an *h*-length embedding of edge-capacitated graph H = (V, E) into edge-capacitated graph G is defined as follows. Let D_H be the demand that for each edge $e = \{u, v\}$ with capacity U_e sends U_e demand from u to v and vice versa. Then an *h*-length embedding of H into G is an *h*-length flow in G that routes D_H .

5 Preliminaries

In this section we review key definitions and theorems from previous work of which we make use.

5.1 Classic Expanders and Expander Robustness

We summarize some (mostly standard) definitions of cut sparsity and classic expanders. As this work will mostly deal with cuts understood as a collection of edges (rather than a collection of vertices), we provide edge-centric definitions. We begin with such a definition for cuts and cut sparsity.

Definition 5.1 (Classic Cut). Given connected graph G = (V, E), a (classic) cut is a set of edges $C \subseteq E$ such that $G - C := (V, E \setminus C)$ contains at least 2 connected components

Definition 5.2 ((Classic Edge) Cut Sparsity). Given graph G, the sparsity of (classic) cut C is

$$\phi(C) := |C| / \sum_{S_C \in \mathcal{S}_C} \operatorname{vol}(S_C)$$

where S_C is all connected components of G - C except for the connected component of maximum volume. We refer to S_C as the witness components of C.

Notice that the above definition of cut sparsity is equivalent to the vertex cut definition provided in Section 1 provided C separates the graph into two components.

The following formalizes classic expanders.

Definition 5.3 (Classic Expander). A graph G = (V, E) is a ϕ -expander if the sparsity of every cut $C \subseteq E$ is at least ϕ .

For the sake of comparison to our results in the length-constrained setting, we give the following result summarizing the robustness of expanders to edge deletions.

Theorem 5.4 (Theorem 1.3 of [SW19]). Let G = (V, E) be a ϕ -expander with m edges, let $D \subseteq E$ be a collection of edges and let $G' = (V, E \setminus D)$ be G with D deleted. Then there is a set $P \subseteq V$ such that:

- 1. $G'[V \setminus P]$ is $\frac{\phi}{6}$ -expanding;
- 2. $\operatorname{vol}(P) \leq \frac{8}{\phi} \cdot |D|$.

5.2 Length-Constrained Cuts (Moving Cuts)

We now recall formal definitions of length-constrained cuts from [HWZ20] which will allow us to define length-constrained expanders and length-constrained expander decompositions.

The following is the length-constrained analogue of a cut.

Definition 5.5 (Length-Constrained Cut (a.k.a. Moving Cut) [HWZ20]). An h-length moving cut (a.k.a. h-length cut) $C : E \mapsto \{0, \frac{1}{h}, \frac{2}{h}, \ldots, 1\}$ assigns to each edge e a fractional cut value between zero and one which is a multiple of $\frac{1}{h}$. The size of C is defined as $|C| = \sum_{e} U_e \cdot C(e)$. The length increase associated with the h-length moving cut C is denoted with $\ell_{C,h}$ and defined as assigning an edge e the length $\ell_{C,h}(e) = h \cdot C(e)$. Any moving cut which only assigns cut values equal to either 0 or 1 is called a pure moving cut.

We can understand length-constrained cuts as cutting in one of two ways. First, we can consider them as cutting apart vertex sets for which they cover all h-length paths between these vertex sets.

Definition 5.6 (Length-Constrained S-T and $\{S_i, T_i\}_i$ Cuts). Given vertex subsets $S, T \subseteq V$, we say that h-length cut C is an h-length S-T cut if each h-length S-T path P satisfies $C(P) \ge 1$. Likewise, given vertex subset pairs $\{S_i, T_i\}_i$ we say that C is an h-length $\{S_i, T_i\}_i$ cut if it is an S_i - T_i cut for each i.

By strong duality the size of the minimum size *h*-length $\{S_i, T_i\}$ cut is equal to the value of the maximum value feasible $\{S_i, T_i\}$ flow; see e.g. [HHS23].⁴ As such, we will say that a pair of *h*-length $\{S_i, T_i\}_i$ flow and cut (F, C) is $(1 \pm \epsilon)$ -approximate for $\epsilon \ge 0$ if the cut certifies the value of the length-constrained flow up to a $(1 - \epsilon)$; i.e. if $(1 - \epsilon) \cdot |C| \le \operatorname{val}(F)$.

Second, if we interpret length-constrained cuts as length increases, then we can understand them as cutting apart vertices that are made sufficiently far apart (i.e. separated). Specifically, consider the following is the result of applying a length-constrained cut in a graph.

Definition 5.7 (G-C). For a graph G with length function l_G and moving cut C, we denote with G-C the graph G with length function $l_{G-C} = l_G + \ell_{C,h}$. We refer to G-C as the graph G after cutting C or after applying the moving cut C.

Then, the following gives the appropriate length-constrained analogue of disconnecting two vertices or a demand by making the demand pairs sufficiently far apart (i.e. separated).

Definition 5.8 (h-Length Separation). Let C be an h-length moving cut. We say two node $v, v' \in V$ are h-length separated by C if their distance in G - C is larger than h, i.e., if $d_{G-C}(v, v') > h$.

Observe that if C is an h-length $\{u\}$ - $\{v\}$ cut then it always h-length separates u and v. However, C might h-length separate nodes u and v even if it is not an h-length $\{u\}$ - $\{v\}$ cut; e.g. in the case where u and v are nearly h-far in G.

⁴Really, strong duality requires that C assigns general values to edges (not just values that are multiples of $\frac{1}{h}$); this nuance can be ignored in this work as we are only interested in approximately optimal cuts.

Definition 5.9 (h-Length Separated Demand). For any demand D and any h-length moving cut C, we define the amount of h-length separated demand as the sum of demands between vertices that are h-length separated by C. We denote this quantity with $\operatorname{sep}_h(C, D)$, i.e.,

$$\operatorname{sep}_h(C,D) = \sum_{u,v:d_{G-C}(u,v) > h} D(u,v).$$

Using demand separation, we can carry over cut sparsity to the length-constrained setting.

Definition 5.10 (*h*-Length Sparsity of a Cut *C* for Demand *D*). For any demand *D* and any *h*-length moving cut *C* with $sep_h(C, D) > 0$, the *h*-length sparsity of *C* with respect to *D* is the ratio of *C*'s size to how much demand it *h*-length separates i.e.,

$$\operatorname{spars}_h(C, D) = \frac{|C|}{\operatorname{sep}_h(C, D)}.$$

Note that if a demand D has any demand between vertices that have length-distance exceeding h then the empty cut has an h-length sparsity for D which is equal to zero. For all other demands, i.e., for any non-empty h-length demand D with h < h', the h'-length sparsity of any cut C for D is always strictly positive.

5.3 Length-Constrained Expanders

We now move on to formally defining length-constrained expanders. Informally, they are graphs with no sparse length-constrained cuts.

We begin by introducing the notion of node-weightings which will give us a formal way of defining what it means for a subset of a graph to be a length-constrained ϕ -expanding.

Definition 5.11 (Node-Weightings). A node-weighting $A : V \to \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ of G assigns a value A(v) to a vertex v. The size of A is denoted by $|A| = \sum_{v} A(v)$. For two node-weightings A, A' we define $\min(A, A'), A - A'$ and A + A' as pointwise operations and let $\operatorname{supp}(A) := \{v : A(v) > 0\}$.

The following summarizes the demands we consider for a particular node-weighting.

Definition 5.12 (Demand Load and Respect). The load of a demand D, denoted with load(D), is the node-weighting which assigns the node v the weight $max\{\sum_{w\in V} D(v,w), \sum_{w\in V} D(w,v)\}$. We write $A \prec A'$ if A is pointwise smaller than A'. We say demand D is A-respecting if $load(D) \prec A$. We say that D is degree-respecting if D is deg_G -respecting.

Having defined node-weightings and their corresponding demands, we can now define their sparsity.

Definition 5.13 ((h, s)-Length Sparsity of a Cut w.r.t. a Node-Weighting). The (h, s)-length sparsity of any hs-length moving cut C with respect to a node-weighting A is defined as:

$$\operatorname{spars}_{(h,s)}(C,A) = \min_{A\text{-respecting }h\text{-length }demand \ D} \operatorname{spars}_{s\cdot h}(C,D)$$

We refer to the minimizing demand D above as the demand witnessing the sparsity of C with respect to A. We can analogously define the length-constrained conductance of a node-weighting.

Definition 5.14 ((h, s)-Length Conductance of a Node-Weighting). The (h, s)-length conductance of a node-weighting A in a graph G is defined as the (h, s)-length sparsity of the sparsest hs-length moving cut C with respect to A, i.e.,

$$\operatorname{cond}_{(h,s)}(A) = \min_{hs-length \ moving \ cut \ C} \operatorname{spars}_{(h,s)}(C,A).$$

When no node-weighting is mentioned then (h, s)-length sparsity and (h, s)-length conductance are defined with respect to the node-weighting deg_G which gives vertex v value deg_G(v). In other words, the (h, s)-length sparsity of an hs-length moving cut C in G is defined as spars_(h,s)<math>(C, G) =min_D spars_{hs}<math>(C, D) where the minimum is taken over all degree-respecting h-length demands. Similarly, the (h, s)-length conductance of G is defined as cond_{$(h,s)}<math>(G) = \min_{C} \text{spars}_{(h,s)}(C, \deg_{G})$ where the minimum is taken over all hs-length moving cuts.</sub></sub></sub>

With the above notion of conductance, we can now define when A is length-constrained expanding and when G is length-constrained expander.

Definition 5.15 ((h, s)-Length ϕ -Expanding Node-Weightings). We say a node-weighting A is (h, s)-length ϕ -expanding in G if the (h, s)-length conductance of A in G is at least ϕ .

Equivalently to the above, we will sometimes say that G is an (h, s)-length ϕ -expander for A. Applying the above definition to deg_G gives our formal definition of length-constrained ϕ -expanders.

Definition 5.16 ((h, s)-Length ϕ -Expanders). A graph G is an (h, s)-length ϕ -expander if deg_G is (h, s)-length ϕ -expanding in G.

The above definition of length-constrained expanders characterizes them in terms of conductance. The below fact from [HRG22] (see their Lemma 3.16) exactly characterizes length-constrained expanders as those graphs that admit both low congestion and low dilation routings.

Theorem 5.17 (Routing Characterization of Length-Constrained Expanders, [HRG22]). Given graph G and node-weighting A, for any $h \ge 1$, $\phi < 1$ and $s \ge 1$ we have:

- Length-Constrained Expanders Have Good Routings If A is (h, s)-length ϕ -expanding in G, then every h-length A-respecting demand can be routed in G with congestion at most $O(\log(N)/\phi)$ and dilation at most $s \cdot h$.
- Not Length-Constrained Expanders Have a Bad Demand If A is not (h, s)-length ϕ -expanding in G, then some h-length A-respecting demand cannot be routed in G with congestion at most $1/2\phi$ and dilation at most $\frac{s}{2} \cdot h$.

5.4 At Most Length-Constrained Expanders

Definition 5.18 (($\leq h, s$)-Length ϕ -Expanding Node-Weightings). We say a node-weighting A is ($\leq h, s$)-length ϕ -expanding in G if the (h', s)-length sparsity of A in G is at least ϕ for every $h' \leq h$.

Definition 5.19 (($\leq h, s$)-Length ϕ -Sparsity of Cut). We say a node-weighting A is ($\leq h, s$)-length ϕ -expanding in G if the (h', s)-length sparsity of A in G is at least ϕ for every $h' \leq h$.

5.5 Length-Constrained Expander Decompositions

Having defined length-constrained expanders, we can now define length-constrained expander decompositions. Informally, these are simply moving cuts whose application renders the graph a length-constrained expander.

Definition 5.20 (Length-Constrained Expander Decomposition). Given graph G, an (h, s)-length (resp. $(\leq h, s)$ -length) ϕ -expander decomposition for a node-weighting A with cut slack κ and length slack s is an hs-length cut C of size at most $\kappa \cdot \phi |A|$ such that A is (h, s)-length (resp. $(\leq h, s)$ -length) ϕ -expanding in G - C.

We will make use of a strengthened version of length-constrained expander decompositions called "linked" length-constrained expander decompositions. Informally, this is a length-constrained expander decomposition which renders G length-constrained expanding even after adding many selfloops. This is a strengthened version because adding self-loops only makes it harder for a graph to be a length-constrained expander. The following definition gives the self-loops we will add for a length-constrained expander decomposition C.

Definition 5.21 (Self-Loop Set L_C^{ℓ}). Let C be an h-length moving cut of a graph G = (V, E) and let ℓ be a positive integer divisible by h. For any vertex v, define $C(v) = \sum_{e \ni v} C(e)$. The self-loop set L_C^{ℓ} consists of $C(v) \cdot \ell$ self-loops at v. We let $G + L_C^{\ell} := (V, E \cup L_C^{\ell})$.

Using the above self-loops, we can now define linked length-constrained expander decompositions.

Definition 5.22 (Linked Length-Constrained Expander Decomposition). Let G be a graph. An ℓ -linked (h, s)-length (resp. $(\leq h, s)$ -length) ϕ -expander decomposition of a node-weighting A on G with cut slack κ is an hs-length moving cut C such that $|C| \leq \kappa \cdot \phi |A|$ and $A \cup L_C^{\ell}$ is (h, s)-length (resp. $(\leq h, s)$ -length) ϕ -expanding in $G + L_C^{\ell} - C$.

As before, we say that moving cut C is an (h, s)-length ϕ -expander decomposition (linked or not) for G if it is an (h, s)-length ϕ -expander decomposition for the node-weighting deg_G.

5.6 Routers, Power Graphs and Expander Power Graph Robustness

Having introduced length-constrained expander decompositions in the previous section, we introduce and discuss the closely related notion of graph routers, which will be useful for our characterizations of length-constrained expanders in terms of (classic) expanders.

Definition 5.23 (Routers). Given graph G and node-weighting A, we say that G is a t-step κ -router for A if every A-respecting demand can be routed in H via a t-step flow with congestion at most κ .

As with length-constrained expanders, we say G is just a t-step κ -router if it is a t-step κ -router for deg_G.

Observe that, by the flow characterization of length-constrained expanders (Theorem 5.17), routers are essentially the same object as (h, s)-length ϕ -expanders with unit length $t = \Theta(hs)$ long routing paths, congestion $\kappa = \tilde{\Theta}(\frac{1}{\phi})$ congestion, and a diameter smaller than h, which guarantees that any demand is h-length and therefore any degree-respecting demand must be routable. The following formalizes this.

Lemma 5.24. Let G be a graph with unit length edges. Let A be a node-weighting where $\operatorname{diam}_G(\operatorname{supp}(A)) \leq h$. Then:

- Expander Implies Router: If G is a (h, s)-length ϕ -expander for A, then G is an hs-step $O(\frac{\log N}{\phi})$ -router for A;
- **Router Implies Expander:** If G is not a (h, s)-length ϕ -expander for A, then G is not an $(\frac{hs}{2})$ -step $\frac{1}{2\phi}$ -router for A.

Proof. Since diam_G(supp(A)) $\leq h$, the set of A-respecting demands and the set of h-length A-respecting demands are identical. Therefore, by Theorem 5.17, if G is a (h, s)-length ϕ -expander for A, then every A-respecting demand can be routed in G with congestion $O(\log(N)/\phi)$ and sh steps. Otherwise, some A-respecting demand cannot be routed in G with congestion $1/2\phi$ and (sh)/2 steps. This completes the proof by Definition 5.23.

Of particular interest to us will be routers constructed by taking power graphs, defined as follows.

Definition 5.25 (kth Power Graph). Given a graph G = (V, E), we let $G^k = (V, E^k)$ be the graph that has an edge for each path of length at most k. In particular, $\{u, v\} \in E^k$ iff $d_G(u, v) \leq k$.

The following are easy-to-verify routers.

Lemma 5.26 (Star is a Router). Let G be a star where rooted at r with node-weighting A where the set of leaves of G is supp(A). The capacity of each star-edge $(r, v) \in E(G)$ is A(v). Then, G is a 2-step 1-router for A.

Lemma 5.27 (Complete Graph is a Router). Let G be a complete graph with node-weighting A where $V(G) = \operatorname{supp}(A)$ and where for each $v, w \in \operatorname{supp}(A)$ and the capacity of (v, w) is $\frac{A(v) \cdot A(w)}{|A|}$. Then, G is a 2-step 2-router for A.

Lemma 5.28 (Expander Power is a Router). Let G be a constant-degree $\Omega(1)$ -expander. Then G is a $O(\log n)$ -step $O(\log n)$ -router and G^k is a $O(\log n/k)$ -step $O(\log n/k)$ -router.

Lastly, we observe that power graphs when used as routers are robust to edge deletions. In particular, the following is immediate from Lemma 5.28 and well-known results for expanders.

Lemma 5.29 (Robustness of Expander Power Routers, Adaptation of Theorem 2.1 of [SW19].). Suppose $H = (V, E_H)$ is an $\Omega(1)$ -expander with maximum degree Δ and $G := H^k = (V, E_G)$ is the kth power graph of H. Then for any subset $D \subseteq E_G$, let $G' := (V, E_G \setminus D)$ be G with D deleted. Then, there exists a subset of vertices $V' \subseteq V$ connected in G'[V'] where:

1. G'[V'] is a $O(\frac{\log N}{k})$ -step $O(\frac{\log N}{k})$ -router; 2. $|V'| \ge |V| - O(\frac{k \cdot \Delta^{2k}}{\phi}) \cdot |D|$.

5.7 Neighborhood Covers

Our characterizations of length-constrained expander decompositions in terms of (classic) expander decompositions will make use of so-called neighborhood covers. Neighborhood covers are a special kind of clustering.

Definition 5.30 (Clustering). Given a graph G with edge lengths ℓ , a clustering S in G with diameter h_{diam} is a collection of disjoint vertex sets $S_1, \ldots, S_{|S|}$, called clusters, where every cluster has diameter at most h_{diam} in G. A clustering has absolute separation h_{sep} or separation factor s if the distance between any two clusters is at least h_{sep} or $s \cdot h_{\text{diam}}$, respectively.

Definition 5.31 (Neighborhood Cover). A neighborhood cover \mathcal{N} with width ω and covering radius h_{cov} is a collection of ω many clusterings S_1, \ldots, S_ω such that for every node v there exists a cluster S in some S_i containing ball (v, h_{cov}) .

We will say that a neighborhood cover \mathcal{N} has diameter h_{diam} if every clustering has diameter at most h_{diam} and absolute separation h_{sep} or separation-factor s if this applies to each of its clusterings. Note, however, that two clusterings in a given neighborhood cover may have different diameters.

We use the following result for neighborhood covers, which can be proved in a similar way to Lemma 8.15 of [HRG22].

Theorem 5.32 ([HRG22]). For any h_{cov} , s > 1 and $\epsilon \in (0, 1)$ and graph G there exists a neighborhood cover with covering radius h_{cov} , separation-factor s, diameter $h_{diam} = \frac{1}{\epsilon} \cdot O(s)^{O(1/\epsilon)} \cdot h_{cov}$ and width $\omega = N^{O(\epsilon)} \log N$. Moreover, there exists an algorithm that computes such a neighborhood cover in $h_{diam} \cdot N^{O(\epsilon)}$ depth and $m \cdot h_{diam} \cdot N^{O(\epsilon)}$ work with high probability.

5.8 Length-Constrained Expansion Witnesses

In this section we define the notion of a witness of $(\leq h, s)$ -length ϕ -expansion. Below, for nodeweighting A and nodes S, we let A_S be A restricted to nodes in S.

Definition 5.33 (Length-Constrained Expansion Witness). $A (\leq h, s)$ -length ϕ -expansion witness for graph G and node-weighting A consists of the following where $s_0 \cdot s_1 \leq s$ and $\kappa_0 \cdot \kappa_1 \leq 1/\phi$:

- Neighborhood Cover: a neighborhood cover $\mathcal{N}_{h'}$ of G with covering radius h' for each $h' \leq h$ a power of 2;
- **Routers:** an s_0 -step and κ_0 congestion router R_S of A_S for each $S \in \bigcup_{h'} \mathcal{N}_{h'}$;
- Embedding of Routers: an $(h' \cdot s_1)$ -length embedding F_S of R_S into G for each $S \in \mathcal{N}_{h'}$ for each $\mathcal{N}_{h'}$ such that $\sum_{h'} \sum_{S \in \mathcal{N}_{h'}} F$ has congestion at most κ_1 .

A witness of (h, s)-length ϕ -expansion is defined identically to the above but there is only a single neighborhood cover \mathcal{N}_h with covering radius h.

It is easy to verify that such a witness indeed witnesses that an input graph is a lengthconstrained expander.

Lemma 5.34. If a graph G and node-weighting A have an (h, s)-length (resp. $(\leq h, s)$ -length) ϕ -expansion witness then G is an (h, s)-length (resp. $(\leq h, s)$ -length) ϕ -expander with respect to A.

The following gives our definition of a witnessed length-constrained expander decomposition.

Definition 5.35 (Witnessed Length-Constrained Expander Decompositions). A witnessed (h, s)-length (resp. $(\leq h, s)$ -length) ϕ -expander decomposition consists of an (h, s)-length (resp. $(\leq h, s)$ -length) ϕ -expander decomposition C along with an (h, s)-length (resp. $(\leq h, s)$ -length) ϕ -expansion witness for G - C.

6 Main Result Restated: Length-Constrained ED Algorithm

Having formally defined length-constrained expander decompositions in the previous section, we now restate the guarantees of our algorithm for computing these decompositions for convenience.

The following gives the main result of our work.

Theorem 1.1. There is a constant c > 1 such that given graph G with edge lengths and capacities, $\epsilon \in \left(\frac{1}{\log^{1/c} N}, 1\right)$, node-weighting A, length bound $h \ge 1$, and conductance $\phi > 0$, one can compute a witnessed $(\le h, s)$ -length ϕ -expander decomposition for A in G with cut and length slack respectively

$$\kappa = n^{\epsilon}$$
 $s = \exp(\operatorname{poly}(1/\epsilon))$

and work and depth respectively

$$\mathsf{W}_{\mathrm{ED}}(A,m) \le m \cdot \tilde{O}\left(n^{\mathrm{poly}(\epsilon)} \cdot \mathrm{poly}(h)\right) \qquad \mathsf{D}_{\mathrm{ED}}(A,m) \le \tilde{O}\left(n^{\mathrm{poly}(\epsilon)} \cdot \mathrm{poly}(h)\right).$$

The proof of Theorem 1.1 uses several new notions and techniques that we introduce in the subsequent sections. The final proof of Theorem 1.1 is in Section 15. We show that we can additionally achieve linkedness in Section 16.

7 Length-Constrained Expanders as Embedded Expander Powers

Towards understanding whether large sparse length-constrained cuts quickly yield length-constrained expander decompositions, we begin by providing a new characterization of length-constrained expander decompositions in terms of classic expanders. One of the great benefits of such a characterization is that it will allow us to bring well-studied tools from the classic expander setting to bear on length-constrained expanders.

Challenge. Achieving such a characterization may seem impossible. Length-constrained expanders are fundamentally different objects from classic expanders: as earlier mentioned, many graphs which are length-constrained expanders are not classic expanders and adding length constraints destroys the structure of many otherwise well-behaved objects.

Basic Version of Result. We show that, nonetheless, length-constrained expander decompositions are exactly those graphs that admit low congestion and dilation embeddings of regular expanders in every local neighborhood. More formally, if H is a constant-degree $\Omega(1)$ -expander, we show that a graph G is an (h, s)-length ϕ -expander iff it is possible to embed H into every h-neighborhood in G with congestion about $\frac{1}{\phi}$ using paths of length at most $hs/\Theta(\log n)$. **Full Result.** The above characterization has two downsides. First, assuming integer lengths, such an embedding only makes sense when $hs \ge \Omega(\log n)$. However, (h, s)-length $\Omega(1)$ -expanders are only interesting and distinct from classic $\Omega(1)$ -expanders when $hs \ll O(\log n)$. Second, the embedding is brittle in the sense that if even a small part of the graph is not embeddable then the entire graph is declared to be not length-constrained expanding.

We address these issues by significantly strengthening this result. First, we allow for $hs = o(\log n)$ by considering embeddings of the "kth power graph" H^k of classic expander H rather than H itself. In particular, this allows use to trade off between congestion and dilation, showing G is an (h, s)-length ϕ -expander iff H^k can be embedded into every neighborhood with congestion at most about $\frac{1}{\phi \cdot 2^k}$ using paths of length at most $hs \cdot k / \Theta(\log n)$. Observe that, assuming integer lengths, such an embedding makes sense as long as $hs \cdot k \ge \Theta(\log n)$. Second, we show that if such embeddings are mostly possible in G, then most of G is an (h, s)-length ϕ -expander.

Techniques. The main proof idea for this result is as follows. First, we argue that we can route in H^k with low congestion over paths of length $O(\log n/k)$. Then, if our embedding exists, we can embed these routes in the expander powers into the original graph with low dilation and congestion. This gives low congestion and dilation routes in the original graph, showing it is a length-constrained expander. We formalize these embeddings with the idea of the "neighborhood router demand."

Theorem 7.1. Suppose we are given a graph G, node-weighting A, $h \ge 1$ and parameters $k, k' \ge 1$. Then:

- Length-Constrained Expander Implies Embedding: If G is an (hk', s)-length ϕ -expander for A then $D_{A,k,k'}$ is routeable with congestion $O(\frac{\log N}{\phi})$ and dilation $2k' \cdot hs$.
- Embedding Implies Length-Constrained Expander: Let G' be G with a moving cut applied. If a (1ϵ) fraction of $D_{A,k,k'}$ is routable in G' with congestion $\frac{1}{\phi}$ and dilation hs then there is a node-weighting $A' \preccurlyeq A$ of size $|A'| \ge |A| \cdot (1 \epsilon')$ such that A' is (h, s')-length ϕ' -expanding in G' where $\epsilon' = O\left(\epsilon \cdot 2^{O(k)} \cdot N^{O(1/k')} \log N\right), s' = O\left(s \cdot \frac{\log N}{k}\right)$ and $\phi' = \Omega\left(\phi \cdot 2^{-O(k)} \cdot N^{-O(1/k')} \cdot \log^{-2} N\right).$

Notice that the above states that if one can embed expander powers into *most* of a graph then *most* of the graph is a length-constrained expander. k and k' above correspond to the power of the expanders that we take and the diameter of neighborhood covers that we use respectively.

7.1 Formalizing the Embedding via the Neighborhood Router Demand

We begin by formalizing the aforementioned embedding with what we call the neighborhood router demand, $D_{A,k,k'}$.

Formally, suppose we are given a graph G = (V, E) and a node-weighting A of G as well as a length bound h and parameters $k, k' \geq 1$. To compute the neighborhood router demand we first compute a neighborhood cover $\mathcal{N} = \{S_1, S_2 \dots\}$ with covering radius h, diameter $k' \cdot h$, load $N^{O(1/k')} \log N$ and separation factor 2; such a neighborhood cover exists by Theorem 5.32.



Figure 1: Our neighborhood router demand for one cluster $S_{i,j}$. 1a gives the cluster $S_{i,j}$ with node v labeled with A(v). 1b gives the graph $H_{i,j}^k$ we want to embed into $S_{i,j}$. 1c gives the demand $D_{i,j}$ corresponding to this embedding (times Δ^k) in dashed blue. Our neighborhood router demand is then computed by doing this for all such clusters and scaling down appropriately.

We now construct a graph $H_{i,j}$ associated with each cluster $S_{i,j} \in \bigcup_i S_i$. The vertex set of $H_{i,j}$ consists of A(u) copies for each vertex $u \in V$ for $\sum_{u \in S_{i,j}} A(u)$ total vertices in $H_{i,j}$. We let copies_{i,j}(u) denote these copies of u in $H_{i,j}$ and let $V_{i,j} := \bigcup_{u \in S_{i,j}} \text{copies}_{i,j}(u)$ be all such copies. Then, we let $H_{i,j} = (V_{i,j}, E_{i,j})$ be a fixed but arbitrary $\Omega(1)$ -expander with max degree $\Delta = O(1)$ with vertex set $V_{i,j}$; such graphs are well-known to exist by e.g. [ASS08].

Likewise, we let $H_{i,j}^k = (V_{i,j}, E_{i,j}^k)$ be the *k*th power graph of $H_{i,j}$ as defined in Section 5.6. Lastly, for $u, v \in V$ we let

$$E_{i,j}^{k}(u,v) := \{\{u',v'\} \in E' : u' \in \text{copies}_{i,j}(u), v' \in \text{copies}_{i,j}(v)\}$$

be edges of $H_{i,j}^k$ between copies of u and v. We then define the neighborhood router demand associated with cluster $S_{i,j}$ on vertices $u, v \in V$ as

$$D_{i,j}(u,v) := \frac{1}{\Delta^k} \cdot |E_{i,j}^k(u,v)|.$$

See Figure 1 for an illustration of $D_{i,j}$.

Similarly, we define the entire neighborhood router demand as

$$D_{A,k,k'} := \frac{1}{\operatorname{load}_{\mathcal{N}}} \cdot \sum_{i,j} D_{i,j}$$

We verify the basic properties of $D_{A,k,k'}$.

Lemma 7.1. $D_{A,k,k'}$ is A-respecting and (hk')-length. Furthermore $|D_{A,k,k'}| \geq \frac{1}{N^{O(1/k')} \cdot \log N} \cdot |A|$.

Proof. We prove that $D_{A,k,k'}$ is hk'-length and then that it is A-respecting.

- $D_{A,k,k'}$ is hk'-length since each $D_{i,j}(u,v) > 1$ only if $u, v \in S_{i,j}$ for some i and j and each $S_{i,j}$ has diameter at most hk' by our assumption that \mathcal{N} has diameter hk'.
- $D_{A,k,k'}$ is A-respecting: recall that to be A-respecting we must show that for every v we have max $\{\sum_{u} D_{A,k,k'}(u,v), \sum_{u} D_{A,k,k'}(v,u)\} \le A(v)$; consider such a v; we will show $\sum_{u} D_{A,k,k'}(v,u) \le A(v)$; consider such a v; we will show $\sum_{u} D_{A,k,k'}(v,u) \le A(v)$; consider such a v; we will show $\sum_{u} D_{A,k,k'}(v,u) \le A(v)$; consider such a v; we will show $\sum_{u} D_{A,k,k'}(v,u) \le A(v)$; consider such a v; we will show $\sum_{u} D_{A,k,k'}(v,u) \le A(v)$; consider such a v; we will show $\sum_{u} D_{A,k,k'}(v,u) \le A(v)$; consider such a v; we will show $\sum_{u} D_{A,k,k'}(v,u) \le A(v)$; consider such a v; we will show $\sum_{u} D_{A,k,k'}(v,u) \le A(v)$; consider such a v; we will show $\sum_{u} D_{A,k,k'}(v,u) \le A(v)$; consider such a v; we will show $\sum_{u} D_{A,k,k'}(v,u) \le A(v)$; consider such a v; we will show $\sum_{u} D_{A,k,k'}(v,u) \le A(v)$; consider such a v; we will show $\sum_{u} D_{A,k,k'}(v,u) \le A(v)$; consider such a v; we will show $\sum_{u} D_{A,k,k'}(v,u) \le A(v)$; consider such a v; we will show $\sum_{u} D_{A,k,k'}(v,u) \le A(v)$; consider such a v; we will show $\sum_{u} D_{A,k,k'}(v,u) \le A(v)$; consider such a v; we will show $\sum_{u} D_{A,k,k'}(v,u) \le A(v)$; consider such a v; we will show $\sum_{u} D_{A,k,k'}(v,u) \le A(v)$; consider such a v; we will show $\sum_{u} D_{A,k,k'}(v,u) \le A(v)$; consider such a v; we will show $\sum_{u} D_{A,k,k'}(v,u) \le A(v)$; consider such a v; we will show $\sum_{u} D_{A,k,k'}(v,u) \le A(v)$; consider such a v; we will show $\sum_{u} D_{A,k'}(v,u) \le A(v)$; consider such a v; we will show $\sum_{u} D_{A,k'}(v,u) \le A(v)$; consider such a v; we will show $\sum_{u} D_{A,k'}(v,u) \le A(v)$; consider such a v; we will show $\sum_{u} D_{A,k'}(v,u) \le A(v)$; consider such a v; we will show $\sum_{u} D_{A,k'}(v,u) \le A(v)$; consider such a v; we will show $\sum_{u} D_{A,k'}(v,u) \le A(v)$; consider such a v; we will show $\sum_{u} D_{A,k'}(v,u) \le A(v)$; consider such a v; we will show $\sum_{u} D_{A,k'}(v,u) \le A(v)$; consider such a v; we will show $\sum_{u} D_{A,k'$

A(v) (showing $\sum_{u} D_{A,k,k'}(u,v) \leq A(v)$ is symmetric); observe that since each vertex in H has degree at most Δ , we know that each vertex in $H_{i,j}^k$ has degree at most Δ^k and so for each i and j we have

$$\sum_{u} D_{i,j}(v,u) = \sum_{u} \sum_{u' \in \operatorname{copies}_{i,j}(u)} \sum_{v' \in \operatorname{copies}_{i,j}(v)} \frac{1}{\Delta^k} \cdot \mathbb{1}(\{u',v'\} \in E(H_{i,j}^k))$$

$$= \sum_{v' \in \operatorname{copies}_{i,j}(v)} \frac{1}{\Delta^k} \cdot \deg_{H_{i,j}^k}(v')$$

$$\leq \sum_{v' \in \operatorname{copies}_{i,j}(v)} 1$$

$$\leq A(v) \qquad (1)$$

The claim then follows from the fact that no vertex is in more than load \mathcal{N} -many clusters. Namely, applying Equation (1) and the definition of load \mathcal{N} :

$$D_{A,k,k'}(v,u) = \frac{1}{\operatorname{load} \mathcal{N}} \cdot \sum_{i,j} D_{i,j}(v,u)$$
$$\leq \frac{1}{\operatorname{load} \mathcal{N}} \cdot \sum_{i,j} A(v)$$
$$\leq A(v).$$

Lastly, we argue the lower bound on $|D_{A,k,k'}|$. Observe that each time a vertex u is in $S_{i,j}$, it is responsible for A(u) copies in each $H_{i,j}^k$ where each copy has degree $\Omega(1)$ and so contributes at least $\Omega(A(u)/\operatorname{load}_{\mathcal{N}})$ to $|D_{A,k,k'}|$.

7.2 Proving Length-Constrained Expanders are Embedded Expander Powers

Having formally defined the neighborhood router demand, we proceed to show the main theorem of this section (Theorem 7.1): the extent to which a graph is a length-constrained expander is more or less captured by how well the neighborhood router demand can be routed and, in particular, how well expander powers embed into the input graph.

Theorem 7.1. Suppose we are given a graph G, node-weighting A, $h \ge 1$ and parameters $k, k' \ge 1$. Then:

- Length-Constrained Expander Implies Embedding: If G is an (hk', s)-length ϕ -expander for A then $D_{A,k,k'}$ is routeable with congestion $O(\frac{\log N}{\phi})$ and dilation $2k' \cdot hs$.
- Embedding Implies Length-Constrained Expander: Let G' be G with a moving cut applied. If a (1ϵ) fraction of $D_{A,k,k'}$ is routable in G' with congestion $\frac{1}{\phi}$ and dilation hs then there is a node-weighting $A' \preccurlyeq A$ of size $|A'| \ge |A| \cdot (1 \epsilon')$ such that A' is (h, s')-length ϕ' -expanding in G' where $\epsilon' = O\left(\epsilon \cdot 2^{O(k)} \cdot N^{O(1/k')} \log N\right), s' = O\left(s \cdot \frac{\log N}{k}\right)$ and $\phi' = \Omega\left(\phi \cdot 2^{-O(k)} \cdot N^{-O(1/k')} \cdot \log^{-2} N\right).$

Proof. The fact that if G is an (hk', s)-length ϕ -expander for A then $D_{A,k,k'}$ can be routed with the stated path length and congestion is immediate from Theorem 5.17 and Lemma 7.1

We now turn to the second point; namely we argue that if a $(1 - \epsilon)$ fraction of $D_{A,k,k'}$ can be routed with congestion $\frac{1}{\phi}$ and dilation hs in G' then there is a node-weighting $A' \preccurlyeq A$ of size at least $|A| \cdot (1 - \epsilon')$ that is (h, s')-length ϕ' -expanding in G'. To argue that such an A' exists, by Theorem 5.17 it suffices to show that there is an A' of size at least $|A| \cdot (1 - \epsilon')$ where every A'-respecting h-length demand can be routed with congestion at most $O(\frac{1}{\phi'})$ and dilation at most O(hs'). We proceed to argue this A' exists.

We let F be the flow in G' that routes at least a $(1 - \epsilon)$ fraction of $D_{A,k,k'}$ with congestion $\frac{1}{\phi}$ and dilation hs. The basic idea is to map F into each $H_{i,j}^k$, perform (normal) expander pruning in $H_{i,j}^k$ and then map the large expanding subset in $H_{i,j}^k$ back into G'.

We say that the pair $\{u, v\} \subseteq V$ is unsuccessfully embedded if $F(u, v) < .5 \cdot D_{A,k,k'}(u, v)$ and let \overline{E} be all unsuccessfully embedded pairs. For a fixed $S_{i,j}$, this allows us to define $\overline{E}_{i,j}^k$ as the edges of $H_{i,j}^k$ corresponding to all unsuccessfully embedded pairs as follows:

$$\bar{E}_{i,j}^k := \bigcup_{\{u,v\}\in\bar{E}} E_{i,j}^k(u,v).$$

We proceed to define our node weights $A' \preccurlyeq A$ of size at least $(1 - \epsilon') \cdot |A|$. In short, we will find this subset by applying expander pruning on $H_{i,j}^k$ where $\bar{E}_{i,j}^k$ gives us the edges we deleted as input to expander pruning. Specifically, letting $\hat{H}_{i,j}^k$ be $H_{i,j}^k$ with $\bar{E}_{i,j}$ deleted, we know by Lemma 5.29 that there is a subset of vertices $V'_{i,j} \subseteq V_{i,j}$ connected in $\hat{H}_{i,j}^k[V'_{i,j}]$ satisfying

1. $\hat{H}_{i,j}^k[V_{i,j}']$ is a $O(\frac{\log N}{k})$ -step $O(\frac{\log N}{k})$ -router;

2.
$$|V'_{i,j}| \ge |V_{i,j}| - k \cdot 2^{O(k)} \cdot |E_{i,j}|.$$

This subset $V'_{i,j}$ naturally corresponds to a node-weighting $A'_{i,j}$. In particular, we let $A'_{i,j}$ on v be:

$$A'_{i,j}(v) := |\operatorname{copies}_{i,j}(v) \cap V'_{i,j}|$$

and then let A' on v be defined as:

$$A'(v) := \min_{i,j} A'_{i,j}(v).$$

First, we claim that $A' \preccurlyeq A$. Observe that for each v we have:

$$\begin{aligned} A'(v) &= \min_{i,j} A'_{i,j}(v) \\ &\leq \max_{i,j} A'_{i,j}(v) \\ &= \max_{i,j} |\text{copies}_{i,j}(v) \cap V'_{i,j} \\ &\leq A(v). \end{aligned}$$

Next, we claim that $|A'| \ge |A| \cdot \left(1 - \epsilon \cdot 2^{O(k)} \cdot N^{O(1/k')} \cdot \log N\right)$.

Let $\bar{D}_{A,k,k'}$ be all the demand that F does not satisfy to extent at least .5; that is, $\bar{D}_{A,k,k'}$ on (u,v) is $\sum_{\{u,v\}\in\bar{E}} D_{A,k,k'}(u,v)$. Observe that by an averaging argument and our assumption that at least a $(1-\epsilon)$ fraction of $D_{A,k,k'}$ is routed we know that $|\bar{D}_{A,k,k'}| \leq 2\epsilon \cdot |D_{A,k,k'}|$. On the other hand, each pair of vertices $\{u,v\}$ in \bar{E} (i.e. each unsuccessfully embedded pair) corresponds to at most $|E_{i,j}(u,v)|$ edges in $H^k_{i,j}$; and so

$$\sum_{i,j} |\bar{E}_{i,j}| = \sum_{i,j} \sum_{\{u,v\} \in \bar{E}} |E_{i,j}(u,v)|$$

$$= \sum_{i,j} \Delta^k \sum_{\{u,v\} \in \bar{E}} D_{i,j}(u,v)$$

$$= \Delta^k \cdot \operatorname{load}_{\mathcal{N}} \cdot \sum_{\{u,v\} \in \bar{E}} D_{A,k,k'}(u,v)$$

$$= \Delta^k \cdot \operatorname{load}_{\mathcal{N}} \cdot |\bar{D}_{A,k,k'}|$$

$$\leq \Delta^k \cdot \operatorname{load}_{\mathcal{N}} \cdot 2\epsilon \cdot |D_{A,k,k'}|$$

$$\leq \epsilon \cdot 2^{O(k)} \cdot N^{O(1/k')} \cdot \log N \cdot |D_{A,k,k'}|.$$
(2)

where in the last line we used our choice of neighborhood cover with load $N^{O(1/k')} \log N$ and the fact that $\Delta = O(1)$.

Thus, combining Equation (2), the fact that $|V'_{i,j}| \ge |V_{i,j}| - k \cdot 2^{O(k)} \cdot |\bar{E}_{i,j}|$ for each *i* and *j* and the fact that $|D_{A,k,k'}| \le |A|$ since $D_{A,k,k'}$ is A-respecting (as proved in Lemma 7.1), we have

$$\begin{aligned} A'| &= \sum_{v} A'(v) \\ &= \sum_{v} \min_{i,j} |\operatorname{copies}_{i,j}(v) \cap V'_{i,j}| \\ &= \sum_{v} A(v) - \max_{i,j} |\operatorname{copies}_{i,j}(v) \setminus V'_{i,j}| \\ &\geq \sum_{v} \left[A(v) - \sum_{i,j} |\operatorname{copies}_{i,j}(v) \setminus V'_{i,j}| \right] \\ &= |A| - \sum_{i,j} \left[|V(H^k_{i,j})| - |V'_{i,j}| \right] \\ &\geq |A| - k \cdot 2^{O(k)} \cdot \sum_{i,j} |\bar{E}_{i,j}| \\ &\geq |A| \cdot \left(1 - \epsilon \cdot 2^{O(k)} \cdot N^{O(1/k')} \cdot \log N \right) \end{aligned}$$

Lastly, we claim that A' is (h, s')-length ϕ' -expanding in G'. Recall that $s' = O\left(s \cdot \frac{\log N}{k}\right)$ and $\phi' = \Omega\left(\phi \cdot 2^{-O(k)} \cdot N^{-O(1/k')} \log^{-2} N\right)$ By Theorem 5.17 it suffices to argue that every *h*-length A'-respecting demand can be routed in G' with congestion at most $O\left(\frac{1}{\phi'}\right)$ and dilation at most O(hs').

Consider an A'-respecting h-length demand D in G'. As above, let F be our flow which certifies that at least a $(1 - \epsilon)$ fraction of $D_{A,k,k'}$ can be routed in G'. The basic idea is to route D by treating F as an embedding of each power graph $H_{i,j}^k$ into G' and then routing in each $H_{i,j}^k$. We will use this strategy to construct a flow \hat{F} which routes D by routing it in each $H_{i,j}^k$ and then using F to project this routes back into G'.

More formally, fix an $S_{i,j}$. We proceed to define a demand $D'_{i,j}$ on $\hat{H}^k_{i,j}[V'_{i,j}]$. In particular, for each pair of vertices $u', v' \in V'_{i,j}$ where $u' \in \text{copies}(u)$ and $v' \in \text{copies}(v)$ we let

$$D'_{i,j}(u',v') := \begin{cases} \frac{D(u,v)}{A'_{i,j}(u) \cdot A'_{i,j}(v)} & \text{if } A'(u) \cdot A'(v) \neq 0\\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

and so by definition of $A'_{i,j}(u)$ we have

$$\sum_{u' \in \operatorname{copies}_{i,j}(u)} \sum_{v' \in \operatorname{copies}_{i,j}(v)} D'_{i,j}(u',v') = D(u,v).$$

We next claim that $D'_{i,j}$ is degree-respecting in $\hat{H}^k_{i,j}[V'_{i,j}]$. To do so we will argue that for any $u' \in V'_{i,j}$ we have $\sum_{v'} D'_{i,j}(u',v') \leq 1$; showing a symmetric upper bound on $\sum_{v'} D'_{i,j}(v',u')$ is symmetric. u' must have degree at least 1 since we know that $\hat{H}^k_{i,j}[V'_{i,j}]$ is connected and so this shows that $D'_{i,j}$ is degree-respecting. To see this observe that applying the definition of $D'_{i,j}$ and the fact that D is A'-respecting we have:

$$\sum_{v'} D'_{i,j}(u',v') = \sum_{v \in S_{i,j}} \sum_{v' \in \operatorname{copies}_{i,j}(v)} D'_{i,j}(u',v')$$
$$= \frac{1}{A'(u)} \cdot \sum_{v} D(u,v)$$
$$\leq 1;$$

Since $D'_{i,j}$ is degree respecting and since $\hat{H}^k_{i,j}[V'_{i,j}]$ is a $O(\log N/k)$ -step $O(\log N/k)$ -router, $D'_{i,j}$ can be routed on $\hat{H}^k_{i,j}[V'_{i,j}]$ with congestion $O(\log N/k)$ and $O(\log N/k)$ steps. Let $F'_{i,j}$ be the flow on $\hat{H}^k_{i,j}[V'_{i,j}]$ that routes $D'_{i,j}$ with congestion $O(\log N/k)$ and $O(\log N/k)$ dilation.

By using F as an embedding, we can see that $F'_{i,j}$ naturally corresponds to a flow $F_{i,j}$ on G. Specifically, by assumption an edge of $\hat{H}^k_{i,j}[V'_{i,j}]$ is of the form $\{u', v'\}$ where $u' \in \text{copies}_{i,j}(u)$, $v' \in \text{copies}_{i,j}(v)$ and $F(u, v) \geq .5 \cdot D_{A,k,k'}(u, v)$. We can therefore project a flow path in the support of $F'_{i,j}$ into G by concatenating the projection of each of its incident edges $\{u', v'\}$ to the flow paths given by F in G between u and v. Below, we formalize this idea.

Consider a path $P' = (v'_1, v'_2, \ldots, v'_l)$ in the support of $F'_{i,j}$ where $v'_x \in \text{copies}_{i,j}(v_x)$ for each $x \in [l]$. Let $\mathcal{P}_x(P')$ be all paths between v_x and v_{x+1} in the support of F. By adding paths with multiplicity to $\mathcal{P}_x(P')$, we may assume that F sends some equal flow amount $\rho_{P'}$ along each path in $\mathcal{P}_x(P')$ for every x. Then, letting z be $\min_x |\mathcal{P}_x(P')|$ (i.e. the number of paths corresponding to the v_x, v_{x+1} pair that has the least flow sent by F) we construct a collection of z paths $\mathcal{P}(P')$ in G gotten by selecting one path from each x; that is if use an arbitrary fixed ordering to the paths of $\mathcal{P}_x(P')$ and we imagine that the first z paths of $\mathcal{P}_x(P')$ are $\{P_x^{(1)}, P_x^{(2)}, \ldots, P_x^{(z)}\}$ then $\mathcal{P}(P')$ consists

of paths in G and is

$$\mathcal{P}(P') := \left\{ P_1^{(y)} \oplus P_2^{(y)} \oplus \ldots \oplus P_{l-1}^{(y)} : y \in [z] \right\}$$

where \oplus is path concatenation. Observe that each path in $\mathcal{P}(P')$ is a path in G of length at most $O(h \cdot \log N/k)$. Let $F_{i,j}^{(P')}$ be the flow that sends $F_{i,j}(P')$ flow by sending equal flow along each path in $\mathcal{P}(P')$ in G; that is

$$F_{i,j}^{(P')}(P) := \begin{cases} \frac{1}{z} \cdot F_{i,j}'(P') & \text{if } P \in \mathcal{P}(P') \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

Lastly, we can construct $F_{i,j}$ as the result of doing this for all flows in the support of $F'_{i,j}$; that is,

$$F_{i,j} := \sum_{P' \in \operatorname{supp}(F'_{i,j})} F_{i,j}^{(P')}$$

We let our final flow \hat{F} to route the demand D that we started with be the result of doing this for every cluster in our neighborhood cover:

$$\hat{F} := \sum_{i,j} F_{i,j}$$

It remains to argue that \hat{F} routes our A'-respecting h-length demand D with congestion $O\left(\frac{1}{\phi'}\right)$ and dilation O(hs') in G'.

We begin by arguing that \hat{F} indeed routes D. To see this consider a pair of vertices u and v in G' with D(u, v) > 0. Since D is h-length, \mathcal{N} has covering radius h and applying a moving cut only increases the distances between nodes, it follows that there is some i and j for which $u, v \in S_{i,j}$. For this i and j we know that each $F_{i,j}^{(P')}$ sends $F'_{i,j}(P')$ from a copy of u to a copy of v and so summing across all P' from copies of u to copies of v we can see that

$$F(u, v) \ge F_{i,j}(u, v)$$

$$= \sum_{u' \in \operatorname{copies}_{i,j}(u)} \sum_{v' \in \operatorname{copies}_{i,j}(v)} \sum_{P'=(u', \dots, v')} F_{i,j}^{(P')}(u, v)$$

$$= \sum_{u' \in \operatorname{copies}_{i,j}(u)} \sum_{v' \in \operatorname{copies}_{i,j}(v)} \sum_{P'=(u', \dots, v')} F_{i,j}'(P')$$

$$= \sum_{u' \in \operatorname{copies}_{i,j}(u)} \sum_{v' \in \operatorname{copies}_{i,j}(v)} F_{i,j}'(u', v')$$

$$= \sum_{u' \operatorname{copies}_{i,j}(u)} \sum_{v' \in \operatorname{copies}_{i,j}(v)} D_{i,j}'(u', v')$$

$$= D(u, v)$$

Our bound on the dilation of \hat{F} is immediate from the fact that every path in $\mathcal{P}(P')$ for every $P' \in \operatorname{supp}(F'_{i,j})$ for every i and j has length at most $O(h \cdot \log N/k) = O(hs')$.

Lastly, we now argue that \hat{F} has congestion at most $O\left(\frac{1}{\phi'}\right) = O\left(\frac{1}{\phi} \cdot 2^{O(k)} \cdot N^{O(1/k')} \log^2 N\right)$. For each $e' = \{u', v'\} \in E(H_{i,j}^k)$ where $u' \in \operatorname{copies}_{i,j}(u)$ and $v' \in \operatorname{copies}_{i,j}(v)$, let

$$F_{e' \to e} := \frac{1}{|E_{i,j}^k(u,v)|} \cdot \sum_{P = (u,...,v) \ni e} F(P)$$

be the flow induced on edge e resulting from embedding e' into e. Applying the fact that each $F'_{i,j}$ has congestion $O(\log N/k)$, the fact that $F(u,v) \ge .5 \cdot D_{A,k,k'}(u,v)$ if $\{u',v'\} \in \hat{H}^k_{i,j}[V'_{i,j}]$, the separation factor of our neighborhood cover \mathcal{N} is 2 (and so our absolute separation is at least h) and F has congestion $\frac{1}{\phi}$, we have that the congestion of \hat{F} on a given edge e in G is

$$\sum_{P \ni e} \hat{F}(P) = \sum_{i,j} \sum_{e' \in E(H_{i,j}^k[V'_{i,j}])} F'_{i,j}(e') \cdot F_{e' \to e}$$

$$\leq O(\log N/k) \cdot \sum_{i,j} \sum_{e' \in E(H_{i,j}^k[V'_{i,j}])} F_{e' \to e}$$

$$= O(\log N/k) \cdot \Delta^k \cdot \operatorname{load}_{\mathcal{N}} \cdot F(e)$$

$$\leq O\left(\frac{1}{\phi} \cdot \frac{\Delta^k \cdot \operatorname{load}_{\mathcal{N}}}{k}\right)$$

$$\leq O\left(\frac{1}{\phi} \cdot 2^{O(k)} \cdot N^{O(1/k')} \cdot \log^2 N\right)$$

as desired.

8 Robustness of Length-Constrained Expanders

In this section we prove that, like (classic) expanders, length-constrained expanders are robust to edge deletions. In particular, we show that if we begin with a length-constrained expander and delete a small number of edges, then, up to various slacks, the remaining graph is mostly still a length-constrained expander.

The basic strategy for proving this fact will be to use the characterization of length-constrained expanders in terms of expander power embeddings from previous section. In particular, we will use this characterization and then apply the robustness of each of the embedded expander powers.

Formally, we show the following theorem.

Theorem 8.1 (Robustness of Length-Constrained Expanders). Suppose that $G = (V, E, \ell)$ is an (hk', s)-length ϕ -expander with respect to node weighting A for $k' \ge 1$, let C be a moving cut and let $G' := (V, E, \ell + C)$ be G with C applied. Then, for any integer $k \ge 1$ there exists a node weighting $A' \preccurlyeq A$ that is (h, s')-length ϕ' -expanding in G' such that $|A'| \ge |A| - |C| \cdot O\left(\frac{2^{O(k)} \cdot N^{O(1/k')} \cdot \log N}{\phi}\right)$ where $\phi' = \Omega\left(\phi \cdot 2^{-O(k)} \cdot N^{-O(1/k')} \cdot \log^{-2} N\right)$ and $s' = O\left(s \cdot \frac{k'}{k} \cdot \log N\right)$.

Proof. Our proof sketch is as follows. Consider the neighborhood router demand. Then, observe that C can increase the length of only a constant fraction of the paths in the support of the flow

which routes the neighborhood router demand and conclude by Theorem 7.1 that there exists a large expanding subset.

More formally, let $D_{A,k,k'}$ be our neighborhood routing demand as defined in Section 7.1.

By Theorem 7.1 since G is an (hk', s) ϕ -expander, it follows that $D_{A,k,k'}$ can be routed in G with congestion at most $O(\frac{1}{\phi})$ and dilation $2k' \cdot hs$. Let F be the flow that witnesses this routing. Since F has congestion at most $O(\frac{1}{\phi})$, it follows by an averaging argument that the total flow across paths in the support of F which have their length increased to at least $4k' \cdot hs$ is at most $O(\frac{1}{\phi}) \cdot |C|$. That is,

$$\sum_{P \in \text{supp}(F): \ell_{G'}(P) > 4k' \cdot hs} F(P) \le O\left(\frac{1}{\phi}\right) \cdot |C|.$$

Let F' be F restricted to all paths in the support of F with length at most $4k' \cdot hs$ in G' so that $\operatorname{val}(F') \geq \operatorname{val}(F) - O\left(\frac{1}{\phi}\right) \cdot |C|$. Observe that by construction the dilation of F' is $O(k' \cdot hs)$.

Furthermore, observe that it follows from the existence of F' that at least a $1 - \epsilon$ fraction of $D_{A,k,k'}$ can be routed in G' for $\epsilon = \Omega\left(\frac{|C|}{\operatorname{val}(F)} \cdot \frac{1}{\phi}\right) \geq \Omega\left(\frac{|C|}{|A|} \cdot \frac{1}{\phi}\right)$ with congestion at most $O\left(\frac{1}{\phi}\right)$ and dilation at most $O(h \cdot sk')$. Applying Theorem 7.1 tells us that there is a node weighting $A' \leq A$ where

$$|A'| \ge |A| \cdot \left(1 - O\left(\epsilon \cdot 2^{O(k)} \cdot N^{O(1/k')} \cdot \log N\right)\right)$$
$$\ge |A| - |C| \cdot O\left(\frac{2^{O(k)} \cdot N^{O(1/k')} \cdot \log N}{\phi}\right)$$

and A' is (h, s')-length ϕ' -expanding in G' where $s' = O(s \cdot \frac{k'}{k} \cdot \log N)$ and $\phi' = \Omega\left(\phi \cdot 2^{-O(k)} \cdot N^{-O(1/k')} \cdot \log^{-2} N\right)$ as required to show our theorem.

9 Union of Sparse (Classic) Cut Sequence is Sparse

In this section we prove that the union of a sequence of sparse (classic) cuts is still a sparse (classic) cut with only an $O(\log n)$ loss in sparsity. Before proceeding, it may be useful for the reader to recall the definition of the sparsity of a classic cut in Section 5.1 and, in particular, the definition of the witness components of a cut.

Formally, we consider the following notion of a sequence of sparse (classic) cuts.

Definition 9.1 (Sequence of (Classic) Cuts). Given graph G = (V, E), a sequence of (classic) cuts is a sequence of (classic) cuts $(C_1, C_2, ...)$ where each C_i is a cut all of whose edges are internal to one connected component H_i of $G - \sum_{j < i} C_j$. We refer to H_i as the source component of C_i and the sparsity of C_i in H_i as its sparsity in the sequence.

The following formalizes the idea that the union of (classic) sparse cuts is sparse. Observe that, in fact, it proves a slightly stronger statement, namely, that the union of cuts has a sparsity at most the (appropriately weighted) average of the cuts in the sequence.

Theorem 9.1 (Union of Sparse (Classic) Cut Sequence is a Sparse (Classic) Cut). Given graph G = (V, E), let $(C_1, C_2, ...)$ be a sequence of (classic) cuts where C_i has sparsity ϕ_i in this sequence. Then the cut $\bigcup_i C_i$ has sparsity ϕ' in G where $\phi' \leq O(\log n) \cdot \frac{\sum_i |C_i|}{\sum_i |C_i|/\phi_i}$.

Observe that if each C_i has sparsity ϕ in the sequence then we get that $\bigcup_i C_i$ has sparsity $O(\phi \cdot \log n)$. Intuitively, we get $O(\log n)$ overhead because each time we take a cut we charge to the smaller side and so an edge can only be charged at most $O(\log n)$ times until its side is empty. The remainder of this section makes this proof idea formal.

9.1 Warmup: When the Source Component is Not a Witness Component

As a simple warmup and helper lemma we observe that the union of two sparse cuts is still sparse assuming the second cut is not in a witness component of the first cut.

Lemma 9.2. Let (C_1, C_2) be a sequence of two (classic) cuts where C_i has sparsity ϕ_i in the sequence. Then if the source component of C_2 is not a witness component of C_1 we have $C_1 \cup C_2$ has sparsity at most ϕ' in G where $\phi' \leq \frac{\sum_i |C_i|}{\sum_i |C_i|/\phi_i}$.

Proof. Let $C = C_1 \cup C_2$. Let M_1 be the connected component of $G - C_1$ of maximum volume in G, (i.e. the one component that is not a witness component for C_1 but which is a source component for C_2). Similarly, let M be the connected component of G - C of maximum volume in G (i.e. the one component that is not a witness component for C).

Observe that $vol(M_2) \leq vol(M)$ since M_2 is a subset of M. Letting m be |E|, o, it follows that

$$m - \operatorname{vol}(M) = m - \operatorname{vol}(M_1) + \operatorname{vol}(M_1) - \operatorname{vol}(M)$$

$$\geq m - \operatorname{vol}(M_1) + \operatorname{vol}(M_1) - \operatorname{vol}(M_2).$$
(3)

On the other hand, observe that by definition of sparsity and the fact that the source component of C_2 is M_1 we have

$$\frac{|C_1|}{\phi_1} = m - \operatorname{vol}(M_1) \tag{4}$$

and

$$\frac{|C_2|}{\phi_2} = \operatorname{vol}(M_1) - \operatorname{vol}(M_2) \tag{5}$$

and so combining Equations 3, 4 and 5 we get

$$m - \operatorname{vol}(M) \ge \sum_{i} \frac{|C_i|}{\phi_i}.$$

Applying this and the definition of sparsity we get

$$\phi(C) \le \frac{\sum_i |C_i|}{\sum_i |C_i|/\phi_i},$$

as required.

As a simple implication of this fact we have that the union of an arbitrary-length sequence of (classic) sparse cuts is still sparse provided each cut in the sequence is never applied to the witness component of any previous cut.

Lemma 9.3. Let $(C_1, C_2, ...)$ be a sequence of (classic) cuts where C_i has sparsity ϕ_i in the sequence. Then if we have that the source component of C_j is not a witness component of C_i for all i and j > i then $\bigcup_i C_i$ is a ϕ' -sparse cut in G where $\phi' \leq \frac{\sum_i |C_i|}{\sum_i |C_i|/\phi_i}$.

Proof. The proof is by a simple induction on the number of cuts in the sequence k and repeated application of Lemma 9.2.

The base case of k = 1 is trivial and the base case of k = 2 is immediate from Lemma 9.2.

Consider the case of k > 3. By Lemma 9.2 we know that $C := C_{k-1} \cup C_k$ is a cut with sparsity ϕ_C which is at most $\frac{|C_{k-1}|+|C_k|}{|C_{k-1}|/\phi_{k-1}+|C_k|/\phi_k}$. Now consider the cut sequence resulting from taking the union of the last two cuts, namely $(C_1, C_2, \ldots, C_{k-2}, C)$. The source component of C is the same as the source component of C_{k-1} and so the precondition of our induction holds and, in particular, by induction we know that $\bigcup_i C_i$ has sparsity at most

$$\frac{\sum_{i} |C_{i}|}{|C|/\phi_{C} + \sum_{i \le k-2} |C_{i}|/\phi_{i}}.$$
(6)

Further, observe that by our upper bound on ϕ_C and the fact that $|C| = |C_{k-1}| + |C_k|$ we know that $\frac{|C|}{\phi_C} \ge \frac{|C_{k-1}|}{\phi_{k-1}} + \frac{|C_k|}{\phi_k}$. Combining this with Equation (6) gives that $\bigcup_i C_i$ has sparsity at most

$$\frac{\sum_i |C_i|}{\sum_i |C_i|/\phi_i}$$

as required.

9.2 Proving the General Case for (Classic) Cuts

We now conclude this section with our proof that the union of (classic) sparse cuts is a sparse cut (Theorem 9.1). Roughly, our proof arranges the sequence of cuts into a "cut sequence tree" and then decomposes this tree into paths that satisfy the preconditions of Lemma 9.3 and so can be unioned together to get cuts of the same sparsity. After contracting such paths in our cut sequence tree we can argue that the result is a depth $O(\log n)$ tree and so by averaging over layers of this tree we can argue that some layer induces sparsity within an $O(\log n)$ of the sparsity for which we are aiming. For readers familiar with heavy-light decompositions [ST81]: this decomposition can be understood as a special sort of heavy-light decomposition whose heavy paths correspond satisfy the preconditions of Lemma 9.3.

Formally, our proof will arrange our cuts into a cut sequence tree which corresponds to the natural laminar partition gotten by applying a sequence of sparse cuts. See Figure 2 for an illustration.

Definition 9.4 (Cut Sequence Tree). Given graph G = (V, E), let $C := (C_1, C_2, \ldots, C_k)$ be a sequence of (classic) cuts. Then, the cut tree T_C of C is recursively defined as follows.



Figure 2: A cut sequence (2a), the resulting connected components from applying all cuts in the sequence (2b) and the corresponding cut sequence tree (2c). Cuts colored to correspond to the depth of their nodes in the cut sequence tree. Internal nodes in cut sequence tree labeled according to their corresponding cut and leaves labeled according to their connected component.

- Suppose k = 1. Then $T_{\mathcal{C}}$ is a star with one leaf for every connected component of $G C_1$.
- Suppose k > 1. Then let $T_{\mathcal{C}'}$ be the cut sequence tree for $\mathcal{C}' = (C_1, C_2, \ldots, C_{k-1})$ and let H_k be the source component of C_k . $T_{\mathcal{C}}$ is the result of taking $T_{\mathcal{C}'}$ and adding one child for each connected component of $H_k C_k$ to the leaf of $T_{\mathcal{C}'}$ corresponding to H_k .

Observe that in the above tree each internal vertex corresponds to a cut of C and every vertex corresponds to a connected component in G after applying some prefix of the cuts C.

We proceed to prove the our main theorem for the section.

Theorem 9.1 (Union of Sparse (Classic) Cut Sequence is a Sparse (Classic) Cut). Given graph G = (V, E), let $(C_1, C_2, ...)$ be a sequence of (classic) cuts where C_i has sparsity ϕ_i in this sequence. Then the cut $\bigcup_i C_i$ has sparsity ϕ' in G where $\phi' \leq O(\log n) \cdot \frac{\sum_i |C_i|}{\sum_i |C_i|/\phi_i}$.

Proof. Let $T_{\mathcal{C}}$ be the cut sequence tree of $\mathcal{C} = (C_1, C_2, \ldots)$ as defined in Definition 9.4.

Call an edge from parent u to child v heavy if:

- 1. u and v are internal in $T_{\mathcal{C}}$ and;
- 2. the component corresponding to v is not a witness component of the cut corresponding to u.

Otherwise, call an edge *light*.

Observe that as each vertex has at most one heavy child the collection of heavy edges induces vertex-disjoint paths in $T_{\mathcal{C}}$, the union of which contain all vertices corresponding to a cut in \mathcal{C} (i.e. all internal vertices of $T_{\mathcal{C}}$). Also, observe that any any root to leaf path intersects at most $O(\log n)$ light edges since each time a light edge is traversed the corresponding component's number of vertices is decreased by at least $\frac{1}{2}$.

Consider one such path of heavy edges $P = (u_1, u_2, ...)$ where u_1 is the vertex closest to the root in $T_{\mathcal{C}}$. Call such a path a heavy path. Observe that by definition of a heavy edge the cut sequence gotten by taking the cuts corresponding $(C'_1, C'_2, ...)$ to these vertices satisfies the conditions of Lemma 9.3 and so their union $\mathcal{C}' := \bigcup_i C'_i$ has sparsity at most

$$\frac{\sum_{i} |C'_{i}|}{\sum_{i} |C'_{i}|/\phi'_{i}}.$$
(7)

where ϕ'_i is the sparsity of C'_i .

Next, consider the cut sequence from taking the cuts corresponding to all such heavy paths. More formally order the heavy paths of $T_{\mathcal{C}}$ in a fixed but arbitrary order $(P_1, P_2, ...)$ where if i < j then no vertex of P_j is an ancestor of a vertex in P_i in $T_{\mathcal{C}}$. Next, consider the cut sequence $\tilde{\mathcal{C}} := (\tilde{C}_1, \tilde{C}_2, ...)$ where \tilde{C}_i is the result of taking the union of all cuts corresponding to vertices in path P_i .

Observe that the cut tree $T_{\tilde{\mathcal{C}}}$ for this sequence \mathcal{C} is just the result of contracting all heavy edges in $T_{\mathcal{C}}$. Furthermore, observe that this tree has depth at most $O(\log n)$ since any root to leaf path in $T_{\mathcal{C}}$ intersects at most $O(\log n)$ light edges.

Consider a fixed layer of $T_{\tilde{\mathcal{C}}}$, namely a subset of vertices all of who are equal distance in $T_{\tilde{\mathcal{C}}}$ from the root of $T_{\tilde{\mathcal{C}}}$. Let \tilde{L} be the cuts of $\tilde{\mathcal{C}}$ corresponding to these vertices and let L be all cuts of \mathcal{C} that are a subset of some cut in $\tilde{\mathcal{C}}$.

Further, assume that \tilde{L} is the layer with corresponding L maximizing $\sum_{C_i \in L} |C_i| / \phi_i$. Observe that by averaging we know that

$$\sum_{C_i \in L} |C_i| / \phi_i \ge \Omega(1/\log n) \cdot \sum_i |C_i| / \phi_i \tag{8}$$

Letting $C = \bigcup_i C_i$ we know that

$$\sum_{S_C \in \mathcal{S}_C} \operatorname{vol}(S_C) \ge \sum_{\tilde{C} \in \tilde{L}} \sum_{S_{\tilde{C}} \in \mathcal{S}_{\tilde{C}}} \operatorname{vol}(S_{\tilde{C}})$$
(9)

since the witness components of all cuts in \tilde{L} are disjoint and the one component of G-C that is not a witness component of C can only be smaller in volume than any of the non-witness components of cuts in \tilde{L} .

Furthermore, observe that by the definitions of sparsity (Definition 5.2), L and \tilde{L} as well as Equation (7) we have

$$\sum_{\tilde{C}\in\tilde{L}}\sum_{S_{\tilde{C}}\in\mathcal{S}_{\tilde{C}}}\operatorname{vol}(S_{\tilde{C}}) \ge \sum_{C_{i}\in L}|C_{i}|/\phi_{i}.$$
(10)

Combining Equations 8, 9 and 10 we get

$$\Omega(1/\log n) \cdot \sum_{i} |C_i|/\phi_i \le \sum_{S_C \in \mathcal{S}_C} \operatorname{vol}(S_C).$$

which when combined with the definition of sparsity and fact that $|C| = \sum_i |C_i|$ gives our claim. \Box

10 Union of Sparse Moving Cut Sequence is Sparse

In the previous section we saw that the union of sequence of classic sparse cuts is itself a sparse cut. In this section, we prove this fact in the much more challenging length-constrained setting. In particular, we show that taking the union of moving cuts preserves sparsity up to an $N^{O(1/s)}$ factor.

Formally, we consider a sequence of moving cuts, defined as follows.

Definition 10.1 (Sequence of Moving Cuts). Given graph G = (V, E) and node-weighting A, a sequence of moving cuts is a sequence of moving cuts $(C_1, C_2, ...)$. We refer to the (h, s)-length sparsity of C_i with respect to A in $G - \sum_{j < i} C_j$ as its (h, s)-length sparsity in the sequence. We say the sequence $(C_1, C_2, ...)$ is (h, s)-length ϕ -sparse if each C_i is (h, s)-length ϕ -sparse in the sequence.

The following summarizes the main theorem of this section: that the union of sparse lengthconstrained moving cuts is sparse.

Theorem 1.2 (Union of Sparse Moving Cuts is a Sparse Moving Cut). Let (C_1, \ldots, C_k) be a sequence of moving cuts where C_i is an (h, s)-length ϕ_i -sparse cut in $G - \sum_{j < i} C_j$ w.r.t. nodeweighting A. Then the moving cut $\sum_i C_i$ is an (h', s')-length ϕ' -sparse cut w.r.t. A where h' = 2h, $s' = \frac{(s-2)}{2}$ and $\phi' = s^3 \cdot \log^3 n \cdot n^{O(1/s)} \cdot \frac{\sum_i |C_i|}{\sum_i |C_i|/\phi_i}$.

Observe that if every cut C_i above is (h, s)-length, then $\sum_i C_i$ is (h', s')-length ϕ -sparse. However, if some of the cuts are even sparser than this lowers the sparsity of $\sum_i C_i$. $\frac{\phi}{\operatorname{spars}_{(h,s)}(C,A)} \cdot |C|$.

To prove the above theorem we must demonstrate the existence of some unit demand D that witnesses the sparsity of $\sum_i C_i$. However, if D_i is the demand which witnesses the sparsity of C_i , we cannot just use $\sum_i D_i$ as D since the result need not be unit. The main idea is to argue that $\sum_i D_i$ can be understood as, more or less, greedily constructing a spanner in parallel and as such induces a graph with arboricity about $N^{O(1/s)}$ where s is the length slack (see Section 4 for a definition of arboricity). We can then decompose $\sum_i D_i$ into trees and use each of these trees to "disperse" the load of $\sum_i D_i$ so that the resulting demand D is unit (after scaling down by about the arboricity). The rest of this section formalizes this argument.

10.1 Low Arboricity Demand Matching Graph via Parallel Greedy Spanners

We begin by formalizing the graph induced by the witnessing demands of our cut sequence. We call this graph the demand matching graph. Informally, this graph simply creates A(v) copies for each vertex v and then matches copies to one another in accordance with the witnessing demands.

Definition 10.2 (Demand Matching Graph). Given a graph G = (V, E), a node-weighting A and A-respecting demands $\mathcal{D} = (D_1, D_2, \ldots)$ we define the demand matching (multi)-graph $G(\mathcal{D}) = (V', E')$ as follows:

- Vertices: H has vertices $V' = \bigsqcup_{v} \operatorname{copies}(v)$ where $\operatorname{copies}(v)$ is A(v) unique "copies" of v.
- **Edges:** For each demand D_i , let E_i be any matching where the number of edges between copies(u) and copies(v) for each $u, v \in V$ is $D_i(u, v)$. Then $E' = \bigcup_i E_i$.

The key property of the demand matching graph that we use is that it induces a graph with low arboricity. We prove this by observing that it can be understood as performing a certain parallel greedy spanner construction. The following summarizes this.

Lemma 10.3 (Bounded Arboricity of Demands of Sequence of Cuts). Let C_1, C_2, \ldots be a sequence of (h, s)-length cuts with witnessing demands $\mathcal{D} = (D_1, D_2, \ldots)$. Then $G(\mathcal{D})$ has arboricity at most $s^3 \cdot \log^3 N \cdot N^{O(1/s)}$.



Figure 3: How we disperse demand given a tree T (3a). 3b gives the support of disperse_T dashed in blue; notice that each vertex has degree at most 2.

Proof. We say that a sequence (E_1, \ldots, E_k) of edge sets on V is s-pg (abbreviation for s-parallel greedy) for some integer $s \ge 2$, iff for each $1 \le i \le k$,

- set E_i is a matching on V; and
- if we denote by G_{i-1} the graph on V induced by edges in $\bigcup_{1 \le j \le i-1} E_j$, then for every edge $(u, v) \in E_i, d_{G_{i-1}}(u, v) > s$.

Equivalently, a sequence (E_1, \ldots, E_k) is s-pg iff for each $1 \le i \le k$, every cycle in G_i of length at most s + 1 contains at least two edges in E_i . We say that a graph G is s-pg iff its edge set E(G) is the union of some s-pg sequence on V(G). [HHT23] proves that every s-pg graph on n vertices has arboricity $s^3 \cdot \log^3 n \cdot n^{O(1/s)}$.

We now show that this fact implies Lemma 10.3 by showing that $G(\mathcal{D})$ is a s-pg graph. By definition, $G(\mathcal{D})$ is the union of a sequence of matchings. Denote $D = (D_1, \ldots, D_k)$. For each i, let $G_i(\mathcal{D})$ be the union of all matchings corresponding to D_k, \ldots, D_i . Consider an edge in E_{i-1} , the matching corresponding to demand D_{i-1} . By definition, it suffices to show that for each $(u, v) \in E_{i-1}$, there is no length-at-most-s path in G_i containing u, v. Assume for contradiction that there exists a path $P = (u, x_1, \ldots, x_{s-1}, v)$ in G_i . This means that in graph $G - \sum_{1 \leq j \leq i-1} C_j$, every pair in $(u, x_1), (x_1, x_2), \ldots, (x_{s-1}, v)$ is at distance at most h. By triangle inequality, this implies that the distance between u, v in $G - \sum_{1 \leq j \leq i-1} C_j$ is less than hs. However, as the moving cut $C_{i-1}, C_{i-1}, \ldots, C_1$ separates all pairs in $D_{i-1}, D_{i-1}, \ldots, D_1$ to distance more than hs in $G - \sum_{1 \leq j \leq i-1} C_j$, a contradiction.

10.2 Matching-Dispersed Demand

In the previous section we formalized the graph induced by the witnessing demands $(D_1, D_2, ...)$ of a sequence of sparse moving cuts and argued that this graph has low arboricity. We now discuss how to use the forest decomposition of this graph to disperse $(D_1, D_2, ...)$ so that the result is a unit demand.
The following notion of tree matching demand formalizes how we disperse the demand in each tree of the forest decomposition of demand matching graph. Informally, given a tree this demand simply matches siblings in the tree to one another. If there are an odd number of siblings the leftover child is matched to its parent. See Figure 3 for an illustration.

Definition 10.4 (Tree Matching Demand). Given tree T = (V, E) we define the tree-matching demand on T as follows. Root T arbitrarily. For each vertex v with children C_v do the following. If $|C_v|$ is odd let $U_v = C_v \cup \{v\}$, otherwise let $U_v = C_v$. Let M_v be an arbitrary perfect matching on U_v and define the demand associated with v as

$$D_v(u_1, u_2) := \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } \{u_1, u_2\} \in M_v\\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

where each edge in M_v has an arbitrary canonical u_1 and u_2 . Then, the tree matching demand for T is defined as

$$\operatorname{disperse}_T := \sum_{v \text{ internal in } T} D_v$$

We observe that a tree matching demand has size equal to the input size (up to constants).

Lemma 10.5. Let T be a tree with n-1 vertices. Then $|disperse_T| \geq \frac{n-1}{2}$.

Proof. For each v that is internal in T let the vertices U_v and the perfect matching M_v on U_v be as defined in Definition 10.4. Then, observe that $\sum_v |U_v| \ge n-1$ since every vertex except for the root appear in at least one U_v . On the other hand, for each v since M_v is a perfect matching on U_v we have $|M_v| = \frac{1}{2}|U_v|$ and since $|\text{disperse}_T| = \sum_{v \text{ internal in } T} |M_v|$, it follows that $|\text{disperse}_T| \ge \frac{n-1}{2}$ as required.

Having formalized how we disperse a demand on a single tree with the tree matching demand, we now formalize how we disperse an arbitrary demand by taking a forest cover, applying the matching-dispersed demand to each tree and then scaling down by the arboricity.

Definition 10.6 (Matching-Dispersed Demand). Given graph G, node-weighting A and demands $\mathcal{D} = (D_1, D_2, \ldots)$, let $G(\mathcal{D})$ be the demand matching graph (Definition 10.2), let T_1, T_2, \ldots be the trees of a minimum size forest cover with α forests of $G(\mathcal{D})$ (Definition 10.2) and let disperse_{T_1}, disperse_{T_2}, \ldots be the corresponding tree matching demands (Definition 10.4). Then, the matching-dispersed demand on nodes $u, v \in V$ is

disperse_{$$\mathcal{D},A(u,v)$$} := $\frac{1}{2\alpha} \cdot \sum_{i} \sum_{u' \in copies(u)} \sum_{v' \in copies(v)} disperse_{T_i}(u',v')$

We begin with a simple helper lemma that observes that the matching-dispersed demand has size essentially equal to the input demands (up to the arboricity).

Lemma 10.7. Given graph G, node-weighting A and and demands $\mathcal{D} = (D_1, D_2, ...)$ where $G(\mathcal{D})$ has arboricity α , we have that the matching-dispersed demand disperse_{\mathcal{D},A} satisfies $|\text{disperse}_{\mathcal{D},A}| \geq \frac{1}{4\alpha} \sum_i |D_i|$

Proof. Observe that the number of edges in $G(\mathcal{D})$ is exactly $\sum_i |D_i|$ and so summing over each tree T_i in our forest cover and applying Lemma 10.5 gives

$$\sum_{j} |\text{disperse}_{T_j}| \ge \frac{1}{2} \cdot \sum_{i} |D_i|$$

Combining this with the definition of disperse_{D,A} (Definition 10.6) gives the claim.

We now argue the key properties of the matching-dispersed demand which will allow us to argue that it can be used as a witnessing demand for $\sum_i D_i$.

Lemma 10.8 (Properties of Matching-Dispersed Demand). Given graph G = (V, E) and nodeweighting A, let C_1, C_2, \ldots be a sequence of moving cuts where C_i is (h, s)-length ϕ_i -sparse in $G - \sum_{j < i} C_i$ w.r.t. A with witnessing demands $\mathcal{D} = (D_1, D_2, \ldots)$. Then the matching dispersed demand disperse_{D.A} is:

- a 2h-length A-respecting demand;
- $h \cdot (s-2)$ -separated by $\sum_i C_i$ and;
- of size $|\text{disperse}_{\mathcal{D},A}| \ge \frac{1}{s^3 \cdot \log^3 N \cdot N^{O(1/s)}} \sum_i \frac{|C_i|}{\phi_i}.$

Proof. To see that disperse_{\mathcal{D},A} is 2h-length observe that a pair of vertices u and v have disperse_{\mathcal{D},A}(u, v) > 0 only if there is a path consisting of at most two edges between a node in copies(u) and a node in copies(v) in the demand matching graph $G(\mathcal{D})$ (Definition 10.2). Furthermore, $u' \in \text{copies}(u)$ and $v' \in \text{copies}(v)$ have an edge in $G(\mathcal{D})$ only if there is some i such that $D_i(u, v) > 0$ and since each D_i is h-length, it follows that in such a case we know $d_G(u, v) \leq h$. Thus, it follows by the triangle inequality that disperse_{\mathcal{D},A} is 2h-length.

To see that disperse_{D,A} is A-respecting we observe that each vertex in G(D) is incident to at most 2α matchings across all of the tree matching demands we use to construct disperse_{D,A} (at most 2 matchings per forest in our forest cover). Thus, for any $u \in V$ since |copies(u)| = A(u) we know

$$\sum_{u' \in \operatorname{copies}(u)} \sum_{j} \sum_{v} \sum_{v' \in \operatorname{copies}(v)} \operatorname{disperse}_{T_j}(u', v') \le \sum_{u' \in \operatorname{copies}(u)} 2\alpha \le 2\alpha \cdot A(u).$$

It follows that for any $u \in V$ we have

$$\sum_{v} \operatorname{disperse}_{\mathcal{D},A}(u,v) = \sum_{v} \frac{1}{2\alpha} \sum_{j} \sum_{u' \in \operatorname{copies}(u)} \sum_{v' \in \operatorname{copies}(v)} \operatorname{disperse}_{T_{j}}(u',v') \le A(u)$$

A symmetric argument shows that $\sum_{v} \text{disperse}_{\mathcal{D},A}(v, u) \leq A(u)$ and so we have that $\text{disperse}_{\mathcal{D},A}$ is *A*-respecting.

We next argue that $\sum_i C_i$ is a moving cut that h(s-2)-separates disperse_{\mathcal{D},A}. Consider an arbitrary pair of vertices u and v such that disperse_{$\mathcal{D},A}(u,v) > 0$; it suffices to argue that $\sum_i C_i$ h(s-2)-separates u and v. As noted above, disperse_{$\mathcal{D},A}(u,v) > 0$ only if there is a path (u', w', v')in $G(\mathcal{D})$ where $u' \in \text{copies}(u), v' \in \text{copies}(v)$ and for some $w \in V$ we have $w' \in \text{copies}(w)$. But,</sub></sub> $\{u', w'\}$ and $\{w', v'\}$ are edges in $G(\mathcal{D})$ only if there is some *i* and *j* such that $D_i(u, w) > 0$ and $D_j(w, v) > 0$.

By definition of $G(\mathcal{D})$ (Definition 10.2), each D_i corresponds to a different matching in $G(\mathcal{D})$ and so since $\{u', w'\}$ and $\{w', v'\}$ share the vertex w', we may assume $i \neq j$ and without loss of generality that i < j. Let $G_{\leq i}$ be G with $\sum_{l < i} C_l$ applied.

Since D_i is hs-separated by $C_{\leq i}$ and $D_i(u, w) > 0$, we know that

$$d_{G_{\leq i}}(u,w) \ge hs. \tag{11}$$

On the other hand, since D_j is an *h*-length demand, j > i and $D_j(w, v) > 0$, we know that the distance between w and v in $G_{\leq i}$ is

$$d_{G_{\leq i}}(w,v) \leq h. \tag{12}$$

Thus, it follows that $C_{\leq i}$ must h(s-2) separate u and v since otherwise we would know that $d_{G_{\leq i}}(u, w) \leq h(s-2)$ and so combining this with Equation (12) and the triangle inequality we get $d_{G_{\leq i}}(u, w) \leq hs - h$, contradicting Equation (11). Thus, $\sum_i C_i$ must h(s-2) vertices u and v.

Lastly, we argue that $|\text{disperse}_{\mathcal{D},A}| \geq \frac{1}{s^3 \cdot \log^3 N \cdot N^{O(1/s)}} \sum_i \frac{|C_i|}{\phi_i}$. By Lemma 10.7 we know that

$$|\text{disperse}_{\mathcal{D},A}| \ge \frac{1}{4\alpha} \sum_{i} |D_i|$$

where α is the arboricity of $G(\mathcal{D})$; applying our bound of $s^3 \cdot \log^3 N \cdot N^{O(1/s)}$ on the arboricity of $G(\mathcal{D})$ from Lemma 10.3 and the fact that since each C_i is ϕ_i -sparse, we know that $|D_i| \geq \frac{|C_i|}{\phi_i}$ for each i gives us

$$|\operatorname{disperse}_{\mathcal{D},A}| \ge \frac{1}{4 \cdot s^3 \cdot \log^3 N \cdot N^{O(1/s)}} \sum_i \frac{|C_i|}{\phi_i},$$

as required.

10.3 Proving Union of Sparse Moving Cuts is a Sparse Moving Cut

We conclude this section by arguing that the union of sparse moving cuts is itself sparse. Our argument does so by using the matching-dispersed demand as the witnessing demand for the union of sparse cuts.

Theorem 1.2 (Union of Sparse Moving Cuts is a Sparse Moving Cut). Let (C_1, \ldots, C_k) be a sequence of moving cuts where C_i is an (h, s)-length ϕ_i -sparse cut in $G - \sum_{j < i} C_j$ w.r.t. nodeweighting A. Then the moving cut $\sum_i C_i$ is an (h', s')-length ϕ' -sparse cut w.r.t. A where h' = 2h, $s' = \frac{(s-2)}{2}$ and $\phi' = s^3 \cdot \log^3 n \cdot n^{O(1/s)} \cdot \frac{\sum_i |C_i|}{\sum_i |C_i|/\phi_i}$.

Proof. Recall that to demonstrate that $\sum_i C_i$ is a ϕ' -sparse (h', s')-length sparse cut, it suffices to argue that there exists an h'-length A-respecting demand D that is h's'-separated by $\sum_i C_i$ where $|D| \geq \frac{\sum_i |C_i|}{\phi'}$.

Lemma 10.8 demonstrates the existence of exactly such a demand—namely the matching dispersed demand as defined in Definition 10.6—for h' = 2h, $s' = \frac{(s-2)}{2}$ and $\phi' = s^3 \cdot \log^3 N \cdot N^{O(1/s)} \cdot \frac{\sum_i |C_i|}{\sum_i |C_i|/\phi_i}$, giving the claim.

11 Equivalence of Distances to Length-Constrained Expander

We now use the tools we developed in the previous section to argue that several quantities related to length-constrained expansion are all equal (up to slacks in sparsity, h and length slack). This equivalence will form the backbone of the analysis of our algorithm. Before proceeding, it may be useful for the reader to recall the definition of a sequence of moving cuts (Definition 10.1) and spars (Definition 5.13). The

The following series of definitions provides the quantities we will argue are all equal up to slacks.

Definition 11.1. Fix a graph G, node-weighting A and parameters h, s and ϕ . Then, we define the following quantities:

1. Largest Sparse Cut Size: $LC(\phi, h, s)$ is the size of the largest (h, s)-length ϕ -sparse cut in G w.r.t. A. That is

$$LC(\phi, h, s) := |C_0|$$

where C_0 is the moving cut of largest size in the set $\{C : \operatorname{spars}_{(h,s)}(C,A) \leq \phi\}$.

2. Largest Sparse Cut Sequence Size: $LSC(\phi, h, s)$ is the size of the largest sequence of ϕ -sparse moving cuts. Then

$$LSC(\phi, h, s) := \sum_{i} |C_i|$$

where (C_1, C_2, \ldots) is the (h, s)-length ϕ -expanding moving cut sequence maximizing $\sum_i |C_i|$.

3. Largest Weighted Sparse Cut Sequence Size: $LWSC(\phi, h, s)$ is the largest weighted size of a sparse cut sequence, namely

$$LWSC(\phi, h, s) := \sum_{i} \frac{\phi}{\operatorname{spars}_{(h,s)}(C_i, A)} \cdot |C_i|$$

where $(C_1, C_2, ...)$ is the (h, s)-length ϕ -expanding moving cut sequence maximizing $\sum_i \frac{\phi}{\operatorname{spars}_{(h,s)}(C_i, A)} \cdot |C_i|$ and each $\operatorname{spars}_{(h,s)}(C_i, A)$ is computed after applying C_j for j < i.

4. Largest Expander's Complement Size: $LEC(\phi, h, s)$ is ϕ times the size of the complement of the largest (h, s)-length ϕ -expanding subset of A. That is, let \hat{A} be the (h, s)-length ϕ expanding node-weighting on G satisfying $\hat{A} \preceq A$ with largest size and let $\bar{A} = A - \hat{A}$ be its complement. Then

$$LEC(\phi, h, s) := \phi \cdot |\bar{A}|.$$

5. Smallest Expander Decomposition Size: $SED(\phi, h, s)$ is the size of the smallest expander decomposition. That is,

$$SED(\phi, h, s) := |C^*|$$

where C^* is the moving cut of minimum size such that A is (h, s)-length ϕ -expanding in $G - C^*$.

The following formalizes our main claim in this section, the equivalence of the above quantities.

Theorem 11.1. Fix a graph G, parameters $k, k' \ge 1$ and ϕ, h, s and a node-weighting A.

$$LC(\phi, h, s) \leq LEC(\phi_1, h, s) \leq LSC(\phi_2, h_2, s_2) \leq LC(\phi_3, h_3, s_3)$$

where

$$\begin{split} \phi_1 &= 3\phi \\ \phi_2 &= \phi_1 \cdot 2^{O(k)} \cdot N^{O(1/k')} \cdot \log^5 N \cdot s^3 \cdot N^{O(1/s)}, \qquad h_2 &= h \cdot 2k', \qquad s_2 = s \cdot O\left(\frac{k}{k'} \cdot \log N\right) \\ \phi_3 &= \phi_2 \cdot s^3 \cdot \log^3 N \cdot N^{O(1/s)}, \qquad \qquad h_3 = h_2 \cdot 2, \qquad s_3 = \frac{(s_2 - 2)}{2} \end{split}.$$

Furthermore, if A is (h_4, s_4) -length ϕ_G -expanding then:

$$\frac{\phi_G}{\phi_4} \cdot LEC(\phi, h, s) \le SED(\phi_4, h_4, s_4) \le LSC(\phi_4, h_4, s_4) \le LC(\phi_5, h_5, s_5) \le LEC(\phi_5, h_5, s_5)$$

where

$$\phi_4 = \phi \cdot 2^{O(k)} \cdot N^{O(1/k')} \cdot \log^2 N, \qquad h_4 = h \cdot k', \qquad s_4 = O\left(\frac{k}{k'} \cdot \log N\right)$$

$$\phi_5 = \phi_4 \cdot s^3 \cdot \log^3 N \cdot N^{O(1/s)}, \qquad h_5 = h_4 \cdot 2, \qquad s_5 = \frac{(s_4 - 2)}{2}.$$

The remainder of this section is dedicated to providing proofs of a series of inequalities which can be combined to get the inequalities in Theorem 11.1.

Techniques. We prove the equivalence of these quantities by a series of inequalities. Four of these inequalities are non-trivial and rely on the above-established theory; intuition below.

- **LWSC** \leq **LC:** Let $(C_1, C_2, ...)$ be the largest weighted sequence of (h, s)-length ϕ -sparse cuts and let C_0 be the largest (h, s)-length ϕ -sparse cut. Showing that the size of $(C_1, C_2, ...)$ is at most the size of C_0 follows from observing that (as discussed above), one can take the union of cuts in $(C_1, C_2, ...)$ to (essentially) get an (h, s)-length ϕ -sparse cut of equal size. Since C_0 is the largest such cut, the inequality follows. Here, we also make use of the idea of "padding out" a sparse cut which forces said cut to have an exact desired sparsity.
- LC \leq LEC: Consider the largest (h, s)-length ϕ -sparse cut C_0 . Intuitively, C_0 should not cut too much into any part of the graph that is already (h, s)-length ϕ -expanding, otherwise it would not sparse. Thus, C_0 cannot have size much larger than the part of the graph that is not expanding. Formalizing this intuition relies on the idea of a "projected down demand."
- LEC \leq LWSC and LEC \leq SED: Again, let $(C_1, C_2, ...)$ be the largest weighted sequence of (h, s)-length ϕ -sparse cuts. Proving that the amount of the graph that is not expanding is at most the size of $(C_1, C_2, ...)$ can be done using the above-described characterization of (h, s)-length expanders in terms of expander power embeddings. In particular, the union of



Figure 4: An overview of the inequalities we show. An arrow from a to b indicates $a \leq b$. Each non-trivial inequality opaque and labeled with the key idea of its proof.

cuts in $(C_1, C_2, ...)$ must be an (h, s)-length ϕ -expander decomposition, otherwise we could append another cut to it and contradict its maximum size. Thus, after applying this sequence, the resulting graph can embed expander powers into *most* neighborhoods using short paths. It follows that in the original graph these parts must have been (h, s)-length expanding, which, in turn, upper bounds how much of the original graph is not (h, s)-length expanding. Arguing LEC \leq SED is similar.

The remainder of the inequalities to be proven are mostly immediate from the relevant definitions. We conclude the section with the proof of this theorem by appropriately stringing together these inequalities.

11.1 Weighted Sparse Cut Sequence (3) at Most Largest Cut (1)

We show LWSC \leq LC using the idea of padding out sparse cuts and the fact that the union of sparse moving cuts is sparse. In particular, padding out cuts allows us to increase the size of our cuts while forcing them to still have bounded sparsity. This allows us to pad out the cuts in our sequence and then take the union of this padded out sequence to observe that it results in a sparse cut which, by definition, can be no larger than the sparsest cut.

Theorem 11.2. Given graph G and node-weighting A, we have that

$$LWSC(\phi, h, s) \leq LC(\phi', h', s')$$

where $\phi' = \phi \cdot s^3 \cdot \log^3 N \cdot N^{O(1/s)}, \ h' = 2h \ and \ s' = \frac{(s-2)}{2}.$

The following formalizes our notion of padding out sparse cuts.

Lemma 11.2 (Padding Out Sparse Cut). Given graph G, let C be a (h, s)-length ϕ -sparse moving cut w.r.t. node-weighting A. Then there exists an (h, s)-length ϕ -sparse moving cut C' such that

$$\frac{\phi}{\operatorname{spars}_{(h,s)}(C,A)} \cdot |C| \le |C'|.$$

Proof. The basic idea is to simply arbitrarily add length increases to C which increases its size while increasing its sparsity; doing so until its sparsity reaches ϕ allows us to make C' of the appropriate size. We must take some slight care to make sure that there are enough length increases we can add to C to make it appropriately large.

For each edge e let $\overline{C}(e) = 1 - C(e)$ be the complement of C. It follows that

$$|\bar{C}| \ge |A| - |C|.$$

Furthermore, since there is some A-respecting demand D witnessing the (h, s)-length spars_(h,s)<math>(C, A)sparsity of C where $\frac{|C|}{\operatorname{spars}_{(h,s)}(C,A)} = |D| \leq |A|$ so we have that</sub>

$$\frac{\phi}{\operatorname{spars}_{(h,s)}(C,A)} \cdot |C| \le |A|$$

Thus, it follows that $|\bar{C}| \ge \frac{\phi}{\operatorname{spars}_{(h,s)}(C,A)} \cdot |C| - |C|$ and so we can arbitrarily increase the length of edges to turn C into a C' satisfying $\frac{\phi}{\operatorname{spars}_{(h,s)}(C,A)} \cdot |C| = |C'|.^5$

Lastly, any such C' is (h, s)-length ϕ -sparse since C' hs-separates D and so

$$\operatorname{spars}_{(h,s)}(C',A) \ge \frac{|C'|}{|D|} = \frac{\phi \cdot |C|}{|D| \cdot \operatorname{spars}_{(h,s)}(C,A)} = \phi.$$

We now prove the main theorem of this section.

Theorem 11.2. Given graph G and node-weighting A, we have that

$$LWSC(\phi, h, s) \le LC(\phi', h', s')$$

where $\phi' = \phi \cdot s^3 \cdot \log^3 N \cdot N^{O(1/s)}$, h' = 2h and $s' = \frac{(s-2)}{2}$.

Proof. The proof is immediate from Lemma 11.2 and the fact that the union of sparse moving cuts is itself a sparse cut as per Theorem 1.2 and so smaller than the largest sparse moving cut.

More formally, let $(C_1, C_2, ...)$ be the largest (h, s)-length ϕ -sparse moving cut sequence w.r.t. A in G of largest weighted size as defined in Definition 11.1 and let C_0 be the (h, s)-length ϕ -sparse cut of largest size w.r.t. A in G. Our goal is to show

$$\sum_{i\geq 1} \frac{\phi}{\operatorname{spars}_{(h,s)}(C_i, A)} \cdot |C_i| \leq |C_0|.$$
(13)

⁵We ignore rounding to multiples of $\frac{1}{h}$ here for simplicity of presentation.

Let $\mathcal{C} := \sum_{i \ge 1} C_i$ be the union of our moving cut sequence. By Theorem 1.2 we know that

$$\operatorname{spars}_{(h',s')}(\mathcal{C},A) \le s^3 \cdot \log^3 N \cdot N^{O(1/s)} \cdot \frac{\sum_i |C_i|}{\sum_i |C_i| / \operatorname{spars}_{(h,s)}(C_i,A)}.$$
(14)

Furthermore, by Lemma 11.2 we know that there exists an (h', s')-length ϕ' -sparse moving cut \mathcal{C}' such that

$$\frac{\phi'}{\operatorname{spars}_{(h',s')}(\mathcal{C},A)} \cdot |\mathcal{C}| \le |\mathcal{C}'|.$$
(15)

Thus, combining Equation (14) and Equation (15) we get

$$\frac{\sum_{i} |C_i| / \operatorname{spars}_{(h,s)}(C_i, A)}{s^3 \cdot \log^3 N \cdot N^{O(1/s)} \cdot \sum_{i} |C_i|} \cdot \phi' \cdot |\mathcal{C}| \le |\mathcal{C}'|$$

and so using our definition of ϕ' and the fact that $|\mathcal{C}| = \sum_{i \geq 1} |C_i|$ we get

$$\sum_{i\geq 1} \frac{\phi}{\operatorname{spars}_{(h,s)}(C_i, A)} \cdot |C_i| \leq |\mathcal{C}'|.$$

However, since C_0 is the largest (h', s')-length ϕ' -sparse cut we know that $|\mathcal{C}'| \leq |C_0|$, giving our desired inequality (Equation (13)).

11.2 Largest Cut (1) at Most Largest Expander's Complement (4)

We now show $LC \leq LEC$. The basic idea is to argue that if the largest length-constrained sparse cut were too large then it would cut into the length-constrained expanding part of our graph, contradicting its sparsity. We formalize this argument with the notion of projected down demand.

Theorem 11.3. Given graph G and node-weighting A and parameters h, s, ϕ , we have that

$$LC(\phi, h, s) \leq LEC(\phi', h, s)$$

where $\phi' = 3\phi$.

11.2.1 Projected Down Demands

The following formalizes the projected down demand.

Definition 11.3 (Projected Down Demand). Suppose we are given graph G, node-weighting A, A-respecting demand D and $\hat{A} \leq A$ where $\bar{A} := A - \hat{A}$ is the complement of \hat{A} . Then, let D^+ be any demand such that $\sum_v D^+(u, v) = \min(\bar{A}(u), \sum_v D(u, v))$ for every u and $D^+ \leq D$. Symmetrically, let D^- be any demand such that $\sum_v D(v, u) = \min(\bar{A}(u), \sum_v D(v, u))$ and $D^- \leq D$. Then we define the demand D projected down to \hat{A} on (u, v) as

$$D^{\downarrow A}(u,v) := \max(0, D(u,v) - D^+(u,v) - D^-(u,v)).$$

The following establishes the basic properties of $D^{|\hat{A}|}$.

Lemma 11.4. Given graph G, node-weighting A, $\hat{A} \preceq A$ where $\bar{A} := A - \hat{A}$, we have that $D^{|\hat{A}|}$ is \hat{A} -respecting, $|D^{|\hat{A}|} \ge |D| - 2|\bar{A}|$ and $D^{|\hat{A}|} \preceq D$.

Proof. To see that $D^{\downarrow \hat{A}}$ is \hat{A} -respecting, fix a vertex u. Casing on the minimizer of $\min(\bar{A}(u), \sum_{v} D(u, v))$ we have the following.

• If $\sum_{v} D^{+}(u, v) = \overline{A}(u)$ (where D^{+} is defined in Definition 11.3) then by the fact that D is A-respecting we have

$$\sum_{v} D^{\mid \hat{A}}(u,v) \leq \sum_{v} D(u,v) - \sum_{v} D^{+}(u,v)$$
$$\leq A(v) - \bar{A}(u)$$
$$= \hat{A}(u).$$

• On the other hand, if $\sum_{v} D^{+}(u, v) = \sum_{v} D(u, v)$ then by the non-negativity of node-weightings we have

$$\sum_{v} D^{\downarrow \hat{A}}(u,v) \le \sum_{v} D(u,v) - \sum_{v} D^{+}(u,v)$$
$$= 0$$
$$= \hat{A}(u).$$

In either case we have $\sum_{v} D^{|\hat{A}}(u,v) \leq \hat{A}(u)$. A symmetric argument using D^- (where D^- is defined in Definition 11.3) shows that $\sum_{v} D^{|\hat{A}}(v,u) \leq \hat{A}(u)$ and so $D^{|\hat{A}}(u,v)$ is \hat{A} -respecting.

To see that $|D^{|\hat{A}|} \ge |D| - 2|\bar{A}|$, observe that by definition, $|D^{|\hat{A}|} \ge |D| - |D^+| - |D^-|$. But, also by definition, $|D^+|, |D^-| \le |\bar{A}|$, giving the claim.

Lastly, observe that $D^{\mid \hat{A}} \preceq D$ trivially by construction.

11.2.2 Proof Of Largest Cut At Most Largest Expander's Complement

Having formalized the projected down demand, we can now formally prove the main theorem of this section.

Theorem 11.3. Given graph G and node-weighting A and parameters h, s, ϕ , we have that

$$LC(\phi, h, s) \leq LEC(\phi', h, s)$$

where $\phi' = 3\phi$.

Proof. The basic idea of the proof is to argue that the largest sparse cut cannot be larger than the size of the complement of the largest expanding subset because if it were then it would cut into the the largest expanding subset itself; this contradicts the fact that no sparse cut can cut too much into an expanding subset. The projected down demand (Definition 11.3) allows us to formalize this idea.

More formally, let C_0 be the (h, s)-length ϕ -sparse cut of largest size w.r.t. A in G and let \overline{A} be the complement of the largest (h, s)-length ϕ' -expanding subset $\widehat{A} \preceq A$ as in Definition 11.1.

Let D be the demand that witnesses the (h, s)-length ϕ -sparsity of C_0 ; that is, it is the minimizing A-respecting demand in Definition 5.13. We may assume, without loss of generality, that C_0 hs-separates all of D; that is, $\sup_{hs}(C_0, D) = |D|$. Let $D^{\mid \hat{A}}$ be the projected down demand (as in Definition 11.3). Recall that by Lemma 11.4 we know that $D^{\mid \hat{A}}$ is \hat{A} -respecting, $|D^{\mid \hat{A}}| \ge |D| - 2|\bar{A}|$ and $D^{\mid \hat{A}} \preceq D$.

However, since C_0 hs-separates all of D and $D^{\lfloor \hat{A}} \leq D$ we know that C_0 must hs-separate all of $D^{\lfloor \hat{A}}$ and so applying this and $|D^{\lfloor \hat{A}}| \geq |D| - 2|\bar{A}|$ we have

$$\operatorname{spars}_{s \cdot h}(C_0, D^{|\hat{A}}) = \frac{|C_0|}{\operatorname{sep}(C_0, D^{|\hat{A}})} = \frac{|C_0|}{|D^{|\hat{A}}|} \le \frac{|C_0|}{|D| - 2|\bar{A}|}$$
(16)

where, as a reminder, spars is defined in Definition 5.10 and Definition 5.13.

On the other hand, since $D^{|\hat{A}|}$ is \hat{A} -respecting and \hat{A} is (h, s)-length ϕ' -expanding by definition, we know that no cut can be too sparse w.r.t. \hat{A} and, in particular, we know that

$$3\phi = \phi' \le \operatorname{spars}_{(h,s)}(C_0, \hat{A}) \le \operatorname{spars}_{s \cdot h}(C_0, D^{\mid A})$$
(17)

Combining Equation (16) and Equation (17) and solving for $\phi' \cdot |\bar{A}|$ we have

$$\frac{3\phi \cdot |D| - |C_0|}{2} \le \phi' \cdot |\bar{A}|$$

However, recall that C_0 is an (h, s)-length ϕ -sparse cut witnessed by D and, in particular, this means that $\frac{1}{\phi}|C_0| \ge |D|$. Applying this we conclude that

$$|C_0| \le \phi' \cdot |A|.$$

as required.

11.3 Largest Expander's Complement (4) at Most Weighted Sparse Cut Sequence (3)

We now argue that LEC \leq LWSC. The basic idea is to use our characterization of lengthconstrained expanders in terms of expander power embeddings (as developed in Section 7 and formalized by the neighborhood router demand). In particular, any demand of the neighborhood router demand not separated by the largest cut sequence must be efficiently routable after applying any expander decomposition since the resulting graph is a length-constrained expander. By Theorem 7.1 this implies the existence of a large expanding subset and so the complement of the largest expanding expanding complement must be small. Formally we show the following.

Theorem 11.4. Given graph G and node-weighting A, we have that

$$LEC(\phi, h, s) \leq LWSC(\phi', h', s')$$

where $\phi' = \phi \cdot \Omega \left(2^{O(k)} \cdot N^{O(1/k')} \cdot \log^2 N \right), \ h' = h \cdot k' \ and \ s' = s \cdot O \left(\frac{k}{k'} \cdot \log N \right).$

It will be useful for us to abstract out this argument as we will later use it to argue that $LEC \leq SED$. The following formalizes the fact which we abstract out.

Lemma 11.5. Given graph G, node-weighting A and parameters $k, k' \ge 1$, let \overline{A} be the largest (h, s)-length ϕ -expanding subset's complement (as defined in Definition 11.1). Furthermore, let C^* be an (h', s')-length ϕ' -expander decomposition where $\phi' = \phi \cdot \Omega \left(2^{O(k)} \cdot N^{O(1/k')} \cdot \log^3 N \right), h' = h \cdot k'$ and $s' = s \cdot O \left(\frac{k}{k'} \cdot \log N \right)$. Then

$$\operatorname{spars}_{(h',s')}(C^*, A) \cdot |\bar{A}| \le |C^*| \cdot O\left(2^{O(k)} \cdot N^{O(1/k')} \cdot \log^2 N\right).$$

Proof. Let $G' := G - C^*$ be G with C^* applied. Observe that G' must be an (h', s')-length ϕ' -expander since C^* is an expander decomposition.

Next, let $D_{A,k,k'}$ be the neighborhood router demand, as defined in Section 7.1. Recall that by Lemma 7.1 we know $D_{A,k,k'}$ is A-respecting and h'-length. Let $D'_{A,k,k'}$ be $D_{A,k,k'}$ restricted to be h's'-length in G'. That is, $D'_{A,k,k'}$ on u and v is defined as

$$D'_{A,k,k'}(u,v) := \begin{cases} D_{A,k,k'}(u,v) & \text{if } d_{G'}(u,v) \le h's' \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Observe that $D'_{A,k,k'}$ is trivially A-respecting since $D_{A,k,k'}$ is A-respecting. Also, $D'_{A,k,k'}$ is h's'-length by construction. Additionally, observe that by construction we have

$$|D'_{A,k,k'}| \ge |D_{A,k,k'}| - \sup_{h's'} (C^*, A)$$

Since G' is an (h', s')-length ϕ' -expander and $D'_{A,k,k'}$ is A-respecting and h's'-length, we know that $D'_{A,k,k'}$ can be routed in G' with congestion at most $O(\frac{\log N}{\phi'})$ and dilation O(h's') by Theorem 5.17. Letting $\epsilon = \frac{\sup_{h's'}(C^*,A)}{|D_{A,k,k'}|}$, it follows that a $1 - \epsilon$ fraction of $D_{A,k,k'}$ can be routed with congestion at most $O(\frac{\log N}{\phi'})$ and dilation at most O(h's'). Applying Theorem 7.1 and the fact that $|D_{A,k,k'}| \ge \Omega\left(\frac{1}{N^{O(1/k')} \cdot \log N} \cdot |A|\right)$ by Lemma 7.1, we have that that there is a node weighting $A' \preceq A$ of size at least

$$|A'| \ge |A| \cdot \left(1 - \frac{\sup_{h's'}(C^*, A)}{|D_{A,k,k'}|} \cdot O\left(2^{O(k)} \cdot N^{O(1/k')} \cdot \log N\right)\right)$$
$$\ge |A| - \sup_{h's'}(C^*, A) \cdot O\left(2^{O(k)} \cdot N^{O(1/k')} \cdot \log^2 N\right)$$

such that A' is (h, s)-length ϕ -expanding in G'.

Let \bar{A} be the complement of the largest (h, s)-length ϕ -expanding subset of A as in Definition 11.1. Then, observing that $|\bar{A}| \leq |A| - |A'|$ and $\sup_{h's'}(\mathcal{C}, A) = \frac{|\mathcal{C}|}{\sup_{spars_{(h',s')}(\mathcal{C},A)}}$ then gives:

$$|\bar{A}| \le |\mathcal{C}| \cdot O\left(\frac{2^{O(k)} \cdot N^{O(1/k')} \cdot \log^2 N}{\operatorname{spars}_{(h',s')}(\mathcal{C},A)}\right)$$

as required.

Applying the above helper lemma allows us to conclude the main fact of this section.

Theorem 11.4. Given graph G and node-weighting A, we have that

$$LEC(\phi, h, s) \leq LWSC(\phi', h', s')$$

where $\phi' = \phi \cdot \Omega \left(2^{O(k)} \cdot N^{O(1/k')} \cdot \log^2 N \right), \ h' = h \cdot k' \ and \ s' = s \cdot O \left(\frac{k}{k'} \cdot \log N \right).$

Proof. The basic idea is to observe that the union of the largest sequence of sparse cuts is an expander decomposition and then apply Lemma 11.5.

More formally, let \overline{A} be the largest (h, s)-length ϕ -expanding subset's complement (as defined in Definition 11.1). Also, let (C_1, C_2, \ldots) be the (h', s')-length ϕ' -sparse moving cut sequence of largest weighted size as defined in Definition 11.1, let $\mathcal{C} := \sum_i C_i$.

Observe that C must be an (h', s')-length ϕ' -expander decomposition since otherwise there would be a cut that could be appended to $(C_1, C_2, ...)$ to increase its size, contradicting its maximality. It follows by Lemma 11.5 that

$$\operatorname{spars}_{(h',s')}(\mathcal{C},A) \cdot |\bar{A}| \le |\mathcal{C}| \cdot O\left(2^{O(k)} \cdot N^{O(1/k')} \cdot \log^2 N\right).$$
(18)

Let D be the A-respecting demand witnessing the sparsity of C so that

$$\operatorname{spars}_{(h',s')}(\mathcal{C},A) = \frac{|\mathcal{C}|}{\operatorname{sep}_{h's'}(\mathcal{C},D)}$$

Observe that by definition of \mathcal{C} and since $\operatorname{spars}_{(h',s')}(C_i, D) \geq \operatorname{spars}_{(h',s')}(C_i, A)$ we get

$$\operatorname{sep}_{(h's')}(\mathcal{C},D) = \sum_{i} \operatorname{sep}_{h's'}(C_i,D) = \sum_{i} \frac{|C_i|}{\operatorname{spars}_{(h',s')}(C_i,D)} \le \sum_{i} \frac{|C_i|}{\operatorname{spars}_{(h',s')}(C_i,A)}$$

and so it follows that

$$\operatorname{spars}_{(h',s')}(\mathcal{C},A) \ge \frac{|\mathcal{C}|}{\sum_i |C_i| / \operatorname{spars}_{(h',s')}(C_i,A)}$$

Combining this bound on $\operatorname{spars}_{(h',s')}(\mathcal{C},A)$ and Equation (18) we get

$$|\bar{A}| \leq \sum_{i} \frac{|C_i|}{\operatorname{spars}_{(h',s')}(C_i,A)} \cdot O\left(2^{O(k)} \cdot N^{O(1/k')} \cdot \log^2 N\right).$$

Multiplying both sides by ϕ we get

$$\phi \cdot |\bar{A}| \leq \sum_{i} \frac{\phi'}{\operatorname{spars}_{(h',s')}(C_i,A)} \cdot |C_i|.$$

as required.

The remaining inequalities we show are mostly trivial.

11.4 Largest Expander's Complement (4) at Most Smallest Expander Decomposition (5)

We now leverage the helper lemma from the previous section (Lemma 11.5) to show LEC \leq SED.

Theorem 11.5. Given graph G that is (h', s')-length ϕ_G -expanding w.r.t. node-weighting A and parameters h, s, ϕ , we have that

$$\frac{\phi_G}{\phi'} \cdot \textit{LEC}(\phi, h, s) \leq \textit{SED}(\phi', h', s').$$

where $\phi' = \phi \cdot \Omega \left(2^{O(k)} \cdot N^{O(1/k')} \cdot \log^2 N \right), \ h' = h \cdot k' \ and \ s' = s \cdot O \left(\frac{k}{k'} \cdot \log N \right).$

Proof. The proof is immediate from our previous helper lemma, Lemma 11.5.

In particular, let C^* be the smallest (h', s')-length ϕ' -expander decomposition and let \overline{A} be the largest (h, s)-length ϕ -expanding subset's complement (as in Definition 11.1). By Lemma 11.5 we know that

$$\operatorname{spars}_{(h',s')}(C^*,A) \cdot |\bar{A}| \le |\mathcal{C}| \cdot O\left(2^{O(k)} \cdot N^{O(1/k')} \cdot \log^2 N\right).$$

Since G is (h', s')-length ϕ_G -expanding we know $\operatorname{spars}_{(h', s')}(C^*, A) \ge \phi_G$ and so

$$\phi_G \cdot |\bar{A}| \le |\mathcal{C}| \cdot O\left(2^{O(k)} \cdot N^{O(1/k')} \cdot \log^2 N\right).$$

Multiplying both sides by ϕ and applying the definition of ϕ' then gives

$$\frac{\phi_G}{\phi'} \cdot \phi |\bar{A}| \le |\mathcal{C}|$$

as required.

11.5 Largest Cut (1) at Most Largest Cut Sequence (2)

Showing $LC \leq LSC$ is trivial since the first moving cut of any sparse length-constrained cut sequence cut could be the largest sparse length-constrained cut.

Theorem 11.6. Given graph G and node-weighting A and parameters h, s, ϕ , we have that

$$LC(\phi, h, s) \leq LSC(\phi, h, s).$$

Proof. Any cut sequence $(C_1, C_2, ...)$ that begins with C will satisfy $|C| \leq \sum_i |C_i|$ and since C can always be chosen as the first cut in an (h, s, ϕ) -sequence this gives the theorem.

11.6 Largest Cut Sequence (2) at Most Largest Weighted Cut Sequence (3)

Likewise LSC \leq LWSC is trivial since the largest weighted sequence of sparse length-constrained cuts always has as a candidate the largest (unweighted) sequence of sparse length-constrained cuts.

Theorem 11.7. Given graph G and node-weighting A and parameters h, s, ϕ , we have that

$$LSC(\phi, h, s) \leq LWSC(\phi, h, s).$$

Proof. The proof is immediate from the fact that the weighted size of a sequence of (h, s)-length ϕ -sparse cuts is always larger than its actual size

Specifically, let $(C_1, C_2,)$ be the largest sequence of (h, s)-length ϕ -sparse cuts and let $(C'_1, C'_2, ...)$ be the sequence of of (h, s)-length ϕ -sparse cuts of largest weighted size (as in Definition 11.1). Observe that since each C_i is ϕ -sparse we know that for each C_i we have $\text{spars}_{(h,s)}(C_i, A) \leq \phi$ and since $(C'_1, C'_2, ...)$ is the (h, s)-length ϕ -sparse cut sequence of largest size we have

$$\sum_{i} |C_i| \le \sum_{i} \frac{\phi}{\operatorname{spars}_{(h,s)}(C_i, A)} \cdot |C_i| \le \sum_{i} \frac{\phi}{\operatorname{spars}_{(h,s)}(C'_i, A)} \cdot |C'_i|$$

as required.

11.7 Smallest Expander Decomposition (5) at Most Largest Cut Sequence (2)

Lastly, $\text{SED} \leq \text{LSC}$ is trivial since the largest sequence of length-constrained sparse cuts is itself a length-constrained expander decomposition.

Theorem 11.8. Given graph G and node-weighting A and parameters h, s, ϕ , we have that

$$SED(\phi, h, s) \leq LSC(\phi, h, s).$$

Proof. Let $(C_1, C_2, ...)$ be the largest sequence of (h, s)-length ϕ -sparse cuts and let C^* be the smallest (h, s)-length ϕ -expander decomposition.

From the maximality of the sequence (C_1, C_2, \ldots) , it must hold that $G - \sum_i C_i$ is an (h, s)-length ϕ -expander, as otherwise we can find another moving cut and append it to the sequence, contradicting the maximality of the sequence (C_1, C_2, \ldots) . Therefore, the moving cut $\mathcal{C} = \sum_i C_i$ is an (h, s)-length ϕ -expander decomposition of G for A. But since C^* is the smallest such expander decomposition we then know that $|C^*| \leq |\mathcal{C}| = \sum_i |C_i|$ as required. \Box

11.8 Proof of Equivalence of Distance Measures (Theorem 11.1)

We conclude this section by stringing together our proven inequalities to show the equivalence of our various graph quantities.

Theorem 11.1. Fix a graph G, parameters $k, k' \ge 1$ and ϕ, h, s and a node-weighting A.

$$LC(\phi, h, s) \leq LEC(\phi_1, h, s) \leq LSC(\phi_2, h_2, s_2) \leq LC(\phi_3, h_3, s_3)$$

where

$$\begin{split} \phi_1 &= 3\phi \\ \phi_2 &= \phi_1 \cdot 2^{O(k)} \cdot N^{O(1/k')} \cdot \log^5 N \cdot s^3 \cdot N^{O(1/s)}, \qquad h_2 &= h \cdot 2k', \qquad s_2 = s \cdot O\left(\frac{k}{k'} \cdot \log N\right) \\ \phi_3 &= \phi_2 \cdot s^3 \cdot \log^3 N \cdot N^{O(1/s)}, \qquad \qquad h_3 = h_2 \cdot 2, \qquad s_3 = \frac{(s_2 - 2)}{2} \end{split}.$$

Furthermore, if A is (h_4, s_4) -length ϕ_G -expanding then:

$$\frac{\phi_G}{\phi_4} \cdot LEC(\phi, h, s) \le SED(\phi_4, h_4, s_4) \le LSC(\phi_4, h_4, s_4) \le LC(\phi_5, h_5, s_5) \le LEC(\phi_5, h_5, s_5)$$

where

$$\phi_4 = \phi \cdot 2^{O(k)} \cdot N^{O(1/k')} \cdot \log^2 N, \qquad h_4 = h \cdot k', \qquad s_4 = O\left(\frac{k}{k'} \cdot \log N\right)$$

$$\phi_5 = \phi_4 \cdot s^3 \cdot \log^3 N \cdot N^{O(1/s)}, \qquad h_5 = h_4 \cdot 2, \qquad s_5 = \frac{(s_4 - 2)}{2}.$$

Proof. We string together our inequalities as follows.

$$\begin{split} & \operatorname{LC}(\phi,h,s) \leq \operatorname{LEC}(\phi_1,h,s) \text{ by Theorem 11.3} \\ & \operatorname{LEC}(\phi_1,h_1,s_1) \leq \operatorname{LSC}(\phi_2,h_2,s_2) \text{ by Theorem 11.4, Theorem 11.2 and Theorem 11.6.} \\ & \operatorname{LSC}(\phi_2,h_2,s_2) \leq \operatorname{LC}(\phi_3,h_3,s_3) \text{ by Theorem 11.7 and Theorem 11.2.} \\ & \operatorname{For \ our \ second \ set \ of \ inequalities \ we \ additionally \ have \ the \ following.} \\ & \frac{\phi_G}{\phi_4} \cdot \operatorname{LEC}(\phi,h,s) \leq \operatorname{SED}(\phi_4,h_4,s_4) \ \text{by Theorem 11.5.} \\ & \operatorname{SED}(\phi_4,h_4,s_4) \leq \operatorname{LSC}(\phi_4,h_4,s_4) \ \text{by Theorem 11.8.} \\ & \operatorname{LSC}(\phi_4,h_4,s_4) \leq \operatorname{LC}(\phi_5,h_5,s_5) \ \text{again \ by Theorem 11.7 and Theorem 11.2.} \\ & \operatorname{LC}(\phi_5,h_5,s_5) \leq \operatorname{LSC}(\phi_5,h_5,s_5) \ \text{by Theorem 11.6.} \end{split}$$

12 Algorithm: Sparse Flows and Cutmatches

Our algorithm to compute large length-constrained sparse cuts from cut strategies will be based on the previously-studied idea of a (length-constrained) cutmatch. Informally, a cutmatch matches two node sets over flow paths and finds a cut certifying that the unmatched nodes cannot be matched without significant additional congestion. In the rest of this section we give new algorithms for efficiently computing cutmatches with sparse flows; towards this, we give the first efficient algorithms for near-optimal length-constrained flows with support size $\tilde{O}(m)$. As our algorithms parallelize, we give our results as parallel algorithms in this section.

To define our cutmatch algorithm guarantees we will make use of the following notion of batching.

Definition 12.1 (b-Batchable). Given a graph G = (V, E) with edge lengths ℓ and vertex subsets $V_1, V_2, \ldots \subseteq V$, we say that $\mathcal{V} = \{V_1, V_2, \ldots\}$ is b-batchable for length h if \mathcal{V} can be partitioned into "batches" $\mathcal{V}_1, \mathcal{V}_2, \ldots, \mathcal{V}_b$ so that if $u \in V_i \in \mathcal{V}_j$ and $v \in V_{i'} \in \mathcal{V}_j$ and $i \neq i'$ then u and v are at least 2h apart in G. We say that pairs of vertex subsets $\{(S_i, T_i)\}_i$ are b-batchable if $\{S_i \cup T_i\}_i$ is b-batchable.

A cutmatch is defined as follows.

Definition 12.2 (Multi-Commodity *h*-Length Cutmatch, [HHS23]). Given a graph G = (V, E)with lengths ℓ , an *h*-length ϕ -sparse cutmatch of congestion γ between disjoint and equal-size nodeweighting pairs $\{(A_i, A'_i)\}_i$ consists of, for each *i*, a partition of the support of the node-weightings $M_i \sqcup U_i = \operatorname{supp}(A_i)$ and $M'_i \sqcup U'_i = \operatorname{supp}(A'_i)$ where M_i, M'_i and U_i, U'_i are the "matched" and "unmatched" parts respectively and

- An integral h-length flow $F = \sum_i F_i$ in G with lengths ℓ of congestion γ according to U where, for each i, each u sends at most $A_i(u)$ according to F_i (with equality iff $u \in M_i$) and each $u' \in M'_i$ receives at most $A'_i(u')$ flow according to F_i (with equality iff $u' \in M'_i$);
- A moving cut C in G where U_i and U'_i are at least h-far according to lengths $\{\ell_e + h \cdot C(e)\}_e$ and C has size at most

$$|C| \le \phi \cdot \left(\left(\sum_{i} |A_i| \right) - \operatorname{val}(F) \right).$$

The below summarizes our new cutmatch algorithms. Previously, [HHS23] gave the same result but with support size $\tilde{O}(b \cdot \text{poly}(h) \cdot m)$.

Theorem 12.3. Suppose we are given a graph G = (V, E) on m edges with lengths ℓ , $h \ge 1$ and $\phi \le 1$. There is an algorithm that, given node-weighting pairs $\{(A_i, B_i)\}_i$ whose supports are bbatchable for length h, outputs a multi-commodity h-length ϕ -sparse cutmatch (F, C) of congestion γ where $\gamma = \tilde{O}(\frac{1}{\phi})$. Furthermore, $|\operatorname{supp}(F)| \le \tilde{O}(m + b + \sum_i |\operatorname{supp}(A_i \cup B_i)|)$ and this algorithm has depth $b \cdot \operatorname{poly}(h, \log N)$ and work $\tilde{O}(|\operatorname{supp}(F)| \cdot \operatorname{poly}(h))$.

Our cutmatch algorithm will be based on new length-constrained flow algorithms whose guarantees are summarized by the below.

Theorem 1.3. Given a graph G = (V, E) with capacities U, lengths ℓ , length constraint $h \ge 1$, $0 < \epsilon < 1$ and b-batchable source, sink pairs $\{(S_i, T_i)\}_i$, one can compute a feasible h-length flow cut pair (F, C) of $\{(S_i, T_i)\}_i$ that is $(1 \pm \epsilon)$ -approximate in (deterministic) depth $\tilde{O}(b \cdot \operatorname{poly}(\frac{1}{\epsilon}, h))$ and work $m \cdot \tilde{O}(b \cdot \operatorname{poly}(\frac{1}{\epsilon}, h))$ where

$$|\operatorname{supp}(F)| \le \tilde{O}(|E|+b).$$

Furthermore, $F = \eta \cdot \sum_{j=1}^{k} F_j$ where $\eta = \tilde{\Theta}(\epsilon^2)$, $k = \tilde{O}\left(\kappa \cdot \frac{h}{\epsilon^4}\right)$ and F_j is an integral h-length S_i - T_i flow for some *i*.

12.1 Rounding Flows to Blaming Flows

In order to achieve sparse flows and cutmatches we introduce the following sense of blaming flows. The utility of the following sense of blaming is that each time an edge is γ -blamed, a γ -fraction of its capacity is used up so if we compute a series of γ -blaming flows the total support size of these flows should be at most (about) m/γ .

Definition 12.4 (Blaming Flow). Given flow F we say that F is γ -blaming if for each P in the support of F there is a unique edge $e \in P$ that P "blames" such that $F(e) \geq \gamma \cdot U_e$.

The following algorithm shows how to convert arbitrary flows into blaming flows

Lemma 12.5. Given a feasible (possibly fractional) h-length flow F on graph G = (V, E) one can compute a feasible integral flow \hat{F} where $\operatorname{supp}(\hat{F}) \subseteq \operatorname{supp}(F)$ and

1. Blaming: \hat{F} is $\frac{1}{2}$ -blaming;

2. Approximate: $\operatorname{val}(\hat{F}) \ge \Omega\left(\frac{1}{h \cdot \log^2 N}\right) \cdot \operatorname{val}(F);$

in $\tilde{O}(|\operatorname{supp}(\hat{F})|/|E| + \log|\operatorname{supp}(\hat{F})|)$ parallel time with *m* processors.

Proof. The basic idea of the algorithm is as follows. By a standard bucketing trick we can assume that every flow path in the support of F has the same value 2^{j^*} and that the minimum capacity edge used by every flow path has the same capacity of 2^{i^*} . We then create an instance of maximal independent set (MIS) whose vertices are our flow paths to select a subset of flow paths $I \subseteq \text{supp}(F)$ so that each capacity 2^{i^*} edge used by F has at most one flow path in I going over it; sending 2^{i^*} flow along each flow path of I gives our result.

More formally, we begin by rounding our flow values and capacities down to powers of 2. Specifically let U' be the capacity which gives edge e value

$$U'_e := 2^{\lfloor \log_2(U_e) \rfloor}$$

Likewise, let F' be the flow which gives path P flow value

$$F'(P) := 2^{\lfloor \log_2(F(P)) - 1 \rfloor}$$

Observe that by the feasibility of F for capacities U and the extra -1 in the exponent in our definition of F'(P) we know that F' is feasible in G for capacities U'. Furthermore, we know by definition of F' that

$$\operatorname{val}(F') \ge \operatorname{val}(F)/2. \tag{19}$$

Next, we partition paths of F' by the smallest capacity edge that they use and their flow value. Specifically, for each i and $j \leq i$, let $\mathcal{P}_{i,j} := \{P \in \operatorname{supp}(F') : \min_{e \in P} U'_e = 2^i \text{ and } F'(P) = 2^j\}$ be all paths in the support of F' with minimum capacity edge of capacity 2^i and flow value 2^j . Let $F'_{i,j}$ be the flow which matches F' on paths in $\mathcal{P}_{i,j}$, namely $F'_{i,j}$ on path P is defined as

$$F'_{i,j}(P) := \begin{cases} F'(P) = 2^j & \text{if } P \in \mathcal{P}_{i,j} \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Let $i^*, j^* := \arg \max_{i,j} \operatorname{val}(F'_{i,j})$ be the index of the maximum such flow. We let

$$F^* := F'_{i^*, i^*}$$

for ease of notation. By our assumption of polynomial capacities, the fact that $F' = \sum_{i,j} F'_{i,j}$ and Equation (19) we know that

$$\operatorname{val}(F^*) \ge \Omega\left(\operatorname{val}(F')/\log^2 N\right) \ge \Omega\left(\operatorname{val}(F)/\log^2 N\right).$$
(20)

Furthermore, we know that F^* is feasible in G with capacities U' and therefore feasible in G with capacities U.

In what remains we will show how to round F^* to another flow \hat{F} which is both integral and blaming to at a negligible loss in cost. Each path in the support of \hat{F} will blame some edge of capacity 2^{i^*} according to U'. We will construct \hat{F} by solving an appropriate instance of maximal independent set (MIS) based on F^* . By construction every path in the support of F^* has flow value 2^{j^*} and uses an edge of capacity 2^{i^*} . Our goal will be to construct an instance of MIS which allows us to select paths so that for each edge of capacity 2^{i^*} that is used by some path in $\operatorname{supp}(F^*)$ we select exactly one path. We will the increase said paths flow value to 2^{i^*} ; likewise we will select 2^{i-i^*} many paths for an edge of capacity $i > i^*$ in G. Specifically, consider the following instance of MIS on graph $H = (V_H, E_H)$.

- MIS Vertices: For each path in $P \in \text{supp}(F^*)$ we have 1 vertex. In other words, $V_H := \text{supp}(F^*)$.
- MIS Edges: For each edge $e \in G$ in our original graph such that $F^*(e) > 0$ we construct edges E_e where $E_H := \sqcup_{e \in E} E_e$ is the union of all such edges. E_e is constructed as follows. Let $\mathcal{P}_e = \{P_0, P_1, \ldots\}$ be all paths in $\operatorname{supp}(F^*)$ which include e ordered arbitrarily and for $l \in \left[\lceil |\mathcal{P}_e|/2^{i^*-j^*} \rceil \right]$ let $\mathcal{P}_e^{(l)} := \{P_{(l-1)\cdot 2^{i^*-j^*}}, \ldots, P_{(l)\cdot 2^{i^*-j^*}}\}$ be the *l*th set of contiguous $2^{i^*-j^*}$ such paths. For each l and each $P, P' \in \mathcal{P}_e^{(l)}$ we include the edge $\{P, P'\}$ in E_e ; in other words, we add a clique for each $\mathcal{P}_e^{(l)}$.

Let $I \subseteq \operatorname{supp}(F^*)$ be an MIS in H. Then, we define \hat{F} as the flow corresponding to I where each flow value is rounded up from 2^{j^*} to 2^{i^*} ; that is, \hat{F} on path P is defined as

$$\hat{F}(P) := \begin{cases} 2^{i^*} & \text{if } P \in I \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

We now argue that \hat{F} satisfies the required properties. We have $\operatorname{supp}(\hat{F}) \subseteq \operatorname{supp}(F)$ since $\operatorname{supp}(\hat{F}) \subseteq \operatorname{supp}(F') \subseteq \operatorname{supp}(F') = \operatorname{supp}(F)$.

 \hat{F} must be integral since $i^* \geq 1$ since we have assumed U_e is integral for every e.

We next argue that \hat{F} is feasible for capacities U. Even stronger, we observe that \hat{F} is feasible for U'. In particular, applying the fact that I includes at most one element from each $\mathcal{P}_e^{(l)}$ and $l \leq |\mathcal{P}_e|/2^{i^*-j^*}$ we have the total flow that \hat{F} sends over edge e is

$$\hat{F}(e) = \sum_{l} \sum_{P \in I \cap \mathcal{P}_{e}^{(l)}} 2^{i^{*}}$$

$$\leq \sum_{l} 2^{i^{*}}$$

$$\leq |\mathcal{P}_{e}| \cdot 2^{j^{*}}$$

$$= F^{*}(e)$$

$$\leq F'(e)$$

$$\leq U'_{e}.$$

Thus, \hat{F} is feasible for U' and since $U'_e \leq U_e$ for every edge e, \hat{F} is also feasible for U.

Next, we claim that \hat{F} is $\frac{1}{2}$ -blaming. By definition of F^* we know that, for each $P \in \text{supp}(F^*)$, there is an edge $e \in P$ such that $U'_e = 2^{i^*}$. As $\text{supp}(\hat{F}) \subseteq \text{supp}(F^*)$ and \hat{F} sends 2^{i^*} over each path in its support, it follows that for each $P \in \text{supp}(\hat{F})$ there is a some $e \in P$ such that $U'_e = 2^{i^*}$. Since

 $\hat{F}(P) = 2^{i^*}$ and \hat{F} is feasible for U', it follows that this edge for each $P \in \operatorname{supp}(\hat{F})$ is unique and $\hat{F}(e) = 2^{i^*}$. Thus, we have $P \in \operatorname{supp}(\hat{F})$ blame this unique edge e; since $U'_e \leq \frac{1}{2} \cdot U_e$, it follows that \hat{F} is $\frac{1}{2}$ -blaming.

Lastly, we argue that \hat{F} has approximately the same value as F. Since every path in F^* consists of at most h-many edges, observe that the maximum degree in H is at most $h \cdot 2^{i^*-j^*}$ so $|I| \ge \frac{1}{h \cdot 2^{i^*-j^*}} \cdot |\operatorname{supp}(F^*)|$. Combining this with the fact that $|\operatorname{supp}(F^*)| = \operatorname{val}(F^*)/2^{j^*}$ we have

$$|I| \ge \frac{1}{h \cdot 2^{i^* - j^*}} \cdot |\operatorname{supp}(F^*)|$$

= $\frac{1}{h \cdot 2^{i^*}} \cdot \operatorname{val}(F^*).$ (21)

Applying Equation (21) and the definition of \hat{F} we get

$$\operatorname{val}(\hat{F}) = 2^{i^*} \cdot |I|$$
$$= \frac{1}{h} \cdot \operatorname{val}(F^*)$$
(22)

Combining Equation (22) and Equation (20) we get

$$\operatorname{val}(\hat{F}) \ge \Omega\left(\frac{1}{h \cdot \log^2 N}\right) \cdot \operatorname{val}(F)$$

as required.

It remains to argue the runtime of our algorithm. Computing \hat{F}^* in the stated time is trivial to do by inspecting each path in the support of F in parallel. Likewise, computing \hat{F} from I is trivial to do in the stated time. The only non-trivial step is to construct H and compute I. Constructing H can be done in the stated time as it consists of $|\operatorname{supp}(F^*)| \leq |\operatorname{supp}(F)|$ -many vertices and each $\mathcal{P}_e^{(l)}$ and its corresponding clique can be computed in parallel. Computing I can then be done by any number of a standard number of parallel MIS algorithms running in deterministic parallel time $O(\log |V_H|) = O(\log |\operatorname{supp}(F)|)$ rounds; see e.g. [Lub85].

12.2 Blaming Flow Sequences

Our algorithm will ultimately compute a sequence of blaming flows, defined as follows.

Definition 12.6 (Blaming Flow Sequence). Given flow F we say that F is decomposable into a γ -blaming flow sequence F_1, F_2, \ldots if F can be expressed as $F = F_1 + F_2 + \ldots$ where F_i is γ -blaming in G with capacities $U^{(i)} := \{U_e - \sum_{j < i} F_j(e)\}_e$.

Given a flow F that can be decomposed into a blaming flow sequence we will refer to the number of times F blames an edge e by which we mean the number of flows in F_1, F_2, \ldots that have in their support a path that blames e.

The following will imply the sparsity of a sequence of blaming flows.

Lemma 12.7. Let F be decomposable into a γ -blaming flow sequence F_1, F_2, \ldots of integral flows on graph G = (V, E) with capacities U. Then each edge is blamed at most $O(\frac{\log N}{\gamma})$ times by F.

Proof. Each time an edge is blamed its capacity is reduced by a $1 - \gamma$ multiplicative factor and by our assumption of polynomial-size capacities such a reduction can happen at most $\frac{1}{\gamma} \cdot \log N$ times.

More formally, fix an edge e suppose (without loss of generality) that F'_1, F'_2, \ldots, F'_k is a subsequence of F_1, F_2, \ldots where each F'_i has in its support a path that blames e. We have that the capacity of e in the graph in which F'_{i+1} contains a path blaming e is at most

$$U_e \cdot (1-\gamma)$$

By our assumption that $U_e \leq N$ we then have that $i \leq O(\log N)$ as required.

12.3 Blaming Near-Lightest Path Blockers

The sequence of blaming flows computed by our algorithm will be a so-called "near-lighted path blocker" as previously introduced by [HHS23]. Towards defining these, it will be useful to treat a moving cut C as assigning "weights" to edges of our input graph. Given a moving cut C and path P we let

$$C(P) := \sum_{e \in P} C(e)$$

be the total weight of the path and let

$$d_C^{(h)}(u,v) := \min_{u-v \text{ path } P: \ell(P) \le h} C(P)$$

give the minimum weight of a length at most h path connecting u and v. For vertex sets $W, W' \subseteq V$ we define $d_C^{(h)}(W, W') := \min_{w \in W} \min_{w' \in W'} d_C^{(h)}(w, w')$ analogously. Then, we have our definition of near-lightest path blockers below.

Definition 12.8 (*h*-length $(1+\epsilon)$ -Lightest Path Blockers, [HHS23] Definition 11.1). Let G = (V, E)be a graph with lengths ℓ , weights C and capacities U. Fix $\epsilon > 0$, $h \ge 1$, $\lambda \le d_C^{(h)}(S,T)$ and $S,T \subseteq V$. Let F be an h-length integral S-T flow. F is an h-length $(1+\epsilon)$ -lightest path blocker if:

- 1. Near-Lightest: $P \in \text{supp}(F)$ has weight at most $(1 + 2\epsilon) \cdot \lambda$;
- 2. Near-Lightest Path Blocking: If S-T path P' has length at most h and weight at most $(1 + \epsilon) \cdot \lambda$ then there is some $e \in P'$ where $F(e) = U_e$.

Previous work showed how to compute near-lightest path blockers.

Theorem 12.1. [[HHS23] Theorem 11.1] One can compute h-length $(1+\epsilon)$ -lightest path blocker F in deterministic parallel time $\tilde{O}\left(\operatorname{poly}(\frac{1}{\epsilon},h)\right)$ with m processors where $|\operatorname{supp}(F)| \leq \tilde{O}\left(\operatorname{poly}(\frac{1}{\epsilon},h) \cdot |E|\right)$.

By repeatedly making near-lightest path blockers blaming, we can compute a near-lightest path blockers which is also blaming.

Theorem 12.2. One can compute an h-length $(1+\epsilon)$ -lightest path blocker F in deterministic parallel time $\tilde{O}\left(\operatorname{poly}(\frac{1}{\epsilon},h)\right)$ with m processors which is decomposable into a $\frac{1}{2}$ -blaming flow sequence.

Proof. Our algorithm simply repeatedly takes lightest path blockers, rounds them to be blaming, reduces capacities and iterates.

More formally, we do the following. We initialize our output $(1 + \epsilon)$ -lightest path blocker F to be the empty flow. Then, we compute a $(1 + \epsilon)$ -lightest path blocker F' using Theorem 12.3. We then apply Lemma 12.5 to round this flow to flow \hat{F} which is $\frac{1}{2}$ -blaming. We update F to $F + \hat{F}$ and decrement the capacity of each edge e by $\hat{F}(e)$. We iterate this until F is near-lightest path blocking.

We first claim that the above algorithm must only iterate $\tilde{O}(\text{poly}(h))$ times. This is proven in Theorem 11.1 of [HHS23]. Our runtime and the fact that \hat{F} is a $(1 + \epsilon)$ -lightest path blocker and decomposable into a $\frac{1}{2}$ -blaming flow sequence is immediate by construction and the guarantees of Theorem 12.3 and Lemma 12.5.

12.4 Sparse Flows and Cutmatches via Blaming Near-Lightest Path Blockers

We now use our near-lightest path blockers to compute sparse flows and cutmatches. Specifically, we adopt Algorithm 1 which was shown by [HHS23] to compute a near-optimal flow.

Theorem 12.3. [[HHS23] Theorem 11.1] Algorithm 1 returns a feasible h-length $\{(S_i, T_i)\}_i$ flow, moving cut pair (F, C) that is $(1 \pm \epsilon)$ -approximate in deterministic parallel time $\tilde{O}(\text{poly}(\frac{1}{\epsilon}, h))$ with m processors. Also, $F = \eta \cdot \sum_{j=1}^{k} F_j$ where $\eta = \tilde{\Theta}(\epsilon^2)$, $k = \tilde{O}(\frac{h}{\epsilon^4})$ and each F_j is an integral h-length S_i - T_i flow for some i.

We observe that if we use blaming flows for our near-lightest path blockers in Algorithm 1 then the resulting flow is sparse.

Lemma 12.9. If each lightest path blocker in Algorithm 1 is decomposable into a γ -blaming flow sequence then the flow F returned by Algorithm 1 satisfies $\operatorname{supp}(F) \leq \tilde{O}\left(\frac{1}{\gamma} \cdot |E|\right)$.

Proof. Consider one edge e. Next, consider one shortest path blocker \hat{F} computed by Algorithm 1. By Lemma 12.7 if \hat{F} blames e at least once then it blames it at most $O\left(\frac{\log N}{\gamma}\right)$ times. Furthermore, if $\hat{F} \gamma$ -blames e at least once then e has its cut value increases by a $(1 + \epsilon_0)^{\gamma}$ multiplicative factor. Since each edge has its cut value initialized to $\frac{1}{m^{O(1)}}$ it follows that the total number of computed shortest path blockers that blame e is at most $\tilde{O}(1)$ and since each such shortest path blocker blames e at most $O\left(\frac{\log N}{\gamma}\right)$ times it follows that the total number of all shortest path blockers computed by Algorithm 1 and therefore in the support of F is $\operatorname{supp}(F) \leq \tilde{O}\left(\frac{1}{\gamma} \cdot |E|\right)$. \Box

We conclude with our sparse flow and cutmatch algorithms.

Theorem 1.3. Given a graph G = (V, E) with capacities U, lengths ℓ , length constraint $h \ge 1$, $0 < \epsilon < 1$ and b-batchable source, sink pairs $\{(S_i, T_i)\}_i$, one can compute a feasible h-length flow cut pair (F, C) of $\{(S_i, T_i)\}_i$ that is $(1 \pm \epsilon)$ -approximate in (deterministic) depth $\tilde{O}(b \cdot \operatorname{poly}(\frac{1}{\epsilon}, h))$ and work $m \cdot \tilde{O}(b \cdot \operatorname{poly}(\frac{1}{\epsilon}, h))$ where

$$|\operatorname{supp}(F)| \le \tilde{O}(|E|+b).$$

Algorithm 1 Multi-Commodity Length-Constrained Flows and Moving Cuts

Input: graph G = (V, E) with lengths ℓ , capacities U, length constraint h and κ -batchable source, sink pairs $\{(S_i, T_i)\}_i$ where $S_i, T_i \subseteq V$ for every i and an $\epsilon \in (0, 1)$. Output: $(1 \pm \epsilon)$ -approximate h-length multi-commodity flow F and moving cut C. Let $\epsilon_0 = \frac{\epsilon}{6}$, let $\zeta = \frac{1+2\epsilon_0}{\epsilon_0} + 1$ and let $\eta = \frac{\epsilon_0}{(1+\epsilon_0)\cdot\zeta} \cdot \frac{1}{\log m}$. Initialize $C(e) \leftarrow (\frac{1}{m})^{\zeta}$. Initialize $\lambda \leftarrow (\frac{1}{m})^{\zeta}$. Initialize $F(P) \leftarrow 0$ for every path P. while $\lambda < 1$ do: for $j \in [\kappa]$ and each batch (S_j, \mathcal{T}_j) do for each (S_i, T_i) with $S_i \in S_j$ and $T_i \in \mathcal{T}_j$ in parallel do for $\Theta\left(\frac{h\log_{1+\epsilon_0}n}{\epsilon_0}\right)$ repetitions do Compute any S_i - T_i h-length $(1 + \epsilon_0)$ -lightest path blocker \hat{F} . Length-Constrained Flow (Primal) Update: $F \leftarrow F + \eta \cdot \hat{F}$. Moving Cut (Dual) Update: $C(e) \leftarrow (1 + \epsilon_0)^{\hat{F}(e)/U_e} \cdot C(e)$ for every $e \in E$. $\lambda \leftarrow (1 + \epsilon_0) \cdot \lambda$ return (F, C).

Furthermore, $F = \eta \cdot \sum_{j=1}^{k} F_j$ where $\eta = \tilde{\Theta}(\epsilon^2)$, $k = \tilde{O}\left(\kappa \cdot \frac{h}{\epsilon^4}\right)$ and F_j is an integral h-length S_i - T_i flow for some *i*.

Proof. The proof is immediate from combining Theorem 12.2, Lemma 12.9 and Theorem 12.3. \Box

[HHS23] showed how to compute cutmatches using flow algorithms. Combining our sparse flows (Theorem 1.3) with the cutmatch algorithms of [HHS23] (which just call batchable multicommodity length-constrained flow, cut algorithms as a blackbox) immediately gives our sparse cutmatches as described in Theorem 12.3.

13 Algorithm: Demand-Size-Large Sparse Cuts from EDs

In the previous section we developed the theory of length-constrained expander decompositions. We now put this theory to use by giving new algorithms for length-constrained expander decompositions. Our algorithms will make use of a well-studied "spiral" paradigm from the classic setting where we compute a length-constrained expander decomposition by repeatedly computing large sparse cuts [SW19]. In particular, we will show that one can compute expander decompositions from large length-constrained sparse cuts (Lemma 14.1) which one can compute from expander decompositions (Lemma 13.4) and so on. In order to prevent this argument from becoming circular we argue that it "spirals" in that the expander decompositions we must compute get smaller and smaller each time we go around the circle of dependencies.

In this section we show how to compute large length-constrained sparse cuts using lengthconstrained expander decompositions. The following is our notion of size which is analogous to the volume of a cut in the non-lengthconstrained setting.

Definition 13.1 ((h, s)-Separated Demand-Size). Given length-constrained cut C and node-weighting A, we define the (h, s)-length demand-size of C with respect to A as the size of the largest A-respecting h-length demand which is (hs)-separated by C. We denote this "demand-size" by $A_{(h,s)}(C)$.

Definition 13.2 (Demand-Size Largest Sparse Cut, LDSC). We call the (h, s)-length ϕ -sparse cut C the demand-size largest (h, s)-length ϕ -sparse cut for node-weighting A if it its demand-size is maximum among all (h, s)-length ϕ -sparse cuts. We notate the size of this cut as

$$LDSC(\phi, h, s) := A_{(h,s)}(C)$$

Definition 13.3 (Approximately Demand-Size-Largest Sparse Length-Constrained Cut). Lengthconstrained cut C is an α -approximate demand-size-largest ($\leq h, s$)-length ϕ -sparse cut for nodeweighting A with length approximation α_s and sparsity approximation α_{ϕ} if it is an (h'', s)-length ϕ -sparse cut for some $h'' \leq \alpha_s \cdot h$ and for all $h' \leq h/\alpha_s$ we have

$$A_{(h'',s)}(C) \ge \frac{1}{\alpha} \cdot LDSC(\phi/\alpha_{\phi}, h', s \cdot \alpha_s).$$

For the below result, recall the definition of a length-constrained expansion witness (Definition 5.33).

Lemma 13.4. For any parameter $\epsilon > 0$, there exists an algorithm that, given a graph G on n vertices and m edges, a node weighting A, a length bound and slack h and s, a recursion size parameter L, and a conductance parameter ϕ , computes a α -approximate demand-size-largest ($\leq h, s$)-length ϕ -sparse cut with sparsity approximation α_{ϕ} and length slack approximation α_s with respect to A where

$$\alpha = \frac{\tilde{O}(N^{O(\epsilon)})}{\epsilon^3} \qquad \qquad \alpha_{\phi} = \frac{s^3 N^{O(1/s)}}{\epsilon} \qquad \qquad \alpha_s = \max\left(2, \frac{1}{\epsilon^2} \cdot (s)^{1+O(1/\epsilon)}\right)$$

with work

$$\mathsf{W}_{\text{sparse-cut}}(A,m) \le m \cdot \tilde{O}\left(\frac{1}{\epsilon} \cdot (s)^{O(1/\epsilon)} \cdot N^{O(\epsilon)} + \frac{1}{\epsilon} \cdot L \cdot N^{O(\epsilon)} \cdot \text{poly}(h)\right) + \frac{\tilde{O}(1)}{\text{poly}(\epsilon)} \sum_{i} \mathsf{W}_{\text{ED}}(A_{i}, m_{i})$$

and depth

$$\mathsf{D}_{\text{sparse-cut}}(A,m) \leq \tilde{O}\left(\frac{1}{\epsilon} \cdot (s)^{O(1/\epsilon)} \cdot N^{O(\epsilon)} + \frac{1}{\epsilon} \cdot L \cdot N^{O(\epsilon)} \cdot \operatorname{poly}(h)\right) + \frac{\tilde{O}(1)}{\operatorname{poly}(\epsilon)} \max_{i} \mathsf{D}_{\text{ED}}(A_{i},m_{i})$$

where $W_{ED}(A_i, m_i)$ and $D_{ED}(A_i, m_i)$ are the work and depth to compute an $(h, 2^{1/\epsilon})$ -length ϕ -expander decomposition with cut slack $N^{poly(\epsilon)}$ for node-weighting A_i in an m_i -edge graph and for all i each $A_i \leq A$ and $|A_i| \leq \frac{|A|}{L}$ and $\{m_i\}_i$ are non-negative integers satisfying

$$\sum_{i} m_{i} \leq \frac{1}{\epsilon} \cdot \tilde{O}(m + n^{1 + O(\epsilon)} + L^{2} \cdot N^{O(\epsilon)}).$$

Furthermore, if the graph is $(\leq h \cdot \frac{1}{\epsilon} \cdot s^{O(1/\epsilon)}, s)$ -length ϕ -expanding then the algorithm also returns $a \ (\leq h, s_w)$ -length ϕ_w -expansion witness where $s_w = \frac{1}{\epsilon^2} \cdot s^{O(1/\epsilon)}$ and $\phi_w = \tilde{O}(\phi \epsilon / N^{O(\epsilon)})$.

Observe that applying our previous relations we can get a simple lower bound on the demandsize of the largest-demand-size length-constrained sparse cut.

Lemma 13.5. Given graph G and node-weighting A and parameters h, s, ϕ , we have that

$$LDSC(\phi, h, s) \leq LEC(\phi', h', s)$$

where $\phi' = \tilde{O}(\phi \cdot s^3 \cdot N^{O(1/s)})$ and h' = 2h.

Proof. See Definition 11.1 for a definition of the relevant graph quantities below. Let C be the (h, s)-length ϕ -sparse cut of largest demand-size. Observe that $\text{LDSC}(\phi, h, s) \leq \frac{1}{\phi} \text{LWSC}(\phi, h, s)$ since we can use C in the largest weighted sparse cut sequence and so $\phi \cdot A_{(h,s)}(C)$ is a lower bound on $\text{LWSC}(\phi, h, s)$. Continuing, by Theorem 11.2 we have

$$LWSC(\phi, h, s) \le LC(\phi'', h', s')$$

where $\phi'' = \tilde{O}(\phi \cdot s^3 \cdot N^{O(1/s)})$, h' = 2h and s' = (s-2)/2. Lastly, by Theorem 11.3 we have

$$LC(\phi'', h', s') \le LEC(3\phi'', h', s').$$

Combining the above and observing that $\text{LEC}(3\phi'', h', s') \leq \text{LEC}(3\phi'', h', s)$ gives the lemma. \Box

We will use the above lower bound to argue that our algorithm returns an approximately demand-size largest sparse cut as described below.

13.1 (Preliminary) Algorithm: Cut Strategies from Expander Decompositions

We describe the cut matching games and describing prior work on computing expander decompositions from cut strategies. The cut-matching game was first proposed and studied in [KKOV07, KRV09], and later on it has found a wide range of applications in graph algorithms. We use a slightly generalized version of it as follows.

Cut Strategies. A cut strategy is an algorithm which given a graph G and node-weighting A produces a set of node-weightings $\{(A^{(j)}, B^{(j)})\}_j$ where for each j we have $A^{(j)} + B^{(j)} \preccurlyeq A$ and $|A^{(j)}| = |B^{(j)}|$ and $A \preceq \sum_j A^{(j)} + B^{(j)}$.

Matching Strategies. A matching strategy is an algorithm which given a graph G and the nodeweighting pairs $\{(A^{(j)}, B^{(j)})\}_j$ produced by a cut player outputs a set of edges $M^{(j)} \subseteq \operatorname{supp}(A^{(j)}) \times$ $\operatorname{supp}(B^{(j)})$ for each j between the vertices in the support of $A^{(j)}$ and $B^{(j)}$ and capacities U subject to the constraint that for every vertex u we have $U(\delta_{M^{(j)}}(u)) \leq A^{(j)}(u), B^{(j)}(u)$.

Cut Matching Games. A cut matching game is a procedure for using cut and matching strategies to produce good routers by a sequence of interactions between cut and matching strategies. Namely, given a set of vertices V and a node-weighting A on V, it produces a series of graphs G_0, \ldots, G_r where $G_0 = (V, \emptyset)$ is the empty graph and we call G_r the output of the cut matching game. The graph G_i is G_{i-1} plus the output of the matching player when given the output of the cut player when given G_{i-1} . That is, if $\{(A_i^{(j)}, B_i^{(j)})\}_j$ is the output of the cut player when given $G_{i-1} = (V, E_{i-1})$ and $\{M_i^{(j)}\}_j$ is the output of the matching player when given $\{(A_i^{(j)}, B_i^{(j)})\}_j$, then $G_i = (V, E_{i-1} \cup \bigcup_j M_i^{(j)})$.

We will be interested in the following parameters of a cut matching game.

- Rounds of Interaction: We call r the number of rounds of interaction.
- Cut Batch Size: We call the maximum number of pairs the cut strategy plays in each round of interaction $\max_i |\{(A_i^{(j)}, B_i^{(j)})\}_j|$ the cut batch size of the cut matching game. In typical cut matching games [KKOV07, KRV09] the cut batch size is 1; we will be interested in potentially larger batch sizes.
- Matching Perfectness: If each set of edges the matching player plays for a batch always has total capacity at least a 1α fraction of the total node-weighting then we say that the cut matching game is (1α) -perfect. That is, a cut matching game is (1α) -perfect if for every *i* we have

$$\sum_{j} U\left(M_i^{(j)}\right) \ge (1-\alpha) \cdot \sum_{j} |A_i^{(j)}| = (1-\alpha) \cdot \sum_{j} |B_i^{(j)}|.$$

We use the following result from [HHG22] which shows both the existence of high quality cut matching games and how to compute them assuming we can compute length-constrained expander decompositions.

Theorem 13.6 ([HHG22]). For every $\epsilon > 0$ there is a cut strategy with cut batch size $N^{O(\epsilon)}$ which when used in a cut matching game with $1/\epsilon$ rounds of interaction against any $(1-\alpha)$ -perfect matching strategy results in a G_r that is a $1/\epsilon$ -step and $N^{O(\epsilon)}$ -congestion router for some $A' \leq A$ of size $|A'| \geq (1 - O(\frac{\alpha}{\epsilon})) \cdot |A|$.

This cut-strategy on a node-weighting A in a graph with m edges can be computed in work

$$W_{\text{cut-strat}}(A,m) \leq \frac{\tilde{O}(1)}{\text{poly}(\epsilon)} \cdot W_{\text{ED}}(A,m)$$

and depth

$$\mathsf{D}_{\text{cut-strat}}(A,m) \le \frac{O(1)}{\text{poly}(\epsilon)} \cdot \mathsf{D}_{\text{ED}}(A,m)$$

where $W_{ED}(A, m)$ and D_{ED} are the work and depth respectively for computing an $(h, 2^{1/\epsilon})$ -length ϕ expander decomposition with cut slack $N^{poly(\epsilon)}$ for node-weighting A in an m-edge graph. Likewise, A' can be computed in the same work and depth and is vertex induced: i.e. for each vertex u if $A'(u) \neq 0$ then A'(u) = A(u).

13.2 Algorithm: Demand-Size-Large Sparse Cuts from Cut Strategies

The following is our main result for this section and shows how to compute large sparse lengthconstrained cuts using cut strategies. Below, we let $W_{cut-strat}$ and $D_{cut-strat}$ give the work and depth to compute the cut strategy given by Theorem 13.6. **Theorem 13.7.** For any parameter $\epsilon > 0$, there exists an algorithm that, given a graph G on n vertices and m edges, a node weighting A, a length bound and slack h and s, a recursion size parameter L, and a conductance parameter ϕ , computes a α -approximate demand-size-largest ($\leq h, s$)-length ϕ -sparse cut with sparsity approximation α_{ϕ} and length slack approximation α_s with respect to A where

$$\alpha = \frac{\tilde{O}(N^{O(\epsilon)})}{\epsilon^3} \qquad \qquad \alpha_{\phi} = \frac{s^3 N^{O(1/s)}}{\epsilon} \qquad \qquad \alpha_s = \max\left(2, \frac{1}{\epsilon^2} \cdot (s)^{1+O(1/\epsilon)}\right)$$

with work

$$\mathsf{W}_{\text{sparse-cut}}(A,m) \le m \cdot \tilde{O}\left(\frac{1}{\epsilon} \cdot (s)^{O(1/\epsilon)} \cdot N^{O(\epsilon)} + \frac{1}{\epsilon} \cdot L \cdot N^{O(\epsilon)} \cdot \operatorname{poly}(h)\right) + \frac{1}{\epsilon} \sum_{i} \mathsf{W}_{\text{cut-strat}}(A_i, m_i)$$

and depth

$$\mathsf{D}_{\text{sparse-cut}}(A,m) \leq \tilde{O}\left(\frac{1}{\epsilon} \cdot (s)^{O(1/\epsilon)} \cdot N^{O(\epsilon)} + \frac{1}{\epsilon} \cdot L \cdot N^{O(\epsilon)} \cdot \operatorname{poly}(h)\right) + \frac{1}{\epsilon} \max_{i} \mathsf{D}_{\text{cut-strat}}(A_i, m_i)$$

where for all i each $A_i \leq A$ and $|A_i| \leq \frac{|A|}{L}$ and $\{m_i\}_i$ are non-negative integers satisfying

$$\sum_{i} m_{i} \leq \frac{1}{\epsilon} \cdot \tilde{O}(m + n^{1 + O(\epsilon)} + L^{2} \cdot N^{O(\epsilon)}).$$

and $W_{\text{cut-strat}}$ and $D_{\text{cut-strat}}$ are the work and depth to compute the cut strategy described in Theorem 13.6 on an m_i -edge graph for node-weighting A_i . Furthermore, if the graph is $(\leq h \cdot \frac{1}{\epsilon} \cdot s^{O(1/\epsilon)}, s)$ length ϕ -expanding then the algorithm also returns a $(\leq h, s_w)$ -length ϕ_w -expansion witness where $s_w = \frac{1}{\epsilon^2} \cdot s^{O(1/\epsilon)}$ and $\phi_w = \tilde{O}(\phi \epsilon/N^{O(\epsilon)})$.

Having shown in the previous section how to compute sparse cutmatches, we now use these cutmatches to compute large length-constrained cuts using the cut strategies from cut matching games. That is, we prove Theorem 13.7.

We begin by describing the algorithm for Theorem 13.7.

Step 1: Create Clusters for Cut Matching Games. We do the following for each $h' \leq h$ which is a power of 2. First, apply Theorem 5.32 to G to compute a neighborhood cover $\mathcal{N}_{h'}$ with covering radius $h_{cov} = h'$, separation factor 2s, cluster diameter $h_{diam} = \frac{1}{\epsilon} \cdot (s)^{O(1/\epsilon)} \cdot h'$ and width $\omega = N^{O(\epsilon)} \log N$.

Modify $\mathcal{N}_{h'}$ as follows. Since we would like to only run our cut strategy on clusters whose node-weightings are a small fraction of the total size of A, we must further break up the nodeweighting in each cluster in our neighborhood cover. Specifically, for each cluster $S \in \mathcal{N}$ we let A_S be the restriction of node-weighting A on S (i.e. $A_S(u)$ is A(u) if $u \in S$ and 0 otherwise). Then if $|A_S| \leq |A|/L$ we do nothing. However, if $|A_S| > |A|/L$ then we break A_S into sub-node-weightings $A_S^{(1)}, A_S^{(2)}, \ldots, A_S^{(L)}$ so that $\sum_i A_S^{(i)} = A$ where each of these has equal size and size at most |A|/L. We remove S from $\mathcal{N}_{h'}$ and add a copy of S for each of $A_S^{(1)}, A_S^{(2)}, \ldots$ to $\mathcal{N}_{h'}$. If we don't break up A_S then we say that A_S corresponds to cluster S; if we do then we say that each of $A_S^{(1)}, A_S^{(2)}, \ldots$ correspond to each respective copy of S. For ease of notation, if we do not break up A_S then we let $A_S^{(1)} := A_S$.

Observe that (by e.g. iterating over vertices and greedily constructing $A_S^{(i)}$), we can ensure that the total support size across the node-weightings of all clusters of $\mathcal{N}[h']$ is

$$\sum_{S \in \mathcal{N}_{h'}} \sum_{i} |\operatorname{supp}(A_S^{(i)})| \le \omega \cdot (n+L^2) \le \tilde{O}(n^{1+O(\epsilon)} + N^{O(\epsilon)}L^2).$$
(23)

We let \mathcal{N} be the union of all clusters of all $\mathcal{N}_{h'}$. We next partition \mathcal{N} on the basis of cluster diameter. Specifically, for $h'' \leq \frac{1}{\epsilon} \cdot (s)^{O(1/\epsilon)} \cdot h$ which is a power of 2, we let $\mathcal{N}[h'']$ be all clusters of \mathcal{N} whose diameter is in (h''/2, h'']. Observe that clusters of $\mathcal{N}[h'']$ have diameter at most h''but may contain clusters in $\mathcal{N}_{h'''}$ for h''' > h'' since $\mathcal{N}_{h'''}$ may contain clusters with diameter much smaller than h'''. For each $S \in \mathcal{N}[h'']$, we let S^+ be all nodes within distance $s \cdot h''$ of some vertex in S.

Step 2: Run Cut Matching Games. First, let

$$\phi' := \phi/\tilde{O}\left(N^{O(\epsilon)}\right) \tag{24}$$

be the (relaxed) sparsity with respect to which we will run compute our cutmatches.

Next, we do the following for each $h'' \leq h \cdot \frac{1}{\epsilon} \cdot (s)^{O(1/\epsilon)}$ which is a power of 2. More or less, we simultaneously implement a cut matching game for the node-weightings corresponding to clusters in $\mathcal{N}[h'']$. For each $S \in \mathcal{N}[h'']$ with corresponding node-weightings $A_S^{(1)}, A_S^{(2)}, \ldots$, we initialize graph $G_{Si} = (S, \emptyset)$ to the empty graph. Then, repeat the following $1/\epsilon$ times.

- 1. **Run Cut Strategies:** For each $S \in \mathcal{N}[h'']$ and each node-weighting $A_S^{(i)}$ corresponding to S, apply the the cut strategy (from Theorem 13.6) to G_{Si} . Let $\{(A_{Si,k}, B_{Si,k})\}_k$ be the output pairs of node-weightings from the cut strategy for cluster S.
- 2. Compute a Cutmatch: For all pairs $\{(A_{Si,k}, B_{Si,k})\}_{S,i,k}$ just computed, compute a $(h'' \cdot s)$ -length ϕ' -sparse cutmatch (F, C) of congestion $\tilde{O}(1/\phi')$ by invoking Theorem 12.3 (we will reason about the batch size in our analysis). We let $F = \sum_{S,i,k} F_{Si,k}$ be the relevant decomposition of this flow.
- 3. Update Graphs: For each pair $(A_{Si,k}, B_{Si,k})$, with corresponding flow $F_{Si,k}$, let $E_{Si,k}$ be the edge set which for each path P in the support of $F_{Si,k}$ with flow value $F_{Si,k}(P)$ from node u to node v has an edge from u to v of capacity $F_{Si,k}(P)$. Add to G_{Si} the edge set $\bigcup_k E_{Si,k}$.

Step 3: Glue Broken Up Clusters. Lastly, we glue together our broken-up clusters. Specifically, we again do the following for each $h'' \leq h \cdot \frac{1}{\epsilon} \cdot (s)^{O(1/\epsilon)}$ which is a power of 2. Let S be a cluster we broke up with diameter in (h''/2, h''] whose node-weighting we broke up into $A_S^{(1)}, A_S^{(2)}, \ldots$ Let $\{A_S^{(i)}, A_S^{(j)}\}_{i \neq j}$ be all relevant pairs for this cluster and let $\{A_S^{(i)}, A_S^{(j)}\}_{i \neq j,S}$ be all pairs across all clusters whose node-weightings we broke up; here, S ranges over all clusters whose node-weightings we broke up; here, S ranges over all clusters whose node-weightings we broke up; here, S ranges over all clusters whose node-weightings we broke up; here, S ranges over all clusters whose node-weightings over a (ϕ'/L) -sparse h''s-length cutmatch (F, C) of congestion $\tilde{O}(L/\phi')$ on the pairs $\{A_S^{(i)}, A_S^{(j)}\}_{i \neq j,S}$ by invoking Theorem 12.3; here, the S in these pairs again ranges over all clusters whose node-weightings we broke up.

Algorithm Output. We return as our cut C^* (and corresponding length $h'' \leq h \cdot \frac{1}{\epsilon} \cdot (s)^{O(1/\epsilon)}$) the largest cut (by demand-size) of any cutmatch we computed above in step 2 or step 3 (among all $O(\log N/\epsilon)$ cutmatches). If the size of C^* is 0 then we return as our $(\leq h, s_w)$ -length ϕ_w -expansion witness the neighborhood covers $\{\mathcal{N}_{h'}\}_{h'}$, the roouter for cluster S gotten by taking the union of the routers computed for $A_S^{(1)}, A_S^{(2)}, \ldots$ from step 2 and the matchings corresponding to step 3 and the embedding given by all flows we compute for our cutmatches in step 2 and step 3. Recall that $s_w = \frac{1}{\epsilon^2} \cdot s^{O(1/\epsilon)}$ and $\phi_w = \tilde{O}(\phi \epsilon/N^{O(\epsilon)})$.

We conclude with our proof of Theorem 13.7.

Theorem 13.7. For any parameter $\epsilon > 0$, there exists an algorithm that, given a graph G on n vertices and m edges, a node weighting A, a length bound and slack h and s, a recursion size parameter L, and a conductance parameter ϕ , computes a α -approximate demand-size-largest ($\leq h, s$)-length ϕ -sparse cut with sparsity approximation α_{ϕ} and length slack approximation α_{s} with respect to A where

$$\alpha = \frac{\tilde{O}(N^{O(\epsilon)})}{\epsilon^3} \qquad \qquad \alpha_{\phi} = \frac{s^3 N^{O(1/s)}}{\epsilon} \qquad \qquad \alpha_s = \max\left(2, \frac{1}{\epsilon^2} \cdot (s)^{1+O(1/\epsilon)}\right)$$

with work

$$\mathsf{W}_{\text{sparse-cut}}(A,m) \le m \cdot \tilde{O}\left(\frac{1}{\epsilon} \cdot (s)^{O(1/\epsilon)} \cdot N^{O(\epsilon)} + \frac{1}{\epsilon} \cdot L \cdot N^{O(\epsilon)} \cdot \operatorname{poly}(h)\right) + \frac{1}{\epsilon} \sum_{i} \mathsf{W}_{\text{cut-strat}}(A_i, m_i)$$

and depth

$$\mathsf{D}_{\text{sparse-cut}}(A,m) \leq \tilde{O}\left(\frac{1}{\epsilon} \cdot (s)^{O(1/\epsilon)} \cdot N^{O(\epsilon)} + \frac{1}{\epsilon} \cdot L \cdot N^{O(\epsilon)} \cdot \operatorname{poly}(h)\right) + \frac{1}{\epsilon} \max_{i} \mathsf{D}_{\text{cut-strat}}(A_i, m_i)$$

where for all i each $A_i \leq A$ and $|A_i| \leq \frac{|A|}{L}$ and $\{m_i\}_i$ are non-negative integers satisfying

$$\sum_{i} m_{i} \leq \frac{1}{\epsilon} \cdot \tilde{O}(m + n^{1+O(\epsilon)} + L^{2} \cdot N^{O(\epsilon)}).$$

and $W_{\text{cut-strat}}$ and $D_{\text{cut-strat}}$ are the work and depth to compute the cut strategy described in Theorem 13.6 on an m_i -edge graph for node-weighting A_i . Furthermore, if the graph is $(\leq h \cdot \frac{1}{\epsilon} \cdot s^{O(1/\epsilon)}, s)$ length ϕ -expanding then the algorithm also returns a $(\leq h, s_w)$ -length ϕ_w -expansion witness where $s_w = \frac{1}{\epsilon^2} \cdot s^{O(1/\epsilon)}$ and $\phi_w = \tilde{O}(\phi \epsilon/N^{O(\epsilon)})$.

Proof. We use the algorithm described directly above.

Runtime Analysis. We begin by analyzing the runtime of the above algorithm. We begin with step 1 wherein we build our neighborhood covers. Since diam $(S) \leq h \cdot \frac{1}{\epsilon} \cdot (s)^{O(1/\epsilon)}$, by Theorem 5.32 we can compute each of our $O(\log h) \leq O(\log N)$ -many neighborhood covers which form \mathcal{N} in work at most

$$m \cdot \frac{1}{\epsilon} \cdot (s)^{O(1/\epsilon)} \cdot N^{O(\epsilon)} \cdot \log N$$
(25)

and depth at most

$$\frac{1}{\epsilon} \cdot (s)^{O(1/\epsilon)} \cdot N^{O(\epsilon)} \cdot \log N \tag{26}$$

Likewise, since each of the clusterings of each $\mathcal{N}_{h'}$ are disjoint and each $\mathcal{N}_{h'}$ has width $N^{O(\epsilon)} \log N$, we can break up all of our clusters in work at most

$$m \cdot N^{O(\epsilon)} \log^2 N. \tag{27}$$

and depth at most

$$N^{O(\epsilon)} \log^2 N. \tag{28}$$

Thus, combining Equations 25 and 27, the total work of step 1 is

$$m \cdot \tilde{O}\left(\frac{1}{\epsilon} \cdot (s)^{O(1/\epsilon)} \cdot N^{O(\epsilon)}\right)$$
(29)

and the total depth of step 1 is

$$\tilde{O}\left(\frac{1}{\epsilon} \cdot (s)^{O(1/\epsilon)} \cdot N^{O(\epsilon)}\right) \tag{30}$$

We now discuss step 2. We first discuss how we compute our cutmatches in step 2. Towards this, we first discuss the batch sizes used when invoking Theorem 12.3 for a given h' in a given one of the $1/\epsilon$ -many iterations. First, observe that for a given $S \in \mathcal{N}[h']$, we have that $\{(A_{Si,k}, B_{Si,k})\}_{i,k}$ is $N^{O(\epsilon)}$ -batchable since, by Theorem 13.6, the batch size of our cut strategy is $N^{O(\epsilon)}$. Furthermore, since $\mathcal{N}_{h'}$ has width $N^{O(\epsilon)} \log N$ before we break up clusters and since we duplicate a given cluster at most *L*-many times when breaking up clusters, it follows that each $\mathcal{N}[h']$ is $N^{O(\epsilon)}L\log^2 N$ batchable. Thus, we therefore have that $\{(A_{Si,k}, B_{Si,k})\}_{Si,k}$ is $\tilde{O}(L \cdot N^{O(\epsilon)})$ -batchable.

It follows by Theorem 12.3 that in one iteration of step 2, we can compute all of our cutmatches for all clusters in $\mathcal{N}[h']$ in work

$$m \cdot \tilde{O}\left(L \cdot N^{O(\epsilon)} \cdot \operatorname{poly}(h)\right)$$

and depth at most

$$\tilde{O}\left(L\cdot N^{O(\epsilon)}\cdot\operatorname{poly}(h)\right)$$

and so we can compute our cut matches for all clusters in ${\cal N}$ across all $1/\epsilon$ iterations in work at most

$$m \cdot \tilde{O}\left(\frac{1}{\epsilon} \cdot L \cdot N^{O(\epsilon)} \cdot \operatorname{poly}(h)\right).$$
 (31)

and depth at most

$$\tilde{O}\left(\frac{1}{\epsilon} \cdot L \cdot N^{O(\epsilon)} \cdot \operatorname{poly}(h)\right).$$
(32)

Next, we analyze the time to compute our cut strategy cuts in step 2. To do so, we first bound the total number of edges across all G_S . Specifically, observe that since we have constructed our clusters so that if $A_S^{(i)}$ is a node-weighting corresponding to cluster $S \in \mathcal{N}[h']$, then we have $\sum_{S \in \mathcal{N}[h'],i} \operatorname{supp}(A_S^{(i)}) \leq \tilde{O}(n^{1+O(\epsilon)} + N^{O(\epsilon)}L^2)$ (see Equation (23)). Furthermore, since in step 2 the pairs $\{(A_{Si,k}, B_{Si,k})\}_k$ for fixed cluster S and i are $N^{O(\epsilon)}$ -batchable (by Theorem 13.6), it follows that for a fixed $S \in \mathcal{N}[h']$ and fixed i we have

$$\sum_{k} |\operatorname{supp}(A_{Si,k} \cup B_{Si,k}))| \le N^{O(\epsilon)} \cdot \operatorname{supp}(A_S^{(i)})$$

and so

$$\sum_{S,i} \sum_{k} |\operatorname{supp}(A_{Si,k} \cup B_{Si,k})| \le \sum_{S,i} N^{O(\epsilon)} \cdot \operatorname{supp}(A_S^{(i)}) \le \tilde{O}(n^{1+O(\epsilon)} + N^{O(\epsilon)}L^2)$$

Thus, plugging this bound on $\sum_{S,i,k} |\operatorname{supp}(A_{Si,k} \cup B_{Si,k})|$ into the guarantees of Theorem 12.3 and the fact that our pairs are $L \cdot N^{O(\epsilon)}$ -batchable, we have that each time we compute a cutmatch in step 2, the total number of edges we add across all G_S for $S \in \mathcal{N}[h']$ for a fixed h' is at most

$$\tilde{O}(m+L\cdot N^{O(\epsilon)}+n^{1+O(\epsilon)}+N^{O(\epsilon)}L)=\tilde{O}(m+n^{1+O(\epsilon)}+L^2\cdot N^{O(\epsilon)}).$$

Since we have $1/\epsilon$ iterations, it follows that the number of edges across all G_S for $S \in \mathcal{N}[h']$ is never more than

$$\frac{1}{\epsilon} \cdot \tilde{O}(m + n^{1 + O(\epsilon)} + L^2 \cdot N^{O(\epsilon)})$$

It follows that the work and depth to compute all cut strategies for all $S \in \mathcal{N}[h']$ for all $1/\epsilon$ -many iterations and all $h' \leq h \cdot \frac{1}{\epsilon} \cdot (s)^{O(1/\epsilon)}$ a power of 2 in step 2 are respectively

$$\frac{1}{\epsilon} \cdot \sum_{i} \mathsf{W}_{\text{cut-strat}}(A_i, m_i) \tag{33}$$

and

$$\frac{1}{\epsilon} \cdot \max_{i} \mathsf{D}_{\mathsf{cut-strat}}(A_i, m_i) \tag{34}$$

where $|A_i| \leq |A|/L$ for all i and $\sum_i m_i \leq \tilde{O}(m + n^{1+O(\epsilon)} + L^2 \cdot N^{O(\epsilon)})$.

Combining the work and depth to compute cutmatches (work Equation (31) and depth Equation (32)) and cut strategies (work Equation (33) and depth Equation (34)) in step 2, we have that the $1/\epsilon$ -many iterations of step 2 for all $h' \leq h \cdot \frac{1}{\epsilon} \cdot (s)^{O(1/\epsilon)}$ a power of 2 can be implemented in work

$$m \cdot \tilde{O}\left(\frac{1}{\epsilon} \cdot L \cdot N^{O(\epsilon)} \cdot \operatorname{poly}(h)\right) + \frac{1}{\epsilon} \cdot \sum_{i} \mathsf{W}_{\operatorname{cut-strat}}(A_i, m_i)$$
(35)

and depth

$$\tilde{O}\left(\frac{1}{\epsilon} \cdot L \cdot N^{O(\epsilon)} \cdot \operatorname{poly}(h)\right) + \frac{1}{\epsilon} \cdot \max_{i} \mathsf{D}_{\operatorname{cut-strat}}(A_{i}, m_{i})$$
(36)

where $|A_i| \leq |A|/L$ for all i and $\sum_i m_i \leq \frac{1}{\epsilon} \cdot \tilde{O}(m + n^{1+O(\epsilon)} + L^2 \cdot N^{O(\epsilon)}).$

Lastly, we analyze the runtime of step 3. Since each $\mathcal{N}[h']$ is $\tilde{O}(L \cdot N^{O(\epsilon)})$ -batchable and by definition of how we broke up clusters, we have that all pairs $\{A_S^{(i)}, A_S^{(j)}\}_{i \neq j,S}$ in step 3 are $\tilde{O}(L \cdot N^{O(\epsilon)})$ -batchable. Thus, applying Theorem 12.3, we have that all cumatches of step 3 can be computed in work

$$m \cdot \tilde{O}\left(L \cdot N^{O(\epsilon)} \cdot \operatorname{poly}(h)\right).$$
 (37)

and depth

$$\tilde{O}\left(L \cdot N^{O(\epsilon)} \cdot \operatorname{poly}(h)\right).$$
(38)

The work and depth of our algorithm then follows by combining the running time of

- step 1 work (Equation (29)) and depth (Equation (30))
- step 2 work (Equation (35)) and depth (Equation (36))
- step 3 work (Equation (37)) and depth (Equation (38)).

Correctness Analysis: Upper Bound on Largest Sparse Cut Size. The basic idea will be to argue that most vertices are successfully "embedded" which in turn gives us a large expanding subset which will allow us to upper bound the demand-size of the largest sparse cut by Lemma 13.5. Fix an $h'' \leq h \cdot \frac{1}{\epsilon} \cdot (s)^{O(1/\epsilon)}$. We fix a suitably large constant $c \in (0, 1)$.

Cut Matching Game Success. Consider a node-weighting $A_S^{(i)}$ with corresponding cluster $S \in \mathcal{N}[h'']$. Let $B_S^{(i)}$ be the (expanding) node-weighting returned by our cut matching game in step 2 as described by Theorem 13.6. We say that a vertex u succeeded for the cut matching game if $|B_S^{(i)}| \ge c \cdot |A_S^{(i)}|$. If $B_S^{(i)}(u) = A_S^{(i)}(u)$. We say that $A_S^{(i)}$ succeeded for the cut matching game if $|B_S^{(i)}| \ge c \cdot |A_S^{(i)}|$. If S is a cluster whose node-weighting we didn't break up then we say that S succeeded for its cut matching games if $A_S^{(1)}$ succeeded. If S is a cluster whose node-weighting we broke up into $A_S^{(1)}, A_S^{(2)}, \ldots$ then we say that S succeeded for its cut matching games if at least a c fraction of the cut matching games of $A_S^{(1)}, A_S^{(2)}, \ldots$ succeeded. We say that a vertex u succeeds for the cut matching games of S if $\sum_i B_S^{(i)}(u) \ge c \cdot A_S(u)$.

Cutmatching Success. Next, suppose $S \in \mathcal{N}[h'']$ is a cluster whose node-weighting A_S we broke up into $A_S^{(1)}, A_S^{(2)}, \ldots$ so that for each i and j the pair $(A_S^{(i)}, A_S^{(j)})$ is a pair for our cutmatching in step 3. We let F_{Sij} be the flow returned for the pair $(A_S^{(i)}, A_S^{(j)})$ of the cutmatching returned in step 3. We say that the pair (i, j) succeeded for the cutmatching if $\operatorname{val}(F_{Sij}) \geq c|A_S^{(i)}| = c|A_S^{(j)}|$. Likewise, we say that the cutmatching succeeded for $A_S^{(i)}$ if, among all j, at least a c fraction of the (i, j) succeeded for the cutmatching. We let I_S be the indices of all $A_S^{(i)}$ which succeeded for the cutmatching. Lastly, we say that the cutmatching succeeded for S if, among all i, at least a cfraction of $A_S^{(i)}$ succeeded for the cut matching; i.e. $|I_S| \geq cL$.

Towards defining the node-weighting we will claim is length-constrained expanding, we define the node-weighting \hat{B}_S for each $S \in \mathcal{N}[h'']$.

- Specifically, for each cluster S whose node-weighting we did not break up and which succeeded for the cut matching game, we let $\hat{B}_S := B_S^{(1)}$.
- If S is a cluster whose node-weighting A_S we broke up into $A_S^{(1)}, A_S^{(2)}, \ldots$, which succeeded for both the cut matching game and cutmatching and V_S are the vertices which succeeded for the cut matching games of S, then we let \hat{B}_S be A_S restricted to V_S .
- If S did not succeed for both the cut matching game and cutmatching, then we just let B_S be uniformly 0.

We now argue that any demand D that decomposes as $D = \sum_S D_S$ where D_S is \hat{B}_S -respecting can be efficiently routed; here, we sum over clusters of $\mathcal{N}[h'']$ without multiplicity. To do so we will first route within routers given by our cut matching game (from step 2), then route across clusters using the cutmatches (from step 3) and then again route according to our cut matching game (from step 2). We describe this more formally below.

Routing Within Clusters. We first describe how to route what we call a *cut matching game demand.* Let $A_S^{(i)}$ be a node-weighting whose cut matching game succeeded and let $B_S^{(i)}$ be the corresponding expanding node-weighting returned by the cut matching game. Likewise, let D_{Si} be a demand that is $B_S^{(i)}$ -respecting. We call $D = \sum_{S,i} D_{Si}$ a cut matching game demand. By the guarantees of Theorem 13.6 we know that the result of our cut matching game on S is a $1/\epsilon$ -step and $N^{O(\epsilon)}$ -congestion router for $B_S^{(i)}$. Since each edge of the output of our cut matching game for cluster S corresponds to a path of length $h'' \cdot s$ in $G[S^+]$ and each of the $1/\epsilon$ cutmatches we compute has congestion $\tilde{O}(1/\phi')$ by Theorem 12.3, it follows that D can be routed over $(h''s/\epsilon)$ -length paths with congestion at most $\tilde{O}(\frac{N^{O(\epsilon)}}{\phi' \cdot \epsilon})$.

Routing Across Clusters. We next describe how to route what we call a *cutmatching demand* between indices. Specifically, consider any function D that decomposes as $\sum_{S} D_{S}$ (where our sum is over clusters whose node-weightings we broke up) such that for each S we have:

- 1. $(i,j) \in \text{supp}(D_S)$ only if $A_S^{(i)}$ and $A_S^{(j)}$ succeeded for the succeeded for the respective cut matching games and the cutmatching for S and;
- 2. $\sum_{j} D_{S}(i,j) \leq |B_{S}^{(i)}|$ and $\sum_{j} D_{S}(j,i) \leq |B_{S}^{(i)}|$ for every *i*.

Then, given any such D, we claim there is a 2h''s-length flow $\hat{F} = \sum_{S,i,j} \hat{F}_{Sij}$ with congestion $\tilde{O}(1/\phi')$ wherein each \hat{F}_{Sij} routes $D_S(i,j)$ flow from $\operatorname{supp}(B_S^{(i)})$ to $\operatorname{supp}(B_S^{(j)})$ so that no vertex u sends or receives more than $B_S^{(i)}(u)$ and $B_S^{(j)}(u)$ flow respectively according to \hat{F}_{Sij} .

To construct \hat{F} , first consider two pairs (i, k) and (k, j) that both succeed for the cutmatching where both $A_S^{(i)}$ and $A_S^{(j)}$ succeeded for their cut matching game. Observe that, by definition of a pair succeeding for the cutmatching, we know that $\operatorname{val}(F_{Sik}) \geq c|A_S^{(k)}|$ and $\operatorname{val}(F_{Skj}) \geq c|A_S^{(k)}|$. Likewise, we know that since both $A_S^{(i)}$ and $A_S^{(j)}$ succeeded for their cut matching game it holds that $B_S^{(i)} \geq c|A_S^{(i)}|$ and $B_S^{(j)} \geq c|A_S^{(j)}|$.

Thus, it follows by scaling and concatenating flow paths of F_{Sik} and F_{Skj} that it is possible to construct a flow \hat{F}_{Sikj} which, for a fixed S, i and j, is a 2h''s-length flow that routes $D_S(i,j)$ flow from i to j and incurs congestion on edge e at most $\sum_{S} \frac{D_S(i,j)}{|A_C^{(i)}|} \cdot O(F_{Sik}(e) + F_{Skj}(e))$.

Next, let I_{Sij} be all k such that the pair (i, k) and the pair (k, j) both succeeded for the cutmatching and i and j succeeded for the cut matching game. Likewise, let

$$\hat{F}_{Sij} := \Theta(1) \sum_{k \in I_{Sij}} \hat{F}_{Sikj} / L$$

for an appropriate hidden constant. Since i and j both succeeded for the cutmatching we know that $|I_{Sij}| \ge \Omega(L)$ so this is a 2h''s-length flow that routes at least $D_S(i, j)$ from i to j and on edge e incurs congestion at most

$$\frac{D_S(i,j)}{|A_S^{(i)}|} \sum_{k \in I_{Sij}} O(F_{Sik}(e) + F_{Skj}(e))/L.$$

Let

$$\hat{F} := \sum_{S} \sum_{i,j} \hat{F}_{Sij}$$

be all such flows pairs for all S, i and j.

This 2h''s-length flow routes, simultaneously for every S, i and j, $D_S(i, j)$ flow from i to j for cluster S and on edge e incurs congestion at most

$$\begin{split} \sum_{S,i,j} \frac{D_S(i,j)}{|A_S^{(i)}|} \sum_{k \in I_{ij}} \frac{O(F_{Sik}(e) + F_{Skj}(e))}{L} &= \sum_{S,i,k} \frac{O(F_{Sik}(e))}{L} \sum_j \frac{D_S(i,j)}{|A_S^{(i)}|} + \sum_{S,j,k} \frac{O(F_{Skj}(e))}{L} \sum_i \frac{D_S(i,j)}{|A_S^{(j)}|} \\ &\leq \sum_{S,i,j} \frac{O(F_{Sij}(e))}{L} \\ &= \frac{F(e)}{L} \\ &\leq \tilde{O}\left(\frac{1}{\phi'}\right) \end{split}$$

where, above, we use the fact that F has congestion $\tilde{O}(L/\phi')$ as given in the definition of step 3.

Routing Across and Within Clusters. Next, we describe how to route an arbitrary demand D which decomposes as $D = \sum D_S$ where D_S is \hat{B}_S respecting. First, a minor technical detail to deal with the fact that a vertex can appear in multiple copies of a cluster: observe that since D_S is \hat{B}_S -respecting, it is possible to decompose D_S into $D_S = \sum_{ij} D_{Sij}$ where for each i we have $\sum_j D_{Sij}$ and $\sum_j D_{Sji}$ are both $B_S^{(i)}$ -respecting. Using this decomposition, we construct our demand D_2 between indices. Namely, we let D'_S for indices $i, j \in I_S$ be

$$D'_S(i,j) := \sum_{u,v} D_{Sij}(u,v)$$

and let $D_2 := \sum_S D'_S$.

First, observe that D_2 is a cutmatching demand by construction and so by the above discussion can be routed over 2h''s-length paths by a flow $\hat{F} = \sum_{S,i,j} \hat{F}_{Sij}$ with congestion at most $\tilde{O}(1/\phi')$ where each node u sends and receives at most $\hat{B}_S^{(i)}(u)$ flow according to \hat{F}_{Sij} . For a given vertex u, we let $w_{Sij}(u)$ be the amount of flow that u sends according to \hat{F}_{Sij} . We use these values to construct two cut matching game demands D_1 and D_3 such that concatenating the routing paths of D_1 , D_2 and D_3 give a routing for D.

We first describe D_1 . Let

$$D_{Si}(u,j) := \sum_{v} D_{Sij}(u,v)$$

be the amount of demand that vertex u sends to $\hat{B}_{S}^{(j)}$ according to D_{S} according to the portion of u's node-weighting that is in $\hat{B}_{S}^{(i)}$. Next, consider the demand \hat{D}_{Si} wherein vertex u sends each of its demands $D_{Si}(u, j)$ to each node v proportional to $w_{Sij}(v)$. Specifically, let

$$\hat{D}_{Sij}(u,v) := D_{Si}(u,j) \cdot \frac{w_{Sij}(v)}{\operatorname{val}(\hat{F}_{Sij})}.$$

and

$$\hat{D}_{Si} := \sum_{j} \hat{D}_{Sij}$$

Lastly, let D_1

$$D_1 := \sum_S \hat{D}_{Si}$$

First, we claim that D_1 is a cut matching game demand. To do so, we must show that \hat{D}_{Si} is $B_S^{(i)}$ -respecting. To see this, observe that the demand that a vertex u sends according to \hat{D}_{Si} is

$$\sum_{v} \hat{D}_{Si}(u, v) = \sum_{v} \sum_{j} D_{Si}(u, j) \cdot \frac{w_{Sij}(v)}{\operatorname{val}(\hat{F}_{Sij})}$$
$$= \sum_{j} D_{Si}(u, j) \sum_{v} \frac{w_{Sij}(v)}{\operatorname{val}(\hat{F}_{Sij})}$$
$$= \sum_{j} \sum_{v} D_{Sij}(u, v)$$
$$\leq B_{S}^{(i)}(u)$$

where in the last step we used the fact that $\sum_{j} D_{Sij}$ is $B_{S}^{(i)}$ -respecting. Symmetrically, one can show that $\sum_{v} \hat{D}_{Si}(v, u) \leq B_{S}^{(i)}(u)$ which shows that D_{1} is indeed a cut matching game demand. It follows by the above discussion that we can route D_{1} over $h''s/\epsilon$ -length paths with congestion at most $\tilde{O}(\frac{N^{O(\epsilon)}}{d'\cdot\epsilon})$.

Next, we claim that it is possible to concatenate the routing paths of D_1 and D_2 to get a flow $F = \sum_{S,i,j} F_{Sij}$ in which F_{Sij} routes from each vertex u a flow of value $D_{Si}(u,j)$ to $B_S^{(j)}$.

We describe F_{Sij} . Recall that $D_1 = \sum_{i,j} \hat{D}_{Sij}$ and let $\hat{F} = \hat{F}_{Sij}$ be the aforementioned flow which routes D_2 . We will construct F_{Sij} by concatenating paths of the portion of the flow for D_1

which routes \hat{D}_{Sij} and F_{Sij} . Specifically, notice that according to \hat{D}_{Sij} the total flow from vertices to a vertex v must be

$$\frac{w_{Sij}(v)}{\text{val}(\hat{F}_{Sij})} \sum_{u} D_{Si}(u, j) = \frac{w_{Sij}(v)}{\text{val}(\hat{F}_{Sij})} \sum_{u, w} D_{Sij}(u, w) = w_{Sij}(v).$$

and since by definition the flow from vertex v according to F_{Sij} is just $w_{Sij}(v)$, we have that we can concatenate the flow paths of these two flows at each vertex v. Next, observe that for a given vertex u this flow sends

$$\sum_{v} \hat{D}_{Sij}(u,v) = \sum_{v} D_{Si}(u,j) \cdot \frac{w_{Sij}(v)}{\operatorname{val}(\hat{F}_{Sij})} = D_{Si}(u,j)$$

flow from u to $B_S^{(j)}$ as required. Lastly, observe that F has length $O(h''s/\epsilon)$ and congestion at most $\tilde{O}(\frac{N^{O(\epsilon)}}{\phi'\cdot\epsilon})$. D_3 can be constructed symmetrically to D_1 and concatenated to F for a flow with the same guarantees but one in which each vertex u sends to vertex v flow $\sum D_{Sij}(u,v)$ flow. Summarizing, we shown how to route our initial demand D that decomposes as $D = \sum_S D_S$ where D_S is \hat{B}_S -with the above length and congestion.

Constructing a Length-Constrained Expanding Node-Weighting. Finally, we use the above routing to demonstrate the existence of a large length-constrained expanding subset.

Specifically, say that a vertex v is h'-length embedded if for every cluster $S \in \mathcal{N}_{h'} \cap \mathcal{N}[h'']$ for all $h'' \leq h \cdot \frac{1}{\epsilon} \cdot (s)^{O(1/\epsilon)}$ which contains v, v succeeds for the cut matching games of S (of which there are either 1 or L), S succeeded for its cut matching games and cut matching. We let $B_{h'}$ be A restricted to all h'-length embedded vertices. Clearly $B_{h'}$ is A-respecting.

We claim that $B_{h'}$ has large h'-length expansion. Consider an h'-length $B_{h'}$ -respecting demand D. Since $\mathcal{N}_{h'}$ is a neighborhood cover with covering radius h', for each pair $(u, v) \in \text{supp}(D)$, we know there must be some cluster $S \in \mathcal{N}_{h'}$ such that $u, v \in S$. It follows that we can decompose D as $D = \sum_{h''} D_{h''}$ where every pair in the support of $D_{h''}$ is contained in some cluster in $S \in \mathcal{N}[h''] \cap \mathcal{N}_{h'}$ wherein both u and v succeeded for the cut matching games of S and S's cut matching games and cutmatching succeeded.

Such a demand $D_{h''}$ is exactly the sort of demand we argued we can route above and so it follows that we can route each $D_{h''}$ and therefore D (at an increase of $O(\log N)$ in congestion) over length $O(h''s/\epsilon) \leq h' \cdot \frac{1}{\epsilon^2} \cdot (s)^{1+O(1/\epsilon)}$ paths with congestion at most $\tilde{O}(\frac{N^{O(\epsilon)}}{\phi' \cdot \epsilon})$. Thus, applying our choice of ϕ' (Equation (24)), we have $B_{h'}$ is $(h', \frac{1}{\epsilon^2} \cdot (s)^{1+O(1/\epsilon)})$ -length $\tilde{O}(\phi \cdot \epsilon)$ -expanding.

Letting $\overline{B}_{h'} := A - B_{h'}$, it follows by Lemma 13.5 that

$$\operatorname{LDSC}\left(\phi\frac{\epsilon}{s^3 N^{O(1/s)}}, \frac{h'}{2}, \frac{1}{\epsilon^2} \cdot (s)^{1+O(1/\epsilon)}\right) \leq \operatorname{LEC}\left(\phi\epsilon, h', \frac{1}{\epsilon^2} \cdot (s)^{1+O(1/\epsilon)}\right) \leq |\bar{B}_{h'}|.$$

In other words, (up to appropriate slacks) the above upper bounds the demand-size of the demand-size-largest (h', s)-length ϕ -sparse cut for any $h' \leq h$ in terms of $|\bar{B}_{h'}|$.

Letting \bar{B}^* be the $\bar{B}_{h'}$ of smallest size, we have the following upper bound for all h' on the demand-size of the demand-size-largest length-constrained $\phi' \frac{\epsilon}{N^{O(\epsilon)}}$ -sparse cut.

$$LDSC\left(\phi\frac{\epsilon}{s^3 N^{O(1/s)}}, \frac{h'}{2}, \frac{1}{\epsilon^2} \cdot (s)^{1+O(1/\epsilon)}\right) \le |\bar{B}^*|.$$
(39)

Correctness Analysis: Sparsity of Each of Our Candidate Cuts. Consider a fixed $h'' \leq h \cdot \frac{1}{\epsilon} \cdot (s)^{O(1/\epsilon)}$ that is a power of 2. Let (F, C) be one of the $1/\epsilon + 1$ cutmatches we compute (in either step 2 or step 3) in this iteration. We argue that C has (h'', s)-length sparsity at most ϕ .

To do so we begin by constructing a large h''-length demand $D_{h''}$ which is h''s-separated in $G + h' \cdot C_{h'}$. Let the pairs for (F, C) be $\{(A_i, A'_i)\}_i$ where the support of each such pair is in some cluster in $\mathcal{N}[h'']$ and with matched and unmatched parts $\{(M_i, M'_i)\}_i$ and $\{(U_i, U'_i)\}_i$ respectively. Throughout this proof we will assume without loss of generality that for all $i A_i(U_i) \leq A'_i(U'_i)$. For each pair (A_i, A'_i) , let D_i be an h''-length demand with $\operatorname{supp}(D_i) \subseteq \operatorname{supp}(U_i) \times \operatorname{supp}(U'_i)$ where each $u \in U_i$ sends $A_i(u)$ to nodes in U'_i so that no node $v \in U'_i$ receives more than $A'_i(v)$ demand. The definition of a cutmatch (Definition 12.2) ensures that in $G + h'' \cdot C_{h''}$ all pairs of this demand are at least (h''s)-far.

Similarly, if we are in step 2 we let

$$D_{h''} := \sum_{i} D_i / \tilde{O}(N^{O(\epsilon)})$$

and if we are in step 3 we let

$$D_{h''} := \sum_{i} D_i / \tilde{O}(L \cdot N^{O(\epsilon)})$$

be this demand summed and scaled appropriately across all pairs. Observe that $C_{h''}$ still clearly (h''s)-separates this demand. Furthermore, observe that this demand is h''-length by since each pair in the support is contained in a cluster in $\mathcal{N}[h'']$. Also, observe that above demand is A-respecting by virtue of the width of each of our neighborhood covers being $N^{O(\epsilon)}$ and by definition of how we break up node-weightings; this holds regardless of whether the cutmatch is computed in step 2 or step 3. Lastly, observe that the size of this demand is

$$D_{h''}| = \sum_{i} A_{i}(U_{i})/\tilde{O}(N^{O(\epsilon)})$$

$$= \sum_{i} \frac{|A_{i}| - A_{i}(M_{i})}{\tilde{O}(N^{O(\epsilon)})}$$

$$\geq \frac{\sum_{i} |A_{i}| - \operatorname{val}(F)}{\tilde{O}(N^{O(\epsilon)})}$$
(40)

On the other hand, by the definition of a cutmatch (Definition 12.2), we have that the size of C is at most

$$|C| \le \phi'' \cdot \left(\left(\sum_{i} |A_i| \right) - \operatorname{val}(F) \right).$$
(41)

where $\phi'' = \phi'/L$ if we are in step 3 and $\phi'' = \phi'$ otherwise.

Combining Equations 40 and 41, the definition of ϕ' (Equation (24)), we have that $C_{h''}$ is an h''-length cut with sparsity at most

$$\phi' / \tilde{O}(N^{O(\epsilon)}) \le \phi.$$
Correctness Analysis: Output Cut is Demand-Size Large. It remains to argue that the demand-size of the cut C^* returned by our algorithm is sufficiently large. Recall that, if C^* was computed when we were considering diameter $h'' \leq h \cdot \frac{1}{\epsilon} \cdot (s)^{O(1/\epsilon)}$, then we know that the (h'', s)-length sparsity of C^* is at most ϕ .

We claim that the (h'', s)-length demand-size of C^* with respect to A (Definition 13.1) is

$$A_{(h'',s)}(C^*) \ge |\bar{B}^*| \cdot \frac{\epsilon^3}{\tilde{O}(N^{O(\epsilon)})}.$$
(42)

Furthermore, by Equation (39) for any $h' \leq h$, the largest $(\frac{h'}{2}, \frac{1}{\epsilon^2} \cdot (s)^{1+O(1/\epsilon)})$ -length demandsize of a $(\frac{h'}{2}, \frac{1}{\epsilon^2} \cdot (s)^{1+O(1/\epsilon)})$ -length $\phi \cdot \frac{\epsilon}{s^3 N^{O(1/s)}}$ -sparse cut is at most $|\bar{B}^*|$. It follows that $C_{h'}$ is a $\frac{\epsilon^3}{\bar{O}(N^{O(\epsilon)})}$ -approximate $(\leq h, s)$ -length ϕ -sparse cut with length slack approximation $\alpha_s = \max\left(2, \frac{1}{\epsilon^2} \cdot (s)^{1+O(1/\epsilon)}\right)$ and sparsity approximation $\alpha_{\phi} = \frac{\epsilon}{s^3 N^{O(1/s)}}$ (see, again, Definition 13.3 for a definition of this notion of approximation).

It remains to argue that Equation (42) holds. We let $\bar{B}_{h'} = \bar{B}^*$ for the remainder of this proof; that is, for the remainder of this proof we let $h' \leq h$ be the length with respect to which $B_{h'} = A - \bar{B}_{h'}$ is length-constrained expanding.

A vertex u can fail to be h'-length embedded if there is a cluster $S \in \mathcal{N}_{h'} \cap \mathcal{N}[h'']$ for some $h'' \leq h' \cdot \frac{1}{\epsilon} \cdot (s)^{O(1/\epsilon)}$ which contains u and with corresponding node-weighting A_S for which

- 1. Cut Matching Games Fails for Vertex. u fails the cut matching game for S; in other words, there is some cluster $S \in \mathcal{N}[h'']$ containing u such that $\sum_i B_S^{(i)}(u) < cA_S(u)$. Let $W_{b''}^{(1)}$ be all such nodes.
- 2. Cut Matching Game Fails for Cluster. u succeeds the cut matching game for S but S does not succeed the cut matching game; i.e it is not the case that a constant fraction of $A_S^1, A_S^{(2)}, \ldots$ succeed. Let $W_{b''}^{(2)}$ be all such nodes.
- 3. Cutmatching Fails. S is a cluster whose node-weighting we broke up which did not succeed for the cutmatching. Let $W_{h''}^{(3)}$ be all such nodes not in $W_{h''}^{(2)}$ or $W_{h''}^{(1)}$.

Likewise, let $W^{(i)} := \bigcup_{h''} W^{(i)}_{h''}$ for $i \in [1,3]$. It follows that

$$|B_{h'}| = A - A(W^{(1)}) - A(W^{(2)}) - A(W^{(1)}).$$

and so

$$|\bar{B}^*| = A(W^{(1)}) + A(W^{(2)}) + A(W^{(3)}).$$

Likewise, by averaging there is some h'' such that

$$A(W^{(1)}) + A(W^{(2)}) + A(W^{(3)}) \le \tilde{O}\left(A(W^{(1)}_{h''}) + A(W^{(2)}_{h''}) + A(W^{(3)}_{h''})\right).$$

Furthermore, observe that by how defined what it means for a cluster to succeed we have $A(W_{h''}^{(2)}) \leq O(A(W_{h''}^{O(1)}))$ for an appropriate hidden constant. Thus, we have

$$|\bar{B}^*| \le \tilde{O}\left(A(W_{h''}^{(1)}) + A(W_{h''}^{(3)})\right).$$

We case on which of $A(W_{h''}^{(1)})$ and $A(W_{h''}^{(3)})$ are larger.

1. Suppose $A(W_{h''}^{(1)}) \ge A(W_{h''}^{(3)})$ so that $|\bar{B}^*| \le \tilde{O}\left(A(W_{h''}^{(1)})\right)$. For a u and i, say that u fails the cut matching game for S and i if $B_S^{(i)}(u) \le c'' \cdot A_S^{(i)}(u)$ for a fixed constant $c'' \in [0, 1)$. Let $W_{Si}^{(1)}$ be all nodes that fail the cut matching game for S and i. Observe that, by choosing c'' appropriately, we have

$$\sum_{S,i} A_S^{(i)}(W_{Si}^{(1)}) \ge \Omega\left(A(W_{h''}^{(1)})\right).$$

and so it suffices to bound $\sum_{S,i} A_S^{(i)}(W_{Si}^{(1)})$.

Let $(F^{(l)}, C^{(l)})$ be the cutmatch we compute in iteration $l \in [1/\epsilon]$ for pairs $\{(A_{Si,k}^{(l)}, B_{Si,k}^{(l)})\}_{S,i,k}$ and let $F^{(l)} = \sum_{S,i,k} F_{Si,k}^{(l)}$ be the decomposition of this flow (one sub-flow for each pair). Let α_{Si} be the smallest matching played by the cut matching game we run on $A_S^{(i)}$. It follows

Let α_{Si} be the smallest matching played by the cut matching game we run on A_{S}^{\prime} . It follows that, for a fixed S and i, there must be some iteration l_{Si} among our $1/\epsilon$ cutmatches

$$\sum_{k} \operatorname{val}(F_{Si,k}^{(l_{Si})}) = (1 - \alpha_{Si}) \cdot \sum_{k} |A_{Si,k}^{(l_{Si})}|.$$

Likewise, we know by the guarantees of Theorem 13.6 that

$$\left(1 - \frac{\alpha_{Si}}{\epsilon}\right) \cdot |A_S^{(i)}| \le |B_S^{(i)}| \le |A_S^{(i)}| - \Omega\left(A_S^{(i)}(W_{Si}^{(1)})\right).$$

and so rearranging we have

$$\epsilon \cdot A_S^{(i)}(W_{Si}^{(1)}) \le \alpha_{Si} \cdot |A_S^{(i)}|.$$

Let $F = \sum_{l} F^{(l)}$, let $C = \sum_{l} C^{(l)}$ and let $D_{h''} = \epsilon \sum_{l} D_{h''}^{(l)}$ where $D_{h''}^{(l)}$ is the demand for this cutmatch as described in our sparsity analysis. Note that C is the cut our algorithm considers from step 2 for this value of h''. Thus, $D_{h''}$ is A-respecting, C h''s-separates $D_{h''}$ and $D_{h''}$ has size at least

$$|D_{h''}| \ge \epsilon \cdot \sum_{l} \sum_{S,i,k} \frac{|A_{Si,k}| - \operatorname{val}(F_{Si,k}^{(l)})}{\tilde{O}(N^{O(\epsilon)})} \ge \epsilon \cdot \sum_{S,i} \frac{\alpha_{Si} \cdot \sum_{k} |A_{Si,k}^{(l_{Si})}|}{\tilde{O}(N^{(\epsilon)})} \ge \epsilon \cdot \sum_{S,i} \frac{\alpha_{Si} \cdot |A_{S}^{(i)}|}{\tilde{O}(N^{(\epsilon)})}$$

where in the last inequality we applied the fact that the total size of the node-weighting of all pairs played by a cut strategy on node-weighting A is at least |A| (by definition of a node-weighting).

Combining the above we get that this demand has size at least

$$|D_{h''}| \ge \epsilon \cdot \sum_{S,i} \frac{\alpha_{Si} \cdot |A_S^{(i)}|}{\tilde{O}(N^{(\epsilon)})} \ge \epsilon^2 \cdot \sum_{S,i} \frac{A_S^{(i)}(W_{Si}^1)}{\tilde{O}(N^{(\epsilon)})} \ge \frac{\epsilon^2}{\tilde{O}(N^{(\epsilon)})} \cdot A(W_{h''}^{(1)}) \ge \frac{\epsilon^2}{\tilde{O}(N^{(\epsilon)})} \cdot |\bar{B}^*|$$

demonstrating that in this case we have $|D_{h''}| \geq \frac{\epsilon^2}{\bar{O}(N^{(\epsilon)})} \cdot |\bar{B}^*|$. By an averaging argument, there must be some $C^{(l)}$ which separates at least an ϵ fraction of $D_{h''}$, demonstrating that one of the $C^{(l)}$ has demand-size at least $\frac{\epsilon^3}{\bar{O}(N^{(\epsilon)})} \cdot |\bar{B}^*|$.

2. Suppose $A(W_{h''}^{(1)}) < A(W_{h''}^{(3)})$ so that $|\bar{B}^*| \leq \tilde{O}\left(A(W_{h''}^{(3)})\right)$. Let (F,C) be the cutmatch returned in step 3 when we are using diameter h''. We claim that $A_{(h,s)}(C)$ is large. Namely, let $D_{h''}$ be the A-respecting demand which is h''s-separated and of size as described above which by Equation (40) has size at least

$$\sum_{S,i,j} \frac{|A_S^{(i)}| - \operatorname{val}(F_{Sij})}{\tilde{O}(L \cdot N^{O(\epsilon)})}$$

Let $\mathcal{S}^{(3)}$ be all clusters of $\mathcal{N}[h'']$ that did not succeed for the cutmatching (without multiplicity). If a cluster $S \in \mathcal{S}^{(3)}$ then we know that, for at least a constant fraction of i, a constant fraction of the pairs (i, j) did not succeed, i.e. $\operatorname{val}(F_{Sij}) < c|A_S^{(i)}|$. Thus, we have that, among all L^2 pairs, a constant fraction did not succeed for S and so for any $S \in \mathcal{S}^{(3)}$ we have

$$\sum_{i,j} |A_S^{(i)}| - \operatorname{val}(F_{Sij}) \ge (1 - c')L \cdot |A_S|$$

for some constant c' > 0.

Since each vertex of $W_{h''}^{(3)}$ appears in at least one cluster of $\mathcal{S}^{(3)}$, we have

$$\sum_{S \in \mathcal{S}^{(3)}} |A_S| \ge A(W_{h''}^{(3)})$$

Thus, we have that this demand has size

$$\frac{\sum_i |A_i| - \operatorname{val}(F)}{\tilde{O}(N^{O(\epsilon)})}$$

Combining the above, we have that the demand $D_{h''}$ has size at least

$$\sum_{S,i,j} \frac{|A_S^{(i)}| - \operatorname{val}(F_{Sij})}{\tilde{O}(L \cdot N^{O(\epsilon)})} \ge \sum_{S \in \mathcal{S}^{(3)}} \frac{\sum_{i,j} |A_S^{(i)}| - \operatorname{val}(F_{Sij})}{\tilde{O}(L \cdot N^{O(\epsilon)})}$$
$$\ge \frac{(1 - c')}{N^{O(\epsilon)}} \sum_{S \in \mathcal{S}^{(3)}} |A_S|$$
$$\ge \frac{1}{\tilde{O}(N^{O(\epsilon)})} \cdot A(W_{h''}^{(3)}).$$

Thus, in this case we have $|D_{h''}| \ge |\bar{B}^*| / \tilde{O}(N^{O(\epsilon)})$ and so the demand-size of C is at least this In either of the above cases we have that one of the cuts we compute for h'' has demand-size at least $|\bar{B}^*| \cdot \frac{\epsilon^3}{\bar{O}(N^{O(\epsilon)})}$ as required.

Correctness Analysis: Witnesses. Lastly, we argue about the returned witness (as defined in Definition 5.33).

• Neighborhood Cover. Clearly, \mathcal{N} is a neighborhood cover satisfying the required properties

- Routers. Recall that each $B_{h'}$ as described above is $(h', \frac{1}{\epsilon^2} \cdot (s)^{1+O(1/\epsilon)})$ -length $\tilde{O}(\phi \cdot \epsilon)$ expanding. Since each cut considered by our algorithm has (h'', s)-length sparsity at most ϕ for some $h'' \leq h \cdot \frac{1}{\epsilon} \cdot s^{O(1/\epsilon)}$, it follows that if any of these cuts has non-zero size then our graph
 is not a (h'', s)-length ϕ -expander. Thus, each of our cutmatches' cuts must always have a cut
 of size 0 and so each router we compute for cluster S must be a $1/\epsilon$ -step and $N^{O(\epsilon)}$ congestion
 router. Thus, if S is a cluster whose node-weighting we broke up into $A_S^{(1)}, A_S^{(2)}, \ldots$ then the
 union of the routers we compute for $A_S^{(1)}, A_S^{(2)}, \ldots$ using our cut matching game along with the
 corresponding matching edges from step 3 is a $(s_0 = (2/\epsilon + 1))$ -step router with congestion $\kappa_0 = N^{O(\epsilon)}$.
- Embedding of Routers. Observe that the sum of the flows we compute across all cutmatches for clusters of $\mathcal{N}_{h'}$ have length at most $h' \cdot \frac{1}{\epsilon} \cdot s^{O(1/\epsilon)} = h' \cdot s_1$ and congestion at most $\kappa_1 = \tilde{O}(N^{O(\epsilon)}/(\phi\epsilon))$.

Lastly, observe that the overall for our witness we get

$$s_0 \cdot s_1 = (2/\epsilon + 1) \cdot \frac{1}{\epsilon} \cdot s^{O(1/\epsilon)} = O\left(\frac{1}{\epsilon^2} \cdot s^{O(1/\epsilon)}\right) = s_w$$

and

$$\kappa_0 \cdot \kappa_1 = N^{O(\epsilon)} \cdot \tilde{O}(N^{O(\epsilon)}/(\phi\epsilon)) = \tilde{O}(N^{O(\epsilon)}/(\phi\epsilon)) = 1/\phi_w$$

Combining Theorem 13.6 and Theorem 13.7 immediately gives Lemma 13.4, restated below for convenience.

Lemma 13.4. For any parameter $\epsilon > 0$, there exists an algorithm that, given a graph G on n vertices and m edges, a node weighting A, a length bound and slack h and s, a recursion size parameter L, and a conductance parameter ϕ , computes a α -approximate demand-size-largest ($\leq h, s$)-length ϕ -sparse cut with sparsity approximation α_{ϕ} and length slack approximation α_s with respect to A where

$$\alpha = \frac{\tilde{O}(N^{O(\epsilon)})}{\epsilon^3} \qquad \qquad \alpha_{\phi} = \frac{s^3 N^{O(1/s)}}{\epsilon} \qquad \qquad \alpha_s = \max\left(2, \frac{1}{\epsilon^2} \cdot (s)^{1+O(1/\epsilon)}\right)$$

with work

$$\mathsf{W}_{\text{sparse-cut}}(A,m) \le m \cdot \tilde{O}\left(\frac{1}{\epsilon} \cdot (s)^{O(1/\epsilon)} \cdot N^{O(\epsilon)} + \frac{1}{\epsilon} \cdot L \cdot N^{O(\epsilon)} \cdot \operatorname{poly}(h)\right) + \frac{\tilde{O}(1)}{\operatorname{poly}(\epsilon)} \sum_{i} \mathsf{W}_{\text{ED}}(A_{i},m_{i})$$

and depth

$$\mathsf{D}_{\text{sparse-cut}}(A,m) \leq \tilde{O}\left(\frac{1}{\epsilon} \cdot (s)^{O(1/\epsilon)} \cdot N^{O(\epsilon)} + \frac{1}{\epsilon} \cdot L \cdot N^{O(\epsilon)} \cdot \operatorname{poly}(h)\right) + \frac{\tilde{O}(1)}{\operatorname{poly}(\epsilon)} \max_{i} \mathsf{D}_{\text{ED}}(A_{i},m_{i})$$

where $W_{ED}(A_i, m_i)$ and $D_{ED}(A_i, m_i)$ are the work and depth to compute an $(h, 2^{1/\epsilon})$ -length ϕ -expander decomposition with cut slack $N^{poly(\epsilon)}$ for node-weighting A_i in an m_i -edge graph and for all i each $A_i \leq A$ and $|A_i| \leq \frac{|A|}{L}$ and $\{m_i\}_i$ are non-negative integers satisfying

$$\sum_{i} m_{i} \leq \frac{1}{\epsilon} \cdot \tilde{O}(m + n^{1+O(\epsilon)} + L^{2} \cdot N^{O(\epsilon)}).$$

Furthermore, if the graph is $(\leq h \cdot \frac{1}{\epsilon} \cdot s^{O(1/\epsilon)}, s)$ -length ϕ -expanding then the algorithm also returns $a \ (\leq h, s_w)$ -length ϕ_w -expansion witness where $s_w = \frac{1}{\epsilon^2} \cdot s^{O(1/\epsilon)}$ and $\phi_w = \tilde{O}(\phi \epsilon/N^{O(\epsilon)})$.

14 Algorithm: EDs from Demand-Size-Large Sparse Cuts

We now show how to compute expander decompositions from demand-size large length-constrained sparse cuts. Specifically, we show the following. Recall the definition of an α -approximate ($\leq h, s$)length ϕ -sparse cut with length approximation α_s and sparsity approximation α_{ϕ} from Definition 13.3.

Lemma 14.1. Fix $\alpha, \alpha_{\phi}, \alpha_s > 1$ and let $W_{\text{sparse-cut}}(A, m)$ be the time to compute an α -approximate $(\leq h', s')$ -length ϕ' -sparse cut with sparsity approximation α_{ϕ} and length approximation α_s w.r.t. node-weighting A in a graph with $m' \leq m$ edges for $h' \leq h$, $s' \leq s$ and $\phi' \geq \phi$.

Then, for every $\epsilon, \epsilon' > 0$, one can compute a $(\leq h, s)$ -length ϕ -expander decomposition for A with cut slack

$$\kappa = \tilde{O}\left(\alpha \cdot N^{O(\epsilon')}\right) \cdot \tilde{O}\left(\alpha_{\phi} \cdot s \cdot N^{O(1/\sqrt{s})}\right)^{O(1/\epsilon')},$$

length slack

$$s = \alpha_s^{O(1/\epsilon')},$$

work

$$\mathsf{W}_{\mathrm{ED}}(A,m) \leq \tilde{O}\left(\frac{N^{O(\epsilon')}}{\epsilon'} \cdot \alpha\right) \cdot \mathsf{W}_{\mathrm{sparse-cut}}(A,m)$$

and depth

$$\mathsf{D}_{\mathrm{ED}}(A,m) \leq \tilde{O}\left(\frac{N^{O(\epsilon')}}{\epsilon'} \cdot \alpha\right) \cdot \mathsf{D}_{\mathrm{sparse-cut}}(A,m)$$

We begin by describing the algorithm we use to prove the above. We give pseudo-code in Algorithm 2. The algorithm runs in $\frac{1}{\epsilon'}$ top-level iterations we call epochs. In epoch epoch the algorithm repeatedly cuts an α -approximate demand-size-largest ($\leq h_{\text{epoch}}, s_{\text{epoch}}$)-length ϕ_{epoch} sparse cut for the target node weighting A in the current graph with sparsity slack α_{ϕ} and length slack α_s . For the next epoch the algorithm adjusts its target values for sparsity and length by decreasing ϕ_{epoch} by about $1/\alpha_{\phi}$, h_{epoch} by about $1/\alpha_s$ and increasing s_{epoch} by about α_s . The proof shows that, at the end of an epoch epoch, no demand-size-large (h'_{epoch}, s'_{epoch}) -length ϕ'_{epoch} -sparse cuts exist for A anymore for h'_{epoch} , s'_{epoch} and ϕ_{epoch} each slightly more relaxed than h_{epoch} , s_{epoch} and ϕ_{epoch} . More specifically, for $h'_{epoch} \leq h_{epoch}/\alpha_s$, $s'_{epoch} = s_{epoch} \cdot \alpha_s$ and $\phi'_{epoch} = \phi_{epoch}/\alpha_{\phi}$. Initially, no such cut of demand-size strictly more than |A| exists (trivially) and in each epoch we improve the quality of this upper bound on the demand-size-largest cut by an $N^{\epsilon'}$ factor so that after $1/\epsilon'$ iterations no such cut exists (for appropriately relaxed length, length slack and sparsity). Generally speaking, the trick is to make sure that our upper bound on |A| improves faster than we must relax our length, length slack and sparsity.

Algorithm 2 Length-Constrained Expander Decompositions (from Large Sparse Cuts)

Input: Edge-capacitated graph G_0 , parameters $\epsilon, \epsilon' \in (0, 1)$, node-weighting A on G, length bound h, and conductance bound $\phi > 0$, an algorithm for demand-size-largest sparse cut. Output: $(\leq h, s)$ -length ϕ -expander decomposition Initialize Graph and Number of Iterations: $G = G_0$ and $l = \Theta(\log N \cdot \alpha \cdot N^{O(\epsilon')})$ Initialize Length: $h_0 = \alpha_s \cdot (2\alpha_s)^{1/\epsilon'} \cdot h$ Initialize Length Slack: $s_0 = 2 \cdot \alpha_s^{1/\epsilon'}$ Initialize Sparsity: $\phi_0 = \phi \cdot \alpha_{\phi} \cdot \prod_{\text{epoch} \in [1/\epsilon']} \left(\tilde{O}(\alpha_{\phi} \cdot s_{\text{epoch}}^3 \cdot N^{O(1/s_{\text{epoch}})}) \right)$ for epoch = $1, 2, \dots 1/\epsilon'$ do Update Length Slack: $s_{\text{epoch}} = \frac{1}{2\alpha_s} \cdot h_{\text{epoch}-1}$ Update Sparsity: $\phi_{\text{epoch}} = \frac{1}{\tilde{O}(\alpha_{\phi} \cdot s_{\text{epoch}}^3 \cdot N^{O(1/s_{\text{epoch}})})} \cdot \phi_{\text{epoch}-1}$ for $j = 1, 2, \dots, l$ do Let C be an α -approximate demand-size-largest ($\leq h_{\text{epoch}}, s_{\text{epoch}}$)-length ϕ_{epoch} -sparse cut for A and length h''_{epoch} in G with length and sparsity approximation α_s and α_{ϕ} . Update Graph: $G = G + s_{\text{epoch}} \cdot h''_{\text{epoch}} \cdot C$.

We will use the following notion of the demand-size of a sequence of cuts and the subsequent relation. Below, recall the definition of LDSC from Definition 13.2.

Definition 14.2 (LDSCS). Fix a graph G, node-weighting A and parameters h, s and ϕ . LDSCS is the demand-size of the demand-size-largest sequence of (h, s)-length ϕ -sparse moving cuts. Specifically,

$$\textit{LDSCS}(\phi, h, s) := \sum_{i} A_{(h,s)}(C_i)$$

where above $A_{(h,s)}(C_i)$ is computed after applying all C_j for j < i and $(C_1, C_2, ...)$ is the (h, s)-length ϕ -expanding moving cut sequence maximizing $\sum_i A_{(h,s)}(C_i)$.

Lemma 14.3. Given graph G and node-weighting A, we have that

$$LDSCS(\phi, h, s) \leq LDSC(\phi', h', s')$$

where h' = 2h, $s' = \frac{(s-2)}{2}$ and $\phi' = s^3 \cdot \log^3 N \cdot N^{O(1/s)} \cdot \phi$.

Proof. Let (C_1, C_2, \ldots) be a sequence of (h, s)-length ϕ -sparse cuts such that $\sum_i A_{(h,s)}(C_i) = \text{LDSCS}(\phi, h, s)$ where $\phi_i \leq \phi$ is the minimum value for which C_i is ϕ_i -sparse. Let D_1, D_2, \ldots be the demands witnessing these cuts so that for all i we have

$$|C_i|/\phi = |D_i|.$$

Let $C = \sum_i C_i$. By Theorem 1.2 we know that C is an (h', s')-length ϕ' -sparse cut for A and so there must be some h'-length demand D which is h's'-separated by C and D has size at least

$$\frac{|C|}{\phi'} = |C| \frac{\sum_i |C_i| / \phi_i}{\sum_i |C_i|} = \sum_i |D_i|$$

In other words, the demand-size of C is at least $\sum_i |D_i|$, as required.

Lemma 14.4. At the end of the epoch *th* epoch of Algorithm 2, we have that for every $h'_{epoch} \leq h_{epoch}/\alpha_s$ that the demand-size-largest (h'_{epoch}, s_{epoch}) -length $(\phi_{epoch}/\alpha_{\phi})$ -sparse cut has (h'_{epoch}, s_{epoch}) α_s)-length demand-size at most $|A| \cdot \left(\frac{1}{N^{O(\epsilon')}}\right)^{epoch}$. In other words, we have for every $h'_{epoch} \leq h_{epoch}/\alpha_s$ that

$$LDSC(\phi_{\mathsf{epoch}}/\alpha_{\phi}, h_{\mathsf{epoch}}', s_{\mathsf{epoch}} \cdot \alpha_s) \leq |A| \cdot \left(\frac{1}{N^{O(\epsilon')}}\right)^{\mathsf{epoch}}$$

Proof. We prove this by induction. Let $\gamma := 1/N^{O(\epsilon')}$ for convenience of notation. The base case when epoch = 0 is trivial as the demand-size of any cut is trivially at most |A|. Next, suppose epoch > 0 and assume for the sake of contradiction that our inductive hypothesis does not hold and so there is some $\hat{h}_{epoch} \leq h_{epoch}/\alpha_s$ such that at the end of the epochth epoch we have

$$LDSC(\phi_{epoch}/\alpha_{\phi}, \hat{h}_{epoch}, s_{epoch} \cdot \alpha_s) > |A|/\gamma^{epoch}.$$
(43)

Consider a cut C we compute in an epoch, epoch, with corresponding length h''_{epoch} . Unpacking the definition of approximate demand-size largest sparse cuts (Definition 13.3), we have that C is an (h''_{epoch}, s_{epoch}) -length ϕ_{epoch} -sparse cut for A where $h''_{epoch} \leq \alpha_s \cdot h_{epoch}$ and, for any $h'_{epoch} \leq h_{epoch}/\alpha_s$ and, in particular, for \hat{h}_{epoch} we have

$$A_{(h_{\text{epoch}}'', s_{\text{epoch}})}(C) \geq \frac{1}{\alpha} \cdot \text{LDSC}(\phi_{\text{epoch}} / \alpha_{\phi}, \hat{h}_{\text{epoch}}, s_{\text{epoch}} \cdot \alpha_s)$$

at the moment when C is computed. Combining the above with Equation (43) and the fact that $LDSC(\phi_{epoch}/\alpha_{\phi}, \hat{h}_{epoch}, s_{epoch} \cdot \alpha_s)$ can only be smaller at the end of our epoch than in the middle of it, we get

$$A_{(h_{\text{epoch}}^{\prime\prime}, s_{\text{epoch}})}(C) > \frac{1}{\alpha} \cdot |A| / \gamma^{\text{epoch}}$$

$$\tag{44}$$

Let $h''_{\text{epoch}} \leq h_{\text{epoch}} \cdot \alpha_s$ be a value that could correspond to a cut in the epochth iteration. Notice that, by our definition $h_{\text{epoch}} = \frac{1}{2\alpha_s} \cdot h_{\text{epoch}-1}$, we have that

$$2h_{\mathsf{epoch}}'' \le 2\alpha_s \cdot h_{\mathsf{epoch}} = h_{\mathsf{epoch}-1}.$$
(45)

We may assume these values are, without loss of generality, powers of 2 and so after we compute $\Theta(\log N \cdot \alpha \cdot \gamma)$ -many cuts, we know that there must be some h''_{epoch} such that $C_{h''_{epoch}}$ contains at least $(\alpha \cdot \gamma)$ -many cuts. We let (C_1, C_2, \ldots) be these cuts. Applying Equation (44) to each of our C_i s, we get

$$\sum_{i} A_{(h_{\text{epoch}}^{\prime\prime}, s_{\text{epoch}})}(C_i) > |A|/\gamma^{\text{epoch}-1}.$$
(46)

 (C_1, C_2, \ldots) is an (h''_{epoch}, s_{epoch}) -length ϕ_{epoch} -sparse sequence of moving cuts and so forms a candidate for the demand-size-largest such sequence.

It therefore follows that at the end of the epochth epoch we have

$$\begin{split} \sum_{i} A_{(h_{\text{epoch}}', s_{\text{epoch}})}(C_{i}) &\leq \text{LDSCS}(\phi_{\text{epoch}}, h_{\text{epoch}}'', s_{\text{epoch}}) \\ &\leq \text{LDSC}\left(\phi_{\text{epoch}} \cdot \tilde{O}(s_{\text{epoch}}^{3} \cdot N^{O(1/s_{\text{epoch}})}), 2h_{\text{epoch}}'', s_{\text{epoch}}\right) \\ &= \text{LDSC}\left(\phi_{\text{epoch}-1}, 2h_{\text{epoch}}'', s_{\text{epoch}-1} \cdot \alpha_{s}\right) \\ &\leq \text{LDSC}\left(\phi_{\text{epoch}-1}, h_{\text{epoch}-1}, s_{\text{epoch}-1}\right) \\ &\leq |A|/\gamma^{\text{epoch}-1}. \end{split}$$

where, above, the second inequality follows from Lemma 14.3, the third from the definition of $\phi_{epoch-1}$ and $s_{epoch-1}$, the fourth from Equation (45) and the fact that $LDSC(\phi, h, s)$ is monotone increasing in h (as long as $s \ge 2$) and monotone decreasing in s and the fifth from our inductive hypothesis. However, the above contradicts Equation (46).

We conclude with our proof of Lemma 14.1.

Lemma 14.1. Fix $\alpha, \alpha_{\phi}, \alpha_s > 1$ and let $W_{\text{sparse-cut}}(A, m)$ be the time to compute an α -approximate $(\leq h', s')$ -length ϕ' -sparse cut with sparsity approximation α_{ϕ} and length approximation α_s w.r.t. node-weighting A in a graph with $m' \leq m$ edges for $h' \leq h$, $s' \leq s$ and $\phi' \geq \phi$.

Then, for every $\epsilon, \epsilon' > 0$, one can compute a $(\leq h, s)$ -length ϕ -expander decomposition for A with cut slack

$$\kappa = \tilde{O}\left(\alpha \cdot N^{O(\epsilon')}\right) \cdot \tilde{O}\left(\alpha_{\phi} \cdot s \cdot N^{O(1/\sqrt{s})}\right)^{O(1/\epsilon')},$$

length slack

$$s=\alpha_s^{O(1/\epsilon')},$$

work

$$\mathsf{W}_{\mathrm{ED}}(A,m) \leq \tilde{O}\left(\frac{N^{O(\epsilon')}}{\epsilon'} \cdot \alpha\right) \cdot \mathsf{W}_{\mathrm{sparse-cut}}(A,m)$$

and depth

$$\mathsf{D}_{\mathrm{ED}}(A,m) \leq \tilde{O}\left(\frac{N^{O(\epsilon')}}{\epsilon'} \cdot \alpha\right) \cdot \mathsf{D}_{\mathrm{sparse-cut}}(A,m).$$

Proof. We use Algorithm 2.

First, we claim that the returned cuts $\sum_{C} C$ are indeed an $(\leq h, s)$ -length expander decomposition for sparsity ϕ with cut slack κ .

Let epoch be $1/\epsilon'$. By our choice of how we initialize h_0 , ϕ_0 , observe that after our $1/\epsilon'$ -many epochs we have that $h_{\text{epoch}} = \alpha_s \cdot h$, $s_{\text{epoch}} = 2 \cdot \alpha_s^{2/\epsilon'}$ and $\phi_{\text{epoch}} = \alpha_\phi \cdot \phi$. Letting $s = 2 \cdot \alpha_s^{2/\epsilon'}$ and applying Lemma 14.4 to the final epoch of our algorithm, we therefore have that, after applying $\sum_C C$ to our graph, for every $h' \leq h_{\text{epoch}}/\alpha_s \leq h$ that the (h, s)-length demand-size of the demand-size-largest (h, s)-length $\phi_{\text{epoch}}/\alpha_\phi = \phi$ -sparse cut is at most

$$|A| \cdot \left(\frac{1}{N^{O(\epsilon')}}^{1/\epsilon'}\right) \le m \cdot \left(\frac{1}{N^{O(\epsilon')}}\right)^{1/\epsilon'} < 1$$

where, above, we applied the fact that $|A| \leq m$ (since it must be degree-respecting). Since the demand-size of a cut is integral, it follows that for all $h' \leq h$ no (h, s)-length ϕ -sparse cut exists and so $\sum_{C} C$ is indeed a $(\leq h, s)$ -length ϕ -expander decomposition (Definition 5.20).

We next consider the cut slack of this expander decomposition. Observe that each cut C that we compute in the epoch epoch is, by construction, a (($\leq h_{epoch}, s_{epoch}$)-length) ϕ_{epoch} -sparse cut for |A| and so has size at most

$$\begin{split} \phi_{\mathsf{epoch}} \cdot |A| &\leq \phi \cdot \alpha_{\phi} \cdot \left(\tilde{O}(\alpha_{\phi} \cdot s^{3}_{\mathsf{epoch}} \cdot N^{O(1/s_{\mathsf{epoch}})}) \right)^{1/\epsilon'} \cdot |A| \\ &\leq \phi \cdot \alpha_{\phi} \cdot \left(\tilde{O}(\alpha_{\phi} \cdot s^{3} \cdot N^{O(1/s_{0})}) \right)^{1/\epsilon'} \cdot |A| \\ &\leq \phi \cdot \alpha_{\phi}^{O(1/\epsilon')} \cdot s^{O(1/\epsilon')} \cdot N^{O(1/(\epsilon' \cdot \sqrt{s}))} \cdot \left(\tilde{O}(1) \right)^{1/\epsilon'} \cdot |A| \end{split}$$

Furthermore, applying the fact that, although we compute $l = \tilde{O}(\alpha \cdot N^{O(\epsilon')})$ total such cuts in one iteration, the size of these cuts is geometrically increasing, so the entire size of $\sum_{C} C$ is dominated by the sum of the cuts we compute in the last iteration. Namely, we have

$$\sum_{C} |C| \le \phi |A| \cdot \left(\tilde{O}\left(\alpha \cdot N^{O(\epsilon')} \right) \cdot \alpha_{\phi}^{O(1/\epsilon')} \cdot s^{O(1/\epsilon')} \cdot N^{O(1/(\epsilon' \cdot \sqrt{s}))} \cdot \left(\tilde{O}(1) \right)^{1/\epsilon'} \right)$$

giving our bound on the cut slack.

Lastly, the work and depth of our algorithm is trivial since we compute $\tilde{O}(\frac{N^{O(\epsilon')}}{\epsilon'} \cdot \alpha)$ -many cuts.

15 Algorithm: Length-Constrained EDs from "The Spiral"

We conclude by combining our algorithm which computes length-constrained expander decompositions using demand-size-large length-constrained sparse cuts (Lemma 14.1) with our algorithm that computes large length-constrained sparse cuts using length-constrained expander decompositions (Lemma 13.4). This forms a "spiral" of mutual recursion where each time we go around the spiral we make substantial progress on the size of the problem on which we are working (in terms of node-weighting size). We first state (and prove) our result with a maximally general tradeoff of parameters (ϵ and ϵ'). We next simplify this presentation by choosing these parameters to get our final theorem.

Theorem 15.1. There exists an algorithm that, given edge-capacitated graph G, parameters $\epsilon, \epsilon' \in (0, 1)$, node-weighting A on G, length bound h, and conductance bound $\phi > 0$, computes an $(\leq h, s)$ -length witnessed ϕ -expander decomposition for A in G with cut and length slack

$$\kappa = N^{O(\epsilon')} \cdot \tilde{O}\left(\frac{N^{O(\epsilon)}}{\operatorname{poly}(\epsilon)}\right)^{O(1/\epsilon')} \qquad s = (1/\epsilon)^{O(1/\epsilon')}$$

with work

$$\mathsf{W}_{\mathrm{ED}}(A,m) \le m \cdot \tilde{O}\left(\frac{N^{O(\epsilon+\epsilon')}}{\mathrm{poly}(\epsilon,\epsilon')}\right) \left(\tilde{O}(1/\epsilon)^{O(1/(\epsilon\epsilon'))} + \mathrm{poly}(h)\right).$$

and depth

$$\mathsf{D}_{\mathrm{ED}}(A,m) \leq \tilde{O}\left(\frac{N^{O(\epsilon+\epsilon')}}{\mathrm{poly}(\epsilon,\epsilon')}\right) \left(\tilde{O}(1/\epsilon)^{O(1/(\epsilon\epsilon'))} + \mathrm{poly}(h)\right)$$

Proof. Applying Lemma 13.4 with $L = N^{\epsilon'}$ we have that one can compute an α -approximate $(\leq h, s)$ -length demand-size largest cut with sparsity and length approximation α_{ϕ} and α_{s} where

$$\alpha = \tilde{O}\left(\frac{N^{O(\epsilon)}}{\epsilon^3}\right) \qquad \qquad \alpha_{\phi} = \frac{s^3 N^{O(1/s)}}{\epsilon} \qquad \qquad \alpha_s = \max\left(2, \frac{1}{\epsilon^2} \cdot (s)^{1+O(1/\epsilon)}\right)$$

with work at most

$$\mathsf{W}_{\text{sparse-cut}}(A,m) \le m \cdot \tilde{O}\left(\frac{1}{\epsilon} \cdot (s)^{O(1/\epsilon)} \cdot N^{O(\epsilon)} + \frac{1}{\epsilon} \cdot N^{O(\epsilon+\epsilon')} \cdot \text{poly}(h)\right) + \frac{1}{\epsilon} \sum_{i} \mathsf{W}_{\text{ED}}(A_i, m_i)$$

where $|A_i| \leq \frac{|A|}{N^{\epsilon'}}$ for all *i* and $\{m_i\}_i$ are non-negative integers satisfying

$$\sum_{i} m_{i} \leq \frac{1}{\epsilon} \cdot \tilde{O}(m + n^{1+O(\epsilon)} + N^{O(\epsilon)}).$$
(47)

Likewise, applying Lemma 14.1, we have that we can compute a $(\leq h, s)$ -length ϕ -expander decomposition for A with cut slack

$$\kappa = \tilde{O}\left(\alpha \cdot N^{O(\epsilon')}\right) \cdot \tilde{O}\left(\alpha_{\phi} \cdot s \cdot N^{O(1/\sqrt{s})}\right)^{O(1/\epsilon')},$$

length slack

$$s = \alpha_s^{O(1/\epsilon')},$$

with work

$$\mathsf{W}_{\mathrm{ED}}(A,m) \leq \tilde{O}\left(\frac{N^{O(\epsilon')}}{\epsilon'} \cdot \alpha\right) \cdot \mathsf{W}_{\mathrm{sparse-cut}}(A,m)$$

where α , α_{ϕ} and α_s are the approximation factors of our approximate demand-size-largest sparse cut algorithm.

We now combine the above recursions into a single recursion to compute a $(\leq h, s_i)$ -length ϕ -expander decomposition for A. We will index each level of our recursion by i. Observe that at the *i*th level of our recursion, we have that

$$s_i = \alpha_{s,i}^{O(1/\epsilon')} = \frac{1}{\epsilon^2} \cdot s_{i-1}^{1+O(1/\epsilon)}$$

Furthermore, since each time we recurse we reduce our node-weighting's size by a multiplicative $N^{\epsilon'}$, the depth of our recursion is at most $1/\epsilon'$ and so we have that s_i is always at most

$$s_i \le \left(\frac{1}{\epsilon}\right)^{O(1/\epsilon')}$$

It follows that our cut slack in the *i*th level of our recursion is

$$\begin{aligned} \kappa_{i} &= \tilde{O}\left(\alpha \cdot N^{O(\epsilon')}\right) \cdot \tilde{O}\left(\alpha_{\phi} \cdot s_{i} \cdot N^{O(1/\sqrt{s_{i}})}\right)^{O(1/\epsilon')} \\ &= \tilde{O}\left(\frac{N^{O(\epsilon+\epsilon')}}{\operatorname{poly}(\epsilon)}\right) \cdot \tilde{O}\left(\frac{s_{i}^{3}N^{O(1/s_{i})}}{\epsilon} \cdot s_{i} \cdot N^{O(1/\sqrt{s_{i}})}\right)^{O(1/\epsilon')} \\ &= \tilde{O}\left(\frac{N^{O(\epsilon+\epsilon')}}{\operatorname{poly}(\epsilon)}\right) \cdot \tilde{O}\left(\frac{1}{\operatorname{poly}(\epsilon)} \cdot N^{O(1/s_{i}+1/\sqrt{s_{i}})}\right)^{O(1/\epsilon')} \\ &= N^{O(\epsilon')} \cdot \tilde{O}\left(\frac{N^{O(\epsilon)}}{\operatorname{poly}(\epsilon)}\right)^{O(1/\epsilon')}.\end{aligned}$$

where in the last line we used the fact that $1/\sqrt{s_i} + 1/s_i \ge 1/\epsilon$ for every value of s_i we consider.

We next bound the work of our algorithm. Letting m_j be the total number of edges at the *j*th level of our recursion and applying our bound on $\sum_i m_i$ from Equation (47) we have

$$m_{j+1} \le \frac{1}{\epsilon} \cdot \tilde{O}(m_j + n^{1+O(\epsilon)} + N^{O(\epsilon)})$$

Applying the fact that our recurrence has depth at most $1/\epsilon'$, we get that the maximum number of edges across an entire level of recursion j is at most

$$m_{j} \leq m \cdot \tilde{O}\left(\frac{1}{\epsilon}\right)^{1/\epsilon'} + \frac{1}{\epsilon'}\left(n^{1+O(\epsilon)} + N^{O(\epsilon)}\right)$$
$$= m \cdot \tilde{O}\left(\frac{1}{\epsilon}\right)^{1/\epsilon'} + \frac{N^{O(\epsilon)}}{\epsilon'}$$
(48)

where, above, m is the number of edges in our original graph. On the other hand, we have that (apart from the recursive calls), the entire work of our algorithm at a single level of recursion is at

most

$$m_{j} \cdot \tilde{O}\left(\frac{\alpha \cdot N^{O(\epsilon')}}{\epsilon'}\right) \left(\frac{1}{\epsilon} \cdot (s)^{O(1/\epsilon)} \cdot N^{O(\epsilon)} + \frac{1}{\epsilon} \cdot N^{O(\epsilon+\epsilon')} \cdot \operatorname{poly}(h)\right)$$

$$\leq m_{j} \cdot \tilde{O}\left(\frac{N^{O(\epsilon+\epsilon')}}{\operatorname{poly}(\epsilon,\epsilon')}\right) \left((s)^{O(1/\epsilon)} + \operatorname{poly}(h)\right)$$

$$\leq m_{j} \cdot \tilde{O}\left(\frac{N^{O(\epsilon+\epsilon')}}{\operatorname{poly}(\epsilon,\epsilon')}\right) \left((1/\epsilon)^{O(1/(\epsilon\epsilon'))} + \operatorname{poly}(h)\right)$$
(49)

Combining Equation (48) and Equation (49) we get that the total work on a single level of recursion (again, excluding recursive calls) is at most

$$\left(m \cdot \tilde{O}\left(\frac{1}{\epsilon}\right)^{1/\epsilon'} + \frac{N^{O(\epsilon)}}{\epsilon'} \right) \cdot \tilde{O}\left(\frac{N^{O(\epsilon+\epsilon')}}{\operatorname{poly}(\epsilon,\epsilon')}\right) \left((1/\epsilon)^{O(1/(\epsilon\epsilon'))} + \operatorname{poly}(h) \right)$$
$$= m \cdot \tilde{O}\left(\frac{N^{O(\epsilon+\epsilon')}}{\operatorname{poly}(\epsilon,\epsilon')}\right) \left(\tilde{O}(1/\epsilon)^{O(1/(\epsilon\epsilon'))} + \operatorname{poly}(h) \right)$$

Summing over our $1/\epsilon'$ -many recursive levels of our algorithm then gives our work bound. The argument for depth is analogous (and, in fact, easier because we do not have to control the total number of edges over each level of recursion using Equation (47)).

Lastly, we give the simplified version of the above theorem with witnesses.

Theorem 1.1. There is a constant c > 1 such that given graph G with edge lengths and capacities, $\epsilon \in \left(\frac{1}{\log^{1/c} N}, 1\right)$, node-weighting A, length bound $h \ge 1$, and conductance $\phi > 0$, one can compute a witnessed $(\le h, s)$ -length ϕ -expander decomposition for A in G with cut and length slack respectively

$$\kappa = n^{\epsilon}$$
 $s = \exp(\operatorname{poly}(1/\epsilon))$

and work and depth respectively

$$\mathsf{W}_{\mathrm{ED}}(A,m) \le m \cdot \tilde{O}\left(n^{\mathrm{poly}(\epsilon)} \cdot \mathrm{poly}(h)\right) \qquad \mathsf{D}_{\mathrm{ED}}(A,m) \le \tilde{O}\left(n^{\mathrm{poly}(\epsilon)} \cdot \mathrm{poly}(h)\right).$$

Proof. We first apply Theorem 15.1 with $\epsilon'_0 = \epsilon$ and $\epsilon_0 = \epsilon^2$ where ϵ'_0 and ϵ_0 are the parameters described in Theorem 15.1. Likewise, let c be an upper-bound on the exponent of the poly-log in the \tilde{O} notations and the exponent of all poly notation of Theorem 15.1. It follows that we can compute a $(\leq h, s)$ -length ϕ -expander decomposition for A in G with cut and length slack

$$\kappa = \frac{N^{O(\epsilon)}}{(\epsilon)^{c \cdot O(1/\epsilon)}} \cdot \log^{c \cdot O(1/\epsilon)} N \qquad \qquad s = (1/\epsilon^2)^{O(1/\epsilon)}$$

with work

$$\mathsf{W}_{\mathrm{ED}}(A,m) \le m \cdot \tilde{O}\left(\frac{N^{O(\mathrm{poly}(\epsilon))}}{\mathrm{poly}(\epsilon)}\right) \left((1/\epsilon)^{O(1/\epsilon^3)} \cdot \log^{c \cdot O(1/\epsilon)} N + \mathrm{poly}(h)\right).$$

and depth

$$\mathsf{D}_{\mathrm{ED}}(A,m) \leq \tilde{O}\left(\frac{N^{O(\mathrm{poly}(\epsilon))}}{\mathrm{poly}(\epsilon)}\right) \left((1/\epsilon)^{O(1/\epsilon^3)} \cdot \log^{c \cdot O(1/\epsilon)} N + \mathrm{poly}(h)\right).$$

We begin by reasoning about our cut slack. Notice that, for a suitable large hidden constant in the Ω we have that if

$$\epsilon \ge \Omega\left(\sqrt{\frac{c \cdot \log \log n}{\log N}}\right)$$

then we have that

$$\frac{c \cdot O(1/\epsilon) \cdot \log \log N}{\log N} \le \epsilon \tag{50}$$

Similarly, we have that if

$$\epsilon \ge \Omega\left(\left(\frac{c}{\log n}\right)^{1/3}\right)$$

then

$$\frac{\log(1/\epsilon) \cdot c \cdot O(1/\epsilon)}{\log N} \le \frac{c \cdot O(1/\epsilon^2)}{\log N} \le \epsilon$$

Thus, our cut slack is

$$\kappa = N^{O(\epsilon) + \frac{c \cdot O(1/\epsilon) \cdot \log \log N}{\log N} + \frac{\log(1/\epsilon) \cdot c \cdot O(1/\epsilon)}{\log N}} \le N^{O(\epsilon)}$$

Likewise, our length slack is

$$s = (1/\epsilon^2)^{O(1/\epsilon)} = \exp(O(1/\epsilon) \cdot \log(1/\epsilon^2)) \le \exp(O(1/\epsilon^2)) = \exp(\operatorname{poly}(1/\epsilon)).$$

Lastly, observe that if

$$\epsilon \ge \Omega \left(\frac{1}{\log N}\right)^{(1/5)}$$

and

$$\epsilon \ge \Omega\left(\log\log n / \log n\right)$$

then we have

$$\frac{O(1/\epsilon^3) \cdot \log(1/\epsilon)}{\log N} + \frac{c \cdot O(1/\epsilon) \cdot \log \log N}{\log N} \le \frac{O(1/\epsilon^4)}{\log N} + \frac{O(1/\epsilon) \cdot \log \log N}{\log N} \le O(\epsilon)$$

and so our work is

$$\begin{split} \mathsf{W}_{\mathrm{ED}}(A,m) &\leq m \cdot \tilde{O}\left(\frac{N^{O(\mathrm{poly}(\epsilon))}}{\mathrm{poly}(\epsilon)}\right) \left((1/\epsilon)^{O(1/\epsilon^3)} \cdot \log^{c \cdot O(1/\epsilon)} N + \mathrm{poly}(h)\right) \\ &= m \cdot \tilde{O}\left(\frac{N^{O(\mathrm{poly}(\epsilon))}}{\mathrm{poly}(\epsilon)}\right) \left(N^{\frac{O(1/\epsilon^3) \cdot \log(1/\epsilon)}{\log N} + \frac{c \cdot O(1/\epsilon) \cdot \log\log N}{\log N}} + \mathrm{poly}(h)\right) \\ &= m \cdot \tilde{O}\left(\frac{N^{O(\mathrm{poly}(\epsilon))}}{\mathrm{poly}(\epsilon)}\right) \left(N^{O(\epsilon)} + \mathrm{poly}(h)\right) \\ &= m \cdot \tilde{O}\left(\frac{N^{O(\mathrm{poly}(\epsilon))}}{\mathrm{poly}(\epsilon)}\right) \cdot \mathrm{poly}(h) \\ &\leq m \cdot \tilde{O}\left(N^{O(\mathrm{poly}(\epsilon))} \cdot \mathrm{poly}(h)\right) \end{split}$$

Where in the last line we used the fact that $\epsilon \geq 1/\log^{O(1)} N$. The final result comes from letting ϵ above be smaller by a suitable large constant (to get the cut slack from $N^{O(\epsilon)}$ to n^{ϵ}). Our depth bound is symmetric.

Lastly, we discuss how to compute our witness. The basic idea is to slightly strengthen the expander decomposition we compute to deal with the slacks from Lemma 13.4. In particular, recall that by Lemma 13.4 if the graph is already ($\leq h \cdot \frac{1}{\epsilon} \cdot s^{O(1/\epsilon)}, s$)-length ϕ -expanding then when we apply Lemma 13.4 we get a ($\leq h, s_w$)-length ϕ_w -expansion witness where $s_w = \frac{1}{\epsilon^2} \cdot s^{O(1/\epsilon)}$ and $\phi_w = \tilde{O}(\phi \epsilon / N^{O(\epsilon)})$.

Fix an ϵ and let $\epsilon_0 = \text{poly}(\epsilon)$ so that if $s_0 = \exp(\text{poly}(1/\epsilon_0))$ we have that

$$\frac{1}{\epsilon_0^2} \cdot s_0^{O(1/\epsilon_0)} \le \exp(\operatorname{poly}(1/\epsilon))$$

and we let $\phi_0 = \phi \cdot \tilde{O}\left(N^{O(\epsilon_0)}\right) / \epsilon_0$ so that

$$\phi \ge \phi_0 \cdot \epsilon / \tilde{O}(N^{O(\epsilon)})$$

Thus, if our graph is $(\leq h_0, s_0)$ -length ϕ_0 -expanding and we apply Lemma 13.4 with these parameters then we get back a $(\leq h, s)$ -length ϕ -expansion witness.

Next, apply our algorithm for computing length-constrained expander decompositions using ϵ_0 to compute a ($\leq h_0, s_0$)-length ϕ_0 -expander decomposition. Since $h_0 \geq h$ and $\epsilon_0 = \text{poly}(\epsilon)$, such a decomposition is a ($\leq h, \exp(\text{poly}(\epsilon))$)-length ϕ -expander decomposition but with a multiplicative cut slack increase of $\phi_0/\phi = N^{O(\epsilon_0)}/\epsilon_0$ for a total cut slack of (assuming $\epsilon_0 \geq \log \log N/\log N$)

$$N^{\epsilon_0} \cdot N^{O(\epsilon_0)} / \epsilon_0 = N^{O(\epsilon_0) \log(\epsilon_0)} / \epsilon_0 \le N^{O(\epsilon_0)}$$

Lastly, letting ϵ_0 be smaller by an appropriate polynomial gives a length slack of $\exp(\text{poly}(\epsilon))$ and cut slack of n^{ϵ} . Furthermore, the time to compute this expander decomposition is as described above since our parameters have only changed by a polynomial. Furthermore, if we apply Lemma 13.4 after applying the above decomposition we get back the desired witness. Finally, the work to invoke Lemma 13.4 with $L = N_0^{\epsilon}$ is

$$\begin{split} m \cdot \tilde{O}\left(\frac{1}{\epsilon_{0}} \cdot s_{0}^{O(1/\epsilon_{0})} \cdot N^{O(\epsilon_{0})} + \frac{1}{\epsilon_{0}} \cdot N^{\epsilon_{0}} \cdot N^{O(\epsilon_{0})} \cdot \operatorname{poly}(h)\right) + \frac{\tilde{O}(1)}{\operatorname{poly}(\epsilon_{0})} \sum_{i} W_{\mathrm{ED}}(A_{i}, m_{i}) \\ &\leq m \cdot \tilde{O}\left(\frac{1}{\epsilon_{0}} \cdot s_{0}^{O(1/\epsilon_{0})} \cdot N^{O(\epsilon_{0})} + \frac{1}{\epsilon} \cdot N^{O(\epsilon_{0})} \cdot \operatorname{poly}(h)\right) \\ &\quad + \frac{\tilde{O}(1)}{\operatorname{poly}(\epsilon_{0})} \sum_{i} m_{i} \cdot \tilde{O}\left(N^{O(\operatorname{poly}(\epsilon_{0}))} \cdot \operatorname{poly}(h)\right) \\ &\leq m \cdot \tilde{O}\left(\frac{1}{\epsilon_{0}} \cdot s_{0}^{O(1/\epsilon_{0})} \cdot N^{O(\epsilon_{0})} + \frac{1}{\epsilon} \cdot N^{O(\epsilon_{0})} \cdot \operatorname{poly}(h)\right) \\ &\quad + \frac{\tilde{O}(1)}{\operatorname{poly}(\epsilon_{0})} \frac{1}{\epsilon_{0}} \cdot \tilde{O}(m + n^{1+O(\epsilon_{0})} + N^{O(\epsilon_{0})}) \cdot \tilde{O}\left(N^{O(\operatorname{poly}(\epsilon_{0}))} \cdot \operatorname{poly}(h)\right) \\ &\leq m \cdot \tilde{O}\left(N^{O(\operatorname{poly}(\epsilon))} \cdot \operatorname{poly}(h)\right) \end{split}$$

where above we applied the previously described algorithm for expander decompositions and in the last line we again assumed $\epsilon \geq 1/\log^{1/c} N$ for a suitable large constant c. Note that the above is asymptotically the same as the time to compute our expander decompositions. The depth calculation is analogous.

In Section 16 we show how to achieve the above algorithm with the linkedness property. Likewise, we note that the above algorithm immediately gives "witnessed" expander decompositions. Specifically, if we run the above algorithm after already applying our expander decomposition, then we find no sparse cuts and the output of our algorithm (and, in particular, Lemma 13.4) is a collection of routers, one for each cluster of our neighborhood cover, along with an embedding of a router into each cluster of the neighborhood cover. We also note that plugging the above result into Lemma 13.4 gives efficient approximation algorithms for the demand-size-largest cut problem.

16 Maintaining Extra Properties (Theorem 1.1 with Linkedness)

In the previous sections we showed how repeatedly cutting large length-constrained sparse cuts gives length-constrained expander decompositions. In this section, we discuss how to incorporate additional graph properties—in particular, the linkedness property—into these decompositions.

Techniques. The basic idea for achieving said properties is to use the robustness of lengthconstrained expanders. In particular, start with a length-constrained expander decomposition. The resulting graph is a length-constrained expander but may not have our desired properties. We then force our graph to have our properties, possibly at the expense of length-constrained expansion. By the robustness properties of length-constrained expanders, we can easily restore length-constrained expansion, now possibly at the cost of our properties. Going back and forth between restoring our properties and length-constrained expansion eventually gives us a length-constrained expander with our desired properties. We call a \mathcal{P} set of (possibly infinitely many) graphs a property. We say that a graph G has property \mathcal{P} iff $G \in \mathcal{P}$. We say that an algorithm \mathcal{A} maintains property \mathcal{P} with initial rate $I : \mathbb{R}^+ \to \mathbb{R}^+$ and maintenance rate $M : \mathbb{R}^+ \to \mathbb{R}^+$, iff for every graph G on n vertices,

- the algorithm \mathcal{A} can first find a subset $E' \subseteq E(G)$ of at most $I(n) \cdot |E(G)|$ edges such that the graph $G' = G \setminus E'$ has property \mathcal{P} ; and
- upon any online sequence of k edge deletions from G', the algorithm \mathcal{A} maintains a pruned set of at most $M(n) \cdot k$ edges of G', such that when the edges in the pruned set are removed from G', the remaining graph has property \mathcal{P} .

In this case, we also say that the property \mathcal{P} has (or can be maintained with) rate $(I(\cdot), M(\cdot))$.

The main result in this section is the following theorem. We will first prove this theorem, and then use it to achieve an additional linkedness property in Theorem 1.1.

Theorem 16.1. Let $\mathcal{P}_1, \ldots, \mathcal{P}_k$ be graph properties with rates $(I_1, M_1), \ldots, (I_k, M_k)$ respectively where $M_1 \geq \cdots \geq M_k$. Assume further that

- $M_1 \cdot \sum_{2 \le i \le k} M_i < 1/4$; and
- $\sum_{2 \le i \le k} M_i < 1/2.$

Then property $\mathcal{P} = \bigcap_{1 \le i \le k} \mathcal{P}_i$ can be maintained with rates $(O(\sum_{1 \le i \le k} I_i), O(\sum_{1 \le i \le k} M_i)).$

16.1 Proof of Theorem 16.1

The remainder of this section is dedicated to the proof of Theorem 16.1. We first prove the following lemma, which is the special case of Theorem 16.1 where k = 2.

Lemma 16.2. Let $\mathcal{P}_1, \mathcal{P}_2$ be graph properties with rates (I_1, M_1) and (I_2, M_2) . If $M_1 \cdot M_2 < 1/2$, then the property $\mathcal{P}_1 \cap \mathcal{P}_2$ can be maintained with rate $(I_1 + (2 + 2M_1) \cdot I_2, M_1 + 2(1 + M_1)^2 \cdot M_2)$.

Proof. Denote by \mathcal{A}_1 and \mathcal{A}_2 the algorithms for maintaining \mathcal{P}_1 and \mathcal{P}_2 with rates (I_1, M_1) and (I_2, M_2) , respectively. We now describe an algorithm that maintains property $\mathcal{P}_1 \cap \mathcal{P}_2$. We first apply \mathcal{A}_1 to G and compute a set $E_0^1 \subseteq E(G)$ of edges such that $|E_0^1| \leq I_1 \cdot |E(G)|$ and $G \setminus E_0^1$ has property \mathcal{P}_1 . We then apply \mathcal{A}_2 to $G \setminus E_0^1$ and compute a set $E_0^2 \subseteq E(G \setminus E_0^1)$ of edges such that $|E_0^2| \leq I_1 \cdot |E(G \setminus (E_0^1 \cup E_0^2))|$ and $G \setminus (E_0^1 \cup E_0^2)$ has property \mathcal{P}_2 . We then perform iterations. In the *i*th iteration, we iteratively maintain properties \mathcal{P}_1 and \mathcal{P}_2 , starting with a graph G_{i-1} (where $G_0 = G \setminus (E_0^1 \cup E_0^2)$). We apply \mathcal{A}_1 to compute a set $E_i^1 \subseteq E(G_{i-1})$ such that $|E_i^1| \leq M_1 \cdot |E_{i-1}^2|$ $G_{i-1} \setminus E_i^1$ has property \mathcal{P}_1 , and then apply \mathcal{A}_2 to compute a set $E_i^2 \subseteq E(G_{i-1} \setminus E_i^1)$ such that $G_{i-1} \setminus (E_i^1 \cup E_i^2)$ has property \mathcal{P}_1 . Define $G_i = G_{i-1} \setminus (E_i^1 \cup E_i^2)$ and continue to the next iteration. Whenever in some iteration i^* we have $E_{i^*}^1 = E_{i^*}^2 = \emptyset$, we terminate the algorithm and return the graph G_i . In other words, the set of edges that we have removed from G is $E' = \bigcup_{0 \le i \le i} (E_i^1 \cup E_i^2)$.

We now describe an ball-moving abstract process and use it to estimate the size of set E'. We have two boxes denoted by B_1 and B_2 , respectively. Initially, B_1 contains $I_1 \cdot |E(G)|$ inactive balls and B_2 contains $I_2 \cdot |E(G)|$ active balls. In each iteration, we either deactivate t balls in B_1 (if B_1 contains at least t active balls at the moment) and add $t \cdot M_2$ new active balls to B_2 , or deactivate t balls from B_2 (if B_2 contains at least t active balls at the moment) and add $t \cdot M_1$ new active balls to B_1 , for an arbitrary t. The process can continue for arbitrarily many iterations and may terminate at any point.

On the one hand, we show our algorithm can be modelled a realization of the process, such that the size of E' is bounded by the number of balls in $B_1 \cup B_2$ at the terminating point. Recall that our algorithm starts by computing a set E_0^1 and then a set E_0^2 to initiate properties \mathcal{P}_1 and \mathcal{P}_2 , where $|E_0^1| \leq I_1 \cdot |E(G)|$ and $|E_0^2| \leq I_2 \cdot |E(G)|$. The reason that the initial balls in B_1 are inactive while the initial balls in B_2 are active is because the set E_0^2 is computed in graph $G \setminus E_1^0$, which means that the edges in E_1^0 are not viewed as the online updates for property \mathcal{P}_2 . In the first iteration after the initialization, we compute a new prune set $|E_1^1| \leq M_1 \cdot |E_0^2|$ to maintain \mathcal{P}_1 . This can be viewed as deactivating $|E_1^1|/M_1 \leq |E_0^2|$ balls in B_2 and add $|E_1^1|$ new active balls in B_1 . Similarly, in the algorithm we then compute a new prune set E_1^2 to maintain \mathcal{P}_1 , and this can be viewed as deactivating $|E_1^2|/M_1$ balls in B_2 and add $|E_1^2|$ new active balls in B_2 . Later iterations can be simulated in a similar way. The algorithm ends whenever $E_{i^*}^1 = E_{i^*}^2 = \emptyset$ for some i^* , and we let the process end at the same time.

From the definition of maintenance rate, upon k online updates, property \mathcal{P}_i can be maintained by a pruned set of at most $M_i \cdot k$ edges. This is exactly modelled by our process. In particular, every time we compute a set E_i^1 , in our process we deactivate $|E_i^1|/M_2$ balls from B_2 , so we are guaranteed that r active balls in one B_2 can give birth to at most $M_2 \cdot r$ new balls in B_1 . Therefore, at any time, we are never required to deactivate more balls than the current active balls in a box. As every edge in the pruned set E' corresponds to a distinct ball in B_1 or B_2 , the size of E' is bounded by the number of balls in $B_1 \cup B_2$ at the end of the process.

On the other hand, we show that, no matter how the process proceeds, the number of balls in $B_1 \cup B_2$ at any time is at most $(I_1 + (2 + 2M_1) \cdot I_2)$. In fact, for each initial active ball in B_2 , it will eventually gives birth to at most $1 + M_1 + M_2M_1 + M_1M_2M_1 + \cdots$ balls in the final set. Therefore, the number of balls in $B_1 \cup B_2$ at any time is bounded by

$$|E(G)| \cdot \left(I_1 + I_2 + M_1 I_2 + M_2 (M_1 I_2) + M_1 (M_2 M_1 I_2) + \cdots \right)$$

$$\leq |E(G)| \cdot \left(I_1 + I_2 \cdot (1 + M_1) \cdot \frac{1}{1 - M_1 M_2} \right)$$

$$\leq |E(G)| \cdot (I_1 + (2 + 2M_1) \cdot I_2),$$

as $M_1M_2 \leq 1/2$. Therefore, our algorithm initializes property $\mathcal{P}_1 \cap \mathcal{P}_2$ with rate $I \leq I_1 + (2+2M_1) \cdot I_2$.

Now upon an update, we perform iterations as exactly described before to maintain properties \mathcal{P}_1 and \mathcal{P}_2 . Via a similar ball-moving process, we can show that the pruned set upon every update has size at most

$$M \le M_1 + (1+M_1)M_2 + M_1(1+M_1)M_2 + M_2(M_1(1+M_1)M_2) + \cdots$$

$$\le M_1 + M_2 \cdot (1+M_1)^2 \cdot \frac{1}{1-M_1M_2}$$

$$\le M_1 + 2(1+M_1)^2 \cdot M_2.$$

We now prove Theorem 16.1 using Lemma 16.2. Denote $I = \sum_{1 \le i \le k} I_i$ and $M = \sum_{1 \le i \le k} M_i$.

We first show that property $\mathcal{P}' = \bigcap_{2 \le i \le k} \mathcal{P}_i$ can be maintained with initial rate $I' = O(\sum_{2 \le i \le k} I_i)$ and maintenance rate $M' = O(\sum_{2 \le i \le k} M_i)$. We describe an algorithm similar to (but simpler than) the one in the proof of Lemma 16.2 that maintains property \mathcal{P} . Denote by \mathcal{A}_i the algorithm for maintaining property \mathcal{P}_i . We perform iterations. In the first iteration, we start with a graph $G_0 = G$, and apply \mathcal{A}_i to compute a set $E_i^1 \subseteq E(G)$ such that $G \setminus E_i^1$ has property \mathcal{P}_i . Define $E^1 = \bigcup_{1 \le i \le k} E_i^1$, so $|E^1| \le (\sum_{2 \le i \le k} I_i) \cdot |E(G)|$. We remove edges in E^1 from graph G_0 and denote by G_1 the remaining graph as the outcome of iteration 1. We now describe the second iteration. Observe that, for each $1 \le i \le k$, the graph G_1 produced by iteration 1 can be seen as obtained from $G \setminus E_i^1$ by removing edges in $E^1 \setminus E_i^1$. Note that $G \setminus E_i^1$ has property \mathcal{P}_i . From the definition of maintenance rate, we can apply \mathcal{A}_i to compute another set $E_i^2 \subseteq E(G_1)$ with $|E_i^2| \le M_i \cdot |E^1 \setminus E_i^1| \le M_i \cdot |E^1|$, such that $G_1 \setminus E_i^2$ has property \mathcal{P}_i . Define $E^2 = \bigcup_{1 \le i \le k} E_i^2$, so $|E^2| \le (\sum_{2 \le i \le k} M_i) \cdot |E^1|$. We sequentially perform iteration j for $j = 3, 4, \ldots$ similarly and compute sets E^3, E^4, \ldots . Whenever for some iteration the set E^{i^*} is empty, we terminate the algorithm and return E' as the union of all sets $E^1, E^2, \ldots, E^{i^*}$ computed in these iterations. Via a similar ball-moving process as in the proof of Lemma 16.2, we can show that

$$\begin{aligned} |E'| &\leq \sum_{2 \leq i \leq k} I_i \cdot |E(G)| + \sum_{j \geq 1} \left(\sum_{2 \leq i \leq k} M_i\right)^j \cdot \sum_{2 \leq i \leq k} I_i \cdot |E(G)| \\ &\leq \frac{\sum_{2 \leq i \leq k} I_i}{1 - \sum_{2 \leq i \leq k} M_i} \cdot |E(G)| \leq 2 \cdot \sum_{2 \leq i \leq k} I_i \cdot |E(G)|. \end{aligned}$$

In other words, the initial rate of property \mathcal{P}' is at most $I' \leq 2 \cdot \sum_{2 \leq i \leq k} I_i$. The same algorithm can also be used to deal with online update sequence. Via similar arguments, we can show that the maintenance rate is at most

$$M' = \left(\sum_{2 \le i \le k} M_i\right) + \left(\sum_{2 \le i \le k} M_i\right)^2 + \left(\sum_{2 \le i \le k} M_i\right)^3 + \dots \le \frac{\sum_{2 \le i \le k} M_i}{1 - \sum_{2 \le i \le k} M_i} \le 2 \cdot \sum_{2 \le i \le k} M_i.$$

We then show that property $\mathcal{P}_1 \cap \mathcal{P}'$ can be maintained with rate (O(I), O(M)). Note that $M_1 \cdot M' \leq M_1 \cdot 2 \cdot \sum_{2 \leq i \leq k} M_i \leq 1/2$. Applying Lemma 16.2 to properties \mathcal{P}' and \mathcal{P}_1 , we get that property \mathcal{P} can be maintained with initial rate

$$I' + (2 + 2M') \cdot I_1 \le I' + (2 + 2 \cdot 2 \cdot 1/2)I_1 \le 5 \cdot \sum_{1 \le i \le k} I_i,$$

and maintenance rate

$$M' + 2(1+M')^2 \cdot M_1 \le M' + 2(1+2\cdot 1/2)^2 M_1 \le 9 \cdot \sum_{1 \le i \le k} M_i$$

16.2 Achieving Linkedness in Theorem 1.1

Let G be the input graph. We define the property $\mathcal{P}(G,\beta)$ as all graphs G' with $G' = G - C + L_C^\beta$ for some moving cut C. Clearly, for graph G, its initial rate is 0, and its maintenance rate is β (as removing an edge will cause β self-loops to be added).

Set $s = \exp(\text{poly}(1/\epsilon))$ as in Theorem 1.1. Let $\mathcal{P}(h, s, \phi)$ be the set of all (h, s)-length ϕ -expanders.

The algorithm for preserving both properties $\mathcal{P}(G,\beta)$ and $\mathcal{P}(h,s,\phi)$ works as follows. Let

$$k = \frac{\text{poly}(\epsilon)}{\epsilon}, \quad k' = 1/\text{poly}(\epsilon).$$

We first apply a $(hk', s/\operatorname{poly}(\epsilon))$ -length $(\phi \cdot 2^{O(k)} \cdot N^{O(1/k')} \cdot \log^2 N)$ -expander decomposition. This has initial rate $\phi \cdot 2^{O(k)} \cdot N^{O(1/k')} \cdot \log^2 N \cdot N^{\epsilon}$. From Theorem 8.1 and Theorem 11.1, its maintenance rate is $\phi \cdot (N^{\epsilon} \cdot 2^{O(k)} \cdot N^{O(1/k')}) \log N = \phi \cdot N^{\operatorname{poly}(\epsilon)}$. Therefore, as long as $\beta \leq \frac{1}{2\phi} \cdot N^{\operatorname{poly}(\epsilon)}$, from Lemma 16.2, properties $\mathcal{P}(G,\beta)$ and $\mathcal{P}(h,s,\phi)$ can be achieved by alternately applying the algorithms for maintaining $\mathcal{P}(G,\beta)$ and $\mathcal{P}(h,s,\phi)$, with the running time dominated by the initialization running time.

References

- [ABS15] Sanjeev Arora, Boaz Barak, and David Steurer. Subexponential algorithms for unique games and related problems. *Journal of the ACM (JACM)*, 62(5):1–25, 2015.
- [ASS08] Noga Alon, Oded Schwartz, and Asaf Shapira. An elementary construction of constant-degree expanders. *Combinatorics, Probability and Computing*, 17(3):319– 327, 2008.
- [BFU92] Andrei Z Broder, Alan M Frieze, and Eli Upfal. Existence and construction of edge disjoint paths on expander graphs. In Annual ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing (STOC), pages 140–149, 1992.
- [Ble96] Guy E Blelloch. Programming parallel algorithms. *Communications of the ACM*, 39(3):85–97, 1996.
- [CGL⁺20] Julia Chuzhoy, Yu Gao, Jason Li, Danupon Nanongkai, Richard Peng, and Thatchaphol Saranurak. A deterministic algorithm for balanced cut with applications to dynamic connectivity, flows, and beyond. In Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science (FOCS), pages 1158–1167. IEEE, 2020.
- [Chu23] Julia Chuzhoy. A distanced matching game, decremental apps in expanders, and faster deterministic algorithms for graph cut problems. In *Proceedings of the ACM-SIAM* Symposium on Discrete Algorithms, 2023.
- [CZ23] Julia Chuzhoy and Ruimin Zhang. A new deterministic algorithm for fully dynamic all-pairs shortest paths. In *Proceedings of the 55th Annual ACM Symposium on Theory* of Computing, pages 1159–1172, 2023.
- [DSHK⁺11] Atish Das Sarma, Stephan Holzer, Liah Kor, Amos Korman, Danupon Nanongkai, Gopal Pandurangan, David Peleg, and Roger Wattenhofer. Distributed verification and hardness of distributed approximation. In Annual ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing (STOC), pages 363–372, 2011.

- [Fri01] Alan M Frieze. Edge-disjoint paths in expander graphs. SIAM Journal on Computing, 30(6):1790–1801, 2001.
- [GHZ21] Mohsen Ghaffari, Bernhard Haeupler, and Goran Zuzic. Hop-constrained oblivious routing. In Annual ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing (STOC), pages 1208– 1220, 2021.
- [GK07] Naveen Garg and Jochen Könemann. Faster and simpler algorithms for multicommodity flow and other fractional packing problems. *SIAM Journal on Computing*, 37(2):630–652, 2007.
- [GKS17] Mohsen Ghaffari, Fabian Kuhn, and Hsin-Hao Su. Distributed mst and routing in almost mixing time. In ACM Symposium on Principles of Distributed Computing (PODC), pages 131–140, 2017.
- [GL18] Mohsen Ghaffari and Jason Li. New distributed algorithms in almost mixing time via transformations from parallel algorithms. In *International Symposium on Distributed Computing (DISC)*, 2018.
- [GRST21] Gramoz Goranci, Harald Räcke, Thatchaphol Saranurak, and Zihan Tan. The expander hierarchy and its applications to dynamic graph algorithms. In Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms (SODA), pages 2212–2228. SIAM, 2021.
- [HHG22] Bernhard Haeupler, Jonas Huebotter, and Mohsen Ghaffari. A cut-matching game for constant-hop expanders. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2211.11726*, 2022.
- [HHL⁺24] Bernhard Haeupler, D Ellis Hershkowitz, Jason Li, Antti Röyskö, and Thatchaphol Saranurak. Low-step multi-commodity flow emulators. In Annual ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing (STOC), 2024.
- [HHS23] Bernhard Haeupler, D Ellis Hershkowitz, and Thatchaphol Saranurak. Maximum length-constrained flows and disjoint paths: Distributed, deterministic and fast. In Annual ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing (STOC), 2023.
- [HHT23] Bernhard Haeupler, D Ellis Hershkowitz, and Zihan Tan. Parallel greedy spanners. arXiv preprint arXiv:2304.08892, 2023.
- [HLS24] Bernhard Haeupler, Yaowei Long, and Thatchaphol Saranurak. Dynamic deterministic constant-approximate distance oracles with n to the epsilon worst-case update time. arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.18541, 2024.
- [HRG22] Bernhard Haeupler, Harald Räcke, and Mohsen Ghaffari. Hop-constrained expander decompositions, oblivious routing, and distributed universal optimality. In Annual ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing (STOC), pages 1325–1338, 2022.
- [HWZ20] Bernhard Haeupler, David Wajc, and Goran Zuzic. Network coding gaps for completion times of multiple unicasts. In Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science (FOCS), pages 494–505. IEEE, 2020.

[KKOV07]	Rohit Khandekar, Subhash Khot, Lorenzo Orecchia, and Nisheeth K Vishnoi. On a cut-matching game for the sparsest cut problem. Univ. California, Berkeley, CA, USA, Tech. Rep. UCB/EECS-2007-177, 6(7):12, 2007.
[KR96]	Jon Kleinberg and Ronitt Rubinfeld. Short paths in expander graphs. In Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science (FOCS), pages 86–95. IEEE, 1996.
[KRV09]	Rohit Khandekar, Satish Rao, and Umesh Vazirani. Graph partitioning using single commodity flows. <i>Journal of the ACM (JACM)</i> , 56(4):1–15, 2009.
[KT18]	Ken-ichi Kawarabayashi and Mikkel Thorup. Deterministic edge connectivity in near- linear time. Journal of the ACM (JACM), 66(1):1–50, 2018.
[Li21]	Jason Li. Deterministic mincut in almost-linear time. In Annual ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing (STOC), pages 384–395, 2021.
[LMR94]	Frank Thomson Leighton, Bruce M Maggs, and Satish B Rao. Packet routing and job-shop scheduling in o (congestion+ dilation) steps. <i>Combinatorica</i> , 14(2):167–186, 1994.
[LR99]	Tom Leighton and Satish Rao. Multicommodity max-flow min-cut theorems and their use in designing approximation algorithms. <i>Journal of the ACM (JACM)</i> , 46(6):787–832, 1999.
[Lub85]	Michael Luby. A simple parallel algorithm for the maximal independent set problem. In Annual ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing (STOC), pages 1–10, 1985.
[NSWN17]	Danupon Nanongkai, Thatchaphol Saranurak, and Christian Wulff-Nilsen. Dynamic minimum spanning forest with subpolynomial worst-case update time. In Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science (FOCS), pages 950–961. IEEE, 2017.
[PR00]	David Peleg and Vitaly Rubinovich. A near-tight lower bound on the time com- plexity of distributed minimum-weight spanning tree construction. <i>SIAM Journal on</i> <i>Computing</i> , 30(5):1427–1442, 2000.
[PU87]	David Peleg and Eli Upfal. Constructing disjoint paths on expander graphs. In Annual ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing (STOC), pages 264–273, 1987.
[Rac02]	Harald Racke. Minimizing congestion in general networks. In Symposium on Foun- dations of Computer Science (FOCS), pages 43–52. IEEE, 2002.
[RS10]	Prasad Raghavendra and David Steurer. Graph expansion and the unique games conjecture. In Annual ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing (STOC), pages 755–764, 2010.
[ST81]	Daniel D Sleator and Robert Endre Tarjan. A data structure for dynamic trees. In Annual ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing (STOC), pages 114–122, 1981.
[ST04]	Daniel A Spielman and Shang-Hua Teng. Nearly-linear time algorithms for graph partitioning, graph sparsification, and solving linear systems. In Annual ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing (STOC), pages 81–90, 2004.

- [SW19] Thatchaphol Saranurak and Di Wang. Expander decomposition and pruning: Faster, stronger, and simpler. In Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms (SODA), pages 2616–2635. SIAM, 2019.
- [Tre05] Luca Trevisan. Approximation algorithms for unique games. In Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science (FOCS), pages 197–205. IEEE, 2005.
- [Val90] Leslie G Valiant. General purpose parallel architectures. In *Algorithms and Complexity*, pages 943–971. Elsevier, 1990.
- [vdBLN⁺20] Jan van den Brand, Yin-Tat Lee, Danupon Nanongkai, Richard Peng, Thatchaphol Saranurak, Aaron Sidford, Zhao Song, and Di Wang. Bipartite matching in nearlylinear time on moderately dense graphs. In 2020 IEEE 61st Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science (FOCS), pages 919–930. IEEE, 2020.
- [W⁺01] Douglas Brent West et al. *Introduction to graph theory*, volume 2. Prentice hall Upper Saddle River, 2001.