

Fully Polynomial-Time Distributed Computation in Low-Treewidth Graphs

Taisuke Izumi* Naoki Kitamura† Takamasa Naruse‡ Gregory Schwartzman§

Abstract

We consider global problems, i.e. problems that take at least diameter time, even when the bandwidth is not restricted. We show that all problems considered admit efficient solutions in low-treewidth graphs. By “efficient” we mean that the running time has polynomial dependence on the treewidth, a linear dependence on the diameter (which is unavoidable), and only a *polylogarithmic* dependence on n , the number of nodes in the graph. We present the following results in the CONGEST model (where τ and D denote the treewidth and diameter of the graph, respectively):

- Exact single-source shortest paths (Actually, the more general problem of computing a distance labeling scheme) for weighted and directed graphs can be computed in $\tilde{O}(\tau^2 D + \tau^5)$ rounds¹. This is the first exact algorithm for the directed single-source shortest paths problem in low-treewidth graphs attaining a $\tilde{O}(\tau^{O(1)} D)$ -round running time.
- Exact bipartite unweighted maximum matching can be computed in $\tilde{O}(\tau^4 D + \tau^7)$ rounds. This is the first algorithm for a non-trivial graph class that achieves a worst case running time *sublinear* in the input size.
- The weighted girth can be computed in $\tilde{O}(\tau^2 D + \tau^5)$ rounds for both directed and undirected graphs. Our results are the first to imply an *exponential* separation between the complexity of computing girth and diameter for a non-trivial graph class.

Although the above problems are seemingly unrelated, we derive all of our results using a single unified framework. Our framework consists of two novel technical ingredients. The first is a fully polynomial-time distributed tree decomposition algorithm, which outputs a decomposition of width $O(\tau^2 \log n)$ in $\tilde{O}(\tau^2 D + \tau^3)$ rounds (where n is the number of nodes in the graph). The second ingredient, and the technical highlight of this paper, is the novel concept of a *stateful walk constraint*, which naturally defines a set of feasible walks in the input graph based on their local properties (e.g., augmenting paths). Given a stateful walk constraint, the constrained version of the shortest paths problem (or distance labeling) requires the algorithm to output the shortest *constrained* walk (or its distance) for a given source and sink vertices. We show that this problem can be efficiently solved in the CONGEST model by reducing it to an *unconstrained* version of the problem.

*Graduate School of Information Science and Technology, Osaka University, 1-5, Yamadaoka, Suita, Osaka, 565-0871, Japan. E-mail: t-izumi@ist.osaka-u.ac.jp.

†Graduate School of Engineering, Nagoya Institute of Technology, Gokiso-cho, Showa-ku, Nagoya, Aichi, 466-8555, Japan. E-mail: ktmr522@yahoo.co.jp.

‡Graduate School of Engineering, Nagoya Institute of Technology, Gokiso-cho, Showa-ku, Nagoya, Aichi, 466-8555, Japan. E-mail: t.naruse.333@stn.nitech.ac.jp.

§Japan Advanced Institute of Science and Technology (JAIST), 1-1 Asahidai, Nomi, Ishikawa 923-1292 Japan. E-mail: greg@jaist.ac.jp.

¹The $\tilde{O}(\cdot)$ notation hides polylog(n) factors.

1 Introduction

1.1 Background and Motivation

The *treewidth* is one of the most important graph parameters and has received a huge amount of attention in the context of centralized algorithms [CFK⁺15]. Informally speaking, it represents the graph’s similarity to a tree (e.g., a tree has treewidth 1, a cycle has treewidth 2, a clique on n nodes has treewidth $n - 1$). In the context of centralized algorithms, a vast class of computationally hard problems is efficiently solvable in low-treewidth graphs. Furthermore, many real-world data sets are indeed low-treewidth graphs [MSJ19].

In this work, we focus on the CONGEST model of distributed computation (see Section 2.1 for a formal definition). The inherent bandwidth limitation in the CONGEST model precludes any efficient centralized solution by aggregating the entire topological information of the network, and thus our algorithms must make do with only *local* information. The usefulness of the treewidth parameter in the CONGEST is mostly due to the recent framework of *low-congestion shortcuts* [GH16b, HIZ16, HLZ18], which provides efficient group communication for a collection of subgraphs [GH16b]. Based on this framework, several algorithms have achieved near-optimal running times for various fundamental problems in low-treewidth graphs [GH16a, GH16b, HIZ16, HLZ18]. For example, minimum-spanning tree, minimum-cut approximation, and approximate undirected single-source shortest paths [GH16b, HIZ16, HL18, ZGY⁺22].

While the low-congestion shortcut framework is a valuable tool for designing CONGEST algorithms (and is also used in this paper), it is a general framework, not limited to any specific graph class. Thus, it leaves many intriguing open questions for the family of low-treewidth graphs. For example, the problems of computing an *efficient* tree decomposition and designing efficient algorithms for fundamental problems based on tree decomposition make explicit use of the structure of low-treewidth graphs. Currently, the only relevant result is due to Li [Li18], which presents a CONGEST algorithm with a running time of $\tilde{O}(\tau^\tau D)$ rounds that computes a tree decomposition of width $O(\tau)$ with applications to the distributed computation of optimal solutions for classic NP-hard problems (e.g., vertex cover) whose running time exponentially depends only on the width of the computed decomposition.

1.2 Our Results

We focus on the study of fully polynomial-time distributed computation in low-treewidth graphs. Where “fully polynomial-time” means that the running time of algorithms depends polynomially on the treewidth of the input graph, linearly on its unweighted diameter D and only has polylogarithmic dependence on n . This can be seen as a distributed analogue of the recent work of [FLP⁺17], which considers problems whose non-parametrized complexity has a super-linear dependence on the input size and presents algorithms whose running time depends polynomially on the treewidth and only *linearly* on the input size. As most of the problems which admit an improved running time for low-treewidth graphs are *global* problems, they admit the universal lower bound of $\Omega(D)$ rounds in the distributed setting. Where the term “universal” means that the lower bound holds for *any* instance. Hence our analog of linear dependence on the input size as a linear dependence on D is very natural.

Our results are not the first to achieve a fully polynomial-time dependence on the treewidth. Specifically, the shortcut-based MST and approximate min-cut algorithms mentioned in Sec. 1.1 require $\tilde{O}(\tau D)$ rounds, which beats the $\tilde{\Omega}(\sqrt{n} + D)$ -round lower bound for general graphs [DSHK⁺11]. However, due to the general nature of the shortcut framework, it does not take full advantage of the structure of specific graph classes. This is exemplified in the recent work of [GP17, LP19, Par20]

on planar graphs. While planar graphs admit efficient shortcut-based algorithms [GH16a, GH16b], it is possible to achieve improved results and tackle new problems by leveraging techniques that are specific to planar graphs. Our research can be seen as a low-treewidth counterpart of these results. The main contribution of this paper is a single algorithmic framework from which we are able to derive fully polynomial-time algorithms in low-treewidth graphs for a set of seemingly unrelated problems. In what follows, we explain the details of our results.

Distance Labeling and Single-Source Shortest Paths Distance labeling (DL) is the problem of assigning vertices with short labels such that it is possible to compute the distance from u to v only by using their labels. The standard single-source shortest paths problem (SSSP) is easily reduced to distance labeling: the source node simply distributes its label to all other nodes. We present a randomized algorithm for exact *directed* DL, which correctly constructs all of the labels in $\tilde{O}(\tau^2 D + \tau^5)$ rounds with high probability (whp)². It is known that the undirected weighted shortest-path problem require $\tilde{\Omega}(\sqrt{n} + D)$ rounds [DSHK⁺11] for general graphs, even for approximate solutions. The first improvement of this bound for low-treewidth graphs is due to Haeupler and Li [HL18]. Their algorithm applies to any undirected graph that admits good shortcuts, including low-treewidth graphs (the running time and approximation factor depend on the quality of the shortcut). However, the approximation factor achieved is super-constant and their results do not extend to *directed* graphs. Concurrently and independently of our work, the approximation ratio and running time of [HL18] was recently improved to $(1 + \epsilon)$ and $\tilde{O}(\tau D n^{o(1)})$ [ZGY⁺22]. However, their results do not apply for *exact* distance computation nor to directed graphs.

Exact Maximum Matching We present a randomized algorithm that computes exact unweighted maximum matching in bipartite graphs running in $\tilde{O}(\tau^4 D + \tau^7)$ rounds. While the maximum matching problem has received much attention in the context of distributed approximation [KMW06, AKO18, LPSP15, BYCHGS17], the complexity of finding an exact solution is yet unknown. For general graphs, [BKS19] were the first to present a non-trivial algorithm with a running time of $O(s_{\max}^2)$ rounds, where s_{\max} is the size of the maximum matching. This was recently improved to $O(s_{\max}^{3/2})$ [KI22]. For the case of bipartite graphs, an algorithm by Ahmadi et al. [AKO18] is the only result for exact maximum matching. It achieves a running time of $\tilde{O}(s_{\max})$ rounds (and thus the worst-case bound is $\tilde{O}(n)$, even in low-treewidth graphs). We present the first algorithm for a non-trivial graph class which achieves a running time sublinear in n .

Weighted Girth We present a randomized algorithm that computes the weighted girth, g , of a directed or undirected input graph in $\tilde{O}(\tau^2 D + \tau^5)$ rounds with high probability. The best known upper bound for computing g in general graphs is $\tilde{O}(\min\{gn^{1-\Theta(1/g)}, n\})$ rounds [CHFG⁺20], and a lower bound of $\tilde{\Omega}(\sqrt{n} + D)$ rounds is also known for unweighted and undirected graphs [FHW12]. The lower bound holds even for a $(2 - \epsilon)$ -approximation of g . Planar graphs admit an efficient solution for computing g in $\tilde{O}(D^2)$ rounds [LP19]. Our approach is structural and is based on a very simple (randomized) reduction of girth computation to a distance labeling scheme. Our techniques are novel and we believe that they may be applicable to other graph classes.

Our result is the first separation between the complexity of diameter computation and girth computation in undirected and unweighted graphs. All previously known results exhibit similar complexity bounds for both problems, i.e., $\Omega(n^{\Theta(1)})$ -round lower bounds for general graphs, and $\tilde{O}(D^{O(1)})$ -round upper bounds for planar graphs [LP19, Par20]. On the other hand, there exist

²Throughout this paper, the term “with high probability” means that the probability is at least $1 - 1/n^c$ for an arbitrary large constant $c > 0$.

hard instances of constant diameter and logarithmic treewidth for which computing the diameter in the CONGEST model requires $\Omega(n)$ rounds [ACK16], contrasted with our algorithm for computing girth. That is, graphs of logarithmic treewidth and diameter are the first non-trivial graph class that exhibits an exponential separation in the round complexity for these two fundamental problems.

1.3 Our Framework

All of our algorithms are a direct result of a single unified framework. The key technical ingredients of our framework are twofold: A new *fully polynomial-time tree-decomposition algorithm*, and the novel concept of a *stateful walk constraint*. In this subsection, we outline their ideas and their applications for our algorithms.

Fully Polynomial-Time Tree Decomposition All of our results require the existence of an *efficient* tree decomposition algorithm with a *small width*. Unfortunately, the best known tree-decomposition algorithm [Li18] has a running time that exponentially depends on the treewidth, and thus is too slow for our needs. Thus, we develop a fully polynomial-time CONGEST algorithm for tree decomposition, which runs in $\tilde{O}(\tau^2 D + \tau^3)$ rounds and computes a tree decomposition of width $\tilde{O}(\tau^2)$. The algorithmic ideas are based on the fully-polynomial time (centralized) tree decomposition algorithm by Fomin et al. [FLP⁺17], with several nontrivial modifications that allow for an efficient implementation in the CONGEST model. While a direct implementation of [FLP⁺17] in the CONGEST model is straightforward, this will result in a round complexity of $\tilde{O}(\tau^{O(1)} D)$, where the exponent of τ is (at least) 7. We introduce novel ideas which allow us to substantially improve the dependence on τ . Our distance labeling result is obtained by combining this tree decomposition algorithm with several techniques by Li and Parter [LP19] which were introduced in the context of distance labeling for planar graphs.

Stateful Walk Constraint The second ingredient of our framework is to extend the applicability of distributed directed shortest paths algorithms (including distance labeling schemes) to a more general type of shortest walks. We consider a constrained version of SSSP (or DL), where a subset C of all walks in the input graph is given. This problem requires that each node v in G knows the length of the shortest walk in C from a source vertex, s , to v (or construct a labeling scheme that allows computing the length of the shortest walk in C connecting the two vertices, using only their labels). This problem is not meaningful if C is *explicitly* given to each node, and our focus is the scenario where C is given in an *implicit* and *distributed* manner.

We introduce a natural class of walk constraints, which we call *stateful walk constraints*. Roughly speaking, a stateful walk constraint is a set, C , of walks such that each node u can *locally* decide if a walk leaving u is contained in C or not, using only a small amount of additional information (referred to as the *state* of a walk). This class captures many natural walks with combinatorial constraints, such as alternating walks (used in our matching algorithm). We show that the constrained versions of directed SSSP and DL under a stateful-walk constraint can be reduced to the corresponding unconstrained versions with a running-time overhead depending on the size of the state space associated with C .

Let us outline how to apply the above framework to the problems of matching and girth. We show that each of these problems can be reduced to finding shortest walks under some stateful-walk constraint. Our maximum matching algorithm, (i.e., alternating path finding) is one of the most natural applications of the framework. By combining the stateful-walk framework with a specific property of augmenting paths in low-treewidth graphs (presented in [IOO18]), we derive our algorithm. For girth computation, our key idea is to use the framework to exclude walks that

“fold onto themselves”, that is, the second half of the walk is the inversion of the first half. This leaves us with a set of walks which *upper bound* the girth. Finally, we use a probabilistic sampling of edge labels combined with the above to derive our algorithm.

The above applications demonstrate the expressive power and versatility of our framework. Finally, we would like to emphasize that the framework is not limited to low-treewidth graphs, but applies to general graphs. The authors believe that this framework is potentially useful in the design of efficient CONGEST algorithms for a wider class of problems.

1.4 Related Work

Distance computation problems are at the core of distributed graph algorithms. Recently there has been a vast number of results for both exact and approximate distance computation problems [LPS13, LP13, FHW12, HW12, DSDP12, PRT12, Nan14, HKN16, GL18, HNS17, FN18, BN19, BKKL17, Elk17, ACK16, IW14, ARKP18, HL18, GKP20, CHFG⁺20, CM20]. The state-of-the-art bounds for general graphs are $\tilde{O}(\sqrt{n} + D)$ rounds for $(1 + \epsilon)$ -approximate SSSP [BKKL17], and $\tilde{O}(\sqrt{n}D^{1/4} + D)$ rounds for exact SSSP [CM20]. These results hold for weighted and directed graphs. A tight runtime bound for exact SSSP is still an open problem. For computing the girth, a near optimal approximation algorithm for unweighted girth is known [PRT12]. It outputs the girth with an additive error of one (i.e., $(2 - 1/\Theta(g))$ -multiplicative approximation) in $O(\sqrt{ng} \log n + D)$ rounds.

Planar graphs are also an intriguing class of graphs, and are closely related to our results. Although our algorithms are applicable to planar graphs, as planar graphs have treewidth of $O(D)$, for distance computation problems the existing algorithms tailored for planar graphs [LP19, Par20] achieve a running time with a better dependence on D .

Distance labeling schemes were first proposed by Gavaille et al. [GPPR04], and their centralized construction was studied for many graph classes [GP03, FGNW17, GP08, KKP05, GPPR04]. Distance labeling is closely related to (*approximate*) *distance oracles*, which are centralized data structures for representing distance matrices that support quick access. There are a few results that consider distributed variants of approximate distance oracles [LPS13, DSDP12, IW14, LPS15] for general graphs. However, all of them consider only approximate oracles, and essentially require the construction time to polynomially depend on n . The best bound for bounded treewidth graphs is the shortcut-based construction [HLZ18], whose approximation factor is $\text{polylog}(n)$.

While most previous results for maximum matching focus on approximate solutions [KMW06, AKO18, LPSP15, BYCHGS17], the problem of finding an *exact* solution has been receiving more and more attention recently [BKS19, AK20, KI22]. On the negative side, the lower bound of $\tilde{\Omega}(\sqrt{n} + D)$ rounds is implied from the result of [AKO18]. This lower bound is recognized as a strong barrier: It has been shown that the well-known approach of reduction from two-party communication complexity does not work for obtaining any stronger lower bound [BCHD⁺19]. It is also known that exact maximum matching does not have any local solution: There exists a hard instance where $D = \Theta(n)$ that exhibits an $\Omega(n)$ -round lower bound [BKS19].

1.5 Organization of the Paper

In Section 2 we introduce the concept of tree decomposition and the CONGEST model. In Section 3, we present our tree decomposition algorithm in the CONGEST model. In Section 4 we show how to solve the distance labeling problem by using our tree decomposition algorithm. In Section 5 we introduce the concept of stateful walks, and show how to reduce the problem of finding (shortest) stateful walks into the standard directed reachability or the shortest paths problem. Sections 6 and

7 are devoted to the applications of our framework.

2 Preliminaries

2.1 Model and Notations

Let us now define the CONGEST model of distributed computation. We model distributed systems as an undirected and unweighted graph, G , on n nodes, where the nodes are computational units and edges are communication links. We assume that nodes have unique $O(\log n)$ bit IDs. Communication between nodes happens in *synchronous* rounds. In each round, each node sends a (possibly different) $O(\log n)$ -bit message to each neighbor and, within the same round, receives all messages from the neighbors. After receiving the messages, it performs some local computation. We assume that nodes have unbounded computational power, and when analyzing our algorithms, we only care about the *communication cost* of the algorithm. That is, the number of communication rounds it takes to complete. For any graph G , we denote its vertex and edge sets by $V(G)$ and $E(G)$ respectively.

While we also deal with directed and weighted multigraphs as input instances, the communication network itself is modeled as a simple undirected unweighted graph (i.e., the orientation, weight, and multiplicity of the edges connecting two vertices do not affect the communication capability between them). More precisely, given an input instance G , we denote by $\llbracket G \rrbracket$ the graph which is obtained by omitting all orientations of $E(G)$, by merging the multiedges connecting the same two vertices into a single one, and by removing all self-loops. Then $\llbracket G \rrbracket$ is the communication network implied by G . Given a graph H , we denote by $D(H)$ the undirected diameter of H (i.e., $D(H)$ is the diameter of $\llbracket H \rrbracket$). For the input graph G , we use D instead of $D(G)$. For any rooted tree T and a vertex $v \in V(T)$, we denote by $T(v)$ the subtree of T rooted by v . We also denote by $\text{ch}(T, v)$ the set of the children of v in tree T .

2.2 Tree Decomposition and Treewidth

Let $G = (V(G), E(G))$ be an undirected and unweighted graph. A tree decomposition of an undirected and unweighted graph G is a pair $\Phi = (T, \{B_x\}_{x \in V(T)})$, where T is a tree, referred to as *decomposition tree*, and each vertex $x \in V(T)$ is associated with a subset $B_x \subseteq V(G)$ of vertices in G (called *bag x*) satisfying the following conditions:

- (a) $V(G) = \bigcup_{x \in V(T)} B_x$.
- (b) Any edge in G is covered by at least one bag, i.e., for all $(u, v) \in E(G)$, there exists $x \in V(T)$ such that $u, v \in B_x$ holds.
- (c) For any $u \in V(G)$, the subgraph of T induced by the bags containing u is connected.

The *width* of a tree decomposition $\Phi = (T, \{B_x\}_{x \in V(T)})$ is defined as the maximum bag size minus one. The *treewidth*, τ , of a graph G is the minimum width over all tree decompositions of G . While the original definition of treewidth applies only to undirected graphs, we define the treewidth of a directed graph G as the treewidth of $\llbracket G \rrbracket$.

Throughout this paper, we assume that any decomposition tree T is rooted, and each vertex in $V(T)$ is identified by a string over the alphabet $[0, n - 1]$. Letting x be any string over the alphabet $[0, n - 1]$ and i be any character, we define $x \bullet i$ as the string obtained by adding i to the tail of x . The null string of length zero is denoted by ψ , which is the identifier of the root of T . Given a vertex $x \in V(T)$, $x \bullet i$ identifies the i -th child of x . We use the notation $x \sqsubseteq y$ if x is a prefix

of y , and the notation $x \parallel y$ if neither $x \sqsubseteq y$ nor $y \sqsubseteq x$ holds. We denote the length of x by $|x|$, which means the depth of vertex x in T . We define $A_\ell(T)$ as the set of vertices of length ℓ in $V(T)$. For any tree decomposition $\Phi = (T, \{B_x\}_{x \in V(T)})$ and $v \in V(G)$, its *canonical string* $c_\Phi^*(v)$ is the shortest string such that $v \in B_{c_\Phi^*(v)}$ holds. Note that $c_\Phi^*(v)$ is uniquely determined because the set of bags containing v forms a connected subgraph of T (by condition (c) of the definition). The subscript Φ is often omitted when it is clear from context. Letting x be a string of non-zero length in $V(T)$, we denote by $p(x)$ the string corresponding to the parent of x (i.e., the string obtained by chopping the tail of x in T). We define $\text{cht}_\Phi(x)$ as the set of $i \in [0, n-1]$ such that $x \bullet i$ is a child of x , i.e., $\text{cht}_\Phi(x) = \{i \mid x \bullet i \in V(T)\}$.

In the distributed setting, computing a tree decomposition means that each node $u \in V(G)$ outputs the IDs of the bags containing u .

2.3 Part-wise Aggregation

Throughout this paper, we often execute an algorithm, \mathcal{A} , on multiple subgraphs of the input graph independently and simultaneously. That is, given a collection $\mathcal{H} = \{H_1, H_2, \dots, H_N\}$ of vertex disjoint connected subgraphs of the input graph G , we execute \mathcal{A} on all $H_i \in \mathcal{H}$ in parallel. The primary obstacle in implementing this type of execution in the CONGEST model is that the diameter $D(H_i)$ for $H_i \in \mathcal{H}$ may be much larger than $D(G)$ (and can be $\Omega(n)$ in the worst case), and thus the running time of \mathcal{A} in H_i can depend on n even if the running time of \mathcal{A} depends only on the diameter of the input graph. The key technical ingredient for this section is a subroutine called *part-wise aggregation* [GH16b], which is defined as follows: Let $G = (V(G), E(G))$ be an undirected graph, $\mathcal{H} = \{H_1, H_2, \dots, H_N\}$ be a collection of connected vertex disjoint subgraphs of G , and \oplus be an associative binary function operating on a value domain \mathcal{M} of cardinality $\text{poly}(n)$. Suppose that each node $v \in V(H_i)$ knows all the edges in $E(H_i)$ incident to v , and has a value $x_{v,i} \in \mathcal{M}$. Every node in H_i wants to learn the value $\bigoplus_{v \in V(H_i)} x_{v,i}$, i.e., the aggregation with operator \oplus over all of the values $x_{v,i}$ for $v \in V(H_i)$. It is known that bounded treewidth graphs admit a fast algorithm for part-wise aggregation [HIZ16, HHW18, Li18], which runs in $\tilde{O}(\tau D)$ rounds.

3 Fully Polynomial-Time Distributed Tree Decomposition

3.1 Balanced Separator

Our tree decomposition algorithm is based on the computation of *balanced separators*, which is a common technique used in many (centralized or distributed) tree decomposition algorithms. We first introduce the notion of a (X, α) -balanced separator, which is a slight generalization of a conventional balanced separator.

Let X be any subset of $V(G)$. For a given vertex subset $Y \subseteq V(G)$, we define $\mu_X(Y) = |Y \cap X|$. We also use a similar notation $\mu_X(H)$ for any subgraph $H \subseteq G$ to mean $\mu_X(V(H))$. The subscript X is omitted if it is clear from the context. An (X, α) -balanced separator, S , of an undirected graph G is a vertex subset whose removal divides G into N connected components G_1, G_2, \dots, G_N such that $\mu_X(G_i)/\mu_X(G) \leq \alpha$ holds for any $1 \leq i \leq N$. A $(V(G), \alpha)$ -balanced separator is simply called an α -balanced separator of G .

It is well-known that any graph G admits a $(1/2)$ -balanced separator whose size is $\tau + 1$ (Lemma 7.19 of [CFK⁺15]), and that one can obtain a tree-decomposition algorithm of width $O(t \log n)$ from any balanced separator algorithm which outputs a separator S of size t . The best known CONGEST algorithm for finding an α -balanced separator of size $O(\tau)$ (for constant $\alpha < 1$) [Li18] has a running time that exponentially depends on τ , and thus does not fit our goals. To get rid of the exponential

dependency, we present a new CONGEST algorithm for computing balanced separators building on the ideas of the centralized algorithm by Fomin et al. [FLP⁺17] (referred to as FLPSW hereafter).

3.2 The Algorithm by Fomin et al.

We first present the outline of FLPSW. We assume $X = V(G)$ for simplicity, but the algorithm can handle an arbitrary X . FLPSW runs with a parameter t , and is guaranteed to output an α -balanced separator of size $O(t^2)$ for $\alpha = 1 - \Theta(1) > 0$ when $\tau + 1 \leq t$. In the case when τ is unknown, one can combine FLPSW with a standard doubling estimation technique for t . To explain the algorithm we first introduce the notion of an U_1 - U_2 vertex cut for $U_1, U_2 \subseteq V(G)$ as a generalization of the standard s - t vertex cut, which is defined as a vertex subset $Z \subseteq V(G) \setminus (U_1 \cup U_2)$ such that U_1 and U_2 belong to different connected components in $G - Z$. If U_1 intersects with U_2 or some edge crosses between U_1 and U_2 , the size of the U_1 - U_2 vertex cut is defined as ∞ .

Let S be a $(1/2)$ -balanced separator of G of size at most t (recall that it necessarily exists). The algorithm first constructs any rooted spanning tree, T , of G , and decomposes it into a set \mathcal{T} of $\Theta(t)$ subtrees of size $\Theta(n/t)$ such that only their root vertices are shared among two or more subtrees in \mathcal{T} . In what follows, we refer to this type of decomposition as the *splitting* of T , and to each subtree as a *split tree*. Let R be the set of the root vertices of split trees. We assume that the hidden constant in the cardinality of \mathcal{T} is sufficiently large, e.g., $\mathcal{T} \geq 100t$. There are two cases to consider.

- (Case 1) R does not intersect S : Since all trees in \mathcal{T} are vertex disjoint except for R , at most $|S| = t$ trees in \mathcal{T} intersect S . Then there exist two split trees $T_1, T_2 \in \mathcal{T}$ such that they belong to different connected components in $G - S$, i.e., the minimum $V(T_1)$ - $V(T_2)$ vertex cut Z has size at most $|S| = t$. The algorithm finds such a pair by computing the minimum $V(T_1)$ - $V(T_2)$ vertex cut for all pairs $(T_1, T_2) \in \mathcal{T}^2$. Once the pair is found, the algorithm outputs Z as the separator. Note that Z is a $(X, 1 - \Theta(1/t))$ -balanced separator of G because both $V(T_1)$ and $V(T_2)$ contain $\Theta(n/t)$ vertices. If the algorithm fails to find such a pair, it concludes that the first case does not apply, and proceeds to case 2.
- (Case 2) R intersects S : The algorithm simply removes R from G and outputs it as the separator. The removal of R results in the deletion of at least one vertex in S from G .

FLPSW iterates the procedure above $2t$ times for the largest connected components of the remaining graph. After all iterations are complete, we obtain a $(1 - \Theta(1))$ -balanced separator. That is, if the first case succeeds t times, then $\Theta(1)$ fraction of vertices are separated. Otherwise, all vertices in S are removed. Since each iteration adds $O(t)$ vertices to the output set, the total size of the output separator is $O(t^2)$. As stated in the introduction, it is relatively straightforward to implement FLPSW in $\tilde{O}(\tau^{O(1)}D)$ rounds if we do not care about optimizing the exponent of τ .

3.3 Our Algorithm

We present a modified version of FLPSW which admits a more efficient CONGEST implementation (the implementation details are deferred to Appendix B). The key differences between our algorithm and FLPSW are threefold. First, instead of solving the minimum $V(T_1)$ - $V(T_2)$ vertex cut problem for all $(T_1, T_2) \in \mathcal{T}^2$, we simply adopt a random sampling strategy for identifying a pair (T_1, T_2) which has a cut of $O(t)$ vertices. When $S \cap R = \emptyset$ holds, this strategy is guaranteed to succeed with a constant probability. Since one pair (T_1, T_2) is sampled per iteration, it suffices to solve $O(t)$ instances of the minimum vertex cut in total.

The second idea is a parallelization-friendly algorithm for tree splitting. More precisely, the algorithm manages a set of disjoint trees \mathcal{T} , where initially $\mathcal{T} = \{T\}$, and iteratively splits trees of large size in \mathcal{T} , and then adds back the resulting split trees to \mathcal{T} if they are still large. This strategy admits an efficient CONGEST implementation because the splitting of two different trees in \mathcal{T} can be performed in parallel.

The third idea is to compute $O(t)$ instances of the minimum vertex cut simultaneously at the final step (FLPSW performs this computation sequentially). Utilizing a careful scheduling technique, we can execute t independent instances of the minimum vertex cut problem in $\tilde{O}(t\tau D + t^2\tau)$ rounds, which is more efficient than sequential processing (which takes $\tilde{O}(t^2\tau D)$ rounds).

We present the centralized version of our algorithm (referred to as SEP hereafter). It works as follows:

1. If $\mu(G) \leq 200t^2$, the algorithm outputs X as a $(X, 14399/14400)$ -balanced separator and halts.

When the algorithm does not halt at step 1, the algorithm iteratively applies the following steps (2 and 3) for $\hat{t} = \lceil 301t/300 \rceil$ times to the graphs $G_1, G_2, \dots, G_{\hat{t}}$, where $G_1 = G$ and the rest of the sequence is generated within the following steps.

2. At the beginning of the i -th iteration (for G_i), the algorithm constructs some spanning tree T^* of G_i , and then split T^* into several trees. In the i -th iteration, this splitting procedure, which we refer to as SPLIT, maintains the two sets of trees \mathcal{T} and \mathcal{T}_i , which initially store $\mathcal{T} = \{T^*\}$ and $\mathcal{T}_i = \emptyset$. By a single invocation of SPLIT, every tree $T \in \mathcal{T}$ is split into a set of trees of size at least $\mu(G)/(12t)$ and at most $5\mu(T)/6$. The original tree T is removed from \mathcal{T} after splitting. Each split tree is added to \mathcal{T} if its size is more than $\mu(G)/(4t)$, or to \mathcal{T}_i otherwise. The splitting process terminates when \mathcal{T} becomes empty.

The details of the procedure SPLIT are as follows: For any $T \in \mathcal{T}_i$, the algorithm finds the center vertex $c \in V(T)$ of T , i.e., the vertex such that removing it decomposes T into several subtrees of size at most $\mu(T)/2$. Now we regard c as the root of T . Next, SPLIT removes all subtrees $T(v)$ for $v \in \text{ch}(T, c)$ such that $\mu(T(v)) \geq \mu(G)/(12t)$ as split trees.


Let T' be the remaining tree. If $\mu(T') < \mu(G)/(12t)$, we pick any tree $T(v)$ split in the first step, and merge T' into $T(v)$ (Fig. 1(a)). The size of $T' + T(v)$ is bounded by $\mu(G)/(12t) + \mu(T)/2 \leq \mu(T)/3 + \mu(T)/2 \leq 5\mu(T)/6$ (recall that any $T \in \mathcal{T}$ has a size at least $\mu(G)/(4t)$ and thus $\mu(G)/(12t) \leq \mu(T)/3$ holds). Otherwise, we further split T' into several subtrees sharing c as their roots. Let us fix some ordering of the children of c in T' , denoted by $y_0, y_1, \dots, y_{\ell-1}$, we define $Y_{a,b} = \bigcup_{a \leq h < b} V(T'(y_h))$. The algorithm computes the indices $0 = q_0, q_1, \dots, q_{\ell'} = \ell - 1$ such that $\mu(G)/(12t) \leq \mu(Y_{q_{h-1}, q_h}) < \mu(G)/(6t)$ holds for all $1 \leq h \leq \ell' - 1$ and $\mu(G)/(12t) \leq \mu(Y_{q_{h-1}, q_h}) < \mu(G)/(4t)$ holds for $h = \ell'$. Then we split T' into ℓ' connected subtrees induced by $Y_{q_h, q_{h+1}} \cup \{c\}$. Since the subtree $T'(y)$ for any $y \in \text{ch}(T, c)$ has a size less than $\mu(G)/12t$, one can always obtain such a splitting. Each induced subtree is added to \mathcal{T}_i because its size is necessarily at most $\mu(G)/(4t)$ (Fig. 1(b)).

It is easy to see that \mathcal{T} becomes empty after $O(\log t)$ invocations of SPLIT. At which point \mathcal{T}_i is a set of split trees covering T^* , whose size is in the range $[\mu(G)/(12t), \mu(G)/(4t)]$.


3. We denote the set of root vertices of subtrees in \mathcal{T}_i by R_i . If $R_i^* = \bigcup_{1 \leq j \leq i} R_j$ is a $(X, 14399/14400)$ -separator of G , the algorithm outputs it and halts. Otherwise, we define G_{i+1} as the heaviest connected component of $G_i - R_i$ with respect to μ .

If the algorithm completes \hat{t} iterations of the steps above without halting, the following step is performed.

4. For each $i \in [1, \hat{t}]$, the algorithm chooses 95 ordered pairs uniformly at random from $\mathcal{T}_i \times \mathcal{T}_i$, and compute the $V(T_1) - V(T_2)$ vertex cut for all chosen pairs. If the computed cut size is at most t , the cut vertices are added to the set Z . Finally, Z is outputted if it is a $(X, 14399/14400)$ -balanced separator. Otherwise SEP fails. When SEP fails for $5 \log n$ trials, it concludes that $\tau + 1 > t$ (and runs again after doubling t).



(a) $\mu(T') < \mu(G)/(12t)$



(b) $\mu(T') \geq \mu(G)/(12t)$

Figure 1: An illustration of the SPLIT procedure. Subtrees circled by a red dotted line are split subtrees.

While the fundamental idea of SEP is similar to FLPSW, it requires a completely new analysis and correctness proof. One significant technical challenge that we overcome is that the subtree pairs chosen in Step (4) are not vertex disjoint. This is problematic as we must prove that the size of the largest connected component after removing the computed separator Z becomes substantially smaller. The complete proof of correctness is deferred to Appendix B.1. To implement SEP efficiently in the CONGEST model, we utilize the part-wise aggregation technique explained in Section 2.3, which is also known to provide efficient algorithms for minimum U_1-U_2 vertex cut and spanning tree construction running in $\tilde{O}(\tau^{O(1)}D)$ rounds [GH16b, HIZ16, Li18]. The details of the implementation and its correctness proof are presented in Appendix B.2. Finally, we obtain the following lemma:

Lemma 1 Let G be an undirected graph, and $X \subseteq V(G)$ be any vertex subset. There exists a randomized CONGEST algorithm that outputs a $(X, 14399/14400)$ -balanced separator of size at most $400(\tau + 1)^2$ for G in $\tilde{O}(\tau^2D + \tau^3)$ rounds whp.

3.4 Distributed Tree Decomposition based on Balanced Separators

We construct a tree decomposition of width at most $O(\tau^2 \log n)$, utilizing the balanced separator algorithm of lemma 1. We refer to the constructed tree decomposition as $\Phi = (T, \{B_x\}_{x \in V(T)})$. As explained in Section 2.2, the subscript x of each bag is a string over the alphabet $[0, n - 1]$. Initially, let $G_\psi = G$. There exists a standard strategy to obtain a decomposition from any balanced separator algorithm, which works as follows: We first compute a balanced separator S of $G = G_\psi$. The set S becomes the root bag B_ψ of the constructed tree decomposition. For each connected component G_0, G_1, \dots, G_{N-1} of $G - S$, we recursively construct their tree decompositions. Finally, we add S to all of the bags in those decompositions, and connect their roots $1, 2, \dots, N$ to the root ψ of the whole tree decomposition as children. Using an algorithm for computing a balanced separator of size $O(\tau^2)$, this strategy yields a tree decomposition of size $O(\tau^2 \log n)$. However, adopting this strategy to the distributed setting is problematic, mainly due to the fact that the bag B_x is not a subset of the vertices of the corresponding graph G_x . To avoid it, our algorithm utilizes a slightly modified strategy.

The algorithm recursively decomposes G_x for each string x by fixing the corresponding bag B_x . It first computes a $O(1)$ -balanced separator S_x of G_x using the algorithm of Lemma 1. If $|V(G_x)| \leq 2|S_x|$, we define $B_x = |V(G_x)|$ and the recursion terminates. Otherwise, we define the bag $B_x = V(G_x) \cap (\bigcup_{x' \sqsubseteq x} S_{x'})$. Let $G'_{x \bullet 0}, G'_{x \bullet 1}, \dots, G'_{x \bullet (N-1)}$ be the connected components of $G_x - B_x$. The graph $G_{x \bullet i}$ (for $0 \leq i \leq N - 1$) is defined as $G_{x \bullet i} = G'_{x \bullet i} + \{(u, v) \mid (u, v) \in (V(G'_{x \bullet i}) \times B_x) \cap E(G_x)\}$. This decomposition strategy is illustrated in Fig. 2 This construction yields a tree decomposition of width $O(\tau^2 \log n)$ and guarantees $B_x \subseteq G_x$ for any $x \in V(T)$.




Figure 2: An illustration of our tree decomposition.

A primary obstacle in adopting this decomposition strategy to the distributed setting is the fact that the collection of subgraphs $\mathcal{G}_\ell = \{G_x \mid x \in A_\ell\}$ for any ℓ is not necessarily vertex disjoint. For the recursive construction of the tree decomposition, we need to execute our balanced separator algorithm for all graphs in \mathcal{G}_ℓ in parallel. We circumvent this obstacle by computing the separator of G'_x (i.e. $G_x - B_{p(x)}$) instead of G_x . Since $\{G'_x \mid x \in A_\ell\}$ are connected and vertex disjoint by definition, one can apply the technique based on the low-congestion shortcut framework to compute the separators of graphs G'_x for all $x \in A_\ell$ in parallel. Each separator S'_x for G'_x is easily transformed into the separator S_x for G_x by adding all vertices in $V(G_x) \cap V(B_{p(x)})$. The bag B_x is defined

as $B_x = V(G_x) \cap (\bigcup_{x' \sqsubseteq x} S_{x'}) = B_{p(x)} \cup S'_x$, and thus its size is bounded by $O(\tau^2 \log n)$. Our main theorem is stated as follows:

Theorem 1 For a given graph, $G = (V, E)$, there exists a tree decomposition algorithm in the CONGEST model, which constructs a tree decomposition, $\Phi = (T, \{B_x\}_{x \in V(T)})$, of width $O(\tau^2 \log n)$ whp. The depth of T is $O(\log n)$ and the running time of the algorithm is $\tilde{O}(\tau^2 D + \tau^3)$ rounds.

The complete details of our distributed implementation, including the formal correctness proof of our tree decomposition algorithm, are given in Appendix B.3.

4 Distributed Distance Labeling in Low-Treewidth Graphs

The proofs of all the lemmas and theorems for this section are deferred to Appendix C.

4.1 Outline

Consider the weighted and directed input graph $G = (V(G), E(G))$ with edge cost function $c_G : E(G) \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$. The distance labeling problem is formally defined as follows:

Definition 1 (Distance Labeling (DL)) Distance labeling consists of a labeling function $\text{la}_G : V(G) \rightarrow \{0, 1\}^*$ that depends on the input graph G (which can be directed and weighted), and a common *decoder* function $\text{dec} : \{0, 1\}^* \times \{0, 1\}^* \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$. The decoder returns the distance $d_G(u, v)$ from two labels $\text{la}_G(u)$ and $\text{la}_G(v)$. The problem requires that each node $v \in V(G)$ outputs its label $\text{la}_G(v)$.

Our distributed implementation of distance labeling adopts a similar approach to the algorithm of Li and Parter [LP19] for planar graphs, whose structure is a slightly modified version of the distance labeling scheme by Gavaille et al. [GP04]. Our implementation is a recursive algorithm utilizing tree decomposition, and can roughly be stated as follows: Let G be a weighted directed input graph, $\Phi = (T, \{B_x\}_{x \in V(T)})$ be the (rooted) tree decomposition of G constructed by the algorithm of Theorem 1. The algorithm recursively and independently constructs distance labels for each graph in \mathcal{G}_1 , and then each node u in $G = G_\psi$ learns the distances from/to all of the nodes in B_ψ and stores them in the label of u constructed in G_x (where G_x is defined in Sec. 3.4). Consider computing the distance from u to v . If the shortest path from u to v does not contain any vertex in B_ψ , the distance is obtained by the label of u and v for G_x . Otherwise, it suffices to take the minimum of the distance from u to s plus that from s to v for every $s \in B_\psi$, which can be computed from the labels of u and v .

We formally define the distance labeling constructed by our CONGEST algorithm. For simplicity of presentation, we assume that the edge cost function c_G is a mapping from $V(G) \times V(G)$ to $\mathbb{N} \cup \{\infty\}$, where we define $c_G(u, v) = \infty$ if $(u, v) \notin E(G)$. A *distance set* $d_G(u, X)$ for $u \in V(G)$ and $X \subseteq V(G)$ is defined as the set of tuples $(u, v, d_G(u, v))$ and $(v, u, d_G(v, u))$ for all $v \in X$. We also define $B_\Phi^\uparrow(u) = \bigcup_{x' \sqsubseteq_{c_\Phi^*} u} B_{x'}$. The label $\text{la}_G(u)$ is defined as $\text{la}_G(u) = d_G(u, B_\Phi^\uparrow(u))$. The decoder function dec is defined as follows:

$$\text{dec}(\text{la}_G(u), \text{la}_G(v)) = \min_{s \in B_\Phi^\uparrow(u) \cap B_\Phi^\uparrow(v)} d_G(u, s) + d_G(s, v).$$

Using the tree decomposition algorithm of Theorem 1, the label size is bounded by $\tilde{O}(\tau^2)$ bits. The lemma below guarantees the correctness of this labeling scheme.

Lemma 2 For any $u, v \in V(G)$, $\text{dec}(\text{la}_G(u), \text{la}_G(v)) = d_G(u, v)$ holds.

4.2 Distance Labeling Construction

We explain the construction of $\text{la}_G(u)$ for all $u \in V(G)$ in the CONGEST model. First we introduce the graph H_x associated with each B_x as follows:

- If $x \in V(T)$ is a leaf node, we define $H_x = G_x$.
- Otherwise, $V(H_x) = B_x$. An edge (u, v) is contained in $E(H_x)$ if and only if $d_{G_x}(u, v)$ is finite or $(u, v) \in E(G)$ holds. The edge cost $c_{H_x}(u, v)$ is defined as $c_{H_x}(u, v) = \min\{c_G(u, v), \min_{i \in \text{cht}(x)} d_{G_{x \bullet i}}(u, v)\}$.

The key properties of the graph H_x are stated in the following two lemmas.

Lemma 3 For any $u, v \in V(H_x)$, $d_{H_x}(u, v) = d_{G_x}(u, v)$ holds.

Lemma 4 Let u and v be any two vertices in $V(G_{x \bullet i}) \cup B_x$ for some $i \in \text{cht}(x)$. Then the following equality holds.

$$d_{G_x}(u, v) = \min\{d_{G_{x \bullet i}}(u, v), \min_{s, s' \in V(H_x)} (d_{G_{x \bullet i}}(u, s) + d_{H_x}(s, s') + d_{G_{x \bullet i}}(s', v))\}.$$

The construction of the labels follows a bottom-up recursion over the decomposition tree T . More precisely, the proposed algorithm constructs $\text{la}_{G_x}(u)$ for all $u \in V(G_x)$, provided that $\text{la}_{G_{x \bullet i}}(u)$ for all $u \in G_{x \bullet i}$ and $i \in \text{ch}(T, x)$ are available. The outline of the algorithm is as follows:

1. If x is a leaf in T , each node $u \in V(G_x)$ broadcasts the information of the edges incident to u in G_x to the nodes in G_x , i.e., each node u knows the entire information of G_x . Since the collection of the graphs for every leaf x is not vertex disjoint, we implement this process by introducing a slightly generalized version of the part-wise aggregation (see Appendix A.1 for the details). By solving the all-pairs shortest paths problem locally, u obtains the label $\text{la}_{G_x}(u)$. If x is not a leaf, the algorithm executes steps 2-4.
2. For all $i \in \text{cht}(x)$, the algorithm recursively constructs the distance labeling $\text{la}_{G_{x \bullet i}}(u)$ for $u \in V(G_{x \bullet i})$ utilizing $\Phi' = (T(x \bullet i), \{B_{x' \bullet i}\}_{x \bullet i \sqsubseteq x'})$ as the tree decomposition of $G_{x \bullet i}$. Since the node $x \bullet i$ is the root of $T(x \bullet i)$, $B_{x \bullet i} \subseteq B_{\Phi'}^\uparrow(u)$ trivially holds. That is, $\text{la}_{G_{x \bullet i}}(u) = d_{G_{x \bullet i}}(u, B_{\Phi'}^\uparrow(u))$ necessarily contains the information of the distance set $d_{G_{x \bullet i}}(u, B_{x \bullet i})$. Thus, each node $u \in B_x$ can identify the edges incident to u in H_x . This process is done via local computation.
3. Each node $u \in B_x$ broadcasts the set of edges incident to u in H_x to all nodes in G_x , which is also implemented by the generalized part-wise aggregation.
4. Using the information received at step 3, each node $u \in V(G_x)$ locally knows H_x . Following the formula of Lemma 4, u updates the distance set $d_{G_{x \bullet i}}(u, B_{\Phi'}^\uparrow(u))$ to $d_{G_x}(u, B_{\Phi'}^\uparrow(u))$, and learns the distance set $d_{G_x}(u, B_x)$.

We state the following theorem.

Theorem 2 Let $G = (V(G), E(G))$ be any directed graph with edge cost function $c : E(G) \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$. Then there exists a randomized CONGEST algorithm that solves DL in $\tilde{O}(\tau^2 D + \tau^5)$ rounds with probability at least $1 - 1/n^9$. The label size of each node is $O(\tau^2 \log^2 n)$ bits.

5 Stateful walks

5.1 Definition

Let $G = (V(G), E(G), \gamma_G)$ be a directed multigraph, where γ_G is a mapping from each element in $E(G)$ to an ordered pair in $V(G) \times V(G)$ (as G is a multigraph, we cannot assume that elements in $E(G)$ are of the form (u, v) , and thus γ_G is required). A walk $w = e_1, e_2, \dots, e_\ell$ in G is a sequence of edges in $E(G)$ such that for any $i \in [1, \ell - 1]$, $\gamma_G(e_i)[1] = \gamma_G(e_{i+1})[0]$ holds. To describe the vertices in the walk explicitly, it can also be represented as an alternating sequence of vertices and edges, $w = u_0, e_1, u_1, e_2, u_2, \dots, e_\ell, u_\ell$, such that $\gamma_G(e_1)[0] = u_0$ and $\gamma_G(e_i)[1] = u_i$ holds for any $i \in [1, \ell]$. We denote by W_G the set of all finite-length walks in G , and also denote the set of all walks from vertex s to vertex t in W_G by $W_G(s, t)$. The walk of length zero in W_G is denoted by ϕ . For two walks $x, y \in W_G$ such that the last vertex of x and the first vertex of y are the same, their concatenation is denoted by $x \circ y$. If y (resp. x) is a walk of length one consisting of an edge $e \in E(G)$, we use the notation $x \circ e$ (resp. $e \circ y$). A walk w is often treated as a subgraph of G , i.e., $V(w)$ and $E(w)$ respectively denote the vertices and edges in w .

A *walk constraint* is a subset $C \subseteq W_G$. That is, a walk constraint limits the set of graph walks to the subset C . Given a walk constraint C , we denote by $W_{G,C}(s, t)$ the set of all walks from s to t in C . If $W_{G,C}(s, t)$ is not empty, we say that t is *C-reachable* from s in G . The *C-distance* from s to t , denoted by $d_{G,C}(s, t)$, is the shortest (weighted) length of all the walks in $W_{G,C}(s, t)$. We consider a variation of the single-source shortest paths problem, which requires that for a given constraint C and source node s each node $v \in V(G)$ outputs the shortest walk from s to v in C , as well as its length $d_{G,C}(s, v)$. As discussed previously, this problem becomes meaningful only when C is provided to the nodes of the graph in an *implicit* and *distributed* manner. To formally define the above, we present the notion of a *stateful walk constraint*, followed by an intuitive description of the definition.

Definition 2 (Stateful Walk Constraint) Let Q be any set containing two special elements \perp and ∇ . A walk constraint $C \subset W_G$ is called *stateful* if it contains ϕ and there exist a function $M_C : W_G \rightarrow Q$ and a tuple of transition functions $\delta_C = (\delta_{C,e})_{e \in E(G)}$ associated with each edge $e \in E(G)$, where $\delta_{C,e}$ is a mapping from Q to Q , satisfying the following three conditions:

1. $M_C(w) \neq \perp$ if and only if $w \in C$. In addition, $M_C(w) = \nabla$ if and only if $w = \phi$.
2. For any $w \in W_G$ terminating at u and $e = (u, v) \in E(G)$, $\delta_{C,e}(M_C(w)) = M_C(w \circ e)$ holds.
3. For any $e \in E(G)$, $\delta_{C,e}(\perp) = \perp$.

We omit the subscript C of M and δ when it is clear from the context. The rough intuition of the definition above is as follows: Every walk $w \in W_G$ has a state in Q (which is referred to as the *state* of w hereafter). Starting from the length-zero walk ϕ , which has the special state ∇ , the state of the walk changes as the length of the walk increases. The function δ_e determines how the state of a given walk w changes by appending edge e to its tail. The second condition implies that the state of $w \circ e$ is determined only by the state of w and the edge e and is independent of any other feature of w . The state \perp is a “reject” state, which implies w does not satisfy the constraint C (i.e., $w \notin C$). Condition 3 implies that once a walk w does not satisfy C (i.e., $M_C(w) = \perp$), no addition of edges to w can make it satisfy C . Let $E_G^{\text{out}}(u)$ be the set of outgoing edges from u in G . Assuming each node u knows the transition function $\delta_{C,e}$ for all $e \in E_G^{\text{out}}(u)$, a stateful walk constraint implies that each node u can *locally* decide the state of a walk w leaving u only from the state of the incoming prefix of the walk. For a stateful walk constraint C , a walk with a state

other than \perp (i.e. a walk in C) is called a *stateful* walk. We now present two concrete examples of stateful walks.

Example 1 (*c*-Colored Walk) Here we assume edges have colors, and we are interested in walks where no two consecutive edges are monochromatic. Consider the edge label domain Σ of cardinality c (i.e. color palette), and an assignment $f : E(G) \rightarrow \Sigma$ of a color to each edge. A *c-colored walk* $w = e_1, e_2, \dots, e_\ell$ is a walk satisfying $f(e_i) \neq f(e_{i+1})$ for all $1 \leq i \leq \ell - 1$. The set of all *c*-colored walks $C_{\text{col}(c)} \subseteq W_G$ is a stateful walk constraint associated with the following triple (Q, M, δ) : The state domain is $Q = \Sigma \cup \{\perp, \nabla\}$. For any $w \in W_G$, $M(w)$ represents $f(e)$ for the last edge e in w if $w \in C_{\text{col}(c)}$, ∇ if $w = \phi$, and \perp otherwise. The state $\delta_e(q)$ is $f(e)$ if $q \neq f(e)$, and \perp otherwise.

Example 2 (count-*c* Walk) Here we assume edges are assigned a binary value (i.e., zero or one), and we are interested in walks that contain at most c edges of value one. A *count- c walk* $w = e_1, e_2, \dots, e_\ell$ is a walk satisfying $\sum_{i \in [1, \ell]} f(e_i) \leq c$. The set of all count- c walks, $C_{\text{cnt}(c)}$, is a stateful walk constraint associated with the following triple (Q, M, δ) : The state domain is defined as $Q = [0, c] \cup \{\perp, \nabla\}$. For any $w \in W_G$, $M(w)$ represents $\sum_{e \in w} f(e)$ if it is within the range $[0, c]$, ∇ if $w = \phi$, and \perp otherwise. The state $\delta_e(q)$ is $q + f(e)$ if $q \notin \{\nabla, \perp\}$ and $q + f(e) \leq c$ hold, $f(e)$ if $q = \nabla$, and \perp otherwise.

As seen in the examples above, the specification of the function δ_e typically relies only on the edge label $f(e)$, but this characteristic is not mandatory.

Subsets of stateful walk constraints Let C be a stateful walk constraint associated with the triple (Q, M, δ) . We denote by $C(q)$ the set of all walks with state q in C , and define $C(Q') = \cup_{q \in Q'} C(q)$ for $Q' \subseteq Q$. By definition, $C(Q')$ for any $Q' \subseteq Q$ is a walk constraint (but not necessarily stateful). For example, while the stateful constraint for count- c walks considers all walks of count *at most* c , we can define *exact* count- c walks (where the count is exactly c) as $C(c) \subset C$.

5.2 Finding Stateful Walks

In this section, we show how to reduce the problem of finding shortest stateful walks to the problem of finding *unconstrained* shortest walks. We present a general framework for reducing the constrained version of the shortest paths problem, for any stateful constraint $C \subseteq W_G$, into the unconstrained version in some auxiliary directed graph G_C . The construction of G_C is defined as follows:

- Let $U_Q(u) = \{(u, i) \mid i \in Q\}$, and define $V(G_C) = \cup_{u \in V(G)} U_Q(u)$ (i.e., $V(G_C) = V(G) \times Q$).
- $((u, i), (v, j)) \in E(G_C)$ if and only if one of the following conditions holds: (1) There exists an edge $e = (u, v) \in E(G)$ satisfying $\delta_{C,e}(i) = j$. (2) $u = v$, $i \neq \perp$, and $j = \perp$ hold.
- If the input graph G is weighted (by an edge-cost function $c : E(G) \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$), for any $u, v \in V(G)$, assign the cost $c(u, v)$ to any edge $E(G_C) \cap (U_Q(u) \times U_Q(v))$.

The intuition of the above construction is that we wish to break down the vertex u into $U_Q(u)$ in order to distinguish walks entering u with different states. The vertex (u, i) can be seen as the arrival vertex of any walk w to u with state i . Since we add an edge between (u, i) and (v, j) if and only if $\delta_{C,e}(i) = j$ holds, the walk $w \circ e$, which has state $\delta_{C,e}(i) = j$ in the original graph G , always reaches (v, j) . An illustration of this construction is presented in Figure 3. Note that the second condition is introduced in order to bound the diameter of $\llbracket G_C \rrbracket$ by $O(D)$. The distance from any node in $U_Q(u)$ to any node in $U_Q(v)$ is at most $d_{\llbracket G \rrbracket}(u, v) + 2$ because there exists a walk from (u, \perp)

to (v, \perp) of length $d_{\llbracket G \rrbracket}(u, v)$ (recall that condition 2 of Definition 2 implies $((u, \perp), (v, \perp)) \in E(G_C)$ for any $e = (u, v) \in E(G)$). We state the following lemma.

Lemma 5 Let $G = (V(G), E(G), \gamma_G)$ be any multigraph with edge-cost function $c : E(G) \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$, and $C \subseteq W_G$ be a stateful walk constraint with associated triple (Q, M, δ) . There exists a walk w of weighted length x from s to t with state q ($s, t \in V(G)$, $q \in Q \setminus \{\perp\}$) in C if and only if there exists a walk w' of weight x from (s, ∇) to (t, q) in G_C .

The proof of the lemma is deferred to Appendix D. For any stateful walk constraint C , its state q , and two vertices $s, t \in V_G$, this lemma allows us to compute the shortest walk in $C(q)$ from s to t (and its distance) by computing the directed shortest path from (s, ∇) to (t, q) in G_C . Letting p_{\max} be the maximum edge multiplicity of the original graph G , it is easy to simulate the execution of any CONGEST algorithm for $\llbracket G_C \rrbracket$ on top of the original communication graph $\llbracket G \rrbracket$ with $O(|Q| \cdot p_{\max})$ -round overhead: Each node $v \in V(G)$ is responsible for the simulation of the nodes in $U_Q(v)$. Consider the subgraph $H(u, v)$ of G_C induced by $U_Q(u) \cup U_Q(v)$. Each node in this subgraph has at most p_{\max} outgoing edges. Thus, the total number of edges in $H(u, v)$ is at most $2p_{\max}|Q|$. A single communication round over the links in $E(\llbracket H(u, v) \rrbracket)$ can be achieved by $O(|Q|p_{\max})$ communication rounds over the edge $(u, v) \in E(\llbracket G \rrbracket)$. The total number of nodes in $\llbracket G_C \rrbracket$ is $|Q|n$, and the diameter of G_C is $O(D)$. It is easy to show that the treewidth of G_C is bounded by $O(|Q| \cdot \tau)$: Given a tree decomposition of G , we replace each vertex v in each bag by $U_Q(v)$. The resulting decomposition is obviously a tree decomposition of G_C and the bag size is multiplied by $|Q| + 1$. Consequently, any $f(n, D, \tau)$ -round algorithm in G_C is simulated on the top of $\llbracket G \rrbracket$ within $O(|Q|p_{\max}f(n, D, \tau(|Q| + 1)))$ rounds.

In our applications, we are interested in the constrained version of distance labeling schemes, which is formalized as follows:

- **Constrained distance labeling (CDL(C))**: Let C be a stateful walk constraint with associated triple (Q, M, δ) . It consists of a labeling function $\text{sla}_{G,C} : V(G) \rightarrow \{0, 1\}^*$, that depends on the input graph G , and a common *decoder* function $\text{sdec}_C : Q \times \{0, 1\}^* \times \{0, 1\}^* \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$. Both functions must satisfy $\text{sdec}_C(q, \text{sla}_{G,C}(u), \text{sla}_{G,C}(v)) = d_{G,C(q)}(u, v)$ for any $u, v \in V(G)$ and $q \in Q$. The problem requires that each node $v \in V(G)$ outputs its label $\text{sla}_{G,C}(v)$.

Note that the input graph G can be directed and weighted. The problem CDL(C) in G is solved by any algorithm for (standard) distance labeling in G_C . Since a node $u \in V(G)$ simulates all nodes $U_Q(u) \subseteq V(G_C)$, after the construction of the standard distance labeling for G_C , u has the set of labels $\{\text{la}_{G_C}((u, i)) \mid i \in Q\}$, which we take as the output of CDL(C). This is because one can obtain the $C(q)$ -distance from u to v by computing $\text{dec}(\text{la}_{G_C}((u, \nabla)), \text{la}_{G_C}((v, q)))$. To solve CDL(C) in a low-treewidth graph, G , we use the algorithm of Theorem 2. Running it on G_C , we obtain an algorithm for CDL(C). Consequently, we obtain the following theorem.

Theorem 3 Let $G = (V(G), E(G), \gamma_G)$ be a multigraph of maximum edge multiplicity p_{\max} , $c : E(G) \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ be an edge cost function of G , and C be a stateful walk constraint with associated triple (Q, M, δ) . Then there exists a randomized CONGEST algorithm that solves CDL(C) in $\tilde{O}(|Q|p_{\max}((|Q|\tau)^2D + (|Q|\tau)^4))$ rounds whp.

While distance labeling only outputs the distance, it can be easily transformed into an algorithm for finding the shortest stateful walk between any pair of vertices $s, t \in V(G)$.

Corollary 1 Let $G = (V(G), E(G), \gamma_G)$ be a multigraph of maximum edge multiplicity p_{\max} , $c : E(G) \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ be an edge cost function of G , and C be a stateful walk constraint with associated triple (Q, M, δ) . Then there exists a randomized CONGEST algorithm for constructing the shortest

walk w in $W_{G,C(q)}(s,t)$ for any given v and $q \in Q$ whp. Each node in $V(w)$ outputs the distance along w from s and its predecessor in w . The running time of the algorithm is $\tilde{O}(|Q|p_{\max}((|Q|\tau)^2D + (|Q|\tau)^4))$ rounds.




Figure 3: An illustration of the construction of the graph G_C (right) from a graph G (left). Here we consider the c -Colored walk problem, where $Q = \{r, b, \perp, \nabla\}$. Note that G_C has no edge labels. The dashed lines are edges added according to condition (1), while the solid lines are edges added according to condition (2). For simplicity, the above example is not weighted. However, if, for example, it holds that $c((v_2, v_3)) = x$ in G then the weight of all edges going from $U_Q(v_2)$ to $U_Q(v_3)$ (left to right) in G_c will have weight x .

6 Exact Bipartite Maximum Matching

Let G be an undirected unweighted graph. A matching $M \subseteq E(G)$ is a set of edges such that any two distinct edges do not share an endpoint. Given a matching M of a graph G , we say that a vertex u is *unmatched* if it is not an endpoint of any matching edge. The maximum matching problem requires the algorithm to output the maximum cardinality matching (by marking the edges in the solution). The maximum matching problem is known to be reducible to the task of finding an *augmenting path*, a simple path connecting two unmatched nodes where matching edges and non-matching edges appear alternately. Once an augmenting path is found, by flipping matching edges and non-matching edges, the size of the matching increases by one. The maximum matching is obtained by iterating this augmentation process until the current matching does not have any augmenting path.

An augmenting path can be seen as a simple 2-colored walk whose endpoints are both unmatched vertices, and thus it fits naturally into our stateful-walk framework (more precisely, the construction of $C_{\text{col}(2)}$ -distance labeling following Example 1 and Theorem 3). This idea is incorrect for general graphs because the shortest 2-colored walk is not necessarily simple, but is valid for bipartite graphs: It is well-known that any shortest 2-colored walk is simple in bipartite graphs. However, we still have a few hurdles to overcome. The first issue is how does each unmatched node detect if there

exists an augmenting path starting from itself? Since there might exist $\Omega(n)$ unmatched nodes, the trivial solution where all unmatched nodes broadcast their own $C_{\text{col}(2)}$ -distance labels is very costly. The second issue is how to speed up the iterations of the matching update. The trivial sequential update takes $\Omega(n)$ iterations. We resolve these issues by a divide-and-conquer approach utilizing balanced separators. The key observation is that if the maximum matching is already computed for each connected component in $G - S$ independently (where $S \subseteq V(G)$ is any vertex subset), it suffices to check only the existence of augmenting paths with at least one endpoint in S . This observation is proved in the following simple proposition, which is a special case of a more general theorem presented in [IOO18]:

Proposition 1 (Iwata et al. [IOO18]) Let G be any (undirected and unweighted) graph G , $U \subseteq V(G)$ be a vertex subset, and $\mathcal{H} = \{H_1, H_2, \dots, H_N\}$ be the set of connected components of $G - U$. Assume that the maximum matching M_i for each connected component $H_i \in \mathcal{H}$ is already computed. Then, for any $v \in V \setminus U$, the size of the maximum matching of the graph $G - (U \setminus \{v\})$ is at most $|\bigcup_{1 \leq i \leq N} M_i| + 1$. Any augmenting path in $G - (U \setminus \{v\})$ starts from v .

This proposition naturally induces a divide-and-conquer approach for bipartite maximum matching in low-treewidth graphs. That is, computing a balanced separator S , we recursively compute the maximum matching of each connected component of $G - S$. To obtain the maximum matching for the whole graph G , it suffices to consider only the augmenting paths starting from S . We state the following theorem (the proof is deferred to Appendix E).

Theorem 4 There exists a randomized CONGEST algorithm that computes the maximum matching for any bipartite graph G in $\tilde{O}(\tau^4 D + \tau^7)$ rounds whp.

7 Computing Girth

Let G be a simple and (positively) weighted graph, which could be directed or undirected. The *girth* of G (denoted by g) is the weight of the shortest³ simple cycle in G . For directed graphs, it is relatively easy to reduce the computation of girth to the distance labeling construction: The length of the shortest cycle containing a directed edge $(u, v) \in E(G)$ is determined by computing the distance from v to u in G , which is obtained by exchanging the labels $\text{la}_G(u)$ and $\text{la}_G(v)$. To compute the girth, it suffices to execute this task for all edges, and take the minimum over all of the computed cycle lengths. In our setting, the running time of this algorithm is $\tilde{O}(\tau^2 D + \tau^5)$ rounds.

The case for undirected graphs is more challenging because the shortest path from v to u can contain the edge (u, v) , while such a case does not occur in directed graphs. This section provides a CONGEST algorithm that computes g in an undirected graph G using our framework. Let $\Sigma = \{0, 1\}$ be the edge label domain. Recall that a walk w is called *exact count-1* if w contains exactly one edge with label one. Since $C_{\text{cnt}(1)}(1) \subset C_{\text{cnt}(1)}$ is obviously the set of all exact count-1 walks, Theorem 3 allows us to compute the shortest length of exact count-1 walks from u to v for any two nodes $u, v \in V(G)$ using their labels (i.e., $\text{sdec}_{C_{\text{cnt}(1)}}(1, \text{sla}_{C_{\text{cnt}(1)}}(u), \text{sla}_{C_{\text{cnt}(1)}}(v))$ is the shortest length of exact count-1 walks from u to v). The following lemma is the key for our girth algorithm.

Lemma 6 Any shortest exact count-1 walk w starting and terminating at the same vertex v contains a simple cycle, and thus the weight of w is at least g .

³By shortest, we mean smallest weight.

Note that the above holds for *any* assignment of binary edge labels. Assume a labeling function f such that some shortest cycle $R = e_0, e_1, \dots, e_{g-1}$ has exactly one edge $e_i \in E(R)$ which satisfies $f(e_i) = 1$. Each node u computes the length of the shortest exact count-1 walk from u to u . Let us denote this by $g(u)$. As explained above, this is possible by using $\text{CDL}(C_{\text{cnt}(1)})$ (note that the shortest length of exact count-1 walks (i.e., $C_{\text{cnt}(1)}(1)$ -distance) from u to u is computed locally by the label $\text{sla}_{C_{\text{cnt}(1)}}(u)$). As R is a shortest cycle in G with exactly one edge labeled "1", by Lemma 6, $g(v) = g$ holds for every $v \in V(R)$. Thus, we can compute the girth $g = \min_{u \in V(G)} g(u)$ by standard aggregation over all nodes.

The final challenge is how to obtain the edge label function f satisfying the above condition. However, this can be resolved by a probabilistic label assignment. Let F be the set of the edges, $e \in E(G)$, such that e is covered by at least one shortest cycle. Note that if exactly one edge in F has label one, the condition holds for at least one shortest cycle. To guarantee that the condition holds with constant probability, it suffices to assign each edge with label one (independently of other edges) with probability $p = \Theta(1/|F|)$. Repeating this process (assigning random labels, computing g , keeping the minimum value of g) a logarithmic number of times, we can amplify the success probability to $1 - 1/n$. While the value of p is unknown to the algorithm, it can be estimated by a standard doubling technique. Consequently, we state the following theorem (the complete argument and proofs are presented in Appendix F).

Theorem 5 There exists a randomized CONGEST algorithm that computes the girth, g , of directed and weighted graph G in $\tilde{O}(\tau^2 D + \tau^5)$ rounds whp.

References

- [ACK16] Amir Abboud, Keren Censor-Hillel, and Seri Khoury. Near-linear lower bounds for distributed distance computations, even in sparse networks. In *30th International Symposium on Distributed Computing (DISC)*, pages 29–42, 2016.
- [AK20] Mohamad Ahmadi and Fabian Kuhn. Distributed maximum matching verification in congest. In *34th International Symposium on Distributed Computing (DISC)*, pages 37:1–37:18, 2020.
- [AKO18] Mohamad Ahmadi, Fabian Kuhn, and Rotem Oshman. Distributed approximate maximum matching in the congest model. In *Proceedings of the 32nd International Symposium on Distributed Computing (DISC)*, pages 6:1–6:17, 2018.
- [ARKP18] Udit Agarwal, Vijaya Ramachandran, Valerie King, and Matteo Pontecorvi. A deterministic distributed algorithm for exact weighted all-pairs shortest paths in $\tilde{O}(n^{3/2})$ rounds. In *Proc. of the 2018 ACM Symposium on Principles of Distributed Computing (PODC)*, pages 199–205, 2018.
- [BCHD⁺19] Nir Bacrach, Keren Censor-Hillel, Michal Dory, Yuval Efron, Dean Leitersdorf, and Ami Paz. Hardness of distributed optimization. In *Proceedings of the 2019 ACM Symposium on Principles of Distributed Computing (PODC)*, page 238–247, 2019.
- [BKKL17] Ruben Becker, Andreas Karrenbauer, Sebastian Krinninger, and Christoph Lenzen. Near-optimal approximate shortest paths and transshipment in distributed and streaming models. In *31st International Symposium on Distributed Computing (DISC)*, pages 7:1–7:16, 2017.

- [BKS19] Ran Ben-Basat, Ken-ichi Kawarabayashi, and Gregory Schwartzman. Parameterized Distributed Algorithms. In *Proc. of 33rd International Symposium on Distributed Computing (DISC)*, pages 6:1–6:16, 2019.
- [BN19] Aaron Bernstein and Danupon Nanongkai. Distributed exact weighted all-pairs shortest paths in near-linear time. In *Proc. of the 51st Annual ACM SIGACT Symposium on Theory of Computing (STOC)*, page 334–342, 2019.
- [BYCHGS17] Reuven Bar-Yehuda, Keren Censor-Hillel, Mohsen Ghaffari, and Gregory Schwartzman. Distributed approximation of maximum independent set and maximum matching. In *Proceedings of the 36th annual ACM Symposium on Principles of Distributed Computing (PODC)*, pages 165–174, 2017.
- [CFK⁺15] Marek Cygan, Fedor V. Fomin, Łukasz Kowalik, Daniel Lokshtanov, Dániel Marx, Marcin Pilipczuk, Michał Pilipczuk, and Saket Saurabh. *Parameterized algorithms*. Springer, 2015.
- [CHFG⁺20] Keren Censor-Hillel, Orr Fischer, Tzlil Gonen, François Le Gall, Dean Leitersdorf, and Rotem Oshman. Fast Distributed Algorithms for Girth, Cycles and Small Subgraphs. In *Proc. of 34th International Symposium on Distributed Computing (DISC)*, pages 33:1–33:17, 2020.
- [CM20] Shiri Chechik and Doron Mukhtar. Single-source shortest paths in the congest model with improved bound. In *Proceedings of the 39th Symposium on Principles of Distributed Computing*, page 464–473, 2020.
- [DSDP12] Atish Das Sarma, Michael Dinitz, and Gopal Pandurangan. Efficient computation of distance sketches in distributed networks. In *Proc. of the 24th ACM Symposium on Parallelism in Algorithms and Architectures (SPAA)*, pages 318–326, 2012.
- [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 *Proc. of the 43rd Annual ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing*, pages 363–372, 2011.
- [Elk17] Michael Elkin. Distributed exact shortest paths in sublinear time. In *Proc. of the 49th Annual ACM SIGACT Symposium on Theory of Computing (STOC)*, pages 757–770, 2017.
- [FGNW17] Ofer Freedman, Paweł Gawrychowski, Patrick K. Nicholson, and Oren Weimann. Optimal distance labeling schemes for trees. In *Proc. of the ACM Symposium on Principles of Distributed Computing (PODC)*, pages 185–194, 2017.
- [FHW12] Silvio Frischknecht, Stephan Holzer, and Roger Wattenhofer. Networks cannot compute their diameter in sublinear time. In *Proc. of the Twenty-Third Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms (SODA)*, pages 1150–1162, 2012.
- [FLP⁺17] Fedor V. Fomin, Daniel Lokshtanov, Michał Pilipczuk, Saket Saurabh, and Marcin Wrochna. Fully polynomial-time parameterized computations for graphs and matrices of low treewidth. *ACM Transactions on Algorithms*, 14(3):1419–1432, 2017.

- [FN18] Sebastian Forster and Danupon Nanongkai. A faster distributed single-source shortest paths algorithm. In *59th IEEE Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science (FOCS)*, pages 686–697, 2018.
- [GH16a] Mohsen Ghaffari and Bernhard Haeupler. Distributed algorithms for planar networks i: Planar embedding. In *Proc. of the 48th ACM Symposium on Principles of Distributed Computing (PODC)*, pages 29–38, 2016.
- [GH16b] Mohsen Ghaffari and Bernhard Haeupler. Distributed algorithms for planar networks ii: Low-congestion shortcuts, mst, and min-cut. In *Proc. of the 27th Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms (SODA)*, pages 202–219, 2016.
- [Gha15] Mohsen Ghaffari. Near-optimal scheduling of distributed algorithms. In *Proceedings of the 2015 ACM Symposium on Principles of Distributed Computing (PODC)*, pages 3–12, 2015.
- [GKP20] Ofer Grossman, Seri Khoury, and Ami Paz. Improved Hardness of Approximation of Diameter in the CONGEST Model. In *Proc. of 34th International Symposium on Distributed Computing (DISC)*, pages 19:1–19:16, 2020.
- [GL18] Mohsen Ghaffari and Jason Li. Improved distributed algorithms for exact shortest paths. In *Proc. of the 50th Annual ACM SIGACT Symposium on Theory of Computing (STOC)*, pages 431–444, 2018.
- [GP03] Cyril Gavoille and Christophe Paul. Distance labeling scheme and split decomposition. *Discrete Mathematics*, 273:115–130, 12 2003.
- [GP08] C. Gavoille and C. Paul. Optimal distance labeling for interval graphs and related graph families. *SIAM Journal on Discrete Mathematics*, 22(3):1239–1258, 2008.
- [GP17] Mohsen Ghaffari and Merav Parter. Near-Optimal Distributed DFS in Planar Graphs. In *31st International Symposium on Distributed Computing (DISC 2017)*, volume 91, pages 21:1–21:16, 2017.
- [GPPR04] Cyril Gavoille, David Peleg, Stéphane Pérennes, and Ran Raz. Distance labeling in graphs. *Journal of Algorithms*, 53(1):85–112, 2004.
- [HHW18] Bernhard Haeupler, D. Ellis Hershkowitz, and David Wajc. Round- and message-optimal distributed graph algorithms. In *Proc. of the 2018 ACM Symposium on Principles of Distributed Computing (PODC)*, page 119–128, 2018.
- [HIZ16] Bernhard Haeupler, Taisuke Izumi, and Goran Zuzic. Near-optimal low-congestion shortcuts on bounded parameter graphs. In *Proc. of 30th International Symposium on Distributed Computing (DISC)*, pages 158–172, 2016.
- [HKN16] Monika Henzinger, Sebastian Krinninger, and Danupon Nanongkai. A deterministic almost-tight distributed algorithm for approximating single-source shortest paths. In *Proc. of the 48th Annual ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing (STOC)*, pages 489–498, 2016.
- [HL18] Bernhard Haeupler and Jason Li. Faster Distributed Shortest Path Approximations via Shortcuts. In *Proc. of 32nd International Symposium on Distributed Computing (DISC)*, pages 33:1–33:14, 2018.

- [HLZ18] Bernhard Haeupler, Jason Li, and Goran Zuzic. Minor excluded network families admit fast distributed algorithms. In *Proc. of the 2018 ACM Symposium on Principles of Distributed Computing, (PODC)*, pages 465–474, 2018.
- [HNS17] Chien-Chung Huang, Danupon Nanongkai, and Thatchaphol Saranurak. Distributed exact weighted all-pairs shortest paths in $\tilde{O}(n^{5/4})$ rounds. In *58th IEEE Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science (FOCS)*, pages 168–179, 2017.
- [HW12] Stephan Holzer and Roger Wattenhofer. Optimal distributed all pairs shortest paths and applications. In *Proc. of the 2012 ACM Symposium on Principles of Distributed Computing (PODC)*, pages 355–364, 2012.
- [IOO18] Yoichi Iwata, Tomoaki Ogasawara, and Naoto Ohsaka. On the Power of Tree-Depth for Fully Polynomial FPT Algorithms. In *Proc. of 35th Symposium on Theoretical Aspects of Computer Science (STACS)*, volume 96, pages 41:1–41:14, 2018.
- [IW14] Taisuke Izumi and Roger Wattenhofer. Time lower bounds for distributed distance oracles. In *Proc. of 18th International Conference on Principles of Distributed Systems (OPODIS)*, pages 60–75, 2014.
- [KI22] Naoki Kitamura and Taisuke Izumi. A subquadratic-time distributed algorithm for exact maximum matching. *IEICE Transactions on Information and Systems*, 105(3):634–645, 2022.
- [KKP05] Michal Katz, Nir A. Katz, and David Peleg. Distance labeling schemes for well-separated graph classes. *Discrete Applied Mathematics*, 145(3):384–402, 2005.
- [KMW06] Fabian Kuhn, Thomas Moscibroda, and Roger Wattenhofer. The price of being near-sighted. In *Proceedings of the seventeenth Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms (SODA)*, pages 1109557–1109666, 2006.
- [Li18] Jason Li. Distributed treewidth computation. *arXiv*, 2018.
- [LP13] Christoph Lenzen and David Peleg. Efficient distributed source detection with limited bandwidth. In *Proc. of the 2013 ACM Symposium on Principles of Distributed Computing (PODC)*, pages 375–382, 2013.
- [LP19] Jason Li and Merav Parter. Planar diameter via metric compression. In *Proceedings of the 51st Annual ACM SIGACT Symposium on Theory of Computing (STOC)*, pages 152–163, 2019.
- [LPS13] Christoph Lenzen and Boaz Patt-Shamir. Fast routing table construction using small messages: Extended abstract. In *Proc. of the 45th Annual ACM Symposium on Symposium on Theory of Computing (STOC)*, pages 381–390, 2013.
- [LPS15] Christoph Lenzen and Boaz Patt-Shamir. Fast partial distance estimation and applications. In *Proc. of the 2015 ACM Symposium on Principles of Distributed Computing (PODC)*, pages 153–162, 2015.
- [LPSP15] Zvi Lotker, Boaz Patt-Shamir, and Seth Pettie. Improved distributed approximate matching. *Journal of the ACM (JACM)*, 62(5):1–17, 2015.

- [MSJ19] Silviu Maniu, Pierre Senellart, and Suraj Jog. An experimental study of the treewidth of real-world graph data. In *ICDT*, volume 127 of *LIPICs*, pages 12:1–12:18. Schloss Dagstuhl - Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik, 2019.
- [Nan14] Danupon Nanongkai. Distributed approximation algorithms for weighted shortest paths. In *Proc. of the 46th Annual ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing (STOC)*, pages 565–573, 2014.
- [Par20] Merav Parter. Distributed Planar Reachability in Nearly Optimal Time. In *Proc. of 34th International Symposium on Distributed Computing (DISC)*, pages 38:1–38:17, 2020.
- [PRT12] David Peleg, Liam Roditty, and Elad Tal. Distributed algorithms for network diameter and girth. In *Proc. of the 39th International Colloquium Conference on Automata, Languages, and Programming (ICALP)*, pages 660–672, 2012.
- [ZGY⁺22] Goran Zuzic, Gramoz Goranci, Mingquan Ye, Bernhard Haeupler, and Xiaorui Sun. Universally-optimal distributed shortest paths and transshipment via graph-based ℓ_1 -oblivious routing. In *Proceedings of the 2022 Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms (SODA)*, pages 2549–2579, 2022.

A Preliminaries for the Appendix

A.1 Part-wise Aggregation for Near Disjoint Collection

We present a generalized version of part-wise aggregation, which is applicable to a certain kind of edge-disjoint but not necessarily vertex-disjoint subgraphs. A collection of connected subgraphs $\mathcal{H} = \{H_1, H_2, \dots, H_N\}$ ($H_i \subseteq G$) is called a *near disjoint collection* of G if it satisfies the following two conditions:

- For any edge $(u, v) \in E(G)$, either u or v is contained in at most one subgraph in \mathcal{H} .
- Let $V'(H_i) \subseteq V(H_i)$ be the set of nodes which do not belong to any other subgraph in $\mathcal{H} \setminus \{H_i\}$. For any $i \in [1, N]$, the subgraph H'_i induced by $V'(H_i)$ is connected.

We extend the applicability of subgraph aggregation to any near disjoint collection of G .

Lemma 7 For any undirected graph G and its near disjoint collection \mathcal{H} , subgraph aggregation for \mathcal{H} and any associative binary operator \oplus can be solved deterministically in $\tilde{O}(\tau D)$ rounds.

Proof. As a preprocessing step, for all $i \in [1, N]$, each node $u \in V(H_i) \setminus V(H'_i)$ sends its input value $x_{u,i}$ to one neighbor v that belongs to $V(H'_i)$. Such a neighbor necessarily exists by the first condition of near disjointness. The node v receiving $x_{u,i}$ sets $x_{v,i} \oplus x_{u,i}$ as its new input value. Then the algorithm executes PA for $\mathcal{H}' = \{H'_1, H'_2, \dots, H'_N\}$. Since \mathcal{H}' is a collection of vertex disjoint connected subgraph, this PA task can be implemented by known algorithm [HIZ16, HHW18], whose running time is $\tilde{O}(\tau D)$ rounds. The output for H'_i is obviously equal to $\bigoplus_{v \in V(H'_i)} x_{v,i}$. This output value for H'_i is sent back to the nodes in $V(H_i) \setminus V(H'_i)$ in one round. The total running time is dominated by that for PA, which takes $\tilde{O}(\tau D)$ rounds. \square

Most of the algorithms presented hereafter are constructed by utilizing the (generalized) part-wise aggregation (PA) and standard one-round neighborhood communication (i.e., a single round of the CONGEST model) as fundamental building blocks. We formalize one-round neighborhood communication as a task of subgraph operations, which we refer to as the short-hand ‘‘SNC.’’ That is, SNC for $\mathcal{H} = \{H_1, H_2, \dots, H_N\}$ is the task where each node $u \in V(H_i)$ exchanges $O(\log n)$ bit messages with its neighbors in H_i . Trivially, SNC can be implemented for any near disjoint collection \mathcal{H} in a single round.

It is known that several fundamental tasks in the distributed setting can be reduced to PA and SNC.

Lemma 8 (Ghaffari et al. [GH16b], Haeupler et al. [HL18], Li [Li18], generalized to near-disjoint collections) Let $\mathcal{H} = \{H_1, H_2, \dots, H_N\}$ be a near-disjoint collection of connected subgraphs of G . The tasks below are deterministically solvable simultaneously and independently for all H_i by $\tilde{O}(1)$ invocations of PA and SNC running on G .

- Subgraph Rooted Spanning Tree (RST): Given root node $r_i \in V(H_i)$, compute a spanning tree T_i rooted at r_i for each H_i . The output of every $v \in V(H_i)$ is the set of all neighbors in T_i as well as a pointer to the parent vertex in T_i . The root node outputs a pointer to itself.
- Subtree Aggregation (STA): Assume that each H_i is a rooted tree. Let \oplus be an associative binary operator over a finite set \mathcal{M} of cardinality $\text{poly}(n)$. Given inputs $x_{v,i} \in \mathcal{M}$ for all $v \in V(H_i)$ and $i \in [1, N]$, each vertex $v \in V(H_i)$ outputs the value $\bigoplus_{u \in V(H_i(v))} x_{u,i}$ (recall that $H_i(v)$ is the subtree of H_i rooted at v).

- Subgraph Leader Election (SLE): Elect a unique leader independently in each subgraph H_i . Each node $v \in V(H_i)$ has a binary input $x_{v,i} \in \{0, 1\}$ indicating if v is a candidate or not. The output of each node in H_i is the ID of the elected leader in H_i . The input of the elected leader must be one.
- Connected Component Detection (CCD): For each H_i , detect all of the connected components of a given subgraph $H'_i \subseteq H_i$. The input of each node $u \in V(H_i)$ is the set of edges incident to u in H'_i . The algorithm assigns each connected component in H_i with a unique ID, which is outputted by the nodes in the component.
- Subgraph Broadcast (BCT) : Each subgraph $H_i \in \mathcal{H}$ contains a single source node u_i , which broadcasts a message, m_i , of $O(\log n)$ bits in H_i . The output of the algorithm at node $v \in V(H_i)$ is m_i .

In addition, the following task is deterministically solvable by $\tilde{O}(t)$ invocations of PA and SNC in G .

- Subgraph minimum vertex cut (MVC(t)): Given two disjoint subsets $X_i, Y_i \subseteq V(H_i)$ for each H_i , output a X_i - Y_i vertex cut of H_i of size at most t . Each node outputs 1 if it is in the computed cut, and 0 otherwise. If there is no cut of size at most t , all nodes in H_i output -1 .

We also use the above three-character shorthands for indicating which algorithm is applied to handle a given task. For example, consider the statement “the algorithm performs some task (STA)”, here we mean that the task is implemented by subtree aggregation.

A.2 Scheduling Multiple Instances of Subgraph Operations

We would like to execute N CONGEST algorithms $\mathcal{A} = \{A_1, A_2, A_3, \dots, A_N\}$ simultaneously and independently in a common network G . The *dilation* of A_i in G is the running time of A_i when only it is executed in G . Letting $c_i(e)$ be the number of rounds that A_i uses edge e (i.e. sends a message through e), the congestion of A_i in G is the value $\max_{e \in E(G)} c_i(e)$. Note that each algorithm A_i can be a randomized algorithm. Then the dilation and congestion of A_i become random variables, and a failure of A_i means that either A_i outputs a wrong answer or violates the specified dilation or congestion bound. The dilation of \mathcal{A} is defined as the maximum dilation over all algorithms in \mathcal{A} , and the congestion of \mathcal{A} in G is defined as $\max_{e \in E(G)} \sum_{1 \leq i \leq N} c_i(e)$. The following general scheduling theorem is known:

Theorem 6 (Ghaffari [Gha15]) Let \mathcal{A} be a set of (possibly randomized) CONGEST algorithms, such that the dilation and congestion of \mathcal{A} in G are respectively bounded by δ and γ whp. Then there exists a CONGEST algorithm for running all algorithms in \mathcal{A} in $\tilde{O}(\delta + \gamma)$ rounds whp.

Now we bound the congestion and dilation of PA for a near disjoint collection of G . The following result is known:

Lemma 9 (Haeupler et al. [HIZ16], [HHW18]) For any undirected graph G and its near disjoint collection \mathcal{H} of connected subgraphs, PA for \mathcal{H} can be solved deterministically with dilation $\tilde{O}(\tau D)$ and congestion $\tilde{O}(\tau)$.

This lemma yields better running time bounds for executing a collection of tasks presented in Lemma 8 independently in parallel. Specifically, our algorithms execute multiple runs of BCT and MVC. We state the following two corollaries.

Corollary 2 Let $\mathcal{H} = \{H_1, H_2, \dots, H_N\}$ be a near disjoint collection of G . For each subgraph H_i , h pairs of disjoint vertex subsets $X_{i,j}, Y_{i,j} \subseteq V(H_i)$ ($1 \leq j \leq h$) are given. Then there exists a randomized algorithm for finding a $X_{i,j}$ - $Y_{i,j}$ vertex cut of size at most t (if it exists) for all $1 \leq i \leq N$ and $1 \leq j \leq h$ in $\tilde{O}(t\tau D + ht\tau)$ rounds whp.

Corollary 3 Let $\mathcal{H} = \{H_1, H_2, \dots, H_N\}$ be a near disjoint collection of G . Assume that each subgraph $H_i \in \mathcal{H}$ contains h source nodes $u_{i,0}, u_{i,1}, \dots, u_{i,h-1}$ (some of which might be the same node). They respectively broadcast messages $m_{i,0}, m_{i,1}, \dots, m_{i,h-1}$ of $O(\log n)$ bits in H_i . The output of the algorithm at node $v \in V(H_i)$ is the set of all source-message pairs $\{(u_{i,0}, m_{i,0}), (u_{i,1}, m_{i,1}), \dots, (u_{i,h-1}, m_{i,h-1})\}$ in H_i . There exists a randomized algorithm for solving this task within $\tilde{O}(\tau D + h\tau)$ rounds whp.

We refer to the operations above as $\text{MVC}(h, t)$ and $\text{BCT}(h)$, respectively.

B Fully Polynomial-Time Distributed Tree Decomposition

B.1 Correctness of Sep

We prove the correctness of SEP. Let S be any $(X, 1/2)$ -balanced separator of size $\tau + 1$ in G . Let $\mathcal{T}^* = \bigcup_{1 \leq i \leq \hat{t}} \mathcal{T}_i$. An ordered pair $(T_1, T_2) \in \mathcal{T}^* \times \mathcal{T}^*$ is called *separated* if T_1 and T_2 do not intersect S and belong to different connected components in $G - S$.

Proposition 2 Assume that the algorithm executes step 4. Then, $\forall i \in [1, \hat{t}], 3.9t \leq |\mathcal{T}_i| \leq 12.1t$ holds.

Proof. Let us denote $N = |\mathcal{T}_i|$. Since R_{i-1}^* is not a $(X, 14399/14400)$ -balanced separator, we get that $\mu(G_i) \geq 14399\mu(V(G))/14400$. Each tree $T \in \mathcal{T}_i$ has a size at most $\mu(G)/(4t)$. Thus the following inequality holds.

$$N \geq \frac{\mu(G_i)}{\frac{\mu(G)}{4t}} = \frac{4t\mu(G_i)}{\mu(G)} \geq \frac{4t \cdot 14399}{14400} \geq 3.9t.$$

Let $\mathcal{T}_i = \{T_1, T_2, \dots, T_N\}$. Trees in \mathcal{T}_i are vertex disjoint except for their root vertices, and thus the collection of vertex subsets $\{\hat{V}_j\}_{1 \leq j \leq N}$, where $\hat{V}_j = V(T_j) \setminus R_i$, are disjoint. Then we have $\mu(\hat{V}_j) = \mu(T_j) - 1 \geq \mu(G_i)/(12t) - 1$. In addition, since the algorithm does not halt at step 1, we obtain $1/\mu(G) \leq 1/200t^2 \leq 1/800$ (recall $t \geq \tau + 1 \geq 2$). Putting everything together, we state the following inequality:

$$N \leq \frac{\mu(G_i)}{\frac{\mu(G)}{12t} - 1} \leq \frac{\mu(G)}{\frac{\mu(G)}{12t} - 1} \leq \frac{12t}{1 - 1/\mu(G)} \leq (12t) \cdot \frac{800}{799} \leq 12.1t.$$

□

Lemma 10 Assume that SEP executes step 4. There exists a subset $I \subset [1, \hat{t}]$ of cardinality $\lceil t/300 \rceil$ such that for any $i \in I$, $|\mathcal{T}_i|^2/20$ pairs in $\mathcal{T}_i \times \mathcal{T}_i$ are separated.

Proof. Since $|S| \leq t$ holds and R_i for all $1 \leq i \leq \hat{t}$ are disjoint, there exists a subset $I \subseteq [1, \hat{t}]$ of cardinality $\hat{t} - t \geq \lceil t/300 \rceil$ such that $R_i \cap S = \emptyset$ holds for any $i \in I$. We show that I satisfies the condition of the lemma. Let i be any index in I . By Proposition 2, we have $|\mathcal{T}_i| \geq 3.9t$. Since

trees in \mathcal{T}_i are vertex disjoint except for roots, at least $|\mathcal{T}_i| - t$ trees in \mathcal{T}_i do not intersect S . Letting $\mathcal{T}'_i \subseteq \mathcal{T}_i$ be the set of such trees, we have

$$|\mathcal{T}'_i| \geq |\mathcal{T}_i| - t \geq |\mathcal{T}_i| - \frac{|\mathcal{T}_i|}{3.9} \geq \frac{2.9|\mathcal{T}_i|}{3.9}.$$

Next, we bound the number of tree pairs in $\mathcal{T}'_i \times \mathcal{T}'_i$ which respectively belong to two distinct connected components in $G - S$. Let H_1, H_2, \dots, H_N be the connected components of $G - S$, $Y = \bigcup_{T \in \mathcal{T}_i \setminus \mathcal{T}'_i} V(T)$, and H'_i be the subgraph of H_i obtained by removing all the vertices in Y . We denote by x_k the number of trees in \mathcal{T}'_i which are contained in H'_k . Without loss of generality, we assume that $x_k \geq x_{k+1}$ holds for $1 \leq k \leq N - 1$. Since S is a $(X, 1/2)$ -balanced separator, $\mu(H'_1) \leq \mu(H_1) \leq \mu(G)/2$ holds. The number of vertices in each tree in \mathcal{T}'_i excluding its root is at least $\mu(G)/(12t) - 1$. By the calculation similar with Proposition 2, it follows that H'_1 contains at most $\mu(H'_1)/(\mu(G)/(12t) - 1) \leq 6.05t$ trees. That is, $t \geq x_1/6.05$ holds. Let $\overline{H}_1 = H'_2 + H'_3 + \dots + H'_N$, and $\overline{x}_1 = x_2 + x_3 + \dots, x_N$. Since each tree in $\mathcal{T}_i \setminus \mathcal{T}'_i$ contains at most $\mu(G)/(4t)$ vertices and at most t trees are contained in $\mathcal{T}_i \setminus \mathcal{T}'_i$, we have $|Y| \leq \mu(G)/4$. By the fact of $\mu(H'_1) \leq \mu(G)/2$, we obtain $\mu(\overline{H}_1) \geq \mu(G)/2 - |Y| \geq \mu(G)/4$. Trees in \mathcal{T}'_i have sizes at most $\mu(G)/(4t)$ and are vertex disjoint except for their roots, each tree in \mathcal{T}'_i can exclusively contains at most $\mu(G)/(4t) - 1$ vertices in \overline{H}_1 . Thus we can bound \overline{x}_1 as follows:

$$\overline{x}_1 \geq \frac{\mu(\overline{H}_1)}{\mu(G)/(4t) - 1} \geq \frac{t\mu(G)}{\mu(G) - 4t} \geq t \geq \frac{x_1}{6.05}.$$

Putting all together, we have

$$\frac{6.05|\mathcal{T}'_i|}{7.05} = \frac{6.05(x_1 + \overline{x}_1)}{7.05} \geq \frac{6.05x_1 + x_1}{7.05} = x_1.$$

Then there exists j such that $|\mathcal{T}'_i|/7.05 \leq \sum_{1 \leq k \leq j} x_k \leq 6.05|\mathcal{T}'_i|/7.05$ holds. We define \mathcal{T}_i^+ as the trees in \mathcal{T}'_i contained in $H_1 + H_2 + \dots + H_j$, and \mathcal{T}_i^- as those contained in $H_{j+1} + H_{j+2} + \dots, + H_N$. Since any pair in $\mathcal{T}_i^+ \times \mathcal{T}_i^-$ is separated, $|\mathcal{T}_i^+|(|\mathcal{T}'_i| - |\mathcal{T}_i^+|)$ pairs in $\mathcal{T}_i \times \mathcal{T}_i$ are separated. \mathcal{T}_i^+ contains at least $|\mathcal{T}'_i|/7.05$ trees, we conclude that $6.05|\mathcal{T}'_i|^2/(7.05 \cdot 7.05) = (6.05 \cdot (2.9)^2)|\mathcal{T}'_i|^2/(7.05 \cdot 3.9)^2 \geq |\mathcal{T}'_i|^2/20$ pairs are separated. \square

In the following argument, let I be the set of indices shown in Lemma 10. For simplicity of argument, we assume $I = [1, \lceil t/300 \rceil]$. Assume that the algorithm executes step 4. For $i \in I$, let $(T_{i,j,1}, T_{i,j,2})$ be the j -th pair chosen from $\mathcal{T}_i \times \mathcal{T}_i$ at step 4 ($1 \leq j \leq 2t$, $1 \leq i \leq 95$), and $\mathcal{P}_i = \{(T_{i,j,1}, T_{i,j,2}) \mid j \in [1, 95]\}$. For a subset $\mathcal{X} \subseteq \mathcal{T}^* \times \mathcal{T}^*$, we define $V(\mathcal{X}) = \bigcup_{(T_1, T_2) \in \mathcal{X}} (V(T_1) \cup V(T_2))$.

Lemma 11 With probability at least $4/5$, there exists a subset $I' \subseteq I$ and a set of pairs $U = \{(T_{i,1}, T_{i,2})\}_{i \in I'}$ satisfying the following two conditions:

- $(T_{i,1}, T_{i,2})$ is contained in \mathcal{P}_i and is separated.
- For any $\gamma : I' \rightarrow \{1, 2\}$, $\bigcup_{i \in I'} V(T_{i,\gamma(i)}) \geq \mu(G)/14400$.

Proof. We say that a tree $T \in \mathcal{T}_i$ has a *large intersection* with a vertex subset $V' \subseteq V(G)$ if $\mu(V' \cap V(T)) > \mu(G)/(24t)$ holds. Similarly, a pair of trees $(T_1, T_2) \in \mathcal{P}_i$ has a large intersection with V' if either T_1 or T_2 has a large intersection with V' . We construct U recursively as follows:

- Add an arbitrary separated pair in \mathcal{P}_1 to U as $(T_{1,1}, T_{1,2})$ if it exists.

- Let $U_i = \{(T_{i',1}, T_{i',2}) \mid i' \leq i\}$. For $i \in [2, \lceil t/300 \rceil]$, add an arbitrary separated pair in \mathcal{P}_i not having a large intersection with $V(U_{i-1})$ to U as $(T_{i,1}, T_{i,2})$ if it exists.

The index i is added to I' if some pair is added as $(T_{i,1}, T_{i,2})$. It is easy to see that this construction satisfies the first condition of the lemma. Hence we focus on the proof of the second condition.

We define the indicator random variables Q_i for $i \in I$ as $Q_i = 1$ if and only if $i \in I'$ (i.e., a pair $(T_{i,1}, T_{i,2})$ in \mathcal{P}_i is added to U). Let $Q = \sum_{i' \in I} Q_{i'}$. Since $\mu(T_{i,j}) \leq \mu(G)/(4t)$ holds and $|I| \leq t/300$, we obtain the following inequality for any $i \leq |I| - 1$.

$$V(U_i) \leq \frac{(|I| - 1)\mu(G)}{2t} \leq \frac{\mu(G)}{600}.$$

Since trees in \mathcal{T}_i are vertex disjoint except for roots, the number of trees in \mathcal{T}_i having a large intersection with $V(U_{i-1})$ is bounded as follows:

$$\frac{\frac{\mu_X(G)}{600}}{\frac{\mu_X(G)}{24t} - 1} \leq \frac{t}{22} \leq \frac{|\mathcal{T}_i|}{80},$$

where the last inequality comes from Proposition 2. Since an ordered pair in $\mathcal{T}_i \times \mathcal{T}_i$ has a large intersection with $V(U_{i-1})$ when at least one of the pair has a large intersection with $V(U_{i-1})$, at most $2(|\mathcal{T}_i| \cdot |\mathcal{T}_i|/80)$ ordered pairs in $\mathcal{T}_i \times \mathcal{T}_i$ have a large intersection with $V(U_{i-1})$. Combined with Lemma 10, there exist $(1/20 - 1/40) \geq |\mathcal{T}|^2/40$ pairs in $\mathcal{T}_i \times \mathcal{T}_i$ are separated and have no large intersection with $V(U_{i-1})$. It implies $\Pr[Q_i = 0] \leq (1 - 1/40)^{95} \leq 1/10$, i.e., $\Pr[Q_i = 1] \geq 9/10$. Then we have $E[Q] \geq 9t/3000$ and thus $E[(t/300 - Q)] < t/3000$. By Markov inequality, $\Pr[(t/300 - Q) > t/600] \leq (t/3000)/(t/600) = 1/5$. Thus we have $\Pr[Q > t/600] \geq 4/5$.

Let $U'_i(\gamma) = \bigcup_{i' \in I' \wedge i' \leq i} V(T_{i', \gamma(i')})$. Since $V(U'_i(\gamma)) \subseteq V(U_i)$ holds for any $i \geq 1$ satisfying $i \in I'$, both $T_{i,1}$ and $T_{i,2}$ do not have a large intersection with $V(U'_{i-1}(\gamma))$ (where $V(U'_0)$ is defined as the empty set). Thus $\mu(V(U'_i(\gamma))) \geq \mu(G)/(24t) + \mu(V(U'_{i-1}(\gamma)))$ if $i \in I'$ and $\mu(V(U'_i(\gamma))) \geq \mu(V(U'_{i-1}(\gamma)))$ otherwise. Since $|I'| > t/600$ holds, we obtain $U'_{|I'|}(\gamma) \geq \mu(G)/14400$. The lemma is proved. \square

Lemma 12 SEP outputs a $(X, 14399/14400)$ -balanced separator of size at most $400(\tau + 1)^2$ with high probability.

Proof. Since the value t such that $\tau + 1 \leq t < 2(\tau + 1)$, it suffices to show that the algorithm outputs a $(X, 14399/14400)$ -balanced separator of size at most $200t^2$ if $t \geq \tau + 1$ holds. The proof is obvious if the algorithm outputs the separator at step 1. Consider the case that the algorithm outputs a separator at step 3 in the i -th iteration. By Proposition 2, $|R_i| \leq |\mathcal{T}_i| \leq 12.1t$ holds for any $i' \leq i$. Thus we obtain $|R_i^*| \leq i \cdot 12.1t \leq 301t/300 \cdot 12.1t \leq 13t^2$. Next, consider the case that the algorithm outputs a separator at step 5. Let $U = \{(T_{i,1}, T_{i,2})\}_{i \in I'}$ be the set of pairs by Lemma 11. Since each pair $(T_{i,1}, T_{i,2})$ is separated, the minimum $V(T_{i,1})$ - $V(T_{i,2})$ vertex cut has a size at most t . Hence it is contained in Z . Then either $T_{i,1}$ or $T_{i,2}$ does not belong to the largest connected component in $G - Z$. We define $\gamma(i)$ as the value such that $T_{i, \gamma(i)}$ does not belong to the largest one. Then Lemma 11 implies that a vertex subset of size $\mu(G)/14400$ is not contained in the largest connected component in $G - Z$, i.e., Z is a $(X, 14399/14400)$ -balanced vertex separator of G . The success probability for one trial is at least $4/5$ by Lemma 11. The total success probability is at least $1 - (1/5)^{5 \log n} \geq 1 - 1/n^{10}$. The exponent 10 of the failure probability $1/n^{10}$ can be an arbitrarily large constant by tuning the constant parameters of the algorithm. \square

B.2 Distributed Implementation of Sep

Now we are ready to prove Lemma 1.

Lemma 1 Let G be any undirected graph, and $X \subseteq V(G)$ be any vertex subset. There exists a randomized CONGEST algorithm which outputs a $(X, 14399/14400)$ -balanced separator of size at most $400(\tau + 1)^2$ for G within $\tilde{O}(\tau^2 D + \tau^3)$ rounds whp.

Proof. The correctness of the output is derived from Lemma 12. Assume $\tau + 1 \leq t$. The cost of estimating t is an extra $O(\log n)$ multiplicative factor in the running time, and thus we omit it. Each step of SEP is implemented as follows.

- (Step 1) This is trivially implemented by counting the number of vertices in X using PA.
- (Step 2) Since the trees in $\mathcal{T} \cup \mathcal{T}_i$ are disjoint except for their roots, one can identify each tree $T \in \mathcal{T} \cup \mathcal{T}_i$ by the ordered pair of the root ID and the maximum of its children's IDs, which we regard as the ID of T . Each node u in $T \in \mathcal{T}_i$ manages the *profile* of T consisting of the value i , the ID of T , and the total size $\mu(T)$. If T belongs to \mathcal{T} , $i = 0$ holds. When a tree T is added to \mathcal{T}_i , the root node of T is guaranteed to know the profile of T . The addition of T to \mathcal{T}_i is done by propagating the profile of T to all nodes in T . Since $\mathcal{T} \cup \mathcal{T}_i$ are the collection of the subtrees which can intersect only at their roots, it is near-disjoint, Hence one can do this propagation using BCT(1) for $\mathcal{T} \cup \mathcal{T}_i$.

In the implementation of step 2, the algorithm first constructs a rooted spanning tree T^* by RST for G , and sets $\mathcal{T} = \{T^*\}$ by the profile propagation above. The nodes of each tree $T' \in \mathcal{T}$ execute the SPLIT procedure. Each node $v \in V(T')$ computes the size $\mu(T'(v))$ of the subtree rooted at v (STA), and finds $\mu(T'(u))$ for $u \in \text{ch}(T', v)$ via communication with its children (SNC). One can choose as a center, c , any node $v \in V(T')$ satisfying (1) $\mu(T'(u)) \leq \mu(T')/2$ for any $u \in \text{ch}(T', v)$ and (2) $\mu(T'(v)) \geq \mu(T')/2$. If two or more nodes satisfy the conditions, an arbitrary one of them is chosen by leader election (SLE). The algorithm replaces the root of T' by the chosen c . The rooted tree after the replacement is referred to as T'' . The detection of the new parent of each node in T'' is implemented by STA: Consider the input of value one for c and zero otherwise, and executing STA for T' with respect to this input. After running STA, each node in T' exchanges the output value with its neighbors (SNC). Each node $u \in T'$ identifies the child $v \in \text{ch}(T', u)$ with output value one as the new parent in T''_c . If no child has output value one, the parent of u in T' is also recognized as the parent in T'' .

Since c knows the size of $T''(u)$ for all $u \in \text{ch}(T''c)$, it can handle the task of splitting T'' locally, and then c puts each split tree into \mathcal{T} or \mathcal{T}_i by propagating its profile. The process above consists only of the subgraph operations for $\mathcal{T} \cup \mathcal{T}_i$. Since SPLIT is invoked $O(\log t)$ times, Step 2 is realized by $\tilde{O}(1)$ invocations of PA, SNC, SLE, RTA, STA, and BCT(1).

- (Step 3) The algorithm first detects all connected components in $G_i - R_i$ using CCD, and then computes the size of each detected component using PA. If some component has a size larger than $14399\mu(G)/14400$, it becomes G_{i+1} .
- (Step 4) The algorithm elects a leader node $r \in V(G)$. Each root node of the trees in \mathcal{T}_i for all $1 \leq i \leq \hat{t}$ sends its profile to r . By Proposition 2, we have the bound $|T_i| \leq 12.1t$. Hence this task is processed by multi-source broadcast BCT($12.1t$) presented in Corollary 3. Then the root node r locally samples 95 pairs of trees from $\mathcal{T}_i \times \mathcal{T}_i$ using the received profiles, and broadcasts the profiles of trees in sampled pairs to all of the nodes in $V(G)$ using BCT($95\hat{t}$).

The nodes in each sampled tree set up the input for the task of MVC. Finally, the algorithm executes $\text{MVC}(95\hat{t}, t + 1)$.

By Lemma 8, the running times of steps 1-3 are all bounded by $\tilde{O}(\tau D)$ rounds. Since steps 2-3 are repeated $O(t)$ times, the total running time spent for those steps is $\tilde{O}(t\tau D)$ rounds. Step 4 consists of invocations of $\text{BCT}(12.1t\hat{t})$, $\text{BCT}(95\hat{t})$, and $\text{MVC}(95\hat{t}, t + 1)$. By Corollaries 2 and 3, this step takes $\tilde{O}(t\tau D + t^2\tau)$ rounds. The algorithm terminates when $t \geq \tau + 1$ holds. Since t is estimated via doubling, it never becomes greater than $2(\tau + 1)$. Hence throughout the execution of the algorithm $t = O(\tau)$ holds. That is, the total running time of the algorithm is $\tilde{O}(\tau^2 D + \tau^3)$. \square

B.3 Distributed Tree Decomposition Based on Balanced Separators

We first show that the output of the proposed algorithm satisfies the definition of tree decomposition. We first present an auxiliary proposition.

Proposition 3 For any $x \in A_\ell(T)$ such that $\ell > 0$, G'_x is a connected component of $G - B_{p(x)}$.

Proof. The proof is by induction on the length of x . (Base) If $|x| = 1$, we have $B_{p(x)} = S_\psi$ and $G_{p(x)} = G$. Since G'_x is a connected component of $G_{p(x)} - B_{p(x)}$, the proposition obviously holds. (Induction step) Assume that the proposition holds for any $x' \in A_\ell(T)$ and consider $x \in A_{\ell+1}(T)$. By the definition of bags B_x , we obtain the following equalities:

$$\begin{aligned} B_{p(x)} &= V(G_{p(x)}) \cap \bigcup_{x' \sqsubseteq p(x)} S_{x'}, \\ B_{p(p(x))} &= V(G_{p(p(x))}) \cap \bigcup_{x' \sqsubseteq p(p(x))} S_{x'}. \end{aligned}$$

It is obvious that $V(G_{p(x)}) \subseteq V(G_{p(p(x))})$ holds. Hence we obtain

$$V(G_{p(x)}) \cap B_{p(p(x))} = V(G_{p(x)}) \cap \bigcup_{x' \sqsubseteq p(p(x))} S_{x'},$$

and thus the following equality holds

$$\begin{aligned} B_{p(x)} &= \left(V(G_{p(x)}) \cap \bigcup_{x' \sqsubseteq p(p(x))} S_{x'} \right) \cup (V(G_{p(x)}) \cap S_{p(x)}) \\ &= (V(G_{p(x)}) \cap B_{p(p(x))}) \cup (V(G_{p(x)}) \cap S_{p(x)}) \\ &= V(G_{p(x)}) \cap (B_{p(p(x))} \cup S_{p(x)}). \end{aligned}$$

The graph G'_x is a connected component of $G_{p(x)} - B_{p(x)}$, i.e., a connected component of $G_{p(x)} - (V(G_{p(x)}) \cap (B_{p(p(x))} \cup S_{p(x)})) = G_{p(x)} - (B_{p(p(x))} \cup S_{p(x)})$ by the equality above. In addition, removing all vertices in $B_{p(p(x))}$ from $G_{p(x)}$ induces the graph $G'_{p(x)}$. Thus we can conclude that G'_x is a connected component of $G'_{p(x)} - S_{p(x)}$. By the induction hypothesis, $B_{p(p(x))}$ separates $G'_{p(x)}$ from G . That is, $B_{p(x)} = V(G_{p(x)}) \cap (B_{p(p(x))} \cup S_{p(x)})$ separates G'_x from G . The proposition holds. \square

The following lemma guarantees the correctness of our tree decomposition.

Lemma 13 The decomposition $\Phi = (T, \{B_x\}_{x \in V(T)})$ is a tree decomposition of width at most $O(\tau^2 \log n)$ for any graph $G = (V, E)$. The depth of T is $O(\log n)$.

Proof. It is obvious that any vertex is contained in at least one bag, and thus condition (a) of the definition of tree decomposition (see section 2.2) is satisfied. Let $u \in V(G)$ be any node, and $X \subseteq V(T)$ be the set of nodes such that their corresponding bags contain u . To prove condition (c), it suffices to show that the subgraph T' of T induced by X is connected. Consider any two nodes x and y in X .

(Case 1) If $x \sqsubseteq y$ holds, for any $x \sqsubseteq z \sqsubseteq y$, we obtain $V(G_y) \subseteq V(G_z) \subseteq V(G_x)$. Then we have $V(G_z)$ contains u . Since $B_x = V(G_x) \cap (\bigcup_{x' \sqsubseteq x} S_{x'})$ holds, we have $u \in \bigcup_{x' \sqsubseteq x} S_{x'} \subseteq \bigcup_{z' \sqsubseteq z} S_{z'}$ holds. Consequently, $u \in B_z = V(G_z) \cap (\bigcup_{z' \sqsubseteq z} S_{z'})$ holds, which implies that x and y is connected in T' .

(Case 2) If $x \parallel y$ holds, let z be the longest common prefix of x and y , and $G_{z \bullet i}$ and $G_{z \bullet j}$ be the graph containing G_x and G_y as subgraphs respectively ($i \neq j$). Since u is contained both $G_{z \bullet i}$ and $G_{z \bullet j}$, we have $u \in V(G_{z \bullet i}) \cap V(G_{z \bullet j}) \subseteq B_z$. Thus we can reduce this case to case 1, i.e., the connectivity between z and x satisfying $z \sqsubseteq x$ is proved and that between B_z and B_y satisfying $z \sqsubseteq y$ is also proved. It follows that condition (c) is satisfied.

By conditions (a) and (c), the canonical string $c_{\Phi}^*(u)$ is well-defined for any $u \in V(G)$. Let $e = (u, v)$ be any edge in $V(G)$. We first show $c_{\Phi}^*(u) \not\parallel c_{\Phi}^*(v)$. Suppose for contradiction that $c_{\Phi}^*(u) \parallel c_{\Phi}^*(v)$ holds. Letting z be the longest common prefix of $c_{\Phi}^*(u)$ and $c_{\Phi}^*(v)$, B_z contains neither u nor v by the definition of canonical strings. If $G_{z \bullet i}$ for some i contains both u and v , it contradicts that z is the longest. Otherwise, B_z separates u and v into two different connected components in $G_x - B_z$, which also contradicts the existence of the edge (u, v) in G . Without loss of generality, we assume $c_{\Phi}^*(u) \sqsubseteq c_{\Phi}^*(v)$. Then it suffices to show $u \in B_{c_{\Phi}^*(v)}$. Let us denote $x = c_{\Phi}^*(v)$ for brevity. By the definition of canonical strings, $v \notin B_{x'}$ for any $x' \sqsubset x$. That is, $v \notin B_{p(x)}$ and $v \in B_x \subseteq V(G_x)$ holds. Since $V(G_x) \subseteq V(G'_x) \cup B_{p(x)}$ holds, it implies $v \in V(G'_x)$. By Proposition 3, B_x separates G'_x from G . Due to the existence of the edge (u, v) , it must be that u is contained in B_x , i.e., condition (b) is satisfied.

By Lemma 1, each separator has a size of $O(\tau^2)$. The depth $O(\log n)$ of \mathcal{T} is derived from the 14399/14400-balanced separation property. Thus we obtain that the width of the decomposition is $O(\tau^2 \log n)$. \square

We prove that our tree decomposition algorithm can be efficiently implemented in the CONGEST model.

Theorem 1 For a given graph, $G = (V, E)$, there exists an algorithm in the CONGEST model which constructs a tree decomposition, $\Phi = (T, \{B_x\}_{x \in V(T)})$, of width $O(\tau^2 \log n)$ whp. The depth of T is $O(\log n)$ and the running time of the algorithm is $\tilde{O}(\tau^2 D + \tau^3)$ rounds.

Proof. The distributed implementation of the algorithm above is relatively straightforward. By Proposition 3, one can execute the algorithm of Lemma 1 for computing the balanced separators of all subgraphs in $\{G'_x \mid x \in A_\ell(T)\}$. After computing S'_x for all $x \in A_\ell(T)$, each node in G_x checks if it belongs to the bag $B_x = V(G_x) \cap (\bigcup_{x' \sqsubseteq x} S'_{x'})$. Note that each node in $S'_{x'}$ knows that it belongs to $S'_{x'}$, as well as the string x' . Hence the set of nodes in B_x are identified locally. The collection of subgraphs $\mathcal{G}_{\ell+1}$ is recognized by the connected component detection for subgraphs $\{G_x - B_x \mid x \in A_\ell\}$ (CCD). The output of a node v in S'_x is x . The correctness of the output follows from Lemma 13. The running time of the algorithm is dominated by that for computing balanced separators (i.e., Lemma 1), i.e. $\tilde{O}(\tau^2 D + \tau^3)$ rounds. \square

C Distributed Distance Labeling in Low-Treewidth Graphs

Lemma 2 For any $u, v \in V(G)$, $\text{dec}(\text{la}_G(u), \text{la}_G(v)) = d_G(u, v)$ holds.

Proof. Let us denote $d = \text{dec}(\text{la}_G(u), \text{la}_G(v))$ for brevity. (Case 1: $c^*(u) \not\parallel c^*(v)$) Without loss of generality, we assume that $c^*(v) \sqsubseteq c^*(u)$. Since $B_\Phi^\uparrow(v) \subseteq B_\Phi^\uparrow(u)$ holds, $\text{la}_G(u)$ and $\text{la}_G(v)$ respectively contain $(u, v, d_G(u, v))$ and $(v, v, d_G(v, v))$, and thus $d = d_G(u, v)$ holds. (Case 2: $c^*(u) \parallel c^*(v)$). Let z be the longest common prefix of $c^*(u)$ and $c^*(v)$. Since $c^*(u) \parallel c^*(v)$ holds, none of u and v belong to B_z . Then B_z separates G into several connected components such that v and u belong to different ones. Thus any shortest path p from u to v necessarily intersects B_z . Let s be any vertex in $B_z \cap V(p)$. Since $B_\Phi^\uparrow(u)$ and $B_\Phi^\uparrow(v)$ contains B_z as a subset, $B_\Phi^\uparrow(u)$ and $B_\Phi^\uparrow(v)$ respectively contain $(u, s, d_G(u, s))$ and $(s, v, d_G(s, v))$. It implies $d = d_G(u, v)$. The lemma is proved. \square

Lemma 3 For any $u, v \in V(H_x)$, $d_{H_x}(u, v) = d_{G_x}(u, v)$ holds.

Proof. Let $p = v_0, v_1, \dots, v_{\ell-1}$ be a shortest path from u to v (i.e., $u = v_0$ and $v = v_{\ell-1}$ in G_x , and $\{v_{i_0}, v_{i_1}, \dots, v_{i_{j-1}}\}$ ($i_h < i_{h+1}$ for all $0 \leq h < j-1$, $i_0 = 0$, and $i_{j-1} = \ell-1$) be the set of vertices in $V(p) \cap V_{H_x}$. We denote by $p(h)$ the subpath of p from v_{i_h} to $v_{i_{h+1}}$. Since $p(h)$ contains no intermediate vertex in H_x , each $p(h)$ is contained in a graph $G'_{x \bullet i}$ for some $i \in \text{ch}(T, x)$, or consists of a single edge $(v_{i_h}, v_{i_{h+1}})$. It implies that H_x has the edge $(v_{i_h}, v_{i_{h+1}})$ of costs $c_{H_x}(v_{i_h}, v_{i_{h+1}}) = d_{G'_x}(v_{i_h}, v_{i_{h+1}})$. Then H_x contains a path $v_{i_0}, v_{i_1}, \dots, v_{i_{j-1}}$ of length $\sum_{0 \leq h \leq j-1} c_{H_x}(v_{i_h}, v_{i_{h+1}}) = \sum_{0 \leq h \leq j-1} d_{G'_x}(v_{i_h}, v_{i_{h+1}}) = d_{G_x}(u, v)$. That is, we have $d_{H_x}(u, v) \leq d_{G_x}(u, v)$. We also obtain $d_{H_x}(u, v) \geq d_{G_x}(u, v)$ by the converse argument. \square

Lemma 4 Let u and v be any vertex in $V(G_{x \bullet i}) \cup B_x$ for some $i \in \text{cht}(x)$. Then the following equality holds.

$$d_{G_x}(u, v) = \min\{d_{G'_{x \bullet i}}(u, v), \min_{s, s' \in V(H_x)} (d_{G_{x \bullet i}}(u, s) + d_{H_x}(s, s') + d_{G_{x \bullet i}}(s', v))\}.$$

Proof. Let p be a shortest path from u to v . If p does not contain any vertex in B_x , p is a path in $G'_{x \bullet i}$. Thus we obtain $d_{G_x}(u, v) = d_{G'_{x \bullet i}}(u, v) = d_{G_{x \bullet i}}(u, v)$. Otherwise, p contains a vertex in B_x . Let s and s' be the first and last vertices in $B_x \cap V(p)$ in p . Then the length of p (i.e. $d_{G_x}(u, v)$) is equal to $d_{G_{x \bullet i}}(u, s) + d_{G_x}(s, s') + d_{G_{x \bullet i}}(s', v)$. By Lemma 3, $d_{G_x}(s, s') = d_{H_x}(s, s')$ holds. Thus we have $d_{G_x}(u, v) = d_{G_{x \bullet i}}(u, s) + d_{H_x}(s, s') + d_{G_{x \bullet i}}(s', v)$. \square

Theorem 2 Let $G = (V(G), E(G))$ be any directed graph with edge cost function $c : E(G) \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$. Then there exists a randomized CONGEST algorithm that solves DL in $\tilde{O}(\tau^2 D + \tau^5)$ rounds with probability at least $1 - 1/n^9$. The label size of each node is $O(\tau^2 \log^2 n)$ bits.

Proof. The correctness of the algorithm follows from Lemmas 3 and 4. Except for the recursive calls, the running time of the algorithm above is dominated by the broadcast operations in steps 1 and 3, which are implemented by BCT(h) (according to Corollary 3). Since we utilize the algorithm of Theorem 1, the width of the given tree decomposition is $\tilde{O}(\tau^2)$, and thus the amount of information broadcast in steps 1 and 3 is $\tilde{O}(\tau^4)$ bits. The running time for the task is $\tilde{O}(\tau D + \tau^5)$. Since the recursion depth is bounded by the height of T , i.e., $O(\log n)$, the running time is $\tilde{O}(\tau D + \tau^5)$ rounds. Combining this with the running time of our tree decomposition algorithm ($\tilde{O}(\tau^2 D + \tau^3)$ rounds), the total running time is bounded by $\tilde{O}(\tau^2 D + \tau^5)$ rounds. \square

D Finding Stateful Walks

D.1 Proof of Lemma 5

Lemma 5 Let $G = (V(G), E(G), \gamma_G, f)$ be any labeled graph, edge-cost function $c : E(G) \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$, and $C \subseteq W_G$ be a stateful walk constraint with associated triple (Q, M, δ) . There exists a walk w of weighted length x from s to t with state q ($s, t \in V(G)$, $q \in Q \setminus \{\perp\}$) in C if and only if there exists a walk w' of weight x from (s, ∇) to (t, q) in G_C .

Proof. We only prove the direction \Rightarrow . The proof for direction \Leftarrow is easily obtained by inverting the argument below. Let $w = e_1, e_2, \dots, e_x$. By conditions 1 and 3 of stateful walk constraints, any prefix w_i of w up to e_i is also contained in C . We denote $u_0 = s$, $u_i = \gamma_G(e_i)[1]$ for $i \in [1, x]$, $q_0 = \nabla$, and $q_i = M(w_i)$ for $i \in [1, x]$. Condition 2 of the stateful walk constraints implies $\delta_e(q_i) = q_{i+1}$. Hence we have an edge $e'_i = ((u_{i-1}, q_{i-1}), (u_i, q_i))$ for each $i \in [1, x]$ in $E(G_C)$. That is, G_C contains a walk $w' = e'_1, e'_2, \dots, e'_x$ from (s, ∇) to (t, q) . Since each e'_i has the same weight as e_i , the weighted length of w' is equal to that of w , i.e., x . \square

E Exact Bipartite Maximum Matching in Low-Treewidth Graphs

Theorem 4 There exists a randomized CONGEST algorithm that computes the maximum matching for any bipartite graph G in $\tilde{O}(\tau^4 D + \tau^7)$ rounds whp.

Proof. The algorithm first finds a $O(1)$ -balanced vertex separator S of size $O(\tau^2)$, and constructs the maximum matching for each connected component of $G - S$. If the component is sufficiently small (i.e., $O(\tau^2)$ vertices), the algorithm computes the maximum matching in the centralized fashion (as the algorithm of Theorem 2). Let $S = \{s_1, s_2, \dots, s_k\}$, and $S_i = \{s_i, s_{i+1}, \dots, s_k\}$. The algorithm sequentially adds vertices in S to $G - S$ and updates the matching. Assume that the maximum matching of $G - S_i$ has been computed. By Proposition 1, it suffices to find an augmenting path from s_i in $G - S_{i+1}$ to obtain the maximum matching of $G - S_{i+1}$, which can be done by solving $\text{CDL}(C_{\text{col}(2)})$. If an augmenting path is found, the matching is updated locally. Otherwise, the maximum matching of $G - S_i$ is also the maximum matching of $G - S_{i+1}$.

The recursive construction for each connected component in $G - S$ is performed in parallel. Since the algorithm of Lemma 1 supports the parallel computation of balanced separators for a collection of disjoint subgraphs, one can compute the balanced separators for each connected component of $G - S$ in $\tilde{O}(\tau^4 D + \tau^7)$ rounds. The construction of $\text{CDL}(C_{\text{col}(2)})$ for each connected component is done by applying the algorithm of Theorem 2 for the entire graph G while assigning all edges incident to a vertex in S with cost ∞ . The construction of augmenting paths in each connected component of $G - S$ is also processed in parallel, because the algorithm of Corollary 1 is implemented by the communication primitives of Appendix A.1 and thus it can be executed in all connected components simultaneously. Consequently, the running time of the algorithm at each recursion level is dominated by that for $O(\tau^2)$ times of augmenting path findings, which takes $\tilde{O}(\tau^4 D + \tau^7)$ rounds. The depth of the recursion is bounded by $O(\log n)$. \square

F Computing Girth

As mentioned in Section 7, we focus on the computation of the girth for undirected and weighted graphs. We first present the proof of Lemma 6.

Lemma 6 Any shortest exact count-1 walk w starting and terminating at the same vertex v contains a simple cycle, and thus the weighted length of w is at least g .

Proof. It suffices to show that if w is not simple, w contains a simple cycle (this obviously implies that $g \leq |w|$). Let $w = u_0, e_1, u_1, e_2, u_2, \dots, e_\ell, u_\ell$ be a shortest exact count-1 walk from v to v (i.e., $u_0 = u_\ell = v$), and assume e_k has label one. Assume w is not simple, and let $w' = u_0, e_1, u_1, e_2, u_2, \dots, e_j, u_j$ be the shortest non-simple prefix of w , where $u_i = u_j$ holds for some $0 \leq i < j$. The only possible case that w' does not contain a simple cycle is the situation of $e_{i+1} = e_j$. Suppose for contradiction that this situation applies. Then e_{i+1} ($= e_j$) cannot have label one because w contains exactly one label-one edge. Hence $i, j < k$ or $i, j \geq k$ holds. However, we can obtain a shorter exact count-1 walk from v to v by skipping the subwalk from u_i to u_j , which contradicts that w is the shortest exact count-1 walk from v to v . \square

Let $C = e_1, e_2, \dots, e_g$ be any shortest cycle in G , and assume that exactly one edge $e_i \in E(C)$ satisfies $f(e_i) = 1$. The algorithm for $C_{\text{cnt}(1)}$ -distance labeling allows each node u to compute the weighted length of the shortest count-1 walk from u to u (this can be computed locally from the output $\text{sla}_{G, C_{\text{cnt}(1)}}(u)$). Letting $g(u)$ be the weighted length computed by a node $u \in V(G)$, the output value $g(v)$ of $v \in V(C)$ is equal to g . By Lemma 6, one can compute the girth $g = \min_{u \in V(G)} g(u)$ by standard aggregation over all nodes. The remaining issue is how to find a function f satisfying the above assumption. This can be solved by a probabilistic label assignment. Let $E_C(G)$ be the set of edges in G which belong to at least one shortest cycle in G , and c be the value of power 2, satisfying $|E_C(G)| \leq c < 2|E_C(G)|$. The value c is obtained by a standard doubling estimation technique. We describe below the entire structure of our algorithm.

- For each $\hat{c} = 1, 2, 4, \dots, 2^{\lceil \log n^2 \rceil + 1}$, repeat the following trial (steps 1 and 2) $O(\log n)$ times.
 1. With probability $1/(3\hat{c})$, assign each edge with label one.
 2. Construct $\text{sla}_{G, C_{\text{cnt}(1)}}(v)$ at each node $v \in V(G)$, and each node v computes the length of the shortest exact count-1 walk from v to v .
- The output of the algorithm is the minimum of all computed values over all nodes and trials.

To prove the theorem below it is sufficient to prove the correctness of the algorithm.

Theorem 5 There exists a randomized CONGEST algorithm that given a directed and weighted graph G , computes its girth, g , in $\tilde{O}(\tau^2 D + \tau^5)$ rounds whp.

Proof. By Lemma 6, the output of the algorithm is obviously lower bounded by g . Thus, it suffices to show that the value g is outputted at a node in some trial with high probability. Let $X_{\hat{c}}$ be the event that exactly one edge in $E_C(G)$ has label one at trial \hat{c} . At the trial $\hat{c} = c$, we have the following bound.

$$\begin{aligned} \Pr[X = \text{true}] &\geq |E_C(G)| \cdot \frac{1}{3c} \left(1 - \frac{1}{3c}\right)^{|E_C(G)|} \\ &\geq \frac{1}{18}. \end{aligned}$$

This implies that at the trial $\hat{c} = c$ some node in a shortest cycle computes the value g with a constant probability. Repeating the trials $O(\log n)$ times sufficiently amplifies the success probability of the algorithm. \square