Fast Computation for the Forest Matrix of an Evolving Graph

Haoxin Sun Fudan University Shanghai, China 21210240097@m.fudan.edu.cn Xiaotian Zhou Fudan University Shanghai, China 22110240080@m.fudan.edu.cn Zhongzhi Zhang* Fudan University Shanghai, China zhangzz@fudan.edu.cn

ABSTRACT

The forest matrix plays a crucial role in network science, opinion dynamics, and machine learning, offering deep insights into the structure of and dynamics on networks. In this paper, we study the problem of querying entries of the forest matrix in evolving graphs, which more accurately represent the dynamic nature of real-world networks compared to static graphs. To address the unique challenges posed by evolving graphs, we first introduce two approximation algorithms, SFQ and SFQPLUS, for static graphs. SFQ employs a probabilistic interpretation of the forest matrix, while SFQPLUS incorporates a novel variance reduction technique and is theoretically proven to offer enhanced accuracy. Based on these two algorithms, we further devise two dynamic algorithms centered around efficiently maintaining a list of spanning converging forests. This approach ensures O(1) runtime complexity for updates, including edge additions and deletions, as well as for querying matrix elements, and provides an unbiased estimation of forest matrix entries. Finally, through extensive experiments on various real-world networks, we demonstrate the efficiency and effectiveness of our algorithms. Particularly, our algorithms are scalable to massive graphs with more than forty million nodes.

CCS CONCEPTS

• Networks → Network algorithms; • Theory of computation → Randomness, geometry and discrete structures; • Information systems → Data mining.

KEYWORDS

Forest matrix, evolving graph, Wilson's algorithm, spanning converging forest, variance reduction

ACM Reference Format:

Haoxin Sun, Xiaotian Zhou, and Zhongzhi Zhang. 2024. Fast Computation for the Forest Matrix of an Evolving Graph. In *Proceedings of the 30th ACM SIGKDD Conference on Knowledge Discovery and Data Mining (KDD '24), August 25–29, 2024, Barcelona, Spain.* ACM, New York, NY, USA, 10 pages. https://doi.org/10.1145/3637528.3671822

KDD '24, August 25-29, 2024, Barcelona, Spain.

1 INTRODUCTION

As a fundamental representation of a graph, the Laplacian matrix L encapsulates a wealth of structural and dynamical information of the graph [34]. The forest matrix, denoted as $\Omega = (I + L)^{-1}$, also plays a pivotal role in the field of network science. This matrix, along with its variants, is recognized as a foundational matrix in numerous applications across various domains, such as Markov processes [4, 5], opinion dynamics [21, 42, 50], graph signal processing [37, 38], game theory [6, 20], and multi-label classification [17]. The entries of the forest matrix notably reflect the structural properties of the graph due to their close relationship with the spanning rooted forests within the graph [12, 13]. In particular, the diagonal entries of Ω are associated with the concept of forest closeness centrality [26, 46] in graph mining and determinantal point processes [29] in machine learning, and find applications in electrical interpretations for multi-agent and network-based challenges [40]. The off-diagonal elements, ω_{ii} , serve as a measure of the proximity of node *i* and node *j*, with a lower ω_{ij} indicating a greater "distance" between the two nodes [13]. These elements are also instrumental in calculating the personalized PageRank centrality between two nodes [25, 47].

Due to the broad applications of the forest matrix, querying its elements is of significant importance. In order to query the entries of Ω for a graph with *n* nodes, a direct inversion of the matrix $I + L \operatorname{costs} O(n^3)$ operations and $O(n^2)$ memories and thus is prohibitive for relatively large graphs. In previous work, some fast Laplacian solver [16] based algorithms were proposed to compute the diagonal of the forest matrix [26, 46]. Besides, some forest sampling algorithms were proposed to compute the trace of the forest matrix [8, 39] and the column sum of the forest matrix [42].

A majority of existing algorithms are designed for static graphs, despite the fact that many real-life networks typically evolve dynamically. To query the elements of the forest matrix in evolving graphs, we need to repeatedly run these algorithms as the graph structure changes, which is very inefficient. Recognizing this limitation, there is a pressing need for a dynamic approach to querying elements of the forest matrix in evolving graphs. Such a dynamic solution should be able to be updated easily whenever edges are added or removed from the network, offering query results significantly faster than recalculating from the beginning. Furthermore, it is equally crucial to ensure that the solution has guaranteed accuracy.

In this paper, we delve deep into the problem of efficiently computing the entries of the forest matrix in an evolving digraph, in order to overcome the challenges and limitations of existing algorithms. The main contributions of this work are summarized as follows:

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

^{© 2024} Copyright held by the owner/author(s). Publication rights licensed to ACM. ACM ISBN 979-8-4007-0490-1/24/08...\$15.00 https://doi.org/10.1145/3637528.3671822

^{*}Corresponding author. Haoxin Sun, Xiaotian Zhou, and Zhongzhi Zhang are with Shanghai Key Laboratory of Intelligent Information Processing, School of Computer Science, Fudan University, Shanghai 200433, China.

(i) For static graphs, we introduce an algorithm SFQ to query forest matrix entries through a probabilistic interpretation. To enhance accuracy and reduce variance, we develop innovative variancereduction techniques and present an algorithm SFQPLUS, alongside a theoretical guarantee for its performance.

(ii) In the context of evolving graphs, we focus on two edge operations: edge insertions and deletions, by devising an update strategy to maintain a list of spanning converging forests. We demonstrate that our algorithm provides an unbiased estimate of the forest matrix entries and maintains an O(1) runtime complexity for both querying and updating.

(iii) Comprehensive experiments on diverse real-world undirected and directed networks show that SFQPLUS consistently delivers superior estimation accuracy compared to SFQ, which returns results close to the ground truth. Furthermore, our algorithms are efficient and scalable, even on massive graphs with more than forty million nodes.

2 RELATED WORK

In this section, we briefly review the existing work related to ours.

The investigation into forest matrix entries has garnered significant attention in recent years, leading to the development of two main categories of algorithms for addressing related problems: solver-based algorithms and sampling-based algorithms. Solverbased algorithms primarily operate on undirected graphs, leveraging the fast Laplacian solver [16]. In works such as [26, 46], the authors utilized the fast Laplacian solver for fast calculation of the diagonal of forest matrix. In [50], the authors combined the Johnson-Lindenstrauss lemma [2, 27] with the fast Laplacian solver to compute relevant quantities related to the forest matrix. Another application in [51] utilizes a similar method for addressing optimization issues in social dynamics, fundamentally relying on the forest matrix.

In addition to solver-based algorithms, many algorithms are sampling-based, inspired by the matrix-forest theorem that establishes a link between spanning forests and the forest matrix [12, 13]. Wilson's algorithm plays a pivotal role in these sampling-based algorithms. Wilson's algorithm and its variants have found applications across various domains, such as computing the trace of the forest matrix [8, 39], estimating the diagonal of forest matrix [43], computing the column sum of the forest matrix to solve optimization problems in opinion dynamics [42], and solving linear systems in graph signal processing related to the forest matrix [37, 38].

For many realistic large graphs like social networks and the Internet, their structures often change over time, posing challenges in maintaining up-to-date information. For example, as the graph's structure evolves, it becomes necessary to repeatedly run previously mentioned algorithms, whether solver-based or sampling-based, to obtain newly queried forest matrix data. Researchers have developed many special tools called dynamic graph algorithms, which help solve problems faster. These tools have been used for various problems that involve edge sparsifiers [22, 23, 28, 44], as well important variants of edge sparsifiers themselves, including minimum spanning trees [24, 35, 36, 49], spanners [9], spectral sparsifiers [1, 18, 45], and low-stretch spanning trees [19]. However, most of these advancements have been more theoretical than practical and may not be suitable for the forest matrix query problem.

Our work takes a step further by applying Wilson's algorithm and providing novel techniques to reduce variance, for quickly updating and querying any entry in the forest matrix in a graph as it changes.

3 PRELIMINARIES

In this section, we introduce some useful notations and tools for the convenience of description and analysis.

3.1 Graph and Laplacian Matrix

Let $\mathcal{G} = (V, E)$ denote an unweighted simple directed graph (digraph), which consists of n = |V| nodes (vertices) and m = |E|directed edges (arcs). Here, $V = \{v_1, v_2, \ldots, v_n\}$ denotes the set of nodes, and E represents the set of directed edges. An directed edge $(v_i, v_j) \in E$ indicates an edge pointing from node v_i to node v_j . In what follows, v_i and i are used interchangeably to represent node v_i if incurring no confusion.

The structure of digraph $\mathcal{G} = (V, E)$ is captured by its adjacency matrix $\mathbf{A} = (a_{ij})_{n \times n}$, where $a_{ij} = 1$ if there is a directed edge from node v_i to node v_j and $a_{ij} = 0$ otherwise. The in-degree d_i^- and out-degree d_i^+ of any node *i* are defined by $d_i^- = \sum_{j=1}^n a_{ji}$ and $d_i^+ = \sum_{j=1}^n a_{ij}$, respectively. In the sequel, we use d_i to represent the outdegree d_i^+ . The diagonal degree matrix representing the out-degrees of digraph \mathcal{G} is $\mathbf{D} = \text{diag}(d_1, d_2, \dots, d_n)$, and the Laplacian matrix is $\mathbf{L} = \mathbf{D} - \mathbf{A}$. For any given node i, N_i^+ and N_i^- denote the sets of its out-neighbors and in-neighbors, meaning $N_i^+ = \{j : (i, j) \in E\}$ and $N_i^- = \{j : (j, i) \in E\}$, respectively. Let \mathbf{I} be the *n*-dimensional identity matrix, and \mathbf{e}_i be the *i*-th standard basis column vector, with *i*-th element being 1 and other elements being 0.

A path *P* from node v_1 to v_j is a sequence of alternating nodes and arcs $v_1, (v_1, v_2), v_2, \dots, v_{j-1}, (v_{j-1}, v_j), v_j$ where each node is unique and every arc connects v_i directly to v_{i+1} . A loop is a path plus an arc from the ending node to the starting node. A digraph is (strongly) connected if there exists a path from one node v_x to another node v_y , and vice versa. A digraph is called weakly connected if it is connected when one replaces any directed edge (i, j) with two directed edges (i, j) and (j, i) in opposite directions. A tree is a weakly connected graph with no loops, and an isolated node is considered as a tree. A forest is a particular graph that is a disjoint union of trees.

3.2 Spanning Converging Forests and Forest Matrix

In a directed graph $\mathcal{G} = (V, E)$, a spanning subgraph contains all the nodes from *V* and a subset of edges from *E*. A rooted converging tree is a weakly connected digraph, where one node, called the root node, has an out-degree of 0, and all other nodes have an out-degree of 1. An isolated node is considered as a converging tree with the root being itself. A spanning converging forest of digraph \mathcal{G} that includes all nodes in *V* and whose weakly connected components are rooted converging trees. Such a forest aligns with the concept of in-forest as described in [3, 11].

The forest matrix [13, 14] is defined as $\Omega = (I + L)^{-1} = (\omega_{ij})_{n \times n}$. In the context of digraphs, the forest matrix Ω is row stochastic, with all its components in the interval [0, 1]. Moreover, for each column, the diagonal elements surpass the other elements, that is $0 \le \omega_{ji} < \omega_{ii} \le 1$ for any pair of different nodes *i* and *j*, and the diagonal element ω_{ii} of matrix Ω satisfies $\frac{1}{1+d_i} \le \omega_{ii} \le \frac{2}{2+d_i}$ [42].

For an unweighted digraph $\mathcal{G} = (V, E)$, let \mathcal{F} denote the set of all its spanning converging forests. For a given spanning converging forest $\phi \in \mathcal{F}$, define the root set $\mathcal{R}(\phi)$ of ϕ as the collection of roots from all converging trees that constitute ϕ , that is, $\mathcal{R}(\phi) =$ $\{i : (i, j) \notin \phi, \forall j \in V\}$. Since each node *i* in ϕ is part of a specific converging tree, we define a function $r_{\phi}(i) : V \to \mathcal{R}(\phi)$ mapping node *i* to the root of its associated converging tree. Thus, if $r_{\phi}(i) = j$, it implies that j is in $\mathcal{R}(\phi)$, and both nodes i and j are part of the same converging tree in ϕ . Define \mathcal{F}_{ij} as the set of spanning converging forests in which nodes i and j are within the same converging tree, rooted at node *j*. Formally, $\mathcal{F}_{ij} = \{\phi : r_{\phi}(i) = i\}$ $j, \phi \in \mathcal{F}$ }. It follows that $\mathcal{F}_{ii} = \{\phi : i \in \mathcal{R}(\phi), \phi \in \mathcal{F}\}$. For two nodes *i* and *j* and a spanning converging forest ϕ , define $\mathbb{I}_{\{r_{\phi}(i)=j\}}$ as an indicator function, which is 1 if the input statement is true and 0 otherwise. For example, if $r_{\phi}(i) = j$, $\mathbb{I}_{\{r_{\phi}(i)=j\}} = 1$, and $\mathbb{I}_{\{r_{\phi}(i)=j\}} = 0$ otherwise.

4 FAST QUERY OF ENTRIES IN FOREST MATRIX FOR DIGRAPHS

In this section, we propose sampling-based algorithms and novel variance reduction techniques, designed to enable fast querying of entries for the forest matrix.

4.1 Extension of Wilson's Algorithm

As mentioned above, the entries of the forest matrix are closely related to the spanning converging forests. In this subsection, we briefly introduce the method for uniformly generating spanning converging forest in graphs, utilizing an extension of Wilson's algorithm.

Wilson proposed an algorithm based on a loop-erased random walk to get a spanning tree rooted at a given node [48]. The looperasure technique, pivotal to this algorithm, is a process derived from the random walk by performing an erasure operation on its loops in chronological order [31, 32]. For a digraph $\mathcal{G} = (V, E)$, we can also apply an extension of Wilson's algorithm to get a spanning converging forest $\phi \in \mathcal{F}$, by using the method similar to that in [5, 38, 42], which includes the following three steps: (i) Construct an augmented digraph \mathcal{G}' of \mathcal{G} , which is obtained from \mathcal{G} by adding one new node Δ to \mathcal{G} , and adding a new edge (i, Δ) for each node i in \mathcal{G} . (ii) Apply Wilson's algorithm to \mathcal{G}' , designating Δ as the root, to produce a rooted spanning tree. (iii) Remove node Δ and its connected edges, and define the root set \mathcal{R} as the nodes with an out-degree of 0, thereby obtaining a spanning converging forest in \mathcal{G} .

Since Wilson's algorithm returns a uniform rooted spanning tree [48], the spanning converging forest obtained using the above steps is also uniformly selected from \mathcal{F} . According to [42], the expected time complexity for generating a uniform spanning converging forest in a digraph $\mathcal{G} = (V, E)$ is O(n), making this method efficient and practical for large-scale graphs.

4.2 Probabilistic Interpretation and Unbiased Estimators of Entries in Forest Matrix

In this subsection, we present a probabilistic interpretation of the entries in the forest matrix and propose unbiased estimators for these entries.

Using the approach in [10, 12, 13], for any pair of nodes $i, j \in V$, the entry ω_{ij} of the forest matrix Ω can be expressed as $\omega_{ij} = |\mathcal{F}_{ij}|/|\mathcal{F}|$. This suggests a probabilistic interpretation of the entry ω_{ij} of the forest matrix which represents the probability of the root of node *i* being node *j* in a uniformly sampled spanning converging forest $\phi \in \mathcal{F}$. For a spanning converging forest $\phi \in \mathcal{F}$, We define an estimator $\widehat{\omega}_{ij}(\phi)$ for ω_{ij} as $\widehat{\omega}_{ij}(\phi) = \mathbb{I}_{\{r_{\phi}(i)=j\}}$. The estimator $\widehat{\omega}_{ij}(\phi)$ takes the value 1 if the root of *i* is *j*, and 0 otherwise. This estimator is unbiased if ϕ is uniformly selected from \mathcal{F} , satisfying $\mathbb{E}(\widehat{\omega}_{ij}(\phi)) = \mathbb{P}(r_{\phi}(i) = j) = \frac{|\mathcal{F}_{ij}|}{|\mathcal{F}|} = \omega_{ij}$. Moreover, the variance of $\widehat{\omega}_{ij}$ is $\operatorname{Var}(\widehat{\omega}_{ij}) = \omega_{ij} - \omega_{ij}^2$.

Algorithm 1: SFQ($\mathcal{G}, \mathcal{F}_0, l, i, j$)							
Input : A digraph \mathcal{G} , a list of l uniformly sampled	t : A digraph \mathcal{G} , a list of <i>l</i> uniformly sampled						
spanning converging forest \mathcal{F}_0 , a pair of querying							
id <i>i</i> , <i>j</i>							
Output : $\widehat{\omega}_{ij}$: an estimator of ω_{ij}							
1 Initialize : $\widehat{\omega}_{ij} \leftarrow 0$							
² for ϕ in \mathcal{F}_0 do							
$k \leftarrow r_{\phi}(i)$							
4 if $k = j$ then							
$5 \qquad \qquad$							
6 return $\widehat{\omega}_{ij}$							

As previously established, we employ the extension of Wilson's algorithm to generate *l* spanning converging forests ϕ_1, \dots, ϕ_l . Then we can approximate ω_{ij} using the mean value $\frac{1}{l} \sum_{k=1}^{l} \widehat{\omega}_{ij}(\phi_k)$. We detailed this in Algorithm 1, named as Spanning Forest Query (SFQ). The time complexity of Algorithm 1 is O(l), where *l* is the number of the pre-sampled spanning converging forests.

4.3 Enhanced Estimators with Reduced Variance

In the preceding subsection, we defined an unbiased estimator $\widehat{\omega}_{ij}(\phi)$ for ω_{ij} . In this subsection, we introduce enhanced estimators that not only maintain the unbiased property, but also achieve reduced variance, thus providing more accurate estimations.

We begin with the cases $i \neq j$. For a spanning converging forest $\phi \in \mathcal{F}$, the initial estimator $\widehat{\omega}_{ij}(\phi)$ assigns a value of 1 if a path exists from *i* to *j* in ϕ , and 0 otherwise. However, this approach overlooks the case where a node $k \in N_j^-$ (indicating an edge $(k, j) \in E$) is the root for node *i* in the forest ϕ . This situation suggests that node *i* might be rooted at node *j* in other forests due to the possible existence of a path from *i* to *j*, which is a concatenation of a path from *i* to *k* and an edge (k, j). Our new approach aims to incorporate these overlooked instances by aggregating information from forests where node *i* is rooted in the in-neighbors of node *j*.

Specifically, for nodes $k \in N^{-}(j)$, ω_{ik} denotes the probability of node *i* rooted at *k*. When performing the loop-erased random walk in the extension of Wilson's algorithm, if the walk is currently at node *i*, it has a probability of $\frac{1}{1+d_i}$ moving to a random outneighbor or becoming a root (moving to the extended node Δ in the augmented graph \mathcal{G}'). Let's consider a loop-erased random walk that starts at node *i* and ends at node *k*, creating a path *P* from *i* to *k* and then terminating. Now, imagine a walking path *P'* slightly different from path *P*, where the walker does not ending at *k*, but continues to jump to node *j* and then terminates. The probability of path *P'* occurring is $\frac{1}{1+d_j}$ times that of *P*. Since any path from *i* to *j* must pass through a node $k \in N^-(j)$ before reaching *j*, we define a new estimator $\widetilde{\omega}_{ij}(\phi)$ for different nodes *i*, *j*, and spanning converging forest $\phi \in \mathcal{F}$ as $\widetilde{\omega}_{ij}(\phi) = \frac{1}{1+d_i} \sum_{k \in N^-(j)} \widehat{\omega}_{ik}(\phi)$.

The following lemma shows that $\tilde{\omega}_{ij}$ is an unbiased estimator of ω_{ij} and has a reduced variance compared to $\hat{\omega}_{ij}$:

LEMMA 4.1. For two different nodes *i* and *j* in graph \mathcal{G} and a uniformly chosen spanning converging forest $\phi \in \mathcal{F}$, $\widetilde{\omega}_{ij}(\phi) = \frac{1}{1+d_j} \sum_{k \in N^-(j)} \widehat{\omega}_{ik}(\phi)$ is an unbiased estimator of ω_{ij} . The variance of this estimator is given by $\operatorname{Var}(\widetilde{\omega}_{ij}) = \frac{\omega_{ij}}{1+d_j} - \omega_{ij}^2$, which is always less than or equal to the variance of the estimator $\widehat{\omega}_{ij}$.

Proof. Using the relationship $\Omega(I + L) = I$, it follows that $e_i^{\top} \Omega(I + L) e_j = 0$. This implies $(1 + d_j)\omega_{ij} - \sum_{k \in N_j^{-}} \omega_{ik} = 0$, leading to $\omega_{ij} = \frac{1}{1+d_j} \sum_{k \in N_j^{-}} \omega_{ik}$. Since $\mathbb{E}(\widehat{\omega}_{ik}) = \omega_{ik}$, we have $\mathbb{E}(\widetilde{\omega}_{ij}) = \frac{1}{1+d_j} \sum_{k \in N^{-}(j)} \mathbb{E}(\widehat{\omega}_{ik}) = \frac{1}{1+d_j} \sum_{k \in N_j^{-}} \omega_{ik} = \omega_{ij}$, which shows that $\widetilde{\omega}_{ij}$ is an unbiased estimator of ω_{ij} .

Next, we calculate the variance of $\widetilde{\omega}_{ij}$. Considering $\mathbb{E}(\widehat{\omega}_{ik}^2) = \omega_{ik}$ and $\mathbb{E}(\widehat{\omega}_{ij}\widehat{\omega}_{ik}) = 0$ for $j \neq k$, we have $\operatorname{Var}(\widetilde{\omega}_{ij}) = \mathbb{E}(\widetilde{\omega}_{ij}^2) - (\mathbb{E}(\widetilde{\omega}_{ij}))^2 = \mathbb{E}(\frac{1}{(1+d_j)^2}(\sum_{k \in N^-(j)}\widehat{\omega}_{ik})^2) - \omega_{ij}^2 = \frac{\sum_{k \in N^-(j)}\widehat{\omega}_{ik}}{(1+d_j)^2} - \omega_{ij}^2 = \frac{\omega_{ij}}{1+d_j} - \omega_{ij}^2$, which finishes the proof. \Box

Lemma 4.1 demonstrates that $\widetilde{\omega}_{ij}$ is an unbiased estimator with a lower variance compared to $\widehat{\omega}_{ij}$. The reduction in variance is attributed to $\widetilde{\omega}_{ij}$ accounting for instances where node *i* is rooted at the in-neighbors of node *j*, a scenario that $\widehat{\omega}_{ij}$ fails to consider. Specifically, if $\phi \in \mathcal{F}_{ik}$ with $k \in N_j^-$, then $\widetilde{\omega}_{ij}(\phi)$ equals $\frac{1}{1+d_i}$, while $\widehat{\omega}_{ij}(\phi)$ is 0. Conversely, for $\phi \in \mathcal{F}_{ij}$, $\widehat{\omega}_{ij}(\phi)$ is 1, but $\widetilde{\omega}_{ij}(\phi)$ is 0. This indicates that $\widetilde{\omega}_{ij}$ partially disregards instances where *i* is directly rooted at *j*.

To address this issue, we introduce an estimator $\overline{\omega}_{ij}(\phi, \alpha)$, which is a linear combination of $\widetilde{\omega}_{ij}$ and $\widehat{\omega}_{ij}$, defined as $\overline{\omega}_{ij}(\phi, \alpha) = \alpha \widehat{\omega}_{ij}(\phi) + (1 - \alpha) \widetilde{\omega}_{ij}(\phi)$. The parameter α is chosen to minimize the variance of the estimator, as explained in the following lemma:

LEMMA 4.2. For two distinct nodes i and j in V, a parameter $\alpha \in \mathcal{R}$, and a uniformly chosen spanning converging forest $\phi \in \mathcal{F}$, the estimator $\overline{\omega}_{ij}(\phi, \alpha) = \alpha \widehat{\omega}_{ij}(\phi) + (1 - \alpha) \widetilde{\omega}_{ij}(\phi)$ is an unbiased estimator for ω_{ij} . The variance of estimator $\overline{\omega}_{ij}(\phi, \alpha)$ is minimized when $\alpha = \frac{1}{2+d_j}$. Defining $\overline{\omega}_{ij}(\phi)$ as $\overline{\omega}_{ij}(\phi, \frac{1}{2+d_j}) = \frac{1}{2+d_j} (\widehat{\omega}_{ij}(\phi) + \sum_{k \in N_j^-} \widehat{\omega}_{ik}(\phi))$, the variance of $\overline{\omega}_{ij}(\phi)$ is given by $\operatorname{Var}(\widetilde{\omega}_{ij}) = \frac{\omega_{ij}}{2+d_j} - \omega_{ij}^2$, which is smaller than that of both $\widehat{\omega}_{ij}(\phi)$ and $\widetilde{\omega}_{ij}(\phi)$. Moreover, the nonnegativity of variance implies $\omega_{ij} \leq \frac{1}{2+d_j}$.

Proof. Since both $\widehat{\omega}_{ij}$ and $\widetilde{\omega}_{ij}$ are unbiased estimators for ω_{ij} , it follows that $\mathbb{E}(\overline{\omega}_{ij}(\phi, \alpha)) = \alpha \mathbb{E}(\widehat{\omega}_{ij}(\phi)) + (1 - \alpha) \mathbb{E}(\widetilde{\omega}_{ij}(\phi)) =$

 ω_{ij} , indicating the estimator $\overline{\omega}_{ij}(\phi, \alpha)$ is also unbiased for ω_{ij} . We proceed to calculate the variance of $\overline{\omega}_{ij}(\phi, \alpha)$ as

$$\begin{aligned} &\operatorname{Var}(\overline{\omega}_{ij}(\phi,\alpha)) = \mathbb{E}(\overline{\omega}_{ij}^2(\phi,\alpha)) - (\mathbb{E}(\overline{\omega}_{ij}(\phi,\alpha))^2 \\ &= \frac{\omega_{ij}(2+d_j)}{1+d_j} \left(\alpha - \frac{1}{2+d_j}\right)^2 + \frac{\omega_{ij}}{2+d_j} - \omega_{ij}^2. \end{aligned}$$

The variance of the estimator $\overline{\omega}_{ij}(\phi, \alpha)$ is minimized when $\alpha = \frac{1}{2+d_j}$, resulting in $\frac{\omega_{ij}}{2+d_j} - \omega_{ij}^2$, which finishes the proof. \Box Lemma 4.2 indicates that the newly formulated estimator $\overline{\omega}_{ij}(\phi) = \frac{1}{2+d_j}$.

Lemma 4.2 indicates that the newly formulated estimator $\overline{\omega}_{ij}(\phi) = \frac{1}{2+d_j}(\widehat{\omega}_{ij}(\phi) + \sum_{k \in N_j^-} \widehat{\omega}_{ik}(\phi))$ has a lower variance than the previous two estimators by incorporating their respective information. Having established the improved estimator $\overline{\omega}_{ij}$ for the scenario $i \neq j$, we next focus on the situation that i is equal to j.

For the case i = j, we consider a similar approach of aggregating information from the in-neighbors of node *i*. This leads to a new estimator with reduced variance compared to $\widehat{\omega}_{ii}$. We define the new estimator $\overline{\omega}_{ii}(\phi)$ as $\overline{\omega}_{ii}(\phi) = \frac{1}{1+d_i}(1 + \sum_{k \in N_i^-} \widehat{\omega}_{ik}(\phi))$. Lemma 4.3 demonstrates that $\overline{\omega}_{ii}(\phi)$ is an unbiased estimator for ω_{ii} with reduced variance.

LEMMA 4.3. For node $i \in V$ and a uniformly chosen spanning converging forest $\phi \in \mathcal{F}$, $\overline{\omega}_{ii}(\phi) = \frac{1}{1+d_i}(1 + \sum_{k \in N_i^-} \widehat{\omega}_{ik}(\phi))$ is an unbiased estimator for ω_{ii} . The variance of this estimator is $\operatorname{Var}(\overline{\omega}_{ii}) = \frac{3\omega_{ii}}{1+d_i} - \frac{2}{(1+d_i)^2} - \omega_{ii}^2$, which is always less than or equal to the variance of the estimator $\widehat{\omega}_{ii}$.

Proof. Since Ω(*I* + *L*) = *I*, it follows that $e_i^T Ω(I + L)e_i = 1$. This implies $(1 + d_i)ω_{ii} - Σ_{k ∈ N_i^-}ω_{ik} = 1$, that is, $ω_{ii} = \frac{1}{1+d_i}(1 + Σ_{k ∈ N_i^-}ω_{ik})$. Since $\mathbb{E}(\widehat{\omega}_{ik}) = \omega_{ik}$, we have $\mathbb{E}(\overline{\omega}_{ii}) = \frac{1}{1+d_i}(1 + Σ_{k ∈ N_i^-}(i) \mathbb{E}(\widehat{\omega}_{ik})) = \frac{1}{1+d_i}(1 + Σ_{k ∈ N_i^-}ω_{ik}) = \omega_{ii}$, which shows that $\widetilde{\omega}_{ij}$ is an unbiased estimator for $ω_{ij}$. The variance of $\overline{\omega}_{ii}$ can be derived as follows: $Var(\overline{\omega}_{ii}) = \mathbb{E}(\overline{\omega}_{ii})^2 - (\mathbb{E}(\overline{\omega}_{ii}))^2 = \frac{1}{(1+d_i)^2} \mathbb{E}((1 + Σ_{k ∈ N_i^-}\widehat{\omega}_{ik})^2) - ω_{ii}^2 = \frac{1+3}{(1+d_i)^2} \mathbb{E}(1 + 2 Σ_{k ∈ N_i^-}\widehat{\omega}_{ik} + (Σ_{k ∈ N_i^-}\widehat{\omega}_{ik})^2) - ω_{ii}^2 = \frac{1+3}{(1+d_i)^2} - ω_{ii}^2 = \frac{3ω_{ii}}{1+d_i} - \frac{2}{(1+d_i)^2} - ω_{ii}^2$. Then we get the following relation $Var\{\widehat{\omega}_{ii}\} - Var\{\overline{\omega}_{ii}\} = \frac{2(1-\omega_{ii})}{(1+d_i)^2} + \frac{d_i(d_i-1)\omega_{ii}}{(1+d_i)^2} \ge 0$. This inequality shows that the variance of $\overline{\omega}_{ii}$, which completes the proof. □

In the above, we have proposed enhanced estimators $\overline{\omega}_{ii}$ and $\overline{\omega}_{ij}$ for the diagonal ω_{ii} and non-diagonal entries ω_{ij} . Suppose that we already have used the extension of Wilson's algorithm to generate l spanning converging forests ϕ_1, \dots, ϕ_l . Then we can approximate ω_{ii} and ω_{ij} using $\frac{1}{l} \sum_{k=1}^{l} \overline{\omega}_{ii}(\phi_k)$ and $\frac{1}{l} \sum_{k=1}^{l} \overline{\omega}_{ij}(\phi_k)$. We detailed this in Algorithm 2, named as Spanning Forest Query Plus (SFQPLUS).

The time complexity of Algorithm 2 is O(l), where l is the number of the pre-sampled spanning converging forests. As we increase the number of pre-sampled forest l, we observe a corresponding decrease in the estimation error between $\overline{\omega}_{ij}$ and the actual value ω_{ij} . To quantify this relationship, we introduce Theorem 4.5, which specifies the necessary size of l to achieve a necessary error guarantee with a high probability. Before giving Theorem 4.5, we introduce the following lemma.

Fast Computation for the Forest Matrix of an Evolving Graph

KDD '24, August 25-29, 2024, Barcelona, Spain.

Algorithm 2: SFQPLUS($\mathcal{G}, \mathcal{F}_0, l, i, j$) **Input** : A digraph $\mathcal{G} = (V, E)$, a list of *l* uniformly sampled spanning converging forest \mathcal{F}_0 , a pair of querying id *i*, *j* **Output** : $\overline{\omega}_{ij}$: an estimator of ω_{ij} 1 if i = j then **Initialize** : $\overline{\omega}_{ij} \leftarrow \frac{1}{1+d_i}$ 2 3 else **Initialize** : $\overline{\omega}_{ij} \leftarrow 0$ 5 for ϕ in \mathcal{F}_0 do $k \leftarrow r_{\phi}(i)$ **if** $k = j \& i \neq j$ **then** $\begin{bmatrix} \overline{\omega}_{ij} \leftarrow \overline{\omega}_{ij} + \frac{1}{(2+d_j)l} \end{bmatrix}$ 7 8 else if $edge(k, j) \in E$ then 9 if i = j then 10 $\begin{bmatrix} \overline{\omega}_{ij} \leftarrow \overline{\omega}_{ij} + \frac{1}{(1+d_j)l} \end{bmatrix}$ 11 else $\overline{\omega}_{ij} \leftarrow \overline{\omega}_{ij} + \frac{1}{(2+d_j)l}$ 12 13 14 return $\overline{\omega}_{ii}$

LEMMA 4.4. (Chernoff bound [15]) Let $x_i (1 \le i \le l)$ be independent random variables satisfying $|x_i - \mathbb{E}\{x_i\}| \le M$ for all $1 \le i \le l$. Let $x = \frac{1}{l} \sum_{i=1}^{l} x_i$. Then we have

$$\mathbb{P}(|x - \mathbb{E}\{x\}| \le \epsilon) \ge 1 - 2\exp\left(-\frac{l\epsilon^2}{2(\operatorname{Var}\{x\}l + M\epsilon/3)}\right).$$
(1)

THEOREM 4.5. For any pair of nodes $i \neq j$, and parameters ϵ , σ , $\delta \in (0, 1)$, if l is chosen obeying $l = \left\lceil \frac{1}{(2+d_j)^2} \left(\frac{1}{2\epsilon^2} + \frac{2}{3\epsilon} \right) \log(\frac{2}{\delta}) \right\rceil$, then the approximation $\overline{\omega}_{ij}$ of ω_{ij} returned by Algorithm 2 satisfies the following relation with probability of at least $1 - \delta$:

$$\omega_{ij} - \epsilon \le \overline{\omega}_{ij} \le \omega_{ij} + \epsilon. \tag{2}$$

For the case that i = j, and for parameters $\epsilon, \delta \in (0, 1)$, if l is chosen obeying $l = \left\lceil \left(\frac{2}{3\epsilon} + \frac{1}{4\epsilon^2}\right) \log\left(\frac{2}{\delta}\right) \right\rceil$, then the approximation $\overline{\omega}_{ii}$ of ω_{ii} returned by Algorithm 2 satisfies the following relation with probability of at least $1 - \delta$:

$$(1 - \epsilon)\omega_{ii} \le \overline{\omega}_{ii} \le (1 + \epsilon)\omega_{ii}.$$
(3)

Proof. For the case that $i \neq j$, the output $\overline{\omega}_{ij}$ of Algorithm 2 is $\overline{\omega}_{ij} = \frac{1}{l} \sum_{k=1}^{l} \overline{\omega}_{ij}(\phi_k)$. Since the variance of $\overline{\omega}_{ij}(\phi_k)$ is $\frac{\omega_{ij}}{2+d_j} - \omega_{ij}^2$ for $k = 1, \dots, l$, and the l variables are independent, we can compute the variance of $\overline{\omega}_{ij}$ as $\operatorname{Var}(\overline{\omega}_{ij}) = \frac{1}{l} (\frac{\omega_{ij}}{2+d_j} - \omega_{ij}^2)$. To obtain the absolute error bound given by (2), $\overline{\omega}_{ij}$ needs to satisfy

$$\mathbb{P}(|\overline{\omega}_{ij} - \omega_{ij}| \ge \epsilon) \le \delta.$$

We now show that the above relation holds true. To this end, we designate $x_j = \overline{\omega}_{ij}(\phi_k)$ for $1 \le k \le l$ and $x = \overline{\omega}_{ij}$, and invoke the Chernoff bound in Lemma 4.4. Then, in order to prove (2), we only need to show that the following inequality holds:

$$2\exp\left(-\frac{l\epsilon^2}{2(\operatorname{Var}\{\overline{\omega}_{ij}\}l+M\epsilon\omega_{ij}/3)}\right) \le \delta$$

which leads to

$$l \ge \log(\frac{2}{\delta}) \left(\frac{2 \operatorname{Var}\{\overline{\omega}_{ij}\}l}{\epsilon^2} + \frac{2 M \omega_{ij}}{3\epsilon} \right).$$
(4)

Since $|\widehat{\omega}_{ij} - \omega_{ij}| \leq \frac{1}{2+d_j}$, we can set $M = \frac{1}{2+d_j}$. Considering that $\operatorname{Var}\{\overline{\omega}_{ij}(\phi_j)\} = \frac{1}{l}(\frac{\omega_{ij}}{2+d_j} - \omega_{ij}^2)$, inequality (4) is reduced to:

$$l \ge \log(\frac{2}{\delta}) \left(\frac{2\omega_{ij}}{\epsilon^2 (2+d_j)} + \frac{2\omega_{ij}}{3\epsilon (2+d_j)} - \frac{2\omega_{ij}^2}{\epsilon^2} \right).$$
(5)

Thus, for any pair of nodes $i \neq j$, since $0 \leq \omega_{ij} \leq \frac{1}{2+d_j}$, selecting $l = \left[\left(\frac{1}{2\epsilon^2} + \frac{2}{3\epsilon} \right) \frac{\log \frac{2}{\delta}}{(2+d_j)^2} \right]$ ensures the required inequality (4) always

holds. This completes the proof.

For the case that i = j, the output $\overline{\omega}_{ii}$ of Algorithm 2 is $\overline{\omega}_{ii} = \frac{1}{l} \sum_{k=1}^{l} \overline{\omega}_{ii}(\phi_k)$. For a spanning converging forest $\phi \in \mathcal{F}$, $\overline{\omega}_{ii}(\phi)$ is either $\frac{1}{1+d_i}$ or $\frac{2}{1+d_i}$. Considering $\frac{1}{1+d_i} \leq \omega_{ii} \leq \frac{2}{2+d_i}$, it follows that $|\overline{\omega}_{ii} - \omega_{ii}| \leq \frac{1}{1+d_i}$. Then we can set the bound M as $M = \frac{1}{1+d_i}$. Employing a similar analytical approach as above, the number of l needs to satisfy the following inequality:

$$l \ge \log(\frac{2}{\delta}) \left(\frac{2 \operatorname{Var}\{\overline{\omega}_{ii}\}l}{\epsilon^2 \omega_{ii}^2} + \frac{2}{3(1+d_i)\epsilon \omega_{ii}} \right).$$
(6)

Given that $\overline{\omega}_{ii} = \frac{1}{l} \left(\frac{3\omega_{ii}}{1+d_i} - \frac{2}{(1+d_i)^2} - \omega_{ii}^2 \right)$, we derive that

$$\frac{\operatorname{Var}(\omega_{ii})l}{\omega_{ii}^2} = \frac{3}{(1+d_i)\omega_{ii}} - \frac{2}{(1+d_i)^2\omega_{ii}^2} - 1$$

$$= -\frac{2}{(1+d_i)^2} \left(\frac{1}{\omega_{ii}} - \frac{3(1+d_i)}{4}\right)^2 + \frac{1}{8} \le \frac{1}{8}$$
(7)

Thus, with $\frac{\operatorname{Var}(\overline{\omega}_{ii})l}{\omega_{ii}^2} \leq \frac{1}{8}$ and $(1 + d_i)\omega_{ii} \leq 1$, choosing $l = \left[\left(\frac{2}{3\epsilon} + \frac{1}{4\epsilon^2}\right)\log\left(\frac{2}{\delta}\right)\right]$ ensures that inequality (6) is always satisfied, which completes the proof. \Box

Based on Theorem 4.5, when the parameters ϵ , σ , and δ are fixed constants, the number of spanning converging forests *l* required by Algorithm 2 to achieve an ϵ absolute error for non-diagonal entries and relative error for diagonal entries does not increase with the expansion of the graph. Therefore, the time complexity of Algorithm 2 can be considered as O(1) for achieving a satisfactory error guarantee, regardless of the graph size.

5 FAST QUERY OF ENTRIES OF FOREST MATRIX FOR EVOLVING GRAPHS

In the previous section, we developed estimators approximating the entries of the forest matrix in static directed graphs. However, real-world graphs often evolve dynamically. This section addresses evolving graphs, focusing on two types of updates: edge insertion and edge deletion.

5.1 Problem Statement

Consider an initial graph $\mathcal{G}_0 = (V_0, E_0)$ and a corresponding list L_0 of l_0 spanning converging forests, which is uniformly sampled using an extension of Wilson's algorithm. In this dynamic context, there are two possible requests: updates and queries. For the request of updates, we restrict our focus to edge insertions and deletions.

Other updates such as nodes insertions/deletions can be easily converted to a sequence of edges insertion/deletions. For the *k*-th edge update, let $e_k = (u_k, v_k)$ denote the edge being modified, resulting in an updated graph $\mathcal{G}_k = (V_k, E_k)$. Specifically, for edge insertions, $E_k = E_{k-1} \cup \{e_k\}$, and for deletions, $E_k = E_{k-1} \setminus \{e_k\}$.

Query requests involve asking for specific values of the forest matrix entries of \mathcal{G}_k , denoted by Ω_k . Let $\mathcal{F}(\mathcal{G}_k)$ denote the set of all spanning converging forests of graph \mathcal{G}_k . Utilizing the methods described earlier, if we have spanning converging forests uniformly sampled from $\mathcal{F}(\mathcal{G}_k)$, Algorithm SFQPLUS can provide an estimation. However, resampling these forests after every update requires time complexity of O(ln) [42], which is inefficient. This naturally leads to the following question. Suppose that L_{k-1} is a spanning converging forest list with l_{k-1} spanning converging forests uniformly sampled from the set $\mathcal{F}(\mathcal{G}_{k-1})$. When an update $e_k = (u_k, v_k)$ occurs, can we develop an efficient method to adapt the list L_{k-1} into L_k , ensuring that each spanning converging forest in set $\mathcal{F}(\mathcal{G}_k)$ has an equal probability appearing in the updated forest list L_k ? In the following, we address this challenge by proposing a method with an expected cost of O(1) for updating the forest list, while preserving the uniform property of the sampling.

5.2 Edge Insertion

In this subsection, we delve into the edge insertion update. Consider the *k*-th update involving the insertion of an edge $e_k = (u_k, v_k)$ to the graph \mathcal{G}_{k-1} . We start with a spanning converging forest list $L_{k-1} = \{\phi_1, \dots, \phi_{l_{k-1}}\}$ with l_{k-1} spanning converging forests. Each forest from the set $\mathcal{F}(\mathcal{G}_{k-1})$ is equally likely to be included in list L_{k-1} . Our goal is to modify L_{k-1} into L_k such that the forests in L_k are uniformly sampled from the updated set $\mathcal{F}(\mathcal{G}_k)$.

Given that $E_k = E_{k-1} \cup \{e_k\}$, it follows that $\mathcal{F}(\mathcal{G}_{k-1})$ is a subset of $\mathcal{F}(\mathcal{G}_k)$, indicating that all forests in $\mathcal{F}(\mathcal{G}_{k-1})$ are also contained in $\mathcal{F}(\mathcal{G}_k)$. We now focus on those spanning converging forests that are in $\mathcal{F}(\mathcal{G}_k)$ but not in $\mathcal{F}(\mathcal{G}_{k-1})$. Define $\Delta \mathcal{F}_k$ as $\mathcal{F}(\mathcal{G}_k) \setminus \mathcal{F}(\mathcal{G}_{k-1})$. It's clear that $\Delta \mathcal{F}_k$ is non-empty, and all its forests include the newly added edge $e_k = (u_k, v_k)$. We define a subset $\mathcal{F}(\mathcal{G}'_{k-1}) \subset \mathcal{F}(\mathcal{G}_{k-1})$, where $\mathcal{F}(\mathcal{G}'_{k-1}) = \{\phi : \phi \in \mathcal{F}(\mathcal{G}_{k-1}), r_{\phi}(u_k) = u_k, r_{\phi}(v_k) \neq u_k\}$. Lemma 5.1 establishes a bijection between $\mathcal{F}(\mathcal{G}'_{k-1})$ and $\Delta \mathcal{F}_k$.

LEMMA 5.1. For any spanning converging forest $\phi \in \Delta \mathcal{F}_k$, the forest $\phi' = \phi \setminus \{e_k\}$ belongs to $\mathcal{F}(\mathcal{G}'_{k-1})$. This mapping constitutes a bijection between $\mathcal{F}(\mathcal{G}'_{k-1})$ and $\Delta \mathcal{F}_k$.

Proof. Consider a spanning converging forest $\phi \in \Delta \mathcal{F}_k$, which includes the newly added edge $e_k = (u_k, v_k)$. By removing this edge, we obtain the forest $\phi' = \phi \setminus \{e_k\}$. Since all edges of ϕ' are part of the graph \mathcal{G}_{k-1} , it is evident that ϕ' belongs to $\mathcal{F}(\mathcal{G}_{k-1})$. Moreover, given that $r_{\phi'}(u_k) = u_k$ and $r_{\phi'}(v_k) \neq u_k$, ϕ' is also a part of $\mathcal{F}(\mathcal{G}'_{k-1})$.

Moreover, for any two distinct spanning converging forests $\phi_1, \phi_2 \in \Delta \mathcal{F}_k$, their corresponding forests ϕ'_1 and ϕ'_2 obtained by deleting edge e_k are also distinct. Additionally, for any spanning forest $\phi' \in \mathcal{F}(\mathcal{G}'_{k-1})$, we consider the forest $\phi = \phi' \cup \{e_k\}$. The conditions $r_{\phi'}(u_k) = u_k$ and $r_{\phi'}(v_k) \neq u_k$ guarantee that ϕ is well-defined and belongs to L_k , which finishes the proof. \Box

With Lemma 5.1, we propose the edge insertion update Algorithm 3 to update the forest list L_{k-1} to L_k .

Algorithm 3: INSERT-UPDATE $(\mathcal{G}_{k-1}, L_{k-1}, l_{k-1}, e_k)$ Input:A digraph $\mathcal{G}_{k-1} = (V_{k-1}, E_{k-1})$, a list of l_{k-1}
spanning converging forest L_{k-1} uniformly
sampled from $\mathcal{F}(\mathcal{G}_{k-1})$, an edge $e_k = (u_k, v_k)$ to
be insertedOutput:An updated spanning converging forest list L_k 1 Initialize: $L_k \leftarrow L_{k-1}$ 2 for ϕ in L_{k-1} do3if $r_{\phi}(u_k) = u_k \& r_{\phi}(v_k) \neq u_k$ then4 $\widehat{\phi} \leftarrow \phi \cup \{e_k\}$ 5Add $\widehat{\phi}$ to L_k 6 return L_k

THEOREM 5.2. For a spanning converging forest list L_{k-1} with l_{k-1} forests uniformly sampled from $\mathcal{F}(\mathcal{G}_{k-1})$, and the insertion edge $e_k = (u_k, v_k)$, all forests in the updated set $\mathcal{F}(\mathcal{G}_k)$ have the same probability to be included in the list returned by Algorithm 3.

Proof. We partition $\mathcal{F}(\mathcal{G}_k)$ into two disjoint subsets: $\mathcal{F}(\mathcal{G}_{k-1})$ and $\Delta \mathcal{F}_k$, with $\Delta \mathcal{F}_k = \mathcal{F}(\mathcal{G}_k) \setminus \mathcal{F}(\mathcal{G}_{k-1})$. In order to prove the theorem, we distinguish four cases: (i) $\phi_1 \in \mathcal{F}(\mathcal{G}_{k-1})$ and $\phi_2 \in \mathcal{F}(\mathcal{G}_{k-1})$, (ii) $\phi_1 \in \Delta \mathcal{F}_k$ and $\phi_2 \in \Delta \mathcal{F}_k$, (iii) $\phi_1 \in \Delta \mathcal{F}(\mathcal{G}_{k-1})$ and $\phi_2 \in \Delta \mathcal{F}_k$, and (iv) $\phi_1 \in \Delta \mathcal{F}_k$ and $\phi_2 \in \Delta \mathcal{F}(\mathcal{G}_{k-1})$. Moreover, for the convenience of description, let $\mathbb{P}(\phi_1 \in L_k)$ denote the probability that forest ϕ_1 is in L_k . In a similar way, we can define other probabilities. Note that all forests in L_{k-1} are uniformly sampled from $\mathcal{F}(\mathcal{G}_{k-1})$. Then, the theorem can be proved as follows.

For the first case that $\phi_1 \in \mathcal{F}(\mathcal{G}_{k-1})$ and $\phi_2 \in \mathcal{F}(\mathcal{G}_{k-1})$, we have $\mathbb{P}(\phi_1 \in L_k) = \mathbb{P}(\phi_1 \in L_{k-1}) = \mathbb{P}(\phi_2 \in L_{k-1}) = \mathbb{P}(\phi_2 \in L_k)$.

For the second case that $\phi_1 \in \Delta \mathcal{F}_k$ and $\phi_2 \in \Delta \mathcal{F}_k$, define $\phi'_1 = \phi_1 \setminus \{e_k\}$ and $\phi'_2 = \phi_2 \setminus \{e_k\}$. Then we have that $\mathbb{P}(\phi_1 \in L_k) = \mathbb{P}(\phi'_1 \in L_{k-1}) = \mathbb{P}(\phi'_2 \in L_{k-1}) = \mathbb{P}(\phi_2 \in L_k)$.

For the third case that $\phi_1 \in \Delta \mathcal{F}(\mathcal{G}_{k-1})$ and $\phi_2 \in \Delta \mathcal{F}_k$, define $\phi'_2 = \phi_2 \setminus \{e_k\}$. Then we have $\mathbb{P}(\phi_1 \in L_k) = \mathbb{P}(\phi_1 \in L_{k-1}) = \mathbb{P}(\phi'_2 \in L_{k-1}) = \mathbb{P}(\phi_2 \in L_k)$.

For the fourth case that $\phi_1 \in \Delta \mathcal{F}_k$ and $\phi_2 \in \Delta \mathcal{F}(\mathcal{G}_{k-1})$, using the same approach as the third case, we obtain $\mathbb{P}(\phi_1 \in L_k) = \mathbb{P}(\phi_2 \in L_k)$.

Thus, for two distinct forests $\phi_1, \phi_2 \in \mathcal{F}(\mathcal{G}_k)$, they have equal probability to appear in L_k . which finishes the proof. \Box

Theorem 5.2 demonstrates that the list L_k , generated by Algorithm 3, achieves uniform sampling from the updated set $\mathcal{F}(\mathcal{G}_k)$. Additionally, the time complexity of Algorithm 3 is $O(l_{k-1})$, where l_{k-1} is the number of forests in the initial list L_{k-1} .

Example 5.3. Consider a simple graph \mathcal{G}_0 in Figure 1, which has 3 nodes and 3 edges. Graph \mathcal{G}_0 comprises 7 spanning converging forests, highlighted in the first row of Figure 1. After the insertion of edge e = (1, 3), the graph updates to \mathcal{G}_1 , which contains 9 spanning converging forests forming $\mathcal{F}(\mathcal{G}_1)$, as demonstrated in the second row of Figure 1. Suppose that we have a forest list L_0 uniformly sampled from $\mathcal{F}(\mathcal{G}_0)$. A straightforward interpretation of Algorithm 3 for updating the list L_0 to L_1 involves two steps: first creating a copy of L_0 , and then attempting to add the new edge into each forest in the list L_0 . For the 7 forests in L_0 , only two forests ϕ_1

and ϕ_2 , distinguished by a yellow background, evolve into the valid forests $\hat{\phi}_1$ and $\hat{\phi}_2$ with the incorporation of the edge e = (1, 3). The addition of edge e to other forests either generates a cycle or results in a node with an out-degree of 2, both of which contradict the definition of spanning converging forests. Lemma 5.1 theoretically validates that there is a bijection between the sets $\{\phi_1, \phi_2\}$ and $\{\hat{\phi}_1, \hat{\phi}_2\}$, which validates that each forest in $\mathcal{F}(\mathcal{G}_1)$ has the same probability to appear in L_1 .



Figure 1: A toy digraph \mathcal{G}_0 and updated graph \mathcal{G}_1 with their spanning converging forests. Blue nodes are roots.

5.3 Edge Deletion

In this subsection, we consider the edge deletion update. Specifically, we consider the deletion of an edge $e_k = (u_k, v_k)$ from the graph \mathcal{G}_{k-1} , resulting in the updated graph $\mathcal{G}_k = \mathcal{G}_{k-1} \setminus \{e_k\}$. Our objective is to adapt the initial forest list L_{k-1} into L_k , ensuring the uniformity property of the sampling is preserved.

Given that the updated edge set E_k is defined as $E_k = E_{k-1} \setminus \{e_k\}$, it is evident that $\mathcal{F}(\mathcal{G}_k)$ is a subset of $\mathcal{F}(\mathcal{G}_{k-1})$. A straightforward approach comes to our mind: for the forests in L_{k-1} , we can define the updated list $L_k = \{\phi : \phi \in L_{k-1}, e_k \notin \phi\}$. That is, L_k is the subset of L_{k-1} excluding any forests that contain the edge e_k . This method ensures that all forests in $\mathcal{F}(\mathcal{G}_k)$ are equally likely to be included in L_k , under the assumption that all forests in L_{k-1} are uniformly sampled from $\mathcal{F}(\mathcal{G}_{k-1})$.

However, this method poses a challenge. The number of forests l_k in the updated list L_k will always be less than or equal to l_{k-1} . Consequently, if all updates are edge deletions, the size of our sampling forest lists will continually diminish. This reduction in sampling size could result in decreased accuracy when responding to query requests. Therefore, the challenge arises: can we devise an alternative method that maintains the uniformity property without leading to a reduction in the number of sampling forests?

To address the challenge, we define $\Delta \mathcal{F}(\mathcal{G}_k) = \mathcal{F}(\mathcal{G}_{k-1}) \setminus \mathcal{F}(\mathcal{G}_k)$. The solution lies in not merely discarding the forests in $\Delta \mathcal{F}(\mathcal{G}_k)$ but effectively utilizing them. Define $\mathcal{F}(\mathcal{G}'_k) = \{\phi : \phi \in \mathcal{F}(\mathcal{G}_k), r_{\phi}(u_k) = u_k, r_{\phi}(v_k) \neq u_k\}$. Considering that edge insertion and deletion are inverse operations, Lemma 5.1 establishes a bijection between $\Delta \mathcal{F}(\mathcal{G}_k)$ and $\mathcal{F}(\mathcal{G}'_k)$. Specifically, for a forest ϕ in $\Delta \mathcal{F}(\mathcal{G}_k)$, the forest $\phi \setminus \{e_k\}$ is included in $\mathcal{F}(\mathcal{G}'_k)$. This insight provides a method to utilize forests in $\Delta \mathcal{F}(\mathcal{G}_k)$ without discarding them. We then introduce an edge deletion update method, the pseudocode of which is described in Algorithm 4.

THEOREM 5.4. For a spanning converging forest list L_{k-1} with l_{k-1} forests uniformly sampled from $\mathcal{F}(\mathcal{G}_{k-1})$, and the deletion edge $e_k = (u_k, v_k)$, all forests in the updated set $\mathcal{F}(\mathcal{G}_k)$ have the same probability to be included in the list returned by Algorithm 4.

Algorithm 4: Delete-Update $(\mathcal{G}_{k-1}, L_{k-1}, l_{k-1}, e_k)$
Input : A digraph $\mathcal{G}_{k-1} = (V_{k-1}, E_{k-1})$, a list of l_{k-1}
spanning converging forest L_{k-1} uniformly
sampled from $\mathcal{F}(\mathcal{G}_{k-1})$, an edge $e_k = (u_k, v_k)$ to
be deleted
Output : An updated spanning converging forest list L_k
1 Initialize : $L_k \leftarrow \emptyset$
² for ϕ in L_{k-1} do
3 if $e_k \in \phi$ then
$4 \qquad \phi \leftarrow \phi \setminus \{e_k\}$
5 Add ϕ to L_k
6 else if $r_{\phi}(u_k) = u_k \& r_{\phi}(v_k) \neq u_k$ then
7 Add ϕ to L_k
8 else
9 Add ϕ to L_k twice
10 return L _k

The proof of Theorem 5.4 is similar to that of Theorem 5.2. Theorem 5.4 demonstrates that the list L_k , generated by Algorithm 4, ensures uniform sampling from the updated set $\mathcal{F}(\mathcal{G}_k)$.

Example 5.5. For a better understanding of Algorithm 4, we present an example depicted in Figure 2. In this example, we remove the edge e = (3, 1) from graph \mathcal{G}_0 , resulting in graph \mathcal{G}_1 . Set $\mathcal{F}(\mathcal{G}_0)$ contains 7 spanning converging forests, shown in the first row of Figure 2, while the set $\mathcal{F}(\mathcal{G}_1)$ comprises 4 spanning converging forests, illustrated in the second row of Figure 2. Assuming a forest list L_0 is uniformly sampled from $\mathcal{F}(\mathcal{G}_0)$, a straightforward approach might suggest discarding the forests ϕ_5 , ϕ_6 , ϕ_7 in L_0 to form L_1 . However, this strategy will unfortunately reduce the sampling size, as mentioned earlier.

Algorithm 4 addresses this challenge by utilizing the forests ϕ_5 , ϕ_6 , ϕ_7 . Lemma 5.1 suggests a bijection between $\{\widehat{\phi}_1, \widehat{\phi}_2, \widehat{\phi}_3\}$ and $\{\phi_5, \phi_6, \phi_7\}$. According to Algorithm 4, for a forest in L_0 , if it belongs to the set $\{\phi_1, \phi_2, \phi_3\}$, it is directly added to L_1 . If a forest is part of the set $\{\phi_4, \phi_5, \phi_6\}$, we first remove the edge e = (3, 1) and then include the modified forest in L_1 . This procedure ensures that $\widehat{\phi}_1$ is derived from ϕ_1 and ϕ_5 , $\widehat{\phi}_2$ from ϕ_2 and ϕ_6 , and $\widehat{\phi}_3$ from ϕ_3 and ϕ_7 . To maintain balanced probabilities, Algorithm 4 adds ϕ_4 to L_1 twice, which is highlighted with a yellow background, thereby ensuring uniformity in the sampling process from the updated forest set.



Figure 2: A toy digraph \mathcal{G}_0 and updated graph \mathcal{G}_1 with their spanning converging forests.

KDD '24, August 25-29, 2024, Barcelona, Spain.

5.4 Prune Technique and Algorithm Details

In this subsection, we introduce the prune technique as well as some details of our algorithms.

Prune Technique. The time complexity of Algorithm 3 and Algorithm 4 is $O(l_{k-1})$, where l_{k-1} is the number of spanning converging forests in the input list L_{k-1} . As illustrated previously, the number l_k of spanning converging forests in the updated list L_k either equals or exceeds l_{k-1} , irrespective of the update being an edge insertion or deletion. Given k updates, with the number of spanning converging forests incrementally rising as $l_0 \leq l_1 \leq \ldots \leq l_k$, it becomes essential to mitigate the potential for exponential growth. To this end, we introduce the pruning technique, which involves setting a threshold l', for instance, $l' = 5l_0$. If l_k surpasses l', a pruning action is undertaken to uniformly select l' forests from L_k , thereby constituting L'_k . This pruning strategy aims to ensure that the time taken for updates and queries remains manageable, avoiding significant increases as the number of updates grows.

Algorithm Details. For every spanning converging forest, our algorithms retain information on the next node for each node in the forest and its root node. This setup results in a space complexity of O(ln), with l representing the required number of spanning converging forests. Upon an update, when either Algorithm 3 or Algorithm 4 is activated, we avoid directly replicating forests to avoid the O(n) cost in copying a single forest. Instead, we only record the updated edge (in the case of insertion) or the adjusted weight (in the case of deletion). This method, combined with the pruning approach, guarantees that our algorithms achieve an O(1) complexity for both query and update operations, enhancing its efficiency and scalability for large-scale network analyses.

6 EXPERIMENTS

In this section, we conduct extensive experiments on various reallife networks in order to evaluate the performance of our algorithms, in terms of accuracy and efficiency.

6.1 Setup

Datasets and Equipment. The datasets of selected real networks are publicly available in the KONECT [30] and SNAP [33]. Our experiments are conducted on a diverse range of undirected and directed networks. The details of these datasets are presented in Table 1. All experiments are conducted using the Julia programming language. We conduct all experiments in a computational environment featuring a 2.5 GHz Intel E5-2682v4 CPU with 512GB of primary memory.

Table 1: Datasets used in experiments.

Network	Туре	Nodes	Edges
Web-Stanford	directed	281,903	2,312,497
Delicious	undirected	536,108	1,375,961
Web-Google	directed	875,713	5,105,039
Youtube	undirected	1,134,890	2,987,624
Livejournal	undirected	10,690,276	112,307,385
Twitter	directed	41,652,230	1,468,365,182

Algorithms and Parameters. In the evaluation of forest matrix entry queries, we compare our two algorithms SFQ and SFQPLUS with the fast linear equation solvers, since direct matrix inversion is computationally infeasible. For undirected graphs, we consider the fast Laplacian solver [16], which is widely used in computation and optimization problems [7, 46, 51]. For directed graphs, the fast Laplacian solver no longer applies. Thus, we choose the GMRES algorithm [41] to get the ground truth with a tolerance set to 10⁻⁹.

According to Theorem 4.5, we set $\delta = 0.01$, $\epsilon = 0.03$, and the number of spanning converging forest *l* is given by $l = \left[\left(\frac{2}{3\epsilon} + \frac{1}{4\epsilon^2} \right) \log\left(\frac{2}{\delta} \right) \right]$. We set the prune threshold to be l' = 5l. Given that Wilson's algorithm can be parallelized efficiently, we use 32 computing cores to speed up the process.

6.2 Accuracy

In this subsection, we evaluate the accuracy of our algorithms SFQ and SFQPLUS with the ground truth. For both SFQ and SFQPLUS, we consider an undirected graph as a special directed graph, given that an edge between two nodes in an undirected graph can be considered as two directed edges between the two nodes in a directed graph setting.

Our initial evaluation focuses on the performance of our algorithms in estimating the diagonal of the forest matrix, which has broad applications. In our experiments, for a graph $\mathcal{G} = (V, E)$, we randomly select a node $i \in V$. We then obtain the ground truth by employing the fast Laplacian solver for undirected graphs and GMRES for directed graphs to solve the linear equation ω_{ii} = $\mathbf{e}_i^{\top}(\mathbf{I} + \mathbf{L})^{-1}\mathbf{e}_i$. Here we choose four graphs: web-Web-Stanford (a), Delicious (b), web-Google (c), Youtube (d), since the solver was unable to process the two large graphs, Livejournal and Twitter, constrained by time and memory. Then we apply algorithms SFQ and SFQPLUS to get the estimation values $\widehat{\omega}_{ii}$ and $\overline{\omega}_{ii}$, respectively. This procedure is repeated 100 times to calculate the average relative errors. In addition to the static graphs, we explore the scenarios where the graph evolves with 50 edges inserted and 50 edges deleted. We repeat the node selection procedure for these updated graphs and calculate the average relative errors. The results for these settings are reported in Figure 3.



Figure 3: Comparison of average relative errors of the diagonals for algorithms SFQ and SFQPLUS on four graphs: web-Web-Stanford (a), Delicious (b), web-Google (c), Youtube(d), where suffix -S indicates the results on static graphs and -D denotes results on the updated graphs.

Figure 3 illustrates that, compared to static graphs, the accuracy of both algorithms experiences varying degrees of decline on updated graphs, confirming our earlier analysis. Specifically, SFQ's accuracy significantly decreases, rendering its results less reliable, while SFQPLUS consistently delivers satisfactory outcomes. This highlights the effectiveness of our variance reduction technique in enhancing accuracy.

We then conduct experiments to estimate the forest distance ρ_{ij} between two distinct nodes *i* and *j*. The forest distance ρ_{ij} is defined as $\rho_{ij} = \omega_{ii} + \omega_{jj} - \omega_{ij} - \omega_{ji}$, which was applied in [26] to measure the proximity between nodes *i* and *j*. It has been shown that the forest distance based node centrality measure is more discriminating than other frequently used metrics for node importance [7]. We obtain the ground truth of ρ_{ij} by solving the linear equations $\rho_{ij} = (\mathbf{e}_i^\top - \mathbf{e}_j^\top)(\mathbf{I} + \mathbf{L})^{-1}\mathbf{e}_i + (\mathbf{e}_j^\top - \mathbf{e}_i^\top)(\mathbf{I} + \mathbf{L})^{-1}\mathbf{e}_j$. We then derive the estimations of ρ_{ij} by executing algorithms SFQ and SFQPLUS four times each. We randomly select 400 pairs of distinct nodes and calculate their forest closeness centrality. The settings for these experiments are consistent with those previously mentioned. The results are displayed in Figure 4. From these results, it is evident that the SFQPLUS algorithm achieves better accuracy than SFQ in both static and updated graphs.



Figure 4: Comparison of average relative errors of the forest closeness centrality measures for algorithms SFQ and SFQPLUS on four graphs: web-Web-Stanford (a), Delicious (b), web-Google (c), Livejournal(d), where suffix -S indicates the results on static graphs and -D denotes results on the updated graphs.

6.3 Efficiency and Scalability

As illustrated above, the SFQPLUS algorithm achieves satisfactory accuracy in comparison to the ground truth. In this subsection, we show the efficiency and scalability of our query algorithms and update strategies on various networks. The results, summarized in Table 2, provide a clear indication of these findings. For each network, the SFQ and SFQPLUS algorithms are initially executed 100 times, yielding an average time denoted as SFQ-S and SFQPLUS-S, respectively, in the table. Subsequently, the graph undergoes 100 updates, comprising 50 random edge insertions and 50 random edge deletions. The update time is calculated as the average of 100 executions, 50 executions of the INSERT-UPDATE algorithm and 50 executions of the DELETE-UPDATE algorithm. After the updates, the SFQ and SFQPLUS algorithms are run another 100 times on the updated graph, with the average runtime recorded as SFQ-D and SFQPLUS-D. To obtain the ground truth, a fast Laplacian solver for undirected graphs and GMRES for directed graphs are used, with the execution time noted in the Solver column of the table.

From these results, it is observable that under identical conditions, the SFQPLUS algorithm typically requires a slightly longer time than SFQ. Moreover, the execution time for both algorithms marginally increases after the updates. Importantly, the time for queries and updates shows insensitivity to the size of the network. This supports the prior analysis that the query and update times are O(1), significantly less than the time required by the linear solver to determine the ground truth. Remarkably, for two massive networks, Livejournal and Twitter, both of which contain over 10 million nodes, the solver fails to run due to time and memory constraints, whereas our algorithms still perform effectively. Our algorithms consistently return results for a single query operation within one second, demonstrating their efficiency and scalability for large-scale network analysis.

Table 2: The running time(seconds) of the linear solver and SFQ and SFQPLUS algorithms, as well as the update time, where suffix -S indicates the results on static graphs and -D denotes results on the updated graphs.

Network	Running Time(seconds)						
	SFQ-S	SFQ-D	SFQPlus-S	SFQPLUS-D	Update	Solver	
Stanford	0.0008	0.027	0.0013	0.028	0.097	22.17	
Delicious	0.0008	0.097	0.0012	0.098	0.429	50.06	
Google	0.0007	0.153	0.0013	0.157	0.485	81.61	
Youtube	0.0009	0.252	0.0014	0.256	0.885	255.64	
Livejournal	0.0009	0.314	0.0014	0.362	1.121	-	
Twitter	0.0011	0.421	0.0021	0.489	1.893	-	

7 CONCLUSIONS

In this paper, we addressed the problem of efficiently querying the entries of the forest matrix of a dynamically evolving graph. Leveraging an extension of Wilson's algorithm, we presented an algorithm SFQ as our foundational approach. We further enhanced this foundation and developed SFQPLUS, an advanced algorithm that incorporates an innovative variance reduction technique to improve the accuracy of estimations for the entries of forest matrix. Additionally, we proposed innovative forest updating techniques to manage evolving graphs, including edge additions and deletions. Our methods maintains O(1) time complexity for both updates and queries, while ensuring unbiased estimates of the entries of the forest matrix entries. Extensive experimentation on various real-world networks validates the effectiveness and efficiency of our algorithms. Moreover, our algorithms are scalable to massive graphs with over forty million nodes.

In future work, we plan to extend our algorithms to other problems on evolving graphs, such as dynamically solving linear systems associated with the forest matrix, thereby broadening their applicability in network analysis.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This work was supported by the National Natural Science Foundation of China (Nos. 62372112, U20B2051, and 61872093).

KDD '24, August 25-29, 2024, Barcelona, Spain.

Haoxin Sun, Xiaotian Zhou, and Zhongzhi Zhang*

REFERENCES

- Ittai Abraham, David Durfee, Ioannis Koutis, Sebastian Krinninger, and Richard Peng. 2016. On fully dynamic graph sparsifiers. In 2016 IEEE 57th Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science. IEEE, 335–344.
- [2] Dimitris Achlioptas. 2003. Database-friendly random projections: Johnson-Lindenstrauss with binary coins. *J. Comput. System Sci.* 66, 4 (2003), 671–687.
 [3] Rafig Pashaevich Agaev and P Yu Chebotarev. 2001. Spanning forests of a digraph
- and their applications. Automation and Remote Control 62, 3 (2001), 443–466. [4] Luca Avena, Fabienne Castell, Alexandre Gaudillière, and Clothilde Mélot. 2018.
- Random forests and networks analysis. *Journal of Statistical Physics* 173 (2018), 985–1027.
- [5] Luca Avena and Alexandre Gaudillière. 2018. Two applications of random spanning forests. *Journal of Theoretical Probability* 31, 4 (2018), 1975–2004.
- [6] Coralio Ballester, Antoni Calvó-Armengol, and Yves Zenou. 2006. Who's who in networks. Wanted: The key player. *Econometrica* 74, 5 (2006), 1403–1417.
- [7] Qi Bao and Zhongzhi Zhang. 2022. Discriminating Power of centrality measures in complex networks. *IEEE Transactions on Cybernetics* 52, 11 (2022), 12583– 12593.
- [8] Simon Barthelmé, Nicolas Tremblay, Alexandre Gaudilliere, Luca Avena, and Pierre-Olivier Amblard. 2019. Estimating the inverse trace using random forests on graphs. arXiv preprint arXiv:1905.02086 (2019).
- [9] Surender Baswana, Sumeet Khurana, and Soumojit Sarkar. 2012. Fully dynamic randomized algorithms for graph spanners. ACM Transactions on Algorithms 8, 4 (2012), 1–51.
- [10] Seth Chaiken. 1982. A combinatorial proof of the all minors matrix tree theorem. SIAM J. Alg. Disc. Meth. 3, 3 (Sep. 1982), 319–329.
- [11] Pavel Chebotarev and Rafig Agaev. 2002. Forest matrices around the Laplacian matrix. *Linear Algebra Appl.* 356, 1-3 (2002), 253–274.
- [12] Pavel Yu. Chebotarev and Elena Shamis. 2006. Matrix-Forest Theorems. ArXiv abs/math/0602575 (2006).
- [13] P. Yu Chebotarev and E. V. Shamis. 1997. The matrix-forest theorem and measuring relations in small social groups. *Automation and Remote Control* 58, 9 (1997), 1505–1514.
- [14] P. Yu Chebotarev and E. V. Shamis. 1998. On proximity measures for graph vertices. Automation and Remote Control 59, 10 (1998), 1443–1459.
- [15] Fan Chung and Linyuan Lu. 2006. Concentration inequalities and martingale inequalities: a survey. *Internet mathematics* 3, 1 (2006), 79–127.
- [16] Michael B Cohen, Rasmus Kyng, Gary L Miller, Jakub W Pachocki, Richard Peng, Anup B Rao, and Shen Chen Xu. 2014. Solving SDD linear systems in nearly m log^{1/2} n time. In Proceedings of the Forty-Sixth Annual ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing. ACM, 343–352.
- [17] Jaydeep De, Xiaowei Zhang, Feng Lin, and Li Cheng. 2017. Transduction on directed graphs via absorbing random walks. *IEEE Transactions on Pattern Analysis* and Machine Intelligence 40, 7 (2017), 1770–1784.
- [18] David Durfee, Yu Gao, Gramoz Goranci, and Richard Peng. 2019. Fully dynamic spectral vertex sparsifiers and applications. In Proceedings of the 51st Annual ACM SIGACT Symposium on Theory of Computing. 914–925.
- [19] Sebastian Forster and Gramoz Goranci. 2019. Dynamic low-stretch trees via dynamic low-diameter decompositions. In Proceedings of the 51st Annual ACM SIGACT Symposium on Theory of Computing. 377–388.
- [20] Andrea Galeotti, Benjamin Golub, and Sanjeev Goyal. 2020. Targeting interventions in networks. *Econometrica* 88, 6 (2020), 2445-2471.
- [21] Aristides Gionis, Evimaria Terzi, and Panayiotis Tsaparas. 2013. Opinion maximization in social networks. In Proceedings of the 2013 SIAM International Conference on Data Mining. SIAM, 387–395.
- [22] Gramoz Goranci, Monika Henzinger, and Mikkel Thorup. 2018. Incremental exact min-cut in polylogarithmic amortized update time. ACM Transactions on Algorithms 14, 2 (2018), 1–21.
- [23] Jacob Holm, Kristian De Lichtenberg, and Mikkel Thorup. 2001. Poly-logarithmic deterministic fully-dynamic algorithms for connectivity, minimum spanning tree, 2-edge, and biconnectivity. J. ACM 48, 4 (2001), 723–760.
- [24] Jacob Holm, Eva Rotenberg, and Christian Wulff-Nilsen. 2015. Faster fullydynamic minimum spanning forest. In Algorithms-ESA 2015: 23rd Annual European Symposium. Springer, 742–753.
- [25] Glen Jeh and Jennifer Widom. 2003. Scaling personalized web search. In Proceedings of the 12th International Conference on World Wide Web. 271–279.
- [26] Yujia Jin, Qi Bao, and Zhongzhi Zhang. 2019. Forest distance closeness centrality in disconnected graphs. In 2018 IEEE International Conference on Data Mining. IEEE, 339–348.
- [27] William B Johnson and Joram Lindenstrauss. 1984. Extensions of Lipschitz mappings into a Hilbert space. Contemp. Math. 26 (1984), 189–206.

- [28] Bruce M Kapron, Valerie King, and Ben Mountjoy. 2013. Dynamic graph connectivity in polylogarithmic worst case time. In Proceedings of the twenty-fourth annual ACM-SIAM symposium on Discrete algorithms. SIAM, 1131–1142.
- [29] Alex Kulesza, Ben Taskar, et al. 2012. Determinantal point processes for machine learning. Foundations and Trends® in Machine Learning 5, 2–3 (2012), 123–286.
 [30] Jérôme Kunegis. 2013. Konect: the koblenz network collection. In Proceedings of
- [30] Jerome Rumegis. 2013. Rollect: the Roberts network concerton: in Proceedings of the 22nd International World Wide Web Conference. ACM, 1343–1350.
 [31] Lawler and F. Gregory. 1980. A self-avoiding random walk. Duke Mathematical
- Journal 47, 3 (1980), 655–693. [32] Gregory Francis Lawler. 1979. A self-avoiding random walk. Ph.D. Dissertation.
- Princeton University. [33] Jure Leskovec and Rok Sosič. 2016. SNAP: A general-purpose network analysis
- [35] Jule Deskoved and Rok Sosie. 2010. SIGH: A general-purpose network analysis and graph-mining library. ACM Transactions on Intelligent Systems and Technology 8, 1 (2016), 1.
- [34] Russell Merris. 1994. Laplacian matrices of graphs: A survey. Linear Algebra Appl. 197 (1994), 143–176.
- [35] Danupon Nanongkai and Thatchaphol Saranurak. 2017. Dynamic spanning forest with worst-case update time: adaptive, las vegas, and o (n1/2-ε)-time. In Proceedings of the 49th Annual ACM SIGACT Symposium on Theory of Computing. 1122–1129.
- [36] Danupon Nanongkai, Thatchaphol Saranurak, and Christian Wulff-Nilsen. 2017. Dynamic minimum spanning forest with subpolynomial worst-case update time. In 2017 IEEE 58th Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science. IEEE, 950–961.
- [37] Yusuf Y Pilavci, Pierre-Olivier Amblard, Simon Barthelme, and Nicolas Tremblay. 2020. Smoothing graph signals via random spanning forests. In Proceedings of IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing. IEEE, 5630–5634.
- [38] Yusuf Yiğit Pilavcı, Pierre-Olivier Amblard, Simon Barthelme, and Nicolas Tremblay. 2021. Graph Tikhonov regularization and interpolation via random spanning forests. *IEEE Transactions on Signal and Information Processing over Networks* 7 (2021), 359–374.
- [39] Yusuf Yigit Pilavci, Pierre-Olivier Amblard, Simon Barthelme, and Nicolas Tremblay. 2022. Variance reduction for inverse trace estimation via random spanning forests. arXiv preprint arXiv:2206.07421 (2022).
- [40] Wilbert Samuel Rossi, Paolo Frasca, and Fabio Fagnani. 2017. Distributed estimation from relative and absolute measurements. *IEEE Trans. Automat. Control* 62, 12 (2017), 6385–6391.
- [41] Youcef Saad and Martin H Schultz. 1986. GMRES: A generalized minimal residual algorithm for solving nonsymmetric linear systems. SIAM J. Sci. Statist. Comput. 7, 3 (1986), 856–869.
- [42] Haoxin Sun and Zhongzhi Zhang. 2023. Opinion optimization in directed social networks. In Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence, Vol. 37. 4623–4632.
- [43] Haoxin Sun and Zhongzhi Zhang. 2024. Efficient computation for diagonal of forest matrix via variance-reduced forest sampling. In Proceedings of the ACM Web Conference 2024. 792–802.
- [44] Mikkel Thorup. 2007. Fully-dynamic min-cut. Combinatorica 27, 1 (2007), 91-127.
- [45] Jan van den Brand, Yu Gao, Arun Jambulapati, Yin Tat Lee, Yang P Liu, Richard Peng, and Aaron Sidford. 2022. Faster maxflow via improved dynamic spectral vertex sparsifiers. In Proceedings of the 54th Annual ACM SIGACT Symposium on Theory of Computing. 543–556.
- [46] Alexander van der Grinten, Eugenio Angriman, Maria Predari, and Henning Meyerhenke. 2021. New approximation algorithms for forest closeness centrality-for individual vertices and vertex groups. In Proceedings of the 2021 SIAM International Conference on Data Mining. SIAM, 136–144.
- [47] Sibo Wang, Renchi Yang, Xiaokui Xiao, Zhewei Wei, and Yin Yang. 2017. FORA: simple and effective approximate single-source personalized PageRank. In Proceedings of the 23rd ACM SIGKDD International Conference on Knowledge Discovery and Data Mining. 505–514.
- [48] David Bruce Wilson. 1996. Generating random spanning trees more quickly than the cover time. In Proceedings of the Twenty-Eighth Annual ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing. 296–303.
- [49] Christian Wulff-Nilsen. 2017. Fully-dynamic minimum spanning forest with improved worst-case update time. In Proceedings of the 49th Annual ACM SIGACT Symposium on Theory of Computing. 1130–1143.
- [50] Wanyue Xu, Qi Bao, and Zhongzhi Zhang. 2021. Fast evaluation for relevant quantities of opinion dynamics. In *Proceedings of The Web Conference*. ACM, 2037–2045.
- [51] Liwang Zhu and Zhongzhi Zhang. 2022. A nearly-linear time algorithm for minimizing risk of conflict in social networks. In Proceedings of the 28th ACM SIGKDD Conference on Knowledge Discovery and Data Mining. 2648–2656.