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#### Abstract

Spectral sparsification for directed Eulerian graphs is a key component in the design of fast algorithms for solving directed Laplacian linear systems. Directed Laplacian linear system solvers are crucial algorithmic primitives to fast computation of fundamental problems on random walks, such as computing stationary distribution, hitting and commute time, and personalized PageRank vectors. While spectral sparsification is well understood for undirected graphs and it is known that for every graph $G,(1+\varepsilon)$-sparsifiers with $O\left(n \varepsilon^{-2}\right)$ edges exist [Batson-Spielman-Srivastava, STOC '09] (which is optimal), the best known constructions of Eulerian sparsifiers require $\Omega\left(n \varepsilon^{-2} \log ^{4} n\right)$ edges and are based on short-cycle decompositions [Chu et al., FOCS '18].

In this paper, we give improved constructions of Eulerian sparsifiers, specifically: 1. We show that for every directed Eulerian graph $\vec{G}$, there exist an Eulerian sparsifier with $O\left(n \varepsilon^{-2} \log ^{2} n \log ^{2} \log n+n \varepsilon^{-4 / 3} \log ^{8 / 3} n\right)$ edges. This result is based on combining shortcycle decompositions [Chu-Gao-Peng-Sachdeva-Sawlani-Wang, FOCS '18, SICOMP] and [Parter-Yogev, ICALP '19], with recent progress on the matrix Spencer conjecture [Bansal-Meka-Jiang, STOC '23]. 2. We give an improved analysis of the constructions based on short-cycle decompositions, giving an $m^{1+\delta}$-time algorithm for any constant $\delta>0$ for constructing Eulerian sparsifiers with $O\left(n \varepsilon^{-2} \log ^{3} n\right)$ edges.


## 1 Introduction

Given a graph $G(V, E)$, a sparsifier of $G$ is a graph $H$ on the same set of vertices $V$, but hopefully supported on a subset of the edges $E^{\prime} \subset E$ such that $H$ approximately preserves certain properties of $G$. Several notions of graph sparsification have been well studied for undirected graphs, e.g. spanners (approximately preserving distances), cut sparsifiers, spectral sparsifiers, etc.

Spectral sparsification is a particularly influential notion of undirected graph sparsification ST04]. Spectral sparsifiers generalize cut-sparsifiers introduced by Benczur-Karger [BK96], which guaranteed that the total weight of every vertex cut is preserved up to a multiplicative factor of $(1+\varepsilon)$ in the sparsifier. Efficient spectral sparsification was one of the core developments that led to the development of nearly-linear time solvers for Laplacian linear systems [ST04]. It further inspired the Laplacian paradigm, resulting in faster algorithms for many graph problems including sampling/counting random spanning trees DKPRS17; DPPR17], approximating edge centrality measures [LZ18] etc.

The first construction of spectral sparsifiers for undirected graphs by Spielman and Teng required $\Omega\left(n \varepsilon^{-2}\right.$ poly $\left.(\log n)\right)$ number of edges with a large, unspecified power of $\log n$. Subsequently, Spielman and Srivastava [SS11] gave a very simple and elegant construction, whereby sampling each edge independently with a probability proportional to its leverage score results in a spectral sparsifier with $O\left(n \varepsilon^{-2} \log n\right)$ edges with high probability. In a complete graph, sampling edges independently with probability $p$ requires $p=\Omega\left(\varepsilon^{-2} \log n\right)$ to achieve ( $1+\varepsilon$ )-spectral sparsification; thus demonstrating that such a construction requires $\Omega\left(n \varepsilon^{-2} \log n\right)$ edges.

Batson-Spielman-Srivastava BSS12] further improved this to show that there exist spectral sparsifiers for undirected graphs with $O\left(n \varepsilon^{-2}\right)$ edges, and that we cannot do better even for the complete graph. Thus, they essentially settled the question of optimal size of undirected spectal sparsifiers.

For directed graphs, sparsification has been trickier to define. It is immediate to see that in a complete bi-partite graph with all edges directed from the left vertices to the right vertices, if one wishes to approximately preserve all directed cuts, one must preserve all the edges. This means that there is no non-trivial cut-sparsification (or its generalization) for arbitrary directed graphs.

Such pathological cases can be avoided if one restricts to Eulerian directed graphs, i.e. a graph where each vertex has its total weighted in-degree equal to its total weighted out-degree, in which case cut sparsification becomes equivalent to cut sparsification of undirected graphs. Indeed, Cohen-Kelner-Peebles-Peng-Rao-Sidford-Vladu [CKPPRSV17] show that it is possible to define a meaningful generalization of spectral sparsification (and hence cut sparsification) to Eulerian directed graphs. We will call these sparsifiers Eulerian sparsifiers for brevity. In a manner similar to the original Spielman-Teng construction, they give a nearly-linear time $\widetilde{O}(m)$-time algorithm to build an Eulerian sparsifier with $O\left(n \varepsilon^{-2}\right.$ poly $\left.(\log n)\right)$ edges, with a large unspecified power of $\log n$.

Since Eulerian sparsification generalizes undirected spectral sparsification, $\Omega\left(n \varepsilon^{-2}\right)$ edges are necessary for constructing Eulerian sparsifiers. There has been some progress on proving the existence of Eulerian sparsifiers with fewer edges: Chu-Gao-Peng-Sachdeva-Sawlani-Wang [GPSSW18] introduced the notion of short-cycle decomposition, a decomposition of an unweighted graph as a union of short edge-disjoint cycles, and a few extra edges. As a simple lemma, they show that every undirected graph can be represented as a union of edge-disjoint cycles of length $2 \log n$, with at most $2 n$ extra edges. Using this short-cycle decomposition, [CGPSSW18] were able to prove that Eulerian sparsifiers with $O\left(n \varepsilon^{-2} \log ^{4} n\right)$ edges exist. However, the following natural question remains unanswered:

What is the best possible sparsity guarantee for constructing Eulerian sparsifiers?

In this paper, we make progress on this question. First, we present an improved analysis of the short-cycle based Eulerian-sparsification from [CGPSSW18].

Theorem 1.1. For every constant $\delta>0$, there is an algorithm that taken as input a directed Eulerian graph $\vec{G}$ and returns an $\varepsilon$-Eulerian sparsifier of $\vec{G}$ with $O\left(n \varepsilon^{-2} \log ^{3} n\right)$ edges in $m^{1+\delta}$ time.

The above algorithm is based on independently toggling short cycles, i.e., with probability $1 / 2$, all the clockwise edges are deleted and counter-clockwise edges are doubled, and with probability $1 / 2$ the the counter-clockwise edges are deleted and the clockwise edges doubled. Given that the edges in each $O(\log n)$ length short-cycle are toggled in a completely correlated manner, and the cycles are toggled independently, this approach naturally cannot lead to a sparsity better than $O\left(n \varepsilon^{-2} \log ^{2} n\right)$.

To go beyond the above result, we leverage discrepancy theory, and specifically the recent progress on the matrix Spencer conjecture by Bansal, Jiang, and Meka [BJM23]. (Please see the related works section, Section 1.1, for a description of the matrix Spencer conjecture.) While the matrix Spencer conjecture itself is not directly useful for our application, we are able to utilize the underlying machinery from [BJM23] towards the conjecture together with the short-cycle decomposition to prove the following:

Theorem 1.2 (Informal). There is an algorithm that given a Eulerian graph $\vec{G}$, can compute in poly-time a $\varepsilon$-Eulerian sparsifier of $\vec{G}$ with $n \varepsilon^{-2} \log ^{2} n+n \varepsilon^{-3 / 4} \log ^{8 / 3} n$ edges (up to $\log \log n$ factors).

For small $\varepsilon$, e.g. $\varepsilon^{-1}=\Omega(\log n)$, the above theorem gives an $n \varepsilon^{-2} \log ^{2} n$ bound, only a $\log ^{2} n$ factor away from the lower bound.

### 1.1 Related works

Sparsification. In the realm of undirected spectral sparsification, there are four major approaches: expander decomposition ST11; ACKQWZ16; JS18], spanners KP12; KX16; KPPS17], importance sampling [SS08; KLP12], and potential function based sparsification [BSS14; ALO15; LS15; LS17.

More closely related to Eulerian spectral sparsification is undirected degree preserving sparsification, introduced by [GPSSW18]. Degree preserving sparsification is useful for constructing spectral sketches. More importantly for us, techniques for degree preserving sparsification can generally be extended to work for directed Eulerian sparsification. The standard notion of Eulerian approximation (and sparsification), first introduced by CKPPRSV17], requires exact preservation of the differences between in and out degrees while ensuring the difference in directed Eulerian Laplacians is small with respect to the Laplacian of the undirectification of the graph. That is, for $\epsilon \in(0,1)$,

$$
\left\|\boldsymbol{L}_{G}^{+/ 2}\left(\boldsymbol{L}_{\vec{H}}-\boldsymbol{L}_{\vec{G}}\right) \boldsymbol{L}_{G}^{+/ 2}\right\| \leq \epsilon
$$

This definition subsumes degree preserving sparsification for undirected graphs. However, the difficulty in Eulerian sparsification compared to degree preserving is that the directed Eulerian Laplacians are neither symmetric nor positive semidefinite while undirected Laplacians satisfy both.

CKPPRSV17] showed the first degree preserving (implicitly) and Eulerian sparsifier using expander decomposition. The algorithm performs random sampling of the directed edges with probability related to the degrees within each expander. A small patching is then added at the
end to fix up the degrees for each expander. Recent work on different notions of Eulerian sparsification [APPSV23] establishes an "equivalence", albeit with significantly stronger requirements than spectral approximation, between degree preserving and Eulerian sparsification under the notion of singular value approximation. They established the first Eulerian sparsifier with both nearly-linear sparsity and nearly-linear runtime using this connection. However, the best known efficient constructions of sparsifiers based on expander decompositions lose a large poly $(\log n)$ factor [APPSV23]. Even ignoring efficient construction, the expander approach has a natural lower bound of at least a $\log ^{2} n$ factor in the worst-case sparsity even for the undirected spectral sparsification due to a lowerbound on the optimal tradeoff between expansion factor and number of expanders (see [SW19]).

As an alternative to using expander decompositions, the technique of using short cycles for sparsification introduced by CGPSSW18] also applies to both degree preserving and Eulerian sparsifications with sparsity $O\left(n \epsilon^{-2} \log ^{2} n\right)$ and $O\left(n \epsilon^{-2} \log ^{4} n\right)$ respectively. Improved short cycle decompositions were subsequently designed in LSY19; PY19] to facilitate faster construction of sparsifiers. Our first result Theorem 1.1 follows closely to [CGPSSW18] and reduces the gap between degree-preserving and Eulerian sparsification under this technique.

Recently [JRT23] demonstrated a new approach in degree preserving sparsification using discrepancy theory. They showed that the operator norm discrepancy bodies are well conditioned (i.e., satisfy certain Gaussian measure lowerbound) for symmetric and positive semidefinite matrices that arise from undirected sparsification and used an approximate version of the framework from [RR23] to give a colouring of the edges (corresponding to adding and deleting edges) under the linear constraint needed for degree preservation. However, the underlying discrepancy bodies studied by [JRT23] do not align well with Eulerian sparsifications where matrices are no longer positive semidefinite and matrix variance statistic is the primary statistic one has control over (see Section (4).

Directed Laplacian solvers. [CKPPSV16] initiated the line of work that studies the problem of solving directed Laplacian linear systems. They established a reduction from solving general directed Laplacian systems to Eulerian Laplacian systems and motivated subsequent studies in Eulerian Laplacian solvers. [CKPPRSV17] gave an almost linear time algorithm for solving Eulerian Laplacians using the squaring identities from PS14]. [KKKPPRS18] gave the first nearly linear time solver using the standard approximate LU factorization techniques that enjoyed great success in undirected Laplacian solvers [KLPSS16; SZ23]. [AJSS19] further established a reduction from solving linear systems of (asymmetric) M-matrices to Eulerian Laplacian systems, giving fast comuptation of several problems closely associated with the Perron-Frobenius theorem. [PS22] extended the approach from [CKKPPRS18] and gave an approach for extending an algorithm for building Eulerian sparsifiers to a fast solver for Eulerian Laplacian linear systems. Combined with Theorem 1.1, they give a $O\left(n \log ^{4} n \log (n / \epsilon)\right)$ time solver with $m^{1+\delta}$ preprocessing time for any constant $\delta>0$. [KMG22] established the first derandomized directed Laplacian solver in almost linear time.

Discrepancy theory. The Matrix Spencer Conjecture Zou12; Mek14] is a major open problem in discrepancy theory:

Conjecture 1.3 (Matrix Spencer Conjecture). Given $n \times n$ symmetric matrices $\boldsymbol{A}_{1}, \ldots, \boldsymbol{A}_{m} \in$ $\mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ with $\left\|\boldsymbol{A}_{i}\right\| \leq 1$, there exist signs $x \in\{ \pm 1\}^{m}$ such that $\left\|\sum_{i=1}^{m} x_{i} \boldsymbol{A}_{i}\right\| \leq O(\sqrt{m}$. $\max \{1, \sqrt{\min \{1, \log (n / m)\}}\})$.

As a natural comparison, for an uniform random colouring $x \in\{ \pm 1\}^{m}$, the matrix Chernoff bound [Tro12] gives that

$$
\mathbb{E}\left[\left\|\sum_{i} x_{i} \boldsymbol{A}_{i}\right\|\right]=O(\sqrt{\log n}) \cdot\left\|\sum_{i} \boldsymbol{A}_{i}^{2}\right\|^{1 / 2} \leq O(\sqrt{m \log n})
$$

which has a gap of $\sqrt{\log n}$ to Conjecture 1.3 when $m \geq n$. We refer readers to LRR17; HRS22; DJR22] for recent progress toward solving this conjecture.

Many natural problems in studying the spectra of matrices can be viewed as matrix discrepancy theory problems, e.g., graph sparsification [BSS14; RR20] and the Kadison-Singer problem MSS15]. RR20] studies the geometry of operator norm balls for a collection of matrices where, $\left\|\sum_{i}\left|\boldsymbol{A}_{i}\right|\right\|$ is small. This result was subsequently used in JRT23] to show optimal degree preserving sparsification. As previously mentioned, this line of work is not applicable for the purpose of Eulerian sparsification since matrices that emerge from our setting do not satisfy that $\left\|\sum_{i}\left|\boldsymbol{A}_{i}\right|\right\|$ is small. BJM23] resolved the Matrix Spencer Conjecture for matrices of rank $n /\left(\log ^{O(1)} n\right)$ using a recent advancement in matrix concentration bounds due to [BBH23]. The partial colouring result for controlling operator norm used in [BJM23] serves as the main machinery in our existential results (see Lemma 1.4). Specifically, the matrices we study naturally satisfy $\left\|\sum_{i} \boldsymbol{A}_{i}^{2}\right\|$ is small.

### 1.2 Technical overview

Our approach to constructing Eulerian sparsifiers builds on the framework introduced in CGPSSW18]. For completeness, the entire algorithm and our improved analysis are presented in Section 3.

The sparsification algorithm in [CGPSSW18] combines importance sampling of edges with a short cycle decomposition. At each iteration, the algorithm restricts its attention to edges with small "importance" in the undirected graph (edges with leverage score $w_{e} \boldsymbol{b}_{e}^{\top} \boldsymbol{L}_{G}^{+} \boldsymbol{b}_{e}$ at most constant times the average leverage score, $O(n / m)$ ). Note that there are $\Omega(m)$ such edges. The algorithm then performs a short cycle decomposition on these edges - expressing the graph as a union of uniformly weighted edge-disjoint short cycles and a few extra edges. For each short cycle, the algorithm independently keeps either the clockwise edges or the counter-clockwise edges with probability $1 / 2$ each. The number of edges reduces by a constant fraction overall in expectation at each iteration. After doubling the weights of the cycle edges retained, the algorithm guarantees that the Eulerianess of each short cycle is preserved and, hence, the entire graph. Moreover, when combined with the undirected leverage score condition above, such changes in directed short cycles also have a small variance overall. The matrix Bernstein inequality for asymmetric matrices guarantees a small approximation error for this randomized step. We repeat this process until the desired approximation error is met.

To obtain our improved analysis of this algorithm, we first present improved variance bounds for random matrices corresponding to short cycles (see Lemma 3.4). Rather than bounding the variance terms through complete graphs as in [CGPSSW18], we instead bound it directly with respect to the undirected cycle. This improved analysis also serves a critical role in our partial colouring approach presented in Section 4.

In the rest of our paper, we present our existential result which uses the partial colouring lemma from [BJM23] (stated in Lemma 1.4) to choose how to sparsify the short cycles.
Lemma 1.4. [[BJM23] Lemma 3.1] There exists constants $c, c^{\prime}>0$ such that the following holds. Given symmetric matrices $\boldsymbol{A}_{1}, \ldots, \boldsymbol{A}_{m} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ that satisfies $\left\|\sum_{i=1}^{m} \boldsymbol{A}_{i}^{2}\right\| \leq \sigma^{2}$ and $\sum_{i=1}^{m}\left\|\boldsymbol{A}_{i}\right\|_{F}^{2} \leq$ $m f^{2}$ and a point $\boldsymbol{y} \in(-1,1)^{m}$, there is an algorithm PartialColour that returns a point $\boldsymbol{x} \in$
$[-1,1]^{m}$ such that

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left\|\sum_{i=1}^{m}\left(x_{i}-y_{i}\right) \boldsymbol{A}_{i}\right\| \leq c\left(\sigma+\left(\log ^{3 / 4} n\right) \sqrt{\sigma f}\right), \tag{1}
\end{equation*}
$$

and $\left|\left\{i: x_{i} \in\{ \pm 1\}\right\}\right|>c^{\prime} m$ in polynomial time.
Our improved algorithm will follow the same high-level approach as the random sampling construction discussed above. For each directed short cycle, instead of independently randomly choosing to preserve either the clockwise or the counter-clockwise edges, we will use the partial coloring $x$ given by the Lemma 1.4. In each iteration, the Lemma 1.4 allows the algorithm to compute a partial colouring with sufficiently many fully coloured entries (i.e., entries with value $\pm 1$ ) on all the short cycles. This colouring indicates which part to remove. The partial colouring lemma allows us to remove these parts of the cycles with less error than random sampling.

However, there are two major challenges in applying Lemma 1.4. Firstly, within each iteration, we cannot afford to fully colour all the cycles by recursively applying Lemma 1.4, since in the worst case, we need to perform the partial colouring $O(\log n)$ times, which will result in an additional $\log$ factor in the sparsity. Hence, we are always left with non-fully coloured cycles (i.e., entries with magnitude $<1$ ). The cycles that are non-fully coloured must still be incorporated into the sparsified graph after each iteration to guarantee the error given by the partial colouring lemma. However, we cannot explicitly modify the graph to include edges corresponding to these cycles. If we were to do so, we would lose the integral and polynomially bounded weight conditions and the short cycle decomposition could no longer be applied to this new graph for further sparsification.

On the other hand, naively incorporating partially coloured cycles into the next iteration is also problematic. Unlike the undirected case, the two parts of a directed cycle do not necessarily have the same number of edges. For example, if a directed cycle has all edges in the same direction, then one part has all the edges and the other part none. If we start our colouring process from a non-zero initial partial colouring (i.e., a non-zero $\boldsymbol{y}$ to Lemma 1.4), we could end up at a colouring where almost no edges are removed.

To deal with these problems, our algorithm handles the integral weighted portion $\vec{G}$ of the graph $\vec{G}^{\prime}$ and the non-fully coloured cycles $\bar{S}$ separately (see Algorithm (4). For the integral weighted portion, we perform the partial colouring to guarantee at least a constant fraction of edges are removed. We then add the non-fully coloured cycles into the set $\bar{S}$. For the set of non-fully coloured cycles $\bar{S}$, we carefully adjust their colouring by considering the difference between the partial colours and $\pm 1$. We ensure that a good portion of cycles in $\bar{S}$ are fully coloured after the procedure to guarantee the size of $\bar{S}$ does not blow up. In both cases, the approximation error incurred by the partial colouring operation is precisely controlled to guarantee our desired final error and hence Theorem 1.2 .

## 2 Preliminaries

General notation. We use $\widetilde{O}(\cdot)$ to suppress polylog factors in $n, m$. We say "with high probability in $n$ " to mean an event suceeeds with probability $1-n^{-\Omega(1)}$ for an arbitrary constant. In the context of graphs, $n$ is assumed to be the number of vertices and is often omitted. All logarithms throughout the paper are with base 2 .

Linear Algebra. We use boldface to denote vectors. The all-zeros and all-ones vector are $\mathbf{0}$ and $\mathbf{1}$. For any $u$, we let $\boldsymbol{e}_{u}$ to denote the vector such that the $u$ th coordinate is 1 and all other coordinates are 0 . We denote $\boldsymbol{b}_{u v}=\boldsymbol{e}_{u}-\boldsymbol{e}_{v}$ for any $u \neq v$. For vectors $\boldsymbol{u}, \boldsymbol{v}$ of equal dimension,
$\boldsymbol{u} \circ \boldsymbol{v}$ is the entrywise product. For a linear subspace $\mathcal{W}$ of a vector space $\mathcal{V}$, we denote $\mathcal{W}^{\perp}$ as the orthogonal complement of $\mathcal{W}$ in $\mathcal{V}$.

Matrices are denoted in boldface capticals. We use $\operatorname{ker}(\boldsymbol{A}), \operatorname{im}(\boldsymbol{A})$ to denote the kernel and image of $\boldsymbol{A}$. For any $u$, we let $(\boldsymbol{A})_{u}$ denote the $u$ th column of $\boldsymbol{A}$. A symmetric matrix $\boldsymbol{A}$ is positive semidefinite (PSD) (resp. positive definite (PD)) if, for any vector $\boldsymbol{x}$ of compatible dimension, $\boldsymbol{x}^{\top} \boldsymbol{A} \boldsymbol{x} \geq 0$ (resp. $\boldsymbol{x}^{\top} \boldsymbol{A} \boldsymbol{x}>0$ ). Let $\boldsymbol{A}$ and $\boldsymbol{B}$ be two symmetric matrices of the same dimension, then we write $\boldsymbol{B} \preccurlyeq \boldsymbol{A}$ or $\boldsymbol{A} \succcurlyeq \boldsymbol{B}$ if $\boldsymbol{A}-\boldsymbol{B}$ is PSD. The ordering given by $\preccurlyeq$ is called Loewner partial order.
Fact 2.1. If $\boldsymbol{A} \succcurlyeq \boldsymbol{B}$ and $\boldsymbol{C}$ is any matrix of compatible dimension, then $\boldsymbol{C A} \boldsymbol{C}^{\top} \succcurlyeq \boldsymbol{C} \boldsymbol{B} \boldsymbol{C}^{\top}$.
Let $\|\boldsymbol{A}\|$ and $\|\boldsymbol{A}\|_{F}=\sqrt{\operatorname{Tr}\left(\boldsymbol{A}^{*} \boldsymbol{A}\right)}$ denote the operator norm and Frobenius norm of a matrix $\boldsymbol{A}$. The operator norm is equal to the largest singular value of $\boldsymbol{A}$. For a matrix $\boldsymbol{A} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times m}$, we define the Hermitian (symmetric) lift of $\boldsymbol{A}$ by

$$
\operatorname{hlift}(\boldsymbol{A})=\left[\boldsymbol{A}^{\top} \begin{array}{ll}
\boldsymbol{A}
\end{array}\right] \in \mathbb{R}^{(n+m) \times(n+m)}
$$

The norms of Hermitian lifts satisfy $\|\operatorname{hlift}(\boldsymbol{A})\|=\|\boldsymbol{A}\|$ and $\|\operatorname{hlift}(\boldsymbol{A})\|_{F}=2\|\boldsymbol{A}\|_{F}$. Given a symmetric matrix with eigenvalue decomposition $\boldsymbol{A}=\sum_{i} \lambda_{i} \boldsymbol{v}_{i} \boldsymbol{v}_{i}^{\top}$, where $\left\{\boldsymbol{v}_{i}\right\}_{i}$ form an orthonormal basis, the pseudoinverse is defined as $\boldsymbol{A}^{+}=\sum_{i: \lambda_{i} \neq 0} \frac{1}{\lambda_{i}} \boldsymbol{v}_{i} \boldsymbol{v}_{i}^{\top}$. The absolute value of $\boldsymbol{A}$ on eigenvalues is defined as $|\boldsymbol{A}|=\sum_{i: \lambda_{i} \neq 0}\left|\lambda_{i}\right| \boldsymbol{v}_{i} \boldsymbol{v}_{i}^{\top}$. Note that $|\boldsymbol{A}|$ is PSD. Similarly for symmetric PSD matrix $\boldsymbol{A}$ we have $\boldsymbol{A}^{1 / 2}=\sum_{i: \lambda_{i} \neq 0} \sqrt{\lambda_{i}} \boldsymbol{v}_{i} \boldsymbol{v}_{i}^{\top}$ and $\boldsymbol{A}^{+/ 2}=\sum_{i: \lambda_{i} \neq 0} \frac{1}{\sqrt{\lambda_{i}}} \boldsymbol{v}_{i} \boldsymbol{v}_{i}^{\top}$.

Graphs and Laplacians. Let $\vec{G}=(V, E, \boldsymbol{w})$ be a weighted directed graph (possibly with multiedges) with edge weights $\boldsymbol{w}: E \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \geq 0$. We write $G$ as the corresponding undirected graph of $\vec{G}$ where each directed edge $e \in E(\vec{G})$ correspond to an undirected edge on the same incident vertices with half its weight. A weighted directed graph $\vec{G}$ is Eulerian if for each vertex $v \in V$, its weighted in degree equals its weighted out degree.

We associate to a weighted directed graph $\vec{G}$ a matrix $\boldsymbol{L}_{\vec{G}} \in \mathbb{R}^{V \times V}$ called the directed Laplacian of $\vec{G}$. We define a non-negative matrix $\boldsymbol{A}_{\vec{G}}$ as the adjacency matrix of $\vec{G}$ with $\boldsymbol{A}_{u v}=w_{u v}$ if $(u, v) \in E$ and $\boldsymbol{A}_{u v}=0$ otherwise. The weighted degree matrix of $\vec{G}$ is a non-negative diagonal matrix $\boldsymbol{D}_{\vec{G}}$ corresponding to the weighted out-degrees of $\vec{G}$. Then, $\boldsymbol{L}_{\vec{G}}=\boldsymbol{D}_{\vec{G}}-\boldsymbol{A}_{\vec{G}}^{\top}$ and satisfies $\mathbf{1}^{\top} \boldsymbol{L}_{\vec{G}}=\mathbf{0}^{\top}$, i.e. $\left(\boldsymbol{L}_{\vec{G}}\right)_{u u}=-\sum_{v \neq u} \boldsymbol{L}_{v u}$ for all $u \in V$. For a weighted Eulerian directed graph $\vec{G}$, its graph Laplacian additionally satisfies $\boldsymbol{L}_{\vec{G}} \mathbf{1}=\mathbf{0}$. Assuming Eulerian graph $\vec{G}$, the associated undirected graph Laplacian matrix of $G$ is $\boldsymbol{L}_{G}=\frac{1}{2}\left(\boldsymbol{L}_{\vec{G}}+\boldsymbol{L}_{\vec{G}}^{\top}\right)$. $\boldsymbol{L}_{G}$ is symmetric and PSD. For an undirected Laplacian $\boldsymbol{L}_{G}$, the effective resistance and leverage score of an edge $e \in E(G)$ is defined by $\operatorname{Reff}_{G}(e)=\boldsymbol{b}_{e}^{\top} \boldsymbol{L}_{G}^{+} \boldsymbol{b}_{e}$ and $\operatorname{lev}_{G}(e)=w_{e} \operatorname{Reff}_{G}(e)$ where we fixed an arbitrary orientation for the undirected edge $e$.

We assume $n$ and $m$ to be the number of vertices and edges in a graph. As is standard, we consider strongly connected Eulerian graphs with positive integral and polynomially bounded edge weights. Whenever we say the weights are polynomially bounded, we assume they are bounded by $n^{O(1)}$.

## 3 Eulerian sparsification via short cycle decomposition

We first present an improved analysis of constructing Eulerian sparsifiers using short cycle decompositions analogous to [CGPSSW18]. In particular, we provide a better variance analysis of the error

```
Procedure CorrectOrientation \((\vec{C})\)
    Pick an arbitrary edge \(e_{1}\) in \(\vec{C}\) and let \(v_{1}\) be its tail vertex. Define \(V_{\vec{C}}\) as the vertex set
        of \(\vec{C}\).
    Initialize \(E_{\vec{S}} \leftarrow \emptyset, E_{\vec{F}} \rightarrow\left\{e_{1}\right\}, V_{\vec{F}}=\left\{v_{1}\right\}, i=1\)
    while \(\left|V_{\vec{C}} \backslash V_{\vec{F}}\right|>0\) do
        \(i \leftarrow i+1\)
        Take \(e_{i+1}\) be the other edge incident on \(v_{i}\).
        If \(e_{i+1}\) is outgoing from \(v_{i}\), take \(v_{i+1}\) the head of \(e_{i+1}\) and update
        \(E_{\vec{F}} \leftarrow E_{\vec{F}} \cup\left\{e_{i+1}\right\}, V_{\vec{F}} \leftarrow V_{\vec{F}} \cup\left\{v_{i+1}\right\}\).
        Else let \(v_{i+1}\) be the tail of \(e_{i+1}\) and update \(E_{\vec{S}} \leftarrow E_{\vec{S}} \cup\left\{e_{i+1}\right\}\),
        \(E_{\vec{F}} \leftarrow E_{\vec{F}} \cup\left\{\operatorname{rev}\left(e_{i+1}\right)\right\}, V_{\vec{F}} \leftarrow V_{\vec{F}} \cup\left\{v_{i+1}\right\}\).
    return \(\vec{F}\) defined by \(E_{\vec{F}}\) and \(V_{\vec{F}}\), and \(S\) the undirected graph defined by \(E_{\vec{S}}\) and the
        incident vertices of \(E_{\vec{S}}\).
```

Algorithm 1: Make a cycle have a consistent orientation/direction
terms in sparsification than what was used by CGPSSW18]; by Matrix Bernstein (Theorem 3.6) this will allow us to use fewer edges to retain a desired error bound.

We first recall the definition of a short cycle decomposition of a graph $G$.
Definition 3.1. An ( $\hat{m}, L$ )-short cycle decomposition of an unweighted undirected graph $G$, decomposes $G$ into several edge-disjoint cycles, each of length at most $L$, and at most $\hat{m}$ edges are not in the union of the cycles.

We assume CycleDecomposition is an algorithm that takes as input an unweighted graph with $n$ vertices and $m$ edges and returns a ( $\hat{m}, L$ )-short cycle decomposition in time $\mathrm{T}_{\mathrm{CD}}(m, n)$. As in CGPSSW18], we also assume the super-additivity of $\mathrm{T}_{\mathrm{CD}}$ :

$$
\sum_{i} \mathrm{~T}_{\mathrm{CD}}\left(m_{i}, n\right) \leq \mathrm{T}_{\mathrm{CD}}\left(\sum_{i} m_{i}, n\right)
$$

for all $m_{i} \geq n$.
Relevant to us is the following construction of a short cycle decomposition.
Lemma 3.2 (PY19] Theorem 2). For any $\delta>0$, there is an algorithm that computes an $\left(O(n \log n), O\left(2^{1 / \delta} \log n\right)\right)$-short cycle decomposition of an undirected unweighted graph in $2^{O(1 / \delta)} m n^{\delta}$ time.

Thus, for every constant $\delta>0$, we have an $m^{1+\delta}$-time algorithm that computes an $(O(n \log n)$, $O(\log n)$ )-short cycle decomposition.

Our random sampling based sparsification algorithm is the same as [CGPSSW18]. We repeatedly sparsify an Eulerian graph by keeping only the "clockwise" or "counter-clockwise" edges of each cycle in a short cycle decomposition of the graph, see CycleSparsify in Algorithm 2 and CycleSparsifyOnce in Algorithm 3 ,

Stated in other words, we will sparsify a cycle by partitioning it into two sets and removing one of those sets randomly. For a directed cycle $\vec{C}$, we take $\vec{F}, S$ to be the outputs of CorrectOrientation $(\vec{C})$. In particular, $\vec{F}$ is the cycle $\vec{C}$ corrected so that every vertex has an incoming edge and

```
Procedure CycleSparsify \((\vec{G}, \epsilon\), CycleDecomposition)
    Decompose each edge by its binary representation.
    Compute \(\boldsymbol{r}\) a 1.5-approximate effective resistances in \(G\).
    while \(|E(\vec{G})| \geq O\left(\hat{m} \log n+\epsilon^{-2} n L^{2} \log n\right)\) do
        \(\vec{G} \leftarrow\) CycleSparsifyOnce \((\vec{G}, \boldsymbol{r}\), CycleDecomposition).
    return \(\vec{G}\).
```

Algorithm 2: Sparsification via short cycle decomposition

```
Procedure CycleSparsifyOnce ( \(\vec{G}, \boldsymbol{r}\), CycleDecomposition)
    Input: A directed Eulerian graph \(\vec{G}\) where edge weights are integral powers of 2,a
        2-approximate effective resistances \(\boldsymbol{r}\) in \(G\), a short cycle decomposition
        algorithm CycleDecomposition.
    Output: A directed Eulerian graph \(\vec{H}\) where edge weights are integral powers of 2 .
    \(\vec{H} \leftarrow \vec{G}\) with only the edges which satisfies \(w_{e} r_{e}>\frac{4 n}{m}\) and remove these edges from \(\vec{G}\).
    Partition \(\vec{G}\) into uniformly weighted graph \(\vec{G}_{1}, \ldots, \vec{G}_{s}\) where \(\vec{G}_{i}\) has all edge weights \(2^{i}\)
        and \(s=O(\log n)\).
    for each \(\vec{G}_{i}\) do
        \(\left\{C_{i, 1}, \ldots, C_{i, t}\right\} \leftarrow\) CycleDecomposition \(\left(G_{i}\right)\) and let \(\vec{C}_{i, j}\) be the corresponding
        directed graph of \(C_{i, j}\) in \(\vec{G}_{i}\).
        \(\vec{H} \leftarrow \vec{H}+\vec{G}_{i} \backslash\left(\bigcup_{j=1}^{t} \vec{C}_{i, j}\right)\).
        for each cycle \(\vec{C}_{i, j}\) do
        With probability \(1 / 2\), add all its clockwise edges with twice their weight to \(\vec{H}\).
        Otherwise, add the counter-clockwise edges instead.
    return \(\vec{H}\).
```

        Algorithm 3: Sparsify once using short cycles
    an outgoing edge, and $S$ is the undirected graph coming from the set of edges in $\vec{C}$ whose direction we reversed (where the edge weight in $S$ are the same as the original edge weights). We consider the direction of edges defined by $\vec{F}$ as clockwise. Then, the edges in $S$ are all the counter-clockwise edges in $\vec{C}$.

For a cycle $C$ and its corresponding directed cycle $\vec{C}$, the directed graph Laplacian added at line 8 in CycleSparsifyOnce is the following:

$$
\begin{cases}\boldsymbol{L}_{\vec{C}}+\boldsymbol{L}_{\vec{F}}-\boldsymbol{L}_{S} & \text { w.p. } 1 / 2 \\ \boldsymbol{L}_{\vec{C}}-\boldsymbol{L}_{\vec{F}}+\boldsymbol{L}_{S} & \text { w.p. } 1 / 2\end{cases}
$$

which means the changes incurred on the directed graph Laplacian is

$$
\left\{\begin{array}{ll}
\widetilde{\boldsymbol{L}} & \text { w.p. } 1 / 2  \tag{2}\\
-\widetilde{\boldsymbol{L}} & \text { w.p. } 1 / 2
\end{array} \text {, where } \widetilde{\boldsymbol{L}}=\boldsymbol{L}_{\vec{F}}-\boldsymbol{L}_{S}\right.
$$

Note that this change preserves the difference between the in and out degrees of $\vec{C}$. Either a vertex had an incoming and outgoing edge (and so difference 0 ), in which case both edges are either in $\vec{F} \backslash S$ or in $S$ and hence always added together with the same weights (so still difference 0 ). Alternatively
a vertex had two incoming or outgoing edges, in which case only one is ever added with twice the weight, which then still preserves the difference between in and out degree.

To analyze the approximation error incurred by each round of sparsification, we first recall a bound on the Laplacian of $S$.

Lemma 3.3 (CGPSSW18] Lemma 5.5). If $\vec{C}$ is an equal weighted directed cycle of length $L$ contained in a graph $\vec{G}$ where each edge $\vec{e} \in \vec{C}$ satisfies $\operatorname{lev}_{G}(e) \leq \rho$, then $\boldsymbol{L}_{S} \preceq(L \cdot \rho) \cdot \boldsymbol{L}_{G}$.

We will also need the following helper lemma which bounds the effect of $L_{\vec{F}}$. Compared to Lemma 5.6 in [CGPSSW18], our result improves the bound by a factor of $L$.

Lemma 3.4. If $\vec{C}$ is a equal weighted directed cycle of length $L$ contained in a graph $\vec{G}$ where each edge $\vec{e} \in \vec{C}$ satisfies $\operatorname{lev}_{G}(e) \leq \rho$. Then, $\boldsymbol{L}_{\vec{F}}^{\top} \boldsymbol{L}_{G}^{+} \boldsymbol{L}_{\vec{F}} \preceq O\left(L^{2} \rho\right) \boldsymbol{L}_{C}$.

Proof. Let $\boldsymbol{\Pi}_{C}=\boldsymbol{I}_{C}-\frac{1}{L} \mathbf{1}_{C} \mathbf{1}_{C}^{\top}$ be the projection matrix on the support of $C$ except the all one vector on $C$. Notice that $\operatorname{ker}^{\perp}\left(\boldsymbol{L}_{C}\right)=\operatorname{im}\left(\boldsymbol{L}_{C}\right)=\operatorname{im}\left(\boldsymbol{\Pi}_{C}\right)$. Furthermore, we have $\operatorname{im}\left(\boldsymbol{L}_{\vec{F}}\right) \subset \operatorname{im}\left(\boldsymbol{\Pi}_{C}\right)$ (as $\left.\boldsymbol{1}_{C} \in \operatorname{im}^{\perp}\left(\boldsymbol{L}_{\vec{F}}\right)\right)$ so $\boldsymbol{\Pi}_{C} \boldsymbol{L}_{\vec{F}}=\boldsymbol{L}_{\vec{F}}$, and also $\operatorname{im}^{\perp}\left(\boldsymbol{\Pi}_{C}\right) \subset \operatorname{ker}\left(\boldsymbol{L}_{\vec{F}}^{\top}\right)$ hence $\boldsymbol{L}_{\vec{F}}^{\top} \boldsymbol{\Pi}_{C}=\boldsymbol{L}_{\vec{F}}^{\top}$. Thus, $\boldsymbol{L}_{\vec{F}}^{\top} \boldsymbol{L}_{G}^{+} \boldsymbol{L}_{\vec{F}}=\boldsymbol{L}_{\vec{F}}^{\top} \boldsymbol{\Pi}_{C} \boldsymbol{L}_{G}^{+} \boldsymbol{\Pi}_{C} \boldsymbol{L}_{\vec{F}}$.

Let $w$ be the weight of each edge in $\vec{C}$. Then, $\boldsymbol{L}_{\vec{F}}=w(\boldsymbol{I}-\boldsymbol{P})$ where $\boldsymbol{P}$ is a permutation matrix on the vertices of $C$ corresponding to the transition matrix $\vec{F}$ and $\boldsymbol{L}_{C}=\frac{w}{2}\left(2 \boldsymbol{I}-\boldsymbol{P}-\boldsymbol{P}^{\top}\right)$. Now, $\boldsymbol{L}_{\vec{F}}^{\top} \boldsymbol{\Pi}_{C} \boldsymbol{L}_{\vec{F}}=\boldsymbol{L}_{\vec{F}}^{\top} \boldsymbol{L}_{\vec{F}}=w^{2}\left(\boldsymbol{I}-\boldsymbol{P}^{\top}\right)(\boldsymbol{I}-\boldsymbol{P})=w^{2}\left(2 \boldsymbol{I}-\boldsymbol{P}-\boldsymbol{P}^{\top}\right)=2 w \boldsymbol{L}_{C}$. It then suffices to show $\boldsymbol{\Pi}_{C} \boldsymbol{L}_{G}^{+} \boldsymbol{\Pi}_{C} \preceq O\left(L^{2} \rho / w\right) \boldsymbol{\Pi}_{C}$. As $\operatorname{ker}\left(\boldsymbol{L}_{G}^{+}\right) \subseteq \operatorname{ker}\left(\boldsymbol{\Pi}_{C}\right)$, it also suffices to show $\left\|\boldsymbol{\Pi}_{C} \boldsymbol{L}_{G}^{+} \boldsymbol{\Pi}_{C}\right\|=$ $O\left(L^{2} \rho / w\right)$. We can write out each entry of $\boldsymbol{\Pi}_{C}$ by $\left(\boldsymbol{\Pi}_{C}\right)_{u}=\frac{1}{L-1} \sum_{v \in C, v \neq u} \boldsymbol{b}_{u v}$ for $u \in C$ and 0 otherwise. As effective resistance is a metric, $w \boldsymbol{b}_{u v}^{\top} \boldsymbol{L}_{G}^{+} \boldsymbol{b}_{u v} \leq(L-1) \rho$ for any distinct vertices $u, v \in C$. Note that this factor of $L$ is an upperbound on the combinatorial distance from $u$ to $v$ in $C$. Then,

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \left|\left(\boldsymbol{\Pi}_{C}\right)_{x}^{\top} \boldsymbol{L}_{G}^{+}\left(\boldsymbol{\Pi}_{C}\right)_{u}\right| \\
= & \left|\left(\frac{1}{L-1} \sum_{y \in C, y \neq x} \boldsymbol{L}_{G}^{+/ 2} \boldsymbol{b}_{x y}\right)^{\top}\left(\frac{1}{L-1} \sum_{v \in C, v \neq u} \boldsymbol{L}_{G}^{+/ 2} \boldsymbol{b}_{u v}\right)\right| \\
\leq & \sum_{y \neq x, y \in C} \sum_{v \neq u, v \in C} \frac{1}{w^{1 / 2}(L-1)}\left\|w^{1 / 2} \boldsymbol{L}_{G}^{+/ 2} \boldsymbol{b}_{x y}\right\| \cdot \frac{1}{w^{1 / 2}(L-1)}\left\|w^{1 / 2} \boldsymbol{L}_{G}^{+/ 2} \boldsymbol{b}_{u v}\right\| \\
\leq & (L-1)^{2} \times \frac{(L-1) \rho}{w L^{2}} \leq L \rho / w .
\end{aligned}
$$

By Gershgorin circle theorem and the length of $C$, any eigenvalue of $\boldsymbol{\Pi}_{C} \boldsymbol{L}_{G}^{+} \boldsymbol{\Pi}_{C}$ cannot exceed $L^{2} \rho / w$ as required.

With Lemma 3.3 and Lemma 3.4 we can now bound a term involving $\tilde{L}$ which will appear later in our variance analysis.

Lemma 3.5. Let $\vec{C}$ is an equal weighted directed cycle of length $L$ contained in a graph $\vec{G}$ where each edge $\vec{e} \in \vec{C}$ satisfies $\operatorname{lev}_{G}(e) \leq \rho$. Then $\boldsymbol{L}_{G}^{+/ 2}\left(\widetilde{\boldsymbol{L}}^{\top} \boldsymbol{L}_{G}^{+} \widetilde{\boldsymbol{L}}\right) \boldsymbol{L}_{G}^{+/ 2} \preceq O\left(L^{2} \rho\right) \cdot \boldsymbol{L}_{G}^{+/ 2} \boldsymbol{L}_{C} \boldsymbol{L}_{G}^{+/ 2}$ and $\boldsymbol{L}_{G}^{+/ 2}\left(\widetilde{\boldsymbol{L}} \boldsymbol{L}_{G}^{+} \widetilde{\boldsymbol{L}}^{\top}\right) \boldsymbol{L}_{G}^{+/ 2} \preceq O\left(L^{2} \rho\right) \cdot \boldsymbol{L}_{G}^{+/ 2} \boldsymbol{L}_{C} \boldsymbol{L}_{G}^{+/ 2}$.

Proof. We prove the first inequality. The other one follows by a similar argument. Since

$$
\begin{aligned}
\left\|\boldsymbol{L}_{G}^{+/ 2} \widetilde{\boldsymbol{L}} \boldsymbol{L}_{G}^{+/ 2} x\right\|^{2} & \leq\left(\left\|\boldsymbol{L}_{G}^{+/ 2} \boldsymbol{L}_{\vec{F}} \boldsymbol{L}_{G}^{+/ 2} x\right\|+\left\|\boldsymbol{L}_{G}^{+/ 2} \boldsymbol{L}_{S} \boldsymbol{L}_{G}^{+/ 2} x\right\|\right)^{2} \\
& \leq 2\left\|\boldsymbol{L}_{G}^{+/ 2} \boldsymbol{L}_{\vec{F}} \boldsymbol{L}_{G}^{+/ 2} x\right\|^{2}+2\left\|\boldsymbol{L}_{G}^{+/ 2} \boldsymbol{L}_{S} \boldsymbol{L}_{G}^{+/ 2} x\right\|^{2}
\end{aligned}
$$

for any conforming vector $x$, we can decompose the LHS into two terms

$$
\boldsymbol{L}_{G}^{+/ 2}\left(\widetilde{\boldsymbol{L}}^{\top} \boldsymbol{L}_{G}^{+} \widetilde{\boldsymbol{L}}\right) \boldsymbol{L}_{G}^{+/ 2} \preceq 2 \boldsymbol{L}_{G}^{+/ 2}\left(\boldsymbol{L}_{\vec{F}}^{\top} \boldsymbol{L}_{G}^{+} \boldsymbol{L}_{\vec{F}}\right) \boldsymbol{L}_{G}^{+/ 2}+2 \boldsymbol{L}_{G}^{+/ 2}\left(\boldsymbol{L}_{S}^{\top} \boldsymbol{L}_{G}^{+} \boldsymbol{L}_{S}\right) \boldsymbol{L}_{G}^{+/ 2}
$$

By Lemma 3.4, the first term is bounded by

$$
\boldsymbol{L}_{G}^{+/ 2}\left(\boldsymbol{L}_{\vec{F}}^{\top} \boldsymbol{L}_{G}^{+} \boldsymbol{L}_{\vec{F}}\right) \boldsymbol{L}_{G}^{+/ 2} \preceq O\left(L^{2} \rho\right) \boldsymbol{I} .
$$

For the second term, we first rearrange the terms from Lemma 3.3 to get

$$
\boldsymbol{L}_{S}^{1 / 2} \boldsymbol{L}_{G}^{+} \boldsymbol{L}_{S}^{1 / 2} \preceq L \rho \boldsymbol{I} .
$$

By multiplying appropriate terms on both sides and by Fact 2.1,

$$
\boldsymbol{L}_{G}^{+/ 2} \boldsymbol{L}_{S} \boldsymbol{L}_{G}^{+} \boldsymbol{L}_{S} \boldsymbol{L}_{G}^{+/ 2} \preceq O(L \rho) \boldsymbol{L}_{G}^{+/ 2} \boldsymbol{L}_{S} \boldsymbol{L}_{G}^{+/ 2} \preceq O(L \rho) \boldsymbol{L}_{G}^{+/ 2} \boldsymbol{L}_{C} \boldsymbol{L}_{G}^{+/ 2}
$$

which completes the proof.
We now recall the Matrix Bernstein inequality which will be used to analyze the error involved in our random construction of sparsifiers.

Theorem 3.6 ([Tro12] Matrix Bernstein). Let $\boldsymbol{X}_{1}, \ldots, \boldsymbol{X}_{m} \in \mathbb{R}^{n_{1} \times n_{2}}$ be independent random matrices that satisfies for any $i$, av $\boldsymbol{X}_{i}=0$ and $\left\|\boldsymbol{X}_{i}\right\| \leq R$. Let the matrix variance be $\sigma^{2}=$ $\max \left\{\left\|\sum_{i=1}^{m} \mathbb{E} \boldsymbol{X}_{i}^{\top} \boldsymbol{X}_{i}\right\|,\left\|\sum_{i=1}^{m} \mathbb{E} \boldsymbol{X}_{i} \boldsymbol{X}_{i}^{\top}\right\|\right\}$. Then, for all $\epsilon>0$,

$$
\mathbb{P}\left(\left\|\sum_{i=1}^{m} \boldsymbol{X}_{i}\right\| \geq \epsilon\right) \leq\left(n_{1}+n_{2}\right) \cdot \exp \left(\frac{-\epsilon^{2} / 2}{\sigma^{2}+R \epsilon / 3}\right)
$$

With now Matrix Bernstein and the previous helper lemmas, we state the sparsification and error analysis of running CycleSparsifyOnce (which involves a random selection of what edges to preserve in a cycle).
Lemma 3.7. Given a directed Eulerian graph $\vec{G}$ whose edge weights are integral powers of 2 , and additionally 2-approximate effective resistances $\boldsymbol{r}$ in $G$, the algorithm CycleSparsifyOnce returns a directed Eulerian graph $\vec{H}$ with edge weights still being powers of 2 such that if the number of edges in $G$ satisfy $m=\Omega\left(\hat{m} \log n+n L^{2} \log n\right)$, then with high probability, the number of edges in $\vec{H}$ is at most $\frac{15}{16} \mathrm{~m}$ and

$$
\left\|\boldsymbol{L}_{G}^{+/ 2}\left(\boldsymbol{L}_{\vec{G}}-\boldsymbol{L}_{\vec{H}}\right) \boldsymbol{L}_{G}^{+/ 2}\right\| \leq O\left(\sqrt{\frac{n L^{2} \log n}{m}}\right)
$$

The algorithm runs in $O(m)+\mathrm{T}_{\mathrm{CD}}(m, n)$ time.

Proof. Recall that whether a cycle $\vec{C}$ is sampled as clockwise or counter-clockwise, the difference between the in-degrees and out-degrees of the vertices does not change. Thus, the final $\vec{H}$ is Eulerian after all the updates in line 8,

Since $\boldsymbol{r}$ is a 2-approximate effective resistances, it suffices to take $\rho=O(n / m)$ so that each edge $e \in G$ satisfies $\operatorname{lev}_{G}(e) \leq \rho$ after the first step. Let $\boldsymbol{X}_{i, j}$ be the matrix random variable corresponding to cycle $C_{i, j}$ such that

$$
\begin{cases}\boldsymbol{L}_{G}^{+/ 2} \widetilde{\boldsymbol{L}}_{i, j} \boldsymbol{L}_{G}^{+/ 2} & \text { w.p. } 1 / 2 \\ -\boldsymbol{L}_{G}^{+/ 2} \widetilde{\boldsymbol{L}}_{i, j} \boldsymbol{L}_{G}^{+/ 2} & \text { w.p. } 1 / 2\end{cases}
$$

Recall from (21), this captures the changes on directed graph Laplacian incurred by line 8,
For any valid pair of $i, j,\left\|\boldsymbol{X}_{i, j}\right\|=\left\|\boldsymbol{L}_{G}^{+/ 2} \widetilde{\boldsymbol{L}}_{i, j} \boldsymbol{L}_{G}^{+/ 2}\right\| \leq \sqrt{O\left(L^{2} \rho\right)\left\|\boldsymbol{L}_{G}^{+/ 2} \boldsymbol{L}_{C_{i, j}} \boldsymbol{L}_{G}^{+/ 2}\right\|}=O\left(L^{2} \rho\right)$ by Lemma 3.5 and the restriction of edges with at most $\rho$ leverage score.

For the variance term, consider first $\left\|\sum_{i, j} \mathbb{E} \boldsymbol{X}_{i, j}^{*} \boldsymbol{X}_{i, j}\right\|$. Now, $\mathbb{E} \boldsymbol{X}_{i, j}^{*} \boldsymbol{X}_{i, j}=\boldsymbol{L}_{G}^{+/ 2} \widetilde{\boldsymbol{L}}_{i, j}^{\top} \boldsymbol{L}_{G}^{+} \widetilde{\boldsymbol{L}}_{i, j} \boldsymbol{L}_{G}^{+/ 2} \preceq$ $O\left(L^{2} \rho\right) \boldsymbol{L}_{G}^{+/ 2} \boldsymbol{L}_{C_{i, j}} \boldsymbol{L}_{G}^{+/ 2}$ by Lemma 3.5. Then,

$$
\begin{aligned}
\sum_{i, j} \mathbb{E} \boldsymbol{X}_{i, j}^{*} \boldsymbol{X}_{i, j} & \preceq O\left(L^{2} \rho\right) \cdot \sum_{i, j} \boldsymbol{L}_{G}^{+/ 2} \boldsymbol{L}_{C_{i, j}} \boldsymbol{L}_{G}^{+/ 2} \\
& \preceq O\left(L^{2} \rho\right) \cdot \boldsymbol{L}_{G}^{+/ 2}\left(\sum_{i, j} \boldsymbol{L}_{C_{i, j}}\right) \boldsymbol{L}_{G}^{+/ 2} \\
& \preceq O\left(L^{2} \rho\right) \cdot \boldsymbol{I}
\end{aligned}
$$

by Lemma 3.5 and the fact for each $j$ all cycles from $G_{i}$ are edge disjoint. Thus, $\left\|\sum_{i, j} \mathbb{E} \boldsymbol{X}_{i, j}^{*} \boldsymbol{X}_{i, j}\right\|=$ $O\left(L^{2} \rho\right)$. Similarly, $\left\|\sum_{i, j} \mathbb{E} \boldsymbol{X}_{i, j} \boldsymbol{X}_{i, j}^{*}\right\|=O\left(L^{2} \rho\right)$.

We can apply Theorem 3.6 with $R=O\left(L^{2} \rho\right)$ and $\sigma^{2}=O\left(L^{2} \rho\right)$. Since $m=\Omega\left(n L^{2} \log n\right)$, with probability $1-n^{-O(1)}$, we get the desired error bound

$$
\left\|\boldsymbol{L}_{G}^{+/ 2}\left(\boldsymbol{L}_{\vec{G}}-\boldsymbol{L}_{\vec{H}}\right) \boldsymbol{L}_{G}^{+/ 2}\right\| \leq O\left(\sqrt{\frac{n L^{2} \log n}{m}}\right)
$$

Consider the number of edges in $\vec{H}$. Since $\boldsymbol{r}$ is 2-approximate effective resistances, $\sum_{e} w_{e} r_{e} \leq$ $2 \sum_{e} \operatorname{lev}_{G}(e) \leq 2(n-1)$. The total number of edges with $w_{e} r_{e} \geq \frac{4 n}{m}$ is at most $\frac{m}{2}$. Since we apply short cycle decomposition for $s=O(\log n)$ graphs, at most $O(n \log n+\hat{m} \log n) \leq \frac{m}{4}$ are not in any cycles if we choose $m=\Omega(\hat{m} \log n+n \log n)$ for some appropriate constant. Thus, at least $\frac{m}{4}$ edges are in the cycles. The expected fraction of edges that are added by line 8 is $\frac{1}{2}$. As there are at least $\frac{m}{4 L}$ cycles and the length of each cycle is bounded by $L$, as long as $L=n^{o(1)}$ and $m=\Omega(n)$, by a Chernoff bound, at most $\frac{3}{4}$ fraction of the cycle edges are added to $\vec{H}$ with high probability, giving us at least $\frac{1}{16}$ fraction of the edges removed as required.

Now, consider the runtime of the algorithm. Since the number of edges across $G_{1}, \ldots, G_{s}$ is $O(m)$, the runtime except short cycle decompositions is $O(m)$ as well. Due to the super-additivity assumption of $\mathrm{T}_{\mathrm{CD}}(\cdot, n)$, the runtime for short cycle decompositions is bounded by $\mathrm{T}_{\mathrm{CD}}(m, n)$.

We now provide the guarantees of CycleSparsify, which repeatedly calls CycleSparsifyOnce until a criterion on the number of edges is met.

Theorem 3.8. Given as input an Eulerian graph $\vec{G}$ with polynomial bounded integral edge weights and $\epsilon \in(0,1 / 2)$, the algorithm CyCLESpARSIFY returns a Eulerian graph $\vec{H}$ with $O(\hat{m} \log n+$ $\left.\epsilon^{-2} n L^{2} \log n\right)$ edges such that with high probability,

$$
\left\|\boldsymbol{L}_{G}^{+/ 2}\left(\boldsymbol{L}_{\vec{G}}-\boldsymbol{L}_{\vec{H}}\right) \boldsymbol{L}_{G}^{+/ 2}\right\| \leq \epsilon
$$

The algorithm runs in time $O\left(m \log ^{2} n\right)+\mathrm{T}_{\mathrm{CD}}(O(m \log n), n)$.
Proof. By Lemma 3.7, the number of edges reduces by a constant factor each iteration with high probability. By a union bound, this holds over $O(\log (m \log n / n))=O(\log n)$ iterations with high probability, which also gives the total number of iterations.

By Lemma 3.7, this geometric decrease in number of edges implies that the total error over all iterations is bounded up to a constant factor by the error in the last round, assuming the desired error bound as in Lemma 3.7:

$$
O\left(\sqrt{\frac{n L^{2} \log n}{m}}\right)
$$

where $m$ here is the number of edges in the last round. Note that since each approximation error bound in Lemma 3.7 with high probability, the error bound above also holds with high probability over $O(\log n)$ iterations. By the stopping condition of $m=\Omega\left(n \epsilon^{-2} L^{2} \log n\right)$, with an appropriate constant we get the final error of at most $\epsilon$. This small error also implies that our 1.5-approximate effective resistances $\boldsymbol{r}$ stays as 2-approximate throughout the algorithm.

Consider the runtime of the algorithm. Lemma 3.7 gives a runtime of

$$
\begin{aligned}
& O\left(\sum_{i=1}^{O(\log n)}\left(\frac{15}{16}\right)^{i} m\right)+\sum_{i=1}^{O(\log n)} \mathrm{T}_{\mathrm{CD}}\left(\left(\frac{15}{16}\right)^{i} m, n\right) \\
\leq & O\left(\sum_{i=1}^{O(\log n)}\left(\frac{15}{16}\right)^{i} m\right)+\mathrm{T}_{\mathrm{CD}}\left(\sum_{i=1}^{O(\log n)}\left(\frac{15}{16}\right)^{i} m \log n, n\right) \\
= & O(m)+\mathrm{T}_{\mathrm{CD}}(O(m \log n), n)
\end{aligned}
$$

with high probability, where the first inequality holds by the super-additivity assumption of $\mathrm{T}_{\mathrm{CD}}$. Combine with a one time overhead of $O\left(m \log ^{2} n\right)$ KLP12] for computing the approximate effective resistances, we get the final runtime bound of $O\left(m \log ^{2} n\right)+\mathrm{T}_{\mathrm{CD}}(O(m \log n), n)$.

Plugging in Lemma 3.2, we obtain the improved results on constructing Eulerian Sparsifiers with short cycle decompositions, summarized in Theorem 1.1.

Theorem 1.1. For every constant $\delta>0$, there is an algorithm that taken as input a directed Eulerian graph $\vec{G}$ and returns an $\varepsilon$-Eulerian sparsifier of $\vec{G}$ with $O\left(n \varepsilon^{-2} \log ^{3} n\right)$ edges in $m^{1+\delta}$ time.

## 4 Sparsification via partial colouring

In the previous algorithm CyCleSparsify, the approach to sparsifying was to randomly pick one part of each cycle (out of a partitioning of the cycle into two parts) to remove from the graph. The analysis then followed by observing on average this leads to a good approximation, and that furthermore the variance in this random construction is sufficiently small. In this section, we show,

```
Procedure ColourSparsify \((\vec{G}, \epsilon)\)
    Decompose each edge by its binary representation.
    Compute \(\boldsymbol{r}\) a 1.5-approximate effective resistances in \(G\).
    Let \(\bar{S}\) be a set of cycles initialized to empty and let \(\bar{x}\) be its corresponding partial
        colouring.
    Set \(\vec{G}^{\prime} \leftarrow \vec{G}+\) ColourWeights \((\bar{S}, \bar{x})\).
    while \(m^{\prime} \geq O\left(n \epsilon^{-2} \log ^{2} n(\log \log n)^{2}+\epsilon^{-4 / 3} n \log ^{8 / 3} n\right)\) do
        if \(4 m \geq m^{\prime}\) then
            \(\vec{G}, \vec{G}^{\prime}, \bar{S}, \bar{x} \leftarrow \operatorname{ColourSPaRSIFyGRaph}\left(\vec{G}, \vec{G}^{\prime}, \bar{S}, \bar{x}, \boldsymbol{r}\right)\).
        else
            \(\vec{G}, \vec{G}^{\prime}, \bar{S}, \bar{x} \leftarrow \operatorname{ColourSparsifyCycle}\left(\vec{G}, \vec{G}^{\prime}, \bar{S}, \bar{x}, \boldsymbol{r}\right)\).
    return \(\vec{G}^{\prime}\).
```

Algorithm 4: Sparsification via partial colouring

```
Procedure ColourWeights( }S,x\mathrm{ )
    Let }\vec{H}\mathrm{ be an empty directed graph.
    for each cycle C \inS and corresponding directed cycle }\vec{C}\mathrm{ do
        Add all the clockwise (resp. counter-clockwise) edges in }\vec{C}\mathrm{ with 1+ x}\mp@subsup{x}{C}{}\mathrm{ (resp.
        1-\mp@subsup{x}{C}{}) times their weight to \vec{H}. Note if 1+\mp@subsup{x}{C}{}=0(resp. 1- x
        corresponding edge is not added.
    return \vec{H}.
```

Algorithm 5: Reweight a set of cycles based on colouring
however, that by using recent partial colouring results on operator norm discrepancy bodies to pick what parts of a cycle to remove, we can obtain better sparsifiers.

The main partial colouring result we use, relevant for picking a subset of matrices to keep with minimal error, is restated below.

Lemma 1.4. [BJM23] Lemma 3.1] There exists constants $c, c^{\prime}>0$ such that the following holds. Given symmetric matrices $\boldsymbol{A}_{1}, \ldots, \boldsymbol{A}_{m} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ that satisfies $\left\|\sum_{i=1}^{m} \boldsymbol{A}_{i}^{2}\right\| \leq \sigma^{2}$ and $\sum_{i=1}^{m}\left\|\boldsymbol{A}_{i}\right\|_{F}^{2} \leq$ $m f^{2}$ and a point $\boldsymbol{y} \in(-1,1)^{m}$, there is an algorithm PartialColour that returns a point $\boldsymbol{x} \in$ $[-1,1]^{m}$ such that

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left\|\sum_{i=1}^{m}\left(x_{i}-y_{i}\right) \boldsymbol{A}_{i}\right\| \leq c\left(\sigma+\left(\log ^{3 / 4} n\right) \sqrt{\sigma f}\right), \tag{1}
\end{equation*}
$$

and $\left|\left\{i: x_{i} \in\{ \pm 1\}\right\}\right|>c^{\prime} m$ in polynomial time.
For this section, we assume the short cycle decomposition guarantees by Lemma 3.2 with $\hat{m}=$ $O(n \log n)$ and $L=O(\log n)$.

For each cycle $C$ with its corresponding directed cycle $\vec{C}$, we set $\boldsymbol{A}(C)=\operatorname{hlift}\left(\boldsymbol{L}_{G^{\prime}}^{+/ 2}\left(\boldsymbol{L}_{\vec{F}_{C}}-\right.\right.$ $\left.\boldsymbol{L}_{S_{C}}\right) \boldsymbol{L}_{G^{\prime}}^{+/ 2}$ ) where $\vec{F}_{C}$ is the cycle $\vec{C}$ with all edges set in clockwise direction and $S_{C}$ is undirected graph with the set of edges corresponding to the counter-clockwise edges in $\vec{C}$, same as in Section 3, Note that this orientation is set initialy by CorrectOrientation after a short cycle decomposition

1 Procedure ColourSparsifyGraph $\left(\vec{G}, \vec{G}^{\prime}, \bar{S}, \overline{\boldsymbol{x}}, \boldsymbol{r}\right)$
Input: A directed Eulerian graph $\vec{G}$ where edge weights are integral powers of 2,a set of cycles $\bar{S}$ where each cycle is edge disjoint from $G$, a partial colouring $\overline{\boldsymbol{x}} \in(-1,1)^{\bar{S}}$, a graph $\vec{G}^{\prime}=\vec{G}+\operatorname{ColourWeights}(\bar{S}, \overline{\boldsymbol{x}})$, a 2-approximate effective resistances $r$ in $G^{\prime}$.
Output: A directed Eulerian graph $\vec{H}$ where edge weights are integral powers of 2, a set of cycles $\bar{T}$ where each cycle is edge disjoint from $H$, a partial colouring $\overline{\boldsymbol{z}} \in(-1,1)^{\bar{T}}$, a graph $\vec{H}^{\prime}=\vec{H}+\operatorname{ColourWeights}(\bar{T}, \bar{z})$.
$2 \quad$ Let $\vec{H} \leftarrow \vec{G}$ with only the edges which satisfy $w_{e} r_{e}>\frac{16 n}{m^{\prime}}$ and remove them from $\vec{G}$.
3 Partition $\vec{G}$ into uniformly weighted graph $\vec{G}_{1}, \ldots, \vec{G}_{q}$ where $\vec{G}_{i}$ has all edge weights $2^{i}$ and $q=O(\log n)$.
4 Let $S$ be the set of all cycles after applying CycleDecomposition on $\vec{G}_{1}, \ldots, \vec{G}_{s}$ and set $\vec{H} \leftarrow \vec{H}+\sum_{i=1}^{s} \vec{G}_{i} \backslash\left(\bigcup_{j=1}^{t} \vec{C}_{i, j}\right)$.
$5 \quad T^{\prime}, \bar{T}^{\prime}, \boldsymbol{y}, \overline{\boldsymbol{y}} \leftarrow \operatorname{ColourTarget}\left(S, \mathbf{0}, \frac{1}{8} m\right)$.
6 If ColourWeights ( $T^{\prime}, \boldsymbol{y}$ ) has more edges than ColourWeights $\left(T^{\prime},-\boldsymbol{y}\right)$, we take $\boldsymbol{y} \leftarrow-\boldsymbol{y}$ and $\overline{\boldsymbol{y}} \leftarrow-\overline{\boldsymbol{y}}$.
$\vec{H} \leftarrow \vec{H}+$ ColourWeights $\left(T^{\prime}, \boldsymbol{y}\right)$.
$\bar{T} \leftarrow \bar{T}^{\prime} \cup \bar{S}$ and set $\overline{\boldsymbol{z}} \leftarrow \overline{\boldsymbol{y}}+\overline{\boldsymbol{x}}$.
$\vec{H}^{\prime} \leftarrow \vec{H}+$ ColourWeights $(\bar{T}, \bar{z})$.
return $\vec{H}, \vec{H}^{\prime}, \bar{T}, \bar{z}$.
Algorithm 6: Sparsify once for the $\vec{G}$ portion of $\vec{G}^{\prime}$
step and fixed through out the execution. Given a set of cycles $S$, we let $\mathcal{A}[S]$ be the collection $\{\boldsymbol{A}(C)\}_{C \in S}$.

ColourWeights is our partial colouring alternative of the random selection of edges in a cycle in CycleSparsifyOnce. It similarly does not change the difference between the in-degree and out-degree and preserves integral weights, stated in Lemma 4.1.

Lemma 4.1. Given a set of cycles $S$ where each cycle is uniformly weighted, and any partial colouring $x \in[-1,1]^{S}$, the algorithm ColourWeights returns a directed graph $\vec{H}$ such that the difference in the in and out degrees are the same as in $\sum_{C \in S} \vec{C}$.

In addition, if $x \in\{ \pm 1\}^{S}, \vec{H}$ also has integral edge weights with the largest edge weight at most twice the largest edge weight in cycles in $S$.

Proof. For the degree condition, it suffices to consider a single cycle $C$ and show that the reweighted directed cycle, say $\vec{C}^{\prime}$ in 4 preserves the differences of the in and out degrees of $\vec{C}$. Recall the definition of $\vec{F}$ and $S$ of $C$, see CorrectOrientation in Algorithm [1, and the argument in Section 3 for showing degree differences preservation under the special case of $x \in\{ \pm 1\}$. Note first that the edge weights are the same. Either a vertex had an incoming and outgoing edge (and so difference 0 ), in which case both edges are either in $\vec{F} \backslash S$ or in $S$ and hence always added together with the same weights of (so still difference 0 ). Alternatively a vertex has two incoming or outgoing edges, in which case one edge gets a new weight of $1+x$ and the other gets $1-x$, which then still preserves the difference between in and out degree.

1 Procedure ColourSparsifyCycle $\left(\vec{G}, \overrightarrow{G^{\prime}}, \bar{S}, \overline{\boldsymbol{x}}, \boldsymbol{r}\right)$
Input: A directed Eulerian graph $\vec{G}$ where edge weights are integral powers of 2,a set of cycles $\bar{S}$ where each cycle is edge disjoint from $G$, a partial colouring $\overline{\boldsymbol{x}} \in(-1,1)^{\bar{S}}$, a graph $\vec{G}^{\prime}=\vec{G}+\operatorname{ColourWeights}(\bar{S}, \overline{\boldsymbol{x}})$, a 2-approximate effective resistances $r$ in $G^{\prime}$.
Output: A directed Eulerian graph $\vec{H}$ where edge weights are integral powers of 2,a set of cycles $\bar{T}$ where each cycle is edge disjoint from $H$, a partial colouring $\overline{\boldsymbol{z}} \in(-1,1)^{\bar{T}}$, a graph $\vec{H}^{\prime}=\vec{H}+\operatorname{ColourWeights}(\bar{T}, \bar{z})$.
2 Set $\bar{S}^{\prime}$ be an empty set of cycles initialy. For each $C \in \bar{S}$, let $C^{\prime}$ be $C$ with its weight by $\left(1-\left|\bar{x}_{C}\right|\right)$ and add $C^{\prime}$ to $\bar{S}^{\prime}$.
$T^{\prime}, \bar{T}^{\prime}, \boldsymbol{y}, \overline{\boldsymbol{y}} \leftarrow \operatorname{ColourTarget}\left(\bar{S}^{\prime}, \mathbf{0}, \frac{1}{4} m^{\prime}\right)$
if $m\left(\left\{C^{\prime} \in T^{\prime}:\left|\bar{x}_{C}-\left(1-\left|\bar{x}_{C}\right|\right) y_{C^{\prime}}\right|=1\right\}\right)>m\left(\left\{C^{\prime} \in T^{\prime}:\left|\bar{x}_{C}+\left(1-\left|\bar{x}_{C}\right|\right) y_{C^{\prime}}\right|=1\right\}\right)$
then
$y \leftarrow-\boldsymbol{y}, \overline{\boldsymbol{y}} \leftarrow-\overline{\boldsymbol{y}}$.
Set $\boldsymbol{z}, \overline{\boldsymbol{z}}$ to be the parts of $\overline{\boldsymbol{x}}+(1-|\overline{\boldsymbol{x}}|) \circ(\boldsymbol{y}+\overline{\boldsymbol{y}})$ with magnitude 1 and $<1$
respectively. Here we abused $\circ$ to let $C$ and $C^{\prime}$ refering to the same index, Set the partition $T, \bar{T}$ of $\bar{S}$ accordingly.
$\vec{H} \leftarrow \vec{H}+\operatorname{ColourWeights}(T, \boldsymbol{z})$.
$\vec{H}^{\prime} \leftarrow \vec{H}+$ ColourWeights $(\bar{T}, \overline{\boldsymbol{z}})$.
return $\vec{H}, \vec{H}^{\prime}, \bar{T}, \bar{z}$.
Algorithm 7: Sparsify once for the $\bar{S}$ portion of $\vec{G}^{\prime}$

If $x \in\{ \pm 1\}$ the edge weights of $\vec{C}^{\prime}$ is exactly twice that of $C$ unless $\vec{C}^{\prime}$ is emtpy. Thus, $\vec{H}$ still has integral edge weights with largest weight at most doubled.

For the rest of this section, we refer to a set of uniformly weighted cycles (two cycles can have different weights) as a set of cycles for simplicity. We write $m(S)=\sum_{C \in S}|E(C)|$ as the total number of edges in $S$. In ColourSparsify, ColourSparsifyGraph and ColourSparsifyCycle, by applying ' to a graph we mean $\vec{G}^{\prime}=\vec{G}+\operatorname{ColourWeights}(\bar{S}, \bar{x})$. We denote $m^{\prime}$ as the number of edges in $\vec{G}^{\prime}$. Note that this is the primary number of edges we consider rather than $m$.

Towards analyzing ColourSparsify, we first state the guarantees of the ColourTarget subroutine which guarantees a partial colouring of at least a specified size.

Lemma 4.2. The returned values of ColourTarget $\left(S, y, m_{t}\right)$ satisfy that $m(\bar{S}) \leq m_{t}$ and the number of calls to PartialColour is $O\left(\log \left(|S| L / m_{t}\right)\right)$.

In addition, If the set of cycles $S$ satisfies $\sum_{C \in S}\|\boldsymbol{A}(C)\| \leq \sigma^{2}$ and $\sum_{C \in S}\|\boldsymbol{A}(C)\|_{F}^{2} \leq v$, then the output of ColourTarget $\left(S, y, m_{t}\right)$ satisfies that

$$
\left\|\sum_{C \in S}(x+\bar{x}-y) \boldsymbol{A}(C)\right\| \leq O\left(\sigma \cdot \log \left(\frac{|S| L}{m_{t}}\right)+\left(\log ^{3 / 4} n\right) \sigma^{1 / 2}\left(\frac{v L}{m_{t}}\right)^{1 / 4}\right)
$$

Proof. Note that each cycle has its number of edges bounded by $L$, hence we have $m(\bar{S}) \leq L|\bar{S}| \leq m_{t}$ by the terminating condition of the while loop in Colourtarget.

For the number of calls, note at each call to the while loop, we have the size of $\bar{S}$ gets decreased by a factor of $1-c^{\prime}$ where $c^{\prime}$ is the universal constant in PartialColour. Hence by the ith round we have $|\bar{S}| \leq\left(1-c^{\prime}\right)^{i}|S|$ and at termination this is $\leq \frac{m_{t}}{L}$. So we have the number of iterations

```
Procedure ColourTarget ( \(S, y, m_{t}\) )
    Input: A set of cycles \(S\) of size \(s=|S|\),
    a partial colouring \(y \in(-1,1)^{S}\),
    and a target mass of \(m_{t}\) edges.
    Output: A set of fully coloured cycles \(S \backslash \bar{S}\) with colouring \(x\),
    A set of partially coloured cycles \(\bar{S}\) with colouring \(\bar{x}\) satisfying \(\bar{x} \in(-1,1)^{\bar{S}}\).
    Initialize \(x=0\) be a empty colouring over \(S\).
    Define \(\bar{S}\) to always be the set of non-fully coloured cycles in \(S\) and let \(\bar{s}=|\bar{S}|\) always.
    Set \(\bar{x}\) be the partial colour on \(\bar{S}\) always.
    while \(\bar{s}>\frac{m_{t}}{L}\) do
        \(x[\bar{S}] \leftarrow \operatorname{PartialColour}(\mathcal{A}[\bar{S}], \bar{x})\).
    Let \(\bar{x} \leftarrow x\) with entries of magnitude \(<1\) and set \(x \leftarrow x-\bar{x}\).
    return \(S \backslash \bar{S}, \bar{S}, x, \bar{x}\).
```

Algorithm 8: Partial colouring cycles with target mass
is the smallest $i$ such that $\left(1-c^{\prime}\right)^{i}|S| \leq \frac{m_{t}}{L}$. Rearranging we get $i=O\left(\log \left(\frac{S \mid L}{m_{t}}\right)\right)$, showing the claimed bound on the number of iterations.

Consider the error bound. Combine the number of iterations with the first term in (1) of Lemma 1.4, we get our desired first term. For the second term, recall from above that $|\bar{S}|$ decreases geometrically. Then $f=(v /|\bar{S}|)^{1 / 2}$ increases exponentially over the iterations. Hence the sum of the second terms in (1) is bounded by the last one with $f=O\left(\left(v L / m_{t}\right)^{1 / 2}\right)$, giving us

$$
O\left(\left(\log ^{3 / 4} n\right) \sigma^{1 / 2} f^{1 / 2}\right)=O\left(\left(\log ^{3 / 4} n\right) \sigma^{1 / 2}\left(v L / m_{t}\right)^{1 / 4}\right)
$$

as required.
With now the guarantees for the subroutines Colourtarget and ColourWeights, we analyze ColourSparsifyGraph and ColourSparsifyCycle which use them.

Lemma 4.3. If the input graphs $\vec{G}, \vec{G}^{\prime}$ satisfy $4 m \geq m^{\prime}$ and the input set of cycles $\bar{S}$ and it corresponding partial colours $\bar{x}$ satisfies that each cycle $C \in \bar{S}$ has $w_{e} r_{e} \leq \frac{4 n}{m^{\prime}}$ for each edge $e \in C$, the algorithm ColourSparsifyGraph returns $\vec{H}$ with edge weights still being powers of 2 and at most twice the largest weight in $\vec{G}$, a set of cycles $\bar{T}$ with its corresponding partial colours $\overline{\boldsymbol{z}}$ satisfying $\vec{H}^{\prime}=\vec{H}+\operatorname{ColourWeights}(\bar{T}, \overline{\boldsymbol{z}})$ is an Eulerian graph and each cycle $C \in \bar{T}$ also has $w_{e} r_{e} \leq \frac{4 n}{m_{H}^{\prime}}$ for each edge $e \in C$, where $m_{H}^{\prime}=|E(\vec{H})|$. and,

$$
\left\|\boldsymbol{L}_{G^{\prime}}^{+/ 2}\left(\boldsymbol{L}_{\vec{G}^{\prime}}-\boldsymbol{L}_{\vec{H}^{\prime}}\right) \boldsymbol{L}_{G^{\prime}}^{+/ 2}\right\| \leq O\left(\sqrt{\frac{n \log ^{2} n}{m^{\prime}}} \log \log n+\left(\frac{n \log ^{8 / 3} n}{m^{\prime}}\right)^{3 / 4}\right)
$$

Proof. The edge weights condition of $\vec{H}$ is guaranteed by Lemma 4.1. Also by Lemma 4.1, both $\vec{H}$ and $\vec{H}^{\prime}$ are Eulerian.

We now show first that the output cycles $\bar{T}$ still satisfy the approximate leverage score condition. To do so, we, in fact, prove that every cycle $C$ arising throughout the algorithm satisfies that $w_{e} r_{e} \leq \frac{4 n}{m^{\prime}}$. Note first that $m_{H}^{\prime}<m^{\prime}$ always. Each cycle can only originate from one of the two sets: $S$ and $\bar{S}$. The condition for cycles in $\bar{S}$ follows by assumption. For cycles in $S$, the first line guarantees the condition as well.

Since $\boldsymbol{r}$ is a 2-approximate effective resistances, it suffices to take $\rho=O\left(n / m^{\prime}\right)$ to ensure $\operatorname{lev}_{G^{\prime}}(e) \leq \rho$ after the first step. By line 7 and line 8, the output Eulerian graph $\vec{H}^{\prime}$ satisfies that

$$
\text { hlift }\left(\boldsymbol{L}_{G^{\prime}}^{+/ 2}\left(\boldsymbol{L}_{\vec{H}^{\prime}}-\boldsymbol{L}_{\vec{G}^{\prime}} \boldsymbol{L}_{G^{\prime}}^{+/ 2}\right)=\sum_{C \in S}\left(y_{C}^{\prime}+\bar{y}_{C}^{\prime}-0\right) \boldsymbol{A}(C)\right.
$$

where all vectors are taken as the final values in an execution.
By definition of Hermitian lift, each matrix $\boldsymbol{A}(C)^{2}$ is block diagonal with blocks $\boldsymbol{L}_{G^{\prime}}^{+/ 2} \widetilde{\boldsymbol{L}}_{\vec{C}}^{+} \boldsymbol{L}_{G^{\prime}}^{+} \widetilde{\boldsymbol{L}}_{\vec{C}} \boldsymbol{L}_{G^{\prime}}^{+/ 2}$ and $\boldsymbol{L}_{G^{\prime}}^{+/ 2} \widetilde{\boldsymbol{L}}_{\vec{C}} \boldsymbol{L}_{G^{\prime}}^{+} \widetilde{\boldsymbol{L}}_{\vec{C}}^{\top} \boldsymbol{L}_{G^{\prime}}^{+/ 2}$. Here $\widetilde{\boldsymbol{L}}_{\vec{C}}=\boldsymbol{L}_{\vec{F}}-\boldsymbol{L}_{S}$ with fixed orientation (recall Correctorientation). Since every cycle $C \in S$ satisfies $\operatorname{lev}_{G^{\prime}}(e) \leq \rho$ for each $e \in C$, by Lemma 3.5, both matrices are spectrally bounded above by $O\left(L^{2} \rho\right) \cdot \boldsymbol{L}_{G^{\prime}}^{+/ 2} \boldsymbol{L}_{C} \boldsymbol{L}_{G^{\prime}}^{+/ 2}$. Thus, as $G$ is a subgraph of $G^{\prime}$,

$$
\sum_{C \in S} \boldsymbol{A}(C)^{2} \preceq O\left(L^{2} \rho\right) \cdot\left[\begin{array}{ll}
\boldsymbol{L}_{G^{\prime}}^{+/ 2}\left(\sum_{C \in S} \boldsymbol{L}_{C}\right) \boldsymbol{L}_{G^{\prime}}^{+/ 2} & \\
& \boldsymbol{L}_{G^{\prime}}^{+/ 2}\left(\sum_{C \in S} \boldsymbol{L}_{C}\right) \boldsymbol{L}_{G^{\prime}}^{+/ 2}
\end{array}\right] \preceq O\left(L^{2} \rho\right)\left[\begin{array}{ll}
\boldsymbol{I} & \\
& \boldsymbol{I}
\end{array}\right] .
$$

The sum of Frobenius norm squared is bounded by

$$
\sum_{C \in S}\|\boldsymbol{A}(C)\|_{F}^{2}=\sum_{C \in S} \operatorname{Tr}\left(\boldsymbol{A}(C)^{2}\right)=\operatorname{Tr}\left(\sum_{C \in S} \boldsymbol{A}(C)^{2}\right) \leq \operatorname{Tr}\left(O\left(L^{2} \rho\right) 2 \boldsymbol{I}\right)=O\left(n L^{2} \rho\right)
$$

We can now apply Lemma 4.2 with $m_{t}=\frac{1}{8} m, \sigma^{2}=O\left(L^{2} \rho\right)$ and $v=O\left(n L^{2} \rho\right)$ to get

$$
\begin{aligned}
\left\|\sum_{C \in S}\left(y_{C}^{\prime}+\bar{y}_{C}^{\prime}-0\right) \boldsymbol{A}(C)\right\| & \leq O\left(\sqrt{L^{2} \rho} \cdot \log \left(\frac{8|S| L}{m}\right)+\left(\log ^{3 / 4} n\right)\left(L^{2} \rho\right)^{1 / 4}\left(\frac{8 n L^{3} \rho}{m}\right)^{1 / 4}\right) \\
& =O\left(\sqrt{\frac{n L^{2}}{m^{\prime}}} \log L+\left(\frac{n L^{5 / 3} \log n}{m^{\prime}}\right)^{3 / 4}\right)
\end{aligned}
$$

where we used $|S| \leq m$ and $m=\Theta\left(m^{\prime}\right)$. Finally, note that

$$
\left\|\boldsymbol{L}_{G^{\prime}}^{+/ 2}\left(\boldsymbol{L}_{\vec{G}^{\prime}}-\boldsymbol{L}_{\vec{H}^{\prime}}\right) \boldsymbol{L}_{G^{\prime}}^{+/ 2}\right\|=\left\|\operatorname{hlift}\left(\boldsymbol{L}_{G^{\prime}}^{+/ 2}\left(\boldsymbol{L}_{\vec{G}^{\prime}}-\boldsymbol{L}_{\vec{H}^{\prime}}\right) \boldsymbol{L}_{G^{\prime}}^{+/ 2}\right)\right\|=\left\|\sum_{C \in S}\left(y_{C}^{\prime}+\bar{y}_{C}^{\prime}-0\right) \boldsymbol{A}(C)\right\| .
$$

Before we prove the approximation guarantees for ColourSparsifyCycle, we show the following lemma regarding scaling matrices in the set of extra cycles $\bar{S}$.

Lemma 4.4. For directed Eulerian graph $\vec{G}$, a set of cycles $\bar{S}$ where each cycle $C \in \bar{S}$ satisfies that $\vec{G}$ and $\vec{C}$, the corresponding directed cycle of $C$, are edge-disjoint. Let $\bar{x} \in(-1,1)^{S}$ be a partial colouring on $\bar{S}$. Then the directed Eulerian graph $\vec{G}^{\prime}=\vec{G}+\operatorname{ColourWeights}(\bar{S}, \bar{x})$ satisfies

$$
\boldsymbol{L}_{G}+\sum_{C \in \bar{S}}\left(1-\left|\bar{x}_{C}\right|\right) \boldsymbol{L}_{C} \preceq \boldsymbol{L}_{G^{\prime}}
$$

Proof. For any $C \in \bar{S}$, let $\vec{C}^{\prime}=$ ColourWeights $\left(C, \bar{x}_{C}\right)$ where we abused the definition of ColourWeights to take in a single cycle instead of a set of cycles. Note that the undirectification $\boldsymbol{L}_{G^{\prime}}=\boldsymbol{L}_{G}+\sum_{C \in \bar{S}} \boldsymbol{L}_{C^{\prime}}$.

Since $\left|\bar{x}_{C}\right|<1$, all edges in $C$ must be present in $C^{\prime}$ as well and the minimum edge weight is at least $1-\left|\bar{x}_{C}\right|$ times the original uniform edge weights of $C$. Hence, since undirected Laplacians are PSD,

$$
\left(1-\left|\bar{x}_{C}\right|\right) \boldsymbol{L}_{C} \preceq \boldsymbol{L}_{C^{\prime}}
$$

Summing over all $C$, we get

$$
\boldsymbol{L}_{G}+\sum_{C \in \bar{S}}\left(1-\left|\bar{x}_{C}\right|\right) \boldsymbol{L}_{C} \preceq \boldsymbol{L}_{G}+\sum_{C \in \bar{S}} \boldsymbol{L}_{C^{\prime}}=\boldsymbol{L}_{G^{\prime}} .
$$

Lemma 4.5. If the input set of cycles $\bar{S}$ and it corresponding partial colours $\bar{x}$ satisfies that each cycle $C \in \bar{S}$ has $w_{e} r_{e} \leq \frac{4 n}{m^{\prime}}$ for each edge $e \in C$, the algorithm ColourSparsifyCycle returns $\vec{H}$ with edge weights still being powers of 2 and at most twice the largest weight in $\vec{G}$, a set of cycles $\bar{T}$ with its corresponding partial colours $\bar{y}$ satisfying $\vec{H}^{\prime}=\vec{H}+\operatorname{ColourWeights}(\bar{T}, \bar{y})$ is an Eulerian graph and each cycle $C \in \bar{T}$ also has $w_{e} r_{e} \leq \frac{4 n}{m_{H}^{\prime}}$ for each edge $e \in C$, where $m_{H}^{\prime}=|E(\vec{H})|$. and,

$$
\left\|\boldsymbol{L}_{G^{\prime}}^{+/ 2}\left(\boldsymbol{L}_{\vec{G}^{\prime}}-\boldsymbol{L}_{\vec{H}^{\prime}}\right) \boldsymbol{L}_{G^{\prime}}^{+/ 2}\right\| \leq O\left(\sqrt{\frac{n \log ^{2} n}{m^{\prime}}} \log \log n+\left(\frac{n \log ^{8 / 3} n}{m^{\prime}}\right)^{3 / 4}\right)
$$

Proof. The proof follows similarly to that of Lemma 4.3.
Again, the edge weights condition of $\vec{H}$ is guaranteed by Lemma 4.1. Also by Lemma 4.1, both $\vec{H}$ and $\vec{H}^{\prime}$ are Eulerian.

Observe that $m_{H}^{\prime} \leq m$ always, and $\bar{T} \subset \bar{S}$. Then, the output cycles still satisfy the approximate leverage score condition.

By line 6, the output Eulerian graph $\vec{H}^{\prime}$ satisfies

$$
\text { hlift }\left(\boldsymbol{L}_{G^{\prime}}^{+/ 2}\left(\boldsymbol{L}_{\vec{H}^{\prime}}-\boldsymbol{L}_{\vec{G}^{\prime}}\right) \boldsymbol{L}_{G^{\prime}}^{+/ 2}\right)=\sum_{C \in \bar{S}}\left(z_{C}+\bar{z}_{C}-x_{C}\right) \boldsymbol{A}(C)=\sum_{C \in \bar{S}}\left(1-\left|x_{C}\right|\right)\left(y_{C}+\bar{y}_{C}\right) \boldsymbol{A}(C)
$$

where all vectors are taken as the final values in an execution. By our definition of $C^{\prime}, \boldsymbol{A}\left(C^{\prime}\right)=$ $\left(1-\left|x_{C}\right|\right) \boldsymbol{A}(C)$ and

$$
\sum_{C \in \bar{S}}\left(1-\left|x_{C}\right|\right)\left(y_{C}+\bar{y}_{C}\right) \boldsymbol{A}(C)=\sum_{C^{\prime} \in \bar{S}^{\prime}}\left(y_{C}+\bar{y}_{C}\right) \boldsymbol{A}\left(C^{\prime}\right)
$$

By definition of Hermitian lift, each matrix $\boldsymbol{A}(C)^{2}$ is block diagonal with blocks $\boldsymbol{L}_{G^{\prime}}^{+/ 2} \widetilde{\boldsymbol{L}}_{\vec{C}}^{\top} \boldsymbol{L}_{G^{\prime}}^{+} \widetilde{\boldsymbol{L}}_{\vec{C}} \boldsymbol{L}_{G^{\prime}}^{+/ 2}$ and $\boldsymbol{L}_{G^{\prime}}^{+/ 2} \widetilde{\boldsymbol{L}}_{\vec{C}} \boldsymbol{L}_{G^{\prime}}^{+} \widetilde{\boldsymbol{L}}_{\vec{C}}^{\top} \boldsymbol{L}_{G^{\prime}}^{+/ 2}$. Here $\widetilde{\boldsymbol{L}}_{\vec{C}}=\boldsymbol{L}_{\vec{F}}-\boldsymbol{L}_{S}$ with fixed orientation (recall CorrectOrientation). Since every cycle $C \in \bar{S}$ satisfies $\operatorname{lev}_{G^{\prime}}(e) \leq \rho$ for each $e \in C$, by Lemma 3.5, both matrices
are spectrally bounded above by $O(L \rho) \cdot \boldsymbol{L}_{G^{\prime}}^{+/ 2} \boldsymbol{L}_{C} \boldsymbol{L}_{G^{\prime}}^{+/ 2}$. Thus, by the disjointness of $G$ and $\bar{S}$,

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \sum_{C^{\prime} \in \bar{S}^{\prime}} \boldsymbol{A}\left(C^{\prime}\right)^{2} \preceq \sum_{C \in \bar{S}}\left(1-\left|x_{C}\right|\right) \boldsymbol{A}(C)^{2} \\
\preceq & O(L \rho) \cdot\left[\begin{array}{ll}
\boldsymbol{L}_{G^{\prime}}^{+/ 2}\left(\sum_{C \in \bar{S}}\left(1-\left|x_{C}\right|\right) \boldsymbol{L}_{C}\right) \boldsymbol{L}_{G^{\prime}}^{+/ 2} & \\
& \boldsymbol{L}_{G^{\prime}}^{+/ 2}\left(\sum_{C \in \bar{S}}\left(1-\left|x_{C}\right|\right) \boldsymbol{L}_{C}\right) \boldsymbol{L}_{G^{\prime}}^{+/ 2}
\end{array}\right] \preceq O\left(L^{2} \rho\right)\left[\begin{array}{ll}
\boldsymbol{I} & \\
& \boldsymbol{I}
\end{array}\right] .
\end{aligned}
$$

where we used the PSD property of $\boldsymbol{A}(C)^{2}$ and the fact $1-\left|x_{C}\right| \leq 1$ for the first inequality and Lemma 4.4 for the second inequality.

The sum of Frobenius norm squared is bounded by

$$
\sum_{C^{\prime} \in \bar{S}^{\prime}}\left\|\boldsymbol{A}\left(C^{\prime}\right)\right\|_{F}^{2} \leq \sum_{C \in \bar{S}}\left(1-\left|x_{C}\right|\right) \operatorname{Tr}\left(\boldsymbol{A}(C)^{2}\right)=\operatorname{Tr}\left(\sum_{C \in \bar{S}}\left(1-\left|x_{C}\right|\right) \boldsymbol{A}(C)^{2}\right)=O\left(n L^{2} \rho\right)
$$

using the variance bound from above.
We can now apply Lemma 4.2 with $m_{t}=\frac{1}{4} m^{\prime}, \sigma^{2}=O\left(L^{2} \rho\right)$ and $v=O\left(n L^{2} \rho\right)$ to get

$$
\begin{aligned}
\left\|\sum_{C^{\prime} \in \bar{S}^{\prime}}\left(y_{C}+\bar{y}_{C}-0\right) \boldsymbol{A}\left(C^{\prime}\right)\right\| & \leq O\left(\sqrt{L^{2} \rho} \cdot \log \left(\frac{4|\bar{S}| L}{m^{\prime}}\right)+\left(\log ^{3 / 4} n\right)\left(L^{2} \rho\right)^{1 / 4}\left(\frac{4 n L^{3} \rho}{m^{\prime}}\right)^{1 / 4}\right) \\
& =O\left(\sqrt{\frac{n L^{2}}{m^{\prime}}} \log L+\left(\frac{n L^{5 / 3} \log n}{m^{\prime}}\right)^{3 / 4}\right)
\end{aligned}
$$

where we used $\left|\bar{S}^{\prime}\right|=|\bar{S}| \leq m^{\prime}$. Finally, note that

$$
\left\|\boldsymbol{L}_{G^{\prime}}^{+/ 2}\left(\boldsymbol{L}_{\vec{G}^{\prime}}-\boldsymbol{L}_{\overrightarrow{H^{\prime}}}\right) \boldsymbol{L}_{G^{\prime}}^{+/ 2}\right\|=\left\|\operatorname{hlift}\left(\boldsymbol{L}_{G^{\prime}}^{+/ 2}\left(\boldsymbol{L}_{\vec{G}^{\prime}}-\boldsymbol{L}_{\overrightarrow{{ }^{\prime}}}\right) ~ \boldsymbol{L}_{G^{\prime}}^{+/ 2}\right)\right\|=\left\|\sum_{C^{\prime} \in \bar{S}^{\prime}}\left(y_{C}+\bar{y}_{C}-0\right) \boldsymbol{A}(C)\right\| .
$$

The sparsification induced by ColourSparsifyOnce is conditional, and we state the condition and sparisification induced in Lemma 4.6. However, even when the condition in Lemma 4.6 is not met, we are guaranteed each ColourSparsifyCycle will geometrically make progress towards satisfying the condition needed for Lemma 4.6. The alternative is stated in Lemma 4.7.
Lemma 4.6. For inputs $\vec{G}, \vec{G}^{\prime}, \bar{S}, \bar{x}, \boldsymbol{r}$ to ColourSparsifyGraph satisfying that $4 m \geq m^{\prime} \geq$ $\Omega\left(n \log ^{2} n\right)$, the outputs satisfy that the number of edges in $\vec{H}^{\prime}$ is upperbounded by $m_{H}^{\prime} \leq \frac{63}{64} m^{\prime}$.
Proof. Since $\boldsymbol{r}$ is 2-approximate effective resistances, $\sum_{e} w_{e} r_{e} \leq 2(n-1)$, we have at most $\frac{1}{8} m^{\prime} \leq$ $\frac{1}{2} m$ edges are removed from $\vec{G}$ in line 2,

Since $m \geq \frac{1}{4} m^{\prime}=\Omega\left(n \log ^{2} n\right)$ and the number of edges not in any cycle is $\hat{m} q=O\left(n \log ^{2} n\right)$, by picking an appropriate constant in $\Omega\left(n \log ^{2} n\right)$, we can guarantee the total number of edges in all cycles satisfies $m(S) \geq \frac{1}{4} m$. Lemma 4.2 then guarantees $m\left(\bar{T}^{\prime}\right) \leq \frac{1}{8} m$ and that $m\left(T^{\prime}\right) \geq \frac{1}{8} m$.

Now, by ColourWeights, the total number of edges in ColourWeights ( $\left.T^{\prime}, \boldsymbol{y}\right)$ and ColourWeights $\left(T^{\prime},-\boldsymbol{y}\right)$ is exactly $m\left(T^{\prime}\right)$. Thus, line 6 means at least $\frac{1}{2} m\left(T^{\prime}\right) \geq \frac{1}{16} m \geq \frac{1}{64} m^{\prime}$ edges are removed in total as required.

Combined with the lemma above, the following lemma (which states the guarantee in the alternative case) tells us that in every two iterations, the number of edges must decrease by at least a constant factor as the conditions needed for Lemma 4.6 will be satisfied.
Lemma 4.7. If inputs $\vec{G}, \vec{G}^{\prime}, \bar{S}, \bar{x}, \boldsymbol{r}$ to ColourSparsifyCycle satisfies that $4 m<m^{\prime}$, then either the number of edges in $\overrightarrow{H^{\prime}}$ decreases to $m_{H}^{\prime} \leq \frac{63}{64} m^{\prime}$, or the number of edges in $\vec{H}$ satisfies $4 m_{H} \geq m_{H}^{\prime}$.
Proof. Suppose $m_{H}^{\prime}>\frac{63}{64} m^{\prime}$. By Lemma 4.2, $m\left(\overline{T^{\prime}}\right) \leq \frac{1}{8} m^{\prime}$.
Since $\boldsymbol{y} \in\{ \pm 1\}^{T^{\prime}}$, we have $\left\{C^{\prime} \in T^{\prime}:\left|\bar{x}_{C}-\left(1-\left|\bar{x}_{C}\right|\right) y_{C^{\prime}}\right|=1\right\} \cup\left\{C^{\prime} \in T^{\prime}:\left|\bar{x}_{C}+\left(1-\left|\bar{x}_{C}\right|\right) y_{C^{\prime}}\right|=\right.$ $1\}=T^{\prime}$. Let the two sets above be $T_{1}^{\prime}$ and $T_{2}^{\prime}$, Then, $m\left(T_{1}^{\prime}\right)+m\left(T_{2}^{\prime}\right) \geq m\left(T^{\prime}\right)$. This means, after re-adjusting the colouring in line 5,

$$
m(\bar{T}) \leq \frac{1}{2} m\left(T^{\prime}\right)+m\left(\overline{T^{\prime}}\right) \leq \frac{1}{2} m^{\prime}+\frac{1}{8} m^{\prime}=\frac{5}{8} m^{\prime} \leq \frac{40}{63} m_{H}^{\prime} .
$$

Then,

$$
m_{H}=m_{H}^{\prime}-m(\bar{T}) \geq \frac{23}{63} m_{H}^{\prime} \geq \frac{1}{4} m_{H}^{\prime}
$$

as required.
With these analyses of ColourSparsifyGraph and ColourSparsifyCycle, we now state the guarantees of ColourSparsify which calls ColourSparsifyGraph and ColourSparsiFYCycle until a desired sparisity is met and provides better sparsifiers than CycleSparsify.

Theorem 4.8 (Theorem 1.2 Formal). Given input a Eulerian graph $\vec{G}$ with polynomial bounded integral edge weights and $\epsilon \in(0,1 / 2)$, the algorithm ColourSparsify returns in polynomial time a Eulerian graph $\vec{H}$ with $O\left(n \epsilon^{-2} \log ^{2} n(\log \log n)^{2}+n \epsilon^{-3 / 4} \log ^{8 / 3} n\right)$ edges satisfying

$$
\left\|\boldsymbol{L}_{G}^{+/ 2}\left(\boldsymbol{L}_{\vec{G}}-\boldsymbol{L}_{\vec{H}}\right) \boldsymbol{L}_{G}^{+/ 2}\right\| \leq \epsilon
$$

Proof. By Lemma 4.6 and Lemma 4.7, in every two iterations the number of edges must decreases by at least a constant fraction, as the condition $4 m \geq m^{\prime}$ must be satisfied at least once. Note that initialy $m=m^{\prime} \geq \frac{1}{4} m^{\prime}$ is satisfied. Thus, the total number of iterations is at most $O(\log (m \log n / n))=O(\log n)$ where the extra $\log n$ comes from the decomposition by edge weights.

By Lemma 4.3 and Lemma 4.5, the largest edge weight doubles each iteration. Thus, the edge weights in each $\vec{G}$ are still integral and polynomially bounded over $O(\log n)$ iterations.

As the number of edges decreases geometrically every $O(1)$ iterations, the total error is bounded by constant factor times the error in the last round for both terms in Lemma 4.3 and Lemma 4.5

$$
O\left(\sqrt{\frac{n \log ^{2} n}{m^{\prime}}} \log \log n+\left(\frac{n \log ^{8 / 3} n}{m^{\prime}}\right)^{3 / 4}\right)
$$

where $m^{\prime}$ is the number of edges in $\vec{G}^{\prime}$ in the last round. Since the algorithm stops at $m^{\prime} \geq$ $\Omega\left(n \epsilon^{-2} \log ^{2} n(\log \log n)^{2}\right)$ and $m^{\prime} \geq \Omega\left(n \epsilon^{-3 / 4} \log ^{8 / 3} n\right)$ edges, the largest of both terms must be bounded by $\frac{1}{2} \epsilon$ by picking appropriate constant for the stopping condition.

This small error also implies that our 1.5-approximate effective resistances $\boldsymbol{r}$ stays as 2-approximate throughout the algorithm. Then, by Lemma 4.3 and Lemma 4.5, the set of cycles $\bar{S}$ always satisfy $w_{e} r_{e} \leq \frac{4 n}{m^{\prime}}$ where $m^{\prime}$ is the number of edges in $\vec{G}^{\prime}$ throughout as required.

Lemma 1.4 guarantees the polynomial running time of our algorithm.

[^0]
## Acknowledgements

This research was was supported by an NSERC Discovery Grant RGPIN-2018-06398 and a Sloan Research Fellowship awarded to SS. AT is supported by a Vanier Fellowship from the Natural Sciences and Engineering Research Council of Canada.

We thank Arun Jambulapati for notifying us an issue in previous version of this manuscript.

## References

[ACKQWZ16] Alexandr Andoni, Jiecao Chen, Robert Krauthgamer, Bo Qin, David P. Woodruff, and Qin Zhang. "On Sketching Quadratic Forms". In: Proceedings of the 2016 ACM Conference on Innovations in Theoretical Computer Science. ITCS '16. Cambridge, Massachusetts, USA: Association for Computing Machinery, 2016, pp. 311-319 (cit. on p. 22).
[AJSS19] AmirMahdi Ahmadinejad, Arun Jambulapati, Amin Saberi, and Aaron Sidford. "Perron-Frobenius Theory in Nearly Linear Time: Positive Eigenvectors, M-matrices, Graph Kernels, and Other Applications". In: Proceedings of the 2019 Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms (SODA). 2019, pp. 1387-1404 (cit. on p. 3).
[ALO15] Zeyuan Allen-Zhu, Zhenyu Liao, and Lorenzo Orecchia. "Spectral Sparsification and Regret Minimization Beyond Matrix Multiplicative Updates". In: Proceedings of the Forty-Seventh Annual ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing. STOC '15. Portland, Oregon, USA: Association for Computing Machinery, 2015, pp. 237245 (cit. on p. 2).
[APPSV23] AmirMahdi Ahmadinejad, John Peebles, Edward Pyne, Aaron Sidford, and Salil Vadhan. "Singular Value Approximation and Reducing Directed to Undirected Graph Sparsification". In: arXiv preprint arXiv:2301.13541 (2023) (cit. on p. 3).
[BBH23] Afonso S Bandeira, March T Boedihardjo, and Ramon van Handel. "Matrix concentration inequalities and free probability". In: Inventiones mathematicae (2023), pp. 1-69 (cit. on p. (4).
[BJM23] Nikhil Bansal, Haotian Jiang, and Raghu Meka. "Resolving Matrix Spencer Conjecture Up to Poly-Logarithmic Rank". In: Proceedings of the 55th Annual ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing. STOC 2023. Orlando, FL, USA: Association for Computing Machinery, 2023, pp. 1814-1819 (cit. on pp. 2, (4, (13).
[BK96] András A. Benczúr and David R. Karger. "Approximating S-t Minimum Cuts in Õ(N2) Time". In: Proceedings of the Twenty-Eighth Annual ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing. STOC '96. Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, USA: Association for Computing Machinery, 1996, pp. 47-55 (cit. on p. (1).
[BSS12] Joshua Batson, Daniel A Spielman, and Nikhil Srivastava. "Twice-Ramanujan sparsifiers". In: SIAM Journal on Computing 41.6 (2012), pp. 1704-1721 (cit. on p. (1).
[BSS14] Joshua Batson, Daniel A. Spielman, and Nikhil Srivastava. "Twice-Ramanujan Sparsifiers". In: SIAM Rev. 56.2 (Jan. 2014), pp. 315-334 (cit. on pp. 2, (4).
[CGPSSW18] Timothy Chu, Yu Gao, Richard Peng, Sushant Sachdeva, Saurabh Sawlani, and Junxing Wang. "Graph Sparsification, Spectral Sketches, and Faster Resistance Computation, via Short Cycle Decompositions". In: 2018 IEEE 59th Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science (FOCS). 2018, pp. 361-372 (cit. on pp. 11, (6, 7, 9).
[CKKPPRS18] Michael B. Cohen, Jonathan Kelner, Rasmus Kyng, John Peebles, Richard Peng, Anup B. Rao, and Aaron Sidford. "Solving Directed Laplacian Systems in NearlyLinear Time through Sparse LU Factorizations". In: 2018 IEEE 59th Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science (FOCS). 2018, pp. 898-909 (cit. on p. (3).
[CKPPRSV17] Michael B. Cohen, Jonathan Kelner, John Peebles, Richard Peng, Anup B. Rao, Aaron Sidford, and Adrian Vladu. "Almost-Linear-Time Algorithms for Markov Chains and New Spectral Primitives for Directed Graphs". In: Proceedings of the 49th Annual ACM SIGACT Symposium on Theory of Computing. STOC 2017. Montreal, Canada: Association for Computing Machinery, 2017, pp. 410-419 (cit. on pp. (1) 3 ).
[CKPPSV16] Michael B. Cohen, Jonathan Kelner, John Peebles, Richard Peng, Aaron Sidford, and Adrian Vladu. "Faster Algorithms for Computing the Stationary Distribution, Simulating Random Walks, and More". In: 2016 IEEE 57 th Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science (FOCS). 2016, pp. 583-592 (cit. on p. 3).
[DJR22] Daniel Dadush, Haotian Jiang, and Victor Reis. "A New Framework for Matrix Discrepancy: Partial Coloring Bounds via Mirror Descent". In: Proceedings of the 54th Annual ACM SIGACT Symposium on Theory of Computing. STOC 2022. Rome, Italy: Association for Computing Machinery, 2022, pp. 649-658 (cit. on p. (4).
[DKPRS17] David Durfee, Rasmus Kyng, John Peebles, Anup B Rao, and Sushant Sachdeva. "Sampling random spanning trees faster than matrix multiplication". In: Proceedings of the 49 th Annual ACM SIGACT Symposium on Theory of Computing. ACM. 2017, pp. 730-742 (cit. on p. 11).
[DPPR17] David Durfee, John Peebles, Richard Peng, and Anup B. Rao. "DeterminantPreserving Sparsification of SDDM Matrices with Applications to Counting and Sampling Spanning Trees". In: FOCS. IEEE Computer Society, 2017, pp. 926-937 (cit. on p. (1).
[HRS22] Samuel B. Hopkins, Prasad Raghavendra, and Abhishek Shetty. "Matrix Discrepancy from Quantum Communication". In: Proceedings of the 54th Annual ACM SIGACT Symposium on Theory of Computing. STOC 2022. Rome, Italy: Association for Computing Machinery, 2022, pp. 637-648 (cit. on p. (4).
[JRT23] Arun Jambulapati, Victor Reis, and Kevin Tian. "Linear-Sized Sparsifiers via Near-Linear Time Discrepancy Theory". In: arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.08434 (2023) (cit. on pp. 3, 4).
[JS18] Arun Jambulapati and Aaron Sidford. "Efficient Õ(n/ $\epsilon$ ) Spectral Sketches for the Laplacian and Its Pseudoinverse". In: Proceedings of the Twenty-Ninth Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms. SODA '18. New Orleans, Louisiana: Society for Industrial and Applied Mathematics, 2018, pp. 2487-2503 (cit. on p. (2).
[KLP12] Ioannis Koutis, Alex Levin, and Richard Peng. "Improved Spectral Sparsification and Numerical Algorithms for SDD Matrices". In: STACS'12 (29th Symposium on Theoretical Aspects of Computer Science). Ed. by Thomas Wilke Christoph Dürr. Vol. 14. Paris, France: LIPIcs, Feb. 2012, pp. 266-277 (cit. on pp. (2) (12).
[KLPSS16] Rasmus Kyng, Yin Tat Lee, Richard Peng, Sushant Sachdeva, and Daniel A. Spielman. "Sparsified Cholesky and Multigrid Solvers for Connection Laplacians". In: Proceedings of the Forty-Eighth Annual ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing. STOC '16. Cambridge, MA, USA: Association for Computing Machinery, 2016, pp. 842-850 (cit. on p. 3).
[KMG22] Rasmus Kyng, Simon Meierhans, and Maximilian Probst Gutenberg. "Derandomizing Directed Random Walks in Almost-Linear Time". In: 2022 IEEE 63rd Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science (FOCS). 2022, pp. 407-418 (cit. on p. (3).
[KP12] Michael Kapralov and Rina Panigrahy. "Spectral Sparsification via Random Spanners". In: Proceedings of the 3rd Innovations in Theoretical Computer Science Conference. ITCS '12. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Association for Computing Machinery, 2012, pp. 393-398 (cit. on p. (2).
[KPPS17] Rasmus Kyng, Jakub Pachocki, Richard Peng, and Sushant Sachdeva. "A Framework for Analyzing Resparsification Algorithms". In: Proceedings of the 2017 Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms (SODA). 2017, pp. 20322043 (cit. on p. (2).
[KX16] Ioannis Koutis and Shen Chen Xu. "Simple Parallel and Distributed Algorithms for Spectral Graph Sparsification". In: ACM Trans. Parallel Comput. 3.2 (Aug. 2016) (cit. on p. (2).
[LRR17] Avi Levy, Harishchandra Ramadas, and Thomas Rothvoss. "Deterministic discrepancy minimization via the multiplicative weight update method". In: International Conference on Integer Programming and Combinatorial Optimization. Springer. 2017, pp. 380-391 (cit. on p. (4).
[LS15] Yin Tat Lee and He Sun. "Constructing Linear-Sized Spectral Sparsification in Almost-Linear Time". In: Proceedings of the 2015 IEEE 56th Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science (FOCS). FOCS '15. USA: IEEE Computer Society, 2015, pp. 250-269 (cit. on p. (2).
[LS17] Yin Tat Lee and He Sun. "An SDP-Based Algorithm for Linear-Sized Spectral Sparsification". In: Proceedings of the 49 th Annual ACM SIGACT Symposium on Theory of Computing. STOC 2017. Montreal, Canada: Association for Computing Machinery, 2017, pp. 678-687 (cit. on p. (2)).
[LSY19] Yang P. Liu, Sushant Sachdeva, and Zejun Yu. "Short Cycles via Low-Diameter Decompositions". In: Proceedings of the Thirtieth Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms. SODA '19. San Diego, California: Society for Industrial and Applied Mathematics, 2019, pp. 2602-2615 (cit. on p. (3).
[LZ18] Huan Li and Zhongzhi Zhang. "Kirchhoff Index As a Measure of Edge Centrality in Weighted Networks: Nearly Linear Time Algorithms". In: Proceedings of the Twenty-Ninth Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms. SIAM. 2018, pp. 2377-2396 (cit. on p. (1).
[Mek14] Raghu Meka. "Discrepancy and beating the union bound". In: Windows on theory, a research blog (2014) (cit. on p. (3).
[MSS15] Adam W Marcus, Daniel A Spielman, and Nikhil Srivastava. "Interlacing families ii: Mixed characteristic polynomials and the kadison-singer problem". In: Annals of Mathematics (2015), pp. 327-350 (cit. on p. (4).
[PS14] Richard Peng and Daniel A. Spielman. "An Efficient Parallel Solver for SDD Linear Systems". In: Proceedings of the Forty-Sixth Annual ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing. STOC '14. New York, New York: Association for Computing Machinery, 2014, pp. 333-342 (cit. on p. 3) )
[PS22] Richard Peng and Zhuoqing Song. "Sparsified Block Elimination for Directed Laplacians". In: Proceedings of the 54th Annual ACM SIGACT Symposium on Theory of Computing. STOC 2022. Rome, Italy: Association for Computing Machinery, 2022, pp. 557-567 (cit. on p. (3).
[PY19] Merav Parter and Eylon Yogev. "Optimal Short Cycle Decomposition in Almost Linear Time". In: 46th International Colloquium on Automata, Languages, and Programming (ICALP 2019). Ed. by Christel Baier, Ioannis Chatzigiannakis, Paola Flocchini, and Stefano Leonardi. Vol. 132. Leibniz International Proceedings in Informatics (LIPIcs). Dagstuhl, Germany: Schloss Dagstuhl-Leibniz-Zentrum fuer Informatik, 2019, 89:1-89:14 (cit. on pp. 3, 7).
[RR20] Victor Reis and Thomas Rothvoss. "Linear Size Sparsifier and the Geometry of the Operator Norm Ball". In: Proceedings of the Thirty-First Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms. SODA '20. Salt Lake City, Utah: Society for Industrial and Applied Mathematics, 2020, pp. 2337-2348 (cit. on p. (4).
[RR23] Victor Reis and Thomas Rothvoss. "Vector balancing in Lebesgue spaces". In: Random Structures E Algorithms 62.3 (2023), pp. 667-688 (cit. on p. 3).
[SS08] Daniel A. Spielman and Nikhil Srivastava. "Graph Sparsification by Effective Resistances". In: Proceedings of the Fortieth Annual ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing. STOC '08. Victoria, British Columbia, Canada: Association for Computing Machinery, 2008, pp. 563-568 (cit. on p. (2).
[SS11] D. Spielman and N. Srivastava. "Graph Sparsification by Effective Resistances". In: SIAM Journal on Computing 40.6 (2011), pp. 1913-1926 (cit. on p. (1).
[ST04] Daniel A. Spielman and Shang-Hua Teng. "Nearly-Linear Time Algorithms for Graph Partitioning, Graph Sparsification, and Solving Linear Systems". In: Proceedings of the Thirty-Sixth Annual ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing. STOC '04. Chicago, IL, USA: Association for Computing Machinery, 2004, pp. 8190 (cit. on p. (1).
[ST11] Daniel A. Spielman and Shang-Hua Teng. "Spectral Sparsification of Graphs". In: SIAM J. Comput. 40.4 (July 2011), pp. 981-1025 (cit. on p. 2).
[SW19] Thatchaphol Saranurak and Di Wang. "Expander Decomposition and Pruning: Faster, Stronger, and Simpler". In: Proceedings of the Thirtieth Annual ACMSIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms. SODA '19. San Diego, California: Society for Industrial and Applied Mathematics, 2019, pp. 2616-2635 (cit. on p. 3).
[SZ23] Sushant Sachdeva and Yibin Zhao. "A Simple and Efficient Parallel Laplacian Solver". In: Proceedings of the 35th ACM Symposium on Parallelism in Algorithms and Architectures. SPAA '23. Orlando, FL, USA: Association for Computing Machinery, 2023, pp. 315-325 (cit. on p. 3).
[Tro12] Joel A Tropp. "User-friendly tail bounds for sums of random matrices". In: Foundations of computational mathematics 12.4 (2012), pp. 389-434 (cit. on pp. 4, (10).
[Zou12] Anastasios Zouzias. "A matrix hyperbolic cosine algorithm and applications". In: International Colloquium on Automata, Languages, and Programming. Springer. 2012, pp. 846-858 (cit. on p. (3).


[^0]:    ${ }^{1}$ Contrary to the proof of Lemma 4.6 this is an inequality since magnitude of 1 can be achieve using both $y_{C^{\prime}}$ and $-y_{C^{\prime}}$ if $x_{C}=0$.

