

Distributed Articulation Point Identification in Time-Varying Undirected Networks[★]

Xinye Xie^{*,**} Ronghao Zheng^{*,**} Senlin Zhang^{*,**}
Meiqin Liu^{**,***}

^{*} College of Electrical Engineering, Zhejiang University, Hangzhou
310027, China

^{**} State Key Laboratory of Industrial Control Technology, Zhejiang
University, Hangzhou 310027, China

^{***} National Key Laboratory of Human-Machine Hybrid Augmented
Intelligence, Xi'an Jiaotong University, Xi'an 710049, China
e-mail: {xinye_xie, rzheng, slzhang, liumeiqin}@zju.edu.cn

Abstract: Identifying articulation points (APs) is fundamental to assessing the robustness of time-varying networks. In such dynamic environments, topological changes including edge additions and deletions can instantly alter the set of APs, demanding rapid and efficient re-assessment. This paper proposes a fully distributed algorithm for identifying APs and monitoring biconnectivity. Our core contribution is an incremental update protocol. Unlike static methods that require global re-initialization which incurs high communication overhead, our algorithm propagates information from the site of the change, updating only the affected nodes' state values. This approach, which builds upon a maximum consensus protocol, not only ensures convergence to the correct AP set following topological changes but also preserves network privacy by preventing nodes from reconstructing the global topology. We provide rigorous proofs of correctness for this eventual convergence and demonstrate its applicability and efficiency through experiments.

Keywords: Time-varying networks; Distributed algorithms; Articulation points

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 Motivation and Literature Review

Analyzing and enhancing network robustness is crucial for ensuring the reliability of interconnected systems. A key aspect of robustness lies in a network's ability to withstand failures while maintaining overall connectivity. The failure of certain critical nodes, known as *articulation points* (APs) or *cut vertices*, can fragment a network into disconnected components (see Fig. 1). Therefore, *biconnectivity*, the property of a network to remain connected even after the removal of any single node, is a vital robustness metric. The identification of APs is the means for assessing network biconnectivity, providing an essential foundation for enhancing robustness in systems ranging from multi-robot networks (Shi et al., 2020; Restrepo and Giordano, 2024) to power grids (Tian et al., 2017; Cox and Considine, 2009) and social networks (Golbeck, 2015; Tulu et al., 2018).

The challenge of AP identification is amplified in time-varying networks, where edge additions and deletions are commonplace. These topological changes can instantly alter the set of APs. Consequently, network biconnectivity




Fig. 1. An undirected graph with 10 nodes. Red nodes with green circles represent APs, namely nodes 4, 5, and 7. Dashed lines represent bridges, namely edges (4, 5) and (4, 10). Edges in different biconnected components are depicted in different colors.

cannot be determined by a one-time calculation but must be continuously tracked.

Unfortunately, most existing algorithms for finding APs were designed for static graphs. Centralized algorithms, such as Tarjan's DFS-based method (Tarjan, 1972; Tarjan and Vishkin, 1984), are efficient but require global topology information, rendering them unsuitable for distributed networks. Early distributed approaches (Ahuja and Zhu, 1989; Liu et al., 2012; Dagdeviren and Akram, 2014) attempted to solve this by building global structures like spanning trees. While functional, these methods have two critical flaws in the context of dynamic networks. First,

[★] This work was supported by the National Natural Science Foundation of China under Grants U23B2060 and 62173294, and the Zhejiang Provincial Natural Science Foundation of China under Grant LZ24F030001. (Corresponding author: Ronghao Zheng.)

they often expose the global network structure and violate privacy. Second, their only recourse to a topological change is a global re-initialization, which is typically requiring time proportional to the network size (Ahuja and Zhu, 1989). Consequently, relying on global re-initialization renders the network’s information perpetually out-of-date in dynamic environments.

A more recent class of privacy-preserving methods employs the maximum consensus protocol (Nejad et al., 2009) to gather necessary topological information, such as reachability or distances, without reconstructing the full graph (Atman and Gusrialdi, 2021; Reed et al., 2023; Ramos et al., 2024). This line of work is highly relevant as it respects the privacy of individual nodes. For example, Venkateswaran et al. (2024) successfully leverages this approach to detect bridges (edges whose removal disconnects the undirected networks) using only local distance information. However, current research in this domain focuses primarily on static networks. Applying max-consensus protocol to time-varying networks requires mechanisms for incremental updates to avoid re-computation. Furthermore, the scope of AP identification is broader than bridge detection. While bridge endpoints are inherently APs, APs can also exist independent of any bridge (e.g., node 7 in Fig. 1).

While research on dynamic graph algorithms is active, it has primarily focused on centralized data structures for properties like biconnectivity (Holm et al., 2001, 2025) or related topological problems such as strongly connected components in directed graphs (Karczmarz and Smulewicz, 2024). In contrast, distributed and dynamic solutions are scarce. Therefore, a solution that combines distributed, privacy-preserving, and incremental updates for the specific problem of AP identification remains a significant gap.

1.2 Statement of Contributions

This work builds upon and extends our preliminary study (Xie et al., 2025). While Xie et al. (2025) established the distributed criterion for identifying APs in static networks, this paper introduces a novel dynamic distributed algorithm for AP identification and biconnectivity check in time-varying, undirected networks. Our algorithm builds upon the privacy-preserving max-consensus framework but introduces an incremental update protocol as a non-trivial extension.

Instead of global re-initialization, a change (e.g., edge deletion) generates a localized “flag” that propagates from the event’s location. This flag triggers localized recalculations of network state, such as reachability and distance metrics, only in the affected nodes, thereby allowing the network to converge to new, stable state values that nodes use to locally identify the correct set of APs.

The main contributions of this paper are twofold:

- We propose a distributed algorithm for AP identification in time-varying networks. The algorithm handles edge additions and deletions through localized, incremental updates, avoiding global re-initialization and reducing convergence overhead.

- We establish rigorous theoretical guarantees for eventual convergence to the correct AP set after any arbitrary sequence of topological changes, assuming a period of stability.

2. PROBLEM FORMULATION

In this section, we establish the graph theoretic foundations and notation. Note that *graph* and *network* are used interchangeably hereafter. Subsequently, we formalize the dynamic AP identification problem and review the necessary preliminaries on distributed estimation.

2.1 Notation and Graph Theory

An *undirected graph* is denoted by $\mathcal{G} = (\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{E})$ with a set of nodes $\mathcal{V} = \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$ and a set of edges $\mathcal{E} \subseteq \mathcal{V} \times \mathcal{V}$. The presence of an edge $(i, j) \in \mathcal{E}$ denotes that information can be mutually exchanged between i and j . The neighborhood set of node i is defined as $\mathcal{N}_i = \{j \in \mathcal{V} \mid (i, j) \in \mathcal{E}\}$.

A *path* between two nodes i_1 and i_p is a sequence of distinct nodes (i_1, i_2, \dots, i_p) where $p > 1$ and each consecutive pair $(i_q, i_{q+1}) \in \mathcal{E}$. The *shortest-path distance* between two nodes is the length of the shortest path connecting them, measured by the number of edges in the path. A *cycle* is a sequence of nodes $(i_1, i_2, \dots, i_p, i_1)$ where $p \geq 3$ and all nodes i_1, i_2, \dots, i_p are distinct. A graph \mathcal{G} is *connected* if there exists at least a path between any pair of distinct nodes. An *AP* is a node whose removal results in the disconnection of the graph. The *vertex connectivity* of a graph is the minimum number of nodes that must be removed to disconnect it, indicating its robustness to node failures. A graph with vertex connectivity 1 has at least one AP, while a *biconnected* graph with vertex connectivity 2 is robust in that it contains no APs and remains connected unless at least two nodes are removed. *Biconnected components* are maximal subgraphs in which every pair of nodes remains connected after removing any single node.

Within this paper, let \mathbb{R} be the set of real numbers and \mathbb{N} be the set of non-negative integers. For a given set \mathcal{N} , $|\mathcal{N}|$ denotes the number of elements in this set. The notation $\binom{\mathcal{N}}{2}$ represents the set of all unordered pairs of distinct elements from \mathcal{N} . The state associated with node i is represented using subscript notation. For example, the state $a \in \mathbb{R}^n$ for node i writes as a_i . The j -th element of the state a_i is denoted by a_{ij} .

2.2 Problem Settings

Consider a time-varying undirected network $\mathcal{G}[t] = (\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{E}[t])$, where \mathcal{V} is the fixed set of nodes and $\mathcal{E}[t]$ denotes the set of active edges at discrete time $t \in \mathbb{N}$. At each synchronous time t , immediate neighbors of node i are denoted by $\mathcal{N}_i[t] = \{j \in \mathcal{V} \mid (i, j) \in \mathcal{E}[t]\}$, and the inclusive neighbor set is denoted by $\bar{\mathcal{N}}_i[t] = \mathcal{N}_i[t] \cup \{i\}$. Each node i is aware of its own unique ID, the total number of nodes n^1 , and at any synchronous time t , it has access to the

¹ The exact total number of nodes n is not strictly necessary. A value \bar{n} exceeding the network diameter suffices to guarantee the termination and correctness of the distributed consensus protocols. Similar parameter relaxation is discussed in Atman and Gusrialdi (2024)

states of its neighbors from the previous time step $t - 1$, denoted by $\mathcal{N}_i[t - 1]$.

Within this framework, this paper’s objective is to develop a privacy-preserving distributed method that enables each node to identify whether it is an AP in the current graph $\mathcal{G}[t]$, and re-assess the overall biconnectivity of the network after topological changes.

2.3 Preliminaries on Distributed Estimation

To facilitate the subsequent analysis of time-varying topologies, we first establish the foundational distributed estimation protocols for static networks. We introduce the binary reachability state $x_i[t] = [x_{i1}[t], \dots, x_{in}[t]]^\top \in \mathbb{R}^n$ for checking if node i is reachable from other nodes (1 for reachable, 0 for unreachable), and the shortest-path distance state $d_i[t] = [d_{i1}[t], \dots, d_{in}[t]]^\top \in \mathbb{R}^n$ for estimating the distance from other nodes.

When the network is initialized at $t = 0$, nodes compute their states iteratively. Each node initializes its reachability state $x_i[0]$ and distance state $d_i[0]$ as

$$x_{ik}[0] = \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if } k = i, \\ 0, & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases} \quad d_{ik}[0] = \begin{cases} 0, & \text{if } k = i, \\ \infty, & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases}$$

and iteratively updates them via the standard max-consensus protocol at time t :

$$x_{ik}[t] = \max_{j \in \mathcal{N}_i[t]} x_{jk}[t - 1], \quad (1)$$

$$d_{ik}[t] = \begin{cases} d_{ik}[t - 1], & \text{if } x_{ik}[t] = x_{ik}[t - 1], \\ \min_{j \in \mathcal{N}_i[t-1]} (d_{jk}[t - 1] + 1), & \text{if } x_{ik}[t] > x_{ik}[t - 1]. \end{cases} \quad (2)$$

If the connected network with diameter D remains static for n iterations, the state x_{ik} converges to 1 and d_{ik} converges to the true shortest-path distance within D iterations (Venkateswaran et al., 2024).

Since the reachability state is binary, the maximum operation is functionally equivalent to the logical disjunction (Boolean OR). Consequently, the protocol (1) can be reformulated using the element-wise logical disjunction operator \vee as

$$x_i[t] = \bigvee_{j \in \mathcal{N}_i[t]} x_j[t - 1]. \quad (3)$$

3. INCREMENTAL UPDATE MECHANISM FOR TIME-VARYING NETWORKS

The identification of APs relies on nodes possessing correct reachability and distance states (Xie et al., 2025). This section presents a distributed algorithm to maintain these states through an incremental update mechanism. We adopt a update-correct architecture: nodes first estimate an intermediate state based on information from neighbors (Consensus), and subsequently adjust this state if a local edge change breaks the shortest path (Correction). This ensures that the final state preserves reachability when the modified edge was not part of the shortest path, while resetting the state if the change invalidates the current shortest path.

3.1 Change Flag Propagation

To facilitate the incremental update, we define the change flag to represent topological events. A change flag is defined as a tuple $\phi \triangleq (\text{type}, u, v, \tau)$, where $\text{type} \in \{\text{ADD}, \text{DELETE}\}$ indicates the event type, (u, v) denotes the incident nodes of the modified edge, and τ represents the generation timestamp. We treat (u, v) as an unordered pair, such that $(\text{type}, u, v) \equiv (\text{type}, v, u)$.

Each node i maintains a set of active change flags at time t , whether locally generated or received from neighbors, denoted by $\Phi_i[t]$. Let $\mathcal{H}_i[t]$ denote the historical set of all change flags encountered by node i up to time t , initialized as $\mathcal{H}_i[0] = \emptyset$.

At time t , node i receives flag sets from its neighbors. The set of newly received flags, denoted as $\tilde{\Phi}_i[t]$, is derived by excluding any flags that have already been processed:

$$\tilde{\Phi}_i[t] = \bigcup_{j \in \mathcal{N}_i[t-1]} \Phi_j[t - 1] \setminus \mathcal{H}_i[t - 1]. \quad (4)$$

The active flag set $\Phi_i[t]$ is initialized with these newly received flags:

$$\Phi_i[t] \leftarrow \tilde{\Phi}_i[t].$$

Note that this set will be further expanded to include locally generated flags in the subsequent correction step (Section 3.3).

The node updates its history set to include these newly received flags:

$$\mathcal{H}_i[t] = \mathcal{H}_i[t - 1] \cup \tilde{\Phi}_i[t]. \quad (5)$$

Remark 1. The timestamp τ ensures the uniqueness of flags generated by recurrent changes on the same edge. It facilitates garbage collection: since the propagation lifespan of a flag is bounded by the network diameter, nodes can safely purge records from \mathcal{H}_i that are older than a safety margin (e.g., n), thereby preventing unbounded memory growth.

Fig. 2 illustrates the generation of change flags when edge (i, j) is deleted at time t and edge (i, k) is added at time $t + 1$. At time t , node i and j generate the deletion flag $\phi_{i,j,\text{Del},t}$ and propagated to neighbors. At $t + 1$, the addition triggers an immediate state exchange (depicted by blue dashed arrows) and the generation of the addition flag $\phi_{i,k,\text{Add},t}$. Consequently, node i aggregates the received deletion flag $\phi_{j,i,\text{Del},t}$ and the locally generated addition flag $\phi_{i,k,\text{Add},t}$ into the active flag set $\Phi_i[t + 1]$.

3.2 Consensus Update Strategy

Based on the active flags $\Phi_i[t]$, nodes execute a consensus protocol to compute an *intermediate* reachability state, denoted by $\hat{x}_i[t]$. This state represents the estimate of reachability derived from neighbors’ states before accounting for instantaneous local topology changes.

The update follows one of three cases:

Case 1: (New Flags Arrived: $\Phi_i[t] \neq \emptyset$) Node i integrates information from both historical events and the newly received flags. This update process consists of three steps.




Fig. 2. Message flow diagram characterizing the network response to the deletion of edge (i, j) at time t and the addition of edge (i, k) at time $t + 1$.

First, it computes a historical reachability state $\bar{x}_i[t]$ based on historical information. Node i computes an intermediate state $\bar{x}_i[t]$ by performing an element-wise logical disjunction (Boolean OR) with these neighbors:

$$\bar{x}_i[t] = \bigvee_{j \in \mathcal{N}_i^{hist} \cup \{i\}} x_j[t-1]. \quad (6)$$

where $\mathcal{N}_i^{hist} = \{j \in \mathcal{N}_i[t-1] \mid \Phi_j[t-1] \cap \mathcal{H}_i[t-1] \neq \emptyset\}$ denotes the subset of neighbors propagating flags that are already present in node i 's history set $\mathcal{H}_i[t-1]$. This operation ensures that node i performs the standard maximum value update along the propagation path of the old flags, thereby incorporating the updated reachability information from neighbors that have already adapted to previous topological changes.

Second, the algorithm processes the newly received flag set $\tilde{\Phi}_i[t]$. For each unique new flag $\phi \in \tilde{\Phi}_i[t]$, the node identifies the set of neighbors $\mathcal{S}(\phi)$ that are carrying that flag, i.e., $\mathcal{S}(\phi) = \{j \in \mathcal{N}_i[t-1] \mid \phi \in \Phi_j[t-1]\}$. An intra-flag aggregation is performed across the set of neighbors $\mathcal{S}(\phi)$ transmitting that specific flag. This computes the maximum reachability supported by the sources of the flag ϕ , denoted as x_ϕ :

$$x_\phi = \bigvee_{j \in \mathcal{S}(\phi)} x_j[t-1]. \quad (7)$$

To account for concurrent topology changes, an inter-flag aggregation intersects reachability state of all events reported by the new flags $\phi \in \tilde{\Phi}_i[t]$ using the element-wise logical conjunction (Boolean AND). The constraint reachability vector is updated as

$$\tilde{x}_i[t] = \bigwedge_{\phi \in \tilde{\Phi}_i[t]} x_\phi, \quad (8)$$

where \bigwedge denotes the element-wise logical conjunction.

Lemma 2. Under the update rules defined by (7) and (8), node i retains reachability to destination k (indicated by $\tilde{x}_{ik}[t] = 1$) if and only if, for every change flag ϕ detected, there exists at least one neighbor j transmitting this flag maintains reachability to k (i.e., $x_{jk}[t-1] = 1$).

Proof. See Appendix B for the derivation.

Finally, the intermediate reachability state $\hat{x}_i[t]$ is the intersection of the historical reachability state from the

first step and the constraint vector from the second step:

$$\hat{x}_i[t] = \bar{x}_i[t] \wedge \tilde{x}_i[t]. \quad (9)$$

This logic ensures that the impact of new topological changes (encoded in $\tilde{x}_i[t]$) overrides the historical state $\bar{x}_i[t]$. Specifically, if $\tilde{x}_{ik}[t]$ becomes zero due to a new edge change, $\hat{x}_{ik}[t]$ transitions to zero regardless of the historical value. Conversely, if the new change does not affect the shortest path to a destination, the reachability established by the historical update is preserved.

Example 3. Consider node i with neighbors $\mathcal{N}_i[t-1] = \mathcal{N}_i[t] = \{j, k, l\}$ and a destination m , where the reachability states at time $t-1$ are $x_{im}[t-1] = 0$, $x_{jm}[t-1] = 1$, $x_{km}[t-1] = 0$, and $x_{lm}[t-1] = 1$. Node i retains a historical flag ϕ_A in $\mathcal{H}_i[t-1]$. At time t , it receives active flag sets from its neighbors: $\Phi_j[t-1] = \{\phi_A, \phi_B\}$, $\Phi_k[t-1] = \{\phi_B\}$, and $\Phi_l[t-1] = \{\phi_C\}$.

The update process at node i proceeds as follows: Node i identifies neighbor j as a historical source ($j \in \mathcal{N}_i^{hist}$) because $\Phi_j[t-1] \cap \mathcal{H}_i[t-1] = \{\phi_A\} \neq \emptyset$. Consequently, the intermediate historical state is computed via (6) as

$$\bar{x}_{im}[t] = x_{im}[t-1] \vee x_{jm}[t-1] = 0 \vee 1 = 1.$$

Second, node i identifies the newly received flag set $\tilde{\Phi}_i[t] = \{\phi_B, \phi_C\}$. For ϕ_B , which is transmitted by j, k , the intra-flag aggregation via (7) yields $x_{\phi_B} = x_{jm}[t-1] \vee x_{km}[t-1] = 1 \vee 0 = 1$. For ϕ_C , transmitted solely by l , the aggregation yields $x_{\phi_C} = x_{lm}[t-1] = 1$. These individual flag states are then intersected via (8):

$$\tilde{x}_{im}[t] = x_{\phi_B} \wedge x_{\phi_C} = 1 \wedge 1 = 1.$$

Finally, the updated reachability state is determined by intersecting the historical state with the new constraints via (9), resulting in

$$\hat{x}_{im}[t] = \bar{x}_{im}[t] \wedge \tilde{x}_{im}[t] = 1 \wedge 1 = 1.$$

In this scenario, despite neighbor k reporting unreachability under flag ϕ_B , the alternative path through j (also carrying ϕ_B) ensures that reachability to m is maintained.

Case 2: (No New Flags, Old Flag Held: $\Phi_i[t] = \emptyset \wedge \Phi_i[t-1] \neq \emptyset$) If no new flags arrive and node i still holds unpropagated flags from a previous step ($\Phi_i[t-1] \neq \emptyset$), its state must remain constant for one more iteration

$$\hat{x}_i[t] \leftarrow \hat{x}_i[t-1].$$

Case 3: (No New Flags, No Old Flag Held: $\Phi_i[t] = \emptyset \wedge \Phi_i[t-1] = \emptyset$) If no new flags arrive and the node has no local active flags, it performs a standard max-consensus protocol (3) to calculate the intermediate reachability state $\hat{x}_i[t]$. This allows the algorithm to re-establish connectivity and shortest paths for nodes not directly impacted by the change flags.

Following the reachability calculation, an intermediate distance state $\hat{d}_i[t]$ is synchronized using a general distance update protocol:

$$\hat{d}_{ik}[t] = \begin{cases} d_{ik}[t-1], & \text{if } x_{ik}[t] = x_{ik}[t-1], \\ \infty, & \text{if } x_{ik}[t] = 0 \\ & \wedge x_{ik}[t-1] = 1, \\ 1 + \min_{j \in \mathcal{N}_i[t-1]} d_{jk}[t-1], & \text{if } x_{ik}[t] = 1 \\ & \wedge x_{ik}[t-1] = 0. \end{cases} \quad (10)$$

This protocol handles three scenarios: persistence of valid paths when the reachability state is unchanged; reset to ∞ when reachability is lost ($1 \rightarrow 0$); and re-calculation of the new shortest path when reachability is established ($0 \rightarrow 1$).

3.3 Change Detection and Local State Correction

The intermediate states ($\hat{x}_i[t], \hat{d}_i[t]$) are derived based on the topology at $t-1$. However, if topological changes occur at time t , these estimates must be corrected. Let $\Delta\mathcal{E}_i[t]$ denote the set of local topology changes detected by node i at time t :

$$\Delta\mathcal{E}_i[t] = \{(\text{type}, i, j) \mid \text{edge } (i, j) \text{ has changed}\}.$$

If $\Delta\mathcal{E}_i[t] \neq \emptyset$, the node executes a correction procedure.

For each detected change $(\text{type}, i, j) \in \Delta\mathcal{E}_i[t]$, node i evaluates whether the change invalidates the current path estimation. This evaluation relies on the *distance difference metric* $\Delta_i^j[t]$, calculated using the states from the previous time step $t-1$ ²:

$$\Delta_i^j[t] = d_i[t-1] - d_j[t-1]. \quad (11)$$

If either $d_i[t-1] = \infty$ or $d_j[t-1] = \infty$, $\Delta_i^j[t]$ is set to ∞ .

Based on this metric, the final reachability state $x_{ik}[t]$ is determined by applying a correction rule to the intermediate state $\hat{x}_{ik}[t]$:

$$x_{ik}[t] = \begin{cases} \hat{x}_{ik}[t], & \text{if } \Delta_i^j[t] \leq 0, \\ 0, & \text{if } \Delta_i^j[t] > 0. \end{cases} \quad (12)$$

The distance state $d_i[t]$ is synchronized with the corrected reachability. $d_{ik}[t]$ is reset to ∞ if $x_{ik}[t]$ is invalidated to 0, and retains the intermediate value $\hat{d}_{ik}[t]$ otherwise.

The correction rule (12) serves as a conservative invalidation mechanism based on the topological relationship between nodes k , i , and j , as illustrated in Fig. 3. Intuitively, if $\Delta_i^j[t] \leq 0$, node k is closer to i than to j . This implies that the shortest path from k to i does not utilize edge (i, j) ; thus, its modification does not affect the current state x_{ik} (see Figs. 3a and 3b). Conversely, if $\Delta_i^j[t] > 0$, edge (i, j) either constitutes the final hop of the shortest path (in deletion) or introduces a potential shortcut (in addition), necessitating a state reset to force re-evaluation (see Figs. 3c and 3d). A detailed derivation of this rationale is provided in Appendix A.

Simultaneously, a unique change flag $\phi = (\text{type}, i, j, t)$ is generated for this change event and added to the locally generated flag set $\Delta\Phi_i[t]$. After processing all local changes, the active flag set $\Phi_i[t]$ is updated by determining




Fig. 3. Illustration of the local state correction logic. Wavy lines represent multi-hop paths (d_{ik}, d_{jk}), distinguishing them from the direct edge (i, j) with unit weight being added (solid blue) or deleted (dashed red).

the union of locally generated flag set $\Delta\Phi_i[t]$ and newly received flag set $\tilde{\Phi}_i[t]$:

$$\Phi_i[t] = \tilde{\Phi}_i[t] \cup \Delta\Phi_i[t]. \quad (13)$$

If no local changes are detected ($\Delta\mathcal{E}_i[t] = \emptyset$), the intermediate states are adopted as final, i.e., $x_i[t] = \hat{x}_i[t]$ and $d_i[t] = \hat{d}_i[t]$.

The complete execution procedure for calculating the updated states and generating the set of local flags is presented in Algorithm 1.

Algorithm 1 Local State Update on Edge Change for Node i at Time t

```

1: procedure ONEEDGECHANGE( $\Delta\mathcal{E}_i[t], \hat{x}_i[t], \hat{d}_i[t]$ )
2:    $\Delta\Phi_i[t] \leftarrow \emptyset$ 
3:   /* Process all local changes sequentially */
4:   for all  $(\text{type}, i, j) \in \Delta\mathcal{E}_i[t]$  do
5:     if  $\text{type} == \text{ADD}$  then
6:       Receive  $d_j[t-1]$  from new neighbor  $j$       ▷
       Immediate handshake
7:     else                                          ▷ DELETE
8:       Retrieve  $d_j[t-1]$  from local memory
9:     end if
10:    Compute  $\Delta_i^j[t]$  via (11)
11:    Update  $x_i[t]$  via (12)
12:     $\phi \leftarrow (\text{type}, i, j, t)$       ▷ Create unique event flag
13:     $\Delta\Phi_i[t] \leftarrow \Delta\Phi_i[t] \cup \{\phi\}$ 
14:  end for
15:  Set  $d_{ik}[t] \leftarrow \infty$  if  $x_{ik}[t] = 0$ , else  $d_{ik}[t] \leftarrow \hat{d}_{ik}[t]$ 
16:  return  $x_i[t], d_i[t], \Delta\Phi_i[t]$ 
17: end procedure

```

3.4 Algorithm and Analysis

The complete distributed protocol integrates the flag propagation mechanism (Sec. 3.1), the consensus update strat-

² Note that for edge addition, $d_j[t-1]$ is obtained via an immediate handshake with the new neighbor; for deletion, $d_j[t-1]$ is retrieved from local memory.

egy (Sec. 3.2), and the local change detection (Sec. 3.3). Algorithm 2 outlines the execution flow at a generic node i during time step t . In each iteration, nodes first exchange information with neighbors to update their flag sets, reachability states and distance states, and subsequently handle any locally detected topological events. Following the algorithmic description, we provide the theoretical convergence analysis.

Algorithm 2 Distributed Reachability and Distance Update for Node i at Time t

Input: Previous states $x_j[t-1], d_j[t-1], \Phi_j[t-1]$ for all $j \in \bar{\mathcal{N}}_i[t-1]$; State history $\mathcal{H}_i[t-1]$; Set of local changes $\Delta\mathcal{E}_i[t]$

Output: Updated states $x_i[t], d_i[t]$

/* Change Flag Propagation */

- 1: Calculate newly received flag set $\tilde{\Phi}_i[t]$ via (4)
- 2: Initialize active flag set $\Phi_i[t] \leftarrow \tilde{\Phi}_i[t]$

/* Consensus Update Strategy */

- 3: **if** $\Phi_i[t] \neq \emptyset$ **then** ▷ Case 1: New flags arrived
- 4: Calculate intermediate state \bar{x}_i via (6)
- 5: Calculate intra-flag aggregation x_ϕ via (7)
- 6: Calculate inter-flag aggregation \tilde{x}_i via (8)
- 7: $\hat{x}_i[t] \leftarrow \bar{x}_i \wedge \tilde{x}_i$ ▷ Intermediate reachability
- 8: **else if** $\Phi_i[t-1] \neq \emptyset$ **then** ▷ Case 2: Old flag held
- 9: $\hat{x}_i[t] \leftarrow x_i[t-1]$ ▷ Local flag persistence
- 10: **else** ▷ Case 3: No new flags, no old flag held
- 11: $\hat{x}_i[t] = \bigvee_{j \in \bar{\mathcal{N}}_i[t]} x_j[t-1]$
- 12: **end if**

/* Distance State Update */

- 13: Update $\hat{d}_i[t]$ based on $\hat{x}_i[t]$ via (10)

/* Local State Correction on Edge Change */

- 14: **if** $\Delta\mathcal{E}_i[t] \neq \emptyset$ **then** ▷ Change events detected
- 15: $[x_i[t], d_i[t], \Delta\Phi_i[t]] \leftarrow$
- 16: $\text{ONEDGECHANGE}(\Delta\mathcal{E}_i[t], \hat{x}_i[t], \hat{d}_i[t])$
- 17: $\Phi_i[t] \leftarrow \tilde{\Phi}_i[t] \cup \Delta\Phi_i[t]$ ▷ Merge locally generated flags
- 18: **else**
- 19: $x_i[t] \leftarrow \hat{x}_i[t]$ ▷ No local change, keep intermediate
- 20: $d_i[t] \leftarrow \hat{d}_i[t]$
- 21: **end if**
- 22: Update history $\mathcal{H}_i[t]$ via (5)
- 23: Send out $x_i[t], d_i[t], \Phi_i[t]$ to all neighbors $\mathcal{N}_i[t]$

Theorem 4. (Dynamic Re-convergence). Consider a network $\mathcal{G}[t]$ undergoing an arbitrary sequence of topological changes. If the topology remains unchanged for an interval of $2n$ communication rounds starting from time T , the algorithm guarantees convergence to the correct values $(x^*[T], d^*[T])$ of $\mathcal{G}[T]$ within at most $2n$ communication rounds.

Proof. The complete proof is presented in Appendix C.

Remark 5. Unlike static algorithms that require specific initialization (e.g., $d_i = \infty$ for all nodes), our algorithm recovers the correct states from any arbitrary state configuration resulting from prior events, without requiring global re-initialization.

3.5 Privacy Preservation

The incremental update mechanism inherits the privacy-preserving properties of the max-consensus protocol.

Nodes only exchange state vectors x_i, d_i and flags ϕ , never their adjacency lists \mathcal{N}_i . As demonstrated in Fig. 4, this information is insufficient for a node to reconstruct the topology outside their 2-hop range.

Take node 2 as an example in Fig. 1. The distance state d_2 converges to

$$d_2 = [1, 0, 1, 1, 2, 3, 3, 4, 4, 2].$$

Node 2 receives the converged distance states from its neighbors $\mathcal{N}_2 = \{1, 3, 4\}$, i.e.,

$$d_1 = d_3 = [1, 0, 1, 1, 2, 3, 3, 4, 4, 2],$$

$$d_4 = [1, 1, 1, 0, 1, 2, 2, 3, 3, 1].$$

Based solely on the information at node 2 after convergence, i.e., d_1, d_2, d_3, d_4 , the topology beyond the 2-hop neighbors cannot be determined. Specifically, the connections between node 5 and 10, as well as the connections among nodes 5, 6, 7, 8, 9 remain unknown. As demonstrated in Fig. 4, two distinct topologies can result in identical distance state at node 2.




Fig. 4. Compared to Fig. 1, the two topologies differ in the addition of edge (5, 10), the removal of edge (6, 7), and other edge variations, yet both maintain the same distance state at node 2. The notation $i(j)$ indicates that i and j are interchangeable nodes.

4. DISTRIBUTED AP IDENTIFICATION IN TIME-VARYING NETWORKS

This section details the procedure for a node to determine its AP status. Unlike static algorithms that execute a single computation pass, our dynamic framework triggers AP identification when the node reaches a stable local state.

4.1 Trigger Condition

Node i starts the identification algorithm at time t if and only if two stability conditions are met:

- (1) The node holds no change flags ($\Phi_i[t] = \emptyset$) and receives no flags from any neighbor ($\Phi_j[t-1] = \emptyset, \forall j \in \mathcal{N}_i[t-1]$).
- (2) Its local reachability and distance vectors remain unchanged from the previous step ($x_i[t] = x_i[t-1]$ and $d_i[t] = d_i[t-1]$).

If a new flag arrives subsequently, the node resumes the incremental update process via Algorithm 2 and re-evaluates its status once stability is regained. Given that the identification process operates under these stable conditions, the time index t is omitted in the subsequent description for brevity.

4.2 Identification Criterion and Biconnectivity Check

Once the local state stabilizes, node i applies the distributed criterion established in our preliminary work (Xie et al., 2025). This method utilizes the local distance states to infer the connectivity of the node's neighborhood.

We define \mathcal{P}_i as the set of neighbor pairs $\{j, k\}$ that satisfy the sufficient conditions for belonging to a common cycle containing i, j , and k . As derived in Xie et al. (2025), this set is constructed locally using the distance difference metric Δ (Eq. (11)):

$$\mathcal{P}_i = \left\{ \{j, k\} \in \binom{\mathcal{N}_i}{2} \mid \begin{array}{l} \Delta_{ik}^j = \Delta_{ij}^k = 0, \text{ or} \\ \exists p \in \mathcal{V} \setminus \mathcal{N}_i, \Delta_{ip}^j \geq 0 \wedge \Delta_{ip}^k \geq 0 \end{array} \right\}. \quad (14)$$

Based on this set, the node determines its AP status via the following theorem.

Theorem 6. (Xie et al., 2025). A node i is not an AP if and only if there exists a set \mathcal{Q}_i such that:

- (1) $\mathcal{Q}_i \subseteq \mathcal{P}_i$;
- (2) The Union-Find structure derived from \mathcal{Q}_i connects all neighbors in \mathcal{N}_i into a single component (i.e., $|\mathcal{C}_i| = 1$);
- (3) \mathcal{Q}_i covers all nodes in \mathcal{N}_i .

Beyond local self-identification, this framework naturally extends to monitoring global network biconnectivity. As detailed in Xie et al. (2025), by employing an auxiliary boolean state variable propagated via the standard max-consensus protocol, nodes can aggregate the identification results. The network is assessed as biconnected if and only if the consensus result indicates that no node has identified itself as an articulation point.

5. SIMULATION EXPERIMENTS

The simulations are based on the 10-node network shown in Fig. 1. To quantify correctness, a ground truth was established. For any time step t , the ground truth $(x^*[t], d^*[t])$ represents the theoretically correct states corresponding to the instantaneous network topology $\mathcal{G}[t]$. The performance metric is the state error, defined as the L1 norm between the algorithm's instantaneous state $x[t]$ and the ground truth state $x^*[t]$. An error of zero signifies convergence to the correct state:

$$\text{Error}[t] = \sum_{i \in \mathcal{V}} \sum_{k \in \mathcal{V}} |x_{ik}[t] - x_{ik}^*[t]|$$

In the simulation, consistent with the distributed protocol, each node independently triggers the AP identification procedure upon detecting local stability, i.e., empty flag sets and constant local states.

The algorithm's performance was first evaluated under elementary topological changes, representing isolated link failure ("bad news") and establishment ("good news") events.

In a single-edge deletion scenario, the edge (2,4) was removed at $t = 5$, as illustrated in Fig. 5a. As shown in the convergence plot Fig. 5b, this event induced an immediate state error. The propagation of the deletion flag triggered the Case 1 update, and the error was observed to converge

to zero within 6 steps. Once local stability was regained, each node verified that the set of APs remained unchanged as $\{4, 5, 7\}$ with the distributed identification criterion.




Fig. 5. Experimental results for single edge deletion event at $t = 5$.

A complementary experiment, involving the addition of a "shortcut" edge (9,10), produced a similar result, as shown in Fig. 6a. The flag generated by this addition triggered updates that incorporated the new path, with the network converging to the new states in 5 steps as shown in Fig. 6b. Once local stability was regained, each node correctly updated the AP set from $\{4, 5, 7\}$ to $\{4\}$, successfully detecting the elimination of APs 5 and 7.




Fig. 6. Experimental results for single edge addition event at $t = 5$.

Further validation involved testing the algorithm's handling of concurrent events. We simulated a sequence of rapid changes summarized in Fig. 7a: edges (2,4) and (7,8) were deleted at $t = 5$, edges (9,10) and (1,10) were added at $t = 8$, and edges (6,7) and (3,4) were deleted at $t = 10$. As depicted in Fig. 7b, the algorithm remained robust and




Fig. 7. Experimental results for concurrent edge addition and deletion events between $t = 5$ and $t = 10$.

guaranteed convergence to the correct final state at $t = 21$. Each node updated the AP set from $\{4, 5, 7\}$ to $\{1, 2, 4, 9\}$.

To provide a more stressful test of the algorithm’s robustness, we simulated an “event storm” scenario on a 20-node Barabási-Albert (BA) network (Fig. 8a). This test involved high-frequency random changes occurring between $t = 5$ to $t = 12$. During this window, a random topological change (either an edge addition or deletion) was initiated at each time step. After $t_{final} = 12$, the topology was held static. The results of a single realization are shown in Fig. 8b. The state error increased during $t \in [5, 12]$ as new state errors were continually introduced by the rapid changes. After the storm stopped at $t_{final} = 12$, the algorithm processed all remaining flags and the state error rapidly converged to zero.




Fig. 8. Experimental results on the 20-node BA network subjected to random changes between $t = 5$ and $t = 12$.

6. CONCLUSION

This paper presents a fully distributed framework for identifying articulation points in time-varying undirected networks. By introducing an incremental update mechanism to the max-consensus protocol, our algorithm efficiently adapts to topological changes without requiring global re-initialization. Theoretical analysis confirms that the algorithm guarantees eventual convergence to the correct network state provided the topology remains static for a finite interval. Furthermore, the proposed approach inherently preserves privacy, as nodes determine their status using only distance vectors without reconstructing the global topology. Future work will focus on extending this framework to asynchronous communication environments and investigating its applicability to directed graphs.

REFERENCES

- Ahuja, M. and Zhu, Y. (1989). An efficient distributed algorithm for finding articulation points, bridges, and biconnected components in asynchronous networks. In *Foundations of Software Technology and Theoretical Computer Science*, 99–108.
- Atman, M.W.S. and Gusrialdi, A. (2021). Distributed algorithms for verifying and ensuring strong connectivity of directed networks. In *2021 60th IEEE Conference on Decision and Control (CDC)*, 4798–4803.
- Atman, M.W.S. and Gusrialdi, A. (2024). A distributed algorithm to establish strong connectivity in spatially distributed networks via estimation of strongly connected components. In *2024 European Control Conference (ECC)*, 2493–2499.
- Cox, W.T. and Considine, T. (2009). Architecturally significant interfaces for the smart grid. In *Grid-Interop Forum*.
- Dagdeviren, O. and Akram, V.K. (2014). An energy-efficient distributed cut vertex detection algorithm for wireless sensor networks. *The Computer Journal*, 57(12), 1852–1869.
- Golbeck, J. (2015). Analyzing networks. In *Introduction to Social Media Investigation*, 221–235. Syngress.
- Holm, J., de Lichtenberg, K., and Thorup, M. (2001). Poly-logarithmic deterministic fully-dynamic algorithms for connectivity, minimum spanning tree, 2-edge, and biconnectivity. *J. ACM*, 48, 723–760.
- Holm, J., Nadara, W., Rotenberg, E., and Sokolowski, M. (2025). Fully dynamic biconnectivity in $\tilde{O}(\log^2 n)$ time. *Proceedings of the 57th Annual ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing*.
- Karczmarz, A. and Smulewicz, M. (2024). Fully Dynamic Strongly Connected Components in Planar Digraphs. In *51st International Colloquium on Automata, Languages, and Programming (ICALP 2024)*, volume 297 of *Leibniz International Proceedings in Informatics (LIPIcs)*, 95:1–95:20.
- Liu, X., Xiao, L., and Kreling, A. (2012). A fully distributed method to detect and reduce cut vertices in large-scale overlay networks. *IEEE Transactions on Computers*, 61(7), 969–985.
- Nejad, B.M., Attia, S.A., and Raisch, J. (2009). Max-consensus in a max-plus algebraic setting: The case of fixed communication topologies. In *2009 XXII International Symposium on Information, Communication and Automation Technologies*, 1–7.
- Ramos, G., Poças, D., and Pequito, S. (2024). Distributed graph augmentation protocols to achieve strong connectivity in multi-agent networks.
- Reed, E.A., Ramos, G., Bogdan, P., and Pequito, S. (2023). A scalable distributed dynamical systems approach to learn the strongly connected components and diameter of networks. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, 68(5), 3099–3106.
- Restrepo, E. and Giordano, P.R. (2024). A distributed strategy for generalized biconnectivity maintenance in open multi-robot systems. In *2024 IEEE 63rd Conference on Decision and Control (CDC)*, 3043–3050.
- Shi, G., Rabban, I.E., and Tokekar, P. (2020). Fast biconnectivity restoration in multi-robot systems for robust communication maintenance. *CoRR*, abs/2011.00685.
- Tarjan, R. and Vishkin, U. (1984). Finding biconnected components and computing tree functions in logarithmic parallel time. In *25th Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science, 1984.*, 12–20.
- Tarjan, R. (1972). Depth-first search and linear graph algorithms. *SIAM Journal on Computing*, 1(2), 146–160.
- Tian, L., Bashan, A., Shi, D.N., and Liu, Y.Y. (2017). Articulation points in complex networks. *Nature Communications*, 8(1).
- Tulu, M.M., Hou, R., and Younas, T. (2018). Identifying influential nodes based on community structure to speed up the dissemination of information in complex network. *IEEE Access*, 6, 7390–7401.
- Venkateswaran, D.B., Qu, Z., and Gusrialdi, A. (2024). A distributed method for detecting critical edges and

increasing edge connectivity in undirected networks. In *2024 IEEE 63rd Conference on Decision and Control (CDC)*, 6951–6956.

Xie, X., Zheng, R., Zhang, S., and Liu, M. (2025). A distributed method for identifying articulation points in undirected networks. In *2025 IEEE 64th Conference on Decision and Control (CDC)*. To appear.

Appendix A. DESIGN RATIONALE FOR LOCAL STATE UPDATE ON EDGE CHANGE

The state update (12) at the incident nodes i and j immediately after a change is a conservative invalidation mechanism. It is designed to immediately reset any state x_{ik} that is potentially invalidated by the modification of edge (i, j) , while preserving any state that is unaffected. The decision relies on the distance difference Δ_{ik}^j , which evaluates the topological relationship between nodes k , i , and j .

First, we consider the case where $\Delta_{ik}^j \leq 0$, meaning node k is closer to (or equidistant from) i than to j . If an edge is added (see Fig. 3a), a new potential path (k, \dots, j, i) is created with length $d_{jk} + 1$. From the case condition, we have $d_{ik} \leq d_{jk} < d_{jk} + 1$. This means the new path is strictly longer than the existing shortest path(s). If an edge is deleted (see Fig. 3b), we analyze if any shortest path from k to i , P_{ki} , could have used the edge (j, i) as its final hop. If it did, its length would be $d_{ik} = d_{jk} + 1$. This directly contradicts the case condition $d_{ik} \leq d_{jk}$. Therefore, no shortest path from k to i utilized the edge (i, j) , and its removal does not affect the shortest-path structure. In both scenarios, the shortest-path structure (both distance and path set) from k to i is provably unaffected by the change. Therefore, The state x_{ik} remains valid.

Second, we consider the case where $\Delta_{ik}^j > 0$, meaning node k was closer to j than to i . If an edge is added (see Fig. 3c), a new path (k, \dots, j, i) (length $d_{jk} + 1$) is introduced. The new shortest path distance will be $\min(d_{ik}, d_{jk} + 1)$. Since $d_{ik} > d_{jk}$, it is possible that $d_{jk} + 1 \leq d_{ik}$. This means the shortest path distance may decrease, or new shortest paths may be formed. If an edge is deleted (see Fig. 3d), the edge (i, j) must have existed. By the triangle inequality, $d_{ik} \leq d_{jk} + 1$. Combining this with the case condition $d_{ik} > d_{jk}$ forces the exact equality $d_{ik} = d_{jk} + 1$. This equality proves that the path (k, \dots, j, i) (where (k, \dots, j) is a shortest path) is a shortest path from k to i . Deleting the edge (i, j) breaks this path, thus invalidating x_{ik} . In both situations, the shortest-path structure that x_{ik} was based on is now invalid. The state x_{ik} is therefore conservatively reset to 0, forcing a re-evaluation of this reachability through subsequent consensus iterations.

Appendix B. PROOF OF LEMMA 2

Consider the k -th component of the reachability vectors, corresponding to destination k . First, Equation (7) computes the component $(x_\phi)_k = \max_{j \in \mathcal{S}(\phi)} x_{jk}[t-1]$. By the definition of logical disjunction, $(x_\phi)_k$ evaluates to 1 if and only if the set $\{j \in \mathcal{S}(\phi) \mid x_{jk}[t-1] = 1\}$ is non-empty. This implies that for the specific event ϕ , at least one neighbor j among those propagating ϕ is capable of

reaching k . Second, Equation (8) computes \tilde{x}_{ik} using a logical conjunction (\wedge) over all active flags $\phi \in \Phi_i[t]$. By the definition of logical conjunction, \tilde{x}_{ik} remains 1 if and only if $(x_\phi)_k = 1$ for every ϕ . Combining these two steps, the condition $\tilde{x}_{ik}[t] = 1$ holds if and only if for every detected event ϕ , there is a neighbor j such that $x_{jk}[t-1] = 1$. \square

Appendix C. PROOF OF THEOREM 4

To prove Theorem 4, we analyze the evolution of the states $(x[t], d[t])$ within the static interval $[T, T + 2n]$.

First, we address the extinction of change flags within the interval $(T, T + n]$. Let D be the diameter of the network, bounded by n . Any change flag ϕ existing in the network at time T propagates one hop per time step via (4) and is recorded in the history set \mathcal{H} via (5). Since \mathcal{H} prevents reprocessing, every flag exists in the active set Φ of any node for exactly one time step. Consequently, by time $T_{\text{purge}} = T + n$, all flags generated at or before T will have traversed the network and been purged from all active sets.

During the propagation, the algorithm ensures that all invalid distances are reset through local correction and consensus propagation. Consider a local edge change occurring at $t \leq T$ that invalidates a path, the local state correction step detects this via the metric calculated via (11) and accordingly resets the reachability state x via (12), which in turn forces the distance state d to ∞ . For nodes not incident to the change, the invalidation propagates via flags. Suppose the shortest path from i to k is affected by a topological event ϕ at or before T . When the ϕ reaches node i at time $t \leq T_{\text{purge}}$, the neighbor j on the affected path has already set $x_{jk}[t-1] = 0$. Consequently, the condition in Lemma 2 is violated. The inter-flag aggregation (8) yields $\tilde{x}_{ik}[t] = 0$ and (9) updates $\hat{x}_{ik}[t] = \bar{x}_{ik}[t] \wedge 0 = 0$. This $1 \rightarrow 0$ transition triggers the distance reset condition in (10), forcing $\hat{d}_{ik}[t] \rightarrow \infty$. Therefore, by time T_{purge} , all reachability states x and distances d corresponding to paths invalidated by prior events are correctly reset to 0 and ∞ , respectively.

Consider a node i that has a valid path to k exists, but currently $x_{ik}[t-1] = 0, d_{ik}[t-1] = \infty$. Any neighbor j that has already processed the relevant flags is considered a historical source. According to (6), if such a neighbor has a valid path $(x_{jk}[t-1] = 1)$, it drives $\bar{x}_{ik}[t] \rightarrow 1$. Since no new active flags exist to block this update (i.e., $\tilde{x}_{ik}[t] = 1$), the final state becomes $x_{ik}[t] = 1$. This $0 \rightarrow 1$ transition triggers the distance update $d_{ik}[t] = 1 + \min_{j \in \mathcal{N}_i} d_{jk}[t-1]$ defined in Eq. (10). By induction, if a neighbor j has converged to the true shortest path distance $L-1$ at time $t-1$, node i computes $d_{ik}[t] = 1 + (L-1) = L$. Since no neighbor can offer a distance less than $L-1$, the value $d_{ik}[t] = L$ is correct.

Since the maximum shortest path length is bounded by n , all nodes converge to the correct distance d^* within at most n additional steps via (2) after T_{purge} . The total convergence time is the sum of the flag purge duration and the relaxation duration, bounded by $2n$. Therefore, after $2n$ rounds (i.e., at time $T + 2n$), the states (x, d) are guaranteed to converge to the correct states of $\mathcal{G}[T]$. \square