

Complexity of modification problems for best match graphs

David Schaller^{1,2}, Peter F. Stadler¹⁻⁵, and Marc Hellmuth^{6,7}

¹Max Planck Institute for Mathematics in the Sciences, Inselstraße 22, D-04103 Leipzig, Germany

²Bioinformatics Group, Department of Computer Science & Interdisciplinary Center for Bioinformatics, Universität Leipzig, Härtelstraße 16–18, D-04107 Leipzig, Germany.

³Institute for Theoretical Chemistry, University of Vienna, Währingerstrasse 17, A-1090 Wien, Austria

⁴Facultad de Ciencias, Universidad Nacional de Colombia, Sede Bogotá, Colombia

⁵Santa Fe Insitute, 1399 Hyde Park Rd., Santa Fe NM 87501, USA

⁶School of Computing, University of Leeds, EC Stoner Building, Leeds LS2 9JT, UK

⁷Department of Mathematics, Faculty of Science, Stockholm University, SE - 106 91 Stockholm, Sweden
mhellmuth@mailbox.org

Abstract

Best match graphs (BMGs) are vertex-colored directed graphs that were introduced to model the relationships of genes (vertices) from different species (colors) given an underlying evolutionary tree that is assumed to be unknown. In real-life applications, BMGs are estimated from sequence similarity data. Measurement noise and approximation errors usually result in empirically determined graphs that in general violate characteristic properties of BMGs. The arc modification problems for BMGs aim at correcting such violations and thus provide a means to improve the initial estimates of best match data. We show here that the arc deletion, arc completion and arc editing problems for BMGs are NP-complete and that they can be formulated and solved as integer linear programs. To this end, we provide a novel characterization of BMGs in terms of triples (binary trees on three leaves) and a characterization of BMGs with two colors in terms of forbidden subgraphs.

Keywords: Best matches, Graph modification, NP-hardness, Integer linear program, Forbidden subgraphs, Rooted triples

1 Introduction

Best match graphs (BMGs) appear in mathematical biology as formal description of the evolutionary relationships within a gene family. Each vertex x represents a gene and is “colored” by the species $\sigma(x)$ in which it resides. A directed arc connects a gene x with its closest relatives in each of the other species [13]. The underlying graph of a BMG that contains only bi-directional arcs, that is, those arcs (x, y) for which there is also an arc (y, x) , is known as reciprocal best match graph (RBMG). The precise definition of BMGs will be given in Section 2. Empirically, best matches are routinely estimated by measuring and comparing the similarity of gene sequences. Measurement errors and systematic biases, however, introduce discrepancies between “most similar genes” extracted from data and the notion of best matches in the sense of closest evolutionary relatedness [13, 15]. While some systematic effects can be corrected directly [37], a residual level of error is unavoidable. It is therefore a question of considerable practical interest in computational biology whether the mathematical properties characterizing BMGs can be used to correct empirical estimates. Formally, this question amounts to a graph editing problem: Given a vertex-labeled directed graph (G, σ) , what is the minimal number of arcs that need to be inserted or deleted to convert (G, σ) into a BMG (G^*, σ) ?

Best matches are, in particular, closely linked to the identification of orthologous genes, i.e., pairs of genes whose last common ancestor coincides with the divergence of two species [12]. Orthologous genes from different species are expected to have essentially the same biological functions. Thus, considerable efforts have been expended to devise methods for orthology assessment, see e.g. [3, 35, 36] for reviews and applications. The orthology graph of a gene family (with the genes as




Figure 1: An evolutionary scenario (left) consists of a gene tree (T, σ) embedded into a species phylogeny S . The coloring σ represents the species, i.e., genomes (leaves of the species tree) in which the genes (leaves of the gene tree) reside. Inner nodes of the gene tree correspond to gene duplications (\square) or speciation events (\bullet), the latter coinciding with the inner nodes of the species tree S . The BMG (G, σ) (right) depends on the topology of the gene tree (middle). A gene y is a best match of x ($x \rightarrow y$ in the BMG) if there is no gene y' of the same color that has a lower last common ancestor with x than y . For instance, b_1 but not b_2 is a best match for a_1 in the blue species.

vertices and undirected edges between orthologous genes) can be shown to be a subgraph of the reciprocal best match graph (RBMG), i.e., the symmetric part of the BMG [15]. This has sparked interest in a characterization of RBMGs [16] and the corresponding graph editing problems [21]. The deletion and the editing problems of 2-colored RBMGs are equivalent to BICLUSTER DELETION and BICLUSTER EDITING, respectively, a fact that was used to demonstrate NP-hardness for the general, ℓ -colored case. On the other hand, orthology graphs are cographs [22]. COGRAPH EDITING or COGRAPH DELETION thus have been used to correct empirical approximations of RBMGs to orthology graphs in [23]. Several related problems have been discussed in the literature, often aiming at using additional biological information as part of the graph modification process, cf. eg. [9, 26–28, 31]. Both COGRAPH EDITING and COGRAPH DELETION are NP-complete [29]. In [33], we showed that knowledge of BMG makes it possible to identify the edges of the RBMG that cannot be part of the orthology graph and found that these edges in general do not form an optimal solution of either COGRAPH EDITING or COGRAPH DELETION. This observation suggests to correct the empirical similarity data at the outset by editing them to the nearest BMGs instead of operating on an empirical approximation of the RBMG. Given a BMG, the orthology graph can then be computed in polynomial time [33].

We therefore analyze the arc modification problems for ℓ -BMGs, that is, BMGs on ℓ colors. This contribution is organized as follows: After introducing some notation and reviewing some important properties of BMGs, Sec. 3 provides a characterization of BMGs in terms of triples (binary trees on three leaves) that can be derived from vertex colored graphs. Moreover, we provide in Sec. 4 a characterization of 2-BMGs in terms of forbidden subgraphs. We then prove in Sec. 5 that 2-BMG DELETION and 2-BMG EDITING are NP-complete by reduction from EXACT 3-COVER, and that 2-BMG COMPLETION is NP-complete by reduction from CHAIN GRAPH COMPLETION. These results are used in Sec. 6 to establish NP-completeness for any fixed number $\ell \geq 2$ of colors. Finally, we provide ILP solutions for the respective ℓ -BMG modification problems in Sec. 7.

2 Preliminaries

2.1 Notation

In this contribution, we consider simple directed graphs (digraphs) $G = (V, E)$ with vertex set V and arc set $E \subseteq V \times V \setminus \{(v, v) \mid v \in V\}$. We will also write $V(G)$ and $E(G)$ when referring to the vertex and arc set, respectively, of a specific graph G .

For a vertex $x \in V$, we say that (y, x) is an *in-arc* and (x, z) is an *out-arc*. The (weakly) connected components of G are the maximal connected subgraphs of the undirected graph underlying G . We call x a *hub-vertex* of a graph $G = (V, E)$ if $(x, v) \in E$ and $(v, x) \in E$ holds for all vertices $v \in V \setminus \{x\}$. The subgraph induced by a subset $W \subseteq V$ is denoted by $G[W]$. We write $N(x) := \{z \in V \mid (x, z) \in E\}$ for the out-neighborhood and $N^-(x) := \{z \in V \mid (z, x) \in E\}$ for the in-neighborhood of $x \in V$. A graph is *sink-free* if it has no vertex with out-degree zero, i.e., if $N(x) \neq \emptyset$ for all $x \in V$.

We write $E \triangle F := (E \setminus F) \cup (F \setminus E)$ for the symmetric difference of the sets E and F . Moreover,

for a graph $G = (V, E)$ and an arc set F , we define the graphs $G+F := (V, E \cup F)$, $G-F := (V, E \setminus F)$ and $G \triangle F := (V, E \triangle F)$. A *vertex coloring* of G is a map $\sigma : V \rightarrow M$, where M is the set of *colors*. A graph G endowed with a vertex coloring σ will be denoted by (G, σ) . A vertex coloring is *proper* if $\sigma(x) \neq \sigma(y)$ for all $(x, y) \in E$. To avoid trivial cases, we will always assume a coloring σ to be surjective. To this end, we define the restriction of σ to a subset $W \subseteq V$ of vertices as $\sigma|_W : W \rightarrow \sigma(W)$ with $\sigma|_W(v) = \sigma(v)$ for all $v \in W$. The colored subgraph of G induced by W is therefore $(G[W], \sigma|_W)$. We often write $|M|$ -coloring to emphasize the number of colors in G . Moreover, we define $\sigma(W) := \{\sigma(v) \mid v \in W\}$.

Observation 2.1. *Let x be a hub-vertex in a properly colored graph (G, σ) . Then x is the only vertex of color $\sigma(x)$ in (G, σ) .*

A phylogenetic tree T (on L) is an (undirected) rooted tree with root ρ_T , leaf set $L = L(T) \subseteq V(T)$ and inner vertices $V^0(T) = V(T) \setminus L$ such that each inner vertex of T (except possibly the root) is of degree at least three. *Throughout this contribution, we assume that every tree is phylogenetic.*

The *ancestor order* on $V(T)$ is defined such that $u \preceq_T v$ if v lies on the unique path from u to the root ρ_T , i.e., if v is an ancestor of u . We write $u \prec_T v$ if $u \preceq_T v$ and $u \neq v$. If xy is an edge in T , such that $y \prec_T x$, then x is the *parent* of y and y the *child* of x . We denote by $\text{child}_T(x)$ the set of all children of x . The set $L(T(v))$ contains all leaves $x \preceq_T v$. For a non-empty subset $A \subseteq V \cup E$ we define $\text{lca}_T(A)$, the *last common ancestor* of A , to be the unique \preceq_T -minimal vertex of T that is an ancestor of every $u \in A$. For simplicity we write $\text{lca}_T(A) = \text{lca}_T(x_1, \dots, x_k)$ whenever we specify a vertex set $A = \{x_1, \dots, x_k\}$ explicitly. Note that $\text{lca}_T(x, y)$ and $\text{lca}_T(x, z)$ are comparable for all $x, y, z \in L$ w.r.t. \preceq_T .

A (*rooted*) *triple* is a tree on three leaves and with two inner vertices. We write $xy|z$ for the triple on the leaves x, y and z if the path from x to y does not intersect the path from z to the root, i.e., if $\text{lca}_T(x, y) \prec_T \text{lca}_T(x, z) = \text{lca}_T(y, z)$. In this case we say that T displays $xy|z$. A set \mathcal{R} of triples on L , i.e., a set of triples \mathcal{R} such that $\bigcup_{T \in \mathcal{R}} L(T) = L$, is *compatible* if there is a tree with leaf set L that displays every triple in \mathcal{R} . If \mathcal{R} is compatible, then such a tree, the *Aho tree* $\text{Aho}(\mathcal{R})$ can be constructed in polynomial time [2]. For a set L , a set of triples \mathcal{R} is *strictly dense* if for all three distinct x, y, z exactly one of the triples $xy|z, xz|y$ and $yz|x$ is contained in \mathcal{R} .

In this contribution, we also consider trees that explicitly do not display certain triples. More precisely, we will need

Definition 2.2. *Let \mathcal{R} and \mathcal{F} be sets of triples. The pair $(\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{F})$ is called compatible if there is a tree T that displays all triples in \mathcal{R} but none of the triples in \mathcal{F} . In the latter case, we also say that T agrees with $(\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{F})$.*

The problem of deciding whether such a pair $(\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{F})$ is compatible and, in particular, of finding a corresponding phylogenetic tree was termed *mixed triplets problem restricted to trees (MTT)* in [20]. This work also reports a polynomial-time algorithm (also called MTT), which is similar to the well-known BUILD algorithm [2].

Theorem 2.3. [20, Thm. 1] *Algorithm MTT outputs a phylogenetic tree T that agrees with the pair $(\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{F})$ (defined on n distinct leaves) if and only if $(\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{F})$ is compatible in $O(|\mathcal{R}| \cdot n + |\mathcal{F}| \cdot n \log n + n^2 \log n)$ time.*

A tree T with leaf set L together with function $\sigma : L \rightarrow M$ is a *leaf-colored tree*, denoted by (T, σ) .

2.2 Best match graphs

Definition 2.4. *Let (T, σ) be a leaf-colored tree. A leaf $y \in L(T)$ is a best match of the leaf $x \in L(T)$ if $\sigma(x) \neq \sigma(y)$ and $\text{lca}(x, y) \preceq_T \text{lca}(x, y')$ holds for all leaves y' of color $\sigma(y') = \sigma(y)$.*

The graph $G(T, \sigma) = (V, E)$ with vertex set $V = L(T)$, vertex coloring σ , and with arcs $(x, y) \in E$ if and only if y is a best match of x w.r.t. (T, σ) is known as the (colored) *best match graph* (BMG) of (T, σ) [13]. We call an ℓ -colored BMG simply ℓ -BMG. Since the last common ancestors of any two vertices of T always exists, and $\text{lca}_T(x, y)$ and $\text{lca}_T(x, z)$ are comparable, there is by definition at least one best match of x for every color $s \in \sigma(V) \setminus \{\sigma(x)\}$:

Observation 2.5. *For every vertex x and every color $s \in \sigma(V(G)) \setminus \{\sigma(x)\}$ in a BMG (G, σ) , there is some vertex $y \in N(x)$ with $\sigma(y) = s$.*

Equivalently, the subgraph induced by every pair of colors is sink-free. In particular, therefore, BMGs are sink-free whenever they contain at least two colors. We note in passing that sink-free graphs also appear naturally e.g. in the context of graph semigroups [1] and graph orientation problems [7].

Definition 2.6. *Let (G, σ) be a colored graph. The coloring σ is sink-free if it is proper and, for every vertex x and every color $s \in \sigma(V(G)) \setminus \{\sigma(x)\}$, there is a vertex $y \in N(x)$ with $\sigma(y) = s$. A graph with a sink-free coloring is sf-colored.*

The definition of BMGs together with Obs. 2.5 implies that BMGs are always sf-colored.

Definition 2.7. *An arbitrary vertex-colored graph (G, σ) is a best match graph (BMG) if there exists a leaf-colored tree (T, σ) such that $(G, \sigma) = G(T, \sigma)$. In this case, we say that (T, σ) explains (G, σ) .*

Whether two vertices x and y are best matches or not does not depend on the presence or absence of vertices z with $\sigma(z) \notin \{\sigma(x), \sigma(y)\}$. More precisely, we have

Observation 2.8. [13, Obs. 1] *Let (G, σ) be a BMG explained by (T, σ) with leaf set L and let $L' := \bigcup_{s \in M'} L[s]$ be a subset of vertices with a restricted color set $M' \subseteq \sigma(L)$. Then the induced subgraph $(G[L'], \sigma|_{L'})$ is explained by the restriction $T|_{L'}$ of T to the leaf set L' , i.e. $(G[L'], \sigma|_{L'}) = G(T|_{L'}, \sigma|_{L'})$.*

It was shown in [13] that BMGs can be characterized in terms of certain induced subgraphs on three vertices. These can be specified as follows [33]:

Definition 2.9. *Let (G, σ) be a vertex colored graph. We say that a triple $xy|y'$ is informative for (G, σ) if x, y and y' are pairwise distinct vertices in G such that (i) $\sigma(x) \neq \sigma(y) = \sigma(y')$ and (ii) $(x, y) \in E(G)$ and $(x, y') \notin E(G)$. The set of informative triples is denoted by $\mathcal{R}(G, \sigma)$.*

As shown in [14], BMGs can be characterized in terms of informative triples.

Theorem 2.10. [14, Thm. 15] *A colored digraph (G, σ) is an n -cBMG if and only if $G(\text{Aho}(\mathcal{R}(G, \sigma)), \sigma) = (G, \sigma)$.*

However, for our purposes, it will be convenient to avoid the construction of the Aho tree. In Sec. 3, we will establish an alternative characterization, which will depend on the following two technical results:

Lemma 2.11. [33, Lemma 5 and 6] *Let (G, σ) be a BMG and $xy|y'$ an informative triple for G . Then, every tree (T, σ) that explains (G, σ) displays the triple $xy|y'$, i.e. $\text{lca}_T(x, y) \prec_T \text{lca}_T(x, y') = \text{lca}_T(y, y')$.*

Moreover, if the triples $ab|b'$ and $cb'|b$ are informative for (G, σ) , then every tree (T, σ) that explains (G, σ) contains two distinct children $v_1, v_2 \in \text{child}_T(\text{lca}_T(a, c))$ such that $a, b \prec_T v_1$ and $b', c \prec_T v_2$.

Lemma 2.12. [13, Prop. 1] *The disjoint union of vertex disjoint BMGs (G_i, σ_i) , $1 \leq i \leq k$, is a BMG if and only if all color sets are the same, i.e., $\sigma_i(V(G_i)) = \sigma_j(V(G_j))$ for $1 \leq i < j \leq k$.*

2.3 Neighborhoods in BMGs

A graph is *thin* if no two vertices have the same neighborhood.

Definition 2.13. *Two vertices $x, y \in L$ are in relation \simeq if $N(x) = N(y)$ and $N^-(x) = N^-(y)$.*

Clearly the *thinness relation* \simeq is an equivalence relation on V . For each \simeq class α we have $N(\alpha) = N(x)$ and $N^-(\alpha) = N^-(x)$ for all $x \in \alpha$. The following characterization of 2-BMGs makes use of the structure of the trees by which they are explained. These properties can be expressed in terms of properties of the vertex neighborhoods in the 2-BMGs. While they can be tested in polynomial time, they are far from being intuitive. We refer to [13] for a detailed discussion.

Theorem 2.14. [13, Thm. 3 and 4] *Let (G, σ) be a connected properly 2-colored digraph. Then, (G, σ) is a BMG if and only if for any two \simeq classes α and β of G holds*

- (N0) $N(\alpha) \neq \emptyset$
- (N1) $\alpha \cap N(\beta) = \beta \cap N(\alpha) = \emptyset$ implies $N(\alpha) \cap N(N(\beta)) = N(\beta) \cap N(N(\alpha)) = \emptyset$.

(N2) $N(N(N(\alpha))) \subseteq N(\alpha)$

(N3) $\alpha \cap N(N(\beta)) = \beta \cap N(N(\alpha)) = \emptyset$ and $N(\alpha) \cap N(\beta) \neq \emptyset$ implies $N^-(\alpha) = N^-(\beta)$ and $N(\alpha) \subseteq N(\beta)$ or $N(\beta) \subseteq N(\alpha)$.

We note that [13] tacitly assumed (N0), i.e., that (G, σ) is sink-free.

3 Characterization of BMGs in terms of triples

In this section, we provide a novel characterization of BMGs utilizing allowed and forbidden triples. To this end, we need

Definition 3.1. Let (G, σ) be a vertex colored graph. We say that a triple $xy|y'$ is forbidden for a graph (G, σ) if x, y and y' are pairwise distinct vertices in G such that (i) $\sigma(x) \neq \sigma(y) = \sigma(y')$ and (ii) $(x, y) \in E(G)$ and $(x, y') \in E(G)$. The set of forbidden triples of (G, σ) is denoted by $\mathcal{F}(G, \sigma)$.

The characterization of BMGs will make use of the following two technical results:

Lemma 3.2. Let (G, σ) be a BMG explained by (T, σ) . Then, none of the triples in $\mathcal{F}(G, \sigma)$ is displayed by (T, σ) .

Proof. Assume, for contradiction, that (T, σ) displays $xy|y' \in \mathcal{F}(G, \sigma)$. Hence, $\text{lca}_T(x, y) \prec_T \text{lca}(x, y')$ and thus, $(x, y) \in E(G)$ and $(x, y') \notin E(G)$ contradicting the definition of $xy|y'$ as a forbidden triple of (G, σ) . \square

Lemma 3.3. Let (G, σ) be an sf-colored graph with vertex set L . Then for every tree (T, σ) on L displaying all triples in $\mathcal{R}(G, \sigma)$, it holds $E(G(T, \sigma)) \subseteq E(G)$.

Proof. Let (T, σ) be a tree displaying all triples in $\mathcal{R}(G, \sigma)$ and set $E' := E(G(T, \sigma))$ and $E := E(G)$. First note that (G, σ) and $G(T, \sigma)$ have the same vertex set L . Suppose that $(a, b) \in E'$ but $(a, b) \notin E$. Since (G, σ) is sf-colored, vertex a must have at least one out-neighbor b' (distinct from b) of color $\sigma(b)$ in (G, σ) , i.e. $(a, b') \in E$. Hence, $(a, b') \in E$ and $(a, b) \notin E$ imply that $ab'|b$ is an informative triple of (G, σ) and thus displayed by T . Therefore $\text{lca}_T(a, b') \prec_T \text{lca}_T(a, b)$ which, together with $\sigma(b) = \sigma(b')$, contradicts $(a, b) \in E'$. Therefore, $E' \subseteq E$. \square

Proposition 3.4. Let (G, σ) be a sf-colored graph with vertex set L . A leaf-colored tree (T, σ) on L explains (G, σ) if and only if (T, σ) agrees with $(\mathcal{R}(G, \sigma), \mathcal{F}(G, \sigma))$. In this case, (G, σ) is a BMG.

Proof. First suppose that (T, σ) explains (G, σ) , in which case (G, σ) is a BMG. The only-if-direction now immediately follows from Lemmas 2.11 and 3.2.

Now suppose that there is a tree (T, σ) on L that displays all triples in $\mathcal{R}(G, \sigma)$ and none of the triples in $\mathcal{F}(G, \sigma)$. Hence, we can apply Lemma 3.3 to conclude that $E' := E(G(T, \sigma)) \subseteq E(G) = E$. Note that (G, σ) and $G(T, \sigma)$ have the same vertex set L . We show that $E' = E$. Assume, for contradiction, that $E' \subset E$, and thus, that there is an $(a, b) \in E \setminus E'$. By Obs. 2.5 and since $G(T, \sigma)$ is a BMG, vertex a must have at least one out-neighbor b' of color $\sigma(b)$. Hence, there is an arc $(a, b') \in E'$. Thus, $ab'|b$ is an informative triple of $G(T, \sigma)$ and must therefore be displayed by T . Moreover, $(a, b') \in E'$ and $E' \subset E$ imply $(a, b') \in E$. Hence, $(a, b), (a, b') \in E$ implies that $ab'|b$ is a forbidden triple of (G, σ) and thus, not displayed by T by assumption; a contradiction. Therefore, $E = E'$ must hold and thus, $G(T, \sigma) = (G, \sigma)$ which, in particular, implies that (G, σ) is a BMG. \square

Theorem 3.5. A vertex colored graph (G, σ) is a BMG if and only if (i) (G, σ) is sf-colored and (ii) $(\mathcal{R}(G, \sigma), \mathcal{F}(G, \sigma))$ is compatible.

Proof. First suppose that (G, σ) is a BMG. The definition of BMGs together with Obs. 2.5 implies that (G, σ) is sf-colored. Thus, there is a tree (T, σ) that explains (G, σ) . By Lemmas 2.11 and 3.2, (T, σ) displays all triples in $\mathcal{R}(G, \sigma)$ and none of the triples in $\mathcal{F}(G, \sigma)$. Hence, the pair $(\mathcal{R}(G, \sigma), \mathcal{F}(G, \sigma))$ is compatible.

For the converse, suppose that (G, σ) is a sf-colored graph and that $(\mathcal{R}(G, \sigma), \mathcal{F}(G, \sigma))$ is compatible. The latter implies that there is a tree (T, σ) on L displaying all triples in $\mathcal{R}(G, \sigma)$ and none of the triples in $\mathcal{F}(G, \sigma)$. Now, we can apply Prop. 3.4 to conclude that (G, σ) is a BMG. \square

In order to use the MTT algorithm [20] to recognize BMGs (G, σ) , we show for completeness that the set of allowed and forbidden triples already determines $V(G)$ except for trivial cases.

Lemma 3.6. *Let (G, σ) be a sf-colored graph, $V(G) \neq \emptyset$ and $L' := \bigcup_{t \in \mathcal{R}(G, \sigma) \cup \mathcal{F}(G, \sigma)} L(t)$. Then the following statements are equivalent:*

1. $L' = V(G)$
2. $\mathcal{R}(G, \sigma) \cup \mathcal{F}(G, \sigma) \neq \emptyset$
3. (G, σ) is ℓ -colored with $\ell \geq 2$ and contains two vertices of the same color.

Otherwise, (G, σ) is a BMG that is explained by any tree (T, σ) on $V(G)$.

Proof. The fact that $L' = V(G) \neq \emptyset$ immediately implies that $\mathcal{R}(G, \sigma) \cup \mathcal{F}(G, \sigma)$ must not be empty. Hence, (1) implies (2).

Suppose Condition (2) is satisfied. Since all triples $xy|y' \in \mathcal{R}(G, \sigma) \cup \mathcal{F}(G, \sigma)$ satisfy $\sigma(x) \neq \sigma(y) = \sigma(y')$, Condition (3) must be satisfied. Hence, (2) implies (3).

Suppose Condition (3) is satisfied. Hence, there are two vertices of the same color r and there must be a vertex $x \in V(G)$ with $\sigma(x) \neq r$. Since (G, σ) is sf-colored, there is a vertex $y \in V(G)$ of color r such that $(x, y) \in E(G)$. Now let $y' \in V(G)$, $y' \neq y$ be one of the additional vertices of color $\sigma(y') = r$. If $(x, y') \notin E(G)$ then $xy|y' \in \mathcal{R}(G, \sigma)$ and, otherwise, if $(x, y') \in E(G)$ then $xy|y' \in \mathcal{F}(G, \sigma)$. In summary, every vertex x of (G, σ) is part of some informative or forbidden triple and thus, $L' = V(G)$. Hence, (3) implies (1).

Finally, suppose that none of the equivalent statements (1), (2), and (3) holds. Then (G, σ) is either 1-colored and thus, does not contain any arc, or $|V(G)|$ -colored in which case (G, σ) is a complete graph. In both cases, the tree topology of (T, σ) does not matter. \square

It is straightforward to test whether a vertex colored graph (G, σ) is sf-colored in $O(|E(G)|)$ time. Moreover, MTT [20] accomplishes the compatibility check of $(\mathcal{R}(G, \sigma), \mathcal{F}(G, \sigma))$ and the construction of a corresponding tree in polynomial time. If $\mathcal{R}(G, \sigma) \cup \mathcal{F}(G, \sigma) = \emptyset$, (G, σ) is a BMG. Otherwise, Lemma 3.6 implies that every vertex in the sf-colored graph (G, σ) appears in an informative and/or a forbidden triple. Together with Prop. 3.4 and Thm. 3.5, this implies

Corollary 3.7. *It can be determined in polynomial time whether a vertex colored graph (G, σ) is a BMG. In the affirmative case, a tree that explains (G, σ) can be constructed in polynomial time.*

4 Forbidden induced subgraphs of 2-BMGs

In this section, we derive a new characterization of 2-colored BMGs in terms of forbidden induced subgraphs. Our starting point is the observation that certain constellations of arcs on four or five vertices cannot occur.

Definition 4.1 (F1-, F2-, and F3-graphs).

- (F1) *A properly 2-colored graph on four distinct vertices $V = \{x_1, x_2, y_1, y_2\}$ with coloring $\sigma(x_1) = \sigma(x_2) \neq \sigma(y_1) = \sigma(y_2)$ is an F1-graph if $(x_1, y_1), (y_2, x_2), (y_1, x_2) \in E$ and $(x_1, y_2), (y_2, x_1) \notin E$.*
- (F2) *A properly 2-colored graph on four distinct vertices $V = \{x_1, x_2, y_1, y_2\}$ with coloring $\sigma(x_1) = \sigma(x_2) \neq \sigma(y_1) = \sigma(y_2)$ is an F2-graph if $(x_1, y_1), (y_1, x_2), (x_2, y_2) \in E$ and $(x_1, y_2) \notin E$.*
- (F3) *A properly 2-colored graph on five distinct vertices $V = \{x_1, x_2, y_1, y_2, y_3\}$ with coloring $\sigma(x_1) = \sigma(x_2) \neq \sigma(y_1) = \sigma(y_2) = \sigma(y_3)$ is an F3-graph if $(x_1, y_1), (x_2, y_2), (x_1, y_3), (x_2, y_3) \in E$ and $(x_1, y_2), (x_2, y_1) \notin E$.*

The “templates” for F1-, F2-, and F3-graphs are shown in Fig. 2. They define 8, 16, and 64 graphs by specifying the presence or absence of the 3, 4, and 6 optional (dashed) arcs, respectively, see Figs. 10 and 11 in the Appendix. The F1- and F2-graphs fall into a total of 16 isomorphism classes, four of which are both F1- and F2-graphs. All but one of the F3-graphs contain an F1- or an F2-graph as induced subgraph. The exception is the “template” of the F3-graphs without optional arcs. The 17 non-redundant forbidden subgraphs are collected in Fig. 3. We shall see below that they are sufficient to characterize 2-BMGs among the sink-free graphs.

Lemma 4.2. *If (G, σ) is a BMG, then it contains no induced F1-, F2-, or F3-graph.*

Proof. Let (T, σ) be a tree that explains (G, σ) .

First, assume that (G, σ) contains an induced F1-graph, i.e., there are four vertices x_1, x_2, y_1, y_2 satisfying (F1), and let $u := \text{lca}_T(x_1, y_2)$. Then, $(x_1, y_1), (y_2, x_2) \in E$, $(x_1, y_2), (y_2, x_1) \notin E$ and Lemma 2.11 imply that T must display the informative triples $x_1 y_1 | y_2$ and $y_2 x_2 | x_1$. Hence, u




Figure 2: Templates of the three families of forbidden induced subgraphs in BMGs. Black arcs must exist, non-arcs must not exist and dashed grey arcs may or may not be present.




Figure 3: Forbidden induced subgraphs in BMGs. All F3-graphs with at least one optional arc have an induced F1- or F2-graph and thus are redundant.

must have two distinct children v_1 and v_2 such that $x_1, y_1 \prec_T v_1$ and $x_2, y_2 \prec_T v_2$. Therefore, $\text{lca}_T(x_1, y_1) \preceq_T v_1 \prec_T u = \text{lca}_T(x_2, y_1)$ and $\sigma(x_1) = \sigma(x_2)$ imply that $(y_1, x_2) \notin E(G)$; a contradiction.

Next, assume that (G, σ) contains an induced F2-graph, i.e., there are four vertices x_1, x_2, y_1, y_2 satisfying (F2). Then $(x_1, y_1) \in E$, $(x_1, y_2) \notin E$ and Lemma 2.11 imply that T displays the informative triple $x_1 y_1 | y_2$ and thus $\text{lca}_T(x_1, y_1) \prec_T \text{lca}_T(x_1, y_2)$. Since $(y_1, x_2) \in E$ and $\sigma(x_1) = \sigma(x_2)$, we conclude that $\text{lca}_T(x_2, y_1) \preceq_T \text{lca}_T(x_1, y_1) \prec_T \text{lca}_T(x_1, y_2)$ and therefore also $\text{lca}_T(x_2, y_1) \prec_T \text{lca}_T(x_2, y_2) = \text{lca}_T(x_1, y_2)$. Together with $\sigma(y_1) = \sigma(y_2)$, the latter contradicts $(x_2, y_2) \in E$.

Finally, assume that (G, σ) contains an induced F3-graph, i.e., there are five vertices x_1, x_2, y_1, y_2, y_3 satisfying (F3). By Lemma 2.11, $(x_1, y_1) \in E$ and $(x_1, y_2) \notin E$ implies that T displays the triple $x_1 y_1 | y_2$, and $(x_2, y_2) \in E$ together with $(x_2, y_1) \notin E$ implies that T displays the triple $x_2 y_2 | y_1$. Furthermore, $\text{lca}_T(x_1, x_2)$ has distinct children v_1 and v_2 such that $x_1, y_1 \prec_T v_1$ and $x_2, y_2 \prec_T v_2$. Now since $\sigma(y_1) = \sigma(y_2) = \sigma(y_3)$, the two arcs (x_1, y_3) and (x_2, y_3) imply that $\text{lca}_T(x_1, y_3) \preceq_T \text{lca}_T(x_1, y_1) \preceq_T v_1$ and $\text{lca}_T(x_2, y_3) \preceq_T \text{lca}_T(x_2, y_2) \preceq_T v_2$, respectively. Since v_1 and v_2 are incomparable w.r.t. \preceq_T , this is a contradiction. \square

Lemma 4.3. *Let (G, σ) be a properly 2-colored graph. Then (G, σ) satisfies (N1) if it does not contain an induced F1-graph, it satisfies (N2) if it does not contain an induced F2-graph, and it satisfies (N3) if it contains neither an induced F1-graph nor an induced F3-graph.*

Proof. We employ contraposition and thus show that $(G = (V, E), \sigma)$ contains a forbidden subgraph whenever (N1), (N2) or (N3) are violated.

Assume that (N1) is not satisfied. Thus, there are two \succsim -classes α and β with $\alpha \cap N(\beta) = \beta \cap N(\alpha) = \emptyset$ for which $N(\alpha) \cap N(N(\beta)) \neq \emptyset$ or $N(\beta) \cap N(N(\alpha)) \neq \emptyset$. We can w.l.o.g. assume that $N(\beta) \cap N(N(\alpha)) \neq \emptyset$. Note that $\alpha \cap N(\beta) = \emptyset$ implies that $(y, x) \notin E$ for all $x \in \alpha, y \in \beta$. Likewise $(x, y) \notin E$ for all $x \in \alpha, y \in \beta$, since $\beta \cap N(\alpha) = \emptyset$. Let $x_1 \in \alpha, y_2 \in \beta$ and $x_2 \in N(\beta) \cap N(N(\alpha)) \neq \emptyset$. It must hold $(x_1, y_2), (y_2, x_1) \notin E$ by the arguments above. Since $x_2 \in N(\beta)$, we have $(y_2, x_2) \in E$. Moreover, $\sigma(x_1) = \sigma(x_2) \neq \sigma(y_2)$, since (G, σ) is properly colored. Clearly, $x_2 \in N(N(\alpha))$ implies that $N(\alpha) \neq \emptyset$. Now, let $y_1 \in N(\alpha)$ be a vertex such that $(y_1, x_2) \in E$, which must exist as a consequence of $x_2 \in N(N(\alpha))$. We have (x_1, y_1) since $y_1 \in N(\alpha)$ and thus $\sigma(y_1) = \sigma(y_2) \neq \sigma(x_1) = \sigma(x_2)$. Finally, $(y_1, x_2) \in E$ immediately implies that $y_1 \neq y_2$. In summary, $(x_1, y_1), (y_1, x_2), (y_2, x_2) \in E$ and $(x_1, y_2), (y_2, x_1) \notin E$, and thus (G, σ) contains an induced F1-graph.

Now assume that (N2) is not satisfied and thus, $N(N(N(\alpha))) \not\subseteq N(\alpha)$ for some \succsim -class α . Note, the latter implies that $N(N(N(\alpha))) \neq \emptyset$. Hence, there is a vertex $y_2 \in N(N(N(\alpha)))$ such that $y_2 \notin N(\alpha)$. Thus, there is a vertex $x_1 \in \alpha$ such that $(x_1, y_2) \notin E$. By the definition of neighborhoods and since $y_2 \in N(N(N(\alpha)))$, we find vertices $y_1 \in N(\alpha)$ and $x_2 \in N(N(\alpha))$ such that $(x_1, y_1), (y_1, x_2), (x_2, y_2)$. Since (G, σ) is properly colored, we must have $\sigma(x_1) = \sigma(x_2) \neq \sigma(y_1) = \sigma(y_2)$. Moreover, $(x_1, y_2) \notin E$ together with $(x_2, y_2) \in E$ and $(x_1, y_1) \in E$ implies $x_1 \neq x_2$ and $y_1 \neq y_2$, respectively. We conclude that the subgraph induced by x_1, x_2, y_1, y_2 contains an induced F2-graph.

Finally, assume that (N3) is not satisfied. Hence, there are two \succsim -classes α and β with $\alpha \cap N(N(\beta)) = \beta \cap N(N(\alpha)) = \emptyset$ and $N(\alpha) \cap N(\beta) \neq \emptyset$, but (i) $N^-(\alpha) \neq N^-(\beta)$, or (ii) neither $N(\alpha) \subseteq N(\beta)$ nor $N(\beta) \subseteq N(\alpha)$. Note, $N(\alpha) \cap N(\beta) \neq \emptyset$ implies that there are vertices $x_1 \in \alpha$ and $x_2 \in \beta$ with $\sigma(x_1) = \sigma(x_2)$ since (G, σ) is properly 2-colored. In particular, there must be a vertex y_3 with $(x_1, y_3), (x_2, y_3) \in E$ and thus $\sigma(x_1) = \sigma(x_2) \neq \sigma(y_3)$.

Now consider Case (i) and suppose that $N^-(\alpha) \neq N^-(\beta)$. Thus we can assume w.l.o.g. that there is a y^* with $(y^*, x_2) \in E$ but $(y^*, x_1) \notin E$. Note, $(x_1, y^*) \notin E$, since otherwise $(x_1, y^*), (y^*, x_2) \in E$ would contradict $\beta \cap N(N(\alpha)) = \emptyset$. Thus, $y^* \neq y_3$ since $(x_1, y^*) \notin E$ and $(x_1, y_3) \in E$. Furthermore, $\sigma(y^*) = \sigma(y_3) \neq \sigma(x_1) = \sigma(x_2)$, since (G, σ) is properly 2-colored. In summary, $(y^*, x_2), (x_1, y_3), (x_2, y_3) \in E$ and $(y^*, x_1), (x_1, y^*) \notin E$ which implies that (G, σ) contains an induced F1-graph.

Now consider Case (ii) and assume that it holds neither $N(\alpha) \subseteq N(\beta)$ nor $N(\beta) \subseteq N(\alpha)$. Clearly, the latter implies $N(\alpha) \neq \emptyset$ and $N(\beta) \neq \emptyset$. The latter two arguments imply that there must be two distinct vertices $y_1 \in N(\alpha) \setminus N(\beta)$ and $y_2 \in N(\beta) \setminus N(\alpha)$ and, therefore, $(x_1, y_1), (x_2, y_2) \in E$ and $(x_1, y_2), (x_2, y_1) \notin E$. It follows that $y_1 \neq y_3$ and $y_2 \neq y_3$ and $\sigma(y_1) = \sigma(y_2) = \sigma(y_3) \neq \sigma(x_1) = \sigma(x_2)$. This and $(x_1, y_1), (x_2, y_2), (x_1, y_3), (x_2, y_3) \in E$ together with $(x_1, y_2), (x_2, y_1) \notin E$ implies that (G, σ) contains an induced F3-graph. \square

Based on the latter findings we obtain here a new characterization of 2-colored BMGs that is not restricted to connected graphs.

Theorem 4.4. *A properly 2-colored graph is a BMG if and only if it is sink-free and does not contain an induced F1-, F2-, or F3-graph.*

Proof. Suppose that (G, σ) is 2-colored BMG and \mathfrak{C} be the set of its connected components. By Lemma 4.2, (G, σ) does not contain an induced F1-, F2- or F3-graph. Moreover, by Lemma 2.12, $(G[C], \sigma|_C)$ must be a 2-colored BMG for all $C \in \mathfrak{C}$. Hence, we can apply Thm. 2.14 to conclude that each $(G[C], \sigma|_C)$ satisfies (N0)-(N3). Since every $x \in V$ is contained in some \succsim -class, (N0) is equivalent to $N(x) \neq \emptyset$, i.e., (G, σ) is sink-free.

Now suppose that (G, σ) is properly 2-colored and sink-free, and that it does not contain an induced F1-, F2- and F3-graph. By Lemma 4.3, (G, σ) satisfies (N1)-(N3). Thus, in particular, each connected component of (G, σ) is sink-free and satisfies (N1)-(N3). Note, $N(x) \neq \emptyset$ implies that the connected components of (G, σ) contain at least one arc and, by assumption, they are properly 2-colored. Moreover, this implies that (N0) is satisfied for every connected component of (G, σ) . Hence, Thm. 2.14 implies that every connected component of (G, σ) is a 2-colored BMG. By Lemma 2.12, (G, σ) is also a 2-colored BMG. \square




Figure 4: A (sub)graph induced by a bi-clique consisting of 3 black and 3 white vertices. It has 18 arcs in total.

5 Complexity of 2-BMG modification problems

In real-life applications, we have to expect that graphs estimated from empirical best match data will contain errors. Therefore, we consider the problem of correcting erroneous and/or missing arcs. Formally, we consider the following graph modification problems for properly colored digraphs.

Problem 5.1 (ℓ -BMG DELETION).

Input: A properly ℓ -colored digraph $(G = (V, E), \sigma)$ and an integer k .

Question: Is there a subset $F \subseteq E$ such that $|F| \leq k$ and $(G - F, \sigma)$ is an ℓ -BMG?

It is worth noting that ℓ -BMG DELETION does not always have a feasible solution. In particular, if (G, σ) contains a sink, no solution exists for any $\ell > 1$ as a consequence of Thm. 3.5 and the fact that we only delete arcs. In contrast, it is always possible to obtain a BMG from a properly colored digraph (G, σ) if arc insertions are allowed. To see this, observe that the graph (G', σ) with $V(G') = V(G)$ that contains all arcs between vertices of different colors is a BMG, since it is explained the tree with leaf set $V(G')$ in which all leaves are directly attached to the root. This suggests that the following two problems are more relevant for practical applications:

Problem 5.2 (ℓ -BMG EDITING).

Input: A properly ℓ -colored digraph $(G = (V, E), \sigma)$ and an integer k .

Question: Is there a subset $F \subseteq V \times V \setminus \{(v, v) \mid v \in V\}$ such that $|F| \leq k$ and $(G \triangle F, \sigma)$ is an ℓ -BMG?

Problem 5.3 (ℓ -BMG COMPLETION).

Input: A properly ℓ -colored digraph $(G = (V, E), \sigma)$ and an integer k .

Question: Is there a subset $F \subseteq V \times V \setminus (\{(v, v) \mid v \in V\} \cup E)$ such that $|F| \leq k$ and $(G + F, \sigma)$ is an ℓ -BMG?

In this section, we consider decision problems related to modifying 2-colored digraphs. The general case with an arbitrarily large number $\ell \geq 2$ of colors will be the subject of the following section. For $\ell = 2$, we will show that both 2-BMG DELETION and 2-BMG EDITING are NP-complete by reduction from the EXACT 3-COVER problem (X3C), one of Karp's famous 21 NP-complete problems [25].

Problem 5.4 (EXACT 3-COVER (X3C)).

Input: A set \mathfrak{S} with $|\mathfrak{S}| = 3t$ elements and a collection \mathcal{C} of 3-element subsets of \mathfrak{S} .

Question: Does \mathcal{C} contain an exact cover for \mathfrak{S} , i.e., a subcollection $\mathcal{C}' \subseteq \mathcal{C}$ such that every element of \mathfrak{S} occurs in exactly one member of \mathcal{C}' ?

An exact 3-cover \mathcal{C}' of \mathfrak{S} with $|\mathfrak{S}| = 3t$ is necessarily of size $|\mathcal{C}'| = t$ and satisfies $\bigcup_{C \in \mathcal{C}'} C = \mathfrak{S}$.

Theorem 5.1. [25] X3C is NP-complete.

In the following, we will make extensive use of properly 2-colored digraphs that contain all possible arcs:

Definition 5.2. A bi-clique of a colored digraph (G, σ) is a subset of vertices $C \subseteq V(G)$ such that (i) $|\sigma(C)| = 2$ and (ii) $(x, y) \in E(G[C])$ if and only if $\sigma(x) \neq \sigma(y)$ for all $x, y \in C$. A colored digraph (G, σ) is a bi-cluster graph if all its connected components are bi-cliques.

In a bi-clique, all arcs between vertices of different color are present. Thus a bi-clique with n and m vertices in the two color classes has $2nm$ arcs, see Fig. 4 for the case $n = m = 3$. We emphasize that, in contrast to the definition used in [21], single vertex graphs are not considered as bi-clique.




Figure 5: A tree (T, σ) whose BMG $G(T, \sigma)$ contains bi-cliques X and Y_1, \dots, Y_n . The thick gray arrows indicate that all arcs in that direction exist between the respective sets.

We start with a simple construction of a subclass of BMGs from disconnected 2-colored bi-cluster graph:

Lemma 5.3. *Let (G, σ) be a 2-colored bi-cluster graph with at least two connected components, let \mathfrak{C} be the set of connected components of (G, σ) , and fix one of these connected components $X \in \mathfrak{C}$. Now, let (G', σ) be the graph obtained from (G, σ) by adding all arcs (x, y) with $x \in X$ and $y \in \bigcup_{Y \in \mathfrak{C} \setminus \{X\}} Y$ for which $\sigma(x) \neq \sigma(y)$. Then (G', σ) is a BMG.*

Proof. To see that (G', σ) is a BMG it suffices to show that there is a tree (T, σ) that explains (G', σ) . To this end, consider the tree (T, σ) as shown in Fig. 5 and its BMG $G(T, \sigma)$. Observe first that, for all $x, y \in X$, it holds $\text{lca}_T(x, y) = \rho = \text{lca}_T(x, y') = \text{lca}(x', y)$ for all $x', y' \in L(T)$. Hence, X is a bi-clique and there are arcs from all vertices in X to all vertices of distinct color in $Y_i \in \mathfrak{C} \setminus \{X\}$. Moreover, for all $x, y \in Y_i \in \mathfrak{C} \setminus \{X\}$ it holds that $\text{lca}_T(x, y) = v_i \preceq_T \text{lca}_T(x, y') = \text{lca}(x', y)$ for all $x', y' \in L(T)$. Hence, Y_i is a bi-clique for all $Y_i \in \mathfrak{C} \setminus \{X\}$. Finally, for all $x, y \in Y_i \in \mathfrak{C} \setminus \{X\}$ and all $x', y' \in L(T) \setminus Y_i$ it holds $\text{lca}_T(x, y) = v_i \prec_T \text{lca}_T(x, y') = \text{lca}(x', y) = \rho$ which implies that there are no arcs from vertices in Y_i to vertices in X and no arcs between distinct $Y_i, Y_j \in \mathfrak{C} \setminus \{X\}$. In summary, $G(T, \sigma) = (G', \sigma)$ and hence, (G', σ) is a BMG. \square

We are now in the position to prove NP-completeness of 2-BMG EDITING. The strategy of the NP-hardness proof is very similar to the one used in [10] and [29] to show the NP-hardness of COGRAPH EDITING. Nevertheless, although similar in fashion, our proof has subtle but important differences when compared to the proofs provided in [10] and [29]. In particular, at the heart of our construction are 2-colored bi-cliques rather than complete graphs.

Theorem 5.4. *2-BMG EDITING is NP-complete.*

Proof. Since BMGs can be recognized in polynomial time by Cor. 3.7, the 2-BMG EDITING problem is clearly contained in NP. To show the NP-hardness, we use reduction from X3C.

Let \mathfrak{S} with $|\mathfrak{S}| = n = 3t$ and $\mathcal{C} = \{C_1, \dots, C_m\}$ be an instance of X3C. Clearly, if $m = t$ the X3C problem becomes trivial and thus, we assume w.l.o.g. that $m > t$. The latter implies that every solution \mathcal{C}' of X3C satisfies $\mathcal{C}' \subsetneq \mathcal{C}$. Moreover, we assume w.l.o.g. that $C_i \neq C_j$, $1 \leq i < j \leq m$. We construct an instance $(G = (V, E), \sigma, k)$, where (G, σ) is colored with the two colors black and white, of the 2-BMG EDITING problem as follows: First, we construct a bi-clique S consisting of a black vertex s_b and a white vertex s_w for every $s \in \mathfrak{S}$. Thus the subgraph induced by S has $6t$ vertices and $r := 18t^2$ arcs in total. Let $q := 3 \times [6r(m-t) + r - 18t]$. For each of the m subsets C_i in \mathcal{C} , we introduce two bi-cliques X_i and Y_i , where X_i consists of r black and r white new vertices, and Y_i consists of q black and q white new vertices. In addition to the arcs provided by bi-cliques constructed in this manner, we add the following additional arcs:

- (x, y) for every $x \in X_i$ and $y \in Y_i$ with $\sigma(x) \neq \sigma(y)$ (note $(y, x) \notin E$),
- (x, s_b) for every white vertex $x \in X_i$ and every element $s \in C_i$, and,
- (x, s_w) for every black vertex $x \in X_i$ and every element $s \in C_i$.

This construction is illustrated in Fig. 6. Clearly, (G, σ) is properly colored, and the reduction can be computed in polynomial time.

We set $k := 6r(m-t) + r - 18t$ and show that there is a t -element subset \mathcal{C}' of \mathcal{C} that is a solution of X3C if and only if 2-BMG EDITING with input (G, σ, k) has a yes-answer. We emphasize that the coloring σ remains unchanged in the proof below.

First suppose that X3C with input \mathfrak{S} and \mathcal{C} has a yes-answer. Thus, there is a t -element subset \mathcal{C}' of \mathcal{C} such that $\bigcup_{C \in \mathcal{C}'} C = \mathfrak{S}$. We construct a set F and add, for all $C_i \in \mathcal{C} \setminus \mathcal{C}'$ and all $s \in C_i$,




Figure 6: Illustration of the reduction from EXACT 3-COVER. The thick gray arrows indicate that all arcs from that set to another set/vertex exist. The illustration emphasizes the analogy to [10] and [29].

the arcs (x, s_w) for every black vertex $x \in X_i$ and the arcs (x, s_b) for every white vertex $x \in X_i$. Since $|C_i| = 3$ for every $C_i \in \mathcal{C}$ and $|\mathcal{C} \setminus \mathcal{C}'| = m - t$, the set F contains exactly $6r(m - t)$ arcs, so far. Now, we add to F all arcs (s_b, s'_w) and (s_w, s'_b) whenever the corresponding elements s and s' belong to distinct elements in \mathcal{C}' , i.e., there is no $C \in \mathcal{C}'$ with $\{s, s'\} \subset C$. Therefore, the subgraph of $G - F$ induced by \mathfrak{S} is the disjoint union of t bi-cliques, each consisting of exactly 3 black vertices, 3 white vertices, and 18 arcs. Hence, F contains, in addition to the $6r(m - t)$ arcs, further $r - 18t$ arcs. Thus $|F| = k$. This completes the construction of F .

Since F contains only arcs but no non-arcs of G , we have $G \triangle F = G - F$. It remains to show that $G \triangle F$ is a BMG. To this end observe that $G \triangle F$ has precisely m connected components that are either induced by $X_i \cup Y_i$ (in case $C_i \in \mathcal{C} \setminus \mathcal{C}'$) or $X_i \cup Y_i \cup S'$ where S' is a bi-clique containing the six vertices corresponding to the elements in $C_i \in \mathcal{C}'$. In particular, each of these components corresponds to the subgraph as specified in Lemma 5.3. To see this, consider the bi-cluster graph consisting of the subgraphs induced by the bi-cliques X_i and Y_i , and additionally S' in the second case. Now fix the connected component X_i of this graph, and add all arcs from the vertices in X_i to differently-colored vertices in the remaining component(s). Thus, we can apply Lemma 5.3 to conclude that every connected component is a BMG. In particular, all of these subgraphs contain at least one black and one white vertex. Hence, Lemma 2.12 implies that $(G \triangle F, \sigma)$ is a BMG.

Now, suppose that 2-BMG EDITING with input (G, σ) has a yes-answer. Thus, there is a set F with $|F| \leq k$ such that $(G \triangle F, \sigma)$ is a BMG. We will prove that we have to delete an arc set similar to the one as constructed above. First note that the number of vertices affected by F , i.e. vertices incident to inserted/deleted arcs, is at most $2k$. Since $2k < q = |\{y \in Y_i \mid \sigma(y) = \text{black}\}| = |\{y \in Y_i \mid \sigma(y) = \text{white}\}|$ for every $1 \leq i \leq m$, we have at least one black vertex $b_i \in Y_i$ and at least one white vertex $w_i \in Y_i$ that are unaffected by F . Recall that S is the bi-clique that we have constructed from a black vertex s_b and a white vertex s_w for every $s \in \mathfrak{S}$. We continue by proving

Claim 5.4.1. *Every vertex $s \in S$ has in-arcs from at most one X_i in $G \triangle F$.*

Proof: Assume w.l.o.g. that s is black and, for contradiction, that there are two distinct vertices $x_1 \in X_i$ and $x_2 \in X_j$ with $i \neq j$ and $(x_1, s), (x_2, s) \in E \triangle F$. Clearly, both x_1 and x_2 are white. As argued above, there are two (distinct) black vertices $b_1 \in Y_i$ and $b_2 \in Y_j$ that are not affected by F . Thus, (x_1, b_1) and (x_2, b_2) remain arcs in $G \triangle F$, whereas (x_1, b_2) and (x_2, b_1) are not arcs in $G \triangle F$, since they do not form arcs in G . In summary, we have five distinct vertices x_1, x_2, b_1, b_2, s with $\sigma(x_1) = \sigma(x_2) \neq \sigma(b_1) = \sigma(b_2) = \sigma(s)$, arcs $(x_1, b_1), (x_2, b_2), (x_1, s), (x_2, s)$ and non-arcs $(x_1, b_2), (x_2, b_1)$. Thus $(G \triangle F, \sigma)$ contains an induced F3-graph. By Lemma 4.2, $(G \triangle F, \sigma)$ is not a BMG; a contradiction. \diamond

By Claim 5.4.1, every vertex in S has in-arcs from at most one X_i . Note each X_i has r black and r white vertices. Since each element in S is either white or black, each single element in S has at most r in-arcs. Since $|S| = 2n$, we obtain at most $2rn = 2r(3t) = 6rt$ such arcs in

$G \triangle F$. In G , there are in total $6rm$ arcs from the vertices in all X_i to the vertices in S . By Claim 5.4.1, F contains at least $6r(m-t)$ deletions. It remains to specify the other at most $r-18t$ arc modifications. To this end, we show first

Claim 5.4.2. *Every vertex $s \in S$ has in-arcs from precisely one X_i in $G \triangle F$.*

Proof: Assume that there is a vertex $s \in S$ that has no in-arc from any X_i . Hence, to the aforementioned $6r(m-t)$ deletions we must add r further deletions. However, at most $r-18t$ further edits are allowed; a contradiction. \diamond

So far, F contains only arc-deletions. For the next arguments, we need the following two statements:

Claim 5.4.3. *The modification set F does not insert any arcs between X_i and X_j with $i \neq j$.*

Proof: Assume for contradiction that F , and thus $G \triangle F$, contains an arc (x_1, x_2) with $x_1 \in X_i$, $x_2 \in X_j$ and $i \neq j$. W.l.o.g. assume that x_1 is white and x_2 is black. As argued above there are black, resp., white vertices $b, w \in Y_j$ that are unaffected by F . Therefore, (x_2, w) and (b, w) remain arcs in $G \triangle F$, whereas (x_1, b) and (b, x_1) are not arcs in $G \triangle F$ since they do not form arcs in G . In summary, $(x_1, x_2), (b, w), (x_2, w)$ are arcs in $G \triangle F$ while $(x_1, b), (b, x_1)$ are not arcs in $G \triangle F$. Since moreover $\sigma(x_1) = \sigma(w) \neq \sigma(b) = \sigma(x_2)$, $(G \triangle F, \sigma)$ contains an induced F1-graph. By Lemma 4.2, $(G \triangle F, \sigma)$ is not a BMG; a contradiction. \diamond

Claim 5.4.4. *Let $s_1, s_2 \in S$ be vertices with in-arcs (x_1, s_1) , resp., (x_2, s_2) in $G \triangle F$ for some $x_1 \in X_i$ and $x_2 \in X_j$ with $i \neq j$. Then (s_1, s_2) and (s_2, s_1) cannot be arcs in $G \triangle F$.*

Proof: Assume w.l.o.g. that (s_1, s_2) is an arc in $G \triangle F$ and that s_1 is black. It follows that x_1 and s_2 are white and x_2 is black. By construction of G and by Claim 5.4.3, we clearly have $(x_1, x_2), (x_2, x_1) \notin E \triangle F$. In summary, we have four distinct vertices x_1, x_2, s_1, s_2 with $\sigma(x_1) = \sigma(s_2) \neq \sigma(s_1) = \sigma(x_2)$, arcs $(x_1, s_1), (x_2, s_2), (s_1, s_2)$ and non-arcs $(x_1, x_2), (x_2, x_1)$ in $G \triangle F$. Thus $(G \triangle F, \sigma)$ contains an induced F1-graph. By Lemma 4.2, $(G \triangle F, \sigma)$ is not a BMG; a contradiction. \diamond

In summary, $G \triangle F$ has the following property: Every $s \in S$ has in-arcs from exactly one X_i , and there are no arcs between two distinct vertices s_1 and s_2 in S that have in-arcs from two different sets X_i and X_j , respectively. Since $|C_i| = 3$ for every $C_i \in \mathcal{C}$, $(G \triangle F)[S]$ contains connected components of size at most 6, i.e., the black and white vertex for each of the three elements in C_i . Hence, the maximum number of arcs in $(G \triangle F)[S]$ is obtained when each of its connected components contains exactly these 6 vertices and they form a bi-clique. In this case, $(G \triangle F)[S]$ contains $18t$ arcs. We conclude that F contains at least another $r-18t$ deletion arcs for S . Together with the at least $6r(m-t)$ deletions between the X_i and the elements of S , we have at least $6r(m-t) + r - 18t = k \geq |F|$ arc-deletions in F . Since $|F| \leq k$ by assumption, we obtain $|F| = k$.

As argued above, the subgraph induced by S is a disjoint union of t bi-cliques of 3 white and 3 black vertices each. Since all vertices of such a bi-clique have in-arcs from the same X_i and these in-arcs are also in G , we readily obtain the desired partition $\mathcal{C}' \subset \mathcal{C}$ of \mathfrak{S} . In other words, the C_i corresponding to the X_i having out-arcs to vertices in S in the edited graph $G \triangle F$ induce an exact cover of \mathfrak{S} . \square

The set F constructed in the proof of Thm. 5.4 contains only arc-deletions. This immediately implies

Corollary 5.5. *2-BMG DELETION is NP-complete.*

In order to tackle the complexity of the 2-BMG COMPLETION, we follow a different approach and employ a reduction from the CHAIN GRAPH COMPLETION problem. To this end, we need some additional notation. An undirected graph U is bipartite if its vertex set can be partitioned into two non-empty disjoint sets P and Q such that $V(U) = P \cup Q$ and every edge has one endpoint in P and the other endpoint in Q . We write $U = (P \cup Q, \tilde{E})$ to emphasize that \tilde{E} is a set of undirected edges and that U is bipartite. Furthermore, we write $N(x)$ also for the neighborhood of a vertex x in an undirected graph. Thus U is bipartite if and only if $x \in P$ implies $N(x) \subseteq Q$ and $x \in Q$ implies $N(x) \subseteq P$.

Definition 5.6. (*[cf. 31, 38]*) *An undirected, bipartite graph $U = (P \cup Q, \tilde{E})$ is a chain graph if there is an order \prec on P such that $u \prec v$ implies $N(u) \subseteq N(v)$.*

The CHAIN GRAPH COMPLETION problem consists of finding a minimum-sized set of additional edges that converts an arbitrary undirected, bipartite graph into a chain graph. More formally, its decision version can be stated as follows:

Problem 5.5 (CHAIN GRAPH COMPLETION (CGC)).

Input: An undirected, bipartite graph $U = (P \cup Q, \tilde{E})$ and an integer k .

Question: Is there a subset $\tilde{F} \subseteq \{\{p, q\} \mid (p, q) \in P \times Q\} \setminus \tilde{E}$ such that $|\tilde{F}| \leq k$ and $U' := (P \cup Q, \tilde{E} \cup \tilde{F})$ is a chain graph?

It is shown in [38] that CGC is NP-complete. Following [38], we say that two edges $\{u, v\}$ and $\{x, y\}$ in an undirected graph U are *independent* if u, v, x, y are pairwise distinct and the subgraph $U[\{u, v, x, y\}]$ contains no additional edges. We will need the following characterization of chain graphs:

Lemma 5.7. [38, Lemma 1] An undirected, bipartite graph $U = (P \cup Q, \tilde{E})$ is a chain graph if and only if it does not contain a pair of independent edges.

Theorem 5.8. 2-BMG COMPLETION is NP-complete.

Proof. Since BMGs can be recognized in polynomial time by Cor. 3.7, 2-BMG COMPLETION is clearly contained in NP. To show NP-hardness, we use a reduction from CGC. Let $(U = (P \cup Q, \tilde{E}), k)$ be an instance of CGC with vertex sets $P = \{p_1, \dots, p_{|P|}\}$ and $Q = \{q_1, \dots, q_{|Q|}\}$. To construct an instance $(G = (V, E), \sigma, k)$ of the 2-BMG COMPLETION problem, we set $V = P \cup Q \cup R \cup \{b\} \cup \{w\}$ where $R = \{r_1, \dots, r_{|Q|}\}$ is a copy of Q . The vertices are colored $\sigma(p_i) = \sigma(r_j) = \sigma(b) = \text{black}$ and $\sigma(q_i) = \sigma(w) = \text{white}$. The arc set E contains (q_i, r_i) and (r_i, q_i) for $1 \leq i \leq |Q|$, (p_i, w) for $1 \leq i \leq |P|$, (w, b) and (b, w) , and (p, q) for every $\{p, q\} \in \tilde{E}$. This construction is illustrated in Fig. 7. Clearly, (G, σ) is properly colored, and the reduction can be computed in polynomial time. Moreover, it is easy to verify that (G, σ) is sink-free by construction, and thus, any graph (G', σ) obtained from (G, σ) by adding arcs is also sink-free. As above, we emphasize that the coloring σ remains unchanged in the completion process.




Figure 7: Illustration of the reduction from CGC. A pair of independent edges in U and the corresponding induced F3-graph in (G, σ) are highlighted.

A pair (F, \tilde{F}) with $F \subseteq P \times Q$ and an edge set $\tilde{F} = \{\{p, q\} \mid (p, q) \in F\}$ will be called a *completion pair* for the bipartite graph $U = (P \cup Q, \tilde{E})$ and the corresponding 2-colored digraph $(G = (V, E), \sigma)$.

Claim 5.8.1. If (F, \tilde{F}) is a completion pair, then $|F| = |\tilde{F}|$, $(p, q) \in F$ if and only if $\{p, q\} \in \tilde{F}$, and $(p, q) \in F \cup E$ if and only if $\{p, q\} \in \tilde{F} \cup \tilde{E}$.

Proof: First note that, by construction, F contains only arcs from vertices in P to vertices in Q . This together with the definition $\tilde{F} = \{\{p, q\} \mid (p, q) \in F\}$ clearly implies $(p, q) \in F$ if and only if $\{p, q\} \in \tilde{F}$ and thus $|F| = |\tilde{F}|$. By construction of our reduction we have $(p, q) \in E$ if and only if $\{p, q\} \in \tilde{E}$ and thus also $(p, q) \in E \cup F$ if and only if $\{p, q\} \in \tilde{E} \cup \tilde{F}$. \diamond

Before we continue, observe that, for every pair of independent edges $\{p_1, q_1\}, \{p_2, q_2\} \in \tilde{E}$, the subgraph of (G, σ) induced by $\{p_1, p_2, q_1, q_2, w\}$ is an F3-graph. Together with Lemmas 4.2 and 5.7, this implies that (G, σ) cannot be a BMG if U is not a chain graph. Eliminating these induced F3-graphs is closely connected to chain graph completion. More precisely we will show:

Claim 5.8.2. *Let (F, \tilde{F}) be a completion pair. If $(G + F, \sigma)$ is a BMG, then $U' = (P \cup Q, \tilde{E} \cup \tilde{F})$ is a chain graph.*

Proof: Suppose that $(G + F, \sigma)$ is a BMG and assume, for contradiction, that $U' = (P \cup Q, \tilde{E} \cup \tilde{F})$ is not a chain graph. The latter and Lemma 5.7 imply that U' has two independent edges $\{p_1, q_1\}, \{p_2, q_2\} \in \tilde{E} \cup \tilde{F}$. Thus $\{p_1, q_2\}, \{p_2, q_1\} \notin \tilde{E} \cup \tilde{F}$. The latter arguments and Claim 5.8.1 imply that $(p_1, q_1), (p_2, q_2) \in E \cup F$ and $(p_1, q_2), (p_2, q_1) \notin E \cup F$. Since moreover $(p_1, w), (p_2, w)$ and $\sigma(p_1) = \sigma(p_2) \neq \sigma(q_1) = \sigma(q_2) = \sigma(w)$, it follows that the five distinct vertices p_1, p_2, q_1, q_2, w induce an F3-graph in $(G + F, \sigma)$. By Lemma 4.2, $(G + F, \sigma)$ cannot be a BMG; a contradiction. \diamond

The converse is also true:

Claim 5.8.3. *Let (F, \tilde{F}) be a completion pair for $U = (P \cup Q, \tilde{E})$, and suppose $U' = (P \cup Q, \tilde{E} \cup \tilde{F})$ is a chain graph. Then $(G + F, \sigma)$ is a BMG.*

Proof: By Thm. 4.4, $(G + F, \sigma)$ is a 2-colored BMG if and only if it is sink-free and does not contain an induced F1-, F2-, or F3-graph. Since (G, σ) is sink-free, this is also true for $(G + F, \sigma)$. Thus it suffices to show that $(G + F, \sigma)$ does not contain an induced F1-, F2-, or F3-graph.

Suppose that $(G + F, \sigma)[u, u', v, v']$ is an induced F1-graph. Let H be a subgraph of $(G + F, \sigma)[u, u', v, v']$ that is isomorphic to the *essential* F1-graph, that is, the F1-graph as specified in Fig. 2 that contains only the solid-lined arcs and none of the dashed arcs while all other non-arcs remain non-arcs. In this case, there is an isomorphism φ from H to the essential F1-graph with vertex-labeling as in Fig. 2. Hence, $\varphi(u)$ corresponds to one of the vertices x_1, x_2, y_1 or y_2 . To simplify the presentation we will say that, in this case, “ u plays the role of $\varphi(u)$ in an F1-graph”. The latter definition naturally extends to F2- and F3-graphs and we will use analogous language for F2- and F3-graphs. Note, in the latter definition, it is not required that $\sigma(u) = \sigma(\varphi(u))$. Nevertheless, for $a, b \in \{u, u', v, v'\}$ with $\sigma(a) \neq \sigma(b)$ it always holds, by construction, that $\sigma(\varphi(a)) \neq \sigma(\varphi(b))$.

In the following, an in- or out-neighbor of a vertex is just called *neighbor*. A *flank vertex* in an F1-, F2-, resp., F3-graph is a vertex that has only a single neighbor in the essential F1-, F2-, resp., F3-graph. To be more precise, when referring to Fig. 2, the flank vertices in an F1-graph and F2-graph are x_1 and y_2 , while the flank vertices in an F3-graph are y_1 and y_2 .

Since (F, \tilde{F}) is a completion pair, by definition, F adds only arcs from P to Q . Hence, each of the vertices in $R \cup \{b\}$ has a single neighbor in $(G + F, \sigma)$ irrespective of the choice of F . Therefore, if $u \in R \cup \{b\}$ is contained in an induced F1-, F2-, or F3-graph in (G, σ) or $(G + F, \sigma)$, it must be a flank vertex. Observe first that b can only play the role of y_2 in the F1- or F2-graph, since otherwise, the fact that w is the single neighbor of b in (G, σ) or $(G + F, \sigma)$ implies that w must play the role of y_1 in the F1- or F2-graph, which is not possible since b is the single out-neighbor of w and F does not affect w . By similar arguments, none of the vertices in $R \cup \{b\}$ can play the role of x_1 in an F1- or F2-graph, or the role of y_1 or y_2 in an F3-graph in (G, σ) or $(G + F, \sigma)$. The vertex w has only in-arcs from the elements in P and from b . Likewise, the vertices $q_i \in Q$ have only in-arcs from P and from their corresponding vertex $r_i \in R$. Therefore and since all elements in P have only out-neighbors, it is an easy task to verify that none of the vertices in $R \cup \{b\}$ can play the role of y_2 in an F1- or F2-graph. Thus none of the vertices in $R \cup \{b\}$ is part of an induced F1-, F2-, or F3-graph.

Thus it suffices to investigate the subgraph (G', σ) of $(G + F, \sigma)$ induced by $\{w\} \cup P \cup Q$ for the presence of induced F1-, F2-, and F3-graphs. In G' , none of the vertices in $\{w\} \cup Q$ have out-neighbors since $F \subseteq P \times Q$ does not affect w and does not contain arcs from $q_i \in Q$ to any other vertex. Thus, none of the vertices in $\{w\} \cup Q$ can play the role of x_1, y_1 or y_2 in an F1-, the role of x_1, y_1 or x_2 in an F2-graph, or the role of x_1 or x_2 in an F3-graph. Since $\{w\} \cup Q$ has only in-arcs from P , and P has no in-arcs in G' , none of the vertices in $\{w\} \cup Q$ can play the role of x_2 in an F1-graphs or the role of y_2 in an F2-graph. Thus none of the vertices in $\{w\} \cup Q$ is part of an induced F1- or F2-graph. Hence, any induced F1- or F2-graph must be contained in $G'[P]$. However, all vertices of P are colored black, and hence $(G'[P], \sigma|_P)$ cannot harbor an induced F1- or F2-graph.




Figure 8: An example solution for CGC, resp., 2-BMG COMPLETION as constructed in the proof of Thm. 5.8. A tree (T, σ) that explains the resulting BMG is shown on the right. Here, we have $k = 4$ edge, resp., arc additions (indicated by dashed-gray lines) to obtain a chain-graph, resp., 2-BMG. The indices of the vertices in $P = \{p_1, \dots, p_{|P|}\}$ are chosen w.r.t. the order \prec on P i.e. $i < j$ if and only if $p_i \prec p_j$ and thus, $N(p_i) \subseteq N(p_j)$. In this example, we have $N(p_1) \cap Q = \emptyset$. Moreover, the vertex q_1 has no neighbor in P .

Suppose (G', σ) contains an induced F3-graph. Then there are five pairwise distinct vertices $x_1, x_2, y_1, y_2, y_3 \in \{w\} \cup P \cup Q$ with coloring $\sigma(x_1) = \sigma(x_2) \neq \sigma(y_1) = \sigma(y_2) = \sigma(y_3)$ satisfying $(x_1, y_1), (x_2, y_2), (x_1, y_3), (x_2, y_3) \in E \cup F$ and $(x_1, y_2), (x_2, y_1) \notin E \cup F$. Since P has no in-arcs in (G', σ) , it must hold that $y_1, y_2, y_3 \notin P$. Since $\sigma(\{w\} \cup Q) \neq \sigma(P)$ and (G', σ) is properly 2-colored, we have $x_1, x_2 \in P$. Since w has in-arcs from all vertices in P and $(x_1, y_2), (x_2, y_1) \notin E \cup F$, vertex w can neither play the role of y_1 nor of y_2 in an F3-subgraph. Thus, $y_1, y_2 \in Q$. Claim 5.8.1 therefore implies $\{x_1, y_1\}, \{x_2, y_2\} \in \tilde{E} \cup \tilde{F}$ and $\{x_1, y_2\}, \{x_2, y_1\} \notin \tilde{E} \cup \tilde{F}$. Hence, U' contains a pair of independent edges. By Lemma 5.7, it follows that U' is not a chain graph; a contradiction. \diamond

Together, Claims 5.8.2 and 5.8.3 imply that $(G + F, \sigma)$ is a BMG if and only if $U' = (P \cup Q, \tilde{E} \cup \tilde{F})$ is a chain graph; see Fig. 8 for an illustrative example.

Claim 5.8.4. *If F is a minimum-sized arc completion set such that $(G + F, \sigma)$ is a BMG, then $F \subseteq P \times Q$.*

Proof: Let F be an arbitrary minimum-sized arc completion set, i.e., $(G + F, \sigma)$ is a BMG, and put $F' := F \cap (P \times Q)$ and let (F', \tilde{F}') be the corresponding completion pair.

If $F' = F$, there is nothing to show. Otherwise, we have $|F'| < |F|$ and minimality of $|F|$ implies that $(G + F', \sigma)$ is not a BMG. By contraposition of Claim 5.8.3, we infer that $U' = (P \cup Q, \tilde{E} \cup \tilde{F}')$ is not a chain graph. Hence, Lemma 5.7 implies that U' contains a set of independent edges $\{p_1, q_1\}, \{p_2, q_2\} \in \tilde{E} \cup \tilde{F}'$ and $\{p_1, q_2\}, \{p_2, q_1\} \notin \tilde{E} \cup \tilde{F}'$. By Claim 5.8.1, it follows that $(p_1, q_1), (p_2, q_2) \in E \cup F'$ and $(p_1, q_2), (p_2, q_1) \notin E \cup F'$. Since $F' \subset F$, we have $(p_1, q_1), (p_2, q_2) \in E \cup F$. Furthermore, from $(p_1, q_2), (p_2, q_1) \in P \times Q$ and $F' = F \cap (P \times Q)$, we conclude that $(p_1, q_2), (p_2, q_1) \notin E \cup F$. By construction of our reduction and since we only insert arcs, we have $(p_1, w), (p_2, w) \in E \cup F$. Together with the coloring $\sigma(p_1) = \sigma(p_2) \neq \sigma(q_1) = \sigma(q_2) = \sigma(w)$, the latter arguments imply that $(G + F, \sigma)$ contains an induced F3-graph. By Lemma 4.2, this contradicts that $(G + F, \sigma)$ is a BMG. \diamond

Now, let (F, \tilde{F}) be a completion pair such that $|\tilde{F}| \leq k$ and \tilde{F} is a minimum-sized edge completion set for U . Thus $U' = (P \cup Q, \tilde{E} \cup \tilde{F})$ is a chain graph. Hence, Claim 5.8.3 implies that $(G + F, \sigma)$ is a BMG. Since $|F| = |\tilde{F}| \leq k$, it follows that 2-BMG COMPLETION with input (G, σ, k) has a yes-answer if CGC with input $(U = (P \cup Q, \tilde{E}), k)$ has a yes-answer.

Finally, let F be a minimum-sized arc completion set for (G, σ) , i.e. $(G + F, \sigma)$ is a BMG, and assume $|F| \leq k$. This and Claim 5.8.4 implies $F \subseteq P \times Q$. For the corresponding completion pair (F, \tilde{F}) we have $|\tilde{F}| = |F| \leq k$. Moreover, since $(G + F, \sigma)$ is a BMG, Claim 5.8.2 implies that $U = (P \cup Q, \tilde{E} \cup \tilde{F})$ is a chain graph. Therefore, CGC with input $(U = (P \cup Q, \tilde{E}), k)$ has a yes-answer if 2-BMG COMPLETION with input (G, σ, k) has a yes-answer. This completes the proof. \square




Figure 9: An hourglass (left) and the unique non-binary tree (right) that explains it.

Not all (2-)BMGs can be explained by binary trees [32, 33]. BMGs (G, σ) for which a binary explaining tree exists have been termed *binary-explainable* [32]. They are of practical significance because phylogenetic trees are often assumed to be binary by nature, with multifurcations arising in many cases as an artifact of insufficient data [8, 24, 30].

We therefore consider the modified completion problem that, given an arbitrary properly colored digraph (G, σ) , aims to find a binary-explainable BMG:

Problem 5.6 (ℓ -BMG COMPLETION RESTRICTED TO BINARY-EXPLAINABLE GRAPHS (ℓ -BMG CBEG)).

Input: A properly ℓ -colored digraph $(G = (V, E), \sigma)$ and an integer k .

Question: Is there a subset $F \subseteq V \times V \setminus (\{(v, v) \mid v \in V\} \cup E)$ such that $|F| \leq k$ and $(G + F, \sigma)$ is a binary-explainable ℓ -BMG?

The corresponding editing and deletion problems will be called ℓ -BMG EBEG and ℓ -BMG DBEG, respectively.

Binary-explainable BMGs can be characterized in terms of a simple forbidden subgraph.

Definition 5.9. An hourglass in a properly vertex-colored graph (G, σ) , denoted by $[xy \times x'y']$, is a subgraph $(G[Q], \sigma|_Q)$ induced by a set of four pairwise distinct vertices $Q = \{x, x', y, y'\} \subseteq V(G)$ such that (i) $\sigma(x) = \sigma(x') \neq \sigma(y) = \sigma(y')$, (ii) $(x, y), (y, x)$ and $(x'y'), (y', x')$ are bidirectional arcs in G , (iii) $(x, y'), (y, x') \in E(G)$, and (iv) $(y', x), (x', y) \notin E(G)$.

Fig. 9 illustrates this definition. A graph (G, σ) is called *hourglass-free* if it does not contain an hourglass as an induced subgraph.

Proposition 5.10. [33, Prop. 8] A BMG (G, σ) can be explained by a binary tree if and only if it is hourglass-free.

The reduction employed in the proof of Thm. 5.8 can be adapted to show that the 2-BMG CBEG problem is hard.

Corollary 5.11. 2-BMG CBEG is NP-complete.

Proof. As shown in [33, Cor. 6] and [32, Cor. 3.6], binary-explainable BMGs can be recognized in polynomial time. Therefore, 2-BMG CBEG is contained in the class NP.

To show hardness of the problem, we use the same reduction from CGC and the same arguments as in the proof of Thm. 5.8. In addition, we observe that the hourglass $[xy \times x'y']$ contains the bidirectional arcs (x, y) and (y, x) and each of the two vertices x and y has two out-neighbors, and thus, also at least two out-neighbors in every graph that contains the hourglass as an induced subgraph.

We have to show that CGC with input $(U = (P \cup Q, \tilde{E}), k)$ has a yes-answer if and only if 2-BMG CBEG with input (G, σ, k) as constructed in the proof of Thm. 5.8 has a yes-answer. Recall that by Claims 5.8.2 and 5.8.3, $(G + F, \sigma)$ is a BMG if and only if $U' = (P \cup Q, \tilde{E} \cup \tilde{F})$ is a chain graph, where (F, \tilde{F}) is a completion pair. Moreover, by Claim 5.8.4, every minimum-sized arc completion set F for which $(G + F, \sigma)$ is a BMG satisfies $F \subseteq P \times Q$. Therefore, we can again argue via minimal completion pairs (F, \tilde{F}) to conclude that, both in the *if*- and in the *only-if*-direction, we have a 2-BMG $(G + F, \sigma)$ with $F \subseteq P \times Q$, i.e., we only inserted arcs from P to Q . Using Fig. 8, it is now easy to verify that every bidirectional pair of arcs in $(G + F, \sigma)$ is either incident to the vertex b or to one of the vertices in R . Moreover, every vertex in $R \cup \{b\}$ has exactly one out-neighbor. The latter two arguments together with the observation that hourglasses require bidirectional arcs $(x, y), (y, x)$ such that both x and y have at least two out-neighbors imply that $(G + F, \sigma)$ must be hourglass-free. Therefore, $(G + F, \sigma)$ is binary-explainable by Prop. 5.10, which completes the proof. \square

Results analogous to Cor. 5.11 cannot be derived as easily for 2-BMG EBEG and 2-BMG DBEG. The reason is that the graph (G, σ) (as well as $(G \triangle F, \sigma)$) constructed in the proof of Thm. 5.4 contains a large number of induced hourglasses. In particular, for every $i \in \{1, \dots, m\}$, we have that every black vertex $a \in X_i$, white vertex $b \in X_i$, black vertex $a' \in Y_i$ and white vertex $b' \in Y_i$ induce an hourglass $[ab \times a'b']$. Even though we suspect these problems to be hard as well, a different reduction will be required to prove this conjecture.

6 Complexity of ℓ -BMG modification problems

We now turn to the graph modification problems for an arbitrary number ℓ of colors. The proof of the next theorem follows the same strategy of adding hub-vertices as in [21].

Theorem 6.1. *ℓ -BMG DELETION, ℓ -BMG COMPLETION, and ℓ -BMG EDITING are NP-complete for all $\ell \geq 2$.*

Proof. BMGs can be recognized in polynomial time by Cor. 3.7 and thus, all three problems are contained in the class NP. Let $(G = (V, E), \sigma)$ be a properly colored digraph with ℓ colors. Thm. 5.4, Cor. 5.5 and Thm. 5.8 state NP-completeness for the case of $\ell = 2$ colors. Thus assume $\ell \geq 3$ in the following.

By slight abuse of notation, we collectively refer to the three problems ℓ -BMG DELETION, ℓ -BMG COMPLETION, and ℓ -BMG EDITING simply as ℓ -BMG MODIFICATION. Correspondingly, we write $(G \odot F, \sigma)$ and distinguish the three problems by the modification operation $\odot \in \{-, +, \Delta\}$, where $\odot = -$, $\odot = +$ and $\odot = \Delta$ specifies that F is a deletion-, completion, or edit set, respectively.

We use reduction from 2-BMG MODIFICATION. To this end, let $(G_2 = (V_2, E_2), \sigma_2, k)$ be an instance of one of the latter three problems. To obtain a properly colored graph $(G_\ell = (V_\ell, E_\ell), \sigma_\ell)$ with ℓ colors, we add to G_2 a set V_H of $\ell - 2$ new vertices with pairwise distinct colors that also do not share any colors with the vertices in (G_2, σ_2) . Moreover, we add arcs such that every $h \in V_H$ becomes a hub-vertex. Note that $V_\ell = V_2 \cup V_H$, $G_\ell[V_2] = G_2$, and $(\sigma_\ell)|_{V_2} = \sigma_2$. Furthermore, V_2 is a subset of V_ℓ satisfying the condition in Obs. 2.8, i.e., $V_2 = \bigcup_{s \in S_2} V_\ell[s]$ for the color set S_2 in (G_2, σ_2) . Clearly, the reduction can be performed in polynomial time. We proceed by showing that an instance (G_2, σ_2, k) of the respective 2-BMG MODIFICATION problem has a yes-answer if and only if the corresponding instance (G_ℓ, σ_ℓ, k) of ℓ -BMG MODIFICATION has a yes-answer.

Suppose that 2-BMG MODIFICATION with input (G_2, σ_2, k) has a yes-answer. Then there is an arc set $F \subseteq V_2 \times V_2 \setminus \{(v, v) \mid v \in V_2\}$ with $|F| \leq k$ such that $(G_2 \odot F, \sigma_2)$ is a BMG. Let (T_2, σ_2) be a tree with root ρ explaining $(G_2 \odot F, \sigma_2)$. Now take (T_2, σ_2) and add the vertices in V_H as leaves of the root ρ and color these leaves as in (G_ℓ, σ_ℓ) , to obtain the tree (T_ℓ, σ_ℓ) . By construction, we have $L(T_\ell) = V_\ell = V_2 \cup V_H$ and $T_2 = (T_\ell)|_{V_2}$, where $(T_\ell)|_{V_2}$ is the restriction of T_ℓ to the leaf set V_2 . The latter arguments together with Obs. 2.8 imply that $(G(T_\ell, \sigma_\ell)[V_2], (\sigma_\ell)|_{V_2}) = G((T_\ell)|_{V_2}, (\sigma_\ell)|_{V_2}) = G(T_2, \sigma_2) = (G_2 \odot F, \sigma_2)$.

Let $h \in V_H$ be arbitrary. Since h is the only vertex of its color, (x, h) is an arc in $G(T_\ell, \sigma_\ell)$ for every $x \in V_\ell \setminus \{h\}$. Since h is a child of the root, we have moreover $\text{lca}_{T_\ell}(x, h) = \rho$, and thus, (h, x) is an arc in $G(T_\ell, \sigma_\ell)$ for every $x \in V_\ell \setminus \{h\}$. The latter two arguments imply that h is a hub-vertex in $G(T_\ell, \sigma_\ell)$. Since F is not incident to any vertex in $V_\ell \setminus V_2 = V_H$ and each vertex $h \in V_H$ is a hub-vertex in (G_ℓ, σ_ℓ) and in $G(T_\ell, \sigma_\ell)$, we conclude that $G(T_\ell, \sigma_\ell) = (G_\ell \odot F, \sigma_\ell)$. Hence, $(G_\ell \odot F, \sigma_\ell)$ is a BMG and the corresponding ℓ -BMG MODIFICATION problem with input (G_ℓ, σ_ℓ, k) has a yes-answer.

For the converse, suppose that ℓ -BMG MODIFICATION with input (G_ℓ, σ_ℓ, k) has a yes-answer. Thus, there is an arc set $F \subseteq V_\ell \times V_\ell \setminus \{(v, v) \mid v \in V_\ell\}$ with $|F| \leq k$ such that $(G_\ell \odot F, \sigma_\ell)$ is a BMG. Let (T_ℓ, σ_ℓ) be a tree explaining $(G_\ell \odot F, \sigma_\ell)$. Let $F' \subseteq F$ be the subset of arc modifications (x, y) for which $x, y \in V_2$. Thus, it holds $|F'| \leq |F| \leq k$. By construction, $(G_\ell \odot F)[V_2] = G_\ell[V_2] \odot F'$. Moreover, by Obs. 2.8, we have $(G(T_\ell, \sigma_\ell)[V_2], (\sigma_\ell)|_{V_2}) = G((T_\ell)|_{V_2}, (\sigma_\ell)|_{V_2})$. In summary, we obtain $(G_2 \odot F', \sigma_2) = (G_\ell[V_2] \odot F', \sigma_2) = ((G_\ell \odot F)[V_2], (\sigma_\ell)|_{V_2}) = (G(T_\ell, \sigma_\ell)[V_2], (\sigma_\ell)|_{V_2}) = G((T_\ell)|_{V_2}, (\sigma_\ell)|_{V_2})$. Thus, $(G_2 \odot F', \sigma_2)$ is a BMG. Together with $|F'| \leq k$, this implies that 2-BMG MODIFICATION with input (G_2, σ_2, k) has a yes-answer. \square

As in the 2-colored case, we can reuse the reduction to show that ℓ -BMG CBEG is NP-complete.

Corollary 6.2. *ℓ -BMG CBEG is NP-complete for all $\ell \geq 2$.*

Proof. As shown in [33, Cor. 6] and [32, Cor. 3.6], binary-explainable BMGs can be recognized in polynomial time. Therefore, ℓ -BMG CBEG is contained in the class NP. Cor. 5.11 states NP-completeness for the case $\ell = 2$. Thus, it remains to show NP-hardness for the case $\ell \geq 3$.

We use a reduction from 2-BMG CBEG and the same polynomial-time construction as in the proof of Thm. 6.1, i.e., we construct an ℓ -colored graph $(G_\ell = (V_\ell, E_\ell), \sigma_\ell)$ from a 2-colored graph $(G_2 = (V_2, E_2), \sigma_2)$ by adding a hub-vertex of $\ell - 2$ pairwise distinct new colors. Note that we only consider arc insertions here, i.e., we have $\odot = +$. We proceed by showing that an instance (G_2, σ_2, k) of the respective 2-BMG CBEG problem has a yes-answer if and only if the corresponding instance (G_ℓ, σ_ℓ, k) of ℓ -BMG CBEG has a yes-answer.

First suppose that 2-BMG CBEG with input (G_2, σ_2, k) has a solution $F \subseteq V_2 \times V_2 \setminus \{(v, v) \mid v \in V_2\}$ with $|F| \leq k$ such that $(G_2 + F, \sigma_2)$ is a *binary-explainable* BMG. By Prop. 5.10, $(G_2 + F, \sigma_2)$ is hourglass-free. Since $(G_2 + F, \sigma_2)$ is in particular a BMG, we can use the same arguments as in the proof of Thm. 6.1 to conclude that $(G_\ell + F, \sigma_\ell)$ is a BMG. Now observe that an hourglass contains two vertices of each of its two colors. Therefore and since every vertex in $V_H = V_\ell \setminus V_2$ is the only vertex of its color, none the vertices in V_H is part of an induced subgraph of $(G_\ell + F, \sigma_\ell)$ that is an hourglass. Hence, all hourglasses of $(G_\ell + F, \sigma_\ell)$ must be part of the induced subgraph $((G_\ell + F)[V_2], (\sigma_\ell)|_{V_2})$. This together with the facts that $((G_\ell + F)[V_2], (\sigma_\ell)|_{V_2}) = (G_2 + F, \sigma_2)$ and $(G_2 + F, \sigma_2)$ is hourglass-free implies that $(G_\ell + F, \sigma_\ell)$ must also be hourglass-free. By Prop. 5.10, the BMG $(G_\ell + F, \sigma_\ell)$ is binary-explainable, and hence, ℓ -BMG CBEG with input (G_ℓ, σ_ℓ, k) has a yes-answer.

For the converse, suppose that ℓ -BMG CBEG with input (G_ℓ, σ_ℓ, k) has a solution $F \subseteq V_\ell \times V_\ell \setminus \{(v, v) \mid v \in V_\ell\}$ with $|F| \leq k$ such that $(G_\ell + F, \sigma_\ell)$ is a binary-explainable BMG. By Prop. 5.10, $(G_\ell + F, \sigma_\ell)$ is hourglass-free. As before, let $F' \subseteq F$ be the subset of arc modifications (x, y) for which $x, y \in V_2$. By the same arguments as in the proof of Thm. 6.1, we have $|F'| \leq |F| \leq k$ and $(G_2 + F', \sigma_2) = ((G_\ell + F)[V_2], (\sigma_\ell)|_{V_2})$ is a BMG. In particular, $(G_2 + F', \sigma_2)$ is an induced subgraph of $(G_\ell + F, \sigma_\ell)$, and thus, hourglass-free. Together with Prop. 5.10, the latter arguments imply that 2-BMG CBEG with input (G_2, σ_2, k) has a yes-answer. \square

It remains an open question whether an analogous result holds for the corresponding editing and deletion problems restricted to binary-explainable graphs. However, by the same arguments as in the proof of Cor. 6.2, we have

Remark 6.3. *If 2-BMG EBEG is NP-complete, then ℓ -BMG EBEG is NP-complete for all $\ell \geq 2$. If 2-BMG DBEG is NP-complete, then ℓ -BMG DBEG is NP-complete for all $\ell \geq 2$.*

7 ILP formulation of ℓ -BMG modification problems

Hard graph editing problems can often be solved with integer linear programming (ILP) on practically relevant instances. It is of interest, therefore, to consider an ILP formulation of the BMG deletion, completion and editing problems considered above. As input, we are given an ℓ -colored digraph $(G = (V, E), \sigma)$. We encode its arcs by the binary constants

$$E_{xy} = 1 \text{ if and only if } (x, y) \in E.$$

for all pairs $(x, y) \in V \times V$, $x \neq y$. The vertex coloring σ is represented by the binary constant

$$\varsigma_{y,s} = 1 \text{ if and only if } \sigma(y) = s$$

The arc set of the modified graph (G^*, σ) is encoded by binary variables ϵ_{xy} , that is, $\epsilon_{xy} = 1$ if and only if (x, y) is arc in the modified graph G^* . The aim is to minimize the number of edit operations, and thus, the symmetric difference between the respective arc sets. This is represented by the objective function

$$\min \sum_{(x,y) \in V \times V} (1 - \epsilon_{xy})E_{xy} + \sum_{(x,y) \in V \times V} (1 - E_{xy})\epsilon_{xy}. \quad (1)$$

The same objective function can also be used for the BMG completion and BMG deletion problem. To ensure that only arcs between vertices of distinct colors exist, we add the constraints

$$\epsilon_{xy} = 0 \text{ for all } (x, y) \in V \times V \text{ with } \sigma(x) = \sigma(y). \quad (2)$$

For the BMG completion problem, the arc set E must be contained in the modified arc set. Hence, we add

$$E_{xy} \leq \epsilon_{xy} \text{ for all } (x, y) \in V \times V. \quad (3)$$

In this case, Equ. (3) ensures that $\epsilon_{xy} = 1$ if $E_{xy} = 1$ and thus, (x, y) remains an arc in the modified graph. In contrast, for the BMG deletion problem, it is not allowed to add arcs and thus, we use

$$\epsilon_{xy} \leq E_{xy} \text{ for all } (x, y) \in V \times V. \quad (4)$$

In this case, Equ. (4) ensures that $\epsilon_{xy} = 0$ if $E_{xy} = 0$ and thus, (x, y) does not become an arc in the modified graph. For the BMG editing problem, we neither need Constraint (3) nor (4). Both characterization in Thm. 4.4 and 3.5, respectively, require that (G^*, σ) is sf-colored. Eq. 2 already ensures a proper coloring and thus, it remains to make sure that each vertex has at least one out-neighbor of every other color. This property translates to the constraint

$$\sum_{y \neq x} \epsilon_{xy} \cdot \varsigma_{y,s} > 0 \quad (5)$$

for all $s \neq \sigma(x)$.

The $O(|V|^2)$ variables and $O(|V|^2)$ constraints introduced above are relevant for ℓ -BMG modification problems for an arbitrary ℓ . In the following two subsections, we present additional constraints and variables that are sufficient for the cases $\ell = 2$ and $\ell \geq 2$, respectively.

2-BMG modification problems

By Thm. 4.4, a properly 2-colored graph is a BMG if and only if it is sink-free and does not contain an induced F1-, F2-, or F3-graph. Equ. (5) already guarantees that (G^*, σ) is sink-free. Hence it suffices to add constraints that exclude induced F1-, F2-, and F3-graphs. For every ordered four-tuple $(x_1, x_2, y_1, y_2) \in V^4$ with pairwise distinct x_1, x_2, y_1, y_2 and $\sigma(x_1) = \sigma(x_2) \neq \sigma(y_1) = \sigma(y_2)$, we require

$$(F1) \quad \epsilon_{x_1 y_1} + \epsilon_{y_1 x_2} + \epsilon_{y_2 x_2} + (1 - \epsilon_{x_1 y_2}) + (1 - \epsilon_{y_2 x_1}) \leq 4 \text{ and} \quad (6)$$

$$(F2) \quad \epsilon_{x_1 y_1} + \epsilon_{y_1 x_2} + \epsilon_{x_2 y_2} + (1 - \epsilon_{x_1 y_2}) \leq 3. \quad (7)$$

In addition, for every ordered five-tuple $(x_1, x_2, y_1, y_2, y_3) \in V^5$ with pairwise distinct x_1, x_2, y_1, y_2, y_3 and $\sigma(x_1) = \sigma(x_2) \neq \sigma(y_1) = \sigma(y_2) = \sigma(y_3)$, we enforce

$$(F3) \quad \epsilon_{x_1 y_1} + \epsilon_{x_1 y_3} + \epsilon_{x_2 y_2} + \epsilon_{x_2 y_3} + (1 - \epsilon_{x_1 y_2}) + (1 - \epsilon_{x_2 y_1}) \leq 5. \quad (8)$$

By construction, we still have $O(|V|^2)$ variables but $O(|V|^5)$ constraints. We note that the 2-colored case is handled correctly by the ILP formulation for the general ℓ -colored case given in the next section. However, the additional variables required for $\ell > 2$ are not needed here. We note in passing that, accordingly, we observed a significant speedup when compared to the application of the general formulation to 2-colored graphs in a cursory simulation.

General ℓ -BMG modification problems

For the general ℓ -colored case, we drop Equations (6)-(8), and instead rely on Thm. 3.5, which requires that the pair $(\mathcal{R}(G^*, \sigma), \mathcal{F}(G^*, \sigma))$ is compatible. To implement this constraint, we follow the approach of [5] and [23]. Note that we make no distinction between the two triples $ba|c$ and $ab|c$. In order to avoid superfluous variables and symmetry conditions connecting them, we assume that the first two indices in triple variables are ordered. Thus there are three triple variables $t_{ab|c}$, $t_{ac|b}$ and $t_{bc|a}$ for any three distinct $a, b, c \in V$. We add constraints such that $t_{ab|c} = 1$ if $ab|c$ is an informative triple (cf. Def. 2.9 and Lemma 2.11) and $t_{ab|c} = 0$ if $ab|c$ is a forbidden triple (cf. Def. 3.1 and Lemma 3.2). Hence, we add

$$\epsilon_{xy} + (1 - \epsilon_{xy'}) - t_{xy|y'} \leq 1 \text{ and} \quad (9)$$

$$\epsilon_{xy} + \epsilon_{xy'} + t_{xy|y'} \leq 2 \quad (10)$$

for all ordered $(x, y, y') \in V^3$ with three pairwise distinct vertices x, y, y' and $\sigma(x) \neq \sigma(y) = \sigma(y')$. Equ. (9) ensures that if (x, y) is an arc ($\epsilon_{xy} = 1$) and (x, y') is not an arc ($\epsilon_{xy'} = 0$) in the edited graph, then $t_{xy|y'} = 1$. To obtain a BMG, we must ensure that there is a tree that displays all triples in $\mathcal{R}(G^*, \sigma)$ and none of the triples in $\mathcal{F}(G^*, \sigma)$.

A phylogenetic tree T is uniquely determined by its sets of clusters $\mathcal{C}(T) := \{L(T(v)) \mid v \in V(T)\}$ [34]. Thus, it is possible to reconstruct T by building the clusters induced by the informative triples

while avoiding that forbidden triples are displayed. The set of clusters $\mathcal{C}(T)$ forms a hierarchy, that is, for all $p, q \in \mathcal{C}(T)$ it holds that $p \cap q \in \{\emptyset, p, q\}$. It is easy to see that, in order to recover T from $\mathcal{C}(T)$, it suffices to take into account only the non-trivial clusters $p \in \mathcal{C}(T)$ with $|p| \neq 1$ and $p \neq V(T)$. The number of non-trivial clusters of T is bounded by $L(T) - 2$ (cf. [23, Lemma 1]), where $L(T) = V$, i.e., the vertex set of the ℓ -colored digraph $(G = (V, E), \sigma)$ given as input. In order to translate the condition that $\mathcal{C}(T)$ forms hierarchy into the language of ILPs, we follow [5, 23]. Let M be a binary $|V| \times (|V| - 2)$ matrix with entries $M(x, p) = 1$ iff vertex $x \in V$ is contained in cluster p . Each cluster p of the tree T_M encoded by M , which is represented by the p -th column of M , corresponds to an inner vertex v_p in T so that $L(T(v_p)) = \{x \mid x \in V, M(x, p) = 1\}$. In the following, we identify column p with the corresponding cluster $L(T(v_p))$.

We next ensure that all informative triples and none of the forbidden triples $ab|c$ are displayed by T_M . This is case if and only if there exists an inner vertex v_p such that $a, b \in L(T(v_p))$ and $c \notin L(T(v_p))$ for every informative triple and no such vertex exists for any forbidden triple. Therefore, we define, for all ordered three-tuples $(a, b, c) \in V^3$ and all $p \in \{1, \dots, |V| - 2\}$, the binary variable $m((ab|c), p)$ and set $m((ab|c), p) = 1$ iff $M(a, p) = M(b, p) = 1$ and $M(c, p) = 0$, i.e., iff the cluster p contains a and b but not c . The latter can be achieved by adding, for all these variables, the constraint

$$0 \leq -3 \cdot m((ab|c), p) + M(a, p) + M(b, p) + (1 - M(c, p)) \leq 2. \quad (11)$$

Full enumeration of all possible values that can be assigned to $M(a, p)$, $M(b, p)$ and $M(c, p)$ shows that $m((ab|c), p) = 1$ if and only if $M(a, p) = M(b, p) = 1$ and $M(c, p) = 0$.

For every informative triple $ab|c$ there must be at least one column p for which $m((ab|c), p) = 1$ and for each forbidden triple it must be ensured that $m((ab|c), p) = 0$ for all $p \in \{1, \dots, |V| - 2\}$. This is achieved by adding

$$t_{ab|c} \leq \sum_{p=1}^{|V|-2} m((ab|c), p) \leq (|V| - 2) \cdot t_{ab|c} \quad (12)$$

for all ordered $(a, b, c) \in V^3$ with three pairwise distinct vertices a, b, c and $\sigma(a) \neq \sigma(b) = \sigma(c)$. If $t_{ab|c} = 1$, then $m((ab|c), p) = 1$ for at least one p and if $t_{ab|c} = 0$ then, $\sum_{p=1}^{|V|-2} m((ab|c), p) \leq 0$ implies that all $m((ab|c), p)$ are put to 0.

Finally, we must ensure that the matrix M indeed encodes the hierarchy of a tree. This is the case if all clusters p and q are compatible, i.e., if $p \cap q \in \{p, q, \emptyset\}$. Equivalently, two clusters p and q are incompatible if there are vertices a, b and c such that $a \in p \setminus q$, $b \in q \setminus p$ and $c \in p \cap q$, which is represented by the ‘‘gametes’’ $(M(a, p), M(a, q)) = (1, 0)$, $(M(b, p), M(b, q)) = (0, 1)$ and $(M(c, p), M(c, q)) = (1, 1)$. We avoid such incompatible clusters by using the so-called three-gamete condition which is described e.g. in [19] or [23, SI]. To this end, we add for each of the three gametes $(\Gamma, \Lambda) \in \{(0, 1), (1, 0), (1, 1)\}$ the binary variables $C(p, q, \Gamma\Lambda)$ for every pair of columns $p \neq q$. Furthermore, we add the constraints

$$C(p, q, 01) \geq -M(a, p) + M(a, q) \quad (13)$$

$$C(p, q, 10) \geq M(a, p) - M(a, q) \quad (14)$$

$$C(p, q, 11) \geq M(a, p) + M(a, q) - 1 \quad (15)$$

for every pair of columns $p \neq q$ and every $a \in V$. This ensures that $C(p, q, \Gamma\Lambda) = 1$ whenever $M(a, p) = \Gamma$ and $M(a, q) = \Lambda$ holds for at least one $a \in V$. Finally, we add the constraint

$$C_{p,q,01} + C_{p,q,10} + C_{p,q,11} \leq 2 \quad (16)$$

for every pair of columns $p \neq q$, in order to ensure the compatibility of clusters p and q .

In total, this ILP formulation requires $O(|V|^4)$ variables and $O(|V|^4)$ constraints where the most expensive part stems from the variables $m((ab|c), p)$ and their corresponding constraints (cf. Equ. 11).

8 Concluding Remarks

We have shown here that arc modification problems for BMGs are NP-complete. This is not necessarily an obstacle for using BMG editing in practical workflows – after all, the computational

problems in phylogenetics all involve several NP-complete steps, including MULTIPLE SEQUENCE ALIGNMENT [11] and the MAXIMUM PARSIMONY TREE [17] or MAXIMUM LIKELIHOOD TREE problems [6]. Nevertheless, highly efficient and accurate heuristics have been devised for these problems, often adjusted to the peculiarities of real-life data, so that the computational phylogenetics have become a routine task in bioinformatics. As a starting point to tackling BMG editing in practice, we gave novel characterizations of BMGs that made it possible to introduce an ILP formulation that should be workable at least for moderate-size instances. Without further optimization, instances with $\ell \geq 3$ colors are very demanding and already problems with ten vertices may take a few hours on a desktop system. The 2-colored version (requiring only $O(|V|^2)$ variables) on the other hand, handles instances with 20 vertices in about a minute. We tested both versions using IBM ILOG CPLEX™ Optimizer 12.10 and Gurobi Optimizer 9.0, and applied them to randomly disturbed (2-)BMGs.

We note in passing that 2-BMG DELETION and 2-BMG COMPLETION can be shown to be fixed-parameter tractable (with the number k of edits as parameter) provided that the input graph is sink-free. To see this, observe that sink-free 2-colored graphs are BMGs if and only if they do not contain induced F1-, F2-, and F3-subgraphs (cf. Thm. 4.4). The FPT result follows directly from the observation that all such subgraphs are of fixed size and only a fixed number of arc deletions (resp., additions) are possible. In the case of 2-BMG DELETION, only those arc deletions are allowed that do not produce sinks in G . Clearly, graphs remain sink-free under arc addition. It remains unclear whether 2-BMG EDITING is also FPT for sink-free graphs. One difficulty is that arc deletions may result in a sink-vertex which then needs to be resolved by subsequent arc additions. It also remains an open question for future research whether the BMG modification problems for (not necessarily sink-free) ℓ -colored graphs are also FPT. We suspect that this is not the case for $\ell \geq 3$, where the characterization also requires consistency of the set of informative triples. Since removal of a triple from $\mathcal{R}(G, \sigma)$ requires the insertion or deletion of an arc, it seems difficult to narrow down the editing candidates to a constant-size set. Indeed, MAXIMUM TRIPLE INCONSISTENCY is not FPT when parametrized by the number k of triples to be excluded [4]. On the other hand, the special case of DENSE MAXIMUM TRIPLE INCONSISTENCY is FPT [18]. The set of informative triples $\mathcal{R}(G, \sigma)$, however, is usually far from being dense.

For larger-scale practical applications, we expect that heuristic algorithms will need to be developed. An interesting starting point is the observation that in many examples some of the (non-)arcs in forbidden subgraphs cannot be modified. This phenomenon of unambiguously identifiable (non-)arcs will be the topic of ongoing work.

Acknowledgments

We thank Nicolas Wieseke for stimulating discussions. This work was funded in part by the German Research Foundation (DFG).

References

- [1] Gene Abrams and Jessica K. Sklar. The graph menagerie: Abstract algebra and the mad veterinarian. *Math. Mag.*, 83:168–179, 2010.
- [2] A.V. Aho, Y. Sagiv, T.G. Szymanski, and J.D. Ullman. Inferring a tree from lowest common ancestors with an application to the optimization of relational expressions. *SIAM J Comput.*, 10:405–421, 1981.
- [3] Adrian M Altenhoff, Brigitte Boeckmann, Salvador Capella-Gutierrez, Daniel A Dalquen, Todd DeLuca, Kristoffer Forslund, Jaime Huerta-Cepas, Benjamin Linard, Cécile Pereira, Leszek P Pryszcz, Fabian Schreiber, Alan Sousa da Silva, Damian Szklarczyk, Clément-Marie Train, Peer Bork, Odile Lecompte, Christian von Mering, Ioannis Xenarios, Kimmen Sjölander, Lars Juhl Jensen, Maria J Martin, Matthieu Muffato, Quest for Orthologs consortium, Toni Gabaldón, Suzanna E Lewis, Paul D Thomas, Erik Sonnhammer, and Christophe Dessimoz. Standardized benchmarking in the quest for orthologs. *Nature Methods*, 13:425–430, 2016.
- [4] Jaroslaw Byrka, Sylvain Guillemot, and Jesper Jansson. New results on optimizing rooted triplets consistency. *Discr. Appl. Math.*, 158:1136–1147, 2010.
- [5] Wen-Chieh Chang, Gordon J Burleigh, David F Fernández-Baca, and Oliver Eulenstein. An ILP solution for the gene duplication problem. *BMC Bioinformatics*, 12(S1):S14, 2011.
- [6] Benny Chor and Tamir Tuller. Finding a maximum likelihood tree is hard. *J. ACM*, 53:722–744, 2006.
- [7] Henry Cohn, Robin Pemantle, and James G. Propp. Generating a random sink-free orientation in quadratic time. *Electr. J. Comb.*, 9:R10, 2002.
- [8] R. DeSalle, R. Absher, and G. Amato. Speciation and phylogenetic resolution. *Trends Ecol. Evol.*, 9:297–298, 1994.
- [9] Riccardo Dondi, Manuel Lafond, and Nadia El-Mabrouk. Approximating the correction of weighted and unweighted orthology and paralogy relations. *Alg. Mol. Biol.*, 12:4, 2017.
- [10] E. S. El-Mallah and C. J. Colbourn. The complexity of some edge deletion problems. *IEEE Trans. Circuits Syst.*, 35:354–362, 1988.
- [11] Isaac Elias. Settling the intractability of multiple alignment. *J. Comput. Biol.*, 13:1323–1339, 2006.
- [12] W M Fitch. Distinguishing homologous from analogous proteins. *Syst Zool*, 19:99–113, 1970.
- [13] Manuela Geiß, Edgar Chávez, Marcos González Laffitte, Alitzel López Sánchez, Bärbel M. R. Stadler, Dulce I. Valdivia, Marc Hellmuth, Maribel Hernández Rosales, and Peter F. Stadler. Best match graphs. *J. Math. Biol.*, 78:2015–2057, 2019.
- [14] Manuela Geiß, Edgar Chávez, Marcos González Laffitte, Alitzel López Sánchez, Bärbel M. R. Stadler, Dulce I. Valdivia, Marc Hellmuth, Maribel Hernández Rosales, and Peter F. Stadler. Best match graphs (*corrigendum*). [arxiv.org/1803.10989v4](https://arxiv.org/abs/1803.10989v4), 2020.
- [15] Manuela Geiß, Marcos E. González Laffitte, Alitzel López Sánchez, Dulce I. Valdivia, Marc Hellmuth, Maribel Hernández Rosales, and Peter F. Stadler. Best match graphs and reconciliation of gene trees with species trees. *J. Math. Biol.*, 80:1459–1495, 2020.
- [16] Manuela Geiß, Peter F. Stadler, and Marc Hellmuth. Reciprocal best match graphs. *J. Math. Biol.*, 80:865–953, 2020.
- [17] R. L. Graham and L. R. Foulds. Unlikelihood that minimal phylogenies for a realistic biological study can be constructed in reasonable computational time. *Math. Biosci.*, 60:133–142, 1982.
- [18] Sylvain Guillemot and Matthias Mnich. Kernel and fast algorithm for dense triplet inconsistency. *Theor. Comp. Sci.*, 494:134–143, 2013.

- [19] D Gusfield. *Algorithms on Strings, Trees and Sequences: Computer Science and Computational Biology*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge UK, 1997.
- [20] Ying-Jun He, Trinh N D Huynh, Jesper Jansson, and Wing-Kin Sung. Inferring phylogenetic relationships avoiding forbidden rooted triplets. *J. Bioinf. Comp. Biol.*, 4:59–74, 2006.
- [21] Marc Hellmuth, Manuela Geiß, and Peter F. Stadler. Complexity of modification problems for reciprocal best match graphs. *Theor. Comp. Sci.*, 809:384–393, 2020.
- [22] Marc Hellmuth, Maribel Hernandez-Rosales, Katharina T. Huber, Vincent Moulton, Peter F. Stadler, and Nicolas Wieseke. Orthology relations, symbolic ultrametrics, and cographs. *J. Math. Biol.*, 66:399–420, 2013.
- [23] Marc Hellmuth, Nicolas Wieseke, Marcus Lechner, Hans-Peter Lenhof, Martin Middendorf, and Peter F. Stadler. Phylogenomics with paralogs. *Proc Natl Acad Sci USA*, 112:2058–2063, 2015.
- [24] G. Hoelzer and D. Meinick. Patterns of speciation and limits to phylogenetic resolution. *Trends Ecol. Evol.*, 9:104–107, 1994a.
- [25] Richard M. Karp. Reducibility among combinatorial problems. In Raymond E. Miller, James W. Thatcher, and Jean D. Bohlinger, editors, *Complexity of Computer Computations: Proceedings of a symposium on the Complexity of Computer Computations*, pages 85–103. Springer, Boston, MA, 1972.
- [26] Manuel Lafond, Riccardo Dondi, and Nadia El-Mabrouk. The link between orthology relations and gene trees: a correction perspective. *Alg. Mol. Biol.*, 11:4, 2016.
- [27] Manuel Lafond and Nadia El-Mabrouk. Orthology and paralogy constraints: satisfiability and consistency. *BMC Genomics*, 15(S6):S12, 2014.
- [28] Manuel Lafond, Magali Semeria, Krister M Swenson, Eric Tannier, and Nadia El-Mabrouk. Gene tree correction guided by orthology. *BMC Bioinformatics*, 14(S15):S5, 2013.
- [29] Yunlong Liu, Jianxin Wang, Jiong Guo, and Jianer Chen. Complexity and parameterized algorithms for Cograph Editing. *Theor. Comp. Sci.*, 461:45–54, 2012.
- [30] W. Maddison. Reconstructing character evolution on polytomous cladograms. *Cladistics*, 5:365–377, 1989.
- [31] Assaf Natanzon, Ron Shamir, and Roded Sharan. Complexity classification of some edge modification problems. *Discr. Appl. Math.*, 113:109–128, 2001.
- [32] David Schaller, Manuela Geiß, Marc Hellmuth, and Peter F. Stadler. Best Match Graphs with Binary Trees. arXiv: 2011.00511, 2020.
- [33] David Schaller, Manuela Geiß, Peter F. Stadler, and Marc Hellmuth. Complete characterization of incorrect orthology assignments in best match graphs. *J. Math. Biol.*, 2020. in press.
- [34] Charles Semple and Mike Steel. *Phylogenetics*. Oxford University Press, Oxford UK, 2003.
- [35] João C. Setubal and Peter F. Stadler. Gene phylogenies and orthologous groups. In João C. Setubal, Peter F. Stadler, and Jens Stoye, editors, *Comparative Genomics*, volume 1704, pages 1–28. Springer, Heidelberg, 2018.
- [36] Erik Sonnhammer, Toni Gabaldón, Alan Wilter Sousa da Silva, Maria Martin, Marc Robinson-Rechavi, Brigitte Boeckmann, Paul Thomas, Christophe Dessimoz, and Quest for Orthologs Consortium. Big data and other challenges in the quest for orthologs. *Bioinformatics*, 30:2993–2998, 2014.
- [37] Peter F. Stadler, Manuela Geiß, David Schaller, Alitzel López Sánchez, Marcos González Lafitte, Dulce I. Valdivia, Marc Hellmuth, and Maribel Hernández Rosales. From pairs of most similar sequences to phylogenetic best matches. *Alg. Mol. Biol.*, 15:5, 2020.
- [38] Mihalis Yannakakis. Computing the Minimum Fill-In is NP-complete. *SIAM J. Algebraic Discr. Methods*, 2:77–79, 1981.

A All forbidden subgraphs in 2-colored BMGs




Figure 10: All F1-graphs and F2-graphs. Isomorphism classes are indicated by the boxes, and labeled according to Fig. 3.




Figure 11: All F3-graphs. Isomorphism classes are indicated by the boxes. Those graphs that contain at least one F1- or F2-graph as an induced subgraph are marked with “F1”, resp. “F2”.