

# Complete combinatorial characterization of greedy-drawable trees

Hiroyuki Miyata  
Faculty of Informatics,  
Gunma University  
hmiyata@gunma-u.ac.jp

Reiya Nosaka  
Faculty of Informatics,  
Gunma University  
t201d062@gunma-u.ac.jp

## Abstract

A (Euclidean) greedy drawing of a graph is a drawing in which, for any two vertices  $s, t$  ( $s \neq t$ ), there is a neighbor vertex of  $s$  that is closer to  $t$  than to  $s$  in the Euclidean distance. Greedy drawings are important in the context of message routing in networks, and graph classes that admit greedy drawings have been actively studied. Nöllenburg and Prutkin (Discrete Comput. Geom., 58(3), pp. 543–579, 2017) gave a characterization of greedy-drawable trees in terms of an inequality system that contains a non-linear equation. Using the characterization, they gave a linear-time recognition algorithm for greedy-drawable trees of maximum degree  $\leq 4$ . However, a combinatorial characterization of greedy-drawable trees of maximum degree 5 was left open. In this paper, we give a combinatorial characterization of greedy-drawable trees of maximum degree 5, which leads to a complete combinatorial characterization of greedy-drawable trees.

Furthermore, we give a characterization of greedy-drawable pseudo-trees. It turns out that greedy-drawable pseudo-trees admit a simpler characterization than greedy-drawable trees.

## 1 Introduction

*Geographic routing* (or *geometric routing*) is a type of routing that uses geographic coordinates of the nodes as addresses for the purpose of routing. One of the simplest routing algorithms is the *greedy routing*, in which each node simply forwards a message to its neighbor that is closest to the destination. In (pure) greedy routing, however, a message delivery fails if the message is forwarded to a node with no neighbor that is closer to the destination. A graph drawing in which greedy routing is guaranteed to work is called a *greedy drawing* (or *greedy embedding*) [10]. That is, a (Euclidean) greedy drawing of a graph  $G$  is a drawing of  $G$  in which for any two vertices  $s, t$  ( $s \neq t$ ) of  $G$ , there is a neighbor vertex  $u$  of  $s$  with  $d(s, t) > d(u, t)$ , where  $d$  is the Euclidean distance. This notion is motivated by work of Rao et al. [11], who proposed an elegant idea of applying greedy routing based on *virtual coordinates* (in other words, a graph drawing) instead of geographic coordinates. This idea enables ones to apply greedy routing even in the absence of locational information, and one can send a message between any pair of nodes if a greedy drawing of the network is constructed. On the basis of extensive experiments, Rao et al. [11] showed that their approach makes greedy routing much more reliable.

In [10], Papadimitriou and Ratajczak presented a remarkable conjecture that gives a theoretical guarantee to the approach of Rao et al. [11]. They conjectured that every 3-connected planar graph admits a greedy drawing. This conjecture, which has an important consequence and at the same time is theoretically deep, triggered much work on greedy-drawable graphs. The conjecture of Papadimitriou and Ratajczak [10] was first proved for triangulations by Dhanpani [5]. The conjecture itself was proved by Leighton and Moitra [8] and Angelini et al. [2] independently. Later, Da Lozzo et al. [4] proved a stronger version of the conjecture, which claims existence of a planar greedy drawing. As greedy-drawability is a monotonic graph property (i.e., adding an edge preserves greedy-drawability), the class of trees has also gained much attention. In [8], Leighton and Moitra investigated a condition that a binary tree

does not admit a greedy drawing. Nöllenburg and Prutkin[9] largely extended the work of Leighton and Moitra, and characterized greedy-drawable trees in terms of an inequality system that contains a non-linear equation. Using the characterization, they gave an explicit description of the greedy-drawable trees of maximum degree 3 and a linear-time recognition algorithm for greedy-drawable trees of maximum degree  $\leq 4$ . Interestingly, Kleinberg [7] proved that every tree has a greedy drawing in the hyperbolic plane.

**Our contributions.** In this paper, we give a complete combinatorial characterization of (Euclidean) greedy-drawable trees. As mentioned, Nöllenburg and Prutkin[9] gave a characterization of greedy-drawable trees in terms of an inequality system that contains a non-linear equation, which leads to an explicit description of the greedy-drawable trees of maximum degree 3 and a linear-time recognition algorithm for greedy-drawable trees of maximum degree  $\leq 4$ . However, a combinatorial characterization of greedy-drawable trees of maximum degree 5 was left open. In this paper, we first carefully reconsider the work of Nöllenburg and Prutkin[9], and give an explicit description of the greedy-drawable trees of maximum degree  $\leq 4$ . Next, we give an explicit description of the greedy-drawable trees of maximum degree 5, which is our main contribution. Since the maximum degree of a greedy-drawable tree is less than 6 [10], our results give a complete combinatorial characterization of greedy-drawable trees.

Moreover, we study greedy-drawability of *pseudo-trees*, i.e., graphs obtained by adding one edge to a tree. We give a complete characterization of greedy-drawable pseudo-trees. Interestingly, it turns out that greedy-drawable pseudo-trees can be completely characterized by a simple inequality, which is also the case for greedy-drawable trees of maximum degree  $\leq 4$  but not the case for greedy-drawable trees of maximum degree 5.

## 2 Preliminaries

Let  $G$  be a graph. A drawing  $\Gamma$  of  $G$  is called a *straight-line drawing* if every node is represented as a point in the plane and every edge as the line segment between its endpoints. We hereafter assume that all drawings are *plane straight-line drawings*, that is, straight-line drawings with no edge crossing. The drawing  $\Gamma$  is said to be *greedy* if for every pair of vertices  $s, t (s \neq t)$  there exists a neighbor vertex  $u$  of  $s$  with  $d(u, t) < d(s, t)$ , where  $d$  is a distance function. In other words, the drawing  $\Gamma$  is greedy if for every pair of vertices  $s, t (s \neq t)$  there exists a path  $v_0(=s), v_1, \dots, v_m(=t)$  such that  $d(v_i, t) > d(v_{i+1}, t)$  for  $i = 1, \dots, m-1$ . In this paper, we consider the case that  $d$  is the Euclidean distance. If  $G$  has a greedy drawing, we say that  $G$  is *greedy-drawable*.

Let  $T$  be a tree. For an edge  $uv$  of  $T$ , we consider the subtree  $T_{uv}^u$  of  $T$  that contains  $u$  obtained by deleting  $uv$ . We let  $\text{axis}(uv)$  be the perpendicular bisector of  $uv$ , and consider the open half-plane  $h_{uv}^u$  bounded by  $\text{axis}(uv)$  that contains  $u$ . Since the half-plane  $h_{uv}^u$  corresponds to the set of points that are closer to  $u$  than to  $v$ , the following holds.

**Proposition 2.1** ([1, Lemma 3],[9, Lemma 1])

A drawing  $\Gamma$  of a tree  $T$  is greedy if and only if every subtree  $T_{uv}^u$  is contained in  $h_{uv}^u$  in  $\Gamma$ .

Based on this proposition, Nöllenburg and Prutkin [9] developed the following strategy to decide greedy-drawability of a tree  $T$ . Let  $r$  be a vertex of  $T$  and  $v_0, \dots, v_{d-1}$  be the neighbors of  $r$ . We first decompose  $T$  into  $d$  subtrees  $T_{rv_i}^{v_i} + rv_i$  ( $i = 0, \dots, d-1$ ). Then, we regard each tree  $T_{rv_i}^{v_i} + rv_i$  as a rooted tree with root  $r$  and denote it by  $T_i = (V_i, E_i)$ . We let  $\text{polytope}(T_i) := \bigcap \{h_{uw}^w \mid uw \in E_i, uw \neq rv_i, d_T(w, r) < d_T(u, r)\}$ , where  $d_T$  is the graph distance, and let  $\widehat{T}_r$  be the subtree induced by  $r$  and its neighbors. Suppose that we already have a greedy drawing of each  $T_i$  and want to construct a greedy drawing of  $T$  by gluing the drawings of  $T_i$ 's. Then, the task is to construct a drawing in which  $\widehat{T}_r$  is drawn greedily and each  $T_j$  ( $j \neq i$ ) is contained in  $\text{polytope}(T_i)$ . If  $\text{polytope}(T_i)$  is unbounded with respect to the direction  $\vec{v_i r}$ , then this task can be simplified; if this condition holds, one can transform the drawing of  $T_i$  into a drawing in which  $T_{rv_i}^{v_i}$  is drawn infinitesimally small, where  $\text{polytope}(T_i)$  is (arbitrarily close to) the open cone spanned by the two unbounded edges (see Figure 1 for an intuition). This observation leads to the notion of opening angles, which plays a fundamental role in classifying greedy-drawable trees.

**Definition 2.2** ([9, Definitions 2,3], slightly modified)

Let  $\Gamma$  be a drawing of  $T$ .

- If  $\text{polytope}(T_i)$  is unbounded, we say that  $T_i$  is drawn with an *open angle* in  $\Gamma$ . Let  $a_1b_1$  and  $a_2b_2$  be the edges of  $T$ , where  $d_T(a_i, r) < d_T(b_i, r)$ , such that  $\text{axis}(a_1b_1)$  and  $\text{axis}(a_2b_2)$  are the supporting lines of the two unbounded edges of  $\text{polytope}(T_i)$ . We define  $\angle T_i := h_{a_1b_1}^{a_1} \cap h_{a_2b_2}^{a_2}$  and call it the *opening angle* of  $T_i$  in  $\Gamma$ . We write  $|\angle T_i| = \alpha$ , where  $\alpha$  is the angle between the two rays of  $\angle T_i$ . We define  $|\angle T_i|_* := \sup\{|\angle T_i| \mid \text{greedy drawings of } T_i\}$ .
- If  $\text{polytope}(T_i)$  is bounded, we say that  $T_i$  is drawn with a *closed angle* in  $\Gamma$  and write  $|\angle T_i| < 0$ . If  $|\angle T_i| < 0$  for any greedy drawing of  $T_i$ , we write  $|\angle T_i|_* < 0$ .




Figure 1: Drawings of  $T_i$  (left: original drawing, right: shrunk drawing)

Nöllenburg and Prutkin [9] proved that one can always shrink the drawing of  $T_{rv_i}^{v_i}$  preserving greediness of  $T$  if  $|\angle T_i| > 0$ .

**Lemma 2.3** (shrinking lemma [9, Lemma 8])

Let  $T = (V, E)$  be a tree and  $T' = T_{rv}^v + rv$ ,  $rv \in E$ , be a subtree of  $T$ . If  $T$  has a greedy drawing  $\Gamma$  such that  $|\angle T'| > 0$ , then there is a greedy drawing  $\Gamma'$  such that  $T_{rv}^v$  is drawn infinitesimally small and the drawing of  $T_{rv}^r$  and the angle  $|\angle T'|$  are the same as in  $\Gamma$  (and  $\angle T'$  is broader than in  $\Gamma$ ).

**Remark 2.4** For some technical reason, the original definition of opening angle is slightly more complicated. Indeed, Lemma 4 in [9] does not always hold with the presented definition. However, if we change the statement of Lemma 4 in [9] into “there exists a drawing such that ...”, it is true with the presented definition. A required drawing can be constructed by shrinking a drawing of each subtree  $T_i$  by Lemma 2.3, in which case the original definition and the presented definition coincide (with arbitrary precision). In the remaining part of the paper, we will always consider such drawings, and the two definitions do not make any difference.

Suppose that each  $T_i$  can be drawn with an open angle and let  $\varphi_i := |\angle T_i|_*$ . Based on Lemma 2.3, Nöllenburg and Prutkin [9, Theorem 1] proved that  $T$  has a greedy drawing if and only if there is a permutation  $\tau$  on  $\{0, \dots, d-1\}$  such that the following inequality system has a solution. For  $i = 0, \dots, d-1$ ,

$$\begin{aligned}
0 &< \alpha_i, \beta_i, \gamma_i < 180, \\
\alpha_i + \beta_i + \gamma_i &= 180, \quad \alpha_0 + \dots + \alpha_{d-1} = 360, \\
\sin(\beta_0) \cdots \sin(\beta_{d-1}) &= \sin(\gamma_0) \cdots \sin(\gamma_{d-1}), \\
\beta_i &< \alpha_i, \quad \gamma_i < \alpha_i, \\
\beta_i + \gamma_{i+1} &< \varphi_{\tau(i)} \quad (i \bmod d).
\end{aligned} \tag{2.1}$$

The conditions in the first three lines describe the possible angles  $\alpha_i, \beta_i, \gamma_i$  of the wheel graph  $W_d$ , which appear in the work of Di Battista and Vismara [6]. Adding the conditions in the fourth line, it describes the possible angles of greedy drawings of the wheel graph  $W_d$ . Finally, if we combine all conditions, it describes the possible angles of greedy drawings of  $T$  in which the subtrees  $T_0, \dots, T_{d-1}$  are drawn infinitesimally small with the order  $T_{\tau(0)}, \dots, T_{\tau(d-1)}$  around  $r$ . We will see that for any greedy-drawable tree  $T$  a vertex  $r$  can be chosen so that  $|\angle T_0|_* > 0, \dots, |\angle T_{d-1}|_* > 0$  (Lemma 3.3). Thus, classification of the greedy-drawable trees can be done in the following two steps [9].

1. Decide the rooted trees that can be drawn with open angles and compute the supremum of opening angles of each tree. We will discuss this issue in Section 3.
2. Decide the possible combinations of rooted trees that can be glued at single vertex by considering feasibility of the system (2.1). We will discuss this issue in Sections 4 and 5.




Figure 2: Constructing a greedy drawing of  $T$  by gluing drawings of subtrees  $T_0, \dots, T_{d-1}$  ( $d = 5$ )

### 3 Rooted trees that can be drawn with open angles

Nöllenburg and Prutkin[9] introduced a procedure to compute the supremum of opening angles of a rooted tree. By analyzing their results, we give an explicit description of the rooted trees that can be drawn with an open angle.

To describe the result, we introduce some definitions. Let  $P$  be a path. A tree  $T$  is called a *degree- $k$  path* associated with  $P$  if  $T$  is constructed by attaching at most  $k - 1$  leaves to each terminal vertex of  $P$  and at most  $k - 2$  leaves to each internal vertex of  $P$ . The number of degree- $k$  vertices is called the *weight* of  $T$ . A leaf of  $T$  that is adjacent to one of the terminal vertices of  $P$  is called an *end leaf* of  $T$ .

If a tree  $T$  can be drawn with an opening angle  $\varphi - \epsilon$  for any  $\epsilon > 0$ , but not  $\varphi$ , we indicate this information by writing  $|\angle T|_* = \varphi^-$ . Since subdividing a tree does not affect the supremum of opening angles, we describe the result under the assumption that a tree contains no degree-2 vertex.

**Proposition 3.1** Let  $T$  be a rooted tree with degree-1 root  $r$  that contains no degree-2 vertex. Then,  $T$  has a greedy drawing with an open angle if and only if  $T$  satisfies one of the following conditions.

- (A)  $T$  is single edge and  $r$  is one of the end vertices. In this case, we have  $|\angle T|_* = 180^\circ$  and call  $T$  the type- $A$  tree.
- (B)  $T$  is a degree-3 path of weight  $n \geq 1$  and  $r$  is one of the end leaves of  $T$ . In this case, we have  $|\angle T|_* = (90^\circ + 60^\circ \times \frac{1}{2^n})^-$  and call  $T$  a type- $B_n$  tree. See Figure 3.
- (C)  $T$  is a degree-4 path of weight  $n \geq 1$  and  $r$  is one of the end leaves of  $T$ . Let  $v$  be the degree-4 vertex farthest from  $r$  (with respect to the graph distance) and  $k$  be the weight of the degree-3 path formed by the degree-3 vertices that are farther from  $r$  than from  $v$ . In this case, we have  $|\angle T|_* = (120^\circ)^- \times \frac{1}{2^n}$  if  $k = 0$  and  $|\angle T|_* = (90^\circ + 60^\circ \times \frac{1}{2^k})^- \times \frac{1}{2^n}$  otherwise. We call  $T$  a type- $C_{k,n}$  tree. See Figure 4.

- (D)  $T$  is obtained by attaching a degree-4 path of weight  $n \geq 0$  and two degree-3 paths of weight  $k, l \geq 1$  ( $l \geq k$ ) to single vertex  $v$ .  $r$  is one of the end leaves of the attached degree-4 path that is farthest from  $v$  (with respect to the graph distance). In this case, we have  $|\angle T|_* = (60^\circ \times \frac{1}{2^k} + 60^\circ \times \frac{1}{2^l})^- \times \frac{1}{2^n}$  and call  $T$  a type- $D_{k,l,n}$  tree. See Figure 5.
- (E)  $T$  is obtained by attaching a degree-4 path of weight  $n \geq 0$  and two degree-3 paths of weight  $k, l \geq 1$  ( $l \geq k$ ) and single edge to single vertex  $v$ .  $r$  is one of the end leaves of the attached degree-4 path that is farthest from  $v$  (with respect to the graph distance). In this case, we have  $|\angle T|_* = (45^\circ \times \frac{1}{2^k} + 30^\circ \times \frac{1}{2^l})^- \times \frac{1}{2^n}$  and call  $T$  a type- $E_{k,l,n}$  tree. See Figure 6.




Figure 3: type- $B_n$  tree




Figure 4: type- $C_{k,n}$  tree




Figure 5: type- $D_{k,l,n}$  tree




Figure 6: type- $E_{k,l,n}$  tree

Proposition 3.1 can easily be proved using Lemmas 10–15 in [9] and we ignore a proof. With this proposition, we can completely decide the rooted trees that have greedy drawings with opening angles greater than  $7.5^\circ$ . The classification is described in Table 1.

$ \angle T _* = 180^\circ$	$A$
$ \angle T _* = (120^\circ)^-$	$B_1$
$ \angle T _* = (105^\circ)^-$	$B_2$
$90^\circ <  \angle T _* \leq 97.5^\circ$	$B_n$ ( $n \geq 3$ )
$ \angle T _* = (60^\circ)^-$	$C_{0,1}, C_{1,1}, D_{1,1,0}$
$45^\circ <  \angle T _* < 60^\circ$	$C_{k,1}$ ( $k \geq 2$ )
$ \angle T _* = (45^\circ)^-$	$D_{1,2,0}$
$ \angle T _* = (37.5^\circ)^-$	$D_{1,3,0}, E_{1,1,0}$
$30^\circ <  \angle T _* \leq 33.75^\circ$	$D_{1,l,0}$ ( $l \geq 4$ )
$ \angle T _* = (30^\circ)^-$	$C_{0,2}, C_{1,2}, D_{2,2,0}, D_{1,1,1}, E_{1,2,0}$
$22.5^\circ <  \angle T _* \leq 26.25^\circ$	$C_{k,2}$ ( $k \geq 2$ ), $E_{1,l,0}$ ( $l \geq 3$ )
$15^\circ <  \angle T _* \leq 22.5^\circ$	$D_{1,l,1}$ ( $l \geq 2$ ), $D_{2,l,0}$ ( $l \geq 3$ ), $E_{1,1,1}, E_{2,2,0}$
$ \angle T _* = (15^\circ)^-$	$C_{0,3}, C_{1,3}, D_{3,3,0}, D_{2,2,1}, D_{1,1,2}, E_{2,3,0}, E_{1,2,1}$
$ \angle T _* = (13.125^\circ)^-$	$C_{2,3}, E_{2,4,0}, E_{1,3,1}$
$11.25^\circ <  \angle T _* < 13.125^\circ$	$C_{k,3}$ ( $k \geq 3$ ), $E_{2,l,0}$ ( $l \geq 5$ ), $E_{1,l,1}$ ( $l \geq 4$ )
$7.5^\circ <  \angle T _* \leq 11.25^\circ$	$D_{3,l,0}$ ( $l \geq 4$ ), $D_{2,l,1}$ ( $l \geq 3$ ), $D_{1,l,2}$ ( $l \geq 2$ ), $E_{3,3,0}, E_{2,2,1}, E_{1,1,2}$

Table 1: Classification of rooted trees with opening angles  $> 7.5^\circ$

For  $I \subset [0^\circ, 180^\circ]$ , we say that a rooted tree  $T$  has *angle type*  $I$  if the supremum of opening angles of  $T$  is in the range  $I$ . For any  $I \subset (7.5^\circ, 180^\circ]$ , we can give an explicit description of the rooted trees of angle type  $I$  using Table 1. For example, the root trees having angle type  $[45^\circ, 90^\circ]$  are  $C_{k,1}$  ( $k \geq 0$ ),

$D_{1,1,0}$ ,  $D_{1,2,0}$ . We denote by  $\Phi$  the set of the suprema of opening angles of rooted trees and by  $\tilde{\Phi}$  the topological closure of  $\Phi$ .

Nöllenburg and Prutkin [9, Proposition 2] implicitly proved that any greedy-drawable tree can be constructed by gluing some rooted trees that can be drawn with open angles. Here, we make this fact more explicit. Let  $T'_1, T'_2$  be subtrees of a tree  $T$  with degree-1 roots  $r'_1, r'_2$  and  $v'_1, v'_2$  be the neighbors of  $r'_1, r'_2$  respectively. The subtrees  $T'_1$  and  $T'_2$  are said to be *independent* if  $T'_2 \setminus \{r'_2\} \subset T_{v'_1 r'_1}^{r'_1}$  and  $T'_1 \setminus \{r'_1\} \subset T_{v'_2 r'_2}^{r'_2}$ . (It may be the case that  $v'_1 = r'_2$  and  $v'_2 = r'_1$ .)

**Lemma 3.2** ([9, Lemma 5]) Let  $T$  be a greedy-drawable tree and  $T'_1, T'_2$  be independent subtrees of  $T$ . In any greedy drawing of  $T$ , we have  $|\angle T'_1| > 0$  or  $|\angle T'_2| > 0$ .

For an edge  $uv$  of a tree  $T$ , we let  $\tilde{T}_{uv}^v := T_{uv}^v + uv$  and regard  $\tilde{T}_{uv}^v$  as a rooted tree with root  $u$ .

**Lemma 3.3** Let  $T = (V(T), E(T))$  be a greedy-drawable tree. Then, there exists a vertex  $u \in V(T)$  such that  $|\angle \tilde{T}_{uv}^v|_* > 0$  for any neighbor vertex  $v$  of  $u$ .

**Proof.** For contradiction, we assume that for any vertex  $u$  of  $T$  there exists a neighbor vertex  $v$  of  $u$  with  $|\angle \tilde{T}_{uv}^v|_* \leq 0$ . Consider the directed graph  $D(T)$  with the vertex set  $V(T)$  such that  $(u, v) \in V(T) \times V(T)$  is an arc if and only if  $uv \in E(T)$  and  $|\angle \tilde{T}_{uv}^v|_* \leq 0$ . By the assumption, there exists an edge outgoing from  $w$  for any vertex  $w$  in  $D(T)$ . Thus, there must exist a directed cycle in  $D(T)$ . Since  $T$  is a tree, the directed cycle must contain a directed cycle of length 2. If we denote such a cycle by  $a \rightarrow b \rightarrow a$ , then we have  $|\angle \tilde{T}_{ab}^a|_* \leq 0$  and  $|\angle \tilde{T}_{ba}^b|_* \leq 0$ . By Lemma 3.2, this is a contradiction.  $\blacksquare$

## 4 Greedy-drawable trees of maximum degree $\leq 4$

Nöllenburg and Prutkin [9] gave a simple characterization of the greedy-drawable trees of maximum degree  $\leq 4$  in terms of opening angles and a linear-time recognition algorithm based on the characterization. In this section, we give an explicit description of the greedy-drawable trees of maximum degree  $\leq 4$ , based on the result of Nöllenburg and Prutkin [9] and the results in Section 3.

Let  $T$  be a greedy-drawable tree of maximum degree  $\leq 4$ . By Lemma 3.3, there is a vertex  $r$  of  $T$  with degree  $d \leq 4$  such that the subtrees  $T_0 := T_{rw_0}^{w_0} + rw_0, \dots, T_{d-1} := T_{rw_{d-1}}^{w_{d-1}} + rw_{d-1}$  can be drawn with open angles, where  $w_0, \dots, w_{d-1}$  are the neighbors of  $r$ . Applying Lemma 2.3 to a greedy drawing of  $T$ , we construct a drawing of  $T$  in which each  $T_i$  is drawn infinitesimally small and each  $\angle T_i$  is broader than the original. In this drawing, each  $\angle T_i$  must contain the  $d$ -gon formed by the vertices  $w_0, \dots, w_{d-1}$  and thus each apex of  $\angle T_j$  ( $i \neq j$ ). Hence, the following inequality holds:

$$\sum_{i=0}^{d-1} |\angle T_i|_* > (d-2)180^\circ. \quad (4.1)$$

Nöllenburg and Prutkin [9, Lemmas 17–19] proved a beautiful fact that  $T$  is greedy-drawable if and only if the above inequality holds. Using Proposition 3.1, we can classify the possible combinations of angle types of  $T_i$ 's. Combining the results for  $d = 2, 3, 4$ , we obtain the following proposition.

**Proposition 4.1** A tree  $T$  of maximum degree  $d \leq 4$  is greedy-drawable if and only if  $T$  is a subgraph of a subdivision of a tree obtained by gluing four trees  $T_0, \dots, T_3$  that have angle types described in Table 2 at single vertex, i.e.,  $T$  is a subgraph of a subdivision of a tree obtained by gluing four trees  $T_0, \dots, T_3$  described in Table 3.

$T_0$	$T_1$	$T_2$	$T_3$	$T_0$	$T_1$	$T_2$	$T_3$
180°	180°	(0°, 180°)	(0°, 180°)	180°	(90°, 97.5°)	45°	45°
180°	120°	60°	(0°, 60°)	180°	(90°, 93.75°)	60°	[30°, 60°]
180°	120°	52.5°	(7.5°, 52.5°)	180°	(90°, 93.75°)	52.5°	[37.5°, 52.5°]
180°	120°	48.75°	(11.25°, 48.75°)	180°	(90°, 93.75°)	[45°, 48.75°]	[45°, 48.75°]
180°	120°	(45°, 46.875°)	[15°, 46.875°]	120°	120°	120°	(0°, 120°)
180°	120°	45°	(15°, 45°)	120°	120°	105°	(15°, 105°)
180°	120°	37.5°	(22.5°, 37.5°)	120°	120°	97.5°	(22.5°, 97.5°)
180°	120°	(30°, 33.75°)	[30°, 33.75°]	120°	120°	(90°, 93.75°)	[30°, 93.75°]
180°	(90°, 105°)	(90°, 105°)	(0°, 105°)	120°	105°	105°	(30°, 105°)
180°	105°	60°	(15°, 60°)	120°	105°	(90°, 97.5°)	[45°, 97.5°]
180°	105°	52.5°	(22.5°, 52.5°)	120°	97.5°	97.5°	(45°, 97.5°)
180°	105°	(45°, 48.75°)	[30°, 48.75°]	120°	97.5°	(90°, 93.75°)	[52.5°, 93.75°]
180°	105°	45°	(30°, 45°)	120°	(90°, 93.75°)	(90°, 93.75°)	[60°, 93.75°]
180°	97.5°	60°	(22.5°, 60°)	105°	105°	105°	(45°, 105°)
180°	97.5°	52.5°	(30°, 52.5°)	105°	105°	(90°, 97.5°)	[60°, 97.5°]
180°	97.5°	(45°, 48.75°)	[37.5°, 48.75°]	(90°, 105°)	(90°, 105°)	(90°, 105°)	(90°, 105°)

Table 2: Angle types of subtrees  $T_0, \dots, T_3$  of greedy-drawable trees of maximum degree 4

$T_0$	$T_1$	$T_2$	$T_3$	$T_0$	$T_1$	$T_2$	$T_3$
A	A	$E_{k,l,n}$	$E_{k,l,n}$	A	$B_n$	$D_{1,2,0}$	$D_{1,2,0}$
A	$B_1$	$C_{1,1}, D_{1,1,0}$	$E_{k,l,n}$	A	$B_n$	$C_{1,1}, D_{1,1,0}$	$C_{1,2}, D_{2,2,0}, D_{1,1,1}, D_{1,l,0}, E_{1,2,0}$
A	$B_1$	$C_{2,1}$	$C_{k,3}, D_{3,l,0}, D_{2,l,1}, D_{1,l,2}, E_{3,3,0}, E_{2,2,1}, E_{1,1,2}, E_{2,l,0}, E_{1,l,1}$	A	$B_n$	$C_{2,1}$	$C_{k,1}, D_{1,3,0}, E_{1,1,0}$
A	$B_1$	$C_{3,1}$	$C_{k,3}, D_{3,3,0}, D_{2,2,1}, D_{1,1,2}, E_{2,l,0}, E_{1,l,1}$	A	$B_n$	$C_{k,1}, D_{1,2,0}$	$C_{k,1}, D_{1,2,0}$
A	$B_1$	$C_{k,1}$	$C_{1,3}, D_{3,3,0}, D_{2,2,1}, D_{1,1,2}, D_{1,l,1}, D_{2,l,0}, E_{2,3,0}, E_{1,2,1}, E_{1,l,0}$	$B_1$	$B_1$	$B_1$	$E_{k,l,n}$
A	$B_1$	$D_{1,2,0}$	$C_{k,2}, D_{2,l,0}, D_{1,l,1}, E_{2,2,0}, E_{1,1,1}, E_{1,l,0}$	$B_1$	$B_1$	$B_2$	$C_{k,2}, D_{2,l,0}, D_{1,l,1}, E_{2,2,0}, E_{1,1,1}, E_{1,l,0}$
A	$B_1$	$D_{1,3,0}, E_{1,1,0}$	$C_{k,2}, D_{2,2,0}, D_{1,1,1}, E_{1,l,0}$	$B_1$	$B_1$	$B_3$	$C_{k,2}, D_{2,2,0}, D_{1,1,1}, E_{1,l,0}$
A	$B_1$	$D_{1,l,0}$	$C_{1,2}, D_{2,2,0}, D_{1,1,1}, D_{1,l,0}, E_{1,2,0}$	$B_1$	$B_1$	$B_n$	$C_{1,2}, D_{2,2,0}, D_{1,1,1}, D_{1,l,0}, E_{1,2,0}$
A	$B_n$	$B_n$	$E_{k,l,n}$	$B_1$	$B_2$	$B_2$	$C_{k,1}, D_{1,l,0}, E_{1,1,0}$
A	$B_2$	$C_{1,1}, D_{1,1,0}$	$C_{k,2}, D_{2,l,0}, D_{1,l,1}, E_{2,2,0}, E_{1,1,1}, E_{1,l,0}$	$B_1$	$B_2$	$B_n$	$C_{k,1}, D_{1,2,0}$
A	$B_2$	$C_{2,1}$	$C_{k,2}, D_{2,2,0}, D_{1,1,1}, E_{1,l,0}$	$B_1$	$B_3$	$B_3$	$C_{k,1}, D_{1,1,0}$
A	$B_2$	$C_{k,1}$	$C_{1,2}, D_{2,2,0}, D_{1,1,1}, D_{1,l,0}, E_{1,2,0}$	$B_1$	$B_3$	$B_n$	$C_{2,1}, D_{1,1,0}$
A	$B_2$	$D_{1,2,0}$	$D_{1,l,0}, E_{1,1,0}$	$B_1$	$B_n$	$B_n$	$C_{1,1}, D_{1,1,0}$
A	$B_3$	$C_{1,1}, D_{1,1,0}$	$C_{k,2}, D_{2,2,0}, D_{1,1,1}, E_{1,l,0}$	$B_2$	$B_2$	$B_2$	$C_{k,1}, D_{1,1,0}$
A	$B_3$	$C_{2,1}$	$C_{k,1}, D_{1,l,0}, E_{1,1,0}$	$B_2$	$B_2$	$B_n$	$C_{1,1}, D_{1,1,0}$
A	$B_3$	$C_{k,1}$	$C_{k,1}, D_{1,3,0}, E_{1,1,0}$	$B_n$	$B_n$	$B_n$	$B_n$

Table 3: Subtrees  $T_0, \dots, T_3$  of maximal greedy-drawable trees of maximum degree 4

## 5 Greedy-drawable trees of maximum degree 5

In this section, we give an explicit description of the greedy-drawable trees of maximum degree 5. Different from the case of maximum degree  $\leq 4$ , greedy-drawability cannot be characterized by the inequality (4.1) and a complete combinatorial characterization is left open in [9].

Let  $T$  be a tree of maximum degree 5. Take a degree-5 vertex  $r$  and let  $v_0, \dots, v_4$  be the neighbors of  $r$  and consider the rooted trees  $T_i := T_{rv_i}^{v_i} + rv_i$  ( $i = 0, \dots, 4$ ). If  $T$  can be drawn greedily, each  $T_i$  must satisfy  $|\angle T_i|_* > 0$ . Indeed, if  $|\angle T_j|_* \leq 0$  for some  $j$ , then the digraph  $D(T)$ , defined in the proof of Lemma 3.3, contains a directed cycle  $r \rightarrow v_j \rightarrow r$ , which is a contradiction. Thus  $T$  is greedy-drawable if and only if  $|\angle T_i|_* > 0$  for each  $i = 0, \dots, 4$  and the inequality system (2.1) is feasible for some permutation  $\tau$  on  $\{0, \dots, 4\}$ , where  $\varphi_0 = |\angle T_0|_*, \dots, \varphi_4 = |\angle T_4|_*$ . We prove the following theorem.

**Theorem 5.1** The tree  $T$  is greedy-drawable if and only if the subtrees  $T_0, \dots, T_4$  are subgraphs of subdivisions of trees described in Table 4.

$T_0$	$T_1$	$T_2$	$T_3$	$T_4$	$T_0$	$T_1$	$T_2$	$T_3$	$T_4$
A	A	$B_1$	$B_1$	$E_{k,l,n}$	A	$B_1$	$B_1$	$B_1$	$C_{k,1}, D_{1,4,0}, E_{1,1,0}$
A	A	$B_1$	$B_2$	$C_{k,2}, D_{2,l,0}, D_{1,l,1}, E_{2,2,0}, E_{1,1,1}, E_{1,l,0}$	A	$B_1$	$B_1$	$B_2$	$C_{k,1}, D_{1,2,0}$
A	A	$B_1$	$B_3$	$C_{k,2}, D_{2,2,0}, D_{1,1,1}, E_{1,l,0}$	A	$B_1$	$B_1$	$B_3$	$C_{4,1}, D_{1,1,0}$
A	A	$B_1$	$B_n$	$C_{1,2}, D_{2,2,0}, D_{1,1,1}, D_{1,l,0}E_{1,2,0}$	A	$B_1$	$B_1$	$B_4$	$C_{3,1}, D_{1,1,0}$
A	A	$B_2$	$B_2$	$C_{k,1}, D_{1,l,0}, E_{1,1,0}$	A	$B_1$	$B_1$	$B_n$	$C_{2,1}, D_{1,1,0}$
A	A	$B_2$	$B_n$	$C_{k,1}, D_{1,2,0}$	A	$B_1$	$B_2$	$B_4$	$C_{1,1}, D_{1,1,0}$
A	A	$B_3$	$B_3$	$C_{k,1}, D_{1,1,0}$	A	$B_1$	$B_n$	$B_n$	$B_n$
A	A	$B_3$	$B_n$	$C_{2,1}, D_{1,1,0}$	A	$B_2$	$B_3$	$B_n$	$B_n$
A	A	$B_n$	$B_n$	$C_{1,1}, D_{1,1,0}$	A	$B_2$	$B_4$	$B_4$	$B_n$
$B_1$	$B_1$	$B_1$	$B_n$	$B_n$	A	$B_2$	$B_4$	$B_5$	$B_5$
$B_1$	$B_1$	$B_2$	$B_2$	$B_n$	A	$B_3$	$B_3$	$B_3$	$B_6$

Table 4: Subtrees  $T_0, \dots, T_4$  of maximal greedy-drawable trees of maximum degree 5

We prove Theorem 5.1 by distinguishing the following two cases.

### 5.1 Case 1: $\varphi_0 \neq 180^\circ$ or $\varphi_0 = \varphi_1 = 180^\circ$

In this case, the conditions for greedy-drawability are already given in [9], which are summarized as follows.

- If  $\varphi_0 \neq 180^\circ$ ,  $T$  is greedy-drawable if and only if  $\varphi_1, \dots, \varphi_4 > 0$  and  $\sum_{i=0}^4 \varphi_i > 540^\circ$  ([9, Lemma 18]).
- If  $\varphi_0 = \varphi_1 = \varphi_2 = 180^\circ$ ,  $T$  is greedy-drawable if and only if  $\varphi_3, \varphi_4 > 0$  and  $\varphi_3 + \varphi_4 > 120^\circ$  ([9, Lemmas 20, 21]).
- If  $\varphi_0 = \varphi_1 = 180^\circ$  and  $\varphi_2 \neq 180^\circ$ ,  $T$  is greedy-drawable if and only if  $\varphi_2, \varphi_3, \varphi_4 > 0$  and  $\varphi_2 + \varphi_3 + \varphi_4 > 240^\circ$  ([9, Lemma 22]).

Using these results and Proposition 3.1, we can explicitly describe the possible angle types of  $T_0, \dots, T_4$  as shown in Table 5.

$T_0$	$T_1$	$T_2$	$T_3$	$T_4$
$180^\circ$	$180^\circ$	$[120^\circ, 180^\circ]$	$[120^\circ, 180^\circ]$	$(0^\circ, 180^\circ)$
$180^\circ$	$180^\circ$	$[120^\circ, 180^\circ]$	$105^\circ$	$(15^\circ, 105^\circ)$
$180^\circ$	$180^\circ$	$[120^\circ, 180^\circ]$	$97.5^\circ$	$(22.5^\circ, 97.5^\circ)$
$180^\circ$	$180^\circ$	$[120^\circ, 180^\circ]$	$(90^\circ, 93.75^\circ)$	$[30^\circ, 93.75^\circ]$
$180^\circ$	$180^\circ$	$105^\circ$	$105^\circ$	$(30^\circ, 105^\circ)$
$180^\circ$	$180^\circ$	$105^\circ$	$(90^\circ, 97.5^\circ)$	$[45^\circ, 97.5^\circ]$
$180^\circ$	$180^\circ$	$97.5^\circ$	$97.5^\circ$	$(45^\circ, 97.5^\circ)$
$180^\circ$	$180^\circ$	$97.5^\circ$	$(90^\circ, 93.75^\circ)$	$[52.5^\circ, 93.75^\circ]$
$180^\circ$	$180^\circ$	$(90^\circ, 93.75^\circ)$	$(90^\circ, 93.75^\circ)$	$[60^\circ, 93.75^\circ]$
$120^\circ$	$120^\circ$	$120^\circ$	$(90^\circ, 120^\circ)$	$(90^\circ, 120^\circ)$
$120^\circ$	$120^\circ$	$105^\circ$	$105^\circ$	$(90^\circ, 105^\circ)$

Table 5: Possible angle types of  $T_0, \dots, T_4$  ( $\varphi_0 = \varphi_1 = 180^\circ$  or  $\varphi_0 \leq 120^\circ$ )

### 5.2 Case 2: $\varphi_0 = 180^\circ$ and $\varphi_1, \dots, \varphi_4 \neq 180^\circ$

Characterizing greedy-drawable trees in this case was left open in [9]. We resolve this case by proving the following proposition.

**Proposition 5.2** Suppose that  $\varphi_0 = 180^\circ$  and  $\varphi_1, \dots, \varphi_4 \neq 180^\circ$ . Then, the tree  $T$  is greedy-drawable if and only if  $T_0, \dots, T_4$  have one of the angle types described in Table 6.

	$T_0$	$T_1$	$T_2$	$T_3$	$T_4$
I	180°	120°	120°	120°	[33.75°, 120°]
II	180°	120°	120°	105°	[45°, 105°]
III	180°	120°	120°	97.5°	[46.875°, 97.5°]
IV	180°	120°	120°	93.75°	[48.75°, 93.75°]
V	180°	120°	120°	(90°, 91.875°]	[52.5°, 91.875°]
VI	180°	120°	105°	[93.75°, 105°]	[60°, 105°]
VII	180°	120°	(90°, 105°]	(90°, 105°]	(90°, 105°]
VIII	180°	105°	[97.5°, 105°]	(90°, 105°]	(90°, 105°]
IX	180°	105°	93.75°	93.75°	(90°, 93.75°]
X	180°	105°	93.75°	91.875°	91.875°
XI	180°	97.5°	97.5°	97.5°	[90.9375°, 97.5°]

Table 6: Possible angle types of  $T_0, \dots, T_4$  ( $\varphi_0 = 180^\circ$ ,  $\varphi_1, \dots, \varphi_4 \neq 180^\circ$ )

**Proof.** We prove Proposition 5.2 with help of computer. To prove the if-part, it suffices to verify feasibility of the system (2.1) (for some permutation  $\tau$ ) for each vector  $(\varphi_0, \dots, \varphi_4)$  listed as follows:

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| Case I: (180,120,120,120,33.75),          | Case II: (180,120,120,105, 45),         |
| Case III: (180,120,120,97.5, 46.875),     | Case IV: (180,120,120,93.75,48.75),     |
| Case V: (180,120,120,90,52.5),            | Case VI: (180,120,105,93.75, 60),       |
| Case VII: (180,120,90,90, 90),            | Case VIII: (180,105,97.5,90, 90),       |
| Case IX: (180,105,93.75,93.75, 90),       | Case X: (180,105,93.75,91.875, 91.875), |
| Case XI: (180,97.5, 97.5, 97.5, 90.9375). |   |

Since the system (2.1) contains a non-linear equation, it is often hard to find a concrete solution. To prove feasibility, we use the intermediate value theorem (as done in [9]). Let  $S_\tau(\varphi_0, \dots, \varphi_4)$  be the set of vectors  $(\beta_0, \dots, \beta_4, \gamma_0, \dots, \gamma_4)$  that satisfy the following inequalities:

$$\begin{aligned}
0 &< \beta_i, \gamma_i < 180, \\
2\beta_i + \gamma_i &< 180, \beta_i + 2\gamma_i < 180, \\
\beta_i + \gamma_{i+1} &< \varphi_{\tau(i)}, \\
\sum_{i=0}^4 (\beta_i + \gamma_i) &= 540.
\end{aligned} \tag{5.1}$$

This system is obtained by eliminating  $\alpha_i$ 's from the system (2.1) and by ignoring the non-linear equation. When  $\tau$  and  $\varphi_0, \dots, \varphi_4$  are clear from the context, we simply denote the solution set by  $S$ . We let  $\omega(\beta_0, \dots, \beta_4, \gamma_0, \dots, \gamma_4) := \prod_{i=0}^4 \sin(\beta_i) - \prod_{i=0}^4 \sin(\gamma_i)$ . To verify feasibility of the original system (2.1), it suffices to find a pair of vectors  $(x_+, x_-)$  such that  $x_+, x_- \in \tilde{S}$  and  $\omega(x_+) > 0$ ,  $\omega(x_-) < 0$ , where  $\tilde{S}$  is the topological closure of  $S$ . Vectors  $x_+, x_-$  that prove greedy drawability for Cases I–IX are listed in Table 7. We found those vectors by trial and errors; we picked up some vertices of the solution set  $S$  (by solving linear programs with certain objective functions) and chose ones that takes positive and negative values. To solve linear programs exactly, we used QSOpt\_ex Rational LP Solver [3], developed by Applegate, Cook, Dash, and Espinoza. For those vectors, we decided that the values of the function  $\omega$  are positive or negative. Since the function  $\omega$  contains the trigonometric functions, it is hard to compute the exact values of  $\omega$ . To verify that  $\omega$  is negative or positive exactly for the vectors in Table 7, we used MPFI library [12], a library for arbitrary precision interval arithmetic, through the interface of SageMath [13].

On the other hand, we prove the only-if part by verifying infeasibility of the system (2.1) for the maximal vectors  $(\varphi_0, \dots, \varphi_4) \in \tilde{\Phi}$  (with respect to the lexicographic order) that do not correspond to the

	$\tau$	$x_+$										$x_-$										
		$\beta_0$	$\beta_1$	$\beta_2$	$\beta_3$	$\beta_4$	$\gamma_0$	$\gamma_1$	$\gamma_2$	$\gamma_3$	$\gamma_4$	$\beta_0$	$\beta_1$	$\beta_2$	$\beta_3$	$\beta_4$	$\gamma_0$	$\gamma_1$	$\gamma_2$	$\gamma_3$	$\gamma_4$	
I	1, 2, 3, 4, 0	60	60	60	$\frac{105}{4}$	$\frac{345}{4}$	60	60	60	60	$\frac{15}{2}$	$\frac{1545}{28}$	$\frac{705}{14}$	$\frac{285}{7}$	$\frac{150}{7}$	$\frac{4695}{56}$	$\frac{3495}{56}$	$\frac{1815}{28}$	$\frac{975}{14}$	$\frac{555}{7}$	$\frac{345}{28}$	
II	3, 1, 2, 4, 0	45	60	60	30	$\frac{165}{2}$	$\frac{135}{2}$	60	60	60	15	$\frac{285}{7}$	$\frac{360}{7}$	$\frac{300}{7}$	$\frac{180}{7}$	$\frac{1125}{14}$	$\frac{975}{14}$	$\frac{450}{7}$	$\frac{480}{7}$	$\frac{540}{7}$	$\frac{135}{7}$	
III	3, 1, 2, 4, 0	$\frac{75}{2}$	60	60	$\frac{375}{8}$	90	$\frac{285}{4}$	60	60	$\frac{435}{8}$	0	$\frac{1905}{56}$	$\frac{1485}{28}$	$\frac{645}{14}$	$\frac{225}{7}$	$\frac{9255}{112}$	$\frac{8175}{112}$	$\frac{3555}{56}$	$\frac{1875}{28}$	$\frac{1035}{14}$	$\frac{825}{56}$	
IV	3, 1, 2, 4, 0	$\frac{135}{4}$	60	60	$\frac{191}{4}$	$\frac{179}{2}$	$\frac{585}{8}$	60	60	$\frac{439}{8}$	1	$\frac{855}{28}$	$\frac{375}{7}$	$\frac{330}{7}$	$\frac{240}{7}$	$\frac{4635}{56}$	$\frac{4185}{56}$	$\frac{885}{14}$	$\frac{465}{7}$	$\frac{510}{7}$	$\frac{405}{28}$	
V	3, 1, 2, 4, 0	30	60	60	$\frac{103}{2}$	$\frac{179}{2}$	75	60	60	53	1	$\frac{375}{14}$	$\frac{375}{7}$	$\frac{330}{7}$	$\frac{240}{7}$	$\frac{2265}{28}$	$\frac{2145}{28}$	$\frac{885}{14}$	$\frac{465}{7}$	$\frac{510}{7}$	$\frac{255}{14}$	
VI	3, 2, 1, 4, 0	$\frac{105}{4}$	45	60	$\frac{195}{4}$	$\frac{675}{8}$	$\frac{615}{8}$	$\frac{135}{2}$	60	60	$\frac{45}{4}$	$\frac{345}{14}$	$\frac{585}{14}$	$\frac{375}{7}$	$\frac{330}{7}$	$\frac{585}{7}$	$\frac{2175}{28}$	$\frac{1935}{28}$	$\frac{885}{14}$	$\frac{465}{7}$	$\frac{90}{7}$	
VII	2, 1, 3, 4, 0	15	60	60	75	$\frac{165}{2}$	$\frac{165}{2}$	60	60	30	15	15	45	30	60	75	$\frac{165}{2}$	$\frac{135}{2}$	75	60	30	
VIII	3, 1, 2, 4, 0	$\frac{75}{4}$	45	60	$\frac{285}{4}$	$\frac{645}{8}$	$\frac{645}{8}$	$\frac{135}{2}$	60	$\frac{75}{2}$	$\frac{75}{4}$	$\frac{75}{4}$	$\frac{75}{2}$	45	$\frac{255}{4}$	$\frac{615}{8}$	$\frac{645}{8}$	$\frac{285}{4}$	$\frac{135}{2}$	$\frac{105}{2}$	$\frac{105}{4}$	
IX	4, 1, 2, 3, 0	$\frac{165}{8}$	45	60	$\frac{585}{8}$	$\frac{1275}{16}$	$\frac{1275}{16}$	$\frac{135}{2}$	60	$\frac{135}{4}$	$\frac{165}{8}$	$\frac{165}{8}$	$\frac{165}{4}$	$\frac{165}{2}$	$\frac{105}{8}$	$\frac{555}{16}$	$\frac{1245}{16}$	$\frac{1275}{16}$	$\frac{555}{8}$	$\frac{255}{4}$	$\frac{165}{4}$	$\frac{195}{8}$
X	3, 1, 2, 4, 0	$\frac{45}{2}$	45	60	$\frac{585}{8}$	$\frac{645}{8}$	$\frac{315}{4}$	$\frac{135}{2}$	60	$\frac{135}{4}$	$\frac{75}{4}$	$\frac{45}{2}$	$\frac{165}{4}$	$\frac{105}{2}$	$\frac{555}{8}$	$\frac{315}{4}$	$\frac{315}{4}$	$\frac{555}{8}$	$\frac{255}{4}$	$\frac{165}{4}$	$\frac{45}{2}$	
XI	1, 2, 3, 4, 0	$\frac{405}{16}$	$\frac{75}{2}$	60	$\frac{285}{4}$	$\frac{2365}{32}$	$\frac{2475}{32}$	$\frac{285}{4}$	60	$\frac{75}{2}$	$\frac{315}{16}$	$\frac{405}{16}$	$\frac{285}{8}$	$\frac{225}{4}$	$\frac{555}{8}$	$\frac{2535}{32}$	$\frac{2475}{32}$	$\frac{1155}{16}$	$\frac{495}{8}$	$\frac{165}{4}$	$\frac{345}{16}$	

Table 7:  $x_+$  and  $x_-$  for maximal greedy-drawable trees

	$(\varphi_{\tau(0)}, \dots, \varphi_{\tau(4)})$		$(\varphi_{\tau(0)}, \dots, \varphi_{\tau(4)})$
(a)	(120, 120, 120, 31.875, 180)	(h)	(91.875, 120, 105, 60, 180)
(b)	(105, 120, 120, 37.5, 180)	(i)	(60, 120, 91.875, 105, 180)
(c)	(97.5, 120, 120, 45.9375, 180)	(j)	(91.875, 105, 120, 60, 180)
(d)	(93.75, 120, 120, 46.875, 180)	(k)	(97.5, 97.5, 120, 60, 180)
(e)	(91.875, 120, 120, 48.75, 180)	(l)	(90.9375, 105, 93.75, 91.875, 180)
(f)	(105, 120, 105, 52.5, 180)	(m)	(90.9375, 93.75, 105, 91.875, 180)
(g)	(105, 105, 120, 52.5, 180)	(o)	(97.5, 97.5, 97.5, 90.46875, 180)

Table 8: Remaining cases:  $S_{\tau}(\varphi_0, \dots, \varphi_4)$  is not empty

angle types described in Table 6. The maximal vectors are described as follows:

(180, 120, 120, 120, 31.875), (180, 120, 120, 105, 37.5), (180, 120, 120, 97.5, 45.9375),  
(180, 120, 120, 93.75, 46.875), (180, 120, 120, 91.875, 48.75), (180, 120, 120, 60, 60),  
(180, 120, 105, 105, 52.5), (180, 120, 105, 91.875, 60), (180, 120, 97.5, 97.5, 60),  
(180, 105, 105, 105, 60), (180, 105, 93.75, 91.875, 90.9375), (180, 105, 91.875, 91.875, 91.875),  
(180, 97.5, 97.5, 93.75, 93.75), (180, 97.5, 97.5, 97.5, 90.46875).

We have to verify infeasibility of the system (2.1) for each permutation  $\tau$  on  $\{0, 1, \dots, 4\}$  and for each vector  $(\varphi_0, \dots, \varphi_4)$  listed above. It was done in the following three steps.

### Step 1.

If  $S$  is empty, then the system (2.1) is clearly infeasible. Since  $S$  is defined by linear inequalities, emptiness of  $S$  can be checked by linear programming. Using QSOpt\_ex Rational LP Solver [3], we verified emptiness of  $S$  except for the fourteen cases listed in Table 8. (We ignore the vectors obtained by applying permutations that correspond to rotations or reflections to those vectors)

### Step 2.

For the fourteen cases in Table 8, the set  $S$  is non-empty and we have to show that adding the equation  $\omega = 0$  makes the system (2.1) infeasible. Since  $S$  is connected and  $\omega$  is continuous on  $S$ , it can be done by verifying that the function  $\omega$  is always positive or always negative on  $S$ . However, since  $\omega$  is a non-linear function, it is hard to verify it directly. Hence, we first compute the axis-aligned bounding

box  $B(S)$  of  $S$  by (by deciding the maximum and minimum of  $\beta_i$ 's and  $\gamma_i$ 's over  $S$ ) and estimate the value of  $\omega$  on  $B(S)$ . If  $\omega$  is always positive or always negative on  $B(S)$ , the system (2.1) is clearly infeasible (see Figure 7 for an intuition). For the vectors  $(\varphi_{\tau(0)}, \dots, \varphi_{\tau(4)})$  in Table 8, one can easily check that  $B(S) \subset [0, 90]^{10}$  (see Table 9). Therefore, letting  $B(S) = [\beta_0^-, \beta_0^+] \times \dots \times [\gamma_4^-, \gamma_4^+]$ , we have  $\prod_{i=0}^4 \sin(\beta_i^-) - \prod_{i=0}^4 \sin(\gamma_i^+) \leq \omega(x) \leq \prod_{i=0}^4 \sin(\beta_i^+) - \prod_{i=0}^4 \sin(\gamma_i^-)$  for all  $x \in B(S)$ . Thus, if  $\prod_{i=0}^4 \sin(\beta_i^-) - \prod_{i=0}^4 \sin(\gamma_i^+)$  and  $\prod_{i=0}^4 \sin(\beta_i^+) - \prod_{i=0}^4 \sin(\gamma_i^-)$  have the same sign, then  $\omega$  is always positive or always negative on  $S$ . We decided the signs of  $\prod_{i=0}^4 \sin(\beta_i^-) - \prod_{i=0}^4 \sin(\gamma_i^+)$  and  $\prod_{i=0}^4 \sin(\beta_i^+) - \prod_{i=0}^4 \sin(\gamma_i^-)$  using MPFI library [12] through SageMath [13]. The computational results are summarized in Table 9. Except for Cases (c), (d), (e), and (j), we were able to verify that the original system (2.1) is infeasible.

	$\beta_0^+$	$\beta_1^+$	$\beta_2^+$	$\beta_3^+$	$\beta_4^+$	$\gamma_0^+$	$\gamma_1^+$	$\gamma_2^+$	$\gamma_3^+$	$\gamma_4^+$	$\beta_0^-$	$\beta_1^-$	$\beta_2^-$	$\beta_3^-$	$\beta_4^-$	$\gamma_0^-$	$\gamma_1^-$	$\gamma_2^-$	$\gamma_3^-$	$\gamma_4^-$	$\omega(x)$
(a)	$\frac{975}{16}$	$\frac{975}{16}$	$\frac{975}{16}$	$\frac{255}{8}$	90	$\frac{4185}{64}$	$\frac{1055}{16}$	$\frac{1935}{28}$	$\frac{1095}{14}$	$\frac{465}{56}$	$\frac{1575}{32}$	$\frac{385}{8}$	$\frac{585}{14}$	$\frac{165}{7}$	$\frac{9615}{112}$	$\frac{465}{8}$	$\frac{465}{8}$	$\frac{465}{8}$	$\frac{465}{8}$	0	$\geq 0.04019886771016 - 3.25 \times 10^{-15}$ $\leq 0.352662021312439 + 9.76 \times 10^{-16}$
(b)	45	60	60	$\frac{75}{2}$	90	$\frac{1125}{16}$	$\frac{255}{4}$	$\frac{465}{7}$	$\frac{510}{7}$	$\frac{45}{14}$	$\frac{315}{8}$	$\frac{105}{2}$	$\frac{330}{7}$	$\frac{240}{7}$	$\frac{2475}{28}$	$\frac{135}{2}$	60	60	60	0	$\geq 0.16628181995631 - 4.00 \times 10^{-15}$ $\leq 0.322844500932659 + 8.88 \times 10^{-16}$
(c)	$\frac{375}{8}$	$\frac{1035}{16}$	$\frac{1995}{32}$	$\frac{735}{16}$	90	$\frac{9945}{128}$	$\frac{2095}{32}$	$\frac{3735}{56}$	$\frac{2055}{28}$	$\frac{1425}{112}$	$\frac{1575}{64}$	$\frac{785}{16}$	$\frac{1305}{28}$	$\frac{465}{14}$	$\frac{18735}{224}$	$\frac{1065}{16}$	$\frac{405}{8}$	$\frac{885}{16}$	$\frac{885}{16}$	0	$\geq -0.04784331869952 - 2.38 \times 10^{-15}$ $\leq 0.41994431818384 + 2.82 \times 10^{-15}$
(d)	$\frac{165}{4}$	$\frac{255}{4}$	$\frac{495}{8}$	$\frac{375}{8}$	90	$\frac{5025}{64}$	$\frac{1035}{16}$	$\frac{1845}{28}$	$\frac{1005}{14}$	$\frac{585}{56}$	$\frac{735}{32}$	$\frac{405}{8}$	$\frac{675}{14}$	$\frac{255}{7}$	$\frac{9495}{112}$	$\frac{555}{8}$	$\frac{105}{2}$	$\frac{225}{4}$	$\frac{225}{4}$	0	$\geq -0.00626089365276 - 3.13 \times 10^{-15}$ $\leq 0.38064127480888 + 2.60 \times 10^{-15}$
(e)	$\frac{165}{4}$	$\frac{1035}{16}$	$\frac{1995}{32}$	$\frac{195}{4}$	90	$\frac{2565}{32}$	65	$\frac{1845}{28}$	$\frac{1005}{14}$	$\frac{345}{28}$	$\frac{315}{16}$	50	$\frac{675}{14}$	$\frac{255}{7}$	$\frac{4695}{56}$	$\frac{555}{8}$	$\frac{405}{8}$	$\frac{885}{16}$	$\frac{885}{16}$	0	$\geq 0.39692841575826 - 2.70 \times 10^{-15}$ $\leq -0.05161138747194 + 3.35 \times 10^{-15}$
(f)	45	60	60	$\frac{105}{2}$	90	$\frac{1155}{16}$	$\frac{265}{4}$	$\frac{495}{7}$	$\frac{465}{7}$	$\frac{75}{14}$	$\frac{285}{8}$	$\frac{95}{2}$	$\frac{270}{7}$	$\frac{330}{7}$	$\frac{2445}{28}$	$\frac{135}{2}$	60	60	45	0	$\geq 0.42073914509770 - 3.48 \times 10^{-15}$ $\leq 0.12567774999668 + 5.19 \times 10^{-15}$
(g)	45	60	$\frac{135}{2}$	$\frac{105}{2}$	90	$\frac{1215}{16}$	$\frac{285}{4}$	$\frac{450}{7}$	$\frac{480}{7}$	$\frac{135}{14}$	$\frac{225}{8}$	$\frac{75}{2}$	$\frac{360}{7}$	$\frac{300}{7}$	$\frac{2385}{28}$	$\frac{135}{2}$	60	45	$\frac{105}{2}$	0	$\geq 0.44884628439700 - 3.80 \times 10^{-15}$ $\leq 0.02302084943542 + 1.68 \times 10^{-15}$
(h)	$\frac{135}{4}$	$\frac{975}{16}$	$\frac{1935}{32}$	60	90	$\frac{315}{4}$	$\frac{525}{8}$	$\frac{1935}{28}$	$\frac{885}{14}$	$\frac{45}{7}$	$\frac{45}{2}$	$\frac{195}{4}$	$\frac{585}{14}$	$\frac{375}{7}$	$\frac{1215}{14}$	$\frac{585}{8}$	$\frac{465}{8}$	$\frac{945}{16}$	$\frac{705}{16}$	0	$\geq 0.07059309513054 - 2.99 \times 10^{-15}$ $\leq 0.365922064215845 + 9.30 \times 10^{-16}$
(i)	$\frac{45}{14}$	$\frac{1725}{28}$	$\frac{3405}{56}$	75	$\frac{1215}{16}$	90	60	$\frac{1005}{16}$	$\frac{75}{2}$	$\frac{135}{4}$	0	$\frac{915}{16}$	$\frac{435}{8}$	$\frac{285}{4}$	$\frac{585}{8}$	$\frac{2475}{28}$	$\frac{795}{14}$	$\frac{1635}{28}$	30	$\frac{225}{8}$	$\geq -0.260537672566709 - 9.48 \times 10^{-16}$ $\leq -0.127529352077151 + 6.17 \times 10^{-16}$
(j)	$\frac{135}{4}$	$\frac{975}{16}$	$\frac{2175}{32}$	60	90	$\frac{165}{2}$	$\frac{565}{8}$	$\frac{1755}{28}$	$\frac{915}{14}$	$\frac{75}{7}$	15	$\frac{155}{4}$	$\frac{765}{14}$	$\frac{345}{7}$	$\frac{1185}{14}$	$\frac{585}{8}$	$\frac{465}{8}$	$\frac{705}{16}$	$\frac{825}{16}$	0	$\geq -0.040708347750012 - 9.41 \times 10^{-16}$ $\leq 0.38984862337978 + 5.44 \times 10^{-15}$
(k)	30	45	$\frac{255}{4}$	60	90	$\frac{315}{4}$	$\frac{145}{2}$	$\frac{855}{14}$	$\frac{435}{7}$	$\frac{30}{7}$	$\frac{45}{2}$	35	$\frac{405}{7}$	$\frac{390}{7}$	$\frac{615}{7}$	75	$\frac{135}{2}$	$\frac{105}{2}$	$\frac{225}{4}$	0	$\geq 0.099362774740883 - 9.62 \times 10^{-16}$ $\leq 0.274610072620768 + 8.01 \times 10^{-16}$
(l)	$\frac{405}{16}$	$\frac{195}{4}$	$\frac{495}{8}$	$\frac{1185}{16}$	$\frac{2595}{32}$	$\frac{315}{4}$	$\frac{1095}{16}$	$\frac{495}{8}$	$\frac{75}{2}$	$\frac{165}{8}$	$\frac{45}{2}$	$\frac{345}{8}$	$\frac{225}{4}$	$\frac{285}{4}$	$\frac{1275}{16}$	$\frac{2475}{32}$	$\frac{525}{8}$	$\frac{225}{4}$	$\frac{255}{8}$	$\frac{285}{16}$	$\geq 0.03013991922475 - 3.53 \times 10^{-15}$ $\leq 0.14994363475076 + 5.09 \times 10^{-15}$
(m)	$\frac{315}{16}$	$\frac{75}{2}$	$\frac{495}{8}$	$\frac{1095}{16}$	$\frac{2505}{32}$	$\frac{1305}{16}$	$\frac{1185}{16}$	$\frac{495}{8}$	$\frac{195}{4}$	$\frac{105}{4}$	$\frac{135}{8}$	$\frac{255}{8}$	$\frac{225}{4}$	$\frac{525}{8}$	$\frac{615}{8}$	$\frac{2565}{32}$	$\frac{285}{4}$	$\frac{225}{4}$	$\frac{345}{8}$	$\frac{375}{16}$	$\geq -0.16587845769802 - 3.03 \times 10^{-15}$ $\leq -0.04621984365605 + 2.29 \times 10^{-15}$
(o)	$\frac{435}{16}$	$\frac{315}{8}$	$\frac{975}{16}$	$\frac{2295}{32}$	$\frac{645}{8}$	$\frac{4935}{64}$	$\frac{2295}{32}$	$\frac{975}{16}$	$\frac{315}{8}$	$\frac{645}{32}$	$\frac{825}{32}$	$\frac{585}{16}$	$\frac{465}{8}$	$\frac{1125}{16}$	$\frac{5115}{64}$	$\frac{2445}{32}$	$\frac{1125}{16}$	$\frac{465}{8}$	$\frac{585}{16}$	$\frac{75}{4}$	$\geq 0.02710311900070 - 3.65 \times 10^{-15}$ $\leq 0.08854800480938 + 2.10 \times 10^{-15}$

Table 9: Bounding box of  $S$  and upper and lower bounds of  $\omega(x)$

### Step 3.

For Cases (c), (d), (e), and (j) in Table 8, the bounding box  $B(S)$  is too large to approximate  $S$  and it is impossible to prove that  $\omega$  is always positive or always negative on  $S$  in Step 2. In those cases, we par-

tion the solution space  $S$  into  $S_1, \dots, S_{k+1}$  by some parallel hyperplanes  $H_1, \dots, H_k$  and then consider the bounding boxes  $B(S_1), \dots, B(S_{k+1})$ . Then, we obtain a finer approximation  $B(S_1) \cup \dots \cup B(S_{k+1})$  of  $S$ . See Figure 8 for an intuition. If  $\omega$  always takes the same sign on each  $B(S_i)$ , the original system (2.1) is infeasible. For Case (c), we considered a partition of  $S$  induced by hyperplanes  $\gamma_4 = 7$  and  $\gamma_4 = 11$ , and obtained the results presented in Table 10. For Cases (d), (e), and (j), we obtained the results in Tables 11–13.

Combining the results in Steps 1–3, we complete the proof of the only-if part.




Figure 7: Bounding box of  $S$




Figure 8: Bounding boxes of  $S_1$  and  $S_2$

	$\beta_0^+$	$\beta_1^+$	$\beta_2^+$	$\beta_3^+$	$\beta_4^+$	$\gamma_0^+$	$\gamma_1^+$	$\gamma_2^+$	$\gamma_3^+$	$\gamma_4^+$	$\beta_0^-$	$\beta_1^-$	$\beta_2^-$	$\beta_3^-$	$\beta_4^-$	$\gamma_0^-$	$\gamma_1^-$	$\gamma_2^-$	$\gamma_3^-$	$\gamma_4^-$	$\omega(x)$
$S_1$	$\frac{375}{8}$	$\frac{1035}{16}$	$\frac{1995}{32}$	$\frac{735}{16}$	90	$\frac{9945}{128}$	$\frac{2095}{32}$	$\frac{3735}{56}$	$\frac{1078}{15}$	7	$\frac{1575}{64}$	$\frac{785}{16}$	$\frac{1305}{28}$	$\frac{544}{15}$	$\frac{21503}{256}$	$\frac{1065}{16}$	$\frac{405}{8}$	$\frac{885}{16}$	$\frac{885}{16}$	0	$\geq 0.03993726639257 - 5.24 \times 10^{-15}$ $\leq 0.41994431818384 + 2.82 \times 10^{-15}$
$S_2$	$\frac{319}{8}$	$\frac{979}{16}$	$\frac{1939}{32}$	$\frac{623}{16}$	$\frac{173}{2}$	$\frac{9609}{128}$	$\frac{6173}{96}$	$\frac{3735}{56}$	$\frac{1094}{15}$	11	$\frac{1911}{64}$	$\frac{2467}{48}$	$\frac{1305}{28}$	$\frac{512}{15}$	$\frac{21439}{256}$	$\frac{1121}{16}$	$\frac{461}{8}$	$\frac{941}{16}$	$\frac{941}{16}$	7	$\geq 0.01183838535761 - 5.48 \times 10^{-15}$ $\leq 0.23617122360425 + 2.63 \times 10^{-15}$
$S_3$	$\frac{287}{8}$	$\frac{227}{4}$	$\frac{107}{2}$	$\frac{559}{16}$	$\frac{169}{2}$	$\frac{9417}{128}$	$\frac{6109}{96}$	$\frac{3735}{56}$	$\frac{2055}{28}$	$\frac{1425}{112}$	$\frac{2103}{64}$	$\frac{2531}{48}$	$\frac{1305}{28}$	$\frac{465}{14}$	$\frac{18735}{224}$	$\frac{1153}{16}$	$\frac{493}{8}$	$\frac{253}{4}$	$\frac{133}{2}$	11	$\geq 0.00422323812900 - 2.80 \times 10^{-15}$ $\leq 0.09377125077374 + 5.77 \times 10^{-15}$

Table 10: Bounding box of  $S_i$  and upper and lower bounds of  $\omega(x)$  (Case (c),  $S_1 := S \cap \{\gamma_4 \leq 7\}$ ,  $S_2 := S \cap \{7 \leq \gamma_4 \leq 11\}$ ,  $S_3 := S \cap \{\gamma_4 \geq 11\}$ )

	$\beta_0^+$	$\beta_1^+$	$\beta_2^+$	$\beta_3^+$	$\beta_4^+$	$\gamma_0^+$	$\gamma_1^+$	$\gamma_2^+$	$\gamma_3^+$	$\gamma_4^+$	$\beta_0^-$	$\beta_1^-$	$\beta_2^-$	$\beta_3^-$	$\beta_4^-$	$\gamma_0^-$	$\gamma_1^-$	$\gamma_2^-$	$\gamma_3^-$	$\gamma_4^-$	$\omega(x)$
$S_1$	$\frac{165}{4}$	$\frac{255}{4}$	$\frac{495}{8}$	$\frac{375}{8}$	90	$\frac{5025}{64}$	$\frac{1035}{16}$	$\frac{1845}{28}$	$\frac{211}{3}$	5	$\frac{735}{32}$	$\frac{405}{8}$	$\frac{675}{14}$	$\frac{118}{3}$	$\frac{10895}{128}$	$\frac{555}{8}$	$\frac{105}{2}$	$\frac{225}{4}$	$\frac{225}{4}$	0	$\geq 0.075681007375979 - 8.99 \times 10^{-16}$ $\leq 0.38064127480888 + 2.60 \times 10^{-15}$
$S_2$	$\frac{145}{4}$	$\frac{245}{4}$	$\frac{485}{8}$	$\frac{335}{8}$	$\frac{175}{2}$	$\frac{4905}{64}$	$\frac{3065}{48}$	$\frac{1845}{28}$	$\frac{1005}{14}$	$\frac{585}{56}$	$\frac{855}{32}$	$\frac{1255}{24}$	$\frac{675}{14}$	$\frac{255}{7}$	$\frac{9495}{112}$	$\frac{575}{8}$	$\frac{115}{2}$	$\frac{235}{4}$	$\frac{235}{4}$	5	$\geq 0.01953883026443 - 1.70 \times 10^{-15}$ $\leq 0.25021013905337 + 4.07 \times 10^{-15}$

Table 11: Bounding box of  $S_i$  and upper and lower bounds of  $\omega(x)$  (Case (d),  $S_1 := S \cap \{\gamma_4 \leq 5\}$ ,  $S_2 := S \cap \{\gamma_4 \geq 5\}$ )

	$\beta_0^+$	$\beta_1^+$	$\beta_2^+$	$\beta_3^+$	$\beta_4^+$	$\gamma_0^+$	$\gamma_1^+$	$\gamma_2^+$	$\gamma_3^+$	$\gamma_4^+$	$\beta_0^-$	$\beta_1^-$	$\beta_2^-$	$\beta_3^-$	$\beta_4^-$	$\gamma_0^-$	$\gamma_1^-$	$\gamma_2^-$	$\gamma_3^-$	$\gamma_4^-$	$\omega(x)$
$S_1$	$\frac{165}{4}$	$\frac{1035}{16}$	$\frac{1995}{32}$	$\frac{195}{4}$	90	$\frac{2565}{32}$	65	$\frac{1845}{28}$	$\frac{2111}{30}$	7	$\frac{315}{16}$	50	$\frac{675}{14}$	$\frac{589}{15}$	$\frac{5387}{64}$	$\frac{555}{8}$	$\frac{405}{8}$	$\frac{885}{16}$	$\frac{885}{16}$	0	$\geq 0.027606528320338 - 6.58 \times 10^{-16}$ $\leq 0.39692841575826 + 2.70 \times 10^{-15}$
$S_2$	$\frac{137}{4}$	$\frac{979}{16}$	$\frac{1939}{32}$	$\frac{167}{4}$	$\frac{173}{2}$	$\frac{2481}{32}$	$\frac{383}{6}$	$\frac{1845}{28}$	$\frac{427}{6}$	10	$\frac{399}{16}$	$\frac{157}{3}$	$\frac{675}{14}$	$\frac{113}{3}$	$\frac{5375}{64}$	$\frac{583}{8}$	$\frac{461}{8}$	$\frac{941}{16}$	$\frac{941}{16}$	7	$\geq 0.01976589000208 - 1.08 \times 10^{-15}$ $\leq 0.21354032967021 + 5.02 \times 10^{-15}$
$S_3$	$\frac{125}{4}$	$\frac{235}{4}$	$\frac{115}{2}$	$\frac{155}{4}$	85	$\frac{2445}{32}$	$\frac{190}{3}$	$\frac{1845}{28}$	$\frac{1005}{14}$	$\frac{345}{28}$	$\frac{435}{16}$	$\frac{160}{3}$	$\frac{675}{14}$	$\frac{255}{7}$	$\frac{4695}{56}$	$\frac{595}{8}$	$\frac{485}{8}$	$\frac{245}{4}$	$\frac{125}{2}$	10	$\geq 0.00062581827947 - 2.19 \times 10^{-15}$ $\leq 0.11990580211028 + 2.31 \times 10^{-15}$

Table 12: Bounding box of  $S_i$  and upper and lower bounds of  $\omega(x)$  (Case (e),  $S_1 := S \cap \{\gamma_4 \leq 7\}$ ,  $S_2 := S \cap \{7 \leq \gamma_4 \leq 10\}$ ,  $S_3 := S \cap \{\gamma_4 \geq 10\}$ )

	$\beta_0^+$	$\beta_1^+$	$\beta_2^+$	$\beta_3^+$	$\beta_4^+$	$\gamma_0^+$	$\gamma_1^+$	$\gamma_2^+$	$\gamma_3^+$	$\gamma_4^+$	$\beta_0^-$	$\beta_1^-$	$\beta_2^-$	$\beta_3^-$	$\beta_4^-$	$\gamma_0^-$	$\gamma_1^-$	$\gamma_2^-$	$\gamma_3^-$	$\gamma_4^-$	$\omega(x)$
$S_1$	$\frac{135}{4}$	$\frac{975}{16}$	$\frac{2175}{32}$	60	90	$\frac{165}{2}$	$\frac{565}{8}$	$\frac{1755}{28}$	$\frac{1931}{30}$	7	15	$\frac{155}{4}$	$\frac{765}{14}$	$\frac{769}{15}$	$\frac{679}{8}$	$\frac{585}{8}$	$\frac{465}{8}$	$\frac{705}{16}$	$\frac{825}{16}$	0	$\geq 0.01134976797036 - 1.92 \times 10^{-15}$ $\leq 0.38984862337978 + 5.44 \times 10^{-15}$
$S_2$	$\frac{107}{4}$	$\frac{199}{4}$	$\frac{499}{8}$	53	$\frac{173}{2}$	$\frac{639}{8}$	$\frac{1667}{24}$	$\frac{1755}{28}$	$\frac{915}{14}$	$\frac{75}{7}$	$\frac{81}{4}$	$\frac{493}{12}$	$\frac{765}{14}$	$\frac{345}{7}$	$\frac{1185}{14}$	$\frac{613}{8}$	$\frac{521}{8}$	$\frac{221}{4}$	$\frac{461}{8}$	7	$\geq 0.00159668015617 - 2.56 \times 10^{-15}$ $\leq 0.167983216625798 + 9.33 \times 10^{-16}$

Table 13: Bounding box of  $S_i$  and upper and lower bounds of  $\omega(x)$  (Case (j),  $S_1 := S \cap \{\gamma_4 \leq 7\}$ ,  $S_2 := S \cap \{\gamma_4 \geq 7\}$ )

■

## 6 Greedy-drawable pseudo-trees

In this section, we characterize greedy-drawable *pseudo-trees*, i.e., graphs obtained by adding one edge to a tree. Let  $\mathcal{T}$  be a pseudo-tree. Then,  $\mathcal{T}$  contains a single cycle. Let  $C = v_0, \dots, v_{m-1}$  be the cycle in  $\mathcal{T}$ . If we remove the edges of  $C$  from  $\mathcal{T}$ , we obtain  $m$  trees. Let  $T_i = (V_i, E_i)$  be the tree that contains  $v_i$ . We consider  $\tilde{T}_i := T_i + v_i v'_i$ , where  $v'_i$  is a new vertex, and define  $|\angle T_i| := |\angle \tilde{T}_i|$  and  $|\angle T_i|_* := |\angle \tilde{T}_i|_*$ . Then, we consider the new pseudo-tree  $\tilde{\mathcal{T}}$  obtained by replacing each  $T_i$  in  $\mathcal{T}$  by  $\tilde{T}_i$  (gluing each  $\tilde{T}_i$  to  $C$  at  $v'_i$ ). We first observe the following fact.

**Lemma 6.1** If a pseudo-tree  $\mathcal{T}$  has a (planar) greedy drawing, then the drawing must be outerplanar.

**Proof.** Suppose that there is an edge  $uv$  that is drawn inside the region bounded by the cycle. Then, the whole of the cycle must be contained in the same side of axis( $uv$ ) (see Section 2), which is impossible. ■

Thus, if  $\mathcal{T}$  has a greedy drawing, then  $\tilde{\mathcal{T}}$  also has a greedy drawing. (Draw each edge  $v_i v'_i$  infinitesimally small.) Applying an argument similar to the proof of Lemma 8 in [9], we can show that  $\tilde{\mathcal{T}}$  has a greedy drawing such that each subtree  $T_i$  with  $|\angle T_i|_* > 0$  is drawn infinitesimally small. Then, we can apply an argument similar to the proof of [9, Lemma 6] and obtain the following lemma.

**Lemma 6.2** If the pseudo-tree  $\mathcal{T}$  is greedy-drawable, then the following inequality holds:

$$\sum_{i=0, \dots, m-1, |\angle T_i|_* > 0} |\angle T_i|_* > 180^\circ (m-2). \quad (6.1)$$

Now we show that the above inequality characterizes greedy-drawable pseudo-trees.

**Theorem 6.3** The pseudo-tree  $\mathcal{T}$  is greedy-drawable if and only if the inequality (6.1) holds.

**Proof.** It suffices to prove the if-part. Let  $\varphi_0 := |\angle T_0|_*, \dots, \varphi_{m-1} := |\angle T_{m-1}|_*$ , where we set  $\varphi_i = 0$  if  $|\angle T_i|_* \leq 0$ , and assume that these angles satisfy the inequality (6.1). Since the case that at most two angles  $\varphi_i$  satisfy  $\varphi_i \neq 180$  is easy, we assume that at least three angles  $\varphi_i$  satisfy  $\varphi_i \neq 180$ . We remark that at most one angle  $\varphi_i$  satisfies  $\varphi_i = 0$ . Otherwise, we have  $\sum_{i=0}^{m-1} \varphi_i \leq 180(m-2)$ , which contradicts to the assumption. We distinguish the following two cases.

(Case 1)  $\varphi_j > 0$  for all  $j$ .

In this case, at most five angles  $\varphi_i$  must satisfy  $\varphi_i \neq 180$ , i.e.,  $\varphi_i \leq 120$ . Otherwise,  $\sum_{i=0}^{m-1} \varphi_i \leq 180(m-6) + 120 \times 6 = 180(m-2)$ , which contradicts to the assumption. Moreover, we can observe the following.

- If five angles  $\varphi_i$  satisfy  $\varphi_i \leq 120$ , no angle  $\varphi_i$  satisfies  $\varphi_i \leq 90$ , i.e.,  $\varphi_i \leq 60$ . Otherwise, we have  $\sum_{i=0}^{m-1} \varphi_i \leq 180(m-5) + 120 \times 4 + 60 = 180(m-2)$ .
- If four angles  $\varphi_i$  satisfy  $\varphi_i \leq 120$ , at most one angle  $\varphi_i$  satisfies  $\varphi_i \leq 90$ , i.e.,  $\varphi_i \leq 60$ . Otherwise,  $\sum_{i=0}^{m-1} \varphi_i \leq 180(m-4) + 120 \times 2 + 60 \times 2 = 180(m-2)$ .

We construct a greedy drawing of  $\mathcal{T}$  as follows. Let  $k \in \arg \min_i \varphi_i$ . First, we draw the cycle  $C$  as a polygon with each angle  $\angle v_{i-1}v_i v_{i+1}$  defined as follows: For sufficiently small  $\epsilon > 0$ ,

$$\angle v_{i-1}v_i v_{i+1} = \begin{cases} 180^\circ & \text{if } \varphi_i = 180, \\ \varphi_i - \epsilon & \text{if } \varphi_i \neq 180 \text{ and } i \neq k, \\ 180^\circ(m-2) - \sum_{i \neq k} \angle v_{i-1}v_i v_{i+1} & \text{if } i = k. \end{cases}$$

Then, the cycle  $C$  is drawn as a triangle, rectangle, or pentagon, and it is easy to check that there is a greedy path between any pair of vertices of the polygon. We first assume that the obtained polygon, denoted by  $\Gamma_1$ , is a pentagon. Let  $V_0, \dots, V_4$  be the vertices of  $\Gamma_1$ , labeled counterclockwise, and  $v_{k_0}, \dots, v_{k_4}$  be the corresponding vertices of  $\mathcal{T}$ . We take a point  $H_1$  on the edge  $V_3V_4$  and take points  $H_0, H_2, H_3, H_4$  in a similar way (see Figure 9). Then, we truncate the pentagon  $\Gamma_1$  around each vertex  $V_i$  by a line vertical to the line  $V_iH_i$ . Let  $V'_i, V''_i$  be the new vertices obtained by truncation around  $V_i$ . We put the vertices  $w_0, \dots, w_N$  of  $C$  that appear between  $v_{k_i}$  and  $v_{k_{i+1}}$  on the line segment  $V'_i, V''_i$ . If the points  $V'_i$  and  $V''_i$  are sufficiently close for each  $i$ , the obtained drawing  $\Gamma_2$  of  $C$  is guaranteed to be greedy. Finally, we replace each line segment  $V'_iV''_i$  by a convex polygonal chain that is sufficiently close to the line segment  $V'_iV''_i$  (see Figure 10) and put  $w_0, \dots, w_N$  on the vertices of the polygonal chain. If we draw each  $T_i$  infinitesimally small so that each  $\angle T_i$  contains the drawing  $\Gamma_2$ , then the constructed drawing is a greedy drawing of  $\mathcal{T}$ . A similar discussion can be applied to the case in which the polygon  $\Gamma_1$  is a triangle or a rectangle. (If  $\Gamma_1$  is a rectangle, we have to slightly modify the construction; see Figure 11.)




Figure 9: Polygon  $\Gamma_1$  and drawing  $\Gamma_2$  ( $\Gamma_1$ : pentagon)




Figure 10: Replacing the line segment  $V'_iV''_i$  by a convex polygonal chain




Figure 11: Polygon  $\Gamma_1$  and drawing  $\Gamma_2$  ( $\Gamma_1$ : rectangle)

(Case 2)  $\varphi_j = 0$  for some  $j$ .

In this case, at most three angles  $\varphi_i$  satisfy  $\varphi_i \neq 180$ , i.e.,  $\varphi_i \leq 120$ . Otherwise,  $\sum_{i=1}^m \varphi_i \leq 180(m - 4) + 0 + 120 \times 3 = 180(m - 2)$ , which contradicts to the assumption. Then, by assumption, there are exactly three angles  $\varphi_a, \varphi_b, \varphi_c \neq 180$ . Consider the tree  $T_{a,b,c}$  obtained by connecting a new vertex  $r$  and each  $T_i, i \in \{a, b, c\}$ , with a new edge  $rv_i$  (see Figure 12). By Lemmas 17–19 in [9] (see also Section 4), the tree  $T_{a,b,c}$  has a greedy drawing. From the greedy drawing of  $T_{a,b,c}$ , we remove the edges  $rv_a, rv_b, rv_c$  and connect each pair of the vertices  $v_a, v_b, v_c$  with a line segment. We obtain a greedy drawing of  $\mathcal{T}$  by transforming the triangle formed by  $v_a, v_b, v_c$  similarly to (Case 1).  $\blacksquare$




Figure 12: Pseudo-tree  $\mathcal{T}$  and tree  $T_{a,b,c}$

## 7 Concluding remarks

In this paper, we have given a complete combinatorial characterization of greedy-drawable trees (Proposition 4.1 and Theorem 5.1). Our characterization immediately leads to a linear-time recognition algorithm for greedy-drawable trees. That is, one can decide greedy-drawability of a tree of maximum degree 5 by checking whether the suprema of opening angles of the subtrees around a degree-5 vertex are in the ranges of angles described in Tables 5 and 6. Since the supremum of opening angles of a tree can be computed by the algorithm *getOpenAngle* in [9] in linear time, this condition can be checked in linear time. Combining this algorithm with the linear-time recognition algorithm for greedy-drawable trees of maximum degree  $\leq 4$  by Nöllenburg and Prutkin [9], we obtain a linear-time recognition algorithm for greedy-drawable trees in general case.

**Corollary 7.1** Greedy drawability of a tree  $T = (V, E)$  can be checked in  $O(|V|)$  time.

As a next step, we have investigated a characterization of greedy-drawable pseudo-trees. Different from the case of trees, greedy-drawable pseudo-trees can be characterized by a simple inequality of opening

angles. Although we did not give an explicit description of greedy-drawable pseudo-trees, it can easily be obtained by deciding the possible angle types of subtrees using Table 1. Similarly to the case of trees, we obtain the following corollary.

**Corollary 7.2** Greedy drawability of a pseudo-tree  $\mathcal{T} = (V, E)$  can be checked in  $O(|V|)$  time.

## Acknowledgement

This work was supported by JSPS KAKENHI Grant Number JP19K20210.

## References

- [1] P. Angelini, G. Di Battista, and F. Frati. Succinct greedy drawings do not always exist. *Networks*, 59(3):267–274, 2012.
- [2] P. Angelini, F. Frati, and L. Grilli. An algorithm to construct greedy drawings of triangulations. *J. Graph Algorithms Appl.*, 14(1):19–51, 2010.
- [3] D. Applegate, W. Cook, S. Dash, and D. Espinoza. QSOpt\_ex Rational LP Solver, <https://www.math.uwaterloo.ca/~bico/qsopt/ex/index.html>.
- [4] G. Da Lozzo, A. D’Angelo, and F. Frati. On Planar Greedy Drawings of 3-Connected Planar Graphs, *Discret. Comput. Geom.* 63(1):114–157, 2020.
- [5] R. Dhandapani. Greedy drawings of triangulations. *Discrete Comput. Geom.*, 43(2): 375–392, 2010.
- [6] G. Di Battista and L. Vismara. Angles of planar triangular graphs. *SIAM J. Discrete Math.*, 9(3):349–359, 1996.
- [7] R. Kleinberg. Geographic routing using hyperbolic space. In *Proc. Computer Communications (INFOCOM 2007)*, 1902–1909. IEEE, 2007.
- [8] T. Leighton and A. Moitra. Some results on greedy embeddings in metric spaces, *Discrete Comput. Geom.*, 44(3):686–705, 2010.
- [9] M. Nöllenburg and R. Prutkin. Euclidean greedy drawings of trees. *Discrete Comput. Geom.*, 58(3): 543–579, 2017.
- [10] C. H. Papadimitriou and D. Ratajczak. On a conjecture related to geometric routing. *Theor. Comput. Sci.*, 344(1):3–14, 2005.
- [11] A. Rao, S. Ratnasamy, C. Papadimitriou, S. Shenker, and I. Stoica. Geographic routing without location information. In *Proc. Mobile Computing and Networking (MobiCom 2003)*, 96–108. ACM, 2003.
- [12] N. Revol and F. Rouillier. Motivations for an Arbitrary Precision Interval Arithmetic and the MPFI Library, *Reliab. Comput.* 11(4):275–290, 2005.
- [13] *SageMath, the Sage Mathematics Software System (Version 9.3)*, The Sage Developers, 2021, <https://www.sagemath.org>.