

On finding 2-cuts and 3-edge-connected components in parallel

Yung H. Tsin*

Abstract

Given a connected undirected multigraph G (a graph that may contain parallel edges), the algorithm of [19] finds the 3-edge-connected components of G in linear time using an innovative graph contraction technique based on a depth-first search. In [21], it was shown that the algorithm can be extended to produce a Mader construction sequence for each 3-edge-connected component, a cactus representation of the 2-cuts (cut-pairs) of each 2-edge-connected component of G , and the 1-cuts (bridges) at the same time. In this paper, we further extend the algorithm of [19] to generate the 2-cuts and the 3-edge-connected components of G simultaneously in linear time by performing only one depth-first search over the input graph. Previously known algorithms solve the two problems separately in multiple phases.

Keywords: 3-edge-connectivity, 3-edge-connected component, 2-cut, cut pair, 1-cut, bridge, depth-first search.

1 Introduction

3-edge-connectivity is a graph-theoretic problem that is useful in a variety of apparently unrelated areas such as editing cluster and aligning genome in bioinformatics [3, 16], solving the G -irreducibility of Feynman diagram in physics and quantum chemistry [2, 9], placing monitors on the edges of a network in flow networks [1], spare capacity allocation [11], layout decomposition for multiple patterning lithography [5, 10], and the traveling salesman problem [8]. The problem calls for determining the 2-cuts and the 3-edge-connected components (abbreviated 3ecc) of a connected undirected graph. A number of linear-time algorithms for 3-edge-connectivity have been proposed [6, 13, 17, 19, 20]. An empirical experimental study reported in [14] shows that [20] has the best performance in determining the 2-cuts while [19] has the best performance in determining the 3eccs. Both algorithms are simple in that they traverse the input graph once to accomplish their task. Notice that [19] does not determine the 2-cuts while [20] needs to make another traversal over the graph after the 2-cuts are removed and some new edges are added to determine the 3eccs. Recently, Georgiadis et al. [7] presented an algorithm for finding the 2-cuts and conducted an experimental study showing that its empirical performance outperforms that of [20]. They did not address the 3ecc problem. In this article, we show that the 3ecc algorithm of [19] can be easily modified to determine the 2-cuts in parallel with the 3eccs by traversing the input graph only once.

*School of Computer Science, University of Windsor, Windsor, Ontario, Canada, N9B 3P4; peter@uwindsor.ca.

2 Basic definitions

The definitions of the graph-theoretic concepts used in this article are standard and can be found in references such as [4, 18]. We only give some important definitions below.

An undirected graph is represented by $G = (V, E)$, where V is the vertex set and E is the edge set. An edge e with u and v as end-vertices is represented by $e = (u, v)$. The graph may contain parallel edges (two or more edges sharing the same pair of end vertices). The *degree* of a vertex u in G , denoted by $deg_G(u)$, is the number of edges with u as an end-vertex. A *path* P in G is a sequence of alternating vertices and edges, $u_0e_1u_1e_2u_2 \dots e_ku_k$, such that $u_i \in V, 0 \leq i \leq k, e_i = (u_{i-1}, u_i), 1 \leq i \leq k$, where $u_i, 0 \leq i \leq k$, are distinct with the exception that u_0 and u_k may be identical. The edges $e_i, 1 \leq i \leq k$, could be omitted if no confusion could occur. The path is a *null path* if $k = 0$ and is a *cycle* if $u_0 = u_k$. The path is called an $u_0 - u_k$ *path* with vertices u_0 and u_k as *terminating vertices* and $u_i, 1 \leq i < k$, as *internal vertices*. If the path P is given an orientation from u_0 to u_k , then u_0 is the *source*, denoted by $s(P)$, and u_k is the *sink*, denoted by $t(P)$, of P and the path P is also represented by $u_0 \rightsquigarrow_G u_k$. The graph G is *connected* if $\forall u, v \in V$, there is a $u - v$ path in it. It is *disconnected* otherwise. Let $G = (V, E)$ be a connected graph. An edge is a *1-cut* (or *bridge*) in G if removing it from G results in a disconnected graph. The graph G is *2-edge-connected* if it has no 1-cuts. A *2-cut* (or *cut-pair*) of G is a pair of edges whose removal results in a disconnected graph and neither edge is a bridge. A *cut-edge* is an edge in a cut-pair. G is *3-edge-connected* if it does not have 1-cut or 2-cut. A *3-edge-connected component* (abbreviated *3ecc*) of G is a maximal subset $U \subseteq V$ such that $\forall u, v \in U, u \neq v$, there exists three edge-disjoint $u - v$ paths in G . A graph $G' = (V', E')$ is a *subgraph* of G if $V' \subseteq V$ and $E' \subseteq E$. Let $U \subseteq V$, the *subgraph of G induced by U* , denoted by $G_{(U)}$, is the maximal subgraph of G whose vertex set is U . Let $D \subseteq E, G \setminus D$ denotes the graph resulting from G after the edges in D are removed.

It is well-known that performing a depth-first search [18] (henceforth, abbreviated *dfs*) over G creates a spanning tree $T = (V, E_T)$, called *dfs spanning tree* of G . T is a *rooted tree* with r , the vertex at which the *dfs* begins, as the *root*. Every vertex u is assigned a distinct integer, $dfs(u)$, called its *dfs number*, which is its rank of u in the order the vertices are visited by the *dfs* for the first time. The edges in T are called *tree edges* and the edges not in T are called *back-edges*. For $y \in V \setminus \{r\}$, there is a unique tree-edge (x, y) such that $dfs(x) < dfs(y)$. Vertex x is called the *parent* of y , denoted by $parent(y)$, while y is a *child* of x . The tree-edge is called the *parent edge* of y and a *child edge* of x and is denoted by $x \rightarrow y$ or $y \leftarrow x$. If $e = (x, y)$, we may write $x \xrightarrow{e} y$ or $y \xleftarrow{e} x$. A back-edge (x, y) with $dfs(y) < dfs(x)$, is an *outgoing*

back-edge (*incoming back-edge*, resp.) of x (y , resp.). The back-edge is denoted by $y \curvearrowright x$ or $x \curvearrowleft y$, where x is the *tail* and y is the *head*. If $e = (x, y)$, we may write $y \xrightarrow{e} x$ or $x \xleftarrow{e} y$.

$\forall w \in V, \text{lowpt}(w) = \min(\{\text{dfs}(w)\} \cup \{\text{dfs}(u) \mid (u \curvearrowright w) \in E \setminus E_T\} \cup \{\text{lowpt}(u) \mid (w \rightarrow u) \in E_T\})$.

Specifically, $\text{lowpt}(w)$ is the smallest *dfs* number of a vertex reachable from w via a (possibly null) tree-path followed by a back-edge [18].

A path connecting a vertex x with a vertex y in the rooted T is denoted by $x \rightsquigarrow_T y$. A vertex v is an *ancestor* of a vertex u , denoted by $v \preceq u$, if and only if it v lies on $r \rightsquigarrow_T u$. Vertex v is a *proper ancestor* of vertex u , denoted by $v \prec u$, if $v \preceq u$ and $v \neq u$. Vertex u is a (proper) *descendant* of vertex v if and only if v is a (proper) ancestor of vertex u . The *subtree* of T rooted at u , denoted by T_u , is the subgraph of T induced by the descendants of u . The notation $x \rightarrow y \rightsquigarrow_T z$ represents a path consisting of $(x \rightarrow y)$ and $(y \rightsquigarrow_T z)$. The notations $x \curvearrowright y \rightsquigarrow_T z$, $x \rightsquigarrow_T y \curvearrowleft z$, etc. are defined similarly. If edge (x, y) is a tree-edge with x as the parent, we use (x, y) , $(x \rightarrow y)$ and $(y \leftarrow x)$ interchangeably. If edge (x, y) is a back-edge with x as the tail, we use (x, y) , $(x \curvearrowright y)$ and $(y \curvearrowleft x)$ interchangeably.

3 Finding 2-cuts

The following are well-known facts about 2-cuts.

Lemma 3.1. [17, 20] *Let $G = (V, E)$ be a 2-edge-connected graph and $T = (V, E_T)$ be a dfs tree of G with r as the root. Let $\{e, e'\}$ be a 2-cut of G .*

- (i) *At most one of e and e' is a back-edge;*
- (ii) *if both e and e' are tree-edges, then e and e' lie on a tree-path connecting the root r to a leaf;*
- (iii) *if $y \xrightarrow{e} x \in E \setminus E_T$ and $w \xrightarrow{e'} u \in E_T$, then $y \preceq w$ while $u \preceq x$ in T ;*
- (iv) *if $\{e', e''\}$ is a 2-cut, then $\{e, e''\}$ is also a 2-cut.*

As an immediate consequence of Lemma 3.1(iv), the set of all cut-edges can be partitioned into a collection of disjoint subsets $\mathcal{E}_i, 1 \leq i \leq \eta$, called *cut-edge chains*, such that every two cut-edges in the same subset form a 2-cut and no two edges from different subsets form a 2-cut. By Lemma 3.1(i), each \mathcal{E}_i contains at most one back-edge. A cut-edge chain containing a back-edge is a *TB-cut-edge chain*. A cut-edge chain containing only tree-edges is a *TT-cut-edge chain*.

Let \mathcal{E}_i be a cut-edge chain. By Lemma 3.1(ii), the edges in \mathcal{E}_i can be lined up along a root-to-leaf path in T as follows:




Figure 1: (i) a TT -cut-pair chain; (ii) a TB -cut-pair chain.

- (i) If \mathcal{E}_i is of TT type, the edges in \mathcal{E}_i can be lined up along a root-to-leaf path in T in an order $e_1 e_2 \dots e_{|\mathcal{E}_i|}$, where $x_j \xrightarrow{e_j} y_j$, $1 \leq j \leq |\mathcal{E}_i|$, such that $y_{j+1} \preceq x_j$, $1 \leq j < |\mathcal{E}_i|$ (Figure 1(i)).
- (ii) If \mathcal{E}_i is of TB type, let the back-edge be $y_1 \overset{e_1}{\curvearrowright} x_1$. Then, the tree-edges in \mathcal{E}_i can be lined up along a root-to-leaf path in T in an order $e_2 e_3 \dots e_{|\mathcal{E}_i|}$, where $x_j \xrightarrow{e_j} y_j$, $2 \leq j \leq |\mathcal{E}_i|$, such that $y_{j+1} \preceq x_j$, $2 \leq j < |\mathcal{E}_i|$ and $y_1 \preceq x_{|\mathcal{E}_i|}$, $y_2 \preceq x_1$ (Figure 1(ii)).

The cut-edge e_1 is called the *generator* of \mathcal{E}_i [17, 20]. Hence, finding all the 2-cuts in G can be reduced to determining all the cut-edge chains of G .

Before explaining how to modify **Algorithm 3-edge-connectivity** of [19] to generate the cut-pair chains \mathcal{E}_i , $1 \leq i \leq \eta$, we give the algorithm a brief review.

The key idea underlying the algorithm is to use a graph contraction operation, called *absorb-eject*, to gradually transform the input graph G into a *null* (i.e., edgeless) graph of which each vertex corresponds to a distinct 3-edge-connected component of G during a depth-first search.

Definition: Let $G' = (V', E')$ and $e = (w, u) \in E'$ such that:

- (i) $\deg_{G'}(u) = 2$, or (ii) e is not a cut-edge (which implies $\deg_{G'}(u) \neq 2$).

Applying the *absorb-eject* operation to e at w results in the graph $G'/e = (V'', E'')$, where

$$V'' = \begin{cases} V', & \text{if } \deg_{G'}(u) = 2; \\ V' \setminus \{u\}, & \text{if } e \text{ is not a cut-edge,} \end{cases}$$

$E'' = E' \setminus E_u \cup E_{w^+}$, where E_u is the set of edges incident on u in G' and $E_{w^+} = \{f' = (w, z) \mid \exists f = (u, z) \in E_u, \text{ for some } z \in V' \setminus \{w\}\}$. (Figure 2)

The edge $f' = (w, z)$ is called an *embodiment* of the edge $f = (u, z)$. In general, an *embodiment* of an edge f is the edge f itself, or an edge created to replace f as a result of applying the absorb-eject operation, or an embodiment of an embodiment of f .




Figure 2: The absorb-eject operation: (i) $\deg_{G'}(u) = 2$; (ii) edge (w, u) is not a cut-edge.

Starting with the input graph $G = (V, E)$, using the absorb-eject operation, the graph is gradually transformed so that vertices that have been confirmed to be belonging to the same $3ecc$ are merged into one vertex, called a *supervertex*. Each supervertex is represented by a vertex $w \in V$ and a set $\sigma(w) (\subseteq V)$ consisting of vertices that have been confirmed to be belonging to the same $3ecc$ as w . Initially, each vertex w is regarded as a supervertex with $\sigma(w) = \{w\}$. When two adjacent supervertices w and u are known to be belonging to the same $3ecc$, the absorb-eject operation is applied to have one of them, say w , absorbing the other resulting in $\sigma(w) := \sigma(w) \cup \sigma(u)$. When a supervertex containing all vertices of a $3ecc$ is formed, it will become of *degree one or two* in the transformed graph (corresponding to a 1-cut or a 2-cut is found)¹. Then, the absorb-eject operation is applied to an adjacent supervertex to separate (*eject*) the supervertex from the graph making it an isolated vertex. At the end, the graph is transformed into a collection of isolated supervertices each of which consists of the vertices of a distinct $3ecc$ of G .

During the depth-first search, at each vertex $w \in V$, when the adjacency list of w is completely processed, let \hat{G}_w be the graph to which G has been transformed at that point in time. The subtree of T rooted at w , T_w , has been transformed into a path of supervertices in \hat{G}_w , $\mathcal{P}_w : (w =)w_0w_1w_2 \dots w_k$, called the *w-path*, and a set of isolated supervertices each of which corresponds to a $3ecc$ residing in T_w . The *w-path* has the properties summarised in the following lemma.

Lemma 3.2. [Lemma 6 of [19]] *Let $\mathcal{P}_w : (w =)w_0w_1w_2 \dots w_k$ and \hat{G}_w is the graph to which G has been transformed at that point in time (Figure 3).*

- (i) $\deg_{\hat{G}_w}(w_0) \geq 1$ and $\deg_{\hat{G}_w}(w_i) \geq 3, 1 \leq i \leq k$;
- (ii) for each back-edge $f = (w_i \rightsquigarrow x), 0 \leq i \leq k$, in \hat{G}_w , $x \preceq v$ (i.e. x lies on the $r \rightsquigarrow_T v$ tree-path);
- (iii) $\exists (w_k \rightsquigarrow z)$ in \hat{G}_w such that $dfs(z) = lowpt(w)$.

Specifically, on the *w-path*, the degree of every supervertex is at least *three* except that of w_0 , there is no back-edge connecting two supervertices on the *w-path*, and the supervertex w_k has an outgoing back-edge

¹In [19], it is pointed out that **Algorithm 3**-edge-connectivity can be easily modified to handle non-2-edge-connected graphs.

reaching the vertex whose dfs number is $lowpt(w)$.

The w -path is constructed as follows. Initially, the w -path is the null path w which is the *current w -path*, and $lowpt(w) = dfs(w)$. When the dfs backtracks from a child u , let $\mathcal{P}_u : (u =)u_0u_1u_2 \dots u_h$ be the u -path, and \hat{G}_u be the graph to which G has been transformed at that point in time.

If $deg_{\hat{G}_u}(u) = 1$, then (w, u) is a 1-cut and $\sigma(u)$ is a $3ecc$ of G . Edge (w, u) is removed making u an isolated supervertex. The current w -path remains unchanged.

If $deg_{\hat{G}_u}(u) = 2$, then $\{(w \rightarrow u), (u \rightarrow u_1)\}$ or $\{(w \rightarrow u), (z \curvearrowright u)\}$, where $dfs(z) = lowpt(u)$, is a 2-cut implying $\sigma(u)$ is a $3ecc$ of G . The absorb-eject operation is applied to edge (w, u) at w to eject supervertex u from the u -path making it an isolated supervertex and the u -path is shorten to $u_1u_2 \dots u_k$ in the former case or vanishes in the latter case. Furthermore, (a) if $lowpt(w) \leq lowpt(u)$, then the vertices in the supervertices on the u -path must all belong to the same $3ecc$ as w . The supervertices are thus absorbed by w through a sequence of absorb-eject operations. (b) if $lowpt(w) > lowpt(u)$, then the vertices in the supervertices on the current w -path must all belong to the same $3ecc$ as w ; the supervertices are thus absorbed by w . Moreover, $lowpt(w)$ is updated to $lowpt(u)$, and the u -path after extended to include (w, u) becomes the current w -path, if u is not ejected. If u is ejected, then the u -path after extended to include (w, u_1) becomes the current w -path, if u_1 exists, and is the null path w , otherwise.

When an outgoing back-edge of w , $(z \curvearrowright w)$, with $dfs(z) < lowpt(w)$ is encountered, vertex w absorbs the current w -path because all the supervertices on it belong to the same $3ecc$ as w ; $lowpt(w)$ and the current w -path are then updated to $dfs(z)$ and the null path w , respectively.

When an incoming back-edge of w , $(w \curvearrowleft x)$, is encountered, if $\exists h, 1 \leq h \leq k$, such that $x \in \sigma(w_h)$ on the current w -path, the vertices in $\sigma(w_i), 1 \leq i \leq h$, must all belong to the same $3ecc$ as w . The supervertices $w_i, 1 \leq i \leq h$, are thus absorbed by w (Property (ii) of the w -path thus holds) and the current w -path is shortened to $ww_{h+1}w_{h+2} \dots w_k$.

When the adjacency list of w is completely processed, if $w \neq r$, the current w -path becomes the w -path, and the depth-first search backtracks to the parent vertex of w . Otherwise, the input graph G has been transformed into a collection of isolated supervertices each of which contains the vertices of a distinct $3ecc$ of G . A complete example is given in [19], pp.132-133.

During an execution of the algorithm, when the depth-first search backtracks from a vertex u to the parent vertex w , if $deg_{\hat{G}_u}(u) = 2$, then $\sigma(u)$ is a $3ecc$, and $\{(w \rightarrow u), (u \rightarrow u_1)\}$ or $\{(w \rightarrow u), (u \curvearrowright z)\}$ is the corresponding 2-cut. Unfortunately, the 2-cut is not in G , but in the transformed graph \hat{G}_u . Specifically, the corresponding 2-cut in G is $\{(w, u), (x, y)\}$, such that $(u \rightarrow u_1)$ or $(u \curvearrowright z)$ is an embodiment of (x, y) .

We shall show that the cut-edge (x, y) can be easily determined as follows:

(i) if the 2-cut in \hat{G}_u is $\{(w \rightarrow u), (u \rightarrow u_1)\}$, the corresponding 2-cut in G is $\{(w, u), (\text{parent}(u_1), u_1)\}$.

(ii) if the 2-cut in \hat{G}_u is $\{(w \rightarrow u), (u \rightsquigarrow z)\}$, the corresponding 2-cut in G is $\{(w, u), (x, z)\}$, where x is the unique vertex such that $u \preceq x$ and $\text{lowpt}(x) = \text{lowpt}(u) = \text{dfs}(z)$.

Lemma 3.3. [17, 20] *Let $e, e' \in E$ be such that $e = (w \rightarrow u)$, $e' = (x, y)$, and $\text{dfs}(u) \leq \text{dfs}(x)$.*

(i) *if e' is a tree-edge $(x \rightarrow y)$, then $\{e, e'\}$ is a 2-cut in G if and only if there does not exist a back-edge*

$(s \rightsquigarrow t)$ such that either;

(a) s is a descendant of u and not of y while t is an ancestor of w , or

(b) s is a descendant of y while t is a descendant of u and not of y .

(ii) *If e' is a back-edge $(y \rightsquigarrow x)$, then $\{e, e'\}$ is a 2-cut in G if and only if there does not exist a back-edge*

$f = (s \rightsquigarrow t)$ such that $f \neq e'$ and s is a descendant of u while t is an ancestor of w .

Lemma 3.4. *During the depth-first search, when the search backtracks from a vertex u to its parent vertex w , Let $\mathcal{P}_u : (u =)u_0u_1u_2 \dots u_k$ be the u -path.*

If $\text{deg}_{\hat{G}_u}(u) = 2$, and

(i) *$\{(w \rightarrow u), (u \rightarrow u_1)\}$ is the 2-cut. Then the corresponding 2-cut in G is $\{(w, u), (\text{parent}(u_1), u_1)\}$;*

(ii) *$\{(w \rightarrow u), (u \rightsquigarrow z)\}$ is the 2-cut (i.e., $k = 0$). Then the corresponding 2-cut in G is $\{(w, u), (x \rightsquigarrow z)\}$,*

where $(x \rightsquigarrow z)$ is the unique edge such that $u \preceq x$, and $\text{lowpt}(x) = \text{lowpt}(u) = \text{dfs}(z)$.

Proof:

(i) The u -path contains u and u_1 implies that there is a u - u_1 path in G . Since u_1 remains on the u -path when the depth-first search backtracks from u to w , there does not exist a back-edge $(s \rightsquigarrow t)$ such that s is a descendant of u_1 while t is a descendant of u and not of u_1 ; otherwise, let $(s \rightsquigarrow t)$ be one that has t closest to u_1 , then u_1 would have been absorbed by vertex t when t became the current vertex of the dfs . Similarly, there does not exist a back-edge $(s \rightsquigarrow t)$ such that s is a descendant of u and not of u_1 while t is an ancestor of w ; otherwise, u would have an incident edge which is an embodiment of $(s \rightsquigarrow t)$ when the depth-first search backtracks from u to w , implying $\text{deg}_{\hat{G}_u}(u) > 2$, which contradicts the assumption $\text{deg}_{\hat{G}_u}(u) = 2$. Hence, by Lemma 3.3(i), $\{(w, u), (\text{parent}(u_1), u_1)\}$ is the 2-cut corresponding to $\sigma(u)$ in G .

(ii) Since $u = u_k$, by Lemma 3.2(iii), $\text{dfs}(z) = \text{lowpt}(u)$. Let the 2-cut in G corresponding to $\{(w \rightarrow u), (u \rightsquigarrow z)\}$ be $\{(w \rightarrow u), (x \rightsquigarrow z)\}$. Since $(u \rightsquigarrow z)$ is an embodiment of $(x \rightsquigarrow z)$, $u \preceq x$

which implies that $lowpt(u) \leq lowpt(x)$. But $(x \curvearrowright z)$ implies $lowpt(x) \leq dfs(z) = lowpt(u)$, We thus have $lowpt(x) = lowpt(u) = dfs(z)$. By Lemma 3.3(ii), there does not exist a back-edge $(s \curvearrowright t)$ such that $u \preceq s$ and $t \preceq w$. Hence, $(x \curvearrowright z)$ is the unique edge such that $u \preceq x$, and $lowpt(u) = lowpt(x) = dfs(z)$. ■

Based on Lemma 3.4, we determine the cut-edge that forms a 2-cut with (w, u) in G as follow:

(i) To determine $(parent(u_1), u_1)$, we have to know the parent vertex of every vertex $u \in V \setminus \{r\}$ in T .

The parent vertex of u is w if the depth-first search advances from w to u . This information can be stored in an array $parent[w], w \in V$, where $parent[r] = \perp$ (undefined).

(ii) During the depth-first search, at each vertex x where $\exists(z \curvearrowright x)$ such that $dfs(z) = lowpt(x)$, let $gen(x) = x$ and $low(x) = z$. Clearly, $low(x)$ can be determined in parallel with $lowpt(x)$. The edge $(gen(x) \curvearrowright low(gen(x))) = (x \curvearrowright z)$ is a potential *TB*-cut-edge chain generator.

When a vertex v absorbs a section of its current v -path on which x is the last vertex, $(x \curvearrowright z)$ is replaced by its embodiment $(v \curvearrowright z)$ in the resulting graph. By letting $gen(v) := gen(x)$, $(x \curvearrowright z)$ can be retrieved as $(x \curvearrowright z) = (gen(x) \curvearrowright low(gen(x))) = (gen(v) \curvearrowright low(gen(v)))$ if needed. The $gen(x)$ value is transmitted upwards in T this way, until a vertex u is reached, where $deg_{\hat{G}_u}(u) = 2$. Then $\{(w \rightarrow u), (u \curvearrowright z)\}$ is a 2-cut, where $(u \curvearrowright z)$ is the embodiment of $(x \curvearrowright z)$ in \hat{G}_u . Then, as $gen(u) = x$, $(x \curvearrowright z)$ can be retrieved through $(gen(u) \curvearrowright low(gen(u)))$ and the corresponding 2-cut in G is $\{(w, u), (gen(u) \curvearrowright low(gen(u)))\}$. After u is ejected, if $lowpt(u) < lowpt(w)$, then $gen(w) := gen(u)$, because $(x \curvearrowright z)$ still has the potential to form new 2-cuts with other edges in G . Otherwise, $gen(x)$ and $low(gen(x))$ become irrelevant as $(x \curvearrowright z)$ can no longer form 2-cuts with other edges.

The following is a pseudo-code of the modified algorithm. For clarity, the new instructions for generating the 2-cuts are marked by •. The following variables are used to stored the cut-edge chains:

- $tChain(x)$: a *TT*-cut-edge chain whose generator is $(parent(x) \rightarrow x)$,
- $bChain(x)$: a *TB*-cut-edge chain whose generator is $(low(x) \curvearrowright x)$.

When a vertex u is ejected, **Procedure** $Gen\text{-}\mathcal{CS}$ is called to add the cut-edge (w, u) to $tChain(u_1)$ if both cut-edges are tree-edges, where u_1 is the vertex following u in the u -path before u was ejected, or to $bChain(gen(u))$, otherwise. In the latter case, $gen(u)$ is transferred to $gen(w)$ if $lowpt(u) < lowpt(w)$.

Procedure `Absorb-path` is called to absorb the current w -path or a u -path. **Procedure** `Absorb-path` is called when vertex w absorbs a section of the current w -path.

In [19], $\deg(w), \forall w \in V$, are calculated implicitly. We calculate them explicitly based on [15]. For clarity, although we include the instructions for generating the $3eccs$, we do not involve them in our discussion as their correctness is covered in [19]. we also excluded the instructions for handling parallel edges. They can be accounted for as follows:

Initially, $\forall w \in V, \text{parent_edge}(w) := \text{false}$. When w is the current vertex of the dfs , on encountering the edge (w, v) , where $v = \text{parent}(w)$, for the first time, $\text{parent_edge}(w) := \text{true}$ and the edge is skipped. For each subsequent (w, v) , $\text{parent_edge}(w) = \text{true}$ implies that the edge is to be processed as an outgoing back-edge of w .

Algorithm 3-edge-connectivity

Input: A connected undirected multigraph $G = (V, E)$;

Output: $\begin{cases} \text{The cut-edge chains of } G; \\ \text{the 3-edge-connected components of } G; \\ \text{The 1-cuts of } G. \end{cases}$

begin

for each $w \in V$ **do**

$\deg(w) := 0; \sigma(w) := \{w\}; \text{dfs}(w) := 0; \text{nd}(w) := 1;$

$tChain(w) := \perp;$ // the TT -cut-edge chain with $(w, \text{parent}(w))$ as the generator

$bChain(w) := \perp;$ // the TB -cut-edge chain with $(w, \text{low}(w))$ as the generator

$\text{gen}(w) := w; \text{low}(w) := w;$ // initialize the potential TB -type generator attached to w with self-loop $(w \curvearrowright w)$

$\text{Bridge}(w) := \emptyset;$ // to store the 1-cuts

$\text{count} := 1;$ // dfs number for next vertex

$3\text{-edge-connect}(r, \perp);$

end.

Procedure $3\text{-edge-connect}(w, v)$ // v is the parent of w

begin

$\text{dfs}(w) := \text{count}; \text{count} := \text{count} + 1; \text{parent}(w) := v;$

$\text{lowpt}(w) := \text{dfs}(w); \text{next}(w) := \perp;$ // initialize the w -path to $\mathcal{P}_w : w$

1 for each $(u \text{ in } L[w])$ **do** // scan the adjacency list of w

 • $\deg(w) := \deg(w) + 1;$ // found a new edge incident on w ; update $\deg(w)$

1.1 if $(\text{dfs}(u) = 0)$ **then** // u is unvisited

$3\text{-edge-connect}(u, w);$ // dfs advances to u

 • $\text{nd}(w) := \text{nd}(w) + \text{nd}(u);$ // update $\text{nd}(w)$

1.1.1 if $(\deg(u) \leq 2)$ **then** // found a 1-cut or 2-cut

 • $\text{Gen-CS}(w, u, \mathcal{P}_u)$ // generate the 1-cut or 2-cut

1.1.2 if $(\text{lowpt}(w) \leq \text{lowpt}(u))$ **then**

 • $w' := \text{next}(w); \text{next}(w) := u;$ // save the current w -path and attach the u -path to w

$\text{Absorb-path}(w);$ // w absorbs the u -path

 • $\text{next}(w) := w';$ // restore the current w -path

else

$\text{lowpt}(w) := \text{lowpt}(u);$ // update $\text{lowpt}(w)$

$\text{Absorb-path}(w);$ // w absorbs the current w -path

$\text{next}(w) := u;$ // attach the u -path to w to form the new current w -path

1.2 else if $(\text{dfs}(u) < \text{dfs}(w))$ **then** // an outgoing back-edge

if $(\text{dfs}(u) < \text{lowpt}(w))$ **then**

$\text{Absorb-path}(w);$ // w absorbs the current w -path

- $lowpt(w) := dfs(u); next(w) := \perp;$ // the new current w -path is $\mathcal{P}_w : w$
- $gen(w) := w; low(w) := u;$ // potential generator ($u \curvearrowright w$)
- 1.3 **else** // an incoming back-edge
 - $deg(w) := deg(w) - 2;$ // update $deg(w)$
 - Absorb-subpath**(w, u); // w absorbs a section of the current w -path

end.

Procedure Gen- $\mathcal{CS}(w, u, \mathcal{P}_u)$ **begin**

- **if** ($deg(u) = 1$) **then**
- $Bridges := Bridges \cup \{(w, u)\};$ // add (w, u) to the 1-cut set
- $u := \perp;$ // eject u
- else** // $deg(u) = 2$
- **if** ($next(u) = \perp$) **then** // $\mathcal{P}_u : u$, i.e., the 2-cut involves a *back-edge*.
- **if** ($bChain(gen(u)) = \perp$) **then**
- $bChain(gen(u)) := (low(gen(u)) \curvearrowright gen(u)) \oplus (w, u);$ // start a *TB-cut-edge chain* $bChain(gen(u))$
with generator ($low(gen(u)) \curvearrowright gen(u)$)
- **else** $bChain(gen(u)) := bChain(gen(u)) \oplus (w, u);$ // append (w, u) to $bChain(gen(u))$
- $u := \perp;$ // $\mathcal{P}_u = nil$, i.e., the u -path vanishes after ejecting u
- **if** ($lowpt(u) < lowpt(w)$) **then** $gen(w) := gen(u);$
- **else if** ($tChain(u_1) = \perp$) **then**
- $tChain(u_1) := (u_1, parent(u_1)) \oplus (w, u);$ //start a *TT-cut-edge chain* $tChain(u_1)$
with generator $(u_1, parent(u_1))$
- **else** $tChain(u_1) := tChain(u_1) \oplus (w, u);$ // append (w, u) to $tChain(u_1)$
- $u := next(u);$ // eject u : $\mathcal{P}_u := \mathcal{P}_u - u$;
- output**($\sigma(u)$); // output the 3-edge-connected component $\sigma(u)$

end.

Procedure Absorb-path(w)

begin

- $x := next(w);$
- while** ($x \neq \perp$) **do**
- $deg(w) := deg(w) + deg(x) - 2;$
- $\sigma(w) := \sigma(w) \cup \sigma(x);$
- $x := next(x);$

end.

Procedure Absorb-subpath(w, u)

begin

- $x := next(w);$
- while** ($(x \neq \perp) \wedge (dfs(x) \leq dfs(u) < dfs(x) + nd(x))$) **do** // u is a descendant of x
- $deg(w) := deg(w) + deg(x) - 2;$
- $\sigma(w) := \sigma(w) \cup \sigma(x);$
- $gen(w) := gen(x);$
- $x := next(x);$
- $next(w) := x;$

end.

Lemma 3.5. *Let $w \in V$. When the adjacency list of w is completely processed, let the w -path be $\mathcal{P}_w : w(= w_0)w_1w_2 \dots w_k$.*

(i) *For each cut-edge chain $\mathcal{E} : e_1e_2 \dots e_{|\mathcal{E}|}$, where $e_1 = (y_1 \curvearrowright x_1)$ or $(x_1 \rightarrow y_1)$, $e_i = (x_i \rightarrow y_i)$; $x_i \prec$*

$y_i \preceq x_{i-1}$, $2 \leq i \leq |\mathcal{E}|$ ($|\mathcal{E}| \geq 2$), such that $x_{\ell+1}$ (if exists) $\prec w \preceq x_\ell$, for some $\ell \geq 2$,

(a) *If $e_1 = (x_1 \rightarrow y_1)$. then $tChain(x_1) = ((x_1 \rightarrow y_1), (x_2 \rightarrow y_2), \dots, (x_\ell \rightarrow y_\ell))$;*

(b) If $e_1 = (x_1 \curvearrowright y_1)$. then $bChain(y_1) = ((x_1 \curvearrowright y_1), (x_2 \rightarrow y_2), \dots, (x_\ell \rightarrow y_\ell))$;

(ii) $gen(w_k) = x$ such that $w \preceq x$, and $(x \curvearrowright low(x)) \in E \setminus E_T$, where $dfs(low(x)) = lowpt(x) = lowpt(w)$, or $(x, low(x)) = (w, w)$.

Proof: By induction on the height of w in T .

At a leaf w , since $w \not\prec x_2$ for any cut-edge chain, Condition (i) vacuously holds.

Since $gen(w) := w$ and $low(w)$ is updated accordingly within Instruction 1.2 whenever the condition $dfs(u) < lowpt(w)$ is detected, when the depth-first search back-tracks from w , $gen(w) = w$ and $low(w) = z$ such that $(w \curvearrowright z) \in E \setminus E_T$ and $dfs(z) = lowpt(w)$. Condition (ii) thus holds.

At an internal vertex w , on encountering a vertex u in the adjacency list, if u is unvisited, the dfs advances to u . when the dfs backtracks from u , if $deg_{\hat{G}_u}(u) = 1$, (w, u) is a 1-cut as its removal disconnects $\sigma(u)$ from G . **Procedure** Gen-CS is invoked to add (w, u) to the collection of 1-cuts, *Bridges*.

Let \mathcal{E} be a cut-edge chain whose generator is attached to T_u (meaning the generator is an edge in T_u or its tail is a vertex of T_u) such that $x_{\ell+1}$ (if exists) $\prec w \preceq x_\ell$, for some $\ell \geq 2$. Since (w, u) is a 1-cut which is not a cut-edge, $w \prec x_\ell$ which implies that $x_{\ell+1} \prec u \preceq x_\ell$. Since the induction hypothesis applies to u , Condition (i) holds for \mathcal{E} . Moreover, as $lowpt(u) = dfs(u) > dfs(w) \geq lowpt(w)$, $gen(w)$ remains unchanged. Condition (ii) remains valid.

If $deg_{\hat{G}_u}(u) = 2$, **Procedure** Gen-CS is invoked.

(a) the u -path is u , (i.e., $\mathcal{P}_u : u$). Then, by Lemma 3.4(ii), $\{(w, u), (u \curvearrowright z)\}$ is the 2-cut, and the corresponding 2-cut in G is $\{(w, u), (x \curvearrowright z)\}$, where $(x \curvearrowright z)$ is the unique edge such that $u \preceq x$ and $lowpt(x) = lowpt(u) = dfs(z)$. By the induction hypothesis, Condition (ii) holds for u which implies that $gen(u) = x'$ such that $u \preceq x'$ and $(x' \curvearrowright low(x')) \in E \setminus E_T$, where $dfs(low(x')) = lowpt(x') = lowpt(u)$. By the uniqueness of $(x \curvearrowright z)$, $(x' \curvearrowright z) = (x \curvearrowright z)$ which implies that $x = x' = gen(u)$ and $z = low(x') = low(gen(u))$. Hence, $\{(low(gen(u)) \curvearrowright gen(u)), (u, w)\}$ is the corresponding 2-cut in G . Clearly, $w \preceq x_2$. If $w = x_2$, then $x_2 \prec u$ and $bChain(gen(u)) = \perp$. Therefore, $\{(low(gen(u)) \curvearrowright gen(u)), (u, w)\}$ is correctly added to $bChain(gen(u))$. If $w \prec x_2$, then $x_{\ell+1} \prec u \preceq x_\ell$ for some $\ell \geq 2$. By the induction hypothesis, Condition (i)(b) holds for \mathcal{E} which implies that $bChain(gen(u)) = ((low(gen(u)) \curvearrowright gen(u)), (x_2 \rightarrow y_2), \dots, (x_\ell \rightarrow y_\ell))$. Therefore, $(w \rightarrow u) = (x_{\ell+1} \rightarrow y_{\ell+1})$ is correctly appended to $bChain(gen(u))$. Notice that $(low(gen(u)), gen(u)) \neq (u, u)$ because $lowpt(u) \leq dfs(u)$.

If $lowpt(u) < lowpt(w)$, then $\mathcal{P}_w : w$ becomes the current w -path, and $lowpt(w) := lowpt(u)$,

$gen(w) := gen(u)$. Condition (ii) holds. If $lowpt(u) \geq lowp(w)$, then as the current w -path and $gen(w)$ remain unchanged, Condition (ii) continues to hold.

(b) $\{(w, u), (u, u_1)\}$ is a 2-cut (i.e., the u -path is $\mathcal{P}_u : uu_1 \dots u_k$, for some $k \geq 1$) in \hat{G}_u . By Lemma 3.4(i), the corresponding 2-cut in G is $\{(u, w), (parent(u_1), u_1)\}$. Clearly, $w \preceq x_2$. If $w = x_2$, then $x_2 \prec u$ and $tChain(w_1) = \perp$. Therefore, $\{(parent(u_1) \rightarrow u_1), (w \rightarrow u)\}$ is correctly added to $tChain(u_1)$. If $w \prec x_2$, then $x_{\ell+1} \prec u \preceq x_\ell$ for some $\ell \geq 2$. By the induction hypothesis, Condition (i)(a) holds for u which implies that $tChain(u_1) = (parent(u_1) \rightarrow u_1), (x_2 \rightarrow y_2), \dots, (x_\ell \rightarrow y_\ell)$. Therefore, $(v \rightarrow w) = (x_{\ell+1} \rightarrow y_{\ell+1})$ is correctly appended to $bChain(u_1)$.

If $lowpt(w) \leq lowpt(u)$, then as the current w -path remains unchanged, Condition (ii) still holds. If $lowpt(u) < lowpt(w)$, then after ejecting vertex u and including edge (w, u_1) , \mathcal{P}_u becomes the current w -path and $lowpt(w) := lowpt(u)$. Since Condition (ii) holds for the u -path by the induction hypothesis, the condition holds for the current w -path. If $lowpt(w) \leq lowpt(u)$, then as the current w -path remains unchanged, Condition (ii) still holds.

If $deg_{\hat{G}_u}(u) > 2$, the argument that Condition (i) holds is similar to the above cases, but much simpler. If $lowpt(w) \leq lowpt(u)$, then as the current w -path remains unchanged, Condition (ii) still holds. If $lowpt(u) < lowpt(w)$, then after including the edge (w, u) , \mathcal{P}_u becomes the current w -path and $lowpt(w) := lowpt(u)$. Since Condition (ii) holds for the u -path by the induction hypothesis, the condition thus holds for the current w -path.

If (w, u) is an outgoing back-edge of w , $(u \curvearrowright w)$, and if $dfs(u) < lowpt(w)$, then the current w -path becomes $\mathcal{P}_w : w$, $lowpt(w) := dfs(u)$, $gen(w) := w$ and $low(w) := u$, Condition (ii) thus holds. If $dfs(u) \geq lowpt(w)$, as the current w -path remains unchanged, Condition (ii) continue to hold. Since the back-edge does not involve any cut-edge chain satisfying $w \preceq x_\ell$, for some $\ell \geq 2$, Condition (i) holds vacuously.

If (w, u) is an incoming back-edge of w , $(w \curvearrowleft u)$, **Procedure** Absorb-subpath is invoked. Since the absorption of the section $w_1 w_2 \dots u$ of \mathcal{P}_w by w does not affect Condition (i), the condition continues to hold. Moreover, if $u \neq w_k$, w does not absorb w_k . Condition (ii) still holds. If $u = w_k$, then w_k vanishes, but when the **while** loop is executed for the last time, $gen(w) := gen(w_k)$ ensures that Condition (ii) holds.

When the adjacency list of w is completely processed, Conditions (i) and (ii) hold for w . The lemma thus follows. ■

Theorem 3.6. Algorithm 3-edge-connectivity generates all the 1-cuts, and all the 2-cuts represented by cut-edge chains for each of the 2-edge-connected components of the input graph $G = (V, E)$ in

$O(|V| + |E|)$ time.

Proof: **Algorithm** 3-edge-connectivity terminates execution when the adjacency list of the root r is completely processed. Since $r \preceq x_{|\mathcal{E}|}$ for every cut-edge chain \mathcal{E} , by Lemma 3.5(i), all cut-edge chains are correctly computed and are kept in their corresponding $tChain(x_1)$ or $bChain(y_1)$.

The time complexity follows from the fact that the time complexity of **Algorithm** 3-edge-connectivity of [19] is $O(|V| + |E|)$, and the new instructions increase the run time by a constant factor only. ■

4 Summary

We presented a linear-time algorithm that generates the 2-cuts, the 3-edge-connected components, and the 1-cuts of a connected undirected multigraph simultaneously by performing only one depth-first search over the input graph. The algorithm is conceptually simple and is based on the algorithm of [19]. Our future work is to perform an empirical study of the performances of our algorithm and the algorithm of Georgiadis et al. [7] for generating 2-cuts. Although Georgiadis et al. [7] does not address the 3-edge-connected component problem, their 2-cut algorithm provides a basis for solving the problem: determine the 2-cuts of the input graph G ; remove the cut-edges from G ; for each cut-edge chain with a tree-edge generator, add a new edge [17]; determine the connected components of the resulting graph which are the 3ecc of G . This multi-pass algorithm should run slower than our one-pass 3ecc algorithm in practice.

References

- [1] Chin F. Y-L., Chrobak M., Yan L., “Algorithms for Placing Monitors in a Flow Network,” AAIM 2009, San Francisco, CA, June 15-17, 2009, LNCS 5564, 114-128 (2009).
- [2] Corcoran J.N., Schneider U., Schttler H.-B., “Perfect Stochastic Summation in High Order Feynman Graph Expansions,” Int. J. Mod. Phys. C, 2006, Vol. 17 (11), 1527-1549.
- [3] Dehne F., Langston M. A., Luo X., Pitre S., Shaw P., Zhang Y., “The Cluster Editing Problem: Implementations and Experiments,” IWPEC 2006, Zuerich, September 2006.
- [4] Even, S.: Graph Algorithms. Computer Science Press, Potomac, MD, 1979.
- [5] Fang S., Chang Y., Chen W., “A novel layout decomposition algorithm for triple patterning lithography,” in Proceedings of the 49th Annual Design Automation Conference. ACM, 2012, pp. 1185-1190.
- [6] Galil Z., Italiano G.F., “Reducing edge connectivity to vertex connectivity”, SIGACT News 22, 1991, 57-61.
- [7] Georgiadis L., Giannis K., Italiano G., Kosinas E., “Computing vertex-edge cut-pairs and 2-edge cuts in practice,” 19th International symposium on experimental algorithms (SEA 2021), No. 20, pp.20:1-20:19.
- [8] Isoart N., Régim J.-C., “Integration of Structural Constraints into TSP Models,” 25th International Conference on Constraint Programming, LNCS vol.11802, pp.284-299, Connecticut, USA, 2019.
- [9] Kim A.J., Li J., Eckstein M., Werner P., “Pseudoparticle vertex solver for quantum impurity models,” Physical Reviews B 106, 085124, 2022.

- [10] Kuang J., Young E., “An efficient layout decomposition approach for triple patterning lithography,” Proceedings of the 50th Annual Design Automation Conference. ACM, 2013
- [11] Liu V. Y., Tipper D., “Spare capacity allocation using shared backup path protection for dual link failures,” *Computer Communications* 36, 666-677, 2013.
- [12] Nadara W., Radecki M., Smulewicz M., Sokolowski M., “Determining 4-edge-connected components in linear time,” arXiv:2105.01699v1 [cs.DS] 4 May 2021.
- [13] Nagamochi H., Ibaraki T., “A linear-time algorithm for computing 3-edge-connected components in a multigraph”, *Japan J. Indust. Appl. Math.*, vol. 9, 1992, 163-180.
- [14] Norouzi N., “A study of 3-edge-connectivity algorithms - Refinement and Implementation,” M.Sc. Thesis, School of Computer Science, University of Windsor, 2007.
- [15] Norouzi N., Tsin Y.H., “A simple 3-edge connected component algorithm revisited,” *Information Processing Letters*, vol. 114(1-2), 2014, 50-55.
- [16] Paten B., Diekhans M., Earl D., St. John J., Ma J., Suh B., Haussler D., “Cactus Graphs for Genome Comparisons,” RECOMB 2010, Lisbon, Portugal, April 2010, LNCS 6044, 410-425 (2010).
- [17] Taoka S., Watanabe T., Onaga K., “A linear-time algorithm for computing all 3-edge-connected components of a multigraph”, *IEICE Trans. Fundamentals*, vol. E75(3), 1992, 410-424.
- [18] Trajan R., “Depth-first Search and Linear Graph Algorithms,” *SIAM J. COMPUT.*, 1 (2), June 1972.
- [19] Tsin, Y.H., “A simple 3-edge-connected component algorithm”, *Theory of Computing Systems*, vol. 40(2), 2007, 125-142.
- [20] Tsin, Y.H., “Yet another optimal algorithm for 3-edge-connectivity”, *Journal of Discrete Algorithms*, vol. 7(1), 2009, 130-146.
- [21] Tsin, Y.H., “A simple certifying algorithm for 3-edge-connectivity,” *Theoretical Computer Science*, 951 (2023) 113760, 1-26.