

Tight Approximation Bounds on a Simple Algorithm for Minimum Average Search Time in Trees

Svein Høgemo
University of Bergen*

February 9, 2024

Abstract

The graph invariant EPT-sum has cropped up in several unrelated fields in later years: As an objective function for hierarchical clustering, as a more fine-grained version of the classical edge ranking problem, and, specifically when the input is a vertex-weighted tree, as a measure of average/expected search length in a partially ordered set. The EPT-sum of a graph G is defined as the minimum sum of the depth of every leaf in an edge partition tree (EPT), a rooted tree where leaves correspond to vertices in G and internal nodes correspond to edges in G .

A simple algorithm that approximates EPT-sum on trees is given by recursively choosing the most balanced edge in the input tree G to build an EPT of G . Due to its fast runtime, this balanced cut algorithm is used in practice. In this paper, we show that the balanced cut algorithm gives a 1.5-approximation of EPT-sum on trees, which amounts to a tight analysis and answers a question posed by Cicalese et al. in 2014.

1 Introduction

Searching in ordered structures is a basic problem in computer science and has seen a lot of attention since the dawn of the field [17, 29]. Some special cases are well understood, e.g. the best search strategy in a totally ordered set is a binary search tree, and the problem of optimal search in totally ordered sets given a probability distribution on the elements was treated by Knuth [21] and Hu and Tucker [19] in 1971. Also, if the search space is every single subset of elements, then it is known that the optimum search strategy is given by a Huffman tree (see [19]). Apart from such specific subcases, little is known except that they are hard problems [11, 24].

*E-mail: svein.hogemo@uib.no

An interesting subclass of partially ordered sets are “tree-like posets”, those posets whose Hasse diagrams are rooted trees, or in other words those posets where for any two elements a, b , the sets $\{x \mid x \preceq a\}$ and $\{x \mid x \preceq b\}$ either are disjoint, or one is contained in the other. They generalize totally ordered sets (whose Hasse diagrams are paths), but are still much easier to work with than the general case of posets. The average performance of search strategies for tree-like posets have been studied by Laber and Molinaro in [22] and later by Cicalese et al. in [10, 11]. For these posets, the optimum search strategy with respect to average search time can be shown to be equal to the *EPT-sum* of their Hasse diagrams, a graph invariant named by Høgemo et al. in [18], but defined and used several times earlier in different circumstances.

1.1 EPT’s and EPT-sum

An *edge partition tree*, or EPT for short, of a graph G is a rooted tree where every leaf corresponds to a vertex in G , the root corresponds to an edge e in G , and each child of the root is itself the root of an EPT of a component of $G \setminus e$. The EPT-sum of G with respect to some EPT T is, loosely speaking, defined as the sum of the depth of each leaf in T ; and the EPT-sum of G is defined as the minimum over all EPT’s. Viewing the EPT as a certain search strategy in the graph G where, upon each edge e , one can query which of the components of $G \setminus e$ contains the wanted vertex, the EPT-sum of G with respect to T is the combined search time of locating every vertex in G with this search strategy. Giving a probability distribution to $V(G)$, the weighted EPT-sum is equal to the expected search time for a vertex pulled at random from the given distribution. When G is itself a tree, this search strategy is equivalent to the usual search strategy on the tree-like poset that has G as its Hasse diagram. The aforementioned edge rank problem, on the other hand, can be interpreted as finding a search strategy with optimal *worst-case* performance on a tree-like poset.

Given a tree G , we are interested in the following algorithm (the *balanced cut algorithm*) to make an approximately optimal EPT of G (with respect to EPT-sum):

- Find a balanced cut in G , i.e. an edge e that minimizes the size of the biggest component in $G \setminus e$.
- Make e the root of T .
- Make EPT’s of the components of $G \setminus e$ recursively, and make the roots of those trees children of e .

The balanced cut algorithm is attractive because of its runtime: Finding a balanced edge in a tree takes $O(n)$ time, so making a balanced EPT can trivially be done in $O(n^2)$ time. However, this runtime can be reduced to $O(n \log^2 n)$, as shown in Lemma 1. This makes it practical for any potential applications of

searching in trees.

For the case of vertex-weighted trees, Cicalese et al. [10, 11] show a lower and upper bound on the performance of the balanced cut algorithm of 1.5 and $\varphi = \frac{\sqrt{5}+1}{2}$, respectively. They ask what the actual performance of this algorithm actually is, and conjecture that it does provide a 1.5-approximation, matching the lower bound.

In this paper we will affirm this conjecture, by proving that the balanced cut algorithm indeed does give a 1.5-approximation of EPT-sum on vertex-weighted trees. Our proof proceeds by constructing a so-called *augmented tree*, built from an optimum EPT by subdividing half of its edges, and showing that it has EPT-sum at most 1.5 times the optimum. Thereafter we iteratively apply operations to this tree that are guaranteed to not increase the EPT-sum, eventually arriving at the EPT constructed by the balanced cut-algorithm.

1.2 Applications of EPT-sum to Hierarchical Clustering

Employing edge-weighted graphs, EPT-sum was considered by Dasgupta in [14] as a suitable objective function for measuring the quality of hierarchical clusterings of similarity graphs (where large weights mean high similarity and vice versa). In this paper and a string of follow-ups [8, 13, 30], several attractive properties of EPT-sum as an objective function were highlighted, and algorithms for optimizing EPT-sum of edge-weighted graphs were proposed. In light of this, a balanced edge of a tree is just a special case of the *sparsest cut* of an edge-weighted graph, a partition (A, B) of $V(G)$ that minimizes the ratio $(\sum_{e \in E(G[A, B])} x_e) / (|A| \cdot |B|)$ (where x_e is the weight of the edge e). In general graphs, the sparsest cut is itself NP-hard, and hard to approximate to a constant (given standard complexity-theoretic assumptions [2, 9]), but Charikar and Chatziafratis [8] showed that given an α -approximation algorithm for sparsest cut, one could find an 8α -approximation for EPT-sum. The state-of-the-art for approximating sparsest cut in general graphs is the $O(\sqrt{\log n})$ algorithm due to Arora et al. [3].

The aforementioned results by Charikar and Chatziafratis clearly indicate that the balanced cut algorithm gives an 8-approximation of the EPT-sum of edge-weighted trees (and other graph classes for which an optimal sparsest cut can be found in polynomial time, like planar graphs, see [1] for more information). Whether this is the real approximation ratio is, however, unknown.

1.3 Related Parameters

EPT's were introduced by Iyer et al. in [20] along with the *edge rank problem*; the problem of finding an EPT of a graph with lowest possible height. EPT's are a variation of *vertex partitioning trees* or VPT's, defined similarly but where every node in the tree corresponds to a vertex in the graph. VPT's

and the *node rank problem* (also called *tree-depth*) of finding a VPT of lowest height have applications in such disparate areas as VLSI chip design [25], sparse matrix multiplication [7, 26], and structural graph theory [27, 28]. The edge rank problem was rediscovered in terms of searching in tree-like posets by Ben-Asher et al. [4], who also found a polynomial-time algorithm for the problem (although polynomial- and linear-time algorithms were already known for edge ranking, see [15, 23]) The equivalence between edge rank of trees and searching in tree-like posets was first pointed out by Dereniowski in [16].

There are also several relevant results on the related parameter of *VPT-sum*; the VPT-sum of a graph G with respect to a VPT T is the sum of depth plus one of every node in the VPT. Optimizing VPT is, on trees, equivalent to optimizing a different search model where one has access to an oracle which, for each vertex $v \in V(G)$, answers which of the components of $G \setminus v$ contains the vertex one is searching for. For this parameter, the corresponding strategy of recursively choosing the most balanced vertex (i.e. the *centroid*) to build a VPT, was recently shown by Berendsohn et al. [5] to give exactly a 2-approximation of VPT-sum – both for weighted and unweighted trees. (In contrast, for EPT-sum we have no strong lower bounds for the approximation ratio of this algorithm on unweighted trees; the algorithm is known to not give optimal EPT’s, but the maximum known asymptotical approximation ratio on unweighted trees is only $(1 + \frac{\Omega(1)}{n})$ [18]). In addition, there exists a PTAS for VPT-sum on trees [6].

EPT-sum and the related parameters that are treated in [18] are all NP-hard to calculate on general, unweighted graphs. In contrast, on unweighted trees, the complexity of EPT-sum and VPT-sum are unknown. For vertex-weighted trees, the complexity of calculating VPT-sum is also, to the best of our knowledge, unknown, but it is NP-hard to calculate EPT-sum [10]. One should note that in the NP-hardness reductions employed in [10], the trees have exponential weights. In [18], a polynomial-time algorithm for EPT-sum of unweighted caterpillars was given, based on an equivalence between EPT-sum on vertex-weighted trees and unweighted trees. So, if EPT-sum is NP-hard on trees where every vertex has polynomial weight, then it is also NP-hard on unweighted trees.

Independently of the result itself, we believe that there might be some interest in the proof technique used here. Specifically, the trick of building an augmented tree that has cost 1.5 times the optimum has, to our knowledge, not been used before.

1.4 Organization

The rest of the paper is organized as follows: in Section 2 we give basic definitions and a brief discussion on EPT’s and EPT-sum in the context of searching in trees. We also show that there is an algorithm for making balanced EPT’s that run in $O(n \log^2 n)$ time. In Section 3 we prove the main result of this paper, namely the fact that a balanced EPT has EPT-sum at most 1.5 the op-

timum. Finally, in Section 4 we restate some of the most relevant results and open problems regarding computing and approximating EPT-sum on trees.

2 Preliminaries

2.1 Basic notions

In general, we follow the notation established in [18]. The vertex set and edge set of a graph G is denoted $V(G)$ and $E(G)$, respectively. Given vertices $S \subseteq V(G)$, $G[S]$ signifies the induced subgraph of G on S . As both the input graphs and the output data structures are trees, we employ the following conventions to avoid confusion: An unrooted tree that is given as input is denoted G , while a rooted tree generated as output is denoted T , and its vertices are called *nodes*. For a node $x \in V(T)$, $T[x]$ signifies the rooted subtree of T rooted in x . The set of *leaves* in T is denoted $L(T)$, a node which is not a leaf is called an *internal node*. A *full binary tree* is a binary tree where every internal node has exactly two children.

The *depth* of a node x in a rooted tree T is equal to the distance from the root r to x in T . For example, r itself has depth 0. The *height* of T is the maximum depth out of any node in T . The nodes on the path from r to x (including both r and x) are the *ancestors* of x , and x is a *descendant* of all these nodes.

2.2 Edge Partition Trees

Given a connected graph G , an *edge partition tree*, or EPT for short, of G is a rooted tree with $|V(G)|$ leaves and $|E(G)|$ internal nodes, that can be defined inductively as follows:

- The EPT of a graph with a single vertex is a tree with a single node.
- For a bigger graph G , the root r of any EPT T corresponds to an edge $e \in E(G)$, and r has at most two children c_1, c_2 ; one for each component of $G \setminus e$. $T[c_1]$ (and $T[c_2]$, if it exists) are, in turn, EPT's of the component(s) of $G \setminus e$.

An EPT is, as such, a binary tree. G is a tree if and only if any (and every) EPT of G is a full binary tree (since in that case, every edge of G is a bridge). Since we focus on trees as input, we assume that EPT's are full binary trees.

There is a bijection from the vertex set of G to the leaves of T , and likewise from the edge set of G to the internal vertices of T . To simplify notation somewhat, we will not notate these bijections and rather say that each leaf of T *is* a vertex of G and each internal node of T *is* an edge of G .

2.3 EPT-sum and Searching in Trees

The focus of this paper is on the graph measure called EPT-sum. We give the most general definition, where G is equipped with both edge and vertex weights:




Figure 1: An unweighted tree G and an EPT T of G . Adding up the depth of each leaf, one sees that $\text{EPT-sum}(G, T) = 39$. This is not optimal for G ; a better EPT can be made by making the edge ef (which incidentally is also the most balanced edge in G) root.

Given a graph G with vertex weights $W = \{w_v \mid v \in V(G)\}$ and edge weights $X = \{x_e \mid e \in E(G)\}$, and an EPT T of G , the EPT-sum of G with respect to T , $\text{EPT-sum}(G, T)$ is equal to

$$\sum_{e \in E(G)} x_e \cdot \left(\sum_{v \in L(T[e])} w_v \right)$$

If G is not vertex-weighted, we can replace the sum of vertex-weights by $|L(T[e])|$.

We can easily verify through reordering of terms that EPT-sum can be equivalently defined as

$$\sum_{v \in V(G)} w_v \cdot \left(\sum_{e \in \text{ancestors of } v} x_e \right)$$

If G is not edge-weighted, we can replace the sum of edge-weights by simply the depth of v in T . The graphs we will treat in this paper are vertex-weighted, but not edge-weighted. Therefore the formula $\sum_{v \in V(G)} (w_v \cdot \text{dist}_T(r, v))$, where r is the root of T , is a natural choice to use.

It is also this formulation that makes EPT-sum and similar measures attractive for measuring the performance of search trees. Rooting a tree G in an arbitrary vertex r and treating it as a Hasse diagram of some poset (V, \preceq) , one sees that a search query of the type “is $x \preceq v$?” partitions the tree into $G[v]$ (when it returns true) and $G \setminus G[v]$ (when it returns false), which are exactly the components of $G \setminus e$ where e is the edge from v to its parent. Then, if $\{w_v \mid v \in V\}$ is a probability distribution, then the EPT-sum of the Hasse diagram G with respect to some EPT T is equal to the expected search length for an x in V (chosen randomly according to the probability distribution), given a search strategy corresponding to T . This equivalence is a variant of the equivalence between edge rank and worst-case performance of searching in trees.

We must note that the equivalence between EPT-sum and average search time only holds if the Hasse diagram actually is a rooted tree; otherwise the relationship between these two problems is more complicated. This is evident

from the fact that the sparsest cut algorithm from [8] provides a $O(\sqrt{\log n})$ -time approximation of EPT-sum in edge-weighted graphs, while it was proven in [10] that searching in posets (i.e. vertex-weighted DAG's) has no $o(\log n)$ -approximation unless every problem in NP has a quasi-polynomial algorithm.

2.4 A Fast Balanced Cut Algorithm

Before moving on to the main result, we show that finding a balanced EPT can be done more quickly than the basic algorithm outlined in the introduction. This has probably been noted beforehand; however we have been unable to find such a result in the literature.

Lemma 1. *Given a tree G , one can compute a balanced EPT of G in time $O(n \log^2 n)$.*

Proof. We will make use of the following observation: A balanced edge e is an edge that maximizes the size of the smallest component C_e^{\min} when e is removed. If $|C_e^{\min}| \geq \frac{1}{3}|G|$, then the size of the biggest component C_e^{\max} is at most $\frac{2}{3}|G|$. However, if $|C_e^{\min}| < \frac{1}{3}|G|$, then the next most balanced edge in C_e^{\max} must still be the most balanced edge after e is removed. This continues until the size of the big component has shrunk enough that it is less than twice the size of the “small” component (i.e. the smallest in G) for the next considered edge. At this point, the big component must be strictly less than $\frac{2}{3}|G|$. Therefore, we can consider the following algorithm:

- Locate a centroid vertex c in G . Put all edges e_1, \dots, e_k incident on c into a list; these must all be the most balanced edges in a big component.
- Sort each edge e_i in descending order after $|C_{e_i}^{\min}|$. This is done in time $O(n \log n)$.
- Find the minimum $s < k$ such that $n - \sum_{i=1}^s |C_{e_i}^{\min}| < 2|C_{e_{s+1}}^{\min}|$.
- Make a caterpillar-shaped partial EPT T with e_1 as root and e_2, \dots, e_s downward.
- Build onto T by recursing on the subtrees left by removing e_1, \dots, e_s from G .

Not having to recompute the most balanced edges until every component has size at most $\frac{2}{3}|G|$ makes this algorithm have runtime $O(n \log^2 n)$. \square

3 Balanced EPT's have EPT-sum at most 1.5 the Optimum

We will go through the proof with unweighted graphs in mind, but note that the proof is agnostic as to whether the vertices have weights. The proof therefore also works for vertex-weighted trees.

The first step is building the tree that has EPT-sum at most 1.5 times as high as the optimal tree.

Definition 1 (Augmented tree). Given a full binary tree T , the augmented tree of T , denoted $aug(T)$, is constructed in the following manner: For any internal node $v \in V(T)$ with children c_l, c_r , choose one child (say, c_r) with the property that $|L(T[c_r])| \leq |L(T[c_l])|$ (this is obviously true for at least one of c_l, c_r). Then, subdivide the edge vc_r once.

If T is an EPT of a tree G , then $aug(T)$ is not an EPT of G , since it has more internal nodes than there are edges in G . Nonetheless, we define $EPT\text{-sum}(aug(T))$ to be the sum of depths of leaves in $aug(T)$.

Lemma 2. For any full binary tree T , $EPT\text{-sum}(aug(T)) \leq \frac{3}{2}EPT\text{-sum}(T)$.

Proof. The proof goes by induction. For the base case, we observe that a full binary tree with one leaf has EPT-sum equal to 0, and no edges to augment.

For the inductive step, assume that the lemma holds for any full binary tree with at most $n - 1 \geq 1$ leaves, and let T be an arbitrary full binary tree with n leaves, and $aug(T)$ the augmented tree of T . Furthermore, let r be the root of T , and c_l, c_r the children of r . Note that c_l and c_r are guaranteed to exist from the assumption that T is a full binary tree with at least two leaves. Also, note that $aug(T)[c_l]$ (resp. $aug(T)[c_r]$) is the augmented tree $aug(T[c_l])$ (resp. $aug(T[c_r])$).

W.l.o.g. assume that rc_r is the edge from r to its children that is subdivided in $aug(T)$. Then we know that $|L(T[c_r])| \leq \frac{n}{2}$. Also, both $T[c_l]$ and $T[c_r]$ have at most $n - 1$ leaves.

By definition,

$$EPT\text{-sum}(T) = EPT\text{-sum}(T[c_l]) + EPT\text{-sum}(T[c_r]) + n$$

while

$$EPT\text{-sum}(aug(T)) = EPT\text{-sum}(aug(T[c_l])) + EPT\text{-sum}(aug(T[c_r])) + n + |L(T[c_r])|$$

which we have seen to be upper-bounded by

$$EPT\text{-sum}(aug(T[c_l])) + EPT\text{-sum}(aug(T[c_r])) + \frac{3}{2}n$$

Therefore

$$\frac{EPT\text{-sum}(aug(T))}{EPT\text{-sum}(T)} \leq \frac{EPT\text{-sum}(aug(T[c_l])) + EPT\text{-sum}(aug(T[c_r])) + \frac{3}{2}n}{EPT\text{-sum}(T[c_l]) + EPT\text{-sum}(T[c_r]) + n}$$

This fraction is a mediant of the three fractions $\frac{EPT\text{-sum}(aug(T[c_l]))}{EPT\text{-sum}(T[c_l])}$, $\frac{EPT\text{-sum}(aug(T[c_r]))}{EPT\text{-sum}(T[c_r])}$ and $\frac{3}{2}$. By the induction hypothesis, all these fractions are upper-bounded by $\frac{3}{2}$, from which we conclude that $\frac{EPT\text{-sum}(aug(T))}{EPT\text{-sum}(T)} \leq \frac{3}{2}$. \square

One should note that this Lemma also holds for EPT's of vertex-weighted trees; this is easily seen by replacing $\frac{n}{2}$ with $\frac{\sum_{v \in V(G)} w_v}{2}$ in the formula.

Theorem 1. *The balanced cut-algorithm gives a 1.5-approximation of EPT-sum on trees.*

Proof. Let G be an unrooted tree, with T^* an optimal EPT of G , and T' an EPT of G given by the balanced cut-algorithm. We want to show that $\text{EPT-sum}(T') \leq \text{EPT-sum}(aug(T^*))$. We achieve this through a procedure that incrementally modifies $aug(T^*)$ into T' . Formally, we generate a series of trees T_0, T_1, \dots, T_t where $T_0 = aug(T^*)$, $T_t = T'$ and, for every $0 \leq i < t$, T_{i+1} is made from T_i by way of the following algorithm:

- If $T_i = T'$: set $t := i$ and halt.
- Otherwise: select a node $v \in V(T_i)$ that has a subdivided edge to one of its children, but where none of its ancestors have such an edge.
- If v is a leaf: do nothing.
- Otherwise: modify $T_i[v]$ in a suitable way, according to Cases 1-7 below (depending on where the balanced edge of $G[v]$ is located in $T_i[v]$).
- Set T_{i+1} equal to the modified tree.

When a balanced edge has been placed correctly in the EPT, the subdivided edge from it to one of its children is smoothed out; therefore the T is gradually modified from an augmented EPT to a non-augmented EPT. Also, because of this, the node v that has been chosen at a particular step is guaranteed to be a node that has not been placed correctly yet, but where all of its ancestors have been placed correctly.

The proof hinges on being able to show that the following invariant holds for every $0 \leq i \leq t$:

$$\text{EPT-sum}(G, T_i) \leq \text{EPT-sum}(G, aug(T^*))$$

The invariant trivially holds for $i = 0$. The rest of the proof goes by induction; assuming that the invariant holds for some i and showing that it then also must hold for $i + 1$. It is not hard to see, given the definition

$$\text{EPT-sum}(G, T) = \sum_{e \in E(G)} \left(\sum_{v \in L(T[e])} w_v \right)$$

that if the modification from T_i to T_{i+1} is constrained to the rooted subtree $T_i[v]$, then

$$\text{EPT-sum}(G, T_{i+1}) - \text{EPT-sum}(G, T_i) = \text{EPT-sum}(G, T_{i+1}[v]) - \text{EPT-sum}(G, T_i[v])$$

(this is what Dasgupta [14] refers to as *modularity of cost*).

How to actually modify T_i depends on where the balanced edge is located, and is subject to a lengthy case analysis, which constitutes the rest of the proof. Each case concentrates on a subtree $T_i[v]$ where v was selected in the manner described above. For visual aid, we include a picture of each case and how that particular tree is modified.

We will employ the following conventions throughout the case analysis: The balanced edge in question is denoted e , and its corresponding node in $T_i[v]$ is located in the subtree on the left hand side of the root (except in Case 1). The leftmost and rightmost subsets of leaves (corresponding to subsets of $V(G)$) are called A and B , respectively, and the root is called v , its left child l , and l 's right child is called b (except in Cases 1-2). Lastly, $A \cup B$ never forms a connected subgraph of G (again, except in Case 1, where $A \cup B$ is the whole of $G[L(T_i[v])]$). Note that since e lies in the left subtree, the right subtree must be strictly smaller, and can therefore safely be assumed to be the one having a subdivided edge from the root in $T_i[v]$.

Given these conventions, one should take care to get convinced that in each case, all rooted subtrees (both in the original tree and the modified one) induce connected subgraphs of G ; this is important, as it is necessary in order for the tree to be an EPT.

In the figures, pink dots signify subdivision nodes. A pink line between two edges signify that one of those edges is subdivided (whichever leads to the subtree with the fewest leaves), but we do not know which.

Case 1: $v = e$.




Figure 2: Case 1.

This is certainly the easiest case. The only modification we do is smoothing the subdivided edge from the root. It is trivial to show that $\text{EPT-sum}(G, T_{i+1}) \leq \text{EPT-sum}(G, T_i)$ and the invariant holds.

Case 2: $l = e$.

Both here and in the following cases, we need to remember that A is defined to be separated from B by M , therefore $G[B \cup M]$ is connected.

In this case, we perform a simple rotation on $T_i[v]$, and smooth the subdivided edge from v to B . We further smooth the edge from e to the smallest




Figure 3: Case 2.

subtree of A and M , and A decreases one in depth, but we subdivide the edge from v to the smallest subtree out of M and B .

When we calculate the change in cost, it is easiest to somehow separate the certain changes (the level of each subtree when disregarding subdivision nodes, as well as those subdivision nodes we know the placement of) from the uncertain changes (the subdivision nodes we do not know the placement of, corresponding to pink lines in the figures). For example, A certainly gets exactly one level shallower, if we disregard the subdivision node that may or may not go from e to A . B certainly stays at the same level if we count the subdivision node that certainly goes from v to B that is removed, but disregard the subdivision node that may be placed in between v and B again, if $|B| \leq |M|$. Taking all this into account, the change in cost therefore simplifies to

$$\min(|M|, |B|) - (|A| + \min(|A|, |M|))$$

where all increase is collected on the top line and decrease on the bottom line. (We will not describe the steps taken and the reasoning behind the change in cost in such detail in the later, more complicated cases. Rather, we refer to the figures for visual aid.) We observe that the inequality $|A| \geq |B|$ must hold, as otherwise v would lead to a more balanced cut than e . Therefore the change in cost is non-positive and $\text{EPT-sum}(G, T_{i+1}) \leq \text{EPT-sum}(G, T_i)$; thus the invariant holds.

Case 3: e lies inside $G[A]$.

This is a unique case in the sense that we do not care to balance the root of $T_i[v]$ at this step. Therefore it is important to keep the subdivided edge v in this case, so that we can balance $T_{i+1}[v]$ at a later step, before moving to its subtrees.

We observe that the inequality $|A| \geq |M| + |B|$ must hold, otherwise l would lead to a more balanced cut than e (this is also why the edge from l to M is subdivided). The change in cost is

$$(|B| + \min(|M|, |B|)) -$$




Figure 4: Case 3.

$$|A|$$

From the aforementioned inequality, the change in cost is non-positive and therefore $\text{EPT-sum}(G, T_{i+1}) \leq \text{EPT-sum}(G, T_i)$; thus the invariant holds.

In the next three cases (4-6), we assume that A and B lie on different sides of e , i.e. that there are connected subgraphs $G[L], G[R]$ such that the components of $G[L(T_i[v])] \setminus e$ are $G[A \cup L]$ and $G[B \cup R]$.

Case 4: e is the root of the tree containing $L \cup R$.




Figure 5: Case 4.

Here, the change in cost is

$$(\min(|A|, |L|) + \min(|R|, |B|)) - (\min(|A|, |L \cup R|) + \min(|L|, |R|) + |L| + |R|)$$

As the sum of the top row is clearly at most $|L| + |R|$, the change in cost is non-positive and $\text{EPT-sum}(G, T_{i+1}) \leq \text{EPT-sum}(G, T_i)$; thus the invariant holds.

Case 5: e lies inside the subtree induced by the child of b containing R .




Figure 6: Case 5.

Both here and in the next case, we must “tear apart” the subtree containing e (in this case $T_i[L_2 \cup R]$), by forcing e to become the root. However, it is clear that, even when augmented, the two subtrees $T_{i+1}[L_2]$ and $T_{i+1}[R]$ in sum have lower EPT-sum than $T_i[L_2 \cup R]$ has. So, we can infer that the change in cost is at most

$$\begin{aligned} & (\min(|A|, |L|) + \min(|L_1|, |L_2|) + \min(|R|, |B|)) - \\ & (\min(|A|, |L \cup R|) + \min(|L_1|, |L_2 \cup R|) + |R|) \end{aligned}$$

where we assume $L = L_1 \cup L_2$. We see that each term in the top row is at most as high as the corresponding term in the bottom row. As such, the change in cost is non-positive and $\text{EPT-sum}(G, T_{i+1}) \leq \text{EPT-sum}(G, T_i)$; thus the invariant holds.

Case 6: e lies inside the subtree induced by the child of b containing L .

As in the previous case, we do not care about the fact that we must tear apart the subtree containing e . Furthermore, we argue that the sum of the EPT-sum of the torn-apart trees is strictly lower than $\text{EPT-sum}(T_i[L \cup R_1])$. Look at the root of that tree. Either that root is equal to e , in which both L and R_1 sit at a lower level in $T_i[v]$ than what is shown in the drawing, or it is not equal to e , in which one of the two – at least the smallest one – sits at a lower level than what is shown in the drawing. We can therefore add a $\min(|L|, |R_1|)$ to the bottom line of the change in cost which thus reads

$$\begin{aligned} & (\min(|A|, |L|) + \min(|R|, |B|) + \min(|R_1|, |R_2|)) - \\ & (\min(|A|, |L \cup R|) + |L| + \min(|L \cup R_1|, |R_2|) + \min(|L|, |R_1|)) \end{aligned}$$




Figure 7: Case 6.

where $R = R_1 \cup R_2$. This is the most complicated case, and we must employ four sub-cases corresponding to what the bottom line evaluates to.

Case 6a): $|A| > |L \cup R|$

In this case, the upper line is upper-bounded by

$$(|L| + |R| + \min(|R_1|, |R_2|))$$

and the lower line is lower-bounded by

$$(|L| + |R| + \min(|L \cup R_1|, |R_2|))$$

The change in cost is non-positive.

Case 6b): $|A| \leq |L \cup R|$ and $|L| < |R_1|$

In this case, the upper line is upper-bounded by

$$(|L| + |B| + \min(|R_1|, |R_2|))$$

and the lower line is lower-bounded by

$$(|A| + 2|L| + \min(|L \cup R_1|, |R_2|))$$

We observe that the inequality $|A| + |L| \geq |B|$ must hold, otherwise v would lead to a more balanced cut than e . Therefore, the change in cost is non-positive.

Case 6c): $|A| \leq |L \cup R|$ and $|L| \geq |R_1|$ and $|L \cup R_1| > |R_2|$

In this case, the upper line is upper-bounded by

$$(|A| + |R_1| + |R|)$$

and the lower line is equal to

$$(|A| + |L| + |R|)$$

. By the definition of this case, the change in cost is non-positive.

Case 6d): $|A| \leq |L \cup R|$ and $|L| \geq |R_1|$ and $|L \cup R_1| \leq |R_2|$
 In this case, the upper line is upper-bounded by

$$(|L| + |B| + |R_1|)$$

and the lower line is equal to

$$(|A| + 2|L| + 2|R_1|)$$

. As, again, $|A| + |L| \geq |B|$, the change in cost is non-positive.

As we have argued, no matter how the sizes of different subtrees relate to each other, $\text{EPT-sum}(G, T_{i+1}) \leq \text{EPT-sum}(G, T_i)$ and the invariant holds.

In the last case, we assume that subtrees A and B lie on the same side of e , and assume w.l.o.g. that the components of $G[L(T_i[v])] \setminus e$ are $G[A \cup B \cup R]$ and $G[L]$.

Case 7: e lies within $L \cup R$ and A and B are in the same component of $G - e$.




Figure 8: Case 7.

In this last case, we will look inside the tree covering $L \cup R$ and enumerate each part of R , i.e. R_1, \dots, R_{k-1} , that is split off before reaching a cut involving L , in order to accurately argue about how the cost changes when modifying T . The crucial point here is that $|L|$ is at least as large as both $|A|$, $|B|$ and $|R_i|$ for every $1 \leq i \leq k - 1$, otherwise v , l or b_i respectively would have led to a more balanced cut than e . Looking at the drawing, we reckon that every pink

line in $T_{i+1}[e]$ incurs at most as high a cost as the corresponding pink dot in $T_i[v]$. We therefore disregard the pink dots and lines, and observe that A , B and R_1, \dots, R_{k-1} all increase in depth between T_i and T_{i+1} , while L decrease in depth. The change of cost is therefore upper-bounded by

$$\begin{aligned} & (|B| + |A| + \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} |R_i|) - \\ & (k+1)|L| \end{aligned}$$

As all the terms on the upper line, of which there are $k+1$, are at most $|L|$, the change in cost is non-positive and $\text{EPT-sum}(G, T_{i+1}) \leq \text{EPT-sum}(G, T_i)$; thus the invariant holds.

With the assumptions placed on the orientation of $T_i[v]$, there is no placement of the balanced edge e that is not covered by one of the Cases 1-7. The procedure must halt after a finite amount of steps (specifically, $O(n^2)$ steps), because each internal node (corresponding to an edge in G , of which there are $n-1$) is correctly placed in accordance with T' in a linear amount of steps. For each subtree, Case 3 may be encountered $O(n)$ times, while any other case may be encountered maximally one time. From this fact and the fact that the invariant holds, we conclude that the theorem is true. \square

Corollary 1. *Theorem 1 holds also for vertex-weighted trees.*

Proof. This follows directly from replacing sizes of subsets of vertices ($|A|$, $|B|$, $|M|$ etc.) with their weighted equivalents ($\sum_{a \in A} w_a$, $\sum_{b \in B} w_b$ etc.). All the inequalities used in the proof must still hold, since a balanced edge in a vertex-weighted tree is defined to be balanced with respect to the weights. \square

4 Conclusion

We have shown that the simple balanced cut algorithm gives a 1.5-approximation of EPT-sum on vertex-weighted trees, and therefore of the minimum average search time in trees.

There are some questions remaining. For the case of weighted trees, Cicalese et al. [11] showed that for the balanced cut algorithm, an approximation ratio of 1.5 must be the best possible, as for any lower ratio, there is an infinite family of graphs failing to achieve that ratio by the balanced cut algorithm. On the other hand, for unweighted trees, we have no such lower bounds. The highest ratio found is by taking the smallest tree in the family found in [18], a tree with 14 vertices; calculating the EPT-sum of the optimal EPT and the one found by taking balanced cuts, the approximation ratio turns out to be $\frac{65}{58}$ for this tree (for the family as a whole, the ratio is $(1 + o(1))$, as previously mentioned). We leave it as an open problem to close the gap between $\frac{65}{58}$ and 1.5 for unweighted

trees.

It must also be noted that for calculating EPT-sum on unweighted trees, it is still unknown whether the problem is NP-hard or polynomial-time solvable. For the related parameter of edge ranking (equivalent to minimum worst-case search time in trees), there are polynomial- and even linear-time algorithms [4, 15, 23], but these are non-trivial. If EPT-sum of unweighted trees is solvable in polynomial time, then there are few reasons to believe that an algorithm should be any easier to find.

Finally, in this paper we did not focus on edge-weighted trees. It is not hard to show that Lemma 2 still holds for trees with weights on both vertices and edges, by defining the augmented tree to have a weight on each of their subdivision nodes equal to that of its parent. On the other hand, as the sparsest cut of an edge-weighted tree is more complex than the balanced cut of an unweighted (or vertex-weighted) tree, we did not try to adapt the proof of Theorem 1 to the setting of edge-weighted trees. Of course, the approximation ratio for trees that are both edge- and vertex-weighted cannot be better than that of trees that are only vertex-weighted, but we do not know if there are any strictly larger lower bounds for this case. Cicalese et al [12] have looked at this problem and provided hardness results for some very restricted classes of trees, as well as an $O(\frac{\log n}{\log \log n})$ -approximation algorithm. It does not go against their results if the sparsest cut algorithm finds a constant approximation also in this case: in fact, for trees that are only edge-weighted, the previously mentioned results of Charikar and Chatziafratis [8] imply that this algorithm should give a constant (8) approximation factor. Whether the actual factor for edge-weighted trees (with or without vertex weights) is as low as 1.5 is an interesting question, and a natural next step for anyone interested in the average performance of searching in trees.

References

- [1] A. Abboud, V. Cohen-Addad, and P. N. Klein. New hardness results for planar graph problems in p and an algorithm for sparsest cut. In *Proceedings of the 52nd Annual ACM SIGACT Symposium on Theory of Computing, STOC 2020*, pages 996–1009, 2020.
- [2] Christoph Ambuhl, Monaldo Mastrolilli, and Ola Svensson. Inapproximability results for sparsest cut, optimal linear arrangement, and precedence constrained scheduling. In *48th Annual IEEE Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science (FOCS'07)*, pages 329–337. IEEE, 2007.
- [3] Sanjeev Arora, Satish Rao, and Umesh Vazirani. Expander flows, geometric embeddings and graph partitioning. *Journal of the ACM*, 56(2), 2009.

- [4] Yosi Ben-Asher, Eitan Farchi, and Ilan Newman. Optimal search in trees. *SIAM Journal on Computing*, 28(6):2090–2102, 1999.
- [5] B.A. Berendsohn, I. Golinsky, H. Kaplan, and L. Kozma. Fast approximation of search trees on trees with centroid trees, 2022. arXiv preprint [cs.DS], <https://arxiv.org/abs/2209.08024>.
- [6] B.A. Berendsohn and L. Kozma. Splay trees on trees. In *Proceedings of the 2022 Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms (SODA)*, pages 1875–1900, 2022.
- [7] Jean RS Blair and Barry Peyton. An introduction to chordal graphs and clique trees. In *Graph theory and sparse matrix computation*, pages 1–29. Springer, 1993.
- [8] M. Charikar and V. Chatziafratis. Approximate hierarchical clustering via sparsest cut and spreading metrics. In *Annual ACM-SIAM symposium on Discrete algorithms (SODA)*, pages 841–854, 2017.
- [9] Shuchi Chawla, Robert Krauthgamer, Ravi Kumar, Yuval Rabani, and D Sivakumar. On the hardness of approximating multicut and sparsest-cut. *computational complexity*, 15:94–114, 2006.
- [10] F. Cicalese, T. Jacobs, E. Laber, and M. Molinaro. On the complexity of searching in trees and partially ordered structures. *Theoretical Computer Science*, 412(50):6879–6896, 2011.
- [11] F. Cicalese, T. Jacobs, E. Laber, and M. Molinaro. Improved approximation algorithms for the average-case tree searching problem. *Algorithmica*, 68(4):1045–1074, 2014.
- [12] Ferdinando Cicalese, Balázs Keszegh, Bernard Lidický, Dömötör Pálvölgyi, and Tomáš Valla. On the tree search problem with non-uniform costs. *Theoretical Computer Science*, 647:22–32, 2016.
- [13] V. Cohen-Addad, V. Kanade, F. Mallmann-Trenn, and C. Mathieu. Hierarchical clustering: Objective functions and algorithms. *Journal of ACM*, 66(4):26:1–26–42, 2019.
- [14] S. Dasgupta. A cost function for similarity-based hierarchical clustering. In *Annual ACM symposium on Theory of Computing (STOC)*, pages 118–127, 2016.
- [15] P. de la Torre, R. Greenlaw, and A. A Schäffer. Optimal edge ranking of trees in polynomial time. *Algorithmica*, 13(6):592–618, 1995.
- [16] Dariusz Dereniowski. Edge ranking and searching in partial orders. *Discrete Applied Mathematics*, 156(13):2493–2500, 2008. Fifth International Conference on Graphs and Optimization.

- [17] Thomas N Hibbard. Some combinatorial properties of certain trees with applications to searching and sorting. *Journal of the ACM (JACM)*, 9(1):13–28, 1962.
- [18] Svein Høgemo, Benjamin Bergougnoux, Ulrik Brandes, Christophe Paul, and Jan Arne Telle. On dasgupta’s hierarchical clustering objective and its relation to other graph parameters. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2105.12093*, 2021.
- [19] T.C. Hu and A.C. Tucker. Optimal computer search trees and variable-length alphabetical codes. *SIAM Journal on Applied Mathematics*, 21(4):514–532, 1971.
- [20] A.V. Iyer, H.D. Ratliff, and G. Vijayan. On an edge ranking problem of trees and graphs. *Discrete Applied Mathematics*, 30(1):43–52, 1991.
- [21] Donald E. Knuth. Optimum binary search trees. *Acta informatica*, 1:14–25, 1971.
- [22] Eduardo Laber and Marco Molinaro. An approximation algorithm for binary searching in trees. *Algorithmica*, 59(4):601–620, 2011.
- [23] T. W. Lam and F. L. Yue. Optimal edge ranking of trees in linear time. *Algorithmica*, 30(1):12–33, 2001.
- [24] Hyafil Laurent and Ronald L Rivest. Constructing optimal binary decision trees is np-complete. *Information processing letters*, 5(1):15–17, 1976.
- [25] Charles E Leiserson. Area-efficient graph layouts (for vlsi). In *21st Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science (sfcs 1980)*, pages 270–281. IEEE, 1980.
- [26] Joseph WH Liu. The role of elimination trees in sparse factorization. *SIAM journal on matrix analysis and applications*, 11(1):134–172, 1990.
- [27] J. Nešetřil and P. Ossona de Mendez. On low tree-depth decompositions. *Graphs and Combinatorics*, 31(6):1941–1963, 2015.
- [28] J. Nešetřil and P. Ossona de Mendez. Tree-depth, subgraph coloring and homomorphism bounds. *European Journal of Combinatorics*, 27(6):1022–1041, 2006.
- [29] Jürg Nievergelt and Edward M Reingold. Binary search trees of bounded balance. In *Proceedings of the fourth annual ACM symposium on Theory of computing*, pages 137–142, 1972.
- [30] A. Roy and S. Pokutta. Hierarchical clustering via spreading metrics. In *Proceedings of the 30th International Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems*, NIPS’16, page 2324–2332, 2016.