

Induced Subforests and Superforests

Dieter Rautenbach

Florian Werner

Institute of Optimization and Operations Research, Ulm University, Ulm, Germany

{dieter.rautenbach,florian.werner}@uni-ulm.de

Abstract

Graph isomorphism, subgraph isomorphism, and maximum common subgraphs are classical well-investigated objects. Their (parameterized) complexity and efficiently tractable cases have been studied. In the present paper, for a given set of forests, we study maximum common induced subforests and minimum common induced superforests. We show that finding a maximum subforest is NP-hard already for two subdivided stars while finding a minimum superforest is tractable for two trees but NP-hard for three trees. For a given set of k trees, we present an efficient greedy $(\frac{k}{2} - \frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{k})$ -approximation algorithm for the minimum superforest problem. Finally, we present a polynomial time approximation scheme for the maximum subforest problem for any given set of forests.

Keywords: Subgraph isomorphism; common subgraph

1 Introduction

We consider finite, simple, and undirected graphs and all considered subgraphs are induced. Let \mathcal{G} be a set of graphs. A *subgraph* of \mathcal{G} is a graph H such that, for every graph G from \mathcal{G} , the graph G has an induced subgraph that is isomorphic to H . A *supergraph* of \mathcal{G} is a graph H such that, for every graph G from \mathcal{G} , the graph H has an induced subgraph that is isomorphic to G . A subgraph that is a forest or tree, is called a *subforest* or *subtree*, respectively. A supergraph that is a forest or tree, is called a *superforest* or *supertree*, respectively.

In this paper we consider the following natural optimization problems.

MAXIMUM SUBFOREST

Instance: A set \mathcal{F} of forests.

Task: Determine a subforest F of \mathcal{F} of maximum order.

MINIMUM SUPERFOREST

Instance: A set \mathcal{F} of forests.

Task: Determine a superforest F of \mathcal{F} of minimum order.

Both problems are already NP-hard restricted to instances $\mathcal{F} = \{F_1, F_2\}$, where F_1 and F_2 are unions of paths: Let I be an instance of the strongly NP-complete problem 3-PARTITION, cf. [SP15] in [10]. Let I consist of $3m$ positive integers a_1, \dots, a_{3m} with $A/4 < a_i < A/2$ for each $i \in [3m]$, where $A = \frac{1}{m}(a_1 + \dots + a_{3m})$. The task for I is to decide whether there is a partition of $[3m]$ into m sets I_1, \dots, I_m each containing exactly three elements such that $\sum_{j \in I_i} a_j = A$ for each $i \in [m]$. Let F_1 be the forest with $3m$ components that are paths of order a_1, \dots, a_{3m} and let F_2 be the forest with m components that are paths of order $A + 2$. Note that $n(F_2) = n(F_1) + 2m$.

Obviously, the following statements are equivalent:

- (i) I is a yes-instance of 3-PARTITION.
- (ii) F_1 is isomorphic to an induced subtree of F_2 .
- (iii) F_1 is a maximum subforest of $\{F_1, F_2\}$.
- (iv) F_2 is a minimum superforest of $\{F_1, F_2\}$.

These equivalences imply the stated hardness of MAXIMUM SUBFOREST and MINIMUM SUPERFOREST. They also show that these problems are closely related to the very well-studied subtree/subgraph isomorphism problem [1, 7, 12, 15, 16]. Maximum common (induced and non-induced) subgraphs were first studied by Bokhari [8] in the context of array processing and are applied in areas ranging from molecular chemistry [17] to pattern matching [18]. The maximum common connected induced subgraph problem was shown to be NP-hard for 3-outerplanar labeled graphs of maximum degree and treewidth at most 4 [5, 6] and for two biconnected series-parallel graphs [14]. It can be solved efficiently [19] for a degree-bounded partial k -tree and a connected graph, whose number of spanning trees is polynomial. For the maximum common induced subgraph problem the parameterized complexity is studied in [2, 3].

Modifying the above NP-hardness comments similarly as in [11] yields the following.

Proposition 1. MAXIMUM SUBFOREST *restricted to instances $\{T_1, T_2\}$ consisting of two subdivided stars is NP-hard.*

Note that all proofs are postponed to Section 2.

If the set \mathcal{F} contains only trees and F is a minimum superforest of \mathcal{F} , then each copy of a tree from \mathcal{F} is completely contained in one component of F . If F would not be connected, then selecting one vertex from each component of F and identifying all selected vertices to a single vertex would yield a strictly smaller superforest of \mathcal{F} . This argument implies the following.

Every minimum superforest of a set of trees is a tree. (1)

For two trees T_1 and T_2 , minimum supertree T_\cup of $\{T_1, T_2\}$, and a maximum subtree T_\cap of $\{T_1, T_2\}$, the following inclusion-exclusion formula concerning the orders of these trees is straightforward.

$$n(T_\cup) = n(T_1) + n(T_2) - n(T_\cap). \tag{2}$$

Furthermore, given subtrees of T_1 and T_2 isomorphic to T_\cap , a minimum superforest of $\{T_1, T_2\}$ can easily be constructed by extending the copy of T_\cap within T_1 by adding $n(T_2) - n(T_\cap)$ new vertices and suitable edges creating a copy of T_2 . Referring to Edmonds and Matula, Akutsu [4] showed that, for two given trees T_1 and T_2 , some maximum subtree of $\{T_1, T_2\}$ can be determined efficiently combining a weighted bipartite matching algorithm with dynamic programming.

Together our comments imply the following.

Proposition 2. MINIMUM SUPERFOREST *restricted to instances $\{T_1, T_2\}$ consisting of two trees can be solved in polynomial time.*

In [4] Akutsu also showed that it is NP-hard to determine a maximum subtree of three given trees. Reflecting this result, we show the following, which does not follow from Akutsu's result.

Theorem 3. *MINIMUM SUPERFOREST restricted to instances $\{T_1, T_2, T_3\}$ consisting of three trees is NP-hard.*

For instances of bounded maximum degree, the problem can be solved efficiently.

Theorem 4. *For every $\Delta \in \mathbb{N}$, there is some $p \in \mathbb{N}$ with the following property: For a given set $\mathcal{T} = \{T_1, T_2, T_3\}$ consisting of 3 trees of order at most n and maximum degree at most Δ , one can determine in time $O(n^p)$ a minimum superforest T of \mathcal{T} .*

By Proposition 2, some minimum supertree, say $s(T, T')$, of two given trees T and T' can be determined efficiently. Repeated applications of this lead to the following natural simple greedy algorithm.

Input: A set $\{T_1, \dots, T_k\}$ of trees.
Output: A supertree T of $\{T_1, \dots, T_k\}$.

```

begin
  for  $i = 1$  to  $k$  do
     $S_i \leftarrow T_i$ ;
    for  $j = 2$  to  $k$  do
       $S_i \leftarrow s(S_i, T_{i+j-1})$ , where indices are identified modulo  $k$ ;
    end
  end
   $\ell \leftarrow \operatorname{argmin}\{n(S_i) : i \in [k]\}$ ;
  return  $S_\ell$ ;
end

```

Algorithm 1: Greedy Supertree

Theorem 5. *Greedy Supertree is an efficient $(\frac{k}{2} - \frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{k})$ -approximation algorithm for MINIMUM SUPERFOREST restricted to instances $\{T_1, \dots, T_k\}$ consisting of k trees.*

For $k = 3$, Theorem 5 provides the approximation factor $4/3$. In Section 2 we show that our analysis of Greedy Supertree is essentially best possible and that this factor can not be improved. The appearance of the factor $4/3$ in this context is actually not surprising. A natural simple dynamic programming algorithm that determines a minimum supertree of two given trees uses a maximum bipartite matching algorithm as a subroutine. Extending this dynamic programming approach from two to three trees would require to replace this subroutine with a 3-dimensional matching algorithm. Now, $4/3 + \epsilon$ is the best known approximation factor for 3-dimensional matching [9] with no improvement during the past decade. More generally, the approximation factor in Theorem 5 reflects that the best known [13] approximation factor for the k -set packing problem is $k/2 + \epsilon$. Altogether, a natural challenging problem in this context is to improve the approximation factor of $4/3$ for MINIMUM SUPERFOREST for sets $\{T_1, T_2, T_3\}$ of three given trees.

In contrast to that MAXIMUM SUBFOREST allows a polynomial time approximation.

Theorem 6. *For every $\epsilon > 0$, there is some $p \in \mathbb{N}$ with the following property: For a given set $\mathcal{F} = \{F_1, \dots, F_k\}$ consisting of k forests of order at most n , one can determine in time $O(kn^p)$ a subforest F of \mathcal{F} with $n(F) \geq (1 - \epsilon)n(F_{\text{opt}})$, where F_{opt} is some maximum subforest of \mathcal{F} .*

2 Proofs

Proof of Proposition 1. Let I be an instance of 3-PARTITION that consists of $3m$ positive integers a_1, \dots, a_{3m} with $A/4 < a_i < A/2$ for each $i \in [3m]$, where $A = \frac{1}{m}(a_1 + \dots + a_{3m})$. Let F_1 be the forest with $3m$ components that are paths of order a_1, \dots, a_{3m} and let F_2 be the forest with m components that are paths of order $A + 2$. Let T_1 arise from F_1 by adding one new vertex r_1 as well as $3m$ new edges between r_1 and one endvertex in each component of F_1 . Similarly, let T_2 arise from F_2 by adding one new vertex r_2 as well as m new edges between r_2 and one endvertex in each component of F_2 . Note that T_1 and T_2 are subdivided stars.

In order to complete the proof, we show that I is a yes-instance of 3-PARTITION if and only if a maximum subforest of $\{T_1, T_2\}$ has order $n(T_1) - 1 = n(F_1) = a_1 + \dots + a_{3m}$. Clearly, we may assume that $m \geq 8$. Note that, since T_2 contains no vertex of degree $d_{T_1}(r_1) = 3m$, T_1 is not a subtree of T_2 , and, hence, a maximum subforest of $\{T_1, T_2\}$ has order at most $n(T_1) - 1$.

If I is a yes-instance of 3-PARTITION, then removing from T_1 only the vertex r_1 and removing from T_2 the vertex r_2 as well as two further vertices from each component of F_2 corresponding to a feasible solution for I yields two forests that are both isomorphic to F_1 . Conversely, suppose now that F is an induced subforest of T_1 of order $n(T_1) - 1$ that is isomorphic to an induced subforest F' of T_2 . Note that F arises from T_1 by removing a single vertex. Suppose, for a contradiction, that r_1 belongs to F . This implies $d_F(r_1) \geq d_{T_1}(r_1) - 1 = 3m - 1 > m$. Since m is the maximum degree of T_2 , this is impossible, which implies $F = T_1 - r_1 = F_1$. Suppose, for a contradiction, that r_2 belongs to F' . Since F is the union of paths, this implies that there are $m - 2$ neighbors u_1, \dots, u_{m-2} of r_2 in T_2 that do not belong to F' . Let P_1, \dots, P_{m-2} be the components of F_2 such that P_i contains u_i for $i \in [m - 2]$. Since each $P_i - u_i$ is a path of order $A + 1$ and each a_i is strictly less than $A/2$, for each P_i , there are at least three vertices that do not belong to F' . Since $m \geq 8$, this implies the contradiction $n(F') \leq n(T_2) - 3(m - 2) < n(T_2) - 2m - 1 = n(T_1) - 1 = n(F_1) = n(F)$. Hence, r_2 does not belong to F' , that is, F' is an induced subforest of F_2 . Again, since each component of F_2 is a path of order $A + 2$ and each a_i is strictly less than $A/2$, for each component of F_2 , there are at least two vertices that do not belong to F' . Since $n(F') = n(F) = n(T_2) - 2m - 1 = n(F_2) - 2m$, it follows that each component of F_2 contains exactly two vertices that do not belong to F' . These two vertices from each component of F_2 indicate a feasible solution for I , which implies that I is a yes-instance of 3-PARTITION. \square

Proof of Theorem 3. We show this result by an efficient reduction of the well-known NP-complete problem 3-DIMENSIONAL MATCHING (3DM), cf. [SP1] in [10], to MINIMUM SUPERFOREST. Let I be an instance of 3DM consisting of three disjoint sets $X = \{x_1, \dots, x_q\}$, $Y = \{y_1, \dots, y_q\}$, and $Z = \{z_1, \dots, z_q\}$ as well as a set $M \subseteq X \times Y \times Z$ of triples. As 3DM remains NP-complete under this restriction [10], we assume that every element of $X \cup Y \cup Z$ occurs in some triple but no element of $X \cup Y \cup Z$ occurs in more than three triples.

For each $i \in [q]$, let $T_0(x_i)$ be the tree that arises from the disjoint union of an isolated vertex $r(x_i)$ and three paths P_1, P_2 , and P_3 , each of order $2q$, by adding an edge between $r(x_i)$ and an endvertex of each P_ℓ . The three vertices in $T_0(x_i)$ at distance j from $r(x_i)$ are associated with y_j and the three vertices in $T_0(x_i)$ at distance $p + k$ from $r(x_i)$ are associated with z_k .

If x_i is contained in three triples from M , then the tree $T(x_i)$ arises from $T_0(x_i)$ by associating each triple (x_i, y_j, z_k) from M containing x_i with a different path P_ℓ and attaching one new endvertex

to each of the two vertices in that P_ℓ at distances j and $q + k$ from $r(x_i)$, that is, the two vertices associated with y_j and z_k , respectively. See Figure 1 for an illustration.




Figure 1: The tree $T(x_i)$ if $q = 4$ and x_i is contained in the three triples (x_i, y_2, z_1) , (x_i, y_3, z_4) , and (x_i, y_4, z_2) .

If x_i is contained in less than three triples, then proceed as before for the one or two triples containing x_i and attach a new endvertex to each of the $2q$ vertices of those P_ℓ that are not associated with some triple containing x_i . See Figure 2 for an illustration.




Figure 2: The left shows $T(x_i)$ if $q = 4$ and x_i is contained in exactly the two triples (x_i, y_3, z_4) and (x_i, y_4, z_2) . The right shows $T(x_i)$ if $q = 4$ and x_i is contained in only one triple (x_i, y_4, z_2) .

For each $j \in [q]$, let $T(y_j)$ be the tree that arises from the disjoint union of an isolated vertex $r(y_j)$ and three paths P_1, P_2 , and P_3 , each of order $2q$, by

- adding an edge between $r(y_j)$ and an endvertex of each P_ℓ ,
- attaching a new endvertex to each of the $2q$ vertices of two of the P_ℓ , and
- attaching one new endvertex to the vertex at distance j from $r(y_j)$ on the third P_ℓ , which we call *the relevant branch for y_j* in what follows.

Let $T(z_k)$ be defined similarly. In particular, $T(z_k)$ has an endvertex attached to a vertex at distance $q + k$ from $r(z_k)$; see Figure 3 for an illustration.

Now, let T_x arise from the disjoint union of an isolated vertex r_x and the trees $T(x_1), \dots, T(x_q)$ by adding q new edges between r_x and $r(x_1), \dots, r(x_q)$. Let T_y and T_z be defined similarly. Note




Figure 3: $T(y_3)$ on the left and $T(z_2)$ on the right.

that the trees T_x , T_y , and T_z are rooted in the vertices r_x , r_y , and r_z of degree q , respectively. The order of T_y and T_z is $n = 10q^2 + 2q + 1$ while the order of T_x depends on the instance I . In order to complete the proof, we show that I is a yes-instance of 3DM if and only if a minimum superforest for $\{T_x, T_y, T_z\}$ has order at most $10q^2 + 3q + 1$.

Suppose that I is a yes-instance of 3DM. Let $M^* \subseteq M$ be such that every element of $X \cup Y \cup Z$ belongs to exactly one triple from M^* . Let the tree T arise from T_y as follows: For each $j \in [q]$, consider the unique triple, say (x_i, y_j, z_k) , from M^* that contains y_j , and attach a new endvertex to the vertex at distance $q + k$ from $r(y_j)$ associated with z_k that belongs to the relevant branch for y_j . Clearly, the order of T is $n(T_y) + q = 10q^2 + 3q + 1$ and it is easy to verify that T contains three induced subtrees isomorphic to T_x , T_y , and T_z , respectively.

Conversely, suppose that a minimum superforest T for $\{T_x, T_y, T_z\}$ has order at most $10q^2 + 3q + 1$, which equals $n(T_y) + q$. By renaming vertices, we may assume that T arises from T_y by adding at most q vertices and suitable edges. The structure of T_y and T_z implies that T arises from T_y by attaching one new endvertex to some vertex of each of the q relevant branches within T_y ; these q additional vertices are attached to vertices associated with the distinct elements of Z . Since T_x is an induced subgraph of T and r_y is the only vertex of T of degree q , for a copy of T_x within T , the root vertex r_x of T_x is mapped to r_y and the q children of r_x in T_x are mapped in a bijective way to the q children of r_y within T . This bijective mapping indicates how to choose, for each $i \in [q]$, a triple from M containing x_i , for which the set M^* of all q selected triples is such that every element of $X \cup Y \cup Z$ is contained in exactly one triple from M^* . This completes the proof. \square

Proof of Theorem 4. Let $\mathcal{T} = \{T_1, T_2, T_3\}$ be the set of the three given trees of order at most n and maximum degree at most Δ . For notational simplicity, assume that the trees T_i have disjoint sets of vertices. We explain how to determine in polynomial time supertrees T of \mathcal{T} that

- either contain disjoint copies of two of the three trees (type 1)
- or contain copies of all three trees that pairwise intersect (type 2)

and are of minimum order subject to this condition. Returning the smallest such supertree yields a minimum supertree of \mathcal{T} .

Firstly, consider supertrees of type 1 that contain disjoint copies of T_2 and T_3 ; the other two pairs can be treated symmetrically. Let $\{T_4, \dots, T_q\}$ be the set of all trees that arise from disjoint copies of T_2 and T_3 and a path P of order between 2 and n by identifying some vertex u in T_2 with one

endvertex of P and some vertex v of T_3 with the other endvertex of P . Since there are at most n choices for the length of P , for the vertex u , and for the vertex v , we have $q = O(n^3)$. By Proposition 2, the $O(n^3)$ minimum supertrees of $\{T_1, T_4\}, \{T_1, T_5\}, \dots, \{T_1, T_q\}$ can be determined in polynomial time, and a smallest of all these trees is a supertree of \mathcal{T} containing disjoint copies of T_2 and T_3 that is of minimum order subject to this condition.

Secondly, consider a supertree T of type 2. Let T'_i be an induced copy of T_i within T such that T'_1, T'_2 , and T'_3 pairwise intersect. By the Helly property of subtrees of a tree, some vertex, say r , belongs to T'_1, T'_2 , and T'_3 . For all possible at most $O(n^3)$ choices for vertices r_1 in T_1, r_2 in T_2 , and r_3 in T_3 corresponding to r , we proceed as follows for every $i \in [3]$:

- Root T_i in r_i .
- For $u_i \in V(T_i)$, let $T_i(u_i)$ be the subtree of T_i rooted in u_i that is induced by u_i and all its descendants within T_i .
- Let $f(\{u_i\}) = n(T_i(u_i))$.
- Let $f(\{u_1, u_2, u_3\})$ be the minimum order of a supertree T of $\{T_1(u_1), T_2(u_2), T_3(u_3)\}$ rooted in some vertex s such that T contains a copy of T_i in which s corresponds to u_i for every $i \in [3]$.
- Let $f(\{u_1, u_2\})$ be the minimum order of a supertree T of $\{T_1(u_1), T_2(u_2)\}$ rooted in some vertex s such that T contains a copy of T_i in which s corresponds to u_i for every $i \in [2]$. Define $f(\{u_1, u_3\})$ and $f(\{u_2, u_3\})$ symmetrically. By Proposition 2, $f(\{u_1, u_2\}), f(\{u_1, u_3\})$, and $f(\{u_2, u_3\})$ can be determined efficiently.

Note that $f(\{r_1, r_2, r_3\})$ is the minimum order of a supertree T of $\{T_1, T_2, T_3\}$ rooted in some vertex r that contains a copy of T_i in which r corresponds to r_i for every $i \in [3]$. Since we consider all $O(n^3)$ choices for the r_i , the smallest such tree is a minimum supertree of type 2.

In order to complete the proof, we explain how to determine the values $f(\{u_1, u_2, u_3\})$ by dynamic programming in polynomial time. If u_1 is an endvertex of T_1 , then $f(\{u_1, u_2, u_3\}) = f(\{u_2, u_3\})$; similarly, if u_2 or u_3 are endvertices. Hence, we may assume that u_1, u_2 , and u_3 are no endvertices. Let U_i be the set of children of u_i in T_i . The definitions imply that $f(\{u_1, u_2, u_3\})$ is the minimum of

$$f(\mathcal{P}) = 1 + \sum_{j=1}^k f(e_j)$$

over all partitions $\mathcal{P} = \{e_1, \dots, e_k\}$ of $U_1 \cup U_2 \cup U_3$ into sets e_j with $|e_j \cap U_i| \leq 1$ for every $i \in [3]$ and $j \in [k]$. Since $|U_1 \cup U_2 \cup U_3| \leq 3\Delta$, there are finitely many such partitions. Altogether, it follows that the values $f(\cdot)$ (together with suitable realizers) can be determined efficiently by dynamic programming, which completes the proof. \square

By an inductive argument also considering type 1 and type 2 supertrees and using the Helly property, Theorem 4 easily generalizes to MINIMUM SUPERTREE for given sets of k trees with the polynomial bounding the running time depending on k . Furthermore, Theorem 4 remains true under the weaker hypothesis that only two of the trees in $\mathcal{T} = \{T_1, T_2, T_3\}$ have maximum degree $O(\log(n))$ and the third tree is of arbitrary maximum degree.

Proof of Theorem 5. Let $\mathcal{T} = \{T_1, \dots, T_k\}$ be the given set of k trees. By Proposition 2, for two given trees T and T' , some minimum supertree $s(T, T')$ of $\{T, T'\}$ can be found efficiently. The trees S_i determined by **Greedy Supertree** are of the form

$$S_i = s(\dots s(s(s(T_i, T_{i+1}), T_{i+2}), T_{i+3}) \dots, T_{i+k-1}) \text{ for } i \in [k],$$

where indices are identified modulo k . We show that returning the smallest of the S_i yields a $(\frac{k}{2} - \frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{k})$ -approximation algorithm for MINIMUM SUPERFOREST on \mathcal{T} . Therefore, let T be a minimum superforest of \mathcal{T} . Let $n = n(T)$. For $i \in [k]$, let $n_i = n(T_i)$ and let $V_i \subseteq V(T)$ be such that $T[V_i] \simeq T_i$. For $ij \in \binom{[k]}{2}$, let $n_{ij} = |V_i \cap V_j|$. Clearly,

$$\begin{aligned} n_i + n_j - n_{ij} &\leq n \text{ for every } ij \in \binom{[k]}{2} \text{ and} \\ \sum_{i \in [k]} n_i - \sum_{ij \in \binom{[k]}{2}} n_{ij} &\leq n. \end{aligned}$$

Adding these $\binom{k}{2} + 1$ inequalities yields

$$k \sum_{i \in [k]} n_i - 2 \sum_{ij \in \binom{[k]}{2}} n_{ij} \leq \left(\binom{k}{2} + 1 \right) n, \quad (3)$$

and, hence,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{k} \sum_{j \in [k]} \left(\sum_{i \in [k]} n_i - \sum_{i \in [k] \setminus \{j\}} n_{ij} \right) &= \sum_{i \in [k]} n_i - \frac{2}{k} \sum_{ij \in \binom{[k]}{2}} n_{ij} \\ &\stackrel{(3)}{\leq} \frac{1}{k} \left(\binom{k}{2} + 1 \right) n \\ &= \left(\frac{k}{2} - \frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{k} \right) n. \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

Since $n_{i(i+1)}$ is the order of some possibly not largest subtree of $\{T_i, T_{i+1}\}$, we have $n(s(T_i, T_{i+1})) \stackrel{(2)}{\leq} n_i + n_{i+1} - n_{i(i+1)}$. Since $n_{i(i+2)}$ is the order of some subtree of $\{T_i, T_{i+2}\}$ and the tree $s(T_i, T_{i+1})$ contains a copy of T_i , we have $n(s(s(T_i, T_{i+1}), T_{i+2})) \leq n(s(T_i, T_{i+1})) + n_{i+2} - n_{i(i+2)} \leq n_i + n_{i+1} - n_{i(i+1)} + n_{i+2} - n_{i(i+2)}$. Using that n_{ij} is the order of some subtree of $\{T_i, T_j\}$ and that each tree of the form $s(\dots s(s(T_i, T_{i+1}), T_{i+2}) \dots, T_{i+\ell})$ for some ℓ contains a copy of T_i , it now follows inductively that

$$n(S_j) \leq \sum_{i \in [k]} n_i - \sum_{i \in [k] \setminus \{j\}} n_{ij}. \quad (5)$$

Altogether, we obtain

$$\min\{n(S_i) : i \in [k]\} \leq \frac{1}{k} \sum_{j \in [k]} n(S_j) \stackrel{(5)}{\leq} \frac{1}{k} \sum_{j \in [k]} \left(\sum_{i \in [k]} n_i - \sum_{i \in [k] \setminus \{j\}} n_{ij} \right) \stackrel{(4)}{\leq} \left(\frac{k}{2} - \frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{k} \right) n,$$

which completes the proof. \square

The analysis of **Greedy Supertree** is essentially best possible. We give an example for $k = 3$ showing that the factor $4/3$ can not be improved. For non-negative integers n_1, \dots, n_p , let the tree $T(n_1, \dots, n_p)$ arise from a path $P : u_1 \dots u_p$ of order p by attaching, for every $i \in [p]$, exactly n_i new endvertices to u_i . For positive integers a, b , and c with $a > b > c \geq 1$, consider the three trees

$$\begin{aligned} T_1 &= T(0, b, a, a, c, 0), \\ T_2 &= T(0, b, 0, a, 0, 0, a, 0), \text{ and} \\ T_3 &= T(0, b, 0, 0, 0, 0, a, 0, c, a, 0) \end{aligned}$$

illustrated in Figure 4.




Figure 4: Three trees T_1, T_2 , and T_3 .

It is easy to verify that

- $s(T_1, T_2) \simeq T(0, b, a, a, c, 0, 0, a, 0)$ does not contain $T(0, a, 0, 0, a, 0)$,
- $s(T_1, T_3) \in \{T(0, b, 0, 0, 0, 0, b, a, a, c, a, 0), T(0, b, 0, 0, 0, 0, c, a, a, b, a, 0)\}$ and does not contain $T(0, a, 0, 0, 0, a, 0)$, and
- $s(T_2, T_3) \simeq T(0, b, 0, a, 0, 0, 0, a, 0, c, a, 0)$ does not contain $T(0, a, a, 0)$.

It follows that all three trees $s(s(T_1, T_2), T_3)$, $s(s(T_1, T_3), T_2)$, and $s(s(T_2, T_3), T_1)$ have order at least $4a$, while the tree $T(0, b, 0, 0, b, b, a, a, c, c, a, 0)$ of order $3a + 3b + 2c + 12$ shown in Figure 5 contains T_1, T_2 , and T_3 .




Figure 5: A supertree for $\{T_1, T_2, T_3\}$.

Choosing a large shows that the factor $4/3$ can not be improved. Note that every supertree of $\{T_1, T_2\}$ that contains $T(0, a, 0, 0, a, 0)$ and can therefore accommodate T_3 in a more efficient way has at least b vertices more than $s(T_1, T_2)$. Choosing a, b , and c such that $4\epsilon a \geq b > \epsilon n(s(T_1, T_2)) = \epsilon(3a + b + c + 9)$ shows that the factor $4/3$ can only be improved marginally if the subroutine for $s(\cdot, \cdot)$ is allowed to return slightly suboptimal trees.

For the proof of Theorem 6, we need an auxiliary statement.

Let $\Delta \in \mathbb{N}$. Let $\mathcal{T}_\Delta = \{T_1, \dots, T_q\}$ be the set of all trees of order at most Δ . Let \mathcal{F}_Δ be the set of all forests whose components belong to \mathcal{T}_Δ . For a forest F , let $t(F) = (t_1, \dots, t_q) \in [n(F)]_0^q$ be such that t_i is the number of components of F that are isomorphic to T_i for every $i \in [q]$ and let

$$\hat{t}(F) = \{t(F') : F' \text{ is an induced subforest of } F\}.$$

For every $t = (t_1, \dots, t_q)$ from $\hat{t}(F)$, an induced subforest F' of F with $t(F') = t$ is a *realizer of t within F* . Note that $t(F)$ counts only small components of F but that F may have large components. Note furthermore, that $\hat{t}(F) \subseteq [n(F)]_0^q$.

For two sets $A, B \in \mathbb{N}_0^q$, let $A \oplus B = \{a + b : a \in A \text{ and } b \in B\}$.

Lemma 7. *For every $\Delta \in \mathbb{N}$, there is some $p \in \mathbb{N}$ with the following property: For every forest F of order at most n , $\hat{t}(F)$ as well as realizers within F can be determined in time $O(n^p)$.*

Proof. If F has components F_1, \dots, F_k , then $\hat{t}(F) = \bigoplus_{i=1}^k \hat{t}(F_i)$. Since $\hat{t}(F_i) \subseteq [n(F_i)]_0^q$ and \oplus is associative, in order to show the desired statement, we may assume that F is a tree. Root F is some vertex r . Let \mathcal{R} be the set of all pairs (S, s) such that $S \in \mathcal{T}_\Delta$ and $s \in V(S)$, that is, \mathcal{R} captures all possible ways of selecting root vertices for the trees in \mathcal{T}_Δ . Let u be some vertex of F . Let F_u be the subtree of F rooted in u that contains u and all its descendants.

For every $(S, s) \in \mathcal{R}$, let $\hat{t}_{(S,s)}(F_u)$ be the set of all $(t_1, \dots, t_q) \in [n(F_u)]_0^q$ such that

- F_u has an induced subforest K that consists of t_i disjoint copies of T_i for every $i \in [q]$,
- the vertex u is contained in some component L of K that is isomorphic to S , and
- some isomorphism π between S and L maps s to u .

See Figure 6 for an illustration.

Note that $\hat{t}_{(S,s)}(F_u)$ is empty, if F_u does not contain a suitable copy of S .




Figure 6: The structure of induced subgraphs K of F_u contributing to $\hat{t}_{(S,s)}(F_u)$.

Similarly, let $\hat{t}_\emptyset(F_u)$ be the set of all $(t_1, \dots, t_q) \in [n(F_u)]_0^q$ such that

- F_u has an induced subforest K that consists of t_i disjoint copies of T_i for every $i \in [q]$ and
- the vertex u does not belong to K .

Clearly,

$$\hat{t}(F_u) = \hat{t}_\emptyset(F_u) \cup \bigcup_{(S,s) \in \mathcal{R}} \hat{t}_{(S,s)}(F_u).$$

Let u have the children v_1, \dots, v_d in F .

We have

$$\hat{t}(F_u) = \hat{t}(F_{v_1}) \oplus \hat{t}(F_{v_2}) \oplus \dots \oplus \hat{t}(F_{v_d}).$$

Now, let $(S, s) \in \mathcal{R}$. Let $s_1, \dots, s_{d'}$ be the neighbors of s in S and let S_i be the component of $S - s$ containing s_i . Since S has order at most Δ , we have $d' < \Delta$.

Furthermore, we have

$$\hat{t}_{(S,s)}(F_u) = \bigcup_{f: [d'] \xrightarrow{\text{injective}} [d]} \left(\bigoplus_{i \in [d']} \hat{t}_{(S_i, s_i)}(F_{v_{f(i)}}) \oplus \bigoplus_{i \in [d] \setminus f([d'])} \hat{t}_\emptyset(F_{v_i}) \right),$$

where the $O(d^\Delta)$ injective functions f capture the different ways of associating the neighbors of s in S with the children of u in F . See Figure 7 for an illustration.




Figure 7: Embedding S (as well as the rest of K) into F_u mapping the root s of S to u and the children s_i of s in S to children $v_{f(i)}$ of u as selected by f .

Using these formulas, a simple dynamic programming approach allows to determine $\hat{t}(F)$ as well as suitable realizers within F in time $O(n^p)$. \square

Proof of Theorem 6. Let $\epsilon > 0$ be fixed. Let $\mathcal{F} = \{F_1, \dots, F_k\}$ be a given set of k forests of order at most n . For $i \in [k]$, let $n_i = n(F_i)$, and let $n_1 = \min\{n_1, \dots, n_k\}$. Let F_{opt} be some maximum subforest of \mathcal{F} . Since each forest F_i in \mathcal{F} has an independent set of order at least $n_i/2 \geq n_1/2$, we have $n(F_{\text{opt}}) \geq n_1/2$.

Let $\Delta = \lceil \frac{2}{\epsilon} \rceil$. Let \mathcal{F}_Δ be as above, that is, \mathcal{F}_Δ is the set of all forests whose components all have order at most Δ . Rooting each component of F_1 in some vertex and iteratively removing vertices u of maximum depth for which u has at least Δ descendants, yields a set X of at most $n_1/\Delta \leq 2n(F_{\text{opt}})/\Delta$ vertices of F_1 such that $F'_1 = F_1 - X$ belongs to \mathcal{F}_Δ . Let F'_{opt} be a maximum subforest of $(\mathcal{F} \setminus \{F_1\}) \cup \{F'_1\}$. Clearly, F'_{opt} is a subforest of \mathcal{F} that belongs to \mathcal{F}_Δ and satisfies

$$n(F'_{\text{opt}}) \geq n(F_{\text{opt}}) - |X| \geq \left(1 - \frac{2}{\Delta}\right) n(F_{\text{opt}}) \geq (1 - \epsilon)n(F_{\text{opt}}).$$

Therefore, in order to complete the proof, it suffices to show that a subforest of \mathcal{F} that belongs to \mathcal{F}_Δ and has maximum possible order subject to this condition, can be found efficiently.

By Lemma 7, we can determine $\hat{t}(F_i)$ as well as suitable realizers within F in time $O(n^{p_1})$ for every $i \in [k]$. Since

$$\max\{n(F) : F \in \mathcal{F}_\Delta \text{ is a subforest of } \mathcal{F}\} = \max \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^q t_i n(T_i) : (t_1, \dots, t_q) \in \prod_{i=1}^k \hat{t}(F_i) \right\},$$

the desired statement follows. \square

It seems interesting to study tradeoffs between supergraphs that are required to belong to different graph classes. For a set \mathcal{F} of trees, for instance, a supergraph of minimum order may be much smaller than a minimum supertree. Indeed, if $\mathcal{F} = \{T(a, 0, a), T(a, 0, 0, a), \dots, T(a, \underbrace{0, \dots, 0}_{k \text{ times}}, a)\}$ for positive integers a and k at least 3, then suitably identifying vertices of degree $a + 1$ yields a supergraph of \mathcal{F} of order $2 + 2a + 1 + 2 + \dots + k = 2a + \binom{k+1}{2} + 2$, while every supertree of \mathcal{F} has order $\Omega(\sqrt{ka})$.

References

- [1] A. Abboud, A. Backurs, T.D. Hansen, V.V. Williams, and O. Zamir. Subtree isomorphism revisited. *ACM Transactions on Algorithms* 14 (2018) Art. 27, 23.
- [2] F.N. Abu-Khzam. Maximum common induced subgraph parameterized by vertex cover. *Information Processing Letters* 114 (2014) 99–103.
- [3] F.N. Abu-Khzam, É. Bonnet, and F. Sikora. On the complexity of various parameterizations of common induced subgraph isomorphism. *Theoretical Computer Science* 697 (2017) 69–78.
- [4] T. Akutsu. An RNC Algorithm for Finding a Largest Common Subtree of Two Trees. *IEICE Transactions on Information and Systems* E75-D (1992) 95–101.
- [5] T. Akutsu, A. Melkman, and T. Tamura. Improved hardness of maximum common subgraph problems on labeled graphs of bounded treewidth and bounded degree. *International Journal of Foundations of Computer Science* 31 (2020) 253–273.

- [6] T. Akutsu and T. Tamura. On the Complexity of the Maximum Common Subgraph Problem for Partial k -Trees of Bounded Degree. International Symposium on Algorithms and Computation (ISAAC 2012). Lecture Notes in Computer Science 7676 (2012) 146–155.
- [7] H.L. Bodlaender, T. Hanaka, Y. Kobayashi, Y. Kobayashi, Y. Okamoto, Y. Otachi, and T.C. van der Zanden. Subgraph isomorphism on graph classes that exclude a substructure. *Algorithmica* 82 (2020) 3566–3587.
- [8] S.H. Bokhari. On the Mapping Problem. *IEEE Transactions on Computers* C-30 (1981) 207–214.
- [9] M. Cygan. Improved approximation for 3-dimensional matching via bounded pathwidth local search. 2013 IEEE 54th Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science (FOCS 2013), 509–518.
- [10] M.R. Garey and D.S. Johnson. *Computers and Intractability: A Guide to the Theory of NP-Completeness*. Freeman, San Francisco, 1979.
- [11] M. Grohe, G. Rattan, and G.J. Woeginger. Graph Similarity and Approximate Isomorphism. In 43rd International Symposium on Mathematical Foundations of Computer Science (MFCS 2018). Leibniz International Proceedings in Informatics (LIPIcs) 117 (2018) 20:1–16.
- [12] P. Heggernes, P. van 't Hof, D. Meister, and Y. Villanger. Induced subgraph isomorphism on proper interval and bipartite permutation graphs. *Theoretical Computer Science* 562 (2015) 252–269.
- [13] C.A.J. Hurkens and A. Schrijver. On the size of systems of sets every t of which have an SDR, with an application to the worst-case ratio of heuristics for packing problems. *SIAM Journal on Discrete Mathematics* 2 (1989) 68–72.
- [14] N. Kriege, F. Kurpicz, and P. Mutzel. On maximum common subgraph problems in series-parallel graphs. *European Journal of Combinatorics* 68 (2018) 79–95.
- [15] D.W. Matula. Subtree isomorphism in $O(n^{5/2})$. *Annals of Discrete Mathematics* 2 (1978) 91–106.
- [16] D. Marx and M. Pilipczuk. Everything you always wanted to know about the parameterized complexity of subgraph isomorphism (but were afraid to ask). 31st International Symposium on Theoretical Aspects of Computer Science. Leibniz International Proceedings in Informatics (LIPIcs) 25 (2014) 20:542–553.
- [17] J.W. Raymond and P. Willett. Maximum common subgraph isomorphism algorithms for the matching of chemical structures. *Journal of Computer-Aided Molecular Design* 16 (2002) 521–533.
- [18] K. Shearer, H. Bunke, and S. Venkatesh. Video indexing and similarity retrieval by largest common subgraph detection using decision trees. *Pattern Recognition* 34 (2001) 1075–1091.
- [19] A. Yamaguchi, K.F. Aoki, and H. Mamitsuka. Finding the maximum common subgraph of a partial k -tree and a graph with a polynomially bounded number of spanning trees. *Information Processing Letters* 92 (2004) 57–63.