

Realizing temporal transportation trees

George B. Mertzios  

Department of Computer Science, Durham University, UK

Hendrik Molter  

Department of Computer Science, Ben-Gurion University of the Negev, Beer-Sheva, Israel

Paul G. Spirakis  

Department of Computer Science, University of Liverpool, UK

Abstract

In this paper, we study the complexity of the *periodic temporal graph realization* problem with respect to *upper bounds* on the fastest path durations among its vertices. This constraint with respect to upper bounds appears naturally in *transportation network design* applications where, for example, a road network is given, and the goal is to appropriately schedule periodic travel routes, while not exceeding some desired upper bounds on the travel times. This approach is in contrast to verification applications of the graph realization problems, where *exact* values for the distances (respectively, fastest travel times) are given, following some kind of precise measurement. In our work, we focus only on underlying *tree topologies*, which are fundamental in many transportation network applications.

As it turns out, the periodic upper-bounded temporal tree realization problem (TTR) has a very different computational complexity behavior than both (i) the classic graph realization problem with respect to shortest path distances in static graphs and (ii) the periodic temporal graph realization problem with *exact* given fastest travel times (which was recently introduced). First, we prove that, surprisingly, TTR is NP-hard, even for a constant period Δ and when the input tree G satisfies at least one of the following conditions: (a) G has a constant diameter, or (b) G has constant maximum degree. In contrast, when we are given exact values of the fastest travel delays, the problem is known to be solvable in polynomial time. Second, we prove that TTR is fixed-parameter tractable (FPT) with respect to the number of leaves in the input tree G , via a novel combination of techniques for totally unimodular matrices and mixed integer linear programming.

2012 ACM Subject Classification Theory of computation \rightarrow Graph algorithms analysis; Mathematics of computing \rightarrow Discrete mathematics

Keywords and phrases Temporal graph, periodic temporal labeling, fastest temporal path, graph realization, temporal connectivity.

Funding *George B. Mertzios*: Supported by the EPSRC grant EP/P020372/1.

Hendrik Molter: Supported by the ISF, grant nr. 1456/18, and the ERC, grant nr. 949707.

Paul G. Spirakis: Supported by the EPSRC grant EP/P02002X/1.

Acknowledgements The authors want to thank Nina Klobas for discussions on the problem that lead to some initial results.

1 Introduction

A temporal (or dynamic) graph is a graph whose topology is subject to discrete changes over time. This paradigm reflects the structure and operation of a great variety of modern networks; social networks, wired or wireless networks whose links change dynamically, transportation networks, and several physical systems are only a few examples of networks that change over time [42, 54, 58]. Inspired by the foundational work of Kempe et al. [43], we adopt here a simple model for temporal graphs, in which the vertex set remains unchanged while each edge is equipped with a set of integer time labels.

► **Definition 1** (temporal graph [43]). A temporal graph is a pair (G, λ) , where $G = (V, E)$ is an underlying (static) graph and $\lambda : E \rightarrow 2^{\mathbb{N}}$ is a labeling function which assigns to every edge of G a finite set of discrete time labels.

Here, whenever $t \in \lambda(e)$, we say that the edge e is *active* or *available* at time t . In the context of temporal graphs, where the notion of vertex adjacency is time-dependent, the notions of path and distance also need to be redefined. The most natural temporal analogue of a path is that of a *temporal* (or *time-dependent*) path, which is a path of the underlying static graph whose time labels strictly increase along the edges of the path. The *duration* of a temporal path is the number of discrete time steps needed to traverse it. Finally, a temporal path from vertex u to vertex v is *fastest* if it has the smallest duration among all temporal paths from u to v .

The *graph realization* problem with respect to some graph property \mathcal{P} is to compute a graph that satisfies \mathcal{P} , or to decide that no such graph exists. The main motivation for graph realization problems stems both from network design and from “verification” applications in engineering. In *network design* applications, the goal is to design network topologies having a desired property [4, 38]. One important application domain of network design problems is that of *transportation network* design where, for example, a road network is given, and the goal is to appropriately schedule periodic travel routes while not exceeding some desired upper bounds on travel times. On the other hand, in *verification* applications, given the outcomes of some exact experimental measurements, the aim is to (re)construct an input network that complies with them. If such a reconstruction is not possible, this proves that the measurements are incorrect or implausible (resp. that the algorithm making the computations is incorrectly implemented).

One example of a graph realization problem is the recognition of probe interval graphs, in the context of the physical mapping of DNA, see [50, 51] and [36, Chapter 4]. Analyzing the computational complexity of the graph realization problems for various natural and fundamental graph properties \mathcal{P} requires a deep understanding of these properties. Among the most studied parameters for graph realization are constraints on the distances between vertices [8, 9, 12, 18, 19, 40, 59, 60, 62], on the vertex degrees [7, 25, 35, 37, 39], on the eccentricities [6, 11, 41, 49], and on connectivity [17, 30–32, 34, 37], among others. Although the majority of studies of graph realization problems concern *static* graphs, the *temporal* (periodic) graph realization problem with respect to given (exact) delays of the fastest temporal paths among vertices has been recently studied in [27, 46], motivated by *verification* applications where exact measurements are given.

In this paper, we consider the (periodic) temporal graph realization problem with respect to the durations of the fastest temporal paths from a *network design* perspective, i. e., where only *upper bounds* on the durations of fastest temporal paths are given. Our work is motivated by *transportation network* applications, where an underlying *tree* graph structure is of fundamental importance [5, 10, 13]. For example, many airlines or railway transportation networks are even star graphs (having a big hub at the center of the network, e.g. in the capital city). The formal definition of our problem is as follows (see Section 2 for formal definitions of all used terminology).

PERIODIC UPPER-BOUNDED TEMPORAL TREE REALIZATION (TTR)

Input: A tree $G = (V, E)$ with $V = \{v_1, v_2, \dots, v_n\}$, an $n \times n$ matrix D of positive integers, and a positive integer Δ .

Question: Does there exist a Δ -periodic labeling $\lambda : E \rightarrow \{1, 2, \dots, \Delta\}$ such that, for every i, j , the duration of the fastest temporal path from v_i to v_j in the Δ -periodic temporal graph (G, λ, Δ) is *at most* $D_{i,j}$.

Many natural and technological systems exhibit a periodic temporal behavior. This is true even more on transportation networks [3], where the goal is to build periodic schedules of transportation units (e.g. trains, buses, or airplanes). The most natural constraint, while designing such periodic transportation schedules, is that the fastest travel time (i.e., the duration of the fastest temporal path) between a specific pair of vertices does not exceed a specific desired upper bound. That is, if the travel time between u and v in the resulting schedule is shorter than this upper bound, the schedule is even better (and thus, still feasible). Periodic temporal graphs have also been studied in various different contexts (see [14, Class 8] and [3, 28, 56, 57]).


We focus on the most fundamental case of periodic temporal graphs, where every edge has the same period Δ and it appears exactly once within each period (while in the more general case, each edge e has a period Δ_e and might appear more than once in each period). As it turns out, TTR has a very different computational complexity behavior than both (i) the classic graph realization problem with respect to shortest path distances in static graphs [40] and (ii) the periodic temporal graph realization problem with *exact* given fastest travel times [46]. We remark that very recently, the case where every edge can appear multiple times in each Δ period has been studied [27].

Our contribution. Our results in this paper are given in two main directions. First, we prove that TTR is NP-hard, even for a constant period Δ and when the input tree G satisfies at least one of the following conditions: (a) G has a constant diameter, or (b) G has constant maximum degree. On the one hand, this hardness comes in wide contrast to the classic (static) graph realization problem with respect to shortest path distances. Indeed, this static analogue is easily solvable in polynomial time in two steps [40]. On the other hand, the complexity of TTR is also surprisingly different than the periodic temporal graph realization problem with *exact* given fastest travel times. More specifically, when the input integer matrix D gives the exact fastest travel times, the problem becomes solvable in polynomial time on trees [46].

Second, we prove that TTR is fixed-parameter tractable (FPT) with respect to the number of leaves in the input tree G . That is, long chains of vertices of degree 2 do not affect the complexity of the problem. To provide our FPT algorithm, we reduce TTR to a number MIXED INTEGER LINEAR PROGRAM (MILP) instances that is upper-bounded by a function of the number of leaves in the input tree. Furthermore, the number of integer variables in each MILP instance is also upper-bounded by a function of the number of leaves in the input tree. This allows us to use a known FPT algorithm for MILP parameterized by the number of integer variables [20, 48] to solve all MILP instances in FPT-time with respect to the number of leaves of the input tree. We prove that the TTR instance is a yes-instance if and only if at least one of the MILP instances admits a feasible solution. To this end, we use a novel combination of techniques for totally unimodular matrices and mixed integer linear programming to design the MILP instances in a way that if they admit a feasible solution, then we can assume that all variables are set to integer values.

Related work. Since the 1960s, (static) graph realization problems have been extensively studied. We give an overview of related work in the introduction.

Several problems related to graph realization have been studied in the temporal setting. In most cases, the goal is to assign labels to (sets of) edges of a given static graph to achieve certain connectivity-related properties [1, 23, 27, 45, 46, 52]. In most of the mentioned works, the sought labeling is not periodic and the desired property is to establish temporal connectivity



■ **Figure 1** Visualization of a Δ -periodic temporal graph (G, λ, Δ) with $\Delta = 5$ and the following Δ -periodic labeling $\lambda : E \rightarrow \{1, 2, \dots, 5\}$: $\lambda(\{v_1, v_2\}) = \lambda(\{v_2, v_3\}) = 3$, $\lambda(\{v_3, v_4\}) = 4$, and $\lambda(\{v_4, v_5\}) = 1$. A fastest temporal path from v_1 to v_5 first traverses edge $\{v_1, v_2\}$ at time 3, then edge $\{v_2, v_3\}$ at time 8, then edge $\{v_3, v_4\}$ at time 9, and then edge $\{v_4, v_5\}$ at time 11, and has duration 9.

among all vertices [1, 45, 52] or a subset of vertices [45], or to restrict reachability [23]. Among all these works, periodic labelings and the duration of the temporal paths were only considered in [27, 46].

Numerous further problems related to temporal connectivity have been studied [15, 21, 22, 24, 26, 29, 33, 53, 55, 63]. Due to the added temporal dimension, the considered problems are typically computationally harder than their non-temporal counterparts, and some of which do not even have a non-temporal counterpart. In many cases, restricting the underlying topology to trees has been considered to obtain tractability results [2, 44, 47].

2 Preliminaries and notation

We already introduced the most central notions and concepts. There are some additional definitions we need to present our proofs and results, which we give in the following.

An undirected graph $G = (V, E)$ consists of a set V of vertices and a set $E \subseteq \binom{V}{2}$ of edges. For a graph G , we also denote by $V(G)$ and $E(G)$ the vertex and edge set of G , respectively. We denote an edge $e \in E$ between vertices $u, v \in V$ as a set $e = \{u, v\}$.

Let $G = (V, E)$ and $\Delta \in \mathbb{N}$, and let $\lambda : E \rightarrow \{1, 2, \dots, \Delta\}$ be an edge-labeling function that assigns to every edge of G exactly one of the labels from $\{1, \dots, \Delta\}$. Then we denote by (G, λ, Δ) the Δ -periodic temporal graph (G, L) , where for every edge $e \in E$ we have $L(e) = \{\lambda(e) + i\Delta \mid i \geq 0\}$. In this case, we call λ a Δ -periodic labeling of G . When it is clear from the context, we drop Δ from the notation and we denote the (Δ -periodic) temporal graph by (G, λ) .

A temporal (s, z) -walk (or *temporal walk*) of length k from vertex $s = v_0$ to vertex $z = v_k$ in a Δ -periodic temporal graph (G, L) is a sequence $P = ((v_{i-1}, v_i, t_i))_{i=1}^k$ of triples that we call *transitions*, such that for all $i \in [k]$ we have that $t_i \in L(\{v_{i-1}, v_i\})$ and for all $i \in [k-1]$ we have that $t_i < t_{i+1}$. Moreover, we call P a *temporal (s, z) -path* (or *temporal path*) of length k if $v_i \neq v_j$ for all $i, j \in \{0, \dots, k\}$ with $i \neq j$. Given a temporal path $P = ((v_{i-1}, v_i, t_i))_{i=1}^k$, we denote the set of vertices of P by $V(P) = \{v_0, v_1, \dots, v_k\}$. A temporal (s, z) -path $P = ((v_{i-1}, v_i, t_i))_{i=1}^k$ is *fastest* if for all temporal (s, z) -path $P' = ((v'_{i-1}, v'_i, t'_i))_{i=1}^{k'}$ we have that $t_k - t_0 \leq t'_{k'} - t'_0$. We say that the *duration* of P is $d(P) = t_k - t_0 + 1$. Furthermore, the concept of *travel delays* is very important for our proofs.

► **Definition 2** (travel delays). *Let (G, λ) be a Δ -periodic temporal graph. Let $e_1 = \{u, v\}$ and $e_2 = \{v, w\}$ be two incident edges in G with $e_1 \cap e_2 = v$. We define the travel delay from u to w at vertex v , denoted with $\tau_v^{u,w}$, as follows.*

$$\tau_v^{u,w} = \begin{cases} \lambda(e_2) - \lambda(e_1), & \text{if } \lambda(e_2) > \lambda(e_1), \\ \lambda(e_2) - \lambda(e_1) + \Delta, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

From Definition 2 we immediately get the following observation.

► **Observation 3.** Let (G, λ) be a Δ -periodic temporal graph. Let $e_1 = \{u, v\}$ and $e_2 = \{v, w\}$ be two incident edges in G with $e_1 \cap e_2 = v$. Then we have the following.

- $\tau_v^{u,w} = \Delta - \tau_v^{w,u}$ if $\lambda(e_1) \neq \lambda(e_2)$.
- $\tau_v^{u,w} = \tau_v^{w,u} = \Delta$ if $\lambda(e_1) = \lambda(e_2)$.

Intuitively, the value of $\tau_v^{u,w}$ quantifies how long a fastest temporal path waits at vertex v when first traversing edge $\{u, v\}$ and then edge $\{v, w\}$. Formally, we have the following very useful lemma.

► **Lemma 4.** Let $P = ((v_{i-1}, v_i, t_i))_{i=1}^k$ be a fastest temporal (s, z) -path. Then we have

$$d(P) = 1 + \sum_{i \in [k-1]} \tau_{v_i}^{v_{i-1}, v_{i+1}}.$$

Proof. This statement can straightforwardly be shown by induction on k . For $k = 1$ it follows from Definition 2 and the definition of the duration of a fastest temporal path. For $k > 1$ we obtain the following.

$$\begin{aligned} d(P) &= t_k - t_0 + 1 = (t_{k-1} - t_0 + 1) + t_k - t_{k-1} \\ &= (1 + \sum_{i \in [k-2]} \tau_{v_i}^{v_{i-1}, v_{i+1}}) + t_k - t_{k-1} \\ &= (1 + \sum_{i \in [k-2]} \tau_{v_i}^{v_{i-1}, v_{i+1}}) + \tau_{v_{k-1}}^{v_{k-2}, v_k} \\ &= 1 + \sum_{i \in [k-1]} \tau_{v_i}^{v_{i-1}, v_{i+1}}. \end{aligned}$$

Here, we use Definition 2 and the fact that P is a fastest temporal path to obtain $t_k - t_{k-1} = \tau_{v_{k-1}}^{v_{k-2}, v_k}$. ◀

3 NP-hardness of TTR

In this section, we prove that TTR is NP-hard. In fact, it remains hard even in quite restrictive settings: when the input tree has constant diameter or constant maximum degree, and in addition the period Δ is also constant. We remark that the diameter can be seen as a measure of how “star-like” a tree is. In particular, on trees, the diameter upper bounds the treedepth. Formally, we show the following.

► **Theorem 5.** TTR is NP-hard even if Δ is constant, and

- the input tree G has constant diameter, or
- the input tree G has constant maximum degree.

To show Theorem 5 we present two polynomial-time many-one reductions from the NP-hard problem MONOTONE NOT-ALL-EQUAL 3-SATISFIABILITY (MONNAE3SAT) [?] to TTR.

MONOTONE NOT-ALL-EQUAL 3-SATISFIABILITY (MONNAE3SAT)

Input: A set X of Boolean variables and a set $C \subseteq \binom{X}{3}$ of clauses, each of which contains three variables.

Question: Is there an assignment to the variables X such that for each clause in C at least one variable is set to true and at least one variable is set to false?

6 Realizing temporal transportation trees

We give one reduction showing that TTR is NP-hard even if the input tree G has constant diameter and we give a second reduction showing that TTR is NP-hard even if G has constant maximum degree. Both reductions are based on similar ideas. Before we give formal descriptions, we present several properties of labelings that we will exploit in the reductions.

The first property establishes a relation between the duration of a fastest temporal path from s to t and the duration of a fastest temporal path from t back to s .

► **Lemma 6.** *Let G be a tree and (G, λ) be a Δ -periodic temporal graph. Let $P_{s,t} = ((v_{i-1}, v_i, t_i))_{i=1}^k$ be a fastest temporal path in (G, λ) from $s = v_0$ to $t = v_k$. Let $P_{t,s}$ be a fastest temporal path in (G, λ) from t to s . Then we have*

$$d(P_{s,t}) + d(P_{t,s}) \geq (k-1) \cdot \Delta + 2.$$

Furthermore, if for all $i \in [k-1]$ we have $\lambda(\{v_{i-1}, v_i\}) \neq \lambda(\{v_i, v_{i+1}\})$, then we have

$$d(P_{s,t}) + d(P_{t,s}) = (k-1) \cdot \Delta + 2.$$

Proof. This follows directly from Lemma 4 and Observation 3. ◀

From Lemma 6, we immediately get the following.

► **Corollary 7.** *Let (G, D, Δ) be a yes-instance of TTR. Let $P_{s,t} = ((v_{i-1}, v_i, t_i))_{i=1}^k$ with $k > 1$ be a fastest temporal path in (G, λ) from $s = v_0$ to $t = v_k$. Assume that $D_{s,t} + D_{t,s} = (k-1) \cdot \Delta + 2$. Then for every solution λ , we have*

$$\lambda(\{v_0, v_1\}) = \lambda(\{v_{k-1}, v_k\}) - D_{s,t} + i \cdot \Delta + 1,$$

for some (uniquely determined) $i \geq 0$.

Intuitively, Corollary 7 allows us to use the matrix D “force” certain labels of certain pairs of edges to be a function of each other. In particular, we can force the labels of certain pairs of edges to be the same. We will heavily exploit this in the gadgets of the reduction.

The next property provides some insight into the maximum duration that any fastest temporal path in a Δ -periodic temporal graph can have.

► **Lemma 8.** *Let (G, λ) be a Δ -periodic temporal graph. Let $P = ((v_{i-1}, v_i, t_i))_{i=1}^k$ be a fastest temporal path in (G, λ) . Then we have $d(P) \leq (k-1) \cdot \Delta + 1$. Furthermore, if $d(P) = (k-1) \cdot \Delta + 1$, then we have for all $i \in [k-1]$ that $\lambda(\{v_{i-1}, v_i\}) = \lambda(\{v_i, v_{i+1}\})$.*

Proof. This follows directly from Lemma 4 and Observation 3. ◀


Intuitively, Lemma 8 tells us which values in D essentially do not put any constraints on a solution labeling. More formally, given a graph G and two vertices s, t of distance k in G , then we say that the upper bound $D_{s,t}$ is *trivial* if $D_{s,t} = (k-1) \cdot \Delta + 1$.

Next, we present variable gadgets and clause gadgets that we use in the reductions. The above properties will help us to prove that the gadgets have the desired functionality. From now on, assume that we are given an instance (X, C) of MONNAE3SAT. We set $\Delta = 5$.

For each variable $x \in X$ we create a *variable gadget* (G_x, D) , where $G_x = (V_x, E_x)$ with $V_x = \{w_x, v_{x,1}, v_{x,2}\}$ and $E_x = \{\{w_x, v_{x,1}\}, \{v_{x,1}, v_{x,2}\}\}$. We set $D_{w_x, v_{x,2}} = 3$ and make all other upper bounds trivial.

For each clause $c \in C$ we create a *clause gadget* (G_c, D) , where $G_c = (V_c, E_c)$ with

■ $V_c = \{w_c, u_{c,1}, u_{c,2}, u_{c,3}, u_{c,4}, u_{c,5}, u_{c,6}\}$, and



■ **Figure 2** Visualization of the variable gadget (left) and the clause gadget (right). Informally, the label on the bold edge of the variable gadget models whether the variable is set to true or false. The three bold edges in the clause gadget correspond to the three variables of the clause. Informally, the clause gadget forbids that all three of those edges obtain the same label, which corresponds to the clause being satisfied if not all three variables are set to the same Boolean value.

$$\blacksquare E_c = \{\{w_c, u_{c,1}\}, \{u_{c,1}, u_{c,2}\}, \{u_{c,1}, u_{c,3}\}, \{u_{c,1}, u_{c,4}\}, \{u_{c,4}, u_{c,5}\}, \{u_{c,4}, u_{c,6}\}\}.$$


Furthermore, we set

- $D_{u_{c,2}, u_{c,4}} = 4$ and $D_{u_{c,4}, u_{c,2}} = 3$,
- $D_{u_{c,5}, u_{c,6}} = 4$ and $D_{u_{c,6}, u_{c,5}} = 3$,
- $D_{u_{c,3}, u_{c,5}} = 6$ and $D_{u_{c,5}, u_{c,3}} = 6$,
- $D_{w_c, u_{c,6}} = 10$,

and make all other upper bounds trivial.

A visualization of the variable gadget and the clause gadget is given in Figure 2. For the two hardness results, we arrange the variable and clause gadgets in different ways. One way produces a tree with constant treewidth, and a second way produces a tree with constant maximum degree. The main idea in both cases is the following. Assume the three variables in each clause are ordered in a fixed but arbitrary way.

- We ensure that all edges $\{w_x, v_{x,1}\}$ of all variable gadgets G_x need to receive the same label. For the sake of creating an intuition, assume this label is one.
- Then the only non-trivial duration upper bound in the variable gadget G_x forces the label on the edge $\{v_{x,1}, v_{x,2}\}$ of each variable gadget to be either two or three. We interpret choosing label two as setting the variable to true, and choosing label three as setting the variable to false.
- In each clause gadget G_c , we associate edge $\{w_c, u_{c,1}\}$ with the first variable of the clause, say x , and use the matrix D to force the label on edge $\{w_c, u_{c,1}\}$ the same as the label on edge $\{v_{x,1}, v_{x,2}\}$. Similarly, we associate edge $\{u_{c,1}, u_{c,4}\}$ with the second variable y of the clause, and we associate edge $\{u_{c,4}, u_{c,6}\}$ with the third variable z of the clause. We use the matrix D to force the label on edge $\{u_{c,1}, u_{c,4}\}$ the same as the label on edge $\{v_{y,1}, v_{y,2}\}$, and to force the label on edge $\{u_{c,4}, u_{c,6}\}$ the same as the label on edge $\{v_{z,1}, v_{z,2}\}$.
- Then the only non-trivial duration upper bound in the clause gadget G_c forces forbids that all three edges $\{w_c, u_{c,1}\}$, $\{u_{c,1}, u_{c,4}\}$, and $\{u_{c,4}, u_{c,6}\}$ receive the same label. Intuitively,



■ **Figure 3** Illustration of $G^{(1)}$ with three variable gadgets for variables x, y, z , a clause gadget for clause c and sketched the connection to a second clause gadget for clause c' . A labeling λ is illustrated that would be created (see proof of Lemma 11) if clause c contains x as the first, y as the second, and z as the third variable, and x is set to true, y is set to true, and z is set to false.

this ensures that at least one variable in the clause needs to be set to true, and at least one variable in the clause needs to be set to false.

Now we formally describe how to create an instance $(G^{(1)}, D^{(1)}, \Delta)$ of TTR where $G^{(1)}$ is a tree with constant diameter. We start with two vertices w^* and w^{**} that are connected by an edge $\{w^*, w^{**}\}$. Now for each variable x , we identify the vertex w_x of the variable gadget G_x with w^* . For each clause c , we identify the vertex w_c of the clause gadget G_c with w^* . This finishes the construction of $G^{(1)}$, for an illustration see Figure 3. The following is easy to observe.

► **Observation 9.** *The tree $G^{(1)}$ has diameter 6.*

Now we describe how to construct $D^{(1)}$. First of all, for each pair of vertices from the same gadget, the matrix $D^{(1)}$ adopts the values from the matrix of that gadget. For each variable x , we set $D_{v_{x,1}, w^{**}}^{(1)} = 2$. Let x be a variable that appears in clause c . Then we set the following values in $D^{(1)}$.

- If x is the first variable in c , then we set $D_{v_{x,2}, u_{c,1}}^{(1)} = 6$ and $D_{u_{c,1}, v_{x,2}}^{(1)} = 6$.
- If x is the second variable in c , then we set $D_{v_{x,2}, u_{c,2}}^{(1)} = 8$ and $D_{u_{c,2}, v_{x,2}}^{(1)} = 9$.
- If x is the third variable in c , then we set $D_{v_{x,2}, u_{c,3}}^{(1)} = 8$ and $D_{u_{c,3}, v_{x,2}}^{(1)} = 9$.

We set all other entries of $D^{(1)}$ to trivial upper bounds.

This finishes the construction of the instance $(G^{(1)}, D^{(1)}, \Delta)$. Clearly, we have the following.

► **Observation 10.** *The instance $(G^{(1)}, D^{(1)}, \Delta)$ of TTR can be computed in polynomial time.*

In the following we show that $(G^{(1)}, D^{(1)}, \Delta)$ is a yes-instance of TTR if and only if (X, C) is a yes-instance of MONNAE3SAT. We begin by proving the following direction of the statement.

► **Lemma 11.** *If (X, C) is a yes-instance of MONNAE3SAT, then $(G^{(1)}, D^{(1)}, \Delta)$ is a yes-instance of TTR.*

Proof. Let (X, C) be a yes-instance of MONNAE3SAT and let $\phi : X \rightarrow \{\text{true}, \text{false}\}$ be a solution for (X, C) . Then we construct a solution λ for $(G^{(1)}, D^{(1)}, \Delta)$ as follows. See Figure 3 for an illustration of the solution we create.

We set $\lambda(\{w^*, w^{**}\}) = 2$. Now consider the variable gadget for variable x . We set $\lambda(\{w^*, v_{x,1}\}) = 1$ and thereby obey the upper bound $D_{v_{x,1}, w^{**}}^{(1)} = 2$. If $\phi(x) = \text{true}$, when we set $\lambda(\{v_{x,1}, v_{x,2}\}) = 2$, otherwise we set $\lambda(\{v_{x,1}, v_{x,2}\}) = 3$. Note that in both cases the upper bound $D_{w^*, v_{x,2}} = 3$ is respected (recall that we identified w_x with w^*). Now we have given labels to all edges corresponding to variable gadgets.

Next, consider clause c . Let x be the first variable in c . Then we set $\lambda(\{w^*, u_{c,1}\}) = \lambda(\{v_{x,1}, v_{x,2}\})$. It is straightforward to verify that this ensures that both upper bounds $D_{v_{x,2}, u_{c,1}}^{(1)} = 6$ and $D_{u_{c,1}, v_{x,2}}^{(1)} = 6$ are respected.

Let y be the second variable in c . Then we set $\lambda(\{u_{c,1}, u_{c,2}\}) = \lambda(\{v_{y,1}, v_{y,2}\}) + 2$ and $\lambda(\{u_{c,1}, u_{c,4}\}) = \lambda(\{v_{y,1}, v_{y,2}\})$. First, note that this means that we set $\lambda(\{u_{c,1}, u_{c,2}\})$ either to 4 or to 5. Second, we have set $D_{v_{y,2}, u_{c,2}}^{(1)} = 8$ and $D_{u_{c,2}, v_{y,2}}^{(1)} = 9$. Third, we have set $D_{u_{c,2}, u_{c,4}}^{(1)} = 4$ and $D_{u_{c,4}, u_{c,2}}^{(1)} = 3$. We first argue that the two upper bounds $D_{v_{y,2}, u_{c,2}}^{(1)} = 8$ and $D_{u_{c,2}, v_{y,2}}^{(1)} = 9$ are respected. The path in $G^{(1)}$ from $v_{y,2}$ to $u_{c,2}$ follows the following ordered sequence of edges.

$$\{v_{y,2}, v_{y,1}\}, \{v_{y,1}, w^*\}, \{w^*, u_{c,1}\}, \{u_{c,1}, u_{c,2}\}$$

By Lemma 4 we know that the duration of a fastest path P from $v_{y,2}$ to $u_{c,2}$ when using the Δ -periodic labeling λ on $G^{(1)}$ is

$$d(P) = 1 + \tau_{v_{y,1}}^{v_{y,2}, w^*} + \tau_{w^*}^{v_{y,1}, u_{c,1}} + \tau_{u_{c,1}}^{w^*, u_{c,2}}.$$

Furthermore, we know that $\lambda(\{v_{y,1}, w^*\}) = 1$ and $\lambda(\{w^*, u_{c,1}\}) \in \{2, 3\}$. Since $\lambda(\{v_{y,2}, v_{y,1}\}) > 1$ it follows that

- $\tau_{v_{y,1}}^{v_{y,2}, w^*} = 6 - \lambda(\{v_{y,2}, v_{y,1}\})$ (recall that $\Delta = 5$),
- $\tau_{w^*}^{v_{y,1}, u_{c,1}} = \lambda(\{w^*, u_{c,1}\}) - 1$, and
- $\tau_{u_{c,1}}^{w^*, u_{c,2}} = \lambda(\{u_{c,1}, u_{c,2}\}) - \lambda(\{w^*, u_{c,1}\})$, since we know that $\lambda(\{u_{c,1}, u_{c,2}\}) > \lambda(\{w^*, u_{c,1}\})$.

It follows that

$$d(P) = 6 - \lambda(\{v_{y,2}, v_{y,1}\}) + \lambda(\{u_{c,1}, u_{c,2}\}).$$

Hence, we get that $D_{v_{y,2}, u_{c,2}}^{(1)} = 8$ imposes the constraint that

$$-\lambda(\{v_{y,2}, v_{y,1}\}) + \lambda(\{u_{c,1}, u_{c,2}\}) \leq 2.$$

Note that setting $\lambda(\{u_{c,1}, u_{c,2}\}) = \lambda(\{v_{y,1}, v_{y,2}\}) + 2$ fulfills this inequality.

By a symmetric argument, we also get that the constraint imposed by $D_{u_{c,2}, v_{y,2}}^{(1)} = 9$ is fulfilled. We next show that the upper bounds $D_{u_{c,2}, u_{c,4}}^{(1)} = 4$ and $D_{u_{c,4}, u_{c,2}}^{(1)} = 3$ are obeyed. The path in $G^{(1)}$ from $u_{c,2}$ to $u_{c,4}$ first traverses the edge $\{u_{c,2}, u_{c,1}\}$ and then the edge $\{u_{c,1}, u_{c,4}\}$. By Lemma 4 we know that the duration of a fastest path P from $u_{c,2}$ to $u_{c,4}$ when using the Δ -periodic labeling λ on $G^{(1)}$ is $d(P) = 1 + \tau_{u_{c,1}}^{u_{c,2}, u_{c,4}}$. We have that $\tau_{u_{c,1}}^{u_{c,2}, u_{c,4}} = 3$ and $\tau_{u_{c,1}}^{u_{c,4}, u_{c,2}} = 2$. It follows that both the upper bounds $D_{u_{c,2}, u_{c,4}}^{(1)} = 4$ and $D_{u_{c,4}, u_{c,2}}^{(1)} = 3$ are respected.

Let z be the third variable in c . Then we set $\lambda(\{u_{c,1}, u_{c,4}\}) = \lambda(\{u_{c,4}, u_{c,5}\}) = \lambda(\{v_{z,1}, v_{z,2}\}) + 2$ and $\lambda(\{u_{c,4}, u_{c,6}\}) = \lambda(\{v_{z,1}, v_{z,2}\})$. By an analysis analogous to the one made for the second variable in c it holds that the constraints corresponding to $D_{u_{c,5}, u_{c,6}}^{(1)} = 4$

and $D_{u_{c,6},u_{c,5}}^{(1)} = 3$, $D_{u_{c,3},u_{c,5}}^{(1)} = 6$ and $D_{u_{c,5},u_{c,3}}^{(1)} = 6$, and $D_{v_{z,2},u_{c,3}}^{(1)} = 8$ and $D_{u_{c,3},v_{z,2}}^{(1)} = 9$ are fulfilled.

It remains to show that the upper bound imposed by $D_{w^*,u_{c,6}}^{(1)} = 10$ is obeyed (recall that we identify w_c with w^*). Assume for contradiction that it is not. Then by Lemma 8 we have that

$$\lambda(\{w^*, u_{c,1}\}) = \lambda(\{u_{c,1}, u_{c,4}\}) = \lambda(\{u_{c,4}, u_{c,6}\}).$$

However, this can only be the case if variables x, y, z are all set to true or if variables x, y, z are all set to false. In both cases, the clause c is not satisfied, a contradiction. Hence, since all other upper bounds in $D^{(1)}$ are trivial, we can conclude that the constructed labeling λ is indeed a solution for $(G^{(1)}, D^{(1)}, \Delta)$. \blacktriangleleft

We proceed with showing the other direction of the correctness.

► Lemma 12. *If $(G^{(1)}, D^{(1)}, \Delta)$ is a yes-instance of TTR, then (X, C) is a yes-instance of MONNAE3SAT.*


Proof. Let $(G^{(1)}, D^{(1)}, \Delta)$ be a yes-instance of TTR and let labeling λ be solution for the instance. We construct a satisfying assignment for the variables in X as follows.

First, observe that adding a constant (modulo Δ) to all labels does not change any duration of any fastest temporal path in the Δ -periodic temporal graph $(G^{(1)}, \lambda)$. Hence, we can assume w.l.o.g. that $\lambda(\{w^*, w^{**}\}) = 2$. Since for all variables x we have that $D_{v_{x,1},w^{**}}^{(1)} = 2$, we must also have that $\lambda(\{v_{x,1}, w^*\}) = 1$. Furthermore, since $D_{w^*,v_{x,2}}^{(1)} = 3$ (recall that we identify w_x with w^*), we must have that $\lambda(\{v_{x,1}, v_{x,2}\}) \in \{2, 3\}$. If $\lambda(\{v_{x,1}, v_{x,2}\}) = 2$, then we set the variable x to true. Otherwise, we set the variable x to false. We claim that this yields a satisfying assignment for (X, C) .

Assume for contradiction that it is not. Then there is a clause $c \in C$ that is not satisfied, that is, either all three variables in the clause are set to true or all three variables are set to false. Assume that x, y, z are the three variables in c and all of them are set to true (the case where all of them are set to false is symmetric). This means that $\lambda(\{v_{x,1}, v_{x,2}\}) = \lambda(\{v_{y,1}, v_{y,2}\}) = \lambda(\{v_{z,1}, v_{z,2}\}) = 2$. Assume that w.l.o.g. that x is the first variable of c , variable y is second, and z is the third variable of c . Note that then we have $D_{v_{x,2},u_{c,1}}^{(1)} = 6$ and $D_{u_{c,1},v_{x,2}}^{(1)} = 6$, $D_{v_{y,2},u_{c,2}}^{(1)} = 8$ and $D_{u_{c,2},v_{y,2}}^{(1)} = 9$, and $D_{v_{z,2},u_{c,3}}^{(1)} = 8$ and $D_{u_{c,3},v_{z,2}}^{(1)} = 9$. Furthermore, the path from $v_{x,2}$ to $u_{c,1}$ in $G^{(1)}$ has length three, and the paths from $v_{y,2}$ to $u_{c,2}$ and from $v_{z,2}$ to $u_{c,3}$ in $G^{(1)}$ each have length four. See Figure 3 for an illustration of $G^{(1)}$. It follows that Corollary 7 applies and we can deduce that $\lambda(\{w^*, u_{c,1}\}) = 2$ and $\lambda(\{u_{c,1}, u_{c,2}\}) = \lambda(\{u_{c,1}, u_{c,3}\}) = 4$. Moreover, we have that $D_{u_{c,2},u_{c,4}}^{(1)} = 4$ and $D_{u_{c,4},u_{c,2}}^{(1)} = 3$. Since the path from $u_{c,2}$ to $u_{c,4}$ in $G^{(1)}$ has length two, we get by Corollary 7 that $\lambda(\{u_{c,1}, u_{c,4}\}) = 2$. Lastly, we have $D_{u_{c,5},u_{c,6}}^{(1)} = 4$ and $D_{u_{c,6},u_{c,5}}^{(1)} = 3$, and $D_{u_{c,3},u_{c,5}}^{(1)} = 6$ and $D_{u_{c,5},u_{c,3}}^{(1)} = 6$. The path from $u_{c,3}$ to $u_{c,5}$ in $G^{(1)}$ has length three. By Corollary 7 we get that $\lambda(\{u_{c,4}, u_{c,5}\}) = 4$. The path from $u_{c,5}$ to $u_{c,6}$ in $G^{(1)}$ has length two. By Corollary 7 we get that $\lambda(\{u_{c,4}, u_{c,6}\}) = 2$. Summarizing, we get that

$$\lambda(\{w^*, u_{c,1}\}) = \lambda(\{u_{c,1}, u_{c,4}\}) = \lambda(\{u_{c,4}, u_{c,6}\}) = 2.$$

This implies that the duration of a fastest path from w^* to $u_{c,6}$ in $(G^{(1)}, \lambda)$ is 11. However, we have $D_{w^*,u_{c,6}}^{(1)} = 10$ (recall that we identify w_c with w^*), a contradiction to the assumption that λ is a solution for $(G^{(1)}, D^{(1)}, \Delta)$. \blacktriangleleft



■ **Figure 4** Illustration of $G^{(2)}$. Depicted are three variable gadgets for variables x, y, z where x is ordered first, y is ordered second, and z is ordered third. Additionally, a clause gadget for clause c and sketch of a second clause gadget for clause c' are depicted, where clause c' is ordered (not directly) after clause c . A labeling λ is illustrated that would be created (see proof of Lemma 15) if clause c contains x as the first, y as the second, and z as the third variable, and x is set to true, y is set to true, and z is set to false.

Lemmas 11 and 12 together with Observations 9 and 10 prove the first part of Theorem 5, namely that TTR is NP-hard even if the input tree G has constant diameter. In the remainder, we prove that TTR is NP-hard even if the input tree G has constant maximum degree. We provide a second reduction from MONNAE3SAT that uses the same variable and clause gadgets, but arranges them in a different way. Intuitively, we replace the vertex w^* in $G^{(1)}$ with a long path.

We now formally describe how to create an instance $(G^{(2)}, D^{(2)}, \Delta)$ of TTR where $G^{(2)}$ is a tree with constant maximum degree. For each variable x , we introduce a new vertex w'_x and connect it to the vertex w_x of the variable gadget G_x , that is, we add edge $\{w_x, w'_x\}$. For each clause c , we introduce a new vertex w'_c and connect it to the vertex w_c of the clause gadget G_c , that is, we add edge $\{w_c, w'_c\}$. Next, we order the variables in some fixed but arbitrary way and we order the clauses in some fixed but arbitrary way. Let x and y be two variables that are consecutive in the ordering and y is ordered after x . Then we connect w_x with w'_y , that is, we add edge $\{w_x, w'_y\}$. Let c and c' be two clauses that are consecutive in the ordering and c' is ordered after c . Then we connect w_c with $w'_{c'}$, that is, we add edge $\{w_c, w'_{c'}\}$. Finally, let z be the variable that is ordered last and let c' be the clause that is ordered first. Then we connect w_z with $w'_{c'}$, that is, we add edge $\{w_z, w'_{c'}\}$. This finishes the construction of $G^{(2)}$, for an illustration see Figure 4. The following is easy to observe.

► **Observation 13.** *The tree $G^{(2)}$ has maximum degree 4.*

Now we describe how to construct $D^{(2)}$. First of all, for each pair of vertices from the same gadget, the matrix $D^{(2)}$ adopts the values from the matrix of that gadget. For each variable x , we set $D^{(2)}_{w'_x, v_{x,1}} = 2$. For each pair of variables x, y that are ordered consecutively, where x is ordered before y , we set $D^{(2)}_{w'_x, w_y} = 6$ and $D^{(2)}_{w_y, w'_x} = 6$.

Let x be a variable that appears in clause c . Let x be the i th variable in the ordering and let c be the j th clause in the ordering. Denote $|X| = n$. Then we set the following values in $D^{(2)}$.

- If x is the first variable in c , then we set

$$D_{v_{x,2}, u_{c,1}}^{(2)} = 5(n - i + j) + 6 \text{ and } D_{u_{c,1}, v_{x,2}}^{(2)} = 5(n - i + j) + 6.$$

- If x is the second variable in c , then we set

$$D_{v_{x,2}, u_{c,2}}^{(2)} = 5(n - i + j) + 8 \text{ and } D_{u_{c,2}, v_{x,2}}^{(2)} = 5(n - i + j) + 9.$$

- If x is the third variable in c , then we set

$$D_{v_{x,2}, u_{c,3}}^{(2)} = 5(n - i + j) + 8 \text{ and } D_{u_{c,3}, v_{x,2}}^{(2)} = 5(n - i + j) + 9.$$

We set all other entries of $D^{(2)}$ to trivial upper bounds.

This finishes the construction of the instance $(G^{(2)}, D^{(2)}, \Delta)$. Clearly, we have the following.

► **Observation 14.** *The instance $(G^{(2)}, D^{(2)}, \Delta)$ of TTR can be computed in polynomial time.*

In the following we show that $(G^{(2)}, D^{(2)}, \Delta)$ is a yes-instance of TTR if and only if (X, C) is a yes-instance of MONNAE3SAT. This is done in a similar way as in Lemmas 11 and 12. We begin by proving the following direction of the statement.

► **Lemma 15.** *If (X, C) is a yes-instance of MONNAE3SAT, then $(G^{(2)}, D^{(2)}, \Delta)$ is a yes-instance of TTR.*

Proof. Let (X, C) be a yes-instance of MONNAE3SAT and let $\phi : X \rightarrow \{\text{true}, \text{false}\}$ be a solution for (X, C) . Then we construct a solution λ for $(G^{(2)}, D^{(2)}, \Delta)$ as follows. See Figure 4 for an illustration of the solution we create.

Consider the variable gadget for variable x . We set $\lambda(\{w'_x, w_x\}) = 5$ and $\lambda(\{w_x, v_{x,1}\}) = 1$ and thereby obey the upper bound $D_{w'_x, v_{x,1}}^{(2)} = 2$. If $\phi(x) = \text{true}$, when we set $\lambda(\{v_{x,1}, v_{x,2}\}) = 2$, otherwise we set $\lambda(\{v_{x,1}, v_{x,2}\}) = 3$. Note that in both cases the upper bound $D_{w_x, v_{x,2}} = 3$ is respected. Lastly, if x is not the last variable in the ordering, we set $\lambda(\{w_x, w'_y\}) = 4$, where y is the variable directly after x in the ordering, otherwise, we set $\lambda(\{w_x, w'_c\}) = 4$, where c is the first clause in the ordering. Now we have given labels to all edges corresponding to variable gadgets. It is easy to check that for each pair of variables x, y that are ordered consecutively, where x is ordered before y , the upper bounds $D_{w'_x, w_y}^{(2)} = 6$ and $D_{w_y, w'_x}^{(2)} = 6$ are respected.

Next, consider clause c , and let c be the j th clause in the ordering. We set $\lambda(\{w'_c, w_c\}) = 5$ and $\lambda(\{w_c, w'_c\}) = 4$, where c' is the $(j + 1)$ st clause (if it exists). Note that this ensures that $\tau_{w'_c}^{w_{c'}, w_c} = 1$ and $\tau_{w_c}^{w'_c, w'_c} = 4$, where c'' is the $(j - 1)$ st clause (or the last variable). Note that we also have that $\tau_{w'_x}^{w_z, w_x} = 1$ and $\tau_{w_x}^{w'_x, w'_y} = 4$ for all variables x , where z denotes the variable ordered directly before x (if it exists) and y denotes the variable ordered directly after x (or the first clause).

Let x be the first variable in c and let x be the i_x th variable in the ordering. Then we set $\lambda(\{w_c, u_{c,1}\}) = \lambda(\{v_{x,1}, v_{x,2}\})$. Note that the path from $v_{x,2}$ to $u_{c,t}$ has length $2(n - i + j) + 3$. A fastest temporal path P from $v_{x,2}$ to $u_{c,t}$ in $(G^{(2)}, \lambda)$ traverses $n - i$ vertices $w_{x'}$ and $n - i$ vertices $w'_{x'}$ for some variables $x' \neq x$. As observed above travel delays are 4 and 1, respectively. Similarly, P traverses $j - 1$ vertices $w_{c'}$ and $j - 1$ vertices $w'_{c'}$ for some clauses $c' \neq c$. Again, as observed above travel delays are 4 and 1, respectively. Those travel delays sum up to $5(n - i_x + j - 1)$. It follows that

$$d(P) = 1 + 5(n - i_x + j - 1) + \tau_{v_{x,1}}^{v_{x,2}, w_x} + \tau_{w_x}^{v_{x,1}, w'_{x'}} + \tau_{w'_c}^{w_{c'}, w_c} + \tau_{w_c}^{w'_c, u_{c,1}},$$

where x' is the variable ordered directly after x (or the first clause) and c' is the clause ordered directly before c (or the last variable). Furthermore, we know that $\lambda(\{v_{x,1}, w_x\}) = 1$, $\lambda(\{w_x, w'_{x'}\}) = 4$, $\lambda(\{w'_c, w_c\}) = 5$, and $\lambda(\{w_c, u_{c,1}\}) = \lambda(\{v_{x,1}, v_{x,2}\}) \in \{2, 3\}$. Moreover, we have that $\tau_{w'_c}^{w_c, w_c} = 1$. Since $\lambda(\{v_{x,2}, v_{x,1}\}) > 1$ it follows that

- $\tau_{v_{x,1}}^{v_{x,2}, w_x} = 6 - \lambda(\{v_{x,2}, v_{x,1}\})$ (recall that $\Delta = 5$),
- $\tau_{w_x}^{v_{x,1}, w'_{x'}} = 3$, and
- $\tau_{w_c}^{w'_c, u_{c,1}} = \lambda(\{w_c, u_{c,1}\})$, since we know that $\lambda(\{w_c, u_{c,1}\}) < 5$.

We can conclude that both upper bounds $D_{v_{x,2}, u_{c,1}}^{(2)} = 5(n - i_x + j) + 6$ and $D_{u_{c,1}, v_{x,2}}^{(2)} = 5(n - i_x + j) + 6$ are respected.

Let y be the second variable in c and let y be the i_y th variable in the ordering. Then we set $\lambda(\{u_{c,1}, u_{c,2}\}) = \lambda(\{v_{y,1}, v_{y,2}\}) + 2$ and $\lambda(\{u_{c,1}, u_{c,4}\}) = \lambda(\{v_{y,1}, v_{y,2}\})$. By an analysis analogous to the one made in Lemma 11 and for the first variable in c it holds that the constraints corresponding to $D_{u_{c,2}, u_{c,4}}^{(2)} = 4$ and $D_{u_{c,4}, u_{c,2}}^{(2)} = 3$, and $D_{v_{y,2}, u_{c,2}}^{(2)} = 5(n - i_y + j) + 8$ and $D_{u_{c,2}, v_{y,2}}^{(2)} = 5(n - i_y + j) + 9$ are fulfilled.

Let z be the third variable in c and let z be the i_z th variable in the ordering. Then we set $\lambda(\{u_{c,1}, u_{c,4}\}) = \lambda(\{u_{c,4}, u_{c,5}\}) = \lambda(\{v_{z,1}, v_{z,2}\}) + 2$ and $\lambda(\{u_{c,4}, u_{c,6}\}) = \lambda(\{v_{z,1}, v_{z,2}\})$. By an analysis analogous to the one made in Lemma 11 and for the first variable in c it holds that the constraints corresponding to $D_{u_{c,5}, u_{c,6}}^{(2)} = 4$ and $D_{u_{c,6}, u_{c,5}}^{(2)} = 3$, $D_{u_{c,3}, u_{c,5}}^{(2)} = 6$ and $D_{u_{c,5}, u_{c,3}}^{(2)} = 6$, and $D_{v_{z,2}, u_{c,3}}^{(2)} = 5(n - i_z + j) + 8$ and $D_{u_{c,3}, v_{z,2}}^{(2)} = 5(n - i_z + j) + 9$ are fulfilled.

It remains to show that the upper bound imposed by $D_{w_c, u_{c,6}}^{(2)} = 10$ is obeyed. Assume for contradiction that it is not. Then by Lemma 8 we have that

$$\lambda(\{w_c, u_{c,1}\}) = \lambda(\{u_{c,1}, u_{c,4}\}) = \lambda(\{u_{c,4}, u_{c,6}\}).$$

However, this can only be the case if variables x, y, z are all set to true or if variables x, y, z are all set to false. In both cases, the clause c is not satisfied, a contradiction. Hence, since all other upper bounds in $D^{(2)}$ are trivial, we can conclude that the constructed labeling λ is indeed a solution for $(G^{(2)}, D^{(2)}, \Delta)$. ◀

We proceed with showing the other direction of the correctness.

► **Lemma 16.** *If $(G^{(2)}, D^{(2)}, \Delta)$ is a yes-instance of TTR, then (X, C) is a yes-instance of MONNAE3SAT.*

Proof. Let $(G^{(2)}, D^{(2)}, \Delta)$ be a yes-instance of TTR and let labeling λ be solution for the instance. We construct a satisfying assignment for the variables in X as follows.

First, observe that adding a constant (modulo Δ) to all labels does not change any duration of any fastest temporal path in the Δ -periodic temporal graph $(G^{(2)}, \lambda)$. Hence, we can assume w.l.o.g. that $\lambda(\{w'_x, w_x\}) = 5$, where x is the first variable. Let y be the second variable. We have that $D_{w'_x, w_y}^{(2)} = 6$ and $D_{w_y, w'_x}^{(2)} = 6$. It follows by Corollary 7 that also $\lambda(\{w'_y, w_y\}) = 5$. By iterating this argument, we obtain that for all variables x , we have that $\lambda(\{w'_x, w_x\}) = 5$. Since for all variables x we further have that $D_{w'_x, v_{x,1}} = 2$, we must also have that $\lambda(\{v_{x,1}, w_x\}) = 1$. Furthermore, since $D_{w_x, v_{x,2}} = 3$, we must have that $\lambda(\{v_{x,1}, v_{x,2}\}) \in \{2, 3\}$. If $\lambda(\{v_{x,1}, v_{x,2}\}) = 2$, then we set the variable x to true. Otherwise, we set the variable x to false. We claim that this yields a satisfying assignment for (X, C) .

Assume for contradiction that it is not. Then there is a clause $c \in C$ that is not satisfied, that is, either all three variables in the clause are set to true or all three variables are set to false. Let c be the j th clause. Assume that x, y, z are the three variables in c and all of them are set to true (the case where all of them are set to false is symmetric). This means

that $\lambda(\{v_{x,1}, v_{x,2}\}) = \lambda(\{v_{y,1}, v_{y,2}\}) = \lambda(\{v_{z,1}, v_{z,2}\}) = 2$. Assume that w.l.o.g. that x is the first variable of c , variable y is second, and z is the third variable of c . Furthermore, let x be the i_x th variable in the ordering, let y be the i_y th variable in the ordering, and let z be the i_z th variable in the ordering. Note that then we have $D_{v_{x,2}, u_{c,1}}^{(2)} = 5(n - i_x + j) + 6$ and $D_{u_{c,1}, v_{x,2}}^{(2)} = 5(n - i_x + j) + 6$, $D_{v_{y,2}, u_{c,2}}^{(2)} = 5(n - i_y + j) + 8$ and $D_{u_{c,2}, v_{y,2}}^{(2)} = 5(n - i_y + j) + 9$, and $D_{v_{z,2}, u_{c,3}}^{(2)} = 5(n - i_z + j) + 8$ and $D_{u_{c,3}, v_{z,2}}^{(2)} = 5(n - i_z + j) + 9$. Furthermore, the path from $v_{x,2}$ to $u_{c,1}$ in $G^{(2)}$ has length $2(n - i_x + j) + 3$, the path from $v_{y,2}$ to $u_{c,2}$ in $G^{(2)}$ has length $2(n - i_y + j) + 4$, and the path from $v_{z,2}$ to $u_{c,3}$ in $G^{(2)}$ has length $2(n - i_z + j) + 4$. See Figure 4 for an illustration of $G^{(2)}$. It follows that Corollary 7 applies and we can deduce that $\lambda(\{w_c, u_{c,1}\}) = 2$ and $\lambda(\{u_{c,1}, u_{c,2}\}) = \lambda(\{u_{c,1}, u_{c,3}\}) = 4$. Moreover, we have that $D_{u_{c,2}, u_{c,4}}^{(2)} = 4$ and $D_{u_{c,4}, u_{c,2}}^{(2)} = 3$. Since the path from $u_{c,2}$ to $u_{c,4}$ in $G^{(2)}$ has length two, we get by Corollary 7 that $\lambda(\{u_{c,1}, u_{c,4}\}) = 2$. Lastly, we have $D_{u_{c,5}, u_{c,6}}^{(2)} = 4$ and $D_{u_{c,6}, u_{c,5}}^{(2)} = 3$, and $D_{u_{c,3}, u_{c,5}}^{(2)} = 6$ and $D_{u_{c,5}, u_{c,3}}^{(2)} = 6$. The path from $u_{c,3}$ to $u_{c,5}$ in $G^{(2)}$ has length three. By Corollary 7 we get that $\lambda(\{u_{c,4}, u_{c,5}\}) = 4$. The path from $u_{c,5}$ to $u_{c,6}$ in $G^{(2)}$ has length two. By Corollary 7 we get that $\lambda(\{u_{c,4}, u_{c,6}\}) = 2$. Summarizing, we get that

$$\lambda(\{w_c, u_{c,1}\}) = \lambda(\{u_{c,1}, u_{c,4}\}) = \lambda(\{u_{c,4}, u_{c,6}\}) = 2.$$

This implies that the duration of a fastest path from w_c to $u_{c,6}$ in $(G^{(2)}, \lambda)$ is 11. However, we have $D_{w_c, u_{c,6}}^{(2)} = 10$, a contradiction to the assumption that λ is a solution for $(G^{(2)}, D^{(2)}, \Delta)$. \blacktriangleleft

Now we have all ingredients to prove Theorem 5.

Proof of Theorem 5. Recall that we set $\Delta = 5$. Lemmas 11 and 12 together with Observations 9 and 10 prove the first part of Theorem 5, namely that TTR is NP-hard even if the input tree G has constant diameter. Lemmas 15 and 16 together with Observations 13 and 14 prove the second part of Theorem 5, namely that TTR is NP-hard even if the input tree G has constant maximum degree. \blacktriangleleft

4 FPT-algorithm for TTR parameterized by the number of leaves

Our hardness results from the previous section (Theorem 5) exclude FPT-algorithms for a variety of parameters. The parameter we consider here is the number of leaves of the tree, which is larger than the maximum degree of the tree and incomparable to the diameter of the tree.

► **Theorem 17.** *TTR is fixed-parameter tractable when parameterized by the number ℓ of leaves of the input tree G .*

To show Theorem 17 we present a Turing-reduction from TTR to MIXED INTEGER LINEAR PROGRAM (MILP).

MIXED INTEGER LINEAR PROGRAM (MILP)

Input: A vector x of n variables of which some are considered integer variables, a constraint matrix $A \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$, and two vectors $b \in \mathbb{R}^m$, $c \in \mathbb{R}^n$.

Task: Compute an assignment to the variables (if one exists) such that all integer variables are set to integer values, $Ax \leq b$, $x \geq 0$, and $c^\top x$ is maximized.

Given an instance (G, D, Δ) of TTR, we will produce several MILP instances. We will prove that (G, D, Δ) is a yes-instance if and only if at least one of the MILP instances admits a feasible solution. The number of produced instances is upper-bounded by a function of the number ℓ of leaves in G . Each of the produced MILP instances will have a small number of integer values. More precisely, the number of integer values will be upper-bounded by a function of the number ℓ of leaves in G . This will allow us to upper-bound the running time necessary to solve the MILP instances using the following known result.

► **Theorem 18** ([20, 48]). *MILP is fixed-parameter tractable when parameterized by the number of integer variables.*

Furthermore, we build our MILP formulations in a specific way that ensures that there always exist optimal solutions where *all* variables are set to integer values. Informally, we ensure that the constraint matrix for the rational variables is totally unimodular. This allows us to use the following result.

► **Lemma 19** ([16]). *Let the following be an MILP.*

$$\max c^\top x \text{ subject to } Ax \leq b, x \geq 0.$$

Let $x = (x_{int} \ x_{frac})^\top$, where x_{int} (resp. x_{frac}) denote the integer (resp. fractional) variables of the MILP. Let $A = (A_{int} \ A_{frac})$ where A_{int} are the first $|x_{int}|$ columns of A , that is, the coefficients of the integer variables, and A_{frac} are the remaining columns, that is, the coefficients of the fractional variables. If A_{frac} is totally unimodular, then there exists an optimal solution to the MILP where all variables are set to integer values.

The main idea for the reduction is the following. Given an instance (G, D, Δ) of TTR, we create variables for the travel delays at the vertices of G . A labelling can easily be computed from the travel delays. We use the constraints to ensure that the durations of the fastest paths respect the upper bounds given in D .

Before we start the description of the reduction, we make a straightforward observation on trees.

► **Observation 20.** *Let G be a tree with ℓ leaves. Let $V_{>2}$ be the set of vertices in G with degree larger than two. We have that $|V_{>2}| \leq \ell$. Furthermore, we have for ever $v \in V_{>2}$ that the degree of v is at most ℓ .*

Furthermore, we show that there always exist solutions to yes-instances of TTR, where the two edges incident with degree two vertices have different labels.

► **Lemma 21.** *Let (G, D, Δ) be a yes-instance of TTR. Let V_2 be the set of vertices in G with degree two. Then there exists a solution λ for (G, D, Δ) such that for all $v \in V_2$ we have the following.*

Let u, w denote the two neighbors of v in G . We have that $\lambda(\{u, v\}) \neq \lambda(\{v, w\})$.

Proof. Assume there is a solution λ for (G, D, Δ) such that for some degree two vertex v in G with neighbors u, w we have that $\lambda(\{u, v\}) = \lambda(\{v, w\})$. Then we modify λ as follows. Let G_u be the subtree of G rooted at v that contains u . For each edge e in G_u , if $\lambda(e) = \Delta$ then we set $\lambda(e) = 1$ and otherwise we increase $\lambda(e)$ by one. By Definition 2 we have that this leaves all travel delays except $\tau_v^{u,w}$ and $\tau_v^{w,u}$ unchanged and it decreases $\tau_v^{u,w}$ and $\tau_v^{w,u}$ each by at least one. It follows no duration of a fastest temporal path increases. By iterating this procedure, we can obtain a solution λ' with the desired property. ◀

From now on assume that we are given an instance (G, D, Δ) of TTR. Assume the vertices in G are ordered in an arbitrary but fixed way. Each MILP instance we create will use the same set of variables. For each vertex v in G , we create the following variables:

- If v has degree two, we create a *fractional* variable x_v . This variable will correspond to the travel delay $\tau_v^{u,w}$, where u, w are the two neighbors of v in G and u is ordered before w .
- If v has degree larger than two, then for every pair u, w of neighbors of v in G , we create an *integer* variable $y_v^{u,w}$. This variable will correspond to the travel delay $\tau_v^{u,w}$.

Furthermore, we create an *integer* variable z_e for every edge e that is incident with v . This variable will correspond to the label $\lambda(e)$ of e .

With the help of Observation 20 we can upper-bound the number of created integer variables as follows.

► **Observation 22.** *The number of integer variables in each MILP instance is in $O(\ell^3)$.*

Now we consider all possibilities of how the labels of edges incident with vertices of degree larger than two can relate to each other. Formally, let v be a vertex in G that has degree larger than two and let E_v be the set of edges incident with v . By Observation 20 we have that $|E_v| \leq \ell$. Any labeling λ partitions E_v into at most $\min(\ell, \Delta)$ sets of edges with equal labels, and the values of the labels define an ordering of those sets. We call a partitioning of E_v into at most $\min(\ell, \Delta)$ sets together with the ordering for those sets a *label configuration* for v . A set of label configurations for all vertices v in G that have degree larger than two is called a *global label configuration*. With the help of Observation 20 we get the following.

► **Observation 23.** *There are $O(\ell^2)$ global label configurations.*

For each global label configuration, we create an MILP instance. From now on fix a global label configuration σ . We describe how to construct an MILP instance I_σ . Consider a vertex v in G that has degree larger than two. Let u, w be a pair of neighbors of v in G . Let $e = \{u, v\}$ and $e' = \{v, w\}$. If according to the global label configuration, we have that e and e' are in different parts of E_v and the part of e is ordered before the part of e' (that is, e has a smaller label than e'), then we add the following constraint.

$$y_v^{u,w} = z_{e'} - z_e \tag{1}$$

If the part of e is ordered after the part of e' (that is, e has a larger label than e'), then we add the following constraint.

$$y_v^{u,w} = z_{e'} - z_e + \Delta \tag{2}$$

In both above cases, we additionally add the following constraint.

$$1 \leq y_v^{u,w} \leq \Delta - 1 \tag{3}$$

If according to the global label configuration, we have that e and e' are in the same part of E_v (that is, they have the same label), then we add the following constraints.

$$z_e = z_{e'} \tag{4}$$

$$y_v^{u,w} = \Delta \tag{5}$$

Furthermore, in any of the above cases, we additionally add the following constraints.

$$1 \leq z_e \leq \Delta \quad (6)$$

$$1 \leq z_{e'} \leq \Delta \quad (7)$$

Now we consider all vertex pairs s, t in G that have distance at least two in G , that is, the (unique) path from s to t in G has at least one internal vertex. Let $P_{s,t}$ denote the path from s to t in G . Then $V_{\text{int}}^{(s,t)} = V(P_{s,t}) \setminus \{s, t\}$ is the set of internal vertices of $P_{s,t}$. We partition $V_{\text{int}}^{(s,t)}$ into two sets. Let $V_{\text{int,deg2}}^{(s,t)} \subseteq V_{\text{int}}^{(s,t)}$ be the internal vertices of $P_{s,t}$ with degree two and let $V_{\text{int,deg>2}}^{(s,t)} \subseteq V_{\text{int}}^{(s,t)}$ be the internal vertices with degree larger than two. Now we further partition the two sets of vertices.

We define $V_{\text{int,deg2,f}}^{(s,t)} \subseteq V_{\text{int,deg2}}^{(s,t)}$ such that for all $v \in V_{\text{int,deg2,f}}^{(s,t)}$, the neighbor of v that is closer to s is ordered before the neighbor of v that is closer to t . Analogously, we define $V_{\text{int,deg2,b}}^{(s,t)} \subseteq V_{\text{int,deg2}}^{(s,t)}$ such that for all $v \in V_{\text{int,deg2,b}}^{(s,t)}$, the neighbor of v that is closer to t is ordered before the neighbor of v that is closer to s .

For the vertices in $V_{\text{int,deg>2}}^{(s,t)}$ we additionally define the following. For $v \in V_{\text{int,deg>2}}^{(s,t)}$ let v' denote the neighbor of v that is on the path from v to s and let v'' denote the neighbor of v that is on the path from v to t . We define $u^{(s,t)}(v) = v'$ and $w^{(s,t)}(v) = v''$.

We add the following constraint for the vertex pair s, t .

$$\sum_{v \in V_{\text{int,deg2,f}}^{(s,t)}} x_v + \sum_{v \in V_{\text{int,deg2,b}}^{(s,t)}} (\Delta - x_v) + \sum_{v \in V_{\text{int,deg>2}}^{(s,t)}} y_v^{u^{(s,t)}(v), w^{(s,t)}(v)} \leq D_{s,t} - 1 \quad (8)$$

Finally, for all fractional variables x_v we add the following constraint.

$$1 \leq x_v \leq \Delta - 1 \quad (9)$$

This finishes the description of the constraints. Since we only want to check whether a feasible solution exists, we arbitrarily choose the vector c for the objective function to be the all-one vector. This finishes the description of the MILP instance I_σ . Clearly, for a given global label configuration, the MILP instance can be constructed in polynomial time.

► **Observation 24.** *Given a global label configuration σ , the MILP instance I_σ can be computed in polynomial time.*

In the following, we prove the correctness of the algorithm. We first show that if the given instance of TTR is a yes-instance, then at least one of the created MILP instances has a feasible solution.

► **Lemma 25.** *Given a yes-instance (G, D, Δ) of TTR, there exists a global label configuration σ such that the MILP instance I_σ admits a feasible solution.*

Proof. Let (G, D, Δ) be a yes-instance of TTR. Let V_2 be the set of vertices in G with degree two. Then by Lemma 21 there exists a solution λ for (G, D, Δ) such that for all $v \in V_2$ we have the following. Let u, w denote the two neighbors of v in G . We have that $\lambda(\{u, v\}) \neq \lambda(\{v, w\})$.

Furthermore, let σ be the global label configuration defined by the labeling function λ . We construct a feasible solution for the MILP instance I_σ as follows.

First, consider all edges e that are incident with vertices of degree larger than two. We set $z_e = \lambda(e)$. Note that, since Constraints (1), (2), and (5) are equality constraints, there is a uniquely defined value for each variable $y_v^{u,w}$ that we need to assign to that variable in order

to fulfill those constraints. Furthermore, since λ defines the global label configuration σ , we also have that the remaining Constraints (3), (4), (6), and (7) are fulfilled by the assignment of the variables. Lastly, it is obvious that all integer variables are assigned integer values.

Now we assign values to the fractional variables. Let V_2 denote the set of all degree two vertices in G . We have a variable x_v for each $v \in V_2$. Consider some $v \in V_2$ and let u, w denote the two neighbors of v , where u is ordered before w . Then we set

$$x_v = \begin{cases} \lambda(\{v, w\}) - \lambda(\{u, v\}), & \text{if } \lambda(\{v, w\}) > \lambda(\{u, v\}), \\ \lambda(\{v, w\}) - \lambda(\{u, v\}) + \Delta, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Recall that due to Lemma 21, we have that $\lambda(\{u, v\}) \neq \lambda(\{v, w\})$. It follows that Constraint (9) is fulfilled. It remains to show that Constraint (8) is fulfilled.

To this end, consider a vertex pair s, t and let $P = ((v_{i-1}, v_i, t_i))_{i=1}^k$ be a fastest temporal (s, z) -path in the Δ -periodic temporal graph (G, λ) . Since G is a tree, we have that $V(P)$ is uniquely determined. In fact, also the order in which the vertices in $V(P)$ are visited by P is uniquely determined. By Lemma 4 we have that

$$d(P) = 1 + \sum_{i \in [k-1]} \tau_{v_i}^{v_{i-1}, v_{i+1}}.$$

Furthermore, we have the following.

- If v_i has degree two in G and v_{i-1} is ordered before v_{i+1} , then we have $x_{v_i} = \tau_{v_i}^{v_{i-1}, v_{i+1}}$.
- If v_i has degree two in G and v_{i+1} is ordered before v_{i-1} , then by Observation 3 we have $x_{v_i} = \Delta - \tau_{v_i}^{v_{i-1}, v_{i+1}}$.
- If v_i has degree larger than two in G , then we have $y_{v_i}^{v_{i-1}, v_{i+1}} = \tau_{v_i}^{v_{i-1}, v_{i+1}}$.

Lastly, since λ is a solution for (G, D, Δ) , we have that $d(P) \leq D_{s,t}$. From this, it follows that Constraint (8) is fulfilled. Hence, we have constructed a feasible solution to the MILP instance I_σ . ◀

Next, we show that if one of the produced MILP instances admits a feasible solution, then we are facing a yes-instance of TTR. To this end, we first show that the constraint matrix for the fractional variables of the produced MILP instances is totally unimodular. Then by Lemma 19 we have that if one of the MILP instances admits a feasible solution, then there also is a feasible solution for that instance where all fractional variables are set to integer values. To do this, we use a sufficient condition for matrices to be totally unimodular. Precisely, we use that every so-called *network matrix* is totally unimodular.


► **Definition 26 (network matrix).** Let $T = (V, A)$ be a directed tree, that is, a tree where each arc has an arbitrary orientation and let A' be a set of directed arcs on V , the same vertex set as T . Let M be a matrix with $|A|$ rows and $|A'|$ columns. Then M is a network matrix if the following holds. For all i, j let $e_i = (a, b) \in A$ and $e'_j = (s, t) \in A'$.

- $M_{i,j} = 1$ if arc (a, b) appears forwards in a path in T from s to t .
- $M_{i,j} = -1$ if arc (a, b) appears backwards in a path in T from s to t .
- $M_{i,j} = 0$ if arc (a, b) does not appear in a path in T from s to t .

► **Lemma 27 ([61]).** Network matrices are totally unimodular.

Formally, we show that the produced MILP instances have the following property.

► **Lemma 28.** Let σ be a global label configuration and let I_σ be the corresponding MILP instance. Let M be the constraint matrix for the fractional variables, that is, the constraint matrix obtained by treating the integer variables $y_v^{u,w}$ and z_e in all constraints of I_σ as



■ **Figure 5** Illustration of the construction of the directed tree T in Lemma 28. On the left an example tree G , where the vertices are ordered by their indices. In the middle the line graph $L(G)$ of G , where the gray vertices form a maximal clique with more than two vertices. On the right the constructed directed tree T , where the vertices of the maximal clique are merged into one vertex (gray) and the directed arcs correspond to the degree two vertices of G .

arbitrary constants, deleting all constraints that do not involve any fractional variables, and deleting all duplicate rows. We have that M is a network matrix.

Proof. First, notice that Constraints (1), (2), (3), (4), (5), (6), and (7) do not involve fractional variables. Hence, from now on we only consider Constraints (8) and (9), where in Constraint (8) we treat the integer variables as constants. Let M be the resulting constraint matrix where also all duplicate rows are deleted. We show that M is a network matrix.

To this end, we define a directed tree $T = (V, A)$ (see Definition 26) as follows. We give an illustration in Figure 5. Let $L(G)$ be the line graph of the input tree G of the TTR instance. Now we exhaustively merge all maximal cliques in $L(G)$ with more than two vertices to a single vertex. Let this graph be called G' . It is easy to see that G' is a tree, and every edge in G' corresponds to a degree two vertex in G . Furthermore, we have that every vertex v in G' that has degree larger than two corresponds to a subtree G_v (which may be the degenerate tree consisting only of one vertex) in G such that all vertices in $V(G_v)$ have degree larger than two in G . Now we transform G' into T by replacing each edge of G' with an oriented arc. Consider a degree two vertex v of G and the corresponding edge e_v in G' . Let u and w be the two neighbors of v in G , where u is ordered before w . We distinguish four cases.

- Vertex u has degree two in G . Let e_u be the edge in G' corresponding to u . Then we orient e_v such that the resulting arc points away from the common endpoint of e_v and e_u .
- The degree of vertex u does not equal two and w has degree two in G . Let e_w be the edge in G' corresponding to w . Then we orient e_v such that the resulting arc points towards the common endpoint of e_v and e_w .
- Neither u nor w have degree two. Then we can assume that at least one of u and w has degree larger than two, otherwise G only has three vertices and we can solve the instance in constant time.
 - Vertex u has degree larger than two in G . Then let G_u denote the maximal subtree

- of G that contains u such that all vertices in $V(G_u)$ have degree larger than two in G . Then there is a vertex u' in G' corresponding to G_u that has degree larger than two and is incident with e_v . We orient e_v such that the resulting arc points away from u' .
- Vertex u has degree one and vertex w has degree larger than two in G . Then let G_w denote the maximal subtree of G that contains w such that all vertices in $V(G_w)$ have degree larger than two in G . Then there is a vertex w' in G' corresponding to G_w that has degree larger than two and is incident with e_v . We orient e_v such that the resulting arc points towards w' .

This finishes the description of the directed tree T .

Next, we make the following observation: Each Constraint (9) produces the same coefficients for the rational variables in the constraint matrix as one of Constraint (8). To see this, note that each Constraint (9) has exactly one non-zero coefficient for one rational variable x_v , which is either 1 or -1 . Variable x_v corresponds to a degree two vertex v in G . Let u and w be the two neighbors of v in G , where u is ordered before w . Then, since u and w have distance at least two in G , we have a Constraint (8) corresponding to the pair of vertices s, t with $s = u$ and $t = w$. This constraint has exactly one non-zero coefficient for a rational variable, which is x_v and the coefficient is 1. In the case where $s = w$ and $t = u$ we have the same situation, except that the coefficient is -1 . Hence, since M has no duplicate rows, we can assume that each row of M corresponds to a Constraint (8).

Now consider a row of M corresponding to Constraint (8), which in turn corresponds to vertex pair s, t in G , where s and t have distance at least two in G . Let $P_{s,t}$ denote the (unique) path from s to t in G . Let $V_{\text{int,deg2,f}}^{(s,t)} \subseteq V(P_{s,t})$ and $V_{\text{int,deg2,b}}^{(s,t)} \subseteq V(P_{s,t})$ be defined as in the description of Constraint (8). Then we have that $V_{\text{int,deg2,f}}^{(s,t)} \cup V_{\text{int,deg2,b}}^{(s,t)}$ are all internal vertices of $P_{s,t}$ that have degree two in G . Furthermore, in Constraint (8) corresponding to vertex pair s, t we have that the fractional variable x_v has a non-zero coefficient if and only if $v \in V_{\text{int,deg2,f}}^{(s,t)} \cup V_{\text{int,deg2,b}}^{(s,t)}$. More specifically, the coefficient of x_v is 1 if $v \in V_{\text{int,deg2,f}}^{(s,t)}$ and the coefficient of x_v is -1 if $v \in V_{\text{int,deg2,b}}^{(s,t)}$.

Furthermore, by construction we have that each vertex in $V_{\text{int,deg2,f}}^{(s,t)} \cup V_{\text{int,deg2,b}}^{(s,t)}$ corresponds to an arc of T . It remains to show that there is a path P' in T that visits exactly the arcs corresponding to the vertices in $V_{\text{int,deg2,f}}^{(s,t)} \cup V_{\text{int,deg2,b}}^{(s,t)}$ such that the arcs corresponding to vertices in $V_{\text{int,deg2,f}}^{(s,t)}$ appear forwards in the path and the arcs corresponding to the vertices in $V_{\text{int,deg2,b}}^{(s,t)}$ appear backwards in the path. To this end, we order the vertices in $V_{\text{int,deg2,f}}^{(s,t)} \cup V_{\text{int,deg2,b}}^{(s,t)}$ in the order in which they are visited by $P_{s,t}$, that is, let $V_{\text{int,deg2,f}}^{(s,t)} \cup V_{\text{int,deg2,b}}^{(s,t)} = \{v_1, v_2, \dots, v_k\}$. Now we show by induction on k that P' exists and that its last arc corresponds to v_k . If $k = 1$ then $P'_{s,t}$ only consists of the arc e_{v_1} corresponding to v_1 . If $v_1 \in V_{\text{int,deg2,f}}^{(s,t)}$, then we consider P' to be the path in which e_{v_1} forwards. Otherwise, we consider P' to be the path in which e_{v_1} backwards. Now assume $k > 1$. Let P'' be the path in T that visits the arcs corresponding to vertices $\{v_1, \dots, v_{k-1}\}$ such that for all $i \in [k-1]$ the arc corresponding to v_i appears forwards if $v_i \in V_{\text{int,deg2,f}}^{(s,t)}$ and backwards otherwise. Furthermore, we have that P'' ends with the arc corresponding to v_{k-1} . Now we show that we can append the arc corresponding to v_k to P'' . We distinguish two cases.

- In the first case, v_k is visited directly after v_{k-1} by $P_{s,t}$. Then the arcs $e_{v_{k-1}}$ and e_{v_k} in T share a common endpoint which is a degree two vertex. It follows that we can append the arc e_{v_k} to P'' to create a new path that ends in e_{v_k} . We still need to show that e_{v_k} is appended in the correct direction. Consider the two neighbors of v_k in G . One of the neighbors is v_{k-1} . Let the second neighbor be w . Now assume that $v_k \in V_{\text{int,deg2,f}}^{(s,t)}$. This implies that v_{k-1} is ordered before w . In this case the arc e_{v_k} in T points away from the

common endpoint of $e_{v_{k-1}}$ and e_{v_k} , and hence it appears forwards in the P'' appended with e_{v_k} . The case where $v_k \in V_{\text{int,deg2,b}}^{(s,t)}$ is analogous.

- In the second case, there is a non-empty set of vertices \hat{V} with degree larger than two, that are visited by $P_{s,t}$ between v_{k-1} and v_k . Let \hat{G} denote the maximal tree in G that only contains vertices that have degree larger than two in G and that contains \hat{V} . By construction, there is vertex \hat{v} in T that corresponds to \hat{G} and both $e_{v_{k-1}}$ and e_{v_k} in T have \hat{v} as one of their endpoints. First, we argue that we can append e_{v_k} to P'' and thereby create a path in T that ends with e_{v_k} . To this end, notice that the vertex visited by $P_{s,t}$ before v_{k-1} cannot be part of \hat{G} , otherwise G would contain a cycle. It follows that the common endpoint of $e_{v_{k-1}}$ and $e_{v_{k-1}}$ is not \hat{v} and appending e_{v_k} to P'' indeed produces a path in T that ends with e_{v_k} . It remains to show that e_{v_k} is appended in the correct direction. Consider the two neighbors u and w of v_k in G . We have that one neighbor is contained in \hat{G} , assume w.l.o.g. that it is u . Then u is visited by $P_{s,t}$ before v_k . Now assume that $v_k \in V_{\text{int,deg2,t}}^{(s,t)}$. This implies that u is ordered before w . In this case the arc e_{v_k} in T points away from u , and hence it appears forwards in the P'' appended with e_{v_k} . The case where $v_k \in V_{\text{int,deg2,b}}^{(s,t)}$ is analogous.

It follows that for every row in M , we can find a path in T such that the conditions in Definition 26 are met. We can conclude that M is a network matrix. ◀

Now we are ready to show that if one of the produced MILP instances admits a feasible solution, then we are facing a yes-instance of TTR.

► **Lemma 29.** *Given an instance (G, D, Δ) of TTR, if there exists a global label configuration σ such that the MILP instance I_σ admits a feasible solution, then (G, D, Δ) is a yes-instance of TTR.*

Proof. Let (G, D, Δ) be an instance of TTR. Assume there exists a global label configuration σ such that the MILP instance I_σ admits a feasible solution. By Lemmas 19, 27, and 28 and the fact that total unimodularity is preserved under row duplication [61] we have that then there exists a feasible solution where *all* variables are set to integer values. Assume we are given such a solution for I_σ . We construct a solution λ for (G, D, Δ) as follows.

To this end, we make the following observation. Let u, v, w be three vertices in G such that $\{u, v\}$ and $\{v, w\}$ are edges in G and u is ordered before w . Then for each fixed label $\lambda(\{u, v\})$ there is a uniquely defined label $\lambda(\{v, w\})$ such that $\tau_v^{u,w} = x_v$ if v has degree two in G , and $\tau_v^{u,w} = y_v^{u,w}$ if v has degree larger than two in G .

This allows us to produce a labeling λ with the following procedure. We arbitrarily pick an edge e , say the lexicographically smallest one according to the vertex ordering, in G and set $\lambda(e) = 1$. Now we iteratively pick an edge $\{u, v\}$ that has not received a label yet and shares a common endpoint v with an edge $\{v, w\}$ in G that has already received a label. By the observation above, the label of $\{v, w\}$ together with the travel delay $\tau_v^{u,w}$ uniquely defines the label of $\{u, v\}$, and in turn $\tau_v^{u,w}$ is given by $x_v, y_v^{u,w}$, or $y_v^{w,u}$, depending on the degree of v and whether u is ordered before w or not. We claim that the described procedure produces a solution λ for (G, D, Δ) .

First, we investigate the travel delays in the Δ -periodic temporal graph (G, λ) . By construction and Observation 3, we have for each vertex v that has degree two in G , and neighbors u, w , where u is ordered before w , that $\tau_v^{u,w} = x_v$ and $\tau_v^{w,u} = \Delta - x_v$. For each vertex v in G that has degree larger than two, the above described procedure does not per se guarantee that for each pair u, w of neighbors of v that $\tau_v^{u,w} = y_v^{u,w}$. However, notice that the labeling λ is uniquely determined by the label used for the first edge. It follows that

there are Δ different labelings that can be produced by the above described procedure, one for each label that can be put on the first edge. Call them $\lambda = \lambda_1, \lambda_2, \dots, \lambda_\Delta$, where for all edges e and for all $1 \leq i < j \leq \Delta$ we have $\lambda_i(e) = \lambda_j(e) + i - j$. In particular, this means that for each vertex v that has degree larger than two and each edge e that is incident with v , there is an $i \in [\Delta]$ such that $\lambda_i(e) = z_e$. In this case, Constraints (1), (2), (3), (4), (5), (6), and (7) ensure that indeed for all edges e that are incident with v we have that $\lambda_i(e) = z_e$. Furthermore, these constraints ensure that indeed for each pair u, w of neighbors of v we have $\tau_v^{u,w} = y_v^{u,w}$. Since all labelings $\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_\Delta$ produce the same travel delays, we can conclude that for each vertex v in G that has degree larger than two and for each pair u, w of neighbors of v that in (G, λ) we have $\tau_v^{u,w} = y_v^{u,w}$.

Assume for contradiction that λ is not a solution for (G, D, Δ) . Then there are two vertices s, t in G such that the duration of a fastest temporal path $P_{s,t} = ((v_{i-1}, v_i, t_i))_{i=1}^k$ in the Δ -periodic temporal graph (G, λ) is larger than $D_{s,t}$. By Lemma 4 we have that

$$d(P_{s,t}) = 1 + \sum_{i \in [k-1]} \tau_{v_i}^{v_{i-1}, v_{i+1}}.$$

As discussed above, we have the following:

- If v_i has degree two and v_{i-1} is ordered before v_{i+1} , then $\tau_{v_i}^{v_{i-1}, v_{i+1}} = x_{v_i}$.
- If v_i has degree two and v_{i+1} is ordered before v_{i-1} , then $\tau_{v_i}^{v_{i-1}, v_{i+1}} = \Delta - x_{v_i}$.
- If v_i has degree larger than two, then $\tau_{v_i}^{v_{i-1}, v_{i+1}} = y_{v_i}^{v_{i-1}, v_{i+1}}$.

Hence, using the notation introduced for Constraint (8), we can write

$$d(P_{s,t}) = 1 + \sum_{v \in V_{\text{int}, \text{deg}2, \text{f}}^{(s,t)}} x_v + \sum_{v \in V_{\text{int}, \text{deg}2, \text{b}}^{(s,t)}} (\Delta - x_v) + \sum_{v \in V_{\text{int}, \text{deg}>2}^{(s,t)}} y_v^{u^{(s,t)}(v), w^{(s,t)}(v)}.$$

However, since Constraint (8) is fulfilled for the vertex pair s, t , it follows that $d(P_{s,t}) \leq D_{s,t}$, a contradiction. This finishes the proof. \blacktriangleleft

Now we have all ingredients to prove Theorem 17.

Proof of Theorem 17. We use the following algorithm to solve TTR. Let (G, D, Δ) be an instance of TTR. For each global label configuration σ we create the MILP instance I_σ . If for some σ the instance I_σ admits a feasible solution, we answer “yes”. Otherwise, we answer “no”.

By Lemmas 25 and 29 this algorithm is correct. It remains to bound the running time. Let ℓ be the number of leaves of G . By Observation 23 we create $O(\ell^2)$ MILP instance. By Observation 24 we can create each MILP instance in polynomial time and by Observation 22 each created MILP instance has $O(\ell^3)$ integer variables. By Theorem 18 it follows that we can solve each MILP instance in FPT-time with respect to parameter ℓ . We can conclude that the overall running time of the algorithm is in $f(\ell) \cdot |(G, D, \Delta)|^{O(1)}$ for some computable function f . \blacktriangleleft

5 Conclusion and future work

We have initiated the investigation of the natural temporal tree realization problem TTR and shown that it NP-hard in quite restrictive cases. On the positive side, we provided an FPT-algorithm for the number of leaves in the input tree as a parameter. Our work spawns several natural future research directions. As an immediate open question, we ask whether the number of leaves can be replaced with a smaller parameter, such as the number of vertices

with degree larger than two in the input tree. Another related question is whether TTR admits an FPT-algorithm with the vertex cover number of the input tree as a parameter. Furthermore, we leave open whether TTR can be solved in polynomial time if the input tree is a star. A more general future research direction is to allow general input graphs in TTR. Especially interesting would be graphs with bounded maximum leaf number or bounded vertex cover number, since our results do not imply computational hardness for those cases.

References

- 1 Eleni C Akrida, Leszek Gąsieniec, George B. Mertzios, and Paul G Spirakis. The complexity of optimal design of temporally connected graphs. *Theory of Computing Systems*, 61:907–944, 2017.
- 2 Eleni C. Akrida, George B. Mertzios, Paul G. Spirakis, and Christoforos Raptopoulos. The temporal explorer who returns to the base. *Journal of Computer and System Sciences*, 120:179–193, 2021.
- 3 Emmanuel Arrighi, Niels Grüttemeier, Nils Morawietz, Frank Sommer, and Petra Wolf. Multi-parameter analysis of finding minors and subgraphs in edge-periodic temporal graphs. In *Proceedings of the 48th International Conference on Current Trends in Theory and Practice of Computer Science (SOFSEM)*, pages 283–297, 2023.
- 4 John Augustine, Keerti Choudhary, Avi Cohen, David Peleg, Sumathi Sivasubramaniam, and Suman Sourav. Distributed graph realizations. *IEEE Transactions on Parallel and Distributed Systems*, 33(6):1321–1337, 2022.
- 5 Jayanth R. Banavar, Francesca Colaiori, Alessandro Flammini, Amos Maritan, and Andrea Rinaldo. Topology of the fittest transportation network. *Physical Review Letters*, 84:4745–4748, 2000.
- 6 Amotz Bar-Noy, Keerti Choudhary, David Peleg, and Dror Rawitz. Efficiently realizing interval sequences. *SIAM Journal on Discrete Mathematics*, 34(4):2318–2337, 2020.
- 7 Amotz Bar-Noy, Keerti Choudhary, David Peleg, and Dror Rawitz. Graph realizations: Maximum degree in vertex neighborhoods. In *Proceedings of the 17th Scandinavian Symposium and Workshops on Algorithm Theory (SWAT)*, pages 10:1–10:17, 2020.
- 8 Amotz Bar-Noy, David Peleg, Mor Perry, and Dror Rawitz. Composed degree-distance realizations of graphs. In *Proceedings of the 32nd International Workshop on Combinatorial Algorithms (IWOCA)*, pages 63–77, 2021.
- 9 Amotz Bar-Noy, David Peleg, Mor Perry, and Dror Rawitz. Graph realization of distance sets. In *Proceedings of the 47th International Symposium on Mathematical Foundations of Computer Science (MFCS)*, pages 13:1–13:14, 2022.
- 10 Marc Barthélemy and Alessandro Flammini. Optimal traffic networks. *Journal of Statistical Mechanics: Theory and Experiment*, 2006(07):L07002, jul 2006.
- 11 Mehdi Behzad and James E Simpson. Eccentric sequences and eccentric sets in graphs. *Discrete Mathematics*, 16(3):187–193, 1976.
- 12 Robert E Bixby and Donald K Wagner. An almost linear-time algorithm for graph realization. *Mathematics of Operations Research*, 13(1):99–123, 1988.
- 13 Steffen Bohn and Marcelo O. Magnasco. Structure, scaling, and phase transition in the optimal transport network. *Physical Review Letters*, 98:088702, 2007.
- 14 Arnaud Casteigts, Paola Flocchini, Walter Quattrociochi, and Nicola Santoro. Time-varying graphs and dynamic networks. *International Journal of Parallel, Emergent and Distributed Systems*, 27(5):387–408, 2012.
- 15 Arnaud Casteigts, Anne-Sophie Himmel, Hendrik Molter, and Philipp Zschoche. Finding temporal paths under waiting time constraints. *Algorithmica*, 83(9):2754–2802, 2021.
- 16 Juhi Chaudhary, Hendrik Molter, and Meirav Zehavi. Parameterized analysis of bribery in challenge the champ tournaments. *CoRR*, abs/2403.17587, 2024. URL: <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2403.17587>.

- 17 Wai-Kai Chen. On the realization of a (p, s) -digraph with prescribed degrees. *Journal of the Franklin Institute*, 281(5):406–422, 1966.
- 18 Fan Chung, Mark Garrett, Ronald Graham, and David Shallcross. Distance realization problems with applications to internet tomography. *Journal of Computer and System Sciences*, 63(3):432–448, 2001.
- 19 Joseph C. Culberson and Piotr Rudnicki. A fast algorithm for constructing trees from distance matrices. *Information Processing Letters*, 30(4):215–220, 1989.
- 20 Daniel Dadush, Chris Peikert, and Santosh Vempala. Enumerative lattice algorithms in any norm via M -ellipsoid coverings. In *Proceedings of the 52nd IEEE Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science (FOCS)*, pages 580–589. IEEE, 2011.
- 21 Argyrios Deligkas and Igor Potapov. Optimizing reachability sets in temporal graphs by delaying. *Information and Computation*, 285:104890, 2022.
- 22 Jessica Enright, Kitty Meeks, George B. Mertzios, and Viktor Zamaraev. Deleting edges to restrict the size of an epidemic in temporal networks. *Journal of Computer and System Sciences*, 119:60–77, 2021.
- 23 Jessica Enright, Kitty Meeks, and Fiona Skerman. Assigning times to minimise reachability in temporal graphs. *Journal of Computer and System Sciences*, 115:169–186, 2021.
- 24 Jessica A. Enright, Kitty Meeks, and Hendrik Molter. Counting temporal paths. In *Proceedings of the 40th International Symposium on Theoretical Aspects of Computer Science (STACS)*, volume 254, pages 30:1–30:19, 2023.
- 25 Paul Erdős and Tibor Gallai. Graphs with prescribed degrees of vertices. *Mat. Lapok*, 11:264–274, 1960.
- 26 Thomas Erlebach, Michael Hoffmann, and Frank Kammer. On temporal graph exploration. *Journal of Computer and System Sciences*, 119:1–18, 2021.
- 27 Thomas Erlebach, Nils Morawietz, and Petra Wolf. Parameterized algorithms for multi-label periodic temporal graph realization. In *Proceedings of the 3rd Symposium on Algorithmic Foundations of Dynamic Networks (SAND)*, 2024. Accepted for publication.
- 28 Thomas Erlebach and Jakob T. Spooner. A game of cops and robbers on graphs with periodic edge-connectivity. In *Proceedings of the 46th International Conference on Current Trends in Theory and Practice of Informatics (SOFSEM)*, pages 64–75, 2020.
- 29 Till Fluschnik, Hendrik Molter, Rolf Niedermeier, Malte Renken, and Philipp Zschoche. Temporal graph classes: A view through temporal separators. *Theoretical Computer Science*, 806:197–218, 2020.
- 30 András Frank. Augmenting graphs to meet edge-connectivity requirements. *SIAM Journal on Discrete Mathematics*, 5(1):25–53, 1992.
- 31 András Frank. Connectivity augmentation problems in network design. *Mathematical Programming: State of the Art 1994*, 1994.
- 32 H. Frank and Wushow Chou. Connectivity considerations in the design of survivable networks. *IEEE Transactions on Circuit Theory*, 17(4):486–490, 1970.
- 33 Eugen Füchle, Hendrik Molter, Rolf Niedermeier, and Malte Renken. Delay-robust routes in temporal graphs. In *Proceedings of the 39th International Symposium on Theoretical Aspects of Computer Science (STACS)*, pages 30:1–30:15, 2022.
- 34 D.R. Fulkerson. Zero-one matrices with zero trace. *Pacific Journal of Mathematics*, 10(3):831–836, 1960.
- 35 Petr A. Golovach and George B. Mertzios. Graph editing to a given degree sequence. *Theoretical Computer Science*, 665:1–12, 2017.
- 36 Martin Charles Golumbic and Ann N. Trenk. *Tolerance Graphs*. Cambridge Studies in Advanced Mathematics. Cambridge University Press, 2004.
- 37 Ralph E Gomory and Tien Chung Hu. Multi-terminal network flows. *Journal of the Society for Industrial and Applied Mathematics*, 9(4):551–570, 1961.
- 38 Martin Grötschel, Clyde L Monma, and Mechthild Stoer. Design of survivable networks. *Handbooks in Operations Research and Management Science*, 7:617–672, 1995.

- 39 S. Louis Hakimi. On realizability of a set of integers as degrees of the vertices of a linear graph. I. *Journal of the Society for Industrial and Applied Mathematics*, 10(3):496–506, 1962.
- 40 S. Louis Hakimi and Stephen S. Yau. Distance matrix of a graph and its realizability. *Quarterly of applied mathematics*, 22(4):305–317, 1965.
- 41 Pavol Hell and David Kirkpatrick. Linear-time certifying algorithms for near-graphical sequences. *Discrete Mathematics*, 309(18):5703–5713, 2009.
- 42 Petter Holme and Jari Saramäki. *Temporal network theory*, volume 2. Springer, 2019.
- 43 David Kempe, Jon M. Kleinberg, and Amit Kumar. Connectivity and inference problems for temporal networks. *Journal of Computer and System Sciences*, 64(4):820–842, 2002.
- 44 Nina Klobas, George B. Mertzios, Hendrik Molter, Rolf Niedermeier, and Philipp Zschoche. Interference-free walks in time: Temporally disjoint paths. *Autonomous Agents and Multi-Agent Systems*, 37(1):1, 2023.
- 45 Nina Klobas, George B. Mertzios, Hendrik Molter, and Paul G. Spirakis. The complexity of computing optimum labelings for temporal connectivity. In *Proceedings of the 47th International Symposium on Mathematical Foundations of Computer Science (MFCS)*, pages 62:1–62:15, 2022.
- 46 Nina Klobas, George B. Mertzios, Hendrik Molter, and Paul G. Spirakis. Temporal graph realization from fastest paths. In *Proceedings of the 3rd Symposium on Algorithmic Foundations of Dynamic Networks (SAND)*, 2024. Accepted for publication. URL: <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2302.08860>.
- 47 Pascal Kunz, Hendrik Molter, and Meirav Zehavi. In which graph structures can we efficiently find temporally disjoint paths and walks? In *Proceedings of the 32nd International Joint Conference on Artificial Intelligence (IJCAI)*, pages 180–188, 2023.
- 48 Hendrik W. Lenstra. Integer programming with a fixed number of variables. *Mathematics of Operations Research*, 8:538–548, 1983.
- 49 Linda Lesniak. Eccentric sequences in graphs. *Periodica Mathematica Hungarica*, 6:287–293, 1975.
- 50 Ross M. McConnell and Jeremy P. Spinrad. Construction of probe interval models. In *Proceedings of the 13th Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms (SODA)*, pages 866–875, 2002.
- 51 F.R. McMorris, Chi Wang, and Peisen Zhang. On probe interval graphs. *Discrete Applied Mathematics*, 88(1):315–324, 1998. Computational Molecular Biology DAM - CMB Series.
- 52 George B. Mertzios, Othon Michail, and Paul G. Spirakis. Temporal network optimization subject to connectivity constraints. *Algorithmica*, 81(4):1416–1449, 2019.
- 53 George B. Mertzios, Hendrik Molter, Malte Renken, Paul G. Spirakis, and Philipp Zschoche. The complexity of transitively orienting temporal graphs. In *Proceedings of the 46th International Symposium on Mathematical Foundations of Computer Science (MFCS)*, pages 75:1–75:18, 2021.
- 54 Othon Michail and Paul G. Spirakis. Elements of the theory of dynamic networks. *Communications of the ACM*, 61(2):72–72, January 2018.
- 55 Hendrik Molter, Malte Renken, and Philipp Zschoche. Temporal reachability minimization: Delaying vs. deleting. In *Proceedings of the 46th International Symposium on Mathematical Foundations of Computer Science (MFCS)*, pages 76:1–76:15, 2021.
- 56 Nils Morawietz, Carolin Rehs, and Mathias Weller. A timecop’s work is harder than you think. In *Proceedings of the 45th International Symposium on Mathematical Foundations of Computer Science (MFCS)*, volume 170, pages 71:1–71:14, 2020.
- 57 Nils Morawietz and Petra Wolf. A timecop’s chase around the table. In *Proceedings of the 46th International Symposium on Mathematical Foundations of Computer Science (MFCS)*, 2021.
- 58 Vincenzo Nicosia, John Tang, Cecilia Mascolo, Mirco Musolesi, Giovanni Russo, and Vito Latora. Graph metrics for temporal networks. In *Temporal Networks*. Springer, 2013.
- 59 A.N. Patrinos and S. Louis Hakimi. The distance matrix of a graph and its tree realization. *Quarterly of Applied Mathematics*, 30:255–269, 1972.

- 60 Elena Rubei. Weighted graphs with distances in given ranges. *Journal of Classification*, 33:282–297, 2016.
- 61 Alexander Schrijver. *Combinatorial optimization: Polyhedra and efficiency*, volume 24. Springer, 2003.
- 62 H. Tamura, M. Sengoku, S. Shinoda, and T. Abe. Realization of a network from the upper and lower bounds of the distances (or capacities) between vertices. In *Proceedings of the 1993 IEEE International Symposium on Circuits and Systems (ISCAS)*, pages 2545–2548, 1993.
- 63 Philipp Zschoche, Till Fluschnik, Hendrik Molter, and Rolf Niedermeier. The complexity of finding separators in temporal graphs. *Journal of Computer and System Sciences*, 107:72–92, 2020.