

# BOTTLENECKING IN GRAPHS AND A COARSE Menger-TYPE CONJECTURE

MICHAEL BRUNER, ATISH MITRA, AND HEIDI STEIGER

**ABSTRACT.** We expand upon the notion of bottlenecking introduced in [7], characterizing a spectrum of graphs and showing this naturally extends to the concept of coarse bottlenecking. We examine how bottlenecking differs from other notions of connectedness. Notably we show how the notion of bottlenecking gives a natural coarse Menger-type conjecture, which is weaker than the Coarse Menger Conjecture [8] that has recently been disproved by a counter example [10].

## 1. INTRODUCTION

Some special classes of edge bottlenecked graphs have been studied extensively since the beginnings of graph theory. More recently the coarse versions of these classes have proven to be of interest in the field of coarse graph theory [1, 2, 4]. For example, graphs that are 1-edge bottlenecked are trees, and cacti are those that are 2-edge bottlenecked. If one examines these closer, there is a pattern where a cactus is a tree with some edges added in to make cycles. A natural extension of this pattern gives 3-bottlenecked graphs as cacti with a few edges (or "cuts") added across the cycles. We will call such a graph a cut-cactus.




FIGURE 1. Examples of a tree, a cactus, and a cut-cactus. Each produced from the last by the addition of a few edges. Note that while each of these graphs has a different bottlenecking number they are all 1-edge connected

2020 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 51F30, 05C10.

*Key words and phrases.* graph theory, coarse geometry, bottlenecking, coarse bottlenecking, graph minor, coarse skeleton, Menger's Theorem.

In Section 3 we examine the differences between bottlenecking and other notions of connectedness. In Section 4 we share a geometric, and a excluded-minor characterization for 1,2 and 3 bottlenecked graphs. We also give a excluded-minor characterization for  $n$ -bottlenecked graphs.

Menger's theorem is a well known result in graph theory. Some characterizations of bottlenecking follow as a natural result from Menger's Theorem [3]. A coarse version of Menger's theorem was independently proposed by both [8] and [4]. In [10] an example was given to show that this conjecture does not hold in the general case. In Section 5 we show how the notion of bottle-necking naturally coarsens. We prove several implications towards a characterization of coarsely bottlenecked graphs, then propose a Menger-type conjecture that would, if true, complete this characterization. We also propose a conjecture about coarse bottlenecking similar in form to [8] Conjecture 1.1, and remark that a positive resolution of the Menger-type conjecture would make it a special case of [8] Conjecture 1.1.

## 2. PRELIMINARIES

In this work we consider only connected, infinite and unbounded graphs. In this section we reproduce definitions for many common notions from graph theory and coarse geometry, for more information one may refer to a standard text [5, 6].

**Definition 2.1. (*Graph, Path, Cycle,  $D_n$ , Tree, Cactus, Cut-cactus*)** A graph  $G$  is defined to be two sets, a collection of vertices  $V(G)$ , and a collection of edges  $E(G)$ . Each edge is associated with two vertices, said to be its endpoints. A path is an ordered collection edges that join a set of distinct vertices, a path between two sets of vertices  $X$  and  $Y$  is said to be an  $X, Y$  path. A cycle is a pair of paths that share exactly their endpoints. We often may refer to trees, cactus and cut-cactus these are classes of graphs with restrictions on the interactions of cycles. Trees have no cycles, cactus allow cycles to only intersect at a single vertex, and cut-cactus allow cycles to only intersect along a path. We often refer to a dipole graph  $D_n$ , this is two vertices joined by  $n$  edges.

**Definition 2.2. ( *$n$ -edge bottlenecking*)**(See [7]) A graph  $G$  is said to have  $n$ -edge bottlenecking if for any two disjoint connected sets  $X, Y \subset V(G)$ , there exists a set  $S \subseteq E(G)$  of size  $n$  such that any  $X, Y$  path contains an element of  $S$ .

**Definition 2.3. ( *$M$ -fat/Coarse  $n$ -bottlenecking*)**(See [7]) A graph  $G$  is said to have  $M$ -fat  $n$  bottlenecking for some  $M, n \in \mathbb{N}$  if for any two connected,  $M$ -disjoint subgraphs  $X, Y \subset G$ , there exists a set  $S \subset V(G) \setminus (V(X) \cup V(Y))$  of size  $n$  such that every  $X, Y$  path intersects  $N_M(S) := \{x \in V(G) | d(x, S) < M\}$ . If a graph is  $M$ -fat  $n$  bottlenecked for some  $M$  it is said to be coarsely  $n$  bottlenecked.

**Remark 2.1.** Bottlenecking defines a natural spectrum of graphs as  $n$ -edge bottlenecking implies  $n + 1$  edge bottlenecking. This is also true for coarse bottlenecking.

**Definition 2.4. ( *$n$ -ladder/ $M$ -fat ladder*)** A graph is said to contain a  $n$ -ladder if there exist disjoint connected sets  $X$  and  $Y$  such that there are  $n$   $X, Y$  paths that are disjoint outside of  $X$  and  $Y$ . The sets  $X$  and  $Y$  are referred to as the poles, and the paths are referred to as the rungs of the ladder. If the poles are at least  $M$ -disjoint and the rungs are all pairwise  $M$ -disjoint a ladder is said to be a  $M$ -fat ladder.

**Remark 2.2.** *The following lemma follows from Menger’s Theorem (see Remark 3.5).*

**Lemma 2.1.** *A graph is  $n$ -edge bottlenecked iff it contains no  $(n + 1)$ -ladders.*

**Definition 2.5. (Minor,  $M$ -fat/Asymptotic Minor)** (See [8, 11]) *A graph  $G$  is said to contain a graph  $H$  as a minor if there exist a subgraph of  $G$  that is the union of disjoint sets corresponding to each of the vertices and edges of  $H$ , such that contracting each set produces the graph  $H$ . If these sets are  $M$ -disjoint except where they are incident in  $H$  then this minor is said to be a  $M$ -fat minor. If a graph contains a  $M$ -fat  $H$  minor for any  $M \in \mathbb{N}$  then that graph is said to contain  $H$  as an asymptotic minor.*

**Remark 2.3.** *A  $n$ -ladder is a  $D_n$  minor, a  $M$ -fat  $n$ -ladder is a  $M$ -fat  $D_n$  minor.*

### 3. OTHER MEASURES OF CONNECTEDNESS

**Remark 3.1.** *Bottlenecking is closely related to an existing and well understood notion “Connectivity”. Informally bottlenecking measures how connected a graph is by finding the area with the highest number of paths between two sets. Whereas “Connectivity” measures how connected a graph is by finding the two points with the fewest number of paths between them.*

**Definition 3.1** ( $n$ -Edge Connectivity). *A graph  $G$  is said to have  $n$ -edge connectivity iff for any two vertices  $x, y \in V(G)$  there exists a set of at least  $n$   $x, y$  paths that share no edges.*

**Proposition 3.1.** *If a graph is  $n$ -edge connected then it is not  $(n - 1)$ -edge bottlenecked.*

*Proof.* If a graph is  $n$ -edge connected then any two vertices have at least  $n$  edge disjoint paths between them so there is a pair of two vertices  $x, y$  such that no set of  $n - 1$  edges intersects every  $x, y$  path.  $\square$

**Remark 3.2.** *A converse of Proposition 3.1 does not hold showing that connectivity is a stronger property than bottlenecking (see Figure 1).*

**Remark 3.3.** *Similarly to edge bottlenecking and edge connectivity there exist notions of point bottlenecking and point connectivity.*

**Definition 3.2. ( $n$ -point bottlenecking)** *A graph  $G$  is said to have  $n$ -point bottlenecking if for any two disjoint connected sets  $X, Y \subset V(G)$ , there exists a set  $S \subseteq V(G)$  of size  $n$  such that any  $X, Y$  path contains an element of  $S$ .*

**Definition 3.3** ( $n$ -point Connectivity). *A graph  $G$  is said to have  $n$ -point connectivity iff for any two vertices  $x, y \in V(G)$  there exists a set of at least  $n$  internally disjoint  $x, y$  paths.*

**Proposition 3.2.** *If a graph is quasi-isometric to a  $n$ -edge bottlenecked graph then it is quasi-isometric to a  $n$ -point bottlenecked graph.*

*Proof.* If a graph is  $n$ -edge bottlenecked then by subdividing every edge once a graph with  $n$ -point bottlenecking may be produced.  $\square$

**Remark 3.4.** *It is not clear if there are  $n$ -point bottlenecked graphs that are not quasi-isometric to a edge bottlenecked graph.*

**Remark 3.5** (Menger’s Theorem). *The edge (or vertex) connectivity of a graph is equal to the minimum number of edges (or vertices) that must be removed from a graph to disconnect a graph. This result is known as Menger’s Theorem. A coarse version of this was recently conjectured by two sets of authors [8, 11] and a counterexample was found [10] using a construction based around a large binary tree.*

#### 4. CHARACTERIZATIONS OF $n$ -EDGE BOTTLENECKED GRAPHS

**Remark 4.1.** *The class of connected graphs that are 1-edge bottlenecked has been studied extensively under the title “Trees” and has proven to be of interest in many different fields, a characterization simmlar to what one might find in any textbook on graph theory [5] is given here.*

##### 4.1. Trees.

**Proposition 4.1.** *The following are equivalent*

- (1) *A graph is 1-edge bottlenecked.*
- (2) *A graph does not contain  $D_2$  as a minor.*
- (3) *A graph has a unique path between any two vertices.*
- (4) *A graph contains no cycles.*

1  $\implies$  2. Assume to a contradiction a graph contains a  $D_2$  minor, then the sets that contract to form the vertices of  $D_2$  give sets  $X$  and  $Y$  such that there is no edge intersecting every  $X, Y$  path, contradicting condition 1.  $\square$

2  $\implies$  3. Assume to a contradiction that there were two distinct paths between two vertices, then there is an edge in one path but not the other, by contracting the whole graph to the endpoints of this edge a  $D_2$  minor is produced, contradicting condition 2.  $\square$

3  $\implies$  4. If a graph has a unique path between any two vertices then there is no pair of internally disjoint paths that share their endpoints.  $\square$

4  $\implies$  1. Assume to a contradiction that a graph is not 1-edge bottlenecked, this gives that there are connected sets  $X$  and  $Y$  such that there is no edge that intersects every  $X, Y$  path. There must be at least two  $X, Y$  paths, and there must be at least one edge contained in only one of these two paths. This edge is a path between its endpoints, and as there is an  $X, Y$  path not through this edge there must be a second path between its endpoints, this gives a cycle and contradicts condition 4.  $\square$

##### 4.2. Cacti.

**Remark 4.2.** *The class of graphs that are 2-edge bottlenecked is well known to many as “Cactus” graphs. These have been studied to some extent as well, but not to the same level as trees.*

**Proposition 4.2.** *The following are equivalent*

- (1) *A graph is 2-edge bottlenecked.*
- (2) *A graph does not contain  $D_3$  as a minor.*
- (3) *The intersection of any two distinct cycles is at most a single vertex.*

1  $\implies$  2. If a graph contains a  $D_3$  minor then each of the sets that contract to form the edges of  $D_3$  give 3 disjoint paths between the sets that contract to form the vertices of  $D_3$ .  $\square$

2  $\implies$  3. If the intersection of two cycles contains more than one vertex then it either contains an edge or is disconnected. If the intersection is disconnected then Proposition 4.4 gives a stronger result so we may assume towards a contradiction there are two cycles with an intersection that is connected and contains at least two vertices. By contracting the endpoints of this connected region (that contains at least one edge) a  $D_3$  minor is produced, contradicting condition 2.  $\square$

3  $\implies$  1. Assume to a contradiction that there are connected sets  $X$  and  $Y$  such that no two edges will intersect every  $X, Y$  path. This gives at least three edges with three  $X, Y$  paths such that each path uses only one of the edges. As  $X$  and  $Y$  are connected any pair of these paths gives a cycle, so two pairs of paths give two cycles that share an edge.  $\square$

**Proposition 4.3.** *If a graph  $G$  contains a  $D_3$  minor then it contains a subdivision of  $D_3$ .*

*Proof.* By Proposition 4.2 a  $D_3$  minor implies there are two distinct cycles that intersect at more than one vertex. let  $C_1$  and  $C_2$  be two such cycles. Cycle  $C_1$  contains a path  $S$  with only its endpoints in  $C_2$ .  $S \cup C_2$  is a structure that can be produced by subdividing  $D_3$ .  $\square$

### 4.3. Cut-Cacti.

**Remark 4.3.** *After trees and cactus, the class of three edge bottlenecked graphs we call cut-cactus. To our knowledge these have not yet been studied extensively.*

**Proposition 4.4.** *The following are equivalent*

- (1) *A graph is 3-edge bottlenecked.*
- (2) *The intersection of any two distinct cycles in  $G$  is empty or connected.*
- (3) *A graph does not contain  $D_4$  as a minor.*

*Proof.* 1  $\implies$  2 Let  $G$  be a 3-edge bottlenecked graph with cycles  $C_1$  and  $C_2$ . Assume to a contradiction that  $C_1 \cap C_2$  is nonempty and not connected. This gives that there are points  $x, y \in C_1 \cap C_2$  such that no  $x, y$  path is contained in  $C_1 \cap C_2$ . Consider the set  $X$  to be the connected component of  $C_1 \cap C_2$  containing  $x$ . Take the sets  $r_1, r_2, r_3, r_4$  to be the segments of  $C_1 \cup C_2 \setminus C_1 \cap C_2$  adjoined to  $X$ . Then take the set  $Y$  to be all of  $C_1 \cup C_2$  aside from  $X$  and the  $r_i$  sets. The  $r_i$  segments give 4 internally disjoint  $X, Y$  paths, contradicting condition 1.  $\square$

*Proof.* 2  $\implies$  3 Let  $G$  be a graph where the intersection of any two distinct cycles is empty or connected and assume to a contradiction that  $G$  contains a  $D_4$  minor. By considering 3 of the edges in this  $D_4$  minor there is a  $D_3$  minor, and thus a  $D_3$  subdivision. By considering the shortest paths between the vertices of this  $D_3$  subdivision that use the remaining edge of the  $D_4$  minor, there are two cycles with a disconnected intersection and this is a contradiction.  $\square$

*Proof.* 3  $\implies$  1 If a graph is not 3-edge bottlenecked then there are sets  $X$  and  $Y$  with at least 4 paths that share no edges between them. By contracting each path to an edge and the sets  $X$  and  $Y$  to vertices a  $D_4$  minor is produced, contradicting condition 3.  $\square$

**Proposition 4.5.** *If a graph contains a 4-ladder then it contains a 4-ladder where the poles are paths, and the connections of two rungs occur at each of the endpoints of each path.*

*Proof.* Let  $G$  be a graph that contains a 4-ladder, there are two cycles in  $G$  that have an intersection that is not connected, pick one connected region of this intersection to be one pole, and the arcs along each cycle to the next connected region to be the rungs, now follow the path of one cycle to connect the shared endpoints of the rungs to form a 4-ladder with the required structure.  $\square$

#### 4.4. $n$ -edge bottlenecking.

**Theorem 4.1.** *The following are equivalent:*

- (1) *A graph  $G$  is  $n$ -edge bottlenecked.*
- (2) *Every minor of  $G$  is  $n$ -edge bottlenecked.*
- (3)  *$G$  does not contain  $D_{n+1}$  as a minor.*

*Proof.* 1  $\iff$  2 The backwards direction is straight-forward as  $G$  is a minor of itself. So assume to a contradiction that  $G$  is  $n$ -edge bottlenecked for some  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  and that there is some minor  $H$  of  $G$  that is not  $n$  bottlenecked. This gives that there are  $X, Y \subset V(H)$  such that there are at least  $(n+1)$ -edge independent  $X, Y$  paths. By considering the sets in  $G$  that contract to form  $X, Y$  and these paths one can construct an  $(n+1)$ -ladder in  $G$ . This would imply that  $G$  is not  $n$ -edge bottlenecked, a contradiction.

2  $\iff$  3 If  $G$  contains  $D_{n+1}$  as a minor it is clear that  $G$  is not  $n$ -edge bottlenecked. So let  $G$  be a graph that does not contain a  $D_{n+1}$  minor and assume to a contradiction that  $G$  is not  $n$  bottlenecked. As  $G$  is not  $n$ -edge bottlenecked there are  $X, Y \subset V(G)$  with  $(n+1)$ -edge independent paths between them. By picking the first edge on each path with an endpoint not in  $X$  and contracting all of  $X, Y$  and the rest of these paths to points gives a  $D_{n+1}$  minor.  $\square$

**Remark 4.4.** *Theorem 4.1 shows that the class of  $n$  bottlenecked graphs is a minor closed family classified by the  $D_{n+1}$  excluded minor.*

## 5. COARSE BOTTLENECKING & COARSE MENDER-TYPE CONJECTURES

**Remark 5.1.** *Lemma 2.1 Gives ladders as a useful tool for studying edge bottlenecking. A  $M$ -fat  $(n+1)$ -ladder is not  $M$ -fat  $n$  bottlenecked, the converse of this statement would be a slightly different version of the coarse Menger Conjecture than previously proposed [8, 11] and disproven [10]. Note that the counter example given does not apply in this case as it contains a fat 3 ladder. We present one such statement below.*

**Theorem 5.1.** *For the following conditions:*

- (1) *A graph  $G$  is  $M$ -fat  $n$  bottlenecked.*
- (2) *Every minor of  $G$  is  $M$ -fat  $n$  bottlenecked.*
- (3)  *$G$  does not contain a  $M$ -fat  $D_{n+1}$  minor.*
- (4) *Every  $M$ -fat minor of  $G$  is  $n$ -bottlenecked.*
- (5)  *$G$  does not contain a  $M$ -fat  $n+1$  ladder*

*The implications:*

$$1 \iff 2 \implies 3 \iff 4 \iff 5$$

*hold.*

**Remark 5.2.** *The implications  $2 \implies 3$  and  $3 \iff 5$  are clear, and the rest are proven by the following lemmas.*

**Lemma 5.1.**  $3 \iff 4$  *A graph  $G$  does not contain a  $M$ -fat  $n + 1$  ladder iff Every  $M$ -fat minor of  $G$  is  $n$ -bottlenecked.*

*Proof.* The direction  $3 \implies 4$  is straight forward. We next will prove  $\beta \implies A$  let  $G$  contain a graph  $H$ , that is not  $n$ -edge bottlenecked as a  $M$ -fat minor. As  $H$  is a  $M$ -fat minor of  $G$ ,  $G$  contains every minor of  $H$  as an  $M$ -fat minor. Since  $H$  is not  $n$ -edge bottlenecked  $H$  contains  $D_{n+1}$  as a minor 4.1. So  $G$  contains  $D_{n+1}$  as a  $M$ -fat minor showing that 4 can not hold.  $\square$

**Lemma 5.2.**  $1 \iff 2$  *A graph  $G$  is  $M$ -fat  $n$  bottlenecked iff every minor of  $G$  is  $M$ -fat  $n$  bottlenecked.*

*Proof.* The direction  $2 \implies 1$  is straight-forward as  $G$  is a minor of itself. We will prove  $1 \implies 2$  by a contradiction. So assume to a contradiction that  $G$  is  $M$ -fat  $n$  bottlenecked for some  $M$  and that there is some  $H$  a minor of  $G$  that is not  $M$ -fat  $n$  bottlenecked. This gives that there are  $M$ -disjoint  $X, Y \subset H$  such that there are at least  $n + 1$   $M$ -disjoint  $X, Y$  paths. By considering the sets in  $G$  that contract to form  $X, Y$  and these paths one can construct a  $M$ -fat  $(n + 1)$ -ladder in  $G$ . This would imply that  $G$  is not  $M$ -fat  $n$  bottlenecked, a contradiction.  $\square$

**Remark 5.3.** *While it has been shown [10] that a coarse Menger's Theorem (as proposed by [8, 4]) does not hold, bottlenecking is closely related to connectivity, and there are reasons to hope that a similar statement pertaining to bottlenecking may be true. The first of these reasons is that, bottlenecking is weaker than connectivity in the non-coarse setting, and can often be controlled by small changes to a graph's structure. A second reason is that the existing counter example relies on large binary trees with connections across the lower layers, and as these structures get big they are not coarsely bottlenecked.*

**Conjecture 5.1.1** (A Coarse "Menger-type" conjecture). *A graph is  $M$ -fat  $n$ -bottlenecked only if it contains no  $M$ -fat  $n + 1$  ladders.*

**Remark 5.4.** *This would serve as the implication  $5 \implies 1$  in 5.1. We call this a "Menger-type" conjecture as its analog, Lemma 2.1 is a direct consequence of Menger's Theorem. This conjecture is notably different from the existing formulation of the Coarse Menger Conjecture [8, 4] as  $M$ -fat bottlenecking deals only with connected sets that are  $M$ -disjoint and the existing counter-example [10] to the Coarse Menger Conjecture, in addition to not being coarsely bottlenecked, rely on sets that are both disconnected, and not disjoint.*

**Remark 5.5.** *Theorem 5.1, along with Conjecture 5.1.1 would show that the class of  $M$ -fat  $n$  bottlenecked graphs is a minor closed family classified by the  $M$ -fat  $D_{n+1}$  excluded minor.*

**Theorem 5.2.** *Of the conditions:*

- (1) *A graph  $G$  is not coarsely bottlenecked.*
- (2)  *$G$  contains  $D_{n+1}$  as an asymptotic minor.*
- (3)  *$G$  contains a  $(n + 1)$ -ladder as an asymptotic minor.*

*The implications*

$$2 \iff 3 \implies 1$$

hold.

**Remark 5.6.** *The remaining implication  $1 \implies 3$  would complete an excluded asymptotic minor characterization of coarsely bottlenecked graphs. A positive resolution of Conjecture 5.1.1 would imply this.*

In [8] Georgakopoulos and Papasoglu proposed the following conjecture.

**Conjecture 5.2.1** ([8] Conjecture 1.1). *Let  $X$  be a graph or a length space, and let  $H$  be a finite graph. Then  $X$  has no  $M$ -fat  $H$  minor for some  $M \in \mathbb{N}$  if and only if  $X$  is quasi-isometric to a graph with no  $H$  minor.*

**Remark 5.7.** *Recently [9] the counter example of the coarse Menger conjecture was adapted to a counter example of Conjecture 5.2.1. For the class of coarsely bottlenecked graphs, we propose the following conjecture in a similar spirit.*

**Conjecture 5.2.2** (Quasi  $n$ -Bottlenecking). *If a graph  $G$  is coarsely  $n$  bottlenecked then it is quasi-isometric to a  $n$ -edge bottlenecked graph.*

**Remark 5.8.** *This conjecture holds in the case of  $n = 1$  [2, 8] and  $n = 2$  [1, 4]. In the case where Conjecture 5.1.1 holds, Conjecture 5.2.2 is a special case of Conjecture 5.2.1, as 5.1.1 would imply that coarse  $n$ -bottlenecking is characterized by an excluded asymptotic  $D_{n+1}$  minor. So Conjecture 5.2.2 would imply that a graph with no asymptotic  $D_n$  minor is quasi-isometric to a graph with no  $D_n$  minor.*

## REFERENCES

- [1] Fujiwara, Koji, and Panos Papasoglu. "A coarse-geometry characterization of cacti." arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.08512 (2023).
- [2] Manning, Jason Fox. "Geometry of Pseudocharacters." *Geometry & Topology*, vol. 9, no. 2, June 2005.
- [3] Menger, K. (1927). Zur allgemeinen kurventheorie. *Fundamenta Mathematicae*, 10(1), 96-115.
- [4] Albrechtsen, S., Huynh, T., Jacobs, R. W., Knappe, P., & Wollan, P. (2023). The induced two paths problem. arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.04721 (2023).
- [5] Bondy, J.A. & Murty, U.S.R. (2008). *Graph Theory*. Graduate Texts in Mathematics
- [6] Roe, J. (2003). *Lectures on coarse geometry* (No. 31). American Mathematical Soc..
- [7] Bruner, Michael, Atish Mitra, and Heidi Steiger. "Graph Skeletons and Diminishing Minors." arXiv preprint arXiv:2405.17785 (2024).
- [8] Georgakopoulos, A., & Papasoglu, P. (2023). Graph minors and metric spaces. arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.07456.
- [9] Davies, J., Hickingbotham, R., Illingworth, F., & McCarty, R. (2024). Fat minors cannot be thinned (by quasi-isometries). arXiv preprint arXiv:2405.09383.
- [10] Albrechtsen, S., Huynh, T., Jacobs, R. W., Knappe, P., & Wollan, P. (2023). The induced two paths problem. arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.04721.
- [11] Chepoi, V., Dragan, F. F., Newman, I., Rabinovich, Y., & Vaxes, Y. (2012). Constant approximation algorithms for embedding graph metrics into trees and outerplanar graphs. *Discrete & Computational Geometry*, 47, 187-214.

UNIVERSITY OF MONTANA, 32 CAMPUS DRIVE MISSOULA, MT 59812  
*Email address:* michael@leebruner.com

MONTANA TECHNOLOGICAL UNIVERSITY, 1300 WEST PARK STREET BUTTE, MT 59701  
*Email address:* amitra@mttech.edu

MONTANA TECHNOLOGICAL UNIVERSITY, 1300 WEST PARK STREET BUTTE, MT 59701  
*Email address:* hsteiger@mttech.edu