

Network Representation and Modular Decomposition of Combinatorial Structures: A Galled-Tree Perspective

Anna Lindeberg¹, Guillaume E. Scholz², and Marc Hellmuth^{1,*}

¹*Department of Mathematics, Faculty of Science, Stockholm University, SE-10691 Stockholm, Sweden*

²*Bioinformatics Group, Department of Computer Science & Interdisciplinary Center for Bioinformatics, Universität Leipzig, Härtelstraße 16–18, D-04107 Leipzig, Germany.*

**corresponding author*

Abstract

In phylogenetics, reconstructing rooted trees from distances between taxa is a common task. Böcker and Dress generalized this concept by introducing symbolic dated maps $\delta: X \times X \rightarrow \Upsilon$, where distances are replaced by symbols, and showed that there is a one-to-one correspondence between symbolic ultrametrics and labeled rooted phylogenetic trees. Many combinatorial structures fall under the umbrella of symbolic dated maps, such as 2-dissimilarities, symmetric labeled 2-structures, or edge-colored complete graphs, and are here referred to as strudigrams.

Strudigrams have a unique decomposition into non-overlapping modules, which can be represented by a modular decomposition tree (MDT). In the absence of prime modules, strudigrams are equivalent to symbolic ultrametrics, and the MDT fully captures the relationships $\delta(x,y)$ between pairs of vertices $x,y \in X$ through the label of their least common ancestor in the MDT. However, in the presence of prime vertices, this information is generally hidden.

To provide this missing structural information, we aim to locally replace the prime vertices in the MDT to obtain networks that capture full information about the strudigrams. While starting with the general framework of prime-vertex replacement networks, we then focus on a specific type of such networks obtained by replacing prime vertices with so-called galls, resulting in labeled galled-trees. We introduce the concept of galled-tree explainable (GATEX) strudigrams, provide their characterization, and demonstrate that recognizing these structures and reconstructing the labeled networks that explain them can be achieved in polynomial time.

Keywords: dissimilarities, symbolic ultrametrics, 2-structures, edge-colored graphs, strudigram, prime-vertex replacement, phylogenetic network, clustering systems

1 Introduction

It is a common task in phylogenetics to reconstruct rooted trees with leaf set X , reflecting the evolutionary relationships between species, genes, or other taxa collected in X , from distances $d: X \times X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ among them. In particular, there is a well-known one-to-one correspondence between so-called rooted dated phylogenetic trees (T,t) and ultrametrics, i.e., metrics satisfying the strong triangle inequality $d(x,y) \leq \max\{d(x,z), d(y,z)\}$ for all $x,y,z \in X$ [27, 51]. In this case, the date $t(\text{lca}(x,y))$ assigned to the unique least common ancestor $\text{lca}(x,y)$ of x and y in T coincides with the distance $d(x,y)$ for all $x,y \in X$.

In their seminal paper [5], Böcker and Dress considered a combinatorial generalization of ultrametrics and removed the restrictions regarding the values of t and d as far as possible. Instead of considering real numbers $d(x,y)$, they considered symbolic dating maps $\delta: X \times X \rightarrow \Upsilon$, i.e., symmetric maps assigning to each pair (x,y) some symbol $\delta(x,y) \in \Upsilon$. In particular, they showed the one-to-one correspondence between so-called symbolic ultrametrics and symbolic dated, or simply labeled, phylogenetic trees (T,t) . Symbolic ultrametrics $\delta: X \times X \rightarrow \Upsilon$ are defined by the following two properties:

(U2) There are no four vertices $x,y,u,v \in X$ such that

$$\delta(x,y) = \delta(y,u) = \delta(u,v) \neq \delta(y,v) = \delta(x,v) = \delta(x,u).$$

(U3) $|\{\delta(x,y), \delta(x,z), \delta(y,z)\}| \leq 2$ for all $x,y,z \in V$.

While long considered of interest only from a theoretical point of view¹ (cf. e.g. [15, 16, 50]), such symbolic dating maps have become relevant in practice and are shown to play a crucial role in the understanding of so-called orthologous and paralogous genes [36, 37] and the reconstruction of gene and species trees [38].

Restricting these symmetric maps $\delta: X \times X \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$ to be binary, there is a direct translation to “usual” graphs $G = (X, E)$ with vertex set X and adjacent vertices x and y precisely if $\delta(x, y) = 1$. It is well known [37] that a graph G represents a symbolic ultrametric if and only if G is a cograph, i.e., G does not contain induced paths P_4 on four vertices [12, 13]. In this case, G can be “explained” by a 0/1-labeled tree (T, t) in the sense that $x, y \in X$ are adjacent if and only if $t(\text{lca}(x, y)) = 1$. In a more general setting, symbolic ultrametrics can be characterized as edge-colored graphs that do not contain so-called monochromatic P_4 s (due to Condition (U2)) and rainbow triangles (due to Condition (U3)) [37, 39], see Theorem 3.2. A similar result was provided by Gurvich in [28, Thm. 3] for the characterization of the normal forms of so-called positional games with perfect information.

Independent of the work of Böcker and Dress, Ehrenfeucht and Rozenberg established the theory of labeled 2-structures [19, 20]. This theory relates to clustering and tree-representation, and is closely connected to symbolic dating maps. As shown in [39], a symbolic dating map δ is a symbolic ultrametric if and only if the translation of δ into symmetric labeled 2-structures is “uniformly non-prime”. The latter is closely related to the notion of modules or clans [21–23, 39], i.e., subsets $M \subseteq X$ for which $\delta(x, z) = \delta(y, z)$ is satisfied for all $x, y \in M$ and $z \in X \setminus M$. In particular, for each symbolic dating map δ , there is a unique set system \mathfrak{C}_δ of non-overlapping modules called the *modular decomposition* of δ . Since no two elements in \mathfrak{C}_δ overlap, \mathfrak{C}_δ is a hierarchy and thus, the Hasse diagram $T_\delta := \mathcal{H}(\mathfrak{C}_\delta)$ is a phylogenetic tree [3, 17, 40] that can be equipped with a labeling t_δ resulting in a labeled tree (T_δ, t_δ) . In the absence of so-called prime modules, the information about δ is fully captured by (T_δ, t_δ) in the sense that $t_\delta(\text{lca}(\{x\}, \{y\})) = \delta(x, y)$ for all $x, y \in X$. However, in the presence of prime modules, the full information of δ cannot be determined from (T_δ, t_δ) alone.

To summarize at this point, several equivalent notions of symbolic dated maps exist: symbolic 2-dissimilarity [41], symmetric 2-structures, or edge-colored graphs. These structures have in common that they are mainly considered from a tree-reconstruction point of view, i.e., characterizations are provided for those symbolic dated maps that can be represented by labeled phylogenetic trees. In this paper, we aim to generalize the latter concept and ask under which conditions symbolic dated maps can be represented by labeled networks, i.e., rooted directed acyclic graphs. A first step in this direction is provided in [32–34], where “binary” maps $\delta: X \times X \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$ have been characterized that can be explained by so-called galled-trees, which results in the definition of so-called GATEX graphs. Furthermore, in [42] those symbolic dated maps are characterized that can be explained by particular rather “tree-like” directed acyclic graphs which may admit several roots. In [9] it was shown that every symbolic map can be explained by some rooted median network and in [41] some results are presented for so-called 3-way symbolic maps that arise from restricted versions of galled-trees.

To cover the different, yet similarly flavored, definitions related to symbolic dated maps and to simplify the notion, we consider *strudigrams*, which are triples $S = (X, \Upsilon, \sigma)$ such that σ is a map that assigns a unique label $\sigma(x, y) \in \Upsilon$ to each two elements $x, y \in X$. The word *strudigram* is composed of the first parts of the words **structures**, **dissimilarities**, and **graphs**. A strudigram S is explained by a labeled network (N, t) with leaf set X if, for all $x, y \in X$, there is a unique least common ancestor $\text{lca}(x, y)$ and it holds that the labels $t(\text{lca}(x, y))$ and $\sigma(x, y)$ coincide.

We provide in Section 2 the necessary definitions concerning clustering systems and networks, and in Section 3 more details on the notion of strudigrams. As it turns out, each strudigram $S = (X, \Upsilon, \sigma)$ can be explained by some labeled network having $O(|X|^2)$ vertices, assigning to each two-element subset $\{x, y\}$ of X a unique lca. This begs the question of whether there are simpler networks. One way to address this question is by using the modular decomposition tree (\mathcal{T}, τ) of S as explained in Section 4. In the absence of so-called prime vertices in (\mathcal{T}, τ) , this labeled tree explains S . This is precisely the case if the translation of S into a symbolic dated map δ is a symbolic ultrametric. The aim is thus to reconstruct a network by locally replacing such prime vertices by some networks and keeping as much of the tree structure of \mathcal{T} as possible. The latter is covered in Section 5. In particular, we show how to obtain so-called lca-networks to explain given strudigrams. While the concept of replacing prime vertices in (\mathcal{T}, τ) is rather general, we focus in Section 6 on those networks that can be obtained from (\mathcal{T}, τ) by replacing prime vertices with so-called galls that are, roughly speaking, biconnected directed acyclic graphs composed of two paths that only share their start and end point. Such networks are also known as galled-trees. We provide characterizations of strudigrams S , called GATEX strudigrams, that can be explained by such labeled galled-trees in terms of their underlying so-called primitive substructures. As it turns out, GATEX strudigrams, as well as networks that explain them, can be constructed in polynomial time, as shown in Section 7.

2 Preliminaries

Sets and Clustering Systems. All sets considered here are assumed to be finite. For a nonempty set X , $\binom{X}{2}$ denotes the collection of all two-element subsets of X and 2^X the powerset of X . A *partition of a set X* is a family of nonempty sets $\{X_1, \dots, X_k\}$ such that $X = \bigcup_{i=1}^k X_i$ and $X_i \cap X_j = \emptyset$ for each $i \neq j$. Two sets X and Y *overlap* if $X \cap Y \notin \{\emptyset, X, Y\}$.

¹Anecdotally, Sebastian Böcker mentioned in a private communication that he never thought that symbolic ultrametrics would have any practical relevance.

A set system $\mathfrak{S} \subseteq 2^X$ is a *clustering system (on X)* if $\emptyset \notin \mathfrak{S}$, $\{x\} \in \mathfrak{S}$ for all $x \in X$ and $X \in \mathfrak{S}$. For a given parameter k , a set system \mathfrak{Q} on X is *pre-k-ary* if, for all non-empty subsets $A \subseteq X$ with $|A| \leq k$ there is a unique inclusion-minimal element $C \in \mathfrak{Q}$ such that $A \subseteq C$. Let \mathfrak{C} be a clustering system. Then, \mathfrak{C} is a *hierarchy* if it does not contain any overlapping clusters. Furthermore, \mathfrak{C} is *closed* if and only if $A, B \in \mathfrak{C}$ and $A \cap B \neq \emptyset$ implies $A \cap B \in \mathfrak{C}$ (cf. [40, L. 16]). Moreover, \mathfrak{C} satisfies property (L) if $C_1 \cap C_2 = C_1 \cap C_3$ for all $C_1, C_2, C_3 \in \mathfrak{C}$ where C_1 overlaps both C_2 and C_3 . Finally, \mathfrak{C} satisfies property (N3O) if \mathfrak{C} contains no three distinct pairwise overlapping clusters.

Given a set system \mathfrak{C} on X , we define

$$\mathfrak{C} - x := \{C \setminus \{x\} \mid C \in \mathfrak{C} \text{ and } C \neq \{x\}\}.$$

In simple words, $\mathfrak{C} - x$ is the set system obtained from \mathfrak{C} by removing $\{x\}$ and from each $C \in \mathfrak{C}$ with $C \neq \{x\}$ the element x (if existent). Note that, by definition, $\mathfrak{C} - x$ is not a multiset, that is, if $C' \setminus \{x\} = C''$ for some $C', C'' \in \mathfrak{C}$ then only one copy of $C' \setminus \{x\}$ and C'' remains in $\mathfrak{C} - x$. As the next result shows, the property of being a clustering system that is closed or that satisfies (L) or (N3O) is heritable.

Lemma 2.1. *Let \mathfrak{C} be a clustering system on X with $|X| > 1$ that satisfies property $\Pi \in \{\text{closed}, (\text{L}), (\text{N3O})\}$ and let $x \in X$. Then, $\mathfrak{C} - x$ is a clustering system on $X \setminus \{x\}$ that satisfies Π .*

Proof. Put $\mathfrak{C}' = \mathfrak{C} - x$ and $X' := X \setminus \{x\}$ for some $x \in X$ with $|X| > 1$. By construction, \mathfrak{C}' is a set system. Since \mathfrak{C} is a clustering system on X we have, by definition, $\emptyset \notin \mathfrak{C}$, $X \in \mathfrak{C}$ and $\{w\} \in \mathfrak{C}$ for all $w \in X$. Since $|X| > 1$, we have $X' \neq \{x\}$ and by construction, $X' \in \mathfrak{C}'$. Moreover, by construction, \mathfrak{C}' still contains $\{w\} \in \mathfrak{C}$ for all $w \in X'$. In particular, $\emptyset \notin \mathfrak{C}'$. Thus, \mathfrak{C}' is a clustering system on X' .

Suppose that \mathfrak{C} is closed. Let $A, B \in \mathfrak{C}$ and put $A' = A \setminus \{x\}$ and $B' = B \setminus \{x\}$. Note that $A = A'$ or $B = B'$ may be possible. Let $C = A \cap B$ and, therefore, $C' = C \setminus \{x\} = A' \cap B'$. We consider now the three cases that may occur for C : (i) $C = \emptyset$, (ii) $C = \{x\}$, and (iii) $C \neq \emptyset$ and $C \neq \{x\}$. If $C = \emptyset$, then $C' = A' \cap B' = \emptyset$ and there is nothing to show. If $C = \{x\}$, then $C' = \emptyset$ and again, there is nothing to show. Assume that $C \neq \emptyset$ and $C \neq \{x\}$. In this case, $C' = A' \cap B' \neq \emptyset$. Since \mathfrak{C} is closed, $C \in \mathfrak{C}$ and, by construction of \mathfrak{C}' , we have $C' \in \mathfrak{C}'$. Thus, \mathfrak{C}' is closed.

Suppose that \mathfrak{C} satisfies (L). Again, for a cluster $C_i \in \mathfrak{C}$ that is distinct from $\{x\}$, we put $C'_i := C_i \setminus \{x\}$. Note that $C_i \neq C_j$ if $C'_i \neq C'_j$. Let $C'_1 \in \mathfrak{C}'$ and assume that C'_1 overlaps both $C'_2, C'_3 \in \mathfrak{C}'$. One easily verifies that C_1 must overlap both C_2 and C_3 . In particular, since \mathfrak{C} satisfies (L), we have $C_1 \cap C_2 = C_1 \cap C_3 = A$ and thus, $C'_1 \cap C'_2 = A \setminus \{x\} = C'_1 \cap C'_3$. Therefore, \mathfrak{C}' satisfies (L).

Suppose that \mathfrak{C} satisfies (N3O). If $A' = A \setminus \{x\}, B' = B \setminus \{x\}, C' = C \setminus \{x\} \in \mathfrak{C}'$ overlap pairwise, one easily verifies that A, B, C overlap pairwise; a contradiction to the assumption that \mathfrak{C} does not contain three distinct pairwise overlapping clusters. Hence, \mathfrak{C}' satisfies (N3O). \square

Graphs. A *directed graph* $G = (V, E)$ is an ordered pair consisting of a nonempty set $V(G) := V$ of *vertices* and a set $E(G) := E \subseteq (V \times V) \setminus \{(v, v) \mid v \in V\}$ of *edges*. If $(x, y) \in E$ implies $(y, x) \in E$ for all $x, y \in V$, then G is called an (*undirected*) *graph*. Two vertices x and y are *adjacent* if $(x, y) \in E$ or $(y, x) \in E$.

A directed graph $G' = (V', E')$ is a *subgraph* of $G = (V, E)$ if $V' \subseteq V$ and $E' \subseteq E$. For $W \subseteq V$, the *induced subgraph* $G[W]$ of G is the graph with vertex set $V(G[W]) = W$ and edge set $E(G[W]) = \{(x, y) \in E \mid x, y \in W\}$. In particular, $G - v$ for $v \in V$ denotes the induced subgraph $G[V \setminus \{v\}]$, whenever $|V| > 1$.

For directed graphs $G = (V, E)$ and $G' = (V', E')$, an *isomorphism between G and G'* is a bijective map $\varphi: V \rightarrow V'$ such that $(u, v) \in E$ if and only if $(\varphi(u), \varphi(v)) \in E'$. If such a map exists, then G and G' are *isomorphic*, in symbols $G \simeq G'$.

A path $P_n = (V, E)$ has vertex set $V = \{v_1, v_2, \dots, v_n\}$ and the edges in E are precisely of one of the form (v_i, v_{i+1}) or (v_{i+1}, v_i) , $i = 1, 2, \dots, n-1$. We often denote such paths by $P_n = v_1 v_2 \dots v_n$ and call them a $v_1 v_n$ -path. If all edges in P_n are precisely of the form (v_i, v_{i+1}) for each $i = 1, 2, \dots, n-1$, then the path P_n is called *directed* and, otherwise, *undirected*. A path P_n has *length* $n-1$, and the vertices v_1 and v_n are called its *end vertices*. In particular, $n=1$ means that the path in question consists of a single (end) vertex, so that it has length zero. A directed graph G is *connected* if there exists an undirected xy -path between any pair of vertices x and y . If G has only one vertex, or if $G - v$ is connected for each vertex v of G , then G is said to be *biconnected*. A *biconnected component* $C = (V', E')$ of $G = (V, E)$ is an inclusion-maximal biconnected induced subgraph. A biconnected component is *non-trivial* if it has at least three vertices, otherwise it is *trivial*.

For each $v \in V$ we define $\text{indeg}(v) := |\{u \in V : (u, v) \in E\}|$ and $\text{outdeg}(v) := |\{u \in V : (v, u) \in E\}|$ as the *in-degree* respectively *out-degree* of v . Moreover, G is said to be *acyclic* if it contains no *directed cycle*, that is, no sequence of $k \geq 2$ distinct vertices $v_1, v_2, \dots, v_k \in V$ such that $(v_1, v_2), (v_2, v_3), \dots, (v_{k-1}, v_k), (v_k, v_1) \in E$.

DAGs and Networks. A directed acyclic graph is called *DAG*. A vertex of a DAG G with out-degree zero is called a *leaf*, and the set of leaves in G is denoted by $L(G)$. In this case, we also say that G is a DAG on $L(G)$.

A (*rooted*) *network* N is a DAG containing a unique vertex with in-degree zero. This vertex is called the *root* of N , and is denoted by ρ_N . The existence of ρ_N in particular implies that N is connected and that, for all $v \in V(N)$, there is a directed $\rho_N v$ -path. If $X = L(N)$ we also state that N is a network on X . A vertex which is not a leaf is called an *inner-vertex* and we put $V^0(N) := V(N) \setminus L(N)$. In particular, the *trivial* network $(\{\rho_N\}, \emptyset)$ contains a single leaf. Furthermore,

a vertex $v \in V(N)$ is a *tree-vertex* if $\text{indeg}(v) \leq 1$ and a *hybrid-vertex* if $\text{indeg}(v) \geq 2$. If a network N contains no hybrid-vertices it is a *tree*. If each leaf of N is a tree-vertex, then N is *leaf-separated*. A network N' is the *leaf-extended version* of a network N , if N' is obtained from N by relabeling all hybrids x in N with $\text{outdeg}_N(x) = 0$ by v_x and adding the edge (v_x, x) . Clearly, if N is a network on X then its leaf-extended version is a network on X . A network on X is *phylogenetic*, if it is either (i) trivial or (ii) non-trivial and there is no vertex v with $\text{outdeg}(v) = 1$ and $\text{indeg}(v) \leq 1$. We emphasize that, by definition, every non-trivial phylogenetic network N satisfies $\text{outdeg}(\rho_N) > 1$.

As usual in rooted DAGs $N = (V, E)$, we say that v is a *child* of u while u is a *parent* of v , for each pair of vertices u and v such that $(u, v) \in E$. We denote with $\text{par}_N(u)$ and $\text{child}_N(u)$ the set of parents and children of vertex u . If $x \in \text{child}_N(u)$ is a leaf, we call x also a *leaf-child* of u . If there is a directed path from u to v (possibly of length zero) in N , then u is an *ancestor* of v while v is a *descendant* of u and we write $u \succeq_N v$. If $u \succeq_N v$ but $u \neq v$, we write $u \succ_N v$. In particular, \succeq_N is a partial order on V . We thus say that $u, v \in V$ are *comparable* if $u \succeq_N v$ or $v \succeq_N u$, and *incomparable* otherwise. We sometimes use $v \preceq_N u$ and $v \prec_N u$ instead of $u \succeq_N v$ and $u \succ_N v$, respectively.

A vertex v in a network N with $\text{outdeg}_N(v) = \text{indeg}_N(v) = 1$ is *suppressed* by applying the following operations: remove v and its two incident edges (u, v) and (v, w) and add the edge (u, w) in case it does not already exist. Note that suppression of a vertex v does not change in- and out-degrees of any of the vertices $z \neq v$. Given a vertex v in N , the *subnetwork rooted at v* , denoted $N(v)$, is obtained from the directed graph $N[\{z \mid z \in V(N), v \succeq_N z\}]$ by suppressing any of its vertices w for which $\text{indeg}(w) = \text{outdeg}(w) = 1$ and, if its new root v has out-degree one, by deleting the vertex v and its incident edge, so that the new root of $N(v)$ is the child of v .

A vertex v of a network N on X is a *least common ancestor* (LCA) of a non-empty subset $A \subseteq V(N)$ if it is a \preceq_N -minimal element among the set of common ancestors of the vertices in A . The set $\text{LCA}_N(A)$ comprises all LCAs of A in N . Note $\text{LCA}_N(A)$ is non-empty, since ρ_N is a common ancestor of every vertex in N . We will, in particular, be interested in situations where $|\text{LCA}_N(A)| = 1$ holds for $A \subseteq X$ (where, usually, $|A| = 2$). For simplicity, we will write $\text{lca}_N(A) = v$ instead of $\text{LCA}_N(A) = \{v\}$ whenever $|\text{lca}_N(A)| = 1$ and say that $\text{lca}_N(A)$ is *well-defined*; otherwise, we leave $\text{lca}_N(A)$ *undefined*. Moreover, we write $\text{lca}_N(x, y)$ instead of $\text{lca}_N(\{x, y\})$.

For every $v \in V$ in a network $N = (V, E)$ on X , the set of its descendant leaves $\mathcal{C}_N(v) := \{x \in X \mid x \preceq_N v\}$ is a *cluster* of N . We write $\mathcal{C}_N := \{\mathcal{C}_N(v) \mid v \in V\}$. In particular, we have $\emptyset \notin \mathcal{C}_N$, $\mathcal{C}_N(x) = \{x\} \in \mathcal{C}_N$ for each $x \in X$, and since ρ_N is an ancestor of every vertex in N , $\mathcal{C}(\rho_N) = X \in \mathcal{C}_N$ holds. Thus \mathcal{C}_N is a clustering system for every network N . To each clustering system $\mathcal{C} \subseteq 2^X$ one can associate a “canonical” network, namely its *Hasse diagram* $\mathcal{H}(\mathcal{C})$, that is, the DAG with vertex set \mathcal{C} and directed edges from $A \in \mathcal{C}$ to $B \in \mathcal{C}$ if (i) $B \subsetneq A$ and (ii) there is no $C \in \mathcal{C}$ with $B \subsetneq C \subsetneq A$. Since X is an element of \mathcal{C} , $\mathcal{H}(\mathcal{C})$ has a unique root. Moreover, the leaves of $\mathcal{H}(\mathcal{C})$ are precisely the singleton sets $\{x\}$ for $x \in X$. This, however, implies that $\mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{H}(\mathcal{C})} \neq \mathcal{C}$. To circumvent this, we write $G \doteq \mathcal{H}(\mathcal{C})$ for the network that is obtained from $\mathcal{H}(\mathcal{C})$ by relabeling all vertices $\{x\}$ in $\mathcal{H}(\mathcal{C})$ by x . Thus, for $G \doteq \mathcal{H}(\mathcal{C})$ it holds that $\mathcal{C}_G = \mathcal{C}$ provided that \mathcal{C} is a clustering system.

For later reference, we provide

Observation 2.2 ([52, Obs. 2.5]). *Let G be a DAG on X , $\emptyset \neq A \subseteq X$, and suppose $\text{lca}_G(A)$ is well-defined. Then, the following is satisfied:*

- (i) $\text{lca}_G(A) \preceq_G v$ for all v with $A \subseteq \mathcal{C}_G(v)$.
- (ii) $\mathcal{C}_G(\text{lca}_G(A))$ is the unique inclusion-minimal cluster in \mathcal{C}_G containing A .
- (iii) $\text{lca}_G(\mathcal{C}_G(\text{lca}_G(A))) = \text{lca}_G(A)$.

Definition 2.3. A DAG G on X has the *k-lca-property* if $\text{lca}_G(A)$ is well-defined for all non-empty subsets $A \subseteq X$ with $|A| \leq k$. Moreover, G is an *lca-network* if it has the *k-lca-property* for all $k \leq |X|$. A DAG G is a *global lca-network*, if $\text{lca}_G(A)$ is well-defined for all non-empty subsets $A \subseteq V(G)$.

Theorem 2.4 ([40, L. 40 & Prop. 11]). *A clustering system \mathcal{C} is closed if and only if there is an lca-network N with $\mathcal{C} = \mathcal{C}_N$. In this case, $G \doteq \mathcal{H}(\mathcal{C})$ is an lca-network. Moreover, every rooted tree is an lca-network.*

We refer to [52] for more details on the relationship between DAGs or networks with *k-lca-property* and their underlying clustering systems. An example of a lca-network is provided in Fig. 1. By Obs. 2.2(ii), $\mathcal{C}(\text{lca}_G(A))$ is the unique inclusion-minimal cluster in \mathcal{C}_G containing A for all non-empty subsets $A \subseteq X$ with $|A| \leq k$. Hence \mathcal{C}_N is pre-*k*-ary.

Observation 2.5. *For every DAG G with *k-lca-property*, the clustering system \mathcal{C}_G is pre-*k*-ary.*

We note that in case the network N is understood from context, we drop the subscript from all notation, so that e.g. $\text{lca}_N(x, y)$ becomes $\text{lca}(x, y)$.

Remark 2.6. *In all drawings that include networks, we omitted drawing the directions of edges as arcs, that is, edges are drawn as simple lines. However, in all cases, the directions are implicitly given by directing the edges “away” from the root.*




Figure 1: Shown is an lca-network N on $X = \{x, y, z\}$ with pre- $|X|$ -ary clustering system $\mathfrak{C}_N = \{\{x\}, \{y\}, \{x\}, \{x, y\}, \{x, y, z\}\}$. None of the vertices v in N with $v \succ_N w$ serve as the lca for any two leaves.

3 Strudigrams and Explanations by Labeled Networks

We will consider *labeled* networks (N, t) , that is, networks $N = (V, E)$ equipped with a (vertex-)labeling $t: V^0(N) \rightarrow \Upsilon$. If N is a network on X that has the 2-lca-property, then we can derive from (N, t) the ordered triple $\mathcal{S}(N, t) = (X, \Upsilon, \sigma)$, where Υ is the image of t and $\sigma: \binom{X}{2} \rightarrow \Upsilon$ is the map defined by $\sigma(\{x, y\}) = t(\text{lca}(x, y))$ for all distinct $x, y \in X$.

An undirected graph $G = (X, E)$ is a *cograph*, if there is a labeled tree (T, t) on X , called *cotree*, with $t: V^0(T) \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$ such that x and y are adjacent in G if and only if $t(\text{lca}(x, y)) = 1$ for all distinct $x, y \in X$ [13]. In other words, the structure of a cograph G is entirely captured by its cotree (T, t) . One easily observe that there is direct translation of any cograph $G = (X, E)$ into a triple $\mathcal{S}_G = (X, \{0, 1\}, \sigma)$ where $\sigma: \binom{X}{2} \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$ such that $\sigma(\{x, y\}) = 1$ precisely if $\{x, y\} \in E$. Hence, G is a cograph if and only if \mathcal{S}_G can be “explained” by a labeled tree (T, t) , i.e., $\mathcal{S}_G = \mathcal{S}(T, t)$. As already outlined in the introduction, there is a natural generalization of the latter concept by means of symbolic dated maps. In particular, a symbolic dated map can be explained by a labeled tree (T, t) precisely if it is a symbolic ultrametric [5]. Our aim is to generalize these results and to consider labeled networks rather than trees. To achieve this goal, we introduce a more universal structure: *strudigrams* which are triples $\mathcal{S} = (X, \Upsilon, \sigma)$, where $V(\mathcal{S}) := X$ and $\Upsilon(\mathcal{S}) := \Upsilon$ are non-empty finite sets and where $\sigma: \binom{X}{2} \rightarrow \Upsilon$ is a map that assigns a unique label $\sigma(\{x, y\}) \in \Upsilon$ to each two-element subset $\{x, y\}$ of X . The elements in X are called *vertices* of \mathcal{S} , and we call $|X|$ the *size* of \mathcal{S} . For simplicity, we put $\sigma(xy) = \sigma(yx) := \sigma(\{x, y\})$.

Definition 3.1. A strudigram $\mathcal{S} = (X, \Upsilon, \sigma)$ is explained by a network (N, t) if N has the 2-lca-property and $\mathcal{S} = \mathcal{S}(N, t)$.

For an illustrative example of Definition 3.1, see Figure 2. As already outlined in introduction, the word *strudigram* is composed of the first parts of the words **structures**, **dissimilarites** and **graphs** to cover the fact that strudigrams can be used to represent different, yet similarly flavored combinatorial objects. Each strudigram $\mathcal{S} = (X, \Upsilon, \sigma)$ gives, for each subset $\Upsilon' \subseteq \Upsilon$, rise to a unique edge-colored undirected graph $G = (X, E)$ with $E \subseteq \binom{X}{2}$ and a coloring $c: E \rightarrow \Upsilon'$. In this case, E represents the set of all $\{x, y\} \in \binom{X}{2}$ for which $\sigma(xy) \in \Upsilon'$ and $c(\{x, y\}) := \sigma(xy)$ for all $\{x, y\} \in E$. In a more direct way, \mathcal{S} yields an undirected complete edge-colored graph $K_{|X|} = (X, \binom{X}{2})$ with color-map $c = \sigma$, structures that have been considered e.g. in [28].

Moreover, \mathcal{S} also defines a (symmetric) 2-structure $g = (X, \mathcal{P})$, where $\mathcal{P} = \{X_i\}_{i \in \Upsilon}$ is a partition of $(X \times X) \setminus \{(v, v) \mid v \in X\}$ such that $(x, y) \in X_i$ precisely if $\sigma(xy) = i$ [19, 20, 22]. Since (x, y) and (y, x) always lie in the same set of \mathcal{P} , g is a symmetric 2-structure. Naturally, g may be extended to a *labeled* symmetric 2-structure $(X, \mathcal{P}, \Upsilon, \delta)$, where $\delta: \mathcal{P} \rightarrow \Upsilon$ assigns a label to each set in the partition ($\delta(X_i) = i$ would be a reasonable choice) [23]. Despite its symmetry, the 2-structure operates on elements of $X \times X$ instead of $\binom{X}{2}$, distinguishing it from strudigrams.

Furthermore, \mathcal{S} defines symmetric symbolic maps $\delta: X \times X \rightarrow \Upsilon$ as well as 2-dissimilarities $\delta: X \cup \binom{X}{2} \rightarrow \Upsilon$ determined by $\delta(x, y) = \sigma(xy)$ for distinct $x, y \in X$ and by putting $\delta(x, x) = \odot$, resp., $\delta(x) = \odot$ for some symbol $\odot \notin \Upsilon$ [5, 37, 39, 41]. Conversely, each edge-colored undirected (complete) graph, symmetric 2-structure, or symmetric symbolic dating map and 2-dissimilarity defines a strudigram in a natural way. In other words, strudigrams help represent classical combinatorial objects, and the results established here for strudigrams hold, therefore, for these objects as well. Vice versa, results that have been established for edge-colored (complete) graphs, symmetric 2-structures, or symmetric symbolic dating maps hold for strudigrams.

A strudigram (X, Υ, σ) contains an induced P_4 if there are four vertices $a, b, c, d \in X$ such that $k := \sigma(ab) = \sigma(bc) = \sigma(cd)$ and $k \notin \{\sigma(ac), \sigma(ad), \sigma(bd)\}$. P_4 -free strudigrams are strudigrams without induced P_4 s. A strudigram (X, Υ, σ) contains a rainbow-triangle, if there are three vertices $a, b, c \in X$ such that $\sigma(ab), \sigma(ac), \sigma(bc)$ are pairwise distinct. Rainbow-triangle-free strudigrams are strudigrams without rainbow-triangles. Note that rainbow-triangle-free and P_4 -free strudigrams are also known as symbolic ultrametrics (cf. [37, Prop. 3]) or, equivalently, as symmetric uniformly non-primitive 2-structures [23, 39].




Figure 2: The network N has clustering system $\mathfrak{C}_N = \{\{a\}, \{b\}, \{c\}, \{d\}, \{b,c\}, \{a,b,c\}, \{b,c,d\}, X\}$ on $X = \{a, b, c, d\}$. Since N does not have the 2-lca-property, it does not explain any strudigram according to Def. 3.1. Moreover, a strudigram S on $X = \{a, b, c, d\}$ is depicted as an edge-colored graph. It contains a rainbow-triangle and, by Theorem 3.2, it cannot be explained by a labeled tree. The three networks $G \doteq \mathcal{H}(\mathfrak{C}_N)$, N' and N'' have the same clustering system \mathfrak{C}_N and satisfy the 2-lca-property. In particular, the labeled versions (G, t) , (N', t') and (N'', t'') all explain S , with edge-colors corresponding to the respective label as shown in the legend. Note that G is a galled-tree while N' and N'' are not.

Theorem 3.2 ([37, Prop. 1 & 3]). *A strudigram can be explained by a labeled tree if and only if it is rainbow-triangle-free and P_4 -free.*

By Theorem 3.2, plenty of strudigrams exist that cannot be explained by any labeled tree. This motivates the question as whether there are labeled networks that can explain any given strudigram. The next result provides an affirmative answer.

Proposition 3.3. *For every strudigram $S = (X, \Upsilon, \sigma)$ there is a phylogenetic lca-network (N, t) on X with $O(|X|^2)$ vertices that explains it.*

Proof. Let $S = (X, \Upsilon, \sigma)$ be a strudigram and consider the set system $\mathfrak{Q} := \{\{x, y\} \mid \text{not necessarily distinct } x, y \in X\} \cup \{X\}$. By construction, \mathfrak{Q} is a clustering system. Consider the network $N \doteq \mathcal{H}(\mathfrak{Q})$ that is obtained from the Hasse diagram $\mathcal{H}(\mathfrak{Q})$ by relabeling all vertices $\{x\}$ with x , ensuring that $L(N) = X$. This together with [40, Lem. 22] implies that N is a phylogenetic network on X . By construction, N contains $1 + |X| + \frac{|X|(|X|-1)}{2} \in O(|X|^2)$ vertices. One easily observes that \mathfrak{Q} is closed. Theorem 2.4 implies that N is an lca-network. In particular, for any vertices $x, y \in X$, the set $\{x, y\}$ is the unique inclusion-minimal cluster in \mathfrak{Q} containing x and y . By Obs. 2.2, we have $\text{lca}_N(x, y) = v$ where v is the unique vertex in N that satisfies $C(v) = \{x, y\}$. This, in turn, implies that for all distinct 2-element subsets $\{x, y\}$ and $\{a, b\}$ it holds that $\text{lca}_N(x, y) \neq \text{lca}_N(a, b)$. We can now equip N with a labeling t defined by $t(\text{lca}_N(x, y)) := \sigma(xy)$ for all $x, y \in X$ and $t(\rho_N) := v$ for some $v \in \Upsilon$. By the latter arguments, (N, t) is a phylogenetic lca-network that explains S . \square

We note that it has already been shown in [9] that every strudigram can be explained by so-called labeled half-grids which also contain $O(|X|^2)$ vertices. Note also that if $\sigma: \binom{X}{2} \rightarrow \Upsilon := \{1, 2, \dots, \frac{|X|(|X|-1)}{2}\}$ is surjective, then $O(|X|^2)$ vertices are necessary in any network that explains $S = (X, \Upsilon, \sigma)$.

Essential for networks explaining strudigrams is the requirement that they satisfy the 2-lca-property. By Proposition 3.3, there is even always an lca-network that explains a strudigram. However, the network constructed in the proof of Proposition 3.3 is rather “dense”, and simpler constructions of lca-networks may exist. A nice feature of lca-networks (N, t) explaining S is that labeled lca-“sub”networks (N', t') can be constructed from (N, t) to explain substrudigrams of S . As we shall see, this result will become quite handy later in Section 6.

Proposition 3.4. *Let (N, t) be a labeled lca-network that explains S and $W \subseteq V(S)$ be a non-empty subset. Put $\mathfrak{C}' := \{C \mid C \in \mathfrak{C}_N \text{ and } C \subseteq W\}$. Then, \mathfrak{C}' is a clustering system on W and $G \doteq \mathcal{H}(\mathfrak{C}')$ is an lca-network that can be equipped with a labeling t' such that (G, t') explains $S[W]$.*

Proof. Let $\mathcal{S} = (X, \Upsilon, \sigma)$ be a strudigram that is explained by a labeled lca-network (N, t) on X , and let $W \subseteq X$ be a non-empty set. If $|X| = 1$, then $W = X$ must hold. In this case, G is the single vertex network and (G, t') trivially explains $\mathcal{S}[W] = \mathcal{S}$ for any labeling t' . Hence, assume that $|X| > 1$. Since any non-empty subset $W \subseteq V(\mathcal{S})$ can be obtained from X by removing vertices in $X \setminus W$ one by one and since, by Prop. 3.3, every (sub)strudigram $\mathcal{S}[W]$ can be explained by some labeled lca-networks, it is sufficient to show that the statement is true for $W := X \setminus \{x\}$ and some $x \in X$.

Put $\mathfrak{C} = \mathfrak{C}_N$ and $\mathfrak{C}' := \mathfrak{C} - x$. By Lemma 2.1, \mathfrak{C}' is a clustering system on W . Since N is an lca-network, Theorem 2.4 implies that \mathfrak{C} must be closed. By Lemma 2.1, \mathfrak{C}' must be closed. Moreover, Theorem 2.4 implies that $G \doteq \mathcal{H}(\mathfrak{C}')$ is an lca-network on W .

Since N is an lca-network, $\text{lca}_N(\mathfrak{C}_G(v))$ is well-defined in N for each $v \in V^0(G)$. Let $w_v := \text{lca}_N(\mathfrak{C}_G(v))$ for all $v \in V^0(G)$. Based on the latter, we can establish a well-defined labeling $t': V^0(G) \rightarrow \Upsilon$ by putting, for all $v \in V^0(G)$,

$$t'(v) = t(w_v).$$

It remains to show that (G, t') explains $\mathcal{S}[W]$. Hence, let $a, b \in W$ be distinct. Since N has, in particular, the 2-lca-property, $u := \text{lca}_N(a, b)$ is well-defined. Obs. 2.2(ii) together with $u = \text{lca}_N(a, b)$ implies that $\mathfrak{C}_N(u)$ is the unique inclusion-minimal cluster in \mathfrak{C} that contains a, b . Similarly, G has the 2-lca-property and thus, $v := \text{lca}_G(a, b)$ is well-defined.

In the following, we show that $\mathfrak{C}_N(u) \setminus \{x\} = \mathfrak{C}_G(v)$. To this end, we show first that $C' := \mathfrak{C}_N(u) \setminus \{x\} \in \mathfrak{C}'$ is an inclusion-minimal cluster in \mathfrak{C}' that contains a, b . We consider the two cases $x \notin \mathfrak{C}_N(u)$ and $x \in \mathfrak{C}_N(u)$.

Suppose that $x \notin \mathfrak{C}_N(u)$ and thus, $C' = \mathfrak{C}_N(u)$. Assume, for contradiction, that there is some $C'' \in \mathfrak{C}'$ such that $C'' \subsetneq C'$ and $a, b \in C''$. Since $C' = \mathfrak{C}_N(u)$ is the unique inclusion-minimal cluster in \mathfrak{C} that contains a, b , we have $C'' \notin \mathfrak{C}$. However, since $C'' \in \mathfrak{C}'$, it must hold that $C'' \cup \{x\} = C$ for some $C \in \mathfrak{C}$. Let z be some vertex with $\mathfrak{C}_N(z) = C$. Since $x \notin C'$ and $x \in C$ it follows that $u \neq z$. This together with $u = \text{lca}_N(a, b)$ and $a, b \in C''$ and Obs. 2.2(i) implies that $u \prec_N z$. Hence, $C' \subsetneq C = C'' \cup \{x\}$ (cf. [40, L. 17]). Since $x \notin C'$, it holds that $C' \subseteq C''$ a contradiction. Hence, $C' = \mathfrak{C}_N(u)$ is an inclusion-minimal cluster in \mathfrak{C}' that contains a, b .

Suppose that $x \in \mathfrak{C}_N(u)$ and thus, $C' \cup \{x\} = \mathfrak{C}_N(u)$. Assume again, for contradiction, that there is some $C'' \in \mathfrak{C}'$ such that $C'' \subsetneq C'$ and $a, b \in C''$. Thus, $C'' \subsetneq \mathfrak{C}_N(u)$. Since $\mathfrak{C}_N(u)$ is the unique inclusion-minimal cluster in \mathfrak{C} that contains a, b , we have $C'' \notin \mathfrak{C}$. However, since $C'' \in \mathfrak{C}'$, it must hold that $C'' \cup \{x\} = C$ for some $C \in \mathfrak{C}$. Since $x \notin C'$, $x \notin C''$ and $C'' \subsetneq C'$, we have $C = C'' \cup \{x\} \subsetneq C' \cup \{x\} = \mathfrak{C}_N(u)$; a contradiction to $\mathfrak{C}_N(u)$ being the unique inclusion-minimal cluster in \mathfrak{C} that contains a and b . Hence, C' is an inclusion-minimal cluster in \mathfrak{C}' that contains a, b .

Finally, Obs. 2.2(ii) implies that $\mathfrak{C}_G(\text{lca}_G(a, b)) = \mathfrak{C}_G(v)$ is the unique inclusion-minimal cluster in \mathfrak{C}' that contains a, b . Hence, $C' = \mathfrak{C}_N(u) \setminus \{x\} = \mathfrak{C}_G(v)$.

We are now in the position to show that $\sigma(ab) = t(\text{lca}_N(a, b)) = t'(\text{lca}_G(a, b))$ and, thus to prove that (G, t') explains $\mathcal{S}[W]$. By Obs. 2.2(iii), $u = \text{lca}_N(a, b) = \text{lca}_N(\mathfrak{C}_N(\text{lca}_N(a, b))) = \text{lca}_N(\mathfrak{C}_N(u))$. Assume that $x \notin \mathfrak{C}_N(u)$. In this case, $\mathfrak{C}_N(u) = \mathfrak{C}_G(v)$ and, therefore, $u = \text{lca}_N(\mathfrak{C}_N(u)) = \text{lca}_N(\mathfrak{C}_G(v)) = w_v$. Hence, $\sigma(ab) = t(\text{lca}_N(a, b)) = t(w_v) = t'(\text{lca}_G(a, b))$. Assume that $x \in \mathfrak{C}_N(u)$ in which case $\mathfrak{C}_G(v) \notin \mathfrak{C}$ since, otherwise $a, b \in \mathfrak{C}_G(v)$ and $\mathfrak{C}_G(v) \subsetneq \mathfrak{C}_N(u)$ would contradict the fact that $\mathfrak{C}_N(u)$ is the inclusion-minimal cluster in \mathfrak{C} containing a, b . Thus, $\mathfrak{C}_N(u)$ is an inclusion-minimal cluster containing $\mathfrak{C}_G(v)$. Since N has the k -lca-property, Obs. 2.5 implies that \mathfrak{C} is pre- k -ary and thus, $\mathfrak{C}_N(u)$ is the unique inclusion-minimal cluster in \mathfrak{C} containing $\mathfrak{C}_G(v) = C' = \mathfrak{C}_N(u) \setminus \{x\}$. Hence, $u = \text{lca}_N(\mathfrak{C}_N(u)) = \text{lca}_N(\mathfrak{C}_N(u) \setminus \{x\}) = \text{lca}_N(\mathfrak{C}_G(v)) = w_v$. Thus, $\sigma(ab) = t(\text{lca}_N(a, b)) = t(w_v) = t'(\text{lca}_G(a, b))$. In summary, for the clustering system \mathfrak{C}' on W , $G \doteq \mathcal{H}(\mathfrak{C}')$ is an lca-network that can be equipped with a labeling t' such that (G, t') explains $\mathcal{S}[W]$. \square

4 Strudigrams and their Modular Decomposition

Modular decomposition and the notion of modules have a long history and goes back to the seminal work by Gallai [25] in 1967 for the purpose of constructing transitive orientations of so-called comparability graphs. Since then this concept has been rediscovered by various researchers under different names for undirected graphs [4, 29, 30, 46, 47]. Generalizations to directed graphs [45], hypergraphs [6, 7, 31], k -structures [18], sets of (not necessarily disjoint) binary relations [39], Boolean functions [2], homogeneous relations [10], k -ary relations or matroids [46, 47] have been established. We will review here some of these concepts needed for the modular decomposition of strudigrams.

Let $\mathcal{S} = (X, \Upsilon, \sigma)$ be a strudigram and $W \subseteq X$. Then, $\sigma|_W: \binom{W}{2} \rightarrow \Upsilon$ denotes the restriction of σ to the set $\binom{W}{2}$, i.e., $\sigma|_W(xy) = \sigma(xy)$ for all distinct $x, y \in W$. Moreover, $\mathcal{S}[W] = (W, \Upsilon, \sigma|_W)$ is the strudigram induced by W and we put $\mathcal{S} - v := \mathcal{S}[X \setminus \{v\}]$. Given two vertex-disjoint strudigrams $\mathcal{S} = (X, \Upsilon, \sigma)$ and $\mathcal{S}' = (X', \Upsilon', \sigma')$ we can construct a new strudigram $\mathcal{S} \bowtie_k \mathcal{S}' = (X \cup X', \Upsilon \cup \Upsilon' \cup \{k\}, \tilde{\sigma})$, called the k -join of \mathcal{S} and \mathcal{S}' by putting

$$\tilde{\sigma}(xy) := \begin{cases} \sigma(xy) & \text{if } x, y \in X \\ \sigma'(xy) & \text{if } x, y \in X' \\ k & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Note that \bowtie_k is associative and commutative on vertex-disjoint strudigrams [23]. Moreover, for \bowtie_k , we may have $k \in \Upsilon \cup \Upsilon'$. If a strudigram \mathcal{S} can be written as the k -join $\mathcal{S} = \mathcal{S}' \bowtie_k \mathcal{S}''$ we call \mathcal{S} a k -series strudigram.




Figure 3: The edge-colored graph representation of a strudigram \mathcal{S} explained by (N, t) and \mathcal{S}' explained by (N', t') , see Fig. 2 for the color legend. \mathcal{S} is a k -series strudigram as $\mathcal{S} = \mathcal{S}[\{a, b\}] \bowtie_k \mathcal{S}[\{c, d, e\}]$ where k refers to the edge-color dotted-blue in the drawing. In this example, both $\mathcal{S}[\{a, b\}]$ and $\mathcal{S}[\{c, d, e\}]$ are k -prime. However, $\mathcal{S}[\{a, b\}]$ is not prime as $\mathcal{S}[\{a, b\}] = \mathcal{S}[\{a\}] \bowtie_{k'} \mathcal{S}[\{b\}]$ where k' refers to the edge-color solid-red. In contrast, $\mathcal{S}[\{c, d, e\}]$ is prime and, even primitive. Moreover, \mathcal{S}' is prime. Neither \mathcal{S} nor \mathcal{S}' is primitive, since $\{a, b\}$ (resp. $\{c, d\}$) is a strong module of \mathcal{S} (resp. \mathcal{S}').

Two strudigrams $\mathcal{S} = (X, \Upsilon, \sigma)$ and $\mathcal{S}' = (X', \Upsilon', \sigma')$ are *color-restrictive (cr)-isomorphic*, in symbols $\mathcal{S} \simeq \mathcal{S}'$, if there is a bijective map $\varphi: X \rightarrow X'$ such that $\sigma(xy) = \sigma'(\varphi(x)\varphi(y))$ for all distinct $x, y \in X$.

Let $\mathcal{S} = (X, \Upsilon, \sigma)$ be a strudigram. A *module* M of \mathcal{S} is a non-empty subset $M \subseteq X$ such that for all $x, y \in M$ and all $z \in X \setminus M$ it holds that $\sigma(xz) = \sigma(yz)$. One easily verifies that X and all $\{x\}$ with $x \in X$ are modules. These modules are called *trivial*, and all other modules *non-trivial*. We denote with $\mathbb{M}(\mathcal{S})$ the set of all modules of \mathcal{S} .

Definition 4.1. A module M of \mathcal{S} is *k -series* if $\mathcal{S}[M]$ is k -series, that is, if there is a $k \in \Upsilon$ and a partition $\{M_1, M_2\}$ of M such that $\mathcal{S}[M] = \mathcal{S}[M_1] \bowtie_k \mathcal{S}[M_2]$.

There are modules that are not k -series. A simple example is provided by the rainbow-triangle $\mathcal{S} = (X, \Upsilon, \sigma)$ with $|X| = 3$ and $\sigma(xy) \neq \sigma(ab)$ for all distinct $\{x, y\}, \{a, b\} \in \binom{X}{2}$ with $\{x, y\} \neq \{a, b\}$. In this case, for any partition $\{M_1, M_2\}$ of X we have $|M_i| > 1$ for some $i \in \{1, 2\}$ and thus $\sigma(xy) \neq \sigma(xy')$ for $x \in M_j$ and $y, y' \in M_i$ with $j \in \{1, 2\} \setminus \{i\}$. Thus, $\mathcal{S}[X] \neq \mathcal{S}[M_1] \bowtie_k \mathcal{S}[M_2]$ for all partitions $\{M_1, M_2\}$ of X and therefore, the module X is not k -series for any $k \in \Upsilon$. Further examples are provided in Fig. 3.

Definition 4.2. Modules that are not k -series for a given k are called *k -prime*. A module M is prime (termed irreducible in [23]) if it is k -prime for all k . We call a strudigram \mathcal{S} k -prime, resp., prime if $V(\mathcal{S})$ is k -prime, resp., prime.

A module M is *strong* if M does not overlap with any other module and we denote with $\mathbb{M}_{\text{str}}(\mathcal{S})$ the set of all strong modules of a strudigram \mathcal{S} , often referred to as its *modular decomposition*. Since the trivial modules of \mathcal{S} are strong, we have $\mathbb{M}_{\text{str}}(\mathcal{S}) \neq \emptyset$. Moreover, $\mathbb{M}_{\text{str}}(\mathcal{S})$ is uniquely determined and has size $O(|V(\mathcal{S})|)$ [21], although there may be exponentially many modules. For example, in the strudigram $\mathcal{S} = (X, \{k\}, \sigma)$ every $M \subseteq X$ is a module and, thus, \mathcal{S} has $2^{|X|}$ modules, however, the $|X| + 1$ strong modules are X and the singletons $\{x\}$, $x \in X$. Note that if M is a module of \mathcal{S} that is not strong, i.e. M overlaps with some module M' , then by [19, Thm. 4.12] both $M \setminus M'$ and $M \cap M'$ are modules of \mathcal{S} . Since $M \setminus M'$ and $M \cap M'$ are disjoint modules there is, by [19, Lem. 4.11], some k such that $\mathcal{S}[M] = \mathcal{S}[M \setminus M'] \bowtie_k \mathcal{S}[M \cap M']$, ensuring that M is not a prime module. We summarize the latter discussion into

Observation 4.3. Every prime module of a strudigram is a strong module.

Note that, for a k -series module M , the partition $\{M_1, M_2\}$ is not necessarily unique, i.e., $\mathcal{S}[M] = \mathcal{S}[M_1] \bowtie_k \mathcal{S}[M_2] = \mathcal{S}[M'_1] \bowtie_k \mathcal{S}[M'_2]$ for different partitions $\{M_1, M_2\}$ and $\{M'_1, M'_2\}$ of M may be possible. The simplest example in this context is again the strudigram $\mathcal{S} = (X, \{k\}, \sigma)$ with $\sigma(xy) = k$ for all $\{x, y\} \in \binom{X}{2}$ for which $\mathcal{S}[X] = \mathcal{S}[M_1] \bowtie_k \mathcal{S}[M_2]$ for any partition of $\{M_1, M_2\}$ of X . Although partitions of k -series strudigrams are not necessarily uniquely determined, there is, for each non-prime (sub)strudigram, a unique partition into k -prime subsets for some unique k .

Theorem 4.4 ([23, Lem. 2.15, Thm. 2.16]). Let $\mathcal{S} = (X, \Upsilon, \sigma)$ be a strudigram and W be an arbitrary non-empty subset of X . Then, $\mathcal{S}[W]$ is either prime or there is a unique $k \in \Upsilon$ and a unique partition $\{W_1, \dots, W_\ell\}$ of W such that $\ell \geq 2$, each $\mathcal{S}[W_i]$ is k -prime and $\mathcal{S}[W] = \mathcal{S}[W_1] \bowtie_k \dots \bowtie_k \mathcal{S}[W_\ell]$. In this case, $\mathbb{M}_{\max}(\mathcal{S}[W]) = \{W_1, \dots, W_\ell\}$.

Note that, for every strudigram \mathcal{S} on X , the set X and all singletons $\{x\}$ with $x \in X$ are contained in $\mathbb{M}_{\text{str}}(\mathcal{S})$. This and the fact that $\mathbb{M}_{\text{str}}(\mathcal{S})$ does not contain pairwise overlapping modules, implies that $\mathbb{M}_{\text{str}}(\mathcal{S})$ is a clustering system on $\{\{x\} \mid x \in X\}$ that is a hierarchy. Hence, $\mathbb{M}_{\text{str}}(\mathcal{S})$ is uniquely represented by the tree $\mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{S}} := \mathcal{H}(\mathbb{M}_{\text{str}}(\mathcal{S}))$. The root of $\mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{S}}$ is, by definition, the vertex X . We denote with $\mathbb{M}_{\text{str}}^0(\mathcal{S})$ the set all strong modules that are distinct from the singletons. In addition, $\mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{S}}$ is equipped with the following labeling $\tau_{\mathcal{S}}: \mathbb{M}_{\text{str}}^0(\mathcal{S}) \rightarrow \Upsilon \cup \{\text{PRIME}\}$, defined by

$$\tau_{\mathcal{S}}(M) = \begin{cases} k & \text{if } M \text{ is } k\text{-series} \\ \text{PRIME} & \text{if } |M| > 1 \text{ and } M \text{ is prime} \end{cases}$$

We write (\mathcal{T}_S, τ_S) for a modular decomposition tree equipped with such a labeling τ_S . By Theorem 4.4, each module M is either k -series for some unique $k \in \Upsilon$ or prime. Hence, the labeling τ_S is uniquely determined. The pair (\mathcal{T}_S, τ_S) at least partially explains the underlying strudigram S , in the sense that if $\tau_S(\text{lca}_{\mathcal{T}_S}(\{x\}, \{y\})) = k \neq \text{PRIME}$ for two distinct $x, y \in X$ then we have $\sigma(xy) = k$. If, on the other hand, $\tau_S(\text{lca}_{\mathcal{T}_S}(\{x\}, \{y\})) = \text{PRIME}$, then \mathcal{T}_S does not reveal information about $\sigma(xy)$.

Definition 4.5 ([22]). *Strudigrams S that consist of trivial modules only are called primitive. Moreover, S is truly-primitive if it is primitive and it has at least three vertices.*

Clearly, if $|V(S)| = 1$, then S is primitive. The term truly-primitive is necessary to distinguish between primitive strudigrams that are at the same time k -series (which is precisely the case when $|V(S)| = 2$) and those that are not.

Theorem 4.6. *For every strudigram $S = (X, \Upsilon, \sigma)$, the following statements are equivalent.*

- (1) S is explained by a labeled tree.
- (2) $\mathbb{M}_{\text{str}}(S)$ contains no prime modules M with $|M| > 1$.
- (3) (\mathcal{T}_S, τ_S) contains no PRIME-labeled inner vertices.
- (4) There is no subset $W \subseteq X$ with $3 \leq |W|$ for which $S[W]$ is primitive, i.e., there is no truly-primitive substructure.
- (5) There is no subset $W \subseteq X$ with $3 \leq |W| \leq 4$ for which $S[W]$ is primitive.
- (6) S is P_4 -free and rainbow-triangle-free.

Proof. To see that (1) implies (2), let (T, t) be a labeled tree and $S = (X, \Upsilon, \sigma)$ be the strudigram that is explained by (T, t) . Let $M \in \mathbb{M}_{\text{str}}(S)$ be an arbitrary strong module with $|M| > 1$ and $v := \text{lca}_T(M)$ be the least common ancestor of the vertices in M . Since $|M| > 1$, the vertex v cannot be a leaf and has, therefore, at least two children. Let u be a child of v and put $M' := L(T(u)) \cap M$ and $M'' := M \setminus M'$. By construction, $\text{lca}_T(x, y) = v$ for all $x \in M'$ and $y \in M''$. Since (T, t) explains S and $\sigma(xy) = k$ for some $k \in \Upsilon$, we have $t(\text{lca}_T(x, y)) = k$ for all $x \in M'$ and $y \in M''$. Hence, $S[M] = S[M'] \bowtie_k S[M'']$. Consequently, M is a k -series modules and, therefore, not prime. Clearly, (2) \implies (3) \implies (1) follows directly from the respective definitions. Thus, Conditions (1), (2) and (3) are equivalent. The equivalence between (3), (4) and (5) is provided in [23, Thm. 3.6] where the statements were proven for the equivalent concept of labeled 2-structures. By Theorem 3.2, Conditions (1) and (6) are equivalent, which completes the proof. \square

The hierarchical structure of $\mathbb{M}_{\text{str}}(S)$ implies that there is a unique partition $\mathbb{M}_{\text{max}}(S) = \{M_1, \dots, M_k\}$ of $V(S)$ into the (inclusion-)maximal strong modules $M_j \neq V(S)$ of S [19, 47]. In particular, for any two disjoint modules M, M' of S there is a $k \in \Upsilon(S)$ such that $\sigma(xy) = k$ for all $x \in M$ and $y \in M'$ [19, L 4.11]. The latter two arguments allow us to define the quotient $S/\mathbb{M}_{\text{max}}(S) = (\mathbb{M}_{\text{max}}(S), \Upsilon, \sigma')$ where $\sigma'(MM') = \sigma(xy)$ for all $M, M' \in \mathbb{M}_{\text{max}}(S)$ and an arbitrary $x \in M$ and $y \in M'$. Since $\mathbb{M}_{\text{max}}(S)$ yields a partition of $V(S)$ and since $\sigma'(MM') = \sigma(xy)$ for all distinct $M, M' \in \mathbb{M}_{\text{max}}(S)$ and all $x \in M$ and $y \in M'$ we obtain,

Observation 4.7. *The quotient $S/\mathbb{M}_{\text{max}}(S)$ with $\mathbb{M}_{\text{max}}(S) = \{M_1, \dots, M_k\}$ is cr-isomorphic to the induced strudigram $S[W]$ for any $W \subseteq X$ that satisfies $|M_i \cap W| = 1$ for all $i \in \{1, \dots, k\}$.*

While there is a clear distinction between S being k -series or prime, there are strudigrams that are neither k -series nor primitive. By way of example, consider $S = (\{y_1, y_2, x_1, x_2\}, \Upsilon, \sigma)$ with $\sigma(x_i y_j) = j$ for $i, j \in \{1, 2\}$ and $\sigma(y_1 y_2) \neq 1, 2$. One easily verifies that S cannot be written as a k -join and that S contains the non-trivial modules $\{x_1, x_2\}$. In addition, there are strudigrams that are k -series and primitive e.g. any strudigram on two vertices. For quotients, however, this situation changes.

Theorem 4.8 ([23, Thm. 2.17]). *Let M be a prime module of S with $|M| > 1$. Then, $|M| \neq 2$ and $S[M]/\mathbb{M}_{\text{max}}(S[M])$ is truly-primitive.*

5 Prime-vertex Replacement

One of the main features of the modular decomposition tree (\mathcal{T}, τ) of a strudigram $S = (X, \Upsilon, \sigma)$ is that, in the absence of prime modules, (\mathcal{T}, τ) explains S . However, the information about $\sigma(x, y)$ is hidden if $\tau(\text{lca}_{\mathcal{T}}(x, y)) = \text{PRIME}$. To provide the missing structural information of S , we aim to locally replace the prime vertices in (\mathcal{T}, τ) to obtain networks that capture full information about S . This idea has already been fruitfully applied by replacing prime vertices with so-called 0/1-labeled galls to obtain networks explaining restricted “binary” strudigrams $(X, \{0, 1\}, \sigma)$ [32], or with so-called labeled halfgrids to obtain networks that explain arbitrary strudigrams [9]. These constructions, involving the replacement of prime vertices by other networks, have been studied for rather restricted types of networks only. Here, we aim to generalize this concept to make the “prime-vertex replacement” applicable in a more general setting.

There are several motivations to consider such networks. On the one hand, structural properties of (N, t) can provide deep structural insights into the strudigrams they explain. For example, strudigrams $S = (X, \{0, 1\}, \sigma)$ that can be explained by so-called labeled galled trees (also known as GATEX graphs) are closely related to weakly-chordal, perfect graphs with perfect order, comparability, and permutation graphs [34]. These results are based on a characterization of

such GATEX graphs in terms of 25 forbidden induced subgraphs, a result established by leveraging the structure of the network that explains \mathcal{S} .

In addition, such networks (N, t) can guide algorithms to solve many NP-hard problems in polynomial time for restricted strudigrams. For example, in the absence of prime modules in $\mathcal{S} = (X, \{0, 1\}, \sigma)$, the graph representation G of \mathcal{S} is a cograph. In this case, the modular decomposition tree (\mathcal{T}, τ) has been shown to be a vital tool to prove that many NP-hard problems such as finding optimal colorings, clique detection, Hamiltonicity, and cluster-deletion can be solved in linear time on cographs [8, 12, 26]. Similarly, if (N, t) is a so-called 0/1-labeled galled tree, the resulting strudigram \mathcal{S} is equivalent to GATEX graphs, and it has been shown in [33, 35] that NP-hard problems such as finding perfect orderings, maximum cliques or independent sets, and minimum colorings can be solved in linear time. Again, (N, t) serves as a guide for these algorithms to find the optimal solutions.

Modular decomposition has many important applications, e.g., in community detection in complex networks [43], in evolutionary biology and orthology detection [37, 38, 44], in structure recognition of protein-interaction networks [14, 24], pattern detection in diagnostic data [49], graph drawing [48], automata theory [1], and many more. However, graphs or, more generally, strudigrams that arise from real-world data, particularly in evolutionary biology, are often better represented by a network rather than a tree to accommodate evolutionary events such as hybridization or horizontal gene transfer. One way to address this problem is, again, the local replacement of prime vertices in (\mathcal{T}, τ) by small labeled networks.

We start here by providing the general concept of prime-vertex replacement (pvr) networks. Later, in Section 6, we will focus on a particular type of DAGs used to replace prime vertices and provide a characterization of strudigrams that can be explained by such types of networks.

In what follows, we say that two networks N and N' are internal vertex-disjoint, if $(V^0(N) \setminus \{\rho_N\}) \cap (V^0(N') \setminus \{\rho_{N'}\}) = \emptyset$.

Definition 5.1 (prime-explaining family). Let $\mathcal{S} = (X, \Upsilon, \sigma)$ be a strudigram and $\mathcal{P} \subseteq \mathbb{M}_{\text{str}}(\mathcal{S})$ be the set of all of its prime modules and (\mathcal{T}, τ) be its modular decomposition tree. A prime-explaining family (of \mathcal{S}) is a set $\mathcal{F}(\mathcal{S}) = \{(N_M, t_M) \mid M \in \mathcal{P}\}$ of pairwise internal vertex-disjoint labeled networks such that, for each $M \in \mathcal{P}$, the network (N_M, t_M) explains the strudigram $\mathcal{S}[M]/\mathbb{M}_{\max}(\mathcal{S}[M])$.

As we shall see, the modular decomposition tree (\mathcal{T}, τ) of each strudigram \mathcal{S} can be modified by locally replacing prime vertices $M \in \mathcal{P}$ by $(N_M, t_M) \in \mathcal{F}(\mathcal{S})$ to obtain a labeled network that explains \mathcal{S} . This idea is made precise in the following

Definition 5.2 (prime-vertex replacement (pvr) networks). Let $\mathcal{S} = (X, \Upsilon, \sigma)$ be a strudigram and \mathcal{P} be the set of all prime vertices in its modular decomposition tree (\mathcal{T}, τ) . Let $\mathcal{F}(\mathcal{S})$ be a prime-explaining family of \mathcal{S} . A prime-vertex replacement (pvr) network $\text{pvr}(\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{F}(\mathcal{S}))$ of \mathcal{S} is the directed, labeled graph (N, t) obtained by the following procedure:

1. For each $M \in \mathcal{P}$, remove all edges (M, M') with $M' \in \text{child}_{\mathcal{T}}(M)$ from \mathcal{T} to obtain the directed graph T' .
2. Construct a directed graph N by adding, for each $M \in \mathcal{P}$, N_M to T' by identifying the root of N_M with M in T' and each leaf M' of N_M with the corresponding child $M' \in \text{child}_{\mathcal{T}}(M)$.
3. Define the labeling $t: V^0(N) \rightarrow \Upsilon$ by putting, for all $w \in V^0(N)$,

$$t(w) := \begin{cases} t_M(w) & \text{if } w \in V^0(N_M) \text{ for some } M \in \mathcal{P} \\ \tau(w) & \text{otherwise, i.e., if } w \in V^0(\mathcal{T}) \setminus \mathcal{P} \end{cases}$$

4. Replace every singleton module $\{x\} \in V(N)$ in N by x .

The resulting labeled directed graph (N, t) is called pvr-network (of \mathcal{S}) and denoted by $\text{pvr}(\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{F}(\mathcal{S}))$.

Step 4 of Definition 5.2 is a necessary technicality brought by the fact that the leaves of the modular decomposition tree consists of the singletons $\{x\}$ for $x \in V(\mathcal{S})$, rather than the set $V(\mathcal{S})$ itself. We emphasize that the networks used in $\mathcal{F}(\mathcal{S})$ are not required to be leaf-separated. See Figure 4 and 8 for illustrative examples.

Lemma 5.3. Let $\mathcal{S} = (X, \Upsilon, \sigma)$ be a strudigram, \mathcal{P} be the set of all prime vertices in its modular decomposition tree (\mathcal{T}, τ) and $\mathcal{F}(\mathcal{S})$ be a prime-explaining family of \mathcal{S} . Then, $\text{pvr}(\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{F}(\mathcal{S}))$ is a labeled network on X .

In particular, $V^0(\mathcal{T}) \cup X \subseteq V(N)$. Moreover, all $u, v \in V(\mathcal{T})$ with $v \preceq_{\mathcal{T}} u$ satisfy $v \preceq_N u$, and every vertex along the (unique) directed uv -path in \mathcal{T} is contained in every directed uv -path in N .

Proof. Let $(N, t) := \text{pvr}(\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{F}(\mathcal{S}))$. We first verify that N is a well-defined network on X . By construction, we have $V(N) = V^0(\mathcal{T}) \cup X \cup (\bigcup_{M \in \mathcal{P}} V^0(N_M))$. Note that each $M \in \mathcal{P}$ is a vertex in $V^0(\mathcal{T})$ and thus, the identification of the root ρ_{N_M} of N_M with the vertex M in \mathcal{T} in Def. 5.2(2) is well-defined. Furthermore, by definition of MDTs, $\text{child}_{\mathcal{T}}(M) = \mathbb{M}_{\max}(\mathcal{S}[M])$ for all strong modules M of \mathcal{S} . Moreover, the quotient strudigram $\mathcal{S}_M := \mathcal{S}[M]/\mathbb{M}_{\max}(\mathcal{S}[M])$ has vertex set $\mathbb{M}_{\max}(\mathcal{S}[M])$ and, by definition of $\mathcal{F}(\mathcal{S})$, the rooted network $(N_M, t_M) \in \mathcal{F}(\mathcal{S})$ explains \mathcal{S}_M and must, therefore, satisfy $L(N_M) = V(\mathcal{S}_M) = \mathbb{M}_{\max}(\mathcal{S}[M]) = \text{child}_{\mathcal{T}}(M)$. Hence there is a 1-to-1 correspondence between the leaves of N_M and the elements of $\text{child}_{\mathcal{T}}(M)$, and the identification of vertices in Def. 5.2(2) is well-defined. Moreover, the only edges

removed from \mathcal{T} while constructing N are edges (M, M') for which $M \in \mathcal{P}$ and $M' \in \text{child}_{\mathcal{T}}(M)$, and every edge of N_M with $M \in \mathcal{P}$ appears in N . Since N_M is a network on $\mathbb{M}_{\max}(\mathcal{S}[M])$, there is a directed path from ρ_{N_M} to each element in $\mathbb{M}_{\max}(\mathcal{S}[M]) = \text{child}_{\mathcal{T}}(M)$ and these paths remain in N . Hence, any $v, u \in V^0(N_M)$ with $v \preceq_{N_M} u$ satisfy $v \preceq_N u$. It is now a straightforward task to verify that the latter argument together with the construction of N immediately implies that, for any $v, u \in V(\mathcal{T})$ with $v \preceq_{\mathcal{T}} u$, there is a directed path uv -path in N , no directed path vu -path in N and every vertex along the (unique) directed uv -path in \mathcal{T} is contained in every directed uv -path in N . Consequently, N is a well-defined DAG. Moreover, it is an easy task to verify that the module X remains, by construction, the unique root of N . In addition, $\{x\} \notin \mathcal{P}$ for all $x \in X$ and by Def. 5.2(4) each $x \in X$ is a vertex in N . Taken the latter two arguments together, N is a well-defined network on X .

By construction all vertices in $V^0(\mathcal{T})$ remain vertices in N and thus, $V^0(\mathcal{T}) \cup X \subseteq V(N)$. Note that each vertex $w \in V^0(N)$ is either a vertex in $V^0(\mathcal{T})$ or a vertex contained in $V^0(N_M)$ for some $M \in \mathcal{P}$ and each such vertex obtained either some color $\tau(w)$ or $t_M(w)$ according to Def. 5.2(3). Consequently, the labeling t as specified in Def. 5.2(3) is well-defined. Hence, $(N, t) = \text{pvr}(\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{F}(\mathcal{S}))$ is a labeled network on X . \square

The important property of a pvr-network is that it can be used to explain strudigrams, ensured by the following two results.

Lemma 5.4. *Let $\mathcal{S} = (X, \Upsilon, \sigma)$ be a strudigram, \mathcal{P} be the set of all prime vertices in its modular decomposition tree (\mathcal{T}, τ) and $\mathcal{F}(\mathcal{S})$ be a prime-explaining family of \mathcal{S} . Put $(N, t) := \text{pvr}(\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{F})$ and $\dot{v} := \{v\}$. Then, N has the 2-lca-property and, for all distinct $x, y \in L(N)$, it holds that*

$$\text{lca}_N(x, y) = \begin{cases} \text{lca}_{\mathcal{T}}(\dot{x}, \dot{y}) & \text{if } \text{lca}_{\mathcal{T}}(\dot{x}, \dot{y}) \notin \mathcal{P} \\ \text{lca}_{N_M}(v_x, v_y) & \text{if } \text{lca}_{\mathcal{T}}(\dot{x}, \dot{y}) = M \in \mathcal{P}, \text{ where } v_x, v_y \in L(N_M) \text{ are the unique} \\ & \text{vertices identified with } M_x \text{ and } M_y \text{ in } \mathcal{T}, \text{ respectively and} \\ & \text{where } x \in M_x \text{ and } y \in M_y. \end{cases}$$

Moreover, if every $(N_M, t_M) \in \mathcal{F}(\mathcal{S})$ has the k -lca-property for some $k \leq |X|$, then (N, t) has the k -lca-property.

Proof. Let $\mathcal{S} = (X, \Upsilon, \sigma)$ be a strudigram, \mathcal{P} be the set of all prime vertices in its modular decomposition tree (\mathcal{T}, τ) and $\mathcal{F}(\mathcal{S})$ be a prime-explaining family of \mathcal{S} . Put $(N, t) := \text{pvr}(\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{F})$. Note that every $(N_M, t_M) \in \mathcal{F}(\mathcal{S})$ has the 2-lca-property. Assume now that every $(N_M, t_M) \in \mathcal{F}(\mathcal{S})$ has the k -lca-property for some $k \geq 2$. Let $A \subseteq X$ with $|A| \leq k$. Since \mathcal{T} is a tree, it is an lca-network and, therefore, $M := \text{lca}_{\mathcal{T}}(A)$ is well-defined. As already argued in the proof of Lemma 5.3, $L(N_M) = \mathbb{M}_{\max}(\mathcal{S}[M]) = \text{child}_{\mathcal{T}}(M)$, for all $M \in \mathcal{P}$. Let $M_1, \dots, M_\ell \in \text{child}_{\mathcal{T}}(M)$ be all children of M for which $A \cap M_i \neq \emptyset$. Since $M_1, \dots, M_\ell \in \mathbb{M}_{\max}(\mathcal{S}[M])$, we have $M_i \cap M_j = \emptyset$, $1 \leq i < j \leq \ell$. In particular, $\ell \leq k$ must hold. Moreover, M is the unique inclusion-minimal cluster in \mathcal{T} that contains $B := \bigcup_{i=1}^\ell M_i$. The latter arguments together with Obs. 2.2 imply $M = \text{lca}_{\mathcal{T}}(A) = \text{lca}_{\mathcal{T}}(B)$.

By Lemma 5.3, N is a network on X and thus, the root ρ_N is an ancestor of all vertices in N . By construction, none of the networks $N_{M'}$ used to replace a prime module $M' \neq M$ along the path from M to any vertex $\{x\}$, in $x \in M_i$, in \mathcal{T} shares vertices or edges with any network $N_{M''}$ used to replace a prime module $M'' \neq M$ along the path from M to $\{y\}$, $y \in M_j$, in \mathcal{T} , $1 \leq i < j \leq \ell$. Let us denote, for a strong module \tilde{M} , with $U(\tilde{M})$ either the set $\{\tilde{M}\}$ in case $\tilde{M} \notin \mathcal{P}$ or the set of vertices in $V^0(N_{\tilde{M}}) \cup \{\tilde{M}\}$ in the network $N_{\tilde{M}}$ used to replace \tilde{M} in case $\tilde{M} \in \mathcal{P}$. By construction of N and Lemma 5.3, for any strong module M''' of \mathcal{S} with $M \prec_{\mathcal{T}} M'''$ we have $v \prec_{\mathcal{T}} u$ for all $v \in U(M)$ and $u \in U(M''')$. Moreover, if M and M''' are $\prec_{\mathcal{T}}$ -incomparable in \mathcal{T} , then the vertices in $U(M)$ are pairwise \prec_N -incomparable with the vertices in $U(M''')$. In other words, no vertex in $U(M''')$ can be a least common ancestors of A for all such M''' . It now follows that either $M = \text{lca}_N(A) = \text{lca}_N(B)$ in case $M \notin \mathcal{P}$ or that the least common ancestors of A and B are located in $V(N_M)$ in case $M \in \mathcal{P}$. In the latter case, the least common ancestors of A and B coincide and, they are equal to the least common ancestors of $\{M_1, \dots, M_\ell\} \subseteq L(N_M)$. Since $\ell \leq k$ and N_M has the k -lca-property, $\text{lca}_{N_M}(\{M_1, \dots, M_\ell\}) = \text{lca}_N(A)$ is well-defined. Since $A \subseteq X$ with $|A| \leq k$ were arbitrarily chosen, N has the k -lca-property.

In particular, since every $(N_M, t_M) \in \mathcal{F}(\mathcal{S})$ has the 2-lca-property, N must have the 2-lca-property. Reusing the latter arguments, it is a straightforward task to verify that $\text{lca}_N(x, y) = \text{lca}_{\mathcal{T}}(\{x\}, \{y\})$ in case $M = \text{lca}_{\mathcal{T}}(\{x\}, \{y\}) \notin \mathcal{P}$ and, otherwise, $\text{lca}_N(x, y) = \text{lca}_{N_M}(v_x, v_y)$ where $v_x, v_y \in L(N_M)$ are the unique vertices identified with M_x and M_y in \mathcal{T} , respectively. \square

Proposition 5.5. *The pvr-network $\text{pvr}(\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{F}(\mathcal{S}))$ explains a strudigram \mathcal{S} for all prime-explaining families $\mathcal{F}(\mathcal{S})$.*

Proof. Let $\mathcal{S} = (X, \Upsilon, \sigma)$ be a strudigram, (\mathcal{T}, τ) its modular decomposition tree, and put $(N, t) := \text{pvr}(\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{F}(\mathcal{S}))$. To simplify writing, we write \dot{x} for the singleton modules $\{x\} \in L(\mathcal{T})$. Let $x, y \in X$ be distinct vertices. Since \mathcal{T} is a tree, $M := \text{lca}_{\mathcal{T}}(\dot{x}, \dot{y})$ is well-defined. Aided by Lemma 5.4, we consider two cases: $M \notin \mathcal{P}$, respectively $M \in \mathcal{P}$.

Assume that $M \notin \mathcal{P}$, so that $M = \text{lca}_{\mathcal{T}}(x, y) \in V(\mathcal{T}) \setminus \mathcal{P}$. Applying Lemma 5.4 and t as specified in Def. 5.2(3) ensures $t(\text{lca}_N(x, y)) = \tau(M)$. On the other hand, the definition of MDTs ensures that $\sigma(xy) = \tau(M)$, since $\tau(v) \neq \text{PRIME}$. Thus $t(\text{lca}_N(x, y)) = \sigma(xy)$ holds.

Assume now that $M \in \mathcal{P}$. Since $\mathcal{F}(\mathcal{S})$ is a prime-explaining family, the network (N_M, t_M) explain the strudigram $S_M := \mathcal{S}[M]/\mathbb{M}_{\max}(\mathcal{S}[M])$, where $M = L(\mathcal{T}(M))$. In other words we have that $L(N_M) = \mathbb{M}_{\max}(\mathcal{S}[M])$ and $\sigma_M(M'M'') =$




Figure 4: An example to illustrate the idea of pvr-networks, see Fig. 2 for the color legend. Shown is the edge-colored graph representation of a strudigram \mathcal{S} on $X = \{0, 1, \dots, 8\}$ (in which $\sigma(xy) = \text{"red"}$ for all $0 \leq x \leq 3$ and $4 \leq y \leq 8$, indicated by three red thick edges) together with its MDT (\mathcal{T}, τ) (right to \mathcal{S}). The strudigram \mathcal{S} contains precisely three non-trivial strong modules, namely $M_0 = \{1, 2\}$, $M_1 = \{0, 1, 2, 3\}$ and $M_2 = \{4, 5, 6, 7, 8\}$. Hence, $\mathbb{M}_{\text{str}}(\mathcal{S}) = \{\{0\}, \{1\}, \dots, \{8\}, M_0, M_1, M_2, X\}$. Both modules M_1 and M_2 are prime and we have $\mathcal{P} = \{M_1, M_2\}$. Here $\mathcal{S}[M_1]$ is prime but not primitive since $\{1, 2\} \in \mathbb{M}_{\text{str}}(\mathcal{S})[M_1]$. The quotient $\mathcal{S}' = \mathcal{S}[M_1]/\mathbb{M}_{\text{max}}(\mathcal{S}[M_1])$ is primitive, where $\mathbb{M}_{\text{max}}(\mathcal{S}[M_1]) = \{\{0\}, \{3\}, \{1, 2\}\}$. The network (N', t') explains \mathcal{S}' . Moreover, $\mathcal{S}'' = \mathcal{S}[M_2] = \mathcal{S}[M_2]/\mathbb{M}_{\text{max}}(\mathcal{S}[M_2])$ is primitive and is explained by the network (N'', t'') . In this example, we thus obtain the prime-explaining family $\mathcal{F}(\mathcal{S}) = \{(N', t'), (N'', t'')\}$ of \mathcal{S} . Replacing the prime vertices in (\mathcal{T}, τ) by the respective network as specified in Def. 5.2 yields the network (N, t) that explains \mathcal{S} .

$t_M(\text{lca}_{N_M}(M', M''))$ for all distinct $M', M'' \in \mathbb{M}_{\max}(\mathcal{S}[M])$, where σ_M denotes the map of \mathcal{S}_M . Due to Observation 4.7, this means that if $M', M'' \in \mathbb{M}_{\max}(\mathcal{S})$ are distinct, and if $u \in M'$ respectively $v \in M''$ are vertices of \mathcal{S} , then

$$\sigma(uv) = t_M(\text{lca}_{N_M}(M', M'')). \quad (1)$$

Moreover, by construction of N we have that $L(N_M) = \text{child}_{\mathcal{T}}(M) = \mathbb{M}_{\max}(\mathcal{S}[M])$, a set which, since $M = \text{lca}_{\mathcal{T}}(x, y)$, must contain two distinct M_x and M_y which satisfy $x \preceq_{\mathcal{T}} M_x$ respectively $y \preceq_{\mathcal{T}} M_y$. In particular, $M_x \cap M_y = \emptyset$. By construction of N and application of Lemma 5.3, $M_x = L(N(M_x))$ and $M_y = L(N(M_y))$. Since $x \in M_x$ and $y \in M_y$, Eq. (1) and Lemma 5.4 imply that

$$t(\text{lca}_N(x, y)) = t_M(\text{lca}_{N_M}(M_x, M_y)) = \sigma(xy).$$

In summary, $t(\text{lca}_N(x, y)) = \sigma(xy)$ for all $x, y \in X$ and, therefore, (N, t) explains \mathcal{S} . \square

Lemma 5.4 together with Prop. 3.3 and 5.5 implies

Corollary 5.6. *If every $(N_M, t_M) \in \mathcal{F}(\mathcal{S})$ in the prime-explaining family of \mathcal{S} has the k -lca-property, then $\text{pvr}(\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{F})$ is a network with k -lca-property that explains \mathcal{S} .*

In particular, for every strudigram \mathcal{S} , there is a prime-explaining family $\mathcal{F}(\mathcal{S})$ consisting solely of labeled lca-networks, in which case $\text{pvr}(\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{F}(\mathcal{S}))$ is an lca-network that explains \mathcal{S} .

6 Galled-trees and GATEX Strudigrams

As shown in the previous sections, every strudigram \mathcal{S} can be explained by some labeled lca-network which has the nice property that $\text{lca}_N(A)$ is well-defined for all $A \subseteq L(N)$. However, these networks can become quite arbitrary, as illustrated in Figure 1. We thus consider here much simpler lca-networks, so-called galled trees.

A *gall* C is a subgraph of a directed graph G such that C is composed of two internal-vertex disjoint di-paths that intersect only in their start- and end-vertex. To be more precise, C is a gall, if there are two directed xy -paths P^1 and P^2 such that $V(P^1) \cap V(P^2) = \{x, y\}$ and such that $V(P^1) \cup V(P^2) = V(C)$ and $E(P^1) \cup E(P^2) = E(C)$. In this case, $\rho_C := x$ is the *root* and $\eta_C := y$ the *hybrid* of C . The paths P^1 and P^2 from which C is composed are also called *sides* of the gall C . A *galled-tree* is a phylogenetic network N where every nontrivial biconnected component is a gall. In this section, we characterize strudigrams that can be explained by labeled galled-trees. Note that in [32], galled-trees have been called level-1 networks. Clearly, every *phylogenetic tree* is a galled-tree. However, in general, galled-trees are not required to be leaf-separated.

A particular type of tree of importance here is a *caterpillar tree*, whose inner vertices consist of a single (directed) path $P^1 = v_1 v_2 \dots v_k$ (possibly $k = 1$) such that v_i has a single leaf-child for each $i = 1, 2, \dots, k - 1$ and such that v_k has precisely two children, both of which are leafs. Additionally, a caterpillar tree will by definition be rooted at the vertex v_1 . Any graph isomorphic to the subgraph of a caterpillar tree induced by v_k and its two children x and y is called a *cherry*. In that case, the leaves x and y are said to be *part of a cherry*.

Theorem 6.1 ([40, Thm. 11]). *\mathfrak{C} is the clustering system of a galled-tree if and only if \mathfrak{C} is closed and satisfies (L) and (N3O). In particular, $\mathcal{H}(\mathfrak{C})$ is a galled-tree.*

Proof. These statements have been proven in [40] for networks whose non-trivial biconnected components are galls but that are not necessarily phylogenetic. Clearly, the *only-if* direction remains true for galled-trees as defined here. Suppose now that \mathfrak{C} is closed and satisfies (L) and (N3O). By [40, Thm. 11], $\mathcal{H}(\mathfrak{C})$ is a galled-tree, which, in particular, establishes the *if* direction of the first statement. \square

Recall that in lca-networks, the lca of any subset of leaves is well-defined. For galled-trees, the following stronger statement holds.

Lemma 6.2. *Every galled-tree is a global lca-network.*

Proof. Let $N = (V, E)$ be a galled-tree. We may construct a network $N^* = (V^*, E^*)$ from N by adding, for every non-leaf vertex $v \in V$ a new vertex x_v to V^* and the edge (v, x_v) to E^* (c.f. [52, Def. 3.9]). Clearly N^* remains a galled-tree. Lemma 49 of [40] implies that N^* is an lca-network. This allows us to apply Proposition 3.11 of [52] to conclude that $\text{lca}(W)$ is well-defined for every $\emptyset \neq W \subseteq V(N)$. \square

From here on, we assume that the fact that a galled-tree is a global lca-network is known and we avoid to mention it each time. In particular, every galled-tree has the 2-lca-property, and $\mathcal{S}(N, t)$ is thus defined for every labeled galled-tree (N, t) . A strudigram the can be explained by a galled-tree is GATEX (Galled-Tree Explainable).

Definition 6.3. *A galled-tree N on X is elementary if it contains exactly one gall C and satisfies the following conditions:*

- (i) *Every vertex of N is a vertex of C or the child of a vertex in C .*
- (ii) *The root ρ_C has no leaf-children, except possibly η_C .*
- (iii) *Each inner vertex $v \neq \rho_C$ has precisely one leaf-child x with $\text{indeg}_N(x) = 1$.*




Figure 5: Three elementary galled-trees are shown. Note, in particular, that an elementary galled-tree can be leaf-separated (middle) or not (left resp. right). Only the right-most network is a strong galled-tree.

Note that by condition (i), $\rho_N = \rho_C$. By assumption, the gall C is the only gall of N and thus every elementary galled-tree has a unique hybrid vertex, namely, η_C . Moreover, this hybrid-vertex is either a leaf or has precisely one child and this child is a leaf. See Figure 5 and its caption for some descriptive examples.

A labeled galled-tree (N, t) is *discriminating* if, for all adjacent inner vertices u and v , we have $t(u) \neq t(v)$. If $t(u) \neq t(v)$ for all edges $(u, v) \in E(N)$ where v is an inner tree-vertex, then (N, t) is *quasi-discriminating*. Since trees have no hybrid vertices any quasi-discriminating tree (T, t) is discriminating.

Definition 6.4. For a path P , let $\tilde{V}(P)$ be the set of vertices in P that are distinct from its end vertices. A gall C with sides P_1 and P_2 in a labeled galled-tree (N, t) is *strong* if it satisfies

(S1) $\tilde{V}(P^i) \neq \emptyset$ for $i \in \{1, 2\}$, and

(S2) if $|\tilde{V}(P^1)| = |\tilde{V}(P^2)| = 1$, then $|\{t(v_1), t(v_2), t(\rho_C)\}| = 3$ where $\tilde{V}(P^i) = \{v_i\}$ for $i \in \{1, 2\}$.

A galled-tree is *strong* if all its galls are strong.

Note that trees vacuously are strong galled-trees. See also Figure 5 and Figure 6 for further (non-)examples of strong (elementary) galled-trees.

In the following, we will focus on labeled galled-trees that are strong, elementary, and quasi-discriminating. As we will soon see, this type of galled-tree is closely connected to the following class of strudigrams.

Definition 6.5. We say that a strudigram $S = (X, \Upsilon, \sigma)$ is a *polar-cat* if there exists a vertex $x \in X$ and induced strudigrams S_1 and S_2 of S such that

(i) $S - x = (S_1 - x) \bowtie_k (S_2 - x)$ for some $k \in \Upsilon$.

(ii) For $i \in \{1, 2\}$, S_i can be explained by a labeled discriminating caterpillar tree (T_i, t_i) such that

(a) x is part of the cherry in T_i , and

(b) $t_i(\rho_{T_i}) \neq k$.

In that case, we also say that S is a $\bowtie_k(x, S_1, S_2)$ -polar-cat.

For an illustrative example of Definition 6.5, see Fig. 7. The concept of polar-cats was introduced in [32] in the context of graphs (without edge-colors) that are explained by galled-trees, and Def. 6.5 is a direct generalization to the case of strudigrams. The name polar-cat stems from the fact that the respective substrudigrams S_1 and S_2 are **polarizing**, i.e. the requirement of $t_i(\rho_{T_i}) \neq k$, and **caterpillar-explainable**. We note in passing the polar-cats as defined in [32] must have at least four vertices. We relaxed this condition to deal with the general case of rainbow-triangles.

In fact, rainbow-triangles are worth remarking upon further. By Theorem 4.6(2), any strudigram on two vertices can be explained by a labeled tree. Moreover, it is an easy task to verify that among all strudigrams on three vertices, only the rainbow-triangle is primitive, and thus, cannot be explained by a tree, see Fig. 6. The latter arguments together with Theorem 4.6 imply

Observation 6.6. The smallest strudigram that is not explained by a labeled tree is the rainbow-triangle and rainbow-triangles are the only strudigrams on three vertices that are primitive. In particular, rainbow-triangles are truly-primitive. Nevertheless, rainbow-triangles are GATEX and can, in particular, be explained by a strong, elementary, quasi-discriminating galled-tree.

Lemma 6.7. Every polar-cat has at least three vertices. Moreover, any rainbow-triangle $S = (\{x_1, x_2, x_3\}, \Upsilon, \sigma)$ is a $(x_i, S[\{x_i, x_j\}], S[\{x_i, x_l\}])$ -polar-cat, $\{i, j, l\} = \{1, 2, 3\}$.




Figure 6: Left, all strudigrams on three vertices (up to choice and permutation of colors) are shown, with color legend as in Fig. 2. Galled-trees that explain \mathcal{S} are drawn in the same row as each individual strudigram \mathcal{S} . Only the rainbow-triangle \mathcal{T} (top-left) cannot be explained by a labeled tree, since it is primitive. Nevertheless it is explained by a strong, elementary and quasi-discriminating galled-tree. In particular, the depicted galled-tree is precisely $(N(b, \mathcal{T}_1, \mathcal{T}_2), t(b, \mathcal{T}_1, \mathcal{T}_2))$ for $\mathcal{T}_1 = \mathcal{T}[\{a, b\}]$ resp. $\mathcal{T}_2 = \mathcal{T}[\{b, c\}]$, as specified in Def. 6.9. Each of the other two labeled galled-trees in the middle and bottom row that contain a gall are elementary but neither strong nor quasi-discriminating.

Proof. Let $\mathcal{S} = (X, \Upsilon, \sigma)$ be a \bowtie_k - $(x, \mathcal{S}_1, \mathcal{S}_2)$ -polar-cat. By Def. 6.5(ii), each of \mathcal{S}_1 and \mathcal{S}_2 is explained by a labeled caterpillar tree such that x is part of the cherry in each of the respective trees. Hence, each of \mathcal{S}_1 and \mathcal{S}_2 contains at least two vertices and both contain x . This together with Def. 6.5(i) implies that \mathcal{S} has at least three vertices. A generic example, that shows that a rainbow-triangle $\mathcal{S} = (\{x_1, x_2, x_3\}, \Upsilon, \sigma)$ is a $(x_i, \mathcal{S}[\{x_i, x_j\}], \mathcal{S}[\{x_i, x_l\}])$ -polar-cat, $\{i, j, l\} = \{1, 2, 3\}$ is provided in Fig. 6(left) where we can put $\{x_1, x_2, x_3\} = \{a, b, c\}$. \square

It is easy to see that strudigrams $\mathcal{S} = (X, \Upsilon, \sigma)$ with either $|X| \leq 2$ or $|X| = 3$ and where the three pairs of vertices in X receive the same color in Υ , can never satisfy Def. 6.5(ii) and are, therefore, not polar-cats. Nevertheless, if $|X| = 3$ and we have 2 colors in Υ distributed among the three pairs of vertices in X we obtain a polar-cat: simply choose $x \in X$ as the vertex that satisfies $\sigma(xv) = \sigma(xu)$ for $u, v \in X \setminus \{x\}$. Thus, all other polar-cats are either rainbow-triangles or have at least four vertices and we call them *handsome*.

Lemma 6.8. *If \mathcal{S} is a strudigram that is explained by a strong, elementary and quasi-discriminating galled-tree, then \mathcal{S} is a handsome polar-cat.*

Proof. Let (N, t) be a strong, elementary and quasi-discriminating galled-tree and let $\mathcal{S} = (X, \Upsilon, \sigma)$ be the strudigram that is explained by (N, t) . Since N is elementary, it contains a unique gall C . Let P^1 and P^2 denote the sides of C . Recall P^1 and P^2 meet only in the root ρ and the (unique) hybrid vertex η of N . Let W_i be the set of the leaf-children of the vertices in P^i and put $\mathcal{S}_i = \mathcal{S}[W_i]$, for $i \in \{1, 2\}$. Furthermore, to ease notation, we let v denote the child of η if such vertex exist; otherwise $v = \eta$. Thus, v is always the leaf of N that satisfies $v \preceq_N \eta$. Clearly, $W_1 \cap W_2 = \{v\}$. Finally, put $k := t(\rho)$.

It is an easy task to verify that $\text{lca}(x, y) = \rho_N$ for all $x \in W_1 \setminus \{v\}$ and $y \in W_2 \setminus \{v\}$. Thus, $t(\text{lca}(x, y)) = t(\rho) = k$ for all $x \in W_1 \setminus \{v\}$ and $y \in W_2 \setminus \{v\}$. Since \mathcal{S} is explained by (N, t) , it holds that $\sigma(xy) = k$ for all $x \in W_1 \setminus \{v\}$ and $y \in W_2 \setminus \{v\}$. Hence, $\mathcal{S} - v = (\mathcal{S}_1 - v) \bowtie_k (\mathcal{S}_2 - v)$ and \mathcal{S}_1 and \mathcal{S}_2 satisfy Definition 6.5(i).

We now construct a caterpillar tree that explains \mathcal{S}_1 . Suppose u is the child of ρ that lies on P^1 , and let (T_1, t_1) be the labeled subnetwork where $T_1 = N(u)$ and where t_1 is the restriction of t to T_1 . Note that $u \neq \eta$ since N is strong. Since N is phylogenetic, elementary and strong, only η may have been suppressed while constructing $N(u)$ (which is the case if η is not already a leaf in N). One easily verifies that T_1 is a caterpillar tree. Moreover, if we let u' denote the \preceq_N -minimal vertex of P^1 that satisfies $\eta \prec_N u'$, then the leaf v must, by construction and since N is phylogenetic, be a child of u' in T_1 and hence, v is part of the cherry of T_1 . By construction, the leaf set of T_1 is precisely W_1 and one easily verifies that $\text{lca}_{T_1}(x, x') = \text{lca}_N(x, x')$ for all $x, x' \in W_1$. Since t_1 is the restriction of t to T_1 , $t_1(\text{lca}_{T_1}(x, x')) = t(\text{lca}_N(x, x'))$ holds for all $x, x' \in W_1$. Hence, (T_1, t_1) explains \mathcal{S}_1 . Since (N, t) is quasi-discriminating, it follows that the root ρ_{T_1} of T_1

(which is the child u of ρ_N in N) satisfies $t_1(\rho_{T_1}) = t(u) \neq t(\rho_N) = k$. Thus, S_1 satisfies Definition 6.5(ii). By analogous argumentation, S_2 satisfies Definition 6.5(ii).

To summarize, S is a polar-cat. To see that S is handsome, observe that Lemma 6.7 implies $|X| \geq 3$. Assume that $|X| = 3$. In this case, (S2) implies that three colors must appear along the three pairs of vertices in X and S is, therefore, a rainbow-triangle. In summary, $|X| \geq 3$ implies that S is a rainbow-triangle or that $|X| \geq 4$ and therefore, that S is handsome. \square

Given a galled-tree (N, t) , constructing the strudigram $\mathcal{S}(N, t)$ is straightforward. The proof of Lemma 6.8 focuses on showing certain properties of $\mathcal{S}(N, t)$ for a specific type of galled-tree, rather than proving its existence. Proving the existence of a galled-tree that explains a given strudigram is generally more challenging. However, the structured nature of polar-cats allows for the explicit construction of a galled-tree that explains it. The main idea is to connect the caterpillar trees that explain the substrudigrams S_1 and S_2 of a (v, S_1, S_2) -polar-cat with an additional root-vertex and by merging their respective occurrences of the leaf v under a common hybrid-vertex. This procedure is formalized as follows (c.f. [32, Def. 4.14]).

Definition 6.9. Let S be a \bowtie_k - (v, S_1, S_2) -polar-cat. Let (T_1, t_1) , resp., (T_2, t_2) be the discriminating caterpillar tree that explains S_1 , resp., S_2 and where v is a part of the cherry in both T_1 and T_2 . We may, without loss of generality, assume that T_1 and T_2 are vertex-disjoint except for the leaf v . However, to distinguish the occurrences of v in the two trees, we call v in T_i simply v_i for $i \in \{1, 2\}$. Then, the di-graph $N := N(v, S_1, S_2)$ is constructed as follows:

1. Let N' be the disjoint union of T_1 and T_2 .
2. Add a new root vertex ρ_N to N' along with edges (ρ_N, ρ_{T_1}) and (ρ_N, ρ_{T_2}) to obtain N'' .
3. Identify the leaves v_1 and v_2 of N'' into a new hybrid vertex denoted η_N , add a new occurrence of the leaf v and the edge (η_N, v) which results in the di-graph N .

The labeling $t := t(v, S_1, S_2)$ of $N(v, S_1, S_2)$ is defined, for every inner vertex u of $N(v, S_1, S_2)$, by

$$t(u) := \begin{cases} t_1(u) & \text{if } u \in V^0(T_1) \\ t_2(u) & \text{if } u \in V^0(T_2) \\ k & \text{if } u \in \{\rho_N, \eta_N\}. \end{cases}$$

The label $t(\eta_N)$ may be arbitrarily defined: for definiteness we have chosen $t(\eta_N) = k$ here. We argue now that $(N, t) := (N(v, S_1, S_2), t(v, S_1, S_2))$ is an elementary, quasi-discriminating, and leaf-separated network. One easily verifies that N is a galled-tree consisting of a single gall rooted at ρ_N and terminating at η_N , since the trees T_1 and T_2 used in the construction of $N := N(v, S_1, S_2)$ are caterpillars. Note that η_N has a single child, namely, the leaf v . Hence, N is leaf-separated. Furthermore, ρ_N has no leaf-children and all other inner vertices have precisely one leaf-child. In other words, N elementary. One easily verifies that the labeling $t = t(v, S_1, S_2)$ is well-defined. Moreover, since both (T_1, t_1) and (T_2, t_2) are discriminating and since $t_i(\rho_{T_i}) \neq k$, $1 \leq i \leq 2$, and since the only newly introduced inner vertex in N that is distinct from ρ_N is the hybrid vertex η_N , it follows that (N, t) is quasi-discriminating, see Fig. 7 for an illustrative example. We summarize the latter findings in

Observation 6.10. If S is a (v, S_1, S_2) -polar-cat, then the directed graph $N(v, S_1, S_2)$ is a galled-tree, and $t(v, S_1, S_2)$ is a well-defined labeling of $N(v, S_1, S_2)$. In particular, $(N(v, S_1, S_2), t(v, S_1, S_2))$ is elementary, leaf-separated and quasi-discriminating.

Let us now investigate the structure of the unique gall C in $(N, t) := (N(v, S_1, S_2), t(v, S_1, S_2))$. Recall that both S_1 and S_2 have at least two vertices each, i.e., the corresponding trees T_1 and T_2 have both at least two leaves. Hence, each side of the gall C of must have at least one vertex that is distinct from ρ_C and η_C and, therefore, always satisfies (S1). In case the polar-cat has at least four vertices then we can conclude that at least one of S_1 and S_2 has at least three vertices, implying that at least one of T_1 and T_2 has at least two inner vertices. In this case, C trivially satisfies (S2) and is, therefore, strong. If a polar-cat S is a rainbow-triangle, then it easily seen that (N, t) must contain at least three distinct labels, namely $|\{t(\rho_N), t(\rho_{T_1}), t(\rho_{T_2})\}| = 3$, so that C again satisfies (S2). See also Figure 6. The latter discussion together with Obs. 6.10 implies

Observation 6.11. If S is a handsome (v, S_1, S_2) -polar-cat, then $(N(v, S_1, S_2), t(v, S_1, S_2))$ is a strong, elementary and quasi-discriminating labeled galled-tree.

The attentive reader may have noted that we could have simply identified the two occurrences of v in Definition 6.9 without the additional leaf-child of η_N and still obtained an elementary and quasi-discriminating galled-tree. However, it would not be leaf-separated, a property that will simplify some of the upcoming proofs.

Lemma 6.12. Every (v, S_1, S_2) -polar-cat is explained by the labeled galled-tree $(N(v, S_1, S_2), t(v, S_1, S_2))$.

Proof. Let $S = (X, \Upsilon, \sigma)$ be a (v, S_1, S_2) -polar-cat and put $(N, t) := (N(v, S_1, S_2), t(v, S_1, S_2))$. Let u_1 and u_2 be the two children of ρ_N . Note that $N(u_1)$ and $N(u_2)$ are precisely the two caterpillar trees (T_1, t_1) and (T_2, t_2) that explain S_1 and S_2 , respectively. Let W_1 and W_2 be the vertex set of S_1 and S_2 , respectively.




Figure 7: Top-left, a strudigram S'' is shown, see Fig. 2 for the color legend. A network (N'', t'') that explains S'' is provided already in Fig. 4. Put $S'_1 := S''[4, 5]$, $S'_2 := S''[5, 6, 7, 8]$ and $v := 5$. The strudigram $S'' - v$ is a k -series strudigram as $S'' - v = (S'_1 - v) \bowtie_k (S'_2 - v)$ where k refers to the edge-color solid-red in the drawing. Hence, S'' satisfies Def. 6.5(i). The substrudigrams S'_1 and S'_2 can be explained by the discriminating caterpillar (T_1, t_1) and (T_2, t_2) , respectively. In addition, the vertex $v = 5$ is a cherry in both T_1 and T_2 and, $t_1(\rho_{T_1}) \neq k$ and $t_2(\rho_{T_2}) \neq k$. Therefore, S'' satisfies Def. 6.5(ii). In summary, S'' is a $(v; S'_1, S'_2)$ -polar-cat. Even more, S'' is handsome. The network (N, t) is the network $(\mathcal{N}(v, S'_1, S'_2), t(v, S'_1, S'_2))$ as specified in Def. 6.9. This network (N, t) explains S'' and thus serves as a much simpler alternative explanation of S'' compared to (N'', t'') shown in Fig. 4.

Let x and y be vertices of \mathcal{S} and, therefore, leaves in N . Suppose first that $x \in W_i \setminus \{v\}$ and $y \in W_j \setminus \{v\}$ with $\{i, j\} = \{1, 2\}$. Since $\mathcal{S} - v = (\mathcal{S}_1 - v) \bowtie_k (\mathcal{S}_2 - v)$, we have $\sigma(xy) = k$. Moreover, x and y are leaf-children of vertices that are located on different sides of the unique gall in the elementary network N . Thus, $\text{lca}_N(x, y) = \rho_N$. By construction, $t(\rho_N) = k$ and therefore, $t(\text{lca}_N(x, y)) = k$. Suppose now that x and y are distinct elements of W_i for some $i \in \{1, 2\}$. In this case, x, y are both leaves of $N(u_i)$. Note that $\text{par}_N(x) \neq \text{par}_N(y)$ and we may assume w.l.o.g. that $\text{par}_N(y) \prec_N \text{par}_N(x)$. It is easy to verify that $u := \text{lca}_N(x, y) = \text{lca}_{T_i}(x, y) = \text{par}_N(x)$. Since the labeling t restricts to t_i on the inner vertices of $N(u_i)$ and since (T_i, t_i) explains \mathcal{S}_i , we thus have $t(u) = t_i(u) = \sigma(xy)$. In summary, (N, t) explains \mathcal{S} . \square

We now investigate the structures of modules in polar-cats.

Lemma 6.13. *If \mathcal{S} is a handsome polar-cat, then \mathcal{S} is truly-primitive.*

Proof. Let $\mathcal{S} = (X, \Upsilon, \sigma)$ be a handsome $(v, \mathcal{S}_1, \mathcal{S}_2)$ -polar-cat. If \mathcal{S} is a rainbow-triangle, then it is truly-primitive by Observation 6.6. We may thus assume $|X| \geq 4$. By Lemma 6.12, \mathcal{S} is explained by the labeled galled-tree $(N, t) := (\mathcal{N}(v, \mathcal{S}_1, \mathcal{S}_2), t(v, \mathcal{S}_1, \mathcal{S}_2))$. By Observation 6.10 and 6.11, (N, t) is both strong, elementary, leaf-separated and quasi-discriminating. Let C denote the unique underlying gall of N and let ρ and η denote its root and unique hybrid vertex, respectively. Let h be the unique leaf in N that is adjacent to η . In what follows, we let $\tilde{w} := \text{par}_N(w)$ denote the unique parent of a leaf w in N . Since N is elementary, \tilde{w} is located on C for every leaf w in N .

Let $M \subseteq X$ be a set of vertices such that $2 \leq |M| < |X|$, and put $\bar{M} := X \setminus M$. Assume, for contradiction, that M is a module of \mathcal{S} . To recall, X is the leaf set of N . Moreover, since \preceq_N is a partial order and each leaf has a distinct parent, we always have that $\tilde{v} \prec_N \tilde{w}$, $\tilde{w} \prec_N \tilde{v}$ or \tilde{v} and \tilde{w} are \preceq_N -incomparable for any two distinct $v, w \in X$. Moreover, no leaf has ρ as a parent. We show first that the following case cannot occur.

Case A: There exist some $x, y \in M$ and some $u \in \bar{M}$ such that $\tilde{x} \succ_N \tilde{u} \succ_N \tilde{y}$. We may, without loss of generality, assume that $x, y \in M$ are taken so that there is no $z \in M$ with $\tilde{x} \succ_N \tilde{z} \succ_N \tilde{y}$ and such that \tilde{u} is the (unique) non-leaf child of \tilde{x} . Since $\tilde{u} \succ_N \tilde{y}$, we have $\tilde{u} \neq \eta$. This and the fact that (N, t) is quasi-discriminating implies that $t(\tilde{x}) \neq t(\tilde{u})$. Moreover, since $\tilde{x} \succ_N \tilde{u} \succ_N \tilde{y}$, we have $\text{lca}_N(x, u) = \tilde{x}$ and $\text{lca}_N(y, u) = \tilde{u}$. Therefore, $\sigma(xu) = t(\tilde{x}) \neq t(\tilde{u}) = \sigma(uy)$ which implies that M is not a module; a contradiction.

Hence, Case A cannot occur under the assumption that M is a module. We now distinguish between the cases that the unique child h of η satisfies (I) $h \in M$ or (II) $h \notin M$.

Case (I): $h \in M$. Since $|M| > 1$, there must be a leaf $z \in M \setminus \{h\}$. In particular, $\tilde{z} \succ_N \eta$ holds. This and the fact that Case A cannot occur implies that, for the unique parent \tilde{x} of η in N with $\tilde{x} \preceq_N \tilde{z}$, we have $x \in M$ (note, $x = z$ might be possible). Moreover, $|M| < |X|$ implies that there is some $u \in \bar{M}$.

Suppose first that \tilde{u} and \tilde{x} are comparable for all $u \in \overline{M}$. Let P^1 be the side of C that contains \tilde{x} and P^2 be the other side of C . Note that P^2 contains at least one vertex distinct from ρ and η , since N is strong. Since all vertices $\tilde{y} \neq \rho, \eta$ along P^2 are incomparable with \tilde{x} , since $\eta = \tilde{h}$ and $h \in M$ and since no leaf of N is adjacent to ρ , we have $y \in M$ for all \tilde{y} along P^2 . Since Case A cannot occur, it follows that $v \in \overline{M}$ for the unique child \tilde{v} of ρ on P^1 . Since (N, t) is quasi-discriminating and since $\tilde{v} \neq \eta$, we have $t(\rho) \neq t(\tilde{v})$. This together with $\text{lca}_N(x, v) = \tilde{v}$ and $\text{lca}_N(y, v) = \rho$ implies $\sigma(xv) \neq \sigma(yv)$; a contradiction to M being a module and $x, y \in M$ and $v \in \overline{M}$. Consequently, there is some $u \in \overline{M}$ such that \tilde{u} and \tilde{x} are incomparable. Since $u \succ_N \eta, h \in M$ and since Case A cannot occur, it follows that the unique child \tilde{v} of ρ with $\tilde{v} \succeq_N \tilde{u}$ satisfies $v \in \overline{M}$. Again we have $t(\rho) \neq t(\tilde{v})$. By construction, $\text{lca}_N(h, v) = \tilde{v}$ and $\text{lca}_N(x, v) = \rho$. Since $x, h \in M$ and $v \in \overline{M}$ we have $\sigma(hv) = \sigma(xv)$. However, $\sigma(hv) = t(\tilde{v})$ and $\sigma(xv) = t(\rho)$ imply $\sigma(hv) \neq \sigma(xv)$; a contradiction.

Thus, neither Case A nor (I) can occur if M is a module. Hence, we consider the final

Case (II): $h \notin M$. One easily verifies that $\tilde{x} = \text{lca}_N(x, h)$ and $\tilde{y} = \text{lca}_N(y, h)$ holds for all $x, y \in M \subseteq X \setminus \{h\}$. Hence, $t(\tilde{x}) = \sigma(xh) = \sigma(yh) = t(\tilde{y})$ must hold for all $x, y \in M$. Note that $\tilde{x} \neq \rho, \eta$ for all $x \in M$. The latter two arguments imply together with the fact that (N, t) is quasi-discriminating that none of the elements \tilde{x} and \tilde{y} can be adjacent in N . Hence, if there are two $x, y \in M$ such that $\tilde{x} \succ_N \tilde{y}$, then there is a vertex \tilde{u} on C that satisfies $\tilde{x} \succ_N \tilde{u} \succ_N \tilde{y}$ and $t(\tilde{u}) \neq t(\tilde{x})$. Consequently, $u \in \overline{M}$ and we have Case A; a contradiction. Thus, any two $x, y \in M$ must be incomparable in N . One easily verifies that, in case $|M| \geq 3$, there are two $x, y \in M$ such $\tilde{x} \succ_N \tilde{y}$ since N is elementary. This and $|M| > 1$ implies that $|M| = 2$. Let $M = \{x, y\}$. Since N is strong and $|X| \geq 4$ and \tilde{x} and \tilde{y} are incomparable, there is some \tilde{u} on C that is comparable to either \tilde{x} or \tilde{y} .

Suppose first that $\tilde{u} \succ_N \tilde{x}$ and thus, $\text{lca}_N(x, u) = \tilde{u}$. As Case A cannot occur, we may w.l.o.g. assume that \tilde{u} is a child of ρ . Since (N, t) is quasi-discriminating we have $t(\tilde{u}) \neq (\rho)$. Since \tilde{u} and \tilde{y} are incomparable, we have $\text{lca}_N(u, y) = \rho$. Hence, $\sigma(xu) = t(\tilde{u}) \neq (\rho) = \sigma(uy)$ together with $u \notin M$ yields a contradiction to $M = \{x, y\}$ being a module. Therefore, $\tilde{u} \succ_N \tilde{x}$ and, by similar arguments, $\tilde{u} \succ_N \tilde{y}$ is not possible for any $u \in \overline{M}$. This and $M = \{x, y\}$ implies that \tilde{x} and \tilde{y} must be the two children of ρ . In this case, there is some $u \in \overline{M}$ such that $\tilde{x} \succ_N \tilde{u}$ and thus, $\text{lca}_N(x, u) = \tilde{x}$. Since $\tilde{x} \neq \eta$ is a child of ρ , we have $t(\tilde{x}) \neq t(\rho)$. Moreover, \tilde{y} and \tilde{u} are incomparable and, thus, $\text{lca}_N(u, y) = \rho$. Hence, $\sigma(uy) = t(\rho) \neq t(\tilde{x}) = \sigma(xu)$ yields again a contradiction.

In summary, there is no $M \subseteq X$ with $2 \leq |M| < |X|$ and such that M is a module. Hence S consists of trivial modules only, i.e., S is primitive. Since $|X| \geq 4$, S is truly-primitive. \square

Lemma 6.14. *Let (N, t) be a galled-tree that contains a gall C . If u and v are the two children of ρ_C that are located on C , then $L(N(u)) \cup L(N(v))$ is a module of $\mathcal{S}(N, t)$ containing at least two vertices.*

Proof. Let u and v be two children of ρ_C that are located on C and put $M := L(N(u)) \cup L(N(v))$. Let $S = (X, Y, \sigma)$ be the strudigram $\mathcal{S}(N, t)$. If $M = X$, then M is trivially a module of S . Otherwise, there is a vertex $y \in X \setminus M$. In particular, y is a leaf in N and thus, neither a descendant of u nor of v . Hence, $\text{lca}_N(x, y) \succeq_N \rho_C$ for every $x \in M$. Consequently, $\sigma(xy) = t(\text{lca}_N(x, y)) = t(\text{lca}_N(\rho_C, y)) = t(\text{lca}_N(x', y)) = \sigma(x'y)$ for all $x, x' \in M$ and any $y \notin M$. Thus, M is a module of S .

We consider now the size of M . Let η_C be the unique hybrid of C . Since u and v are contained in the gall C and η_C is the unique \preceq_C -minimal vertex in C it follows that $\eta_C \preceq_C u, v$. By [40, L. 17], $L(N(\eta_C)) \subseteq L(N(v))$ and $L(N(\eta_C)) \subseteq L(N(u))$ must hold. We now show that $M \setminus L(N(\eta_C)) \neq \emptyset$. This statement is clearly satisfied if $L(N(\eta_C))$ is a proper subset of both $L(N(u))$ and of $L(N(v))$. Hence, suppose that $L(N(u)) = L(N(\eta_C))$. It is an easy task to verify that $u = \eta_C$, and $v \neq \eta_C$. The latter implies that v has at least one child v' not on C , so that $\emptyset \neq L(N(v')) \subset L(N(v))$. In particular, $L(N(v)) \setminus L(N(\eta_C)) \neq \emptyset$. Analogously, $L(N(v)) = L(N(\eta_C))$ implies $L(N(u)) \setminus L(N(\eta_C)) \neq \emptyset$. In both cases, we thus have that

$$M \setminus L(N(\eta_C)) = (L(N(u)) \setminus L(N(\eta_C))) \cup (L(N(v)) \setminus L(N(\eta_C))) \neq \emptyset.$$

To summarize, we have $|M| = |M \setminus L(N(\eta_C))| + |L(N(\eta_C))| \geq 1 + 1 = 2$. \square

Lemma 6.15. *If S is a truly-primitive and GATEX strudigram, then every labeled galled-tree (N, t) that explains S is strong, elementary and quasi-discriminating.*

Proof. Let $S = (X, Y, \sigma)$ be a truly-primitive GATEX strudigram. Hence, S is explained by some labeled galled-tree (N, t) . Since S is truly-primitive, we have $|X| \geq 3$. By Theorem 4.6 and since $S = S[X]$ is primitive, S cannot be explained by a labeled tree and, therefore, N contains at least one gall C . Let u and v denote the two children of ρ_C that are located on C . By Lemma 6.14 the set $M = L(N(u)) \cup L(N(v))$ is a module of S such that $|M| > 1$. Since S is primitive it has no nontrivial modules, which enforces $M = X$. This means that $\rho_C = \rho_N$, and ρ_N does not have any other children than u and v . In particular, C is the only gall of N .

We continue with showing that N is elementary. Let $W = V(C) \setminus \{\rho_C\}$. For each $w \in W$ we introduce the set

$$\mathcal{L}(w) := \{x \in L(N(w)) \mid \forall u \in W \text{ with } u \prec_N w \text{ we have } x \not\preceq_N u\}.$$

In simple words, $\mathcal{L}(w)$ consists of the leaves in $N(w)$ which are not descendant of any $u \in W$ with $u \prec_N w$. Note that each vertex $w \in W \setminus \{\eta_C\}$ has a child v_w that is not located on C . In particular, v_w is incomparable to each $u \in W$

with $u \prec_N w$. Hence, $L(N(v_w)) \subseteq \mathcal{L}(w)$ and, therefore, $|\mathcal{L}(w)| \geq 1$ for all $w \in W \setminus \{\eta_C\}$. Moreover, it is clear that $|\mathcal{L}(\eta_C)| = |L(N(\eta_C))| \geq 1$. By construction, $\mathcal{L}(w) \cap \mathcal{L}(w') = \emptyset$ for all distinct $w, w' \in W$. This and $|\mathcal{L}(w)| \geq 1$ for all $w \in W$ implies that $|L(N)| = |X| > |\mathcal{L}(w)| \geq 1$ for all $w \in W$. Moreover, since $\rho_N = \rho_C$ has out-degree two, $\{\mathcal{L}(w) \mid w \in W\}$ forms a partition of $L(N)$. Assume, for contradiction, that $|\mathcal{L}(w)| > 1$ for some $w \in W$. Put $M = \mathcal{L}(w)$. Clearly, $\text{lca}_N(M) \preceq_N w$ must hold. It is an easy task to verify that $\text{lca}_N(x, u) = \text{lca}_N(x', u) = \text{lca}_N(w, u) \in V(C)$ and thus, $t(\text{lca}_N(x, u)) = t(\text{lca}_N(x', u))$ for every $u \in L(N) \setminus M$ and $x, x' \in M$. Hence, M is a module of S satisfying $1 < |M| < |X|$; contradicting primitivity of S . Hence, $|\mathcal{L}(w)| = 1$ must hold for all $w \in W$ and since N does not contain vertices with in- and out-degree 1, each $w \in W \setminus \{\eta_C\}$ has precisely one leaf-child with in-degree one. Moreover, $|\mathcal{L}(\eta_C)| = 1$ implies that η_C itself is a leaf, or η_C is an inner-vertex with precisely one child, and that child is a leaf. This together with the latter arguments implies that N is elementary.

We continue with showing that (N, t) is a strong galled-tree, i.e. that C is a strong gall and thus satisfies (S1) and (S2). Let P^1 and P^2 be the two sides of C . In what follows, we let $\tilde{V}(P^i)$ denote the set of vertices of P^i that are distinct from its end vertices, $i \in \{1, 2\}$.

Assume, for contradiction, that C does not satisfy (S1). W.l.o.g., assume that $\tilde{V}(P^1) = \emptyset$, i.e., P^1 consists of ρ_C and η_C only. Consider the unique leaf x of N that satisfy $x \preceq \eta_C$ and the leaf-child $y \neq \eta_C$ of the \preceq -minimal vertex v in $\tilde{V}(P^2)$. Since N is elementary and has $|X| \geq 3$ leaves we have $|M| < |X|$ for $M = \{x, y\}$. Moreover, for any leaf $u \neq x, y$ in N we have $\text{par}_N(u) \succ v, \eta_C$ and, in particular, $\text{lca}_N(x, u) = \text{par}_N(u) = \text{lca}_N(y, u)$ and therefore, $t(\text{lca}_N(x, u)) = t(\text{lca}_N(y, u))$ for all $u \in X \setminus M$. Thus, M is a non-trivial module of S ; a contradiction. Hence C must satisfy (S1).

Note that since N is elementary and C satisfies (S1), Condition (S2) is trivially satisfied whenever $|X| > 3$. We thus consider the case $|X| = 3$, which together with (S1) and N being elementary implies that $\tilde{V}(P^i) = \{v_i\}$ i.e. $|\tilde{V}(P^i)| = 1$ for $i \in \{1, 2\}$ must hold. Moreover, for $i \in \{1, 2\}$, the vertex v_i has two children; namely a leaf x_i and the hybrid η of C . Finally, N must contain a unique leaf x_3 such that $x_3 \preceq \eta$, so that $X = \{x_1, x_2, x_3\}$. As S is a truly-primitive strudigram with three vertices it is, by Lemma 6.7 a rainbow triangle. One now easily verifies that $|\{t(\rho_C), t(v_1), t(v_2)\}| = |\{\sigma(x_1x_2), \sigma(x_1x_3), \sigma(x_2x_3)\}| = 3$, i.e. C satisfies (S2). In summary so far, (N, t) is a strong, elementary network.

Finally, assume for contradiction that (N, t) is not quasi-discriminating and let $v, v' \in V(C) \setminus \{\eta_C\}$ be adjacent tree vertices of C such that $t(v) = t(v')$. Without loss of generality, we may suppose $\rho_N \succeq_N v \succ v' \succ \eta_C$. Let $x' \neq \eta_C$ denote the leaf-child of v' with in-degree one. First assume $\rho_N = v$ and thus that v has no leaf-children. It is an easy task to verify that, in this case, $\text{lca}(x', y) \in \{v', v\}$ for all $y \in M := X \setminus \{x'\}$. Since $t(v) = t(v')$ and $2 \leq |X| - 1 = |M| < |X|$, M is a non-trivial module of S ; a contradiction. Hence, $v \neq \rho_N$ must hold. Since $\rho_N \succ v \succ v' \succ \eta$ and N is elementary, v has a unique leaf-child x . Moreover, since v and v' are adjacent, we have for $y \in X \setminus \{x, x'\}$ either (i) $\text{par}_N(y) \succ_N v, v'$ or (ii) $v, v' \succ_N \text{par}_N(y)$ or (iii) $\text{par}_N(y)$ is incomparable to both v and v' . One easily verifies that, in Case (i) we have $\text{lca}(x, y) = \text{lca}(x', y) = \text{par}(y)$, in Case (ii) we have $\text{lca}(x, y) = v$ and $\text{lca}(x', y) = v'$ and in Case (iii) we have $\text{lca}(x, y) = \text{lca}(x', y) = \rho_N$. Hence, in all cases it holds that $t(\text{lca}(x, y)) = t(\text{lca}(x', y))$ which implies that $M' = \{x, x'\}$ is a non-trivial module of S ; a contradiction. Thus, (N, t) must be quasi-discriminating. \square

We now state one of the main result of this section.

Theorem 6.16. *For every strudigram S , the following statements are equivalent.*

- (a) S is explained by a strong, elementary and quasi-discriminating galled-tree.
- (b) S is a handsome polar-cat.
- (c) S is a truly-primitive polar-cat.
- (d) S is truly-primitive and GATEX.

Proof. If $S = (X, \Upsilon, \sigma)$ can be explained by a strong, elementary and quasi-discriminating labeled-galled-tree, then we can apply Lemma 6.8 to conclude that S is a handsome polar-cat, so (a) implies (b). Assume that S is handsome polar-cat. By Lemma 6.13, S is truly-primitive and, thus, (b) implies (c). By Lemma 6.12, S is GATEX. Thus, (c) implies (d). Finally, by Lemma 6.15, (d) implies (a), which completes this proof. \square

By Theorem 6.16, handsome polar-cats form a subclass of truly-primitive strudigrams. This together with Theorem 4.6 implies

Corollary 6.17. *Every truly-primitive strudigram and thus, every handsome polar-cat contains an induced P_4 or a rainbow-triangle.*

By Theorem 6.16, all truly-primitive GATEX strudigrams can be explained by a (strong, elementary, and quasi-discriminating) galled-trees and are exactly the handsome polar-cats. Moreover, for each prime module M of some strudigram S for which $|M| > 1$, Thm. 4.8 implies that $S' = S[M]/\mathbb{M}_{\max}(S[M])$ is truly-primitive. Hence, we may apply the machinery of pvr-networks in the context of galled-trees.

Lemma 6.18. *If $\mathcal{F}(S)$ is a prime-explaining family of a strudigram S which contains only galled-trees, then the pvr-network $\text{pvr}(S, \mathcal{F}(S))$ is a galled-tree.*




Figure 8: Shown is a labeled network (\tilde{N}, \tilde{t}) that explains the strudigram \mathcal{S} as shown in Fig. 4. (\tilde{N}, \tilde{t}) is the pvr-network obtained from the MDT of \mathcal{S} by replacing the prime vertices by the network (N', t') as shown in Fig. 4 and the network (N, t) as shown in Fig. 7. Since (\tilde{N}, \tilde{t}) is a galled-tree, \mathcal{S} is GATEX.

Proof. Let $\mathcal{F}(\mathcal{S}) = \{(N_M, t_M) \mid M \in \mathcal{P}\}$ be a prime-explaining family of a strudigram $\mathcal{S} = (X, \Upsilon, \sigma)$, where \mathcal{P} is the set of prime-labeled vertices in the MDT (Υ, τ) of \mathcal{S} . Furthermore, put $(N, t) := \text{pvr}(\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{F})$ and assume that N_M is a galled-tree for each $M \in \mathcal{P}$. By Lemma 5.3, N is a network on X .

To verify that N is a galled-tree, we must verify that N is phylogenetic and that every non-trivial biconnected component of N is a gall. Since Υ is phylogenetic and the in- and out-degrees of non-prime vertices in Υ remain unaffected when constructing N , it follows that all vertices v in Υ that do not correspond to a prime module of \mathcal{S} do not satisfy $\text{outdeg}_N(v) = \text{indeg}_N(v) = 1$. Let us now consider a vertex v in Υ that corresponds to a prime module M' of \mathcal{S} . In this case, v is now the root of $N_{M'}$ and thus, $\text{outdeg}_N(v) = \text{outdeg}_{N_{M'}}(\rho_{N_{M'}}) > 1$ must hold. Moreover, since $N_{M'}$ is phylogenetic, none of its inner vertices v satisfy in N : $\text{outdeg}_N(v) = \text{indeg}_N(v) = 1$. If, on the other hand, v is a leaf in $N_{M'}$, then it corresponds to some vertex in Υ which, by the latter arguments, does not satisfy $\text{outdeg}_N(v) = \text{indeg}_N(v) = 1$. In summary, N is phylogenetic.

Moreover, for any two $M', M \in \mathcal{P}$, the networks N_M and $N_{M'}$ can, by construction, share at most one vertex v , namely the root of one of these networks and a leaf of the other network. It follows that, in the latter case, v is a cut vertex. This immediately implies that C is a non-trivial biconnected component in N if and only if C is a non-trivial biconnected component in N_M for precisely one $M \in \mathcal{P}$. This and the fact that all non-trivial biconnected components in each of the N_M are galls, implies that all non-trivial biconnected component in N are galls. Taking the latter arguments together, N is a galled-tree. \square

As it turns out, GATEX strudigrams are precisely those strudigrams for which particular quotients are handsome polar-cats.

Definition 6.19. $\mathcal{S}^{\text{prime}}$ denotes the set of all strudigrams \mathcal{S} for which $\mathcal{S}[M]/\mathbb{M}_{\max}(\mathcal{S}[M])$ is a handsome polar-cat for every prime module M of \mathcal{S} with $|M| > 1$.

Theorem 6.20. The following statements are equivalent for every strudigram \mathcal{S}

- (a) \mathcal{S} is GATEX
- (b) $\mathcal{S}[W]$ is GATEX for all non-empty subsets $W \subseteq V(\mathcal{S})$.
- (c) $\mathcal{S} \in \mathcal{S}^{\text{prime}}$

Proof. Let $\mathcal{S} = (X, \Upsilon, \sigma)$ be a strudigram. To prove that (a) implies (b), assume that \mathcal{S} is explained by a labeled galled-tree (N, t) on X , and let $W \subseteq X$ be a non-empty subset. Put $\mathcal{C}' := \{C \mid C \in \mathcal{C}_N \text{ and } C \subseteq W\}$. Since N is a galled-tree, Theorem 6.1 implies that \mathcal{C}' must be closed, and satisfies (L) and (N3O). Repeated application of Lemma 2.1 to all $x \in X \setminus W$ shows that \mathcal{C}' must be closed and satisfies (L) and (N3O). Moreover, Theorem 6.1 implies that $G \doteq \mathcal{H}(\mathcal{C}')$ is a galled-tree on W . By Lemma 6.2, N is an lca-network. This together with Prop. 3.4 implies that G can be equipped with a labeling t' such that (G, t') explains $\mathcal{S}[W]$. In summary, $\mathcal{S}[W]$ is GATEX. Hence, (a) implies (b).

To show that (b) implies (c), assume that $\mathcal{S}[W]$ is GATEX for every non-empty subset $W \subseteq X$. If \mathcal{S} does not contain any prime module M with $|M| > 1$, then $\mathcal{S} \in \mathcal{S}^{\text{prime}}$ is vacuously true. Assume that \mathcal{S} contains a prime module M with $|M| > 1$. Consider the quotient $\mathcal{S}' := \mathcal{S}[M]/\mathbb{M}_{\max}(\mathcal{S}[M])$ with $\mathbb{M}_{\max}(\mathcal{S}[M]) = \{M_1, \dots, M_k\}$. By Obs. 4.7, $\mathcal{S}' \simeq \mathcal{S}[W]$ with $W \subseteq M$ such that for all $i \in \{1, \dots, k\}$ we have $|M_i \cap W| = 1$. By assumption, $\mathcal{S}[W]$ is GATEX and, therefore, \mathcal{S}' is GATEX. Since M is a prime module, Thm. 4.8 implies that \mathcal{S}' is truly-primitive. The latter two arguments together with Theorem 6.16 imply that \mathcal{S}' is a handsome polar-cat. Since the latter arguments hold for every prime module M of \mathcal{S} with $|M| > 1$, we have $\mathcal{S} \in \mathcal{S}^{\text{prime}}$ i.e. (b) implies (c).

Finally, assume that $\mathcal{S} \in \mathcal{D}^{\text{prime}}$. Applying Theorem 6.16 ensures the existence of a (strong, elementary and quasi-discriminating) galled-tree (N_M, t_M) that explains $\mathcal{S}[M]/\mathbb{M}_{\max}(\mathcal{S}[M])$ for every prime module M of \mathcal{S} with $|M| > 1$. Hence there exist a prime-explaining family \mathcal{F} of \mathcal{S} containing only galled-trees. The pvr-network $(N, t) := \text{pvr}(\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{F})$ is a galled-tree by Lemma 6.18 and, by Proposition 5.5, (N, t) explains \mathcal{S} . Hence (c) implies (a), which completes the proof. \square

In contrast to Prop 3.3, we obtain

Corollary 6.21. *Every GATEX strudigram $\mathcal{S} = (X, \Upsilon, \sigma)$ can be explained by a network (N, t) on X with $O(|X|)$ vertices.*

Proof. Since $\mathcal{S} = (X, \Upsilon, \sigma)$ is GATEX, it can be explained by a galled-tree (N, t) on X . By [11, Prop. 1], $|V(N)| \leq 4|X| - 3 \in O(|X|)$. \square

7 Algorithmic Aspects

In this section, we show that it can be verified whether \mathcal{S} is GATEX and, in the affirmative, that a labeled galled-tree that explains \mathcal{S} can be constructed in polynomial time. Aided by Theorem 6.20, recognition of GATEX strudigrams is, in essence, solved by recognition of polar-cats. For the latter, we first provide two further structural results.

Lemma 7.1. *Let \mathcal{S} be a handsome polar-cat. Then, for every vertex v for which \mathcal{S} is a $(v, \mathcal{S}_1, \mathcal{S}_2)$ -polar-cat it holds that v is located on every induced P_4 and every rainbow-triangle that exists in \mathcal{S} .*

Proof. Let $\mathcal{S} = (X, \Upsilon, \sigma)$ be a handsome polar-cat. By Cor. 6.17, \mathcal{S} contains an induced P_4 or rainbow-triangle. Since \mathcal{S} is a polar-cat it is, by definition, in particular a $(v, \mathcal{S}_1, \mathcal{S}_2)$ -polar-cat for some $v \in V(\mathcal{S})$. We show that v is located on any P_4 and any rainbow-triangle that may exists in \mathcal{S} . By Lemma 6.12 and 6.15, \mathcal{S} is explained by the strong, elementary, quasi-discriminating and leaf-separated network $(N, t) := (\mathcal{N}(v, \mathcal{S}_1, \mathcal{S}_2), t(v, \mathcal{S}_1, \mathcal{S}_2))$.

By construction of $N = \mathcal{N}(v, \mathcal{S}_1, \mathcal{S}_2)$, v is the single child of the unique hybrid vertex η in N . In particular v is a leaf in N . Note that, by [40, L. 48], if $L(N(u))$ and $L(N(w))$ overlap for some $u, w \in V(N)$, then $L(N(u)) \cap L(N(w)) = L(N(\eta)) = \{v\}$. Thus, $\mathcal{C}' := \mathcal{C}_N - v$ does not contain any overlapping clusters and is, therefore, a hierarchy. By [40, Cor. 9], $G \doteq \mathcal{H}(\mathcal{C}')$ is a phylogenetic tree on $W := X \setminus \{v\}$. By Proposition 3.4, G can be equipped with a labeling t' such that (G, t') explains $\mathcal{S} - v = \mathcal{S}[W]$. Hence, $\mathcal{S} - v$ is explained by a labeled tree. This together with Theorem 4.6 implies that $\mathcal{S} - v$ is P_4 -free and rainbow-triangle-free. Hence, v must be located on every P_4 and every rainbow-triangle that may exists in \mathcal{S} . \square

Lemma 7.2. *Let \mathcal{S} be a $(v, \mathcal{S}_1, \mathcal{S}_2)$ -polar-cat. Then, $\mathbb{M}_{\max}(\mathcal{S} - v) = \{V(\mathcal{S}_1 - v), V(\mathcal{S}_2 - v)\}$. If \mathcal{S} , in addition, is a $(v, \mathcal{T}_1, \mathcal{T}_2)$ -polar-cat, then $\{\mathcal{S}_1, \mathcal{S}_2\} = \{\mathcal{T}_1, \mathcal{T}_2\}$.*

Proof. Assume that \mathcal{S} is a $(v, \mathcal{S}_1, \mathcal{S}_2)$ -polar-cat. Note that, by definition of polar-cats, we have $\mathcal{S} - v = (\mathcal{S}_1 - v) \bowtie_k (\mathcal{S}_2 - v)$ for some k . This, in particular, implies that $\mathcal{S}' := \mathcal{S} - v$ is not a prime strudigram. By Theorem 4.4, the set $\mathbb{M}_{\max}(\mathcal{S}')$ is a unique partition of $V(\mathcal{S}')$ such that $\mathcal{S}'[M]$ is k -prime for each $M \in \mathbb{M}_{\max}(\mathcal{S}')$. It is clear that $\{V(\mathcal{S}_1 - v), V(\mathcal{S}_2 - v)\}$ is a partition of $V(\mathcal{S}') = V(\mathcal{S}) \setminus \{v\}$, and we proceed by showing that $\mathcal{S}_i - v$ is k -prime for $i = 1, 2$.

By definition, there is some discriminating caterpillar tree (T, t) that explains \mathcal{S}_1 , such that $t(\rho_T) \neq k$. Since T is a caterpillar tree, it has at least two leafs and ρ_T has at least two children. If \mathcal{S}_1 has only two vertices, then $\mathcal{S}_1 - v$ has precisely one vertex and is vacuously k -prime. If, instead, $|V(\mathcal{S}_1)| \geq 3$, then v is not the leaf-child of ρ_T , since v is part of the cherry of T . Thus, the leaf-child $x \neq v$ of ρ_T satisfies $\sigma|_{V(\mathcal{S}_1)}(xy) = t(\rho_T) \neq k$ for all $y \in V(\mathcal{S}_1) \setminus \{x\}$. Hence $\mathcal{S}_1 - v$ is not the k -join of any two substrudigrams, and $\mathcal{S}_1 - v$ is k -prime. Similarly, $\mathcal{S}_2 - v$ is k -prime. In conclusion, $\mathbb{M}_{\max}(\mathcal{S} - v) = \{V(\mathcal{S}_1 - v), V(\mathcal{S}_2 - v)\}$.

Suppose now that there are strudigrams \mathcal{T}_1 and \mathcal{T}_2 such that \mathcal{S} is also $(v, \mathcal{T}_1, \mathcal{T}_2)$ -polar-cat. By analogous reasoning, we have $\mathbb{M}_{\max}(\mathcal{S} - v) = \{V(\mathcal{T}_1 - v), V(\mathcal{T}_2 - v)\}$. Since $\mathbb{M}_{\max}(\mathcal{S} - v)$ is uniquely determined, it holds that $\{\mathcal{S}_1 - v, \mathcal{S}_2 - v\} = \{\mathcal{T}_1 - v, \mathcal{T}_2 - v\}$. Since, in addition, $\mathcal{S}_1, \mathcal{S}_2, \mathcal{T}_1$ and \mathcal{T}_2 contain v and are induced substrudigrams of \mathcal{S} , it follows that $\{\mathcal{S}_1, \mathcal{S}_2\} = \{\mathcal{T}_1, \mathcal{T}_2\}$. \square

To recognize polar-cats, we provide `Check_polar-cat` in Algorithm 1, and show its correctness.

Lemma 7.3. *Let \mathcal{S} be a truly-primitive strudigram. In polynomial time, `Check_polar-cat` correctly verifies if \mathcal{S} is a (handsome) polar-cat and, in the affirmative, constructs a labeled galled-tree that explains \mathcal{S} .*

Proof. Let $\mathcal{S} = (X, \Upsilon, \sigma)$ be a truly-primitive strudigram. Since \mathcal{S} is truly-primitive, we know that $n := |X| \geq 3$. Since Theorem 6.20 ensures \mathcal{S} is a $(v, \mathcal{S}_1, \mathcal{S}_2)$ -polar-cat if and only if it is a handsome $(v, \mathcal{S}_1, \mathcal{S}_2)$ -polar-cat, it suffices to show that `Check_polar-cat` returns `False` if and only if \mathcal{S} is not a polar-cat. By Lemma 7.1, every vertex v for which \mathcal{S} is a $(v, \mathcal{S}_1, \mathcal{S}_2)$ -polar-cat must be located on all induced P_4 and all rainbow-triangles that exist in \mathcal{S} . By Cor. 6.17, at least one induced P_4 or rainbow-triangle exists in \mathcal{S} and is detected and denoted by H in Line 1. By the latter arguments, if \mathcal{S} is a polar-cat, then it is a $(v, \mathcal{S}_1, \mathcal{S}_2)$ -polar-cat for at least one vertex v in H . All vertices v of H are now examined in the for-loop starting in Line 2.

Observe that $\mathcal{S}' := \mathcal{S} - v$ can be computed in polynomial time, and that the modular decomposition tree (\mathcal{T}, τ) of \mathcal{S}' can be constructed in $O(|V(\mathcal{S}')|^2) = O(n^2)$ time [21], as done in Line 3. For Line 4, the set \mathcal{P} of prime vertices of (\mathcal{T}, τ)

Algorithm 1 Check_polar-cat

Input: A truly-primitive strudigram \mathcal{S}

Output: A labeled galled-tree (N, t) that explains \mathcal{S} if \mathcal{S} is a (handsome) polar-cat, otherwise **false**

- 1: Let H be an induced P_4 or a rainbow-triangle in \mathcal{S}
- 2: **for all** $v \in V(H)$ **do**
- 3: Compute $\mathcal{S}' = \mathcal{S} - v$ and the MDT (\mathcal{T}, τ) of \mathcal{S}' .
- 4: **if** \mathcal{T} does not contain prime-labeled vertices **then**
- 5: **if** the root of \mathcal{T} has precisely 2 children **then**
- 6: Find $\mathbb{M}_{\max}(\mathcal{S}') = \{M_1, M_2\}$
- 7: Let $\mathcal{S}_i = \mathcal{S}[M_i \cup \{v\}]$ for $i = 1, 2$
- 8: **if** \mathcal{S}_i satisfy Definition 6.5(ii) for $i = 1, 2$ **then**
- 9: Construct the galled-tree $\mathcal{N}(v, \mathcal{S}_1, \mathcal{S}_2)$ according to Definition 6.9
- 10: **return** $\mathcal{N}(v, \mathcal{S}_1, \mathcal{S}_2)$
- 11: **return false**

can be found by a polynomial-time traversal of \mathcal{T} . If $\mathcal{P} \neq \emptyset$, then \mathcal{S}' has at least one induced P_4 or rainbow triangle, by Theorem 4.6. Thus v does not lie on all P_4 s and rainbow triangles of \mathcal{S} , so that Lemma 7.1 implies that \mathcal{S} is not a $(v, \mathcal{S}_1, \mathcal{S}_2)$ -polar-cat. The algorithm thus correctly continues to the next vertex of H .

Otherwise, namely if $\mathcal{P} = \emptyset$, we next consider Line 5. Since $n \geq 3$, we have $|V(\mathcal{S}')| \geq 2$, i.e., the tree \mathcal{T} has at least two leafs. Hence, the root $\rho_{\mathcal{T}}$ has at least two children. By definitions of MDTs, we have $\text{child}_{\mathcal{T}}(\rho_{\mathcal{T}}) = \mathbb{M}_{\max}(\mathcal{S}') = \{M_1, M_2, \dots, M_\ell\}$ for $\ell \geq 2$. If $\ell \geq 3$, then by Lemma 7.2, \mathcal{S}' is not a $(v, \mathcal{S}_1, \mathcal{S}_2)$ -polar-cat and Check_polar-cat thus correctly continues to the next vertex of H .

If, instead, a trivial look-up in \mathcal{T} reveals that $\ell = 2$, we define \mathcal{S}_1 and \mathcal{S}_2 to be the induced substrudigrams $\mathcal{S}[M_1 \cup \{v\}]$ respectively $\mathcal{S}[M_2 \cup \{v\}]$ in Line 7; a task that can be done again in polynomial time. By Theorem 4.4 we have $\mathcal{S}' = (\mathcal{S}_1 - v) \bowtie_k (\mathcal{S}_2 - v)$, where $k = t(\rho_{\mathcal{T}})$, whenever Check_polar-cat reaches Line 7. At this point, \mathcal{S}' is thus a $(v, \mathcal{S}_1, \mathcal{S}_2)$ -polar-cat if and only if Definition 6.5(ii) is satisfied; a task that is accomplished in the *if*-clause in Line 8. In particular, we must check if \mathcal{S}_i is explained by a labeled discriminating caterpillar tree (T_i, t_i) , for $1 \leq i \leq 2$. As shown in [37], checking if there exists a labeled discriminating tree (T_i, t_i) that explains \mathcal{S}_i , and computing it in the affirmative case, can be done in polynomial time. In particular, these trees (T_1, t_1) and (T_2, t_2) are unique (up to isomorphism), see [37, Thm. 2] or [5]. It is now an easy task to verify if (T_i, t_i) is a caterpillar tree in polynomial-time. To verify Def. 6.5(ii) we finally check that $t(\rho_{T_i}) \neq k$ and that v is part of a cherry in T_i for each $i \in \{1, 2\}$ by a simple polynomial-time traversal of T_i . In summary, the condition in Line 8 can be checked in polynomial time, and \mathcal{S} is, at this point, a $(v, \mathcal{S}_1, \mathcal{S}_2)$ -polar-cat if and only if this condition evaluates to True. In particular, Check_polar-cat continues to the next vertex of H if \mathcal{S} is not a $(v, \mathcal{S}_1, \mathcal{S}_2)$ -polar-cat and will, in extension, always return False in Line 11 whenever there is no vertex $v \in V(H)$, i.e. no vertex $v \in X$, such that \mathcal{S} is a $(v, \mathcal{S}_1, \mathcal{S}_2)$ -polar-cat. Whenever the condition on Line 8 holds, it is easy to construct the galled-tree $(N, t) := \mathcal{N}(v, \mathcal{S}_1, \mathcal{S}_2)$ from the caterpillar trees (T_1, t_1) and (T_2, t_2) in polynomial-time, which, by Theorem 6.12, explains \mathcal{S} . Hence (N, t) is correctly returned in Line 10. As argued, every step of the *for*-loop of Check_polar-cat takes polynomial-time, concluding an overall polynomial runtime of Check_polar-cat. \square

Our construction of galled-trees that are not elementary relies on pvr-networks. To prove that the construction of a pvr-network from a prime-explaining family can be implemented in polynomial time, we need to make some general assumptions about how networks are represented and stored in memory; for simplicity, we assume that each network (N, t) is represented such that each vertex $v \in V(N)$ has access to arrays $v.\text{child}$ resp. $v.\text{parent}$ of pointers to its children respectively parents and, moreover, to the value $t(v)$ stored at $v.t$. Although technically not required by Definition 5.2, it is also natural to assume that the number of vertices in a network (N_M, t_M) of a prime-explaining family \mathcal{F} is polynomially bounded in terms of the number of leaves of N_M ; to be more precise, we assume that $|V(N_M)| \in O(p(|L(N_M)|))$ for some polynomial p . This is motivated by Proposition 3.3 which, to recall, ensures that there exists a network with $O(|L(N_M)|^2)$ vertices explaining the same strudigram as (N_M, t_M) . In particular, elementary galled-trees with ℓ leaves have $O(\ell)$ vertices and edges.

Proposition 7.4. *Given a prime-explaining family \mathcal{F} of a strudigram \mathcal{S} , construction of the pvr-network $\text{pvr}(\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{F})$ can be implemented to run in polynomial time.*

Proof. Given a strudigram $\mathcal{S} = (X, \Upsilon, \sigma)$ with $|X| = n$, we can construct its MDT (\mathcal{T}, τ) in polynomial time [21]. Suppose, additionally, that a prime-explaining family $\mathcal{F} = \{(N_M, t_M) \mid M \in \mathcal{P}\}$ of \mathcal{S} is given, where \mathcal{P} is the set of prime module of \mathcal{S} . Note that since the MDT of \mathcal{S} is phylogenetic, it contains at most $n - 1$ inner-vertices in addition to its n leaves, thus $|V(\mathcal{T})| \in O(n)$ and $|E(\mathcal{T})| \leq 2n - 2 \in O(n)$. In particular, $|\mathcal{P}| \in O(n)$. Starting a traversal of \mathcal{T} at its root, at each vertex $M \in \mathcal{P}$ we replace $M.\text{child}$ (but temporarily storing its content in an array A) with the elements of $\rho_{N_M}.\text{child}$ and put $v.t$ to be $\rho_{N_M}.t$, followed by a traversal of N_M to locate the elements of $L(N_M)$. For each $M' \in L(N_M)$, locate the vertex v of \mathcal{T} in A that is to be identified with the vertex M' , and replace the array $v.\text{parent}$ with the content of $M'.\text{parent}$. It is easy to see that after \mathcal{T} is fully traversed, the resulting network aligns with Definition 5.2. Since each step of the traversal

of the $O(n)$ vertices in \mathcal{T} depend only on $|\mathcal{P}|$, $|A|$ and the number of vertices and edges in N_M , all which are polynomially bounded, an implementation of these tasks can be done in polynomial time. \square

Finally, we show that general GATEX strudigrams can be recognized and the construction of networks explaining GATEX strudigrams can be done in polynomial time.

Proposition 7.5. *It is possible to correctly verify if a strudigram \mathcal{S} is GATEX and, in the affirmative, construct a labeled galled-tree that explains \mathcal{S} . Both tasks can be implemented to run in polynomial time.*

Proof. Let \mathcal{S} be a strudigram. The modular decomposition \mathbb{M}_{str} of \mathcal{S} can be determined in polynomial time [21]. In particular, the set $\mathcal{P} \subseteq \mathbb{M}_{\text{str}}$ of all prime modules of \mathcal{S} can be obtained in polynomial time. Moreover, given some $M \in \mathcal{P}$ the computation of a strudigram that is cr-isomorphic to the quotient $\mathcal{S}_M := \mathcal{S}[M]/\mathbb{M}_{\max}(\mathcal{S}[M])$ can, by Observation 4.7, be done by constructing a set W that contains precisely one element from each module in $\mathbb{M}_{\max}(\mathcal{S}[M]) \subseteq \mathbb{M}_{\text{str}}$ and then considering the strudigram $\mathcal{S}[W]$. Thus construction of \mathcal{S}_M is possible in polynomial time. Recall that by Theorem 4.8 the quotient strudigram \mathcal{S}_M is truly-primitive. This together with Lemma 7.3 implies that one can correctly verify whether \mathcal{S}_M is a handsome polar-cat in polynomial time. Since M was arbitrarily chosen, and \mathcal{S} is, by Theorem 6.20, GATEX if and only if $\mathcal{S} \in \mathcal{D}^{\text{prime}}$, it is thus possible to decide whether or not \mathcal{S} is GATEX in polynomial time.

Suppose now that \mathcal{S} is GATEX, that is, when $\mathcal{S} \in \mathcal{D}^{\text{prime}}$. Using the notation from the previous paragraph, we note that by Lemma 7.3, the algorithm `Check_polar-cat` will output a labeled galled-tree (N_M, t_M) that explains \mathcal{S}_M for each $M \in \mathcal{P}$. Hence, if \mathcal{S} is GATEX, it is possible to find a prime-explaining family $\mathcal{F} = \{(N_p, t_p)\}_{p \in \mathcal{P}}$ of \mathcal{S} containing only galled-trees. By Proposition 7.4, it is possible to construct the pvr network $(N, t) := \text{pvr}(\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{F})$ in polynomial time. Finally, by Proposition 5.5 respectively Lemma 6.18, (N, t) is a galled-tree that explains \mathcal{S} . \square

8 Summary and Outlook

In this work, we considered strudigrams, which encompass several combinatorial objects such as symbolic date maps, labeled symmetric 2-structures, and edge-colored undirected graphs. Specifically, we provided a polynomial-time approach to construct labeled networks (N, t) that explain an arbitrary given strudigram \mathcal{S} . Furthermore, we demonstrated that every strudigram can be explained by an lca-network. These networks N have the advantageous property that the least common ancestor (lca) for all $A \subseteq L(N)$ is well-defined. However, such networks can be quite complex, as illustrated in Fig. 1. This raises the question of whether simpler networks can explain \mathcal{S} . To address this, we considered galled-trees. We characterized strudigrams that can be explained by galled-trees (GATEX strudigrams) and provided polynomial-time algorithms for their recognition and the construction of labeled galled-trees explaining them. For this purpose, we used prime-vertex replacement (pvr) networks obtained from the modular decomposition tree by replacing prime vertices with labeled galls.

This paper opens many avenues for future research. One promising direction is to establish a characterization of GATEX strudigrams in terms of a family of forbidden substrudigrams. Since the property of being GATEX is hereditary, such a family exists but could be of infinite size. Nevertheless, for GATEX strudigrams $\mathcal{S} = (X, \Upsilon, \sigma)$ with $|\Upsilon| = 2$, a characterization was provided in [34, Theorem 4.8] by means of a set of 25 forbidden subgraphs, the largest of which has a size of 8. It would be interesting to investigate whether this bound still holds for larger sets Υ , and if not, to determine how this bound relates to the size of Υ .

In Sections 6 and 7, we focused on galled-trees, a subclass of level-1 networks, which are networks where each biconnected component contains at most one hybrid. It would be interesting to characterize strudigrams that can be explained by level-1 or more general level-k networks. In this context, we believe that pvr networks become crucial, and one of the main tasks is to characterize the structure of primitive strudigrams that can be explained by such networks.

Generally, one might be interested in networks N with the 2-lca-property that are free from “superfluous” vertices that do not serve as the lca for any $x, y \in L(N)$. For example, in Fig. 1, the lca of any two vertices is located in the network $N(w)$ rooted at w . It would be valuable to explore constructive methods to stepwise remove such superfluous vertices. In particular, one may seek networks with a minimum number of vertices or hybrids that explain a given strudigram. Are these problems NP-hard or solvable in polynomial time?

Regarding truly primitive strudigrams, Theorem 4.6 implies that such type of strudigrams must contain at least one induced P_4 or rainbow triangle. Observations suggest that these substructures are quite prevalent in truly primitive strudigrams, with a significant proportion of vertices involved in at least one P_4 or rainbow triangle. To gain a deeper understanding of the structure of truly primitive strudigrams, it would be of interest to study the density and distribution of these substructures in greater detail. Additionally, it is worth investigating to what extent truly primitive strudigrams $\mathcal{S} = (X, \Upsilon, \sigma)$ are explained by unique galled-trees, a question that has already been answered for the case $|\Upsilon| = 2$ [32, Prop. 6.13].

Acknowledgements This paper is dedicated to the memory of Andreas Dress, whose pioneering work and dedication to discrete biomathematics, as well as many other fields, have inspired generations of researchers. His contributions will undoubtedly continue to influence and guide our work for many years to come.

Declarations

The authors declare that they have no competing interests. All authors contributed equally to this work.

References

- [1] Biggar O, Zamani M, Shames I (2021) Modular decomposition of hierarchical finite state machines. arXiv preprint arXiv:211104902
- [2] Bioch JC (2005) The complexity of modular decomposition of boolean functions. *Discrete Applied Mathematics* 149(1):1–13, DOI 10.1016/j.dam.2003.12.010
- [3] Birkhoff G (1948) Lattice theory, vol 25. American Mathematical Soc., New York City, USA
- [4] Blass A (1978) Graphs with unique maximal clumpings. *Journal of Graph Theory* 2(1):19–24, DOI 10.1002/jgt.3190020104
- [5] Böcker S, Dress AWM (1998) Recovering symbolically dated, rooted trees from symbolic ultrametrics. *Advances in Mathematics* 138:105–125, DOI 10.1006/aima.1998.1743
- [6] Bonizzoni P, Della Vedova G (1995) Modular decomposition of hypergraphs. In: Nagl M (ed) *Graph-Theoretic Concepts in Computer Science*, Springer Berlin Heidelberg, Berlin, Heidelberg, pp 303–317, DOI 10.1007/3-540-60618-1_84
- [7] Bonizzoni P, Della Vedova G (1999) An algorithm for the modular decomposition of hypergraphs. *Journal of Algorithms* 32(2):65–86, DOI 10.1006/jagm.1999.1016
- [8] Brandstädt A, Le VB, Spinrad JP (1999) *Graph Classes: A Survey*. Society for Industrial and Applied Mathematics, Philadelphia, PA, USA
- [9] Bruckmann C, Stadler P, Hellmuth M (2022) From modular decomposition trees to rooted median graphs. *Discrete Applied Mathematics* 310:1–9, DOI 10.1016/j.dam.2021.12.017
- [10] Bui-Xuan BM, Habib M, Limouzy V, de Montgolfier F (2009) Algorithmic aspects of a general modular decomposition theory. *Discrete Applied Mathematics* 157(9):1993–2009, DOI 10.1016/j.dam.2008.11.001, optimal Discrete Structures and Algorithms
- [11] Cardona G, Rossello F, Valiente G (2009) Comparison of tree-child phylogenetic networks. *IEEE/ACM Transactions on Computational Biology and Bioinformatics* 6(4):552–569, DOI 10.1109/TCBB.2007.70270
- [12] Corneil D, Lerchs H, Burlingham LS (1981) Complement reducible graphs. *Discrete Applied Mathematics* 3(3):163–174, DOI 10.1016/0166-218X(81)90013-5
- [13] Corneil DG, Perl Y, Stewart LK (1985) A linear recognition algorithm for cographs. *SIAM Journal on Computing* 14(4):926–934, DOI 10.1137/0214065
- [14] Del Mondo G, Eveillard D, Rusu I (2009) Homogeneous decomposition of protein interaction networks: refining the description of intra-modular interactions. *Bioinformatics* 25(7):926–932, DOI 10.1093/bioinformatics/btp083
- [15] Dress A, Steel M (2007) Phylogenetic diversity over an abelian group. *Annals of Combinatorics* 11(2):143–160, DOI 10.1007/s00026-007-0311-4
- [16] Dress A, Huber KT, Moulton V (2007) Some uses of the farris transform in mathematics and phylogenetics—a review. *Annals of Combinatorics* 11(1):1–37, DOI 10.1007/s00026-007-0302-5
- [17] Dress AWM (1997) Towards a theory of holistic clustering. In: Mirkin B, McMorris FR, Roberts A Fred S Rzhetsky (eds) *Mathematical Hierarchies and Biology*, DIMACS Series in Discrete Mathematics and Theoretical Computer Science, vol 37, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, pp 271–289, DOI 10.1090/dimacs/037/19
- [18] Ehrenfeucht A, McConnell R (1994) A k-structure generalization of the theory of 2-structures. *Theoretical Computer Science* 132(1):209–227, DOI 10.1016/0304-3975(94)90233-X
- [19] Ehrenfeucht A, Rozenberg G (1990) Theory of 2-structures, part I: Clans, basic subclasses, and morphisms. *Theoretical Computer Science* 70(3):277–303, DOI 10.1016/0304-3975(90)90129-6

- [20] Ehrenfeucht A, Rozenberg G (1990) Theory of 2-structures, part II: Representation through labeled tree families. *Theoretical Computer Science* 70(3):305–342, DOI 10.1016/0304-3975(90)90130-A
- [21] Ehrenfeucht A, Gabow H, McConnell R, Sullivan S (1994) An $O(n^2)$ divide-and-conquer algorithm for the prime tree decomposition of two-structures and modular decomposition of graphs. *Journal of Algorithms* 16(2):283–294, DOI 10.1006/jagm.1994.1013
- [22] Ehrenfeucht A, Harju T, Rozenberg G (1999) The theory of 2-structures: A framework for decomposition and transformation of graphs. World Scientific, Singapore
- [23] Engelfriet J, Harju T, Proskurowski A, Rozenberg G (1996) Characterization and complexity of uniformly nonprimitive labeled 2-structures. *Theoretical Computer Science* 154(2):247–282, DOI 10.1016/0304-3975(94)00272-X
- [24] Gagneur J, Krause R, Bouwmeester T, Casari G (2004) Modular decomposition of protein-protein interaction networks. *Genome biology* 5:1–12, DOI 10.1186/gb-2004-5-8-r57
- [25] Gallai T (1967) Transitiv orientierbare graphen. *Acta Mathematica Academiae Scientiarum Hungarica* 18(1):25–66, DOI 10.1007/BF02020961
- [26] Gao Y, Hare DR, Nastos J (2013) The cluster deletion problem for cographs. *Discrete Mathematics* 313(23):2763–2771, DOI 10.1016/j.disc.2013.08.017
- [27] Gordon AD (1987) A Review of Hierarchical Classification. *Royal Statistical Society Journal Series A: General* 150(2):119–137, DOI 10.2307/2981629
- [28] Gurvich V (2009) Decomposing complete edge-chromatic graphs and hypergraphs. revisited. *Discrete Applied Mathematics* 157(14):3069–3085, DOI 10.1016/j.dam.2009.06.026
- [29] Habib M, Maurer M (1979) On the X-join decomposition for undirected graphs. *Discrete Appl Math* 3:198–207, DOI 10.1016/0166-218X(79)90043-X
- [30] Habib M, Paul C (2010) A survey of the algorithmic aspects of modular decomposition. *Computer Science Review* 4(1):41–59, DOI 10.1016/j.cosrev.2010.01.001
- [31] Habib M, de Montgolfier F, Mouatadid L, Zou M (2022) A general algorithmic scheme for combinatorial decompositions with application to modular decompositions of hypergraphs. *Theoretical Computer Science* 923:56–73, DOI 10.1016/j.tcs.2022.04.052
- [32] Hellmuth M, Scholz GE (2022) From modular decomposition trees to level-1 networks: Pseudo-cographs, polar-cats and prime polar-cats. *Discrete Applied Mathematics* 321:179–219, DOI 10.1016/j.dam.2022.06.042
- [33] Hellmuth M, Scholz GE (2024) Linear time algorithms for NP-hard problems restricted to GaTEX graphs. In: Wu W, Tong G (eds) Computing and Combinatorics, Springer Nature Switzerland, Cham, pp 115–126, DOI 10.1007/978-3-031-49190-0_8
- [34] Hellmuth M, Scholz GE (2024) Resolving prime modules: The structure of pseudo-cographs and galled-tree explainable graphs. *Discrete Applied Mathematics* 343:25–43, DOI 10.1016/j.dam.2023.09.034
- [35] Hellmuth M, Scholz GE (2024) Solving NP-hard problems on GaTEX graphs: Linear-time algorithms for perfect orderings, cliques, colorings, and independent sets. arXiv preprint arXiv:230604367v2
- [36] Hellmuth M, Stadler PF (2024) The Theory of Gene Family Histories, Springer US, New York, NY, pp 1–32. DOI 10.1007/978-1-0716-3838-5_1
- [37] Hellmuth M, Hernandez-Rosales M, Huber KT, Moulton V, Stadler PF, Wieseke N (2013) Orthology relations, symbolic ultrametrics, and cographs. *Journal of Mathematical Biology* 66:399–420, DOI 10.1007/s00285-012-0525-x
- [38] Hellmuth M, Wieseke N, Lechner M, Lenhof HP, Middendorf M, Stadler PF (2015) Phylogenomics with paralogs. *Proc Natl Acad Sci USA* 112(7):2058–2063, DOI 10.1073/pnas.1412770112
- [39] Hellmuth M, Stadler PF, Wieseke N (2017) The mathematics of xenology: Di-cographs, symbolic ultrametrics, 2-structures and tree-representable systems of binary relations. *Journal of Mathematical Biology* 75(1):199–237, DOI 10.1007/s00285-016-1084-3
- [40] Hellmuth M, Schaller D, Stadler PF (2023) Clustering systems of phylogenetic networks. *Theory in Biosciences* DOI 10.1007/s12064-023-00398-w

- [41] Huber KT, Scholz GE (2018) Beyond representing orthology relations by trees. *Algorithmica* 80(1):73–103, DOI 10.1007/s00453-016-0241-9
- [42] Huber KT, Moulton V, Scholz GE (2023) Shared ancestry graphs and symbolic arboreal maps. arXiv preprint arXiv:230806139
- [43] Jia S, Gao L, Gao Y, Nastos J, Wang Y, Zhang X, Wang H (2015) Defining and identifying cograph communities in complex networks. *New Journal of Physics* 17(1):013044, DOI 10.1088/1367-2630/17/1/013044
- [44] Lafond M, El-Mabrouk N (2015) Orthology relation and gene tree correction: Complexity results. In: Pop M, Touzet H (eds) *Algorithms in Bioinformatics*, Springer Berlin Heidelberg, Berlin, Heidelberg, pp 66–79, DOI 10.1007/978-3-662-48221-6_5
- [45] McConnell RM, de Montgolfier F (2005) Linear-time modular decomposition of directed graphs. *Discrete Applied Mathematics* 145(2):198–209, DOI 10.1016/j.dam.2004.02.017, URL <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0166218X04002458>, structural Decompositions, Width Parameters, and Graph Labelings
- [46] Möhring R (1985) Algorithmic aspects of the substitution decomposition in optimization over relations, set systems and boolean functions. *Annals of Operations Research* 4(1):195–225, DOI 10.1007/BF02022041
- [47] Möhring RH, Rademacher FJ (1984) Substitution decomposition for discrete structures and connections with combinatorial optimization. In: Burkard R, Cuninghame-Green R, Zimmermann U (eds) *Algebraic and Combinatorial Methods in Operations Research*, North-Holland Mathematics Studies, vol 95, North-Holland, pp 257–355, DOI 10.1016/S0304-0208(08)72966-9
- [48] Papadopoulos C, Voglis C (2006) Drawing graphs using modular decomposition. In: Healy P, Nikolov NS (eds) *Graph Drawing*, Springer Berlin Heidelberg, Berlin, Heidelberg, pp 343–354, DOI 10.1007/11618058_31
- [49] Piceno ME, Rodríguez-Navas L, Balcázar JL (2021) Co-occurrence patterns in diagnostic data. *Computational intelligence* 37(4):1499–1514, DOI 10.1111/coin.12317
- [50] Semple C, Steel M (1999) Tree representations of non-symmetric group-valued proximities. *Advances in Applied Mathematics* 23(3):300–321, DOI 10.1006/aama.1999.0662
- [51] Semple C, Steel M (2003) *Phylogenetics*, Oxford Lecture Series in Mathematics and its Applications, vol 24. Oxford University Press, Oxford, UK
- [52] Shanavas A, Changat M, Hellmuth M, , Stadler P (2024) Clusters and unique least common ancestors in directed acyclic graphs. DOI 10.21203/rs.3.rs-3997739/v1