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Abstract

The general position number of a connected graph is the cardinality of a largest set of vertices such that no three pairwise-distinct vertices from the set lie on a common shortest path. In this paper it is proved that the general position number is additive on the Cartesian product of two trees.
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1 Introduction

Let $d_G(x, y)$ denote, as usual, the number of edges on a shortest $x, y$-path in $G$. A set $S$ of vertices of a connected graph $G$ is a \textit{general position set} if $d_G(x, y) \neq d_G(x, z) + d_G(z, y)$ holds for every $\{x, y, z\} \in \binom{S}{3}$. The \textit{general position number} $\text{gp}(G)$ of $G$ is the cardinality of a largest general position set in $G$. Such a set is briefly called a \textit{gp-set} of $G$. 
Before the general position number was introduced in [9], an equivalent concept was proposed in [14]. Much earlier, however, the general position problem has been studied by Körner [8] in the special case of hypercubes. Following [9], the graph theory general position problem has been investigated in [1, 5, 6, 10, 11, 13].

The Cartesian product $G \square H$ of vertex-disjoint graphs $G$ and $H$ is the graph with vertex set $V(G) \times V(H)$, vertices $(g, h)$ and $(g', h')$ being adjacent if either $g = g'$ and $hh' \in E(H)$, or $h = h'$ and $gg' \in E(G)$. In this paper we are interested in $\text{gp}(G \square H)$, a problem earlier studied in [3, 6, 10, 13]. More precisely, we are interested in Cartesian products of two (finite) trees. (For some of the other investigations of the Cartesian product of trees see [2, 12, 15].) An important reason for this interest is the fact that the general position number of products of paths is far from being trivial. First, denoting with $P_\infty$ the two-way infinite path, one of the main results from [10] asserts that $\text{gp}(P_\infty \square P_\infty) = 4$. Denoting further with $G^n$ the $n$-fold Cartesian product of $G$, it was demonstrated in the same paper that $10 \leq \text{gp}(P_\infty^n) \leq 16$. The lower bound 10 was improved to 14 in [6]. Very recently, these results were superseded in [7] by proving that if $n$ is an arbitrary positive integer, then $\text{gp}(P_\infty^n) = 2^{2n-1}$. Denoting with $n(G)$ the order of a graph $G$, in this paper we prove:

**Theorem 1.** If $T$ and $T^*$ are trees with $\min\{n(T), n(T^*)\} \geq 3$, then

$$\text{gp}(T \square T^*) = \text{gp}(T) + \text{gp}(T^*).$$

Theorem 1 widely extends the above mentioned result $\text{gp}(P_\infty \square P_\infty) = 4$. Further, the equality $\text{gp}(P_\infty^n) = 2^{2n-1}$ shows that Theorem 1 has no obvious (inductive) extension to Cartesian products of more than two trees. Hence, to determine the general position number of such products remains a challenging problem.

In the next section we give further definitions, recall known results needed, and prove several auxiliary new results. Then, in Section 3 we prove Theorem 1.

## 2 Preliminaries

Let $T$ be a tree. The set of leaves of $T$ will be denoted by $L(T)$, and let $\ell(T) = |L(T)|$. If $u$ and $v$ are vertices of $T$ with $\deg(u) \geq 2$ and $\deg(v) = 1$, then the unique $u,v$-path is a branching path of $T$. If $u$ is not a leaf of $T$, then there are exactly $\ell(T)$ branching paths starting from $u$; we say that the $u$ is the root of these branching paths and that the degree 1 vertex of a branching path $P$ is the leaf of $P$.

**Lemma 1.** ([9]) If $T$ is a tree, then $\text{gp}(T) = \ell(T)$.

We next describe which vertices of a tree lie in some gp-set of the tree.
Lemma 2. A non-leaf vertex $u$ in a tree $T$ belongs to a gp-set of $T$ if and only if $T - u$ has exactly two components and at least one of them is a path.

Proof. First, let $R$ be a gp-set of $T$ containing the non-leaf vertex $u$. Suppose that $T - u$ has at least three components, say $T_1, T_2$ and $T_3$. Since $R$ is a gp-set containing $u$, $R$ intersects with at most one of $T_1, T_2$ and $T_3$. Assume without loss of generality that $R \cap V(T_2) = \emptyset$ and $R \cap V(T_3) = \emptyset$. Choose vertices $v$ and $w$ in $T$ such that $v \in V(T_2)$ and $w \in V(T_3)$. Then $(R - \{u\}) \cup \{v, w\}$ is a larger gp-set than $R$ in $T$, a contradiction. Hence $T - u$ has exactly two components, say $T_1$ and $T_2$. Now suppose that neither $T_1$ nor $T_2$ is a path. Then as above, we have $R \cap V(T_1) = \emptyset$ or $R \cap V(T_2) = \emptyset$. By symmetry, we assume that $R \cap V(T_2) = \emptyset$. Since $T_2$ is not a path, there are at least two leaves $x_1$ and $x_2$ in $T_2$. Then the set $(R - \{u\}) \cup \{x_1, x_2\}$ is a larger gp-set than $R$, again, in $T$. Therefore, at least one of $T_1$ and $T_2$ is a path.

Conversely, we observe that $u$ is a non-leaf vertex on a pendant path in $T$. Then $u$ belongs to a gp-set in $T$. □

In $G \square H$, if $h \in V(H)$, then the subgraph of $G \square H$ induced by the vertices $(g, h)$, $g \in V(G)$, is a $G$-layer, denoted with $G^h$. Analogously $H$-layers $^gH$ are defined. $G$-layers and $H$-layers are isomorphic to $G$ and to $H$, respectively. The distance function in Cartesian products is additive, that is, if $(g_1, h_1), (g_2, h_2) \in V(G \square H)$, then

$$d_{G \square H}((g_1, h_1), (g_2, h_2)) = d_G(g_1, g_2) + d_H(h_1, h_2).\quad (1)$$

If $u, v \in V(G)$, then the interval $I_G(u, v)$ between $u$ and $v$ in $G$ is the set of all vertices lying on shortest $u, v$-paths, that is,

$$I_G(u, v) = \{w : d_G(u, v) = d_G(u, w) + d_G(w, u)\}.$$

In what follows, the notations $d_G(u, v)$ and $I_G(u, v)$ may be simplified to $d(u, v)$ and $I(u, v)$ if $G$ will be clear from the context. Equality (1) implies that intervals in Cartesian products have the following nice structure, cf. [4, Proposition 12.4].

Lemma 3. If $G$ and $H$ are connected graphs and $(g_1, h_1), (g_2, h_2) \in V(G \square H)$, then

$$I_{G \square H}((g_1, h_1), (g_2, h_2)) = I_G(g_1, g_2) \times I_H(h_1, h_2).$$

Equality (1) also easily implies the following fact (also proved in [13]).

Lemma 4. Let $G$ and $H$ be connected graphs and $R$ a general position set of $G \square H$. If $u = (g, h) \in R$, then $V(^gH) \cap R = \{u\}$ or $V(G^h) \cap R = \{u\}$. For finite paths the already mentioned result $\text{gp}(P_{\infty} \square P_{\infty}) = 4$ reduces to:
Lemma 5. \([10]\) If \(n_1, n_2 \geq 2\), then
\[
\text{gp}(P_{n_1} \square P_{n_2}) = \begin{cases} 
4; & \min\{n_1, n_2\} \geq 3, \\
3; & \text{otherwise}.
\end{cases}
\]

To conclude the preliminaries we construct special maximal (with respect to inclusion) general position sets in products of trees.

Lemma 6. Let \(T\) and \(T^*\) be two trees with \(\min\{n(T), n(T^*)\} \geq 3\), \(v_i \in V(T) \setminus L(T)\), and \(v^*_j \in V(T^*) \setminus L(T^*)\). Then \((L(T) \times \{v^*_j\}) \cup (\{v_i\} \times L(T^*))\) is a maximal general position set of \(T \square T^*\).

Proof. Set \(R = (L(T) \times \{v^*_j\}) \cup (\{v_i\} \times L(T^*))\) and let \(V_0 = \{u, v, w\} \subseteq R\). We first consider the case when \(V_0 \subseteq L(T) \times \{v^*_j\}\) or \(V_0 \subseteq (\{v_i\} \times L(T^*))\). By symmetry, assume that \(V_0 \subseteq L(T) \times \{v^*_j\}\). Then each vertex of \(V_0\) is corresponding to a leaf of \(L(T)\) in the layer \(T^*_j \cong T\). Therefore \(u, v, w\) do not lie on a common geodesic in \(T \square T^*\).

In the following, without loss of generality, we can assume that \(u, w \in L(T) \times \{v^*_j\}\) with \(u = (v_k, v^*_j)\), \(w = (v_s, v^*_s)\) and \(v = (v_i, v^*_s) \in \{v_i\} \times L(T^*)\). By Equality \((\text{II})\), we have \(d(u, v) = d_T(v_k, v_i) + d_T(v^*_j, v^*_s)\) and \(d(u, w) = d_T(v_k, v_s)\). Therefore \(d(u, v) < d(u, w) + d(w, v)\) in \(T \square T^*\). Thus \(w\) does not lie on the \(u, v\)-geodesic in \(T \square T^*\).

Next we prove the maximality of \((L(T) \times \{v^*_j\}) \cup (\{v_i\} \times L(T^*))\) as a general position set in \(T \square T^*\). Otherwise, there is a general position set \(R^*\) in \(T \square T^*\) of order greater than \(\ell(T) + \ell(T^*)\) such that \(R \subseteq R^*\). Then there exists a vertex \(z \in R^* \setminus R\), say \(z = (v_p, v^*_q)\). If \(p = i\), then there exist two vertices \((v_i, v^*_s), (v_i, v^*_q) \in R\) such that \(z \in I_{T \square T^*}(v_i, v^*_s), (v_i, v^*_q)\) (since \(v^*_q \in T^*\)). This is a contradiction showing that \(p \neq i\). Similarly, we have \(q \neq j\). Now we consider the positions of \(v_p\) and \(v^*_q\) in \(T^*\) and \(T\). Suppose first that \(v_p \in L(T), v^*_q \in L(T^*)\). Then there are two vertices \((v_p, v^*_j), (v_i, v^*_q) \in R\) such that \(z \in I_{T \square T^*}(v_p, v^*_j), (v_i, v^*_q)\) (since \(v^*_j \in T^*\)). This is a contradiction showing that \(R \cup \{z\}\) is a general position set of \(T \square T^*\). If \(v_p \in L(T)\) and \(v^*_q \in L(T^*)\) such that \(v^*_q\) is closer to the leaf of the corresponding branching path than \(v^*_j\) in \(T^*\). Then \(z \in I_{T \square T^*}(v_p, v^*_j), (v_i, v^*_q)\), a contradiction. Similarly, \(v_p \notin L(T)\) and \(v^*_q \in L(T^*)\) cannot occur. Finally, we assume that \(v_p \notin L(T)\), \(v^*_q \notin L(T^*)\). Now we select two vertices \(v_{p'} \in L(T)\) and \(v^*_{q'} \in L(T^*)\) such that \(v_{p'}\) is closer to the leaf of the branching path than \(v_p\) in \(T\) and \(v^*_{q'}\) is closer to the leaf of the branching path than \(v^*_q\) in \(T^*\). But then \((v_p, v^*_q) \in I_{T \square T^*}(v_{p'}, v^*_{q'}), (v_i, v^*_q)\), a final contradiction. \(\square\)
3 Proof of Theorem 1

If $T$ and $T^*$ are both paths, then Theorem 1 holds by Lemma 5. In the following we may thus without loss of generality assume that $T^*$ is not a path. Lemma 4 implies that $\text{gp}(T \sqcap T^*) \geq \text{gp}(T) + \text{gp}(T^*)$, hence it remains to prove that $\text{gp}(T \sqcap T^*) \leq \text{gp}(T) + \text{gp}(T^*)$. Set $n = n(T)$, $n^* = n(T^*)$, $V(T) = \{v_1, \ldots, v_n\}$, and $V(T^*) = \{v^*_1, \ldots, v^*_n\}$.

Assume on the contrary that there exists a general position set $R$ of $T$ such that $|R| > \text{gp}(T) + \text{gp}(T^*)$. Since the restriction of $R$ to a $T$-layer of $T \sqcap T^*$ is a general position set of the layer (which is in turn isomorphic to $T$), the restriction contains at most $\text{gp}(T) = \ell(T)$ elements. Similarly, the restriction of $R$ to a $T^*$-layer contains at most $\text{gp}(T^*) = \ell(T^*)$ elements. We now distinguish the following cases.

**Case 1.** There exists a $T$-layer $T^{v_j}$ with $|V(T^{v_j}) \cap R| = \text{gp}(T)$, or a $T^*$-layer $T^{v^*_j}$ with $|V(T^{v^*_j}) \cap R| = \text{gp}(T^*)$.

By the commutativity of the Cartesian product, we may without loss of generality assume that there is a layer $v^{\ast}T^*$ with $|R \cap V(v^{\ast}T^*)| = \text{gp}(T^*)$. Let $R = R_1 \cup R_2$, where $R_1 = R \cap V(v^{\ast}T^*)$ and $R_2 = R \setminus R_1$, that is, $R_2 = \bigcup_{i \in [n] \setminus \{i\}} (V(v^{\ast}T^*) \cap R)$. Let further $S^*$ be the projection of $R \cap V(v^{\ast}T^*)$ on $T^*$, that is, $S^* = \{v^*_j : (v_i, v^*_j) \in R_1\}$. Since $|R_1| = \text{gp}(T^*)$, our assumption implies $|R_2| \geq \text{gp}(T) + 1$. Then, as $\text{gp}(T) = \ell(T)$, there exist two different vertices $w = (v_p, v^*_p)$ and $w' = (v^*_{p'}, v^*_{q'})$ from $R_2$ such that $v_p$ and $v^*_{p'}$ lie on a same branching path $P$ of $T$. (Note that it is possible that $v_p = v^*_{p'}$.) We may assume that $d_T(v^*_{p'}, x) \leq d_T(v_p, x)$, where $x$ is the leaf of $P$. We proceed by distinguishing two subcases based on the position of $v^*_q$ and $v^*_{q'}$ in $T^*$.

**Case 1.1.** There exists a branching path $P^*$ of $T^*$ that contains both $v^*_q$ and $v^*_{q'}$.

Recall that $T^*$ is not a path. Lemma 2 implies that a vertex of a tree belongs to a gp-set if and only if it lies on a pendant path and has degree 1 or 2. Therefore, we can select $P^*$ with the root of degree at least 3. Assume that $d_{T^*}(v^*_q, y) \leq d_{T^*}(v^*_{q'}, y)$, where $y$ is the leaf of $P^*$. (The reverse case can be treated analogously.) Since $S^*$ is a gp-set of $T^*$ which is not isomorphic to a path, there is a vertex $v^*_{k} \in S^*$ lying on $P^*$. So we may consider that $P^*$ is a branching path that contains $v^*_q$, $v^*_p$ and a vertex $v^*_{k} \in S^*$. (It is possible that some of these vertices are the same.) Let $z = (v_i, v^*_k)$. Then $z \in R_1$. We proceed by distinguishing the following subcases based on the position of $v_p, v^*_{p'}$ and $v_i$ in $T$.

**Subcase 1.1.1.** $v^*_{p'} \in I(v_i, v_p)$.

In this subcase, if $v^*_q$ is closer than $v^*_p$ to the leaf $y$ of $P^*$, then, by Lemma 3, $w' \in I_T \sqcap T^*(w, z)$, a contradiction.

If $v^*_k \in I(v^*_q, v^*_{p'})$, then since $\ell(T^*) \geq 3$, there exists $z' = (v_i, v^*_{k'}) \in \{v_i\} \times S^*$ such that
that \( v^*_k, v^*_q \in I(v^*_p, v^*_r) \) in \( T^* \). Then we have
\[
\begin{align*}
  d(w', z') &= d_T(v^*_{p'}, v_i) + d_{T^*}(v^*_q, v^*_k) \\
           &= d_T(v^*_{p'}, v_i) + d_{T^*}(v^*_q, v^*_k) + d_{T^*}(v^*_k, v^*_r) \\
           &= d(w', z) + d(z, z'),
\end{align*}
\]
which implies that \( z \in I_{T \cap T^*}(w', z') \), a contradiction.

**Subcase 1.1.2.** \( v_i \in I(v_p, v_{p'}) \).

In this subcase, if \( v^*_k \in I(v^*_q, v^*_p) \) in \( P^* \), then \( z \in I_{T \cap T^*}(w, w') \) by Lemma 3, a contradiction.

Assume that \( v^*_k \) is closer than \( v^*_q, v^*_p \) to the leaf of \( P^* \). Since \( |S^*| = \ell(T^*) \geq 3 \), there is a vertex \( z' = (v_i, v^*_k) \in \{v_i\} \times S^* \) such that \( v^*_q, v^*_p \in I(v^*_k, v^*_r) \) in \( T^* \). Let \( v^*_k \) be on a branching path \( P^* \) in \( T^* \) where \( P^* \neq P^* \). Note that \( \ell(T) + 1 \geq 3 \). There exists at least one vertex \( a = (v_x, v^*_y) \in R_2 \setminus \{w, w'\} \). Next we consider the positions of \( v_x, v^*_y \) in \( T, T^* \), respectively.

Suppose first that \( v^*_y \in V(P^* \cup P^*) \). If \( v_x, v_p, v_p' \) and \( v_i \) lie on a path in \( T \), then there are five vertices \( w, w', z, z' \) and \( a \) in \( R_2 \), three of which lie on a common geodesic in \( T \cap T^* \), a contradiction. Note that if \( T \) is a path, then we are done as above. Therefore, assume that \( T \) is not isomorphic to a path in the following and the root of \( P \) has degree at least 3. Otherwise, \( v_x \notin P \) and \( v_x, v_p \) lie on a common branching path in \( T \). Let \( V_s \) be the set of vertices of \( T \) but not contained in \( T_{i^p} \) where \( T_{i^p} \) is the subtree of \( T - v_p \) containing \( v_i \) and \( v_{p'} \). If there is a vertex \( a' = (v_s, v^*_i) \in R_2 \) with \( v_s \in V_s \), then \( R_2 \) contains \( w, w', z, z' \) and \( a' \), three of which are on a common geodesic, a contradiction. Therefore, the first coordinate of any vertex in \( R_2 \) cannot be in \( V_s \). Assume that \( P^* \neq P^* \) is any branching path containing \( v_p \) and a leaf both in \( T_{i^p} \) and \( T \). Then, besides \( w \), \( P^* \cap T^* \) contains at most one vertex in \( R_2 \) of \( T \cap T^* \). Otherwise, \( P^* \cap T^* \) contain two vertices \( h, h' \) in \( R_2 \). Then there exist two vertices \( h_0, h'_0 \in \{v_i\} \times S^* \) such that three vertices from \( \{h, h', h_0, h_0', w\} \) lie on some geodesic in \( T \cap T^* \), a contradiction. (Here \( h_0 \) may be equal to \( h'_0 \).) Note that \( V_s \) contains at least two leaves of \( T \) since the root of \( P \) (just in \( V_s \)) has degree at least 3. Then \( T_{i^p} \) has at most \( \ell(T) - 2 \) leaves in \( T \). Since \( P \cap T^* \) contains two vertices \( w \) and \( w' \) in \( R_2 \), we have \( |R_2| \leq \ell(T) - 2 + 1 < \ell(T) = |P(T)| \), a contradiction with the assumption.

Assume now that \( v^*_y \notin V(P^* \cup P^*) \). Then there exists a vertex \( z'' = (v_i, v^*_k) \in \{v_i\} \times S^* \) such that \( v^*_y, v^*_k \) lie on a common branching path in \( T^* \). If \( v^*_y \) is closer to the leaf of the branching path than \( v^*_k \) in \( T^* \), then \( v_i \in I(v_x, v_i) \) and \( v^*_k \in I(v^*_y, v^*_k) \). Therefore, by Lemma 3 we get \( z'' \in I_{T \cap T^*}(a, z) \), a contradiction. In the case that \( v^*_k \) is closer to the leaf of the branching path than \( v^*_y \) in \( T^* \), we consider the positions of \( v_x, v_p, v_{p'} \) and \( v_i \) in \( T \). Let \( V_1 = \{z, z', w, w', a, z''\} \). Then \( V_1 \subseteq R_2 \). If \( v_x, v_p, v_{p'} \) and \( v_i \) lie on a path in \( T \), then there exist three vertices in \( V_1 \) lying on a common geodesic in
$T \Box T^*$, a contradiction again. Otherwise, $v_x \notin P$ and $v_x, v_p$ lie on a common branching path in $T$. Similarly as above, a contradiction occurs.

**Subcase 1.1.3.** $v_p \in I(v_i, v_{p'})$.
In this subcase, since $\ell(T^*) \geq 3$, there exists a vertex $z' = (v_i, v_k') \in \{v_i\} \times S^*$ such that $v_k^* \notin P^*$ and $v_q^* \in I(v_k^*, v_{q'})$ in $T^*$. Since

$$d(z', w') = d_T(v_i, v_{p'}) + d_T(v_k^*, v_q^*)$$
$$= d_T(v_i, v_p) + d_T(v_k^*, v_q^*) + d_T(v_p, v_{p'}) + d_T(v_q^*, v_{q'})$$
$$= d(z', w) + d(w, w'),$$

we have $w \in I_{T \Box T^*}(z', w')$, a contradiction.

**Subcase 1.1.4.** $v_i \notin V(P)$ such that $v_i$, $v_p$ lie on a same branching path in $T$.
In this subcase, since $\ell(T^*) \geq 3$, there is a vertex $z' = (v_i, v_{k'}) \in \{v_i\} \times S^*$ such that $v_q^* \in I(v_{k'}, v_q^*)$ in $T^*$. If $v_k^* \in I(v_{k'}, v_q^*)$, then obviously $v_k^* \in I(v_q^*, v_{k'})$ and therefore,

$$d(w', z') = d_T(v_{p'}, v_i) + d_T(v_{k'}, v_q^*)$$
$$= d_T(v_{p'}, v_i) + d_T(v_{k'}, v_q^*) + d_T(v_{q'}^*, v_{k'})$$
$$= d(w', z) + d(z, z').$$

We conclude that $z \in I_{T \Box T^*}(w', z')$, a contradiction.

If $v_k^*$ is closer to the leaf of $P^*$ than $v_q^*$, we get a contradiction similarly as in Subcase 1.1.2.

**Case 1.2.** $v_q^*$ and $v_{q'}^*$ do not lie on a same branching path in $T^*$.
In this subcase, we may assume that $v_q^*$ and $v_{q'}^*$ lie on distinct branching paths $P^*$ and $P'^*$ in $T^*$, respectively. Since $\ell(T^*) \geq 3$ and $T^*$ is not isomorphic to a path, there exist two vertices $z = (v_i, v_k^*)$ and $z' = (v_i, v_{k'})$ from $\{v_i\} \times S^*$, such that $v_k^* \in P^*$ and $v_{k'}^* \in P'^*$. We consider the following subcases based on the positions of $v_p, v_{p'}$ and $v_i$ in $T$.

**Subcase 1.2.1.** $v_{p'} \in I(v_i, v_p)$.
In this subcase, if $v_{k'}^*$ is closer than $v_{q'}^*$ to the leaf of $P'^*$, then $v_{p'} \in I(v_p, v_i)$ and $v_{q'}^* \in I(v_{k'}^*, v_{p'}^*)$. Lemma \ref{lem} gives $w' \in I_{T\Box T^*}(w, z')$, a contradiction. On the other hand, if $v_{q'}^*$ is closer than $v_{k'}^*$ to the leaf of $P'^*$, then $v_i \in I(v_i, v_{p'})$ and $v_{k'}^* \in I(v_{q'}^*, v_i)$, hence Lemma \ref{lem} gives $z' \in I_{T\Box T^*}(w', z)$, a contradiction again.

**Subcase 1.2.2.** $v_i \in I(v_p, v_{p'})$.
In this subcase, we first assume that $v_{q'}^*$ is closer than $v_{k'}^*$ to the leaf of $P'^*$. Then $v_i \in I(v_i, v_{p'})$ and $v_{q'}^* \in I(v_{k'}^*, v_{q'}^*)$. Therefore, by Lemma \ref{lem}, we get $z' \in I_{T\Box T^*}(z, w')$ as a contradiction. Otherwise we suppose that $v_{k'}^*$ is closer than $v_{q'}^*$ to the leaf of $P'^*$. If $v_{q'}^*$
is closer than \( v_k^* \) to the leaf of \( P^* \), then \( v_i \in I(v_p, v_i) \) and \( v_k^* \in I(v_q^*, v_k^*) \). Therefore, by Lemma 3 we get \( z \in I \sqcap T^*(w, z') \), a contradiction. In the case that \( v_k^* \) is closer than \( v_q^* \) to the leaf of \( P^* \), we find a contradiction similarly as the proof of Subcase 1.1.2.

**Subcase 1.2.3.** \( v_p \in I(v_i, v_{p'}) \).

In this subcase, if \( v_k^* \) is closer than \( v_q^* \) to the leaf of \( P^* \), then \( v_p \in I(v_i, v_{p'}) \) and \( v_q^* \in I(v_k^*, v_{q'}^*) \). So Lemma 3 gives \( w \in I \sqcap T^*(z, w') \), a contradiction. And if \( v_q^* \) is closer than \( v_k^* \) to the leaf of \( P^* \), then \( v_i \in I(v_i, v_p) \) and \( v_k^* \in I(v_{k'}, v_{q'}^*) \), hence we get \( z \in I \sqcap T^*(z', w) \).

**Subcase 1.2.4.** \( v_i \notin V(P) \) such that \( v_i, v_p \) lie on a same branching path in \( T \).

First suppose that \( v_q^* \) is closer to the leaf than \( v_k^* \) in \( P^* \), then \( v_i \in I(v_i, v_{p'}) \) and \( v_k^* \in I(v_{q'}, v_{q'}^*) \). Thus, by Lemma 3 we get \( z \in I \sqcap T^*(w, z') \).

Assume that \( v_k^* \) is closer than \( v_q^* \) to the leaf of \( P^* \). If \( v_q^* \) is closer to the leaf than \( v_k^* \), then \( v_i \in I(v_i, v_{p'}) \) and \( v_{k'}^* \in I(v_{k'}, v_{q'}^*) \), which gives \( z' \in I \sqcap T^*(z, w') \). If \( v_{k'}^* \) is closer than \( v_q^* \) to the leaf of \( P^* \), we can proceed similarly as in Subcase 1.1.4.

Now we turn to the second case.

**Case 2.** \( |R \cap V(v_k T^*)| < \ell(T^*) \) for any \( k \in [n] \), and \( |R \cap V(v_i T^*)| < \ell(T) \) for any \( t \in [n^*] \).

In this case, let \( v_i T^* \) be a layer with \( |R \cap V(v_i T^*)| = \max\{|R \cap V(v_k T^*)| : k \in [n]\} \). Let \( R = R_1 \cup R_2 \) where \( R_1 = R \cap V(v_i T^*) \) and \( R_2 = R \setminus R_1 \), that is, \( R_2 = \bigcup_{k \in [n^*] \setminus \{i\}} (V(v_k T^*) \cap R) \). Set further \( S^* = \{v_i^* : (v_i, v_i^*) \in R_1 \} \). Then \( 1 \leq |S^*| \leq \ell(T^*) - 1 \).

Assume first \( |S^*| = 1 \). Therefore \( |R \cap V(v_i T^*)| \leq 1 \) for any \( k \in [n] \). Next we only need to consider \( |R \cap V(v_i T^*)| \leq 1 \) for any \( j \in [n^*] \). (If \( |R \cap V(v_i T^*)| \geq 2 \) for some \( j \in [n^*] \), by commutativity of \( T \sqcap T^* \), the proof is similar to the subcase in which \( 2 \leq |S^*| \leq \ell(T^*) - 1 \).) Therefore, suppose that \( |R \cap V(v_i T^*)| \leq 1 \) for any \( j \in [n^*] \). Then \( |R| \leq \min\{n, n^*\} \). We now claim that \( |R| \leq \ell(T) + \ell(T^*) \). If not, then since \( |R| \geq \ell(T) + \ell(T^*) + 1 \geq 6 \), there exist three vertices \( u = (v_p, v_p^*) \), \( v = (v_{p'}, v_{q'}^*) \) and \( w = (v_k, v_k^*) \) from \( R \) such that \( v_p, v_{p'} \) lie on a same branching path in \( T \), and \( v_k^*, v_k^* \) lie on a common branching path in \( T^* \). Note that there may be \( p' = q = \ell \). But we can always select a vertex \( h \in R \setminus \{u, v, w\} \) such that \( u, v, h \) or \( u, w, h \) lie on a same geodesic in \( T \sqcap T^* \), which is a contradiction. So our result holds when \( |S^*| = 1 \).

Suppose second that \( 2 \leq |S^*| \leq \ell(T^*) - 1 \). As \( |R_1| = |S^*| \), we need to prove that \( |R_2| \leq \ell(T) + \ell(T^*) - |S^*| + 1 \). Assume on the contrary that \( |R_2| \geq \ell(T) + \ell(T^*) - |S^*| + 1 \). Since \( |S^*| \geq 2 \), there are two distinct vertices \( w = (v_i, v_i^*) \) and \( w' = (v_i, v_i^*) \) from \( \{v_i\} \times S^* \). We distinguish the following cases based on the positions of \( v_j^*, v_j^* \) in \( T^* \).

**Case 2.1.** \( v_j^* \) and \( v_j^* \) lie on a same branching path \( P^* \) of \( T^* \).

In this subcase, we may without loss of generality assume that \( v_j^* \) is closer than \( v_j^* \)
In this subcase, let $T^*_{v_j}$ be the maximal subtree of $T^* - v_j$ containing $v_j$, and let $V^*_j = V(T^*) \setminus V(T^*_{v_j})$. Let further $S^*_1 = \{v^*_q : v^*_q \in I(v^*_j, v^*_j), v^*_j \in S^* \cap V(T^*_{v_j})\}$. Now we prove the following claim.

**Claim 1.** If $z = (v_p, v^*_j) \in R_2$, then $v^*_j \in S^*_1$.

**Proof of Claim 1.** If not, suppose first that $v^*_j \in V(P^*)$ is closer than $v^*_j$ to the leaf of $P^*$. Then $v^*_j \in I(v_i, v_p)$ and $v^*_j \in I(v^*_j, v^*_j)$. Hence, $w' \in I_T(w, z)$. And if $v^*_j \in V^*_j$, then $v^*_j \in I(v^*_j, v^*_j)$. Combining this fact with $v^*_i \in I(v_i, v_p)$, we have $w \in I_T(w', z)$. This proves Claim 1.

By Claim 1, we have $|\bigcup_{v^*_j \in S^*_1} (V(T^*_j) \cap R)| \geq \ell(T) + \ell(T^*) - |S^*| + 1 \geq \ell(T) + 1$. Then there exist two vertices $z = (v_p, v^*_j)$ and $z' = (v_p, v^*_j)$ from $\bigcup_{v^*_j \in S^*_1} (V(T^*_j) \cap R)$ such that $v^*_j, v^*_j \in S^*_1$ and $v^*_i, v^*_j$ lie on a same branching path $P$. Without loss of generality, let $v^*_j$ be closer than $v^*_i$ to the leaf of $P$, and let $v^*_j, v^*_j \in I(v^*_j, v^*_j)$ (by the definition of $S^*_1$). We consider the following subcases according to the positions of $v^*_i, v^*_i, v^*_i, v^*_i$ in $T$.

**Subcase 2.1.1.** $v^*_i \in I(v_i, v_p)$.

If $v^*_i$ is closer than $v^*_i$ in $P^*$, then we have $v^*_i \in I(v_i, v_p)$ and $v^*_i \in I(v^*_i, v^*_i)$. Therefore, $z' \in I_T(z, w')$. And if $v^*_i$ is closer than $v^*_i$ in $P^*$, then we have $v^*_i \in I(v_i, v_p)$ and $v^*_i \in I(v^*_i, v^*_i)$ and so $z' \in I_T(z, w)$.

**Subcase 2.1.2.** $v_i \in I(v_i, v_p)$.

Note that $\ell(T) + \ell(T^*) - |S^*| + 1 \geq 4$. Then there exists at least a vertex $a = (v_x, v^*_y) \in \bigcup_{v^*_y \in S^*_1} (V(T^*_y) \cap R)$ different from $z$ and $z'$. Based on the position of $v^*_y (v^*_y \in P^*$ or $v^*_y \notin P^*$) in $T^*$, and the positions of $v_x, v_i, v_p$ and $v_p$, we get contradictions using a similar proof as in Subcase 1.1.2.

**Subcase 2.1.3.** $v_p \in I(v_i, v_p)$.

If $v^*_i$ is closer than $v^*_i$ in $T^*$, then $v_p \in I(v_i, v_p)$ and $v^*_i \in I(v^*_i, v^*_i)$, therefore $z \in I_T(z, w')$. And if $v^*_i$ is closer than $v^*_i$ in $T^*$, then $v_p \in I(v_i, v_p)$ and $v^*_i \in I(v^*_i, v^*_i)$, hence $z \in I_T(z, w')$.

**Subcase 2.1.4.** $v_i \notin V(P)$ such that $v_i, v_p$ lie on a same branching path in $T$.

Since $\ell(T) + \ell(T^*) - |S^*| + 1 \geq 4$, there exists a vertex $(v_x, v^*_y) \in \bigcup_{v^*_y \in S^*_1} (V(T^*_y) \cap R)$. Proceeding similarly as in Subcase 1.1.4, we get required contradictions. But then $|\bigcup_{v^*_y \in S^*_1} (V(T^*_y) \cap R)| \leq \ell(T) + \ell(T^*) - |S^*|$, a contradiction with the assumption.

**Case 2.2.** $v^*_j, v^*_j$ lie on different branching paths $P^*, P^*$ in $T^*$, respectively.

In this subcase, let $S^*_2$ be a set of vertices of $v_i T^*$ closer to the leaf of a branching path than $v^*_j$ for any $v^*_j \in S^*$. Note that $S^* \cap S^*_2 = \emptyset$. We prove the following claim.

**Claim 2.** If $(v_p, v^*_j) \in R_2$, then $v^*_j \in V(T^*) \setminus (S^* \cup S^*_2)$. 
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Proof of Claim 2. Lemma 4 implies \( v^*_q \notin S^* \). Assume that \( v^*_q \in S^*_2 \) lies on a same branching path for some \( v^*_q \) in \( T^* \). Note that \( |S^*| \geq 2 \). Then there exists another vertex \( v^*_g \) such that \( v^*_g \in I(v^*_q, v^*_q) \). Combining this fact with \( v_i \in I(v_i, v_p) \), we arrive at a contradiction \( w \in I_T \cap T^*(z, w') \). This proves Claim 2.

Let now \( S^*_1 \) = \( \{ v^*_q : v^*_q \in I(v^*_g, v^*_q), v^*_q, v^*_g \in S^* \} \). By a parallel reasoning as in Subcase 2.1 and with Claim 2 in hands we infer that \( |\bigcup_{v^*_q \in S^*_1} (V(T^{v^*_q}) \cap R) \| \leq \ell(T) \).

Let \( S = \{ v_k : (v_k, v^*_q) \in \bigcup_{v^*_q \in S^*_1} (V(T^{v^*_q}) \cap R) \} \) and set \( S^{**} = V(T^*) \setminus (S^* \cup S^*_1) \). From the assumption we have \( |\bigcup_{v^*_q \in S^{**}} (V(T^{v^*_q}) \cap R) | \geq \ell(T) + \ell(T^*) - |S| - |S^*| + 1 \). So there exists a vertex \( z = (v_p, v^*_q) \in \bigcup_{v^*_q \in S^{**}} (V(T^{v^*_q}) \cap R) \), and we can always select two distinct vertices \( u = (v_h, v^*_q) \) and \( v = (v_{h'}, v^*_q) \) from \( R \) such that \( v_p \) and \( v_h \) lie on a same branching path in \( T \), while \( v^*_q \) and \( v^*_q \) lie on a common branching path in \( T^* \). But we can choose another vertex \( w \in R \) such that either \( u, w, z \) or \( u, v, z \) lie on a same geodesic in \( T \cap T^* \) as a contradiction. Therefore,

\[
| \bigcup_{v^*_q \in S^{**}} (V(T^{v^*_q}) \cap R) | \leq \ell(T) + \ell(T^*) - |S| - |S^*|.
\]

and we are done.
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