

On graphs coverable by k shortest paths

Maël Dumas* Florent Foucaud^{†‡} Anthony Perez[†] Ioan Todinca[†]

April 2022

Abstract

We show that if the edges or vertices of an undirected graph G can be covered by k shortest paths, then the pathwidth of G is upper-bounded by a single-exponential function of k . As a corollary, we prove that the problem ISOMETRIC PATH COVER WITH TERMINALS (which, given a graph G and a set of k pairs of vertices called *terminals*, asks whether G can be covered by k shortest paths, each joining a pair of terminals) is FPT with respect to the number of terminals. The same holds for the similar problem STRONG GEODETIC SET WITH TERMINALS (which, given a graph G and a set of k terminals, asks whether there exist $\binom{k}{2}$ shortest paths covering G , each joining a distinct pair of terminals). Moreover, this implies that the related problems ISOMETRIC PATH COVER and STRONG GEODETIC SET (defined similarly but where the set of terminals is not part of the input) are in XP with respect to parameter k .

1 Introduction

Path problems such as HAMILTONIAN PATH are among the most fundamental problems in the field of algorithms. HAMILTONIAN PATH can be generalized as the covering problem PATH COVER [2], where one asks to cover the vertices of an input graph using a prescribed number of paths. The packing variant is DISJOINT PATHS where, given a set of k pairs of terminal vertices of a graph G , one asks whether there are k vertex-disjoint paths in G , each joining two paired terminals. DISJOINT PATHS is a fundamental problem and a precursor to the field of parameterized complexity due to the celebrated fixed-parameter tractable algorithm devised by Robertson and Seymour [24] for the parameter “number of paths”. We recall that in the field of parameterized algorithms and complexity, one studies *parameterized problems*, whose input I comes together with a parameter k . A parameterized problem is said to be FPT (fixed-parameter tractable) if it can be solved in time $f(k) \cdot |I|^{O(1)}$, for some computable function f . If the problem can be solved in time $O(|I|^{f(k)})$, it belongs to class XP ; see, e.g., [8] for more details.

In this paper, we will not consider arbitrary paths, but *shortest paths*, which are fundamental for many applications. In the problem DISJOINT SHORTEST PATHS, given a graph G and k pairs of terminals, one asks whether G contains k vertex-disjoint shortest paths pairwise connecting the k pairs of terminals. This problem was introduced in [12] and recently shown to be polynomial-time solvable for every fixed k by an XP algorithm [5, 19]. The problem ISOMETRIC PATH COVER WITH TERMINALS, which we define as follows, is the covering counterpart of DISJOINT SHORTEST PATHS.

ISOMETRIC PATH COVER WITH TERMINALS

Input: A graph G and k pairs of vertices $(s_1, t_1), \dots, (s_k, t_k)$ called *terminals*.

Question: Does there exist a set of k shortest paths, the i th path being an s_i - t_i shortest path, such that each vertex of G belongs to at least one of the paths?

*Univ. Orléans, INSA Centre Val de Loire, LIFO EA 4022, F-45067 Orléans Cedex 2, France.

[†]Université Clermont Auvergne, CNRS, Clermont Auvergne INP, Mines Saint-Etienne, LIMOS, 63000 Clermont-Ferrand, France.

[‡]This author was financed by the ANR project GRALMECO (ANR-21-CE48-0004) and the French government IDEX-ISITE initiative 16-IDEX-0001 (CAP 20-25).

The name ISOMETRIC PATH COVER WITH TERMINALS comes from the related ISOMETRIC PATH COVER problem where the terminals are not part of the input, which was introduced in [14] in the context of the Cops and Robbers game on graphs (see also [1]).

ISOMETRIC PATH COVER

Input: A graph G and an integer k .

Question: Does there exist a set of k shortest paths such that each vertex of G belongs to at least one of the paths?

Closely related variants of ISOMETRIC PATH COVER WITH TERMINALS and ISOMETRIC PATH COVER have been studied, in which there are only k terminals, and one asks to find $\binom{k}{2}$ shortest paths joining each pair of terminals. The version without terminals has been called STRONG GEODETIC SET in the literature; we call the version with terminals STRONG GEODETIC SET WITH TERMINALS. It was first studied (independently) in [9, 10], see also [18].

STRONG GEODETIC SET WITH TERMINALS

Input: A graph G and a set of k vertices of G called *terminals*.

Question: Does there exist a set of $\binom{k}{2}$ shortest paths, each path joining a distinct pair of terminals, such that each vertex of G belongs to at least one of the paths?

The variant where the terminals are not given in the input was defined in [4] as follows.

STRONG GEODETIC SET

Input: A graph G and an integer k .

Question: Does there exist a set of k terminals and a set of $\binom{k}{2}$ shortest paths, each path joining a distinct pair of terminals, such that each vertex of G belongs to at least one of the paths?

The complexity of these problems has been studied in the literature. It was shown in [6] that ISOMETRIC PATH COVER is NP-complete, even for chordal graphs, a class for which the authors of [6] also provide a constant-factor approximation algorithm. For general graphs, it was shown in [25] that the problem can be approximated in polynomial time within a factor of $O(\log d)$, where d is the diameter of the input graph. It was proven to be polynomial-time solvable on block graphs [23]. It is shown in [9] that STRONG GEODETIC SET WITH TERMINALS is NP-hard. In [10], it is shown that this holds even for bipartite graphs of maximum degree 4 or diameter 6, however STRONG GEODETIC SET WITH TERMINALS is polynomial-time solvable on split graphs, graphs of diameter 2, block graphs, and cactus graphs. We prove here (cf. Proposition 1) that ISOMETRIC PATH COVER WITH TERMINALS is also NP-complete.

Finally, STRONG GEODETIC SET is known to be NP-hard [4], even for bipartite graphs, chordal graphs, graphs of diameter 2 and cobipartite graphs [10] as well as for subcubic graphs of arbitrary girth [9]. However it is polynomial-time solvable on outerplanar graphs [22], cactus graphs, block graphs and threshold graphs [10].

All these problems can also be studied in their edge-covering version, where one requires to cover all edges of the input graph by the corresponding shortest paths. For instance, the STRONG EDGE GEODETIC SET problem is studied in [21]. The version of ISOMETRIC PATH COVER where the solution paths are required to be vertex-disjoint has also been studied under the names of ISOMETRIC PATH PARTITION [20] and SHORTEST PATH PARTITION [13].

Our results Our main combinatorial theorems are as follows (see Section 2 for the definition of pathwidth).

Theorem 1. *Let G be a graph whose edge set can be covered by at most k shortest paths. Then the pathwidth of G is $O(3^k)$.*

Theorem 2. *Let G be a graph whose **vertex set** can be covered by at most k shortest paths. Then the pathwidth of G is $O(k \cdot 3^k)$.*

We actually show that in such a graph G , given an arbitrary vertex a and an integer D , the number of vertices at distance exactly D from a is upper-bounded by a function of k , and the bound does not depend on the size of the input graph. It follows that a very simple linear-time algorithm based on a breadth-first search provides a path decomposition whose width is upper-bounded by twice the aforementioned function of k . The complexity of the algorithm computing the path decomposition does not depend on k .

Besides the combinatorial bounds, we employ the celebrated theorem of Courcelle [7], stating that problems expressible in Monadic Second-Order Logic (MSOL₂) can be solved in linear time for graphs of bounded treewidth (and thus, of bounded pathwidth). More precisely, we reduce the problem ISOMETRIC PATH COVER WITH TERMINALS to an optimization problem expressible in MSOL₂. The result can also be obtained by dynamic programming but the algorithm would be tedious and not particularly efficient, therefore we prefer the general logic-based framework for further extensions. The running time is linear in n , the number of vertices of the graph, but super-exponential in the parameter k . Together with [Theorem 2](#), this implies the following.

Theorem 3. ISOMETRIC PATH COVER WITH TERMINALS *and* STRONG GEODETIC SET WITH TERMINALS *are FPT when parameterized by the number of terminals.*

Corollary 1. ISOMETRIC PATH COVER *and* STRONG GEODETIC SET *are in XP when parameterized by the number of paths, respectively terminals.*

Thanks to the flexibility of Monadic Second-Order Logic and to [Theorem 1](#), our algorithmic results easily extend to the edge-covering versions of our problems, and to variants where we require the paths to be edge-disjoint, or vertex-disjoint like ISOMETRIC PATH PARTITION, studied in [13, 20]. The second part of [Theorem 3](#) answers positively a question asked in [18].

Outline After some preliminaries in [Section 2](#), we prove [Theorem 1](#) in [Sections 3](#) and [4](#). More specifically, [Section 3](#) provides the upper bound on the pathwidth of graphs whose edges are coverable by k shortest paths, then the tools are extended to vertex-coverings in the next section. Algorithmic consequences ([Theorem 3](#)) are derived in [Section 5](#), and we conclude with some open questions.

2 Preliminaries and notations

Paths and concatenation operators \oplus and \odot We refer to [11] for usual notations on graphs. In this paper we only consider undirected, unweighted graphs. For simplicity, we assume that our input graph $G = (V, E)$ is connected, though all our combinatorial and algorithmic results extend to non-connected graphs. As usual $N(x)$ denotes the neighbourhood of vertex x .

A path P of graph $G = (V, E)$ is a sequence of distinct vertices (x_1, \dots, x_l) such that for each $i, 1 \leq i \leq l-1$, $\{x_i, x_{i+1}\}$ is an edge of the graph. We also say that P is an x_1 - x_l path. Note that our paths are simple as they do not use twice the same vertex. We denote by $V(P)$ the vertices of path P , and by $E(P)$ its edges. Given two vertices $x, y \in V(P)$, we denote by $P[x, y]$ the subpath of P between x and y . Let $|P|$ denote the *length* of path P , that is, its number of edges. The *distance* between two vertices a and b in G is denoted $\text{dist}(a, b)$ and corresponds to the length of a shortest a - b path.

Throughout the paper, we will construct paths by concatenation operations. It is convenient to think of our paths as directed: when we speak of an a - b path, we think of it as being directed from a to b .

Given two vertex disjoint paths $\nu = (x_1, \dots, x_l)$ and $\eta = (y_1, \dots, y_t)$ of G such that $\{x_l, y_1\}$ is an edge of G , we define the *concatenation operator* \oplus whose result is $\nu \oplus \eta = (x_1, \dots, x_l, y_1, \dots, y_t)$. In particular, $|\nu \oplus \eta| = |\nu| + |\eta| + 1$.

We define similarly the *glueing operator* \odot between two paths $\nu = (x_1, \dots, x_l)$ and $\eta = (x_l, y_1, \dots, y_t)$ with $V(\nu) \cap V(\eta) = \{x_l\}$ by $\nu \odot \eta = (x_1, \dots, x_l, y_1, \dots, y_t)$. Note that in this case $|\nu \odot \eta| = |\nu| + |\eta|$.

Path decompositions through breadth-first search A path decomposition of $G = (V, E)$ is a sequence $\mathcal{P} = (X_1, X_2, \dots, X_q)$ of vertex subsets of G , called *bags*, such that for every edge $\{x, y\} \in E$ there is at least one bag containing both endpoints, and for every vertex $x \in V$, the bags containing x form a continuous sub-sequence of \mathcal{P} . The width of \mathcal{P} is $\max\{|X_i| - 1 \mid 1 \leq i \leq q\}$, and the *pathwidth* $\text{pw}(G)$ of G is the minimum width over all path decompositions of G .

The *treewidth* $\text{tw}(G)$ of graph G is defined similarly (see e.g. [11]), using a so-called tree decomposition; for our purpose, we only need to know that for any graph G , $\text{tw}(G) \leq \text{pw}(G)$, in particular any path decomposition is also a tree decomposition of the same width. We also need the following folklore lemma on path decompositions.

Lemma 1. *Let $G = (V, E)$ be a graph, a be a vertex of G and K be an upper bound on the number of vertices of G at distance exactly D from a , for any integer D .*

Then, $\text{pw}(G) \leq 2K - 1$. Moreover, a path decomposition of width $2K - 1$ can be computed in linear time, by breadth-first search.

Proof. Let $\text{ecc}(a)$ be the eccentricity of vertex a (i.e., $\max_{x \in V} \text{dist}(a, x)$). For any D with $0 \leq D \leq \text{ecc}(a)$ we denote by $\text{Layer}(D)$ the set of vertices at distance exactly D from a , i.e. the layers of a breadth-first search on G starting at a . Observe that, by taking as bags the unions $\text{Layer}(D) \cup \text{Layer}(D + 1)$ of pairs of consecutive layers, $0 \leq D < \text{ecc}(a)$, and by ordering them according to D , we obtain a path decomposition of G . Indeed for each edge $\{x, y\}$ both endpoints are in the same layer or in two consecutive layers, thus will appear in the same bag. For each vertex x , it appears in at most two bags: if $d = \text{dist}(a, x)$ then x is in bags $\text{Layer}(d - 1) \cup \text{Layer}(d)$ and $\text{Layer}(d) \cup \text{Layer}(d + 1)$ (or one bag if $d = 0$ or $d = \text{ecc}(a)$), and these bags appear consecutively in the decomposition. Since each layer has at most K vertices, the width of this decomposition is at most $2K - 1$. \square

3 Edge-covering with k shortest paths

We start by proving [Theorem 1](#), upper bounding the pathwidth of graphs $G = (V, E)$ that are edge-coverable by k shortest paths. In this case, there is a simple and elegant encoding of shortest paths leading to a factorial upper bound, given in [Section 3.1](#). This bound is improved to a single-exponential one in [Section 3.2](#). We recall that the case of vertex-coverings, which is more technical, will be studied in [Section 4](#).

In this section, $G = (V, E)$ denotes a graph whose edge set is coverable by k shortest paths. Let us fix such a set of paths μ_1, \dots, μ_k , and call them the *base paths* of G . All constructions in this section are built on this particular set of base paths (without explicitly recalling it for each lemma, in order to ease the notations). We endow each base path μ_c , $1 \leq c \leq k$ with an arbitrary *direction*. E.g., assuming that the vertices of G are numbered from 1 to n , the direction of path P is from its smallest towards its largest end-vertex. A (directed) subpath $\mu_c[x, y]$ of μ_c is given a positive *sign* $+$ if it follows the direction of μ_c , otherwise it is given a negative sign $-$. For each edge e of G , let $\text{colours}(e)$ be the set of all values $c \in \{1, \dots, k\}$ such that e is an edge of μ_c .

Good colourings Let P be an a - b path of G , from vertex a to vertex b . A *colouring* of P is a function $\text{col}: E(P) \rightarrow \{1, \dots, k\}$ assigning to each edge e of the path one of its colours $\text{col}(e) \in \text{colours}(e)$. The colouring col of P is said to be *good* if, for any colour c , the set of edges using this colour form a connected subpath $P[x, y]$ of P . (Since our paths are simple, this condition entails that $P[x, y] = \mu_c[x, y]$.) A pair (P, col) formed by a path together with a good colouring is called *well-coloured path*.

Operator \odot defined in Section 2 naturally extends to coloured paths. Given a coloured path (P, col) , we simply denote by $(P[x, y], \text{col})$ its restriction to a subpath $P[x, y]$ of P . Finally, we define for any path P and any colour $1 \leq c \leq k$ the function $\text{monochr}_c : E(P) \rightarrow \{c\}$. Hence all edges of the coloured path $(P, \text{monochr}_c)$ have colour c .

With these notations, any well-coloured a - b path (P, col) with colours (c_1, \dots, c_l) appearing in this order can be written as:

$$(\mu_{c_1}[x_1, x_2], \text{monochr}_{c_1}) \odot (\mu_{c_2}[x_2, x_3], \text{monochr}_{c_2}) \odot \dots \odot (\mu_{c_l}[x_l, x_{l+1}], \text{monochr}_{c_l})$$

for some vertices $a = x_1, x_2, x_3 \dots, x_l, x_{l+1} = b$. In full words, $P[x_i, x_{i+1}]$ are the monochromatic subpaths of (P, col) , coloured c_i .

Lemma 2 (Good colouring lemma). *For any pair of vertices a and b of G , there exists a well-coloured a - b path (P, col) such that P is a shortest a - b path.*

We will simply call (P, col) a well-coloured shortest a - b path.

Proof. Among all shortest a - b paths, choose one that admits a colouring with a minimum number of monochromatic subpaths. Let P be this path, and col the corresponding colouring. Assume by contradiction that the colouring is not good. Then there exist three edges $e_1 = \{y_1, z_1\}$, $e_2 = \{y_2, z_2\}$ and $e_3 = \{y_3, z_3\}$, appearing in this order, such that $\text{col}(e_1) = \text{col}(e_3) \neq \text{col}(e_2)$. Assume w.l.o.g. that the vertices appear in the order $y_1, z_1, y_2, z_2, y_3, z_3$ from a to b (note that we may have $z_1 = y_2$ or $z_2 = y_3$). Let $c = \text{col}(e_1) = \text{col}(e_3)$. Therefore z_1 and y_3 are on the same base path μ_c . Let P' be the path obtained from P by replacing $P[z_1, y_3]$ by $\mu_c[z_1, y_3]$. First, P' is no longer than P , since $\mu_c[z_1, y_3]$ is a shortest possible z_1 - y_3 path of graph G (in particular, P' has no repeated vertices). Second, in P' we can colour all edges of $P'[z_1, y_3]$ with colour c , and keep all other colours unchanged. Hence P' has strictly fewer monochromatic subpaths than P — a contradiction. \square

Let (P, col) be a well-coloured a - b path, with colours (c_1, \dots, c_l) in this order. Recall that each monochromatic subpath $P[x_i, x_{i+1}]$ of P , of colour c_i , induces a sign on the corresponding base path μ_{c_i} (positive if $P[x_i, x_{i+1}]$ has the same direction as μ_{c_i} , negative otherwise). Therefore, we can define the *colours-signs word* $\text{ColoursSignsW}(P, \text{col}) = ((c_1, s_1), (c_2, s_2), \dots, (c_l, s_l))$ on the alphabet $\{1, \dots, k\} \times \{+, -\}$, corresponding to the colours and signs of the monochromatic subpaths of P , according to the ordering in which these subpaths appear from a to b .

3.1 Warm-up: Factorial bound

Observe that colours-signs words have at most k letters on an alphabet of size $2k$. Therefore the number of different such words is upper bounded by a function of k :

Lemma 3. *The number of possible colours-signs words, over all well-coloured paths of G , is upper bounded by $h(k) = \sum_{l=1}^k 2^l \frac{k!}{(k-l)!}$.*

Proof. We claim that the number of colours-signs words of l letters is upper bounded by $2^l \frac{k!}{(k-l)!}$. Observe that the colours form a word of length l , on an alphabet of size k , without repetition. The number of such words is $\frac{k!}{(k-l)!}$ (e.g., by choosing l letters among the k possible ones, and applying all possible permutations). Since each letter also has a sign in $\{+, -\}$, we multiply this quantity by 2^l , and the conclusion follows by summing over all possible values of l . \square

The following crucial lemma implies that, given a start vertex a , a distance D and a colours-signs word ω , there is at most one vertex b at distance D from a , such that the well-coloured shortest a - b path respects word ω . This will allow to upper bound the number of vertices at distance D from a .

Lemma 4 (Colours-signs encoding). *Consider two vertices b and c at the same distance from some vertex a of G . Let (P, col) be a well-coloured shortest a - b path and (P', col') be a well-coloured shortest a - c path. If $\text{ColoursSignsW}(P, \text{col}) = \text{ColoursSignsW}(P', \text{col}')$, then $b = c$.*

Proof. We proceed by induction on the number of letters of the word $\text{ColoursSignsW}(P, \text{col})$. Let us denote it by $\omega = ((c_1, s_1), (c_2, s_2), \dots, (c_l, s_l))$.

Let $P[a, x_2]$ (resp. $P'[a, x'_2]$) be the maximal subpath of P (resp. P') of colour c_1 starting from a . Assume w.l.o.g. that $P[a, x_2]$ is at least as long as $P'[a, x'_2]$. Since both are subpaths of μ_{c_1} , starting from a and having the same sign s_1 w.r.t. μ_{c_1} , we actually have that $P'[a, x'_2]$ is contained in $P[a, x_2]$, in particular x'_2 is between a and x_2 in P and in μ_{c_1} .

Observe that, if word ω has only one letter, $P[a, x_2] = P$ and $P'[a, x'_2] = P'$, thus they are all of the same length. Since they are of the same sign w.r.t. μ_{c_1} , this implies that $x_2 = x'_2 = b = c$, which proves the base case of our induction.

Assume now that ω has $l \geq 2$ letters and that the lemma is true for words of length $l - 1$.

Consider first the case when $P[a, x_2]$ and $P'[a, x'_2]$ have the same length. Then $x_2 = x'_2$ is also the first vertex of the subpaths of colour c_2 of both P and P' . Then $(P[x'_2, b], \text{col})$ and $(P'[x'_2, c], \text{col}')$ are well-coloured shortest paths of the same length, and have the same colours-signs word $((c_2, s_2), \dots, (c_l, s_l))$, with $l - 1$ letters. Hence the property follows by the induction hypothesis.

We now handle the second and last case, when $P[a, x_2]$ is strictly longer than $P'[a, x'_2]$. Let x_3 be the last vertex of the subpath coloured c_2 in (P, col) . In particular, x'_2, x_2 and x_3 are all vertices of μ_{c_2} . Let us make an easy but crucial observation: on μ_{c_2} , vertex x_2 is between x'_2 and x_3 . To prove this claim, note that in path P , vertices a, x'_2 and x_2 appear in this order (as observed in the beginning of the proof), and by construction x_2 appears between a and x_3 . Therefore a, x'_2, x_2, x_3 appear in this order on P , which is a shortest path. Hence $\text{dist}(x'_2, x_3) = \text{dist}(x'_2, x_2) + \text{dist}(x_2, x_3)$. Since the three vertices x'_2, x_2, x_3 are all on the shortest path μ_{c_2} , they must appear in this order on it. Consequently, $\mu_{c_2}[x'_2, x_3]$ induces the same sign s_2 on μ_{c_2} as $P[x_2, x_3] = \mu_{c_2}[x_2, x_3]$. In particular, in path:

$$(P[x'_2, b], \text{col}) = (P[x'_2, x_2], \text{monochr}_{c_1}) \odot (P[x_2, x_3], \text{monochr}_{c_2}) \odot (P[x_3, b], \text{col}),$$

we can replace the first subpath $P[x'_2, x_2]$ coloured c_1 by $\mu_{c_2}[x'_2, x_2]$, coloured c_2 , without changing the total length. We obtain the well-coloured shortest x'_2 - b path

$$(\tilde{P}[x'_2, b], \tilde{\text{col}}) = (\mu_{c_2}[x'_2, x_3], \text{monochr}_{c_2}) \odot (P[x_3, b], \text{col}).$$

Its colours-signs word is $((c_2, s_2), \dots, (c_l, s_l))$, the same as for the shortest x'_2 - c path $(P'[x'_2, c], \text{col}')$. Moreover, the two paths have the same length, $|P| - |P[a, x'_2]|$, hence by the induction hypothesis we have $b = c$, which proves our lemma. \square

Corollary 2. *For any vertex a of G and any integer D , there are at most $h(k) = \sum_{l=1}^k 2^l \frac{k!}{(k-l)!}$ vertices at distance exactly D from a .*

Proof. For any fixed vertex a and fixed integer D , thanks to [Lemma 4](#) the number of vertices x at distance exactly D from a is upper-bounded by the number of colours-signs words, which is in turn upper bounded by $h(k)$ by [Lemma 3](#). \square

[Corollary 2](#) together with [Lemma 1](#) entail a weaker version of [Theorem 1](#): the pathwidth of graphs edge-coverable by k shortest paths is at most $2h(k) - 1$, providing a factorial upper bound.

3.2 Single exponential bound

In this section, we will show that the number of vertices at distance D from a vertex a can actually be bounded by $O(3^k)$. In the previous section we showed that any two shortest well-coloured paths of length D starting from a with the same colours-signs words lead to the same vertex. We observe that paths with different colours-signs word may also lead to the same vertex, see [Fig. 1](#). In this section, we generalize this idea to a set of shortest paths from a to all vertices at distance D from a .




Figure 1: (P_1, col_1) and (P_2, col_2) are well-coloured shortest paths of same length. The vertex x is shared by the two paths. One can replace $\mu_{\text{blue}}[a, x]$ in P_2 by $\mu_{\text{red}}[a, x]$, this proves that $b = c$.

Before getting into details, let us try to give an informal description of our construction (see Fig. 3). Let \mathcal{P} be a family of well-coloured shortest paths starting from vertex a , with different endpoints. Initially this family reaches all vertices at distance D from a . We transform it into another family with the same properties, preserving the endpoints. Let x_n be the furthest vertex from a , contained on all paths of \mathcal{P} , such that these paths share the same coloured subpath from a to x_n . We focus on the colours \mathcal{C} appearing on the edges right after x_n . Firstly, we apply the following transformation. For each path $(P, \text{col}) \in \mathcal{P}$, we consider the furthest edge having its colour c in \mathcal{C} (e.g., in Fig. 3, for path P_3 this edge is coloured red), and we replace the whole subpath of P from x_n to this edge with a subpath of μ_c , of colour c . This new family of paths is then split into subfamilies according to the colour and sign of the first edge after x_n , and we branch on each subfamily. We eventually prove that this branching process corresponds to a tree (that we call *k-labelled branching tree*), in the sense that the output paths are bijectively mapped on the leaves of the tree. Moreover we will upper bound the number of leaves of the tree, and thus the number of paths, to $O(3^k)$.

We firstly define *k-labelled branching trees* and show in Lemma 5 that they have $O(3^k)$ leaves. Then we formally describe the above branching process in Lemma 6, deducing the same upper bound on the number of vertices at distance D from a .

Let us define a *rooted labelled tree* as a pair (T, lab) where T is a rooted tree and $\text{lab} : E(T) \rightarrow \mathcal{CS}$ is an edge labelling function with $\mathcal{CS} = \{1, \dots, k\} \times \{+, -\}$. For a node n of T let T_n be the subtree rooted in n . For a node n of T and its children n_1, \dots, n_t let $\mathcal{L}(n) = \{\text{lab}(\{n, n_1\}), \dots, \text{lab}(\{n, n_t\})\}$ and $\mathcal{LS}(n) = \{(c, s), (c, \bar{s}) \mid (c, s) \in \mathcal{L}(n)\}$, where \bar{s} is the opposite of sign s .

Definition 1. A rooted labelled tree (T, lab) is called a *k-labelled branching tree* if the following properties hold:

(i) in every path from the root of T to one of its leaves, the edges with the same label form a connected subpath.

And for every node n of T with children n_1, \dots, n_t :

(ii) the labels on the edges $\{n, n_i\}, i \in \{1, \dots, t\}$ are pairwise distinct,

(iii) for every $i \in \{1, \dots, t\}$, T_{n_i} does not contain any edge with labels in $\mathcal{LS}(n) \setminus \{\text{lab}(\{n, n_i\})\}$,

We now give a combinatorial bound on the number of leaves contained in a *k-labelled branching tree*. We would like to mention that in a general setting where the labelling function lab is defined over some alphabet Σ and the second condition is replaced by " T_{n_i} does not contain any edge with labels in $\mathcal{L}(n) \setminus \{\text{lab}(\{n, n_i\})\}$ ", one can achieve an $O(2^{|\Sigma|})$ bound, thus giving $O(4^k)$ in our case (observe that we simply replaced, in the second condition, \mathcal{LS} by \mathcal{L}). However by exploiting the specificity of the alphabet \mathcal{CS} we actually have the following.

Lemma 5. A *k-labelled branching tree* (T, lab) contains $O(3^k)$ leaves.

Proof. Let (T, lab) be a *k-labelled branching tree*, with the labelling function $\text{lab} : E(T) \rightarrow \mathcal{CS}$. Let $\mathcal{B}(n)$ be the set of labels that have not been forbidden in T_n by condition (i) or condition (iii) of Definition 1 applied to some ancestor of n in the tree T . In particular, if n is the root, then $\mathcal{B}(n) = \mathcal{CS}$, and at any node n , $\mathcal{B}(n)$ is a superset of all labels of $E(T_n)$. If n has exactly one child n' , by definition $\mathcal{B}(n') \subseteq \mathcal{B}(n)$ so $|\mathcal{B}(n')| \leq |\mathcal{B}(n)|$.

Claim 1. Let n be a node of T with $t \geq 2$ children n_1, \dots, n_t . If n is the root then $|\mathcal{B}(n_i)| \leq |\mathcal{B}(n)| - (t - 1)$, else $|\mathcal{B}(n_i)| \leq |\mathcal{B}(n)| - \max\{2, t - 1\}$.

Proof. Since T is a k -labelled branching tree, by condition (ii) the labels of the edges $\{n, n_j\}$, $1 \leq j \leq t$ are pairwise distinct. In particular, the $t - 1$ distinct labels of edges $\{n, n_j\}$, with $j \neq i$, appear in $\mathcal{B}(n)$ but not in $\mathcal{B}(n_i)$, by condition (iii). Therefore $|\mathcal{B}(n_i)| \leq |\mathcal{B}(n)| - (t - 1)$.

It remains to prove that if n is not the root and has exactly two children n_1, n_2 , then $|\mathcal{B}(n_i)| \leq |\mathcal{B}(n)| - 2$, for $i \in \{1, 2\}$. Let p be the parent node of n in T , we denote $(c, s) = \text{lab}(\{p, n\})$ and $(c_i, s_i) = \text{lab}(\{n, n_i\})$ for $i \in \{1, 2\}$ (see Fig. 2). We claim that if $c_i \neq c$ then both (c_i, s_i) and (c_i, \bar{s}_i) are in $\mathcal{B}(n)$. Indeed, in such a case condition (i) implies that label (c_i, s_i) does not appear on the path from n to the root of T . By condition (iii), nor does label (c_i, \bar{s}_i) : this would forbid label (c_i, s_i) in the tree below, in particular in T_n . Hence labels (c_i, s_i) and (c_i, \bar{s}_i) do not appear on the path from n to the root of T . By condition (iii), for any edge $\{n', n''\}$ of T such that n' is an ancestor of n and n'' is not an ancestor of n (see Fig. 2), c_i cannot appear in the label $\text{lab}(\{n', n''\})$ since otherwise (c_i, s_i) and (c_i, \bar{s}_i) would be forbidden in the subtree of $T_{n'}$ containing n (which does not contain n''). In particular (c_i, s_i) could not be used as label of $\{n, n_i\}$. This means that colour c_i does not appear on edges incident to the path from n to the root of T . Altogether both (c_i, s_i) and (c_i, \bar{s}_i) are in $\mathcal{B}(n)$ since they could not be forbidden by conditions (i) or (iii).




Figure 2: Illustration of the configuration one obtains when n is not the root, has at least two children n_1 and n_2 and parent p . Node n' is an ancestor of n while n'' is not.

Assume now w.l.o.g. that $i = 1$. If $c_1 = c$ then we claim that $c_2 \neq c$. Indeed by condition (ii), if $c_1 = c_2 = c$ then signs s_1 and s_2 are opposite, so one is the opposite \bar{s} of s , contradicting the fact that label (c, \bar{s}) is in $\mathcal{L}\mathcal{S}(p)$ and has been forbidden in T_n by condition (iii). Therefore (c_2, s_2) and (c_2, \bar{s}_2) are in $\mathcal{B}(n)$ and by condition (iii) are forbidden in T_{n_1} and thus $|\mathcal{B}(n_1)| \leq |\mathcal{B}(n)| - 2$.

If $c_1 \neq c$, then (c, s) is not in $\mathcal{B}(n_1)$ by condition (i) but is in $\mathcal{B}(n)$ and (c_1, \bar{s}_1) is not in $\mathcal{B}(n_1)$ by condition (iii) but is in $\mathcal{B}(n)$, hence $|\mathcal{B}(n_1)| \leq |\mathcal{B}(n)| - 2$. \diamond

We now prove that T has $O(3^k)$ leaves. For a node n of the tree, we see $|\mathcal{B}(n)|$ as the *budget* of the tree T_n and we estimate the number of leaves w.r.t. this budget. We remind that the budget of the root is $2k$. Let $F(b)$ be the maximum number of leaves in any k -labelled branching tree with budget b at its root. Observe that if $b = 1$ then $F(b) = 1$ and for $b \leq b'$, $F(b) \leq F(b')$. Let n be a node of T , then $F(|\mathcal{B}(n)|)$ is the maximal number of leaves of T_n . Observe that if n has exactly one child, i.e. it does not branch, then $F(|\mathcal{B}(n)|) = F(|\mathcal{B}(n_1)|)$ since $\mathcal{B}(n_1) \subseteq \mathcal{B}(n)$. Suppose that n has $t \geq 2$ children n_1, \dots, n_t . If n is the root then, by Claim 1:

$$F(|\mathcal{B}(n)|) \leq F(|\mathcal{B}(n_1)|) + \dots + F(|\mathcal{B}(n_t)|) \leq t \cdot F(|\mathcal{B}(n)| - (t - 1)),$$

else if n is not the root,

$$F(|\mathcal{B}(n)|) \leq t \cdot F(|\mathcal{B}(n)| - \max\{2, t - 1\}).$$

At the root r of the tree, since $\mathcal{B}(r) = \mathcal{CS}$, we have $|\mathcal{B}(r)| = 2k$. We need to prove that $F(2k) = O(3^k)$. Let us recall some standard techniques for the analysis on the growth of functions described by linear equations (or linear inequalities). The reader can refer to the book of Fomin and Kratsch [15, Chapter 2] for detailed explanations. Consider a function C on positive integers. Assume there are positive integers $\beta_1, \beta_2, \dots, \beta_q$ such that

$$C(b) \leq C(b - \beta_1) + C(b - \beta_2) + \dots + C(b - \beta_q),$$

for all values b (or at least for all b larger than a threshold b_0). Then $C(b) = O(\alpha^b)$, where α is the (unique) positive real root of equation

$$x^b - x^{b-\beta_1} - x^{b-\beta_2} - \dots - x^{b-\beta_q} = 0.$$

In [15], $(\beta_1, \beta_2, \dots, \beta_q)$ is called a branching vector, and α is the branching factor of this vector. Now in our case, for function F , we know that for each value b there exists some $t \geq 3$ such that $F(b) \leq t \cdot F(b - (t - 1))$, and also (except at the root, if the root has at most two children), $F(b) \leq 2 \cdot F(b - 2)$ or $F(b) \leq F(b - 1)$. Each of the inequalities leads to a different branching factor: $\alpha_t = t^{-1/t}$ for the first equation, and $\alpha_2 = \sqrt{2}$, $\alpha_1 = 1$ for the latter. Also according to [15], when a function F satisfies one among a family of linear inequalities, the growth of F is $F(b) = O(\alpha^b)$, where α is an upper bound on all branching factors. In our case, observe that the maximum value of $\alpha_1 = 1, \alpha_2 = \sqrt{2}$ and $\alpha_t = t^{-1/t}, t \geq 3$ is attained for $t = 3$ with $\alpha_3 = \sqrt{3}$. Therefore $F(b) = O(3^{b/2})$. Observe that this also holds if the root has one or two children. Indeed for each child of the root, the number of leaves in the corresponding subtree is $O(3^{b/2})$, and since there are at most two such children, the total number of leaves is $O(3^{b/2})$.

Since at the root $b = 2k$, we conclude that our k -labelled branching tree has $O(3^k)$ leaves. \square

We now prove formally the high-level description given before Lemma 5. In a slight abuse of notation, for a coloured path (P, col) we define $\text{colours}(P, \text{col})$ as the set of colours that appear on (P, col) , *i.e.* $\text{colours}(P, \text{col}) = \{\text{col}(e) \mid e \in E(P)\}$. For a set of coloured paths \mathcal{P} , $\text{colours}(\mathcal{P}) = \bigcup_{(P, \text{col}) \in \mathcal{P}} \text{colours}(P, \text{col})$. For a coloured a - b path (P, col) and a vertex x of P , we let $P[x:] = P[x, b]$ and for a set of coloured paths \mathcal{P} that share vertex x we let $\mathcal{P}[x:] = \bigcup_{(P, \text{col}) \in \mathcal{P}} (P[x:], \text{col})$.




Figure 3: Example of the construction in the proof of Lemma 6 for a set of paths \mathcal{P}_n . In this example, all paths share the same subpath $(P_1[a, x_n], \text{col})$, $\mathcal{C}_n = \{\text{red}, \text{blue}, \text{green}\}$ and there are no edges with colour in \mathcal{C}_n in the path $(P_i[w_{P_i}], \text{col}_i)$. The sets $\mathcal{P}(\text{red}, -)$, $\mathcal{P}(\text{green}, +)$, $\mathcal{P}(\text{green}, -)$ are empty.

Lemma 6. *For any vertex a of $V(G)$ and any integer D , there are $O(3^k)$ vertices at distance exactly D from a .*

Proof. Let $\{b_1, \dots, b_\ell\}$ be the set of vertices at distance D from a in G and \mathcal{P} denote a set $\{(P_1, \text{col}_1), \dots, (P_\ell, \text{col}_\ell)\}$ of well-coloured shortest a - b_i paths. We aim to construct a k -labelled branching tree (T, lab) such that each node n of T is associated with a set of paths \mathcal{P}_n . Moreover for each vertex b_i there is a leaf l of T such that \mathcal{P}_l contains a well-coloured shortest a - b_i path and for each leaf l , \mathcal{P}_l contains exactly one path.

We will construct (T, lab) recursively starting from the root r of T . Initially $\mathcal{P}_r = \mathcal{P}$. For every node n of T , \mathcal{P}_n will be a set of well-coloured shortest paths from a to a subset of vertices of $\{b_1, \dots, b_\ell\}$. Let n be an already computed node of T . If $|\mathcal{P}_n| = 1$ we do nothing: n is a leaf of our tree and no recursive step is performed at n . If $|\mathcal{P}_n| > 1$, we will grow the tree from n . We construct the sets of paths that will be associated with the children of n as follows:

1. Let x_n be the vertex at maximum distance from a such that for every pair of coloured paths $(P, \text{col}), (P', \text{col}') \in \mathcal{P}_n$, $(P[a, x_n], \text{col}) = (P'[a, x_n], \text{col}')$. This vertex is guaranteed to exist, notice that x_n can be the vertex a .
2. Let $\mathcal{C}_n = \{\text{col}(x_n, y_P) \mid (P, \text{col}) \in \mathcal{P}_n\}$ where $\{x_n, y_P\}$ denotes the first edge of $P[x_n:]$.
3. For each $(P, \text{col}) \in \mathcal{P}_n$, let $\{z_P, w_P\}$ be the edge that is farthest from x_n on $P[x_n:]$ whose colour is in \mathcal{C}_n , and let $c_P = \text{col}(\{z_P, w_P\})$. Construct the path

$$(P^*, \text{col}^*) = (P[a, x_n], \text{col}) \odot (\mu_{c_P}[x_n, w_P], \text{monochr}_{c_P}) \odot (P[w_P:], \text{col})$$

4. For each $(c, s) \in \mathcal{CS}_n = (\mathcal{C}_n \times \{+, -\})$ define the set $\mathcal{P}_{(c,s)}$ as $\{(P^*, \text{col}^*) \mid (P, \text{col}) \in \mathcal{P}_n, (c_P, s_P) = (c, s)\}$, where s_P is the sign of $\mu_{c_P}[x_n, w_P]$.

This construction is illustrated [Fig. 3](#). For each non-empty set $\mathcal{P}_{(c,s)}$, $(c, s) \in \mathcal{CS}_n$, we then create a child n' of n associated with $\mathcal{P}_{(c,s)}$, where the edge $\{n, n'\}$ is labelled (c, s) . Then, we recursively apply the process to each created node.

Claim 2. *For any node n of T , \mathcal{P}_n is a set of well-coloured shortest paths.*

Proof. This trivially holds for \mathcal{P}_r where r is the root of T . We show that for a node n of T , if $(P, \text{col}) \in \mathcal{P}_n$ is a well-coloured shortest a - b_i path, then the path $(P^*, \text{col}^*) = (P[a, x_n], \text{col}) \odot (\mu_{c_P}[x_n, w_P], \text{monochr}_c) \odot (P[w_P:], \text{col}_i)$ constructed in [Item 3](#) is a well-coloured shortest a - b_i path. It is clear from the construction that P' is an a - b_i path, moreover it is also a shortest path since $\mu_{c_P}[x_n, w_P]$ is a shortest x_n - w_P path. Since (P, col) is well-coloured, so are $(P[a, x_n], \text{col})$ and $(P[w_P:], \text{col})$. Since $\{z_P, w_P\}$ is the last edge of (P, col) coloured c_P , this colour does not appear in $(P[w_P:], \text{col})$. Additionally, if $c_P \in \text{colours}(P[a, x_n])$, it has to be the last colour to appear, otherwise (P, col) would not be well-coloured. It follows that the path (P^*, col^*) is well-coloured. Thus, for each $(c, s) \in \mathcal{CS}_n$, the set $\mathcal{P}_{(c,s)}$ associated to a child n' of n is a set of well-coloured shortest paths. Hence, by induction, for any node n of T , \mathcal{P}_n is a set of well-coloured-shortest paths. \diamond

We now show that the construction terminates. In particular, we show that for any non-leaf node n and any of its non-leaf children n_i , we have $\text{dist}(a, x_n) < \text{dist}(a, x_{n_i})$. Since for any node n of T , the paths of sets \mathcal{P}_n are shortest paths of length D , this implies that the construction terminates. By construction (see [Item 3](#)), for $(P', \text{col}') \in \mathcal{P}_{n_i}$, there is a path $(P, \text{col}) \in \mathcal{P}_n$ such that $(P', \text{col}') = (P^*, \text{col}^*)$, implying that $(P[a, x_n], \text{col}) = (P'[a, x_n], \text{col}')$. Moreover, let $\{x_n, y\}$ be the first edge of $(P'[x_n:], \text{col}')$. By definition of $\mathcal{P}_{n_i} = \mathcal{P}_{(c_P, s_P)}$ in [Item 4](#), all paths in \mathcal{P}_{n_i} share this edge and hence share the subpath $(P'[a, y], \text{col}')$. Hence, $\text{dist}(a, x_n) < \text{dist}(a, y) \leq \text{dist}(a, x_{n_i})$ since the paths of \mathcal{P}_n and \mathcal{P}_{n_i} are shortest paths by [Claim 2](#). It is possible to prove that the height of T is at most k , but it is not necessary.

The following observation is verified if n' is a child of n by the previous arguments, hence by induction it is also verified for any node of T_n .

Observation 1. *Let n be a node of T and $n' \neq n$ a node of T_n . Then, we have $\text{dist}(a, x_n) < \text{dist}(a, x_{n'})$, and for $(P, \text{col}) \in \mathcal{P}_n$ and $(P', \text{col}') \in \mathcal{P}_{n'}$, $(P[a, x_n], \text{col}) = (P'[a, x_n], \text{col}')$ holds.*

Observation 2. Let $\{n, n'\}$ be an edge of T and $(P, \text{col}) \in \mathcal{P}_{n'}$. Then, the first letter of $\text{ColoursSignsW}(P[x_n, :], \text{col})$ is $\text{lab}(\{n, n'\})$. If n' is a non leaf node, there might be more than one letter in $\text{ColoursSignsW}(P[x_n, x_{n'}], \text{col})$.

Claim 3. (T, lab) is a k -labelled branching tree.

Proof. Let n be a node of T and n_1, \dots, n_t its children. **Item (ii)** of **Definition 1** is verified, since for each $(c, s) \in \mathcal{CS}_n$, at most one edge $\{n, n_i\}$ is labelled (c, s) . We now prove **Item (iii)**, i.e. T_{n_i} does not contain any edge with labels in $\mathcal{LS}(n) \setminus \{\text{lab}(\{n, n_i\})\}$. Recall that $\mathcal{LS}(n) = \{(c, s), (c, \bar{s}) \mid (c, s) \in \mathcal{L}(n)\}$, where $\mathcal{L}(n) = \{\text{lab}(\{n, n_1\}), \dots, \text{lab}(\{n, n_t\})\}$ and \bar{s} is the opposite of s . Observe that $\mathcal{LS}(n) \subseteq \mathcal{CS}_n$ (there might be some empty set $\mathcal{P}_{(c,s)}$), and that \mathcal{CS}_n is defined from the set of colours \mathcal{C}_n that appear on the first edge after x_n on paths of \mathcal{P}_n .

Fix n_i a child of n , and let $(c_i, s_i) = \text{lab}(\{n, n_i\})$. The case when n_i is a leaf is trivial, since T_{n_i} has no edges. Assume now that n_i is not a leaf. Observe that for any $(P, \text{col}) \in \mathcal{P}_n$ and by choice of w_P , the only colour from \mathcal{C}_n used in $(P^*[x_n:], \text{col}^*)$ is c_P . Formally, we have $\text{colours}(P^*[x_n:], \text{col}^*) \subseteq \text{colours}(P[x_n:], \text{col}) \setminus (\mathcal{C}_n \setminus \{c_P\})$, thus $\text{colours}(\mathcal{P}_{n_i}[x_n:], \text{col}^*) \subseteq \text{colours}(\mathcal{P}_n[x_n:], \text{col}) \setminus (\mathcal{C}_n \setminus \{c_i\})$ for $1 \leq i \leq t$. By induction, this implies that for any node n' of T_{n_i} , $\text{colours}(\mathcal{P}_{n'}[x_n:], \text{col}^*) \subseteq (\text{colours}(\mathcal{P}_n[x_n:], \text{col}) \setminus (\mathcal{C}_n \setminus \{c_i\}))$. By **Observation 2**, the label of an edge $\{n', n''\}$ of T_{n_i} depends on the colours that appear after $x_{n'}$ in paths of $\mathcal{P}_{n''}$, hence no edges of T_{n_i} has a label in $(\mathcal{C}_n \setminus \{c_i\}) \times \{+, -\}$.

We now prove that (c_i, \bar{s}_i) is not used as label for edges of T_{n_i} . Let $\{n', n''\}$ be an edge of T_{n_i} and assume by contradiction that $\text{lab}(\{n', n''\}) = (c_i, \bar{s}_i)$. Moreover, let $(P, \text{col}) \in \mathcal{P}_{n_i}$ and $(P', \text{col}') \in \mathcal{P}_{n''}$. By **Observation 1**, $(P[x_n, x_{n_i}], \text{col}) = (P'[x_n, x_{n_i}], \text{col}')$. By **Observation 2**, the first letter of $\text{ColoursSignsW}(P[x_n:], \text{col})$ is (c_i, s_i) and the first letter of $\text{ColoursSignsW}(P'[x_n:], \text{col}')$ is (c_i, \bar{s}_i) , which is a contradiction since the path (P', col') is well-coloured (**Claim 2**). Hence, there are no edges of T_{n_i} with labels in $\mathcal{CS}_n \setminus \{(c_i, s_i)\}$, proving **Item (iii)**.

It remains to prove **Item (i)**, i.e., in every path from the root of T to one of its leaves, the edges with the same label form a connected subpath. Let $r = p_1, p_2, \dots, p_t = n$ be the path from the root r of T to a non-leaf node n . If there exists a child n' of n such that $\text{lab}(\{n, n'\}) = \text{lab}(\{p_{i-1}, p_i\}) = (c, s), i \in \{2, \dots, t\}$, then we have to show that for any $i < j \leq t$, $\text{lab}(\{p_{j-1}, p_j\}) = (c, s)$. Suppose that there are such n' and i . For $(P, \text{col}) \in \mathcal{P}_{p_i}$ and $(P', \text{col}') \in \mathcal{P}_{n'}$, by **Observation 1** we have $(P[x_{p_{i-1}}, x_{p_i}], \text{col}) = (P'[x_{p_{i-1}}, x_{p_i}], \text{col}')$. By **Observation 2**, the first edge of these subpaths is coloured c , and so is the first edge of $(P'[x_n:], \text{col}')$. Since (P', col') is well-coloured, the whole subpath $(P'[x_{p_{i-1}}, x_n], \text{col}')$ is entirely coloured with c . For any $i < j \leq t$, $(P''[x_{p_{j-1}}, x_{p_j}], \text{col}'') = (P'[x_{p_{j-1}}, x_{p_j}], \text{col}')$, with $(P'', \text{col}'') \in \mathcal{P}_{p_j}$, and this implies that the first colour of $(P''[x_{p_{j-1}}, x_{p_j}], \text{col}'')$ is c . Thus $\text{lab}(\{p_{j-1}, p_j\}) = (c, s)$ and hence **Item (i)** is verified. It follows that (T, col) is a k -labelled branching tree, which concludes the proof of **Claim 3**. \diamond

For a non-leaf node n of T , we can observe that for any a - b_i path in \mathcal{P}_n , $b_i \in \{b_1, \dots, b_\ell\}$, there is a child n' such that $\mathcal{P}_{n'}$ contains an a - b_i path. This implies that for any b_i there is a leaf l of T such that \mathcal{P}_l contains a well-coloured shortest a - b_i path. Since T is a k -labelled branching tree, by **Lemma 5**, it has $O(3^k)$ leaves and for each leaf l of T , $|\mathcal{P}_l| = 1$ (otherwise our construction would have created a child for node l). It follows that there are $O(3^k)$ vertices at distance D from a . \square

In order to complete the proof of **Theorem 1** and show that $\text{pw}(G) = O(3^k)$, we simply apply **Lemma 5** with $K = O(3^k)$.

4 Vertex-covering with k shortest paths

In this section, $G = (V, E)$ denotes a graph whose *vertices* can be covered by k shortest paths μ_1, \dots, μ_k . As before we endow each base path μ_c with a direction, but now colours are assigned to vertices. We can easily adapt the notions of good colourings of the previous section to these vertex-colourings. Again, for any pair of vertices a and b , there is a well-coloured shortest path joining them (**Lemma 7**), which defines a colours-signs word. But we shall see that now (unlike

in the simpler case of edge-coverings), we may have two distinct vertices b and c at the same distance D from a , and well-coloured shortest a - b and a - c paths with the same colours-signs word. More efforts will be needed to recover a (slightly larger) upper bound on the number of vertices at distance D from a (Lemma 8).

Good colourings For each vertex v of G , let $\text{colours}(v)$ denote the set of indices (colours) $c \in \{1 \dots, k\}$ such that v is a vertex of μ_c . Let P be an a - b path of G , from vertex a to vertex b . A *colouring* of P is a function $\text{col}:V(P) \rightarrow \{1, \dots, k\}$ assigning to each vertex v of P one of its colours $\text{col}(v) \in \text{colours}(v)$. A coloured path is a pair (P, col) . The colouring col of P is said to be *good* if, for any colour c , the subgraph induced by the set of vertices using this colour c forms a connected subpath $P[x, y]$ of P (which implies that $P[x, y] = \mu_c[x, y]$). A coloured path (P, col) where col is a good colouring is called *well-coloured*.

Operators \oplus and \odot naturally extend to (vertex) coloured paths, with the precaution that $(\nu, \text{col}) \odot (\eta, \text{col}')$ is defined only when their common vertex x , the last of ν and first of η , satisfies $\text{col}(x) = \text{col}'(x)$. Given a coloured path (P, col) , we again denote by $(P[x, y], \text{col})$ its restriction to a subpath $P[x, y]$ of P . For each colour $1 \leq c \leq k$, let now $(P, \text{monochr}_c)$ denote the monochromatic colouring of $V(P)$ with colour c . With these notations, any well-coloured a - b path (P, col) with colours (c_1, \dots, c_l) is of the form

$$(\mu_{c_1}[a_1, b_1], \text{monochr}_{c_1}) \oplus (\mu_{c_2}[a_2, b_2], \text{monochr}_{c_2}) \oplus \dots \oplus (\mu_{c_l}[a_l, b_l], \text{monochr}_{c_l})$$

for some vertices $a = a_1, b_1, a_2, b_2, \dots, a_l, b_l = b$. Like in the previous section, we have:

Lemma 7. *For any pair of vertices a and b of G , there exists a well-coloured shortest a - b path.*

Proof. Among all shortest a - b paths, choose one that admits a colouring with a minimum number of monochromatic subpaths. Let (P, col) be such a coloured path. Assume for a contradiction that the colouring col is not good. Then there exist three vertices x, y and z , appearing in this order in P such that $\text{col}(x) = \text{col}(z) \neq \text{col}(y)$. Therefore x and z are on the same base path μ_c . Let P' be the path obtained from P by replacing $P[x, z]$ by $\mu_c[x, z]$. Notice that P' is no longer than P , since $\mu_c[x, z]$ is a shortest x - z path of graph G . Moreover, in P' we can colour all vertices of $P'[x, z]$ with colour c , and keep all other colours unchanged. Hence P' has strictly fewer monochromatic subpaths than P — a contradiction. \square

Colours-signs word Let (P, col) be a well-coloured a - b path; we recall that we see it as being directed from a to b . As in Section 3, each monochromatic subpath P' of P , say of colour c , induces a sign (+ or -) depending on its direction w.r.t. μ_c , if P' has at least two vertices. If P' has a unique vertex, we assign to it sign +. Therefore, we can again define the *colours-signs word* $\text{ColoursSignsW}(P, \text{col}) = ((c_1, s_1), (c_2, s_2), \dots, (c_l, s_l))$ on the alphabet $\{1, \dots, k\} \times \{+, -\}$, corresponding to the colours and signs of the monochromatic subpaths of P according to the ordering in which these subpaths appear from a to b .

In the case of edge-covering, we had the elegant statement of Lemma 4, by which, given a vertex a , a colours-signs word ω and a distance D , there is a unique vertex b (if any exists) at distance D such that the well-coloured shortest a - b path corresponds to this word.




Figure 4: Two well-coloured paths (P, col) and (P', col') with same colours-signs word $\omega = ((red, -), (blue, +))$, same length 5 and same start vertex a but different end-vertices (b and c).

Unfortunately, this does not extend to vertex-covering: Fig. 4 presents two distinct vertices b and c located at the same distance D from vertex a , together with a well-coloured shortest a - b path (P, col) and a well-coloured shortest a - c path (P', col') . These coloured paths starting from a have

the same colours-signs word and the same length, but this does not imply that their endpoints are equal. However, we can prove a single-exponential bound for this case as well with similar (but more involved) arguments as the ones in [Section 3.2](#).

Again, adapting notations to vertex-coloured paths, for a coloured path (P, col) we define $\text{colours}(P, \text{col}) = \{\text{col}(x) \mid x \in V(P)\}$, the set of colours that appear on (P, col) . For a set of coloured paths \mathcal{P} , $\text{colours}(\mathcal{P}) = \bigcup_{(P, \text{col}) \in \mathcal{P}} \text{colours}(P, \text{col})$. For a coloured a - b path (P, col) and a vertex x of P , we let $P[x:] = P[x, b]$ and for a set of coloured paths \mathcal{P} that shares the vertex x we let $\mathcal{P}[x:] = \bigcup_{(P, \text{col}) \in \mathcal{P}} (P[x:], \text{col})$.

Lemma 8. *For any vertex a of G and any integer D , there are $O(k \cdot 3^k)$ vertices at distance exactly D from a .*

Proof. Let $\{b_1, \dots, b_\ell\}$ be the set of vertices at distance D from a in G and \mathcal{P} denote a set $\{(P_1, \text{col}_1), \dots, (P_\ell, \text{col}_\ell)\}$ of well-coloured shortest a - b_i paths. We aim to construct a k -labelled branching tree (T, lab) such that each node n of T is associated with a set of paths \mathcal{P}_n and for each vertex b_i there is a leaf l of T such that \mathcal{P}_l contains a well-coloured a - b_i path. However, unlike in the proof of [Lemma 6](#) where any leaf node was associated to exactly one path, the set \mathcal{P}_l corresponding to any leaf node l can contain up to $2k + 1$ paths.

We will construct recursively (T, lab) starting from the root r of T . Initially $\mathcal{P}_r = \mathcal{P}$. For every node n of T , \mathcal{P}_n will be a set of well-coloured paths from a to a subset of vertices of $\{b_1, \dots, b_\ell\}$. These paths may not be shortest paths, but will be of length at most $D + 2d$ where d is the depth of the node n in T (the depth of the root being 0). Let n be an already computed node of T . If there is a path in \mathcal{P}_n such that all the others paths of \mathcal{P}_n are coloured subpaths of it, do nothing: n is a leaf of our tree and no recursive step is performed at n . If there is no such path, we will grow the tree from n . We now construct the sets of paths that will be associated with the children of n .

We first consider the case where n is the root r of T . Note that there might exist $(P, \text{col}), (P', \text{col}') \in \mathcal{P}_n$ such that $\text{col}(a) \neq \text{col}'(a)$. In any case:

1. Let $\mathcal{C}_n = \{\text{col}(a) \mid (P, \text{col}) \in \mathcal{P}_n\}$.
2. For each $(P, \text{col}) \in \mathcal{P}_n$, let w_P be the last vertex of P such that $c_P = \text{col}(w_P) \in \mathcal{C}_n$. Construct the path $(P^*, \text{col}^*) = (\mu_{c_P}[a, w_P], \text{monochr}_{c_P}) \odot (P[w_P:], \text{col})$.
3. For each $(c, s) \in \mathcal{CS}_n = (\mathcal{C}_n \times \{+, -\})$ define the set $\mathcal{P}_{(c, s)}$ as $\{(P^*, \text{col}^*) \mid (P, \text{col}) \in \mathcal{P}_n, (c_P, s_P) = (c, s)\}$, where s_P is the sign of $\mu_{c_P}[a, w_P]$.

If $n \neq r$, let (P_0, col_0) be a longest path of \mathcal{P}_n and x_n be the last vertex of P_0 such that for any path $(P, \text{col}) \in \mathcal{P}_n$, either $(P_0[a, x_n], \text{col}_0) = (P[a, x_n], \text{col})$ or (P, col) is a coloured subpath of $(P_0[a, x_n], \text{col}_0)$. This vertex is guaranteed to exist, and notice that x_n can be the vertex a . We proceed as follows:

4. Let \mathcal{P}_n° be the set of paths of \mathcal{P}_n that are coloured subpaths of $(P_0[a, x_n], \text{col}_0)$ and $\hat{\mathcal{P}}_n = \mathcal{P}_n \setminus \mathcal{P}_n^\circ$.
5. Let $\mathcal{C}_n = \{\text{col}(z_P) \mid (P, \text{col}) \in \hat{\mathcal{P}}_n\}$ where z_P denotes the vertex appearing right after x_n on path P .
6. For $(P, \text{col}) \in \hat{\mathcal{P}}_n$, let w_P be the last vertex of P such that $c_P = \text{col}(w_P) \in \mathcal{C}_n$. Let y_P be the second vertex of $\mu_{c_P}[x_n, w_P]$ if $x_n \in V(\mu_{c_P})$; otherwise y_P is defined as the first vertex of μ_{c_P} adjacent to x_n . We define:

$$(P^*, \text{col}^*) = (P[a, x_n], \text{col}) \oplus (\mu_{c_P}[y_P, w_P], \text{monochr}_{c_P}) \odot (P[w_P:], \text{col})$$

7. For each $(c, s) \in \mathcal{CS}_n = (\mathcal{C}_n \times \{+, -\})$ define the set $\mathcal{P}_{(c,s)}$ as $\{(P^*, \text{col}^*) \mid (P, \text{col}) \in \hat{\mathcal{P}}_n, (c_P, s_P) = (c, s)\}$. Here s_P is the sign of $\mu_{c_P}[y_P, w_P]$, except when $y_P = w_P$ and $\text{col}^*(x_n) = \text{col}^*(y_P)$, in which case s_P is the sign of $\mu_{c_P}[x_n, y_P]$.
8. Add \mathcal{P}_n° to an arbitrary non-empty set $\mathcal{P}_{(c,s)}$.

This construction is illustrated in Fig. 5. For each non-empty set $\mathcal{P}_{(c,s)}$, $(c, s) \in \mathcal{CS}_n$ we then create a child n' of n associated with $\mathcal{P}_{(c,s)}$ where the edge $\{n, n'\}$ labelled (c, s) . Then, we recursively apply the process to each created node.




Figure 5: Example of the construction in proof of Lemma 8 for a set of paths \mathcal{P}_n . In this example, all paths share the same subpath $(P_1[a, x_n], \text{col})$ except for P_5 that is subpath of the latter. Moreover these paths may have different length. We have $\mathcal{C}_n = \{\text{red}, \text{blue}, \text{green}\}$ and there are no vertices with colour in \mathcal{C}_n in the path $(P_i[w_{P_i}], \text{col}_i)$ except for w_{P_i} . The sets $\mathcal{P}_{(\text{red}, -)}$, $\mathcal{P}_{(\text{green}, +)}$, $\mathcal{P}_{(\text{green}, -)}$ are empty. The vertices y_{P_1} and $y_{P_3} = y_{P_4}$ are the same if $x_n \notin V(\mu_{\text{blue}})$ and distinct else. The path P_2^* has the same length as P_1 , the other modified paths might not have the same length than their counterpart, even P_4^* as z_{P_4} might be different from y_{P_4} . The path P_5 was arbitrarily added to $\mathcal{P}_{(\text{blue}, +)}$.

Claim 4. For any node n of depth d of T , \mathcal{P}_n is a set of well-coloured paths of length at most $D + 2d$.

Proof. This trivially holds for \mathcal{P}_r where r is the root of T . We show that for a node n of T , if $(P, \text{col}) \in \mathcal{P}_n$ is a well-coloured a - b path, then the path (P^*, col^*) constructed in Item 2 or Item 6 is a well-coloured a - b path such that $|P^*| \leq |P| + 2$.

In both cases it is clear from the construction that P^* is an a - b path. In the case of Item 2 where $n = r$, since $(P[w_P:], \text{col})$ is well-coloured and $\text{col}(w_P) = c_P$ it follows that (P^*, col^*) is well-coloured. Moreover, $(\mu_{c_P}[a, w_P], \text{monochr}_{c_P})$ is a shortest a - w_P path, hence $|P^*| = |P|$.

In the case of Item 6, since (P, col) is well-coloured so are $(P[a, x_n], \text{col})$ and $(P[w_P:], \text{col})$. The vertex w_P is coloured c_P and if $c_P \in \text{colours}(P[a, x_n])$ it has to be the last colour to appear, otherwise (P, col) would not be well-coloured. It follows that the path (P^*, col^*) is well-coloured.

We now show that $|P^*| \leq |P| + 2$. This is verified if $x_n \in V(\mu_{c_P})$ since y_P is the second vertex of the shortest x_n - w_P path $\mu_{c_P}[x_n, w_P]$ and hence $P^* = P[a, x_n] \odot \mu_{c_P}[x_n, w_P] \odot P[w_P:]$ and $|P^*| \leq |P|$. Otherwise, in the case when $x_n \notin V(\mu_{c_P})$, y_P is the first vertex of μ_{c_P} adjacent to

x_n . The path $\mu_{c_P}[y_P, w_P]$ is a shortest y_P - w_P path, hence $|\mu_{c_P}[y_P, w_P]| \leq |(y_P) \oplus P[x_n, w_P]| \leq 1 + |P[x_n, w_P]|$. This implies the following:

$$\begin{aligned} |P^*| &= |P[a, x_n] \oplus \mu_{c_P}[y_P, w_P] \odot P[w_P:]| \\ &= |P[a, x_n]| + 1 + |\mu_{c_P}[y_P, w_P]| + |P[w_P:]| \\ &\leq |P[a, x_n]| + 2 + |P[x_n, w_P]| + |P[w_P:]| = |P| + 2 \end{aligned}$$

It remains that for each $(c, s) \in \mathcal{CS}_n$, the set $\mathcal{P}_{(c,s)}$ associated to a child n' of n is a set of well-coloured paths of length at most $D' + 2$, where D' is the maximum length of paths in \mathcal{P}_n . Hence by induction, for any node n of depth d of T , \mathcal{P}_n is a set of well-coloured paths of length at most $D + 2d$. \diamond

Let $n \neq r$ be a node of T . Observe that for $(c, s) \in \mathcal{CS}_n$, all paths of $\mathcal{P}_{(c,s)}$ share the same successor of x_n , the vertex y_P defined in [Item 6](#). Thus for every node $n \neq r$ of T with parent $p \neq r$, we can define a vertex y_n , the successor of x_p in paths of $\hat{\mathcal{P}}_n$, see [Fig. 6](#). If $n = r$ or $p = r$ we let $y_n = a$.



Figure 6: Structure of a path $(P, \text{col}) \in \hat{\mathcal{P}}_n$ with p the parent of n . Note that $y_n = x_n$ is possible.

Let now $n \neq r$ be a node of T and n' be one of its children. For $(P', \text{col}') \in \hat{\mathcal{P}}_{n'}$ there is $(P, \text{col}) \in \hat{\mathcal{P}}_n$ such that (P', col') corresponds to the coloured path (P^*, col^*) constructed from (P, col) at node n , see [Item 6](#). Therefore $(P[a, x_n], \text{col}) = (P'[a, x_n], \text{col}')$. Moreover the vertex $y_{n'}$ is the successor of x_n shared among all the paths in $\hat{\mathcal{P}}_{n'}$. Hence, if n' is not a leaf, the vertex $x_{n'}$ appears strictly after x_n on paths of $\hat{\mathcal{P}}_{n'}$ since $x_{n'}$ is either $y_{n'}$ or comes after it. Therefore, the following observation is verified by induction.

Observation 3. *Let $n \neq r$ be a node of T , $n' \neq n$ a node of T_n , $(P, \text{col}) \in \hat{\mathcal{P}}_n$ and $(P', \text{col}') \in \hat{\mathcal{P}}_{n'}$. Then $(P[a, x_n], \text{col}) = (P'[a, x_n], \text{col}')$ and if n' is not a leaf, x_n appears strictly before $x_{n'}$ on the path P' .*

The following observation is a direct consequence of our construction.

Observation 4. *Let $\{n, n'\}$ be an edge of T and $(P, \text{col}) \in \hat{\mathcal{P}}_{n'}$. Then $\text{lab}(\{n, n'\})$ is a letter of $\text{ColoursSignsW}(P[a, x_n], \text{col})$. Moreover, the colour of $\text{lab}(\{n, n'\})$ is the colour of the first letter of $\text{ColoursSignsW}(P[y_{n'}:], \text{col})$ (the signs can be different, see the special case for the definition of s_P in [Item 7](#)).*

The following claim implies that the construction terminates.

Claim 5. *The height of T is at most k .*

Proof. Let $n \neq r$ be a node of T and $(P, \text{col}) \in \hat{\mathcal{P}}_n$. We show that $\text{colours}(P^*[y_P:]) \subsetneq \text{colours}(P[y_n:])$. From the choice of w_P in [Item 6](#), $\text{colours}(P^*[y_P:]) \subseteq \text{colours}(P[y_n:]) \setminus (\mathcal{C}_n \setminus \{c_P\})$. If $|\mathcal{C}_n| \geq 2$ it follows that $\text{colours}(P^*[y_P:]) \subsetneq \text{colours}(P[y_n:])$. If $|\mathcal{C}_n| = 1$, then $c = \text{col}(y_n) \notin \mathcal{C}_n$, indeed if c was the only colour in \mathcal{C}_n , since paths in $\hat{\mathcal{P}}_n$ are well-coloured and $y_n \neq y_P$, they all share the subpath $(\mu_c[y_n, y_P], \text{monochr}_c)$, a contradiction with the choice of x_n . Hence $\text{colours}(P^*[y_P:]) \subseteq \text{colours}(P[y_n:]) \setminus \{c\}$. It follows that for any child n' of n , $\text{colours}(\hat{\mathcal{P}}_{n'}[y_{n'}:]) \subsetneq \text{colours}(\hat{\mathcal{P}}_n[y_n:])$. Hence for a node $n \neq r$ of T , $|\text{colours}(\hat{\mathcal{P}}_n[y_n:])| \geq 1$, $|\text{colours}(\hat{\mathcal{P}}_{n'}[y_{n'}:])| < |\text{colours}(\hat{\mathcal{P}}_n[y_n:])|$ for a child n' of n and $|\text{colours}(\mathcal{P}_r)| \leq k$. It follows that the height of T is at most k . \diamond

Claim 6. *(T, lab) is a k -labelled branching tree.*

Proof. Let n be a node of T and n_1, \dots, n_t its children. **Item (ii)** of **Definition 1** is verified since for each $(c, s) \in \mathcal{CS}_n$ at most one edge $\{n, n_i\}$ is labelled (c, s) .

We now prove **Item (iii)**, i.e. T_{n_i} does not contain any edge with labels in $\mathcal{LS}(n) \setminus \{\text{lab}(\{n, n_i\})\}$. Recall that $\mathcal{LS}(n) = \{(c, s), (c, \bar{s}) \mid (c, s) \in \mathcal{L}(n)\}$, where $\mathcal{L}(n) = \{\text{lab}(\{n, n_1\}), \dots, \text{lab}(\{n, n_t\})\}$ and \bar{s} is the opposite of s . Observe that $\mathcal{LS}(n) \subseteq \mathcal{CS}_n$ (there might be some empty set $\mathcal{P}_{(c,s)}$), and that \mathcal{CS}_n is defined by the set of colours \mathcal{C}_n that appear on the first vertices after x_n on paths of $\hat{\mathcal{P}}_n$.

Fix n_i a child of n and let $(c_i, s_i) = \text{lab}(\{n, n_i\})$. The case when n_i is a leaf is trivial, since T_{n_i} has no edges, so let us assume that n_i is not a leaf. For any $(P, \text{col}) \in \hat{\mathcal{P}}_n$ by choice of w_P , $\text{colours}(P^*[y_P:], \text{col}^*) \subseteq (\text{colours}(P[y_n:], \text{col}) \setminus (\mathcal{C}_n \setminus \{c_P\}))$ (replace y_P by a if n is the root). Thus $\text{colours}(\hat{\mathcal{P}}_{n_i}[y_{n_i}:], \text{col}) \subseteq (\text{colours}(\hat{\mathcal{P}}_n[y_n:], \text{col}) \setminus (\mathcal{C}_n \setminus \{c_i\}))$. By induction, this implies that for any node n' of T_{n_i} , $\text{colours}(\hat{\mathcal{P}}_{n'}[y_{n'}:], \text{col}) \subseteq (\text{colours}(\hat{\mathcal{P}}_n[y_n:], \text{col}) \setminus (\mathcal{C}_n \setminus \{c_i\}))$. By **Observation 4**, the label of an edge $\{n', n''\}$ of T_{n_i} contains the colour of $y_{n''}$ in paths of $\hat{\mathcal{P}}_{n''}$, hence no edges of T_{n_i} have a label in $(\mathcal{C}_n \setminus \{c_i\}) \times \{+, -\}$. We now prove that (c_i, \bar{s}_i) is not used as label for edges of T_{n_i} . Let $\{n', n''\}$ be an edge of T_{n_i} and assume that $\text{lab}(\{n', n''\}) = (c_i, \bar{s}_i)$. Let $(P, \text{col}) \in \hat{\mathcal{P}}_{n_i}$ and $(P', \text{col}') \in \hat{\mathcal{P}}_{n''}$. By **Observation 3**, $(P[a, x_{n_i}], \text{col}) = (P'[a, x_{n_i}], \text{col}')$, hence by **Observation 4** $\text{lab}(\{n, n_i\}) = (c_i, s_i)$ is a letter of $\text{ColoursSignsW}(P'[a, x_{n_i}], \text{col}')$ and (c_i, \bar{s}_i) is a letter of $\text{ColoursSignsW}(P', \text{col}')$. This is a contradiction since the path (P', col') is well-coloured (**Claim 4**). Hence there are no edges of T_{n_i} with labels in $\mathcal{CS}_n \setminus \{(c_i, s_i)\}$, proving **Item (iii)**.

It remains to prove **Item (i)**, i.e., in every path from the root of T to one of its leaves, the edges with the same label form a connected subpath. Let $r = p_1, p_2, \dots, p_t = n$ be the path from the root r of T to a non-leaf node n . If there exists a child n' of n such that $\text{lab}(\{n, n'\}) = \text{lab}(\{p_{i-1}, p_i\}) = (c, s), i \in \{2, \dots, t\}$, then we have to show that for any $i < j \leq t$, $\text{lab}(\{p_{j-1}, p_j\}) = (c, s)$. Suppose that there exist such n' and i . For $(P, \text{col}) \in \hat{\mathcal{P}}_{p_i}$ and $(P', \text{col}') \in \hat{\mathcal{P}}_{n'}$, by **Observation 3** $(P[a, x_{p_i}], \text{col}) = (P'[a, x_{p_i}], \text{col}')$. By **Observation 4**, the vertex y_{p_i} (that appears before x_{p_i}) is coloured c in both of these subpaths, and so is $y_{n'}$ in (P', col') . Since (P', col') is well-coloured, the subpath $(P'[y_{p_i}, y_{n'}], \text{col}')$ is entirely coloured with c . For any $i < j \leq t$, $(P''[a, x_{p_j}], \text{col}'') = (P'[a, x_{p_j}], \text{col}')$, with $(P'', \text{col}'') \in \hat{\mathcal{P}}_{p_j}$. This implies that the first colour of $(P''[y_{p_j}:], \text{col}'')$ is c . Since there is no edge of T_{n_i} labelled (c, \bar{s}) , it follows that $\text{lab}(\{p_{j-1}, p_j\}) = (c, s)$ and hence **Item (i)** is verified. It remains that (T, col) is a k -labelled branching tree, which concludes the proof of **Claim 3**. \diamond

For a non-leaf node n of T , we can observe that for any a - b_i path in \mathcal{P}_n , $b_i \in \{b_1, \dots, b_\ell\}$, there is a child n' such that $\mathcal{P}_{n'}$ contains a a - b_i path (notice that it may be added via the set \mathcal{P}_n°). This implies that for any b_i there is a leaf l of T such that \mathcal{P}_l contains a well-coloured a - b_i path. For a leaf l of T , by construction, \mathcal{P}_l contains a path (P, col) including any other path of \mathcal{P}_l . Moreover the length of P is at most $D + 2k$ by **Claims 4** and **5**. This implies that $|\mathcal{P}_l| \leq 2k + 1$, because \mathcal{P}_l only contains subpaths of P , of length between D and $D + 2k$. Since T is a k -labelled branching tree, by **Lemma 5**, it has $O(3^k)$ leaves, hence there are $O(k \cdot 3^k)$ vertices at distance D from a . \square

In order to complete the proof of **Theorem 1** and show that $\text{pw}(G) = O(k \cdot 3^k)$, we simply apply **Lemma 5** with $K = O(k \cdot 3^k)$.

5 Algorithmic consequences

Problem **STRONG GEODETIC SET WITH TERMINALS** is known to be NP-complete by [9]. By a simple reduction, so is **ISOMETRIC PATH COVER WITH TERMINALS**.

Proposition 1. **ISOMETRIC PATH COVER WITH TERMINALS** is NP-Complete.

Proof. We provide a straightforward reduction from **STRONG GEODETIC SET WITH TERMINALS**. Let $(G = (V, E), k)$ be an instance of **STRONG GEODETIC SET WITH TERMINALS** with terminals v_1, \dots, v_k . We build an instance of **ISOMETRIC PATH COVER WITH TERMINALS** by considering all $\binom{k}{2}$ possible pairs of terminals i.e. $(G = (V, E), \bigcup_{1 \leq i < j \leq k} \{(v_i, v_j)\})$. By definition, (G, k) is a

YES-instance of STRONG GEODETIC SET WITH TERMINALS, *i.e.* there exists a set of $\binom{k}{2}$ shortest paths covering $V(G)$ if and only if (G, k') is a YES-instance of ISOMETRIC PATH COVER WITH TERMINALS, *i.e.* a set of k' shortest v_i - v_j paths, $1 \leq i < j \leq k$ covering $V(G)$. \square

Proof of Theorem 3 and Corollary 1 Recall that, for simplicity, we assume that our input graph is connected, but all results easily extend to disconnected graphs. We first show that problem ISOMETRIC PATH COVER WITH TERMINALS is FPT when parameterized by k , the number of pairs of terminals. As a first consequence, so is problem STRONG GEODETIC SET WITH TERMINALS, a special case of ISOMETRIC PATH COVER WITH TERMINALS with $\binom{k}{2}$ pairs of terminals. (Both problems are NP-complete, by [9] and Proposition 1.) Corollary 1 follows immediately, since for both ISOMETRIC PATH COVER and STRONG GEODETIC SET it suffices to try all possible sets of terminals and use the FPT algorithms for the versions with terminals.

Let us focus on ISOMETRIC PATH COVER WITH TERMINALS, with parameter k , input G and the k pairs of terminals $(s_1, t_1), \dots, (s_k, t_k)$. We can assume that the pathwidth (and hence treewidth) of the input graph is upper bounded by a function of k , as stated in Theorem 2, and that we have in the input a tree decomposition of such width. Indeed recall that Theorem 2 does not only provide a combinatorial bound on the pathwidth of YES-instances, but also a simple, BFS-algorithm for computing the suitable path decompositions (which is also, as stated in Section 2, a tree decomposition of the same width). If the algorithm fails to find a path decomposition of small width, we can directly conclude that our input graph is a NO-instance.

Therefore, we can use the classical Monadic Second-Order Logic of graphs (henceforth called MSOL₂) tools on bounded treewidth graphs. MSOL₂ includes the logical connectives $\vee, \wedge, \neg, \Leftrightarrow, \Rightarrow$, variables for vertices, edges, sets of vertices, and sets of edges, the quantifiers \forall and \exists that can be applied to these variables, and five binary relations: $\text{adj}(u, v)$, where u and v are vertex variables and the interpretation is that u and v are adjacent; $\text{inc}(v, e)$, where v is a vertex variable and e is an edge variable and the interpretation is that v is incident to e ; $v \in V'$, where v is a vertex variable and V' is a vertex set variable; the similar $e \in E'$ on edge variable e and edge set variable E' , and eventually equality of two variables of the same nature.

By a celebrated theorem of Courcelle [7], any problem expressible in MSOL₂ can be solved in time $f(\text{tw}) \cdot n$ time on bounded treewidth graphs, if a tree decomposition of the input graph is also given. Function f depends on the formula (hence, on the problem). Courcelle's theorem extends in several ways to optimization problems, and slightly larger classes of formulae, e.g., allowing to identify a fixed number of terminal vertices, as we shall detail later. Here we will refer to [3], one of the (alternative) proofs of Courcelle's theorem, with some extensions. As noted in [3], MSOL₂ allows to express properties as $\text{Connected}(V', E')$ where V' is a vertex set variable and E' is an edge set variable and the property is true if and only if (V', E') is a connected subgraph of G . Also let $\text{Cover}(V_1, \dots, V_k)$ express the fact that vertex subsets V_1, \dots, V_k cover all vertices of the graph, by simply stating that $\forall x(x \in V_1 \vee x \in V_2 \vee \dots \vee x \in V_k)$.

This allows us to express ISOMETRIC PATH COVER WITH TERMINALS as an optimization MSOL₂ problem, called an EMS-problem in [3]. Let $\varphi(E_1, E_2, \dots, E_k)$ be the formula on edge sets E_1, \dots, E_k expressing the property that there exist k connected subgraphs $(V_1, E_1), \dots, (V_k, E_k)$ of G such that the sets V_1, \dots, V_k cover all vertices of G , and graph (V_i, E_i) contains terminals s_i, t_i , for all $1 \leq i \leq k$. More formally:

$$\begin{aligned} \varphi(E_1, E_2, \dots, E_k) &= \exists V_1, V_2, \dots, V_k [(s_1 \in V_1) \wedge (t_1 \in V_1) \wedge \dots \wedge (s_k \in V_k) \wedge (t_k \in V_k) \\ &\quad \wedge \text{Cover}(V_1, \dots, V_k) \wedge \text{Connected}(V_1, E_1) \wedge \dots \wedge \text{Connected}(V_k, E_k)] \end{aligned}$$

Consider now the optimization version of this problem, where the goal is to find edge sets E_1, E_2, \dots, E_k satisfying $\varphi(E_1, E_2, \dots, E_k)$ and minimizing $|E_1| + |E_2| + \dots + |E_k|$. Let OptCover denote this optimum. By Theorem 5.6 in [3], this problem can be solved in linear time on bounded treewidth graphs. More precisely, Arnborg *et al.* [3] call such problems "EMS linear extremum problems", in the sense that they correspond to linear optimization functions over the sizes of set variables, when these variables satisfy an MSOL₂ formula over labelled graphs with a fixed number




Figure 7: A graph that can be edge-covered with k shortest paths and with 2^k vertices at distance $2^k - 1$ from a . Therefore, a path decomposition obtained by a BFS from vertex a has width exponential in k . Nevertheless, one can easily prove that this graph has pathwidth at most k .

of labels (here we consider each terminal vertex labelled with a different label). In contemporary terms, the problem is FPT parameterized by treewidth plus the number of terminals, and the running time is linear in n .

We now observe that our input is a YES-instance of ISOMETRIC PATH COVER WITH TERMINALS if and only if $\text{OptCover} = \text{dist}(s_1, t_1) + \text{dist}(s_2, t_2) + \dots + \text{dist}(s_k, t_k)$. Indeed if there exist the required shortest s_i - t_i paths P_1, \dots, P_k covering the vertex set of the whole graph, then their edge sets E_1, \dots, E_k provide a solution for our optimization problem whose objective is the sum of the lengths of the paths. Conversely, for any of the k connected subgraphs (V_i, E_i) of G such that $s_i, t_i \in V_i$, we have $|E_i| \geq \text{dist}(s_i, t_i)$. Therefore by simply checking if OptCover corresponds to the sum of the distances between pairs of terminals, we decide whether the input satisfies ISOMETRIC PATH COVER WITH TERMINALS. Altogether, this problem is FPT parameterized by k , which concludes the proof of [Theorem 3](#).

As mentioned in the introduction, the same techniques extend to variants where the covering paths are required to be edge-disjoint or vertex-disjoint, by simply adding disjointness conditions in the MSOL₂ formula φ .

6 Conclusion

We have shown that graphs that can be covered by k shortest paths have their pathwidth upper-bounded by a function of k . Our bound is exponential, and the first natural open question is whether it can be improved to a polynomial bound. Such an improvement cannot rely on path decompositions based on the layers of an arbitrary BFS, since we have examples (see [Fig. 7](#)) where the same layer contains 2^k vertices. Nevertheless, we leave as an open question whether graphs whose vertices (or edges) can be covered by k shortest paths have treewidth at most a polynomial in k .

Observe that the approach does not generalize to coverings with few *induced paths*, since grids have arbitrarily large treewidth but are edge-coverable by four induced paths.

On the algorithmic side, we have proved that problems ISOMETRIC PATH COVER WITH TERMINALS and STRONG GEODETIC SET WITH TERMINALS are FPT parameterized by the number of terminals. This directly entails that problems ISOMETRIC PATH COVER and STRONG GEODETIC SET are in XP with respect to the same parameter, by simply enumerating all possible pairs (respectively, sets) of terminals. An exciting open question is whether these two problems are FPT. By [Theorem 2](#), this is equivalent to asking if the problems are FPT when parameterized by the solution size (i.e., number of paths/terminals) + pathwidth. (Indeed, if k is the number of terminals, [Theorem 2](#) ensures that either the pathwidth pw of the input graph is upper bounded by a function $f(k)$, or we can directly reject the input for being a NO-instance. Therefore, if one of the problems is FPT parameterized by $k + \text{pw}$, we obtain an FPT algorithm parameterized by k as fol-

lows. The algorithm checks that $\text{pw} \leq f(k)$ as in [Theorem 2](#), by a simple breadth-first search from an arbitrary vertex. If the assertion is false, the algorithm rejects. Otherwise it simply remains to apply the algorithm parameterized by $k + \text{pw}$ on parameter $k + f(k)$. Nevertheless, the answer to the question whether these problems are FPT for parameter $k + \text{pw}$ seems non-trivial. At least, while many optimization problems are FPT when parameterized by treewidth/pathwidth, several problems including constraints on distances remain $W[1]$ -hard even when parameterized by such structural parameters, plus solution size. We can cite recent hardness results for d -SCATTERED SET [16], whose goal is to find a large set of vertices at pairwise distance at least d or, even closer to our problems, GEODETIC SET [17], where one aims to find a small set of terminals of the input graph such that the set of all shortest paths between every pair of terminals covers the graph.

Another natural question is the study of these problems on directed graphs. Note that ISOMETRIC PATH PARTITION, the partition version of ISOMETRIC PATH COVER, was proved to be $W[1]$ -hard on DAGs for the parameter solution size in [13]. Moreover, there are tournaments (orientations of cliques) whose vertices can be covered by a unique shortest path (create a tournament from a directed Hamiltonian path, and orient all other arcs in the reverse direction), in particular the treewidth of the underlying undirected graph is not bounded. A DAG that can be covered by two directed paths but whose underlying undirected graph has large treewidth is the following: consider two disjoint directed paths, and add all arcs from the vertices of the first path to all vertices of the second one. Thus, our results cannot be directly extended to digraphs, not even to DAGs.

References

- [1] M. Aigner and M. Fromme. A game of cops and robbers. *Discrete Applied Mathematics*, 8(1):1–12, 1984.
- [2] G. Andreatta and F. Mason. Path covering problems and testing of printed circuits. *Discrete Applied Mathematics*, 62(1):5–13, 1995.
- [3] S. Arnborg, J. Lagergren, and D. Seese. Easy problems for tree-decomposable graphs. *Journal of Algorithms*, 12(2):308–340, 1991.
- [4] A. Arokiaraj, S. Klavžar, P. D. Manuel, E. Thomas, and A. Xavier. Strong geodetic problems in networks. *Discussiones Mathematicae Graph Theory*, 40(1):307–321, 2020.
- [5] M. Bentert, A. Nichterlein, M. Renken, and P. Zschoche. Using a Geometric Lens to Find k Disjoint Shortest Paths. In N. Bansal, E. Merelli, and J. Worrell, editors, *48th International Colloquium on Automata, Languages, and Programming (ICALP 2021)*, volume 198 of *Leibniz International Proceedings in Informatics (LIPIcs)*, pages 26:1–26:14, Dagstuhl, Germany, 2021. Schloss Dagstuhl – Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik.
- [6] D. Chakraborty, A. Dailly, S. Das, F. Foucaud, H. Gahlawat, and S. K. Ghosh. Complexity and algorithms for isometric path cover on chordal graphs and beyond. In *Proceedings of the 33rd International Symposium on Algorithms and Computation, ISAAC 2022*, volume 248 of *LIPIcs*, pages 12:1–12:17. Schloss Dagstuhl - Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik, 2022.
- [7] B. Courcelle. The monadic second-order logic of graphs. I. Recognizable sets of finite graphs. *Information and Computation*, 85(1):12–75, 1990.
- [8] M. Cygan, F. V. Fomin, L. Kowalik, D. Lokshantov, D. Marx, M. Pilipczuk, M. Pilipczuk, and S. Saurabh. *Parameterized Algorithms*. Springer, 2015.
- [9] T. Davot, L. Isenmann, and J. Thiebaut. On the approximation hardness of geodetic set and its variants. In *Proceedings of the 27th International Computing and Combinatorics Conference, COCOON 2021*, volume 13025 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 76–88. Springer, 2021.

- [10] J. H. G. de Sousa. Exact algorithms and computational complexity for the strong geodetic set problem. Master’s thesis, Universidade Federal de Minas Gerais, Brazil, 2018.
- [11] R. Diestel. *Graph Theory, 4th Edition*, volume 173 of *Graduate texts in mathematics*. Springer, 2012.
- [12] T. Eilam-Tzoref. The disjoint shortest paths problem. *Discrete Applied Mathematics*, 85(2):113–138, 1998.
- [13] H. Fernau, F. Foucaud, K. Mann, R. R. K. N., and U. Paradiya. Parameterizing path partitions. In *Proceedings of the 13th International Symposium on Algorithms and Complexity, CIAC 2023*, Lecture Notes in Computer Science. Springer, 2023.
- [14] D. C. Fisher and S. L. Fitzpatrick. The isometric number of a graph. *Journal of Combinatorial Mathematics and Combinatorial Computing*, 38(1):97–110, 2001.
- [15] F. V. Fomin and D. Kratsch. *Exact Exponential Algorithms*. Texts in Theoretical Computer Science. An EATCS Series. Springer, 2010.
- [16] I. Katsikarelis, M. Lampis, and V. T. Paschos. Structurally parameterized d-scattered set. *Discret. Appl. Math.*, 308:168–186, 2022.
- [17] L. Kellerhals and T. Koana. Parameterized complexity of geodetic set. In *Proceedings of the 15th International Symposium on Parameterized and Exact Computation, IPEC 2020*, volume 180 of *LIPICs*, pages 20:1–20:14. Schloss Dagstuhl - Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik, 2020.
- [18] C. V. G. C. Lima, V. F. d. Santos, J. H. G. Sousa, and S. A. Urrutia. On the computational complexity of the strong geodetic recognition problem, 2022.
- [19] W. Lochet. A polynomial time algorithm for the k -disjoint shortest paths problem. In *Proceedings of the 2021 ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms, SODA 2021*, pages 169–178. SIAM, 2021.
- [20] P. Manuel. On the isometric path partition problem. *Discussiones Mathematicae Graph Theory*, 41(4):1077–1089, 2021.
- [21] P. Manuel, S. Klavžar, A. Xavier, A. Arokiaraj, and E. Thomas. Strong edge geodetic problem in networks. *Open Mathematics*, 15(1):1225–1235, 2017.
- [22] M. Mezzini. An $O(mn^2)$ algorithm for computing the strong geodetic number in outerplanar graphs. *Discussiones Mathematicae Graph Theory*, 42(2):591–599, 2022.
- [23] J. Pan and G. J. Chang. Isometric-path numbers of block graphs. *Information Processing Letters*, 93(2):99–102, 2005.
- [24] N. Robertson and P. D. Seymour. Graph minors. XIII. The disjoint paths problem. *Journal of Combinatorial Theory, Series B*, 63(1):65–110, 1995.
- [25] M. Thiessen and T. Gaertner. Active learning of convex halfspaces on graphs. In *Proceedings of the 35th Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems, NeurIPS 2021*, volume 34, pages 23413–23425. Curran Associates, Inc., 2021.