

# On graphs coverable by $k$ shortest paths

Maël Dumas\*   Florent Foucaud<sup>†‡</sup>   Anthony Perez\*   Ioan Todinca\*

July 1, 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 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, each joining a distinct pair of terminals such that these paths cover  $G$ ). 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, where one asks to cover the vertices of an input graph using a prescribed number of paths. The corresponding packing problem is DISJOINT PATHS (here, 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 [19] 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., [6] 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 [10] and recently shown to be polynomial-time solvable for every fixed  $k$  by an XP algorithm [14]. 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.

<sup>†</sup>Université Clermont-Auvergne, CNRS, Mines de Saint-Étienne, Clermont-Auvergne-INP, LIMOS, 63000 Clermont-Ferrand, France.

<sup>‡</sup>This author’s research was financed by the French government IDEX-ISITE initiative 16-IDEX-0001 (CAP 20-25) and by the ANR project GRALMECO (ANR-21-CE48-0004-01).

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 [11] 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 [7, 8].

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 [3] 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. ISOMETRIC PATH COVER is NP-hard, even for chordal graphs, on which the problem can be approximated within a constant factor [4]. It was proven to be polynomial-time solvable on block graphs [18]. It is shown in [7] that STRONG GEODETIC SET WITH TERMINALS is NP-hard. In [8], 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. There is a straightforward reduction from STRONG GEODETIC SET WITH TERMINALS to ISOMETRIC PATH COVER WITH TERMINALS, implying that the latter problem is NP-Complete. We describe such a reduction in Appendix A for the sake of completeness.

Finally, STRONG GEODETIC SET is known to be NP-hard [3], even for bipartite graphs, chordal graphs, graphs of diameter 2 and cobipartite graphs [8] as well as for subcubic graphs of arbitrary girth [7]. However it is polynomial-time solvable on outerplanar graphs [17], cactus graphs, block graph and threshold graphs [8].

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 [15].

**Our results** Our main combinatorial theorem is 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 at most  $f(k)$ , for function  $f(k) = \sum_{i=1}^k 2^{i+1} \cdot \frac{k!}{(k-i)!}$ .*

*If  $G$  is such that its **vertex set** can be covered by at most  $k$  shortest paths, then the pathwidth of  $G$  is at most  $(2k - 1) \cdot f(k)$ .*

We actually show that in such graphs  $G$ , 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  $k$ , that 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 the aforementioned function of  $k$ . The complexity of the algorithm itself does not depend on  $k$ .

Besides the combinatorial bounds, we employ the celebrated theorem of Courcelle [5], stating that problems expressible in Monadic Second-Order Logic (MSOL<sub>2</sub>) can be solved in linear time for graphs of bounded treewidth (and thus, of bounded pathwidth). More precisely, we reduce problem ISOMETRIC PATH COVER WITH TERMINALS to an optimization problem expressible in MSOL<sub>2</sub>. The result can also be obtained by dynamic programming but 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 1, this implies the following.

**Theorem 2.** *Problems ISOMETRIC PATH COVER WITH TERMINALS and STRONG GEODETIC SET WITH TERMINALS are FPT when parameterized by the number of terminals.*

Moreover, this also entails the following.

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

Thanks to the flexibility of Monadic Second-Order Logic, 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 (as studied in [16]).

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 2) 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 [9] for usual notations on graphs. For simplicity, we consider that our input graph  $G = (V, E)$  is connected, though all our combinatorial and algorithmic results extend to non-connected graphs. As usually  $N(x)$  denotes the neighborhood 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 a  $x_1$ - $x_l$  path. Note that our paths are simple, they do not use twice a 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  $y$ . Moreover we let  $|P|$  denote the *length* of path  $P$ , that is, the number of its 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 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  $\eta = (x_l, y_1, \dots, y_t)$  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. [9]), using 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 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 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 a same layer or in two consecutive layers, thus will appear in a 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 Warm-up: edge-covering with $k$ shortest paths

As a warm-up, we start by proving Theorem 1 in the case when graph  $G = (V, E)$  is edge-coverable by  $k$  shortest paths. In this case, there is a simple and elegant encoding of shortest paths leading to the desired result; the case of vertex-covering, more technical, will be studied in the next section.

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  $\mu_1, \dots, \mu_k$ , 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  $\mu_c$ ,  $1 \leq c \leq k$  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  $\mu_c$  is given a positive *sign*  $+$  if it follows the direction of  $\mu_c$ , 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  $\mu_c$ .

**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  $\text{col}$  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  $(P, \text{col})$  formed by a path together with a good colouring is called *well-coloured*.

Operator  $\odot$  defined in Section 2 naturally extends to coloured paths. Given a coloured path  $(P, \text{col})$ , 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  $(P, \text{col})$  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  $(P, \text{col})$ , 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  $(P, \text{col})$  such that  $P$  is a shortest  $a$ - $b$  path.*

*We will simply call  $(P, \text{col})$  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  $\text{col}$  the corresponding colouring. Assume by contradiction that the colouring is not good. Then there exist three edges  $e_1 = \{x_1, y_1\}$ ,  $e_2 = \{x_2, y_2\}$  and  $e_3 = \{x_3, y_3\}$ , 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  $x_1 < y_1 \leq x_2 < y_2 \leq x_3 < y_3$ , from  $a$  to  $b$ . Let  $c = \text{col}(e_1) = \text{col}(e_3)$ . Therefore  $y_1$  and  $x_3$  are on the same base path  $\mu_c$ . Let  $P'$  be the path obtained from  $P$  by replacing  $P[y_1, x_3]$  by  $\mu_c[y_1, x_3]$ . First,  $P'$  is no longer than  $P$ , since  $\mu_c[y_1, x_3]$  is a shortest possible  $y_1$ - $x_3$  path of graph  $G$ . Second, in  $P'$  we can colour all edges of  $P'[y_1, x_3]$  with colour  $c$ , and keep all other colours unchanged. Hence  $P'$  has strictly fewer monochromatic subpaths than  $P$  — a contradiction.  $\square$

Let  $(P, \text{col})$  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  $\mu_{c_i}$  (positive if  $P[x_i, x_{i+1}]$  has the same direction as  $\mu_{c_i}$ , 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  $b$ . Observe that such words have at most  $k$  letters on an alphabet of size  $2k$ . Therefore the number of different 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  $\omega$ , there is at most one vertex  $b$  at distance  $D$  from  $a$ , such that the well-coloured shortest  $a$ - $b$  path respects word  $\omega$ . 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 same distance from some vertex  $a$  of  $G$ . Let  $(P, \text{col})$  be a well-coloured shortest  $a$ - $b$  path and  $(P', \text{col}')$  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  $\mu_{c_1}$ , starting from  $a$  and having the same sign  $s_1$  w.r.t.  $\mu_{c_1}$ , 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  $\mu_{c_1}$ .

Observe that, if word  $\omega$  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.  $\mu_{c_1}$ , this implies that  $x_2 = x'_2 = b = c$ , which proves the base case of our induction.

Assume now that  $\omega$  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  $(P, \text{col})$ . In particular,  $x'_2, x_2$  and  $x_3$  are all vertices of  $\mu_{c_2}$ .

Let us make an easy but crucial observation: on  $\mu_{c_2}$ , 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  $\mu_{c_2}$ , they must appear in this order on the latter. Consequently,  $\mu_{c_2}[x'_2, x_3]$  induces the same sign  $s_2$  on  $\mu_{c_2}$  as  $P[x_2, x_3] = \mu_{c_2}[x_2, x_3]$ .

In particular, in the 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.  $\square$

In order to complete the proof of the first part of Theorem 1 and show that  $\text{pw}(G) \leq 2h(k)$ , we simply apply Lemma 1 with  $K = h(k)$ .

## 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  $\mu_1, \dots, \mu_k$ . As before we endow each base path  $\mu_c$  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 5), 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 a same distance  $D$  from  $a$ , and well-coloured shortest  $a$ - $b$  and  $a$ - $c$  paths with a 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  $a$  (Corollary 4).

**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  $\mu_c$ . 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  $(P, \text{col})$ . The colouring  $\text{col}$  of  $P$  is said to be *good* if, for any colour  $c$ , the subgraph induced by the set of *vertices* using this colour forms a connected subpath  $P[x, y]$  of  $P$  (which implies that  $P[x, y] = \mu_c[x, y]$ ). A coloured path  $(P, \text{col})$  where  $\text{col}$  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  $\nu$  and first of  $\eta$ , satisfies  $\text{col}(x) = \text{col}'(x)$ . Given a coloured path  $(P, \text{col})$ , 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  $(P, \text{col})$  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  $a = a_1, b_1, a_2, b_2, \dots, a_l, b_l = b$ , as in Figure 2.

Like in the previous section, we have:

**Lemma 5.** *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  $(P, \text{col})$  be such a coloured path. Assume for a contradiction that the colouring  $\text{col}$  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 a same base path  $\mu_c$ . 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  $(P, \text{col})$  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.  $\mu_c$ , 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  $\omega$  and a distance  $D$ , there is a unique vertex  $b$  at distance  $D$  such that the well-coloured shortest  $a$ - $b$  path corresponds to this word. Unfortunately, this does not extend to vertex-covering: Figure 1 presents two distinct vertices  $b$  and  $c$  located at a same distance  $D$  from vertex  $a$ , together with a well-coloured shortest  $a$ - $b$  path  $(P, \text{col})$  and a well-coloured shortest  $a$ - $c$  path  $(P', \text{col}')$ . These coloured paths starting from  $a$  have the same colours-signs word and the same length, but this does not imply that their end-vertices are equal.




Figure 1: Two well-coloured paths  $(P, \text{col})$  and  $(P', \text{col}')$  with same colours-signs word  $\omega = ((\text{red}, -), (\text{blue}, +))$ , same length (5) and same start vertex ( $a$ ), but different end-vertices ( $b$  and  $c$ ).

**Canonical well-coloured paths** In order to obtain a situation somewhat similar to the case of edge-covering, we define a *canonical representation* of well-coloured paths (see Figure 2 for an example). Given a colours-signs word  $\omega = ((c_1, s_1), (c_2, s_2), \dots, (c_l, s_l))$  with no repetition of colours, a start vertex  $a$  and a length  $L$ , we define a *unique* well-coloured path  $\text{CanonPath}(\omega, a, L)$  starting from  $a$ , of the prescribed length  $L$  and having the colours-signs word  $\omega$ , as follows:

1. If  $l = 1$ , let  $b$  be the vertex at distance  $L$  of  $a$  on the path  $\mu_{c_1}$  w.r.t.  $s_1$ . Then :

$$\text{CanonPath}(\omega, a, L) = (\mu_{c_1}[a, b], \text{monochr}_{c_1})$$

2. Otherwise, let  $b_1$  be the first vertex of  $\mu_{c_1}$  starting from  $a$  w.r.t.  $s_1$  having a neighbour in  $\mu_{c_2}$ . Among the vertices of  $\mu_{c_2}$  adjacent to  $b_1$ , choose  $a_2$  to be the one that appears first in  $\mu_{c_2}$ , according to its direction. We let:

$$\text{CanonPath}(\omega, a, L) = (\mu_{c_1}[a, b_1], \text{monochr}_{c_1}) \oplus \text{CanonPath}(((c_2, s_2), \dots, (c_l, s_l)), a_2, L - |\mu_{c_1}[a, b_1]| - 1) \quad (1)$$

Note that the path  $\text{CanonPath}(\omega, a, L)$  might not exist, *e.g.* if, in the base case of the construction,  $a \notin \mu_{c_1}$  or the subpath of  $\mu_{c_1}$  starting from  $a$  and following sign  $s_1$  is shorter than  $L$  or, in the second step, vertex  $b_1$  does not exist, or  $|\mu_{c_1}[a, b_1]|$  exceeds  $L$ .

**Observation 1.** *Given a colours-signs word  $\omega$ , a vertex  $a$  and a length  $L$ , if the path  $(P, \text{col}) = \text{CanonPath}(\omega, a, L)$  exists, then it is well-coloured. Moreover, this path is unique and satisfies  $(P, \text{col}) = \text{CanonPath}(\text{ColoursSignsW}(P, \text{col}), a, |P|)$ .*

*Proof.* Notice first that, by construction, we have  $|P| = L$  and  $\text{ColoursSignsW}(P, \text{col}) = \omega$  which implies the last part of the statement. Now since this path is recursively obtained by the concatenation of monochromatic (simple) subpaths (Equation 1), it is well-coloured. The uniqueness of path  $(P, \text{col})$  comes from the deterministic choices made during the algorithm, which concludes the proof.  $\square$




Figure 2: A canonical well-coloured  $a$ - $b$  path  $(P, \text{col})$  with  $\text{ColoursSignsW}(P, \text{col}) = ((c_1, +), (c_2, +), (c_3, +), (c_4, -))$ .

**Definition 1** (canonical well-coloured path). *A well-coloured  $a$ - $b$  path  $(P, \text{col})$  is called canonical if  $(P, \text{col}) = \text{CanonPath}(\text{ColoursSignsW}(P, \text{col}), a, |P|)$ .*

To obtain a result similar to Lemma 4, we provide an algorithm that takes as input a well-coloured  $a$ - $b$  path  $P$ , the corresponding good colouring  $\text{col}$  with  $l$  colours, and that computes a canonical well-coloured  $a$ - $b$  path whose length is upper-bounded by  $|P| + 2(l - 1)$  (see Algorithm 1 and Lemma 6). As before, let  $\omega = ((c_1, s_1), \dots, (c_l, s_l))$  be the colours-signs word of  $(P, \text{col})$  and for each  $1 \leq i \leq l$ , let  $a_i$  (resp.  $b_i$ ) denote the first (resp. last) vertex of  $(P, \text{col})$  coloured  $c_i$ . Informally, the algorithm recursively computes a coloured path as follows: if  $l = 1$ , we let  $\text{Canonize}(P, \text{col}) = (P, \text{col})$ . Otherwise, we consider  $b'_1$  as the first vertex of  $P[a, b_1]$  (hence, of  $\mu_{c_1}$  starting from  $a$  following sign  $s_1$ ) having a neighbour in  $\mu_{c_2}$  (line 4). As in the definition of the  $\text{CanonPath}$  function, we choose the neighbour  $a'_2$  of  $b'_1$  to be the vertex of  $\mu_{c_2}$  that appears first on this path, according to its direction, among the neighbours of  $b'_1$  (line 5). We next replace  $P[b'_1, b_2]$  by  $(b'_1, a'_2) \odot \mu_{c_2}[a'_2, b_2]$  (see line 6 and Figure 3), and then re-apply the transformation on the new path starting from  $a'_2$  (line 7).

**Lemma 6** (canonization of well-coloured paths). *Given a well-coloured  $a$ - $b$  path  $(P, \text{col})$ , with a colours-signs word of  $l$  letters, the result of  $\text{Canonize}(P, \text{col})$  is a canonical well-coloured  $a$ - $b$  path of length at most  $|P| + 2(l - 1)$ .*

*Proof.* Denote  $(P_c, \text{col}_c) = \text{Canonize}(P, \text{col})$  and let  $\omega_c = \text{ColoursSignsW}(P_c, \text{col}_c)$  be its colours-signs word. We first claim that  $(P_c, \text{col}_c)$  is a canonical well-coloured path, *i.e.* equal to  $\text{CanonPath}(\omega_c, a, |P_c|)$  (Definition 1). In order to prove the claim we proceed by induction on the number  $l$  of colours of  $(P, \text{col})$ . The property is true if  $(P, \text{col})$  has a unique colour, since in this (base) case,  $(P_c, \text{col}_c) = (P, \text{col})$  and  $\omega_c = \omega$  (line 3 of Algorithm 1).

Otherwise, by induction,  $(P_c, \text{col}_c)$  is formed by  $(P[a, b'_1], \text{monochr}_{c_1})$  concatenated with  $(P'', \text{col}'') = \text{Canonize}(P', \text{col}')$ , where  $(P', \text{col}')$  is a well-coloured  $a'_2$ - $b$  path with  $l - 1$  different colours. Let  $\omega'' = \text{ColoursSignsW}(P'', \text{col}'')$  be the colours-signs word of  $P''$ . By the induction hypothesis,  $(P'', \text{col}'') = \text{CanonPath}(\omega'', a'_2, |P''|)$ . Moreover, for constructing path  $P$  we started from  $a$  along  $\mu_{c_1}$  following sign  $s_1$  until we reached the first vertex  $b'_1$  adjacent to vertex  $a'_2$  of  $\mu_{c_2}$ ,



---

**Algorithm 1:** Function computing the canonical well-coloured path  $\text{Canonize}(P, \text{col})$ .

---

**Input :** A well-coloured  $a$ - $b$  path  $(P, \text{col})$   
**Output:** A canonical well-coloured  $a$ - $b$  path

```

1 Function Canonize( $P, \text{col}$ ):
2   if  $l == 1$  then
3     return  $(P, \text{col})$ ;
4     /* first vertex of  $\mu_{c_1}$  starting from  $a$  w.r.t.  $s_1$  having a neighbour in  $\mu_{c_2}$  */
5      $b'_1 \leftarrow$  first vertex of  $P[a, b_1]$  having a neighbour in  $\mu_{c_2}$ ;
6      $a'_2 \leftarrow$  vertex of  $V(\mu_{c_2}) \cap N(b'_1)$  that appears first on  $\mu_{c_2}$  according to its direction;
7     /*  $P[b'_1, b_2]$  is replaced by  $(b'_1, a'_2) \odot_{\mu_{c_2}} [a'_2, b_2]$  */
8      $(P', \text{col}') = (\mu_{c_2}[a'_2, b_2], \text{monochr}_{c_2}) \odot (P[b_2, b], \text{col})$ ;
9     return  $(P[a, b'_1], \text{monochr}_{c_1}) \oplus \text{Canonize}(P', \text{col}')$ ;

```

---




Figure 3: The construction of  $\text{Canonize}(P, \text{col})$ .

and concatenated it with the canonical  $a'_2$ - $b$  path  $(P'', \text{col}'')$ , as in the definition of the  $\text{CanonPath}$  function. Therefore, path  $(P_c, \text{col}_c)$  is canonical for the triple  $(\omega_c, a, |P_c|)$ .

It remains to show that the length of  $P_c$  is at most  $|P| + 2(l - 1)$ . We proceed again by induction on  $l$ . The property is true if  $l = 1$  since  $P_c = P$ . Otherwise, for  $l \geq 2$ , recall that  $(P_c, \text{col}_c) = (P[a, b'_1], \text{monochr}_{c_1}) \oplus (P'', \text{col}'')$  where  $(P'', \text{col}'') = \text{Canonize}(P', \text{col}')$  and  $(P', \text{col}') = (\mu_{c_2}[a'_2, b_2], \text{monochr}_{c_2}) \odot (P[b_2, b], \text{col})$  is a well-coloured  $a'_2$ - $b$  path with  $l - 1$  different colours (by lines 6 and 7 of Algorithm 1). Now we show that:

$$|P[a, b'_1] \oplus P'| \leq |P| + 2 \quad (2)$$

We recall that in the well-coloured path  $(P, \text{col})$ ,  $b_1$  denotes the last vertex on  $P$  such that  $\text{col}(b_1) = c_1$  and  $a_2$  the first vertex on  $P$  such that  $\text{col}(a_2) = c_2$ . In particular (see Figure 3),

$$P[a, b'_1] \oplus P' = P[a, b'_1] \oplus \mu_{c_2}[a'_2, b_2] \odot P[b_2, b]$$

while  $P$  can be described by

$$P = P[a, b'_1] \odot \mu_{c_1}[b'_1, b_1] \oplus \mu_{c_2}[a_2, b_2] \odot P[b_2, b]$$

Therefore, in order to prove Inequality 2, we need to show that

$$|\mu_{c_2}[a'_2, b_2]| \leq |\mu_{c_1}[b'_1, b_1]| + |\mu_{c_2}[a_2, b_2]| + 2 \quad (3)$$

Observe that  $|\mu_{c_2}[a'_2, a_2]| \leq |\mu_{c_1}[b'_1, b_1]| + 2$ , otherwise  $\mu_{c_2}[a'_2, a_2]$  would not be a shortest  $a'_2$ - $a_2$  path since the  $a'_2$ - $a_2$  path  $(a'_2) \oplus \mu_{c_1}[b'_1, b_1] \oplus (a_2)$  would be of length  $|\mu_{c_1}[b'_1, b_1]| + 2$ , thus shorter. Next, observe that  $|\mu_{c_2}[a'_2, b_2]| \leq |\mu_{c_2}[a'_2, a_2]| + |\mu_{c_2}[a_2, b_2]|$  no matter in which order the vertices  $a'_2, a_2$  and  $b_2$  appear on  $\mu_{c_2}$ . These observations prove Inequality 3, which proves Inequality 2.

Inequality 2 entails that  $|P'| \leq |P| + 1 - |P[a, b'_1]|$ . By the induction hypothesis on  $(P'', \text{col}'')$ , since  $(P', \text{col}')$  uses  $l - 1$  colours, we have that  $|P''| \leq |P'| + 2(l - 2)$ . Thus

$$|P''| \leq |P| + 2l - 3 - |P[a, b'_1]|.$$

Now since  $(P_c, \text{col}_c) = (P[a, b'_1], \text{monochr}_{c_1}) \oplus (P'', \text{col}'')$  we have that  $|P_c| = |P[a, b'_1]| + 1 + |P''|$ . Plugging this into the previous inequality we have  $|P_c| \leq |P[a, b'_1]| + 1 + |P| + 2l - 3 - |P[a, b'_1]|$ , which completes the proof of our lemma.  $\square$

**Corollary 3** (canonical representation). *Given two vertices  $a$  and  $b$ , there exists a canonical well-coloured  $a$ - $b$  path  $(P, \text{col})$  such that  $|P| \leq \text{dist}(a, b) + 2(k - 1)$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $(P_s, \text{col}_s)$  be a shortest well-coloured  $a$ - $b$  path, which exists by Lemma 5. By Lemma 6,  $(P, \text{col}) = \text{Canonize}(P_s, \text{col}_s)$  is the required canonical well-coloured  $a$ - $b$  path, of length  $|P| \leq |P_s| + 2(k - 1) = \text{dist}(a, b) + 2(k - 1)$ .  $\square$

In particular, Lemma 6 implies the following.

**Corollary 4.** *Let  $G$  be a graph whose vertices are covered by  $k$  shortest paths. For any vertex  $a$  of  $G$  and any fixed distance  $D$ , there are at most  $g(k)$  vertices at distance  $D$  from  $a$ , where:*

$$g(k) = (2k - 1) \cdot \left[ \sum_{i=1}^k 2^i \cdot \frac{k!}{(k-i)!} \right]$$

*Proof.* For any fixed vertex  $a$  and fixed length  $L$ , the number of vertices that can be reached from  $a$  through a canonical well-coloured path of length  $L$  is upper bounded by  $h(k) = \sum_{i=1}^k 2^i \cdot \frac{k!}{(k-i)!}$ , the number of colours-signs words, by Lemma 3. Moreover for each vertex  $b$ , by Corollary 3, there exists a canonical well-coloured  $a$ - $b$  path  $P$  such that  $|P| \leq \text{dist}(a, b) + 2(k - 1)$ . Therefore the number of vertices at a fixed distance  $D$  from  $a$  in  $G$  is at most  $(2k - 1) \cdot h(k)$ . Indeed, vertex  $b$  is uniquely identified by  $a$ , the colours-signs word of the well-coloured path  $P$ , and the quantity  $|P| - \text{dist}(a, b)$ . The latter has  $2k - 1$  possible values, from 0 to  $2(k - 1)$ , which completes the proof.  $\square$

In order to complete the proof of Theorem 1 (in the case where the  $k$  paths cover all vertices of the graph) and show that the pathwidth of  $G$  is at most  $2 \cdot g(k)$ , we apply Lemma 1 for  $K = g(k)$ , and the conclusion follows.

## 5 Algorithmic consequences

We now prove Theorem 2 and Corollary 1. 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 [7] and Appendix A.)

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 treewidth of the input graph is upper bounded by a function of  $k$ , as stated in Theorem 1, and that we have in the input a tree decomposition of such width. Indeed recall that Theorem 1 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 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 (MSOL<sub>2</sub>) tools on bounded treewidth graphs. MSOL<sub>2</sub> 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  $u$  is incident to  $e$ ;  $v \in V'$ , where  $u$  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 same nature.

By a celebrated theorem of Courcelle [5], any problem expressible in  $\text{MSOL}_2$  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 [2], one of the (alternative) proofs of Courcelle's theorem, with some extensions.

As noted for example in [2],  $\text{MSOL}_2$  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  $\text{ISOMETRIC PATH COVER WITH TERMINALS}$  as an optimization  $\text{MSOL}_2$  problem, called an EMS-problem in [2].

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 sets  $V_i$  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  $\text{OptCover}$  denote this optimum. By Theorem 5.6 in [2], this problem can be solved in linear time on bounded treewidth graphs. More precisely, Arnborg *et al.* [2] 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  $\text{MSOL}_2$  formula over labelled graphs with a fixed number of labels (here we consider each terminal vertex labeled 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 conclude by observing that our input is a YES-instance of  $\text{ISOMETRIC PATH COVER WITH TERMINALS}$  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  $k$  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  $\text{OptCover}$  corresponds to the sum of the distances between pairs of terminals, we decide whether the input satisfies  $\text{ISOMETRIC PATH COVER WITH TERMINALS}$ . Altogether, this problem is FPT parameterized by  $k$ , which concludes the proof of Theorem 2.

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  $\text{MSOL}_2$  formula  $\varphi$ .

## 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 super-exponential,  $2^{\Theta(k \log k)}$ . The first natural open question is whether this upper bound can be improved to something smaller, perhaps even polynomial in  $k$ ? Such an improvement cannot rely on path decompositions based on the layers of an arbitrary BFS, since we have examples (see Appendix B) where a 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 parameters, by simply enumerating all possible pairs (respectively, sets) of terminals. One exciting open question is whether these two problems are FPT. By Theorem 1, this is equivalent to asking if the problems are FPT when parameterized by solution size + pathwidth, and the answer 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 [12], whose goal is to find a large set of vertices at pairwise distance at least  $d$  or, even closer to our problems, GEODETIC SET [13], where one aims to find a small set of terminals of the input graph such that all vertices lie on a shortest path between two terminals.

## References

- [1] M. Aigner and M. Fromme. A game of cops and robbers. *Discrete Applied Mathematics*, 8(1):1–12, 1984. URL: <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/0166218X84900738>, doi:[https://doi.org/10.1016/0166-218X\(84\)90073-8](https://doi.org/10.1016/0166-218X(84)90073-8).
- [2] Stefan Arnborg, Jens Lagergren, and Detlef Seese. Easy problems for tree-decomposable graphs. *J. Algorithms*, 12(2):308–340, 1991. doi:10.1016/0196-6774(91)90006-K.
- [3] Andrew Arokiaraj, Sandi Klavžar, Paul D. Manuel, Elizabeth Thomas, and Antony Xavier. Strong geodetic problems in networks. *Discussiones Mathematicae Graph Theory*, 40(1):307–321, 2020. doi:10.7151/dmgt.2139.
- [4] Dibyayan Chakraborty, Antoine Dailly, Sandip Das, Florent Foucaud, Harmender Gahlawat, and Subir K. Ghosh. Complexity and algorithms for isometric path cover on chordal graphs and beyond. Unpublished Manuscript, 2022.
- [5] Bruno Courcelle. The monadic second-order logic of graphs. I. Recognizable sets of finite graphs. *Inf. Comput.*, 85(1):12–75, 1990. doi:10.1016/0890-5401(90)90043-H.
- [6] Marek Cygan, Fedor V. Fomin, Lukasz Kowalik, Daniel Lokshtanov, Dániel Marx, Marcin Pilipczuk, Michal Pilipczuk, and Saket Saurabh. *Parameterized Algorithms*. Springer, 2015. doi:10.1007/978-3-319-21275-3.
- [7] Tom Davot, Lucas Isenmann, and Jocelyn Thiebaud. On the approximation hardness of geodetic set and its variants. In Chi-Yeh Chen, Wing-Kai Hon, Ling-Ju Hung, and Chia-Wei Lee, editors, *Computing and Combinatorics (COCOON'21)*, pages 76–88, Cham, 2021. Springer International Publishing.
- [8] João Henrique Gonçalves de Sousa. Exact algorithms and computational complexity for the strong geodetic set problem. Master’s thesis, Universidade Federal de Minas Gerais, Brazil, 2018. URL: <http://hdl.handle.net/1843/ESBF-BA8NJD>.
- [9] Reinhard Diestel. *Graph Theory, 4th Edition*, volume 173 of *Graduate texts in mathematics*. Springer, 2012.
- [10] Tali Eilam-Tzoref. The disjoint shortest paths problem. *Discrete Applied Mathematics*, 85(2):113–138, 1998. URL: <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0166218X97001212>, doi:[https://doi.org/10.1016/S0166-218X\(97\)00121-2](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0166-218X(97)00121-2).

- [11] 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.
- [12] Ioannis Katsikarelis, Michael Lampis, and Vangelis Th. Paschos. Structurally parameterized d-scattered set. *Discret. Appl. Math.*, 308:168–186, 2022. doi:10.1016/j.dam.2020.03.052.
- [13] Leon Kellerhals and Tomohiro Koana. Parameterized complexity of geodetic set. In Yixin Cao and Marcin Pilipczuk, editors, *15th International Symposium on Parameterized and Exact Computation, IPEC 2020, December 14-18, 2020, Hong Kong, China (Virtual Conference)*, volume 180 of *LIPICs*, pages 20:1–20:14. Schloss Dagstuhl - Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik, 2020. doi:10.4230/LIPICs.IPEC.2020.20.
- [14] Willian Lochet. A polynomial time algorithm for the  $k$ -disjoint shortest paths problem. In *Proceedings of the 2021 ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms (SODA'21)*, pages 169–178, 2021. doi:10.1137/1.9781611976465.12.
- [15] Paul Manuel, Sandi Klavžar, Antony Xavier, Andrew Arokiaraj, and Elizabeth Thomas. Strong edge geodetic problem in networks. *Open Mathematics*, 15(1):1225–1235, 2017. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1515/math-2017-0101>, doi:doi:10.1515/math-2017-0101.
- [16] Paul D. Manuel. On the isometric path partition problem. *Discussiones Mathematicae: Graph Theory*, 41(4), 2021.
- [17] Mauro Mezzini. An  $O(mn^2)$  algorithm for computing the strong geodetic number in outerplanar graphs. *Discussiones Mathematicae Graph Theory*, 42(2):591–599, 2022. URL: <https://doi.org/10.7151/dmgt.2311>, doi:doi:10.7151/dmgt.2311.
- [18] Jun-Jie Pan and Gerard J Chang. Isometric-path numbers of block graphs. *Information processing letters*, 93(2):99–102, 2005.
- [19] Neil Robertson and Paul D. Seymour. Graph minors. XIII. The disjoint paths problem. *Journal of Combinatorial Theory, Series B*, 63(1):65–110, 1995. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1006/jctb.1995.1006>.

## A NP-completeness of Isometric Path Cover with Terminals

Problem STRONG GEODETIC SET WITH TERMINALS is known to be NP-complete by [7]. By a simple reduction, so is ISOMETRIC PATH COVER WITH TERMINALS.

**Lemma 7.** 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  $(G = (V, E), k' = \binom{k}{2})$  of ISOMETRIC PATH COVER WITH TERMINALS by considering all possible  $\binom{k}{2}$  possible pairs of terminals, that is pairs  $(v_i, v_j)$  with  $1 \leq i < j \leq k$ .

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  $V(G)$ .  $\square$

## B On the (non) tightness of our combinatorial bounds

Our combinatorial bounds on the pathwidth of graphs coverable by  $k$  shortest paths are super-exponential in  $k$ . Moreover, they rely on the fact that in such graphs, given any vertex  $a$  and any integer  $D$ , the number of vertices at distance exactly  $D$  from  $k$  is upper bounded by some




Figure 4: A graph that can be edge-covered with  $k$  shortest paths and with  $2^k$  vertices at distance  $2^k - 1$  from  $a$ .

function on  $k$ . Figure 4 shows that this upper bound is at least  $2^k$ , even for edge-coverings; the construction, illustrated for  $k = 4$ , can be easily generalized to any value  $k$ .

Note that the pathwidth of our example is still polynomial in  $k$ , which leaves entirely open the question whether graphs coverable by  $k$  shortest paths have treewidth or pathwidth at most some polynomial in  $k$ .