

GRAPH TRAVERSALS AS UNIVERSAL CONSTRUCTIONS

SIDDHARTH BHASKAR* AND ROBIN KAARSGAARD†

ABSTRACT. We exploit a decomposition of graph traversals to give a novel characterization of depth-first *and* breadth-first traversals as universal constructions. Specifically, we introduce functors from two different categories of *edge-ordered* directed graphs into two different categories of transitively closed edge-ordered graphs; one defines the lexicographic depth-first traversal and the other the lexicographic breadth-first traversal. We show that each functor factors as a composition of universal constructions, and that the usual presentation of traversals as linear orders on vertices can be recovered with the addition of an inclusion functor. Finally, we raise the question of to what extent we can recover search algorithms from the categorical description of the traversal they compute.

1. INTRODUCTION

Graph searches are algorithms for visiting the vertices in a connected graph from a prescribed source. Both graph searches and their resulting vertex orders, or *traversals*, are absolutely fundamental in the theory of graph algorithms, and have important applications in other areas of theoretical computer science such as computational complexity theory.

We start from the premise that a concept as natural as a traversal should be obtainable canonically from the original graph. For example, let us consider the graph G in Figure 1, and fix a as a source. Of the six vertex orderings of G starting with a , two are not traversals: (a, d, b, c) and (a, d, c, b) . This is because while searching a graph, each vertex added must be in the boundary of previously visited vertices, but d is not in the boundary of $\{a\}$.

Of the four remaining vertex orders, two are breadth-first traversals ((a, b, c, d) and (a, c, b, d)) and two are depth-first traversals ((a, b, d, c) and (a, c, d, b)). This can easily be checked by hand: in a breadth-first search, we go level-by-level, and must visit both b and c before we visit d . In a depth-first search, we prioritize the neighbor of the most recently visited vertex, so we visit d before the latter of $\{b, c\}$.

*Supported by DFF | Natural Sciences Research Project 1 115554 *Cons-Free Recursion Theory*.

†Supported by DFF | Natural Sciences International Postdoctoral Fellowship 0131-00025B *Landauer Meets von Neumann: Reversibility in Categorical Quantum Semantics*.




FIGURE 1. A 4-cycle




FIGURE 2. The construction of the lexicographic depth-first traversal starting from a on a given edge-ordered graph. First we extract the least-path tree, transitively close it, then isolate the ordered neighborhood of a . Numerals indicate the edge ordering. Each transformation is universal, except for a “silent” (forgetful) transformation fixing the transitive graph but forgetting some structure on morphisms.

However, notice that there is no way of canonically distinguishing between the two breadth-first or the two depth-first traversals. Concretely, once we visit a , there is no canonical way to choose between b and c . A natural fix is to linearly order each neighborhood and visit lesser neighbors first. We call the resulting traversals *lexicographic*. For example, if we say that $b < c$, then the lexicographic breadth-first traversal is (a, b, c, d) and the lexicographic depth-first traversal is (a, b, d, c) . If we say that $c < b$, we get (a, c, b, d) and (a, c, d, b) respectively. We call a graph whose neighborhoods are linearly ordered an *edge-ordered* graph.

In the present paper, we show that both the lexicographic breadth-first traversal and lexicographic depth-first traversal are canonically obtainable from a given edge-ordered graph with a distinguished source. Specifically, we equip edge-ordered graphs with two different kinds of morphisms, and obtain lexicographic breadth- and depth-first traversals by applying a functor out of each category of edge-ordered graphs into the category of linear orders. We furthermore factor each functor as a composition of a forgetful functor and a sequence of *universal* (free and cofree) constructions on edge-ordered graphs.

At a first approximation, each lexicographic traversal can be expressed as the composition of a least-path tree and a transitive closure (see Figure 2). This decomposition was first observed in [4]—and not in the context of category theory— and used to derive efficient parallel algorithms; see also [2, 5]. The main technical contribution of our paper is in identifying precisely the right notions of edge-ordered graphs and homomorphisms that allow us to formulate least-path trees and transitive closures as universal constructions.

To the best of our knowledge, equipping algorithmic problems with a categorical structure is a relatively recent idea. While graphs have been studied extensively from a categorical point of view, the focus has been on topics such as graph rewriting and string diagrams [6, 8] and relationships with properads [7] rather than graph algorithms. The only other papers that we know of in the algorithmic vein are that of Master on the open algebraic path problem [9] and the compositional algorithm by Rathke, Sobociński and Stephens [10] for reachability in Petri nets. These papers suggest that there might be a categorical setting for reachability problems on graphs, generally understood.

In [1], Abramsky describes a “great divide” between those areas of theoretical computer science focused on *structure* (semantics and type theory), and those focused on *power* (computability and complexity theory); they have “almost disjoint communities” with “no common technical language or tools.” He proposes a high-level “theory-building” program of integrating these approaches with the intent of solving hard problems, akin to Grothendieck’s program in algebraic geometry. We envision developing a theory of *compositional graph algorithms through universal properties* as a step along this way. A long-term

goal of such a project would be to see whether one could recover *algorithms* from *problem statements*, if the latter are suitably formulated.

This paper is structured as follows: We describe the necessary background on graphs and (lexicographic) traversals in Section 2, and present an alternate formulation of traversals in Section 3 that the remaining work will build on. We go on to describe the categories of edge-ordered graphs on which our work is founded in Section 4, and present the two categories of least path trees and universal constructions associated with lexicographic breadth-first and depth-first traversals respectively in Section 5 and Section 6. The categories of transitively closed least path trees and their universal constructions are presented in Section 7 and Section 8. Finally, we summarise our categorical construction of lexicographic breadth-first and depth-first traversals by universal means in Section 9, and end with some concluding remarks in Section 10.

Note that in the interests of space, we postpone all proofs until two appendices: one for the pre-categorical development (Sections 2 and 3), and another for category theory (Sections 4 through Section 9).

2. BACKGROUND AND PRELIMINARIES

Our objective is to give a categorical formulation of the canonical breadth-first and depth-first traversals of directed edge-ordered graphs. But first, in Sections 2 and 3, we give a “pre-categorical” account of these traversals in terms of extremal-path trees, which motivates the subsequent categorical treatment in Sections 4 through 8. The main results of Sections 2 and 3 can be found in [4], but we provide our own presentation.

Definition 1. A (directed) graph is a pair (V, \rightarrow) where V is the set of *vertices* and $\rightarrow \subseteq V \times V$ is the *edge relation*.

Definition 2. The *neighborhood* of a vertex $v \in V$, denoted $N(v)$, is the set of *outgoing* edges of v ; that is, $N(v) = \rightarrow \cap \{(v, x) \mid x \in V\}$. A graph is *pointed* when it has a distinguished vertex v_0 .

Definition 3. A *path* in a graph is a finite sequence of vertices $v_1 \rightarrow v_2 \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow v_n$; say that v_1 is the *source* of the path, and v_n the *target*. We will write $u \rightsquigarrow v$ to say that there is a path from u to v , and $u \overset{\pi}{\rightsquigarrow} v$ about a specific such path named π . We say that a path is *proper* when no vertex occurs more than once in the path, i.e., when $v_i = v_j$ implies $i = j$ for all $i, j \in I$. We use ε to denote the unique *empty* (proper) path in each neighborhood.

Definition 4. Two paths are *co-initial* in case they share a source, and *co-final* in case they share a target. If the source of σ agrees with the target of π , we can *compose* them to obtain $\pi\sigma$. For two co-initial paths π and σ , we say $\pi \sqsubset \sigma$ (read: σ *extends* π) in case π is an initial subsequence (i.e., a prefix) of σ .

Remark. Notice that $u \rightsquigarrow v$ iff there exists a proper path from u to v , as repetitions in a path can always be deleted.

Definition 5. A pointed graph (G, v_0) is *connected* if for every vertex v , there exists a path $v_0 \rightsquigarrow v$.

2.1. Graph searching and traversals. By a *graph search*, we mean an algorithm for visiting all the vertices in a connected graph, starting at a given source. Two of the most important types of graph search are *depth-first* and *breadth-first* :

Definition 6 (Depth-first search). Given as input a finite connected graph $G = (V, E)$, initialize a list $L = ()$, and a stack $S = (v_0)$ for some vertex v_0 . While S is nonempty, pop the first element v from S . If v is already contained in L , go back to the start of the loop. Otherwise, let $L = (L, v)$, and push every vertex in ∂v onto S , where $\partial v = N(v) \setminus L$.

Definition 7 (Breadth-first search). Given as input a finite connected graph $G = (V, E)$, initialize a list $L = ()$, and a queue $Q = (v_0)$ for some vertex v_0 . While S is nonempty, dequeue the front element v from Q . If v is already contained in L , go back to the start of the loop. Otherwise, let $L = (L, v)$, and enqueue every vertex in ∂v to the back of Q , where $\partial v = N(v) \setminus L$.

Note that depth-first and breadth-first search are nondeterministic, in the sense that we do not specify which order to add vertices from ∂v in. Moreover, vertices may occur more than once in S or Q , as the same vertex may be added as a neighbor multiple times. However, vertices may not occur more than once in L ; when depth-first or breadth-first search is complete, L lists all the vertices in G .

As we vary over all the nondeterministic traces of depth-first search or breadth-first search over a graph G , the resulting orderings are depth-first or breadth-first traversals.

Definition 8. A linear ordering $<$ of the vertices of a graph G is a *depth-first traversal*, respectively *breadth-first traversal* of G if there exists some computation of depth-first search, respectively breadth-first search, on G according to which vertices are added to L in exactly the order $<$.

Both depth- and breadth-first traversals have important characterizations in the first-order language of ordered graphs; these are due to Corneil and Krueger [3], who state them in the special case of undirected graphs. Here, we only need to know that they are necessary.

Lemma 1. *If $\cdot < \cdot$ is a depth-first traversal of a finite, connected graph G , and if there are vertices $u < v < w$ such that $u \rightarrow w$, then there exists some v' such that $u \leq v' < v$ and $v' \rightarrow v$.*

Lemma 2. *If $\cdot < \cdot$ is a breadth-first traversal of a finite, connected graph G , and if there are vertices $u < v < w$ such that $u \rightarrow w$, then there exists some v' such that $v' \leq u < v$ and $v' \rightarrow v$.*

These characterizations motivate the following definitions.

Definition 9. Let G be a finite connected graph and $\cdot < \cdot$ be a depth-first traversal of G . Then for any vertex v , define the *depth-first predecessor* $dfp(v)$ to be the greatest $u < v$ such that $u \rightarrow v$, if v is not the minimal vertex. For the minimal vertex v , let $dfp(v) = v$.

Definition 10. Let G be a finite connected graph and $\cdot < \cdot$ be a depth-first traversal of G . Then for any vertex v , define the *breadth-first predecessor* $bfp(v)$ to be the least $u < v$ such that $u \rightarrow v$, if v is not the minimal vertex. For the minimal vertex v , let $bfp(v) = v$.

Depth- and breadth-first predecessors allow for elegant restatements of Lemmata 1 and 2: if $\cdot < \cdot$ is a depth-first traversal of G , then for any $v < w$, if $dfp(w) < v$, then $dfp(w) \leq dfp(v)$. Similarly, if $\cdot < \cdot$ is a breadth-first traversal of G then for any $v < w$, if $bfp(w) < v$, then $bfp(v) \leq bfp(w)$. In fact the second condition is equivalent to saying that bfp is weakly monotone, viz., $v \leq w \implies bfp(v) \leq bfp(w)$.

For the next definition, notice that the orbits $\{v, dfp(v), dfp^2(v), \dots\}$ and $\{v, bfp(v), bfp^2(v), \dots\}$ of any vertex v are finite, and their *reversals* are paths from the least vertex v_0 to v .

Definition 11. Let G be a finite connected graph, $\cdot < \cdot$ be a depth-first traversal of G , and v_0 be the $<$ -least vertex. Then the *canonical df-path* from v_0 to any vertex v is the path $v_0 \rightarrow v_1 \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow v_{\ell-1}$ such that $v_{\ell-1} = v$, and for every $0 \leq i < \ell - 1$, $dfp(v_{i+1}) = v_i$.

Analogously, the *canonical bf-path* from v_0 to any vertex v is the path $v_0 \rightarrow v_1 \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow v_{\ell-1}$ such that $v_{\ell-1} = v$, and for every $0 \leq i < \ell - 1$, $bfp(v_{i+1}) = v_i$.

2.2. Lexicographic searching. The objective of this paper is to show that the depth-first and breadth-first traversals of a graph is *canonical* in some precise categorical sense. Of course, this cannot be true at face value: in a complete graph, every ordering of the vertices is both a breadth-first and a depth-first traversal, and none of them is canonical.

As we remarked in the introduction, an edge-ordering is precisely the amount of additional structure we need. Over such graphs, we can make searching deterministic, as we now show.

Definition 12. A *finite edge ordered graph* is a finite graph where each neighborhood is equipped with a (strict) linear order $\cdot \triangleleft \cdot$.

Definition 13 (Lexicographic depth-first search). Let G be a finite, connected, pointed, edge-ordered graph with distinguished vertex v_0 . Initialize a list $L = ()$ and a stack $S = (v_0)$. While S is nonempty, pop the first element v from S . If v is already contained in L , go back to the start of the loop. Otherwise, let $L = (L, v)$, and push every vertex in ∂v onto S in *reverse* \triangleleft -order, where ∂v is the set of neighbors of v not in L .

Remark. We push vertices from ∂v onto S in reverse \triangleleft -order, so that the least vertices from ∂v end up on top of S .

Definition 14 (Lexicographic breadth-first search). Let G be a finite, connected, pointed, edge-ordered graph with distinguished vertex v_0 . Initialize a list $L = ()$ and a queue $Q = (v_0)$. While Q is nonempty, dequeue first element v from S . If v is already contained in L , go back to the start of the loop. Otherwise, let $L = (L, v)$, and enqueue every vertex from ∂v onto Q in \triangleleft -order, where ∂v is the set of neighbors of v not in L .

Definition 15. The depth-first traversal computed by lexicographic depth-first search on a finite, connected, pointed, edge-ordered graph G , is its *lexicographic depth-first traversal*. Similarly, the breadth-first traversal computed by lexicographic breadth-first search is its *lexicographic breadth-first traversal*.

Remark. The usage of *lexicographic (depth, breadth)-first (search, traversal)* is ambiguous in the literature. Here, we use it in the same way as Delatorre and Kruskal [4, 5]; however, the *lexicographic breadth-first search* of Rose and Tarjan [11] and the analogous *depth-first* version of Corneil and Krueger [3] are different. The latter are further refinements of breadth-first search and depth-first search over graphs, not a “determinization” by an edge-ordering.

3. AN ALTERNATE FORMULATION

In this section, we give different characterizations of the lexicographic depth-first and breadth-first traversals, independent of any graph search, which suggest the category-theoretic treatment that occupies us for the rest of the paper.

Definition 16. Fix an edge-ordered graph G . Define the *lexicographic path relation* $\cdot \prec \cdot$ on any proper co-initial paths π and σ in G as follows:

- (i) if $\pi \sqsubset \sigma$, then $\pi \prec \sigma$, similarly if $\sigma \sqsubset \pi$, then $\sigma \prec \pi$; otherwise,
- (ii) let ζ be the longest common prefix of π and σ , let u be the target of ζ , and let v_1 and v_2 be the first vertices immediately following ζ in π and σ respectively. Order $\pi \prec \sigma \iff u \rightarrow v_1 \triangleleft u \rightarrow v_2$.

Remark. The following properties hold of \prec :

- (1) The empty path (v) is least among all paths from v .
- (2) If $\pi \prec \sigma$ and $\pi \not\sqsubseteq \sigma$, then for any α and β , $\pi\alpha \prec \sigma\beta$.
- (3) If $\pi \prec \sigma$, then $\alpha\pi \prec \alpha\sigma$.
- (4) If $\alpha\pi \prec \alpha\sigma$, then $\pi \prec \sigma$.

Since the set of proper paths is finite, any subset has a \prec -least element, which justifies the next definitions.

Definition 17. For vertices u, v in a finite edge-ordered graph, let $\min(u \rightsquigarrow v)$ be the lexicographically least proper path from u to v .

Definition 18. For vertices u, v in a finite edge-ordered graph, let $\min^s(u \rightsquigarrow v)$ be the lexicographically least *shortest* path from u to v .

In fact, it will be convenient to define the following relation, the *shortlex* order:

Definition 19. Let $\pi \prec^s \sigma$ mean that either $|\pi| < |\sigma|$, or $|\pi| = |\sigma|$ and $\pi \prec \sigma$.

In this case, $\min^s(u \rightsquigarrow v)$ is simply, the \prec^s -least path $u \rightsquigarrow v$.

In the remainder of this section, we fix a finite, connected, pointed, edge-ordered graph G with distinguished element v_0 . Reserve the symbol $\cdot \triangleleft \cdot$ for the given ordering on co-initial edges and $\cdot \prec \cdot$ for the induced lexicographic ordering on co-initial paths. Let $\cdot <_D \cdot$ and $\cdot <_B \cdot$ denote the lexicographic depth-first and breadth-first traversals respectively. Let $\mathfrak{P}v$ and $\mathfrak{Q}v$ denote the canonical df- and bf-paths from v_0 to v with respect to $\cdot <_D \cdot$ and $\cdot <_B \cdot$ respectively.

Our goal is to prove the following ‘‘alternate characterizations’’ of the lexicographic depth- and breadth-first traversals:

$$\begin{aligned} u <_D v &\iff \mathfrak{P}u \prec \mathfrak{P}v \\ u <_B v &\iff \mathfrak{Q}u \prec^s \mathfrak{Q}v. \end{aligned}$$

In the breadth-first case,

Lemma 3. *If $u \leq_B v$, then for any path $\pi : v_0 \rightsquigarrow v$, $|\mathfrak{Q}u| \leq |\pi|$. In addition, if $|\mathfrak{Q}u| = |\pi|$, then $\mathfrak{Q}u \preceq \pi$.*

Corollary 4. *The following are all true of the operator \mathfrak{Q} :*

- (1) *For any vertex v of G , $\mathfrak{Q}v = \min^s(v_0 \rightsquigarrow v)$.*
- (2) *$u \leq_B v$ iff $\mathfrak{Q}u \preceq^s \mathfrak{Q}v$.*

Corollary 4 gives us our desired alternate characterization of the lexicographic breadth-first traversal, viz., $u <_B v \iff \mathfrak{Q}u \prec^s \mathfrak{Q}v$. In the depth-first case,

Definition 20. Define $v \prec_D w$ in case $\min(v_0 \rightsquigarrow v) \prec \min(v_0 \rightsquigarrow w)$.

Lemma 5. *For any vertex v of G , $\mathfrak{P}v = \min(v_0 \rightsquigarrow v)$.*

Theorem 6. *The order $\cdot \prec_D \cdot$ is exactly the lexicographic depth-first traversal $\cdot <_D \cdot$ of G .*

4. CATEGORIES OF GRAPHS

We now work towards a categorical formulation of the lexicographic depth-first traversal based on Theorem 6. This means we need to categorify, i.e., equip with morphisms, all the objects we defined in Section 2, as well as introduce some new objects.

Continuing the convention established above, we use the symbol \prec and variations thereof to refer to orderings of co-initial paths, and the symbol \triangleleft to refer to neighborhood orders, i.e., orderings of co-initial edges. We reserve the symbol $<$ for vertex orders, but these will not reappear until Section 9.

Definition 21. A *homomorphism of graphs* $G \xrightarrow{h} H$ is a function from G -vertices to H -vertices which preserves edge connectivity: For all G -vertices u, v , $u \rightarrow v$ in G implies $h(u) \rightarrow h(v)$ in H . A *homomorphism of pointed graphs* $G \xrightarrow{h} H$ must additionally map the distinguished vertex of G , and *only* that vertex, to the distinguished vertex of H .

Definition 22. If $h : G \rightarrow H$ is a graph homomorphism and π is the path $v_1 \rightarrow v_2 \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow v_n$ in G , then $h(\pi)$ is defined to be the path $h(v_1) \rightarrow h(v_2) \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow h(v_n)$ in H .

Remark. The following hold of any homomorphism $h : G \rightarrow H$;

- (1) $h(\varepsilon) = \varepsilon$, $h(\pi\sigma) = h(\pi)h(\sigma)$, and if $\pi \sqsubset \sigma$, then $h(\pi) \sqsubset h(\sigma)$.
- (2) If h is injective on vertices and π is a proper path, then $h(\pi)$ is a proper path.
- (3) If h is injective on vertices, then h preserves longest common prefixes.

We now define homomorphisms of edge-ordered graphs (cf. Definition 12). In addition to the “straight-forward” property of being monotone on neighborhoods, we also want to consider homomorphisms that preserve lexicographically minimal paths. This gives us two refinements of the notion of homomorphism, depending on whether we want to preserve lexicographically (\prec) least paths or short-lex (\prec^s) least paths.

Definition 23. A *homomorphism* of finite, pointed, edge-ordered graphs $G \xrightarrow{h} H$ is a homomorphism of pointed graphs that is monotone on neighborhoods; explicitly,

- (i) $u \rightarrow v$ in G implies $h(u) \rightarrow h(v)$ in H ,
- (ii) v_G is the *unique* vertex such that $h(v_G) = v_H$, where v_G and v_H are the distinguished points of G and H respectively, and
- (iii) $u \rightarrow v_1 \prec u \rightarrow v_2$ implies $h(u) \rightarrow h(v_1) \prec h(u) \rightarrow h(v_2)$.

In addition, a *lex-homomorphism* must preserve minimal paths:

- (iv) $h(\min(u \rightsquigarrow v)) = \min(h(u) \rightsquigarrow h(v))$,

and a *short-lex homomorphism* must preserve minimal shortest paths:

- (v) $h(\min^s(u \rightsquigarrow v)) = \min^s(h(u) \rightsquigarrow h(v))$.

Lemma 7. If $h : G \rightarrow H$ is a homomorphism of edge-ordered graphs then h preserves $\cdot \prec \cdot$ as well as $\cdot \prec^s \cdot$.

An important special case of edge-ordered graphs are those where the edge order agrees with the path order in each neighborhood.

Definition 24. A *lex-graph* is a pointed, connected, edge-ordered finite graph such that the edge order is compatible with the lexicographic path order; explicitly, it is a finite directed graph equipped with

- (i) a distinguished vertex v_0 , and
- (ii) a linear order \triangleleft on each neighbourhood $N(u)$ such that for every $v_1, v_2 \in N(u)$, $\min(u \rightsquigarrow v_1) \prec \min(u \rightsquigarrow v_2) \iff u \rightarrow v_1 \triangleleft u \rightarrow v_2$.

Remark. We might be tempted to define, analogously, a *short-lex graph* by demanding that $v_1, v_2 \in N(u)$, $\min^s(u \rightsquigarrow v_1) \prec^s \min^s(u \rightsquigarrow v_2) \iff u \rightarrow v_1 \triangleleft u \rightarrow v_2$. However notice that this condition simply holds automatically for any edge-ordered graph: if there is an edge $u \rightarrow v$, that edge is the lexicographically least shortest path.

Finally, we isolate two extremal special cases of lex-graphs, one with very few edges, and one with very many.

Definition 25. An *arborescence* is a pointed directed graph $G = (V, \rightarrow, v_0)$ such that for every vertex u , there is a unique path $v_0 \rightsquigarrow u$ in G .

Remark. If (V, \rightarrow, v_0) is an arborescence, its underlying undirected graph (V, E) is connected and acyclic (where $E(u, v)$ iff $(u \rightarrow v)$ or $(v \rightarrow u)$), and every edge $u \rightarrow v$ is oriented away from v_0 , meaning that the distance from v_0 to u is less than the distance from v_0 to v . If G is a finite edge-ordered graph that




FIGURE 3. Categories of edge-ordered graphs and their relationships.

is also an arborescence, then it is already lex-graph, since the only path between u and $v \in N(u)$ is the edge $u \rightarrow v$. Moreover, if S and T are arborescences and if $h : S \rightarrow T$ is a pointed, edge-ordered graph homomorphism, then it is already both a lex-homomorphism and a short-lex homomorphism.

Definition 26. A graph is *transitive* if its edge relation is; i.e., if $u \rightarrow v$ and $v \rightarrow w$ implies $u \rightarrow w$. A *transitive lex-graph* is simply a lex-graph with a transitive edge relation.

It follows readily that this zoo of graph variations each form a category,

- $\mathbf{FinGraph}_*^l$ of connected, finite pointed edge ordered graphs with homomorphisms,
- $\mathbf{FinGraph}_*^l$ of connected, finite pointed edge ordered graphs with lex-homomorphisms,
- $\mathbf{FinGraph}_*^s$ of connected, finite pointed edge ordered graphs with short-lex homomorphisms,
- $\mathbf{LexGraph}$ of lex-graphs with lex-homomorphisms,
- $\mathbf{FinArb}_*^<$ of finite, edge-ordered arborescences with edge-ordered graph homomorphisms,
- $\mathbf{TLexGraph}$ of transitive lex-graphs with lex-homomorphisms,

Diagrammatically, we summarize the relationships between these categories in Figure 3, where each arrow indicates inclusion as a full subcategory.

There is one additional category that will be introduced in Section 8, and that is \mathbf{TArb} (Definition 31) whose objects are transitive closures of arborescences with a particular edge order depending on the underlying arborescence. Curiously, their morphisms preserve *longest* paths instead of shortest paths.

5. LEAST PATH TREES

Given a finite, connected, pointed, edge-ordered graph, we can delete all edges which are not on some lexicographically least path starting from the distinguished vertex v_0 . We get a finite, edge-ordered arborescence. In this section, we show that this construction (denoted Θ) is cofree, indeed coreflective: it is right adjoint to the inclusion functor I .

Definition 27 (The functor Θ). Given a finite, connected, pointed, edge-ordered graph G , with distinguished vertex v_0 , the graph $\Theta(G)$ is defined as follows:

- the vertices of $\Theta(G)$ are the vertices of G , and
- any edge $u \rightarrow v$ appears in $\Theta(G)$ iff $u \rightarrow v$ is contained in $\min(v_0 \rightsquigarrow v)$.
- Order co-initial edges $u \rightarrow v_1 \triangleleft u \rightarrow v_2$ in $\Theta(G)$ iff the same relation holds in G .

For a lex-homomorphism $h : G \rightarrow H$ define $\Theta(h) : \Theta(G) \rightarrow \Theta(H)$ by $\Theta(h)(v) = h(v)$ for any vertex $v \in \Theta(G)$.

The proof that Θ is a well-defined functor into the indicated category is in the appendix (Lemma 21). Next we define I , which is simply inclusion of categories.

Definition 28 (The functor I). Given a finite, edge-ordered arborescence T , the object $I(T)$ is simply identified with T . Given a pointed, edge-ordered homomorphism $h : S \rightarrow T$, the homomorphism $I(h) : I(S) \rightarrow I(T)$ is simply identified with h .

Since every finite, edge-ordered arborescence is a finite, connected, pointed edge-ordered graph, and since morphisms in $\mathbf{FinArb}_*^<$ are defined to be morphisms of pointed, edge-ordered graphs, I is well-defined.

Theorem 8. *There is an adjunction $I \dashv \Theta$.*

Since the image of I is always a lex-graph, and since $\mathbf{LexGraph}$ is a full subcategory of $\mathbf{FinGraph}_*^l$, we actually get another adjunction for free, namely $I' \dashv \Theta'$ where I' is the functor I but with target category $\mathbf{LexGraph}$, and Θ' is Θ restricted to $\mathbf{LexGraph}$. The proof is in the appendix (Lemma 22).

6. LEAST SHORTEST-PATH TREES

Our objective in this section is to establish a shortest-paths analogue of the previous section, viz., $I \dashv S$ where $\mathbf{FinGraph}_*^s \xrightarrow{S} \mathbf{FinArb}_*^<$ remembers only the edges on lexicographically least *shortest* paths and $\mathbf{FinArb}_*^< \xrightarrow{I} \mathbf{FinGraph}_*^s$ is the inclusion functor. (It is not, of course, the same I as in the previous section, the source category being different.)

Definition 29 (The functor S). Given a finite, connected, pointed, edge-ordered graph G , with distinguished vertex v_0 , the graph $S(G)$ is defined as follows:

- the vertices of $S(G)$ are identified with the vertices of G , and
- any edge $u \rightarrow v$ appears in $S(G)$ iff $u \rightarrow v$ is contained in $\min^s(v_0 \rightsquigarrow v)$.
- Order co-initial edges $u \rightarrow v_1 \triangleleft u \rightarrow v_2$ in $S(G)$ iff the same relation holds in G .

If $h : G \rightarrow H$ is a homomorphism, define $S(h) : S(G) \rightarrow S(H)$ by $S(h)(v) = h(v)$, for any vertex $v \in S(G)$.

To show that S is functorial, it suffices to check that $S(G)$ is always an arborescence. We prove this in the appendix (Lemma 23).

Theorem 9. *There is an adjunction $I \dashv S$.*

7. TRANSITIVE CLOSURE OF LEX-GRAPHS

There is a well-known adjunction between the category of graphs and the category \mathbf{TGraph} of transitive graphs, where the functor in one direction transitively closes the edge relation, and in the other direction is simply inclusion [9]. Here, we refine this to an adjunction between $\mathbf{LexGraph}$ and $\mathbf{TLexGraph}$. Indeed, the usual transitive closure appears when forgetting the order

While it is immediately clear that there is a forgetful (inclusion) functor $\mathbf{TLexGraph} \xrightarrow{U} \mathbf{LexGraph}$, we must construct the free functor in the other direction.

Definition 30 (The functor F). Given a lex-graph G , define the transitive lex-graph $F(G)$ as follows:

- the vertices of $F(G)$ are the vertices of G ,
- the distinguished point of $F(G)$ is the distinguished point of G ,
- The edge relation of $F(G)$ is the transitive closure of the edge relation of G , and finally
- for any vertices v_1, v_2 in a common neighborhood $N(u)$, let $u \rightarrow v_1 \triangleleft u \rightarrow v_2$ in $F(G)$ iff $\min(u \rightsquigarrow v_1) \triangleleft \min(u \rightsquigarrow v_2)$ in G .

On morphisms, given $G \xrightarrow{h} H$ we define $F(G) \xrightarrow{F(h)} F(H)$ by $F(h)(v) = h(v)$.

We must show that F is a well-defined functor, but before doing so, we state several important relationships between the lex-graph G and the edge-ordered graph $F(G)$:

Lemma 10. *For any lex-graph G ,*

- (i) The neighborhood order of $F(G)$ extends that of G
- (ii) The lexicographic path order of $F(G)$ extends that of G .
- (iii) Minimal paths in G and $F(G)$ coincide.

Lemma 11. The map $\mathbf{LexGraph} \xrightarrow{F} \mathbf{TLexGraph}$ is well-defined and functorial.

Theorem 12. There is an adjunction $F \dashv U$.

Remark. In the title of this paper, we promise universal constructions – and while such do arise from adjunctions (from the unit and counit), it seems fitting that we make this explicit at least once. The reader is invited to extract similar universal mapping properties from other adjunctions in this paper.

As a consequence of Theorem 12, for any lex-graph G in with lexicographic-transitive closure $U(F(G))$, given any other transitive lex-graph $U(G')$ and $G \xrightarrow{h} U(G')$ there is a *unique* homomorphism of transitive lex-graphs $F(G) \xrightarrow{\hat{h}} G'$ such that h factors as $G \hookrightarrow U(F(G)) \xrightarrow{U(\hat{h})} U(G')$.

8. TRANSITIVE CLOSURE OF LEAST SHORTEST PATH TREES

We now establish the final adjunction of our paper, and the second adjunction needed to characterize breadth-first traversals. Analogously to the depth-first case, this adjunction relates $\mathbf{FinArb}_*^<$ and a category of transitively closed graphs:

Definition 31 (The category \mathbf{TArb}). A finite, pointed, connected, edge-ordered graph G is an object of \mathbf{TArb} iff there exists a finite, connected, pointed, edge-ordered arborescence T and an identification of the vertices of G with the vertices of T such that

- the distinguished points of each are identical,
- the edge relation of G is the transitive closure of the edge relation of T , and
- $u \rightarrow v_1 \triangleleft u \rightarrow v_2$ in G iff $v_0 \rightsquigarrow v_1 \prec^s v_0 \rightsquigarrow v_2$ in T , where $v_0 \rightsquigarrow v$ is the *unique* path from v_0 to v in T .

A map $G_1 \xrightarrow{h} G_2$ is a morphism in \mathbf{TArb} if it is a homomorphism of edge-ordered graphs ((i)-(iii) of Definition 23) and in addition it preserves *longest* paths.

This last property only makes sense if longest paths are unique. Luckily, longest paths in the transitive closure of an arborescence are exactly the edges of the original tree.

Lemma 13. If T is an arborescence (not necessarily edge-ordered) with root v_0 , and G is its transitive closure, then an edge $u \rightarrow v$ of G is an edge of T iff $u \rightarrow v$ appears on a longest path $v_0 \rightsquigarrow v$ in G . Moreover, the longest path $u \rightsquigarrow v$ in G is unique.

Remark. As a consequence of Lemma 13, for any graph $G \in \mathbf{TArb}$, $u \rightarrow v_1 \triangleleft u \rightarrow v_2$ in G iff $v_0 \rightsquigarrow v_1 \prec^s v_0 \rightsquigarrow v_2$ in G , where $v_0 \rightsquigarrow v$ is the unique longest path from v_0 to v in G .

While the presentation of depth- and breadth-first traversals has thus far been similar even at a rather small scale, this adjunction diverges from the previous one in several ways: it does not decompose into an inclusion and a functor which lifts the ordinary transitive closure, and the curious preservation longest paths by morphisms is not suggested by the pre-categorical treatment of breadth-first traversals. This category arises somewhat mysteriously, and we have no justification for introducing it other than it works.

We now define the two functors of the adjunction. The proofs that they are functorial are Lemmas 24 and 25 in the appendix.

Definition 32. Define the functor $\mathbf{FinArb}_*^< \xrightarrow{\Gamma} \mathbf{TArb}$ by $\Gamma(V, v_0, \rightarrow) = (V, v_0, \xrightarrow{\text{trans}})$, and for any vertices (u, v_1, v_2) such that $u \rightarrow v_1$ and $u \rightarrow v_2$ in $\Gamma(T)$, define $u \rightarrow v_1 \triangleleft u \rightarrow v_2$ iff $v_0 \rightsquigarrow v_1 \prec^s v_0 \rightsquigarrow v_2$ in T . For morphisms $T \xrightarrow{h} T'$, define $\Gamma(h) : \Gamma(T) \rightarrow \Gamma(T')$ by $\Gamma(h)(v) = h(v)$.

Definition 33. Define the functor $\mathbf{TArb} \xrightarrow{L} \mathbf{FinArb}_*^<$ by identifying the set of vertices of $L(G)$ with the vertices of G , and including an edge $u \rightarrow v$ in $L(G)$ iff it lies on the longest path $v_0 \rightsquigarrow v$ in G . The neighborhood order in $L(G)$ is inherited from G , and for morphisms $G \xrightarrow{h} H$, define $L(h) : L(G) \rightarrow L(H)$ by $L(h)(v) = h(v)$.

Theorem 14. *There is an adjunction $\Gamma \dashv L$.*

9. PUTTING IT ALL TOGETHER

Suppose we fix a finite, pointed, edge-ordered graph, locate it in either $\mathbf{FinGraph}_*^l$ or $\mathbf{FinGraph}_*^s$, then apply the appropriate least-path tree and the transitive closure functors. Then the edge ordering of the distinguished vertex in the result is the lexicographic depth-first or breadth-first traversal respectively.

Lemma 15. *Given any $G \in \mathbf{FinGraph}_*^l$, let $T = (F \circ I' \circ \Theta)(G)$. Then the neighborhood ordering \triangleleft on the distinguished point in T is the lexicographic depth-first traversal of G .*

Lemma 16. *Given any $G \in \mathbf{FinGraph}_*^s$, let $T = (\Gamma \circ S)(G)$. Then the neighborhood ordering \triangleleft on the distinguished point in T is the lexicographic breadth-first traversal of G .*

Finally, we show that these traversals can be extracted as vertex orders rather than edge orders, by defining a functor that takes an edge-ordered graph into the ordered neighborhood of its distinguished point. Let $\mathbf{FinLiset}$ denote the category of finite linearly ordered sets with monotone functions.

Lemma 17. *There is a functor $E : \mathbf{FinGraph}_*^< \rightarrow \mathbf{FinLiset}$ that linearly orders the vertices in a given graph according to the ordering on $N(v_0)$.*

Since there are inclusions $\mathbf{TLexGraph} \rightarrow \mathbf{FinGraph}_*^<$ and $\mathbf{TArb} \rightarrow \mathbf{FinGraph}_*^<$, we get

Corollary 18. *There are functors $\mathbf{FinGraph}_*^l \rightarrow \mathbf{FinLiset}$ and $\mathbf{FinGraph}_*^s \rightarrow \mathbf{FinLiset}$ which compute the lexicographic depth-first and breadth-first traversals respectively.*

Note that parts of this final step $\mathbf{FinGraph}_*^< \rightarrow \mathbf{FinLiset}$ can also be made universal, but since we still have to accept the presence of inclusion functors without adjoints, we only sketch this construction: The functor E from Lemma 17 restricts to a functor from the category of *transitive* finite, pointed, edge-ordered graphs and their homomorphisms, and into the category of finite *nonempty* linearly ordered sets with monotone functions *which additionally preserve the least element*. This restricted functor has a left adjoint given by mapping a finite linearly ordered set $(V, <)$ to the graph with vertices V , distinguished vertex the least element v_0 of V (guaranteed to exist when V is finite), and edge relation given by $v_0 \rightarrow v$ for all $v \in V$ with $v \neq v_0$. This specializes to neither $\mathbf{TLexGraph}$ nor \mathbf{TArb} , however, since the counit of this adjunction need not preserve either least or longest paths.

10. DISCUSSION AND OPEN QUESTIONS

We have described a construction of depth-first traversals from a category of finite edge-ordered graphs whose morphisms preserve least paths as a series of universal constructions, and in analogous fashion, a construction of breadth-first traversals from a category of finite edge-ordered graphs whose morphisms preserve least shortest paths.

This begs the question of whether there is way of generalizing these two constructions using a general notion of extremal path. Such a method is suggested by Delatorre and Kruskal [4] using the machinery of a closed semiring system, which provides a general setting for several algebraic path problems, not only lexicographic breadth-first and depth-first search, but *lexicographic topological search* as well.

The deepest question raised by our work is whether there is any sense in which an algorithm can be recovered from the categorical presentation of the problem which it solves. For example, do the universal constructions in our factorization admit greedy algorithms? Do they allow us to recover the parallel traversal algorithms of [4]? Can we infer that sequential depth-first and breadth-first search require LIFO and FIFO (i.e., stack and queue) data structures respectively?

Positive answers to any of these questions would be strong evidence that the “categorical structure theory of algorithms” mentioned in the introduction is actually a viable program; that it can not only describe problems, but suggest ways to solve them—in the elegant characterization of [1], to *lead* rather than to *follow*.

REFERENCES

- [1] S. Abramsky. Whither semantics? *Theoretical Computer Science*, 807:3–14, 2020.
- [2] E. Allender, A. Chauhan, and S. Datta. Depth-first search in directed graphs, revisited. *Electronic colloquium on computational complexity*, 20(74), 2020.
- [3] D. Corneil and R. Krueger. A unified view of graph searching. *SIAM J. Discrete Math.*, 22:1259–1276, 01 2008.
- [4] P. Delatorre and C.P. Kruskal. Fast parallel algorithms for all-sources lexicographic search and path-algebra problems. *Journal of Algorithms*, 19(1):1–24, 1995.
- [5] P. Delatorre and C.P. Kruskal. Polynomially improved efficiency for fast parallel single-source lexicographic depth-first search, breadth-first search, and topological-first search. *Theory of Computing Systems*, 34:275–298, 2001.
- [6] L. Dixon and A. Kissinger. Open-graphs and monoidal theories. *Mathematical Structures in Computer Science*, 23(2):308–359, 2013.
- [7] J. Kock. Graphs, hypergraphs, and properads. *Collectanea mathematica*, 67(2):155–190, 2016.
- [8] S. Lack and P. Sobociński. Adhesive and quasiadhesive categories. *RAIRO-Theoretical Informatics and Applications*, 39(3):511–545, 2005.
- [9] J. Master. The open algebraic path problem, 2020. [arXiv:arXiv:2005.06682](https://arxiv.org/abs/2005.06682).
- [10] J. Rathke, P. Sobociński, and O. Stephens. Compositional reachability in petri nets. In J. Ouaknine, I. Potapov, and J. Worrell, editors, *Reachability Problems*, pages 230–243. Springer, 2014.
- [11] D. J. Rose and R. E. Tarjan. Algorithmic aspects of vertex elimination. In *Proceedings of the Seventh Annual ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing (STOC '75)*, pages 245–254. ACM, 1975.

APPENDIX: PROOFS FROM SECTIONS 2 AND 3

Here we prove the results from these sections as well as some auxiliary definitions and lemmas which are required for the proofs of these results, not their statements.

When reasoning about depth- and breadth-first searches (Definitions 6 and 7), the notion of *stages* is important:

Definition 34. Suppose a graph G has n vertices. For a specific computation of depth- or breadth-first traversal over G , label the vertices v_0, \dots, v_{n-1} according to the order in which they are added to L . (Equivalently, in the order of the traversal defined by this computation.)

For $0 \leq i < n$ *stage* i refer to the pass of the while loop during which v_i is removed from S or Q and added to L . Let S_i , respectively Q_i , and L_i be the values of S , respectively Q , and L immediately before stage i . Notice that v_i is the top of S_i , respectively the front of Q_i , and $L_i = (v_0, \dots, v_{i-1})$.

Even though there are other passes through the while loop besides the labeled stages, no new vertices are added to S , Q , or L during these.

Proof of Lemma 1. Suppose G has n vertices, and let $(v_0, v_1, \dots, v_{n-1})$ be the vertices of G according to $\cdot < \cdot$. Fix a computation of depth-first search computing the traversal $<$.

Consider three vertices $u < v < w$ such that $u \rightarrow w$. Let i, j , and k satisfy $u = v_i, v = v_j$ and $w = v_k$; then $0 \leq i < j < k \leq n-1$. Notice that we push a new occurrence of w onto S at stage i : as $w \in N(v_i)$ and $w \notin L_i, w \in \partial v_i$.

Notice that $v < w$ in the traversal ordering, which means that by the stage (j) that v appears at the top of S , w has never appeared at the top of S . This means one of two things: either v appears and is discharged from S before w is ever pushed onto it, or v and w co-exist on the stack S simultaneously.

The first case does not hold: w is pushed onto S at stage i , but v has not been discharged from S at this point, or else it would occur in $L_{i+1} = (v_0, \dots, v_i)$.

Therefore, v and w occur in S simultaneously. Consider all the stages $\ell < j$, before either v or w appears on top of S . Since S is a last-in first-out data structure and since v appears on top first, we conclude that for every stage $\ell < j$ at which w gets pushed onto S , there is another stage $\ell \leq \ell' < j$ at which v gets pushed onto S .

In particular, consider ℓ' when $\ell = i$, and let $v' = v_{\ell'}$. Then $u \leq v'$ (since $i \leq \ell'$), $v' < v$ (since $\ell' < j$), and $v' \rightarrow v$ (since v is pushed onto S at stage ℓ'). This is exactly what we wanted to show. \square

Proof of 2. Suppose G has n vertices, and let $(v_0, v_1, \dots, v_{n-1})$ be the vertices of G according to $\cdot < \cdot$. Fix a computation of depth-first search computing the traversal $<$.

Consider three vertices $u < v < w$ such that $u \rightarrow w$. Let i, j , and k satisfy $u = v_i, v = v_j$ and $w = v_k$; then $0 \leq i < j < k \leq n-1$. Notice that we enqueue a new occurrence of w onto Q at stage i : as $w \in N(v_i)$ and $w \notin L_i, w \in \partial v_i$.

Notice that $v < w$ in the traversal ordering, which means that by the stage (j) that v appears at the front of Q , w has never appeared at the front of Q . This means one of two things: either v is added to and discharged from Q before w is ever pushed onto it, or v and w co-exist on Q simultaneously.

The first case does not hold: w is enqueued at stage i , but v has not been dequeued at this point, or else it would occur in $L_{i+1} = (v_0, \dots, v_i)$.

Therefore, v and w occur in S simultaneously. Consider all the stages $\ell < j$, before either v or w appears at the front of Q . Since Q is a first-in first-out data structure and since v appears in front first, we conclude that for every stage $\ell < j$ at which a copy w is enqueued, there is another stage $\ell' \leq \ell$ at which a copy of v is enqueued.

In particular, consider ℓ' when $\ell = i$, and let $v' = v_{\ell'}$. Then $v' \leq u$ (since $\ell' \leq i$) and $v' \rightarrow v$ (since v is enqueued at stage ℓ'). This is exactly what we wanted to show. \square

The following is an important algorithmic characterization of bfp and dfp which we need in subsequent proofs.

Lemma 19. *Suppose $\cdot < \cdot$ is a depth-first traversal, respectively breadth-first traversal, on a finite connected graph G with n vertices. Consider the execution of depth-first search, respectively breadth-first search, computing $\cdot < \cdot$. For each such $0 \leq i < n$, v_i occurs the top of S_i , respectively front of Q_i . Let $j < i$ be the stage at which that copy of v_i was added to S , respectively Q . Then $v_j = dfp(v_i)$, respectively $v_j = bfp(v_i)$.*

Proof. Mark every occurrence of v_i that is pushed onto S or Q with the stage at which it was pushed on; hence, the copy above appears as (v_i, j) .

In the depth-first case: suppose there were some $j < j' < i$ such that $v_{j'} \rightarrow v_i$; in this case, (v_i, j') is pushed onto S above (v_i, j) . But because of the last-in first-out property of S , (v_i, j') would appear on top of S before (v_i, j) , which contradicts the definition of (v_i, j) as the first occurrence of v_i to appear on top of S . Hence v_j is the $<$ -greatest (i.e., latest) preceding neighbor of v_i , which is what we wanted to show.

In the breadth-first case: suppose there were some $j' < j$ such that $v_{j'} \rightarrow v_i$; in this case, (v_i, j') is pushed onto Q before (v_i, j) . But because of the first-in first-out property of S , (v_i, j') would appear on top of Q before (v_i, j) , which contradicts the definition of (v_i, j) as the first occurrence of v_i to appear in the front of Q . Hence v_j is the $<$ -least (i.e., earliest) preceding neighbor of v_i , which is what we wanted to show. \square

Proof of Lemma 3. Let $(v^0, v^1, v^2, \dots, v^{\ell-1})$ be the vertices of π in reverse order, where $v^0 = v$ and $v^{\ell-1} = v_0$. Assume by contradiction that $\ell < |\Omega u|$, and let $u^i = bfp^i(u)$ for $0 \leq i \leq \ell - 1$.

We claim that for all $0 \leq i \leq \ell - 1$, $u^i \leq_B v^i$. The base case is $u \leq_B v$. Since bfp respects \leq_B , $u^i \leq_B v^i \implies u^{i+1} \leq_B bfp(v^i) \leq_B v^{i+1}$, the second inequality coming from $v^{i+1} \rightarrow v_i$. In particular, $u^{\ell-1} \leq_B v^{\ell-1} = v_0$, which contradicts $\ell < |\Omega u|$.

For the second claim, assume by contradiction that there exist some u and v and a path $\pi : v_0 \rightsquigarrow v$ such that $u \leq_B v$, $|\Omega u| = |\pi|$, but $\pi \prec \Omega u$. We may assume that u is the $<_B$ -least vertex to occur in such a pair, and moreover that neither u nor v is v_0 .

Let u' and v' be the second-to-last elements in Ωu and π respectively, and let $\pi' : v_0 \rightsquigarrow v'$ be obtained from π by deleting the last element v . Then $u' \leq_B v'$ (as in the proof of the first claim) and $|\Omega u'| = |\pi'|$, so $\Omega u' \preceq \pi'$ by minimality of u .

How can it be the case that $\Omega u' \preceq \pi'$ but $(\pi', v) \prec (\Omega u', u)$? It must be the case that $\Omega u' = \pi'$ and $v <_B u$, contradicting $u \leq_B v$. \square

Proof of Corollary 4. (1) Take $u = v$ and $\pi = \min^s(v_0 \rightsquigarrow v)$ in the statement of the lemma. (2) In the forward direction, take $\pi = \Omega v$ in the statement of the lemma. In the backwards direction, it suffices to show that $u <_B v \implies \Omega u \prec^s \Omega v$. But, this follows from the forwards direction. \square

Proof of Lemma 5. When $v = v_0$, both $\mathfrak{P}v$ and $\min(v_0 \rightsquigarrow v)$ are simply the trivial path (v_0) . Therefore, we may assume $v \neq v_0$.

Assume by contradiction that v is the $<_D$ -least vertex such that $\mathfrak{P}v \neq \min(v_0 \rightsquigarrow v)$. Since these are unequal, co-initial, co-final proper paths, neither is a prefix of the other. Let w be the final vertex on the greatest common prefix of $\mathfrak{P}v$ and $\min(v_0 \rightsquigarrow v)$, let $w \rightarrow u_1$ be the next edge of $\mathfrak{P}v$, and let $w \rightarrow u_2$ be the next edge of $\min(v_0 \rightsquigarrow v)$. Then $w \rightarrow u_2 \triangleleft w \rightarrow u_1$, by minimality of $\min(v_0 \rightsquigarrow v)$.

Since $w = \text{dfp}(u_1)$, it must be the case that $w <_D u_1$, and hence $w <_D v$. We claim that $w <_D u_2$ as well. For if $u_2 <_D w$, then $u_2 <_D v$; hence $\min(v_0 \rightsquigarrow u_2) = \mathfrak{P}u_2$, and by monotonicity, $\min(v_0 \rightsquigarrow u_2)$ could not contain w , which it must. (Notice that $u_2 \neq w$ since $\min(v_0 \rightsquigarrow v)$ is a proper path.)

Consider the stage of depth-first search when w is added to L . At this stage, new occurrences of both u_1 and u_2 are added to S , the latter being closer to the top. Since $w = \text{dfp}(u_1)$, no subsequent occurrence of u_1 is pushed onto to S before u_1 appears on top of S . Therefore, u_2 appears on top of S prior to u_1 , which means $w <_D u_2 <_D u_1$. In particular, since $u_1 \leq v$, $u_2 \neq v$.

We finish the proof by a case analysis.

- Suppose that for each vertex $x \in \min(v_0 \rightsquigarrow v)$, $x \leq u_1$. Then, since $u_1 \leq v$ and $v \in \min(v_0 \rightsquigarrow v)$, it must be the case that $u_1 = v$. Let z be the penultimate vertex in $\min(v_0 \rightsquigarrow v)$. Then there is an edge $z \rightarrow v$, and by the case assumption, $z <_D v$. Since $w = \text{dfp}(v)$, $z \leq w$, and by minimality of v , $\mathfrak{P}z = \min(v_0 \rightsquigarrow z)$. In particular, the latter path is monotone in $<_D$; therefore, all of its elements are $\leq z$. However $u_2 \in \min(v_0 \rightsquigarrow z)$ and $z \leq w <_D u_2$, contradiction.
- Suppose that there exists a vertex $x \in \min(v_0 \rightsquigarrow v)$ such that $x > u_1$. Let x be the first such vertex in $\min(v_0 \rightsquigarrow v)$. Notice that in particular, x must come after u_2 , since $u_2 <_D v \implies \min(v_0 \rightsquigarrow u_2) = \mathfrak{P}u_2$ is monotone in $<_D$, and hence cannot contain x .

Let y be the vertex immediately preceding x in $\min(v_0 \rightsquigarrow v)$, so that $y \leq u_1$. In fact, since $\min(v_0 \rightsquigarrow y)$ contains u_2 and is monotone in $<_D$ (being identical to $\mathfrak{P}y$), it must be the cause that $u_2 \leq y \leq u_1$, in particular, $w <_D y$.

If $y \neq u_1$, then $y <_D u_1 <_D x$, $y \rightarrow x$, but $\text{dfp}(u_1) <_D y$, contradicting the depth-first traversal property of Lemma 1.

If $y = u_1$, then let z be the vertex immediately preceding y in $\min(v_0 \rightsquigarrow v)$. For the same reason as y , $u_2 \leq z$ ($\min(v_0 \rightsquigarrow z)$ must contain u_2 and is monotone in $<_D$). Hence $w <_D z <_D y = u_1$, but $z \rightarrow u_1$, contradicting $w = \text{dfp}(u_1)$.

This concludes the proof. \square

Lemma 20. *For any $u <_D v <_D w$, if $u \rightarrow w$, then there exists some $u \preceq_D v' <_D v$ such that $v' \rightarrow v$.*

Proof. Let \mathbf{u} , \mathbf{v} , and \mathbf{w} refer to $\min(v_0 \rightsquigarrow u)$, $\min(v_0 \rightsquigarrow v)$, and $\min(v_0 \rightsquigarrow w)$ respectively. By assumption $\mathbf{u} < \mathbf{v} < \mathbf{w}$, and since $u \rightarrow w$, $\mathbf{w} \preceq (\mathbf{u}, w)$. In particular, $\mathbf{u} < \mathbf{v} < (\mathbf{u}, w)$.

We claim that $\mathbf{u} \sqsubseteq \mathbf{v}$, i.e., that \mathbf{u} is a prefix of \mathbf{v} . Otherwise, if the longest common prefix of the two paths were a proper prefix of each, then the same holds of (\mathbf{u}, w) and \mathbf{v} , and moreover, $\mathbf{u} < \mathbf{v} \implies (\mathbf{u}, w) < \mathbf{v}$, a contradiction.

Therefore, $\mathbf{u} \sqsubseteq \mathbf{v}$; indeed, $\mathbf{u} \sqsubset \mathbf{v}$ as they are not equal. Let v' be the penultimate vertex in \mathbf{v} ; then $v' \rightarrow v$, and $\mathbf{v} = (\min(v_0 \rightsquigarrow v'), v)$, since minimal paths are closed under taking prefixes. In particular, $\mathbf{u} \sqsubseteq \min(v_0 \rightsquigarrow v')$, hence $u \preceq_D v'$, which is what we needed to show. \square

Proof of Theorem 6. Recall the definition of *stage i* (Definition 34), for $0 \leq i < n$, the vertex v_i , and the values L_i and S_i of L and S . In this notation, $i < j \iff v_i <_D v_j$, so we can restate our theorem as $v_i <_D v_j \iff i < j$, for every $(i, j) \in n^2$.

Let $\vec{u} = (u_0, \dots, u_{n-1})$ be the vertices of G ordered according to $\cdot <_D \cdot$, and suppose by contradiction that $\vec{u} \neq \vec{v}$, where $\vec{v} = (v_0, \dots, v_{n-1})$. Let \hat{i} be the least index i such that $u_i \neq v_i$. Since v_0 is the $<_D$ -least vertex of G , $u_0 = v_0$ and $\hat{i} > 0$. By Lemma 1, u_i and v_i have preceding neighbors in \vec{u} and \vec{v} . Let \hat{j} and \hat{j}' be the *greatest* indices less than i such that there exist edges $u_{\hat{j}} \rightarrow u_i$ and $v_{\hat{j}'} \rightarrow v_i$ respectively. By minimality of \hat{i} , $u_{\hat{j}} = v_{\hat{j}}$ and $u_{\hat{j}'} = v_{\hat{j}'}$. Moreover, there exist $\hat{k}, \hat{k}' > i$ such that $v_i = u_{\hat{k}}$ and $u_i = v_{\hat{k}'}$. Therefore, $v_j \rightarrow v_{\hat{k}'}$ and $u_{\hat{j}'} \rightarrow u_{\hat{k}}$.

Suppose that $\hat{j} < \hat{j}'$. Then we have $\hat{j} < \hat{j}' < \hat{i} < \hat{k}$, but $u_{\hat{j}} \rightarrow u_{\hat{i}}$ and $u_{\hat{j}'} \rightarrow u_{\hat{k}}$, contradicting the DFT property of \prec_D (Lemma 20). Similarly if $\hat{j}' < \hat{j}$, then $\hat{j}' < \hat{j} < \hat{i} < \hat{k}'$, but $v_{\hat{j}'} \rightarrow v_{\hat{i}}$ and $v_{\hat{j}} \rightarrow u_{\hat{k}'}$, contradicting the DFT property of \prec_D (Lemma 1). Therefore $\hat{j} = \hat{j}'$, and there is an edge from $v_{\hat{j}} = u_{\hat{j}'}$ to both $v_{\hat{i}}$ and $v_{\hat{k}'} = u_{\hat{i}}$.

By definition, $v_{\hat{j}}$ is the top of the stack $S_{\hat{j}}$. Therefore, $S_{\hat{j}+1}$ is obtained from $S_{\hat{j}}$ by popping $v_{\hat{j}}$ off and pushing all of its neighbors on, in reverse neighborhood order, which are not contained in $L_{\hat{j}+1}$; this includes both $v_{\hat{i}}$ and $u_{\hat{i}}$. We claim that this is the *final* occurrence of $v_{\hat{i}}$ that is pushed onto S .

Otherwise, if there were some $\ell > \hat{j}$ such that $S_{\ell+1}$ contains a new occurrence of $v_{\hat{i}}$, then it must be the case that $\ell < \hat{i}$, for otherwise $v_{\hat{i}} \in L_{\ell+1}$, which would prevent it from being pushed onto $S_{\ell+1}$. But it also must be the case that there is an edge $v_{\ell} \rightarrow v_{\hat{i}}$, contradicting the maximality of $v_{\hat{j}}$ among prior neighbors of $v_{\hat{i}}$.

Since this is the final occurrence of $v_{\hat{i}}$ that is pushed on S , and since $v_{\hat{i}}$ is popped off of S *before* $u_{\hat{i}}$, we can infer that (i) $u_{\hat{i}}$ is pushed onto $S_{\hat{j}+1}$ before $v_{\hat{i}}$, and (ii) no subsequent occurrence of $u_{\hat{i}}$ is pushed onto S . This means that (i) $v_{\hat{j}} \rightarrow v_{\hat{i}} \triangleleft v_{\hat{j}} \rightarrow u_{\hat{i}}$, and (ii) $dfp(u_{\hat{i}}) = v_{\hat{j}}$.

Since $dfp(v_{\hat{i}}) = v_{\hat{j}}$ as well, we can infer that $\mathfrak{P}u_{\hat{i}} = \mathfrak{P}v_{\hat{j}} \rightarrow u_{\hat{i}}$ and $\mathfrak{P}v_{\hat{i}} = \mathfrak{P}v_{\hat{j}} \rightarrow v_{\hat{i}}$. By Lemma 5, $\min(v_0 \rightsquigarrow u_{\hat{i}}) = \min(v_0 \rightsquigarrow v_{\hat{j}}) \rightarrow u_{\hat{i}}$ and $\min(v_0 \rightsquigarrow v_{\hat{i}}) = \min(v_0 \rightsquigarrow v_{\hat{j}}) \rightarrow v_{\hat{i}}$.

Since $u_{\hat{i}} \prec_D v_{\hat{i}}$, $\min(v_0 \rightsquigarrow u_{\hat{i}}) \prec \min(v_0 \rightsquigarrow v_{\hat{i}})$, which means in particular that $v_{\hat{j}} \rightarrow u_{\hat{i}} \triangleleft v_{\hat{j}} \rightarrow v_{\hat{i}}$. But this contradicts assertion (i) above. \square

APPENDIX: PROOFS FROM SECTIONS 4 THROUGH 9

Proof of Lemma 7. It suffices to show that h preserves $\cdot \prec \cdot$; the second statement follows from the observation that graph homomorphisms preserve path length, i.e., $|\pi| = |h(\pi)|$ for every path π .

Suppose that π and σ are co-initial paths in G such that $\pi \prec \sigma$. If $\pi \sqsubset \sigma$, then $h(\pi) \sqsubset h(\sigma)$ and we're done. Otherwise, let $u \rightarrow v_1$ and $u \rightarrow v_2$ be the first edges in π and σ respectively following their longest common prefix ζ . Since $\pi \prec \sigma$, $u \rightarrow v_1 \triangleleft u \rightarrow v_2$, so $h(u) \rightarrow h(v_1) \triangleleft h(u) \rightarrow h(v_2)$.

Notice that $h(\zeta)$ is a common prefix of $h(\pi)$ and $h(\sigma)$, and since $h(u) \rightarrow h(v_1) \triangleleft h(u) \rightarrow h(v_2)$, it must be the longest one. Moreover, since $h(u) \rightarrow h(v_1) \triangleleft h(u) \rightarrow h(v_2)$, $h(\pi) \prec h(\sigma)$, which is what we wanted to show. \square

Lemma 21. *The functor Θ is well-defined.*

Proof. We first have to check that $\Theta(G)$ is a finite, edge-ordered arborescence. It is trivially finite and edge-oriented. Notice that $\Theta(G)$ is connected: for every vertex u , every edge on the path $\min(v_0 \rightsquigarrow u)$ is contained in $\Theta(G)$. On the other hand, the in-degree of each vertex is at most 1: there cannot be two distinct edges $u \rightarrow v$ and $u' \rightarrow v$ in $\min(v_0 \rightsquigarrow v)$.

Next we have to check that for any homomorphism h , $\Theta(h)$ is in fact a homomorphism of pointed, edge-ordered graphs. First notice that $\Theta(h)$ actually maps into $\Theta(H)$: if $u \rightarrow v$ is included in $\Theta(G)$, then it must be contained in $\min(v_0 \rightsquigarrow v)$ in G , whose h -image is $\min(h(v_0) \rightsquigarrow h(v))$ by property (iv) of Definition 23; therefore, $h(u \rightarrow v)$ is contained in a least path and so included in $\Theta(H)$.

Moreover, $\Theta(h)$ clearly fixes the distinguished vertex, and visibly inherits monotonicity on co-initial edges from h . Hence, $\Theta(h)$ is a pointed, edge-ordered graph homomorphism. \square

Proof of Theorem 8. First, given $I(T) \xrightarrow{h^\uparrow} G$ in $\mathbf{FinGraph}_*^l$, we describe how to obtain $T \xrightarrow{h_\downarrow} T(G)$ in $\mathbf{FinArb}_*^<$. Define $h_\downarrow(v) = h^\uparrow(v)$, for $v \in T$ (which, remember is the same as $I(T)$). To check that h_\downarrow is well-defined, we must show that if $u \rightarrow v$ is an edge of T , then $h^\uparrow(u \rightarrow v)$ is contained in $\Theta(G)$. But

since T is an arborescence, $u \rightarrow v$ is trivially contained in $\min(v_0 \rightsquigarrow v)$, so $h^\uparrow(u \rightarrow v)$ is contained in $\min(h(v_0) \rightsquigarrow h(v))$, and hence included in $\Theta(G)$.

Moreover, the fact that h_\downarrow maps edges to edges, preserves the distinguished point, and is monotone on co-initial edges, is immediately inherited from h^\uparrow .

Next, given $T \xrightarrow{h^\downarrow} \Theta(G)$ in $\mathbf{FinArb}_*^<$, define $I(T) \xrightarrow{h^\uparrow} G$ in $\mathbf{FinGraph}_*^l$ by $h^\uparrow(v) = h_\downarrow(v)$, for $v \in I(T)$. In this case, we do not need to check that h^\uparrow is well-defined, and the properties of mapping edges to edges, preserving the distinguished point, and monotonicity on neighborhoods, are inherited immediately from h_\downarrow . The fact that h^\uparrow maps minimal paths to minimal paths is easily justified by observing that h^\uparrow maps into $\Theta(G)$, the tree of minimal paths in G .

To check that this correspondence is bijective, notice that starting from either h^\uparrow or h_\downarrow , passing to the other one, and passing back again, gives us the same morphism we started with. Naturality follows straightforwardly by observing that both functors are the identity on morphisms, so naturality squares trivially commute. \square

Lemma 22. *There is an adjunction*

$$\begin{array}{ccc} & \Theta' & \\ & \curvearrowright & \\ \mathbf{LexGraph} & \top & \mathbf{FinArb}_*^< \\ & \curvearrowleft & \\ & I' & \end{array}$$

Proof. The adjunction from Theorem 8 factors as

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathbf{LexGraph} & \xrightarrow{J} & \mathbf{FinGraph}_*^l \\ & \swarrow I' & \uparrow I \quad \downarrow \Theta \\ & & \mathbf{FinArb}_*^< \end{array}$$

where J is the fully faithful identity-on-objects functor witnessing the inclusion of $\mathbf{LexGraph}$ in $\mathbf{FinGraph}_*^l$, and $\Theta' = \Theta \circ J$. The natural isomorphism

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{LexGraph}(I'(G), H) &\cong \mathbf{FinGraph}_*^l(J(I'(G)), J(H)) \\ &= \mathbf{FinGraph}_*^l(I(G), J(H)) \\ &\cong \mathbf{FinArb}_*^<(G, \Theta(J(H))) \\ &= \mathbf{FinArb}_*^<(G, \Theta'(H)) \end{aligned}$$

establishes this adjunction. \square

Lemma 23. *For any finite, connected, pointed, edge-ordered graph G , $S(G)$ is an arborescence.*

Proof. To verify that $S(G)$ is a well-defined arborescence, it suffices to observe that $S(G)$ is connected (as it preserves least shortest paths), and that there is a unique path $v_0 \rightsquigarrow v$: two distinct edges $u \rightarrow v$ and $u' \rightarrow v$ cannot both occur in $\min^s(v_0 \rightsquigarrow v)$.

To check that $S(G \xrightarrow{h} H)$ is well defined, we have to verify for $u \rightarrow v \in S(G)$, $h(u) \rightarrow h(v) \in S(H)$. But such morphisms h preserve least shortest paths by Definition 23 (v). \square

Proof of Theorem 9. The proof is obtained by literally copying the proof of Theorem 8 and replacing $\mathbf{FinGraph}_*^l$ by $\mathbf{FinGraph}_*^s$, Θ by S , and \min by \min^s throughout.

Given $I(T) \xrightarrow{h^\uparrow} G$ in $\mathbf{FinGraph}_*^s$, we describe how to obtain $T \xrightarrow{h_\downarrow} T(G)$ in $\mathbf{FinArb}_*^<$. Define $h_\downarrow(v) = h^\uparrow(v)$, for $v \in T$ (which we identified with $I(T)$). To check that h_\downarrow is well-defined, we must show that if $u \rightarrow v$ is an edge of T , then $h^\uparrow(u \rightarrow v)$ is contained in $S(G)$. But since T is an arborescence, $u \rightarrow v$ is trivially contained in $\min^s(v_0 \rightsquigarrow v)$, so $h^\uparrow(u \rightarrow v)$ is contained in $\min^s(h(v_0) \rightsquigarrow h(v))$, and hence included in $S(G)$.

Moreover, the fact that h_\downarrow maps edges to edges, preserves the distinguished point, and is monotone on co-initial edges, is immediately inherited from h^\uparrow .

Next, given $T \xrightarrow{h_\downarrow} S(G)$ in $\mathbf{FinArb}_*^<$, define $I(T) \xrightarrow{h^\uparrow} G$ in $\mathbf{FinGraph}_*^s$ by $h^\uparrow(v) = h_\downarrow(v)$, for $v \in I(T)$ (which we identified with T). In this case, we do not need to check that h^\uparrow is well-defined, and the properties of mapping edges to edges, preserving the distinguished point, and monotonicity on neighborhoods, are inherited immediately from h_\downarrow . The fact that h^\uparrow maps minimal shortest paths to minimal shortest paths is easily justified by observing that h^\uparrow maps into $S(G)$, the tree of minimal shortest paths in G .

To check that this correspondence is bijective, notice that starting from either h^\uparrow or h_\downarrow , passing to the other one, and passing back again, gives us the same morphism we started with. Naturality follows straightforwardly by observing that both functors are the identity on morphisms, so naturality squares trivially commute. \square

Proof of Lemma 10. (i): If there are edges $u \rightarrow v_1$ and $u \rightarrow v_2$ of G , then $u \rightarrow v_1 \triangleleft u \rightarrow v_2$ in G iff $\min(u \rightsquigarrow v_1) \prec \min(u \rightsquigarrow v_2)$ in G (since G is a lex-graph) iff $u \rightarrow v_1 \triangleleft u \rightarrow v_2$ in $F(G)$ (by definition of F).

(ii): Suppose σ and π are co-initial paths from G . We may assume that σ and π share no nontrivial prefix; then either σ or π is empty (and the claim is trivial), or σ and π differ on their first edge, and the claim follows from (i).

(iii): Work in $F(G)$. It suffices to show that minimal paths in $F(G)$ consist of only edges in G ; by the above remark, if two paths consist of G -edges, it does not matter whether we compare them in G or in $F(G)$.

Towards which, it suffices to show that every edge $u \rightarrow v$ not in G is greater than the minimal path $\min_G(u \rightsquigarrow v)$ between u and v in G . Then any path with non-edges in G can be lessened; in particular minimal paths in $F(G)$ cannot contain any non-edges of G .

Let $v_1 \neq v$ be the second vertex in $\min_G(u \rightsquigarrow v)$. Since minimal paths are closed under taking prefixes, $u \rightarrow v_1 = \min_G(u \rightsquigarrow v_1)$, in both G and $F(G)$. Since $\min_G(u \rightsquigarrow v_1) \prec \min_G(u \rightsquigarrow v)$, $u \rightarrow v_1 \triangleleft u \rightarrow v$ in $F(G)$. But then $\min_G(u \rightsquigarrow v) \prec u \rightarrow v$, which is what we wanted to show. \square

Proof of Lemma 11. Given any lex-graph G , $F(G)$ is clearly a transitive edge-ordered graph, but we must check that it satisfies the lex-graph property (Definition 24-(ii)). But for any v_1 and v_2 in the neighborhood of a common u in $F(G)$, $u \rightarrow v_1 \triangleleft u \rightarrow v_2$ in $F(G)$ iff $\min(u \rightsquigarrow v_1) \prec \min(u \rightsquigarrow v_2)$ in G (by definition of F) iff $\min(u \rightsquigarrow v_1) \prec \min(u \rightsquigarrow v_2)$ in $F(G)$ (by Lemma 10 plus the preceding remark).

By definition, F immediately preserves identities and compositions of homomorphisms, and it remains to check that for any lex-homomorphism $G \xrightarrow{h} H$ of lex-graphs, $F(h)$ is a lex-homomorphism $F(G) \rightarrow F(H)$. We check each of the conditions in Definition 23:

- (i) If $u \rightarrow v$ in $F(G)$, then there is a path $u \rightsquigarrow v$ in G , so there is a path $h(u) \rightsquigarrow h(v)$ in H , and hence an edge $h(u) \rightarrow h(v)$ in $F(H)$.
- (ii) Since h preserves the distinguished point, so does $F(h)$.

- (iii) If $u \rightarrow v_1 \triangleleft u \rightarrow v_2$ in G , $\min(u \rightsquigarrow v_1) \prec \min(u \rightsquigarrow v_2)$, as G is a lex-graph. Since h is a lex-homomorphism, $\min_H(h(u) \rightsquigarrow h(v_i)) = h(\min_G(u \rightsquigarrow v_i))$, so $\min(h(u) \rightsquigarrow h(v_1)) \prec \min(h(u) \rightsquigarrow h(v_2))$ in H . By definition of F , $h(u) \rightarrow h(v_1) \triangleleft h(u) \rightarrow h(v_2)$ in $F(H)$.
- (iv) As the minimal path $\min(u \rightsquigarrow v)$ in $F(G)$ is also minimal in G , as shown above, and as h preserves minimal paths, $h(\min(u \rightsquigarrow v))$ is $\min(h(u) \rightsquigarrow h(v))$ in H , and this in turn is also the minimal path in $F(H)$.

□

Proof of Theorem 12. Let $F(G) \xrightarrow{h^\uparrow} H$ be a homomorphism of **TLexGraph**. Since $F(G)$ has the same vertices as G , we may define $G \xrightarrow{h_\downarrow} U(H)$ by $h_\downarrow(v) = h^\uparrow(v)$ (since H and $U(H)$ are exactly identical).

We check that h_\downarrow is a lex-homomorphism by checking Definition 23 (i)-(iv). We write, e.g., $h(v)$ to refer unambiguously to the vertex $h^\uparrow(v) = h_\downarrow(v)$.

- (i) If $u \rightarrow v$ is an edge of G , it is an edge of $F(G)$, so $h(u) \rightarrow h(v)$ is an edge of H , and hence an edge of $U(H)$.
- (ii) h_\downarrow directly inherits preservation of the distinguished point from h^\uparrow .
- (iii) If $u \rightarrow v_1 \triangleleft u \rightarrow v_2$ in G , then $u \rightarrow v_1 \triangleleft u \rightarrow v_2$ in $F(G)$ (Lemma 10), so $h(u) \rightarrow h(v_1) \triangleleft h(u) \rightarrow h(v_2)$ in H (monotonicity of h^\uparrow), and hence the same holds in $U(H)$.
- (iv) If π is the minimal path $u \rightsquigarrow v$ in G , then it's minimal in $F(G)$ (Lemma 10), so $h(\pi)$ is minimal in H (since h^\uparrow is a lex-homomorphism), and hence also in $U(H)$.

In the other direction, we suppose that we are given some homomorphism of lex-graphs $G \xrightarrow{h_\downarrow} U(H)$ in **LexGraph**. Define $F(G) \xrightarrow{h^\uparrow} H$ by $h^\uparrow(v) = h_\downarrow(v)$. Again, we check (i)-(iv) of Definition 23.

- (i) If $u \rightarrow v$ is an edge of $F(G)$, then there is a path $u \rightsquigarrow v$ in G , and hence a path $h(u) \rightsquigarrow h(v)$ in $U(H)$, and (since H is transitive), and edge $h(u) \rightarrow h(v)$.
- (ii) h^\uparrow directly inherits preservation of the distinguished point from h_\downarrow .
- (iii) If $u \rightarrow v_1 \triangleleft u \rightarrow v_2$ in $F(G)$, then $\min(u \rightsquigarrow v_1) \prec \min(u \rightsquigarrow v_2)$ in G ; hence (since h_\downarrow is a lex-homomorphism) $\min(h(u) \rightsquigarrow h(v_1)) \prec \min(h(u) \rightsquigarrow h(v_2))$ in $U(H)$, hence in H . Since H is a lex-graph, $h(u) \rightarrow h(v_1) \triangleleft h(u) \rightarrow h(v_2)$.
- (iv) If π is the minimal path $u \rightsquigarrow v$ in $F(G)$, then it's the minimal path in G (Lemma 10), so $h(\pi)$ is minimal in $U(H)$ (since h_\downarrow is a lex-homomorphism), and hence in H .

We need only now to check that this correspondence is bijective and natural. Bijectivity follows readily from the fact that we always have $h^\uparrow = h_\downarrow$, so going from $G \xrightarrow{h_\downarrow} U(H)$ to $F(G) \xrightarrow{h^\uparrow} H$ and back has no effect, and similarly in the other direction. Similarly, naturality follows straightforwardly by noting that $U(h)(v) = F(h)(v) = h(v)$ for all h and v , so naturality squares trivially commute. □

Proof of Lemma 13. Notice that distances between vertices are never increased in G compared to T , only decreased, meaning that if there is a path $u \rightsquigarrow v$ in G , there is a path $u \rightsquigarrow v$ in T that is no shorter. Therefore, longest paths in G must consist entirely of edges in T , and are therefore unique.

Conversely, if $u \rightarrow v$ is an edge of T , then it appears on the unique path $v_0 \rightsquigarrow v$ in T . As just observed, the longest path $v_0 \rightsquigarrow v$ in G is also a path in T ; hence, it is the unique path $v_0 \rightsquigarrow v$ in T , and thus contains $u \rightarrow v$. □

Lemma 24. Γ is a well-defined functor.

Proof. Clearly Γ preserves identities and composition. We must check that for any morphism h of $\mathbf{FinArb}_\star^<$, $\Gamma(h)$ satisfies Definition 23 (i)-(iii) and preserves longest paths:

- (i) If $u \rightarrow v$ in $\Gamma(T)$, then $u \rightsquigarrow v$ in T , so $h(u) \rightsquigarrow h(v)$ in T' , so $h(u) \rightarrow h(v)$ in $\Gamma(T')$.

- (ii) Since h maps the distinguished point, and only that point, of T to the distinguished point of T' , Γ does the same from $\Gamma(T)$ to $\Gamma(T')$.
- (iii) If $u \rightarrow v_1 \triangleleft u \rightarrow v_2$ in $\Gamma(T)$, then $v_0 \rightsquigarrow v_1 \prec^s v_0 \rightsquigarrow v_2$ in T . By Lemma 7, $h(v_0 \rightsquigarrow v_1) \prec^s h(v_0 \rightsquigarrow v_2)$ in T' , and since paths in arborescences are unique, $h(u) \rightsquigarrow h(v_1) \prec^s h(u) \rightsquigarrow h(v_2)$ in T' . Hence $h(u) \rightarrow h(v_1) \triangleleft h(u) \rightarrow h(v_2)$ in $\Gamma(T')$.
- Finally, if $u \rightsquigarrow v$ is the longest path in $\Gamma(T)$, then it is a path in T by Lemma 13, and therefore, $h(u \rightsquigarrow v) = h(u) \rightsquigarrow h(v)$ is a path in T' . Again by Lemma 13, $h(u \rightsquigarrow v)$ is the longest path in $\Gamma(T')$.

□

Lemma 25. L is a well-defined functor $\mathbf{TArb} \rightarrow \mathbf{FinArb}_*^{\leq}$.

Proof. In each graph $G \in \mathbf{TArb}$, the unique longest paths are closed under taking prefixes. Therefore, the union of all least longest paths forms an arborescence.

To check that L is a functor, note that for any morphism $h \in \mathbf{TArb}$, $L(h)$ clearly preserves the distinguished point and is monotone on neighborhoods. We only need to show that if $u \rightarrow v$ is an edge in $L(G)$ and $h : G \rightarrow H$ is a morphism in \mathbf{TArb} , then $h(u) \rightarrow h(v)$ is an edge of $L(H)$. But, this is guaranteed by the fact that h preserves longest paths.

Finally, note that L preserves the identity morphism and respects composition. □

Proof of Theorem 14. Fix a pointed, connected, edge-ordered arborescence T and a pointed, connected, transitive, edge-ordered graph G .

Given $\Gamma(T) \xrightarrow{h^\uparrow} G$ in \mathbf{TArb} , we define $T \xrightarrow{h_\downarrow} L(G)$ by $h_\downarrow(v) = h^\uparrow(v)$. This is well-defined, because if $u \rightarrow v$ is an edge in T , then by Lemma 13, it appears on the unique longest path $v_0 \rightsquigarrow v$ in $\Gamma(T)$. Since h^\uparrow preserves least longest paths, the edge $u \rightarrow v$ maps into $L(G)$. Moreover, h_\downarrow preserves the distinguished point and inherits monotonicity in neighborhoods from h^\uparrow , so satisfies the conditions of Definition 23 and is a morphism in \mathbf{FinArb}_*^{\leq} .

In the other direction, given $T \xrightarrow{h_\downarrow} L(G)$ in \mathbf{FinArb}_*^{\leq} , we define $\Gamma(T) \xrightarrow{h^\uparrow} G$ by $h^\uparrow(v) = h_\downarrow(v)$; let us unambiguously write $h(v)$ for brevity. If $u \rightarrow v$ is an edge of $\Gamma(T)$, then there is a path $u \rightsquigarrow v$ in T , hence a path $h(u) \rightsquigarrow h(v)$ in $L(G)$, and therefore an edge $h(u) \rightarrow h(v)$ in G . Moreover, if $u \rightarrow v_1 \triangleleft u \rightarrow v_2$ in $\Gamma(T)$, then $v_0 \rightsquigarrow v_1 \prec^s v_0 \rightsquigarrow v_2$ in T , so $h(u) \rightsquigarrow h(v_1) \prec^s h(u) \rightsquigarrow h(v_2)$ in $L(G)$, by Lemma 7. By the remark succeeding Lemma 13, $h(u) \rightarrow h(v_1) \triangleleft h(u) \rightarrow h(v_2)$ in G . Finally, if $u \rightsquigarrow v$ is the longest path from u to v in $\Gamma(T)$, then each of its edges lies in T by Lemma 13, hence its h -image lies in $L(G)$, which means it is a longest path of G . Therefore, h^\uparrow is a morphism of \mathbf{TArb} .

It remains to show that the maps relating h^\uparrow and h_\downarrow are bijective and natural. As in the proof of Theorem 12, this is immediate from the definition of each map; the only thing to show is that they were well-defined. □

Proof of Lemma 15. Fix $u, v \neq v_0$. By definition of F , $v_0 \rightarrow u \triangleleft v_0 \rightarrow v$ in T iff $\min(v_0 \rightsquigarrow u) \prec \min(v_0 \rightsquigarrow v)$ in $(I' \circ \Theta)(G)$. Since I' is an inclusion functor, this is equivalent to $\min(v_0 \rightsquigarrow u) \prec \min(v_0 \rightsquigarrow v)$ in $\Theta(G)$; indeed, the *unique* path $v_0 \rightsquigarrow u$ is less than the *unique* path $v_0 \rightsquigarrow v$ in $\Theta(G)$.

But the unique paths $v_0 \rightsquigarrow u$ and $v_0 \rightsquigarrow v$ in $\Theta(G)$ are exactly $\min(v_0 \rightsquigarrow u)$ and $\min(v_0 \rightsquigarrow v)$ in G respectively; moreover, the relative order on the latter two paths in G is inherited from the relative order on the former two in $\Theta(G)$.

Therefore, $v_0 \rightarrow u \triangleleft v_0 \rightarrow v$ in T iff $\min(v_0 \rightsquigarrow u) \prec \min(v_0 \rightsquigarrow v)$ in G , but this is exactly the relation $<_D$ of Definition 20, which is the lexicographic depth-first traversal of G by Theorem 6. □

Proof of 16. Fix $u, v \neq v_0$. By definition of Γ , $v_0 \rightarrow u \triangleleft v_0 \rightarrow v$ in T iff $v_0 \rightsquigarrow u \prec^s v_0 \rightsquigarrow v$ in $S(G)$ (where paths from v_0 are unique). By definition of S , this is equivalent to $\min^s(v_0 \rightsquigarrow u) \prec^s \min^s(v_0 \rightsquigarrow v)$ in G . By Corollary 4, this is equivalent to $u <_B v$. \square

Proof of Lemma 17. For a finite, edge-ordered graph G , we define $E(G)$ to be the order $(\{v_0\} \cup N(v_0), <)$, where for $u, v \neq v_0$, $u < v \iff v_0 \rightarrow u \triangleleft v_0 \rightarrow v$, and for $u \neq v_0$, $v_0 < u$.

On morphisms, given a homomorphism of edge-ordered graphs $G \xrightarrow{h} H$, we define $E(G) \xrightarrow{E(h)} E(H)$ by $E(h)(v) = h(v)$. Notice that E is well-defined, since it maps the distinguished point v_0 of G to the distinguished point w_0 of H , and also maps $N_G(v_0)$ into $N_H(w_0)$. By definition, it is clear that E preserves both identities and compositions, so we have only left to show that $E(h)$ is monotone.

Since h maps only v_0 to w_0 , it suffices to show that if $u, v \in N_G(v_0)$ and $v_0 \rightarrow u \triangleleft v_0 \rightarrow v$ in G , then $w_0 \rightarrow h(u) \triangleleft w_0 \rightarrow h(v)$ in H . But this follows from monotonicity of h (Definition 23-(iii)) \square

UNIVERSITY OF COPENHAGEN, DENMARK
Email address: `sbhaskar@di.ku.dk`

UNIVERSITY OF EDINBURGH, UNITED KINGDOM
Email address: `robin.kaarsgaard@ed.ac.uk`