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#### Abstract

We show that for each fixed $k$ there exists a linear-time algorithm for the problem: given: an undirected plane graph $G=(V, E)$ and subsets $X_{1}, \ldots, X_{p}$ of $V$ with $\left|X_{1} \cup \cdots \cup X_{p}\right| \leq k$; find: pairwise vertex-disjoint trees $T_{1}, \ldots, T_{p}$ in $G$ such that $T_{i}$ covers $X_{i}(i=1, \ldots, p)$.


## 1. Introduction

Consider the following disjoint trees problem:
given: an undirected graph $G=(V, E)$ and subsets $X_{1}, \ldots, X_{p}$ of $V$;
find: pairwise vertex-disjoint trees $T_{1}, \ldots, T_{p}$ in $G$ such that $T_{i}$ covers $X_{i}(i=1, \ldots, p)$.
(We say that tree $T_{i}$ covers $X_{i}$ if each vertex in $X_{i}$ is a vertex of $T_{i}$.)
Robertson and Seymour [5] gave an algorithm for this problem that runs, for each fixed $k$, in time $O\left(|V|^{3}\right)$ for inputs satisfying $\left|X_{1} \cup \cdots \cup X_{p}\right| \leq k$. (Recently, Reed gave an improved version with running time $O\left(|V|^{2} \log |V|\right)$.) In this paper we show that if we moreover restrict the input graphs to planar graphs there exists a linear-time algorithm:

Theorem. There exists an algorithm for the disjoint trees problem for planar graphs that runs, for each fixed $k$, in time $O(|V|)$ for inputs satisfying

[^0]$\left|X_{1} \cup \cdots \cup X_{p}\right| \leq k$.
If we do not fix an upper bound $k$ on $\left|X_{1} \cup \cdots \cup X_{p}\right|$, the disjoint trees problem is NP-hard (D.E. Knuth, see [1]), even when we restrict ourselves to planar graphs and each $X_{i}$ is a pair of vertices (Lynch [2]).

Our result extends a result of Suzuki, Akama, and Nishizeki [7] stating that the disjoint trees problem is solvable in linear time for planar graphs for each fixed upper bound $k$ on $\left|X_{1} \cup \cdots \cup X_{p}\right|$, when
(1) there exist two faces $f_{1}$ and $f_{2}$ such that each vertex in $X_{1} \cup \cdots \cup X_{p}$ is incident with at least one of $f_{1}$ and $f_{2}$.
(In fact, they showed more strongly that the problem (for nonfixed $k$ ) is solvable in time $O(k|V|)$. Indeed, recently Ripphausen, Wagner, and Weihe [4] showed that it is solvable in time $O(|V|)$.)

Equivalent to a linear-time algorithm for the disjoint trees problem (for fixed $k)$ is one for the following "realization problem". Let $G=(V, E)$ be a graph and let $X \subseteq V$. For any $E^{\prime} \subseteq E$ let $\Pi\left(E^{\prime}\right)$ be the partition $\{K \cap X \mid K$ is a component of the graph $\left(V, E^{\prime}\right)$ with $\left.K \cap X \neq \emptyset\right\}$ of $X$. We say that $E^{\prime}$ realizes $\Pi$ if $\Pi=\Pi\left(E^{\prime}\right)$. We call a partition of $X$ realizable in $G$ if it is realized by at least one subset $E^{\prime}$ of $E$. Now the realization problem is:
given: a graph $G=(V, E)$ and a subset $X$ of $V$;
find: subsets $E_{1}, \ldots, E_{N}$ of $E$ such that each realizable partition of $X$ is realized by at least one of $E_{1}, \ldots, E_{N}$.

We give an algorithm for the realization problem for planar graphs that runs, for each fixed $k$, in time $O(|V|)$ for inputs satisfying $|X| \leq k$. In [3] we extend this result to graphs embedded on any fixed compact surface.

## 2. Realizable partitions

We will use the following lemma of Robertson and Seymour [6], saying that any vertex that is "far away" from $X$ and also is not on any "short" curve separating $X$, is irrelevant for the realization problem and can be left out from the graph.

Let $G=(V, E)$ be a plane graph (that is, a graph embedded in the plane $\mathcal{R}^{2}$ ). For any curve $C$ on $\mathcal{R}^{2}$, the length length $(C)$ of $C$ is the number of times $C$ meets $G$ (counting multiplicities). We say that a curve $C$ separates a subset $X$ of $\mathcal{R}^{2}$ if $X$ is contained in none of the components of $\mathcal{R}^{2} \backslash C$. (So $C$ separates $X$ if $C$ intersects $X$.)

Lemma. There exists a computable function $g: \mathcal{N} \longrightarrow \mathcal{N}$ with the following property. Let $G=(V, E)$ be a plane graph, let $X \subseteq V$ and let $v \in V$ be such that each closed curve $C$ traversing $v$ and separating $X$ satisfies length $(C) \geq g(|X|)$; then each partition of $X$ realizable in $G$ is also realizable in $G-v$.
[ $G-v$ is the graph obtained from $G$ by deleting $v$ and all edges incident with $v$.]

Moreover, we use the following easy proposition, enabling us to reduce the realization problem to smaller problems.

Proposition 1. Let $G=(V, E)$ be an undirected graph and let $X \subseteq V$. Moreover, let $V_{1}, \ldots, V_{n}, Y$ be subsets of $V$ such that
(2) (i) each edge of $G$ is contained in at least one of $V_{1}, \ldots, V_{n}$;
(ii) $X \subseteq Y$ and $V_{i} \cap V_{j} \subseteq Y$ for each $i, j \in\{1, \ldots, t\}$ with $i \neq j$.

Let $E_{i, 1}, \ldots, E_{i, N_{i}}$ form a solution for the realization problem with input $\left\langle V_{i}\right\rangle, V_{i} \cap$ $Y(i=1, \ldots, n)$. Then the sets $E_{1, j_{1}} \cup \cdots \cup E_{n, j_{n}}$, where $j_{i}$ ranges over $1, \ldots, N_{i}$ (for $i=1, \ldots, n$ ), form a solution for the realization problem with input $G, X$.
[ $\langle W\rangle$ denotes the subgraph of $G$ induced by $W$.]

## 3. Proof of the theorem

We show that, for each fixed $k$, there exists a linear-time algorithm for the realization problem for plane graphs $G=(V, E)$ and subsets $X$ of $V$ with $|X| \leq$ $k$. We may assume that $G$ is connected.
For any subset $W$ of $V$ let $\delta(W)$ be the set of vertices in $W$ that are adjacent to at least one vertex in $V \backslash W$. Let $W^{o}:=W \backslash \delta(W)$.
Let $H$ be the graph with vertex set $V$, where two vertices $v, v^{\prime}$ are adjacent if and only if there exists a face of $G$ that is incident with both $v$ and $v^{\prime}$. For any subset $W$ of $V$, let $\kappa(W)$ denote the number of components of the subgraph of $H$ induced by $W$. Note that $\kappa(W)$ can be computed in linear time.
We say that $W$ is linked if $\kappa(W)=1$. Observe that if $W \neq \emptyset$ then
(3) $\quad W$ is linked if and only if $G$ does not contain a circuit $C$ splitting $W$.

Here we say that $C$ splits $W$ if $C$ does not intersect $W$ and $\emptyset \neq W \cap \operatorname{int} C \neq W$, where int $C$ denotes the (open) area of $\mathcal{R}^{2}$ enclosed by $C$.
We apply induction on $\kappa(X)$. If $\kappa(X) \leq 2$, the problem can be reduced to one satisfying (1). Indeed, if $\kappa(X)=2$ we can find in linear time a collection $F$ of faces of $G$ such that the subspace $X \cup \bigcup_{f \in F} f$ of $\mathcal{R}^{2}$ has two connected components and such that $|F| \leq|X|$. Choose two faces $f, f^{\prime} \in F$ and a vertex $v \in X$ incident with both $f$ and $f^{\prime}$. "Open" the graph at $v$, by splitting $v$ into two new vertices, joining $f$ and $f^{\prime}$ to form one new face. After this is repeated $|F|-3$ times, the faces in $F$ are replaced by two faces $f_{1}$ and $f_{2}$ and the vertices in $X$ are split (or not) to a set $X^{\prime}$ of $|X|+|F|-2$ vertices, such that each vertex in $X^{\prime}$ is incident with $f_{1}$ or $f_{2}$. By the result of Suzuki, Akama, and Nishizeki [7] we can solve the realization problem for the new graph and $X^{\prime}$ in linear time. This directly gives a solution for the realization problem for the original realization problem. We proceed similarly if $\kappa(X)=1$.
If $\kappa(X)>2$ we proceed as follows. Let $X_{1}, \ldots, X_{t}$ be the components of the subgraph of $H$ induced by $X$. (So $t=\kappa(X) \leq k$.) We may assume that $\delta\left(X_{i}\right)=X_{i}$ for each $i=1, \ldots, t$ (by attaching to each vertex in $X_{i}$ a new vertex
of valency 1). Let $p$ be a nonnegative integer. A p-neighbourhood is a collection $W_{1}, \ldots, W_{t}$ of pairwise disjoint linked subsets of $V$ with the following properties:
(i) for $i=1, \ldots, t, W_{i} \supseteq X_{i}$, and if $W_{i} \neq X_{i}$ then $\left|\delta\left(W_{i}\right)\right|=p$
(ii) for all distinct $i, j \in\{1, \ldots, t\}$, there are $p$ vertex-disjoint paths in $G$ between $W_{i}$ and $W_{j}$.

We note:
Proposition 2. Let $W_{1}, \ldots, W_{t}$ be a p-neighbourhood. Let $i, j \in\{1, \ldots, t\}$ be distinct, and let $T$ be a set of vertices intersecting each path from $W_{i}$ to $W_{j}$ such that $|T|=p$. Then $T$ is linked.

Proof. Suppose not. Let $C$ be a circuit in $G$ splitting $T$. Let $U_{i}$ and $U_{j}$ be the sets of vertices that can be reached from $W_{i}$ and $W_{j}$, respectively, without intersecting $T$. So $U_{i} \cap U_{j}=\emptyset$. Then $U_{i} \cap C=\emptyset$ or $U_{j} \cap C=\emptyset$, since otherwise all vertices in $C$ belong both to $U_{i}$ and $U_{j}$. We may assume that $U_{i} \cap C=\emptyset$. Hence we may assume moreover that $U_{i}$ is contained in $\operatorname{int} C$ (as $U_{i}$ is linked). Then each path from $W_{i}$ to $W_{j}$ intersects $T \cap \operatorname{int} C$, contradicting the facts that there exist $p$ disjoint such paths and that $|T \cap \operatorname{int} C|<|T|=p$.

In particular, $\delta\left(W_{i}\right)$ is linked for all $i$. (If $W_{i}=X_{i}$ then $\delta\left(W_{i}\right)=\delta\left(X_{i}\right)={ }^{\text {* }} X_{i}$.)
Call a $p$-neighbourhood $W_{1}, \ldots, W_{t}$ maximal if for each $i=1, \ldots, t$ and for each linked $U$ satisfying $W_{i} \subset U \subseteq V \backslash \bigcup_{j \neq i} W_{j}$ one has $|\delta(U)|>p$.

First we describe an algorithm which, given a $p$-neighbourhood $W_{1}, \ldots, W_{t}$, finds a maximal $p$-neighbourhood:

1. Choose $i \in\{1, \ldots, t\}$. Determine an inclusionwise maximal set $U$ satisfying $W_{i} \subseteq U \subseteq V \backslash \bigcup_{j \neq i} W_{j}$ and $|\delta(U)|=p$. Replace $W_{i}$ by $U$. If no such $U$ exists, we leave $W_{i}$ unchanged.
2. Repeat for all $i \in\{1, \ldots, t\}$ in turn. This gives a maximal $p$ neighbourhood.

Note that by Proposition 2, $\delta(U)$ in Step 1 is linked, and hence $U$ is linked. Note moreover that Step 1 can be performed in time $O(p|V|)$ with the FordFulkerson augmenting path method (one augmenting path can be found in time $O(|V|))$. See also [4].
Second we give an algorithm which, given a maximal $p$-neighbourhood, finds either a $p+1$-neighbourhood or a reduction for the realization problem:

1. If there exist $i \neq j$ and a vertex $v$ such that both $W_{i} \cup\{v\}$ and $W_{j} \cup\{v\}$ are linked, apply Proposition 1 to $V_{1}:=W_{i} \cup\{v\}, V_{2}:=$ $W_{j} \cup\{v\}, V_{3}:=V \backslash\left(W_{i}^{o} \cup W_{j}^{o}\right)$ and $Y:=X \cup \delta\left(W_{i}\right) \cup \delta\left(W_{j}\right) \cup\{v\}$.
Otherwise, for each $i=1, \ldots, t$ with $\left|\delta\left(W_{i}\right)\right|=p$, choose a vertex $v_{i} \in V \backslash W_{i}$ such that $W_{i} \cup\left\{v_{i}\right\}$ is linked, and let $U_{i}:=W_{i} \cup\left\{v_{i}\right\}$; for all other $i$ let $U_{i}:=W_{i}$.
2. If there exist $i \neq j$ such that there do not exist $p+1$ disjoint paths connecting $U_{i}$ and $U_{j}$, find a subset $U$ of $V$ such that $U_{i} \subseteq$ $U, U_{j} \subseteq U^{\prime}:=V \backslash U^{o}$ and $|\delta(U)|=p$. Apply Proposition 1 to $V_{1}:=W_{1}, \ldots, V_{t}:=W_{t}, V_{t+1}:=\left(U \backslash\left(W_{1}^{o} \cup \cdots \cup W_{t}^{o}\right)\right) \cup \delta(U), V_{t+2}:=$ $\left(U^{\prime} \backslash\left(W_{1}^{o} \cup \cdots \cup W_{t}^{o}\right)\right) \cup \delta(U)$ and $Y:=X \cup \delta\left(W_{1}\right) \cup \cdots \cup \delta\left(W_{t}\right) \cup \delta(U)$.
3. Otherwise, $U_{1}, \ldots, U_{t}$ form a $p+1$-neighbourhood.

Proposition 3. In Step 1, if there exist $i$ and $j$ as stated, then $\kappa\left(V_{h} \cap Y\right)<t$ for $h=1,2,3$.

Proof. Without loss of generality, $i=1$ and $j=2$. We have $\kappa\left(V_{1} \cap Y\right)=$ $\kappa\left(X_{1} \cup \delta\left(W_{1}\right) \cup\{v\}\right) \leq 2<t$, since both $X_{1}$ and $\delta\left(W_{1}\right) \cup\{v\}$ are linked. Similarly, $\kappa\left(V_{2} \cap Y\right) \leq 2<t$.

Finally, $\kappa\left(V_{3} \cap Y\right)<t$, since $V_{3} \cap Y=X_{3} \cup \cdots \cup X_{t} \cup \delta\left(W_{1}\right) \cup \delta\left(W_{2}\right) \cup\{v\}$, where $X_{3}, \ldots, X_{t}$ and $\delta\left(W_{1}\right) \cup \delta\left(W_{2}\right) \cup\{v\}$ are linked (as $\delta\left(W_{1}\right) \cup\{v\}$ and $\delta\left(W_{2}\right) \cup\{v\}$ are linked).

Proposition 4. Let $A, B \subseteq V$ such that $\delta(A)$ and $\delta(B)$ are linked, and such that $B \nsubseteq A^{\circ}$ and $A^{o} \cup B^{\circ} \neq V G$. Then $\delta(A) \cup(A \cap \delta(B))$ is linked.

Proof. Suppose $\delta(A) \cup(A \cap \delta(B))$ is not linked. Let $C$ be a circuit in $G$ splitting $\delta(A) \cup(A \cap \delta(B))$. Since $\delta(A)$ is linked, we may assume that $\delta(A) \subset \operatorname{int} C$. Since $C$ splits $\delta(A) \cup(A \cap \delta(B))$, we know that there are vertices in $A \cap \delta(B)$ that are in the exterior of $C$.

Since $G$ is connected, there exists a path in $G$ from a vertex in $A$ in the exterior of $C$ to a vertex of $C$ disjoint from $\delta(A)$, and hence $C$ intersects $A$. Therefore, $V C \subseteq A$. Hence every vertex of $G$ in the exterior of $C$ belongs to $A$. As $\delta(B)$ is linked and as $\delta(B)$ does not intersect $C$ (because $A \cap \delta(B)$ does not intersect $C$ ), we have that $\delta(B)$ is contained in the exterior of $C$. As $B \nsubseteq A^{\circ}$ this implies that each vertex in $\operatorname{int} C$ is contained in $B$. So $A^{o} \cup B^{o}=V G$, contradicting the assumption.

Proposition 5. In Step 2, if there exist $i$ and $j$ as stated, then $\kappa\left(V_{h} \cap Y\right)<t$ for $h=1, \ldots, t+2$.

Proof. Without loss of generality, $i=1$ and $j=2$. By the maximality of $W_{1}$ we know that $U$ intersects at least one of $W_{2}, W_{3} \ldots, W_{t}$. So $U$ intersects at least two of $W_{1}, \ldots, W_{t}$. Similarly, $U^{\prime}$ intersects at least two of $W_{1}, \ldots, W_{t}$.

For each $h=1, \ldots, t$ we have $\kappa\left(V_{h} \cap Y\right) \leq 2<t$, since $V_{h} \cap Y=X_{h} \cup \delta\left(W_{h}\right) \cup$ ( $\left.W_{h} \cap \delta(U)\right)$ and since $\delta\left(W_{h}\right) \cup\left(W_{h} \cap \delta(U)\right)$ is linked by Proposition 4. (Note that $U \nsubseteq W_{h}^{o}$ since $U$ intersects at least two of $W_{1}, \ldots, W_{t}$, and that $U^{o} \cup W_{h}^{o} \neq V G$ since $U^{\prime}$ intersects at least two of $W_{1}, \ldots, W_{t}$.)
Next we show $\kappa\left(V_{t+1} \cap Y\right)<t$. Note that $V_{t+1} \cap Y=\delta(U) \cup\left(U \cap\left(\delta\left(W_{1}\right) \cup\right.\right.$ $\left.\cdots \cup \delta\left(W_{t}\right)\right)$ ). Since $U^{\prime}$ intersects at least two of $W_{1}, \ldots, W_{t}$, it suffices to show that if $U^{\prime}$ intersects $W_{h}$ then $\delta(U) \cup\left(U \cap \delta\left(W_{h}\right)\right)$ is linked.

Suppose $U^{\prime}$ intersects $W_{h}$ and $\delta(U) \cup\left(U \cap \delta\left(W_{h}\right)\right)$ is not linked. As $\delta(U)$ and $\delta\left(W_{h}\right)$ are linked (by Proposition 2), Proposition 4 implies that $W_{h} \subseteq U^{0}$ or $W_{h}^{o} \cup U^{o}=V G$. However, $W_{h} \subseteq U^{\circ}$ contradicts the fact that $W_{h}$ intersects $U^{\prime}$. Moreover, $W_{h}^{o} \cup U^{o}=V G$ contradicts the fact that there is another $W_{h^{\prime}}$ intersecting $U^{\prime}$.

This shows $\kappa\left(V_{t+1} \cap Y\right)<t$. Similarly, $\kappa\left(V_{t+2} \cap Y\right)<t$.
Finally we give the algorithm which finds a reduction:
Starting with the 0 -neighbourhood $X_{1}, \ldots, X_{t}$, for $p=0,1, . ., 2 g(k)-$ 1 apply the above algorithms to find a reduction or a $2 g(k)$-neighbourhood.
If we find a $2 g(k)$-neighbourhood $W_{1}, \ldots, W_{t}$, then for all distinct $i, j \in\{1, \ldots, t\}$, find a shortest path $P_{i, j}$ in $H$ between $W_{i}$ and $W_{j}$. Among all $P_{i, j}$ choose one, $P:=P_{1,2}$ say, of minimum length.
If length $(P)>2 g(k)$, delete from $G$ all vertices of $P$ except the first $g(k)$ and the last $g(k)$. If length $(P) \leq 2 g(k)$ leave $G$ unchanged. Call the new graph $G^{\prime}$.
Let $R$ be the set of vertices in $P$ that are not deleted. Apply Proposition 1 to $G^{\prime}$ and $V_{1}:=W_{1}, V_{2}:=W_{2}, V_{3}:=V \backslash\left(W_{1}^{o} \cup W_{2}^{o}\right)$ and $Y:=X \cup \delta\left(W_{1}\right) \cup \delta\left(W_{2}\right) \cup R$.

Proposition 6. In $G^{\prime}, \kappa\left(V_{h} \cap Y\right)<t$ for $h=1,2,3$.
Proof. $\kappa\left(V_{1} \cap Y\right)=\kappa\left(X_{1} \cup \delta\left(W_{1}\right)\right) \leq 2<t$. Similarly, $\kappa\left(V_{2} \cap Y\right)<t$. Finally, $\kappa\left(V_{3} \cap Y\right)=\kappa\left(X_{3} \cup \cdots \cup X_{t} \cup \delta\left(W_{1}\right) \cup \delta\left(W_{2}\right) \cup R\right)<t$ since $\delta\left(W_{1}\right) \cup \delta\left(W_{2}\right) \cup R$ is linked.

Proposition 7. Deleting the vertices does not affect realizability.
Proof. Let $Q$ be the set of vertices deleted. We must show that for any vertex $v \in Q$, any closed curve $C$ traversing $v$ and separating $X$ has at least $g(k)$ intersections with $G-(Q \backslash\{v\})$ (since it means by the lemma that we can delete $v$, even after having deleted all other vertices in $Q$ ). In other words, any closed curve in $\mathcal{R}^{2}$ intersecting $Q$ and separating $X$ should have at least $g(k)-1$ intersections with $G-Q$.
Let $C$ be a closed curve intersecting $Q$ and separating $X$, having a minimum number $p$ of intersections with $G-Q$. We may assume that $C$ intersects $G$ only in vertices of $G$. Suppose $p \leq g(k)-2$. It is not difficult to see that, by the minimality of $p$, there exist $x, y \in Q$ on $C$ (possibly $x=y$ ) such that, if we denote by $K$ and $K^{\prime}$ the two (closed) $x-y$ parts of $C$, then one of these parts, $K$ say, intersects $G$ only in $Q$, while $K^{\prime}$ intersects $Q$ only in the end points $x$ and $y$ of $K^{\prime}$. We may assume that $K$ is part of $P$. Hence as $P$ is a shortest path, length $(K) \leq$ length $\left(K^{\prime}\right)=p+2$. So length $(C)=$ length $(K)+$ length $\left(K^{\prime}\right)-2 \leq$ $2 p+2 \leq 2 g(k)-2$.

Hence $C$ does not intersect any face incident with any point in any $W_{i}$, since otherwise $C$ would contain a curve of length at most $g(k)-1$ connecting $Q$ and $W_{i}$, contradicting the minimality of $P$. As $C$ separates $X$, there exist $i \neq j$ such that $W_{i}$ and $W_{j}$ are in different components of $\mathcal{R}^{2} \backslash C$. This contradicts the facts that there exist $2 g(k)$ pairwise disjoint paths from $W_{i}$ to $W_{j}$ and that length $(C)<2 g(k)$.
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