

# A local search 4/3-approximation algorithm for the minimum 3-path partition problem

Yong Chen<sup>1</sup> · Randy Goebel<sup>2</sup> · Guohui Lin<sup>2</sup> · Longcheng Liu<sup>3</sup> · Bing Su<sup>4</sup> · Weitian Tong<sup>5</sup> · Yao Xu<sup>5</sup> · An Zhang<sup>1</sup>

Accepted: 19 September 2022 / Published online: 28 September 2022 © The Author(s), under exclusive licence to Springer Science+Business Media, LLC, part of Springer Nature 2022

# Abstract

Given a graph G = (V, E), the 3-path partition problem is to find a minimum collection of vertex-disjoint paths each of order at most 3 to cover all the vertices of V. The previous best approximation algorithm for the 3-path partition problem has a performance ratio 13/9, which is based on a simple local search strategy. We propose a more involved local search and show by an amortized analysis that it is a 4/3-approximation; we also design an instance to illustrate that the approximation ratio is tight.

Keywords Path partition  $\cdot$  Path cover  $\cdot$  Local search  $\cdot$  Approximation algorithms  $\cdot$  Amortized analysis

# **1** Introduction

Motivated by the data integrity of communication in wireless sensor networks and several other applications, the *k*-PATH PARTITION (*k*PP) problem was first considered by Yan et al. (1997). Given a simple graph G = (V, E) (we consider only simple graphs and we drop "simple" hereafter), with n = |V| and m = |E|, the *order* of a simple path in *G* is the number of vertices on the path and it is called a *k*-path if its order is *k*. The *k*PP problem is to find a minimum collection of vertex-disjoint paths each of order at most *k* such that every vertex is on some path in the collection.

⊠ Bing Su subing684@sohu.com

Extended author information available on the last page of the article

An extended abstract (Chen et al. 2019a) of this paper appears in the *Proceedings of 13th International Frontiers of Algorithmics Workshop (FAW 2019)*, LNCS 11458, pages 14–25.

Guohui Lin guohui@ualberta.ca

Clearly, the 2PP problem is exactly the MAXIMUM MATCHING problem, which is solvable in  $O(m\sqrt{n}\log(n^2/m)/\log n)$ -time (Goldberg and Karzanov 2004). For each  $k \ge 3$ , kPP is NP-hard (Garey and Johnson 1979). We point out the key phrase "at most k" in the problem definition, that ensures the existence of a feasible solution for any given graph; on the other hand, if one asks for a path partition in which every path has an order exactly k, the problem is called  $P_k$ -partitioning and is also NP-complete for any fixed constant  $k \ge 3$  (Garey and Johnson 1979), even on bipartite graphs of maximum degree three (Monnot and Toulouse 2007). To the best of our knowledge, there is no prior approximation algorithm with proven performance for the general kPP problem, except the trivial k-approximation using all 1-paths. For 3PP, Monnot and Toulouse (2007) proposed a 3/2-approximation, based on two maximum matchings; recently, Chen et al. (2019b) presented an improved 13/9-approximation, based on a simple local search strategy (which is briefly reviewed below).

The *k*PP problem is a generalization to the PATH COVER problem (Franzblau and Raychaudhuri 2002) (also called PATH PARTITION), which is to find a minimum collection of vertex-disjoint paths that together cover all the vertices in the graph. PATH COVER contains the HAMILTONIAN PATH problem (Garey and Johnson 1979) as a special case, and thus it is NP-hard and it is outside APX unless P = NP.

The *k*PP problem is also closely related to the well-known SET COVER problem. Given a collection of subsets  $C = \{S_1, S_2, \ldots, S_m\}$  of a finite ground set  $U = \{x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_n\}$ , an element  $x_i \in S_j$  is said to be *covered* by the subset  $S_j$ , and a *set cover* is a collection of subsets which together cover all the elements of the ground set U. The SET COVER problem asks to find a minimum set cover. SET COVER is one of the first problems proven to be NP-hard (Garey and Johnson 1979), and is also one of the most studied optimization problems for the approximability (Johnson 1974) and inapproximability (Raz and Safra 1997; Feige 1998; Vazirani 2003). The variant of SET COVER in which every given subset has size at most k is called k- SET COVER, which is APX-complete and admits a 4/3-approximation for k = 3 (Duh and Fürer 1997) and an  $(H_k - \frac{196}{390})$ -approximation for  $k \ge 4$  (Levin 2006), where  $H_k$  is the k-th harmonic number.

To see the connection between kPP and k- SET COVER, we may take the vertex set V of the given graph as the ground set, and an  $\ell$ -path with  $\ell \leq k$  as a subset; then the kPP problem is the same as asking for a minimum *exact* set cover. That is, the kPP problem is a special case of the *minimum* EXACT COVER problem (Karp 1972), for which unfortunately there is no approximation result that we may borrow. Existing approximations for (non-exact) k- SET COVER do not readily apply to kPP, because in a feasible set cover, an element of the ground set could be covered by multiple subsets. There is a way to enforce the *exactness* requirement in the SET COVER problem, by expanding the given collection C to include all the proper subsets of each given subset  $S_j \in C$ . However, in an instance graph of kPP, not every subset of vertices on a path is traceable, and hence such an expanding technique does not apply. In summary, kPP and k- SET COVER share some similarities, but none contains the other as a special case.

In this paper, we study the 3PP problem. The authors of the 13/9-approximation (Chen et al. 2019b) first presented an O(nm)-time algorithm to compute a *k*-path partition with the least 1-paths, for any  $k \ge 3$ ; then they applied an  $O(n^3)$ -time local

search strategy to find three 2-paths that can be replaced by two 3-paths, until not possible. We aim to design better approximations for 3PP with provable performance, and we achieve a 4/3-approximation. Our algorithm starts with a 3-path partition with the least 1-paths, then it applies a more involved local search scheme to repeatedly search for a *collection* of 2- and 3-paths that can be replaced by a *strictly smaller collection* of new 2- and 3-paths, so as to reduce the size of the 3-path partition, until not possible. One thus may view our local search as a refinement of the previous work; using a slightly more complex amortized analysis, we are able to prove the performance ratio 4/3.

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. In Sect. 2 we present the local search scheme for searching a candidate collection of 2- and 3-paths. The amortized analysis and the proof of the performance of the algorithm are done in Sect. 3, and at the end we design an instance to show that the approximation ratio 4/3 is tight. We conclude the paper in Sect. 4.

# 2 A local search approximation algorithm

The 13/9-approximation proposed by Chen et al. (2019b) applies a simple local search strategy to iteratively find three 2-paths in the current solution that can be replaced by two 3-paths (OPERATION 3- 0- BY- 0- 2 in Definition 1). Such a replacement operation looks at only those six vertices covered by the three 2-paths, but no more. In our more involved local search, we examine three more possibilities where three 2-paths can be *transferred* into two 3-paths, either alone or with the help of a few other 2-paths and/or 3-paths. Specifically, we look for the help either from a single 3-path (OPERATION 3- 1- BY- 0- 3 in Definition 1), or from a combination of a 2-path and a 3-path (OPERATION 4- 1- BY- 1- 3 in Definition 1), or from a combination of a 2-path and two 3-paths (OPERATION 4- 2- BY- 1- 4 in Definition 1). We show that these three additional replacement operations are sufficient to achieve the performance ratio of 4/3.

Starting with a 3-path partition with the least 1-paths, our approximation algorithm repeatedly finds a certain collection of 2- and 3-paths in the current solution and replaces it by another collection of one less new 2- and 3-paths. This way, the new solution is better and the algorithm continues on until further reduction is impossible.

In Sect. 2.1 we present all the four replacement operations to be executed on the 3-path partition with the least 1-paths. The complete algorithm, denoted as APPROX, is summarized in Sect. 2.2.

### 2.1 Local operations

Throughout the local search, the 3-path partitions are maintained to have the least 1-paths. Our four local operations are designed so not to touch the 1-paths, ensuring that the final 3-path partition still contains the least 1-paths. We remind the reader that the local search algorithm is iterative, and every iteration ends after executing a local

**Fig. 1** A configuration of a candidate collection for the OPERATION 3- 0- BY- 0- 2, where blue solid edges are in Q and black dashed edges are in *E* but outside of Q (Color figure online)



operation. The algorithm terminates when none of the designed local operations is applicable.

**Definition 1** With respect to the current 3-path partition Q, a local OPERATION  $i_1$ - $i_2$ -BY- $j_1$ - $j_2$ , where  $j_1 = i_1 - 3$  and  $j_2 = i_2 + 2$ , replaces a collection of  $i_1$  2-paths and  $i_2$  3-paths in Q by a collection of  $j_1$  2-paths and  $j_2$  3-paths on the same subset of  $2i_1 + 3i_2$  vertices.

For ease of presentation, the collection of  $i_1$  2-paths and  $i_2$  3-paths in the current 3-path partition Q is referred to as a *candidate* collection; while the latter collection of  $j_1$  2-paths and  $j_2$  3-paths on the same subset of  $2i_1 + 3i_2$  vertices is referred to as a *replacement* collection.

We remark that by such a local OPERATION  $i_1$ - $i_2$ - BY-  $j_1$ - $j_2$ , three 2-paths in the candidate collection are transferred into two 3-paths, with the help of the other 2-paths and the 3-paths in the candidate collection. One clearly sees that the achieved 3-path partition contains exactly one less path than Q (since  $j_1 + j_2 = i_1 + i_2 - 1$ ).

In the rest of this section we determine the configurations for all the local operations.

#### 2.1.1 OPERATION 3-0-BY-0-2

When three 2-paths of Q can be connected into a 6-path in the graph *G* (see Fig. 1 for an illustration), they form a candidate collection satisfying Definition 1. By removing the middle edge on the 6-path, we achieve two 3-paths on the same six vertices which replace the original three 2-paths. In the example illustrated in Fig. 1, using the two edges  $(u_1, v_2), (u_2, v_3) \in E$  outside of Q (shown as black dashed), the OPERATION 3- 0- BY- 0- 2 replaces the three 2-paths  $u_1-v_1, u_2-v_2$ , and  $u_3-v_3$  of Q by two new 3-paths  $v_1-u_1-v_2$  and  $u_2-v_3-u_3$ .

Another way to look at this candidate collection  $\{u_1-v_1, u_2-v_2, u_3-v_3\}$  is, supposing the two 2-paths  $u_2-v_2$  and  $u_3-v_3$  are connected via the edge  $(u_2, v_3)$ , the 2-path  $u_1-v_1$  *directly* reaches it via the edge  $(u_1, v_2)$ .

Assume a 3-path  $u-w-v \in Q$ . Clearly, if  $(u, v) \in E$ , then one can replace u-w-v by w-v-u or v-u-w in Q so that the three vertices remain covered by the same path. In this sense, we say that these three paths are *equivalent* to each other, and if needed, any one of them can replace the other to present in Q (see Fig. 2 for an illustration).

#### 2.1.2 OPERATION 3-1-BY-0-3

Consider a collection of three 2-paths  $u_1-v_1$ ,  $u_2-v_2$ ,  $u_3-v_3$ , and a 3-path u-w-v in Q. If one of the 2-paths, say  $u_1-v_1$ , is adjacent to an endpoint of the 3-path, say  $(u_1, u) \in E$ (see Fig. 3 for an illustration), then we can remove the edge (u, w) while add the edge



 $(u, u_1)$  to transfer the 2-path  $u_1$ - $v_1$  and the 3-path u-w-v into a new 3-path u- $u_1$ - $v_1$  and a new 2-path w-v. If follows that, when an OPERATION 3- 0- BY- 0- 2 is applicable to the three 2-paths  $u_2$ - $v_2$ ,  $u_3$ - $v_3$ , and w-v, then the original collection { $u_1$ - $v_1$ ,  $u_2$ - $v_2$ ,  $u_3$ - $v_3$ , u-w-v} is a candidate collection for applying an OPERATION 3- 1- BY- 0- 3. In the example illustrated in Fig. 3, the replacement collection is {u- $u_1$ - $v_1$ , v-w- $v_2$ ,  $u_2$ - $v_3$ - $u_3$ }.

Similarly, another way to look at this candidate collection  $\{u_1-v_1, u_2-v_2, u_3-v_3, u-w-v\}$  is, supposing the two 2-paths  $u_2-v_2$  and  $u_3-v_3$  are connected via the edge  $(u_2, v_3)$ , the 2-path  $u_1-v_1$  reaches it *indirectly* to the 3-path via the edge  $(u_1, u)$  first and then via the edge  $(w, v_2)$ . That is, the 3-path u-w-v offers help for the operation.

#### 2.1.3 OPERATION 4-1-BY-1-3

Assume the two 2-paths  $u_1-v_1$  and  $u_2-v_2$  of Q are connected via the edge  $(v_1, u_2)$ , and the other two 2-paths  $u_3-v_3$  and  $u_4-v_4$  of Q are connected via the edge  $(v_3, u_4)$ . If both  $u_1$  and  $u_3$  are adjacent to an endpoint of a 3-path, say the vertex u of u-w-v(see Fig. 4 for an illustration), then these four 2-paths and the 3-path form a candidate collection. By removing the three edges (u, w),  $(u_1, v_1)$ ,  $(u_3, v_3)$  while adding the four edges  $(u_1, u)$ ,  $(u, u_3)$ ,  $(v_1, u_2)$ ,  $(v_3, u_4)$ , an OPERATION 4- 1- BY- 1- 3 transfers the candidate collection into the replacement collection {w-v,  $u_1-u-u_3$ ,  $v_1-u_2-v_2$ ,  $v_3-u_4-v_4$ }.

In such an operation, the 3-path u-w-v offers help by breaking itself into a 2-path w-v and a singleton u, the latter of which connects the two 4-paths into a 9-path (which is broken down into three 3-paths afterwards).





#### 2.1.4 OPERATION 4-2-BY-1-4

Assume the two 2-paths  $u_1 \cdot v_1$  and  $u_2 \cdot v_2$  of Q are connected via the edge  $(v_1, u_2)$ , and the other two 2-paths  $u_3 \cdot v_3$  and  $u_4 \cdot v_4$  of Q are connected via the edge  $(v_3, u_4)$ . If  $u_1$  is adjacent to a vertex on a 3-path  $u \cdot w \cdot v$  and  $u_3$  is adjacent to a vertex on another 3-path  $u' \cdot w' \cdot v'$ , then we examine whether there is an edge connecting these two 3-paths so that an OPERATION 4-2- BY- 1-4 transfers the collection { $u_1 \cdot v_1, u_2 \cdot v_2, u_3 \cdot v_3, u_4 \cdot v_4, u \cdot w \cdot v, u' \cdot w' \cdot v'$ } into a replacement collection of a 2-path and four 3-paths.

Depending on how the vertices  $u_1$  and  $u_3$  are adjacent to the vertices on the 3-paths u-w-v and u'-w'-v', respectively, there are three possible classes of configurations. In the first class, both  $u_1$  and  $u_3$  are adjacent to endpoints, say  $(u_1, u), (u_3, u') \in E$ . Then, the existence of one of the five edges (u, v'), (v, u'), (w, v'), (v, w'), (v, v') enables the OPERATION 4-2- BY- 1-4 (see Fig. 5a for an illustration). For example, when  $(u, v') \in E$ , removing the four edges  $(u, w), (w', v'), (u_1, v_1), (u_3, v_3)$  while adding the five edges  $(u_1, u), (u_3, u'), (u, v'), (v_1, u_2), (v_3, u_4)$ , transfer the candidate collection into the replacement collection  $\{w$ - $v, u_1$ -u-v', w'-u'- $u_3, v_1$ - $u_2$ - $v_2, v_3$ - $u_4$ - $v_4$ }.

In the second class,  $u_1$  and  $u_3$  are adjacent to an endpoint and an midpoint, respectively, say  $(u_1, u), (u_3, w') \in E$ . Then, the existence of one of the six edges (u, u'), (v, v'), (u, v'), (v, u'), (w, u'), (w, v') enables the OPERATION 4-2- BY-1-4 (see Fig. 5b for an illustration). For example, when  $(u, v') \in E$ , removing the four edges  $(u, w), (w', v'), (u_1, v_1), (u_3, v_3)$  while adding the five edges  $(u_1, u), (u_3, w'), (u, v'), (v_1, u_2), (v_3, u_4)$ , transfer the candidate collection into the replacement collection  $\{w - v, u_1 - u - v', u' - w' - u_3, v_1 - u_2 - v_2, v_3 - u_4 - v_4\}$ .

In the last class, both  $u_1$  and  $u_3$  are adjacent to midpoints, that is,  $(u_1, w)$ ,  $(u_3, w') \in E$ . Then, the existence of one of the four edges (u, u'), (v, v'), (u, v'), (v, u') enables the OPERATION 4-2-BY-1-4 (see Fig. 5c for an illustration). For example, when  $(u, v') \in E$ , removing the four edges (u, w), (w', v'),  $(u_1, v_1)$ ,  $(u_3, v_3)$  while adding the five edges  $(u_1, w)$ ,  $(u_3, w')$ , (u, v'),  $(v_1, u_2)$ ,  $(v_3, u_4)$ , transfer the candidate collection into the replacement collection  $\{u-v', u_1-w-v, u'-w'-u_3, v_1-u_2-v_2, v_3-u_4-v_4\}$ .

### 2.2 The complete local search algorithm APPROX

The first step of our local search algorithm APPROX is to compute a 3-path partition Q with the least 1-paths. The second step is iterative, and in each iteration the algorithm



**Fig. 5** The three classes of configurations of a candidate collection for the OPERATION 4-2-BY-1-4, where blue solid edges are in Q, black dashed edges are in *E* but outside of Q, and for each class at least one red dotted edge is in *E* but outside of Q (Color figure online)

Algorithm APPROX on G = (V, E): **Step 1.** Compute a 3-path partition Q with the least 1-paths in G; **Step 2.** iteratively, if an OPERATION  $i_1$ - $i_2$ -BY- $j_1$ - $j_2$  is applicable, update Q; **Step 3.** return Q.

Fig. 6 A high-level description of the local search algorithm APPROX

tries to apply one of the four local operations, by finding a candidate collection and determining the subsequent replacement collection. When no candidate collection can be found, the second step terminates. The algorithm outputs the achieved 3-path partition Q as the solution. A high-level description of the complete algorithm APPROX is depicted in Fig. 6.

Step 1 runs in O(nm) time (Chen et al. 2019b), where n = |V| and m = |E|. Note that there are O(n) 2-paths and O(n) 3-paths in the Q at the beginning of Step 2, and therefore there are  $O(n^6)$  original collections to be examined, since a candidate collection has a maximum size of 6. When a local operation is applied, the iteration ends and the 3-path partition Q reduces its size by 1, while introducing at most 5 new 2-paths and 3-paths. These new 2-paths and 3-paths give rise to  $O(n^5)$  new collections (each contains at least one of the new paths) to be examined in the subsequent iterations. Since there are at most n iterations in Step 2, we conclude that the total number of original and new collection, and if so, deciding the corresponding replacement collection, can be done in O(1) time. We thus conclude that the overall running time of Step 2 is  $O(n^6)$ , and consequently have proved the following theorem.

**Theorem 1** The running time of the algorithm APPROX is in  $O(n^6)$ .

# 3 Analysis of the approximation ratio 4/3

In this section, we show that our local search algorithm APPROX is a 4/3-approximation for 3PP. The performance analysis is done through amortization.

The 3-path partition produced by the algorithm APPROX is denoted as Q; let  $Q_i$  denote the sub-collection of all the *i*-paths in Q, for i = 1, 2, 3, respectively. Let  $Q^*$ 

be an optimal 3-path partition, *i.e.*, it achieves the minimum total number of paths, and let  $Q_i^*$  denote the sub-collection of all the *i*-paths in  $Q^*$ , for i = 1, 2, 3, respectively. Since our Q contains the least 1-paths among all 3-path partitions for *G*, we have

$$|\mathcal{Q}_1| \le |\mathcal{Q}_1^*|. \tag{1}$$

Since both Q and  $Q^*$  cover all the vertices of V, we have

$$|\mathcal{Q}_1| + 2|\mathcal{Q}_2| + 3|\mathcal{Q}_3| = n = |\mathcal{Q}_1^*| + 2|\mathcal{Q}_2^*| + 3|\mathcal{Q}_3^*|.$$
(2)

Next, we prove the following inequality which gives an upper bound on  $|Q_2|$ , through an amortized analysis:

$$|\mathcal{Q}_2| \le |\mathcal{Q}_1^*| + 2|\mathcal{Q}_2^*| + |\mathcal{Q}_3^*|.$$
(3)

Combining Eqs. (1, 2, 3), it follows that

$$3|\mathcal{Q}_1| + 3|\mathcal{Q}_2| + 3|\mathcal{Q}_3| \le 4|\mathcal{Q}_1^*| + 4|\mathcal{Q}_2^*| + 4|\mathcal{Q}_3^*|, \tag{4}$$

that is,  $|\mathcal{Q}| \leq \frac{4}{3}|\mathcal{Q}^*|$ , and consequently the following theorem holds.

**Theorem 2** The algorithm APPROX is an  $O(n^6)$ -time 4/3-approximation for the 3PP problem, and the performance ratio 4/3 is tight for APPROX.

In the amortized analysis, each 2-path of  $Q_2$  has one token (*i.e.*,  $|Q_2|$  tokens in total) to be distributed to the paths of  $Q^*$ . The upper bound in Eq. (3) will immediately follow if we prove the following lemma.

Lemma 1 There is a token distribution scheme in which

- 1. every 1-path of  $Q_1^*$  receives at most 1 token;
- 2. every 2-path of  $Q_2^*$  receives at most 2 tokens;
- 3. every 3-path of  $\mathcal{Q}_3^{\tilde{*}}$  receives at most 1 token.

In the rest of the section we present the distribution scheme that satisfies the three requirements stated in Lemma 1.

Denote  $E(Q_2)$ ,  $E(Q_3)$ ,  $E(Q_2^*)$ ,  $E(Q_3^*)$  as the set of all the edges on the paths of  $Q_2$ ,  $Q_3$ ,  $Q_2^*$ ,  $Q_3^*$ , respectively, and  $E(Q^*) = E(Q_2^*) \cup E(Q_3^*)$ . In the subgraph of  $G(V, E(Q_2) \cup E(Q^*))$ , only the midpoint of a 3-path of  $Q_3^*$  may have degree 3, *i.e.*, it is incident with two edges of  $E(Q^*)$  and one edge of  $E(Q_2)$ , while all the other vertices have degree at most 2 since each is incident with at most one edge of  $E(Q_2)$  and at most one edge of  $E(Q^*)$ .

Our distribution scheme consists of two phases. We define two functions  $\tau_1(P)$  and  $\tau_2(P)$  to denote the fractional amount of token received by a path  $P \in Q^*$  in Phase 1 and Phase 2, respectively; then  $\tau(P) = \tau_1(P) + \tau_2(P)$  is the total amount of token received by the path  $P \in Q^*$  at the end of our distribution process. Recall that  $\sum_{P \in Q^*} \tau(P) = |Q_2|$ .



**Fig. 7** Illustrations of the token distribution scheme in Phase 1, where blue solid edges are in  $E(\mathcal{Q}_2)$ , black dashed edges are in  $E(\mathcal{Q}^*)$ , and red dotted arrows indicate how tokens are distributed. In (a),  $P = v \in \mathcal{Q}_1^*$ ; in (b),  $P = v \cdot w \in \mathcal{Q}_2^*$ ; in (c), both v and u are on a 3-path of  $\mathcal{Q}_3^*$  (Color figure online)

# 3.1 Distribution process Phase 1

In Phase 1, we distribute all the  $|Q_2|$  tokens to the paths of  $Q^*$  (*i.e.*,  $\sum_{P \in Q^*} \tau_1(P) = |Q_2|$ ) such that a path  $P \in Q^*$  receives some token from a 2-path  $u \cdot v \in Q_2$  if and only if u or v is (or both are) on P, and the following three requirements are satisfied:

1.  $\tau_1(P) \leq 1$  for  $\forall P \in \mathcal{Q}_1^*$ ; 2.  $\tau_1(P) \leq 2$  for  $\forall P \in \mathcal{Q}_2^*$ ;

3.  $\tau_1(P) \leq 3/2$  for  $\forall P \in \mathcal{Q}_3^*$ .

In this phase, the one token held by each 2-path of  $Q_2$  is breakable but can only be broken into two halves. So for every path  $P \in Q^*$ ,  $\tau_1(P)$  is a multiple of 1/2.

For each 2-path  $u \cdot v \in Q_2$ , if one vertex v or u lies on a singleton (P = v in Fig. 7a) or a 2-path ( $P = v \cdot w$  in Fig. 7b) of  $Q^*$ , then  $u \cdot v$  gives its whole token to the singleton or the 2-path; otherwise, both v and u lie on a 3-path ( $P_1$  and  $P_2$ , respectively, in Fig. 7c) of  $Q^*$ , and then the whole token of  $u \cdot v$  is broken into two halves, one for each of the two 3-paths. This way, we distribute the tokens to the paths of  $Q^*$  satisfying the above three requirements.

#### 3.2 Distribution process Phase 2

In Phase 2, we will transfer the extra 1/2 token from every 3-path  $P \in Q_3^*$  with  $\tau_1(P) = 3/2$  to some other paths of  $Q^*$  in order to satisfy the three requirements of Lemma 1. In this phase, each 1/2 token can be broken into two quarters, thus for a path  $P \in Q^*$ ,  $\tau_2(P)$  is a multiple of 1/4.

Consider a 3-path  $P_1 = v'' - v' - v \in Q_3^*$ . We observe that if  $\tau_1(P_1) = 3/2$ , then each of v, v', and v'' must be incident with an edge  $e \in E(Q_2)$ , such that the other endpoint of the edge e is also on a 3-path of  $Q_3^*$  — see Phase 1. Since there are three of them, we assume without loss of generality that  $(u, v) \in E(Q_2)$  and the vertex u lies on a 3-path  $P_2 \in Q_3^*$  distinct from  $P_1$ , that is,  $P_2 \neq P_1$ , and furthermore (u, w) is an edge on the 3-path  $P_2$  (see Fig. 8 for an illustration). We can verify the following claim that the vertex w is on a 3-path of  $Q_3$ , and consequently  $\tau_1(P_2) \leq 1$ .

**Claim 1** The vertex w is on a 3-path of  $Q_3$ .



**Fig. 8** An illustration of a 3-path  $P_1 = v \cdot v' \cdot v'' \in \mathcal{Q}_3^*$  with  $\tau_1(P_1) = 3/2$ , where  $u \cdot v, u' \cdot v', u'' \cdot v'' \in \mathcal{Q}_2$  shown in blue solid edges; the vertex u is on a distinct 3-path  $P_2 \in \mathcal{Q}_3^*$  and the edge (u, w) is on  $P_2$  shown black dashed. Then, w must lie on a 3-path  $P_3 \in \mathcal{Q}_3$ . The red dotted arrow indicates how tokens are redistributed out of  $P_1$  (Color figure online)

**Proof** See Fig. 8 for an illustration, where we denote the 2-paths of  $Q_2$  incident at v' and v'' as u'-v' and u''-v'', respectively. We remark that u' and v'' (and likewise u'' and v', respectively) are not necessarily distinct.

Firstly, w cannot collide into any of u', u'' since otherwise the three 2-paths u-v, u'-v', u''-v'' form a candidate collection for an OPERATION 3- 0- BY- 0- 2. Secondly, suppose w is on a 2-path w-x of  $Q_2$ , then the three 2-paths u-v, u'-v', w-x also form a candidate collection for an OPERATION 3- 0- BY- 0- 2. These contradictions show that w does not lie on any 2-path of  $Q_2$ .

Lastly, suppose w is a singleton of  $Q_1$ , then w and the 2-path u-v can be merged to a 3-path, contradicting to the fact that Q is a partition with the least 1-paths. This proves the claim.

We summarize the above into the following lemma.

**Lemma 2** For any 3-path  $P_1 \in Q_3^*$  with  $\tau_1(P_1) = 3/2$ , there must be another 3-path  $P_2 \in Q_3^*$  with  $\tau_1(P_2) \le 1$  such that

- (1) *u*-*v* is a 2-path of  $Q_2$ , where *v* is on  $P_1$  and *u* is on  $P_2$ , and
- (2) any vertex adjacent to u on  $P_2$  is on a 3-path  $P_3$  of  $Q_3$ .

From Lemma 2 and seeing Fig. 8 for an illustration, the first step of Phase 2 is to transfer the extra 1/2 token held by  $P_1$  from  $P_1$  to the 2-path *u*-*v* through vertex *v*. This way, we have  $\tau_2(P_1) = -1/2$  and  $\tau(P_1) = 3/2 - 1/2 = 1$ .

Let us continue using the notations in Lemma 2, and let  $x_1$  and  $y_1$  be the other two vertices on  $P_3$  (*i.e.*,  $P_3 = w \cdot x_1 \cdot y_1$  or  $P_3 = x_1 \cdot w \cdot y_1$ ). Denote the path in  $Q^*$  on which  $x_1$  ( $y_1$ , respectively) lies as  $P_4$  ( $P_5$ , respectively). Next, we will transfer the 1/2 token from  $u \cdot v$  to the paths  $P_4$  or/and  $P_5$  through some *pipes*, to be defined below.

We define a *pipe*  $r \to s \to t$ , where *r* is an endpoint of a *source* 2-path of  $Q_2$ (the path *u*-*v* in the current consideration) which receives 1/2 token in the first step of Phase 2, (r, s) is an edge on a 3-path  $P \in Q_3^*$  with  $\tau_1(P) \leq 1$  (the path  $P_2$  in the current consideration), *s* and *t* are both on a 3-path of  $Q_3$  (the path  $P_3$  in the current consideration), and *t* is a vertex on the *destination* path of  $Q^*$  (the path  $P_4$  or  $P_5$  in the current consideration) which will receive token from the source 2-path of  $Q_2$ . That is, the pipe  $r \to s \to t$  will transfer some token from the source 2-path of  $Q_2$  on which *r* lies, to the destination path of  $Q^*$  on which *t* lies; and we call *r* and *t* the *head* and the *tail* of the pipe, respectively. For example, in the configuration shown in Fig. 9a, there are four possible pipes  $u \to w \to x_1, u \to w \to y_1, u'' \to w \to x_1$ , and  $u'' \to w \to y_1$ . We distinguish the cases by the orders of the two destination paths  $P_4$  and  $P_5$ , to determine how they receive token from source 2-paths through pipes.

Note that *u* can be either an endpoint or the midpoint of  $P_2$ . Nevertheless, when *u* is the midpoint of  $P_2$ , there are at most two possible pipes passing through *w*; consequently, it can be treated as a subcase of the more general case where *u* is an endpoint of  $P_2$ . Below we consider the more general case, and assume that  $P_2 = u - w - u''$ ; then there are two possible pipes headed by *u* and two possible pipes headed by *u''* passing through *w*. The second step of Phase 2 is to transfer the 1/2 token held by the 2-path *u-v* to the paths  $P_4$  or/and  $P_5$ , separated into the following three cases:

- Case 1. One of  $P_4$  and  $P_5$  is a singleton. We assume without loss of generality  $P_4 = x_1 \in Q_1^*$  (see Fig. 9 for illustrations). In this case, we transfer the 1/2 token from *u*-*v* to  $P_4$  through the pipe  $u \to w \to x_1$ .
- Case 2. Both  $P_4$  and  $P_5$  are paths of  $\mathcal{Q}_2^* \cup \mathcal{Q}_3^*$ , and w is an endpoint of  $P_3 = w \cdot x_1 \cdot y_1$ . In this case, we transfer the 1/2 token from  $u \cdot v$  to  $P_5$  through the pipe  $u \rightarrow w \rightarrow y_1$  (see Fig. 10a for an illustration).
- Case 3. Both  $P_4$  and  $P_5$  are paths of  $Q_2^* \cup Q_3^*$ , and w is the midpoint of  $P_3 = x_1 \cdot w \cdot y_1$ . In this case, we transfer 1/4 token from  $u \cdot v$  to  $P_4$  through the pipe  $u \rightarrow w \rightarrow x_1$  and transfer the other 1/4 token from  $u \cdot v$  to  $P_5$  through the pipe  $u \rightarrow w \rightarrow y_1$  (see Fig. 10b for an illustration).

**Claim 2** The first item of Lemma 1 holds, that is, for any 1-path  $P \in \mathcal{Q}_1^*$ ,  $\tau(P) \leq 1$ .

**Proof** Note that if the vertex v on the singleton  $P \in Q_1^*$  does not lie on a 3-path of  $Q_3$ , then its token is not changed in Phase 2 and thus  $\tau(P) = \tau_1(P) \leq 1$ . In other words, if the token of P is increased during Phase 2, then  $\tau_1(P) = 0$  and  $\tau_2(P)$  is assigned in Case 1 during the second step of Phase 2. We thus consider the path  $P_4$  in Case 1, and refer to the configurations in Fig. 9.

Firstly, if  $P_5$  is a singleton or a 2-path, then there are at most 2 pipes ending at  $x_1$ , which are  $u \to w \to x_1$  and  $u'' \to w \to x_1$ . Therefore,  $\tau_2(P_4) \le 2 \times 1/2 = 1$ .

Next, we assume that  $P_5$  is a 3-path so that there could be two more pipes passing through  $y_1$  to  $x_1$  (that is,  $y_1$  takes up the role of w); let  $(y_1, y_2)$  be an edge on  $P_5$ , then  $y_2 \rightarrow y_1 \rightarrow x_1$  is one of the two possible pipes if  $y_2$  has the same role as u.

When *w* is the midpoint of  $P_3 = x_1 \cdot w \cdot y_1$  (see Fig. 9a for an illustration),  $y_2$  cannot have the same role as *u* since  $y_2$  cannot be on a 2-path of  $Q_2$ ; or otherwise  $\{u'-v', u-v, P', P_3\}$  would be a candidate collection for an OPERATION 3-1-BY-0-3, where P' is 2-path of  $Q_2$  on which  $y_2$  lies. Therefore, we again have  $\tau_2(P_4) \le 2 \times 1/2 = 1$ .

When w is an endpoint of  $P_3$ , *i.e.*, either  $P_3 = w \cdot x_1 \cdot y_1$  (see Fig. 9b for an illustration) or  $P_3 = w \cdot y_1 \cdot x_1$  (see Fig. 9c for an illustration), u'' cannot have the same role as u; or otherwise  $\{u' \cdot v', u \cdot v, P', P'', P_3\}$  would be a candidate collection for an OPER-ATION 4-1-BY-1-3, where P' and P'' are the two 2-paths of  $Q_2$  associated with u'' (just like the two 2-paths  $u' \cdot v'$  and  $u \cdot v$  associated with u). That is,  $u'' \to w \to x_1$  is not a pipe. Additionally, for the same reason as in the last paragraph,  $y_2$  cannot have the same role as u when either  $P_3 = w \cdot x_1 \cdot y_1$  or  $P_3 = w \cdot y_1 \cdot x_1$ . Therefore, we have  $\tau_2(P_4) \leq 1/2$ .



**Fig. 9** The configurations in which  $P_4 = x_1$  is a singleton of  $\mathcal{Q}_1^*$ , where blue solid edges are in  $E(\mathcal{Q})$  and black dashed edges are in  $E(\mathcal{Q}^*)$ . The vertex  $x_1$  is the tail of a pipe through which  $P_4$  receives 1/2 token from the source 2-path *u*-*v*, indicated by red dotted arrows (Color figure online)

In summary, we have showed that  $\tau_2(P_4) \leq 1$ ; it follows from  $\tau_1(P_4) = 0$  that  $\tau(P_4) \leq 1$ .

**Claim 3** The second item of Lemma 1 holds, that is, for any 2-path  $P \in \mathcal{Q}_2^*, \tau(P) \leq 2$ .

**Proof** Note that for a 2-path  $P = u \cdot v \in Q_2^*$ , if the vertex v does not lie on a 3-path of  $Q_3$ , then its token received through v is not changed in Phase 2, and we denote this portion of token as  $\tau(P(v)) = \tau_1(P(v)) \le 1$ . In other words, if  $\tau_2(P(v)) > 0$ , then  $\tau_1(P(v)) = 0$  and  $\tau_2(P(v))$  is assigned in Cases 2 and 3 during the second step of Phase 2. We thus consider the path  $P_5$  in these two cases, and refer to the configurations in Fig. 10.

In Case 2 where w is an endpoint of  $P_3 = w \cdot x_1 \cdot y_1$  (see Fig. 10a), u'' cannot have the same role as u; or otherwise  $\{u' \cdot v', u \cdot v, P', P'', P_3\}$  would be a candidate collection for an OPERATION 4- 1- BY- 1- 3, where P' and P'' are the two 2-paths of  $Q_2$  associated with u'' (just like the two 2-paths  $u' \cdot v'$  and  $u \cdot v$  associated with u). That is,  $u'' \to w \to y_1$  is not a pipe. Assume  $(x_1, x_2)$  is an edge on the path  $P_4$ ; for the same reason  $x_2$  cannot have the same role as u, since otherwise  $\{u \cdot v, P', P'', P_3\}$ would be a candidate collection for an OPERATION 3- 1- BY- 0- 3, where P' and P'' are the two 2-paths of  $Q_2$  associated with  $x_2$  (just like the two 2-paths  $u' \cdot v'$  and  $u \cdot v$ associated with u). That is,  $x_2 \to x_1 \to y_1$  is not a pipe either. Therefore, we have  $\tau_2(P_5(y_1)) \leq 1/2$ .

In Case 3 where w is the midpoint of  $P_3 = x_1 \cdot w \cdot y_1$  (see Fig. 10b), we assume  $(x_1, x_2)$  is an edge on the path  $P_4$ ; for the same reason as in the last paragraph  $x_2$  cannot have the same role as u. That is,  $x_2 \rightarrow x_1 \rightarrow y_1$  is not a pipe. Therefore, there are at most two pipes ending with  $y_1$  and consequently  $\tau_2(P_5(y_1)) \le 2 \times 1/4 = 1/2$ .

In summary, we have showed that the token received through the vertex  $y_1$  is at most  $\tau_2(P_5(y_1)) \leq 1/2$ ; it follows from  $\tau_1(P_5(y_1)) = 0$  that  $\tau(P_5(y_1)) \leq 1/2$ . One can apply exactly the same argument on the other vertex  $y_2$  and show that if  $\tau_2(P_5(y_2)) > 0$  then  $\tau(P_5(y_2)) \leq 1/2$ . These together prove that for every  $P \in \mathcal{Q}_2^*$ ,  $\tau(P) \leq \max\{2, 1 + 1/2, 1/2 + 1/2\} = 2$ .

**Claim 4** *The third item of Lemma* 1 *holds, that is, for any* 3-*path*  $P \in \mathcal{Q}_3^*, \tau(P) \leq 1$ .

**Proof** Recall that for every 3-path  $P \in \mathcal{Q}_3^*$ , P receives 1/2 token through its vertex v in Phase 1 if and only if v lies on a 2-path  $v \cdot v' \in \mathcal{Q}_2$  and v' is also on a 3-path of  $\mathcal{Q}_3^*$ . We denote this portion of token as  $\tau_1(P(v))$ .



**Fig. 10** The configurations in which both  $P_4$  and  $P_5$  are in  $\mathcal{Q}_2^* \cup \mathcal{Q}_3^*$ , where blue solid edges are in  $E(\mathcal{Q})$  and black dashed edges are in  $E(\mathcal{Q}^*)$ . In (**a**),  $y_1$  is the tail of a pipe through which  $P_5$  receives 1/2 token from the source 2-path u-v; in (**b**),  $x_1$  is the tail of a pipe through which  $P_4$  receives 1/4 token from the source 2-path u-v and  $y_1$  is the tail of a pipe through which  $P_5$  receives 1/4 token from the source 2-path u-v. The red dotted arrows indicate how tokens are moved (Color figure online)

Furthermore, if  $\tau_1(P) = 3/2$  then  $\tau_2(P) = -1/2$  in the first step of Phase 2 and *P* never receives any token in the second step of Phase 2; therefore,  $\tau(P) = 1$ . If  $\tau_1(P) \le 1$  and  $\tau_2(P) > 0$ , then *P* receives token through pipes with their tails on *P* and a 3-path of  $Q_3$ , and  $\tau_2(P)$  is assigned in Cases 2 and 3 during the second step of Phase 2. We thus consider the paths  $P_4$  and  $P_5$  in these two cases, and refer to the configurations in Fig. 10.

In Case 2 where w is an endpoint of  $P_3 = w \cdot x_1 \cdot y_1$  (see Fig. 10a), the same as in the proof of Claim 3, u'' cannot have the same role as u; that is,  $u'' \to w \to y_1$  is not a pipe. Assume  $(x_1, x_2)$  is an edge on the path  $P_4$ ; for the same reason  $x_2$  cannot have the same role as u, that is,  $x_2 \to x_1 \to y_1$  is not a pipe either. Therefore, we have  $\tau_2(P_5(y_1)) \le 1/2$ .

Additionally, one sees that  $y_2$  cannot lie on a 2-path  $P'_3 \in Q_2$ , since otherwise  $\{u'-v', u-v, P'_3, P_3\}$  would be a candidate collection for an OPERATION 3-1-BY-0-3. Therefore,  $\tau_1(P_5(y_2)) = 0$ . Note that  $y_2$  cannot be a singleton in Q either, due to the fact that Q has the least singletons; we conclude that  $y_2$  lies on a 3-path  $P'_3 \in Q_3$ . If  $y_2$  is the tail of a pipe, say  $z_1 \rightarrow w' \rightarrow y_2$ , that is, both  $y_2$  and w' are on  $P'_3$  and  $z_1$  has the same role as u (see Fig. 11 for an illustration), then  $\{u'-v', u-v, P', P'', P_3, P'_3\}$  would be a candidate collection for an OPERATION 4-2-BY-1-4, where P' and P'' are the two 2-paths of  $Q_2$  associated with  $z_1$  (just like the two 2-paths u'-v' and u-v associated with u). In Fig. 11, P' and P'' are shown as  $z_1-z_2$  and  $z_3-z_4$ . This proves that  $y_2$  cannot be the tail of any pipe, and thus  $\tau_2(P_5(y_2)) = 0$  too.

In summary, in Case 2 we have  $\tau(P_5(y_1)) \leq 1/2$  and  $\tau(P_5(y_2)) = 0$ .

In Case 3 where w is the midpoint of  $P_3 = x_1 \cdot w \cdot y_1$  (see Fig. 10b), we assume  $(x_1, x_2)$  is an edge on the path  $P_4$ ; the same as in the proof of Claim 3,  $x_2$  cannot have the same role as u. That is,  $x_2 \rightarrow x_1 \rightarrow y_1$  is not a pipe. Therefore, there are at most two pipes ending with  $y_1$  and consequently  $\tau_2(P_5(y_1)) \leq 2 \times 1/4 = 1/2$ .

Additionally and the same as in the above argument for Case 2, one sees that  $y_2$  cannot lie on a 2-path or a singleton of Q; therefore,  $y_2$  lies on a 3-path  $P'_3 \in Q_3$  and  $\tau_1(P_5(y_2)) = 0$ . The exactly same argument for Case 2 above proves that  $y_2$  cannot be the tail of any pipe, and thus  $\tau_2(P_5(y_2)) = 0$  too.



**Fig. 12** A tight instance of 27 vertices, where blue solid edges represent a 3-path partition Q produced by APPROX and black dashed edges represent an optimal 3-path partition  $Q^*$ . The edges  $(u_{3i+1}, v_{3i+1})$ ,  $i = 0, 1, \ldots, 4$ , are in  $E(Q_2) \cap E(Q^*)$ , shown both blue solid and black dashed. The vertex  $u_{3i+1}$  collides into  $v_{3i+2}$  (denoted as  $v_{3i+2}/u_{3i+1}$ ),  $i = 0, 1, \ldots, 4$ . Applying our token distribution scheme, each of the nine 3-paths in  $Q^*$  receives exactly 1 token (Color figure online)

In summary, in Case 3 we have  $\tau(P_5(y_1)) \le 1/2$  and  $\tau(P_5(y_2)) = 0$ .

From the above, we conclude that the token received through the vertex  $y_1$  is at most  $\tau(P_5(y_1)) \le 1/2$  and the token received through the vertex  $y_2$  is  $\tau(P_5(y_2)) = 0$ . For the other vertex  $y_3$  on  $P_5$ , if  $\tau_1(P_5(y_3)) = 1/2$ , then  $\tau_2(P_5(y_3)) = 0$ ; otherwise  $\tau_1(P_5(y_3)) = 0$ , and the above argument applies again to show that  $\tau_2(P_5(y_3)) \le 1/2$ . Together, we have  $\tau(P_5) = \tau(P_5(y_1)) + \tau(P_5(y_2)) + \tau(P_5(y_3)) \le 2 \times 1/2 = 1$ . This proves the claim.

From Claims 2, 3 and 4, Lemma 1 holds.

#### 3.3 A tight instance for the algorithm APPROX

Figure 12 illustrates a tight instance, in which our solution 3-path partition Q contains nine 2-paths and three 3-paths (solid edges) and an optimal 3-path partition  $Q^*$  contains nine 3-paths (dashed edges). When applying our token distribution scheme, each 3path of  $Q^*$  receives exactly 1 token from the 2-paths in Q. This instance shows that the performance ratio of 4/3 is tight for APPROX, thus Theorem 2 is proved.

# 4 Conclusions

We studied the 3PP problem and designed a 4/3-approximation algorithm APPROX. APPROX first computes a 3-path partition Q with the least 1-paths in O(nm)-time, then iteratively applies four local operations to reduce the total number of paths in Q. The overall running time of APPROX is  $O(n^6)$ . The performance ratio 4/3 of APPROX is proved through an amortization scheme, using the structure properties of the 3-path partition returned by APPROX. We also showed that the performance ratio 4/3 is tight for our algorithm.

The 3PP problem is closely related to the 3- SET COVER problem, but none of them is a special case of the other. The best 4/3-approximation for 3- SET COVER has stood there for more than three decades; our algorithm APPROX for 3PP has the approximation ratio matches up to this best approximation ratio 4/3. We leave it open to better approximate 3PP (during the preparation of this journal version, Weitian led the group to design a completely new and improved 21/16-approximation algorithm for 3PP (Chen et al. 2019c)).

Acknowledgements The authors are grateful to the reviewers for their comments and suggestions to improve the presentation.

**Funding** YC and AZ are supported by the NSFC Grants 11771114, 11971139 and the Zhejiang Provincial NSFC Grant LY21A010014; YC and AZ are also supported by the CSC Grants 201508330054 and 201908330090, respectively. RG and GL are supported by the NSERC Canada. LL was supported by the China Scholarship Council Grant No. 201706315073 and the Fundamental Research Funds for the Central Universities Grant No. 20720160035. BS is supported by the National Social Science Foundation of China (Grant No. 20XGL023) and Science and Technology Department of Shaanxi Province (Grant No. 2020JQ-654).

Data availability Not applicable.

# Declarations

**Conflict of interest** The authors declare that they have no known competing financial interests or personal relationships that could have appeared to influence the work reported in this paper.

# References

- Chen Y, Goebel R, Lin G, Liu L, Su B, Tong W, Xu Y, Zhang A (2019a) A local search 4/3-approximation algorithm for the minimum 3-path partition problem. In: Proceedings of FAW 2019, LNCS, vol 11458, pp 14–25
- Chen Y, Goebel R, Lin G, Su B, Xu Y, Zhang A (2019b) An improved approximation algorithm for the minimum 3-path partition problem. J Comb Optim 38:150–164
- Chen Y, Goebel R, Su B, Tong W, Xu Y, Zhang A (2019c) A 21/16-approximation for the minimum 3-path partition problem. In: Proceedings of ISAAC 2019, LIPIcs, vol 149, pp 46:1–46:20
- Duh R, Fürer M (1997) Approximation of *k*-set cover by semi-local optimization. In: Proceedings of the twenty-ninth annual ACM symposium on theory of computing, STOC'97, pp 256–264

Feige U (1998) A threshold of for approximating set cover. J ACM 45:634–652

- Franzblau DS, Raychaudhuri A (2002) Optimal Hamiltonian completions and path covers for trees, and a reduction to maximum flow. ANZIAM J 44:193–204
- Garey MR, Johnson DS (1979) Computers and intractability: a guide to the theory of NP-completeness. W. H. Freeman and Company, San Francisco

Goldberg AV, Karzanov AV (2004) Maximum skew-symmetric flows and matchings. Math Program 100:537–568

Johnson DS (1974) Approximation algorithms for combinatorial problems. J Comput Syst Sci 9:256–278

Karp RM (1972) Reducibility among combinatorial problems. In: Proceedings of a symposium on the complexity of computer computations. Springer, Boston

- Levin A (2006) Approximating the unweighted k-set cover problem: greedy meets local search. In: Proceedings of the 4th international workshop on approximation and online algorithms (WAOA 2006), LNCS, vol 4368, pp 290–301
- Monnot J, Toulouse S (2007) The path partition problem and related problems in bipartite graphs. Oper Res Lett 35:677–684
- Raz R, Safra S (1997) A sub-constant error-probability low-degree test, and sub-constant error-probability PCP characterization of NP. In: Proceedings of the 29th annual ACM symposium on theory of computing (STOC'97), pp 475–484
- Vazirani V (2003) Approximation algorithms. Springer, Berlin
- Yan J-H, Chang GJ, Hedetniemi SM, Hedetniemi ST (1997) *k*-path partitions in trees. Discret Appl Math 78:227–233

**Publisher's Note** Springer Nature remains neutral with regard to jurisdictional claims in published maps and institutional affiliations.

Springer Nature or its licensor holds exclusive rights to this article under a publishing agreement with the author(s) or other rightsholder(s); author self-archiving of the accepted manuscript version of this article is solely governed by the terms of such publishing agreement and applicable law.

# Authors and Affiliations

# Yong Chen<sup>1</sup> $\cdot$ Randy Goebel<sup>2</sup> $\cdot$ Guohui Lin<sup>2</sup> $\cdot$ Longcheng Liu<sup>3</sup> $\cdot$ Bing Su<sup>4</sup> $\cdot$ Weitian Tong<sup>5</sup> $\cdot$ Yao Xu<sup>5</sup> $\cdot$ An Zhang<sup>1</sup>

Yong Chen chenyong@hdu.edu.cn

Randy Goebel rgoebel@ualberta.ca

Longcheng Liu longchengliu@xmu.edu.cn

Weitian Tong wtong@georgiasouthern.edu

Yao Xu yxu@georgiasouthern.edu

An Zhang anzhang@hdu.edu.cn

- <sup>1</sup> Department of Mathematics, Hangzhou Dianzi University, Hangzhou, China
- <sup>2</sup> Department of Computing Science, University of Alberta, Edmonton, AB T6G 2E8, Canada
- <sup>3</sup> School of Mathematical Sciences, Xiamen University, Xiamen, China
- <sup>4</sup> School of Economics and Management, Xi'an Technological University, Xi'an, China
- <sup>5</sup> Department of Computer Science, Georgia Southern University, Statesboro, USA