

Alternating DFS and Strongly Connected Components

Linear time algorithms with applications to infinite pebble games

Carlo Comin* Romeo Rizzi†

Abstract

An alternating graph is a directed graph whose vertex set is partitioned into two classes, existential and universal. This forms the basic arena for a plethora of infinite duration two-player games where Player \square and \circ alternate in a turn-based sliding of a pebble along the arcs they control.

We study alternating strongly-connectedness as a generalization of strongly-connectedness in directed graphs, aiming at providing a linear time decomposition and a sound structural graph characterization. For this a refined notion of alternating reachability is introduced: Player \square attempts to reach vertices without leaving a prescribed subset of the vertices, while Player \circ works against. This is named *safe alternating reachability*. It is shown that every arena uniquely decomposes into safe alternating strongly-connected components where Player \square can visit each vertex within a given component infinitely often, without having to ever leave out the component itself.

Our main result is a linear time algorithm for computing this alternating graph decomposition.

Both the underlying graph structures and the algorithm generalize the classical decomposition of a directed graph into strongly-connected components. The algorithm builds on a linear time generalization of the depth-first search on alternation, taking inspiration from Tarjan 1972 machinery.

Our theory has direct applications in solving well-known infinite duration pebble games faster. Dinneen and Khoussainov showed in 1999 that deciding a given Update Game costs $O(mn)$ time, where n is the number of vertices and m is that of arcs. We solve the task in $\Theta(m+n)$ linear time. The complexity of Explicit McNaughton-Müller Games also improves from cubic to quadratic.

Keywords: Alternation, Infinite Pebble Games, Linear Time Algorithm, McNaughton-Müller Games, Strongly-Connected Components, Update Games, Update Networks.

1 Introduction

The alternating model of computation originated in [2,3,9] as a generalization of nondeterminism in which existential and universal quantifiers alternate along the course of the computation. Alternating Turing Machines were defined and the corresponding time and space complexity classes were characterized in terms of resource-bounded deterministic machines. In the complexity landscape, generalizing complete computational models to alternation leads more often than not to complexity blowups, e.g., alternating polynomial time equals deterministic polynomial space.

Still alternation can be further inquired by generalizing specific polynomial time computable problems. One of the classical P-complete problems is the Alternating Graph Accessibility Problem (AGAP) [2,7]. An alternating graph \mathcal{A} is a finite directed graph (V, A) whose vertex set V is partitioned into two classes, existential V_{\square} and universal V_{\circ} . A source s and target vertex t are given in input. The task is to decide whether or not t is *alternating reachable* from s , which can be defined recursively as follows: either $s = t$, or $s \in V_{\square}$ and for some outgoing arc $(s, s') \in A$ the target t is alternating reachable from s' , or $s \in V_{\circ}$ and for every outgoing arc $(s, s') \in A$ the target t is alternating reachable from s' . When restricted to only existential vertices, the problem is equivalent to the Directed Graph Accessibility Problem (GAP), also known as (s, t) -Connectivity (STCON), which is complete for nondeterministic logarithmic space [11].

* (e-mail: carlo.comin.86@gmail.com)

† (e-mail: romeo.rizzi@univr.it)

Both GAP (STCON) and AGAP admit linear time algorithms. In GAP, a depth first search starting from s works out. In the alternating case, a linear time solution can be achieved by computing the \square -attractor set T_\square of t , defined as: $t \in T_\square$; if $x \in V_\square$ has an outgoing arc (x, y) such that $y \in T_\square$ then $x \in T_\square$; if $x \in V_\circ$ has all outgoing arcs (x, y) such that $y \in T_\square$ then $x \in T_\square$; nothing else is in T_\square .

Classical algorithmics further shows that the depth first search can be suitably extended to decompose a finite directed graph into strongly connected components (SCCs), keeping the time complexity linear. For instance the celebrated algorithm of Tarjan [12] finds strongly-connected components in linear time.

In this work we propose and study a notion of *alternating strongly-connectedness* as a natural generalization of strongly-connectedness in directed graphs, aiming at providing a linear time decomposition and a sound structural graph characterization. For this a refined notion of alternating reachability is introduced, where Player \square attempts to reach vertices without leaving a prescribed subset of the vertices, while Player \circ works against. This is named *safe alternating reachability*. It is shown that every alternating graph uniquely decomposes into safe alternating strongly-connected components where Player \square can visit each vertex within a given component infinitely often, without having to ever leave out the component itself. Our main result is a linear time algorithm for computing the corresponding alternating graph decomposition. Both the underlying graph structures and the algorithm generalize the classical decomposition of a directed graph into its strongly-connected components. The algorithm builds over a linear time generalization on alternation of the DFS, taking inspiration from Tarjan algorithm [12].

Our theory has direct applications for faster solving some well-known models of infinite pebble games. Infinite duration games can be applied in the construction of finite state reactive systems, like communication protocols or control systems, where a central aim is to put the development of hardware and software on a mathematical basis which is both firm and practical. A characteristic feature of such systems is their perpetual interaction with the environment as well as their non-terminating behaviour. The theory of infinite duration games offers many appealing results under this prospect, see e.g., [6].

For instance consider the following communication network problem. Often one requirement is to share key information between all nodes of a network, suppose we have data stored on each node of a network and we want to continuously update all nodes with some consistent information. This can be done by having a data packet of current information continuously going through all nodes. Unfortunately not all routing choices are always under our control, as some of them may be controlled by the network environment which could play against. Essentially this describes an infinite duration two-player game played on an alternating graph where Player \square wants to visit all vertices infinitely often, by keep moving the pebble everywhere around and forever, while Player \circ works against by trying to rule out at least one vertex from a certain moment onwards. This model is named Update Game (UG) in [1, 4, 5]. Dinneen and Khoussainov [4] showed that deciding who's the winner in a given UG costs $O(mn)$ time, where n is the number of vertices and m is that of the arcs. Solving UGs turns out to be a fundamental subproblem when solving Explicit McNaughton-Müller Games in polynomial time as in Horn's algorithm [8].

1.1 Results and Organization

We study alternating strongly-connectedness on alternating graphs as a natural generalization of strongly-connectedness in directed graphs, aiming at providing a linear time decomposition and a sound structural graph characterization. Section 1.2 and Section 2 provide the background and formal definitions.

In order to accomplish our task a refined notion of alternating reachability is introduced in Section 2.1, namely *safe alternating reachability*, where Player \square attempts to reach vertices without leaving a prescribed vertex subset, while Player \circ works against.

In Section 2.2, it is shown that every alternating graph uniquely decomposes into safe alternating strongly-connected components where Player \square can visit infinitely often each vertex within a given component without having to ever leave out the component itself.

Our main result is a linear time algorithm for computing this alternating graph decomposition.

Both the underlying graph structures (analyzed in Section 3.2) and the algorithm (given in Section 4) generalize the classical decomposition of a directed graph into strongly-connected components. The algorithm builds on a linear time generalization of the depth-first search on alternation, which is studied in Section 3, taking inspiration from Tarjan 1972 machinery.

As a corollary, we obtain the following major linear time complexity result on Update Games [1, 4, 5]. The best previously known upper bound was $O(mn)$, as shown by Dinneen and Khousainov in [4]. Section 2.3 offers more formal details.

Theorem 1. *Deciding who wins a given Update Game $\mathcal{A} = (V, A, \langle V_\square, V_\circ \rangle)$ costs time $\Theta(|V| + |A|)$.*

Proof. On input \mathcal{A} , the UG decision procedure just invokes our proposed decomposition algorithm *safe- α STCC*(\mathcal{A}) (Algorithm 2), given in Section 4, and it returns *YES* if \mathcal{A} has *only one* safe alternating strongly-connected component; otherwise \mathcal{A} has at least two components, so it returns *NO*.

Correctness will follow from that of *safe- α STCC*(\mathcal{A}) (Algorithm 2), see Section 4 and Appendix A. \square

Thus the complexity of Explicit McNaughton-Müller Games [8] also improves from cubic to quadratic.

Corollary 1. *Deciding the winner in a given Explicit MG $(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{F})$ costs time $O(|\mathcal{F}| \cdot (|\mathcal{A}| + |\mathcal{F}|))$.*

Proof. This is established again in Section 2.3, where the formal definition of Explicit MGs is also recalled. \square

1.2 Notation and Preliminaries.

An *alternating graph* (α graph) $\mathcal{A} = (V, A, \langle V_\square, V_\circ \rangle)$ is a finite directed simple graph $G_{\mathcal{A}} \doteq (V, A)$ (i.e., there are no loops nor parallel arcs) whose vertex set is splitted into the set V_\square of existential vertices owned by Player \square , and the set of universal vertices V_\circ owned by Player \circ . Notice that $G_{\mathcal{A}}$ is not required to be a bipartite graph on colour classes V_\square and V_\circ .

The ingoing and outgoing neighbourhoods of any $u \in V$ are denoted by $N_{\mathcal{A}}^{\text{in}}(u) \doteq \{v \in V \mid (v, u) \in A\}$ and $N_{\mathcal{A}}^{\text{out}}(u) \doteq \{v \in V \mid (u, v) \in A\}$, respectively. Disjoint set union is denoted by \cup , e.g., $V = V_\square \cup V_\circ$.

An α graph serves as an arena where a game can be played for infinitely many rounds by moving a pebble along the arcs from one vertex to an adjacent one. Initially the pebble is put on a *starting position* $v_s \in V$. At each round, if the pebble is on position $v \in V_i$, for some $i \in \{\square, \circ\}$, then Player i chooses an arc $(v, v') \in A$; and then the next round starts with the pebble on v' .

A finite (or infinite) *path* in $G_{\mathcal{A}}$ is a sequence $v_0 v_1 \dots v_n \dots \in V^*$ (or V^ω) such that $\forall_{j \geq 0} (v_j, v_{j+1}) \in A$, the *length* of $v_0 v_1 \dots v_n$ is n . A *play* on \mathcal{A} is any infinite path in $G_{\mathcal{A}}$. A *strategy* for Player i , where $i \in \{\square, \circ\}$, is a map $\sigma_i : V^* \times V_i \rightarrow V$ such that for every finite path $p'v$ in $G_{\mathcal{A}}$, where $p' \in V^*$ and $v \in V_i$, it holds that $(v, \sigma_i(p', v)) \in A$. The set of all strategies of Player i in \mathcal{A} is denoted by $\Sigma_i^{\mathcal{A}}$. A play $v_0 v_1 \dots v_n \dots$ is *consistent* with some $\sigma \in \Sigma_i^{\mathcal{A}}$ if $v_{j+1} = \sigma(v_0 v_1 \dots v_j)$ whenever $v_j \in V_i$. Given two strategies $\sigma_\square \in \Sigma_\square^{\mathcal{A}}$ and $\sigma_\circ \in \Sigma_\circ^{\mathcal{A}}$, and some $v_s \in V$, the *outcome* play $\rho_{\mathcal{A}}(v_s, \sigma_\square, \sigma_\circ)$ is the (unique) play that starts at v_s and is consistent with both σ_\square and σ_\circ . For any $v \in V$, we denote by $\rho_{\mathcal{A}}(v_s, \sigma_\square, \sigma_\circ, v)$ the (unique) prefix of $\rho_{\mathcal{A}}(v_s, \sigma_\square, \sigma_\circ)$ which ends at the first occurrence of v , if any; otherwise, $\rho_{\mathcal{A}}(v_s, \sigma_\square, \sigma_\circ, v) \doteq \rho_{\mathcal{A}}(v_s, \sigma_\square, \sigma_\circ)$. For any finite (or infinite) path $p \in V^*$ (or $p \in V^\omega$), the *alphabet* $\Xi(p)$ is the set of vertices appearing in p .

Let $T = (V_T, A_T)$ be an inward directed tree, rooted at $r_T \in V_T$. We simply write $u \in T$ for $u \in V_T$. For each $u \in T$, there is only one *path* p_u going from u to r_T ; the *depth* $d(u)$ of u is the length of p_u . An *ancestor* of $u \in T$ is any $v \in \Xi(p_u)$; it is a *proper ancestor* if $v \neq u$, it is the *parent* $\pi_T(u)$ of u if $(u, v) \in A_T$. The *children* of $u \in T$ are all the $v \in T$ such that $\pi_T(v) = u$. A *descendant* of $u \in T$ is any $v \in T$ such that $u \in \Xi(p_v)$; it is a *proper descendant* if $v \neq u$. A *leaf* of T is any $u \in T$ having no children. The *lowest common ancestor (LCA)* γ_S of a subset of vertices $S \subseteq T$ is:

$$\gamma_S \doteq \arg \max \{d(\gamma) \mid \gamma \in T \text{ and } \forall_{s \in S} s \text{ is a descendant of } \gamma \text{ in } T\}.$$

The maximal subtree of T that is rooted at any $u \in T$ is denoted by T_u . Given a LIFO stack St containing some element $v \in St$, then $St(v)$ denotes the set of all elements $u \in St$ going from the top of St down 'til the first occurrence of v , extremes are included.

2 Alternating Strongly Connected Components

This section introduces *alternating strongly connectedness* and its *safe* refinement. In doing this, we are interested in showing that both concepts can be built bottom-up (i.e., as a natural generalization of strongly-connectedness in directed graphs) and that they are sound and applicable (i.e., they have a clear characterization in terms of quotient sets of certain reachability equivalence relations, and they can be employed for faster solving problems concerning infinite pebble games on graphs).

Firstly, we consider alternating reachability and *alternating strongly connected components* as the most natural notions in the neighborhood of possible definitions, already presenting some technical pitfalls compared to graph reachability and classical strongly connected components. Secondly, aiming at providing a linear time algorithm and a sound structural graph characterization, we introduce *safe alternating reachability*, a refined notion of alternating reachability on alternating graphs that will form the backbone on which the forthcoming notions and algorithms will sustain. On this, *safe alternating strongly connectedness* is introduced, in turn a refined notion of alternating strongly connectedness. It is offered a sound characterization of *safe alternating strongly connected components* in terms of safe alternating reachability quotient sets (i.e., equivalence classes).

Safe alternating reachability captures in a natural way the fundamental invariant property lying at the ground of both the forthcoming structural graph characterization and the linear time algorithm for decomposing an alternating graph into safe alternating strongly connected components – this is actually the reason why it seems necessary and not just interesting to introduce and study the safe variant.

To conclude this section, it is observed that both alternating strongly connectedness and its safe variant can be considered to solve Update Games, and thus Explicit McNaughton-Müller Games as shown in [8]. The algorithm to be developed in Section 4 will ultimately provide a faster solution to those two problems. Let us now recall the definition of alternating reachability on alternating graphs.

Definition 1 ([2,7]). *Let \mathcal{A} be an alternating graph on vertex set V , and let $u, v \in V$ be any two vertices.*

We say that v is alternating reachable (α reachable) from u in \mathcal{A} if and only if there exists a strategy $\sigma_{\square} \in \Sigma_{\square}^{\mathcal{A}}$ (i.e., $\sigma_{\square} = \sigma_{\square}(u, v)$) such that for every $\sigma_{\circ} \in \Sigma_{\circ}^{\mathcal{A}}$ it holds that the target v lies in the outcome play which starts at u and proceeds consistently with the given strategies, i.e., if and only if

$$\exists_{\sigma_{\square} \in \Sigma_{\square}^{\mathcal{A}}} \forall_{\sigma_{\circ} \in \Sigma_{\circ}^{\mathcal{A}}} v \in \Xi(\rho_{\mathcal{A}}(u, \sigma_{\square}, \sigma_{\circ})).$$

This will be compactly denoted by $\sigma_{\square} : u \rightsquigarrow v$.

Then we consider a natural notion of alternating strongly connectedness also clarified in Example 1.

Definition 2. *Let \mathcal{A} be an alternating graph on vertex set V . We say $U \subseteq V$ is an alternating strongly connected set (α sc set) if and only if for every $(u, v) \in U \times U$ there exists $\sigma_{\square} \in \Sigma_{\square}^{\mathcal{A}}$ (i.e., $\sigma_{\square} = \sigma_{\square}(u, v)$) such that $\sigma_{\square} : u \rightsquigarrow v$.*

Definition 3. *An alternating strongly connected component (α SCC) is any maximal α sc subset $C \subseteq V$. (i.e., if $C \subseteq C'$ and C' is α sc, then $C = C'$)*




Figure 1: An alternating graph on vertex set $\{a, b, c\}$, and its α SCCs $\gamma = \{a, c\}$ and $\beta = \{b\}$.

Example 1. Consider the alternating graph $\mathcal{A} = (V, A, (V_\square, V_\circ))$ such that $V = V_\square \cup V_\circ$ where $V_\square = \{b, c\}$, $V_\circ = \{a\}$, and $A = \{(a, c), (a, b), (b, c), (c, a)\}$. Fig. 1 highlights the corresponding decomposition into α SCCs $\{\beta, \gamma\}$. Consider the component $\gamma = \{a, c\}$: if the play starts from a , for sure the pebble will soon reach c – but, in order to do this, it might slip out of γ (escape), firstly reaching b ; i.e., even though vertex c is areachable from vertex a , Player \square has no way of staying safe inside γ , because Player \circ can always push the pebble to slip out (to β) at will.

This is the distinguishing characteristics of α SCCs as compared to the classical counterpart notion in directed graphs. However, α SCCs are well-posed and they coincide with equivalence classes of the following binary relation on the vertex set.

Definition 4. The binary relation $\sim_{\alpha sc}$ on V is defined as follows:

$$\sim_{\alpha sc} \doteq \{(u, v) \in V \times V \mid \{u, v\} \text{ is } \alpha sc\}.$$

It is easy to see that $\sim_{\alpha sc}$ is an equivalence relation on V . The proof of the following is also direct.

Lemma 1. Let $\{\mathcal{C}_i\}_{i=1}^k$ be all the distinct equivalence classes of $\sim_{\alpha sc}$. Then,

1. \mathcal{C}_i is αsc for each $i \in [k]$;
2. Let $U \subseteq V$ be any αsc subset. Then, $\mathcal{C}_i \subsetneq U$ for no $i \in [k]$ (i.e., if $\mathcal{C}_i \subseteq U$, then $\mathcal{C}_i = U$).

The next proposition asserts the identity between α SCCs and equivalence classes of $\sim_{\alpha sc}$.

Proposition 1. Let \mathcal{A} be an alternating graph on vertex set V . Let $\mathcal{C} \subseteq V$, and consider the relation $\sim_{\alpha sc}$ on V . It holds that \mathcal{C} is an α SCC of \mathcal{A} if and only if \mathcal{C} is an equivalence class of $\sim_{\alpha sc}$.

Proof. (\Rightarrow) If \mathcal{C} is a α SCC, then \mathcal{C} is αsc . So, $u \sim_{\alpha sc} v$ for every $u, v \in \mathcal{C}$. Then, $\mathcal{C} \subseteq \mathcal{C}'$ holds for some equivalence class \mathcal{C}' of $\sim_{\alpha sc}$. By item 1 of Lemma 4, \mathcal{C}' is αsc . Thus, by maximality, \mathcal{C} is not a proper subset of \mathcal{C}' . Therefore, $\mathcal{C} = \mathcal{C}'$.

(\Leftarrow) If \mathcal{C} is an equivalence class of $\sim_{\alpha sc}$, then: \mathcal{C} is αsc by item 1 of Lemma 4; and \mathcal{C} is maximal by item 2 of Lemma 4. Therefore, \mathcal{C} is a α SCC of \mathcal{A} . \square

We have decided to look at these simple properties explicitly because they will be taken back and transported to our *safe* notion of alternating strongly connectedness. In order to formalize it, we need to introduce safe-areachability.

2.1 Safe Alternating Reachability

Instead of giving the definition directly in a flat manner, we wish to present safe-areachability by arguing that it emerges naturally as soon one tries gamifying the classical graph structures underlying depth-first search on directed graphs, which were pointed out by Tarjan [12], et al. next recalled.

Recalling palm-trees and jungles. In [12] many fundamental properties and applications of the *depth-first search (DFS)* were analyzed. Particularly, specific underlying graph structures were discussed, they were named *palm-trees* and *jungles*. This allowed the author to offer the celebrated linear time algorithm for computing strongly-connected components (SCCs) known as *Tarjan's SCCs algorithm*.

Following [12], assume G is a finite directed simple graph that we wish to explore. Initially all the vertices of G are unexplored, say. We start from some vertex of G and choose an *outgoing* arc to follow. At each step, we select an unexplored arc (leading from a vertex already reached) and explore (traverse) that arc. When selecting an arc to explore, we always choose an arc emanating from the vertex most recently reached which still has unexplored arcs. Traversing the selected arc leads to some vertex, either new or already reached; if already reached, we backtrack and select another unexplored arc. Whenever we run out of arcs leading from old vertices, we choose some unreached vertex, if any exists, and begin a new exploration from this point. Eventually, the procedure will traverse all the arcs of G , each exactly once. This is a DFS of G ; let us call it *forward-DFS*, for at each step the chosen arc is an *outgoing* one.

Now, for recalling *palm-trees* [12], let us consider in more detail what happens when DFS runs on G . The set of arcs leading to an unexplored vertex, when traversed during the search, forms an outward




Figure 2: A reverse-palm-tree (b), generated by reverse-DFS (c) starting at A .

directed *tree* T . All of the other arcs fall into four categories: (i) some arcs are running from ancestors to descendants in T , these may well be ignored as (even if we remove them from the graph) they do not affect the strongly connectedness relations of G ; still, (ii) some other arcs run from descendants to ancestors in T , these are quite relevant to determine strongly connectedness instead, and they are called *fronds*; (iii) other arcs run from one subtree to another within the same tree T , these are also relevant and named *internal cross-links*; (iv) suppose to continue the DFS until all arcs are explored, the process creates a family of trees which contains all vertices of G , i.e., a *spanning forest* F of G , plus sets of (fronds and) cross-links which may also connect two different trees in F , and these would be the *external cross-links*. It is easy to see that if the vertices of G are numbered in the order in which they are reached during the search, e.g., by an index $idx : V \rightarrow \{1, \dots, |V|\}$, then any (internal or external) cross-link (u, v) always has $idx[u] > idx[v]$. Any tree T of F , comprising fronds and cross-links, it is a *palm-tree*.

A directed graph consisting of a spanning forest, plus fronds and cross-links, it is named *jungle*, i.e., a family of palm-trees plus external cross-links; which is a natural representation of the graph reachability relations of the input graph G .

Reverse-DFS, palm-trees and jungles. Since we are dealing with alternating graphs, we need to impose an *opposite* direction w.r.t. that in which the arcs are traversed; so, at each step of the DFS, we actually choose an *ingoing* arc to follow instead of an outgoing one. In this way, the corresponding search algorithm may be called *reverse-DFS*. A moment's reflection reveals that this symmetric twist doesn't affect the basic properties of the search. For instance, if the vertices are numbered in the order in which they are reached during the a reverse-DFS, e.g., by $idx : V \rightarrow \{1, \dots, |V|\}$, now a cross-link (u, v) always has $idx[u] < idx[v]$. So, a family of *reverse-palm-trees* is constructed during reverse-DFS. Let us call *reverse-jungle* the graph structure underlying a reverse-DFS, that is a family of reverse-palm-trees comprising *fronds* and *cross-links*. Since we only deal with the reverse variants, from now on, we shall refer to them simply as DFS, palm-trees and jungles in the forthcoming sections – the “reverse” prefix will be omitted.

Safe- α Reachability. Graph reachability trivially holds in any palm-tree $T = (V_T, A_T)$: for any $u, v \in T$ such that v is an ancestor of u in T , there exists a simple path from u to v in T , i.e., v is reachable from u in T . With this in mind, let us now try to explore an *alternating graph* \mathcal{A} with a classical DFS. Let \mathcal{J} be the resulting jungle, and let T be any palm-tree of \mathcal{J} . An example is depicted in Fig. 2a and the corresponding palm-tree T is in Fig. 2b; notice, T is still an alternating graph. At this point, let us consider alternating reachability (instead of graph reachability), which is most relevant to 2-player pebble games. Observe that the palm-tree T , constructed as above, doesn't respect α reachability: e.g., consider the two vertices $F, B \in V_{\square}$ in the palm-tree T shown in Fig. 2b; starting from F , Player \square admits no strategy allowing him to reach B , even though B is an ancestor of F in T ; indeed, any play starting from F must first reach D , so at that point, if Player \square plays (D, G) then Player \circ can go back to F by playing (G, F) . Otherwise, if Player \square plays (D, C) , then Player \circ can reply (C, H) thus

reaching H – and notice that once on H the continuation of the play must reach D back again. So, starting from F , Player \circ can prevent Player \square to reach B . We now aim at gamifying the classical DFS, as well as palm-trees and jungles, by generalizing them from directed graphs to alternating graphs, in such a way as to preserve reachability *within* the (suitably adapted notion of) palm-trees. Particularly, a desirable “DFS on alternating graphs” should maintain the following basic property: for any (suitably adapted) palm-tree T , if $u, v \in T$ and v is an ancestor of u in T , there exists $\sigma_{\square} \in \Sigma_{\square}^A$ which allows Player \square to eventually reach v starting from u , *without leaving T* at the same time, no matter which counter-strategy $\sigma_{\circ} \in \Sigma_{\circ}^A$ is chosen by Player \circ . The formal definition of *safe- α reachability* follows next.

Definition 5. *Given an alternating graph \mathcal{A} on vertex set V , let $U \subseteq V$ and $u, v \in U$. We say v is U -safe- α reachable from u when there is $\sigma_{\square} \in \Sigma_{\square}^A$ (i.e., $\sigma_{\square} = \sigma_{\square}(u, v)$) such that for every $\sigma_{\circ} \in \Sigma_{\circ}^A$:*

[α reachability] *v is eventually reached by playing σ_{\square} starting from u , i.e., $v \in \Xi[\rho_{\mathcal{A}}(u, \sigma_{\square}, \sigma_{\circ})]$;*
and,

[safety] *meanwhile the pebble never leaves U , i.e., $\Xi[\rho_{\mathcal{A}}(u, \sigma_{\square}, \sigma_{\circ}, v)] \subseteq U$.*

In this case we denote $\sigma_{\square} : u \overset{U}{\rightsquigarrow} v$, or $u \overset{U}{\rightsquigarrow} v$ when σ_{\square} is implicit; if $U = V$, denote $\sigma_{\square} : u \rightsquigarrow v$ or $u \rightsquigarrow v$.

Remark: Any $u \in U$ is always U -safe- α reachable from itself, for every non-empty $U \subseteq V$. □

We are now in the position of refining alternating strongly connectedness.

2.2 Safe Alternating Strongly Connected Components

Definition 6. *Let \mathcal{A} be an α graph on vertex set V . We say that $U \subseteq V$ is safe alternating strongly connected (safe- α sc) if and only if, for every pair $(u, v) \in U \times U$, v is U -safe- α reachable from u in \mathcal{A} ; i.e., if and only if there exists $\sigma_{\square} \in \Sigma_{\square}^A$ (i.e., $\sigma_{\square} = \sigma_{\square}(u, v)$) such that:*

$$\sigma_{\square} : u \overset{U}{\rightsquigarrow} v.$$

Remark. Notice that \emptyset and $\{v\}$ are $\{v\}$ -safe- α sc for every $v \in V$. □

Definition 7. *A safe alternating strongly connected component (safe- α SCC) is a maximal safe- α sc $\mathcal{C} \subseteq V$. (i.e., if $\mathcal{C} \subseteq \mathcal{C}'$ and \mathcal{C}' is safe- α sc, then $\mathcal{C} = \mathcal{C}'$)*




Figure 3: An agraph on vertex set $\{a, b, c\}$, and its safe- α SCCs $\alpha = \{a\}, \beta = \{b\}, \gamma = \{c\}$.

Next, we observe the following property concerning safe- α sc sets.

Lemma 2. *Let $V_1, V_2 \subseteq V$ be safe- α sc. If $V_1 \cap V_2 \neq \emptyset$, then $V_1 \cup V_2$ is safe- α sc.*

Proof. Pick some $u, v \in V_1 \cup V_2$ and $z \in V_1 \cap V_2$, arbitrarily. Since $\{u, z\} \subseteq V_1$, and since V_1 is safe- α sc, there exists some $\sigma_{\square}(u, z) \in \Sigma_{\square}^A$ such that:

$$\sigma_{\square}(u, z) : u \overset{V_1}{\rightsquigarrow} z,$$

similarly, there is some $\sigma_{\square}(z, v) \in \Sigma_{\square}^A$ such that:

$$\sigma_{\square}(z, v) : z \xrightarrow{V_2} v.$$

Then, consider the strategy $\sigma_{\square}(u, v) \in \Sigma_{\square}^A$ constructed as follows:

$$\sigma_{\square}(u, v) \doteq \begin{cases} (1) \text{ Starting from } u, \text{ play } \sigma_{\square}(u, z) \text{ until } z \text{ is firstly reached; then,} \\ (2) \text{ once on } z, \text{ play } \sigma_{\square}(z, v) \text{ until } v \text{ is finally reached.} \end{cases}$$

Clearly, $\sigma_{\square}(u, v) : u \xrightarrow{V_1 \cup V_2} v$. Since u and v were chosen arbitrarily, then $V_1 \cup V_2$ is safe- α sc. \square

Lemma 2 allows us to define and study an equivalence relation, i.e., $\sim_{\text{safe}} \subseteq V \times V$.

Definition 8. *The binary relation \sim_{safe} on V is defined as follows:*

$$\sim_{\text{safe}} \doteq \{(u, v) \in V \times V \mid \exists U \subseteq V \text{ such that } U \text{ is safe-}\alpha\text{sc and } \{u, v\} \subseteq U\}.$$

Lemma 3. *\sim_{safe} is an equivalence relation on V .*

Proof. To begin, (i) \sim_{safe} is clearly *reflexive*: for any $u \in V$, let $U \doteq \{u\}$; then, $u \xrightarrow{U} u$, so U is safe- α sc; this shows $u \sim_{\text{safe}} u$. (ii) \sim_{safe} is *symmetric*, (actually, by definition): for any $u, v \in V$, assume $u \sim_{\text{safe}} v$; then, there exists some $U \subseteq V$ which is safe- α sc and $u, v \in U$; so, the same set U certifies $v \sim_{\text{safe}} u$. Finally, (iii) \sim_{safe} is *transitive*: indeed, for any $a, b, c \in V$, assume $a \sim_{\text{safe}} b$ and $b \sim_{\text{safe}} c$. Since $a \sim_{\text{safe}} b$, there exists V_1 which is safe- α sc and such that $a, b \in V_1$; similarly, there exists V_2 which is safe- α sc and such that $b, c \in V_2$. Consider $U \doteq V_1 \cup V_2$. Since $b \in V_1 \cap V_2$, and V_1, V_2 are both safe- α sc, then U is safe- α sc by Lemma 2. Moreover, $a, c \in U$. So, $a \sim_{\text{safe}} c$. This proves that \sim_{safe} is an equivalence relation. \square

Lemma 4. *Let $\{\mathcal{C}_i\}_{i=1}^k$ be all the distinct equivalence classes of \sim_{safe} . Then, the following holds.*

1. *If $U \subseteq V$ is safe- α sc and $U \cap \mathcal{C}_i \neq \emptyset$, then $U \subseteq \mathcal{C}_i$;*
2. *\mathcal{C}_i is safe- α sc for each $i \in [k]$;*
3. *Let $U \subseteq V$ be safe- α sc. Then, $\mathcal{C}_i \subsetneq U$ for no $i \in [k]$.*

Proof of (1). Since $U \cap \mathcal{C}_i \neq \emptyset$, it's possible to pick $z \in U \cap \mathcal{C}_i$. Pick $v \in U$, arbitrarily. Since U is safe- α sc and $z, v \in U$, then $v \sim_{\text{safe}} z$. Therefore, $v \in \mathcal{C}_i$ (because $z \in \mathcal{C}_i$, which is an equivalence class of \sim_{safe}). \square

Proof of (2). Let $u, v \in \mathcal{C}_i$, arbitrarily. Then, $u \sim_{\text{safe}} v$. So, there exists some $U \subseteq V$ which is safe- α sc and such that $u, v \in U$. Thus, $u \xrightarrow{U} v$. Notice, $u, v \in U \cap \mathcal{C}_i \neq \emptyset$. Then, by item 1 of Lemma 4, $U \subseteq \mathcal{C}_i$. Since $u \xrightarrow{U} v$ and $U \subseteq \mathcal{C}_i$, then $u \xrightarrow{\mathcal{C}_i} v$. So, \mathcal{C}_i is safe- α sc. \square

Proof of (3). Assume that $\mathcal{C}_i \subseteq U$, for some $i \in [k]$, and some $U \subseteq V$ which is safe- α sc. Then, since $U \cap \mathcal{C}_i = \mathcal{C}_i \neq \emptyset$, by item 1 of Lemma 4 we have $U \subseteq \mathcal{C}_i$. So, $\mathcal{C}_i = U$. \square

Proposition 2. *Let $\mathcal{C} \subseteq V$, and consider the \sim_{safe} relation on V .*

It holds that \mathcal{C} is a safe- α SCC of \mathcal{A} if and only if \mathcal{C} is an equivalence class of \sim_{safe} .

Proof. (\Rightarrow) If \mathcal{C} is a safe- α SCC, then \mathcal{C} is safe- α sc. So, $u \sim_{\text{safe}} v$ for every $u, v \in \mathcal{C}$. Then, $\mathcal{C} \subseteq \mathcal{C}'$ holds for some equivalence class \mathcal{C}' of \sim_{safe} . By item 2 of Lemma 4, \mathcal{C}' is safe- α sc. Thus, by maximality, \mathcal{C} is not a proper subset of \mathcal{C}' . Therefore, $\mathcal{C} = \mathcal{C}'$.

(\Leftarrow) If \mathcal{C} is an equivalence class of \sim_{safe} , then: \mathcal{C} is safe- α sc by item 2 of Lemma 4; and \mathcal{C} is maximal by item 3 of Lemma 4. Therefore, \mathcal{C} is a safe- α SCC of \mathcal{A} . \square

Indeed, since safe- α sc is a more constrained form of α sc, the former implies the latter (see below).

Proposition 3. *The \sim_{safe} equivalence relation is finer than the $\sim_{\alpha\text{sc}}$ one.*

Proof. It is enough to point out that every equivalence class of \sim_{safe} is a subset of an equivalence class of $\sim_{\alpha\text{sc}}$ (and thus every equivalence class of the latter is a union of equivalence classes of the former). \square

This is clear as every safe- α sc set is α sc too. \square

2.3 Applications to Update Games and McNaughton-Müller Games

An *Update Game (UG)* [1, 4, 5] is played on an α graph \mathcal{A} with vertex set V and arc set A for an infinite number of rounds. In this context, a *play* is an infinite path $\rho = v_0 v_1 v_2 \dots \in V^\omega$ such that $(v_i, v_{i+1}) \in A$ for every $i \in \mathbb{N}$. Let $\text{Inf}(\rho)$ be the set of all the vertices $v \in V$ appearing infinitely often in ρ ; namely,

$$\text{Inf}[\rho] \doteq \{v \in V \mid \forall_{j \in \mathbb{N}} \exists_{k \in \mathbb{N}, k > j}, \text{ such that } v = v_k\}, \text{ provided } \rho = v_0 v_1 v_2 \dots v_k \dots \in V^\omega.$$

Player \square wins the UG played on \mathcal{A} if and only if there exists $\sigma_\square \in \Sigma_\square^A$ such that, for every $\sigma_\circ \in \Sigma_\circ^A$, every vertex is visited infinitely often in the unique play that is consistent with σ_\square and σ_\circ , independently w.r.t. the starting position $v_s \in V$; namely, if and only if the following holds:

$$\exists_{\sigma_\square \in \Sigma_\square^A} \forall_{\sigma_\circ \in \Sigma_\circ^A} \forall_{v_s \in V} \text{Inf}[\rho_{\mathcal{A}}(v_s, \sigma_\square, \sigma_\circ)] = V;$$

otherwise, Player \circ wins. When Player \square wins an UG \mathcal{A} , then \mathcal{A} is called *Update Network (UN)* [1, 4, 5].

Proposition 4. *Player \square wins the UG played on \mathcal{A} if and only if V is safe- α sc; or equivalently (just in this case), if and only if V is α sc.*

Proof. Clearly, the whole vertex set V is safe- α sc if and only if it is α sc. So let us consider, e.g., safe- α sc.

If Player \square wins the UG played on \mathcal{A} , then V is safe- α sc (it follows directly from definitions, as every vertex can be visited infinitely often then every vertex is α reachable from any other one). Conversely, if V is safe- α sc, and $v_1, \dots, v_{|V|-1}$ is a vertex ordering, for every i there is $\sigma_\square(i) \in \Sigma_\square^M$ such that $\sigma_\square(i) : v_i \rightsquigarrow v_{i'}$, where $i' \doteq (i+1) \bmod |V|$ for every $i \in \{0, \dots, |V|-1\}$. Starting from any v_i , Player \square can visit infinitely often all vertices in V by playing forever $(\sigma_\square(i), \sigma_\square(i'), \sigma_\square(i''), \dots)$ in cascade. \square

Let us consider also *McNaughton-Müller Games (MGs)* [8]. They provide a useful model for the synthesis of controllers in reactive systems, but their complexity depends on the representation of the winning conditions. The most straightforward way to represent a Müller winning condition $\mathcal{F} \subseteq 2^V$ is to provide an explicit list of subsets of vertices as in [8], i.e., $\mathcal{F} = \{\mathcal{F}_i \subseteq V \mid 1 \leq i \leq \ell\}$ for some $\ell \in \mathbb{N}$.

A play $\rho \in V^\omega$ is winning for Player \square if and only if $\text{Inf}[\rho] \in \mathcal{F}$. So-called *Explicit MGs* can be solved in polynomial time, e.g., with Horn's algorithm [8]. Concerning time complexity, given an input α graph \mathcal{A} and explicit winning condition \mathcal{F} , there are at most $|\mathcal{F}|$ loops in a run of that algorithm, and the most time consuming operation at each iteration is precisely to decide an UG of size at most $|\mathcal{A}| + |\mathcal{F}|$, see [8].

Thus deciding whether the whole vertex set of a game is safe- α sc/ α sc is relevant to EMGs too.

By Theorem 1, we can decide an UG in $\Theta(|\mathcal{A}| + |\mathcal{F}|)$ linear time. As an consequence, the time complexity of Horn's algorithm [8] improves by a factor $|\mathcal{A}| + |\mathcal{F}|$ (i.e., from cubic to quadratic).

In summary, from Theorem 1 and Horn's algorithm [8], we obtain Corollary 1 (see Section 1.1).

3 Alternating Depth First Search

This section aims at gamifying the DFS algorithm, as a depth-first exploration of α graphs.

The fundamental underlying invariant property (as proved in Proposition 5) goes as follows.

During the α DFS exploration of an input α graph \mathcal{A} on vertex set V , a new vertex $u \in V$ is visited and attached to the α DFS's palm-tree T under formation as soon as the T -safe- α reachability of its root r_T becomes guaranteed from u . This happens only after that a certain set of outgoing neighbours of u has been visited: i.e., *all* of its outgoing neighbours if $u \in V_\circ$; and *at least one* if $u \in V_\square$.

(So, safe- α reachability is invariantly preserved in the palm-trees instead of just graph reachability)

This invariant property is needed to capture *Alternating Depth-First Search (α DFS)*; as it turns out, safe- α reachability characterizes its dynamics. Also recall that we are considering reverse-DFS.

Of course we will need additional (non-trivial) arguments to ensure the algorithm runs in linear time. For instance, when a new vertex $u \in V_\circ$ attaches to the α DFS's palm-tree T under formation, the berth point (i.e., the parent of u in T) must be chosen carefully. The following rule turns out to work out.

During the α DFS exploration of the given input α graph \mathcal{A} on vertex set V , assume that a new vertex $u \in V$ finally attaches to the α DFS's palm-tree T under formation. If $u \in V_{\square}$, the parent of u in T is any of the already visited outgoing neighbours of u in T ; otherwise, if $u \in V_{\circ}$, the parent of u in T is precisely the *Lowest Common Ancestor (LCA)* of all the outgoing neighbours of u in T (and they must've been already visited). (So, safe-areachability is preserved from $u \in V_{\circ}$ to that LCA)

A detailed description of the algorithm follows below, where some additional technical machinery (e.g., counters, stacks, and disjoint sets) is employed precisely for reasons of running time efficiency.

As it starts to be clear, the major need will be that to perform LCAs lookups in linear time.

3.1 Description of α DFS

The main procedure is α DFS() (Algo. 1). However the actual search visit operation will be handled by a subprocedure, namely, α DFS-visit() (Proc. 1).

Given an α graph \mathcal{A} on vertex set $V = V_{\square} \cup V_{\circ}$, a forest-like α graph $\mathcal{J}_{\mathcal{A}}$ is built during the search like the traditional DFS constructs a jungle. So, α DFS(\mathcal{A}) (Algo. 1) is a gamification and generalization of the DFS, in the sense that, if $V_{\circ} = \emptyset$, it basically works as a reverse-DFS and $\mathcal{J}_{\mathcal{A}}$ coincides with a Tarjan's jungle. So $\mathcal{J}_{\mathcal{A}}$ comprises a forest of trees, each called *alternating palm-tree (α palm-tree)*, with *fronds* and *cross-links*. Arcs will be classified into four sets during the search, namely, $A_{\text{tree}}, A_{\text{frond}}, A_{\text{stalk}}, A_{\text{cross}}$; at the end, their union A' will be the whole arc set of what we call the *alternating jungle (α jungle)* $\mathcal{J}_{\mathcal{A}}$. This is kind of a forest graph. Let's say a vertex $u \in V$ joins $\mathcal{J}_{\mathcal{A}}$ precisely when (u, v) is added to A_{tree} for some $v \in V$ during the search.

An index $idx : V \rightarrow \{1, \dots, |V|\} \cup \{+\infty\}$ numbers the vertices in the order in which they are visited joining $\mathcal{J}_{\mathcal{A}}$; initially the index is undefined, say $\forall u \in V \text{ } idx[u] \leftarrow +\infty$.

Say $u \in V$ is *visited* if $idx[u] < +\infty$, and *unvisited* if $idx[u] = +\infty$. Any $u \in V_{\square}$ is visited, and it joins $\mathcal{J}_{\mathcal{A}}$, as soon as it is firstly discovered in the ingoing neighbourhood of some vertex that is currently being visited, so the two moments coincide.

The V_{\circ} -rule (i.e., that allowing an $u \in V_{\circ}$ to join $\mathcal{J}_{\mathcal{A}}$) is rather more involved, as the visiting and joining steps are both delayed w.r.t. the (possibly repeated) discovery of u as an ingoing neighbour: any $u \in V_{\circ}$ joins $\mathcal{J}_{\mathcal{A}}$ only after that *all* of its out-neighbours $u' \in N_{\mathcal{A}}^{\text{out}}(u)$ have already did. The exact moment being when the visit backtracks, from the lastly visited out-neighbour $u' \in N_{\mathcal{A}}^{\text{out}}(u)$, up to the corresponding parent vertex π_u . And when $u \in V_{\circ}$ joins $\mathcal{J}_{\mathcal{A}}$ with parent π_u (i.e., if $u \in V_{\circ}$ and $(u, \pi_u) \in A_{\text{tree}}$ for some $\pi_u \in V$), then π_u is prescribed by the V_{\circ} -rule to be the *LCA* γ of $N_{\mathcal{A}}^{\text{out}}(u)$ in the α palm-tree under formation \mathcal{P} ; and *all* of the outgoing arcs of u become *stalk-arcs* at that point.

In fact, besides fronds and cross-links, α palm-trees have an additional class: *stalk-arcs* are those thanks to which $u \in V_{\circ}$ is connected to $\mathcal{J}_{\mathcal{A}}$; $(u, \pi_u) \in A_{\text{tree}} \subseteq A'$ may not exist in the original arc set A .

By hooking to LCAs the V_{\circ} -rule allows us to preserve safe-areachability, as shown in Proposition 5. A moment's reflection reveals that, by construction, (V, A_{tree}) is really a forest graph, more formal details on the graph structure of $\mathcal{J}_{\mathcal{A}}$ are postponed to Proposition 7. In the following Proposition 5 we denote by $\{\mathcal{P}_i\}_{i=1}^k$ the vertex disjoint family comprising all of the α palm-trees of $\mathcal{J}_{\mathcal{A}}$.

Proposition 5. *Assume that α DFS runs on a given input α graph \mathcal{A} . Consider the α palm-trees $\{\mathcal{P}_i\}_{i=1}^k$ that are constructed during the visiting process; say that $\mathcal{P}_i = (V_i, A_i, (V_{\square_i}, V_{\circ_i}))$ is the i -th one, on vertex set V_i and arc set A_i for each $i \in [k]$. For any two vertices $u, v \in V_i$, any $i \in [k]$, if u is a descendant of v in \mathcal{P}_i , then v is V_i -safe-areachable fom u w.r.t. \mathcal{A} . Particularly, this holds thanks to the following*

Algorithm 1: Alternating DFS

```

Procedure  $\alpha$ DFS( $\mathcal{A}$ )
  input : An  $\alpha$ graph
            $\mathcal{A} = (V, A, (V_{\circ}, V_{\square}))$ .
  output: An  $\alpha$ jungle  $\mathcal{J}_{\mathcal{A}}$ .
   $A_{\text{tree}}, A_{\text{frond}}, A_{\text{stalk}}, A_{\text{cross}} \leftarrow \emptyset$ ;
1  foreach  $u \in V$  do
2     $idx[u] \leftarrow +\infty$ ;
3     $active[u] \leftarrow false$ ;
4     $rSt[u] \leftarrow \emptyset$ ;
5    if  $u \in V_{\circ}$  then
6       $cnt[u] \leftarrow |N_{\mathcal{A}}^{\text{out}}(u)|$ ;
7
8   $next\_idx \leftarrow 1$ ;
9  foreach  $u \in V_{\square}$  do
10   if  $idx[u] = +\infty$  then
11      $\alpha$ DFS-visit( $u, \mathcal{A}$ );
12
13  foreach  $u \in V_{\circ}$  do
14   if  $idx[u] = +\infty$  then
15      $idx[u] \leftarrow next\_idx$ ;
16      $next\_idx \leftarrow next\_idx + 1$ ;
17
18   $A' \leftarrow A_{\text{tree}} \cup A_{\text{frond}} \cup A_{\text{stalk}} \cup A_{\text{cross}}$ ;
19  return  $\mathcal{J}_{\mathcal{A}} \leftarrow (V, A', (V_{\square}, V_{\circ}))$ ;

```

strategy $\sigma_{\square} \in \Sigma_{\square}^{\mathcal{A}}$, where $\pi(u)$ denotes the parent of any $u \in V_{\square}$ in (V, A_{tree}) :

$$\forall u \in V_{\square} \sigma_{\square}(u) \doteq \begin{cases} \pi(u), & \text{if } u \text{ is not the root of any } \alpha\text{palm-tree } \mathcal{P}_i; \\ \text{any } u' \in N_{\mathcal{A}}^{\text{out}}(u), & \text{if } u \text{ is the root of some } \alpha\text{palm-tree } \mathcal{P}_i. \end{cases}$$

Proof. Assume $u, v \in V_i$ where u is a descendant of v in the α palm-tree \mathcal{P}_i , for some $i \in [k]$ fixed arbitrarily. Recall that during the α DFS all vertices are given an index so that $idx[v] < idx[u]$ if v is a proper ancestor of u in some α palm-tree. Let us proceed arguing by induction on $idx[u]$. Let $z \doteq \min_{x \in V_i} idx[x]$ be the vertex with minimum index in \mathcal{P}_i . Assume $idx[u] = z$ as a base case. So, u is the root of \mathcal{P}_i . Then $v = u$, so there is nothing to prove. Now, assume $idx[u] > z$. Let w.l.o.g $u \neq v$. Assume as induction hypothesis that the thesis holds for every vertex $x \in V_i$ such that $idx[x] < idx[u]$.

Let us break the forthcoming analysis in two cases, according to whether $u \in V_{\square}$ or $u \in V_{\circ}$.

- If $u \in V_{\square}$, since u is not the root of \mathcal{P}_i , then $\sigma_{\square}(u) = \pi(u)$. By construction, $idx[\pi(u)] < idx[u]$. Since $\pi(u)$ is the parent of u in \mathcal{P}_i and $u \neq v$, then $\pi(u)$ is still a descendant of v in \mathcal{P}_i (possibly, $\pi(u) = v$); thus, by induction hypothesis:

$$\sigma_{\square} : \pi(u) \xrightarrow{V_i} v.$$

Since $\sigma_{\square} : u \xrightarrow{V_i} \pi(u)$ and $\sigma_{\square} : \pi(u) \xrightarrow{V_i} v$, therefore by composition, $\sigma_{\square} : u \xrightarrow{V_i} v$.

- If $u \in V_{\circ}$, recall that by definition of α DFS, $\pi(u)$ is the LCA of the outgoing neighbours of u in \mathcal{A} , i.e., the LCA of $N_{\mathcal{A}}^{\text{out}}(u) = \{u' \in V \mid (u, u') \in A_{\text{stalk}}\}$. Fix some $u' \in N_{\mathcal{A}}^{\text{out}}(u)$, arbitrarily. Notice that u' is still a descendant of $\pi(u)$ in \mathcal{P}_i (possibly, $u' = \pi(u)$), just because $\pi(u)$ is the LCA of $N_{\mathcal{A}}^{\text{out}}(u)$ in \mathcal{P}_i . Thus, since $\pi(u)$ is a descendant of v in \mathcal{P}_i (possibly, $\pi(u) = v$), then by transitivity u' is also a descendant of v in \mathcal{P}_i . And, by definition of α DFS, it must be that $idx[u'] < idx[u]$. Therefore, by induction hypothesis:

$$\sigma_{\square} : u' \xrightarrow{V_i} v.$$

Since u' was chosen arbitrarily, the latter assertion holds for every $u' \in N_{\mathcal{A}}^{\text{out}}(u)$; so, $\sigma_{\square} : u \xrightarrow{V_i} v$.

This concludes the inductive step of the proof. So, anyway, $\sigma_{\square} : u \xrightarrow{V_i} v$. □

In order to implement the V_{\circ} -rule efficiently, an additional out-neighbours counter $cnt : V_{\circ} \rightarrow \mathbf{N}$ is constantly checked and updated. The following invariant I_{cnt} is kept maintained during the α DFS:

$$\forall u \in V_{\circ} \text{ cnt}[u] = |\{v \in N_{\mathcal{A}}^{\text{out}}(u) \mid idx[v] = +\infty\}|. \quad (I_{cnt})$$

In order to keep a coherent ordering in the indices of the vertices and for fast lookup, for each $v \in V$ it is employed a LIFO stack of vertices named $rSt[v]$ (i.e., the ready stack). Its role, during the α DFS-visit(), is to memorize that a certain vertex $\pi_u \in V$ is identified as the parent of some other vertex $u \in V_{\circ}$ (i.e., when $cnt[u] = 0$ and $\pi_u = \gamma$ is the LCA of $N_{\mathcal{A}}^{\text{out}}(u)$ in \mathcal{P}); at that point u would be promptly pushed onto the ready stack $rSt[\pi_u]$. Then, u will have to join $\mathcal{J}_{\mathcal{A}}$ being visited by α DFS-visit(), this happens as soon as the visit backtracks from u up to his parent π_u . (Recall that, by the V_{\circ} -rule, the parent π_u is not necessarily an out-neighbour of $u \in V_{\circ}$ in the original α graph \mathcal{A} , even though it might be such in the α palm-tree \mathcal{P} to which it belongs.)

More details. Let us further provide some lower-level implementation details of α DFS (Algo. 1).

Concerning stacks and counters, $rSt[u]$ is initialized to be empty for every $u \in V$ and, for every $u \in V_{\circ}$, it is initialized $cnt[u] \leftarrow |N_{\mathcal{A}}^{\text{out}}(u)|$ (see lines 5-7 of Algo. 1). Then $cnt[u]$ is decremented whenever some

outgoing neighbour v of u is visited during the search process. When $cnt[u] = 0$ (see line 11 of Proc. 1), all outgoing neighbours of u have already joined the α jungle \mathcal{J}_A .

Procedure 1: Visit Procedure of Alternating DFS

```

Procedure  $\alpha DFS\text{-}visit(v, \mathcal{A})$ 
  input : One vertex  $v \in V$  of  $\mathcal{A}$ .
  1  $active[v] \leftarrow true;$ 
  2  $idx[v] \leftarrow next\_idx;$ 
  3  $next\_idx \leftarrow next\_idx + 1;$ 
  // Check the ingoing neighbourhood of  $v$ 
  4 foreach  $u \in N_{\mathcal{A}}^{in}(v)$  do
  5   if  $idx[u] = +\infty$  then
  6     if  $u \in V_{\square}$  then
  7        $add(u, v)$  to  $A_{tree};$ 
  8        $\alpha DFS\text{-}visit(u, \mathcal{A});$ 
  9     else
 10        $cnt[u] \leftarrow cnt[u] - 1;$ 
 11       if  $cnt[u] = 0$  and  $\exists(LCA \text{ of } N_{\mathcal{A}}^{out}(u) \text{ in } (V, A_{tree}))$  then
 12          $\gamma \leftarrow$  the LCA of  $N_{\mathcal{A}}^{out}(u)$  in  $(V, A_{tree});$ 
 13          $rSt[\gamma].push(u);$ 
 14     else if  $active[u] = true$  then
 15        $add(u, v)$  to  $A_{frond};$ 
 16     else  $add(u, v)$  to  $A_{cross};$ 
  // Check the ready-stack of  $v$ , i.e.,  $rSt[v]$ , and visit its vertices
 17 while  $rSt[v] \neq \emptyset$  do
 18    $u \leftarrow rSt[v].pop();$  //  $u \in V_{\circ}$ 
 19    $add(u, v)$  to  $A_{tree};$ 
 20   for each  $t \in N_{\mathcal{A}}^{out}(u)$  do  $add(u, t)$  to  $A_{stalk};$ 
 21    $\alpha DFS\text{-}visit(u, \mathcal{A});$ 
 22  $active[v] \leftarrow false;$ 

```

Notice, if any two outgoing neighbours of u belong to two distinct α palm-trees in \mathcal{J}_A , there is no way to preserve safe-areachability because Player \circ might choose to move from u to any of the two shafts at will, and the LCA γ of $N_{\mathcal{A}}^{out}(u)$ in (V, A_{tree}) might not exist; still, if all outgoing neighbours of u belong to the same α palm-tree, the LCA γ of $N_{\mathcal{A}}^{out}(u)$ in (V, A_{tree}) does exist. So, when $cnt[u] = 0$, firstly we seek for the LCA γ and if it exists we push u on top of $rSt[\gamma]$ (see lines 11-13 of $\alpha DFS\text{-}visit()$, Proc. 1).

In so doing, $u \in V_{\circ}$ will join \mathcal{J}_A as soon as $\alpha DFS\text{-}visit()$ backtracks from the last outgoing neighbour v of u that has been visited to γ (possibly $\gamma = v$). At that point (see line 19), as $rSt[\gamma]$ will be checked and u will be found therein, (u, γ) will be added to A_{tree} ; and, for each $t \in N_{\mathcal{A}}^{out}(u)$ the arc (u, t) will be added to A_{stalk} . Finally $\alpha DFS\text{-}visit(u, \mathcal{A})$ will be invoked to make a recursive visiting of u . In this way, every vertex is visited exactly once.

In order to classify the remaining arcs into fronds or cross-links, an additional flag array $active : V \rightarrow \{true, false\}$ is employed; initially, all vertices are marked as inactive; then, a vertex u becomes active as soon as it is visited, but it will turn back inactive when the visit backtracks.

During $\alpha DFS\text{-}visit(v, \mathcal{A})$, when it is explored some ingoing neighbour u of v such that $idx[u] \neq +\infty$, if u is still active then (u, v) is added to A_{frond} , otherwise u is inactive and (u, v) goes to A_{cross} .

There's still one minor detail which is worth mentioning as it helps keeping smooth the algorithm. Firstly all $u \in V_{\square}$ are considered as roots of the α palm-trees, i.e., no $u \in V_{\circ}$ can become a root of an α palm-tree due to lines 9-11 of $\alpha DFS()$ (Algo. 1). After the visiting is completed, for each $u \in V_{\circ}$ which still remained unvisited, $idx[u]$ is assigned incrementally and the visiting process is not invoked anymore.

Indeed, w.l.o.g we can assume that $\forall v \in V |N_{\mathcal{A}}^{out}(v)| \geq 2$ holds. Just pre-process \mathcal{A} as follows: for any $v \in V$, if $N_{\mathcal{A}}^{out}(v) = \emptyset$, remove v from the α graph; if $N_{\mathcal{A}}^{out}(v) = \{v'\}$ is a singleton, add (u, v') to A for each $u \in N_{\mathcal{A}}^{in}(v)$ and then remove v from the α graph. So doing, even if $\alpha DFS\text{-}visit(v, \mathcal{A})$ would've been invoked for some $v \in V_{\circ}$, say at line 14 of $\alpha DFS()$, there would've been no actual α palm-tree to visit, i.e., no vertex u such that $(u, v) \in A_{tree}$. Indeed, (u, v) could not have been added to A_{tree} neither at line 7 (because all $u \in V_{\square}$ would've been already visited before at that time) nor at line 19 (since $\forall v \in V_{\circ} |N_{\mathcal{A}}^{out}(v)| \geq 2$ now, there would've been no way for an LCA of $N_{\mathcal{A}}^{out}(u)$ to exist at line 11). So this strategy is fine, and a moment's reflection reveals that it keeps simpler the algorithm. This ends the detailed description of $\alpha DFS()$ (Algo. 1). Let us now analyze its time and space complexity.




Figure 4: An α graph (a) and an α palm-tree (b) generated by α DFS (c).

Proposition 6. *Assume that α DFS runs on a given input α graph \mathcal{A} on vertex set V and arc set A . Then each vertex $v \in V$ is numbered by idx exactly once, and the algorithm halts in time $\Theta(|V| + |A| + \text{Time}[LCA])$, consuming space $\Theta(|V| + |A| + \text{Space}[LCA])$, where $\text{Time}[LCA]$ ($\text{Space}[LCA]$) is the aggregate total time (space) taken by all LCA computations that are done at lines 11-12 of α DFS-visit() (Proc. 1).*

Proof. The initialization phase takes $\Theta(|V| + |A|)$ time (see lines 1-7 of Algo. 1). Secondly, recall that Algo. 1 basically performs a sequence of invocations to α DFS-visit(v, \mathcal{A}) (Proc. 1), each for some $v \in V$. Any such invocation happens if and only if $idx[v] = +\infty$, and then $idx[v]$ is set to some non-zero value at line 2. Thus, the total number of invocations of α DFS-visit() (Proc. 1) is at most $|V|$. Actually, by lines 9 and 12 of α DFS() (Algo. 1), it is exactly $|V|$. So, each vertex $v \in V$ is numbered by $idx: V \rightarrow \{1, \dots, |V|\}$ exactly once. Concerning time complexity, consider each of such visits independently from one another: each explores an ingoing neighbourhood $N_{\mathcal{A}}^{\text{in}}(v)$. For some $u \in N_{\mathcal{A}}^{\text{in}}(v) \cap V_{\square}$, the LCA of $N_{\mathcal{A}}^{\text{out}}(u)$ might be computed, but notice that all the other operations around $N_{\mathcal{A}}^{\text{in}}(v)$ can be done in constant time per single $u \in N_{\mathcal{A}}^{\text{in}}(v)$. At the end of the call the stack $rSt[v]$ is emptied, still, due to the condition $cnt[u] = 0$ (that is checked when the stack is filled) any $u \in V_{\square}$ can be pushed on $rSt[v]$ at most once and for at most one $v \in V$. Therefore, the $\Theta(|V| + |A| + \text{Time}[LCA])$ time bound holds. Concerning space complexity, a similar argument shows that the aggregate total space of storing $\{rSt[v]\}_{v \in V}$ is $O(|V|)$. Also, the total size of idx , $active$ and cnt is $\Theta(|V|)$, and that of A' is $\Theta(|A|)$. \square

Later on in [Section 3.3 Theorem 3], the aggregate total time and space of all LCA computations ($\text{Time}[LCA]$ and $\text{Space}[LCA]$) will be bounded linearly. Before that, in the following Section 3.2, let us read out and carefully analyze the graph structure of an α jungle $\mathcal{J}_{\mathcal{A}}$.

3.2 Graph Structures

Let's start by formalizing the structural properties of the α palm-trees. Examples are given in Fig. 4 and 5.

Definition 9. *An alternating palm-tree (α palm-tree) is a pair (\mathcal{P}, idx) , where:*

- (i) $\mathcal{P} = (V, A, (V_{\square}, V_{\circ}))$ is an α graph on $V = V_{\square} \cup V_{\circ}$ and $A = A_{\text{tree}} \cup A_{\text{frond}} \cup A_{\text{stalk}} \cup A_{\text{cross}}$; so, the vertex set is splitted in squared and circled vertices whereas the arc set is partitioned into four classes.
- (ii) $idx: V \rightarrow \{1 + j, \dots, |V| + j\}$ for some fixed $j \in \mathbf{N}$, enumerates the vertex set V with an offset j ;
- (iii) the following four main properties hold:

(α pt-1) $\mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{P}} \doteq (V, A_{\text{tree}})$ is an inward directed rooted tree such that:

- (a) the root $r_{\mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{P}}}$ of $\mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{P}}$ is controlled by Player \square , i.e., $r_{\mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{P}}} \in V_{\square}$;
- (b) $idx[u] > idx[v]$ whenever $(u, v) \in A_{\text{tree}}$, i.e., whenever $v = \pi(u)$ is the parent of u in $\mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{P}}$;

- (*apt-2*) Each frond-arc $(u, v) \in A_{frond}$ connects some $u \in V_{\square}$ to one of its proper descendants $v \in V$ in $\mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{P}}$;
- (*apt-3*) Each stalk-arc $(u, v) \in A_{stalk}$ connects some $u \in V_{\circ}$ to one of the descendants v of its parent $\pi(u)$ (i.e., possibly to $\pi(u)$ itself); particularly, given any $u \in V_{\circ}$, the following three properties hold:
- (a) $\{v \in V \mid (u, v) \in A_{stalk}\} \cup \{\pi(u)\} = N_{\mathcal{P}}^{out}(u)$;
 - (b) $\pi(u)$ is the LCA of $\{v \in V \mid (u, v) \in A_{stalk}\}$ in $\mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{P}}$;
 - (c) $idx[u] > idx[v]$ for every $v \in N_{\mathcal{P}}^{out}(u)$.
- (*apt-4*) Each cross-arc $(u, v) \in A_{cross}$ connects some $u \in V_{\square}$ to some $v \in V$ such that:
- (a) v is not a descendant of u in $\mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{P}}$;
 - (b) either v is a proper ancestor of u in $\mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{P}}$ (in that case $idx[u] > idx[v]$), or $idx[u] < idx[v]$.

An α jungle is formed by a disjoint union of α palm-trees (see α jn-1 and α jn-2), possibly with external cross-arcs connecting two distinct α palm-trees (see α jn-3), plus a (possibly empty) set of circled vertices each one having outgoing neighbours lying in at least two distinct α palm-trees (see α jn-4).

Definition 10. An alternating jungle (α jungle) is an α graph $\mathcal{J} = (V, A, (V_{\square}, V_{\circ}))$ comprising a family of vertex-disjoint α palm-trees $\{(\mathcal{P}_i, idx_i)\}_{i=1}^k$, whose vertices are indexed in $\{1, \dots, |V|\}$ by $idx(v) = idx_i(v)$ provided v lies in \mathcal{P}_i , and the following properties hold:

- (α jn-1) $\forall_{i \in [k]} \mathcal{P}_i = (V_i, A_i, (V_{\square_i}, V_{\circ_i}))$, where $V_{\square_i} \subseteq V_{\square}, V_{\circ_i} \subseteq V_{\circ}, A_i \subseteq A$;
- (α jn-2) $\forall_{i, j \in [k]} V_i \cap V_j = \emptyset$ if $i \neq j$;
- (α jn-3) If $(u, v) \in A$ for some $u \in V_i$ and $v \in V_j$ such that $i \neq j$, then $u \in V_{\square_i}$ and $i < j$;
- (α jn-4) If $v \in V \setminus \bigcup_{i=1}^k V_i$, then $v \in V_{\circ}$ and $N_{\mathcal{J}}^{out}(v) \subseteq V_i$ for no $i \in [k]$.

Proposition 7 shows that α DFS() (Algo. 1) really constructs an α jungle. It's worth introducing a technical but conceptually simple notion, that of *support* for an α jungle. The support of \mathcal{J} is just the same α graph deprived of all the arcs in $\{(u, v) \in A_{tree} \mid u \in V_{\circ}\}$, i.e., those arcs that are added by α DFS() (Algo. 1) but that they may have not existed in the original α graph. More formal details below.

Definition 11. Given an α palm-tree (\mathcal{P}, idx) , for $\mathcal{P} = (V, A, (V_{\square}, V_{\circ}))$, $A = A_{tree} \cup A_{frond} \cup A_{stalk} \cup A_{cross}$, the support of \mathcal{P} is the α graph $\mathcal{P}_* \doteq (V, A_*, (V_{\square}, V_{\circ}))$, where: $A_* \doteq \{(u, v) \in A \mid u \in V_{\square}\} \cup A_{stalk}$.

Notice that $A_* = A \setminus \{(u, v) \in A_{tree} \mid u \in V_{\circ}\}$ holds by (*apt-3*).

Given an α jungle \mathcal{J} with family of α palm-trees $\{\mathcal{P}_i\}_{i=1}^k$, let $\bar{V} \doteq V \setminus \bigcup_{i=1}^k V_i$ (where V_i is the vertex set of \mathcal{P}_i). The support of \mathcal{J} is the α graph \mathcal{J}_* obtained from \mathcal{J} by replacing each \mathcal{P}_i with its support \mathcal{P}_{i*} , and by leaving intact all the vertices in \bar{V} and all arcs (u, v) of \mathcal{J} such that: either, (i) $u \in V_i$ and $v \in V_j$ for some $i \neq j$ (i.e., all external cross-arcs); or, (ii) $u \in \bar{V}$ or $v \in \bar{V}$ (possibly both).

Let us now argue more formally that α jungles really trace down the behaviour of α DFS (Algo. 1).

Proposition 7. Let $\mathcal{A} = (V, A, (V_{\square}, V_{\circ}))$ be an α graph. The following two propositions hold.

1. Let J be the α graph constructed by executing α DFS(\mathcal{A}) (Algo. 1). Then, J is an α jungle.
2. Let J be an α jungle with support J_* . Then, α DFS(J_*) (Algo. 1) reconstructs J itself, i.e., $\mathcal{J}_{J_*} = J$.

Proof of (1). Recall, α DFS(\mathcal{A}) (Algo. 1) performs a sequence of invocations to α DFS-visit(\cdot, \mathcal{A}) (Proc. 1). Let k be the total number of times that α DFS-visit() is invoked *only* at line 11 of α DFS() (Algo. 1). For each $i = 1, 2, \dots, k$, let $u_i \in V_{\square}$ be the vertex that is passed as a parameter to the i -th invocation, i.e., assume α DFS-visit(u_i, \mathcal{A}) is the i -th call; notice that it holds $u_i \in V_{\square}$ by line 9 of α DFS() (Algo. 1). Now, let $V_i \subseteq V$ be the set of all vertices numbered by idx during the i -th invocation (recursive calls included). Similarly, let A_i be the set of arcs that are explored during that invocation (recursive calls included), and consider the *internal arcs* i.e., $A_{i,int} \doteq \{(a, b) \in A_i \mid \text{both } a, b \in V_i\}$. Finally let $\mathcal{P}_i \doteq (V_i, A_{i,int}, (V_{\square} \cap V_i, V_{\circ} \cap V_i))$, and let idx_i be the restriction of idx to V_i . It is easy to check that (\mathcal{P}_i, idx_i) is an α palm-tree: indeed, (\mathcal{P}_i, idx_i) as constructed by α DFS-visit(u_i, \mathcal{A}) satisfies all properties (*apt-1*) to (*apt-4*). We also claim that J is an α jungle with α palm-tree family $\{\mathcal{P}_i\}_{i \in [k]}$. Clearly, we are given




Figure 5: An α graph (a), and the construction of a corresponding α jungle (b-h).

a family $\{\mathcal{P}_i\}_{i \in [k]}$ of vertex-disjoint α palm-trees, so $(\alpha jn-1)$ and $(\alpha jn-2)$ hold. Concerning $(\alpha jn-3)$, let $(u, v) \in A$ by any arc such that $u \in V_i$ and $v \in V_j$ for any $i \neq j$; then $u \in V_{\square_i}$ (we can argue this by exclusion: since \mathcal{P}_i is an α palm-tree, $(\alpha pt-3)$ holds for V_{\square_i} , so the tail u of an external cross-link connecting two distinct α palm-trees must be squared); also, $i < j$ since otherwise u would've joined \mathcal{P}_j instead of \mathcal{P}_i (at lines 6-8 of $\alpha DFS\text{-}visit()$). Concerning $(\alpha jn-4)$, let $v \in V \setminus \bigcup_{i=1}^k V_i$, then $v \in V_{\square}$ (by lines 9-15 of $\alpha DFS()$); also, $N_{\mathcal{J}}^{\text{out}}(v) \subseteq V_i$ holds for no $i \in [k]$, otherwise v would've joined \mathcal{P}_i thanks to lines 9-13 and 17-21 of $\alpha DFS\text{-}visit()$. All in, J is an α jungle. \square

Proof of (2). Recall that the support J_* can be obtained from J simply by removing from the α palm-trees of J all the arcs $(u, v) \in A_{\text{tree}}$ such that $u \in V_{\square}$. Consider the total ordering $<_{idx}$ on the vertex set V induced by the labelling idx of J , i.e., $\forall a, b \in V \ a <_{idx} b \iff idx[a] < idx[b]$. Encode an adjacency list of J_* such that: (i) the main list of vertices is ordered according to $<_{idx}$; (ii) for each $u \in V$, also the ingoing neighbourhood $N_{\mathcal{J}}^{\text{in}}(u)$ is ordered according to $<_{idx}$. Since J satisfies $(\alpha jn-1)$ to $(\alpha jn-4)$ and their α palm-trees satisfy $(\alpha pt-1)$ to $(\alpha pt-4)$, it's now direct to check inductively that $\alpha DFS(J_*) = J$. \square

Still it remains to be seen how to perform efficiently, in linear time, all the LCAs computations that are

needed at lines 11-12 of $\alpha DFS\text{-visit}()$ (Proc. 1). In the next subsection, we suggest to adopt a disjoint-set forest data structure with a non-ranked union and a classical *Find* primitive based on path-compression.

3.3 Computing LCAs with a Disjoint-Set Forest

A *disjoint-set forest (dsf)* data structure [13], hereby denoted \mathcal{D} , is a data structure that keeps track of a set of elements partitioned into a number of disjoint (non-overlapping) subsets, each of which is represented by a rooted tree. This is also known as union-find data structure or merge-find set.

The following three operations are supported:

$\mathcal{D}.\text{MakeSet}(\cdot)$, $\mathcal{D}.\text{Union}(\cdot, \cdot)$ and $\mathcal{D}.\text{Find}(\cdot)$, where:

(*dsf-1*) The representative element of each disjoint set is the root of that set's tree;

(*dsf-2*) $\text{MakeSet}(v)$ initializes the parent of a vertex $v \in V$ to be v itself, i.e., a singleton vertex tree;

(*dsf-3*) $\text{Union}(u, v)$ combines two trees, T_1 rooted at u and T_2 rooted at v , into a new tree T_3 which is still rooted at v , i.e., u simply becomes a child of v (this is a *non-ranked* union).

(*dsf-4*) $\text{Find}(v)$, starting from v , traverses the ancestors of v until the root r of the tree containing v is finally reached. While doing this, it changes each ancestor's parent reference to directly point to r (and this is *path-compression*); the resulting tree is much flatter, speeding up future operations, not only on these traversed elements but also on those referencing them from the downstairs of the tree.

We can now describe how to implement the LCAs computations at lines 11-12 of $\alpha DFS\text{-visit}()$ (Proc. 1). The resulting algorithm is named *dsf- α DFS*, based on a global dsf data structure \mathcal{D} .

The main procedure of dsf- α DFS is almost the same as α DFS() (Algo. 1), the only additions being:

(*dsf-init-1*) $\mathcal{D}.\text{MakeSet}(v)$ is executed for each $v \in V$;

(*dsf-init-2*) For each $v \in V_{\circ}$, an array $low_ready : V \rightarrow \mathbf{N} \cup \{+\infty\}$ is initialized as $low_ready[v] \leftarrow +\infty$.

Its role is tracking the index of the unique outgoing neighbour of $v \in V_{\circ}$ which is visited firstly and before all other out-neighbours (i.e., the outgoing neighbour having minimum index). So, given \mathcal{A} in input, the following invariant property will be maintained:

$$\forall v \in V_{\circ} \quad low_ready[v] = \min \{ idx[u] \mid u \in N_{\mathcal{A}}^{\text{out}}(v) \}. \quad (\text{I}_{\text{low}})$$

Lemma 5 shows that $low_ready[v]$ works as a compass needle for LCA lookups; indeed, because of the two forthcoming rules, the LCA that we need to find turns out to be the root of the disjoint set tree containing precisely the vertex indexed by $low_ready[v]$.

Let us now describe in more detail the distinctive rules of the dsf- α DFS algorithm. Let $v \in V$, then:

(*dsf-visit-1*) Whenever the visiting subprocedure, i.e., $dsf\text{-}\alpha DFS\text{-visit}(v, \mathcal{A})$, makes a recursive call on some ingoing neighbour $u \in N_{\mathcal{A}}^{\text{in}}(v) \cup rSt[v]$ (see lines 8 and 21 of Proc. 1), soon after that, it is executed $\mathcal{D}.\text{Union}(u, v)$. Doing so, as soon as the recursive call on u returns, the disjoint set tree of the child u is merged with that of its parent v . So, parent-children ordering relations are preserved. This allows us for a fast lookup of the subtrees' roots (i.e., the LCAs) that are needed in the second rule below.

(*dsf-visit-2*) Suppose that $dsf\text{-}\alpha DFS\text{-visit}(v, \mathcal{A})$ is currently visiting some $v \in V$, and that it comes to consider some ingoing neighbour $u \in N_{\mathcal{A}}^{\text{in}}(v) \cap V_{\circ}$ (at line 4 and 9). Then, low_ready is updated as:

$$low_ready[u] \leftarrow \min(low_ready[u], idx[v]);$$

of course this aims at satisfying the I_{low} invariant. Next, $cnt[u]$ is decremented (see at line 10 of Proc. 1).

If the condition $cnt[u] = 0$ is met (line 11 of Proc. 1), the following is done:

- (a) It is identified the unique $x \in N_{\mathcal{A}}^{\text{out}}(u)$ such that $idx[x] = low_ready[u]$, and it is assigned to low_v ;
- (b) Then, we lookup for the root γ of the corresponding disjoint set tree: $\gamma \leftarrow \mathcal{D}.\text{Find}(low_v)$;
- (c) If $active[\gamma] = true$, γ is pushed on $rSt[\gamma]$; indeed, in that case, we can prove (see Lemma 5) that the LCA of $N_{\mathcal{A}}^{\text{out}}(u)$ in (V, A_{tree}) does exist and it is really γ (i.e., the root of low_v).

The rest of dsf- α DFS-visit is the same as Proc. 1. This ends the description of dsf- α DFS.

At this point we should prove that the above mentioned claim concerning γ and LCAs really holds.

Lemma 5. *Suppose $dsf\text{-}\alpha DFS\text{-visit}(v, \mathcal{A})$ is visiting some $v \in V$ meanwhile considering an ingoing neighbour $u \in N_{\mathcal{A}}^{\text{in}}(v) \cap V_{\circ}$. Assume that u is still unvisited, i.e., $idx[u] = +\infty$, and that v is the*

last outgoing neighbour of v that is being visited, i.e., that $\text{cnt}[u] = 0$. Let γ be the vertex returned by $\mathcal{D}.\text{find}(\text{low}_v)$, i.e., the root of the disjoint set tree of low_v , where low_v is the unique $x \in V$ such that $\text{idx}[x] = \text{low_ready}[u]$. If $\text{active}[\gamma] = \text{true}$ holds at that time, the LCA of $N_{\mathcal{A}}^{\text{out}}(u)$ in (V, A_{tree}) is really γ .

Proof. Notice, during the execution of $\text{dsf-}\alpha\text{DFS}$, that (V, A_{tree}) still grows as a forest. Indeed, if a new arc (u, v) is added to A_{tree} it still holds that $\text{idx}[u] = +\infty$ and $\text{idx}[v] < +\infty$; no cycle can be formed. Thus, assuming $\alpha\text{DFS-visit}(v, \mathcal{A})$ is invoked for some $v \in V$, we can consider the unique maximal tree \mathcal{T}_v in (V, A_{tree}) containing v – constructed *until* the time of that particular invocation – Let p_v be the path in \mathcal{T}_v going from v up to the root r of \mathcal{T}_v . By *(dsf-visit-1, dsf-visit-2)* and by the definition of low_v , and since $\gamma = \mathcal{D}.\text{find}(\text{low}_v)$ and γ is active by hypothesis, then γ lies on p_v . Thus, γ must be the LCA of low_v and v in \mathcal{T}_v (possibly $\gamma = \text{low}_v$). We argue that $N_{\mathcal{A}}^{\text{out}}(u) \subseteq \mathcal{T}_v^\gamma$, where \mathcal{T}_v^γ is the maximal subtree of \mathcal{T}_v rooted at γ . Indeed, by *(dsf-visit-2)*, the I_{low} invariant holds:

$$\text{idx}[\text{low}_v] = \min \{ \text{idx}[x] \mid x \in N_{\mathcal{A}}^{\text{out}}(u) \}.$$

So, when $\text{cnt}[u] = 0$, and since γ is an ancestor of low_v , then:

$$\forall x \in N_{\mathcal{A}}^{\text{out}}(u) \text{idx}[\gamma] \leq \text{idx}[\text{low}_v] \leq \text{idx}[x] < +\infty.$$

Notice that all vertices in \mathcal{T}_v which are not descendants of γ still have a smaller index than γ (i.e., they were all visited before γ), and all those which are proper descendants of γ have a greater index than γ . All these combined, it must be $N_{\mathcal{A}}^{\text{out}}(u) \subseteq \mathcal{T}_v^\gamma$. So, γ is a common ancestor of all outgoing neighbours of u in \mathcal{T}_v ; but γ is also the LCA of $\{\text{low}_v, v\} \subseteq N_{\mathcal{A}}^{\text{out}}(u)$, then, γ is the LCA of all $N_{\mathcal{A}}^{\text{out}}(u)$ in \mathcal{T}_v . \square

By Lemma 5, Proposition 7 holds even for $\text{dsf-}\alpha\text{DFS}$, proving correctness. Concerning time complexity, by relying on technical results offered in [10], we now show that $\text{dsf-}\alpha\text{DFS}$ runs in linear time.

The first technical ingredient is the following definition of “strong postorder path compression system”.

Definition 12 ([10]). *Let $T = (V, A)$ be a rooted tree. Let u_1, \dots, u_k be a path in T listed from a leaf u_1 in the direction towards the root of T (i.e., u_k is some ancestor of u_1). A path compression $C = (u_1, \dots, u_k)$ is an operation that modifies T in the following way:*

- (i) *It deletes from T all the arcs (u_i, u_{i+1}) , for $i = 1, \dots, k - 1$;*
- (ii) *It makes each of the vertices u_i , for $i = 1, \dots, k - 1$, a new child of u_k ;*
- (iii) *It deletes all new children of u_k of degree 1 which may occur (particularly, u_1 is deleted).*

The vertex u_k is called the root of C . We also say that C starts from u_1 . The length of C is $|C| \doteq k - 1$.

A sequence of path compressions $S = (C_1, \dots, C_n)$ on a tree T is called a strong postorder path compression system (sppcs) if and only if the following four properties are met:

- (i) *Each C_i is a path compression on the tree T_i obtained from T after that the path compressions C_1, \dots, C_{i-1} have been performed (where $T^1 = T$);*
- (ii) *Each leaf of T is a starting point of exactly one path compression of S ;*
- (iii) *$(1, 2, \dots, n)$ is a linear ordering of all the n leaves of T induced by a fixed postorder of T ;*
- (iv) *Let the root of a compression C_i , for any $2 \leq i \leq n$, be some vertex u of T . Then, all the compressions C_j such that $j < i$ and $j \in T_u$ have roots in a descendant of u in T .*

The length of an sppcs S is defined as $|S| \doteq \sum_{i=1}^n |C_i|$.

The main result of [10] asserts that the length of an sppcs is linear in the number of the leaves.

Theorem 2 ([10]). *Let S be an sppcs on a rooted tree T having n leaves. Then, $|S| \leq 5n$.*

By relying on Theorem 2 as a main ingredient, we can prove the following linear time bound thanks to a simple reduction where the main idea is that to check that the dsf operations performed by dsf- α DFS really induce an spps on the corresponding disjoint set forest.

Our concerns below is to formalize this fact.

Theorem 3. *Given an input α graph \mathcal{A} on vertex set V and arc set A , dsf- α DFS(\mathcal{A}) halts in linear time.*

Proof. Recall that during the dsf- α DFS, the graph (V, A_{tree}) always grows as a forest. By (*dsf-visit-1*), a moment's reflection reveals that its membership relations (i.e., which vertices belong to which subtree) are fully represented by the dsf \mathcal{D} that grows thanks to the corresponding $\mathcal{D}.Union(\cdot, \cdot)$ operations.

To reduce our problem to that of Theorem 2, we consider an auxiliary directed rooted tree T^* . Its vertex set V_{T^*} is given by V plus an additional common root r_{T^*} and one additional leaf vertex $l_{(u,v)}$ for each arc $(u, v) \in A$ such that $u \in V_{\circ}$. A_{T^*} comprises all the arcs in A_{tree} (as it stands at the end when the dsf- α DFS halts), plus, the root $r_{\mathcal{T}}$ of each tree \mathcal{T} in (V, A_{tree}) is joined to the common root r_{T^*} by introducing one new arc $(r_{\mathcal{T}}, r_{T^*})$ for each \mathcal{T} , and finally, each additional leaf $l_{(u,v)}$ is joined to v by introducing one new arc $(l_{(u,v)}, v)$ for each $u \in V_{\circ}$ and $(u, v) \in A$. Formally and more compactly,

$$\begin{aligned} T^* &\doteq (V_{T^*}, A_{T^*}), \\ V_{T^*} &\doteq V \cup \{r_{T^*}\} \cup \{l_{(u,v)} \mid (u, v) \in A, u \in V_{\circ}\}, \\ A_{T^*} &\doteq A_{\text{tree}} \cup \{(r_{\mathcal{T}}, r_{T^*}) \mid \mathcal{T} \text{ is a tree in } (V, A_{\text{tree}}) \text{ and } r_{\mathcal{T}} \text{ is its root}\} \\ &\quad \cup \{(l_{(u,v)}, v) \mid l_{(u,v)} \in V_{T^*}\}. \end{aligned}$$

So r_{T^*} is the root of T^* and $\{l_{(u,v)} \in V_{T^*}\}$ is a subset of the leaves of T^* . All unions above are disjoint. Notice, that the size of T^* is linear in that of \mathcal{A} , i.e.,

$$\begin{aligned} |V_{T^*}| &= 1 + |V| + |\{(u, v) \in A, u \in V_{\circ}\}| \leq 1 + |V| + |A|, \\ |A_{T^*}| &= |V_{T^*}| - 1 \leq |V| + |A|. \end{aligned}$$

Recall that each $\mathcal{D}.Find()$ call is made by α DFS-visit(v, \mathcal{A}) for some $v \in V$ as prescribed by (*dsf-visit-2*) and only if $cnt[u] = 0$, i.e., it happens in the form $\gamma \leftarrow \mathcal{D}.Find(low_{_}v)$, where $low_{_}v$ is the unique outgoing neighbour x of u such that $idx[x] = low_ready[u]$ and $u \in V_{\circ} \cap N_{\mathcal{A}}^{\text{in}}(v)$.

Each of these $\mathcal{D}.Find()$ operations acts in a natural manner on T^* : indeed, $\mathcal{D}.Find(low_{_}v)$ induces a path compression $C(u, low_{_}v)$ on T^* , just assume $C(u, low_{_}v)$ starts at the leaf $l_{(u, low_{_}v)}$ and terminates at γ (i.e., assume γ is the root of $C(u, low_{_}v)$). Since $\gamma \leftarrow \mathcal{D}.Find(low_{_}v)$ is executed only if $cnt[u] = 0$, each path compression on T^* starts from a distinct leaf $l_{(u, low_{_}v)}$. It is safe to assume that each leaf of T^* is a starting point of exactly one path compression, as for each leaf l' of T^* that was the starting point of no path compression, just impose a *void* path compression (i.e., starting and terminating at l').

We claim that the sequence of all path compressions on T^* that are induced by the whole execution of dsf- α DFS(\mathcal{A}) is an spps. A moment's reflection already reveals that that (*spps-1*, *spps-2*) both holds. Concerning the remaining properties, firstly, notice that during the dsf- α DFS T^* is still (implicitly) visited in a post-ordering (depth-first and post-ordering coincide in this case); so (*spps-3*) holds. Secondly, whenever some $v' \in V$ is visited and an ingoing neighbour $u' \in N_{\mathcal{A}}^{\text{in}}(v') \cap V_{\circ}$ such that $cnt[u'] = 0$ is explored, then the root γ' of the path compression $C(u', low_{_}v')$ is the LCA of $\{v', low_{_}v'\}$ in T^* (by Lemma 5). With this, we can now prove (*spps-4*). Assume some path compression $C(u', low_{_}v')$ was done before another $C(u, low_{_}v)$ and that $low_{_}v' \in T_{\gamma}^*$ belongs to the maximal subtree of T^* rooted at γ . So, $idx[\gamma] \leq idx[low_{_}v']$. Also, by rule (*dsf-visit-2*), $C(u', low_{_}v')$ was induced during dsf- α DFS-visit(v', \mathcal{A}) for some $v' \in V$; since $C(u', low_{_}v')$ was done before $C(u, low_{_}v)$, then $idx[v'] < idx[v]$; and by definition of $low_{_}v'$, then $idx[low_{_}v'] \leq idx[v']$. Therefore, the following holds when $C(u, low_{_}v)$ is performed:

$$idx[\gamma] \leq idx[low_{_}v'] \leq idx[v'] < idx[v] < +\infty.$$

This means that $low_{_}v', v' \in T_{\gamma}^*$ both belong to the same maximal subtree of T^* that is rooted at γ . Since the root γ' of $C(u', low_{_}v')$ is the LCA of $\{v', low_{_}v'\}$ in T^* (as we have mentioned above), and since $\{v', low_{_}v'\} \subseteq T_{\gamma}^*$, then $\gamma' \in T_{\gamma}^*$; so, (*spps-4*) holds. At this point, by Theorem 2, the total length of all the path compressions performed during dsf- α DFS(\mathcal{A}) is $O(|V_{T^*}|) = O(|V| + |A|)$. The space required for storing \mathcal{D} is also $\Theta(|V| + |A|)$. All in, also by Proposition 6, the complexity of dsf- α DFS is linear. \square




Figure 6: An illustration of Example 2

4 A Linear Time Algorithm for Safe Alternating SCCs

In order to design a linear time algorithm for decomposing an α graph into safe- α SCCs, some more technical machinery is needed. The catalyst is Definition 13 below.

Indeed we show that the problem of computing safe- α SCCs of a given α graph \mathcal{A} can be reduced to that of finding the roots of the components' subtrees in the α jungle $\mathcal{J}_{\mathcal{A}}$, this is reminiscent to what happens in Tarjan's algorithm for the classical problem of decomposing a directed graph.

So we have identified an efficient procedure to decide whether a vertex is the root of a safe- α SCC subtree in $\mathcal{J}_{\mathcal{A}}$. It is based on a *lowlink* indexing, gamifying the lowlink calculation performed in [12].

Definition 13. Let \mathcal{J} be an α jungle constructed over an α graph \mathcal{A} on vertex set V . Let the vertices be indexed by $idx: V \rightarrow \{1, \dots, |V|\}$, and let $\{(\mathcal{P}_i, idx_i)\}_{i=1}^k$ be the α palm-trees of \mathcal{J} each having vertex set V_i and arc set $A_i = A_{i\text{tree}} \cup A_{i\text{frond}} \cup A_{i\text{cross}} \cup A_{i\text{stalk}}$.

The α lowlink $_{\mathcal{J}}: V \rightarrow \mathbf{N}$ is defined as the following minimum index for every $v \in V$:

α lowlink $_{\mathcal{J}}(v) \doteq \min \{idx[v]\} \cup \{idx[u] \mid u \in V \setminus \{v\} \text{ and } \exists_{i \in [k]} \text{ such that the following two hold:}$

(α ll-1) $\exists_{t \geq 1} \exists_{(u, v_1, \dots, v_{t-1}, (v_t=v)) \in (V_i)^+}$ such that:

(a) $(u, v_1) \in A_{i\text{frond}}^i \cup A_{i\text{cross}}^i$;

(b) if $t \geq 2, \forall_{j \in \{1, \dots, t-1\}}$ it holds $(v_j, v_{j+1}) \in A_{i\text{tree}}^i$.

and (α ll-2) $\exists_{\gamma \in V_i}$ such that:

(a) γ is a common ancestor of u and v in $(V_i, A_{i\text{tree}})$;

(b) γ and u are in the same safe- α SCC of \mathcal{A} , i.e., $\gamma \in \mathcal{C}_u$.

}.

(where, for any $u \in V$, \mathcal{C}_u denotes the unique safe- α SCC of \mathcal{A} which includes vertex u)

However, in order to proceed on this route, we must overcome at this point some obstructions. It is not always true that, if $\mathcal{C} \subseteq V$ is a safe- α SCC of an α graph \mathcal{A} , then, \mathcal{C} induces a subtree $T_{\mathcal{C}}$ in $\mathcal{J}_{\mathcal{A}}$ – if $\mathcal{J}_{\mathcal{A}}$ is the α jungle constructed during an α DFS as defined in Section 3. And even when it's true by chance, it is not always true that a vertex v of \mathcal{A} is the root of some safe- α SCC if and only if α lowlink $_{\mathcal{J}_{\mathcal{A}}}(v) = idx[v]$.

Still, for all this to happen, we claim that just a minor revision to the α DFS (and, thus, to the structure of the α jungle) needs to be introduced. To better illustrate the issue, let us consider the following Example 2 and Example 3.

Example 2. Consider the α graph $\mathcal{A}_1 = (V, A, \langle V_\square, V_\circ \rangle)$ shown in Fig. 7a where $V_\square = \{a, b, c, d, e, f, h\}$ and $V_\circ = \{g\}$, where $V = V_\square \cup V_\circ$ and $A = \{(a, h), (b, a), (c, a), (d, b), (e, b), (f, b), (g, d), (g, e), (g, f), (h, c)\}$.

Fig. 6b shows the α jungle $\mathcal{J}_{\mathcal{A}_1}$ tracing the execution of α DFS on input \mathcal{A}_1 . Indices and α lowlinks are shown above each vertex (denoted $\langle idx \rangle / \langle \alpha lowlink \rangle$). Notice (g, a) is an arc in $\mathcal{J}_{\mathcal{A}_1}$ but not in \mathcal{A}_1 . Concerning the safe- α SCCs of \mathcal{A}_1 , a moment's reflection reveals that they are $\mathcal{C}_1 = \{a, h, c\}$ and all of the remaining vertices are singleton safe- α SCCs. Notice that b is always α reachable from \mathcal{C}_1 , but Player \circ decides how to reach it by controlling g .

However the main issue here is that \mathcal{C}_1 doesn't induce a subtree in $\mathcal{J}_{\mathcal{A}_1}$ because (a, h) is a frond, (h, c) is a cross arc, and $g \notin \mathcal{C}_1$ is a vertex in the middle, between h and a . The problem here is that g joined the α jungle $\mathcal{J}_{\mathcal{A}_1}$ by attaching to parent a (which is fine if one is interested in capturing just the safe- α reachability relations but it's not enough for safe- α SCCs).




Figure 7: An illustration of Example 3

Example 3. Consider the α graph $\mathcal{A}_2 = (V, A, \langle V_\square, V_\circ \rangle)$ of Fig. 7a: $V_\square = \{a, b, c, d, e, g, h\}$ and $V_\circ = \{f\}$, where $V = V_\square \cup V_\circ$ and $A = \{(a, h), (b, a), (c, a), (c, e), (d, a), (f, b), (f, e), (f, d), (g, f), (g, h), (h, g)\}$.

Fig. 7b shows the α jungle $\mathcal{J}_{\mathcal{A}_2}$ tracing the execution of α DFS on input \mathcal{A}_2 . Indices and α lowlinks are shown above each vertex (denoted $\langle idx \rangle / \langle \alpha lowlink \rangle$). Notice that the arc (f, a) belongs to $\mathcal{J}_{\mathcal{A}_2}$ but not to \mathcal{A}_2 . Concerning the safe- α SCCs of \mathcal{A}_2 , a moment's reflection reveals that they are $\mathcal{C}_1 = \{c, e\}$, $\mathcal{C}_2 = \{g, h\}$ and all of the remaining vertices are singleton safe- α SCCs. Notice that luckily enough both \mathcal{C}_1 and \mathcal{C}_2 induce a subtree in $\mathcal{J}_{\mathcal{A}_2}$. Also notice that c is the root of \mathcal{C}_1 and g is that of \mathcal{C}_2 .

But $\alpha lowlink_{\mathcal{J}_{\mathcal{A}_2}}(g) = 1 \neq 7 = idx[g]$, so g can't be recognized as a root simply by testing the α lowlink. The problem is still that f joined $\mathcal{J}_{\mathcal{A}_2}$ by attaching to parent a .

A revision of the α DFS is next provided in order to decompose a graph into safe- α SCC. Based on $dsf\text{-}\alpha$ DFS (Algo. 1), but still, with some additional and distinctive rules for indentifying the components:

(r1) All vertices that have already been visited during the search, but whose safe- α SCC has not been identified yet, are stored on a new stack named cSt (i.e., the component stack);

(r2) cSt shrinks back when the condition $\alpha lowlink(v) = idx[v]$ is met (see Propositions 8 and 11 below for correctness), at that point a brand new safe- α SCC \mathcal{C} is identified and detached.

(r3) The V_\circ -rule that allows circled vertices to join $\mathcal{J}_{\mathcal{A}}$ is revised by restriction. Now a circled vertex $u \in rSt[v]$ joins $\mathcal{J}_{\mathcal{A}}$ as a child of v if and only if *all* of its outgoing neighbours are still found on the component stack cSt ; otherwise, u is simply discarded and becomes a singleton component at the end.

Remark. The safe- α SCC algorithm doesn't need to build the α jungle $\mathcal{J}_{\mathcal{A}}$ explicitly (i.e., there is no real need to store it in memory; still, an α jungle is defined implicitly just by following the trace of

Algorithm 2: safe- α SCC

```

Procedure safe- $\alpha$ SCC( $\mathcal{A}$ )
  input : An  $\alpha$ graph  $\mathcal{A} = (V, A, (V_\circ, V_\square))$ .
  output: The safe- $\alpha$ SCC of  $\mathcal{A}$ .
1  foreach  $u \in V$  do
2     $idx[u] \leftarrow +\infty$ ;
3     $\alpha lowlink[u] \leftarrow +\infty$ ;
4     $on\_stack[u] \leftarrow false$ ;
5     $\mathcal{D}.make\_set(u)$ ;
6     $rSt[u] \leftarrow \emptyset$ ;
7    if  $u \in V_\circ$  then
8       $low\_ready[u] \leftarrow +\infty$ ;
9       $cnt[u] \leftarrow |N_{\mathcal{A}}^{out}(u)|$ ;
10    $next\_idx \leftarrow 1$ ;  $cSt \leftarrow \emptyset$ ;
11   foreach  $u \in V_\square$  do
12     if  $idx[u] = +\infty$  then
13        $safe\text{-}\alpha SCC\text{-}visit(u, \mathcal{A})$ ;
14   foreach  $u \in V_\circ$  do
15     if  $idx[u] = +\infty$  then
16        $idx[u] \leftarrow next\_idx$ ;
17        $next\_idx \leftarrow next\_idx + 1$ ;
18        $\alpha lowlink[u] \leftarrow idx[u]$ ;
  
```

vertices that are visited during the backtracking. As it will be convenient to consider the α jungle $\mathcal{J}_{\mathcal{A}}$ during the correctness proof, we shall continue refer to it anyways. \square

More details follow. The main procedure is called *safe- α SCC()* (Algo. 2). Given an α graph \mathcal{A} in input, it aims at identifying and printing out all the safe- α SCC $\mathcal{C}_1, \dots, \mathcal{C}_k$ of \mathcal{A} without repetitions.

A subprocedure named *safe- α SCC-visit()* (Proc. 2) is also employed for visiting the vertices.

safe- α SCC() goes like *dsf- α DFS()*, the major distinction being that now there is also an additional component stack cSt (which is initialized empty) and an additional flag vector $on_stack : V \rightarrow \{true, false\}$ (where all flags are initially *false*).

safe- α SCC-visit(v, \mathcal{A}) (Proc. 2) goes like *dsf- α DFS-visit()*, but now there are some new features for computing the α lowlinks and for keeping track of the components.

The idea for computing the α lowlinks being that to keep an eye just on the indices coming from active frond-arcs and cross-arcs (i.e., to check the minimum $\alpha lowlink$ in $N_{\mathcal{A}}^{in}[LCA]$, or from the recursive children of the currently visited vertex v (i.e., checking the minimum in $\{\alpha lowlink(c) \mid c \text{ is a child of } v \text{ in } \mathcal{J}_{\mathcal{A}}\}$).

In order to identify the components, *safe- α SCC-visit()* tests whether $\alpha lowlink[v] = idx[v]$ (this is reminiscent to Tarjan's algorithm for SCCs [12]). If that's the case a brand new safe- α SCC \mathcal{C} is identified; thus some vertices u will be repeatedly removed from cSt and added to \mathcal{C} , until $u = v$ (v comprised).

However, in order for this test to be sound and complete, we have to overcome the issues observed before in Examples 2 and 3. As mentioned in (r3) above, the proposed solution is simple. Soon after that the whole ingoing neighbourhood of any $v \in V$ has been visited by *safe- α SCC-visit(v, \mathcal{A})*, a circled vertex $u \in rSt[v]$ is visited with a recursive call (and thus attached to $\mathcal{J}_{\mathcal{A}}$ as a child of v) if and only if *all* of its out-neighbours are still on stack cSt (see lines 22-26); otherwise, u is simply discarded and becomes a singleton component at the end. Intuitively, this works because if some of the neighbours of u is no longer on the stack at that point, then it has already been detached into another component that has been fully identified already (i.e., by induction), so it would not be possible to guarantee safe-areachability from $u \in V_\circ$ to the parent $\pi(u) = v$ within the safe- α SCC of v that is currently under formation.

Soundness and completeness is formally proved in the forthcoming Propositions 8 and 11.

Remark. Notice that with (r3), the α jungle underlying safe- α SCC (Algo. 2) might be different w.r.t. the α jungle $\mathcal{J}_{\mathcal{A}}$ that would have been built by running α DFS. Like if some of the α palm-trees of $\mathcal{J}_{\mathcal{A}}$ were partitioned into subtrees, where the breaking points are precisely those arcs $(u, v) \in A_{tree}$ on circled vertices $u \in rSt[v]$ that can no longer join $\mathcal{J}_{\mathcal{A}}$ because at that point $u' \notin rSt[v]$ for some $u' \in N_{\mathcal{A}}^{out}(u)$. However, a moment's reflection reveals that this is just a minor structural refinement of $\mathcal{J}_{\mathcal{A}}$, the resulting graph structure still satisfies the fundamental properties of an α jungle given in Definitions 9 and 10.

Procedure 2: $safe\text{-}\alpha SCC\text{-}visit()$

```

Procedure  $safe\text{-}\alpha SCC\text{-}visit(v, \mathcal{A})$ 
  input : A vertex  $v \in V$ .
  1  $idx[v] \leftarrow next\_idx;$ 
  2  $\alpha lowlink[v] \leftarrow next\_idx;$ 
  3  $next\_idx \leftarrow next\_idx + 1;$ 
  4  $cSt.push(v);$ 
  5  $on\_stack[v] \leftarrow true$ 
  // Check the in-neighbourhood of  $v$ 
  6 foreach  $u \in N_{\mathcal{A}}^{in}(v)$  do
  7   if  $idx[u] = +\infty$  then
  8     if  $u \in V_{\square}$  then
  9        $safe\text{-}\alpha SCC\text{-}visit(u, \mathcal{A});$ 
 10        $\alpha lowlink[v] \leftarrow \min(\alpha lowlink[v], \alpha lowlink[u]);$ 
 11        $\mathcal{D}.Union(u, v);$ 
 12     else
 13        $low\_ready[u] \leftarrow \min(low\_ready[u], idx[v]);$ 
 14        $cnt[u] \leftarrow cnt[u] - 1;$ 
 15       if  $cnt[u] = 0$  then
 16          $low\_w \leftarrow$  the unique  $x$  such that  $idx[x] = low\_ready[u];$ 
 17          $\gamma \leftarrow \mathcal{D}.find(low\_w);$ 
 18         if  $on\_stack[\gamma] = true$  then
 19            $rSt[\gamma].push(u);$ 
 20       else if  $on\_stack[u] = true$  then
 21          $\alpha lowlink[v] \leftarrow \min(\alpha lowlink[v], idx[u]);$ 
  // Check the ready-stack of  $v$ , i.e.,  $rSt[v]$ 
 22 while  $rSt[v] \neq \emptyset$  do
 23    $u \leftarrow rSt[v].pop();$  //  $u \in V_{\circ}$ 
 24   if  $\forall u' \in N_{\mathcal{A}}^{out}(u) on\_stack[u'] = true$  then
 25      $safe\text{-}\alpha SCC\text{-}visit(u, \mathcal{A});$ 
 26      $\alpha lowlink[v] \leftarrow \min(\alpha lowlink[v], \alpha lowlink[u]);$ 
 27      $\mathcal{D}.union(u, v);$ 
  // Check for a new safe- $\alpha SCC$ 
 28 if  $\alpha lowlink[v] = idx[v]$  then
 29    $\mathcal{C} \leftarrow \emptyset;$ 
 30   repeat
 31      $u \leftarrow cSt.pop();$ 
 32      $on\_stack[u] \leftarrow false;$ 
 33     add  $u$  to  $\mathcal{C};$ 
 34   until  $u = v$ 
 35    $output(\mathcal{C});$ 

```

The only exception being property ($\alpha jn-4$), because now there might be circled vertices u that can no longer join $\mathcal{J}_{\mathcal{A}}$ even if all out-neighbours belong to the same α palm-tree – but this property would be still satisfied if only we imagine that, as soon as a safe- αSCC is identified, the corresponding subtree detaches from the maximal tree to which it belongs. So the resulting graph structure is really an α jungle; we will continue to denote it by $\mathcal{J}_{\mathcal{A}}$ as the context of $safe\text{-}\alpha SCC()$ (Algo. 2) supersedes possible confusion. \square

Let us now provide some more implementation details of $safe\text{-}\alpha SCC\text{-}visit(v, \mathcal{A})$ (Proc. 2).

At the very beginning, the vertex v which is currently being visited is pushed on top of the component stack cSt and flagged $on_stack[v] \leftarrow true$ (see lines 4-5 of Proc. 2).

Then, whenever some ingoing neighbour $u \in N_{\mathcal{A}}^{in}(v)$ is visited, and as soon as the child recursive call $safe\text{-}\alpha SCC\text{-}visit(u, \mathcal{A})$ returns the $\alpha lowlink$ is updated as follows:

$$\alpha lowlink[v] \leftarrow \min(\alpha lowlink[v], \alpha lowlink[u]) \quad (\text{see lines 9 and 25})$$

besides executing a $\mathcal{D}.Union(u, v)$ to update the disjoint-set forest as before in $dsf\text{-}\alpha DFS\text{-}visit()$.

Next, when exploring the ingoing neighbourhood $N_{\mathcal{A}}^{in}(v)$ aiming at visiting unexplored vertices: if an ingoing neighbour $u \in N_{\mathcal{A}}^{in}(v) \cap V_{\circ}$ is still unvisited (i.e., $idx[u] = +\infty$), and it happens that $cnt[u] = 0$, then u is pushed to the ready stack $rSt[\gamma]$ if and only if $on_stack[\gamma] = true$ (since we now have the additional stack cSt flagged by on_stack , it would be redundant to keep an *active* flag as in αDFS); else, if $u \in N_{\mathcal{A}}^{in}(v)$ has been already visited (i.e., if $idx[u] \neq +\infty$), and if $on_stack[u] = true$, then the




Figure 8: The α jungles of Examples 2 and 3 as revised by safe- α SCC (Algo. 2)

α lowlink of v is updated as follows:

$$\alpha\text{lowlink}[v] \leftarrow \min(\alpha\text{lowlink}[v], \text{idx}[u]) \quad (\text{see lines 20-21})$$

Soon after that the ingoing neighbourhood of v has been visited (see lines 22-27), $rSt[v]$ is managed almost as it was in $dsf\text{-}\alpha\text{DFS}\text{-visit}()$; the only difference being that, as already mentioned, a circled vertex $u \in rSt[v]$ is visited with a recursive call if and only if all of its out-neighbours are still on cSt . Of course when such an u gets visited the disjoint-set forest is updated as usual by $\mathcal{D}.Union(u, v)$, but now also the α lowlink of v is updated by taking the minimum, i.e., $\alpha\text{lowlink}[v] \leftarrow \min(\alpha\text{lowlink}[v], \alpha\text{lowlink}[u])$.

This concludes the description of $\text{safe-}\alpha\text{SCC}\text{-visit}()$ (Proc. 2) and that of Algorithm 2.

Now let us revise Examples 2 and 3 to illustrate how safe- α SCC (Algo. 2) runs on the α graphs \mathcal{A}_1 and \mathcal{A}_2 ; the resulting α jungles are shown in Fig. 8a and Fig. 8b (respectively).

Concerning Example 2, Fig. 8a shows that all vertices in the safe- α SCC $\mathcal{C}_1 = \{a, h, c\}$ have α lowlink equal to $\text{idx}[a] = 1$ and all other vertices are singletons. Now \mathcal{C}_1 induces a subtree in the α palm-tree.

Similarly for Example 3, Fig. 8b shows that all vertices in the safe- α SCC $\mathcal{C}_1 = \{c, e\}$ have α lowlink equal to $\text{idx}[c] = 2$, and all vertices in $\mathcal{C}_2 = \{g, h\}$ have an α lowlink equal to $\text{idx}[g] = 6$. All of the remaining vertices are singleton safe- α SCCs. Again both $\mathcal{C}_1 = \{c, e\}$ and $\mathcal{C}_2 = \{g, h\}$ induce a subtree, rooted at c and g respectively.

In summary, safe- α SCC (Algo. 2) enjoys the following major properties whose proof is in Appendix A.

Proposition 8. *Assume $\text{safe-}\alpha\text{SCC}()$ (Algo. 2) runs on a given input α graph \mathcal{A} , and let $\mathcal{J}_{\mathcal{A}}$ be the corresponding α jungle, then the $\alpha\text{lowlink}_{\mathcal{J}_{\mathcal{A}}}$ indexing is correctly computed as in Definition 13.*

Proposition 9. *Let $\mathcal{J}_{\mathcal{A}}$ be an α jungle constructed when $\text{safe-}\alpha\text{SCC}()$ (Algo. 2) runs on the α graph \mathcal{A} . If \mathcal{C} is a safe- α SCC of \mathcal{A} , then \mathcal{C} induces a subtree in the forest of $\mathcal{J}_{\mathcal{A}}$.*

Since any safe- α SCC \mathcal{C} induces a subtree in $\mathcal{J}_{\mathcal{A}}$, we can identify the roots of the subtrees.

Proposition 10. *Let $\mathcal{J}_{\mathcal{A}}$ be an α jungle constructed when $\text{safe-}\alpha\text{SCC}()$ (Algo. 2) runs on the α graph \mathcal{A} . Let $\text{idx} : V \rightarrow \{1, \dots, |V|\}$ be the corresponding indexing, and let $\alpha\text{lowlink}_{\mathcal{J}_{\mathcal{A}}} : V \rightarrow \mathbf{N}$ be as in Definition 13. Any vertex $v \in V$ is the root of some safe- α SCC of \mathcal{A} if and only if $\alpha\text{lowlink}_{\mathcal{J}_{\mathcal{A}}}(v) = \text{idx}[v]$.*

Thus safe- α SCC (Algo. 2) is correct as shown in Appendix A. Concerning time complexity, Theorem 3 implies that it is linear.

5 Conclusion

We expect that the proposed theory and the corresponding linear time decomposition algorithm could possibly pave the way for speeding up computations in other problems concerning infinite pebble games.

Future works will likely investigate further on this way.

References

- [1] BODLAENDER, H. L., DINNEEN, M. J., AND KHOUSSAINOV, B. *Algorithms and Computation: 12th International Symposium, ISAAC 2001 Christchurch, New Zealand, December 19–21, 2001 Proceedings*. Springer Berlin Heidelberg, Berlin, Heidelberg, 2001, ch. On Game-Theoretic Models of Networks, pp. 550–561.
- [2] CHANDRA, A. K., KOZEN, D. C., AND STOCKMEYER, L. J. Alternation. *J. ACM* 28, 1 (Jan. 1981), 114–133.
- [3] CHANDRA, A. K., AND STOCKMEYER, L. J. Alternation. In *FOCS (1976)*, IEEE Computer Society, pp. 98–108.
- [4] DINNEEN, M. J., AND KHOUSSAINOV, B. Update games and update networks. In *Proceedings of the 10th Australasian Workshop on Combinatorial Algorithms (1999)*, AWOCA '99, pp. 7–18.
- [5] DINNEEN, M. J., AND KHOUSSAINOV, B. *Graph-Theoretic Concepts in Computer Science: 26th International Workshop, WG 2000 Konstanz, Germany, June 15–17, 2000 Proceedings*. Springer Berlin Heidelberg, Berlin, Heidelberg, 2000, ch. Update Networks and Their Routing Strategies, pp. 127–136.
- [6] GRÄDEL, E., THOMAS, W., AND WILKE, T., Eds. *Automata Logics, and Infinite Games: A Guide to Current Research*. Springer-Verlag New York, Inc., New York, NY, USA, 2002.
- [7] GREENLAW, R., HOOVER, H. J., AND RUZZO, W. L. *Limits to Parallel Computation: P-completeness Theory*. Oxford University Press, Inc., New York, NY, USA, 1995.
- [8] HORN, F. Explicit muller games are PTIME. In *IARCS Annual Conference on Foundations of Software Technology and Theoretical Computer Science, FSTTCS 2008, December 9–11, 2008, Bangalore, India (2008)*, pp. 235–243.
- [9] KOZEN, D. On parallelism in turing machines. In *FOCS (1976)*, IEEE Computer Society, pp. 89–97.
- [10] LOEBL, M., AND NEŠETŘIL, J. Linearity and unprovability of set union problem strategies. *Journal of Algorithms* 23, 2 (1997), 207 – 220.
- [11] SAVITCH, W. J. Relationships between nondeterministic and deterministic tape complexities. *J. Comput. Syst. Sci.* 4, 2 (1970), 177–192.
- [12] TARJAN, R. Depth-First Search and Linear Graph Algorithms. *SIAM Journal on Computing* 1, 2 (1972), 146–160.
- [13] TARJAN, R. E. Efficiency of a good but not linear set union algorithm. *J. ACM* 22, 2 (Apr. 1975), 215–225.

A Proof that Safe- α SCC (Algo. 2) is Correct

For the sake of the argument let us say that, during an execution of *safe- α SCC()* (Algo. 2), a vertex v becomes *active* from the moment when *safe- α SCC-visit*(v, \mathcal{A}) (Proc. 2) is invoked, recursive calls included, and until it finally backtracks to v for the last time; moreover, let us say that v is *deactivated* as soon as the search ends backtracking on v (i.e., when the recursive call *safe- α SCC-visit*(v, \mathcal{A}) halts).

In order to prove Proposition 11, which basically asserts that safe- α SCC (Algo. 2) is correct, let us dive into the following two technical lemmata.

Lemma 6. *Assume that *safe- α SCC()* (Algo. 2) runs on a given α graph \mathcal{A} on vertex set V . Let $u \in V$ be a descendant of $\gamma \in V$ in the forest of $\mathcal{J}_{\mathcal{A}}$ such that u is still on the component stack $cSt(\gamma)$ when *safe- α SCC-visit*() backtracks from u up to γ (i.e., let us say, at line 28 of *safe- α SCC-visit*(γ, \mathcal{A})) (Proc. 2).*

Then, γ lies in the same safe- α SCC of u , i.e., $\gamma \in \mathcal{C}_u$.

Proof. The proof goes by induction on the order in which vertices are deactivated during the execution of *safe- α SCC*(\mathcal{A}), let it be $(v_1, \dots, v_i, \dots, v_{|V|})$. Also, w.l.o.g., let u be a proper descendant of $\gamma \in V$.

Base Case: $u = v_1$. Notice the first deactivated vertex $u = v_1$ must be a leaf in the forest of $\mathcal{J}_{\mathcal{A}}$. Since u is still on the component stack $cSt(\gamma)$ when *safe- α SCC-visit*() backtracks up to γ , then,

$$\alpha lowlink[u] < idx[u]; \quad (*)$$

actually, every ancestor of u that is also a proper descendant of γ must be still on $cSt(\gamma)$ (together with u) when *safe- α SCC-visit*() backtracks up to γ , so $\alpha lowlink[\hat{v}] < idx[\hat{v}]$ for every such \hat{v} . Since $\alpha lowlink[u] < idx[u]$, there is one vertex $\gamma' \neq u$ such that $idx[\gamma'] = \alpha lowlink[u]$. Since u is the first deactivated vertex in the forest of $\mathcal{J}_{\mathcal{A}}$, then γ' is a proper ancestor of u and thus (γ', u) is a frond arc. Let x be any ancestor of u that is also a descendant of γ' (possibly $x = u$ or $x = \gamma'$, but not both).

We claim that x can't be a circled vertex, so it must be $x \in V_{\square}$. Indeed, suppose $x \in V_{\circ}$ for the sake of contradiction, consider any out-neighbour $y \in N_{\mathcal{A}}^{\text{out}}(x)$ which is not the parent of x in $\mathcal{J}_{\mathcal{A}}$ (notice y exists because w.l.o.g. $|N_{\mathcal{A}}^{\text{out}}(x)| \geq 2$ if $x \in V_{\circ}$), so (x, y) is just a stalk arc. By the V_{\circ} -rule, y must have been deactivated before x ; this is absurd as u is the first deactivated vertex of $\mathcal{J}_{\mathcal{A}}$ and $u \neq y$. So $x \in V_{\square}$.

Since any ancestor of u that is also a descendant of γ' lies in V_{\square} , and since (γ', u) is a frond arc, then u and γ' together with all the ancestors of u that are also descendants of γ' , they form a safe- α asc set, so they all lie within the same safe- α SCC of \mathcal{A} . There are two cases now to analyze.

If $idx[\gamma'] \leq idx[\gamma]$, and since u is the first deactivated vertex, then γ must be an ancestor of u and descendant of γ' , so $\gamma \in \mathcal{C}_u$ and we are done.

Otherwise, if $idx[\gamma'] > idx[\gamma]$, and since u is the first deactivated vertex, then γ' must be a proper ancestor of u and also a proper descendant of γ . Thus, as mentioned before at the beginning, also γ' must be still on $cSt(\gamma)$ when *safe- α SCC-visit*() backtracks up to γ . Therefore,

$$\alpha lowlink[\gamma'] < idx[\gamma'].$$

At this point a moment's reflection reveals that now we can reiterate the same argument that we have just applied on u (cfr. inequality (*) above), but this time to γ' . Even though γ' is not the first deactivated vertex, notice that all the same observations apply to γ' too. This happens because γ' is anyway an ancestor of the first deactivated vertex u , it's easy to check that this is enough to sustain the argument. After that, possibly, we may need to reiterate the argument along subsequent proper ancestors \hat{v} of γ' too, but at some point we must reach γ , because at each iteration the corresponding $idx[\hat{v}]$ decreases by at least one unit. So, also in this case, $\gamma \in \mathcal{C}_u$.

Inductive Step: $u = v_i$ for some $i > 1$. In this case, $\alpha lowlink[v_i]$ can be assigned either at line 2, 10, 21, 26 of *safe- α SCC-visit*(v_i, \mathcal{A}) (Proc. 2). Since u is still on the component stack $cSt(\gamma)$ when *safe- α SCC-visit*() backtracks from u up to γ , then,

$$\alpha lowlink[u] < idx[u]; \quad (*)$$

also, every ancestor of u that is a proper descendant of γ must be still on $cSt(\gamma)$ (together with u) when *safe- α SCC-visit*() backtracks from u up to γ , so $\alpha lowlink[\hat{v}] < idx[\hat{v}]$ for every such \hat{v} . Since

$\alpha\text{lowlink}[u] < \text{idx}[u]$, there is one vertex $u' \neq u$ such that $\text{idx}[u'] = \alpha\text{lowlink}[u]$. All in, $\text{idx}[u'] < \text{idx}[u]$. A moment's reflection reveals that there must be a descendant x of u (possibly, $x = u$) such that $\alpha\text{lowlink}[x] = \text{idx}[u']$ and (u', x) is either a frond or a cross arc in \mathcal{J}_A . So, u' was still on cSt when $\text{safe-}\alpha\text{SCC-visit}()$ backtracked on x . Then let γ' be the LCA of u', u in the forest of \mathcal{J}_A (possibly, $\gamma' = u'$, but $\gamma' \neq u$). Also, since u' was still on cSt when $\text{safe-}\alpha\text{SCC-visit}()$ backtracked on x , and since x is a descendant of u , then the fact that $\text{idx}[u'] < \text{idx}[u]$ implies that u' is still on $cSt(\gamma')$ when $\text{safe-}\alpha\text{SCC-visit}()$ backtracks up to γ' too.

We now claim that $\gamma' \in \mathcal{C}_u$. If $\gamma' = u'$, this is trivial. So, assume w.l.o.g. $\gamma' \neq u'$. Then, since u' was still on cSt when $\text{safe-}\alpha\text{SCC-visit}()$ backtracked on x , and x is a descendant of u , then u' must have been deactivated before u . So the induction hypothesis applies to u' and γ' , thus $\gamma' \in \mathcal{C}_u$.

We now claim that $\gamma' \in \mathcal{C}_u$ too. Recall that $\gamma' \in \mathcal{C}_{u'}$ and (u', x) is either a frond or a cross arc in \mathcal{J}_A , and x is a descendant of u , which is a descendant of γ' . Let P be the set of all ancestors of x which are also descendants of γ' . Proposition 5 implies that every vertex in P is $\mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{P}_x}$ -safe- α reachable from x , with a strategy that simply goes up along the α palm-tree \mathcal{P}_x in which x resides, i.e., a strategy that goes from any $c \in P$ to its parent $\pi(c)$. To conclude the proof of $\gamma' \in \mathcal{C}_u$, it is now sufficient to show that: if $c \in P \cap V_\circ$, then for every out-neighbour $c' \in N_{\mathcal{A}}^{\text{out}}(c)$ such that $c' \neq \pi(c)$ (i.e., (c, c') is just a stalk arc), it holds $\pi(c) \in \mathcal{C}_{c'}$. For this, observe that, by the V_\circ -rule, c' must have been already deactivated when c joined \mathcal{J}_A . Thus, since x is a child of c , c' must have been deactivated before x was. Thus, since x is a child of u , then c' must have been deactivated before u was. Therefore, the induction hypothesis applies to c' with parent $\pi(c)$, i.e., $\pi(c) \in \mathcal{C}_{c'}$ as claimed. All in, $\mathcal{C}_u = \mathcal{C}_p$ for every $p \in P$. So, $\gamma' \in \mathcal{C}_u$.

In order to conclude the proof of the inductive step, there are two cases now to analyze.

If $\text{idx}[\gamma'] \leq \text{idx}[\gamma]$, since γ, γ' are both ancestors of u , then γ' must be an ancestor of γ (possibly, $\gamma' = \gamma$). In this case $\gamma \in P$, and the argument above already proves $\gamma \in \mathcal{C}_u$.

Otherwise, if $\text{idx}[\gamma'] > \text{idx}[\gamma]$, and since γ, γ' are both ancestors of u , then γ must be a proper ancestor of γ' . So, as mentioned before (at the beginning of the inductive step), also γ' must be still on $cSt(\gamma)$ when $\text{safe-}\alpha\text{SCC-visit}()$ backtracks up to γ . Therefore,

$$\alpha\text{lowlink}[\gamma'] < \text{idx}[\gamma'].$$

At this point a moment's reflection reveals that now we can reiterate the same argument that we have just applied on u (cfr. inequality (*) above), but this time on γ' . Even though γ' is deactivated after u , notice that all the same observations apply to γ' too. This happens because γ' is anyway an ancestor of u in \mathcal{J}_A , and a moment's reflection reveals that this is enough to sustain the argument even if the induction hypothesis still holds only with respect to those vertices that are deactivated before u . Indeed, since $\alpha\text{lowlink}[\gamma'] < \text{idx}[\gamma']$, there is still one vertex $u'' \neq \gamma'$ such that $\text{idx}[u''] = \alpha\text{lowlink}[\gamma']$. Since $\text{idx}[u''] < \text{idx}[\gamma'] < \text{idx}[u]$, so either u'' is an ancestor of γ' or must have been deactivated before u and thus the argument can proceed as before.

After that, possibly, we may need to reiterate the argument along subsequent proper ancestors \hat{v} of γ' too, but at some point we must reach γ , because at each iteration of the argument the corresponding $\text{idx}[\hat{v}]$ decreases by at least one unit. So, also in this case, $\gamma \in \mathcal{C}_u$. \square

Lemma 7. *Assume that $\text{safe-}\alpha\text{SCC}()$ (Algo. 2) runs on a given α graph \mathcal{A} on vertex set V . Let $u \in V$ be a descendant of $\gamma \in V$ in the forest of \mathcal{J}_A lying in the same $\text{safe-}\alpha\text{SCC}$ of u , i.e., such that $\gamma \in \mathcal{C}_u$. Then, u is still on the component stack $cSt(\gamma)$ when $\text{safe-}\alpha\text{SCC-visit}()$ backtracks from u up to γ .*

Proof. Firstly, assume w.l.o.g. that $\text{idx}[\gamma]$ is the smallest possible index in \mathcal{C}_u , i.e.,

$$\gamma = \arg \min_{v \in \mathcal{C}_u} \text{idx}[v].$$

Indeed, thanks to the structural connectivity properties of \mathcal{J}_A (see Definitions 9 and 10, particularly, $\alpha\text{pt-2}$, $\alpha\text{pt-4}$ and $\alpha\text{jn-3}$), if $\gamma \in \mathcal{C}_u$ then γ belongs to the same α palm-tree in which u resides, and any other possible ancestor $\gamma' \neq \gamma$ of u such that $\gamma' \in \mathcal{C}_u$ must be a proper descendant of γ because $\text{idx}[\gamma]$ is minimum. So proving the thesis w.r.t. the smallest γ subsumes proving it for any other γ' satisfying the hypothesis.

The proof proceeds by induction on $idx[u]$, for $idx[u] \geq idx[\gamma]$.

In the *Base Case*, $u = \gamma$, so the thesis trivially holds.

Inductive Step: Since $\gamma \in \mathcal{C}_u$ because of the structural connectivity properties of \mathcal{J}_A (see Definitions 9 and 10, particularly, α pt-2, α pt-4 and α jn-3), a moment's reflection reveals that along any of those paths that start at γ and reach u without ever leaving \mathcal{C}_u (i.e., any of those paths thanks to which u is \mathcal{C}_u -safe-areachable from γ), at some point there must be a pair of vertices $u', x \in \mathcal{C}_u$ such that: $idx[u'] < idx[u]$, x is a descendant of u in the forest of \mathcal{J}_A (possibly $x = u$, but $x \neq u'$), and (u', x) is either a frond or a cross arc.

Now, notice that since $idx[\gamma]$ is minimum, then u' is still a descendant of γ (possibly, $u' = \gamma$). Also notice that, since $u' \in \mathcal{C}_u$, then $\mathcal{C}_{u'} = \mathcal{C}_u$, so $\gamma \in \mathcal{C}_{u'}$.

Since $idx[u'] < idx[u]$ and u' is a descendant of γ such that $\gamma \in \mathcal{C}_{u'}$, by induction hypothesis applied to u' , then u' is still on the component stack $cSt(\gamma)$ when $safe\text{-}\alpha SCC\text{-}visit()$ backtracks from u up to γ .

Thus, since x is a descendant of u and $idx[u'] < idx[u]$, u' is already on the component stack $cSt(\gamma)$ when $safe\text{-}\alpha SCC\text{-}visit()$ backtracks on x . Therefore, by line 21 of $safe\text{-}\alpha SCC\text{-}visit()$, $\alpha lowlink[x] \leq idx[u']$. So, x stays on cSt as long as u' stays there. Then also u stays on cSt as long as u' stays there. Therefore, since u' is on $cSt(\gamma)$ when $safe\text{-}\alpha SCC\text{-}visit()$ backtracks from u up to γ , also $u \in cSt(\gamma)$ at that time. \square

We are finally in the position of proving correctenss.

Proposition 11. *If $safe\text{-}\alpha SCC()$ (Algo. 2) runs on a given α graph \mathcal{A} , and $safe\text{-}\alpha SCC\text{-}visit()$ (Proc. 2) outputs some subset of vertices $C \subseteq V$, then C is a safe- αSCC of \mathcal{A} .*

Proof. Assume that $safe\text{-}\alpha SCC\text{-}visit(\gamma, \mathcal{A})$ (Proc. 2) outputs some subset of vertices $C \subseteq V$, for some $\gamma \in C$, when $\alpha lowlink[\gamma] = idx[\gamma]$ holds at line 27. So, $C = cSt(\gamma)$. By Lemma 6, then $\gamma \in \mathcal{C}_u$ for every $u \in cSt(\gamma)$. So, $cSt(\gamma) \subseteq \mathcal{C}_\gamma$.

Now we claim that $\mathcal{C}_\gamma \subseteq cSt(\gamma)$. Pick $\gamma' \in \mathcal{C}_\gamma$. It is not possible for γ' to be an ancestor of γ , because by Lemma 7 it would be $\gamma \in cSt(\gamma')$, against $\alpha lowlink[\gamma] = idx[\gamma]$. Thus, since there are no ancestors of γ in \mathcal{C}_γ , it is not possible for γ' to be uncomparable with γ (i.e., neither an ancestor nor a descendant), because this would contradict the structural connectivity properties of \mathcal{J}_A (see Definitions 9 and 10, particularly, α pt-2, α pt-4 and α jn-3). So, γ' must be a descendant of γ in the forest of \mathcal{J}_A . Then by Lemma 7 it holds $\gamma' \in cSt(\gamma)$. All in, $cSt(\gamma) = \mathcal{C}_\gamma$. \square

Next, for the sake of completeness, it is shown that safe- αSCC (Algo. 2) correctly computes the $\alpha lowlinks$ as prescribed by Definition 13. This follows from Lemma 6 and Lemma 7

Proof of Proposition 8. The proof goes by induction on the order in which vertices are deactivated during the execution of $safe\text{-}\alpha SCC(\mathcal{A})$, let it be $(v_1, \dots, v_i, \dots, v_{|V|})$.

For every $v \in V$, for the sake of the argument, let us define the following ingoing neighbourhood by considering the state of the component stack cSt when line 22 of $safe\text{-}\alpha SCC\text{-}visit(v, \mathcal{A})$ is executed:

$$N_{\mathcal{A}}^{\text{in}}[cSt](v) \doteq \left\{ u \in N_{\mathcal{A}}^{\text{in}}(v) \mid u \in cSt \text{ when line 22 of } safe\text{-}\alpha SCC\text{-}visit(v, \mathcal{A}) \text{ (Proc. 2) is executed} \right\}.$$

Also for the sake of the argument let us define for every $v \in V$:

$$N_{\mathcal{A}}^{\text{in}}[\text{LCA}](v) \doteq \{ u \in N_{\mathcal{A}}^{\text{in}}(v) \cap V_{\square} \mid \text{the LCA } \gamma \text{ of } \{u, v\} \text{ in } \mathcal{J}_A \text{ exists and } \gamma \in \mathcal{C}_u \}.$$

Base Case: $i = 1$. Notice that the first deactivated vertex v_1 must be a leaf in the forest of \mathcal{J}_A . In this case, $\alpha lowlink[v_1]$ can be assigned only at line 21 of $safe\text{-}\alpha SCC\text{-}visit(v_1, \mathcal{A})$. So, the following holds:

$$\alpha lowlink[v_1] = \min\{idx[v_1]\} \cup \{idx[u] \mid u \in N_{\mathcal{A}}^{\text{in}}[cSt](v_1)\}. \quad (\text{eq. 1})$$

Since v_1 is the *first* deactivated leaf,

$$N_{\mathcal{A}}^{\text{in}}[cSt](v_1) = \{ u \in N_{\mathcal{A}}^{\text{in}}(v_1) \mid u \text{ is an ancestor of } v_1 \text{ in } \mathcal{J}_A \}. \quad (\text{eq. 2})$$

On the other hand, since v_1 is a leaf in \mathcal{J}_A and by Definition 13, a moment's reflection reveals:

$$\alpha\text{lowlink}(v_1) = \min \{ \text{idx}[v_1] \} \cup \{ \text{idx}[u] \mid u \in N_{\mathcal{A}}^{\text{in}}[\text{LCA}](v_1) \}. \quad (\text{eq. 3})$$

Since v_1 is the first deactivated leaf and by (eq. 2), $N_{\mathcal{A}}^{\text{in}}[\text{LCA}](v_1) = N_{\mathcal{A}}^{\text{in}}[cSt](v_1)$.

Therefore, by (eq. 1) and (eq. 3), $\alpha\text{lowlink}[v_1] = \alpha\text{lowlink}(v_1)$.

This concludes the proof of the base case.

Inductive Step: $i > 1$. In this case, $\alpha\text{lowlink}[v_i]$ can be assigned either at line 2, 10, 21, 26 of *safe- α SCC-visit*(v_i, \mathcal{A}) (Proc. 2). A moment's reflection reveals that the following holds by construction:

$$\alpha\text{lowlink}[v_i] = \min \{ \text{idx}[v_i] \} \cup \{ \text{idx}[u] \mid u \in N_{\mathcal{A}}^{\text{in}}[cSt](v_i) \} \cup \{ \alpha\text{lowlink}[u] \mid u \text{ is a child of } v_i \text{ in } \mathcal{J}_A \}.$$

On the other side, by Definition 13, it is not difficult to see that by reasoning on the structure and connectivity properties of \mathcal{J}_A (Definitions 9 and 10), the minimality of $\alpha\text{lowlink}$, and the ordering of *idx*:

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha\text{lowlink}(v_i) = \min \{ \text{idx}[v_i] \} \cup \{ \text{idx}[u] \mid u \in N_{\mathcal{A}}^{\text{in}}[\text{LCA}](v_i) \} \\ \cup \{ \alpha\text{lowlink}(u) \mid u \text{ is a child of } v_i \text{ in } \mathcal{J}_A \}. \end{aligned}$$

If u is a child of v_i in \mathcal{J}_A , then u is deactivated before v_i . By induction hypothesis, $\alpha\text{lowlink}[u] = \alpha\text{lowlink}(u)$ for every child u of v_i in \mathcal{J}_A that is considered either at line 10 or 26 of *safe- α SCC-visit*(v_i, \mathcal{A}).

To finish the proof, it is sufficient to show that $N_{\mathcal{A}}^{\text{in}}[cSt](v_i) = N_{\mathcal{A}}^{\text{in}}[\text{LCA}](v_i)$.

- Firstly, we claim $N_{\mathcal{A}}^{\text{in}}[cSt](v_i) \subseteq N_{\mathcal{A}}^{\text{in}}[\text{LCA}](v_i)$.

Let $u \in N_{\mathcal{A}}^{\text{in}}[cSt](v_i)$. Then, u and v_i lie within the same tree in \mathcal{J}_A : indeed, notice that *cSt* is completely emptied as soon as the root of an α palm-tree is deactivated, thus the stack *cSt* can't contain vertices belonging to two distinct maximal α palm-tree. So, the LCA γ of $\{u, v_i\}$ in \mathcal{J}_A exists. Since $u \in cSt$ when v_i is being visited, $u \in cSt(\gamma)$ when *safe- α SCC-visit*() backtracks to γ . By Lemma 6, $\gamma \in \mathcal{C}_u$. So, $u \in N_{\mathcal{A}}^{\text{in}}[\text{LCA}](v_i)$.

- Secondly, we claim $N_{\mathcal{A}}^{\text{in}}[\text{LCA}](v_i) \subseteq N_{\mathcal{A}}^{\text{in}}[cSt](v_i)$.

Let $u \in N_{\mathcal{A}}^{\text{in}}[\text{LCA}](v_i)$, and let $\gamma \in \mathcal{C}_u$ be the LCA of $\{u, v_i\}$ in \mathcal{J}_A . By Lemma 7, since $\gamma \in \mathcal{C}_u$, then u is still on the component stack *cSt*(γ) when *safe- α SCC-visit*() backtracks to γ . So, $u \in N_{\mathcal{A}}^{\text{in}}[cSt](v_i)$.

All in, $N_{\mathcal{A}}^{\text{in}}[cSt](v_i) = N_{\mathcal{A}}^{\text{in}}[\text{LCA}](v_i)$. This concludes the *inductive step*. \square