

The Bichromatic Two-Center Problem on Graphs^{★ ★★}

Qi Sun and Jingru Zhang

Cleveland State University, Cleveland, Ohio 44115, USA
q.sun1@vikes.csuohio.edu, j.zhang40@csuohio.edu

Abstract. In this paper, we study the (weighted) bichromatic two-center problem on graphs. The input consists of a graph G of n (weighted) vertices and m edges, and a set \mathcal{P} of pairs of distinct vertices, where no vertex appears in more than one pair. The problem aims to find two points (i.e., centers) on G by assigning vertices of each pair to different centers so as to minimize the maximum (weighted) distance of vertices to their assigned centers (so that the graph can be bi-colored with this goal). To the best of our knowledge, this problem has not been studied on graphs, including tree graphs. In this paper, we propose an $O(m^2 n \log n \log mn)$ algorithm for solving the problem on an undirected graph provided with the distance matrix, an $O(n \log n)$ -time algorithm for the problem on trees, and a linear-time approach for the unweighted tree version.

1 Introduction

The bichromatic two-center problem is a new facility location problem, proposed by Arkin et al. in [1], with the goal to construct two public transport hubs to connect origin and destination sites while aiming to minimize the maximum transportation cost between the sites and the hubs. To the best of our knowledge, all previous work has focused on the planar unweighted case [1,21], and no result is known for the problem on graphs. In this paper, we present the first algorithms for the (weighted) bichromatic two-center problem on various graphs.

Let $G = (V, E)$ be an undirected graph with n vertices and m edges where each vertex v is of a weight $w(v) \geq 0$ and each edge e is of length $l(e) > 0$. In addition, the input includes a set of k pairs of distinct vertices so that no vertex of G occurs in more than one pair. Let $\mathcal{P} = \{P_1, \dots, P_k\}$ represent this set of pairs; denote by v_i and u_i the two vertices in each pair P_i .

For any two vertex u, v , denote $e(u, v)$ by the edge connecting them. We talk about ‘points’ on $e(u, v)$ so that a point q of $e(u, v)$ is at distance $t(q)$ to u along (segment) $e(u, v)$. So, the distance of two points q_1 and q_2 of G is the length of their shortest path $\pi(q_1, q_2)$.

For each pair $P_i \in \mathcal{P}$, define $\phi_i(q_1, q_2)$ as the minimized maximum (weighted) distance by assigning v_i and u_i to different points of q_1 and q_2 ; namely, $\phi_i(q_1, q_2)$ is the minimum value of $\max\{w(v_i)d(v_i, q_1), w(u_i)d(u_i, q_2)\}$ and $\max\{w(u_i)d(u_i, q_1), w(v_i)d(v_i, q_2)\}$. The bichromatic two-center problem aims to find two points q_1^* and q_2^* on G so as to minimize $\max_{1 \leq i \leq k} \phi_i(q_1, q_2)$.

Consider coloring vertices assigned to q_1^* red, and vertices assigned to q_2^* blue in an optimal solution. In addition, the center of vertices in a subset of V is a point on G that minimizes the maximum (weighted) distance from it to the vertices. Hence, this problem is indeed a graph 2-coloring variant that aims to choose from each pair a vertex to be red and let the other to be blue, in such a way that minimizes the maximum one-center objective values respectively for red and blue vertices.

In this paper, we propose an $O(nm^2 \log n \log mn)$ -time algorithm for the problem on an undirected graph, provided with the distance matrix. Moreover, an $O(n \log n)$ -time algorithm is given for solving the problem on a tree, and an $O(n)$ -time improvement is obtained for the unweighted tree case.

[★] This research was supported in part by U.S. National Science Foundation under Grant CCF-2339371.

^{★★} A preliminary version of this paper will appear in *Proceedings of the 18th Annual International Conference on Combinatorial Optimization and Applications (COCO A 2025)*.

Related work. As motivated by a chromatic clustering problem [11] arising in biology and transportation, Arkin et al. [1] proposed the bichromatic two-center problem for pairs of points in the plane, which aims to choose from each pair a point to be colored red and let the other to be blue so as to minimize the maximum of the two radii of the minimum balls respectively enclosing red and blue points. They gave an linear-time algorithm for the problem in L_∞ metric, and an $O(n^3 \log n)$ -time exact algorithm as well as two approximation algorithms for the problem in L_2 metric. Recently, Wang and Xue [21] improved their exact algorithm for the L_2 metric to $O(n^2 \log n)$ and gave a faster approximation algorithm. As far as we are aware, however, no previous result exists for the problem on graph networks.

This bichromatic two-center problem is closely related to the one-center and two-center problems [21]. These two problems have been studied on various graphs in the literature. Megiddo [17] proposed a prune-and-search algorithm for addressing the one-center problem on trees in linear time. By adapting Megiddo's prune-and-search scheme, Ben-Moshe et al. [3] solved the two-center problem on tree in linear time. On cactus graphs, Ben-Moshe et al. [4] first gave a 'binary search' algorithm to solve the one-center problem and then extended their one-center scheme to address the two-center problem in $O(n \log^3 n)$ time. On general graphs, Kariv and Hakimi [15] gave the first exact algorithms for the one-center problem and the unweighted case. Later, Bhattacharya and Shi [8] improved their result to $O(m^2 n \log^2 n)$ by proposing an $O(m^2 n \log n)$ -time feasibility test.

To solve our problem, a geometric piercing problem needs to be addressed: Given a set of subsets of two-sided axis-parallel rectangles, the goal is to find a point in the plane that pierces (or lies in) one rectangle in each subset. To the best of our knowledge, no exact algorithm exists for this problem, and most exact works focus on finding $O(1)$ points to pierce n geometric objects, e.g., disks and rectangles [16,9,20,18].

Our approach. Let λ^* be the optimal objective value, and denote by q_1^* and q_2^* the two centers. We observe that λ^* is determined by the *local* center of two vertices on an edge of G . Because the local center of any two vertices on an edge is determined by an intersection of their distance functions $w(v)d(v, x)$ w.r.t. x on the edge. By forming the distance function for each vertex w.r.t. each edge of G , the line-arrangement searching technique can be adapted to find λ^* with assistance of our feasibility test which determines for any given value λ whether $\lambda \geq \lambda^*$.

To determine whether $\lambda \geq \lambda^*$, we determine for every pair of edges whether each edge contains a point such that the objective value w.r.t. the two points is at most λ . This problem can be reduced into the above-mentioned geometric piercing problem. The sweeping technique is adapted to solve this problem in $O(n \log n)$ time with the assistance of our data structure.

For G being a tree, we perform a 'binary search' on it to find the two edges that respectively contain q_1^* and q_2^* with the assistance of our key lemma: Given any point of the tree, we can find its *hanging* subtrees (i.e., two subtrees incident to the point) respectively containing q_1^* and q_2^* in linear time. This key lemma is based on our linear-time feasibility test. As a result, λ^* can be computed in $O(n \log n)$ time.

When every vertex of the tree is of same weight, we observe that λ^* is determined by the longest path(s) between two vertices assigned to q_1^* or q_2^* , where one of its endpoints must be the endpoint of the longest path of the tree. This implies that the optimal assignment for each pair P_i is determined by $\phi_i(\alpha, \beta)$ where the path between vertices α and β is a longest path of the tree, which leads a linear-time algorithm.

Outline. In Section 2, we introduce some observations and review a technique. We present our algorithm for the problem on general graphs in Section 3, and our algorithms for the weighted and unweighted cases on tree graphs in Section 4.

2 Preliminaries

Let $V(\mathcal{P})$ be the set of vertices in all pairs of \mathcal{P} . Note that $V(\mathcal{P})$ might be a subset of V . If so, we set the weight of each vertex in $V/V(\mathcal{P})$ as zero and then form new pairs for all vertices in $V/V(\mathcal{P})$. It should be mentioned that when n is odd, before forming new pairs, we join a new vertex into G by connecting it and any vertex

of G via an edge of a positive length. By the provided distance matrix, the distance of this new vertex to every other vertex can be known in $O(1)$ time.

Let \mathcal{P}' denote the set of all obtained pairs including those in \mathcal{P} , and G' denote the new graph in the case that n is odd. Clearly, solving the problem on G w.r.t. \mathcal{P} is equivalent to solving the problem on G' w.r.t. \mathcal{P}' . The time complexity of the reduction is $O(n + m)$. Below, we thus focus on solving the case of $V(P) = V$.

For any subset V' of V and any edge e of G , there is a point on e that minimizes the maximum (weighted) distance of it to vertices in V' ; such a point is the *local center* of V' on e . The center of V' on G is the one with the smallest maximum (weighted) distance, i.e., the smallest one-center objective value of V' , among all its local centers.




Fig. 1. Illustrate the three cases of function $y = w(v)d(v, x)$ w.r.t. x on edge e . Point x' is the (unique) semicircular point of v on e .




Fig. 2. Illustrate that each assignment of pair $P_i = (v_i, u_i)$ leads at most four disjoint rectangles in box B each sharing a vertex of B . In (a), v_i (resp., u_i) is assigned to center $q_1 \in e_1$ (resp., $q_2 \in e_2$) so two rectangles R_1 and R_2 are generated; (b) illustrates the other assignment which leads rectangle R_3 .

Consider the weighted distance $w(v)d(v, x)$ of each $v \in V'$ to a point x of e . Recall that x is at distance $t(x)$ to an incident vertex of e along e . As $t(x)$ increases (namely, x moves along e from an incident vertex to the other), $w(v)d(v, x)$ linearly increases or decreases, and otherwise, it first linearly increases until x reaches v 's *semicircular* point on e , which is the unique point on e so that v has two shortest paths to it containing different incident vertices of e , and then linearly decreases. So, $w(v)d(v, x)$ is a piecewise linear function w.r.t. $t(x)$ (see Fig. 1). As shown in [15,8] for the graph one-center problem, the local center of V' on e is determined by an intersection between distance functions $y = w(v)d(v, x)$ of two vertices, where their slopes are of opposite signs. Hence, we have the following observation.

Observation 1 λ^* belongs to the set of values $w(v)d(v, x) = w(u)d(u, x)$ for each pair of vertices $u, v \in V$ w.r.t. every edge of G .

Clearly, this candidate set is of size $O(mn^2)$ and it can be computed in $O(mn^2)$ time by the provided distance matrix of G .

When G is a tree, for any two vertices, there is only one (simple) path between them. For any path π' , supposing x is a point on π' , $w(v)d(v, x)$ is a convex function w.r.t. the distance of x to an endpoint of π' . So, the center of V' is determined by the center of two vertices on their path, and the size of the candidate set is decreased to $O(n^2)$ [17,2,22].

Observation 2 For G being a tree, λ^* belongs to the set of values $w(v)d(v, x) = w(u)d(u, x)$ for each pair of vertices $u, v \in V$ w.r.t. x on the path between the two vertices.

Besides of computing the candidate set, an implicit way to enumerate this candidate set is forming the distance function $y = w(v)d(v, x)$ for each vertex w.r.t. every edge of G in the x, y -coordinate plane such that λ^* belongs to the set of the y -coordinates of intersections between the distance functions.

Consider the set of $O(mn)$ lines obtained by extending each line segment on the graph of every distance function formed in the x, y -coordinate plane. These lines define a plane subdivision where each intersection of lines is a vertex and vice versa. A benefit for implicitly enumerating the candidate set is that the line arrangement search technique [10] can be utilized to search for λ^* among the y -coordinates of all intersections without computing the arrangement of the lines in advance. Note that both explicit and implicit ways need the assistance of a feasibility test that determines for any given value λ , whether $\lambda \geq \lambda^*$. The line arrangement search technique is reviewed as follows.

Suppose L is a set of N lines in the plane. Denote by $\mathcal{A}(L)$ the arrangement of lines in L . For any point p in the plane, denote by $x(p)$ its x -coordinate and $y(p)$ its y -coordinate. Let $v_1(L)$ be the lowest vertex of $\mathcal{A}(L)$ whose $y(v_1(L))$ is a feasible value, and let $v_2(L)$ be the highest vertex of $\mathcal{A}(L)$ with $y(v_2(L)) < y(v_1(L))$. By the definition, $y(v_2(L)) < \lambda^* \leq y(v_1(L))$, and no vertex in $\mathcal{A}(L)$ has a y -coordinate in the range $(y(v_2(L)), y(v_1(L)))$. Lemma 1 was proved in [10] for finding the two vertices.

Lemma 1. [10] *Both vertices $v_1(L)$ and $v_2(L)$ can be computed in $O((N + \tau) \log N)$ time, where τ is the time for a feasibility test.*

3 The problem on a graph

In this section, we first give the algorithm for computing λ^* and present our feasibility test later in Section 3.1.

The above analysis in Section 2 leads our algorithm: For each edge $e(u, u')$ of G , we form the distance function $y = w(v)d(v, x)$ for every vertex $v \in V$ w.r.t. x on $e(u, u')$ in the x, y -coordinate plane where $e(u, u')$ is on the positive side of the x -axis with u at the origin. By the given distance matrix, this can be carried out in $O(mn)$ time. Next, we extend each line segment on the graph of every distance function into a line, which generates in $O(mn)$ time a set L of $O(mn)$ lines.

Consider the line arrangement \mathcal{A} of lines in L . We say that a value is feasible iff it is no less than λ^* , and otherwise, it is infeasible. Because λ^* equals the y -coordinate of the lowest vertex in \mathcal{A} whose y -coordinate is feasible. We apply Lemma 1 to find this lowest vertex of \mathcal{A} by using Lemma 2 for the feasibility test. The proof of Lemma 2 is given in Section 3.1. Thus, the time complexity for computing λ^* is $O(m^2 n \log n \log mn)$.

Lemma 2. *Given any value $\lambda > 0$, we can decide whether $\lambda \geq \lambda^*$ in $O(m^2 n \log n)$ time.*

Theorem 1. *The bichromatic two-center problem can be solved in $O(m^2 n \log n \log mn)$ time.*

3.1 Proof of Lemma 2

Given any value $\lambda > 0$, the feasibility test aims to determine whether there are two points q_1 and q_2 on G so that $\max_{1 \leq i \leq k} \phi_i(q_1, q_2) \leq \lambda$. If yes, then $\lambda \geq \lambda^*$ so it is feasible, and otherwise, $\lambda < \lambda^*$ and it is infeasible.

Our strategy is to determine for every pair of edges, say (e_1, e_2) , whether there exist two points $q_1 \in e_1$ and $q_2 \in e_2$ so that $\max_{1 \leq i \leq k} \phi_i(q_1, q_2) \leq \lambda$. Note that e_1 might be same as e_2 for considering the case where q_1^* and q_2^* are on the same edge. Refer to the problem of determining the existence of such two points for a pair of edges as a *local feasibility test*.

Below, we shall present how to solve a local feasibility test: Given two edges $e_1, e_2 \in G$, our goal is to find two points $q_1 \in e_1$ and $q_2 \in e_2$ such that by assigning one vertex of each pair P_i to q_1 and the other to q_2 , the maximum (weighted) distance of each vertex to its assigned point is no more than λ .

We first present below that solving the local feasibility test is equivalent to solving the following geometric piercing problem: Let U be a set of axis-parallel rectangles in a box each sharing a vertex of the box, i.e., a set of quadrants. Let U_1, \dots, U_k be a set of subsets of $O(1)$ rectangles in U . The goal is to determine whether there is a point that pierces (or lies in) a rectangle in U_i for each $1 \leq i \leq k$.

Problem reduction. For each vertex v , solving $w(v)d(v, x) \leq \lambda$ for $x \in e_i$ with $1 \leq i \leq 2$ generates at most two disjoint closed intervals each of which includes an incident vertex of e_i ; we say that each obtained interval is a *feasible* interval of v on e_i . Suppose e_i is incident to vertex α_i and β_i . Let $I_1(v, e_i)$ and $I_2(v, e_i)$ represent v 's feasible intervals on e_i where $I_1(v, e_i)$ includes α_i and $I_2(v, e_i)$ includes β_i ; note that $I_1(v, e_i)$ or $I_2(v, e_i)$ may be null if only one interval or none is obtained by solving $w(v)d(v, x) \leq \lambda$ for $x \in e_i$.

Consider the x, y -coordinate plane where e_1 (resp., e_2) is on the positive side of x -axis (resp., y -axis) with α_1 (resp., α_2) at the origin. Let B be the intersection box (rectangle) of slabs $\{(x, y) | 0 \leq x \leq x(\beta_1)\}$ and $\{(x, y) | 0 \leq y \leq y(\beta_2)\}$.

For each pair $P_i = (v_i, u_i)$ of \mathcal{P} , consider the intersection of (vertical) slabs respectively containing v_i 's feasible intervals $I_1(e_1, v_i)$ and $I_2(e_1, v_i)$ on e_1 and (horizontal) slabs respectively containing u_i 's feasible intervals $I_1(e_2, u_i)$ and $I_2(e_2, u_i)$ on e_2 ; their intersection consists of four disjoint axis-parallel rectangles in B , each sharing a vertex with B . As illustrated in Fig. 2 (a), there exist two points $q_1 \leq e_1$ and $q_2 \leq e_2$ so that v_i is covered by q_1 and u_i is covered by q_2 (under λ) iff point $(x = x(q_1), y = y(q_2))$ pierces one of the intersection rectangles.

Consider the other assignment where v_i is assigned to the center on e_2 and u_i to the center on e_1 . Likewise, two points $q_1 \leq e_1$ and $q_2 \leq e_2$ exist such that $w(v_i)d(v_i, q_2) \leq \lambda$ and $w(u_i)d(u_i, q_1) \leq \lambda$ iff point $(x = x(q_1), y = y(q_2))$ pierces one of $O(1)$ disjoint two-sided intersection rectangles of slabs respectively containing v_i 's feasible intervals $I_1(e_2, v_i)$ and $I_2(e_2, v_i)$ on e_2 and horizontal slabs respectively containing u_i 's feasible intervals $I_1(e_1, u_i)$ and $I_2(e_1, u_i)$ on e_1 (see Fig. 2 (b)).

It should be mentioned that if v_i and u_i have no feasible intervals on e_1 (resp., e_2), then it is not likely to find two points $q_1 \in e_1$ and $q_2 \in e_2$ with $\phi_i(q_1, q_2) \leq \lambda$ and thereby, λ is infeasible.

Let U_i be the set of the $O(1)$ axis-parallel rectangles obtained for the two assignments of v_i and u_i . The above analysis implies that there are two points $q_1 \leq e_1$ and $q_2 \leq e_2$ with $\phi_i(q_1, q_2) \leq \lambda$ iff point $(x = x(q_1), y = y(q_2))$ pierces a rectangle in U_i for each $1 \leq i \leq k$. It follows that if there is a point in B that pierces a rectangle of U_i for each $1 \leq i \leq k$, then λ is feasible, and otherwise, λ is infeasible w.r.t. the two edges e_1 and e_2 .

As a result, each local feasibility test can be reduced to an instance of the geometric piercing problem, which asks whether there is a point in B that pierces at least one rectangle of U_i for each $1 \leq i \leq k$. Regarding to the reduction time, the feasible intervals of each vertex on any edge can be obtained in $O(1)$ time with the provided distance matrix; additionally, each rectangle set U_i can be obtained in $O(1)$ time. Hence, the reduction can be done in $O(n)$ time.

The geometric piercing problem is quite interesting since each geometric object is a set of multiple axis-parallel two-sided rectangles. To the best of our knowledge, no previous work exists for addressing this problem. We shall present below a sweeping algorithm for solving it in $O(n \log n)$ time.

3.1.1 Solving the geometric piercing problem

We say that a rectangle set U_i is hit by a point if it pierces a rectangle of U_i . Hence, the goal is to find a point (in box B) that hits set U_i for each $1 \leq i \leq k$.

Obviously, if all sets U_i 's can be hit by a point, then at least one such point is on the left side of a rectangle. Thus, our strategy is to sweep the plane by a vertical line h from left to right while determining whether such a point exists at each event where h encounters a rectangle.

Let $X = \{x_1, \dots, x_N\}$ be the x -coordinate sequence of vertical sides of B and all rectangles in U from left to right; clearly, $N = O(n)$. For each $1 \leq j \leq N$, let S_j be the intersection segment of line $x = x_j$ and box B where S_j 's upper endpoint is denoted by a_j and its lower endpoint is by b_j . For each $1 \leq i \leq k$, the intersection of line $x = x_j$ and (rectangles of) set U_i is null, a closed segment on S_j that includes a_j or b_j , or two disjoint closed segments on S_j which end respectively at a_j and b_j . A point piercing an intersection segment of line $x = x_j$ and each set U_i hits all sets U_i .

Instead, we consider the following problem to determine whether such a point on S_j exists or not. Let l_i be the complement segment of the intersection segment of S_j and U_i . l_i could be either of the following: S_j , an open segment on S_j , a half-open segment closing at either a_j or b_j , and null. See Fig. 3 for an example. We have the following observation.





Fig. 3. Illustrating Observation 3. U_t has three (bold) rectangles and $U_{t'}$ has two (non-bold) rectangles. The sweep line h intersects B at the (blue) line segment S_j . The dashed lines; v is a virtual point in its each hanging sub-complement segments of U_t and $U_{t'}$ on S_j are l_t and $l_{t'}$.

Observation 3 $\cup_{i=1}^k l_i = S_j$ iff no point of S_j hits sets U_i for all $1 \leq i \leq k$. If $\cup_{i=1}^k l_i \neq S_j$, then an endpoint of a complement segment hits all sets U_i 's.

Proof. Suppose no point on S_j hits all rectangle sets U_i . For any point q on S_j , there must be at least one set, say $U_{i'}$, so that q is not contained in its intersection segment(s) with S_j . It follows that every point of S_j is contained in a complement segment. Thus, $\cup_{i=1}^k l_i = S_j$. For the other direction, suppose $\cup_{i=1}^k l_i = S_j$. Every point of S_j is contained in a complement segment. It follows that no point on S_j hits sets U_i for all $1 \leq i \leq t$. This proves the first statement.

If $\cup_{i=1}^k l_i \neq S_j$, an endpoint of the intersection segment(s) between a rectangle set and S_j hits all sets U_i ; this endpoint is also an endpoint of the complement segment of the rectangle set on S_j . Hence, the second statement is true. \square

Observation 3 implies that for each $1 \leq j \leq N$, determining whether there is a point on S_j that hits sets U_i for all $1 \leq i \leq k$ is equivalent to determine whether $\cup_{i=1}^n l_i = S_j$.

In fact, for each $1 \leq j \leq N$, the complement segment l_i of set U_i on S_j is the intersection of line $x = x_j$ (or S_j) and the complement area of rectangles of U_i in box B . Because each U_i consists of at most eight axis-parallel rectangles in B , each sharing a vertex with B . The complement area of U_i in B consists of $O(1)$ disjoint rectilinear polygons each with $O(1)$ sides such that all their sides except those in B 's boundary are open and no vertical line intersects more than one of them. Consequently, as sweeping h from left to right, there will be $O(1)$ distinct complement segments for each U_i on the intersection segment between B and h . Denote by \mathcal{L} the set of the $O(1)$ complement segments of set U_i for all $1 \leq i \leq k$. The above analysis and observation 3 imply the following observation.

Observation 4 If all sets U_i can be hit by a point of B , then an endpoint of a segment in \mathcal{L} must hit all sets U_i .

There is no point in box B hitting all sets U_i iff every point of B is in the complement area of a rectangle set. It follows that no point of B hits all sets U_i iff the measure of the union of all complement polygons of sets U_i is equal to B 's. It seems that the algorithms [7,19] for the 2D Klee's measure problem, which asks for the measure of the union of axis-parallel rectangles, can be adapted to compute the measure of their union after decomposing every polygon into $O(1)$ axis-parallel rectangles. However, every complement polygon in our problem might be open at its sides. Hence, the 2D Klee's measure algorithms cannot be adapted to solve our problem.

Now we are ready to describe our sweeping algorithm for solving this geometric piercing problem.

Preprocessing. We first compute the sequence X as well as sequences $Y = \{y_1, \dots, y_M\}$, $I_{in} = \{I_{in}^1, \dots, I_{in}^N\}$, and $I_{out} = \{I_{out}^1, \dots, I_{out}^N\}$, where Y is the ascending order of y -coordinates of endpoints of segments in \mathcal{L} , and each

I_{in}^t (resp., I_{out}^t) stores the indices of all rectangle sets U_i that contain rectangles with the left (resp., right) side on line $x = x_j$. Clearly, $M = O(n)$, $\cup_{t=1}^N |I_{in}^t| = O(k)$ and $\cup_{t=1}^N |I_{out}^t| = O(k)$; the four sequences can be obtained in $O(n \log n)$ time.

Furthermore, we construct a balanced binary search tree Γ on Y to maintain the event status when the sweeping line h intersects a line $x = x'$: letting S' be the intersection segment between h and box B , the number of complement segments on S' of sets U_i that contain the point on S' of y -coordinate equal y_t for each $y_t \in Y$, and the minimum of such attributes for all points defined by Y on S' . (Because a point of y -coordinate in Y must hit all sets U_i if all sets U_i can be hit by a point of B .)

In details, all y -coordinates of Y are stored in the leaf level as keys from left to right in order. Each leaf node u stores another attribute η , which is the number of complement segments on S' including the point on S' of y -coordinate equal to its key, denoted by $key(u)$. Every internal node u is attached two attributes: The smallest key $key(u)$ and the smallest η among all nodes in the subtree Γ_u rooted at u . All attributes η are initialized as zero.

In addition, Γ supports two operations: The *range-addition* operation which is adding a given value to attributes η in leaves of keys within a given range, and the *minimum* query for the minimum η over the whole tree (or all leaves). To achieve a logarithmic-time updating, we apply the lazy propagation mechanism [13,14] to Γ (so as to avoid updating all nodes of keys within the given range at once): Each node u contains an extra attribute $z(u)$ such that when $z(u) \neq 0$, an addition of $z(u)$ needs to be applied to attribute η of each (leaf) node in Γ_u (and u is a *lazy* node); $z(u)$ is set as zero at the beginning.

Clearly, Γ is of size $O(n)$ and height $O(\log n)$; provided with Y , the construction can be finished in $O(n)$ time. In the following, to distinguish the status of Γ at different events, we denote by $\Gamma(x')$ the status of Γ when h intersects a line $x = x'$.

The algorithm. Sweep the plane by the vertical line h from left to right. For each $x_j \in X$, h halts at the event of h intersecting line $x = x_j$. For each event, we first determine the status $\Gamma(x_j)$ of Γ and then decide whether $\cup_{i=1}^k l_i = S_j$ by performing a minimum query on $\Gamma(x_j)$. If the obtained value is zero, then a point of S_j is not contained in any complement segment on S_j , so a point of S_j hits all sets U_i ; otherwise, by observation 3, we have $\cup_{i=1}^k l_i = S_j$. More details of handling each event are as follows:

- h intersects line $x = x_1$: $I_{out}^1 = \emptyset$. For each index $i \in I_{in}^1$, we first compute the complement segment l_i of U_i on S_1 in constant time, and then perform a range-addition operation on Γ to add 1 to attribute η of every leaf of key in the y -coordinate range of l_i (namely, inserting a new segment that covers each point on S_1 of y -coordinate in the y -coordinate range of l_i). Clearly, computing $\Gamma(x_1)$ takes $O(|I_{in}^1| \log n)$ time. Afterward, we perform a minimum query on $\Gamma(x_1)$ in $O(1)$ time. If it is zero, then a point on S_1 hits all sets U_i so we terminate the algorithm, and otherwise, we continue the sweeping.

It should be mentioned that $\Gamma(x_1)$ is consistent with the status $\Gamma(x')$ for any $x_1 < x' < x_2$.

- h intersects line $x = x_j$ with $1 < j < N$. Γ 's current status is consistent with its status for h in slab $x_{j-1} < x < x_j$. Recall that only set U_t for each $t \in I_{in}^j$ contains rectangles whose left sides are in line $x = x_j$ (namely, h enters some rectangles of U_t at line $x = x_j$). To determine $\Gamma(x_j)$, for each $t \in I_{in}^j$, we compute the complement segment l'_t of U_t on a vertical line $x = x'$ with $x_{j-1} < x' < x_j$, as well as its complement segment l_t on S_j . Next, for each $t \in I_{in}^j$, we first decrement attributes η of leaves with keys in the y -coordinate range of l'_t and then increment attributes η in leaves with keys in the y -coordinate range of l_t , which can be carried out in $O(\log n)$ time by performing two range-addition operations on Γ . This derives $\Gamma(x_j)$ and the running time is $O(|I_{in}^j| \log n)$.

We proceed to perform a minimum query on Γ to determine whether $\cup_{i=1}^k l_i = S_j$. If the obtained value equals zero, then a point on S_j hits all sets U_i so we immediately return. Otherwise, we proceed to determine the status $\Gamma(x')$ for any $x_j < x' < x_{j+1}$ by processing each set U_t with $t \in I_{out}^j$. (Recall that each set U_t with $t \in I_{out}^j$ contain a rectangle whose right side is in line $x = x_j$ so h is leaving a rectangle.)

For each $t \in I_{out}^j$, we compute the complement segment l_t of set U_t on S_j , and perform a range-addition operation to decrement attribute η of each leaf of key in the y -coordinate range of l_t ; next, we compute

its complement segment l_t'' on the intersection segment between B and line $x = x'$ for any $x' \in (x_j, x_{j+1})$, followed by executing a range-addition operation to increment attribute η of each leaf of key in the y -coordinate range of l_t'' .

The overall running time for handling such event is $O((|I_{in}^j| + |I_{out}^j|) \log n)$.

- h intersects line $x = x_N$: Because $\Gamma(x_N)$ is consistent with $\Gamma(x')$ for any $x_{N-1} < x' < x_N$, which is the current status of Γ . We perform a minimum query on Γ . If it is zero then a point on S_N hits sets U_i . Otherwise, no point in box B (including its boundaries) hits sets U_i (so the union of complement rectilinear polygons of sets U_i in B is exactly box B).

It remains to show how to perform on Γ a range-addition operation with lazy propagation and a query for the minimum attribute η of Γ .

- Range-addition. Given any range γ and value c , the goal is to add value c to attribute η of each leaf with key in γ while updating attribute η of necessary internal nodes. Let u_a and u_b be the two leaves whose keys are the boundary values of γ with $\text{key}(u_a) \leq \text{key}(u_b)$. First, we locate the lowest common ancestor $\text{lcs}(u_a, u_b)$ of u_a and u_b , where the searching path for u_a and u_b starts to split. During the searching for $\text{lcs}(a, b)$, for each node u encountered, we check if $z(u) \neq 0$. If so, then an addition of $z(u)$ needs to be applied to attribute η of all nodes in subtree Γ_u ; but with the lazy propagation, we ‘push down’ this update only to its children by adding $z(u)$ to attribute η of u and attribute $z(u')$ of its each child u' ; last, we reset $z(u)$ of u as zero.

Once we arrives at $\text{lcs}(u_a, u_b)$, we continue to search for u_a in the subtree rooted at its left child u_L , and then find u_b in the one rooted at its right child u_R . During the traversal on Γ_{u_L} , for each node, we first push down the update to its children and then decide the searching direction for u_a . Note that after arriving u_a , every node on the searching path of u_a is not lazy. This means that the current value $z(u')$ in any lazy child node u' of nodes on this path is the sum of all previous addends to attribute η of every node in the subtree rooted at u' ; it follows that $z(u')$ plus the current value of η in u' is the up-to-date value of η after all prior updates.

Furthermore, during the traceback from u_a to u_L , we perform an addition of value c to necessary nodes in range γ (with lazy propagation). More specifically, for node u_a , if γ is closed at $\text{key}(u_a)$, then we add value c to η of u_a . For every other node u , we find its child u' of key larger than $\text{key}(u_a)$ and add c to $z(u')$ (in that the key of every leaf in $\Gamma_{u'}$ is in range γ). We then perform a push-down operation at each child of u followed by setting attribute η of u as the minimum η of its children. Note that the current value η of u is the minimum η over subtree Γ_u as all previous additions including value c have been properly made to relevant nodes in Γ_u since values η of u 's child nodes are up to date after the above push-down operations at them.

For u_b , we perform a similar routine in the subtree Γ_{u_R} . After that, we traverse back to the root from $\text{lcs}(u_a, u_b)$, during which for each node, we apply a push-down operation at its each child and then reset its attribute η as the minimum η of its children. Clearly, the running time is $O(\log n)$.

- The minimum query. Because the (global) minimum of attributes η in Γ is always well maintained at its root. The minimum query can be answered in $O(1)$ time.

Recall that our sweeping algorithm processes each event of h intersecting line $x = x_j$ for each $x_j \in X$ in $O((|I_{in}^j| + |I_{out}^j|) \log n)$ time. Due to $\bigcup_{t=1}^N |I_{in}^t| = O(n)$ and $\bigcup_{t=1}^N |I_{out}^t| = O(n)$, including the preprocessing work, we can determine whether there is a point in B hitting all sets U_i in $O(n \log n)$ time.

Lemma 3. *The geometric piercing problem can be solved in $O(n \log n)$ time.*

Notice that if there is a point on S_j for some $1 \leq j \leq N$ hitting all sets U_i , then such a point on S_j can be found in $O(n \log n)$ time. Recall that to decide whether sets U_i can be hit by a point of B , it is equivalent to determine whether the measure of the union of complement polygons of sets U_i in box B is equal to B 's. Thus, our algorithm can be adapted to solve this union-measure problem.

3.1.2 Wrapping things up

Recall that any local feasibility test, which is to determine for two given edges e_1, e_2 of G whether two points $q_1 \in e_1$ and $q_2 \in e_2$ exist so that $\max_{i=1}^k \phi_i(q_1, q_2) \leq \lambda$, can be reduced to an instance of the above geometric piercing problem. If a point is returned (which hits all sets U_i), then λ is feasible and q_1 (resp., q_2) is at the perpendicular projection of that point onto e_1 (resp., e_2) in the x -axis (resp., y -axis). Otherwise, λ is infeasible w.r.t. edges e_1, e_2 . Because computing the rectangle set U_i for each pair $P_i \in \mathcal{P}$ (i.e., the reduction) can be done in $O(n)$ time with the provided distance matrix of G . We have the following lemma.

Lemma 4. *The local feasibility test can be solved in $O(n \log n)$ time.*

To decide the feasibility of λ , we perform a local feasibility test for every pair of edges in E including pairs each containing same edges. If λ is infeasible w.r.t. every pair of edges, then λ is infeasible for the problem. Thus, the running time of the feasibility test is $O(m^2 n \log n)$. We finish the proof of Lemma 2.

4 The problem on a tree

In this section, we present a faster algorithm for the problem on a vertex-weighted tree graph, and then give a linear-time result for the unweighted tree version.

In the following, we use T to represent the given tree. Assume that the distance matrix of T is not given. To realize a constant-time computation for distance, as preprocessing, we construct in linear time the range-minima data structure [5,6] for T so that given any two vertices, their lowest common ancestor can be known in constant time. Then, we compute and maintain the distance between the root and every vertex of T . With these information, the distance between any two points of T can be obtained in $O(1)$ time.

We first present our feasibility test that is to determine for any given λ , whether there exist two points q_1 and q_2 on T with $\max_{i=1}^k \phi_i(q_1, q_2) \leq \lambda$.

4.1 The feasibility test

For any point q of T , removing q from T generates several disjoint subtrees and each of them is a *split* subtree of q . Additionally, q and each of its split subtrees induces a *hanging* subtree of q where q is considered as a virtual point. The terminologies are illustrated in Fig. 4.

Our algorithm traverses T to place two centers q_1 and q_2 such that q_1 (resp., q_2) covers all vertices in a hanging subtree of q_1 (resp., q_2) which cannot be covered by any point out of this subtree, where the two hanging subtrees of q_1 and q_2 have no common vertices. Our proof shows that λ is feasible iff such two centers lead an objective value no more than λ .

Set any leaf of T as its root. At first, we attach an attribute $z(u)$ with each vertex u where $z(u)$ is the distance of the furthest point to u not in subtree T_u that covers (all vertices of) T_u , and initialize it as zero. Then we traverse T in the post-order from its root to place the first center as follows.

For each vertex u , assuming u 's children are c_1, \dots, c_s , we update $z(u)$ as the minimum of $\lambda/w(u)$ and values $z(c_i) - l(e(c_i, u))$ for all $1 \leq i \leq s$. Note that $z(c_i) - l(e(c_i, u)) > 0$ for each $1 \leq i \leq s$ since no centers have been placed yet. Now, $z(u)$ is the distance of the furthest point to u not in T_u that covers T_u .

We then determine whether a center must be placed on edge $e(u, u')$ between u and its parent u' . Clearly, if $z(u) - l(e(u, u')) > 0$ then then a point outside of $T_{u'}$ can cover T_u so we continue our traversal; otherwise, we place a center on $e(u, u')$ at the point at distance $z(u)$ to u to cover T_u and most vertices in T/T_u .

Once the first center is placed on T , assuming it is q_1 , we continue our traversal while determining for each vertex v whether it can be covered by q_1 instead. If yes, then λ is feasible due to $\max_{i=1}^k \phi_i(q_1, q_1) \leq \lambda$. Otherwise, at least two centers are needed to cover all vertices of T under λ .

Suppose q_1 is on the edge $e(\alpha_1, \beta_1)$ so that q_1 is known to cover T_{α_1} (rather than T/T_{α_1}). Proceed to traverse subtree T/T_{α_1} starting from its root β_1 to place the second center q_2 as the above. Clearly, the running time for placing q_1 and q_2 is $O(n)$.

Suppose q_2 is on the edge $e(\alpha_2, \beta_2)$ and it is known to cover T_{α_2} . Now we visit each pair $P_i \in \mathcal{P}$ to determine whether $\max_{i=1}^k \phi_i(q_1, q_2) \leq \lambda$. If yes, λ is feasible. Otherwise, $\max_{i=1}^k \phi_i(q_1, q_2) > \lambda$, and by the following lemma, λ is infeasible.

Observation 5 *If $\max_{i=1}^n \phi_i(q_1, q_2) > \lambda$, then λ is infeasible.*

Proof. By the definition, there must be a pair, say $P_{i'} = (u_{i'}, v_{i'})$, so that $\phi_{i'}(q_1, q_2) > \lambda$. Based on the locations of $u_{i'}$ and $v_{i'}$, we prove the truth of the statement for each case as follows. Note that it is not likely that $u_{i'} \in T_{\alpha_1}$ and $v_{i'} \in T_{\alpha_2}$ since otherwise, $\phi_{i'}(q_1, q_2) \leq \lambda$.

On the one hand, $u_{i'}$ and $v_{i'}$ are in the same subtree of T_{α_1} and T_{α_2} . Recall that $T_{\alpha_1} \cap T_{\alpha_2} = \emptyset$. Suppose they belong to T_{α_1} . Then, q_2 covers neither of the two vertices. Let v' be any vertex of T_{α_2} that determines q_2 . Clearly, no point of T can cover both v' and $u_{i'}$ (resp., $v_{i'}$) under λ . Hence, λ is infeasible. The proof is similar for the case where $u_{i'}, v_{i'} \in T_{\alpha_2}$.

On the other hand, either $u_{i'}$ or $v_{i'}$ is in subtree $T/(T_{\alpha_1} \cup T_{\alpha_2})$. Due to $\phi_{i'}(q_1, q_2) > \lambda$, the one of them that is in $T/(T_{\alpha_1} \cup T_{\alpha_2})$ can be covered by neither of q_1 and q_2 under λ . So, at least three centers are needed to cover all vertices under λ . It implies that λ is infeasible.

Thus, the observation holds. \square

Recall that such two centers can be found in $O(n)$ time; the objective value w.r.t. them can be computed in linear time. Thus, the following lemma is derived.

Lemma 5. *The feasibility test can be done in $O(n)$ time.*

4.2 The algorithm

Our algorithm consists of two phases: In the first phase, we find the two edges $e(\alpha_1^*, \beta_1^*)$ and $e(\alpha_2^*, \beta_2^*)$ that respectively consist of q_1^* and q_2^* . In the second phase, we compute λ^* as well as centers q_1^* and q_2^* .

Phase 1. Compute the *centroid* c of T in linear time, which is a node of T so that its hanging subtrees each with size no more than $\frac{2}{3}$ of T 's. Apply Lemma 6 to c to find in linear time the hanging subtrees of c that contains q_1^* and q_2^* , respectively. The proof of Lemma 6 is given below. We recursively apply Lemma 6 to the subtree containing q_1^* (resp., q_2^*) to find edge $e(\alpha_1^*, \beta_1^*)$ (resp., $e(\alpha_2^*, \beta_2^*)$). Clearly, the two edges can be obtained after $O(\log n)$ recursive steps; so the running time is $O(n \log n)$.

Lemma 6. *Given any vertex u of T , we can find its hanging subtrees respectively containing q_1^* and q_2^* in $O(n)$ time.*

Proof. Let T_1, T_2, \dots, T_s represent u 's hanging subtrees. Note that u is a virtual vertex in each T_i . Define τ_i as $\max_{v \in T_i} w(v)d(v, u)$ for each $1 \leq i \leq s$. Without loss of generality, suppose $\tau_1 \geq \tau_2 \geq \dots \geq \tau_s$. Clearly, $\lambda^* \leq \tau_1$.

We claim that any T_i with $\tau_i < \tau_2$ does not contain centers. Suppose T_i is such a subtree but contains a center. If no vertex in $T_1 \cup T_2$ is assigned to the center in T_i , then $\lambda^* \geq \tau_2$; if so, this center in T_i can be moved to u without increasing the objective value. Hence, the claim is true.

By the claim, we consider only the following cases for locating q_1^* and q_2^* .

- $\tau_1 > \tau_2 = \tau_3$. Clearly, a center, say q_1^* , must be placed in T_1 in order to achieve an objective value smaller than τ_1 . We claim $\lambda^* \geq \tau_2$. For any subtree T_i with $\tau_i = \tau_2$, if one of its vertices that determine τ_i is assigned to q_1^* , then $\lambda^* > \tau_2$. Otherwise, vertices in each subtree T_i with $\tau_i = \tau_2$ that determine τ_i are all assigned to q_2^* , so $\lambda^* \geq \tau_2$. So, the claim is true.
Clearly, q_2^* must be placed in $T_1 \cup \{u\}$ in order to minimize its maximum distance to T_1 's vertices. Note that by applying the feasibility test to $\lambda = \tau_2$, we can determine whether $\lambda^* = \tau_2$ or not in linear time.
- $\tau_1 = \tau_2 = \tau_3$: If a vertex in T_i with $\tau_i = \tau_1$ that determines τ_i is covered by a center not at u , then the objective value must be larger than τ_1 . Clearly, to minimize the objective value, two centers can be placed at u , which means $\lambda^* = \tau_1$.

- $\tau_1 = \tau_2 > \tau_3$: Suppose there is a pair where its vertices are all in T_1 (resp., T_2), and their minimum (weighted) distance to u is τ_1 . Then, we have $\lambda^* = \tau_1$. It is because a vertex in such a pair must be covered by the same center together with a vertex in T_2 (resp., T_1) that determines τ_2 (resp., τ_1). Thus, both centers can be placed at u . Clearly, the existence of such a pair can be determined in linear time. In general, there is no such pairs. In order to achieve a smaller objective value than τ_1 , q_1^* (resp., q_2^*) must be placed in T_1 (resp., T_2) and the vertices of T_1 (resp., T_2) leading τ_1 (resp., τ_2) must be assigned to q_1^* (resp., q_2^*).
- $\tau_1 > \tau_2 > \tau_3$: By the above claim, no centers are in T_i with $i > 2$. If there is a pair where its vertices are in T_1 and their minimum (weighted) distance to u equals τ_1 , then both centers are in T_1 due to $\lambda^* \leq \tau_1$. Otherwise, no such pairs exist, so at least one center, say q_1^* , must be placed in T_1 to cover at least those vertices of T_1 determining τ_1 . Moreover, if T_2 contains a pair where the minimum (weighted) distance of its vertices to u equals τ_2 , then $\lambda^* > \tau_2$ since one of its vertices is covered by q_1^* . If so, both centers can be placed in T_1 to minimize the maximum (weighted) distance of vertices in T_1 to q_2^* . Otherwise, no such pairs are in T_2 . A feasibility test is then applied to τ_2 . If $\lambda^* \leq \tau_2$ then q_2^* is in $T_2 \cup \{u\}$. Otherwise, $\lambda^* > \tau_2$, so both centers are in T_1 .

Consequently, for each above case, the hanging subtrees of u respectively containing q_1^* and q_2^* can be determined in linear time. Additionally, values τ_i for all $1 \leq i \leq s$ can be determined in $O(n)$ time by traversing each hanging subtree of u . Thus, the lemma holds. \square

Phase 2. We form $y = w(u)d(u, x)$ for each vertex u respectively with respect to $x \in e(a_1^*, \beta_1^*)$ and $x \in e(a_2^*, \beta_2^*)$ in the x, y -coordinate plane, which can be done in $O(n)$ time. As stated in Section 2, λ^* belongs to the set of y -coordinates of intersections between the $O(n)$ distance functions. With the assistance of our feasibility test, Lemma 1 can be applied to find that intersection in $O((n + \tau) \log n)$ time, where τ is the time of our feasibility test. Hence, we have the following theorem.

Theorem 2. *The bichromatic two-center problem on trees can be solved in $O(n \log n)$ time.*

4.3 The unweighted case

In the unweighted case, the weights of vertices in the given tree T are all same. Without loss of generality, we assume that each vertex is of weight one.

Recall that some vertices of the given tree may not be in any given pair, and for the weighted version, we first preprocess the input graph to reduce the problem into an instance where every vertex of the obtained graph is paired. Instead, for the unweighted tree version, we preprocess the given tree as follows: Traverse the given tree in the post-order to iteratively remove its leaves until its every leaf is in a pair of the given set \mathcal{P} . This generates a subtree of T of size no more than n where every leaf is in a pair of \mathcal{P} . Clearly, solving the problem on this obtained subtree w.r.t. \mathcal{P} is equivalent to solving the problem on the given tree w.r.t. \mathcal{P} . With a little abuse of notation, let T represent the obtained subtree.

Let q^* be the center of T and ϵ^* be the optimal one-center objective value. As proved in [12], q^* is the (common) midpoint of the longest path(s) of T and ϵ^* is the longest path length. Since any longest path of T is between two leaves and every leaf is in a pair of \mathcal{P} , $\lambda^* \leq \epsilon^*$. Additionally, we have the following observation.

Observation 6 q_1^* (resp., q_2^*) is at the (common) midpoint of the longest path(s) between two vertices assigned to q_1^* (resp., q_2^*); $2\lambda^*$ equals the maximum length of the two longest paths respectively for q_1^* and q_2^* .

Proof. Let T' be the minimum subtree of T that contains all vertices assigned to q_1^* in an optimal solution. Every leaf of T' is assigned to q_1^* but an internal node might be assigned to q_2^* or not in any pair of \mathcal{P} . Each longest path of T' is between two leaves; if there are multiple longest paths then these paths must share the same midpoint. Clearly, the maximum distance from vertices assigned to q_1^* to this (common) midpoint is

minimized over T' (or T) since the distance from an endpoint of a longest path to any other point of T' (or T) is larger than half of the longest path. Hence, q_1^* is at this midpoint, and any vertices of T' except for the endpoints (leaves) of its longest paths are not relevant to q_1^* .

The proof for q_2^* is similar. It follows that $2\lambda^*$ equals the maximum length of two longest paths respectively determining q_1^* and q_2^* . Thus, the observation holds. \square

We say that a vertex is a *key* vertex of q^* if its distance to q^* equals to ϵ^* (i.e., if it is an endpoint of the longest path of T). Every key vertex of q^* is a leaf of T , and q^* has at least two hanging subtrees each of which contains at least one of its key vertices.

As explained in the proof of Lemma 6, $\lambda^* = \epsilon^*$ if either of the two conditions satisfies: (1) q^* has more than two hanging subtrees such that each of them contains a key vertex of q^* ; (2) a hanging subtree of q^* contains a pair in \mathcal{P} whose both vertices are key vertices of q^* . In general, neither of two conditions satisfies so $\lambda^* < \epsilon^*$.

Denote by T_1 and T_2 the two hanging subtrees of q^* containing its key vertices. Due to $\lambda^* < \epsilon^*$, T_1 and T_2 each contains a center; assume $q_1^* \in T_1$ and $q_2^* \in T_2$. Let T_1^* be the minimum subtree of T induced by all vertices assigned to q_1^* in an optimal solution, and T_2^* be the minimum subtree by all vertices assigned to q_2^* . We have the following observation.

Observation 7 *Each longest path of T_1^* (resp., T_2^*) ends with a key vertex of q^* in T_1 (resp., T_2) and each key vertex of q^* in T_1 (resp., T_2) is an endpoint of a longest path of T_1^* (resp., T_2^*).*

Proof. Below we focus on the proof for T_1^* since the proof for T_2^* is similar. Due to $\lambda^* < \epsilon^*$, all key vertices of q^* in T_1 must be assigned to $q_1^* \in T_1$ so they are leaves of T_1^* .

Assume q^* is the root of T . Let u' be the lowest common ancestor of all key vertices of q^* in T_1 . Note that each key vertex of q^* in T_1 is of the same distance to u' (since they are the furthest vertices of q^*), and u' is in T_1^* . Clearly, the longest path of T_1^* is at least as long as the path(s) between q^* 's key vertices in T_1 . Denote by δ the path length between q^* 's key vertices in T_1 . Note that $\delta = 0$ iff. q^* has only one key vertex in T_1 .

Suppose the longest path of T_1^* is of length equal to δ , which means that q^* has multiple key vertices in T_1 (or $T_{u'}$). So, u' must be the common midpoint of all longest paths of T_1^* . Hence, each key vertex of q^* in T_1 is an endpoint of a longest path of T_1^* . In addition, each key vertex of q^* in $T_{u'}$ is further to u' than any vertex of $T_{u'}$ that is not a key vertex of q^* ; the path of any two vertices in $T/T_{u'}$ does not contain u' . So, each longest path of T_1^* must end with a key vertex of q^* in T_1 ($T_{u'}$). Thus, the statement is true.

Suppose the longest path of T_1^* is of length larger than δ . This implies that each longest path of T_1^* must end with a vertex in $T/T_{u'}$. Let v be any vertex of T_1^* in $T/T_{u'}$. We claim that each key vertex of q^* in $T_{u'}$ (or T_1) is v 's furthest vertex in T_1^* . If v is T/T_1 , then each key vertex of q^* in $T_{u'}$ is v 's furthest vertex in T and thereby, in T_1^* . Otherwise, v is $T_1/T_{u'}$. If each key vertex of q^* in $T_{u'}$ is not the furthest vertex of v in T_1^* , then v 's furthest vertex in T_1^* is not in $T_{u'}$. If so, the path between v 's furthest vertex and each key vertex of q^* in T_1 is longer than v 's path to its furthest vertex. Hence, the claim is true. This implies that the statement is true.

It should be mentioned that for either of the above cases, q_1^* must be on the path between u' and q^* since the key vertices of q^* in T_1 are furthest to q^* than any other vertex of T_1^* .

For T_2^* , the proof is similar so we omit the details. Thus, the observation holds. \square

Let α (resp., β) be any key vertex of q^* in T_1 (resp., T_2). Observation 6 and Observation 7 imply the following lemma.

Lemma 7. *There is an optimal solution where the assignment for each pair P_i is determined by $\phi_i(\alpha, \beta)$ so that q_1^* (resp., q_2^*) is the center of all vertices assigned to α (resp., β).*

Proof. By Observation 6 and Observation 7, our problem indeed asks for a partition on each pair (v_i, u_i) so as to minimize the maximum length of the longest paths respectively to any key vertex of q^* in T_1 and any key vertex of q^* in T_2 . Thus, the lemma holds. \square

Now we are ready to present our algorithm: First, traverse T in the post-order while iteratively removing its leaves that are not in any pair of \mathcal{P} , which can be done in $O(n)$ time. Second, compute q^* and ϵ^* in $O(n)$ time [12]. Then, apply Lemma 6 to determine whether $\lambda^* = \epsilon^*$. If yes, then q_1^* and q_2^* are at q^* and for each pair $P_i \in \mathcal{P}$, we assign any one of its vertices to q_1^* and the other to q_2^* . Otherwise, we obtain exactly two hanging subtrees T_1 and T_2 of q^* , which contain key vertices of q^* .

Pick a key vertex of q^* from each of the two subtrees; denote them by α and β . Proceed to determine in $O(1)$ time the optimal assignment of vertices in each pair by letting $q_1 = \alpha$ and $q_2 = \beta$. Last, we find in linear time the longest path between α and a vertex assigned to q_1 as well as the longest path between β and a vertex assigned to q_2 . λ^* equals the half of the maximum length of the two longest paths, and q_1^* and q_2^* are respectively at their midpoints. Thus, we have the following theorem.

Theorem 3. *The unweighted bichromatic two-center problem on trees can be solved in $O(n)$ time.*

5 Conclusion

The weighted two-center problem on trees can be solved in linear time by a prune-and-search algorithm [3]. However, our result for the bichromatic version on a vertex-weighted tree is $O(n \log n)$. So, can we adapt the prune-and-search mechanism or extend our linear-time approach for the unweighted case to solve our weighted case in linear time?

Recall that our Lemma 6 finds one or two (disjoint) subtrees that contain centers. To apply the prune-and-search mechanism, we need to determine the optimal assignment for some pairs whose both vertices are not in the subtree(s) containing centers in order to find and prune vertices assigned to q_1^* that are not relevant to q_1^* . Let (v_i, u_i) be such a pair. Even though v_i is known to have a larger weighted distance at either center than u_i , without knowing q_1^* and q_2^* , it is not clear which assignment for two vertices leads a smaller objective value.

In addition, since the key vertices of the weighted center of the tree might not be relevant to λ^* , we cannot apply Lemma 7 to determine the optimal assignment for each pair. Hence, it seems not likely to extend the prune-and-search scheme or our linear-time framework for the unweighted case to solve the weighted version. An open question is whether one can solve the bichromatic two-center problem on a vertex-weighted tree in linear time.

References

1. Arkin, E.M., Díaz-Báñez, J.M., Hurtado, F., Kumar, P., Mitchell, J.S., Palop, B., Pérez-Lantero, P., Saumell, M., Silveira, R.I.: Bichromatic 2-center of pairs of points. *Computational Geometry: Theory and Applications* **48**(2), 94–107 (2015). <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.comgeo.2014.08.004>
2. Banik, A., Bhattacharya, B., Das, S., Kameda, T., Song, Z.: The p -center problem in tree networks revisited. In: *Proc. of the 15th Scandinavian Symposium and Workshops on Algorithm Theory*. pp. 6:1–15 (2016). <https://doi.org/10.4230/LIPIcs.SWAT.2016.6>
3. Ben-Moshe, B., Bhattacharya, B., Shi, Q.: An optimal algorithm for the continuous/discrete weighted 2-center problem in trees. In: *Proc. of the 7th Latin American conference on Theoretical Informatics*. pp. 166–177 (2006). https://doi.org/10.1007/11682462_19
4. Ben-Moshe, B., Bhattacharya, B., Shi, Q., Tamar, A.: Efficient algorithms for center problems in cactus networks. *Theoretical Computer Science* **378**, 237–252 (2007). <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tcs.2007.02.033>
5. Bender, M., Farach-Colton, M.: The LCA problem revisited. In: *Proc. of the 4th Latin American Symposium on Theoretical Informatics*. pp. 88–94 (2000). https://doi.org/10.1007/10719839_9
6. Bender, M., Farach-Colton, M.: The level ancestor problem simplified. *Theoretical Computer Science* **321**, 5–12 (2004). <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tcs.2003.05.002>
7. Bentley, J., Ottmann, T.: Algorithms for reporting and counting geometric intersections. *IEEE Transactions on Computers* **28**(9), 643–647 (1979). <https://doi.org/10.1109/TC.1979.1675432>
8. Bhattacharya, B., Shi, Q.: Improved algorithms to network p -center location problems. *Computational Geometry: Theory and Applications* **47**(2), 307–315 (2014). <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.comgeo.2009.07.003>

9. Carmi, P., Katz, M.J., Morin, P.: Stabbing pairwise intersecting disks by four points. *Discrete & Computational Geometry* **70**(4), 1751–1784 (2023). <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00454-023-00567-0>
10. Chen, D., Wang, H.: A note on searching line arrangements and applications. *Information Processing Letters* **113**, 518–521 (2013). <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ipl.2013.04.011>
11. Ding, H., Xu, J.: Solving the chromatic cone clustering problem via minimum spanning sphere. In: *Proc. of the 38th International Colloquium on Automata, Languages, and Programming (ICALP)*. pp. 773–784 (2011). https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-22006-7_65
12. Halfin, S.: On finding the absolute and vertex centers of a tree with distances. *Transportation Science* **8**(1), 75–77 (1974). <https://doi.org/10.1287/trsc.8.1.75>
13. Halim, S., Halim, F.: *Competitive Programming 3: The New Lower Bound of Programming Contests*. Lulu.com (2013)
14. Ibtehaz, N., Kaykobad, M., Sohel Rahman, M.: Multidimensional segment trees can do range updates in poly-logarithmic time. *Theoretical Computer Science* **854**, 30–43 (2021). <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tcs.2020.11.034>
15. Kariv, O., Hakimi, S.: An algorithmic approach to network location problems. I: The p -centers. *SIAM Journal on Applied Mathematics* **37**(3), 513–538 (1979). <https://doi.org/10.1137/0137040>
16. Löffler, M., Kreveld, M.: Largest bounding box, smallest diameter, and related problems on imprecise points. *Computational Geometry* **43**(4), 419–433 (2010). <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.comgeo.2009.03.007>
17. Megiddo, N.: Linear-time algorithms for linear programming in R^3 and related problems. *SIAM Journal on Computing* **12**(4), 759–776 (1983). <https://doi.org/10.1109/SFCS.1982.24>
18. Nussbaum, D.: Rectilinear p -piercing problems. In: *Proc. of the 1997 International Symposium on Symbolic and Algebraic Computation*. pp. 316–323 (1997). <https://doi.org/10.1145/258726.258828>
19. Preparata, F.P., Shamos, M.I.: *Computational Geometry: An Introduction*. Springer-Verlag, New York (1985). <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4612-1098-6>
20. Sharir, M., Welzl, E.: Rectilinear and polygonal p -piercing and p -center problems. In: *Proc. of the Twelfth Annual Symposium on Computational Geometry*. pp. 122–132 (1996). <https://doi.org/10.1145/237218.237255>
21. Wang, H., Xue, J.: Improved algorithms for the bichromatic two-center problem for pairs of points. *Computational Geometry: Theory and Applications* **98**, 117–140 (2022). <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.comgeo.2021.101806>
22. Wang, H., Zhang, J.: An $o(n \log n)$ -time algorithm for the k -center problem in trees. *SIAM Journal on Computing (SICOMP)* **50**(2), 602–635 (2021). <https://doi.org/10.1137/18M1196522>