

On the Complexity of Maximal/Closed Frequent Tree Mining for Bounded Height Trees

Kenta Komoto Kazuhiro Kurita Hirotaka Ono

Abstract

In this paper, we address the problem of enumerating all frequent maximal/closed trees. This is a classical and central problem in data mining. Although many practical algorithms have been developed for this problem, its complexity under “realistic assumptions” on tree height has not been clarified. More specifically, while it was known that the mining problem becomes hard when the tree height is at least 60, the complexity for cases where the tree height is smaller has not yet been clarified. We resolve this gap by establishing results for these tree mining problems under several settings, including ordered and unordered trees, as well as maximal and closed variants.

1 Introduction

Pattern mining is a classical and central problem in the field of data mining. The goal of this problem is to discover “important” or “interesting” patterns. However, since it is difficult to mathematically formalize what constitutes an “important pattern” or an “interesting pattern,” even the formulation of pattern mining problems is nontrivial. Therefore, many studies adopt high frequency as a necessary condition for a pattern to be considered important or interesting.

Among the discrete structures considered in pattern mining, itemsets are the most common. The frequent itemset mining problem, which enumerates highly frequent itemsets, is formulated as follows. Given a set of items $U = \{1, \dots, n\}$, a collection of m subsets $X_1, \dots, X_m \subseteq U$, and an integer threshold θ , enumerate all subsets of U that are contained in at least θ itemsets. For a subset of U , the number of itemsets X_i satisfying $U \subseteq X_i$ is called the frequency of U . If the frequency of U is at least θ , then U is a frequent itemset.

In the frequent itemset mining, problems that enumerate more informative itemsets such as closed frequent itemsets and maximal frequent itemsets

have also been studied. A frequent itemset P is *closed* if, for any itemset $P' \supset P$, the frequency of P' is smaller than that of P . A frequent itemset P is called *maximal* if it is not strictly contained in any other frequent itemset. These problems have been studied from both theoretical and practical perspectives [5, 24].

For the mining problems described above, the number of outputs may be exponential in the input size, and polynomial time enumeration is impossible. Thus, output-sensitive analyzes that take the number of outputs into account are commonly used for mining problems [14]. If an algorithm runs in time polynomial in the sum of the input size and the number of outputs, then the algorithm is called an *output-polynomial time algorithm*. In addition, there is another evaluation criterion known as *delay*. This measure is defined as the worst-case time between outputting one solution and outputting the next solution.

Strings and graphs are discrete structures considered in pattern mining problems. The frequent subsequence mining problem is to enumerate all subsequences that appear in at least θ strings as subsequences in a set of strings. Similarly, the frequent subgraph mining problem is to enumerate all graphs that appear in at least θ graphs in a set of graphs. As in itemset mining, the enumeration of closed and maximal frequent subsequences and subgraphs has been studied [7, 15, 25].

In previous studies, three types of discrete structures were considered in frequent closed/maximal pattern mining problems. This leads to six different problem settings. Currently, the complexities of these problems are known. Except for the enumeration of closed frequent itemsets, all problems are known to be unsolvable in output-polynomial time unless $P = NP$ [5, 7, 13, 24].

In closed/maximal frequent subgraph mining, even the problem of finding a single closed/maximal frequent subgraph is NP-complete, which can be shown easily by a reduction from the maximum clique problem. Using the arguments in [13], it follows that closed/maximal frequent subgraph mining is NP-hard even to find a single solution for many graph classes. Therefore, the authors in [15] studied the complexity of this problem when restricted to trees, one of the simplest graph classes. They showed that even when the input consists of two trees, closed/maximal frequent subgraph mining does not admit an output-polynomial-time algorithm unless $P = NP$. According to their reduction, the problem becomes hard when the heights of the two trees are at least 60.

Thus, maximal/closed frequent subgraph mining remains hard even when the input graphs are restricted to (rooted) trees. In contrast, when consid-

ering practical applications of mining problems on rooted trees, the height of the trees is usually much smaller. One application of closed/maximal frequent tree mining is the analysis of XML files [21, 27]. XML is a markup language used for data exchange between different systems and can be represented as labeled rooted trees. In the synthetic data generated in the experiments by Zaki [26], the depth of rooted trees was set to around 10, and in the real-world CSLOGS dataset, the average string length of the string representation of rooted trees is 23.3 [26]. Moreover, for rooted tree mining, many practical algorithms have been studied for various settings, such as whether trees are labeled or ordered, and whether the output consists of closed frequent subtrees or maximal frequent trees [3, 8–10, 27].

For these realistic problem settings, the complexity of these mining problems has remained open. We investigate the complexity of these problems when the height of each tree is small. As a positive result, we show the following theorem.

Theorem 1. There is a polynomial-delay algorithm for enumerating closed frequent trees of rooted unordered trees with a height of at most 2.

As negative results, we show the following hardness. DUALIZATION (also known as MINIMAL TRANSVERSAL and MAXIMAL INDEPENDENT SET ENUMERATION in a hypergraph) is one of the most important open problems in the field of enumeration algorithms, and whether an output-polynomial-time algorithm exists has remained open for more than 30 years [11, 12].

Theorem 2. If there is an output-polynomial time algorithm for enumerating closed frequent trees of rooted unordered trees with height at most 2, then DUALIZATION can be solved in output-polynomial time.

Theorem 3. There is no output-polynomial time algorithm for enumerating maximal frequent trees of rooted ordered trees with a height of at most 2 unless $P = NP$. Moreover, there is no output-polynomial time algorithm for enumerating maximal frequent trees of rooted unordered trees with a height of at most 5 unless $P = NP$.

2 Preliminaries

Let $G = (V, E)$ be a graph. For a graph G , we denote the set of vertices and edges of G as $V(G)$ and $E(G)$, respectively. A sequence of vertices $P = (v_1, \dots, v_k)$ is a v_1 - v_k *path* if for any $1 \leq i < j \leq k$, $v_i \neq v_j$ and

Table 1: Summary of our paper. PT = Polynomial-time solvable, PD = Polynomial delay, Dual-hard = If it can be solved in output-polynomial time, then DUALIZATION can be solved in output-polynomial time, N-OP = No output-polynomial time algorithms unless $P = NP$, - = Open.

	Unordered/Closed	Ordered/Closed	Unordered/Maximal	Ordered/Maximal
$h = 1$	PT	PT	PT	PT
$h = 2$	PD	Dual-hard	PT if $\theta = \mathcal{T} $	N-OP
$3 \leq h \leq 4$	-	Dual-hard	-	N-OP
$5 \leq h \leq 60$	-	Dual-hard	N-OP	N-OP
$h \geq 60$	N-OP [15]	Dual-hard	N-OP [15]	N-OP

$\{v_i, v_{i+1}\} \in E$. The *length* of a path P is defined by the number of vertices in P minus one. A graph G is *connected* if G has a u - v path for any pair of vertices $u, v \in V$.

A sequence of vertices $P = (v_1, \dots, v_k)$ is a *cycle* if v_1 equals v_k , and (v_1, \dots, v_{k-1}) is a path of length at least 2. If G is connected and has no cycles, then G is a *tree*. We denote a tree as T . A *rooted tree* is a pair (T, r) , where T is a tree and r is a vertex in T . As a shorthand notation, we denote a rooted tree (T, r) and the root as T and $r(T)$, respectively. The *height* of a vertex v in T is the length of the r - v path. Moreover, the *height* of T is the maximum length of r - v path for $v \in V(T)$. For a vertex v , $P = (v_1 = r, \dots, v_k = v)$ is the r - v path in T . A vertex v_{k-1} is the *parent* of v , and the vertices v_1, \dots, v_k are *ancestors* of v . We denote the parent of v as $par(v)$. For a vertex v , a vertex u is a *child* of v if $par(u) = v$, and if v is an ancestor of u , u is a *descendant* of v . We denote the set of children of v as $ch(v)$. A non-root vertex that has no children is a *leaf*. For rooted trees $T_1 = (V_1, E_1)$ and $T_2 = (V_2, E_2)$, T_2 is a *subtree* of T_1 if $V_2 \subseteq V_1$, $E_2 \subseteq E_1$, and u is a child of v in T_1 if and only if u is a child of v in T_2 .

Let T be a rooted tree and v be a vertex in T . D_v is the set of descendants of v . A rooted tree (T_v, v) is a *subtree of T rooted at v* , where T_v is a tree $(D_v, \{\{u, w\} \in E(T) \mid u, w \in D_v\})$. For two rooted trees T_1 and T_2 , T_1 is *subtree isomorphic* to T_2 if T_2 has a subtree T'_2 and there is a bijection $\varphi : V(T'_2) \rightarrow V(T_1)$ satisfying u is the parent of v in T_2 if and only if $\varphi(u)$ is the parent of $\varphi(v)$ in T_1 . We denote it as $T_1 \preceq_{\text{iso}} T_2$. If $T_1 \preceq_{\text{iso}} T_2$, we say that T_1 is *contained* in T_2 as a subtree. If $T_1 \preceq_{\text{iso}} T_2$ and $T_2 \preceq_{\text{iso}} T_1$, then we denote it as $T_1 =_{\text{iso}} T_2$, and T_1 is *isomorphic* to T_2 . A bijection φ is a *subtree isomorphism mapping*. Especially, φ is a *tree isomorphism mapping* if T_1 is isomorphic to T_2 .

We define rooted *ordered* trees. For a rooted tree T and a partial order

\preceq on $V(T)$, (T, \preceq) is a *rooted ordered tree* if \preceq is a total order for $ch(v)$ for any $v \in V(T)$. When no confusion arises, we denote a rooted ordered tree as T . For two rooted ordered trees T_1 and T_2 , T_1 is *subtree isomorphic* to T_2 if T_2 has a subtree T'_2 and there is a bijection $\varphi : V(T'_2) \rightarrow V(T_1)$ such that u is the parent of v in T_2 if and only if $\varphi(u)$ is the parent of $\varphi(v)$ in T_1 and $u \preceq v$ if and only if $\varphi(u) \preceq \varphi(v)$. If $T_1 \preceq_{\text{iso}} T_2$ and $T_2 \preceq_{\text{iso}} T_1$, then we denote it as $T_1 =_{\text{iso}} T_2$, and T_1 is *equivalent* to T_2 . A bijection φ is a *subtree isomorphism mapping*. If T_1 is equivalent to T_2 , φ is a *tree isomorphism mapping*.

For a multiset of rooted unordered trees $\mathcal{T} = \{T_1, \dots, T_n\}$, the *support* of T is the number of trees in \mathcal{T} that contain T as a subtree. More precisely, the support of T is defined by $|\{R \in \mathcal{T} \mid T \preceq_{\text{iso}} R\}|$. We define the set of trees in \mathcal{T} that contains T as $\mathcal{T}(T)$. A rooted tree T is θ -*frequent* if the support of T is at least θ . Especially, a $|\mathcal{T}|$ -frequent tree is a *common subtree* of \mathcal{T} . A θ -frequent tree T is *maximal* if, for any distinct θ -frequent tree T' , $T \not\preceq_{\text{iso}} T'$. When no confusion arises, we denote a (maximal) θ -frequent tree as a (maximal) frequent tree. For a multiset of rooted trees \mathcal{T} , a rooted tree T is *closed* if, for any distinct rooted tree T' satisfying $T \preceq_{\text{iso}} T'$, the support of T is larger than the support of T' . The above definition is given in the same way for ordered trees.

In this paper, we discuss the following four mining problems.

MAXIMAL FREQUENT TREE MINING

Input: A multiset of rooted unordered/ordered trees \mathcal{T} and an integer θ .

Output: All maximal θ -frequent ordered/unordered trees of \mathcal{T} .

CLOSED FREQUENT TREE MINING

Input: A multiset of rooted unordered/ordered trees \mathcal{T} and an integer θ .

Output: All closed θ -frequent ordered/unordered trees of \mathcal{T} .

3 Maximal Common Tree Mining

We address MAXIMAL COMMON TREE MINING. It is a special case of MAXIMAL FREQUENT TREE MINING and CLOSED FREQUENT TREE MINING by setting $\theta = |\mathcal{T}|$. We show that when each rooted unordered tree has a height of at most 2, the maximal common tree is uniquely determined. This observation is essential for our algorithm for CLOSED FREQUENT TREE MINING

in the unordered case. In addition, we show the dual-hardness of CLOSED FREQUENT TREE MINING in the ordered case.

3.1 Tractability of the Unordered Case

If \mathcal{T} contains a tree of height 1, a maximal common tree of \mathcal{T} is uniquely determined. Thus, assume that \mathcal{T} does not contain a tree of height 1. Let \mathcal{T}_2 be the set of rooted trees of height 2 and \mathcal{N} be the multiset of non-negative integers. We show that there is a bijection between \mathcal{T}_2 and \mathcal{N} . We define a function $\chi : \mathcal{T}_2 \rightarrow \mathcal{N}$ as $\chi(T) := \{|ch(v)| + 1 \mid v \in ch(r(T))\}$ and a relation \sqsubseteq as follows.

Definition 1. For two multisets $X, Y \in \mathcal{N}$, $X \sqsubseteq Y$ if there is an injection $\psi : X \rightarrow Y$ satisfying $x \leq \psi(x)$ for any $x \in X$.

Lemma 4. A relation \sqsubseteq is a partial order on \mathcal{N} .

Proof. A relation \sqsubseteq is reflexive and transitive based on the definition of \sqsubseteq . Thus, we show that \sqsubseteq is antisymmetric, that is, $X \sqsubseteq Y$ and $Y \sqsubseteq X$ imply $X = Y$. Notice that $|X| = |Y|$ if $X \sqsubseteq Y$ and $Y \sqsubseteq X$.

We prove by induction on $|X|$. If $|X| = 1$, $X = Y$ since $x \leq y$ and $y \leq x$ hold. Suppose that $|X| > 1$. Since $X \sqsubseteq Y$ and $Y \sqsubseteq X$, there are injections $\psi_{YX} : Y \rightarrow X$ and $\psi_{XY} : X \rightarrow Y$ such that $x \leq \psi_{XY}(x)$ and $y \leq \psi_{YX}(y)$ hold for any $x \in X$ and $y \in Y$. We define a sequence $(w_0, \dots, w_{|X|+|Y|})$ as follows. (i) $w_0 = x_0$, (ii) if i is odd, $w_{i+1} = \psi_{YX}(w_i)$, and (iii) if i is even, $w_{i+1} = \psi_{XY}(w_i)$. From the condition of ψ_{XY} and ψ_{YX} , $w_0 \leq \dots \leq w_{|X|+|Y|}$. Since ψ_{YX} is injective, there exists an odd integer j such that $\psi_{YX}(w_j) = x_0$. Therefore, $w_0 = \dots = w_j = x_0$, and $\{x_0, \dots, x_{(j-1)/2}\} = \{y_0, \dots, y_{(j-1)/2}\}$. By the induction hypothesis, $X \setminus \{x_0, \dots, x_{(j-1)/2}\} = Y \setminus \{y_0, \dots, y_{(j-1)/2}\}$. Therefore, \sqsubseteq is antisymmetric, and the statement holds. \square \square

We next show that there is a bijection between \mathcal{T}_2 and \mathcal{N} .

Lemma 5. For any rooted trees $T_1, T_2 \in \mathcal{T}_2$, $T_1 \preceq_{\text{iso}} T_2$ if and only if $\chi(T_1) \sqsubseteq \chi(T_2)$.

Proof. Suppose that $T_1 \preceq_{\text{iso}} T_2$. Let φ be a subtree isomorphism mapping. Thus, for a vertex $v \in ch(r(T_1))$, $|ch(v)| \leq |ch(\varphi(v))|$. Therefore, $\chi(T_1) \sqsubseteq \chi(T_2)$.

Suppose that $\chi(T_1) \sqsubseteq \chi(T_2)$. From the assumption, there exists an injection $\varphi : \chi(T_1) \rightarrow \chi(T_2)$ such that, for each $x \in \chi(T_1)$, $x \leq \varphi(x)$.

Moreover, from the definition of χ , x and $\varphi(x)$ correspond to a vertex in $ch(r(T_1))$ and $ch(r(T_2))$, respectively. We define a function $\varphi' : V(T_1) \rightarrow V(T_2)$ based on φ . For $r(T_1)$, $\varphi'(r(T_1)) = r(T_2)$. For $v \in ch(r(T_1))$, $\varphi'(v) = u$, where u is a vertex in $V(T_2)$ satisfying $\varphi(|ch(v)|) = |ch(u)|$. Let v be a leaf in $V(T_1)$, and let $par(v)$ denote the parent of v . We define $\varphi'(v)$ to be a leaf whose parent is $\varphi(par(v))$. Since the number of leaves adjacent to $par(v)$ is at most the number of leaves adjacent to $\varphi'(par(v))$, this construction defines an injection. Therefore, $T_1 \preceq_{\text{iso}} T_2$. \square \square

Lemma 6. Let $\chi : \mathcal{T}_2 \rightarrow \mathcal{N}$ be a function defined by $\{|ch(v)| + 1 \mid v \in ch(r(T))\}$. Then, χ is bijective.

Proof. We show that χ is surjective. For each $X = \{x_1, \dots, x_{|X|}\} \in \mathcal{N}$, we define $T_X = (V_X, E_X)$ as follows. The root $r(T_X)$ has $|X|$ children, and each child v_i has x_i leaves. Thus, T_X is a rooted tree of height 2 and $\chi(T_X) = X$, and χ is surjective.

We show that χ is injective. Let T_1 and T_2 be rooted trees in \mathcal{T}_2 . Suppose that $\chi(T_1) = \chi(T_2)$. From Theorem 5, $T_1 \preceq_{\text{iso}} T_2$ and $T_2 \preceq_{\text{iso}} T_1$. Therefore, $T_1 =_{\text{iso}} T_2$, and χ is injective. \square \square

From the discussion above, χ is a bijection, and we can define an inverse function χ^{-1} . Using this fact, we show that the maximal common tree of a multiset of rooted trees is unique. To this end, we first consider the case of two rooted trees. In what follows, we identify a multiset of integers and a sequence of integers in non-decreasing order. Let T_i be a rooted tree in $\{T_1, \dots, T_k\}$ and $\chi(T_i) = (x_1^i, \dots, x_{d_i}^i)$, where d_i is the number of children of $r(T_i)$. We denote $\min(\{T_1, \dots, T_k\}) := (\min_{1 \leq i \leq k}(x_1^i), \dots, \min_{1 \leq i \leq k}(x_{d_{\min}}^i))$, where d_{\min} is $\min_{1 \leq i \leq k}(d_i)$.

Theorem 7. Let T_1 and T_2 be two rooted trees with a height 2. A maximal common tree of T_1 and T_2 is uniquely determined, and it is $\chi^{-1}(\min(\{T_1, T_2\}))$.

Proof. Let $X_{d_{\min}}$ be a multiset $(x_1^1, \dots, x_{d_{\min}}^1)$, where d_{\min} is $\min(d_1, d_2)$. Here, $\chi^{-1}(X_{d_{\min}})$ is subtree isomorphic to T_1 . From Theorem 5, $\chi^{-1}(\min(\{T_1, T_2\}))$ is subtree isomorphic to $\chi^{-1}(X_{d_{\min}})$. Thus, $\chi^{-1}(\min(\{T_1, T_2\})) \preceq_{\text{iso}} T_1$. Similarly, from Theorem 5, $\chi^{-1}(\min(\{T_1, T_2\}))$ is subtree isomorphic to T_2 and $\chi^{-1}(\min(\{T_1, T_2\}))$ is a common tree of T_1 and T_2 .

We next show that $\chi^{-1}(\min(\{T_1, T_2\}))$ is a maximal common tree. Let i be an integer at most d_{\min} . We consider a sequence X obtained by adding one to the i -th integer in $(\min(x_1^1, x_1^2), \dots, \min(x_{d_{\min}}^1, x_{d_{\min}}^2))$. From Theorem 5, X is not contained in T_1 or T_2 . Therefore, $\chi^{-1}(\min(\{T_1, T_2\}))$ is maximal. \square \square

We generalize the above theorem into a multiset of rooted trees \mathcal{T} . In what follows, we denote the set of all subtrees of T as $st(T)$. From the definition of a common tree, all common trees of $\{T_1, \dots, T_k\}$ are $\bigcap_{1 \leq i \leq k} st(T_i)$. We denote it as $ct(\mathcal{T})$. Moreover, we denote the set of all maximal common trees of \mathcal{T} as $mct(\mathcal{T})$. The following property of $ct(\cdot)$ is helpful for our proof.

Lemma 8. Let \mathcal{T} be a multiset of rooted trees such that $mct(\mathcal{T})$ is uniquely determined. Then $ct(\mathcal{T}) = st(T_{max})$, where T_{max} is the unique maximal common tree of \mathcal{T} .

Proof. We first show that any rooted tree $T \in ct(\mathcal{T})$ is subtree isomorphic to T_{max} . Since T is a common tree of \mathcal{T} and T_{max} is the unique maximal common tree, T is a subtree isomorphic to T_{max} as a subtree, and $T \in st(T_{max})$.

Let T be a rooted tree in $st(T_{max})$, that is, $T \preceq_{iso} T_{max}$. For each tree $T' \in \mathcal{T}$, T_{max} is subtree isomorphic to T' since T_{max} is a common tree of \mathcal{T} . Since $T \preceq_{iso} T_{max}$, $T \preceq_{iso} T_{max} \preceq_{iso} T'$, and T is a common tree of \mathcal{T} . \square

Theorem 9. Let \mathcal{T} be a multiset of rooted trees with a height 2. A maximal common tree of \mathcal{T} is uniquely determined, and it is $\chi^{-1}(\min(\mathcal{T}))$.

Proof. We prove by induction on the number of trees in \mathcal{T} . If $|\mathcal{T}| = 1$, the statement holds. Recall that $mct(\mathcal{T})$ is the set of maximal trees in $ct(\mathcal{T})$ with respect to the relation \preceq_{iso} .

From the definition of $ct(\cdot)$, $ct(\{T_1, \dots, T_k\}) = ct(\{T_1\}) \cap ct(\{T_2, \dots, T_k\})$. Since a maximal common tree of T_1 is unique, and from the induction hypothesis, both $mct(\{T_1\})$ and $mct(\{T_2, \dots, T_k\})$ are unique. Let R be the maximal common tree of $\{T_2, \dots, T_k\}$. From Theorem 8, $ct(\mathcal{T})$ is equivalent to $ct(\{T_1\}) \cap ct(\{R\})$ from Theorem 8, and $ct(\mathcal{T}) = ct(\{T_1, R\})$. From Theorem 7, $\{T_1, R\}$ has the unique maximal common tree. Therefore, $ct(\mathcal{T}) = st(mct\{T_1, R\})$ from Theorem 8, and the statement holds. \square

3.2 Hardness of the Ordered Case

We next address the ordered case. We show the Dual-hardness of MAXIMAL COMMON TREE MINING even if the height of each tree is at most 2. To this end, we show the existence of an “almost” bijection between the set of maximal independent sets in a hypergraph and the set of maximal common trees. An almost bijection means that a bijection from the set of maximal independent sets in a hypergraph to the set of maximal common trees can be constructed, except for a constant number of maximal common trees.

For a hypergraph $\mathcal{H} = (V, \mathcal{E})$, a set of vertices I is an *independent set* if for any $E \in \mathcal{E}$, $E \cap I \neq E$. An independent set I is *maximal* if there is no independent set I' such that $I' \supset I$. We denote the set of maximal independent sets in \mathcal{H} as $\text{mis}(\mathcal{H})$.

In our reduction, we assume that $\mathcal{H} = (V, \mathcal{E})$ has no vertices that is contained in all hyperedges. If such a vertex v exists, $\text{mis}(\mathcal{H})$ can be partitioned into $V \setminus \{v\}$ and $\text{mis}(\mathcal{H} - v)$, where $\mathcal{H} - v = (V \setminus \{v\}, \{E \setminus \{v\} \mid E \in \mathcal{E}\})$. Thus, the assumption can be adopted without loss of generality. Notice that since \mathcal{H} has no such vertices, the size of a maximum independent set is less than $|V| - 1$. Furthermore, we identify each element of V with an integer from 1 to $|V|$.

We construct $|\mathcal{E}| + 1$ rooted trees $S, T(E_1), \dots, T(E_{|\mathcal{E}|})$ as follows. Let r be the root of S , and r has $|V|$ children $v_1, \dots, v_{|V|}$. Each child v_i has one leaf as a child. For each $E_i = \{w_1, \dots, w_{|E_i|}\} \subseteq V$, we define $T(E_i)$ as follows. Without loss of generality, we assume that E_i is sorted, that is, $w_j < w_k$ if and only if $j < k$. The root of $T(E_i)$ is r_i , and r_i has $|V| + |E_i| - 1$ children. The i -th child v_i is a leaf if and only if i is equivalent to $w_j + j - 1$ for some $1 \leq j \leq |E_i|$. Otherwise, v_i has a unique child u_i . For each tree, the order of the children of the root is determined by their indices. From the above construction, it is easy to show that each tree $T(E_i)$ contains a tree W such that $r(W)$ has $|V| - 1$ children, with each child having a unique leaf. Hereafter, for $U \subseteq V$, we denote the tree obtained by the above construction as $T(U)$. For $\mathcal{H} = (V, \mathcal{E})$, we denote $\bigcup_{E \in \mathcal{E}} \{T(E)\}$ as $\mathcal{T}(\mathcal{H})$.

Lemma 10. Let W be a rooted ordered tree such that the root of W has $|V| - 1$ children and each child has a unique leaf. If \mathcal{H} has no independent sets with cardinality $|V| - 1$, then W is a maximal common tree of $\mathcal{T}(\mathcal{H})$.

Proof. From the construction of each tree $T \in \mathcal{T}(\mathcal{H})$, T has $|V| - 1$ children that have a unique leaf. Thus, W is a common tree of $\mathcal{T}(\mathcal{H})$.

Suppose that W is non-maximal. Since W is non-maximal, there is a rooted ordered tree W' that contains W . Since the height of each tree is 2 and W' is contained in S , $r(W')$ has $|V|$ children. Moreover, if all children have a leaf, it contradicts that W' is contained in $T_i \in \mathcal{T}(\mathcal{H})$ for $1 \leq i \leq |\mathcal{E}|$ since the root of T_i has exactly $|V| - 1$ vertices that have only one child. Therefore, r' has a leaf vertex v as a child.

Suppose that v is the j -th child of $r(W')$. Since W' is contained in $T_i \in \mathcal{T}(\mathcal{H})$, there is an injection $\varphi : V(W') \rightarrow V(T_i)$. Since the root of T_i has exactly $|V| - 1$ vertices that have at least one child, for each $u \in \text{ch}(r(W')) \setminus \{v\}$, $\varphi(u)$ is uniquely determined. Therefore, if $j \notin E_i$, W' is not subtree isomorphic to T_i . It implies that any $E_i \in \mathcal{E}$ contains v_j ,

and it contradicts the fact that \mathcal{H} has no independent set with cardinality $|V| - 1$. \square \square

From the above lemma and $\mathcal{T}(\mathcal{H})$ contains S , the root of every maximal common tree has $|V|$ children except for W . Thus, we can define the following function χ the subtrees of S such that the root has $|V|$ children to 2^V . For each subtree T of S , $\chi(T)$ contains i if and only if the i -th child of T is a non-leaf. Here, χ is a bijection, and we denote the tree defined by $U \subseteq V$ as $\chi^{-1}(U)$.

Lemma 11. For $U, U' \subseteq V$, $U \subseteq U'$ if and only if $\chi^{-1}(U') \not\preceq_{\text{iso}} T(U)$.

Proof. Suppose that $\chi^{-1}(U') \preceq_{\text{iso}} T(U)$. Let φ be a subtree isomorphism mapping from $V(\chi^{-1}(U'))$ to $V(T(U))$. Since $r(T(U))$ has at most $|V| - 1$ non-leaf children, $\chi^{-1}(U')$ has a leaf v_i such that $\varphi(v_i)$ is a leaf. From the construction of $\chi^{-1}(U')$, $v_i \notin U'$. However, U contains v_i and $U \not\subseteq U'$.

Suppose that $U \subseteq U'$. Without loss of generality, assume that $U = U'$ since $\chi^{-1}(U)$ is contained in $\chi^{-1}(U')$. We prove by induction on $|U|$. Suppose that $U = \{u_1\}$. The root of $T(U)$ and $\chi^{-1}(U)$ have $|V|$ children. However, the u_1 -th child of $r(T(U))$ has a child, and the u_1 -th child of $r(\chi^{-1}(U))$ is a leaf. Therefore, $\chi^{-1}(U)$ is not contained in $T(U)$.

As an induction step, assume that U contains $k > 1$ vertices $u_1 < \dots < u_k$. Let $v_1, \dots, v_{|V|}$ be the children of $r(\chi^{-1}(U))$ and $w_1, \dots, w_{|V|+|U|-1}$ be the children $T(U)$. If $\chi^{-1}(U)$ is subtree isomorphic to $T(U)$, there is a function φ from $V(\chi^{-1}(U))$ to $V(T(U))$. For the u_1 -th child v_{u_1} , $\varphi(v_{u_1})$ is greater than w_{u_1+1} since the w_{u_1} is a leaf. Therefore, $\varphi(v_{u_2})$ is greater than the w_{u_1} . Since a subtree consists of $\{r(T(U)), u_2, \dots, u_{|V|+|E|-1}\}$ is isomorphic $T(\{u_2 - u_1, \dots, u_k - u_1\})$, $\chi^{-1}(U) \not\preceq_{\text{iso}} T(U)$. \square \square

Lemma 12. Let I be a maximal independent set of \mathcal{H} . Then, $\chi^{-1}(I)$ is a maximal common tree of $\mathcal{T}(\mathcal{H})$.

Proof. We first show that $\chi^{-1}(I)$ is a common tree of $\mathcal{T}(\mathcal{H})$. Suppose that $\chi^{-1}(I)$ is not a common tree. It implies that $\chi^{-1}(I) \not\preceq_{\text{iso}} T(E_i)$ for some $E_i \in \mathcal{E}$. From Theorem 11, I is not an independent set since $I \supseteq E_i$.

We next show that $\chi^{-1}(I)$ is maximal. Suppose that $\chi^{-1}(I)$ is non maximal. Let T' be a maximal common tree containing $\chi^{-1}(I)$. From the definition of χ , $\chi(T') \supset I$. Since I is a maximal independent set of \mathcal{H} , \mathcal{H} has a hyperedge E such that $E \subseteq \chi^{-1}(T')$. From Theorem 11, $\chi^{-1}(E) \not\preceq_{\text{iso}} T(E)$. Since $\chi^{-1}(E) \preceq_{\text{iso}} \chi^{-1}(I)$, it contradicts the fact that T' is a common tree of $\mathcal{T}(\mathcal{H})$. \square \square

Lemma 13. Let $T \not\equiv_{\text{iso}} W$ be a maximal common tree of $\mathcal{T}(\mathcal{H})$. Then, $\chi(T)$ is a maximal independent set of \mathcal{H} .

Proof. Suppose that $\chi(T)$ is a non independent set, that is, \mathcal{H} has $E \subseteq \chi(T)$. From Theorem 11, $\chi^{-1}(E) \not\equiv_{\text{iso}} T(E)$, it contradicts the fact that T is a common tree of $\mathcal{T}(\mathcal{H})$ since $\chi^{-1}(E)$ is contained in T .

Suppose that $\chi(T)$ is non maximal. Let I' be a maximal independent set of \mathcal{H} . From Theorem 12, $\chi^{-1}(I')$ is a common tree of $\mathcal{T}(\mathcal{H})$. From the definition of χ , $\chi^{-1}(I) \preceq_{\text{iso}} \chi^{-1}(I')$. It contradicts the maximality of T . \square

From Theorems 12 and 13, χ is a bijection between $\text{mis}(\mathcal{H})$ and the set of maximal common trees of $\mathcal{T}(\mathcal{H})$. Moreover, for a rooted tree T , we can obtain $\chi(T)$ in polynomial time. Therefore, the following theorem holds.

Theorem 14. If CLOSED FREQUENT TREE MINING for the ordered case can be solved in output-polynomial time, then DUALIZATION can be solved in output-polynomial time.

4 Closed Frequent Tree Mining

We present a polynomial-delay and polynomial-space algorithm for CLOSED FREQUENT TREE MINING in the unordered case if each tree in \mathcal{T} has a height of at most 2. Before describing the details of our algorithm, we show that CLOSED FREQUENT TREE MINING can be regarded as the problem of enumerating a subset of \mathcal{T} .

Theorem 15. Let \mathcal{T} be a set of rooted trees with a height of at most 2. Then, a rooted tree T is a closed tree of \mathcal{T} if and only if $T \equiv_{\text{iso}} T_{\text{mct}}$, where $T_{\text{mct}} \equiv_{\text{iso}} \text{mct}(\mathcal{T}(T))$.

Proof. Let T be a closed tree. If $T \preceq_{\text{iso}} T_{\text{mct}}$ and $T \not\equiv_{\text{iso}} T_{\text{mct}}$, then it contradicts the fact that T is closed since $\mathcal{T}(T) = \mathcal{T}(T_{\text{mct}})$.

Suppose that $T \equiv_{\text{iso}} T_{\text{mct}}$. From theorem 9, T_{mct} is the tree whose associated integers are the pointwise minimum of $\chi(T')$ over all $T' \in \mathcal{T}(T)$. Suppose that T is non-closed. In this case, there is a rooted tree T' such that T' contains T and $\mathcal{T}(T) = \mathcal{T}(T')$. However, since $T \equiv_{\text{iso}} T_{\text{mct}}$, $\mathcal{T}(T')$ is a proper subset of $\mathcal{T}(T)$. This contradicts the assumption that T is non-closed, and hence T must be closed. \square \square

From the above theorem, CLOSED FREQUENT TREE MINING can be regarded as the problem of enumerating all subsets of $\mathcal{T}' \subseteq \mathcal{T}$ satisfying

$\mathcal{T}' = \mathcal{T}(\text{mct}(\mathcal{T}'))$. In what follows, we present an algorithm for enumerating all such subsets based on reverse search [1].

We provide an overview of reverse search. In reverse search, we define a tree structure \mathcal{F} rooted at R . The set of vertices in \mathcal{F} is the set of closed frequent trees, and we assume that we can find R in polynomial time. We enumerate all closed frequent trees by traversing \mathcal{F} from R . We define the parent of a closed frequent tree T for each non-root $T \in V(\mathcal{F}) \setminus \{R\}$. To traverse \mathcal{F} , the definitions of the neighbors of T are essential. As a key point in the definition of the neighbors, the neighbors of T must be defined so that it contains all closed frequent trees that have T as their parent. When we define the parent and the neighbors satisfying these conditions, we can traverse \mathcal{F} from the root. More precisely, if the parent and the neighbors can be found in polynomial time, then we can enumerate all closed frequent trees in polynomial delay.

Our algorithm does not enumerate all closed trees but only the closed frequent trees for a threshold θ . Therefore, when defining the parent-child relation, we ensure that the support of a parent is at least that of its child. This guarantees the monotonicity of the tree structure, which in turn makes it possible to enumerate all closed frequent trees. Several papers have proposed techniques that use monotonicity along parent-child relationships [16, 17, 23].

We define the root, the parent, and the neighbors of each solution. As the root of \mathcal{F} , we define $R := \text{mct}(\mathcal{T})$. From Theorem 9, it can be found in polynomial time. For a closed frequent tree $T \in V(\mathcal{F}) \setminus \{R\}$, we define the parent of T as follows. Since T is not the root R , $\mathcal{T} \setminus \mathcal{T}(T) \neq \emptyset$. We can find $\mathcal{T}(T)$ in polynomial time since subtree isomorphism can be solved in polynomial time [20]. We choose $T' \in \mathcal{T} \setminus \mathcal{T}(T)$ such that $\text{mct}(\mathcal{T}(T) \cup \{T'\})$ is minimal with respect to a relation \preceq_{iso} . If several such trees T' exist, we select one according to a predetermined rule. The parent of T is defined by $\text{mct}(\mathcal{T}(T) \cup \{T'\})$. In this definition, the support of the parent of T is greater than the support of T . Thus, if T is a closed frequent tree, then its parent is also a closed frequent tree. Moreover, by applying the parent relation at most $|\mathcal{T}|$ times, any closed tree becomes R . This means that this parent relation does not make a cycle on \mathcal{F} .

We define the neighbors of each closed frequent tree T . In our definition, T has at most $|V(T)|$ neighbors. For a vertex $v \in V(T)$, T_v is a rooted tree obtained by adding a leaf u as a child of v . Since $\text{mct}(\mathcal{T}(T_v))$ is a closed tree, we define it as a neighbor of T .

We show that all children of T are contained in neighbors of T . To this end, we show the following lemma.

Lemma 16. Let T be a closed tree and T_c be a child of T . Then, there is a vertex v such that $mct(\mathcal{T}(T_v)) =_{\text{iso}} T_c$.

Proof. From the definition of the parent of T , \mathcal{T} has a rooted tree T' such that $T =_{\text{iso}} mct(\mathcal{T}(T_c) \cup \{T'\})$. Moreover, T has a vertex v such that $T_v \preceq_{\text{iso}} T_c$ since T is subtree isomorphic to T_c . Since T is closed and $T_v \preceq_{\text{iso}} T_c$, $\mathcal{T}(T) \supset \mathcal{T}(T_v) \supseteq \mathcal{T}(T_c)$. If $mct(\mathcal{T}(T_v))$ is not tree isomorphic to T_c , $\mathcal{T}(T_v)$ is not equivalent to $\mathcal{T}(T_c)$. Since $T_v \preceq_{\text{iso}} T_c$, $\mathcal{T}(T_v)$ is a proper superset of $\mathcal{T}(T_c)$. If such $\mathcal{T}(T_v)$ exists, it contradicts the fact that T_c is a child of T since $mct(\mathcal{T}(T_v)) \preceq_{\text{iso}} T_c$. \square \square

From Theorem 16, we obtain a polynomial-delay and polynomial-space algorithm using reverse search.

Theorem 17. If each tree of \mathcal{T} has a height of at most 2, then CLOSED FREQUENT TREE MINING can be solved in polynomial delay and polynomial space.

5 Maximal Frequent Tree Mining

We show that MAXIMAL FREQUENT TREE MINING has no output-polynomial time algorithms unless $P = NP$ in both cases. Describing the details of our proof, we introduce a technique to show the hardness of the enumeration problems. To show the hardness of the mining problem, we consider the problem called the *another solution problem* (also called finished decision problem [4], or additional problems [2]). This discussion is used as folklore to show the hardness of mining (enumeration) problems [4–7, 18, 19]. For details on the hardness of the another solution problem and enumeration problems, see [4, 6, 18].

5.1 Hardness of the Unordered Case

We address MAXIMAL FREQUENT TREE MINING for unordered rooted trees. We show that this problem cannot be solved in output-polynomial time unless $P = NP$, even if the height of each tree is at most 5. To this end, we provide a reduction from (3,4)-SAT. (3,4)-SAT is a special case of 3-CNF SAT. Each clause has at most three literals, and each literal appears at most four times. It is known that it is NP-complete [22]. ANOTHER MAXIMAL FREQUENT TREE is a decision problem that, given a multiset of rooted trees \mathcal{T} and its maximal frequent trees \mathcal{S} , asks whether there exists a maximal frequent tree that is not contained in \mathcal{S} . Our proof adapts the hardness proof




Figure 1: Our reduction from (3,4)-SAT to ANOTHER MAXIMAL FREQUENT TREE.

from the paper [15] (Theorem 5.2) and provides a reduction from (3,4)-SAT. In our reduction, we assume that the number of variables and clauses are greater than 10.

We introduce notations. Let φ be a CNF formula $C_1 \wedge \dots \wedge C_m$ and $V(\varphi) = \{x_1, \dots, x_n\}$ be the set of variables in φ . A literal a_i is an element in $\{x_i, \neg x_i\}$ for a variable $x_i \in V(\varphi)$. For a CNF formula φ and a literal a_i , $\varphi[a_i]$ is the set of all clauses that contain a_i . For an assignment $\alpha : V(\varphi) \rightarrow \{\mathbf{true}, \mathbf{false}\}$, $\varphi[\alpha]$ is the set of clauses that are satisfied by α . Especially, α satisfies φ if and only if $\varphi[\alpha] = \varphi$. If $\varphi[\alpha] = \varphi$, α is a *satisfying assignment*.

Figure 1 illustrates the construction of the trees ξ, ξ_1, \dots, ξ_m and Γ_φ used in our reduction. Each tree is a rooted tree whose root is the vertex positioned at the top of the figure. The construction of each tree is described as follows.

- For a tree ν_j^m , the root of ν_j^m has $m - j + 1$ children. Each of these children has exactly j leaves.
- A tree ζ is obtained by adding m children w_1, \dots, w_m . For each w_i , a subtree rooted at w_i is ν_i^m .

- A tree ζ_j is obtained by removing a child ν_j^m from ζ .
- For each $1 \leq i \leq n$, the root of a tree μ_i has two children, u_i^1 and u_i^2 . If x_i satisfies c_j , u_i^1 has ν_j^m as a child. If $\neg x_i$ satisfies c_j , u_i^2 has ν_j^m as a child.

Intuitively, a tree ν_j^m corresponds to a clause, and μ_i corresponds to a set of clauses satisfied by a literal a . For a CNF formula φ , we construct $\mathcal{T}_\varphi = \{\xi, \xi_1, \dots, \xi_m, \Gamma_\varphi\}$, $\theta = 2$, and $\mathcal{S} = \{\xi_1, \dots, \xi_m\}$. For any $1 \leq j \leq m$, ξ_j is contained in ξ . Thus, ξ_i is a 2-frequent tree of \mathcal{T}_φ . We show that ξ_j is maximal.

Lemma 18. For any ν_j^m and ν_k^m , $\nu_j^m \preceq_{\text{iso}} \nu_k^m$ if and only if $j = k$.

Proof. If $j = k$, trivially $\nu_j^m \preceq_{\text{iso}} \nu_k^m$ since ν_j^m is isomorphic to ν_k^m . Thus, we prove the other direction by contradiction. Let $\psi : V(\nu_j^m) \rightarrow V(\nu_k^m)$ be a subtree isomorphism mapping. Suppose that $j < k$. Since both the height of ν_j^m and ν_k^m are 2, $\psi(r(\nu_j^m)) = r(\nu_k^m)$. Moreover, since j is smaller than k , the number of children of $r(\nu_j^m)$ is larger than the number of children of $r(\nu_k^m)$. It contradicts the fact that $\nu_j^m \preceq_{\text{iso}} \nu_k^m$.

Suppose that $k < j$. In this case, $\psi(r(\nu_j^m)) = r(\nu_k^m)$ also holds. However, ν_j^m has $m - j + 1$ children with j children and ν_k^m has $m - k + 1$ children with k children. Let u be a child of $r(\nu_j^m)$ with j children, and w be a child of $r(\nu_k^m)$ with k children. Since $\psi(u) \neq w$, it contradicts that $\nu_j^m \preceq_{\text{iso}} \nu_k^m$. \square \square

Lemma 19. Rooted trees ξ_1, \dots, ξ_m are maximal 2-frequent trees of \mathcal{T}_φ .

Proof. We first show that ξ_i is not contained in Γ_φ as a subtree. Suppose that $\xi_j \preceq_{\text{iso}} \Gamma_\varphi$. Let ψ be a subtree isomorphism mapping from $V(\xi_j) \rightarrow V(\Gamma_\varphi)$. Since the heights of ξ_j and Γ_φ are 5, $\psi(r(\xi_j)) = r(\Gamma_\varphi)$. Let u be a vertex in ξ_j with the height 2. A subtree of ξ_j rooted at u is equivalent to ζ_j and the number of children of u is m . If Γ_φ has a vertex v_i with the height 2 such that the subtree rooted at v_i contains ζ_j , then φ has a literal a that contains $m - 1$ clauses. In this case, φ breaks the condition of (3, 4)-SAT, and ξ_i is not contained in Γ_φ .

Let T_i be a maximal 2-frequent tree that contains ξ_i . Since ξ_i is not contained in Γ_φ , T_i is contained in two trees in $\{\xi, \xi_1, \dots, \xi_m\}$. If $T_i \preceq_{\text{iso}} \xi$, it contradicts the fact T_i is a 2-frequent tree. From Theorem 18, for any $k \neq j$, ν_k^m does not contain ν_j^m as a subtree. Hence, $\xi_j \not\preceq_{\text{iso}} \xi_k$. Therefore, T_i is not a 2-frequent tree and ξ_i is maximal. \square \square

To show the correctness of our reduction, we define a rooted tree Γ_α based on an assignment α as follows. For an assignment α , we modify Γ_φ

as follows: For each i , if $\alpha(x_i) = \mathbf{true}$, we remove the subtree of μ_i rooted at u_i^1 in Figure 1, otherwise, we remove the subtree of μ_i rooted at u_i^2 . We denote the resultant tree as Γ_α . For an assignment α of a CNF formula φ , the following lemma holds

Lemma 20. Let α be an assignment of φ . There exists j satisfying $\Gamma_\alpha \preceq_{\text{iso}} \xi_j$ if and only if α is not a satisfying assignment.

Proof. Suppose that α is not a satisfying assignment. In this case, there is a clause C_k such that $C_k \notin \varphi[\alpha]$. Notice that Γ_α does not have ν_k^m as a subtree from the construction of Γ_α . Thus, Γ_α is a subtree of ξ_k .

Suppose that Γ_α is a subtree of ξ_k for some k . Let C_k be the k -th clause in φ and ψ be a subtree isomorphism mapping from $V(\Gamma_\alpha) \rightarrow V(\xi_k)$. Since both trees are of height 5, $\psi(r(\Gamma_\alpha)) = r(\xi_k)$. We prove that $\varphi[\alpha]$ does not contain C_k by contradiction. Suppose that $C_k \in \varphi[\alpha]$, that is, C_k is satisfied by α . Therefore, ν_k^m is contained in Γ_α as a subtree. From Theorem 18, ξ_k does not contain ν_k^m as a subtree, and it is a contradiction. \square \square

From Theorems 19 and 20, the following lemma holds.

Lemma 21. If a CNF formula φ is satisfiable, then \mathcal{T}_φ has at least $m + 1$ maximal 2-frequent trees.

Proof. From Theorem 19, \mathcal{T}_φ has at least m maximal 2-frequent trees ξ_1, \dots, ξ_m . Suppose that α is a satisfying assignment. In this case, since Γ_α is a subtree of Γ_φ and ξ , Γ_α is a 2-frequent tree of \mathcal{T}_φ . From Theorem 20, Γ_α is not contained in ξ_j as a subtree. Therefore, there is a maximal 2-frequent tree that contains Γ_α as a subtree, and the statement holds. \square \square

Conversely, we show that if \mathcal{T}_φ has at least $m + 1$ maximal 2-frequent trees, φ has a satisfying assignment α . Let T be a maximal 2-frequent tree of \mathcal{T}_φ satisfying $T \not\preceq_{\text{iso}} \xi_j$ for any $1 \leq j \leq m$. Since $T \not\preceq_{\text{iso}} \xi_j$ for any $1 \leq j \leq m$ and T is 2-frequent, T is subtree isomorphic to T_φ and ξ .

Lemma 22. Let T be a maximal 2-frequent tree of \mathcal{T}_φ that is not contained in any ξ_1, \dots, ξ_m as a subtree. Then, the height of T is 5.

Proof. We prove by contradiction. Let Γ_φ^4 be a tree obtained by removing vertices with a height 5 in Γ_φ . If the height of T is at most 4, T is contained in Γ_φ^4 or μ_i as a subtree for some $1 \leq i \leq n$. If T is contained in μ_i , T is contained in ξ_j for some $1 \leq j \leq m$ since φ has no literals contained in all clauses.

Suppose that T is contained in Γ_φ^4 as a subtree. We show that T is contained in ξ_1 . Let v_j be a vertex in Γ_φ corresponding to the root of ν_j^m . In Γ_φ^4 , we remove all grandchildren of v_j . Let T_{v_j} be the subtree rooted at v_j in Γ_φ^4 . Here, T_{v_i} is subtree isomorphic to T_{v_j} if and only if $i < j$. Therefore, ξ_1 contains T . It contradicts the maximality of T , and the height of T is 5. \square \square

Finally, the following lemma shows that a CNF formula φ is satisfiable if Γ_α is a maximal 2-frequent tree of \mathcal{T}_φ .

Lemma 23. If \mathcal{T}_φ has at least $m + 1$ maximal 2-frequent trees, then there is an assignment α such that Γ_α is a maximal 2-frequent tree of \mathcal{T}_φ .

Proof. Let T be a maximal 2-frequent tree not contained in ξ_1, \dots, ξ_m . Since \mathcal{T}_φ consists of $\{\xi, \xi_1, \dots, \xi_m, \Gamma_\varphi\}$, $T \preceq_{\text{iso}} \xi$ and $T \preceq_{\text{iso}} \Gamma_\varphi$. From Theorem 22, there are ψ_ξ and ψ_φ such that $\psi_\xi(r(T)) = r(\xi)$ and $\psi_\varphi(r(T)) = r(\Gamma_\varphi)$. From the maximality of T , $r(T)$ has n children. For each child $v \in \text{ch}(r(T))$, v has only one child from the existence of ψ_ξ . Therefore, a subtree rooted at v corresponds to a subtree rooted at u_i^1 or u_i^2 in μ_i . Therefore, there is an assignment α such that Γ_α is isomorphic to T . From Theorem 20, α is a satisfying assignment. \square \square

Theorem 24. There are no output-polynomial time algorithms for MAXIMAL FREQUENT SUBTREE MINING unless $P = NP$, even if the height of each tree is at most 5.

5.2 Hardness of the Ordered Case

We show that there are no output-polynomial time algorithms for enumerating all maximal frequent trees of rooted ordered trees \mathcal{T} even if the height of each tree is at most 2. To this end, we show the NP-completeness of ANOTHER MAXIMAL FREQUENT TREE for ordered trees. We provide a reduction from ANOTHER MAXIMAL FREQUENT ITEMSET. An input for this problem is a set of elements $U = \{1, \dots, n\}$, itemsets $\mathcal{X} = \{X_1, \dots, X_k\}$, a set of maximal frequent itemsets $\mathcal{Y} = \{Y_1, \dots, Y_\ell\}$, and an integer η . The task is to determine whether the set of all maximal frequent itemsets of \mathcal{X} is not equivalent to \mathcal{Y} . The authors in [5] showed the NP-completeness of the problem.

Our reduction is as follows. An integer θ is equivalent to η . For each itemset X_i , we generate rooted trees T_i as follows. The root of T_i has n children. If X_i contains an element j , we add a leaf to the j -th child of the

root of T_i . For each maximal frequent itemset Y_i , we generate a rooted tree, applying the same rule. For an itemset X , we denote the resultant rooted tree as $T(X)$. As shorthand notation, we denote the union of the multiset of resultant rooted trees of a set of itemsets \mathcal{X} as $\mathcal{T}(\mathcal{X})$.

We define θ rooted trees $\mathcal{R} = \{R_1, \dots, R_\theta\}$. Each R_j has $n - 1$ children, and each child has a unique leaf. Notice that each R_i is tree isomorphic to R_j . We denote the multiset of rooted trees $\mathcal{T}(X) \cup \mathcal{R}$ as $\mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{R}}(X)$. Moreover, \mathcal{S} consists of $\mathcal{T}(\mathcal{Y}) \cup \{R_1\}$. From the above procedure, we obtain the instance of ANOTHER MAXIMAL FREQUENT TREE. Since \mathcal{S} contains R_1 , if there is another solution, the root of this tree has exactly n children. In this construction, the following lemma holds.

Lemma 25. For two itemsets X_1 and X_2 , $T(X_1) \preceq_{\text{iso}} T(X_2)$ if and only if $X_1 \subseteq X_2$.

Proof. Suppose that $X_1 \subseteq X_2$. We consider the following function $\varphi : V(T(X_1)) \rightarrow V(T(X_2))$. For the root $r(T(X_1))$, $\varphi(r(T(X_1))) = r(T(X_2))$. For the i -th child c_i^1 of r_1 , $\varphi(c_i^1) = c_i^2$, where c_j^2 is the j -th child of $r(T(X_2))$. From the construction of $T(X_1)$, the remaining vertices consist of a single leaf that is a grandchild of the root. We denote a leaf ℓ_i^1 with the parent c_i^1 as v_i . Since $X_1 \subseteq X_2$, $T(X_2)$ also contains a leaf ℓ_i^2 with the parent c_i^2 . We define $\varphi(\ell_i^1) = \ell_i^2$. Therefore, $T(X_1) \preceq_{\text{iso}} T(X_2)$.

Suppose that $T(X_1)$ is subtree isomorphic to $T(X_2)$. Therefore, there is a subtree isomorphism mapping $\varphi : V(T(X_1)) \rightarrow V(T(X_2))$. Since φ is a subtree isomorphism mapping, $\varphi(c_i^1) = c_i^2$. If $X_1 \setminus X_2 \neq \emptyset$, $X_1 \setminus X_2$ has an item j . In this case, c_j^1 has a child ℓ_j^1 . On the other hand, c_j^2 is a leaf. Therefore, the parent of $\varphi(\ell_j^1)$ is not c_j^2 , and it contradicts that φ is a subtree isomorphism mapping. \square \square

In the remainder of this subsection, we show that \mathcal{X} has a maximal frequent itemset not contained in \mathcal{Y} if and only if $\mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{R}}(\mathcal{X})$ has a maximal frequent tree not contained in \mathcal{S} .

Lemma 26. Let X be a maximal frequent itemset not contained in \mathcal{Y} . Then, $\mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{R}}(\mathcal{X})$ has a rooted tree T with a frequency of at least η , and $T \not\preceq_{\text{iso}} S$ for any $S \in \mathcal{S}$.

Proof. From Theorem 25, $T(X)$ is contained in a tree in $\mathcal{T}(X_i)$ if and only if X is contained in X_i . Since the occurrence of X is at least η , the occurrence of $T(X)$ in $\mathcal{T}(\mathcal{X})$ is at least η . Moreover, any tree in $\mathcal{T}(\mathcal{Y})$ does not contain $T(X)$ as a subtree from Theorem 25. Otherwise, it contradicts the

maximality of X . Therefore, $T(X)$ is a maximal frequent tree that is not contained in $\mathcal{T}(\mathcal{Y})$. \square \square

Lemma 27. Let T be a maximal frequent tree of $\mathcal{T}(\mathcal{X})$ not contained in \mathcal{S} . Then, there is an itemset X with a frequency of at least θ and X is not contained in any itemset in \mathcal{Y} .

Proof. We show that $r(T)$ has exactly n children. If $r(T)$ has less than n children, R_1 obtained by adding a leaf to r is still a frequent tree. It contradicts the maximality of T . Therefore, T has exactly n children.

For the i -th child c_i of $r(T)$, c_i has at most one child. For T , we consider an itemset X defined as follows. The i -th child c_i has a child if and only if X contains i . In this construction, $T(X) = T$. From Theorem 25, X is an itemset with a frequency of at least θ and X is not contained any itemset in \mathcal{Y} . \square \square

From Theorems 26 and 27, if MAXIMAL FREQUENT TREE MINING for the ordered case can be solved in output-polynomial time, ANOTHER MAXIMAL ITEMSET can be solved in polynomial time. Therefore, we obtain the following theorem.

Theorem 28. There is no output-polynomial time algorithm for MAXIMAL FREQUENT TREE MINING, even if each ordered tree has a height of at most 2, unless $P = NP$.

6 Conclusion

In this paper, we investigate the complexity of frequent tree mining problems. In the ordered case, these problems are hard even if the height of each tree is at most two. More precisely, mining the maximal frequent common trees has no output-polynomial time unless $P = NP$ even if the height of each tree is at most two. In addition, mining the closed frequent common trees is harder than DUALIZATION. It means that if it can be solved in output-polynomial time, then DUALIZATION can be solved in output-polynomial time.

In the unordered case, the mining of maximal common trees has no output-polynomial time unless $P = NP$ even if the height of each tree is at most five. Moreover, the mining of closed frequent common trees can be solved in polynomial delay if the height of each tree is at most two. As future work, it would be interesting to investigate the complexity of CLOSED FREQUENT TREE MINING when the height is at least three.

References

- [1] David Avis and Komei Fukuda. Reverse search for enumeration. *Discrete Applied Mathematics*, 65(1):21–46, 1996.
- [2] Mikhail A. Babin and Sergei O. Kuznetsov. Dualization in lattices given by ordered sets of irreducibles. *Theoretical Computer Science*, 658:316–326, 2017. Horn formulas, directed hypergraphs, lattices and closure systems: related formalism and application.
- [3] José L Balcázar, Albert Bifet, and Antoni Lozano. Mining frequent closed rooted trees. *Machine Learning*, 78:1–33, 2010.
- [4] Fritz Bökler. *Output-sensitive complexity of multiobjective combinatorial optimization with an application to the multiobjective shortest path problem*. PhD thesis, Dortmund University, Germany, 2018.
- [5] Endre Boros, Vladimir Gurvich, Leonid Khachiyan, and Kazuhisa Makino. On maximal frequent and minimal infrequent sets in binary matrices. *Ann. Math. Artif. Intell.*, 39:211–221, 2003.
- [6] Caroline Brosse, Oscar Defrain, Kazuhiro Kurita, Vincent Limouzy, Takeaki Uno, and Kunihiro Wasa. On the hardness of inclusion-wise minimal separators enumeration. *Inf. Process. Lett.*, 185:106469, 2024.
- [7] Giovanni Buzzega, Alessio Conte, Yasuaki Kobayashi, Kazuhiro Kurita, and Giulia Punzi. The complexity of maximal common subsequence enumeration. *Proc. ACM Manag. Data*, 3(2):115:1–115:19, 2025.
- [8] Mostafa Haghiri Chehreghani. Efficiently mining unordered trees. In *2011 IEEE 11th International Conference on Data Mining*, pages 111–120, 2011.
- [9] Yun Chi, Yirong Yang, and Richard R. Muntz. Hybridtreeminer: An efficient algorithm for mining frequent rooted trees and free trees using canonical forms. In *Proceedings of the 16th International Conference on Scientific and Statistical Database Management, SSDBM '04*, page 11, USA, 2004. IEEE Computer Society.
- [10] Yun Chi, Yirong Yang, Yi Xia, and Richard R. Muntz. Cmtreeminer: Mining both closed and maximal frequent subtrees. In Honghua Dai, Ramakrishnan Srikant, and Chengqi Zhang, editors, *Advances in Knowledge Discovery and Data Mining*, pages 63–73, Berlin, Heidelberg, 2004. Springer Berlin Heidelberg.

- [11] Thomas Eiter, Kazuhisa Makino, and Georg Gottlob. Computational aspects of monotone dualization: A brief survey. *Discret. Appl. Math.*, 156(11):2035–2049, 2008.
- [12] Michael L. Fredman and Leonid Khachiyan. On the complexity of dualization of monotone disjunctive normal forms. *J. Algorithms*, 21(3):618–628, 1996.
- [13] Tamás Horváth, Keisuke Otaki, and Jan Ramon. Efficient frequent connected induced subgraph mining in graphs of bounded tree-width. In *PKDD 2013*, pages 622–637, Berlin, Heidelberg, 2013. Springer Berlin Heidelberg.
- [14] David S. Johnson, Mihalis Yannakakis, and Christos H. Papadimitriou. On generating all maximal independent sets. *Information Processing Letters*, 27(3):119–123, 1988.
- [15] Benny Kimelfeld and Phokion G. Kolaitis. The complexity of mining maximal frequent subgraphs. In *PODS 2013*, page 13–24, New York, NY, USA, 2013. Association for Computing Machinery.
- [16] Yasuaki Kobayashi, Kazuhiro Kurita, and Kunihiro Wasa. Polynomial-delay and polynomial-space enumeration of large maximal matchings. In Michael A. Bekos and Michael Kaufmann, editors, *Graph-Theoretic Concepts in Computer Science - 48th International Workshop, WG 2022, Tübingen, Germany, June 22-24, 2022, Revised Selected Papers*, volume 13453 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 342–355. Springer, 2022.
- [17] Yasuaki Kobayashi, Kazuhiro Kurita, and Kunihiro Wasa. Polynomial-delay enumeration of large maximal common independent sets in two matroids and beyond. *Inf. Comput.*, 304:105282, 2025.
- [18] Kazuhiro Kurita, Andrea Marino, Jason Schoeters, and Takeaki Uno. Spanner enumeration for temporal graphs. In Kitty Meeks and Christian Scheideler, editors, *4th Symposium on Algorithmic Foundations of Dynamic Networks, SAND 2025, Liverpool, UK, June 9-11, 2025*, volume 330 of *LIPICs*, pages 9:1–9:21. Schloss Dagstuhl - Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik, 2025.
- [19] Eugene L. Lawler, Jan Karel Lenstra, and A. H. G. Rinnooy Kan. Generating all maximal independent sets: Np-hardness and polynomial-time algorithms. *SIAM J. Comput.*, 9(3):558–565, 1980.

- [20] David W. Matula. Subtree isomorphism in $o(n^{5/2})$. In B. Alspach, P. Hell, and D.J. Miller, editors, *Algorithmic Aspects of Combinatorics*, volume 2 of *Annals of Discrete Mathematics*, pages 91–106. Elsevier, 1978.
- [21] Alexandre Termier, Marie christine Rousset, and Michèle Sebag. Treefinder: a first step towards xml data mining. *ICDM 2002*, pages 450–457, 2002.
- [22] Craig A. Tovey. A simplified np-complete satisfiability problem. *Discrete Applied Mathematics*, 8(1):85–89, 1984.
- [23] Takeaki Uno. An efficient algorithm for solving pseudo clique enumeration problem. *Algorithmica*, 56(1):3–16, 2010.
- [24] Takeaki Uno, Masashi Kiyomi, and Hiroki Arimura. LCM ver. 2: Efficient mining algorithms for frequent/closed/maximal itemsets. In Roberto J. Bayardo Jr., Bart Goethals, and Mohammed Javeed Zaki, editors, *FIMI '04, Proceedings of the IEEE ICDM Workshop on Frequent Itemset Mining Implementations, Brighton, UK, November 1, 2004*, volume 126 of *CEUR Workshop Proceedings*. CEUR-WS.org, 2004.
- [25] Xifeng Yan and Jiawei Han. gspan: Graph-based substructure pattern mining. In *Proceedings of the 2002 IEEE International Conference on Data Mining (ICDM 2002), 9-12 December 2002, Maebashi City, Japan*, pages 721–724. IEEE Computer Society, 2002.
- [26] Mohammed J. Zaki. Efficiently mining frequent trees in a forest. In *KDD 2002*, page 71–80, New York, NY, USA, 2002. Association for Computing Machinery.
- [27] Mohammed J. Zaki. Efficiently mining frequent embedded unordered trees. *Fundamenta Informaticae*, 66(1-2):33–52, 2005.