arXiv:1206.1837v1 [cs.DS] 8 Jun 2012

Efficient Algorithms for Finding Tucker Patterns

Cedric Chauve, Tamon Stephen, and Maria Tamayo

Department of Mathematics, Simon Fraser University, Burnaby (BC), Canada.
[cedric.chauve,tamon,mtamayo]@sfu.ca

Abstract. The Consecutive Ones Property is an important notion for binary matrices, both from a theoretical and applied point of view. Tucker gave in 1972 a characterization of matrices that do not satisfy the Consecutive Ones Property in terms of forbidden submatrices, the Tucker patterns. We describe here a linear time algorithm to find a Tucker pattern in a non-C1P binary matrix, which allows to extract in linear time a certificate for the non-C1P. We also describe an output-sensitive algorithm to enumerate all Tucker patterns of a non-C1P binary matrix.

1 Introduction

The Consecutive-Ones Property. A binary matrix has the *Consecutive Ones Property* (*C1P*) if there exists a permutation of its columns such that after ordering the columns according to this permutation, all the entries equal to 1 in each row are consecutive. Binary matrices that have the C1P are called C1P matrices, and binary matrices that do not have C1P are called non-C1P matrices. The Consecutive Ones Property was introduced in the mathematical community by Fulkerson and Gross [8], motivated by a problem of genetics, namely the linear structure of genes, studied by Benzer [1]. Since then, it has been used in several fields, from interval graph recognition to the seriation of archaeological data, computational biology .... From a graph-theoretical perspective, binary matrices are incidence matrices of bipartite graphs, with vertices corresponding respectively to rows and columns called row-vertices and column-vertices, and C1P matrices are exactly bipartite graphs that are convex for column-vertices [18].

Deciding the Consecutive-Ones Property and certificates. Fulkerson and Gross provided the first polynomial time algorithm to decide if a binary matrix is C1P [8], using a linear algebra approach. The most celebrated result on this problem is due to Booth and Lueker [4], who introduced the PQ-tree data structure: if a binary matrix is C1P, then the set of all permutations of its columns that satisfy the C1P can be encoded in linear space using a PQ-tree, and such a PQ-tree can be computed in linear time. However, the linear time PQ-tree construction algorithm described in [4], based on the notion of *reduction* of sets of permutations encoded by tree structures, is relatively complicated to implement. Since them, several other linear time algorithms to decide if a binary matrix is C1P have been introduced (see [17] and references there), with the aim to propose simpler alternatives to the PQ-tree approach. The recent optimal algorithm of Raffinot [17], building on the enlightening work of McConnell [13], can easily be implemented using elementary data structures.

Algorithms to decide the C1P are in general constructive: if a binary matrix is C1P, they will compute a column permutation that makes all entries 1 consecutive on each row. Such a *valid* permutation is then a *C1P certificate*. However, in order to be fully *certifying*(we refer the reader to [14] for a recent survey on certifying algorithms), a C1P testing algorithm would need to output also a *non-C1P certificate* if the considered matrix is non-C1P. As far as we know the first and only fully certifying algorithm for testing the C1P is due to McConnell [13]. McConnell proved that a matrix is C1P if and only if an associated graph, the *incompatibility graph*, is bipartite, and any odd cycle in this graph is then a non-C1P certificate. McConnell proved that such a non-C1P certificate can be computed in linear time, although he did not provide all algorithmic details (see also [12] for a correction of the bounds on the length of odd cycle given in [13]).

Tucker patterns. In [19], Tucker provided a simple combinatorial characterization of non-C1P matrices. He showed that a matrix is non-C1P if and only if the bipartite graph it encodes contains an *asteroidal triple* composed of three column-vertices. As a consequence, a non-C1P matrix contains a submatrix belonging to one of five families of binary matrices he explicitly described, called *Tucker patterns*. Column asteroidal triples and Tucker patterns can then be seen as natural non-C1P certificates. However, it is not until recently that Tucker patterns were considered from an algorithmic point of view [3,7,6]. As far as we know, the only polynomial time algorithms aiming at extracting Tucker patterns from a non-C1P binary matrix focus on *minimal* patterns and have a non-linear time complexity [7]: a naive implementation of the algorithm given in [7, Fig. 7] leads to a quadratic time complexity to find a Tucker pattern.

Results, relation to previous works and roadmap. Our main result is a linear time algorithm to extract a Tucker pattern and an asteroidal triple from a non-C1P binary matrix. Our algorithm is a post-processing of the partition refinement structure computed by the recent algorithm of Raffinot [17]. While in terms of asymptotic complexity we do not improve upon McConnell's already optimal algorithm to extract a non-C1P certificate, we believe our result is of interest for two reasons. First it is very easy to implement using standard data structures such as lists and arrays: we can provide all details explicitly in a few lines of pseudo-code, and it can be used as an add-on onto the simple algorithm described in [17]. Second, it is the first optimal algorithm for detecting Tucker patterns, a question open for almost 40 years now; indeed while the odd cycles of the incompatibility graph computed by the algorithm of McConnell represents a submatrix of the initial non-C1P matrix (vertices of the incompatibility graph are defined in terms of rows columns of the matrix and edges in terms of rows), it is not clear from the idetails given in [13] that this submatrix is a Tucker pattern, or if it is easy to extract a column-vertices asteroidal triple from this submatrix. On a more conceptual level, our algorithm, following the work of Raffinot and others [5,17], participates to a trend aimed at providing optimal algorithms for the C1P that can be easily implemented with low constants, using the ubiquitous algorithmic technique of partition refinement [10]. We also describe an output-sensitive algorithm that computes all Tucker patterns contained in a non-C1P matrix, which has interesting applications in genomics, for example.

Our paper is organized as follows. In Section 2 we introduce most concepts we rely on: the C1P, Tucker patterns, partition refinement, minimal conflicting sets. In Section 3 we describe our linear time algorithm to find a Tucker pattern. In Section 4 we describe our output-sensitive algorithm to enumerate all Tucker patterns. We conclude in Section 5.

2 Preliminaries

Binary matrices and bipartite graph. For a binary matrix M with m rows, n columns and e non-zero entries, we denote by $X = \{r_1, \ldots, r_m\}$ its rows and $Y = \{c_1, \ldots, c_n\}$ its columns; remind that we call vertices from X (resp. Y) row-vertices (resp. column-vertices). We assume from now that each row r_i is represented by a subset of $\{1, \ldots, n\}$ describing the indices of the columns c_j such that $M_{i,j} = 1$. We also denote by e the number of entries 1 in M, that defines the *size* of M.

Remark 1. Without loss of generality, we assume that M does not contain any row or column containing only entries 0.

We say that two binary matrices are *equivalent* if one can be transformed into the other one by reordering its rows and/or columns, and from now, unless otherwise specified, we refer to such equivalence classes as binary matrices. A *submatrix* of a binary matrix is defined by a subset of its rows and/or a subset of its columns.

Given a binary matrix M and a row r (resp. column c) of M, we denote by $M - r$ (resp. $M - c$) the matrix obtained by removing r (resp. c) from M.

M can also be seen as the adjacency matrix of a bipartite graph with vertex set $X \cup Y$. For the sake of simplicity, we also denote this graph by M and we transport to binary matrices graph-theoretical concepts: the *neighborhood* of a column (resp. row) of M is the set of rows (resp.

columns) that have an entry 1 in this column (resp. row), and a *path* between two columns is an ordered list of (alternating) rows and columns such that any consecutive elements correspond to an entry 1 of M.

The Consecutive-Ones Property. A permutation π of $\{1, \ldots, n\}$ is *valid* for M if ordering the columns of M according to π arranges consecutively the entries 1 of each row of M, or in other words, each row is an interval of π. M is said to satisfy the Consecutive-Ones Property, or equivalently to be C1P, if it admits at least one valid permutation. In terms of bipartite graphs, the C1P is equivalent to the notion of Y-convexity: M, as a binary matrix, is C1P if and only if M, as a bipartite graph is convex for Y [18].

The set of all valid permutations of a C1P matrix can be efficiently encoded into a data structure called PQ-tree, introduced by Booth and Lueker [4], that can be computed in linear time (see [13] for example).

Asteroidal triples and Tucker patterns. In [19], Tucker related the C1P to asteroidal triples and five families of forbidden submatrices, called *Tucker patterns*.

Definition 1. *A* Y-asteroidal triple *(Y-AT) is a set $\{c, c', c''\} \subseteq Y$ such that there is a path between any two vertices that avoids the neighborhood of the third one. A* filled Y*-AT is a Y-AT together with a path between any pair of vertices of $\{c, c', c''\}$ that avoids the neighborhood of the third one.*

Theorem 1. [19] *A matrix M is C1P if and only if M does not contain a Y-asteroidal triple.*

The five families of Tucker patterns are described in Fig. 1, where one can notice that the first three ones are parametrized, while the last two ones are of fixed size. The corresponding bipartite graphs are described in Fig. 5, and one can also notice that Tucker patterns also define Y-asteroidal triples, as stated in the property below.

Property 1. In M_{I_k}, any triple of column-vertices is a Y-AT, in M_{II_k} and M_{III_k}, (c_1, c_{k+2}, c_{k+3}) is a Y-AT, in M_{IV}, (c_2, c_4, c_6) is a Y-AT, and in M_V, (c_2, c_4, c_5) is a Y-AT.

Remark 2. Tucker patterns are minimal obstructions to the C1P as flipping any entry from 1 to 0, or deleting any row or column of a Tucker pattern results in a C1P matrix.

M_{I_k}:

	c_1	c_2	c_3	…	c_{k+2}
r_1	1	1	0	…	0
r_2	0	1	1	…	0
…			…		
r_{k+1}	0	0	…	1	1
r_{k+2}	1	0	…	0	1

M_{II_k}:

	c_1	c_2	c_3	…	c_{k+2}	c_{k+3}
r_1	1	1	0	…	0	0
r_2	0	1	1	…	0	0
…				…		
r_{k+1}	0	0	…	1	1	0
r_{k+2}	0	1	1	…	1	1
r_{k+3}	1	1	…	1	0	1

M_{III_k}:

	c_1	c_2	c_3	…	c_{k+2}	c_{k+3}
r_1	1	1	0	…	0	0
r_2	0	1	1	…	0	0
…				…		
r_{k+1}	0	0	…	1	1	0
r_{k+2}	0	1	…	1	0	1

M_{IV}:

	c_1	c_2	c_3	c_4	c_5	c_6
r_1	1	1	0	0	0	0
r_2	0	0	1	1	0	0
r_3	0	0	0	0	1	1
r_4	1	0	1	0	1	0

M_V:

	c_1	c_2	c_3	c_4	c_5
r_1	1	1	0	0	0
r_2	0	0	1	1	0
r_3	1	1	1	1	0
r_4	1	0	1	0	1

Fig. 1. Tucker patterns M_{I_k}, M_{II_k}, M_{III_k}, M_{IV} and M_V.

Theorem 2. [19] *A matrix M is C1P if and only if M does not contain a submatrix equivalent to M_{I_k}, M_{II_k}, M_{III_k}, M_{IV} or M_V.*

Connected components of the overlap graph. Two rows r_i and r_j are said to *overlap* if $r_i \cap r_j \neq \emptyset$, $r_i \not\subseteq r_j$, $r_j \not\subseteq r_i$. The overlap relation defines a graph O_M whose vertices are the rows of M. We can partition the rows into according to the connected components of this graph. Each such connected component naturally defines a submatrix of M, the submatrix composed of the rows forming the component. The *support* of a connected component of O_M is the union of the rows that compose it; in terms of binary matrices the support of a connected component of O_M is then a subset of columns of M, the subset of columns having entries 1 in at least one of the rows defining this component.

Computing the overlap graph of a binary matrix M can be done in linear time and space [5]. The following theorem is straightforward, and was already at the heart of the first polynomial C1P algorithm due to Fulkerson and Gross [8].

Theorem 3. *A matrix M is C1P if and only if each connected component of O_M is C1P.*

It follows that, given a non-C1P binary matrix M, every Tucker pattern it contains belong to a connected component of its overlap graph. Hence, (1) to find one Tucker pattern in a non-C1P matrix it is sufficient to consider a submatrix corresponding to a non-C1P connected component of O_M, and (2) to enumerate all Tucker patterns, one only need to consider successively and independently all connected components of O_M. We call a matrix M whose overlap graph is connected a *connected binary matrix*.

Computing efficiently the connected components of O_M is at the heart of McConnell's linear-time algorithm to decide if a binary matrix is C1P [13], and has been described in detail in [5,17].

From now, without loss of generality, we assume that M is a connected non-C1P binary matrix, implying that its support is also the full set of columns of M.

Partitions and partition refinement. Given a connected matrix M, *partition refinement* is an efficient algorithmic technique to decide if it is C1P. It was used for this purpose in [10,13,17] for example, where it was shown it can be used to decide if M is C1P in time and space $O(e)$.

Definition 2. *A* partition *of a connected matrix M is a totally ordered list $\mathcal{P} = ((P_1, C_1), \ldots, (P_k, C_k))$, where P_is are called* parts *and C_is are called* labels*, satisfying the following properties:*

1. *$P_i \subseteq Y$ (resp $C_i \subseteq X$), for $i = 1, \ldots, k$,*
2. *$P_i \cap P_j = \emptyset$ for all $1 \leq i < j \leq k$,*
3. *$\cup_{i=1}^{k} P_i = Y$ (the support of M is exactly the union of the P_is),*
4. *$\cup_{i=1}^{k} C_i = X$,*
5. *for every row r of M, if the sets of labels containing r is $\{C_{i_1}, \ldots, C_{i_p}\}$, then $r = \cup_{j=1}^{p} P_{i_j}$.*

$\mathcal{P}$ is said to be minimal *if it satisfies*

6. *$C_i \neq C_{i+1}$ for all $1 \leq i < k - 1$.*

The reversed partition *$\mathcal{P}^r$ of $\mathcal{P}$ is the partition $((P_k, C_k), \ldots, (P_1, C_1))$.*

A partition $\mathcal{P}$ naturally defines a partial order $<_{\mathcal{P}}$ on Y: $c_i <_{\mathcal{P}} c_j$ if and only if the part containing c_i appears strictly before the part containing c_j. This order is a *weak order*. We denote by $\ell(\mathcal{P})$ the set of *linear extensions* of this partial order.

Definition 3. *Let $\mathcal{P} = ((P_1, C_1), \ldots, (P_k, C_k))$ be a partition of M. The* span *$sp(r, \mathcal{P})$ of a row r in $\mathcal{P}$ is the minimal interval $((P_a, C_a), \ldots, (P_b, C_b))$ of $\mathcal{P}$ that contains all parts whose labels contain r. The span $sp(r, \mathcal{P})$ contains a* gap *if at least one part in $((P_a, C_a), \ldots, (P_b, C_b))$ has a label that does not contain r; $\mathcal{P}$ is said to be* valid *if, for every row r of M, $sp(r, \mathcal{P})$ does not have a gap.*

Theorem 4 below is a straightforward translation of the C1P in terms of partitions of binary matrices and is relied upon in several C1P decision algorithms (see [13] for example).

Theorem 4. *A connected binary matrix M is C1P if and only if there exists a valid partition of M. If M is C1P, there exists a unique, up to reversal, minimal partition $\mathcal{P}$ of M and a permutation is valid for M if and only if it belongs to $\ell(\mathcal{P}) \cup \ell(\mathcal{P}^r)$.*

The description above focuses on structural aspect of partitions. From an algorithmic point of view, partition refinement processes rows of a connected matrix M in a given sequential order (say $r_1, \ldots, r_m$), starting from an empty partition, and until, either all rows have been processed, in which case M is C1P, or adding the current row to the set of already processed rows results into a non-C1P matrix. Processing the current row r_k results in either a non-C1P matrix $\{r_1, \ldots, r_k\}$, in which case the process stops, or in refining the current minimal valid partition of the already processed rows $\{r_1, \ldots, r_{k-1}\}$ by adding at least one new part and at most two new parts. The order in which rows are processed is fundamental.

In earlier works [10,13], rows of M were to be processed in such a way that, when current row r_k is considered ($k > 1$), it overlaps at least one of the rows $r_1, \ldots, r_{k-1}$. Recently, Raffinot relaxed this condition to allow some specific cases of non-overlap with previously processed rows [17]. Nevertheless, we can state the following property on the result of applying this technique to a connected binary matrix.

Proposition 1. *Let M be a connected non-C1P binary matrix with m rows. Applying partition refinement to M results in (1) a set of $k \leq m$ rows $\{r_1, \ldots, r_k\}$ such that $\{r_1, \ldots, r_{k-1}\}$ is C1P, $\{r_1, \ldots, r_k\}$ is not C1P, and (2) a minimal valid partition $\mathcal{P}$ of $\{r_1, \ldots, r_{k-1}\}$.*

Minimal Conflicting Sets. The notion of Minimal Conflicting Set for the C1P was introduced in [2] as minimal sets of rows that were obstructing the C1P. It has since then proved to be useful in several problems of computational biology relying on the C1P [20,6].

Definition 4. *A subset $R = \{r_{i_1}, \ldots, r_{i_p}\}$ (resp. $C = \{c_{i_1}, \ldots, c_{i_q}\}$) is a* Minimal Conflicting Set for Rows *(MCS-R) (resp. Minimal Conflicting Set for Columns (MCS-C)) for M if it is not C1P but every proper subset of R (resp. C) is C1P.*

The minimality of Tucker patterns immediately implies the following result, that was central in [7].

Lemma 1. *A submatrix M' of a non-C1P matrix M, defined by rows $R = \{r_{i_1}, \ldots, r_{i_p}\}$ and columns $C = \{c_{i_1}, \ldots, c_{i_q}\}$, is a Tucker pattern if and only if R is an MCS-R and C is an MCS-C.*

3 Extracting a Tucker pattern from a non-C1P binary matrix

Our goal in this section is twofold. Given a non-C1P binary matrix M, we first want to compute a submatrix T of M that is a Tucker pattern. We also want to specify to which family it belongs to and to provide a set of three columns (a, b, c) of T that forms a Y-AT, together with three paths that define a filled Y-AT. The second objective is motivated by the use of a Y-AT as a non-C1P certificate and aims at making it trivial to check that the proposed structure (triple of vertices and paths) is indeed a filled Y-AT and thus a non-C1P certificate.

In Section 3.1 we provide a high-level description of our algorithm, followed, in Section 3.2, by a description of a linear time and space implementation of this algorithm.

3.1 Algorithmic principles

Let us start with a few assumptions. We first assume that M is a non-C1P connected binary matrix with p rows $\{r_1, \ldots, r_p\}$. Following Proposition 1, we can also assume without loss of generality that $\{r_1, \ldots, r_{p-1}\}$ is C1P.

Algorithm 1.

a. Let $T = \{r_1, \ldots, r_p\}$ (Note T is a binary matrix).
b. For $i = 1$ to p, if $T - \{r_i\}$ is not C1P, then $T = T - \{r_i\}$.
c. Let $C = \{c_1, \ldots, c_q\}$ be the support of T.
d. For $i = 1$ to q, if $T - \{c_i\}$ is not C1P, then $T = T - \{c_i\}$.
e. Return T.

Fig. 2. Algorithm 1: computing a Tucker pattern

Extracting a Tucker pattern. Following Lemma 1, we extract a Tucker pattern from M in two stages: we first extract a subset R of rows of M that is an MCS-R, then a subset C of the columns of R that is an MCS-C. We use the Algorithm 1, that follows principles introduced in [7,6].

Proposition 2. *If M is a non-C1P binary matrix, the binary matrix T returned by Algorithm 1 is a Tucker pattern.*

Proof. Straightforward consequence of Lemma 1. □

Note that this algorithm can obviously be implemented in $O((n+m)e)$ time as it reduces to $(n+m)$ C1P tests. One of our main contributions is to describe a $O(e)$ time implementation.

Identifying the family a Tucker pattern belongs to. We now assume that we are given a matrix M that is a Tucker pattern, and we want to find to which family it belongs to, and to order its rows and columns according to the order described in Fig. 1; we call such ordering a *canonical* ordering of M.

Proposition 3. *Let M be a Tucker pattern, with p rows, q columns and f entries* 1*. Deciding if M belongs to M_{I_k}, M_{II_k}, M_{III_k}, M_{IV} or M_V can be done in $O(f)$ time.*

Proof. The number of rows and columns of M, together with the size of the rows, allow to discriminate between patterns. M_{IV} is the only pattern that can contain 4 rows and 6 columns. For M_V, the only other pattern with 4 rows and 5 columns is M_{III_2}, that contains row of respective sizes 2, 2,, 2, 3 while M_V contains rows of sizes 2, 2, 3, 4. To discriminate between M_{III} and M_{II} and M_I it is sufficient to notice that only M_I and M_{II} satisfy $m = n$. Finally to discriminate between M_I and M_{II}, it is sufficient to notice that M_I has only rows of size 2.

All these simple rules can obviously be checked in $O(f)$ time. □

Extracting a Y-AT from a Tucker pattern. The first point to notice that if M has a constant number of rows (and then columns), then its rows and columns can be ordered according to the description of Tucker pattern given in Fig. 1, from which extracting the three columns and paths forming a Y-AT is trivial.

So we assume from now that M has a non-constant number of rows, and that we are seeking patterns of type I_k, II_k, III_k. For the sake of exposition, we assume that $k \geq 4$, which means that M has at least 7 rows. The key point is to notice from Fig. 7, Fig. 8, Fig. 9, that illustrates all possible partition refinement outcomes (M, r) where M is a Tucker pattern and $r = r_m$ is the row of M that has been processed last, that the three columns forming a Y-AT have special positions in the partition, that can be identified easily. From there, conceptually, computing a path between two columns is just a matter of deleting the neighborhood of the third one and computing a path between the two other ones.

3.2 A linear time implementation

Preliminaries. To implement the general algorithm described in the previous section, we first follow [17] and assume that the initial matrix M is given as a set of m subsets of $\{1, \ldots, n\}$, each representing a row of M.

The algorithms described in [17] are then applied to this matrix to identify a non-C1P component, C in which an obstruction to the C1P was identified after processing p rows. Without loss of generality, we label these rows $r_1, \ldots, r_p$: the connected matrix defined by $\{r_1, \ldots, r_{p-1}\}$ is C1P but not the one defined by $\{r_1, \ldots, r_p\}$.

Following [17], these initial steps can be done in time and space $O(e)$.

Data structures for partitions. To encode the partition $\mathcal{P}$ of $\{r_1, \ldots, r_{p-1}\}$, we again follow [17]. The encoding uses an array P of n cells. Each cell is either empty or contains a column label (i.e. an integer from $\{1, \ldots, n\}$). The set of non-empty cells is either empty or forms a suffix of the array[1]. Each cell $P[c]$ also points toward a pair of integers (a, b), with $a \geq b$, that defines a part of $\mathcal{P}$: all cells between the cells in position a and position b point toward (a, b) and represent a part of $\mathcal{P}$. Hence, a part is a consecutive sequence of cells of P. We also assume that for every integer i in the support of C, we know its position $pos[i]$ in the array P.

We augment this data structure as follows: each cell $P[c]$ is associated with an ordered list $P[c].\ell$ of its labels (i.e. the rows that contain entries 1 in the columns belonging to the part) and that the relative order of every pair of rows of C is the same in different parts. In particular, we assume that, if a cell c is such that $P[c] \in r_p$, then its label list ends by r_p.

We also require that, in the partition data structure, the cells forming the first (resp. last) part containing elements from r_p are organized in such a way that all elements not belonging to r_p appear, in the array P, before (resp. after) the elements belonging to r_p.

Finally, we denote by R the number of elements of r_p that do not appear in any of the rows $r_1, \ldots, r_{p-1}$ and we denote by F and L the positions of the first and last elements of r_p in P.

Proposition 4. *Computing the data structure encoding $\mathcal{P}$ and r_p as described above can be done in time and space $O(e)$.*

Proof. In [17], it was shown how to compute the arrays P and pos, without the labels of parts and without considering r_p in time and space $O(e)$. So we need only to consider the augmentations to the data structure we introduced.

Adding the labels of the parts (the structure $P[c].\ell$ to each cell c) can be done by iterating on rows $\{r_1, \ldots, r_p\}$ and for each row r and each element $i \in r$, adding at the end of $P[pos[i]].\ell$ the label r. This can be done in constant time using a standard implementation of linked lists.

To ensure the cells of the first part containing elements of r_p are organized with cells belonging to r_p can be achieved in $O(e)$ time by scanning the part from both sides until one cell belonging to r_p and one cell not belonging to r_p are met, and then swapped. The same holds for ensuring the proper order in the last part containing elements of r_p. □

Computing an MCS-R. We first need to define the notion of *gap cell* in $\mathcal{P}$ caused by r_p: a gap cell is a non-empty cell that does not belong to r_p. A gap cell is *internal* if there is at least one non-gap cell appearing before in the array P and one non-gap cell appearing after in the array P; it and *external* gap cell otherwise. An external gap cell can be a *left gap* if it appears before the first non-gap cell of P and a *right gap* cell if it appears after the last non-gap cell of P. The property below follows directly from the assumptions on $\{r_1, \ldots, r_p\}$ and from the definition of a partition of a C1P matrix.

Property 2. $\mathcal{P}$ contains either at least one gap cell. If it does not contain an internal gap cell, then $R > 0$ and $\mathcal{P}$ contains at least one left gap cell and one right gap cell.

Following Algorithm 1 (steps a and b), we want to decide if, given a partition $\mathcal{P}$, removing a row r from it (1) destroys all internal gap cells and, in the case where $R > 0$, (2) results in not having both left and right gap cells. If this does not happen, then removing r results into the partition of a non-C1P matrix and we want to remove definitively r. Otherwise, we do not want to remove r.

[1] In [17], the non-empty cells for either a prefix of the array or a prefix and a suffix of the array. But we can obviously shift cells in order that the non-empty cells form a prefix of the array (see Fig. 2 in [17]).

Algorithm 2.

1 Let $T = \{r_1, \ldots, r_p\}$.
2 Let IG (resp. LG, RG) be the number of internal (resp. left, right) gap cells, F and L the first and last cell containing an element of r_p.
3 For i from 1 to $p-1$ do
  3.1 Let u (resp. v) be the position of the first (resp. last) element of r_i present in A. Let $ig = 0$ and $lg = 0$ and $rg = 0$.
  3.2 For c from u to v do
    3.2.1 If $c < F$ and $P[c].\ell = (r_i)$ then $lg = lg + 1$ (*left gap cell*)
    3.2.2 If $c > L$ and $P[c].\ell = (r_i)$ then $rg = rg + 1$ (*right gap cell*)
    3.2.3 If $F < c < L$ and $P[c].\ell = (r_i)$ then $ig = ig + 1$ (*internal cell gap*)
  3.3 If $ig < IG$ or ($R > 0$ and $lg < LG$ and $rg < RG$) then (*$T - \{r_i\}$ is not C1P*)
    3.3.1 For c from u to v do remove r_i from $P[c].\ell$.
    3.3.2 Remove r_i from T.
    3.3.3 $IG = IG - ig$, $LG = LG - lg$, $RG = RG - rg$.

Fig. 3. Algorithm 2, computing an MCS-R: steps a and b of Algorithm 1

Proposition 5. *Algorithm 2 computes an MCS-R in time $O(e)$.*

Proof. We assume that the given array P satisfies the assumptions described in the previous paragraph (Proposition 4). The correctness of the algorithm follows from Proposition 2.

Computing IG, LG and RG can be achieved by scanning P and requires $O(e)$ time.

Computing u and v for a given r_i can be done in $O(|r_i|)$ time using the array *pos*. The loop in line 3.2 requires a constant time per scanned cell, so a $O(|r_i|)$ time complexity. To implement line 3.3.1 in time $O(|r_i|)$, we only need to maintain, in each structure $P[c].\ell$ a cursor pointing to the last visited label, as the assumption that the relative order of labels pairs among these lists is the same ensures that we can access to the label r_i in constant time, and then remove it from the linked list containing it in constant time. This all leads to an amortized time complexity of $O(f)$ over the loop in line 3, which belongs to $O(e)$. □

Remark 3. It follows from the fact that the set T of rows computed by Algorithm 2 contains a Tucker pattern that it is connected, which implies that P encodes a partition for $T - \{r_p\}$. However, this partition might not be minimal in the sense of Definition 2.

Computing an MCS-C. The general principle is similar to the case of computing an MCS: removing a column results in a C1P matrix if it destroys all internal gap cells and at least one set of external gap cells if $R > 0$, and if this does not happen, removing the currently processed columns modifies IG, LG and RG. To implement the operation of removing a column in position $P[c]$, we delete the list $P[c].\ell$; hence a cell $P[c]$ with an empty structure $P[c].\ell$ is considered as removed.

Proposition 6. *Algorithm 3 computes an MCS-C in time $O(e)$.*

Proof. The correctness of the algorithm follows from Proposition 2. Computing IG, LG, RG, F, L and E can be achieved by scanning P and requires $O(e)$ time. All steps but step 3 require constant time. Step 4 can obviously be done in time linear in the size of P, so $O(e)$. □

Extracting a Y-AT and a certificate. Combining Propositions 2, 5 and 6, we obtain the following result.

Theorem 5. *Given a non-C1P binary matrix M with e entries 1, one can compute a Tucker pattern contained in M in time and space $O(e)$.*

The Tucker pattern is defined by the partition encoded by the prefix of non-empty cells of P resulting from step 3 of Algorithm 3. Using the simple rules given in the proof of Proposition 3, one can then decide which family this Tucker pattern belongs to.

Algorithm 3. (*Assumption: T and P are obtained from Algorithm 2*)

1 Let IG (resp. LG, RG) be the number of internal (resp. left, right) gap cells, F and L the first and last cell containing an element of r_p, and E be the position of the last non-empty cell in P.
2 For c from 1 to E do
  2.1 If $c < F$ then $lg = 1$ else $lg = 0$
  2.2 If $c > L$ then $rg = 1$ else $rg = 0$
  2.3 If $F < c < L$ and $r_p \notin P[c].\ell$ then $ig = 1$ else $ig = 0$
  2.4 If $ig < IG$ or ($R > 0$ and $lg < LG$ and $rg < RG$) then (*T minus column $P[c]$ is not C1P*)
    2.4.1 $IG = IG - ig$, $LG = LG - lg$, $RG = RG - rg$.
    2.4.2 Delete $P[c].\ell$
3 Shift non-empty cells of P in order that they form a prefix of P.

Fig. 4. Algorithm 3, computing an MCS-C: steps c and d of Algorithm 1

Theorem 6. *Given a non-C1P binary matrix M with e entries 1, one can compute a filled Y-AT in M in time and space $O(e)$.*

Proof. The basis of the proof is Property 1. If the extracted Tucker pattern T contains a constant number of rows, then a brute-force approach that considers all triples of columns is sufficient.

Otherwise, if T belongs to M_{I_k}, any triple of columns defines a Y-AT.

Finally, if T belongs to M_{II_k} or M_{III_k}, if follows from Fig. 8 and Fig. 9 that there is a single internal gap cell, that is either c_1 or c_{k+2} or c_{k+3} and thus belongs to the corresponding Y-AT, while the two other columns of this triple are the first and last of P. Hence, it takes time $O(e)$ to extract this Y-AT from P.

In order to compute a filled Y-AT, it is sufficient to compute, for every pair $\{c, c'\}$ of the Y-AT, a path between c and c' in the bipartite graph obtained from T by deleting the vertices belonging to the neighborhood of the third vertex of the Y-AT, which can be done in linear time through standard approaches such as depth-first search for example. Note however, there is no need to create explicitly the bipartite graph defined by M, as the data structure P used above encodes all its edges.

All such operations can then be done in $O(e)$ time and space. □

Remark 4. As noted by McConnell in [13], the time complexity of the certificate checking step depends on the representation of M. Here we consider that M is given by a set of m subsets of $\{1, \ldots, n\}$. Given two columns x and y and a path between them, defined as a totally ordered list L of (alternating) rows and columns, checking that this path avoids the neighborhood of a third column z can obviously be done in $O(e)$ time (by scanning all rows to identify and mark the ones containing z, then scanning L to check that it contains no marked row). It then remains to check that L is indeed a path between x and y; this requires only to check that each column-vertex is incident to all surrounding row-vertices in the path, which can obviously be done in time $O(e)$.

4 Enumerating all Tucker patterns

In this section, we combine the general approach used in [7,3] to find small Tucker patterns with a classical output-sensitive algorithm to enumerate all cycles in a graph due to Read and Tarjan [16] to design an output-sensitive algorithm that enumerate all Tucker patterns in a non-C1P matrix.

Theorem 7. *Let M be a non-C1P binary matrix with m rows, n columns, e entries 1 and containing k Tucker patterns. All Tucker patterns of M can be enumerated in time $O((m^4+n^3m^2)(n+m)+e(k+1))$.*

We denote by k_i the number of Tucker patterns of type M_i, for $i = I, II, III, IV, V$, and we describe, for each pattern, how to enumerate all its occurrences. Roughly speaking, pattern M_I

can be enumerated using a simple variation on the classical cycles enumeration algorithm of [16], while patterns M_{II} and M_{III} can be enumerated by checking configurations of vertices for the vertices (or some subset) x, y, z, a, b, c, d and listing all paths between y and z, and patterns M_{IV} and M_V, which are of bounded size, can be enumerated by slight modification of a brute-force approach that requires time polynomial in the size of M.

Pattern M_I. The pattern M_I is a chordless cycle in M, where a chord is a single edge linking two non-consecutive vertices of the cycle. In [16], Read and Tarjan describes an algorithm that can enumerate all C cycles of M in time $O(n + m + e + eC)$. It can easily be modified to avoid computing the cycles with chords as follows: when extending a path P, starting at a vertex v and that can be closed into a cycle (step $C1$ in [16]), one checks if there exists a path from the current vertex of P to v that avoids every vertex incident to P, by discarding all edges adjacent to a vertex of P but x. We can then enumerate all Tucker patterns M_I in time $O(n + m + e(k_I + 1))$.

Pattern M_{II}. To enumerate all occurrences of patterns M_{II}, one starts by enumerating all possible sets of three column vertices for $\{x, y, z\}$ and two row vertices for $\{a, b\}$, in time $O(n^3m^2)$. Then, for every set $\{x, y, z, a, b\}$, we partition the remaining vertices into the sets $V_{a,b}$ of column vertices that are adjacent to both a and b, and the set $V_{y,z}$ of row vertices that are adjacent to either y (resp. z) and a vertex of $V_{a,b}$, or at least two vertices of $V_{a,b}$, but not x. As these two sets of vertices are disjoint and are defined by bounded size subgraphs of M, they can be computed in time $O(n+m)$. Then, to enumerate all patterns M_{II}, we only need to enumerate all chordless paths between y and z using only vertices from $V_{a,b} \cup V_{y,z}$, where again a chord is a single edge linking two non consecutive vertices of such a path. This can be achieved in time $O(n+m+e(k_{II}+1))$ using Read and Tarjan's algorithm as modified above. The total complexity is then $O(n^3m^2(n+m)+e(k_{II}+1))$.

Pattern M_{III}. Occurrences of pattern M_{III} can be enumerated in a similar way to pattern M_{II}. The main difference is that the initial step requires to enumerate all quadruples $\{x, y, z, a\}$ of vertices, and can then be done in time $O(n^3m)$, resulting in a total time complexity of $O(n^3m(n+m) + e(k_{III} + 1))$.

Pattern M_{IV}. To enumerate all occurrences of pattern M_{IV} more efficiently than checking all configurations of 4 row vertices and 6 column vertices, one starts by enumerating only the row vertices $\{a, b, c, d\}$, in time $O(m^4)$. Then, all potential sets of column vertices compatible with this quadruplet (denoted by V_x for possible vertices x, V_y, V_z, V_u, V_v and V_w being defined similarly) are computed, in time $O(n)$ as they are pairwise disjoint. It is then sufficient to list all $(x, y, z, u, v, w) \in V_x \times V_y \ldots \times V_w$, as each defines an occurrence of a Tucker pattern M_{IV}. This can then be done in time $O(m^4n + k_{IV})$.

Pattern M_V. Pattern M_V can be enumerated in a similar way, starting from all possible quadruples $\{a, b, c, d\}$ of row vertices, in time $O(m^4n + k_{IV})$.

Summing the complexities of these five steps, we then obtain the complexity stated in Theorem 7.

5 Conclusion

We provide a simple and optimal algorithm to extract a Tucker pattern and a Y-AT from a non-C1P matrix that can be used as a certificate. We also provide a simple output-sensitive algorithm to enumerate all Tucker pattern in a non-C1P matrix.

Among the related problems that deserve attention, the most obvious would be to lower the time complexity of enumerating all Tucker patterns. Note however that we have been able to apply our algorithm to real genomics data with matrices that were very close of being C1P, illustrating the usefulness of our algorithm. It would also be interesting to investigate similar questions for another characterization of non-C1P matrices, the row-column intersection graph [11,15].

Acknowledgments. Research supported by NSERC Discovery Grants to C.C. and T.S.

References

1. S. Benzer. 1961. On the Topography of the Genetic Fine Structure. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 47, 403–415.
2. A. Bergeron, M. Blanchette, A. Chateau and C. Chauve. 2004. Reconstructing ancestral gene orders using conserved intervals. In: *WABI 2004*, *LNCS* 3240, 14–25.
3. G. Blin, R. Rizzi and S. Vialette. 2010. A faster algorithm for finding minimum Tucker submatrices. In: *CiE 2010*, *LNCS* 6158, 69–77.
4. K.S. Booth and G. S.Lueker. 1976. Testing for the consecutive ones property, interval graphs, and planarity using pq-tree algorithms. *J. Comput. Syst. Sci.* 13, 335–379.
5. P. Charbit, M. Habib, V. Limouzy, F. de Montgolfier, M. Raffinot and M. Rao. 2008. A note on computing set overlap classes. *Inf. Process. Lett.* 108, 186–191.
6. C. Chauve, U.-U. Haus, T. Stephen, V.P. You. 2010. Minimal conflicting sets for the Consecutive Ones Property in ancestral genome reconstruction. *J. Comput. Biol.*, 17, 1167–1181.
7. M. Dom, J. Guo and R. Niedermeier. 2010. Approximation and fixed-parameter algorithms for consecutive ones submatrix problems. *J. Comput. Syst. Sci.* 76, 204–221.
8. D.R. Fulkerson and O.A. Gross. 1965. Incidence matrices and interval graphs. *Pacific J. Math.* 15, 835–855.
9. M. Habib, C. Paul and L. Viennot. 1999. Partition Refinement Techniques: An Interesting Algorithmic Tool Kit. *Int. J. Found. Comput. Sci.* 10, 147–170.
10. M. Habib, R.M. McConnell, C. Paul and L. Viennot. 2000. Lex-BFS and partition refinement, with applications to transitive orientation, interval graph recognition and consecutive ones testing. *Theoret. Comput. Sci.* 234, 59–84.
11. C.G. Lekkerkerker and J.C. Boland. 1962. Representation of a finite graph by a set of intervals on the real line. *Fund. Math.*, 51, 45-64.
12. M. Malekesmaeili, C. Chauve and T. Stephen. A tight bound on the length of odd cycles in the incompatibility graph of a non-C1P matrix. 2011. CoRR, abs/1109.0562. http://arxiv.org/abs/1109.0562.
13. R.M. McConnell. 2004. A certifying algorithm for the consecutive-ones property. In: Proceedings of the fifteenth annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms, *SODA 2004*, pp. 768–777.
14. R.M. McConnell, K. Mehlhorn, S. Näher, P. Schweitzer. 2011. Certifying algorithms. *Comput. Sci. Review* 5, 119–161.
15. A. Ouangraoua, M. Raffinot. 2012. Faster and Simpler Minimal Conflicting Set Identification. CoRR, abs/1201.5513. http://arxiv.org/abs/1201.5513.
16. R.C. Read and R.E. Tarjan. 1975. Bounds on backtrack algorithms for listing cycles, paths, and spanning trees. *Networks* 5, 237–252.
17. M. Raffinot. 2011. Consecutive Ones Property Testing: Cut or Swap. In: *CiE 2011*, *LNCS* 6735, 239–249.
18. J. Spinrad. 2003. Efficient graph representations. American Mathematical Society, Providence, Rhode Island.
19. A.C. Tucker. 1972. A structure theorem for the consecutive 1's property. *J. Combinat. Theory (B)* 12, 153–162.
20. J. Stoye and R. Wittler. 2009. A Unified Approach for Reconstructing Ancient Gene Clusters. *IEEE/ACM Trans. Comput. Biology Bioinform.* 6, 387–400.

Additional figures




Fig. 5. Bipartite graphs of Tucker patterns. Top row, from left to right: M_{I_k}, M_{II_k}, M_{III_k}. Bottom row, from left to right: M_{IV}, M_V




Fig. 6. Overlap graphs of Tucker patterns. From left to right: M_{I_k}, M_{II_k}, M_{III_k}, M_{IV}, M_V

Notation. Figures 7, 8, 9, represent all possible partitions resulting from applying partition refinement to a Tucker pattern $T = \{r_1, \ldots, r_m\}$ (with support $\{c_1, \ldots, c_n\}$), with the last row being processed indicated in the left-hand part of the table. Boxes represent parts of the partition, rows above parts represent the labels of these parts and the lines joining r to the parts indicate which parts belong to r; when some entries 1 of r do not belong to any part of the partition, they appear as a separate part, on the left, with no associated label




Fig. 7. Partition of M_{I_k}.




Fig. 8. Partition of M_{II_k}.




Fig. 9. Partition of M_{III_k}.