

# On the Heapability of finite partial orders

János Balogh\*    Cosmin Bonchiş, Diana Diniş, Gabriel Istrate†

Ioan Todinca‡

March 20, 2018

## Abstract

We investigate the partitioning of partial orders into a minimal number of heapable subsets. We prove a characterization result reminiscent of the proof of Dilworth’s theorem, which yields as a byproduct a flow-based algorithm for computing such a minimal decomposition. On the other hand, in the particular case of sets and sequences of intervals we prove that this minimal decomposition can be computed by a simple greedy-type algorithm. The paper ends with a couple of open problems related to the analog of the Ulam-Hammersley problem for decompositions of sets and sequences of random intervals into heapable sets.

**Keywords:** partial order; heapable sequence; Dilworth’s theorem; greedy algorithm; random intervals.

## 1 Introduction

The *longest increasing subsequence* is a classical problem in combinatorics and algorithmics, with deep connections to statistical physics and random matrix theory (for a very readable introduction see [23]).

Byers et al. [5] introduced an interesting variant of the concept of increasing sequence: sequence of integers  $A = a_1, a_2, \dots, a_n$  is *heapable* if numbers  $a_1, a_2, \dots, a_n$  can be successively inserted as actual leaves into a heap-ordered binary tree (not necessarily complete).

Heapability was further investigated in [15] (and, independently, in [22]). In particular, a subgroup of the authors of the present papers showed that for permutations one can compute in polynomial time a minimal decomposition

---

\*Dept. of Applied Informatics, Gyula Juhász Faculty of Education, University of Szeged, Hungary, balogh@jgypk.u-szeged.hu

†Dept. of Computer Science, West University of Timișoara and the e-Austria Research Institute, Bd. V. Pârvan 4, cam. 045B, Timișoara, RO-300223, Romania. Corresponding author’s email: [gabrielistrate@acm.org](mailto:gabrielistrate@acm.org)

‡Université d’Orléans, INSA Centre Val de Loire, LIFO EA 4022, Orléans, France, ioan.todinca@univ-orleans.fr.

into heapable subsequences, and connected this problem to a variation on Hammersley’s interacting particle process (see also further work in [16, 2, 3], that extended/confirmed some of the conjectures of [15]).

This paper started as a conversation on the heapability of *sequences of intervals* during a joint Timișoara-Szeged seminar on theoretical computer science in November 2015. Its main purpose is to offer a different perspective on the concept of heapability, by connecting the problem of computing a minimal decomposition of partial ordered sets into ”heapable subsequences” (that will be parametrized in this paper by an integer  $k \geq 2$ , and will be called *k-chains*) to the classical theorems of Dilworth and Kőnig-Egerváry: we show that the number of classes in a minimal decomposition can be obtained as a vertex cover in a bipartite graph. As a byproduct we obtain an efficient algorithm based on network flows for computing such a minimal decomposition. This results and the ones from [15] (where the same parameter was computed, in the case of integer sequences, via a direct greedy algorithm) raise the question whether such greedy algorithms exist for other posets. We answer this question in the affirmative way by adapting the result of [15] to *sets and sequences of intervals*, ordered by the natural partial order, the setting that motivated the discussion leading to the paper.

The structure of the paper is as follows: in Section 2 we review the main concepts and technical results we will be concerned with. Then, in Section 3 we prove a numerical characterization inspired by (the proof of) Dilworth’s theorem for the size of minimal partition of a partial order into *k-chains*. This result provides, as a byproduct, a flow-based algorithm for the computation of such a minimal partition. We then investigate, in Section 4 a special case of this problem for sequences of intervals, showing that a greedy-type algorithm computes such a minimal partition in this special case. In Section 5 we show that the result above extends to (unordered) *sets* (rather than sequences) of intervals. We extend this result in Section 6 from interval to trapezoid partial orders. In Section 7 we investigate the maximum heapability of interval partial orders, proving that it has polynomial time algorithms: the status of this problem for permutation posets is open. We conclude in Section 8 with some open questions raised by our results.

## 2 Preliminaries

We will assume knowledge of standard graph-theoretic notions. In particular, given integer  $k \geq 1$ , rooted tree  $T$  is *k-ary* if every node has at most  $k$  descendants. Given a directed graph  $G = (V, E)$ , we will denote by  $vc(G)$  the size of the minimum vertex cover of  $G$ .

Let  $k \geq 1$ . A sequence of integers  $A = (a_1, a_2, \dots, a_n)$  is called *k-heapable* if there exists a *k-ary* tree  $T$  with  $n$  nodes, such that its nodes are labeled by  $a_1, a_2, \dots, a_n$ , and a bijection between vertices of  $T$  and elements of  $A$  such that for any two nodes labeled  $a_i, a_j$ , if  $a_j$  is a descendant of  $a_i$  of  $T$  then  $i < j$  holds for their indices and  $a_i < a_j$ .

We will be concerned with finite partially ordered sets (posets) only. Sequences of elements from a poset naturally embed into this framework by associating, to every sequence  $A = (a_1, \dots, a_n)$  the poset  $Q_A = \{(i, a_i) : 1 \leq i \leq n\}$  with partial order  $(i, a_i) \leq (j, a_j)$  if and only if  $i \leq j$  and  $a_i \leq a_j$ . Given poset  $Q$ , its subset  $B$  is a *chain* if the partial order of  $Q$  is a total order on  $B$ . Subset  $C$  is an *antichain* if no two elements  $a, b$  of  $C$  are comparable with respect to the partial order relation of  $Q$ . Dilworth's theorem [7] states that the minimum number of classes in a chain decomposition of a partial order  $Q$  is equal to the size of the largest antichain of  $Q$ .

One particular type of partial orders we consider is that of *permutation orders*: partial order  $\preceq$  is a permutation order if there exists a permutation  $\pi$  of the elements of  $U$  such that, for all  $a, b \in U$ ,  $\text{rank}_\pi(a) < \text{rank}_\pi(b)$  and  $\pi[a] < \pi[b]$ .

Another particular case we will be concerned with is that of *interval orders*. Without loss of generality all our intervals will be closed subsets of  $(0, 1)$ . We define a partial order of them as follows: Given intervals  $I_1 = [a_1, b_1]$  and  $I_2 = [a_2, b_2]$  with  $a_1 < b_1$  and  $a_2 < b_2$ , we say that  $I_1 \leq I_2$  if and only if the entire interval  $I_1$  lies to the left of  $I_2$  on the real numbers axis, that is  $b_1 \leq a_2$ . For technical reasons we will also require a total ordering of intervals, denoted by  $\sqsubseteq$  and defined as follows:  $I_1 \sqsubseteq I_2$  if either  $b_1 < b_2$  or  $b_1 = b_2$  and  $a_1 < a_2$ . On the other hand, by the phrase "random intervals" we will mean, similarly to the model in [17], random subintervals of  $(0, 1)$ . A random sample  $I$  can be constructed iteratively at each step by choosing two random real numbers  $a, b \in (0, 1)$  and taking  $I = [\min(a, b), \max(a, b)]$ .

We need to briefly review one classical proof of Dilworth's theorem, due to Fulkerson [11]. This proof employs the König-Egerváry theorem [18, 8], stating that the size of a maximum matching in a bipartite graph is equal to the minimum vertex cover in the same graph. This result is applied as follows: first, we prove that each matching in  $G_Q$  uniquely corresponds to a chain decomposition of  $Q$ . Next we apply König's theorem to the so-called *split graph associated to poset*  $Q = (U, \leq)$  [10], i.e. the bipartite graph  $G_Q = (V_1, V_2, E)$ , where  $V_1 = \{x^- : x \in U\}$  and  $V_2 = \{y^+ : y \in U\}$  are independent copies of  $U$ , and given  $x \leq y \in U$  we add to  $E$  edge  $x^-y^+$ . The conclusion is that the cardinality of a minimum chain decomposition of  $Q$  is equal to  $n$ , the number of elements in  $U$ , minus the size of the smallest vertex cover in  $G_Q$  defined above. Finally, this latter quantity is proved to coincide to the size of the largest antichain of  $Q$ .

We extend the definition of  $k$ -heapable sequences to general posets as follows: given integer  $k \geq 1$  and poset  $Q = (U, \leq)$  a subset  $A$  of the base set  $U$  is called  *$k$ -heapable* (or, equivalently, a  *$k$ -chain* of  $Q$ ) if there exists a  $k$ -ary rooted tree  $T$  and a bijection between  $A$  and the vertices of  $T$  such that for every  $i, j \in A$ , if  $j$  is a descendant of  $i$  in  $T$  then  $i < j$  in  $Q$ . The  *$k$ -width of poset*  $Q$ , denoted by  $k\text{-wd}(Q)$ , was defined in [16] as the smallest number of classes in a partition of  $Q$  into  $k$ -chains. For  $k = 1$ , by Dilworth's theorem, we recover the usual definition of poset width [24]. On the other hand, when  $\pi \in S_n$  is a permutation of  $n$  elements,  $k\text{-wd}(Q_\pi)$  particularizes to the parameter whose scaling properties

were investigated in [15].

Two important (unpublished) minimax theorems attributed in [13] to Tibor Gallai deal with partitioning sets of intervals. We will only be concerned with the first of them, that states that, given a set of intervals  $J$  on the real numbers line the following equality holds:

**Proposition 1.** *The minimum number of partition classes of  $J$  into pairwise disjoint intervals is equal to the maximum number of pairwise intersecting intervals in  $J$ .*

Of course, the first quantity in Proposition 1 is nothing but the 1-width of the partial order  $\leq$  on intervals. As for random permutations (the well-known *Ulam-Hammersley problem* [19, 25]), the scaling of (the expected value of) this parameter for sets  $R$  of  $n$  random intervals has been settled and has the form [17]

$$E[1\text{-wd}(R)] \sim \frac{2}{\sqrt{\pi}} \sqrt{n}.$$

## 2.1 A graph-theoretic restatement

Problems that we are concerned with have, it turns out, an algorithmic interpretation that is strongly related to problems of computing the maximum independent sets and the chromatic number of various classes of graphs. The idea first appeared (somewhat implicitly) in [22]. One can make it fully explicit as follows: Given directed graph  $P = (U, \leq)$ , call a set of elements  $W \subseteq U$  a  $k$ -treelike independent set of  $P$  if there is a  $k$ -ary tree  $T$ , not necessarily complete, and a bijection  $V(T) \rightarrow W$  such that, for all vertices  $v, w$  of  $T$ , if  $v$  is an ancestor of  $w$  in  $T$  then  $f(v)$  and  $f(w)$  are **not** connected in  $P$ .

For  $k = 1$  the previous concept coincides with that of an independent set. Paralleling the case  $k = 1$  (for which a polynomial time algorithm is known, in the form of patience sorting [20]), we can restate the open problem from [5] as the problem of computing a maximal 2-treelike independent set:

**Proposition 2.** *Computing the longest  $k$ -heapable subsequence of an arbitrary permutation is equivalent to computing a maximum  $k$ -treelike independent sets in the permutation digraph induced by the Hasse diagram of  $P$ .*

When  $k$  is implied, we will informally use the name *maximum heapable subset* for the problem of computing a maximum  $k$ -chain of an arbitrary permutation. Similarly, the problem of partitioning the set into  $k$ -chains can be regarded as a generalization of graph coloring: define a  $k$ -treelike coloring of a partial order  $P$  to be a partition of the universe  $U$  into classes that induce  $k$ -treelike independent sets. The  *$k$ -treelike chromatic number* of a partial order  $P$  is the minimum number of colors in a  $k$ -treelike coloring of  $P$ .

The main result from [15] is equivalent to the following statement:

**Proposition 3.** *For  $k \geq 2$  the greedy algorithm of Figure 1 computes an optimal  $k$ -treelike coloring of permutation partial orders.*

<p><b>Input:</b> Permutation order <math>P</math> specified by permutation <math>\pi \in S_n</math>.</p> <p><b>Output:</b> A <math>k</math>-treelike coloring of <math>P</math>.</p> <p><b>let</b> <math>F = \emptyset</math></p> <p><b>for</b> <math>i := 1</math> to <math>n</math> do:</p> <p style="padding-left: 2em;"><b>if</b> <math>\pi(i)</math> cannot become the child of any node in <math>F</math>.</p> <p style="padding-left: 4em;"><b>then</b></p> <p style="padding-left: 6em;">Start a new tree with root <math>\pi(i)</math>.</p> <p style="padding-left: 4em;"><b>else</b></p> <p style="padding-left: 6em;">make <math>\pi(i)</math> a child of the largest value <math>\pi(j) &lt; \pi(i)</math>, <math>j &lt; i</math> that has fewer than two children.</p>
---

Figure 1: The greedy best-fit algorithm for tree-like colorings of permutation posets.

Again, let us remark that the corresponding statement for  $k = 1$  is well known, as it is equivalent to the greedy coloring of permutation graphs, accomplished by Patience Sorting.

### 3 Main result

Our main result gives a characterization of the  $k$ -width of a finite poset that is strongly related to the proof of Dilworth's theorem sketched above:

**Definition 1.** Given poset  $Q = (U, \leq)$  an integer  $k \geq 1$ , the  $k$ -split graph associated to poset  $Q$  is the bipartite graph  $G_{Q,k} = (V_1, V_2, E)$ , where

- $V_1 = \{x_1^-, \dots, x_k^- : x \in U\}$
- $V_2 = \{y^+ : y \in U\}$
- given  $x, y \in U$ ,  $x \leq y$  and  $1 \leq i \leq k$ , add to  $E$  edge  $x_i^- y^+$ .

**Theorem 1.** Let  $Q = (U, \leq)$  be a finite poset with  $n$  elements and a fixed integer  $k \geq 1$ . Then

$$k\text{-wd}(Q) = n - vc(G_{Q,k}). \tag{1}$$

*Proof.* Define a left outgoing  $k$ -matching of graph  $G_Q$  to be any set of edges  $A \subseteq E$  such that for every  $x, y \in U$ ,  $\deg_A(x^-) \leq k$  and  $\deg_A(y^+) \leq 1$ .

**Claim 1.** *Partitions of  $Q$  into  $k$ -chains bijectively correspond to left  $k$ -matchings of  $G_Q$ . The number of classes of a partition is equal to  $n$  minus the number of edges in the associated left  $k$ -matching.*

*Proof.* Consider a left  $k$ -matching  $A$  in  $G_Q$ . Define the partition  $P_A$  as follows: roots of the  $k$ -chains consist of those  $x \in U$  for which  $\deg_A(x^+) = 0$ . There must be some element  $x \in U$  satisfying this condition, as the minimal elements of  $P$  with respect to  $\leq$  satisfy this condition.

Now we recursively add elements of  $U$  to the partition  $P$  (in parallel) as follows:

1. All elements  $y \in U$  not yet added to any  $k$ -chain, and such that  $y^+$  is connected to some  $x^-$  by an edge in  $A$  are added to the  $k$ -chain containing  $x$ , as direct descendants of  $x$ . Note that element  $x$  (if there exists at least one  $y$  with this property) is unique (since  $\deg_A(y^+) = 1$ ), so the specification of the  $k$ -chain to add  $y$  to is well defined. On the other hand, each operation adds at most  $k$  successors of any  $x$  to its  $k$ -chain, since  $\deg_A(x^-) \leq k$ .
2. If all direct predecessors of an element  $x \in U$  have been added to some  $k$ -chain and are no longer leaves of that  $k$ -chain then  $x$  becomes the root of a new  $k$ -chain.

Conversely, given any partition  $P$  of  $U$  into  $k$ -chains, define set  $A$  consisting of edges  $x^-, y^+$  such that  $x$  is the father of  $y$  in a  $k$ -chain. It is immediate that  $A$  is a left  $k$ -matching.  $\square$

**Corollary 1.** *There is a bijective mapping between partitions of  $Q$  into  $k$ -chains and matchings of  $G_{Q,k}$  such that the number of  $k$ -chains in a partition is  $n$  minus the number of edges in the matching.*

*Proof.* We will actually show how to associate left  $k$ -matchings of  $G_Q$  to matchings of  $G_{Q,k}$ . The idea is simple: given a node  $x^-$  of  $G_Q$  with  $l \leq k$  neighbors in  $V_2$ , construct a matching in  $G_{Q,k}$  by giving each of  $x_1^-, \dots, x_l^-$  a single neighbor from the neighbors of  $x^-$ . In the other direction, if  $e = x_i y$  is an edge in the matching of  $G_{Q,k}$  then consider the edge in appropriate  $x, y$  edge in  $G_Q$ . It is easy to check that it gives a  $k$ -chain in  $G_Q$ , and the number of  $k$ -chains is the number of edges in the left  $k$ -matching in  $G_Q$  which is the same as  $n$  minus  $vc(G_Q)$ .  $\square$

We complete the proof of Theorem 1 by applying in a straightforward way (based on Claim 1 and Corollary 1) the König's theorem to graph  $G_{Q,k}$ .  $\square$

**Corollary 2.** *One can compute parameter  $k$ -wd( $Q$ ) by creating a flow network  $Z_Q$  and computing the value of the maximum flow of  $Z_Q$  consisting of :*

- vertices and edges of  $G_Q$ , with capacity 1.
- a source  $s$ , connected to nodes in  $V_1$  by directed edges of capacity  $k$ ,

- a sink  $t$ , that all nodes in  $V_2$  connect to via oriented edges of capacity 1.

computing the maximum  $s$ - $t$  network flow value  $f$  in network  $Z_Q$  and outputting  $k$ -wd( $Q$ )= $n$ - $f$ .

*Proof.* Straightforward, this is simply the maximal flow algorithm for computing the maximal size left  $k$ -matching in  $G_Q$ , similar to the construction for maximum matchings in bipartite graphs in the literature.  $\square$

## 4 Heapability of sequences of intervals: a greedy approach

The result in the previous section naturally raises the following question: for random permutations a greedy approach, extending the well-known *patience sorting algorithm* [20] works, as it was shown in [15]. On the other hand network flow algorithms are **not** greedy. One is naturally led to inquire whether such an algorithm can be defined/works for any other partial order. In the sequel we provide an affirmative answer to this question, in the case of interval sequences:

**Theorem 2.** *For every fixed  $k \geq 1$  there exists a (polynomial time) greedy algorithm that, given the sequence of intervals  $S = (I_1, I_2, \dots, I_n)$  as input, computes a minimal partition of  $S$  into  $k$ -chains.*

Before proceeding with the proof of theorem 2, let us remark a potential application of a variant of this result to parallel computing: many algorithms in this area (e.g. algorithms using a *parallel prefix-sum* design methodology [4]) require the computation of all prefixes of an associative operation  $A_1 * A_2 * \dots * A_n$ . Operations being performed (each corresponding to one computation of a  $*$ -product) are arranged on a binary tree. In the (completely equivalent) max-heap variant of theorem 2, children intervals are required to be less or equal to the parent interval with respect to ordering  $\leq$ . This is quite natural from the standpoint of parallel computing: consider the setting of a parallel-prefix problem where each intermediate  $*$ -computation is a rather costly operation; intervals now represent times when these operations can be scheduled. The requirement that the parent interval be larger than child intervals with respect to  $\leq$  is completely natural, as child computations need to complete in order to feed their results to the parent computation. Thus our result answers the question whether all the time intervals can be scheduled on a single heap-ordered binary tree, and gives such a scheduling, if the answer is affirmative.

### 4.1 Proof of theorem 2

Without loss of generality, we will present the proof of the theorem for  $k = 2$ , but the proof is similar for all  $k$ 's. The proof employs the concept of *slots*, adapted for interval sequences from similar concepts for permutations [5, 15]:

**Definition 2.** When a new interval is added to a  $k$ -chain it opens  $k$  new positions to possibly insert other intervals as direct successors into this node. Each position has an associated integer value that will be called its slot. The value of all empty slots created by inserting  $I_1 = [a_1, b_1]$  into a  $k$ -chain will be  $b_1$ , the right endpoint of  $I_1$ .

**Definition 3.** An interval  $I$  is compatible with a slot with value  $x$  if all of  $I$  lies in  $[x, \infty)$ .

Intuitively,  $x$  is the smallest value of the left endpoint of an interval that can be inserted in the  $k$ -chain as a child of an interval  $I_1$  with right endpoint  $x$  while respecting the heap property. Indeed, as  $k$ -chains are (min-)heap ordered, an insertion of an interval  $I$  into a  $k$ -chain as a child of  $I_1$  is legal if the interval  $I$  is greater than  $I_1$  with respect to  $\leq$  relation. This readily translates to the stated condition, that the start point of  $I$  must be greater or equal than the slot value of its parent.

**Input:** A sequence of intervals  $I = (I_1, I_2, \dots, I_n)$ .  
**Output:** A partition  $H$  of  $I$  into  $k$ -chains.

**for**  $i := 1$  to  $n$  do:

**if**  $I_i = [l_i, r_i]$  can be inserted into some empty slot

**then** insert  $I_i$  in the highest-valued compatible slot (a child of the node with this slot).

**else** create new  $k$ -chain rooted at  $I_i$

Figure 2: The greedy best-fit algorithm for  $k$ -chain partition of sequences of intervals.

The proposed greedy best-fit algorithm for computing a minimum partition into 2-chains a sequence of  $n$  intervals is described in Figure 2. As an example, consider the sequence of intervals  $S_1$  below, with  $k = 2$ . The resulting configuration is shown in Figure 3.

$$S_1 = \{[1, 7], [1, 11], [11, 12], [15, 16], [7, 9], [8, 16], [1, 2], [3, 19], [13, 17], [5, 7]\}$$

By choosing the highest valued slot available for insertion for  $I_k = [a_k, b_k]$ , we make sure that the difference between the slot value  $s$  and  $a_k$  is minimal. This is desirable because there may be some interval further down the sequence with starting point value in between the  $s$  and  $a_k$  that fits slot  $s$  but cannot be inserted there, as the slot is no longer available.

We define the concepts of signature of a multiset of slots and domination between such multisets in a similar way to the corresponding concepts for permutations in [5]:




Figure 3: The 2-chain configuration corresponding to  $S_1$ .

**Definition 4.** Given multiset of slots  $H$ , we call the vector of slots, sorted in increasing order, the signature of  $H$ . We shall denote this by  $\text{sig}(H)$ . By slightly abusing notation, we will employ the previous definition in the obvious way when  $H$  is a union of 2-chains as well.

**Definition 5.** Multiset  $P$  dominates multiset  $Q$  (denoted  $P \preceq Q$ ) if  $|\text{sig}(P)| \leq |\text{sig}(Q)|$  and for all  $1 \leq i \leq |\text{sig}(P)|$  we have  $\text{sig}(P)[i] \leq \text{sig}(Q)[i]$ .

For example, for the 2-chains in the Figure 3 their corresponding signatures are, respectively:

$$\text{sig}(H_1) = [9, 9, 16, 16];$$

$$\text{sig}(H_2) = [11, 16, 16, 17, 17];$$

$$\text{sig}(H_3) = [7, 7, 19, 19].$$

Therefore, in our example  $H_1 \preceq H_2$ , ( $H_1$  dominates  $H_2$ ), but no other domination relations between  $H_1, H_2, H_3$  are true.

**Lemma 1.** Assume that  $A, B$  are multisets of slots and  $A$  dominates  $B$ . Then the multisets  $A'$  and  $B'$  obtained after inserting a new interval into the largest compatible slot of  $A$ , and into an arbitrary compatible slot of  $B$ , propagates the domination property, i.e.  $A'$  dominates  $B'$ .

*Proof.* Let  $\text{sig}(A) = [a_1, a_2, \dots, a_{|\text{sig}(A)|}]$  and  $\text{sig}(B) = [b_1, b_2, \dots, b_{|\text{sig}(B)|}]$ . Also, by convention, define  $a_0 = b_0 = -\infty$  and  $a_{|\text{sig}(A)|+1} = b_{|\text{sig}(B)|+1} = +\infty$ .

Proving that  $A' \preceq B'$  is equivalent to proving that  $|\text{sig}(A')| \leq |\text{sig}(B')|$  and for all indices  $1 \leq l \leq |\text{sig}(A')|$ :

$$\text{sig}(A')[l] \leq \text{sig}(B')[l]. \quad (2)$$




Figure 4: The various cases of inserting a new interval  $[x, y]$  into  $B$  and  $A$ .

The cardinality condition can be easily verified: indeed,  $|sig(A')|$  is either  $|sig(A)| + 1$  (if the process adds two copies of  $y$  but also kills a lifeline) or  $|sig(A)| + 2$  (no slot exists with a value less or equal to  $x$ ), and similarly for  $|sig(B')|$ . It follows easily from the domination property that when  $|sig(A')|$  is larger by 2, than  $|sig(A)|$  then so is  $|sig(B')|$  with respect to  $|sig(B)|$ . Indeed, since  $|sig(A')| = |sig(A)| + 2$ , no slot of  $A$  has value lower than  $x$  (or it would lose a lifeline). Thus  $a_1 > x$  and since  $A \preceq B$ ,  $b_1 \geq a_1 > x$ . So no slot of  $B$  is smaller than  $x$  either.

As for the second condition, consider the slots from  $A$  and  $B$  which interfere with the newly arrived interval as follows:

- Let  $i$  and  $i'$  be the (unique) indices such that  $a_i \leq x < a_{i+1}$  and  $a_{i'} \leq y < a_{i'+1}$  hold in  $A$ , with  $i, i' \in 0, \dots, |sig(A)|$ .
- Similarly, let  $j$  and  $j'$  be the unique indices such that  $b_j \leq x < b_{j+1}$  and  $b_{j'} \leq y < b_{j'+1}$  hold in  $B$ , with  $j, j' \in 0, \dots, |sig(B)|$ .

Since  $A \preceq B$ , it follows that  $i \geq j$  and  $i' \geq j'$ . Suppose that we insert the interval  $[x, y]$  in  $B$  in an arbitrary slot  $b_k \leq b_j$  (thus removing one life of slot  $b_k$  and inserting two copies of slot  $y$ ). The rest of the proof is by a case analysis. The four cases which can be distinguished (Fig. 4) are:

Case 1.  $l < k$ :

In this case, none of the signatures were affected at position  $l$  by the insertion of  $[x, y]$ , hence:

$$sig(A')[l] = sig(A)[l] \leq sig(B)[l] = sig(B')[l].$$

Case 2.  $l \in [k, j')$ :

In this range all slots from  $B'$  have been shifted by one position to the left compared to  $B$  due to the removal of  $b_k$ . Consequently:

$$sig(A')[l] = sig(A)[l] \leq sig(B)[l + 1] = sig(B')[l].$$

Case 3.  $l \in [j', i']$ :

Knowing that  $j'$  is the position in  $A$  where we inserted two new slots with value  $y$ ,  $i'$  is the position in  $B$  where we inserted these same slots and  $i' \geq j'$ , the following is true:

$$\text{sig}(A)[l] \leq \text{sig}(B)[i'] = y = \text{sig}(B')[j'] \leq \text{sig}(B')[l].$$

Case 4.  $l \geq i'$ :

a) For  $l = i'$  and  $l = i' + 1$  :  $\text{sig}(H'_q)[l] = \text{sig}(H'_p)[j'] = y$ . Since  $j' < i' < i' + 1$ , then:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{sig}(A')[i'] &= y = \text{sig}(B')[j'] \leq \text{sig}(B')[i'] \\ \text{sig}(A')[i' + 1] &= y = \text{sig}(B')[j'] \leq \text{sig}(B')[i' + 1]. \end{aligned}$$

b) For  $l > i' + 1$  the two signatures do not have any shifted components compared to the original signatures of  $A$  and  $B$ , so:

$$\text{sig}(A')[i' + k] = \text{sig}(A)[i' + k - 1] \leq \text{sig}(B)[i' + k - 1] = \text{sig}(B')[i' + k]$$

In conclusion,  $\text{sig}(A')[l] \leq \text{sig}(B')[l]$  for any  $l$ , and relation  $A' \preceq B'$  follows.  $\square$

**Lemma 2.** *Given sequence  $I$  of intervals, consider the optimal way to partition  $I$  into  $k$ -chains. Let  $r$  be a stage where the greedy best-fit algorithm creates a new  $k$ -chain. Then the optimal way also creates a new  $k$ -chain.*

*Proof.* We use the fact that, by Lemma 1, before every step  $r$  of the algorithm the multiset  $\Gamma_{r-1}$  of slots created by our greedy algorithm dominates the multiset  $\Omega_{r-1}$  created by the optimal insertion.

Suppose that at stage  $r$  the newly inserted interval  $I_r$  element causes a new  $k$ -chain to be created. That means that the left endpoint  $l_r$  of  $I_r$  is lower than any of the elements of multiset  $\Gamma_{r-1}$ . By domination, the minimum slot of  $\Omega_{r-1}$  is higher than the minimum slot of  $\Gamma_{r-1}$ . Therefore  $l_r$  is also lower than any slot of  $\Omega_{r-1}$ , which means that the optimal algorithm also creates a new  $k$ -chain when inserting  $I_r$ .  $\square$

Lemma 2 proves that the Greedy algorithm for insertion of new intervals is optimal.

## 4.2 The interval Hammersley (tree) process

One of the most fruitful avenues for the investigation of the scaling properties of the LIS (Longest increasing subsequence) of a random permutation is made via the study of the (so-called *hydrodynamic*) limit behavior of an interacting particle system known as *Hammersley's process* [1]. This is a stochastic process that, for the purposes of this paper can be defined (in a somewhat simplified form) as follows: random numbers  $X_0, X_1, \dots, X_n, \dots \in (0, 1)$  arrive at integer moments. Each value  $X_j$  eliminates ("kills") the smallest  $X_i > X_j$  that is still

alive at moment  $j$ . Intuitively, "live" particles represent the top of the stacks in the so-called *patience sorting algorithm* [20] that computes parameter LIS.

The problem of partitioning a random permutation into a minimal set of  $k$ -heapable subsequences is similarly connected to a variant of the above process, introduced in [15] and further studied in [2, 3], where it was baptized *Hammersley's trees process*. Now particles come with  $k$  lives, and each particle  $X_j$  merely takes one life of the smallest  $X_i > X_j$ , if any (instead of outright killing it).

The proof of theorem 2 shows that a similar connection holds for sequences of *intervals*. The *Hammersley interval tree process* is defined as follows: "particles" are still numbers in  $(0, 1)$ , that may have up to  $k$  lives. However now the sequence  $I_0, I_1, \dots, I_n, \dots$  is comprised of random *intervals* in  $(0, 1)$ . When interval  $I_n = [a_n, b_n]$  arrives, it is  $a_n$  that takes a life from the largest live particle  $y < a_n$ . However, it is  $b_n$  that is inserted as a new particle, initially with  $k$  lives.

**Corollary 3.** *Live particles in the above Hammersley interval process correspond to slots in our greedy insertion algorithm above. The newly created  $k$ -chains correspond to local minima (particle insertions that have a value lower than the value of any particle that is live at that particular moment).*

## 5 From sequences to sets of intervals

Theorem 2 dealt with *sequences* of intervals. On the other hand a set of intervals does not come with any particular listing order on the constituent intervals. Nevertheless, the problem can be easily reduced to the sequence case by the following:

**Theorem 3.** *Let  $k \geq 1$  and  $Q$  be a set of intervals. Then the  $k$ -width of  $Q$  is equal to the  $k$ -width of  $Gr_Q$ , the sequence of intervals obtained by listing the intervals in the increasing order of their right endpoints (with earlier starting intervals being preferred in the case of ties).*

*Proof.* Clearly  $k\text{-wd}(Q) \leq k\text{-wd}(Gr_Q)$ , since a partition of  $Gr_Q$  into  $k$ -chains is also a partition of  $Q$ .

To prove the opposite direction we need the following:

**Lemma 3.** *Let  $S$  be a multiset of slots. Let  $I_1 = [a_1, b_1], I_2 = [a_2, b_2]$  be two intervals such that  $b_1 < b_2$  or  $b_1 = b_2$  and  $a_1 < a_2$ . Let  $S_1$  and  $S_2$  be the multisets of slots obtained by inserting the two intervals in the order  $(I_1, I_2)$  and  $(I_2, I_1)$ , respectively. Then  $S_1$  dominates  $S_2$ .*

*Proof.* The only nontrivial cases are those for which  $S_1 \neq S_2$ . This condition can only happen when the insertions of  $I_1, I_2$  "interact".

Indeed, let  $x, y$  be the largest slots less or equal to  $a_1, a_2$ , respectively. If  $x \neq y$  and  $b_1$  does not become (after insertion of  $I_1$ ) the slot occupied by  $b_2$  instead of  $y$  (nor does the symmetric situation for the insertion order  $I_2, I_1$  hold)

then  $S_1, S_2$  are obtained by adding  $k$  copies of  $b_1, b_2$  each, and deleting  $x, y$ , so  $S_1 = S_2$ .

If instead  $x = y$  then the two slots to be deleted (for both insertion orders) are  $x$  and the largest slot smaller or equal than  $x$ . Again  $S_1 = S_2$ .

The only remaining case is when the slot removed after insertion of  $I_2$  is  $b_1$ . In this case  $S$  cannot contain any element in the range  $(b_1, a_2)$ . Insertion  $(I_1, I_2)$  removes  $p$ , adds  $k - 1$  copies of  $b_1$  and  $k$  copies of  $b_2$ . On the other hand, insertion  $(I_2, I_1)$  may remove some element  $x'$ . It is certainly  $x \leq x' \leq b_1$ . It then adds  $k$  copies of  $b_2$ . Then it removes some  $x'' \leq x$  and adds  $k$  copies of  $b_1$ . Thus both sets  $S_1, S_2$  can be described as adding  $k$  copies of  $b_1$  and  $k$  copies of  $b_2$  to  $S$ , and then deleting one or two elements,

Two elements

- $x$  and  $b_1$  in the case of order  $(I_1, I_2)$
- $x'$  and  $x''$  in the case of order  $(I_2, I_1)$ .

in the case when some element of  $S$  is strictly less than  $a_1$ ,

And one element

- $b_1$  in the case of order  $(I_1, I_2)$
- $x''$  in the case of order  $(I_2, I_1)$ .

In the second case the result follows by taking into account the fact that  $x'' \leq b_1$  and the following lemma:

**Lemma 4.** *Let  $S$  be a multiset of slots. Let  $s_2 \leq s_1 \in S$ , and let  $S_1, S_2$  be the sets obtained by deleting from  $S$  elements  $s_1$  (or  $s_2$ , respectively). Then  $S_1$  dominates  $S_2$ .*

*Proof.* It follows easily from the simple fact that for every  $r \geq 1$  and multiset  $W$  the function that maps an integer  $x \in W$  to the  $r$ 'th smallest element of  $W \setminus x$  is non-increasing (more precisely a function that jump from the  $r + 1$ 'th down to the  $r$ 'th smallest element of  $W$ )  $\square$

The first case is only slightly more involved. Since  $x' \leq x$ , by applying Lemma 4 twice we infer:

$$\begin{aligned} S_1 &= S \setminus \{x, b_1\} = (S \setminus \{b_1\}) \setminus \{x\} \preceq (S \setminus \{b_1\}) \setminus \{x'\} = (S \setminus \{x'\}) \setminus \{b_1\} \preceq \\ &\preceq (S \setminus \{x'\}) \setminus \{x''\} = S_2. \end{aligned}$$

which is what we wanted to prove.  $\square$

From Lemma 3 we infer the following result

<p><b>Input:</b> A set of intervals <math>I</math>.</p> <p><b>Output:</b> A partition <math>H</math> of <math>I</math> into <math>k</math>-chains.</p> <p><b>Sort</b> the intervals w.r.t. <math>\sqsubseteq</math>: <math>I = (I_1, \dots, I_n)</math>.</p> <p><b>For</b> <math>i := 1</math> to <math>n</math> do:</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;"><b>If</b> <math>I_i = [a_i, b_i]</math> can be inserted into some empty slot</p> <p style="padding-left: 80px;"><b>then</b> insert <math>I_i</math> in the highest-valued compatible slot.</p> <p style="padding-left: 80px;"><b>else</b> create new <math>k</math>-chain rooted at <math>I_i</math></p>
--

Figure 5: The greedy algorithm for sets of intervals.

**Lemma 5.** *Let  $1 \leq r \leq n$  and let  $X, Y$  be two permutations of intervals  $I_1, I_2, \dots, I_n$ ,*

$$\begin{aligned}
 X &= (I_1, \dots, I_{r-1}, I_r, I_{r+1}, \dots, I_n), \\
 Y &= (I_1, \dots, I_{r-1}, I_{r+1}, I_r, \dots, I_n).
 \end{aligned}$$

*respectively (i.e.  $X, Y$  differ by a transposition). If  $I_r \leq I_{r+1}$  then multisets of slots  $S_X, S_Y$  obtained by inserting intervals according to the listing specified by  $X$  and  $Y$ , respectively, satisfy*

$$S_X \preceq S_Y.$$

*Proof.* Without loss of generality one may assume that  $r = n - 1$  (as the result for a general  $n$  follows from this special case by repeatedly applying Lemma 1). Let  $S$  be the multiset of slots obtained by inserting (in this order) intervals  $I_1, \dots, I_{r-1}$ . Applying Lemma 3 to intervals  $I_r, I_{r+1}$  we complete the proof of Lemma 5.  $\square$

Now the opposite direction in the proof of theorem 3 (and the theorem) follows: the multiset of labels obtained by inserting the intervals according to  $Gr_Q$  dominates any multiset of labels arising from a different permutation, since one can "bubble down" smaller intervals (as in bubble sort), until we obtain  $Gr_Q$ . As we do so, at each step, the new multiset of labels dominates the old one. Hence  $S_{Gr(Q)}$  dominates all multisets arising from permutations of  $I_1, \dots, I_n$ , so sequence  $Gr_Q$  minimizes the parameter  $k$ -wd among all permutations of  $Q$ .  $\square$

**Corollary 4.** *The greedy algorithm in Figure 5 computes the  $k$ -width of an arbitrary set of intervals.*

**Corollary 5.** *Modify the Hammersley interval process to work on sets of intervals by considering them in non-decreasing order according to relation  $\sqsubseteq$ . Then live particles in the modified process correspond to slots obtained using our greedy insertion algorithm for sets of intervals. New  $k$ -chains correspond to local minima (such particle insertions that have a value lower than the value of any particle that is live at that particular moment).*

## 6 Extension to sequences of elements from a trapezoid partial order

The theorem in the previous section is strongly reminiscent of the fact that for interval partial orders a greedy best-fit algorithm computes the chromatic number [21]. This result has an extension to an even more general class of graphs, that of *trapezoid graphs* [6]. Trapezoid graphs are an extension of both interval and permutation graphs that unify many natural algorithms (for problems such as maximum independent set, coloring) for the two classes of graphs.

As noted in [9], trapezoid graphs can be equivalently defined as the cocomparability graphs of two-dimensional boxes, with sides parallel to the coordinate axes:

**Definition 6.** *A box is the set of points in  $\mathbf{R}^2$  defined as*

$$B = \{(x_1, x_2) \in \mathbf{R}^2 \mid l_i^B \leq x_i \leq r_i^B, i = 1, 2\}$$

for some numbers  $l_i^B \leq r_i^B \in \mathbf{R}$ , where  $l_B = (l_1^B, l_2^B)$  is the lower corner of the box  $B$  and  $r_B = (r_1^B, r_2^B)$  is the upper corner.

The interval  $I(B)$  associated to box  $B$  is the projection onto the  $y$  axis of box  $B$ . Clearly  $I(B) = [l_2^B, r_2^B]$ .

The dominance partial order on intervals naturally extends to boxes:

**Definition 7.** *The dominance partial order among boxes is defined as follows: box  $B_2$  dominates box  $B_1$  if point  $L_{B_2}$  dominates point  $r_{B_1}$ , i.e.*

$$r_i^{B_1} \leq l_i^{B_2} \text{ for } i = 1, 2.$$

A trapezoid partial order is a poset  $P$  induced by the dominance partial order on a finite set  $V$  of boxes.  $l$  and  $u$  refer to the lower and upper corner coordinate functions defining the boxes. That is, for every  $v \in V$ ,  $l(v)$  is the lower corner of box  $v$  and  $u(v)$  is its upper corner.

The box representation allowed the authors of [9] to give a “sweep-line algorithm” for coloring trapezoid graphs that improved the coloring algorithm in [6]. Such an algorithm can be described as moving a (vertical) sweep line  $L$  from left to right through the  $x$  positions of the lower/upper corners of the boxes from  $B$ .

As noted in Section 2.1, partition into  $k$ -heapable sequences is a natural generalization of coloring permutation graphs. In the sequel we give an algorithm

that generalizes the sweep-line coloring algorithm for trapezoid graphs from [6] to the partition into  $k$ -chains of a particular class of sequences of boxes.

**Theorem 4.** *Let  $B = (B_1, B_2, \dots, B_n)$  be a set of two-dimensional axis-parallel boxes, totally ordered by the  $x$ -coordinates of their right endpoints. Then the greedy sweep-line algorithm in Figure 6 computes an optimal partition of sequence  $B$  into  $k$ -chains.*

<p><b>Input:</b> A sequence of boxes <math>B = (B_1, B_2, \dots, B_n)</math>.  <b>Output:</b> A partition <math>H</math> of <math>B</math> into <math>k</math>-chains.</p> <p><b>initialize</b> <math>S = \{d\}</math>, where <math>d</math> is a real number smaller  than all the <math>y</math> coordinates of corners in <math>l(B) \cup u(B)</math>,  marked <i>available</i></p> <p><b>foreach</b> <math>p = (p_1, p_2) \in l(B) \cup u(B)</math> from left to right <b>do</b>:</p> <p style="padding-left: 2em;"><math>q \leftarrow</math> first available slot below <math>p_2</math> in <math>S</math></p> <p style="padding-left: 2em;"><b>if</b> <math>p = l(v)</math> for some <math>v \in B</math> <b>then</b></p> <p style="padding-left: 4em;"><b>if</b> <math>q = u(w)_2</math> for some <math>w \in B</math> <b>then</b></p> <p style="padding-left: 6em;">insert <math>v</math> in the <math>k</math>-chain of <math>w</math> as a child of this node</p> <p style="padding-left: 6em;">remove <math>q</math> from <math>S</math></p> <p style="padding-left: 6em;">add <math>k</math> copies of <math>p_2</math> to <math>S</math>, marking them unavailable</p> <p style="padding-left: 4em;"><b>else</b> // (<math>q == d</math>)</p> <p style="padding-left: 6em;">start a new <math>k</math>-chain rooted at <math>v</math></p> <p style="padding-left: 6em;">add <math>k</math> copies of <math>p_2</math> to <math>S</math>, marking them unavailable</p> <p style="padding-left: 2em;"><b>if</b> <math>p = u(v)</math> for some <math>v \in B</math> <b>then</b></p> <p style="padding-left: 4em;">mark all slots with value <math>p_2</math> in <math>S</math> as available</p> <p><b>return</b> the set of <math>k</math>-chains constructed by the algorithm.</p>
--

Figure 6: The greedy sweep-line algorithm for  $x$ -sorted trapezoid sequences.

*Proof.* The proof of Theorem 4 leverages and extends the method used for intervals in the proof of Theorem 2. The fact that sequence  $B$  is sorted in increasing order of the  $x$ -coordinate of the endpoints allows us to see the problem as one ofn intervals: instead of dealing with boxes  $B_1, B_2, \dots, B_n$  we will instead deal with the associated intervals  $I(B_1), I(B_2), \dots, I(B_n)$ .

We will assume that the  $x$  and the  $y$  coordinates of all boxes in  $B$  are all distinct. As usual with such algorithms, the truth of our statement does not rely on this assumption: if the statement is not true then points can be slightly perturbed to make the assumption true. The algorithm we give then extends to the degenerate cases as well.

The sweep line maintains a multiset  $S$  of *slots*, that correspond to right endpoints of the intervals associated with the boxes processed so far. The difference with respect to the case of Theorem 2 is that the slots are now of one of two types:

- *unavailable*: a slot of this type is present in multiset  $S$  but cannot be used to process intervals.
- *available*: a slot of this type can be fully employed when processing a new interval.

The action of a sweep line comprises two types of actions:

- *insertion*: This happens when the sweep line reaches the left corner of some box  $B_j$ . We process the interval  $I(B_j)$  similarly to the process in Theorem 2. Namely, we remove one lifeline from the largest **available slot** with value at most  $l_j^2$ , and insert into  $S$   $k$  slots with value  $r_j^2$ . These slots are marked **unavailable**.
- *state change*: This happens when the sweep line reaches the right corner of some box  $B_j$ . All the slots with value  $r_j^2$  change marking, from **unavailable** to **available**.

The intuitive explanation for this modification is clear: a box  $D$  can become the parent of another box  $E$  only when the right corner of  $D$  is to the left (on the  $x$  axis) of the left corner of  $E$ . Thus, if the sweep line has not reached the right endpoint of a box  $D$  then this box is not eligible to become the parent of any currently processed box.

Let  $\sigma_t$ , be the multiset of all slots created by the sweep-line algorithm up to at a given moment  $t$ . Let  $OPT_t$  be the multiset of slots corresponding to the *optimal* partition into  $k$ -chains. Let  $\sigma'_t$  be the corresponding (multi)set of all slots marked *available* at moment  $t$ . Let  $OPT'_t$  be the set of slots in  $OPT_t$  marked available at moment  $t$ .

The basis for the proof of Theorem 4 is the following adaptation of Lemma 1 to the setting of slots with availability statuses:

**Lemma 6.** *For every  $t \geq 0$ ,  $sig(\sigma'_t) \preceq sig(OPT'_t)$ .*

*Proof.* By induction on  $t$ . The statement is clear for  $t = 0$ , since both  $\sigma_0$  and  $OPT_0$  are empty. Assume the claim is true for all  $t' < t$ . Let  $sig(\sigma'_{t-1}) = [a_1, a_2, \dots, a_{|sig(\sigma'_{t-1})|}]$  and  $sig(OPT'_{t-1}) = [b_1, b_2, \dots, b_{|sig(OPT'_{t-1})|}]$ . Also, by convention, define  $a_0 = b_0 = -\infty$  and  $a_{|sig(\sigma'_{t-1})|+1} = b_{|sig(OPT'_{t-1})|+1} = +\infty$ . Finally, let  $[l_s^2, r_s^2]$  is the interval to be processed at stage  $t$ .

Proving that  $\sigma'_{t-1} \preceq OPT'_{t-1}$  entails proving that  $|sig(\sigma'_t)| \leq |sig(OPT'_t)|$  and for all indices  $1 \leq l \leq |sig(\sigma'_t)|$ :

$$sig(\sigma'_t)[l] \leq sig(OPT'_t)[l]. \quad (3)$$

• **Case 1:  $t$  is an insertion step:**

$\sigma'_t$  is obtained from  $\sigma'_{t-1}$  by removing the largest available slot less or equal to  $l_s^2$ .  $OPT'_t$  is obtained from  $OPT'_{t-1}$  by perhaps removing some slot with value at most  $l_s^2$ .

The inequality  $|\sigma'_t| \leq |OPT'_{t-1}|$  follows easily from the corresponding inequality at stage  $t-1$ . Indeed,  $\sigma'_{t-1}$  may lose an element (in which case  $OPT'_{t-1}$  may also lose at most one element) or stay the same (in which case  $OPT'_{t-1}$  also stays the same (because there is no available slot to lose a lifeline.))

As for inequality (3): if  $OPT'_{t-1}$  does not lose an element the inequality follows easily from the induction hypothesis for stage  $t-1$  and the fact that elements of  $\sigma'_{t-1}$  stay in place or shift to the left.

If both  $\sigma'_{t-1}$  and  $OPT'_{t-1}$  lose one element to yield  $\sigma'_t, OPT'_t$ , there are four types of positions  $l$ :

- Those below both deleted positions. They are unchanged as we move from  $\sigma'_{t-1}$  and  $OPT'_{t-1}$  to  $\sigma'_t, OPT'_t$ . That is:

$$\sigma'_t[l] = \sigma'_{t-1}[l] \text{ and } OPT'_t[l] = OPT'_{t-1}[l].$$

Hence inequality (3) is true by the induction hypothesis.

- Those above both deleted positions. They get shifted to the left by one in both  $\sigma'_t$  and  $OPT'_t$ . That is:

$$\sigma'_t[l] = \sigma'_{t-1}[l+1] \text{ and } OPT'_t[l] = OPT'_{t-1}[l+1].$$

Hence again inequality (3) is true by the induction hypothesis.

- Those below one but above the other deleted position. By the fact that the deleted slot in  $OPT'_{t-1}$  is less or equal than the one in  $\sigma'_{t-1}$  (since this is the largest available slot less or equal to  $l_s^2$ ), it follows that

$$\sigma'_t[l] = \sigma'_{t-1}[l] \text{ and } OPT'_t[l] = OPT'_{t-1}[l+1].$$

Hence

$$\sigma'_t[l] = \sigma'_{t-1}[l] \leq OPT'_{t-1}[l] \leq OPT'_{t-1}[l+1] = OPT'_t[l].$$

so relation (3) holds in all cases.

- **Case 2:  $t$  is a change step:** The effect of such a step is that, both in  $\sigma_{t-1}$  and  $OPT_{t-1}$  the  $k$  slots with value  $r_s^2$  (that were previously inserted, but marked unavailable) become available.

Since  $|\sigma'_t| = |\sigma'_{t-1}| + k$  and, similarly,  $|OPT'_t| = |OPT'_{t-1}| + k$ , statement  $|\sigma'_t| \leq |OPT'_t|$  follows from the analogous statement for  $t - 1$ .

Positions  $l$  before the insertion points of the  $k$  copies of  $r_s^2$  are not modified in  $\sigma'_t, OPT'_t$  so equation (3) follows for such  $l$ 's from the corresponding inequalities for stage  $t - 1$ . Similarly, positions larger than both insertion points get shifted by exactly  $k$ , so inequality (3) also follows for such  $l$ 's by the corresponding inequality for stage  $t - 1$ .

These two cases cover all positions  $l$  for which both values are different from the newly inserted values equal to  $r_s^2$ . If *both* positions are equal to  $r_s^2$  the inequality also follows. The only remaining cases are those  $l$  for which one of  $\sigma'_t[l], OPT'_t[l]$  is equal to the newly inserted value  $r_s^2$  but the other is not. On inspection, though, inequality (3) is true in these cases as well: because of dominance, the insertion point into  $OPT'_{t-1}$  is to the left (or equal) to the insertion point into  $\sigma'_{t-1}$ . So if  $\sigma'_t[l] \neq r_s^2$  but  $OPT'_t[l] = r_s^2$  then  $\sigma'_t[l] < r_s^2 = OPT'_t[l]$ . The reasoning in the case  $\sigma'_t[l] = r_s^2$  but  $OPT'_t[l] \neq r_s^2$  is analogous, the conclusion being that  $\sigma'_t[l] = r_s^2 < OPT'_t[l]$ .

□

Using Lemma 6 we infer that at every step  $t$  when the greedy best-fit algorithm creates a new  $k$ -chain (because there is no available slot to lose a lifeline), so does the optimal algorithm (for the very same reason). Hence the greedy best-fit algorithm is optimal. □

## 7 Maximal heapable subsets of interval orders

Finally, note that we are unable to solve the open problem in [5] on the complexity of computing a maximum treelike 2-independent set in permutation posets. Instead, we settle this problem on a different class of partial orders, that of interval orders:

**Theorem 5.** *Given a set of intervals  $I$ , the best-fit algorithm in Figure 7 computes a longest heapable subset of intervals of the set  $I$ .*

*Proof.* We prove by induction the following result, which implies the statement of the theorem:

**Lemma 7.** *For every  $1 \leq r \leq n$  there exists a longest heapable subsequence  $\Gamma_r$  of  $I$  and a tree  $T_r$  witnessing the optimality of  $\Gamma_r$  such that the tree  $T_G$  built by the greedy algorithm of Figure 7 agrees with  $T_r$  with respect to the intervals  $I_1, I_2, \dots, I_r$  (with respect to the presence or absence of these intervals).*

*Proof.* By induction.

The result is simple for  $r = 1$ : if  $I_1$  is part of an optimal solution then there is nothing to prove, since  $I_1$  can only participate in a heap-ordered tree as its root. If, on the other hand,  $I_1$  is not part of an optimal solution, then consider such a solution  $\Gamma$ . Create a new solution  $\Gamma_1$  with the same tree shape

<p><b>Input:</b> A set of intervals <math>I</math>.</p> <p><b>Output:</b> A <math>k</math>-chain <math>J \subseteq I</math> of maximum cardinality.</p> <p><b>Sort</b> the intervals w.r.t. <math>\sqsubseteq</math>: <math>I = (I_1, \dots, I_n)</math>.</p> <p><b>For</b> <math>i := 1</math> to <math>n</math> do:</p> <p style="padding-left: 2em;"><b>If</b> <math>I_i = [l_i, r_i]</math> can be inserted into some empty slot</p> <p style="padding-left: 4em;"><b>then</b></p> <p style="padding-left: 6em;"><math>J = J \cup \{i\}</math>.</p> <p style="padding-left: 6em;">insert <math>I_i</math> in the highest-valued compatible slot.</p> <p style="padding-left: 4em;"><b>else</b></p> <p style="padding-left: 6em;">reject <math>I_i</math> from <math>J</math>.</p>
---

Figure 7: The greedy best-fit algorithm for sets of intervals.

by replacing the root interval  $I$  of  $\Gamma$  by  $I_1$  (thus obtaining tree  $T_1$ ). This is legal, since  $I_1$  ends earlier than  $I$ .

Assume we have proved the result for  $1 \leq i \leq r - 1$ . Consider now the optimal solution  $\Gamma_{r-1}$  (with tree  $T_{r-1}$ ) agreeing with the greedy solution  $T_G$  on the presence of the first  $r - 1$  intervals.

- If  $I_r \in \Gamma_{r-1}$  then there is nothing to prove.
- If  $I_r$  cannot be inserted into  $\Gamma_{r-1}$  after  $I_1, I_2, \dots, I_{r-1}$  it means that no slot is available for  $I_r$ . By domination (Lemma 1) this must true for both the Greedy and the optimal solution  $\Gamma_{r-1}$ . Therefore these two solutions coincide on the set  $I_1, I_2, \dots, I_r$  as well.
- The remaining case is when  $I_r$  can be inserted in a slot (thus is present in the greedy solution) but is **not** present in the optimal solution  $\Gamma_{r-1}$ . Let  $J$  be the interval that sits in the same position in  $\Gamma_{r-1}$  as  $I_r$  in the greedy solution (Figure 8).  $J$  must exist, otherwise one could extend  $\Gamma_{r-1}$  by inserting  $I_r$  at that position.

By the order we considered, the intervals  $I_r$  ends no later than  $J$  does. So by inserting  $I_r$  instead of  $J$  we obtain an optimal solution  $\Gamma_r = \Gamma_{r-1} \setminus \{J\} \cup \{I_r\}$  that satisfies the induction property.

□

□The conclusion of the induction argument is that there exists an optimal tree containing *exactly the same* intervals as  $T_G$ . Thus the greedy best-fit algorithm produces an optimal solution.

□

□




Figure 8: Creating optimal solution  $\Gamma_r = \Gamma_{r-1} \setminus \{J\} \cup \{I_r\}$ .

## 8 Open questions and future work

Our Theorem 1 is very similar to (the proof of) Dilworth's theorem. It is not *yet* a proper generalization of this result to the case  $k \geq 1$  because of the lack of a suitable extension of the notion of *antichain*:

**Open problem 1.** *Is there a suitable definition of the concept of  $k$ -antichain, that coincides with this concept for  $k = 1$  and leads (via our theorem 1) to an extension of Dilworth's theorem ?*

On the other hand, results in Section 4 naturally raise the following:

**Open problem 2.** *For which partial orders  $Q$  can one compute the parameter  $k\text{-wd}(Q)$  (and an associate optimal  $k$ -chain decomposition) via a greedy algorithm ?*

Several open problem concerns the limit behavior of the expected value of the  $k$ -width of a set of random intervals, for  $k \geq 1$ . As discussed in Section 2, for  $k = 1$  the scaling behavior of this parameter is known [17]. However, in the case of random permutations, the most illuminating description of this scaling behavior is by analyzing the hydrodynamic limit of the Hammersley process [1, 12]. As shown in Section 5, the difference between sequences and sets of intervals is not substantial.

We ask, therefore, whether the success in analyzing this process for random permutations can be replicated in the case of sequences/sets of random intervals:

**Open problem 3.** *Analyze the hydrodynamic limit of the Hammersley process for sequences/sets of random intervals.*

When  $k \geq 2$  even the scaling behavior is not known, for both sequences and sets of random intervals. The connection with the interval Hammersley process given by Corollaries 3 and 5 provides a convenient, lean way to simulate the dynamics, leading to experimental observations on the scaling constants. A C++ program used to perform these experiments is publicly available at [14]. Based on these experiments we would like to raise the following:

**Conjecture 1.** *For every  $k \geq 2$  there exists a positive constant  $c_k > 0$  such that, if  $R_n$  is a sequence of  $n$  random intervals then*

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{E[k\text{-}wd(R_n)]}{n} = c_k \quad (4)$$

Moreover  $c_k = \frac{1}{k+1}$ .

According to this conjecture, just as in the case of random permutations, the scaling behavior of the  $k$ -width changes when going from  $k = 1$  to  $k = 2$ . Note, though, that the direction of change is different ( $\Theta(\sqrt{n})$  to  $\Theta(\log n)$  for integer sequences,  $\Theta(\sqrt{n})$  to  $\Theta(n)$  for sequences of intervals). On the other hand, somewhat surprisingly, the scaling behavior of sets of random intervals seems to be similar to that for sequences:

**Conjecture 2.** *For every  $k \geq 2$  there exists a positive constant  $d_k > 0$  such that, if  $W_n$  is a set of  $n$  random intervals then*

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{E[k\text{-}wd(W_n)]}{n} = d_k \quad (5)$$

Experiments suggest that  $d_2 = c_2 = \frac{1}{3}$ , and similarly for  $k = 3, 4$   $d_k = c_k = \frac{1}{k+1}$ . Therefore we conjecture that

$$d_k = c_k = \frac{1}{k+1} \text{ for all } k \geq 2. \quad (6)$$

## 9 Acknowledgments

Research of J.B. was supported by the European Union, co-financed by the European Social Fund (EFOP-3.6.3-VEKOP-16-2017-00002).

Research of C.B. was supported in part by a grant of the Romanian National Authority for Scientific Research and Innovation, CNCS-UEFISCDI, project no. PN-II-RU-TE-2014-4-0270 - FraDys: "Theoretical and Numerical Analysis of Fractional-Order Dynamical Systems and Applications".

G. I. and D.D. were supported in part by a grant of Ministry of Research and Innovation, CNCS - UEFISCDI, project number PN-III-P4-ID-PCE-2016-0842, within PNCDI III, ATCO: "Advanced techniques in optimization and computational complexity".

I.T. was partially supported by the ANR (Agence Nationale pour la Recherche) project GraphEn, ANR-15-CE40-0009.

## References

- [1] David Aldous and Persi Diaconis. Hammersley's interacting particle process and longest increasing subsequences. *Probability theory and related fields*, 103(2):199–213, 1995.

- [2] A-L Basdevant, Lucas Gerin, J-B Gouéré, and Arvind Singh. From Hammersleys lines to Hammersleys trees. *Probability Theory and Related Fields*, pages 1–51, 2016.
- [3] Anne-Laure Basdevant and Arvind Singh. Almost-sure asymptotic for the number of heaps inside a random sequence. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1702.06444*, 2017.
- [4] Guy E. Blelloch. Prefix sums and their applications. Technical Report CMU-CS-90-190, School of Computer Science, Carnegie Mellon University, November 1990.
- [5] John Byers, Brent Heeringa, Michael Mitzenmacher, and Georgios Zervas. Heapable sequences and subsequences. In *Proceedings of the Eighth Workshop on Analytic Algorithmics and Combinatorics (ANALCO'2011)*, pages 33–44. SIAM Press, 2011.
- [6] Ido Dagan, Martin Charles Golumbic, and Ron Yair Pinter. Trapezoid graphs and their coloring. *Discrete Applied Mathematics*, 21(1):35–46, 1988.
- [7] Robert P. Dilworth. A decomposition theorem for partially ordered sets. *Annals of Mathematics*, pages 161–166, 1950.
- [8] Jenő Egerváry. Matrixok kombinatorikus tulajdonságairól. *Matematikai és Fizikai Lapok*, 38(1931):16–28, 1931.
- [9] Stefan Felsner, Rudolf Müller, and Lorenz Wernisch. Trapezoid graphs and generalizations, geometry and algorithms. *Discrete Applied Mathematics*, 74(1):13–32, 1997.
- [10] Stefan Felsner, Vijay Raghavan, and Jeremy Spinrad. Recognition algorithms for orders of small width and graphs of small Dilworth number. *Order*, 20(4):351–364, 2003.
- [11] D.R. Fulkerson. Note on Dilworth’s decomposition theorem for partially ordered sets. *Proceedings of the American Mathematical Society*, 7(4):701–702, 1956.
- [12] Piet Groeneboom. Hydrodynamical methods for analyzing longest increasing subsequences. *Journal of Computational and Applied Mathematics*, 142(1):83–105, 2002.
- [13] András Gyárfás and Jenő Lehel. Covering and coloring problems for relatives of intervals. *Discrete Mathematics*, 55(2):167–180, 1985.
- [14] Gabriel Istrate. C++ program *interval* for experiments on the heapability of intervals. <https://bitbucket.org/gabriel-istrate/heapable-intervals>, 2017. Accessed: 2017-05-06.

- [15] Gabriel Istrate and Cosmin Bonchiş. Partition into heapable sequences, heap tableaux and a multiset extension of Hammersley’s process. In *Proceedings of the 26th Annual Symposium on Combinatorial Pattern Matching (CPM’15), Ischia, Italy*, volume 9133 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 261–271. Springer, 2015.
- [16] Gabriel Istrate and Cosmin Bonchiş. Heapability, interactive particle systems, partial orders: Results and open problems. In *Proceedings of the 18th International Conference on Descriptive Complexity of Formal Systems (DCFS’2016), Bucharest, Romania*, volume 9777 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 18–28. Springer, 2016.
- [17] Joyce Justicz, Edward R. Scheinerman, and Peter M. Winkler. Random intervals. *Amer. Math. Monthly*, 97(10):881–889, 1990.
- [18] Denés Konig. Gráfok és mátrixok. *Matematikai és Fizikai Lapok*, 38:116–119, 1931.
- [19] Benjamin F. Logan and Larry A. Shepp. A variational problem for random Young tableaux. *Advances in mathematics*, 26(2):206–222, 1977.
- [20] Colin L Mallows. Patience sorting. *SIAM Review*, 5(4):375–376, 1963.
- [21] Stephan Olariu. An optimal greedy heuristic to color interval graphs. *Information Processing Letters*, 37(1):21–25, 1991.
- [22] Jaclyn Porfilio. A combinatorial characterization of heapability. Master’s thesis, Williams College, May 2015. available from <https://unbound.williams.edu/theses/islandora/object/studenttheses/%3A907>. Accessed: March 2018.
- [23] Dan Romik. *The surprising mathematics of longest increasing subsequences*. Cambridge University Press, 2015.
- [24] William T. Trotter. Partially ordered sets. *Handbook of combinatorics*, 1:433–480, 1995.
- [25] Anatoly M. Vershik and Sergei V. Kerov. Asymptotics of Plancherel measure of symmetrical group and limit form of Young tables. *Doklady Akademii Nauk SSSR*, 233(6):1024–1027, 1977.