

A Simple 2-Approximation for Maximum-Leaf Spanning Tree*

I-Cheng Liao[†]

Hsueh-I Lu[‡]

April 2, 2024

Abstract

For an m -edge connected simple graph G , finding a spanning tree of G with the maximum number of leaves is MAXSNP-complete. The problem remains NP-complete even if G is planar and the maximal degree of G is at most four. Lu and Ravi gave the first known polynomial-time approximation algorithms with approximation factors 5 and 3. Later, they obtained a 3-approximation algorithm that runs in near-linear time. The best known result is Solis-Oba, Bonsma, and Lowski's $O(m)$ -time 2-approximation algorithm. We show an alternative simple $O(m)$ -time 2-approximation algorithm whose analysis is simpler. This paper is dedicated to the cherished memory of our dear friend, Professor Takao Nishizeki.

1 Introduction

We dedicate this paper to honoring the enduring contributions of our beloved friend, Professor Takao Nishizeki, to the field of graph algorithms. Throughout his distinguished career, Professor Nishizeki contributes many classic results to the field, including interesting work on approximation algorithms [6, 14, 22, 23] and spanning trees [15, 20, 21, 30]. We remember him with deep affection and gratitude for his remarkable achievements.

For an n -vertex m -edge connected simple graph G , finding a spanning tree of G with the maximum number of leaves is NP-complete even if G is planar and has maximum degree at most four [12]. Moreover, the problem is MAXSNP-complete [11], implying that it does not admit a polynomial-time approximation scheme unless $\text{NP} = \text{P}$ [1, 2, 24]. The problem finds applications in communication networks, circuit layouts, and computer graphics [7, 8, 31]. See [26] for an up-to-date survey on the maximum leaf spanning tree problem.

Lu and Ravi [18] gave the first polynomial-time approximation algorithms for the problem based on local search. Their 3-approximation (respectively, 5-approximation) algorithm runs in $O(m^2n^3)$ (respectively, $O(mn^2)$) time. They later gave a new 3-approximation algorithm that runs in $O(m \cdot \alpha(m, n))$ time [19]. Solis-Oba, Bonsma, and Lowski [27, 28] improved their result by giving an

*See [17] for a preliminary version of this work, which was conducted independently of [27, 28].

[†]Department of Computer Science and Information Engineering, National Chung-Cheng University, Chia-Yi, Taiwan.

[‡]Corresponding author. Email: hil@csie.ntu.edu.tw. Department of Computer Science and Information Engineering, National Taiwan University, Taipei, Taiwan. Research of this author is supported by Grant 110-2221-E-002-075-MY3 of National Science and Technology Council (NSTC), formerly known as Ministry of Science and Technology (MOST).

$O(m)$ -time 2-approximation algorithm. Their algorithm has multiple phases of loops. Their proof for the approximation ratio is also somewhat involved. We give an alternative $O(m)$ -time 2-approximation algorithm that is simpler: (1) Our algorithm has only one simple loop, easily implementable to run in linear time using basic data structures like arrays and linked lists. (2) Our proof for the approximation ratio is shorter.

Theorem 1. *Algorithm $\text{tree}(G)$ is an $O(m)$ -time 2-approximation algorithm for the maximum-leaf spanning tree problem.*

We follow a similar approach to the one introduced by Solis-Oba, Bonsma, and Lowski [27, 28]: In each round, the algorithm selects a vertex u on the current tree and expands the tree by adding all neighbors of u that are not already in the tree, directly linking them to u . The choice of u is based on the number of its neighbors outside the current tree. Our algorithm expands the tree in a greedy manner, aiming to maximize the number of leaves in each round. If a round cannot increase the number of leaves (i.e., each leaf has at most one neighbor outside the tree), the algorithm looks ahead one round and attempts to maximize the number of leaves increased in two consecutive rounds. When no suitable expansion vertices can be found for two consecutive rounds, the algorithm employs a “depth-first” expansion strategy to simplify the analysis of the approximation ratio.

The maximum-leaf spanning tree problem has been extensively studied in the literature. Most of the early work focused on finding spanning trees with many leaves in graphs with minimum degree at least d for some $d \geq 3$. For such graphs, good lower bounds on the number of leaves achievable in a spanning tree have been derived in [4, 5, 9, 13, 16, 25, 29]. There has also been work on polynomial-time solutions to the problem of determining if a given graph has a spanning tree with at least k leaves for a fixed k . The first such algorithm, running in $O(n^2)$ time, was due to Fellows and Langston [10]. Bodlaender [3] improved the running time to $O(m)$.

Section 2 describes our algorithm. Section 3 analyzes the approximation ratio. Section 4 shows a linear-time implementation of our algorithm. Section 5 concludes the paper.

2 The algorithm

All graphs in this paper are undirected and simple, i. e., having no multiple edges and self-loops. Let H be a graph. Let $V(H)$ (respectively, $E(H)$) denote the vertex (respectively, edge) set of H . Let $d_H(u)$ with $u \in V(H)$ denote the number of neighbors of u in H . Let $L(H)$ (respectively, $V_2(H)$ and $V_0(H)$) consist of each vertex u with $d_H(u) = 1$ (respectively, $d_H(u) \geq 2$ and $d_H(u) = 0$). A vertex $u \in V(H)$ is a *leaf* of H if $u \in L(H)$.

Let G be the input n -vertex m -edge connected graph. Assume without loss of generality that G contains a vertex a with $d_G(a) \geq 2$. Let T be a tree of G . For a vertex u of T , let $V_T(u)$ consist of the vertices $v \in V(G) \setminus V(T)$ with $uv \in E(G)$ and let $E_T(u)$ consist of the edges uv of G with $v \in V_T(u)$. If $|V_T(u)| = 1$, then let $v_T(u)$ denote the vertex in $V_T(u)$.

- Let $W_2(T)$ consist of each vertex u of T with $|V_T(u)| \geq 2$.
- Let $W_1(T)$ consist of each vertex u of T with $|V_T(u)| = 1$ and $|V_{T \cup E_T(u)}(v_T(u))| \geq 2$.
- Let $W_0(T)$ consist of each vertex u of T with $|V_T(u)| = 1$ and $|V_{T \cup E_T(u)}(v_T(u))| \leq 1$.

Algorithm $\text{tree}(G)$:

Let T be the initial tree of G consisting of a vertex a of G with $d_G(a) \geq 2$.

Repeat the following steps until $V(T) = V(G)$:

 If $W_2(T) \neq \emptyset$, then

 let u be an arbitrary vertex in $W_2(T)$

 else if $W_1(T) \neq \emptyset$, then

 let u be an arbitrary vertex in $W_1(T)$

 else

 let u be the vertex in $W_0(T)$ that joins $V(T)$ most recently.

 Expand T at u by letting $T = T \cup E_T(u)$.

Return T .

Figure 1: Our algorithm on a connected graph G .




Figure 2: An example of the spanning tree T returned by our algorithm. The edges of T are represented by the solid lines. (a) Vertex i is the i -th expanded vertex. The vertices with no labels are the leaves of the returned spanning tree. (b) The label of each vertex is its rank according to the expansion order given in (a).

Our algorithm is as in Figure 1. That is, starting with the initial tree $T = \{a\}$ of G , we iteratively expand T until $V(T) = V(G)$. Each iteration expands T at a vertex u of T with $|V_T(u)| \neq 0$ (which has to be a leaf of T except when $u = a$) by letting $T = T \cup E_T(u)$. Hence, the tree returned by the algorithm is a spanning tree of G . The vertex at which T is expanded is chosen from $W_2(T)$, $W_1(T)$, and $W_0(T)$ in order. Thus, if T is to be expanded at a vertex in $W_i(T)$ with $i \in \{0, 1\}$, then each $W_j(T)$ with $i < j \leq 2$ is empty. Moreover, the vertices in $W_0(T)$ are chosen in the reversed order of their joining $V(T)$. As a result, once T is about to be expanded at a vertex $u \in W_0(T) \cup W_1(T)$, then algorithm grows a path for T from u by repeatedly letting $T = T \cup \{uv_T(u)\}$ and $u = v_T(u)$ until $|E_T(u)| \neq 1$. If the halting condition is $|E_T(u)| = 0$ (respectively, $|E_T(u)| \geq 2$), then the grown path ends at a leaf (respectively, a vertex with degree at least three) in the final tree returned by the algorithm. The chosen order of the vertices at which T is expanded is crucial in analyzing the approximation ratio in the next section. An example is shown in Figure 2(a), where vertex i is the i -th vertex at which T is expanded.

3 The approximation ratio

Throughout the section, let T denote the tree returned by our algorithm rooted at the vertex a of the initial tree. For each vertex v of T other than a , let $p(v)$ denote the parent of v in T . For each vertex u of T with $d_T(u) \geq 2$, let T_u be the subtree of T when T_u is about to be expanded at u and let $T^u = T_u \cup E_{T_u}(u)$. Thus, $u = p(v)$ if and only if $v \in V_{T_u}(u)$, i.e., uv joins T via expanding T_u at u . Define the *rank* $r(v)$ of each $v \in V(G)$ as follows. Let $r(a) = 1$. For each edge uv of T with $u = p(v)$, let

$$r(v) = \begin{cases} r(u) & \text{if } u \in W_2(T_u) \\ 1 + \max_{w \in V(T_u)} r(w) & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

See Figure 2(b) for an example. If uv is an edge of G with $r(u) < r(v)$, then $v \notin V(T_u)$. That is, when the tree is about to be expanded at u , the tree does not contain any vertex whose rank is higher than $r(u)$. Thus, for an edge uv of G with $r(u) < r(v)$, if $uv \in E(T)$, then $u = p(v)$ and $u \in W_0(T_u) \cup W_1(T_u)$; otherwise, u is a leaf of T with $r(p(u)) = r(u)$. Let U consist of the vertices with unique ranks. The U in Figure 2(b) consists of the vertices of ranks 4, 5, and 6. If $u = p(v)$, then the definition of our algorithm implies

- $u \in W_2(T_u)$ if and only if $r(u) = r(v)$,
- $u \in W_1(T_u)$ if and only if $r(u) < r(v)$ and $v \notin U$, and
- $u \in W_0(T_u)$ if and only if $r(u) < r(v)$ and $v \in U$.

Lemma 1. *Let uvw is a path of G with $\{u, v\} \subseteq U$ and $r(u) < r(v) < r(w)$, then $d_G(v) = 2$.*

Proof. Assume for contradiction that there is a neighbor x of v in G other than u and w . By $\{u, v\} \subseteq U$ and $r(u) < r(v)$, we have $r(u) = r(v) - 1$ and $u \in W_0(T_u)$. Therefore, $W_1(T_u) = W_2(T_u) = \emptyset$, implying $r(x) < r(u)$. By $\{u, w\} \subseteq V_{T^u \cup \{xv\}}(v)$, we have $x \in W_2(T_{p(u)}) \cup W_1(T_{p(u)})$, contradicting $p(u) \in W_0(T_{p(u)})$. \square

Lemma 2. *Each vertex u of G has at most one neighbor v in G with $r(u) < r(v)$.*

Proof. Assume for contradiction that v and w are distinct neighbors of u in G with

$$r(u) < r(v) \leq r(w). \tag{1}$$

Thus, $u \neq a$. Let $p = p(u)$. By Equation (1), we have $V(T_p) \cap \{v, w\} = \emptyset$, implying $p \notin W_0(T_p)$. Also, we have $p \notin W_1(T_p)$; or else $\{v, w\} \subseteq V_{T_u}(u)$ implies $r(u) = r(v) = r(w)$, violating Equation (1). Hence, $p \in W_2(T_p)$ and $\{v, w\} \subseteq V_{T^p}(u)$, implying $u \in W_2(T^p)$. By Equation (1), we have $V_{T_u}(u) \cap \{v, w\} = \emptyset$. Thus, $u \in W_2(T_u)$, violating Equation (1). \square

Let F be the forest obtained from T by deleting all edges uv with $r(u) \neq r(v)$. Thus, for any vertices u and v of G , we have $r(u) = r(v)$ if and only if u and v are connected in F .

Lemma 3. *If uv is an edge of G with $u \in V_2(F)$, then $r(u) \geq r(v)$.*

Proof. Assume $r(u) < r(v)$ for contradiction, implying $v \notin V(T_u)$. By $u \in V_2(F)$, we have $r(u) = r(v)$, contradiction. \square




Figure 3: The solid edges form a spanning forest F having 6 connected components, three of which have at least three vertices. Any two vertices are connected in F if and only if their ranks (as shown in Figure 2(b)) are identical. The dark vertex in each connected component F_i with $1 \leq i \leq 6$ is a nonleaf vertex f_i of F_i . (a) The 15 dotted edges form a spanning tree R . The 11 dark dotted edges form the minimal subtree R' of R that spans the dark vertices f_1, \dots, f_6 . (b) The 5 dotted edges form a minimal forest S with $|V(S)| = 9$ of R' such that $F \cup S$ is a spanning tree. S has four connected components.

Lemma 4. *If uv is an edge of G with $u \in U$ and $v \in L(F)$, then $r(u) > r(v)$.*

Proof. Assume $r(u) \leq r(v)$ for contradiction. By $u \in U$, we have $r(u) < r(v)$, implying $v \notin V(T_u)$. By $u \in U$, we have $u = p(v)$, implying $T^u = T_v$. Thus, $v \in U \cup V_2(F)$, violating $v \in L(F)$. \square

Let F_i with $i \geq 1$ be the i -th largest connected component of F . Let k denote the number of connected components of F having at least three vertices. By $d_G(a) \geq 2$, we have $k \geq 1$. If uv is an edge of T with $r(u) < r(v)$, then $u = p(v)$ and $d_F(v) \neq 1$. By definition of our algorithm, $|V(F_i)| \neq 2$ holds for each $i \geq 1$.

- If $|V(F_i)| = 1$, then F_i has at most two incident edges in T . Thus, $|L(F)| \leq |L(T)| + k - 1$.
- If $|V(F_i)| \geq 3$, then F_i has at most one vertex u with $d_{F_i}(u) = 2$. Thus, $|V(F_i)| \leq 2 \cdot |L(F_i)| - 1$.

We have $U = V_0(F)$ and

$$n - |U| = \sum_{i=1}^k |V(F_i)| \leq \sum_{i=1}^k (2 \cdot |L(F_i)| - 1) = 2 \cdot |L(F)| - k \leq 2 \cdot |L(T)| + k - 2.$$

To show that T is 2-approximate, it remains to prove for an arbitrary spanning tree R of G

$$|L(R)| \leq n - |U| - k + 1. \quad (2)$$

Let each f_i with $1 \leq i \leq k + |U|$ be an arbitrary vertex of $V(F_i) \setminus L(F_i)$. Let R' be the minimum subtree of R that spans all $k + |U|$ vertices f_i . We have $L(R') \cap L(F) = \emptyset$ and $L(R) \cap V(R') \subseteq L(R')$, implying

$$L(S) \cap L(F) = \emptyset \quad (3)$$

for any minimal forest S of R' such that $S \cup F$ is a spanning tree of G . By minimality of S , the vertices of a connected component of S have distinct ranks. By minimality of S , each connected

component of S has at least two vertices and a connected component of S having j vertices connects exactly $j - 1$ connected components of F . Since F has $k + |U|$ connected components, we have $|V(S)| = |U| + k + t - 1$, where $t \geq 0$ is the number of connected components of S . See [Figure 3](#) for an example. Thus,

$$|L(R) \setminus V(S)| \leq |V(R) \setminus V(S)| = n - |U| - k - t + 1.$$

We first claim that each connected component of S contains at most one leaf of R , implying $|L(R) \cap V(S)| \leq t$. Thus, Equation (2) follows from

$$|L(R)| = |L(R) \setminus V(S)| + |L(R) \cap V(S)| \leq n - |U| - k + 1.$$

It remains to prove the claim. Recall that all vertices of a connected component of S have distinct ranks. Assume for contradiction that a connected component of S contains distinct leaves u and v of R with $r(u) < r(v)$. By $S \subseteq R' \subseteq R$, we have $\{u, v\} \subseteq L(S)$. Let P be the uv -path of S . For any $\{x, y\} \in V(P)$, let $P[x, y]$ denote the xy -path of P . By Equation (3), we have the following cases:

Case 1: $u \in V_2(F)$. Let w be the neighbor of u in P . By Lemma 3, we have $r(w) < r(u) < r(v)$. Thus, there is a path xyz of P with $r(y) < r(x) < r(z)$, violating Lemma 2.

Case 2: $u \in U$ and $v \in V_2(F)$. By Lemmas 2 and 3, the ranks of the vertices in P are monotonically increasing from u to v . Let xy be the edge of P with $V(P[u, x]) \subseteq U$ and $y \notin U$. By $x \in U$, we have $p(x) \in W_0(T_{p(x)})$. Thus, $T^{p(x)} = T_x$, implying $x = p(y)$ by $r(x) < r(y)$. By $x = p(y)$ and $y \notin U$, we have $y \in V_2(F)$. We have $y = v$; or else the rank of the neighbor of y in $P[y, v]$ is lower than $r(y)$ by Lemma 3. Lemma 1 implies $d_R(w) = 2$ for each interior vertex w of P . Thus, a and u are not connected in R , contradiction.

Case 3: $\{u, v\} \subseteq U$.

- Case 3a: A set $\{x, z\} = \{u, v\}$ and an interior vertex y of P with $y \in L(F)$ satisfy $V(P[y, z] - y) \subseteq U$. Since the neighbor of y in $P[y, z]$ is in U , its rank is higher than $r(y)$ by Lemma 4. By Lemma 2, the ranks of the vertices of $P[x, y]$ are monotonically increasing from x to y . Thus, $V(P[x, y]) \cap V_2(F) = \emptyset$ by Lemma 3. By $x \in U$ and $y \in L(F)$, there is a vertex w of $P[x, y]$ in $L(F)$ such that its neighbor in $P[x, w]$ is in U , contradicting Lemma 4.
- Case 3b: Case 3a does not hold and there is an interior vertex w of P in $V_2(F)$. By Lemmas 2 and 3, the ranks of the vertices of $P[x, w]$ are monotonically increasing for each $x \in \{u, v\}$, implying that w is the only vertex of P in $V_2(F)$. Since Case 3a does not hold, we have $V(P - w) \subseteq U$. Let y and z be the neighbors of w in P with $r(y) < r(z)$. Thus, $V(T_y) \cap \{w, z\} = \emptyset$. By $y \in U$ and $V_{T^{p(y)}}(y) \neq \emptyset$, we have $T^{p(y)} = T_y$. Lemma 1 implies $d_G(y) = 2$. Thus, $y = p(w)$ and $T^y = T_w$, implying $r(w) = r(z)$, contradiction.
- Case 3c: Neither of Cases 3a and 3b holds. Thus, $V(P) \subseteq U$. Since a and u are connected in R and $\{u, v\} \subseteq L(R)$, there is an interior vertex w of P with $d_G(w) \geq 3$. By Lemmas 1 and 2, the ranks of the vertices of P are monotonically increasing from u (respectively, v) to w . Let x and y be the neighbors of w in P with $r(x) < r(y)$. Let z be a neighbor of w in G other than x and y .
 - If $r(x) < r(z)$, then $V(T_x) \cap \{y, z, w\} = \emptyset$. By $x \in U$ and $V_{T^{p(x)}}(x) \neq \emptyset$, we have $T^{p(x)} = T_x$. Lemma 1 implies $d_G(x) = 2$. Thus, $x = p(w)$ and $T^x = T_w$, implying $r(w) = r(y)$, contradiction.




Figure 4: The spanning tree T consists of the solid edges. The number of each internal vertex of T represents its expansion order.

- If $r(z) < r(x)$, then $V(T_z) \cap \{x, y, w\} = \emptyset$. By $w \in U$, we have $T^z = T_w$, implying $r(x) = r(w) = r(y)$, contradiction.

Our analysis is tight. Consider the graph G in Figure 4 composed of the solid and the dashed lines. If vertex i is the i -vertex expanded, then the spanning tree T computed by our algorithm is exactly the one consisting of the solid lines with $|L(T)| = 6$. However, G has a spanning tree R rooted at the highest-degree vertex with $|L(R)| = 10$, which is $2|L(T)| - 2$.

4 A linear-time implementation

Our algorithm can easily be implemented to run in $O(m)$ time using merely arrays and linked lists. We maintain three (“waiting”) lists W_2 , W_1 , and W_0 of the leaves of T and a list U_w for each $w \in V(G)$ of the (“unspanned”) neighbors of w in $V(G) \setminus V(T)$. To expand T at a vertex $u \in V(T)$, we (i) insert each vertex $v \in V_T(u)$ to the bottom of W_2 and let $U_w = U_w \setminus \{v\}$ for each $vw \in E(G)$ and (ii) let $T = T \cup E_T(u)$. Thus, it takes overall $O(m)$ time to expand T throughout the algorithm. The algorithm expands the initial $T = \{a\}$ at a and enters the loop, each of whose iterations runs the following instructions. Note that, according to the above implementation, expanding T at a vertex $u \in V(T)$ with $|V_T(u)| = 0$ does nothing.

- Case 1: $W_2 \neq \emptyset$. Delete a vertex u from the top of W_2 . If $|V_T(u)| = 1$, then insert u to the bottom of W_1 . Otherwise, expand T at u .
- Case 2: $W_2 = \emptyset$ and $W_1 \neq \emptyset$. Delete a vertex u from the top of W_1 . If $|V_{T \cup E_T(u)}(v_T(u))| = 1$, then insert u to the bottom of W_0 . Otherwise, expand T at u .
- Case 3: $W_2 = W_1 = \emptyset$ and $W_0 \neq \emptyset$. Delete a vertex u from the bottom of W_2 . Expand T at u .

Each condition involving $|V_T(u)|$ or $|V_{T \cup E_T(u)}(v_T(u))|$ can be determined in $O(1)$ time using the lists U_w . Thus, excluding the time for expanding T , the loop takes overall $O(n)$ time. The three lists W_2 , W_1 , and W_0 enforce that the vertex u of T are chosen in the order of $W_2(T)$, $W_1(T)$, and $W_0(T)$. Since each W_i with $i \in \{0, 1, 2\}$ preserves the order of its vertices that join $V(T)$ and W_0 is processed in the reversed order, the vertices in $W_0(T)$ are chosen in the reversed order of their joining $V(T)$. Hence, our algorithm is correctly implemented above to run in $O(m)$ time.

Theorem 1 is proved.

5 Conclusion

We present a simple linear-time 2-approximation algorithm for the problem of maximum-leaf spanning tree. Our analysis for the approximation ratio is tight. However, as suggested by the example shown in Figure 4, it is of interest to see if the approximation ratio can be improved by starting our algorithm with a vertex having the highest degree. The problem is MAX SNP-complete, so it is also of interest to have nontrivial lower bounds on the approximation ratio.

References

- [1] S. Arora, C. Lund, R. Motwani, M. Sudan, and M. Szegedy. Proof verification and the hardness of approximation problems. *Journal of the ACM*, 45(3):501–555, 1998. doi:10.1145/278298.278306.
- [2] S. Arora and S. Safra. Probabilistic checking of proofs: A new characterization of NP. *Journal of the ACM*, 45(1):70–122, 1998. doi:10.1145/273865.273901.
- [3] H. L. Bodlaender. On linear time minor tests with depth-first search. *Journal of Algorithms*, 14(1):1–23, 1993. doi:10.1006/jagm.1993.1001.
- [4] P. S. Bonsma and F. Zickfeld. Improved bounds for spanning trees with many leaves. *Discrete Mathematics*, 312(6):1178–1194, 2012. doi:10.1016/j.disc.2011.11.043.
- [5] N. Bousquet, T. Ito, Y. Kobayashi, H. Mizuta, P. Ouvrard, A. Suzuki, and K. Wasa. Reconfiguration of spanning trees with many or few leaves. In F. Grandoni, G. Herman, and P. Sanders, editors, *Proceedings of the 28th Annual European Symposium on Algorithms*, LIPIcs 173, pages 24:1–24:15, 2020. doi:10.4230/LIPIcs.ESA.2020.24.
- [6] N. Chiba, T. Nishizeki, and N. Saito. An approximation algorithm for the maximum independent set problem on planar graphs. *SIAM Journal on Computing*, 11(4):663–675, 1982. doi:10.1137/0211055.
- [7] P. Diaz-Gutierrez, A. Bhushan, M. Gopi, and R. Pajarola. Single-strips for fast interactive rendering. *The Visual Computer*, 22(6):372–386, 2006. doi:10.1007/s00371-006-0018-2.
- [8] E. W. Dijkstra. Self-stabilizing systems in spite of distributed control. *Communications of the ACM*, 17(11):643–644, 1974. doi:10.1145/361179.361202.
- [9] G. Ding, T. Johnson, and P. D. Seymour. Spanning trees with many leaves. *Journal of Graph Theory*, 37(4):189–197, 2001. doi:10.1002/jgt.1013.
- [10] M. R. Fellows and M. A. Langston. On well-partial-order theory and its application to combinatorial problems of VLSI design. *SIAM Journal on Discrete Mathematics*, 5(1):117–126, 1992. doi:10.1137/0405010.

- [11] G. Galbiati, F. Maffioli, and A. Morzenti. A short note on the approximability of the maximum leaves spanning tree problem. *Information Processing Letters*, 52(1):45–49, 1994. doi:10.1016/0020-0190(94)90139-2.
- [12] M. R. Garey and D. S. Johnson. *Computers and Intractability: A guide to the theory of NP-completeness*. W. H. Freeman, San Francisco, 1979.
- [13] J. Griggs, D. J. Kleitman, and A. Shastri. Spanning trees with many leaves in cubic graphs. *Journal of Graph Theory*, 13(6):669–695, 1989. doi:10.1002/jgt.3190130604.
- [14] T. Ito, E. D. Demaine, X. Zhou, and T. Nishizeki. Approximability of partitioning graphs with supply and demand. *Journal of Discrete Algorithms*, 6(4):627–650, 2008. doi:10.1016/j.jda.2008.03.002.
- [15] M. Kawabata and T. Nishizeki. Spanning distribution trees of graphs. *IEICE Transactions on Information and Systems*, 97-D(3):406–412, 2014. doi:10.1587/transinf.E97.D.406.
- [16] D. J. Kleitman and D. B. West. Spanning trees with many leaves. *SIAM Journal on Discrete Mathematics*, 4(1):99–106, 1991. doi:10.1137/0404010.
- [17] I.-C. Liao. An improved approximation algorithm for maximum-leaf spanning tree. Master’s thesis, Department of Computer Science and Information Engineering, National Chung-Cheng University, 2001. <https://hdl.handle.net/11296/z535d3>.
- [18] H.-I. Lu and R. Ravi. The power of local optimization: Approximation algorithms for maximum-leaf spanning tree. In *Proceedings of the 30th Annual Allerton Conference on Communication, Control and Computing*, pages 533–542, 1992.
- [19] H.-I. Lu and R. Ravi. Approximating maximum-leaf spanning trees in almost linear time. *Journal of Algorithms*, 29(1):132–141, 1998. doi:10.1006/jagm.1998.0944.
- [20] K. Miura, M. Azuma, and T. Nishizeki. Canonical decomposition, realizer, Schnyder labeling and orderly spanning trees of plane graphs. *Internal Journal of Foundations of Computer Science*, 16(1):117–141, 2005. doi:10.1142/S0129054105002905.
- [21] K. Miura, D. Takahashi, S. Nakano, and T. Nishizeki. A linear-time algorithm to find four independent spanning trees in four connected planar graphs. *Internal Journal of Foundations of Computer Science*, 10(2):195–210, 1999. doi:10.1142/S0129054199000149.
- [22] T. Nishizeki, T. Asano, and T. Watanabe. An approximation algorithm for the hamiltonian walk problem on maximal planar graphs. *Discrete Applied Mathematics*, 5(2):211–222, 1983. doi:10.1016/0166-218X(83)90042-2.
- [23] Y. Obata and T. Nishizeki. Efficient approximation algorithms for bandwidth consecutive multicolorings of graphs. *Theoretical Computer Science*, 607:208–220, 2015. doi:10.1016/j.tcs.2015.07.052.
- [24] C. H. Papadimitriou and M. Yannakakis. Optimization, approximation and complexity classes. In *Proceedings of the 20th Annual ACM Symposium on the Theory of Computing*, pages 229–234, 1988. doi:10.1145/62212.62233.

- [25] C. Payan, M. Tchuente, and N. H. Xuong. Arbres avec un nombres maximum de sommets pendants. *Discrete Mathematics*, 49(3):267–273, 1984. doi:10.1016/0012-365X(84)90163-8.
- [26] F. Rosamond. Max leaf spanning tree. In M.-Y. Kao, editor, *Encyclopedia of Algorithms*, pages 1211–1215. Springer New York, 2016. doi:10.1007/978-1-4939-2864-4_228.
- [27] R. Solis-Oba. 2-approximation algorithm for finding a spanning tree with maximum number of leaves. In G. Bilardi, G. F. Italiano, A. Pietracaprina, and G. Pucci, editors, *Proceedings of the 6th Annual European Symposium on Algorithms*, Lecture Notes in Computer Science 1461, pages 441–452, 1998. doi:10.1007/3-540-68530-8_37.
- [28] R. Solis-Oba, P. S. Bonsma, and S. Lowski. A 2-approximation algorithm for finding a spanning tree with maximum number of leaves. *Algorithmica*, 77(2):374–388, 2017. doi:10.1007/s00453-015-0080-0.
- [29] J. A. Storer. Constructing full spanning trees for cubic graphs. *Information Processing Letters*, 13(1):8–11, 1981. doi:10.1016/0020-0190(81)90141-1.
- [30] K. Takamizawa, T. Nishizeki, and N. Saito. An algorithm for finding a short closed spanning walk in a graph. *Networks*, 10(3):249–263, 1980. doi:10.1002/net.3230100306.
- [31] M. Tchuente. Sur l’auto-stabilisation dans un réseau d’ordinateurs. *RAIRO. Informatique Théorique*, 15(1):47–66, 1981. http://www.numdam.org/item/ITA_1981__15_1_47_0/.