

Burning a binary tree and its generalization

Sandip Das, Sk Samim Islam, Ritam M Mitra, and Sanchita Paul*

Indian Statistical Institute, Kolkata, India

Abstract. Graph burning is a graph process that models the spread of social contagion. Initially, all the vertices of a graph G are unburnt. At each step, an unburnt vertex is put on fire and the fire from burnt vertices of the previous step spreads to their adjacent unburnt vertices. This process continues till all the vertices are burnt. The burning number $b(G)$ of the graph G is the minimum number of steps required to burn all the vertices in the graph. The burning number conjecture by Bonato et al. states that for a connected graph G of order n , its burning number $b(G) \leq \lceil \sqrt{n} \rceil$. It is easy to observe that in order to burn a graph it is enough to burn its spanning tree. Hence it suffices to prove that for any tree T of order n , its burning number $b(T) \leq \lceil \sqrt{n} \rceil$ where T is the spanning tree of G . It was proved in 2018 that $b(T) \leq \lceil \sqrt{n + n_2 + 1/4} + 1/2 \rceil$ for a tree T where n_2 is the number of degree 2 vertices in T . In this paper, we provide an algorithm to burn a tree and we improve the existing bound using this algorithm. We prove that $b(T) \leq \lceil \sqrt{n + n_2 + 8} \rceil - 1$ which is an improved bound for $n \geq 50$. We also provide an algorithm to burn some subclasses of the binary tree and prove the burning number conjecture for the same.

Keywords: Binary Tree · Graph Burning · Algorithm.

1 Introduction

Graph burning is a process that captures the spread of social contagion and was introduced by Bonato, Janssen, and Roshanbin [4] in 2014. The way ideas and feelings spread among people on social networks is a hot topic in social network research. For instance, check out these studies [1,10,11,12,15,16]. A recent study focused on how emotions spread on Facebook [13]. What's interesting is that it found that the structure of the network itself is crucial. Surprisingly, you don't need to meet someone in person or see their body language for emotions to spread. Instead, people in the network share these feelings with their friends or followers, and it keeps spreading over time. Now, here's the question: If you wanted to make this emotional spread happen as quickly as possible across the whole network, who should you start with, and in what order? To address this problem, we study graph burning. We can think that each person or profile is a vertex of a graph. Two people can share their feelings in one step if there is an edge between them. We say a vertex is burnt if the feeling is spread to the vertex.

Below, we describe the process of burning a simple graph $G(V, E)$ where $|V| = n$. Graph burning consists of discrete steps. After each step, each vertex is either burnt or unburnt, once a vertex is burnt it remains burnt till the end. Initially, all the vertices are unburnt. In the first step, we burn a vertex. At each subsequent step, two things happen: first, one new unburned vertex is chosen to burn; second, the fire spreads from each burnt vertex of the previous step to its neighboring vertices and burns the unburned vertices from the neighbors. If a vertex is burned, then it remains in that state until the end of the process. The process ends when all the vertices are burnt. The *burning number*, denoted by $b(G)$, is the minimum number of steps taken for this

* Corresponding author

process to end. The burning problem asks, given a graph G and an integer $k \geq 2$, whether $b(G) \leq k$. An intuitive way to look at this process is to cover the vertices of the graph G by k balls of radius $0, 1, \dots, k-1$, placed at appropriate vertices such that $b(G)$ is minimized. A ball of radius r placed at a vertex v can cover vertices that are at a distance of at most r from v . For example, it is straightforward to see that $b(K_n) = 2$. However, even for a relatively simple graph such as the path P_n on n nodes, computing the burning number is more complex; in fact, $b(P_n) = \lceil \sqrt{n} \rceil$ as [4] proved. Suppose that in the process of burning a graph G , we eventually burn the whole graph G in k steps, and for each i , $1 \leq i \leq k$, we denote the node where we set the fire in the i th step by x_i . We call such a node simply a source of fire. The sequence (x_1, x_2, \dots, x_k) is called a burning sequence for G .

Graph burning can be likened to the way viruses propagate within populations. When left uncontrolled, a limited number of infected individuals within a population can lead to the widespread transmission of the virus. Similarly, one can draw an analogy to a forest fire, which, when left to burn without intervention, can devastate entire forests across a vast expanse.

Bessy et al. [2] showed that the Graph Burning problem is NP-complete when restricted to the trees of maximum degree three. This implies that the burning graph problem is NP-complete for binary trees, chordal graphs, bipartite graphs, planar graphs, and disconnected graphs. Moreover, they showed the NP-completeness of the burning problem even for trees with a structure as simple as spider graphs, and also for disconnected graphs such as path-forests. Furthermore, there is a polynomial time approximation algorithm with approximation factor 3 for general graphs. Hence, determining the precise burning number of a graph is currently not the primary focus. Now, a question can be raised: Is there any tight relation between the burning number and the number of vertices of a graph? Bonato, Janssen, and Roshanbin [5] proposed the Burning Number Conjecture that relates these two numbers of a graph.

Burning Number Conjecture (BNC): Let G be a connected graph of order n , then $b(G) \leq \lceil \sqrt{n} \rceil$.

In order to burn a connected graph, it is sufficient to burn its spanning trees [5]. Therefore, in the study of graph burning, much focus has been spent on the trees. Note that, if T is a spanning tree of a graph G , then $b(G) \leq b(T)$, since the number of steps required to burn T is at least the number of steps required to burn G . Therefore, if the BNC holds for all the trees, then it definitely holds for all the graphs. Now the main challenge is to solve the BNC for the trees. Till now the BNC has been solved for some subclasses of trees including Spider [7,9], Double spider [17], Caterpillars [14].

Our Contribution: In this paper, we study the graph burning problem on several types of binary trees.

A *perfect binary tree* is a special type of binary tree in which all the leaf nodes are at the same level and all internal nodes have exactly two children. In Section 3, we provide a relation between the height and the burning number of a perfect binary tree:

Theorem 1. *Let T be a perfect binary tree of height h , then $b(T) = h + 1$.*

Using Theorem 1, we show that the BNC is true for the perfect binary tree.

Section 4 is based on the study of the graph burning problem on the complete binary tree. A *complete binary tree* is a binary tree in which every level, except the last, is completely filled, and all nodes in the last level are filled from as left as possible. We provide a relation between the height and the burning number of a complete binary tree:

Theorem 2. *Let T be a binary tree of height h which needs exactly 1 more leaf to be perfect. Then $b(T) = h + 1$.*

Theorem 3. *Let T be a complete binary tree of height h which does not have at least 2 leaves in its last level. Then $b(T) = h$.*

Using Theorem 2 and Theorem 3, we show that the BNC is true for the complete binary tree.

A *full binary tree* is a binary tree in which all of the nodes have either 0 or 2 children. In other words, except for the leaf nodes, all other nodes have two children, and it is not necessary for all leaf nodes to be at the same level. In section 5, we show that the burning number of a full binary tree which is not perfect is upper bounded by its height. We state that in the following theorem:

Theorem 4. *Let T be a full binary tree of height h , which is not perfect, then $b(T) \leq h$.*

In the same section, we provide an algorithm to burn the full binary tree which is not perfect, that yields the following Theorem which says the BNC is true for the same:

Theorem 5. *Let T be a full binary tree of n vertices, which is not perfect. Then we have $b(T) \leq \lceil \sqrt{n} \rceil$.*

Moreover, we provide a tighter bound of the burning number for the full binary tree which is not perfect having the number of vertices more than 17. We state that in the following theorem:

Theorem 6. *Let T be a full binary tree on n vertices, which is not perfect, then $b(T) \leq \lceil \sqrt{n+9} \rceil - 1$.*

In 2018, Bessy et al. proved [3] that $b(T) \leq \lceil \sqrt{n+n_2+1/4} + 1/2 \rceil$ for a tree T where n_2 is the number of degree 2 vertices in T . Using Theorem 5, we improve this bound for the trees having the number of vertices at least 50. The improved bound is the following:

Theorem 7. *Let T be a tree of order n and n_2 be the number of degree 2 vertices. Then $b(T) \leq \lceil \sqrt{n+n_2+8} \rceil - 1$.*

2 Preliminaries

Since every connected graph is spanned by a tree, burning the spanning tree is sufficient to burn the connected graph's vertices. *Binary trees* are the most commonly known trees, which have several applications in data structure and algorithms [8]. Binary trees have the characteristic feature that they are rooted trees, and every vertex has at most two children. The *depth* of a node in a tree is the number of edges present in the path from the root node to that node. For a binary tree T , any two vertices are said to be at the same *level* if they are at the same depth from the root. The root is considered to be at the 1st level, and any other vertex that is at level i is said to be $i - 1$ distant from the root. Any non-leaf node is said to be an *internal node*. We call the internal nodes that are the parents of leaves as *parent-leaves*. We call one node to be the *sibling* of other if they have a common parent. The *height* of a node is the number of edges present in the path connecting that node to a leaf node. For any other definition, we follow the standard notation of West [18].

Given a positive integer k , the *k -th closed neighbourhood* of v in a tree $T = (V, E)$ is defined by $N_k[v] = \{u \in V : d(u, v) \leq k\}$.

3 Perfect Binary Tree

A *perfect binary tree* is a special type of binary tree in which all the leaf nodes are at the same level and all internal nodes have exactly two children. In simple terms, this means that all leaf nodes are at the maximum depth of the tree. It is to be noted that a perfect binary tree of height h has 2^h number of leaf nodes.

Theorem 1. *Let T be a perfect binary tree of height h , then $b(T) = h + 1$.*

Proof. T has total $h + 1$ levels, since T has height h . Suppose we set the fire at the root of T which is at the 1st level. At the t -th step, the fire completes the burning of the t -th level of T . Therefore, the burning of the whole T will be completed after $h + 1$ steps, since T has total $h + 1$ levels. Therefore, $b(T) \leq h + 1$.

Now we will show that $b(T) \geq h + 1$. We prove this by contradiction. Suppose there is a burning sequence $S = (x_1, x_2, \dots, x_\alpha)$, where $\alpha < h + 1$. After completing the burning of T using this burning sequence, the fire that was set on the vertex x_j can spread to the vertices of the ball $N_{\alpha-j}[x_j]$, for all j where $1 \leq j \leq \alpha$. Note that, $N_{\alpha-j}[x_j]$ can contain at most $2^{\alpha-j}$ leaves of T . Therefore, the total number of leaves that can be burned using the burning sequence S is at most $\sum_{j=1}^{\alpha} 2^{\alpha-j} = 2^\alpha - 1$. But the total number of leaves of T is 2^h . Now, $2^h \geq 2^\alpha > 2^\alpha - 1$. Therefore, all the leaves of T can not be burned by S , which is a contradiction. Therefore, $b(T) \geq h + 1$. \square

A perfect binary tree T of height h is of order $n = 2^{h+1} - 1$, therefore, we have $b(T) = h + 1 = \log_2(n + 1) \leq \lceil \sqrt{n} \rceil$ for $n \geq 19$. This validates the burning number conjecture for this graph class.

4 Complete Binary Tree

A *complete binary tree* is a binary tree in which every level, except the last, is completely filled, and all nodes in the last level are filled from as left as possible. The number of nodes (leaves) at the last level, ranges from 1 to $2^h - 1$, where h is the height of the tree.

Theorem 2. *Let T be a binary tree of height h which needs exactly 1 more leaf to be perfect. Then $b(T) = h + 1$.*

Proof. The fact that $b(T) \leq h + 1$ can be determined by placing the source of fire at the root of T at the first step of burning.

We will now show that T cannot be burnt in h steps. On the contrary, let (x_1, x_2, \dots, x_h) be an arbitrary burning sequence of T , i.e., $b(T) \leq h$. After completing the burning of T using this burning sequence, the fire that was set on the vertex x_i can spread to the vertices of the ball $N_{h-i}[x_i]$, for all i where $1 \leq i \leq h$. Now we show that for x_i , the total number of leaves that can be burnt from the fire spread from x_i , i.e., which are in $N_{h-i}[x_i]$ is at most 2^{h-i} in number and maximality is attained only when x_i is at $i + 1$ th level. If x_i is at j th level where $1 \leq j \leq i$, then any leaf (say l) that is the descendant of x_i remains unburnt from the fire spread from x_i since, $d(x_i, l) = h + 1 - j \geq h + 1 - i > (h - i)$. Therefore, it is necessary to place x_i at $j(\geq i + 1)$ th level to burn the leaves, and furthermore, maximality can only be attained when $j = i + 1$. Note that x_h cannot burn any more vertex except itself. Hence, the total number of leaves and parent-leaves that can be burnt by all the x_i 's up to h th step of burning is at most $\sum_{i=1}^{h-1} (2^{h-i} + 2^{h-i-1}) + 1 = 2^h + 2^{h-1} - 2$. Again, since there is only one leaf is missing at the $h + 1$ th level, the total number of leaves and parent leaves in T is $(2^h - 1) + 2^{h-1}$. Therefore, at least 1 vertex (leaf/parent-leaf) is left unburnt after h th step. Therefore $b(T) = h + 1$. \square

Theorem 3. *Let T be a complete binary tree of height h which does not have at least 2 leaves in its last level. Then $b(T) = h$.*

Proof. First, we show that h steps are sufficient to burn T in this case, i.e., $b(T) \leq h$. Let c be the root of T and T_1, T_2 be two subtrees of T rooted at the two children c_1, c_2 of c . Since T is a complete binary tree where at least two leaves are absent at its last level, at least one among T_1, T_2 , let's say T_1 is of height $h - 1$, while T_2 is of height $h - 2$ or $h - 1$. Let u_1, u_2, \dots, u_{h-1} be the vertices on a branch of T_2 that does not contain any leaf from $h + 1$ th level (see Figure 1) satisfying $d_T(c, u_i) = i$ and x_i be the sibling node of u_i . Then $d(c, x_i) = i$. We set $v_1 = c_1, v_i = x_i, 2 \leq i \leq h - 1$ and $v_h = u_{h-1}$. Now consider the sequence $(v_1, v_2, \dots, v_{h-1}, v_h)$. As every subtree rooted at $v_i, 1 \leq i \leq h - 1$ is of height $h - i$ or $h - i - 1$ and v_h is a leaf node of T_2 , we get $\bigcup_{i=1}^h N_{h-i}[v_i] = V(T)$. Therefore, (v_1, v_2, \dots, v_h) becomes the burning sequence of T . Thus, up to h steps T must be burnt.

Now we will show that T cannot be burnt in $h - 1$ steps. Let T' be the perfect binary subtree of T having height $h - 1$. If we assume on the contrary that T can be burnt in $h - 1$ steps, then T' should also be burnt in $h - 1$ steps. But from Theorem 1 we know that $b(T') = h$, which contradicts our assumption. Hence $b(T) = h$. \square




Fig. 1: Complete Binary Tree

A complete binary tree of height h that does not contain exactly one leaf in its last level is of order $2^{h+1} - 2$. Hence $b(T) = h + 1 = \log_2(n + 2) \leq \lceil \sqrt{n} \rceil$ when $n \geq 20$. For the other complete binary trees, $n \geq 2^h$, therefore, $b(T) = h \leq \log_2 n \leq \lceil \sqrt{n} \rceil$. Hence, the burning number conjecture holds true for this subclass.

5 Full Binary Tree

A *full binary tree* is a binary tree in which all of the nodes have either 0 or 2 children. In other words, except for the leaf nodes, all other nodes have two children, and it is not necessary for all leaf nodes to be at the same level.

Theorem 4. *Let T be a full binary tree of height h , which is not perfect, then $b(T) \leq h$.*

Proof. Let c be the root and x_1, x_2 be the two children of c in T . By induction hypothesis, we assume that the result is true for all such trees of height less than h . Now consider the subtrees T_1, T_2 of T having x_1, x_2 as their roots. It is easy to note that

T_1, T_2 are two disjoint trees. Also, they cannot be perfect binary trees of height $h - 1$ simultaneously, as T is not perfect. Without loss of generality, let T_1 be any full binary tree of height $h - 1$ and T_2 be a full binary tree of height $\leq h - 1$ which is not perfect. Thus, using the algorithm stated in the proof of Theorem 1, T_1 can be burnt in h steps by only placing fire at x_1 in the 1st step. Note that we do not need to set fire to any other vertex of T_1 to burn it in h steps. Now, by the induction hypothesis, we know $b(T_2) \leq h - 1$. Also if T_2 is perfect and of height $\leq h - 2$ then it can be burned upto $h - 1$ steps by the algorithm stated in the proof of Theorem 1. Let the burning sequence to burn T_2 be (y_1, \dots, y_{h-1}) . Thus, the burning sequence $(x_1, y_1, \dots, y_{h-1})$ is sufficient to burn T upto h steps. Therefore, $b(T) \leq h$. \square

For convenience, we denote the class of full binary tree which is not perfect by the notation **FBTNP** (Full Binary Tree Not Perfect).

Proposition 1. *Given any positive integer k , there exists a maximal full binary tree $T = (V, E)$ which is not perfect satisfying $|V| = 3(2^k - 1) - 2k$, that can be burnt in k steps.*




Fig. 2: Maximal Burning

Proof. It is sufficient to create a burning sequence (v_1, v_2, \dots, v_k) in such a manner so that $N_{k-1}[v_1] \cup N_{k-2}[v_2] \cup \dots \cup N_0[v_k] = V$ for some FBTNP tree T and $|V| = 3(2^k - 1) - 2k$. Maximality can be guaranteed whenever we are able to prevent all instances of double-burning in T , i.e., if T can be constructed in such a way that $N_{k-i}[v_i] \cap N_{k-j}[v_j] = \emptyset$ for all $i \neq j$.

First, we construct a perfect binary tree $T(v_1)$ (say) of height $k - 1$, rooted at the vertex v_1 . Let v'_1 be the neighbor of v_1 apart from the two children of v_1 in $T(v_1)$. Clearly, $v'_1 \notin V(T(v_1))$. Next, we create a perfect binary tree of height $k - 2$ rooted at v'_1 , say $T(v'_1)$ disjoint from $T(v_1)$. It is important to note that, $T(v_1)$ and $T(v'_1)$ are two separate perfect binary trees and are connected by the edge $v_1 v'_1$. Let, $T_1 = T(v_1) \cup T(v'_1)$ be a subtree of T . It is easy to verify that $|N_{k-1}[v_1]| = |V(T_1)| = |V(T(v_1))| + |V(T(v'_1))| = (2^k - 1) + (2^{k-1} - 1) = 2^k + 2^{k-1} - 2$ (see Figure 2). We construct the subtrees T_2, T_3, \dots, T_k sequentially in the aforementioned procedure where $T_i = N_{k-i}[v_i]$ and $|T_i| = |N_{k-i}[v_i]| = 2^{(k-i)+1} + 2^{k-i} - 2$ for $2 \leq i \leq k$. We create an edge between any two leaves of T_i, T_j for all $i \neq j$. Thus we build $T = T_1 \cup T_2 \cup T_3 \dots \cup T_k$.

One can verify that T is an FBTNP with the root as one of the leaves of $T(v'_1)$. Furthermore, the total number of vertices of T is $(2^k + 2^{k-1} - 2) + \sum_{i=2}^k (2^{k-i+1} + 2^{k-i} - 2) = 3(2^k - 1) - 2k$. Since each of $T(v_i)$ and $T(v'_i)$ are perfect binary trees of height $k - i$ and $k - i - 1$ respectively, and $v_i, v'_i \in E$, using Theorem 1 we can burn the FBTNP T in k steps. The maximality of T is ensured by the above construction. \square

5.1 Algorithm to burn an FBTNP




Fig. 3: Cases in Full Binary Tree (case (a) at the top, case (b)(i) in the middle, case (b)(ii) in the bottom)

In this subsection, we propose an algorithm to burn an FBTNP which is recursive in nature. We construct a burning sequence (v_1, \dots, v_k) of an FBTNP tree T of height h for some $k \in \mathbb{N}$. Our idea is to burn a portion of the tree T at each step by using one or two sources of fire. When $k < h$, we cut the portion from the main tree in such a way that the remaining graph becomes an FBTNP¹ itself with a smaller size. Otherwise, only a single source of fire spreading upto k steps is sufficient to burn the whole tree. In the Theorem 5, we prove that for an FBTNP of order n , the value of $k = \lceil \sqrt{n} \rceil$.

Algorithm: Let $T = (V, E)$ be an FBTNP having $P_{d+1} = (u_0, u_1, \dots, u_d)$ as the diametral path, where d is the diameter and h be the height of T . Below we will construct a burning sequence (v_1, v_2, \dots, v_k) of T for some $k \in \mathbb{N}$. For $0 \leq i \leq d$, we define $T(u_i)$ to be the subtree rooted at u_i , formed by the branches of T attached to the vertices u_0, u_1, \dots, u_i excluding the branch (u_{i+1}, \dots, u_d) . Let u_c be the root of T and p_i be the neighbour of $u_i \neq u_c$, where $p_i \neq u_{i-1}$ or u_{i+1} . Similarly, another

¹ except some trivial situations where after generating the sequence (v_1, \dots, v_{k-2}) , the modified tree may not be an FBTNP. In these cases, it can be P_2 or $K_{1,3}$ and both can be burned by placing v_{k-1} and v_k

subtree $T'(u_i)$ rooted at u_i can be formed by the branches attached to the vertices u_i, u_{i+1}, \dots, u_d , excluding the branch (u_0, \dots, u_{i-1}) at u_i in T .

In order to burn the tree T in k steps, we consider the two circumstances.

1) Let $k \geq h$. If the root u_c lies on the diametral path $(u_0, \dots, u_c, \dots, u_k, \dots, u_d)$. Then either $u_c = u_{k-1}$ or it occurs left to u_{k-1} along the path P_{d+1} . We place v_1 at u_c to burn $T(u_c) \cup T'(u_c) = T$ up to k steps.

In the other situation, i.e., when the root u_c is not on the diametral path P_{d+1} , then it must be on a branch attached to some u_l , where $0 < l < k$ or $d - k < l < d$. Without loss of generality, we assume $0 < l < k$ and p_m be the maximum distance vertex on that branch measured from u_l . We place v_1 at u_l to burn $T(u_l) \cup T'(u_l) = T$ up to k steps.

Choices of v_2, \dots, v_k in this case, can be arbitrary.

2) Let $k < h$. We will apply the following technique to form the burning sequence (v_1, v_2, \dots, v_k) of T . We start the algorithm from the maximum end of P_{d+1} , calculated from the root of T . If both of the endpoints of P_{d+1} are of the same distance from the root, then we can start from any end. Without loss of generality, assume that u_0 is at maximum distance from the root (Refer to Figure 3).

Step I:

a) Let the number of vertices of the subtree $T(u_{k-2})$ be greater than equal $2k - 1$. Then the order of $T(u_{k-2}) \cup \{p_{k-1}\}$ becomes $\geq 2k$. One can observe that for this to happen there must exist at least one branch from a vertex u_i , $1 \leq i \leq k - 2$ having its height ≥ 2 which is different from P_{d+1} . Now we place v_1 at u_{k-1} in order to burn the vertices of $T(u_{k-2}) \cup \{p_{k-1}\}$ upto k steps.

Next, we update the diametral path P_{d+1} to $P_{d-k+2} = (u_{k-1}, u_k, \dots, u_d)$. It is important to note that we include u_{k-1} in the updated diametral path so that the modified tree $T'(u_k) \cup \{u_{k-1}\}$ preserves all the features of the initial tree T .

b) Next, we consider the case when the order of the subtree $T(u_{k-2})$ is less than $2k - 1$. Since $k < h$, no vertex u_i , $0 \leq i \leq k$ can be the root of T . Therefore $|V(T(u_{k-2}))| \geq 2k - 3$ and hence $T(u_{k-1}) \cup \{p_k\}$ is of order $\geq (2k - 3) + 3 = 2k$ as T is an FBTNP.

The following situations may further occur.

i) The branch attached to u_k different from P_{d+1} is of maximum height $k - 2$. Then we place v_1 at u_{k-1} to burn the vertices of $T(u_{k-1}) \cup \{p_k\}$ upto k steps.

ii) The branch attached to u_k different from P_{d+1} is of height $k - 1$ or k . Let p_m be the last vertex in the attached branch. Then $m = k$ or $k - 1$. Apart from p_k , there must be at least $2k - 2$ vertices in this branch. We place v_1 at p_k and v_2 at u_{k-2} so that up to k th step the total number of vertices burnt due to the fire spread from the vertices v_1, v_2 become $\geq 4k - 4$.

After this, the diametral path P_{d+1} of T is updated, resulting in the new diametral path $P_{d-k+1} = (u_k, \dots, u_d)$. In order to ensure that the modified tree $T'(u_{k+1}) \cup \{u_k\}$ retains all the properties of the original tree T , we include the vertex u_k in the updated diameter ².

Step II: Repeat Step I.

Theorem 5. *Let T be a full binary tree of n vertices, which is not perfect. Then we have $b(T) \leq \lceil \sqrt{n} \rceil$.*

² in both of these cases, we have placed v_1 or $\{v_1, v_2\}$ on the branches of T in a suitable manner so that the modified tree remains a connected FBTNP and the remaining graph completely burns upto k steps

Proof. Let $P_d = (u_0, u_1, \dots, u_d)$ be the diametral path of T . We follow the Algorithm 5.1 to burn T in k steps. We will use induction on $|V(T)|$ to prove the theorem.

Induction Hypothesis : Suppose the result is true for all FBTNP trees having order less than equal t^2 , i.e., if $|V(T)| \leq t^2$ then we get $b(T) \leq t$.

Inductive Step: Consider an FBTNP tree T of m vertices such that $t^2 < m \leq (t+1)^2$. In order to prove the theorem, it is sufficient to show that T can be burnt in $t+1$ steps. Assume $k = t+1$.

First, we consider the situation when $k \geq h$. If u_c is on P_{d+1} then $h = d(u_0, u_c) < d(u_c, u_k) = k$. In the other situation, $d(u_0, u_c) = h < k = d(u_0, u_k)$ imply $d(u_0, u_l) < k$. Again, $d(u_l, u_d) < d(u_c, u_d) < h \leq k$. Furthermore, $d(u_l, u_m) < k$ follows from the definition of diametral path P_{d+1} . More specifically, $N_{k-1}[v_1] = V(T)$ as $v_1 = u_l$. Therefore all the vertices of T will get burnt up to $k = t+1$ th step due to the fire spread from v_1 .

Next, we consider the case when $k < h$. For Case (a) and Case (b) (i), the total number of vertices burnt due to the fire spread from v_1 upto $t+1$ th step is $\geq 2(t+1) \geq 2t+2$. Moreover, since P_{d+1} is the diametral path, any branch attached to u_{k-1} is of maximum height $k-1$ and the branch attached to u_k is of maximum height $k-2$ in case (b) (i). Therefore, after placing v_1 at u_{k-1} , the subtree $T(u_{k-1})$ in case (a) and the subtree $T(u_k)$ in case (b)(i) will be completely burnt up to k steps.

One can observe that the order of the modified tree becomes less than equal to $m - 2t - 2$ after updating the diameter for both of the above cases. Since $m \leq (t+1)^2$, the number of vertices of the modified tree is $\leq (t+1)^2 - 2t - 2 = t^2 - 1 < t^2$. Thus, the modified tree can be burnt in t steps by the induction hypothesis.

For Case (b) (ii), the total number of vertices burnt as a result of the fire spreading from v_1, v_2 up to $t+1$ th step is $\geq 4(t+1) - 4 \geq 4t$. Also, it is important to note that any branch attached to u_k can be of maximum height k , as a result, the placement of v_1, v_2 as described in the algorithm ensures the complete burnability of the subtree $T(u_k)$ up to k th step. Due to this burning, the order of the modified tree becomes less than equal $m - 4t \leq (t+1)^2 - 4t \leq (t-1)^2$. Therefore, according to the induction hypothesis the modified tree can be burnt in $t-1$ steps.

Conclusion: Thus, by induction the FBTNP T , having $|V(T)| \leq (t+1)^2$ can be burnt in $(t+1)$ steps. Hence we get $b(T) \leq \lceil \sqrt{m} \rceil$. \square

5.2 Improved Bound Algorithm to burn an FBTNP

Algorithm : Let $P_{d+1} = (u_0, u_1, \dots, u_d)$ be the diametral path where d is the diameter and h be the height of an FBTNP $T = (V, E)$. We consider the following cases, depending on which we develop a method to burn the tree T in k steps. The burning sequence of T will be built as (v_1, v_2, \dots, v_k) . If $k \geq h$, then we follow the method to burn T as described in Algorithm 5.1. Now we will consider the situation when $k < h$. Let $L_i = (p_{i,1}, p_{i,2}, \dots, p_{i,h'})$ be the branch attached to u_i different from P_{d+1} where $1 \leq i \leq d-1$ and $h' = d(u_i, p_{i,h'})$ be the height of L_i computed from u_i . To keep the notations simple, we denote the subtree rooted at $p_{i,l}$, $1 \leq l \leq h'$ by considering all the branches which are attached to the path $(p_{i,l}, \dots, p_{i,h'})$. Other notations will remain the same as in Algorithm 5.1.

Step I:

Case 1: First, we consider the case where $T(u_{k-1})$ has order $\geq 2k+1$. Here are three situations that may happen. For this to happen, there must be a branch from some u_i , $1 \leq i \leq k-1$ of height ≥ 2 that is different from P_{d+1} .

a) If the branch L_{k-1} attached to u_{k-1} is of height ≥ 2 , then order of $T(u_{k-1}) \setminus \{u_{k-1}\} \geq 2k + 2$. In this situation, we place v_1 at u_{k-1} to burn $\geq 2k + 2$ vertices up to k steps. Next, we update the diametral path P_{d+1} to $P_{d-k+2} = (u_{k-1}, \dots, u_d)$. It is important to note that we include the vertex u_{k-1} in the updated diametral path so that the modified tree $T'(u_k) \cup \{u_{k-1}\}$ retains all properties of the original tree T . (Refer Figure 4a)




Fig. 4: Case 1

b) Next, we consider the situation when L_{k-1} is of height 1, i.e., a single pendant is attached to u_{k-1} . We observe that $T(u_{k-1}) \cup \{p_{k,1}\}$ have order $\geq 2k + 2$.

If the branch L_k attached to u_k is of height at most $k - 2$, then we place v_1 at u_{k-1} to burn $T(u_{k-1}) \cup \{p_{k,1}\}$. (see Figure 4b).

Again, if L_k is of height k , then we place v_1 at $p_{k,1}$ and v_2 at u_{k-2} to burn $\geq 4k$ vertices. In both of these situations, we update the diametral path P_{d+1} to $P_{d-k+1} = (u_k, \dots, u_d)$ and the modified FBTNP becomes $T'(u_{k+1}) \cup \{u_k\}$. (Refer Figure 4d)

When L_k is of height $k - 1$ and furthermore there is a branch of height ≥ 2 at $p_{k,1}$ different from L_k , then by placing v_1 at $p_{k,1}$ and v_2 at u_{k-2} we burn $T(u_k) \setminus \{u_k\}$ upto k steps, i.e. total of $\geq 4k$ vertices, otherwise, we place v_1 at u_{k-1} to burn $\geq 4k - 5$ many vertices to burn $T(u_k) \setminus T(p_{k,k-2})$ up to k steps. Next, we place v_{k-1} at $p_{k,k-2}$ to burn $T(p_{k,k-2})$. Therefore, total $\geq 4k - 2$ vertices get burnt by burning $T(u_k) \setminus \{u_k\}$ up to k steps. Also, to burn the modified tree $T'(u_{k+1}) \cup \{u_k\}$ we use Algorithm 5.1. (Refer Figure 4c)

Case 2: Next, we consider the case when $T(u_{k-1})$ have order less than $2k + 1$. Since $k < h$, no vertex u_i , $0 \leq i \leq k$ can be the root of T . Therefore, number of vertices of $T(u_{k-1})$ is $\geq 2k - 1$. In fact, $|V(T(u_{k-1}))| = 2k - 1$ as T is an FBTNP. Hence the total number of vertices of $T(u_k) \geq (2k - 1) + 2 = 2k + 1$. The following situations may arise:

a) First, we consider the situation when the branch L_k attached to u_k is of height ≥ 2 .




Fig. 5: Case 2a

If the branch L_k attached to u_k is of maximum height $k-2$, then order of $T(u_k) \setminus \{u_k\}$ is $\geq (2k-1) + 3 = 2k+2$. We place v_1 at u_{k-1} to burn $\geq 2k+2$ vertices to burn $T(u_k) \setminus \{u_k\}$ up to k steps. Next, we update the diametral path P_{d+1} to $P_{d-k+1} = (u_k, \dots, u_d)$ so that the modified FBTNP becomes $T'(u_{k+1}) \cup \{u_k\}$. (Refer Figure 5a)

Now, consider the situation when L_k is of height k . If there is a branch of height ≥ 2 from any $p_{k,i}$ where $1 \leq i \leq k-2$, then $|V(T(p_{k,1}))| \geq 2k+1$. We can modify the diametral path P_{d+1} to $(p_{k,k}, \dots, p_{k,1}, u_k, \dots, u_d)$ and hence we can apply Case 1 by taking $|V(T(p_{k,1}))| \geq 2k+1$. In another situation, order of $T(u_k) \setminus \{u_k\}$ is $(2k-1) + (2k-1) = 4k-2$. Therefore, we place v_1 at u_{k-1} and v_{k-1} at $p_{k,k-1}$ and v_k at the pendant attached to $p_{k,k-2}$ to burn $4k-2$ vertices up to k steps. (Refer Figure 5c)

Again, if L_k is of height $k-1$, we place v_1 at u_k and v_{k-1} at u_1 to burn $4k-4$ vertices of the subtree $T(u_k) \setminus \{u_k\}$. In both of these circumstances, we update the diametral path to P_{d-k+1} and to burn the modified FBTNP $T'(u_{k+1}) \cup \{u_k\}$ we apply Algorithm 5.1. (Refer Figure 5b)

b) If there is only one pendant attached to u_k , i.e., $|V(T(u_k))| = 2k+1$. Let u_{k+1} be the root of T . Then we place v_1 at u_{k-1} to burn $2k+2$ vertices of the subtree $T(u_{k+1})$ in k steps. We update the diametral path P_{d+1} to $L_{k+2} \cup (u_{k+2}, \dots, u_d)$ and hence the modified FBTNP becomes $T'(u_{k+2})$.

Now, consider the situation when u_{k+1} is not the root of T . Let $T(u_k) \cup \{p_{k+1,1}\}$ has order $\geq 2k+2$. Since $k < h$, no vertex of the path L_{k+1} can be the root of T .

If the branch L_{k+1} attached to u_{k+1} is of height $\leq k-3$, then we place v_1 at u_{k-1} to burn $T(u_{k+1})$ up to k steps. Next, we update the diametral path P_{d+1} to $P_{d-k} = (u_{k+1}, \dots, u_d)$ so that the modified FBTNP becomes $T'(u_{k+2}) \cup \{u_{k+1}\}$. (Refer Figure 6a)

If L_{k+1} is of height $k+1$. Let the subtree $T(u_k) \cup T(p_{k+1,1})$ have order exactly equals $4k+2$. Then every branch from the internal nodes of L_{k+1} is of height exactly equals 1. We place v_1 at $p_{k+1,2}$ and v_2 at u_{k-2} to burn $T(u_{k+1}) \setminus \{u_k\}$ up to k steps. Hence the modified FBTNP is $T'(u_{k+2}) \cup \{u_{k+1}\}$. (Refer Figure 6e)

Again, if the subtree $T(u_k) \cup T(p_{k+1,1})$ has its order $> 4k+2$, then there must be some branch from the vertices of L_{k+1} of height ≥ 2 , different from L_{k+1} as $|V(T(u_k))| = 2k+1$. Now, if the order of the subtree $T(p_{k+1,2}) \geq 2k+1$, then we update the diametral path P_{d+1} to $L_{k+1} \cup (u_{k+1}, \dots, u_d)$ and apply Case 1, otherwise, i.e., when the order




Fig. 6: Case 2b

of the subtree $T(p_{k+1,1}) \geq 2k + 3$ and $|V(T(p_{k+1,2}))| = 2k - 1$, then also we update the the diametral path P_{d+1} to $L_{k+1} \cup (u_{k+1}, \dots, u_d)$ and apply Case 2(a).

If the branch L_{k+1} is of height k , then the order of the subtree $T(u_k) \cup T(p_{k+1,1})$ has order $\geq 4k$. We place v_1 at $p_{k+1,1}$ and v_2 at u_{k-2} to burn $T(u_{k+1}) \setminus \{u_{k+1}\}$ up to k steps. After this, we update the diametral path P_{d+1} to P_{d-k} so that the modified tree $T'(u_{k+2}) \cup \{u_{k+1}\}$ preserves all properties of the initial tree T . (Refer Figure 6d)

When the branch L_{k+1} is of height $k - 1$, then if the order of the subtree $T(u_k) \cup T(p_{k+1,1})$ has order $4k - 2 (\geq 2k + 2)$, then we place v_1 at u_{k+1} and v_{k-1} at u_1 and v_k at the leaf of u_2 to burn $T(u_{k+1}) \setminus \{u_k\}$ up to k steps (Refer Figure 6c). After this placement, we update the diametral path to P_{d-k} and the modified FBTNP becomes $T'(u_{k+2}) \cup \{u_{k+1}\}$.

If the branch L_{k+1} is of height $k - 2$, then $T(u_k) \cup T(p_{k+1,1})$ has order $\geq 4k - 4$. We place v_1 at u_k and v_{k-1} at u_1 to burn $T(u_k) \cup T(p_{k+1,1})$ up to k steps (Refer Figure 6b). Next, we update the diametral path to P_{d-k} so that the modified FBTNP becomes $T'(u_{k+2}) \cup \{u_{k+1}\}$.

Step II: Repeat Step I.

Theorem 6. *Let T be a full binary tree on n vertices, which is not perfect, then $b(T) \leq \lceil \sqrt{n+9} \rceil - 1$.*

Proof. Let $P_{d+1} = (u_0, u_1, \dots, u_d)$ be the diametral path of T . We follow the Algorithm 5.2 to burn T in k steps. We will use induction on $|V(T)|$ to prove the theorem.

Induction Hypothesis : Suppose, all FBTNP trees having order less than equal $(t + 1)^2 - 9$, i.e. $|V(T)| \leq (t + 1)^2 - 9$ can be burnt in t steps.

Inductive Step: Consider a tree T with m vertices such that $(t+1)^2 - 9 < m \leq (t+2)^2 - 9$. In order to prove the theorem, it is sufficient to show that T can be burnt in $t+1$ steps. We set $k = t + 1$. For $k \geq h$, the verification is similar to what we did in Theorem 5.

Consider the case when $k < h$. In the first step of Algorithm 5.2, different vertices have been chosen as sources of fire as per requirement. The choices are made among the following sources $\{v_1, v_2, v_{k-1}, v_k\}$ before updating the diametral path of T for the first time. We have burnt a certain number of vertices in each of the cases in such a manner so that the modified FBTNP remains connected and the remaining graph gets burnt completely up to k steps. In each of the cases, we prove $k = \lceil \sqrt{n+9} \rceil - 1$.

We select v_1 as a source of fire to burn $\geq 2k + 2$ vertices for some cases. Therefore, the number of vertices burnt due to the fire spread from v_1 up to $t+1$ th step is $\geq 2t+4$. Therefore, the order of the modified tree becomes less than equal $m - (2t+4)$. Since $m \leq (t+2)^2 - 9$, the number of vertices of the modified tree is $\leq (t+2)^2 - 9 - (2t+4) = (t+1)^2 - 10 < (t+1)^2 - 9$. Hence, it can be burnt in t steps by induction hypothesis.

We select v_1 and v_2 at suitable places over the branches of T to burn $\geq 4k$ vertices. Therefore, the number of vertices burnt up to $t+1$ th step from the fire spread from v_1, v_2 is $\geq 4t+4$. Hence the order of the modified tree is $\leq m - (4t+4) \leq (t+2)^2 - 9 - 4t - 4 = t^2 - 9$. Therefore, the modified tree can be burnt in $t-1$ steps by induction hypothesis.

The remaining cases have been proved with the help of Theorem 5.

We select v_1 and v_{k-1} at appropriate locations over the branches of T to burn $\geq 4k - 4$ vertices. Therefore, the number of vertices burnt up to $t+1$ th step from the fire spread from v_1, v_t is $\geq 4t$. Hence the order of the modified tree is $\leq m - 4t \leq (t+2)^2 - 9 - 4t = t^2 - 5 < t^2$.

Again, in some situations, to burn $4k - 2$ vertices, we choose v_1, v_{k-1}, v_k suitably at proper places on the branches of T . Hence, the number of vertices burnt up to $t+1$ th step from the fire spread from v_1, v_t, v_{t+1} is $\geq 4t + 2$. Therefore, the order of the modified tree is $m - (4t+2) \leq (t+2)^2 - 9 - 4t = t^2 - 7 < t^2$. = (

We see in both of the above cases the modified tree has order $\leq t^2 - 5$. Now, we claim that (v_2, \dots, v_{t-2}) is sufficient to burn the modified tree. From the proof of Theorem 5, we know, we can burn a tree of order t^2 in t steps (i.e., (v'_1, \dots, v'_t)). Note that, the sources v'_{t-1} and v'_t burn a maximum of 5 vertices in an FBTNP. Thus, using (v'_1, \dots, v'_{t-2}) is enough to burn a tree using a tree of order $t^2 - 5$. It is easy to observe that the burning sequence $(v_2, v_3, \dots, v_{t+1})$ is equivalent to $(v'_1, v'_2, \dots, v'_t)$.

Conclusion: Thus, by induction we are able to prove that an FBTNP T having $|V(T)| \leq (t+2)^2 - 9$ can be burnt in $t+1$ steps. Hence we get $b(T) \leq \lceil \sqrt{n+9} \rceil - 1$. \square

6 General Tree

We now extend our results to the more general tree. The k -ary tree is a rooted tree, where each node can hold at most k number of children. We define a special type of k -ary tree, where each internal node can hold at least 2 children and at most k children, we name this tree as $(3, k)$ -ary tree. Note that, Algorithm 5.2 works for this special kind of k -ary.

In 2018, Bessy et al. proved [3] that $b(T) \leq \lceil \sqrt{n+n_2+1/4} + 1/2 \rceil$ for a tree T where n_2 is the number of degree 2 vertices in T . Using Theorem 6, we improve this bound for the trees having the number of vertices at least 50.

Theorem 7. *Let T be a tree of order n and n_2 be the number of degree 2 vertices. Then $b(T) \leq \lceil \sqrt{n+n_2+8} \rceil - 1$.*

Proof. Let a tree T of order n has n_2 nodes of degree 2. We add a pendent vertex to each of $n_2 - 1$ nodes leaving out 1 node as the root, thus transforming T to a $(3, k)$ -ary T' of order $n + n_2 - 1$. We know that Algorithm 5.2 works for $(3, k)$ -ary tree. By Theorem 7 we can burn T' in $\lceil \sqrt{(n + n_2 - 1) + 9} \rceil - 1 = \lceil \sqrt{n + n_2 + 8} \rceil - 1$ steps. \square

The burning number of a connected graph G equals the burning number of a spanning tree of G ; see [5]. Hence, we derive the following results for a connected graph. As, $n_2 \leq n - 2$, thus a tree of order n can be burnt in $\lceil \sqrt{2n + 6} \rceil - 1$ steps which is an improvement over [3]. Also, when $n_2 \leq n/3$, then $b(T) \leq \lceil \sqrt{4n/3 + 8} \rceil - 1$ which is an improvement over [6] under the given condition.

7 Conclusion

To sum up, the burning number conjecture has been proved for the perfect binary tree, complete binary tree, and FBTNP. For an FBTNP, an improved algorithm has been given which in turn has improved the bound from the original conjecture.

The burning number conjecture could also be studied for the other interesting subclasses of trees.

References

1. Banerjee, S., Gopalan, A., Das, A.K., Shakkottai, S.: Epidemic spreading with external agents. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory* **60**(7), 4125–4138 (2014)
2. Bessy, S., Bonato, A., Janssen, J., Rautenbach, D., Roshanbin, E.: Burning a graph is hard. *Discrete Applied Mathematics* **232**, 73–87 (2017)
3. Bessy, S., Bonato, A., Janssen, J., Rautenbach, D., Roshanbin, E.: Bounds on the burning number. *Discrete Applied Mathematics* **235**, 16–22 (2018)
4. Bonato, A., Janssen, J., Roshanbin, E.: Burning a graph as a model of social contagion. In: *Algorithms and Models for the Web Graph: 11th International Workshop, WAW 2014, Beijing, China, December 17–18, 2014, Proceedings 11*. pp. 13–22. Springer (2014)
5. Bonato, A., Janssen, J., Roshanbin, E.: How to burn a graph. *Internet Mathematics* **12**(1–2), 85–100 (2016)
6. Bonato, A., Kamali, S.: An improved bound on the burning number of graphs. arXiv preprint arXiv:2110.01087 (2021)
7. Bonato, A., Lidbetter, T.: Bounds on the burning numbers of spiders and path-forests. *Theoretical Computer Science* **794**, 12–19 (2019)
8. Cormen, T., Leiserson, C., Rivest, R., Stein, C.: *Introduction To Algorithms*. Mit Electrical Engineering and Computer Science, MIT Press (2001)
9. Das, S., Dev, S.R., Sadhukhan, A., Sahoo, U.K., Sen, S.: Burning spiders. In: *Algorithms and Discrete Applied Mathematics: 4th International Conference, CALDAM 2018, Guwahati, India, February 15–17, 2018, Proceedings*. pp. 155–163. Springer (2018)
10. Domingos, P., Richardson, M.: Mining the network value of customers. In: *Proceedings of the seventh ACM SIGKDD international conference on Knowledge discovery and data mining*. pp. 57–66 (2001)
11. Kempe, D., Kleinberg, J., Tardos, É.: Maximizing the spread of influence through a social network. In: *Proceedings of the ninth ACM SIGKDD international conference on Knowledge discovery and data mining*. pp. 137–146 (2003)
12. Kempe, D., Kleinberg, J., Tardos, É.: Influential nodes in a diffusion model for social networks. In: *Automata, Languages and Programming: 32nd International Colloquium, ICALP 2005, Lisbon, Portugal, July 11–15, 2005, Proceedings 32*. pp. 1127–1138. Springer (2005)
13. Kramer, A.D., Guillory, J.E., Hancock, J.T.: Experimental evidence of massive-scale emotional contagion through social networks. *Proceedings of the National academy of Sciences of the United States of America* **111**(24), 8788 (2014)

14. Liu, H., Hu, X., Hu, X.: Burning number of caterpillars. *Discrete Applied Mathematics* **284**, 332–340 (2020)
15. Mossel, E., Roch, S.: On the submodularity of influence in social networks. In: *Proceedings of the thirty-ninth annual ACM symposium on Theory of computing*. pp. 128–134 (2007)
16. Richardson, M., Domingos, P.: Mining knowledge-sharing sites for viral marketing. In: *Proceedings of the eighth ACM SIGKDD international conference on Knowledge discovery and data mining*. pp. 61–70 (2002)
17. Tan, T.S., Teh, W.C.: Burnability of double spiders and path forests. *Applied Mathematics and Computation* **438**, 127574 (2023)
18. West, D.: *Introduction to graph theory*. 2nd edn. Pearson Education, London (2002)