

The Greedy Superstring Algorithm Achieves Ratio 2 for Strings of Length 6 Already

Nikolai Chukhin ^{*} Alexander S. Kulikov [†] Ivan Mihajlin [‡] Alexander Smal [§]

Abstract

In the Shortest Common Superstring (SCS) problem, one is given a set of strings and is asked to find a string of minimum length containing each of the input strings as a substring. The greedy superstring conjecture states that the following natural greedy algorithm has approximation ratio 2: while there is more than one string, select the pair of strings with the maximum overlap, merge them, and add the merged string back to the set. The greedy algorithm works in linear time and is probably the simplest possible approximation algorithm for SCS. If the conjecture holds, then the greedy algorithm also surpasses the approximation guarantees of the best known approximation algorithms. The conjecture is open for 40 years already and even the approximation ratio ρ_k in the special case in which input strings have length k has not yet been found: for all $k \geq 3$, $2 - 1/k \leq \rho_k \leq \min\{(k+1)/2, 3.396\}$.

We prove that already for strings of length 6, the approximation ratio of the greedy algorithm is at least 2: $\rho_k \geq 2$ for all $k \geq 6$. We also show that $\rho_3 = 9/5$, thus completely characterizing the worst-case behavior of the greedy algorithm for strings of length 3.

1 Greedy Superstring Conjecture

In the Shortest Common Superstring problem (SCS, also known as Shortest Superstring Problem), one is given a set of strings and is asked to find a string of minimum length containing each of the input strings as a substring. It is a mathematical model of the genome assembly problem and has applications in data compression and scheduling problems [GP14]. For this reason, approximation algorithms for SCS are actively studied for the last 35 years (a recent paper [Nik24] provides a list of all known bounds). The algorithms and their analysis are getting more and more involved, the currently best known approximation ratio is 2.466 [EMV23]. At the same time, there is an extremely simple greedy algorithm whose approximation ratio is conjectured [Sto88, TU88, Tur89, BJT⁺91] to be equal to 2: while there is more than one string, select the pair of strings with the maximum overlap, merge them, and add the merged string back to the set.

This greedy algorithm is simpler, both to describe and to implement, than all known approximation algorithms, many of which are based on finding an optimum weight matching in a graph. This also makes it faster than other approximation algorithms: assuming that the alphabet size is constant, it is possible to implement the greedy algorithm so that it works in linear time [Ukk90]. The greedy algorithm is also known to behave well in practice [RBT04, Ma09]. It is not difficult to see that the

^{*}JetBrains Research. Email: buyolitsez1951@gmail.com

[†]JetBrains Research. Email: alexander.s.kulikov@gmail.com

[‡]JetBrains Research. Email: ivmihajlin@gmail.com

[§]JetBrains Research. Email: avsmal@gmail.com

approximation ratio of the greedy algorithm is at least 2: for an instance $\{\mathbf{ab}^{k-1}, \mathbf{b}^k, \mathbf{b}^{k-1}\mathbf{a}\}$, the optimum superstring $\mathbf{ab}^k\mathbf{a}$ has length $k+2$, whereas the greedy algorithm may produce a superstring $\mathbf{ab}^{k-1}\mathbf{ab}^k$ of length $2k+1$. The currently best known upper bound is 3.396 [EMV23].

For various NP-hard problems, the behavior of a natural greedy heuristic is well understood and is known for many decades. Say, for Vertex Cover, an algorithm “while there is an uncovered edge, select the edge, add both of its endpoints to the cover, and remove all edges incident to them” (folklore, see [Vaz01, Algorithm 1.2]) has approximation ratio 2. For Set Cover, an algorithm “while there are uncovered elements, select the set covering the largest number of uncovered elements, add it to the solution, and mark its elements as covered” has approximation ratio $\ln n$ [Joh73]. For List Scheduling, an algorithm “while there are unscheduled jobs, assign the next job to the least loaded machine” has approximation ratio $2 - 1/\mu$ on μ machines [Gra66].

For this reason, it is surprising (and perhaps depressing) that the approximation ratio of such a remarkably simple greedy heuristic for SCS is still unknown. Yet, here we are: the greedy superstring conjecture is open for 40 years already and even the behavior of the greedy heuristic in the special case of strings of constant length is still a mystery. For each $k \geq 2$, let k -SCS denote the restriction in which every input string has length k , and let ρ_k be the approximation ratio of the greedy algorithm on this restriction. The restriction 2-SCS is in P, whereas 3-SCS is already NP-hard [GMS80]. The following summarizes the bounds on ρ_k known before this work. The classical example $\{\mathbf{ab}^{k-1}, \mathbf{b}^k, \mathbf{b}^{k-1}\mathbf{a}\}$ shows that $\rho_k \geq \frac{2k+1}{k+2} = 2 - \frac{3}{k+2}$. Cazaux and Rivals [CR18] proved that $\rho_k \leq \frac{k+1}{2}$ and constructed a series of SCS instances showing that $\rho_k \geq 2 - \frac{1}{k}$. They conjectured that, in fact, $\rho_k = 2 - \frac{1}{k}$. Combining known results gives the following picture:

$$1.66 \leq \rho_3 \leq 2, \quad 1.75 \leq \rho_4 \leq 2.5, \quad 1.8 \leq \rho_5 \leq 3, \quad 2 - 1/k \leq \rho_k \leq 3.396, \text{ for all } k \geq 6.$$

Our Contribution. We prove that already for strings of length 6, the approximation ratio of the greedy algorithm is at least 2: $\rho_k \geq 2$ for all $k \geq 6$. This disproves the conjecture by Cazaux and Rivals [CR18]. Then, we show that $\rho_3 = \frac{9}{5}$, thus improving known lower and upper bounds on ρ_3 and providing the first exact value of at least one ρ_k in the NP-hard range $k \geq 3$.

2 Preliminaries

All strings that we consider are finite. For strings u, v , write $u \sqsubseteq v$ if u occurs in v as a substring. For strings p, q , their *overlap*, denoted by $\text{ov}(p, q)$, is the largest $\ell \geq 0$ such that the length- ℓ suffix of p equals the length- ℓ prefix of q . Their *overlap merge* $p \odot q$ is obtained by appending to p the part of q following this prefix, and hence

$$|p \odot q| = |p| + |q| - \text{ov}(p, q).$$

For a string $s = s_0 s_1 \cdots s_{m-1}$ of length $m \geq 1$ and integers $1 \leq k \leq m$ and $0 \leq i \leq m - k$, we denote by $\text{substr}_k(s, i)$ a length- k substring of s starting at position i ,

$$\text{substr}_k(s, i) = s_i s_{i+1} \cdots s_{i+k-1}.$$

The set of all length- k substrings of s is called the k -*spectrum* of s and is denoted by $\text{Spec}_k(s)$,

$$\text{Spec}_k(s) = \{\text{substr}_k(s, i) : 0 \leq i \leq |s| - k\}.$$

A string w is a *common superstring* of a set S if $s \sqsubseteq w$ for every $s \in S$. The Shortest Common Superstring problem, abbreviated SCS, takes as input a finite nonempty set S of distinct strings over a finite alphabet Σ and asks for a common superstring of minimum length. For an integer $k \geq 1$, k -SCS is the restriction of SCS to inputs $S \subseteq \Sigma^k$; equivalently, every input string has length exactly k . Consequently, for an instance S of k -SCS, we have $s \not\sqsubseteq t$ for all distinct $s, t \in S$. Throughout the paper, $n = |S|$ denotes the number of input strings.

Starting from S , GREEDY repeatedly chooses an ordered pair p, q of distinct strings with maximum overlap and replaces them by $p \odot q$ [TU88]. Ties are resolved arbitrarily, and GREEDY continues to merge pairs until one string remains.

Let $\text{GREEDY}(S)$ be the set of all outputs obtainable in this way, and let $\text{OPT}(S)$ be the minimum length of a common superstring of S . We write

$$\rho_k = \sup_{\substack{\Sigma \text{ finite,} \\ \emptyset \neq S \subseteq \Sigma^k}} \sup_{g \in \text{GREEDY}(S)} \frac{|g|}{\text{OPT}(S)},$$

for the worst-case approximation ratio of the greedy algorithm on strings of length k .

For an instance S , we write $\|S\| = \sum_{s \in S} |s|$ for its total length. The *compression* of a common superstring w of S is $\|S\| - |w|$.

Theorem 2.1 ([TU88, KN24]). *Let S be a finite nonempty set of strings such that $x \not\sqsubseteq y$ for all distinct $x, y \in S$. For every $g \in \text{GREEDY}(S)$,*

$$\|S\| - |g| \geq \frac{1}{2}(\|S\| - \text{OPT}(S)).$$

For a string x produced during an execution of the greedy algorithm from S , let $\text{left}(x), \text{right}(x) \in S$ be its leftmost and rightmost input strings.

Lemma 2.2 ([BJL⁺91]). *For an instance S of k -SCS, at any point during an execution of the greedy algorithm, any two distinct strings x, y currently present satisfy $x \not\sqsubseteq y$ and*

$$\text{ov}(x, y) = \text{ov}(\text{right}(x), \text{left}(y)) \leq k - 1.$$

For a directed graph H , write $V(H)$ and $E(H)$ for its vertex and edge sets, respectively, and write $v(H) = |V(H)|$ and $e(H) = |E(H)|$ for their cardinalities. Its *weak components* are the connected components of the undirected graph obtained by dropping the directions of the edges. The graph H is *weakly connected* if it has exactly one weak component. A *trail* in a directed graph is a directed walk in which no edge is repeated. A *trail cover* of H is an edge-disjoint family of directed trails whose union is $E(H)$. Write $\tau(H)$ for the minimum size of such a cover.

For an instance $S \subseteq \Sigma^k$ of k -SCS, let $\mathcal{G}(S)$ be a directed graph whose vertices are the length- $(k-1)$ prefixes and suffixes of the strings in S . For every string $s = s_0 \cdots s_{k-1} \in S$, the graph $\mathcal{G}(S)$ contains the edge

$$s_0 \cdots s_{k-2} \longrightarrow s_1 \cdots s_{k-1}.$$

Equivalently, $\mathcal{G}(S)$ is the subgraph of the de Bruijn graph [dB46] on the strings of length $k-1$ over the alphabet Σ consisting of the edges corresponding to the strings of S .

Lemma 2.3 ([Pev89]). *If $\mathcal{G}(S)$ is balanced and weakly connected, then*

$$\text{OPT}(S) = n + k - 1.$$

3 Lower bound for ρ_k when $k \geq 6$

Theorem 3.1. *For all $k \geq 6$, $\rho_k \geq 2$.*

We first establish a construction that shows $\rho_6 \geq 2$, and then we extend this construction to all $k \geq 7$. The construction is based on the cyclic spectra of strings.

3.1 Cyclic spectra of strings

For a string $s = s_0s_1 \dots s_{m-1}$ of length $m \geq 1$ and integers $k \geq 1$ and $0 \leq i < m$, we denote by $\text{csubstr}_k(s, i)$ the length- k *cyclic substring* of s starting at position i :

$$\text{csubstr}_k(s, i) = s_i s_{i+1} \dots s_{i+k-1},$$

where the indices are taken modulo m , that is, $s_j = s_{j \bmod m}$ for every $j \geq 0$. The set of all length- k cyclic substrings of s is called the *cyclic k -spectrum* of s and is denoted by $\text{CSpec}_k(s)$:

$$\text{CSpec}_k(s) = \{\text{csubstr}_k(s, i) : 0 \leq i < |s|\}.$$

For some fixed positive integer k , let u be a string of length n and assume that $\text{CSpec}_k(u)$ consists of n different strings. Let $\ell = n + k - 1$, and for $0 \leq i < n$, define a string $w_i = \text{csubstr}_\ell(u, i)$. Clearly, $w_0, \dots, w_{n-1}$ are cyclic shifts of each other. A simple but crucial observation is that $w_i \in \text{GREEDY}(\text{CSpec}_k(u))$ for every $0 \leq i < n$. This is best illustrated with an example. Let $u = \text{ABCA}$ and $k = 5$. Then,

$$\text{CSpec}_5(u) = \{\text{ABCAA}, \text{BCAAB}, \text{CAABC}, \text{AABCA}\}.$$

Clearly, every two consecutive strings here, including the last one and the first one, have an overlap of size $k - 1 = 4$. Hence, starting from any string in this sequence, the greedy algorithm may merge the strings going (cyclically) from left to right to obtain any of the following superstrings w_0, w_1, w_2, w_3 of length $\ell = n + k - 1 = 8$:

$$\text{ABCAABCA}, \text{BCAABCAA}, \text{CAABCAAB}, \text{AABCAABC}.$$

3.2 The case of $k = 6$

We start by covering the case $k = 6$ as it demonstrates the main ideas in a clean way. We then generalize the construction to every $k \geq 6$.


Consider two strings $p = \text{ABAABX}$ and $q = \text{ABX}$ and their cyclic 6-spectra:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{CSpec}_6(p) &= \{\text{ABAABX}, \text{BAABXA}, \text{AABXAB}, \text{ABXABA}, \text{BXABAA}, \text{XABAAB}\}, \\ \text{CSpec}_6(q) &= \{\text{ABXABX}, \text{BXABXA}, \text{XABXAB}\}. \end{aligned}$$

It is straightforward to check that all nine strings are distinct; hence, $S = \text{CSpec}_6(p) \cup \text{CSpec}_6(q)$ has size 9. Moreover, S is a (linear) 6-spectrum of the following string of length 14:

$$s^* = \text{ABAABXABXABAAB}.$$

It is not difficult to check this by hand, but it is particularly instructive to look at the graph $\mathcal{G}(S)$.



It is clearly Eulerian and using the node **ABAAB** as a starting point, one can spell the superstring s^* . Now, it is intuitive that, when starting from **ABAAB** and moving along the left cycle, one needs to traverse the right cycle after arriving at the node **ABXAB**, and only then continue traversing the left cycle. The greedy algorithm, however, does not have this intuition. Instead, it may merge the strings from $\text{CSpec}_6(p)$ to **XABAABXABAA** and merge the strings from $\text{CSpec}_6(q)$ to **BXABXABX**. The resulting two strings of length 11 and 8 have an overlap of length 1, so the final superstring has length 18:

$$\mathbf{BXABXABXABAABXABAA}.$$

Again, the fact that the string s^* has an overlap of length 5 with itself allows us to iterate this construction as follows. For an integer parameter $t \geq 1$ and for every $i \in [t]$, let $p_i = \mathbf{ABAABX}_i$ and $q_i = \mathbf{ABX}_i$. That is, the strings p_i and q_i contain a fresh symbol $\mathbf{X}_i$. Then, let

$$S_t = \bigcup_{i \in [t]} \text{CSpec}_6(p_i) \cup \text{CSpec}_6(q_i).$$

As discussed above, each block has a superstring of length 14 starting and ending with **ABAAB**. All these strings can be merged into a superstring for S_t of length $9t + 5$. At the same time, the greedy algorithm may produce a superstring of length $18t$. Hence, $\rho_6 \geq \frac{18t}{9t+5}$ meaning that $\rho_6 \geq 2$.

3.3 The case of $k \geq 7$

Fix any $k \geq 7$, let $d = k - 6$ and choose a string $y = \mathbf{Y}_1\mathbf{Y}_2 \cdots \mathbf{Y}_d$ of d fresh symbols. Consider the following two strings

$$p = \mathbf{ABAABX}_i y, \quad q = \mathbf{ABX}_i y.$$

It is not difficult to see that the same structure as in the case of $k = 6$ is preserved: $|p| = k$, $|q| = k - 3$, all the strings in their cyclic k -spectra are distinct, and hence $S = \text{CSpec}_k(p) \cup \text{CSpec}_k(q)$ has size $2k - 3$. The graph $\mathcal{G}(S)$ also has two cycles that are connected through the vertex **ABX_iyAB** (adding the string y makes the cycles longer while preserving the global structure of the graph). Therefore, there is an optimal common superstring of S of length $3k - 4$,

$$s^* = y\mathbf{ABAABX}_i y \mathbf{ABX}_i y \mathbf{ABAAB}.$$

The greedy algorithm may merge the strings from $\text{CSpec}_k(p)$ to **XyABAABX_iyABAA** and merge the strings from $\text{CSpec}_k(q)$ to **BXyABX_iyABX**. The resulting two strings of length $2k - 1$ and $2k - 4$ have an overlap of length 1, so the final common superstring has length $4k - 6$.

We use the same idea to iterate this construction: for an integer parameter $t \geq 1$ and for every $i \in [t]$, let $p_i = \mathbf{ABAABX}_i y$ and $q_i = \mathbf{ABX}_i y$ for a fresh symbol $\mathbf{X}_i$. Let

$$S_t = \bigcup_{i \in [t]} \text{CSpec}_k(p_i) \cup \text{CSpec}_k(q_i).$$

Each block i has a superstring of length $3k - 4$ starting and ending with **yABAAB**. All these block superstrings can be merged into a superstring for S_t of length $(2k - 3)t + k - 1$. At the same time,

the greedy algorithm may produce a superstring of length $(4k - 6)t$ by combining non-overlapping superstrings of length $4k - 6$ for each block. Hence,

$$\rho_k \geq \frac{(4k - 6)t}{(2k - 3)t + k - 1}.$$

Since $t \geq 1$ was arbitrary, we obtain $\rho_k \geq 2$.

4 Lower bound for ρ_3

Theorem 4.1. $\rho_3 \geq 9/5$.

Proof. The main building block of our construction is a string $ABXAXAB$ and its 3-spectrum ABX , BXA , XAX , AXA , XAB . For this instance, the greedy algorithm may proceed as follows: merge AXA and XAX into $AXAX$; then, merge BXA , XAB , and ABX into $BXABX$; finally, concatenate the two remaining strings $AXAX$ and $BXABX$. Thus, instead of using four 2-overlaps, it uses three 2-overlaps, thereby producing a superstring of length 9 instead of an optimum superstring of length 7.

The fact that the string $ABXAXAB$ has an overlap of length 2 with itself allows us to iterate this construction efficiently. Namely, consider a string (square brackets indicate parameterized blocks)

$$AB [X_1 AX_1 AB] [X_2 AX_2 AB] \cdots [X_t AX_t AB]$$

of length $5t + 2$ and its 3-spectrum consisting of $5t$ different 3-strings. The greedy algorithm may take $3t$ overlaps of length 2 to get the following $2t$ strings:

$$AX_1 AX_1, BX_1 ABX_1, AX_2 AX_2, BX_2 ABX_2, \dots, AX_t AX_t, BX_t ABX_t.$$

For these strings, no nontrivial overlap remains, so the greedy algorithm concatenates them and gets a superstring of length $9t$. Thus, $\rho_3 \geq \frac{9t}{5t+2}$, for all t , and hence $\rho_3 \geq \frac{9}{5}$. $\square$

5 Upper bound for ρ_3

Theorem 5.1. $\rho_3 \leq \frac{9}{5}$.

5.1 Graph representation

Fix an instance S of 3-SCS and an output $g \in \text{GREEDY}(S)$. By [Lemma 2.2](#), overlaps never exceed two and depend only on the leftmost and rightmost input strings. So, the greedy algorithm always performs all overlap-two merges before any overlap-one merge, and all overlap-one merges before any zero-overlap merge. Let κ_2 be the number of strings remaining after all overlap-two merges, and let κ_1 be the number of strings remaining after all subsequent overlap-one merges; thus, $\kappa_2 \geq \kappa_1$. There are $n - \kappa_2$ overlap-two merges and $\kappa_2 - \kappa_1$ overlap-one merges. Starting from total length $3n$, we therefore obtain

$$|g| = 3n - 2(n - \kappa_2) - (\kappa_2 - \kappa_1) = n + \kappa_1 + \kappa_2.$$

Let $\mathcal{G} = \mathcal{G}(S)$. Every overlap-two merge concatenates two trails in $\mathcal{G}$; hence, the greedy algorithm forms a trail cover C of $\mathcal{G}$ in which no two distinct trails can be concatenated, and $|C| = \kappa_2$. For $0 \leq i \leq e(P)$, we denote by $P_i \in \Sigma^2$ the i -th vertex of the trail P in $\mathcal{G}$. The trail P

is *open* if $P_0 \neq P_{e(P)}$ and *closed* otherwise. For closed P , the vertex $P_0 = P_{e(P)}$ is the *root* of P . We call all trail vertices *internal* except for the first and last vertices of the trail.

Let $\mathcal{M}$ be a directed multigraph with vertex set Σ . Consecutive vertices of any $P \in C$ overlap in one character, so there are letters $a_0, \dots, a_{e(P)+1} \in \Sigma$ such that

$$P_i = a_i a_{i+1} \quad (0 \leq i \leq e(P)).$$

For each $P \in C$, the graph $\mathcal{M}$ has an edge

$$e_P: a_0 \rightarrow a_{e(P)+1}.$$

The overlap-one phase yields a trail cover of $\mathcal{M}$ with κ_1 trails.

We start with a simple lower bound on the size of an optimal string in terms of $\tau(\mathcal{G})$.

Lemma 5.2.

$$\text{OPT}(S) \geq n + \tau(\mathcal{G}) + 1.$$

Proof. Let w be a shortest common superstring of S , and choose one occurrence of each input string in w . Apply the same two-stage grouping to these occurrences in their order, and let γ_2 and γ_1 denote the numbers of groups remaining after the overlap-two and overlap-one stages, respectively. So, $\gamma_2 \geq \tau(\mathcal{G})$, while $\gamma_1 \geq 1$ and therefore

$$\text{OPT}(S) = |w| \geq n + \gamma_2 + \gamma_1 \geq n + \tau(\mathcal{G}) + 1. \quad \square$$

5.2 Proof overview

The greedy algorithm has two main phases: first, it merges strings with overlap two, and then it merges the resulting strings with overlap one. The proof analyzes these phases separately. The graph $\mathcal{G}$ captures the first phase, whereas the graph $\mathcal{M}$ captures the second. Thus, κ_2 is exactly the size of the trail cover C of $\mathcal{G}$, while κ_1 is the size of the trail cover produced in $\mathcal{M}$. In the lower-bound construction from [Theorem 4.1](#), the greedy output contains many length-two closed trails corresponding to $\mathbf{AX}_i \mathbf{AX}_i$. The following proposition shows that, without closed trails of length one or two, the approximation ratio of the greedy algorithm is already below $\frac{5}{3}$.

Proposition 5.3. *Suppose that every closed trail in C has at least three edges. Then*

$$\frac{|g|}{\text{OPT}(S)} < \frac{5}{3}.$$

Proof. Let β and γ be the numbers of open and closed trails in C , respectively. Every open trail contains at least one edge, while every closed trail contains at least three, and hence

$$n \geq \beta + 3\gamma = 3\kappa_2 - 2\beta.$$

Since $\kappa_1 \leq \kappa_2$,

$$|g| = n + \kappa_1 + \kappa_2 \leq n + 2\kappa_2 \leq \frac{5n + 4\beta}{3}.$$

By [Lemma 5.5](#), $\beta \leq \tau(\mathcal{G})$, and [Lemma 5.2](#) gives $\text{OPT}(S) \geq n + \beta + 1$. Therefore

$$\frac{|g|}{\text{OPT}(S)} \leq \frac{5n + 4\beta}{3(n + \beta + 1)} = \frac{5}{3} - \frac{\beta + 5}{3(n + \beta + 1)} < \frac{5}{3}. \quad \square$$

The general case is harder precisely because C may contain many short closed trails. The proof treats such trails as objects that must be paid for by longer trails. The payment mechanism is a budget. A nonisolated loop $[aaa]$ is assigned to an internal occurrence of the vertex aa on another trail so that it is accounted for in that trail's budget. For every trail P that is not a loop, its *budget* δ_P is the number of internal positions of P that remain available after the loop assignments, with one unit subtracted when P is closed. The total available budget is $\sigma = \sum_P \delta_P$, where the sum ranges over all non-loop trails.

According to their role in this accounting, the trails of $\mathcal{G}$ fall into three types.

- A loop has no budget of its own.
- A *bundle* consists of closed trails that share a rigid structure and have zero budget: after the loop assignments, each has exactly one available internal position.
- A *connector* is an open trail or a closed trail with positive budget; connectors can pay for bundles and loops.

Consider an m -edge trail. Since all its intermediate strings have overlap two on both sides, the trail arranges at least $m - 2$ strings optimally. The budget of a connector measures how much of this slack remains available to pay for loops and bundles that the greedy algorithm left separate.

The budget links the two phases: if the overlap-two phase leaves many trails, then little budget remains, and this limits the cost of the overlap-one phase. More precisely, we convert the trail cover of $\mathcal{G}$ into a trail cover of $\mathcal{M}$, with an overhead controlled by σ . This accounting yields the two complementary inequalities

$$2\kappa_2 \leq n + \tau(\mathcal{G}) - \sigma, \quad \tau(\mathcal{M}) \leq 2\sigma + 2\tau(\mathcal{G}).$$

The first inequality says that a large budget can exist only when the overlap-two phase leaves few trails, so a large σ means that this phase is efficient. The second inequality uses the assignments above to build trail covers of $\mathcal{M}$, so a small σ shows that the overlap-one phase is efficient.

5.3 Trail bounds

The next lemma bounds the number of strings remaining after the overlap-one phase. Starting from κ_2 strings, the greedy algorithm produces a trail cover of $\mathcal{M}$ with at most $\frac{\kappa_2 + \tau(\mathcal{M})}{2}$ trails.

Lemma 5.4.

$$2\kappa_1 \leq \kappa_2 + \tau(\mathcal{M}).$$

Proof. Let R be the set of κ_2 strings after the overlap-two phase. By [Lemma 2.2](#), no string in R contains another, and every overlap between distinct strings in R has length at most one. The overlap-one phase on R has compression $\kappa_2 - \kappa_1$. A minimum trail cover of $\mathcal{M}$ orders these κ_2 strings along $\tau(\mathcal{M})$ trails, yielding a common superstring of R with compression $\kappa_2 - \tau(\mathcal{M})$. Hence, by [Theorem 2.1](#),

$$\kappa_2 - \kappa_1 \geq \frac{1}{2}(\|R\| - \text{OPT}(R)) \geq \frac{1}{2}(\kappa_2 - \tau(\mathcal{M})).$$

Rearranging gives $2\kappa_1 \leq \kappa_2 + \tau(\mathcal{M})$. □

By the lemmas above, it remains to bound κ_2 and $\tau(\mathcal{M})$ in terms of n and $\tau(\mathcal{G})$. We use a nonnegative budget σ and show that a large σ forces κ_2 to be small, whereas a small σ yields a small cover of $\mathcal{M}$.

We begin by accounting for the contribution of each weak component to $\tau(\mathcal{G})$. Let $H_1, \dots, H_\nu$ be the weak components of $\mathcal{G}$, and for $1 \leq j \leq \nu$ let

$$\beta_j = \sum_{\substack{v \in V(H_j), \\ \deg^+(v) \geq \deg^-(v)}} \deg^+(v) - \deg^-(v).$$

At a vertex v , the imbalance $\deg^+(v) - \deg^-(v)$ equals the number of trails that start at v minus the number of trails that end at v , for any trail cover of $\mathcal{G}$.

We use the following result due to Gallant, Maier, and Storer [GMS80]. It shows that the degree imbalances fully determine the number of open trails in C , whereas the number of closed trails may depend on the greedy choices. Thus, the main difficulty is to control the closed trails.

Lemma 5.5 ([GMS80]). $\tau(\mathcal{G}) = \sum_{j=1}^\nu \max\{\beta_j, 1\}$. Moreover, each component H_j of $\mathcal{G}$ contains exactly β_j open trails of C .

We now define the budget formally. Set

$$C^* = \{P \in C : P \text{ is open or } e(P) > 1\}.$$

The trails omitted from C^* are precisely the loops $[aaa]$. For a closed $P \in C^*$, an index $i \in [0, e(P)-1]$ is a *transition* if $a_i \neq a_{i+1}$, where $P_i = a_i a_{i+1}$. Every other index i is called a *constant position*. A string is called *constant* if it has no transitions. A transition at $i = 0$ is said to occur at the root. For every loop $[aaa] \in C$ whose weak component in $\mathcal{G}$ contains another edge, there is some other trail $P \in C$ that visits aa . Note that $e(P) > 1$, and every occurrence $P_i = aa$ is internal, since otherwise the greedy algorithm would concatenate P and $[aaa]$. Choose one such occurrence and say that $[aaa]$ is assigned to P_i .

For $P \in C^*$, let $\text{free}(P)$ be the set of internal positions not used by the loop assignment:

$$\text{free}(P) = \{i : 0 < i < e(P) \text{ and no loop is assigned to } P_i\}.$$

The number of free positions will bound the number of additional trails needed in our construction of a trail cover of $\mathcal{M}$. Define

$$\delta_P = \begin{cases} |\text{free}(P)|, & P \text{ is open,} \\ |\text{free}(P)| - 1, & P \text{ is closed.} \end{cases}$$

For a closed $P \in C^*$, the sequence $a_0, \dots, a_{e(P)}$ contains at least two transitions because P is a trail with more than one edge, and $a_{e(P)} = a_0$ because P is closed. At most one of them occurs at the root, and every other transition belongs to $\text{free}(P)$; hence $\text{free}(P) \neq \emptyset$ and $\delta_P \geq 0$. We refer to δ_P as the budget of P . Finally, set

$$\sigma = \sum_{P \in C^*} \delta_P,$$

which is the total budget over all trails in C^* .

Lemma 5.6.

$$2\kappa_2 + \sigma \leq n + \tau(\mathcal{G}).$$

Proof. Let $\beta = \sum_{j=1}^{\nu} \beta_j$ be the number of open trails in C , and let λ_0 be the number of loops that form isolated weak components of $\mathcal{G}$. By the definition of δ_P , the contribution of an open trail P to $2\kappa_2 + \sigma$ is $e(P) + 1$ minus the number of loops assigned to P . For a closed trail $P \in C^*$, the contribution is $e(P)$ minus the number of loops assigned to P . A loop contributes 2 to $2\kappa_2 + \sigma$ but only 1 to n . If the loop is nonisolated, then it is assigned to a trail P , and this assignment decreases δ_P by 1. Its contribution to $2\kappa_2 + \sigma$ is therefore 1, matching its contribution to n . An isolated loop has no assignment, so the difference remains and is counted by λ_0 . By Lemma 5.5, $\beta + \lambda_0 \leq \tau(\mathcal{G})$, and hence

$$2\kappa_2 + \sigma = n + \beta + \lambda_0 \leq n + \tau(\mathcal{G}). \quad \square$$

Now, we construct a trail cover of $\mathcal{M}$. We first show that all closed trails with zero budget have a rigid structure.

Lemma 5.7. *If $P \in C^*$ is closed and $\delta_P = 0$, then P has exactly two transitions, one of which occurs at the root. Consequently, exactly two distinct letters occur among $a_0, \dots, a_{e(P)-1}$, and every position i with $a_i = a_{i+1}$ receives an assigned loop.*

Proof. Let

$$\eta_P = |\{0 \leq i < e(P) : a_i \neq a_{i+1}\}|.$$

Since $a_{e(P)} = a_0$ and the sequence $a_0, \dots, a_{e(P)}$ is nonconstant, we have $\eta_P \geq 2$. Since $\delta_P = 0$, exactly $e(P) - 2$ loops are assigned to P . These loops occupy distinct constant positions, so $e(P) - 2 \leq e(P) - \eta_P$ and hence $\eta_P \leq 2$. Thus $\eta_P = 2$, and every constant position receives an assigned loop. The root cannot be assigned a loop, so it is a transition. $\square$

Although zero-budget trails cannot pay for other pieces, they have a particularly simple joint structure in $\mathcal{M}$. We group them into the following objects. For an unordered pair $\{a, b\} \subseteq \Sigma$ with $a \neq b$, set

$$Z_{a,b} = \{P \in C^* : P \text{ is closed, } \delta_P = 0, \{a_i : 0 \leq i < e(P)\} = \{a, b\}\},$$

and call every nonempty $Z_{a,b}$ a *bundle*. For a trail P , let $V(P)$ be the set of vertices of $\mathcal{G}$ visited by P , and put $V(Z) = \bigcup_{P \in Z} V(P)$ for a bundle Z .

By Lemma 5.7, every trail in $Z_{a,b}$ is rooted at ab or ba . At most one trail has either root, because two closed trails with the same root could be concatenated; hence, $|Z_{a,b}| \leq 2$. Also, distinct bundles have disjoint vertex sets.

More importantly, the edges of $\mathcal{M}$ corresponding to a bundle $Z_{a,b}$ belong to $\{a \rightarrow b, b \rightarrow a\}$, with at most one edge in each direction, and its assigned loops give only the edges $a \rightarrow a$ and $b \rightarrow b$. Thus an entire bundle, together with its assigned loops, can be covered by a single trail in $\mathcal{M}$.

5.4 Local covers

Since a bundle has no budget of its own, we either leave it as the sole nontrivial piece of its component or assign it to a connector and include it in the corresponding local cover.

Call a trail $P \in C^*$ a *connector*¹ if P is open or $\delta_P > 0$. We now incorporate each bundle that lies in a component containing a connector into a trail cover of $\mathcal{M}$. Loops do not help to connect distinct trails, and distinct bundles do not intersect. Thus every bundle either forms an entire component together with its assigned loops or shares a vertex with a connector; the only component

¹Each trail $P \in C$ is either a loop, an element of a bundle, or a connector.

containing neither is an isolated loop. A component with no connector therefore can be covered by one trail in $\mathcal{M}$.

We henceforth focus on components containing connectors. A bundle that shares an endpoint with a connector will be inserted there (note that no two bundles can contain the same endpoint). Each remaining bundle Z will be assigned to a free internal position P_i of a connector P satisfying $P_i \in V(Z)$.

First, suppose that a bundle Z and a connector P share the endpoint ab . Then $a \neq b$, since otherwise $[aaa]$ could concatenate with P . For the same reason, Z does not contain a trail rooted at ab . Thus $Z = Z_{a,b}$, and since it is nonempty, it consists of one trail Q rooted at ba . In $\mathcal{M}$, the edge $e_Q = b \rightarrow a$, together with the loops assigned to Q , can be prepended to e_P if ab is the first vertex of an open P , and appended otherwise. In either case, the result is a trail in $\mathcal{M}$.

Now consider a bundle Z that shares no endpoint with any connector. Choose a connector P and an occurrence $P_i \in V(Z)$. Then $0 < i < e(P)$. Moreover, $i \in \text{free}(P)$: if $P_i = ab$ with $a \neq b$, no loop can be assigned there, whereas if $P_i = aa$, the unique loop $[aaa]$ is assigned to a trail in Z and not to P . The chosen positions are distinct because distinct bundles have disjoint vertex sets. For each connector P , let $B_P \subseteq \text{free}(P)$ be the set of positions assigned to bundles. Thus every bundle has either been inserted at an endpoint or assigned to one position in B_P .

Bundles are not the only pieces that can cost an additional trail in $\mathcal{M}$. A loop may be nonisolated in $\mathcal{G}$ but become the only edge of its weak component in $\mathcal{M}$. Such a loop cannot be inserted into another trail of $\mathcal{M}$, so we also include it in the local cover of the connector to which it was assigned. For each connector P , let λ_P be the number of isolated loops assigned to P . We first show that the positions adjacent to an isolated loop cannot be assigned bundles.

Lemma 5.8. *Fix a connector P and an isolated loop $[aaa]$, counted by λ_P , and let $P_i = aa$ be its assigned occurrence. Since $0 < i < e(P)$, let $b = a_{i-1}$ and $c = a_{i+2}$ be the letters immediately before and after this occurrence. Then $b, c \neq a$, and every bundle Z satisfies*

$$\{ba, ac\} \cap V(Z) = \emptyset.$$

Proof. If $b = a$ or $c = a$, then P contains the edge $[aaa]$, contradicting that this edge belongs to the distinct trail $[aaa] \in C$. Hence $b, c \neq a$. Since $e_{[aaa]}: a \rightarrow a$ is an isolated component of $\mathcal{M}$, no bundle edge is incident to a . If a bundle Z visits ba or ac , then the unordered pair defining Z would contain a , so some bundle edge e_Q would be incident to a . This is a contradiction, and hence $\{ba, ac\} \cap V(Z) = \emptyset$. $\square$

We can now show that the bundles and isolated loops fit into the available budget of their connector.

Lemma 5.9. *Every connector P satisfies*

$$|B_P| + \lambda_P \leq \delta_P + 1.$$

Moreover, if P is closed, then $\lambda_P \leq \delta_P$.

Proof. For each isolated loop $[aaa]$ counted by λ_P , let $j(a)$ denote the index of the pair vertex ac , where c is the letter following the occurrence aa in P . By Lemma 5.8, $c \neq a$ and no bundle visits ac .

Hence no loop is assigned to the position $j(a)$, and $j(a) \notin B_P$. Since $e_{[aaa]}$ is an isolated component of $\mathcal{M}$, the edge e_P is not incident with a ; hence $j(a)$ is not the root when P is closed. Moreover,

$$j(a) \in \begin{cases} \text{free}(P) \cup \{e(P)\}, & P \text{ is open,} \\ \text{free}(P), & P \text{ is closed,} \end{cases}$$

and $|\{a : j(a) = e(P)\}| \leq 1$. Counting the indices in $\text{free}(P) \setminus B_P$ yields

$$|B_P| + \max\{\lambda_P - 1, 0\} \leq \delta_P \quad (P \text{ is open}), \quad |B_P| + \lambda_P \leq \delta_P + 1 \quad (P \text{ is closed}).$$

Both cases imply $|B_P| + \lambda_P \leq \delta_P + 1$. For closed P , the first transition encountered after the root is a free position distinct from every $j(a)$, because its preceding letter occurs in the root and hence is not an isolated loop; therefore $|\text{free}(P)| \geq \lambda_P + 1$, or equivalently, $\lambda_P \leq \delta_P$. $\square$

We are ready to construct the local pieces of a trail cover of $\mathcal{M}$. For a connector P , we build a subgraph of $\mathcal{M}$ around it as follows. Start with the edge e_P , add all edges from the bundles inserted at the endpoints of P or assigned to a position in B_P , include the loops assigned to those bundles, and finally add the isolated loops assigned to P . Denote the resulting subgraph of $\mathcal{M}$ by $\mathcal{D}_P$.

Lemma 5.10. *The graph $\mathcal{D}_P$ has a trail cover of size at most*

$$\begin{cases} 2\delta_P + 2, & P \text{ is open,} \\ 2\delta_P, & P \text{ is closed.} \end{cases}$$

Proof. After the endpoint insertions, one trail contains e_P and all the bundles inserted at the endpoints of P . Each position in B_P corresponds to one bundle, which forms one trail together with its assigned loops. Finally, each of the λ_P isolated loops contributes one trail. Hence

$$\tau(\mathcal{D}_P) \leq 1 + |B_P| + \lambda_P \leq \delta_P + 2.$$

This proves the claim for open P , and for closed P with $\delta_P \geq 2$. It remains to consider a closed P with $\delta_P = 1$. Then $|\text{free}(P)| = 2$ and $\lambda_P \leq 1$.

Suppose first that $\lambda_P = 1$, and let $[aaa]$ be the isolated loop assigned to P . Since the assigned occurrence is $P_i = aa$ with $0 < i < e(P)$, let $b = a_{i-1}$ and $c = a_{i+2}$ be the letters immediately before and after it. Since this loop is isolated from e_P , the root contains no a . Hence the two boundary transitions ba and ac are distinct positions of $\text{free}(P)$, and by Lemma 5.8, no bundle visits either of them. They exhaust $\text{free}(P)$, so $B_P = \emptyset$ and $\tau(\mathcal{D}_P) \leq 2$.

Now suppose that $\lambda_P = 0$. If $|B_P| \leq 1$, the trivial cover has size at most two, so assume that $|B_P| = 2$. Every transition of P other than the root belongs to $\text{free}(P)$, so P has at most three transitions. Since P has at least two transitions, it has either two or three. Suppose that it has exactly two, say ab and ba . If the root is the transition ab , any bundle containing ba also contains the root and was already inserted there, so the position of ba does not belong to B_P . If the root is constant, the vertices ab and ba both belong to $V(Z_{a,b})$, so at most one of their positions belongs to B_P . Thus $|B_P| \leq 1$, contradicting $|B_P| = 2$. Hence P has exactly three transitions: the root and the two positions in B_P .

They use three distinct letters and form the three sides of a triangle in $\mathcal{D}_P$. Hence $\mathcal{D}_P$ is weakly connected with total positive imbalance at most two, and the construction from Lemma 5.5 gives $\tau(\mathcal{D}_P) \leq 2$. $\square$

5.5 Combining the local covers

The previous subsection covers the edges that are attached to individual connectors. We now sum those local covers component by component in $\mathcal{G}$ and insert any remaining nonisolated loops for free.

Lemma 5.11. *The graph $\mathcal{M}$ satisfies*

$$\tau(\mathcal{M}) \leq 2\sigma + 2\tau(\mathcal{G}).$$

Proof. For $1 \leq j \leq \nu$, set

$$\sigma_j = \sum_{\substack{P \in C^*, \\ E(P) \subseteq E(H_j)}} \delta_P.$$

By Lemma 5.10, each connector P contributes at most $2\delta_P$ trails, and an open connector contributes two additional trails. By Lemma 5.5, the component H_j contains exactly β_j open connectors. Hence, if H_j contains a connector, the subgraphs $\mathcal{D}_P$ associated with its connectors together have a trail cover of size at most $2\sigma_j + 2\beta_j$.

If H_j contains no connector, then it consists of one bundle together with its assigned loops, or of one isolated loop; in either case, the corresponding edges of $\mathcal{M}$ have a one-trail cover. Thus, in all cases, the local pieces arising from H_j can be covered by at most $2\sigma_j + 2\max\{\beta_j, 1\}$ trails.

The only uncovered edges are loops $a \rightarrow a$ whose weak components in $\mathcal{M}$ contain another edge. For each such loop, some already covered edge is incident to a , so one of the trails in the current cover visits a . We can insert the loop at that visit without increasing the number of trails.

Summing over all the components and applying Lemma 5.5 gives

$$\tau(\mathcal{M}) \leq 2 \sum_{j=1}^{\nu} \sigma_j + 2 \sum_{j=1}^{\nu} \max\{\beta_j, 1\} = 2\sigma + 2\tau(\mathcal{G}). \quad \square$$

Proof of Theorem 5.1. Substituting the upper bound on 2σ from Lemma 5.6 into Lemma 5.11 eliminates σ and gives

$$4\kappa_2 + \tau(\mathcal{M}) \leq 2n + 4\tau(\mathcal{G}).$$

Rearranging and applying Lemma 5.4 gives

$$\kappa_1 \leq n + 2\tau(\mathcal{G}) - \frac{3}{2}\kappa_2.$$

To cancel the κ_2 term, we combine four fifths of this bound with one fifth of the trivial bound $\kappa_1 \leq \kappa_2$:

$$\kappa_1 + \kappa_2 = \frac{4}{5}\kappa_1 + \frac{1}{5}\kappa_1 + \kappa_2 \leq \frac{4}{5} \left(n + 2\tau(\mathcal{G}) - \frac{3}{2}\kappa_2 \right) + \frac{1}{5}\kappa_2 + \kappa_2 = \frac{4}{5}n + \frac{8}{5}\tau(\mathcal{G}).$$

Together with Lemma 5.2, this yields

$$\frac{|g|}{\text{OPT}(S)} \leq \frac{9n + 8\tau(\mathcal{G})}{5(n + \tau(\mathcal{G}) + 1)} = \frac{9}{5} - \frac{\tau(\mathcal{G}) + 9}{5(n + \tau(\mathcal{G}) + 1)} < \frac{9}{5}. \quad \square$$

Acknowledgments

We thank Thomas Preu for bringing a typo in [Section 3](#) to our attention and for helping us improve the manuscript.

AI Disclosure

The authors used GPT-5.6 Sol Ultra and GPT-5.6 Sol Pro in tandem throughout this project to find and refine constructions, discuss proof ideas, and check arguments. The investigation of ρ_3 began with a model-generated construction giving a lower bound strictly larger than $\frac{5}{3}$. Through repeated discussions and iterations with the models, the authors strengthened this construction and developed the upper-bound argument until the two bounds met at $\rho_3 = \frac{9}{5}$. The same iterative process was used to search for strong lower bounds for larger k , eventually yielding constructions that establish $\rho_k \geq 2$ for every $k \geq 6$. The models also assisted with proofreading and the literature review. The authors independently verified all arguments and assume full responsibility for content of the paper.

References

- [BJL⁺91] Avrim Blum, Tao Jiang, Ming Li, John Tromp, and Mihalis Yannakakis. Linear approximation of shortest superstrings. In *STOC*, pages 328–336. ACM, 1991.
- [CR18] Bastien Cazaux and Eric Rivals. Relationship between superstring and compression measures: New insights on the greedy conjecture. *Discret. Appl. Math.*, 245:59–64, 2018.
- [dB46] Nicolaas Govert de Bruijn. A Combinatorial Problem. *Proceedings of the Section of Sciences of the Koninklijke Nederlandse Akademie van Wetenschappen te Amsterdam*, 49(7):758–764, 1946.
- [EMV23] Matthias Englert, Nicolaos Matsakis, and Pavel Veselý. Approximation guarantees for shortest superstrings: Simpler and better. In *ISAAC*, volume 283 of *LIPICs*, pages 29:1–29:17. Schloss Dagstuhl - Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik, 2023.
- [GMS80] John Gallant, David Maier, and James A. Storer. On finding minimal length superstrings. *J. Comput. Syst. Sci.*, 20(1):50–58, 1980.
- [GP14] Theodoros P. Gevezes and Leonidas S. Pitsoulis. The Shortest Superstring Problem. In *Optimization in Science and Engineering*, pages 189–227. Springer, 2014.
- [Gra66] Ronald L. Graham. Bounds for Certain Multiprocessing Anomalies. *Bell System Technical Journal*, 45(9):1563–1581, 1966.
- [Joh73] David S. Johnson. Approximation algorithms for combinatorial problems. In *STOC*, pages 38–49. ACM, 1973.
- [KN24] Pavel E. Kalugin and Maksim S. Nikolaev. The greedy algorithm for the shortest common superstring problem is a $\frac{1}{2}$ -approximation in terms of compression: a simple proof. In *SOSA*, pages 97–99. SIAM, 2024.

- [Ma09] Bin Ma. Why Greed Works for Shortest Common Superstring Problem. *Theor. Comput. Sci.*, 410(51):5374–5381, 2009.
- [Nik24] Maksim S. Nikolaev. Greedy conjecture for the shortest common superstring problem and its strengthenings. In *SPIRE*, volume 14899 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 233–248. Springer, 2024.
- [Pev89] Pavel A Pevzner. l-tuple dna sequencing: computer analysis. *Journal of Biomolecular structure and dynamics*, 7(1):63–73, 1989.
- [RBT04] Heidi J. Romero, Carlos A. Brizuela, and Andrei Tchernykh. An experimental comparison of approximation algorithms for the shortest common superstring problem. In *ENC*, pages 27–34. IEEE Computer Society, 2004.
- [Sto88] James A. Storer. *Data Compression: Methods and Theory*. Computer Science Press, 1988.
- [TU88] Jorma Tarhio and Esko Ukkonen. A Greedy Approximation Algorithm for Constructing Shortest Common Superstrings. *Theor. Comput. Sci.*, 57(1):131–145, 1988.
- [Tur89] Jonathan S. Turner. Approximation Algorithms for the Shortest Common Superstring Problem. *Inf. Comput.*, 83(1):1–20, 1989.
- [Ukk90] Esko Ukkonen. A Linear-Time Algorithm for Finding Approximate Shortest Common Superstrings. *Algorithmica*, 5(3):313–323, 1990.
- [Vaz01] Vijay V. Vazirani. *Approximation Algorithms*. Springer, 2001.