

## Parameterized Algorithms Tutorial

### Tutorial Exercise T6

Recall that a smooth tree decomposition  $\mathcal{T} = (T = (I, F), \{X_i \mid i \in I\})$  of a graph  $G$  of width  $k$  is one which satisfies the conditions:

1.  $|X_i| = k + 1$  for all  $i \in I$ ;
2.  $|X_i \cap X_j| = k$  for all  $\{i, j\} \in F$ .

Show that if  $\mathcal{T} = (T = (I, F), \{X_i \mid i \in I\})$  is a smooth tree decomposition of  $G = (V, E)$  of width  $k$  then  $|I| = |V| - k$ .

### Solution

We use induction on  $|V|$ . To show that there is a basis for induction, note that when  $|V| = k + 1$  with a smooth tree decomposition of width  $k$ , then  $|I| = 1$ . Therefore assume that if  $G$  is any graph on  $k + i + 1$  vertices, where  $i \geq 0$ , then a smooth tree decomposition  $\mathcal{T}$  of  $G$  of width  $k$  has  $i + 1$  nodes. Let  $G$  be a graph on  $k + i + 2$  nodes and let  $\mathcal{T} = (T = (I, F), \{X_i \mid i \in I\})$  be a smooth tree decomposition of  $G$  of width  $k$ . Consider a leaf node  $l \in I$  of this tree decomposition. By the properties of a smooth tree decomposition, there exists  $x \in X_l$  such that  $x \notin X_i$  for all  $i \in I \setminus \{l\}$  and that  $X_l \setminus \{x\} \subseteq X_p$ , where  $p \in I$  is the parent of  $l$ . Deleting  $l$  from the tree decomposition yields a smooth tree decomposition for the graph  $G - x$ , which has  $k + 1 + i$  vertices. By induction hypothesis, the decomposition obtained by deleting  $l$  has  $k + i$  nodes. Therefore  $\mathcal{T}$  has  $k + i + 1$  nodes and this completes the proof.

### Tutorial Exercise T7

Show that a graph  $G = (V, E)$  of treewidth at most  $k$  has at most  $k \cdot |V| - \binom{k+1}{2}$  edges.

### Solution

Again we use induction on  $|V|$ . To show basis, note that when  $|V| = k + 1$  then the number of edges in a graph of width at most  $k$  is at most

$$\binom{k+1}{2} = k(k+1) - \binom{k+1}{2}.$$

Assume that when  $G$  is any graph on  $k + i + 1$  vertices with width at most  $k$ , then it has at most  $k(k + i + 1) - \binom{k+1}{2}$  edges. Consider a graph  $G$  on  $k + i + 2$  vertices and let  $\mathcal{T} = (T = (I, F), \{X_i \mid i \in I\})$  be a smooth tree decomposition of width  $k$ . As in the last exercise, let  $l \in I$  be a leaf node and let  $x \in X_l$  be such that  $x$  occurs in none of the other bags of the decomposition. Since  $\mathcal{T}$  is smooth,  $X_l \setminus \{x\} \subseteq X_p$ , where  $p \in I$  is the parent of  $l$ . Deleting  $l$  from  $T$  yields a smooth tree decomposition of width  $k$  for the

graph  $G - x$ , which by induction hypothesis has at most  $k(k + i + 1) - \binom{k+1}{2}$  edges. Since the vertex  $x$  has at most  $k$  neighbors in  $G$ , the number of edges in  $G$  is at most

$$k(k + i + 1) - \binom{k + 1}{2} + k = k(k + i + 2) - \binom{k + 1}{2}.$$

Therefore, by induction, the claim is true.

### Tutorial Exercise T8

Show that given a tree decomposition  $\mathcal{T} = (T = (I, F), \{X_i \mid i \in I\})$  of width  $k$ , one can in  $O(|I|)$  time obtain a tree decomposition of width  $k$  satisfying the condition  $X_i \not\subseteq X_j$  for all  $\{i, j\} \in F$ .

Suppose  $\mathcal{T} = (T = (I, F), \{X_i \mid i \in I\})$  is such a tree decomposition. Then show that

1. for all  $\{i, j\} \in F$ ,  $X_i \cap X_j$  is a cut in  $G$ ;
2. if  $X_i$  is not a leaf, then  $X_i$  is a cut in  $G$ .

### Proposed Solution

Let  $\mathcal{T} = (T = (I, F), \{X_i \mid i \in I\})$  be a tree decomposition of a graph  $G$  of width  $k$ . Root the tree  $T$  at an arbitrary node. Do a depth-first search of the tree  $T$  postorder. When the traversal has finished visiting all the children of a node  $i$  with parent  $j$ , check whether  $X_i \subseteq X_j$ . If this is the case, delete  $i$  and add an edge from each child of  $i$  to  $j$ . At the end of this process, there is no parent-child pair such that  $X_{\text{child}} \subseteq X_{\text{parent}}$ . The time taken is  $O(|I| \cdot k)$ .

Assume that  $\mathcal{T} = (T = (I, F), \{X_i \mid i \in I\})$  be a tree decomposition of a graph  $G$  of width  $k$ . Since for all  $\{i, j\} \in F$  neither  $X_i \subseteq X_j$  nor  $X_j \subseteq X_i$ , there exists  $u \in X_i \setminus X_j$  and  $v \in X_j \setminus X_i$ . We claim that in  $G - (X_i \cap X_j)$  there is no path from  $u$  to  $v$ . Let  $u, x_1, \dots, x_r, v$  denote a path from  $u$  to  $v$  in  $G$  with  $r$  internal vertices. One of these internal vertices must be in  $X_i \cap X_j$ . For, if not, then for at least one of the edges  $\{u, x_1\}$  or  $\{x_r, v\}$ , no bag of the decomposition contains both end points. But if at least one internal vertex is in  $X_i \cap X_j$ , this path cannot exist in  $G - (X_i \cap X_j)$ .

### Tutorial Exercise T9

Design a dynamic programming algorithm for the INDEPENDENT SET problem on graphs of treewidth at most  $k$ . Assume that you are given as input, a graph, and a smooth tree decomposition of the graph. What is the running time of your algorithm?

### Solution

Let  $G = (V, E)$  be the input graph and let  $\mathcal{T} = (T = (I, F), \{X_i \mid i \in I\})$  be a smooth tree decomposition of  $G$  of width  $k$ . Root the tree  $T$  at an arbitrary node  $r$  and for  $i \in I$  let  $V_i := \bigcup_{j \in T_i} X_j$ , where  $T_i$  is the subtree of  $T$  rooted at the node  $i$ . For  $S \subseteq X_i$ , define  $f_i(S)$  to be the size of a maximum independent set in  $G[V_i]$  whose intersection with  $X_i$  is precisely  $S$ . The table associated with node  $i \in I$  consists of at most  $2^{k+1}$  rows, with each row corresponding to a distinct subset of the bag  $X_i$ . The entry for a row corresponding to  $S \subseteq X_i$  is the number  $f_i(S)$ .

Here is how the tables are updated.

**Leaf Nodes.** If  $i \in I$  is a leaf of  $T$ , then for  $S \subseteq X_i$

$$f_i(S) = \begin{cases} |S|, & \text{if } S \text{ is an independent set in } G; \\ -\infty, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

**Non-leaf Nodes.** Let  $i$  be an internal node with children  $j_1, \dots, j_p$ . Then for  $S \subseteq X_i$ , set  $f_i(S) = -\infty$  if  $S$  is not an independent set in  $G$ . Otherwise,

$$f_i(S) = |S| + \sum_{l=1}^p \max\{(f_{j_l}(W) - |S \cap W|)\},$$

where the maximum is taken over all  $W \subseteq X_{j_l}$  such that the following conditions hold:

1.  $S \cap X_{j_l} = W \cap X_i$ ;
2.  $S \cup W$  is independent.

The first condition on  $W$  states that the vertices of  $X_i$  that are in  $W$  are precisely those vertices of  $S$  that are part of  $X_{j_l}$ . The intuition behind this is that  $f_i(S)$  gives the size of a maximum independent set of  $G[V_i]$  that intersects  $X_i$  in precisely  $S$ . Consider a child, say,  $X_{j_1}$  of  $X$ . How does such an independent set intersect  $X_{j_1}$ ? If this independent set intersects  $X_{j_1}$  in a set  $W$ , then  $W$  must contain  $S \cap X_{j_1}$ . Additionally,  $W$  must not contain any other vertex in  $X_i \setminus S$  because this would violate the condition that the independent set intersects  $X_i$  in precisely  $S$ . These two conditions may be stated as  $S \cap X_{j_1} = W \cap X_i$ , which is the first condition above. Moreover, we want  $S \cup W$  to be independent, which is the second condition. Finally, we want to compute the maximum value of  $f_{j_1}(W)$  over all such sets  $W$ . For each maximum value, we subtract the contribution of  $S$  in the independent set in  $T_{j_1}$  so as not to count the vertices of  $S$  multiple times. But this means that we need to add back  $|S|$ , which is exactly what we do.

**Running Time.** The work done at a node  $i$  is proportional to

$$4^k \cdot k^2 \cdot (\text{number of children of } i).$$

Thus the total work done is  $O(4^k \cdot k^2 \cdot |F|)$  which is  $O(4^k \cdot k^2 \cdot |V|)$ .

### Homework H5

Let  $T = (V, E)$  be a tree and let  $w: V \rightarrow \mathbf{R}^+ \cup \{0\}$  be a weighting of the vertices of the tree by nonnegative reals. Then show that there exists a set  $S$  of at most two vertices such that for every component  $T[C]$  of  $T[V \setminus S]$ ,  $w(C) \leq w(V)/2$ . Here for any  $X \subseteq V$ ,  $w(X) = \sum_{u \in X} w(u)$ .

Generalize this result to show that if  $\mathcal{T} = (T = (I, F), \{X_i \mid i \in I\})$  is a width  $k$  decomposition of  $G = (V, E)$  and  $w: I \rightarrow \mathbf{R}^+ \cup \{0\}$  is a weighting of the nodes of the tree, there exists  $i \in I$  such that each component of  $G[V \setminus X_i]$  has weight at most  $w(V)/2$ .

[10 points]

## Homework H6

In this exercise, we want to design a dynamic programming algorithm for the DOMINATING SET problem on graphs of bounded treewidth. Assume that you have a nice tree decomposition  $\mathcal{T} = (T = (I, F), \{X_i \mid i \in I\})$  to begin with. As usual, root this decomposition at an arbitrary node and for  $i \in I$ , let  $V_i := \bigcup_{j \in T_i} X_j$ , where  $T_i$  is the subtree of  $T$  rooted at  $X_i$ . We have to decide what information we wish to maintain in the tables associated with the nodes in the tree decomposition. In this dynamic program, every vertex  $u$  of the graph is in one of three states:

- State **Green** meaning that  $u$  is in the dominating set.
- State **Yellow** meaning that  $u$  is dominated but not in the dominating set.
- State **Red** meaning that  $u$  is not yet dominated.

A table entry for a node  $i$  (with bag  $X_i = \{u_1, \dots, u_p\}$ ) of the tree decomposition consists of a state configuration  $(c_1, \dots, c_p) \in \{\mathbf{Green}, \mathbf{Yellow}, \mathbf{Red}\}^p$  of the vertices of the bag  $X_i$  and a number  $s_i(c_1, \dots, c_p)$ . The number  $s_i(c_1, \dots, c_p)$  is the size of a minimum dominating set in the graph  $G[V_i]$  such that vertex  $u_j$  is in state  $c_j$ . If no such dominating set exists then the entry is set to  $\infty$ .

If  $i$  is a leaf node with bag  $X_i = \{u_1, \dots, u_p\}$ , then for any state configuration  $\tilde{c} = (c_1, \dots, c_p)$  of the vertices in  $X_i$ ,

$$s_i(\tilde{c}) = \begin{cases} \infty, & \text{if some } c_j \text{ is } \mathbf{Yellow} \text{ but } u_j \text{ is not dominated by any vertex in } X_i. \\ \#\mathbf{Green}(\tilde{c}). & \end{cases}$$

Let  $i$  be a forget node with child  $j$  and suppose that  $X_i = \{u_1, \dots, u_p\}$  and  $X_j = \{u_1, \dots, u_p, u\}$  (so that  $u$  is the vertex that is forgotten). Since  $u$  is being forgotten, to evaluate  $s_i(c_1, \dots, c_p)$  we need to make sure that  $u$  is either in the dominating set or is already dominated in  $T_j$ . One can verify that

$$s_i(c_1, \dots, c_p) = \min_{c_{p+1} \in \{\mathbf{Green}, \mathbf{Yellow}\}} s_j(c_1, \dots, c_p, c_{p+1}).$$

Show how one might update the introduce and join nodes

[10 points]