

Tight Running Time Lower Bounds for Vertex Deletion Problems

Christian Komusiewicz*

*Friedrich-Schiller-Universität Jena
Institut für Informatik
Ernst-Abbe-Platz 2, D-07743 Jena*

April 28, 2019

Abstract

The Π -VERTEX DELETION problem has as input an undirected graph $G = (V, E)$ and an integer k and asks whether there is a set of at most k vertices that can be deleted such that the resulting graph is a member of the graph class Π . By a classic result of Lewis and Yannakakis [J. Comput. Syst. Sci. '80], Π -VERTEX DELETION is NP-hard for all hereditary properties Π . We adapt the original NP-hardness construction to show that under the Exponential Time Hypothesis (ETH) tight complexity results can be obtained. We show that Π -VERTEX DELETION does not admit a $2^{o(n)}$ -time algorithm where n is the number of vertices in G . We also obtain a dichotomy for the number m of edges in the input graph: If Π contains all independent sets, then there is no $2^{o(m)}$ -time algorithm for Π -VERTEX DELETION. If there is a fixed independent set that is not contained in Π , then Π -VERTEX DELETION can be solved in $2^{o(m)}$ time. Finally, we consider the special case that G is planar and obtain that Π -VERTEX DELETION cannot be solved in $2^{o(\sqrt{n})}$ time for all hereditary Π containing and excluding infinitely many planar graphs.

1 Introduction

In graph modification problems, the aim is to modify a given graph such that it fulfills a certain property Π , for example being acyclic, bipartite, having bounded diameter, or being an independent set (that is, an edgeless graph). Formally, a graph property is simply a set of graphs. The focus is usually on nontrivial graph properties, that is, properties such that the set of graphs fulfilling the property and the set of graphs *not* fulfilling the property are infinite. Throughout this work, we consider only nontrivial graph properties.

The most common operations to modify the graph are vertex deletion, edge deletion and edge addition. Graph modification problems have many applications, for example in data anonymization [17], data clustering [3], data visualization [4], in the modeling of complex networks via differential equations [8], and in social network analysis [2].

In this work, we consider graph modification problems where only vertex deletions are allowed. Formally, we study the following problem:

*E-mail: christian.komusiewicz@uni-jena.de; supported by the DFG, project KO 3669/4-1.

Π -VERTEX DELETION

Input: An undirected graph $G = (V, E)$ and an integer k .

Question: Is there a set $S \subseteq V$ such that $|S| \leq k$ and $G[V \setminus S]$ is contained in Π ?

A natural class of graph properties occurring in many applications are the hereditary graph properties: A graph property is *hereditary* if it is closed under vertex deletion. Equivalently, if a graph G fulfills a hereditary property Π , then every induced subgraph of G fulfills Π . Hereditary graph properties can be characterized by forbidden induced subgraphs. That is, there is a (possibly infinite) set of graphs \mathcal{F} such that G has property Π if and only if it does not contain a graph from \mathcal{F} as an induced subgraph. For example, a graph is a forest if and only if it does not contain any cycle as induced subgraph. For these graph properties, there is the following classic hardness result due to Lewis and Yannakakis [14].

Theorem 1 ([14]). *Let Π be a hereditary graph property. Then Π -VERTEX DELETION is NP-hard.*

While this result rules out the possibility of polynomial-time algorithms, it leaves open the existence of subexponential-time algorithms for these problems. Our aim is to rule out the existence of subexponential-time algorithms for these problems by assuming the Exponential Time Hypothesis (ETH) [12]. To this end, let us inspect the reduction by Yannakakis¹ more closely.

The source problem in this reduction is VERTEX COVER.

VERTEX COVER

Input: An undirected graph $G = (V, E)$ and an integer k .

Question: Is there a set $S \subseteq V$ such that $|S| \leq k$ and $G[V \setminus S]$ is an independent set?

Assuming ETH, VERTEX COVER does not admit a $2^{o(n+m)}$ -time algorithm where n is the number of vertices in the input graph and m is the number of edges. Hence, VERTEX COVER is a suitable source problem for a reduction in the ETH-framework. The construction of Yannakakis, however, reduces n -vertex instances of VERTEX COVER to $\Theta(n^2)$ -vertex instances of Π -VERTEX DELETION. This blowup in the vertex number only yields a running time lower bound of $2^{o(\sqrt{n})}$. Thus, to obtain a better lower bound, we need to “re-engineer” the original construction.

We adapt the hardness construction of Yannakakis in two ways: We take a slightly more fine-grained approach for choosing the graphs which are used as basis for the gadgets in the reduction from the VERTEX COVER instance and we reduce from a more restricted variant of VERTEX COVER. These two modifications of the reduction allow us to obtain our main result. Here, n denotes the number of vertices in the input graph and m denotes its number of edges.

Theorem 2. *Let Π be a hereditary graph property, then:*

1. *If the ETH is true, then Π -VERTEX DELETION cannot be solved in $2^{o(n)}$ time,*
2. *If the ETH is true, then Π -VERTEX DELETION cannot be solved in $2^{o(n+m)}$ time if Π contains all independent sets.*
3. *If Π excludes some independent set and if membership in Π can be recognized in $2^{O(n)}$ time, then Π -VERTEX DELETION can be solved in $2^{O(\sqrt{m} \log m)}$ time.*

¹The article by Lewis and Yannakakis explicitly attributes the construction which will form the basis of our reduction to Yannakakis [14].

The first and second statement of the theorem follow from our adaption of Yannakakis' construction, described in Section 3. The third statement follows from a simple combinatorial algorithm, described in Section 4.

In addition to our main theorem, we observe that the reduction yields a similarly tight lower bound for vertex deletion problems in planar graphs. More precisely, we show that any nontrivial variant of Π -VERTEX DELETION cannot be solved in $2^{o(\sqrt{n})}$ time on n -vertex planar graphs. This result aligns nicely with the so-called square root phenomenon [16] that many NP-hard problems on planar graphs can be solved in $2^{O(\sqrt{n})}$ time but not faster.

Related Work. Fellows et al. [7] adapted the reduction of Yannakakis to provide NP-hardness results for the variant of Π -VERTEX DELETION where one aims to find a solution that is disjoint from and smaller than a given solution. The study considers the case that Π is closed under taking disjoint unions of graphs. These are exactly the graph properties that have only connected minimal forbidden induced subgraphs. As an introduction to their result, they describe a modified version of the original reduction which already implies Theorem 2 for this case. In subsequent work, Guo and Shrestha [11] investigated the complexity of the remaining case when the forbidden subgraphs have disconnected forbidden subgraphs, showing NP-hardness for most cases.

When edge deletions or additions are the allowed operations, there is no hardness result as general as the one of Lewis and Yannakakis [14]. Nevertheless, many variants of Π -EDGE DELETION are NP-hard [18]. If Π has exactly one forbidden induced subgraph, then a complexity dichotomy and tight ETH-based running time lower bounds can be achieved for edge deletion problems [1]. In similar spirit, tight running time lower bounds have been obtained for some Π -COMPLETION problems, where one may only add edges to obtain the graph property Π [6].

2 Preliminaries

Unless stated otherwise, we consider undirected graphs $G = (V, E)$ where V is the vertex set and $E \subseteq \{\{u, v\} \mid u, v \in V\}$ is the edge set of the graph. For a graph G , let $V(G)$ denote its vertex set and $E(G)$ its edge set. The (*open*) *neighborhood* of a vertex v is denoted by $N(v) := \{u \mid \{u, v\} \in E\}$ and the *closed neighborhood* by $N[v] := N(v) \cup \{v\}$. For a vertex set $S \subseteq V$, let $G[S] := (S, \{\{u, v\} \in E \mid u, v \in S\})$ denote the *subgraph of G induced by S* . For a vertex set $S \subseteq V$, let $G - S := G[V \setminus S]$ denote the induced subgraph of G obtained by deleting the vertices of S and their incident edges. Similarly, for a vertex $v \in V$ let $G - v := G - \{v\}$ denote the graph obtained by deleting this vertex and all its incident edges. A vertex v in a graph is a *cut-vertex* if $G - v$ has more connected components than G . Let $A = (a_1, a_2, \dots, a_n)$ and $B = (b_1, b_2, \dots, b_m)$ be two sequences where i is the smallest index such that $a_i \neq b_i$. Then, A is *lexicographically smaller than B* if $a_i < b_i$.

We say that a parameterized problem (I, k) has a *subexponential-time algorithm* if it can be solved in $2^{o(k)} \cdot n^{O(1)}$ time. In this work, the parameters under consideration are n , the number of vertices in the input graph, and m , the number of edges in the input graph. The *Exponential Time Hypothesis (ETH)* states that the 3-SAT problem, which is given a boolean formula in 3-conjunctive normal form and asks whether this formula can be satisfied by assigning truth values to the variables, cannot be solved in $2^{o(n)}$ time where n is the number of variables in the input formula [12]. For a survey on lower bounds based on the Exponential Time Hypothesis, refer to [15].

We now show that, assuming the ETH, the following special case of VERTEX COVER does not admit a subexponential-time algorithm. This problem variant will be used as source problem in our reduction; here, a subcubic graph is one with maximum degree at most three.

SUBCUBIC GIRTH- d VERTEX COVER

Input: An undirected subcubic graph $G = (V, E)$ such that every cycle in G has length at least d and an integer k .

Question: Does G have a vertex cover of size at most k ?

We show the running time lower bound by devising a simple reduction from VERTEX COVER that replaces edges by long paths on an even number of vertices. For the sake of completeness, we give a formal proof.

Theorem 3. *If the ETH is true, then SUBCUBIC GIRTH- d VERTEX COVER cannot be solved in $2^{o(n+m)}$ time.*

Proof. We reduce from VERTEX COVER in subcubic graphs, which is known to admit no $2^{o(n)}$ -time algorithm (assuming ETH) [13]. Assume that d is even; otherwise, increase d by one. Given a vertex cover instance $(G = (V, E), k)$ the reduction is simply to replace each edge $\{u, v\}$ of G by a path on d vertices and to make one endpoint of this path adjacent to u and the other one adjacent to v . Equivalently, subdivide each edge d times. Let G' denote the resulting graph, and call the paths that are added during the construction the d -paths of G' . To complete the construction, set $k' := k + (d/2) \cdot |E(G)|$. As we will show, the two instances are equivalent. Assume for now that equivalence holds. The shortest cycle in G' clearly contains more than d vertices (in fact it contains more than $3d$ vertices). Moreover, the construction does not increase the maximum degree of G , hence G' has maximum degree three. Finally, G' has $O(|V(G)|)$ many vertices and edges. Thus, any algorithm that solves (G', k') in $2^{o(|V(G')| + |E(G')|)}$ time can be used to obtain an algorithm that solves VERTEX COVER on subcubic n -vertex graphs in $2^{o(n+m)}$ time which contradicts the ETH.

Thus to complete the proof it remains to show equivalence of the instances.

(G, k) is a yes-instance $\Leftrightarrow (G', k')$ is yes-instance.

\Rightarrow : Let S be size- k vertex cover of G . Consider the graph $G' - S$. By construction, all remaining edges are incident with vertices in d -paths. Moreover, for each d -path, the non-path neighbor of at least one of its endpoints is contained in S since S is a vertex cover. Thus, deleting the other endpoint of the path and then every other vertex of the path gives a set of $d/2$ vertex deletions that together destroy all edges that are incident with vertices of this path. This can be done for all $|E(G)|$ many d -paths, resulting in $(d/2) \cdot |E(G)|$ vertex deletions. Consequently, $(d/2) \cdot |E(G)| + k$ vertex deletions suffice to destroy all edges in G' .

\Leftarrow : Observe that any vertex cover contains at least $(d/2) \cdot |E(G)|$ vertices that are on d -paths. Moreover, there is an optimal vertex cover such that no two neighbors u and v in a d -path are deleted: Deleting u makes v a degree-one vertex which means that deleting the other neighbor of v instead of v gives a vertex cover which is at most as large as one that deletes u and v . Thus, there is an optimal vertex cover S' that contains for each d -path exactly one of its two endpoints. Moreover, the neighbor of the other endpoint that is not in the d -path is contained in S' . Let $S := S' \cap V$ denote the vertices from V that are contained in S . For each edge $\{u, v\} \in E$, there is a d -path connecting u and v in E . By the discussion above, either u or v is in S . Thus, S is a vertex cover. Since S' contains at least $(d/2) \cdot |E(G)|$ vertices from d -paths, we have $|S| \leq k$. \square




Figure 1: A graph H with α -sequence $(3, 2, 1)$. Deleting any non-cut-vertex v gives $\alpha(H, v) = (6)$. The two cut-vertices c and d give $\alpha(H, c) = (3, 2, 1)$ and $\alpha(H, d) = (4, 1, 1)$, respectively. The graph $J(H)$ is highlighted by a gray background.

3 Hardness for Graph Properties Containing all Independent Sets

The main idea of the reduction of Yannakakis is the following. Reduce from VERTEX COVER by replacing edges of the VERTEX COVER instance by some graph H that is not contained arbitrarily often in any graph fulfilling Π (and thus needs to be destroyed by a vertex deletion). Then, deleting edges in the VERTEX COVER instance corresponds to destroying forbidden induced subgraphs in the Π -VERTEX DELETION instance. The main technical difficulty arises when the forbidden subgraphs for graph property Π have cut-vertices as in this case, two graphs that are used to replace two edges incident with the same vertex may form another forbidden subgraph of Π . Thus, the graph H which is used in the construction must be chosen carefully. To this end, Yannakakis introduces the notion of α -sequence for connected graphs.

Definition 1. Let H be a connected graph, let c be a vertex in H , and let H_1, \dots, H_ℓ denote the connected components of $H - c$ where $|V(H_1)| \geq |V(H_2)| \geq \dots \geq |V(H_\ell)|$. Then, $\alpha(H, c) := (|V(H_1)|, |V(H_2)|, \dots, |V(H_\ell)|)$. The α -sequence of H , denoted $\alpha(H)$, is the lexicographically smallest sequence such that $\alpha(H) = \alpha(H, c)$ for some $c \in V(H)$.

An example of a graph H with its α -sequence is presented in Figure 1. The idea in the reduction of Yannakakis is to choose a forbidden subgraph that has a connected component with a lexicographically smallest α -sequence as basis for the gadget. More precisely, the edges of the vertex cover instance are replaced by the largest connected component remaining after deletion of a vertex c which produces the smallest α -sequence of H . To this end, let $c \in V(H)$ be a fixed vertex such that $\alpha(H) = \alpha(H, c)$, and let J' be a fixed largest connected component of $H - c$. Then, let $J(H) := H[V(J') \cup \{c\}]$ denote the subgraph of H consisting of this component plus c . Since H has an edge, $J(H)$ has at least two vertices. The graph $J(H)$ will be used to replace the edges of the VERTEX COVER instance.

This terminology is sufficient to deal with the case that all forbidden subgraphs are connected. To deal with disconnected forbidden induced subgraphs, we introduce the notion of Γ -sequence.² Observe that the α -sequences imply a partial ordering on all graphs, but there maybe non-isomorphic graphs that have the same α -sequence. We want to avoid this, and thus the first step is to refine this partial ordering to a total ordering by breaking ties arbitrarily.

²Yannakakis uses the related notion of β -sequence which does not break ties between non-isomorphic graphs that have the same α -sequence [14]. This tie-breaking, however, is necessary for our reduction. Guo and Shrestha [11] use Ω -sequences which also do not break ties between non-isomorphic graphs.



Figure 2: The two minimal forbidden subgraphs co-diamond (left) and co-claw (right) for Π being the complement graphs of line graphs of triangle-free graphs (see <http://www.graphclasses.org/>). Here, H_Π is the co-diamond since the lexicographically largest α -sequence of any component of the co-diamond is (1) and the lexicographically largest α -sequence of any component of the co-claw is (2).

Definition 2. A γ -ordering is a function from the set of all connected graphs to \mathbb{N} if $\gamma(G_i) \geq \gamma(G_j)$ implies $\alpha(G_i) \geq \alpha(G_j)$ and $\gamma(G_i) = \gamma(G_j)$ if and only if G_i and G_j are isomorphic.

In the following, fix an arbitrary γ -ordering of all graphs. To obtain the Γ -sequence we consider the sequence of γ -values created by the connected components of a graph H .

Definition 3. Let H be graph with connected components H_1, \dots, H_ℓ such that $\gamma(H_1) \geq \gamma(H_2) \geq \dots \geq \gamma(H_\ell)$. Then, the Γ -sequence of H is $\Gamma(H) := (\gamma(H_1), \gamma(H_2), \dots, \gamma(H_\ell))$.

Now, the basis for our construction will be the minimal forbidden induced subgraph of Π that has the lexicographically smallest Γ -sequence. For a graph property Π , denote this graph by H_Π , an example is given in Figure 2. We are now ready to prove the first part of Theorem 2; an example of the construction is presented in Figure 3.

Lemma 1. Let Π be a hereditary graph property such that all independent sets are in Π . Then, if the ETH is true, Π -VERTEX DELETION cannot be solved in $2^{o(n+m)}$ time.

Proof. We reduce from SUBCUBIC GIRTH-3d VERTEX COVER with gadgets based on the graph H_Π . Let H_1 be the connected component of H_Π with maximum γ -value and let d denote the number of connected components of H_Π that are isomorphic to H_1 . Moreover, let c denote a vertex of H_1 such that $\alpha(H_1, c) = \alpha(H_1)$, that is, c is a vertex whose deletion produces a lexicographically smallest sequence of connected component sizes. Let n denote the number of vertices in the SUBCUBIC GIRTH-3d VERTEX COVER instance $(G = (V, E), k)$ and assume without loss of generality that n is larger than $|V(H_\Pi)|$ (otherwise, we can solve the SUBCUBIC GIRTH-3d VERTEX COVER instance in constant time).

Starting from an empty graph G' , construct the instance of Π -VERTEX DELETION as follows. For each connected component H_i of H_Π that is not isomorphic to H_1 , add $2n$ disjoint copies of H_i to G' .³ Then, add $d - 1$ disjoint copies of H_1 to G' . Call the graph constructed so far the *base graph* of the construction.

Now, add the graph G to G' and replace each edge $\{u, v\}$ of G by the graph $J := J(H_1)$ in the following way.⁴ Let c' be a vertex from J that is different from c . Remove $\{u, v\}$ from G' , add a copy of J to G' and identify u with c and v with c' . Now, let $D := H_1 - (V(J) \setminus \{c\})$. For each vertex $v \in V$, add a disjoint copy of D to G' and identify the vertex c of this copy with v . Call the part of G' that is obtained from G' the *vc-extension* of the construction. Complete the construction

³This is the part of the construction, where tie-breaking is necessary, as these graphs might have the same α -sequence as H_1 .

⁴This part of the construction follows the construction of Yannakakis [14].




Figure 3: An example of the reduction (in this case from VERTEX COVER instead of SUBCUBIC GIRTH- d VERTEX COVER). Top left: the forbidden subgraph H_{Π} with the vertex c of H_1 ; top right: the graph G of the VERTEX COVER instance; bottom: the constructed graph G' of the Π -VERTEX DELETION instance. Vertices of G and their corresponding vertices in G' are shown in gray.

of the Π -VERTEX DELETION instance by setting $k' := k$. We next show the equivalence of the two instances, that is,

G has a vertex cover of size at most $k \Leftrightarrow G'$ has a Π -vertex deletion set of size at most k .

\Rightarrow : Let S be a size- k vertex cover of G . Then, S is a Π -vertex deletion set in G' , that is, $G' - S$ fulfills Π . To see this, first observe that each connected component C of the vc-extension of $G' - S$ has γ -value lower than $\gamma(H_1)$: If C does not contain a vertex from V , then it is either a proper induced subgraph of D or of J . In both cases, C has a lexicographically lower α -sequence than H_1 and thus lower γ -value. If C contains a vertex v from V , then v is a cut-vertex in C , as deleting it disconnects the remainder of the copy of D containing v . Now, observe that the other connected components of $C - v$ have size at most $|V(J)| - 2$: These components are subgraphs of copies of J corresponding to an edge $\{u, v\}$ of G . Since S is a vertex cover, u is deleted from G , cutting the rest of the graph from this copy of J and leaving only $|V(J) - 2|$ vertices in the component. Consequently, the α -sequence of C is lexicographically smaller than the α -sequence of H_1 . This implies that the γ -value of this connected component is smaller than $\gamma(H_1)$.

Moreover, the base part exactly contains $d - 1$ connected components with γ -value $\gamma(H_1)$. Hence, $G' - S$ fulfills Π : Any induced subgraph of $G' - S$ has at most $d - 1$ connected components with γ -value $\gamma(H_1)$. By the assumption that H_{Π}

- has exactly d connected components with γ -value $\gamma(H_1)$ and no connected components with

larger γ -value, and

- H_Π has the lexicographically smallest Γ -sequence among all forbidden induced subgraphs of Π ,

$G' - S$ cannot contain any forbidden induced subgraph of Π as induced subgraph.

\Leftarrow : Let S' be a size- k Π -vertex deletion set in G' . Since $k < 2n$, we have that the number of copies of all connected components of H_Π with γ -value smaller than $\gamma(H_1)$ is at least as large in $G' - S'$ as it is in H_Π . Hence, $G' - S'$ contains at most $d - 1$ vertex-disjoint copies of H_1 as otherwise, $G' - S'$ contains H_Π as induced subgraph. Then, create a set $S_A \subseteq V$ as follows:

- For each vertex $v \in V \cap S'$, add v to S_A ,
- for each copy D^* of D in G' such that S' contains a vertex from $V(D^*) \setminus V$, add the vertex $v \in V(D^*) \cap V$ to S_A ,
- for each copy J^* of J such that $S' \setminus V$ contains a vertex from $V(J^*) \setminus V$ add an arbitrary vertex of $V(J^*) \cap V$ to S_A .

Observe that the set S_A has size at most k . If $G - S_A$ is an independent set, then G has a vertex cover of size at most k . Otherwise, consider the graph $G - S_A$ and observe that every edge $\{u, v\}$ in $G - S_A$ directly corresponds to an induced copy of H_1 in $G' - S'$: Since $\{u, v\}$ is present in $G - S_A$, we have that S' does not contain u or v , does not contain vertices from the copies of D that are attached to u or v , and does not contain a vertex from the copy of J attached to u and v . Now let q denote the size of a maximum matching in $G - S_A$ and observe that this implies that the vc-extension of $G' - S'$ has q vertex-disjoint copies of H_1 . Since $G' - S'$ contains at most $d - 1$ vertex-disjoint copies of H_1 , this implies that $q \leq d - 1$ and that S' contains at least q vertex deletions in the base graph (it needs to destroy at least q of the vertex-disjoint copies of H_1 in the base graph). Thus, $|S_A| \leq k - q$. Finally, observe that since $G - S_A$ has a maximum matching of size $q \leq d - 1$ it cannot contain a cycle as all cycles in G have length at least $3d$. Thus, $G - S_A$ has a vertex cover S_B of size at most q which together with S_A is a size- k vertex cover of G .

Since the two instances are equivalent, any algorithm deciding (G', k') decides (G, k) . Since H_Π has constant size for each fixed graph property Π , the base graph contains $O(n)$ vertices and edges. Similarly, the vc-extension of G has $O(n)$ copies of J (since G has $O(n)$ edges) and $O(n)$ copies of D and no further vertices. Consequently, G' has $O(n)$ edges and $O(n)$ edges. Any algorithm deciding G' in $2^{o(|V(G')| + |E(G')|)}$ thus decides SUBCUBIC GIRTH- $3d$ VERTEX COVER in time $2^{o(n)}$, contradicting the ETH by Theorem 3. \square

Let us briefly show why we need to assume large girth for the VERTEX COVER instance. If Π is for example the property of being $2K_2$ -free, that is, not containing an induced matching of size two, then given a VERTEX COVER instance (G, k) , the reduction would simply add an edge to G . Now, if G is a triangle and $k = 1$, then we have a no-instance but the resulting Π -VERTEX DELETION instance is a yes-instance: deleting the isolated edge is sufficient to destroy all $2K_2$ s.

We can directly use Lemma 1 to obtain a lower bound for all other nontrivial graph properties. First observe that, by Ramsey's theorem, every nontrivial graph property Π contains either all independent sets or all cliques: Since Π is nontrivial, the order of the graphs in Π is unbounded. Thus, for every number n , Π contains a graph which has $R_{n,n}$ many nodes and therefore contains either an n -vertex clique or an n -vertex independent set. Thus, if Π does not contain all independent

sets, then it contains all cliques. In this case, however, Lemma 1 implies a running time lower bound for $\text{co}(\Pi)$ -VERTEX DELETION, where $\text{co}(\Pi)$ is the graph property containing exactly the graphs that are complement graphs of a graph in Π . Now $\text{co}(\Pi)$ -VERTEX DELETION problem can be easily reduced to Π -VERTEX DELETION by complementing the input graph. This reduction does not change the number of vertices in the graph, thus leading to a lower bound for all hereditary graph properties when the running time is measured in terms of the number of vertices n .

Corollary 1. *Let Π be a hereditary graph property. Then, if the ETH is true, Π -VERTEX DELETION cannot be solved in $2^{o(n)}$ time.*

4 Subexponential-Time Algorithms for Graph Properties Excluding Some Independent Set

The hardness results from the previous section leave open the possibility of algorithms that have subexponential running time with respect to the number of edges m of G for graph properties Π that do not contain all independent sets. We now show that Π -VERTEX DELETION can be solved in $2^{o(m)}$ time if Π can be recognized sufficiently fast and does not contain all independent sets. The algorithm is based on a very simple observation which is informally stated as follows: First, the number of vertices that have a high degree in G is sublinear in m . Second, for sufficiently large m , the number of vertices that have a low degree and can be contained in a graph fulfilling Π is also sublinear in m .

Lemma 2. *Let Π be a graph property such that*

- *for some fixed d , Π does not contain the d -vertex independent set, and*
- *for an n -vertex graph, membership in Π can be verified in $2^{O(n)}$ time.*

Then, Π -VERTEX DELETION can be solved in $2^{O(\sqrt{m \log m})} + O(n)$ time.

Proof. Given an input (G, k) , the first step of the algorithm is to delete all except at most $d - 1$ singletons of the input graph and to decrease the size bound accordingly. These deletions are necessary by the assumption that Π does not contain the d -vertex independent set. Afterwards, the graph has $O(m)$ vertices.

Now, let A denote an arbitrary but fixed maximum-cardinality set such that $G[A] \in \Pi$. Let V_h denote the vertices in G that have degree at least $2\sqrt{m/\log m}$ and observe that $|V_h| \leq \sqrt{m} \cdot \sqrt{\log m}$. For each $A_h \subseteq V_h$, branch into a case that assumes $A_h = A \cap V_h$. In one of these branches, the assumption is correct.

Now consider the vertices in $V_\ell := V \setminus V_h$ that have degree at most $2\sqrt{m/\log m} - 1$ in G . Since $G[A \cap V_\ell]$ has no independent set on d vertices and a maximum degree of $2\sqrt{m/\log m} - 1$ it has less than $d \cdot 2\sqrt{m/\log m} = O(\sqrt{m/\log m})$ vertices. Thus, for each subset A_ℓ of V_ℓ that has size less than $d \cdot 2\sqrt{m/\log m}$, branch into a case that assumes $A_\ell = A \cap V_\ell$. Now, if $|A_h \cup A_\ell| \geq n - k$ check whether $G[A_h \cup A_\ell]$ fulfills Π using the algorithm promised by the premise of the lemma and return “yes” if this is the case. If all branches fail, then return “no”. The correctness of the algorithm is obvious from the fact that it considers all possibilities for $V_h \cap A$ and all valid possibilities of $V_\ell \cap A$.

The running time bound can be obtained as follows: The number of subsets of V_h is $2^{O(\sqrt{m \log m})}$. The number of subsets of size at most $d \cdot 2\sqrt{m/\log m}$ of V_ℓ is

$$n^{d \cdot 2\sqrt{m/\log m}} = m^{O(\sqrt{m/\log m})} = 2^{O(\sqrt{m \log m})}.$$

Thus, the recognition algorithm for Π has to be invoked $2^{O(\sqrt{m \log m})}$ times, each time on a graph with $O(\sqrt{m \log m})$ vertices. By the premise, this algorithm takes $2^{O(\sqrt{m \log m})}$ time, resulting in the claimed overall running time. \square

For the following subclass of these graph properties, we obtain a slightly better running time bound. The algorithm behind the statement follows the same idea as a known $2^{O(\sqrt{m})}$ -time algorithm for CLIQUE [9].

Theorem 4. *Let Π be a graph property such that*

- *all n -vertex graphs G with property Π have minimum degree $n - d$ for some constant d , and*
- *for an n -vertex graph, membership in Π can be verified in $2^{O(n)}$ time.*

Then, Π -VERTEX DELETION can be solved in $2^{O(\sqrt{m})} + O(n)$ time.

Proof. Given an input (G, k) , the first step of the algorithm is to delete all except at most d singletons of the input graph and to decrease the size bound accordingly. These deletions are necessary by the assumption that every n -vertex graph in Π has minimum degree at least $n - d$. Afterwards, the graph has $O(m)$ vertices.

Now, let A denote an arbitrary but fixed minimum-cardinality set such that $G[A] \in \Pi$. First, consider the case that A contains a vertex v that has degree at most \sqrt{m} in G . Then, for each $A' \subseteq N(v)$ branch into a case assuming that $A' = A \cap N(v)$. In each of these cases, branch for each subset A_d of size at most d of $V \setminus N[v]$ into a case assuming $A_d = A \setminus N[v]$. Now if $|A' \cup A_d \cup \{v\}| \geq n - k$, then check whether $G[A' \cup A_d \cup \{v\}]$ fulfills Π using the algorithm promised by the premise of the lemma. If this is the case, then return “yes”. If A contains v , then in one of the created branches both assumptions are correct. Hence, if all of the branches for all v with degree at most \sqrt{m} return “no”, then A contains only vertices of degree at least $\sqrt{m} + 1$. Thus, all other vertices may be removed from the graph, reducing the size bound k accordingly.

In the remaining graph, $n < 2\sqrt{m}$, thus a brute-force algorithm testing for each vertex subset A of size at least $n - k$ whether $G[A]$ fulfills Π has running time $2^{O(n)} = 2^{O(\sqrt{m})}$. \square

5 Planar Graphs

The Π -VERTEX DELETION problem is also of interest if the input graph is planar.

PLANAR Π -VERTEX DELETION

Input: An undirected planar graph $G = (V, E)$ and an integer k .

Question: Is there a set $S \subseteq V$ such that $|S| \leq k$ and $G[V \setminus S]$ is contained in Π ?

In PLANAR Π -VERTEX DELETION, we are only interested in properties Π that contain all independent sets: Otherwise, for some fixed $d \geq 5$ (depending on Π), the property Π cannot

contain planar graphs of order at least $R_{d,d}$ since these graphs cannot contain an independent set of size d and thus contain a K_5 .

For graph properties Π containing all independent sets and excluding at least one planar graph, we can apply our modification of Yannakakis' reduction when we reduce from PLANAR VERTEX COVER instead: First, as noted for example in [5, Theorem 14.9] it is known that PLANAR VERTEX COVER cannot be solved in $2^{o(\sqrt{n})}$ time (assuming the ETH).⁵ Second, the reduction behind Theorem 3 produces a planar graph if it has a planar graph as input. Third, if Π is hereditary and excludes some planar graph, then it has a nonempty family of planar forbidden induced subgraphs \mathcal{F} . Finally, in a reduction producing a planar graph, we may ignore all nonplanar forbidden induced subgraphs. Thus, we can simply carry out the reduction behind Lemma 1 starting from PLANAR VERTEX COVER and picking the gadget graph H_Π only among the planar forbidden induced subgraphs of Π . The replacement of edges of the PLANAR VERTEX COVER instance by planar graphs and the attachment of planar graphs to single vertices clearly yields a planar graph, as noted by Yannakakis [14]. Moreover, if the PLANAR VERTEX COVER instance has $O(n)$ vertices, then so has the PLANAR Π -VERTEX DELETION instance. Altogether, we arrive at the following.

Theorem 5. *Let Π be a hereditary graph property containing all independent sets and excluding at least one planar graph. Then, if the ETH is true, PLANAR Π -VERTEX DELETION cannot be solved in $2^{o(\sqrt{n})}$ time.*

References

- [1] N. R. Aravind, R. B. Sandeep, and N. Sivadasan. Parameterized lower bounds and dichotomy results for the NP-completeness of H -free edge modification problems. *CoRR*, abs/1509.08807, 2015.
- [2] B. Balasundaram, S. Butenko, and I. V. Hicks. Clique relaxations in social network analysis: The maximum k -plex problem. *Operations Research*, 59(1):133–142, 2011.
- [3] S. Böcker and J. Baumbach. Cluster Editing. In *Proceedings of the 9th Conference on Computability in Europe (CIE '13)*, volume 7921 of *LNCS*, pages 33–44. Springer, 2013.
- [4] K. Buchin, M. Buchin, J. Byrka, M. Nöllenburg, Y. Okamoto, R. I. Silveira, and A. Wolff. Drawing (complete) binary tanglegrams - hardness, approximation, fixed-parameter tractability. *Algorithmica*, 62(1-2):309–332, 2012.
- [5] M. Cygan, F. V. Fomin, L. Kowalik, D. Lokshtanov, D. Marx, M. Pilipczuk, M. Pilipczuk, and S. Saurabh. *Parameterized Algorithms*. Springer, 2015.
- [6] P. G. Drange, F. V. Fomin, M. Pilipczuk, and Y. Villanger. Exploring the subexponential complexity of completion problems. *ACM Transactions on Computation Theory*, 7(4):14, 2015.
- [7] M. R. Fellows, J. Guo, H. Moser, and R. Niedermeier. A complexity dichotomy for finding disjoint solutions of vertex deletion problems. *ACM Transactions on Computation Theory*, 2(2):5, 2011.

⁵The result follows essentially from a classic reduction [10] of VERTEX COVER to PLANAR VERTEX COVER that uses constant-size uncrossing gadgets.

- [8] B. Fiedler, A. Mochizuki, G. Kurosawa, and D. Saito. Dynamics and control at feedback vertex sets. I: Informative and determining nodes in regulatory networks. *Journal of Dynamics and Differential Equations*, 25(3), 2013.
- [9] F. V. Fomin and D. Kratsch. *Exact Exponential Algorithms*. Springer, 2010.
- [10] M. R. Garey, D. S. Johnson, and L. J. Stockmeyer. Some simplified NP-complete graph problems. *Theoretical Computer Science*, 1(3):237–267, 1976.
- [11] J. Guo and Y. R. Shrestha. Complexity of disjoint Π -vertex deletion for disconnected forbidden subgraphs. *Journal of Graph Algorithms and Applications*, 18(4):603–631, 2014.
- [12] R. Impagliazzo, R. Paturi, and F. Zane. Which problems have strongly exponential complexity? *Journal of Computer and System Sciences*, 63(4):512–530, 2001.
- [13] D. S. Johnson and M. Szegedy. What are the least tractable instances of max independent set? In *Proceedings of the 10th Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms (SODA '99)*, pages 927–928, 1999.
- [14] J. M. Lewis and M. Yannakakis. The node-deletion problem for hereditary properties is NP-complete. *Journal of Computer and System Sciences*, 20(2):219–230, 1980.
- [15] D. Lokshtanov, D. Marx, and S. Saurabh. Lower bounds based on the exponential time hypothesis. *Bulletin of the EATCS*, 105:41–72, 2011.
- [16] D. Marx. The square root phenomenon in planar graphs. In *Proceedings of the 40th International Colloquium on Automata, Languages, and Programming (ICALP '13)*, volume 7966 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, page 28. Springer, 2013.
- [17] A. Nichterlein. *Degree-Constrained Editing of Small-Degree Graphs*. Phd thesis, TU Berlin, December 2014.
- [18] M. Yannakakis. Edge-deletion problems. *SIAM Journal on Computing*, 10(2):297–309, 1981.