# EDAN55, supplementary notes for fixed parameter tractability

#### October 24, 2012

This note extends the presentation in Kleinberg and Tardos, chapter 10 with a case study of finding a *k*-path in a graph. In particular, it introduces Bodleander's algorithm. This algorithm provides a good example of dynamic programming over a tree decomposition, but, more importantly, finds a (not necessarily optimal) tree decomposition in a natural way. Moreover, we see the classical colour coding technique. That section makes sense after an introduction to randomized algorithms, such as chapter 13 *ibid*.

# 10.6 Case study: *k*-path

A *k*-path in a graph is a simple path of length *k*, i.e., a sequence of distinct vertices  $(v_1, \ldots, v_k)$  such that  $v_i v_{i+1} \in E$  for  $1 \le i < k$ .

The *k*-path problem is given a connected graph G = (V, E) and integer *k*, determine if *G* has a *k*-path. The problem makes sense for both directed and undirected graphs. Setting k = |V| the problem is known as the Hamiltonian path problem, which is well known to be NP-hard. In particular, there is little hope of solving the *k*-path problem in time polynomial in *n* and *k*.

#### **First attempts**

The brute force attempt is to check every subset of *k* vertices and see if they form a simple path in *G* by considering all of their orderings. The running time is within a polynomial factor of  $O(\binom{n}{k}k!k)$ .

We can use *decrease-and-conquer* from each starting vertex  $v \in V$  and iterate over all neighbours. Indeed, if we let  $P_i(v_1)$  denote the set of sequences  $v_1, \ldots, v_i$  of neighbouring vertices in *G* (not necessarily simple), then

$$P_{i}(v_{1}) = \bigcup_{v_{2}: v_{1}v_{2} \in E} \{ v_{1} \cdot \alpha : \alpha \in P_{i-1}(v_{2}), v_{1} \notin \alpha \},$$
(1)

where  $\cdot$  denotes concatenation.<sup>1</sup> This produces all sequences of distinct neighbouring vertices of length *k* in *G*, their number is  $n(n-1)\cdots(n-k-1)$ , the *falling factorial*  $n^{\underline{k}} = O(n^k)$ . We need to check each of them to see that it is simple; the total time is within a polynomial factor of  $O(n^k k)$ .

## FPT for regular graphs

Assume that *G* is regular, i.e., all vertices  $u \in V$  have the same degree  $deg(u) = \delta$ . In this case it is easy to see that the *k*-path problem is FPT.

<sup>1</sup> Maybe give as pseudocode instead.

° rev. fa5a008

If  $k \leq \delta$  then the *k*-path problem can be solved by depth first search: Start at an arbitary vertex, mark it, and go to an unmarked neighbour, until *k* vertices are marked. At no intermediate stage can you find yourself surrounded by *k* marked vertices, so there is always an unmarked neighbour. The running time is  $O(k\delta) = O(kn)$ .

If  $k > \delta$  then the decrease-and-conquer approach works. The number of neighbours considered at each step in (1) is  $\delta$ , so the total number of sequences constructed can be bounded by  $\delta^{\underline{k}}$ , and the total running time becomes  $O(k^k)$ .

#### Bodlaender's algorithm

Many of the algorithmic tools for algorithms on tree decompositions were developed by Hans Bodlaender. In particular, an early paper<sup>2</sup> develops an FPT algorithm for k-path for general graphs.

Perform a depth first search (DFS) from an arbitrary vertex r, constructing a DFS tree T rooted at r. If the depth of T is at least k, then the corresponding path from root to leaf is a k-path, and we're done.

Otherwise, the root-leaf paths (all of which have length less than k) form the pieces of a tree-decomposition of size k. To be precise, for every node t of T, let  $V_t$  consist of the vertices on the unique path from t to r in T.

We claim that  $(T, \{V_t : t \in T\})$  is tree decomposition of *G* of tree-width *k*.

- *Node coverage.* Node coverage is easily established in this tree decomposion, because every vertex in v is also a node in T. In particular, v belongs to  $V_v$ . (In general, the tree T in a tree decomposition can have completely different nodes than G.)
- *Edge coverage.* A fundamental property of DFS trees is that they have no "crossing edges:" every edge in the graph goes from a vertex in the DFS tree to its ancestor, cf. (3.7) in [KT, p. 85]. Therefore every graph edge is fully contained in some piece. (For instance, the graph edge  $uv \in E$  is fully contained in  $V_t$  for every t in the subtree of T rooted at u.)
- *Coherence.* Let  $t_1, t_2, t_3$  be three nodes of T such that  $t_2$  lies on the path from  $t_1$  to  $t_3$ . Let  $v \in V$  belong to both  $V_{t_1}$  and  $V_{t_3}$ . Since both  $V_{t_1}$  and  $V_{t_3}$  contain the vertex v, it must lie on both the path from  $t_1$  to r and from  $t_3$  to r in T. In particular, v is a common ancestor in T of  $t_1$  and  $t_3$ . If  $t_2$  lies on the path from  $t_2$  and  $t_3$  then v must be an ancestor of  $t_2$ .<sup>3</sup> But then v lies on the path from  $t_2$  to r, in particular it belongs to  $V_{t_2}$ .







<sup>3</sup> True, but probably needs a case analysis. Note to self: work this out.

*Tree-width.* Every piece contains at most k - 1 elements, because the distance in *T* from *t* to *r* is less than *k*.

We solve the *k*-path problem using dynamic programming over the tree decomposition  $(T, \{V_t : t \in T\})$  in same the fashion of the maximum independent set algorithm of section 10.4.

*Modifying the tree-decomposition.* We will exploit the fact that the tree decomposition defined above has very special structure, namely that if  $t_1$  is a parent of  $t_2$  in the tree decomposition thue  $V_{t_1} \subseteq V_{t_2}$ . In fact, we have  $V_{t_1} = V_{t_2} - \{t_2\}$ . This makes our constructions slightly simpler than for a general tree decomposition. However, our assumption is not crucial: an algorithm for finding a longest path in graph of tree-width k using a general tree decomposition can also be given, and within the same time bounds.

However, there is a further simplification of the tree decomposition that we want to perform before moving on. The DFS tree *T* can have high degree, so we transform *T* into a binary tree using a straightforward modification. Suppose that node *t* has children  $t_1, \ldots, t_d$  with d > 2. Remove the edges  $(t_i, t)$  for  $i = 2, \ldots, d$  and introduce fresh nodes  $t'_i$  for each  $i = 2, \ldots, d - 1$ . Then connect these nodes into a binary tree by adding the edges  $(t_i, t'_i)$  for  $i = 2, \ldots, d - 1$ , the edge  $(t'_i, t'_{i-1})$  for  $i = 3, \ldots, d - 1$ , and finally the edges  $(t'_2, t)$  and  $(t_d, t'_{d-1})$ . See figure 2.

This results in a new, binary tree T'. We complete the tree decomposition by specifying the pieces associated with the new nodes  $t'_i$  by setting  $V_{t'_i} = V_t$  for all i = 2, ..., d. In other words, every fresh node is associated with the piece of the original parent t. It is straightforward to check that this is still a tree-composition of tree-width k. We will abuse notation and continue using the letter T for the transformed tree T'.

*Defining the subproblems.* As in section 10.4, let  $T_t$  denote the subtree of T rootet at t, let  $V_t$  be the vertices associated with  $t \in T$ , and let  $G_t$  denote the subgraph of G induced by the vertices in the pieces associated with the nodes of  $T_t$ .

We define the subproblems of our dynamic programming solution for each subtree  $T_t$  as follows. Let  $\overline{w} = w_1, \ldots, w_r$  be a sequence of vertices from  $V_t$  without repetitions, and set  $W = w_1, \ldots, w_r$ . Then the subproblem  $f(\overline{w})$  is defined as the length of a longest simple path in  $G_t$  that is *consistent* with the ordering  $w_1, \ldots, w_r$ . By consistent we mean that the path visits the vertices from W in the order given by  $\overline{w}$ ; the path can visit other vertices in  $G_t \setminus V_t$  in between, but no vertices in  $V_t \setminus W$ . If no such path exists, the we set  $f(\overline{w}) = 0$ .

The number of subproblems at node *t* is  $\sum_{r=0}^{k} {k \choose r} r! \leq k! 2^{k}$ .



Figure 2: Transformation of a node  $t \in T$  with more than 2 children.

*Building Up Solutions.* We proceed to show how solutions to subproblems are constructed.

For a leaf *t*, the subgraph *G*<sub>t</sub> is just the graph induced by *V*<sub>t</sub>. We will solve this suproblem by exhaustive search. To be precise, to compute the subproblem *f* at a leaf node *t* we iterate over all choices of  $W \subseteq V_t$ , and all *r*! orderings  $w_1, \ldots, w_r$  of the r = |W| vertices in *W*, and check that the sequence of vertices  $w_1, \ldots, w_r$  defines a simple path, i.e., we check that that  $w_i w_{i+1} \in E$  for  $1 \le i < r$ . If so, we set  $f(\overline{w}) = r$ , otherwise 0.

Suppose node t' is a child of node t in T. Let  $\overline{w}' = w'_1, \ldots, w'_r$  denote a subproblem associated with t' and let  $\overline{w} = w_1, \ldots, w_r$  denote a subproblem associated with t. We say that  $\overline{w}'$  is *compatible* with  $\overline{w}$  if the two sequences contain the same vertices in the same order, except for possibly t' itself as a detour. Formally, either  $\overline{w}' = \overline{w}$  or there is some j such that  $\overline{w}' = w_1, \ldots, w_j, t', w_{j+1}, \ldots, w_r$  with  $w_j t' \in E$  and  $t'w_{j+1} \in E$ .

Now consider a node t with two children  $t_1$  and  $t_2$  and assume we already computed the optimum solutions  $f_1$  and  $f_2$  for all subproblems associated with the children. Then for subproblem  $\overline{w}$  of length r set

$$f(\overline{w}) = \max_{\overline{w}_1, \overline{w}_2} \{ f_1(\overline{w}_1), f_2(\overline{w}_2), f_1(\overline{w}_1) + f_2(\overline{w}_2) - r \}$$

where the maximum is taken over all subproblems  $\overline{w}_i$  associated with  $t_i$  for i = 1, 2 that are compatible with  $\overline{w}$ . Note that these subproblems encode all ways of traversing  $G_t$  because there is no edge between  $t_1$  and  $t_2$  in G.

Nodes with only one child are handled in a similar fashion.

The time for the computation of  $f_t(\overline{w})$  is  $O(k^2)$ , so  $f_t$  is computed for all subproblems in time  $O(k!2^kk^2)$ . Finally, the total time for the entire computation becomes  $O(k!2^kk^2 \cdot m)$ . This is of the desired form  $f(k)n^{O(1)}$ .

## **Colour coding**

A famous randomized algorithm by Alon, Yuster, and Zwick improves Bodlaender's algorithm both in running time and simplicity of exposition.

- 1. Give each vertex  $v \in V$  a random value  $\chi(v) \in \{1, 2, ..., k\}$ , called a *colour*.<sup>4</sup>
- 2. Find a *rainbow coloured k*-path, i.e., a *k*-path on which every colour appears. (And therefore appears exactly once.)

Consider a *k*-path *P* in the given graph. The vertices of *P* admit  $k^k$  different colourings, of which k! are rainbow colourings. Thus the

<sup>4</sup> This is not a proper colouring in the sense of graph colouring, so edges uv with  $\chi(u) = \chi(v)$  can occur.

 $5 r! \geq \sqrt{2\pi r} \left(\frac{r}{a}\right)^r$ 

event *R* that *P* is rainbow coloured happens with probability

$$\Pr(R) = \frac{k!}{k^k} \ge \sqrt{2\pi k} \frac{1}{e^k}.$$

using Stirling's formula.<sup>5</sup> The remarkable thing is that Pr(R) is merely exponential in k, instead of 1/k!.

Determining if a coloured graph contains a rainbow *k*-path can be accomplished using dynamic programming. For every subset  $X \subseteq \{1, ..., k\}$  of colours and vertex  $u \in V$ , let P(X, u) be true if there is a path of length |X| starting in *u* that uses exactly the colours in *X*. (In particular, such paths are simple.) Then

$$P(X, u) = \bigwedge_{uv \in E} P(X - \chi(u), v) \quad \text{for } \chi(v) \in X, |X| > 1,$$

and  $P(\{r\}, u)$  true if and only if  $r = \chi(u)$ . The graph *G* has a rainbow coloured *k*-path if and only if  $P(\{1, ..., k\}, u)$  holds for some *u*. Using dynamic programming, the values  $P(\{1, ..., k\}, u)$  can be computed in time  $O(2^k n)$  for every *u*, so the rainbow coloured *P* can be detected in time  $O(2^k n^2)$ . The algorithm takes  $O(2^k n)$  space.

By repeating the procedure  $t = 1/\Pr(R)$  times, the path *P* becomes rainbow coloured (and is therefore detected) with constant nonzero probability

$$(1 - \Pr(R))^{1/\Pr(R)} \ge \frac{1}{4}$$

in FPT time

$$O(2^k n^2 \Pr(R)^{-1}) = O(2^k n^2 e^k) = O(5.44^k n^2).$$