
Graph-Based Data Clustering:
A Quadratic-Vertex Problem Kernel for
 s -Plex Cluster Vertex Deletion

by

RENÉ VAN BEVERN

Studienarbeit

14. September 2009

Betreuung: Hannes Moser,

Rolf Niedermeier



Friedrich-Schiller-Universität Jena
Institut für Informatik
Theoretische Informatik I / Komplexitätstheorie

Cite this work as: René van Bevern. A quadratic-vertex problem kernel for s -plex cluster vertex deletion. Studienarbeit, Department of Mathematics and Computer Science, Friedrich Schiller University of Jena, Germany, 2009.

Abstract

We introduce the s -PLEX CLUSTER VERTEX DELETION problem. Like the CLUSTER VERTEX DELETION problem, it is NP-hard and motivated by graph-based data clustering. While the task in CLUSTER VERTEX DELETION is to delete vertices from a graph so that its connected components become *cliques*, the task in s -PLEX CLUSTER VERTEX DELETION is to delete vertices from a graph so that its connected components become *s -plexes*. An s -plex is a graph in which every vertex is nonadjacent to at most $s - 1$ other vertices; a clique is an 1-plex. In contrast to CLUSTER VERTEX DELETION, s -PLEX CLUSTER VERTEX DELETION allows to balance the number of vertex deletions against the sizes and the density of the resulting clusters, which are s -plexes instead of cliques.

The focus of this work is the development of provably efficient and effective data reduction rules for s -PLEX CLUSTER VERTEX DELETION. In terms of fixed-parameter algorithmics, these yield a so-called *problem kernel*. A similar problem, s -PLEX EDITING, where the task is the insertion or the deletion of edges so that the connected components of a graph become s -plexes, has also been studied in terms of fixed-parameter algorithmics. Using the number of allowed graph modifications as parameter, we expect typical parameter values for s -PLEX CLUSTER VERTEX DELETION to be significantly lower than for s -PLEX EDITING, because one vertex deletion can lead to a high number of edge deletions. This holds out the prospect for faster fixed-parameter algorithms for s -PLEX CLUSTER VERTEX DELETION.

Contents

1	Introduction	4
2	Kernelization for 2-Plex Cluster Vertex Deletion	8
2.1	An Approximate Solution	9
2.2	Bounding the Number of Connected Components	10
2.2.1	Peripheral Sets	11
2.2.2	Reducing the Number of Connected Components	15
2.3	Bounding the Sizes of Connected Components	17
2.3.1	Data Reduction Based on Modules	18
2.3.2	Constructing Redundant Sets	22
2.3.3	Data Reduction Based on Separators	24
2.4	Kernel Size	26
3	Kernelization for s-Plex Cluster Vertex Deletion	30
3.1	Approximate Solutions and Peripheral Sets	30
3.2	Adapted Data Reduction Rules and Bounds	32
3.3	Kernel Size	35
4	Conclusion and Outlook	37

1 Introduction

Data clustering problems are of great importance in the disciplines of machine learning, pattern recognition, and data mining [3]. Given a data set, one can define a measure of similarity on data pairs. The goal in data clustering is to partition the data set into *clusters* so that the elements within a cluster are similar, while there are less similarities between vertices in different clusters. Mapping clustering tasks into graph-theoretic models allows the usage of the broad variety of graph algorithms to process and cluster data [23]. Usually, the similarity between data records is mapped to a graph G as follows: each vertex in G corresponds to a data record, and an edge between two vertices in G exists if and only if the similarity of the corresponding data records exceeds a certain threshold. This threshold is specific to the actual clustering problem. An obvious possible postulation on clusters is for each data pair in one cluster to be similar. A cluster can therefore be interpreted as a complete graph, also called *clique*. Subject to our goal that there shall be only few similarities between vertices in different clusters, the graph G constructed from our data would ideally consist of isolated cliques only. Such a graph is called a *cluster graph*. For real-world data, it is unrealistic to expect G to be a cluster graph. We could modify G to become a cluster graph, but because we want to avoid excessive perturbation of the input data, the graph should be modified only modestly. One way to model this task is CLUSTER VERTEX DELETION [14].

CLUSTER VERTEX DELETION

Instance: An undirected graph $G = (V, E)$ and a natural number k .

Question: Is there a vertex set $S \subseteq V$ with $|S| \leq k$ such that deleting all vertices in S from G results in a graph where each connected component forms a clique?

This problem corresponds to discarding at most k data records in order to find a plausible data clustering. We can regard the discarded data records as outliers. Although CLUSTER VERTEX DELETION is a very intuitive model of graph-based data clustering, it is very restrictive as it requires *every* data pair in a cluster to be similar. CLUSTER VERTEX DELETION offers no option to relax this requirement, so that we could allow for a few dissimilarities within the resulting clusters. Obviously, it is desirable to balance the amount of discarded data against the number of dissimilarities within a cluster. Also, inaccuracies in the data could render finding satisfactory clustering results using CLUSTER VERTEX DELETION impossible, yielding too many or too small clusters. Therefore, we weaken the requirement for every connected component to form a clique. Seidman and Foster [24] have introduced one generalization of the clique concept in 1978:

Definition 1.1. For $s \geq 1$, an *s-plex* is a graph $G = (V, E)$ such that every vertex in V is adjacent to at least $|V| - s$ other vertices in V .

For example, a clique is an 1-plex. By modeling clusters using s -plexes instead of cliques, we allow each data record to be dissimilar to $s - 1$ other data records within the same cluster. Although the s -plex concept has already been introduced in 1978, it has only recently become subject to algorithmic research [2, 11, 18, 20, 26]. In this work, we introduce the s -PLEX CLUSTER VERTEX DELETION problem.

s -PLEX CLUSTER VERTEX DELETION

Instance: An undirected graph $G = (V, E)$ and a natural number k .

Question: Is there a vertex set $S \subseteq V$ with $|S| \leq k$ such that deleting all vertices in S from G results in a graph where each connected component forms an s -plex?

In the following, we will call a graph that has only s -plexes as connected components an s -plex cluster graph. For each s , the s -PLEX CLUSTER VERTEX DELETION problem yields a different clustering model. In each model, s determines the “density” of the resulting clusters and with that the dissimilarities that are allowed within each cluster.

Fixed-Parameter Algorithmics. In this work, we study the s -PLEX CLUSTER VERTEX DELETION problem in terms of fixed-parameter algorithmics. Fixed-parameter algorithmics aims at a multivariate complexity analysis of problems without giving up the demand for finding optimal solutions [6, 8, 21]. A *parameterized* problem is a language $L \subseteq \Sigma^* \times \mathbb{N}$, where Σ is a finite alphabet. The second component is called the *parameter* of the problem. The s -PLEX CLUSTER VERTEX DELETION problem is a parameterized problem with the input G and the parameter k . A parameterized problem L is *fixed-parameter tractable* if it can be determined in $f(k)|x|^{O(1)}$ time whether $(x, k) \in L$, where f is a computable function only depending on k . The corresponding complexity class is called *FPT*.

Given a parameterized problem instance (x, k) , *reduction to a problem kernel* or *kernelization* means to transform (x, k) into an instance (x', k') in polynomial time, such that the size of x' is bounded from above by some function only depending on k , $k' \leq k$, and (x, k) is a yes-instance if and only if (x', k') is a yes-instance. We refer to (x', k') as *problem kernel*. Kernelization enables us to develop provably efficient and effective *data reduction rules*. Refer to Guo and Niedermeier [13] for a survey on problem kernelization. In this work, we present a kernelization for s -PLEX CLUSTER VERTEX DELETION.

Terminology. We only consider *undirected* graphs $G = (V, E)$, where V is the set of vertices and E is the set of edges. Throughout this work, we use $n := |V|$ and $m := |E|$. We call two vertices $v, w \in V$ *adjacent* or *neighbors* if $\{v, w\} \in E$. The *neighborhood* $N(v)$ of a vertex $v \in V$ is the set of vertices that are adjacent to v . For a vertex set $U \subseteq V$, we set $N(U) := \bigcup_{v \in U} N(v) \setminus U$. We call a vertex $v \in V$ *adjacent* to $V' \subseteq V$ if v has a neighbor in V' . Analogously, we extend this definition and call a vertex set $U \subseteq V$ *adjacent* to a vertex set $W \subseteq V$ with $W \cap U = \emptyset$ if $N(U) \cap W \neq \emptyset$. A *path* in G from v_1 to v_ℓ is a sequence $(v_1, v_2, \dots, v_\ell) \in V^\ell$ of vertices with $\{v_i, v_{i+1}\} \in E$ for $i \in \{1, \dots, \ell - 1\}$. We call two vertices v and w *connected* in G if there exists a path from v to w in G . For a set of vertices $V' \subseteq V$, the *induced subgraph* $G[V']$ is the graph over the vertex set V' with the edge set $\{\{v, w\} \in E \mid v, w \in V'\}$. For $V' \subseteq V$, we use $G - V'$ as an abbreviation for $G[V \setminus V']$.




Figure 1.1: Minimal forbidden induced subgraphs for $s = 2$.

Related Work. The two “sister problems” of s -PLEX CLUSTER VERTEX DELETION, namely s -PLEX EDITING and CLUSTER VERTEX DELETION, have been subject to recent research [11, 14]. The goal of the s -PLEX EDITING problem is to transform a graph into an s -plex cluster graph by insertion or removal of at most k edges. For CLUSTER VERTEX DELETION, Hüffner et al. [14] have developed fixed-parameter algorithms using the recent iterative compression [12] technique introduced by Reed et al. [22]. Their algorithm solves CLUSTER VERTEX DELETION in $O(2^k \cdot n^2(m + n \log n))$ time, where k is the number of allowed vertex deletions. Guo et al. [11] have shown a problem kernel with $O(ks^2)$ vertices for s -PLEX EDITING, where k is the number of allowed edge modifications. They also have developed the following forbidden induced subgraph characterization for s -plex cluster graphs.

Theorem 1.1 (Guo et al. [11]). *Let $G = (V, E)$ be a graph. Let F be the set of all connected graphs with at most $|V|$ vertices that contain a vertex that is nonadjacent to s other vertices. The graph G is an s -plex cluster graph if and only if it does not contain any graph from F as induced subgraph.*

Guo et al. [11] have also shown the stronger result that, for each natural number s , there exists a natural number $d \in O(s + \sqrt{s})$ such that if a graph G is not an s -plex cluster graph, then G contains a forbidden induced subgraph (FISG) with at most d vertices. They present an algorithm that, if G is not an s -plex cluster graph, finds such a FISG in G in $O(s(n + m))$ time. If $s = 2$ and if G is not a 2-plex cluster graph, then their algorithm always finds one of the three FISGs shown in Figure 1.1. We can solve s -PLEX CLUSTER VERTEX DELETION by repeatedly finding a FISG with at most d vertices in $O(s(n + m))$ time and then branching into all possibilities of deleting one of its vertices. This yields a trivial search tree algorithm to solve s -PLEX CLUSTER VERTEX DELETION in $O(d^k s(n + m))$ time. Algorithms with a lower exponential time term can be obtained employing the d -HITTING SET problem:

d -HITTING SET

Instance: A set H , a collection of subsets $\mathcal{C} \subseteq \{H' \subseteq H \mid |H'| \leq d\}$ and a natural number k .

Question: Is there a *hitting set* $S \subseteq H$ with $|S| \leq k$ such that each set in \mathcal{C} contains an element of S ?

We obtain a d -HITTING SET instance (H, \mathcal{C}, k) from an s -PLEX CLUSTER VERTEX DELETION instance (G, k) as follows: we use the vertex set of G as H ; for each FISG F containing at most d vertices from G , we add the vertex set of F to \mathcal{C} . Because each

element in \mathcal{C} corresponds to a FISG with at most d vertices, we have $|\mathcal{C}| \in O(n^d)$. Because this bound is exponential in d , it is practically infeasible to transform an s -PLEX CLUSTER VERTEX DELETION instance into a d -HITTING SET instance without prior data reduction. We can solve d -HITTING SET using a trivial $O(d^k|\mathcal{C}|)$ -time search tree algorithm; we repeatedly choose a set from the collection \mathcal{C} and branch into all possibilities of adding one of its vertices to a hitting set. Faster algorithms for d -HITTING SET are known [21]. For example, consider the special case $s = 2$. The FISGs for 2-PLEX CLUSTER VERTEX DELETION are shown in Figure 1.1. The trivial search tree algorithm for 2-PLEX CLUSTER VERTEX DELETION (as discussed above) runs in $O(4^k(n + m))$ time. We can solve an equivalent 4-HITTING SET instance in $O(3.076^k + |\mathcal{C}|)$ time by combining Wahlström’s $O(2.076^k + |\mathcal{C}|)$ -time algorithm for 3-HITTING SET [25] with iterative compression, as discussed by Dom et al. [5].

The forbidden induced subgraph characterization by Guo et al. [11] implies that every induced subgraph of an s -plex cluster graph is again an s -plex cluster graph. The property of being an s -plex cluster graph is thus *hereditary*. Lewis and Yannakakis [16] have shown that vertex deletion problems for hereditary graph properties are NP-hard. Because it can be verified in polynomial time whether a graph contains a FISG for s -plex cluster graphs, s -PLEX CLUSTER VERTEX DELETION is in NP. As a consequence, we can conclude that s -PLEX CLUSTER VERTEX DELETION is NP-complete. Further, Lund and Yannakakis [17] have shown that vertex deletion problems for hereditary graph properties are constant-factor approximable and MAX SNP-hard, if the graph property admits a characterization by a finite number of FISGs. Because s -plex cluster graphs are characterized by a finite number of FISGs, finding a minimum solution for s -PLEX CLUSTER VERTEX DELETION is constant-factor approximable and MAX SNP-hard.

Our contributions. We show a problem kernel with $O(k^2)$ vertices for 2-PLEX CLUSTER VERTEX DELETION, which can be found in $O(kn^2)$ time. We then generalize this kernelization algorithm to show a problem kernel with $O(k^2s^3)$ vertices for s -PLEX CLUSTER VERTEX DELETION, which can be found in $O(ksn^2)$ time.

2 Kernelization for 2-Plex Cluster Vertex Deletion

In this chapter, we transform a 2-PLEX CLUSTER VERTEX DELETION instance (G, k) into a problem kernel (G', k') . To this end, we present a series of data reduction rules that remove vertices from G so that the maximum number of vertices in the resulting graph G' depends only on the parameter k . These data reduction rules also compute the new parameter $k' \leq k$. For each data reduction rule, we show that it can be carried out in polynomial time and that it is *correct*, that is, we show that (G, k) is a yes-instance if and only if (G', k') is a yes-instance.

Assume that we are given a 2-PLEX CLUSTER VERTEX DELETION instance (G, k) . We want to apply a series of data reduction rules to G so that we can bound the size of G by a function only depending on the parameter k . To structure the graph G , we first search for a constant-factor approximate solution X so that each connected component in $G - X$ is a 2-plex. This partitions the graph as shown in Figure 2.1. To bound the overall size of G by a function only depending on the parameter k , we independently bound the sizes of $G - X$ and X by functions only depending on k .




Figure 2.1: Constant-factor approximate solution X and the graph $G - X$.

To bound the size of X , we use that X is a constant-factor approximate solution. If (G, k) is a yes-instance, then G can be transformed into a 2-plex cluster graph by at most k vertex deletions. This implies that the size of X is at most ck for some constant factor c . In particular, the maximum size of X only depends on k . If X contains more than ck vertices, we stop our kernelization algorithm and output that (G, k) is a no-instance.

It is left to bound the size of $G - X$ by a function only depending on the parameter k . To this end, we present data reduction rules to independently bound the *number* and the *sizes* of the connected components in $G - X$ by functions only depending on k . Bounding the sizes of the connected components is the most sophisticated part of our kernelization

algorithm. To this end, we employ graph separators and introduce a generalization of the graph module concept [9, 19] in Section 2.3.

Summarizing, we obtain a problem kernel for a 2-PLEX CLUSTER VERTEX DELETION instance (G, k) by executing the following steps:

1. Find a constant-factor approximate solution X such that $G - X$ is a 2-plex cluster graph. This is the subject of Section 2.1. Because X is a constant-factor approximate solution, the size of X is bounded by a function only depending on the parameter k .
2. Bound the *number* of connected components in $G - X$ by a function only depending on the parameter k . To this end, we use data reduction rules presented in Section 2.2.
3. Bound the *sizes* of the connected component in $G - X$ by a function only depending on the parameter k . To this end, we use data reduction rules presented in Section 2.3.

In Section 2.4, we show that the remaining graph (consisting of the vertices in X and the connected components in $G - X$ to which all data reduction rules have been applied) contains $O(k^2)$ vertices. Together with the new parameter computed by our data reduction rules, this graph constitutes our problem kernel.

In the following, we write *solution* for a vertex set X such that $G - X$ is a 2-plex cluster graph. If we intend to refer to a solution containing at most k vertices, then we state it explicitly.

2.1 An Approximate Solution

In this section, we present an algorithm that greedily computes an approximate solution for 2-PLEX CLUSTER VERTEX DELETION. Given a graph G , Guo et al. [11] have shown that if G is not an s -plex cluster graph, an $O(s + \sqrt{s})$ -vertex FISG in G can be found in $O(s(n + m))$ time. For the case $s = 2$, this algorithm finds the FISGs shown in Figure 1.1. We apply their algorithm for $s = 2$ to construct an initial solution:

Algorithm 2.1. Given a graph G , we start with $H = G$ and $X = \emptyset$. We repeatedly apply the algorithm by Guo et al. [11] to find a FISG in H , we add its vertices to X , and remove them from H . If no FISG can be found, then the algorithm stops and returns X .

Figure 2.1 illustrates the separation of G into X and $H = G - X$.

Lemma 2.1. *Algorithm 2.1 computes a factor-4 approximate solution for 2-PLEX CLUSTER VERTEX DELETION. It can be carried out in $O(n(n + m))$ time.*

Proof. First, we show the running time. In each step, a FISG can be found in $O(n + m)$ time. Because in each step of Algorithm 2.1 four vertices are removed from H , we apply it at most $O(n)$ times. Therefore, Algorithm 2.1 runs in $O(n(n + m))$ time.

It is left to show that the set X computed by Algorithm 2.1 is a factor-4 approximate solution. Algorithm 2.1 stops when no more FISGs can be found in $H = G - X$. Thus, H must be a 2-plex cluster graph and X is a solution.

Let F be the set of all FISGs found by [Algorithm 2.1](#). Because each FISG is deleted from H when it is discovered, the graphs in F are pairwise vertex-disjoint. Any solution must contain at least one vertex of each FISG in F . Therefore, the size of a solution is at least $|F|$. Each FISG found by the algorithm of Guo et al. [11] contains four vertices. It follows that the solution X computed by [Algorithm 2.1](#) contains $4|F|$ vertices, which is at most four times the number of vertices in an optimal solution. \square

Corollary 2.1. *Let (G, k) be a yes-instance. Then, [Algorithm 2.1](#) computes a solution for G that contains at most $4k$ vertices.*

Many of the following observations and data reduction rules require an initial solution X . In those observations, we make no assumptions about X other than X being a solution. For practical considerations, a heuristic search for an initial solution might be superior to employing [Algorithm 2.1](#). Heuristic search might not only be faster, but might also find a smaller solution. This is desirable because the size of our problem kernel is proportional to the size of the initial solution. However, to conclude a problem kernel with $O(k^2)$ vertices, we require an initial constant-factor approximate solution.

2.2 Bounding the Number of Connected Components

Let X be a solution for G . In this section we bound the number of connected components in $G - X$ by a function only depending on the parameter k . To this end, we employ a data reduction rule that resembles Buss and Goldsmith's [4] kernelization of the VERTEX COVER problem.

Lemma 2.2. *Let (G, k) be a 2-PLEX CLUSTER VERTEX DELETION instance and let $F(v)$ be a set of FISGs pairwise intersecting only in the vertex v of G . If $|F(v)| > k$, then (G, k) is a yes-instance if and only if $(G - \{v\}, k - 1)$ is a yes-instance.*

Proof. If (G, k) is a yes-instance, then there exists a solution S with $|S| \leq k$ such that $G - S$ is a 2-plex cluster graph. The set $S \setminus \{v\}$ is a solution for $G - \{v\}$. If S does not contain v , then it contains at least one vertex for every FISG in $F(v)$. Because there are more than k FISGs in $F(v)$, this contradicts $|S| \leq k$. Therefore, $v \in S$ and $S \setminus \{v\}$ contains at most $k - 1$ vertices. This shows that $(G - \{v\}, k - 1)$ is a yes-instance.

If $(G - \{v\}, k - 1)$ is a yes-instance, then $G - \{v\}$ admits a solution S of size $k - 1$. The set $S \cup \{v\}$ is a solution for G that contains at most k vertices. Thus, (G, k) is a yes-instance. \square

In [Section 2.2.1](#), we introduce the concept of *peripheral* sets. Given a solution X , peripheral sets help us in [Section 2.2.2](#) to bound the number of connected components in $G - X$ and help us in [Section 2.3](#) to bound their sizes. We present an algorithm that constructs a peripheral set efficiently and enables us to give a lower bound on the number of vertices that pairwise intersect only in a single vertex $v \in X$. If more than k FISGs intersect only in v , then we can remove v from G according to [Lemma 2.2](#).

2.2.1 Peripheral Sets

In this section, we present an algorithm that, for each vertex v in a solution X , constructs a vertex set $M(v)$ that allows us to give a lower bound on the number of FISGs that pairwise intersect only in the vertex v . If this lower bound shows that more than k FISGs pairwise intersect only in v , then we can remove v from G according to [Lemma 2.2](#).

As a side effect, we construct the sets $M(v)$ so that their union $M := \bigcup_{v \in X} M(v)$ helps us to bound the number and the sizes of the connected components in $G - X$: informally speaking, if we remove M from G , then we want each vertex $v \in X$ to be adjacent to only one large connected component in $G - (X \cup M)$. As a result, there will be at most $|X|$ large connected components in $G - (X \cup M)$ adjacent to X . Further, if a vertex $v \in X$ has a neighbor in a connected component in $G - (X \cup M)$, then we want the vertex v to be adjacent to almost all of that connected component's vertices. This will help us in [Section 2.3](#) to bound the sizes of the connected components in $G - X$. We later formalize these properties and capture them under the concept of a *peripheral* set.

We will see that we can easily bound the size of M by a function only depending on the parameter k . Thus, the graph $G - M$ can be thought of as the “core” of our kernelization problem, for which we must provide further data reduction rules. In contrast, the vertices in M are only of peripheral interest.

Given a solution X for G , we now construct the set $M(v)$ for each vertex $v \in X$. We start with $M(v) = \emptyset$. Then, we repeatedly search for a FISG F in G that contains v but no vertices from $M(v)$ and add the vertices of $F - \{v\}$ to $M(v)$. This ensures that we only find FISGs that pairwise intersect only in v . To find such FISGs, we present three observations on the connected components in $G - X$. Each observation will lead to a phase of an algorithm that constructs the sets $M(v)$.

Definition 2.1. Let V be the vertex set of G and let X be a solution. We define the collection $\mathcal{H}(X) := \{H \subseteq V \mid H \text{ induces a connected component in } G - X\}$ of the vertex sets of the connected components in $G - X$.

Because each set in $\mathcal{H}(X)$ induces a connected component in $G - X$ and because X is a solution, each set in $\mathcal{H}(X)$ induces a 2-plex.

We now turn to our first out of three observations. Let $v \in X$ be a vertex with three neighbors u , w , and t . Assume that u is nonadjacent to w and t , as shown in [Figure 2.2\(a\)](#). Then, $F := G[\{t, u, v, w\}]$ is a connected graph, but v is nonadjacent to *two* vertices t and w . According to [Theorem 1.1](#), F is a FISG.

Algorithm 2.2 (Phase 1). Given a graph G and a solution X , initialize $M(v) := \emptyset$ for each $v \in X$. For each $v \in X$, as long as there are vertices $t, u, w \in N(v) \setminus (M(v) \cup X)$ such that u is neither adjacent to t nor w , add the vertices t, u , and w to $M(v)$.

Now, for each vertex v in the solution X , let $M(v)$ be the set constructed by Phase 1 of [Algorithm 2.2](#). For a vertex $v \in X$, assume that there exists a set $H \in \mathcal{H}(X)$ such that v is adjacent to a vertex $u \in H \setminus M(v)$ but nonadjacent to *two* vertices $t, w \in H \setminus M(v)$. This situation is shown in [Figure 2.2\(b\)](#). The graph $G[\{t, u, w\}]$ is an induced subgraph of $G[H]$. Thus, it is a 2-plex with three vertices, implying that it is connected. Because v is




Figure 2.2: Each figure shows the graph G with a solution X and FISGs that are found in the different phases of [Algorithm 2.2](#). Also compare these FISGs with the FISGs shown in [Figure 1.1](#). The vertices u, v, w , and t as used in the algorithm are shown. The big circles represent connected components in $G - X$, that is, they are 2-plexes and their vertex sets are sets in $\mathcal{H}(X)$. Squares are vertices in the set $M(v)$ for some vertex $v \in X$, that is, they are vertices of FISGs that have already been found.

adjacent to u , the vertex v is connected but nonadjacent to the *two* vertices t and w . By [Theorem 1.1](#), $G[\{t, u, v, w\}]$ is a FISG. We continue [Algorithm 2.2](#) as follows:

Algorithm 2.2 (Phase 2). For each $v \in X$, as long as there is a set $H \in \mathcal{H}(X)$ such that

1. the vertex v is adjacent to a vertex $u \in H \setminus M(v)$ and
2. the vertex v is nonadjacent to two vertices $t, w \in H \setminus M(v)$,

add the vertices t, u , and w to $M(v)$.

Now, for each vertex v in a solution X , let $M(v)$ be the set constructed by Phase 1 and Phase 2 of [Algorithm 2.2](#). Assume that for a vertex $v \in X$, there exist two sets $U, W \in \mathcal{H}(X)$ such that there exist two neighbors $u \in U \setminus M(v)$ and $w \in W \setminus M(v)$ of v . This situation is shown in [Figure 2.2\(c\)](#). Assume that $U \setminus M(v)$ or $W \setminus M(v)$ contains at least three vertices. Without loss of generality, assume that $|U \setminus M(v)| \geq 3$. Then, $G[U \setminus M(v)]$ is a connected 2-plex. Therefore, there exists a neighbor $t \in U \setminus M(v)$ of u . The vertex w is nonadjacent to t and u , because w is in another set in $\mathcal{H}(X)$. Because $F := G[\{t, u, v, w\}]$ is connected, F is a FISG according to [Theorem 1.1](#).




Figure 2.3: An example for a peripheral set M , which contains the vertices drawn as squares. Shown is the graph G with a solution X . The circles represent sets in $\mathcal{H}(X)$, which induce connected components in $G - X$.

Algorithm 2.2 (Phase 3). For each vertex $v \in X$, as long as there are two vertex sets $U, W \in \mathcal{H}(X)$ such that

1. the vertex v has neighbors $u \in U \setminus M(v)$ and $w \in W \setminus M(v)$ and
2. there is a neighbor $t \notin X \cup M(v)$ of either u or w ,

add the vertices t, u , and w to $M(v)$. Finally, return $M(v)$ for all vertices $v \in X$.

This concludes the description of [Algorithm 2.2](#). For a solution X , we now inspect the union $M := \bigcup_{v \in X} M(v)$ of the sets $M(v)$ constructed by [Algorithm 2.2](#). Informally speaking, we show that if we remove M from G , then each vertex $v \in X$ is adjacent to the vertices of at most one large connected component in $G - (X \cup M)$. As a result, there are at most $|X|$ large connected components in $G - (X \cup M)$ containing neighbors of X . Further, we show that if v is adjacent to vertices of a connected component in $G - (X \cup M)$, then it is adjacent to almost all of its vertices. This helps us in [Section 2.3](#) to bound the sizes of the connected components in $G - X$. To formalize these properties, we introduce the concept of a *peripheral set*:

Definition 2.2. Let X be a solution. We call a vertex set M with the following properties *peripheral with respect to X* :

1. For each vertex $v \in X$, there are at most two sets $H \in \mathcal{H}(X)$ such that $H \setminus M$ is adjacent to v .
2. If there is a vertex $v \in X$ and a set $H \in \mathcal{H}(X)$ such that $H \setminus M$ is adjacent to v , then v is nonadjacent to at most one vertex in $H \setminus M$.
3. For each vertex $v \in X$, if there is more than one set $H \in \mathcal{H}(X)$ such that $H \setminus M$ is adjacent to v , then each such set H satisfies $|H \setminus M| \leq 2$.

For an example, refer to [Figure 2.3](#). In this figure, no vertex in X is adjacent to the three sets $T \setminus M$, $U \setminus M$, and $W \setminus M$, as required by [Definition 2.2\(1\)](#). The vertex u is adjacent to $T \setminus M$ and $U \setminus M$. There is only one vertex in $T \setminus M$ that is nonadjacent to u , as required by [Definition 2.2\(2\)](#). As required by [Definition 2.2\(3\)](#), the sets $T \setminus M$ and $U \setminus M$ each contain at most two vertices. The vertex w is only adjacent to $W \setminus M$. Because $W \setminus M$ contains more than two vertices, w is only adjacent to $W \setminus M$, as required by [Definition 2.2\(3\)](#).

Lemma 2.3. *Let X be a solution. Let $M := \bigcup_{v \in X} M(v)$ be the set constructed by Algorithm 2.2. The set M is peripheral with respect to X .*

Proof. We do not directly prove that for each vertex $v \in X$, the set M satisfies the properties in Definition 2.2. Instead, we show for each vertex $v \in X$ that the set $M(v)$ satisfies them. Because $M(v) \subseteq M$ for all $v \in X$, this is sufficient. We show the properties separately.

(1) Assume that there exists a vertex $v \in X$ and three sets $T, U, W \in \mathcal{H}(X)$ such that v has the neighbors $t \in T \setminus M(v)$, $u \in U \setminus M(v)$, and $w \in W \setminus M(v)$. This case is illustrated for the vertex v' in Figure 2.2(a). Because the vertices t, u , and w come from different connected components in $G - X$, they are pairwise nonadjacent. Phase 1 of Algorithm 2.2 would have added t, u , and w to $M(v)$. This contradicts the assumption that $t \in T \setminus M(v)$, $u \in U \setminus M(v)$, and $w \in T \setminus M(v)$. This shows the first property.

(2) Assume that there exists a set $H \in \mathcal{H}(X)$ such that the vertex $v \in X$ is adjacent to the vertex $u \in H \setminus M(v)$ and v is nonadjacent to the vertices $t \in H \setminus M(v)$ and $w \in H \setminus M(v)$. This is illustrated in Figure 2.2(b). Phase 2 of Algorithm 2.2 would have added the vertices t, u , and w to $M(v)$. This contradicts the assumption that $t, u, w \in H \setminus M(v)$. This shows the second property.

(3) Assume that there exist two sets $U, W \in \mathcal{H}(X)$ such that a vertex $v \in X$ has the neighbors $u \in U \setminus M(v)$ and $w \in W \setminus M(v)$. Without loss of generality, assume that $|U \setminus M(v)| > 2$. This situation is shown in Figure 2.2(c). Because $|U \setminus M(v)| > 2$, the 2-plex $G[U \setminus M(v)]$ is connected. Therefore, the vertex u has a neighbor $t \in U \setminus M(v)$. Phase 3 of Algorithm 2.2 would have added t, u , and w to $M(v)$. This contradicts the assumption that $u \in U \setminus M(v)$ and $w \in W \setminus M(v)$. To fully prove the third property, one can show $|W \setminus M(v)| \leq 2$ analogously. \square

In the following, we provide a more detailed view on the execution steps of Algorithm 2.2 and also analyze its running time. The following lemma enables us to execute Phase 3 of Algorithm 2.2 quickly.

Lemma 2.4. *Let X be a solution. For each vertex $v \in X$, let $M(v)$ be the set constructed by Phase 1 of Algorithm 2.2. If there exists a vertex $v \in X$ and two sets $U, W \in \mathcal{H}(X)$ such that $U \setminus M(v)$ and $W \setminus M(v)$ are adjacent to v , then $|N(v) \setminus (M(v) \cup X)| = 2$.*

Proof. Assume that the vertex $v \in X$ has three neighbors $t, u, w \notin M(v) \cup X$, as shown in Figure 2.2(a). According to the proof of Lemma 2.3, there are at most two sets $U, W \in \mathcal{H}(X)$ such that v is adjacent to $U \setminus M(v)$ and $W \setminus M(v)$. Without loss of generality, assume that $t, w \in W \setminus M(v)$ and $u \in U \setminus M(v)$. The vertices t, u , and w are neighbors of v and u is neither adjacent to t nor w . Phase 1 of Algorithm 2.2 would have added t, u , and w to $M(v)$. This contradicts the assumption that $t, u, w \notin M(v) \cup X$. \square

Lemma 2.5. *Given a solution X , Algorithm 2.2 can be carried out in $O(|X|n^2)$ time.*

Proof. Given a graph G and a solution X , we first compute the graph $G - X$ in $O(n + m)$ time. We can then compute the collection $\mathcal{H}(X)$ of vertex sets of the connected components in $G - X$. This can be done in $O(n + m)$ time using breadth-first search.

During the construction of $\mathcal{H}(X)$, we construct a table T that stores, for each vertex u , the set $H \in \mathcal{H}(X)$ with $u \in H$. We assume that set membership can be tested in constant time and that elements can be added to sets in constant time. For each vertex $v \in X$, we now execute the three phases:

In Phase 1, we construct the set $N(v) \setminus (M(v) \cup X)$ in $O(n)$ time. For each vertex $u \in N(v) \setminus (M(v) \cup X)$, we scan the set $N(v) \setminus (M(v) \cup X)$ again to find two vertices nonadjacent to u . Therefore, Phase 1 runs in $O(n^2)$ time for each vertex $v \in X$.

In Phase 2, for each $u \in N(v)$, we can (using the table T) find $H \in \mathcal{H}(X)$ with $u \in H$ in constant time. If $u \in X$ or $u \in M(v)$, then we proceed with the next $u \in N(v)$. Otherwise, in $O(n)$ time, we scan $H \setminus M(v)$ for two vertices that are nonadjacent to v . The running time for one vertex $u \in N(v)$ is thus $O(n)$, resulting in a running time of $O(n^2)$ for each $v \in X$.

In Phase 3, we first construct the set $N(v) \setminus (M(v) \cup X)$ in $O(n)$ time. According to [Lemma 2.4](#), if we have $|N(v) \setminus (M(v) \cup X)| \neq 2$, then there is at most one set $H \in \mathcal{H}(X)$ such that $H \setminus M(v)$ is adjacent to v . Thus, we continue with the next $v \in X$. Otherwise, let $u, w \in N(v) \setminus (M(v) \cup X)$. In constant time, we check (using the table T) if the vertices u and w are in different sets in $\mathcal{H}(X)$. If so, we scan the neighborhoods of u and w for a vertex $t \notin X \cup M(v)$ in $O(n)$ time. Thus, the total running time of Phase 3 is $O(n)$ for each v . [Algorithm 2.2](#) has a worst-case running time of $O(|X|n^2)$. \square

Note that, given a vertex v of a solution X , [Algorithm 2.2](#) only finds a FISG F containing v if the vertices in $F - \{v\}$ are neighbors of v or if at least two vertices of $F - \{v\}$ are in distinct connected components in $G - X$. This is not the case for the FISGs shown in [Figure 2.2\(d\)](#). Thus, [Algorithm 2.2](#) does not necessarily find them. We could search for these FISGs, but this would presumably increase the asymptotic running time of [Algorithm 2.2](#). It would not improve the worst-case size of our problem kernel.

2.2.2 Reducing the Number of Connected Components

In this section, given a solution X for the graph G , we present data reduction rules to bound the number of connected components in $G - X$ by a function only depending on the parameter k . To this end, we bound the size of the peripheral set constructed by [Algorithm 2.2](#) using the following data reduction rule, which is based on [Lemma 2.2](#).

Reduction Rule 2.1. Let X be a solution. For each vertex $v \in X$, let $M(v)$ be the set constructed by [Algorithm 2.2](#). If there exist a vertex $v \in X$ such that $|M(v)| > 3k$, then delete v from G and X and decrement k by one.

Lemma 2.6. *Reduction Rule 2.1 is correct. Given a solution X and the set $M(v)$ constructed by [Algorithm 2.2](#) for each vertex $v \in X$, we can exhaustively apply [Reduction Rule 2.1](#) in $O(|X|n + m)$ time.*

Proof. If [Algorithm 2.2](#) adds vertices to $M(v)$ for a vertex $v \in X$, then it has found a FISG that contains no vertices from $M(v)$. That is, apart from v , this FISG does not contain vertices from previously found FISGs. Thus, if $|M(v)| > 3k$, then $M(v)$ contains vertices of more than k FISGs that pairwise intersect only in the vertex v . According

to [Lemma 2.2](#), we can delete v from G and decrement the parameter k by one. For each vertex $v \in X$, the elements in $M(v)$ can be counted in $O(n)$ time. The deletion of all vertices $v \in X$ with $|M(v)| > 3k$ is possible in $O(n + m)$ time. \square

Observe that for each vertex v in a solution X , [Reduction Rule 2.1](#) does not change the set $M(v)$ constructed by [Algorithm 2.2](#). Also, the graph $G - X$ is invariant under [Reduction Rule 2.1](#); so is the set $\mathcal{H}(X)$. We can conclude that, after we have applied [Reduction Rule 2.1](#) to G and X , the proof of [Lemma 2.3](#) is still valid and shows that the set $\bigcup_{v \in X} M(v)$ is still peripheral by [Definition 2.2](#). Therefore, [Reduction Rule 2.1](#) does not only reduce the size of G and X ; we also obtain a smaller peripheral set. This is because after the exhaustive application of [Reduction Rule 2.1](#), for each vertex $v \in X$, the set $M(v)$ contains at most $3k$ vertices.

Corollary 2.2. *Let X be a solution for G . For each vertex $v \in X$, let $M(v)$ be the set constructed by [Algorithm 2.2](#). After exhaustively applying [Reduction Rule 2.1](#) to G and X , the peripheral set $M := \bigcup_{v \in X} M(v)$ contains at most $3k|X|$ vertices.*

Now that we have bounded the size of the peripheral set, we can, given a solution X , bound the number of connected components in $G - X$. First, we remove connected components from $G - X$, which are induced by the vertex sets in $\mathcal{H}(X)$, according to the following data reduction rule. Then, we use a peripheral set to show a bound on the number of the remaining connected components.

Reduction Rule 2.2. Let X be a solution. If there exists a set $H \in \mathcal{H}(X)$ that is nonadjacent to X , then remove the vertices in H from G .

Lemma 2.7. *[Reduction Rule 2.2](#) is correct. Given a solution X , we can exhaustively apply [Reduction Rule 2.2](#) in $O(n + m)$ time.*

Proof. Let $H \in \mathcal{H}(X)$ be the set of vertices chosen for removal by [Reduction Rule 2.2](#) and let $G' := G - H$. To prove the correctness of [Reduction Rule 2.2](#), we have to show that (G', k) is a yes-instance if and only if (G, k) is a yes-instance. If (G, k) is a yes-instance, then there exists a solution S with $|S| \leq k$ for G . Since $G - S$ is a 2-plex cluster graph, $G' - S$ is a 2-plex cluster graph as well. Thus, (G', k) is a yes-instance.

If (G', k) is a yes-instance, then there exists a solution S with $|S| \leq k$ for G' . Because [Reduction Rule 2.2](#) chooses to remove the vertices in H from G , the set H is nonadjacent to the solution X . Therefore, H induces an isolated 2-plex in G . It can therefore not contain vertices of a FISG. Thus, also $G - S$ is a 2-plex cluster graph and (G, k) is a yes-instance.

Considering the running time, we can obtain the set $\mathcal{H}(X)$ in $O(n + m)$ time. During the construction of $\mathcal{H}(X)$, we use a table T to store for each vertex u the set $H \in \mathcal{H}(X)$ with $u \in H$. We have already used this technique in the proof of [Lemma 2.5](#). We construct a further table T' as follows: for each vertex $v \in X$ and for each vertex $u \in N(v) \setminus X$, we set $T'[T[u]] = 1$. This can be done in $O(n + m)$ time. Then, the sets $H \in \mathcal{H}(X)$ with $T'[H] = 0$ are known to have no neighbor in X . These can be removed from G in $O(n + m)$ time. \square




Figure 2.4: A solution X and a vertex set M . The big circles represent sets in $\mathcal{H}(X)$, or connected components in $G - X$, likewise.

Given a solution X and a vertex set M , there are two possible scenarios for a connected component in $G - X$. Consider the vertex set $H \in \mathcal{H}(X)$ of such a connected component. As shown in [Figure 2.4\(a\)](#), it might be the case that the edges between the set $H \cap M$ and the solution X separate the vertices in H from the vertices in X . That is, the set $H \setminus M$ might be nonadjacent to X . As shown in [Figure 2.4\(b\)](#), it might also be the case that for a set $H \in \mathcal{H}(X)$, the set $H \setminus M$ is adjacent to X . According to [Definition 2.2\(1\)](#), if M is peripheral, then there are at most $2|X|$ sets $H \in \mathcal{H}(X)$ such that $H \setminus M$ is adjacent to X . To bound the total number of connected components in $G - X$, it is left to bound the number of sets $H \in \mathcal{H}(X)$ such that $H \setminus M$ is nonadjacent to X .

Lemma 2.8. *Let X be a solution and let M be a vertex set. After applying [Reduction Rule 2.2](#), there are at most $|M|$ sets $H \in \mathcal{H}(X)$ such that $H \setminus M$ is nonadjacent to X .*

Proof. Let $H \in \mathcal{H}(X)$ such that $H \setminus M$ is nonadjacent to the solution X . Because [Reduction Rule 2.2](#) has been applied, the set H must be adjacent to X . Otherwise, [Reduction Rule 2.2](#) would have removed H . Because the set $H \setminus M$ is nonadjacent to X , the set H must contain a vertex from M that is adjacent to X . Because a vertex in M can be contained in only one set in $\mathcal{H}(X)$, there can be at most $|M|$ sets $H \in \mathcal{H}(X)$ such that $H \setminus M$ is nonadjacent to X . \square

Given a solution X and a peripheral set M , we conclude from [Definition 2.2\(1\)](#) and [Lemma 2.8](#) that the number of the connected components in $G - X$ is at most $2|X| + |M|$.

2.3 Bounding the Sizes of Connected Components

In this section, given a solution X for G , we bound the *sizes* of the connected components in $G - X$ by functions only depending on the parameter k . Because we have already bounded the size of X and the *number* of connected components in $G - X$, this will finally lead to a problem kernel, as we have discussed in the beginning of [Chapter 2](#). In [Section 2.3.1](#), we present a generalization of the *module* concept [[9](#), [19](#)]. Based on this, we develop a data reduction rule to reduce the sizes of the connected components in $G - X$.




Figure 2.5: In each displayed graph, the vertices drawn as squares form an X -module.

Section 2.3.2 deals with the efficient execution of this data reduction rule and uses a peripheral set M to bound the sizes of the connected components. In Section 2.3.3, we present an additional data reduction rule that is only applicable to connected components induced by sets $H \in \mathcal{H}(X)$ such that $H \setminus M$ is nonadjacent to X . We have already specially handled this type of connected components in Section 2.2.2, where we bounded the *number* of connected components in $G - X$. We use the fact that the edges between the set $H \cap M$ and the solution X separate the vertices in H from the vertices in X , as shown in Figure 2.4(a). We will see that the additional data reduction rule presented in Section 2.3.3 is necessary to obtain an $O(k^2)$ -vertex problem kernel.

2.3.1 Data Reduction Based on Modules

Given a solution X , we now develop a characterization of vertices that can be removed from the connected components in $G - X$. This characterization is based on so-called *modules* [9, 19]. For a graph with the vertex set V , a vertex subset $Z \subseteq V$ is called a *module*, if any two vertices $u, v \in Z$ satisfy $N(v) \setminus Z = N(u) \setminus Z$. That is, a vertex not in Z is adjacent to either to all or to no vertices in Z . For example, the two vertices w and x in Figure 2.5(a) form a module. Modules also serve as the base of the *critical clique* concept introduced by Guo [10] to kernelize the CLUSTER EDITING problem.

Given a vertex set $W \subseteq V$, we generalize the module concept and introduce the W -*module*. We call a vertex set $Z \subseteq V$ a W -*module*, if any two vertices $u, v \in Z$ satisfy $N(u) \cap W = N(v) \cap W$. That is, a vertex in W is either adjacent to all or to no vertices in Z . Figure 2.5 shows examples for W -modules. Observe that if $Z \subseteq V$ is a $(V \setminus Z)$ -module, then Z is a module. Every subset of a W -module is again a W -module.

For a graph G and a solution X , we use the fact that the vertices in an X -module are equivalent with respect to their neighborhood in X . The idea is, informally, to represent a large X -module by one of its subsets and to replace the X -module by its representative. Consider the following example, which also shows that we cannot choose an arbitrary subset of an X -module as representative: the graph shown in Figure 2.5(a), call it G' , requires one vertex deletion to transform it into a 2-plex cluster graph. The vertices u, w , and x are part of an X -module. Observe that also for $G' - \{w, x\}$ shown in Figure 2.5(b), one vertex deletion is required to transform it into a 2-plex cluster graph. It follows that (G', k) is a yes-instance if and only if $(G' - \{w, x\}, k)$ is. Therefore, it is valid to

remove w and x from G' to obtain the graph shown in [Figure 2.5\(b\)](#). In contrast, the graph $G' - \{u\}$ shown in [Figure 2.5\(c\)](#) is a 2-plex cluster graph. Because $G' - \{u\}$ can be transformed into a 2-plex cluster graph with less vertex deletions than G' , we may not remove u from G' . To circumvent this problem, we give a constraint on the vertices that may be removed from an X -module in G . Recall that the connected components in $G - X$ are induced by vertex sets in $\mathcal{H}(X)$.

Definition 2.3. Let X be a solution. For $H \in \mathcal{H}(X)$, let $R(H) \subseteq H$ be an X -module. We call $R(H)$ *redundant* if there exists an X -module $Z(H)$ with $R(H) \subseteq Z(H) \subseteq H$ that contains all vertices from H that are nonadjacent to a vertex in $R(H)$.

Reduction Rule 2.3. Let X be a solution, let $H \in \mathcal{H}(X)$ and let $R(H)$ be a redundant subset of H . If $|R(H)| > k + 3$, then choose an arbitrary vertex from $R(H)$ and remove it from G .

In [Section 2.3.2](#) we construct a redundant set $R(H)$ for each vertex set $H \in \mathcal{H}(X)$ so that we can give a bound on the size of $H \setminus R(H)$. Using [Reduction Rule 2.3](#), we can then bound the size of $R(H)$. To prove the correctness of the above data reduction rule, we assume that [Reduction Rule 2.3](#) chooses to remove a vertex u from G and show that (G, k) is a yes-instance if and only if $(G - \{u\}, k)$ is a yes-instance. To this end, we need three further observations, which we present in the following lemmas.

Lemma 2.9. *Let \mathcal{G} be an arbitrary graph and let v be a vertex of \mathcal{G} . If $\mathcal{G} - \{v\}$ but not \mathcal{G} is a 2-plex cluster graph, then \mathcal{G} contains a FISG including the vertex v .*

Proof. Because \mathcal{G} is not a 2-plex cluster graph, it contains a FISG. If all FISGs in \mathcal{G} did not contain v , then no FISG could be destroyed by removing v from \mathcal{G} . Thus, $\mathcal{G} - \{v\}$ would not be a 2-plex cluster graph, contradicting our assumption. \square

Additionally to the assumption that [Reduction Rule 2.3](#) chooses to remove a vertex u from G , we now assume that $(G - \{u\}, k)$ is a yes-instance and show two further lemmas. Finally, we prove the correctness of [Reduction Rule 2.3](#).

Assumption 2.1. Let X be a solution and let $R(H)$ be a redundant subset of $H \in \mathcal{H}(X)$. Assume that [Reduction Rule 2.3](#) chooses to remove the vertex $u \in R(H)$ from G . Further, assume that $(G - \{u\}, k)$ is a yes-instance, that is, that there exists a solution S with $|S| \leq k$ for the graph $G - \{u\}$.

In the following, we write G' for $G - \{u\}$. Because we assume that [Reduction Rule 2.3](#) chooses to remove u from $R(H)$, the set $R(H)$ must contain more than $k + 3$ vertices, which implies $|R(H) \setminus (S \cup \{u\})| \geq 3$. Because $G[H]$ is a 2-plex, $G[R(H) \setminus (S \cup \{u\})]$ is a 2-plex containing at least three vertices. We can conclude that $G[R(H) \setminus (S \cup \{u\})]$ is connected. The graph $G[H \setminus (S \cup \{u\})]$ is connected for the same reason.

Lemma 2.10. *Under [Assumption 2.1](#), let $G - S$ contain a FISG F including u . Then in $G' - S$, the vertices of $F - \{u\}$ are connected to all vertices in $H \setminus (S \cup \{u\})$.*



(a) Case $w \in H \setminus S$. Because $H \setminus (S \cup \{u\})$ contains three vertices, the vertices in $H \setminus (S \cup \{u\})$ are connected.

(b) Case $w \in X$. Because $R(H) \setminus S$ is an X -module and u is adjacent to $w \in X$, all vertices in $R(H) \setminus S$ are adjacent to w .

Figure 2.6: The vertices u, v , and w are named as in the proof of [Lemma 2.10](#). Note that in either case, v is connected to all vertices in $H \setminus (S \cup \{u\})$ even if u is removed. Also note that the vertex v is not necessarily in X .

Proof. Let v be a vertex of $F - \{u\}$. Because F is connected, there exists a path in $G - S$, connecting v to u . This path has to use a neighbor w of u (possibly, $v = w$). We now distinguish between the two cases $w \in H \setminus S$ and $w \notin H \setminus S$.

According to [Assumption 2.1](#), $G[H \setminus (S \cup \{u\})]$ is connected. So if $w \in H \setminus S$, as shown in [Figure 2.6\(a\)](#), then w is connected to every other vertex in $H \setminus (S \cup \{u\})$. That is, w connects v to the vertices in $H \setminus (S \cup \{u\})$ even when u is removed.

Because w is in $G - S$, we have $w \notin S$. That is, if $w \notin H \setminus S$, then $w \notin H$. Because w is adjacent to $u \in R(H)$ and because there are no edges between distinct sets in $\mathcal{H}(X)$, we have $w \in X$, as shown in [Figure 2.6\(b\)](#). Because u is the neighbor of $w \in X$ and u is in the X -module $R(H)$, it follows that all vertices in $R(H) \setminus (S \cup \{u\})$ are neighbors of w in $G' - S$. So w connects v to the vertices in $H \setminus (S \cup \{u\})$ even when u is removed. \square

Lemma 2.11. *Under [Assumption 2.1](#), let $Z(H)$ be an X -module with $R(H) \subseteq Z(H) \subseteq H$ and let F be a FISG in $G - S$ including u . If a vertex v of F is nonadjacent to a vertex $w \in Z(H) \setminus S$, then $v \in H \setminus S$.*

Proof. Assume that a vertex $v \notin H \setminus S$ of F is nonadjacent to the vertex $w \in Z(H) \setminus S$. This situation is shown in [Figure 2.7](#). Because v is in $G - S$, we have $v \notin S$ and therefore $v \notin H$. We first show that v is nonadjacent to the X -module $Z(H) \setminus S$.

Assume that v is adjacent to the X -module $Z(H) \setminus S$. This implies $v \in X$, because there are no edges between distinct sets in $\mathcal{H}(X)$ and $v \notin H$. Because w is in the X -module $Z(H) \setminus S$ and because $v \in X$ is adjacent to $Z(H) \setminus S$, the vertex v must also be adjacent to w . This is by our assumption not the case, so v is nonadjacent to the X -module $Z(H) \setminus S$. In particular, v is nonadjacent to its subset $R(H) \setminus (S \cup \{u\})$.

According to [Lemma 2.10](#), the vertex v is connected to all vertices in $R(H) \setminus (S \cup \{u\})$ in $G' - S$. By [Assumption 2.1](#), there are at least three vertices in $R(H) \setminus (S \cup \{u\})$.




Figure 2.7: Because $v \in X$ is nonadjacent to the vertex w of the X -module $Z(H) \setminus S$, the vertex v can not be adjacent to any vertex in $Z(H) \setminus S$. These are more than three vertices. But v is connected to all vertices in $H \setminus S$, including $Z(H) \setminus S$.

These are connected but nonadjacent to v in $G' - S$. By [Theorem 1.1](#), this implies that there exists a FISG in $G' - S$, contradicting [Assumption 2.1](#). \square

Lemma 2.12. *Reduction Rule 2.3 is correct.*

Proof. Assume that [Reduction Rule 2.3](#) chooses to remove a vertex u from G . Let G' denote the graph $G - \{u\}$. We have to show that (G, k) is a yes-instance if and only if (G', k) is a yes-instance. If (G, k) is a yes-instance, then there exists a solution S with $|S| \leq k$ such that $G - S$ is a 2-plex cluster graph. Then, also $G' - S$ is a 2-plex cluster graph and (G', k) is a yes-instance.

If (G', k) is a yes-instance, then there exists a solution S with $|S| \leq k$ such that $G' - S$ is a 2-plex cluster graph, implying that [Assumption 2.1](#) is true. Assume that $G - S$ contains a FISG. By [Lemma 2.9](#), there exists a FISG F in $G - S$ containing the vertex u . Because F is a FISG, it contains a vertex v that is connected but nonadjacent to two vertices w, x in F .

If $u \notin \{v, w, x\}$, then [Lemma 2.10](#) shows that the vertices v, w, x are connected to all vertices in $H \setminus (S \cup \{u\})$ in $G' - S$. Thus, the vertices v, w , and x would exist in $G' - S$ and would be connected. That contradicts $G' - S$ being a 2-plex cluster graph, because v is nonadjacent but connected to the vertices w and x . Thus, u must be one of v, w or x .

First, assume that $u = v$. That is, the vertex $u \in R(H)$ is nonadjacent to the vertices w and x . From [Lemma 2.11](#), we can conclude that $w, x \in H \setminus S$. Because also $u \in H \setminus S$, this contradicts the graph $G[H \setminus S]$ being a 2-plex. So u must either be w or x .

Without loss of generality, assume that $u = w$. That is, the vertex $u \in R(H)$ is nonadjacent to v . By [Lemma 2.11](#), we have $v \in H \setminus S$. By [Definition 2.3](#), there exists an X -module $Z(H)$ with $R(H) \subseteq Z(H) \subseteq H$ and $v \in Z(H)$, because the vertex $v \in H \setminus S$ is nonadjacent to the vertex $u \in R(H)$. But then, because the vertex $v \in Z(H)$ is nonadjacent to x , the vertex x must also be in $H \setminus S$ by [Lemma 2.11](#). This again contradicts $G[H \setminus S]$ being a 2-plex. We conclude that $G - S$ must be a 2-plex cluster graph. Thus, (G', k) is a yes-instance. \square

2.3.2 Constructing Redundant Sets

In this section, we show how to efficiently find redundant sets as defined in [Definition 2.3](#). Our goal is, given a solution X and the vertex set $H \in \mathcal{H}(X)$ of a connected component in $G - X$, to construct a redundant subset $R(H) \subseteq H$ so that the size of $H \setminus R(H)$ is bounded by a function only depending on the parameter k . Then, we can apply [Reduction Rule 2.3](#) to $R(H)$ to bound the overall size of H .

To this end, we employ a peripheral set M . Using [Corollary 2.2](#), we can bound the size of M by $3k|X|$. Thus, for each $H \in \mathcal{H}(X)$, we only need to bound the size of the set $H \setminus M$. [Definition 2.2\(2\)](#) for peripheral sets guarantees that if a vertex $v \in X$ is adjacent to $H \setminus M$, then there is at most one vertex in $H \setminus M$ that is nonadjacent to the vertex v . Thus, the number of vertices in $H \setminus M$ that are nonadjacent to a vertex in $N(H \setminus M) \cap X$ cannot exceed $|X|$. The size of X is in turn bounded by $4k$ in [Corollary 2.1](#). It follows that we only have to bound the number of vertices in $H \setminus M$ that are adjacent to *all* vertices in $N(H \setminus M) \cap X$. We show that we can obtain a redundant set from such vertices by employing the following algorithm:

Algorithm 2.3. Given a set M that is peripheral with respect to a solution X , for each $H \in \mathcal{H}(X)$, first find all vertices belonging to $H \cap M$ and $N(H \setminus M) \cap X$. Then, construct the sets

$$\begin{aligned} A(H) &:= \{u \in H \mid \exists w \in H \cap M : u \text{ is nonadjacent to } w\}, \\ B(H) &:= \{u \in H \mid \exists w \in N(H \setminus M) \cap X : u \text{ is nonadjacent to } w\}, \text{ and} \\ C(H) &:= \{u \in H \mid \exists w \in B(H) : u \text{ is nonadjacent to } w\}. \end{aligned}$$

Return $R(H) := H \setminus \bar{R}(H)$, where $\bar{R}(H) := A(H) \cup B(H) \cup C(H) \cup (H \cap M)$.

Lemma 2.13. *Given a set M that is peripheral with respect to a solution X , for $H \in \mathcal{H}(X)$, let $R(H)$ be the set constructed by [Algorithm 2.3](#). The set $R(H)$ is redundant.*

Proof. According to [Definition 2.3](#), we have to show that there exists an X -module $Z(H)$ with $R(H) \subseteq Z(H) \subseteq H$ that contains all vertices in H that are nonadjacent to a vertex in $R(H)$. Because $G[H]$ is a 2-plex, we could choose $Z(H) := R(H)$. But with s -plexes in mind, we present a proof that does not rely on the fact that $G[H]$ is a 2-plex.

Consider the set $Z(H) := \{u \in H \setminus M \mid N(u) \cap X = N(H \setminus M) \cap X\}$. For any two vertices $u, v \in Z(H)$, we have that $N(u) \cap X = N(H \setminus M) \cap X = N(v) \cap X$. Thus, the set $Z(H) \subseteq H$ is an X -module. To show that a vertex u is in $Z(H)$, it is sufficient to show $u \in H \setminus M$ and $N(H \setminus M) \cap X \subseteq N(u) \cap X$. The opposite inclusion $N(H \setminus M) \cap X \supseteq N(u) \cap X$ follows directly from $u \in H \setminus M$.

We first show that $R(H) \subseteq Z(H)$. Because $R(H) \cap M = \emptyset$, every vertex in $R(H)$ is in $H \setminus M$. Because $R(H) \cap B(H) = \emptyset$, for a vertex $w \in N(H \setminus M) \cap X$, each vertex $u \in R(H)$ is adjacent to w . Otherwise, u would be in $B(H)$. From this, we can conclude that $N(H \setminus M) \cap X \subseteq N(u) \cap X$. This implies $u \in Z(H)$.

Now assume that there exists a vertex $u \in R(H)$ and a vertex $w \in H$ such that u and w are nonadjacent. From $R(H) \cap A(H) = \emptyset$ follows that $w \notin M$. Otherwise, u would be in $A(H)$. Because $R(H) \cap C(H) = \emptyset$, for a vertex $v \in N(H \setminus M) \cap X$, the vertex

w is adjacent to v . Otherwise, $w \in B(H)$ and therefore $u \in C(H)$. Thus, we have $N(H \setminus M) \cap X \subseteq N(w) \cap X$ and $w \in Z(H)$. \square

Lemma 2.14. *Given a set M that is peripheral with respect to a solution X , [Algorithm 2.3](#) can be carried out in $O(n^2)$ time.*

Proof. Observe that we can construct the set $\mathcal{H}(X)$ in $O(n + m)$ time. During the construction of $\mathcal{H}(X)$, we use a table T to store for each vertex u the set $H \in \mathcal{H}(X)$ with $u \in H$. We now scan each $H \in \mathcal{H}(X)$ in four passes, classifying each vertex $u \in H$ as follows:

The first pass constructs the sets $H \cap M$ and $N(H \setminus M) \cap X$. If $u \in M$, we memorize the vertex u to belong to $H \cap M$. If $u \notin M$, we memorize its neighbors in X to belong to $N(H \setminus M) \cap X$. Finding u 's neighbors in X can take $O(|X|)$ time.

The second pass constructs the sets $A(H)$ and $B(H)$ with the results from the first pass as follows: if the vertex u is nonadjacent to a vertex in $H \cap M$, then add u to $A(H)$. This works in $O(|H \cap M|)$ time. If the vertex u is nonadjacent to a vertex in $N(H \setminus M) \cap X$, which can be checked in $O(|X|)$ time, then add u to $B(H)$.

The third pass is similar to the second pass and constructs $C(H)$ from $B(H)$ in $O(|B(H)|)$ time. In a final pass, we add all vertices u that are not in $A(H), B(H), C(H)$ or M to $R(H)$. This can be done in constant time for each vertex u .

Finally, we encounter at most n vertices scanning through each $H \in \mathcal{H}(X)$, yielding a total running time of $O(n^2)$. \square

Lemma 2.15. *Given a set M that is peripheral with respect to a solution X , we can exhaustively apply [Reduction Rule 2.3](#) in $O(n^2)$ time.*

Proof. We first, for all $H \in \mathcal{H}(X)$, use [Algorithm 2.3](#) on the sets X and M to construct the sets $R(H)$ in $O(n^2)$ time ([Lemma 2.14](#)). According to [Lemma 2.13](#), these sets are redundant. Thus, [Reduction Rule 2.3](#) can be applied.

Observe that after [Reduction Rule 2.3](#) removes a vertex $u \in R(H)$ from G , the set $R(H) \setminus \{u\}$ is still redundant. Thus, we can remove a whole subset of $R(H)$ from G without constructing new redundant sets between vertex deletions.

For each $H \in \mathcal{H}(X)$, we can count the number of vertices in $R(H)$ in $O(|R(H)|)$ time. Removing a set of vertices works in $O(n + m)$ time. \square

Given an instance (G, k) and a solution X for G , we can now bound the sizes of the connected components in $G - X$ by a function that only depends on the parameter k .

Lemma 2.16. *Let the set M be peripheral with respect to a solution X . For a set $H \in \mathcal{H}(X)$, let $R(H)$ be the redundant subset constructed by [Algorithm 2.3](#). After exhaustively applying [Reduction Rule 2.3](#) using $R(H)$, the number of vertices in $H \setminus M$ is at most $|H \cap M| + 2|N(H \setminus M) \cap X| + k + 3$.*

Proof. To prove the above lemma, we study the sets constructed in [Algorithm 2.3](#). By construction of $R(H)$, we have $R(H) = H \setminus \bar{R}(H)$. Observe that because $\bar{R}(H) \subseteq H$, we also have $H \setminus R(H) = \bar{R}(H)$. Because $G[H]$ is a 2-plex, there exists at most one

vertex $u \in H$ for every vertex $w \in H \cap M$ such that u and w are nonadjacent. Thus, we have $|A(H)| \leq |H \cap M|$. Because M is peripheral, we can conclude from [Definition 2.2\(2\)](#) that for each vertex $w \in N(H \setminus M) \cap X$, there is at most one vertex $u \in H \setminus M$ such that u and w are nonadjacent. If $N(H \setminus M) \cap X = \emptyset$, then $B(H) = \emptyset$. Thus, we have $|B(H)| \leq |N(H \setminus M) \cap X|$. Now, again because $G[H]$ is a 2-plex, there exists at most one vertex $u \in H$ for every vertex $w \in B(H)$ such that u and w are nonadjacent. Thus, we have $|C(H)| \leq |B(H)| \leq |N(H \setminus M) \cap X|$. This shows that the number of vertices in $H \setminus (R(H) \cup M)$ cannot exceed $|H \cap M| + 2|N(H \setminus M) \cap X|$. To get the total number of vertices in $H \setminus M$, we must add $|R(H)|$. [Reduction Rule 2.3](#) bounds $|R(H)|$ to $k + 3$. \square

2.3.3 Data Reduction Based on Separators

In the previous section, we have, given a solution X , bounded the sizes of the connected components in $G - X$. Given a peripheral set M , we now present an additional data reduction rule to further reduce the sizes of the connected components induced by vertex sets from the collection $\mathcal{H}_0(X, M) := \{H \in \mathcal{H}(X) \mid H \setminus M \text{ is nonadjacent to } X\}$. The vertices in a set $H \in \mathcal{H}_0(X, M)$ are *separated* from the vertices in the solution X by the edges between M and X , as shown in [Figure 2.4\(a\)](#). [Figure 2.4\(b\)](#) shows an example for a vertex set that is *not* in $\mathcal{H}_0(X, M)$. The following observation makes clear why an additional data reduction rule for sets in $\mathcal{H}_0(X, M)$ is necessary.

According to [Corollary 2.2](#), if k is our parameter, we can employ [Reduction Rule 2.1](#) to obtain a peripheral set M containing at most $3k|X|$ vertices. By [Lemma 2.8](#), exhaustively applying [Reduction Rule 2.2](#) gives us a bound of $|M|$ on the number of sets in $\mathcal{H}_0(X, M)$. Since we have $|M| \leq 3k|X|$, if we bound the size of each set in $\mathcal{H}_0(X, M)$ by a function linear in k , then the total number of vertices in sets in $\mathcal{H}_0(X, M)$ is $O(|X|k^2)$. To conclude an $O(|X|k)$ -vertex problem kernel, we have to provide a data reduction rule additionally to [Reduction Rule 2.3](#).

For each connected component in $G - X$ that is induced by a set $H \in \mathcal{H}_0(X, M)$, we now bound $|H|$ by a function linear in $|H \cap M|$. Thus, we effectively bound the total number of vertices in sets in $\mathcal{H}_0(X, M)$ by $O(|M|)$. Observe that since X is a solution, every FISG that contains a vertex from a set $H \in \mathcal{H}_0(X, M)$ must also contain a vertex from X . Because $H \setminus M$ is nonadjacent to X , the FISG F must also contain a vertex from $H \cap M$. The following data reduction rule is based on the idea that if $|H \setminus M|$ is too large and contains vertices of FISGs, then we can find a small solution containing the vertices in $H \cap M$.

Reduction Rule 2.4. Let X be a solution and let $H \in \mathcal{H}(X)$. Given a vertex set M such that $H \setminus M$ is nonadjacent to X , if $|H \setminus M| > |H \cap M| + 1$, then choose a vertex from $H \setminus M$ and remove it from G .

To prove the correctness of this data reduction rule, we need a series of observations. To this end, we use the following definition:

Definition 2.4. For two vertex sets U and W , we introduce the set $E(U, W)$ of edges between U and W . That is, $E(U, W) = \{\{u, w\} \mid u \in U \text{ and } w \in W \text{ are adjacent in } G\}$. We say that a solution *destroys* an edge e , if the solution contains a vertex incident to e .




Figure 2.8: Empty squares are the vertices in the set M . Filled squares are in the solution S . Dashed edges are destroyed by S . Note that there are no edges from X to vertices in $H \setminus M$. Shown are FISGs that result if a solution S does not destroy an edge $e \in E(H, X)$ and if S does not contain all but one vertex in $H \setminus M$.

For a solution X and the vertex set $H \in \mathcal{H}(X)$ of a connected component in $G - X$, the edges in $E(H, X)$ separate the vertices in H from the vertices in X . This is shown in Figure 2.8. If a solution S destroys all edges in $E(H, X)$, then $G[H \setminus S]$ is an isolated 2-plex.

Lemma 2.17. *Let S and X be solutions. Assume that there is a vertex set M and a set $H \in \mathcal{H}(X)$ such that $H \setminus M$ is nonadjacent to X . If S does not destroy all edges in $E(H, X)$, then it contains $|H \setminus M| - 1$ vertices from $H \setminus M$.*

Proof. Because the solution S does not destroy all edges in $E(H, X)$, there must exist an edge $e \in E(H \setminus S, X \setminus S)$. Now assume that S does not contain two distinct vertices $u, w \in H \setminus M$, as shown in Figure 2.8. Because $u, w \notin M$ and because $H \setminus M$ is nonadjacent to X , the vertex $v \in X \setminus S$ incident to the edge e cannot be adjacent to the vertices $u, w \in H \setminus (S \cup M)$. But $H \setminus S$ contains at least three vertices: u, w and at least one vertex from $H \cap M$. Thus, the vertex v is connected but nonadjacent to u and w . We can conclude from Theorem 1.1 that they are part of a FISG. This contradicts S being a solution. \square

Lemma 2.18. *Let S and X be solutions. Assume that there is a vertex set M and a set $H \in \mathcal{H}(X)$ such that $H \setminus M$ is nonadjacent to X . If $|H \setminus M| \geq |H \cap M| + 1$, then there exists a solution S' with $|S'| \leq |S|$ that destroys all edges in $E(H, X)$.*

Proof. Assume that S does not destroy all edges in $E(H, X)$. From Lemma 2.17 and from $|H \setminus M| \geq |H \cap M| + 1$, we can conclude that there are at least $|H \cap M|$ vertices from $H \setminus M$ in S . The set $S' := S \cup (H \cap M) \setminus (H \setminus M)$ destroys all edges in $E(H, X)$. Because S contains at least $|H \cap M|$ vertices from $H \setminus M$ and S' instead contains $H \cap M$, the set S' is not larger than S . The set S' is a solution, because $G' := G - (S \cup (H \cap M))$ is a 2-plex cluster graph and because $G - S'$ is G' with the additional connected component formed by the 2-plex $G[H \setminus M]$. \square

Lemma 2.19. *Reduction Rule 2.4 is correct. Given a vertex set M and a solution X , we can exhaustively apply Reduction Rule 2.4 in $O(n + m)$ time.*

Proof. Let u be the vertex chosen by [Reduction Rule 2.4](#) and let $G' := G - \{u\}$. We have to show that (G', k) is a yes-instance if and only if (G, k) is a yes-instance. If (G, k) is a yes-instance, then there exists a solution S with $|S| \leq k$ for G . Since $G - S$ is a 2-plex cluster graph, $G' - S$ is a 2-plex cluster graph as well. Thus, (G', k) is a yes-instance.

If (G', k) is a yes-instance, then there exists a solution S with $|S| \leq k$ for G' . From [Lemma 2.18](#), we can without loss of generality assume that the solution S destroys all edges in $E(H, X)$. Now assume that $G - S$ is not a 2-plex cluster graph. From [Lemma 2.9](#), we can conclude that G contains a FISG F including u . The FISG F also contains a vertex $v \in X \setminus S$, because X is a solution. However, the vertices u and v are not connected in $G - S$, because S destroys all edges in $E(H, X)$. Therefore, F cannot exist in $G - S$ and S must be a solution for G . Because $|S| \leq k$, it follows that (G, k) is a yes-instance.

To prove the running time, recall that we can construct the set $\mathcal{H}(X)$ in $O(n + m)$ time. Then, in $O(n + m)$ time, we construct a table T so that for every neighbor v of X , we have $T[v] = 1$. For each $H \in \mathcal{H}(X)$, we now count the number of vertices in $H \setminus M$ and $H \cap M$ in $O(|H|)$ time. If in the counting process, we find a vertex $v \in H \setminus M$ with $T[v] = 1$, then $H \setminus M$ is adjacent to X . This implies that [Reduction Rule 2.4](#) is not applicable for H ; we continue with the next set in $\mathcal{H}(X)$. The removal of vertices works in $O(n + m)$ time. \square

Corollary 2.3. *Let X be a solution. Assume that there is a vertex set M and a set $H \in \mathcal{H}(X)$ such that $H \setminus M$ is nonadjacent to X . After exhaustively applying [Reduction Rule 2.4](#) given M , the set $H \setminus M$ contains at most $|H \cap M| + 1$ vertices.*

2.4 Kernel Size

In this section, we count the total number of vertices remaining in a graph G after all data reduction rules have been applied. To this end, we assume that we have a solution X and a set M that is peripheral with reference to X . Then, we count the vertices in X , the vertices in M and the vertices in the connected components in $G - X$ that are not in M .

Observe that to bound the sizes of the connected components in $G - X$, which are induced by sets in $\mathcal{H}(X)$, we have presented *two* data reduction rules in [Section 2.3](#). [Reduction Rule 2.3](#) is applicable to all sets in $\mathcal{H}(X)$. The additional [Reduction Rule 2.4](#) is only applicable to sets in the collection $\mathcal{H}_0(X, M) := \{H \in \mathcal{H}(X) \mid H \setminus M \text{ is nonadjacent to } X\}$. Thus, we independently count the vertices in the sets in $\mathcal{H}_0(X, M)$ and the vertices in the sets in $\mathcal{H}_1(X, M) := \{H \in \mathcal{H}(X) \mid H \setminus M \text{ is adjacent to } X\}$. [Figure 2.4\(a\)](#) shows an example for a set in $\mathcal{H}_0(X, M)$, [Figure 2.4\(b\)](#) shows an example for a set in $\mathcal{H}_1(X, M)$. We have already made this distinction when we bounded the number of sets in $\mathcal{H}(X)$ in [Section 2.2.2](#); it is not the only distinction we make:

[Definition 2.2\(3\)](#) for peripheral sets ensures that if there is more than one set $H \in \mathcal{H}_1(X, M)$ such that a vertex $v \in X$ is adjacent to $H \setminus M$, then each such set H satisfies $|H \setminus M| \leq 2$. To allow for a tighter worst-case analysis, we count the vertices in such sets independently. To this end, we use the following lemma:

Lemma 2.20. *Let the set M be peripheral with respect to a solution X . For the sets*

$$\begin{aligned} X_1 &:= \{v \in X \mid \text{there is exactly one set } H \in \mathcal{H}(X) \text{ such that } H \setminus M \text{ is adjacent to } v\}, \\ X_2 &:= \{v \in X \mid \text{there are two or no sets } H \in \mathcal{H}(X) \text{ such that } H \setminus M \text{ is adjacent to } v\} \\ &= X \setminus X_1 \text{ (because } M \text{ is peripheral and because of Definition 2.2(1)) and} \\ \tilde{\mathcal{H}} &:= \{H \in \mathcal{H}_1(X, M) \mid H \setminus M \text{ is adjacent to only vertices in } X_1\}, \end{aligned}$$

the following relations hold:

$$\sum_{H \in \tilde{\mathcal{H}}} |N(H \setminus M) \cap X| = |X_1| \quad \text{and} \quad |\tilde{\mathcal{H}}| \leq |X_1| \quad \text{and} \quad |\mathcal{H}_1(X, M) \setminus \tilde{\mathcal{H}}| \leq 2|X_2|.$$

Proof. Let $H \in \tilde{\mathcal{H}}$ be a set such that $H \setminus M$ is only adjacent to vertices in X_1 . For a vertex $v \in X_1$ that is adjacent to $H \setminus M$, there is by definition of X_1 no other set $H' \in \mathcal{H}_1(X, M)$ such that $H' \setminus M$ is adjacent to v . Thus, if we count the number of vertices in $N(H \setminus M) \cap X$ for all $H \in \tilde{\mathcal{H}}$, then we count every vertex $v \in X_1$ exactly once. This proves the first relation.

For each $H \in \tilde{\mathcal{H}} \subseteq \mathcal{H}_1(X, M)$, there is by definition of $\mathcal{H}_1(X, M)$ at least one vertex $v \in X_1$ such that $H \setminus M$ is adjacent to v . Thus, $|\tilde{\mathcal{H}}| \leq |X_1|$.

According to Definition 2.2(1), there are at most two sets $H \in \mathcal{H}(X)$ such that $H \setminus M$ is adjacent to v . The set $\mathcal{H}_1(X, M) \setminus \tilde{\mathcal{H}}$ only contains sets $H \in \mathcal{H}_1(X, M)$ such that a vertex in X_2 is adjacent to $H \setminus M$. This yields $|\mathcal{H}_1(X, M) \setminus \tilde{\mathcal{H}}| \leq 2|X_2|$. \square

Given a solution X and a set M that is peripheral with respect to X , we now assume that all data reduction rules have been exhaustively applied to our input graph G and count the vertices in the connected components in $G - X$ that are not in M .

Lemma 2.21. *Let X be a solution and let the set M be peripheral with respect to X . After exhaustively applying Reduction Rule 2.2, Reduction Rule 2.3 and Reduction Rule 2.4, it holds that*

$$\left| \bigcup_{H \in \mathcal{H}(X)} (H \setminus M) \right| \leq (k + 5)|X| + 2|M|.$$

Proof. Let $\tilde{\mathcal{H}}$, X_1 , and X_2 be as defined in Lemma 2.20. We can conclude from Lemma 2.16 and Corollary 2.3 that $|\bigcup_{H \in \mathcal{H}(X)} H \setminus sM|$ is upper-bounded by

$$\sum_{H \in \mathcal{H}_1(X, M)} (|H \cap M| + 2|N(H \setminus M) \cap X| + k + 3) + \sum_{H \in \mathcal{H}_0(X, M)} (|H \cap M| + 1).$$

Because the sets in $\mathcal{H}(X)$ are pairwise disjoint, the two occurrences of $|H \cap M|$ sum up to a total of $|M|$, yielding

$$\sum_{H \in \mathcal{H}_1(X, M)} (2|N(H \setminus M) \cap X| + k + 3) + |M| + |\mathcal{H}_0(X, M)|.$$

By [Lemma 2.8](#), we have that $|\mathcal{H}_0(X, M)| \leq |M|$. Thus, the above term is bounded by

$$\sum_{H \in \mathcal{H}_1(X, M)} (2|N(H \setminus M) \cap X| + k + 3) + 2|M|.$$

For each set $H \in \mathcal{H}_1(X, M) \setminus \tilde{\mathcal{H}}$, the set $H \setminus M$ must be adjacent to a vertex from X_2 . This follows from the definition of $\tilde{\mathcal{H}}$ in [Lemma 2.20](#) and by definition of $\mathcal{H}_1(X, M)$. From [Definition 2.2\(3\)](#), we can conclude that $|H \setminus M| \leq 2$, implying that only sets in $\tilde{\mathcal{H}}$ may actually contain $2|N(H \setminus M) \cap X| + k + 3$ vertices that are not in M . We obtain

$$\left| \bigcup_{H \in \mathcal{H}(X)} (H \setminus M) \right| \leq \sum_{H \in \tilde{\mathcal{H}}} (2|N(H \setminus M) \cap X| + k + 3) + 2|\mathcal{H}_1(X, M) \setminus \tilde{\mathcal{H}}| + 2|M|.$$

Applying [Lemma 2.20](#), we can bound this by

$$2|X_1| + |X_1|(k + 3) + 4|X_2| + 2|M| \leq (5 + k)|X_1| + 4|X_2| + 2|M|$$

We can interpret this term as a function in $|X_1|$ and $|X_2|$ with fixed $|X|$ and $k \geq 0$. Subject to the constraint $|X_1| + |X_2| = |X|$, it is maximal for $|X_1| = |X|$ and $|X_2| = 0$. This yields the desired result. \square

Theorem 2.1. 2-PLEX CLUSTER VERTEX DELETION has a problem kernel containing $(10k + 6)|X| \leq 40k^2 + 24k$ vertices. It can be found in $O(kn^2)$ time.

Proof. Given a 2-PLEX CLUSTER VERTEX DELETION instance (G, k) , we first compute a constant-factor approximate solution X using [Algorithm 2.1](#). Then, we compute a set that is peripheral with respect to X using [Algorithm 2.2](#). We apply [Reduction Rule 2.1](#), from which we obtain a new parameter $k' \leq k$ and a peripheral set M with $|M| \leq 3k|X|$ according to [Corollary 2.2](#). Finally, we apply [Reduction Rule 2.2](#), [Reduction Rule 2.3](#), and [Reduction Rule 2.4](#) to G . The so-obtained graph and the new parameter k' constitute our problem kernel.

We first show that after applying all data reduction rules to G , the size of G only depends on the parameter k . To this end, we count the vertices in the solution X , the vertices in the peripheral set M and the vertices in $G - X$ that are not in the peripheral set M . If (G, k) is a yes-instance, then [Corollary 2.1](#) gives an upper bound of $4k$ on the number of vertices in the constant-factor approximate solution X . If X is larger, we terminate our kernelization algorithm and output that (G, k) is a no-instance. By applying [Reduction Rule 2.1](#), we obtain a peripheral set M that contains at most $3k|X|$ vertices according to [Corollary 2.2](#). By exhaustively applying [Reduction Rule 2.2](#), [Reduction Rule 2.3](#), and [Reduction Rule 2.4](#) to G , we can use [Lemma 2.21](#) to give a bound of $(k + 5)|X| + 2|M| = (7k + 5)|X|$ on the number of vertices in $G - X$ that are not in the peripheral set M . Adding $|X|$ and $|M|$, we conclude that G contains at most $(10k + 6)|X| = 40k^2 + 24k$ vertices.

The correctness of [Reduction Rule 2.1](#), [Reduction Rule 2.2](#), [Reduction Rule 2.3](#), and [Reduction Rule 2.4](#), has been shown in [Lemma 2.2](#), [Lemma 2.7](#), [Lemma 2.12](#), and [Lemma 2.19](#), respectively.

Finally, we show the running time of our kernelization algorithm. When we construct an approximate solution X using [Algorithm 2.1](#), we can stop after finding more than k pairwise vertex-disjoint FISGs, because this implies that (G, k) is a no-instance. Analogously to the proof of [Lemma 2.1](#), it follows that we can construct X in $O(k(n + m))$ time. [Algorithm 2.2](#), [Reduction Rule 2.1](#), [Reduction Rule 2.2](#), [Reduction Rule 2.3](#), and [Reduction Rule 2.4](#) run in $O(kn^2)$ time according to [Lemma 2.5](#), [Lemma 2.6](#), [Lemma 2.7](#), [Lemma 2.15](#), and [Lemma 2.19](#), respectively. \square

To solve a 2-PLEX CLUSTER VERTEX DELETION instance, we can compute a problem kernel with $O(k^2)$ vertices and reduce this problem kernel to a 4-HITTING SET instance with $O((k^2)^4)$ sets, as discussed in [Chapter 1](#). Then, we can solve this 4-HITTING SET instance by combining Wahlström’s algorithm for 3-HITTING SET [[25](#)] with iterative compression, as discussed by Dom et al. [[5](#)].

Corollary 2.4. *Using 4-HITTING SET, we can solve 2-PLEX CLUSTER VERTEX DELETION in $O(3.076^k + k^8 + kn^2)$ time.*

Concluding Remarks. Peripheral sets played a central role in all stages of our kernelization algorithm. After constructing a peripheral set M with respect to a solution X using [Algorithm 2.2](#), the peripheral set M helps us to bound the number of the connected components in $G - X$ in [Section 2.2.2](#). For a connected component in $G - X$, in [Section 2.3.2](#) we use the peripheral set M to bound the number of vertices that are *not* in the redundant set constructed by [Algorithm 2.3](#). Then, we remove vertices from that redundant set to bound the overall size of the connected component. In [Section 2.3.3](#), we use the set of edges between M and X as a separator to develop an additional data reduction rule to further reduce the sizes of the connected components in $G - X$.

To construct a set M that is peripheral with respect to a solution X , we employ [Algorithm 2.2](#). We could also construct M by enumerating all minimal FISGs in G , which are shown in [Figure 1.1](#). Then, for each vertex $v \in X$, we could pick an inclusion-maximal set of FISGs that pairwise intersect only in v . However, because each minimal FISG contains four vertices, the total number of minimal FISGs in a graph with n vertices is $O(n^4)$. In contrast, [Algorithm 2.2](#) finds at most $O(n)$ FISGs for each vertex $v \in X$. It runs in $O(kn^2)$ time. Therefore, the running time of enumerating all minimal FISGs in a graph might be significantly worse than that of [Algorithm 2.2](#).

3 Kernelization for s -Plex Cluster Vertex Deletion

In this chapter, we generalize the problem kernel for 2-PLEX CLUSTER VERTEX DELETION to s -PLEX CLUSTER VERTEX DELETION. We will see that many definitions and lemmas that we have worked out for the case $s = 2$ also work for general s if we modify them slightly. In [Section 3.1](#), we first show how to find an approximate solution X for a graph G , so that $G - X$ is an s -plex cluster graph. Then, we generalize our concept of a peripheral set and show how to find one. In [Section 3.2](#), we revise our data reduction rules to bound the number and the sizes of the connected components in $G - X$. In [Section 3.3](#), we conclude a problem kernel with $O(k^2 s^3)$ vertices for s -PLEX CLUSTER VERTEX DELETION.

We now turn our attention to the main difference between 2-PLEX CLUSTER VERTEX DELETION and s -PLEX CLUSTER VERTEX DELETION. For 2-PLEX CLUSTER VERTEX DELETION, we used the fact that a 2-plex containing at least three vertices is connected. We used this fact to construct a peripheral set using [Algorithm 2.2](#), in the correctness proof of [Reduction Rule 2.3](#), and in the correctness proof of [Reduction Rule 2.4](#). To generalize these proofs, we need the following result:

Lemma 3.1. *An s -plex containing at least $2s - 1$ vertices is a connected graph.*

Proof. Let $G = (V, E)$ be an s -plex with more than one connected component. Because G is an s -plex, a vertex in G is nonadjacent to at most $s - 1$ other vertices in G .

Let $W \subseteq V$ be the vertex set of a connected component of G . Because a vertex in W is nonadjacent to all vertices in $V \setminus W$, we have that $|V \setminus W| \leq s - 1$ and $|W| \leq s - 1$. Therefore, it holds that $|V| \leq 2s - 2$. Thus, if an s -plex contains at least $2s - 1$ vertices, it must be a connected graph. \square

Note that the bound given in [Lemma 3.1](#) is tight. Consider two cliques with $s - 1$ vertices each. These two cliques can still be considered as one single s -plex with $2s - 2$ vertices.

3.1 Approximate Solutions and Peripheral Sets

Given an s -PLEX CLUSTER VERTEX DELETION instance (G, k) , in this section we first show how to find an approximate solution X for G . We then generalize our concept of peripheral sets and construct a set that is peripheral with respect to the solution X .

Similarly to the case $s = 2$, we can easily find a constant-factor approximate solution for s -PLEX CLUSTER VERTEX DELETION using the algorithm by Guo et al. [[11](#)], which finds an $O(s + \sqrt{s})$ -vertex FISG in $O(s(n + m))$ time if we apply it to a graph that

is not a s -plex cluster graph. In particular, if T_s is the maximum integer satisfying $T_s \cdot (T_s + 1) \leq s$, then Guo et al. [11] show that their algorithm finds a FISG with at most $s+1+T_s$ vertices. Similarly to Lemma 2.1, we can show that Algorithm 2.1 computes a constant-factor approximate solution for s -PLEX CLUSTER VERTEX DELETION.

Lemma 3.2. *There is a factor- $(s+1+T_s)$ approximate solution for s -PLEX CLUSTER VERTEX DELETION and it can be found in $O(ns(n+m))$ time.*

Corollary 3.1. *Let (G, k) be a yes-instance and let X be a factor- $(s+1+T_s)$ approximate solution for G . Then, X contains $O(sk)$ vertices.*

We now construct a set that is peripheral with respect to a solution X . To this end, we modify Definition 2.2.

Definition 3.1. Let X be a solution. We call a vertex set M with the following properties *peripheral (with respect to X)*:

1. For each vertex $v \in X$, there are at most s sets $H \in \mathcal{H}(X)$ such that $H \setminus M$ is adjacent to v .
2. If there is a vertex $v \in X$ and a set $H \in \mathcal{H}(X)$ such that $H \setminus M$ is adjacent to v , then v is nonadjacent to at most $2s - 3$ vertices in $H \setminus M$.
3. For each vertex $v \in X$, if there is more than one set $H \in \mathcal{H}(X)$ such that $H \setminus M$ is adjacent to v , then each such set H satisfies $|H \setminus M| \leq 2s - 2$.

To construct a peripheral set, we proceed analogously to Section 2.2: for each vertex v in a given solution X , we find a FISG F including v that contains no vertices from $M(v)$. Then, we add the vertices of $F - \{v\}$ to $M(v)$. We find such FISGs by three observations, each leading to one of three phases of an algorithm that constructs the sets $M(v)$.

We now turn to our first observation. Given a solution X , assume that there exists a vertex $v \in X$ and a set $U \subseteq N(v) \setminus X$ of $s+1$ neighbors of v such that U contains a vertex u that is nonadjacent to $U \setminus \{u\}$. Then, the vertex u is connected to every vertex in U , because the vertices in U are neighbors of v . The vertex u is nonadjacent to the s vertices in $U \setminus \{u\}$. By Theorem 1.1, the graph $G[\{v\} \cup U]$ is a FISG.

Algorithm 3.1 (Phase 1). Given a graph G and a solution X , for each vertex $v \in X$, let $M(v) = \emptyset$. For each $v \in X$, as long as there is a set $U \subseteq N(v) \setminus (X \cup M(v))$ such that

1. $|U| = s+1$ and
2. there exists a vertex $u \in U$ that is nonadjacent to $U \setminus \{u\}$,

add the vertices in U to $M(v)$.

Now, for each vertex v in the solution X , let $M(v)$ be the set constructed by Phase 1 of Algorithm 3.1. For a vertex $v \in X$, assume that there exists a set $H \in \mathcal{H}(X)$ such that v is adjacent to a vertex $u \in H \setminus M(v)$. Further, assume that the vertex v is nonadjacent to a set $W \subseteq H \setminus M(v)$ of $2s - 2$ vertices. Then, the graph $G[\{u\} \cup W]$ is an induced subgraph of the s -plex $G[H]$ and contains $2s - 1$ vertices. According to Lemma 3.1, it is connected. The vertex v is, because it is a neighbor of u and because u is adjacent to W , connected but nonadjacent to the $2s - 2$ vertices in W . By Theorem 1.1, the graph $G[\{u, v\} \cup W]$ is a FISG. We continue Algorithm 3.1 as follows:

Algorithm 3.1 (Phase 2). For each $v \in X$, as long as there is a set $H \in \mathcal{H}(X)$ such that

1. the vertex v is adjacent to a vertex $u \in H \setminus M(v)$ and
2. the vertex v is nonadjacent to a set $W \subseteq H \setminus M(v)$ of vertices with $|W| = 2s - 2$,

add the vertex u and the vertices in W to $M(v)$.

Now, for each vertex v in the solution X , let $M(v)$ be the set constructed by Phase 1 and Phase 2 of [Algorithm 3.1](#). Assume that for a vertex $v \in X$, there are two sets $U, W \in \mathcal{H}(X)$ such that v is adjacent to the vertices $u \in U \setminus M(v)$ and $w \in W \setminus M(v)$. Further, assume that $W \setminus M(v)$ contains at least $2s - 1$ vertices. Then, $G[W \setminus M(v)]$ is a 2-plex containing at least $2s - 1$ vertices. According to [Lemma 3.1](#), it is connected. The vertex $u \in U \setminus M(v)$ is nonadjacent to at least $2s - 1$ vertices in $W \setminus M(v)$, but $F := G[\{u, v\} \cup W]$ is connected. According to [Theorem 1.1](#), it is a FISG.

Algorithm 3.1 (Phase 3). For each $v \in X$, as long as there are $U, W \in \mathcal{H}(X)$ such that

1. $|W \setminus M(v)| \geq 2s - 1$ and
2. the vertex v has neighbors $u \in U \setminus M(v)$ and $w \in W \setminus M(v)$,

add the vertices u, w , and $2s - 2$ other vertices from $W \setminus M(v)$ to $M(v)$.

Note that in contrast to [Algorithm 2.2](#), Phase 2 and Phase 3 of [Algorithm 3.1](#) do not necessarily find minimal FISGs. That is, there exist FISGs found by Phase 2 and Phase 3 such that we could remove a vertex from them and they would still be FISGs. For running time considerations, we construct FISGs from parts of s -plexes that contain enough vertices to derive their connectedness from [Lemma 3.1](#). Thus, we do not have to explicitly check whether the subgraphs that we find are connected.

Lemma 3.3. *Let X be a solution. Let $M := \bigcup_{v \in X} M(v)$ be the set constructed by [Algorithm 3.1](#). The set M is peripheral with respect to X .*

Proof. The proof of this lemma is analogous to the proof of [Lemma 2.3](#). For each vertex $v \in X$, the set $M(v)$ satisfies all properties in [Definition 3.1](#). This follows directly from the description of [Algorithm 2.2](#). \square

Lemma 3.4. *Given a solution X , [Algorithm 3.1](#) can be carried out in $O(|X|n^2)$ time.*

Proof. The running times of Phase 1 and Phase 2 of [Algorithm 3.1](#) can be proven in the same way as for [Algorithm 2.2](#) in [Lemma 2.5](#). We only prove the running time of the modified Phase 3. First, we construct for each vertex $v \in X$ the set $N(v) \setminus (M(v) \cup X)$. The proof of [Lemma 2.5](#) shows how this can be done in $O(n)$ time. For each vertex $u \in N(v) \setminus (M(v) \cup X)$, we can determine the set $H \in \mathcal{H}(X)$ with $u \in H$ in constant time, as seen in the proof of [Lemma 2.5](#). Counting the elements in $H \setminus M(v)$ takes at most $O(n)$ time. This yields a running time of $O(|X|n^2)$ for Phase 3 of [Algorithm 3.1](#). \square

3.2 Adapted Data Reduction Rules and Bounds

Given an s -PLEX CLUSTER VERTEX DELETION instance (G, k) and a solution X for G , we now bound the number and the sizes of the connected components in $G - X$. To this end, we first revise [Reduction Rule 2.1](#) as shown below.

Reduction Rule 3.1. Let X be a solution. For each vertex $v \in X$, let $M(v)$ be the set constructed by [Algorithm 3.1](#). If there exists a vertex $v \in X$ such that $|M(v)| > 2sk$, then delete v from G and X and decrement k by one.

Lemma 3.5. *Reduction Rule 3.1 is correct. Given a solution X and the set $M(v)$ constructed by [Algorithm 3.1](#) for each vertex $v \in X$, we can exhaustively apply [Reduction Rule 3.1](#) in $O(|X|n + m)$ time.*

Proof. For each vertex v in a solution X , [Algorithm 3.1](#) adds at most $2s$ vertices to $M(v)$ for each found FISG. If a vertex $v \in X$ satisfies $|M(v)| > 2sk$, then more than k FISGs pairwise intersect only in v . According to [Lemma 2.2](#), we can delete v from G and decrement k by one. The running time can be shown analogously to [Lemma 2.6](#). \square

Corollary 3.2. *Let X be a solution for G . For each $v \in X$, let $M(v)$ be the set constructed by [Algorithm 3.1](#). After exhaustively applying [Reduction Rule 2.1](#) to G and X , the peripheral set $M := \bigcup_{v \in X} M(v)$ contains at most $2sk|X|$ vertices.*

Given a graph G and a solution X , we can apply [Reduction Rule 2.2](#) without any changes compared to the case $s = 2$. As we have seen in [Section 2.2.2](#), [Lemma 2.8](#) and [Definition 2.2](#) then bound the number of connected components in $G - X$. It is left to bound their sizes. To this end, we only need to slightly change [Reduction Rule 2.3](#) and [Reduction Rule 2.4](#). Recall that the connected components in $G - X$ are induced by sets in the collection $\mathcal{H}(X)$. We start with a revision of [Reduction Rule 2.3](#):

Reduction Rule 3.2. Let X be a solution, let $H \in \mathcal{H}(X)$ and let $R(H)$ be a redundant subset of H as defined in [Definition 2.3](#). If $|R(H)| > k + 2s - 1$, choose an arbitrary vertex from $R(H)$ and remove it from G .

For the correctness proof of [Reduction Rule 3.2](#), observe that [Lemma 2.10](#) and [Lemma 2.11](#) are still valid if we prove them under the following assumption instead of proving them under [Assumption 2.1](#):

Assumption 3.1. Let X be a solution and let $R(H)$ be a redundant subset of $H \in \mathcal{H}(X)$. Assume that [Reduction Rule 3.2](#) chooses to remove $u \in R(H)$ from G . Further, assume that there exists a solution S with $|S| \leq k$ for the graph $G - \{u\}$.

[Assumption 3.1](#) implies that $|R(H) \setminus (S \cup \{u\})| \geq 2s - 1$; otherwise, [Reduction Rule 3.2](#) could not have been applied. Because $G[H]$ is a 2-plex, $G[R(H) \setminus (S \cup \{u\})]$ is connected. The graph $G[H \setminus (S \cup \{u\})]$ is connected for the same reason. In the following, we write G' for $G - \{u\}$.

Lemma 3.6. *Reduction Rule 3.2 is correct.*

Proof. We have to show that (G, k) is a yes-instance if and only if (G', k) is a yes-instance. If (G, k) is a yes-instance, then there exists a solution S with $|S| \leq k$ such that $G - S$ is an s -plex cluster graph. Clearly, then also $G' - S$ is an s -plex cluster graph and (G', k) is a yes-instance.

If (G', k) is a yes-instance, then there exists a solution S with $|S| \leq k$ such that $G' - S$ is an s -plex cluster graph, implying that [Assumption 3.1](#) is true. Assume that $G - S$ contains a FISG. By [Lemma 2.9](#), there exists a FISG F in $G - S$ containing the vertex u . Because F is a FISG, it contains a vertex v that is connected but nonadjacent to a set W of s other vertices in F .

If $u \notin \{v\} \cup W$, then [Lemma 2.10](#) shows that the vertices in $\{v\} \cup W$ are connected to all vertices in $H \setminus (S \cup \{u\})$. Thus, the vertices in $\{u\} \cup W$ would exist in $G' - S$ and would be connected. That contradicts $G' - S$ being an s -plex cluster graph, because v is nonadjacent but connected to the s vertices in W . Thus, we have $u \in \{v\} \cup W$.

First, assume that $u = v$. That is, the vertex $u \in R(H)$ is nonadjacent to W . From [Lemma 2.11](#), we can conclude that $W \subseteq H \setminus S$. Because also $u \in H \setminus S$, this contradicts the graph $G[H \setminus S]$ being an s -plex. Thus, we have $u \in W$.

Because $u \in W$, we have that u is nonadjacent to v . From [Lemma 2.11](#), we conclude that $v \in H \setminus S$. By [Definition 2.3](#), there exists an X -module $Z(H)$ with $R(H) \subseteq Z(H) \subseteq H$ and $v \in Z(H)$, because the vertex $v \in H \setminus S$ is nonadjacent to the vertex $u \in R(H)$. But then, because the vertex $v \in Z(H)$ is nonadjacent to W , the vertices in W must also be in $H \setminus S$ by [Lemma 2.11](#). Because also v is in $H \setminus S$, this again contradicts $G[H \setminus S]$ being an s -plex. We conclude that $G - S$ must be a s -plex cluster graph. Thus, (G, k) is a yes-instance. \square

We employ [Algorithm 2.3](#) to construct redundant sets. For a solution X , the bound on the number of vertices in a connected component in $G - X$ then changes as follows:

Lemma 3.7. *Let the set M be peripheral with respect to a solution X . For a vertex set $H \in \mathcal{H}(X)$, let $R(H)$ be the redundant subset constructed by [Algorithm 2.3](#). After exhaustively applying [Reduction Rule 3.2](#) using $R(H)$, the number of vertices in $H \setminus M$ is $O(s|H \cap M| + s^2|N(H \setminus M) \cap X| + k)$.*

Proof. To prove the above lemma, we study the sets constructed in [Algorithm 2.3](#). By construction of $R(H)$, we have $R(H) = H \setminus \bar{R}(H)$. Observe that because $\bar{R}(H) \subseteq H$, we also have $H \setminus R(H) = \bar{R}(H)$. Because $G[H]$ is an s -plex, there exist at most $s - 1$ vertices $u \in H$ for every vertex $w \in H \cap M$ such that u and w are nonadjacent. Thus, we have $|A(H)| \in O(s|H \cap M|)$. Because M is peripheral, we can conclude from [Definition 3.1](#) that for each vertex $w \in N(H \setminus M) \cap X$, there are at most $2s - 3$ vertices $u \in H$ such that u and w are nonadjacent. Thus, we have $|B(H)| \in O(s|N(H \setminus M) \cap X|)$. Now, again because $G[H]$ is an s -plex, there exist at most $s - 1$ vertices $u \in H$ for every vertex $w \in B(H)$ such that u and w are nonadjacent. Thus, we have $|C(H)| \in O(s|B(H)|) \subseteq O(s^2|N(H \setminus M) \cap X|)$. This shows that the number of vertices in $H \setminus (R(H) \cup M)$ is $O(s|H \cap M| + s^2|N(H \setminus M) \cap X|)$. After applying [Reduction Rule 2.3](#), the number of vertices in $R(H)$ is $O(k)$. \square

Let M be peripheral with respect to a solution X . We now revise [Reduction Rule 2.4](#) to reduce the sizes of the connected components in $G - X$ that are induced by sets $H \in \mathcal{H}(X)$ such that $H \setminus M$ is nonadjacent to X . Refer to [Figure 2.4\(a\)](#) for an example.

Reduction Rule 3.3. Let X be a solution and let $H \in \mathcal{H}(X)$. Given a vertex set M such that $H \setminus M$ is nonadjacent to X , if $|H \setminus M| > |H \cap M| + 2s - 3$, then choose a vertex from $H \setminus M$ and remove it from G .

Lemma 3.8. *Reduction Rule 3.3 is correct. Given a vertex set M , we can exhaustively apply Reduction Rule 3.3 in $O(n + m)$ time.*

Proof. Let S be a solution. First, observe that analogous to the proof of Lemma 2.17, we can show that if S does not destroy all edges between vertices in H and X , then it must contain at least $|H \setminus M| - (2s - 3)$ vertices from $H \setminus M$. If $|H \setminus M| \geq |H \cap M| + 2s - 3$, then we can analogously to the proof of Lemma 2.18 find a solution S' with $|S'| \leq |S|$ that destroys all edges between vertices in H and X . From this, Lemma 3.8 follows analogously to Lemma 2.19. \square

Corollary 3.3. *Let X be a solution. Assume that there is a vertex set M and a set $H \in \mathcal{H}(X)$ such that $H \setminus M$ is nonadjacent to X . After exhaustively applying Reduction Rule 3.3 given M , the number of vertices in $H \setminus M$ is $O(s + |H \cap M|)$.*

3.3 Kernel Size

Given an s -PLEX CLUSTER VERTEX DELETION instance (G, k) , we now give a bound on the number of vertices in G after all data reduction rules have been applied. Given a solution X , recall that for a connected component in $G - X$ that is induced by a set $H \in \mathcal{H}_0(X, M)$, the set $H \setminus M$ is nonadjacent to X (cf. Figure 2.4(a)); for a vertex set $H \in \mathcal{H}_1(X, M)$, the set $H \setminus M$ is adjacent to X (cf. Figure 2.4(b)). We handle connected components induced by vertex sets in $\mathcal{H}_1(X, M)$ and $\mathcal{H}_0(X, M)$ separately.

Lemma 3.9. *Let the set M be peripheral with respect to a solution X . For the sets*

$$X_1 := \{v \in X \mid \text{there is exactly one set } H \in \mathcal{H}(X) \text{ such that } H \setminus M \text{ is adjacent to } v\},$$

$$X_2 := X \setminus X_1 \text{ and}$$

$$\tilde{\mathcal{H}} := \{H \in \mathcal{H}_1(X, M) \mid H \setminus M \text{ is adjacent to only vertices in } X_1\},$$

the following relations hold:

$$\sum_{H \in \tilde{\mathcal{H}}} |N(H \setminus M) \cap X| = |X_1| \quad \text{and} \quad |\tilde{\mathcal{H}}| \leq |X_1| \quad \text{and} \quad |\mathcal{H}_1(X, M) \setminus \tilde{\mathcal{H}}| \leq s|X_2|.$$

Proof. This follows analogously to the proof of Lemma 2.20 with Definition 3.1 for peripheral sets. \square

Theorem 3.1. *s -PLEX CLUSTER VERTEX DELETION has a problem kernel with $O(k^2 s^3)$ vertices. It can be found in $O(ksn^2)$ time.*

Proof. Given an s -PLEX CLUSTER VERTEX DELETION instance (G, k) , we first find a constant-factor approximate solution X for G using Algorithm 2.1. If (G, k) is a yes-instance, we have $|X| \in O(sk)$ according to Corollary 3.1. In this case, we find $|X|$

in $O(ks(n+m))$ time according to [Lemma 3.2](#), because if we find more than k FIGS using [Algorithm 2.1](#), then we can stop and output that (G, k) is a no-instance. After constructing the constant-factor approximate solution X , we construct a set M that is peripheral with respect to X . According to [Lemma 3.4](#), this can be done in $O(|X|n^2)$ time using [Algorithm 3.1](#). According to [Corollary 3.2](#), we can use [Reduction Rule 3.1](#) to reduce the size of M to at most $2sk|X|$ vertices. This can be done in $O(|X|n+m)$ time according to [Lemma 3.5](#). We then apply [Reduction Rule 2.2](#) in $O(n+m)$ time as shown in [Lemma 2.7](#), followed by [Reduction Rule 3.2](#). Analogously to the proof of [Lemma 2.15](#), we can show that this works in $O(n^2)$ time. Finally, we apply [Reduction Rule 3.3](#), which runs in $O(n+m)$ time; this follows analogously to the proof of [Lemma 2.19](#).

We now count the vertices that remain in G . The graph G contains vertices from X , vertices from M , and vertices from the connected components in $G - X$ that are not in M . As shown above, we have $|X| \in O(sk)$ and $|M| \in O(s^2k^2)$. It is left to count the vertices in $\bigcup_{H \in \mathcal{H}(X)} (H \setminus M)$. Let $\tilde{\mathcal{H}}$, X_1 , and X_2 be as defined in [Lemma 3.9](#). We can conclude from [Lemma 3.7](#) and [Corollary 3.3](#) that the size of $\bigcup_{H \in \mathcal{H}(X)} (H \setminus M)$ is

$$O\left(\sum_{H \in \mathcal{H}_1(X, M)} (s|H \cap M| + s^2|N(H \setminus M) \cap X| + k) + \sum_{H \in \mathcal{H}_0(X, M)} (|H \cap M| + s)\right).$$

Because the sets in $\mathcal{H}(X)$ are pairwise disjoint, we have that $\sum_{H \in \mathcal{H}(X)} s|H \cap M| \leq s|M|$. Thus, the above term is

$$O\left(\sum_{H \in \mathcal{H}_1(X, M)} (s^2|N(H \setminus M) \cap X| + k) + s|M| + s|\mathcal{H}_0(X, M)|\right).$$

By [Lemma 2.8](#), we have that $|\mathcal{H}_0(X, M)| \leq |M|$. Thus, this is

$$O\left(\sum_{H \in \mathcal{H}_1(X, M)} (s^2|N(H \setminus M) \cap X| + k) + s|M|\right).$$

For each set $H \in \mathcal{H}_1(X, M) \setminus \tilde{\mathcal{H}}$, the set $H \setminus M$ must be adjacent to a vertex from X_2 . This is by definition of $\tilde{\mathcal{H}}$ in [Lemma 3.9](#) and by definition of $\mathcal{H}_1(X, M)$. From [Definition 3.1](#), we can conclude that $|H \setminus M| \in O(s)$, implying that only the sets in $\tilde{\mathcal{H}}$ may contain $\Theta(s^2|N(H \setminus M) \cap X| + k)$ vertices that are not in M . Thus, we have

$$\left|\bigcup_{H \in \mathcal{H}(X)} (H \setminus M)\right| \in O\left(\sum_{H \in \tilde{\mathcal{H}}} (s^2|N(H \setminus M) \cap X| + k) + s|\mathcal{H}_1(X, M) \setminus \tilde{\mathcal{H}}| + s|M|\right).$$

By [Lemma 3.9](#), this is $O(|X_1|s^2 + k|X_1| + |X_2|s^2 + s|M|)$. Using $|X_1| + |X_2| = |X|$ and adding the vertices in M and X , this is $O((s^2 + k)|X| + s|M|)$. Thus, the total number of vertices in G is $O(k^2s^3)$. \square

4 Conclusion and Outlook

We have shown an $O(k^2s^3)$ -vertex problem kernel for s -PLEX CLUSTER VERTEX DELETION. This result is comparable with the $O(ks^2)$ -vertex problem kernel for s -PLEX EDITING shown by Guo et al. [11]: in an n -vertex graph, one vertex deletion can lead to $n - 1$ edge deletions. Under the assumption that input graphs for clustering problems are typically dense, this suggests that typical parameter values for s -PLEX EDITING are at least quadratic in parameter values for s -PLEX CLUSTER VERTEX DELETION; the parameter is the number of allowed graph modifications. Seen from this angle, our result seems consistent with the result that s -PLEX EDITING has a problem kernel with $O(ks^2)$ vertices.

It is open whether s -PLEX CLUSTER VERTEX DELETION has an $O(ks^c)$ -vertex problem kernel for some constant c . It is also open to improve the s^3 -factor in the number of vertices in our problem kernel. This factor results from the size of the constant-factor approximate solution shown in Corollary 3.1, from the size of the peripheral set shown in Corollary 3.2, and from the way we construct redundant sets in Lemma 3.7. The most promising approach to improve on the s^3 -factor seems to be the construction of larger redundant sets so that more vertices can be removed by Reduction Rule 3.2.

In Chapter 1, we discussed how to solve s -PLEX CLUSTER VERTEX DELETION using d -HITTING SET for a natural number $d \in O(s + \sqrt{s})$. For d -HITTING SET, problem kernels containing $O(k^{d-1})$ or $O(k^d)$ elements are known [1, 8, 15]. This bound is exponential in d and d is in turn bounded by a function linear in s . This yields an upper bound on the number of elements in a d -HITTING SET kernel that is exponential in s . From this angle, it is remarkable that problem kernels for s -PLEX CLUSTER VERTEX DELETION as well as for s -PLEX EDITING exist whose number of vertices is bounded by a polynomial in s as well as in k .

It might be hard to find a search tree for s -PLEX CLUSTER VERTEX DELETION that is smaller than the search tree for an equivalent d -HITTING SET instance. However, a d -HITTING SET instance obtained from our s -PLEX CLUSTER VERTEX DELETION problem kernel contains $O(k^{2d})$ sets. This bound is exponential in d . Thus, constructing a d -HITTING SET instance from an s -PLEX CLUSTER VERTEX DELETION instance might be practically infeasible. It is open to find faster algorithms for s -PLEX CLUSTER VERTEX DELETION that do not rely on d -HITTING SET.

The most promising approach to faster algorithms for s -PLEX CLUSTER VERTEX DELETION seems to be iterative compression [12] introduced by Reed et al. [22]. Hüffner et al. [14] have successfully applied it to CLUSTER VERTEX DELETION. Using iterative compression, we can solve s -PLEX CLUSTER VERTEX DELETION by solving multiple instances of the following problem:

DISJOINT s -PLEX CLUSTER VERTEX DELETION

Instance: A graph $G = (V, E)$, a non-negative number k , and a solution $S \subseteq V$ with $|S| \leq k + 1$ such that $G - S$ is an s -plex cluster graph.

Question: Is there an alternative solution S' with $S \cap S' = \emptyset$ and $|S'| \leq k$ such that $G - S'$ is an s -plex cluster graph?

Fellows et al. [7] have shown that while the analog problem for CLUSTER VERTEX DELETION is in P, DISJOINT s -PLEX CLUSTER VERTEX DELETION is NP-hard. After some initial observations on the case $s = 2$, we guess that DISJOINT 2-PLEX CLUSTER VERTEX DELETION can be solved using a size- $O(2^k)$ search tree. In combination with our kernelization algorithm, we could then solve 2-PLEX CLUSTER VERTEX DELETION in $O(3^k k^c + kn^2)$ time for some constant c .

Bibliography

- [1] Faisal N. Abu-Khzam. Kernelization algorithms for d -hitting set problems. In *Proceedings of the 10th International Workshop on Algorithms and Data Structures (WADS '07)*, volume 4619 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 434–445. Springer, 2007.
- [2] Balabhaskar Balasundaram, Sergiy Butenko, and Illya V. Hicks. Clique relaxations in social network analysis: The maximum k -plex problem. *Operations Research*, 2009. To appear.
- [3] Pavel Berkhin. A survey of clustering data mining techniques. In *Grouping Multidimensional Data*, pages 25–71. Springer, 2006.
- [4] Jonathan F. Buss and Judy Goldsmith. Nondeterminism within P . *SIAM Journal on Computing*, 22(3):560–572, 1993.
- [5] Michael Dom, Jiong Guo, Falk Hüffner, Rolf Niedermeier, and Anke Truss. Fixed-parameter tractability results for feedback set problems in tournaments. *Journal of Discrete Algorithms*, 2009.
- [6] Rodney G. Downey and Michael R. Fellows. *Parameterized Complexity*. Springer, 1999.
- [7] Michael R. Fellows, Jiong Guo, Hannes Moser, and Rolf Niedermeier. A complexity dichotomy for finding disjoint solutions of vertex deletion problems. In *Proceedings of Mathematical Foundations of Computer Science (MFCS '09)*, volume 5734 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 319–330. Springer, 2009.
- [8] Jörg Flum and Martin Grohe. *Parameterized Complexity Theory*. Springer, 2006.
- [9] Tibor Gallai. Transitiv orientierbare Graphen. *Acta Mathematica Hungarica*, 18(1–2):25–66, 1967.
- [10] Jiong Guo. A more effective linear kernelization for cluster editing. *Theoretical Computer Science*, 410(8-10):718–726, 2009.
- [11] Jiong Guo, Christian Komusiewicz, Rolf Niedermeier, and Johannes Uhlmann. A more relaxed model for graph-based data clustering: s -Plex Editing. In *Proceedings of the 5th International Conference on Algorithmic Aspects in Information and Management (AAIM '09)*, volume 5564 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 226–239. Springer, 2009.

- [12] Jiong Guo, Hannes Moser, and Rolf Niedermeier. Iterative compression for exactly solving NP-hard minimization problems. In *Algorithmics of Large and Complex Networks*, volume 5515, pages 65–80. Springer, 2009.
- [13] Jiong Guo and Rolf Niedermeier. Invitation to data reduction and problem kernelization. *SIGACT News*, 38(1):31–45, 2007.
- [14] Falk Hüffner, Christian Komusiewicz, Hannes Moser, and Rolf Niedermeier. Fixed-parameter algorithms for cluster vertex deletion. *Theory of Computing Systems*, 2009. Available electronically.
- [15] Stefan Kratsch. Polynomial kernelizations for $\text{MIN } F^+\Pi_1$ and MAX NP . In *Proceedings of the 26th International Symposium on Theoretical Aspects of Computer Science (STACS '09)*, volume 09001 of *Dagstuhl Seminar Proceedings*, pages 601–612. Internationales Begegnungs- und Forschungszentrum für Informatik (IBFI), Schloss Dagstuhl, Germany, 2009.
- [16] John M. Lewis and Mihalis Yannakakis. The node-deletion problem for hereditary properties is NP-complete. *Journal of Computer and System Sciences*, 20(2):219–230, 1980.
- [17] Carsten Lund and Mihalis Yannakakis. The approximation of maximum subgraph problems. In *Proceedings of the 20th International Colloquium on Automata, Languages and Programming (ICALP '93)*, pages 40–51, London, UK, 1993. Springer.
- [18] Benjamin McClosky and Illya V. Hicks. Combinatorial algorithms for the maximum k -plex problem. Manuscript, January 2009.
- [19] Ross M. McConnell and Jeremy Spinrad. Modular decomposition and transitive orientation. *Discrete Mathematics*, 201(1-3):189–241, 1999.
- [20] Hannes Moser, Rolf Niedermeier, and Manuel Sorge. Algorithms and experiments for clique relaxations—finding maximum s -plexes. In *Proceedings of the 8th International Symposium on Experimental Algorithms (SEA '09)*, volume 5526 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 233–244. Springer, 2009.
- [21] Rolf Niedermeier. *Invitation to Fixed-Parameter Algorithms*. Oxford University Press, 2006.
- [22] Bruce Reed, Kaleigh Smith, and Adrian Vetta. Finding odd cycle transversals. *Operations Research Letters*, 32(4):299–301, 2004.
- [23] Satu Elisa Schaeffer. Graph clustering. *Computer Science Review*, 1(1):27–64, 2007.
- [24] Stephen B. Seidman and Brian L. Foster. A graph-theoretic generalization of the clique concept. *Journal of Mathematical Sociology*, 6:139–154, 1978.

- [25] Magnus Wahlström. *Algorithms, Measures and Upper Bounds for Satisfiability and Related Problems*. PhD thesis, Department of Computer and Information Science, Linköpings universitet, Sweden, 2007.
- [26] Bin Wu and Xin Pei. A parallel algorithm for enumerating all the maximal k -plexes. In *Emerging Technologies in Knowledge Discovery and Data Mining*, volume 4819 of *Lecture Notes in Artificial Intelligence*, pages 476–483. Springer, 2007.