

# Network Decontamination with a Single Agent

Yessine Daadaa<sup>1</sup>, Asif Jamshed<sup>2</sup>, and Mudassir Shabbir<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> School of Electrical Engineering and Computer Science,  
Faculty of Engineering,  
University of Ottawa,  
Ottawa, Canada

<sup>2</sup> Department of Computer Science, Rutgers University, NJ, USA  
ydaadaa@site.uottawa.ca,  
{ajamshed,mudassir}@cs.rutgers.edu

**Abstract.** Faults and viruses often spread in networked environments by propagating from site to neighboring site. We model this process of *network contamination* by graphs. Consider a graph  $G = (V, E)$ , whose vertex set is contaminated and our goal is to decontaminate the set  $V(G)$  using mobile decontamination agents that traverse along the edge set of  $G$ . Temporal immunity  $\tau(G) \geq 0$  is defined as the time that a decontaminated vertex of  $G$  can remain continuously exposed to some contaminated neighbor without getting infected itself. The *immunity number* of  $G$ ,  $\iota_k(G)$ , is the least  $\tau$  that is required to decontaminate  $G$  using  $k$  agents. We study immunity number for some classes of graphs corresponding to network topologies and present upper bounds on  $\iota_1(G)$ , in some cases with matching lower bounds. Variations of this problem have been extensively studied in literature, but proposed algorithms have been restricted to *monotone* strategies, where a vertex, once decontaminated, may not be recontaminated. We exploit nonmonotonicity to give bounds which are strictly better than those derived using monotone strategies.

## 1 Introduction

Faults and viruses often spread in networked environments by propagating from site to neighboring site. The process is called *network contamination*. Once contaminated, a network node might behave incorrectly, and it could cause its neighboring node to become contaminated as well, thus propagating faulty computations. The propagation patterns of faults can follow different dynamics, depending on the behavior of the affected node, and topology of the network. At one extreme we have a full spread behavior: when a site is affected by a virus or any other malfunction, such a malfunction can propagate to all its neighbors; other times, faults propagate only to sites that are susceptible to be affected; the definition of susceptibility depends on the application but oftentimes it is based on local conditions, for example, a node could be vulnerable to contamination if a majority of its neighbors are faulty, and immune otherwise (e.g., see [14], [15], [18]); or it could be immune to contamination for a certain amount of time after being repaired (e.g., see [8], [12]).

In this paper we consider a propagation of faults based on what we call *temporal immunity*: a clean node is allowed to be exposed to contaminated nodes for a predefined

41 amount of time after which it becomes *contaminated*. Actual decontamination is per-  
42 formed by mobile cleaning agents which which move from host to host over network  
43 connections.

## 44 1.1 Previous Work

45 **Graph Search.** The decontamination problem considered in this paper is a variation of  
46 a problem extensively studied in the literature known as *graph search*. The graph search  
47 problem was first introduced by Breish in [5], where an approach for the problem of  
48 finding an explorer that is lost in a complicated system of dark caves is given. Parsons  
49 ([20][21]) proposed and studied the pursuit-evasion problem on graphs. Members of  
50 a team of searchers traverse the edges of a graph in pursuit of a fugitive, who moves  
51 along the edges of the graph with complete knowledge of the locations of the pursuers.  
52 The efficiency of a graph search solution is based on the size of the search team. Size of  
53 smallest search team that can *clear* a graph  $G$  is called search number, and is denoted in  
54 literature by  $s(G)$ . In [19], Megiddo et al. approached the algorithmic question: *Given*  
55 *an arbitrary  $G$ , how should one calculate  $s(G)$ ?* They proved that for arbitrary graphs,  
56 determining if the search number is less than or equal to an integer  $k$  is NP-Hard. They  
57 also gave algorithms to compute  $s(G)$  where  $G$  is a special case of trees. For their  
58 results, they use the fact that recontamination of a cleared vertex does not help reduce  
59  $s(G)$ , which was proved by LaPaugh in [16]. A search plan for  $G$  that does not involve  
60 recontamination of cleared vertices is referred to as a *monotone* plan.

61 **Decontamination.** The model for decontamination studied in literature is defined as  
62 follows. A team of agents is initially located at the same node, the homebase, and all  
63 the other nodes are contaminated. A decontamination strategy consists of a sequence of  
64 movements of the agents along the edges of the network. At any point in time each node  
65 of the network can be in one of three possible states: clean, contaminated, or guarded.  
66 A node is guarded when it contains at least one agent. A node is clean when an agent  
67 passes by it and all its neighboring nodes are clean or guarded, contaminated otherwise.  
68 Initially all nodes are contaminated except for the homebase (which is guarded). The  
69 solution to the problem is given by devising a strategy for the agents to move in the  
70 network in such a way that at the end all the nodes are clean.

71 The tree was the first topology to be investigated. In [2], Barrière et al. showed that for  
72 a given tree  $T$ , the minimum number of agents needed to decontaminate  $T$  depends on  
73 the location of the homebase. They gave first strategies to decontaminate trees.

74 In [11], Flocchini et al. consider the problem of decontaminating a mesh graph. They  
75 present some lower bounds on the number of agents, number of moves, and time re-  
76 quired to decontaminate a  $p \times q$  mesh ( $p \leq q$ ). At least  $p$  agents,  $pq$  moves, and  
77  $p + q - 2$  time units are required to solve the decontamination problem. Decontamina-  
78 tion in graphs with *temporal immunity*, which is similar to the model of decontamina-  
79 tion used in this paper, was first introduced in [12] where minimum team size necessary  
80 to disinfect a given tree with temporal immunity  $\tau$  is derived. The main difference be-  
81 tween the classical decontamination model, and the new model in [12] is that, once an  
82 agent departs, the decontaminated node is immune for a certain  $\tau \geq 0$  (i.e.  $\tau = 0$  cor-  
83 responds to the classical model studied in the previous work) time units to viral attacks

from infected neighbors. After the temporal immunity  $\tau$  has elapsed, recontamination can occur. Some further work in the same model was done in [9], where a two dimensional lattice is considered.

## 1.2 Definitions and Terminology

We only deal with connected finite graphs without loops or multiple edges. For a graph  $G = (V, E)$ , and a vertex  $v \in V$  let  $N(v)$ , the neighborhood of  $v$ , be the set of all vertices  $w$  such that  $v$  is connected to  $w$  by an edge. Let  $deg(v)$  denote the degree of a vertex  $v$  which is defined to be the size of its neighborhood. Maximum and minimum degree of any vertex in  $G$  is denoted by  $\Delta(G)$  and  $\delta(G)$  respectively. The shortest distance between any two vertices  $u, v \in V$  is denoted by  $dist(u, v)$  and eccentricity of  $v \in V$  is the maximum  $dist(u, v)$  for any other vertex  $u$  in  $G$ . The radius of a graph,  $rad(G)$ , is the minimum eccentricity of any vertex of  $G$  and the vertices whose eccentricity is equal to  $rad(G)$  are called the *center vertices*. The diameter of a graph,  $diam(G)$ , is the maximum eccentricity of a vertex in  $G$ .

$K_n$  is the complete graph on  $n$  vertices.  $K_{m,n}$  denotes the complete bipartite graph where the size of two partitions is  $m$  and  $n$ . An acyclic graph is known as a tree and a vertex of degree 1 in a tree is known as a *leaf* of the tree. Rest of the tree terminology used is standard. A star graph,  $S_n$ , is a tree on  $n+1$  vertices where one vertex has degree  $n$  and the rest of the vertices are leaves. Sometimes a single vertex of a tree is labeled as the *root* of the tree. In this case the tree is known as a *rooted tree*. If we remove the root vertex from a rooted tree it decomposes into one or more subtrees; each such subtree along with the root is called a *branch*, denoted by  $B_i$ , of original tree. Similarly, an *arm* is the set of vertices that lie on the path from root to a leaf, denoted by  $A_i$ .


Other classes of graphs will be defined as and when needed.

## 1.3 Decontamination Model Specification

Our decontamination model is a synchronous system. We assume that initially, at time  $t = 0$ , all vertices in the graph are contaminated. A *decontaminating agent* (henceforth referred to as an agent) is an entity, or a marker, that can be placed on any vertex. A concept similar to this is referred to in the literature as a *pebble* [6]. Assume that at some time step  $k$ , agent is at  $v \in V$ , then at the next time step, we may move the agent to any of the neighbors of  $v$ . Vertices visited in this process are marked *decontaminated*, or *disinfected*. Any vertex that the agent is currently placed on is considered to be decontaminated.

A decontaminated vertex can get contaminated by uninterrupted exposure, for a certain amount of time, to a contaminated vertex in its neighborhood. For decontaminated  $v$  if there is no agent placed on  $v$  but some neighbor of  $v$  is contaminated, we say that  $v$  is *exposed*. For a decontaminated vertex  $v$  we define the *exposure time* of  $v$ ,  $\Xi(v)$ , as the duration time  $v$  has been exposed. Every time an agent visits  $v$ , or all vertices in  $N(v)$  are decontaminated, we reset  $\Xi(v) = 0$ . We say that  $G$  has temporal immunity  $\tau(G)$  if a decontaminated vertex  $v \in V$  can only be recontaminated if for uninterrupted  $\tau(G)$  time units, there is a neighbor of  $v$  (not necessarily unique) that is contaminated

126 and an agent does not visit  $v$  during that time period. Note that for any decontaminated  
 127 vertex  $v$  we have that  $0 \leq \Xi(v) \leq \tau(G) - 1$ .



**Fig. 1.** Figure illustrates variation in exposure times of vertices  $a$  and  $b$  at different time steps as the agent tries to decontaminate  $G$ , with  $\tau(G) = 2$ .

128 Given a graph  $G$ , a temporal immunity  $\tau$  and  $n$  agents, our goal is to devise a  
 129 decontamination strategy, which consists of choosing an initial placement for the agents  
 130 and their movement pattern so that we can reach a state where all the vertices of  $G$   
 131 are simultaneously decontaminated and we call the graph fully decontaminated. A strategy  
 132 is called monotone if a decontaminated vertex is never recontaminated and is called  
 133 nonmonotone otherwise. *Immunity number* of  $G$  with  $k$  agents,  $\iota_k(G)$ , is the least  $\tau$   
 134 for which full decontamination of  $G$  is possible. It is trivial to see that  $\iota_k(G)$  is always  
 135 finite for  $k \geq 1$ .

136 **Observation 1** Let  $G$  be a connected graph on  $n$  vertices, then  $\iota_k(G) \leq 2(n - 1)$  for  
 137 all  $k \geq 1$ .

138 Without loss of generality, assume that  $k = 1$ . First compute a spanning tree  $T$  of  $G$   
 139 and then make your the agent move in a depth first search order on  $T$ . Since the entire  
 140 traversal takes exactly  $2(n - 1)$  steps this monotone strategy fully decontaminates any  
 141 given graph.

142 However, in this paper we focus on decontamination of graph with a single agent; this  
 143 gives us the liberty to use shortened notation  $\iota(G)$ , and just  $\iota$  when the graph is obvious  
 144 from context, to mean  $\iota_1(G)$ , the immunity number of a graph using a single agent.

#### 145 1.4 Our Results

146 In section 2 we prove bounds on  $\iota$  for some simple graphs. In section 3 we give asymp-  
 147 totically sharp upper and lower bounds on  $\iota(G)$  where  $G$  is a mesh graph. We also

give algorithms to decontaminate spider graphs and  $k$ -ary trees. We then extend these techniques to give upper bound on immunity number of general trees. In section 5 we discuss some open problems. Our results are outlined in the table below.

Graph Topology	Upper Bound on $\iota$	Lower Bound on $\iota$
Path $P_n$	0 [Proposition 1]	0 [Proposition 1]
Cycle $C_n$	2 [Proposition 2]	2 [Proposition 2]
Complete Graph $K_n$	$n - 1$ [Theorem 2]	$n - 1$ [Theorem 2]
Complete Bipartite Graph $K_{m,n}$ , with $m \leq n$	$2(m - 1)$ [Theorem 3]	$2(m - 1)$ [Theorem 3]
Spider Graph on $n + 1$ vertices	$4\sqrt{n}$ [Corollary 1]	-
Tree on $n$ vertices	$30\sqrt{n}$ [Theorem 8]	-
Mesh $m \times n$	$m$ [Theorem 6]	$\frac{m}{2}$ [Theorem 7]
Planar Graph on $n$ vertices	$n - 1$ [Theorem 11]	$\Omega(\sqrt{n})$ [Corollary 4]
General Graphs	$n - 1$ [Theorem 11]	$n - 1$ [Theorem 2]

**Table 1.** A summary of our results.

## 2 Some Simple Graphs

We begin with the simple case when the graph that we want to decontaminate is a path.

**Proposition 1.** *Let  $P_n$  be a path on  $n$  vertices, then  $\iota(P_n) = 0$  for all  $n \geq 1$ .*

It is easy to see that we do not need any temporal immunity to decontaminate the entire path if we start with our agent at one leaf vertex and at each time step we move it towards the other end until we reach it at  $t = n - 1$ .

A cycle can be decontaminated using a similar strategy.

**Proposition 2.** *Let  $C_n$  be a cycle on  $n$  vertices,  $\iota(C_n) = 2$  for all  $n \geq 4$ .*

*Proof.* To see that  $\iota(C_n) \leq 2$  set the temporal immunity  $\tau = 2$  and begin with the agent at any vertex of the cycle. At  $t = 1$  choose one of its neighbors to move to. Henceforth, for  $t = k \geq 2$ , we always move our agent in a fixed, say clockwise, direction. It is straightforward to verify that we will end up with a fully decontaminated graph in at most  $2n$  time steps. Note that this is a nonmonotone strategy.

If we set temporal immunity  $\tau = 1$  then we will show that we can never decontaminate more than two (adjacent) vertices of the cycle. Suppose that four vertices  $v_n, v_1, v_2, v_3$  appear in the cycle in that order. Assume that at time step  $t = 0$  the agent is placed at  $v_1$  and, without loss of generality, it moves to  $v_2$  at the next time step. At  $t = 2$  if the agent moves to  $v_3$  then  $v_1$  becomes contaminated due to its exposure to  $v_n$  and we end up with only  $v_2$  and  $v_3$  decontaminated which is the same as not having made any progress. If, on the other hand, the agent had moved back to  $v_1$  at  $t = 2$  we would again have ended up with no progress since the agent would still have the same constraints on proceeding to its next vertex, therefore  $\iota(C_n) > 1$ .  $\square$

165 *Remark 1.* Bound presented in Proposition 2 is only tight because of our definition of  $\tau$   
 166 as an integer. Otherwise we observe that there always exists a strategy to decontaminate  
 167  $C_n$  with  $\tau = 1 + \epsilon$  for any real number  $\epsilon > 0$  in finite time; in fact same strategy as  
 168 outlined in proof of upper bound above will work.

169 **Complete Graph and Complete Bipartite Graph** Path and cycle happen to be the  
 170 simplest possible graphs that can be decontaminated easily with optimal constant im-  
 171 munity numbers as seen above. We now tend to some dense graphs and show that they  
 172 may require much larger value of  $\tau$ .

173 **Theorem 2** *Let  $K_n$  be a complete graph on  $n$  vertices, then  $\iota(K_n) = n - 1$  for all*  
 174  *$n \geq 4$ .*

175 *Proof.* Let the vertex set  $V = \{v_1, v_2, \dots, v_n\}$ . Since there is fully connected, we can  
 176 fully decontaminate  $K_n$  by making the agent visit all the vertices sequentially in any  
 177 order giving us  $\iota(K_n) \leq n - 1$ .

178

To see that this bound is actually tight we need to show that temporal immunity of  
 $n - 2$  is not good enough for full decontamination. For this purpose set  $\tau = n - 2$   
 and suppose that at time step  $t = k$  we have somehow managed to decontaminate all  
 the vertices of  $K_n$  except one last vertex, say,  $v_n$ . Assume without loss of generality  
 that the agent is at  $v_{n-1}$ . As long as the complete graph is not fully decontaminated,  
 all the vertices which do not have the agent placed on them are exposed. This implies  
 that the vertices  $v_1, \dots, v_{n-2}$  have all been visited by the agent in the last  $n - 2$  time  
 steps, that is,  $\Xi(v_i) < n - 2$  for  $1 \leq i \leq n - 2$ . It also implies that since there is  
 one agent, all these vertices have different exposure times, meaning that there is one  
 vertex, say  $v_1$ , such that  $\Xi(v_1) = n - 3$ . At time step  $k + 1$ , if the agent moves to  
 $v_n$  and decontaminates it, then  $v_1$  becomes contaminated hence we make no progress;  
 there is still one contaminated vertex remaining in the graph. If on the other hand agent  
 $x$  is moved to  $v_1$  to avoid its contamination, we will again have not made any progress.  
 Moving the agent to any other vertex at  $t = k + 1$  actually increases the number of  
 contaminated vertices in the graph.  $\square$

179 The immunity number of complete bipartite graph depends upon the size of smaller  
 180 partition.

181 **Theorem 3** *Let  $G$  be a complete bipartite graph on the vertex sets  $A$  and  $B$  where*  
 182  *$|A| = m, |B| = n$  such that  $3 \leq m \leq n$ , then  $\iota(G) = 2m - 1$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $A = \{a_1, a_2, \dots, a_m\}$  and  $B = \{b_1, b_2, \dots, b_n\}$ . Set the temporal immu-  
 nity  $\tau = 2m - 1$  and place an agent at  $a_1$  at  $t = 0$ . Now we cycle through the vertices  
 in  $A$  and  $B$  in an interleaved sequence as follows:

$$a_1, b_1, a_2, b_2, a_3, b_2, \dots, a_m, b_m, a_1, b_{m+1}, a_2, b_{m+2}, \dots, b_n.$$

183 When  $t < 2m$  none of the vertices are exposed long enough to be recontaminated.  
 184 At  $t = 2m$  the agent returns to  $a_1$ , and thereafter none of the decontaminated vertices in

$B$  remain exposed while the vertices of  $A$  keep getting visited by the agent before their exposure time reaches  $\tau$ . It follows that this monotone strategy fully decontaminates  $G$  in  $2n - 1$  time steps.

Our claim is that if  $\tau < 2m - 1$  then it is not possible to fully decontaminate a partition during any stage of a given decontamination strategy. Consider a strategy that aims to fully decontaminate  $A$  at some point (and  $B$  is never fully decontaminated before that). Suppose that at time  $t = k$  there remains exactly one contaminated vertex in  $A$  (and that there were two contaminated vertices in  $A$  at  $t = k - 1$ ). Note that this implies that the agent is at some vertex in  $A$  at  $t = k - 1$ . Since  $B$  has never fully been decontaminated, it follows that there exists a vertex  $a_j \in A$  such that  $\Xi(a_j) = 2m - 3$ . Since it is a bipartite graph, it will take at least two additional time steps to reach the last contaminated vertex of  $A$ , and if the temporal immunity is less than  $2m - 1$  the agent will fail to decontaminate  $A$  fully.

In the case where the decontamination strategy requires that  $B$  is fully decontaminated before  $A$ , similar argument gives us a lower bound of  $2n - 1$  on  $\iota(G)$  but we have already given a strategy that decontaminates  $A$  first which gives a better upper bound.  $\square$

### 3 Spider, $k$ -ary Tree, and Mesh Graph

Star and mesh are two important network topologies, which are extreme examples of centralization and decentralization respectively. In the following we study our problem on star, *spider* a generalization of star,  $k$ -ary trees, and mesh graphs. Some of the ideas and proof techniques developed in this section will feature in proof of upper bound on immunity number for general trees in the next section.

#### 3.1 Spider

Let  $S$  be a star graph. The simple strategy of starting the agent at the center vertex and visiting each leaf in turn (via the center) gives us the best possible bound on  $\iota(S_n)$ .

**Lemma 1.** *Temporal immunity  $\tau = 1$  is necessary and sufficient for any star graph.*

*Proof.* The strategy outlined above gives us the upper bound of  $\iota(S_n) \leq 1$ . Argument for matching lower bound is straightforward and we omit the details.  $\square$

A graph that is structurally closely related to a star graph is the *spider*. A spider is a tree in which one vertex, called the *root*, has degree at least 3, and all the rest of the vertices have degree at most 2. Another way to look at it is that a spider consists of  $k$  vertex disjoint paths all of whose one endpoint is connected to a root vertex. Such a spider is said to have  $k$  *arms*.

Let  $S$  be a spider such that the degree of the root is  $\Delta$ . If  $m$  is the length of the longest arm of  $S$  then using a naive monotone strategy of visiting each arm sequentially, starting at the root and traversing each arm to the end and returning to the root shows that temporal immunity  $\tau = 2m$  is enough to fully decontaminate  $S$ . A better bound may be obtained if we allow nonmonotonicity. This time we set  $\tau = m$  and fully

218 decontaminate each arm of the spider in turn and keep doing so until the entire spider is  
 219 decontaminated. It is easy to verify that eventually (after possibly multiple rounds) this  
 220 process ends. However one can obtain an even better estimate on  $\iota(S)$ .

221 **Theorem 4** *Let  $S$  be a spider on  $n$  vertices such that the degree of the root is  $\Delta$ . If  $m$   
 222 is the length of the longest arm of  $S$  then  $\iota(S) \leq \Delta + \sqrt{\Delta^2 + 4m}$ .*

223 *Proof.* Arbitrarily order the arms of the spider  $A_1, A_2, \dots, A_\Delta$  and let the temporal  
 224 immunity  $\tau = t_0$ , that is, the agent, when starting from the root, can decontaminate  $t_0$   
 225 vertices on an arm before the exposed root gets recontaminated. Our strategy is going to  
 226 be iterative and in each iteration, we are going to let the root get contaminated just once  
 227 in the beginning, and after we decontaminate it, we will make sure that it does not get  
 228 recontaminated during the course of that iteration. At the end of each iteration,  $j$ , we  
 229 will have decontaminated all the arms of the spider from  $A_1$  to  $A_j$  including the root.  
 230 Since this is going to be a nonmonotone strategy, parts or whole of these arms may be  
 231 recontaminated during the course of the rest of the algorithm.

232 At the first iteration we start from the root, traverse  $A_1$  to the end and return to the  
 233 root. We proceed to decontaminate the rest of the spider using the following strategy.  
 234 At the beginning of  $j$ th iteration, our agent is at the root of the spider and all the arms  
 235 from  $A_1, \dots, A_{j-1}$  are fully decontaminated whereas  $A_j, \dots, A_\Delta$  are all fully contami-  
 236 nated (except for the root). The agent traverses each arm of the spider up to the farthest  
 237 contaminated vertex and returns to the root in sequence starting from  $A_j$  down to  $A_1$ .  
 238 Note that, as mentioned before, we will allow the root to get contaminated just once  
 239 in this iteration, that is, when our agent is traversing  $A_j$ . We want to fine tune our the  
 240 temporal immunity  $\tau$  such that once the agent returns after visiting all the vertices in  
 241  $A_j$ , during the rest of the iteration when the agent is visiting other arms, the root never  
 242 gets contaminated again.

243 Let  $t_1$  be the total time needed to traverse the arms  $A_j, \dots, A_2$  after the root has  
 244 been recontaminated (when the agent reached vertex  $t_0$  of  $A_j$ ). Then

$$245 \quad t_1 < 2m + 2(j-1) \times \frac{t_0}{2} \quad (1)$$

246 where the last term is the result of the constraint that the root may not be recontaminated  
 247 in the current iteration. Now during the time  $t_1$  at most  $t_0/2$  vertices of  $A_1$  should have  
 248 been contaminated (once again to avoid recontamination of the root when we visit  $A_1$ ).  
 249 But that would have taken  $t_0^2/2$  time units, therefore:


$$250 \quad t_1 = \frac{t_0^2}{2} \leq 2m + 2(j-1) \times \frac{t_0}{2}. \quad (2)$$

Solving (2) and using the fact that we get the worst bound at  $j = \Delta$  we conclude  
 that

$$\tau = t_0 < \Delta + \sqrt{\Delta^2 + 4m}.$$

□

251 **Corollary 1.** *If  $S$  is a spider on  $n$  vertices then  $\iota(S) = O(\sqrt{n})$ .*



**Fig. 2.** The agent is at the root. Arms  $A_1, \dots, A_6$  are decontaminated, represented as white dots. Dotted line segments show the path followed by the agent in 7th iteration to decontaminate  $A_7$ .

*Proof.* Let  $S$  be rooted at a vertex  $r$ . If  $\deg(r) = \Delta \leq \sqrt{n}$ , it follows from Theorem 4 that  $\iota(S) \leq \Delta + \sqrt{\Delta^2 + 4m} \leq 4\sqrt{n}$  which gives the claim. So, without loss of generality, assume that  $\Delta > \sqrt{n}$ .

Let  $A_1, A_2, \dots, A_\Delta$  be arms of  $S$  with  $|A_i| \leq |A_j|$ , for all  $i \leq j$ . Again without loss of generality for some  $k$

$$|A_i| \begin{cases} < \sqrt{n} & \text{if } 1 \leq i \leq k \\ \geq \sqrt{n} & \text{if } k < i \leq m \end{cases}$$

Now consider a modified spider  $S^* = S \setminus \bigcup_{1 \leq i \leq k} A_i$  with  $r$  as root. By pigeon hole principle,  $\Delta(S^*) \leq \sqrt{n}$ . So we can apply technique used in proof of Theorem 4 to decontaminate  $S^*$  with  $\tau \leq 4\sqrt{n}$ . Once  $S^*$  is decontaminated, we use Lemma 2 to decontaminate  $(S \setminus S^*) \cup \{r\}$ . Bound follows because height of this tree is less  $\sqrt{n}$  and already decontaminated  $S$  never gets recontaminated by monotonicity in Lemma 2.  $\square$

### 3.2 $k$ -ary Tree

252

**Lemma 2.** Any  $k$ -ary tree  $T$  with height  $h$  can be decontaminated with  $\tau = 2h - 1$  using a monotone algorithm.

253

254

*Proof.* First label the leaf vertices of  $T$  so that  $l_1, l_2, l_3, \dots$  represents the order in which the leaves are visited if an in-order depth first traversal is performed on  $T$  starting from

the root vertex. Now it is straightforward to verify that if we start with the agent at the root, and visit each leaf in order  $l_1, l_2, l_3, \dots$  returning to the root every time before visiting the next leaf, then  $\tau = 2h - 1$  would be enough to decontaminate the entire  $k$ -ary tree. Also note that once decontaminated any leaf  $l_i$  is never exposed again, and all nonleaf vertices, once decontaminated, are exposed for at most  $2h - 1$  time units. Monotonicity follows.  $\square$

255 Lemma 2 gives us the following corollary.

256 **Corollary 2.** *Let  $T$  be a perfect  $k$ -ary tree on  $n$  vertices, then  $\iota(T) = O(\log n)$ .*

257 In case of a binary tree the bound on temporal immunity can be slightly improved if we  
 258 use the above strategy to first fully decontaminate the subtree rooted at the left child of  
 259 the root, and then use the same method to decontaminate the subtree rooted at the right  
 260 child of the root.

261 **Observation 5** *A binary tree with height  $h$  can be decontaminated with an temporal*  
 262 *immunity of  $2h - 3$ .*

### 263 3.3 Mesh

264 A  $p \times q$  mesh is a graph that consists of  $pq$  vertices. It is convenient to work with  
 265 planar drawing of the graph where the vertices of  $G = (V, E)$  are embedded on the  
 266 integer coordinates of Cartesian plane. The vertices are named  $v_{(i,j)}$  for  $1 \leq i \leq q$ ,  
 267  $1 \leq j \leq p$  corresponding to their coordinates in the planar embedding. There is an  
 268 edge between a pair of vertices if their euclidean distance is exactly 1. We can partition  
 269  $V$  into  $C_1, C_2, \dots, C_q$  column sets so that  $v_{(i,j)} \in C_i$  for  $1 \leq i \leq q$  and  $1 \leq j \leq p$ .  
 270 Row sets of vertices  $R_1, R_2, \dots, R_p$  are defined analogously.


271 A simple approach to fully decontaminate a  $p \times q$  mesh would be to place our agent  
 272 at  $v_{(1,1)}$  at  $t = 0$ , proceed to visit all vertices in the column till we reach  $v_{(1,p)}$ , move  
 273 right one step to  $v_{(2,p)}$  and proceed all the way down to  $v_{(2,1)}$ . This process may now  
 274 be continued by moving the agent to  $v_{(3,1)}$  and going on to decontaminate the entire  
 275 graph column by column until we reach the last vertex. Clearly an temporal immunity  
 276 of  $2p - 1$  is enough for this strategy to monotonically decontaminate the entire graph.  
 277 In [7] the same strategy was used, albeit under a slightly different notion of *temporal*  
 278 *immunity*, to get a similar upper bound. However, once again we can improve this bound  
 279 by resorting to a nonmonotone strategy.

280 **Theorem 6** *Let  $G$  be a  $p \times q$  mesh where  $p \leq q$ , then  $\iota(G) \leq p$ .*

281 *Proof.* We will describe a strategy to decontaminate  $G$  in which we decontaminate each  
 282 column nonmonotonically. However, once we declare a column to be decontaminated,  
 283 we do not allow any of its vertices to be contaminated again.

Set the temporal immunity  $\tau = p$  and start with the agent at  $v_{(1,1)}$ . Proceed all the way up to  $v_{(1,p)}$ , move the agent to the next column onto  $v_{(2,p)}$ , and then start traversing down the column until we reach  $v_{(2, \lceil \frac{p}{2} \rceil + 1)}$ . Note that the vertices of  $C_1$  had started getting recontaminated when the agent reached  $v_{(2,p-1)}$  because the exposure time of  $v_{(1,1)}$  became equal to  $\tau$  at that point. Now move the agent back to  $C_1$  onto  $v_{(1, \lceil \frac{p}{2} \rceil + 1)}$  and

proceed all the way down back to  $v_{(1,1)}$ . We declare that  $C_1$  has been decontaminated and none of its vertices will be recontaminated during the course of decontamination of the rest of the graph. It is pertinent to note that at this point,  $\Xi(v_{(2,p)}) = \tau - 1 = p - 1$ . To decontaminate the rest of the columns we use the following scheme. Assume that we



**Fig. 3.** Dotted line segments outline the path agent to decontaminate mesh graph with  $\tau = 8$ . Once agent returns to  $v_{(1,1)}$ , we declare first column decontaminated, and proceed to first vertex of second column, and henceforth.

have declared all the columns  $C_1, C_2, \dots, C_k$  to be decontaminated and our agent is at  $v_{(k,1)}$ . We also know that  $\Xi(v_{(k+1,p)}) = \tau - 1$ . We move the agent to the next column onto  $v_{(k+1,1)}$ . At this point  $v_{(k+1,p)}$  becomes contaminated leaving  $v_{(k,p)}$  exposed. We follow the same strategy as the one that we followed when we were decontaminating  $C_1$ . We move the agent all the way up to  $v_{(k+1,p)}$ , move to  $C_{k+2}$ , traverse all the way down to  $v_{(k+2, \lceil \frac{p}{2} \rceil + 1)}$ , revert back to  $C_{k+1}$  and move back down to  $v_{(k+1,1)}$  declaring column  $C_{k+1}$  to be decontaminated. None of the vertices in  $C_k$  will be recontaminated since  $v_{(k,p)}$  had the maximum exposure time due to  $v_{(k+1,p)}$ , and we were able to decontaminate  $v_{(k+1,p)}$  before  $v_{(k,p)}$  got contaminated. Similarly, it is not difficult for the reader to verify that none of the rest of the vertices of  $C_k$  are exposed long enough to be recontaminated.  $\square$

**Corollary 3.** Let  $G$  be a mesh on  $n$  vertices, then  $\iota(G) \leq \sqrt{n}$ .

284

*Remark 2.* Strategy used in proof of Theorem 6 can also be used to decontaminate a cylinder graph (a mesh graph with an edge between the leftmost and the rightmost vertices on each row).

285

286

287

288 In the following we present an asymptotically sharp lower bound for mesh graphs, but  
 289 first we would like to establish a graph isoperimetric result that we use in proof of lower  
 290 bound.

291 **Lemma 3.** *Let  $G = (V, E)$  be an  $\sqrt{n} \times \sqrt{n}$  mesh graph, then for any  $W \subset V$ ,  $|W| =$   
 292  $\frac{n}{2}$ , size of maximum matching between  $W$  and its complement has size at least  $\sqrt{n}$ .*

293 *Proof.* For ease of understanding let us say that a vertex is colored white if it is in set  
 294  $W$ , and black otherwise. An edge is monochromatic if both its endpoints have the same  
 295 color, and nonmonochromatic otherwise. Let  $R_1, R_2, \dots, R_{\sqrt{n}}$ , and  $C_1, C_2, \dots, C_{\sqrt{n}}$   
 296 be the row and column sets respectively. We observe following four possible cases:

297 *Case 1.* For each row  $R_i$ ,  $0 < |R_i \cap W| < \sqrt{n}$ :

298 Since  $R_i$  contains vertices of both colors, it is clear that there will be at least one non-  
 299 monochromatic edge. We pick one such edge from each  $R_i$ . As these edges are disjoint,  
 300 we have a matching of size at least  $\sqrt{n}$ .

301 *Case 2.* There exist two rows  $R_i, R_j$ , such that  $|R_i \cap W| = 0$ , and  $|R_j \cap W| = \sqrt{n}$ :

302 We interchange the roles of rows and columns. Claim then follows from Case 1.

303 *Case 3.* There exists a row  $R_i$ , such that  $|R_i \cap W| = 0$ , and for every row  $R_j$ ,  $|R_j \cap W| \neq$   
 304  $\sqrt{n}$ :

305 We present a scheme to match vertices in this case below.

306 We will use two markers  $\mathbf{b}$  (for bottom row), and  $\mathbf{c}$  (for current row). In the begin-  
 307 ning, both point to the first row of the mesh i.e  $\mathbf{b} := \mathbf{c} := 1$ .

- 308 1. Locate minimum  $x \geq \mathbf{c} \geq \mathbf{b}$ , such that  $R_x \cap W = \emptyset$ . If we can not find such an  $x$ ,  
 309 go to Step 3.
- 310 (a) Now locate maximum  $y < x \leq \mathbf{b}$ , such that  $|R_y \cap W| \geq x - y + 1$ . For  
 311 all the white vertices in  $R_y$  we have black vertices in corresponding columns  
 312 of  $R_x$ . So for each such column there exists a pair of rows  $R_i, R_{i+1}$  with a  
 313 nonmonochromatic edge in that column where  $y \leq i < x$ . We set  $\mathbf{c} := x + 1$ ,  
 314 and call rows  $R_j$  for  $y \leq j \leq x$  *matched*.
- 315 (b) If we cannot find such a  $y$ , then we look for a minimum  $z > x$ , such that  
 316  $|R_z \cap W| \geq z - x + 1$ . For all the white vertices in  $R_z$ , we can find non-  
 317 monochromatic edges as above. We set  $\mathbf{c} := z + 1$  and  $\mathbf{b} := x + 1$  and we call  
 318 rows  $R_j, x \leq j \leq z$  *matched*.
2. Repeat Step 1. Failure to find both  $y$  and  $z$  at any step would imply a contradiction  
 because there are not enough black vertices as assumed. In worst case

$$\left| \bigcup_{i=1}^{x-1} R_i \right| \leq (x-1) \frac{\sqrt{n}}{2}$$

(alternating complete black and white rows), and

$$\left| \bigcup_{j=x+1}^{\sqrt{n}} R_j \right| < (\sqrt{n} - (x+1)) \frac{\sqrt{n}}{2}$$

3. Match all unmatched rows as in Case 1. 319

*Case 4.* There exists a row  $R_i$ , such that  $|R_i \cap W| = \sqrt{n}$  and for every row  $R_j$ ,  $|R_j \cap W| \neq 0$ . 320

Claim in this case follows directly from the proof of Case 3 by reversing the roles of  $W$  and  $\overline{W}$ . 321  
322  
323

This concludes the proof of Lemma. □

Note that bound in Lemma 3 is tight when  $W$  is a *rectangular* subgrid. We do not know of a tight example which is not rectangular in shape. We observe that since  $\Delta = 4$  for mesh, Lemma 3 also follows from vertex and edge isoperimetric inequalities proved in [3][4] except for a constant factor. 324  
325  
326  
327

**Theorem 7** Let  $G$  be a  $p \times q$  mesh where  $p \leq q$ , then  $\iota(G) > \frac{p}{2}$ . 328

*Proof.* Let us assume the contrapositive i.e, a decontaminating algorithm exists with  $\tau = \frac{p}{2}$ . For simplicity assume that  $G$  is a  $p \times p$  mesh and ignore the agent's moves in rest of the vertices if any. Let  $n = p^2$ , then at some time step during this algorithm we will have exactly  $\frac{n}{2}$  decontaminated vertices. Lemma 3 implies that at this stage at least  $p$  vertices of  $G$  are exposed through at least  $p$  disjoint edges to contaminated vertices. By considering all possible moves of the agent for next  $\frac{p}{2}$  steps it is clear that at least  $\frac{p}{2}$  vertices will be recontaminated, and no matter what the agent does this can decontaminate at most  $\frac{p}{2}$  vertices making no progress at all. It already gives that number of decontaminated vertices can never exceed  $\frac{n}{2} + \frac{p}{2}$ . It follows that no decontaminating algorithm exists with assumed temporal immunity. □

## 4 General Trees 329

To upper bound  $\iota$  for general trees, we will try to adapt the strategy used to decontaminate  $k$ -ary trees. The simplest approach is to naively apply the same strategy on a given tree  $T$  as before, this time considering the center vertex (choose one arbitrarily if there are two center vertices) of the tree to be the *root* and then visiting each of the leaves of  $T$  in the depth first search discovery order, every time returning to the center vertex, as in the previous case. It is clear that an temporal immunity  $\tau = 2 \cdot \text{rad}(T) = \text{diam}(T) + 1$  is sufficient to fully decontaminate  $T$  but the diameter of a tree on  $n$  vertices can easily be  $O(n)$ . However, we can use nonmonotonicity to our advantage by letting a controlled number of vertices get recontaminated so that we get a much stronger bound even for trees with large diameters. 330  
331  
332  
333  
334  
335  
336  
337  
338  
339

We will need the following lemma which describes a monotone strategy to decontaminate trees with small height. 340  
341

**Lemma 4.** Any rooted tree  $T$ , with height  $h$ , can be decontaminated with temporal immunity  $\tau \geq \alpha h$ , in time  $cn$ , where  $n$  is the number of vertices in  $T$ , and  $c \leq 4 \frac{\alpha-1}{\alpha-2}$  for any positive  $\alpha > 2$ . 342  
343  
344

345 *Proof.* Assuming an arbitrary tree with height and temporal immunity  $\tau$  as above, we  
 346 present an algorithm with claimed time complexity.

347

348 Let  $l$  be maximum integer such that there exists a subtree  $P_1$  rooted at  $p_1$  with  
 349  $|P_1| > h\frac{\alpha}{2} - h$  at level  $l$ , and let  $s_1, s_2, \dots, s_m$  be children of one such  $s$ ; for all  $i$  let  $S_i$   
 350 be subtrees rooted at  $s_i$ , then  $|S_i| < h\frac{\alpha}{2} - h$  by maximality of  $l$ . Now let  $j$  be the largest  
 351 integer such that  $|S_1 \cup \dots \cup S_j \cup \{p_1\}| < (h\frac{\alpha}{2} - h)$ , we define  $X_1 := S_1 \cup \dots \cup S_j \cup \{p_1\}$ .  
 352 We similarly define  $X_2, \dots, X_k$ , as maximal subtrees all rooted at  $p_1$  making sure that  
 353  $\frac{1}{2}h(\frac{\alpha}{2} - 1) < |X_i| < h(\frac{\alpha}{2} - 1)$ , with possible exception of  $X_k$  which might be of  
 354 smaller cardinality.




Fig. 4. Example illustrating grouping of  $S_i$  into  $X_j$

355

356 For decontamination process, the agent starts at root of  $T$ , walks its way to  $p_1$ , per-  
 357 forms a depth first search traversal on each  $X_i$  one by one. We can afford this because  
 358 immunity is strictly greater than the amount of time it takes to perform the traversal on  
 359 each  $X_i$ ; in fact its easy to see that any  $\tau \geq h\alpha - 2h$  is enough to completely clean  $P_1$ .

360

Next step is to walk up to  $p_2$  parent of  $p_1$ . The plan is to make sure that  $p_2$  never  
 gets recontaminated. Let  $P_2$  be the subtree rooted at  $p_2$ . Arbitrarily choose any subtree  
 $R \subseteq P_2 \setminus P_1$ , at minimum possible distance from  $P_2$  (e.g. potentially  $R = P_2$ ), with  
 the property that for all subtrees  $R_i$  of  $R$ ,  $|R_i| < h\frac{\alpha}{2} - h$  as before. We will group  
 $R_i$ 's into  $X_j$ 's as before but this time after performing depth first search traversal on  
 each  $X_j$ , we will pay a visit to  $p_2$ , making sure it remains decontaminated. Once  $P_2$   
 is decontaminated, we proceed to  $p_3$  the parent of  $p_2$  and repeat the process until  $p_j$   
 is the root of  $T$ , and that we are done with decontamination process. From the fact that

each  $X_i$  is small enough, it is easy to see that  $\tau = \alpha h$  is enough for the process. We can always group any tree into at most  $2\frac{n}{q}$  subtrees each of size  $(h\frac{\alpha}{2} - h) \leq |X_i| \leq h(\alpha - 2)$  where  $q = h(\alpha - 2)$ . The agent spends at most  $2q$  time units on depth first traversal and  $2h$  time units on visiting some  $p_j$  potentially at distance  $h$  for each such subtree. Total amount of time spent in the process is

$$\begin{aligned}
&\leq 2\frac{n}{q} \times 2(q + h) \\
&\leq 2\frac{n}{q} \times 2(q + \frac{q}{\alpha - 2}) \\
&= 2n \times 2(1 + \frac{1}{\alpha - 2}) \\
&= 4n \times \frac{\alpha - 1}{\alpha - 2}
\end{aligned}$$

□

**Theorem 8** *Let  $T$  be a tree on  $n$  vertices, then  $\iota(T) = O(\sqrt{n})$ .*

*Proof.* First of all, following is easily seen:

**Observation 9** *Decontamination strategy in Lemma 4 is a monotone strategy.*

Now let  $c$  be a center vertex of  $T$  and let  $m$  be the number of leaves in  $T$ . Recall that an arm  $A_i$  is a set of vertices that lie on the path from  $c$  to a leaf  $l_i$  for all  $1 \leq i \leq m$ . Given a tree  $T$  rooted at  $v$ , we denote by  $T_x(v)$  a subtree of  $T$  that is attained by removing all vertices from  $T$  that are at distance more than  $x$  from  $v$  i.e.,  $T_x$  is  $T$  truncated at depth  $x$ . Assume without loss of generality that leaves  $l_i$  are sorted in their depth first search discovery ordering. This implies an ordering on arms  $A_i$ . Note that  $A_i \setminus \{c\}$  are not disjoint in general. Once we have an order, agent will start decontaminating arms one by one according to following algorithm.

– For  $i = 1$  to  $m$

- Perform an auxiliary step and apply Lemma 4 on  $T_{\sqrt{n}}(c)$  with  $\alpha = 3$ .
- Move the agent from  $c$  towards leaf  $l_i$  until it reaches a vertex  $v_j$  with  $\deg(v_j) > 2$ . We will apply Lemma 4 on  $T_{10\sqrt{n}}(v_j)$  again with  $\alpha = 3$ . After performing an auxiliary decontamination step, we will not perform any more auxiliary steps for next  $5\sqrt{n}$  time units of this walk. Since  $l_i$  can be at distance at most  $\frac{n}{2}$  from  $c$ , total number of auxiliary steps we perform on this walk is bounded from above by  $\frac{n}{10\sqrt{n}}$ . It also follows that no vertex lies in more than two  $T_{10\sqrt{n}}(v_j)$ 's. We return to  $c$  along the shortest path.

To analyze this scheme, we find following definition useful:

**Definition 1.** *A vertex  $v$  in tree  $T$  is called secured at some time step  $i$  if it never gets contaminated again.*

384 Agent decontaminates a new arm  $A_i$  in  $i$ th iteration of the algorithm. We Observe  
 385 that

386 *Claim.* Following invariants hold for every step of the algorithm:

- 387 (i) Root  $c$  is secured at iteration 1.
- 388 (ii) For any secured vertex  $v$ , and a contaminated vertex  $w$ , which is in same branch as  
 389  $A_i$ ,  $dist(v, w) > \sqrt{n}$  at start of iteration  $i + 1$ .
- 390 (iii) All vertices  $v_j \in A_i$  are secured at start of iteration  $i + 1$ .

*Proof.* We fix  $\tau = 30\sqrt{n}$ . Let  $\Gamma(i)$  be the time spent in the algorithm at iteration  $i$ , then  $\Gamma(i)$  can be broken down into three parts: (1) the time spent performing auxiliary decontamination at  $c$ , (2) the time spent visiting  $l_i$ , and (3) time spent at each auxiliary step on the way to  $l_i$ , which is  $8a_j$  with  $a_j$  be size of the tree used in auxiliary step. We have,

$$\begin{aligned}\Gamma(i) &\leq 8n + n + 8\sum_j a_j \\ &\leq 8n + n + 16n \\ &= 25n\end{aligned}$$

391 where we use the fact that  $\sum_j a_j$  cannot be more than twice the number of total vertices  
 392 since each vertex is used in at most two such auxiliary steps. Since  $\tau = 30\sqrt{n}$ , after  
 393 performing an auxiliary decontamination step on tree with  $\sqrt{n}$  height, it takes  $\geq 30n$   
 394 for the contamination to creep back to the root which is less than the time spent in one  
 395 iteration. This fact along with Observation 9 gives the first invariant (i).  
 396

397 Now a vertex  $v$  is secured only if  $v \in A_j$  for some  $j \leq i$ . If  $v$  lies in a different  
 398 branch than the one  $A_i$  lies in then invariant (ii), and (iii) follow from (i) i.e. if  $c$  is  
 399 secured then contamination has no way to spread from one branch to another, and if a  
 400 branch has been decontaminated, it will not get recontaminated. For any contaminated  
 401 vertex  $w$ ,  $dist(c, w) > \sqrt{n}$  implies that  $dist(v, w) > \sqrt{n}$ , for any  $v$  in a fully de-  
 402 contaminated branch. So we assume without loss of generality that  $v$  lies in the same  
 403 branch as  $A_i$ . From order defined on leaves in which we decontaminate them, it is clear  
 404 that after iteration  $i$ , closest secured vertex to any contaminated vertex, lies in arm  $A_i$ .  
 405 A direct consequence of performing auxiliary decontamination during iteration  $i$  is that  
 406 any contaminated vertex is at distance more than  $5\sqrt{n}$  from closest  $v \in A_i$ . When we  
 407 have completed iteration  $i$ , it is still more than  $4\sqrt{n}$  distance away. Which implies part  
 408 invariant (ii).  
 409

For any contaminated vertex  $w$ , any  $u \in A_i$ , and any  $v \in A_j$  for  $j < i$  all contained  
 in the same branch it holds that  $dist(u, w) < dist(v, w)$ . It follows that  $v \in A_j$  for  
 $j < i$  never get contaminated during decontamination process of their branch. This  
 along with (i) implies (iii).  $\square$

Claim completes the proof of Theorem with  $\iota = 30\sqrt{n}$ . Although constant can be  
 improved upto 6, but resulting structure of proof is messier and, in our opinion, doesn't  
 yield any further insight into the problem.  $\square$

## 5 Discussion

410

While we presented some interesting results, we would like to mention that there are still some very basic questions that seem to be open for further investigations. For example, we showed that for any tree  $T$ ,  $\iota(T) = O(\sqrt{n})$ , yet it is not clear whether this is asymptotically optimal or not. Using somewhat involved argument, it can be shown that there exist trees  $T$  on  $n$  vertices for which  $\iota(T) = \Omega(n^{\frac{1}{3}+\epsilon})$  for any constant  $\epsilon > 0$ . It is also noteworthy to state that if we limit algorithms to be monotone, it is easy to see that  $\iota(T) = \Theta(n)$  e.g. consider a spider with three arms of equal length. Another interesting topology is that of planar graphs. Since mesh is a planar graph, it directly follows from Theorem 7 that

411  
412  
413  
414  
415  
416  
417  
418  
419

**Corollary 4.** *There exist planar graphs on  $n$  vertices such that their immunity number  $\iota > \frac{\sqrt{n}}{2}$ .*

420  
421

We believe that

422

*Conjecture 1.* Any planar graph  $G$  on  $n$  vertices can be decontaminated with  $\tau(G) = O(\sqrt{n})$ .

423  
424

A similar bound for a slightly different problem of bounding,  $s(G)$ , lends some credence to the above conjecture. Search number,  $s(G)$ , is the minimum number of agents needed to decontaminate a graph with  $\tau = 0$ . Following was proved in [1] by Alon et al., but we note that proof we present here is simpler, shorter, and more intuitive.

425  
426  
427  
428

**Theorem 10** *Any planar graph  $G = (V, E)$  on  $n$  vertices can be decontaminated with  $s(G) = O(\sqrt{n})$  agents where vertices of  $G$  don't have any immunity.*

429  
430

*Proof.* We partition  $V$  into three sets  $V_1, V_2$ , and  $S$  using Planar Separator Theorem [17], where  $|V_i| \leq \frac{2n}{3}$ ,  $|S| \leq 3\sqrt{n}$ , owing to improvements in [10], and for any  $v \in V_1$ , and any  $w \in V_2$ , edge  $vw \notin E$ . We place  $3\sqrt{n}$  agents on  $S$  to make sure that contamination can not spread from  $V_1$  to  $V_2$ , or vice versa. Let  $G_1 = (V_1, E_1)$  be the subgraph of  $G$  where an edge of  $E$  is in  $E_1$  if both its endpoints are in  $V_1$ . Similarly, define  $G_2 = (V_2, E_2)$ . Now let's say it takes  $s(G_1)$  agents to decontaminate  $G_1$ , once  $G_1$  is fully decontaminated, we can reuse all those agents to decontaminate  $G_2$ . Since both  $G_1$  and  $G_2$  are also planar graphs, this gives us an obvious recurrence for  $s(G)$ :

$$s(G) \leq \max(s(G_1), s(G_2)) + 3\sqrt{n}$$

So the total number of agents required is at most  $3\sqrt{n} + 3\sqrt{\frac{2n}{3}} + \dots = O(\sqrt{n})$  which completes the proof.  $\square$

Technique used in proof of Theorem 10 may help devise a similar proof for the conjectured bound on immunity number of planar graph. In any case, we do have a hunch that Planar Separator Theorem may be beneficial in that case as well.

431  
432  
433  
434

Also it's not hard to show that  $K_n$  has highest immunity number among all graphs on  $n$  vertices.

435  
436

437 **Theorem 11** Any connected graph  $G = (V, E)$  on  $n$  vertices can be decontaminated  
 438 with  $\tau = n - 1$ .

*Proof.* Start with an agent on arbitrary vertex  $v_1$ , and at each time step keep walking the agent to successive nonvisited neighbors. If we exhaust all  $V$  then we are done since we visited all vertices before first vertex got recontaminated. Otherwise agent gets stuck at the end of some path  $v_1, \dots, v_{k-1}, v_k$  such that all neighbors of  $v_k$  have already been visited. We call such a vertex *terminal* vertex. For the rest of decontamination process, we will assume that  $v_k$  does not exist. We traverse the agent back along  $v_k, v_{k-1}, \dots, v_1$  to reach  $v_1$ , and then come back along same path to reach  $v_{k-1}$ . This time the agent moves to some other neighbor of  $v_{k-1}$  if any, and continue as before either finding another terminal vertex and deleting it too or finding a cycle on rest of the vertices. In either case, process completes in finite time. Since the agent decontaminated terminal vertices, they cannot contaminate any other vertex after they have been visited. And since, every time the agent encounters a terminal vertex it goes back to  $v_1$ , and visits all its neighbors (all of which lie on agent's path back to  $v_1$ ) in the next less than  $n - 1$  steps, terminal vertices cannot get contaminated again. Vertices that are not terminal are decontaminated at the end of the process because they are visited in the traversal on cycle which takes at most  $n - 1$  steps after we leave  $v_1$ . The claim follows.  $\square$

439 This might tempt one to conjecture that  $\iota(G)$  is an increasing graph property i.e. if we  
 440 add new edges to  $G$  then immunity number can only go up. But as the following claim  
 441 illustrates, that is not the case.

442 **Observation 12** Immunity number is not an increasing graph property. [13]

*Proof.* Consider the following counter-example. Let  $G$  be a spider with  $2\sqrt{n}$  arms labeled  $A_1, A_2, \dots, A_{2\sqrt{n}}$ , where


$$|A_i| = \begin{cases} \sqrt{n} - 1 & \text{if } i \equiv 0 \pmod{2} \\ 1 & \text{if } i \equiv 1 \pmod{2} \end{cases}$$

Now construct  $G^*$  by adding edges  $vw$  where  $v \in A_i, w \in A_{i+1}$ , for all  $i \equiv 1 \pmod{2}$  then we can decontaminate  $G^*$  with  $\tau(G^*) = 2$ . We leave it as an exercise for the reader to verify that  $\iota(G) > 2$ .  $\square$

443 There are natural generalizations of the problem investigated in this paper to directed  
 444 and weighted graphs. One can also look at behavior of immunity number of random  
 445 graphs.

## 446 6 Acknowledgments

447 We are grateful to Devendra Desai, Jeff Kahn, and William Steiger for their insightful  
 448 comments and discussions.



**Fig. 5.** (Left)  $G$  is a spider tree, and can't be decontaminated with small temporal immunity. We get  $G^*$  (on right) by adding dashed edges, and its easy to see that we can decontaminate  $G^*$  with  $\tau = 2$ .

## References

1. Noga Alon and Abbas Mehrabian. Chasing a fast robber on planar graphs and random graphs. 450
2. Lali Barrière, Paola Flocchini, Pierre Fraigniaud, and Nicola Santoro. Capture of an intruder by mobile agents. In *Proceedings of the fourteenth annual ACM symposium on Parallel algorithms and architectures*, pages 200–209. ACM, 2002. 451
3. Béla Bollobás and Imre Leader. Compressions and isoperimetric inequalities. *Journal of Combinatorial Theory, Series A*, 56(1):47–62, 1991. 452
4. Béla Bollobás and Imre Leader. Edge-isoperimetric inequalities in the grid. *Combinatorica*, 11(4):299–314, 1991. 453
5. R Breisch. An intuitive approach to speleotopology. *Southwestern cavers*, 6(5):72–78, 1967. 454
6. Fan RK Chung. Pebbling in hypercubes. *SIAM Journal on Discrete Mathematics*, 2(4):467–472, 1989. 455
7. Yassine Daadaa. *Network Decontamination with Temporal Immunity*. PhD thesis, University of Ottawa, 2012. 456
8. Yassine Daadaa, Paola Flocchini, and Nejib Zaguia. Network decontamination with temporal immunity by cellular automata. In *Cellular Automata*, pages 287–299. Springer, 2010. 457
9. Yassine Daadaa, Paola Flocchini, and Nejib Zaguia. Decontamination with temporal immunity by mobile cellular automata. In *International Conference on Scientific Computing (CSC)*, pages 172–178, 2011. 458
10. Hristo Nicolov Djidjev. On the problem of partitioning planar graphs. *SIAM Journal on Algebraic Discrete Methods*, 3(2):229–240, 1982. 459
11. Paola Flocchini, Flaminia L Luccio, and L Xiuli Song. Size optimal strategies for capturing an intruder in mesh networks. In *Proceedings of the International Conference on Communications in Computing (CIC), Las Vegas, USA*, pages 200–206, 2005. 460
12. Paola Flocchini, Bernard Mans, and Nicola Santoro. Tree decontamination with temporary immunity. In *Algorithms and Computation*, pages 330–341. Springer, 2008. 461
13. Jeff Kahn. Personal communication, 2013. 462

- 477 14. Shay Kutten and David Peleg. Fault-local distributed mending. *Journal of Algorithms*,  
478 30(1):144–165, 1999.
- 479 15. Shay Kutten and David Peleg. Tight fault locality. *SIAM Journal on Computing*, 30(1):247–  
480 268, 2000.
- 481 16. Andrea S LaPaugh. Recontamination does not help to search a graph. *Journal of the ACM*  
482 (*JACM*), 40(2):224–245, 1993.
- 483 17. Richard J Lipton and Robert Endre Tarjan. A separator theorem for planar graphs. *SIAM*  
484 *Journal on Applied Mathematics*, 36(2):177–189, 1979.
- 485 18. Fabrizio Luccio, Linda Pagli, and Nicola Santoro. Network decontamination with local im-  
486 munization. In *Proceedings of the 20th international conference on Parallel and distributed*  
487 *processing*, pages 264–264. IEEE Computer Society, 2006.
- 488 19. Nimrod Megiddo, S Louis Hakimi, Michael R Garey, David S Johnson, and Christos H  
489 Papadimitriou. The complexity of searching a graph. *Journal of the ACM (JACM)*, 35(1):18–  
490 44, 1988.
- 491 20. Torrence D Parson. Pursuit-evasion in a graph. theory and applications of graphs. *Lecture*  
492 *Notes in Mathematics, Springer-Verlag*, pages 426–441, 1976.
- 493 21. Torrence D Parsons. The search number of a connected graph. In *Proc. 9th South-Eastern*  
494 *Conf. on Combinatorics, Graph Theory, and Computing*, pages 549–554, 1978.