

Simultaneous Consecutive Ones Submatrix and Editing Problems : Classical Complexity & Fixed-Parameter Tractable Results

Rani M. R, R. Subashini, Mohith Jagalmohan

*Department of Computer Science & Engineering,
National Institute of Technology, Calicut
{rani_p150067cs, suba}@nitc.ac.in*

Abstract

A binary matrix M has the consecutive ones property (C1P) for rows (resp. columns) if there is a permutation of its columns (resp. rows) that arranges the ones consecutively in all the rows (resp. columns). If M has the C1P for rows and the C1P for columns, then M is said to have the simultaneous consecutive ones property (SC1P). Binary matrices having the SC1P plays an important role in theoretical as well as practical applications.

In this article, we consider the classical complexity and fixed-parameter tractability of (a) Simultaneous Consecutive Ones Submatrix (SC1S) and (b) Simultaneous Consecutive Ones Editing (SC1E) [Oswald et al., Theoretical Comp. Sci. 410(21-23):1986-1992, 2009] problems. SC1S problems focus on deleting a minimum number of rows, columns, and rows as well as columns to establish the SC1P, whereas SC1E problems deal with flipping a minimum number of 0-entries, 1-entries, and 0-entries as well as 1-entries to obtain the SC1P. We show that the decision versions of SC1S and SC1E problems are NP-complete.

We consider the parameterized versions of SC1S and SC1E problems with d , being the solution size, as the parameter. Given a binary matrix M and a positive integer d , d -SC1S-R, d -SC1S-C, and d -SC1S-RC problems decide whether there exists a set of rows, columns, and rows as well as columns, respectively, of size at most d , whose deletion results in a matrix with the SC1P. The d -SC1P-0E, d -SC1P-1E, and d -SC1P-01E problems decide whether there exists a set of 0-entries, 1-entries, and 0-entries as well as 1-entries, respectively, of size at most d , whose flipping results in a matrix with the SC1P.

Our main results include:

1. The decision versions of SC1S and SC1E problems are NP-complete.
2. Using bounded search tree technique, certain reductions and related results from the literature [Cao et al., *Algorithmica* 75(1):118-137, 2016, and Kaplan et al., *SIAM Journal on Computing* 28(5):1906-1922, 1999], we show that d-SC1S-R, d-SC1S-C, d-SC1S-RC and d-SC1P-0E are fixed-parameter tractable on binary matrices with run-times $O^*(8^d)$, $O^*(8^d)$, $O^*(2^{O(d \log d)})$ and $O^*(18^d)$ respectively.

We also give improved FPT algorithms for SC1S and SC1E problems on certain restricted binary matrices.

Keywords: Simultaneous Consecutive Ones Property, Consecutive Ones Property, Fixed-Parameter Tractable, Parameterized Complexity

1. Introduction

Binary matrices having the simultaneous consecutive ones property are fundamental in recognizing biconvex graphs [1], recognizing proper interval graphs [2], identifying block structure of matrices in applications arising from integer linear programming [3] and finding clusters of ones from metabolic networks [4]. A binary matrix has the *consecutive ones property (C1P) for rows (resp. columns)* [5], if there is a permutation of its columns (resp. rows) that arranges the ones consecutively in all the rows (resp. columns). A binary matrix has the *simultaneous consecutive ones property (SC1P)* [6], if we can permute the rows and columns in such a way that the ones in every column and in every row occur consecutively. That is, a binary matrix has the SC1P if it satisfies the C1P for both rows and columns. Matrices with the C1P and the SC1P are related to interval graphs and proper interval graphs respectively. There exist several linear-time and polynomial-time algorithms for testing the C1P for columns (see, for example [7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12]). These algorithms can also be used for testing the C1P for rows. The column permutation (if one exists) to obtain the C1P for rows will not affect the C1P of the columns (if one exists) and vice versa. Thus, testing the SC1P can also be done in linear time.

SC1P being a non-trivial property, we aim to establish the SC1P in a given binary matrix through deletion of row(s)/column(s) and flipping of 0s/1s. We consider the Simultaneous Consecutive Ones Submatrix (SC1S) and Simultaneous Consecutive Ones Editing (SC1E) [6] problems to establish the SC1P, if the given binary matrix do not have the SC1P. *SC1S problems* focus on deleting a minimum number of rows, columns, and rows as well as columns to establish the SC1P whereas *SC1E problems* deal with flipping a minimum number of 0-entries, 1-entries, and 0-entries as well as 1-entries to obtain the SC1P. We pose the following optimization problems: SC1S-ROW DELETION, SC1S-COLUMN DELETION and SC1S-ROW-COLUMN DELETION in the SC1S category, and, SC1P-0-FLIPPING, SC1P-1-FLIPPING and SC1P-01-FLIPPING in the SC1E category. Given a binary matrix M , the SC1S-ROW/COLUMN/ROW-COLUMN DELETION finds a minimum number of rows/columns/rows as well as columns, whose deletion results in a matrix satisfying the SC1P. On the other hand, the SC1P-0/1/01-FLIPPING finds a minimum number of 0-entries/1-entries/any entries, to be flipped to satisfy the SC1P. We show that the decision versions of the above defined problems are NP-complete. We refer to the parameterized versions of the above problems, parameterized by d as d -SC1S-R/C/RC and d -SC1P-0E/1E/01E respectively, with d being the number of rows/columns/rows as well as columns that can be deleted, and the number of 0-entries/1-entries/any entries that can be flipped respectively.

Parameterized Complexity: Fixed-parameter tractability is one of the ways to deal with NP-hard problems. In parameterized complexity, the running time of an algorithm is measured not only in terms of the input size, but also in terms of a parameter. A parameter is an integer associated with an instance of a problem. It is a measure of some property of the input instance. A problem is *fixed-parameter tractable (FPT)* with respect to a parameter d , if there exists an algorithm that solves the problem in $f(d) \cdot n^{O(1)}$ time, where f is a computable function depending only on d , and n is the size of the input instance. The time complexity of such algorithms can be expressed as $O^*(f(d))$, by hiding the polynomial terms in n . We recommend the interested reader to [13] for a more comprehensive overview of the topic.

Problem Definition: A *matrix* can be considered as a set of rows (columns) together with an order on this set [14]. Here, in this paper, the term matrix always refer to a *binary matrix*. For a given matrix M , m_{ij} refers to the entry corresponding to i^{th} row and j^{th} column of M . Matrix having at most x ones in each column and at most y ones in each row is denoted as (x, y) -matrix. A $(2, *)$ -matrix can contain at most two ones per column and there is no bound on the number of ones per row. A $(*, 2)$ -matrix has no restriction on the number of ones per column and have at most two ones per row. Given an $m \times n$ matrix M , let $R(M) = \{r_1, r_2, \dots, r_m\}$ and $C(M) = \{c_1, c_2, \dots, c_n\}$ denote the sets of rows and columns of M , respectively. Here, r_i and c_j denote the binary vectors corresponding to row r_i and column c_j of M , respectively. For a subset $R' \subseteq R(M)$ of rows, $M[R']$ and $M \setminus R'$ denote the submatrix induced on R' and $R(M) \setminus R'$ respectively. Similarly, for a subset $C' \subseteq C(M)$ of columns, the submatrix induced on C' and $C(M) \setminus C'$ are denoted by $M[C']$ and $M \setminus C'$ respectively. Let $A(M) = \{ij \mid m_{ij} = 1\}$ and $B(M) = \{ij \mid m_{ij} = 0\}$ be the set of indices of all 1-entries and 0-entries respectively in M . We present the formal definitions of the problems d-SC1S-R, d-SC1S-C, d-SC1S-RC, d-SC1P-0E and d-SC1P-01E as follows.

Simultaneous Consecutive Ones Submatrix (SC1S) Problems

Instance: $\langle M, d \rangle$ - An $m \times n$ matrix M and an integer $d \geq 0$.

Parameter: d .

d-SC1S-R: Does there exist a set $R' \subseteq R(M)$, with $|R'| \leq d$ such that $M \setminus R'$ satisfies the SC1P?

d-SC1S-C: Does there exist a set $C' \subseteq C(M)$, with $|C'| \leq d$ such that $M \setminus C'$ satisfies the SC1P?

d-SC1S-RC: Does there exist sets $R' \subseteq R(M)$, and $C' \subseteq C(M)$, with $|R'| + |C'| \leq d$ such that $((M \setminus R') \setminus C')$ satisfies the SC1P?

Simultaneous Consecutive Ones Editing (SC1E) Problems

Instance: $\langle M, d \rangle$ - An $m \times n$ matrix M and an integer $d \geq 0$.

Parameter: d .

d -SC1P-1E [6]: Does there exist a set $A' \subseteq A(M)$, with $|A'| \leq d$ such that the resultant matrix obtained by flipping the entries of A' in M satisfies the SC1P?

d -SC1P-0E: Does there exist a set $B' \subseteq B(M)$, with $|B'| \leq d$ such that the resultant matrix obtained by flipping the entries of B' in M satisfies the SC1P?

d -SC1P-01E: Does there exist a set $I \subseteq A(M) \cup B(M)$, with $|I| \leq d$ such that the resultant matrix obtained by flipping the entries of I in M satisfies the SC1P?

Complexity Status: Oswald and Reinelt [6] posed the decision version of the SC1P-1-FLIPPING problem as *k-augmented simultaneous consecutive ones property* and showed that it is NP-complete even for $(*, 2)$ -matrices. To the best of our knowledge, the parameterized problems posed under SC1S and SC1E category are not explicitly mentioned in the literature. Also, the classical complexity and parameterized complexity of SC1S and SC1E problems are not known prior to this work.

Our Results: We investigate the classical complexity and fixed-parameter tractability of SC1S and SC1E problems (defined above). We prove the NP-completeness of the decision versions of SC1S and SC1E problems except for the SC1P-1-FLIPPING problem. Using bounded search tree technique, few reduction rules and related results from the literature [15, 16], we present fixed-parameter tractable algorithms for d -SC1S-R, d -SC1S-C, d -SC1S-RC and d -SC1P-0E problems on *general matrices* (where there is no restriction on the number of ones in rows and columns) with run-times $O^*(8^d)$, $O^*(8^d)$, $O^*(2^{O(d \log d)})$ and $O^*(18^d)$ respectively.

For $(2, 2)$ -matrices, we observe that SC1S and SC1E problems are solvable in polynomial-time. We also give improved FPT algorithms for SC1S and SC1E problems on certain restricted matrices. We summarize our FPT results in the following table.

Problem	(2, *)-matrix	(* , 2)-matrix	(* , *)-matrix
d-SC1S-R/C	$O^*(4^d/3^d)$	$O^*(3^d/4^d)$	$O^*(8^d)$
d-SC1S-RC	$O^*(7^d)$	$O^*(7^d)$	$O^*(2^{O(d \log d)})$
d-SC1P-0E	irrelevant	irrelevant	$O^*(18^d)$
d-SC1P-1E	$O^*(6^d)$	$O^*(6^d)$?
d-SC1P-01E	irrelevant	irrelevant	?

Here, we observe that while defining d-SC1P-0E and d-SC1P-01E problems on $(2, *)/(*, 2)$ -matrix, flipping of 0-entries, may change the input matrix to one which is not a $(2, *)/(*, 2)$ -matrix. We also observe that on $(2, *)$ -matrices and $(* , 2)$ -matrices, SC1S and SC1E problems, except SC1P-0-FLIPPING and SC1P-01-FLIPPING, admit constant factor polynomial-time approximation algorithms.

Motivation : In Bioinformatics [4], to discover functionally meaningful patterns from a vast amount of gene expression data, one needs to construct the metabolic network of genes using knowledge about their interaction behavior. A *metabolic network* is made up of all chemical reactions that involve metabolites, and a *metabolite* is the intermediate end product of metabolism. To obtain functional gene expression patterns from this metabolic network, an adjacency matrix of metabolites is created, and clusters of ones are located in the adjacency matrix. One way to find the clusters of ones is to transform the adjacency matrix into a matrix having the SC1P by flipping 0's to 1's. This practically motivated problem is posed as an instance of the d-SC1P-0E problem as follows:

Finding Clusters of Ones
Instance: $\langle M, d \rangle$, where M is an adjacency matrix of metabolites and $d \geq 0$.
Parameter: d .
Question: Does there exist a set of 0-entries of size at most d in M , whose flipping results in a matrix with the SC1P?

The fixed-parameter tractability of d-SC1P-0E problem shows that finding clusters of ones from metabolic networks is also FPT. Another theoretically motivated problem in the area of Graph theory is BICONVEX DELETION. An immediate consequence of the fixed-parameter tractability of d-SC1S-RC problem is that BICONVEX DELETION prob-

lem is FPT. In addition, the fixed-parameter tractability of d-SC1P-0E problem shows that BICONVEX COMPLETION problem is also FPT. Several practically relevant problems (scheduling, matching, etc [17, 18]) are polynomial-time solvable on biconvex graphs.

Problems on Biconvex Graphs

Instance: $\langle G, d \rangle$, where $G=(V_1, V_2, E)$ is a bipartite graph with $|V_1| = n, |V_2| = m$ and $d \geq 0$.

Parameter: d .

BICONVEX DELETION: Does there exist a set $D \subseteq V_1 \cup V_2$, with $|D| \leq d$ such that $G[(V_1 \cup V_2) \setminus D]$ is a biconvex graph ?

BICONVEX EDGE DELETION: Does there exist a set $E' \subseteq E$, with $|E'| \leq d$ such that $G=(V_1, V_2, E \setminus E')$ is a biconvex graph ?

BICONVEX COMPLETION: Does there exist a set $E' \subseteq (V_1 \times V_2) \setminus E$, with $|E'| \leq d$ such that $G=(V_1, V_2, E \cup E')$ is a biconvex graph ?

In addition, the FPT algorithm for d-SC1S-R on $(2, *)$ -matrices shows that PROPER INTERVAL VERTEX DELETION (Section 2.1) problem on *triangle-free* graphs is FPT (using Lemma 8) with a run-time of $O^*(4^d)$, where d denotes the number of allowed vertex deletions. The FPT algorithm for d-SC1P-1E on $(2, *)$ -matrices shows that BICONVEX EDGE DELETION problem is fixed-parameter tractable on certain bipartite graphs, in which the degree of all vertices in one partition is at most two.

Techniques Used: Our results rely on the following forbidden submatrix characterization of the SC1P (see Figure 1) by Tucker [1].

Theorem 1. ([1, Theorem 11]) *A matrix M has the SC1P if and only if no submatrix of M , or of the transpose of M , is a member of the configuration (see Section 2.2) of M_{1_k} ($k \geq 1$), M_{2_1} , M_{2_2} , M_{3_1} , M_{3_2} and M_{3_3} .*

That is, a matrix M has the SC1P if and only if no submatrix of M is a member of the configuration of M_{1_k} ($k \geq 1$), M_{2_1} , M_{2_2} , M_{3_1} , M_{3_2} , M_{3_3} or their transposes. We refer to the set of all forbidden submatrices of the SC1P as F_{SC1P} .

$$F_{SC1P} = \{M_{1_k}, M_{2_1}, M_{2_2}, M_{3_1}, M_{3_2}, M_{3_3}, M_{1_k}^T, M_{2_1}^T, M_{2_2}^T, M_{3_1}^T, M_{3_2}^T, M_{3_3}^T\}, \text{ where } k \geq 1.$$

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
\begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1 & 0 & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 1 & 0 & \cdot & \cdot & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 0 & \cdot & 0 \\ \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot \\ 0 & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & 0 & 1 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix} & \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 \\ 1 & 1 & 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix} & \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 \\ 1 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix} \\
M_{I_k}, k \geq 1 \text{ (} k+2 \text{ rows and} & M_{2_1} & M_{2_2} \\
k+2 \text{ columns)} & & \\
\begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix} & \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix} & \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix} \\
M_{3_1} & M_{3_2} & M_{3_3}
\end{array}$$

Figure 1: A subset of the forbidden submatrices for the SC1P [1].

For a given matrix M , while solving SC1S and SC1E problems, a recursive branching algorithm first destroys all fixed size forbidden submatrices from F_{SC1P} . For d-SC1S-R/C/RC and d-SC1P-0E problems, the number of branches for this step will be at most 6/6/11 and 18 respectively. If the resultant matrix still does not have the SC1P, then the only forbidden submatrices that can remain in M are of type M_{I_k} and $M_{I_k}^T$, where $k \geq 1$.

In d-SC1S-R/C and d-SC1S-RC problems, we reduce the resultant matrix at each leaf node of the bounded search tree to an instance of d-COS-R (Section 2.2) and CHORDAL VERTEX DELETION (Section 2.1) problems respectively. Then, we apply algorithms of d-COS-R (Theorem 12) and CHORDAL VERTEX DELETION (Theorem 2) problems to the reduced instances of d-SC1S-R/C and d-SC1S-RC problems respectively. Finally, the

output of d-SC1S-R/C and d-SC1S-RC problems on M , relies on the output of d-COS-R and Chordal-Vertex-Deletion algorithms respectively on the reduced instances.

For d-SC1P-0E problem, we prove in Section 3.3 that, the presence of a large $M_{I_k}/M_{I_k}^\top$ (where $k > d$) is enough to say that we are dealing with a No instance, but this is not the case, for d-SC1S-R/C/RC and d-SC1P-1E/01E problems. Using a result on the number of 4-cycle decompositions of an even n -cycle where $n \geq 6$, from [16], we show in Section 3.3 that, the number of ways to destroy an $M_{I_k}/M_{I_k}^\top$ (where $k \leq d$) in d-SC1P-0E is equal to the number of ternary trees with $k-1$ internal nodes, which is crucial for our FPT algorithm. We prove in Section 3.3.2 that, the number of ternary trees with $k-1$ internal nodes can be improved from 8^{k-1} to 6.75^{k-1} , using Stirlings approximation (Lemma 3).

Organization of the paper: In Section 2, we provide necessary preliminaries and observations. Section 3.1 presents polynomial-time algorithms for SC1S and SC1E problems on $(2, 2)$ -matrices. The classical complexity and fixed-parameter tractability of SC1S and SC1E problems are described in Sections 3.2 and 3.3 respectively. Last section draws conclusions and gives an insight to further work.

2. Preliminaries

In this section, we present definitions and notations related to binary matrix and graphs associated with binary matrix. We recall the definition of a few graph classes that are related to the SC1P. For the sake of completeness, we also define some commonly known matrices that are used to represent graphs. We also state a few results that are used in proving the NP-completeness and fixed-parameter tractability of the problems posed in Section 1.

2.1. Graphs

A *graph* G is defined as a tuple $G = (V, E)$, where $V = \{v_1, v_2, \dots, v_n\}$ is a finite set of vertices and $E = \{e_1, e_2, \dots, e_m\}$ is a finite set of edges. Throughout this paper, we consider $|V| = n$ and $|E| = m$ respectively. All graphs discussed in this paper shall always be undirected and simple. We refer the reader to [19] for the standard definitions and notations related to graphs. A sequence of distinct vertices (u_1, u_2, \dots, u_n) with

u_i adjacent to u_{i+1} for each $1 \leq i < n$ is called a u_1 - u_n *path*. A *Hamiltonian path* is a path that visits every vertex exactly once. A *cycle* is a graph consisting of a path (u_1, u_2, \dots, u_n) and the additional edge $\{u_n, u_1\}$. The *length of a path (cycle)* is the number of edges present in it. A cycle (path) on n vertices is denoted as C_n (P_n). Two vertices u, w in V are *connected*, if there exists a path between u and w in G . A graph $G = (V, E)$ is a *connected graph*, if there exists a path between every pair of vertices in V . A graph $G' = (V', E')$ is a *subgraph* of G , if $V' \subseteq V$ and $E' \subseteq E$. The subgraph of G *induced* by V' , denoted as $G[V']$, is the graph $G' = (V', E')$ with $V' \subseteq V$ and $E' = \{\{v, w\} \in E \mid v \in V' \text{ and } w \in V'\}$. A graph $G = (V, E)$ is called a *triangle-free* (C_3 -free) graph, if it does not contain C_3 as an induced subgraph. A *connected component* of G is a maximal connected subgraph of G . *Deletion* of a vertex $v \in V$ means, deleting v and all edges incident on v .

A *chord* in a cycle is an edge that is not part of the cycle but connects two non-consecutive vertices in the cycle. A *hole* or *chordless cycle* is a cycle of length at least four, where no chords exist. In other words, a chordless cycle C is a cycle (u_1, u_2, \dots, u_n) with $n \geq 4$, and the additional constraint that there exists no edges of the form (u_i, u_j) , where $j \neq i \pm 1$ and $2 \leq i, j \leq n - 1$. A graph is *chordal* if it contains no hole. That is, in a chordal graph, every cycle of length at least four contains a chord. A chord (u, v) is an *odd chord* in an even-chordless cycle C , if the number of edges in the paths connecting u and v is odd. For an even-chordless cycle C , a *4-cycle decomposition* is a minimal set O , of odd chords in C , such that $C \cup O$ does not have induced even chordless cycles of length at least six. We need the following lemma for our algorithms described in Section 3.1.

Lemma 1. ([20, Theorem 2]) *In a graph $G = (V, E)$, a chordless cycle can be detected in $O(n + m)$ -time, where n and m are the number of vertices and edges in G respectively.*

Given a graph $G = (V, E)$, and a non-negative integer k , CHORDAL VERTEX DELETION problem decides whether there exists a set of vertices of size at most k in V , whose deletion results in a chordal graph. We used the following theorem for our FPT algorithm described in Section 3.2.3.

Theorem 2. ([15, Theorem 1.1]) *CHORDAL VERTEX DELETION problem is fixed-parameter*

tractable with a run-time of $O^*(2^{k \log k})$, where k is the number of allowed vertex deletions.

Here, we define certain graph classes that are related to the SC1P.

Definition 1. A graph is an *interval graph* if for every vertex, an interval on the real line can be assigned, such that two vertices share an edge, iff their corresponding intervals intersect. A graph is a *proper interval graph*, if it is an interval graph that has an intersection model, in which no interval properly contains another.

Given a graph $G = (V, E)$, and a non-negative integer k , PROPER INTERVAL VERTEX DELETION [21] problem decides whether there exists a set of vertices of size at most k in V , whose deletion results in a proper interval graph.

Definition 2. A graph $G = (V, E)$ is *bipartite* if V can be partitioned into two disjoint vertex sets V_1 and V_2 such that every edge in E has one endpoint in V_1 and the other endpoint in V_2 . A bipartite graph is denoted as $G = (V_1, V_2, E)$, where V_1 and V_2 are the two partitions of V .

Definition 3. A bipartite graph is *chordal bipartite* if each cycle of length at least six has a chord.

We observe that a bipartite graph H , which is an even chordless cycle of length $2n$, where $n \geq 3$ can be converted to a chordal bipartite graph by adding $n-2$ edges. This observation is also mentioned in a different form in ([16, Lemma 4.2]). The number of ways to achieve this is given in the following lemma.

Lemma 2. ([16, Lemma 4.3]) *Given a bipartite graph $H = (V_1, V_2, E)$, which is an even chordless cycle of length $2n$ (where $n \geq 3$), the number of ways to make H a chordal bipartite graph by adding $n-2$ edges is equal to the number of ternary trees with $n-1$ internal nodes and is no greater than 8^{n-1} .*

We used the following lemma to get a tighter upper bound of 6.75^{n-1} for the number of ways to make H a chordal bipartite graph.

Lemma 3. [22] $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} n! = \sqrt{2\pi n} \left(\frac{n}{e}\right)^n$ (This is well known as Stirlings approximation).

The following lemma gives the number of ternary trees with n internal nodes.

Lemma 4. ([23], p.349) *The number of ternary trees with n internal nodes is equal to $\frac{\binom{3n+1}{n}}{3n+1} = \frac{\binom{3n}{n}}{2n+1}$.*

Definition 4. A bipartite graph $G = (V_1, V_2, E)$ is *biconvex* if the vertices of both V_1 and V_2 can be ordered, such that for every vertex v in $V_1 \cup V_2$, the neighbors of v occur consecutively in the ordering.

Given a bipartite graph $G = (V_1, V_2, E)$, and a non-negative integer k , BICONVEX DELETION problem decides whether there exists a set of vertices of size at most k in $V_1 \cup V_2$, whose deletion results in a biconvex graph. BICONVEX DELETION problem can be shown to be NP-complete, using the results given by Yannakakis [24, 25].

Definition 5. A bipartite graph $G = (V_1, V_2, E)$ is called a *chain graph* [26] if there exists an ordering π of the vertices in V_1 , $\pi : \{1, 2, \dots, |V_1|\} \rightarrow V_1$ such that $N(\pi(1)) \subseteq N(\pi(2)) \subseteq \dots \subseteq N(\pi(|V_1|))$, where $N(\pi(i))$ denotes the set of neighbours of $\pi(i)$ in G .

Given a bipartite graph $G = (V_1, V_2, E)$, and a non-negative integer k , k -CHAIN COMPLETION problem decides whether there exists a set of k non-edges in G , whose addition transforms G into a chain graph. Yannakakis [27] showed that k -CHAIN COMPLETION problem is NP-complete. He also developed finite forbidden induced subgraph characterization for chain graphs. Accordingly, a bipartite graph $G = (V_1, V_2, E)$ is a chain graph iff it does not contain $2K_2$ as an induced subgraph, where K_2 is a complete graph on two vertices. Given a bipartite graph, k -CHAIN EDITING problem decides whether there exists a set of k edge additions and deletions, which transforms G into a chain graph. Drange et al. [28] have shown that k -CHAIN EDITING problem belongs to the class NP-complete.

2.2. Matrices

Given an $m \times n$ matrix M , the $n \times m$ matrix M' with $m'_{ji} = m_{ij}$ is called the *transpose* of M and is denoted by M^T . Two matrices M and M' are *isomorphic* if M is a permutation of the rows or/and columns of M' . We say, a matrix M *contains* M' , if M contains a submatrix that is isomorphic to M' . The *configuration* of an $m \times n$ matrix M is defined

to be the set of all $m \times n$ matrices which can be obtained from M by row or/and column permutations.

Here, we define some commonly known matrices that are used to represent graphs.

Definition 6. The *half adjacency matrix* [14] of a bipartite graph $G = (V_1, V_2, E)$ with $V_1 = \{u_1, \dots, u_{n_1}\}$ and $V_2 = \{v_1, \dots, v_{n_2}\}$ is an $n_1 \times n_2$ matrix M_G with $m_{ij} = 1$ iff $\{u_i, v_j\} \in E$, where $1 \leq i \leq n_1$ and $1 \leq j \leq n_2$.

Every matrix M can be viewed as the half adjacency matrix of a bipartite graph. The corresponding bipartite graph of M is referred to as the *representing graph* of M , denoted by G_M . The *representing graph* G_M [14] of a matrix $M_{m \times n}$ is obtained as follows:

Definition 7. For a matrix $M_{m \times n}$, G_M contains a vertex corresponding to every row and every column of M , and there is an edge between two vertices corresponding to i^{th} row and j^{th} column of M iff the corresponding entry $m_{ij} = 1$, where $1 \leq i \leq m$ and $1 \leq j \leq n$.

Characterizations of biconvex and chain graphs relating their half adjacency matrices are mentioned in Lemma 5 and 6.

Lemma 5. [1] *A bipartite graph is biconvex iff its half adjacency matrix has the SC1P.*

Lemma 6. [27] *A bipartite graph $G = (V_1, V_2, E)$ is a chain graph iff its half adjacency matrix M_G does not contain $\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}$ as a submatrix.*

We remark here that, the half-adjacency matrix of a chain graph satisfies the SC1P, however the converse is not true.

A graph G can also be represented using *edge-vertex incidence matrix*, denoted by $M(G)$, and is defined as follows.

Definition 8. For a graph $G = (V, E)$, the rows and columns of $M(G)$ correspond to edges and vertices of G respectively. The entries m_{ij} of $M(G)$ are defined as follows: $m_{ij} = 1$, if edge e_i is incident on vertex v_j , and $m_{ij} = 0$ otherwise, where $1 \leq i \leq m$ and $1 \leq j \leq n$.

Following Lemma shows that G is a path if $M(G)$ has the C1P for rows.

Lemma 7. ([14, Theorem 2.2]) *If G is a connected graph and the edge-vertex incidence matrix $M(G)$ of G has the C1P for rows, then G is a path.*

A graph G can also be represented using *maximal-clique matrix (vertex-clique incidence matrix)*, and is defined as follows.

Definition 9. Let $V = \{v_1, v_2, \dots, v_n\}$ and $C = \{c_1, c_2, \dots, c_m\}$ be the set of vertices and the set of maximal cliques, respectively, in G . The maximal-clique matrix of G is an $n \times m$ matrix M , whose rows and columns represent the vertices and maximal cliques, respectively, in G , and an entry $m_{ij} = 1$ if v_i belongs to c_j , and $m_{ij} = 0$ otherwise, where $1 \leq i \leq n$ and $1 \leq j \leq m$.

A characterization of proper interval graph relating its maximal-clique matrix is mentioned in Lemma 8.

Lemma 8. [14] *A graph is a proper interval graph iff its maximal-clique matrix has the SC1P.*

Next, we state few results that are used in proving the correctness of our FPT algorithms described in Sections 3.2.2-3.3.2.

For ease of reference, we refer to the fixed-size forbidden matrices in the forbidden submatrix characterization of SC1P (Theorem 1) as X . i.e

$$X = \{M_{2_1}, M_{2_2}, M_{3_1}, M_{3_2}, M_{3_3}, M_{2_1}^T, M_{2_2}^T, M_{3_1}^T, M_{3_2}^T, M_{3_3}^T\}.$$

Lemma 9 and Lemma 10 state the run-time to find a forbidden matrix of X and $M_{1_k}/M_{1_k}^T$ respectively in M .

Lemma 9. *Let M be a matrix of size $m \times n$. Then, a minimum size submatrix in M that is isomorphic to one of the forbidden matrices of X can be found in $O(m^6n)$ -time.*

The above Lemma is obtained from ([14, Proposition 3.2]), by considering the maximum possible size of the forbidden matrix in X as 6×5 (shown in Figure 1). By considering the maximum number of ones in each row of M as n in ([14, Proposition 3.4]), leads to the following Lemma.

Lemma 10. *Let M be a matrix of size $m \times n$. Then, a minimum size submatrix of type M_{1_k} or $M_{1_k}^T$ ($k \geq 1$) in M can be found in $O(n^3m^3)$ -time.*

Following result shows that the representing graph $G_{M_{I_k}}/G_{M_{I_k}^T}$ (Definition 7) of $M_{I_k}/M_{I_k}^T$ (where $k \geq 1$) is a chordless cycle.

Lemma 11. ([14, Observation 3.1]) *The representing graph of $M_{I_k}/M_{I_k}^T$, i.e., $(G_{M_{I_k}}/G_{M_{I_k}^T})$, is a chordless cycle of length $2k + 4$.*

It is clear from Lemma 11, that the representing graph of both M_{I_k} and its transpose are same, which simplifies the task of searching for $M_{I_k}/M_{I_k}^T$.

Few of our results are based on the forbidden submatrix characterization of the C1P for rows and is given below.

Theorem 3. ([1, Theorem 9]) *A binary matrix M has the C1P for rows if and only if no submatrix of M is a member of the configuration of M_{I_k} , M_{II_k} , M_{III_k} , M_{IV} and M_V , where $k \geq 1$.*

Given a binary matrix M and a non-negative integer d , d -COS-R (resp. d -COS-C) problem decides whether there exists a set of rows (resp. columns), of size at most d in M , whose deletion results in a matrix with the C1P for rows.

We used the following lemma to obtain an FPT algorithm for d -SC1S-R/C problems.

Lemma 12. ([29, Theorem 7]) *d -COS-R problem is fixed-parameter tractable with a run-time of $O^*(10^d)$, where d denotes the number of allowed row deletions.*

Using the recent improved FPT algorithm for INTERVAL DELETION problem [30], it turns out that d -COS-R problem has an improved run-time of $O^*(8^d)$.

3. Our Results

Even though the number of forbidden submatrices to establish the SC1P is less than the number of forbidden submatrices for the C1P, the problems posed in this paper, to obtain the SC1P also turn out to be NP-complete. Firstly, we present polynomial-time algorithms for SC1S and SC1E problems on $(2, 2)$ -matrices. For a given matrix M , while solving SC1S problems, we delete an entire row/column of every forbidden submatrix present in M ; hence destroying any forbidden submatrix from F_{SC1P} (defined in Section 1) in M does not introduce new forbidden submatrices from F_{SC1P} in M , which

were not originally present in M . The same observation, however, is not applicable for SC1E problems. The reason is that flipping an entry (0/1) may introduce new forbidden submatrices from F_{SC1P} which were not originally present in M . This motivated us to consider the two categories of problems for establishing the SC1P in a given matrix separately. The classical complexity as well as the parameterized complexity of SC1S and SC1E problems are described in detail in Sections 3.2 and 3.3 respectively.

3.1. Easily solvable instances of SC1S and SC1E problems

The problems SC1S and SC1E defined in Section 1 are solvable in polynomial-time on $(2, 2)$ -matrices. A $(2, 2)$ -matrix can contain only forbidden matrices M_{I_k} and $M_{I_k}^T$ (where $k \geq 1$) of unbounded size, because all other forbidden matrices of F_{SC1P} contain either a row or column with more than two ones. Since a matrix can be viewed as the half adjacency matrix of a bipartite graph, the d-SC1S-R, d-SC1S-C, d-SC1S-RC, d-SC1P-0E, d-SC1P-1E, and d-SC1P-01E problems can be formulated as graph modification problems (Here, modification means deletion of vertex/edge or addition of edge).

Given a $(2, 2)$ -matrix M , consider the representing graph G_M (Definition 7), of M . Since each column and row of M contains at most two ones, the degree of each vertex in G_M is at most two. So the connected components of G_M are disjoint chordless cycles or paths. It follows from Lemma 11 that, to destroy M_{I_k} and $M_{I_k}^T$, it is sufficient to destroy chordless cycles of length greater than four in G_M .

Theorem 4. *On $(2, 2)$ -matrices, d-SC1S-R is polynomial-time solvable.*

Proof. For each chordless cycle C of length greater than four in G_M , consider the submatrix M' induced by the vertices of C . To destroy C , delete a vertex v in C , that corresponds to a row r in M' . Decrement the parameter d by one and delete r from M . The input is an Yes-instance, if the total number of rows removed from M is at most d , otherwise it is a No-instance.

The representing graph G_M of M can be constructed in polynomial time. Since the degree of each vertex in G_M is at most two, every pair of chordless cycles in G_M will be disjoint. We also know that G_M contains only finite number of vertices. The above two facts imply that G_M contains only finite number of cycles. Using Lemma 1, each chordless

cycle can be detected in $O(m+n)$ -time. Therefore for $(2,2)$ -matrices, d -SC1S-R can be solved in $O(d(m+n))$ -time. \square

Algorithms for solving d -SC1S-C, d -SC1S-RC, d -SC1P-0E, d -SC1P-1E and d -SC1P-01E problems on $(2,2)$ -matrices are similar to the algorithm for solving d -SC1S-R (Theorem 4), except that they differ only in the way the chordless cycles are destroyed. Therefore the run-time of all these problems on $(2,2)$ -matrices is $O(d(m+n))$. Let C be a chordless cycle of length greater than four in G_M . In the following corollaries, we describe how the chordless cycles are destroyed in each of the problems.

Corollary 1. *For $(2,2)$ -matrices, d -SC1S-C problem is polynomial-time solvable.*

Proof. In d -SC1S-C problem, deletion of a column in M corresponds to a vertex deletion in the representing graph G_M . For each chordless cycle C in G_M , consider the submatrix M' induced by the vertices of C . To destroy C , delete a vertex v in C , that corresponds to a column in M' . \square

Corollary 2. *For $(2,2)$ -matrices, d -SC1S-RC problem is polynomial-time solvable.*

Proof. In d -SC1S-RC problem, deletion of a row as well as column in M corresponds to a vertex deletion in the representing graph G_M . For each chordless cycle C in G_M , consider the submatrix M' induced by the vertices of C . To destroy C , delete a vertex v in C , that corresponds to a row or column in M' . \square

Corollary 3. *For $(2,2)$ -matrices, d -SC1P-0E problem is polynomial-time solvable.*

Proof. In d -SC1P-0E problem, flipping a 0-entry in M corresponds to an edge addition in the representing graph G_M . For each chordless cycle C of length, say k , in G_M , consider the submatrix M' induced by the vertices of C . From Lemma 2, to make C a chordal bipartite graph, we have to add $\frac{k}{2}-2$ edges. Hence, check whether the parameter $d \geq \frac{k}{2}-2$ or not. If so, decrement d by $\frac{k}{2}-2$ and flip the 0-entries corresponding to the newly added edges in M . The input is a Yes-instance if the total number of 0-entries flipped in M (edges added in G_M) is at most d , otherwise it is a No-instance. \square

Corollary 4. *For $(2,2)$ -matrices, d -SC1P-1E problem is polynomial-time solvable.*

400 *Proof.* In d -SC1P-1E problem, flipping a 1-entry in M corresponds to an edge deletion in the representing graph G_M . To destroy C , delete an edge, say e in C . Decrement the parameter d by one and flip the corresponding 1-entry in M . The input is an Yes-instance if the total number of 1-entries flipped in M (edges deleted in G_M) is at most d , otherwise it is a No-instance. \square

Corollary 5. *For $(2, 2)$ -matrices, d -SC1P-01E problem is polynomial-time solvable.*

Proof. In d -SC1P-01E problem, the allowed operations are edge additions and edge deletions. In a chordless cycle C of length $2k + 4$, the number of edges to be added to destroy C is k where $k \geq 1$, but deletion of any edge in C destroys C . Hence, we always delete an edge from each of the chordless cycles in G_M for destroying it. This proof is same as the proof of Corollary 4. \square

3.2. Establishing SC1P by Deletion of Rows/Columns

This section considers the classical complexity and fixed-parameter tractability of SC1S problems by row, column and row as well as column deletion. We refer to the decision versions of the optimization problems SC1S-ROW DELETION, SC1S-COLUMN DELETION and SC1S-ROW-COLUMN DELETION defined in Section 1 as k -SC1S-R, k -SC1S-C, and k -SC1S-RC respectively, where k denotes the number of allowed deletions. First, we show that these problems are NP-complete. Then, we give FPT algorithms for these problems on general matrices. For each of these problems, we also give improved FPT algorithms on certain restricted matrices.

3.2.1. NP-Completeness

The following theorem proves the NP-completeness of k -SC1S-R problem using HAMILTONIAN-PATH as a candidate problem.

Theorem 5. *Given an $m \times n$ matrix M , deciding if there exists a set $R' \subseteq R(M)$, of rows such that $|R'| \leq k$ and $M \setminus R'$ have the SC1P is NP-complete.*

Proof. We first show that k -SC1S-R \in NP. Given a matrix M and an integer k , the certificate chosen is a set of rows $R' \subseteq R(M)$. The verification algorithm affirms that $|R'| \leq k$, and then it checks whether deletion of these k rows from M yields a matrix

with the SC1P. This certificate can be verified in polynomial-time.

We prove that k -SC1S-R problem is NP-hard by showing that HAMILTONIAN-PATH \leq_p k -SC1S-R. Let $G = (V, E)$ be a graph with $|V| = n$ and $|E| = m$, and $M(G)_{m \times n}$ be the edge-vertex incidence matrix (see Definition 8) obtained from G . Without loss of generality, assume that G is connected and let k be $m-n+1$. We show that G has a Hamiltonian path if and only if there exists a set of rows of size k in $M(G)$ whose deletion results in a matrix $M'(G)$, that satisfy the SC1P.

Assume that G contains a Hamiltonian path. In $M(G)$, delete the rows that correspond to edges which are not part of the Hamiltonian path in G . Since Hamiltonian path contains $n-1$ edges, the number of rows remaining in $M(G)$ will be $n-1$ which is equal to $m-k$ and hence the number of rows deleted will be k . Now, order the columns and rows of $M(G)$ with respect to the sequence of vertices and edges, respectively in the Hamiltonian path. Clearly, the resulting matrix has the SC1P.

To prove the other direction, let $M'(G)$ be the matrix obtained by deleting k rows from $M(G)$ and assume that $M'(G)$ has the SC1P. Now, the number of rows in $M'(G)$ is $m-k$, which is equal to $n-1$. Let G' be the subgraph obtained from $M'(G)$, by considering $M'(G)$ as an edge-vertex incidence matrix of G' . Since $M'(G)$ has the SC1P; it has the C1P for rows. Also, note that $M'(G)$ has $n-1$ rows. We claim that the subgraph G' is connected. Otherwise one of the connected components of G' must contain a cycle which contradicts the fact that $M'(G)$ has the C1P for rows. This implies that G' is a path (see Lemma 7) of length $n-1$, which clearly indicates that G has a Hamiltonian path. The column permutation needed to convert $M'(G)$ into a matrix that has the C1P for rows gives the relative order of vertices of G 's Hamiltonian path. This proves the NP-completeness of k -SC1S-R. \square

Corollary 6. *The problem k -SC1S-C is NP-complete.*

Proof. The NP-completeness of k -SC1S-C can be proved similar to Theorem 5 (NP-completeness of k -SC1S-R) by considering M as the vertex-edge incidence matrix and k as the number of columns to be deleted. \square

Since the edge-vertex incidence matrix (resp. vertex-edge incidence matrix) is a $(*, 2)$ -matrix (resp. $(2, *)$ -matrix), in fact, the following stronger result holds:

Corollary 7. *k-SC1S-R (resp. k-SC1S-C) problem is NP-complete even for $(*, 2)$ -matrices (resp. $(2, *)$ -matrices).*

To prove the NP-completeness of the k-SC1S-RC problem, we use the BICONVEX DELETION problem (Definition 4) as a candidate problem. The following theorem proves the NP-completeness of k-SC1S-RC.

Theorem 6. *The k-SC1S-RC problem is NP-complete.*

Proof. It is easy to show that k-SC1S-RC \in NP. We prove that k-SC1S-RC problem is NP-hard by showing that BICONVEX DELETION problem \leq_p k-SC1S-RC. Let $G = (V_1, V_2, E)$ be a bipartite graph and M be a half adjacency matrix (see Definition 7) of G . Using Lemma 5, it can be shown that G has a set of vertices, $V'_1 \subseteq V_1$ and $V'_2 \subseteq V_2$, with $|V'_1| + |V'_2| \leq k$, whose deletion results in a biconvex graph if and only if there exists a set of rows $R' \subseteq R(M)$ and columns $C' \subseteq C(M)$, with $|R'| + |C'| \leq k$ in M whose deletion results in a matrix M' , that satisfy the SC1P. Therefore k-SC1S-RC is NP-complete. \square

3.2.2. An FPT algorithm for d-SC1S-R/d-SC1S-C problem

Here, we present an FPT algorithm *d-SC1S-Row-Deletion* (Algorithm 1), for d-SC1S-R problem on general matrices. Given a binary matrix M and a non-negative integer d , Algorithm 1 first destroys the fixed size forbidden submatrices from X in M , using a simple search tree based branching algorithm. If M contains a forbidden matrix from X (see Section 2.2), then the algorithm recursively branches into at most six subcases, since the largest forbidden matrix of X has six rows. In each subcase, delete one of the rows of the forbidden submatrix of X found in M and decrement the parameter d by one. This process is continued in each subcase until its d value becomes zero or until it does not contain any matrix from X as its submatrix. If any of the leaf instances satisfy the SC1P, then algorithm returns Yes, indicating that input is an Yes instance. Otherwise, for each valid leaf instance (leaf instances with $d_i > 0$), say $\langle M_i, d_i \rangle$ (where $1 \leq i \leq 6^d$) of the above depth bounded search tree, if M_i still does not have the SC1P, then destroy M_{i_k} and $M_{i_k}^T$ (where $k \geq 1$) in M_i , using the algorithm for d-COS-R (see Lemma 12) on M_i . The following claim holds true for any leaf instance $\langle M_i, d_i \rangle$, where $1 \leq i \leq 6^d$.

Claim 1. *Let M be a matrix that does not contain any fixed size forbidden matrices from*

Algorithm 1 Algorithm *d-SC1S-Row-Deletion*(M, d)

Input: An instance $\langle M_{m \times n}, d \rangle$, where M is a binary matrix and $d \geq 0$.

Output = $\begin{cases} \text{Yes,} & \text{if there exists a set } R' \subseteq R(M), \text{ with } |R'| \leq d, \text{ such that } M \setminus R' \\ & \text{has the SC1P.} \\ \text{No,} & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$

1: **if** M has the SC1P and $d \geq 0$ **then** return Yes.

2: **if** $d < 0$ **then** return No.

Branching Step:

3: **if** M contains a forbidden submatrix M' from X ,

Branch into at most 6 instances $I_i = \langle M_i, d_i \rangle$ where $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, 6\}$

$M_i = M \setminus r_i$, where $r_i \in R(M')$

Update $d_i = d - 1$ // Decrement parameter by 1.

For some $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, 6\}$, if *d-SC1S-Row-Deletion*(M_i, d_i) return Yes, then return

Yes, else if all instances return No, then return No.

4: **else**

5: **if** M contains either M_{I_k} or $M_{I_k}^T$,

6: $D = d\text{-COS-R}(M, d)$ (Using Lemma 12)

7: **if** $|D| > 0$

8: return Yes

9: **else**

10: return No

11: **end if**

12: **end if**

13: **end if**

X , then $d\text{-COS-R}(M, d)$ would destroy only forbidden matrices of the form M_{I_k} and $M_{I_k}^T$ in M , where $k \geq 1$.

Proof. Let F_{C1PR} , F_{C1PC} , and F_{SC1P} represent the set of forbidden submatrices of C1P for rows, C1P for columns and SC1P respectively.

Let $F_{C1PR} = X_1 \cup \{M_{I_k}\}$, where $X_1 = \{M_{III_k}, M_{III_k}, M_{IV}, M_V\}$ (see Theorem 3)

Then, $F_{C1PC} = X_1^T \cup \{M_{I_k}^T\}$, where $X_1^T = \{M_{III_k}^T, M_{III_k}^T, M_{IV}^T, M_V^T\}$

Now, $F_{SC1P} = X_1 \cup X_1^T \cup \{M_{I_k}, M_{I_k}^T\}$

From Lemma 11, it is clear that searching for both M_{I_k} and its transpose is equivalent to searching for M_{I_k} alone.

This implies, $F_{SC1P} = X_1 \cup X_1^T \cup \{M_{I_k}\}$, where $k \geq 1$

Now, one of the matrices from X occurs as a submatrix of every matrix in $X_1 \cup X_1^T$. Since M being a matrix not containing any matrices from X , M will not have any matrix from $X_1 \cup X_1^T$ as a submatrix. Hence, employing d -COS-R on M would destroy only forbidden submatrices of the form M_{I_k} in M . \square

If any of the valid leaf instances $\langle M_i, d_i \rangle$ (where $1 \leq i \leq 6^d$) return Yes after employing d -COS-R algorithm, then Algorithm 1 returns Yes indicating that M is an Yes instance, otherwise it returns No.

Theorem 7. d -SC1S-R is fixed-parameter tractable on general matrices with a run-time of $O^*(8^d)$.

Proof. Algorithm 1 employs a search tree, in which each node in the tree has at most six subproblems. Let us assume that out of the d row-deletions that are allowed, d_1 are used for destroying the finite size forbidden matrices, and d_2 are used to destroy the remaining non-finite forbidden matrices. Therefore, the tree has at most 6^{d_1} leaves. A submatrix M' of M , that is isomorphic to one of the forbidden matrices in X can be found in $O(m^6n)$ -time (using Lemma 9). Therefore, the time taken to destroy the finite size forbidden matrices is $O^*(6^{d_1})$. For each leaf instance, destroying all M_{I_k} and $M_{I_k}^T$ (where $k \geq 1$) using d -COS-R subroutine (Lemma 12) takes $O^*(8^d)$ -time. Therefore, the time taken to destroy the non-finite size forbidden matrices is $O^*(8^{d_2})$. So, the total run-time of the algorithm would be $O^*(6^{d_1} \cdot 8^{d_2}) = O^*(8^d)$. \square

Since d -SC1S-C on M is equivalent to d -SC1S-R on M^T , we obtain the following corollary.

Corollary 8. d -SC1S-C is fixed-parameter tractable on general matrices with a run-time of $O^*(8^d)$.

3.2.3. An FPT algorithm for d -SC1S-RC problem

Here, we present an FPT algorithm d -SC1S-RC-Deletion (Algorithm 2), for the problem d -SC1S-RC on general matrices. Algorithm 2 consists of two stages. Given a binary matrix M and a non-negative integer d , stage 1 of Algorithm 2 destroys all forbidden submatrices from X in M using a simple search tree algorithm. If M contains a forbidden matrix from X , then Algorithm 2 branches into at most 11 subcases, since the number of rows and columns in the largest forbidden matrix of X is 11. In each subcase, delete

Algorithm 2 Algorithm d -SC1S-RC-*Deletion*(M, d)

Input: An instance $\langle M_{m \times n}, d \rangle$, where M is a binary matrix and $d \geq 0$.

Output = $\begin{cases} \text{Yes,} & \text{if there exists a set } R' \subseteq R(M) \text{ and } C' \subseteq C(M), \text{ with } |R'| + |C'| \leq d, \\ & \text{such that } ((M \setminus R') \setminus C') \text{ has the SC1P} \\ \text{No,} & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$

1: **if** M has the SC1P and $d \geq 0$ **then** return Yes.

2: **if** $d < 0$ **then** return No.

Branching Step:

3: **if** M contains a forbidden submatrix M' from X **then**,

Branch into at most 11 instances $I_i = \langle M_i, d_i \rangle$ where $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, 11\}$

$M_i = M \setminus m_i$, where $m_i \in R(M')$ or $m_i \in C(M')$

Update $d_i = d - 1$ // Decrement parameter by 1.

For some $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, 11\}$, if d -SC1S-RC-*Deletion*(M_i, d_i) return Yes, then return

Yes, else if all instances return No, then return No.

4: **else**

5: **if** Stage-2(G_M, d) returns Yes **then**, // Presented in Algorithm 3

6: return Yes

7: **else**

8: return No.

9: **end if**

10: **end if**

one of the rows or columns of the forbidden submatrix found in M and decrement the parameter d by one. This process is continued in each subcase until its d value becomes zero or until it does not contain any matrix from X as its submatrix. If any of the leaf instances satisfy the SC1P, then this algorithm returns Yes. Otherwise, to each valid leaf instance $\langle M_i, d_i \rangle$ (leaf instance with $d_i > 0$), where $1 \leq i \leq 11^d$, we apply stage 2 of Algorithm 2 to destroy M_{i_k} and $M_{i_k}^T$, where $k \geq 1$. Stage 2 of Algorithm 2 considers the representing graph G_{M_i} , of each valid leaf instance M_i , where $1 \leq i \leq 11^d$. The following observation holds true for the representing graph G_{M_i} of each valid leaf instance M_i .

Observation 1. *Let M be a matrix that does not contain any forbidden matrix in X .*

Then, the representing graph G_M , of M contains none of the graphs $G_{M_{2_1}}, G_{M_{2_1}^T}, G_{M_{2_2}}, G_{M_{2_2}^T}, G_{M_{3_1}}, G_{M_{3_1}^T}, G_{M_{3_2}}, G_{M_{3_2}^T}, G_{M_{3_3}}, G_{M_{3_3}^T}$ shown in Figure 2 as its induced subgraph.




Figure 2: Representing graph of (a) M_{2_1} ($M_{2_1}^T$) (b) M_{2_2} ($M_{2_2}^T$) (c) M_{3_1} ($M_{3_1}^T$) (d) M_{3_2} ($M_{3_2}^T$) (e) M_{3_3} ($M_{3_3}^T$).

It is easy to see that deleting a row or column in M_i is equivalent to deleting a vertex in G_{M_i} and, destroying M_{i_k} and $M_{i_k}^T$, where $k \geq 1$ in M_i is equivalent to destroying even chordless cycles of length greater than or equal to six in G_{M_i} (Using Lemma 11). This instance is same as that of CHORDAL VERTEX DELETION instance (Section 2) except the fact that 4-cycles need to be preserved and the remaining chordless cycles are of length greater than or equal to six. Thus in stage 2 (Algorithm 3), after preserving 4-cycles in G_{M_i} , we use *chordal vertex deletion algorithm* (Theorem 2) to destroy all chordless cycles of length greater than or equal to six. We apply the following reduction rules to G_{M_i} before performing chordal vertex deletion algorithm on G_{M_i} .

Reduction Rules

In order to avoid the destruction of 4-cycles in G_{M_i} by chordal vertex deletion algorithm, we apply the following reduction rules.

Rule 1: (Killing shorter chordless cycles): If graph G_{M_i} contains a chordless cycle of length six, eight or ten, then branch in to at most ten subproblems, deleting in each branch one of the vertices of the chordless cycle found.

Recursively apply Rule 1 to G_{M_i} , until all chordless cycles of length six, eight and ten are destroyed from it.

Algorithm 3 Algorithm *STAGE-2*(G_M, d)

Input: An instance $\langle G_M, d \rangle$, where $G_M = (V_1, V_2, E)$ is a bipartite graph with $|V_1| = m$, $|V_2| = n$, such that G_M does not contain any of the graphs shown in Figure 2 as its induced subgraph, and $d \geq 0$.

Output = $\begin{cases} \text{Yes,} & \text{if there exists a set } V' \subseteq V_1 \cup V_2, \text{ with } |V'| \leq d, \text{ such that } G_M \setminus V' \\ & \text{is chordal bipartite.} \\ \text{No,} & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$

```

1: if  $G_M$  is chordal bipartite then return Yes.
2: if  $d < 0$  then return No.
3: if  $G_M$  contains a chordless cycle  $C'$  of length six, eight or ten then, // Rule 1
    Branch into at most 10 instances  $I_i = \langle G_{M_i}, d_i \rangle$  where  $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, 10\}$ 
     $G_{M_i} = G_M \setminus v_i$ , where  $v_i$  is a vertex in  $C'$ 
    Update  $d_i = d - 1$  // Decrement parameter by 1
    For some  $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, 10\}$ , if STAGE-2( $G_{M_i}, d_i$ ) returns Yes, then return Yes, else
    if all instances return No, then return No.
4: else
5:   if there exists a 4-cycle  $C'$  in  $G_M$  then,
6:      $G'_M \leftarrow$  graph obtained from  $G_M$  after reducing  $C'$  using Rule 2
7:     if STAGE-2( $G'_M, d$ ) returns Yes, then return Yes, otherwise return No
8:   end if
9:   Apply Rule 3 to  $G_M$ . // Degree $_{\leq 1}$  rule
10:  if CHORDAL_VERTEX_DELETION( $G_M, d$ ) returns Yes, then
11:    return Yes
12:  else
13:    return No
14:  end if
15: end if

```

Rule 2: (4-cycle preserving rule): If graph G_{M_i} contains a 4-cycle, say (x_1, y_1, x_2, y_2) as an induced subgraph, modify G_{M_i} as follows: Introduce two new vertices and label them as x_1x_2 and y_1y_2 . Make all edges incident on $(x_1 \text{ or } x_2) / (y_1 \text{ or } y_2)$ to incident on x_1x_2 / y_1y_2 and add an edge between x_1x_2 and y_1y_2 . Delete the vertices x_1, x_2, y_1 and y_2 from G_{M_i} . This is explained in Figure 3.

Each time after applying Rule 2, call Rule 1. The main purpose of calling Rule 1 after preserving every 4-cycle is to avoid the longer chordless cycle C (chordless cycle having length greater than or equal to twelve) getting totally disappeared from G_{M_i} , when C

intersects with many 4-cycles. Recursively apply Rule 2 to G_{M_i} , until G_{M_i} contains no 4-cycles.

Rule 3: (Degree $_{\leq 1}$ rule): Delete all vertices having degree less than or equal to one in G_{M_i} .

Rule 3 is safe, since vertices having degree less than or equal to one do not contribute to chordless cycles of length greater than four.




Figure 3: Illustration of preserving a 4-cycle in G_{M_i}

Next, we prove that the process of preserving 4-cycles in G_{M_i} do not introduce already destroyed forbidden matrices from X in M_i .

Claim 2. Let G_{M_i} be the representing graph of a valid leaf instance $\langle M_i, d_i \rangle$, obtained after Stage 1 of Algorithm 2 and, let G'_{M_i} be the graph obtained from G_{M_i} , after applying Rules 1, 2 and 3. Then, G'_{M_i} contains none of the graphs $G_{M_{21}}, G_{M_{21}^I}, G_{M_{22}}, G_{M_{22}^I}, G_{M_{31}}, G_{M_{31}^I}, G_{M_{32}}, G_{M_{32}^I}, G_{M_{33}}, G_{M_{33}^I}$ as shown in Figure 2 as an induced subgraph.

Proof. The graphs $G_{M_{21}}, G_{M_{21}^I}, G_{M_{22}}, G_{M_{22}^I}, G_{M_{32}}, G_{M_{32}^I}, G_{M_{33}}, G_{M_{33}^I}$ as shown in Figure 2(a), (b), (d) and (e) contain chordless cycles of length 4. Since 4-cycle preserving rule reduces all chordless cycles of length exactly four from G_{M_i} , the resultant graph G'_{M_i} will not contain any of the graphs $G_{M_{21}}, G_{M_{21}^I}, G_{M_{22}}, G_{M_{22}^I}, G_{M_{32}}, G_{M_{32}^I}, G_{M_{33}}, G_{M_{33}^I}$




Figure 4: Illustration of different cases when G'_{M_i} has an induced subgraph isomorphic to $G_{M_{3_1}} / G_{M_{3_1}^T}$

as an induced subgraph. Next, we prove that G'_{M_i} will not contain any of the graphs $G_{M_{3_1}}, G_{M_{3_1}^T}$ shown in Figure 2(c) as its induced subgraph. For a contradiction, assume that G'_{M_i} contains an induced subgraph H' , isomorphic to the graph $G_{M_{3_1}}$ or $G_{M_{3_1}^T}$. Then, at least one edge, say (x_1x_2, y_1y_2) in H' is obtained by reducing a 4-cycle in G_{M_i} . Figure 4 shows two such cases. The same observation also holds for other edges in H' . In each case, it turns out that the original graph G_{M_i} contains the graph $G_{M_{3_1}}$ or $G_{M_{3_1}^T}$ as its induced subgraph, which is a contradiction (From Observation 1). \square

Next, we prove that preserving 4-cycles in G_{M_i} using Rule 2 preserves all existing chordless cycles of length greater than or equal to 12 and do not introduce new chordless cycles in G_{M_i} .

Claim 3. *Let G_{M_i} be the representing graph of a valid leaf instance (M_i, d_i) , obtained after Stage 1 of Algorithm 2 and, let $C = (x_1, y_1, \dots, x_n, y_n)$ be a chordless cycle of length $2n$, where $n \geq 6$ in G_{M_i} . Let $C_4 = (x_1, y_1, x_2, y_2)$ be a chordless cycle of length*




Figure 5: (a) C contains exactly one vertex from C_4 (b) C contains exactly two vertices from C_4 (c) C contains exactly three vertices from C_4

exactly four in G_{M_i} . Then, reducing C_4 using Rule 2 in G_{M_i} preserves C and do not introduce new chordless cycles. It only reduces the length of C by $0, 2, \dots, 2n - 10$.

Proof. Firstly, we show that preserving 4-cycles in G_{M_i} , preserves an existing chordless cycle C of length $2n$, where $n \geq 6$.

Case (a) : C includes exactly one of the vertices of C_4 , say x_1 as shown in Figure 5(a). After reducing C_4 , y_3 and y_4 will be incident on the newly created vertex x_1x_2 . In this case, the length of C is reduced by zero.

Case (b) : C includes exactly two vertices from C_4 , say x_1 and y_1 as shown in Figure 5(b). After reducing C_4 , y_3 and x_3 will be incident on the newly created vertices x_1x_2 and y_1y_2 respectively. In this case, the length of C is reduced by zero.

Case (c) : C includes exactly three vertices from C_4 , say x_1 , y_1 and x_2 as shown in Figure 5(c). After reducing C_4 , y_3 and y_4 will be incident on the newly created vertex x_1x_2 . In this case, the length of C is reduced by two.

Next, we show that reducing C_4 using Rule 2 do not create a new chordless cycle of length greater than or equal to 12 in G_{M_i} . For a contradiction, assume that C' be a chordless cycle of length greater than or equal to 12 in G'_{M_i} , that is formed as a result of reducing C_4 using Rule 2. Then, at least one edge in C' is obtained by reducing C_4 .




Figure 6: Illustration of different cases when x_1, y_1, x_2 and y_2 of C_4 are incident on x' and y' in G_{M_i}

Let (x_1x_2, y_1y_2) be that edge and without loss of generality assume that x_1x_2 and y_1y_2 are incident on y' and x' respectively in C' as shown in Figure 6(a). Then, there should be an induced path of length greater than or equal to 9 from y' to x' . Figure 6(b), (c), (d), and (e) shows the different cases, when x_1, y_1, x_2 and y_2 are incident on x' and y' in C' . In each case, it is easy to see that the induced path from y' to x' along with an edge in C_4 forms a chordless cycle of length greater than or equal to 12 in the original graph G_{M_i} . This implies that C' is not a newly created cycle in G'_{M_i} . \square

Lemma 13. *Rule 2 is safe.*

Proof. Proof follows from Claim 2 and Claim 3. \square

Next, we show that solving d-SC1S-RC on M_i is equivalent to solving chordal vertex deletion problem on G'_{M_i} .

Lemma 14. *Let $\langle M_i, d_i \rangle$, where $1 \leq i \leq 11^d$ be a valid leaf instance obtained after Stage 1 of Algorithm 2 and, let G_{M_i} be the representing graph of M_i . Let G'_{M_i} be the graph obtained from G_{M_i} , after applying Rules 1, 2 and 3. Then, solving d-SC1S-RC on M_i is equivalent to solving CHORDAL VERTEX DELETION problem on G'_{M_i} , and M_i has a d_i size solution for d-SC1S-RC if and only if G'_{M_i} has a d_i size solution for CHORDAL VERTEX DELETION problem.*

Proof. The only forbidden matrices that can survive in M_i are M_{I_k} and $M_{I_k}^T$ (where $k \geq 1$), which corresponds to even chordless cycles of length greater than or equal to six in G_{M_i} . Since Rule 2 reduces each chordless cycle of length exactly four in G_{M_i} to an edge in G'_{M_i} , G'_{M_i} will not have any four length chordless cycles. Also, G'_{M_i} do not contain odd chordless cycles. Therefore, solving CHORDAL VERTEX DELETION problem on G'_{M_i} is equivalent to destroying all M_{I_k} and $M_{I_k}^T$ (where $k \geq 4$) in M_i , and M_i has a d_i size solution for d-SC1S-RC if and only if G'_{M_i} has a d_i size solution for chordal vertex deletion algorithm. \square

Theorem 8. *d-SC1S-RC is fixed-parameter tractable on general matrices with a runtime of $O^*(2^{d \log d})$.*

Proof. Stage 1 of Algorithm 2 employs a search tree, where each node has at most 11 subproblems. Therefore, the tree has at most 11^d leaves after Stage 1. A submatrix M' of M , that is isomorphic to one of the forbidden matrices in X can be found in $O(\max(m^6 n, n^3 m^3))$ -time (using Lemma 9 and Lemma 10). The initial branching step takes at most $O(11^d \cdot \max(m^6 n, n^3 m^3))$ -time. Chordal Vertex Deletion algorithm called in each of the leaf instances runs in $O^*(2^{d \log d})$ -time (Theorem 2). Therefore, the total time complexity of Algorithm 2 is $O^*(2^{d \log d})$. \square

The following corollary on BICONVEX DELETION problem is a direct consequence of Theorem 8.




Figure 7: (a) Forbidden submatrix $M_{3_1}^T$ (b) $G_{M_{3_1}^T}$, the representing graph of $M_{3_1}^T$ (c) Forbidden submatrix M_{3_1} and (d) $G_{M_{3_1}}$, the representing graph of M_{3_1} .

Corollary 9. BICONVEX DELETION problem is fixed-parameter tractable on bipartite graphs with a run-time of $O^*(2^{d \log d})$, where d denotes the number of allowed vertex deletions.

3.2.4. Improved FPT algorithms for SC1S problems on restricted matrices

In this section, we present FPT algorithms for the problems d-SC1S-R, d-SC1S-C and d-SC1S-RC on $(2, *)$ -matrices and $(*, 2)$ -matrices. Our algorithm makes use of the forbidden submatrix characterization for the SC1P by Tucker (see Theorem 1). A similar technique is used in ([14, Chapter 4]) to prove the fixed-parameter tractability of d-COS-R problem on $(2, *)$ -matrices. We extend those results to SC1S and SC1E problems. Given an input matrix M , our algorithm consists of two stages. Stage 1 first preprocess the input matrix to remove identical rows and columns and then destroys all fixed-size forbidden submatrices from X in M . Stage 2 focuses on destroying infinite-size forbidden submatrices in M .

Preprocessing on the input matrix M is done by assigning *weights* to each row, column and entry and deleting all but one occurrence of identical rows and columns. For a matrix M , the *weight of a row (resp. column)* is equal to the number of times that row (resp. column) appears in M . The *weight of an entry* is equal to the product of the weight of its row and column. Assigning weights to rows and columns ensures that preprocessing doesn't change the original matrix while deleting identical rows and columns. The resultant matrix thus obtained will have no identical rows and columns,




Figure 8: Possible chordless cycles of length four in a $(2, *)$ -matrix and $(*, 2)$ -matrix .

and it is also possible for a matrix to have more than one row/column with equal weight.

If M is a $(2, *)/(*, 2)$ -matrix, then the only forbidden matrix from X (Section 2.2) that can be appear in M is $M_{3_1}^T/M_{3_1}$, because all other matrices in X contain a column/row with more than two ones. We use a recursive branching algorithm, which is a search tree that checks for forbidden matrices of type $M_{3_1}^T/M_{3_1}$ in M and then branches recursively into three/four subcases, depending upon the problem under consideration. If the resultant matrix obtained after satge 1 does not have the SC1P, then stage 2 of our algorithm focuses on destroying the forbidden matrices of type M_{I_k} and $M_{I_k}^T$ (where $k \geq 1$) efficiently.

In stage 2 of our algorithm, branching strategy cannot be applied to destroy M_{I_k} and $M_{I_k}^T$ (where $k \geq 1$), because their sizes are unbounded. We use the result of Theorem 9 cleverly, to get rid of M_{I_k} and $M_{I_k}^T$ in stage 2.

Lemma 15. *If M is a $(2, *)$ -matrix or a $(*, 2)$ -matrix, that does not have identical columns and identical rows, then there are no chordless cycles of length four in the representing graph G_M , of M .*

Proof. The possible chordless cycles of length four in the representing graph of a $(2, *)$ and $(*, 2)$ -matrices are shown in Figure 8. Here, we can note that the vertices b and d cannot have degree greater than two, because we are considering only $(2, *)$ -matrices and $(*, 2)$ -matrices. In Figure 8 (i), (ii) and (iii), we can see that the vertices b and d are connected to the same vertices. That means the rows (or columns) corresponding to vertices b and d in M are identical, which is a contradiction. \square

Theorem 9. *Let M be a $(2, *)$ -matrix or $(*, 2)$ -matrix that does not have identical columns and identical rows. If M does not have the SC1P and does not contain ma-*




Figure 9: Minimal possibilities for the representing graph G_M , of a $(2, *)$ -matrix or $(*, 2)$ -matrix to have two chordless cycles of length six that share at least one vertex. The edges shown in dotted lines are the edges of the the forbidden subgraphs $G_{M_{3_1}}$ or $G_{M_{3_1}^T}$.

trices in X as submatrices, then the matrices of type M_{I_k} and $M_{I_k}^T$ (where $k \geq 1$), that are contained in M are pairwise disjoint, i.e. they have no common column or row.

Proof. Consider the representing graph G_M of a given $m \times n$ matrix M . From Lemma 15, it is clear that there are no chordless cycles of length 4 in G_M , since M is a $(2, *)/(*, 2)$ -matrix with no identical rows and columns,. For a contradiction, assume that M contains a pair of matrices of type M_{I_k} and/or $M_{I_k}^T$ (where $k \geq 1$), that share at least one common column or row. This implies that, there are two induced cycles of length at least six in G_M , that have at least one vertex in common corresponding to a column or row of M (Lemma 11). Figure 9 (a) and (b) shows the minimal possibilities for G_M to have two chordless cycles of length six that share at least one vertex. Each of these graphs have either a $G_{M_{3_1}}$ or $G_{M_{3_1}^T}$ (See Figure 7 and 9) as an induced subgraph. This means that, M contains an M_{3_1} or $M_{3_1}^T$, which is a contradiction, to the fact that all forbidden matrices in X have been removed from M . The same can be proved by induction on chordless cycles of length eight, ten, twelve, $\dots, 2(\min(m, n))$. Therefore our assumption that two chordless cycles in M share at least one vertex is wrong. Therefore, matrices of type M_{I_k} and $M_{I_k}^T$ (where $k \geq 1$) that are contained in M are pairwise disjoint. \square

An FPT Algorithm for d-SC1S-R :

In Algorithm 4, we present an FPT algorithm *d-SC1S-row-deletion-restricted-matrices* for solving d-SC1S-R problem on $(2, *)$ -matrices. Given a matrix M and a parameter d (maximum number of rows that can be deleted), Algorithm 4 first preprocess (Section

3.2.4) the input matrix, and then search and destroy every submatrix of M that contains an $M_{3_1}^\top$. If M contains an $M_{3_1}^\top$, then the algorithm branches into at most four subcases (depending on the rows of $M_{3_1}^\top$ found in M). Each branch corresponds to deleting a row of the forbidden matrix $M_{3_1}^\top$ found in M . In each of the subcases, when a row is deleted, the parameter d is decremented by the weight (Section 3.2.4) of that row. As long as $d > 0$, the above steps are repeated for each subcase until all the forbidden matrices of type $M_{3_1}^\top$ are destroyed. The number of leaf instances is at most $O(4^d)$. For each of the leaf instances M_i , if the resulting matrix still does not have the SC1P, then the only possible forbidden matrices that can remain in M_i are of type M_{I_k} and $M_{I_k}^\top$ (where $k \geq 1$). If they appear in M_i , by Theorem 9 they are pairwise disjoint. Pairwise disjoint M_{I_k} and $M_{I_k}^\top$ in M_i , can be destroyed by deleting a row with minimum weight (by breaking ties arbitrarily) from each of them. On deletion of a row, the parameter d is decremented by the weight of that row. If the sum of the weights of all the deleted rows is less than or equal to d then, the algorithm returns Yes indicating that input is an Yes instance. Otherwise, the algorithm returns No.

The correctness of the branching step can be explained in the following Lemma.

Lemma 16. *Let M be a $(2, *)$ -matrix that does not have the SC1P. Suppose M contains one of the forbidden matrices from X . Let $M[\{r_1, \dots, r_4\}]$ be a submatrix that contains a forbidden matrix from X , where $\{r_1, \dots, r_4\} \subseteq R(M)$. Then, any solution of d -SC1S-R includes at least one of the rows r_1, \dots, r_4 .*

Proof. Assume that there exists a solution for d -SC1S-R, say S that contains none of the rows r_1, r_2, \dots, r_4 . Let $M' = M \setminus S$ be the matrix with the SC1P. This implies that $M[\{r_1, r_2, \dots, r_4\}]$ in M' satisfies the SC1P, which is a contradiction. \square

Algorithm 4 can be used to solve d -SC1S-R problem on $(*, 2)$ -matrices also, by searching for an M_{3_1} instead of $M_{3_1}^\top$ in M (in line 6 of Algorithm 4), and considering the number of branches as three (since the only forbidden matrix in X that can occur in a $(*, 2)$ -matrix is M_{3_1} and it has three rows).

Theorem 10. *d -SC1S-R is fixed-parameter tractable on $(2, *)/(*, 2)$ -matrices with a run-time of $O^*(4^d)/O^*(3^d)$, where d denotes the number of rows that can be deleted.*

Algorithm 4 Algorithm *d-SC1S-row-deletion-restricted-matrices*(M, d)

Input: An instance $\langle M_{m \times n}, d \rangle$ where M is a $(2, *)$ -binary matrix and $d \geq 0$

Output = $\begin{cases} \text{Yes,} & \text{if there exists a set } R' \subseteq R(M), \text{ with } |R'| \leq d, \text{ such that } M \setminus R' \\ & \text{has the SC1P.} \\ \text{No,} & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$

Stage 1:

- 1: Apply preprocessing steps as discussed in Section 3.2.4 on M .
- 2: **if** M has the SC1P and $d \geq 0$ **then**, return Yes.
- 3: **if** $d < 0$ **then**, return No.

Branching Step:

- 4: **if** there exists a submatrix M' in M that is isomorphic to $M_{3_1}^T$ **then**,
 Branch into at most four instances $I_i = \langle M_i, d_i \rangle$ where $i \in \{1, 2, 3, 4\}$
 Set $M_i \leftarrow M \setminus \{r_i\}$ // r_i denotes the i^{th} row of M' .
 Update $d_i \leftarrow d - \text{wt}(r_i)$ // $\text{wt}(r_i)$ denotes the weight of row r_i .
 For some $i \in \{1, 2, 3, 4\}$, if *d-SC1S-row-deletion-restricted-matrices*(M_i, d_i) returns
 Yes, then return Yes, else if all instances return No, then return No.
- 5: **end if**

Stage 2:

- 6: **while** there exists a submatrix N in M that is isomorphic to an M_{I_k} or $M_{I_k}^T$ and $d > 0$ **do**,
 - 7: Delete a row r in N having minimum weight from M .
 - 8: Decrement the parameter d by the weight of the deleted row r .
 - 9: **end while**
 - 10: **if** M does not contain M_{I_k} or $M_{I_k}^T$ and $d \geq 0$ **then** return Yes, otherwise return No
-

Proof. Algorithm 4 employs a search tree, where each node in the search tree has at most four/three subproblems, and therefore the tree has at most $4^d/3^d$ leaves. The size of the search tree is $O(4^d)/O(3^d)$. A submatrix M' of M , that is isomorphic to $M_{3_1}^T$ and M_{3_1} can be found in $O(m^4n)$ -time and $O(m^3n)$ -time (using Lemma 9) respectively. Therefore, for an input matrix M , the time required for destroying an $M_{3_1}^T/M_{3_1}$ (stage 1) is $O(4^d m^4 n)/O(3^d m^3 n)$. The time required for finding a submatrix of type M_{I_k} and $M_{I_k}^T$, (where $k \geq 1$) in M is $O(m^3 n^3)$ and $O(m^3)$ (using Lemma 10) on $(2, *)$ -matrices and $(*, 2)$ -matrices respectively. For each of the leaf instance M_i , line 6 of Algorithm 4 is executed at most d_i times and $d_i \leq d$. Therefore the time complexity of destroying M_{I_k} and $M_{I_k}^T$ in M (stage 2) is $O(4^d m^3 n^3 d)/O(3^d m^3 d)$. The total time complexity of

Algorithm 4 is $O(4^d(m^4n + d.m^3n^3))/O(3^d(m^3n + d.m^3))$ on $(2, *)/(*, 2)$ -matrices. \square

The following corollary on PROPER INTERVAL VERTEX DELETION problem (Section 2.1) is a direct consequence of Theorem 10.

Corollary 10. *PROPER INTERVAL VERTEX DELETION problem is fixed-parameter tractable on triangle-free graphs with a run-time of $O^*(4^d)$, where d denotes the number of allowed vertex deletions.*

Corollary 11. *The optimization version of d -SC1S-R problem (SC1S-ROW DELETION) on a $(2, *)/(*, 2)$ -matrix can be approximated in polynomial-time with a factor of four/three.*

Proof. In Stage 1 of Algorithm 4, instead of branching on each of the rows of a forbidden submatrix $M_{3_1}^T/M_{3_1}$ found in M , delete all rows of each of the forbidden submatrix $M_{3_1}^T/M_{3_1}$ found in M . From Algorithm 4, it is clear that Stage 2 solves the problem exactly. This results in a 4-factor/3-factor approximation algorithm. \square

An FPT Algorithm for d -SC1S-C:

A related problem of deleting at most d number of columns to get the SC1P (d -SC1S-C problem) can also be solved using Algorithm 4 (consider the columns instead of rows in lines 4, 7 and 8) in $O^*(3^d)$ -time for $(2, *)$ -matrix ($O^*(4^d)$ -time for $(*, 2)$ -matrix) and the approximation factor for the optimization version of d -SC1S-C problem (SC1S-COLUMN DELETION) is three (four).

An FPT Algorithm for d -SC1S-RC:

d -SC1S-RC problem can also be solved using Algorithm 4 (consider the rows as well as columns instead of rows in lines 4, 7 and 8) in $O^*(7^d)$ -time on $(2, *)/(*, 2)$ -matrices. The approximation factor for the optimization version of d -SC1S-RC problem (SC1S-ROW-COLUMN DELETION) is seven.

3.3. Establishing SC1P by Flipping Entries

This section considers SC1E problems by flipping 0/1 and 01-entries. We refer to the decision versions of the optimization problems SC1P-0-Flipping and SC1P-01-Flipping defined in Section 1 as k -SC1P-0E and k -SC1P-01E respectively, where k denotes the

number of allowed flippings. First, we show that these problems are NP-complete. Then, we give an FPT algorithm for d-SC1P-0E problem on general matrices. Finally, we present an FPT algorithm for d-SC1P-1E problem on certain restricted matrices.

3.3.1. NP-completeness

The following theorem proves the NP-completeness of k-SC1P-0E problem using k-CHAIN COMPLETION problem (Definition 5) on bipartite graphs as a candidate problem.

Theorem 11. *The k-SC1P-0E problem is NP-complete.*

Proof. We first show that k-SC1P-0E \in NP. Given a matrix M and an integer k , the certificate is a set A' of indices corresponding to 0-entries in M . The verification algorithm affirms that $|A'| \leq k$, and then it checks whether flipping these 0-entries in M yields a matrix with the SC1P. This verification can be done in polynomial time.

We prove that k-SC1P-0E problem is NP-hard by showing that k-CHAIN COMPLETION \leq_p k-SC1P-0E. The half-adjacency matrix of any chain graph can be observed to satisfy the SC1P, however the converse is not true. Given a bipartite graph $G = (V_1, V_2, E)$ with $V_1 = m$ and $V_2 = n$, we create a $2m \times 2n$ binary matrix $M_{G_{new}}$ as follows. $M_{G_{new}} = \begin{bmatrix} J_{m,n} & M_G \\ 0_{m,n} & J_{m,n} \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} A & B \\ D & C \end{bmatrix}$, where M_G is the half adjacency matrix of G , $J_{m,n}$ is an $m \times n$ matrix with all entries as one and $0_{m,n}$ is an $m \times n$ matrix with all entries as zero. It can be noted that adding an edge in G corresponds to flipping a 0-entry in B . We show that G can be converted to a chain graph G' by adding at most k edges if and only if there are at most k number of 0-flippings in $M_{G_{new}}$, such that the resultant matrix $M_{G'_{new}}$ satisfies the SC1P.

Suppose G' is a chain graph, then $\begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix}$ cannot occur exclusively in B (from Lemma

6). By construction of $M_{G_{new}}$, it can be observed that $\begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \end{bmatrix}$ and $\begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}$ cannot

occur as submatrices in $M_{G'_{new}}$. From Figure 1, it is clear that one of the configurations of these two matrices occur as a submatrix in all the forbidden submatrices of the SC1P, except M_{I_1} . Hence M_{I_1} is the only forbidden submatrix of the SC1P that could appear in $M_{G'_{new}}$. However, if $M_{G'_{new}}$ contains M_{I_1} , then it would further imply that

B' (matrix obtained after flipping the 0-entries of B) contains $\begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix}$ as a submatrix, which contradicts the assumption that G' is a chain graph. Therefore, if k edges can be added to G to make it a chain graph, then k 0-entries can be flipped in $M_{G_{new}}$ to make it satisfy the SC1P.

Conversely, suppose that $k=k_1+k_2$ 0-flippings are performed on $M_{G_{new}}$ to make it satisfy the SC1P, where k_1 and k_2 refer to the number of 0-flippings performed in B and D respectively. Let us assume that the corresponding bipartite graph G' , obtained after the flipping of zeroes in B is not a chain graph. Since G' is not a chain graph, it contains $2K_2$ as an induced subgraph, which further means that B' contains $\begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix}$ as a submatrix. The construction of $M_{G_{new}}$ implies that $M_{G'_{new}}$ has M_{I_1} as a submatrix (considering the remaining 3 quadrants of $M_{G'_{new}}$), which leads to a contradiction. Hence G' is a chain graph. Therefore, k -SC1P-0E is NP-complete. \square

The following corollary on BICONVEX COMPLETION problem is a direct consequence of the above theorem.

Corollary 12. *Given a bipartite graph $G = (V_1, V_2, E)$ and a non-negative integer k , the problem of deciding whether there exists a set $E' \subseteq (V_1 \times V_2) \setminus E$, of size at most k , such that $G = (V_1, V_2, E \cup E')$ is a biconvex graph is NP-complete.*

The following theorem proves the NP-completeness of the k -SC1P-01E problem using the k -CHAIN EDITING problem (Definition 5) on bipartite graphs as a candidate problem.

Theorem 12. *The k -SC1P-01E problem is NP-complete.*

Proof. We first show that k -SC1P-01E \in NP. Given a matrix M and an integer k , the certificate is a set A' of indices corresponding to 0/1-entries in M . The verification algorithm affirms that $|A'| \leq k$, and then it checks whether flipping these 0/1-entries in M yields a matrix with the SC1P. This verification can be done in polynomial time.

We prove that k -SC1P-01E is NP-hard by showing that k -CHAIN EDITING \leq_p k -SC1P-01E. The NP-hardness of k -SC1P-01E can be proved similar to the NP-hardness of k -SC1P-0E (Theorem 11) by considering $M_{G_{new}}$ as follows: $M_{G_{new}} = \begin{bmatrix} J_{m,mn} & M_G \\ 0_{mn,mn} & J_{mn,n} \end{bmatrix}$,

where $G = (P, Q, E)$ is a bipartite graph, with $|P|=m$ and $|Q|=n$ and M_G being the half adjacency matrix of G . It can be noted that adding/removing an edge in G corresponds to flipping a 0/1-entry in B . We claim that G can be converted to a chain graph G' by adding/deleting at most k edges if and only if there are at most k number of 0/1-flippings in $M_{G_{new}}$, such that the resultant matrix $M_{G'_{new}}$ satisfies the SC1P (This can be proved similar to Theorem 11). \square

The following corollary on BICONVEX EDITING problem is a direct consequence of the above theorem.

Corollary 13. *Given a bipartite graph $G = (V_1, V_2, E)$ and a non-negative integer k , the problem of deciding whether there exists a set of at most k edge modifications (edge additions/deletions) in G , that results in a biconvex graph is NP-complete.*

3.3.2. An FPT algorithm for d-SC1P-0E problem

In this section, we present an FPT algorithm *d-SC1P-0-Flipping* (Algorithm 5), for d-SC1P-0E problem on general matrices. Given a binary matrix M and a non-negative integer d , Algorithm 5 destroys forbidden submatrices from F_{SC1P} in M , using a simple search tree based branching algorithm. The algorithm recursively branches, if M contains a forbidden matrix from X (see Section 2.2) as well as M_{i_k} or $M_{i_k}^T$ (where $k \geq 1$). If M contains a forbidden matrix from X , then the algorithm branches into at most eighteen subcases, since the largest forbidden matrix of X has eighteen 0-entries. In each subcase, flip one of the 0-entry of the forbidden submatrix found in M and decrement the parameter d by one. Otherwise, if M contains a forbidden submatrix of type M_{i_k} or $M_{i_k}^T$, then the algorithm finds a minimum size forbidden matrix M' , of type M_{i_k} or $M_{i_k}^T$ in M . If the value of k is greater than d , then the algorithm returns No (using Corollary 14), otherwise the algorithm branches into at most $O(7^d)$ -subcases (using Lemma 17). In each subcase, flip k 0-entries of the forbidden submatrix M' found in M , and decrement the parameter d by k . This process is continued in each subcase, until its d value becomes zero or until it satisfies the SC1P. Algorithm 5 returns Yes if any of the subcases returns Yes, otherwise it returns No.

Flipping a 0-entry in M is equivalent to adding an edge in the representing graph G_M of M . From this fact and Lemma 11, it follows that to destroy M_{i_k} and $M_{i_k}^T$ in M , it is

The above observation leads to a $O^*(d^{2d})$ algorithm for d-SC1P-0E. But, using the result of the following lemma, we get a $O^*(18^d)$ algorithm for d-SC1P-0E.

Lemma 17. *Given a bipartite graph $H = (V_1, V_2, E)$, which is an even chordless cycle of length $2n$ (where $n \geq 3$), the number of ways to make H a chordal bipartite graph by adding $n-2$ edges is at most 6.75^{n-1} .*

Proof. Number of ways to make H a chordal bipartite graph = Number of ternary trees with $n-1$ internal nodes (using Lemma 2).

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Number of ternary trees with } n \text{ internal nodes} &= \frac{\binom{3n+1}{n}}{3n+1} \\ &= \frac{\binom{3n}{n}}{2n+1} = \frac{(3n)!}{(2n+1)(2n)!n!} \end{aligned}$$

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} n! = \sqrt{2\pi n} \left(\frac{n}{e}\right)^n \text{ (using Lemma 3).}$$

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\binom{3n}{n}}{2n+1} &= \frac{\sqrt{2\pi(3n)} \left(\frac{3n}{e}\right)^{3n}}{\sqrt{2\pi(2n)} \left(\frac{2n}{e}\right)^{2n} \times \sqrt{2\pi(n)} \left(\frac{n}{e}\right)^n \times (2n+1)} \\ &= \frac{\sqrt{3} \times 3^{3n}}{\sqrt{4\pi n} \times 2^{2n} \times (2n+1)} \\ \frac{\binom{3n}{n}}{2n+1} &= O\left(\frac{3^{3n}}{\sqrt{n} \times 2^{2n} \times (2n+1)}\right) \sim O\left(\frac{3^{3n}}{2^{2n}}\right) = O(6.75^n) \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, number of ternary trees with n internal nodes = $O(6.75^n)$.

Hence, the number of ways to make H a chordal bipartite graph is same as the number of ternary trees with $n-1$ internal nodes and is $O(6.75^{n-1})$. \square

Lemma 18. *In Algorithm 5, destroying $M_{i_k}/M_{i_k}^T$ takes $O^*(6.75^d)$ -time.*

Proof. Let $\phi(k)$ represent the number of 4-cycle decompositions (Section 2.1) of a $2(k+2)$ -cycle, or rather the representing graph of an M_{i_k} or $M_{i_k}^T$, where $k \geq 1$. Using Lemma 4, $\phi(k) = \frac{\binom{3k+3}{k+1}}{2k+3}$. Let there be chordless cycles of sizes $2(i_1+2), 2(i_2+2), \dots, 2(i_m+2)$ (in the non-decreasing order of size) in the representing graph of the input matrix, and let d be the number of allowed edge additions. Since i_n is equal to the number of edges to be added to the n^{th} smallest cycle in the representing graph of the input matrix, we get $\sum_{n=1}^m i_n \leq d$. Then, the number of leaves associated with the removal of $M_{i_k}/M_{i_k}^T$ in the search tree is given by:

$$\begin{aligned}
T(k) &= \phi(i_1) \times \phi(i_2) \times \phi(i_3), \dots, \phi(i_k) = \prod_{n=1}^m \phi(i_n) \\
&\leq \prod_{n=1}^m \phi(i_n)^{\frac{(2i_n+3)(i_n+1)}{3i_n+1}}, \text{ where } \sum_{n=1}^m i_n \leq d. \\
&= \prod_{n=1}^m \binom{3i_n}{i_n} \\
&= O\left(\frac{\sqrt{2\pi(3d)}\left(\frac{3d}{e}\right)^{3d}}{\sqrt{2\pi(2d)}\left(\frac{2d}{e}\right)^{2d} \cdot \sqrt{2\pi d}\left(\frac{d}{e}\right)^d}\right) \quad (\text{Using Lemma 3}). \\
&= O\left(\frac{3^{3d}}{\sqrt{d} \cdot 2^{2d}}\right) = O\left(\frac{3^{3d}}{2^{2d}}\right) = O(6.75^d).
\end{aligned}$$

Hence, destroying all $M_{I_k}/M_{I_k}^T$ (where $k \geq 1$), in M takes $O^*(6.75^d)$ -time. \square

Theorem 13. *d-SC1P-0E problem on a matrix $M_{m \times n}$, can be solved in $O^*(18^d)$ -time, where d denotes the number of 0-entries that can be flipped. Consequently, it is FPT.*

Proof. Each node in the search tree of Algorithm 5 has at most 18 or $O(7^k)$ subproblems, depending on whether we are destroying the fixed size forbidden matrices or $M_{I_k}/M_{I_k}^T$ respectively. A submatrix M' of M , that is isomorphic to one of the forbidden matrices in X , and $M_{I_k}/M_{I_k}^T$ can be found in $O(m^6n)$ -time (using Lemma 9) and $O(m^3n^3)$ -time (using Lemma 10) respectively. From Lemma 18, it follows that destroying all $M_{I_k}/M_{I_k}^T$ in M takes $O^*(6.75^d)$ -time, whereas destroying all the forbidden matrices from X takes $O^*(18^d)$ -time. Therefore, the total time complexity of Algorithm 5 is $O^*(18^d)$. \square

The idea used in Algorithm 5, does not work for SC1S and other SC1E problems defined in Section 1. In d-SC1P-0E problem, the presence of a large M_{I_k} (or a large chordless cycle), where $k > d$ is enough to say that we are dealing with a No instance (Using Corollary 14). But for d-SC1S-R\C\RC and d-SC1P-1E\01E problems, a chordless cycle (of any length) can be destroyed by deleting an arbitrary vertex and an arbitrary edge respectively. This idea plays a crucial role in the context of flipping zeroes, but not flipping ones, and deleting rows/columns in the input matrix.

The following corollary on BICONVEX COMPLETION problem (Section 1) is a direct consequence of Theorem 13.

Corollary 15. *BICONVEX COMPLETION problem is fixed-parameter tractable on bipartite graphs with a run-time of $O^*(18^d)$, where d denotes the number of allowed edge additions.*

3.3.3. An FPT algorithm for d-SC1P-1E problem on restricted matrices

The d-SC1P-1E problem on $(2, *)/(*, 2)$ -matrices can also be solved using Algorithm 4, with a modification in the branching step as follows. Here, we branch on the number

of 1-entries of the forbidden submatrix $M_{3_1}^\top/M_{3_1}$ found in M . In each branch, we flip the corresponding 1-entry and the parameter d is decremented by the weight of that 1-entry (Definition 3.2.4). The number of 1-entries in an $M_{3_1}^\top/M_{3_1}$ is 6 (for both $(2, *)$ and $(*, 2)$ -matrix), which leads to a branching factor of at most 6. After the branching step, the remaining pairwise disjoint forbidden submatrices of type M_{1_k} and $M_{1_k}^\top$ (where $k \geq 1$) in M can be destroyed in polynomial time by flipping a minimum weight 1-entry in M_{1_k} and $M_{1_k}^\top$ respectively. Therefore, the total time complexity is $O^*(6^d)$, which leads to the following theorem.

Theorem 14. *d-SC1P-1E on a $(2, *)/(*, 2)$ -matrix $M_{m \times n}$ can be solved in $O^*(6^d)$ -time where d denotes the number of allowed 1-flippings. The optimization version of d-SC1P-1E problem (SC1P-1-FLIPPING) can be approximated in polynomial-time with a factor of six.*

The following corollary on BICONVEX EDGE DELETION problem (Section 1) is a direct consequence of Theorem 14.

Corollary 16. *BICONVEX EDGE DELETION problem is fixed-parameter tractable on certain bipartite graphs, in which the degree of all vertices in one partition is at most two, with a run-time of $O^*(6^d)$, where d denotes the number of allowed edge deletions.*

4. Conclusion

In this work, first we showed that the decision versions of SC1S and SC1E problems are NP-complete. Then, we proved that d-SC1S-R/C/RC and d-SC1P-0E problems are fixed-parameter tractable on general matrices. We also showed that d-SC1P-1E problem is fixed-parameter tractable on certain restricted matrices. Improved FPT algorithms for d-SC1S-R/C/RC problems on $(2, *)$ and $(*, 2)$ matrices are also presented here. We also observed that the fixed-parameter tractability of d-SC1S-R problem on $(2, *)$ -matrices implies that PROPER INTERVAL VERTEX DELETION problem is FPT on triangle-free graphs with a run-time of $O^*(4^d)$. From our results, it turns out that BICONVEX VERTEX DELETION and BICONVEX COMPLETION problems are fixed-parameter tractable. We also observed that BICONVEX EDGE DELETION problem is fixed-parameter tractable on certain restricted bipartite graphs. We conjecture that d-SC1P-1E and d-SC1P-01E

problems are also fixed-parameter tractable on general matrices. However, the idea used for solving d-SC1P-0E cannot be extended to solve d-SC1P-1E and d-SC1P-01E problems. In d-SC1P-1E and d-SC1P-01E problems, a chordless cycle of any length can be destroyed by removing a single edge, which leads to an unbounded number of branches. An interesting direction for future work would be to investigate the parameterized complexity of d-SC1P-1E/01E problems on general matrices.

References

- [1] A. Tucker, A structure theorem for the consecutive 1's property, *Journal of Combinatorial Theory, Series B* 12 (2) (1972) 153–162. doi:10.1016/0095-8956(72)90019-6.
- [2] P. C. Fishburn, *Interval orders and interval graphs*, *Discrete Mathematics* 55 (2) (1985) 135–149. URL <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/0012365X85900421>
- [3] M. Oswald, *Weighted consecutive ones problems*, Ph.D. thesis (2003). URL <http://archiv.ub.uni-heidelberg.de/volltextserver/3588/1/diss.pdf>
- [4] R. König, G. Schramm, M. Oswald, H. Seitz, S. Sager, M. Zapatka, G. Reinelt, R. Eils, Discovering functional gene expression patterns in the metabolic network of escherichia coli with wavelets transforms, *BMC bioinformatics* 7 (1) (2006) 119. doi:10.1186/1471-2105-7-119.
- [5] D. Fulkerson, O. Gross, Incidence matrices and interval graphs, *Pacific journal of mathematics* 15 (3) (1965) 835–855. doi:10.2140/pjm.1965.15.835.
- [6] M. Oswald, G. Reinelt, The simultaneous consecutive ones problem, *Theoretical Computer Science* 410 (21-23) (2009) 1986–1992. doi:10.1016/j.tcs.2008.12.039.
- [7] K. S. Booth, G. S. Lueker, Testing for the consecutive ones property, interval graphs, and graph planarity using pq-tree algorithms, *Journal of Computer and System Sciences* 13 (3) (1976) 335–379. doi:10.1016/S0022-0000(76)80045-1.
- [8] W.-L. Hsu, A simple test for the consecutive ones property, *Journal of Algorithms* 43 (1) (2002) 1–16. doi:10.1006/jagm.2001.1205.
- [9] W.-L. Hsu, R. M. McConnell, Pc trees and circular-ones arrangements, *Theoretical computer science* 296 (1) (2003) 99–116. doi:10.1016/S0304-3975(02)00435-8.
- [10] R. M. McConnell, *A certifying algorithm for the consecutive-ones property*, in: *Proceedings of the fifteenth annual ACM-SIAM symposium on Discrete algorithms*, Society for Industrial and Applied Mathematics, 2004, pp. 768–777. URL <http://dl.acm.org/citation.cfm?id=982792.982909>
- [11] J. Meidanis, O. Porto, G. P. Telles, On the consecutive ones property, *Discrete Applied Mathematics* 88 (1-3) (1998) 325–354. doi:10.1016/S0166-218X(98)00078-X.
- [12] M. Raffinot, Consecutive ones property testing: cut or swap, in: *Conference on Computability in Europe*, Springer, 2011, pp. 239–249. doi:10.1007/978-3-642-21875-0_25.

- [13] R. G. Downey, M. R. Fellows, *Fundamentals of parameterized complexity*, Vol. 4, Springer, 2013.
doi:10.1007/978-1-4471-5559-1.
- [14] M. Dom, *Recognition, Generation, and Application of Binary Matrices with the Consecutive Ones Property*, Cuvillier, 2009.
URL <http://fpt.akt.tu-berlin.de/publications/theses/dom08.pdf>
- [15] Y. Cao, D. Marx, *Chordal editing is fixed-parameter tractable*, *Algorithmica* 75 (1) (2016) 118–137.
URL <https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s00453-015-0014-x>
- [16] H. Kaplan, R. Shamir, R. E. Tarjan, *Tractability of parameterized completion problems on chordal, strongly chordal, and proper interval graphs*, *SIAM Journal on Computing* 28 (5) (1999) 1906–1922.
doi:10.1137/S0097539796303044.
- [17] W. Lipski, F. P. Preparata, *Efficient algorithms for finding maximum matchings in convex bipartite graphs and related problems*, *Acta Informatica* 15 (4) (1981) 329–346. doi:10.1007/BF00264533.
- [18] S.-L. Peng, Y.-C. Yang, *On the treewidth and pathwidth of biconvex bipartite graphs*, in: *International Conference on Theory and Applications of Models of Computation*, Springer, 2007, pp. 244–255. doi:10.1007/978-3-540-72504-6_22.
- [19] D. B. West, *Introduction to graph theory*, Vol. 2, Prentice hall Upper Saddle River, 2009.
URL https://ia801204.us.archive.org/35/items/igt_west/igt_west_text.pdf
- 1000 [20] T. Uno, H. Satoh, *An efficient algorithm for enumerating chordless cycles and chordless paths*, in: *International Conference on Discovery Science*, Springer, 2014, pp. 313–324.
URL <http://arxiv.org/abs/1404.7610>
- [21] P. VanâŽt Hof, Y. Villanger, *Proper interval vertex deletion*, *Algorithmica* 65 (4) (2013) 845–867.
doi:10.1007/s00453-012-9661-3.
- [22] J. Stirling, *Methodus differentialis, sive tractatus de summation et interpolation serierum infinitarum, london*, *The Differential Method: A Treatise of the Summation and Interpolation of Infinite Series* (trans: Holliday, J.) [1749] (1730).
URL https://archive.org/details/bub_gb_J6dqTJWSAcMC/page/n3
- [23] R. L. Graham, D. E. Knuth, O. Patashnik, S. Liu, *Concrete mathematics: a foundation for computer science*, *Computers in Physics* 3 (5) (1989) 106–107.
URL <https://aip.scitation.org/doi/pdf/10.1063/1.4822863>
- [24] M. Yannakakis, *Node and edge-deletion np-complete problems*, in: *Proceedings of the tenth annual ACM symposium on Theory of computing*, ACM, 1978, pp. 253–264.
URL <http://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/viewdoc/download?doi=10.1.1.319.8796&rep=rep1&type=pdf>
- [25] M. Yannakakis, *Node-deletion problems on bipartite graphs*, *SIAM Journal on Computing* 10 (2) (1981) 310–327. doi:https://doi.org/10.1137/0210022.
- [26] A. Natanzon, R. Shamir, R. Sharan, *Complexity classification of some edge modification problems*, *Discrete Applied Mathematics* 113 (1) (2001) 109–128.
URL <http://www.cs.tau.ac.il/~roded/articles/mod.pdf>
- [27] M. Yannakakis, *Computing the minimum fill-in is np-complete*, *SIAM Journal on Algebraic Discrete*

Methods 2 (1) (1981) 77–79.

URL <https://doi.org/10.1137/0602010>

- [28] P. G. Drange, M. S. Dregi, D. Lokshtanov, B. D. Sullivan, *On the threshold of intractability*, in: Algorithms-ESA 2015, Springer, 2015, pp. 411–423.

URL <http://www.ii.uib.no/~daniello/papers/thresholdEdit.pdf>

- [29] N. Narayanaswamy, R. Subashini, Obtaining matrices with the consecutive ones property by row deletions, *Algorithmica* 71 (3) (2015) 758–773. doi:10.1007/s00453-014-9925-1.

- [30] Y. Cao, *Linear recognition of almost interval graphs*, in: Proceedings of the twenty-seventh annual ACM-SIAM symposium on Discrete algorithms, SIAM, 2016, pp. 1096–1115.

URL <https://dl.acm.org/citation.cfm?id=2884512>