

An Approximation Algorithm for Covering Vertices by 4^+ -Paths

Mingyang Gong* Zhi-Zhong Chen^{†‡} Guohui Lin* Zhaohui Zhan[§]

Abstract

This paper deals with the problem of finding a collection of vertex-disjoint paths in a given graph $G = (V, E)$ such that each path has at least four vertices and the total number of vertices in these paths is maximized. The problem is NP-hard and admits an approximation algorithm which achieves a ratio of 2 and runs in $O(|V|^8)$ time. The known algorithm is based on time-consuming local search, and its authors ask whether one can design a better approximation algorithm by a completely different approach. In this paper, we answer their question in the affirmative by presenting a new approximation algorithm for the problem. Our algorithm achieves a ratio of 1.874 and runs in $O(\min\{|E|^2|V|^2, |V|^5\})$ time. Unlike the previously best algorithm, ours starts with a maximum matching M of G and then tries to transform M into a solution by utilizing a maximum-weight path-cycle cover in a suitably constructed graph.

Keywords: Path cover; path-cycle cover; maximum matching; recursion; approximation algorithm

*Department of Computing Science, University of Alberta. Edmonton, Alberta T6G 2E8, Canada. Emails: {mgong4, guohui}@ualberta.ca

[†]Division of Information System Design, Tokyo Denki University. Saitama 350-0394, Japan. Email: zzchen@mail.dendai.ac.jp

[‡]Correspondence author.

[§]Department of Computer Science, City University of Hong Kong. Hong Kong SAR, China. Email: zhghan3-c@my.cityu.edu.hk

1 Introduction

Throughout this paper, a graph always means a simple undirected graph without parallel edges or self-loops, and an approximation algorithm always means one running in polynomial time. Let k be a positive integer. Given a graph $G = (V, E)$, MPC_v^{k+} is the problem of finding a collection of vertex-disjoint paths each with at least k vertices in G so that the total number of vertices in these paths is maximized. Note that we can assume that each path in the output collection has at most $2k - 1$ vertices. This is because we can split a path having $2k$ or more vertices into two or more paths each having at least k and at most $2k - 1$ vertices. MPC_v^{k+} has numerous real-life applications such as transportation networks [9]. In this paper, we mainly focus on MPC_v^{4+} .

On one hand, MPC_v^{k+} is related to many important optimization problems. For example, Berman and Karpinski [3] consider *the maximum path cover problem*, which is the problem of finding a collection of vertex-disjoint paths in a given graph so that the total number of edges in the paths is maximized. For other related path cover problems with different objectives, the reader is referred to [3, 1, 15, 2, 16, 4, 8, 5] for more details. On the other hand, MPC_v^{k+} can be viewed as a special case of *the maximum-weight $(2k - 1)$ -set packing problem* because the former can be easily reduced to the latter as follows. Recall that an instance of the latter problem is a collection \mathcal{C} of sets each having a non-negative weight and at most $2k - 1$ elements. The objective is to select a collection of pairwise-disjoint sets in \mathcal{C} so that the total weight of the selected sets is maximized. To reduce MPC_v^{k+} to the maximum-weight $(2k - 1)$ -set packing problem, it suffices to construct an instance \mathcal{C} of the latter problem from a given instance graph G of MPC_v^{k+} , where \mathcal{C} is the collection of all paths of G with at least k and at most $2k - 1$ vertices and the weight of each path P in \mathcal{C} is the number of vertices in P . This reduction leads to an approximation algorithm for MPC_v^{k+} achieving a ratio of k because the maximum-weight $(2k - 1)$ -set packing problem can be approximated within a ratio of k [10] or within a slightly better ratio of $k - \frac{1}{63,700,992} + \epsilon$ [14] for any $\epsilon > 0$.

MPC_v^{k+} can be solved in polynomial time if $k \leq 3$ [5], but is NP-hard otherwise [11]. Kobayashi *et al.* [11] design an approximation algorithm for MPC_v^{4+} achieving a ratio of 4. Afterwards, Gong *et al.* [9] give the formal definition of MPC_v^{k+} and present an approximation algorithm for MPC_v^{k+} which achieves a ratio of $\rho(k) \leq 0.4394k + 0.6576$ and runs in $O(|V|^{k+1})$ time. The core of their algorithm is three local improvement operations, each of which increases the number of vertices in the current solution by at least 1 if it is applicable. The algorithm stops when none of the three operations is applicable. They employ an amortization scheme to analyze the approximation ratio of their algorithm by assigning the vertices in the optimal solution to the vertices of the solution outputted by their algorithm. For the special case where $k = 4$, they design two more local improvement operations to increase the number of vertices or the number of paths with exactly 4 vertices in the current solution, and then use a more careful amortization scheme to prove that the approximation ratio of their algorithm is bounded by 2 although the running time jumps to $O(|V|^8)$. As an open question, they ask whether one can design better approximation algorithms for the problem by completely different approaches.

In this paper, we answer their open question in the affirmative for the case where $k = 4$. Motivated by the approaches in [12, 6, 5] for similar problems, one may want to design an approximation algorithm for MPC_v^{k+} by first computing a maximum path-cycle cover \mathcal{C} of the input graph G and then transforming \mathcal{C} into a solution for G . Unfortunately, this approach to maximizing the number of edges does not seem to work. Our new idea for designing a better approximation algorithm for MPC_v^{4+} is to let the algorithm start by computing a maximum matching M in the input graph G . The intuition behind this idea is that the paths in an optimal solution for G can cover at most $\frac{5}{2}|M|$ vertices. So, it suffices to find a solution for G of which the paths cover a large fraction of the endpoints of the edges in M . To this purpose, our algorithm then constructs a maximum-weight path-cycle cover \mathcal{C} in an auxiliary graph suitably constructed from M and G . Our algorithm further tries to use the edges in \mathcal{C} to connect a large fraction of the edges of M into paths with at least four vertices. If the algorithm fails to do so, then it will be able to reduce the problem to a smaller problem and in turn uses recursion to get a good solution.

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. Section 2 gives some basic definitions. Section 3 presents the algorithm for MPC_v^{4+} . Section 4 analyzes the approximation ratio of the algorithm. Lastly, Section 5 concludes the paper with the main algorithm design ideas and some possible future research.

2 Basic Definitions

A number of symbols and terms are specified in Notations 1–9, and used in the rest of the paper.

Notation 1 For a graph G , $V(G)$ denotes the vertex set of G and $E(G)$ denotes the edge set of G .

Let G be a graph. For a subset F of $E(G)$, we use $V(F)$ to denote the set $\{v \in V(G) \mid v \text{ is an endpoint of an edge in } F\}$. A *spanning subgraph* of G is a subgraph H with $V(H) = V(G)$. For a set F of edges in G , $G - F$ denotes the spanning subgraph $(V(G), E(G) \setminus F)$. In contrast, for a set F of edges with $V(F) \subseteq V(G)$ and $F \cap E(G) = \emptyset$, $G + F$ denotes the graph $(V(G), E(G) \cup F)$. The *degree* of a vertex v in G , denoted by $d_G(v)$, is the number of edges incident to v in G . A vertex v of G is *isolated* in G if $d_G(v) = 0$. The *subgraph induced by* a subset U of $V(G)$, denoted by $G[U]$, is the graph (U, E_U) , where $E_U = \{\{u, v\} \in E(G) \mid u, v \in U\}$. Two vertex-disjoint subgraphs of G are *adjacent* in G if G has an edge between them.

A *cycle* in G is a connected subgraph of G in which each vertex is of degree 2. A *path* in G is either a single vertex of G or a connected subgraph of G in which exactly two vertices (called the *endpoints*) are of degree 1 and the others (called the *internal vertices*) are of degree 2. A *path component* of G is a connected component of G that is a path. If a path component is an edge, then it is called an *edge component*. The *order* of a cycle or path P , denoted by $|P|$, is the number of vertices in P . A *k-path* of G is a path of order k in G , while a *k⁺-path* of G is a path of order k or more in G . A *triangle* of G is a cycle of order 3 in G . A *matching* of G is a (possibly empty) set of edges of G in which no two edges share an endpoint. A *maximum matching* of G is a matching of G whose size is maximized over all matchings of G . A *path-cycle cover* of G is a set F of edges in G such that in the spanning subgraph $(V(G), F)$, the degree of each vertex is at most 2. A *star* is a connected graph in which at most one vertex is of degree ≥ 2 and each of the remaining vertices is of degree 1. The vertex of degree ≥ 2 is called the *center*, while the other vertices are the *satellites* of the star. Note that a single edge is not readily a star, but becomes so after one vertex is chosen to be the center and accordingly the other becomes the satellite.

Notation 2 For a graph G ,

- $OPT(G)$ denotes an optimal solution for the instance graph G of MPC_v^{4+} , and $opt(G)$ denotes the total number of vertices in $OPT(G)$;
- $ALG(G)$ denotes the solution for G outputted by a specific algorithm, and $alg(G)$ denotes the total number of vertices in $ALG(G)$.

As aforementioned, we have the following fact:

Fact 1 The order of each path in any feasible solution is between 4 and 7.

3 The Algorithm for MPC_v^{4+}

Throughout the remainder of this paper, we fix an instance G of MPC_v^{4+} for discussion. Let $n = |V(G)|$ and $m = |E(G)|$.

Our algorithm for MPC_v^{4+} consists of multiple phases. In the first phase, it computes a maximum matching M in G in $O(\sqrt{nm})$ time [13], initializes a subgraph $H = (V(M), M)$, then repeatedly modifies H and M (cf. Section 3.1) in such a way that M always remains to be a maximum matching of G with $M \subseteq E(H)$ and H eventually becomes a graph in which each connected component is an edge in M , a triangle with one edge in M , a star with one edge in M , or a 5-path with two edges in M .

Lemma 1 $|V(M)| \geq \frac{4}{5}opt(G)$.

PROOF. Consider an arbitrary path P in $OPT(G)$. Let e_1, \dots, e_ℓ be the edges of P and suppose that they appear in P in this order from one endpoint to the other. Obviously, $M_o = \{e_i \mid i \text{ is odd}\}$ is a matching. If ℓ is odd, $V(P) = V(M_o)$; otherwise, exactly one vertex of P is not in $V(M_o)$. We claim that $|V(M_o)| \geq \frac{4}{5}|V(P)|$. This is clearly true if ℓ is odd. So, we may assume below that ℓ is even. Then,

$\ell \geq 4$ because $\ell + 1 = |V(P)| \geq 4$ and both ℓ and 4 are even. Now, since $|V(M_o)| \geq \frac{\ell}{\ell+1}|V(P)|$, we have $|V(M_o)| \geq \frac{4}{5}|V(P)|$. Note that $\cup_P M_o$ is a matching and $opt(G) = \sum_P |V(P)|$, where P ranges over all paths in $OPT(G)$. So, by the claim, $|V(M)| \geq \frac{4}{5}opt(G)$. \square

3.1 Modifying H and M

We here describe a process for modifying H and M iteratively. The process consists of two steps. During the first step, the following will be an invariant.

Invariant 1 $M \subseteq E(H)$ and each connected component K of H is an edge or a 5-path. Moreover, if K is an edge, then this edge is in M ; if K is a 5-path, then the two edges of $E(K)$ incident to the endpoints of K are in M .

Initially, Invariant 1 clearly holds.

Definition 1 An augmenting triple with respect to H is a triple $(u_0, e_0 = \{v_0, w_0\}, e_1 = \{v_1, w_1\})$ such that $u_0 \in V(G) \setminus V(H)$, both e_0 and e_1 are edge components of H , and one of the following two conditions holds:

- C1. $\{u_0, v_0\}, \{u_0, v_1\} \in E(G)$.
- C2. $\{u_0, v_0\}, \{w_0, v_1\} \in E(G)$.

Definition 2 Modifying H and M with an augmenting triple (u_0, e_0, e_1) w.r.t. H is the operation of modifying H and M as follows:

Case 1: Condition C1 holds. In this case, add u_0 and the edges $\{u_0, v_0\}, \{u_0, v_1\}$ to H .

Case 2: Condition C2 holds. In this case, add u_0 and the edges $\{u_0, v_0\}, \{w_0, v_1\}$ to H and then modify M by replacing e_0 with $\{u_0, v_0\}$.

It is possible that an augmenting triple (u_0, e_0, e_1) satisfies both Conditions C1 and C2. If this happens, then we prefer Condition C1, i.e., we modify H as in Case 1.

The first step of the modification process is as follows.

Step 1.1 Repeatedly modify H and M with an augmenting triple until no such triple exists.

Modifying M and H with a given augmenting triple takes $O(1)$ time and produces one more 5-path in H . So, there are at most $O(n)$ repetitions in Step 1.1. To decide whether there is an augmenting triple satisfying Condition C1, it suffices to check, for each vertex $u \in V(G) \setminus V(H)$, whether two edges incident to u in G can be used to connect two edge components of H into a 5-path of G . So, this takes $O(\min\{m^2, n^3\})$ time. Similarly, to decide whether there is an augmenting triple satisfying Condition C2, it suffices to check, for each edge component $e = \{v, w\}$ of H , whether v has a neighbor $u \in V(G) \setminus V(H)$ and w has a neighbor in $V(M \setminus \{e\})$. So, this takes $O(\min\{m^2, n^3\})$ time, too. In total, Step 1.1 takes $O(\min\{m^2n, n^4\})$ time. We have the following lemma on H and M when Step 1.1 terminates.

Lemma 2 When Step 1.1 terminates, the following statements on H and M hold:

1. M is a maximum matching in G .
2. Each connected component of H is a 5-path or an edge of M . Moreover, if it is a 5-path, then the two edges incident to the endpoints are in M .
3. If $e = \{v, w\}$ is an edge component of H and u is a vertex of $V(G) \setminus V(H)$ such that $\{u, v\} \in E(G)$, then an edge of G can connect u (w , respectively) only to w (u , respectively) or the internal but not the middle vertices of 5-paths in H .

PROOF. The first statement is true since M is modified by edge swapping only during Step 1.1.

The second statement is obvious too, since when an augmenting triple with respect to the current H and M is identified, two edge components and an outside vertex are merged into a 5-path component, which stays untouched till Step 1.1 terminates.

We next prove the third statement. Consider the vertex $u \in V(G) \setminus V(H)$. No edge of G can connect u to a vertex not in $V(M)$ or an endpoint of a 5-path, due to M being a maximum matching. No edge of G can connect u to another edge component of H than e either, since otherwise Step 1.1 would still be applicable. It follows that the only possible neighbors of u are the internal but not the middle vertices of 5-paths, besides the vertices v and w of e .

The third statement in the lemma holds for the vertex w for the same reasons, as one can swap the edge $\{u, v\}$ with the edge e of H to obtain an essentially equivalent graph. \square

By Lemma 2, we continue to modify H (but not M) in the next step to add edges connecting the outside vertices and the edge components.

Step 1.2 Add all those edges $\{u, v\} \in E(G)$ such that $u \in V(G) \setminus V(H)$ and v is an endpoint of an edge component of H , as well as their endpoints u , to H .

Step 1.2 is done in $O(m)$ time. We have the next lemma on H and M at the end of Step 1.2.

Lemma 3 *Suppose H and M have been modified as in the above Steps 1.1–1.2 in $O(\min\{m^2n, n^4\})$ time. The following statements hold.*

1. M is a maximum matching in G .
2. Each connected component K of H is a 5-path, an edge, a triangle, or a star. Moreover, if K is a 5-path, then the two edges incident to the endpoints are in M ; otherwise, exactly one edge of $E(K)$ is in M .
3. If K_1 and K_2 are two different connected components of H such that there is an edge $\{v_1, v_2\} \in E(G)$ with $v_i \in V(K_i)$, and either K_1 is a star and v_1 is its satellite or K_1 is a triangle, then K_2 is a 5-path and v_2 is an internal but not the middle vertex of K_2 .
4. For each vertex $u \in V(G) \setminus V(H)$, every neighbor of u in G is an internal but not the middle vertex of a 5-path in H .

PROOF. The first statement follows from Lemma 2, since M stays untouched during Step 1.2.

The second statement follows from Lemma 2 and the fact that when Step 1.1 terminates, the two endpoints of an edge component of H cannot be adjacent to two distinct outside vertices due to M being a maximum matching in G . That is, if the two endpoints of an edge component of H are not adjacent to any outside vertex, then it remains as an edge component at the end of Step 1.2; if the two endpoints of an edge component of H are adjacent to a common outside vertex, then it becomes a triangle component at the end of Step 1.2; otherwise, exactly one of the two endpoints of an edge component of H is adjacent to one or more outside vertices, and then it becomes a star component at the end of Step 1.2, with the endpoint being the center. Note that all these possibilities are originated from an edge component and thus they contain exactly one edge of M .

For the third statement, one sees that we may assume without loss of generality that v_1 is an outside vertex of H when Step 1.1 terminates, i.e., the same as the vertex u in Lemma 2; therefore, by Lemma 2 again v_2 is an internal but not the middle vertex of a 5-path. The last statement holds again due to M being a maximum matching in G . \square

3.2 Bad components and rescuing them

We consider the subgraph H and the maximum matching M at the end of Step 1.2.

Definition 3 *A bad component of H is a connected component that is not a 5-path.*

In the sequel, a component always means a *connected* component. In the second phase, we *rescue* as many bad components of H as possible, by performing three steps of operations.

Step 2.1 Construct a spanning subgraph G_1 of G of which the edge set consists of all the edges $\{v_1, v_2\}$ of G such that v_1 and v_2 appear in different components of H and at least one of the components is bad.

Definition 4 A set F of edges in G_1 saturates a bad component K of H if at least one edge in F is incident to a vertex of K . The weight of F is the number of bad components saturated by F .

Lemma 4 A maximum-weighted path-cycle cover in G_1 can be computed in $O(\min\{nm, n^2\} \log n)$ time.

PROOF. The proof is a reduction to the maximum-weight $[f, g]$ -factor problem. Recall that for two functions f and g mapping each vertex v of an edge-weighted graph G' to two non-negative integers $f(v), g(v)$ with $f(v) \leq g(v)$, an $[f, g]$ -factor of G' is a set F of edges in G' such that in the spanning subgraph $(V(G'), F)$, the degree of each vertex v is at least $f(v)$ and at most $g(v)$. The weight of an $[f, g]$ -factor F of G' is the total weight of the edges in F . Given G' , f , and g , a maximum-weight $[f, g]$ -factor of G' can be computed in $O(m'n' \log n')$ time [7], where $m' = |E(G')|$ and $n' = |V(G')|$.

Let B_1, B_2, \dots, B_h be the bad components of H . We construct an auxiliary edge-weighted graph $G' = (V(G) \cup X, E(G_1) \cup F_1 \cup F_2)$ as follows:

- $X = \{x_i, y_i, z_i \mid 1 \leq i \leq h\}$.
- $F_1 = \{\{x_i, v\}, \{y_i, v\} \mid v \in V(B_i), 1 \leq i \leq h\}$ and $F_2 = \{\{x_i, z_i\}, \{y_i, z_i\} \mid 1 \leq i \leq h\}$.
- The weight of each edge in $E(G_1) \cup F_1$ is 0 while the weight of each edge in F_2 is 1.
- For each vertex $v \in \bigcup_{i=1}^h V(B_i)$, let $f(v) = g(v) = 2$.
- For each $v \in V(G) - \bigcup_{i=1}^h V(B_i)$, let $f(v) = 0$ and $g(v) = 2$.
- For each $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, h\}$, $f(x_i) = f(y_i) = f(z_i) = 0$ and $g(x_i) = g(y_i) = |V(B_i)|$, $g(z_i) = 1$.

We next prove that the maximum weight of an $[f, g]$ -factor of G' equals the maximum weight of a path-cycle cover of G_1 .

Given a maximum-weight path-cycle cover C of G_1 , we can obtain an $[f, g]$ -factor F for G' as follows: Initially, we set $F = C$. Then, for each bad component B_i and each vertex v in B_i , we perform one of the following according to the degree of v in the graph $(V(G), F)$.

- If the degree of v in the graph $(V(G), F)$ is 0, then add the edges $\{v, x_i\}, \{v, y_i\}$ to F .
- If the degree of v in the graph $(V(G), F)$ is 1, then add the edge $\{v, x_i\}$ to F , and further add the edge $\{y_i, z_i\}$ to F if it has not been added to F .
- If the degree of v in the graph $(V(G), F)$ is 2, then add the edge $\{y_i, z_i\}$ to F if it has not been added to F .

Clearly, F is an $[f, g]$ -factor of G' . We claim that the weight of F is no less than that of C . To see this, consider a bad component B_i saturated by C . Then, there exists a vertex v in B_i such that C contains an edge incident to v . Hence, by the construction of F , F contains $\{y_i, z_i\}$. Since the weight of $\{y_i, z_i\}$ is 1, the claim holds.

Conversely, given a maximum-weight $[f, g]$ -factor F of G' , we obtain a subset C of $E(G_1)$ with $C = E(G_1) \cap F$. Since $g(v) = 2$ for each vertex $v \in V(G_1)$, C is a path-cycle cover of G_1 . We claim that the weight of C is no less than that of F . To see this, consider a bad component B_i such that $\{x_i, z_i\}$ or $\{y_i, z_i\}$ is in F . Since $g(z_i) = 1$, exactly one of $\{x_i, z_i\}$ and $\{y_i, z_i\}$ is in F . Without loss of generality, we assume $\{x_i, z_i\}$ is in F . Then, there exists a vertex v in B_i such that the edge $\{v, x_i\}$ is not in F . Since $f(v) = g(v) = 2$, C contains an edge incident to v and hence C saturates B_i . So, the claim holds.

By the above two claims, the maximum weight of an $[f, g]$ -factor of G' equals the maximum weight of a path-cycle cover of G_1 . Now, since $|V(G')| \leq 4n$ and $|E(G')| \leq m + 4n$, the running time is bounded by $O(\min\{mn, n^2\} \log n)$. So, the lemma holds. \square

Step 2.2. Compute a maximum-weight path-cycle cover C of G_1 (as in the proof of Lemma 4).

Step 2.3. As long as C contains an edge e such that $C \setminus e$ has the same weight as C , repeatedly remove e from C .

Notation 3

- G_1 denotes the spanning subgraph of G constructed in Step 2.1.

- C denotes the maximum weight path-cycle cover of G_1 computed at the end of Step 2.3.
- M_C denotes the subset of the maximum matching M containing those edges in 5-paths of H or in bad components of H saturated by C .

The next lemma will be crucial for analyzing the approximation ratio of our algorithm.

Lemma 5 *We have $|V(M_C)| \geq \frac{4}{5}opt(G)$.*

PROOF. Let m_b be the total number of edges of M contained in the bad components of H . Let B_1, \dots, B_h be the bad components such that no edge in $OPT(G)$ is incident to any vertex of B_i , $i = 1, \dots, h$. Note that $E(G_1) \cap E(OPT(G))$ is a path-cycle cover of G_1 with weight $m_b - h$.

Let ℓ be the number of bad components not saturated by C . Then, $|M| = |M_C| + \ell$ since each bad component has exactly one edge in M by Lemma 3. Moreover, the weight of the path-cycle cover C is $m_b - \ell$. Since we compute a maximum-weight path-cycle cover of G_1 by Lemma 4, $m_b - h \leq m_b - \ell$ and in turn $h \geq \ell$.

A crucial point is that for each bad component B_i with $1 \leq i \leq h$, no vertex of B_i can appear in $OPT(G)$ because $|opt(B_i)| = 0$ and $OPT(G)$ has no edge connecting B_i to the outside of B_i . By this point, $OPT(G)$ is actually an optimal solution for the graph G_o obtained from G by removing the vertices of B_i for every $i \in \{1, \dots, h\}$. So, by Lemma 1, $|V(M_o)| \geq \frac{4}{5}opt(G)$, where M_o is a maximum matching in G_o .

Note that $M_o \cup \left(\bigcup_{i=1}^h E(B_i) \cap M \right)$ is a matching of G and its size is $|M_o| + h$ because $|E(B_i) \cap M| = 1$ by Lemma 3. Since M is a maximum matching of G , $|M_o| + h \leq |M|$. Recall that $h \geq \ell$ and $|M| = |M_C| + \ell$. Hence, $|M_o| \leq |M_C|$ and $|V(M_C)| \geq \frac{4}{5}opt(G)$. \square

3.3 Structure of composite components of $H + C$

By Lemma 5, $|V(M_C)|$ is relatively large compared to $opt(G)$. Intuitively speaking, in order to obtain a good approximate solution for G , it suffices to focus on M_C instead of its superset M . That is, we may ignore the edges of M in the bad components *not* saturated by C .

Notation 4

- $H+C$ denotes the spanning subgraph $(V(G), E(H) \cup C)$. In the sequel, we use K to refer to a component in $H + C$.
- $(H + C)_m$ denotes the graph obtained from $H + C$ by contracting each component of H into a single node. In other words, the nodes of $(H + C)_m$ one-to-one correspond to the components of H and two nodes are adjacent in $(H + C)_m$ if and only if C contains an edge between the two corresponding components.

We use $(K)_m$ to refer to the component of $(H + C)_m$ corresponding to the component K in $H + C$.

Definition 5 *A composite component K of $H + C$ is one that contains two or more components of H , which are connected through the edges of C .*

In contrast, an isolated component K of $H + C$ is one that contains exactly one component of H .

Lemma 6 *For each component $(K)_m$ of $(H + C)_m$ (see Notation 4), the following statements hold:*

1. $(K)_m$ is an isolated node, an edge, or a star.
2. If $(K)_m$ is an edge, then at least one endpoint of $(K)_m$ corresponds to a bad component of H .
3. If $(K)_m$ is a star, then each satellite of $(K)_m$ corresponds to a bad component of H .

PROOF. If K is isolated in $H + C$, then $(K)_m$ is an isolated node in $(H + C)_m$. Otherwise, K is a composite component of $H + C$. Suppose $(K)_m$ contains a 4^+ -path. Let v_1, v_2, v_3, v_4 be the first four nodes of such a 4^+ -path from one endpoint to the other. By Step 2.3, we can remove the edge of C corresponding to $\{v_2, v_3\}$ such that the weight of C is unchanged since no node of $(K)_m$ becomes isolated. Such a contradiction shows that there is no 4^+ -path, and similarly no cycle, in $(K)_m$. It follows that $(K)_m$ is either an edge or a star. This proves the first statement.

The other two statements follow from the construction of G_1 in Step 2.1, the computation of C in Steps 2.2 and 2.3, and the definition of $(H + C)_m$. \square

By the second statement in Lemma 6, when $(K)_m$ is an edge, we choose an endpoint corresponding to a bad component of H as the satellite, while the other endpoint as the center. This way, an edge becomes a star.

Definition 6 *For each composite component K of $H + C$, its center element is the component of H corresponding to the center of $(K)_m$, and it is denoted as K_c in the sequel; the other components of H contained in K are the satellite elements of K .*

A center (satellite, respectively) element of $H + C$ is a center (satellite, respectively) element of some composite component of $H + C$; an isolated 5-path of $H + C$ is also called a center element.

We remark that an isolated bad component of $H + C$ is not saturated by C , it contains an edge of $M \setminus M_C$, and it is ignored from further discussion.

Lemma 7 *The following statements hold:*

1. *Each center element K_c of $H + C$ is a 5-path, an edge or a star but not a triangle of H ; each satellite element S of $H + C$ is an edge, a star or a triangle but not a 5-path of H .*
2. *Suppose v is a vertex of K_c and some satellite element S is adjacent to v in $H + C$. If K_c is a star, then v is the center vertex of K_c and thus $v \in V(M)$; if S is a triangle component of H , then K_c is a 5-path and v is an internal but not the middle vertex of K_c .*

PROOF. Suppose K_c is a triangle of H . Then by the third statement in Lemma 3, K_c is the center of a composite component K of which each satellite element is a 5-path. The third statement in Lemma 6 says that $(K)_m$ is an edge, and thus the 5-path should be the center element, a contradiction. Next, suppose S is a satellite element of K , and suppose to the contrary S is a 5-path. Then, $(K)_m$ is an edge by the third statement of Lemma 6, and thus S should be the center element, again a contradiction. This proves the first statement.

For the second statement, if K_c is a star and v is a satellite of K_c , then the third statement in Lemma 3 implies that S is a 5-path, and subsequently the third statement in Lemma 6 implies that $(K)_m$ is an edge, again leading to a contradiction that S should be the center element. If S is a triangle of H , then by the third statement of Lemma 3 K_c is a 5-path and v is an internal but not the middle vertex of K_c . This proves the lemma. \square

We define the following for the vertices of a center element K_c .

Definition 7 *A vertex v of a center element K_c is an anchor of $H + C$ if K_c is a 5-path or an edge, or K_c is a star and v is the center vertex of K_c . The edge connecting v to a satellite element S in C is called the rescue-edge for S and v is called the supporting anchor for S . For a nonnegative integer j , an anchor v is a j -anchor if v is the supporting anchor for exactly j satellite elements of $H + C$.*

We note that, if K_c is a star component of H , then the second statement in Lemma 7 implies that each satellite of K_c cannot be adjacent to any satellite element of $H + C$ and thus is excluded from the above definition of anchors. Since C is a path-cycle cover of G_1 obtained in Step 2.3, each satellite element S of $H + C$ is adjacent to a unique anchor, and each anchor is a 0-, 1-, or 2-anchor.

Notation 5 *For each component K of $H + C$, let $s(K)$ denote the number of vertices in both K and $V(M_C)$, i.e., $s(K) = |V(K) \cap V(M_C)|$.*

If the center K_c of K is a 5-path, then let v_1, \dots, v_5 be the anchors of K ordered from one endpoint to the other on K_c ; if K_c is an edge, then let v_1, v_2 be the anchors of K ; otherwise, K_c is a star and let v_1 be the unique anchor (which is the center vertex of K_c) of K and let v_2 be the satellite vertex of K_c such that $\{v_1, v_2\} \in M$.

Lemma 8 *For each component K of $H + C$, an $OPT(K)$ can be computed in $O(1)$ time.*

PROOF. Let \mathcal{S} be the collection of the satellite elements of K . By Lemma 7, the center element K_c is a 5-path, an edge or a star, and thus we distinguish three cases.

Firstly, if K_c is a 5-path, then by Lemma 7 S is a triangle, an edge or a star, for each $S \in \mathcal{S}$. If S is a triangle or an edge, then $|V(S)| \leq 3$. If S is a star and the center vertex of S is incident with the rescue-edge for S , then we can remove all but one satellite vertex of S to keep $opt(K)$ unchanged, which leads to $|V(S)| \leq 2$. If one satellite vertex v of S is incident with the rescue-edge for S , then we remove all satellites of S except v and one satellite not incident with the rescue-edge for S to keep $opt(K)$ unchanged, which leads to $|V(S)| \leq 3$. In conclusion, $|V(S)| \leq 3$ for each $S \in \mathcal{S}$. Recall that each anchor is a 0-, 1-, or 2-anchor. It follows that $|\mathcal{S}| \leq 10$ and after the vertex removal for each $S \in \mathcal{S}$, $|V(K)| \leq 10 \times 3 + 5 = 35$ and hence we can compute an $OPT(K)$ in constant time.

Secondly, if K_c is an edge, then by Lemmas 7 and 3, each $S \in \mathcal{S}$ is an edge or a star and if S is a star then the center vertex of S must be in the rescue-edge of S . Similarly as in the first case, if S is an edge then $|V(S)| = 2$; if S is a star, then removing all but one satellite vertex of S from K does not decrease $opt(K)$, and so $|V(S)| = 2$ now. Note that $|\mathcal{S}| \leq 4$. After the vertex removal for each S , we have $|V(K)| \leq 4 \times 2 + 2 = 10$ and hence we can compute an $OPT(K)$ in constant time.

Lastly, K_c is a star. By Lemma 7, each $S \in \mathcal{S}$ must be adjacent to the center vertex of K_c , and thus $|\mathcal{S}| \leq 2$. Also, we can remove all but one satellite vertex of K_c to keep $opt(K)$ unchanged, i.e., $|V(K_c)| = 2$. Similarly to the second case above, for each $S \in \mathcal{S}$ we have $|V(S)| = 2$ after removing some vertices of S if necessary. It follows that $|V(K)| \leq 2 \times 2 + 2 = 6$ and hence an $OPT(K)$ can be computed in constant time. This completes the proof. \square

Generally speaking, by computing an $OPT(K)$ for every K of $H + C$ and outputting their union as an approximate solution for G , we obtain an approximation algorithm for MPC_v^{4+} achieving a ratio of $\frac{5}{4} \max_K \frac{s(K)}{opt(K)}$ because of Lemma 5, unless K is *critical* and *responsible*, to be defined later. If K is an isolated 5-path, then by Lemma 3 we have $\frac{s(K)}{opt(K)} = \frac{4}{5}$. But if K is a composite component, $\frac{s(K)}{opt(K)}$ is not necessarily small (smaller than our target value which is about 1.4992). This motivates the next definition of *critical component*.

Definition 8 A critical component of $H + C$ is a component K with $\frac{s(K)}{opt(K)} \geq \frac{14}{11}$.

Notation 6 Let v be an anchor of K .

- If v is a 0-anchor, then let Q_v be the vertex v ; otherwise, Q_v denotes the longest path among those paths in K each starts with v followed by an edge of C incident to v .
- If v is a 2-anchor, then we use P_v to denote the longest path among those paths in K each contains v and the two edges of C incident to v .

Remark 1 When v is a 2-anchor, Q_v can be a part of P_v . By Lemma 7, each satellite element of K is either a triangle, an edge or a star. Therefore, if v is not a 0-anchor, then Q_v is a 3- or 4-path; if v is a 2-anchor, then P_v is a 5-, 6-, or 7-path.

Lemma 9 Suppose K_c is a 5-path. Then, the following statements hold:

1. Suppose the total number of 1- and 2-anchors is 5. Then, $opt(K) \geq 17$ if one of v_1, v_3, v_5 is a 2-anchor; otherwise, $opt(K) \geq 13$.
2. Suppose the total number of 1- and 2-anchors is 4. Then, $opt(K) \geq 15$ if one of v_1, v_3, v_5 is a 2-anchor; otherwise, $opt(K) \geq 12$.

PROOF. Suppose the total number of 1- and 2-anchors is 5. So, there is no 0-anchor in K . The first case is that one of v_1, v_3, v_5 is a 2-anchor. We assume v_1 is a 2-anchor and the case when v_3 or v_5 is a 2-anchor can be discussed similarly. Then, we can construct two vertex-disjoint 6^+ -paths by connecting $\{v_j, v_{j+1}\}$ and $Q_{v_j}, Q_{v_{j+1}}$, $j = 2, 4$ and a 5^+ -path P_{v_1} . So, $opt(K) \geq 2 \times 6 + 5 = 17$. We can assume v_1, v_3, v_5 are not 2-anchors. Then, we can construct a 6^+ -path by using $\{v_1, v_2\}$ to connect Q_{v_1}, Q_{v_2} and a 7^+ -path by connecting Q_{v_3}, Q_{v_5} with the 3-path $v_3-v_4-v_5$. So, $opt(K) \geq 13$.

Suppose the total number of 1- and 2-anchors is 4 and one of v_1, v_3, v_5 is a 2-anchor. We assume v_1 is a 2-anchor and the case when v_3 or v_5 is a 2-anchor can be discussed similarly. Then, we can construct a 6^+ -path and a 4^+ -path by connecting $Q_{v_j}, Q_{v_{j+1}}$ with $\{v_j, v_{j+1}\}$, $j = 2, 4$ and a 5^+ -path P_{v_1} . So, $opt(K) \geq 15$.

Now, we can assume v_1, v_3, v_5 are not 2-anchors. Recall that K has exactly one 0-anchor. Suppose one of v_2, v_4 is a 0-anchor. Without loss of generality, we assume v_2 is a 0-anchor. Then, we can construct a 6^+ -path by using $\{v_4, v_5\}$ to connect Q_{v_4}, Q_{v_5} and a 7^+ -path by using the 3-path $v_1-v_2-v_3$ to connect Q_{v_1}, Q_{v_3} . So, $opt(K) \geq 13$. Then, we can assume one of v_1, v_3, v_5 is the unique 0-anchor in K . We can only discuss the case when v_1 is the unique 0-anchor and we can analyze the case when one of v_3 or v_5 is the 0-anchor similarly. Then, we can construct two vertex-disjoint 6^+ -path by using $\{v_j, v_{j+1}\}$ to connect $Q_{v_j}, Q_{v_{j+1}}$, $j = 2, 4$. So, in this case, $opt(K) \geq 12$, which completes the proof. \square

Lemma 10 *Suppose that K has no 2-anchor. Then, $\frac{s(K)}{opt(K)} < \frac{14}{11}$ and hence K is not critical.*

PROOF. First, consider the case where K_c is an edge. Then, either both v_1 and v_2 are 1-anchors of K , or exactly one of v_1 and v_2 is a 1-anchor of K . In the former case, Q_{v_1} and Q_{v_2} are connected with $\{v_1, v_2\}$ into a 6^+ -path in K . In the latter case, without loss of generality, we assume v_1 is a 1-anchor. So, Q_{v_1} can be extended to a 4^+ -path with $\{v_1, v_2\}$. In conclusion, in either case, $\frac{s(K)}{opt(K)} \leq 1$ and hence K is not critical.

If K_c is a star, then v_1 is the unique 1-anchor where v_1 is the center vertex of K_c . So, $s(K) = 4$ and we can construct a 4^+ -path by connecting Q_{v_1} with $\{v_1, v_2\}$ where v_2 is the vertex in $V(M)$. It follows that $opt(K) \geq 4$ and thus $\frac{s(K)}{opt(K)} \leq 1$ and K is not critical.

We next consider the case where K_c is a 5-path. Then, $opt(K) \geq 5$ because of the 5-path. So, we may assume that $s(K) > 6$ because otherwise $\frac{s(K)}{opt(K)} \leq \frac{6}{5} < \frac{14}{11}$ and we are done. Since K has no 2-anchor, $s(K) \leq 14$. Thus, $8 \leq s(K) \leq 14$ because $s(K)$ is even. If K has at least four 1-anchors, then by Lemma 9, $opt(K) \geq 12$, implying that $\frac{s(K)}{opt(K)} \leq \frac{14}{12} < \frac{14}{11}$ and we are done. Hence, we may assume that K has at most three 1-anchors, i.e., $s(K) \leq 10$. It remains to distinguish two cases as follows.

Case 1: $s(K) = 8$. In this case, K has exactly two 1-anchors. Either at least one endpoint of K_c is a 1-anchor, or at least two internal vertices of K_c are 1-anchors. In the former case, without loss of generality, we assume v_1 is a 1-anchor. Then, $opt(K) \geq 7$ because K_c and Q_{v_1} are connected into a 7^+ -path in K . In the latter case, $opt(K) \geq 8$ because we can construct two vertex-disjoint 4^+ -paths in K , each of which is obtained by choosing two 1-anchors v_j, v_k of K and connecting Q_{v_j}, Q_{v_k} with a subpath of K_c , respectively. So, in both cases, $\frac{s(K)}{opt(K)} \leq \frac{8}{7} < \frac{14}{11}$.

Case 2: $s(K) = 10$. In this case, K has exactly three 1-anchors. Either both endpoints of K_c are 1-anchors, or at least two internal vertices of K are 1-anchors. In the former case, $opt(K) \geq 9$ because K_c, Q_{v_1} , and Q_{v_5} are connected into a 9^+ -path in K . In the latter case, similarly to Case 1, $opt(K) \geq 8$. So, in both cases, $\frac{s(K)}{opt(K)} \leq \frac{10}{8} < \frac{14}{11}$. \square

Lemma 11 *Suppose that K has at least three 2-anchors. Then, the following statements hold and hence K is not critical.*

1. *If K has five 2-anchors, then $s(K) = 24$ and $opt(K) \geq 25$.*
2. *If K has four 2-anchors, then $s(K) \leq 22$ and $opt(K) \geq 20$.*
3. *If K has three 2-anchors, then either $s(K) = 20$ and $opt(K) \geq 17$, or $s(K) \leq 18$ and $opt(K) \geq 15$.*

PROOF. Since K has at least three 2-anchors, K_c is a 5-path. Obviously, $s(K)$ is even and $s(K) \leq 24$. If K has at least four 2-anchors, then because of the vertex-disjoint 5^+ -paths P_{v_j} for each 2-anchor v_j , the first two statements in the lemma hold. Thus, we may assume that K has exactly three 2-anchors. Then, $opt(K) \geq 3 \times 5 = 15$ and $s(K) \leq 20$.

If $s(K) \leq 18$, then $\frac{s(K)}{opt(K)} \leq \frac{18}{15}$ and we are done. So, we may assume $s(K) = 20$. Then, three vertices of K_c are 2-anchors and the other two vertices of K_c are 1-anchors. It follows that at least one of v_1, v_3, v_5 is a 2-anchor. By the first statement of Lemma 9, $opt(K) \geq 17$ and K is not critical, which completes the proof. \square

Lemma 12 *Suppose that K has exactly two 2-anchors. Then, K_c is a 5-path or an edge and the following statements hold:*

1. *If K_c is an edge, then $s(K) = 10$ and $opt(K) \geq 10$, and hence K is not critical.*
2. *If K_c is a 5-path and $s(K) \leq 12$, then $opt(K) \geq 10$ and hence K is not critical.*
3. *Suppose that K_c is a 5-path and $s(K) = 18$. If K is critical, then $opt(K) \in \{13, 14\}$ and the two non-middle internal vertices of K_c are 2-anchors in K ; otherwise, $opt(K) \geq 15$.*
4. *Suppose that K_c is a 5-path and $s(K) = 16$. If K is critical, then $opt(K) = 12$ and the two non-middle internal vertices of K_c are 2-anchors in K ; otherwise, $opt(K) \geq 13$.*
5. *Suppose that K_c is a 5-path and $s(K) = 14$. If K is critical, then $opt(K) = 11$ and K has only five different structures as shown in Figure 1; otherwise, $opt(K) \geq 12$.*

PROOF. Note that if K_c is a star, then it has exactly one anchor. So, by the first statement of Lemma 7, K_c is a 5-path or an edge. If K_c is an edge, then clearly both v_1, v_2 of K_c are 2-anchors and hence $opt(K) \geq 2 \times 5 = 10$ because of the two vertex-disjoint 5^+ -paths P_{v_1} and P_{v_2} .

Suppose K_c is a 5-path. Since K has exactly two 2-anchors, $opt(K) \geq 2 \times 5 = 10$ and $s(K) \leq 18$. Now, if $s(K) \leq 12$, then we are done. Thus, we can further assume that $s(K) > 12$ and in turn $s(K) \geq 14$ because $s(K)$ is even. Therefore, $s(K) \in \{14, 16, 18\}$.

Case 1: $s(K) = 18$. In this case, K has exactly seven satellite elements in total. Since K has only two 2-anchors, each vertex of K_c is a 1- or 2-anchor in K . So, the total number of 1- and 2-anchors is 5. By Lemma 9, if one of v_1, v_3, v_5 is a 2-anchor, then $opt(K) \geq 17$ and $\frac{s(K)}{opt(K)} \leq \frac{18}{17}$. Hence K is not critical and then we can assume none of v_1, v_3, v_5 is a 2-anchor. That is, v_2, v_4 are both 2-anchors and v_1, v_2, v_3 are both 1-anchors. By Lemma 9 again, $opt(K) \geq 13$. Obviously, if $opt(K) \geq 15$, then $\frac{s(K)}{opt(K)} \leq \frac{18}{15} < \frac{14}{11}$ and hence K is not critical. Otherwise, $opt(K) = 13$ or 14 , and $\frac{s(K)}{opt(K)} = \frac{18}{13}$ or $\frac{18}{14}$.

Case 2: $s(K) = 16$. In this case, K has exactly six satellite elements in total. Since K has exactly two 2-anchors, the total number of 1- and 2-anchors is 4. By Lemma 9, if one of v_1, v_3, v_5 is a 2-anchor, then $opt(K) \geq 15$ and K is not critical. Similarly to Case 1, we can assume v_2, v_4 are both 2-anchors and two of v_1, v_2, v_3 are 1-anchors. By Lemma 9 again, $opt(K) \geq 12$. Obviously, if $opt(K) \geq 13$, then $\frac{s(K)}{opt(K)} \leq \frac{16}{13} < \frac{14}{11}$ and hence K is not critical. Otherwise, $opt(K) = 12$ and $\frac{s(K)}{opt(K)} = \frac{16}{12} > \frac{14}{11}$.

Case 3: $s(K) = 14$. In this case, K has exactly five satellite elements in total. If both v_1 and v_2 are 2-anchors in K , then K contains three vertex-disjoint 4^+ -paths (namely, P_{v_1} , P_{v_2} , and a 4^+ -path obtained by connecting an edge of K_c to Q_{v_i} for some $i \in \{3, 4, 5\}$ where v_i is a 1-anchor). Hence $opt(K) \geq 2 \times 5 + 4 = 14$, implying that K is not critical. Similarly, if both v_4, v_5 or v_1, v_5 are 2-anchors in K , then $opt(K) \geq 14$, implying that K is not critical. So, it remains to consider the following three subcases.

Case 3.1: v_3 is a 2-anchor in K . In this case, either some $v_i \in \{v_1, v_2\}$ or some $v_i \in \{v_4, v_5\}$ is the other 2-anchor of K . Without loss of generality, we assume the former case. If some $v_j \in \{v_4, v_5\}$ is a 1-anchor in K , then K contains three vertex-disjoint 4^+ -paths (namely, P_{v_3} , P_{v_i} , and a 4^+ -path obtained by connecting the edge $\{v_4, v_5\}$ to P_{v_j}), and hence $opt(K) \geq 2 \times 5 + 4 = 12$, implying that K is not critical. Thus, we may assume that one of v_1 and v_2 is a 2-anchor and the other is a 1-anchor in K . Then, K contains a 6^+ -path obtained by using the edge $\{v_1, v_2\}$ to connect Q_{v_1} and Q_{v_2} . Since this 6^+ -path and P_{v_3} are vertex-disjoint, $opt(K) \geq 5 + 6 = 11$ and hence $\frac{s(K)}{opt(K)} \leq \frac{14}{11}$. If $opt(K) \geq 12$, then $\frac{s(K)}{opt(K)} \leq \frac{14}{12} < \frac{14}{11}$ and therefore K is not critical. Otherwise, $opt(K) = 11$ and K is critical.

Case 3.2: Both v_2 and v_4 are 2-anchors in K . In this case, v_1, v_3 , or v_5 is a 1-anchor in K . We assume that v_1 is a 1-anchor in K ; the other two cases can be similarly discussed. Then, besides P_{v_4} , K contains a 6^+ -path obtained by using the edge $\{v_1, v_2\}$ to connect Q_{v_1} and Q_{v_2} . So, $opt(K) \geq 5 + 6 = 11$. If $opt(K) \geq 12$, then $\frac{s(K)}{opt(K)} \leq \frac{14}{12}$ and K is not critical. Thus, K can be critical only when $opt(K) = 11$.

Case 3.3: Either both v_1 and v_4 are 2-anchors in K , or both v_2 and v_5 are 2-anchors in K . By symmetry, we may assume the former case. If v_2 is a 1-anchor in K , then besides P_{v_1} and P_{v_4} , K contains a 4^+ -path obtained by using the path $\{v_2, v_3\}$ to connect Q_{v_2} , implying that $opt(K) \geq 2 \times 5 + 4 = 14$ and hence K is

not critical. Similarly, if v_3 is a 1-anchor in K , then $\text{opt}(K) \geq 14$ and hence K is not critical. Hence, we may assume that v_5 is a 1-anchor in K . Then, similarly to Case 3.2, K can be critical only when $\text{opt}(K) = 11$. \square

Lemma 13 *Suppose that K has exactly one 2-anchor. Then, the following statements hold:*

1. *Suppose K_c is an edge. If K is critical, then $s(K) = 8$ and $\text{opt}(K) = 6$; otherwise, either $s(K) = 6$ and $\text{opt}(K) \geq 5$, or $s(K) = 8$ and $\text{opt}(K) \geq 7$.*
2. *Suppose K_c is a star. Then, $s(K) = 6$, $\text{opt}(K) \geq 5$ and hence K is not critical.*
3. *Suppose K_c is a 5-path and $s(K) \geq 12$. Then, $s(K) = 12$ and $\text{opt}(K) \geq 10$; $s(K) = 14$ and $\text{opt}(K) \geq 12$; $s(K) = 16$ and $\text{opt}(K) \geq 13$. Hence K is not critical.*
4. *Suppose that K_c is a 5-path and $s(K) = 10$. If K is not critical, then $\text{opt}(K) \geq 8$; otherwise, $\text{opt}(K) = 7$ and there is a pair $(v_i, v_j) \in \{(v_2, v_1), (v_4, v_5)\}$ such that v_i is a 2-anchor and v_j is a 1-anchor in K .*
5. *Suppose that K_c is a 5-path and $s(K) = 8$. If K is not critical, then $\text{opt}(K) \geq 7$; otherwise, either $\text{opt}(K) = 5$ or $\text{opt}(K) = 6$. Moreover, if $\text{opt}(K) = 6$, then one of the non-middle internal vertex of K is a 2-anchor in K ; if $\text{opt}(K) = 5$, then the middle vertex of K_c is a 2-anchor in K .*

PROOF. We first prove the first statement. Without loss of generality, let v_1 be the unique 2-anchor in K . If K contains no 1-anchor, then $s(K) = 6$ and $\text{opt}(K) \geq 5$ because of P_{v_1} , implying that K is not critical. So, we may assume that v_2 is a 1-anchor. Thus, $s(K) = 8$, and $\text{opt}(K) \geq 6$ because we can obtain a 6^+ -path by using the edge $\{v_1, v_2\}$ to connect Q_{v_1} and Q_{v_2} . If $\text{opt}(K) \geq 7$, $\frac{s(K)}{\text{opt}(K)} \leq \frac{8}{7}$ and hence K is not critical. Otherwise, $\text{opt}(K) = 6$, and K is critical and has the first structure in Figure 1.

If K_c is a star, then v_1 is a 2-anchor and $s(K) = 6$. We can obtain a 5^+ -path by choosing P_{v_1} . So, $\text{opt}(K) \geq 5$ and K is not critical.

To prove the other statements, we assume that K_c is a 5-path. Since K has exactly one 2-anchors and $s(K)$ is even, $s(K) \in \{8, 10, 12, 14, 16\}$.

Case 1: $s(K) = 16$. In this case, one vertex of K_c is a 2-anchor in K and each other vertex of K_c is a 1-anchor in K . So, by the first statement of Lemma 9, $\text{opt}(K) \geq 13$ and $\frac{s(K)}{\text{opt}(K)} \leq \frac{16}{13}$. Therefore, K is not critical.

Case 2: $s(K) = 14$. In this case, K has exactly three 1-anchors and one 2-anchor. So, by the second statement of Lemma 9, $\text{opt}(K) \geq 12$ and K is not critical.

Case 3: $s(K) = 12$. In this case, we distinguish three subcases as follows.

Case 3.1: v_3 is a 2-anchor in K . In this case, if both v_i and v_{i+1} are 1-anchors in K for some $i \in \{1, 4\}$, then besides P_{v_3} , K contains a 6^+ -path obtained by using the edge $\{v_i, v_{i+1}\}$ to connect Q_{v_i} and $Q_{v_{i+1}}$. So, $\text{opt}(K) \geq 5 + 6 = 11$ and K is not critical. Otherwise, exactly one of v_1 and v_2 is a 1-anchor in K and so is exactly one of v_4 and v_5 , and besides P_{v_3} , K contains two 4^+ -paths obtained by connecting the edge $\{v_j, v_{j+1}\}$ to Q_{v_j} or $Q_{v_{j+1}}$ for each $j \in \{1, 4\}$. Therefore $\text{opt}(K) \geq 2 \times 4 + 5 = 13$ and K is not critical.

Case 3.2: v_1 or v_5 is a 2-anchor in K . By symmetry, we may assume v_1 is a 2-anchor in K . Then, two vertices v_i and v_j in $\{v_2, \dots, v_5\}$ are 1-anchors in K . So, besides P_{v_1} , K has a 6^+ -path (vertex-disjoint from P_{v_1}) obtained by using the subpath of K_c between v_i and v_j to connect Q_{v_i} and Q_{v_j} . Thus, $\text{opt}(K) \geq 5 + 6 = 11$ and hence K is not critical.

Case 3.3: v_2 or v_4 is a 2-anchor in K . By symmetry, we may assume v_2 is a 2-anchor in K . If two vertices in $\{v_3, v_4, v_5\}$ are 1-anchors in K , then as in Case 3.2, $\text{opt}(K) \geq 11$. So, we may assume that v_1 is a 1-anchor in K . Then, K has a 6^+ -path obtained by using the edge $\{v_1, v_2\}$ to connect Q_{v_1} and Q_{v_2} . Moreover, K has a 4^+ -path obtained by connecting the edge $\{v_i, v_{i+1}\}$ to Q_{v_i} or $Q_{v_{i+1}}$ for some $i \in \{3, 4\}$ since one of v_3, v_4, v_5 is a 1-anchor. Thus, $\text{opt}(K) \geq 6 + 4 = 10$ and K is not critical.

Case 4: $s(K) = 10$. In this case, K has exactly one 2-anchor and exactly one 1-anchor.

Case 4.1: v_i is a 2-anchor in K for some $i \in \{1, 3, 5\}$. In this case, besides P_{v_i} , K has a 4^+ -path (vertex-disjoint from P_{v_i}) obtained by connecting the edge $\{v_j, v_{j+1}\}$ to Q_{v_j} or $Q_{v_{j+1}}$ for some $j \in \{1, \dots, 5\}$. So, $\text{opt}(K) \geq 5 + 4 = 9$ and K is not critical.

Case 4.2: v_i is a 2-anchor in K for some $i \in \{2, 4\}$. By symmetry, we may assume v_2 is the 2-anchor. If some $v_j \in \{v_3, v_4, v_5\}$ is a 1-anchor in K , then besides P_{v_2} , K has a 4^+ -path (vertex-disjoint from P_{v_i}) obtained by connecting the edge $\{v_j, v_{j+1}\}$ to Q_{v_j} or $Q_{v_{j+1}}$ for some $j \in \{3, 4\}$; so, $\text{opt}(K) \geq 5 + 4 = 9$ and K is not critical. Thus, we may further assume that v_1 is a 1-anchor in K . Then, K has a 7^+ -path obtained by connecting K_c to Q_{v_1} , and hence $\text{opt}(K) \geq 7$. If $\text{opt}(K) \geq 8$, then K is not critical. Otherwise, $\text{opt}(K) = 7$ and K becomes critical.

Case 5: $s(K) = 8$. In this case, one vertex of K is a 2-anchor in K and the other vertices of K are 0-anchors. If v_i is a 2-anchor in K for some $i \in \{1, 5\}$, then besides P_{v_i} , K has a 4^+ -path (indeed, a subpath of K_c) disjoint from P_{v_i} ; so, $\text{opt}(K) \geq 5 + 4 = 9$ and K is not critical. Otherwise, either v_3 or some $v_i \in \{v_2, v_4\}$ is a 2-anchor in K . In the former case, $\text{opt}(K) \geq 5$ by choosing K_c and hence $\frac{s(K)}{\text{opt}(K)} \leq \frac{8}{5}$. If $\text{opt}(K) \geq 7$, then $\frac{s(K)}{\text{opt}(K)} \leq \frac{8}{7} < \frac{14}{11}$ and K is not critical. By the third statement of Lemma 3, for each satellite element of v_3 , if it is a star, then the center vertex must be in its rescue-edge. So, P_{v_3} is a 5-path and hence if K is critical, then $\text{opt}(K) = 5$.

In the latter case, K has a 6^+ -path obtained by connecting Q_{v_i} to a subpath of K_c with four vertices, and hence $\text{opt}(K) \geq 6$ and $\frac{s(K)}{\text{opt}(K)} \leq \frac{8}{6}$. Obviously, if $\text{opt}(K) \geq 7$, then $\frac{s(K)}{\text{opt}(K)} \leq \frac{8}{7} < \frac{14}{11}$ and K is not critical. In summary, if K is critical, then either $\text{opt}(K) = 5$ or $\text{opt}(K) = 6$.

By the discussion for the case when $s(K) = 8$, v_3 is a 2-anchor in K if $\text{opt}(K) = 5$, while either v_2 or v_4 is a 2-anchor in K if $\text{opt}(K) = 6$. Then, the lemma follows. \square

Now, Lemmas 10–13 imply that a critical component K of $H + C$ has one 2-anchor or two 2-anchors. Furthermore, if K has one 2-anchor, then by Lemma 13, K_c is an edge or a 5-path and the possible structures for K are shown in the first row of Figure 1. Otherwise, K has two 2-anchors and K_c is a 5-path. By Lemma 12, $s(K) \in \{14, 16, 18\}$ and Figure 1 except the first row shows all possible structures for K .

Remark 2 *Even if a satellite element S of K can be a star or triangle, we almost always draw only one edge of S in Figure 1 for simplicity. We will keep this convention in the subsequent figures.*

Recall that every critical component K has one or two 2-anchors. We introduce the following definition for such two 2-anchors.

Definition 9 *A 2-anchor of $H + C$ is critical if it appears in a critical component of $H + C$. A satellite element of $H + C$ is critical if its rescue-anchor is critical in $H + C$.*

Definition 10 *Suppose that v is a 0- or 1-anchor in $H + C$ and S is a satellite element in $H + C$ such that S has a vertex w with $\{v, w\} \in E(G)$. Then, moving S to v in $H + C$ is the operation of modifying C by replacing the rescue-edge of S with the edge $\{v, w\}$.*

By Figure 1, we have the next fact.

Fact 2 *For each critical component K of $H + C$ and its critical satellite element S , the following statements hold:*

1. *If we delete S from K , then K is no longer critical and will not become isolated.*
2. *If v is a 0-anchor of K such that v is adjacent to S in G , then moving S to v in $H + C$ makes K no longer critical.*
3. *If v is a 1-anchor in K , then moving S to v makes K remain critical only if one of the following two cases happens:*
 - (a) *K has the first structure in Figure 1 and the rescue-anchor of S is the unique 2-anchor in K . G contains an edge $\{v, x\}$, where x appears in S and v is the unique 1-anchor in K .*
 - (b) *K has the last or the second last structure in Figure 1 and the rescue-anchor of S is the leftmost 2-anchor in K . G contains an edge $\{v, x\}$, where x appears in S and v is the unique 1-anchor in K .*




Figure 1: The possible structures for a critical component K of $H + C$, where thick (respectively, dashed) edges are in the matching M (respectively, the path-cycle cover C), thin edges are not in $M \cup C$, the filled (respectively, blank) vertices are in (respectively, not in) $V(M)$, gray vertices are 2-anchors, and the fraction on the right side of each structure is $\frac{s(K)}{opt(K)}$.

PROOF. Recall that K has one 2-anchor or two 2-anchors since K is critical. If we delete one critical satellite element S of K , then the number of 2-anchors is reduced by one. If K has one 2-anchor, then after the removal of S , K has no 2-anchor. So, by Lemma 10, K is not critical. If K has two 2-anchors, then $s(K) \in \{14, 16, 18\}$. Thus, if we delete one critical satellite element of K , then $s(K) \in \{12, 14, 16\}$ and K has one 2-anchor. By Lemma 13, K is not critical now. Since K has at least one satellite element after the removal of S , then K is not isolated. So, the first statement holds.

Note that v is a 0-anchor. So, moving S to v makes K reduce the number of 2-anchors by one. By a similar proof of the first statement, the second statement holds.

If K has one 2-anchor, then by Lemma 13, either K_c is an edge, $s(K) = 8$ or K_c is a 5-path, $s(K) = 10$. In the former case, K has a same structure by symmetry after moving S to v . In the latter case, by Lemma 13, there is a pair $(v_i, v_j) \in \{(v_2, v_1), (v_4, v_5)\}$ such that v_i is a 2-anchor and v_j is a 1-anchor in K . Without loss of generality, we assume v_2 is a 2-anchor and v_1 is a 1-anchor (the second structure in Figure 1). Then clearly, moving S to v_1 makes K no longer critical.

If K has two 2-anchors, $s(K) \in \{14, 16, 18\}$ and K_c is a 5-path by Lemma 12. Furthermore, if $s(K) \in \{16, 18\}$, v_2, v_4 are both 2-anchors. Hence moving S to v makes K no longer critical since at least one of v_2, v_4 is not a 2-anchor. The remaining case is $s(K) = 14$. We can check the last five structures in Figure 1 and we find the third statement holds. \square

Definition 11 Let K be a composite component of $H + C$. If K has a 1-anchor v such that G has an edge between v and some critical satellite-element S of $H + C$ in G and moving S to v in $H + C$ makes K critical in $H + C$, then we call K a responsible component of $H + C$ and call v a responsible 1-anchor of $H + C$.

By the third statement in Fact 2, a component of $H + C$ can be both critical and responsible only if it has the first or one of the last two structures in Figure 1.

Lemma 14 *Suppose that a component K of $H + C$ is both critical and responsible. If K has the first structure in Figure 1, then $s(K) = 8$ and we find a feasible solution with at least 7 vertices in $O(1)$ time; otherwise, $s(K) = 14$ and we find a feasible solution with at least 12 vertices in $O(1)$ time.*

PROOF. First, consider the case where K has the first structure in Figure 1. Without loss of generality, we assume v_1 and v_2 are the unique 2- and 1-anchor, respectively. Since K is responsible, G contains an edge $\{v_2, x\}$, where x appears in a satellite element S whose rescue-anchor is v_1 . If S and Q_{v_1} are not vertex-disjoint, then we find the satellite element S' other than S whose rescue-anchor is v_1 , and re-define Q_{v_1} to be the longest path among those paths in K which starts with v_1 and the rescue-edge of S' . Then, $G[V(K)]$ contains a 7^+ -path in which Q_{v_2} , the edge $\{v, x\}$, a path from x to v_1 in K , and Q_{v_1} appear in this order.

Next, consider the case where K has one of the last two structures in Figure 1. We assume the last structure in Figure 1; the following discussion also applies to the other case similarly. Since K is responsible, G contains an edge $\{v_1, x\}$, where x appears in a satellite element S whose rescue-anchor is v_2 . If S and Q_{v_2} are not vertex-disjoint, then we find the satellite element S' other than S whose rescue-anchor is v_2 , and re-define Q_{v_2} to be the longest path among those paths in K which starts with v_2 and the rescue-edge of S' . Besides P_{v_3} , G contains a 7^+ -path obtained by connecting Q_{v_1} , the edge $\{v_1, x\}$, a path from x to v_2 in K , and Q_{v_2} . So, we can find a solution with at least 12 vertices, which completes the proof. \square

By the above lemma, we know for each critical and responsible component K , we can find a feasible solution for K in constant time, which is still denoted as $OPT(K)$ for ease of presentation, with $\frac{s(K)}{opt(K)} < \frac{14}{11}$. Now, we can regard each critical and responsible component K as a non-critical component. So, any critical component cannot be responsible or vice versa. Hereafter, a critical component always refers to a critical but not responsible component and a responsible component always refers to a responsible but not critical component.

By Definition 11, the structure for a responsible component of $H + C$ can only be obtained by deleting a critical satellite-element from one of the structures in Figure 1. So, by Figure 1, we can list all possible structures for responsible components of $H + C$, which are shown in Figure 2.

3.4 Operations for modifying critical components

In this subsection, we define three operations for modifying C (and accordingly one or more critical components of $H + C$) so that after the modification, $H + C$ will hopefully have fewer critical components. Let v be a vertex of a satellite element S in a critical component K and v' be a vertex of K' in $H + C$. We remark that K and K' may be the same. Suppose $\{v, v'\} \in E(G) \setminus C$ and we design the following three operations.

Operation 1 *Suppose one the following two conditions is satisfied:*

- v' is a 0-anchor of K or
- v' is a 1-anchor of K and modifying C by replacing the rescue-edge of S with the edge $\{v, v'\}$ decreases the number of critical components in $H + C$.

Then, the operation modifies C by replacing the rescue-edges of S with the edge $\{v, v'\}$. (cf. Figure 3)

Clearly, Operation 1 does not change the weight of C by the first statements in Fact 2. Suppose v' is a 0-anchor. If $K = K'$, then after Operation 1, K is no longer critical by the second statement of Fact 2. Then, we suppose $K \neq K'$. Obviously, K is no longer critical but K' may become critical after Operation 1. So, Operation 1 may not necessarily decrease but does not increase the number of critical components in $H + C$. Fortunately, Operation 1 changes v' from a 0-anchor to a 1-anchor. So, Operation 1 decreases the number of 0-anchors in $H + C$ by 1 or the number of critical components in $H + C$ by 1. Obviously, Operation 1 does not change the number of components in $H + C$.

Operation 2 *Suppose v' is in a satellite-element S' of K' and the center element K'_c of K' is an edge or a star to which no satellite element other than S' is adjacent in $H + C$. Then (cf. Figure 4), the operation modifies C by replacing the rescue-edge of S with the edge $\{v, v'\}$.*




Figure 2: The possible structures for a responsible but not critical component K of $H + C$, where thick (respectively, dashed) edges are in the matching M (respectively, the path-cycle cover C), thin edges are not in $M \cup C$, the filled (respectively, blank) vertices are in (respectively, not in) $V(M)$, gray vertices are 2-anchors, red vertices are responsible 1-anchors (cf. Definition 2), and the fraction on the right side of each structure is $\frac{s(K)}{opt(K)}$.

Obviously, Operation 2 does not change the weight of C by the first statement of Fact 2. Note that K' has no 2-anchor and hence K' is not critical by Lemma 10. So, $K \neq K'$ since K is critical. Moreover, after Operation 2, S' becomes the center element of K' and hence Lemma 6 still holds. Furthermore, by the first statement in Fact 2 and Lemma 12, K, K' are not critical after Operation 2 and thus Operation 2 decreases the number of critical components in $H + C$ by 1. Clearly, Operation 2 does not change the number of components in $H + C$. Before Operation 2, K' may have one 0-anchor x . After Operation 2, x will be in a satellite element of $H + C$ and hence will not be a 0-anchor, but S' will become a center element with two satellite elements adjacent to it in $H + C$, implying that one vertex of S' may become a 0-anchor in $H + C$ (or not an anchor, if S' is a star). In summary, Operation 2 does not increase the number of 0-anchors in $H + C$.

Operation 3 Suppose v' appears in a satellite-element S' of K' and K'_c is a 5-path or K'_c is an edge or a star to which at least one more satellite element other than S' is adjacent in $H + C$. Then (cf. Figure 5), the operation modifies C by replacing the rescue-edges of S and S' with the edge $\{v, v'\}$.

By the first statement of Fact 2, Operation 3 does not change the weight of C since K, K' will not be an isolated bad component of H .

Operation 3 uses the edge $\{v, v'\}$ to connect S and S' into a new composite component K_{new} of $H + C$. Since both S and S' are not 5-paths by the first statement of Lemma 7, either of them can be treated as the




Figure 3: Two representative possible cases in Operation 1, where the first (respectively, second) satisfies v is a 0-anchor (respectively, 1-anchor) and the green edge is the edge $\{v, v'\}$.



Figure 4: A representative possible case in Operation 2 and the green edge is the edge $\{v, v'\}$.

center element of K_{new} and the other becomes the satellite element of K_{new} . Note that K_{new} has at most one 0-anchor, and the rescue-anchor of S' may be a 1-anchor before Operation 3. So, Operation 3 increases the number of 0-anchors in $H + C$ by at most 2.

By Lemma 10, K_{new} is not critical. If $K = K'$, then clearly Operation 3 does not increase the number of critical components in $H + C$. Otherwise, Operation 3 makes K not critical because of the first statement in Fact 2, but it is possible that Operation 3 makes K' critical. In any case, Operation 3 does not increase the number of critical components in $H + C$. Luckily, Operation 3 always increases the number of components in $H + C$ by 1.




Figure 5: A representative possible case in Operation 3 and the green edge is the edge $\{v, v'\}$.

Lemma 15 *If G has an edge $\{v, v'\}$ such that v is in a critical satellite-element S of $H + C$ and $v' \notin V(S)$ is neither a 2-anchor nor a responsible 1-anchor in $H + C$, then one of Operations 1, 2, and 3 is applicable.*

PROOF. Suppose v' belongs to a satellite element S' of K' . If K'_c is an edge or a star and S' is the unique satellite element of K' , then Operation 2 is applicable. Otherwise, K'_c is a 5-path or K'_c is an edge or a star and K' has at least two satellite elements by Lemma 7. So, Operation 3 is applicable.

We next assume v' belongs to the center element K'_c of K' . By the second statement of Lemma 7 and Definition 7, v' is an anchor of K'_c . Note that v' is neither a 2-anchor nor a responsible 1-anchor. So, v' is a 0-anchor or v' is a 1-anchor such that moving S to K' will not make K' critical. It follows that Operation 1 is applicable again, which completes the proof. \square

Lemma 16 *If we repeatedly perform Operations 1, 2, and 3 until none of them is applicable, then the number of repetitions is bounded by $O(n)$.*

PROOF. Let n_0 be the number of 0-anchors in $H + C$, n_c be the number of components in $H + C$, and n_{cc} be the number of critical components in $H + C$. Let $g = n_0 + n_{cc} - 3n_c$. Recall that Operation 1 decreases n_0 or n_{cc} by 1 but does not change n_c and Operation 2 decreases n_{cc} by 1, does not change n_c , and does not increase n_0 . As for Operation 3, it increases n_c by 1, increases n_0 at most 2, but does not increase n_{cc} . So, each time we perform one of the operations, we decrease the value of g by at least 1. Note that $2n \geq g \geq -3n$. Therefore, if we repeatedly perform the operations until none of them is applicable, then the number of repetitions is at most $O(n)$. \square

3.5 Bounding $opt(G)$

Notation 7 Let R denote the set of vertices $v \in V(H)$ such that v is a 2-anchor or a responsible 1-anchor in $H + C$.

Obviously, if K is an isolated 5-path of $H + C$, then each vertex of K is a 0-anchor and hence $|R \cap V(K)| = 0$. Moreover, for each composite component K of $H + C$, $|R \cap V(K)|$ is bounded by the number of anchors in K . Thus, if the center element K_c of K is an edge, then $|R \cap V(K)| \in \{0, 1, 2\}$. If K_c is a star, then $|R \cap V(K)| \in \{0, 1\}$. Similarly, if K_c is a 5-path, then $|R \cap V(K)| \in \{0, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5\}$.

Notation 8 For the components in $H + C$, we define the notations as follows.

- Let \mathcal{K} be the set of components of $H + C$ that are not isolated bad components of H .
- For each $i \in \{0, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5\}$, let $\mathcal{K}_i \subseteq \mathcal{K}$ be a subset of \mathcal{K} such that $|R \cap V(K)| = i$.
- For each $i \in \{1, 2\}$, let $\mathcal{K}_{i,c}$ be the set of critical components in \mathcal{K}_i .
(Comment: By Figure 1, each critical component K of $H + C$ has one or two 2-anchors and no responsible 1-anchor since K is not responsible.)
- Let R_c be the set of 2-anchors in the critical components of $H + C$.
- $U_c = \bigcup_{v \in R_c} \{w \in V(H) \mid w \text{ appears in a critical satellite-element whose rescue-anchor is } v\}$.
- Let $G_c = G[V(G) \setminus (R_c \cup U_c)]$.

Lemma 17 $opt(G) \leq opt(G_c) + 7 \sum_{i=1}^5 i |\mathcal{K}_i|$.

PROOF. Consider a critical satellite-element S whose rescue-anchor is in R_c . Since S is a bad component of H by Lemma 7, $G[V(S)]$ contains no 4^+ -path. Moreover, if a vertex $v \notin V(S)$ is adjacent to S in G , then $v \in R$ by Lemma 15 and none of Operations 1, 2 and 3 is applicable. Thus, removing the vertices of $R_c \cup U_c$ from G destroys at most $|R|$ paths of $OPT(G)$. By Fact 1, each path has at most seven vertices. Moreover, each un-destroyed path of $OPT(G)$ still has at least four vertices. Hence, $opt(G_c) \geq opt(G) - 7|R|$. Because $|R| = \sum_{i=1}^5 i |\mathcal{K}_i|$, the lemma holds. \square

3.6 Summary of the algorithm

Let $r = \frac{15 + \sqrt{505}}{20} \approx 1.874$ be the positive root to the quadratic equation $10r^2 - 15r - 7 = 0$. Our algorithm proceeds as follows.

0. If $|V(G)| \leq 4$, then find an optimal solution by brute-force search, output it, and then halt.
1. Construct the graph H as follows:
 - (a) Compute a maximum matching M in G and initialize H to be the graph $(V(M), M)$.
 - (b) Modify M and H by performing Steps 1.1 and 1.2 in Section 3.1.
2. Compute a maximum path-cycle cover C and modify it as follows:
 - (a) Perform Steps 2.1, 2.2, and 2.3 in Section 3.2 to compute a maximum path-cycle cover C of edges $\{v, w\} \in E(G)$ such that v and w are in different components of H and at least one of them is a bad component.

3. Repeatedly perform Operations 1, 2, and 3 in Section 3.4 to modify C , until none of them is applicable.
4. If no component of $H + C$ is critical, or $\frac{\sum_{i=1}^5 i|\mathcal{K}_i|}{|\mathcal{K}_{1,c}|+2|\mathcal{K}_{2,c}|} > \frac{5}{7}r$, then
 - (a) compute $OPT(K)$ for each component K of $H + C$ that is not an isolated bad component of H ;
 - (b) output their union as a solution for G , and then halt.
5. Otherwise, there exists at least one critical component in $H + C$ and $\frac{\sum_{i=1}^5 i|\mathcal{K}_i|}{|\mathcal{K}_{1,c}|+2|\mathcal{K}_{2,c}|} \leq \frac{5}{7}r$.
 - (a) Recursively call the algorithm on the graph G_c to obtain a solution $ALG(G_c)$.
 - (b) For each $v \in R_c$, compute a 5^+ -path P_v since v is an 2-anchor.
 - (c) Output the union of $ALG(G_c)$ and $\cup_{v \in R_c} P_v$, and halt.

4 Analyzing the performance

In this section, we show that the approximation ratio achieved by our algorithm is at most $r = \frac{15+\sqrt{505}}{20} \approx 1.874$. For brevity, we first define several notations.

Notation 9 We define the notation \preceq as follows:

- For any $K \in \mathcal{K}$ and a rational fraction $\frac{a}{b}$, we write $\frac{s(K)}{opt(K)} \preceq \frac{a}{b}$, whenever $opt(K) \geq b$ and $s(K) \leq a$.
(Comment: If $\frac{s(K)}{opt(K)} \preceq \frac{a}{b}$, then $\frac{s(K)}{opt(K)} \leq \frac{a}{b}$, but not vice versa.)
- For a $K \in \mathcal{K}$ and a set \mathcal{F} of rational fractions, we write $\frac{s(K)}{opt(K)} \preceq \mathcal{F}$ if $\frac{s(K)}{opt(K)} \preceq \frac{a}{b}$ for all $\frac{a}{b} \in \mathcal{F}$.
- For a rational fraction $\frac{a}{b}$ and a set \mathcal{F} of rational fractions, we write $\mathcal{F} \preceq \frac{a}{b}$ if $\frac{c}{d} \leq \frac{a}{b}$ for all $\frac{c}{d} \in \mathcal{F}$.

Obviously, $\mathcal{K} = \bigcup_{i=0}^5 \mathcal{K}_i$. The next fact follows from Lemmas 10–14.

Fact 3 The following statements hold:

1. For each $K \in \mathcal{K}_0$, $\frac{s(K)}{opt(K)} < \frac{14}{11}$.
2. For each $K \in \mathcal{K}_{1,c}$, $\frac{s(K)}{opt(K)} \preceq \{\frac{8}{5}, \frac{10}{7}\}$; while for each $K \in \mathcal{K}_1 \setminus \mathcal{K}_{1,c}$, $\frac{s(K)}{opt(K)} \preceq \{\frac{6}{5}, \frac{8}{7}, \frac{10}{8}, \frac{12}{10}, \frac{14}{12}, \frac{16}{13}\}$.
3. For each $K \in \mathcal{K}_{2,c}$, $\frac{s(K)}{opt(K)} \preceq \{\frac{16}{12}, \frac{18}{13}, \frac{14}{11}\}$; while for each $K \in \mathcal{K}_2 \setminus \mathcal{K}_{2,c}$, $\frac{s(K)}{opt(K)} \preceq \{\frac{6}{6}, \frac{12}{10}, \frac{14}{12}, \frac{16}{13}, \frac{18}{15}\}$.
4. For each $K \in \mathcal{K}_3$, $\frac{s(K)}{opt(K)} \preceq \{\frac{18}{15}, \frac{20}{17}, \frac{12}{11}\}$.
5. For each $K \in \mathcal{K}_4$, $\frac{s(K)}{opt(K)} \preceq \frac{22}{20}$.
6. For each $K \in \mathcal{K}_5$, $\frac{s(K)}{opt(K)} \preceq \frac{24}{25}$.

PROOF. If $K \in \mathcal{K}_0$, then K has no 2-anchor. By Lemma 10, K is not critical and hence $\frac{s(K)}{opt(K)} < \frac{14}{11}$. If $K \in \mathcal{K}_{1,c}$, then K is critical and K has exactly one 2-anchor (See the first line of Figure 1). So, by Lemma 13, $\frac{s(K)}{opt(K)} \preceq \{\frac{8}{5}, \frac{10}{7}\}$. If $K \in \mathcal{K} \setminus \mathcal{K}_{1,c}$, then K is not critical and K has one 2-anchor or one responsible 1-anchor (See the first line of Figure 2). So, $s(K) \in \{6, 8, 10, 12, 14, 16\}$. Since K is not critical, $\frac{s(K)}{opt(K)} < \frac{14}{11}$ and hence $\frac{s(K)}{opt(K)} \preceq \{\frac{6}{5}, \frac{8}{7}, \frac{10}{8}, \frac{12}{10}, \frac{14}{12}, \frac{16}{13}\}$.

If K is in $\mathcal{K}_{2,c}$, then K is critical and K has exactly two 2-anchors (See Figure 1 except the first line). So, by Lemma 12, $\frac{s(K)}{opt(K)} \preceq \{\frac{16}{12}, \frac{18}{13}, \frac{14}{11}\}$. If $K \in \mathcal{K} \setminus \mathcal{K}_{2,c}$, then K is not critical. Furthermore, K has two responsible 1-anchors; one responsible 1-anchor and a 2-anchor or two 2-anchors. By the second structure of Figure 2, $\frac{s(K)}{opt(K)} \leq \frac{6}{6}$ if K has two responsible 1-anchors. If K has a responsible 1-anchor and a 2-anchor, then by Figure 2, $\frac{s(K)}{opt(K)} \preceq \{\frac{12}{10}, \frac{14}{12}, \frac{16}{13}\}$. Lastly, K has two 2-anchors and hence $s(K) \in \{12, 14, 16, 18\}$. Since K is not critical, we know $\frac{s(K)}{opt(K)} \preceq \{\frac{12}{10}, \frac{14}{12}, \frac{16}{13}, \frac{18}{15}\}$, which completes the proof of the third statement.

If $K \in \mathcal{K}_3$, then by Figure 2, K has three 2-anchors or one 2-anchor and two responsible 1-anchors. By Lemma 11 and the second structure of the fourth line in Figure 2, $\frac{s(K)}{\text{opt}(K)} \preceq \left\{ \frac{12}{11}, \frac{18}{15}, \frac{20}{17} \right\}$. If $K \in \mathcal{K}_4 \cup \mathcal{K}_5$, then K has no responsible 1-anchor. By Lemma 11 again, the lemma is proved. \square

Lemma 18 *Suppose that no component of $H + C$ is critical. Then, $\text{opt}(G) < \frac{35}{22} \text{alg}(G)$.*

PROOF. By Step 4 of the algorithm, $\text{alg}(G) = \sum_{K \in \mathcal{K}} \text{opt}(K)$. Moreover, Definition 8 implies $\frac{s(K)}{\text{opt}(K)} < \frac{14}{11}$. So, $\text{alg}(G) = \sum_{K \in \mathcal{K}} \text{opt}(K) \geq \frac{11}{14} \sum_K s(K) = \frac{11}{14} |V(M_C)|$. By Lemma 5, the lemma is proved. \square

Lemma 19 *Suppose that at least one component of $H + C$ is critical and $\frac{\sum_{i=1}^5 i |\mathcal{K}_i|}{|\mathcal{K}_{1,c}| + 2|\mathcal{K}_{2,c}|} > \frac{5}{7}r$. Then, $\text{opt}(G) \leq r \times \text{alg}(G)$.*

PROOF. By Step 4 of the algorithm, $\text{alg}(G) = \sum_K \text{opt}(K)$, where K ranges over all components of $H + C$ that is not a bad component of H . We can rewrite

$$\sum_{K \in \mathcal{K}} \text{opt}(K) = \sum_{i \in \{0,3,4,5\}} \sum_{K \in \mathcal{K}_i} \text{opt}(K) + \sum_{i \in \{1,2\}} \sum_{K \in \mathcal{K}_i \setminus \mathcal{K}_{i,c}} \text{opt}(K) + \sum_{i \in \{1,2\}} \sum_{K \in \mathcal{K}_{i,c}} \text{opt}(K). \quad (1)$$

By Lemma 5, it suffices to show that $\frac{|V(M_C)|}{\text{alg}(G)} \leq \frac{4}{5}r$. We can rewrite

$$\begin{aligned} |V(M_C)| &= \sum_{i \in \{0,3,4,5\}} \sum_{K \in \mathcal{K}_i} s(K) + \sum_{i \in \{1,2\}} \sum_{K \in \mathcal{K}_i \setminus \mathcal{K}_{i,c}} s(K) + \sum_{i \in \{1,2\}} \sum_{K \in \mathcal{K}_{i,c}} s(K) \\ &\leq \sum_{i \in \{0,3,4,5\}} \sum_{K \in \mathcal{K}_i} (s(K) + (4r - 6)i) + \sum_{i \in \{1,2\}} \sum_{K \in \mathcal{K}_i \setminus \mathcal{K}_{i,c}} (s(K) + (4r - 6)i) \\ &\quad + \sum_{i \in \{1,2\}} \sum_{K \in \mathcal{K}_{i,c}} \left(s(K) - \frac{(4r - 6)(5r - 7)}{7}i \right) \\ &= \sum_{i \in \{0,3,4,5\}} \sum_{K \in \mathcal{K}_i} (s(K) + (4r - 6)i) + \sum_{i \in \{1,2\}} \sum_{K \in \mathcal{K}_i \setminus \mathcal{K}_{i,c}} (s(K) + (4r - 6)i) \\ &\quad + \sum_{i \in \{1,2\}} \sum_{K \in \mathcal{K}_{i,c}} (s(K) - (8 - 4r)i), \end{aligned} \quad (2)$$

where the last equality holds because $10r^2 - 15r - 7 = 0$, while the inequality holds because

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{i \in \{0,3,4,5\}} \sum_{K \in \mathcal{K}_i} (4r - 6)i + \sum_{i \in \{1,2\}} \sum_{K \in \mathcal{K}_i \setminus \mathcal{K}_{i,c}} (4r - 6)i &= (4r - 6) \left(\sum_{i=1}^5 i |\mathcal{K}_i| - |\mathcal{K}_{1,c}| - 2|\mathcal{K}_{2,c}| \right) \\ &\geq \frac{(4r - 6)(5r - 7)}{7} (|\mathcal{K}_{1,c}| + 2|\mathcal{K}_{2,c}|). \end{aligned}$$

For each $i \in \{0, 3, 4, 5\}$ and each $K \in \mathcal{K}_i$, we define $s'(K) = s(K) + (4r - 6)i$. Similarly, for each $i \in \{1, 2\}$ and each $K \in \mathcal{K}_i \setminus \mathcal{K}_{i,c}$, we define $s'(K) = s(K) + (4r - 6)i$. Moreover, for each $i \in \{1, 2\}$ and each $K \in \mathcal{K}_{i,c}$, we define $s'(K) = s(K) - (8 - 4r)i$. Then, by Eqs. (1, 2), it suffices to show that $\frac{s'(K)}{\text{opt}(K)} \leq \frac{4}{5}r$ for all $K \in \mathcal{K}$, in order to show that $\frac{|V(M_C)|}{\text{alg}(G)} \leq \frac{4}{5}r$.

Consider a $K \in \mathcal{K}$. If $K \in \mathcal{K}_0$, then similarly to Lemma 18, $\frac{s'(K)}{\text{opt}(K)} \leq \frac{4}{5}r$. If $K \in \mathcal{K}_1 \setminus \mathcal{K}_{1,c}$, then by the second statement in Fact 3, we have

$$\frac{s'(K)}{\text{opt}(K)} \preceq \left\{ \frac{4r}{5}, \frac{4r+2}{7}, \frac{4r+4}{8}, \frac{4r+6}{10}, \frac{4r+8}{12}, \frac{4r+10}{13} \right\} \preceq \frac{4r}{5}.$$

If $K \in \mathcal{K}_2 \setminus \mathcal{K}_{2,c}$, then by the third statement in Fact 3, we have

$$\frac{s'(K)}{\text{opt}(K)} \preceq \left\{ \frac{8r-6}{6}, \frac{8r}{10}, \frac{8r+2}{12}, \frac{8r+4}{13}, \frac{8r+6}{15} \right\} \preceq \frac{4r}{5}.$$

If $K \in \mathcal{K}_3 \cup \mathcal{K}_4 \cup \mathcal{K}_5$, then by the last two statements in Fact 3, we have

$$\frac{s'(K)}{\text{opt}(K)} \preceq \left\{ \frac{12r}{15}, \frac{12r+2}{17}, \frac{12r-6}{11}, \frac{16r}{20}, \frac{20r-6}{25} \right\} \preceq \frac{4r}{5}.$$

If $K \in \mathcal{K}_{1,c}$, then by the second statement in Fact 3, we have

$$\frac{s'(K)}{\text{opt}(K)} \preceq \left\{ \frac{4r}{5}, \frac{4r+2}{7} \right\} \preceq \frac{4r}{5}.$$

If $K \in \mathcal{K}_{2,c}$, by the third statement in Fact 3, we have

$$\frac{s'(K)}{\text{opt}(K)} \preceq \left\{ \frac{8r-2}{11}, \frac{8r}{12}, \frac{8r+2}{13} \right\} \preceq \frac{4r}{5}.$$

This completes the proof. \square

Theorem 1 *The running time of the algorithm is bounded by $O(\min\{m^2n^2, n^5\})$ and the approximation ratio is at most $r = \frac{15+\sqrt{505}}{20} \approx 1.874$.*

PROOF. It is easy to see that each of Operations 1, 2, and 3 can be done in $O(m)$. Since they are executed at most $O(n)$ repetitions in Step 3 of the algorithm by Lemma 16, it takes $O(nm)$ time. By Lemmas 3 and 4, Steps 1 and 2 can be done in $O(\min\{m^2n, n^4\})$ time. It is easy to verify that compared to these three steps, the other steps take less time. Since the recursion depth is $O(n)$, the algorithm takes $O(\min\{m^2n^2, n^5\})$ time in total.

We next prove that the approximation ratio is at most r . The proof is done by induction on n . In the base case, $n \leq 4$ and the algorithm outputs the optimal solution for G and hence we are done. Now suppose that $n \geq 5$. By Lemmas 18 and 19, we only need to consider the case where there exists a critical component in $H + C$ and $\frac{\sum_{i=1}^5 i|\mathcal{K}_i|}{|\mathcal{K}_{1,c}|+2|\mathcal{K}_{2,c}|} \leq \frac{5r}{7}$. In this case, we have $\text{alg}(G) \geq 5(|\mathcal{K}_{1,c}| + 2|\mathcal{K}_{2,c}|) + \text{alg}(G_c)$ by the last step of the algorithm. By the inductive hypothesis, $\text{opt}(G_c) \leq r \times \text{alg}(G_c)$. According to Lemma 17, we finally obtain that

$$\frac{\text{opt}(G)}{\text{alg}(G)} \leq \frac{7 \sum_{i=1}^5 i|\mathcal{K}_i| + \text{opt}(G_c)}{5(|\mathcal{K}_{1,c}| + 2|\mathcal{K}_{2,c}|) + \text{alg}(G_c)} \leq r.$$

This completes the proof. \square

5 Conclusions

In this paper, we investigated the problem MPC_v^{4+} to find a collection of vertex-disjoint paths, each containing at least 4 vertices, such that the number of vertices in these paths is maximized. In [9], the authors design an $O(n^8)$ -time 2-approximation algorithm based on several local improvement operations, where n is the number of vertices in the input graph $G = (V, E)$. They asked whether better approximation algorithms are possible by a completely different method.

We answered this open question affirmatively in this paper, to construct a solution on top of a maximum matching M . The key observation to this success is that the maximum matching M can be proven to contain at least $4/5$ of the vertices in the optimal solution. The subsequent construction involves extending edges of M into 5-paths, computing a maximum-weight path-cycle cover C of an auxiliary graph, and three operations to modify the achieved subgraph. We not only reduce the running time to $O(\min\{m^2n^2, n^5\})$, where m is the number of edges in the input graph, but also prove a better approximation ratio of 1.874 for our algorithm.

Our design idea can be extended to MPC_v^{5+} with some effort. However, new ideas are needed for the general $k \geq 6$. It is possible that the local operations we designed inside our algorithm can be developed into local search algorithms with better performance ratios. Currently we do not have any inapproximability result for MPC_v^{k+} for any fixed constant $k \geq 4$. Such negative results can be interesting to pursue.

Acknowledgments

ZZC is supported in part by the Grant-in-Aid for Scientific Research of the Ministry of Education, Science, Sports and Culture of Japan, under Grant No. 18K11183. GL is supported by the NSERC Canada. ZZ is supported by National Science Foundation of China (NSFC: 61972329), GRF grants for Hong Kong Special Administrative Region, China (CityU 11210119, CityU 11206120, CityU11218821), and a grant from City University of Hong Kong (CityU 11214522).

References

- [1] K. Asdre and S. D. Nikolopoulos. A linear-time algorithm for the k -fixed-endpoint path cover problem on cographs. *Networks*, 50:231–240, 2007.
- [2] K. Asdre and S. D. Nikolopoulos. A polynomial solution to the k -fixed-endpoint path cover problem on proper interval graphs. *Theoretical Computer Science*, 411:967–975, 2010.
- [3] P. Berman and M. Karpinski. 8/7-approximation algorithm for (1,2)-TSP. In *Proceedings of ACM-SIAM SODA '06*, pages 641–648, 2006.
- [4] Y. Cai, G. Chen, Y. Chen, R. Goebel, G. Lin, L. Liu, and An Zhang. Approximation algorithms for two-machine flow-shop scheduling with a conflict graph. In *Proceedings of COCOON 2018*, LNCS 10976, pages 205–217, 2018.
- [5] Y. Chen, Y. Cai, L. Liu, G. Chen, R. Goebel, G. Lin, B. Su, and A. Zhang. Path cover with minimum nontrivial paths and its application in two-machine flow-shop scheduling with a conflict graph. *Journal of Combinatorial Optimization*, 43:571–588, 2022.
- [6] Z.-Z. Chen, S. Konno, and Y. Matsushita. Approximating maximum edge 2-coloring in simple graphs. *Discrete Applied Mathematics*, 158:1894–1901, 2010.
- [7] H. N. Gabow. An efficient reduction technique for degree-constrained subgraph and bidirected network flow problems. In *Proceedings of ACM STOC'83*, pages 448–456, 1983.
- [8] R. Gomez and Y. Wakabayashi. Nontrivial path covers of graphs: Existence, minimization and maximization. *Journal of Combinatorial Optimization*, 39:437–456, 2020.
- [9] M. Gong, J. Fan, G. Lin, and E. Miyano. Approximation algorithms for covering vertices by long paths. In *Proceedings of MFCS 2022*, LIPIcs 241, pages 53:1–53:14, 2022.
- [10] D. S. Hochbaum. Efficient bounds for the stable set, vertex cover and set packing problems. *Discrete Applied Mathematics*, 6:243–254, 1983.
- [11] K. Kobayashi, G. Lin, E. Miyano, T. Saitoh, A. Suzuki, T. Utashima, and T. Yagita. Path cover problems with length cost. In *Proceedings of WALCOM 2022*, LNCS 13174, pages 396–408, 2022.
- [12] A. Kosowski. Approximating the maximum 2- and 3-edge-colorable subgraph problems. *Discrete Applied Mathematics*, 157:3593–3600, 2009.
- [13] S. Micali and V. V. Vazirani. An $O(\sqrt{|V|}|E|)$ algorithm for finding maximum matching in general graphs. In *Proceedings of IEEE FOCS'80*, pages 17–27, 1980.
- [14] M. Neuwöhner. An improved approximation algorithm for the maximum weight independent set problem in d -claw free graphs. In *Proceedings of STACS 2021*, pages 53:1–53:20, 2021.
- [15] L. L. Pao and C. H. Hong. The two-equal-disjoint path cover problem of matching composition network. *Information Processing Letters*, 107:18–23, 2008.
- [16] R. Rizzi, A. I. Tomescu, and V. Mäkinen. On the complexity of minimum path cover with subpath constraints for multi-assembly. *BMC Bioinformatics*, 15:S5, 2014.