

Efficient Approximation for Subgraph-Hitting Problems in Sparse Graphs and Geometric Intersection Graphs

Zdeněk Dvořák* Daniel Lokshantov† Fahad Panolan‡ Saket Saurabh§
 Jie Xue¶ Meirav Zehavi||

Abstract

We investigate a fundamental vertex-deletion problem called (INDUCED) SUBGRAPH HITTING: given a graph G and a set \mathcal{F} of forbidden graphs, the goal is to compute a minimum-sized set S of vertices of G such that $G - S$ does not contain any graph in \mathcal{F} as an (induced) subgraph. This is a generic problem that encompasses many well-known problems that were extensively studied on their own, particularly (but not only) from the perspectives of both approximation and parameterization.

In this paper, we study the approximability of the problem on a large variety of graph classes. Our first result is a *linear-time* $(1 + \varepsilon)$ -approximation reduction from (INDUCED) SUBGRAPH HITTING on any graph class \mathcal{G} of bounded expansion to the same problem on *bounded degree* graphs within \mathcal{G} . This directly yields linear-size $(1 + \varepsilon)$ -approximation lossy kernels for the problems on any bounded-expansion graph classes. Our second result is a *linear-time* approximation scheme for (INDUCED) SUBGRAPH HITTING on any graph class \mathcal{G} of polynomial expansion, based on the local-search framework of Har-Peled and Quanrud [SICOMP 2017]. This approximation scheme can be applied to a more general family of problems that aim to hit all subgraphs satisfying a certain property π that is efficiently testable and has bounded diameter. Both of our results have applications to SUBGRAPH HITTING (not induced) on wide classes of geometric intersection graphs, resulting in linear-size lossy kernels and (near-)linear time approximation schemes for the problem.

1 Introduction

The generic definition of any vertex-deletion problem is: given an (undirected) n -vertex graph G (taken from some graph class), find a minimum-sized vertex subset $S \subseteq V(G)$ of G such that $G - S$ satisfies some property, where $G - S$ is the graph obtained from G by deleting all vertices in S . Often, the desired property is closed under taking (possibly induced) subgraphs. Whenever this is the case, the vertex-deletion problem can be formulated as hitting certain forbidden (induced) subgraphs of G using fewest vertices. This motivates the following generic vertex-deletion problem, called (INDUCED) SUBGRAPH HITTING.

*Charles University, Prague, Czech Republic. Email: rakdver@iuuk.mff.cuni.cz

†University of California, Santa Barbara, USA. Email: daniello@ucsb.edu

‡IIT Hyderabad, India. Email: fahad@cse.iith.ac.in

§Institute of Mathematical Sciences, Chennai, India. Email: saket@imsc.res.in

¶NYU Shanghai, China. Email: jiexue@nyu.edu

||Ben-Gurion University, Israel. Email: meiravze@bgu.ac.il

(INDUCED) SUBGRAPH HITTING

Input: A graph G and a set \mathcal{F} of graphs called *forbidden patterns*.

Goal: Compute a subset $S \subseteq V(G)$ of minimum size such that $G - S$ does not contain any forbidden pattern $F \in \mathcal{F}$ as a (induced) subgraph.

In particular, by setting the forbidden set \mathcal{F} to be various fixed (finite) sets, it is seen that (INDUCED) SUBGRAPH HITTING generalizes many fundamental vertex-deletion problems, which were previously extensively studied on their own in the literature, particularly (but not only) from the perspectives of approximation and parameterization. To name a few, these include VERTEX COVER, (INDUCED) P_k -HITTING where P_k is the path of length k [13, 72, 88] (which subsumes CLUSTER VERTEX DELETION [1, 54, 133]), TRIANGLE HITTING [93, 94] or more generally (INDUCED) C_k -HITTING where C_k is the cycle of length k [70, 112], K_k -HITTING where K_k is the clique of size k [55], (INDUCED) BICLIQUE HITTING [68], COMPONENT ORDER CONNECTIVITY [41, 71, 84], DEGREE MODULATOR [8, 67, 72], and TREEDPTH MODULATOR [11, 49, 65]. We elaborate on related works, particularly on these specific problems, in Appendix A.

Our main contribution is a *linear-time* approximation-preserving reduction from (INDUCED) SUBGRAPH HITTING on any graph class \mathcal{G} of bounded expansion to the same problem on bounded degree graphs within \mathcal{G} . This yields a novel algorithmic technique to design (efficient) approximation schemes on very broad graph classes, well beyond the state-of-the-art, on which we elaborate below. First, we start with some relevant background for context and motivation.

The (arguably grim) starting point of our research. The seminal result of Lund and Yannakakis [96] shows that (INDUCED) SUBGRAPH HITTING, for any fixed nontrivial¹ \mathcal{F} , is APX-hard, while the problem admits a polynomial-time constant-approximation algorithm for any fixed \mathcal{F} . As such, when the input G is a general graph, one cannot expect the existence of polynomial-time approximation schemes (PTASes)—that is, polynomial-time $(1 + \varepsilon)$ -approximation algorithms—even with a fixed \mathcal{F} . Now, there is a natural question to be asked: on which graph classes (INDUCED) SUBGRAPH HITTING admits efficient approximation schemes? The classical work of Baker [4] gives some answers to this question. Specifically, Baker’s approach yields an approximation scheme for (INDUCED) SUBGRAPH HITTING on planar graphs with running time $f(\varepsilon, \mathcal{F}) \cdot n^{O(1)}$ for some function f , which can be extended to minor-free graphs [33, 43]. In addition, Baker’s approach (together with some preprocessing) also results in an approximation scheme with the same running time for SUBGRAPH HITTING (not induced) on unit-disk graphs [60]. However, beyond these results, little was known about the approximability of the problem (even for very special cases of it).

Our purpose is to study (INDUCED) SUBGRAPH HITTING (and obtain positive results) on substantially broader graph classes. Specifically, we consider graph classes of *bounded expansion* and other important graph classes related to them. Graph classes of bounded expansion were introduced by Nešetřil and De Mendez [103, 104] as a general model of structurally sparse graph classes, generalizing many well-studied graph classes, such as graphs excluded a (topological) minor, graphs of bounded degree, graphs with bounded stack or queue number, many graph classes defined geometrically, etc. There has been an extensive study on graphs of bounded expansion from both combinatorial perspective [47, 103, 105, 107, 113, 138] and algorithmic perspective [42, 44, 45, 46, 69, 75, 104]. We refer the interested reader to the book of Nešetřil and De Mendez [106] for a deeper introduction. Unfortunately, we cannot expect (INDUCED) SUBGRAPH HITTING to admit efficient approximation schemes on a (general) graph class of bounded expansion, because the simplest special case, VERTEX COVER, is already APX-hard even on bounded-degree graphs [40].

Particularly interesting subclass of bounded-expansion graphs are graph classes of *polynomial*

¹Here “nontrivial” means that \mathcal{F} does not contain the single-vertex graph.

expansion. Some well-studied examples include minor-free graphs, graphs drawn in the plane (or on a fixed surface) with a bounded number of crossings on each edge [107], k -nearest neighbor graphs of a point set in \mathbb{R}^d for fixed k and d [100], greedy Euclidean spanners [87], and many geometric intersection graphs without dense structures (discussed below), etc. One feature that makes these graph classes especially important is their strong connection to graph separators. It was shown [47] that graph classes of polynomial expansion are exactly those having *strongly sublinear separators*, which serve as a key ingredient needed in many efficient graph algorithms.

An important open question in the topic of graph sparsity is whether every optimization problem expressible in the first-order logic admits a PTAS on graph classes of polynomial expansion [43, 44, 46]. For maximization problems, considerable progress has been made recently [44, 46, 66, 99, 114]. Notably, it was shown by Dvořák [44] that every monotone maximization problem expressible in the first-order logic admits a QPTAS on polynomial-expansion graph classes (and admits a PTAS in many special cases). However, the Baker-like approaches used in the literature [44, 46, 66] do not work for minimization problems. Therefore, the question for minimization problems in this setting is more challenging and their approximability is less understood.

1.1 Our results

Surprisingly, we show that the inapproximability of the problem on any graph class of bounded expansion comes *exactly* from the bounded-degree graphs in that class! In other words, if the bounded-degree instances in the class can be approximated efficiently, so do all instances in the class. Formally, we prove the following theorem, which is the first main contribution of this paper (here “hereditary” means closed under taking induced subgraphs).

Theorem 1.1. *Let \mathcal{G} be any hereditary graph class of bounded expansion. If (INDUCED) SUBGRAPH HITTING on \mathcal{G} admits an approximation scheme with running time $f_0(\varepsilon, \mathcal{F}, \Delta) \cdot n^c$ for some function f_0 and some constant $c \geq 1$, then the same problem also admits an approximation scheme with running time $f(\varepsilon, \mathcal{F}) \cdot n^c$ for some function f , where n is the number of vertices in the input graph $G \in \mathcal{G}$ and Δ is the maximum degree of G .*

The reduction in Theorem 1.1 consists of two steps. Both steps are $(1 + \varepsilon)$ -approximation reductions and can be done in linear time. The first step reduces an instance (G, \mathcal{F}) of (INDUCED) SUBGRAPH HITTING on \mathcal{G} to $r = O_{\mathcal{F}}(1)$ instances $(G, \mathcal{F}_1), \dots, (G, \mathcal{F}_r)$, where $\mathcal{F}_1, \dots, \mathcal{F}_r$ only depend on \mathcal{F} and only consist of connected graphs. Then the second step reduces each instance (G, \mathcal{F}_i) to an instance (G_i, \mathcal{F}_i) where G_i is an induced subgraph of G of degree $O_{\varepsilon, \mathcal{F}}(1)$. The same reduction can also result in some variants of Theorem 1.1. For example, it can be used to prove that an approximation scheme with running time $n^{f_0(\varepsilon, \mathcal{F}, \Delta)}$ implies an approximation scheme with running time $n^{f(\varepsilon, \mathcal{F})}$, an approximation scheme with running time $f_0(\varepsilon, \mathcal{F}, \Delta) \cdot n^{g(\varepsilon)}$ implies an approximation scheme with running time $f(\varepsilon, \mathcal{F}) \cdot n^{g(\varepsilon)}$, an approximation scheme with running time $f_0(\varepsilon, \mathcal{F}, \Delta) \cdot n^{g(\mathcal{F})}$ implies an approximation scheme with running time $f(\varepsilon, \mathcal{F}) \cdot n^{g(\mathcal{F})}$, etc. Although we shall only use Theorem 1.1 in this paper (as it results in the best bounds), we believe that the other variants can also find their applications in the future.

A direct application of (the second step of) our reduction in Theorem 1.1 is a $(1 + \varepsilon)$ -approximate lossy kernel of *linear* size for the problem with a fixed \mathcal{F} that only contain connected graphs. We now take a short detour and define the notion of lossy kernels. Kernelization is a subfield of Parameterized Complexity, that provides a mathematical framework to analyze polynomial time preprocessing [30, 61]. Let $g : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ be a function. A *kernel of size $g(k)$* for a parameterized problem Π is a polynomial time algorithm that takes as input an instance (I, k) and outputs another instance (I', k') such that $(I, k) \in \Pi$ if and only if $(I', k') \in \Pi$ and $|I'| + k' \leq g(k)$. If $g(k)$ is a linear,

quadratic or polynomial function of k , we say that this is a linear, quadratic or polynomial kernel, respectively. Lokshtanov et al. [92] defined the notion of lossy kernels that combines well with approximation algorithms. Informally speaking, an (α) -lossy kernel of size $g(k)$ is a polynomial time algorithm that, given an instance (I, k) , outputs an instance (I', k') such that $|I'| + k' \leq g(k)$ and any c -approximate solution s' to the instance (I', k') can be turned in polynomial time into a $(c \cdot \alpha)$ -approximate solution s to the original instance (I, k) . Our result regarding lossy kernels is as follows.

Theorem 1.2. *Let \mathcal{G} be any graph class of bounded expansion. For any fixed (finite) \mathcal{F} consisting of connected graphs, (INDUCED) SUBGRAPH HITTING on \mathcal{G} with forbidden set \mathcal{F} admits a $(1 + \varepsilon)$ -approximation lossy kernel of size $f(\varepsilon) \cdot k$ for some function f . The kernelization algorithm runs in $g(\varepsilon) \cdot n$ time for some function g .*

The linear-size lossy kernels in Theorem 1.2 (together with the first step of our reduction in Theorem 1.1) already give approximation schemes with running time $f(\varepsilon, \mathcal{F}) \cdot n^{O(1)}$ for (INDUCED) SUBGRAPH HITTING on any graph class of polynomial expansion. Indeed, as long as a graph admits (strongly) sublinear separators, we can apply the standard Lipton-Tarjan approach to compute a subset $S \subseteq V(G)$ of size εn such that each connected component of $G - S$ has size $f(\varepsilon)$. We then include S in our solution together with an optimal solution for every component of $G - S$, which can be computed independently. As the lossy kernels in Theorem 1.2 are of linear size, we have $\text{opt} = \Omega(n)$ for the kernel instance, and therefore the solution we compute is a $(1 + O(\varepsilon))$ -approximation of the optimal one.

A downside of the approximation schemes obtained from Theorem 1.2 is that their running time is super-linear in n , since computing separators on a general graph class of polynomial expansion is time-consuming. Furthermore, it seems difficult to generalize the results of Theorems 1.1 and 1.2 to other related first-order optimization problems on polynomial-expansion graph classes. Therefore, in our second main result, we directly give general approximation schemes, based on the local-search framework of Har-Peled and Quanrud [75], that can be implemented linear time and apply to a large family of first-order optimization problems on graph class of polynomial expansion, including (INDUCED) SUBGRAPH HITTING. Note that the Theorem 1.2 applies on all graphs classes of bounded expansion, however, the approximation schemes that we propose only apply to classes of polynomial expansion. As observed earlier, this restriction on graph classes is unavoidable because the simplest special case of our problem, VERTEX COVER, is already APX-hard even on bounded-degree graphs [40].

In order to present the most general version of our results, we first define a general family of hitting set problems on graphs that subsumes (INDUCED) SUBGRAPH HITTING. Let π be a property of pairs (G, Z) , where G is a graph and $Z \subseteq V(G)$ is non-empty, i.e., π is a class of such pairs closed under isomorphisms. More precisely, given isomorphic pairs (G_1, Z_1) and (G_2, Z_2) (that is, G_1 is isomorphic to G_2 by a function f such that $f(Z_1) = Z_2$), either both pairs belong to π or both don't. The *diameter* of the property π is the maximum diameter of $G[Z]$ over all pairs $(G, Z) \in \pi$. A set $S \subseteq V(G)$ is a π -*hitting set* if $S \cap Z \neq \emptyset$ for all sets $Z \subseteq V(G)$ such that $(G, Z) \in \pi$. The π -HITTING problem asks us to find a minimum-size π -hitting set for a given graph G . For example:

- For a finite set \mathcal{F} of connected graphs, if π is the property of pairs (G, Z) such that $G[Z]$ contains a graph in \mathcal{F} as a subgraph, and Z is minimal (that is, for any $z \in Z$, $G[Z \setminus \{z\}]$ does not contain any graph in \mathcal{F} as a subgraph), then we obtain the SUBGRAPH HITTING problem with forbidden set \mathcal{F} , and the diameter of π is the maximum diameter of a graph in \mathcal{F} . Similarly, if π is the property that $G[Z]$ is isomorphic to a graph in \mathcal{F} , we obtain INDUCED SUBGRAPH HITTING.

- Let r be a positive integer, and let π be satisfied by (G, Z) if and only if there exists a vertex $z \in V(G)$ such that Z consists exactly of vertices at distance at most r from z in G . Then S is a π -hitting set if and only if it is an r -dominating set, i.e., every vertex of G is at distance at most r from S . The diameter of this property π is $2r$.

Thus, π -HITTING problem is a common generalization of both covering and packing problems. Although, we were not able to extend Theorem 1.1 to the π -HITTING problem for properties π that are of bounded diameter (which generalizes the problems captured by Theorem 1.1), some of the ideas we developed in the proof apply in this setting also. These ideas allow us to show that the local-search approach of Har-Peled and Quanrud [75] yields approximation schemes for the problem. For a positive integer c , the c -local search heuristic starts with $S = V(G)$ and repeats the following local improvement as long as possible: If there exists a set $Y \subseteq V(G)$ of size at most c such that $|S \Delta Y| < |S|$ and $S \Delta Y$ is a π -hitting set, then replace S by $S \Delta Y$. While this naïve algorithm of course fails to get a reasonable approximation in general, as our second main result, we show that it succeeds for bounded diameter properties on any graph class of polynomial expansion. In addition, if the property π can be defined in first-order logic, we can implement the local-search procedure in linear time.

Theorem 1.3. *Let \mathcal{G} be a graph class of polynomial expansion and π be a property of finite diameter. Then for every $\varepsilon > 0$, there exists a constant $c > 0$ such that c -local search gives a $(1 + \varepsilon)$ -approximation solution for π -HITTING on \mathcal{G} . Furthermore, if π is first-order definable, the c -local search algorithm can be implemented in $f(c) \cdot n$ time for some function f .*

When π is not first-order definable but is efficiently testable in \mathcal{G} (i.e., there exists a polynomial-time algorithm that decides, for a graph $G \in \mathcal{G}$ and a set $S \subseteq V(G)$, whether S is a π -hitting set), we can implement c -local search in $n^{O(c)}$ time, which gives us a PTAS for π -HITTING on \mathcal{G} .

The property π for (INDUCED) SUBGRAPH HITTING (with a fixed forbidden set \mathcal{F}) is first-order definable. Therefore, Theorem 1.3 directly gives us a *linear-time* approximation scheme for the problem when \mathcal{F} consists of connected graphs.

Corollary 1.4. (INDUCED) SUBGRAPH HITTING on any graph class \mathcal{G} of polynomial expansion admits an approximation scheme with running time $f(\varepsilon, \mathcal{F}) \cdot n$, where n is the number of vertices in the input graph $G \in \mathcal{G}$.

Interestingly, the local-search approach also applies to the dual notion of packing. More precisely, a set \mathcal{P} of disjoint subsets of vertices of G is a π -packing if (G, P) has the property π for every $P \in \mathcal{P}$; it is an *induced π -packing* if additionally no edge of G has ends in distinct elements of \mathcal{P} . The π -PACKING problem asks us to find a maximum-size π -packing in a given graph G . For example:

- For a graph F , if π is the property that $G[P]$ is isomorphic to F , we obtain the F -MATCHING (and INDUCED F -MATCHING) problem of finding the maximum number of disjoint (and non-adjacent) copies of F in the input graph. When F is a single vertex then the INDUCED F -MATCHING corresponds to the classical INDEPENDENT SET problem.
- Let r be a positive integer, and let π be satisfied by (G, Z) if and only if there exists $z \in V(G)$ such that Z consists exactly of vertices at distance at most r from z in G . Then a π -packing corresponds to a $2r$ -independent set (a set of vertices is t -independent if the distance between any two of them is greater than t), and an induced π -packing corresponds to a $(2r + 1)$ -independent set.

For the (INDUCED) π -PACKING problem, we can run the following maximization variant of the c -local search algorithm: Start with $\mathcal{P} = \emptyset$, and repeat the following local improvement step as long as possible: If there exists $Y \subseteq \mathcal{P}$ of size less than c such that $\mathcal{P} \setminus Y$ can be extended to an (induced) π -packing \mathcal{P}' of size greater than $|\mathcal{P}|$, then replace \mathcal{P} by \mathcal{P}' . We can show that the local-search approach also results in approximation schemes for (INDUCED) π -PACKING on graph classes of polynomial expansion, as long as π is of finite diameter.

Theorem 1.5. *Let \mathcal{G} be a graph class of polynomial expansion and π be a property of finite diameter. Then for every $\varepsilon > 0$, there exists a constant $c > 0$ such that c -local search gives $(1 - \varepsilon)$ -approximation solution for (INDUCED) π -PACKING on \mathcal{G} . Furthermore, if π is first-order definable, the c -local-search algorithm can be implemented in $f(c) \cdot n$ time for some function f .*

Let us remark that the proof of Theorem 1.5 is less involved than that of Theorem 1.3, and is essentially implicit in [75]. So we view Theorem 1.5 as a byproduct of the paper.

1.2 Applications to geometric intersection graphs

Geometric intersection graphs are graphs that depict the intersection patterns of geometric objects in a Euclidean space \mathbb{R}^d . In a geometric intersection graph, each vertex corresponds to a geometric object in \mathbb{R}^d and two vertices are connected by an edge if the two corresponding objects intersect. In general, geometric intersection graphs are not sparse (as the geometric objects can stack in one place to form a large clique) and thus not of polynomial expansion. However, most interesting classes of geometric intersection graphs are closely related to polynomial-expansion graphs in the sense that either the graph contains a large clique or it has strongly sublinear separators (i.e., belongs to a subclass of polynomial expansion). Formally, we say a graph class \mathcal{G} is of *clique-dependent polynomial expansion* if any subclass of \mathcal{G} with bounded clique size is of polynomial expansion. Note that for SUBGRAPH HITTING (not induced), large cliques are great for approximation, since we need to delete almost all vertices in the clique (so we might as well delete the entire clique). We design a divide-and-conquer algorithm that can partition a graph into several k -cliques and a part without k -cliques (called a *k -clique decomposition*) for any given integer $k \geq 1$. Our algorithm runs in $f(k) \cdot n \log n + O(m)$ time when applying on a graph class of clique-dependent bounded expansion. Using this algorithm, we can extend Theorem 1.2 and Corollary 1.4 to any class of geometric intersection graphs that is clique-dependent polynomial expansion. Examples of such geometric intersection graphs include the following.

- All classes of intersection graphs of any fat objects (i.e., convex objects whose diameter-width ratio is bounded). These classes are of clique-dependent polynomial expansion [34, 44, 51], and include, for example, intersection graphs of balls, hypercubes, and similar convex objects.
- The class of intersection graphs of pseudo-disks (i.e., topological disks in the plane satisfying that the boundaries of every pair of them are either disjoint or intersect twice). We show that this class is also of clique-dependent polynomial expansion.

Both fat-object graphs and pseudo-disk graphs generalize the well-studied classes of disk graphs and unit-disk graphs. Because these classes are of clique-dependent polynomial expansion, the aforementioned approximation scheme and lossy kernels on polynomial-expansion graph classes can also be applied to them. Thus, applying Theorem 1.2 and Corollary 1.4 yields the following.

Theorem 1.6. *Let \mathcal{G} be a class of fat-object graphs or the class of pseudo-disk graphs.*

1. For any fixed (finite) \mathcal{F} of connected graphs, SUBGRAPH HITTING on \mathcal{G} with forbidden list \mathcal{F} admits a $(1 + \varepsilon)$ -approximation lossy kernel of size $f(\varepsilon) \cdot k$ for some function f . The kernelization algorithm runs in $g(\varepsilon) \cdot n \log n + O(m)$ time for some function g .
2. SUBGRAPH HITTING on \mathcal{G} admits an approximation scheme with running time $f(\varepsilon, \mathcal{F}) \cdot n \log n + O(m)$ for some function f .

Prior to this work, only special cases of the SUBGRAPH HITTING problem have been considered on geometric intersection graphs beyond unit-disk graphs. It was known that VERTEX COVER admits PTASes on fat-object graphs [51, 127, 137]. Zhang et al. [135] showed that the P_k -HITTING problem (also known as PATH TRANSVERSAL) admits a PTAS on unit-ball graphs. Very recently, Lokshtanov et al. [94] gave a general approach that leads to EPTASes for various cases of SUBGRAPH HITTING on disk graphs when the forbidden list \mathcal{F} contains a “triangle-bundle” and satisfies the so-called “clone-closed” property. The approach of Lokshtanov et al. relies heavily on these properties of the forbidden patterns as well as the plane geometry of disk graphs, and is thus unlikely to work for the general SUBGRAPH HITTING problem or be generalized to geometric intersection graphs in higher dimensions (such as ball graphs). In fact, Lokshtanov et al. [94] asked explicitly as an open question whether one can obtain EPTASes for hitting any fixed forbidden pattern in disk graphs or more general classes of geometric intersection graphs. Our result affirmatively answers this question, and improves the running time of their EPTASes (for SUBGRAPH HITTING related problems) to near-linear.

Application to string graphs. String graphs form the widest class of geometric intersection graphs in \mathbb{R}^2 , which are defined by arbitrary connected geometric objects in \mathbb{R}^2 . This includes in particular intersection graphs of rectangles and segments (which are not covered by the aforementioned classes of geometric intersection graphs). Unfortunately, string graphs are not of clique-dependent polynomial expansion. But they are of *biclique-dependent* polynomial expansion: any subclass with bounded biclique size is of polynomial expansion [62]. The approximation scheme on polynomial-expansion graph classes with running time $f(\varepsilon, \mathcal{F}) \cdot n$ also works on string graphs. Exploiting this property, we can use Theorem 1.2 and Corollary 1.4 to obtain $(2 + \varepsilon)$ -approximation lossy kernels and algorithms for BIPARTITE SUBGRAPH HITTING, which is the special case of SUBGRAPH HITTING where \mathcal{F} contains at least one bipartite graph.

Theorem 1.7. *Let \mathcal{G} be the class of string graphs.*

1. For any fixed (finite) set \mathcal{F} of connected graphs among which at least one is bipartite, SUBGRAPH HITTING on \mathcal{G} with forbidden list \mathcal{F} admits a $(2 + \varepsilon)$ -approximation lossy kernel of size $f(\varepsilon) \cdot k$ for some function f . The kernelization algorithm runs in $g(\varepsilon) \cdot n^2$ time for some function g .
2. BIPARTITE SUBGRAPH HITTING on \mathcal{G} admits a $(2 + \varepsilon)$ -approximation algorithm with running time $f(\varepsilon, \mathcal{F}) \cdot n^2$ for some function f .

BIPARTITE SUBGRAPH HITTING, though more restrictive compared to the general SUBGRAPH HITTING problem, already covers many interesting vertex-deletion problems, such as VERTEX COVER, P_k -HITTING, COMPONENT ORDER CONNECTIVITY, DEGREE MODULATOR, and more. While $(2 + \varepsilon)$ -approximation algorithms are less satisfying than approximation schemes, obtaining approximation schemes on string graphs is very difficult. Indeed, we are not aware of any known approximation schemes for NP-hard problems on string graphs (in fact, even on the subclass of rectangle graphs or segment graphs). Even worse, prior to this work, the only problems whose approximation ratio on string graphs is better than that on general graphs are INDEPENDENT SET and CHROMATIC NUMBER [63], to the best of our knowledge. Our result in Theorem 1.7 adds many new problems to this small club.

1.3 Subgraph isomorphism

SUBGRAPH ISOMORPHISM is a special case of SUBGRAPH HITTING, which aims to find a subgraph of the input graph G that is isomorphic to a given graph H . When the number of vertices in H is bounded by k , the problem is also called k -SUBGRAPH ISOMORPHISM. Our aforementioned efficient k -clique decomposition algorithm straightforwardly gives us a byproduct, which is a k -SUBGRAPH ISOMORPHISM algorithm on any graph classes of clique-dependent polynomial expansion (and thus on the classes of fat-object graphs and pseudo-disk graphs) with running time $f(k) \cdot n \log n + O(m)$ (see Theorem 6.6). The k -SUBGRAPH ISOMORPHISM problem on fat-object graphs was considered very recently by Chan [22], who gave an algorithm with running time $f(k) \cdot n \log n$ time, which requires the geometric realization of the graph (i.e., the geometric objects) to be given. Contrary to this, our algorithm is *robust* in the sense that it does not rely on the realization. Note that if we are only given the graph, the additional $O(m)$ term in our running time is necessary.

Theorem 1.8. *Let \mathcal{G} be a class of fat-object graphs or the class of pseudo-disk graphs. k -SUBGRAPH ISOMORPHISM on \mathcal{G} can be solved in $f(k) \cdot n \log n + O(m)$ time for some function f , where n and m are the numbers of vertices and edges in the input graph $G \in \mathcal{G}$, respectively.*

2 Our techniques

2.1 Overview of the proof of Theorem 1.1

In this section, we give an informal overview of the proof of our main theorem. Let \mathcal{G} be a hereditary graph class of bounded expansion. For convenience, we say a graph G is (*induced*) F -free (for some graph F) if it does not contain F as a (*induced*) subgraph. Similarly, we say G is (*induced*) \mathcal{F} -free (for some set \mathcal{F} of graphs) if (*induced*) F -free for all $F \in \mathcal{F}$.

Our first step of proving Theorem 1.1 is to reduce to the case in which all forbidden patterns are connected. Specifically, we show that if we have an approximation scheme \mathbf{A} for (INDUCED) SUBGRAPH HITTING on \mathcal{G} which works only when \mathcal{F} consists of connected graphs, then we have an approximation scheme \mathbf{A}' for the same problem which works for any \mathcal{F} (with almost the same running time). We now sketch a proof for this step. To design the approximation scheme \mathbf{A}' (provided the approximation scheme \mathbf{A}), consider a (INDUCED) SUBGRAPH HITTING instance (G, \mathcal{F}) . For simplicity, let us assume $\mathcal{F} = \{F\}$ where F consists of only two connected components C and D . Our ideas for handling this special case can directly be generalized to any \mathcal{F} . Set $\gamma = |V(F)|$. Let $S \subseteq V(G)$, $S_C \subseteq V(G)$, $S_D \subseteq V(G)$ be optimal solutions of the (INDUCED) SUBGRAPH HITTING instances (G, \mathcal{F}) , $(G, \{C\})$, $(G, \{D\})$, respectively. The key observation here is that $\min\{|S_C|, |S_D|\} - |S| \leq \alpha(F)$ for some (computable) function α . Before showing this observation, we first explain why it is useful. Observe that a feasible solution of $(G, \{C\})$ or $(G, \{D\})$ is also a feasible solution of (G, \mathcal{F}) , since if a graph is (*induced*) C -free or (*induced*) D -free, then it must be (*induced*) F -free. We can apply \mathbf{A} to compute $(1 + \varepsilon)$ -approximation solutions for $(G, \{C\})$ and $(G, \{D\})$, as C and D are connected. According to the inequality $\min\{|S_C|, |S_D|\} - |S| \leq \alpha(F)$, we know that one of these two solutions is of size at most $(1 + \varepsilon) \cdot (|S| + \alpha(F))$. If $|S| = \Omega(\alpha(F)/\varepsilon)$, this gives us a $(1 + O(\varepsilon))$ -approximation solution of (G, \mathcal{F}) . Otherwise, S is small (i.e. $|S|$ is bounded by a function of ε and \mathcal{F}) and we can apply the known FPT algorithm for (INDUCED) SUBGRAPH HITTING on bounded-expansion graphs to compute an optimal solution in $f(\mathcal{F}, |S|) \cdot n$ time.

To show $\min\{|S_C|, |S_D|\} - |S| \leq \alpha(F)$, we first consider SUBGRAPH HITTING (which is easier). Recall $\gamma = |F|$. The key observation is that $G - S$ cannot simultaneously contain many disjoint subgraphs isomorphic to C and many disjoint subgraphs isomorphic to D (here “disjoint” means *vertex-disjoint*). To see this, assume $G - S$ contains γ disjoint subgraphs C_1, \dots, C_γ isomorphic

to C and γ disjoint subgraphs D_1, \dots, D_γ isomorphic to D . Since C_1 has at most $|V(C)| \leq \gamma - 1$ vertices, there exists $i \in [\gamma]$ such that C_1 and D_i are disjoint. Now C_1 and D_i together form a subgraph of $G - S$ isomorphic to F . But $G - S$ is F -free, as S is a solution of (G, \mathcal{F}) . Thus, the above observation holds. Now we can assume without loss of generality that $G - S$ does not contain γ disjoint subgraphs isomorphic to C . That means we can hit all subgraphs of $G - S$ isomorphic to C using γ^2 vertices of $G - S$: simply take a maximal set \mathcal{C} of disjoint subgraphs of $G - S$ isomorphic to C (whose size is smaller than γ), then $\bigcup_{C \in \mathcal{C}} V(C)$ hits all subgraphs of $G - S$ isomorphic to C (by the maximality of \mathcal{C}) and $|\bigcup_{C \in \mathcal{C}} V(C)| \leq \gamma^2$. It follows that $|S_C| \leq |S| + \gamma^2$. Setting $\alpha(F) = \gamma^2$, we have $\min\{|S_C|, |S_D|\} - |S| \leq \alpha(F)$. Note that in this argument, we did not use the bounded expansion of \mathcal{G} and the function α is also independent of \mathcal{G} .

For INDUCED SUBGRAPH HITTING, the key observation is the same: $G - S$ cannot simultaneously contain many disjoint induced subgraphs isomorphic to C and many disjoint induced subgraphs isomorphic to D . But the proof is slightly more involved, and relies on the fact that \mathcal{G} is of bounded expansion. The bounded expansion of \mathcal{G} actually implies that the average degree of every subgraph of G is bounded by some constant d . Assume $G - S$ contains $\gamma' = (2d + 1) \cdot \gamma$ disjoint induced subgraphs $C_1, \dots, C_{\gamma'}$ isomorphic to C and γ' disjoint induced subgraphs $D_1, \dots, D_{\gamma'}$ isomorphic to D . Let $V = \bigcup_{i=1}^{\gamma'} (V(C_i) \cup V(D_i))$. We have $|V| \leq 2\gamma\gamma'$. The average degree of $G[V]$ is at most d . So a simple averaging argument shows that there exists $i \in [\gamma']$ such that the $\sum_{v \in V(C_i)} \deg_{G[V]}(v) \leq d|V|/\gamma' \leq 2d\gamma$. As $|V(C_i)| = |V(C)| \leq \gamma - 1$ and $\sum_{v \in V(C_i)} \deg_{G[V]}(v) \leq 2d\gamma$, there are at most $\gamma - 1$ indices $j \in [\gamma']$ such that C_i intersects D_j and at most $2d\gamma$ indices $j \in [\gamma']$ such that C_i is neighboring to D_j . So there exists $j \in [\gamma']$ such that C_i and D_j are disjoint and non-adjacent, which implies that C_i and D_j together form an induced subgraph of $G - S$ isomorphic to F . Thus, the key observation holds and the same argument as before shows the inequality $\min\{|S_C|, |S_D|\} - |S| \leq \alpha(F)$. Here the function α may depend on the graph class \mathcal{G} .

With the above argument, we can now restrict ourselves to connected forbidden patterns. Next, we discuss the main part of our proof, how to solve the problem with connected forbidden patterns. Before we start, we need to briefly discuss an important invariant of graphs, called *weak coloring number*. Consider a graph G and an ordering σ of the vertices of G . For $u, v \in V(G)$, we write $u <_\sigma v$ if u is before v under the ordering σ . Define $>_\sigma, \leq_\sigma, \geq_\sigma$ similarly. For an integer $r \geq 0$, we say u is r -weakly reachable from v under σ if there is a path π between v and u of length at most r such that $u \geq_\sigma w$ for any vertex w on π (in particular, $u \geq_\sigma v$). Let $\text{WR}_r(G, \sigma, v)$ denote the set of vertices in G that are r -weakly reachable from v under σ . The *weak r -coloring number* of G under σ is $\text{wcol}_r(G, \sigma) = \max_{v \in V(G)} |\text{WR}_r(G, \sigma, v)|$. Then the *weak r -coloring number* of G is defined as $\text{wcol}_r(G) = \min_{\sigma \in \Pi(G)} \text{wcol}_r(G, \sigma)$ where $\Pi(G)$ is the set of all orderings of the vertices of G . An important characterization for bounded-expansion graphs [103, 138] is that a graph class \mathcal{G} is of bounded expansion iff there is a function χ such that for every $r \geq 0$, the weak r -coloring numbers of the graphs in \mathcal{G} has an upper bound $\chi(r)$, i.e., $\text{wcol}_r(G) \leq \chi(r)$ for all $G \in \mathcal{G}$. In our proof, we shall repeatedly exploit the bounded weak coloring number of our graph class \mathcal{G} .

Consider a (INDUCED) SUBGRAPH HITTING instance (G, \mathcal{F}) where $G \in \mathcal{G}$ and \mathcal{F} consists of connected forbidden patterns. We shall show how to reduce (G, \mathcal{F}) to another instance (G', \mathcal{F}) in $f(\varepsilon, \mathcal{F}) \cdot n$ time, where G' is an induced subgraph of G of degree $O_{\varepsilon, \mathcal{F}}(1)$. Here the reduction is in the sense that one can obtain a $(1 + O(\varepsilon))$ -approximation solution S of (G, \mathcal{F}) efficiently from a $(1 + \varepsilon)$ -approximation solution S' of (G', \mathcal{F}) . This solves the problem, because we can compute S' by applying the given approximation scheme with running time $f_0(\varepsilon, \mathcal{F}, \Delta) \cdot n^c$ on G' (note that $G' \in \mathcal{G}$ as \mathcal{G} is hereditary), which takes $f(\varepsilon, \mathcal{F}) \cdot n^c$ time due to the bounded degree of G' . For convenience, we define some notations. Let $\gamma = \max_{F \in \mathcal{F}} |V(F)|$ and $\mathcal{V} = \{V(H) : H \text{ is a forbidden (induced) subgraph of } G\}$ where a forbidden (induced) subgraph refers to a (in-

duced) subgraph isomorphic to some $F \in \mathcal{F}$. A solution of (G, \mathcal{F}) is just a hitting set of \mathcal{V} . In our reduction, we shall only use two properties of \mathcal{V} :

(P1) $|V| \leq \gamma$ for all $V \in \mathcal{V}$,

(P2) for all $V \in \mathcal{V}$, the subgraph of G induced by V (denoted by $G[V]$) is connected (this follows from the assumption that \mathcal{F} consists of connected graphs), and

These properties hold for both SUBGRAPH HITTING and INDUCED SUBGRAPH HITTING. Thus, in what follows, we shall not distinguish the two problems. Fix an ordering σ on $V(G)$ that satisfies $\text{wcol}_\gamma(G, \sigma) = \text{wcol}_\gamma(G)$. Throughout this section, when we say a vertex is “large” or “small”, it is always in terms of the ordering σ . As \mathcal{G} is of bounded expansion, $\text{wcol}_\gamma(G) \leq \chi(\gamma)$ for some function χ only depending on \mathcal{G} . Thus, $|\text{WR}_\gamma(G, \sigma, v)| \leq \text{wcol}_\gamma(G, \sigma) \leq \chi(\gamma)$ for all $v \in V(G)$. In other words, the size of $\text{WR}_\gamma(G, \sigma, v)$ is bounded by a function of \mathcal{F} for $v \in V(G)$. Our reduction consists of two steps.

Step 1. The first step reduces (G, \mathcal{F}) to an instance (G_1, \mathcal{F}) where G_1 is an induced subgraph of G satisfying certain properties. In this step, we deal with the *sunflowers* in \mathcal{V} . Recall that an r -*sunflower* is a collection $\{V_1, \dots, V_r\}$ of r sets which have a common intersection X such that $V_1 \setminus X, \dots, V_r \setminus X$ are disjoint. If X is nonempty, it is called the *core* of the sunflower. Suppose \mathcal{V} contains a sunflower $\{V_1, \dots, V_r\}$ with core X , for a large r . In order to optimally hit all sets in \mathcal{V} , intuitively, we should pick a vertex in X , for otherwise we need to waste at least r vertices outside X to hit all of V_1, \dots, V_r . But this intuition is incorrect in general: if we choose to hit V_1, \dots, V_r using r vertices outside X , those vertices can also be used to hit other sets in \mathcal{V} (and thus are not necessarily wasted). Interestingly, as we will see, it turns out to be useful in our setting.

For a vertex a vertex $v \in V(G)$ and a set $S \subseteq V(G)$, we denote by $\rho(v, S)$ the number of vertices $u \in S$ satisfying $v \in \text{WR}_\gamma(G, \sigma, u)$. For an integer $t \geq 0$, we say a set $S \subseteq V(G)$ is t -*closed* if $\rho(v, S) < t$ for all $v \in V(G) \setminus S$. Note that if S_1 and S_2 are both t -closed, then $S_1 \cap S_2$ is also t -closed, because simply because $\rho(v, S_1 \cap S_2) \leq \min\{\rho(v, S_1), \rho(v, S_2)\}$ for all $v \in V(G)$. Therefore, for any $S \subseteq V(G)$, there exists a unique minimal superset $S' \supseteq S$ that is t -closed, which we call the t -*closure* of S . The t -closure S' of S can be easily constructed as follows. We begin with $S' = S$ and repeatedly add vertices $v \in V(G) \setminus S'$ satisfying $\rho(v, S') \geq t$ to S' . One can easily verify that the resulting S' is the t -closure of S .

Lemma 2.1. *If S' is the t -closure of S , then $|S'| \leq |S|/(1 - \chi(\gamma)/t)$.*

Proof. From the construction of t -closure, we see that every $v \in S' \setminus S$ satisfies $\rho(v, S') \geq t$, which implies $\sum_{v \in S' \setminus S} \rho(v, S') \geq t \cdot |S' \setminus S|$. On the other hand, notice the equation

$$\sum_{v \in S' \setminus S} \rho(v, S') = \sum_{u \in S'} |\text{WR}_\gamma(G, \sigma, u) \cap (S' \setminus S)| \leq \sum_{u \in S'} |\text{WR}_\gamma(G, \sigma, u)| \leq \chi(\gamma) \cdot |S'|.$$

It follows that $t \cdot |S' \setminus S| \leq \chi(\gamma) \cdot |S'|$, which implies $|S'| \leq |S|/(1 - \chi(\gamma)/t)$. \square

Lemma 2.2. *Let $S \subseteq V(G)$, S' be the $(r - \chi(G))$ -closure of S , and $\{V_1, \dots, V_r\}$ be a sunflower in \mathcal{V} with core X . If S is a hitting set of $\{V_1, \dots, V_r\}$, then $S' \cap X \neq \emptyset$.*

Proof. If $S \cap X = \emptyset$, we are done. Otherwise, for each $i \in [r]$, S contains a vertex $u_i \in V_i \setminus X$. Note that u_1, \dots, u_r are all distinct, because $V_1 \setminus X, \dots, V_r \setminus X$ are disjoint. Let $v^* \in X$ be the largest vertex in X , and $v_i \in V_i$ be the largest vertex in V_i for $i \in [r]$. We show $v^* \in S'$ and thus $S' \cap X \neq \emptyset$. Define $I = \{i \in [r] : v_i = v^*\}$. Observe the following facts.

- $r - |I| \leq \chi(\gamma)$. To see this, first notice that $v_i \in \text{WR}_\gamma(G, \sigma, v^*)$ for all $i \in [r]$. Indeed, we have $v_i \geq v^*$ by construction. By properties **(P1)** and **(P2)**, $G[V_i]$ is connected and $|V_i| \leq \gamma$. So v_i is weakly γ -reachable from any vertex in V_i and in particular from v^* . Furthermore, $v_i \in V_i \setminus X$ for all $i \in [r] \setminus I$ (for otherwise v_i is the largest vertex in X and thus $v_i = v^*$). Thus, the vertices v_i 's for $i \in [r] \setminus I$ are distinct, as $V_1 \setminus X, \dots, V_r \setminus X$ are distinct. As all these vertices are in $\text{WR}_\gamma(G, \sigma, v^*)$, we have $r - |I| \leq |\text{WR}_\gamma(G, \sigma, v^*)| \leq \chi(\gamma)$.
- $v^* \in \text{WR}_\gamma(G, \sigma, u_i)$ for all $i \in I$. Note that v^* is the largest vertex in V_i for $i \in I$. As $G[V_i]$ is connected and $|V_i| \leq \gamma$, v^* is weakly γ -reachable from any vertex in V_i and thus from u_i .

The first fact implies $|I| \geq r - \chi(\gamma)$. The second fact implies $\rho(v^*, S) \geq |I|$, since $u_1, \dots, u_r \in S$ and these vertices are distinct. Therefore, $\rho(v^*, S) \geq r - \chi(\gamma)$ and thus $v^* \in S'$. \square

Now we use the above lemmas to do our reduction. Set $t = (1 + \varepsilon) \cdot (\chi(\gamma)/\varepsilon)$ and $r = t + \chi(\gamma)$. Then $1/(1 - \chi(\gamma)/t) = 1 + \varepsilon$. We begin with $G_1 = G$ and keep removing vertices from G_1 while guaranteeing the following invariant.

- For any solution $S \subseteq V(G_1)$ of the instance (G_1, \mathcal{F}) , the t -closure of S is a solution of (G, \mathcal{F}) .

For a set $A \subseteq V(G)$, we denote by $\mathcal{V} \pitchfork A$ the sub-collection of \mathcal{V} consisting of all sets that are contained in V . We say a vertex $v \in V(G_1)$ is *redundant* in G_1 if every $V \in \mathcal{V} \pitchfork V(G_1)$ containing v also contains the core of an r -sunflower in $V \in \mathcal{V} \pitchfork (V(G_1) \setminus \{v\})$. Then what we do is very simple: as long as the current G_1 has a redundant vertex, remove it from G_1 . The procedure terminates when G_1 does not have any redundant vertices. We show that the desired invariant always holds during the procedure. Assume it holds for G_1 , and we want it to also hold for $G_1 - \{v\}$ for a redundant vertex $v \in V(G_1)$. Let $S \subseteq V(G_1) \setminus \{v\}$ be a solution of $(G_1 - \{v\}, \mathcal{F})$, and S' be its t -closure. We claim that S' is a solution of (G_1, \mathcal{F}) . By Lemma 2.2, S' hits the cores of all r -sunflowers in $\mathcal{V} \pitchfork (V(G_1) \setminus \{v\})$. Consider a set $V \in \mathcal{V} \pitchfork V(G_1)$. If $v \notin V$, then V is hit by S and hence by S' . Otherwise, since v is redundant in G_1 , V should contain the core of an r -sunflower in $\mathcal{V} \pitchfork (V(G_1) \setminus \{v\})$. But S' hits that core, and thus hits V . Thus, S' hits all sets in $\mathcal{V} \pitchfork V(G_1)$ and is a solution of (G_1, \mathcal{F}) . As the invariant holds for G_1 , the t -closure of S' , which is S' itself, is a solution of (G, \mathcal{F}) .

The invariant guarantees that we can reduce the original instance (G, \mathcal{F}) to the new instance (G_1, \mathcal{F}) . Indeed, given a $(1 + \varepsilon)$ -approximation solution $S \subseteq V(G_1)$ of (G_1, \mathcal{F}) , we can compute the t -closure S' of S , which is a solution of (G, \mathcal{F}) by the invariant and satisfies that $|S'| \leq |S|/(1 - \chi(\gamma)/t)$ by Lemma 2.1. Since $1/(1 - \chi(\gamma)/t) = 1 + \varepsilon$, S' is a $(1 + O(\varepsilon))$ -approximation solution of (G, \mathcal{F}) . This completes the first step of our reduction. We omit the implementation details for constructing G_1 and for computing the t -closure of a set S — by properly using the existing algorithms for first-order model checking on bounded-expansion graphs and other results, both can be implemented in linear time.

Step 2. In this step, we further reduce (G_1, \mathcal{F}) to another instance (G_2, \mathcal{F}) where the maximum degree of G_2 is bounded (by a function of ε and γ) and thus complete our proof. What we do is very simple: pick a large threshold $d = O_{\varepsilon, \mathcal{F}}(1)$ and then let $G_2 = G_1 - V^*$, where V^* consists of all vertices in G_1 whose degree is larger than d , i.e., $V^* = \{v \in V(G_1) : \deg_{G_1}(v) > d\}$. Given a solution $S \subseteq V(G_2)$ of (G_2, \mathcal{F}) , we can simply construct a solution $S' \subseteq V(G_1)$ of (G_1, \mathcal{F}) by setting $S' = S \cup V^*$. The only thing non-obvious is that if S is a $(1 + \varepsilon)$ -approximation solution of (G_2, \mathcal{F}) , then S' is a $(1 + O(\varepsilon))$ -approximation solution of (G_1, \mathcal{F}) . We show this is true if the threshold d is chosen properly.

It suffices to have $|V^*| = O(\varepsilon|S^*|)$ for an optimal solution S^* of (G_1, \mathcal{F}) . We rely on a nice property of the graph G_1 guaranteed in the first step: it does not contain any redundant vertices. In other words, for every $v \in V(G_1)$, there exists $V \in \mathcal{V} \cap V(G_1)$ containing v such that V does not contain the core of any t -sunflower in $\mathcal{V} \cap (V(G_1) \cap \{v\})$. Let S^* be an optimal solution of (G_1, \mathcal{F}) and $t = (1 + \varepsilon) \cdot (\chi(\gamma)/\varepsilon)$ (same as what we used in Step 1).

Lemma 2.3. *Let $r > \max\{\gamma, t + \chi(\gamma)\}$ be an integer. If $d \geq r^\gamma \gamma!$, then $\rho(v, S^*) \geq t$ for all $v \in V^*$.*

Proof. Since $v \in V^*$, the degree of v in G_1 is larger than d . Let $v_1, \dots, v_d \in V(G_1)$ be d neighbors of v . As aforementioned, for each v_i , there exists $V_i \in \mathcal{V} \cap V(G_1)$ containing v_i such that V_i does not contain the core of any t -sunflower in $\mathcal{V} \cap (V(G_1) \cap \{v_i\})$. By the sunflower lemma, there exists an r -sunflower in $\{V_1, \dots, V_d\}$, and assume it is V_1, \dots, V_r without loss of generality. We claim that V_1, \dots, V_r are disjoint. Assume this is not the case. Let X be the core of V_1, \dots, V_r . As $|X| \leq \gamma$ and $r > \gamma$, there exists $i \in [r]$ such that $v_i \notin X$. Thus, X is the core of an r -sunflower (and hence a t -sunflower as $r > t$) in $\mathcal{V} \cap (V(G_1) \cap \{v_i\})$. We have $X \subseteq V_i$, which contradicts the fact that V_i does not contain the core of any t -sunflower in $\mathcal{V} \cap (V(G_1) \cap \{v_i\})$. So V_1, \dots, V_r must be disjoint.

Next we apply an argument similar to the proof of Lemma 2.2. We have $S^* \cap V_i \neq \emptyset$ for all $i \in [r]$, as S^* is a solution of (G_1, \mathcal{F}) . Let $u_i \in S^* \cap V_i$ for $i \in [r]$. For each u_i , there exists a path π_i between v and u_i in $G[V_i \cup \{v\}]$ of length at most γ , since $G[V_i]$ is connected and v is either in V_i or neighboring to V_i . Let p_i be the largest vertex on π_i , and define $I = \{i \in [r] : p_i = v\}$. Note that $p_i \in V_i$ for all $i \in [r] \setminus I$. As V_1, \dots, V_r are disjoint, the vertices p_i 's for $i \in [r] \setminus I$ are distinct. We have $p_i \in \text{WR}_\gamma(G, \sigma, v)$, because of the sub-path of π_i between v and p_i . It follows that $r - |I| \leq |\text{WR}_\gamma(G, \sigma, v)| \leq \chi(\gamma)$ and hence $|I| \geq r - \chi(\gamma) > t$. On the other hand, we have $v \in \text{WR}_\gamma(G, \sigma, u_i)$ for all $i \in I$, because of the path π_i . As $u_1, \dots, u_r \in S^*$ are distinct, $\rho(v, S^*) \geq |I| > t$. \square

Set $d \geq (t + \chi(\gamma) + \gamma)^\gamma \gamma!$. The above lemma implies $\rho(v, S^*) \geq t$ for all $v \in V^*$. Finally, we use the same argument as in the proof of Lemma 2.1 to show that $|V^*| \leq \varepsilon|S^*|$:

$$t|V^*| \leq \sum_{v \in V^*} \rho(v, S^*) \leq \sum_{u \in S^*} |\text{WR}_\gamma(G, \sigma, u)| \leq \chi(\gamma)|S^*|.$$

This implies $|V^*| \leq \chi(\gamma)|S^*|/t = O(\varepsilon|S^*|)$, and we are done.

2.2 Overview of the proofs of Theorems 1.3 and 1.5

Let \mathcal{C} be a collection of subsets of vertices of a graph G . The *packing graph* $G[\mathcal{C}]$ is defined as the graph with vertex set \mathcal{C} where C_1 and C_2 are adjacent if there exist $v_1 \in C_1$ and $v_2 \in C_2$ such that $v_1 = v_2$ or $v_1 v_2 \in E(G)$. The collection is *shallow* if for each $C \in \mathcal{C}$, the graph $G[C]$ has radius bounded by a constant, and *thin* if every vertex of G belongs to only constantly many sets of \mathcal{C} . For $K \subseteq \mathcal{C}$, let ∂K be the set of vertices of K with a neighbor outside of K . Consider an arbitrary HITTING SET problem. The framework of Har-Peled and Quanrud [75] shows that the local search gives a PTAS for this problem in graph classes with polynomial expansion if the following technical condition holds: For any solutions A and O to the problem in a graph G , we can find a function C assigning subsets of $V(G)$ to vertices of $A \cup O$ such that

- (i) the system $\mathcal{C} = \{C(v) : v \in A \cup O\}$ of subsets of G is shallow and thin, and
- (ii) for any $K \subseteq V(G[\mathcal{C}])$, the set

$$A_K = (A \setminus C^{-1}(K \setminus \partial K)) \cup (O \cap C^{-1}(K))$$

is also a valid solution.

The condition (i) can be used to show that if G is from a class with polynomial expansion, then the packing graph $G[\mathcal{C}]$ also has expansion bounded by a polynomial. Hence, $G[\mathcal{C}]$ has strongly sublinear separators, which by a standard result dating back to Lipton and Tarjan [90] implies that for every $\varepsilon > 0$, $G[\mathcal{C}]$ can be broken into parts of size $O(\text{poly}(1/\varepsilon))$ with overlaps of total size at most $\varepsilon|V(G[\mathcal{C}])| \leq \varepsilon(|A| + |O|)$. We apply this construction with O being an optimal solution and A being the local search solution. Then for each part K , the condition (ii) and the local optimality of A implies that $|A_K| \geq |A|$, and thus O is not much better on K than A . From this, an easy computation concludes that A is a good approximation of the optimal solution O .

For example, in the case of VERTEX COVER or K_2 -HITTING SET, we can let $C(v) = \{v\}$ for each $v \in O \cup A$. Consider any edge $e = uv$ of G . If $\{u, v\} \cap A \setminus C^{-1}(K \setminus \partial K) \neq \emptyset$, then A_K hits e . Otherwise, since A is a vertex cover, we can assume $u \in A \cap C^{-1}(K \setminus \partial K)$. If $u \in O$, then $u \in O \cap C^{-1}(K)$ and again A_K hits e . Hence, suppose that $u \notin O$, and since O is a vertex cover, we have $v \in O$. Then $C(u)$ and $C(v)$ are adjacent in $G[\mathcal{C}]$, and since $C(u) \in K \setminus \partial K$, we have $C(v) \in K$. But then $v \in O \cap C^{-1}$, and A_K hits e . Therefore, A_K is also a vertex cover, and the condition (ii) holds.

To illustrate the difficulty with generalizing this idea to the proof of Theorem 1.3, consider the P_3 -HITTING SET problem. If $P = uvx$ is a 3-vertex path in G , A intersects P in u and O in v , then u and v would not necessarily be adjacent in the graph $G[\mathcal{C}]$ defined in the same way, and thus the condition (ii) could fail to hold. An obvious solution is to let $C(v)$ for $v \in O$ be not just a single vertex, but a subgraph of G of bounded radius. For example, letting $C(v)$ be the closed neighborhood $N[v]$ of v in G would ensure that $C(u)C(v) \in E(G[\mathcal{C}])$, which in turn would imply (ii). An issue is that then (i) might be false, since if a vertex z has many neighbors in O , it would belong to many sets of the system \mathcal{C} .

The observation that we use to solve this issue is that because G has bounded expansion, the number of vertices with many neighbors in O is small, say less than $\varepsilon|O|$, and instead of comparing A with the optimal solution O , we can compare it with a near-optimal solution O' consisting of O and the set O_1 of vertices of G with many neighbors in O . We can then define $C(v) = N[v] \setminus O_1$ for $v \in O$ and $C(v) = \{v\}$ for $v \in (A \cup O') \setminus O$. This system is thin, since a vertex z can belong to $C(v) \setminus \{v\}$ only for its neighbors $v \in O$ and only if $z \notin O_1$, and the number of such neighbors is small by the definition of O_1 . Moreover, this is sufficient to ensure that if $u \in A$ and $v \in O$ both intersect a 3-vertex path in G , then $C(u)$ has a neighbor $C(v')$ in $G[\mathcal{C}]$ with $v' \in O'$, where either $v' = v$, or v' is a neighbor of v in O_1 . This implies that both (i) and (ii) hold, and the framework of Har-Peled and Quanrud [75] applies.

For general bounded-diameter properties, we need to be somewhat more careful in selecting the elements of the shallow cover (selecting full neighborhoods up to the diameter of the property would work for (ii), but it is completely hopeless for (i)). However, with a little extra effort, this can be achieved by basing the elements of the cover on weak reachability in an ordering with bounded weak coloring number, similarly to the arguments from Section 2.1.

The proof of Theorem 1.5 is much less involved, and all its ideas come from [75]; we include it for completeness, as it is interesting and not explicitly formulated there.

2.3 Overview of the proofs of Theorems 1.6

As mentioned in Section 1.2, the main ingredient of Theorem 1.6 is an efficient algorithm for computing k -clique decompositions on graph classes of clique-dependent bounded expansion. Let \mathcal{G} be a hereditary graph class of clique-dependent bounded expansion, and $G \in \mathcal{G}$ be a graph. Our algorithm is based on a simple divide-and-conquer approach. We evenly divide $V(G)$ into two subsets V' and V'' . Then we recursively compute k -clique decompositions on $G[V']$ and $G[V'']$. Once

$G[V']$ and $G[V'']$ have been decomposed, we only need to further compute a k -clique decomposition on $G[V'_0 \cup V''_0]$, where V'_0 (resp., V''_0) is the part of $G[V']$ (resp., $G[V'']$) without k -cliques. As $G[V'_0]$ and $G[V''_0]$ do not contain k -cliques, $G[V'_0 \cup V''_0]$ does not contain $2k$ -cliques. Therefore, $G[V'_0 \cup V''_0] \in \mathcal{G}_{2k}$ where $\mathcal{G}_{2k} \subseteq \mathcal{G}$ consists of all graphs with maximum clique size at most $2k$. Since \mathcal{G} is of clique-dependent bounded expansion, \mathcal{G}_{2k} is of bounded expansion. Finding small subgraphs in bounded-expansion graph classes takes linear time [45]. It follows that computing a k -clique decomposition on $G[V'_0 \cup V''_0]$ can be done in $f(k) \cdot n$ time. A straightforward implementation of this approach takes $f(k) \cdot n \log n + O(m \log n)$ time. A more careful implementation using the algorithm of Harel and Tarjan [76] for finding lowest common ancestors can improve the running time to $f(k) \cdot n \log n + O(m)$ time.

3 Preliminaries

Basic notations. We use \mathbb{N} to denote the set $\{1, 2, 3, \dots\}$. For an integer $n \in \mathbb{N}$, $[n] = \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$. Let G be a graph. We use $V(G)$ and $E(G)$ to denote the set of vertices and the set of edges in G , respectively. For a vertex subset $S \subseteq V(G)$, $N_G(S) = \{u \in V(G) \setminus S : (u, x) \in E(G) \text{ for some } x \in S\}$ and $N_G[S] = N_G(S) \cup S$. A *subgraph* of G is a graph $G' = (V', E')$, denoted by $G' \subseteq G$, where $V' \subseteq V(G)$ and $E' \subseteq E(G)$. The graph G' is an *induced subgraph* of G , denoted by $G' \subseteq_{\text{in}} G$, if $E' = \{(u, v) \in E(G) : u \in V' \text{ and } v \in V'\}$. For a set $V \subseteq V(G)$, the notation $G[V]$ denotes the subgraph of G induced by V . The notation $\omega(G)$ denotes the size (i.e., number of vertices) of a maximum clique in G . For a graph G and a collection \mathcal{F} of graphs, we define

- $\mathcal{V}_{\mathcal{F}}(G) = \{V(G') : G' \text{ is a subgraph of } G \text{ isomorphic to some } F \in \mathcal{F}\}$,
- $\mathcal{V}_{\mathcal{F}}^{\text{in}}(G) = \{V(G') : G' \text{ is an induced subgraph of } G \text{ isomorphic to some } F \in \mathcal{F}\}$.

For a graph G , a vertex ordering σ is a bijection from $V(G)$ to $\{1, 2, \dots, |V(G)|\}$. For $u, v \in V(G)$, we write $u <_{\sigma} v$ if $\sigma(u) < \sigma(v)$. The notations $>_{\sigma}$, \leq_{σ} , \geq_{σ} are defined analogously. For a vertex subset $Y \subseteq V(G)$, we use $\max(Y, \sigma)$ to denote the vertex $x \in Y$ such that $\sigma(x) = \max_{y \in Y} \{\sigma(y)\}$. Here, we say that x is the largest vertex in Y under the ordering σ .

Set system and sunflowers. A *set system* refers to a collection \mathcal{S} of sets whose elements belong to the same ground set U . Let \mathcal{S} be a set system with ground set U . For a subset $U' \subseteq U$, we denote by $\mathcal{S} \upharpoonright U'$ the sub-collection of \mathcal{S} consisting of all sets that are contained in U' , i.e., $\mathcal{S} \upharpoonright U' = \{S \in \mathcal{S} : S \subseteq U'\}$.

An *r -sunflower* (for $r \geq 2$) in \mathcal{S} is a sub-collection $\mathcal{R} \subseteq \mathcal{S}$ of size r satisfying the follow condition: there exists $X \subseteq U$ such that $R \cap R' = X$ for any different sets $R, R' \in \mathcal{R}$; we call X the *core* of the sunflower \mathcal{R} . One of the most important results about sunflowers is the following sunflower lemma.

Lemma 3.1 (sunflower lemma). *Let \mathcal{S} be a set system in which every set is of size at most k . If $|\mathcal{S}| \geq (r-1)^k \cdot k!$, then there exists an r -sunflower in \mathcal{S} .*

Minors, graphs of bounded expansion, and weakly coloring number. For a graph G , and two vertices $u, v \in V(G)$, $\text{dist}_G(u, v)$ denotes the length of a shortest path from u to v in G . For a graph G , $\text{rad}(G)$ denotes the radius of G . That is, $\text{rad}(G) = \min_{u \in V(G)} \max_{x \in V(G)} \text{dist}_G(u, x)$

Definition 3.2 (minor). *A graph H is a **minor** of a graph G , denoted by $H \preceq G$, if there is a function ϕ from $V(H)$ to connected subgraphs of G such that following conditions hold.*

- For any two distinct vertices $u, v \in V(H)$, $V(\phi(u)) \cap V(\phi(v)) = \emptyset$.

- For any edge $(u, v) \in E(H)$, there exist $x \in V(\phi(u))$ and $y \in V(\phi(v))$ such that $(x, y) \in E(G)$.

The function ϕ is called the model of H in G .

Definition 3.3 (depth- r minor). Let r be a positive integer. A graph H is a **depth- r minor** of G , denoted by $H \preceq_r G$, if H is a minor of G with a model ϕ such that for all $v \in V(H)$, $\text{rad}(\phi(v)) \leq r$.

Definition 3.4 (bounded expansion and polynomial expansion). Let G be a graph and $r \geq 1$ be an integer. We define

$$\nabla_r(G) = \sup \left\{ \frac{|E(H)|}{|V(H)|} : H \preceq_r G \right\}.$$

We say that a graph class \mathcal{G} has **bounded expansion**, if there is a function $f : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ such that for all $r \in \mathbb{N}$ and $G \in \mathcal{G}$, $\nabla_r \leq f(r)$. We use $\nabla_r(\mathcal{G})$ to denote $\sup_{G \in \mathcal{G}} \nabla_r(G)$. If f is a polynomial function, then \mathcal{G} is a class of **polynomial expansion**.

Theorem 3.5 ([108]). Let \mathcal{G} be a graph class of bounded expansion and let H be a fixed graph. There is a linear time algorithm that given a graph $G \in \mathcal{G}$ and $S \subseteq V(G)$ and decides whether there is an (induced) subgraph G' of G containing at least one vertex from S and isomorphic to H .

Let G be a graph and σ be an ordering of the vertices of G . For an integer $r \geq 0$ and two vertices $u, v \in V(G)$, we say u is r -weakly reachable from v under σ if there exists a path π in G between v and u of length at most r such that $u \geq_\sigma w$ for any vertex w on π (in particular, $u \geq_\sigma v$). Let $\text{WR}_r(G, \sigma, v)$ denote the set of vertices in G that are r -weakly reachable from v under σ . The *weak r -coloring number* of G under σ is $\text{wcol}_r(G, \sigma) = \max_{v \in V(G)} |\text{WR}_r(G, \sigma, v)|$. Then the *weak r -coloring number* of G is defined as $\text{wcol}_r(G) = \min_{\sigma \in \Pi(G)} \text{wcol}_r(G, \sigma)$ where $\Pi(G)$ is the set of all orderings of the vertices of G .

Theorem 3.6 ([103, 138]). A graph class \mathcal{G} is of bounded expansion iff there exists a function $\chi_{\mathcal{G}} : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ such that $\text{wcol}_r(G) \leq \chi_{\mathcal{G}}(r)$ for all $G \in \mathcal{G}$ and $r \in \mathbb{N}$.

Theorem 3.7 ([113]). Let \mathcal{G} be a graph class of bounded expansion. Then there exists some constant $c_{\mathcal{G}}$ such that for any graph $G \in \mathcal{G}$ and any $V \subseteq V(G)$, we have $|\{N_G[\{v\}] \cap V : v \in V(G)\}| \leq c_{\mathcal{G}} \cdot |V|$.

Theorem 3.8 ([42]). Let \mathcal{G} be a graph class of bounded expansion. Given a graph $G \in \mathcal{G}$ and an integer $r \in [n]$, one can compute in $O(n)$ time an ordering σ of $V(G)$ satisfying $\text{wcol}_r(G, \sigma) \leq \text{wcol}_r^{r+1}(G)$ and a number α satisfying $\alpha \leq \text{wcol}_r(G) \leq \alpha^{r+1}$.

First-order model checking. We deal with first-order logic for graphs, where the variables correspond to vertices of the given graph. Let G be a graph and $Q \subseteq V(G)$ be a unary relation on $V(G)$, i.e., the set of variables. The first-order formulas over (G, Q) are built by combining three types of *atomic formulas*, defined as follows:

- Equality for variables u, v , denoted $u = v$: True iff u and v are equal (i.e., the same vertex).
- Adjacency for variables u, v , denoted $\text{Adj}(u, v)$: True iff u and v are adjacent in G .
- Q -satisfiability for a variable v , denoted by $Q(v)$: True iff v has the relation Q , i.e., $v \in Q$.

Then, combination is done based on the following constructions:

- Boolean connectives for formulas φ, ψ : And, denoted $\varphi \wedge \psi$, which is true if and only if both φ and ψ are true; Or, denoted $\varphi \vee \psi$, which is true if and only if at least one among φ and ψ is true; Not, denoted $\neg\varphi$, which is true if and only if φ is false.

- Quantification for formula φ and variable v : Exists, denoted $\exists v \varphi(v)$, which is true iff there exists a vertex in G so that, when it assigned to v , φ is true; For all, denoted $\forall v \varphi(v)$, which is true iff for every vertex in G , when it assigned to v , φ is true.

We shall use the following dynamic data structure for first-order model-checking on graphs of bounded expansion.

Theorem 3.9 ([45]). *Let \mathcal{G} be a graph class of bounded expansion. Given an n -vertex graph $G \in \mathcal{G}$, a unary relation $Q \subseteq V(G)$, and a first-order formula φ over (G, Q) , one can build in $O(n)$ time a data structure on G that supports the following operations (where f is some function):*

- Testing whether (G, Q) satisfies φ in $f(|\varphi|)$ time.
- Deleting an element from Q or deleting an edge from G with $f(|\varphi|)$ update time.
- Adding back an element to Q or adding back an edge to G with $f(|\varphi|)$ update time. Note that here one can only add elements (resp., edges) that were previously deleted from Q (resp., G).

4 Degree reduction and lossy kernels

In this section, we prove our degree-reduction theorem, which is restated below.

Theorem 1.1. *Let \mathcal{G} be any hereditary graph class of bounded expansion. If (INDUCED) SUBGRAPH HITTING on \mathcal{G} admits an approximation scheme with running time $f_0(\varepsilon, \mathcal{F}, \Delta) \cdot n^c$ for some function f_0 and some constant $c \geq 1$, then the same problem also admits an approximation scheme with running time $f(\varepsilon, \mathcal{F}) \cdot n^c$ for some function f , where n is the number of vertices in the input graph $G \in \mathcal{G}$ and Δ is the maximum degree of G .*

4.1 Reducing to connected forbidden patterns

Our first step is to reduce the (INDUCED) SUBGRAPH HITTING with general forbidden patterns to the same problem with *connected* forbidden patterns. For a graph F , let \mathcal{C}_F denote the set of connected components of F (which is a set of connected graphs). For a finite set $\mathcal{F} = \{F_1, \dots, F_m\}$ of graphs, define $\text{Conn}(\mathcal{F}) = \{\{C_1, \dots, C_m\} : C_i \in \mathcal{C}_{F_i}\}$, that is, $\text{Conn}(\mathcal{F})$ consists of all sets \mathcal{F}' of graphs where \mathcal{F}' can be constructed by including exactly one graph in \mathcal{C}_F for each $F \in \mathcal{F}$. For a graph G and for a finite set of graph \mathcal{F} , we use $\text{opt}(G, \mathcal{F})$ and $\text{opt}^*(G, \mathcal{F})$ to denote the cardinalities of the optimum solutions to (G, \mathcal{F}) for the problems SUBGRAPH HITTING and INDUCED SUBGRAPH HITTING, respectively. We have the following observation for SUBGRAPH HITTING.

Lemma 4.1. *For every finite set \mathcal{F} of graphs, there exists a number $\alpha_{\mathcal{F}}$ such that for any graph G , we have $\text{opt}(G, \mathcal{F}') \leq \text{opt}(G, \mathcal{F}) + \alpha_{\mathcal{F}}$ for some $\mathcal{F}' \in \text{Conn}(\mathcal{F})$. Here, $\alpha_{\mathcal{F}} = |\mathcal{F}| \cdot \ell \cdot c^2$, where ℓ is the maximum number of connected components in a graph F in \mathcal{F} and c is the maximum number of vertices in a connected component of a graph in \mathcal{F} .*

Proof. Let S be an optimum solution for the SUBGRAPH HITTING problem on (G, \mathcal{F}) . Now we claim that for each $F \in \mathcal{F}$, there is a connected component D_F in \mathcal{C}_F such that the maximum number of vertex disjoint subgraphs of $G - S$ that are isomorphic to D_F is at most $\ell \cdot c$. Towards the proof let us fix a graph $F \in \mathcal{F}$. Let $C_1, \dots, C_{\ell'}$ be the connected components of F . For the sake of contradiction, assume that for all $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, \ell'\}$, the maximum number of vertex disjoint subgraphs of $G - S$ that are isomorphic to C_i is strictly more than $\ell \cdot c$. Now we explain a procedure to obtain a subgraph in $G - S$ that is isomorphic to F which will be a contradiction to the fact

that S is a solution for SUBGRAPH HITTING on (G, \mathcal{F}) . First, we pick a subgraph H_1 of $G - S$ that is isomorphic to C_1 . Since $|V(H_1)| \leq c$, for all $j \in \{2, \dots, \ell'\}$, there are strictly more than $(\ell - 1)c$ vertex disjoint subgraphs of $G_1 = G - (S \cup V(H_1))$ that are isomorphic to C_j . Next, we pick a subgraph H_2 of G_1 that is isomorphic to C_2 . At the end of step i , we have vertex disjoint subgraphs H_1, H_2, \dots, H_i of $G - S$ such that for all $i' \in \{1, 2, \dots, i\}$, $H_{i'}$ is isomorphic to $C_{i'}$ and for all $j \in \{i + 1, \dots, \ell'\}$, there are strictly more than $(\ell - i)c$ vertex disjoint subgraphs of $G_i = G - (S \cup \bigcup_{r \in [i]} V(H_r))$ that are isomorphic to C_j . In step $i + 1$, we pick a subgraph H_{i+1} of G_i that is isomorphic to C_{j+1} . Thus, since $\ell' \leq \ell$, at the end of step ℓ' we get vertex disjoint subgraphs $H_1, H_2, \dots, H_{\ell'}$ of $G - S$ such that for all $r \in \{1, 2, \dots, \ell'\}$, H_r is isomorphic to C_r . This implies that F is a subgraph of $G - S$ which is a contradiction.

Thus, we have proved that for each $F \in \mathcal{F}$, there is a connected component D_F in \mathcal{C}_F such that the maximum number of vertex disjoint subgraphs of $G - S$ that are isomorphic to D_F is at most $\ell \cdot c$. Then, for each $F \in \mathcal{F}$, there is a vertex subset S_F of $V(G) \setminus S$, of size at most ℓc^2 such that S_F intersects with all the subgraphs of $G - S$ that are isomorphic to D_F . This implies that $S^* = S \cup \bigcup_{F \in \mathcal{F}} S_F$ is a solution for SUBGRAPH HITTING on (G, \mathcal{F}') where $\mathcal{F}' = \{D_F : F \in \mathcal{F}\}$ and $|S^*| \leq |S| + |\mathcal{F}| \cdot \ell \cdot c^2 = \text{opt}(G, \mathcal{F}) + \alpha_{\mathcal{F}}$. Here, $\alpha_{\mathcal{F}} = |\mathcal{F}| \cdot \ell \cdot c^2$. \square

For INDUCED SUBGRAPH HITTING, we can have a result similar to the above lemma. However, it only applies to sparse graphs, or more precisely, graphs of bounded degeneracy.

Lemma 4.2. *For every graph G of degeneracy d and every finite set \mathcal{F} of graphs, there exists a number $\alpha_{\mathcal{F}}^*$ (depending on \mathcal{F} and d) such that $\text{opt}^*(G, \mathcal{F}') \leq \text{opt}^*(G, \mathcal{F}) + \alpha_{\mathcal{F}}^*$ for some $\mathcal{F}' \in \text{Conn}(\mathcal{F})$. Here, $\alpha_{\mathcal{F}}^* = |\mathcal{F}| \ell^2 c^3 d$, where ℓ is the maximum number of connected components in a graph F in \mathcal{F} and c is the maximum number of vertices in a connected component of a graph in \mathcal{F} .*

Proof. The proof strategy is similar to the proof of Lemma 4.1. But, here we use the fact that the degeneracy of G is d . Let S be an optimum solution for the INDUCED SUBGRAPH HITTING problem on (G, \mathcal{F}) . First, we claim that for each $F \in \mathcal{F}$, there is a connected component D_F in \mathcal{C}_F such that the maximum number of vertex disjoint induced subgraphs of $G - S$ that are isomorphic to D_F is at most $\ell^2 c^2 d$. Towards the proof of the claim, we fix a graph $F \in \mathcal{F}$ and let $C_1, \dots, C_{\ell'}$ be the connected components of F . Suppose the claim is not true. Then, for all $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, \ell'\}$, the maximum number of vertex disjoint induced subgraphs of $G - S$ that are isomorphic to C_i is strictly more than $\ell^2 c^2 d$. Then, we explain a procedure to obtain an induced subgraph isomorphic to F in $G - S$, leading to a contradiction to the fact that S is a solution for INDUCED SUBGRAPH HITTING on (G, \mathcal{F}) .

Let $p = \ell \cdot c \cdot d$. As a first step we construct sets of induced subgraphs $\mathcal{I}_1, \dots, \mathcal{I}_{\ell'}$ of $G - S$ such that the graphs in $\bigcup_{i \in [\ell']} \mathcal{I}_i$ are pairwise vertex disjoint and for each $i \in \{1, \dots, \ell'\}$, $|\mathcal{I}_i| = p$ and the graphs in \mathcal{I}_i are isomorphic to C_i . Towards that, we pick a set of p vertex disjoint induced subgraphs $\mathcal{I}_1 = \{H_{1,1}, H_{1,2}, \dots, H_{1,p}\}$ of $G - S$ that are isomorphic to C_1 . Since $|V(H_{1,r})| \leq c$ for all $r \in \{1, 2, \dots, p\}$, there are strictly more than $\ell^2 c^2 d - (p \cdot c)$ vertex disjoint induced subgraphs of $G_1 = G - (S \cup V_1)$ that are isomorphic to C_j for all $j \in \{2, \dots, \ell'\}$, where $V_1 = \bigcup_{H \in \mathcal{I}_1} V(H)$. Next, we pick a set of p induced subgraphs $\mathcal{I}_2 = \{H_{2,1}, \dots, H_{2,p}\}$ of G_1 that are isomorphic to C_2 . In general, at the end of step i , we have sets $\mathcal{I}_1, \dots, \mathcal{I}_i$ of induced subgraphs of $G - S$ such that the following properties holds.

- For each $j \in \{1, 2, \dots, i\}$, $|\mathcal{I}_j| = p$ and each graph in \mathcal{I}_j is isomorphic to C_j .
- The induced graphs of $G - S$ in $\mathcal{H}_{\leq i} = \bigcup_{j \in [i]} \mathcal{I}_j$ are pairwise vertex disjoint.
- For any $j \in \{i + 1, \dots, \ell\}$ there are strictly more than $\ell^2 c^2 d - (p \cdot i \cdot c) = d \ell c^2 (\ell - i)$ vertex disjoint induced subgraphs of $G_i = G - (S \cup \bigcup_{H \in \mathcal{H}_{\leq i}} V(H))$ that are isomorphic to C_j .

In step $i + 1$, we pick a set of p vertex disjoint induced subgraphs $\mathcal{I}_{i+1} = \{H_{i+1,1}, \dots, H_{i+1,p}\}$ of G_i that are isomorphic to C_{i+1} . Thus, since $\ell' \leq \ell$, at the end of step ℓ' , we obtain a set of vertex disjoint induced subgraphs $\mathcal{H}_{\leq \ell'} = \bigcup_{r \in [\ell']} \mathcal{I}_r$ of $G - S$. Notice that for any $i \in [\ell']$, the graphs in \mathcal{I}_i are isomorphic to C_i .

Next, for each $i \in [\ell']$, we identify a graph J_i from \mathcal{I}_i such that there is no edge in G between any two vertices from distinct J_i and $J_{i'}$. In other words, $J_1 \cup J_2 \cup \dots \cup J_{\ell'}$ form an induced subgraph of $G - S$ that is isomorphic to F which will be a contradiction. Let G^* be the subgraph of $G - S$ induced on the union of the vertices of the graphs in $\mathcal{H}_{\leq \ell'}$. Notice that the number of vertices in each graph in $\mathcal{H}_{\leq \ell'}$ is at most c . Since $G - S$ (and hence G^*) has degeneracy at most d , there is a graph $J \in \mathcal{H}_{\leq \ell'}$ such that $\delta_{G^*}(V(J)) \leq c \cdot d$. Let $i_1 \in [\ell']$ be the index such that $J \in \mathcal{I}_{i_1}$. Now, we set $J_{i_1} = J$. Let G_1^* be the subgraph of G^* induced on the union of the vertices of the graphs H in $\mathcal{H}_{\leq \ell'} \setminus \mathcal{I}_{i_1}$ such that no vertex in H is adjacent to a vertex in J_{i_1} . Notice that for each $j \in \{1, 2, \dots, \ell'\} \setminus \{i_1\}$, there are at least $p - (c \cdot d)$ graphs in $\{H \in \mathcal{I}_j : V(H) \cap N(V(J_{i_1})) = \emptyset\}$. Now, there is an index $i_2 \in \{1, 2, \dots, \ell'\} \setminus \{i_1\}$ and a graph J_{i_2} in $\{H \in \mathcal{I}_{i_2} : V(H) \cap N(V(J_{i_1})) = \emptyset\}$ such that $\delta_{G_1^*}(V(J_{i_2})) \leq c \cdot d$. We continue this process, and at the end of step j , we have j distinct indices i_1, i_2, \dots, i_j and graphs $J_{i_1} \in \mathcal{I}_{i_1}, J_{i_2} \in \mathcal{I}_{i_2}, \dots, J_{i_j} \in \mathcal{I}_{i_j}$ with the following properties.

- There do not exist two distinct indices s and t in $\{i_1, i_2, \dots, i_j\}$ such that there is an edge in G between a vertex in $V(J_s)$ and a vertex in $V(J_t)$.
- For each $j' \in \{1, 2, \dots, q\} \setminus \{i_1, i_2, \dots, i_j\}$, $|\{H \in \mathcal{I}_{j'} : V(H) \cap N(\bigcup_{r \in [j]} V(J_{i_r})) = \emptyset\}|$ is at least $p - (j \cdot c \cdot d)$.

Then, we find an index i_{j+1} and a graph $J_{j+1} \in \mathcal{I}_{j+1}$ such that no vertex in $V(J_{j+1})$ is adjacent to a vertex in $\bigcup_{r \in [j]} V(J_{i_r})$ and $\delta_{G_j^*}(V(J_{j+1})) \leq c \cdot d$. Here, G_j^* is the graph induced on the union of the vertices in the graphs H in $\mathcal{H}_{\leq \ell'} \setminus (\bigcup_{r \in [j]} \mathcal{I}_{i_r})$ such that no vertex in $V(H)$ is adjacent to a vertex in $\bigcup_{r \in [j]} V(J_{i_r})$. Thus, at the end of step ℓ' , we obtain $J_1 \in \mathcal{I}_1, J_2 \in \mathcal{I}_2, \dots, J_{\ell'} \in \mathcal{I}_{\ell'}$ with the following property. There do not exist two distinct indices s and t in $\{1, 2, \dots, \ell'\}$ such that there is an edge in G between a vertex in $V(J_s)$ and a vertex in $V(J_t)$. This implies that the subgraph of $G - S$ induced on $\bigcup_{r \in [\ell']} V(J_r)$ is isomorphic to F . This is a contradiction to the fact that S is a solution.

Thus, we have proved that for each $F \in \mathcal{F}$, there is a connected component D_F in \mathcal{C}_F such that the maximum number of vertex disjoint induced subgraphs of $G - S$ that are isomorphic to D_F is at most $\ell^2 c^2 d$. Then, for each $F \in \mathcal{F}$, there is a vertex subset S_F of $V(G) \setminus S$, of size at most $\ell^2 c^3 d$ such that S_F intersects with all the induced subgraphs of $G - S$ that are isomorphic to D_F . This implies that $S^* = S \cup \bigcup_{F \in \mathcal{F}} S_F$ is a solution for INDUCED SUBGRAPH HITTING on (G, \mathcal{F}') where $\mathcal{F}' = \{D_F : F \in \mathcal{F}\}$ and $|S^*| \leq |S| + |\mathcal{F}| \ell^2 c^3 d = \text{opt}^*(G, \mathcal{F}) + \alpha_{\mathcal{F}}^*$. Here $\alpha_{\mathcal{F}}^* = |\mathcal{F}| \ell^2 c^3 d$. \square

Using the above two lemmas, we can do our reduction from general forbidden patterns to connected forbidden patterns.

Corollary 4.3. *Let \mathcal{G} be any graph class of bounded expansion. If (INDUCED) SUBGRAPH HITTING on \mathcal{G} with connected forbidden patterns admits an approximation scheme with running time $f_0(\varepsilon, \mathcal{F}) \cdot n^c$ for some function f_0 , then (INDUCED) SUBGRAPH HITTING on \mathcal{G} (with arbitrary forbidden patterns) admits an approximation scheme with running time $f(\varepsilon, \mathcal{F}) \cdot n^c$ for some function f .*

Proof. We prove the lemma for SUBGRAPH HITTING and the case for (INDUCED) SUBGRAPH HITTING is identical and hence omitted. Let \mathcal{A} be an algorithm that given (G, \mathcal{F}) and $\varepsilon > 0$, outputs a $(1 + \varepsilon)$ approximate solution for SUBGRAPH HITTING on (G, \mathcal{F}) , where \mathcal{F} is a set of connected forbidden patterns.

Now, we design an algorithm \mathcal{A}' using \mathcal{A} when the forbidden patterns in \mathcal{F} are arbitrary. Let (G, \mathcal{F}) be the input and $\varepsilon > 0$ be the given error parameter. Recall that $\text{Conn}(\mathcal{F}) = \{\{C_1, \dots, C_m\} : C_i \in \mathcal{C}_{F_i}\}$. Notice that for any $\mathcal{F}_1 \in \text{Conn}(\mathcal{F})$ a solution for SUBGRAPH HITTING on (G, \mathcal{F}_1) is also a solution to (G, \mathcal{F}) . Moreover, by Lemma 4.1 we know that there exist a constant $\alpha_{\mathcal{F}}$ (which is computable) and $\mathcal{F}' \in \text{Conn}(\mathcal{F})$ such that $\text{opt}(G, \mathcal{F}') \leq \text{opt}(G, \mathcal{F}) + \alpha_{\mathcal{F}}$. First, we test whether $\text{opt}(G, \mathcal{F}) \leq \frac{5}{\varepsilon} \alpha_{\mathcal{F}}$ and if so, we compute an optimum solution. Towards that, we can design a simple branching algorithm running in time $g(\mathcal{F}) \cdot n$ using Theorem 3.5, for some function g . That is, find a subgraph G' of G isomorphic to a graph in \mathcal{F} and for each $v \in V(G')$, recursively find a solution to $(G - v, \mathcal{F})$ (if there is a solution of size at most $\frac{5}{\varepsilon} \alpha_{\mathcal{F}} - 1$) and output the best solution. Now on, we assume that $\text{opt}(G, \mathcal{F}) > \frac{5}{\varepsilon} \alpha_{\mathcal{F}}$.

Now, by Lemma 4.1, we know that there exists $\mathcal{F}' \in \text{Conn}(\mathcal{F})$ such that $\text{opt}(G, \mathcal{F}') \leq \text{opt}(G, \mathcal{F}) + \alpha_{\mathcal{F}} \leq (1 + \frac{\varepsilon}{5}) \text{opt}(G, \mathcal{F})$. Hence a $(1 + \frac{\varepsilon}{5})$ -approximate solution to (G, \mathcal{F}') is a $(1 + \varepsilon)$ -approximate solution to (G, \mathcal{F}) . Thus, for each $\mathcal{F}_1 \in \text{Conn}(\mathcal{F})$, we run the algorithm \mathcal{A} (because \mathcal{F}_1 is a set of connected graphs) and output the best solution among them.

Notice that the number of times we run \mathcal{A} is $|\text{Conn}(\mathcal{F})|$ which is bounded by a function of \mathcal{F} . Thus, the total running time of our algorithm is $f(\varepsilon, \mathcal{F}) \cdot n^c$ for some function f . \square

4.2 Algorithm for connected forbidden patterns

Based on the discussion in the previous section, it suffices to design an $f(\varepsilon, \mathcal{F}) \cdot n^c$ -time approximation scheme for (INDUCED) SUBGRAPH HITTING on \mathcal{G} with connected forbidden patterns, provided an approximation scheme for the same problem running in $f_0(\varepsilon, \mathcal{F}, \Delta) \cdot n^c$ time (for convenience, we call it the *degree-sensitive* approximation scheme). We denote by HITTING' the provided degree-sensitive approximation scheme, where HITTING'(G, F, ε) returns a $(1 + \varepsilon)$ -approximation solution for the (INDUCED) SUBGRAPH HITTING instance (G, \mathcal{F}) .

Let (G, \mathcal{F}) be the input where $G \in \mathcal{G}$, and $\varepsilon > 0$ be the approximation ratio. Suppose all graphs in \mathcal{F} are connected. Set $n = |V(G)|$ and $\gamma = \max_{F \in \mathcal{F}} |V(F)|$. Our approximation schemes for SUBGRAPH HITTING and INDUCED SUBGRAPH HITTING are essentially identical, so we show them together in Algorithm 1. At the beginning, we define $\mathcal{V} := \mathcal{V}_{\mathcal{F}}(G)$ for SUBGRAPH HITTING and $\mathcal{V} := \mathcal{V}_{\mathcal{F}}^{\text{in}}(G)$ for INDUCED SUBGRAPH HITTING (line 1). After this, every step is the same for SUBGRAPH HITTING and INDUCED SUBGRAPH HITTING (the underlying problem of the two sub-routines HITTING' and HITTING'' is always the same as the problem we are solving).

Let $\delta = O_{\varepsilon, \mathcal{F}}(1)$ and $\delta' = O_{\varepsilon, \mathcal{F}}(1)$ be two parameters to be determined later. Besides defining \mathcal{V} , we also define a collection Γ_H and a set R_H for every induced subgraph H of G , where Γ_H consists of all nonempty subsets $X \subseteq V(H)$ that is the core of a δ -sunflower in $\mathcal{V} \cap V(H)$ and R_H consists of all vertices $v \in V(H)$ such that every $V \in \mathcal{V} \cap V(H)$ with $v \in V$ contains some set in $\Gamma_{H - \{v\}}$. Note that in line 1 we only define (conceptually) these sets instead of computing them; in fact, we cannot afford to compute them and also do not need to. In line 2-5, we construct an induced subgraph G_1 of G . Initially, we set $G_1 = G$. Whenever $R_{G_1} \neq \emptyset$, we arbitrarily pick $v \in R_{G_1}$ and remove it from G_1 . We keep doing this until $R_{G_1} = \emptyset$. Note that G_1 is changing during this procedure and hence R_{G_1} is also changing accordingly. Next, in line 6-7, we in turn construct an induced subgraph G_2 of G_1 . This construction is simply removing all large-degree vertices from G_1 , using δ' as the threshold. Specifically, we define $G_2 = G_1 - V^*$ where $V^* \subseteq V(G_1)$ consists of all vertices in G_1 of degree at least δ' .

The rest of the algorithm (lines 8-14) is dedicated to computing a solution for the instance (G, \mathcal{F}) . This is done backwards: we first compute a solution $S_2 \subseteq V(G_2)$ for (G_2, \mathcal{F}) , then use it to obtain a solution $S_1 \subseteq V(G_1)$ for (G_1, \mathcal{F}) and in turn obtain the desired solution $S \subseteq V(G)$ for (G, \mathcal{F}) . Note that the maximum degree of G_2 is bounded by $\delta' = O_{\varepsilon, \mathcal{F}}(1)$. Furthermore, $G_2 \in \mathcal{G}$, as

Algorithm 1 HITTING($G, \mathcal{F}, \varepsilon$)

```
1:  $\mathcal{V} := \mathcal{V}_{\mathcal{F}}(G)$  for SUBGRAPH HITTING and  $\mathcal{V} := \mathcal{V}_{\mathcal{F}}^{\text{in}}(G)$  for INDUCED SUBGRAPH HITTING
    $\Gamma_H := \{X \subseteq V(H) : X \neq \emptyset \text{ is the core of a } \delta\text{-sunflower in } \mathcal{V} \cap V(H)\}$  for  $H \subseteq_{\text{in}} G$ 
    $R_H := \{v \in V(H) : \text{every } V \in \mathcal{V} \cap V(H) \text{ with } v \in V \text{ contains some } X \in \Gamma_{H-\{v\}}\}$  for  $H \subseteq_{\text{in}} G$ 
2:  $G_1 \leftarrow G$ 
3: while  $R_{G_1} \neq \emptyset$  do
4:    $v \leftarrow$  an arbitrary vertex in  $R_{G_1}$ 
5:    $G_1 \leftarrow G_1 - \{v\}$ 
6:  $V^* \leftarrow \{v \in V(G_1) : \deg_{G_1}(v) \geq \delta'\}$ 
7:  $G_2 \leftarrow G_1 - V^*$ 
8:  $S_2 \leftarrow \text{HITTING}'(G_2, \mathcal{F}, \varepsilon/4)$  ▷ a solution of  $(G_2, \mathcal{F})$ 
9:  $S_1 \leftarrow S_2 \cup V^*$  ▷ a solution of  $(G_1, \mathcal{F})$ 
10:  $\sigma \leftarrow \text{ORDER}(G, \gamma)$  ▷ applying Theorem 3.8
11:  $S \leftarrow S_1$ 
12: while  $\exists v \in V(G) \setminus S$  such that  $\rho(v, S) \geq \delta - \text{wcol}_{\gamma}(G, \sigma)$  do
13:    $S \leftarrow S \cup \{v\}$ 
14: return  $S$  ▷ a solution of  $(G, \mathcal{F})$ 
```

\mathcal{G} is hereditary. Thus, we can use the degree-sensitive approximation scheme HITTING' to efficiently compute S_2 (line 8). Here we choose the approximation ratio of S_2 to be $1 + \frac{\varepsilon}{4}$. Then we simply define $S_1 = S_2 \cap V^*$ (line 9). Since $G_1 - S_1 = G_2 - S_2$, S_1 is a solution for (G_1, \mathcal{F}) . To further compute the solution S for (G, \mathcal{F}) is more complicated. We first apply the algorithm of Theorem 3.8 on G and $r = \gamma$ to obtain an ordering σ of the vertices of G (line 10). For a vertex $v \in V(G)$ and a set $A \subseteq V(G)$, we write $\rho(v, A) = |\{u \in A : v \in \text{WR}_{\gamma}(G, \sigma, u)\}|$, i.e., the number of vertices $u \in A$ such that v is weakly reachable from u under σ within distance γ . Then we construct S iteratively as follows. Initially, set $S = S_1$ (line 11). Whenever there exists a vertex $v \in V(G) \setminus S$ such that $\rho(v, S) \geq \delta - \text{wcol}_{\gamma}(G, \sigma)$, we add it to S . We keep doing this until we cannot find such a vertex v . Note that S is changing during this procedure, and hence $\rho(v, S)$ might also change. When the procedure terminates, we return S (line 14). Later we will see that S is a solution for (G, \mathcal{F}) .

In the following sections, we analyze the correctness of Algorithm 1 and show how to implement it with the desired running time.

4.3 Analysis

In this section, we analyze the correctness of Algorithm 1. We shall show that if the parameters δ and δ' are chosen properly, then the set S returned by Algorithm 1 is a $(1 + \varepsilon)$ -approximation solution for the instance (G, \mathcal{F}) . For convenience, for every induced subgraph H of G , we write $\text{opt}(H)$ as the minimum size of a hitting set of $\mathcal{V} \cap V(H)$. Clearly, $\text{opt}(H)$ is the optimum for the instance (H, \mathcal{F}) . Throughout the analysis, we only one basic properties of \mathcal{V} (which hold no matter whether $\mathcal{V} = \mathcal{V}_{\mathcal{F}}(G)$ or $\mathcal{V} = \mathcal{V}_{\mathcal{F}}^{\text{in}}(G)$): $G[V]$ is connected for all $V \in \mathcal{V}$. As such, we do not need to distinguish the cases $\mathcal{V} = \mathcal{V}_{\mathcal{F}}(G)$ and $\mathcal{V} = \mathcal{V}_{\mathcal{F}}^{\text{in}}(G)$, and can do the analysis for SUBGRAPH HITTING and INDUCED SUBGRAPH HITTING simultaneously.

4.3.1 From S_1 to S

We first show that if the parameter δ is chosen properly and S_1 is a $(1 + \frac{\varepsilon}{2})$ -approximation solution of (G_1, \mathcal{F}) , then S is a $(1 + \varepsilon)$ -approximation solution of (G, \mathcal{F}) . The following lemma gives a bound on the size of S .

Lemma 4.4. $|S \setminus S_1| \leq \frac{\text{wcol}_\gamma(G, \sigma)}{\delta - \text{wcol}_\gamma(G, \sigma)} \cdot |S|$ and thus $|S| \leq \left(1 + \frac{\text{wcol}_\gamma(G, \sigma)}{\delta - 2\text{wcol}_\gamma(G, \sigma)}\right) \cdot |S_1|$.

Proof. By the definition of weakly reachability, $|\text{WR}_\gamma(G, \sigma, v)| \leq \text{wcol}_\gamma(G, \sigma)$ for all $v \in V(G)$. For every vertex $v \in V(G)$, $\rho(v, S)$ is equal to the number of pairs (u, v) such that $u \in S$ and $v \in \text{WR}_\gamma(G, \sigma, u)$. Therefore,

$$\sum_{v \in V(G)} \rho(v, S) = \sum_{u \in S} |\text{WR}_\gamma(G, \sigma, u)| \leq \text{wcol}_\gamma(G, \sigma) \cdot |S|.$$

In particular, $\sum_{v \in S \setminus S_1} \rho(v, S) \leq \text{wcol}_\gamma(G, \sigma) \cdot |S|$. For every $v \in S \setminus S_1$, $\rho(v, S) \geq \delta - \text{wcol}_\gamma(G, \sigma)$ when we add v to S in line 13, and thus we also have $\rho(v, S) \geq \delta - \text{wcol}_\gamma(G, \sigma)$ after the entire while-loop (line 12-13). Therefore, $\sum_{v \in S \setminus S_1} \rho(v, S) \geq (\delta - \text{wcol}_\gamma(G, \sigma)) \cdot |S \setminus S_1|$. It follows that

$$(\delta - \text{wcol}_\gamma(G, \sigma)) \cdot |S \setminus S_1| \leq \sum_{v \in S \setminus S_1} \rho(v, S) \leq \text{wcol}_\gamma(G, \sigma) \cdot |S|,$$

and hence $|S \setminus S_1| \leq \frac{\text{wcol}_\gamma(G, \sigma)}{\delta - \text{wcol}_\gamma(G, \sigma)} \cdot |S|$. This further implies that $|S_1| \geq \left(1 - \frac{\text{wcol}_\gamma(G, \sigma)}{\delta - \text{wcol}_\gamma(G, \sigma)}\right) \cdot |S|$. So we finally have $|S| \leq \left(1 + \frac{\text{wcol}_\gamma(G, \sigma)}{\delta - 2\text{wcol}_\gamma(G, \sigma)}\right) \cdot |S_1|$. \square

Next, we show that S is truly a solution of (G, \mathcal{F}) . Equivalently, we need to show that S hits all sets in \mathcal{V} . Suppose the while-loop in line 3-5 has r iterations, and let v_i denote the vertex removed from G_1 in the i -th iteration for $i \in [r]$. Then $G_1 = G - \{v_1, \dots, v_r\}$. Define $H_i = G - \{v_1, \dots, v_{r-i}\}$ for $i \in \{0\} \cup [r]$. Note that $H_r = G$ and $H_0 = G_1$.

Lemma 4.5. *Suppose S_1 is a solution for (G_1, \mathcal{F}) . Then for every $i \in \{0\} \cup [r]$, S hits all sets in $\mathcal{V} \cap V(H_i)$. In particular, S hits all sets in \mathcal{V} .*

Proof. We apply induction on i . When $i = 0$, the statement trivially holds, since $H_0 = G_1$ and the sets in $\mathcal{V} \cap V(G_1)$ are all hit by S_1 (and thus by S) according to our assumption. Suppose the statement holds for $i - 1$, and we shall show it also holds for i . We first show that S hits all sets in $\Gamma_{H_{i-1}}$. Consider a set $X \in \Gamma_{H_{i-1}}$, and assume $X \cap S = \emptyset$ in order to deduce a contradiction. By definition, X is the core of a sunflower $V_1, \dots, V_\delta \in \mathcal{V} \cap V(H_{i-1})$. Let $v^* \in X$ be the largest vertex under the ordering σ , i.e., $v^* \geq_\sigma v$ for all $v \in X$. Define I as the set of all indices $i \in [\delta]$ such that all vertices in V_i are smaller than or equal to v^* under the ordering σ . For each $i \in [\delta]$, let $v_i \in V_i$ denote the largest vertex under σ . Note that the induced subgraph $G[V_i]$ is connected, as $V_i \in \mathcal{V}$. So there exists a path π_i in $G[V_i]$ of length at most $|V_i| \leq \gamma$ which connects v^* and v_i . Since v_i is the largest vertex in V_i , it is also the largest vertex on π_i , which implies $v_i \in \text{WR}_\gamma(G, \sigma, v^*)$. By the definition of I , we have $v_i >_\sigma v^*$ for all $i \in [\delta] \setminus I$ and thus $v_i \in V_i \setminus X$, since v^* is the largest vertex in X under the ordering σ . Therefore, the vertices v_i for $i \in [\delta] \setminus I$ are distinct, and there are $\delta - |I|$ such vertices. Using the fact that all these vertices are contained in $\text{WR}_\gamma(G, \sigma, v^*)$, we have

$$\delta - |I| \leq |\text{WR}_\gamma(G, \sigma, v^*)| \leq \text{wcol}_\gamma(G, \sigma).$$

Equivalently, $|I| \geq \delta - \text{wcol}_\gamma(G, \sigma)$. As $X \cap S = \emptyset$, we must have $(V_i \setminus X) \cap S \neq \emptyset$ for all $i \in [\delta]$, because S is a hitting set of $\mathcal{V} \cap V(H_{i-1})$ and thus hits V_1, \dots, V_δ . For each $i \in [\delta]$, we pick a vertex

$p_i \in (V_i \setminus X) \cap S$. Note that the vertices p_1, \dots, p_δ are distinct, since $V_1 \setminus X, \dots, V_\delta \setminus X$ are disjoint. We claim that $v^* \in \text{WR}_\gamma(G, \sigma, p_i)$ for all $i \in I$. Indeed, if $i \in I$, then v^* is the largest vertex in V_i under σ . Since $G[V_i]$ is connected, there is a path in $G[V_i]$ of length at most $|V_i| \leq \gamma$ which connects p_i and v^* . On this path, v^* is the largest vertex, which implies $v^* \in \text{WR}_\gamma(G, \sigma, p_i)$. It follows that $\rho(v^*, S) \geq |I|$, as the vertices p_1, \dots, p_δ are distinct. Recall that $|I| \geq \delta - \text{wcol}_\gamma(G, \sigma)$. Therefore, $\rho(v^*, S) \geq \delta - \text{wcol}_\gamma(G, \sigma)$. This implies $v^* \in S$, for otherwise v^* will be added to S during the while-loop in line 12-13. However, this contradicts with our assumption $X \cap S = \emptyset$. So we conclude that S hits all sets in $\Gamma_{H_{i-1}}$.

To complete the induction argument, we need to further show that S hits all sets in $\mathcal{V} \pitchfork V(H_i)$. Set $v = v_{r-i+1}$. Then $H_{i-1} = H_i - \{v\}$. Consider a set $V \in \mathcal{V} \pitchfork V(H_i)$. If $v \notin V$, then $V \in \mathcal{V} \pitchfork V(H_{i-1})$ and V is hit by S according to our induction hypothesis. So assume $v \in V$. Note that $v \in R_{H_i}$, since in the while-loop in line 3-5 we removed v from H_i to obtain H_{i-1} . By the definition of R_{H_i} and the fact $v \in V$, there exists $X \in \Gamma_{H_i - \{v\}} = \Gamma_{H_{i-1}}$ such that $X \subseteq V$. As shown above, $X \cap S \neq \emptyset$, which implies $V \cap S \neq \emptyset$. Therefore, S hits all sets in $\mathcal{V} \pitchfork V(H_i)$. Finally, apply the statement with $i = r$, we conclude that S hits all sets in $\mathcal{V} \pitchfork V(H_r) = \mathcal{V}$. \square

Corollary 4.6. *If $\delta \geq \frac{2+3\varepsilon}{\varepsilon} \cdot \text{wcol}_\gamma^{\gamma+1}(G)$ and S_1 is a $(1 + \frac{\varepsilon}{2})$ -approximation solution for the instance (G_1, \mathcal{F}) , then S is a $(1 + \varepsilon)$ -approximation solution for the instance (G, \mathcal{F}) .*

Proof. By Lemma 4.5, S is a hitting set of \mathcal{V} and thus a solution of (G, \mathcal{F}) . By Theorem 3.8, we have $\text{wcol}_\gamma(G, \sigma) \leq \text{wcol}_\gamma^{\gamma+1}(G)$. If $\delta \geq \frac{2+3\varepsilon}{\varepsilon} \cdot \text{wcol}_\gamma^{\gamma+1}(G)$, then Lemma 4.4 implies

$$|S| \leq \left(1 + \frac{\text{wcol}_\gamma(G, \sigma)}{\delta - 2\text{wcol}_\gamma(G, \sigma)}\right) \cdot |S_1| \leq \left(1 + \frac{\text{wcol}_\gamma^{\gamma+1}(G)}{\delta - 2\text{wcol}_\gamma^{\gamma+1}(G)}\right) \cdot |S_1| \leq \left(1 + \frac{\varepsilon}{2 + \varepsilon}\right) \cdot |S_1|.$$

If we further have $|S_1| \leq (1 + \frac{\varepsilon}{2}) \cdot \text{opt}(G_1)$, then $|S| \leq (1 + \varepsilon) \cdot \text{opt}(G_1) \leq (1 + \varepsilon) \cdot \text{opt}(G)$. \square

4.3.2 From S_2 to S_1

In this section, we show that if the parameters δ and δ' are chosen properly, then $|S_1| \leq (1 + \frac{\varepsilon}{2}) \cdot \text{opt}(G_1)$, based on the fact that $|S_2| \leq (1 + \frac{\varepsilon}{4}) \cdot \text{opt}(G_2)$. Combining this with Corollary 4.6 completes our analysis. Let $V^* \subseteq V(G_1)$ be the set defined in line 6 of Algorithm 1, which consists of the vertices in $V(G_1)$ with degree at least δ' . We have $|S_1| = |S_2| + |V^*|$. Since $|S_2| \leq (1 + \frac{\varepsilon}{4}) \cdot \text{opt}(G_2) \leq (1 + \frac{\varepsilon}{4}) \cdot \text{opt}(G_1)$, to have $|S_1| \leq (1 + \frac{\varepsilon}{2}) \cdot \text{opt}(G_1)$, it suffices to show $|V^*| \leq \frac{\varepsilon}{4} \cdot \text{opt}(G_1)$, i.e., there are not many high-degree vertices in G_1 .

Our proof relies on two properties of G_1 : (i) $R_{G_1} = \emptyset$ and (ii) G_1 has bounded weakly coloring numbers. For a vertex $v \in V(G_1)$ and a set $V \in \mathcal{V} \pitchfork V(G_1)$, we say V is witnessed by v if $v \in V$ or v is neighboring to some vertex in V .

Lemma 4.7. *For an integer $r > \max\{\gamma, \delta\}$, if $\deg_{G_1}(v) \geq r^\gamma \gamma!$, then there exists r disjoint sets in $\mathcal{V} \pitchfork V(G_1)$ witnessed by v .*

Proof. For each $u \in V(G_1)$, since $u \notin R_{G_1}$, there exists a set $V_u \in \mathcal{V} \pitchfork V(G_1)$ such that $u \in V_u$ and V_u does not contain any set in $\Gamma_{G_1 - \{u\}}$. We have $|V_u| \leq \gamma$ for all $u \in V(G_1)$. Suppose $\deg_{G_1}(v) \geq r^\gamma \gamma!$ or equivalently $|N_{G_1}(v)| \geq r^\gamma \gamma!$, where $r > \max\{\gamma, \delta\}$. By the sunflower lemma (Lemma 3.1), $\{V_u : u \in N_{G_1}(v)\}$ contains a sunflower of size r , i.e., there exists $U \subseteq N_{G_1}(v)$ with $|U| = r$ such that the sets in $\{V_u : u \in U\}$ form a sunflower. All sets in this sunflower are witnessed by v . We claim that the core K of the sunflower is empty. Assume $K \neq \emptyset$. As $r > \gamma$ and $|K| \leq \gamma$, there exists $u \in U$ such that $u \notin K$. Therefore, for any $u' \in U \setminus \{u\}$, we have $u \notin V_{u'}$ and thus $V_{u'} \in \mathcal{V} \pitchfork V(G - \{u\})$. It follows that $\{V_{u'} : u' \in U \setminus \{u\}\}$ is a $(r - 1)$ -sunflower in $\mathcal{V} \pitchfork V(G - \{u\})$

with core K . Since $K \neq \emptyset$ and $r - 1 \geq \delta$, we have $K \in \Gamma_{G-\{u\}}$. However, this contradicts the fact that V_u does not contain any set in $\Gamma_{G_1-\{u\}}$. So we have $K = \emptyset$ and the sets in $\{V_u : u \in U\}$ are disjoint, which implies that v witnesses r disjoint sets in $\mathcal{V} \pitchfork V(G_1)$. \square

Lemma 4.8. *Let S be a solution of the instance (G_1, \mathcal{F}) . If a vertex $v \in V(G_1)$ witnesses r disjoint sets in $\mathcal{V} \pitchfork V(G_1)$, then $\rho(v, S) \geq r - \text{wcol}_\gamma(G)$.*

Proof. Suppose v witnesses $V_1, \dots, V_r \in \mathcal{V} \pitchfork V(G_1)$, which are disjoint. For each $i \in [r]$ and each $u \in V_i$, there exists a path π_u between v and u in $G[V_i \cup \{v\}]$ of length at most γ , since $G[V_i]$ is connected and v is either in V_i or neighboring to V_i . Let $v_i \in V_i$ be the largest vertex under σ , and define $I = \{i \in [r] : v_i >_\sigma v\}$. As V_1, \dots, V_r are disjoint, v_1, \dots, v_r are distinct. Furthermore, for $i \in I$, the vertex v_i is the largest vertex on π_{v_i} , which implies that $v_i \in \text{WR}_\gamma(G, \sigma, v)$. It follows that $|I| \leq |\text{WR}_\gamma(G, \sigma, v)| \leq \text{wcol}_\gamma(G, \sigma) = \text{wcol}_\gamma(G)$. Thus, $|[r] \setminus I| \geq r - \text{wcol}_\gamma(G)$. As S is a solution of (G_1, \mathcal{F}) , we have $S \cap V_i \neq \emptyset$ for all $i \in [r]$. Let $p_i \in S \cap V_i$ for $i \in [r]$. Again, as V_1, \dots, V_r are disjoint, p_1, \dots, p_r are distinct. For $i \in [r] \setminus I$, we have $v \geq_\sigma v_i$ and thus $v \geq_\sigma u$ for all $u \in V_i$. Therefore, v is the largest vertex on π_{p_i} and $v \in \text{WR}_\gamma(G, \sigma, p_i)$, for all $i \in [r] \setminus I$. It follows that $\rho(v, S) \geq |[r] \setminus I| \geq r - \text{wcol}_\gamma(G)$. \square

Corollary 4.9. *For any $r > \max\{\gamma, \delta\}$, there exist at most $\frac{\text{wcol}_\gamma(G)}{r - \text{wcol}_\gamma(G)} \cdot \text{opt}(G_1)$ vertices in G_1 of degree at least $r^\gamma \gamma!$. In particular, if $\delta' \geq (\frac{4+\varepsilon}{\varepsilon} \cdot \text{wcol}_\gamma(G) + \max\{\gamma, \delta\})^\gamma \gamma!$, then $|V^*| \leq \frac{\varepsilon}{4} \cdot \text{opt}(G_1)$ and S_1 is a $(1 + \frac{\varepsilon}{2})$ -approximation solution for the instance (G_1, \mathcal{F}) .*

Proof. Let $S^* \subseteq V(G_1)$ be an optimal solution for the instance (G_1, \mathcal{F}) . By Lemma 4.7, every vertex in G_1 of degree at least $r^\gamma \gamma!$ witnesses r disjoint sets in $\mathcal{V} \pitchfork V(G_1)$. Further applying Lemma 4.8, we have $\rho(v, S^*) \geq r - \text{wcol}_\gamma(G)$ for all $v \in V(G_1)$ with $\deg_{G_1}(v) \geq r^\gamma \gamma!$. Note that

$$\sum_{v \in V(G_1)} \rho(v, S^*) = \sum_{u \in S^*} |\text{WR}_\gamma(G, \sigma, u)| \leq \text{wcol}_\gamma(G) \cdot |S^*| = \text{wcol}_\gamma(G) \cdot \text{opt}(G_1).$$

By an averaging argument, the number of vertices $v \in V(G_1)$ with $\rho(v, S^*) \geq r - \text{wcol}_\gamma(G)$ is at most $\frac{\text{wcol}_\gamma(G)}{r - \text{wcol}_\gamma(G)} \cdot \text{opt}(G_1)$, which also bounds the number of vertices of degree at least $r^\gamma \gamma!$. If we set $r = \frac{4+\varepsilon}{\varepsilon} \cdot \text{wcol}_\gamma(G) + \max\{\gamma, \delta\}$ and $\delta' \geq r^\gamma \gamma!$, then $r > \max\{\gamma, \delta\}$ and thus

$$|V^*| \leq \frac{\text{wcol}_\gamma(G)}{r - \text{wcol}_\gamma(G)} \cdot \text{opt}(G_1) \leq \frac{\text{wcol}_\gamma(G)}{\frac{4+\varepsilon}{\varepsilon} \cdot \text{wcol}_\gamma(G) + \max\{\gamma, \delta\} - \text{wcol}_\gamma(G)} \cdot \text{opt}(G_1) \leq \frac{\varepsilon}{4} \cdot \text{opt}(G_1).$$

Finally, $|S_1| = |S_2| + |V^*| \leq (1 + \frac{\varepsilon}{4}) \cdot \text{opt}(G_2) + \frac{\varepsilon}{4} \cdot \text{opt}(G_1) \leq (1 + \frac{\varepsilon}{2}) \cdot \text{opt}(G_1)$. \square

4.4 Linear-time implementation

In this section, we show how to implement Algorithm 1 (except the call of the sub-routine HITTING' in line 8) in linear time, or more precisely, $O_{\varepsilon, \mathcal{F}}(n)$ time. Note that if this can be done, then the overall time complexity of Algorithm 1 is $f(\varepsilon, \mathcal{F}) \cdot n^c$ time for some function f , because line 8 takes $f_0(\varepsilon, \mathcal{F}, \Delta) \cdot n^c$ time where Δ is the maximum degree of G_2 which is bounded by $\delta' = O_{\varepsilon, \mathcal{F}}(1)$. We divide Algorithm 1 into two parts: the part for computing G_2 (line 1-7) and the part for computing S (line 9-13). We discuss these two parts in the following two sections.

4.4.1 Computing G_2

Consider line 1-7 of Algorithm 1. The sets defined in line 1 are not computed explicitly. It suffices to the while-loop in line 3-5 in linear time. The idea is to formulate the computation tasks as first-order model-checking problems, and properly apply the efficient data structure of Theorem 3.9.

Lemma 4.10. *Whether a vertex $v \in V(G_1)$ is in R_{G_1} can be expressed as a first-order formula $\varphi(v)$ whose length depends only on ε and \mathcal{F} . Thus, the while-loop in line 3-5 can be implemented in $f(\varepsilon, \mathcal{F}) \cdot n$ time for some function f .*

Proof. Towards the presentation of the formula to check the membership of v in R_{G_1} , we first present several simpler formulas that will be used as building blocks. Recall that for two vertices $u, u' \in V(G_1)$, $\text{Adj}(u, u')$ is the atomic formula that is true if and only if u and u' are adjacent in G_1 . We start with some simple formulas.

- For every $\ell \in \mathbb{N}$, $\text{Distinct}(v_1, v_2, \dots, v_\ell)$: True iff v_1, v_2, \dots, v_ℓ are distinct. Defined as follows:

$$\bigwedge_{i,j \in [\ell], i \neq j} v_i \neq v_j.$$

- For every $r, \ell \in \mathbb{N}$, $\text{Subset}(u_1, u_2, \dots, u_r, v_1, v_2, \dots, v_\ell)$: True iff $\{u_1, u_2, \dots, u_r\} \subseteq \{v_1, v_2, \dots, v_\ell\}$. Defined as follows:

$$\bigwedge_{i \in [r]} \left(\bigvee_{j \in [\ell]} u_i = v_j \right).$$

For every $F \in \mathcal{F}$, we arbitrary order $V(F)$, denoted by $V(F) = \{v_1^F, v_2^F, \dots, v_{|V(F)|}^F\}$. We proceed to formulas to check isomorphism.

- For every $F \in \mathcal{F}$, $F\text{-Isomorphic}(v_1, v_2, \dots, v_\ell)$ where $\ell = |V(F)|$: True iff $G_1[\{v_1, v_2, \dots, v_\ell\}]$ contains a spanning subgraph isomorphic to F where the isomorphism maps v_i to v_i^F for every $i \in [\ell]$. Defined as follows:

$$\text{Distinct}(v_1, v_2, \dots, v_\ell) \wedge \left(\bigwedge_{i,j \in [\ell], \{v_i^F, v_j^F\} \in E(F)} \text{Adj}(v_i, v_j) \right).$$

- For every $F \in \mathcal{F}$, $F\text{-Isomorphic}^{\text{in}}(v_1, v_2, \dots, v_\ell)$ where $\ell = |V(F)|$: True iff $G_1[\{v_1, v_2, \dots, v_\ell\}]$ is isomorphic to F where the isomorphism maps v_i to v_i^F for every $i \in [\ell]$. Defined as follows:

$$\text{Distinct}(v_1, v_2, \dots, v_\ell) \wedge \left(\bigwedge_{i,j \in [\ell], \{v_i^F, v_j^F\} \in E(F)} \text{Adj}(v_i, v_j) \right) \wedge \left(\bigwedge_{i,j \in [\ell], \{v_i^F, v_j^F\} \notin E(F)} \neg \text{Adj}(v_i, v_j) \right).$$

- For every $\ell \in \mathbb{N}$, $\text{BelongsTo}\mathcal{V}_{\mathcal{F}}(v_1, v_2, \dots, v_\ell)$: True iff $G_1[\{v_1, v_2, \dots, v_\ell\}]$ contains a spanning subgraph isomorphic to some graph $F \in \mathcal{F}$ where the isomorphism maps v_i to v_i^F for every $i \in [\ell]$. Defined as follows:

$$\bigvee_{F \in \mathcal{F}, |V(F)| = \ell} F\text{-Isomorphic}(v_1, v_2, \dots, v_\ell).$$

Now, we present formulas to check the membership of a set in $\Gamma_{G_1 - \{v\}}$.

- For every $\ell \in \mathbb{N}$, **Core** $(v, v_1, v_2, \dots, v_\ell)$: True iff $\{v_1, v_2, \dots, v_\ell\} \in \Gamma_{G_1 - \{v\}}$. Defined as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} & \bigvee_{f: [\delta] \rightarrow [\gamma]} (\exists u_1^1, u_2^1, \dots, u_{f(1)}^1, u_1^2, u_2^2, \dots, u_{f(2)}^2, \dots, u_1^\delta, u_2^\delta, \dots, u_{f(\delta)}^\delta) \\ & \bigwedge_{i \in [\delta]} ((u_1^i \neq v) \wedge ((u_2^i \neq v) \wedge \dots \wedge (u_{f(i)}^i \neq v))) \\ & \wedge \bigwedge_{i \in [\delta]} (\text{BelongsTo}\mathcal{V}_{\mathcal{F}}(u_1^i, u_2^i, \dots, u_{f(i)}^i) \wedge \text{Subset}(v_1, v_2, \dots, v_\ell, u_1^i, u_2^i, \dots, u_{f(i)}^i)) \\ & \wedge \bigwedge_{i, j \in [\delta], i \neq j, k \in [f(i)]} (\text{Subset}(u_k^i, v_1, v_2, \dots, v_\ell) \vee \neg \text{Subset}(u_k^i, u_1^j, u_2^j, \dots, u_{f(j)}^j)). \end{aligned}$$

We remark that, here, we use **Subset** to check the membership of an element (the first argument) in a set.

- For every $\ell \in \mathbb{N}$, **ContainsCore** $(v_1, v_2, \dots, v_\ell)$: True iff $\{v_1, v_2, \dots, v_\ell\}$ contains a set in $\Gamma_{G_1 - \{v\}}$ w.r.t. **SUBGRAPH HITTING**. Defined as follows:

$$\bigvee_{r \in [\ell]} (\exists u_1, u_2, \dots, u_r \text{Distinct}(u_1, \dots, u_r) \wedge \text{Subset}(u_1, \dots, u_r, v_1, \dots, v_\ell) \wedge \text{Heavy}(u_1, \dots, u_r)).$$

We are now ready to present the formula to check whether $v \in R_{G_1}$. We start with **SUBGRAPH HITTING**:

$$\bigwedge_{\ell \in [\gamma]} \left(\forall v_1, v_2, \dots, v_\ell \bigvee_{i \in [\ell]} (v = v_i) \wedge (\text{BelongsTo}\mathcal{V}_{\mathcal{F}}(v_1, v_2, \dots, v_\ell) \rightarrow \text{ContainsCore}(v_1, v_2, \dots, v_\ell)) \right).$$

For **INDUCED SUBGRAPH HITTING**, the required formula is identical except that every use of **F-Isomorphic** $(v_1, v_2, \dots, v_\ell)$ is replaced by the use of **F-Isomorphic**ⁱⁿ $(v_1, v_2, \dots, v_\ell)$.

We have seen how to construct a first-order formula $\phi(v)$ such that $v \in R_{G_1}$ iff $\phi(v)$ is true. Set $\varphi = \exists v(\phi(v))$. We build in $f(|\varphi|) \cdot n$ time the data structure \mathcal{D} of Theorem 3.9 on the graph G with the first-order formula φ . In each iteration of the while-loop in line 3-5, we test whether G satisfies φ or not in $f(|\varphi|)$ time. If not, then $R_{G_1} = \emptyset$ and we are done. Otherwise, the data structure can find a vertex $v \in V(G_1)$ that satisfies $\phi(v)$. Then we need to remove v from G_1 and proceed to the next iteration. Note that the data structure \mathcal{D} only supports edge deletions. Therefore, instead of truly deleting v , we delete all edges incident to v from G_1 . In this way, v still exists in G_1 but becomes an isolated vertex. This is in fact equivalent to deleting v from G_1 , because the forbidden patterns in \mathcal{F} are all connected (and thus isolated vertices do not influence anything). The time cost for updating \mathcal{D} after each edge-deletion is $f(|\varphi|)$. As each edge can be deleted at most once, the total update time of \mathcal{D} during the while-loop is $f(|\varphi|) \cdot n$ due to the sparsity of G_1 . Also, since the while-loop can have at most n iterations, the total query time of \mathcal{D} is also $f(|\varphi|) \cdot n$. As a result, the while-loop in line 3-5 can be implemented in $f(|\varphi|) \cdot n$ time. \square

4.4.2 Computing S

Consider line 9-14 in Algorithm 1. By Theorem 3.8, line 9 can be done in $O(n)$ time. So it suffices to show how to compute ρ_v for all $v \in V(G)$ (line 10) in linear time. The key here is an efficient algorithm for computing the weakly reachable sets.

Lemma 4.11. *Let G be a graph of n vertices and m edges. Given an ordering σ of $V(G)$ and $r \in [n]$, one can compute in $O(n + rm \cdot \text{wcol}_r(G, \sigma))$ time the sets $\text{WR}_r(G, \sigma, v)$ for all $v \in V(G)$.*

Proof. Without loss of generality, we can assume G is connected and thus $m = \Omega(n)$. We shall compute the sets $\text{WR}_i(G, \sigma, v)$ iteratively for $i = 0, 1, \dots, r$. We have $\text{WR}_0(G, \sigma, v) = \{v\}$ for all $v \in V(G)$. Suppose the sets $\text{WR}_{i-1}(G, \sigma, v)$ are already computed for all $v \in V(G)$. To compute $\text{WR}_i(G, \sigma, v)$, the key observation is that $\text{WR}_i(G, \sigma, v)$ consists of exactly the vertices in $\bigcup_{u \in N[v]} \text{WR}_{i-1}(G, \sigma, u)$ which are larger than or equal to v under the ordering σ ; here $N[v]$ is the set of neighbors of v in G (including v itself). Indeed, if $x \in \text{WR}_i(G, \sigma, v)$, then there exists a path $(u_0 = v, u_1, \dots, u_i = x)$ in G on which x is the largest vertex under the ordering σ . We have $u_1 \in N[v]$ and $x \in \text{WR}_{i-1}(G, \sigma, u_1)$ because of the sub-path (u_1, \dots, u_i) . Thus, $x \in \bigcup_{u \in N[v]} \text{WR}_{i-1}(G, \sigma, u)$ and $x \geq_\sigma v$. On the other hand, if $x \in \text{WR}_{i-1}(G, \sigma, u)$ for some $u \in N[v]$ and $x \geq_\sigma v$, then there exists a path $(u_1 = u, \dots, u_i = x)$ in G on which x is the largest vertex. In this case, (v, u_1, \dots, u_i) is a path between v and x on which x is the largest vertex, and thus $x \in \text{WR}_i(G, \sigma, v)$. With this observation, to compute $\text{WR}_i(G, \sigma, v)$, we only need to check all vertices in $\bigcup_{u \in N[v]} \text{WR}_{i-1}(G, \sigma, u)$ and take the ones larger than v , which can be done in $O(|N[v]| \cdot \text{wcol}_r(G, \sigma))$ time because $|\text{WR}_{i-1}(G, \sigma, u)| \leq \text{wcol}_{i-1}(G, \sigma) \leq \text{wcol}_r(G, \sigma)$. Since $\sum_{v \in V(G)} |N[v]| = O(m)$, computing $\text{WR}_i(G, \sigma, v)$ for all $v \in V(G)$ takes $O(m \cdot \text{wcol}_r(G, \sigma))$ time. We need r iterations to compute $\text{WR}_r(G, \sigma, v)$, so the overall running time is $O(rm \cdot \text{wcol}_r(G, \sigma))$. \square

To efficiently implement the while-loop in line 12-13, we first apply the above lemma to compute $\text{WR}_\gamma(G, \sigma, u)$ for all $u \in V(G)$. For every $v \in V(G)$, we maintain a number ρ_v which is equal to $\rho(v, S)$ for the current S . To compute the initial values of ρ_v , we consider every vertex $u \in S$ and increase ρ_v by 1 for all $v \in \text{WR}_\gamma(G, \sigma, u)$. By Theorem 3.8, $\text{wcol}_\gamma(G, \sigma) \leq \text{wcol}_\gamma^{\gamma+1}(G)$. Furthermore, by Theorem 3.6, $\text{wcol}_\gamma(G)$ is bounded by $\chi_{\mathcal{G}}(\gamma)$ for a function $\chi_{\mathcal{G}}$, and thus $\text{wcol}_\gamma(G, \sigma)$ is also bounded by a function of γ . So computing the initial values of ρ_v takes $f(\gamma) \cdot n$ time. During the while-loop, we maintain a queue Q that contains the vertices in $V(G) \setminus S$ whose current *rho* values are at least $\delta - \text{wcol}_\gamma(G, \sigma)$. In each iteration, we pop a vertex u from Q and add it to S . As S changes, we need to update the values of ρ_v , which is done by considering every $v \in \text{WR}_\gamma(G, \sigma, u)$ and increasing ρ_v by 1. In this procedure, if $\rho_v \geq \delta - \text{wcol}_\gamma(G, \sigma)$ after the update and $v \notin S$, we add it to Q . The while-loop terminates when Q becomes empty. Clearly, there are at most n iterations and each iteration takes $f(\gamma)$ time. Therefore, the entire while-loop can be implemented in $f(\gamma) \cdot n$ time.

4.5 Putting everything together

We pick a sufficiently large δ that satisfies the condition in Corollary 4.6 and a sufficiently large δ' that satisfies the condition in Corollary 4.9. As the weak coloring numbers of G and G_1 are all bounded, we can guarantee that $\delta = O_{\varepsilon, \mathcal{F}}(1)$ and $\delta' = O_{\varepsilon, \mathcal{F}}(1)$. Here a small technical issue is that we cannot compute the weak coloring numbers of G and G_1 efficiently. However, we can use the *admissibility* numbers to approximate the weak coloring numbers. The *r-admissibility* number of G , $\text{adm}_r(G)$, satisfies the inequality $\text{adm}_r(G) \leq \text{wcol}_r(G) \leq \text{adm}_r^{\gamma+1}(G)$ [42]. Furthermore, the *r-admissibility* number of bounded-expansion graphs can be computed in $O(n)$ time for any $r \geq 0$ [42]. As such, when picking δ and δ' , we can simply use the upper bound of the weak coloring numbers provided by admissibility numbers to ensure that δ and δ' are sufficiently large while on the other hand still bounded by $O_{\varepsilon, \mathcal{F}}(1)$. (We omit the definition of admissibility numbers, as it is not used in the paper.)

Next, we consider the overall running time of Algorithm 1. As shown in Section 4.4, all steps except line 8 can be done in $f(\varepsilon, \mathcal{F}) \cdot n$ time. Since G_2 is of maximum degree at most $\delta' = O_{\varepsilon, \mathcal{F}}(1)$, line 8 takes $f(\varepsilon, \mathcal{F}) \cdot n^c$ time. As such, the time complexity of Algorithm 1 is $f(\varepsilon, \mathcal{F}) \cdot n^c$. Combining this with the reduction in Section 4.1 (Corollary 4.3) completes the proof of Theorem 1.1.

Variants. When the provided degree-sensitive algorithm in Theorem 1.1 has a different running time or a different approximation factor, the performance of the algorithm we obtain also changes. Therefore, the same proof can also result in variants of Theorem 1.1. For example, when the provided algorithm has an approximation factor $c + \varepsilon$, then we also obtain a $(c + \varepsilon)$ -approximation algorithm. Also, when the provided algorithm has running time $n^{f_0(\varepsilon, \mathcal{F}, \Delta)}$, $f_0(\varepsilon, \mathcal{F}, \Delta) \cdot n^{g(\varepsilon)}$, and $f_0(\varepsilon, \mathcal{F}, \Delta) \cdot n^{g(\mathcal{F})}$, the obtained algorithm has running time $n^{f(\varepsilon, \mathcal{F})}$, $f(\varepsilon, \mathcal{F}) \cdot n^{g(\varepsilon)}$, and $f(\varepsilon, \mathcal{F}) \cdot n^{g(\mathcal{F})}$, respectively. We believe that these variants can also find their applications in the future.

4.6 Lossy kernels

In this section, we apply Theorem 1.1 (more specifically, our degree reduction in Algorithm 1) to prove the lossy kernelization results, i.e., Theorem 1.2.

Theorem 1.2. *Let \mathcal{G} be any graph class of bounded expansion. For any fixed (finite) \mathcal{F} consisting of connected graphs, (INDUCED) SUBGRAPH HITTING on \mathcal{G} with forbidden set \mathcal{F} admits a $(1 + \varepsilon)$ -approximation lossy kernel of size $f(\varepsilon) \cdot k$ for some function f . The kernelization algorithm runs in $g(\varepsilon) \cdot n$ time for some function g .*

Let \mathcal{G} be a hereditary graph class of bounded expansion and \mathcal{F} be a fixed finite set of connected graphs. Consider an instance (G, \mathcal{F}) of (INDUCED) SUBGRAPH HITTING where $G \in \mathcal{G}$. Applying Algorithm 1 with any $\varepsilon > 0$, we can compute in $O_\varepsilon(n)$ time an instance (G', \mathcal{F}) such that G' is an induced subgraph of G of degree $O_\varepsilon(1)$, and given a c -approximation solution for (G', \mathcal{F}) one can compute in $O_\varepsilon(n)$ time a $(1 + \varepsilon)c$ -approximation solution for (G, \mathcal{F}) .

To further obtain a lossy kernel of linear size, we simply remove all *irrelevant* vertices from G' . We say a vertex $v \in V(G')$ is *irrelevant* if it is not contained in any set in $\mathcal{V} \cap V(G')$. Here the definition of \mathcal{V} is the same as in Algorithm 1. Let $I \subseteq V(G')$ be the set of irrelevant vertices in G' , and $G'' = G' - I$. Note that a c -approximation solution for the instance (G'', \mathcal{F}) is also a c -approximation solution for (G', \mathcal{F}) , simply because $\mathcal{V} \cap V(G'') = \mathcal{V} \cap V(G')$. Therefore, given a c -approximation solution for (G'', \mathcal{F}) , one can compute in $O_\varepsilon(n)$ time a $(1 + \varepsilon)c$ -approximation solution for (G, \mathcal{F}) . To compute I and G'' in linear time, we can use the data structure of Theorem 3.9, similarly to that in Section 4.4. Recall that in the proof of Lemma 4.10, we defined the first-order formula $\text{BelongsTo}\mathcal{V}_{\mathcal{F}}(v_1, v_2, \dots, v_\ell)$ that can check whether $G'[\{v_1, \dots, v_\ell\}]$ contains a spanning subgraph isomorphic to some $F \in \mathcal{F}$. Now we define

$$\phi(v) = \bigvee_{\ell \in [\gamma]} \left(\exists v_1, \dots, v_\ell \left(\bigvee_{i \in [\ell]} v = v_i \right) \wedge \text{BelongsTo}\mathcal{V}_{\mathcal{F}}(v_1, v_2, \dots, v_\ell) \right),$$

which is true iff $v \notin I$. Let $Q = V(G')$ be a unary relation on $V(G')$, and set $\varphi = \exists v(\neg\phi(v) \wedge Q(v))$. We build the data structure \mathcal{D} of Theorem 3.9 on the graph G' with the unary relation Q and the formula φ . We then delete all elements from Q and keep updating \mathcal{D} , which takes $f(|\varphi|) \cdot n$ time. To compute I , we iteratively consider the vertex of G' . For a vertex $v \in V(G')$, to check whether $v \in I$, we add back v to Q and check whether (G', Q) satisfies φ (and delete v from Q afterwards). In this way, we can test whether a vertex is in I in $f(|\varphi|)$ time, and hence compute I in $f(|\varphi|) \cdot n$ time. Finally, we observe the following property of G'' .

Lemma 4.12. $|V(G'')| \leq f(\varepsilon) \cdot \text{opt}(G'', \mathcal{F})$ for some function f .

Proof. It suffices to prove that there are $\Omega_\varepsilon(n)$ vertex disjoint sets of $\mathcal{V} \cap V(G'')$. To this end, we show that there is a subset $Z \subseteq V(G'')$ of size $\Omega_\varepsilon(n)$ such that for any pair (u, v) of distinct vertices

in Z , the distance between them in G'' is at least 2γ . We construct Z as follows. Initially, we set $Z = \emptyset$. Then we pick a vertex $v_1 \in V(G'')$, add to Z , and mark all the vertices which are at a distance at most 2γ from v_1 . There are only $O_\varepsilon(1)$ such vertices since the degree of G'' is $O_\varepsilon(1)$. In the next round, we further pick an unmarked vertex v_2 , add to Z and again mark all the vertices which are at a distance at most 2γ from v_2 . We continue this process until all the vertices are marked. Since in each step we mark at most $O_\varepsilon(1)$ vertices, the number of vertices in Z will be $O_\varepsilon(n)$. Note that every vertex of G'' is contained in some set in $\mathcal{V} \cap V(G'')$, by our construction. For each $z \in Z$, pick a set $V_z \in \mathcal{V} \cap V(G'')$ such that $z \in V_z$. We have $G[V_z]$ is connected, since the graphs in \mathcal{F} are all connected. It follows that the sets V_z are pairwise disjoint, since the pairwise distances among the vertices in Z are at least 2γ . \square

Note that $\text{opt}(G'', \mathcal{F}) \leq \text{opt}(G, \mathcal{F})$, because G'' is an induced subgraph of G . Given a parameterized instance (G, k) for (INDUCED) SUBGRAPH HITTING with forbidden list \mathcal{F} , our kernelization algorithm simply constructs the graph G'' as above. If $|V(G'')| \leq f(\varepsilon) \cdot k$ for the function f in Lemma 4.12, then we output the parameterized instance (G'', k) , whose size is linear in k . Otherwise, we know that $k < \text{opt}(G'', \mathcal{F}) \leq \text{opt}(G, \mathcal{F})$ and thus (G, k) is a NO instance. The running time of the kernelization algorithm as well as the time cost for turning a solution of (G'', k) to a solution of (G, k) is $g(\varepsilon) \cdot n$ for some function g . This proves Theorem 1.2.

5 Local search

In this section, we prove and further discuss our results on the local search algorithms in classes with polynomial expansion. Let us start with some preparatory work.

5.1 Tools

A collection \mathcal{C} of subsets of vertices of a graph G is (ω, t) -shallow if every vertex of G appears in at most ω elements of \mathcal{C} and $G[C]$ has radius at most t for every $C \in \mathcal{C}$. The *packing graph* $G[\mathcal{C}]$ is defined as the graph with vertex set \mathcal{C} where C_1 and C_2 are adjacent if there exist $v_1 \in C_1$ and $v_2 \in C_2$ such that $v_1 = v_2$ or $v_1 v_2 \in E(G)$. In particular, an r -shallow minor is the packing graph of a $(1, r)$ -shallow collection.

Theorem 5.1 (Har-Peled and Quanrud [75]). *Let G be a graph with expansion bounded by a function f . For every (ω, t) -shallow collection \mathcal{C} of subsets of vertices of G , the graph $G[\mathcal{C}]$ has expansion bounded by the function*

$$f'(r) = 5\omega^2(2t+1)^2(2r+1)^2 f((2t+1)r+t).$$

Corollary 5.2. *For every class \mathcal{G} with polynomial expansion and all non-negative integers ω and t , there exists a class \mathcal{G}' with polynomial expansion such that the packing graph of any (ω, t) -shallow collection of subsets of vertices of a graph $G \in \mathcal{G}$ belongs to \mathcal{G}' .*

Next, we need to introduce an important notion called *strongly sublinear separator*.

Definition 5.3. *Let G be an n -vertex graph. A vertex subset $X \subseteq V(G)$ is called a balanced separator if each component of $G - X$ has at most $2n/3$ vertices. Let $s(G)$ denote the minimum size of a balanced separator in G . For a graph class \mathcal{G} , let $s_{\mathcal{G}} : \mathbb{N}_0 \rightarrow \mathbb{N}_0$ be the function defined by $s_{\mathcal{G}}(n) = \max\{s(H) : H \subseteq G \in \mathcal{G}, |V(H)| \leq n\}$. The graph class \mathcal{G} has strongly sublinear separators if $s_{\mathcal{G}}(n) = O(n^\eta)$ for some $\eta < 1$.*

The following theorem gives a nice characterization of polynomial-expansion graphs.

Theorem 5.4 ([47]). *A graph class is of polynomial expansion iff it has strongly sublinear separators.*

A well-known fact dating back to the work of Lipton and Tarjan [90] is that in any graph G from a class \mathcal{G} with strongly sublinear separators (satisfying $s_{\mathcal{G}}(n) = O(n^\eta)$ for some $\eta < 1$), we can for every $\varepsilon > 0$ delete at most $\varepsilon|V(G)|$ vertices to break up G to components of size $O(\left(\frac{1}{\varepsilon}\right)^{\frac{1}{1-\eta}})$. We need a more technical form of this statement, proved in [74]. Let \mathcal{K} be a system of subsets of vertices of a graph G . We say that \mathcal{K} is a *cover* of G if $\bigcup_{K \in \mathcal{K}} G[K] = G$. For $K \in \mathcal{K}$, let ∂K be the set of vertices of K that belong to more than one element of \mathcal{K} . The *excess* of a cover \mathcal{K} is $\sum_{K \in \mathcal{K}} |\partial K|$.

Lemma 5.5. *Let \mathcal{G} be a class of graphs with strongly sublinear separators. There exists a polynomial p such that for every $\varepsilon > 0$, every graph $G \in \mathcal{G}$ has a cover with excess at most $\varepsilon|V(G)|$ consisting of sets of size at most $p(1/\varepsilon)$.*

5.2 Proof of Theorem 1.3

The proof of Theorem 1.3 follows the idea of Har-Peled and Quanrud [75], with the following crucial difference: Instead of comparing the local search solution with the optimal one, we compare it with a suitably chosen enlargement of the optimal solution. Recall that $\text{WR}_r(G, \sigma, v)$ denote the set of vertices in G that are r -weakly reachable from a vertex v under an ordering σ of vertices of G . Let $\text{WR}_r^{-1}(G, \sigma, u)$ denote the set of vertices v from which u is r -weakly reachable, i.e., the set $\{v \in V(G) : u \in \text{WR}_r(G, \sigma, v)\}$. For a set O of vertices a non-negative integer m , we say a vertex u is (r, σ, m, O) -rich if $|\text{WR}_r^{-1}(G, \sigma, u) \cap O| \geq m$, i.e., if u is r -weakly reachable from many vertices in O .

Observation 5.6. *Let G be a graph, let O be a set of vertices of G , let r and m be non-negative integers, and let σ be a linear ordering of vertices of G . Let O' be the set of all (r, σ, m, O) -rich vertices. If the weak r -coloring number of G under σ is at most b , then*

$$|O'| \leq \frac{b}{m}|O|.$$

Proof. By the definition of richness, there are at least $m|O'|$ pairs of vertices (u, v) such that $u \in O'$ and $v \in \text{WR}_r^{-1}(G, \sigma, u) \cap O$. However, then $u \in \text{WR}_r(G, \sigma, v)$, and $|\text{WR}_r(G, \sigma, v)| \leq b$ for each $v \in V(G)$ by the assumptions. Hence, the number of such pairs is also at most $b|O|$. \square

In the proof, O will be an optimal solution and we are going to enlarge it slightly by adding the vertices of O' . Let us consider the setting of Observation 5.6, and let A be another set of vertices of G (in the proof, this will be the solution returned by the local search). The key idea of Har-Peled and Quanrud [75] was to consider an auxiliary packing graph of suitably chosen neighborhoods of vertices of $O \cup A$. In our setting, we are going to consider the packing graph of the following set system. Let $\mathcal{C}_{r, \sigma, m, O, A} = \{C_u : u \in A \cup O \cup O'\}$ be a system of subsets of vertices of G defined as follows:

- For $u \in O' \setminus O$, let $C_u = \text{WR}_r^{-1}(G, \sigma, u)$.
- For $u \in O$, let

$$C_u = \text{WR}_r^{-1}(G, \sigma, u) \cup \bigcup_{x \in \text{WR}_r(G, \sigma, u) \setminus O'} \text{WR}_r^{-1}(G, \sigma, x).$$

- For $u \in A \setminus (O \cup O')$, let $C_u = \{u\}$.

The system is chosen so that we get the following lemma, stating that when O and A both hit a bounded diameter subgraph, this is reflected by an adjacency in the packing graph of $\mathcal{C}_{r,\sigma,m,O,A}$.

Lemma 5.7. *Let G be a graph, let A and O be sets of vertices of G , let r and m be non-negative integers, and let σ be a linear ordering of vertices of G . Let O' be the set of all (r, σ, m, O) -rich vertices. Let H be the packing graph of $\mathcal{C} = \mathcal{C}_{r,\sigma,m,O,A}$. If F is a subgraph of G of diameter at most r and $V(F) \cap O \neq \emptyset$, then there exists $u \in V(F) \cap (O \cup O')$ such that $C_u C_v \in E(H)$ for every $v \in V(F) \cap A \setminus (O \cup O')$. Moreover, if the weak r -coloring number of G under σ is at most b , then \mathcal{C} is $(bm + 1, 2r)$ -shallow.*

Proof. Let x be the largest vertex of $V(F)$ in the ordering σ . Since F has diameter at most r , for every $y \in V(F)$, there exists a path from y to x of length at most r in F , and by the choice of x , the vertices of this path appear before x in the ordering σ . Consequently $x \in \text{WR}_r(G, \sigma, y)$. Since this holds for every $y \in V(F)$, we have $V(F) \subseteq \text{WR}_r^{-1}(G, \sigma, x)$.

If $x \in O'$, then let $u = x$, otherwise choose u as an arbitrary vertex of $V(F) \cap O$. In the former case, we have $V(F) \subseteq \text{WR}_r^{-1}(G, \sigma, u) \subseteq C_u$. In the latter case, we have $x \in \text{WR}_r(G, \sigma, u) \setminus O'$, and thus $V(F) \subseteq \text{WR}_r^{-1}(G, \sigma, u) \subseteq C_u$. Hence, $C_u C_v \in E(H)$ for every $v \in V(F) \cap A \setminus (O \cup O')$.

Next, let us bound the diameter of the sets in \mathcal{C} . For any $z \in V(G)$ and for every vertex w of $\text{WR}_r^{-1}(G, \sigma, z)$, there is a path of length at most r from w to z with all vertices appearing before z in σ ; observe that the vertices of this path also belong to $\text{WR}_r^{-1}(G, \sigma, z)$. Therefore, every vertex of $\text{WR}_r^{-1}(G, \sigma, z)$ is at distance at most r from z in $G[\text{WR}_r^{-1}(G, \sigma, z)]$ and thus $G[\text{WR}_r^{-1}(G, \sigma, z)]$ has diameter at most $2r$. For $u \in O \cup O'$, we conclude that C_u is the union of vertex sets of graphs of diameter at most $2r$, each of them containing u , and thus $G[C_u]$ has radius at most $2r$. For $u \in A \setminus (O \cup O')$, $G[C_u]$ has radius 0.

Finally, let us argue that no vertex belongs to too many of the sets in \mathcal{C} . If a vertex z belongs to C_u for $u \in O' \setminus O$, then $z \in \text{WR}_r^{-1}(G, \sigma, u)$, and thus u is one of at most b vertices in $\text{WR}_r(G, \sigma, z)$. If z belongs to C_u for $u \in O$, then either $z \in \text{WR}_r^{-1}(G, \sigma, u)$ and u is again one vertices in $\text{WR}_r(G, \sigma, z)$, or $z \in \text{WR}_r^{-1}(G, \sigma, x)$ for some $x \in \text{WR}_r(G, \sigma, u) \setminus O'$. There are at most b choices for x in $\text{WR}_r(G, \sigma, z)$, and for fixed $x \notin O'$, there are less than m vertices $u \in O$ such that $x \in \text{WR}_r(G, \sigma, u)$ (or equivalently, $u \in \text{WR}_r^{-1}(G, \sigma, x) \cap O$). Finally, vertex z belongs to C_u for at most one $u \in A \setminus (O \cup O')$. Therefore, z belongs to C_v for at most $b + b(m - 1) + 1 = bm + 1$ vertices $v \in A \cup O \cup O'$. Therefore, \mathcal{C} is $(bm + 1, 2r)$ -shallow. \square

We are now ready to prove the main result, Theorem 1.3, which we restate for convenience.

Theorem 1.3. *Let \mathcal{G} be a graph class of polynomial expansion and π be a property of finite diameter. Then for every $\varepsilon > 0$, there exists a constant $c > 0$ such that c -local search gives a $(1 + \varepsilon)$ -approximation solution for π -HITTING on \mathcal{G} . Furthermore, if π is first-order definable, the c -local-search algorithm can be implemented in $f(c) \cdot n$ time for some function f .*

Proof. Without loss of generality, assume that $\varepsilon \leq 1$. Let r be the diameter of π . By Theorem 3.6, there exists b such that the weak r -coloring number of every graph $G \in \mathcal{G}$ is at most b . Let $m = \lceil 3b/\varepsilon \rceil$. Let \mathcal{G}' be the class of graphs with polynomial expansion given by Corollary 5.2 with $\omega = bm + 1$ and $t = 2r$. Let p be the polynomial from Lemma 5.5 for this class \mathcal{G}' . Let us define $c = \lceil p(18/\varepsilon) \rceil$.

Consider any graph $G \in \mathcal{G}$, and let σ be an ordering of vertices of G such that G has weak r -coloring number at most b under σ . Let O be a π -hitting set in G of size $\gamma_\pi(G)$, and let A be the π -hitting set returned by the c -local search algorithm. Let O' be the set of all (r, σ, m, O) -rich

vertices in G ; by Observation 5.6, we have $|O'| \leq \frac{b}{m}|O| \leq \frac{\varepsilon}{3}|O|$. Let $\mathcal{C} = \mathcal{C}_{r,\sigma,m,O,A}$; by Lemma 5.7, \mathcal{C} is $(bm+1, 2r)$ -shallow, and by Corollary 5.2, the packing graph $H = G[\mathcal{C}]$ belongs to \mathcal{G}' . For any $Y \subseteq V(H)$, let $\bar{Y} = \{v \in V(G) : C_v \in Y\}$. By Lemma 5.5, there exists a cover \mathcal{K} of H with excess at most $\frac{\varepsilon}{18}|V(H)| \leq \frac{\varepsilon}{18}(|A| + |O| + |O'|) \leq \frac{\varepsilon}{6}|A|$ such that each element of \mathcal{K} has size at most $p(18/\varepsilon) \leq c$.

Consider any $K \in \mathcal{K}$, and let $A' = (A \setminus \overline{(K \setminus \partial K)}) \cup ((O \cup O') \cap \overline{K})$. We claim that A' is a π -hitting set. Indeed, suppose for a contradiction that there exists $Z \subseteq V(G)$ such that (G, Z) satisfies the property π , but $A' \cap Z = \emptyset$. Since A is a π -hitting set, there exists $v \in A \cap Z$, and since $v \notin A'$, we have $v \in \overline{(K \setminus \partial K)} \setminus (O \cup O')$. Since O is a π -hitting set, we have $Z \cap O \neq \emptyset$, and by Lemma 5.7 applied to $F = G[Z]$, there exists $u \in Z \cap (O \cup O')$ such that $C_u C_v \in E(H)$. Since \mathcal{K} is a cover of H , there exists $K' \in \mathcal{K}$ such that $C_u C_v \in E(H[K'])$. Since $C_v \in K \setminus \partial K$, it follows that $K' = K$, and thus this implies $C_u \in K$. Therefore, we have $u \in (O \cup O') \cap \overline{K}$, and $u \in A' \cap Z$, which is a contradiction.

Note that $A \Delta A' \subseteq \overline{K}$, and thus $|A \Delta A'| \leq c$. Hence, the c -local search algorithm considered the solution A' and did not improve A to A' , which implies that $|A'| \geq |A|$. We conclude that

$$|(O \cup O') \cap \overline{K}| \geq |A \cap \overline{(K \setminus \partial K)}|$$

for every $K \in \mathcal{K}$. Therefore, denoting by s the excess of \mathcal{K} , we have

$$\begin{aligned} |A| &\leq \sum_{K \in \mathcal{K}} |A \cap \overline{K}| \leq s + \sum_{K \in \mathcal{K}} |A \cap \overline{(K \setminus \partial K)}| \\ &\leq s + \sum_{K \in \mathcal{K}} |(O \cup O') \cap \overline{K}| \leq 2s + \sum_{K \in \mathcal{K}} |(O \cup O') \cap \overline{(K \setminus \partial K)}| \\ &\leq 2s + |O| + |O'| \leq \frac{\varepsilon}{3}|A| + (1 + \varepsilon/3)|O|. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore,

$$|A| \leq \frac{1 + \varepsilon/3}{1 - \varepsilon/3} |O| \leq (1 + \varepsilon)|O|,$$

as required. We will discuss the running time of the algorithm in Section 5.3. \square

The proof for the packing version is much simpler.

Theorem 1.5. *Let \mathcal{G} be a graph class of polynomial expansion and π be a property of finite diameter. Then for every $\varepsilon > 0$, there exists a constant $c > 0$ such that c -local search gives $(1 - \varepsilon)$ -approximation solution for (INDUCED) π -PACKING on \mathcal{G} . Furthermore, if π is first-order definable, the c -local-search algorithm can be implemented in $f(c) \cdot n$ time for some function f .*

Proof. Without loss of generality, assume that $\varepsilon \leq 1$. Let r be the diameter of π . Let \mathcal{G}' be the class of graphs with polynomial expansion given by Corollary 5.2 with $\omega = 2$ and $t = r$. Let p be the polynomial from Lemma 5.5 for this class \mathcal{G}' . Let us define $c = \lceil p(4/\varepsilon) \rceil$.

Consider any graph $G \in \mathcal{G}$. Let O be an (induced) π -packing in G of size $\alpha_\pi(G)$ (or $\alpha'_\pi(G)$), and let A be the (induced) π -packing returned by the c -local search algorithm. Let $\mathcal{C} = A \cup O$, and note that \mathcal{C} is $(2, r)$ -shallow. By Corollary 5.2, the packing graph $H = G[\mathcal{C}]$ belongs to \mathcal{G}' . By Lemma 5.5, there exists a cover \mathcal{K} of H with excess at most $\frac{\varepsilon}{4}|V(H)| \leq \frac{\varepsilon}{4}(|A| + |O|) \leq \frac{\varepsilon}{2}|O|$ such that each element of \mathcal{K} has size at most $p(4/\varepsilon) \leq c$.

Consider any $K \in \mathcal{K}$, and let $A' = (A \setminus K) \cup (O \cap (K \setminus \partial K))$. We claim that A' is an (induced) π -packing. Indeed, since both A and O have this property, the only way how this could be false is if there existed $P \in A \setminus K$ and $P' \in O \cap (K \setminus \partial K)$ that intersect (or contain adjacent vertices

in the induced case). However, then $PP' \in E(H)$, which is a contradiction since $P' \in K \setminus \partial K$ and $P \notin K$. Observe also that $|A'| \leq |A|$, as otherwise the c -local search algorithm would extend $A \setminus K$ to a solution larger than A (if $|A'| > |A|$, then $K \not\subseteq A$, and thus $A \setminus K$ is obtained from A by deleting less than c elements).

We conclude that

$$|A \cap K| \geq |O \cap (K \setminus \partial K)|$$

for every $K \in \mathcal{K}$. Therefore, denoting by s the excess of \mathcal{K} , we have

$$\begin{aligned} |A| &\geq \sum_{K \in \mathcal{K}} |A \cap (K \setminus \partial K)| \geq -s + \sum_{K \in \mathcal{K}} |A \cap K| \\ &\geq -s + \sum_{K \in \mathcal{K}} |O \cap (K \setminus \partial K)| \geq -2s + \sum_{K \in \mathcal{K}} |O \cap K| \\ &\geq -2s + |O| \geq (1 - \varepsilon)|O|, \end{aligned}$$

as required. We discuss the running time of the algorithm in Section 5.3. \square

5.3 Efficient implementation of the local search algorithms

The time complexity of the c -local-search algorithm (for a straightforward implementation) is $O(n^{c+1})$ times the complexity of testing whether a set is π -hitting or finding an extension of a π -packing. Consequently, the exponent of the time complexity of the algorithms arising from Theorem 1.3 and 1.5 depends on the desired precision; i.e., we obtain a PTAS, not an EPTAS. However, in all the problems that we considered (INDUCED SUBGRAPH HITTING, DISTANCE r -DOMINATION or INDEPENDENT SET), the property π is *FO-definable* in the following sense: There exists a formula $\varphi(x_1, \dots, x_m, z)$ with free variables x_1, \dots, x_m , and z in the first-order logic (allowing quantification over vertices, but not over sets of vertices or over edges) using the adjacency predicate, such that (G, Z) with Z non-empty has the property π if and only if for some $v_1, \dots, v_m \in G$,

$$Z = \{v \in V(G) : G \models \varphi(v_1, \dots, v_m, v)\}.$$

E.g., for the property π used to define r -dominating and $2r$ -independent set problems, we can set $\varphi(x_1, z) \equiv \text{dist}_r(x_1, z)$, where

$$\text{dist}_r(x, y) \equiv (\exists p_0, \dots, p_r) x = p_0 \wedge y = p_r \wedge \bigwedge_{i=1}^r (p_{i-1} = p_i \vee p_{i-1}p_i \in E).$$

In this case, we can express the testing and extension in first-order logic. Let us demonstrate this on the most difficult example, the c -local search for the π -PACKING problem.

Let \mathcal{P} be the current π -packing in a graph G that we are trying to improve. To represent \mathcal{P} in a way accessible in a first-order formula, for each element P of \mathcal{P} , color the edges of a BFS spanning tree the subgraph of G induced by P red; we will access this information about edge colors using a new binary predicate R . Let $\text{dist}_r^R(x, y)$ be the predicate defined analogously to $\text{dist}_r(x, y)$, but with E replaced by R . Let T be the unary predicate interpreted as the set $\bigcup \mathcal{P}$. Note that in this representation, the sets in \mathcal{P} are exactly the components of the red-edge graph contained in the set T . We can delete at most $c - 1$ elements from \mathcal{P} and add c other elements to obtain a π -packing

exactly if the following first-order formula is satisfied:

$$\begin{aligned}
& (\exists r_1, \dots, r_{c-1}, x_1^1, \dots, x_m^1, \dots, x_1^c, \dots, x_m^c) \\
& \bigwedge_{j=1}^c (\exists z) \varphi(x_1^j, \dots, x_m^j, z) \\
& \wedge \bigwedge_{j=1}^c (\forall z) \left(\varphi(x_1^j, \dots, x_m^j, z) \wedge z \in T \Rightarrow \bigvee_{i=1}^{c-1} r_i \in T \wedge \text{dist}_{2r}^R(z, r_i) \right) \\
& \wedge \bigwedge_{1 \leq j_1 < j_2 \leq c} (\forall z_1, z_2) \left(\varphi(x_1^{j_1}, \dots, x_m^{j_1}, z_1) \wedge \varphi(x_1^{j_2}, \dots, x_m^{j_2}, z_2) \Rightarrow z_1 \neq z_2 \right).
\end{aligned}$$

The elements to be removed from \mathcal{P} are those intersected by r_1, \dots, r_{c-1} , while those added are given by the formula φ with parameters x_1^j, \dots, x_m^j for $j \in \{1, \dots, c\}$.

- The second line expresses that for each j , the formula φ parameterized by the m -tuple x_1^j, \dots, x_m^j defines a non-empty set Z_j .
- The third line states that Z_j intersects T only in the elements containing r_1, \dots, r_{c-1} that are to be removed from \mathcal{P} .
- The final line describes that the sets Z_1, \dots, Z_m are disjoint.

Using the data structure from Theorem 3.9 (in a variant supporting colors of edges), we can maintain the predicates T and R representing the current state of \mathcal{P} in constant time per recoloring, and find a value for the variables $r_1, \dots, r_{c-1}, x_1^1, \dots, x_m^1, \dots, x_1^c, \dots, x_m^c$ satisfying the formula above (if they exist) in constant time per query.

We conclude that for an FO-definable property of bounded diameter, an n -vertex graph G from any fixed class with bounded expansion, and any fixed positive integer c , we can run

- c -local search for minimum π -hitting in time $O(n)$, and
- (induced) c -local search for maximum π -packing in time $O(n^2)$.

The reason for the quadratic time in the second case is due to the need to recolor the red edges after each iteration, which may result in $O(n)$ time in case the sets of the (induced) π -packing have unbounded size. In case they have bounded size, e.g., for the maximum (induced) F -matching problem, the time complexity becomes $O(n)$. Moreover, even if the elements of the packing have unbounded size, it may be possible to use a different way how to represent the packing in the first-order logic (e.g., in the case of maximum t -independent set, we can just mark the vertices forming the set), again resulting in total time $O(n)$.

6 Applications to geometric intersection graphs

6.1 Fat-object graphs and pseudo-disk graphs

A graph class \mathcal{G} has *bounded clique-size* if there exists an integer $k \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $\omega(G) \leq k$ for all $G \in \mathcal{G}$. We say a graph class \mathcal{G} is of *clique-dependent polynomial expansion* if any sub-class $\mathcal{G}' \subseteq \mathcal{G}$ that has bounded clique-size is of polynomial expansion. Similarly, we say a graph class \mathcal{G} is of *clique-dependent bounded degeneracy* if any sub-class $\mathcal{G}' \subseteq \mathcal{G}$ that has bounded clique-size is of bounded degeneracy. By definition, it is clear that if a graph class is of clique-dependent

polynomial expansion, then it is also of clique-dependent bounded degeneracy. In what follows, we shall discuss two examples of geometric intersection graphs that are of clique-dependent polynomial expansion.

The first example is intersection graphs of *fat objects*. A geometric object X in \mathbb{R}^d is α -*fat* for a number $\alpha \geq 1$ if X is convex and there are two balls $B_{\text{in}}, B_{\text{out}}$ in \mathbb{R}^d such that $B_{\text{in}} \subseteq X \subseteq B_{\text{out}}$ and $\text{rad}(B_{\text{out}}) \leq \alpha \cdot \text{rad}(B_{\text{in}})$. Clearly, balls are exactly the 1-fat geometric objects. We say \mathcal{G} is a class of *fat-object graphs* if there exist $\alpha \geq 1$ and $d \in \mathbb{N}$ such that every graph in \mathcal{G} is the intersection graph of a set of α -fat geometric objects in \mathbb{R}^d . It was known that fat-object graphs with bounded clique size form a graph class with strongly sublinear separators [34, 44, 51]. Therefore, a class of fat-object graphs is of clique-dependent polynomial expansion.

The second example is intersection graphs of *pseudo-disks*. A set of geometric objects in the plane are called *pseudo-disks* if each of them is homeomorphic to a disk and the boundaries of any two objects are either disjoint or intersect exactly twice. A graph is a *pseudo-disk graph* if it is the intersection graph of a set of pseudo-disks in the plane. We show that pseudo-disk graphs with bounded clique size have strongly sublinear separators, and thus form a graph class of clique-dependent polynomial expansion.

Lemma 6.1. *The class of pseudo-disk graphs is of clique-dependent polynomial expansion.*

Proof. Consider a set \mathcal{S} of pseudo-disks in the plane and let G be the intersection graph of \mathcal{S} . Suppose $\omega(G) \leq p$. For each $S \in \mathcal{S}$, we denote by $v_S \in V(G)$ its corresponding vertex. The boundaries of the pseudo-disks in \mathcal{S} subdivide the plane into connected regions called *faces*. The *depth* of a face is the number of pseudo-disks in \mathcal{S} containing it. Two faces are *adjacent* if their boundaries share a common arc. The *arrangement graph* $A(\mathcal{S})$ of \mathcal{S} is a planar graph whose vertices are the faces contained in at least one pseudo-disk in \mathcal{S} and two vertices are connected by an edge if they are adjacent. Observe that each $S \in \mathcal{S}$, the subgraph of $A(\mathcal{S})$ induced by the faces contained in S is connected, because S is connected. It is well-known [82] that the number of faces of depth at most d is bounded by $O(dn)$, where $n = |\mathcal{S}|$. Since $\omega(G) \leq p$, all faces are of depth at most p and thus the total number of faces is $O(pn)$, which implies that $A(\mathcal{S})$ has $O(pn)$ vertices. By recursively applying the separator theorem for planar graphs, we can find a set X of $f(p) \cdot \sqrt{n}$ vertices of $A(\mathcal{S})$ such that each connected component of $A(\mathcal{S}) - X$ has at most $n/(2p)$ vertices. Let $\mathcal{S}' \subseteq \mathcal{S}$ be the subset consisting of pseudo-disks which contain a face corresponding to some $x \in X$. Since the depth of each face is at most p , we have $|\mathcal{S}'| \leq p \cdot |X| = f'(p) \cdot \sqrt{n}$ where $f'(p) = pf(p)$. We claim that \mathcal{S}' is a balanced separator of G . Let C_1, \dots, C_r be the connected components of $A(\mathcal{S}) - X$. For each pseudo-disk $S \in \mathcal{S} \setminus \mathcal{S}'$, let Y_S be the set of vertices of $A(\mathcal{S})$ whose corresponding faces are contained in S . Observe that the vertices in Y_S belong to the same connected component of $A(\mathcal{S}) - X$, because $Y_S \cap X = \emptyset$ and Y_S induces a connected subgraph of $A(\mathcal{S})$; we say S *belongs to* C_i if the vertices in Y_S belong to C_i . Also notice that if $S, S' \in \mathcal{S} \setminus \mathcal{S}'$ belong to different connected components of $A(\mathcal{S}) - X$, then there is no edge between S and S' in G , since S and S' do not intersect. Therefore, the vertices in one connected component of $G - \mathcal{S}'$ must belong to the same C_i . Since each C_i has at most $n/(2p)$ vertices and the face corresponding to each vertex can be contained in at most p pseudo-disks in \mathcal{S} , the number of vertices of $G - \mathcal{S}'$ belonging to C_i is at most $n/2$. As a result, each connected component of $G - \mathcal{S}'$ contains at most $n/2$ vertices and thus \mathcal{S}' is a balanced separator of G . Now we see every n -vertex pseudo-disk graph with maximum clique size at most p has a balanced separator of size $f(p) \cdot \sqrt{n}$ for some function f . Thus, the class of pseudo-disk graphs is of clique-dependent polynomial expansion. \square

Now we show how to extend our results in the previous sections to graph classes of clique-dependent polynomial expansion. The key is a clique-decomposition scheme. For a graph G and

an integer $k \geq 1$, a k -clique decomposition of G is a partition of $V(G)$ into V_0, V_1, \dots, V_r such that $\omega(G[V_0]) < k$ and $G[V_i]$ is a k -clique for all $i \in [r]$. Note that a k -clique decomposition always exists for any graph and any k . Indeed, one can keep removing k -cliques from the graph until the maximum clique is of size smaller than k .

Lemma 6.2. *Given a graph G and an integer $k \geq 1$, one can compute a k -clique decomposition of G in $f(d) \cdot n$ time for some function f , where $n = |V(G)|$ and d is the degeneracy of G .*

Proof. Using the classical algorithm by Matula and Beck [98], one can compute a degeneracy ordering of G in $O(n + |E(G)|)$ time, i.e., $O(dn)$ time. Let v_1, \dots, v_n be the degeneracy ordering computed. Define $E_i = \{(v_j, v_i) \in E(G) : j < i\}$ for $i \in [n]$. By the property of a degeneracy ordering, $|E_i| \leq d$ for all $i \in [n]$. Furthermore, one can easily compute E_1, \dots, E_n in $O(dn)$ time. Next, we consider each vertex v_i for i from 1 to n . During this procedure, we maintain a k -clique decomposition of the graph $G[\{v_1, \dots, v_i\}]$. Suppose V_0, V_1, \dots, V_r is a k -clique decomposition of the graph $G[\{v_1, \dots, v_{i-1}\}]$. In order to obtain a k -clique decomposition of $G[\{v_1, \dots, v_i\}]$, we consider the graph $G[V_0 \cup \{v_i\}]$. If $\omega(G[V_0 \cup \{v_i\}]) < k$, then $V_0 \cup \{v_i\}, V_1, \dots, V_r$ is a k -clique decomposition of $G[\{v_1, \dots, v_i\}]$. Otherwise, there exists a k -clique K in $G[V_0 \cup \{v_i\}]$, which must contain v_i since $\omega(G[V_0]) < k$. In this case, $V_0 \setminus V(K), V_1, \dots, V_r, K$ is a k -clique decomposition of $G[\{v_1, \dots, v_i\}]$, because $\omega(G[V_0 \setminus V(K)]) \leq \omega(G[V_0]) < k$. So it suffices to find the clique K (or verify its non-existence). Since we know $v_i \in V(K)$, the other vertices of K are all in $N_G(v_i) \cap V_0$. The problem now becomes finding a $(k-1)$ -clique in $G[N_G(v_i) \cap V_0]$. Note that the vertices in $N_G(v_i) \cap V_0$ are exactly those incident to the edges in E_i and contained in V_0 . As $|E_i| \leq d$, by checking all endpoints of the edges in E_i , we can compute $N_G(v_i) \cap V_0$ in $O(d)$ time. Indeed, we can determine whether a vertex is in V_0 or not in $O(1)$ time by maintaining a mark on each vertex in V_0 . After obtaining $N_G(v_i) \cap V_0$, we then retrieve the edges of $G[N_G(v_i) \cap V_0]$. This can be done in $O(d^2)$ time since every edge of $G[N_G(v_i) \cap V_0]$ is contained in E_j for some $v_j \in N_G(v_i) \cap V_0$. Once we have the graph $G[N_G(v_i) \cap V_0]$ in hand, we can find a $(k-1)$ -clique in $G[N_G(v_i) \cap V_0]$ or determine no such a clique in $2^{O(d)}$ time by brute-force, because $G[N_G(v_i) \cap V_0]$ has at most d vertices. In this way, we obtain a k -clique decomposition of $G[\{v_1, \dots, v_i\}]$ from the k -clique decomposition of $G[\{v_1, \dots, v_{i-1}\}]$ in $2^{O(d)}$ time. After considering all vertices v_1, \dots, v_n , we finally obtain a k -clique decomposition of G , and the total time cost is $f(d) \cdot n$ for some function f . \square

Lemma 6.3. *Let \mathcal{G} be a hereditary graph class of clique-dependent bounded degeneracy. Given a graph $G \in \mathcal{G}$ and an integer $k \geq 1$, one can compute a k -clique decomposition of G in $f(k) \cdot n \log n + O(m)$ time for some function f , where $n = |V(G)|$ and $m = |E(G)|$.*

Proof. For $p \in \mathbb{N}$, we write $\mathcal{G}_p = \{G \in \mathcal{G} : \omega(G) \leq p\}$. Since \mathcal{G} is of clique-dependent bounded degeneracy, there exists a function $d : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ such that all graphs in \mathcal{G}_p has degeneracy at most $d(p)$ for every $p \in \mathbb{N}$. We compute a k -clique decomposition of a given graph $G \in \mathcal{G}$ using a simple divide-and-conquer algorithm. First, we evenly partition the vertices of G into two sets V' and V'' , each of which contains $n/2$ vertices. Then we recursively compute a k -clique decomposition $V'_0, V'_1, \dots, V'_{r'}$ of $G[V']$ and a k -clique decomposition $V''_0, V''_1, \dots, V''_{r''}$ of $G[V'']$. Finally, we compute a k -clique decomposition V_0, V_1, \dots, V_r of $G[V'_0 \cup V''_0]$ using the algorithm in Lemma 6.2. Observe that $V_0, V_1, \dots, V_r, V'_0, V'_1, \dots, V'_{r'}, V''_0, V''_1, \dots, V''_{r''}$ is a k -clique decomposition of G . Indeed, this is clearly a partition of $V(G)$ in which $\omega(G[V_0]) < k$ and all the other parts induce k -cliques. Therefore, we can return it as our output. To analyze the running time of our algorithm, note that $\omega(G[V'_0 \cup V''_0]) < 2k$, because $\omega(G[V'_0]) < k$ and $\omega(G[V''_0]) < k$. Also, $G[V'_0 \cup V''_0] \in \mathcal{G}$ since \mathcal{G} is hereditary. It follows that $G[V'_0 \cup V''_0] \in \mathcal{G}_{2k}$ and the degeneracy of $G[V'_0 \cup V''_0]$ is at most $d(2k)$. Therefore, applying the algorithm in Lemma 6.2 takes $f_0(d(2k)) \cdot n$ time for some function f_0 . Besides, before

the recursive calls of the algorithm on $G[V']$ and $G[V'']$, we need to construct these two graphs. Also, we need to construct $G[V'_0 \cup V''_0]$ before working on it. If we do these graph constructions explicitly, it takes $O(m)$ time. In this way, the running time of our algorithm satisfies the recurrence

$$T(n, m) = T(n/2, m') + T(n/2, m'') + f_0(d(2k)) \cdot n + O(m),$$

where m' and m'' are the numbers of edges in $G[V']$ and $G[V'']$, respectively. As $m' + m'' \leq m$, This recurrence solves to $T(n, m) = f(k) \cdot n \log n + O(m \log n)$ for some function f .

In fact, we can further improve the running time to $f(k) \cdot n \log n + O(m)$ as follows. The recursion tree of the above algorithm is a binary tree T of depth $O(\log n)$ whose leaves one-to-one correspond to the n vertices in G . Each node of T corresponds to a recursive call of the algorithm. For each node $t \in T$, let G_t denote the subgraph of G induced by the vertices corresponding to the leaves of the subtree of T rooted at t . The call at the node t returns a k -clique decomposition of G_t . In order to avoid the $O(m \log n)$ term in the above algorithm, we do a preprocessing as follows. We first build the recursion tree T , which can be done in $O(n)$ time. Next, we store every edge $e = (u, v) \in E(G)$ at the lowest common ancestor of the two leaves of T corresponding to u and v . Using the classical algorithm by Harel and Tarjan [76], the lowest common ancestor can be found in $O(1)$ time. Thus, this step can be done in $O(m)$ time in total. Let E_t denote the set of edges stored at each node $t \in T$. After this preprocessing, we apply the above recursive algorithm with some small modifications. First, in the call at a node $t \in T$, we not only return a k -clique decomposition V_0, V_1, \dots, V_k of G_t , but also return the induced subgraph $G[V_0]$. Achieving this is not difficult, as the part V_0 is finally obtained by the algorithm of Lemma 6.2 and that algorithm can actually also return the induced subgraph $G[V_0]$ in the same running time. Second, when we recursively call the algorithm at the children of a node, we do not construct the corresponding graphs of the children beforehand. This modification brings us an issue: when solving the problem at a node t , we do not have the graph G_t in hand. In this situation, we can still do the recursive calls at the children t' and t'' of t (as we do not need to construct the corresponding graphs). However, after we obtain the k -clique decomposition $V'_0, V'_1, \dots, V'_{r'}$ of $G_{t'}$ and the k -clique decomposition $V''_0, V''_1, \dots, V''_{r''}$ of $G_{t''}$ returned by the recursive calls, we have to efficiently construct the graph $G[V'_0 \cup V''_0]$ without knowing G_t and then apply the algorithm of Lemma 6.2 on $G[V'_0 \cup V''_0]$. By assumption, the recursive calls already return us the graphs $G[V'_0]$ and $G[V''_0]$. Observe that all edges of $G[V'_0 \cup V''_0]$ except those in $G[V'_0]$ and $G[V''_0]$ are in the set E_t . Therefore, to construct $G[V'_0 \cup V''_0]$ provided $G[V'_0]$ and $G[V''_0]$, we only need to check every edge in E_t and find those with one endpoint in V'_0 and the other endpoint in V''_0 , which can be done in $O(|E_t|)$ time. Now if we use $T(t)$ to denote the running time of the call at the node t , it satisfies the recurrence

$$T(t) = T(t') + T(t'') + f_0(d(2k)) \cdot |V(G_t)| + O(|E_t|).$$

Since $\sum_{t \in T} |E_t| = m$, the recurrence solves to $T(\text{rt}) = f(k) \cdot n \log n + O(m)$ for some function f , where $\text{rt} \in T$ is the root of T . \square

Based on the clique-decomposition algorithm, we can extend our lossy kernels and approximation schemes to any classes of geometric intersection graphs that are of clique-dependent polynomial expansion, which include in particular fat-object graphs and pseudo-disk graphs.

Theorem 6.4. *Let \mathcal{G} be a class of fat-object graphs or the class of pseudo-disk graphs. For any fixed (finite) \mathcal{F} of connected graphs, SUBGRAPH HITTING on \mathcal{G} with forbidden list \mathcal{F} admits a $(1 + \varepsilon)$ -approximation lossy kernel of size $f(\varepsilon) \cdot k$ for some function f . The kernelization algorithm runs in $g(\varepsilon) \cdot n \log n + O(m)$ time for some function g , where n (resp., m) is the number of vertices (resp., edges) of the input graph $G \in \mathcal{G}$.*

Proof. In this proof, all instances of SUBGRAPH HITTING are with forbidden list \mathcal{F} . For $p \in \mathbb{N}$, we write $\mathcal{G}_p = \{G \in \mathcal{G} : \omega(G) \leq p\}$. Since \mathcal{G} is of clique-dependent polynomial expansion, \mathcal{G}_p is of polynomial expansion for every $p \in \mathbb{N}$. Let $G \in \mathcal{G}$ be a SUBGRAPH HITTING instance and $\varepsilon > 0$ be the approximation factor. As before, set $\gamma = \max_{F \in \mathcal{F}} |V(F)|$. Define $t = \frac{1+\varepsilon}{\varepsilon} \cdot (\gamma - 1)$. We first apply the algorithm of Lemma 6.3 to compute a t -clique decomposition V_0, V_1, \dots, V_r of G . We have $\omega(G[V_0]) < t$. It follows that $G[V_0] \in \mathcal{G}_t$, since \mathcal{G} is hereditary.

We observe that if $S_0 \subseteq G[V_0]$ is a c -approximation solution for the instance $G[V_0]$, then $S = S_0 \cup (\bigcup_{i=1}^r V_i)$ is a $(1 + \varepsilon)c$ -approximation solution for the instance G . Clearly, S is a feasible solution for G . Indeed, $G - S = G[V_0] - S_0$ and the latter contains no forbidden pattern in \mathcal{F} as a subgraph since S_0 is a solution of $G[V_0]$. It suffices to show that $|S| \leq (1 + \varepsilon)c \cdot |S'|$ for any solution $S' \subseteq V(G)$. First observe that $S' \cap V_0$ is a feasible solution of $G[V_0]$, for otherwise the graph $G[V_0] - S' \cap V_0$ contains a forbidden pattern in \mathcal{F} as a subgraph and so does $G - S'$, which contradicts that S' is a solution for G . Therefore, $|S_0| \leq c \cdot |S' \cap V_0|$. Now we consider the sets V_1, \dots, V_r , which induce t -cliques in G . For each $i \in [r]$, we must have $|V_i \setminus S'| \leq \gamma - 1$, for otherwise $G - S'$ contains a γ -clique and thus contains any forbidden pattern in \mathcal{F} . It follows that $|S' \cap V_i| \geq t - (\gamma - 1) = \frac{t}{1+\varepsilon}$ for each $i \in [r]$. So we have

$$|S| = |S_0| + rt \leq c \cdot |S' \cap V_0| + (1 + \varepsilon) \cdot \sum_{i=1}^r |S' \cap V_i| = (1 + \varepsilon)c \cdot |S'|.$$

Now we see that given a c -approximation solution for $G[V_0]$, one can compute in linear time a $(1 + \varepsilon)c$ -approximation solution for G . So we can reduce the instance G to the instance $G[V_0]$. As $G[V_0] \in \mathcal{G}_t$ and \mathcal{G}_t is of polynomial expansion, we can further apply Theorem 1.2 to reduce $G[V_0]$ to a linear-size lossy kernel. The kernel size is $f(\varepsilon, t) \cdot k$ and the running time is $g(\varepsilon, t) \cdot n \log n + O(m)$. Note that t depends only on ε . Thus, we have the bounds in the theorem. \square

Theorem 6.5. *Let \mathcal{G} be a class of fat-object graphs or the class of pseudo-disk graphs. SUBGRAPH HITTING on \mathcal{G} admits an approximation scheme with running time $f(\varepsilon, \mathcal{F}) \cdot n \log n + O(m)$ for some function f , where n (resp., m) is the number of vertices (resp., edges) of the input graph $G \in \mathcal{G}$.*

Proof. The proof is similar to that of Theorem 6.4. For $p \in \mathbb{N}$, we write $\mathcal{G}_p = \{G \in \mathcal{G} : \omega(G) \leq p\}$. Since \mathcal{G} is of clique-dependent polynomial expansion, \mathcal{G}_p is of polynomial expansion for every $p \in \mathbb{N}$. Let (G, \mathcal{F}) be a SUBGRAPH HITTING instance where $G \in \mathcal{G}$, and $\varepsilon > 0$ be the approximation factor. As before, set $\gamma = \max_{F \in \mathcal{F}} |V(F)|$. Define $t = \frac{1+\varepsilon}{\varepsilon} \cdot (\gamma - 1)$. We apply Lemma 6.3 to compute a t -clique decomposition V_0, V_1, \dots, V_r of G . We have $\omega(G[V_0]) < t$ and $G[V_0] \in \mathcal{G}_t$. Now apply Corollary 1.4 to compute $(1 + \varepsilon)$ -approximation $S_0 \subseteq V_0$ for $(G[V_0], \mathcal{F})$ in $f(\varepsilon, t) \cdot n$ time. The same analysis as in the proof of Theorem 6.5 shows that $S = S_0 \cup (\bigcup_{i=1}^r V_i)$ is a $(1 + \varepsilon)$ -approximation solution for (G, \mathcal{F}) . As t depends only on ε and \mathcal{F} , the total running time is $f(\varepsilon, \mathcal{F}) \cdot n$. \square

Lemma 6.3 also gives us a byproduct for k -SUBGRAPH ISOMORPHISM.

Theorem 6.6. *Let \mathcal{G} be a class of fat-object graphs or the class of pseudo-disk graphs. k -SUBGRAPH ISOMORPHISM on \mathcal{G} can be solved in $f(k) \cdot n \log n + O(m)$ time for some function f , where n and m are the numbers of vertices and edges in the input graph $G \in \mathcal{G}$, respectively.*

Proof. For $p \in \mathbb{N}$, we write $\mathcal{G}_p = \{G \in \mathcal{G} : \omega(G) \leq p\}$. Since \mathcal{G} is of clique-dependent polynomial expansion, \mathcal{G}_p is of polynomial expansion for every $p \in \mathbb{N}$. Thus, by Theorem 3.5, for each $p \in \mathbb{N}$, there exists a function f_p such that k -SUBGRAPH ISOMORPHISM on \mathcal{G}_p can be solved in $f_p(k) \cdot n$ time. Now consider a graph $G \in \mathcal{G}$, and let H be the k -vertex graph we are looking for. We first apply

Lemma 6.3 to compute a k -clique decomposition V_0, V_1, \dots, V_r of G in $f(k) \cdot n \log n + O(m)$ time. If $r \geq 1$, then we find a k -clique that contains H as a subgraph. Otherwise, $r = 0$ and $G = G[V_0]$, which implies that $\omega(G) < k$, i.e., $G \in \mathcal{G}_k$. In this case, we can solve k -SUBGRAPH ISOMORPHISM on G in $f_k(k) \cdot n$ time. Finally, the total running time is bounded by $f(k) \cdot n \log n + O(m)$ time for some function f . \square

6.2 String graphs

String graphs are intersection graphs of arbitrary connected geometric objects in the plane. Unfortunately, string graphs are not of clique-dependent polynomial expansion. However, these graphs are “biclique-dependent” polynomial expansion: any subclass of string graphs that has bounded biclique-size is of polynomial expansion.

For a graph G and an integer $k \geq 1$, a k -biclique decomposition of G is a partition of $V(G)$ into V_0, V_1, \dots, V_r such that $\omega'(G[V_0]) < k$ and $G[V_i]$ is a (k, k) -biclique for all $i \in [r]$. We show that k -biclique decompositions can be computed efficiently on graph classes of biclique-dependent polynomial expansion.

Lemma 6.7. *Let \mathcal{G} be a hereditary graph class of biclique-dependent polynomial expansion. Given a graph $G \in \mathcal{G}$ and an integer k , one can compute a k -biclique decomposition of G in $f(k) \cdot n^2$ time for some function f , where $n = |V(G)|$.*

Proof. For $p \in \mathbb{N}$, we write $\mathcal{G}_p = \{G \in \mathcal{G} : \omega'(G) \leq p\}$. Since \mathcal{G} is of biclique-dependent polynomial expansion, each \mathcal{G}_p is a graph class of polynomial expansion. So SUBGRAPH ISOMORPHISM (for a fixed subgraph) can be solved in linear time on \mathcal{G}_p [45]. In other words, there exists a function f_p such that one can find a subgraph of q vertices in a given $G \in \mathcal{G}_p$ in $f_p(q) \cdot n$ time. For convenience, we denote this SUBGRAPH ISOMORPHISM algorithm by \mathbf{A}_p .

We compute a k -biclique decomposition of a given graph $G \in \mathcal{G}$ as follows. Suppose $V(G) = \{v_1, \dots, v_n\}$. We consider each v_i iteratively for $i = 1, \dots, n$ and maintain a k -biclique decomposition of the induced subgraph $G[\{v_1, \dots, v_i\}]$. Let V_0, V_1, \dots, V_r be a k -biclique decomposition of $G[\{v_1, \dots, v_{i-1}\}]$. To compute a k -biclique decomposition of $G[\{v_1, \dots, v_i\}]$, we simply call the algorithm \mathbf{A}_k to find a (k, k) -biclique in $G[V_0 \cup \{v_i\}]$. Note that \mathbf{A}_k can be applied to $G[V_0 \cup \{v_i\}]$, and it takes $f_k(2k) \cdot n$ time. Indeed, we have $\omega'(G[V_0 \cup \{v_i\}]) \leq \omega'(G[V_0]) + 1 \leq k$, since $\omega'(G[V_0]) < k$ by the definition of a k -biclique decomposition. If $G[V_0 \cup \{v_i\}]$ does not contain a (k, k) -biclique, then $V_0 \cup \{v_i\}, V_1, \dots, V_r$ is a k -biclique decomposition of $G[\{v_1, \dots, v_i\}]$. Otherwise, let V_{r+1} be (the vertex set of) a (k, k) -biclique in $G[V_0 \cup \{v_i\}]$. Observe that $v_i \in V_{r+1}$, for otherwise $G[V_0]$ contains a (k, k) -biclique, which contradicts the fact $\omega'(G[V_0]) < k$. Therefore, $\omega'(G[(V_0 \cup \{v_i\}) \setminus V_{r+1}]) < k$, as $(V_0 \cup \{v_i\}) \setminus V_{r+1} \subseteq V_0$. In this case, $(V_0 \cup \{v_i\}) \setminus V_{r+1}, V_1, \dots, V_r, V_{r+1}$ is a k -biclique decomposition of $G[\{v_1, \dots, v_i\}]$. After the last vertex v_n is considered, we obtain a k -biclique decomposition of G . The overall time complexity of the algorithm is $f(k) \cdot n^2$ for some function f , since each iteration takes linear time. \square

Based on the biclique-decomposition algorithm, we can extend our lossy kernels and approximation schemes to string graphs, when the forbidden graphs contain a bipartite graph.

Theorem 6.8. *Let \mathcal{G} be the class of string graphs. For any fixed (finite) set \mathcal{F} of connected graphs among which at least one is bipartite, SUBGRAPH HITTING on \mathcal{G} with forbidden list \mathcal{F} admits a $(2 + \varepsilon)$ -approximation lossy kernel of size $f(\varepsilon) \cdot k$ for some function f . The kernelization algorithm runs in $g(\varepsilon) \cdot n^2$ time for some function g , where n is the number of vertices of the input graph $G \in \mathcal{G}$.*

Proof. The proof is almost the same as that of Theorem 6.4. For $p \in \mathbb{N}$, we write $\mathcal{G}_p = \{G \in \mathcal{G} : \omega'(G) \leq p\}$. Since \mathcal{G} is of biclique-dependent polynomial expansion, \mathcal{G}_p is of polynomial expansion for every $p \in \mathbb{N}$. Let $G \in \mathcal{G}$ be a SUBGRAPH HITTING instance (with forbidden list \mathcal{F}) and $\varepsilon > 0$ be the approximation factor. As before, set $\gamma = \max_{F \in \mathcal{F}} |V(F)|$. By assumption, there exists a bipartite graph $F \in \mathcal{F}$. Define $t = \frac{2+\varepsilon}{\varepsilon} \cdot (\gamma - 1)$. We first apply the algorithm of Lemma 6.7 to compute a t -biclique decomposition V_0, V_1, \dots, V_r of G . We have $\omega'(G[V_0]) < t$. It follows that $G[V_0] \in \mathcal{G}_t$, since \mathcal{G} is hereditary.

We observe that if $S_0 \subseteq G[V_0]$ is a c -approximation solution for the instance $G[V_0]$, then $S = S_0 \cup (\bigcup_{i=1}^r V_i)$ is a $(2 + \varepsilon)c$ -approximation solution for the instance G . Clearly, S is a feasible solution for G . Indeed, $G - S = G[V_0] - S_0$ and the latter contains no forbidden pattern in \mathcal{F} as a subgraph since S_0 is a solution of $G[V_0]$. It suffices to show that $|S| \leq (2 + \varepsilon)c \cdot |S'|$ for any solution $S' \subseteq V(G)$. First observe that $S' \cap V_0$ is a feasible solution of $G[V_0]$, for otherwise the graph $G[V_0] - S' \cap V_0$ contains a forbidden pattern in \mathcal{F} as a subgraph and so does $G - S'$, which contradicts that S' is a solution for G . Therefore, $|S_0| \leq c \cdot |S' \cap V_0|$. Now we consider the sets V_1, \dots, V_r , each of which forms a (t, t) -biclique in G . For each $i \in [r]$, S' must intersect one side of $G[V_i]$ with at least $t - (\gamma - 1)$ vertices, for otherwise $G - S'$ contains a (γ, γ) -biclique and thus contains the bipartite forbidden pattern F . It follows that $|S' \cap V_i| \geq t - (\gamma - 1) = \frac{2t}{2+\varepsilon}$ for each $i \in [r]$. So we have

$$|S| = |S_0| + 2rt \leq c \cdot |S' \cap V_0| + (2 + \varepsilon) \cdot \sum_{i=1}^r |S' \cap V_i| = (2 + \varepsilon)c \cdot |S'|.$$

Now we see that given a c -approximation solution for $G[V_0]$, one can compute in linear time a $(2 + \varepsilon)c$ -approximation solution for G . So we can reduce the instance G to the instance $G[V_0]$. As $G[V_0] \in \mathcal{G}_t$ and \mathcal{G}_t is of polynomial expansion, we can further apply Theorem 1.2 to reduce $G[V_0]$ to a linear-size lossy kernel. The kernel size is $f(\varepsilon, t) \cdot k$ and the running time is $g(\varepsilon, t) \cdot n^2$. Note that t depends only on ε . Thus, we have the bounds in the theorem. \square

Theorem 6.9. *Let \mathcal{G} be the class of string graphs. BIPARTITE SUBGRAPH HITTING on \mathcal{G} admits a $(2 + \varepsilon)$ -approximation algorithm with running time $f(\varepsilon, \mathcal{F}) \cdot n^2$ for some function f , where n is the number of vertices of the input graph $G \in \mathcal{G}$.*

Proof. The proof is similar to that of Theorem 6.8. For $p \in \mathbb{N}$, we write $\mathcal{G}_p = \{G \in \mathcal{G} : \omega(G) \leq p\}$. Since \mathcal{G} is of biclique-dependent polynomial expansion, \mathcal{G}_p is of polynomial expansion for every $p \in \mathbb{N}$. Let (G, \mathcal{F}) be a BIPARTITE SUBGRAPH HITTING instance where $G \in \mathcal{G}$, and $\varepsilon > 0$ be the approximation factor. As before, set $\gamma = \max_{F \in \mathcal{F}} |V(F)|$. Define $t = \frac{2+\varepsilon}{\varepsilon} \cdot (\gamma - 1)$. We apply Lemma 6.3 to compute a t -biclique decomposition V_0, V_1, \dots, V_r of G . We have $\omega(G[V_0]) < t$ and $G[V_0] \in \mathcal{G}_t$. Now apply Corollary 1.4 to compute $(1 + \varepsilon)$ -approximation $S_0 \subseteq V_0$ for $(G[V_0], \mathcal{F})$ in $f(\varepsilon, t) \cdot n$ time. The same analysis as in the proof of Theorem 6.9 shows that $S = S_0 \cup (\bigcup_{i=1}^r V_i)$ is a $(2 + \varepsilon)$ -approximation solution for (G, \mathcal{F}) . As t depends only on ε and \mathcal{F} , the total running time is $f(\varepsilon, \mathcal{F}) \cdot n^2$. \square

7 Hitting shallow minors

In this section, we show that the (INDUCED) SHALLOW-MINOR HITTING problem can be reduced to (INDUCED) SUBGRAPH HITTING, and thus Theorem 1.1 as well as all its applications can be extended to (INDUCED) SHALLOW-MINOR HITTING.

Lemma 7.1. *Given a finite set \mathcal{F} of graphs and an integer $d \geq 0$, one can compute another finite set \mathcal{F}' of graphs such that a graph contains a (induced) d -shallow minor in \mathcal{F} iff it contains a (induced) subgraph in \mathcal{F}' .*

Proof. Let $\delta = \max_{F \in \mathcal{F}} |V(F)|$. We define \mathcal{F}' as the set of all graphs F' such that $|V(F')| \leq (d+1)\delta^2$ and F' contains F as an induced d -shallow minor for some $F \in \mathcal{F}$. Clearly, if a graph G contains some $F' \in \mathcal{F}'$ as a (induced) subgraph, then it contains some $F \in \mathcal{F}$ as a (induced) d -shallow minor. For the other direction, assume G contains some $F \in \mathcal{F}$ as a (induced) d -shallow minor. For a vertex $v \in V(F)$, denote by G_v the connected subgraph of G that is contracted to v . In each G_v , we pick a reference vertex $\xi_v \in V(G_v)$. The diameter of G_v is at most d . Thus, for each edge $(u, v) \in E(F)$, there exists a path $\pi_{u,v} = (v_0, v_1, \dots, v_r)$ in G between ξ_u and ξ_v such that **(i)** $\pi_{u,v}$ contains at most $2(d+1)$ vertices and **(ii)** there exists $i \in [r]$ such that $v_0, \dots, v_{i-1} \in V(G_u)$ and $v_i, \dots, v_r \in V(G_v)$. Let F'_0 be the subgraph of G consisting of the paths $\pi_{u,v}$ for all $(u, v) \in E(F)$. We now add to F'_0 some extra edges. Specifically, for each $v \in V(F)$, we add to F'_0 all edges of G_v with both endpoints in $V(F'_0)$. Also, for each $(u, v) \in E(F)$, we add to F'_0 all edges of G with one endpoint in $F'_0 \cap G_u$ and the other endpoint in $F'_0 \cap G_v$. Let F' denote the resulting new graph, which is still a subgraph of G . As $|E(F)| \leq \delta^2/2$, we have $|V(F')| = |V(F'_0)| \leq (d+1)\delta^2$. Furthermore, F' contains F as an induced d -shallow minor. To see this, notice that $F' \cap G_v$ is connected for all $v \in V(F)$, simply because $F'_0 \cap G_v$ is connected. Furthermore, there is an edge in F' between $F' \cap G_u$ and $F' \cap G_v$ iff $(u, v) \in E(F)$. Thus, F can be obtained from F' by contracting each $F' \cap G_v$ to a single vertex. It follows that $F' \in \mathcal{F}'$. Clearly, F' is a subgraph of G . If F is an *induced* minor of G , we claim that F' is an induced subgraph of G . Consider two vertices $x, y \in V(F')$ such that $(x, y) \in E(G)$. If $x, y \in G_v$ for some $v \in V(F)$, then $(x, y) \in E(F')$ by our construction. If $x \in G_u$ and $y \in G_v$ where $u \neq v$, then $(u, v) \in E(F)$ because F is an induced minor of G . Again by our construction, $(x, y) \in E(F')$. \square

Recall that in (INDUCED) SHALLOW-MINOR HITTING, we are given a graph G , a forbidden list \mathcal{F} , an integer $d \geq 0$, and the goal is to compute a minimum set $S \subseteq V(G)$ such that $G - S$ does not contain any graph in \mathcal{F} as a d -shallow minor. Consider an instance (G, \mathcal{F}, d) of (INDUCED) SHALLOW-MINOR HITTING. We can use the above lemma to compute a set \mathcal{F}' of graphs, which only depends on \mathcal{F} and d . Now a subset $S \subseteq V(G)$ is a solution of the (INDUCED) SHALLOW-MINOR HITTING instance (G, \mathcal{F}, d) iff it is a solution of the (INDUCED) SUBGRAPH HITTING instance (G, \mathcal{F}') . On the other hand, there is a trivial reduction from (INDUCED) SUBGRAPH HITTING to (INDUCED) SHALLOW-MINOR HITTING, because (induced) subgraphs are exactly (induced) 0-shallow minors. As such, Theorem 1.1 can be extended to (INDUCED) SHALLOW-MINOR HITTING.

Theorem 7.2. *Let \mathcal{G} be any hereditary graph class of bounded expansion. If (INDUCED) SHALLOW-MINOR HITTING on \mathcal{G} admits an approximation scheme with running time $f_0(\varepsilon, \mathcal{F}, d, \Delta) \cdot n^c$ for some function f_0 , then the same problem also admits an approximation scheme with running time $f(\varepsilon, \mathcal{F}, d) \cdot n^c$ for some function f , where n is the number of vertices in the input graph $G \in \mathcal{G}$ and Δ is the maximum degree of G .*

Also, all of our algorithmic results derived from Theorem 1.1 can be extended to (INDUCED) SHALLOW-MINOR HITTING, with the same running time.

Acknowledgement

The authors would like to thank anonymous reviewers for their detailed comments on an earlier version of this paper. Specifically, the comments of one reviewer helped us substantially improve

the running time of our approximation schemes.

References

- [1] Manuel Aprile, Matthew Drescher, Samuel Fiorini, and Tony Huynh. A tight approximation algorithm for the cluster vertex deletion problem. In *Integer Programming and Combinatorial Optimization: 22nd International Conference, IPCO 2021, Atlanta, GA, USA, May 19–21, 2021, Proceedings 22*, pages 340–353. Springer, 2021. 2, 51
- [2] Per Austrin, Subhash Khot, and Muli Safra. Inapproximability of vertex cover and independent set in bounded degree graphs. *Theory of Computing*, 7(1):27–43, 2011. 51
- [3] Zongwen Bai, Jianhua Tu, and Yongtang Shi. An improved algorithm for the vertex cover p_3 problem on graphs of bounded treewidth. *CoRR*, abs/1603.09448, 2016. URL: <http://arxiv.org/abs/1603.09448>. 51
- [4] Brenda S. Baker. Approximation algorithms for np-complete problems on planar graphs. *J. ACM*, 41(1):153–180, 1994. URL: <http://doi.acm.org/10.1145/174644.174650>, doi: 10.1145/174644.174650. 2, 50
- [5] R Balasubramanian, Michael R Fellows, and Venkatesh Raman. An improved fixed-parameter algorithm for vertex cover. *Information Processing Letters*, 65(3):163–168, 1998. 51
- [6] Reuven Bar-Yehuda and Shimon Even. A local-ratio theorem for approximating the weighted vertex cover problem. *Annals of Discrete Mathematics*, 25(27-46):50, 1985. 51
- [7] Reuven Bar-Yehuda, Danny Hermelin, and Dror Rawitz. Minimum vertex cover in rectangle graphs. *Computational Geometry*, 44(6-7):356–364, 2011. 51
- [8] Nadja Betzler, Robert Bredereck, Rolf Niedermeier, and Johannes Uhlmann. On bounded-degree vertex deletion parameterized by treewidth. *Discrete Applied Mathematics*, 160(1-2):53–60, 2012. 2, 52
- [9] Rodica Boliac, Kathie Cameron, and Vadim V. Lozin. On computing the dissociation number and the induced matching number of bipartite graphs. *Ars Comb.*, 72, 2004. 51
- [10] Anudhyan Boral, Marek Cygan, Tomasz Kociumaka, and Marcin Pilipczuk. A fast branching algorithm for cluster vertex deletion. *Theory of Computing Systems*, 58:357–376, 2016. 51
- [11] Marin Bougeret and Ignasi Sau. How much does a treedepth modulator help to obtain polynomial kernels beyond sparse graphs? *Algorithmica*, 81(10):4043–4068, 2019. 2, 52
- [12] Christoph Brause and Rastislav Krivos-Bellus. On a relation between k -path partition and k -path vertex cover. *Discret. Appl. Math.*, 223:28–38, 2017. 51
- [13] Boštjan Brešar, Marko Jakovac, Ján Katrenič, Gabriel Semanišin, and Andrej Taranenko. On the vertex k -path cover. *Discrete Applied Mathematics*, 161(13-14):1943–1949, 2013. 2
- [14] Bostjan Bresar, Tim Kos, Rastislav Krivos-Bellus, and Gabriel Semanišin. Hitting subgraphs in P_4 -tidy graphs. *Appl. Math. Comput.*, 352:211–219, 2019. 51

- [15] Noah Brüstle, Tal Elbaz, Hamed Hatami, Onur Kocer, and Bingchan Ma. Approximation algorithms for hitting subgraphs. In *Combinatorial Algorithms: 32nd International Workshop, IWOCA 2021, Ottawa, ON, Canada, July 5–7, 2021, Proceedings 32*, pages 370–384. Springer, 2021. [50](#), [51](#)
- [16] Jonathan F Buss and Judy Goldsmith. Nondeterminism within p^\wedge . *SIAM Journal on Computing*, 22(3):560–572, 1993. [51](#)
- [17] Leizhen Cai and Yufei Cai. Incompressibility of h-free edge modification problems. *Algorithmica*, 71(3):731–757, 2015. [50](#)
- [18] Kathie Cameron and Pavol Hell. Independent packings in structured graphs. *Math. Program.*, 105(2-3):201–213, 2006. [51](#)
- [19] Radovan Cervený, Pratibha Choudhary, and Ondrej Suchý. On kernels for d-path vertex cover. *CoRR*, abs/2107.12245, 2021. [51](#)
- [20] Radovan Cervený and Ondrej Suchý. Faster FPT algorithm for 5-path vertex cover. In *44th International Symposium on Mathematical Foundations of Computer Science, MFCS 2019, August 26-30, 2019, Aachen, Germany*, pages 32:1–32:13, 2019. [51](#)
- [21] Radovan Cervený and Ondrej Suchý. Generating faster algorithms for d-path vertex cover. *CoRR*, abs/2111.05896, 2021. URL: <https://arxiv.org/abs/2111.05896>. [51](#)
- [22] Timothy M. Chan. Finding triangles and other small subgraphs in geometric intersection graphs. In *34rd Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms*. SIAM, 2023. [8](#)
- [23] L Sunil Chandran and Fabrizio Grandoni. Refined memorisation for vertex cover. In *Parameterized and Exact Computation: First International Workshop, IWPEC 2004, Bergen, Norway, September 14-17, 2004. Proceedings 1*, pages 61–70. Springer, 2004. [51](#)
- [24] Maw-Shang Chang, Li-Hsuan Chen, Ling-Ju Hung, Yi-Zhi Liu, Peter Rossmanith, and Somnath Sikdar. An $o^*(1.4658^n)$ -time exact algorithm for the maximum bounded-degree-1 set problem. In *Proceedings of the 31st workshop on combinatorial mathematics and computation theory*, pages 9–18, 2014. [51](#)
- [25] Maw-Shang Chang, Li-Hsuan Chen, Ling-Ju Hung, Yi-Zhi Liu, Peter Rossmanith, and Somnath Sikdar. Moderately exponential time algorithms for the maximum bounded-degree-1 set problem. *Discrete Applied Mathematics*, 251:114–125, 2018. [51](#)
- [26] Jianer Chen, Henning Fernau, Iyad A. Kanj, and Ge Xia. Parametric duality and kernelization: Lower bounds and upper bounds on kernel size. In Volker Diekert and Bruno Durand, editors, *STACS 2005, 22nd Annual Symposium on Theoretical Aspects of Computer Science, Stuttgart, Germany, February 24-26, 2005, Proceedings*, volume 3404 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 269–280. Springer, 2005. [51](#)
- [27] Jianer Chen, Iyad A Kanj, and Weijia Jia. Vertex cover: further observations and further improvements. *Journal of Algorithms*, 41(2):280–301, 2001. [51](#)
- [28] Jianer Chen, Iyad A. Kanj, and Ge Xia. Improved upper bounds for vertex cover. *Theor. Comput. Sci.*, 411(40-42):3736–3756, 2010. [51](#)

- [29] Miroslav Chlebík and Janka Chlebíková. Crown reductions for the minimum weighted vertex cover problem. *Discret. Appl. Math.*, 156(3):292–312, 2008. [51](#)
- [30] Marek Cygan, Fedor V. Fomin, Lukasz Kowalik, Daniel Lokshtanov, Dániel Marx, Marcin Pilipczuk, Michal Pilipczuk, and Saket Saurabh. *Parameterized Algorithms*. Springer, 2015. [doi:10.1007/978-3-319-21275-3](#). [3](#), [50](#), [51](#)
- [31] Marek Cygan, Dániel Marx, Marcin Pilipczuk, and Michał Pilipczuk. Hitting forbidden subgraphs in graphs of bounded treewidth. *Information and Computation*, 256:62–82, 2017. [50](#)
- [32] Marek Cygan, Marcin Pilipczuk, Michał Pilipczuk, Erik Jan Van Leeuwen, and Marcin Wrochna. Polynomial kernelization for removing induced claws and diamonds. *Theory of Computing Systems*, 60:615–636, 2017. [50](#)
- [33] Anuj Dawar, Martin Grohe, Stephan Kreutzer, and Nicole Schweikardt. Approximation schemes for first-order definable optimisation problems. In *21st Annual IEEE Symposium on Logic in Computer Science (LICS'06)*, pages 411–420. IEEE, 2006. [2](#), [50](#)
- [34] Mark De Berg, Hans L Bodlaender, Sándor Kisfaludi-Bak, Dániel Marx, and Tom C Van Der Zanden. A framework for exponential-time-hypothesis-tight algorithms and lower bounds in geometric intersection graphs. *SIAM Journal on Computing*, 49(6):1291–1331, 2020. [6](#), [34](#)
- [35] Holger Dell and Dieter Van Melkebeek. Satisfiability allows no nontrivial sparsification unless the polynomial-time hierarchy collapses. *Journal of the ACM (JACM)*, 61(4):1–27, 2014. [51](#)
- [36] Erik D. Demaine, Fedor V. Fomin, Mohammad Taghi Hajiaghayi, and Dimitrios M. Thilikos. Subexponential parameterized algorithms on bounded-genus graphs and H -minor-free graphs. *J. ACM*, 52(6):866–893, 2005. [doi:10.1145/1101821.1101823](#). [51](#), [52](#)
- [37] Erik D. Demaine, Timothy D. Goodrich, Kyle Kloster, Brian Lavalley, Quanquan C. Liu, Blair D. Sullivan, Ali Vakilian, and Andrew van der Poel. Structural rounding: Approximation algorithms for graphs near an algorithmically tractable class. In *27th Annual European Symposium on Algorithms, ESA 2019, September 9-11, 2019, Munich/Garching, Germany*, pages 37:1–37:15, 2019. [52](#)
- [38] Anders Dessmark, Klaus Jansen, and Andrzej Lingas. The maximum k -dependent and f -dependent set problem. In *Algorithms and Computation, 4th International Symposium, ISAAC '93, Hong Kong, December 15-17, 1993, Proceedings*, pages 88–98, 1993. [52](#)
- [39] N Safina Devi, Aniket C Mane, and Sounaka Mishra. Computational complexity of minimum p_4 vertex cover problem for regular and k_1 , 4-free graphs. *Discrete Applied Mathematics*, 184:114–121, 2015. [51](#)
- [40] Irit Dinur and Samuel Safra. On the hardness of approximating minimum vertex cover. *Annals of mathematics*, pages 439–485, 2005. [2](#), [4](#), [51](#)
- [41] Pål Grønås Drange, Markus Dregi, and Pim van't Hof. On the computational complexity of vertex integrity and component order connectivity. *Algorithmica*, 76(4):1181–1202, 2016. [2](#), [52](#)
- [42] Zdeněk Dvořák. Constant-factor approximation of the domination number in sparse graphs. *European Journal of Combinatorics*, 34(5):833–840, 2013. [2](#), [15](#), [26](#), [50](#)

- [43] Zdeněk Dvořák. Baker game and polynomial-time approximation schemes. In *Proceedings of the Fourteenth Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms*, pages 2227–2240. SIAM, 2020. [2](#), [3](#), [50](#)
- [44] Zdeněk Dvořák. Approximation metatheorems for classes with bounded expansion. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2103.08698*, 2021. [2](#), [3](#), [6](#), [34](#), [50](#)
- [45] Zdeněk Dvořák, Daniel Král, and Robin Thomas. Testing first-order properties for subclasses of sparse graphs. *Journal of the ACM (JACM)*, 60(5):1–24, 2013. [2](#), [14](#), [16](#), [38](#), [50](#)
- [46] Zdeněk Dvořák and Abhiruk Lahiri. Approximation schemes for bounded distance problems on fractionally treewidth-fragile graphs. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2105.01780*, 2021. [2](#), [3](#)
- [47] Zdeněk Dvořák and Sergey Norin. Strongly sublinear separators and polynomial expansion. *SIAM Journal on Discrete Mathematics*, 30(2):1095–1101, 2016. [arXiv:https://doi.org/10.1137/15M1017569](#), [doi:10.1137/15M1017569](#). [2](#), [3](#), [29](#)
- [48] Eduard Eiben, William Lochet, and Saket Saurabh. A polynomial kernel for paw-free editing. In *15th International Symposium on Parameterized and Exact Computation, IPEC 2020, December 14–18, 2020, Hong Kong, China (Virtual Conference)*, pages 10:1–10:15, 2020. [50](#)
- [49] Eduard Eiben, Diptapriyo Majumdar, and MS Ramanujan. On the lossy kernelization for connected treedepth deletion set. In *International Workshop on Graph-Theoretic Concepts in Computer Science*, pages 201–214. Springer, 2022. [2](#), [52](#)
- [50] Jessica Enright and Kitty Meeks. Deleting edges to restrict the size of an epidemic: a new application for treewidth. *Algorithmica*, 80(6):1857–1889, 2018. [50](#)
- [51] Thomas Erlebach, Klaus Jansen, and Eike Seidel. Polynomial-time approximation schemes for geometric intersection graphs. *SIAM J. Comput.*, 34(6):1302–1323, 2005. [doi:10.1137/S0097539702402676](#). [6](#), [7](#), [34](#), [51](#)
- [52] Michael R. Fellows, Jiong Guo, Hannes Moser, and Rolf Niedermeier. A generalization of nemhauser and trotter’s local optimization theorem. *J. Comput. Syst. Sci.*, 77(6):1141–1158, 2011. [51](#), [52](#)
- [53] Samuel Fiorini, Gwenaël Joret, and Oliver Schaudt. Improved approximation algorithms for hitting 3-vertex paths. In *Integer Programming and Combinatorial Optimization: 18th International Conference, IPCO 2016, Liège, Belgium, June 1–3, 2016, Proceedings 18*, pages 238–249. Springer, 2016. [51](#)
- [54] Samuel Fiorini, Gwenaël Joret, and Oliver Schaudt. Improved approximation algorithms for hitting 3-vertex paths. *Mathematical Programming*, 182(1-2):355–367, 2020. [2](#), [51](#)
- [55] Samuel Fiorini, R Krithika, NS Narayanaswamy, and Venkatesh Raman. Approximability of clique transversal in perfect graphs. *Algorithmica*, 80(8):2221–2239, 2018. [2](#), [52](#)
- [56] Fedor V. Fomin, Tien-Nam Le, Daniel Lokshtanov, Saket Saurabh, Stéphan Thomassé, and Meirav Zehavi. Subquadratic kernels for implicit 3-hitting set and 3-set packing problems. *ACM Trans. Algorithms*, 15(1):13:1–13:44, 2019. [51](#)

- [57] Fedor V. Fomin, Daniel Lokshtanov, Fahad Panolan, Saket Saurabh, and Meirav Zehavi. Decomposition of map graphs with applications. In *46th International Colloquium on Automata, Languages, and Programming, ICALP 2019, July 9-12, 2019, Patras, Greece*, pages 60:1–60:15, 2019. [51](#), [52](#)
- [58] Fedor V. Fomin, Daniel Lokshtanov, Fahad Panolan, Saket Saurabh, and Meirav Zehavi. Finding, hitting and packing cycles in subexponential time on unit disk graphs. *Discret. Comput. Geom.*, 62(4):879–911, 2019. doi:[10.1007/s00454-018-00054-x](#). [51](#), [52](#)
- [59] Fedor V. Fomin, Daniel Lokshtanov, and Saket Saurabh. Bidimensionality and geometric graphs. In *Proceedings of the Twenty-Third Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms, SODA 2012, Kyoto, Japan, January 17-19, 2012*, pages 1563–1575, 2012. [51](#), [52](#)
- [60] Fedor V. Fomin, Daniel Lokshtanov, and Saket Saurabh. Excluded grid minors and efficient polynomial-time approximation schemes. *J. ACM*, 65(2):10:1–10:44, 2018. doi:[10.1145/3154833](#). [2](#), [50](#)
- [61] Fedor V Fomin, Daniel Lokshtanov, Saket Saurabh, and Meirav Zehavi. *Kernelization: theory of parameterized preprocessing*. Cambridge University Press, 2019. [3](#)
- [62] Jacob Fox and János Pach. A separator theorem for string graphs and its applications. *Combinatorics, Probability and Computing*, 19(3):371–390, 2010. [7](#)
- [63] Jacob Fox and János Pach. Computing the independence number of intersection graphs. In *Proceedings of the twenty-second annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete algorithms*, pages 1161–1165. SIAM, 2011. [7](#)
- [64] Ajinkya Gaikwad and Soumen Maity. Further parameterized algorithms for the f-free edge deletion problem. *Theoretical Computer Science*, 933:125–137, 2022. [50](#)
- [65] Jakub Gajarský, Petr Hliněný, Jan Obdržálek, Sebastian Ordyniak, Felix Reidl, Peter Rossmanith, Fernando Sánchez Villaamil, and Somnath Sikdar. Kernelization using structural parameters on sparse graph classes. *Journal of Computer and System Sciences*, 84:219–242, 2017. [2](#), [52](#)
- [66] Esther Galby, Andrea Munaro, and Shizhou Yang. Polynomial-time approximation schemes for independent packing problems on fractionally tree-independence-number-fragile graphs. *To appear in the 39th International Symposium on Computational Geometry (SoCG)*, 2023. [3](#)
- [67] Robert Ganian, Fabian Klute, and Sebastian Ordyniak. On structural parameterizations of the bounded-degree vertex deletion problem. *Algorithmica*, 83(1):297–336, 2021. [2](#), [52](#)
- [68] Lito Julius Goldmann. *Parameterized Complexity of Modifying Graphs to be Biclique-free*. PhD thesis, Institute of Software, 2021. [2](#), [52](#)
- [69] Martin Grohe, Stephan Kreutzer, and Sebastian Siebertz. Deciding first-order properties of nowhere dense graphs. *Journal of the ACM (JACM)*, 64(3):1–32, 2017. [2](#)
- [70] Marina Groshaus, Pavol Hell, Sulamita Klein, Loana Tito Nogueira, and Fábio Protti. Cycle transversals in bounded degree graphs. *Electronic Notes in Discrete Mathematics*, 35:189–195, 2009. [2](#), [52](#)

- [71] Daniel Gross, Monika Heinig, Lakshmi Iswara, L William Kazmierczak, Kristi Luttrell, John T Saccoman, and Charles Suffel. A survey of component order connectivity models of graph theoretic networks. *WSEAS Transactions on Mathematics*, 12:895–910, 2013. 2, 52
- [72] Anupam Gupta, Euiwoong Lee, Jason Li, Pasin Manurangsi, and Michał Włodarczyk. Losing treewidth by separating subsets. In *Proceedings of the Thirtieth Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms*, pages 1731–1749. SIAM, 2019. 2, 51, 52
- [73] Eran Halperin. Improved approximation algorithms for the vertex cover problem in graphs and hypergraphs. *SIAM Journal on Computing*, 31(5):1608–1623, 2002. 51
- [74] Sariel Har-Peled and Kent Quanrud. Notes on approximation algorithms for polynomial-expansion and low-density graphs. *CoRR*, abs/1603.03098, 2016. URL: <http://arxiv.org/abs/1603.03098>, [arXiv:1603.03098](https://arxiv.org/abs/1603.03098). 29
- [75] Sariel Har-Peled and Kent Quanrud. Approximation algorithms for polynomial-expansion and low-density graphs. *SIAM Journal on Computing*, 46(6):1712–1744, 2017. 2, 4, 5, 6, 12, 13, 28, 29, 51
- [76] Dov Harel and Robert Endre Tarjan. Fast algorithms for finding nearest common ancestors. *siam Journal on Computing*, 13(2):338–355, 1984. 14, 36
- [77] Sun-Yuan Hsieh, Van Bang Le, and Sheng-Lung Peng. On the d-claw vertex deletion problem. In *Computing and Combinatorics: 27th International Conference, COCOON 2021, Tainan, Taiwan, October 24–26, 2021, Proceedings 27*, pages 591–603. Springer, 2021. 52
- [78] Falk Hüffner, Christian Komusiewicz, Hannes Moser, and Rolf Niedermeier. Fixed-parameter algorithms for cluster vertex deletion. *Theory of Computing Systems*, 47(1):196–217, 2010. 51
- [79] George Karakostas. A better approximation ratio for the vertex cover problem. *ACM Transactions on Algorithms (TALG)*, 5(4):1–8, 2009. 51
- [80] František Kardoš, Ján Katrenič, and Ingo Schiermeyer. On computing the minimum 3-path vertex cover and dissociation number of graphs. *Theoretical Computer Science*, 412(50):7009–7017, 2011. 51
- [81] Marek Karpinski and Alexander Zelikovsky. *Approximating dense cases of covering problems*. Citeseer, 1996. 51
- [82] Klara Kedem, Ron Livne, János Pach, and Micha Sharir. On the union of jordan regions and collision-free translational motion amidst polygonal obstacles. *Discrete & Computational Geometry*, 1(1):59–71, 1986. 34
- [83] Subhash Khot and Oded Regev. Vertex cover might be hard to approximate to within $2 - \epsilon$. *Journal of Computer and System Sciences*, 74(3):335–349, 2008. 51
- [84] Mithilesh Kumar and Daniel Lokshantov. A 2lk kernel for l-component order connectivity. In *11th International Symposium on Parameterized and Exact Computation (IPEC 2016)*. Schloss Dagstuhl-Leibniz-Zentrum fuer Informatik, 2017. 2, 52
- [85] Mrinal Kumar, Sounaka Mishra, N Safina Devi, and Saket Saurabh. Approximation algorithms for node deletion problems on bipartite graphs with finite forbidden subgraph characterization. *Theoretical Computer Science*, 526:90–96, 2014. 51

- [86] Hoang-Oanh Le and Van Bang Le. Complexity of the cluster vertex deletion problem on h -free graphs. In *47th International Symposium on Mathematical Foundations of Computer Science (MFCS 2022)*. Schloss Dagstuhl-Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik, 2022. 51
- [87] Hung Le and Cuong Than. Greedy spanners in euclidean spaces admit sublinear separators. In *Proceedings of the 2022 Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms (SODA)*, pages 3287–3310. SIAM, 2022. 3
- [88] Euiwoong Lee. Partitioning a graph into small pieces with applications to path transversal. In *Proceedings of the Twenty-Eighth Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms*, pages 1546–1558. SIAM, 2017. 2, 51
- [89] Wenjun Li, Huan Peng, and Yongjie Yang. Improved kernel and algorithm for claw and diamond free edge deletion based on refined observations. *Theoretical Computer Science*, 906:83–93, 2022. 50
- [90] Richard J. Lipton and Robert Endre Tarjan. Applications of a planar separator theorem. *SIAM Journal on Computing*, 9(3):615–627, 1980. [arXiv:https://doi.org/10.1137/0209046](https://doi.org/10.1137/0209046), [doi:10.1137/0209046](https://doi.org/10.1137/0209046). 13, 29
- [91] Daniel Lokshtanov, Pranabendu Misra, M. S. Ramanujan, Saket Saurabh, and Meirav Zehavi. Fpt-approximation for FPT problems. In *Proceedings of the 2021 ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms, SODA 2021, Virtual Conference, January 10 - 13, 2021*, pages 199–218, 2021. 52
- [92] Daniel Lokshtanov, Fahad Panolan, M. S. Ramanujan, and Saket Saurabh. Lossy kernelization. In Hamed Hatami, Pierre McKenzie, and Valerie King, editors, *Proceedings of the 49th Annual ACM SIGACT Symposium on Theory of Computing, STOC 2017, Montreal, QC, Canada, June 19-23, 2017*, pages 224–237. ACM, 2017. [doi:10.1145/3055399.3055456](https://doi.org/10.1145/3055399.3055456). 4
- [93] Daniel Lokshtanov, Fahad Panolan, Saket Saurabh, Jie Xue, and Meirav Zehavi. Subexponential parameterized algorithms on disk graphs (extended abstract). In *Proceedings of the 2022 Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms (SODA)*, pages 2005–2031. SIAM, 2022. 2, 52
- [94] Daniel Lokshtanov, Fahad Panolan, Saket Saurabh, Jie Xue, and Meirav Zehavi. A framework for approximation schemes on disk graphs. In *34rd Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms*. SIAM, 2023. 2, 7, 51, 52
- [95] Vadim V. Lozin and Dieter Rautenbach. Some results on graphs without long induced paths. *Inf. Process. Lett.*, 88(4):167–171, 2003. 51
- [96] Carsten Lund and Mihalis Yannakakis. The approximation of maximum subgraph problems. In *International Colloquium on Automata, Languages, and Programming*, pages 40–51. Springer, 1993. 2
- [97] Dániel Marx and RB Sandeep. Incompressibility of h -free edge modification problems: Towards a dichotomy. *Journal of Computer and System Sciences*, 125:25–58, 2022. 50
- [98] David W Matula and Leland L Beck. Smallest-last ordering and clustering and graph coloring algorithms. *Journal of the ACM (JACM)*, 30(3):417–427, 1983. 35

- [99] Balázs F Mezei, Marcin Wrochna, and Stanislav Živný. Ptas for sparse general-valued csps. *ACM Transactions on Algorithms*, 19(2):1–31, 2023. [3](#)
- [100] Gary L Miller, Shang-Hua Teng, William Thurston, and Stephen A Vavasis. Separators for sphere-packings and nearest neighbor graphs. *Journal of the ACM (JACM)*, 44(1):1–29, 1997. [3](#)
- [101] Burkhard Monien and Ewald Speckenmeyer. Ramsey numbers and an approximation algorithm for the vertex cover problem. *Acta Informatica*, 22(1):115–123, 1985. [51](#)
- [102] Hannes Moser, Rolf Niedermeier, and Manuel Sorge. Exact combinatorial algorithms and experiments for finding maximum k-plexes. *J. Comb. Optim.*, 24(3):347–373, 2012. [52](#)
- [103] Jaroslav Nešetřil and Patrice Ossona De Mendez. Grad and classes with bounded expansion i. decompositions. *European Journal of Combinatorics*, 29(3):760–776, 2008. [2](#), [9](#), [15](#)
- [104] Jaroslav Nešetřil and Patrice Ossona De Mendez. Grad and classes with bounded expansion ii. algorithmic aspects. *European Journal of Combinatorics*, 29(3):777–791, 2008. [2](#)
- [105] Jaroslav Nešetřil and Patrice Ossona De Mendez. On nowhere dense graphs. *European Journal of Combinatorics*, 32(4):600–617, 2011. [2](#)
- [106] Jaroslav Nešetřil and Patrice Ossona De Mendez. *Sparsity: graphs, structures, and algorithms*, volume 28. Springer Science & Business Media, 2012. [2](#)
- [107] Jaroslav Nešetřil, Patrice Ossona de Mendez, and David R Wood. Characterisations and examples of graph classes with bounded expansion. *European Journal of Combinatorics*, 33(3):350–373, 2012. [2](#), [3](#)
- [108] Jaroslav Nešetřil and Patrice Ossona de Mendez. Grad and classes with bounded expansion ii. algorithmic aspects. *European Journal of Combinatorics*, 29(3):777–791, 2008. URL: <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0195669807000571>, doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ejc.2006.07.014>. [15](#)
- [109] Rolf Niedermeier and Peter Rossmanith. Upper bounds for vertex cover further improved. In *STACS 99: 16th Annual Symposium on Theoretical Aspects of Computer Science Trier, Germany, March 4–6, 1999 Proceedings 16*, pages 561–570. Springer, 1999. [51](#)
- [110] Naomi Nishimura, Prabhakar Ragde, and Dimitrios M. Thilikos. Fast fixed-parameter tractable algorithms for nontrivial generalizations of vertex cover. *Discret. Appl. Math.*, 152(1-3):229–245, 2005. [52](#)
- [111] Yury L. Orlovich, Alexandre Dolgui, Gerd Finke, Valery S. Gordon, and Frank Werner. The complexity of dissociation set problems in graphs. *Discret. Appl. Math.*, 159(13):1352–1366, 2011. [51](#)
- [112] Michał Pilipczuk. Problems parameterized by treewidth tractable in single exponential time: A logical approach. In *International Symposium on Mathematical Foundations of Computer Science*, pages 520–531. Springer, 2011. [2](#), [52](#)
- [113] Felix Reidl, Fernando Sánchez Villaamil, and Konstantinos Stavropoulos. Characterising bounded expansion by neighbourhood complexity. *European Journal of Combinatorics*, 75:152–168, 2019. [2](#), [15](#)

- [114] Miguel Romero, Marcin Wrochna, and Stanislav Živný. Treewidth-pleability and ptas for max-csps. In *Proceedings of the 2021 ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms (SODA)*, pages 473–483. SIAM, 2021. 3
- [115] Ignasi Sau and Uéverton dos Santos Souza. Hitting forbidden induced subgraphs on bounded treewidth graphs. *Information and Computation*, 281:104812, 2021. 50
- [116] Hadas Shachnai and Meirav Zehavi. A multivariate framework for weighted FPT algorithms. *J. Comput. Syst. Sci.*, 89:157–189, 2017. 51
- [117] Arezou Soleimanfallah and Anders Yeo. A kernel of order $2k - c$ for vertex cover. *Discrete Mathematics*, 311(10):892–895, 2011. 51
- [118] Ulrike Stege and Michael Ralph Fellows. An improved fixed parameter tractable algorithm for vertex cover. *Technical report/Departement Informatik, ETH Zürich*, 318, 1999. 51
- [119] Jiri Sgall Tomas Ebenlendr, Petr Kolman. An approximation algorithm for bounded degree deletion. In *Preprint*, 2009. 52
- [120] Dekel Tsur. l-path vertex cover is easier than l-hitting set for small l. *CoRR*, abs/1906.10523, 2019. URL: <http://arxiv.org/abs/1906.10523>. 51
- [121] Dekel Tsur. Faster parameterized algorithm for cluster vertex deletion. *Theory of Computing Systems*, 65(2):323–343, 2021. 51
- [122] Dekel Tsur. An $o_*(2.619k)$ algorithm for 4-path vertex cover. *Discret. Appl. Math.*, 291:1–14, 2021. 51
- [123] Jianhua Tu. A survey on the k-path vertex cover problem. *Axioms*, 11(5):191, 2022. 51
- [124] Jianhua Tu and Zemin Jin. An FPT algorithm for the vertex cover p_4 problem. *Discret. Appl. Math.*, 200:186–190, 2016. 51
- [125] Jianhua Tu, Lidong Wu, Jing Yuan, and Lei Cui. On the vertex cover p_3 problem parameterized by treewidth. *J. Comb. Optim.*, 34(2):414–425, 2017. 51
- [126] Jianhua Tu and Wenli Zhou. A factor 2 approximation algorithm for the vertex cover p_3 problem. *Information Processing Letters*, 111(14):683–686, 2011. 51
- [127] Erik Jan van Leeuwen. Better approximation schemes for disk graphs. In Lars Arge and Rusins Freivalds, editors, *Algorithm Theory - SWAT 2006, 10th Scandinavian Workshop on Algorithm Theory, Riga, Latvia, July 6-8, 2006, Proceedings*, volume 4059 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 316–327. Springer, 2006. doi:10.1007/11785293_30. 7, 51
- [128] David P Williamson and David B Shmoys. *The design of approximation algorithms*. Cambridge university press, 2011. 50, 51
- [129] Mingyu Xiao. Linear kernels for separating a graph into components of bounded size. *J. Comput. Syst. Sci.*, 88:260–270, 2017. 52
- [130] Mingyu Xiao. On a generalization of nemhauser and trotter’s local optimization theorem. *J. Comput. Syst. Sci.*, 84:97–106, 2017. 51

- [131] Mingyu Xiao and Shaowei Kou. Kernelization and parameterized algorithms for 3-path vertex cover. In *Theory and Applications of Models of Computation - 14th Annual Conference, TAMC 2017, Bern, Switzerland, April 20-22, 2017, Proceedings*, pages 654–668, 2017. 51
- [132] Mingyu Xiao and Hiroshi Nagamochi. Exact algorithms for maximum independent set. *Information and Computation*, 255:126–146, 2017. 51
- [133] Jie You, Jianxin Wang, and Yixin Cao. Approximate association via dissociation. *Discrete Applied Mathematics*, 219:202–209, 2017. 2, 51
- [134] An Zhang, Yong Chen, Zhi-Zhong Chen, and Guohui Lin. Improved approximation algorithms for path vertex covers in regular graphs. *Algorithmica*, 82(10):3041–3064, 2020. 51
- [135] Zhao Zhang, Xiaoting Li, Yishuo Shi, Hongmei Nie, and Yuqing Zhu. PTAS for minimum k -path vertex cover in ball graph. *Information Processing Letters*, 119:9–13, 2017. 7
- [136] Zhao Zhang, Xiaoting Li, Yishuo Shi, Hongmei Nie, and Yuqing Zhu. PTAS for minimum k -path vertex cover in ball graph. *Inf. Process. Lett.*, 119:9–13, 2017. 51
- [137] Zhao Zhang, Weili Wu, Lidan Fan, and Ding-Zhu Du. Minimum vertex cover in ball graphs through local search. *Journal of Global Optimization*, 59(2):663–671, 2014. 7
- [138] Xuding Zhu. Colouring graphs with bounded generalized colouring number. *Discrete Mathematics*, 309(18):5562–5568, 2009. 2, 9, 15

A Other Related Works

We first remark that constant-approximation algorithms are known for various problems on bounded-expansion graphs, including various versions of INDEPENDENT SET and DOMINATING SET [42] as well as all monotone maximization problems expressible in first-order logic [44]. Next, we consider the generic (INDUCED) SUBGRAPH HITTING problem and some (though not all) of its special cases that were studied independently in the literature. A thorough survey is beyond the scope of our work. Here, our goal is only to mention some of the known results. Further, we do not survey results concerning SUBGRAPH ISOMORPHISM since the literature about it is as rich as the literature on SUBGRAPH HITTING. Still, since it is highly relevant to our work, we note that on graphs of bounded expansion, testing first-order properties can be done in linear time [45], which implies that SUBGRAPH ISOMORPHISM can be solved in linear time for any fixed k (the size of the pattern).

The generic (INDUCED) SUBGRAPH HITTING problem is a special case of (or, more precisely, trivially reducible to) d -HITTING SET, and hence all results for d -HITTING SET (e.g., approximation algorithm, FPT algorithms and kernels [128, 30]) directly transfer. For further discussion on the possibility of better approximation algorithms for (INDUCED) SUBGRAPH HITTING, we refer to [15]. On bounded-treewidth graphs, the problem was studied in [31, 115] from the perspective of parameterized complexity. We remind that, on planar graphs, the classical work of Baker [4] yields a PTAS, which can be extended to minor-free graphs [33, 43] and unit-disk graphs [60]. We remark that the generic edge-deletion version of the problem was also considered in the literature (e.g., see [50, 64]). Further, there is a substantial body of works on special cases of the edge-deletion version dedicated to hitting specific graphs on only few vertices such as claws, paws and diamonds, particularly from the perspective of kernelization (see, e.g., [89, 32, 48, 17, 97] for a few examples).

VERTEX COVER: The VERTEX COVER problem is widely considered to be the most extensively studied problem in parameterized complexity, and is often considered a testbed for the introduction

of new notions and techniques [30]. It is long known that this problem can be approximated within ratio 2 [128], while ratio $(2 - \epsilon)$ is impossible under the Unique Games Conjecture (UGC) [83]. More involved techniques yield slightly better ratios [6, 101, 73, 79]; for example, consider the ratio of $2 - \Theta(\frac{1}{\sqrt{\log n}})$ by [79]. Under the assumption $P \neq NP$, the known lower bound is weaker [40]. Constants better than 2 are known for various graph classes, such as bounded degree graphs, where we know of matching upper [73] and lower [2] bounds (under the UGC) for the approximation ratio, dense graphs [81], and rectangle graphs [7]. Further, VERTEX COVER was already known to admit a PTAS on bounded expansion graphs [75] and an EPTAS on disk graphs [51, 127, 94].

From the perspective of parameterized complexity, there has been long races to achieve the best possible running times on general graphs and on bounded degree graphs, as well as when considering exact exponential-time algorithms (see [5, 16, 27, 23, 27, 109, 28, 118, 132] for a few of the papers); we only briefly mention that the best known parameterized algorithm for general graphs achieves the bound $1.28^k \cdot n^{O(1)}$ [28]. The problem is long known to admit a kernel of size $O(k^2)$ [16], which is essentially optimal unless the polynomial hierarchy collapses [35]. Nevertheless, the number of vertices in the kernel can be reduced to $2k$ [27] with slight improvements given in [117, 29], but it is unlikely that it can be reduced to $(2 - \epsilon)k$ [26]. Further, Bidimensionality theory for minor-free and unit-disk graphs [36, 59, 58] as well as map graphs [57] yields subexponential FPT algorithms.

(INDUCED) P_k -HITTING: Clearly, VERTEX COVER is the special case of P_k -HITTING (also known as k -PATH VERTEX COVER) when $k = 2$. Still, even for small values of k , it is harder. For example, for $k = 3$, it is APX-complete on bipartite graphs [85] (whereas VERTEX COVER is solvable in polynomial time), and for $k = 4$, it is APX-complete on cubic bipartite graphs [39]. Still, for $k = 3$, it is solvable in polynomial-time on various graph classes [9, 12, 14, 18, 95, 111] such as P_5 -free graphs [12]. Lee [88] gave an FPT $O(\log k)$ -approximation algorithm where the parameter is k . His result was generalized and improved upon (in terms of running time) by Gupta et al. [72]. For $k = 3$, a 2-approximation algorithm was given in [126] (improving upon [80]). Recently, for $k \geq 3$, Brüstle [15] presented a $(k - \frac{1}{2})$ -approximation algorithm (even for a more general case of hitting trees). Other approximation algorithms for this problem can be found in [25, 134]. We note that the problem admits an EPTAS on disk graphs [94] for $3 \leq k \leq 5$, and a PTAS on ball graphs for any fixed k [136]. Exact exponential-time algorithms for $k = 3$ were developed in [80, 25, 24, 132]. Also, for various fixed values of $k \geq 3$, the problem was intensively studied in parameterized complexity: parameterized algorithms were developed in [20, 21, 120, 122, 124, 3, 116, 125] and kernels were developed in [131, 19, 52, 130, 131]. Further, the Bidimensionality theory for minor-free and unit-disk graphs [36, 59, 58] as well as map graphs [57] yields subexponential FPT algorithms. For more information on P_k -HITTING, we refer to the survey of [123].

It is known that INDUCED P_3 -HITTING is equivalent to the CLUSTER VERTEX DELETION problem (where the objective is to delete a minimum number of vertices to attain a *cluster graph*, which is a collection of cliques), which has been extensively studied in the literature. As such, it trivially has a 3-approximation (polynomial-time) algorithm. The first non-trivial approximation algorithm was a $\frac{5}{3}$ -approximation due to You et al. [133]. Shortly afterward, Fiorini et al. gave a $\frac{7}{3}$ -approximation [53], and subsequently a $\frac{9}{4}$ -approximation [54]. Afterwards, a 2-approximation was found [1], which is easily seen to be optimal under the UGC (by a simple reduction from VERTEX COVER). The problem also received attention from the perspectives of FPT algorithms [10, 78, 121] and kernelization [56]. Further, it was studied on special graph classes such as H -free graphs [86].

DEGREE MODULATOR: Notice that DEGREE MODULATOR, where the goal is to delete a minimum number of vertices to reduce the maximum degree of the graph to be k , is equivalent to hitting stars of size $k + 1$. When $k = 0$, we derive VERTEX COVER, and when $k = 1$, we derive P_2 -

HITTING, both discussed earlier. So, here, we only consider the case where $k \geq 2$. First, we remark that the FPT $O(\log k)$ -approximation algorithm by Gupta et al. [72] is also noted to apply to this problem. However, previously, a randomized (polynomial-time) $O(\log k)$ -approximation algorithm was already known [119]. A matching inapproximability result was given in [37]. The problem is also known to admit an EPTAS on disk graphs [94]. Moreover, FPT algorithms, kernels and W[1]-hardness results for this problem (sometimes referred to by a different name) parameterized by k plus (or only by) the solution size or a structural measure such as treewidth of the graph were given in [8, 67, 110, 52, 102, 38, 91]. We note that the complexity of the problem of hitting induced stars on $k + 1$ vertices, also known as induced k -claws, was also previously studied (see, e.g., [77]).

(INDUCED) C_k -HITTING: First, note that the (INDUCED) C_k -HITTING problem only makes sense for $k \geq 3$. The restriction of the case where $k = 3$ (i.e., when we aim to hit triangles) to disk graphs admits a subexponential FPT algorithm (when parameterized by solution size) [93] as well as an EPTAS [94]. Further, the parameterized complexity of (INDUCED) C_k -HITTING with respect to treewidth was studied in [112], and a dichotomy concerning its membership in P was given in [70].

K_k -HITTING and (INDUCED) BICLIQUE HITTING: Approximation and parameterized algorithms for K_k -HITTING on perfect graphs were given in [55]. Additionally, the parameterized complexity of (INDUCED) BICLIQUE HITTING was studied in [68].

COMPONENT ORDER CONNECTIVITY: The objective of this problem is delete a minimum number of vertices in order to hit all connected graphs of size at most k . Clearly, VERTEX COVER is its special case when $k = 2$. For COMPONENT ORDER CONNECTIVITY, Bidimensionality theory for minor-free and unit-disk graphs [36, 59, 58] as well as map graphs [57] yields subexponential FPT algorithms. Drange et al. [41] provided an FPT and a kernel for COMPONENT ORDER CONNECTIVITY parameterized by k plus the solution size, and, in addition, studied the complexity of the problem on special graph classes. Improved $O(k s)$ -vertex kernels were given by [84, 129], where s is the solution size. Moreover, an FPT approximation scheme with respect to treewidth was given in [91]. Additional results can be found in the survey [71].

TREEDPTH MODULATOR: The objective of this problem is to delete a minimum-sized t -treedpth modulator in the given graph, that is, a minimum number of vertices whose deletion from the given graph yields a graph of treedpth at most t . Here, $t \in \mathbb{N}$ is a given fixed constant. The problem can be phrased as a subgraph hitting problem where all subgraphs are of size bounded by a function of t . The computation and utility of treedpth modulators were studied from the perspective of parameterized complexity (see, e.g., [11, 49, 65]).