On Solution Discovery via Reconfiguration

Michael R. Fellows University of Bergen, Norway michael.fellows@uib.no

Nicole Megow University of Bremen, Germany nicole.megow@uni-bremen.de

> Vijayaragunathan Ramamoorthi University of Bremen, Germany vira@uni-bremen.de

Daniel Schmand University of Bremen, Germany schmand@uni-bremen.de

Mario Grobler University of Bremen, Germany grobler@uni-bremen.de

Amer E. Mouawad American University of Beirut, Lebanon aa368@aub.edu.lb

> Frances A. Rosamond University of Bergen, Norway Frances.Rosamond@uib.no

Sebastian Siebertz University of Bremen, Germany siebertz@uni-bremen.de

April 28, 2023

Abstract

The dynamics of real-world applications and systems require efficient methods for improving infeasible solutions or restoring corrupted ones by making modifications to the current state of a system in a restricted way. We propose a new framework of *solution discovery via reconfiguration* for constructing a feasible solution for a given problem by executing a sequence of small modifications starting from a given state. Our framework integrates and formalizes different aspects of classical local search, reoptimization, and combinatorial reconfiguration. We exemplify our framework on a multitude of fundamental combinatorial problems, namely Vertex Cover, Independent Set, Dominating Set, and Coloring. We study the classical as well as the parameterized complexity of the solution discovery variants of those problems and explore the boundary between tractable and intractable instances.

1 Introduction

In many dynamic real-world applications of decision-making problems, feasible solutions must be found starting from a certain predetermined system state. This is in contrast to the classical academic problems where we are allowed to compute a feasible solution from scratch. However, when constructing a new solution from scratch, we have no control over the difference between the current state and the new target one. In this work, we develop a new framework, where we aim for modifying some, possibly infeasible, solution to a feasible one via a bounded number of "small" modification steps.

Consider for example a frequency assignment problem [\[1,](#page-29-0) [41\]](#page-32-0) where agents communicate via wireless message transmissions. Each agent can broadcast over a fixed frequency. Any two nearby agents are required to operate over different frequencies, as otherwise their signals would interfere, which must be avoided. The objective is to assign a given number of frequencies such that no interference occurs. This problem can conveniently be modeled as a vertex coloring problem on graphs. The vertices of the graph represent the agents and two vertices are connected by an edge if they are close to one another and frequencies of the corresponding agents could interfere. Then, the frequencies correspond to colors assigned to the vertices, as adjacent vertices must receive distinct colors. In the solution discovery variant of the graph coloring problem, we are given a non-proper coloring of a graph using a fixed number of colors and a fixed budget. The goal is to transform the given non-proper coloring into a proper one such that the number of recoloring steps does not exceed the budget (various definitions of a recoloring step exist; we discuss the most common ones later). The above agent communication example corresponds to the setting where agents have already been assigned frequencies that cause some interference. This might happen due to various possible changes to a running system such as the introduction of new agents, the change of locations, or the increase of the broadcasting range. Recomputing a valid coloring from scratch might be undesirable as this may induce many changes in the system. Depending on the given infeasible assignment, it might be possible to satisfy the feasibility constraints by just a few controlled changes to the coloring. A change however, may trigger other changes, and the question is whether a "cheap" reconfiguration of the system into a valid state is possible.

As a second motivation for our framework consider, e.g., a group of mobile agents tasked with monitoring (parts of) a country (represented by a graph) for security threats, such as natural disasters. Each agent is responsible for monitoring a certain subset of the country (a few cities), and the cities are connected in a way that reflects the dependencies/adjacencies between the different parts of the network. The agents in a dominating set would represent the agents that are able to monitor the entirety of the parts of interest. By identifying a small dominating set in this graph, it is possible to identify/place a small number of agents that are responsible for maintaining the security of the country. In the real world, agents can be retired from or added to the system or the areas of interest to monitor (i.e. cities) can also change over time. Given that it is most likely expensive to move the agents around (think of agents as being mobile monitoring vehicles), it is desirable to be able to compute a new dominating set in the modified system while accounting for the cost of transformation steps.

Our new framework models such solution discovery versions of static (decision) problems. Solution discovery problems are similar in flavor to other approaches transforming one solution to another such as *local search*, *reoptimization*, *dynamic algorithms*, and *combinatorial reconfiguration*.

Local search is an algorithmic paradigm that is based on the iterative improvement of (possibly infeasible) solutions by searching for a better solution in a well-defined neighborhood (typically defined by certain local changes). A local search procedure terminates once there is no improved solution in the neighborhood. Strongly related is the framework of *reoptimization* where one looks for solutions for a problem instance when given solutions to neighboring instances. Local search and reoptimization have proven to be very powerful for many problems in theory and practice; see, e.g., [\[2,](#page-29-1) [36,](#page-32-1) 8]. In contrast to those models, in a solution discovery problem, a sequence of reconfiguration steps may not necessarily find improved solutions at each step, as long as we arrive at a feasible solution within a bounded number of steps.

In the area of *dynamic (graph) algorithms*, the dynamic nature of real-world systems is modeled via a sequence of additions/deletions of vertices/edges in a graph. The goal is to output an updated solution much more efficiently than a static algorithm that is computing one from scratch. Dynamic graph algorithms have been studied extensively, also for coloring graphs [\[5\]](#page-30-0), maximum independent sets $[4]$, and minimum vertex covers $[62, 6]$ $[62, 6]$. The (parameterized) complexity of dynamic algorithms has been studied, e.g., in [\[43,](#page-32-2) [3,](#page-29-2) [53\]](#page-33-1). In contrast to the solution discovery framework, changes to the system happen in a very specific way, while the reconfiguration steps are restricted only indirectly by the computation time (and space) and not by a concrete reconfiguration budget.

In the *combinatorial reconfiguration* framework [\[68,](#page-34-0) [61\]](#page-33-2), we are given both an initial solution and a target solution (for a fixed graph) and we aim to transform the initial solution to the target one by executing a sequence of reconfiguration steps chosen from a well-defined restricted collection of steps that is typically described by allowed token moves. However, in a solution discovery problem, the target feasible solution is not known (and might not even exist) and the goal is to find any feasible target solution via arbitrary intermediate (possibly infeasible) configurations whose number is bounded by the budget.

1.1 Solution discovery via reconfiguration

We focus on fundamental graph problems, where we are given a graph *G* and an integer *k* and the goal is to find a feasible solution for an instance (G, k) , e.g., finding a vertex cover, independent set, dominating set of size (at most) *k*, or a proper vertex coloring using at most *k* colors. These are prominent combinatorial problems in artificial intelligence, see e.g. [\[16,](#page-30-3) [44,](#page-32-3) [45,](#page-32-4) [58,](#page-33-3) [64,](#page-34-1) [69\]](#page-34-2), with plenty of applications to real-world problems, including feature selection [\[71\]](#page-34-3), scheduling, planning, resource allocation [\[7\]](#page-30-4), frequency assignment [\[1\]](#page-29-0), network security [\[17\]](#page-30-5), sensor systems [\[50\]](#page-33-4), and many more.

We introduce the solution discovery variant of such problems, where we are given a graph *G*, a starting configuration of size k (which is not necessarily a feasible solution), and a budget $b \in \mathbb{N}$. The goal is to transform the starting configuration into a feasible solution using at most *b* modification steps. Inspired by the reconfiguration framework, we mainly focus on modification steps consisting of changes along edges of the graph (*token sliding*). We briefly discuss other modification steps (*token addition/removal resp. swapping* and *jumping*) that have been studied in the literature.

As mentioned earlier, our framework is inspired by methods for finding a feasible solution starting from a predefined system state such as in local search, dynamic algorithms, and reoptimization, but it restricts the local modification steps as is common in combinatorial reconfiguration. Two applications with natural restrictions on how a solution can be modified by moving an entity along edges in a graph were presented in the previous section. More generally, we model applications where items/agents can be moved only along links in a given physical network such as road network or computer network, or whenever there are restrictions on the movement trajectories.

We demonstrate our framework by applying it to the VERTEX COVER, INDEPENDENT SET, DOMINATING SET, and COLORING problems. These are central problems that have been extensively studied from the perspective of local search, reoptimization, and combinatorial reconfiguration. To state our results, we assume some familiarity with graph theory, the aforementioned problems, and (parameterized) complexity. All notation will be formally defined before it is first used in the following sections.

Let Π be a vertex subset problem, i.e., a problem defined on undirected graphs such that a solution consists of a subset of vertices. The Π-Discovery problem is defined as follows. We are given a graph *G*, a subset $S \subseteq V(G)$ of size *k* (which at this point is not necessarily a solution for Π), and a budget *b* (as a positive integer). We assume that each vertex in *S* contains a token (which corresponds to an agent). The goal is to decide if we can move the tokens on *S* using at most *b* moves such that the resulting set is a solution for Π.

Dependent on the underlying problem, different notions of token moves have been established in the reconfiguration literature. That is, for token configurations $Q, Q' \subseteq V(G)$ we have the following models. In the *token sliding model*, we say a token *slides* from $u \in V(G)$ to $v \in V(G)$ if $u \in Q$, $v \notin Q$, $v \in Q'$, $u \notin Q'$, and $\{u, v\} \in E(G)$. In the *token jumping model*, a token *jumps* from $u \in V(G)$ to $v \in V(G)$ if $u \in Q$, $v \notin Q$, $v \in Q'$, and $u \notin Q'$. Finally, in the *token addition/removal model*, a token is *added* to vertex $v \in V(G)$ if $v \notin Q$ and $v \in Q'$. Similarly, a token is *removed* from vertex $v \in V(G)$ if $v \in Q$ and $v \notin Q'$.

We note that we focus on sliding for vertex subset problems as most of our results for Π-Discovery are based on it. By instantiating Π with Vertex Cover, Independent Set, or Dominating Set, we obtain the Vertex Cover Discovery (VCD), Independent Set Discovery (ISD), or Dominating Set Discovery (DSD) problem, respectively. Similar to the vertex subset discovery problems, we define the Coloring Discovery problem in [Section 6.](#page-22-0)

1.2 Our results

We study the classical as well as the parameterized complexity of the aforementioned solution discovery problems and prove the following results.

1*.* **Vertex Cover Discovery:** We show that the problem is NP-complete even on planar graphs of maximum degree four and W[1]-hard for parameter *b*, even on 2-degenerate bipartite graphs. On the positive side, we show that the problem is XP for parameter treewidth (that is, polynomial-time solvable on every fixed class of bounded treewidth), FPT for parameter *k* on general graphs and FPT for parameter *b* when restricted to structurally nowhere dense classes of graphs.

2*.* **Independent Set Discovery:** We show that the problem is NP-complete even on planar graphs of maximum degree four, $W[1]$ -hard for parameter $k + b$ even on graphs excluding ${C_4, \ldots, C_p}$ as induced subgraphs (for any constant *p*), and W[1]-hard for parameter *b* even on 2-degenerate bipartite graphs. On the positive side, we show that the problem is XP for parameter treewidth, FPT for parameter *k* on *d*-degenerate and nowhere dense classes of graphs as well as FPT for parameter *b* on structurally nowhere dense classes of graphs.

Figure 1: The considered graph classes. Arrows indicate inclusion.

3*.* **Dominating Set Discovery:** We show that the problem is NP-complete even on planar graphs of maximum degree five, $W[1]$ -hard for parameter $k + b$ even on bipartite graphs, and $W[1]$ -hard for parameter *b* even on 2-degenerate graphs. On the positive side, we show that the problem is XP for parameter treewidth, FPT for parameter *k* on biclique-free and semi-ladder-free graphs as well as FPT for parameter *b* on structurally nowhere dense classes of graphs.

4. **Coloring Discovery:** We show that the problem is NP-complete for every $k \geq 3$ even on planar bipartite graphs (that is, para-NP-hard for parameter *k*), W[1]-hard for parameter treewidth, and W[1]-hard for parameter $k + b$ on general graphs. On the positive side, we show that the problem is polynomial-time solvable for $k = 2$ and FPT parameterized by $k + b$ on structurally nowhere dense classes of graphs.

Our results provide an almost complete classification of the complexity of the problems on minor-closed, resp. monotone (i.e. subgraph-closed) classes of graphs. Concerning the polynomialtime solvable cases, observe that a class of graphs has bounded treewidth if and only if it excludes a planar graph as a minor [63]. Hence, for the vertex subset discovery problems, hardness on planar graphs implies that for minor-closed classes of graphs efficient algorithms can only be expected for classes with bounded treewidth, which is exactly what we establish. Coloring DISCOVERY is NP-complete both on planar graphs and on classes with bounded treewidth for any $k \geq 3$, hence, our tractability result for $k = 2$ is the best we can hope for.

The notions of degeneracy and nowhere density are very general notions of graph sparsity. Besides the theoretical interest in these classes, many real-world networks, such as several social networks (such as physical disease propagation networks), biological networks (such as gene interactions or brain networks), and informatics networks (such as autonomous systems), turn out to be degenerate or nowhere dense, see e.g. [\[15,](#page-30-6) [26,](#page-31-0) [33\]](#page-32-5). Degenerate and nowhere dense classes are biclique free. It is not easy to find biclique-free classes that are neither degenerate

nor nowhere dense – one interesting example being the class of all *n*-vertex graphs of girth at least 5 with average degree $\mathcal{O}(n^{1/5})$, see [\[65\]](#page-34-4). Structurally nowhere dense classes are a dense extension of nowhere dense classes and semi-ladder free classes are a dense extension of bicliquefree classes. We refer to [Figure 1](#page-4-0) for an overview.

We provide an almost complete classification on monotone classes of graphs for the vertex subset discovery problems and the parameter *b*; we establish hardness on degenerate classes and tractability on (structurally) nowhere dense classes. For parameter k , VERTEX COVER DISCOVery is tractable on all graphs. Similarly, for parameter *k*, Independent Set Discovery is tractable both on degenerate and on (structurally) nowhere dense classes, and it remains open whether it is tractable on biclique-free classes. DOMINATING SET DISCOVERY is tractable even on semi-ladder-free, and hence on biclique-free classes.

For Coloring Discovery more questions remain open. It remains open whether the problem is tractable for parameter $k + b$ on *d*-degenerate graphs, parameter *b* on planar graphs, and parameter *k* on classes with bounded treewidth.

2 Preliminaries

We denote the set of natural numbers by N. For $k \in \mathbb{N}$ we define $[k] = \{1, 2, \ldots, k\}.$

Graphs We consider finite, simple, loopless, and undirected graphs. For a graph *G*, we denote by $V(G)$ and $E(G)$ the vertex set and edge set of *G*, respectively. Two vertices $u, v \in V(G)$ with $\{u, v\} \in E(G)$ are called adjacent or neighbors. The vertices *u* and *v* are called the endpoints of the edge $\{u, v\}$. The degree of a vertex v is equal to the number of neighbors of v. A graph has maximum degree *d* if all its vertices have degree at most *d*.

A sequence v_1, \ldots, v_q of pairwise distinct vertices is a path of length $q-1$ if $\{v_i, v_{i+1}\} \in E(G)$ for all $1 \leq i \leq q$. A sequence v_1, \ldots, v_q of pairwise distinct vertices is a cycle of length *q* if $\{v_i, v_{i+1}\} \in E(G)$, for all $1 \leq i < q$, and $\{v_q, v_1\} \in E(G)$. We write P_q to denote a path of length q and C_q to denote a cycle of length q .

Parameterized complexity A *parameterized problem* is a language $L \subseteq \Sigma^* \times \mathbb{N}$, where Σ is a fixed finite alphabet. For an instance $(x, \kappa) \in \Sigma^* \times \mathbb{N}$, κ is called the *parameter*. The problem *L* is called *fixed-parameter tractable*, FPT for short, if there exists an algorithm that on input (x, κ) decides in time $f(\kappa) \cdot |(x,\kappa)|^c$ whether $(x,\kappa) \in L$, for a computable function f and constant c. Likewise, the problem belongs to para-NP if it can be solved within the same time bound by a nondeterministic algorithm. *L* is *slice-wise polynomial*, XP for short, if there is an algorithm deciding whether (x, κ) belongs to *L* in time $f(\kappa) \cdot |(x, \kappa)|^{g(\kappa)}$, for computable functions *f*, *g*.

The W*-hierarchy* is a collection of parameterized complexity classes FPT ⊆ W[1] ⊆ *. . .* ⊆ W[t] \subseteq ... \subseteq para-NP \cap XP. We have FPT \neq para-NP if and only if P \neq NP, which is a standard assumption. Also the inclusion FPT $\subseteq W[1]$ is conjectured to be strict (and this conjecture is known to be true when assuming the exponential-time hypothesis). Therefore, showing intractability in the parameterized setting is usually accomplished by establishing an FPT-reduction from a W-hard problem.

Let $L, L' \subseteq \Sigma^* \times \mathbb{N}$ be parameterized problems. A *parameterized reduction* from *L* to *L'* is an algorithm that, given an instance (x, κ) of *L*, outputs an instance (x', κ') of *L'* such that $(x, \kappa) \in L \Leftrightarrow (x', \kappa') \in L', \, \kappa' \leq g(\kappa)$ for some computable function *g*, and the running time of the algorithm is bounded by $f(\kappa) \cdot |(x,\kappa)|^c$ for some computable function *f* and constant *c*.

We refer to the textbooks [\[22,](#page-31-1) 29, [35\]](#page-32-6) for extensive background on parameterized complexity.

3 Vertex cover discovery

In the NP-complete VERTEX COVER (VC) problem [\[37\]](#page-32-7), we are given a graph *G* and an integer *k* and the problem is to decide whether *G* admits a vertex cover *C* of size at most *k*, i.e., a set *C* of at most k vertices such that for every edge $\{u, v\} \in E(G)$ we have $\{u, v\} \cap C \neq \emptyset$.

3.1 Related work

The VERTEX COVER problem admits a 2-approximation and is hard to approximate within a factor of $(2 - \varepsilon)$, for any $\varepsilon > 0$, assuming the unique games conjecture [51]. For an integer λ , we call two sets A and B λ -close if their symmetric difference has size at most λ . Local search by exchanging with *λ*-close solutions, for $\lambda \in \mathcal{O}(1/poly(\varepsilon))$, leads to a $(1+\varepsilon)$ -approximation algorithm for VERTEX COVER on graph classes with subexponential expansion $[42]$. The VERtex Cover problem is the textbook example of a fixed-parameter tractable problem [29]. The dynamic variant of the problem was studied, e.g., in [\[3\]](#page-29-2).

The VERTEX COVER problem is also very well studied under the combinatorial reconfiguration framework [\[68,](#page-34-0) [61\]](#page-33-2). Recall that in the reconfiguration variant of a (graph vertex subset) problem, we are given a graph *G* and two feasible solutions *S* (source) and *T* (target) and the goal is to decide whether we can transform S to T via "small" reconfiguration steps while maintaining feasibility (sometimes bounding the number of allowed reconfiguration steps).

In contrast to the decision variant, VERTEX COVER RECONFIGURATION (VCR) is known to be PSPACE-complete on general graphs for the token sliding, token jumping, and token addition/removal models [46, 48]. This remains true even for very restricted graph classes such as graphs of bounded bandwidth/pathwidth/treewidth [70]. On the positive side, polynomialtime algorithms are known only for very simple graph classes such as trees [25]. More positive results (which vary depending on the model) are possible if we consider the parameterized complexity of the problem. We refer the reader to [\[14\]](#page-30-7) for more details.

3.2 Notation and definitions

In the VERTEX COVER DISCOVERY (VCD) problem, we are given a graph G , a starting configuration *S*, and a positive integer budget *b*. The goal is to decide whether we can reach a vertex cover of *G* (starting from *S*) using at most *b* token slides (where we forbid multiple tokens occupying the same vertex). Formally, an instance of VCD is a tuple $((G, S, b), \kappa)$, where κ is the parameter. For readability we will simply write (G, S, b) and make the parameter explicit in the text. We will always use k to denote the size of *S*, i.e., $k = |S|$, except in [Section 6](#page-22-0) where k will denote the number of colors. Possible choices for the parameter κ are k , b , $k + b$, or structural parameters such as the treewidth of the input graph.

3.3 Intractability

Note that for all solution discovery variants of (graph) vertex subset problems, we can always assume that $b \leq n^2$, where *n* is the number of vertices in the input graph. This follows from the fact that each token will have to traverse a path of length at most *n*. Hence, all the solution discovery variants of such problems are indeed in NP. We first show that the VERTEX COVER Discovery problem is NP-complete even on very restricted graph classes.

Theorem 3.1. The VERTEX COVER DISCOVERY problem is NP-complete on the class of planar graphs of maximum degree four.

Proof. We give a reduction from VC on planar graphs of maximum degree three, which is known to be NP-complete [55]. Given an instance (G, κ) of VC, where G is a planar graph of maximum degree three, we construct an instance of VCD as follows. We create a new graph *H* which consists of a copy of *G*. Then, for each vertex $v \in V(H)$, we create a new path consisting of three vertices $\{x_v, y_v, z_v\}$ and we connect *v* to x_v . We choose $S = \{x_v, y_v \mid v \in V(G)\}$ and we set the budget $b = \kappa$. Note that $k = |S| = 2|V(G)|$. This completes the construction of the instance (H, S, b) of VCD. It follows from the construction that *H* is planar and of maximum degree four. We prove that (G, κ) is a yes-instance of VC if and only if (H, S, b) is a yes-instance of VCD.

First, assume that *G* has a vertex cover *C* of size at most κ . Then, in *H* we can simply slide every token on x_v to *v*, where $v \in C$. Since *C* is of size at most $\kappa = b$, we have at most *b* slides. To see that the resulting set is a vertex cover of *H*, note that every edge $\{v, x_v\}$ is still covered by either *v* or x_v and the edges $\{x_v, y_v\}$ and $\{y_v, z_v\}$ are still covered by y_v . Moreover, all the other edges of *H* are covered since *C* is a vertex cover of *G*.

For the reverse direction, assume that (H, S, b) is a yes-instance of VCD. Since $b = \kappa$, we know that at most κ tokens can move, i.e., be placed in $H[V(G)]$. Moreover, since the resulting configuration must be a vertex cover of *H* and $H[V(G)]$ is an induced subgraph of *H* it follows that the tokens on vertices corresponding to vertices of *G* must form a vertex cover of *G* of size \Box at most κ , as needed.

Our next result shows that, from a parameterized perspective, the VERTEX COVER DISCOVery problem remains hard when parameterized by the budget *b* alone, even on 2-degenerate bipartite graphs. Recall that a graph *G* is called *d*-degenerate if every subgraph *H* of *G* has a vertex of degree at most *d*.

Theorem 3.2. The VERTEX COVER DISCOVERY problem is W[1]-hard when parameterized by the budget *b* even on the class of 2-degenerate bipartite graphs.

Proof. We present a parameterized reduction from the CLIQUE problem. Let (G, κ) be an instance of the Clique problem. We construct a graph *H* from *G* as follows. First, we define the vertex set *V*(*H*). *V*(*H*) is partitioned into six vertex sets V_1, \ldots, V_6 . Let $V_1 = \{r_i \mid i \in \binom{\kappa}{2}\}\$ and $V_2 = \{z_i \mid i \in \binom{\kappa}{2} \}$. For $m = |E(G)|$, the set V_3 consists of $2m\binom{\kappa}{2}$ vertices grouped into m sets V_3^e for each $e \in E(G)$. For each $e \in E(G)$, let $V_3^e = \{g_e^i, h_e^i \mid i \in [n] \}$. Let $V_4 = \{y_e \mid e \in E(G)\}, V_5 = \{x_u \mid u \in V(G)\}$ and $V_6 = \{s_u \mid u \in V(G)\}.$ Now we define the edge set $E(H)$. For each $i \in \binom{k}{2}$, we add an edge between the vertices $r_i \in V_1$ and

 $z_i \in V_2$. Next, for each $i \in \left[\binom{\kappa}{2}\right]$ and $e \in E(G)$, the vertex $g_e^i \in V_3^e$ is adjacent to the vertices $z_i \in V_2$, $h_e^i \in V_3^e$, and $y_e \in V_4$. For each edge $e = \{u, v\} \in E(G)$, the vertex $y_e \in V_4$ is adjacent to $x_u, x_v \in V_5$. Finally, for each $u \in V(G)$, we add an edge between the vertices $x_u \in V_5$ and $s_u \in V_6$. This completes the construction of the graph *H*. We define the starting configuration $S = V_6 \cup V_4 \cup \{g_e^i \in V_3 \mid e \in E(G), i \in \binom{\kappa}{2}\}\$ of size $k = m + n + m\binom{\kappa}{2}$ and we set $b = 2\binom{\kappa}{2} + \kappa$ (see [Figure 2\)](#page-8-0).

We first prove that the graph *H* is indeed 2-degenerate. Recall that a graph *H* is *d*-degenerate if every induced subgraph of *H* contains a vertex of degree at most *d*. Consider any induced subgraph H' of H . If H' contains a vertex from V_1 , V_3 , or V_6 , then we are done, since vertices in V_1 and V_6 have degree one in *H* and vertices of V_3 have degree three in *H* but one of those neighbors is a vertex of degree one. It is not hard to see that any induced subgraph of *H* not including a vertex of $V_1 \cup V_3 \cup V_6$ must either have an isolated vertex from V_2 , or a degree-two vertex from V_4 , or an isolated vertex from V_5 (when no vertex from V_4 is included).

Figure 2: An illustration of the W[1]-hardness reduction. The red-colored vertices denote the starting configuration.

We now prove the correctness of the reduction starting with the forward direction. Let *C* be a clique of size κ in *G*. Let $S' = (S \cup V_2 \cup \{x_u \mid u \in C\}) \setminus (\{y_{uv} \mid u, v \in C\} \cup \{s_u \mid u \in C\}).$ We obtain $S' \subseteq V(H)$ from *S* using at most *b* token slides. We slide the tokens from any $\binom{\kappa}{2}$ arbitrary vertices in *V*₃ to *V*₂. Then, we will slide the tokens from $\{y_{uv} \mid u, v \in C\} \subseteq V_4$ to the swapped $\binom{\kappa}{2}$ vertices in *V*₃. Next, we slide κ tokens from $\{s_u \mid u \in C\}$ to $\{x_u \mid u \in C\}$. Since $V_2 \cup \{g_e^i \in V_3 \mid e \in E(G), i \in \binom{\kappa}{2}\}\subseteq S'$, the edges incident on these vertices are covered. For each $u \in V(G)$, either $x_u \in V_5$ or $s_u \in V_6$ is in S'. Therefore, the edges between the sets V_5 and V_6 are covered by *S*'. Finally, the edges between the vertices in V_4 that are not in *S'* and V_5 are covered by the vertices corresponding to the clique C since the moved vertices in V_4 correspond to the edges of the clique *C*.

For the reverse direction, we consider the properties of feasible solutions for the VCD problem in *H*. The set *S* does not contain any vertex from $V_1 \cup V_2$. Since the edges between V_1 and *V*₂ are $\binom{\kappa}{2}$ matching edges, we need to move $\binom{\kappa}{2}$ tokens from *S* to *V*₂. These tokens have to come from *V*₃. For each $i \in [r \choose 2]$ and each $e \in E(G)$, either g_e^i or h_e^i should be in a feasible solution. Therefore, we have to move $\binom{\kappa}{2}$ tokens from V_4 to V_3 . We are left with only a budget of κ to cover the edges between the $\binom{\kappa}{2}$ vertices. This is possible only when the $\binom{\kappa}{2}$ edges form a clique. \Box

3.4 Tractability

We now show that the VERTEX COVER DISCOVERY problem becomes fixed-parameter tractable when considering different parameters. Unlike [Theorem 3.2,](#page-7-0) our next result shows that parameterizing by the number of tokens *k* instead of the budget *b* makes the problem tractable.

Theorem 3.3. The VERTEX COVER DISCOVERY problem is fixed-parameter tractable when parameterized by the number of tokens *k*. Moreover, the problem can be solved in time $\mathcal{O}(2^k \cdot n^3)$.

Proof. Our algorithm consists of an enumeration step, which enumerates all minimal vertex covers of *G* of size at most *k*. Then, for each vertex cover *C* of size at most *k*, we solve an instance of Minimum Weight Perfect Matching (MWPM) on bipartite graphs.

To enumerate all vertex covers of size at most *k*, we follow the standard search-tree algorithm that gradually constructs minimal vertex covers, producing all minimal vertex covers of size at most *k* in its leaves. Consider an instance of VC. To build the search-tree, at each non-leaf node, the algorithm chooses an edge that has not yet been covered, and branches on the two possible ways of covering this edge, including one of the endpoints of the edge in each branch. Since we are not interested in vertex covers of cardinality more than *k*, we do not need to search beyond depth *k* in the tree, proving an upper bound of 2*^k* on the number of leaves, and an upper bound of $\mathcal{O}^*(2^k)$ on the enumeration time.

It remains to check whether any vertex cover *C* of size at most *k* can be reached from *S* using at most *b* token slides. To do so, we proceed as follows. For each set *C*, we construct a complete weighted bipartite graph *H* where the bipartition of *H* consists of (*S, C*). That is, we have the vertices of *S* on one side and the vertices of *C* on the other side. For each pair of vertices $u \in S$ and $v \in C$, we set the weight of the edge $\{u, v\} \in E(H)$ to the number of edges along a shortest path from *u* to *v* in *G* (we set the weight to $m+b+1$ whenever *u* and *v* belong to different connected components). Now we apply an algorithm for MWPM in *H*. If the weight of the perfect matching is *b* or less, then we can move the tokens accordingly. Otherwise, we proceed to the next vertex cover. To see why this is indeed correct, note that if the path a token t_1 would take to reach its destination has another token t_2 on it, we can have the two tokens switch destinations and continue moving *t*2. One can check that the number of moves does not exceed the weight of the perfect matching. On the other hand, any solution to the discovery problem must move tokens to targets and cannot do better than the total length of the shortest paths in a minimum weight perfect matching. This observation was first made in [18]. It is well-known that the MWPM problem can be solved in $\mathcal{O}(n^3)$ time using, e.g., Edmonds' blossom algorithm [\[31\]](#page-31-2). \Box

Next, we show that VCD is XP when parameterized by the treewidth of the input graph. In particular, the problem is polynomial-time solvable on every fixed class of bounded treewidth. Note that *k* in the following theorem can be in $\mathcal{O}(n)$ so that $2^{\mathcal{O}(t \log k)} \in n^{\mathcal{O}(t)}$. We remark that the problem could potentially be even FPT for parameter treewidth, but we were neither able to prove this claim nor prove W[1]-hardness.

Theorem 3.4. The VERTEX COVER DISCOVERY problem can be solved in time $2^{\mathcal{O}(t \log k)} \cdot n^{\mathcal{O}(1)}$, where *t* denotes the treewidth of the input graph.

Proof. Let (G, S, b) be an instance of the VCD problem. We first compute a nice tree decomposition $(T, (X_i)_{i \in V(T)})$ of *G* of width $\mathcal{O}(t)$. This is possible in time $2^{\mathcal{O}(t)} \cdot n^2$ and we refer to the textbook [\[22\]](#page-31-1) for the undefined notions of treewidth and nice tree decompositions. We write G_i for the subgraph induced by all vertices in the bags of the subtree rooted at *i*. For each node $i \in V(T)$, we compute a table Sol_i . The entries of the table are indexed by four-tuples. We refer to the four-tuples as *states*. A state *s* at the node *i* is hence a tuple (q, ℓ, A, B) , where

- $0 \leq q \leq k$ is an integer that specifies the size of the desired vertex cover solution (the number of tokens) for the sub-problem on G_i ,
- $0 \leq \ell \leq b$ is an integer that specifies the number of sliding steps allowed in the sub-problem on G_i ,
- A : $X_i \rightarrow \{0,1\}$ is an indicator function for the vertices in X_i (marking the vertices of X_i) that must belong to a solution), and
- B : $X_i \rightarrow [-k, k]$ is a function that specifies the number of tokens that slide through each vertex in X_i , where a negative value indicates that more tokens slide from G_i to the rest of the graph, while a positive value indicates the converse. Let $\gamma^+ = \{u \in X_i \mid B(u) > 0\}$ and $\gamma^{-} = \{u \in X_i \mid B(u) < 0\}$. For each vertex $u \in \gamma^{+}$, we can use $B(u)$ many additional tokens available at *u*. These tokens are assumed to be available at the vertex *u* which are slid from the vertices outside G_i . Further, for each vertex $u \in \gamma^-$, we have to slide $B(u)$ many tokens to the vertex *u* where the purpose of these tokens is that they can later slide to vertices outside G_i .

We denote by S_i the set of all states of the node *i*. For a state $s = (q, \ell, A, B) \in S_i$, $Sol_i[s]$ is set to 1 if and only if the following holds: There exists a set $C \subseteq V(G_i)$ of size q such that

- *C* is a vertex cover of G_i where $C \cap X_i = \mathbf{A}^{-1}(1)$, and
- $C \cup \gamma$ [−] can be reached from $(S \cap V(G_i)) \cup \gamma$ ⁺ using at most ℓ sliding steps, using B(*u*) tokens from each vertex $u \in \gamma^+$, and sliding $B(u)$ tokens to each vertex $u \in \gamma^-$.

Intuitively speaking, the function B determines two quantities:

- the number of available extra tokens that could reach the separator from outside G_i ; and
- the number of required tokens that need to reach the separator so that they eventually slide to vertices outside of *Gⁱ* .

We compute solutions for all possible functions B, functions A, solution sizes $0 \le q \le k$, and number of sliding steps $0 \leq \ell \leq b$.

Locally invalid states. A state *s* is said to be *locally invalid* if there exists a vertex $u \in X_i$ such that $N[u] \subseteq V(G_i)$ and $B(u) \neq 0$. For any vertex *u* with $N[u] \subseteq V(G_i)$, $B(u)$ must be 0 since the tokens cannot slide from vertex u to vertices outside of G_i . Therefore, for a locally invalid state *s*, we set $\text{Sol}_i[s] = 0$. Further, the existence of such a state will be no more useful for any states in the parent node. If a state is not locally invalid, then it is a *locally valid state*. Therefore, we consider only locally valid states in our dynamic programming computation.

For each node $i \in V(T)$ and a state $s \in S_i$, we show how to compute $\text{Sol}_i[s]$ based on the type of the node *i* in *T*.

Leaf node. Let *i* be a leaf node with bag $X_i = \emptyset$. The state set S_i is a singleton set with only state $s = (0, 0, \emptyset \to \{0, 1\}, \emptyset \to [-k, k])$ with $\texttt{Sol}_i[s] = 1$.

Introduce node. Let *i* be an introduce node with child *j* such that $X_i = X_j \cup \{v\}$, for some $v \notin X_j$. Observe that $N[v] \cap V(G_i) \subseteq X_i$. Let $N_v = N(v) \cap X_i$. If $A(v) = 0$ and $N(v) \cap X_i \nsubseteq A^{-1}(1)$, then we set $\text{Sol}_i[s] = 0$. That is, the edges incident on *v* are either covered by *v* or by the neighbors of *v*. Therefore, either *v* is included in the solution or all neighbors of *v* in X_i are included in the solution. The vertex *v* will be treated as the external vertex when we process the table entries of node *j*. We consider all possible ways of sliding tokens through *v*. Let $F = \{f : N_v \to [-k, k] \mid \sum_{u \in N_v} f(u) = B(v)\}.$ A function $f \in F$ defines the number of tokens given to (or obtained from) the vertex *v* by each neighbor $u \in N_v$. For each $f \in F$, we define $B_f: X_j \to [-k, k]$ such that, for each $u \in X_j$, we have

$$
B_f(u) = \begin{cases} B(u) + f(u) & \text{if } u \in N_v, \\ B(u) & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}
$$

For each $f \in F$, let $den(f) = \sum_{u \in N_v} |f(u)|$ and $s_f = (q - A(v), \ell - den(f), A_j, B_f)$. The value $den(f)$ refers to the number of sliding steps required to slide tokens through or to v and A_j denotes the function A restricted to the set X_j . Finally, the table value for the state *s* can be computed as

$$
\mathtt{Sol}_i[s] = \bigvee_{f \in F} \mathtt{Sol}_j[s_f].
$$

The time required to compute the value $\text{Sol}_i[s]$ is bounded by $\mathcal{O}(|F| \cdot t) = 2^{\mathcal{O}(t \log k)}$.

Forget node. Let *i* be a forget node with child *j* such that $X_i = X_j \setminus \{v\}$, for some $v \in X_j$. Observe that $N[v] \subseteq V(G_i) = V(G_j)$. Therefore, for any locally valid state $s' = (q', \ell', \mathbf{A}', \mathbf{B}') \in$ S_j , $B'(v) = 0$. Let us define $B_j : X_j \to [-k, k]$ such that, for each $u \in X_j$, we have

$$
B_j(u) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } u = v, \\ B(u) & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}
$$

Next, we try both possibilities of either including or excluding the vertex *v* from the desired solution. For $c \in \{0,1\}$, let us define $A_c: X_j \to \{0,1\}$ such that, for each $u \in X_j$, we have

$$
\mathbf{A}_c(u) = \begin{cases} c & \text{if } u = v, \\ \mathbf{A}(u) & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}
$$

We compute the value $\texttt{Sol}_i[s]$ for the state *s* as

$$
\mathtt{Sol}_i[s] = \bigvee_{c \in \{0,1\}} \mathtt{Sol}_j[(q,\ell,\mathtt{A}_c,\mathtt{B}_j)].
$$

The value $\text{Sol}_i[s]$ can be computed in constant $(\mathcal{O}(1))$ time.

Join node. Let *i* be a join node with children *j* and *h* such that $X_i = X_j = X_h$. Let $F = \{f : X_i \to [-k, k]\}.$ The size of the desired solution is *q*, where $A^{-1}(1)$ vertices are contained in X_i . Therefore, we try all possible ways to get the $q - A^{-1}(1)$ additional vertices from $V(G_i) \setminus X_i$. For each $0 \le q' \le q - A^{-1}(1)$, let $q_j = q' + A^{-1}(1)$ and $q_h = q - q'$.

Similarly, we have a budget of *ℓ* sliding steps in total. Therefore, we try all possible ways of splitting ℓ into the two subtrees rooted at j and h , respectively, where we assign ℓ' to the subtree rooted at *j* and $\ell - \ell'$ to the subtree rooted at *h*. Next, we define the computation of B functions for *j* and *h*. For each $f \in F$, we define B_j^f $j: X_j \to [-k, k]$ and B_h^f $\frac{J}{h}: X_h \to [-k, k]$ as follows. For each $u \in X_j$, B_j^f $f_j(u) = B(u) + f(u)$, and for each $u \in X_h$, B_h^f $f_h^f(u) = B(u) - f(u).$ A function $f \in F$ defines the number of tokens that move across the two subtrees (rooted at *j* and h). A positive sign represents token movement from the subtree rooted at j to the subtree rooted at h , and vice versa for a negative sign. We compute the value $\texttt{Sol}_i[s]$ for the state s as

$$
\texttt{Sol}_i[s] = \bigvee_{\substack{0 \leq q' \leq q - \mathtt{A}^{-1}(1), \\ 0 \leq \ell' \leq \ell, \\ \overline{f} \in \overline{F}}} (\texttt{Sol}_j[q_j, \ell', \mathtt{A}, \mathtt{B}_j^f] \wedge \texttt{Sol}_h[q_h, \ell - \ell', \mathtt{A}, \mathtt{B}_h^f]).
$$

The time to compute the value of $\text{Sol}_i[s]$ is bounded by $\mathcal{O}(|F| \cdot k \cdot b) = 2^{\mathcal{O}(t \log k)}$.

Given a graph *G* on *n* vertices, a tree decomposition of *G* has $\mathcal{O}(n)$ nodes. For each node *i* in the tree decomposition, the table Sol_i stores values for $2^{\mathcal{O}(t \log k)}$ many states. A table entry for a state can be computed in time $2^{\mathcal{O}(t \log k)} \cdot n^{\mathcal{O}(1)}$. Therefore, the tables for all the nodes in the tree decomposition can be computed in time $2^{\mathcal{O}(t \log k)} \cdot n^{\mathcal{O}(1)}$. Let r be the root node. We obtain the final answer from the table entry at the root node. That is, (G, S, b) is a yes-instance of VCD if and only if $\text{Sol}_r[(k, \ell, \emptyset \to \{0, 1\}, \emptyset \to [-k, k])] = 1$ for some $\ell \leq b$. \Box

We now consider the parameter *b* on (structurally) nowhere dense classes of graphs. The notion of nowhere dense graph classes has been introduced as a common generalization of several previously known notions of sparsity in graphs such as planar graphs, graphs with forbidden (topological) minors, graphs with (locally) bounded treewidth, or graphs with bounded maximum degree. It is known that for every nowhere dense class of graphs there is a function *f* such that every property definable as a first-order formula φ can be decided in time $f(|\varphi|, \varepsilon) \cdot n^{1+\varepsilon}$, for any $\varepsilon > 0$ [39]. Recently, this tractability result was extended to structurally nowhere dense classes [\[30\]](#page-31-3), which constitute a dense version of nowhere dense classes. We use this meta-theorem to show the existence of a fixed-parameter tractable algorithm for the VERTEX COVER DISCOVery problem parameterized by *b* and restricted to structurally nowhere dense graph classes.

Theorem 3.5. The VERTEX COVER DISCOVERY problem is fixed-parameter tractable when parameterized by *b* and restricted to structurally nowhere dense classes of graphs.

Proof. We reduce VCD to the first-order model checking problem, which is known to be fixedparameter tractable on structurally nowhere dense graph classes [\[30\]](#page-31-3). It suffices to show that we can construct a first-order formula φ expressing the existence of a solution to a VCD instance such that $|\varphi| = f(b)$, for some function f. Given an instance (G, S, b) of VCD, we mark the set *S* by a unary predicate, that is, a unary relation such that $S(v)$ holds whenever $v \in S$. This makes the input configuration accessible to the first-order formula. To construct φ we proceed as follows. Note that we need to express the existence of $q \leq \min\{k, b\}$ distinct vertices in *S* that can reach *q* other distinct vertices not in *S* by paths of total length at most *b* such that the resulting set is a vertex cover of *G*. To express this, we existentially quantify over at most $q \leq \min\{k, b\}$ distinct vertices u_1, \ldots, u_q that belong to *S* and we existentially quantify over *q* distinct vertices v_1, \ldots, v_q that belong to $V(G) \setminus S$. Now, for all ℓ_1, \ldots, ℓ_q such that $\sum_{1 \leq i \leq q} \ell_i \leq b$ we verify (again by existential quantification) that there exists a path from u_i to v_i of length ℓ_i . We make a big disjunction over all such choices for ℓ_1, \ldots, ℓ_q . Finally, it remains to check that the set $(S \setminus \{u_i \mid i \in [q]\}) \cup \{v_i \mid i \in [q]\}$ is a vertex cover of the graph. This can be accomplished by checking that each edge of the graph has at least one endpoint either in $S \setminus \{u_1, \ldots, u_q\}$ or in $\{v_1, \ldots, v_q\}$. We omit the formal presentation of the formula as it offers \Box no further insights.

4 Independent set discovery

In the INDEPENDENT SET (IS) problem, we are given a graph *G* and an integer *k* and the problem is to decide whether *G* contains an independent set of size at least *k*, where an independent set is a set of pairwise non-adjacent vertices.

4.1 Related work

The INDEPENDENT SET problem is NP-complete [\[49\]](#page-33-5), and even NP-complete to approximate within a factor of $n^{1-\epsilon}$, for any $\epsilon > 0$ [\[72\]](#page-34-5). The INDEPENDENT SET problem parameterized by solution size *k* is W[1]-complete and hence assumed to not be fixed-parameter tractable [\[28\]](#page-31-4).

Hence, on general graphs, local search approaches cannot be expected to improve the above stated approximation factor. However, in practice we are often dealing with graphs belonging to special graph classes, e.g. planar graphs and, more generally, classes with subexponential expansion, where local search is known to lead to much better approximation algorithms, and even to polynomial-time approximation schemes (PTAS), see e.g. [\[42\]](#page-32-8).

The INDEPENDENT SET problem is also one of the most studied problems under the combinatorial reconfiguration framework [\[68,](#page-34-0) [61\]](#page-33-2). With respect to classical complexity, results for the Independent Set Reconfiguration problem and the Vertex Cover Reconfiguration problem are interchangeable; we simply complement vertex sets (recall that each edge has at least one endpoint in a vertex cover, so that the remaining vertices form an independent set). More positive results (quite different than those for VERTEX COVER RECONFIGURATION) are possible if we consider the parameterized complexity of the problem [60].

4.2 Notation and definitions

In the INDEPENDENT SET DISCOVERY (ISD) problem, we are given a graph *G*, a starting configuration *S* consisting of *k* tokens, and a positive integer budget *b*. The goal is to decide whether we can reach an independent set of *G* starting from *S* using at most *b* token slides (we do not allow two or more tokens to occupy the same vertex). Again, we denote an instance of ISD by (*G, S, b*) and make the considered parameter explicit in the text.

Note that, for Independent Set Discovery, the token jumping model and token addition/removal model boil down to the following problems. If $k \leq b$ for token jumping or $k \leq 2b$ for token/addition removal, then the question is simply whether there exists a solution of size *k*, as in this case we can simply move the tokens to this solution one by one. In other words, the problem boils down to the classical INDEPENDENT SET problem. If $b \leq k$ (for token jumping) or $2b \leq k$ (for token addition/removal), then the question is whether there exists a solution whose symmetric difference with the initial configuration is at most 2*b*. This question has been studied in the local search version of INDEPENDENT SET. We therefore focus on the token sliding model.

4.3 Intractability

We first show NP-completeness of INDEPENDENT SET DISCOVERY even restricted to planar graphs of maximum degree four.

Theorem 4.1. The INDEPENDENT SET DISCOVERY problem is NP-complete on the class of planar graphs of maximum degree four.

Proof. We give a reduction from IS on planar graphs of maximum degree three, which is known to be NP-complete [\[59\]](#page-33-6). Given an instance (G, κ) of IS, where G is a planar graph of maximum degree three, we construct an instance of ISD as follows. We create a new graph *H* that initially consists of a copy of *G*. Then, for each vertex $v \in V(H)$, we create a new path on five vertices w_v, x_v, c_v, y_v, z_v and we connect v to c_v . We choose $S = \{c_v, x_v, y_v \mid v \in V(G)\}\$ and we set the budget $b = 2n - \kappa$, where $n = |V(G)|$. Note that $k = 3|V(G)|$. This completes the construction of the instance (H, S, b) . It is easy to observe that the graph *H* is planar and of maximum degree four. We prove that (G, κ) is a yes-instance of IS if and only if (H, S, b) is a yes-instance of ISD.

First assume that *G* has an independent set *I* of size at least *κ*. Then, in *H* we can slide every token on c_v to *v*, where $v \in I$. For all other vertices $v \notin I$ we slide every token on x_v to w_v and every token on y_v to z_v . Observe that we need a budget of 2 to repair the path on every vertex $v \notin I$, while we need only a budget of 1 to repair the paths on vertices $v \in I$. Since *I* is of size at least κ , we need no more than $2n - \kappa = b$ slides. To see that the resulting set is

an independent set of H , note that for every path on a vertex $v \in I$ we have moved the token from c_v to *v* itself. As *I* is an independent set, and the only conflicting neighbor of x_v resp. y_v is c_v , the tokens from these paths form an independent set. The tokens on paths of vertices $v \notin I$ also form an independent set. As the only neighbor of w_v is x_v and the token has been moved from x_v to w_v , hence there is no conflict. This is also true for y_v and z_v . As the neighbors x_v and y_v of c_v have been freed, and there is no token on *v* itself, i.e., these paths form an independent set.

For the reverse direction, assume that (H, S, b) is a yes-instance of ISD. Let *I* be the resulting independent set. We need to show that $|I \cap V(G)| \geq \kappa$, which then corresponds to an independent set in *G*. Assume towards a contradiction that $|I \cap V(G)| = \ell < \kappa$. This implies that $3n - \ell$ tokens are still on the path gadgets. Since every path gadget can contain at most 3 independent vertices and *I* is an independent set, at least $n - \ell$ path gadgets contain 3 tokens. It takes at least 2 slides to keep the 3 tokens independent while not moving them out of the path. Hence, we require a budget of at least $2n - 2\ell$ for these slides. Moreover, each of the ℓ tokens on *V*(*G*) require at least one slide. In total, we require a budget of $2n - \ell > 2n - \kappa$, a contradiction. \Box

We next show that the problem is also hard from a parameterized perspective when considering the parameter $k + b$.

Theorem 4.2. The INDEPENDENT SET DISCOVERY problem is W[1]-hard when parameterized by $k + b$ even on graphs excluding $\{C_4, \ldots, C_p\}$ as induced subgraphs, for any constant *p*.

Proof. We present a parameterized reduction from the MULTICOLORED INDEPENDENT SET (MIS) problem, which is known to be $W[1]$ -hard on graphs excluding $\{C_4, \ldots, C_p\}$ as induced subgraphs, for any constant *p* [10]. Recall that in the MIS problem we are given a graph *G* and an integer κ , where $V(G)$ is partitioned into κ cliques $V_1, V_2, \ldots, V_\kappa$, and the goal is to find a multicolored independent set of size *κ*, i.e., an independent set containing one vertex from each set V_i , for $i \in [\kappa]$. Given an instance (G, κ) of MIS, we construct an instance (H, S, b) of ISD as follows. First, let *H* be a copy of *G*. Then, for each $i \in [\kappa]$, we add an edge on two new vertices $\{u_i, w_i\}$ and we make u_i adjacent to all vertices in V_i . Finally, we choose $S = \{u_i \mid i \in [\kappa]\} \cup \{w_i \mid i \in [\kappa]\}\$ and we set $b = \kappa$. Note that $k = |S| = 2\kappa$.

Assume that *G* has a multicolored independent set of size *κ*. Let $I = \{v_1, \ldots, v_k\}$ denote such a set, where $v_i \in V_i$. Then we can solve the discovery instance by sliding each token on u_i to the vertex v_i , as needed. For the reverse direction, since we need to slide all the tokens on vertices u_i and each set V_i can contain only one token, it follows that this is only possible if G has a multicolored independent set of size *κ*. \Box

In what follows, we further investigate the complexity of the INDEPENDENT SET DISCOVERY problem when parameterized only by *b* or *k* instead of *k*+*b* and restricted to special graph classes. It turns out that the problem remains W[1]-hard when parameterized by *b* and restricted to the class of 2-degenerate bipartite graphs.

Theorem 4.3. The INDEPENDENT SET DISCOVERY problem is W[1]-hard when parameterized by the budget *b* even on the class of 2-degenerate bipartite graphs.

Figure 3: An illustration of the $W[1]$ -hardness reduction for INDEPENDENT SET DISCOVERY on 2-degenerate bipartite graphs.

Proof. We present a parameterized reduction from the MULTICOLORED CLIQUE problem, which is a well-known $W[1]$ -hard problem [\[22\]](#page-31-1). Recall that in the MULTICOLORED CLIQUE problem we are given a graph *G* and an integer κ , where $V(G)$ is partitioned into κ independent sets *V*₁, *V*₂, ..., *V*_{*κ*}, and the goal is to find a multicolored clique of size κ , i.e., a clique containing one vertex from each set V_i , for $i \in [\kappa]$. Given an instance (G, κ) of MULTICOLORED CLIQUE, we construct an instance (H, S, b) of ISD as follows. We first describe the graph *H*. For each vertex set V_i , we create a new set X_i , where each vertex $v \in V_i$ is replaced by a path on 3 vertices which we denote by x_v , y_v , and z_v . Moreover, we add a vertex u_i that is connected to all vertices z_v , for $v \in V_i$. Finally, we add a vertex w_i that is only adjacent to vertex u_i . For $i < j \in [\kappa]$, we use $E_{i,j}$ to denote the set of edges between vertices in V_i and vertices in V_j (in the graph *G*). For each $E_{i,j}$, we create a new set of vertices, which we denote by $Y_{i,j}$, that contains one vertex e_{uv} for each edge $\{u, v\} \in E_{i,j}$. We additionally add an edge (consisting of two new vertices) $\{w_{i,j}, u_{i,j}\}$, where $u_{i,j}$ is also adjacent to every vertex in $Y_{i,j}$ (but not part of $Y_{i,j}$). For each vertex $e_{uv} \in Y_{i,j}$, $i < j \in [\kappa]$, we connect e_{uv} to y_u via a path consisting of two new vertices and we connect e_{uv} to y_v via a path consisting of two new vertices. Let $X = \bigcup_{i \in [\kappa]} X_i$ and $Y = \bigcup_{i,j \in [\kappa]} Y_{i,j}$. We use *W* to denote the set of all vertices along paths from *Y* to *X* that are at distance one from some vertex in *Y* and we use *Z* to denote the set of all vertices along such paths that are at distance two from some vertex in *Y* . Finally, let $S = W \cup \{u_i \mid i \in [\kappa]\} \cup \{w_i \mid i \in [\kappa]\} \cup \{u_{i,j} \mid i < j \in [\kappa]\} \cup \{w_{i,j} \mid i < j \in [\kappa]\} \cup \{y_v \mid v \in V(G)\}$ and let $b = 3\binom{\kappa}{2} + 2\kappa$ and $k = 2\kappa + 2\binom{\kappa}{2} + n + 2m$ (see [Figure 3\)](#page-16-0).

It is not hard to see that the graph *H* is indeed bipartite by construction. To see that the graph *H* is 2-degenerate it suffices to note that after deleting all y_v vertices, u_i vertices, and $u_{i,j}$ vertices, we get a graph of maximum degree two and none of the deleted vertices are adjacent. Hence every subgraph of *H* either has a vertex of the form w_i , $w_{i,j}$, x_v , z_v , or a vertex in $W \cup Y$ which all have degree at most 2, or no such vertex implying that every other vertex has degree at most 2. We claim that (G, κ) is a yes-instance of MULTICOLORED CLIQUE if and only if (H, S, b) is a yes-instance of ISD.

First assume that (G, k) is a yes-instance and let $C = \{v_1, v_2, \ldots v_k\}$ denote a multicolored clique in *G*, where each vertex v_i belongs to V_i , for $i \in [\kappa]$. We construct a sequence of slides transforming *S* to an independent set as follows. For each *i*, we slide the token on y_{v_i} to x_{v_i} and then slide the token on u_i to z_{v_i} . This requires a total of 2κ slides. Next, for each pair i, j with $i < j$, we slide the token on $u_{i,j}$ to the vertex $e_{v_i v_j}$ and then slide the two tokens in *W* to their neighbors in *Z*. This requires a total of $3\binom{\kappa}{2}$ slides which gives us a total of $b = 3\binom{\kappa}{2} + 2\kappa$ slides. Since C is a multicolored clique in G , it follows that the resulting configuration is indeed an independent set of *H*.

For the reverse direction, assume that (H, S, b) is a yes-instance of ISD. Since we have two adjacent tokens on u_i and w_i , for each $i \in [\kappa]$, we know that we need at least one move for each *i*. Moreover, since every vertex *y^v* contains a token, we know that we need an extra slide for each *i*. Hence, we need a minimum of 2κ slides for the edges of the form $\{u_i, w_i\}$. Similarly, for each pair *i, j* with $i < j$, we have two adjacent tokens on $w_{i,j}$ and $u_{i,j}$. Moreover, all vertices in *W* contain tokens. Hence, for each pair *i, j* with *i < j* we need at least three slides for a total of $3\binom{\kappa}{2}$ slides for the edges of the form $\{u_{i,j}, w_{i,j}\}$. Hence, there must exist κ vertices y_{v_i} and $\binom{\kappa}{2}$ vertices $e_{v_i v_j}$ adjacent to those vertices in order to successfully slide the tokens on the u_i and $u_{i,j}$ vertices away from their neighbors w_i and $w_{i,j}$ that contain tokens. \Box

4.4 Tractability

Our positive results for Independent Set Discovery parameterized by *k* make use of the notion of independence covering families introduced in [56]. We formally define such families and the various algorithms for extracting them on different graph classes.

Definition 4.1. For a graph *G* and $k \geq 1$, a family of independent sets of *G* is called an *independence covering family for* (G, k) , denoted by $\mathcal{F}(G, k)$, if for every independent set *I* in *G* of size at most *k*, there exists $J \in \mathcal{F}(G, k)$ such that $I \subseteq J$.

Theorem 4.4 ([56]). Given a *d*-degenerate or a nowhere dense class of graphs \mathscr{C} , a graph $G \in \mathscr{C}$, and $k \geq 1$, there exists a deterministic algorithm that runs in time $f(k) \cdot n^{\mathcal{O}(1)}$ and outputs an independence covering family for (G, k) of size at most $g(k) \cdot n^{\mathcal{O}(1)}$, where $f(k)$ and $g(k)$ depend on k and the class $\mathscr C$ but are independent of the size of the graph.

We are now ready to prove the following theorem:

Theorem 4.5. The INDEPENDENT SET DISCOVERY problem is fixed-parameter tractable when parameterized by k for every class $\mathscr C$ of graphs that admits independence covering families of size $g(k) \cdot n^{\mathcal{O}(1)}$ computable in time $f(k) \cdot n^{\mathcal{O}(1)}$, where f and g are computable functions. In particular, the problem is fixed parameter tractable on *d*-degenerate and nowhere dense classes of graphs.

Proof. Given an instance (G, S, b) of ISD where $G \in \mathscr{C}$, we start by computing an independence covering family $\mathcal{F}(G, k)$ of size $g(k) \cdot n^{\mathcal{O}(1)}$ in time $f(k) \cdot n^{\mathcal{O}(1)}$, which is possible by assumption (or by [Theorem 4.4](#page-17-0) for *d*-degenerate and nowhere dense classes of graphs). Let $\mathcal{F}(G, k)$ = $\{J_1, J_2, \ldots\}$ denote the resulting family. Let $J \in \mathcal{F}(G, k)$. We construct a complete weighted

bipartite graph $H_{S,J}$ as follows. Let *S* be the vertices *S* on one side and *J* be the vertices on the other side. We set the weight of each edge $\{u, v\}$ to be the number of edges along a shortest path from *u* to *v* in *G* (we set the weight to $m + b + 1$ whenever *u* and *v* belong to different components).

It remains to show that (G, S, b) is a yes-instance if and only if there exists a $J \in \mathcal{F}(G, k)$ such that $|J| \geq k$ and the minimum weight perfect matching in $H_{S,J}$ has weight at most *b*. Assuming the previous claim, the algorithm then follows by simply iterating over each *J* of size at least *k*, constructing the graph *HS,J*, and then computing a minimum weight perfect matching in *HS,J*. If we find a matching of weight at most *b* then we have a yes-instance; otherwise we have a no-instance.

Assume that (*G, S, b*) is a yes-instance. Then, there exists an independent set *I* of size *k* that can be reached from *S* by at most *b* token slides. By the definition of independence covering families, there exists $J \in \mathcal{F}(G, k)$ such that $I \subseteq J$. Moreover, since *I* is reachable from *S* in at most *b* slides, it must be the case that the weight of a perfect matching in *HS,I* is at most *b*. Hence, the minimum weight perfect matching in $H_{S,J}$ has weight at most b , as needed.

Now assume that there exists a $J \in \mathcal{F}(G, k)$ of size at least k such that the minimum weight perfect matching in *HS,J* has weight at most *b*. Recall that, by the definition of independence covering families, J is an independent set in G . Hence, any subset I of J of size k is an independent set of size *k* in *G*. Let *I* denote the set of vertices that are matched to some vertex in *S* in the minimum weight perfect matching. As we just described, *I* is an independent set of size k in G . Hence, it remains to show that we can reach I from S using at most b slides. If the path a token t_1 would take to reach its destination has another token t_2 on it, we can have the two tokens switch destinations and continue moving *t*2. One can check that the number of moves does not exceed the weight of the perfect matching.

It is well-known that MINIMUM WEIGHT PERFECT MATCHING can be solved in $\mathcal{O}(n^3)$ time using either the blossom algorithm [\[31\]](#page-31-2) or the Hungarian algorithm [\[54\]](#page-33-7). 口

Using the same dynamic programming techniques as those used for the VERTEX COVER Discovery problem on graphs of bounded treewidth [\(Theorem 3.4\)](#page-10-0) and reduction to first-order model checking [\(Theorem 3.5\)](#page-13-0) on structurally nowhere dense classes, we can show the following results:

Theorem 4.6. The INDEPENDENT SET DISCOVERY problem can be solved in time $2^{\mathcal{O}(t \log k)} \cdot n^{\mathcal{O}(1)}$, where *t* denotes the treewidth of the input graph.

Theorem 4.7. The INDEPENDENT SET DISCOVERY problem is fixed-parameter tractable when parameterized by the budget *b* and restricted to structurally nowhere dense classes of graphs.

5 Dominating set discovery

In the NP-complete DOMINATING SET (DS) problem [\[37\]](#page-32-7), we are given a graph *G* and an integer *k* and the problem is to decide whether *G* admits a dominating set *D* of size at most *k*, i.e., a set D of at most k vertices such that every vertex in $V(G)$ is either in D or has a neighbor in *D*.

5.1 Related work

The DOMINATING SET problem can be approximated up to a factor of $\log n$ by a simple greedy algorithm [\[47,](#page-32-9) [57\]](#page-33-8) and this factor asymptotically cannot be improved unless $P = NP$ [\[27\]](#page-31-5). Local search by exchanging with *λ*-close solutions for $\lambda \in \mathcal{O}(1/poly(\varepsilon))$ leads to a $(1+\varepsilon)$ -approximation on classes with subexponential expansion $[42]$. The problem is W[2]-complete [\[28\]](#page-31-4). The dynamic variant of the problem was studied e.g. in [\[3\]](#page-29-2).

For the DOMINATING SET RECONFIGURATION problem, it is known that the problem under the token jumping model is PSPACE-complete on split graphs, bipartite graphs, graphs of bounded bandwidth, and planar graphs of maximum degree six [40]. On the positive side, the problem is linear-time solvable in trees, interval graphs, and cographs. Bonamy et al. [9] show that under the token sliding model DOMINATING SET RECONFIGURATION is PSPACE-complete on split, bipartite, and bounded treewidth graphs, and polynomial-time solvable on dually chordal graphs and cographs. Bousquet and Joffard [13] show that the problem is polynomialtime solvable on circular-arc graphs and PSPACE-complete on circle graphs.

5.2 Notation and definitions

In the DOMINATING SET DISCOVERY (DSD) problem, we are given a graph *G*, a starting configuration *S* consisting of *k* tokens, and a positive integer budget *b*. The goal is to decide whether we can reach a dominating set of *G* of size *k* (starting from *S*) using at most *b* token slides. We denote an instance of DOMINATING SET DISCOVERY by (G, S, b) and make the parameter explicit in the text.

5.3 Intractability

We first show that the problem is NP-complete even on the class of planar graphs of maximum degree five.

Theorem 5.1. The DOMINATING SET DISCOVERY problem is NP-complete on the class of planar graphs of maximum degree five.

Proof. We give a reduction from DS on planar graphs of maximum degree three, which is known to be NP-complete [\[37\]](#page-32-7). Given an instance (G, κ) of DS, where G is a planar graph of maximum degree three, we construct an instance of DSD as follows. We create a new graph *H* which consists of a copy of *G*. Then, for each vertex $v \in V(H)$, we create a new path consisting of vertices $\{w_v, x_v, y_v, z_v\}$ and we connected *v* to w_v . Then, we create an additional new vertex u_v and we connect u_v to both v and x_v . We choose $S = \{x_v, y_v, v \in V(G)\}$ and we set the budget $b = 2\kappa$. Note that $k = 2|V(G)|$. This completes the construction of the instance (H, S, b) of DSD. It follows from the construction that the graph *H* is planar and of maximum degree five.

Assume that *G* has a dominating set *D* of size at most *κ*. Then, in *H* we can slide every token on x_v to *v*, where $v \in D$. Since D is of size at most κ , we need no more than 2κ slides. To see that the resulting set is a dominating set of H , note that every pair of vertices w_v and u_v is dominated by either x_v or *v*. Moreover, every pair of vertices y_v and z_v is dominated by y_v . The vertex x_v is either dominated by x_v or y_v (depending on whether $v \in D$ or not). Since *D* is a dominating set of *G*, all vertices *v* are also dominated, as needed.

For the reverse direction, assume that (H, S, b) is a yes-instance of DSD. Note that moving a token on *x^v* to either *w^v* or *u^v* leaves a none dominated vertex. Moreover, to dominate all vertices $\{u_v, w_v, x_v, y_v, z_v\}$ we need at least two tokens which implies that in the resulting configuration, for each *v*, we either have a token on *v* or a token on x_v ; the second token is either on y_v (if there is a token on *v* and no token on x_v) or possibly e_v (if the token on x_v does not slide to *v*). Since $b = 2\kappa$ and the distance from x_v to *v* is two, we can have at most κ tokens slide to vertices corresponding to vertices of *G*. Such vertices must form a dominating set of *G*, as needed. \Box

We next show that the problem is also hard from a parameterized perspective when parameterized by $k + b$.

Theorem 5.2. The DOMINATING SET DISCOVERY problem is W[2]-hard when parameterized by $k + b$ even on the class of bipartite graphs.

Proof. We present a parameterized reduction from the DS problem, which is known to be W[2]hard on general graphs. Given an instance (G, κ) of DS, we construct an instance (H, S, b) of DSD as follows. First, *H* contains two copies of the vertex set of *G*. We denote these two sets by *L* and *R*. We connect each vertex $v \in L$ to $N[v] = \{v' \in R \mid \{v, v'\} \in E(H)\} \cup \{v\}$ in *R*, that is, we connect *v* to each vertex in its closed neighborhood in *R*. Then, we set $k = \kappa + 1$ and add *k* new vertices v_1, \ldots, v_k , such that each v_i is adjacent to all vertices in *L*. We further add one more vertex *u* such that *u* has $\kappa + 1$ pendent neighbors $\{w_1, \ldots, w_{\kappa+1}\}\$ attached to it. We make *u* adjacent to all vertices in *L*. We choose $S = \{u, v_1, v_2, \ldots, v_k\}$ (hence $k = \kappa + 1$) and we set $b = \kappa$. This completes the construction. The graph *H* is indeed bipartite with bipartition $(L \cup \{w_i \mid i \in [\kappa + 1]\}, R \cup \{u\} \cup \{v_i \mid i \in \kappa\}).$

Assume that *G* has a dominating set of size *κ*. Let *D* denote such a set. Then we can solve the discovery instance by sliding each token on v_i to some copy of a vertex of D in L . Those vertices will dominate $R \cup \{v_i \mid i \in \kappa\}$ while vertex *u* dominates $L \cup \{w_i \mid i \in [\kappa + 1]\}$. For the reverse direction, we can assume without loss of generality that, in the resulting configuration, we have one token on *u* and no tokens on *R*. This follows from the fact that not having a token on *u* requires moving $\kappa + 1 > b$ tokens to its neighbors $\{w_1, \ldots, w_{\kappa+1}\}\$, which is impossible. Moreover, every token in *R* can only dominate itself since *L* is already dominated by *u*. Hence, every token in *R* can instead be placed using less moves on the copy of the same vertex in *L* and potentially dominate more vertices. Putting it all together, we can assume that the resulting configuration contains a token on *u* and at most κ tokens in L that must dominate all vertices of *R*, as needed. \Box

For the next result, we use the standard reduction from VERTEX COVER to DOMINATING SET to reduce VERTEX COVER DISCOVERY on 2-degenerate bipartite graphs to DOMINATING SET DISCOVERY on 2-degenerate graphs.

Theorem 5.3*.* The Dominating Set Discovery problem is W[1]-hard when parameterized by the budget *b* even on the class of 2-degenerate graphs.

Proof. Given an instance (G, S, b) of VCD, we create an instance (H, S, b) of DSD where *H* is obtained from *G* by adding a new vertex e_{uv} for each edge $\{u, v\} \in E(G)$ and connecting e_{uv} to both *u* and *v*. Since we do not increase the distances between vertices of *G* and we can assume, without loss of generality, that a dominating set of *H* will not contain subdivision vertices, i.e., vertices of the form *euv*, the proof follows. Note that since we start with a 2-degenerate bipartite graph *G* and we simply add vertices of degree two (forming triangles) it follows that *H* is also 2-degenerate (but not bipartite). \Box

5.4 Tractability

Our positive results for Dominating Set Discovery parameterized by *k* make use of the notion of *k*-domination cores, a notion that to the best of our knowledge goes back to Dawar and Kreutzer [\[23\]](#page-31-6).

Definition 5.1. Let *G* be a graph and $k \geq 1$. A set $C \subseteq V(G)$ is a *k*-domination core if every set of size at most *k* that dominates *C* also dominates *G*.

Bounded size domination cores do not exist for general graphs, however, they do exist for many important graph classes, see e.g. [\[52,](#page-33-9) [67\]](#page-34-6), most generally for semi-ladder free graphs [\[32\]](#page-31-7).

Theorem 5.4 ([\[32\]](#page-31-7)). Let $\mathscr C$ be a class of graphs with bounded semi-ladder index. Then there exists a function *f* such that for every graph $G \in \mathscr{C}$ and $k \in \mathbb{N}$ we can compute in polynomial time a *k*-domination core of *G* of size $f(k)$.

Theorem 5.5*.* The Dominating Set Discovery problem is fixed-parameter tractable when parameterized by *k* and restricted to semi-ladder-free graphs.

Proof. Let (*G, S, b*) denote an instance of DSD. We first compute a domination core *C* of size $f(k)$, which is possible due to [Theorem 5.4.](#page-21-0) We then compute the projection classes towards *C*. That is, we compute a family of sets/classes of vertices such that any two vertices $u, v \in$ $V(G) \setminus C$ belong to the same set/class if and only if $N(u) \cap C = N(v) \cap C$. The number of projection classes is also bounded in terms of *k* only; in fact a trivial upper bound is $2^{f(k)}$ but better bounds are known. By the definition of domination cores, we can assume, without loss of generality, that any minimal dominating set of *G* of size at most *k* contains at most one vertex from each projection class. Hence, we can now enumerate all minimal dominating sets of size at most *k* by treating each projection class as a single vertex. Since both |*C*| and the number of projection classes is bounded by a function of *k*, this brute-force enumeration can be accomplished in time bounded by some function of *k*. Let *D* denote a dominating set consisting of vertices from *C* as well as vertices representing projection classes. We now construct the following bipartite graph *H*. On one side we have the vertices of *S* and on the other side we have the vertices of *D*. We connect each $u \in S$ to a vertex $v \in D \cap C$ and assign as a weight the length of a shortest path from *u* to *v*. We connect each $u \in S$ to a vertex $v \in D \setminus C$ and assign as a weight the length of a shortest path from *u* to any vertex in the corresponding projection class; the weight being zero if *u* belongs to the projection class. The rest of the proof proceeds just as in the case of ISD or VCD, i.e., we look for perfect matching of weight at most *b* whose existence implies that can we slide tokens along edges of shortest paths between pairs of matched \Box vertices.

Again, using the same dynamic programming techniques as those used for the VERTEX Cover Discovery problem on graphs of bounded treewidth [\(Theorem 3.4\)](#page-10-0) and reduction to first-order model checking [\(Theorem 3.5\)](#page-13-0) on structurally nowhere dense classes, we get the following results:

Theorem 5.6*.* The Dominating Set Discovery problem can be solved in time $2^{\mathcal{O}(t \log k)} \cdot n^{\mathcal{O}(1)}$, where *t* denotes the treewidth of the input graph.

Theorem 5.7*.* The Dominating Set Discovery problem is fixed-parameter tractable when parameterized by *b* and restricted to structurally nowhere dense classes of graphs.

6 Coloring discovery

Until now the feasible solutions for all considered base problems are subsets of vertices satisfying some problem specific properties. In fact, our framework is much richer and can be applied to a broader class of problems. We exemplify the richness of our solution discovery framework by turning to the very fundamental Coloring problem, where possible solutions are no longer subsets of vertices.

A *k*-coloring of a graph *G* is a mapping $\varphi: V(G) \to [k]$. A *k*-coloring is said to be *proper* if whenever $\{u, v\} \in E(G)$ then $\varphi(u) \neq \varphi(v)$. In the NP-complete COLORING problem [\[37\]](#page-32-7), we are given a graph *G* and an integer *k* and the goal is to decide whether *G* admits a proper *k*-coloring.

6.1 Related work

The reconfiguration variant of the Coloring problem is a central problem in the combinatorial reconfiguration literature [\[68,](#page-34-0) [61\]](#page-33-2). There are many possible definitions of adjacency relations between feasible (and infeasible) colorings. The reconfiguration steps we consider (cf. token models) are defined next. In the *color flipping model*, in each step, we can change the color of any vertex to any color in the color set $[k] = \{1, \ldots, k\}$. In the *color swapping model*, a (u, v) color-swap allows for the swap of colors between two arbitrary vertices $u \in V(G)$ and $v \in V(G)$, where $u \neq v$. Finally, in the *color sliding model*, a (u, v) -color-slide is a (u, v) -color swap along an edge of the graph. In other words, in color sliding we can only perform a (*u, v*)-color-swap if { u, v } ∈ $E(G)$.

The color flipping model is one of the most studied models in the reconfiguration variant of the COLORING problem. Rather surprisingly, in this model the COLORING RECONFIGURATION problem is solvable in polynomial time for $k \leq 3$ [\[19\]](#page-31-8) and PSPACE-complete for $k \geq 4$ [\[12\]](#page-30-8). The color sliding model was studied in [\[11\]](#page-30-9). To the best of our knowledge, the color swapping model has not been considered in the reconfiguration framework.

The discovery variant of the Coloring problem has already been studied (under different names) in the color flipping model (*k*-Fix [\[38\]](#page-32-10)) and the color swapping model (*k*-Swap [\[24\]](#page-31-9)). Garnero et al. [\[38\]](#page-32-10) show that, for color flipping, the discovery variant is NP-complete, even for bipartite planar graphs. Moreover, they show that the problem is W[1]-hard when parameterized by *b*, even for bipartite graphs, whereas it is fixed-parameter tractable when parameterized by $k + b$. Interestingly, the latter is not true in the color swapping model, where the problem is W[1]-hard for any fixed $k \geq 3$ when parameterized by *b* [\[24\]](#page-31-9). It is also shown that both

problems *k*-Fix and *k*-Swap are W[1]-hard when parameterized by the treewidth of the input graph. Finally, it is shown that the *k*-Fix problem, i.e., discovery in the color flipping model, is polynomial-time solvable for $k \leq 2$ colors but this question was left open for the color swapping and color sliding models [\[38\]](#page-32-10). Related to our work is also the notion of chromatic villainy [\[21\]](#page-31-10). Given the above, we mainly consider (unless stated otherwise) Coloring Discovery in the color sliding model.

6.2 Notation and definitions

In the COLORING DISCOVERY (CD) problem, we are given a (non-proper) *k*-coloring $\varphi: V \to [k]$ of a graph $G = (V, E)$ and a budget $b \in \mathbb{N}$. The task is to decide whether there is a transformation of the given coloring into a proper *k*-coloring by using at most *b* recoloring steps. We denote instances of COLORING DISCOVERY by (G, φ, b) and make the parameter explicit in the text. We remark that we could add an additional input parameter q if we want to reach a coloring with (at most) *q* colors. This however is not relevant in the color sliding model that we focus on; color sliding preserves the number of colors in the graph.

6.3 Intractability

Even proving membership in NP is non-trivial in the color sliding model. We show the crucial property that, to slide the correct color to a vertex, we need at most 2*n* color slides along edges. Hence, we can assume $b \leq 2n^2$ and a recoloring sequence is a polynomial-time checkable certificate.

Proposition 6.1. COLORING DISCOVERY under the color sliding model is in NP.

Proof. We show that we can assume that *b* is polynomially bounded in *n* and use a recoloring sequence as a certificate. In fact, we need at most 2*n* color slides along edges in order to fix the color of a vertex. To see this, consider a path from *u* to *v*, where we aim to color *u* using *v*'s color. Let the path be $(u, w_1, w_2, \ldots, w_\ell, v)$. We swap the colors of *u* and *v* by the following sequence of slides:

- 1. Start by sliding $(u, w_1), (w_1, w_2), (w_2, w_3), \ldots, (w_\ell, v)$ sequentially. After performing these slides, *v* has *u*'s original color and all other vertices have the original color of their successor on the path.
- 2. Afterwards, perform slides $(w_{\ell-1}, w_{\ell}), (w_{\ell-2}, w_{\ell-1}), \ldots, (w_1, w_2), (u, w_1)$. After these slides *u* gets the original color of *v*, *v* still has *u*'s original color, and all other vertices are recolored to their original color.

 \Box

Thus, if a recoloring sequence exists, at most $2n^2$ color sliding are sufficient.

We show that the COLORING DISCOVERY problem is NP-complete for $k \geq 3$ in all three models, even on planar bipartite graphs. For the color flipping and color swapping models this has been shown recently [\[38,](#page-32-10) [24\]](#page-31-9). Our proof unifies the hardness reduction for all three models. We show NP-hardness by a reduction from the LIST k-COLORING (LIKC) problem, which asks for a given graph $G = (V, E)$ and a list $L(u) \subseteq [k]$ of colors assigned to each vertex $u \in V(G)$, whether there is a proper coloring φ of *G* with $\varphi(u) \in L(u)$ for every vertex *u* of *G*. The LIKC problem is known to be NP-complete for $k \geq 3$ even for planar bipartite 3-regular graphs [\[20\]](#page-31-11).

Theorem 6.1. COLORING DISCOVERY with $k \geq 3$ colors is NP-complete under all three models, even on the class of planar bipartite graphs.

Proof. For $k \geq 3$, let $(G, L = (L_u \subseteq [k] \mid u \in V(G)))$ be an instance of the LIKC problem, where the graph *G* is a planar bipartite graph. We construct an instance (H, φ, b) of CD with $b = n(n + 1)$, where *H* is a planar bipartite graph and φ is an initial (non-proper) *k*-coloring of its vertices. Let us define a function $f : [k] \to [k]$ such that $f(c) = c + 1$ for $c < k$ and $f(k) = 1$. We start with a graph *H* which is a copy of *G*. Every vertex in *H* is colored k. For each vertex $u \in V(G)$, we add $k-1$ neighbors u_1, \ldots, u_{k-1} to the corresponding vertex u in *H*. For each $i \in [k-1]$, the new vertex u_i is colored with color i, respectively. For each color $c \in L(u)$, we add *n* neighbors to *u* which we denote by $\{x_c^i \mid i \in [n]\}$ and which are assigned color *c*. Each vertex x^i_z will have a neighbor y^i_z which is assigned color $f(c)$. For each color $c \notin L(u)$, we add $b+1$ neighbors to *u* denoted by $\{x_c^i \mid i \in [b+1]\}$ and assign them color *c*. This completes the construction of the graph H . The graph H is a planar bipartite graph since G is a planar bipartite graph. [Figure 4](#page-25-0) shows the corresponding gadgets for *k* = 3 and the color set {green*,* blue*,*red}.

Now we prove the correctness of the reduction. First, we show that if (*G, L*) is a yes-instance of the LIKC problem then (H, φ, b) is a yes-instance of the CD problem. Let $\psi : V(G) \to [k]$ be a feasible solution for the instance (*G, L*). We show how to find a proper coloring of *H* using at most *b* steps starting from the (infeasible) coloring φ . For each vertex $u \in V(G)$, if $\psi(u) \neq k$ we swap the colors between *u* and $u_{\psi(u)}$. This swap ensures that $H[V(G)]$ is properly colored. Also, for each vertex $u \in V(G)$ and $i \in [k-1]$ the vertices u_i agree with the proper coloring locally, i.e., there is no monochromatic edge in the subgraph induced by these vertices. Further, for each $i \in [n]$, we swap the colors between $x_{\psi(u)}^i$ and $y_{\psi(u)}^i$. This produces a proper *k*-coloring with at most $1 + n$ color swaps per vertex in $V(G)$.

We finish the proof by showing that a yes-instance of the CD problem corresponds to a yesinstance of the LikC problem. If it is possible to achieve a proper coloring in the constructed graph, we also obtain a proper *k*-coloring of the graph *G* by definition. We only need to show that we never use a color *c* for some vertex *u* that is not in the list $L(u)$. However, if $\varphi(u) = c$, we must have recolored all vertices x_c^i for $i \in [b+1]$, which is a contradiction to the budget of *b*.

Note that given a yes-instance of LIKC the budget of $n(n+1)$ is sufficient in the color sliding, the color swapping, and the color flipping model. Conversely, we cannot recolor all vertices x_c^i for $i \in [b+1]$ with a budget of *b* in the color flipping and color swapping model. \Box

We now consider the parameterized complexity of the COLORING DISCOVERY problem with respect to the parameters *k*, *b*, and treewidth. The next result follows immediately from [Theorem 6.1](#page-24-0) and [Proposition 6.1.](#page-23-0)

Corollary 6.1. COLORING DISCOVERY parameterized by $k \geq 3$ is para-NP-complete in all three models, even when restricted to planar bipartite graphs.

Theorem 6.2. COLORING DISCOVERY parameterized by $k + b$ is W[1]-hard in the color sliding model.

Figure 4: Gadgets for different list size of the vertices, and $k = 3$

Proof. We reduce from the MULTICOLORED INDEPENDENT SET problem, known to be W[1]complete. Let (G, κ) be an instance of the problem where $V(G)$ is partitioned into independent sets V_1, \ldots, V_κ . We assume, without loss of generality, that each set V_i has size at least $3\kappa + 1$; we can vertices appropriately otherwise. We construct an instance (H, φ, b) of CD as follows. First, let *H* be a copy of *G*. Then, we add new vertices u_i , for $1 \leq i \leq \kappa$, and new vertices w_j , for $1 \leq j \leq \kappa + 1$. We connect u_i with w_j , for $1 \leq i \leq \kappa$ and $1 \leq j \leq \kappa + 1$. We further add edges to turn the w_j vertices, $1 \leq j \leq \kappa + 1$, into a clique of size $\kappa + 1$. For each $i \in [\kappa]$, we connect u_i with every vertex in V_i . We color all vertices of V_i using color *i*, the vertices u_i , $i \in [\kappa]$, using color $\kappa + 1$, the vertices w_j , $j \in [\kappa]$, using color $\kappa + 2$, and vertex $w_{\kappa+1}$ using color $\kappa + 1$. Hence, we have $k = \kappa + 2$ and we set the budget *b* to 2κ .

Let $I = \{v_1, v_2, \dots v_{\kappa}\}\$ denote a multicolored independent set in *G*, where each vertex v_i belongs to V_i , for $i \in [\kappa]$. To arrive at a proper coloring starting from φ and using $b = 2\kappa$ slides we proceed as follows. We first perform the slides (v_i, u_i) , for $i \in [\kappa]$. Next, we perform the slides (u_i, w_i) , for $i \in [\kappa]$. Note that every vertex w_j , $j \in [\kappa]$, now has a different color in $[\kappa]$, all the vertices $u_i, i \in [\kappa]$, have color $\kappa + 2$, vertex $w_{\kappa+1}$ has color $\kappa + 1$, and the vertices of *I* have color $\kappa + 1$, which is a proper coloring of *H*.

For the reverse direction, assume that (H, φ, b) is a yes-instance of CD. The only way to arrive at a proper coloring within $b = 2\kappa$ slides is to color the vertices $\{w_j \mid j \in [\kappa + 1]\}$, using $\kappa + 1$ different colors; as these vertices form a clique. As each of those vertices has κ neighbors colored $\kappa + 1$, we need to "steal" exactly κ colors from *G*. As we must steal κ distinct colors, each color must come from a different V_i set, $i \in [\kappa]$. Note that sliding a single color from some V_i to some vertex w_j requires a budget of 2. Moreover, in the resulting proper coloring, a vertex u_i cannot be colored using color *i* since u_i is adjacent to at least 3κ vertices of color *i* (by our assumption that $|V_i| \geq 3\kappa + 1$. Moreover, no two vertices w_j and w'_j can receive the same color and no two vertices u_i and w_j can receive the same color. Putting it all together, it follows that there must exist κ vertices, one from each V_i set, that can receive color $\kappa + 1$ therefore forming an independent set. This corresponds to a multicolored independent set in *G*. \Box

Theorem 6.3. COLORING DISCOVERY parameterized by the treewidth of the input graph is W[1]-hard in the color sliding model.

Proof. We follow the same strategy developed for the *k*-Fix and *k*-Swap problems in [\[24\]](#page-31-9). In the PRECOLORING EXTENSION (PREXT) problem, we are given a graph $G = (V, E)$, a set $W \subseteq V(G)$ of precolored vertices, and a precoloring $c: W \to [r], r \geq 2$, of the vertices in *W*. The goal is to decide whether there is a proper *r*-coloring c' of G extending the coloring c (i.e., $c'(v) = c(v)$ for every $v \in W$). PREXT is known to be W[1]-hard when parameterized by the treewidth of the input graph [34].

Let (G, W, c) be an instance of PREXT, where we assume, without loss of generality, that c is a proper *r*-coloring of *G*[*W*]. We construct an instance (H, φ, b) of CD as follows. First, let *H* be a copy of *G* and let $k = r$ denote the number of available colors. Now, we choose $\varphi(v) = c(v)$ for every vertex $v \in W$. For each vertex $v \in W$, we add $(r-1)n$ pendent vertices, where each group of *n* vertices receives one of the colors in $|r| \n\backslash c(v)$. Note that, as long as we set our budget to $b \leq n$, the added pendent vertices guarantee that no vertex of W can change colors. Finally, for each vertex $u \in V(G) \setminus W$, we add $r-1$ pendent vertices, colored from 1 to $r-1$, and we assign vertex *u* color *r*, i.e., all vertices $u \in V(G) \setminus W$ receive color *r*. We set $b = n - |W|$, which concludes the construction. It is not hard to see that both instances are indeed equivalent and then the result follows from the well-known fact that the addition of vertices of degree at most one does not increase the treewidth of a graph. \Box

6.4 Tractability

We consider the COLORING DISCOVERY problem with $k = 2$ colors. To simplify notation, we assume in this subsection the color set to be {red*,* green}. It is known that the Coloring DISCOVERY problem for $k = 2$ is solvable in polynomial time under the color flipping model [\[38\]](#page-32-10). We show that this is also true for the other two reconfiguration models, i.e., color swapping and color sliding. A graph is 2-colorable if and only if it is bipartite. We can check by a graph search in polynomial time whether a given graph *G* is non-bipartite and declare a no-instance in this case. Hence, in what follows we restrict ourselves to bipartite graphs.

Theorem 6.4. COLORING DISCOVERY with $k = 2$ is solvable in polynomial time in the color swapping model.

Proof. For each connected component *Gⁱ* of the bipartite input graph *G* we find a bipartition (L_i, R_i) of $V(G_i)$. Any proper coloring of G_i colors all vertices of L_i in color red and all vertices of R_i in color green, or vice versa.

Both the needed budget for recoloring as well as the number of vertices colored in red and green in a proper coloring might be different for the two choices. For a given choice, both the needed number of swaps and number of colors can be calculated straightforwardly. As a swap always swaps colors red and green, the overall needed budget is given by the number of vertices colored in red that have to be recolored to green. Dependent on the two possibilities, we denote the needed budget by b_1^i or b_2^i to recolor the connected component G_i properly. Additionally, for each choice we define the excess of a connected component G_i by the number of vertices that are initially colored in color red minus those that have to be colored in color red, i.e.,

$$
e_1(G_i) = |\{v \in V(G_i) \mid \varphi(v) = \text{red}\}| - |L_i|, \text{ and}
$$

$$
e_2(G_i) = |\{v \in V(G_i) \mid \varphi(v) = \text{red}\}| - |R_i|.
$$

Thus, dependent on the two possible choices we either need a budget b_1^i and realize an excess $e_1(G_i)$, or a budget of b_2^i with excess $e_2(G_i)$. Overall, we can recolor the whole graph with the given budget if and only if there is a set of choices such that the overall excess is 0 and the needed budget is at most *b*. More formally, we can properly recolor a graph *G* with *q* connected components if and only if there is a vector $\mathbf{x} \in \{1,2\}^q$ with

$$
\sum_{i=1}^{q} e_{x_i}(G_i) = 0, \text{ and}
$$

$$
\sum_{i=1}^{q} b_{x_i}^i \le b.
$$

In the remainder of the proof, we describe a dynamic program to solve the decision problem. We define a state of the dynamic program by a triple (x, y, z) of integers. This triple corresponds to the fact that there are recoloring choices for the connected components G_1, \ldots, G_x such that the sum of excesses is *y* and the needed budget is *z*. We say state (0*,* 0*,* 0) is *possible*. Based on the two possible choices for each component, we reach 2 other possible states from each state. If (x, y, z) is possible, $(x+1, y+e_1(G_{x+1}), z+b_1^{x+1})$ and $(x+1, y+e_2(G_{x+1}), z+b_2^{x+1})$ are possible. Note that there are at most $|V(G)|^3$ possible states as the number of connected components, the overall excess, and the budget can never exceed $|V(G)|$, respectively.

By graph search for some state $(q, 0, z)$, where q is the number of connected components and $z \leq b$, we solve the problem. \Box

Theorem 6.5. COLORING DISCOVERY with $k = 2$ is solvable in polynomial time under the color sliding model.

Proof. In the color sliding model we can treat connected components independently. Thus, we assume that *G* is connected. First, we compute a bipartition (L, R) of *G*. There are, in principle, two possible proper 2-colorings of *G*, either a vertex is colored in red if and only if it is in *L* or it is colored in green if and only if it is in *R*. We treat both cases separately and choose the one with smallest cost. Summing over all connected components yields the result. We assume now that all vertices in *L* should be colored using color red. The other case is analogous.

We will solve the CD problem by computing a minimum cost maximum flow in an adjusted network. First, note that the number of vertices that need to be recolored in *L* must be the same as the number of vertices that need to be recolored in *R*. Otherwise, the CD instance is not solvable. Let this number be denoted by *q*. Given the graph $G = (V, E)$ with an initial coloring, we design the MINIMUM COST MAXIMUM FLOW instance as follows. We copy the graph *G*, add a source *s* and connect it by an arc with cost 0 and capacity 1 to all $v \in L$ that are colored in color green, i.e., that have to be recolored. We add a sink *t* with incoming arcs from each $v \in R$, that is wrongly colored, i.e., colored with red. These arcs have capacity 1 and cost 0. For all original edges $\{u, v\}$, we add an arc (u, v) and (v, u) both with cost 1 and capacity q. We then compute a maximum flow of minimum cost from *s* to *t*. We will show that there is a flow with flow value q and cost at most b if and only if the COLORING DISCOVERY instance is a yes-instance. The reduction also provides a constructive proof, i.e., we can compute a sequence of swaps yielding the recoloring. Note that computing a maximum flow of minimum cost can be accomplished in polynomial time [66].

First, we show that if there is a flow f with $|f| = q$ and cost b, we can recolor the graph and obtain a proper 2-coloring using *b* swaps. For a given flow *f*, we calculate a shortest path from *s* to *t* using only edges with positive flow. Let $(s, v_1, v_2, v_3, \ldots, v_\ell, t)$ denote such a shortest path. As it is a shortest path it has the property that initially $v_1, v_2, v_4, v_6, \ldots, v_{\ell-2}$ are colored in color green, and $v_3, v_5, \ldots, v_{\ell-1}, v_{\ell}$ are colored in color red. Otherwise if any $v_i, i \geq 3$ being odd, is wrongly colored, then we have an edge from *s* to v_i . Similarly, for $i \leq \ell - 2$ and *i* being even, if v_i is wrongly colored, then we have an edge from v_i to t , also a contradiction. Hence, we can swap the colors as follows. First, swap colors along the edges $(v_2, v_3), \ldots, (v_{\ell-2}, v_{\ell-1})$. After these $(\ell-2)/2$ swaps, nodes $v_1, v_3, v_5, \ldots, v_{\ell-1}$ are colored in red and $v_2, v_4, \ldots, v_{\ell}$ in color green. Now, perform color swaps along the edges $(v_1, v_2), (v_3, v_4), \ldots, (v_{\ell-1}, v_{\ell})$. After these $\ell/2$ swaps, the color of vertices v_i is red if and only if i is odd. Thus, the total number of performed swaps is $(\ell-2)/2+\ell/2=\ell-1$, i.e., the length of the path. Furthermore, the swaps exactly change the colors of vertices v_1 and v_ℓ and all other vertices preserve their original color. Thus, all vertices on the path are colored correctly after the swaps and q is reduced by 1. We reduce the flow by 1 along the path and continue with a next shortest path. Overall, we obtain a proper coloring after performing exactly *b* swaps.

Second, we show that if we can recolor the graph by *b* slides, there is a flow f with $|f| = q$ and cost *b* in the constructed network. Suppose we are given a slide sequence of *b* slides that recolors the graph into a proper 2-coloring. Given this sequence, we create the flow step by step by raising flow along paths from *s* to *t*. We start with the 0-flow. Let e_1, e_2, \ldots, e_b denote the edges of the slide sequence. Note that some edges might appear multiple times in the sequence. Before performing the slides, we assume vertices are equipped with ids and we attach the id of the vertex to it's color. When sliding colors, we swap the ids together with the colors. That is, consider some vertex v_i with some initial color, say green in L. After a slide (v_i, v_j) the vertex v_i is colored in color red. The id of this new color of v_i points to v_j that was initially colored in this color. By tracking the id during the slide procedure, we obtain a path from each vertex to the origin of the new color. For a vertex v_i that received a color from v_j in the sliding procedure we denote the path by $p(v_i, v_j)$. If $v_i \in L$ either v_j was initially a wrongly colored node in *R*, or a correctly colored node in L. If $v_j \in R$, we stop and raise the flow along the path $(s, v_i), p(v_i, v_j), (v_j, t)$. Otherwise, $v_j \in L$, i.e., is now colored with color red. Tracking the id of the new color of v_j analogously to the description above yields a path to some node *v^ℓ* . We continue this procedure until we reach a node $v_{\ell'}$ in R . Note that the ids are unique, i.e., this procedure cannot cycle. By tracking the whole concatenated path (s, v_i) , $p(v_i, v_j)$, $p(v_j, v_\ell)$, ..., (v'_ℓ, t) we obtain a path from *s* to *t* along which we raise the flow by 1. We continue with the next node in *L* that was initially colored with color green. Overall, we obtain a flow with flow value q and cost b as each edge with positive cost used by some flow unit corresponds to a slide in the slide procedure. \Box

Using similar techniques to those used in [Theorem 3.5,](#page-13-0) we can show the following result. Note that, unlike [Theorem 3.5,](#page-13-0) here we need *k* as part of the parameter so that our first-order formula can access all *k* colors in an instance. We add the colors as unary predicates so that they are accessible to first-order logic. Again we quantify the $q \leq \max\{k, b\}$ vertices that should change their color and hardcode with a formula of length *f*(*b*) how to arrive at the new coloring.

Theorem 6.6*.* The Coloring Discovery problem (in all three models) is fixed-parameter tractable when parameterized by $k + b$ and restricted to structurally nowhere dense classes of graphs.

7 Conclusion and future work

We have proved many positive and hardness results concerning solution discovery variants of fundamental graph problems. While some problems resulting from our framework have already been considered in the literature (albeit under different names), we believe that viewing such problems from a unified perspective can lead to more global insights and, hopefully, more unifying results.

In future work, we plan to combine our framework with other established frameworks, e.g., dynamic problems, to categorize more of these dynamic real-world applications of decisionmaking problems. For instance, one can augment the solution discovery framework by allowing two input graphs G and G' for each instance, where G' is obtained from G by a small number of edge/vertex addition/deletions. Moreover, we require the initial state *S* to satisfy certain properties in *G*. Now the question becomes whether we can transform *S* to *S* ′ using at most *b* reconfiguration steps such that *S'* satisfies some/similar properties in G' . This generalization increases the degrees of freedom in which we can analyze the problems and pushes towards multivariate analyses, where the changes in the graph can now also be part of the parameter.

Another possible avenue to explore is to relax the constraints that we impose on token positions. For instance, for graph vertex-subset problem, we can allow multiple tokens to occupy the same vertex. This, in turn, allows us to decouple the size of the starting configuration from the size of the desired target feasible solution. As an example, the INDEPENDENT SET DISCOVERY problem could be reformulated as follows. We are given a graph *G*, a starting configuration *S*, an integer $k \leq |S|$, and a budget *b*. The goal is now to decide whether we can reach an independent set of size at least *k* starting from *S* and using at most *b* steps. Similarly, for the Coloring Discovery problem in the flipping model, one can add an additional input *q < k* and ask whether we can reach a proper *q*-coloring starting from a (non-proper) *k*-coloring.

References

- [1] Karen Aardal, Stan P. M. van Hoesel, Arie M. C. A. Koster, Carlo Mannino, and Antonio Sassano. Models and solution techniques for frequency assignment problems. *Annals of Operations Research*, 153(1):79–129, 2007.
- [2] Emile Aarts and Jan Karel Lenstra. *Local search in combinatorial optimization*. Chichester: Wiley, 1997.
- [3] Faisal N. Abu-Khzam, Judith Egan, Michael R. Fellows, Frances A. Rosamond, and Peter Shaw. On the parameterized complexity of dynamic problems. *Theoretical Computer Science*, 607:426–434, 2015.
- [4] Sepehr Assadi, Krzysztof Onak, Baruch Schieber, and Shay Solomon. Fully dynamic maximal independent set with sublinear update time. In *STOC 2018*, pages 815–826. ACM, 2018.
- [5] Sayan Bhattacharya, Deeparnab Chakrabarty, Monika Henzinger, and Danupon Nanongkai. Dynamic algorithms for graph coloring. In *SODA 2018*, pages 1–20. SIAM, 2018.
- [6] Sayan Bhattacharya, Monika Henzinger, and Giuseppe F. Italiano. Deterministic fully dynamic data structures for vertex cover and matching. *SIAM Journal on Computing*, 47(3):859–887, 2018.
- [7] Yaad Blum and Jeffrey S. Rosenschein. Multiagent graph coloring: Pareto efficiency, fairness and individual rationality. In *AAAI 2008*, pages 24–29. AAAI Press, 2008.
- [8] Hans-Joachim Böckenhauer, Juraj Hromkovic, and Dennis Komm. Reoptimization of hard optimization problems. In *Handbook of Approximation Algorithms and Metaheuristics, Second Edition, Volume 1: Methologies and Traditional Applications*, pages 427–454. Chapman and Hall/CRC, 2018.
- [9] Marthe Bonamy, Paul Dorbec, and Paul Ouvrard. Dominating sets reconfiguration under token sliding. *Discrete Applied Mathematics*, 301:6–18, 2021.
- [10] Édouard Bonnet, Nicolas Bousquet, Pierre Charbit, Stéphan Thomassé, and Rémi Watrigant. Parameterized complexity of independent set in h-free graphs. *Algorithmica*, 82(8):2360–2394, 2020.
- [11] Édouard Bonnet, Tillmann Miltzow, and Paweł Rzazewski. Complexity of token swapping and its variants. *Algorithmica*, 80(9):2656–2682, 2018.
- [12] Paul Bonsma and Luis Cereceda. Finding paths between graph colourings: Pspacecompleteness and superpolynomial distances. *Theoretical Computer Science*, 410(50):5215– 5226, 2009.
- [13] Nicolas Bousquet and Alice Joffard. TS-reconfiguration of dominating sets in circle and circular-arc graphs. In *FCT 2021*, pages 114–134. Springer, 2021.
- [14] Nicolas Bousquet, Amer E. Mouawad, Naomi Nishimura, and Sebastian Siebertz. A survey on the parameterized complexity of the independent set and (connected) dominating set reconfiguration problems. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2204.10526*, 2022.
- [15] C. Titus Brown, Dominik Moritz, Michael P. O'Brien, Felix Reidl, Taylor Reiter, and Blair D. Sullivan. Exploring neighborhoods in large metagenome assembly graphs using spacegraphcats reveals hidden sequence diversity. *Genome Biology*, 21:1–16, 2020.
- [16] Shaowei Cai, Wenying Hou, Jinkun Lin, and Yuanjie Li. Improving local search for minimum weight vertex cover by dynamic strategies. In *IJCAI 2018*, pages 1412–1418. ijcai.org, 2018.
- [17] Shaowei Cai, Jinkun Lin, and Chuan Luo. Finding A small vertex cover in massive sparse graphs: Construct, local search, and preprocess. *Journal of Artificial Intelligence Research*, 59:463–494, 2017.
- [18] Gruia Călinescu, Adrian Dumitrescu, and János Pach. Reconfigurations in graphs and grids. *SIAM Journal on Discrete Mathematics*, 22(1):124–138, 2008.
- [19] Luis Cereceda, Jan Van Den Heuvel, and Matthew Johnson. Finding paths between 3 colorings. *Journal of graph theory*, 67(1):69–82, 2011.
- [20] Miroslav Chlebík and Janka Chlebíková. Hard coloring problems in low degree planar bipartite graphs. *Discrete Applied Mathematics*, 154(14):1960–1965, 2006.
- [21] Sally A. Clark, John E. Holliday, Sarah H. Holliday, Peter Johnson, Janet E. Trimm, Robert R. Rubalcaba, and Matt Walsh. Chromatic villainy in graphs. *Congressus Numerantium*, 182:171, 2006.
- [22] Marek Cygan, Fedor V. Fomin, Lukasz Kowalik, Daniel Lokshtanov, Dániel Marx, Marcin Pilipczuk, Michal Pilipczuk, and Saket Saurabh. *Parameterized Algorithms*. Springer, 2015.
- [23] Anuj Dawar and Stephan Kreutzer. Domination problems in nowhere-dense classes. In *FSTTCS 2009*, pages 157–168. Schloss Dagstuhl - Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik, 2009.
- [24] Marzio De Biasi and Juho Lauri. On the complexity of restoring corrupted colorings. *Journal of Combinatorial Optimization*, 37(4):1150–1169, 2019.
- [25] Erik D. Demaine, Martin L. Demaine, Eli Fox-Epstein, Duc A. Hoang, Takehiro Ito, Hirotaka Ono, Yota Otachi, Ryuhei Uehara, and Takeshi Yamada. Polynomial-time algorithm for sliding tokens on trees. In *ISAAC 2014*, pages 389–400. Springer, 2014.
- [26] Erik D. Demaine, Felix Reidl, Peter Rossmanith, Fernando Sánchez Villaamil, Somnath Sikdar, and Blair D. Sullivan. Structural sparsity of complex networks: Bounded expansion in random models and real-world graphs. *Journal of Computer and System Sciences*, 105:199–241, 2019.
- [27] Irit Dinur and David Steurer. Analytical approach to parallel repetition. In *STOC 2014*, pages 624–633. ACM, 2014.
- [28] Rod G. Downey and Michael R. Fellows. Fixed-parameter tractability and completeness II: On completeness for W[1]. *Theoretical Computer Science*, 141(1-2):109–131, 1995.
- [29] Rodney G. Downey and Michael R. Fellows. *Parameterized Complexity*. Monographs in Computer Science. Springer, 1999.
- [30] Jan Dreier, Nikolas Mählmann, and Sebastian Siebertz. First-order model checking on structurally sparse graph classes. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2302.03527*, 2023.
- [31] Jack Edmonds and Richard M. Karp. Theoretical improvements in algorithmic efficiency for network flow problems. *Journal of the ACM*, 19(2):248–264, 1972.
- [32] Grzegorz Fabianski, Michal Pilipczuk, Sebastian Siebertz, and Szymon Torunczyk. Progressive algorithms for domination and independence. In *STACS 2019*, pages 27:1–27:16. Schloss Dagstuhl - Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik, 2019.
- [33] Matthew Farrell, Timothy D. Goodrich, Nathan Lemons, Felix Reidl, Fernando Sánchez Villaamil, and Blair D. Sullivan. Hyperbolicity, degeneracy, and expansion of random intersection graphs. In *WAW 2015*, pages 29–41. Springer, 2015.
- [34] Michael R. Fellows, Fedor V. Fomin, Daniel Lokshtanov, Frances A. Rosamond, Saket Saurabh, Stefan Szeider, and Carsten Thomassen. On the complexity of some colorful problems parameterized by treewidth. *Information and Computation*, 209(2):143–153, 2011.
- [35] Jörg Flum and Martin Grohe. *Parameterized Complexity Theory*. Texts in Theoretical Computer Science. An EATCS Series. Springer, 2006.
- [36] Philippe Galinier and Alain Hertz. A survey of local search methods for graph coloring. *Computers & Operations Research*, 33(9):2547–2562, 2006.
- [37] M. R. Garey and David S. Johnson. *Computers and Intractability: A Guide to the Theory of NP-Completeness*. W. H. Freeman, 1979.
- [38] Valentin Garnero, Konstanty Junosza-Szaniawski, Mathieu Liedloff, Pedro Montealegre, and Paweł Rzazewski. Fixing improper colorings of graphs. *Theoretical Computer Science*, 711:66–78, 2018.
- [39] Martin Grohe, Stephan Kreutzer, and Sebastian Siebertz. Deciding first-order properties of nowhere dense graphs. In *STOC 2014*, pages 89–98. ACM, 2014.
- [40] Arash Haddadan, Takehiro Ito, Amer E. Mouawad, Naomi Nishimura, Hirotaka Ono, Akira Suzuki, and Youcef Tebbal. The complexity of dominating set reconfiguration. *Theoretical Computer Science*, 651:37–49, 2016.
- [41] William K. Hale. Frequency assignment: Theory and applications. *Proceedings of the IEEE*, 68:1497–1514, 1980.
- [42] Sariel Har-Peled and Kent Quanrud. Approximation algorithms for polynomial-expansion and low-density graphs. *SIAM Journal on Computing*, 46(6):1712–1744, 2017.
- [43] Sepp Hartung and Rolf Niedermeier. Incremental list coloring of graphs, parameterized by conservation. *Theoretical Computer Science*, 494:86–98, 2013.
- [44] Emmanuel Hebrard and George Katsirelos. Clause learning and new bounds for graph coloring. In *IJCAI 2019*, pages 6166–6170. ijcai.org, 2019.
- [45] Pei Huang, Minghao Liu, Ping Wang, Wenhui Zhang, Feifei Ma, and Jian Zhang. Solving the satisfiability problem of modal logic S5 guided by graph coloring. In *IJCAI 2019*, pages 1093–1100. ijcai.org, 2019.
- [46] Takehiro Ito, Erik D. Demaine, Nicholas J. A. Harvey, Christos H. Papadimitriou, Martha Sideri, Ryuhei Uehara, and Yushi Uno. On the complexity of reconfiguration problems. *Theoretical Computer Science*, 412(12-14):1054–1065, 2011.
- [47] David S. Johnson. Approximation algorithms for combinatorial problems. In *STOC 1973*, pages 38–49. ACM, 1973.
- [48] Marcin Kaminski, Paul Medvedev, and Martin Milanic. Complexity of independent set reconfigurability problems. *Theoretical Computer Science*, 439:9–15, 2012.
- [49] Richard M. Karp. Reducibility among combinatorial problems. In Raymond E. Miller, James W. Thatcher, and Jean D. Bohlinger, editors, *Complexity of Computer Computations*, pages 85–103. Springer, 1972.
- [50] Vedat Kavalci, Aybars Ural, and Orhan Dagdeviren. Distributed vertex cover algorithms for wireless sensor networks. *International Journal of Computer Networks & Communications*, 6:95–110, 2014.
- [51] Subhash Khot and Oded Regev. Vertex cover might be hard to approximate to within 2-*ε*. In *Computational Complexity Conference*, page 379. IEEE Computer Society, 2003.
- [52] Stephan Kreutzer, Roman Rabinovich, and Sebastian Siebertz. Polynomial kernels and wideness properties of nowhere dense graph classes. *Transactions on Algorithms*, 15(2):1– 19, 2018.
- [53] R. Krithika, Abhishek Sahu, and Prafullkumar Tale. Dynamic parameterized problems. *Algorithmica*, 80(9):2637–2655, 2018.
- [54] Harold W. Kuhn. The Hungarian method for the assignment problem. *Naval research logistics quarterly*, 2(1-2):83–97, 1955.
- [55] David Lichtenstein. Planar formulae and their uses. *SIAM Journal on Computing*, 11(2):329–343, 1982.
- [56] Daniel Lokshtanov, Fahad Panolan, Saket Saurabh, Roohani Sharma, and Meirav Zehavi. Covering small independent sets and separators with applications to parameterized algorithms. *ACM Transactions on Algorithms*, 16(3):32:1–32:31, 2020.
- [57] László Lovász. On the ratio of optimal integral and fractional covers. *Discrete mathematics*, 13(4):383–390, 1975.
- [58] Chuan Luo, Holger H. Hoos, Shaowei Cai, Qingwei Lin, Hongyu Zhang, and Dongmei Zhang. Local search with efficient automatic configuration for minimum vertex cover. In *IJCAI 2019*, pages 1297–1304. ijcai.org, 2019.
- [59] Bojan Mohar. Face covers and the genus problem for apex graphs. *Journal of Combinatorial Theory, Series B*, 82(1):102–117, 2001.
- [60] Amer E. Mouawad, Naomi Nishimura, Venkatesh Raman, Narges Simjour, and Akira Suzuki. On the parameterized complexity of reconfiguration problems. *Algorithmica*, 78(1):274–297, 2017.
- [61] Naomi Nishimura. Introduction to reconfiguration. *Algorithms*, 11(4):52, 2018.
- [62] Krzysztof Onak and Ronitt Rubinfeld. Maintaining a large matching and a small vertex cover. In *STOC 2010*, pages 457–464. ACM, 2010.
- [63] Neil Robertson and Paul D. Seymour. Graph minors. v. excluding a planar graph. *Journal of Combinatorial Theory, Series B*, 41(1):92–114, 1986.
- [64] Yunzhuang Shen, Yuan Sun, Xiaodong Li, Andrew S. Eberhard, and Andreas T. Ernst. Enhancing column generation by a machine-learning-based pricing heuristic for graph coloring. In *AAAI 2022*, pages 9926–9934. AAAI Press, 2022.
- [65] Miklós Simonovits. Extremal graph theory. In Lowell W. Beineke and Robin J. Wilson, editors, *Selected Topics in Graph Theory 2*, pages 161–200. Academic Press Inc, 1983.
- [66] Éva Tardos. A strongly polynomial minimum cost circulation algorithm. *Combinatorica*, 5(3):247–256, 1985.
- [67] Jan Arne Telle and Yngve Villanger. Fpt algorithms for domination in sparse graphs and beyond. *Theoretical Computer Science*, 770:62–68, 2019.
- [68] Jan van den Heuvel. The complexity of change. *Surveys in Combinatorics*, 409(2013):127– 160, 2013.
- [69] Yiyuan Wang, Shaowei Cai, Shiwei Pan, Ximing Li, and Minghao Yin. Reduction and local search for weighted graph coloring problem. In *AAAI 2020*, pages 2433–2441. AAAI Press, 2020.
- [70] Marcin Wrochna. Reconfiguration in bounded bandwidth and tree-depth. *Journal of Computer and System Sciences*, 93:1–10, 2018.
- [71] Xiaojun Xie and Xiaolin Qin. Dynamic feature selection algorithm based on minimum vertex cover of hypergraph. In *PAKDD 2018*, pages 40–51. Springer, 2018.
- [72] David Zuckerman. Linear degree extractors and the inapproximability of max clique and chromatic number. In *STOC 2006*, pages 681–690. ACM, 2006.