

The directed metric dimension of directed co-graphs

Yannick Schmitz and Egon Wanke

Heinrich-Heine-Universität Düsseldorf, Germany
yannick.schmitz@hhu.de, egon.wanke@hhu.de

Abstract

A vertex w *resolves* two vertices u and v in a directed graph G if the distance from w to u is different to the distance from w to v . A set of vertices R is a *resolving set* for a directed graph G if for every pair of vertices u, v which are not in R there is at least one vertex in R that resolves u and v in G . The *directed metric dimension* of a directed graph G is the size of a minimum resolving set for G . The decision problem DIRECTED METRIC DIMENSION for a given directed graph G and a given number k is the question whether G has a resolving set of size at most k . In this paper, we study directed co-graphs. We introduce a linear time algorithm for computing a minimum resolving set for directed co-graphs and show that DIRECTED METRIC DIMENSION already is NP-complete for directed acyclic graphs.

1 Introduction

The metric dimension of graphs is originally defined for undirected graphs. In an undirected graph G , two vertices u and v are *resolved* by a vertex w if the distance between w and u differs from the distance between w and v . In directed graphs, two vertices u and v are *resolved* by a vertex w if the distance from w to u differs from the distance from w to v . In the undirected case as well as in the directed case, a set of vertices R is called a *resolving set* for G if for every pair of vertices u, v which are not in R there is at least one vertex w in R resolving u and v . The *metric dimension* of G is the size of a smallest resolving set for G .

The metric dimension of undirected graphs has been introduced in the 1970s independently by Slater [Sla75] and by Harary and Melter [HM76]. It finds applications in various areas, including network discovery and verification [BEE⁺05], geographical routing protocols [LA06], combinatorial optimisation [ST04], sensor networks [HW12], robot navigation [KRR96], and chemistry [CEJO00, Hay77].

Deciding whether a given graph G has metric dimension $\leq k$ is NP-complete for undirected and directed graphs, see [GJ79, KRR96]. There are several algorithms for computing a minimum resolving set in polynomial time for special classes of undirected graphs, as for example for trees [CEJO00, KRR96], wheels [HMP⁺05], grid graphs [MT84], k -regular bipartite graphs [BBS⁺11], amalgamation of cycles [IBSS10], and outerplanar graphs [DPSL12]. The approximability of the metric dimension has been studied for bounded degree, dense, and general graphs in [HSV12]. Upper and lower bounds on the metric dimension are considered in [CGH08, CPZ00] for further classes of undirected graphs. In the undirected case, several variants of the metric dimension have been studied, which are usually NP-complete for general graphs as well [?, ?, ?].

A natural way of generalising graph theoretical problems is to consider their directed counterparts. In the context of the metric dimension of graphs, this was first considered by Chartrand, Rains, and Zhang in [CRZK00], before receiving further consideration in several other papers, see [FGO06, FXW13, Loz13, RRCM14].

In this paper, we study directed co-graphs [BDGR97] and introduce a linear time algorithm for computing minimum resolving sets for directed co-graphs in linear time. We also show that DIRECTED METRIC DIMENSION already is NP-complete for directed acyclic graphs.

1.1 The directed metric dimension

All graphs in this paper are finite and simple. For a graph $G = (V, E)$ with vertex set V and edge set E , we write $V(G)$ for vertex set V and $E(G)$ for edge set E to reduce the number of variable names and indices when using several graphs. For two vertices $u, v \in V(G)$ the distance $d_G(u, v)$ from u to v is the length (number of edges) of a shortest path from u to v . If there is no such path from u to v , then $d_G(u, v)$ is not defined. A directed graph G is *strongly connected* if for each pair of vertices u and v , there is a path from u to v and a path from v to u .

The *metric dimension* of a directed graph can be defined in the same way as for undirected graphs, see Figure 1 for an example.

Definition 1 (Directed metric dimension). *Two distinct vertices u and v of a directed graph G are resolved by a vertex w if*

1. $w = u$,
2. $w = v$, or
3. *there is a path from w to u and a path from w to v such that $d_G(w, u) \neq d_G(w, v)$.*

A set of vertices $R \subseteq V(G)$ is called a *resolving set* of G if for every pair of vertices $u, v \in V(G)$ there is at least one vertex w in R resolving u and v . The *directed metric dimension* of G is the size of a minimum resolving set for G .

Note that it is also possible to consider the distances $d_G(u, w)$ from each vertex to the vertices in R instead of the distances $d_G(w, u)$, but both definitions are equivalent if every edge (u, v) in G is replaced by an edge (v, u) . Also note that if $d_G(w, u)$ is undefined, it can not be compared to any other distance $d_G(w, v)$.

The decision problem DIRECTED METRIC DIMENSION is defined as follows.

DIRECTED METRIC DIMENSION	
<i>Instance:</i>	A directed graph G and a number k .
<i>Question:</i>	Is there a resolving set $R \subseteq V(G)$ for G of size at most k ?




Figure 1: Vertex set $\{a, f, g\}$ is a minimum resolving set for directed graph G . Vertex a resolves the vertex pairs $a, b, a, c, a, d, a, e, a, f, a, g, b, d, b, e, b, f, b, g, c, d, c, e, c, f, c, g, d, e, d, g, f, e$, and f, g in G , vertex f resolves the vertex pairs $a, c, a, e, a, f, a, g, b, c, b, e, b, f, b, g, c, d, c, e, c, f, c, g, d, e, d, f, d, g, e, f$, and f, g in G , and vertex g resolves the vertex pairs $a, c, a, d, a, e, a, f, a, g, b, c, b, d, b, e, b, f, b, g, c, e, c, g, d, e, d, g, e, f, e, g$, and f, g in G .

The following notion of a vertex set R that resolves only the vertex pairs of a vertex set $U \subseteq V(G)$ is frequently used in the next section.

Notation 1. Let $U \subseteq V(G)$ be a set of vertices. A set of vertices $R \subseteq U$ resolves a vertex set U in G , or in other words, R is a resolving set for U in G , if for each pair of vertices $u, v \in U$ there is at least one vertex w in R that resolves u and v in G .

If R resolves the vertices of U in G , then the necessary shortest paths with different distances $d_G(w, u)$ and $d_G(w, v)$ are paths in graph G and do not need to be paths in the subgraph of G induced by U . For example, in Figure 1 vertex set $R = \{a\}$ is a resolving set for $U = \{c, d, g\}$ in G .

2 Directed metric dimension of directed co-graphs

In this section, we show how to compute a minimum resolving set for directed co-graphs in linear time. In Definition 2, co-graphs and co-trees are defined step by step simultaneously. We use variable names with a hat symbol for nodes in trees to distinguish them more clearly from vertices in graphs.

Definition 2 (Directed co-graphs and co-trees).

- A directed graph G that consists of a single vertex u is a directed co-graph.
The co-tree T of G consists of a single node \hat{u} associated with vertex u of G . Node \hat{u} is the root of T . Let $\text{vertex}(\hat{u}) := u$ and $\text{node}(u) := \hat{u}$. The notation $\text{vertex}(\hat{u})$ is only defined for leaves \hat{u} of T .
- If G_1 and G_2 are two directed co-graphs, then the disjoint union, join, or directed join of G_1 and G_2 , denoted by $G_1 \cup G_2$, $G_1 \times G_2$, and $G_1 \gg G_2$, respectively, is a directed co-graph G with vertex set $V(G_1) \cup V(G_2)$ and edge set


$$\begin{aligned} & E(G_1) \cup E(G_2), \\ & E(G_1) \cup E(G_2) \cup \{(u, v), (v, u) \mid u \in V(G_1), v \in V(G_2)\}, \text{ and} \\ & E(G_1) \cup E(G_2) \cup \{(u, v) \mid u \in V(G_1), v \in V(G_2)\}, \text{ respectively.} \end{aligned}$$

Let T_1 and T_2 be the co-trees of G_1 and G_2 with root \hat{l} and \hat{r} , respectively. The co-tree T of G is the disjoint union of T_1 and T_2 with an additional node \hat{u} and two additional edges $\{\hat{u}, \hat{l}\}$ and $\{\hat{u}, \hat{r}\}$. Node \hat{u} is the root of T labelled by \cup , \times , and \gg , respectively. Node \hat{l} is the left successor node of \hat{u} , also denoted by $\text{left}(\hat{u})$, and node \hat{r} is the right successor node of \hat{u} , also denoted by $\text{right}(\hat{u})$. Node \hat{u} is the predecessor node of \hat{l} and \hat{r} .

The nodes of T that are not leaves are called inner nodes of T . If \hat{u} is an inner node of T labelled by \cup or \times and one of its two successor nodes $\text{left}(\hat{u})$ and $\text{right}(\hat{u})$ is a leaf and the other one is not a leaf, then without loss of generality, we assume that successor node $\text{right}(\hat{u})$ is the leaf.

Figure 2 shows an example of a directed co-graph and its co-tree. Directed co-graphs can be recognised in linear time [CP06]. This includes the computation of the co-tree. In a strongly connected directed co-graph for each pair of vertices $u, v \in V(G)$ the distance $d_G(u, v)$ is at most 2.

For a directed co-graph G with co-tree T and a node $\hat{w} \in V(T)$ let $T_{\hat{w}}$ be the subtree of T rooted at \hat{w} and let $G_{\hat{w}}$ be the subgraph of G induced by the vertices $\text{vertex}(\hat{u})$ of the leaves \hat{u} of $T_{\hat{w}}$.

Figure 2: A directed co-graph G and its co-tree T .

Lemma 1. *Let G be a strongly connected directed co-graph with co-tree T and $\hat{w} \in V(T)$ be an inner node of T . There is no vertex $w \in V(G) \setminus V(G_{\hat{w}})$ that resolves two vertices of $V(G_{\hat{w}})$ in G .*

Proof. Since in each further composition of $G_{\hat{w}}$ all vertices of $V(G_{\hat{w}})$ get the same additional connections to vertices of $V(G) \setminus V(G_{\hat{w}})$, it follows that for each vertex $w \in V(G) \setminus V(G_{\hat{w}})$ and each vertex pair $v_1, v_2 \in V(G_{\hat{w}})$ either $d_G(w, v_1) = d_G(w, v_2) = 1$ or $d_G(w, v_1) = d_G(w, v_2) = 2$. Note that G is strongly connected and thus $d_G(u, v) \leq 2$ for each vertex pair $u, v \in V(G)$. \square

If R is a resolving set for G , then by Lemma 1 $R \cap V(G_{\hat{w}})$ is a resolving set for $V(G_{\hat{w}})$ in G . Note that $R \cap V(G_{\hat{w}})$ does not need to be a resolving set for $G_{\hat{w}}$, because $G_{\hat{w}}$ does not need to be strongly connected. For example, suppose G_1, G_2, G_3 , and G_4 are four graphs with exactly one vertex u_1, u_2, u_3 , and u_4 , respectively. Then $\{u_1\}$ is a resolving set for $\{u_1, u_2, u_3\}$ in $G = ((G_1 \gg G_2) \cup G_3) \times G_4$, but not a resolving set for $G' = (G_1 \gg G_2) \cup G_3$, because there is no path from u_1 to u_3 in G' .

Our analysis of directed co-graphs requires the distinction between the following two different vertex types.

Definition 3. *Let G be a directed graph, $u, v \in V(G)$ be two distinct vertices of G , and $R \subseteq V(G)$ be a non-empty set of vertices. A vertex $u \in V(G) \setminus \{R\}$ is called a distance 1 vertex (or 1-vertex for short) w.r.t. R if $\forall w \in R : (w, u) \in E(G)$. It is called a distance 2 vertex (or 2-vertex for short) w.r.t. R if $\forall w \in R : (w, u) \notin E(G)$.*

Figure 3 shows an example of a 1-vertex and a 2-vertex w.r.t. a vertex set R .

If a vertex $u \in V(G) \setminus R$ is a 1-vertex or 2-vertex w.r.t. vertex set $R \subseteq V(G)$, then u obviously is a 1-vertex or 2-vertex, respectively, w.r.t. each non-empty subset R' of R . If R is a resolving set for G , then there is at most one 1-vertex w.r.t. R and at most one 2-vertex w.r.t. R , because two 1-vertices and two 2-vertices u, v w.r.t. R have the same distance $d_G(w, u_1) = d_G(w, u_2) = 1$ and $d_G(w, u_1) = d_G(w, u_2) = 2$, respectively, from each vertex $w \in R$.




Figure 3: Vertex a is a 1-vertices w.r.t. $R = \{f, g, h\}$, vertex c is a 2-vertex w.r.t. R , and vertex b is neither a 1-vertex nor a 2-vertex w.r.t. R .

The algorithm for computing a minimum resolving set for a strongly connected directed co-graph G analyses the co-tree T for G bottom-up, see procedure **BottomUp**(\hat{w}). For each inner node \hat{w} of T , it computes one or two minimum resolving sets for $V(G_{\hat{w}})$ in G . The resolving sets for node \hat{w} are build by the union of a resolving set $R_{\hat{l}}$ for $V(G_{\hat{l}})$ in G and a resolving set $R_{\hat{r}}$ for $V(G_{\hat{r}})$ in G , where \hat{l} and \hat{r} are the left and right successor nodes of \hat{w} in T .

```

BottomUp( $\hat{w}$ )
  if ( $\hat{w}$  is an inner node of  $T$ ) then
     $\hat{l} \leftarrow$  left successor node of  $\hat{w}$ ;
    BottomUp( $\hat{l}$ );
     $\hat{r} \leftarrow$  right successor node of  $\hat{w}$ ;
    BottomUp( $\hat{r}$ );
    Merge( $\hat{w}, \hat{l}, \hat{r}$ );
  end

```

The next lemma specifies the conditions under which the minimum resolving sets for $V(G_{\hat{l}})$ and $V(G_{\hat{r}})$ in G only need to be joined to get a resolving set for $V(G_{\hat{w}})$ in G .

Lemma 2. *Let G be a strongly connected directed co-graph with co-tree T , $\hat{w} \in V(T)$ be an inner node of T , $\hat{l} = \text{left}(\hat{w})$ be the left successor of \hat{w} and $\hat{r} = \text{right}(\hat{w})$ be the right successor of \hat{w} . If \hat{l} is an inner node of T , then let $R_{\hat{l}} \subseteq V(G_{\hat{l}})$ be a resolving set for $V(G_{\hat{l}})$ in G . If \hat{r} is an inner node of T , then let $R_{\hat{r}} \subseteq V(G_{\hat{r}})$ be a resolving set for $V(G_{\hat{r}})$ in G .*

We distinguish between the three labels \cup , \times and \gg for node \hat{w} and the cases where the successor nodes of \hat{w} are inner nodes or leaves.

1. Let \hat{w} be labelled by \cup .
 - (a) Let \hat{l} and \hat{r} be inner nodes of T .
 $R_{\hat{l}} \cup R_{\hat{r}}$ is a minimum resolving set for $V(G_{\hat{w}})$ in G iff $R_{\hat{l}}$ is a minimum resolving set for $V(G_{\hat{l}})$ in G , $R_{\hat{r}}$ is a minimum resolving set for $V(G_{\hat{r}})$ in G , and $G_{\hat{l}}$ has no 2-vertex w.r.t. $R_{\hat{l}}$ or $G_{\hat{r}}$ has no 2-vertex w.r.t. $R_{\hat{r}}$.
 - (b) Let \hat{l} be an inner node of T and \hat{r} be a leaf of T .
 $R_{\hat{l}}$ is a minimum resolving set for $V(G_{\hat{w}})$ in G iff $R_{\hat{l}}$ is a minimum resolving set for $V(G_{\hat{l}})$ in G and $G_{\hat{l}}$ has no 2-vertex w.r.t. $R_{\hat{l}}$.
2. Let \hat{w} be labelled by \times .
 - (a) Let \hat{l} and \hat{r} be inner nodes of T .

$R_{\hat{l}} \cup R_{\hat{r}}$ is a minimum resolving set for $V(G_{\hat{w}})$ in G iff $R_{\hat{l}}$ is a minimum resolving set for $V(G_{\hat{l}})$ in G , $R_{\hat{r}}$ is a minimum resolving set for $V(G_{\hat{r}})$ in G , and $G_{\hat{l}}$ has no 1-vertex w.r.t. $R_{\hat{l}}$ or $G_{\hat{r}}$ has no 1-vertex w.r.t. $R_{\hat{r}}$.

(b) Let \hat{l} be an inner node of T and \hat{r} be a leaf of T .

$R_{\hat{l}}$ is a minimum resolving set for $V(G_{\hat{w}})$ in G iff $R_{\hat{l}}$ is a minimum resolving set for $V(G_{\hat{l}})$ in G and $G_{\hat{l}}$ has no 1-vertex w.r.t. $R_{\hat{l}}$.

3. Let \hat{w} be labelled by \gg .

(a) Let \hat{l} and \hat{r} be inner nodes of T .

$R_{\hat{l}} \cup R_{\hat{r}}$ is a minimum resolving set for $V(G_{\hat{w}})$ in G iff $R_{\hat{l}}$ is a minimum resolving set for $V(G_{\hat{l}})$ in G , $R_{\hat{r}}$ is a minimum resolving set for $V(G_{\hat{r}})$ in G , and $G_{\hat{l}}$ has no 1-vertex w.r.t. $R_{\hat{l}}$ or $G_{\hat{r}}$ has no 2-vertex w.r.t. $R_{\hat{r}}$.

(b) Let \hat{l} be an inner node of T and \hat{r} be a leaf of T .

$R_{\hat{l}}$ is a minimum resolving set for $V(G_{\hat{w}})$ in G iff $R_{\hat{l}}$ is a minimum resolving set for $V(G_{\hat{l}})$ in G , and $G_{\hat{l}}$ has no 1-vertex w.r.t. $R_{\hat{l}}$.

(c) Let \hat{l} be a leaf of T and \hat{r} be an inner node of T .

$R_{\hat{r}}$ is a minimum resolving set for $V(G_{\hat{w}})$ in G iff $R_{\hat{r}}$ is a minimum resolving set for $V(G_{\hat{r}})$ in G , and $G_{\hat{r}}$ has no 2-vertex w.r.t. $R_{\hat{r}}$.

Proof. Since two distinct vertices from $V(G_{\hat{l}}) \setminus R_{\hat{l}}$ as well as two distinct vertices from $V(G_{\hat{r}}) \setminus R_{\hat{r}}$ are resolved in G by a vertex of $R_{\hat{r}}$ and a vertex of $R_{\hat{l}}$, respectively, we only need to consider the case in which one vertex is from $V(G_{\hat{l}}) \setminus R_{\hat{l}}$ and the other vertex is from $V(G_{\hat{r}}) \setminus R_{\hat{r}}$.

1. Let \hat{w} be labelled by \cup .

In this case, for each vertex $u_l \in V(G_{\hat{l}}) \setminus R_{\hat{l}}$ and for each vertex $u_r \in V(G_{\hat{r}}) \setminus R_{\hat{r}}$, or $u_r = \text{vertex}(\hat{r})$ if \hat{r} is a leaf in T , we have $d_G(u_l, u_r) = d_G(u_r, u_l) = 2$.

(a) Let \hat{l} and \hat{r} be inner nodes of T .

If u_l is not a 2-vertex w.r.t. $R_{\hat{l}}$, then there is vertex $v_l \in R_{\hat{l}}$ such that $d_G(v_l, u_l) = 1$. If u_r is not a 2-vertex w.r.t. $R_{\hat{r}}$, then there is a vertex $v_r \in R_{\hat{r}}$ such that $d_G(v_r, u_r) = 1$. Since $d_G(v_l, u_r) = 2$ and $d_G(v_r, u_l) = 2$, vertex u_l and vertex u_r are resolved in G by v_l or v_r . Thus $R_{\hat{l}} \cup R_{\hat{r}}$ is a resolving set for $V(G_{\hat{w}})$ in G . By Lemma 1, it is a minimum resolving set for $V(G_{\hat{w}})$ in G if $R_{\hat{l}}$ is a minimum resolving set for $V(G_{\hat{l}})$ in G and $R_{\hat{r}}$ is a minimum resolving set for $V(G_{\hat{r}})$ in G .

If u_l is a 2-vertex w.r.t. $R_{\hat{l}}$ and u_r is a 2-vertex w.r.t. $R_{\hat{r}}$, then for each vertex $v \in R_{\hat{l}} \cup R_{\hat{r}}$, $d_G(v, u_l) = d_G(v, u_r) = 2$. In this case, u_l and u_r are not resolved by any vertex of $R_{\hat{l}} \cup R_{\hat{r}}$ in G and thus $R_{\hat{l}} \cup R_{\hat{r}}$ is not a resolving set for $V(G_{\hat{w}})$ in G .

(b) Let \hat{l} be an inner node of T and \hat{r} be a leaf of T .

If u_l is not a 2-vertex w.r.t. $R_{\hat{l}}$, then there is a vertex $v_l \in R_{\hat{l}}$ such that $d_G(v_l, u_l) = 1$. Since $d_G(v_l, u_r) = 2$, vertex u_l and vertex u_r are resolved in G by v_l . Thus $R_{\hat{l}}$ is a resolving set for $V(G_{\hat{w}})$ in G . By Lemma 1, it is a minimum resolving set for $V(G_{\hat{w}})$ in G if $R_{\hat{l}}$ is a minimum resolving set for $V(G_{\hat{l}})$ in G .

If u_l is a 2-vertex w.r.t. $R_{\hat{l}}$, then for each vertex $v_l \in R_{\hat{l}}$, $d_G(v_l, u_l) = 2$. In this case, vertex u_l and vertex u_r are not resolved by any vertex of $R_{\hat{l}}$ and thus $R_{\hat{l}}$ is not a resolving set for $V(G_{\hat{w}})$ in G .

2. Let \hat{w} be labelled by \times .

The proof is running analogously to the proof for label \cup .

3. Let \hat{w} be labelled by \gg .

In this case, for each vertex $u_l \in V(G_{\hat{l}})$, or $u_l = \text{vertex}(\hat{l})$ if \hat{l} is a leaf in T , and for each vertex $u_r \in V(G_{\hat{r}})$, or $u_r = \text{vertex}(\hat{r})$ if \hat{r} is a leaf in T , we have $d_G(u_l, u_r) = 1$ and $d_G(u_r, u_l) = 2$.

- (a) Let \hat{l} and \hat{r} be inner nodes of T .

If u_l is not a 1-vertex w.r.t. $R_{\hat{l}}$, then there is a vertex $v_l \in R_{\hat{l}}$ such that $d_G(v_l, u_l) = 2$. If u_r is not a 2-vertex w.r.t. $R_{\hat{r}}$, then there is a vertex $v_r \in R_{\hat{r}}$ such that $d_G(v_r, u_r) = 1$. Since $d_G(v_l, u_r) = 1$ and $d_G(v_r, u_l) = 2$, vertex u_l and vertex u_r are resolved in G by v_l or v_r . Thus $R_{\hat{l}} \cup R_{\hat{r}}$ is a resolving set for $V(G_{\hat{w}})$ in G . By Lemma 1, it is a minimum resolving set for $V(G_{\hat{w}})$ in G if $R_{\hat{l}}$ is a minimum resolving set for $V(G_{\hat{l}})$ in G and $R_{\hat{r}}$ is a minimum resolving set for $V(G_{\hat{r}})$ in G .

If u_l is a 1-vertex w.r.t. $R_{\hat{l}}$ and u_r is a 2-vertex w.r.t. $R_{\hat{r}}$, then for every $v \in R_{\hat{l}}$, $d_G(v, u_l) = d_G(v, u_r) = 1$ and for every $v \in R_{\hat{r}}$, $d_G(v, u_l) = d_G(v, u_r) = 2$. In this case u_l and u_r are not resolved by any vertex of $R_{\hat{l}} \cup R_{\hat{r}}$ and thus $R_{\hat{l}} \cup R_{\hat{r}}$ is not a resolving set for $V(G_{\hat{w}})$ in G .

- (b) Let \hat{l} be an inner node of T and \hat{r} be a leaf of T .

If u_l is not a 1-vertex w.r.t. $R_{\hat{l}}$, then there is a vertex $v_l \in R_{\hat{l}}$ such that $d_G(v_l, u_l) = 2$. Since $d_G(v_l, u_r) = 1$, vertex u_l and vertex u_r are resolved in G by v_l . Thus $R_{\hat{l}}$ is a resolving set for $V(G_{\hat{w}})$ in G . By Lemma 1, it is a minimum resolving set for $V(G_{\hat{w}})$ in G if $R_{\hat{l}}$ is a minimum resolving set for $V(G_{\hat{l}})$ in G .

If u_l is a 1-vertex w.r.t. $R_{\hat{l}}$, then for each vertex $v_l \in R_{\hat{l}}$, $d_G(v_l, u_l) = 1$. In this case, vertex u_l and vertex u_r are not resolved by any vertex of $R_{\hat{l}}$ and thus $R_{\hat{l}}$ is not a resolving set for $V(G_{\hat{w}})$ in G .

- (c) Let \hat{l} be a leaf of T and \hat{r} be an inner node of T .

If u_r is not a 2-vertex w.r.t. $R_{\hat{r}}$, then there is a vertex $v_r \in R_{\hat{r}}$ such that $d_G(v_r, u_r) = 1$. Since $d_G(v_r, u_l) = 2$, vertex u_l and vertex u_r are resolved in G by v_r . Thus $R_{\hat{r}}$ is a resolving set for $V(G_{\hat{w}})$ in G . By Lemma 1, it is a minimum resolving set for $V(G_{\hat{w}})$ in G if $R_{\hat{r}}$ is a minimum resolving set for $V(G_{\hat{r}})$ in G .

If u_r is a 2-vertex w.r.t. $R_{\hat{r}}$, then for each vertex $v_r \in R_{\hat{r}}$, $d_G(v_r, u_r) = 2$. In this case, vertex u_r and vertex u_l are not resolved by any vertex of $R_{\hat{r}}$ and thus $R_{\hat{r}}$ is not a resolving set for $V(G_{\hat{w}})$ in G .

□

The proof of Lemma 2 shows the following observation.

1. Suppose \hat{l} and \hat{r} are inner node of T . If $R_{\hat{l}} \cup R_{\hat{r}}$ is not a resolving set for $V(G_{\hat{w}})$ in G , then it is sufficient to add one additional vertex u of $G_{\hat{w}}$ to $R_{\hat{l}} \cup R_{\hat{r}}$ to get a resolving set for $V(G_{\hat{w}})$ in G . This is possible with a vertex of $G_{\hat{l}}$ and with a vertex from $G_{\hat{r}}$. If \hat{w} is labelled by \cup (\times , \gg), then we can use the 2-vertex (1-vertex, 1-vertex) of $G_{\hat{l}}$ and the (2-vertex, 1-vertex, 2-vertex) of $G_{\hat{r}}$.

2. Suppose \hat{l} is an inner node and \hat{r} is a leaf of T . If $R_{\hat{l}}$ is not a resolving set for $V(G_{\hat{w}})$ in G , then it is also sufficient to add one additional vertex u of $G_{\hat{w}}$ to $R_{\hat{l}}$ to get a resolving set for $V(G_{\hat{w}})$ in G . If \hat{w} is labelled by \cup (\times , \gg), then we can use the 2-vertex (1-vertex, 1-vertex) of $G_{\hat{l}}$ or vertex $\text{vertex}(\hat{r})$.
3. Suppose \hat{l} is a leaf and \hat{r} is an inner node of T . If $R_{\hat{r}}$ is not a resolving set for $V(G_{\hat{w}})$ in G , then again it is also sufficient to add one additional vertex u of $G_{\hat{w}}$ to $R_{\hat{r}}$ to get a resolving set for $V(G_{\hat{w}})$ in G . Since \hat{w} is labelled by \gg , we can use vertex $\text{vertex}(\hat{l})$ and the 2-vertex of $G_{\hat{r}}$.

If a strongly connected graph G has a 1-vertex u_1 (a 2-vertex u_2) w.r.t. a resolving set R , then, obviously, G has no 1-vertex w.r.t. $R \cup \{u_1\}$ (no 2-vertex w.r.t. $R \cup \{u_2\}$, respectively). Suppose G has both a 1-vertex u_1 and a 2-vertex u_2 w.r.t. a resolving set R . If there is an edge from u_1 to u_2 (no edge from u_2 to u_1), then G neither has a 1-vertex nor a 2-vertex w.r.t. $R \cup \{u_1\}$ (w.r.t. $R \cup \{u_2\}$, respectively). In this case, we call vertex u_1 (vertex u_2 , respectively) a *double remover*.

Notation 2. Let u_1 be a 1-vertex and u_2 be a 2-vertex of a strongly connected graph G w.r.t. a vertex set R . A vertex v is a *double remover* if u_1 is not a 1-vertex and u_2 is not a 2-vertex of G w.r.t. $R \cup \{v\}$.

Figure 4 (1.), (2.), and (3.) show the necessary and forbidden edges for the case that a 1-vertex u_1 is a double remover, a 2-vertex u_2 is a double remover, and a 1-vertex u_1 and a 2-vertex u_2 are both double removers. An induced subgraph with all necessary edges and without all of the forbidden edges of the graph in the third case is not a directed co-graph.




Figure 4: Let R be a resolving set for $V(G)$ in G , vertex u_1 be a 1-vertex w.r.t. R , and vertex u_2 be a 2-vertex w.r.t. R . In graph (1.), vertex u_2 is not a 2-vertex w.r.t. $R \cup \{u_1\}$. In graph (2.), vertex u_1 is not a 1-vertex w.r.t. $R \cup \{u_2\}$. In graph (3.), vertex u_1 is not a 1-vertex w.r.t. $R \cup \{u_2\}$ and vertex u_2 is not a 2-vertex w.r.t. $R \cup \{u_1\}$. If these conditions are met, the green edges must be edges of $E(G)$ and the red edges must not be edges of $E(G)$. There is no directed co-graph that has an induced subgraph with vertex set $\{u_1, u_2, w_1, w_2\}$ and all the necessary green edges but none of the forbidden red edges of graph (3.).

The next lemma shows that there is no vertex $v \in V(G_{\hat{w}}) \setminus \{u_1, u_2\}$ such that $G_{\hat{w}}$ neither has a 1-vertex nor a 2-vertex w.r.t. $R_{\hat{w}} \cup \{v\}$. That is, u_1 and u_2 are the only possible double removers. This shows that we only need to consider a 1-vertex or a 2-vertex to remove a 1-vertex or 2-vertex of $G_{\hat{w}}$ w.r.t. a resolving set $R_{\hat{w}}$, see Figure 5.

Lemma 3. Let G be a strongly connected directed co-graph with co-tree T , $\hat{w} \in V(T)$ be an inner node of T , and $R_{\hat{w}} \subseteq V(G_{\hat{w}})$ be a resolving sets for $V(G_{\hat{w}})$ in G , such that $G_{\hat{w}}$ has a 1-vertex u_1 and a 2-vertex u_2 w.r.t. $R_{\hat{w}}$. Then there is no vertex $v \in V(G_{\hat{w}}) \setminus \{u_1, u_2\}$ such that $R_{\hat{w}} \cup \{v\}$ is a resolving set for $V(G_{\hat{w}})$ in G and $G_{\hat{w}}$ has neither a 1-vertex nor a 2-vertex w.r.t. $R_{\hat{w}} \cup \{v\}$.




Figure 5: Let R be a resolving set for $V(G)$ in G , vertex u_1 be a 1-vertex w.r.t. R , vertex u_2 be a 2-vertex w.r.t. R , and vertex v be a vertex such that u_1 is not a 1-vertex w.r.t. $R \cup \{v\}$ and u_2 is not a 2-vertex w.r.t. $R \cup \{v\}$. Then the green edges must be edges of $E(G)$ and the red edges must not be edges of $E(G)$. There is no directed co-graph that has an induced subgraph with vertex set $\{u_1, v, u_2, w_1, w_2\}$ and all the necessary green edges but none of the forbidden red edges.

Proof by contradiction. Suppose there is a vertex $v \in V(G_{\hat{w}}) \setminus \{u_1, u_2\}$ such that $R_{\hat{w}} \cup \{v\}$ is a resolving set for $V(G_{\hat{w}})$ in G and $G_{\hat{w}}$ neither has a 1-vertex nor a 2-vertex w.r.t. $R_{\hat{w}} \cup \{v\}$. Since $R_{\hat{w}}$ is a resolving set for $V(G_{\hat{w}})$ in G the three vertex pairs u_1, u_2 , u_1, v and u_2, v have to be resolved in G by vertices of $R_{\hat{w}}$. Since each vertex of $R_{\hat{w}}$ resolves the vertex pair u_1, u_2 in G , set $R_{\hat{w}}$ has to contain at least two vertices w_1, w_2 , where w_1 has no edge to v and w_2 has an edge to v . That is, vertex w_1 resolves vertex pair u_1, v in G and vertex w_2 resolves vertex pair u_2, v in G . Up to now, we have $(w_1, u_1), (w_2, u_1), (w_2, v) \in E(G_{\hat{w}})$ and $(w_1, u_2), (w_1, v), (w_2, u_2) \notin E(G_{\hat{w}})$. Since u_1 is not a 1-vertex w.r.t. $R_{\hat{w}} \cup \{v\}$, we have $(v, u_1) \notin E(G_{\hat{w}})$. Since u_2 is not a 2-vertex w.r.t. $R_{\hat{w}} \cup \{v\}$, we have $(v, u_2) \in E(G_{\hat{w}})$. Figure 5 illustrates this situation.

Now it is easy to see that there is no partition of the vertex set $\{u_1, u_2, v, w_1, w_2\}$ into two non-empty sets U_1 and U_2 such that there are graphs G_1 and G_2 with vertex sets U_1 and U_2 , respectively, and $G_1 \cup G_2$, $G_1 \times G_2$, or $G_1 \gg G_2$ contains the required edges and does not contain the forbidden edges. \square

For each inner node \hat{w} of T , the procedure **Merge** $(\hat{w}, \hat{l}, \hat{r})$ computes at most two of the following 4 minimum resolving sets for $V(G_{\hat{w}})$ in G . The 4 sets are denoted by $R_{\hat{w}, t_{\hat{w}}}$, where $t_{\hat{w}} \in \{0, 1, 2, 12\}$ and

1. $R_{\hat{w}, 0}$ is a minimum resolving set for $V(G_{\hat{w}})$ in G such that $G_{\hat{w}}$ neither has a 1-vertex nor a 2-vertex w.r.t. $R_{\hat{w}, 0}$,
2. $R_{\hat{w}, 1}$ is a minimum resolving set for $V(G_{\hat{w}})$ in G such that $G_{\hat{w}}$ has a 1-vertex but no 2-vertex w.r.t. $R_{\hat{w}, 1}$,
3. $R_{\hat{w}, 2}$ is a minimum resolving set for $V(G_{\hat{w}})$ in G such that $G_{\hat{w}}$ has no 1-vertex but a 2-vertex w.r.t. $R_{\hat{w}, 2}$, and
4. $R_{\hat{w}, 12}$ is a minimum resolving set for $V(G_{\hat{w}})$ in G such that $G_{\hat{w}}$ has a 1-vertex and a 2-vertex w.r.t. $R_{\hat{w}, 12}$.

Additionally, we store for each defined set $R_{\hat{w}, 1}$ and $R_{\hat{w}, 2}$, the 1-vertex and 2-vertex of $G_{\hat{w}}$ w.r.t. $R_{\hat{w}, 1}$ and $R_{\hat{w}, 2}$, respectively, as well as for each defined set $R_{\hat{w}, 12}$, the 1-vertex and 2-vertex of $G_{\hat{w}}$ w.r.t. $R_{\hat{w}, 12}$ and the information whether one of these two vertices, and if so, which one of them, is a double remover.

The minimum resolving sets for $V(G_{\hat{w}})$ in G are computed from the previously computed minimum resolving sets for $V(G_{\hat{l}})$ and $V(G_{\hat{r}})$ in G . In the simplest case, a minimum resolving set for $V(G_{\hat{w}})$ in G can be defined by the union of a minimum resolving set for $V(G_{\hat{l}})$ in G and

a minimum resolving set for $V(G_{\hat{r}})$ in G . In the worst case, at most one additional vertex from $V(G_{\hat{w}})$ has to be added. However, this additional vertex v is always a 1-vertex or 2-vertex of $G_{\hat{l}}$ w.r.t. the corresponding minimum resolving set for $V(G_{\hat{l}})$ in G , or a 1-vertex or 2-vertex of $G_{\hat{r}}$ w.r.t. the corresponding minimum resolving set for $V(G_{\hat{r}})$ in G . Existing double removers are of course preferred here. If \hat{l} or \hat{r} or both are leaves, then vertex $\text{vertex}(\hat{l})$ and $\text{vertex}(\hat{r})$ are also a possible choice for v .

To explain how the procedure $\mathbf{Merge}(\hat{w}, \hat{l}, \hat{r})$ works in detail, we again distinguish between the three labels \cup , \times and \gg for node \hat{w} and the cases where the successor nodes of \hat{w} are inner nodes or leaves. Let $R_{\hat{l}, t_{\hat{l}}}$ be an already computed resolving set for $V(G_{\hat{l}})$ in G and $R_{\hat{r}, t_{\hat{r}}}$ be an already computed resolving set for $V(G_{\hat{r}})$ in G , where $t_{\hat{l}}, t_{\hat{r}} \in \{0, 1, 2, 12\}$. To update a resolving set $R_{\hat{w}, t_{\hat{w}}}$ for some $t_{\hat{w}} \in \{0, 1, 2, 12\}$ by a minimum resolving set R means that $R_{\hat{w}, t_{\hat{w}}}$ is set to R , if $R_{\hat{w}, t_{\hat{w}}}$ is not already defined, or the size of R is less than the size of $R_{\hat{w}, t_{\hat{w}}}$, if $R_{\hat{w}, t_{\hat{w}}}$ is already defined.

Suppose $R_{\hat{w}, 0}$, $R_{\hat{w}, 1}$, $R_{\hat{w}, 2}$, and $R_{\hat{w}, 12}$ are defined. The following simplifications for updating the quantities result from the fact that we can prefer smaller quantities or quantities of the same size with fewer restrictions.

- If $|R_{\hat{w}, 0}| \leq |R_{\hat{w}, 1}|$ or $|R_{\hat{w}, 0}| \leq |R_{\hat{w}, 2}|$, then we do not need to update $R_{\hat{w}, 1}$ or $R_{\hat{w}, 2}$.
- If $|R_{\hat{w}, 1}| < |R_{\hat{w}, 0}|$ or $|R_{\hat{w}, 2}| < |R_{\hat{w}, 0}|$, then we do not need to update $R_{\hat{w}, 0}$.
- If $|R_{\hat{w}, 1}| \leq |R_{\hat{w}, 12}|$ or $|R_{\hat{w}, 2}| \leq |R_{\hat{w}, 12}|$, then we do not need to update $R_{\hat{w}, 12}$.
- If $|R_{\hat{w}, 1}| < |R_{\hat{w}, 12}|$ or $|R_{\hat{w}, 2}| < |R_{\hat{w}, 12}|$, then we do not need to update $R_{\hat{w}, 1}$ or $R_{\hat{w}, 2}$.

That is, we either consider the resolving set $R_{\hat{w}, 0}$, one or both of the resolving sets $R_{\hat{w}, 1}$ and $R_{\hat{w}, 2}$, or the resolving set $R_{\hat{w}, 12}$ for $V(G_{\hat{w}})$ in G .

Initially, all resolving sets $R_{\hat{w}, t_{\hat{w}}}$, $\hat{w} \in V(T)$, $t_{\hat{w}} \in \{0, 1, 2, 12\}$, are undefined. The rules for updating the sets are summarised in Tables 1 to 3. The rows $(t_{\hat{l}}, t_{\hat{r}}, v, t_{\hat{w}}, u_1, u_2)$ of Tables 1 and 2 show how the resolving sets $R_{\hat{w}, t_{\hat{w}}}$ for $V(G_{\hat{w}})$ in G are updated.

- The types $t_{\hat{l}}$, $t_{\hat{r}}$, and $t_{\hat{w}}$ are the types of the resolving sets for $V(G_{\hat{l}})$, $V(G_{\hat{r}})$, and $V(G_{\hat{w}})$ in G , respectively. If $t_{\hat{l}} = \text{"-"}$ or $t_{\hat{r}} = \text{"-"}$, then \hat{l} or \hat{r} is a leaf of T , respectively.
- Vertex v is the vertex that can be added to create a resolving set for $V(G_{\hat{w}})$ in G from the union of a minimum resolving set for $V(G_{\hat{l}})$ in G and a minimum resolving set for $V(G_{\hat{r}})$ in G . If $v = \text{"-"}$, then $R_{\hat{l}, t_{\hat{l}}} \cup R_{\hat{r}, t_{\hat{r}}}$ is already a resolving set for $V(G_{\hat{w}})$ in G . In this case, $R_{\hat{w}, t_{\hat{w}}}$ is updated by $R_{\hat{l}, t_{\hat{l}}} \cup R_{\hat{r}, t_{\hat{r}}}$. Otherwise, $R_{\hat{l}, t_{\hat{l}}} \cup R_{\hat{r}, t_{\hat{r}}} \cup \{v\}$ is a resolving set for $V(G_{\hat{w}})$ in G and $R_{\hat{w}, t_{\hat{w}}}$ is updated by $R_{\hat{l}, t_{\hat{l}}} \cup R_{\hat{r}, t_{\hat{r}}} \cup \{v\}$. Vertex v is either the 1-vertex, 2-vertex, or double remover of $V(G_{\hat{l}})$ w.r.t. $R_{\hat{l}, t_{\hat{l}}}$ denoted by $u_{l, 1}$, $u_{l, 2}$, and $u_{l, \star}$, respectively, or the 1-vertex, 2-vertex, or double remover of $V(G_{\hat{r}})$ w.r.t. $R_{\hat{r}, t_{\hat{r}}}$ denoted by $u_{r, 1}$, $u_{r, 2}$, and $u_{r, \star}$, respectively. If \hat{l} or \hat{r} is a leaf, then $u_l = \text{vertex}(\hat{l})$ and $u_r = \text{vertex}(\hat{r})$, respectively.
- Vertex u_1 and u_2 are the 1-vertex and 2-vertex of $G_{\hat{w}}$ w.r.t. the resulting resolving set for $V(G_{\hat{w}})$ in G . A created double remover gets a superscript asterisk. If $u_1 = \text{"-"}$ or $u_2 = \text{"-"}$, then $G_{\hat{w}}$ has no 1-vertex or 2-vertex, respectively, w.r.t. the resulting resolving set for $V(G_{\hat{w}})$ in G .

Table 3 describes the minimum resolving sets for $V(G_{\hat{w}})$ in G for the case that \hat{l} and \hat{r} are leaves in T .

$t_{\hat{l}}$	$t_{\hat{r}}$	v	$t_{\hat{w}}$	u_1	u_2
0	0	—	0	—	—
0	1	—	0	—	—
0	2	—	2	—	$u_{r,2}$
0	12	—	2	—	$u_{r,2}$
1	0	—	0	—	—
1	1	—	0	—	—
1	2	—	2	—	$u_{r,2}$
1	12	—	2	—	$u_{r,2}$
2	0	—	2	—	$u_{l,2}$
2	1	—	2	—	$u_{l,2}$
2	2	$u_{l,2}$	2	—	$u_{r,2}$
		$u_{r,2}$	2	—	$u_{l,2}$
2	12	$u_{l,2}$	2	—	$u_{r,2}$
		$u_{r,2}$	2	—	$u_{l,2}$
		$u_{r,*}$	2	—	$u_{l,2}$
12	0	—	2	—	$u_{l,2}$
12	1	—	2	—	$u_{l,2}$
12	2	$u_{l,2}$	2	—	$u_{r,2}$
		$u_{l,*}$	2	—	$u_{r,2}$
		$u_{r,2}$	2	—	$u_{l,2}$
12	12	$u_{l,2}$	2	—	$u_{r,2}$
		$u_{l,*}$	2	—	$u_{r,2}$
		$u_{r,2}$	2	—	$u_{l,2}$
		$u_{r,*}$	2	—	$u_{l,2}$

Label \cup

$t_{\hat{l}}$	$t_{\hat{r}}$	v	$t_{\hat{w}}$	u_1	u_2
0	0	—	0	—	—
0	1	—	1	$u_{r,1}$	—
0	2	—	0	—	—
0	12	—	1	$u_{r,1}$	—
1	0	—	1	$u_{l,1}$	—
1	1	$u_{l,1}$	1	$u_{r,1}$	—
		$u_{r,1}$	1	$u_{l,1}$	—
1	2	—	1	$u_{l,1}$	—
1	12	$u_{l,1}$	1	$u_{r,1}$	—
		$u_{r,1}$	1	$u_{l,1}$	—
		$u_{r,*}$	1	$u_{l,1}$	—
2	0	—	0	—	—
2	1	—	1	$u_{r,1}$	—
2	2	—	0	—	—
2	12	—	1	$u_{r,1}$	—
12	0	—	1	$u_{l,1}$	—
12	1	$u_{l,1}$	1	$u_{r,1}$	—
		$u_{l,*}$	1	$u_{r,1}$	—
		$u_{r,1}$	1	$u_{l,1}$	—
12	2	—	1	$u_{l,1}$	—
12	12	$u_{l,1}$	1	$u_{r,1}$	—
		$u_{l,*}$	1	$u_{r,1}$	—
		$u_{r,1}$	1	$u_{l,1}$	—
		$u_{r,*}$	1	$u_{l,1}$	—

Label \times

$t_{\hat{l}}$	$t_{\hat{r}}$	v	$t_{\hat{w}}$	u_1	u_2
0	0	—	0	—	—
0	1	—	1	$u_{r,1}$	—
0	2	—	0	—	—
0	12	—	1	$u_{r,1}$	—
1	0	—	0	—	—
1	1	—	1	$u_{r,1}$	—
1	2	$u_{l,1}$	0	—	—
		$u_{r,2}$	0	—	—
1	12	$u_{l,1}$	1	$u_{r,1}$	—
		$u_{r,2}$	1	$u_{r,1}$	—
		$u_{r,*}$	0	—	—
2	0	—	2	—	$u_{l,2}$
2	1	—	12	$u_{r,1}$	$u_{l,2}$
2	2	—	2	—	$u_{l,2}$
2	12	—	12	$u_{r,1}$	$u_{l,2}$
12	0	—	2	—	$u_{l,2}$
12	1	—	12	$u_{r,1}$	$u_{l,2}$
12	2	$u_{l,1}$	2	—	$u_{l,2}$
		$u_{l,*}$	0	—	—
		$u_{r,2}$	2	—	$u_{l,2}$
12	12	$u_{l,1}$	12	$u_{r,1}$	$u_{l,2}$
		$u_{l,*}$	1	$u_{r,1}$	—
		$u_{r,2}$	12	$u_{r,1}$	$u_{l,2}$
		$u_{r,*}$	2	—	$u_{l,2}$

Label \gg

Table 1: The tables for the case that \hat{l} and \hat{r} are inner nodes of T .

The rows with a blue background do not need to be taken into account, because in these cases there is another selection that provides a solution that is at least as good as the blue one.

The running time of computing a minimum resolving set for G is therefore linear in the size of the given co-graph G .

Theorem 1. *A minimum resolving set for a strongly connected directed co-graph G is computable in linear time.*

Example 1. *The table below shows the results computed by the **BottomUp()** procedure for the co-graph G defined by the co-tree T below. There is a column for each possible minimum resolving set $R_{\hat{w}, t_{\hat{w}}}$, $t_{\hat{w}} \in \{0, 1, 2, 12\}$. The vertices u_1, u_2 next to the minimum resolving sets $R_{\hat{w}, t_{\hat{w}}}$ are the 1-vertex and 2-vertices of $G_{\hat{w}}$ w.r.t. $R_{\hat{w}, t_{\hat{w}}}$. The double remover is marked by an asterisk.*

$t_{\hat{l}}$	$t_{\hat{r}}$	v	$t_{\hat{w}}$	u_1	u_2
0	-	-	2	-	u_r
1	-	-	12	$u_{l,1}$	u_r^*
2	-	$u_{l,2}$	2	-	u_r
		u_r	2	-	$u_{l,2}$
12	-	$u_{l,2}$	12	$u_{l,1}$	u_r^*
		$u_{l,*}$	2	-	u_r
		u_r	2	-	$u_{l,2}$

Label \cup , \hat{r} is a leaf

$t_{\hat{l}}$	$t_{\hat{r}}$	v	$t_{\hat{w}}$	u_1	u_2
0	-	-	1	u_r	-
1	-	$u_{l,1}$	1	u_r	-
		u_r	1	$u_{l,1}$	-
2	-	-	12	u_r^*	$u_{l,2}$
12	-	$u_{l,1}$	12	u_r^*	$u_{l,2}$
		$u_{l,*}$	1	u_r	-
		u_r	1	$u_{l,1}$	-

Label \times , \hat{r} is a leaf

$t_{\hat{l}}$	$t_{\hat{r}}$	v	$t_{\hat{w}}$	u_1	u_2
0	-	-	1	u_r	-
1	-	$u_{l,1}$	1	u_r	-
		u_r	0	-	-
2	-	-	12	u_r	$u_{l,2}$
12	-	$u_{l,1}$	12	u_r	$u_{l,2}$
		$u_{l,*}$	1	u_r	-
		u_r	2	-	$u_{l,2}$

Label \gg , \hat{r} is a leaf

$t_{\hat{l}}$	$t_{\hat{r}}$	v	$t_{\hat{w}}$	u_1	u_2
-	0	-	2	-	u_l
-	1	-	12	$u_{r,1}$	u_l
-	2	u_l	0	-	-
		$u_{r,2}$	2	-	u_l
-	12	u_l	1	$u_{r,1}$	-
		$u_{r,2}$	12	$u_{r,1}$	u_l
		$u_{r,*}$	2	-	u_l

Label \gg , \hat{l} is a leaf

Table 2: The tables for the case that either \hat{l} or \hat{r} is a leaf of T .

$R_{\hat{w}, t_{\hat{w}}}$	$t_{\hat{w}}$	u_1	u_2
$\{u_l\}$	2	-	u_r
$\{u_r\}$	2	-	u_l

Label \cup , \hat{l} and \hat{r} are leaves


$R_{\hat{w}, t_{\hat{w}}}$	$t_{\hat{w}}$	u_1	u_2
$\{u_l\}$	1	u_r	-
$\{u_r\}$	1	u_l	-

Label \times , \hat{l} and \hat{r} are leaves

$R_{\hat{w}, t_{\hat{w}}}$	$t_{\hat{w}}$	u_1	u_2
$\{u_l\}$	1	u_r	-
$\{u_r\}$	2	-	u_l

Label \gg , \hat{l} and \hat{r} are leaves

Table 3: The tables for the case that \hat{l} and \hat{r} are leaves of T .



$G_{\hat{w}}$	$R_{\hat{w}, 0}$	$R_{\hat{w}, 1}/u_1$	$R_{\hat{w}, 2}/u_2$	$R_{\hat{w}, 12}/u_1, u_2$
$G_{\hat{u}_1} = G_{\hat{a}} \times G_{\hat{b}}$	-	$\{a\}/b$	-	-
$G_{\hat{u}_2} = G_{\hat{c}} \times G_{\hat{d}}$	-	$\{c\}/d$	-	-
$G_{\hat{u}_3} = G_{\hat{u}_2} \cup \hat{e}$	-	-	-	$\{c\}/d, e^*$
$G_{\hat{u}_4} = G_{\hat{u}_1} \gg G_{\hat{u}_3}$	$\{a, c, e\}$	-	-	-
$G_{\hat{u}_5} = G_{\hat{f}} \times G_{\hat{g}}$	-	-	$\{f\}/g$	-
$G_{\hat{u}_6} = G_{\hat{u}_4} \times G_{\hat{u}_5}$	$\{a, c, e, f\}$	-	-	-

Vertex set $\{a, c, e, f\}$ is a minimum resolving set for the strongly connected directed co-graph G defined by co-tree T of the figure above.

3 Directed acyclic graphs

An undirected graph can easily be transformed into a directed graph by replacing each undirected edge $\{u, v\}$ by two directed edges (u, v) and (v, u) . Thus, DIRECTED METRIC DIMENSION is NP-complete, because METRIC DIMENSION is NP-complete, see [KRR96], but it is also NP-complete for oriented graphs, see [RRCM14]. However, the following theorem shows that DIRECTED METRIC DIMENSION is also NP-complete for directed acyclic graphs, i.e., for DAGs.

Theorem 2. DIRECTED METRIC DIMENSION is NP-complete for DAGs.

Proof. The problem is obviously in NP. The NP-hardness is shown by a polynomial time reduction from HITTING SET. Let $\mathcal{C} = \{C_1, \dots, C_m\}$ be a set of subsets of a set $X = \{x_1, \dots, x_n\}$. We define a directed acyclic graph G such that G has a resolving set of size at most $3 + k$ if and only if there is a subset $X' \subset X$ of size at most k such that $X' \cap C_j \neq \emptyset$ for $j = 1, \dots, m$. W.l.o.g., we assume that $m > n$, otherwise duplicate some sets of \mathcal{C} , and that for each subset C_j there is at least one x_i such that $x_i \notin C_j$.

The graph G defined for X, \mathcal{C} has

1. three vertices u_a, u_b and u_c ,
2. n vertices u_{x_i} for $i = 1, \dots, n$,
3. $2m$ vertices $u_{C_j}, u_{C'_j}$ for $j = 1, \dots, m$,

and

1. n edges (u_a, u_{x_i}) for $i = 1, \dots, n$,
2. one edge (u_b, u_{x_1}) ,
3. $n - 1$ edges $(u_{x_i}, u_{x_{i+1}})$ for $i = 1, \dots, n - 1$,
4. two edges $(u_c, u_{C_1}), (u_c, u_{C'_1})$,
5. m edges $(u_{C_j}, u_{C'_j})$, for $j = 1, \dots, m$,
6. $4(m - 1)$ edges $(u_{C_j}, u_{C_{j+1}}), (u_{C_j}, u_{C'_{j+1}}), (u_{C'_j}, u_{C_{j+1}}), (u_{C'_j}, u_{C'_{j+1}})$, for $j = 1, \dots, m - 1$,
7. nm edges (u_{x_i}, u_{C_j}) for $i = 1, \dots, n$ for $j = 1, \dots, m$, and
8. an edge $(u_{x_i}, u_{C'_j})$, $1 \leq i \leq n$, $1 \leq j \leq m$, if and only if $x_i \notin C_j$.

Figure 6 shows an example.

Each minimum resolving set for G contains the three vertices u_a, u_b, u_c , because these vertices have no incoming edges. Vertex u_b resolves every vertex pair u_{x_i}, u_{x_j} , $1 \leq i < j \leq n$, because $d_G(u_b, u_{x_i}) = i$. Vertex u_c resolves every vertex pair $(u_{C_i}, u_{C_j}), (u_{C_i}, u_{C'_j}), (u_{C'_i}, u_{C_j})$ and $(u_{C'_i}, u_{C'_j})$, $1 \leq i < j \leq m$, because $d_G(u_c, u_{C_i}) = d_G(u_c, u_{C'_i}) = i$. Vertex u_a resolves every vertex pair u_{x_i}, u_{C_j} and every vertex pair $u_{x_i}, u_{C'_j}$, $1 \leq i \leq n$, $1 \leq j \leq m$, because $d_G(u_a, u_{x_i}) = 1$ and $d_G(u_a, u_{C_j}) = 2$. Note that we assume that for each subset C_j there is at least one x_i such that $x_i \notin C_j$, therefore $d_G(u_a, u_{C'_j}) = 2$. The only vertex pairs that have not




Figure 6: Graph G obtained by instance X, \mathcal{C} with $X = \{x_1, x_2, x_3, x_4\}$, $\mathcal{C} = \{C_1, C_2, C_3, C_4, C_5, C_6, C_7\}$, $C_1 = \{x_1, x_3, x_4\}$, $C_2 = \{x_1, x_4\}$, $C_3 = \{x_1, x_2, x_4\}$, $C_4 = \{x_2\}$, $C_5 = \{x_1, x_4\}$, $C_6 = \{x_2, x_3\}$, $C_7 = \{x_1, x_3, x_4\}$ for HITTING SET in the proof of Theorem 2. The edges which result from the membership of the elements x_i to the subset C_j are drawn separately below for reasons of clarity. These are the edges in edge set E' . Set $X' = \{x_2, x_4\}$ is a minimum HITTING SET for X, \mathcal{C} , where $\{u_a, u_b, u_c, u_{x_2}, u_{x_4}\}$ is a minimum resolving set for G .

been considered yet are the vertex pairs $u_{C_j}, u_{C'_j}$ for $j = 1, \dots, m$. A vertex pair $u_{C_j}, u_{C'_j}$ can only be resolved by vertex u_{C_j} , by vertex $u_{C'_j}$ or by a vertex u_{x_i} such that $x_i \in C_j$, because $x_i \in C_j$ if and only if $d_G(u_{x_i}, u_{C'_j}) = 2$.

Let $X' \subseteq X$ be a hitting set for \mathcal{C} of size at most k , i.e., $X' \cap C_j \neq \emptyset$ for $j = 1, \dots, m$. Then the vertices u_{x_i} with $x_i \in X'$ resolve all vertex pairs $u_{C_j}, u_{C'_j}$, $1 \leq j \leq m$. Thus

$$R = \{u_a, u_b, u_c\} \cup \bigcup_{x_i \in X'} u_{x_i}$$

is a resolving set for G of size at most $3 + k$. Let R be a resolving set for G of size at most $3 + k$. If R contains a vertex $u_{C_j} \in R$ or $u_{C'_j} \in R$, then replace it by a vertex u_{x_i} where $x_i \in C_j$. The resulting set R' is also a resolving set for G of size at most $3 + k$ and

$$X' = \{x_i | u_{x_i} \in R'\}$$

is a hitting set for \mathcal{C} . □

4 Conclusions

In this paper we have shown that DIRECTED METRIC DIMENSION is decidable in linear time for directed co-graphs and we also presented an algorithm to compute minimum resolving sets for directed co-graphs in linear time. Additionally, we have shown that DIRECTED METRIC DIMENSION is NP-complete for DAGs, extending the existing results for general directed and oriented graphs.

The metric dimension as well as its variants have rarely been studied for directed graphs [SW21]. Developing efficient algorithms to compute the metric dimension for specific graph classes is one of the most interesting challenges to us.

References

- [BBS⁺11] BAČA, Martin ; BASKORO, Edy T. ; SALMAN, A. N. M. ; SAPUTRO, Suhadi W. ; SUPRIJANTO, Djoko: The Metric Dimension of Regular Bipartite Graphs. In: *Bulletin mathématique de la Société des sciences mathématiques de Roumanie* 54 (2011), Nr. 1, S. 15–28
- [BDGR97] BECHET, Denis ; DE GROOTE, Philippe ; RETORÉ, Christian: A complete axiomatisation for the inclusion of series-parallel partial orders. In: *International Conference on Rewriting Techniques and Applications* Springer, 1997, S. 230–240
- [BEE⁺05] BEERLIOVA, Zuzana ; EBERHARD, Felix ; ERLEBACH, Thomas ; HALL, Alexander ; HOFFMANN, Michael ; MIHALÁK, Matúš ; RAM, L. S.: Network Discovery and Verification. In: KRATSCHE, Dieter (Hrsg.): *Graph-Theoretic Concepts in Computer Science*, Springer Berlin Heidelberg, 2005, 127–138
- [CEJO00] CHARTRAND, Gary ; EROH, Linda ; JOHNSON, Mark A. ; OELLERMANN, Ortrud: Resolvability in graphs and the metric dimension of a graph. In: *Discrete Applied Mathematics* 105 (2000), Nr. 1-3, 99–113. [http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0166-218X\(00\)00198-0](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0166-218X(00)00198-0). – DOI 10.1016/S0166-218X(00)00198-0
- [CGH08] CHAPPELL, Glenn G. ; GIMBEL, John G. ; HARTMAN, Chris: Bounds on the metric and partition dimensions of a graph. In: *Ars Combinatoria* 88 (2008)
- [CP06] CRESPELLE, Christophe ; PAUL, Christophe: Fully dynamic recognition algorithm and certificate for directed cographs. In: *Discrete Applied Mathematics* 154 (2006), Nr. 12, S. 1722–1741
- [CPZ00] CHARTRAND, Gary ; POISSON, Christopher ; ZHANG, Ping: Resolvability and the upper dimension of graphs. In: *Computers and Mathematics with Applications* 39 (2000), Nr. 12, S. 19–28
- [CRZK00] CHARTRAND, Gary ; RAINES, Michael ; ZHANG, Ping ; KALAMAZOO: The directed distance dimension of oriented graphs. In: *Mathematica Bohemica* 125 (2000), Nr. 02, 155–168. https://www.emis.de/journals/MB/125.2/mb125_2_5.pdf
- [DPSL12] DÍAZ, Josep ; POTTONEN, Olli ; SERNA, Maria J. ; LEEUWEN, Erik J.: On the Complexity of Metric Dimension. In: *Algorithms - ESA 2012 - 20th Annual European Symposium, Ljubljana, Slovenia, September 10-12, 2012. Proceedings*, 2012, 419–430
- [FGO06] FEHR, Melodie ; GOSSELIN, Shonda ; OELLERMANN, Ortrud R.: The metric dimension of Cayley digraphs. In: *Discrete Mathematics* 306 (2006), Nr. 1, 31–41. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.disc.2005.09.015>. – DOI 10.1016/j.disc.2005.09.015
- [FXW13] FENG, Min ; XU, Min ; WANG, Kaishun: On the metric dimension of line graphs. In: *Discret. Appl. Math.* 161 (2013), Nr. 6, 802–805. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.dam.2012.10.018>. – DOI 10.1016/j.dam.2012.10.018
- [GJ79] GAREY, Michael R. ; JOHNSON, David S.: *Computers and Intractability: A Guide to the Theory of NP-Completeness*. W. H. Freeman, 1979. – ISBN 0-7167-1044-7

- [Hay77] HAYAT, Sakander: Computing distance-based topological descriptors of complex chemical networks: New theoretical techniques. In: *Chemical Physics Letters* 688 (1977), Nr. 1, 51–58. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.cplett.2017.09.055>. – DOI 10.1016/j.cplett.2017.09.055
- [HM76] HARARY, Frank ; MELTER, Robert A.: On the metric dimension of a graph. In: *Ars Combinatoria* 2 (1976), S. 191–195
- [HMP⁺05] HERNANDO, M. C. ; MORA, Mercè ; PELAYO, Ignacio M. ; SEARA, Carlos ; CÁCERES, José ; PUERTAS, María Luz: On the metric dimension of some families of graphs. In: *Electronic Notes in Discrete Mathematics* 22 (2005), 129–133. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.endm.2005.06.023>. – DOI 10.1016/j.endm.2005.06.023
- [HSV12] HAUPTMANN, Mathias ; SCHMIED, Richard ; VIEHMANN, Claus: Approximation complexity of Metric Dimension problem. In: *Journal of Discrete Algorithms* 14 (2012), 214–222. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jda.2011.12.010>. – DOI 10.1016/j.jda.2011.12.010
- [HW12] HOFFMANN, Stefan ; WANKE, Egon: Metric Dimension for Gabriel Unit Disk Graphs Is NP-Complete. In: *Algorithms for Sensor Systems, 8th International Symposium on Algorithms for Sensor Systems, Wireless Ad Hoc Networks and Autonomous Mobile Entities, ALGOSENSORS 2012, Ljubljana, Slovenia, September 13-14, 2012. Revised Selected Papers, 2012*, 90–92
- [IBSS10] ISWADI, H. ; BASKORO, Edy T. ; SALMAN, A.N.M. ; SIMANJUNTAK, Rinovia: The metric dimension of amalgamation of cycles. In: *Far East Journal of Mathematical Sciences (FJMS)* 41 (2010), Nr. 1, S. 19–31
- [KRR96] KHULLER, Samir ; RAGHAVACHARI, Balaaji ; ROSENFELD, Azriel: Landmarks in Graphs. In: *Discrete Applied Mathematics* 70 (1996), Nr. 3, 217–229. [http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/0166-218X\(95\)00106-2](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/0166-218X(95)00106-2). – DOI 10.1016/0166-218X(95)00106-2
- [LA06] LIU, Ke ; ABU-GHAZALEH, Nael B.: Virtual Coordinates with Backtracking for Void Traversal in Geographic Routing. In: *Ad-Hoc, Mobile, and Wireless Networks, 5th International Conference, ADHOC-NOW 2006, Ottawa, Canada, August 17-19, 2006, Proceedings, 2006*, 46–59
- [Loz13] LOZANO, Antoni: Symmetry Breaking in Tournaments. In: *Electron. J. Comb.* 20 (2013), Nr. 1, 69. <http://dx.doi.org/10.37236/3182>. – DOI 10.37236/3182
- [MT84] MELTER, Robert A. ; TOMESCU, Ioan: Metric bases in digital geometry. In: *Computer Vision, Graphics, and Image Processing* 25 (1984), Nr. 1, 113–121. [http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/0734-189X\(84\)90051-3](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/0734-189X(84)90051-3). – DOI 10.1016/0734-189X(84)90051-3
- [RRCM14] RAJAN, Bharati ; RAJASINGH, Indra ; CYNTHIA, Jude A. ; MANUEL, Paul D.: Metric dimension of directed graphs. In: *International Journal of Computer Mathematics* 91 (2014), Nr. 7, 1397–1406. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/00207160.2013.844335>. – DOI 10.1080/00207160.2013.844335
- [Sla75] SLATER, Peter J.: Leaves of trees. In: *Congressum Numerantium* 14 (1975), S. 549–559
- [ST04] SEBÖ, András ; TANNIER, Eric: On Metric Generators of Graphs. In: *Mathematics of Operations Research* 29 (2004), Nr. 2, 383–393. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1287/moor.1030.0070>. – DOI 10.1287/moor.1030.0070
- [SW21] SCHMITZ, Yannick ; WANKE, Egon: On the Strong Metric Dimension of directed co-graphs. In: *CoRR* abs/2111.13054 (2021). <https://arxiv.org/abs/2111.13054>