

LOWER BOUND FOR INDEPENDENCE COVERING IN C_4 -FREE GRAPHS

MICHAEL KUHN*, DANIEL LOKSHTANOV, AND ZACHARY MILLER†

ABSTRACT. An *independent set* in a graph G is a set S of pairwise non-adjacent vertices in G . A family \mathcal{F} of independent sets in G is called a *k -independence covering family* if for every independent set I in G of size at most k , there exists an $S \in \mathcal{F}$ such that $I \subseteq S$. Lokshtanov et al. [ACM Transactions on Algorithms, 2018] showed that graphs of degeneracy d admit k -independence covering families of size $\binom{k(d+1)}{k} \cdot 2^{o(kd)} \cdot \log n$, and used this result to design efficient parameterized algorithms for a number of problems, including STABLE ODD CYCLE TRANSVERSAL and STABLE MULTICUT.

In light of the results of Lokshtanov et al. it is quite natural to ask whether even more general families of graphs admit k -independence covering families of size $f(k)n^{O(1)}$. Graphs that exclude a complete bipartite graph $K_{d+1,d+1}$ with $d+1$ vertices on both sides as a subgraph, called *$K_{d+1,d+1}$ -free graphs*, are a frequently considered generalization of d -degenerate graphs. This motivates the question whether $K_{d,d}$ -free graphs admit k -independence covering families of size $f(k,d)n^{O(1)}$. Our main result is a resounding “no” to this question – specifically we prove that even $K_{2,2}$ -free graphs (or equivalently C_4 -free graphs) do not admit k -independence covering families of size $f(k)n^{\frac{k}{4}-\epsilon}$.

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA SANTA BARBARA, SANTA BARBARA CA 93106

E-mail addresses: mkuhn@ucsb.edu, daniello@ucsb.edu, zmilller@ucsb.edu.

Date: August 29, 2023.

*Thanks to the donors to the Science/Mathematics Summer Undergraduate Research Fellowship Fund at CCS for supporting my 2022 Summer Undergraduate Research Fellowship.

†Thanks to the donors to the Computer Science Endowment at CCS for supporting my 2022 Summer Undergraduate Research Fellowship.

1. INTRODUCTION

An *independent set* in a graph G is a set S of vertices in G such that no two distinct vertices in S are adjacent in G . A family \mathcal{F} of independent sets in G is said to be a *k -independence covering family* if, for every independent set I in G of size at most k , there exists an $S \in \mathcal{F}$ such that I is a subset of S . Every n -vertex graph G has a k -independence covering family of size at most n^k , namely the family of all independent sets of size at most k . Lokshtanov et al. [8] observed that many graphs have substantially smaller k -independence covering families, and that k -independence covering families of sufficiently small size (in particular of size $f(k)n^{O(1)}$) are very useful for designing parameterized algorithms for certain problems, including STABLE s - t -SEPARATOR, STABLE ODD CYCLE TRANSVERSAL and STABLE MULTICUT (we refer to Lokshtanov et al. [8] for the definitions of these problems).

Lokshtanov et al. gave constructions of k -independence covering families of size $\binom{k(d+1)}{k} \cdot 2^{o(kd)} \cdot \log n$ for every d -degenerate graph (a graph G is *d -degenerate* if every induced subgraph of G , including G itself, has a vertex of degree at most d), and of size $f(k)n^\epsilon$ for every $\epsilon > 0$ and every nowhere-dense family of graphs (the definition of nowhere-dense families of graphs is not relevant for this article, so we omit it). These constructions have later been used to design parameterized algorithms for a number of different graph problems [1, 2, 4, 5, 6].

A limiting factor for the applicability of k -independence covering families is that the constructions of Lokshtanov et al. [8] do not work for all graphs, but only for d -degenerate and nowhere dense families of graphs. One might ask whether this limitation is necessary; could it be that every n -vertex graph G has a k -independence covering family of size $f(k)n^{O(1)}$? This question has a simple negative answer – in the disjoint union of k complete graphs on n/k vertices, any k -independence covering family must have size at least $(n/k)^k$.

This motivates the research question of this paper: what is the most general family of graphs in which every graph has a k -independence covering family of size $f(k)n^{O(1)}$? A tempting target is the class of $K_{d,d}$ -free graphs. For every integer $d \geq 1$, $K_{d,d}$ is the complete bipartite graph with d vertices on both sides (i.e, with vertices v_1, \dots, v_{2d} and edge set $\{v_i v_j : i \leq d < j\}$). A graph G is *$K_{d,d}$ -free* if one cannot obtain $K_{d,d}$ from G by deleting vertices and edges.

The reason why studying k -independence covering of $K_{d,d}$ -free graphs is particularly appealing is because both d -degenerate graphs and nowhere dense families of graphs exclude a $K_{d',d'}$ for some d' . Therefore a k -independence covering family of size $f(k)n^{O(1)}$ for $K_{d,d}$ -free graphs would yield a common generalization of the two constructions of Lokshtanov et al. [8] for d -degenerate and nowhere dense families of graphs. Our main result is that, unfortunately, for every function f there exist $K_{d,d}$ -free graphs that do not admit k -independence covering families of size at most $f(k)n^{O(1)}$; this holds for any choice of $d \geq 2$. In fact, we show that a well known example of bipartite $K_{2,2}$ -free graphs (the $K_{2,2}$ is usually referred to as C_4 , the cycle on 4 vertices), namely the point-line incidence graphs of projective planes, do not admit k -independence covering families of size at most $f(k)n^{\frac{k}{4}-\epsilon}$. While the example graph is well known, the proof of the lower bound requires some effort and the application of a fairly recent isoperimetric inequality for such graphs [9]. On the positive side we show that C_4 -free graphs do admit k -independence covering families of size at most $k^{k+O(1)} \cdot n^{k/2+o(k)}$. This bound easily follows from

the fact that C_4 -free graphs are $\lceil \sqrt{n} \rceil$ -degenerate together with the construction of k -independence covering families of Lokshtanov et al [8].

2. LOWER BOUND FOR INDEPENDENCE COVERING IN C_4 -FREE GRAPHS

All graphs considered in this work are simple and undirected. We denote by $V(G)$ and $E(G)$ the set of vertices and edges of G , respectively. The *neighborhood* of a vertex v in a graph G is the set $N(v) = \{u \in V(G) : uv \in E(G)\}$. For a vertex set S the set $N(S)$ is defined as $N(S) = (\bigcup_{u \in S} N(u)) - S$. A graph G is said to be *bipartite* if there exists a partition V_1, V_2 of $V(G)$ such that every edge of G has one endpoint in V_1 and the other in V_2 . The sets V_1 and V_2 are called the *sides* or *bipartitions* of G .

For every prime q we construct a graph Γ_q . The graph can be succinctly described as the Levi graph (i.e point-line incidence graph) of a projective plane of order q (see Section 3 of [3] for a construction of projective planes of order q). In order to keep the presentation self contained we give a full description of the graph here, and neither the construction of Γ_q nor our lower bound on the size of independence covering families require the reader to know projective planes.

The graph Γ_q . For a prime q , let \mathbb{Z}_q be the finite field of order q , i.e. the set of integers $\{0, \dots, q-1\}$ equipped with the $+$ and \cdot operation modulo q . The set P has the following $q^2 + q + 1$ vertices: (i) a vertex $p_{x,y}$ for every pair $(x, y) \in \mathbb{Z}_q \times \mathbb{Z}_q$, (ii) a vertex \hat{p}_a for every element $a \in \mathbb{Z}_q$, and (iii) a vertex \tilde{p} . The set L has the following $q^2 + q + 1$ vertices: (i) a vertex $\ell_{a,b}$ for every pair $(a, b) \in \mathbb{Z}_q \times \mathbb{Z}_q$, (ii) a vertex $\hat{\ell}_x$ for every element $x \in \mathbb{Z}_q$, and (iii) a vertex $\tilde{\ell}$. We describe the set of edges of Γ_q by describing for every vertex of P , the set of its adjacent vertices in L . (i) For each $(x, y) \in \mathbb{Z}_q \times \mathbb{Z}_q$ the vertex $p_{x,y}$ is adjacent to all vertices $\ell_{a,b}$ such that $ax + b \equiv y \pmod{q}$, as well as to $\hat{\ell}_x$. (ii) For each $a \in \mathbb{Z}_q$ the vertex \hat{p}_a is adjacent to all vertices $\ell_{a,b}$ (for all $b \in \mathbb{Z}_q$), as well as to $\tilde{\ell}$. (iii) The vertex \tilde{p} is adjacent to $\hat{\ell}_x$ for every element $x \in \mathbb{Z}_q$, as well as to $\tilde{\ell}$. This concludes the construction of Γ_q .


A way to visualize the graph Γ_q is to draw the vertices $p_{x,y}$ in the Cartesian plane in the coordinates (x, y) . Each vertex $\ell_{a,b}$ corresponds to a line with slope a which passes through the y -axis in the point $(0, b)$ and “wraps around” modulo q . The vertex $p_{x,y}$ is adjacent to $\ell_{a,b}$ if the point lies on the corresponding line. For each $a \in \mathbb{Z}_q$ the vertex \hat{p}_a corresponds to the “point out in infinity” where all the lines with slope a meet. For each $x \in \mathbb{Z}_q$ the vertex $\hat{\ell}_x$ corresponds to the vertical line that pass through the x -axis in $(x, 0)$. The vertex \tilde{p} is the “point out in infinity” where all the vertical lines $\hat{\ell}_x$ meet, and $\tilde{\ell}$ is the “line” that passes through all points out in infinity. The visual for Γ_2 is shown in Figure 1.

We summarize without proof a few properties of the graph Γ_q . These properties can be verified directly from the definition of Γ_q .

Lemma 1. *For every prime q the graph Γ_q satisfies the following properties.*

- (1) Γ_q has $n = 2(q^2 + q + 1)$ vertices.
- (2) For every $p \in P$, $|N(p)| = q + 1$.
- (3) For every pair of distinct vertices p_1, p_2 in P , we have $|N(p_1) \cap N(p_2)| = 1$.
- (4) For every $\ell \in L$, $|N(\ell)| = q + 1$.
- (5) For every pair of distinct vertices ℓ_1, ℓ_2 in L , we have $|N(\ell_1) \cap N(\ell_2)| = 1$.

In the rest of this section we will prove that for every function $f : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$, integer k and $\epsilon > 0$, when q (and therefore n) is sufficiently large compared to k then Γ_q

FIGURE 1. The *fano plane*, Γ_2 .

does not have a k -independence covering family of size $f(k)n^{\frac{k}{4}-\epsilon}$. The fact that Γ_q is bipartite with sides P and L , as well as the properties listed in Lemma 1 are the only properties of Γ_q that we will use in this proof. The fact that Γ_q is C_4 -free follows immediately from Property 3 of Lemma 1.

We say that a graph G is a (η, Δ, λ) -graph if G is a bipartite graph with bipartition (V_1, V_2) with $|V_1| = |V_2| = \eta$, every vertex in G has degree exactly Δ , and for every $i \in \{1, 2\}$ and every pair of distinct vertices in $V_i(G)$ have exactly λ common neighbors. Lemma 1 states precisely that Γ_q is a $(q^2 + q + 1, q + 1, 1)$ -graph. A key ingredient of our proof is the following Lemma by Price et al. [9], which states that in (η, Δ, λ) -graphs where λ is small compared to Δ , every set S of size up to about Δ/λ has a large neighborhood (relative to the size of S).

Lemma 2 ([9]). *For every (η, Δ, λ) -graph G , and a nonempty subset S of $V_1(G)$ or $V_2(G)$ it holds that*

$$\frac{|N(S)|}{|S|} \geq \frac{\Delta^2}{\Delta + \lambda(|S| - 1)}.$$

Applying Lemma 2 to Γ_q immediately yields the following corollary.

Corollary 1. *In Γ_q , every nonempty subset S of P or L satisfies*

$$(1) \quad |N(S)| \geq \frac{(q+1)^2|S|}{q+|S|}.$$

Proof. From Lemma 2 we have that

$$\frac{|N(S)|}{|S|} \geq \frac{(q+1)^2}{(q+1) + (|S|-1)} = \frac{(q+1)^2}{q+|S|}.$$

Multiplying on both sides by $|S|$ proves the statement of the corollary. \square

The main idea of our construction is to use Corollary 1 in order to show that no independent set in Γ_q can have many vertices both in P and in L . This in turn shows that no independent set in Γ_q can contain many independent subsets with $k/2$ vertices in P and $k/2$ vertices in L . For sufficiently small k , a ‘‘large fraction’’ of sets of $k/2$ vertices in P and $k/2$ vertices in L form an independent set, and a simple counting argument then yields the lower bound on the size of k -independence covering families. We start by showing that no independent set in Γ_q can have many vertices both in P and in L .

Lemma 3. *Let I be an independent set in Γ_q , $a = |I \cap P|$ and $b = |I \cap L|$. Then $ab \leq q(q+1)^2 < 2n^{3/2}$.*

Proof. Let $S = I \cap P$ and $T = I \cap L$. Then $a = |S|$, and we have that

$$\begin{aligned} b &\leq |V_2(\Gamma_q)| - |N(S)| && \text{since } I \text{ is independent} \\ &\leq ((q+1)^2 - q) - \frac{(q+1)^2 a}{q+a} && \text{by Corollary 1} \\ &= \frac{q(q+1)^2 - q(q+a)}{q+a} \\ &\leq \frac{q(q+1)^2}{a}. \end{aligned}$$

Multiplying both sides by a yields $ab \leq q(q+1)^2 = q(n+q)$. Now $q < \sqrt{n} < n$, hence the bound can be simplified to $q(n+q) < \sqrt{n}(n+q) < 2n^{3/2}$, proving the statement of the lemma. \square

Corollary 2. *Let I be an independent set in Γ_q and k be an even integer. Then there are at most $2^{k/2} n^{3k/4}$ distinct vertex sets $Z \subseteq I$ such that $|Z \cap P| = |Z \cap L| = k/2$.*

Proof. Let $a = |I \cap P|$ and $b = |I \cap L|$. If $\min(a, b) < k/2$ there are no choices for Z and so the statement of the corollary follows. If $\min(a, b) \geq k/2$ there are

$$\binom{a}{k/2} \binom{b}{k/2} \leq (ab)^{k/2} < (2n^{3/2})^{k/2}$$

choices for Z , and the statement follows. Here the last inequality follows from Lemma 3. \square

Corollary 2 implies that in a k -independence covering family \mathcal{F} of Γ_q each set $I \in \mathcal{F}$ contains no more than $2^{k/2} n^{3k/4}$ independent sets that have $k/2$ vertices both in P and in L . We now show that the number of such independent sets in Γ_q is much larger, in particular quite close to n^k . This immediately implies a lower bound on $|\mathcal{F}|$ of about $n^{k/4}$.

Lemma 4. *Let $k \leq q$ be an even integer. The number of independent sets Z in Γ_q such that $|Z \cap P| = |Z \cap L| = k/2$ is at least $\left(\frac{n}{4k}\right)^k$.*

Proof. There are $\binom{|P|}{k/2} = \binom{n/2}{k/2}$ choices for $Z \cap P$. Since every vertex in Γ_q has degree $q + 1$ and $k \leq q$ we have that every choice of $Z \cap P$ satisfies

$$|N(Z \cap P)| \leq (q + 1) \frac{k}{2} \leq \frac{q^2 + q}{2} < \frac{n}{4}.$$

Hence, for each choice of $Z \cap P$ there are at least $\binom{n/4}{k/2}$ choices for $Z \cap L$. Therefore there are at least $\binom{n/2}{k/2} \binom{n/4}{k/2}$ distinct choices for Z . Now,

$$\binom{n/2}{k/2} \binom{n/4}{k/2} > \binom{n/4}{k/2}^2 > \left(\frac{(n/4 - k/2)^{\frac{k}{2}}}{(k/2)^{\frac{k}{2}}} \right)^2 = \left(\frac{n/2 - k}{k} \right)^k > \left(\frac{n}{4k} \right)^k.$$

Here the last transition holds because $k \leq q < n/4$. □

We are now ready to lower bound the size of k -independence covering families of Γ_q .

Theorem 1. *Let $k \leq q$ be an even integer and \mathcal{F} be a k -independence covering family of Γ_q . Then $|\mathcal{F}| \geq \frac{n^{k/4}}{(4\sqrt{2}k)^k}$.*

Proof. By Lemma 4 there are at least $\left(\frac{n}{4k}\right)^k$ independent sets Z of size k in Γ_q such that $|Z \cap P| = |Z \cap L| = k/2$. For each such Z there exists an $I \in \mathcal{F}$ such that $Z \subseteq I$. However, by Corollary 2 there are no more than $2^{k/2} n^{3k/4}$ distinct vertex sets $Z \subseteq I$ such that $|Z \cap P| = |Z \cap L| = k/2$. Thus,

$$|\mathcal{F}| \geq \frac{\left(\frac{n}{4k}\right)^k}{2^{k/2} n^{3k/4}} = \frac{n^{k/4}}{(4\sqrt{2}k)^k}.$$

□

Since k can be chosen arbitrarily small compared to q (and therefore n) in the statement of Theorem 1, this rules out the possibility of k -independence covering families of size $f(k)n^{\frac{k}{4}-\epsilon}$ for C_4 -free graphs. Indeed, for a given function $f : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$, integer k and $\epsilon > 0$ we choose a prime q such that $k < q$ and $n^\epsilon > f(k)(4\sqrt{2}k)^k$. Then Theorem 1 yields that the size of any k -independence covering family for Γ_q must be at least $\frac{n^{k/4}}{(4\sqrt{2}k)^k}$, which is strictly more than $f(k)n^{\frac{k}{4}-\epsilon}$.

3. UPPER BOUND FOR INDEPENDENCE COVERING ON C_4 -FREE GRAPHS

We now show that C_4 -free graphs admit an independence-covering lemma which is slightly better than naively iterating over all independent sets of size k . Our result follows directly by combining the independence-covering lemma for d -degenerate graphs of Loksthanov et al. [8] with a classic degeneracy bound for C_4 -free graphs. We start with the degeneracy bound. The proof closely follows an upper bound on the number of edges in d -degenerate graphs attributed to Rieman (see [7]).

Lemma 5. *Every C_4 -free graph G is $\lceil \sqrt{n} \rceil$ -degenerate.*

Proof. Since every subgraph of a C_4 -free graph is C_4 -free it suffices to show that every C_4 -free graph has a vertex of degree at most $\lceil \sqrt{n} \rceil$. Suppose not, and define for every vertex v in G the set E_v to be the set of unordered pairs xy of distinct vertices in $N(v)$. For every $v \in V(G)$ we have $|E_v| = \binom{|N(v)|}{2} \geq n/2$. Since the number of

distinct unordered pairs of vertices in G is $n(n-1)/2 < n^2/2 \leq \sum_{v \in V(G)} |E_v|$ the pigeon hole principle yields that there exists a pair xy and vertices u, v such that $xy \in E_u \cap E_v$. But then u, x, v, y is a cycle on 4 vertices in G , contradicting that G is C_4 -free. \square

We now re-state Lemma 3.2 of Lokshtanov et al. [8]. The upper bounds stated here are slightly less sharp than they are in [8] because we will only need to apply the lemma with $d = \lceil \sqrt{n} \rceil$.

Lemma 6 (Lemma 3.2 of [8]). *There is an algorithm that given a d -degenerate n -vertex graph G and $k \in \mathbb{N}$, runs in time $\binom{k(d+1)}{k}^{1+o(1)} n^{O(1)}$ and outputs a k -independence covering family for G of size at most $\binom{k(d+1)}{k}^{1+o(1)} k(d+1) \log n$.*

Since C_4 -free graphs are $\lceil \sqrt{n} \rceil$ -degenerate (by Lemma 5), Lemma 6 with $d = \lceil \sqrt{n} \rceil$ immediately implies the following independence covering lemma for C_4 -free graphs.

Lemma 7. *There is an algorithm that given an n -vertex C_4 -free graph G and $k \in \mathbb{N}$, runs in time $k^{k+O(1)} \cdot n^{k/2+o(k)}$ and outputs a k -independence covering family for G of size at most $k^{k+O(1)} \cdot n^{k/2+o(k)}$.*

4. CONCLUSION

We showed that C_4 -free graphs do not admit k -independence covering families of size $f(k)n^{k\frac{1-\epsilon}{4}}$ for any function f . We remark that this lower bound holds not only against independence covering families, but also against randomized independence covering lemmas on the form of Lemma 1 of Lokshtanov et al. [8]. In particular, there cannot exist a probability distribution on the independent sets of Γ_q such that for every independent set Z of size at most k the probability that the sampled independent set I contains Z is at least $(f(k)n^{k\frac{1-\epsilon}{4}})^{-1}$. Indeed, sampling $(f(k)n^{k\frac{1-\epsilon}{4}}) \cdot O(k \log n)$ independent sets from such a distribution would produce with non-zero probability a k -independence covering family for Γ_q , contradicting Theorem 1.

Our work leaves a gap between the $n^{k/4}$ lower bound and the $n^{k/2}$ upper bound for the size of k -independence covering families of C_4 -free graphs, and closing this gap might be interesting. Perhaps more interesting is to obtain a more complete understanding of which graph families aside from d -degenerate and nowhere dense admit k -independence covering families of size $f(k)n^{O(1)}$.

REFERENCES

- [1] Akanksha Agrawal, Soumita Hait, and Amer E. Mouawad. On finding short reconfiguration sequences between independent sets. In Sang Won Bae and Heejin Park, editors, *33rd International Symposium on Algorithms and Computation, ISAAC 2022, December 19-21, 2022, Seoul, Korea*, volume 248 of *LIPICs*, pages 39:1–39:14, 2022.
- [2] Akanksha Agrawal, Pallavi Jain, Lawqueen Kanesh, and Saket Saurabh. Parameterized complexity of conflict-free matchings and paths. *Algorithmica*, 82(7):1939–1965, 2020.
- [3] John C. Baez. The octonions. *Bulletin of the American Mathematical Society*, 39(2):145–205, 2001.
- [4] Michael R. Fellows, Mario Grobler, Nicole Megow, Amer E. Mouawad, Vijayaragunathan Ramamoorthi, Frances A. Rosamond, Daniel Schmand, and Sebastian Siebertz. On solution discovery via reconfiguration. *CoRR*, abs/2304.14295, 2023.
- [5] Ashwin Jacob, Diptapriyo Majumdar, and Venkatesh Raman. Parameterized complexity of conflict-free set cover. *Theory Comput. Syst.*, 65(3):515–540, 2021.
- [6] Pallavi Jain, Lawqueen Kanesh, and Pranabendu Misra. Conflict free version of covering problems on graphs: Classical and parameterized. *Theory Comput. Syst.*, 64(6):1067–1093, 2020.
- [7] Stasys Jukna. *Extremal Combinatorics*. Springer Berlin, Heidelberg, 2011.
- [8] Daniel Lokshtanov, Fahad Panolan, Saket Saurabh, Roohani Sharma, and Meirav Zehavi. Covering small independent sets and separators with applications to parameterized algorithms. *ACM Trans. Algorithms*, 16(3), 2020.
- [9] Andrew Elvey Price, Muhammad Adib Surani, and Sanming Zhou. The isoperimetric number of the incidence graph of $PG(n,q)$. *The Electronic Journal of Combinatorics*, 2018.