
The Computational Complexity of Concise Hypersphere Classification

Eduard Eiben¹ Robert Ganian² Iyad Kanj³ Sebastian Ordyniak⁴ Stefan Szeider²

Abstract

Hypersphere classification is a classical and foundational method that can provide easy-to-process explanations for the classification of real-valued and binary data. However, obtaining an (ideally concise) explanation via hypersphere classification is much more difficult when dealing with binary data than real-valued data. In this paper, we perform the first complexity-theoretic study of the hypersphere classification problem for binary data. We use the fine-grained parameterized complexity paradigm to analyze the impact of structural properties that may be present in the input data as well as potential conciseness constraints. Our results include stronger lower bounds and new fixed-parameter algorithms for hypersphere classification of binary data, which can find an exact and concise explanation when one exists.

1. Introduction

With the rapid advancement of Machine Learning (ML) models to automate decisions, there has been increasing interest in explainable Artificial Intelligence (XAI), where the ML models can explain their decisions in a way humans understand. This has led to the reexamination of ML models that are implicitly easy to explain and interpret with a particular focus on the conciseness of explanations (Doshi-Velez & Kim, 2017; Lipton, 2018; Monroe, 2018; Ribeiro et al., 2018; Shih et al., 2018; Barceló et al., 2020; Chalasani et al., 2020; Darwiche & Hirth, 2020; Blanc et al., 2021; Ignatiev et al., 2021; Wäldchen et al., 2021; Izza et al., 2022).

In this article, we consider a simple classification task—one of the cornerstones of machine learning—

from the viewpoint of XAI. However, unlike previous works on explainability, which have typically targeted questions such as identifying a suitable interpretable model for (area-specific) classification (Nori et al., 2021; Shih et al., 2021; Wang et al., 2021) or measuring the accuracy cost of explainability (Laber & Murtinho, 2021; Makarychev & Shan, 2021), the goal of this work is to obtain a comprehensive understanding of the computational complexity of performing binary classification via one of the most fundamental interpretable models.

Consider a set M of either real-valued or binary training feature points, each represented as a d -dimensional feature vector over $[0, 1]$ or $\{0, 1\}$ and labeled as either “blue” (the set V_B) or “red” (the set V_R). There is, by now, a broad set of more or less opaque classifiers capable of using such a training set to classify unlabeled data, where the suitability of each method depends on the data domain and context; moreover, some classifiers are tailored to real-valued data, while others are designed for binary (or, more generally, categorical) data. In this paper, we consider one of the two arguably simplest—and hence easiest to explain and visualize—types of classifiers, which can be used in both data settings: a hypersphere. More formally, the explanations we consider consist of a cluster center \vec{c} (an element of $[0, 1]^d$ or $\{0, 1\}^d$) and distance ℓ such that each feature vector is at a distance at most ℓ from \vec{c} if and only if it is blue.

The reason for studying the complexity of hypersphere classification does not stem purely from the problem’s connection to explainability. Together with classification by a separating hyperplane, hypersphere classification represents one of the most classic explanatory examples of classifiers (see (Cooper, 1962; Wang et al., 2007; 2005) to name a few) which have been extensively studied from both the computational geometry and the machine learning perspectives (Astorino et al., 2016; Astorino & Gaudioso, 2009; Cooper, 1962; Wang et al., 2007; 2005; O’Rourke et al., 1986; Agarwal et al., 2006; Hurtado et al., 2003). Moreover, hypersphere classification is of special importance in one-class classification due to the inherent asymmetry of the provided explanations (Kim et al., 2021). While hyperplane separation can be encoded as a linear program and hence is easily polynomial-time solvable for real-valued and binary data, the computational complexity of hyper-

^{*}Equal contribution ¹Royal Holloway, University of London, UK. ²Algorithms and Complexity Group, TU Wien, Austria. ³DePaul University, USA. ⁴University of Leeds, UK. Correspondence to: Eduard Eiben <eduard.eiben@rhul.ac.uk>, Robert Ganian <rganian@gmail.com>, Iyad Kanj <ikanj@depaul.edu>, Sebastian Ordyniak <sordyniak@gmail.com>, Stefan Szeider <sz@ac.tuwien.ac.at>.

sphere classification is far less obvious and has so far remained surprisingly unexplored.

This apparent gap contrasts the situation for several other computational problems arising in the area of machine learning, which have already been targeted by detailed complexity-theoretic studies (Ordyniak & Szeider, 2013; Ganian et al., 2018; Simonov et al., 2019; Dahiya et al., 2021; Ganian & Korchemna, 2021; Ganian et al., 2022; Grüttemeier & Komusiewicz, 2022), carried out using the classical as well as the parameterized-complexity paradigms. In this article, we close the gap by laying bare a detailed map of the problem’s computational complexity via the design of novel theoretical algorithms as well as accompanying computational lower bounds.

Contributions. We begin by observing that the hypersphere classification problem is polynomial-time solvable when the input data is real-valued; in particular, this case can be handled via a more sophisticated linear programming encoding than the one used for the classical hyperplane separation problem. However, this approach completely fails when dealing with binary data, warranting a more careful complexity-theoretic study of this case. Our first result shows that hypersphere classification of binary data is not only NP-hard in general but remains NP-hard even when there are only two red vectors. We also obtain an analogous hardness result for instances with two blue vectors.

The fact that the problem’s complexity differs between real-valued and categorical data is already interesting. However, the NP-hardness of the latter case does not preclude the existence of efficient algorithms that can solve the problem under additional natural restrictions. Indeed, one of the central themes in modern complexity-theoretic research is the identification of the exact boundaries of tractability. This is frequently achieved through the lens of the *parameterized complexity* paradigm (Downey & Fellows, 2013; Cygan et al., 2015), where we associate each problem instance \mathcal{I} with an integer parameter k (often capturing a certain structural property of the instance) and ask whether the problem of interest can be solved by a “fixed-parameter” algorithm, that is, by an algorithm with runtime of the form $f(k) \cdot |\mathcal{I}|^{\mathcal{O}(1)}$ for some computable function f . This gives rise to a strong form of computational tractability called *fixed-parameter tractability* (FPT).

In the case of our problem of interest, it is easy to observe that hypersphere classification of binary data is fixed-parameter tractable when parameterized by the data dimension d (since the number of possible centers is upper-bounded by 2^d). Moreover, we show that the problem also admits a fixed-parameter algorithm when parameterized by the total number of feature points via a combinatorial reduction to a known tractable fragment of In-

teger Linear Programming. While these are important pieces of the complexity-theoretic landscape of hypersphere classification, these two initial results are somewhat unsatisfying on their own because (1) they rely on highly restrictive parameterizations, and (2) they ignore a central aspect of explainability, which is *conciseness* or *succinctness* (Ribeiro et al., 2018; Shih et al., 2018; Blanc et al., 2021; Wäldchen et al., 2021; Chalasani et al., 2020; Izza et al., 2022; Ordyniak et al., 2023).

A natural measure of conciseness in our setting is the number of “1” coordinates in a vector; indeed, any explanation produced by a classifier will likely end up ignored by users if such an explanation is incomprehensibly long, relying on too many features. At the same time, depending on the source of the input data, we may often deal with feature vectors that are already concise. Having concise feature vectors does not necessarily guarantee the existence of a concise center (and vice-versa, concise centers may exist for non-concise data); however, at least one of the two independent measures of conciseness can be expected (or even required) to be small in a variety of settings, making them natural choices for parameters in our analysis. In the second part of the article, we show that these two conciseness parameters—a bound econ on the conciseness of the sought-after explanation and a bound dcon on the conciseness of all feature vectors in the training data—can be algorithmically exploited to cope with the NP-hardness of the hypersphere classification problem for binary data.

Toward understanding the complexity of hypersphere classification of binary data through the perspective of conciseness constraints, we begin by considering restrictions on the data conciseness dcon . We obtain a tight classification by showing that the problem is polynomial-time tractable when $\text{dcon} \leq 3$ via a reduction to a tractable fragment of the constraint satisfaction problem and NP-hard otherwise. Moreover, we obtain fixed-parameter algorithms parameterized by dcon plus the number of red or blue points, circumventing the earlier NP-hardness results. When considering the explanation conciseness, we show that hypersphere classification is XP-tractable when parameterized by econ and at the same time provide evidence excluding fixed-parameter tractability even parameterized by econ together with the number of red or blue points. Finally, we obtain a linear-time fixed-parameter algorithm for the problem parameterized by $\text{econ} + \text{dcon}$.

While this settles the complexity of binary-data hypersphere classification from the perspective of conciseness measures, the obtained lower bounds imply that neither measure of conciseness (i.e., neither econ nor dcon) suffices to achieve fixed-parameter tractability on its own. As our final contribution, we consider whether achieving tractability for the problem is possible by exploiting a suitable struc-

Structure	Conciseness			
	\emptyset	econ	dcon	econ + dcon
\emptyset	NP-h (Thm 6)	XP (Obs 13), W[2]-h (Thm 14)	NP-h $_{\geq 4}$ (Thm 10)	FPT (Thm 16)
$ V_R $	NP-h $_{\geq 2}$ (Thm 6)	XP (Obs 13), W[2]-h (Thm 14)	FPT (Thm 12)	FPT (Thm 12)
$ V_B $	NP-h $_{\geq 2}$ (Thm 6)	XP (Obs 13), W[1]-h (Thm 15)	FPT (Thm 12)	FPT (Thm 12)
$ V_R \cup V_B $	FPT (Thm 8)	FPT (Thm 8)	FPT (Thm 8)	FPT (Thm 8)
d	FPT (trivial)	FPT (trivial)	FPT (trivial)	FPT (trivial)
tw	XP (Cor 23)	FPT (Cor 24)	FPT (Cor 25)	FPT (Cor 24)

Table 1. The complexity landscape of hypersphere classification with respect to combinations of structural and conciseness parameters: V_R and V_B are the sets of red and blue points, respectively; d is the dimension; tw is the incidence treewidth of the data representation; econ is the conciseness of the explanation, and dcon is the data conciseness. NP-h $_{\geq i}$ means that the problem becomes NP-hard for parameter values of at least i , while W[j]-h means that the problem is hard for the complexity class W[j] and hence is unlikely to be fixed-parameter tractable (Downey & Fellows, 2013).

tural measure of the input data. In particular, following recent successes in closely related areas such as clustering and data completion (Ganian et al., 2022; 2018), we consider the *incidence treewidth* tw of the data representation. Using a non-trivial dynamic programming procedure, we obtain a fixed-parameter algorithm for binary-data hypersphere classification parameterized by either tw + econ or tw + dcon; in other words, each of the two notions of conciseness suffices for tractability of hypersphere clustering for data that is “well-structured,” in the sense of having small incidence treewidth. Moreover, as a byproduct of our algorithm, we also obtain the XP-tractability of binary-data hypersphere classification parameterized by tw alone.

A summary of our results is provided in Table 1.

Related Work.

While there is, to the best of our knowledge, no prior work targeting the complexity of hypersphere classification of binary data, there is a significant work on the real-valued variant of the problem by the machine learning community (Cooper, 1962; Wang et al., 2007; 2005; Astorino & Gaudioso, 2009; Astorino et al., 2016), where they studied the optimization version of the problem in which one seeks the smallest bounding sphere that separates the blue points from the red ones. Our results extend to the optimization version of the problem for binary data, as mentioned in Section 7. Many of the above works consider relaxations of the real-valued optimization problem, in which the sphere sought is not of minimum radius (Wang et al., 2007; 2005; Astorino & Gaudioso, 2009; Astorino et al., 2016)—allowing for error or for outliers—and reduce the problem to some fragment of quadratic programming. We point out that the problem is also related to that of finding a minimum bounding sphere to distinguish/discriminate a set of objects (i.e., one-class classification) (Tax & Duin, 1999), which is, in turn, inspired by the Support Vector Machine models introduced in (Vapnik, 1995).

The hypersphere classification of real-valued low-dimensional data has also been studied in the context of point separability within the field of computational geometry. In particular, the separability of two sets of points in \mathbb{R}^2 by a circle was studied by O’Rourke, Kosaraju and Megiddo (1986), who established the linear-time tractability of that case. They also observed that their result could be lifted to an $\mathcal{O}(n^d)$ -time algorithm for the separability of n d -dimensional data points by a hypersphere; however this is superseded by the $n^{\mathcal{O}(1)}$ -time algorithm observed in Proposition 1, which runs in polynomial time even for unbounded values of d . Several authors also studied related point-separation problems in \mathbb{R}^2 and \mathbb{R}^3 , such as separability of points via polyhedra (Megiddo, 1988), L-shapes (Sheikhi et al., 2015) and a variety of other objects (Agarwal et al., 2006; Alegría et al., 2022).

2. Preliminaries

For $\ell \in \mathbb{N}$, we write $[\ell]$ for $\{1, \dots, \ell\}$. For convenience, we identify each vector $\vec{v} = (v_1, \dots, v_d)$ with the point (v_1, \dots, v_d) in d -dimensional space.

Problem Definition and Terminology. For two vectors $\vec{a}, \vec{b} \in \{0, 1\}^d$, we denote by $\delta(\vec{a}, \vec{b})$ the Hamming distance between \vec{a} and \vec{b} . For a vector $\vec{v} \in \{0, 1\}^d$ and $r \in \mathbb{N}$, denote by $B(\vec{v}, r)$ the hypersphere (i.e., ball) centered at \vec{v} and of radius r ; that is, the set of all vectors $\vec{x} \in \{0, 1\}^d$ satisfying $\delta(\vec{v}, \vec{x}) \leq r$. Similarly, for vectors over $[0, 1]^d$ we denote by $B(\vec{v}, r)$ the hypersphere (i.e., ball) centered at \vec{v} and of radius r with respect to the Euclidean distance in \mathbb{R}^d .

The problem under consideration in this paper is defined as follows:

BINARY HYPERSPHERE CLASSIFICATION (BHC)

Input: A set $V = V_R \cup V_B$ of d -dimensional vectors over the binary domain $D = \{0, 1\}$, where $V_R \cap V_B = \emptyset$.

Question: Is there a vector $\vec{c} \in D^d$ and $r \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $V_B \subseteq B(\vec{c}, r)$ and $V_R \cap B(\vec{c}, r) = \emptyset$?

Throughout the paper, we will refer to the vectors in V_R as “red” and those in V_B as “blue”. We also denote by $\mathbf{1}(\vec{v})$ the set of all coordinates i such that $\vec{v}[i] = 1$ and we write $\text{con}(\vec{v})$ for the *conciseness* of \vec{v} , i.e., $\text{con}(\vec{v}) = |\mathbf{1}(\vec{v})|$. Moreover, observe that the Hamming distance $\delta(\vec{v}, \vec{c})$ of two vectors \vec{v} and \vec{c} can be written as $\delta(\vec{v}, \vec{c}) = |\mathbf{1}(\vec{c})| + |\mathbf{1}(\vec{v})| - 2|\mathbf{1}(\vec{v}) \cap \mathbf{1}(\vec{c})|$.

Naturally, one may also consider the analogous problem of REAL-VALUED HYPERSPHERE CLASSIFICATION, where the only distinction is that the domain is $[0, 1]$ instead of $\{0, 1\}$. As mentioned in the introduction, this problem can be shown to be polynomial-time solvable and hence is not considered further in our complexity-theoretic analysis.

Proposition 1. REAL-VALUED HYPERSPHERE CLASSIFICATION can be solved in polynomial time.

Proof. We give a reduction to LINEAR PROGRAMMING, i.e., the task of finding a solution to a set of linear inequalities. We construct a variable x_i for each of the dimensions $i \in [d]$ which will capture the coordinates of a hypothetical center \vec{c} . For each pair of vectors $\vec{r} \in V_R$ and $\vec{b} \in V_B$, we introduce a constraint which ensures that c will be closer to the latter than the former. Note that every \vec{c} satisfying this property (for all pairs of blue and red vectors) can serve as a center for a hypersphere containing only blue vectors—one can simply set the radius to the maximum distance of a blue vector from \vec{c} .

To define this constraint, we observe that the distance between \vec{c} and \vec{r} is precisely equal to $\sqrt{\sum_{i \in [d]} (\vec{r}[i] - x_i)^2}$, and similarly for \vec{b} . Hence, we need a constraint ensuring that

$$\sqrt{\sum_{i \in [d]} (\vec{r}[i] - x_i)^2} > \sqrt{\sum_{i \in [d]} (\vec{b}[i] - x_i)^2},$$

which can be equivalently reduced to

$$\sum_{i \in [d]} (\vec{r}[i] - x_i)^2 > \sum_{i \in [d]} (\vec{b}[i] - x_i)^2.$$

Since the quadratic terms of the x_i variable are the same on both sides, the inequality can be simplified by removing them completely.

$$\sum_{i \in [d]} \vec{r}[i]^2 - \vec{b}[i]^2 > \sum_{i \in [d]} 2(\vec{r}[i] - \vec{b}[i])x_i.$$

Hence, each constraint can be stipulated by adding a linear inequality into the linear program. The claim then follows by the well-known polynomial-time tractability of LINEAR PROGRAMMING. \square

Parameterized Complexity. In parameterized complexity (Flum & Grohe, 2006; Downey & Fellows, 2013; Cygan et al., 2015), the complexity of a problem is studied not only with respect to the input size, but also with respect to some problem parameter(s). The core idea behind parameterized complexity is that the combinatorial explosion resulting from the NP-hardness of a problem can sometimes be confined to certain structural parameters that are small in practical settings. We now proceed to the formal definitions.

A *parameterized problem* Q is a subset of $\Omega^* \times \mathbb{N}$, where Ω is a fixed alphabet. Each instance of Q is a pair (I, κ) , where $\kappa \in \mathbb{N}$ is called the *parameter*. A parameterized problem Q is *fixed-parameter tractable* (FPT) (Flum & Grohe, 2006; Downey & Fellows, 2013; Cygan et al., 2015), if there is an algorithm, called an *FPT-algorithm*, that decides whether an input (I, κ) is a member of Q in time $f(\kappa) \cdot |I|^{\mathcal{O}(1)}$, where f is a computable function and $|I|$ is the input instance size. The class FPT denotes the class of all fixed-parameter tractable parameterized problems.

A parameterized problem Q is *FPT-reducible* to a parameterized problem Q' if there is an algorithm, called an *FPT-reduction*, that transforms each instance (I, κ) of Q into an instance (I', κ') of Q' in time $f(\kappa) \cdot |I|^{\mathcal{O}(1)}$, such that $\kappa' \leq g(\kappa)$ and $(I, \kappa) \in Q$ if and only if $(I', \kappa') \in Q'$, where f and g are computable functions. By *FPT-time*, we denote time of the form $f(\kappa) \cdot |I|^{\mathcal{O}(1)}$, where f is a computable function. Based on the notion of FPT-reducibility, a hierarchy of parameterized complexity, *the W-hierarchy* $= \bigcup_{t \geq 0} W[t]$, where $W[t] \subseteq W[t+1]$ for all $t \geq 0$, has been introduced, in which the 0-th level $W[0]$ is the class FPT. The notions of hardness and completeness have been defined for each level $W[i]$ of the W-hierarchy for $i \geq 1$ (Downey & Fellows, 2013; Cygan et al., 2015). It is commonly believed that $W[1] \neq \text{FPT}$ (see (Downey & Fellows, 2013; Cygan et al., 2015)). The $W[1]$ -hardness has served as the main working hypothesis of fixed-parameter intractability. The class XP contains parameterized problems that can be solved in time $\mathcal{O}(|I|^{f(\kappa)})$, where f is a computable function; it contains the class $W[t]$, for $t \geq 0$, and every problem in XP is polynomial-time solvable when the parameters are bounded by a constant. The class paraNP is the class of parameterized problems that can be solved

by non-deterministic algorithms in time $f(\kappa) \cdot |I|^{\mathcal{O}(1)}$, where f is a computable function. A problem is *paraNP-hard* if it is NP-hard for a constant value of the parameter (Flum & Grohe, 2006).

Treewidth. A nice tree-decomposition \mathcal{T} of a graph $G = (V, E)$ is a pair (T, χ) , where T is a tree (whose vertices are called *nodes*) rooted at a node t_r and χ is a function that assigns each node t a set $\chi(t) \subseteq V$ such that the following hold:

- For every $uv \in E$ there is a node t such that $u, v \in \chi(t)$.
- For every vertex $v \in V$, the set of nodes t satisfying $v \in \chi(t)$ forms a subtree of T .
- $|\chi(\ell)| = 0$ for every leaf ℓ of T and $|\chi(t_r)| = 0$.
- There are only three kinds of non-leaf nodes in T :
 - **Introduce node:** a node t with exactly one child t' such that $\chi(t) = \chi(t') \cup \{v\}$ for some vertex $v \notin \chi(t')$.
 - **Forget node:** a node t with exactly one child t' such that $\chi(t) = \chi(t') \setminus \{v\}$ for some vertex $v \in \chi(t')$.
 - **Join node:** a node t with two children t_1, t_2 such that $\chi(t) = \chi(t_1) = \chi(t_2)$.

The *width* of a nice tree-decomposition (T, χ) is the size of a largest set $\chi(t)$ minus 1, and the *treewidth* of the graph G , denoted $\text{tw}(G)$, is the minimum width of a nice tree-decomposition of G .

We let T_t denote the subtree of T rooted at a node t , and use $\chi(T_t)$ to denote the set $\bigcup_{t' \in V(T_t)} \chi(t')$ and G_t to denote the graph $G[\chi(T_t)]$ induced by the vertices in $\chi(T_t)$. Efficient fixed-parameter algorithms are known for computing a nice tree-decomposition of near-optimal width:

Proposition 2 (Kloks 1994; Korhonen 2021). *There exists an algorithm which, given an n -vertex graph G and an integer k , in time $2^{\mathcal{O}(k)} \cdot n$ either outputs a nice tree-decomposition of G of width at most $2k+1$ and $\mathcal{O}(n)$ nodes, or determines that $\text{tw}(G) > k$.*

Constraint Satisfaction Problems. Let $D = \{0, 1\}$ and let n an integer. An n -ary relation on D is a subset of D^n . An instance I of a *Boolean constraint satisfaction problem* (CSP) is a pair (V, C) , where V is a finite set of variables and C is a set of constraints. A constraint $c \in C$ consists of a *scope*, denoted by $V(c)$, which is an ordered list of a subset of V , and a *relation*, denoted by $R(c)$, which is a $|V(c)|$ -ary relation on D ; $|V(c)|$ is the *arity* of c . To simplify notation, we sometimes treat ordered lists without repetitions, such as the scope of a constraint, like sets. For a variable $v \in V(c)$ and a tuple $t \in R(c)$, we denote by $t[v]$, the i -th entry of t , where i is the position of v in $V(c)$.

A *solution* to a CSP instance $I = (V, C)$ is a mapping $\tau : V \rightarrow D$ such that $\langle \tau(v_1), \dots, \tau(v_{|V(c)|}) \rangle \in R(c)$ for every $c \in C$ with $V(c) = \langle v_1, \dots, v_{|V(c)|} \rangle$. A CSP instance is *satisfiable* if and only if it has at least one solution.

A *constraint language* Γ over D is a set of relations over D . \mathcal{C}_Γ denotes the class of CSP instances I with the property that for each $c \in C(I)$ we have $R(c) \in \Gamma$. $\text{CSP}(\Gamma)$ refers to the CSP with instances restricted to \mathcal{C}_Γ . A constraint language Γ is *tractable* if $\text{CSP}(\Gamma)$ can be solved in polynomial time.

Given a k -ary relation R over D and a function $\phi : D^n \rightarrow D$, we say that R is *closed under* ϕ , if for all collections of n tuples t_1, \dots, t_n from R , the tuple $\langle \phi(t_1[1], \dots, t_n[1]), \dots, \phi(t_1[k], \dots, t_n[k]) \rangle$ belongs to R . The function ϕ is also said to be a *polymorphism of* R . We say that a constraint language Γ is *closed under* ϕ (or equivalently that ϕ is a *polymorphism for* Γ) if all relations in R are closed under ϕ . Similarly, we say that a CSP instance $I = (V, C)$ is *closed under* ϕ if $R(c)$ is closed under ϕ for every constraint $c \in C$.

We need the following well-known (types) of operations:

- An operation $\phi : D \rightarrow D$ is *constant* if there is a $d \in D$ such that for every $d' \in D$, it holds that $\phi(d') = d$.
- An operation $\phi : D^2 \rightarrow D$ is a *AND/OR* operation if there is an ordering of the elements of D such that for every $d, d' \in D$, it holds that $\phi(d, d') = \phi(d', d) = \min\{d, d'\}$ or $\phi(d, d') = \phi(d', d) = \max\{d, d'\}$, respectively.
- An operation $\phi : D^3 \rightarrow D$ is a *majority* operation if for every $d, d' \in D$ it holds that $\phi(d, d, d') = \phi(d, d', d) = \phi(d', d, d) = d$.
- An operation $\phi : D^3 \rightarrow D$ is a *minority* operation if for every $d, d' \in D$ it holds that $\phi(d, d, d') = \phi(d, d', d) = \phi(d', d, d) = d'$.

The following is commonly known as Schaefer's dichotomy theorem:

Theorem 3 (Schaefer 1978; Chen 2009). *Let Γ be a finite constraint language over D . Then, $\text{CSP}(\Gamma)$ is tractable in polynomial-time if Γ is closed under any of the following (types) of operations: (1) a constant operation, (2) an AND or an OR operation, (3) a majority operation, or (4) a minority operation. Otherwise, $\text{CSP}(\Gamma)$ is NP-complete.*

We will later use reductions to Boolean CSP instances that are closed under a majority operation. It is easy to see that there is only one majority operation defined on the Boolean domain, which we will refer to from here onwards as the Boolean majority operation.

The following proposition provides the exact run-time to solve any Boolean CSP instance that is closed under the unique Boolean majority operation. The proposition follows because as observed in (Jeavons et al., 1997) any such CSP is equivalent to an instance of 2-Satisfiability, i.e., deciding the satisfiability of a propositional formula in 2-CNF, together with the fact that 2-Satisfiability can be solved in linear-time (Aspvall et al., 1979).

Proposition 4 (Jeavons et al. 1997; Aspvall et al. 1979). *Any Boolean CSP instance $I = (V, C)$ that is closed under the unique Boolean majority operation can be solved in time $\mathcal{O}(|V| + |C|)$.*

Next we will introduce certain relations and show that they are closed under the unique majority operation for Boolean CSPs. Let $R_{\leq x}^a$ and $R_{\geq x}^a$ be the Boolean a -ary relations containing all tuples that contain at most x 1's or at least x 1's, respectively. Moreover, let R_O^a and R_Z^a be the a -ary Boolean relations that contain only the all-one and all-zero tuple, respectively.

Lemma 5. *Let a be an integer. Then, R_O^a and R_Z^a are closed under the Boolean majority operation. Moreover, if $1 \leq a \leq 3$, then $R_{\leq 1}^a$ and $R_{\geq 2}^a$ are closed under the Boolean majority operation.*

Proof. The claim of the lemma clearly holds for R_O^a and R_Z^a since each contains only one tuple.

Thus, let t_1, t_2 , and t_3 be three distinct tuples in $R_{\leq 1}^a$; note that if the tuples are not distinct then the majority of the three tuples is the one that occurs more than once and is therefore trivially part of $R_{\leq 1}^a$. Since each of the three tuples contains at most one 1 and since all tuples are distinct, the majority of the three tuples will always be equal to the all-zero tuple, which is clearly part of $R_{\leq 1}^a$.

Finally, the claim of the lemma for $R_{\geq 2}^a$ follows since $R_{\geq 2}^a$ is the complement of $R_{\leq 1}^a$. \square

3. NP-hardness of BHC Restricted to Two Red or Blue Vectors

In this section, we show that BHC remains NP-hard even when one of the two sets (V_B or V_R) has size at most two. In particular, let us denote by 2RED-BHC the restriction of BHC to instances in which the number of red vectors is two (i.e., $|V_R| = 2$), and by 2BLUE-BHC the restriction of BHC to instances in which the number of blue vectors is two (i.e., $|V_B| = 2$).

Theorem 6. *2RED-BHC and 2BLUE-BHC are NP-complete.*

Proof. Proving membership in NP is straightforward and is omitted. We will first show the NP-hardness of 2RED-

BHC and explain how the proof can be slightly modified to yield the NP-hardness of 2Blue-BHC.

The following problem is known to be NP-hard (Frances & Litman, 1997):

Minimum Radius (MR)

Input:	A set V of $(2n)$ -dimensional binary vectors where $n \in \mathbb{N}$.
Question:	Is there a $(2n)$ -dimensional center vector \vec{c} such that $V \subseteq B(\vec{c}, n)$?

Denote by Rest-MR the restriction of MR to instances in which V contains the $(2n)$ -dimensional all-zero vector $\vec{0}_{2n}$ and we ask for a center vector \vec{c} that contains exactly n ones. We first show that Rest-MR remains NP-hard. To show that, we exhibit a polynomial-time Turing-reduction from MR to Rest-MR.

For each $\vec{x} \in V$, define the set of vectors $V_{\vec{x}}$ obtained from V by normalizing the vectors in V so that \vec{x} is the $\vec{0}_{2n}$ vector; that is, for each vector $\vec{y} \in V$, $V_{\vec{x}}$ contains the vector \vec{y}' where the i -th coordinate of \vec{y}' is 0 if and only if the i -th coordinate of \vec{y} is equal to the i -th coordinate of \vec{x} . Observe that the map $\Pi_{\vec{x}} : \{0, 1\}^{2n} \rightarrow \{0, 1\}^{2n}$, where $\Pi_{\vec{x}}(\vec{y}) = \vec{y}'$ (as described above) is a bijection. Moreover, it preserves the Hamming distance: For any two vectors $\vec{u}, \vec{w} \in \{0, 1\}^{2n}$, we have $\delta(\vec{u}, \vec{w}) = \delta(\Pi_{\vec{x}}(\vec{u}), \Pi_{\vec{x}}(\vec{w}))$. Clearly, each $V_{\vec{x}}$ is a set of $(2n)$ -dimensional vectors that contains $\vec{0}_{2n}$, which is the vector $\Pi_{\vec{x}}(\vec{x})$. We claim that V is a Yes-instance of MR if and only if there exists $\vec{x} \in V$ such that $V_{\vec{x}}$ is a Yes-instance of Rest-MR. This would show that MR is polynomial-time Turing reducible to Rest-MR.

One direction is easy to see. If $V_{\vec{x}}$ is a Yes-instance of Rest-MR for some $\vec{x} \in V$, then there is a vector \vec{c}' containing exactly n 1's such that $V_{\vec{x}} \subseteq B(\vec{c}', n)$. By the properties of the mapping $\Pi_{\vec{x}}$, it is easy to see that $V \subseteq B(\vec{c}, n)$, where $\vec{c} = \Pi_{\vec{x}}^{-1}(\vec{c}')$, and hence, V is a Yes-instance of MR. To prove the converse, suppose that V is Yes-instance of MR. Then there exists $\vec{c} \in \{0, 1\}^{2n}$ such that $V \subseteq B(\vec{c}, n)$. Let \vec{x} be the vector in V that is farthest away from \vec{c} ; that is, \vec{x} is a vector in V with the maximum Hamming distance to \vec{c} . Let $V_{\vec{x}} = \{\Pi_{\vec{x}}(\vec{y}) \mid \vec{y} \in V\}$, and let $\vec{c}' = \Pi_{\vec{x}}(\vec{c})$. By the properties of $\Pi_{\vec{x}}$, it holds that $V_{\vec{x}} \subseteq B(\vec{c}', n)$. Since $\vec{0}_{2n} = \Pi_{\vec{x}}(\vec{x}) \in V_{\vec{x}}$, it follows that \vec{c}' contains at most n ones. Moreover, since \vec{x} is a vector in V that is farthest away from \vec{c} , $\vec{0}_{2n}$ is a vector in $V_{\vec{x}}$ that is farthest away from \vec{c}' . If \vec{c}' contains fewer than n 1's, let r be the number of 1's in \vec{c}' . Observe that $\delta(\vec{c}', \vec{0}_{2n}) = r$ and that r is the maximum distance between \vec{c}' and any vector in $V_{\vec{x}}$. By flipping any $n-r$ 0's in \vec{c}' (to 1's), we obtain a vector \vec{c}'' that contains exactly n 1's and satisfying $V_{\vec{x}} \subseteq B(\vec{c}'', n)$. This shows that $V_{\vec{x}}$ is a Yes-instance of Rest-MR and completes

the proof of the claim.

Therefore, to complete the proof of the theorem, it suffices to exhibit a polynomial-time (many-one) reduction from Rest-MR to 2RED-BHC. Let V be an instance of Rest-MR. We will construct in polynomial time an instance V^+ of 2Red-RB such that V is a Yes-instance of Rest-MR if and only if V^+ is a Yes-instance of 2RED-BHC. Without loss of generality, we may assume that (the $(2n)$ -dimensional all 1's vector) $\vec{1}_{2n} \in V$ since V is a Yes-instance of Rest-MR if and only if $V \cup \{\vec{1}_{2n}\}$ is. The previous statement is true since $\vec{0}_{2n} \in V \subseteq B(\vec{c}, n)$, where \vec{c} contains exactly n 1's, if and only if $(V \cup \{\vec{1}_{2n}\}) \subseteq B(\vec{c}, n)$.

To construct V^+ , we extend each $(2n)$ -dimensional vector $\vec{v} \in V$ by adding two coordinates, that we refer to as coordinates q_{2n+1} and q_{2n+2} , and setting their values to 0 and 1, respectively; let \vec{v}^+ denote the extension of \vec{v} . (It does not really matter which coordinate is set to 0 and which is set to 1 provided that it is done consistently over all the vectors.) Let V_b be the resulting set of (extended) vectors from V , and let $V_r = \{\vec{0}_{2n+2}, \vec{1}_{2n+2}\}$, where $\vec{0}_{2n+2}, \vec{1}_{2n+2}$ are the $(2n+2)$ -dimensional all-zero and all-one vectors, respectively. Finally, let $V^+ = V_b \cup V_r$. We claim that V is a Yes-instance of Rest-MR if and only if V^+ is a Yes-instance of 2Red-BHC.

In effect, suppose that V is a Yes-instance of Rest-MR. Then there exists a $(2n)$ -dimensional vector \vec{c} containing exactly n 1's such that $V \subseteq B(\vec{c}, n)$. Consider the $(2n+2)$ -dimensional extension vector \vec{c}^+ of \vec{c} , whose q_{2n+1} coordinate is 0 and q_{2n+2} coordinate is 1. Observe that, for every $\vec{v} \in V$, we have $\delta(\vec{c}, \vec{v}) = \delta(\vec{c}^+, \vec{v}^+) = n$. It follows that $V_b \subseteq B(\vec{c}^+, n)$. Moreover, we have $\delta(\vec{c}^+, \vec{0}_{2n+2}) = \delta(\vec{c}^+, \vec{1}_{2n+2}) = n+1$, and hence, $V_r \cap B(\vec{c}^+, n) = \emptyset$. It follows that V^+ is a Yes-instance of 2Red-BHC. To prove the converse, suppose that V^+ is a Yes-instance of 2Red-BHC. Then there exists $\vec{c}^+ \in \{0, 1\}^{2n+2}$ and $r \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $V_b \subseteq B(\vec{c}^+, r)$ and $V_r \cap B(\vec{c}^+, r) = \emptyset$. Since $\vec{0}_{2n+2}^+$ is in $B(\vec{c}^+, r)$ and $\vec{0}_{2n+2}$ is not, it follows that coordinate q_{2n+2} of \vec{c}^+ is 1. Similarly, since $\vec{1}_{2n+2}^+$ is in $B(\vec{c}^+, r)$ and $\vec{1}_{2n+2}$ is not, it follows that coordinate q_{2n+1} of \vec{c}^+ is 0. Let \vec{c} be the restriction of \vec{c}^+ to the first $2n$ coordinates. If \vec{c} contains fewer than n 1's, then its distance from $\vec{1}_{2n}^+$ would not be less than its distance from $\vec{0}_{2n+2}$, contradicting the fact that $\vec{1}_{2n}^+ \in V_b$ and $\vec{0}_{2n+2} \in V_r$. The argument is similar if \vec{c} contains more than n 1's. It follows from the above that \vec{c} contains exactly n 1's and that $r = n$. Furthermore, since coordinates q_{2n+1} and q_{2n+2} of \vec{c}^+ are 0 and 1, respectively, which match the values of these coordinates for each \vec{v}^+ , where $\vec{v} \in V$, it follows that, for every $\vec{v} \in V$, we have $\delta(\vec{c}, \vec{v}) = \delta(\vec{c}^+, \vec{v}^+)$. Since $V_b \subseteq B(\vec{c}^+, r = n)$, it follows that $V \subseteq B(\vec{c}, n)$, where \vec{c} contains exactly n 1's. This shows that V is a Yes-instance of Rest-MR and completes the proof.

Finally, to prove the NP-hardness of 2Blue-BHC, we make the following observation. Denote by $\overline{\vec{c}^+}$ the bit-wise complement vector of \vec{c}^+ (i.e., the vector obtained from \vec{c}^+ by flipping each coordinate of \vec{c}^+). It is straightforward to see that $V_b \subseteq B(\vec{c}^+, n)$ and $V_r \cap B(\vec{c}^+, n) = \emptyset$ if and only if $V_r \subseteq B(\overline{\vec{c}^+}, n+1)$ and $V_b \cap B(\overline{\vec{c}^+}, n+1) = \emptyset$. Therefore, by proceeding as in the reduction above but switching the sets V_r and V_b at the end, we obtain a polynomial-time Turing reduction from MR to 2BLUE-BHC thus showing the NP-hardness of 2Blue-BHC. \square

4. Basic Parameterizations for BHC

We follow up on Theorem 6 by considering the two remaining obvious parameterizations of the problem, notably d and $|V|$. The former case is trivial since it bounds the size of the input.

Observation 7. BHC is FPT parameterized by d .

Next, we give a fixed-parameter algorithm for BHC parameterized by the total number of vectors.

Theorem 8. BHC is FPT parameterized by the number of red vectors plus blue vectors.

Proof. Let k be the total number of red vectors plus blue vectors. For convenience, we will consider the matrix representation of the input, in which the vectors are represented as the rows of a matrix M . Observe that, since there are k rows of binary coordinates in M , the total number of different column configurations of M is at most 2^k . Let $T = \{t_1, \dots, t_s\}$, where $s \leq 2^k$, be the set of (distinct) columns in M , and let n_i be the number of columns in M that are equal to t_i , for $i \in [s]$. The idea behind the FPT algorithm is to encode the problem as an instance of an Integer Linear Program (ILP) with $f(k)$ variables, where f is a function of k , and where the variables determine the coordinates of the center \vec{c} of a hypersphere B that contains all blue vectors and excludes all the red ones. It is well known that such an ILP instance can then be solved in FPT time using the classical result of Lenstra (H. W. Lenstra, 1983; Kannan, 1987; Frank & Tardos, 1987). Once the coordinates of \vec{c} have been determined, the radius of B can be set as the maximum Hamming distance between \vec{c} and the blue vectors in M .

For each column type $t_i \in T$, let C_i be the set of coordinates (i.e., column indices of M) whose columns are equal to t_i . We introduce two integer-valued variables, x_i^0, x_i^1 , where x_i^0 is the number of coordinates in C_i for which \vec{c} has value 0, and x_i^1 is that for which \vec{c} has value 1. Clearly, the total number of variables in this ILP instance is $2 \cdot s \leq 2^{k+1}$. Observe that, once x_i^0 and x_i^1 have been determined, knowing the specific x_i^0 -many coordinates in C_i for which \vec{c} has value 0 and the specific x_i^1 -many coordinates in C_i for

which \vec{c} has value 1 is unnecessary. That is, any partitioning of the values of the coordinates of \vec{c} that are in C_i into x_i^0 0's and x_i^1 1's will result in the same Hamming distance between the restriction of \vec{c} to the coordinates of C_i and the restriction of any vector in M to these coordinates. This is true since all columns corresponding to the coordinates in C_i are equal. More specifically, for a vector $\vec{v} \in M$, denote by $\delta_{C_i}(\vec{c}, \vec{v})$ the Hamming distance between the restriction of \vec{c} and \vec{v} to the coordinates in C_i . Then, for any partitioning of the values of the coordinates of \vec{c} that are in C_i into x_i^0 0's and x_i^1 1's, it holds that $\delta_{C_i}(\vec{c}, \vec{v}) = x_i^1$ if the coordinates of \vec{v} that are in C_i have value 0, and $\delta_{C_i}(\vec{c}, \vec{v}) = n_i - x_i^1$ if the coordinates of \vec{v} that are in C_i have value 1.

Therefore, we can construct the desired ILP instance as follows. For each blue vector $\vec{v}_{blue} \in M$ and for each red vector $\vec{v}_{red} \in M$, we add the following constraint to the ILP instance, which stipulates that $\delta(\vec{c}, \vec{v}_{blue}) < \delta(\vec{c}, \vec{v}_{red})$:

$$\sum_{i=1}^s \delta_{C_i}(\vec{c}, \vec{v}_{blue}) + 1 \leq \sum_{i=1}^s \delta_{C_i}(\vec{c}, \vec{v}_{red}).$$

Observe that the ILP instance has no objective function, and that we only need to determine the feasibility of the ILP. If no solution to the above ILP instance exists, then the algorithm reports that no solution exists for the instance of BHC. Otherwise, the solution to the above ILP instance gives the values of the variables x_i^0, x_i^1 , for $i \in [s]$, and hence, by the above discussion, determines the coordinates of the center \vec{c} of a hypersphere B satisfying the constraints of the ILP instance. As such, for each blue vector $\vec{v}_{blue} \in M$ and for each red vector $\vec{v}_{red} \in M$, it holds that $\delta(\vec{c}, \vec{v}_{blue}) < \delta(\vec{c}, \vec{v}_{red})$. By choosing $r = \max\{\delta(\vec{c}, \vec{v}_{blue}) \mid \vec{v}_{blue} \in M\}$, the hypersphere $B(\vec{c}, r)$ contains all blue vectors in M and excludes all red ones. Since the ILP instance has at most 2^{k+1} variables, and hence can be solved in FPT time in k (H. W. Lenstra, 1983; Kannan, 1987; Frank & Tardos, 1987), the result follows. \square

5. The Complexity of BHC with Conciseness

In this section, we perform a detailed analysis of the complexity of BHC with respect to conciseness. We will distinguish between data conciseness and explanation conciseness. Data conciseness is the maximum number of 1's appearing in any red or blue vector of the instance I and is denoted $\text{dcon}(I)$; that is, $\text{dcon}(I) = \max_{\vec{v} \in V_R \cup V_B} \text{con}(\vec{v})$. The explanation conciseness on the other hand is the maximum number of 1's appearing in the sought-after vector \vec{c} . To capture this aspect of the problem, we define a new version of BHC that imposes a bound econ on the explanation conciseness of the vector \vec{c} . Formally, let EC-BHC be defined analogously to BHC, but where we are additionally

given an integer econ and the question is whether there exists a vector $\vec{c} \in D^d$ of conciseness at most econ and $r \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $V_B \subseteq B(\vec{c}, r)$ and $V_R \cap B(\vec{c}, r) = \emptyset$.

5.1. Data Conciseness

In this subsection, we analyse the parameterized complexity of BHC parameterized by the conciseness of the data $\text{dcon}(I)$. We start by showing that instances I satisfying $\text{dcon}(I) \leq 3$ can be solved in polynomial-time.

Theorem 9. *The restriction of BHC to instances I satisfying $\text{dcon}(I) \leq 3$ can be solved in time $\mathcal{O}(|V|d)$.*

Proof. Let $I = (V_R, V_B, d)$ be an instance of BHC with $\text{dcon}(I) \leq 3$ and let $V = V_R \cup V_B$. Note first that for one fixed solution \vec{c} for I , $|\mathbf{1}(\vec{v})| - 2|\mathbf{1}(\vec{v}) \cap \mathbf{1}(\vec{c})|$ can be used instead of the Hamming distance to compare the distances of two vectors from \vec{c} ; here $\vec{v} \in V_R \cup V_B$.

Let $m_r(\vec{c}) = \min_{\vec{v} \in V_R} |\mathbf{1}(\vec{v})| - 2|\mathbf{1}(\vec{v}) \cap \mathbf{1}(\vec{c})|$. Note that since $\text{dcon}(I) \leq 3$, it holds that $-3 \leq m_r(\vec{c}) \leq 3$ for every solution \vec{c} of I . We now show that for every integer M_r with $-3 \leq M_r \leq 3$, we can decide whether I has a solution \vec{c} with $M_r = m_r(\vec{c})$ in time at most $\mathcal{O}(|V|d)$.

Note that if \vec{c} is a solution for I with $M_r = m_r(\vec{c})$, then $M_b = m_b(\vec{c}) = \max_{\vec{v} \in V_B} |\mathbf{1}(\vec{v})| - 2|\mathbf{1}(\vec{v}) \cap \mathbf{1}(\vec{c})| < M_r$, which will be useful in the following. We distinguish the following cases.

- ($M_r \leq -1$ and $M_b \leq -2$): If I contains a blue vector \vec{b} with $|\mathbf{1}(\vec{b})| = 1$, we can immediately reject I ; this is because for any such blue vector \vec{b} , we have $|\mathbf{1}(\vec{b})| - 2|\mathbf{1}(\vec{b}) \cap \mathbf{1}(\vec{c})| \geq -1 \geq M_b$. Similarly, it follows that $\mathbf{1}(\vec{b}) \subseteq \mathbf{1}(\vec{c})$ for every blue vector $\vec{b} \in V_B$ and any solution \vec{c} . But then, a solution \vec{c} for I must satisfy $\bigcup_{\vec{v} \in V_B} \mathbf{1}(\vec{v}) \subseteq \vec{c}$ and therefore I has a solution if and only if the vector \vec{c} that is 1 at all coordinates in $\bigcup_{\vec{v} \in V_B} \mathbf{1}(\vec{v})$ and otherwise 0 is a solution for I ; this is because setting the coordinates outside of $\bigcup_{\vec{v} \in V_B} \mathbf{1}(\vec{v})$ to 1 only reduces the distance of \vec{c} to vectors in V_R . Therefore, we can solve I by checking whether \vec{c} is a solution for I , which can be achieved in time $\mathcal{O}(|V|d)$.
- ($M_r = 0$ and $M_b \leq -1$): Then, the following holds for every solution \vec{c} for I :
 - 1) $\mathbf{1}(\vec{b}) \subseteq \mathbf{1}(\vec{c})$ for every blue vector $\vec{b} \in V_B$ with $|\mathbf{1}(\vec{b})| \leq 2$; this is because $|\mathbf{1}(\vec{b})| - 2|\mathbf{1}(\vec{b}) \cap \mathbf{1}(\vec{c})| \geq 0 = M_r$, whenever $|\mathbf{1}(\vec{b})| = 1$ and $|\mathbf{1}(\vec{b}) \cap \mathbf{1}(\vec{c})| < 1$ or $|\mathbf{1}(\vec{b})| = 2$ and $|\mathbf{1}(\vec{b}) \cap \mathbf{1}(\vec{c})| < 2$.
 - 2) $|\mathbf{1}(\vec{b}) \cap \mathbf{1}(\vec{c})| \geq 2$ for every blue vector $\vec{b} \in V_B$ with $|\mathbf{1}(\vec{b})| = 3$.

- 3) $|\mathbf{1}(\vec{r}) \cap \mathbf{1}(\vec{c})| \leq 0$ for every red vector $\vec{r} \in V_R$ with $|\mathbf{1}(\vec{r})| = 1$; this is because $|\mathbf{1}(\vec{r})| - 2|\mathbf{1}(\vec{r}) \cap \mathbf{1}(\vec{c})| < 0 = M_r$, if $|\mathbf{1}(\vec{r})| = 1$ and $|\mathbf{1}(\vec{b}) \cap \mathbf{1}(\vec{c})| > 0$.
- 4) $|\mathbf{1}(\vec{r}) \cap \mathbf{1}(\vec{c})| \leq 1$ for every red vector $\vec{r} \in V_R$ with $|\mathbf{1}(\vec{r})| \geq 2$.

Moreover, it is easy to see that a vector \vec{c} is a solution for I if and only if it satisfies 1)–4) above. Therefore, it is sufficient to decide whether there is a vector that satisfies 1)–4). To achieve this, we will reduce the problem to a Boolean CSP instance that is closed under the unique Boolean majority operation and can therefore be solved polynomial-time.

Let $I' = (V', C)$ be the CSP instance obtained from I as follows.

- V' contains one Boolean variable v_i for every coordinate i with $1 \leq i \leq d$.
- For every blue vector $\vec{b} \in V_B$, C contains the constraint $c_{\vec{b}}$ with scope $\{v_i \mid i \in \mathbf{1}(\vec{b})\}$ and relation R_O^1, R_O^2 , and $R_{\geq 2}^3$ if $|\mathbf{1}(\vec{b})| = 1$, $|\mathbf{1}(\vec{b})| = 2$, and $|\mathbf{1}(\vec{b})| = 3$, respectively.
- For every red vector $\vec{r} \in V_R$, C contains the constraint $c_{\vec{r}}$ with scope $\{v_i \mid i \in \mathbf{1}(\vec{r})\}$ and relation $R_Z^1, R_{\leq 1}^2$, and $R_{\leq 1}^3$ if $|\mathbf{1}(\vec{r})| = 1$, $|\mathbf{1}(\vec{r})| = 2$, and $|\mathbf{1}(\vec{r})| = 3$, respectively.

It is now straightforward to verify that there is a d -dimensional Boolean vector \vec{c} satisfying 1)–4) above if and only if I' has a solution. Clearly, I' can be constructed from I in time $\mathcal{O}(|V|d)$. Moreover, because of Proposition 4, we can solve I' in time $\mathcal{O}(|V'| + |C|) = \mathcal{O}(d + |V|)$. Therefore, we can solve I in time $\mathcal{O}(|V|d)$.

- ($M_r = 1$ and $M_b \leq 0$): The following holds for every solution \vec{c} for I :

- 1) $|\mathbf{1}(\vec{b}) \cap \mathbf{1}(\vec{c})| \geq 1$ for every blue vector $\vec{b} \in V_B$ with $|\mathbf{1}(\vec{b})| \leq 2$.
- 2) $|\mathbf{1}(\vec{b}) \cap \mathbf{1}(\vec{c})| \geq 2$ for every blue vector $\vec{b} \in V_B$ with $|\mathbf{1}(\vec{b})| = 3$.
- 3) $|\mathbf{1}(\vec{r}) \cap \mathbf{1}(\vec{c})| \leq 0$ for every red vector $\vec{r} \in V_R$ with $|\mathbf{1}(\vec{r})| \leq 2$.
- 4) $|\mathbf{1}(\vec{r}) \cap \mathbf{1}(\vec{c})| \leq 1$ for every red vector $\vec{r} \in V_R$ with $|\mathbf{1}(\vec{b})| \geq 2$.

As in the previous case, it is straightforward to verify that a vector \vec{c} is a solution for I if and only if it satisfies 1)–4).

Let $I' = (V', C)$ be the CSP instance obtained from I as follows.

- V' contains one Boolean variable v_i for every coordinate i with $1 \leq i \leq d$.

- For every blue vector $\vec{b} \in V_B$, C contains the constraint $c_{\vec{b}}$ with scope $\{v_i \mid i \in \mathbf{1}(\vec{b})\}$ and relation $R_O^1, R_{\geq 1}^2$ and $R_{\geq 2}^3$ if $|\mathbf{1}(\vec{b})| = 1$, $|\mathbf{1}(\vec{b})| = 2$, and $|\mathbf{1}(\vec{b})| = 3$, respectively.
- For every red vector $\vec{r} \in V_R$, C contains the constraint $c_{\vec{r}}$ with scope $\{v_i \mid i \in \mathbf{1}(\vec{r})\}$ and relation R_Z^1, R_Z^2 , and $R_{\leq 1}^3$ if $|\mathbf{1}(\vec{r})| = 1$, $|\mathbf{1}(\vec{r})| = 2$, and $|\mathbf{1}(\vec{r})| = 3$, respectively.

As in the previous case, it follows that I is equivalent with I' and can be solved in time $\mathcal{O}(|V|d)$ by solving I' .

- ($M_r \geq 2$ and $M_b \leq 1$): Then $|\mathbf{1}(\vec{r}) \cap \mathbf{1}(\vec{c})| = 0$ for every red vector $\vec{r} \in V_R$. Therefore, I has a solution if and only if the vector \vec{c} has 1 at all coordinates in $[d] \setminus \bigcup_{\vec{r} \in V_{-r}} \mathbf{1}(\vec{r})$ and 0 otherwise, which can be checked in time $\mathcal{O}(|V|d)$.

Therefore, I has a solution if and only if one of the above cases has a solution, which can be checked in time $\mathcal{O}(|V|d)$. \square

We now show that BHC is already NP-complete for instances with $\text{dcon}(I) \geq 4$; in fact, this holds even when restricted to the class of instances where $\text{dcon}(I)$ is precisely 4.

Theorem 10. *BHC is NP-complete even when restricted to instances I satisfying $\text{dcon}(I) = 4$.*

We prove Theorem 10 via a reduction from the CSP problem using a constraint language Γ_4 that is NP-hard by Schaefer's theorem (Schaefer, 1978; Chen, 2009). Γ_4 is the Boolean constraint language containing the following two Boolean 4-ary relations: the *red* relation R_R containing all tuples having at most 2 ones and the *blue* relation R_B containing all tuples having at least 3 ones.

Lemma 11. *CSP(Γ_4) is NP-complete.*

Proof. By Theorem 3, it suffices to show that Γ_4 is not closed under any of the 4 types of operations stated in the theorem. The following shows that this is indeed not the case, i.e., Γ_4 is not closed under:

- Any constant operation since R_R does not contain the all-one tuple and R_B does not contain the all-zero tuple.
- Any AND operation since the AND of any two distinct tuples of R_B each having exactly 3 ones, gives a tuple containing exactly 2 ones which is not in R_B .
- Any OR operation since the OR of any two distinct tuples of R_R each having exactly 2 ones, gives a tuple containing more than 2 ones, which is not in R_R .

- The unique Boolean majority operation, because of R_R . Indeed, the majority of the following three tuples in R_R is not in R_R : the tuples that are 1 exactly at the first and second, exactly at the first and third, and exactly at the second and third entries.
- Any minority operation since the minority of any three distinct tuples in R_B gives a tuple with at least 2 ones which is not in R_B . \square

With Lemma 11 in hand, we establish Theorem 10 by designing a polynomial-time reduction from $\text{CSP}(\Gamma_4)$. We note that, as mentioned already in the proof of Theorem 6, inclusion in NP is trivial.

Proof of Theorem 10. Let $I = (V, C)$ be the given instance of $\text{CSP}(\Gamma_4)$. We denote by C_r/C_b the set of all constraints c in C with $R(c) = R_R/R(c) = R_B$; note that $C = C_r \cup C_b$. We will construct the instance $I' = (V_R, V_B, d)$ of BHC as follows. First, we introduce one coordinate d_v for every variable $v \in V$. Moreover, for every constraint $c \in C_r$, we introduce the red vector \vec{r}_c that is 1 on all coordinates that correspond to variables within the scope of c and is 0 otherwise, i.e., \vec{r}_c is 1 exactly on the coordinates in $\{d_v \mid v \in S(c)\}$ and 0 at all other coordinates. Similarly, for every constraint $c \in C_b$, we introduce the blue vector \vec{b}_c that is 1 on all coordinates that correspond to variables within the scope of c and 0 otherwise.

Finally, we will introduce two gadgets which will enforce that in every solution \vec{c} of I' , it holds that:

- (1) there is a red vector $\vec{r} \in V_R$ such that \vec{c} is 1 on at least two coordinates, where \vec{r} is also 1; and
- (2) there is a blue vector $\vec{b} \in V_B$ such that \vec{c} is not 1 on all coordinates where \vec{b} is 1.

Towards enforcing (1), we add two new blue vectors \vec{v}_1^b and \vec{v}_2^b together with 8 new coordinates d_1^b, \dots, d_8^b such that \vec{v}_1^b is 1 exactly at the coordinates d_1^b, \dots, d_4^b and \vec{v}_2^b is 1 exactly at the coordinates d_5^b, \dots, d_8^b . Moreover, for every i and j with $1 \leq i < j \leq 8$, we introduce a red vector \vec{v}_{ij}^r that is 1 exactly at the coordinates c_i and c_j plus two additional fresh coordinates.

Towards enforcing (2), we add one new blue vector \vec{u}_i^b together with four fresh coordinates e_1^i, \dots, e_4^i for every i with $1 \leq i \leq 4$ such that \vec{u}_i^b is 1 exactly on the coordinates e_1^i, \dots, e_4^i . Finally, we add one new red vector \vec{u}^r that is 1 exactly at the coordinates e_1^1, e_2^1, e_3^1 , and e_1^4 .

To show the forward direction, let $\tau : V \rightarrow D$ be a solution of I . We claim that the vector \vec{c} defined by setting:

- $\vec{c}[d_v] = \tau(v)$ for every $v \in V$,
- $\vec{c}[d_1^b] = \vec{c}[d_2^b] = \vec{c}[d_3^b] = 1$ and $\vec{c}[d_4^b] = 0$,

- $\vec{c}[d_5^b] = \vec{c}[d_6^b] = \vec{c}[d_7^b] = 1$ and $\vec{c}[d_8^b] = 0$,
- $\vec{c}[e_1^i] = 0$ and $\vec{c}[e_2^i] = \vec{c}[e_3^i] = \vec{c}[e_4^i] = 1$ for every i with $1 \leq i \leq 4$, and
- all remaining coordinates of \vec{c} are set to 0,

is a solution for I' . We start by showing that $|\mathbf{1}(\vec{c}) \cap \mathbf{1}(\vec{v})| \geq 3$ for every blue vector $\vec{v} \in V_B$. This clearly holds by the definition of \vec{c} and the fact that τ is a solution for I for every blue vector \vec{v}_c with $c \in C_b$. It also clearly holds for the remaining blue vectors $\vec{v}_1^b, \vec{v}_2^b, \vec{u}_1^b, \dots, \vec{u}_4^b$ from the definition of \vec{c} . We now show that $|\mathbf{1}(\vec{c}) \cap \mathbf{1}(\vec{v})| \leq 2$ for every red vector $\vec{v} \in V_R$, which shows that \vec{c} is indeed a solution for I' . Again, this clearly holds for every red vector r_c with $c \in C_r$ because τ is a solution for I . It also holds for the red vector \vec{u}^r as well as all remaining red vectors \vec{v}_{ij}^r for every i and j with $1 \leq i < j \leq 4$ from the definition of \vec{c} .

To show the converse, let \vec{c} be a solution for I' . We claim that the assignment $\tau : V \rightarrow D$ with $\tau(v) = \vec{c}[d_v]$ is a solution for I . To show this, it suffices to show that (1) $|\mathbf{1}(\vec{c}) \cap \mathbf{1}(\vec{b}_c)| \geq 3$ for every $c \in C_b$ and (2) $|\mathbf{1}(\vec{c}) \cap \mathbf{1}(\vec{b}_c)| \leq 2$ for every $c \in C_r$. Towards showing (1), we will show that there is a red vector $\vec{v}_{ij}^r \in V_R$ for some i and j with $1 \leq i < j \leq 4$ such that $|\mathbf{1}(\vec{c}) \cap \mathbf{1}(\vec{v}_{ij}^r)| \geq 2$, which, since \vec{c} is a solution for I' , implies that $|\mathbf{1}(\vec{c}) \cap \mathbf{1}(\vec{b}_c)| \geq 3$ for every $c \in C_b$. Suppose for a contradiction that this is not the case, then either \vec{c} is zero at all coordinates d_1^b, \dots, d_4^b or \vec{c} is zero at all coordinates d_5^b, \dots, d_8^b . Suppose without loss of generality that the former holds. Then, the distance of \vec{c} to \vec{v}_1^b is at least as large as the distance of \vec{c} to any red vector, contradicting our assumption that \vec{c} is a solution for I' . Therefore, the red vector \vec{v}_{ij}^r and \vec{c} are 1 on at least two common coordinates (i.e., the coordinates d_i^b and d_j^b).

It remains to show (2), i.e., that $|\mathbf{1}(\vec{c}) \cap \mathbf{1}(\vec{b}_c)| \leq 2$ for every $c \in C_r$, for which, since \vec{c} is a solution for I , it suffices to show that there is a blue vector \vec{v} in V_B with $|\vec{c} \cap \vec{v}| \leq 3$. Consider the red vector \vec{u}^r . Clearly, $|\mathbf{1}(\vec{c}) \cap \mathbf{1}(\vec{u}^r)| \leq 3$ since otherwise \vec{u}^r would be as close to \vec{c} as every other vector, which would contradict our assumption that \vec{c} is a solution for I . Therefore, there is a coordinate e_1^i for some $1 \leq i \leq 4$ such that $\vec{c}[e_1^i] = 0$. But then, the blue vector \vec{u}_i^b satisfies that $|\vec{c} \cap \vec{u}_i^b| \leq 3$ and therefore $|\mathbf{1}(\vec{c}) \cap \mathbf{1}(\vec{b}_c)| \leq 2$ for every $c \in C_r$. \square

5.2. Data Conciseness Plus $|V_R|$ or $|V_B|$

Here we show that if in addition to the input conciseness one also parameterizes by the minimum of the numbers of red vectors and blue vectors, then BHC becomes fixed-parameter tractable.

Theorem 12. *BHC is fixed-parameter tractable parameterized by $\text{dcon}(I) + \min\{|V_B|, |V_R|\}$.*

Proof. Let $I = (V_R, V_B, d)$ be the given instance of BHC. It suffices to show that BHC is fixed-parameter tractable parameterized by $\text{dcon}(I) + |V_B|$ and also by $\text{dcon}(I) + |V_R|$. To avoid any confusion, we remark that it is well known (and easy to see) that establishing fixed-parameter tractability w.r.t. the sum $\alpha + \beta$ of two numbers is equivalent to establishing fixed-parameter tractability w.r.t. the product $\alpha \cdot \beta$ of the same numbers.

The main observation behind the algorithm (for the case $\text{dcon}(I) + |V_B|$) is that the total number of coordinates, where any blue vector can be 1 is at most $|V_B| \text{dcon}(I)$; let $B = \bigcup_{\vec{b} \in V_B} \mathbf{1}(\vec{b})$ be the set of all those coordinates. Since any solution \vec{c} can be assumed to be 0 at any coordinate outside of B , we can solve I by “guessing” (i.e., branching to find) a solution in time $\mathcal{O}(2^{\text{dcon}(I)|V_B|}|V|d)$. More specifically, for every subset B' of the at most $2^{\text{dcon}(I)|V_B|}$ subsets of B , we check in time $\mathcal{O}(|V|d)$ whether the vector \vec{c} that is 1 exactly at the coordinates in B' is a solution for I . If one of those vectors is a solution, then we output it, otherwise we can correctly return that I is a No-instance.

The algorithm for the case where we parameterize by $\text{dcon}(I) + |V_R|$ is almost identical with the only difference being the observation that the set $R = \bigcup_{\vec{r} \in V_R} \mathbf{1}(\vec{r})$ has size at most $2^{\text{dcon}(I)|V_R|}$ and that any solution \vec{c} can be assumed to be 1 at every coordinate in R . \square

5.3. Explanation Conciseness

Recall that EC-BHC is defined analogously as BHC, but one is additionally given an integer econ and is asked for a solution \vec{c} for BHC with conciseness at most econ . Note that a simple brute-force algorithm that enumerates all potential solution vectors \vec{c} with at most econ 1's shows that EC-BHC is in XP parameterized by econ .

Observation 13. EC-BHC can be solved in time $\mathcal{O}(d^{\text{econ}}|V|d)$.

Therefore, it becomes natural to ask whether this can be improved to fixed-parameter tractability. The following two theorems show that this is unlikely to be the case, even if we additionally assume $|V_B| = 1$ or $|V_R| = 1$.

Theorem 14. EC-BHC is W[2]-hard parameterized by the conciseness econ of the solution even if $|V_R| = 1$.

Proof. We provide a parameterized reduction from the UNIFORM HITTING SET problem, which given a set U of elements, a family $\mathcal{F} \subseteq 2^U$ of subsets of U with $|F| = \ell$ for every $F \in \mathcal{F}$ and an integer k , asks whether \mathcal{F} has a hitting set $H \subseteq U$ of size at most k , i.e., $H \cap F \neq \emptyset$ for every $F \in \mathcal{F}$. UNIFORM HITTING SET is W[2]-complete parameterized by k (Downey & Fellows, 2013).

Let $I = (U, \mathcal{F}, k)$ be an instance of UNIFORM HITTING

SET with sets of size ℓ . We construct an equivalent instance $I' = (V_R, V_B, d, \text{econ})$ of EC-BHC as follows. We set $\text{econ} = k$. For every $u \in U$, we introduce the (element) coordinate d_u and for every i with $1 \leq i \leq \ell$, we introduce the (dummy) coordinate d'_i . Moreover, for every $F \in \mathcal{F}$, we add the blue vector \vec{b}_F to V_B , which is 1 on all coordinates d_u with $u \in F$ and 0 at all other coordinates. Finally, we introduce the red vector \vec{r} that is 1 at all dummy coordinates d'_i and 0 at all element coordinates. This completes the construction of I' , which can clearly be achieved in polynomial-time. We can now show that I is a Yes-instance of UNIFORM HITTING SET if and only if I' is a Yes-instance of EC-BHC.

Towards showing the forward direction, let $H \subseteq U$ with $|H| \leq k = \text{econ}$ be a hitting set for \mathcal{F} . We claim that the vector \vec{c} that is 1 at all element coordinates d_u where $u \in H$ and 0 at all other coordinates, is a solution for I' . This holds since $\text{con}(\vec{c}) \leq \text{econ}$ and $\delta(\vec{b}_F, \vec{c}) < \ell + |H|$ for every $\vec{b}_F \in V_B$ but $\delta(\vec{r}, \vec{c}) = \ell + |H|$, and therefore, every blue vector in V_B is closer to \vec{c} than every red vector in V_R .

Towards showing the converse, let \vec{c} with $\text{con}(\vec{c}) \leq \text{econ} = k$ be a solution for I' . We claim that the set H that contains all elements u , where $\vec{c}[d_u] = 1$ is a hitting set for \mathcal{F} . Suppose for a contradiction that this is not the case and there is a set $F \in \mathcal{F}$ with $H \cap F = \emptyset$. Then, $\delta(\vec{b}_F, \vec{c}) = \ell + |\vec{c}|$ but also $\delta(\vec{r}, \vec{c}) \leq \ell + |\mathbf{1}(\vec{c})|$, which contradicts our assumption that \vec{c} is a solution for I' . \square

Theorem 15. EC-BHC is W[1]-hard parameterized by the conciseness econ of the solution even if $|V_B| = 1$.

Proof. We will provide a parameterized reduction from the MULTI-COLORED INDEPENDENT SET problem, which given an undirected graph $G = (V, E)$, where V is partitioned into k vertex sets V_1, \dots, V_k with $|V_i| = n$ and $G[V_i]$ is a clique and an integer k , asks whether G has an independent set of size at least k ; note that such an independent set must contain exactly one vertex from each V_i . MULTI-COLORED INDEPENDENT SET is well-known to be W[1]-complete (Downey & Fellows, 2013).

Let $I = (G, V_1, \dots, V_k, k)$ be an instance of MULTI-COLORED INDEPENDENT SET with $|V_i| = n$ and $V = \bigcup_{i=1}^k V_i$. We construct an equivalent instance $I' = (V_R, V_B, d, \text{econ})$ of EC-BHC as follows. We set $\text{econ} = k$. For every $v \in V$, we introduce the (vertex) coordinate d_v and for every i with $1 \leq i \leq nk - 2k + 1$, we introduce the (dummy) coordinate d'_i . Moreover, for every $e = \{u, v\} \in E(G)$, we add the red vector \vec{r}_e to V_R , which is 1 on the coordinates d_u and d_v as well as the coordinate d'_i for every i with $1 \leq i \leq nk - 2k + 1$. We also add the red vector \vec{r} to V_R that is 1 at the coordinates d'_i with $1 \leq i \leq nk - 2k + 1$. Finally, we introduce the

blue vector \vec{b} that is 1 at all vertex coordinates d_v and 0 at all dummy coordinates. This completes the construction of I' , which can clearly be achieved in polynomial-time. We can now show that I is a Yes-instance of MULTI-COLORED INDEPENDENT SET if and only if I' is a Yes-instance of EC-BHC.

Towards showing the forward direction, let $C \subseteq V$ with $|C| = k = \text{econ}$ be an independent set for G . We claim that the vector \vec{c} that is 1 at all vertex coordinates d_v with $v \in C$ and 0 at all other coordinates is a solution for I' . This holds because $\text{con}(\vec{c}) \leq \text{econ}$ and:

- $\delta(\vec{r}_e, \vec{c}) \geq nk - 2k + 1 + k = nk - k + 1$ for every $e \in E(G)$ (because $G[C]$ is an independent set),
- $\delta(\vec{r}, \vec{c}) = nk - 2k + 1 + k = nk - k + 1$
- $\delta(\vec{b}, \vec{c}) = nk - k$.

Therefore every red vector in V_R is closer to \vec{c} than the only blue in V_B .

Towards showing the reverse direction, let \vec{c} with $\text{con}(\vec{c}) \leq \text{econ} = k$ be a solution for I' . We claim that the set C that contains all vertices v , where $\vec{c}[d_v] = 1$ is an independent set in G of size k in G . We first show that $|C| \geq k$. Suppose not, then $\delta(\vec{b}, \vec{c}) > nk - k$ but $\delta(\vec{r}, \vec{c}) < nk - 2k + 1 + k = nk - k + 1$, contradicting our assumption that \vec{c} is a solution for I . It remains to show that C is an independent set for G . Suppose for a contradiction that this is not the case and there is an edge $e = \{u, v\} \in E(G)$ with $u, v \in C$. Then, $\delta(\vec{r}_e, \vec{c}) \leq nk - 2k + 1 + (k - 2) = nk - k - 1$ but also $\delta(\vec{b}, \vec{c}) = nk - k$, which contradicts our assumption that \vec{c} is a solution for I' . \square

5.4. Data and Explanation Conciseness

As our final result in this section, we show that EC-BHC is fixed-parameter tractable when parameterized by data and explanation conciseness combined.

Theorem 16. *EC-BHC can be solved in time $\mathcal{O}(\text{dcon}(I)^{\text{econ}}|V|d)$ and is therefore fixed-parameter tractable parameterized by $\text{econ} + \text{dcon}$.*

Proof. Let $I = (V_R, V_B, d, \text{econ})$ with $V = V_R \cup V_B$ be the given instance of EC-BHC. The main idea behind the algorithm is as follows. We start by initializing the solution vector \vec{c} to the all-zero vector. We then check in time $\mathcal{O}(|V|d)$ whether \vec{c} is already a solution. If so, we are done. Otherwise, there must exist a red vector $\vec{r} \in V_R$ and a blue vector $\vec{b} \in V_B$ such that $\delta(\vec{r}, \vec{c}) \leq \delta(\vec{b}, \vec{c})$ and therefore: $|\mathbf{1}(\vec{r})| + |\mathbf{1}(\vec{c})| - 2|\mathbf{1}(\vec{r}) \cap \mathbf{1}(\vec{c})| \leq |\mathbf{1}(\vec{b})| + |\mathbf{1}(\vec{c})| - 2|\mathbf{1}(\vec{b}) \cap \mathbf{1}(\vec{c})|$, or in short $|\mathbf{1}(\vec{r})| - 2|\mathbf{1}(\vec{r}) \cap \mathbf{1}(\vec{c})| \leq |\mathbf{1}(\vec{b})| - 2|\mathbf{1}(\vec{b}) \cap \mathbf{1}(\vec{c})|$. It follows that any vector \vec{c}' with $\mathbf{1}(\vec{c}) \subseteq \mathbf{1}(\vec{c}')$ and $\delta(\vec{r}, \vec{c}') >$

$\delta(\vec{b}, \vec{c}')$ has to be obtained from \vec{c} by flipping at least one coordinate in $B = \mathbf{1}(\vec{b}) \setminus (\mathbf{1}(\vec{r}) \cup \mathbf{1}(\vec{c}))$ from 0 to 1; note that $|B| \leq \text{dcon}(I)$. We can therefore branch on the coordinates of B , and for every such choice $b \in B$, we continue with the vector \vec{c}' obtained from \vec{c} after flipping the coordinate b from 0 to 1. We stop if either we have reached a solution or if the number of 1's in the current vector \vec{c}' exceeds the conciseness upper bound econ . In other words, we can solve the problem using a branching algorithm that has at most $|\mathbf{1}(\vec{b})| \leq \text{dcon}(I)$ many choices per branch, uses time $\mathcal{O}(|V|d)$ per search-tree node, and makes at most econ branching decisions before it stops. Therefore, the run-time of the algorithm is $\mathcal{O}(\text{dcon}(I)^{\text{econ}}|V|d)$. \square

6. A Treewidth-Based Algorithm for BHC

Let the *incidence graph* G_I of an instance $I = (V_R, V_B, d)$ of BHC be the bipartite graph defined as follows. First of all, $V(G_I) = V_R \cup V_B \cup [d]$. As for the edge set, there is an edge $\vec{v}c \in E(G_I)$ between a vector $\vec{v} \in V_R \cup V_B$ and a coordinate $c \in [d]$ if and only if $c \in \mathbf{1}(\vec{v})$. We identify the vertices of G_I with the vectors in $V_R \cup V_B$ and the coordinates in $[d]$. That is, for a set of vertices X in G_I , we often say “vectors in X ” or “coordinates in X ” to mean the vectors/the coordinates associated with the vertices in X .

This section is dedicated to proving the following technical theorem, which implies all the claimed tractability results concerning the treewidth of the incidence graph:

Theorem 17. *Given an instance $I = (V_R, V_B, d)$ of BHC and a nice tree-decomposition $\mathcal{T} = (T, \chi)$ of G_I of width w , there is an algorithm solving I in time $(2 \min\{\text{econ}_{\min}, \text{dcon}(I)\})^{2w+2} \cdot (|V| + d)^{\mathcal{O}(1)}$, where econ_{\min} is the minimum conciseness of any center. Moreover, if I is Yes-instance, then the algorithm outputs a center with conciseness econ_{\min} and minimum radius among all such centers.*

For the rest of this section, we will fix a radius r and center-conciseness λ , and assume that we are looking for a center with conciseness precisely λ such that the hypersphere around the center with radius r separates the vectors in V_B from the ones in V_R . To do this we will, for every possible center conciseness $\lambda = 0, 1, 2, \dots, d$ in the ascending order, run the algorithm for every radius $r = 0, 1, 2, \dots, d$. This way, we output the center with minimum conciseness and minimum radius among all centers with minimum conciseness.

The algorithm is a bottom-up dynamic programming along the nice tree-decomposition \mathcal{T} . We first describe the records that we need to compute for every node t of T . Given the description of the records, we need to show that for each of the node types (i.e., leaf/introduce/forget/join), we can compute the records from the records of their chil-

dren. Finally, we need to also show that given the records for the root node of the tree-decomposition, we can decide whether I is a Yes-instance and if so output a center vector \vec{c} such that $|\mathbf{1}(\vec{c})| = \lambda$, $V_B \subseteq B(\vec{c}, r)$, and $V_R \cap B(\vec{c}, r) = \emptyset$.

We begin by describing the record Γ_t for each node $t \in T$. We can think about Γ_t as a map that maps a tuple $\mathcal{C} = (c_{\text{past}}, c_{\text{future}}, C_{\text{bag}}, V_{\text{bag}}) \in \mathbb{N} \times \mathbb{N} \times 2^{\chi(t)} \times \mathbb{N}^{|\chi(t)|}$ to either a vector $\vec{c}_t = \{0, 1\}^d$ with $\text{con}(\vec{c}_t) = \lambda$ or \perp . The intuition behind the record is that the tuple $(c_{\text{past}}, c_{\text{future}}, C_{\text{bag}}, V_{\text{bag}})$ is mapped to an arbitrary vector \vec{c}_t such that

1. c_{past} is the number of non-zero coordinates of \vec{c}_t on already “forgotten” coordinates, i.e., $c_{\text{past}} = |\mathbf{1}(\vec{c}_t) \cap \chi(T_t) \setminus \chi(t)|$;
2. c_{future} is the number of non-zero coordinates of \vec{c}_t on coordinates that are not yet introduced, i.e., $c_{\text{future}} = |\mathbf{1}(\vec{c}_t) \cap [d] \setminus \chi(T_t)|$;
3. $C_{\text{bag}} = \mathbf{1}(\vec{c}_t) \cap \chi(t)$;
4. V_{bag} contains, for every vector $\vec{v} \in \chi(t)$, the number of ones on “forgotten” coordinates in $\mathbf{1}(\vec{c}_t)$, that is $V_{\text{bag}}(\vec{v}) = |\mathbf{1}(\vec{c}_t) \cap \mathbf{1}(\vec{v}) \cap (\chi(T_t) \setminus \chi(t))|$;
5. no forgotten red vector is at distance at most r from \vec{c}_t , i.e., $V_R \cap (\chi(T_t) \setminus \chi(t)) \cap B(\vec{c}_t, r) = \emptyset$; and
6. all forgotten blue vectors are at distance at most r from \vec{c}_t , i.e., $(V_B \cap (\chi(T_t) \setminus \chi(t))) \subseteq B(\vec{c}_t, r)$.

We say that a vector \vec{c}_t that satisfies all the above properties is *compatible* with $(c_{\text{past}}, c_{\text{future}}, C_{\text{bag}}, V_{\text{bag}})$ for t . Moreover, $(c_{\text{past}}, c_{\text{future}}, C_{\text{bag}}, V_{\text{bag}})$ is mapped to \perp if and only if no vector in $\{0, 1\}^d$ is compatible with $(c_{\text{past}}, c_{\text{future}}, C_{\text{bag}}, V_{\text{bag}})$.

First note that if t is the root node, then $\chi(t)$ is empty and $\chi(T_t) \setminus \chi(t)$ contains all vectors in the instance. Hence, if any tuple is mapped to a vector in the root, then the vector is a solution by properties 5 and 6 above.

We say that a tuple $\mathcal{C} = (c_{\text{past}}, c_{\text{future}}, C_{\text{bag}}, V_{\text{bag}})$ is *achievable* for Γ_t if the following holds:

- $c_{\text{past}} + c_{\text{future}} + |C_{\text{bag}}| = \lambda$; and
- for all vectors $\vec{v} \in \chi(t)$: $V_{\text{bag}}(\vec{v}) \leq \min\{\lambda, |\mathbf{1}(\vec{v}) \cap (\chi(T_t) \setminus \chi(t))|\}$.

Note that if \mathcal{C} is not achievable for Γ_t , then no vector with conciseness λ can be compatible with \mathcal{C} . Hence, the table Γ_t will only contain the achievable tuples for Γ_t . It is straightforward to observe that:

Observation 18. $|\Gamma_t| \leq \lambda^2 \cdot 2^{\chi(t)} \cdot (\min\{\lambda, \text{dcon}(I)\})^{|\chi(t)|}$, and we can enumerate all achievable tuples for Γ_t in $\mathcal{O}(\lambda^2 \cdot 2^{\chi(t)} \cdot (\min\{\lambda, \text{dcon}(I)\})^{|\chi(t)|})$ time.

Lemma 19 (leaf node). *Let $t \in V(T)$ be a leaf node and $\mathcal{C} = (c_{\text{past}}, c_{\text{future}}, C_{\text{bag}}, V_{\text{bag}})$ an achievable tuples for t . Then in $\mathcal{O}(d)$ time, we can either compute a compatible vector for \mathcal{C} or decide that no such vector exists.*

Proof. Since $\chi(t) = \emptyset$, the only achievable tuple for Γ_t

is $(0, \lambda, \emptyset, \emptyset)$. One can easily verify that any vector with precisely λ many ones is compatible with $(0, \lambda, \emptyset, \emptyset)$ for t . \square

Lemma 20 (introduce node). *Let $t \in V(T)$ be an introduce node with child t' such that $\chi(t) \setminus \chi(t') = \{v\}$ and $\mathcal{C} = (c_{\text{past}}, c_{\text{future}}, C_{\text{bag}}, V_{\text{bag}})$ an achievable tuple for t . Given $\Gamma_{t'}$, in polynomial time we can either compute a compatible vector for \mathcal{C} or decide that no such vector exists.*

Proof. We distinguish between two possibilities depending on whether vertex v represents a vector or a coordinate. First, consider that v is the coordinate $c \in [d]$ and consider the tuple $\mathcal{C}' = (c_{\text{past}}, c_{\text{future}} + |C_{\text{bag}} \cap \{c\}|, C_{\text{bag}} \setminus \{c\}, V_{\text{bag}})$ for the node t' . It is straightforward to verify that if \vec{c}_t is compatible with \mathcal{C} for t , then it is also compatible with \mathcal{C}' for t' . To see this, observe that $\chi(T_t) \setminus \chi(t) = \chi(T_{t'}) \setminus \chi(t')$. Hence, $c_{\text{past}} = |\mathbf{1}(\vec{c}_t) \cap \chi(T_t) \setminus \chi(t)| = |\mathbf{1}(\vec{c}_t) \cap \chi(T_{t'}) \setminus \chi(t')|$ and property 1 follows. Moreover, $V_R \cap (\chi(T_{t'}) \setminus \chi(t')) \cap B(\vec{c}_t, r) = V_R \cap (\chi(T_t) \setminus \chi(t)) \cap B(\vec{c}_t, r) = \emptyset$ and $(V_B \cap (\chi(T_{t'}) \setminus \chi(t'))) = (V_B \cap (\chi(T_t) \setminus \chi(t))) \subseteq B(\vec{c}_t, r)$ and properties 5 and 6 follow. The property 2 is satisfied, because \vec{c}_t is compatible with \mathcal{C} for t and so the number of non-zero coordinates of \vec{c}_t in $[d] \setminus \chi(T_{t'}) = ([d] \setminus \chi(T_t)) \cup \{c\}$ is either c_{future} if $c \notin \mathbf{1}(\vec{c}_t)$ or $c_{\text{future}} + 1$. Similarly, since \vec{c}_t is compatible with \mathcal{C} for t , property 3 is satisfied, because $\mathbf{1}(\vec{c}_t) \cap \chi(t') = \mathbf{1}(\vec{c}_t) \cap (\chi(t) \setminus \{c\}) = C_{\text{bag}} \setminus \{c\}$. Finally, since $\chi(t)$ and $\chi(t')$ differ only by a single coordinate, the set of vectors is the same in both, i.e., $\chi(t) \cap (V_R \cup V_B) = \chi(t') \cap (V_R \cup V_B)$ and for every vector $\vec{v} \in \chi(t)$ we have $V_{\text{bag}}(\vec{v}) = |\mathbf{1}(\vec{c}_t) \cap \mathbf{1}(\vec{v}) \cap (\chi(T_t) \setminus \chi(t))| = |\mathbf{1}(\vec{c}_t) \cap \mathbf{1}(\vec{v}) \cap (\chi(T_{t'}) \setminus \chi(t'))|$ and property 4 follows. Therefore, if $\Gamma_{t'}[\mathcal{C}'] = \perp$, then $\Gamma_t[\mathcal{C}] = \perp$ and we are done.

Now let $\Gamma_{t'}[\mathcal{C}'] = \vec{c}_{t'}$. If c is either in both C_{bag} and $\mathbf{1}(\vec{c}_{t'})$ or in neither of them, then $\vec{c}_{t'}$ is compatible with \mathcal{C} and we are done. Otherwise, $c \in C_{\text{bag}}$, but $c \notin \mathbf{1}(\vec{c}_{t'})$. Let c' be an arbitrary coordinate that has not yet been introduced such that $\vec{c}_{t'}$ is one on that coordinate; that is, $c' \in \mathbf{1}(\vec{c}_{t'}) \cap ([d] \setminus \chi(T_t))$. Note that such a coordinate exists since \mathcal{C}' is compatible with $\vec{c}_{t'}$, and hence, by property 2, $c_{\text{future}} + |C_{\text{bag}} \cap \{c\}| = |\mathbf{1}(\vec{c}_{t'}) \cap [d] \setminus \chi(T_{t'})|$. Moreover, $c_{\text{future}} + |C_{\text{bag}} \cap \{c\}| \geq |C_{\text{bag}} \cap \{c\}| = 1$ and c is not in $\mathbf{1}(\vec{c}_{t'})$. We claim that the vector \vec{c}_t such that $\mathbf{1}(\vec{c}_t) = (\mathbf{1}(\vec{c}_{t'}) \setminus \{c'\}) \cup \{c\}$ is compatible with \mathcal{C} . Properties 1-4 are straightforward to verify from the fact that $\vec{c}_{t'}$ is compatible with \mathcal{C}' for t' . For properties 5 and 6, recall that $\chi(t')$ is a separator in G_I , and hence all forgotten vectors are zero on both c and c' .

Second, let the introduced vertex v be a vector denoted \vec{v} . Note that since $\chi(t')$ is a separator in G_I , there is no edge between any forgotten coordinate $c \in [d] \cap (\chi(T_{t'}) \setminus \chi(t'))$ and the vector \vec{v} , which means that \vec{v} is zero on all the

forgotten coordinates. By definition, since \mathcal{C} is achievable for t , we have $V_{\text{bag}}(\vec{v}) = 0$. Consider a tuple $\mathcal{C}' = (c_{\text{past}}, c_{\text{future}}, C_{\text{bag}}, V_{\text{bag}}')$, where $V_{\text{bag}}'(\vec{u}) = V_{\text{bag}}(\vec{u})$ for every vector $\vec{u} \in \chi(t')$. It is easy to verify that any vector \vec{c}_t is compatible with \mathcal{C} for t if and only if it is compatible with \mathcal{C}' for t' . Hence, we let $\Gamma_t[\mathcal{C}] = \Gamma_{t'}[\mathcal{C}']$. \square

Lemma 21 (forget node). *Let $t \in V(T)$ be a forget node with child t' such that $\chi(t) = \chi(t') \setminus \{v\}$ and $\mathcal{C} = (c_{\text{past}}, c_{\text{future}}, C_{\text{bag}}, V_{\text{bag}})$ an achievable tuple for t . Given $\Gamma_{t'}$, in polynomial time we can either compute a compatible vector for \mathcal{C} or decide that no such vector exists.*

Proof. We again distinguish between two possibilities depending on whether vertex v represents a vector or a coordinate. First, let us assume that the forgotten vertex v is a coordinate $c \in [d]$. Consider the following two tuples achievable for Γ_t , $\mathcal{C}'_1 = (c_{\text{past}}, c_{\text{future}}, C_{\text{bag}}, V_{\text{bag}})$ and $\mathcal{C}'_2 = (c_{\text{past}} - 1, c_{\text{future}}, C_{\text{bag}} \cup \{c\}, V_{\text{bag}}')$, where $V_{\text{bag}}'(\vec{v}) = V_{\text{bag}}(\vec{v}) - \mathbf{1}(\vec{v}) \cap \{c\}$ for all $\vec{v} \in \chi(t)$. It is straightforward to verify that if vector \vec{c}_t is compatible with \mathcal{C} for t , then either $c \notin \mathbf{1}(\vec{c}_t)$ and \vec{c}_t is compatible with \mathcal{C}'_1 , or $c \in \mathbf{1}(\vec{c}_t)$ and \vec{c}_t is compatible with \mathcal{C}'_2 . Moreover, any vector compatible with \mathcal{C}'_1 or \mathcal{C}'_2 for t' , then it is also compatible with \mathcal{C} for t . Therefore, we let $\Gamma_t[\mathcal{C}] = \Gamma_{t'}[\mathcal{C}'_1]$ if $\Gamma_{t'}[\mathcal{C}'_1] \neq \perp$, otherwise, we let $\Gamma_t[\mathcal{C}] = \Gamma_{t'}[\mathcal{C}'_2]$.

Second, assume that v is a vector \vec{v} . Consider all tuples \mathcal{C}'_i , for $i \in [c_{\text{past}}]$ such that $\mathcal{C}'_i = (c_{\text{past}}, c_{\text{future}}, C_{\text{bag}}, V_{\text{bag}}^i)$, where $V_{\text{bag}}^i(\vec{u}) = V_{\text{bag}}(\vec{u})$ for all $\vec{u} \in \chi(t)$ and $V_{\text{bag}}^i(\vec{v}) = i$. It is easy to see that if \vec{c}_t is compatible with \mathcal{C} for t , then \vec{c}_t is compatible with \mathcal{C}'_i for t' for some $i \in [c_{\text{past}}]$. Note that since $\chi(t)$ is a separator, \vec{v} is zero on all coordinates that have not been introduced yet. Therefore, the distance between \vec{v} and any center compatible with \mathcal{C}'_i is precisely $\lambda + \text{con}(\vec{v}) - 2 \cdot (V_{\text{bag}}^i(\vec{v}) + |\mathbf{1}(\vec{v}) \cap C_{\text{bag}}|) = \lambda + \text{con}(\vec{v}) - 2 \cdot (i + |\mathbf{1}(\vec{v}) \cap C_{\text{bag}}|)$, and in particular, this distance does not depend on the center as long as the center is compatible with \mathcal{C}'_i for t' . For that reason, we just need to go over all $i \in [c_{\text{past}}]$, and check if $\Gamma_{t'}[\mathcal{C}'_i] \neq \perp$ and if so we check if $\lambda + \text{con}(\vec{v}) - 2 \cdot (i + |\mathbf{1}(\vec{v}) \cap C_{\text{bag}}|)$ is at most r in case \vec{v} is blue, or at least $r + 1$ if \vec{v} is red. If both conditions are satisfied for some $i \in [\lambda]$, then we let $\Gamma_t[\mathcal{C}] = \Gamma_{t'}[\mathcal{C}'_i]$; otherwise, we let $\Gamma_t[\mathcal{C}] = \perp$. \square

Lemma 22 (join node). *Let $t \in V(T)$ be a join node with children t_1, t_2 such that $\chi(t) = \chi(t_1) = \chi(t_2)$ and $\mathcal{C} = (c_{\text{past}}, c_{\text{future}}, C_{\text{bag}}, V_{\text{bag}})$ an achievable tuple for t . Given Γ_{t_1} and Γ_{t_2} , in $\mathcal{O}(|\Gamma_{t_1}| \cdot (|V| + d)^{\mathcal{O}(1)})$ time we can either compute a compatible vector for \mathcal{C} or decide that no such vector exists.*

Proof. Let \vec{c}_t be a vector compatible with \mathcal{C} for t . Observe that \vec{c}_t is also compatible with some tuple $\mathcal{C}_1 =$

$(c_{\text{past}}^1, c_{\text{future}}^1, C_{\text{bag}}^1, V_{\text{bag}}^1)$ for t_1 and some tuple $\mathcal{C}_2 = (c_{\text{past}}^2, c_{\text{future}}^2, C_{\text{bag}}^2, V_{\text{bag}}^2)$ for t_2 such that

- $c_{\text{past}} = c_{\text{past}}^1 + c_{\text{past}}^2$;
- $c_{\text{future}}^i = \lambda - c_{\text{past}}^i - |C_{\text{bag}}| = c_{\text{future}} + c_{\text{past}}^{3-i}$ for $i \in \{1, 2\}$;
- $C_{\text{bag}} = C_{\text{bag}}^1 = C_{\text{bag}}^2$; and
- $V_{\text{bag}}(\vec{v}) = V_{\text{bag}}^1(\vec{v}) + V_{\text{bag}}^2(\vec{v})$ for all vectors $\vec{v} \in \chi(t)$.

We call such pair of tuples \mathcal{C}_1 and \mathcal{C}_2 satisfying the above four conditions *joinable pair*.

On the other hand, consider a joinable pair of tuples $\mathcal{C}_1 = (c_{\text{past}}^1, c_{\text{future}}^1, C_{\text{bag}}^1, V_{\text{bag}}^1)$ for t_1 and $\mathcal{C}_2 = (c_{\text{past}}^2, c_{\text{future}}^2, C_{\text{bag}}^2, V_{\text{bag}}^2)$. Moreover, let \vec{c}_t^1 be a vector compatible with \mathcal{C}_1 for t_1 and \vec{c}_t^2 be a vector compatible with \mathcal{C}_2 for t_2 . Now let \vec{c}_t be an arbitrary vector such that $\mathbf{1}(\vec{c}_t) \cap \chi(T_{t_1}) \setminus \chi(t) = \mathbf{1}(\vec{c}_t^1) \cap \chi(T_{t_1}) \setminus \chi(t)$, $\mathbf{1}(\vec{c}_t) \cap \chi(T_{t_2}) \setminus \chi(t) = \mathbf{1}(\vec{c}_t^2) \cap \chi(T_{t_2}) \setminus \chi(t)$, $\mathbf{1}(\vec{c}_t) \cap \chi(t) = C_{\text{bag}}$, and $|\mathbf{1}(\vec{c}_t) \setminus \chi(T_t)| = c_{\text{future}}$. That is, \vec{c}_t agrees with \vec{c}_t^1 on the coordinates that are forgotten in a node below t_1 , and with \vec{c}_t^2 on the coordinates that are forgotten in a node below t_2 . We claim that \vec{c}_t is compatible with \mathcal{C} for t . Properties 1-4 follow directly from the construction of \vec{c}_t . Now let \vec{v} be a vector in $\chi(T_{t_i}) \setminus \chi(t_i)$ for $i \in \{1, 2\}$. We claim that the distance between \vec{v} and \vec{c}_t is precisely the same as the distance between \vec{v} and \vec{c}_t^i . This is because \vec{c}_t^i and \vec{c}_t coincide on the coordinates in $\chi(T_{t_i})$, \vec{v} is zero on all the other coordinates, and the number of non-zero coordinates of \vec{c}_t^i and \vec{c}_t in $[d] \setminus \chi(T_{t_i})$ is the same. It follows that properties 5 and 6 are satisfied as well.

Therefore, to compute $\Gamma_t[\mathcal{C}]$ we can go over all tuples $\mathcal{C}_1 = (c_{\text{past}}^1, c_{\text{future}}^1, C_{\text{bag}}^1, V_{\text{bag}}^1)$ in Γ_{t_1} such that $C_{\text{bag}}^1 = C_{\text{bag}}$. By definition of “joinable pair of tuples”, there is a unique tuple \mathcal{C}_2 that forms a joinable pair with \mathcal{C}_1 given by $\mathcal{C}_2 = (c_{\text{past}} - c_{\text{past}}^1, c_{\text{future}} + c_{\text{past}}^1, C_{\text{bag}}, V_{\text{bag}}^2)$, where $V_{\text{bag}}^2(\vec{v}) = V_{\text{bag}}(\vec{v}) - V_{\text{bag}}^1(\vec{v})$ for all vectors $\vec{v} \in \chi(t)$. If $\Gamma_{t_1}[\mathcal{C}_1] \neq \perp$ and $\Gamma_{t_2}[\mathcal{C}_2] \neq \perp$, then we compute $\Gamma_t[\mathcal{C}]$ as above and stop. On the other hand, if for all pairs $(\mathcal{C}_1, \mathcal{C}_2)$ we have either $\Gamma_{t_1}[\mathcal{C}_1] = \perp$ or $\Gamma_{t_2}[\mathcal{C}_2] = \perp$, then we correctly return that $\Gamma_t[\mathcal{C}] = \perp$. \square

Now we are ready to put the whole algorithm together and prove the main theorem of this section.

Proof of Theorem 17. The algorithm works by going over all $\lambda \in \{0, 1, \dots, d\}$, and for each λ , it goes over all $r \in \{0, 1, \dots, d\}$. For each pair (λ, r) , we use the algorithms of Observation 18 and Lemmas 19-22 to compute the table Γ_t for each node $t \in T$. Finally, we go over all tuples for the root node t_r . If for some tuple \mathcal{C} we have $\Gamma_{t_r}[\mathcal{C}] \neq \perp$, we return $\Gamma_{t_r}[\mathcal{C}]$, note that in this case $\text{econ}_{\min} = \lambda$ is indeed a minimum possible conciseness, otherwise, we continue to next pair (λ, r) . The running time follows from Observation 18 and Lemmas 19-22. \square

Combining Theorem 17 and Proposition 2, we get the following three corollaries:

Corollary 23. BHC and EC-BHC are in XP parameterized by $\text{tw}(G_I)$.

Corollary 24. EC-BHC is fixed-parameter tractable parameterized by $\text{tw}(G_I) + \text{econ}$.

Corollary 25. BHC and EC-BHC are fixed-parameter tractable parameterized by $\text{tw}(G_I) + \text{dcon}(I)$.

7. Concluding Remarks

In this paper, we studied hypersphere classification problems from a parameterized complexity perspective, focusing strongly on conciseness. We considered conciseness in terms of the sought-after explanation and in terms of the feature vectors in the training data. Our algorithmic and lower-bound results draw a comprehensive complexity map of hypersphere classification. This map pinpoints the exact complexity of the various combinations of parameters which can either measure the structural properties of the input data or the conciseness of data or explanations.

All our lower and upper complexity bounds are essentially tight, with a single exception: While we show that hypersphere classification without conciseness restrictions is XP-tractable when parameterized by treewidth alone, whether the problem is fixed-parameter tractable or W[1]-hard under this parameterization is left open.

Finally, we remark that all our results carry over to the case where one aims to find a minimum-radius separating hypersphere (instead of merely deciding whether one exists) that classifies the training data. This problem has also been extensively studied (Cooper, 1962; Wang et al., 2007; 2005; Astorino & Gaudio, 2009; Astorino et al., 2016).

Acknowledgments

Robert Ganian acknowledges support from the Austrian Science Fund (FWF, project Y1329). Iyad Kanj acknowledges support from DePaul University through a URC grant 602061. Stefan Szeider acknowledges support from the Austrian Science Fund (FWF, projects P32441), and from the Vienna Science and Technology Fund (WWTF, project ICT19-065). Sebastian Ordyniak acknowledges support from the Engineering and Physical Sciences Research Council (EPSRC, project EP/V00252X/1).

References

Agarwal, P. K., Aronov, B., and Koltun, V. Efficient algorithms for bichromatic separability. *ACM Trans. Algorithms*, 2(2):209–227, 2006.

Alegría, C., Orden, D., Seara, C., and Urrutia, J. Separating

bichromatic point sets in the plane by restricted orientation convex hulls. *Journal of Global Optimization*, pp. 1–34, 2022.

Aspvall, B., Plass, M. F., and Tarjan, R. E. A linear-time algorithm for testing the truth of certain quantified boolean formulas. *Inf. Process. Lett.*, 8(3):121–123, 1979.

Astorino, A. and Gaudio, M. A fixed-center spherical separation algorithm with kernel transformations for classification problems. *Comput. Manag. Sci.*, 6(3):357–372, 2009.

Astorino, A., Fuduli, A., and Gaudio, M. Nonlinear programming for classification problems in machine learning. In *AIP Conference Proceedings*, volume 1776, 2016.

Barceló, P., Monet, M., Pérez, J., and Subercaseaux, B. Model interpretability through the lens of computational complexity. In *Proceedings of the Thirty-Third Annual Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems NeurIPS*, pp. 15487–15498, 2020.

Blanc, G., Lange, J., and Tan, L. Provably efficient, succinct, and precise explanations. In *Proceedings of the Thirty-Fourth Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems NeurIPS*, pp. 6129–6141, 2021.

Chalasanani, P., Chen, J., Chowdhury, A. R., Wu, X., and Jha, S. Concise explanations of neural networks using adversarial training. In *Proceedings of the 37th International Conference on Machine Learning (ICML)*, volume 119, pp. 1383–1391. PMLR, 2020.

Chen, H. A rendezvous of logic, complexity, and algebra. *ACM Comput. Surv.*, 42(1):2:1–2:32, 2009.

Cooper, P. W. The hypersphere in pattern recognition. *Inf. Control.*, 5(4):324–346, 1962.

Cygan, M., Fomin, F. V., Kowalik, L., Lokshtanov, D., Marx, D., Pilipczuk, M., Pilipczuk, M., and Saurabh, S. *Parameterized Algorithms*. Springer, 2015.

Dahiya, Y., Fomin, F. V., Panolan, F., and Simonov, K. Fixed-parameter and approximation algorithms for PCA with outliers. In *Proceedings of the 38th International Conference on Machine Learning (ICML)*, volume 139, pp. 2341–2351, 2021.

Darwiche, A. and Hirth, A. On the reasons behind decisions. In *ECAI 2020 - 24th European Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, volume 325 of *Frontiers in Artificial Intelligence and Applications*, pp. 712–720, 2020.

Doshi-Velez, F. and Kim, B. A roadmap for a rigorous science of interpretability. *CoRR*, abs/1702.08608, 2017. URL <http://arxiv.org/abs/1702.08608>.

- Downey, R. G. and Fellows, M. R. *Fundamentals of Parameterized Complexity*. Texts in Computer Science. Springer, 2013.
- Flum, J. and Grohe, M. *Parameterized Complexity Theory*, volume XIV of *Texts in Theoretical Computer Science. An EATCS Series*. Springer, Berlin, 2006.
- Frances, M. and Litman, A. On covering problems of codes. *Theory of Computing Systems*, 30:113–119, 1997.
- Frank, A. and Tardos, É. An application of simultaneous diophantine approximation in combinatorial optimization. *Combinatorica*, 7(1):49–65, 1987.
- Ganian, R. and Korchemna, V. The complexity of bayesian network learning: Revisiting the superstructure. In *Proceedings of the Thirty-Fourth Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems NeurIPS*, pp. 430–442, 2021.
- Ganian, R., Kanj, I. A., Ordyniak, S., and Szeider, S. Parameterized algorithms for the matrix completion problem. In *Proceedings of the 35th International Conference on Machine Learning (ICML)*, volume 80, pp. 1642–1651, 2018.
- Ganian, R., Hamm, T., Korchemna, V., Okrasa, K., and Simonov, K. The complexity of k-means clustering when little is known. In *International Conference on Machine Learning (ICML)*, volume 162, pp. 6960–6987, 2022.
- Grüttemeier, N. and Komusiewicz, C. Learning bayesian networks under sparsity constraints: A parameterized complexity analysis. *J. Artif. Intell. Res.*, 74:1225–1267, 2022.
- H. W. Lenstra, J. Integer programming with a fixed number of variables. *Mathematics of Operations Research*, 8(4): 538–548, 1983.
- Hurtado, F., Seara, C., and Sethia, S. Red-blue separability problems in 3D. In *Computational Science and Its Applications*, pp. 766–775, Berlin, Heidelberg, 2003. Springer Berlin.
- Ignatiev, A., Marques-Silva, J., Narodytska, N., and Stuckey, P. J. Reasoning-based learning of interpretable ML models. In Zhou, Z. (ed.), *Proceedings of the Thirtieth International Joint Conference on Artificial Intelligence IJCAI*, pp. 4458–4465, 2021.
- Izza, Y., Ignatiev, A., Narodytska, N., Cooper, M. C., and Marques-Silva, J. Provably precise, succinct and efficient explanations for decision trees. *CoRR*, abs/2205.09569, 2022.
- Jeavons, P., Cohen, D., and Gyssens, M. Closure properties of constraints. *J. ACM*, 44(4):527–548, 1997.
- Kannan, R. Minkowski’s convex body theorem and integer programming. *Mathematics of Operations Research*, 12(3):415–440, 1987.
- Kim, S., Lee, K., and Jeong, Y. Norm ball classifier for one-class classification. *Ann. Oper. Res.*, 303(1):433–482, 2021.
- Kloks, T. *Treewidth, Computations and Approximations*, volume 842 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*. Springer, 1994.
- Korhonen, T. A single-exponential time 2-approximation algorithm for treewidth. In *62nd IEEE Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science (FOCS)*, pp. 184–192. IEEE, 2021.
- Laber, E. S. and Murtinho, L. On the price of explainability for some clustering problems. In *Proceedings of the 38th International Conference on Machine Learning (ICML)*, volume 139, pp. 5915–5925, 2021.
- Lipton, Z. C. The mythos of model interpretability. *Commun. ACM*, 61(10):36–43, 2018.
- Makarychev, K. and Shan, L. Near-optimal algorithms for explainable k-medians and k-means. In *Proceedings of the 38th International Conference on Machine Learning (ICML)*, volume 139, pp. 7358–7367, 2021.
- Megiddo, N. On the complexity of polyhedral separability. *Discrete & Computational Geometry*, 3(4):325–337, 1988.
- Monroe, D. Ai, explain yourself. *Commun. ACM*, 61(11): 11–13, 2018.
- Nori, H., Caruana, R., Bu, Z., Shen, J. H., and Kulkarni, J. Accuracy, interpretability, and differential privacy via explainable boosting. In *Proceedings of the 38th International Conference on Machine Learning (ICML)*, volume 139, pp. 8227–8237, 2021.
- Ordyniak, S. and Szeider, S. Parameterized complexity results for exact bayesian network structure learning. *J. Artif. Intell. Res.*, 46:263–302, 2013.
- Ordyniak, S., Paesani, G., and Szeider, S. The parameterized complexity of finding concise local explanations. In Elkind, E. (ed.), *The 32nd International Joint Conference on Artificial Intelligence (IJCAI-23)*, August 19–25, 2023, Macao, S.A.R. International Joint Conferences on Artificial Intelligence Organization, 2023. Main Track, to appear.
- O’Rourke, J., Kosaraju, S. R., and Megiddo, N. Computing circular separability. *Discrete & computational geometry*, 1:105–114, 1986.

- Ribeiro, M. T., Singh, S., and Guestrin, C. Anchors: High-precision model-agnostic explanations. In *Proceedings of the Thirty-Second AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, pp. 1527–1535. AAAI Press, 2018.
- Schaefer, T. J. The complexity of satisfiability problems. In *Proceedings of the 10th Annual ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing, May 1-3, 1978, San Diego, California, USA*, pp. 216–226. ACM, 1978.
- Sheikhi, F., Mohades, A., de Berg, M., and Davoodi, M. Separating bichromatic point sets by l-shapes. *Comput. Geom.*, 48(9):673–687, 2015.
- Shih, A., Choi, A., and Darwiche, A. A symbolic approach to explaining bayesian network classifiers. In *Proceedings of the Twenty-Seventh International Joint Conference on Artificial Intelligence, IJCAI*, pp. 5103–5111, 2018.
- Shih, S., Tien, P., and Karnin, Z. GANMEX: one-vs-one attributions using gan-based model explainability. In *Proceedings of the 38th International Conference on Machine Learning (ICML)*, volume 139, pp. 9592–9602, 2021.
- Simonov, K., Fomin, F. V., Golovach, P. A., and Panolan, F. Refined complexity of PCA with outliers. In *Proceedings of the 36th International Conference on Machine Learning (ICML)*, volume 97, pp. 5818–5826, 2019.
- Tax, D. M. J. and Duin, R. P. W. Data domain description using support vectors. In *The European Symposium on Artificial Neural Networks*, 1999.
- Vapnik, V. N. *The Nature of Statistical Learning Theory*. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, Heidelberg, 1995.
- Wäldchen, S., MacDonald, J., Hauch, S., and Kutyniok, G. The computational complexity of understanding binary classifier decisions. *J. Artif. Intell. Res.*, 70:351–387, 2021.
- Wang, J., Neskovic, P., and Cooper, L. N. Pattern classification via single spheres. In *proceedings of 8th International Conference on Discovery Science*, volume 3735 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pp. 241–252. Springer, 2005.
- Wang, J., Neskovic, P., and Cooper, L. N. Bayes classification based on minimum bounding spheres. *Neurocomputing*, 70(4-6):801–808, 2007.
- Wang, Z., Zhang, W., Liu, N., and Wang, J. Scalable rule-based representation learning for interpretable classification. In *Proceedings of the Thirty-Fourth Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems (NeurIPS)*, pp. 30479–30491, 2021.