

On the Confluence of Directed Graph Reductions Preserving Feedback Vertex Set Minimality

Moussa Abdenbi

Université du Québec à Montréal
Québec, Canada

abdenbi.moussa@uqam.ca

Alexandre Blondin Massé

Université du Québec à Montréal
Québec, Canada

blondin_masse.alexandre@uqam.ca

Alain Goupil

Université du Québec À Trois-Rivières
Québec, Canada

alain.goupil@uqtr.ca

Odile Marcotte

Université du Québec à Montréal
Québec, Canada

odile.marcotte@videotron.ca

1 Introduction

In graph theory, the minimum directed feedback vertex set (FVS) problem consists in identifying the smallest subsets of vertices in a directed graph whose deletion renders the directed graph acyclic. In other words, a FVS in a directed graph G with vertex set V is a subset of V with a nonempty intersection with every circuit of G . Computing a minimum cardinality FVS (MFVS) is NP-hard [4, 5]. In this extended abstract we investigate graph reductions that preserve all or some minimum cardinality FVS and we focus on their properties, especially the Church-Rosser property, also called confluence. The Church-Rosser property implies the irrelevance of reduction order, leading to a unique digraph [2]. We explore graph reductions proposed for solving the MFVS problem, preserving the collection of MFVS or at least one of them [6, 7, 8]. The study seeks the largest set of reductions with the Church-Rosser property and explores the adaptability of reductions to meet this criterion. Addressing these questions is crucial, as it may have algorithmic implications, including potential parallelization and speeding up sequential algorithms in graph classes with polynomial algorithms [3, 9].

For sake of completeness, we recall some definitions and notation from graph theory.

A *directed graph* (or *digraph*) is an ordered pair $G = (V, E)$ where V is a finite set of *vertices* and $E \subseteq V \times V$ is a set of arcs. Let $G = (V, E)$ be a digraph, $u, v \in V$ and $U \subseteq V$. We denote $N_G^+(u) = \{s \in V \mid (u, s) \in E\}$ and $N_G^-(u) = \{p \in V \mid (p, u) \in E\}$ the set of successors and the set of predecessors of u respectively. For a vertex $u \in V$, $G - u$ denotes the digraph whose set of vertices is $V \setminus \{u\}$ and whose set of arcs is $E \setminus \{(x, y) \in E \mid x = u \text{ or } y = u\}$. Accordingly, for a given arc $(u, v) \in E$, $G - (u, v)$ is the digraph where the set of vertices is V and the set of arcs is $E \setminus \{(u, v)\}$. Similarly, the digraph $G \circ u$ is the digraph where the set of vertices is $V \setminus \{u\}$ and the set of arcs is $(E \setminus \{(x, y) \in E \mid x = u \text{ or } y = u\}) \cup N_G^-(u) \times N_G^+(u)$.

For $e = (u, v) \in E$, we say that e is a *2-way arc* in G if $(v, u) \in E$. The set of all 2-way arcs of G is denoted by $E^{\leftrightarrow} = \{(u, v) \in E \mid (v, u) \in E\}$. Given a digraph $G = (V, E)$ we distinguish two special digraphs $G^{\leftrightarrow} = (V, E^{\leftrightarrow})$ and $G^{\rightarrow} = (V, E^{\rightarrow})$ where $E^{\rightarrow} = E \setminus E^{\leftrightarrow}$.

A (*directed*) *path* of G is a sequence $p = (v_1, v_2, \dots, v_k)$ of vertices $v_i \in V$ for $i = 1, 2, \dots, k$ such that $(v_i, v_{i+1}) \in E$ for $i = 1, 2, \dots, k-1$. Moreover, a path p is called a *circuit* if $v_1 = v_k$. An arc (u, u) is called a *loop*. We say that G is *acyclic*, if there is no circuit in G . Given $U \subseteq V$, we say that U is a *directed clique* or *diclique* of G if for each $u, v \in U$ and $u \neq v$, we have $(u, v) \in E$ and $(u, u) \notin E$.




Figure 1: Illustration of the INDICLIQUE reduction. (a) $N_G^-(u)$ is a diclique, so INDICLIQUE(u) is applicable. (b) We remove u and all its incident arcs, and we add the new arcs (p_i, s_j) for $i \in \{1, 2, 3\}$ and $j \in \{1, 2\}$.

A set $U \subseteq V$ is called a *feedback vertex set* if $G' = (V', E')$ where $V' = V \setminus U$ and $E' = E \setminus \{(u, v) \mid u \in U \text{ or } v \in U\}$ is acyclic. The set of all feedback vertex sets of G is denoted by $FVS(G)$. The set of all *minimal feedback vertex sets*, in short $MFVS(G)$, is the set of feedback vertex sets with minimal cardinality.

2 Reductions

Given a digraph $G = (V, E)$, the problem of finding a minimum feedback vertex set is NP-hard [4]. However, in some cases we can use a set of *transformations* by which the size of the input graph can be reduced, with the guarantee that at least one minimum feedback vertex set in G could be constructed from a minimum feedback vertex set in the reduced graph, in polynomial time. These transformations are called *digraph reductions*.

In this context, by digraph reduction we mean a transformation of the digraph $G = (V, E)$ into a digraph $G' = (V', E')$ such that (1) either $|V'| < |V|$, or $|V'| = |V|$ and $|E'| < |E|$, and (2) an MFVS of G can be computed in polynomial time from any MFVS of G' .

In the following, we give a brief description of Levy and Low's [7] simple and straightforward reductions, followed by a generalization of two of their reductions by Lemaic [6], and additional reductions from Lin and Jou [8]. Let $G = (V, E)$ be a digraph and $u, v \in V$.

- The precondition of the reduction LOOP(u) is $(u, u) \in E$. This reduction transforms $G = (V, E)$ in $G - u$ and adds u to the MFVS in construction.
- The precondition of IN0(u) is $N_G^-(u) = \emptyset$. This reduction transforms $G = (V, E)$ in $G - u$.
- The precondition of OUT0(u) is $N_G^+(u) = \emptyset$. This reduction transforms $G = (V, E)$ in $G - u$.
- The precondition of IN1(u) is $(u, u) \notin E$ and $|N_G^-(u)| = 1$. The transformation consists of replacing G by the digraph $G \circ u$. This reduction does not necessarily preserve all the FVS of the original digraph but every MFVS of the reduced digraph is also an MFVS of the original graph.
- The precondition of OUT1(u) is $(u, u) \notin E$ and $|N_G^+(u)| = 1$. The transformation consists of replacing G by the digraph $G \circ u$. This reduction does not necessarily preserve all the FVS of the original digraph but every MFVS of the reduced digraph is also an MFVS of the original digraph.

Lemaic [6] proposed a generalization of IN1 and OUT1 based on the diclique concept.

- The precondition of INDICLIQUE(u) is $(u, u) \notin E$ and $N_G^-(u)$ forms a diclique in G . The transformation consists of replacing G by $G \circ u$. Similar to IN1(u), this reduction, illustrated in Figure 1,




Figure 2: Illustration of Lin and Jou reductions preconditions. (a) PIE is applicable on the blue and red arcs. Indeed, there no circuit going through the blue arcs (b, v) and (a, w) in G , and therefore in G^{\rightarrow} and the same is true for the red arcs (v, w) and (w, u) in G^{\rightarrow} . Therefore we can remove the blue and red arcs from G . (b) $\text{CORE}(u)$ is applicable since u and its neighbors, $\{u, u_1, u_2, u_3\}$ form a diclique. So we can add $\{u_1, u_2, u_3\}$ to the MFVS and remove them from G . (c) In the top the first case of DOME and in the bottom the second case. The arc (u, v) is dominated and we can remove it from G .

does not necessarily preserve all the FVS of the original digraph but every MFVS of the reduced digraph is also an MFVS of the original digraph.

- The precondition of $\text{OUTDICLIQUE}(u)$ is $(u, u) \notin E$ and $N_G^+(u)$ forms a diclique in G . The transformation consists of replacing G by $G \circ u$. This reduction does not necessarily preserve all the FVS of the original digraph but every MFVS of the reduced digraph is also an MFVS of the original digraph.

Lin and Jou extended the work of Levy and Low by proposing the following three reductions [7, 8].

- The precondition of $\text{PIE}(u, v)$, for an arc (u, v) of G that is not a 2-way arc, is the following: there is no circuit in the digraph G^{\rightarrow} going through arc (u, v) . The transformation consists of replacing G with $G - (u, v)$. This reduction preserves all the FVS of the original digraph.
- The precondition of $\text{CORE}(u)$ is $\{u\} \cup N_G^-(u) \cup N_G^+(u)$ is a diclique of G . The transformation consists of removing all vertices $x \in N_G^-(u) \cup N_G^+(u)$ and add them to the MFVS and we replace G with $G - x$. This reduction does not necessarily preserve all the FVS of the original digraph but every MFVS of the reduced digraph is also an MFVS of the original digraph.
- The precondition of $\text{DOME}(u, v)$, for an arc (u, v) of G , is $N_{G^{\rightarrow}}^-(u) \subseteq N_G^-(v)$ (first case) or $N_{G^{\rightarrow}}^+(v) \subseteq N_G^+(u)$ (second case). The transformation consists of replacing G with $G - (u, v)$. This reduction preserves all the FVS of the original digraph.

See Figure 2 for illustrations of the preconditions of the Lin and Jou reductions.

3 The finite Church-Rosser property

Another way to see digraph reductions is to consider them as binary relations on the set of all digraphs \mathcal{G} . More precisely, a reduction R can be seen as a binary relation $\mathcal{R} \subseteq \mathcal{G} \times \mathcal{G}$. Hence for $G, G' \in \mathcal{G}$ if we can reduce G to G' with the reduction R , then we say that $(G, G') \in \mathcal{R}$. For a given reduction relation \mathcal{R} , we say that $G \in \mathcal{G}$ is \mathcal{R} -irreducible (or simply *irreducible* when the context is clear) if there does not exist $G' \in \mathcal{G}$ such that $(G, G') \in \mathcal{R}$.




Figure 3: A digraph showing that the reductions in the article by Lin and Jou does not have the Church-Rosser property. If $G = (V, E)$ denotes the displayed digraph, the equalities $N_{G \rightarrow}^-(c) = \{a, b\} \subseteq \{a, b, c, d\} = N_G^-(e)$ and $N_{G \rightarrow}^-(d) = \{a, c\} \subseteq \{a, b, c, d\} = N_G^-(e)$ hold. Hence we can reduce G using $\text{DOME}(c, e)$ and $\text{DOME}(d, e)$. We can apply $\text{DOME}(d, e)$ followed by $\text{DOME}(c, e)$. If we first apply $\text{DOME}(c, e)$, however, the precondition of $\text{DOME}(d, e)$ is not verified. Indeed, we have $N_{G-(c,e)}^-(d) = \{a, c\} \not\subseteq \{a, b, d\} = N_{G-(c,e)}^-(e)$ and the graph $(V, E - (c, e))$ cannot be reduced further.

Now, given some $G \in \mathcal{G}$, one might wish to *reduce* G as much as possible by using the following procedure: (Step 1) if there is no G' such that $(G, G') \in \mathcal{R}$, then stop; (Step 2) otherwise, pick any $G' \in \mathcal{G}$ such that $(G, G') \in \mathcal{R}$; (Step 3) replace G by G' and repeat the previous steps. However, there is no guarantee that the final digraph is unique, since there might be more than one available candidate for G' at Step 2). An important property that could be satisfied by a set of reductions is the *Church-Rosser finiteness* property [2] also called *confluence* [1]. According to this property, the order in which a sequence of reductions is applied does not affect the final reduced graph.

In order to introduce more formally this property, we need some additional definitions. Let $\mathcal{R} \subseteq \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{S}$ be any binary relation on a set \mathcal{S} and write $x\mathcal{R}y$ whenever $(x, y) \in \mathcal{R}$. The *reflexive closure* of \mathcal{R} , denoted by \mathcal{R}^R , is given by $\mathcal{R}^R = \mathcal{R} \cup \{(x, x) \mid x \in \mathcal{S}\}$. Its *transitive closure* is defined by $\mathcal{R}^T = \bigcup_{i=1}^{\infty} \mathcal{R}^i$ where \mathcal{R}^i is the composition of \mathcal{R} with itself i times. The *reflexive-transitive closure* of \mathcal{R} is then defined by $\mathcal{R}^{RT} = \mathcal{R}^R \cup \mathcal{R}^T$. The *completion* of \mathcal{R} is given by $\mathcal{R}^C = \{(x, y) \in \mathcal{R}^{RT} \mid \text{there does not exist } z \in \mathcal{S} \text{ such that } (y, z) \in \mathcal{R}\}$. A pair $(\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{R})$ is called *finite* if for $x, y \in \mathcal{S}$, there is a constant k such that if $x\mathcal{R}^i y$, then $i \leq k$.

We say that $(\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{R})$ has the *Church-Rosser finiteness property*, if $(\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{R})$ is finite and for $x, y, z \in \mathcal{S}$, if $(x, y) \in \mathcal{R}^C$ and $(x, z) \in \mathcal{R}^C$, then $y = z$. The following theorem proved in [10] gives a simpler test for Church-Rosser finiteness property.

Theorem 1 (Sethi [10]). *Let \mathcal{R} be a relation on a set \mathcal{S} . Then $(\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{R})$ is Church-Rosser finite if and only if $(\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{R})$ is finite and, for all $x, y, z \in \mathcal{S}$, the conditions $x\mathcal{R}y$ and $x\mathcal{R}z$ imply that there exists $w \in \mathcal{S}$ such that $y\mathcal{R}^T w$ and $z\mathcal{R}^T w$.*

The Church-Rosser finiteness property has been equivalently called *confluence* [1]. From now on, for the sake of making the text shorter, we shall use that word as well.

Levy and Low have shown that the set of reductions $\{\text{LOOP}, \text{IN0}, \text{OUT0}, \text{IN1}, \text{OUT1}\}$ is confluent [7], and Lemaic has shown that the set of reductions $\{\text{LOOP}, \text{INDICLIQUE}, \text{OUTDICLIQUE}\}$ is also confluent [6]. However, Lin and Jou in their article [8] did not investigate whether the confluence is preserved if one includes their three additional reductions (namely, $\text{PIE}(u, v)$, $\text{CORE}(u)$ and $\text{DOME}(u, v)$) in the family of reductions.

The digraph displayed in Figure 3 is a counter-example to the (false) claim that the family consisting of $\{\text{LOOP}, \text{IN0}, \text{OUT0}, \text{IN1}, \text{OUT1}, \text{PIE}, \text{CORE}, \text{DOME}\}$ is confluent.

Moreover, for practical purposes, when proving confluence, it is convenient to exclude the reductions subsumed by other reductions. For example, IN1 is subsumed by INDICLIQUE which means that if IN1 is applicable on a given vertex u , then INDICLIQUE is also applicable on u . Therefore, if $\{\text{INDICLIQUE}, \mathcal{R}\}$ is confluent, then $\{\text{IN1}, \text{INDICLIQUE}, \mathcal{R}\}$ is also confluent. The following proposition formalizes this property.

Proposition 1. *Let \mathcal{S} be a set and $\mathcal{R}_1, \mathcal{R}_2$ and \mathcal{R}_3 three relations on \mathcal{S} . If $\mathcal{R}_1 \subseteq \mathcal{R}_2$ and $\{\mathcal{R}_2, \mathcal{R}_3\}$ is confluent, then $\{\mathcal{R}_1, \mathcal{R}_2, \mathcal{R}_3\}$ is also confluent.*

So according to Propostion 1, proving that $\{\text{LOOP}, \text{INDICLIQUE}, \text{OUTDICLIQUE}, \text{PIE}\}$ is confluent implies that $\{\text{LOOP}, \text{IN0}, \text{OUT0}, \text{IN1}, \text{OUT1}, \text{PIE}, \text{CORE}, \text{INDICLIQUE}, \text{OUTDICLIQUE}\}$ is also confluent. Indeed, Lemaic has proved that IN1 and OUT1 are subsumed by INDICLIQUE and OUTDICLIQUE. The same is true for IN0 and OUT0 if we consider an empty set as a diclique. For the CORE reduction we can subsume it with INDICLIQUE/OUTDICLIQUE followed by LOOP. Indeed, if $u \in V$ is a core, then $N_G^-(u) \cup N_G^+(u) \cup \{u\}$ forms a diclique. In particular, $N_G^-(u) \cup N_G^+(u) = N_G^-(u) = N_G^+(u)$ forms a diclique, so we can apply INDICLIQUE(u) or OUTDICLIQUE(u). Hence, the neighbors of u will all have loops in $G \circ u$, which means that they have to be added to the minimum FVS which is equivalent to what CORE(u) should do, except that CORE(u) will isolate u and add its neighbors to the minimum FVS. On the other hand, INDICLIQUE(u) or OUTDICLIQUE(u) and LOOP will remove u and vertices in $N_G^-(u) \cup N_G^+(u)$ are added to the minimum FVS.

So in order to prove that $\{\text{LOOP}, \text{INDICLIQUE}, \text{OUTDICLIQUE}, \text{PIE}\}$ is confluent, we use Lemma 1.

Lemma 1. *Given a digraph $G = (V, E)$, an arc $(u, v) \in E$, $s \in N_G^+(v)$ and $p \in N_G^-(u)$, if (u, v) is acyclic in G , then (u, s) and (p, v) are also acyclic.*

We can now state the following Theorem for the confluence of the set of binary relations $\{\mathcal{R}_{\text{LOOP}}, \mathcal{R}_{\text{INDICLIQUE}}, \mathcal{R}_{\text{OUTDICLIQUE}}, \mathcal{R}_{\text{PIE}}\}$.

Theorem 2. *Let \mathcal{G} be the set of all digraphs and $\mathcal{R} = \mathcal{R}_{\text{LOOP}} \cup \mathcal{R}_{\text{INDICLIQUE}} \cup \mathcal{R}_{\text{OUTDICLIQUE}} \cup \mathcal{R}_{\text{PIE}}$ a binary relation on \mathcal{G} . Then, $(\mathcal{G}, \mathcal{R})$ is confluent.*

Proof. According to Theorem 1 it is enough to prove that $(\mathcal{G}, \mathcal{R})$ is finite and that for $G, G_1, G_2 \in \mathcal{G}$ if $(G, G_1) \in \mathcal{R}$ and $(G, G_2) \in \mathcal{R}$, then there exist $G' \in \mathcal{G}$ such that $(G_1, G') \in \mathcal{R}^T$ and $(G_2, G') \in \mathcal{R}^T$. Thanks to Proposition 1, it is sufficient to prove this only for \mathcal{R}_{PIE} and the other relations, since $\{\mathcal{R}_{\text{LOOP}}, \mathcal{R}_{\text{INDICLIQUE}}, \mathcal{R}_{\text{OUTDICLIQUE}}\}$ was proved to be confluent [6].

Let $G = (V, E) \in \mathcal{G}$ be a digraph, $x \in V$ and $(u, v) \in E$. PIE being a reduction, then its successive application are bounded by $|V|^2$, hence $(\mathcal{G}, \mathcal{R})$ is finite. Now, assume that PIE(u, v) is applicable.

If LOOP(x) is applicable, then it remains applicable after applying PIE(u, v), even if $x = u$ or $x = v$. So it is enough to consider $G' = G - x$. Otherwise, the two reductions can be applied in any order and $G' = (G - x) - (u, v)$.

Thanks to Lemma 1, if INDICLIQUE(x) (resp. OUTDICLIQUE(x)) is applied first, and $x = u$ or $x = v$, then PIE(p, v) or PIE(u, s) is applicable, $\forall p \in N_G^-(x = u)$ or $\forall s \in N_G^+(x = v)$ (the same goes if we first apply OUTDICLIQUE(x)). Otherwise, if we apply PIE(u, v) first, the applicability of INDICLIQUE(u) (resp. OUTDICLIQUE(u)) remains valid. In both cases, we can get the same digraph $G' = (G \circ x) - \{\bigcup_{p \in N_G^-(x)} (p, v)\} = (G - (u, v)) \circ x$ if $x = u$, or $G' = (G \circ x) - \{\bigcup_{s \in N_G^+(x)} (u, s)\} = (G - (u, v)) \circ x$ if $x = v$. Obviously, this remains true if $x \neq u$ and $x \neq v$, with $G' = (G \circ x) - (u, v) = (G - (u, v)) \circ x$.

Finally, it is easy to see that $(G - (u, v)) - (x, y) = (G - (x, y)) - (u, v)$, if PIE(x, y) is applicable for a given $(x, y) \in E$. Therefore, we can conclude that $(\mathcal{G}, \mathcal{R})$ is confluent. \square

4 Concluding remarks

In this extended abstract we focus on reductions for the minimum feedback vertex set problem, exploring their properties with an emphasis on confluence. By identifying a subset of reductions with confluence property and considering their adaptability, this work contributes to the understanding of graph reductions and their potential impact on algorithmic advancements. The exploration of the confluence property not only enhances our comprehension of algorithmic strategies but also opens avenues for parallelization and speed improvements in sequential algorithms. In future work, we will investigate the DOME reduction and explore how it can be modified so that it can be included in a confluent set of reductions considered in this extended abstract.

References

- [1] Franz Baader & Tobias Nipkow (1998): *Term rewriting and all that*. Cambridge University Press, USA, doi:10.5555/280474.
- [2] Alonzo Church & J. B. Rosser (1936): *Some properties of conversion*. *Transactions of the American Mathematical Society* 39(3), pp. 472–482, doi:10.1090/S0002-9947-1936-1501858-0.
- [3] Hartmut Ehrig & Barry K. Rosen (1980): *Parallelism and concurrency of graph manipulations*. *Theoretical Computer Science* 11(3), pp. 247–275, doi:10.1016/0304-3975(80)90016-X.
- [4] Michael R. Garey & David S. Johnson (1990): *Computers and Intractability; A Guide to the Theory of NP-Completeness*. W. H. Freeman & Co., USA, doi:10.5555/574848.
- [5] Richard M. Karp (1972): *Reducibility among Combinatorial Problems*, pp. 85–103. Springer US, Boston, MA, doi:10.1007/978-1-4684-2001-2_9.
- [6] Mile Lemaic (2008): *Markov-Chain-Based Heuristics for the Feedback Vertex Set Problem for Digraphs*. Ph.D. thesis, Universität zu Köln. Available at <https://kups.ub.uni-koeln.de/2547/>.
- [7] Hanoch Levy & David W Low (1988): *A contraction algorithm for finding small cycle cutsets*. *Journal of Algorithms* 9(4), pp. 470–493, doi:10.1016/0196-6774(88)90013-2.
- [8] Hen-Ming Lin & Jing-Yang Jou (2000): *On computing the minimum feedback vertex set of a directed graph by contraction operations*. *IEEE Transactions on Computer-Aided Design of Integrated Circuits and Systems* 19(3), pp. 295–307, doi:10.1109/43.833199.
- [9] Barry K Rosen (1976): *Correctness of parallel programs: The Church-Rosser approach*. *Theoretical Computer Science* 2(2), pp. 183–207, doi:10.1016/0304-3975(76)90032-3.
- [10] Ravi Sethi (1974): *Testing for the Church-Rosser Property*. *J. ACM* 21(4), p. 671–679, doi:10.1145/321850.321862.