

Optimizing Minimum Vertex Cover Solving via a GCN-assisted Heuristic Algorithm

Enqiang Zhu^a, Qiqi Bao^a, Yu Zhang^b, Chanjuan Liu^{*c}

^aInstitute of Computing Science and Technology, Guangzhou University, Guangzhou, 510006, China

^bSchool of Computer Science, Peking University, Beijing, 100091, China

^cSchool of Computer Science and Technology, Dalian University of Technology, Dalian, 116024, China

Abstract

The problem of finding a minimum vertex cover (MVC) in a graph is a well-known \mathcal{NP} -hard problem with significant practical applications in optimization and scheduling. Its complexity, combined with the increasing scale of problems, underscores the need for efficient and effective algorithms. However, existing heuristic algorithms for MVC often rely on simplistic initialization strategies and overlook the impact of edge attributes and neighborhood information on vertex selection. In this paper, we introduce GCNIVC, a novel heuristic search algorithm designed to address the limitations of existing methods for solving MVC problems in large-scale graphs. Our approach features two main innovations. First, it utilizes a Graph Convolutional Network (GCN) to capture the global structure of graphs, which enables the generation of high-quality initial solutions that enhance the efficiency of the subsequent search process. Second, GCNIVC introduces a new heuristic that employs three containers and the concept of double-covered edges (dc-edges), improving search efficiency and providing greater flexibility for adding and removing operations based on edge attributes. Through extensive experiments on benchmark datasets, we demonstrate that GCNIVC outperforms state-of-the-art MVC algorithms in terms of both accuracy and efficiency. Our results highlight the effectiveness of GCNIVC's GCN-assisted initialization and its edge-informed search strategy. This study not only advances the understanding of MVC problem-solving but also contributes a new tool for addressing large-scale graph optimization challenges.

Keywords: Minimum vertex cover (MVC); Heuristic search; Deep learning; Optimization; Graph convolution network (GCN); Large-scale problem.

1. Introduction

Given an undirected graph $G = (V, E)$, the minimum vertex cover (MVC) problem is tasked with identifying the smallest subset C of vertices such that each edge $e \in E$ has at least one of its endpoints included in C .

Recognized as an \mathcal{NP} -hard problem [1, 2], MVC is not only theoretically significant but also crucial for a multitude of real-world applications in optimization and scheduling [3]. Key applications include identifying influential users to maximize social network impact, ensuring router coverage and sensor deployment in communication networks, and analyzing protein interactions to optimize gene regulation in bioinformatics. For example, in social networks, the MVC problem can help identify key users who can effectively expand outreach or communication. It also plays a role in optimizing facility locations, maintaining power grids, and allocating

resources efficiently by covering critical relationships with the minimal number of nodes.

1.1. Background

As technology progresses, the scale of MVC problems, such as influence propagation, router coverage, and sensor deployment, has grown significantly. Traditional algorithms struggle with the computational efficiency and solution quality required for these large-scale instances. These algorithms are generally categorized into two types: exact algorithms and approximation algorithms.

Among the exact methods, branch-and-bound algorithms are a key technique to reduce the base of exponential running time [4, 5]. The core idea is to systematically explore the solution space by dividing it into smaller subproblems and using bounds to discard subproblems that cannot yield better solutions than the cur-

rent best. However, these exact algorithms cannot eliminate the exponential time complexity, making them impractical for large-scale MVC instances.

Approximation algorithms have been developed to provide near-optimal solutions effectively. Greedy algorithms, known for their simplicity, are often used to approximate solutions for \mathcal{NP} -hard problems, including the connected dominating set, weighted vertex cover, independent set problems, and flow shop scheduling problem [6, 7, 8, 9]. The greedy approach involves making a series of locally optimal choices, such as selecting the vertex with the highest degree at each step to cover the most edges. While greedy algorithms can generate feasible solutions quickly, the quality of these solutions often fails to meet real-world application demands.

Heuristic methods are often employed to solve large-scale \mathcal{NP} -hard problems, as they can provide near-optimal solutions within a reasonable time limit [10, 11, 12, 3, 13, 14]. The heuristic approach for MVC typically involves two main steps: initialization and search. The initialization process aims to produce a relatively high-quality solution quickly, which is then iteratively refined during the search stage through operations like node exchange. Existing algorithms often rely on random initialization or simple strategies, such as selecting high-degree vertices, to construct the initial solution. Recent studies highlight the significant impact of the initialization mechanism on heuristic algorithm performance [15]. Therefore, improving the initialization mechanism for heuristic algorithms in MVC is crucial. Moreover, during the search phase, existing algorithms focus on identifying higher-quality vertices but overlook the impact of different edges and neighboring information on vertices, which is detrimental to efficient space search.

1.2. Our Contributions

In this paper, we introduce GCNIVC, a novel heuristic search algorithm designed for MVC on large-scale graphs. GCNIVC leverages a graph convolutional network (GCN) to capture the holistic structure of graphs and generate a high-quality initial solution. By integrating edge search and container optimization strategies, GCNIVC enhances heuristic search performance.

Our contributions are summarized as follows:

(1) Based on the GCN framework, GCNIVC uses the probabilities of vertices generated by the neural network to produce a high-quality initial solution. This approach offers a new perspective for addressing the MVC problem by harnessing the learning capabilities of neural networks to understand the relationships between a ver-

tex’s neighbors and the overall structure of the graph, thereby enhancing the quality of the initial solution.

(2) We introduce a new heuristic for MVC that incorporates three containers and proposes the concept of double-covered edges (dc-edges), which integrates three types of edges and utilizing their structural features to further improve solution quality and enhance search efficiency.

We have conducted experiments on multiple benchmark datasets to verify the performance of the proposed algorithm. The results show that GCNIVC demonstrates superior performance in accuracy and efficiency compared to state-of-the-art MVC algorithms.

1.3. Organization of This Paper

The rest of the paper is structured as follows: Section 2 offers an overview of related work on heuristic search algorithms for the Minimum Vertex Cover (MVC) problem. Section 3 presents foundational knowledge, including key definitions in graph theory, the heuristic framework, and an introduction to graph neural networks. In Section 4, we delve into the main components of our algorithm, which has been developed through a thorough research process. Our experimental results are discussed in Section 5. Finally, Section 6 concludes the paper with potential directions for future work.

2. Related Work

Heuristic algorithms for the Minimum Vertex Cover (MVC) problem have been extensively studied. For example, EdgeGreedyVC [16] improves a partial solution by repeatedly adding the endpoint of an uncovered edge that has the maximum degree and then removing any redundant vertices. Although EdgeGreedyVC enhances the quality of the solution by reducing the size of the vertex cover without sacrificing coverage, it only takes into account the local structure of the graphs.

Cai et al. [17] introduced a two-stage exchange strategy and an edge weighting mechanism to develop a heuristic search algorithm for the Minimum Vertex Cover (MVC) problem, named NuMVC. This method aimed to resolve the inefficiencies caused by the simultaneous selection of vertices in earlier studies [18, 19]. However, it encountered significant challenges when addressing large-scale instances.

In 2015, Cai et al. [16] proposed the Best from Multiple Selections (BMS) heuristic, which involves randomly sampling vertices from a candidate set and removing the one with the minimum loss value. This approach contributed to the development of FastVC, an algorithm specifically designed to efficiently handle large

instances of the Minimum Vertex Cover (MVC) problem.

Ma et al. [20] further refined this approach by integrating a noisy selection strategy into BMS, resulting in the NoiseVC algorithm. They also presented the WalkBMS algorithm, which probabilistically chooses between BMS and a random walk for vertex selection, addressing local optima issues in FastVC [16]. Subsequently, Cai et al. [21] proposed an improved version of FastVC, named FastVC2+p, which integrates additional processing techniques and enhances initial solution construction methods. More recently, Luo et al. [22] introduced MetaVC, a highly parametric heuristic framework that utilizes various effective heuristic search techniques. This framework includes an automatic algorithm configurator aimed at optimizing performance based on the parameters of each instance.

Later, Quan et al. [23] proposed EABMS, a new edge weighting method based on edge age, which led to the development of EAVC and its variant EAVC2+p. Both demonstrated superior performance on large graphs compared to previous methods, including FastVC, MetaVC, and their variants. Recently, Zhang et al. [24] introduced a novel edge weighting method based on vertex age, known as TIVC, and developed the TIVC algorithm. This algorithm demonstrated significant superiority over other methods in graph processing tasks. The introduction of the TIVC algorithm marks a pivotal advancement in understanding the role of vertex age in the MVC problem.

Overall, FastVC, EAVC, TIVC, and their variants represent the state-of-the-art heuristic search algorithms for MVC, especially for handling large instances. Their effectiveness has been validated through comparisons with baseline algorithms. However, despite these advancements, several critical limitations persist in practical applications. These limitations include inadequate consideration of initial solutions and a failure to account for the impact of different edges during the iterative improvement process. To tackle these challenges, this study incorporates the GCN framework to enhance the quality of initial solutions and improve overall solution quality by influencing vertex selection using various types of edges.

3. Preliminaries

The following section presents foundational information. Specifically, Section 3.1 presents pertinent notations and terminologies, Section 3.2 succinctly outlines the heuristic search method, and Section 3.3 introduces the graph neural network.

3.1. Notations and Terminologies

Let’s consider an undirected graph $G = (V, E)$ with a vertex set V and an edge set E . For an edge $e = (u, v)$, the vertices u and v are referred to as the *endpoints* of e . If two vertices are the endpoints of an edge, they are considered *adjacent*, and one is called a *neighbor* of the other. An edge is *incident* with its endpoints, and vice versa. The set containing all neighbors of a vertex $v \in V$ is denoted by $N(v)$ and is called the *neighborhood* of v . The *closed neighborhood* of v , denoted by $N[v]$, is defined as $N[v] = N(v) \cup \{v\}$. The *degree* of v , denoted by $d(v)$, is the number of edges incident with v . For a vertex set $S \subseteq V$, let $N[S] = \bigcup_{v \in S} N[v]$ and $N(S) = N[S] \setminus S$.

In a graph $G = (V, E)$, a set of vertices $S \subseteq V$ *covers* an edge $e \in E$ if at least one of the endpoints of e belongs to S . If all edges of G are covered by S , then S is called a *vertex cover* (VC) of G . A vertex cover with the smallest cardinality is called a *minimum vertex cover* (MVC) of G . Notably, a graph $G = (V, E)$ may have more than one MVC. We use $E_u(S) \subseteq E$ to denote the set of edges uncovered by S and $E_c(S) \subseteq E$ to denote the set of edges covered by S . The MVC problem involves finding an MVC for a given graph.

3.2. Heuristic Search

In the context of the MVC problem, we use C to denote a candidate (or partial) solution. The general approach for heuristic search in MVC involves initially constructing a VC and then iteratively improving the solution to a smaller one by swapping vertices. The LS algorithms typically utilize $\text{gain}(v)$ and $\text{loss}(v)$ to assess the importance of a vertex v . Here, $\text{gain}(v)$ represents the number of edges uncovered by C but covered by $C \cup \{v\}$, while $\text{loss}(v)$ is the number of edges covered by C but uncovered by $C \setminus \{v\}$. The “age” of a vertex v , denoted by $\text{age}(v)$, refers to the number of steps since it was last removed from C . Age values are often used to break ties when multiple vertices have the same *gain* or *loss* value. Additionally, the “age” of an edge e , denoted by $\text{age}(e)$, represents the number of steps since it was last uncovered by C . This criterion is commonly used for selecting edges [23, 24].

3.3. Graph Neural Network

In recent years, graph convolutional networks (GCN) have emerged as a popular framework for directly learning from graph-structured data using deep learning. GCNs aim to learn how to transform node features by considering the feature values and the graph structure. They learn node embeddings through information

propagation between nodes and their neighbors, making them widely applicable to tasks such as node classification, graph embedding, and graph clustering [25, 26]. The core idea of GCNs is to extend the convolution operation to irregular graph structures, thereby aggregating features based on the adjacency relationships within the graph. GCNs define the neighborhood relationships between nodes using the graph’s adjacency matrix, aggregating the features of each node along with those of its neighboring nodes. Consequently, the representation of a node depends not only on its features but also on the feature information of its neighbors.

The model essentially functions as a message-passing mechanism, where the convolution operation at each layer can be interpreted as each node receiving and aggregating information from its neighboring nodes. This mechanism allows GCNs to progressively broaden the influence of each node, thereby integrating structural information from a broader range within the graph. Formally, it can be described as follows:

$$H^{(\ell+1)} = \sigma\left(\tilde{D}^{-\frac{1}{2}}\tilde{A}\tilde{D}^{-\frac{1}{2}}H^{(\ell)}W^{(\ell)}\right).$$

Here are some details about the terms used in this equation:

- The matrix $H^{(\ell)} \in \mathbb{R}^{N \times D^{(\ell)}}$ represents the node feature matrix at layer ℓ , where $\ell \geq 0$. In this context, N denotes the number of nodes in the graph, and $D^{(\ell)}$ represents the feature dimension at layer ℓ . The initial node feature matrix $H^{(0)}$ corresponds to the input node feature matrix.
- The normalized adjacency matrix, denoted as \tilde{A} , is obtained using the formula $\tilde{A} = \hat{D}^{-\frac{1}{2}}\hat{A}\hat{D}^{-\frac{1}{2}}$. This method ensures numerical stability and balanced feature aggregation. In this context, $\hat{A} = A + I$ is derived from adding the original adjacency matrix A to the identity matrix I . The degree matrix \hat{D} normalizes the adjacency matrix.
- The matrix $W^{(\ell)} \in \mathbb{R}^{D^{(\ell)} \times D^{(\ell+1)}}$ denotes the trainable weight matrix at layer ℓ .
- The function $\sigma(\cdot)$ serves as a non-linear activation function, such as ReLU, and is responsible for introducing non-linearity into the model.

4. Main Algorithm

In this section, we introduce our algorithm GCNIVC. We first discuss two main components of GCNIVC: GCNConstructVC, which is responsible for constructing the initial solution, and ContainerRemoveVertex,

which optimizes the process of removing vertices from a current solution. After that, we will provide a detailed description of the algorithm.

4.1. GCNConstructVC

In the initial stage of LS algorithms for MVC, a small-scale initial VC (the initial solution) can effectively minimize unnecessary computation during the subsequent search process, thereby accelerating the convergence towards a high-quality solution. However, it is crucial to balance the quality of the initial solution and the time required to construct it. Overemphasizing either aspect could render the algorithm inefficient in practical applications. Therefore, it is necessary to consider not only the local structure of a graph but also its global structure. To address this, we introduce the GCN to the initialization process and develop an algorithm GCNConstructVC to effectively generate a high-quality initial solution.

A GCN takes an $n \times d$ node feature matrix and an $n \times n$ adjacency matrix as inputs and produces a $n \times k$ feature matrix as output, where n represents the number of nodes, d denotes the number of input features for each node, and k indicates the number of output features for each node. In our specific task, the input features comprise four components (i.e., $d = 4$): nodes’ weight (set to 1 for all vertices in our experiment), nodes’ degree, graph’s density $\frac{m}{n^2}$ (m denotes the number of edges), and the difference between a node and the mean value of its neighbors $\frac{\frac{1}{|N(v)|} \sum_{u \in N(v)} d(u)}{d(v)}$. The output consists of the probabilities of nodes belonging to an MVC. A general structure of a GCN is depicted in Figure 1. Small graphs are utilized to train the model, including T1/T2 and UDG instances with a maximum of 250 vertices. The exact algorithm EMVC, proposed by Wang et al. [27] is employed to determine MVCs for these small graphs. Note that only small graphs are utilized for training due to the inefficiency of existing exact MVC algorithms for large-scale graphs.

Algorithm 1 presents the pseudocode of ConstructVC. The algorithm comprises four parts. In the first part, the probability $prob(v)$ of each vertex v belonging to a minimum vertex cover (MVC) is computed using a GCN model (line 2). It’s important to note that this probability alone is insufficient for estimating the importance of vertices, as some vertices may have a high degree but a low probability, and vice versa. To address this, the second part (lines 3-12) introduces a new parameter called $pscore$, a function on the set of vertices.




Figure 1: The framework of a GCN for the probabilistic determination of vertices within a minimum vertex cover.

Algorithm 1 GCNConstructVC

Input: graph $G = (V, E)$

Output: A vertex cover C of G

```

1:  $C \leftarrow \emptyset$ ;
2:  $prob \leftarrow$  a function derived from a GCN model that assigns a probability to each vertex (indicating the likelihood of a vertex belonging to an MVC);
3: for each vertex  $v \in V$  do
4:    $pscore(v) \leftarrow d(v)$ ;
5: end for
6: for each edge  $v_1v_2 \in E$  do
7:   if  $prob(v_1) > prob(v_2)$  then
8:      $pscore(v_1) \leftarrow pscore(v_1) + 1$ ;
9:   else if  $prob(v_1) < prob(v_2)$  then
10:     $pscore(v_2) \leftarrow pscore(v_2) + 1$ ;
11:   end if
12: end for
13: for each  $e = v_1v_2 \in E$  do
14:   if  $e$  is uncovered then
15:     if  $pscore(v_1) > pscore(v_2)$  then
16:        $C \leftarrow C \cup \{v_1\}$ ;
17:     else if  $pscore(v_1) < pscore(v_2)$  then
18:        $C \leftarrow C \cup \{v_2\}$ ;
19:     end if
20:   end if
21: end for
22: for each  $v \in C$  do
23:    $loss(v) \leftarrow 0$ ;
24: end for
25: for each  $e \in E$  do
26:   if only one endpoint  $v$  of  $e$  belongs to  $C$  then
27:      $loss(v)++$ ;
28:   end if
29: end for
30: for each  $v \in C$  do
31:   if  $loss(v) = 0$  then
32:      $C = C \setminus \{v\}$ ; update loss of vertices in  $C$ ;
33:   end if
34: end for
35: return  $C$ 

```

This parameter combines the probability and the degree of vertices. Specifically, for each vertex v , $pscore(v)$ is initialized as its degree (lines 3-5). Then, for each edge v_1v_2 , if the probability of v_1 (or v_2) is greater than that of v_2 (or v_1), the value of $pscore(v_1)$ (or $pscore(v_2)$) is increased by one (lines 6-12).

The third part focuses on extending a partial solution C to form a VC based on the $pscore$ (lines 13-21). For each edge v_1v_2 , if $pscore(v_1)$ (or $pscore(v_2)$) is greater than $pscore(v_2)$ (or $pscore(v_1)$), then v_1 (or v_2) is added to C . Finally, the fourth section aims to optimize C by removing redundant vertices using the $loss$ function (lines 22-35). The $loss$ value of each vertex v is initialized to zero (lines 22-24). For each edge e , if C contains exactly one endpoint v of e , then $loss(v)$ is increased by one (lines 25-29). Subsequently, for each vertex $v \in C$, it is removed from C if $loss(v) = 0$ (lines 30-34).

4.2. ContainerRemoveVertex

Vertex exchange is essential for optimizing solutions in an heuristic search algorithm. This process involves removing vertices from a current solution C and adding vertices not in C to C . The quality of the vertices to be removed is crucial for enhancing the algorithm's efficiency. To address this, we introduce a heuristic method called ContainerRemoveVertex (CRV) to identify the vertex in C for the subsequent vertex exchange.

In Algorithm 2, the CRV procedure takes a solution C , three containers $ctner_1$, $ctner_2$, and $ctner_3$ of vertices, an integer num , and a function age associated with vertices as input. It outputs a partial solution of the graph. When any of $ctner_1$, $ctner_2$, or $ctner_3$ is not empty, it randomly selects a vertex v from the union of these containers (lines 1-2). It then iterates through each container num times, choosing a random vertex u each time, and updates v with u if $d(v) \times age(u) < d(u) \times age(v)$ (lines 3-10). Finally, it removes v from C . On the other

hand, if $ctner_1 \cup ctner_2 \cup ctner_3 = \emptyset$, it removes a vertex with the smallest *loss* value from C , resolving ties based on the *age* of the vertex (line 13).

This method provides two primary advantages: A higher likelihood of selecting vertices with lower degrees and the variability in vertex selection due to the random selection mechanism, thereby reducing the risk of prolonged heuristic search cycles under identical conditions.

Algorithm 2 ContainerRemoveVertex (CRV)

Input: A vertex cover C , three containers $ctner_1$, $ctner_2$, and $ctner_3$, and an integer num , a function age

Output: A (partial) vertex cover C of G

```

1: if ( $ctner_1 \cup ctner_2 \cup ctner_3 \neq \emptyset$ ) then
2:    $v \leftarrow$  a random vertex from  $ctner_1 \cup ctner_2 \cup ctner_3$ ;
3:   for each  $ctner \in \{ctner_1, ctner_2, ctner_3\}$  do
4:     for  $i = 0; i < num; i++$  do
5:        $u \leftarrow$  a random vertex from  $ctner$ ;
6:       if  $d(v) \times age(u) < d(u) \times age(v)$  then
7:          $v \leftarrow u$ ;
8:       end if
9:     end for
10:  end for
11:   $C \leftarrow C \setminus \{v\}$ ;
12: else
13:   Remove the vertex with the minimum loss from  $C$ , resolving ties by the age of vertex;
14: end if
15: return  $C$ 

```

4.3. GCNIVC

Our GCNIVC algorithm takes a graph $G = (V, E)$, a time limit *cutoff*, and an integer *num* as inputs and produces a VC C^* of G . It begins by generating an initial solution C using GCNConstructVC and initializing various parameters, including three containers $ctnr_1, ctnr_2, ctnr_3$, and the age of each vertex. Subsequently, it enters a loop to improve the current solution C iteratively. We introduce a new type of edge, called double-covered edge (dc-edge), to streamline the iteration process.

Definition 1: Let C be a partial VC of a graph $G = (V, E)$. An edge $e \in E$ is defined as a *double-covered edge* (dc-edge) if both endpoints belong to C . The *double-covered number* (or *dcnumber* simply) of a vertex v , denoted by $dcnumber(v)$, is the number of dc-edges incident with the vertex.

When removing a vertex from the current solution C , we prioritize those with smaller *dcnumber* values. This is because removing such a vertex may cause only a small number of vertices in its neighborhood to experience an increase in their *loss* values, thus reducing

the number of uncovered edges resulting from removing vertices. Conversely, when adding a vertex to C , we prioritize those with larger *dcnumber* values. This is because adding such a vertex may cause a large number of vertices in its neighborhood to experience a decrease in their *loss* values, thereby reducing the number of vertices with a higher *loss* value in the graph and enhancing the diversity of deleting vertices by BMS strategy in subsequent operations.

Algorithm 3 GCNIVC

Input: A graph $G = (V, E)$, a time limit *cutoff*, an integer *num*

Output: A vertex cover C^* of G

```

1:  $C \leftarrow$  GCNConstructVC( $G$ )
2:  $ctner_i \leftarrow$  the set of vertices of degree  $i$  in  $G$ , for  $i = 1, 2, 3$ ;
3:  $age(v) \leftarrow 1$ , for each vertex  $v \in V$ ;
4: while elapsed.time  $<$  cutoff do
5:   if  $C$  covers all edges then
6:      $C^* \leftarrow C$ ;
7:      $C \leftarrow$  ContainerRomoveVertex( $C, ctner_1, ctner_2, ctner_3, num, age$ );
8:   end if
9:    $u_1 \leftarrow$  a vertex in  $C$  selected by BMS heuristic, breaking ties sequentially by age and dcnumber;
10:   $C \leftarrow C \setminus \{u_1\}$ ;
11:   $u_2 \leftarrow$  a random vertex in  $C$ ;
12:   $C \leftarrow C \setminus \{u_2\}$ ;
13:   $e \leftarrow$  an edge in  $E_u(C)$  selected by BMS heuristic;
14:   $w_1 \leftarrow$  the endpoint of  $e$  with a larger gain value, breaking ties sequentially by age and dcnumber;
15:   $C \leftarrow C \cup \{w_1\}$ ;
16:  if  $E_u(C) \neq \emptyset$  then
17:     $e \leftarrow$  a random edge in  $E_u(C)$ ;
18:     $w_2 \leftarrow$  the endpoint of  $e$  with a larger gain value, breaking ties sequentially by age and dcnumber;
19:     $C \leftarrow C \cup \{w_2\}$ ;
20:  end if
21: end while
22: return  $C^*$ 

```

In each iteration, the algorithm utilizes the (3,2)-swap framework to optimize solutions, consisting of two phases: vertex removal and vertex addition. If C covers all edges in the vertex removal phase, the algorithm updates the best solution C^* with C and removes a vertex from C using the CRV procedure (lines 5-8). Subsequently, two additional vertices are removed from C using the BMS heuristic and a random strategy, respectively, with ties resolved sequentially based on the vertices' *age* and *dcnumber* (lines 9-12). In the vertex addition phase, the algorithm selects an edge from the set of edges not covered by C and adds an endpoint of

the edge with a larger *gain* to C , resolving ties sequentially based on the *age* and *dcnumber* of vertices (lines 13-15). Furthermore, if C still does not cover edges of G , i.e., $E_u(C) \neq \emptyset$, the algorithm randomly selects an edge from $E_u(C)$ and adds an endpoint of the edge with a larger *gain* to C , resolving ties sequentially based on the *age* and *dcnumber* of vertices (lines 16-20).

5. Experiments

The performance of the GCNIVC algorithm is evaluated through experiments on various benchmark datasets. In the subsequent section, we describe the benchmark datasets and the experiment setup. We then present the experimental results, which include the sizes of the vertex covers produced by the algorithms under identical conditions, along with an analysis of their convergence times to achieve a final solution. We empirically evaluate the parameters within the GCNIVC algorithm, followed by a comprehensive discussion of the experimental findings.

5.1. Benchmark Datasets

We investigate the MVC problem using multiple benchmark datasets. These datasets include three benchmarks (UDG and T_1/T_2) of small graphs for training the GCN model and four benchmarks ($DIMACS10$, $SNAP$, $NetworkRepository$, $Gset$) of large sparse real-world graphs for testing the algorithms. All instances are treated as undirected, unweighted simple graphs.

UDG ¹: It contains graphs commonly used to simulate wireless sensor networks or other spatially distributed networks. In these graphs, each vertex represents the center of a unit disk, and edges exist between vertices whose corresponding disks overlap. Unit disk graphs (UDGs) are typically sparse, as each node only connects to nearby nodes, resulting in a relatively low overall degree of connectivity. This dataset comprises 12 families, each containing ten instances of unit disk graphs with 50 to 1000 vertices.

T_1/T_2 ²: This dataset comprises 53 families, each containing ten instances related to graph partitioning and clustering problems in graph theory and network science. The instances in each family have the same size, ranging from 50 to 1000.

$DIMACS10$ ³: This dataset provides biologically relevant networks widely used to study graph partitioning

and graph clustering problems [28]. It comprises 130 sparse instances with 1,024 to 23,947,347 vertices.

$SNAP$ ⁴: It is a comprehensive network analysis platform designed to study and process large-scale networks. It encompasses diverse real-world instances, encompassing social, biological, and technical networks. This dataset comprises 13 instances with 1,005 to 3,774,768 vertices.

$NetworkRepository$ ⁵: This dataset platform is dedicated to storing and sharing various network datasets commonly utilized in network science, machine learning, data mining, and graph theory. This dataset comprises 127 instances with 39 to 23,947,347 vertices.

$Gset$ ⁶: The dataset, originating from the University of Iowa, was utilized by Ye et al. [29] to test the dual scaling algorithm. To assess GCNIVC, we collect all instances utilized in the dataset, each comprising between 800 and 7,000 vertices.

5.2. Experiment Setup

All algorithms were implemented in C++ and compiled using gcc 7.1.0 with the '-O3' optimization option. The experiments were conducted on CentOS Linux 7.6.1810, using an Intel(R) Xeon(R) Gold 6254 CPU running at 3.10 GHz, 256 GB memory, and a V100 graphics card. TIVC, FastVC, and EAVC parameter settings are consistent with those reported in the original literature [24, 16, 23]. No data preprocessing techniques were employed during the experiments to ensure a fair comparison with other algorithms. The parameter *num* in the BMS heuristic and *CRV* was set to a random value in the range of 45 to 55, following the authors' suggestion [16], and was ultimately set to 50.

GCNIVC was compared against three state-of-the-art heuristic search algorithms: FastVC [16], EAVC [23], and TIVC [24]. These algorithms are all designed to address the MVC problem for large-scale instances. FastVC integrates a two-stage exchange framework and a BMS heuristic, striking an effective balance between solution accuracy and computational efficiency, particularly for large graphs. EAVC, based on a two-stage framework, employs WalkBMS and EABMS strategies, providing effective guidance in vertex and edge selection phases. TIVC introduces an efficient heuristic search algorithm for MVC, featuring an innovative 3-improvement framework with minor perturbations. This framework allows the algorithm to directly search for

¹<https://github.com/yiyuanwang1988/MDSCClassicalBenchmarks>

²<https://github.com/yiyuanwang1988/MDSCClassicalBenchmarks>

³<https://www.cc.gatech.edu/dimacs10/downloads.shtml>

⁴<https://snap.stanford.edu/data/>

⁵<https://networkrepository.com>

⁶<git:ftp://dollar.biz.uiowa.edu/pub/yyyye/Gset/>

solutions of size $k - 2$ after adding a vertex to a feasible solution of size k . Additionally, TIVC introduces a highly efficient edge selection strategy, significantly accelerating the search process. The source codes for FastVC and EAVC are publicly available: FastVC ⁷, EAVC ⁸.

We executed the FastVC, EAVC, TIVC, and GCNIVC algorithms on each instance ten times, employing random seeds ranging from 1 to 10. Each run was conducted on a dedicated CPU core, with a cutoff time of 1000 seconds. For every instance, we presented the best size (Min.) and the average size (Avg.) of the solutions identified by the algorithms across the ten runs. Additionally, we included the average convergence time (t.Avg.) for each algorithm to determine its final solution on an instance. If an algorithm did not achieve the optimal solution, the average convergence time was recorded as “-”.

5.3. Experimental Result

We analyzed the experimental results from running FastVC, EAVC, TIVC, and GCNIVC across all benchmark datasets. Table 1 highlights the competitive advantages of GCNIVC compared to the other three algorithms across various benchmarks. It presents the number of instances (within each benchmark) where an algorithm performs best and outperforms all other algorithms. As illustrated in Table 1, GCNIVC consistently outperforms the other three algorithms, demonstrating particularly strong performance on the DIMACS10 benchmark.

5.3.1. Comparison of solution quality

The results of the four algorithms FastVC, EAVC, TIVC, and GCNIVC across all benchmark instances are detailed in Tables 2 to 7 (Tables 6 and 7 are in Appendix). The optimal solutions identified by each algorithm are emphasized in bold. Among the 302 benchmark instances, GCNIVC achieved optimal minimum values in 268 cases, followed by TIVC in 212, EAVC in 203, and FastVC in 199 cases. Furthermore, GCNIVC, TIVC, EAVC, and FastVC attained strictly optimal minimum values in 69, 11, nine, and eight instances, respectively. Obviously, GCNIVC exhibits remarkable performance regarding solution quality (Min.). We proceed to discuss the results in more detail.

DATASET	GCNIVC	FastVC	TIVC	EAVC
SNAP	12/1	11/0	12/1	11/0
Gset	32/0	32/0	32/0	32/0
Network Repository	123/5	116/1	120/2	116/0
DIMACS10	101/63	40/8	48/8	43/8

Table 1: Summarizing the number of instances in which an algorithm demonstrates strong performance, where x/y indicates that on x instances, the algorithm achieves the optimal solution, and on y instances, it surpasses all other algorithms.

In the DIMACS10 benchmark, GCNIVC achieved the optimal solutions in 101 out of 130 instances. In contrast, the FastVC, TIVC, and EAVC algorithms secured the best solutions in 40, 48, and 43 cases, respectively. In the SNAP benchmark, GCNIVC continued to lead, attaining the best solutions in 12 out of 13 instances, while FastVC, TIVC, and EAVC each achieved the top solutions in 11 cases. For the Network Repository benchmark, GCNIVC once again excelled, obtaining the best solutions in 124 out of 127 instances. FastVC, TIVC, and EAVC followed closely, with their best solutions achieved in 116, 120, and 117 cases, respectively. Lastly, since the instances in the Gset benchmark are small, all algorithms successfully attained the best solutions across all 32 instances. Moreover, GCNIVC outperformed the other algorithms by producing smaller VCs in 63 instances from DIMACS10, five from Network Repository, and one from SNAP. TIVC found smaller VCs in eight instances from DIMACS10, two from Network Repository, and one from SNAP. EAVC generated smaller VCs in eight instances from DIMACS10, while FastVC found smaller VCs in eight instances from DIMACS10 and one from Network Repository. In addition, among the 302 instances, the GCNIVC, TIVC, EAVC, and FastVC algorithms achieved the smallest average values (Avg.) in 255, 183, 196, and 186 instances, respectively. The above comparisons demonstrate that GCNIVC has a superior performance compared to the other algorithms, highlighting its notable effectiveness across these extensive, sparse real-world benchmarks.

5.3.2. Analysis of convergence speed

We generated convergence curves to analyze how the size of solutions evolves for each algorithm throughout the search process. Generally, heuristic search algorithms exhibit rapid convergence in the early stages, resulting in steep decline curves, particularly in smaller instances. This phenomenon makes it challenging to differentiate between the curves of various algorithms. To address this, we established an upper bound threshold for the MVC in each graph, omitting any segments that surpassed this threshold. This strategy effectively

⁷<http://lcs.ios.ac.cn/caisw/VC.html>

⁸<https://github.com/quancs/EAVC>

Table 3: Experimental results on DAMACS10 continue.

luxembourg_osc	56936	56937	288.412	56936	56937	504.936	56937	56938.1	-	56937	56937	-
m14b	175773	175792.8	-	175759	175791.2	-	175693	175713.9	884.959	175792	175791.2	-
M6	2423393	2423784.3	999.516	2424418	2426472.8	-	2424802	2425438.6	-	2424600	2426472.8	-
ma2010	87947	87955	482.958	87955	87961.2	-	87952	87963.9	-	87961	87961.2	-
md2010	77495	77498.7	538.144	77501	77507.3	-	77504	77510.5	-	77514	77507.3	-
me2010	37052	37053.4	545.704	37053	37055.7	-	37055	37059.7	-	37057	37055.7	-
mi2010	185819	185831.1	526.489	185880	185904	-	185899	185917.6	-	185906	185904	-
mn2010	144013	144029.8	363.04	144054	144080.4	-	144061	144093.5	-	144088	144080.4	-
no2010	187679	187684.8	105.533	187710	187717.2	-	187695	187717	-	187741	187717.2	-
ms2010	94936	94940.1	550.15	94944	94955.8	-	94947	94956.8	-	94955	94955.8	-
mt2010	70631	70643.3	521.483	70641	70659.8	-	70652	70670.6	-	70652	70659.8	-
nc2010	159831	159836.8	68.561	159859	159870.4	-	159860	159872.3	-	159867	159870.4	-
nd2010	73681	73689.9	681.222	73711	73719.3	-	73720	73724.4	-	73716	73719.3	-
ne2010	108184	108194.7	641.721	108232	108246	-	108237	108254.1	-	108277	108246	-
netherlands_osc	1100047	1100056.7	961.626	1100083	1100095.7	-	1100084	1100093.6	-	1100136	1100095.7	-
nh2010	25956	25956.4	532.643	25956	25956.6	595.811	25957	25961.3	-	25957	25956.6	-
nj2010	96795	96800.1	626.151	96828	96839.9	-	96830	96842.1	-	96838	96839.9	-
NLR	2881932	2882387.4	999.65	2895352	2906568.7	-	2888773	2894395.6	-	2883577	2906568.7	-
nm2010	91765	91772.8	456.312	91784	91792.7	-	91781	91795.6	-	91797	91792.7	-
nv2010	46157	46163.4	736.28	46161	46166.7	-	46166	46174.1	-	46184	46166.7	-
oh2010	205441	205452.2	632.067	205492	205518.9	-	205500	205515.2	-	205530	205518.9	-
ok2010	147566	147582.6	600.037	147631	147662.5	-	147635	147662.3	-	147682	147662.5	-
or2010	107622	107629.5	420.516	107637	107656.7	-	107648	107656.9	-	107675	107656.7	-
p-hat700-3	690	690	1.167	690	690	0.578	690	690	0.13	690	690	0.029
preferentialAttachment	57899	57901.4	-	57895	57899.3	564.193	57895	57898.6	572.747	57895	57899.3	560.209
ri2010	14377	14377.5	475.117	14377	14378	677.768	14381	14383.8	-	14384	14378	-
road_central	6855046	6862104.2	1000	7051550	7055778.8	-	7049103	7051093.7	-	7050693	7055778.8	-
road_usa	11772344	11773699.8	1000	12077392	12079749.5	-	12074967	12077887.9	-	12122686	12079749.5	-
sc2010	100844	100850.9	475.374	100855	100862.6	-	100859	100866.8	-	100870	100862.6	-
sd2010	49302	49316.9	852.058	49326	49334.7	-	49348	49359.2	-	49352	49334.7	-
smallworld	75541	75553.4	-	75532	75538.3	982.666	75609	75624.2	-	75665	75538.3	-
t60k	30324	30332	50.33	30332	30332	-	30332	30332	-	30332	30332	-
tn2010	134349	134355.4	275.611	134358	134364.8	-	134356	134367.2	-	134377	134364.8	-
tx2010	512894	512922.4	593.468	513117	513168.1	-	513114	513154.1	-	513222	513168.1	-
uk	2626	2626	115.868	2626	2626	52.965	2626	2626.6	438.331	2629	2626	-
ut2010	62142	62147.6	708.633	62155	62159.9	-	62158	62164.7	-	62164	62159.9	-
va2010	154257	154263.4	336.302	154270	154277.3	-	154272	154281.7	-	154291	154277.3	-
venturiLevel3	2026295	2026301.9	877.714	2026353	2026363.9	-	2026354	2026359.4	-	2026352	2026363.9	-
vsp_sctap1-2b_and_seymourl	17784	17785.1	573.491	17785	17785.2	-	17787	17787.3	-	17787	17785.2	-
vt2010	17461	17461.1	516.454	17461	17461.5	566.526	17462	17464.1	-	17465	17461.5	-
wa2010	108793	108799.2	616.691	108832	108841.1	-	108830	108847.1	-	108861	108841.1	-
wi2010	141664	141679.1	382.336	141704	141726.5	-	141707	141725.2	-	141729	141726.5	-
wing	36879	36897.7	-	36867	36886.8	981.95	36975	36990.2	-	37010	36886.8	-
wing_nodal	8807	8808.5	-	8806	8808.1	-	8801	8802.6	-	8800	8808.1	482.861
wv2010	71166	71170	436.763	71170	71179	-	71167	71181.6	-	71178	71179	-
wy2010	46748	46752.1	678.237	46748	46754.7	847.438	46756	46762.9	-	46775	46754.7	-

Table 4: Experimental results on SNAP

Instance	GCNIVC			TIVC			EAVC			FastVC		
	Min.	Avg.	T.Avg.	Min.	Avg.	T.Avg.	Min.	Avg.	T.Avg.	Min.	Avg.	T.Avg.
ca-MathSciNet	139951	139951	4.97	139951	139951	4.992	139951	139951	3.288	139951	139951	11.567
c-fat200-1	182	182	<0.001	182	182	<0.001	182	182	<0.001	182	182	<0.001
c-fat200-2	191	191	<0.001	191	191	<0.001	191	191	<0.001	191	191	<0.001
c-fat200-5	197	197	<0.001	197	197	0.003	197	197	0.002	197	197	<0.001
com-DBLP	164949	164949	3.177	164949	164949	2.463	164949	164949	3.035	164949	164949	13.43
co-papers-citeseer	386106	386106	21.105	386106	386106	12.645	386106	386106	10.851	386106	386106	38.388
ia2010	123075	123087.7	670.688	123198	123206.9	-	123126	123144.6	-	123152	123163.3	-
ia-reality	81	81	0.002	81	81	0.002	81	81	0.003	81	81	<0.001
loc-Brightkite	21867	21867.1	116.11	21867	21867	102.738	21867	21867.2	58.983	21867	21867	0.427
loc-Gowalla	84222	84222.7	111.621	84222	84222.6	64.972	84222	84222.5	25.892	84222	84222.6	85.634
ca-netscience	214	214	<0.001	214	214	<0.001	214	214	<0.001	214	214	<0.001
ca-HepPh	6555	6555	0.041	6555	6555	0.03	6555	6555	0.034	6555	6555	0.025
caidaRouterLevel	75193	75209.6	-	75189	75204.6	887.406	75194	75214.2	-	75432	75204.6	-

highlights each algorithm’s performance within an acceptable solution space, facilitating a more nuanced comparison of their convergence speeds and the quality of their final solutions.

Given the outstanding performance of our GCNIVC on the DIMACS10 benchmark regarding solution quality, we evaluated the convergence speed of solutions on instances from this benchmark. We compared four algorithms across four instances for our testing, where graphs were selected based on varying sizes, specifically two large graphs with a size of 10^6 (Figures 2 (a)

and (b)) and two smaller graphs with a size of 10^5 (Figures 2 (c) and (d)). Figure 2 presents the convergence curves of these algorithms across the four graphs, with the x-axis representing time and the y-axis indicating the size of a VC. Due to the large number of vertices in the graphs shown in Figures 2 (a) and (b), the convergence curves provide clear differentiation for analyzing the algorithms’ performance. By establishing a higher upper bound threshold (denoted as 5,892,463 for Figure 2 (a) and 3,853,211 for Figure 2 (b)), we can observe the rapid convergence process of these algorithms in the

Table 5: Experimental results on Gset

Instance	GCNIVC			TIVC			EAVC			FastVC		
	Min.	Avg.	T_Avg.	Min.	Avg.	T_Avg.	Min.	Avg.	T_Avg.	Min.	Avg.	T_Avg.
G1	705	705	0.553	705	705	0.172	705	705	0.093	705	705	1.1
G14	521	521	0.006	521	521	0.002	521	521	0.005	521	521	0.105
G15	517	517	0.006	517	517	0.002	517	517	<0.001	517	517	0.002
G16	515	515	<0.001	515	515	<0.001	515	515	<0.001	515	515	<0.001
G17	514	514	0.012	514	514	0.007	514	514	0.009	514	514	0.017
G2	706	706	0.51	706	706	0.484	706	706	0.06	706	706	0.139
G22	1567	1567	5.965	1567	1567	2.743	1567	1567	80.451	1567	1567	470.18
G23	1573	1573	125.242	1573	1573	97.096	1573	1573.5	422.327	1573	1573	336.577
G24	1569	1569	55.064	1569	1569	18.007	1569	1569	140.438	1569	1569	207.84
G25	1570	1570	3.114	1570	1570	1.156	1570	1570	9.608	1570	1570	26.736
G26	1573	1573	4.698	1573	1573	1.563	1573	1573.1	11.517	1573	1573	98.189
G3	706	706	0.787	706	706	0.182	706	706	0.114	706	706	0.677
G35	1282	1282	0.009	1282	1282	0.003	1282	1282	0.005	1282	1282	0.018
G36	1304	1304	0.016	1304	1304	0.011	1304	1304	0.011	1304	1304	0.017
G37	1292	1292	0.016	1292	1292	0.014	1292	1292	0.005	1292	1292	0.036
G38	1284	1284	0.002	1284	1284	<0.001	1284	1284	0.001	1284	1284	0.01
G4	705	705	3.448	705	705	3.317	705	705	0.182	705	705	0.503
G43	787	787	1.165	787	787	0.705	787	787	0.858	787	787	53.642
G44	786	786	0.156	786	786	0.146	786	786	0.137	786	786	2.54
G45	789	789	0.327	789	789	0.159	789	789	0.476	789	789	6.955
G46	789	789	2.632	789	789	1.041	789	789	3.343	789	789	43.772
G47	785	785	1.144	785	785	0.559	785	785	16.804	785	785	187.001
G48	1500	1500	<0.001	1500	1500	0.001	1500	1500	0.005	1500	1500	<0.001
G49	1500	1500	0.003	1500	1500	0.003	1500	1500	0.004	1500	1500	<0.001
G5	706	706	2.638	706	706	0.962	706	706	0.179	706	706	0.722
G50	1560	1560	0.004	1560	1560	0.003	1560	1560	0.001	1560	1560	<0.001
G51	651	651	0.003	651	651	0.002	651	651	0.005	651	651	<0.001
G52	652	652	0.007	652	652	0.002	652	652	0.003	652	652	<0.001
G53	653	653	0.082	653	653	0.099	653	653	0.059	653	653	0.184
G54	659	659	0.009	659	659	0.004	659	659	0.006	659	659	0.006
G58	3218	3218	2.225	3218	3218	1.236	3218	3218	0.25	3218	3218	1.935
G63	4507	4507	0.22	4507	4507	0.216	4507	4507	0.1	4507	4507	0.519

early stages. In contrast, the graphs in Figures 2 (c) and (d) have a smaller scale. Therefore, the convergence curves exhibit a steep decline in the initial stages, followed by a less pronounced stabilization phase. To better illuminate this behavior, we apply an upper bound threshold (designated as 261,250 for Figure 2 (c) and 123,300 for Figure 2 (d)).

The findings presented in Figure 2 (a) and Figure 2 (b) illustrate that the GCNIVC algorithm effectively employs the GCN-based initialization method to attain an optimal initial solution. This solution surpasses those obtained by the FastVC, EAVC, and TIVC algorithms, which require additional processing times to refine their results through heuristic search procedures. As a result, the GCNIVC algorithm saves more time for subsequent heuristic searches. For instance, in Figure 2 (a), the GCNIVC algorithm successfully reduces the solution size from 5,830,163 vertices to 5,735,000 vertices in just 91 seconds. In comparison, the TIVC algorithm necessitates 1,000 seconds to achieve the same reduction, while the EAVC algorithm takes approximately 684 seconds, and FastVC requires around 230 seconds. Similarly, in Figure 2 (b), the GCNIVC algorithm decreases the solution size from 3,853,211 vertices to 3,780,000 in about 65 seconds. In contrast, the TIVC algorithm takes

roughly 414 seconds, the EAVC algorithm takes around 374 seconds, and FastVC takes approximately 143 seconds to reach the same result.

When working with relatively smaller graphs, all algorithms quickly converge at the beginning. In Figure 2 (c), they enter a slow improvement phase after about 200 seconds. GCNIVC gets a solution size of 261,008 during this phase, while FastVC, TIVC, and EAVC reach 261,223, 261,177, and 261,184, respectively. GCNIVC provides the best quality solution at the start of this slow phase. Then, GCNIVC reduces its solution size to 261,001, while FastVC, TIVC, and EAVC reduce their solution sizes to 261,217, 261,167, and 261,183, respectively. Thus, the reductions in solution sizes during this slow improvement phase are seven for GCNIVC, six for FastVC, ten for TIVC, and one for EAVC. Similarly, Figure 2 (d) shows that the algorithms enter the slow improvement phase in just 5 seconds. Currently, GCNIVC has a solution size of 123,089, while FastVC, TIVC, and EAVC produce sizes of 123,199, 123,150, and 123,152, respectively. Again, GCNIVC offers the best solution at the start of the slow phase. After this phase, GCNIVC reduces its size to 123,075, while FastVC, TIVC, and EAVC achieve sizes of 123,198, 123,126, and 123,152, respectively. There-




Figure 2: The decreasing trend of using different heuristic search algorithms over 1000 seconds on benchmark tests.

fore, the reductions in solution size during this phase are 14 for GCNIVC, 0 for FastVC, 24 for TIVC, and 0




Figure 3: Results of parameter tuning.

for EAVC. This indicates that although TIVC performs slightly better during the slow improvement period, GCNIVC shows the best convergence speed in the whole period.

5.3.3. Parameter tuning

We experimented to optimize the parameters $ctner$ and bms_num in GCNIVC (Algorithm 3). For this, we selected 19 instances from various benchmarks, with the number of vertices ranging from 10^5 to 10^7 . We assessed the performance of GCNIVC across 28 different combinations associated with these two parameters, where $ctner$ took values from $\{1, 2, 3, 4\}$ and bms_num varied within the range $\{47, 48, 49, 50, 51, 52, 53\}$, following the experimental setup detailed in Section 5.2. For each configuration, we executed GCNIVC with fixed values of $ctner$ and bms_num , utilizing ten different random seeds, and reported the best results.

Figure 3 showcases the experimental results, with the x-axis denoting bms_num , the y-axis representing $ctner$, and the z-axis indicating the number of instances in which an optimal solution (i.e., an MVC) is achieved. The 3D surface plot above the $z = 0$ plane clearly visualizes how various combinations influence the number of optimal solutions obtained. In this plot, higher z-values signify a greater number of optimal solutions, with the peak of the surface representing the optimal combination, where the planar plot at $z = -8$ illustrates the color distribution for each combination of $ctner$ and bms_num . A deeper red hue reflects a higher count of optimal solutions that combination attained. As depicted in Figure 3, GCNIVC achieved optimal solutions for seven instances with $ctner = 3$ and $bms_num = 50$. This combination represents the highest number of in-

stances effectively resolved by GCNIVC in this experiment. Consequently, we selected $ctner = 3$ and $bms_num = 50$ as the optimal parameters for GCNIVC.

5.3.4. Initial solutions

Table 8-9 (see Appendix) presents the sizes of initial solutions generated by GreedyConstructVC and GCNConstructVC across 302 benchmark instances. The data demonstrates that GCNConstructVC outperforms GreedyConstructVC. Specifically, GCNConstructVC yielded superior initial solutions in 178 instances, while GreedyConstructVC excelled in 68 instances. These findings highlight the considerable advantage of GCNConstructVC in generating high-quality initial solutions.

5.3.5. Ablation experiments

We conducted an ablation study to assess the impact of various components on the overall performance of the GCNIVC algorithm. In this study, we removed the CRV strategy (Algorithm 2) from GCNIVC (line 7 in Algorithm 3) and the double-covered number technique (Definition 1) from GCNIVC (lines 9 and 18 in Algorithm 3), resulting in two new algorithms designated as No_CRV and No_Dnumber, respectively. We used ten random seeds to compare GCNIVC with No_CRV and No_Dnumber across the 302 graphs from the four testing benchmarks. It is important to emphasize that since small graphs can frequently yield optimal solutions, we focused exclusively on larger graphs and reported results only for instances where the two compared algorithms generated different solutions. Table 10 (see Appendix) summarizes the experimental results for No_CRV versus GCNIVC. The findings reveal that GCNIVC outperformed No_CRV in 77 instances, while No_CRV produced better solutions in 8 cases. Likewise, Table 11 (see Appendix) presents the results of the comparison between No_Dnumber and GCNIVC, showing that GCNIVC outperformed No_Dnumber in 81 instances, while No_Dnumber achieved superior solutions in 5 cases. This comparative analysis concludes that both components significantly enhance the algorithm's performance, particularly when combined. Nonetheless, each component positively contributes to the overall results.

5.3.6. Discussion

The exceptional performance of GCNIVC can be attributed to several key factors. Firstly, the impressive enhancement in heuristic search algorithms is mainly due to the rapid convergence speed of GCNConstruct. This quick convergence facilitates the generation of

high-quality initial solutions faster, allowing more time for subsequent searches to refine the ultimate solution's quality. Moreover, by incorporating the CRV heuristic, which is based on three containers and the concept of double-covered edges, GCNIVC can dynamically adjust removal operations throughout the solution search phase. This adaptability greatly enhances GCNIVC's ability to improve the quality of the final solution. These insights thoroughly explain why GCNIVC consistently achieves outstanding performance across benchmark instances.

6. Conclusion and Future Work

We have developed an efficient heuristic search algorithm, GCNIVC, designed to address the MVC problem. This algorithm employs the GCN framework during its initialization phase, allowing for effective analysis of graph structures and generating a high-quality initial solution. Additionally, GCNIVC introduces a novel concept known as double-covered edges, which aids in vertex selection. This enhancement boosts search efficiency by offering increased flexibility in adding and removing operations based on the attributes of edges. Our extensive experimental results demonstrate that GCNIVC outperforms other state-of-the-art MVC algorithms across four benchmark datasets, encompassing 302 instances. This performance improvement underscores the algorithm's effectiveness in handling the MVC problem on large-scale graphs.

In our future work, we aspire to expand the application of these techniques to solve other intractable graph problems involving large-scale graphs, such as the minimum dominating set problem. In addition, we plan to explore more methodologies for incorporating advanced machine-learning techniques into the heuristic search framework. Our goals include enhancing the quality of initial solutions even further and optimizing the convergence speed of the algorithm to make it more efficient in practical applications.

References

- [1] D. Coppersmith, U. Vishkin, Solving np-hard problems in 'almost trees': Vertex cover, *Discret. Appl. Math.* 10 (1) (1985) 27–45.
- [2] I. Dinur, S. Safra, On the hardness of approximating minimum vertex cover, *Annals of mathematics* (2005) 439–485.
- [3] C. Liu, S. Ge, Y. Zhang, Identifying the cardinality-constrained critical nodes with a hybrid evolutionary algorithm, *Inf. Sci.* 642 (2023) 119140.
- [4] T. Akiba, Y. Iwata, Branch-and-reduce exponential/fpt algorithms in practice: A case study of vertex cover, *Theoretical Computer Science* 609 (2016) 211–225.

- [5] J. Chen, I. A. Kanj, G. Xia, Improved upper bounds for vertex cover, *Theoretical Computer Science* 411 (40-42) (2010) 3736–3756.
- [6] Y. Li, M. T. Thai, F. Wang, C.-W. Yi, P.-J. Wan, D.-Z. Du, On greedy construction of connected dominating sets in wireless networks, *Wireless Communications and Mobile Computing* 5 (8) (2005) 927–932.
- [7] S. Bouamama, C. Blum, A. Boukerram, A population-based iterated greedy algorithm for the minimum weight vertex cover problem, *Applied Soft Computing* 12 (6) (2012) 1632–1639.
- [8] T. A. Feo, M. G. Resende, S. H. Smith, A greedy randomized adaptive search procedure for maximum independent set, *Operations Research* 42 (5) (1994) 860–878.
- [9] Q. Han, H. Sang, Q. Pan, B. Zhang, H. Guo, An efficient collaborative multi-swap iterated greedy algorithm for the distributed permutation flowshop scheduling problem with preventive maintenance, *Swarm Evol. Comput.* 86 (2024) 101537. doi:10.1016/J.SWEVO.2024.101537. URL <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.swevo.2024.101537>
- [10] M. S. Viana, O. M. Junior, R. C. Contreras, A modified genetic algorithm with local search strategies and multi-crossover operator for job shop scheduling problem, *Sensors* 20 (18) (2020) 5440.
- [11] E. Zhu, F. Jiang, C. Liu, J. Xu, Partition independent set and reduction-based approach for partition coloring problem, *IEEE Trans. Cybern.* 52 (6) (2022) 4960–4969.
- [12] B. Zhao, H. Lu, S. Chen, J. Liu, D. Wu, Convolutional neural networks for time series classification, *Journal of systems engineering and electronics* 28 (1) (2017) 162–169.
- [13] J. Xie, L. Gao, X. Li, L. Gui, A hybrid genetic tabu search algorithm for distributed job-shop scheduling problems, *Swarm Evol. Comput.* 90 (2024) 101670. doi:10.1016/J.SWEVO.2024.101670. URL <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.swevo.2024.101670>
- [14] S. Tian, C. Zhang, J. Fan, X. Li, L. Gao, A genetic algorithm with critical path-based variable neighborhood search for distributed assembly job shop scheduling problem, *Swarm Evol. Comput.* 85 (2024) 101485. doi:10.1016/J.SWEVO.2024.101485. URL <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.swevo.2024.101485>
- [15] C. Liu, G. Liu, C. Luo, S. Cai, Z. Lei, W. Zhang, Y. Chu, G. Zhang, Optimizing local search-based partial maxsat solving via initial assignment prediction, *Science China Information Sciences* 68 (2025).
- [16] S. Cai, Balance between complexity and quality: Local search for minimum vertex cover in massive graphs, in: *Twenty-Fourth International Joint Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, 2015.
- [17] S. Cai, K. Su, C. Luo, A. Sattar, Numvc: An efficient local search algorithm for minimum vertex cover, *Journal of Artificial Intelligence Research* 46 (2013) 687–716.
- [18] S. Richter, M. Helmert, C. Gretton, A stochastic local search approach to vertex cover, in: J. Hertzberg, M. Beetz, R. Englert (Eds.), *KI 2007: Advances in Artificial Intelligence*, 30th Annual German Conference on AI, KI 2007, Osnabrück, Germany, September 10-13, 2007, Proceedings, Vol. 4667 of Lecture Notes in Computer Science, Springer, 2007, pp. 412–426.
- [19] S. Cai, K. Su, A. Sattar, Local search with edge weighting and configuration checking heuristics for minimum vertex cover, *Artif. Intell.* 175 (9-10) (2011) 1672–1696.
- [20] Z. Ma, Y. Fan, K. Su, C. Li, A. Sattar, Local search with noisy strategy for minimum vertex cover in massive graphs, in: R. Booth, M. Zhang (Eds.), *PRICAI 2016: Trends in Artificial Intelligence - 14th Pacific Rim International Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, Phuket, Thailand, August 22-26, 2016, Proceedings, Vol. 9810 of Lecture Notes in Computer Science, Springer, 2016, pp. 283–294.
- [21] S. Cai, J. Lin, C. Luo, Finding A small vertex cover in massive sparse graphs: Construct, local search, and preprocess, *J. Artif. Intell. Res.* 59 (2017) 463–494.
- [22] C. Luo, H. H. Hoos, S. Cai, Q. Lin, H. Zhang, D. Zhang, Local search with efficient automatic configuration for minimum vertex cover., in: *IJCAI*, 2019, pp. 1297–1304.
- [23] C. Quan, P. Guo, A local search method based on edge age strategy for minimum vertex cover problem in massive graphs, *Expert Systems with Applications* 182 (2021) 115185.
- [24] Y. Zhang, S. Wang, C. Liu, E. Zhu, Tivc: An efficient local search algorithm for minimum vertex cover in large graphs, *Sensors* 23 (18) (2023) 7831.
- [25] Y. Rong, W. Huang, T. Xu, J. Huang, Droppedge: Towards deep graph convolutional networks on node classification, in: *8th International Conference on Learning Representations, ICLR 2020*, Addis Ababa, Ethiopia, April 26-30, 2020, OpenReview.net, 2020.
- [26] A. Tsitsulin, J. Palowitch, B. Perozzi, E. Müller, Graph clustering with graph neural networks, *J. Mach. Learn. Res.* 24 (2023) 127:1–127:21.
- [27] L. Wang, S. Hu, M. Li, J. Zhou, An exact algorithm for minimum vertex cover problem, *Mathematics* 7 (7) (2019).
- [28] D. A. Bader, H. Meyerhenke, P. Sanders, D. Wagner, *Graph partitioning and graph clustering*, Vol. 588, American Mathematical Society Providence, RI, 2013.
- [29] S. J. Benson, Y. Yeb, X. Zhang, Mixed linear and semidefinite programming for combinatorial and quadratic optimization, *Optimization Methods and Software* 11 (1-4) (1999) 515–544.

Appendix

See Tables 6 and 11.

Table 6: Experimental results on Network Repository

Instance	GCNIVC			TIVC			EAVC			FastVC		
	Min.	Avg.	T_Avg.	Min.	Avg.	T_Avg.	Min.	Avg.	T_Avg.	Min.	Avg.	T_Avg.
p-hat1000-1	925	925	6.672	925	925	2.984	925	925	0.073	925	925	0.031
p-hat1000-2	946	946	1.087	946	946	0.339	946	946	0.047	946	946	0.009
p-hat1500-1	1413	1413	6.725	1413	1413	3.272	1413	1413	0.117	1413	1413	0.042
p-hat1500-2	1438	1438	1.12	1438	1438	0.342	1438	1438	0.081	1438	1438	0.019
p-hat1500-3	1488	1488.2	249.719	1488	1488.1	303.954	1488	1488.3	24.333	1488	1488.1	4.391
p-hat300-3	291	291	0.013	291	291	0.008	291	291	0.006	291	291	0.001
p-hat500-2	464	464	0.017	464	464	0.012	464	464	0.009	464	464	0.001
p-hat500-3	490	490	0.154	490	490	0.037	490	490	0.023	490	490	0.015
p-hat700-1	635	635	0.027	635	635	0.013	635	635	0.01	635	635	0.001
p-hat700-2	651	651	0.03	651	651	0.022	651	651	0.017	651	651	0.001
san1000	933	933	0.039	933	933	0.035	933	933	0.039	933	933	0.004
san200-0-7-1	191	191	0.02	191	191	0.01	191	191	0.006	191	191	0.027
san200-0-7-2	188	188	<0.001	188	188	<0.001	188	188	<0.001	188	188	<0.001
san200-0-9-1	196	196	0.004	196	196	0.005	196	196	0.002	196	196	0.001
san200-0-9-2	196	196	0.004	196	196	0.003	196	196	0.001	196	196	<0.001
san200-0-9-3	195	195	0.004	195	195	0.005	195	195	0.002	195	195	<0.001
san400-0-5-1	368	368	<0.001	368	368	0.001	368	368	0.002	368	368	0.001
san400-0-7-1	389	389	0.013	389	389	0.007	389	389	0.002	389	389	<0.001
san400-0-7-2	385	385	1.061	385	385	0.634	385	385.3	0.059	385	385	0.487
san400-0-7-3	381	381	0.01	381	381.6	19.33	382	382	-	381	381.6	<0.001
san400-0-9-1	395	395	0.013	395	395	0.01	395	395	0.01	395	395	0.002
sanr200-0-7	193	193	0.001	193	193	<0.001	193	193	<0.001	193	193	<0.001
sanr200-0-9	196	196	0.003	196	196	0.003	196	196	0.003	196	196	<0.001
sanr400-0-5	387	387	0.465	387	387	0.154	387	387	0.061	387	387	0.055
sanr400-0-7	392	392	0.038	392	392	0.024	392	392	0.007	392	392	0.001
scc_infect-dublin	9103	9103	0.082	9103	9103	2.795	9103	9103	67.958	9104	9103	-
scc_infect-hyper	110	110	0.001	110	110	<0.001	110	110	<0.001	110	110	<0.001
scc_reality	2486	2486	0.649	2486	2486	0.622	2486	2486	0.627	2486	2486	0.119
soc-BlogCatalog	20752	20752	1.128	20752	20752	0.812	20752	20752	0.583	20752	20752	0.469
soc-brightkite	21190	21190	54.289	21190	21190	58.291	21190	21190.3	82.545	21190	21190	0.457
soc-buzznet	30618	30621.5	-	30615	30620.1	321.467	30624	30624	-	30625	30620.1	-
soc-delicious	85498	85527.9	-	85488	85527.7	770.838	85503	85539.6	-	85686	85527.7	-
soc-digg	103238	103242.4	95.394	103240	103242.1	-	103240	103242.7	-	103244	103242.1	-
soc-douban	8685	8685	0.117	8685	8685	0.119	8685	8685	0.12	8685	8685	0.016
soc-epinions	9757	9757	0.163	9757	9757	0.161	9757	9757	0.097	9757	9757	0.298
soc-flickr	153271	153271.1	34.344	153271	153271.1	72.772	153271	153271	11.591	153272	153271.1	-
soc-flixster	96317	96317	6.404	96317	96317	5.856	96317	96317	4.035	96317	96317	4.596
soc-FourSquare	90108	90109.2	128.083	90108	90108.5	420.022	90108	90109.5	77.094	90109	90108.5	-
soc-gowalla	84222	84222.7	103.727	84222	84222.6	62.147	84222	84222.5	25.805	84222	84222.6	84.58
soc-lastfm	78688	78688	2.641	78688	78688	2.128	78688	78688	2.037	78688	78688	1.295
soc-LiveMocha	43427	43427	73.364	43427	43427	41.666	43427	43427	27.141	43427	43427	45.961
soc-slashdot	22373	22373	0.411	22373	22373	0.357	22373	22373	0.208	22373	22373	0.481
soc-twitter-follows	2323	2323	0.373	2323	2323	0.346	2323	2323	0.337	2323	2323	0.028
soc-wiki-Vote	406	406	<0.001	406	406	<0.001	406	406	<0.001	406	406	<0.001
soc-youtube	146376	146377	8.087	146376	146377	7.028	146376	146377	5.232	146376	146377	17.432
soc-youtube-snap	276945	276945.8	22.985	276945	276945.8	18.487	276945	276945.8	18.539	276945	276945.8	30.989
power-US-Grid	2203	2203	0.011	2203	2203	0.011	2203	2203	0.007	2203	2203	0.014
USpowerGrid	2203	2203	0.013	2203	2203	0.01	2203	2203	0.01	2203	2203	0.015
3elt	3236	3236	287.811	3236	3236.5	235.285	3236	3236.8	436.833	3236	3236.5	409.236
3elt_dual	4651	4651.7	544.364	4651	4652.3	555.858	4652	4653.4	-	4654	4652.3	-
power	2203	2203	0.011	2203	2203	0.01	2203	2203	0.011	2203	2203	0.014
as-22july06	3303	3303	0.017	3303	3303	2.93	3303	3303	12.967	3303	3303	0.007
chesapeake	22	22	<0.001	22	22	<0.001	22	22	<0.001	22	22	<0.001
polbooks	62	62	<0.001	62	62	<0.001	62	62	<0.001	62	62	<0.001
hamming8-2	254	254	0.001	254	254	<0.001	254	254	<0.001	254	254	<0.001
hamming8-4	240	240	<0.001	240	240	<0.001	240	240	<0.001	240	240	<0.001
johnson32-2-4	465	465	0.017	465	465	0.016	465	465	0.01	465	465	<0.001
MANN-a45	1032	1032	0.085	1032	1032	0.084	1032	1032	0.085	1032	1032	0.015
MANN-a81	3318	3318	0.871	3318	3318	0.877	3318	3318	1.11	3318	3318	0.183
soc-dolphins	34	34	<0.001	34	34	<0.001	34	34	<0.001	34	34	<0.001
hamming10-2	1022	1022	0.07	1022	1022	0.071	1022	1022	0.08	1022	1022	0.01
hamming10-4	1004	1004	0.056	1004	1004	0.053	1004	1004	0.061	1004	1004	0.011
bio-celegans	249	249	<0.001	249	249	<0.001	249	249	<0.001	249	249	<0.001
bio-yeast	456	456	<0.001	456	456	<0.001	456	456	<0.001	456	456	<0.001
C1000-9	994	994	4.134	994	994	4.134	994	994	2.118	994	994	0.338
C125-9	121	121	<0.001	121	121	<0.001	121	121	0.005	121	121	<0.001
C2000-5	1985	1985.1	-	1985	1985	-	1984	1984.6	133.883	1984	1985	21.543
C2000-9	1994	1994	10.058	1994	1994	10.058	1994	1994	2.175	1994	1994	1.07
C250-9	245	245	0.006	245	245	0.006	245	245	0.005	245	245	<0.001
C4000-5	3985	3985.3	-	3984	3985.2	-	3984	3984.5	-	3983	3985.2	119.496
C500-9	495	495	0.037	495	495	0.037	495	495	0.018	495	495	0.01
ca2010	404197	404219.8	396.606	404325	404360	396.606	404340	404359.6	-	404372	404360	-
ca-AstroPh	11483	11483	0.075	11483	11483	0.075	11483	11483	0.054	11483	11483	0.053
ca-citeseer	129193	129193	1.851	129193	129193	1.851	129193	129193	1.076	129193	129193	3.559

Table 7: Experimental results on Network Repository (continued)

ca-coauthors-dblp	472179	472179	35.184	472179	472179	23.723	472179	472179	12.502	472179	472179	33.352
ca-CondMat	12480	12480	0.063	12480	12480	0.053	12480	12480	0.039	12480	12480	0.044
ca-dblp-2010	121969	121969	4.462	121969	121969	2.837	121969	121969	2.767	121969	121969	4.818
ca-GrQc	2208	2208	0.009	2208	2208	0.007	2208	2208	0.003	2208	2208	0.008
CSphd	550	550	<0.001	550	550	<0.001	550	550	<0.001	550	550	<0.001
DSJC1000-5	985	985.6	104.475	985	985.1	203.892	985	985	61.892	985	985.1	3.973
DSJC500-5	487	487	0.255	487	487	0.141	487	487	0.062	487	487	0.03
email	594	594	0.005	594	594	0.001	594	594	0.003	594	594	<0.001
email-enron-large	12781	12781	0.118	12781	12781	0.085	12781	12781	0.082	12781	12781	0.102
email-enron-only	86	86	<0.001	86	86	<0.001	86	86	<0.001	86	86	<0.001
frb30-15-5	435	435	0.009	435	435	0.01	435	435	0.011	435	435	<0.001
frb35-17-2	578	578	0.018	578	578	0.022	578	578	0.019	578	578	0.001
frb35-17-3	578	578	0.018	578	578	0.018	578	578	0.018	578	578	0.003
frb35-17-4	578	578	0.018	578	578	0.017	578	578	0.02	578	578	0.001
frb35-17-5	578	578	0.021	578	578	0.02	578	578	0.02	578	578	<0.001
frb40-19-1	741	741	0.031	741	741	0.035	741	741	0.032	741	741	0.003
frb40-19-2	741	741	0.033	741	741	0.029	741	741	0.036	741	741	0.007
frb40-19-3	741	741	0.034	741	741	0.031	741	741	0.032	741	741	0.006
frb40-19-4	741	741	0.035	741	741	0.037	741	741	0.037	741	741	0.006
frb40-19-5	741	741	0.035	741	741	0.035	741	741	0.033	741	741	0.003
frb45-21-1	924	924	0.051	924	924	0.049	924	924	0.049	924	924	0.004
frb45-21-2	924	924	0.05	924	924	0.049	924	924	0.047	924	924	0.002
frb45-21-3	924	924	0.049	924	924	0.051	924	924	0.026	924	924	0.005
frb45-21-4	924	924	0.052	924	924	0.053	924	924	0.03	924	924	0.002
frb45-21-5	924	924	0.052	924	924	0.047	924	924	0.017	924	924	0.011
frb50-23-1	1127	1127	0.074	1127	1127	0.067	1127	1127	0.09	1127	1127	0.016
frb50-23-2	1127	1127	0.073	1127	1127	0.069	1127	1127	0.08	1127	1127	0.012
frb50-23-3	1127	1127	0.074	1127	1127	0.067	1127	1127	0.083	1127	1127	0.014
frb50-23-4	1127	1127	0.078	1127	1127	0.068	1127	1127	0.071	1127	1127	0.015
frb50-23-5	1127	1127	0.069	1127	1127	0.071	1127	1127	0.086	1127	1127	0.012
frb53-24-5	1248	1248	0.088	1248	1248	0.085	1248	1248	0.1	1248	1248	0.018
frb59-26-1	1508	1508	0.128	1508	1508	0.128	1508	1508	0.138	1508	1508	0.024
frb59-26-2	1508	1508	0.13	1508	1508	0.132	1508	1508	0.143	1508	1508	0.027
frb59-26-3	1508	1508	0.128	1508	1508	0.133	1508	1508	0.141	1508	1508	0.024
frb59-26-4	1508	1508	0.124	1508	1508	0.127	1508	1508	0.152	1508	1508	0.023
frb59-26-5	1508	1508	0.13	1508	1508	0.126	1508	1508	0.134	1508	1508	0.028
gen200-p0-9-44	195	195	0.005	195	195	0.005	195	195	0.004	195	195	<0.001
gen200-p0-9-55	195	195	0.006	195	195	0.004	195	195	0.006	195	195	0.005
gen400-p0-9-55	392	392.1	0.03	392	392.1	0.011	392	392.4	0.012	392	392.1	0.003
gen400-p0-9-65	393	393	0.014	393	393	0.012	393	393.5	0.01	393	393	0.002
gen400-p0-9-75	394	394	0.01	394	394	0.01	394	394	0.01	394	394	0.003
ia-email-EU	820	820	0.016	820	820	0.015	820	820	0.016	820	820	<0.001
ia-email-univ	594	594	0.002	594	594	0.002	594	594	0.003	594	594	<0.001
ia-enron-large	12781	12781	0.128	12781	12781	0.085	12781	12781	0.079	12781	12781	0.098
ia-enron-only	86	86	<0.001	86	86	<0.001	86	86	<0.001	86	86	<0.001
ia-fb-messages	578	578	0.008	578	578	0.007	578	578	0.005	578	578	0.001
ia-infect-dublin	293	293	<0.001	293	293	<0.001	293	293	<0.001	293	293	339.57
keller5	745	745.2	0.032	745	745.2	0.033	745	745.2	0.04	745	745.2	0.009
keller6	3298	3298	0.632	3298	3298	0.63	3298	3298	0.574	3298	3298	0.117
pa2010	241120	241135.9	336.263	241192	241212	-	241189	241211.3	-	241236	241212	-
minnesota	1319	1319	0.011	1319	1319	0.006	1319	1319	0.001	1319	1319	-
usroads	65694	65699	701.152	65700	65704.2	-	65704	65708.9	-	65702	65704.2	-
usroads-48	64206	64214.2	653.852	64214	64221.3	-	64219	64226.4	-	64221	64221.3	-

Table 8: Comparison of the initial solutions constructed by two methods: the GCNConstructVC and the GreedyConstructVC.

Instance	GCNConstructVC	GreedyConstructVC	Instance	GCNConstructVC	GreedyConstructVC	Instance	GCNConstructVC	GreedyConstructVC
144	121987	122465	bio-yeast	479	459(473)	ca-citeeer	129330	129258
333SP	2704261	2719254	brock200-2	196	191(195)	ca-coauthors-dblp	473913	472259
3elt	3453	3480	brock200-3	196	193(197)	ca-CondMat	12509	12497
3elt_dual	4896	4804	brock200-4	196	192(194)	ca-dblp-2010	122108	122073
598a	92792	92855	brock400-1	395	394(394)	ca-GrQc	2216	2214
adaptive	3408907	3408898	brock400-4	396	395(396)	ca-HepPh	6574	6565
al2010	141044	143593	brock800-1	793	794(794)	ca-MathSciNet	140367	140446
ar2010	104614	106477	brock800-2	796	(794)	ca2010	414221	422878
as-22july06	3325	3325	brock800-3	794	792(795)	caidaRouterLevel	77323	78494
AS365	2729194	2785283	brock800-4	794	794(795)	channel-500x100x100-b050	3690904	3628053
asia_osc	6048471	6085708	c-fat200-2	191	192(192)	citationCiteeer	121242	123264
auto	377297	378817	c-fat500-5	492	493(493)	co-papers-citeeer	387314	386188
az2010	134872	136926	C250-9	248	246(248)	co2010	112754	114912
belgium_osc	733239	739448	C4000-5	3993	3987(3991)	coAuthorsCiteeer	129330	129258
bio-celegans	257	259	ca-AstroPh	11635	11521(11669)	coAuthorsDBLP	155826	155756
com-Amazon	162253	163552	G2	727	729	inf-power	2333	2271
com-DBLP	165158	165084	G22	1632	1649	inf-road.central	6926551	7165443
coPapersDBLP	473913	472259	G23	1649	1654	keller5	765	766
cs4	14634	14749	G24	1636	1646	keller6	3348	3347
CSphd	550	553	G25	1643	1645	ks2010	137881	141240
ct2010	38569	39170	G26	1652	1664	ky2010	90537	92075
cti	9977	10046	G3	726	733	la2010	116350	119056
data	2237	2201	G35	1336	1349	loc-Brightkite	22147	22146
de2010	13789	14072	G36	1343	1357	loc-Gowalla	85758	85538
delaunay_n10	730	747	G37	1344	1363	luxembourg_osc	57981	58239

Table 9: Comparison of the initial solutions constructed by two methods: the GCNConstructVC and the GreedyConstructVC.

Instance	GCNConstructVC	GreedyConstructVC	Instance	GCNConstructVC	GreedyConstructVC	Instance	GCNConstructVC	GreedyConstructVC
delaunay_n11	1449	1481	G38	1325	1342	m14b	181813	182314
delaunay_n12	2917	2963	G43	824	832	M6	2519414	2568592
delaunay_n13	5811	5909	G44	820	822	ma2010	89588	91149
delaunay_n14	11616	11831	G45	824	831	md2010	78865	80115
delaunay_n15	23165	23630	G46	832	822	me2010	37619	38120
delaunay_n16	46389	47258	G47	811	821	mi2010	190553	194920
delaunay_n18	185812	189220	G5	726	729	minnesota	1351	1392
delaunay_n19	371735	378493	G51	674	678	mn2010	147466	150786
delaunay_n20	743387	757013	G52	674	687	mo2010	191364	194923
delaunay_n21	1486424	1513884	G53	677	683	ms2010	96601	98326
delaunay_n22	2972220	3028303	G54	681	684	mt2010	72256	73462
delaunay_n23	5944908	6057125	G58	3342	3367	mycielskian10	405	403
DSJC500-5	491	490	G63	4675	4711	mycielskian11	806	807
email	613	615	ga2010	164588	167349	mycielskian12	1605	1600
email-enron-large	12854	12822	gen200-p0-9-44	196	197	mycielskian13	3215	3217
email-enron-only	88	87	gen400-p0-9-75	397	395	mycielskian14	6378	6370
fe-4elt2	8052	8119	germany_osc	5830163	5892463	mycielskian15	12815	12807
fe-ocean	82889	80426	great-britain_osc	3853211	3890029	mycielskian16	25413	25398
fe-sphere	11784	11016	hi2010	14276	14531	mycielskian17	51085	51027
fe-tooth	50660	50753	hugetrace-00000	2677698	2677603	mycielskian9	201	202
fe_rotor	81902	82132	hugetrace-00010	7000430	6990029	nc2010	162720	165661
fl2010	273900	279242	hugetrace-00020	9438065	9418528	nd2010	75236	76695
frb30-15-5	442	443	hugetric-00000	3403903	3404512	ne2010	110934	113339
frb35-17-2	578	587	hugetric-00010	3938525	3928096	netherlands_osc	1130535	1149044
frb35-17-5	587	589	hugetric-00020	4248609	4237685	nh2010	26347	26694
frb40-19-1	741	745	ia-email-EU	828	827	nj2010	99449	101564
frb40-19-2	741	753	ia-email-univ	613	615	NLR	2994993	3053479
frb40-19-3	741	751	ia-enron-large	12854	12822	mm2010	93635	95170
frb40-19-4	747	753	ia-enron-only	88	87	nv2010	47107	47842
frb40-19-5	741	752	ia-fb-messages	589	592	oh2010	209972	214215
frb45-21-1	938	924	ia-infect-dublin	299	300	ok2010	151311	154481
frb45-21-2	935	939	ia-wiki-Talk	17448	17464	or2010	109813	111561
frb45-21-3	938	924	ia2010	126447	129524	p-hat1000-1	937	938
frb50-23-1	1127	1141	id2010	80701	81836	p-hat1000-2	952	953
frb50-23-4	1138	1139	il2010	268529	275355	p-hat1500-1	1423	1424
frb53-24-5	1262	1248	in2010	155328	158853	p-hat1500-2	1449	1450
frb59-26-3	1529	1508	inf-asia_osc	6048471	6085708	p-hat1500-3	1492	1491
frb59-26-5	1508	1523	inf-belgium_osc	733239	739448	p-hat500-2	469	468
G1	727	726	inf-germany_osc	5830163	5892463	p-hat700-1	643	644
G14	540	548	inf-great-britain_osc	3853211	3890029	p-hat700-3	692	693
G15	535	540	inf-italy_osc	3380659	3399601	pa2010	246941	252018
G16	530	533	inf-luxembourg_osc	57981	58239	polbooks	63	65
G17	530	537	inf-netherlands_osc	1130535	1149044	power	2233	2271
power-US-Grid	2233	2271	loc-brightkite	21470	21469	tn2010	136762	142226
preferentialAttachment	60908	61680	loc-buzznet	31828	31795	tx2010	526576	550104
ri2010	14713	14957	loc-delicious	88268	90812	uk	2824	2816
road_central	6926551	7165443	loc-digg	107009	106831	USPowerGrid	2233	2350
road_usa	11811200	12200485	loc-douban	8693	8704	usroads	63273	65714
san1000	935	933	loc-epinions	9853	9860	usroads-48	67865	70088
san200-0-9-3	195	197	loc-flickr	154595	154471	ut2010	63273	65714
san400-0-5-1	377	369	loc-flixster	96804	96873	va2010	157038	162934
san400-0-7-1	392	390	loc-FourSquare	91041	90719	venturiLevel3	2031366	2030900
san400-0-7-2	394	390	loc-gowalla	85758	85538	vsp_sctap1-2b_and_seymourl	18431	18939
san400-0-7-3	381	385	loc-lastfm	80184	80205	vt2010	17725	18351
sanr200-0-9	197	196	loc-LiveMocha	44922	45314	wa2010	111427	116261
sc2010	102693	104406	loc-slashdot	22688	22665	wi2010	144973	151667
sec_infect-dublin	9132	9124	loc-twitter-follows	2376	2419	wing	40570	40999
sec_infect-hyper	110	110	loc-wiki-Vote	415	414	wing_nodal	9159	9409
sec_reality	2490	2486	loc-youtube	279661	149089	wv2010	72389	75019
sd2010	50722	52052	loc-youtube-snap	149198	279389	soc-BlogCatalog	21281	21257
smallworld	78261	79350	160k	30667	30533			

Table 10: Comparison of solution quality between No.CRV and GCNIVC.

Instance	No.CRV	GCNIVC	Instance	No.CRV	GCNIVC	Instance	No.CRV	GCNIVC
144	117819	117820	ia2010	123121	123075	NLR	2882055	2881932
333SP	2545721	2546845	id2010	79175	79173	nm2010	91779	91765
598a	89162	89164	il2010	261156	261001	nv2010	46165	46157
al2010	138528	138512	in2010	151508	151460	oh2010	205511	205441
ar2010	102554	102547	inf-asia_osm	5965693	5965475	ok2010	147627	147566
AS365	2629649	2629682	inf-belgium_osm	716873	716867	or2010	107643	107622
asia_osm	5963763	5965052	inf-germany_osm	5778444	5741704	pa2010	241211	241120
auto	364598	364594	inf-great-britain_osm	3794838	3775859	road_central	6924682	6855046
az2010	132203	132183	inf-italy_osm	3334878	3334068	road_usa	11844139	11772344
belgium_osm	716870	716868	inf-netherlands_osm	1100078	1100046	sc2010	100847	100844
ca2010	404321	404197	inf-road_central	6886386	6856610	smallworld	75546	75541
caidaRouterLevel	75197	75193	ks2010	134377	134310	soc-delicious	85501	85498
citationCiteseer	118143	118133	ky2010	88791	88783	soc-digg	103241	103238
co2010	110118	110073	la2010	113471	113448	t60k	30332	30324
com-Amazon	160240	160242	m14b	175785	175773	tn2010	134350	134349
cs4	13339	13345	M6	2423910	2423393	tx2010	513090	512894
ct2010	37959	37958	ma2010	87950	87947	usroads	65699	65694
delaunay_n14	11229	11228	md2010	77496	77495	usroads-48	64213	64206
delaunay_n18	179581	179579	me2010	37053	37052	ut2010	62146	62142
delaunay_n19	359127	359123	mi2010	185892	185819	va2010	154264	154257
delaunay_n20	718290	718224	mn2010	144064	144013	venturiLevel3	2026333	2026295
delaunay_n21	1436537	1436518	mo2010	187702	187679	vsp_sctap1-2b_and_seymourl	17785	17784
delaunay_n22	2873160	2873088	ms2010	94944	94936	wa2010	108821	108793
delaunay_n23	5851454	5831454	mt2010	70644	70631	wi2010	141709	141664
fe-ocean	72086	72173	nc2010	159854	159831	wing	36888	36879
fl2010	267019	266945	nd2010	73700	73681	wv2010	71169	71166
ga2010	161701	161677	ne2010	108224	108184	wy2010	46756	46748
germany_osm	5707867	5707860	netherlands_osm	1100078	1100047			
great-britain_osm	3775520	3775495	nj2010	96819	96795			

Table 11: Comparison of solution quality between No.Dcnumber and GCNIVC.

Instance	No.Dcnumber	GCNIVC	Instance	No.Dcnumber	GCNIVC	Instance	No.Dcnumber	GCNIVC
144	117802	117820	ia2010	123119	123075	nm2010	91779	91765
333SP	2565721	2546845	id2010	79182	79173	nv2010	46165	46157
598a	89174	89164	il2010	261156	261001	oh2010	205498	205441
al2010	138520	138512	in2010	151494	151460	ok2010	147618	147566
ar2010	102551	102547	inf-asia_osm	6010304	5965475	or2010	107636	107622
AS365	2630248	2629682	inf-belgium_osm	716870	716867	pa2010	241191	241120
asia_osm	5992845	5965052	inf-germany_osm	5786664	5741704	road_central	6966221	6855046
auto	364599	364594	inf-great-britain_osm	3794838	3775859	road_usa	11833068	11772344
az2010	132205	132183	inf-italy_osm	3334648	3334068	sc2010	100849	100844
belgium_osm	716878	716868	inf-netherlands_osm	1100078	1100046	smallworld	75546	75541
ca2010	404322	404197	inf-road_central	6888692	6856610	soc-delicious	85505	85498
caidaRouterLevel	75200	75193	ks2010	134379	134310	soc-digg	103240	103238
channel-500x100x100-b050	3608700	3601693	ky2010	88785	88783	t60k	30332	30324
citationCiteseer	118138	118133	la2010	113479	113448	tn2010	134358	134349
co2010	110114	110073	m14b	175772	175773	tx2010	513106	512894
cs4	13347	13345	M6	2427627	2423393	usroads	65689	65694
ct2010	37959	37958	ma2010	87948	87947	usroads-48	64210	64206
delaunay_n18	179584	179579	me2010	37053	37052	ut2010	62151	62142
delaunay_n20	718258	718224	mi2010	185889	185819	va2010	154259	154257
delaunay_n21	1436537	1436518	mn2010	144051	144013	venturiLevel3	2026320	2026295
delaunay_n22	2873160	2873088	mo2010	187694	187679	vsp_sctap1-2b_and_seymourl	17785	17784
delaunay_n23	5892351	5831454	ms2010	94943	94936	wa2010	108822	108793
fe-4elt2	7574	7572	mt2010	70635	70631	wi2010	141701	141664
fe-ocean	72341	72173	nc2010	159854	159831	wing	36837	36879
fe_rotor	77611	77615	nd2010	73699	73681	wv2010	71181	71166
fl2010	267017	266945	ne2010	108208	108184	wy2010	46751	46748
ga2010	161700	161677	netherlands_osm	1100064	1100047	venturiLevel3	2026333	2026295
germany_osm	5707867	5707860	nj2010	96811	96795	sd2010	49303	49302
great-britain_osm	3775520	3775495	NLR	2884302	2881932			