

# The Parameterized Complexity of Terminal Monitoring Set

N. R. Aravind and Roopam Saxena

Department of Computer Science and Engineering  
IIT Hyderabad, Hyderabad, India  
aravind@cse.iith.ac.in, cs18resch11004@iith.ac.in

**Abstract.** In TERMINAL MONITORING SET (TMS), the input is an undirected graph  $G = (V, E)$ , together with a collection  $T$  of terminal pairs and the goal is to find a subset  $S$  of minimum size that hits a shortest path between every pair of terminals. We show that this problem is  $W[2]$ -hard with respect to solution size. On the positive side, we show that TMS is fixed parameter tractable with respect to solution size plus distance to cluster, solution size plus neighborhood diversity, and feedback edge number. For the weighted version of the problem, we obtain a FPT algorithm with respect to vertex cover number, and for a relaxed version of the problem, we show that it is  $W[1]$ -hard with respect to solution size plus feedback vertex number.

**Keywords:** monitoring set, hitting set, hub location, parameterized complexity, fixed parameter tractability

## 1 Introduction

### 1.1 Problem Definition

Consider a communication network and a set of pairs of nodes, say  $\mathcal{T} = \{\{u_1, v_1\}, \{u_2, v_2\}, \dots, \{u_m, v_m\}\}$  such that every pair in  $\mathcal{T}$  is communicating through a shortest path between them. We want to monitor this communicating data while deploying monitoring devices at minimum number of nodes in the network. Consider a scenario where we want to achieve an incremental deployment of a software defined network over a legacy network by deploying costly smart switches at only a few locations initially.

Motivated by the above scenarios, we formulate the terminal monitoring set problem as follows.

**TERMINAL MONITORING SET (TMS):**

*Input:* An instance  $I = (G, \mathcal{T}, k)$ , where  $G = (V, E)$  is an undirected graph,  $\mathcal{T} = \{\{u_1, v_1\}, \dots, \{u_l, v_l\}\}$  where  $u_i, v_i \in V$  and  $k \in \mathbb{N}$ .

*Output:* YES, if  $G$  contains a set  $S \subseteq V$  of size at most  $k$  such that for every  $\{u, v\} \in \mathcal{T}$ , there exists a  $w \in S$  such that  $d(u, w) + d(w, v) = d(u, v)$ ; NO otherwise.

We say a set  $S \subseteq V(G)$  is a terminal monitoring set (regardless of its size) for  $\mathcal{T}$  if for every  $\{u, v\} \in \mathcal{T}$ , there exists a  $w \in S$  such that  $d(u, w) + d(w, v) = d(u, v)$ . We remark that a vertex can belong to multiple pairs in the list  $\mathcal{T}$ , but we assume without loss of generality that no terminal pair appears twice. Further, we assume distance between every terminal pair in  $\mathcal{T}$  is finite (they are reachable by each other, hence belong to a same connected component).

While there are similar problems in the literature, some of which we will discuss in the next section, to the best of our knowledge, the optimization equivalent of TERMINAL MONITORING SET has not been studied before.

## 1.2 Related Work

The closest related problem to TERMINAL MONITORING SET in the literature is the  $(k, r)$ -center problem, where we are given an undirected graph and it is asked if there exists a vertex set  $S \subseteq V(G)$  such that  $|S| \leq k$  and for every vertex  $v \in V(G) \setminus S$  there exists a vertex  $u \in S$  such that distance between  $u$  and  $v$  is at most  $r$ . Optimization of  $r$  for a fixed  $k$  is studied in [7,14,17,18,21], and optimization of  $k$  for fixed  $r$  is studied in [3,5,8,20]. Recently Katsikarelis, Lampis, Paschos [16] studied parameterized complexity of  $(k, r)$ -center with respect to various structural parameters. Benedito, Melo, and Pedrosa [4] studied a problem related to  $(k, r)$ -center, under the name of Multiple Allocation  $k$ -Hub Center, which is also a closely related problem to TERMINAL MONITORING SET.

Another related problem is hub location where packets must travel from each source to its corresponding destination via a small number of hubs. Surveys of hub location can be found in [2] and [12].

The problem HITTING SET is as follows, we are given a universe  $\mathcal{U}$ , and a family  $\mathcal{F}$  of subsets of  $\mathcal{U}$ , and the question is to decide if there exists a set  $S \subseteq \mathcal{U}$  of size at most  $k$  such that  $S$  intersects with every set in  $\mathcal{F}$ . Jansen in [15] investigated a special case of HITTING SET and called it HITTING PATHS IN A GRAPH where a graph  $G$  and a collection  $\mathcal{P}$  of simple paths in  $G$  is given, and it is to decide if there exist a vertex set of size at most  $k$  in  $G$  that intersects with every path in  $\mathcal{P}$ . Jansen [15] showed that HITTING PATHS IN A GRAPH is FPT parameterized by feedback edge number of the input graph, complementing this result Jansen also showed that HITTING PATHS IN A GRAPH is para NP-hard for the parameter feedback vertex number and treewidth of the input graph.

TERMINAL MONITORING SET can be considered as a special case of HITTING SET, where the universe  $\mathcal{U}$  must be a vertex set of an input graph  $G$ , and every set in family  $\mathcal{F}$  must be a union of vertices of all the shortest paths between a terminal pairs (vertex pairs). And hence, TERMINAL MONITORING SET can be formulated as a HITTING SET, and thus it is natural that results on HITTING SET are relevant to this work. In particular, the results of [1] and [13] that use the sunflower lemma for set systems of bounded size. We use similar ideas in some of our algorithmic results.

### 1.3 Our Results

- Hardness Results
  - a TERMINAL MONITORING SET is NP-hard.
  - b TERMINAL MONITORING SET is W[2]-hard with respect to solution size.

On the positive side, we have the following results.

- TERMINAL MONITORING SET admits an FPT algorithm when parameterized by solution size plus distance to cluster of the input graph  $G$ .
- TERMINAL MONITORING SET admits an FPT algorithm when parameterized by solution size plus neighborhood diversity of the input graph  $G$ .
- Weighted-TERMINAL MONITORING SET admits an FPT algorithm when parameterized by vertex cover number of the input graph  $G$ .

We also found that Jansen’s Algorithm [15] also solves TERMINAL MONITORING SET correctly, thus we have the following result.

- TERMINAL MONITORING SET admits an FPT algorithm when parameterized by the feedback edge number of the input graph  $G$ .

We leave open the parameterized complexity of TERMINAL MONITORING SET by feedback vertex number; however we obtain a hardness result for the following relaxation of TERMINAL MONITORING SET.

$\alpha$ -RELAXED TERMINAL MONITORING SET ( $\alpha$ -RTMS):

*Input:* An instance  $I = (G, \mathcal{T}, k)$ , where  $G = (V, E)$  is an undirected graph,  $\mathcal{T} = \{\{u_1, v_1\}, \dots, \{u_i, v_i\}\}$  where  $u_i, v_i \in V$ ,  $k \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $\alpha \in \mathbb{Q}_{\geq 0}$ .

*Output:* YES, if  $G$  contains a subset  $S$  of size at most  $k$  such that for every  $\{u, v\} \in \mathcal{T}$ , there exists a  $w \in S$  such that  $d(u, w) + d(w, v) \leq (1 + \alpha) \cdot d(u, v)$ ; NO otherwise.

- For every fixed  $0 < \alpha \leq 0.5$ ,  $\alpha$ -RTMS is W[1]-hard with respect to feedback vertex number of the input graph  $G$  plus solution size, even when the input graph is a planar graph.

## 2 Preliminaries

### 2.1 Graph Notations and Terminologies

All the graphs consider in this paper are simple and finite. We use standard graph notations and terminologies and refer the reader to [10] for basic graph notations and terminologies. We mention some notations used in this paper. A graph  $G = (V, E)$  has a vertex set  $V$  and edge set  $E$ . We also use  $V(G)$  and  $E(G)$  to denote the vertex set and edge set of  $G$  respectively. For an edge set  $F \subseteq E(G)$ ,  $V(F)$  denotes the set of all the vertices of  $G$  with at least one edge in  $F$  incident on it. For a vertex set  $S \subseteq V(G)$ ,  $G[S]$  denotes the induced sub graph of  $G$  on vertex set  $S$ , and  $G - S$  denotes the graph  $G[V(G) \setminus S]$ . For an edge set  $E' \subseteq E$ ,  $G[E']$  denotes the sub graph of  $G$  on edge set  $E'$  i.e.  $G[E'] = (V(E'), E')$ . For an edge set  $A \subseteq E(G)$ ,  $G - A$  denotes the graph with vertex set  $V(G)$  and edge set  $E(G) \setminus A$ . A component  $C$  of a graph  $G$  is a maximally connected subgraph of  $G$ . A graph  $G$  is a forest if every component of  $G$  is a tree. We use  $G' \subseteq G$  to denote that  $G'$  is a subgraph of  $G$ . For a  $v \in V(G)$ , we use  $N_G(v)$  to denote the open neighborhood of  $v$  in  $G$  that is the set of all adjacent vertices of  $v$  in  $G$ . Further, for a set  $Z \subseteq V$ ,  $N(Z) = \bigcup_{v \in Z} N(v)$ .

For a weighted graph  $G$ ,  $w(e)$  is the weight of an edge  $e \in E(G)$ . For a graph  $G$ ,  $d(u, v)$  is the distance between vertices  $u$  and  $v$  in  $G$ . Given a graph  $G$ , and  $u, v \in V(G)$ , we define  $SP_G(u, v)$  to be the set  $\{x \mid x \in V(G) \wedge d(u, x) + d(x, v) = d(u, v)\}$ . When the context is clear, we simply write  $SP(u, v)$ . For undirected graphs,  $SP(u, v)$  and  $SP(v, u)$  are the same; and we avoid writing  $SP(\{u, v\})$ .

### 2.2 Set Terminologies

We define the **core** of a set family  $\mathcal{F}$  to be  $\bigcap_{S \in \mathcal{F}} S$  and denote it by  $core(\mathcal{F})$ . We say that a collection  $\mathcal{F}$  of sets forms a **sunflower** if there is a set  $C$  such that  $S \cap T = C$  for every distinct pair  $S, T \in \mathcal{F}$ . Notice that  $C = core(\mathcal{F})$  in this case (see [9,13] for details on sunflower, sunflower lemma, and its application to HITTING SET).

### 2.3 Graph Structural Parameters

A vertex set  $S \subseteq V(G)$  is a vertex cover of  $G$  if the sub graph  $G[V \setminus S]$  has no edge. The minimum size of any vertex cover of  $G$  is called vertex cover number of  $G$ . A vertex set  $S \subseteq V(G)$  is a feedback vertex set of  $G$  if the sub graph  $G[V \setminus S]$  has no cycle. The minimum size of any feedback vertex set of  $G$  is called feedback vertex number (FVN) of  $G$ . An edge set  $F \subseteq E(G)$  is a feedback edge set of  $G$  if the sub graph  $G - F$  has no cycle. The minimum size of any feedback edge set of  $G$  is called feedback edge number (FEN) of  $G$ .

A cluster graph is a disjoint union of complete graphs. For a graph  $G = (V, E)$ , a vertex set  $X \subseteq V$  is a cluster deletion set if  $G - X$  is a cluster graph. The smallest size of a cluster deletion set of  $G$  is called the distance to cluster of  $G$ . A co-cluster graph is a complete multipartite graph. For a graph  $G = (V, E)$ , a vertex set  $X \subseteq V$  is a co-cluster deletion set if  $G - X$  is a co-cluster graph. The smallest size of a co-cluster deletion set of  $G$  is called the distance to co-cluster of  $G$ .

For the details on neighborhood diversity we refer to [19], and recall the definition here.

**Definition 1 ([19]).** *In a graph  $G = (V, E)$ , two vertices  $u$  and  $v$  have the same type if and only if  $N(v) \setminus \{u\} = N(u) \setminus \{v\}$ . A graph  $G = (V, E)$  has a neighborhood diversity at most  $t$  if the set  $V$  can be partitioned into at most  $t$  sets such that all the vertices of each set have the same type.*

## 2.4 Parameterized Complexity

**Basic Definitions and Terminologies** For details on parameterized complexity, we refer to [9,11], and recall some definitions here.

**Definition 2 ([9]).** *A parameterized problem is a language  $L \subseteq \Sigma^* \times \mathbb{N}$  where  $\Sigma$  is a fixed and finite alphabet. For an instance  $I = (x, k) \in \Sigma^* \times \mathbb{N}$ ,  $k$  is called the parameter.*

**Definition 3 ([9]).** *A parameterized problem is called fixed-parameter tractable if there exists a computable function  $f : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ , a constant  $c$ , and an algorithm  $\mathcal{A}$  (called a fixed-parameter algorithm) such that: the algorithm  $\mathcal{A}$  correctly decides whether  $I \in L$  in time bounded by  $f(k) \cdot |I|^c$ . The complexity class containing all fixed-parameter tractable problems is called FPT.*

Informally, a W[1]-hard problem is unlikely to be fixed parameter tractable, see [9] for details on complexity class W[1].<sup>4</sup>

**Definition 4 ([9]).** *Let  $P, Q$  be two parameterized problems. A parameterized reduction from  $P$  to  $Q$  is an algorithm which for an instance  $(x, k)$  of  $P$  outputs an instance  $(x', k')$  of  $Q$  such that:*

- $(x, k)$  is yes instance of  $P$  if and only if  $(x', k')$  is a yes instance of  $Q$ ,
- $k' \leq g(k)$  for some computable function  $g$ , and
- the reduction algorithm takes time  $f(k) \cdot |x|^{O(1)}$  for some computable function  $f$ .

**Theorem 1 ([9]).** *If there is a parameterized reduction from  $P$  to  $Q$  and  $Q$  is fixed parameter tractable then  $P$  is also fixed parameter tractable.*

## 2.5 Some Problem Definitions and Existing Results

HITTING SUBGRAPHS IN A GRAPH (HSG):

*Input:* An instance  $I = (G, \mathcal{V}, k)$ , where  $G = (V, E)$  is an undirected graph,  $\mathcal{V}$  is a collection of subgraphs of  $G$ , and  $k \in \mathbb{N}$ .

*Output:* YES, if  $G$  contains a  $S \subseteq V(G)$  of size at most  $k$  that intersects with vertex set of every graph in  $\mathcal{V}$ ; NO otherwise.

If HITTING SUBGRAPHS IN A GRAPH has the constraint that every graph in  $\mathcal{V}$  is a simple path in  $G$ , then we call the problem HITTING PATHS IN A GRAPH (HPG), the problem HITTING PATHS IN A GRAPH was studied in [15].

**Lemma 1 (folklore, discussed in [15]).** HITTING PATHS IN A GRAPH *can be solved in polynomial time if the input graph  $G$  is a tree.*

From [15] we recall that a graph  $G$  is a flower graph if it has a specific vertex  $z$  (called its core) such that  $G - \{z\}$  is a disjoint union of paths, each such path is called its petal, and no internal vertex of any such path is adjacent to  $z$ , assume an arbitrary but distinct ordering  $\{R_1, R_2, \dots, R_l\}$  of these petals.

HITTING PATHS IN A FLOWER WITH BUDGETS(HPFB)[15]:

*Input:* An instance  $I = (G, z, P, b)$ , where  $G$  is a flower graph with core  $z$  and petals  $R_1, R_2, \dots, R_l$ , a set  $P$  of simple paths in  $G$ , and  $b : [l] \rightarrow \mathbb{N}_{\geq 1}$ .

*Question:* Is there a set  $S \subseteq V(G) \setminus \{z\}$  hitting every path in  $P$  such that  $|S \cap V(R_i)| = b(i)$  for every  $i \in [l]$ ?

**Lemma 2 ([15]).** HPFB *is polynomial time solvable.*

## 3 FPT Algorithms

In this section we prove the following theorems.

**Theorem 2.** *There exists an FPT algorithm for TERMINAL MONITORING SET when parameterized by solution size plus distance to cluster of the input graph  $G$ .*

**Theorem 3.** *There exists an FPT algorithm for TERMINAL MONITORING SET when parameterized by solution size plus neighborhood diversity of the input graph  $G$ .*

**Theorem 4.** *There exists an FPT algorithm for weighted-TERMINAL MONITORING SET when parameterized by vertex cover number of the input graph  $G$ .*

**Theorem 5.** *There exists an FPT algorithm for TERMINAL MONITORING SET when parameterized by the feedback edge number of the input graph  $G$ .*

Given an instance  $(G, \mathcal{T}, k)$ , our main idea is to create an equivalent instance  $(\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{F}, k')$  of HITTING SET where the number of sets in  $\mathcal{F}$  is a function of  $k$  plus the structural parameter under consideration. An instance  $(\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{F}, k')$  of HITTING SET with  $\mathcal{F}$  having  $m$  sets and  $\mathcal{U}$  having  $n$  elements can be solved in  $O(2^m \cdot (n+m)^{O(1)})$  time by a standard dynamic programming algorithm (see [9]). Using this we can obtain an FPT algorithm for TERMINAL MONITORING SET.

Another idea that we use is the following, which we will call the *standard vertex cover reduction*. This is the reduction applied to obtain a quadratic kernel for VERTEX COVER in [6].

**Observation 1** *Given an instance  $I = (\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{F}, k)$  of HITTING SET where  $\mathcal{F} = \mathcal{F}_1 \cup \mathcal{F}_2$  such that every set in  $\mathcal{F}_2$  is of size at most 2, then in time polynomial in  $|I|$ , either we conclude that  $I$  is a no instance, or we find a family  $\mathcal{F}_3$  of size at most  $O(k^2)$  such that  $(\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{F}, k)$  is a YES instance if and only if  $(\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{F}_1 \cup \mathcal{F}_3, k)$  is a YES instance.*

We remark that this can be generalized to subfamilies of bounded size and we indeed do this in a slightly more general way later in this paper (Proposition 1).

Let  $(G, \mathcal{T}, k)$  be the input instance of TERMINAL MONITORING SET. We may assume that  $G$  is connected otherwise we do the following. If a terminal pair exists in  $\mathcal{T}$  such that both of its vertices belong to distinct connected component, then we conclude that input is a no instance, as there is no path between them. Otherwise, we introduce a vertex  $z$  and arbitrarily pick a vertex from every connected component of  $G$ , we connect  $z$  to every picked vertex. By this modification, no new shortest path is introduced between any terminal pair in  $\mathcal{T}$  as every connected component of original  $G$  is now connected to rest of the graph by only a single edge, hence no new cycle in  $G$  is introduced. After this modification, distance to cluster of  $G$  is increased by at most 1, vertex cover number is increased by at most 1, and feedback edge number remains same. Also observe that if neighborhood diversity of  $G$  was  $t$ , then after this modification the neighborhood diversity of  $G$  will be at most  $2t + 1$ , which is sufficient for our purposes. Hence, we may assume that the input graph  $G$  is always connected.

### 3.1 Parameterized by Solution Size + Distance to Cluster

In this section, we give the proof of Theorem 2.

Given an input instance  $(G, \mathcal{T}, k)$  of TERMINAL MONITORING SET, We say that a family  $H \subseteq \mathcal{T}$  is *core-invariant* if family  $\{SP(u, v) \mid \{u, v\} \in H\}$  forms a sunflower.

**Reduction Rule 1** *Given a core-invariant family  $H$  with at least  $k + 2$  pairs, remove all but  $k + 1$  pairs of  $H$  from  $\mathcal{T}$ .*

The above rule is safe because any set of size at most  $k$  that hits  $(k+1)$  sets in the sunflower must hit the core, and hence hit  $SP(u, v)$  for every pair  $\{u, v\}$  in  $H$ .

For the input graph  $G = (V, E)$ , let  $M \subseteq V$  be a cluster deletion set of size at most  $q$ . Let these clique components be  $C_1, C_2, \dots, C_r$  and let  $\mathcal{C} = \bigcup_{i \in [r]} V(C_i)$ . Further, we define the following.

- $T_0 = \{\{u, v\} \mid \{u, v\} \in (\mathcal{T} \cap E)\}$ ;
- $T_1 = \{\{u, v\} \mid \{u, v\} \in (\mathcal{T} \setminus T_0) \wedge u \in \mathcal{C} \wedge v \in M\}$ ;
- $T_2 = \{\{u, v\} \mid \{u, v\} \in (\mathcal{T} \setminus T_0) \wedge u, v \in \mathcal{C}\}$ .
- $T_3 = \{\{u, v\} \mid \{u, v\} \in (\mathcal{T} \setminus T_0) \wedge u, v \in M\}$ .

Observe that  $\{T_0, T_1, T_2, T_3\}$  is a partition of  $\mathcal{T}$ . We first reduce and bound the size of  $T_2$ .

**Reducing and Bounding Size of  $T_2$ .** We fix an arbitrary ordering between both the vertices of every pair  $\{u, v\} \in T_2$ , and thus  $\{u, v\}$  is denoted by  $(u, v)$  or  $(v, u)$  depending on the ordering. The ordering will not affect  $SP(u, v)$  for  $\{u, v\}$ .

We say that a pair  $(u, v) \in T_2$  is of *type*  $X$  if  $X$  is the smallest subset of  $M \times \{1, 2\} \times M \times \{1, 2\}$  such that the following holds: for every shortest path  $P$  from  $u$  to  $v$ , there exists  $(x, i, y, j) \in X$  such that  $x$  and  $y$  are the closest vertices in  $V(P) \cap M$  to  $u$  and  $v$  respectively, and  $d(u, x) = i$ ,  $d(v, y) = j$ .

Note that the number of possible types  $X$  is at most  $2^{4q^2}$ . Every pair  $(u, v) \in T_2$  is of some type  $X$ . This is because  $u$  and  $v$  belong to distinct cliques, and thus every shortest path from  $u$  to  $v$  must go through the vertices of  $M$ , and for every vertex in  $C$  its distance from its closest vertex in  $M$  is at most 2. Further, given  $(u, v)$  and  $X$ , we can verify in polynomial time whether  $(u, v)$  is of type  $X$  by verifying the condition that a tuple  $(x, i, y, j) \in M \times \{1, 2\} \times M \times \{1, 2\}$  belongs to  $X$  if and only if  $d(u, x) = i$ ,  $d(y, v) = j$ , and  $d(x, y) + i + j = d(u, v)$ .

For each  $X \subseteq M \times \{1, 2\} \times M \times \{1, 2\}$ , we define an auxiliary graph  $H_X = (V_X, E_X)$  with  $V_X = \{c_1, c_2, \dots, c_r\}$  and  $\{c_i, c_j\} \in E_X$  if there exists a pair  $(u, v) \in T_2$  of type  $X$  such that one of its endpoint (either  $u$  or  $v$ ) belong to  $C_i$  and the other endpoint belong to  $C_j$ . These auxiliary graphs  $H_X$  can be computed in polynomial time.

**Claim 1.** *For every  $(u, v) \in T_2$  and its type  $X$ , the following holds:  $SP(u, v) \supseteq \bigcup_{(x, i, y, j) \in X} SP(x, y)$ .*

*Proof.* By definition, for every  $(x, i, y, j) \in X$ , there exists a shortest path  $P$  from  $u$  to  $v$  such that  $x, y \in V(P)$ , and thus every vertex in  $SP(x, y)$  must belong to  $SP(u, v)$ .



**Claim 2.** *If  $|E_X| > (2(k+2))^3$ , then we can find a core-invariant family with at least  $(k+2)$  pairs, and hence apply Reduction Rule 1.*

*Proof.* If  $|E_X| > (2(k+2))^3$ , then  $H_X$  must contain a vertex of degree at least  $(2(k+2))^2$  or (by Vizing's theorem), a matching  $A$  of size at least  $2(k+2)$ .

**Case 1:**  $H_X$  contains a matching  $A$  of size at least  $2(k+2)$ . In this case, for every edge in  $A$ , pick exactly one terminal pair from  $T_2$  which corresponds to its construction, let  $A^*$  be these picked pairs, every pair in  $A^*$  is of type  $X$ . We claim that  $A^*$  is a core-invariant family with at least  $k+2$  pairs, to see this consider the following arguments. By Claim 1, we have that for every distinct  $(u_1, v_1), (u_2, v_2) \in A^*$ ,  $SP(u_1, v_1) \cap SP(u_2, v_2) \supseteq \bigcup_{(x,i,y,j) \in X} SP(x, y)$ ; the equality holds since every vertex in  $\bigcup_{\{u,v\} \in A^*} \{u, v\}$  belongs to a distinct cluster and if there exist a vertex  $w$  in  $SP(u_1, v_1) \cap SP(u_2, v_2)$  which do not belong to  $\bigcup_{(x,i,y,j) \in X} SP(x, y)$ , then  $w$  must belong to the clique of one of  $u_1, v_1, u_2, v_2$ . W.l.o.g. let  $w$  belong to the clique of  $u_1$ , in this case  $w$  can not belong to  $SP(u_2, v_2)$  as it do not belong to  $\bigcup_{(x,i,y,j) \in X} SP(x, y)$ , a contradiction. Hence, for every distinct  $(u_1, v_1), (u_2, v_2) \in A^*$ ,  $SP(u_1, v_1) \cap SP(u_2, v_2) = \bigcup_{(x,i,y,j) \in X} SP(x, y)$ . Hence, using  $A^*$  we can apply Reduction Rule 1.

**Case 2:**  $H_X$  contains a vertex  $c_l$  of degree at least  $(2(k+2))^2$ . For every edge incident on  $c_l$ , pick exactly one terminal pair from  $T_2$  which corresponds to its construction, let  $B$  be the set of these picked pairs. Let  $V_B = \bigcup_{\{u,v\} \in B} \{u, v\}$ . Consider an auxiliary graph  $G_B = (V_B, B)$ , here the ordering of pairs of  $B$  is not considered, thus  $G_B$  is un-directed. By construction, one endpoint of every edge in  $G_B$  belongs to clique  $C_l$  and other endpoint belong to a distinct maximal clique of  $G - M$ . Since  $G_B$  has at least  $(2(k+2))^2$  edges, there must either be a vertex  $u$  in  $G_B$  which belong to clique  $C_l$  and has degree  $2(k+2)$  in  $G_B$ , or there must be a matching  $M_B$  in  $G_B$  of size  $2(k+2)$ . We discuss both the cases separately in the following.

**Case 2a:** A vertex  $u$  in  $G_B$  belonging to  $C_l$  has degree  $2(k+2)$  in  $G_B$ . Let  $U$  be the set of edges (terminal pairs in  $T_2$ ) incident on  $u$  in  $G_B$ . We recall that the pairs in  $T_2$  were assigned arbitrary ordering; let  $U_1$  be those terminal pairs of  $U$  where the first vertex is  $u$  (Ex.  $(u, v)$ ), and let  $U_2$  be those terminal pairs in  $U$  where the second vertex is  $u$  (Ex.  $(x, u)$ ). At least one of  $U_1$  or  $U_2$  has at least  $k+2$  pairs, let it be  $U_1$ . For every pair in  $U_1$  the second vertex belongs to a distinct maximal clique in  $G - M$ . We claim for every distinct  $(u, v_1), (u, v_2) \in U_1$ ,  $SP(u, v_1) \cap SP(u, v_2) = \bigcup_{(x,i,y,j) \in X} (SP(u, x) \cup SP(x, y))$  and thus  $U_1$  is core-invariant family. It is straight forward to verify that for every distinct  $(u, v_1), (u, v_2) \in U_1$ ,  $SP(u, v_1) \cap SP(u, v_2) \supseteq \bigcup_{(x,i,y,j) \in X} (SP(u, x) \cup SP(x, y))$ , we move on to show equality. Let a vertex  $w$  in  $SP(u, v_1) \cap SP(u, v_2)$  exists which do not belong to  $\bigcup_{(x,i,y,j) \in X} (SP(u, x) \cup SP(x, y))$ , then  $w$  must belong to the maximal clique of one of  $v_1, v_2$ . W.l.o.g. let  $w$  belong to the maximal clique of  $v_1$ , in this case  $w$  can not belong to  $SP(u, v_2)$  as it do not belong to  $\bigcup_{(x,i,y,j) \in X} (SP(u, x) \cup SP(x, y))$ , a contradiction. Similar arguments holds when  $U_2$  has at least  $k+2$  pairs. Hence, using  $U_1$  or  $U_2$  we apply Reduction Rule 1.

**Case 2b:** There exists a matching  $M_B$  in  $G_B$  of size  $2(k+2)$ , then for every edge in  $M_B$ , its one endpoint is a distinct vertex of clique  $C_l$  and the other endpoint is a vertex of a distinct maximum clique in  $G - M$ . Let  $M_{B,1}$  (resp  $M_{B,2}$ ) be the set of those terminal pairs of  $M_B$  where the first vertex (resp. second vertex) belongs to  $C_l$ . Either  $M_{B,1}$  or  $M_{B,2}$  has at least  $k+2$  pairs, let it be  $M_{B,1}$ . Let  $V_l = \bigcup_{(u,v) \in M_{B,1}} \{u\}$  that is  $V_l$  consists of all the vertices of  $C_l$  which belong to a pair in  $M_{B,1}$ . For every  $(u,v) \in M_{B,1}$ , we define  $L_u^* = (\bigcup_{(x,i,y,j) \in X} SP(u,x) \cap V(C_l)) \setminus V_l$ . we claim that for every distinct  $(u_1, v_1), (u_2, v_2) \in M_{B,1}$ ,  $L_{u_1}^* = L_{u_2}^*$ , this is because every  $L_u^*$  contains only those vertices of  $C_l$  which do not belong to any pair in  $M_{B,1}$  and are adjacent to an  $x$  such that  $(x, i, y, j) \in X$  because the distance between  $u$  and  $x$  is at most 2. Thus, we now use  $L^*$  instead of  $L_u^*$  as the value  $L_u^*$  for every  $(u,v) \in M_{B,1}$  is same. We now claim that for every distinct  $(u_1, v_1), (u_2, v_2) \in M_{B,1}$ ,  $SP(u_1, v_1) \cap SP(u_2, v_2) = L^* \cup (\bigcup_{(x,i,y,j) \in X} SP(x, y))$  and thus  $M_{B,1}$  is a core-invariant family. For the proof, let  $w$  be a vertex in  $SP(u_1, v_1) \cap SP(u_2, v_2)$  which do not belong to  $L^* \cup (\bigcup_{(x,i,y,j) \in X} SP(x, y))$ , then  $w$  must belong to either  $C_l$  or to the maximal clique of either  $v_1$  or  $v_2$ . If  $w$  belong to the maximal clique of either  $v_1$  then it can not belong to  $SP(u_2, v_2)$ , similarly if  $w$  belong to the maximal clique of either  $v_2$  then it can not belong to  $SP(u_1, v_1)$ , a contradiction in both cases. We now consider the case when  $w$  belongs to  $C_l$ , in this case  $w$  belongs to both  $(\bigcup_{(x,i,y,j) \in X} SP(u_1, x))$  and  $(\bigcup_{(x,i,y,j) \in X} SP(u_2, x))$ , and since  $w$  is not in  $L^*$ ,  $w$  must belong to  $V_l$ . Further, since  $u_1 \neq u_2$  we have that  $w \neq u_1$  and  $w \neq u_2$ . In this case there exists a pair  $(w, w') \in M_{B,1}$ , and thus  $d(w, x) = d(u_1, x) = d(u_2, x) = i$  for every  $(x, i, y, j) \in X$ , contradicting that  $w$  belongs to  $\bigcup_{(x,i,y,j) \in X} SP(u_1, x)$ . It follows that  $M_{B,1}$  is core-invariant with at least  $k+2$  pairs, similar arguments holds when  $M_{B,2}$  has at least  $k+2$  pairs. Hence, using at least one of  $M_{B,1}$  and  $M_{B,2}$  we can apply Reduction Rule 1.

**Claim 3.** *If there exist distinct  $p, q \in [r]$  such that there are more than  $(2(k+2))^2$  distinct pairs in  $T_2$  of a same type  $X$  with one endpoint in  $C_p$  and another endpoint in  $C_q$ , then we can find a core-invariant family with at least  $k+2$  pairs. Hence, apply Reduction Rule 1.*

*Proof.* Let  $B$  be the set of all the pairs in  $T_2$  of type  $X$  with one endpoint in  $C_p$  and another endpoint in  $C_q$  for distinct  $p, q \in [r]$ . Let  $V_B = \bigcup_{\{u,v\} \in B} \{u, v\}$ . Consider an auxiliary graph  $G_B = (V_B, B)$ , here the ordering of pairs of  $B$  is not considered, thus  $G_B$  is undirected. By construction, one endpoint of every edge in  $G_B$  belongs to clique  $C_p$  and other endpoint belong to  $C_q$  hence  $G_B$  is a bipartite graph. Since  $G_B$  has at least  $(2(k+2))^2$  edges, there must either be a vertex  $u$  in  $G_B$  which has degree  $2(k+2)$  in  $G_B$ , or there must be a matching  $M_B$  in  $G_B$  of size  $2(k+2)$ . We discuss both the cases separately in the following.

**Case 1:** A vertex  $u$  in  $G_B$  has degree  $2(k+2)$  in  $G_B$ . Let  $u$  belong to  $C_p$  and the case when  $u$  belong to  $C_q$  follows similar arguments. Let  $U$  be the set of edges (terminal pairs in  $T_2$ ) incident on  $u$  in  $G_B$ . We recall that the pairs in  $T_2$  were assigned arbitrary ordering; let  $U_1$  be those terminal pairs of  $U$  where the first vertex is  $u$  (Ex.  $(u, v)$ ), and let  $U_2$  be those terminal pairs in  $U$  where the second

vertex is  $u$  (Ex.  $(x, u)$ ). At least one of  $U_1$  or  $U_2$  has at least  $k+2$  pairs, let it be  $U_1$ . For every pair in  $U_1$  the second vertex belongs to  $C_q$ . Let  $V_q = \bigcup_{(u,v) \in U_1} \{v\}$  that is  $V_q$  consists of all the vertices of  $C_q$  which belong to a pair in  $U_1$ . For every  $(u, v) \in U_1$ , we define  $R_v^* = (\bigcup_{(x,i,y,j) \in X} SP(y, v) \cap V(C_q)) \setminus V_q$ . we claim that for every distinct  $(u, v_1), (u, v_2) \in U_1$ ,  $R_{v_1}^* = R_{v_2}^*$ , this is because every  $R_u^*$  contains only those vertices of  $C_q$  which do not belong to any pair in  $U_1$  and are adjacent to a  $y$  such that  $(x, i, y, j) \in X$ , and because the distance between  $v$  and  $y$  is at most 2. Thus, we now use  $R^*$  instead of  $R_v^*$  as the value  $R_v^*$  for every  $(u, v) \in U_1$  is same. We now claim that for every distinct  $(u, v_1), (u, v_2) \in U_1$ ,  $SP(u, v_1) \cap SP(u, v_2) = (\bigcup_{(x,i,y,j) \in X} (SP(u, x) \cup SP(x, y))) \cup R^*$ , and thus  $U_1$  is a core-invariant family. For the proof, let  $w$  be a vertex in  $SP(u, v_1) \cap SP(u, v_2)$  which do not belong to  $(\bigcup_{(x,i,y,j) \in X} (SP(u, x) \cup SP(x, y))) \cup R^*$ , then  $w$  must belong to  $C_q$ , in this case  $w$  belongs to both  $(\bigcup_{(x,i,y,j) \in X} SP(y, v_1))$  and  $(\bigcup_{(x,i,y,j) \in X} SP(y, v_2))$ , and since  $w$  is not in  $R^*$ ,  $w$  must belong to  $V_q$ . Further, since  $v_1 \neq v_2$  we have that  $w \neq v_1$  and  $w \neq v_2$ . In this case there exists a pair  $(w', w) \in U_1$ , and thus  $d(y, w) = d(y, v_1) = d(y, v_2) = j$  for every  $(x, i, y, j) \in X$ , contradicting assumption that  $w$  belongs to  $\bigcup_{(x,i,y,j) \in X} SP(y, v_1)$ . It follows that  $U_1$  is core-invariant with at least  $k+2$  pairs, similar arguments holds when  $U_2$  has at least  $k+2$  pairs. Hence, using at least one of  $U_1$  and  $U_2$  we can apply Reduction Rule 1.

**Case 2:** There exists a matching  $M_B$  in  $G_B$  of size  $2(k+2)$ . Then for every edge in  $M_B$ , its one endpoint is a distinct vertex of clique  $C_p$  and the other endpoint is a distinct vertex  $C_q$ . Let  $M_{B,1}$  (resp  $M_{B,2}$ ) be the set of those terminal pairs of  $M_B$  where the first vertex (resp. second vertex) belongs to  $C_l$ . Either  $M_{B,1}$  or  $M_{B,2}$  has at least  $k+2$  pairs, let it be  $M_{B,1}$ . Let  $V_p = \bigcup_{(u,v) \in M_{B,1}} \{u\}$ , and  $V_q = \bigcup_{(u,v) \in M_{B,1}} \{v\}$ . And for every  $(u, v) \in M_{B,1}$ , we define  $L_u^* = (\bigcup_{(x,i,y,j) \in X} SP(u, x) \cap V(C_p)) \setminus V_p$ , and  $R_v^* = (\bigcup_{(x,i,y,j) \in X} SP(y, v) \cap V(C_q)) \setminus V_q$ . We claim that for every distinct  $(u_1, v_1), (u_2, v_2) \in M_{B,1}$ ,  $L_{u_1}^* = L_{u_2}^*$  and  $R_{v_1}^* = R_{v_2}^*$ , this is because every  $L_u^*$  (resp.  $R_v^*$ ) contains only those vertices of  $C_p$  (resp.  $C_q$  which do not belong to any pair in  $M_{B,1}$  and are adjacent to an  $x$  (resp.  $y$ ) such that  $(x, i, y, j) \in X$ , and because the distance between  $u$  and  $x$ , and  $y$  and  $v$  is at most 2. Thus, we now use  $L^*$  (resp  $R^*$ ) instead of  $L_u^*$  (resp.  $R_v^*$ ) as the value  $L_u^*$  (resp.  $R_v^*$ ) for every  $(u, v) \in M_{B,1}$  is same.

We now claim that for every distinct  $(u_1, v_1), (u_2, v_2) \in M_{B,1}$ ,  $SP(u_1, v_1) \cap SP(u_2, v_2) = L^* \cup (\bigcup_{(x,i,y,j) \in X} SP(x, y)) \cup R^*$  and thus  $M_{B,1}$  is a core-invariant family. For the proof, let  $w$  be a vertex in  $SP(u_1, v_1) \cap SP(u_2, v_2)$  which do not belong to  $L^* \cup (\bigcup_{(x,i,y,j) \in X} SP(x, y)) \cup R^*$ , then  $w$  must belong to either  $C_p$  or to  $C_q$ . If  $w$  belongs to  $C_p$ , then  $w$  belongs to both  $(\bigcup_{(x,i,y,j) \in X} SP(u_1, x))$  and  $(\bigcup_{(x,i,y,j) \in X} SP(u_2, x))$ , and since  $w$  is not in  $L^*$ ,  $w$  must belong to  $V_p$ . Further, since  $u_1 \neq u_2$  we have that  $w \neq u_1$  and  $w \neq u_2$ . In this case there exists a pair  $(w, w') \in M_{B,1}$ , and thus  $d(w, x) = d(u_1, x) = d(u_2, x) = i$  for every  $(x, i, y, j) \in X$ , contradicting that  $w$  belongs to  $\bigcup_{(x,i,y,j) \in X} SP(u_1, x)$ . Else if  $w$  belongs to  $C_q$ , then  $w$  belongs to both  $(\bigcup_{(x,i,y,j) \in X} SP(y, v_1))$  and  $(\bigcup_{(x,i,y,j) \in X} SP(y, v_2))$ , and since  $w$  is not in  $R^*$ ,  $w$  must belong to  $V_q$ . Further,

since  $v_1 \neq v_2$  we have that  $w \neq v_1$  and  $w \neq v_2$ . In this case there exists a pair  $(w', w) \in M_{B,1}$ , and thus  $d(y, w) = d(y, v_1) = d(y, v_2) = i$  for every  $(x, i, y, j) \in X$ , contradicting that  $w$  belongs to  $\bigcup_{(x,i,y,j) \in X} SP(u_1, x)$ . It follows that  $M_{B,1}$  is core-invariant with at least  $k+2$  pairs, similar arguments holds when  $M_{B,2}$  has at least  $k+2$  pairs. Hence, using at least one of  $M_{B,1}$  and  $M_{B,2}$  we can apply Reduction Rule 1.

For every type  $X$ , we apply Reduction Rule 1 exhaustively while the condition in Claim 2 or the condition in Claim 3 holds. We now have  $|E_X| \leq (2(k+2))^3$ . Further, for every edge  $\{i, j\} \in E_X$ , the number of pairs in  $T_2$  with one endpoint in  $C_p$  and the other end-point in  $C_q$  is at most  $(2(k+2))^2$  (because Claim 2 is not applicable). Thus, we obtain a reduced set  $T_2$  such that  $|T_2| \leq (2(k+2))^5 2^{4q^2}$ .

**Reducing and Bounding Size of  $T_1$ .** We shall now reduce the size of  $T_1$  in a similar manner. We fix an ordering between both the vertices of every pair  $\{u, v\} \in T_1$  such that its first vertex belong to  $\mathcal{C}$ , and thus  $\{u, v\}$  denoted by  $(u, v)$  when  $u$  belongs to  $\mathcal{C}$  and  $v$  belongs to  $M$ . We say that a pair  $(u, v) \in T_1$  is of *type  $X$*  if  $X$  is the smallest subset of  $M \times \{1, 2\}$  such that the following holds: for every shortest path  $P$  from  $u$  to  $v$ , there exists  $(x, i) \in X$  such that  $x$  is the closest vertex in  $V(P) \cap M$  to  $u$  and  $d(u, x) = i$ .

As before, for every  $X \subseteq M \times \{1, 2\}$ , we define an auxiliary bipartite graph  $H_X = (V_X, E_X)$ , where  $V_X = \{c_1, c_2, \dots, c_r\} \cup M$  and  $\{c_i, m\} \in E_X$  if and only if there exists a pair  $(u, m) \in T_1$  of type  $X$  such that  $u \in C_i$ .

**Claim 4.** *If there is a vertex  $m \in M$  with at least  $(k+2)$  neighbors in  $H_X$ , then we can find a core-invariant family with at least  $(k+2)$  pairs and apply Reduction Rule 1.*

**Claim 5.** *If there exists  $i \in [r]$ ,  $m \in M$ , and  $X \subseteq M \times \{1, 2\}$  such that there are at least  $(k+2)$  distinct pairs in  $T_1$  of type  $X$  with one endpoint in  $C_i$  and other endpoint being vertex  $m$ , then we can find a core-invariant family at least  $k+2$  pairs, and apply Reduction Rule 1.*

The above claims are similar to that of Claim 2 and Claim 3, hence we skip their proof. For every type  $X \subseteq M \times \{1, 2\}$ , we apply Reduction Rule 1 exhaustively while the condition in Claim 4 or the condition in Claim 5 holds. We now have:  $|T_1| \leq q(k+2)^2 2^{2q}$ .

**Reducing and Bounding Size of  $T_0$  and  $T_3$ .**

For every pair in  $T_3$ , both the vertices belong to  $M$  and since  $|M| = q$ , there can be at most  $O(q^2)$  pairs in  $T_3$ .

For  $i \in \{0, 1, 2, 3\}$ , we define  $\mathcal{T}_i = \{SP(u, v) \mid \{u, v\} \in T_i\}$ . We construct an instance  $I = (V(G), \mathcal{T}_1 \cup \mathcal{T}_2 \cup \mathcal{T}_3 \cup \mathcal{T}_0, k)$  of HITTING SET which is an equivalent instance of  $(G, \mathcal{T}, k)$  of TERMINAL MONITORING SET. Observe that for every pair  $\{u, v\} \in T_0$ ,  $SP(u, v) = \{u, v\}$  as  $u, v$  are neighbors, thus every set in  $\mathcal{T}_0$  is of size at most 2. Thus, we apply Observation 1, and either conclude that  $I$  is a no instance or obtain an equivalent instance  $I' = (V(G), \mathcal{T}_1 \cup \mathcal{T}_2 \cup \mathcal{T}_3 \cup \mathcal{T}_0^*, k)$  where  $|\mathcal{T}_0^*| = O(k^2)$ .

Thus, the number of sets in  $\mathcal{T}_1 \cup \mathcal{T}_2 \cup \mathcal{T}_3 \cup \mathcal{T}_0^*$  are bounded by  $O(q(k+2)^5 2^{4q^2})$ . We then solve the HITTING SET instance  $I'$  in time FPT in  $q+k$ . This completes the proof of Theorem 2.

### 3.2 Parameterized by Neighborhood Diversity

In this section we give proof of Theorem 3. For the proof we use existing kernels for the HITTING SET problem with a small modification.

**Definition 5.** For a family  $\mathcal{F}$  and a set  $S \in \mathcal{F}$ , we define the effective size of  $S$  with respect to  $\mathcal{F}$  as  $\Upsilon(\mathcal{F}, S) = |S \setminus \text{core}(\mathcal{F})|$ . Further, we define the effective size bound of  $\mathcal{F}$  as  $\Upsilon(\mathcal{F}) = \max\{\Upsilon(\mathcal{F}, S) \mid S \in \mathcal{F}\}$ .

The following proposition is an adaptation of a well-known application of the sunflower lemma to HITTING SET, see [1,9,13].

**Proposition 1.** There is an algorithm, that given set families  $\mathcal{F}_1, \dots, \mathcal{F}_m$  each with an effective size bound at most  $d$ , and an integer  $k$ , finds set families  $\mathcal{C}_1, \dots, \mathcal{C}_m$  in time polynomial in  $m+d$ , and the number of sets such that:

- $|\mathcal{C}_i| = O(k^d \cdot d!)$ ;
- $(\mathcal{U}, \bigcup_{i \in [m]} \mathcal{F}_i, k)$  and  $(\mathcal{U}, \bigcup_{i \in [m]} \mathcal{C}_i, k)$  are equivalent instances of HITTING SET.

Let  $(G, \mathcal{T}, k)$  be an input to TERMINAL MONITORING SET with  $G$  having neighborhood diversity  $t$ . We assume that  $G$  is connected. Let  $V(G) = V_1 \cup \dots \cup V_t$  where all the vertices of each  $V_i$  have the same type. Observe that each  $V_i$  either forms a clique or an independent set in  $G$ .

For  $1 \leq i \leq j \leq t$ , let  $T_{i,j} = \{\{u, v\} \mid \{u, v\} \in \mathcal{T} \wedge u \in V_i \wedge v \in V_j\}$ . We define the family  $\mathcal{F}_{i,j} = \{SP(u, v) \mid \{u, v\} \in T_{i,j}\}$ , and construct  $I = (V(G), \bigcup_{1 \leq i \leq j \leq t} \mathcal{F}_{i,j}, k)$ . Observe that every set in every  $\mathcal{F}_{i,j}$  contains one vertex from  $V_i$  and one vertex from  $V_j$ ; and thus, has an effective size bound  $\leq 2$ , where  $\text{core}(\mathcal{F}_{i,j}) \supseteq (\bigcup_{S \in \mathcal{F}_{i,j}} S) \setminus (V_i \cup V_j)$ . Thus, using Proposition 1, we obtain an equivalent instance of HITTING SET with  $O(t^2 k^2)$  sets, and solve it in time FPT in  $t+k$ . This finishes the proof of Theorem 3.

### Alternative proof of Theorem 3

For the proof, we follow terminologies used in Section 3.1. For  $1 \leq i \leq j \leq t$ , let  $T_{i,j} = \{\{u, v\} \mid \{u, v\} \in \mathcal{T} \wedge u \in V_i \wedge v \in V_j\}$ , further we define graph  $H_{i,j} = (V_i \cup V_j, T_{i,j})$ .

**Claim 6.** *For  $1 \leq i \leq j \leq t$ , If  $|T_{i,j}| > (k+2)^2$ , then we can find a core-invariant family with at least  $(k+2)$  pairs, and hence apply Reduction Rule 1.*

*Proof.* By Vizing's theorem,  $H_{i,j}$  will either have a vertex of degree at least  $k+2$  or a matching of size  $k+2$ .

**Case 1:** There is a vertex  $u$  with degree at least  $k+2$ . In this case, consider the following two cases.

**Case 1a:** if  $i \neq j$ . W.l.o.g. let  $u$  belong to  $V_i$ , in this case all the neighbors of  $u$  in  $H_{i,j}$  belong to  $V_j$  and they have the same type in  $G$ , the pairs containing  $u$  in  $T_{i,j}$  forms a core invariant family.

**Case 1b:** If  $i = j$ . In this case if  $V_i$  forms a clique, then all the neighbors of  $u$  in  $H_{i,i}$  are also neighbors of  $u$  in  $G$ , hence the pairs containing  $u$  in  $T_{i,i}$  forms a core invariant family. If  $V_i$  forms an independent set, then  $u$  and all the neighbors of  $u$  in  $H_{i,i}$  forms an independent set and have the same type in  $G$ , hence the pairs containing  $u$  in  $T_{i,i}$  forms a core invariant family.

**Case 2:** There is a matching  $A$  of size least  $k+2$ . In this case, Consider the following two cases.

**Case 2a:** If  $i \neq j$ , then for every pair in  $A$ , one endpoint is a distinct vertex of  $V_i$  and other endpoint is a distinct vertex of  $V_j$ , since all the vertices of  $V_i$  (resp.  $V_j$ ) have the same type,  $A$  forms a core invariant family.

**Case 2b:** If  $i = j$ . In this case all the pairs in  $A$  are mutually disjoint, and all the vertices in  $A$  have the same type,  $A$  forms a core invariant family.

If condition in Claim 6 is no longer applicable, then for every  $1 \leq i \leq j \leq t$ ,  $|T_{i,j}| \leq O(k^2)$ , and hence  $|\bigcup_{1 \leq i \leq j \leq t} T_{i,j}| = O(t^2 k^2)$ . Hence, we obtain an equivalent instance of HITTING SET with  $O(t^2 k^2)$  sets, and solve it in time FPT in  $t+k$ .

### 3.3 Weighted Version Parameterized by Vertex Cover Number

In this section we give proof of Theorem 4. In this section, we consider weighted-TERMINAL MONITORING SET where the underlying graph  $G$  has positive weights on its edges. The distance is then the shortest weighted distance and  $SP(u, v)$  is defined accordingly.

Let  $(G, \mathcal{T}, k)$  be the input instance of weighted-TERMINAL MONITORING SET, and let  $C = \{v_1, \dots, v_t\}$  be a given vertex cover of  $G$  and  $I = V \setminus C$ . Note that we may assume that  $k \leq t$ ; otherwise  $C$  itself is a terminal monitoring set of size at most  $k$ .

Let  $M$  be a binary matrix indexed by  $C$ , a terminal monitoring set  $S$  of  $\mathcal{T}$  is called  $M$ -compatible if the following holds:

$$\forall u, v \in C, S \cap SP(u, v) \neq \emptyset \Leftrightarrow M[u, v] = 1. \quad (1)$$

We note that by the above condition, a vertex  $v \in S$  if and only if  $M[v, v] = 1$ . Observe that for every terminal monitoring set  $S$ , there exists a binary  $M$  matrix indexed by  $C$  by such that  $S$  is  $M$ -compatible. The idea is to first guess a matrix  $M$ , and then verify in desired time if an  $M$ -compatible terminal set  $S$  of size at most  $k$  exists or not; we make exhaustive guesses on  $M$ , and if for any  $M$ , an  $M$ -compatible terminal set of size at most  $k$  exist, then we conclude that  $(G, \mathcal{T}, k)$  is a yes instance, otherwise we conclude that its a no instance.

Given an  $M$ , to verify if an  $M$ -compatible terminal set  $S$  of size at most  $k$  exist, we construct and solve an instance of HITTING SET in time FPT in  $|C|$ .

To this end, first we guess  $M$ . and let  $C_1 = \{v \mid v \in C \wedge M[v, v] = 1\}$  and  $C_0 = C \setminus C_1$ . Let  $S_0 = \bigcup_{u, v \in C \wedge M[u, v] = 0} SP(u, v)$ . Note that for the guessed  $M$ , we are looking for a terminal monitoring set  $S$  such that  $S \cap S_0 = \emptyset$ . If there exist  $u, v \in C$  such that  $M[u, v] = 1$  and  $SP(u, v) \setminus S_0 = \emptyset$ , or there exists a  $\{x, y\} \in \mathcal{T}$  such that  $SP(x, y) \setminus S_0 = \emptyset$ , then no  $M$  compatible solution exists and we make the next guess of  $M$ .

We now move on to the construction of an instance of HITTING SET. Let  $\mathcal{F}_1 = \{SP(u, v) \setminus S_0 \mid u, v \in C \wedge M[u, v] = 1\}$ . Let  $T_1 = \{\{u, v\} \mid \{u, v\} \in T \wedge \exists f \in \mathcal{F}_1 (f \subseteq SP(u, v))\}$ . Then every hitting set for  $\mathcal{F}_1$  also hits  $SP(u, v)$  for all terminal pairs  $\{u, v\} \in T_1$ . Thus, we now consider  $T_0 = T \setminus T_1$ . We also note that the set  $T_0$  can be computed in polynomial time. We now move on to construct a family  $\mathcal{F}_2$  which will be part of the instance of HITTING SET.

**Reduction Rule 2** *Let  $T_0^* = T_0$ , we initialize a family  $\mathcal{F}_2 = \emptyset$ . While there exists a pair  $\{u, v\} \in T_0^*$  such that  $u \in I, v \in C_0$ , do the following:*

- $\mathcal{F}_2 = \mathcal{F}_2 \cup \{u\}$ ;
- Let  $T_0^* = T_0^* \setminus \{\{x, y\} \mid \{x, y\} \in T_0 \wedge u \in SP(x, y)\}$ .

The above reduction is sound, since  $\{u, v\} \in T_0$  and  $M[w, v] = 0$  for every neighbor  $w$  of  $u$  which belongs to the shortest path between  $u$  and  $v$ , and  $SP(u, v) \setminus S_0 \neq \emptyset$ , it must hold that  $SP(u, v) \setminus S_0 = \{u\}$ . And if any hitting set hits  $\{u\}$  ( $u$  must be in it), then it must hit  $SP(x, y)$  in which  $u$  belong.

Let  $T_0^*$  and  $\mathcal{F}_2$  be the resulting set of terminal pairs and set family respectively. We claim that for a pair  $\{u, v\} \in T_0^*$  such that  $u \in I, v \in C_0$ ,  $SP(u, v) \setminus S_0$  equals  $\{u, v\} \setminus S_0$ . This is because since  $\{u, v\} \in T_0$  we have that  $M[x, y] = 0$  for every  $x, y$  such that of  $x$  is neighbor  $u$  and  $y$  is neighbor of  $v$  and  $x, y$  belongs to a same shortest path between  $u$  and  $v$ . Hence,  $SP(u, v) \setminus S_0 = \{u, v\} \setminus S_0$ . To this end, we construct  $\mathcal{F}_2 = \mathcal{F}_2 \cup (\{u, v\} \setminus S_0)$  and  $\mathcal{F} = \mathcal{F}_1 \cup \mathcal{F}_2$ .

**Claim 7.**  $I' = (\bigcup_{f \in \mathcal{F}} f, \mathcal{F}, k)$  is a yes instance of HITTING SET if and only if there is a  $M$ -compatible terminal monitoring set for  $\mathcal{T}$  of size at most  $k$

The proof of the above claim easily follows from the construction of  $\mathcal{F}_1$  and  $\mathcal{F}_2$ . Further, by applying Observation 1 to  $(\bigcup_{f \in \mathcal{F}} f, \mathcal{F}, k)$ , we can obtain an equivalent instance  $(\bigcup_{f \in \mathcal{F}_1 \cup \mathcal{F}_3} f, \mathcal{F}_1 \cup \mathcal{F}_3, k)$  of HITTING SET. We solve the instance  $(\bigcup_{f \in \mathcal{F}_1 \cup \mathcal{F}_3} f, \mathcal{F}_1 \cup \mathcal{F}_3, k)$ ; since  $|\mathcal{F}_1 \cup \mathcal{F}_3| \leq t^2 + O(k^2) = O(t^2)$ , we can solve this instance in time FPT in  $t$ . The correctness of algorithm for weighted-TERMINAL MONITORING SET follows from exhaustive guesses on  $M$ , further there can be at most  $2^{t^2}$  distinct guesses of  $M$  and thus we can solve weighted-TERMINAL MONITORING SET in time FPT in  $t$ . This finishes the proof of Theorem 4.

### 3.4 Feedback Edge Number: Proof of Theorem 5


Jansen [15] gave an algorithm (which we refer to as Jansen’s algorithm) running in time FPT by feedback edge number of the input graph to solve HITTING PATHS IN A GRAPH. In TERMINAL MONITORING SET, we need to hit a set of connected subgraphs, and we found that Jansen’s algorithm solves TERMINAL MONITORING SET correctly, and for the proof sketch of Theorem 5, we recall Jansen’s algorithm from [15] and discuss it in this section.

We may assume that input graph  $G$  is connected. Otherwise, we create a clique on 4 vertices  $Z = \{z_1, z_2, z_3, z_4\}$  and connect this clique to  $G$  by adding an arbitrary edge. This will increase feedback edge number of  $G$  by a constant, and it will not change the solution, as no new shortest path between any terminal pair introduced. In the rest of the section we assume that feedback edge number of  $G$  is  $t$ . Given an instance  $(G, \mathcal{T}, k)$  of TERMINAL MONITORING SET, the following preprocessing is performed.

**Preprocessing 1 (adapted from Observation 3 in [15]):** While there is a vertex  $v \in G$  of degree one.

- If there is a terminal pair  $\{v\}$  in  $\mathcal{T}$ , then put  $v$  in solution  $S$ , decrease  $k$  by one, and remove every terminal pair containing  $v$  from  $\mathcal{T}$ . Otherwise, we replace every terminal pair  $\{v, y\}$  with  $\{u, y\}$  in  $\mathcal{T}$  where  $u$  is the only neighbor of  $v$  in  $G$ . Remove  $v$  from  $G$ .

The above preprocessing is safe, if both vertices of a pair are  $v$ , then  $v$  must be in the solution, else  $v$  can be replaced by  $u$  in any solution that contains  $v$ .



**Fig. 1.**  $G$  with minimum degree two, darkened vertices forms  $V_{\geq 3}$ .



After Preprocessing 1,  $G$  has minimum degree two, and we will assume that for every  $I = (G, \mathcal{T}, k)$ ,  $G$  has minimum degree at least two. For a graph  $G$  with degree at least two, let  $V_{\geq 3}$  be the set of all the vertices of  $G$  with degree at least three (Figure 1),  $G - V_{\geq 3}$  is a disjoint union of paths as  $V_{\geq 3} \neq \emptyset$  (we added a clique on  $Z$  in  $G$ ) and  $G$  is connected. Let  $\mathcal{D}$  be the set of all the components (paths) in  $G - V_{\geq 3}$ . Observe that every component of  $\mathcal{D}$  is connected to rest of the graph by 2 edges, each of which connecting an endpoint of  $D$  to a vertex of  $V_{\geq 3}$  as every vertex in  $D$  has degree two in  $G$  (see also [15]). In the remaining part, for the graph in context, we simply use  $V_{\geq 3}$  and  $\mathcal{D}$  for it as defined above. Given an instance  $I = (G, \mathcal{T}, k)$  of TERMINAL MONITORING SET, the following holds.

**Observation 2** *For every  $\{x, y\} \in \mathcal{T}$ ,  $SP(x, y)$  induces a connected graph and every vertex in  $SP(x, y) \setminus \{x, y\}$  has degree at least two in  $G[SP(x, y)]$ .*

*Proof.* It follows from the fact that a union of all the shortest path between  $(x, y)$  is a subgraph of graph induced by  $SP(x, y)$ .

**Observation 3** *For every  $\{x, y\} \in \mathcal{T}$  and  $D \in \mathcal{D}$  it holds that: if  $SP(x, y) \subseteq V(D)$ , then  $SP(x, y)$  induces a sub path of  $D$  in  $G$ .*

Given an instance  $(G, \mathcal{T}, k)$  of TERMINAL MONITORING SET, we define the following (using similar notations to [15]). For every  $D \in \mathcal{D}$ , let  $\text{OPT}(D)$  be the minimum size of a terminal monitoring set for  $\{\{x, y\} \mid \{x, y\} \in \mathcal{T} \wedge SP(x, y) \subseteq V(D)\}$ . From Observation 3 and Lemma 1, we have that  $\text{OPT}(D)$  can be computed in polynomial time for every  $D \in \mathcal{D}$ .

**Lemma 3 (Lemma 5 in [15], stating for TMS).** *Given an instance  $(G, \mathcal{T}, k)$  of TERMINAL MONITORING SET, there exists a minimum size terminal monitoring set  $S'$  for  $T$  such that: for every  $D \in \mathcal{D}$ ,  $S'$  contains either  $\text{OPT}(D)$  or  $\text{OPT}(D)+1$  vertices of  $D$ .*

Proof for Lemma 3 uses same arguments as given in the proof of [15, Lemma 5] and only requires supplementing them with Observation 2 and Observation 3, hence we skip it.

Jansen's algorithm [15] while solving an instance of HITTING PATHS IN A GRAPH makes successive guesses (to branch), and if it decides that a guess may lead to a solution within the budget, it constructs an instance of HPFB, and solves it in polynomial time. We found that Jansen's algorithm correctly solves TERMINAL MONITORING SET as well, crucially by correctly constructing instances of HPFB for input  $I = (G, \mathcal{T}, k)$ . For completeness, we recall steps of Jansen's algorithm from [15] which are divided into branching and construction of HPFB, we demonstrate them for the input instance  $I = (G, \mathcal{T}, k)$  of TERMINAL MONITORING SET.

**Branching (Section 3.2 in [15]):** First make a guess on the vertices of  $V_{\geq 3}$  which will be in the solution, and a guess on the number of vertices in the solution from every  $D \in \mathcal{D}$  using the functions  $f_v : V_{\geq 3} \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$  and  $f_d : \mathcal{D} \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$ . If  $k \geq \sum_{v \in V_{\geq 3}} f_v(v) + \sum_{D \in \mathcal{D}} (\text{OPT}(D) + f_d(D))$ , then construct an instance of HPFB .

**Construction of an instance of HPFB (Section 3.2 in [15]):** Given  $f_v, f_d$ . Create  $G_1$  and  $\mathcal{D}_1$  as copies of  $G$  and  $\mathcal{D}$  respectively, and  $f_d$  remains same for  $\mathcal{D}_1$ . Let  $\mathcal{U}_1 = \{SP(x, y) \mid \{x, y\} \in \mathcal{T}\}$ , and do the following.

- For every  $U \in \mathcal{U}_1$  : if  $U$  contains a vertex  $v \in V_{\geq 3}$  such that  $f_v(v) = 1$  or  $U$  contains all the vertices of a  $D \in \mathcal{D}$  such that  $(\text{OPT}(D) + f_d(D)) > 0$ , then remove  $U$  from  $\mathcal{U}_1$ .
- For every  $D \in \mathcal{D}_1$  such that  $(\text{OPT}(D) + f_d(D)) = 0$  : remove  $D$  from  $\mathcal{D}_1$ , remove  $V(D)$  from  $G_1$ , and remove  $V(D)$  from every set  $U \in \mathcal{U}_1$ .
- For every  $v \in V_{\geq 3}$  such that  $f_v(v) = 1$  : remove  $v$  from  $G_1$ .
- Contract remaining vertices of  $V_{\geq 3}$  in  $G_1$  into a single vertex  $z$  in  $G_1$ , and replace  $U \cap V_{\geq 3}$  (if non empty) with  $z$  in every  $U \in \mathcal{U}_1$ .
- Assign a distinct number in  $[\|\mathcal{D}_1\|]$  to every remaining path in  $\mathcal{D}_1$ , set  $b(i) = (\text{OPT}(D) + f_d(D_i))$ , where  $D_i \in \mathcal{D}_1$ . Output  $(G_1, z, \mathcal{U}_1, b)$ .

For the input instance  $I = (G, \mathcal{T}, k)$  of TERMINAL MONITORING SET, for every guess  $f_v, f_d$ , and correspondingly constructed  $(G_1, z, \mathcal{U}_1, b)$ , the following claims hold.

**Claim 8 (Claim 5 in [15], stating for  $(G, \mathcal{T}, k)$ ).**  $G_1$  is a flower graph with core  $z$  and every vertex set in  $\mathcal{U}_1$  induces a simple path in  $G_1$ .

**Claim 9 (Claim 6 in [15], stating for  $(G, \mathcal{T}, k)$ ).** The following two statements are equivalent.

- There exists a terminal monitoring set  $S$  for  $\mathcal{T}$  such that :  $|S \cap V(D)| = \text{OPT}(D) + f_d(D)$  for every  $D \in \mathcal{D}$ , and  $v \in S \Leftrightarrow f_v(v) = 1$  for every  $v \in V_{\geq 3}$ .
- There exists a solution for instance  $(G_1, z, \mathcal{U}_1, b)$  of HPFB.

Proof of Claim 8 and proof of Claim 9 for instance  $(G, \mathcal{T}, k)$  follow from the same arguments given in proof of [15, Claim 5] and proof of [15, Claim 6] respectively by supplementing them with Observation 2 and Observation 3, hence we skip them.

If any constructed instance of HPFB has a solution, then Jansen’s algorithm returns YES, otherwise NO. Further, correctness on  $(G, \mathcal{T}, k)$  follows from Claim 9, Claim 8, and Lemma 3. Size of  $V_{\geq 3}$  and  $\mathcal{D}$  can be bounded by  $2t$  and  $3t$  respectively if  $V_{\geq 3} \neq \emptyset$  [15]. Further, Jansen’s algorithm makes at most  $2^{5t}$  guesses, and its running time is bounded by  $2^{5t} \cdot (|V(G)| + |\mathcal{U}|)^{O(1)}$  [15].

## 4 Hardness Results

In this section we prove the following theorems.

**Theorem 6.** (a) *TERMINAL MONITORING SET is NP-hard.*

(b) *TERMINAL MONITORING SET is  $W[2]$ -hard with respect to solution size.*

**Theorem 7.** *For every fixed  $0 < \alpha \leq 0.5$ ,  $\alpha$ -RTMS is  $W[1]$ -hard with respect to feedback vertex number of the input graph plus solution size, even when the input graph is a planar graph.*

### 4.1 Proof of Theorem 6


We reduce RED-BLUE DOMINATING SET (RBDS) to TERMINAL MONITORING SET. In RBDS we are given a bipartite graph  $G = (V_B \cup V_R, E)$ , and it is asked if there is a vertex set  $D \subseteq V_B$  of size at most  $k$  such that every vertex in  $V_R$  is adjacent to at least one vertex in  $D$ . It is known that RBDS is  $W[2]$ -hard parameterized by solution size  $k$  (see [9]).

Let  $I = (G = (V_B \cup V_R, E), k)$  be the input instance of RBDS, let  $V_R = \{r_1, r_2, \dots, r_n\}$ , and let  $V_B = \{b_1, b_2, \dots, b_m\}$ . We construct an instance  $I'$  of TERMINAL MONITORING SET as follows. We construct the graph  $G'$  as follows. Create a vertex set  $V'_R = \{r'_1, r'_2, \dots, r'_n\}$ . For every  $i \in [n]$ , we connect  $r'_i$  to all the neighbors of  $r_i$  in  $V_B$ , and call the set of all these introduced edges as  $E'$ . Essentially we are creating a twin vertex for every  $r \in V_R$ . We construct terminal set  $T = \{\{r_i, r'_i\} \mid i \in [n]\}$ . The instance  $I' = (G' = (V_B \cup V_R \cup V'_R, E \cup E'), T, k)$ .

**Lemma 4.**  *$I$  is a yes instance of RBDS if and only if  $I'$  is a yes instance of TERMINAL MONITORING SET.*

*Proof.* For the forward direction, let  $D \subseteq V_B$  be a solution to  $I$ , in this case we can verify that  $D$  is also a solution to  $I'$ , since every terminal pair in  $T$  are twins and are not adjacent, they have the same neighborhood in  $V_B$ , and the distance between them is 2, and if a vertex in  $D$  is adjacent to an  $r_i \in V_B$ , then it is adjacent to its twin  $r'_i \in V'_R$  as well.

For the other direction, let  $S$  be a solution to  $I'$ , in this case if  $S$  contain a vertex from  $r_i \in V_R \cup V'_R$ , then we can observe that  $r_i$  is only hitting the terminal pair  $(r_i, r'_i)$ , because it doesn't belong to a shortest path between any other terminal pair. So we can safely replace  $r_i$  with any of its neighbor in  $V_B$ . This way while  $S$  contains a vertex from  $V_R \cup V'_R$ , we replace that vertex with any of its neighbor in  $V_B$ . Now  $S$  contains only vertices of  $V_B$  and since its a set that hit all terminal pairs in  $T$ , it is easy to see that it dominates all the vertices in  $V_R$ .



**Fig. 2.** An example of  $H_i$  connected to bridge vertex  $b$ , with each path  $P(u_{i,j}, b)$  and  $P(u'_{i,j}, b)$  is of length  $L$  and contains  $L - 1$  intermediate vertices.

#### 4.2 Proof of Theorem 7

MULTI COLOR INDEPENDENT SET is a well know problem in parameterized complexity and it is known to be  $W[1]$ -hard when parameterized by solution size  $k$  [9]. We reduce MULTI COLOR INDEPENDENT SET to  $\alpha$ -RELAXED TERMINAL MONITORING SET. Let  $I = (G, k)$  such that  $V(G)$  is partitioned into  $\{V_1, V_2, \dots, V_k\}$ , be an instance of MULTI COLOR INDEPENDENT SET, and we need to decide if there exists an independent set  $S$  containing exactly one vertex from every  $V_i$ , where  $i \in [k]$ . We may assume that for every  $i \in [k]$ ,  $|V_i| = n$ , and  $n$  is odd. We begin our construction by first defining the following values.

For  $0 \leq \alpha \leq 0.5$ , we set  $L = \lceil \frac{1}{2\alpha} \cdot n \rceil$ ;  $L_p = \lceil \frac{n-1}{\alpha} \rceil$ .

The construction of  $G'$  is as follows (Figure 2). We create a vertex  $b$  and call it the bridge vertex. For every vertex set  $V_i$  in  $G$  we construct a gadget  $H_i$  as follows.

- Create a set  $U'_i = \{u'_{i,j} \mid v_{i,j} \in V_i\}$  and make a path on these vertices as  $(u'_{i,1}, u'_{i,2}, \dots, u'_{i,n})$ . Create another set  $U_i = \{u_{i,j} \mid v_{i,j} \in V_i\}$  and create a path  $(u_{i,1}, u_{i,2}, \dots, u_{i,n})$  as well. Connect  $u'_{i,1}$  to  $u_{i,n}$  by creating a vertex  $z_i$  and connect  $z_i$  to  $u'_{i,1}$  and  $u_{i,n}$ . Similarly, connect  $u'_{i,n}$  to  $u_{i,1}$  by creating a vertex  $z'_i$ .
- create a vertex  $p_i$ , create a path with  $L_p - 1$  vertices, and connect one endpoint of this path to  $p_i$  and another endpoint with vertex  $u_{i,(n+1)/2}$ . We denote this path from  $p_i$  to  $u_{i,(n+1)/2}$  by  $P(p_i, u_{i,(n+1)/2})$  which include both  $p_i$  and  $u_{i,(n+1)/2}$ .

For every  $i \in [k]$ , we connect the vertices of  $H_i$  to  $b$  as follows.

- For every  $i \in [k]$  and  $j \in [n]$ , connect  $u_{i,j}$  to  $b$  by creating a path with  $L - 1$  intermediate vertices, denote this path  $P(u_{i,j}, b)$ . Thus,  $d(u_{i,j}, b) = L$ . Similarly, connect  $u'_{i,j}$  with vertex  $b$  by creating a path with  $L - 1$  intermediate vertices, and denote this path by  $P(u'_{i,j}, b)$ . Thus,  $d(u'_{i,j}, b) = L$ .

We now construct the terminal set  $\mathcal{T}$  as follows.

- From every  $H_i$  we put  $\{p_i, u_{i,(n+1)/2}\}$  in  $\mathcal{T}$ . It is a vertex selection constraints.
- Let  $E_{i,j}$  be the set of edges with one endpoint in  $V_i$  and another in  $V_j$  in  $G$ , for every  $i, j \in [k]$ , such that  $i < j$ , construct  $T_{i,j} = \{\{u'_{i,i'}, u'_{j,j'}\} \mid i', j' \in [n] \wedge v_{i,i'} v_{j,j'} \in E_{i,j}\}$  and put all the pairs of  $T_{i,j}$  in  $\mathcal{T}$ . Addition of these terminal pairs acts as edge verification constraints.

The instance  $I' = (G', \mathcal{T}, k)$ . We can see that if we remove vertices  $b$  and  $u_{i,1}$  for every  $i \in [k]$ , then  $G'$  becomes acyclic, thus the feedback vertex number (FVN) of  $G'$  is  $k + 1$ , thus the parameter FVN + solution size remain  $O(k)$ . Further, it is easy to verify that constructed graph is a planar graph as no crossing edge is constructed (see Figure 2). We now move on to show the correctness of our reduction. We start with stating some observation which will help establishing equivalence.

**Observation 4** For every distinct  $i, j \in [k]$ , for every  $x \in U'_i \cup U_i$  and every  $y \in U'_j \cup U_j$ , the distance  $d(x, y) = 2L$ .

**Definition 6.** For an  $i \in [k]$ , we say a vertex  $w \in V(G')$  is  $H_i$ -representative if the following holds.

- $w \in V(P(p_i, u_{i,(n+1)/2}))$  (OR)  $d(u_{i,(n+1)/2}, w) \leq \frac{n-1}{2}$ .

**Observation 5** No vertex in  $V(G')$  can be  $H_i$ -representative for two or more distinct  $i \in [k]$ .

*Proof.* This is because distance between  $u_{i,(n+1)/2}$  and  $u_{j,(n+1)/2}$  for every distinct  $i, j \in [k]$  is  $2L$  and  $L$  is at least  $n$ .

**Lemma 5.** If  $S$  is a terminal monitoring set of size at most  $k$  for the instance  $(G', \mathcal{T}, k)$ , then for every  $i \in [k]$ , there is a vertex  $w \in S$  such that  $w$  is an  $H_i$ -representative.

*Proof.* Recall that from every  $H_i$  we put the pair  $\{p_i, u_{i, \frac{n+1}{2}}\}$  in  $\mathcal{T}$ . To satisfy this constraint there must be a vertex  $w \in S$  such that  $d(u_{i, \frac{n+1}{2}}, w) + d(w, p_i) \leq (1 + \alpha) \cdot d(p_i, u_{i, \frac{n+1}{2}})$ . If  $w$  belongs to  $P(p_i, u_{i, \frac{n+1}{2}})$ , then the constraint is trivially

satisfied. Otherwise, the path from  $p_i$  to  $w$  must contain  $u_{i, \frac{n+1}{2}}$ , and then

$$\begin{aligned} d(u_{i, \frac{n+1}{2}}, w) + d(w, p_i) &= d(u_{i, \frac{n+1}{2}}, w) + d(u_{i, \frac{n+1}{2}}, w) + d(u_{i, \frac{n+1}{2}}, p_i). \\ &= d(u_{i, \frac{n+1}{2}}, w) + d(u_{i, \frac{n+1}{2}}, w) + L_p. \end{aligned}$$

to satisfy the constraint

$$\begin{aligned} (1 + \alpha) \cdot L_p &\geq d(u_{i, \frac{n+1}{2}}, w) + d(u_{i, \frac{n+1}{2}}, w) + L_p. \\ (1 + \alpha) \cdot L_p - L_p &\geq 2 \cdot d(u_{i, \frac{n+1}{2}}, w). \\ \alpha \cdot L_p &\geq 2 \cdot d(u_{i, \frac{n+1}{2}}, w). \\ \alpha \cdot \lceil \frac{n-1}{\alpha} \rceil &\geq 2 \cdot d(u_{i, \frac{n+1}{2}}, w). \\ \alpha \cdot (\frac{n-1}{\alpha} + \epsilon) &\geq 2 \cdot d(u_{i, \frac{n+1}{2}}, w). \\ n - 1 + \alpha \cdot \epsilon &\geq 2 \cdot d(u_{i, \frac{n+1}{2}}, w). \end{aligned}$$

since  $\epsilon$  is rounding off for ceil function and must be strictly less than one, and  $\alpha$  is at most 0.5, we have

$$\frac{n-1}{2} + 0.25 \geq d(u_{i, \frac{n+1}{2}}, w).$$

Since distances are in integers,  $d(u_{i, \frac{n+1}{2}}, w)$  must be at most  $\frac{n-1}{2}$ .

**Definition 7.** A solution set  $S$  of  $I'$  is nice if and only if the following holds.

$$- |S \cap U_i| = 1 \text{ for every } i \in [k]; \text{ (AND) } S = \bigcup_{i \in [k]} S \cap U_i.$$

**Lemma 6.** For every distinct  $i, j, l \in [k]$ , such that  $j < l$ , the following holds: if a vertex  $w$  is an  $H_i$ -representative, then for every  $\{x, y\} \in T_{j,l}$ ,  $d(x, w) + d(w, y) \geq (1 + \alpha) \cdot d(x, y)$ , that is  $w$  satisfies constraint imposed by no terminal pair in  $T_{j,l}$ .

*Proof.* Since  $i, j, l$  are distinct, and by definition  $H_i$  representative vertex  $w$  is at most  $\frac{n-1}{2}$  distance apart from  $u_{i, \frac{n+1}{2}}$  or belong to  $P(p_i, u_{i, \frac{n+1}{2}})$ , in both cases  $w$  is at least  $L - \frac{n-1}{2}$  distance apart from vertex  $b$  (as  $u_{i, \frac{n+1}{2}}$  is at least  $L$  distance apart from  $b$ ), in this case to reach  $w$  from every vertex of  $H_j$  and  $H_l$  one has to go via  $b$ . And thus, for any pair  $\{x, y\} \in T_{j,l}$ , the distance  $d(w, x) + d(w, y)$  is

$$\begin{aligned}
d(w, x) + d(w, y) &= d(w, b) + d(b, x) + d(w, b) + d(b, y). \\
&\geq L - \frac{n-1}{2} + L + L - \frac{n-1}{2} + L. \\
&\geq 4L - 2 \cdot \frac{n-1}{2}. \\
&\geq 4L - n + 1. \\
&\geq 3L + 1. \text{ (As } L \text{ is at least } n\text{).} \\
&\geq (1 + 0.5) \cdot 2L + 1. \\
&\geq (1 + \alpha) \cdot 2L + 1. \\
&\geq (1 + \alpha) \cdot d(x, y).
\end{aligned}$$

Now consider the following observation.

**Observation 6** *For an  $i \in [k]$ , if a vertex  $w$  is  $H_i$ -representative, then one of the following holds.*

- $w$  belongs to  $V(P(p_i, u_{i, \frac{n+1}{2}}))$ .
- There exists a  $j$  such that  $1 \leq j \leq \frac{n-1}{2}$  and  $w$  belongs to the first  $j$  vertices of constructed path  $P(u_{i,j}, b)$  starting from  $u_{i,j}$ .
- There exists a  $j$  such that  $\frac{n+1}{2} \leq j \leq n$  and  $w$  belongs to the first  $n - j + 1$  vertices of constructed path  $P(u_{i,j}, b)$  starting from  $u_{i,j}$ .

*Proof.* We refer to Figure 2 to verify that a vertex  $w$  with  $d(u_{i, \frac{n+1}{2}}, w) \leq \frac{n-1}{2}$  belongs to vertex sets as mentioned above.

**Lemma 7.** *If there is a solution  $S$  for instance  $(G', \mathcal{T}, k)$ , then there exists a nice solution  $S^*$  for instance  $(G', \mathcal{T}, k)$ .*

*Proof.* Recalling Lemma 5, For every  $i \in [k]$ ,  $S$  must contain a vertex  $w$  which is an  $H_i$ -representative. Further, recalling Observation 6,  $w$  must belong to path  $P(p_i, u_{i, \frac{n+1}{2}})$ , or to  $P(u_{i,i'}, b)$  for an  $i' \in [n]$ . Initially we make  $S^*$  as a copy of  $S$ . For every  $i \in [k]$  we do the following.

- If  $H_i$ -representative vertex  $w$  belongs to path  $P(p_i, u_{i, \frac{n+1}{2}})$ , then we replace  $w$  with  $u_{i, \frac{n+1}{2}}$  in  $S^*$ .
- Else, if  $H_i$ -representative vertex  $w$  belongs to path  $P(u_{i,q}, b)$  for a  $q \in [n]$ , then we replace  $w$  with  $u_{i,q}$  in  $S^*$ .

The above replacements are safe, we argue this for a fixed  $i \in [k]$ , and the similar arguments hold for every  $i \in [k]$ . Recalling Lemma 6,  $H_i$ -representative  $w$  can only satisfy constraint imposed by terminal pairs of  $T_{i,j}$  where  $i < j < k$  or  $T_{j,i}$  where  $1 < j < i$ . We will argue for a fixed  $T_{i,j}$  where  $i < j < k$  and similar arguments hold for all  $T_{i,j}$  where  $i < j < k$  and  $T_{j,i}$  where  $1 < j < i$ .

By construction, every pair in  $T_{i,j}$  has one vertex from  $U'_i$  and other vertex from  $U'_j$ . Let  $\{u'_{i,i'}, u'_{j,j'}\}$  be a pair whose constraint is satisfied by  $w$ , that is  $d(u'_{i,i'}, w) + d(w, u'_{j,j'}) \leq (1 + \alpha) \cdot d(u'_{j,j'}, u'_{i,i'})$ , and let  $u_{i,q}$  be the replacement of  $w$  in the above. Let  $u_{i,q}$  be at distance  $l$  from  $w$ , consider the following cases.

**Case 1:**  $w$  belongs to  $P(p_i, u_{i, \frac{n+1}{2}})$ . In this case,  $d(u'_{i,i'}, u_{i,q}) = d(u'_{i,i'}, w) - l$  and  $d(u_{i,q}, b) = d(w, b) - l$ . Further, the shortest paths from  $w$  and  $u_{i,q}$  to  $u'_{j,j'}$  go via  $b$ , so we have that

$$\begin{aligned} d(u'_{i,i'}, w) + d(w, u'_{j,j'}) &= d(u'_{i,i'}, w) + d(w, b) + d(b, u'_{j,j'}). \\ &= d(u'_{i,i'}, u'_{i,q}) + l + d(u_{i,q}, b) + l + d(b, u'_{j,j'}). \\ &= d(u'_{i,i'}, u'_{i,q}) + d(u_{i,q}, u'_{j,j'}) + 2l. \end{aligned}$$

**Case 2:**  $w$  belongs to  $P(u_{i,q}, b)$ . In this case,  $d(u'_{i,i'}, u_{i,q}) = d(u'_{i,i'}, w) - l$  and  $d(u_{i,q}, b) = d(w, b) + l$ . Further, the shortest paths from  $w$  and  $u_{i,q}$  to  $u'_{j,j'}$  go via  $b$ , so we have that

$$\begin{aligned} d(u'_{i,i'}, w) + d(w, u'_{j,j'}) &= d(u'_{i,i'}, w) + d(w, b) + d(b, u'_{j,j'}). \\ &= d(u'_{i,i'}, u'_{i,q}) + l + d(u_{i,q}, b) - l + d(b, u'_{j,j'}). \\ &= d(u'_{i,i'}, u'_{i,q}) + d(u_{i,q}, u'_{j,j'}). \end{aligned}$$

In both the above cases  $u_{i,q}$  also satisfies the constraint imposed by pair  $\{u'_{i,i'}, u'_{j,j'}\}$ . Further, since solution  $S$  contains an  $H_i$ -representative for every  $i \in [k]$ , and by Definition 6, it is easy to observe that no vertex can be  $H_i$ -representative of two or more distinct  $i \in [k]$ , we have that the above construction of  $S^*$  satisfies properties of Definition 7.

**Lemma 8.** *For every distinct  $i, j \in [k]$ , and for every  $i', j' \in [n]$ , the following holds:*

$$\begin{aligned} - d(u'_{i,i'}, u_{i,i'}) + d(u_{i,i'}, u'_{j,j'}) &\geq (1 + \alpha) \cdot d(u'_{i,i'}, u'_{j,j'}). \\ - d(u'_{j,j'}, u_{j,j'}) + d(u_{j,j'}, u'_{i,i'}) &\geq (1 + \alpha) \cdot d(u'_{i,i'}, u'_{j,j'}). \end{aligned}$$

*Proof.* We prove the first statement, the second follows similar arguments. We have  $L \geq n$  and  $1 \leq L$ ; refer Figure 2 to see that the distance  $d(u'_{i,i'}, u_{i,i'})$  is  $1 + n$  which is at most  $2L$ . The shortest path between  $u'_{i,i'}$  and  $u_{i,i'}$  will be achieved by following the path on  $U'$  vertices and then path on  $U$  vertices after going through either  $z_i$  or  $z'_i$  in the gadget  $H_i$ , while the path through vertex  $b$  will be of length  $2L$ . Recalling Observation 4,  $d(u_{i,i'}, u'_{j,j'}) = 2L$ . Thus,

$$\begin{aligned} d(u'_{i,i'}, u_{i,i'}) + d(u_{i,i'}, u'_{j,j'}) &= 2L + 1 + n. \\ &= 2L + 1 + 2 \cdot \alpha \cdot (L - \epsilon). \\ &= 2L + 1 + 2 \cdot \alpha \cdot L - 2 \cdot \alpha \cdot \epsilon. \\ &= ((1 + \alpha) \cdot 2L) + 1 - 2 \cdot \alpha \cdot \epsilon. \\ &\geq (1 + \alpha) \cdot 2L. \end{aligned}$$



In the above equations  $\epsilon$  is the small addition of ceil function for computing  $L$ , which is strictly less than 1.

**Lemma 9.** *For every distinct  $i, j \in [k]$ , and for every distinct  $i', i'' \in [n]$  and distinct  $j', j'' \in [n]$ , the following holds:*

$$\begin{aligned} - d(u'_{i,i'}, u_{i,i''}) + d(u_{i,i''}, u'_{j,j'}) &\leq (1 + \alpha) \cdot d(u'_{i,i'}, u'_{j,j'}). \\ - d(u'_{j,j'}, u_{j,j''}) + d(u_{j,j''}, u'_{i,i'}) &\leq (1 + \alpha) \cdot d(u'_{i,i'}, u'_{j,j'}). \end{aligned}$$

*Proof.* We prove the first statement, the second follows similar arguments. We have  $L \geq n$  and  $1 \leq L$ . Refer Figure 2, the distance  $d(u'_{i,i'}, u_{i,i''})$  is  $\leq n$  which is strictly less than  $2L$ . The shortest path will be achieved by following the path on  $U'$  vertices and then path on  $U$  vertices after going through either  $z_i$  or  $z'_i$  in the gadget  $H_i$ , while the path through vertex  $b$  will be of length  $2L$ . Recalling Observation 4,  $d(u_{i,i'}, u'_{j,j'}) = 2L$ . Thus,

$$\begin{aligned} d(u'_{i,i'}, u_{i,i''}) + d(u_{i,i''}, u'_{j,j'}) &\leq 2L + n. \\ &\leq 2L + 2 \cdot \alpha \cdot 2 \cdot \alpha \cdot (L - \epsilon). \\ &\leq 2L + 2 \cdot \alpha \cdot L - 2 \cdot \alpha \cdot \epsilon. \\ &\leq ((1 + \alpha) \cdot 2L) - 2 \cdot \alpha \cdot \epsilon. \\ &\leq (1 + \alpha) \cdot 2L. \end{aligned}$$

In the above equations  $\epsilon$  is the small addition for ceil function for calculation of  $L$ , which is strictly non negative.

**Lemma 10.**  *$I$  is a yes instance of MULTI COLOR INDEPENDENT SET if and only if  $I'$  is a yes instance of  $\alpha$ -RELAXED TERMINAL MONITORING SET.*

*Proof.* For the forward direction let  $S$  be a solution for instance  $I$ . We construct  $S' = \{u_{i,j} \mid i \in [k] \wedge j \in [n] \wedge v_{i,j} \in S\}$ . Since  $S$  contains exactly one vertex from every vertex set  $V_i$ ,  $S'$  contains exactly one vertex from every vertex set  $U_i$  in  $G'$ . We argue that  $S'$  is a solution for instance  $I'$ . Assume to the contrary that there exists a pair  $(u'_{i,i'}, u'_{j,j''}) \in \mathcal{T}$  such that no vertex in  $S'$  satisfies its constraint. In this case let  $u_{i,x}$  and  $u_{j,y}$  be the vertices in  $S'$  from  $U_i$  and  $U_j$  respectively. By construction  $u_{i,x}$  and  $u_{j,y}$  are selected in  $S'$  because of  $v_{i,x}$  and  $v_{j,y}$  in  $S$  which are not adjacent. Since every pair in  $\mathcal{T}$  correspond to an edge with endpoints in different vertex sets, either  $i'$  and  $x$  are distinct, or  $j'$  and  $y$  must be distinct, and in this case by Lemma 9, constraint imposed by pair  $(u'_{i,i'}, u'_{j,j'})$  must be satisfied, contradicting the assumption. Thus,  $S'$  is a terminal monitoring set of size  $k$  for the instance  $I'$ .

For the other direction, let  $S'$  be a terminal monitoring set of size  $k$  for instance  $I'$ , by Lemma 7, we may assume that  $S'$  is a nice solution. Thus, by definition of nice solution,  $S'$  contains exactly one vertex from  $U_i$  for every  $i \in [k]$ , and no other vertex. We now construct  $S = \{v_{i,j} \mid u_{i,j} \in S'\}$ . We argue that  $S$  is a solution to instance  $I$ . Assume to the contrary that  $S$  contain

two vertices  $v_{i,i'}$  and  $v_{j,j'}$  which are adjacent, and let  $u_{i,i'}$  and  $u_{j,j'}$  be their corresponding vertices in  $S'$ , and let  $i < j$ . Consider the terminal pairs  $T_{i,j}$ , the constraints imposed by every pair in  $T_{i,j}$  must be satisfied by either  $u_{i,i'}$  or  $u_{j,j'}$  because vertices in  $S' \setminus \{u_{i,i'}, u_{j,j'}\}$  belongs to  $U_q$  where  $q \neq i$  and  $q \neq j$ , and by Observation 4 every vertex in  $S' \setminus \{u_{i,i'}, u_{j,j'}\}$  must be  $2L$  distance apart from every the vertex of every terminal pair in  $T_{i,j}$ , hence vertices in  $S' \setminus \{u_{i,i'}, u_{j,j'}\}$  can satisfy constraint imposed no terminal in  $T_{i,j}$ . Since  $S'$  is a solution, all the constraints imposed by  $T_{i,j}$  are satisfied by  $u_{i,i'}$  and  $u_{j,j'}$ , this implies that  $(u'_{i,i'}, u'_{j,j'})$  is not a terminal pair in  $T_{i,j}$ , otherwise as per Lemma 8 its constraint would not be satisfied by either of  $u_{i,i'}$  or  $u_{j,j'}$  as well. Thus,  $(v_{i,i'}, v_{j,j'})$  is not an edge in  $G$ , contradicting the assumption. This finishes the proof.

The above lemma finishes the proof of Theorem 7.

## 5 Conclusion

We introduced TERMINAL MONITORING SET and initiated an investigation of its parameterized complexity. We obtained both hardness and tractability results. We also studied  $\alpha$ -RELAXED TERMINAL MONITORING SET which is a generalization of TERMINAL MONITORING SET and proved it to be  $W[1]$ -hard parameterized by feedback vertex number plus solution size when input graph is a planar graph. We leave open the parameterized complexity of TERMINAL MONITORING SET with the following parameters: pathwidth, treewidth, feedback vertex number, vertex deletion number to disjoint union of paths.

## References

1. Abu-Khizam, F.N.: A kernelization algorithm for d-hitting set. *J. Comput. Syst. Sci.* **76**(7), 524–531 (2010). <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcss.2009.09.002>
2. Alumur, S.A., Kara, B.Y.: Network hub location problems: The state of the art. *Eur. J. Oper. Res.* **190**(1), 1–21 (2008)
3. Barilan, J., Kortsarz, G., Peleg, D.: How to allocate network centers. *J. Algorithms* **15**(3), 385–415 (1993). <https://doi.org/10.1006/jagm.1993.1047>
4. Bedito, M.P.L., Melo, L.P., Pedrosa, L.L.C.: A parameterized approximation algorithm for the multiple allocation k-hub center. In: Castañeda, A., Rodríguez-Henríquez, F. (eds.) *LATIN 2022: Theoretical Informatics - 15th Latin American Symposium*, Guanajuato, Mexico, November 7-11, 2022, Proceedings. *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, vol. 13568, pp. 141–156. Springer (2022). [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-20624-5\\_9](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-20624-5_9)
5. Brandstädt, A., Dragan, F.F.: A linear-time algorithm for connected r-domination and steiner tree on distance-hereditary graphs. *Networks* **31**(3), 177–182 (1998)
6. Buss, J.F., Goldsmith, J.: Nondeterminism within P. *SIAM J. Comput.* **22**(3), 560–572 (1993). <https://doi.org/10.1137/0222038>
7. Chechik, S., Peleg, D.: The fault-tolerant capacitated k-center problem. *Theor. Comput. Sci.* **566**, 12–25 (2015). <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tcs.2014.11.017>

8. Coelho, R.S., Moura, P.F.S., Wakabayashi, Y.: The  $k$ -hop connected dominating set problem: hardness and polyhedra. *Electron. Notes Discret. Math.* **50**, 59–64 (2015). <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.endm.2015.07.011>
9. Cygan, M., Fomin, F.V., Kowalik, L., Lokshtanov, D., Marx, D., Pilipczuk, M., Pilipczuk, M., Saurabh, S.: *Parameterized Algorithms*. Springer (2015). <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-21275-3>
10. Diestel, R.: *Graph Theory*, 4th Edition, Graduate texts in mathematics, vol. 173. Springer (2012)
11. Downey, R.G., Fellows, M.R.: *Fundamentals of Parameterized Complexity*. Texts in Computer Science, Springer (2013). <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4471-5559-1>, <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4471-5559-1>
12. Farahani, R.Z., Hekmatfar, M., Arabani, A.B., Nikbakhsh, E.: Hub location problems: A review of models, classification, solution techniques, and applications. *Comput. Ind. Eng.* **64**(4), 1096–1109 (2013)
13. Flum, J., Grohe, M.: *Parameterized Complexity Theory*. Texts in Theoretical Computer Science. An EATCS Series, Springer (2006). <https://doi.org/10.1007/3-540-29953-X>
14. Hochbaum, D.S., Shmoys, D.B.: A unified approach to approximation algorithms for bottleneck problems. *J. ACM* **33**(3), 533–550 (1986)
15. Jansen, B.M.P.: On structural parameterizations of hitting set: Hitting paths in graphs using 2-sat. *Journal of Graph Algorithms and Applications* **21**(2), 219–243 (2017). <https://doi.org/10.7155/jgaa.00413>
16. Katsikarelis, I., Lampis, M., Paschos, V.T.: Structural parameters, tight bounds, and approximation for  $(k, r)$ -center. *Discret. Appl. Math.* **264**, 90–117 (2019). <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.dam.2018.11.002>
17. Khuller, S., Sussmann, Y.J.: The capacitated  $K$ -center problem. *SIAM J. Discret. Math.* **13**(3), 403–418 (2000). <https://doi.org/10.1137/S0895480197329776>
18. Krumke, S.O.: On a generalization of the  $p$ -center problem. *Inf. Process. Lett.* **56**(2), 67–71 (1995). [https://doi.org/10.1016/0020-0190\(95\)00141-X](https://doi.org/10.1016/0020-0190(95)00141-X)
19. Lampis, M.: Algorithmic meta-theorems for restrictions of treewidth. *Algorithmica* **64**(1), 19–37 (2012). <https://doi.org/10.1007/S00453-011-9554-X>
20. Lokshtanov, D., Misra, N., Philip, G., Ramanujan, M.S., Saurabh, S.: Hardness of  $r$ -dominating set on graphs of diameter  $(r + 1)$ . In: Gutin, G.Z., Szeider, S. (eds.) *Parameterized and Exact Computation - 8th International Symposium, IPEC 2013, Sophia Antipolis, France, September 4-6, 2013, Revised Selected Papers*. Lecture Notes in Computer Science, vol. 8246, pp. 255–267. Springer (2013). [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-03898-8\\_22](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-03898-8_22)
21. Panigrahy, R., Vishwanathan, S.: An  $o(\log^* n)$  approximation algorithm for the asymmetric  $p$ -center problem. *J. Algorithms* **27**(2), 259–268 (1998)