



(Independent) Roman Domination Parameterized by Distance to Cluster

Pradeesha Ashok  

International Institute of Information Technology Bangalore, India

Gautam K. Das 

Department of Mathematics, Indian Institute of Technology Guwahati, India

Arti Pandey 

Department of Mathematics, Indian Institute of Technology Ropar, India

Kaustav Paul 

Department of Mathematics, Indian Institute of Technology Ropar, India

Subhabrata Paul 

Department of Mathematics, Indian Institute of Technology Patna, India

Abstract

Given a graph $G = (V, E)$, a function $f : V \rightarrow \{0, 1, 2\}$ is said to be a *Roman Dominating function* (RDF) if for every $v \in V$ with $f(v) = 0$, there exists a vertex $u \in N(v)$ such that $f(u) = 2$. A Roman Dominating function f is said to be an *Independent Roman Dominating function* (IRDF), if $V_1 \cup V_2$ forms an independent set, where $V_i = \{v \in V \mid f(v) = i\}$, for $i \in \{0, 1, 2\}$. The total weight of f is equal to $\sum_{v \in V} f(v)$, and is denoted as $w(f)$. The *Roman Domination Number* (resp. *Independent Roman Domination Number*) of G , denoted by $\gamma_R(G)$ (resp. $i_R(G)$), is defined as $\min\{w(f) \mid f \text{ is an RDF (resp. IRDF) of } G\}$. For a given graph G , the problem of computing $\gamma_R(G)$ (resp. $i_R(G)$) is defined as the *Roman Domination problem* (resp. *Independent Roman Domination problem*).

In this paper, we examine structural parameterizations of the (Independent) Roman Domination problem. We propose fixed-parameter tractable (FPT) algorithms for the (Independent) Roman Domination problem in graphs that are k vertices away from a cluster graph. These graphs have a set of k vertices whose removal results in a cluster graph. We refer to k as the distance to the cluster graph. Specifically, we prove the following results when parameterized by the deletion distance k to cluster graphs: we can find the Roman Domination Number (and Independent Roman Domination Number) in time $4^k n^{O(1)}$. In terms of lower bounds, we show that the Roman Domination number can not be computed in time $2^{\epsilon k} n^{O(1)}$, for any $0 < \epsilon < 1$ unless a well-known conjecture, SETH fails. In addition, we also show that the Roman Domination problem parameterized by distance to cluster, does not admit a polynomial kernel unless $\text{NP} \subseteq \text{coNP/poly}$.

2012 ACM Subject Classification Design and Analysis of Algorithms

Keywords and phrases Roman Domination, Independent Roman Domination, FPT, Distance to Cluster, Kernel

Digital Object Identifier 10.4230/LIPIcs...

1 Introduction

The concept of Roman Dominating function originated in an article by Ian Stewart, titled “Defend the Roman Empire!” [14], published in Scientific American. Given a graph, where every vertex corresponds to a distinct geographical region within the historical narrative of the Roman Empire, the characterization of a location as secured or unsecured is delineated by the Roman Dominating function, denoted as f .

Specifically, a vertex v is said to be unsecured if it lacks stationed legions, expressed as $f(v) = 0$. Conversely, a secured location is one where one or two legions are stationed,



© ; licensed under Creative Commons License CC-BY 4.0

Leibniz International Proceedings in Informatics

LIPICs Schloss Dagstuhl – Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik, Dagstuhl Publishing, Germany

denoted by $f(v) \in \{1, 2\}$. The strategic methodology for securing an unsecured area involves the deployment of a legion from a neighboring location.

In the fourth century A.D., Emperor Constantine the Great enacted an edict precluding the transfer of a legion from a fortified position to an unfortified one if such an action would result in leaving the latter unsecured. Therefore, it is necessary to first have two legions at a given location ($f(v) = 2$) before sending one legion to a neighbouring location. This strategic approach, pioneered by Emperor Constantine the Great, effectively fortified the Roman Empire. Considering the substantial costs associated with legion deployment in specific areas, the Emperor aimed to strategically minimize the number of legions required to safeguard the Roman Empire.

The notion of Roman Domination in graphs was first introduced in an article by Ian Stewart [14]. Given a graph $G = (V, E)$, a *Roman Dominating function* (RDF) is defined as a function $f : V \rightarrow \{0, 1, 2\}$, where every vertex v , for which $f(v) = 0$ must be adjacent to at least one vertex u with $f(u) = 2$. The weight of an RDF is defined as $w(f) = \sum_{v \in V} f(v)$. The *Roman Domination Number* is defined as $\gamma_R(G) = \min\{w(f) \mid f \text{ is an RDF of } G\}$. While the context is clear, if $f(v) = i$ for some RDF f , then we say that v has label i .

Given a graph $G = (V, E)$, a set $S \subseteq V$ is defined as *independent set* if any two vertices of S are non-adjacent. A function f is referred to as an *Independent Roman Dominating function* (IRDF) if f is an RDF and $V_1 \cup V_2$ is an independent set. The *Independent Roman Domination Number* is defined as $i_R(G) = \min\{w(f) \mid f \text{ is an IRDF of } G\}$. An IRDF f of G with $w(f) = i_R(G)$ is denoted as an $i_R(G)$ -function of G . Given a graph $G = (V, E)$, the problem of computing $i_R(G)$ is known as *Independent Roman Domination problem*.

One of the objectives of parameterized complexity is to identify parameters that render NP-hard problems fixed-parameter tractable (FPT). This is of practical significance because there are often small parameters, aside from solution size, that capture important practical inputs. Hence, it only makes sense to explore problems under a multitude of parameters. There has recently been a lot of research in this area. A key research direction involves identifying a parameter as small as possible, under which a problem becomes fixed-parameter tractable or admits a polynomial-sized kernel. Structural parameterization involves a parameter that is a function of the input structure rather than the standard output size. A recent trend in structural parameterization is to study problems parameterized by the deletion distance to various graph classes where the problem is efficiently solvable.

Our parameter of interest is the ‘distance’ of the graph from a natural class of graphs. Here, ‘distance’ refers to the number of vertices that must be deleted from the graph to belong to the specified class. This article focuses on one such special class of graphs: cluster graphs, where each connected component of the graph is a clique. Note that both Roman Domination and Independent Roman Domination problems can be easily solved in cluster graphs. Given a graph $G = (V, E)$, the minimum number of vertices that need to be deleted from the graph so that the remaining graph becomes a cluster graph is called *distance to cluster* of G (denoted by CVD size of G).

2 Preliminaries

2.1 Graph Theoretic Notations

This paper only considers simple, undirected, finite and nontrivial graphs. Let $G = (V, E)$ be a graph. n and m will be used to denote the cardinalities of V and E , respectively. $N(v)$ stands for the set of neighbors of a vertex v in V . The number of neighbors of a vertex $v \in V$ defines its *degree*, which is represented by the symbol $deg(v)$. The maximum degree of the

graph will be denoted by Δ . For a set $U \subseteq V$, the notation $deg_U(v)$ is used to represent the number of neighbors that a vertex v has within the subset U . Additionally, we use $N_U(v)$ to refer to the set of neighbors of vertex v within U . Given a set $S \subseteq V$, $G \setminus S$ is defined as the graph induced on $V \setminus S$, that is $G[V \setminus S]$.

A vertex of degree one is known as a *pendant vertex*. A set $S \subseteq V$ is said to be a *dominating set* if every vertex of $V \setminus S$ is adjacent to some vertex of S . A graph G is said to be a *complete graph* if any two vertices of G are adjacent. A set $S \subseteq V$ is said to be a clique if the subgraph of G induced on S is a complete graph. A graph is said to be a *cluster graph* if every component of the graph is a clique. For every positive integer n , $[n]$ denotes the set $\{1, 2, \dots, n\}$.

Given a graph $G = (V, E)$ and a function $f : V \rightarrow \{0, 1, 2\}$, $f_H : V(H) \rightarrow \{0, 1, 2\}$ is defined to be the function f restricted on H , where H is an induced subgraph of G .

For a graph $G = (V, E)$ and a function $f : V \rightarrow \{0, 1, 2\}$; we define $V_i = \{v \in V \mid f(v) = i\}$ for $i \in \{0, 1, 2\}$. The partition (V_0, V_1, V_2) is said to be *ordered partition* of V induced by f . Note that the function $f : V \rightarrow \{0, 1, 2\}$ and the ordered partition (V_0, V_1, V_2) of V have a one-to-one correspondence. So, when the context is clear, we write $f = (V_0, V_1, V_2)$. Given an RDF $f = (V_0, V_1, V_2)$, (V_1, V_2) is said to be *Roman Dominating pair* corresponding to f . When the context is clear, we write Roman Dominating pair (omitting the notion of f).

2.2 Problem Definitions

Before presenting our results, we formalize the problems considered in the paper as follows.
SET-COVER

Input: An universe U and a collection of subsets of U , $F = \{S_1, \dots, S_m\}$ and a non-negative integer k .

Parameter: $|U|$.

Question: Does there exists k sets S_{i_1}, \dots, S_{i_k} in F , such that $\bigcup_{j=1}^k S_{i_j} = U$?

RD-CVD

Input: A graph $G = (V, E)$, a cluster vertex deletion set S and a non-negative integer ℓ .

Parameter: $|S| = k$.

Question: Does there exists an RDF f on G , with weight at most ℓ ?

RD-VC

Input: A graph $G = (V, E)$, a vertex cover S and a non-negative integer ℓ .

Parameter: $|S| = k$.

Question: Does there exists an RDF f on G , with weight at most ℓ ?

IRD-CVD

Input: A graph $G = (V, E)$, a cluster vertex deletion set S and a non-negative integer ℓ .

Parameter: $|S| = k$.

Question: Does there exists an IRDF f on G , with weight at most ℓ ?

d-HITTING SET

Input: An universe U and a collection of subsets of U , $F = \{S_1, \dots, S_m\}$ such that $|S_i| \leq d$, for all $i \in [m]$ and a non-negative integer k .

Parameter: $|U|$.

Question: Does there exists a subset $U' \subseteq U$, such that $U' \cap S_i \neq \emptyset$, for every $i \in [m]$?

2.3 Parameterized Complexity Notations and Definitions

► **Definition 1.** (*Fixed Parameter Tractability*) Let $L \subseteq \Sigma^* \times \mathbb{N}$ be a parameterized language. L is said to be fixed parameter tractable (or FPT) if there exists an algorithm \mathcal{B} , a constant c and a computable function f such that for all x , for all k ; \mathcal{B} on input (x, k) runs in at most $f(k) \cdot |x|^c$ time and outputs $(x, k) \in L$ if and only if $\mathcal{B}([x, k]) = 1$. We call the algorithm \mathcal{B} as fixed parameter tractable algorithm (or FPT algorithm).

► **Definition 2.** (*Parameterized Reduction*) Let $P_1, P_2 \in \Sigma^* \times \mathbb{N}$ be two parameterized languages. Suppose there exists an algorithm \mathcal{B} that takes input (x, k) (an instance of P_1) and constructs an instance (x', k') of P_2 such that the following conditions are satisfied:

- (x, k) is a YES instance if and only if (x', k') is a YES-Instance.
- $k' \in f(k)$ for some function depending only on k .
- Algorithm \mathcal{B} must run in $g(k)|x|^c$ time, where $g(\cdot)$ is a computable function.

Then we say that there exists a parameterized reduction from P_1 to P_2 .

W-hierarchy: To capture the parameterized languages being FPT or not, the W-hierarchy is defined as $\text{FPT} \subseteq \text{W}[1] \subseteq \dots \subseteq \text{XP}$. It is believed that this subset relation is strict [5]. Hence, a parameterized language that is hard for some complexity class above FPT is unlikely to be FPT. Theorem 4 gives the use of parameterized reduction. If a parameterized language $L \subseteq \Sigma^* \times \mathbb{N}$ can be solved by an algorithm running in time $\mathcal{O}(n^{f(k)})$, then we say $L \in \text{XP}$. In such a situation, we also say that L admits an XP algorithm.

► **Definition 3.** (*para-NP-hardness*) A parameterized language $L \subseteq \Sigma^* \times \mathbb{N}$ is called para-NP-hard if it is NP-hard for some constant value of the parameter.

It is believed that a para-NP-hard problem does not admit an XP algorithm as; otherwise it will imply $\text{P} = \text{NP}$ [5].

► **Theorem 4.** [5] Let there be a parameterized reduction from parameterized problem P_1 to parameterized problem P_2 . Then if P_2 is FPT, then so is P_1 . Equivalently, if P_1 is $\text{W}[i]$ -hard for some $i \geq 1$, then so is P_2 .

► **Definition 5.** (*Kernelization*) Let $L \subseteq \Sigma^* \times \mathbb{N}$ be a parameterized language. Kernelization is an algorithm that replaces the input instance (x, k) by a reduced instance (x', k') such that

- $k' \leq f(k), |x'| \leq g(k)$ for some functions f, g depending only on k .
- $(x, k) \in L$ if and only if $(x', k') \in L$.

The reduction from (x, k) to (x', k') must be computable in $p(|x| + k)$ time, where $p(\cdot)$ is a polynomial function. If $g(k) = k^{\mathcal{O}(1)}$ then we say that L admits a polynomial kernel.

It is well-known that a decidable parameterized problem is FPT if and only if it has a kernel. However, the kernel size could be exponential (or worse) in the parameter. There is a hardness theory for problems having polynomial sized kernel. Towards that, we define the notion of polynomial parameter transformation.

► **Definition 6.** (*Polynomial parameter transformation (PPT)*) Let P_1 and P_2 be two parameterized languages. We say that P_1 is polynomial parameter reducible to P_2 if there exists a polynomial time computable function (or algorithm) $f : \Sigma^* \times \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \Sigma^* \times \mathbb{N}$, a polynomial $p : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ such that $(x, k) \in P_1$ if and only if $f(x, k) \in P_2$ and $k' \leq p(k)$ where $f(x, k) = (x', k')$. We call f to be a polynomial parameter transformation from P_1 to P_2 .

The following theorem gives the use of the polynomial parameter transformation for obtaining kernels for one problem from another.

► **Theorem 7.** [2] Let $P, Q \subseteq \Sigma^* \times \mathbb{N}$ be two parameterized problems and assume that there exists a PPT from P to Q . Furthermore, assume that the classical version of P is NP-hard and Q is in NP. Then, if Q has a polynomial kernel, then P has a polynomial kernel.

We use the following conjecture to prove one of our lower bounds.

► **Conjecture 8.** [11] (Strong Exponential Time Hypothesis (SETH)) There is no $\epsilon > 0$ such that $\forall q \geq 3$, q -CNFSAT can be solved in $(2 - \epsilon)^n n^{O(1)}$ time where n is the number of variables in input formula.

We have the following theorem, which gives an algorithm for SET-COVER parameterized by the size of the universe.

► **Theorem 9.** [9] The SET-COVER problem can be solved in $2^n(m + n)^{O(1)}$ time where n is the size of the universe and m is the size of the family of subsets of the universe.

2.4 Related Works

From the parameterized complexity point of view, it is surprising that there does not exist much literature on the Roman Domination problem (except [12, 8]), while the classical dominating set problem is very well studied. Some related literature about the parameterized complexity of the domination problem can be found in [1, 7, 13]. One recent work about the domination problem parameterized by several structural parameters like distance to cluster, distance to split, can be found in [10]. The techniques we designed in this paper, are adaption of the technique used in [10], with appropriate modification to fit our problem.

In [8], Fernau proved that the Roman Domination parameterized by the solution size is $W[2]$ -hard in general graphs, but FPT for planar graphs. He also showed that the same problem parameterized by treewidth is FPT. In [12], Mohannapriya et al. showed that a more generalized problem, that is k -Roman Domination problem parameterized by solution size is $W[1]$ -hard, even for split graphs. To the best of our knowledge, no other parameterized complexity results exist for the Roman Domination problem.

2.5 Our Results

The main contribution of the paper is following:

- In Section 3.1 (resp. Section 3.2), we show that the RD-CVD (resp. IRD-CVD) problem is FPT.
- In Section 4, we show that the RD-CVD problem cannot be solved in time $2^{\epsilon k} n^{O(1)}$ (where $0 < \epsilon < 1$) unless SETH fails, neither it admits a polynomial kernel unless $\text{NP} \subseteq \text{coNP/poly}$.
- In Section 5, we conclude the paper with some future research directions.

3 Variants of Roman Domination parameterized by CVD size

In this section, we assume that a cluster vertex deletion set S of size k is given with the input graph $G = (V, E)$. If not, the algorithm mentioned in [3] can be used, which runs in $1.92^k n^{O(1)}$ time and outputs a cluster vertex deletion set of size at most k or concludes that there does not any cluster vertex deletion set of size at most k .

3.1 Roman Domination

In this section, we propose an FPT algorithm for the Roman Domination problem when the parameter is CVD size.

We consider a CVD set S as a part of the input, where $|S| = k$. Our algorithm starts with making a guess for $S_1 = V_1 \cap S$ and $S_2 = V_2 \cap S$, where (V_1, V_2) is an optimal Roman Dominating pair. At first, a guess of S_2 is made from S . Then, the vertices of $N[S_2] \cap S$ are deleted from the graph. Then we guess S_1 from the remaining S and delete S_1 from S .

Note that S is a CVD set, hence $G \setminus S$ is disjoint union of cliques. Let $G \setminus S = C_1 \cup C_2 \cup \dots \cup C_q$, where every C_i is a clique and $|C_i| = \ell_i$, for $i \in [q]$. Note that $q \leq n - k$. After the selection of S_1 and S_2 , every clique belongs to exactly one of the following three types:

Type 0 (T_0) cliques: C_i is a T_0 clique if every vertex of C_i is adjacent to at least one vertex of S_2 .

Type 1 (T_1) cliques: C_i is a T_1 clique if exactly one vertex of C_i is not adjacent to any vertex of S_2 .

Type 2 (T_2) cliques: C_i is a T_2 clique if C_i contains at least two vertices which are not adjacent to any vertex of S_2 .

We define an order ρ_i on the vertices of the clique C_i as follows: if C_i is a T_0 or T_2 clique, then we order them arbitrarily; if C_i is a T_1 clique, then the set $C_i \setminus N[S_2]$ contains exactly one vertex. We make that vertex the first vertex of ρ_i and order the rest of the vertices of C_i arbitrarily. Now we define an order ρ on the vertex set of $G \setminus S$ as follows: $\rho = v_1, v_2, \dots, v_{|G \setminus S|}$, where first ℓ_1 vertices of ρ are vertices of C_1 and follows the order ρ_1 , then the next ℓ_2 vertices of ρ are vertices of C_2 and follows the order ρ_2 and so on. Now, here comes an observation.

► **Observation 10.** *Given a T_2 clique C_i , any Roman Dominating pair (V_1, V_2) extended from (S_1, S_2) has one of the following properties:*

1. $C_i \cap V_2 \neq \emptyset$.
2. A Roman Dominating pair (V'_1, V'_2) can be extended from (S_1, S_2) , which has same or less weight than (V_1, V_2) and $V'_2 \cap C_i \neq \emptyset$

Proof. As C_i is a T_2 clique, let us assume that v_1 and v_2 are two vertices of C_i which are not adjacent to S_2 . If either of v_1, v_2 belongs to V_2 , then we are done. If not, then two cases may arise:

Case 1: At least one vertex among v_1, v_2 has label 0. Without loss of generality, let v_1 has label 0. Then, one neighbour v of v_1 must have label 2. But v can not belong to S as $V_2 \cap S = S_2$ and v_1 has no neighbour in S_2 . Hence, v must belong to C_i , which implies that $C_i \cap V_2 \neq \emptyset$.

Case 2: None of v_1, v_2 has label 0, which implies that both have label 1. Now we construct a dominating pair (V'_1, V'_2) as follows: $V'_2 = V_2 \cup \{v_1\}$ and $V'_1 = V_1 \setminus \{v_1, v_2\}$. Note that (V'_1, V'_2) is a Roman Dominating pair and (V'_1, V'_2) has the same weight as (V_1, V_2) and $V'_2 \cap C_i \neq \emptyset$. Hence, the result follows. ◀

From the above observation, we can rephrase the remaining problem as follows:

RD-DISJOINTCLUSTER problem

Input: A graph $G = (V, E)$, a subset $S \subseteq V$ such that every component of $G \setminus S$ is a clique, a $(0, 1, 2)$ -flag vector $f = (f_1, f_2, \dots, f_q)$ corresponding to the cliques (C_1, C_2, \dots, C_q) and $\ell \in \mathbb{Z}^+$.

Parameter: $|S|$.

Question: Does there exists a subset $T \subseteq G \setminus S$ which satisfies all of the following conditions?

- a. For every C_i with $f_i = 2$, $T \cap C_i \neq \emptyset$.
- b. $2|T| + g(T) \leq \ell$, where $g(T) =$ number of cliques with flag 1, which have empty intersection with T .

For an instance (G, S, ℓ) of the RD-CVD problem, with cliques C_1, \dots, C_q and the guesses of S_1, S_2 , we build an instance $(\hat{G}, \hat{S}, f, \hat{\ell})$ of the RD-DISJOINTCLUSTER problem as follows:

- $\hat{G} = G \setminus ((N[S_2] \cap S) \cup S_1)$.
- $\hat{S} = S \setminus ((N[S_2] \cap S) \cup S_1)$.
- $\hat{\ell} = \ell - 2|S_2| - |S_1|$.
- For all $i \in [q]$, $f_i = j$, if C_i is a T_j clique, $j \in \{0, 1, 2\}$.

Formulation of the problem as a variant of set cover: We define a variant of the set cover problem. Given an instance of the RD-DISJOINTCLUSTER problem, we construct an instance of the set cover problem. Let (G, S, f, ℓ) be an instance of the RD-DISJOINTCLUSTER problem and $\rho = (v_1, v_2, \dots, v_{|G \setminus S|})$ be an ordering of the vertex set of $G \setminus S$, as defined earlier. We take the universe $U = S$ and $F = \{S_1, S_2, \dots, S_{|G \setminus S|}\}$, where $S_i = N(v_i) \cap S$ for every $i \in [|G \setminus S|]$. Now, we modify the usual SET-COVER problem to suit our problem. The modified SET-COVER problem is defined below:

SET-COVERWITHPARTITION problem (SCP)

Input: Universe U , a family of sets $F = \{S_1, S_2, \dots, S_m\}$, a partition of $\beta = (\beta_1, \dots, \beta_q)$ of F , a $(0, 1, 2)$ flag vector $f = (f_1, f_2, \dots, f_q)$ corresponding to each block in the partition β and a non-negative integer ℓ .

Parameter: $|U|$.

Question: Does there exists a subset $F' \subseteq F$ which satisfies all of the following conditions?

- a. For every β_i with $f_i = 2$, $F' \cap \beta_i \neq \emptyset$.
- b. $2|F'| + g(F') \leq \ell$, where $g(A) =$ number of blocks with flag 1, which have empty intersection with A , for $A \subseteq F$.

Given an instance (G, S, f, ℓ) of the RD-DISJOINTCLUSTER problem, we define an instance (U, F, β, f', ℓ') of the SCP problem as follows:

- $U = S$.
- $F = \{S_i = N(v_i) \cap S \mid v_i \in G \setminus S\}$.
- $\beta_i = \{S_j \mid v_j \in C_i\}$, for $i \in [q]$.
- $f' = f$.
- $\ell' = \ell$.

It is not hard to show that the RD-DISJOINTCLUSTER and SCP are equivalent problems.

► **Observation 11.** (G, S, f, ℓ) is a YES instance of the RD-DISJOINTCLUSTER problem if and only if (U, F, β, f', ℓ') is a YES instance of the SCP problem.

Now, we propose an algorithm to solve the SCP problem.

► **Theorem 12.** The SET-COVERWITHPARTITION problem can be solved in $2^{|U|}O(m \cdot |U|)$ time.

Proof. We propose a dynamic programming algorithm to solve the problem. For every $W \subseteq U$, $j \in [m]$ and $b \in \{0, 1, 2\}$, we define $OPT[W, j, b] := \min_X \{2|X| + g_j(X)\}$, where X satisfies the following properties:

XX:8 (Independent) Roman Domination Parameterized by Distance to Cluster

1. $X \subseteq \{S_1, \dots, S_j\}$.
2. X covers W .
3. Let β_x be the block that contains S_j . We redefine $f_x = b$, where f_x is the flag associated with β_x . From every block β_i ($i \leq x$) with $f_i = 2$, at least one set from β_i is in X .
4. The function g_j is defined as follows. $g_j(X) :=$ number of blocks β_i ($i \leq x$) with $f_i = 1$, which have empty intersection with X .

Now, coming to the base case, for every $W \subseteq U$, with $W \neq \emptyset$ and $b \in \{0, 1, 2\}$; $OPT[W, 1, b] = 2$ if $W \subseteq S_1$, $OPT[W, 1, b] = \infty$, otherwise.

If $W = \emptyset$, $OPT[W, 1, b] = b$, for $b \in \{0, 1, 2\}$. To compute all the values of $OPT[W, j, b]$, we initially set all the remaining values to be ∞ . We construct the following recursive formulation for $OPT[W, j + 1, b]$, for $j \geq 1$:

Case 1: S_{j+1} is not the first set of the block β_x .

Note that two possibilities appear here. First, we pick S_{j+1} in the solution X . Hence, we are left with the problem of covering $W \setminus S_{j+1}$ with some subset of $\{S_1, \dots, S_j\}$ and since S_{j+1} from the partition β_x is already taken in solution, so the flag of β_x can be reset to 0. Hence, in this case $OPT[W, j + 1, b] = 2 + OPT[W \setminus S_{j+1}, j, 0]$.

In the latter case, we do not pick S_{j+1} in X ; hence nothing is changed except the fact that now we need to cover W with a subset of $\{S_1, \dots, S_j\}$ and the flag of β_x remains unchanged as b . Hence, $OPT[W, j + 1, b] = OPT[W, j, b]$.

So, $OPT[W, j + 1, b] = \min\{2 + OPT[W \setminus S_{j+1}, j, 0], OPT[W, j, b]\}$.

Case 2: S_{j+1} is the first set of the block β_x . Here, three scenarios can appear:

Case 2.1: $b = 2$.

In this case, there is no option but to include S_{j+1} in the solution as $b = 2$. Hence, we take S_{j+1} in the solution and shift to the previous block. Now we need to cover $W \setminus S_{j+1}$ with a subset of $\{S_1, \dots, S_j\}$. Hence, $OPT[W, j + 1, b] = 2 + OPT[W \setminus S_{j+1}, j, f_{x-1}]$.

Case 2.2: $b = 0$.

In this case, there are two choices, to include S_{j+1} in the solution or not. If we include S_{j+1} in the solution, then $OPT[W, j + 1, b] = 2 + OPT[W \setminus S_{j+1}, j, f_{x-1}]$. If we do not, then $OPT[W, j + 1, b] = OPT[W, j, f_{x-1}]$. Hence $OPT[W, j + 1, b] = \min\{2 + OPT[W \setminus S_{j+1}, j, f_{x-1}], OPT[W, j, f_{x-1}]\}$

Case 2.3: $b = 1$.

Similarly, in this case, there are two choices. If S_{j+1} is included in the solution then $OPT[W, j + 1, b] = 2 + OPT[W \setminus S_{j+1}, j, f_{x-1}]$, by similar argument as above. If not, then S_{j+1} has to contribute 1 in $OPT[W, j + 1, b]$, as at least one set from the block β_x has to contribute 1 to $OPT[W, j + 1, b]$ and S_{j+1} is the only set left in β_x at this moment. So, in this case, $OPT[W, j + 1, b] = 1 + OPT[W, j, f_{x-1}]$. Hence, $OPT[W, j + 1, b] = \min\{2 + OPT[W \setminus S_{j+1}, j, f_{x-1}], 1 + OPT[W, j, f_{x-1}]\}$.

We compute $OPT[W, j, b]$ in the increasing order of size of W, j, b . Hence, there are $3 \cdot 2^{|U|} \cdot m$ subproblems. It takes $|U|$ time to compute set differences (like $W \setminus S_{j+1}$). Hence, the time-complexity of our algorithm is $2^{|U|}O(m \cdot |U|)$. ◀

Hence, the following corollary can be concluded.

► **Corollary 13.** *The RD-DISJOINTCLUSTER problem can be solved in time $2^{|S|}n^{O(1)}$.*

► **Theorem 14.** *The RD-CVD problem can be solved in time $4^k n^{O(1)}$.*

Proof. Given an instance (G, S, ℓ) of the RD-CVD problem and for every guess of $S'_1, S'_2 \subseteq S$ (with $|S'_1| = i_1$ and $|S'_2| = i_2$), we can construct an instance $(\hat{G}, \hat{S}, f, \hat{\ell})$ of the RD-DISJOINTCLUSTER problem, which can be solved in time $2^{k-i_1-i_2}n^{O(1)}$. Hence, total time taken is $\sum_{i_1=1}^k \binom{k}{i_1} \sum_{i_2=1}^{k-i_1} \binom{k-i_1}{i_2} 2^{k-i_1-i_2} n^{O(1)} = 4^k n^{O(1)}$. ◀

In the next section, using a similar approach, we show that the IRD-CVD problem is also FPT.

3.2 Independent Roman Domination

In this section, we propose an FPT algorithm for the Independent Roman Domination problem when the parameter is the CVD size.

Similarly, like the case of Roman Domination, a guess for $S_1 = V_1 \cap S$ and $S_2 = V_2 \cap S$ is made, where (V_1, V_2) is an optimal independent Roman Dominating pair. At first, we guess an independent set S_2 from S and then delete all the vertices of $N[S_2]$ from the graph, as if our choice of S_2 is right, then all the vertices in $N(S_2) \setminus S_2$ should have label 0. Then, we choose another independent set S_1 from the remaining S and delete all the vertices of S_1 and $N(S_1) \cap (G \setminus S)$ from the remaining graph. Note that if there exists a clique $C_i \subseteq N[S_1] \cup N[S_2]$ such that C_i has a vertex v , that is not adjacent to any vertex of S_2 , but it is adjacent to some vertex in S_1 , then our choices of S_1, S_2 are incorrect, and we do not move further with these choices of S_1 and S_2 .

Note that S is a CVD set, hence $G \setminus S$ is disjoint union of cliques. Let $G \setminus S = C_1 \cup C_2 \cup \dots \cup C_q$, where every C_i is a clique and $|C_i| = \ell_i$, for $i \in [q]$. Note that $q \leq n - k$. Note that, after the selection of S_1 and S_2 and the deletion process, every clique belongs to exactly one of the following two types:

Type 1 (T_1) cliques: C_i is a T_1 clique if C_i has exactly one vertex.

Type 2 (T_2) cliques: C_i is a T_2 clique if C_i has at least two vertices.

▶ **Observation 15.** *Given a T_2 clique C_i , any independent Roman Dominating pair (V_1, V_2) extended from (S_1, S_2) has the following property: $C_i \cap V_2 \neq \emptyset$.*

Proof. C_i is a T_2 clique, hence there exist at least two vertices v_1, v_2 in C_i . Note that both of them can not have non zero labels; at least one of them must have label 0. Without loss of generality, let v_1 have label 0, but v_1 does not have any neighbor in S , which has label 2, which implies a vertex in C_i must have label 2. Hence, the result follows. ◀

Hence the remaining problem can be rephrased as follows:

IRD-DISJOINTCLUSTER problem

Input: A graph $G = (V, E)$, a subset $S \subseteq V$ such that every component of $G \setminus S$ is a clique, a $(1, 2)$ -flag vector $f = (f_1, f_2, \dots, f_q)$ corresponding to the cliques (C_1, C_2, \dots, C_q) and $\ell \in \mathbb{Z}^+$.

Parameter: $|S|$.

Question: Does there exists a subset $T \subseteq G \setminus S$ which satisfies all of the following conditions?

- a. For every C_i with $f_i = 2$, $|T \cap C_i| = 1$.
- b. $2|T| + g(T) \leq \ell$, where $g(T) =$ number of cliques with flag 1, which have empty intersection with T .

For an instance (G, S, ℓ) of the IRD-CVD problem, with cliques C_1, \dots, C_q and the guesses of S_1, S_2 , we build an instance $(\hat{G}, \hat{S}, f, \hat{\ell})$ of the IRD-DISJOINTCLUSTER problem as follows:

XX:10 (Independent) Roman Domination Parameterized by Distance to Cluster

- $\hat{G} = G \setminus (S_1 \cup N[S_2] \cup (N(S_1) \cap (G \setminus S)))$.
- $\hat{S} = S \setminus (N[S_2] \cup S_1)$.
- $\hat{\ell} = \ell - 2|S_2| - |S_1|$.
- $f_i = j$, if C_i is a T_j clique, $i \in [q]$ and $j \in \{1, 2\}$.

Formulation of the problem as a variant of set cover: We define a variant of the set cover problem similarly to the Roman Domination problem. Given an instance of the IRD-DISJOINTCLUSTER problem, we construct an instance of the set cover problem. Let (G, S, ℓ, f) be an instance of the IRD-DISJOINTCLUSTER problem and ρ be any arbitrary order of the vertex set $G \setminus S$. We take the universe $U = S$ and $F = \{S_1, S_2, \dots, S_{|G \setminus S|}\}$, where $S_i = N(v_i) \cap S$ for every $i \in [|G \setminus S|]$. Now, we modify the usual set cover problem to suit our problem. The modified set cover problem is defined below:

INDEPENDENT-SET-COVERWITHPARTITION problem (ISCP)

Input: Universe U , a family of sets $F = \{S_1, S_2, \dots, S_m\}$, a partition of $\beta = (\beta_1, \dots, \beta_q)$ of F , a $(1, 2)$ flag vector $f = (f_1, f_2, \dots, f_q)$ corresponding to each block in the partition β and a non-negative integer ℓ .

Parameter: $|U|$.

Question: Does there exist a subset $F' \subseteq F$ which satisfies all of the following conditions?

- a. For every β_i with $f_i = 2$, $|F' \cap \beta_i| = 1$.
- b. $2|F'| + g(F') \leq \ell$, where $g(A) =$ number of blocks with flag 1, which have empty intersection with A ; for $A \subseteq F$.

Given an instance (G, S, f, ℓ) of the IRD-DISJOINTCLUSTER problem, we define an instance (U, F, β, f', ℓ') of the ISCP problem as follows:

- $U = S$.
- $F = \{S_i = N(v_i) \cap S \mid v_i \in G \setminus S\}$.
- $\beta_i = \{S_j \mid v_j \in C_i\}$, for $i \in [q]$.
- $f' = f$.
- $\ell' = \ell$.

► **Observation 16.** (G, S, f, ℓ) is a YES instance of the IRD-DISJOINTCLUSTER problem if and only if (U, F, β, f', ℓ') is a YES instance of the ISCP problem.

Next we propose an algorithm to solve the ISCP problem.

► **Theorem 17.** The INDEPENDENT-SET-COVERWITHPARTITION problem can be solved in $2^{|U|}O(m \cdot |U|)$ time.

Proof. We propose a dynamic programming algorithm to solve the problem, similar to the algorithm used in the previous section, with slight modifications. For every $W \subseteq U$, $j \in [m]$ and $b \in \{1, 2\}$, we define $OPT[W, j, b] := \min_X \{2|X| + g_j(X)\}$, where X satisfies the following properties:

1. $X \subseteq \{S_1, \dots, S_j\}$.
2. X covers W .
3. Let β_x be the block that contains S_j . We redefine $f_x = b$, where f_x is the flag associated with β_x . From every block β_i ($i \leq x$) with $f_i = 2$, exactly one set from β_i is in X .
4. $g_j(X) :=$ number of blocks β_i ($i \leq x$) with $f_i = 1$, which have empty intersection with X .

The base cases are defined as follows:

If $S_j \in \beta_1$ and $W \neq \emptyset$, then $OPT[W, j, b] = 2$ if $W \subseteq S_i$, for some $i \leq j$ and $OPT[W, j, b] = \infty$ otherwise.

If $S_j \in \beta_1$ and $W = \emptyset$, then $OPT[W, j, b] = b$. To compute all the values of $OPT[W, j, b]$, we initially set all the remaining values to be ∞ . We construct the following recursive formulation for $OPT[W, j + 1, b]$, (where $S_{j+1} \notin \beta_1$):

Case 1: S_{j+1} is not the first set of the block β_x .

Then, two choices appear. The first one is to include S_{j+1} in the solution, then we are left with the problem of covering $W \setminus S_{j+1}$ by a subset of $\{S_1, \dots, S_k\}$, where S_k is the last set in the block β_{x-1} . Hence for this choice, $OPT[W, j + 1, b] = 2 + OPT[W \setminus S_{j+1}, k, f_{x-1}]$.

If S_{j+1} is not included in the solution, then $OPT[W, j + 1, b] = OPT[W, j, b]$. Hence $OPT[W, j + 1, b] = \min\{2 + OPT[W \setminus S_{j+1}, k, f_{x-1}], OPT[W, j, b]\}$.

Case 2: S_{j+1} is the first set of the block β_x .

Case 2.1: $b = 2$.

In this case, there is no option but to include S_{j+1} in the solution as $b = 2$. Hence, we shift to the previous block, and now we need to cover $W \setminus S_{j+1}$ with a subset of $\{S_1, \dots, S_j\}$. Hence, $OPT[W, j + 1, b] = 2 + OPT[W \setminus S_{j+1}, j, f_{x-1}]$.

Case 2.2: $b = 1$.

In this case, there are two choices. If S_{j+1} is included in the solution then $OPT[W, j + 1, b] = 2 + OPT[W \setminus S_{j+1}, j, f_{x-1}]$, by similar argument as above. If not, then S_{j+1} has to contribute 1 in $OPT[W, j + 1, b]$, as at least one set from the block β_x has to contribute 1 to $OPT[W, j + 1, b]$ and S_{j+1} is the only set left in β_x at this moment. So, in this case, $OPT[W, j + 1, b] = 1 + OPT[W, j, f_{x-1}]$. Hence, $OPT[W, j + 1, b] = \min\{2 + OPT[W \setminus S_{j+1}, j, f_{x-1}], 1 + OPT[W, j, f_{x-1}]\}$.

We compute $OPT[W, j, b]$ in the increasing order of size of W, j, b . Hence, there are $2 \cdot 2^{|U|} \cdot m$ subproblems. Each subproblem takes $|U|$ time to compute set differences (like $W \setminus S_{j+1}$). Hence, the time-complexity of our algorithm is $2^{|U|} O(m \cdot |U|)$. ◀

Hence, the following corollary can be concluded.

▶ **Corollary 18.** *The IRD-DISJOINTCLUSTER problem can be solved in time $2^{|S|} n^{O(1)}$.*

▶ **Theorem 19.** *The IRD-CVD problem can be solved in time $4^k n^{O(1)}$.*

Proof. The proof is analogous to the proof of Theorem 14. ◀

4 Lower Bounds

In this section, we propose a lower bound on the time-complexity of the RD-CVD problem. We also show that the RD-CVD (resp. RD-VC) problem does not admit a polynomial kernel (recall that RD-VC is the Roman Domination problem parameterized by vertex cover number).

First, we provide the lower bound for the RD-CVD problem. Below, we state a necessary result from the existing literature (refer to Theorem 1.1 in [4]).

▶ **Theorem 20.** [4] *The following statement is equivalent to SETH: For every $\epsilon < 1$, there exists $d \in \mathbb{Z}^+$, such that the d -HITTING SET problem for set systems over $[n]$ can not be solved in time $O(2^{\epsilon n})$.*

Now, we show a reduction from the d -HITTING SET problem to the RD-CVD problem to show a similar lower bound like Theorem 20 for the RD-CVD problem.

XX:12 (Independent) Roman Domination Parameterized by Distance to Cluster

► **Theorem 21.** *There exists a polynomial time algorithm that takes an instance (U, F, t) of the d -HITTING SET problem and outputs an instance $(G, 2t)$ of the RD-CVD problem (and the RD-VC problem), where G has a cluster vertex deletion set (and vertex cover) of size $|U|$; and (U, F) has a d -hitting set of size at most t if and only if G has a Roman Dominating function of size at most $2t$.*

Proof. Consider a d -HITTING SET instance (U, F, t) , where $U = \{u_1, \dots, u_n\}$ and $F = \{S_1, \dots, S_m\}$. We construct a graph $G = (V, E)$ as follows:

- $V = U \cup F_1 \cup F_2$, where the vertices of U correspond to elements of the universe U and vertices in F_1 and F_2 correspond to sets in F . $U = \{u_1, \dots, u_n\}$ and $F_i = \{s_j^i \mid S_j \in F\}$, for $i \in \{1, 2\}$.
- $E = E_1 \cup E_2 \cup E_3$, where $E_1 = \{u_i u_j \mid i, j \in [n], i \neq j\}$, $E_2 = \{u_i s_j^1 \mid u_i \in S_j\}$ and $E_3 = \{u_i s_j^2 \mid u_i \in S_j\}$.

Note that G is a split graph, where U is a clique, and $F_1 \cup F_2$ is the independent set. U is a cluster vertex deletion set and a vertex cover of G .

Let (U, F, t) be a YES instance, which implies that there exists $S \subseteq U$, such that $S \cap S_i \neq \emptyset$, for every $i \in [m]$, and $|S| \leq t$. Now, we define a function on V as follows: $f : V \rightarrow \{0, 1, 2\}$, where $f(v) = 2$ for $v \in S$ and $f(v) = 0$, otherwise. Now, since $S \subseteq U$, $f(v) = 0$ for every $v \in F_1 \cup F_2$. For every $s_j^i \in F_i$, there must exist $u_k \in S$ which is adjacent to s_j^i , since S must have an element u_k which hits the set S_j . For every $v \in U \setminus S$, with $f(v) = 0$ is adjacent to some vertex with f -value 2, as $G[U]$ is a clique and S is nonempty. Hence, we can conclude that f is an RDF with weight at most $2|S| \leq 2t$.

Conversely, let f be an RDF with $w(f) \leq 2t$. First, we prove the following claim.

▷ **Claim 22.** There exists an RDF g on V with weight at most $w(f)$, which satisfies the property: $g(v) = 0$, for all $v \in F_1 \cup F_2$.

Proof. Let there exist $v \in F_1 \cup F_2$, such that $f(v) > 0$. Two cases may appear:

Case 1: $f(v) = 1$

Without loss of generality, let $v \in F_1$, hence $v = s_j^1$ for some $j \in [m]$. If s_j^1 has a neighbour v' which has non zero label, then define a function $f' : V \rightarrow \{0, 1, 2\}$ as follows: $f'(v') = 2$ and $f'(s_j^1) = 0$ and $f'(u) = f(u)$ for every other $u \in V$. Note that f' is an RDF and $w(f') \leq w(f)$.

Now, if every neighbour of s_j^1 has label 0 under f , then observe that $f(s_j^2) > 0$. Hence, we define a function $f' : V \rightarrow \{0, 1, 2\}$ as follows: $f'(v') = 2$, $f'(s_j^1) = f'(s_j^2) = 0$, where v' is a neighbour of s_j^1 and $f'(u) = f(u)$ for every other $u \in V$. Note that f' is an RDF and $w(f') \leq w(f)$.

Case 2: $f(v) = 2$

In this case, we define a function $f' : V \rightarrow \{0, 1, 2\}$ as follows: $f'(v') = 2$, $f'(v) = 0$, where v' is a neighbour of v and $f'(u) = f(u)$ for every other $u \in V$. Note that f' is an RDF and $w(f') \leq w(f)$.

Hence, in both cases, we can define another RDF f' of the same or less weight than f , such that $|(V_1^{f'} \cup V_2^{f'}) \cap (F_1 \cup F_2)| < |(V_1^f \cup V_2^f) \cap (F_1 \cup F_2)|$. Hence, applying this technique iteratively, we get an RDF g , with $w(g) \leq w(f)$ and $|(V_1^g \cup V_2^g) \cap (F_1 \cup F_2)| = 0$. Hence, the claim follows. ◀

Hence, by Claim 22, we consider an RDF f on V , such that $f(v) = 0$, for every $v \in F_1 \cup F_2$ and $w(f) \leq 2t$. We define $S = \{v \in U \mid f(v) = 2\}$. Note that $|S| \leq \frac{2t}{2} = t$ and every vertex of $F_1 \cup F_2$ is adjacent to some vertex of S . This implies that S is a hitting set of (U, F) of cardinality at most t . Hence, the theorem follows. ◀

Hence, by Theorem 20 and 21, we can prove the following theorem.

► **Theorem 23.** *The RD-CVD (and RD-VC) problem can not be solved in time $2^{\epsilon k} n^{O(1)}$, for any $0 < \epsilon < 1$, unless SETH fails.*

Proof. Let the RD-CVD (or RD-VC) problem be solved in time $2^{\epsilon k} n^{O(1)}$. Then by Theorem 21, we can solve the d -HITTING SET problem with $|U| = k$ in $2^{\epsilon k} n^{O(1)}$ time. Hence, by Theorem 20, this contradicts the SETH. Hence, the RD-CVD (and RD-VC) problem can not be solved in time $2^{\epsilon k} n^{O(1)}$, unless the SETH fails. ◀

We state another theorem to show that the RD-CVD (and RD-VC) problem is unlikely to admit a polynomial kernel.

► **Theorem 24.** *[6] The d -HITTING SET problem parameterized by the universe size does not admit any polynomial kernel unless $NP \subseteq coNP/poly$.*

Hence combining the above discussion with Theorem 24, the following theorem can be concluded.

► **Theorem 25.** *The RD-CVD (and RD-VC) problem does not admit a polynomial kernel unless $NP \subseteq coNP/poly$.*

Proof. By Theorem 24, the d -HITTING SET problem parameterized by universe size does not admit a polynomial kernel unless $NP \subseteq coNP/poly$. Since the reduction provided in Theorem 21 is a polynomial parameter transformation (PPT), by Theorem 7, the RD-CVD and RD-VC do not admit a polynomial kernel unless $NP \subseteq coNP/poly$. ◀

5 Conclusion

In this work, we have extended the study on the parameterized complexity of the Roman Domination problem and one of its variants. There are other interesting structural parameters, such as neighborhood diversity and cliquewidth, for which it would be interesting to determine whether the problem parameterized by these parameters is fixed parameter tractable (FPT).

Another promising research direction is to develop an algorithm to solve the RD-CVD problem with better time-complexity than $4^k n^{O(1)}$. Given that the lower bound on time-complexity mentioned in Theorem 23, it might be possible to achieve an improved algorithm.

References

- 1 Jochen Alber, Michael R. Fellows, and Rolf Niedermeier. Polynomial-time data reduction for dominating set. *J. ACM*, 51(3):363–384, 2004.
- 2 Hans L. Bodlaender, Stéphan Thomassé, and Anders Yeo. Kernel bounds for disjoint cycles and disjoint paths. *Theor. Comput. Sci.*, 412(35):4570–4578, 2011.
- 3 Anudhyan Boral, Marek Cygan, Tomasz Kociumaka, and Marcin Pilipczuk. A fast branching algorithm for cluster vertex deletion. *Theory Comput. Syst.*, 58(2):357–376, 2016.
- 4 Marek Cygan, Holger Dell, Daniel Lokshtanov, Dániel Marx, Jesper Nederlof, Yoshio Okamoto, Ramamohan Paturi, Saket Saurabh, and Magnus Wahlström. On problems as hard as cnf-sat. *ACM Trans. Algorithms*, 12, may 2016.
- 5 Marek Cygan, Fedor V. Fomin, Lukasz Kowalik, Daniel Lokshtanov, Dániel Marx, Marcin Pilipczuk, Michal Pilipczuk, and Saket Saurabh. *Parameterized Algorithms*. Springer, 2015.
- 6 Michael Dom, Daniel Lokshtanov, and Saket Saurabh. Kernelization lower bounds through colors and ids. *ACM Trans. Algorithms*, 11, 2014.
- 7 Rodney G. Downey and Michael R. Fellows. Fixed-parameter tractability and completeness II: on completeness for W[1]. *Theor. Comput. Sci.*, 141(1&2):109–131, 1995.

XX:14 (Independent) Roman Domination Parameterized by Distance to Cluster

- 8 Henning Fernau. ROMAN DOMINATION: a parameterized perspective. *Int. J. Comput. Math.*, 85(1):25–38, 2008.
- 9 Fedor V. Fomin and Dieter Kratsch. *Exact Exponential Algorithms*. Texts in Theoretical Computer Science. An EATCS Series. Springer, 2010.
- 10 Dishant Goyal, Ashwin Jacob, Kaushtubh Kumar, Diptapriyo Majumdar, and Venkatesh Raman. Parameterized complexity of dominating set variants in almost cluster and split graphs. *CoRR*, abs/2405.10556, 2024.
- 11 Russell Impagliazzo, Ramamohan Paturi, and Francis Zane. Which problems have strongly exponential complexity? *J. Comput. Syst. Sci.*, 63(4):512–530, 2001.
- 12 A. Mohanapriya, P. Renjith, and N. Sadagopan. Roman k-domination: Hardness, approximation and parameterized results. In Chun-Cheng Lin, Bertrand M. T. Lin, and Giuseppe Liotta, editors, *WALCOM: Algorithms and Computation - 17th International Conference and Workshops, WALCOM 2023, Hsinchu, Taiwan, March 22-24, 2023, Proceedings*, volume 13973 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 343–355. Springer, 2023.
- 13 Geevarghese Philip, Venkatesh Raman, and Somnath Sikdar. Polynomial kernels for dominating set in graphs of bounded degeneracy and beyond. *ACM Trans. Algorithms*, 9(1):11:1–11:23, 2012.
- 14 Ian Stewart. Defend the roman empire! *Scientific American*, 281:136–138, 1999.