

Parameterized Complexity of Star Decomposition Problem

Sahab Hajebi

Department of Combinatorics and Optimization, University of Waterloo, Waterloo, Ontario, Canada
s2hajebi@uwaterloo.ca

Ramin Javadi 

Isfahan University of Technology, Isfahan, Iran
rjavadi@iut.ac.ir

Abstract

A star of length ℓ is defined as the complete bipartite graph $K_{1,\ell}$. In this paper we deal with the problem of edge decomposition of graphs into stars of varying lengths. Given a graph G and a list of integers $S = (s_1, \dots, s_t)$, an S -star decomposition of G is an edge decomposition of G into graphs G_1, G_2, \dots, G_t such that G_i is isomorphic to a star of length s_i , for each $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, t\}$. Given a graph G and a list of integers S , STAR DECOMPOSITION problem asks if G admits an S -star decomposition. The problem is known to be NP-complete even when all stars are of length three. In this paper, we investigate parametrized complexity of the problem with respect to the structural parameters such as minimum vertex cover, treewidth, tree-depth and neighborhood diversity as well as some intrinsic parameters of the problem such as number of distinct star lengths, the maximum size of stars and the maximum degree of the graph, giving a roughly complete picture of the parameterized complexity landscape of the problem.

2012 ACM Subject Classification Theory of computation \rightarrow Fixed parameter tractability; Theory of computation \rightarrow Integer Programming

Keywords and phrases Star decomposition, parameterized complexity, vertex cover, treewidth, tree-depth, neighborhood diversity, linear programming.

1 Introduction

By a star of length s we mean the complete bipartite graph $K_{1,s}$ and the vertex of degree s is called the center of the star. Let $G = (V, E)$ be a simple graph. A decomposition of G is a collection of subgraphs of G say $\mathcal{G} = \{G_1, \dots, G_n\}$ where each edge of G is in exactly one G_i . If all G_i 's are isomorphic to a star, then we say that \mathcal{G} is a star decomposition. Let \mathcal{S} be a multiset of positive integers. By an \mathcal{S} -star decomposition, we mean a star decomposition where the lengths of stars of the decomposition are in \mathcal{S} with the same multiplicities. Given a graph G and a multiset \mathcal{S} , the STAR DECOMPOSITION seeks for an \mathcal{S} -star decomposition for G . In this paper, we consider the high-multiplicity setting of the problem in which the multiset \mathcal{S} is encoded with its distinct elements and its multiplicities. More precisely, suppose that the distinct integers in \mathcal{S} are s_1, \dots, s_d with multiplicities a_1, \dots, a_d , then we assume that \mathcal{S} is encoded by (\mathbf{s}, \mathbf{a}) , where $\mathbf{s} = (s_1, \dots, s_d)$ and $\mathbf{a} = (a_1, \dots, a_d)$. Therefore, G admits an (\mathbf{s}, \mathbf{a}) -star decomposition if there exists a star decomposition \mathcal{G} for G such that for each $i \in [d]$, there are exactly a_i stars of length s_i in \mathcal{G} . It is clear that if such a decomposition exists, then $\mathbf{s} \cdot \mathbf{a} = \sum_{i=1}^d a_i s_i = |E(G)|$. So, the problem can be formulated as follows.

STAR DECOMPOSITION

Input: A graph $G = (V, E)$ and two vectors of positive integers (\mathbf{s}, \mathbf{a}) such that $\mathbf{s} \cdot \mathbf{a} = |E|$.

Question: Does G admit an (\mathbf{s}, \mathbf{a}) -star decomposition?

STAR DECOMPOSITION problem can be seen as a two-stage problem where in first stage, we choose an orientation on the edges of the graph G and in second stage we distribute the star lengths on vertices of G such that the sum of star lengths assigned to each vertex v is equal to the out-degree of v . The second stage is in fact a bin packing problem in which a set of items with prescribed weights (star lengths) as well as a set of bins (vertices of G) with different capacities (out-degrees) are given and the task is to assign items to bins such that the sum of item weights assigned to each bin does not exceed its capacity.

In this paper, we will investigate parameterized complexity of STAR DECOMPOSITION by considering structural parameters of the input graph such as treewidth (tw), tree-depth (td), neighborhood diversity (nd) and vertex cover number (vc) as well as the intrinsic parameters of the problem such as d (the number of star types), $s = \max_i s_i$ (the maximum length of stars) and Δ (the maximum degree of the graph). It can be easily seen that

$$d \leq s \leq \Delta, \tag{1}$$

$$\text{tw} \leq \text{td} \leq \text{vc}, \tag{2}$$

$$\text{nd} \leq 2^{\text{vc}} + \text{vc}. \tag{3}$$

For the proof of (2) and (3) see [20]. In [10] it is proved that the decomposition of a graph into stars of lengths three is NP-hard on graphs of maximum degree 4. Therefore, the problem is para-NP-hard with all parameters d, s, Δ .

► **Theorem 1.** [10] *The problem of decomposition of a graph of maximum degree four into stars of length three $K_{1,3}$ is NP-hard. Consequently, STAR DECOMPOSITION is NP-hard for $d = 1, s = 3$ and $\Delta = 4$.*

We begin with improving the above result by proving that STAR DECOMPOSITION is NP-hard even on Hamiltonian planar graphs when $d = 2, s = 3$, and $\Delta = 3$. We also prove that this is the border line for NP-hardness, i.e. the problem can be solved in polynomial time on graphs of maximum degree 3 whenever $s \leq 2$ or $(s, d) = (3, 1)$.

By considering STAR DECOMPOSITION on trees and complete graphs, we will show that STAR DECOMPOSITION is W[1]-hard with respect to vertex cover number (vc) on the class of trees of depth at most two and complete graphs (see Theorems 8 and 10). Therefore, the problem is para-NP-hard with respect to treewidth (tw), tree-depth (td) and neighborhood diversity (nd). Hence, we will consider the combined parameters as follows. We will prove that the problem is W[1]-hard with respect to (tw, d) , (td, d) and (nd, d) and is FPT with respect to (vc, d) and (nd, s) . We will also prove that STAR DECOMPOSITION is in XP with respect to vc as well as (tw, d) . A summary of our results is shown in Table 1.

1.1 Related work

The decomposition problems on graphs have been extensively studied in the literature. In particular, the study of decomposition of a graph into stars dates back to 1975 in which Yamamoto et al. [29] found necessary and sufficient conditions for the decomposition of a complete graph or complete bipartite graph into stars of length ℓ . This result was then generalized to the decomposition of complete multipartite graphs [28] and complete multigraphs [26]. Also, in 1980, Tarsi [27] found a sufficient condition for the existence of a decomposition of a graph into stars of varying sizes (see Theorem 6). In particular, he proved that if $s = \max_i s_i \leq n/2$, then K_n admits an (\mathbf{s}, \mathbf{a}) -star decomposition.

The main conjecture about the complexity of decomposition problems was Holyer's conjecture [17] which asserts that given a graph H , the problem of existence of an H -decomposition is NP-complete whenever H has a connected component with at least three

■ **Table 1** Overview of new NP-hardness and parameterized results for the STAR DECOMPOSITION.

| | | d | s | Δ |
|----|---------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------|
| | | NP-h for $d = 1$ [Th. 1] W[1]-h for \mathcal{CB} and \mathcal{T} [Ths. 8,10] | NP-h for $s = 3$ [Ths. 1,7] FPT for \mathcal{CB} | NP-h for $\Delta = 3$ [Th. 7] |
| tw | NP-h for $tw = 1$ [Th. 10] | W[1]-h [Th. 10] XP [Cor. 13] | XP | XP |
| td | NP-h for $td = 2$ [Th. 10] | W[1]-h for \mathcal{T} [Cor. 11] XP | FPT [Cor. 12] | FPT |
| nd | NP-h for $nd = 2$ [Cor. 9] | W[1]-h [Cor. 9] | FPT [Th. 17] | FPT |
| vc | XP [Th. 16] W[1]-h for \mathcal{CB} and \mathcal{T} [Ths. 8,10] | FPT [Th. 14] | FPT | FPT |

edges. After a series of partial results, Holyer's conjecture was settled completely by Dor and Tarsi in a seminal work [8]. A recent result is due to Cameron et al. [3] which studied NP-completeness of the problem of decomposition of complete multigraph into stars of varying sizes.

A related problem is studied in [4] in which we are going to decompose the graph into stars such that the minimum length of stars in the decomposition is as large as possible. They proved that the problem is NP-hard for planar graphs with maximum degree four, and for a given graph, it is hard to check whether there exists a star decomposition with stars of length at least three (it appears to be tractable when three is replaced with two). They also proved that the problem is polytime solvable on graphs with maximum degree three and trees, and they provide a linear time $1/2$ -approximation algorithm.

Another related problem is STAR PARTITION which, given a graph G and positive integer k , looks for a partition of the vertex set (instead of the edge set) of an input graph G into k sets V_1, \dots, V_k such that the induced graph of G on V_i is a star. The problem is known to be NP-complete for many classes including chordal bipartite graphs [22], split graphs, line graphs, subcubic bipartite planar graphs [25], and (C_4, \dots, C_{2t}) -free bipartite graphs for every fixed $t \geq 2$ [9]. At the other hand, it is known that the problem is polynomially solvable for bipartite permutation graphs [2, 13], convex bipartite graphs [1, 6], doubly convex bipartite graphs [1], and trees [16]. From the parameterized complexity aspect, the problem is W[2]-hard with respect to k for bipartite graphs [24]. However, the problem is fixed parameter tractable with respect to k on split graphs and graphs of girth at least five [7, 24], and with respect to parameters vertex cover and treewidth on general graphs [23].

1.2 Notations and Terminology

For two integers m, n , the sets $\{1, \dots, n\}$ and $\{m, \dots, n\}$ are denoted by $[n]$ and $[m, n]$, respectively. For a graph $G = (V, E)$ and two subsets of vertices $A, B \subseteq V$, the set of all edges with one endpoint in A and one endpoint in B is denoted by $E_G(A, B)$ and we define $d_G(A, B) = |E_G(A, B)|$ and $E_G(S) = E_G(S, S)$ (we drop subscripts whenever there is no ambiguity). Also, we say that A is complete (resp. incomplete) to B if every vertex in A is adjacent (resp. nonadjacent) to every vertex in B . Let $G = (V, E)$ be a digraph. For every vertex v , $N_G^+(v)$ (resp. $N_G^-(v)$) stands for the set of vertices u where vu (resp. uv) is an

edge in G . Also, define $\deg_G^+(v) = |N_G^+(v)|$ and $\deg_G^-(v) = |N_G^-(v)|$. Moreover, for a subset $S \subseteq V$, we define $N_S^+(v) = N_G^+(v) \cap S$ and $N_S^-(v) = N_G^-(v) \cap S$.

2 Tools

In this section, we gather all necessary tools that we need through the paper. One of the main tools that we are applying is formulating STAR DECOMPOSITION in different linear programming formats and then deploying existing machinery on solving integer programmings. Consider a general standard form of an ILP as follows.

$$\min\{\mathbf{w} \cdot \mathbf{x} \mid A\mathbf{x} = \mathbf{b}, \mathbf{1} \leq \mathbf{x} \leq \mathbf{u}, \mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{Z}^n\}, \quad (4)$$

where $\mathbf{w} \cdot \mathbf{x}$ is the dot product of \mathbf{w} and \mathbf{x} . It is well-known that ILP is NP-hard in general [5]. The most classic result regarding fixed-parameter tractability of ILP is an old result due to Lenstra which states that ILP is in FPT with respect to the number of variables.

► **Theorem 2.** [21] *An ILP feasibility instance of size L with p variables can be solved using $O(p^{2.5p+o(p)} \cdot L)$ arithmetic operations and space polynomial in L .*

Later, many other techniques beyond Lenstra's algorithm developed for fixed-parameter solvability of ILP. One of the nice approach is solving an ILP when the coefficient matrix is an special matrix such N -fold, tree-fold or In this regards, we can assign some invariants to the coefficient matrix A and solve the ILP in FPT with respect to these invariants.

The *dual graph* corresponding to the matrix A denoted by $G_D(A)$ is a graph which has a vertex for each row of A and two vertices are adjacent if there exists a column such that both rows are non-zero. The *tree-depth* of a graph G denoted by $\text{td}(G)$ is defined as the minimum height of a rooted forest F such that $V(F) = V(G)$ and for each edge $uv \in E(G)$, u is either an ancestor or a descendant of v in F . The *dual tree-depth* of A is defined as $\text{td}_D(A) = \text{td}(G_D(A))$. Also, the *dual treewidth* of A is defined as $\text{tw}_D(A) = \text{tw}(G_D(A))$.

We need the following result which states that an ILP can be solved in FPT time with respect to $\|A\|_\infty$ and $\text{td}_D(A)$.

► **Theorem 3.** [12] *The general ILP problem (4) can be solved in time $O^*((\|A\|_\infty + 1)^{2^{\text{td}_D(A)}})$.*

It is known that the above result cannot be generalized with replacement of $\text{td}_D(A)$ with $\text{tw}_D(A)$ since ILP is NP-hard even when $\|A\|_\infty = 2$ and $\text{tw}_D(A) = 2$ [12]. However, Ganian et al. [11] proved that

► **Theorem 4.** [11] *The general ILP problem (4) can be solved in time $\Gamma^{O(\text{tw}_D(A))} \cdot n$, where*

$$\Gamma = \max_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{Z}^n: A\mathbf{x} = \mathbf{b}, \mathbf{1} \leq \mathbf{x} \leq \mathbf{u}} \max_{k \in [n]} \left\| \sum_{j=1}^k A_j x_j \right\|_\infty. \quad (5)$$

We also need a generalization of Hall's Theorem regarding existence of an SDR for a set family. Let $\mathcal{F} = (F_i : i \in I)$ be a family of sets and $\eta : I \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}^+$ be a function. An η -SDR for \mathcal{F} is a family $(S_i : i \in I)$ of disjoint subsets such that $S_i \subseteq F_i$ and $|S_i| = \eta(i)$, for each $i \in I$. The following theorem gives a necessary and sufficient condition for the existence of an η -SDR for \mathcal{F} .

► **Theorem 5.** *Let $\mathcal{F} = (F_i : i \in I)$ be a family of sets and $\eta : I \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}^+$ be a function. There exists an η -SDR for \mathcal{F} if and only if*

$$\left| \bigcup_{j \in J} F_j \right| \geq \sum_{j \in J} \eta(j), \quad \forall J \subseteq I,$$

and if the above conditions hold, then an η -SDR for \mathcal{F} can be found in $O(n^3)$, where $n = |\cup_{i \in I} F_i|$.

Finally, we need the following result from [27] which guarantees the existence of star decomposition in good expanders.

Given a graph $G = (V, E)$, the *edge expansion* of G is defined as

$$\varphi(G) = \min_{S \subseteq V: S \neq \emptyset} \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{1}{|S|} + \frac{1}{|V \setminus S|} \right) d(S, V \setminus S). \quad (6)$$

► **Theorem 6.** *Let $I = (G(V, E), \mathbf{s}, \mathbf{a})$ be an instance of STAR DECOMPOSITION. If $s = \max_i s_i \leq \varphi(G)$, then I is a yes instance.*

In Section 5, we will generalize the above result and prove that if C is a vertex cover of G and $s \leq \varphi(G[C])$, then G admits an (\mathbf{s}, \mathbf{a}) -star decomposition.

3 Hardness results

In this section, we prove that STAR DECOMPOSITION is NP-hard on graphs of maximum degree 3 even when $d = 2$ and $s = 3$ and this is the border line for NP-hardness of the problem since it is polynomially solvable when either $s \leq 2$ or $s = 3$ and $d = 1$ (by Theorem 1, we know that STAR DECOMPOSITION is NP-hard for graphs of maximum degree four when $s = 3$ and $d = 1$). Also, we prove that the problem is W[1]-hard with respect to the parameters vc and d on the class of all complete bipartite graphs as well as the class of trees with depth 2.

► **Theorem 7.** *STAR DECOMPOSITION is polynomially solvable when $s \leq 2$. It is also polynomially solvable on graphs of maximum degree three when $s = 3$ and $d = 1$. However, it is NP-hard on Hamiltonian planar cubic graphs when $s = 3$ and $d = 2$.*

Proof. Let $(G(V, E), \mathbf{s}, \mathbf{a})$ be an instance of STAR DECOMPOSITION. If $s \leq 2$, we can prove that G has an (\mathbf{s}, \mathbf{a}) -star decomposition if and only if the number of connected components of G with odd sizes is at most a_1 . To see this, note that in any (\mathbf{s}, \mathbf{a}) -star decomposition of G , any odd connected component has at least one star of length one, therefore the number of odd connected components is at most a_1 . For the reverse, we can remove one edge from each odd connected component to ensure that all connected components are even. Then, it is known that every connected graph with even number of edges can be decomposed into paths of length two. So, the star decomposition exists.

Now, suppose that $\Delta(G) = 3$ and $s = 3$ and $d = 1$, i.e. we want to decompose the graph G into stars of length three. If such decomposition exists, then the centers of stars is a vertex cover which is also an independent set. Therefore, G is a bipartite graph where all vertices in one part are of degree three. It is clear that this condition is also sufficient for the existence of the decomposition of G into stars of length three. The condition can be evidently checked in polynomial time.

Finally, we prove that STAR DECOMPOSITION is NP-hard on Hamiltonian planar cubic graphs when $s = 3$ and $d = 2$. We give a reduction from INDEPENDENT SET on Hamiltonian planar cubic graphs which is known to be NP-hard [14]. Given a Hamiltonian planar cubic graph G and integer k as an instance of INDEPENDENT SET, take the same graph G and let $\mathbf{s} = (3, 1)$ and $\mathbf{a} = (k, 3n/2 - 3k)$. We show that G has an independent set of size k if and only if G admits an (\mathbf{s}, \mathbf{a}) -star decomposition. First, let G has an independent set $I = \{v_1, \dots, v_k\}$. So, for each v_i consider a star of length 3 with center v_i and cover all remaining edges with stars of length one. This gives an (\mathbf{s}, \mathbf{a}) -star decomposition for G . Now,

suppose that G admits an (\mathbf{s}, \mathbf{a}) -star decomposition and $I = \{v_1, \dots, v_k\}$ is the set of centers of stars of length 3 in this decomposition. For each $i, j \in [k]$, v_i is not adjacent to v_j , since they have degree three and they cannot share any edge. Thus, I is an independent set of size k of G . ◀

► **Theorem 8.** *STAR DECOMPOSITION is $W[1]$ -hard on the class of all complete bipartite graphs when parameterized by the parameters vc or d .*

Proof. We give a parameterized reduction from UNARY BIN PACKING, which is defined as follows

UNARY BIN PACKING

Input: Given d item types $w_1, \dots, w_d \in \mathbb{Z}^+$ in increasing order and for each $i \in [d]$, there are a_i items of weight w_i . Also, integers $m, B \in \mathbb{Z}^+$ are given. The input $(\mathbf{w}, \mathbf{a}, m, B)$ are given in unary encoding.

Question: Can we partition the items into m bins such that the sum of the weights of items in each bin is at most B ?

Note that if $\sum_{i=1}^d a_i w_i > Bm$, then the answer is obviously no. So, without loss of generality, we can suppose that $\sum_{i=1}^d a_i w_i \leq Bm$. Also, by adding $Bm - \sum_{i=1}^d a_i w_i$ items of weight one, we can assume that $\sum_{i=1}^d a_i w_i = Bm$ and in any solution, the sum of the weights of items in each bin is equal to B .

It is proved that UNARY BIN PACKING is strongly NP-complete [15] and also $W[1]$ -complete when it is parameterized by the number of bins m [18] and also the number of types d [19].

Suppose that $(\mathbf{w}, \mathbf{a}, m, B)$ is an instance of UNARY BIN PACKING, where $\sum_{i=1}^d a_i w_i = Bm$. Set $n = B(m+1)$ and consider the complete bipartite graph $K_{m,n}$ with bipartition (X, Y) , where $X = \{v_1, \dots, v_m\}$ and $Y = \{u_1, \dots, u_n\}$. Now, for each $i \in [d]$, define $s_i = (m+1)w_i$. We claim that $K_{m,n}$ admits an (\mathbf{s}, \mathbf{a}) -star decomposition if and only if $(\mathbf{w}, \mathbf{a}, m, B)$ is a yes-instance for UNARY BIN PACKING.

First, suppose that the items can be partitioned into m bins (multisets) A_1, A_2, \dots, A_m such that for each $i \in [m]$, $\sigma(A_i) = B$. Now, for each $i \in [d]$ and for each item of weight w in A_i , consider a star of length $(m+1)w$ with the center v_i . This gives an (\mathbf{s}, \mathbf{a}) -star decomposition for $K_{m,n}$.

Now, suppose that there exists an (\mathbf{s}, \mathbf{a}) -star decomposition \mathcal{D} for $K_{m,n}$. Since all s_i 's are greater than m , the centers of all stars in \mathcal{D} are in X . Now, for each $i \in [m]$, let M_i be the multiset of lengths of all stars in \mathcal{D} with center v_i . It is clear that $\sigma(M_i) = (m+1)B$. Then, the multisets $A_i = (m+1)^{-1}M_i$, $i \in [m]$, pack all items into m bins of size B . Hence, $(\mathbf{w}, \mathbf{a}, m, B)$ is a yes-instance for UNARY BIN PACKING.

Note that since the input is given in unary encoding, this is a polynomial-time reduction. Also, since $vc = m$ and UNARY BIN PACKING is $W[1]$ -hard with respect to both parameters d and m , STAR DECOMPOSITION is $W[1]$ -hard with respect to both parameters d and vc on the complete bipartite graphs. ◀

Since the complete bipartite graph has neighborhood diversity equal to two, we have the following corollary.

► **Corollary 9.** *STAR DECOMPOSITION is $W[1]$ -hard on the class of all graphs of neighborhood diversity at most two when parameterized by the parameters vc or d .*

In the following theorem, we prove $W[1]$ -hardness of STAR DECOMPOSITION with respect to the parameters vc or d on another class of graphs which is trees of tree-depth at most two.

► **Theorem 10.** *STAR DECOMPOSITION is $W[1]$ -hard on the class of all trees of depth at most two when parameterized by the parameters vc or d .*

Proof. We again provide a parameterized reduction from UNARY BIN PACKING. Let $(\mathbf{w}, \mathbf{a}, m, B)$ be an instance of UNARY BIN PACKING. Again, without loss of generality, we can assume that $\sum_{i=1}^d a_i w_i = Bm$ and for each $i \in [d]$, $w_i \leq B$. Let $\ell = \max\{m, B + 2\}$. Define the rooted tree T with a root r of degree ℓ with children u_1, \dots, u_ℓ such that for each $i \in [m]$, u_i has exactly B children and for each $i \in [m + 1, \ell]$, u_i is a leaf. Also, for each $i \in [d]$, define $s_i = w_i$, $\hat{a}_i = a_i$ and $s_{d+1} = \ell$ and $\hat{a}_{d+1} = 1$. We claim that $(\mathbf{w}, \mathbf{a}, m, B)$ is a yes-instance of UNARY BIN PACKING if and only if T admits an $(\mathbf{s}, \hat{\mathbf{a}})$ -star decomposition.

First, let (A_1, \dots, A_m) be a partition of items into m bins such that $\sigma(A_i) = B$. Now, for each $i \in [d]$ and for each item of weight w in A_i , consider a star of length $(m + 1)w$ with the center u_i . Also, consider a star of length ℓ with the center r . This gives an $(\mathbf{s}, \hat{\mathbf{a}})$ -star decomposition for T . Conversely, let \mathcal{D} be an $(\mathbf{s}, \hat{\mathbf{a}})$ -star decomposition of T . Since r is the only vertex of T with degree ℓ , the center of the unique star of length $s_{d+1} = \ell$ is the vertex r . Now, for each $i \in [m]$, define A_i be the multiset of lengths of all stars in \mathcal{D} with center u_i . Since each u_i has exactly B children, it is clear that $\sigma(A_i) = B$. This implies that $(\mathbf{w}, \mathbf{a}, m, B)$ is a yes-instance for UNARY BIN PACKING.

Note that the set $\{r, u_1, \dots, u_m\}$ is a vertex cover of T and so $vc(T) \leq m + 1$. Also, T is a tree of depth two. Since UNARY BIN PACKING is $W[1]$ -hard with respect to both parameters m and d ([18],[19]), STAR DECOMPOSITION is also $W[1]$ -hard with respect to both parameters vc and d on the class of all trees of depth at most two. ◀

► **Corollary 11.** *STAR DECOMPOSITION is $W[1]$ -hard with respect to the combined parameter (td, d) even on the class of trees.*

4 ILP formulations

Let $I = (G(V, E), \mathbf{s}, \mathbf{a})$ be an instance of STAR DECOMPOSITION. It can be seen that I is a yes-instance if and only if there is an orientation τ on G such that G_τ admits an (\mathbf{s}, \mathbf{a}) star decomposition. Now, we can write an integer linear programming (ILP) for the problem as follows. Suppose that $V = [n]$ and for each vertex $u \in V$ and star length $i \in [d]$, define the variable $x_{i,u}$ as the number of stars of length s_i with the center u . Also, for each edge $e = uv \in E$, $u < v$, define the variable y_e which is equal to one if e is oriented in τ from u to v and is equal to zero, otherwise. Now, it is clear that I is a yes-instance if and only if the following ILP has a feasible solution.

ILP1 :

$$\sum_{u \in V} x_{i,u} = a_i \quad \forall i \in [d] \quad (7)$$

$$\sum_{i=1}^d s_i x_{i,u} = \sum_{\substack{uv \in E \\ u < v}} y_{uv} + \sum_{\substack{uv \in E \\ v < u}} (1 - y_{vu}) \quad \forall u \in V \quad (8)$$

$$x_{i,u} \in \mathbb{Z}^{\geq 0} \quad \forall i \in [d] \text{ and } \forall u \in V$$

$$y_{uv} \in \{0, 1\} \quad \forall uv \in E$$

Constraints (7) assure that the total number of used stars of length s_i on all vertices is equal to a_i , for each $i \in [d]$ and Constraints (8) guarantee that the sum of lengths of stars on vertex u is equal to the out-degree of the vertex u , for each $u \in V$.

Now, we compute the dual tree-depth of ILP1 as follows. Let A be the coefficient matrix of ILP1 which has $n + d$ rows corresponding to n constraints in (7) and d constraints in (8). So, the vertex set of the graph $G_D(A)$ is $U \cup W$ such that $U = \{u_1, \dots, u_n\}$ corresponds to the constraints in (8) and $W = \{w_1, \dots, w_d\}$ corresponds to the constraints in (7). Note that since the constraints in (7) have no common variable, $G_D(A)$ induces a stable set on W . Also, for two adjacent vertices u and v in G , their corresponding constraints in (8) have the variable y_{uv} in common, so $G_D(A)$ induces the graph G on U . Finally every constraint in (7) have a common variable $x_{i,u}$ with every constraint in (8). Therefore, U is complete to W in $G_D(A)$. Hence, $G_D(A)$ is the join of the graph G and an stable set of size d and thus, $\text{td}_D(A) \leq \text{td}(G) + d$ and $\text{tw}_D(A) \leq \text{tw}(G) + d$. Also, $\|A\|_\infty = s = \max_i s_i$. Now, we can apply Theorem 3 to prove that STAR DECOMPOSITION is FPT with respect to $(\text{td}(G), s)$ (note that $d \leq s$).

► **Corollary 12.** *Let $(G(V, E), \mathbf{s}, \mathbf{a})$ be an instance of STAR DECOMPOSITION, td be the tree-depth of the graph G and $s = \max_i s_i$. The problem can be solved in time $O^*((s + 1)^{2^{\text{td} + d}})$. In particular, STAR DECOMPOSITION is in FPT with respect to (td, s) .*

Moreover, we can apply Theorem 4 to prove that STAR DECOMPOSITION is in XP with respect to (tw, d) .

► **Corollary 13.** *Let $(G(V, E), \mathbf{s}, \mathbf{a})$ be an instance of STAR DECOMPOSITION, tw and Δ be the treewidth and the maximum degree of the graph G , respectively, $a = \max_i a_i$ and d be the number of star lengths. The problem can be solved in time $O^*(\max(a, \Delta)^{O(\text{tw} + d)})$. In particular, STAR DECOMPOSITION is in XP with respect to (tw, d) .*

Proof. In the light of Theorem 4 and the fact that in ILP1, we have $\text{tw}_D(A) \leq \text{tw}(G) + d$, it is just enough to prove that in ILP1, $\Gamma \leq \max(a, \Delta)$ (Γ is defined in (5)). For this, let A be the coefficient matrix of ILP1 and let $\mathbf{z} = (\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})$ be a feasible solution for ILP1. For each $i \in [d]$, we have $\sum_{u \in V} x_{i,u} = a_i$, thus $|A_i \mathbf{z}| = a_i$. Also, $x_{i,u} \geq 0$, so for each column k of A , we have $|\sum_{j=1}^k A_{ij} z_j| \leq a_i$. Moreover, for each $u \in V$, because of (8), we have

$$\left| \sum_{j=1}^k A_{uj} z_j \right| \leq \max \left(\sum_{i=1}^d s_i x_{i,u} + \sum_{\substack{uv \in E \\ v < u}} y_{uv}, \sum_{\substack{uv \in E \\ u < v}} y_{uv} \right) \leq \Delta.$$

Therefore, $\Gamma \leq \max(a, \Delta)$ and we are done. ◀

Theorems 8 and 10 guarantee that STAR DECOMPOSITION is W[1]-hard with respect to the parameters vc and d separately. In the following, we prove that the problem happens to be FPT with respect to the combined parameter (vc, d) . First, it should be noted that ILP1 and Theorem 3 is not sufficient to prove FPT-ness of the problem for (vc, d) because if A is the coefficient matrix of ILP1, then $\|A\|_\infty = s = \max_i s_i$ and s could be much larger than any function of vc and d (in fact, vertices in the vertex cover might have large degrees and can receive stars of length much larger than any function of vc and d). On the other hand, the number of variables in ILP1 is $nd + m$ which is not bounded by the parameters and so Theorem 2 is not applicable. Hence, here we are going to write a new ILP for the problem, such that the number of variables is bounded by a function of vc and d and thus, Theorem 2 implies the assertion.

► **Theorem 14.** *STAR DECOMPOSITION is FPT with respect to the parameter (vc, d) . In particular, it can be solved in time at most $O^*(2^{O(d \cdot \log d \cdot vc \cdot 8^{vc})})$.*

Proof. First, let $I = (G(V, E), \mathbf{s}, \mathbf{a})$ be an instance of STAR DECOMPOSITION and $C \subset V$ be a vertex cover of size vc . For convenience, set $C = [vc]$. Also, let $S = V \setminus C$ and $d' = \max\{i \in [d] : s_i \leq vc\}$. Note that for each vertex $v \in S$, the degree of v is at most vc and cannot be the center of any star of length s_i , $i > d'$. For each $i \in [d]$ and each $u \in C$, define the variable $x_{i,u}$ which stands for the number of stars of length s_i with center u . Also, let τ be an orientation on $E(G)$ which induces directed graph G_τ . For each $e = uv \in E$ such that $u, v \in C$ and $u < v$, define the variable y_e which is equal to one if e is oriented in τ from u to v and is equal to zero, otherwise. For each $t \in [0, vc]$, define $\mathcal{B}_t = \{\mathbf{b} \in [0, vc]^{d'} : \sum_{i=1}^{d'} b_i s_i = t\}$. Now, for each subset $T \subset C$ and each vector $\mathbf{b} \in \mathcal{B}_{|T|}$, define a variable $z_{\mathbf{b}, T}$ which stands for the number of vertices $v \in S$ where $N^+(v) = T$ and for each $i \in [d']$, there are exactly b_i stars of length s_i on v . Also, for each $T \subset C$, $i \in [d']$, $b \in [0, vc]$, define

$$z_T = \sum_{\mathbf{b} \in \mathcal{B}_{|T|}} z_{\mathbf{b}, T}, \quad (9)$$

$$z_{b,i} = \sum_{T \subseteq C} \sum_{\mathbf{b} \in \mathcal{B}_{|T|} : b_i = b} z_{\mathbf{b}, T}. \quad (10)$$

Finally, for each $T \subseteq C$, define $N_T = \{v \in S : T \subset N(v)\}$ and for each $u \in C$, define $d_u = |E(u, S)|$. Now, we are ready to introduce the following ILP which has a feasible solution if and only if I is a yes-instance.

ILP2 :

$$\sum_{T \subseteq C} z_T = |S| \quad (11)$$

$$\sum_{u \in C} x_{i,u} + \sum_{b=0}^{vc} b z_{b,i} = a_i \quad \forall i \in [d'] \quad (12)$$

$$\sum_{u \in C} x_{i,u} = a_i \quad \forall i \in [d' + 1, d] \quad (13)$$

$$\sum_{i=1}^d s_i x_{i,u} = \sum_{\substack{uv \in E(C) \\ u < v}} y_{uv} + \sum_{\substack{uv \in E(C) \\ v < u}} (1 - y_{vu}) + d_u - \sum_{\substack{T \subseteq C \\ u \in T}} z_T \quad \forall u \in C \quad (14)$$

$$\sum_{T \in \mathcal{T}} z_T \leq \left| \bigcup_{T \in \mathcal{T}} N_T \right| \quad \forall \mathcal{T} \subseteq 2^C \quad (15)$$

$$x_{i,u} \in \mathbb{Z}^{\geq 0} \quad \forall i \in [d], \forall u \in C$$

$$y_{uv} \in \{0, 1\} \quad \forall uv \in E(C)$$

$$z_{\mathbf{b}, T} \in \mathbb{Z}^{\geq 0} \quad \forall T \subseteq C, \mathbf{b} \in \mathcal{B}_{|T|}$$

Note that z_T is the number of vertices v in S with $N^+(v) = T$, so Constraint (11) assures that every vertex in S is enumerated in some z_T , $T \subseteq C$. Constraints (12) and (13) guarantee that the total number of used stars of length i is exactly equal to a_i , for each $i \in [d]$ (note that vertices in S can receive only stars with length s_i , $i \in [d']$, and vertices in C can receive stars of all lengths s_i , $i \in [d]$). Constraints (14) show that the sum of lengths of stars on each vertex $u \in C$ is equal to $N^+(u)$. Finally, Constraints (15) hold because if a vertex $v \in S$ is

enumerated in some z_T , then $v \in N_T$. Now, we prove that I is a yes-instance if and only if ILP2 has a feasible solution.

Proof of Necessity. Suppose that I is a yes-instance and consider an (\mathbf{s}, \mathbf{a}) -star decomposition of G . Also, let G_τ be its corresponding orientation on G . Assign to each of the variables $x_{i,u}$, y_{uv} and $z_{\mathbf{b},T}$ its corresponding value according to their definitions and define $z_{b,i}$ and z_T as in (9) and (10). Also, for each $T \subseteq S$, define $Z_T = \{v \in S : N^+(v) = T\}$. It is clear that all Z_T 's are disjoint, $|Z_T| = z_T$ and each vertex $v \in S$ is in some Z_T , therefore, Constraint (11) holds. Now, for each star size s_i , $i \in [d']$, there are exactly $x_{i,u}$ stars of length s_i on each vertex $u \in C$ and the number of stars of length s_i on the vertices in S is equal to $\sum_{b=0}^{\text{vc}} b z_{b,i}$ (because each vertex $v \in S$ with exactly b stars of length s_i , for some b , is enumerated in $z_{b,i}$). Thus, Constraints (12) hold. On the other hand, for each star length s_i , $i \in [d' + 1, d]$, no vertices in S can have a star of length s_i , so Constraints (13) also hold. Now, note that for each $u \in C$, $\sum_{i=1}^d s_i x_{i,u}$ is equal to $|N^+(u)| = |N_S^+(u)| + |N_C^+(u)|$. Also, it is clear that $|N_C^+(u)| = \sum_{uv \in E(C), u < v} y_{uv} + \sum_{uv \in E(C), v < u} (1 - y_{uv})$ and $|N_S^+(u)| = +d_u - \sum_{T \subseteq C, u \in T} z_T$ (since $N_S^-(u) = \cup_{T \ni u} Z_T$ and Z_T 's are disjoint). Finally, for each $T \subseteq C$, $Z_T \subseteq N_T$ and Z_T 's are disjoint, so Constraints (15) hold. This implies that there exists a feasible solution to ILP2, as desired.

Proof of sufficiency. Now, suppose that $(x_{i,u}, y_{uv}, z_{\mathbf{b},T})$ is a feasible solution to ILP2 and for each $T \subseteq C$, define z_T as in (9). First, we define an orientation τ on G as follows. If $e = uv$ is an edge with both endpoints in C where $u < v$, then orient e from u to v if and only if $y_{uv} = 1$. Now, apply Theorem 5 by setting $\mathcal{F} = (N_T : T \subseteq C)$ and $\eta(T) = z_T$, for each $T \subseteq C$. Since Constraints (15) hold, there exists an η -SDR for \mathcal{F} , i.e. for each $T \subseteq C$, there exists a subset $Z_T \subseteq N_T$ such that $|Z_T| = z_T$ and Z_T 's are disjoint. Note that because of Constraint 11, the sets Z_T , $T \subseteq C$, partition the set S . Now, for each edge $e = uv$, where $u \in C$ and $v \in Z_T$, for some $T \subseteq C$, orient e from v to u if $u \in T$ and from u to v if $u \in C \setminus T$. This gives rise to an orientation τ on G . Now, we give an (\mathbf{s}, \mathbf{a}) -star decomposition for G_τ . First, because of (9), the set Z_T can be partitioned into arbitrary disjoint subsets $Z_{\mathbf{b},T}$, $\mathbf{b} \in \mathcal{B}_{|T|}$, where $|Z_{\mathbf{b},T}| = z_{\mathbf{b},T}$. Now, for each $i \in [d]$ and $u \in C$, assign $x_{u,i}$ stars of length s_i to the vertex u . Also, for each $i \in [d']$ and $v \in S$, if $v \in Z_{\mathbf{b},T}$, for some $T \subseteq C$ and $\mathbf{b} \in \mathcal{B}_{|T|}$, then assign b_i stars of length s_i to the vertex v . Since for each $v \in Z_{\mathbf{b},T}$, $|N^+(v)| = |T| = \sum_{i=1}^d b_i s_i$, the outdegree of v is equal to the sum of lengths of its assigned stars. On the other hand, for each $u \in C$, $|N^+(u)| = \sum_{u < v} y_{uv} + \sum_{v < u} (1 - y_{uv}) + d_u - \sum_{T \subseteq C, u \in T} z_T$ and so Constraints (14) guarantee that the outdegree of u is equal to the sum of lengths of its assigned stars. Finally, because of Constraints (12) and (13) all stars have been assigned. Hence, G admits an (\mathbf{s}, \mathbf{a}) -star decomposition.

Time analysis. ILP2 has $d \cdot \text{vc}$ variables $x_{i,u}$, at most vc^2 variables y_{uv} , $\sum_{t=0}^{\text{vc}} \binom{\text{vc}}{t} |\mathcal{B}_t|$ variables $z_{\mathbf{b},T}$. Therefore, the total number of variables is at most

$$d \cdot \text{vc} + \text{vc}^2 + \sum_{t=0}^{\text{vc}} \binom{\text{vc}}{t} \binom{t + d'}{d'} \leq d \cdot \text{vc} + \text{vc}^2 + 2^{3 \text{vc}} = O(d \cdot 2^{3 \text{vc}}).$$

Hence, by Theorem 2, ILP2 can be solved in $2^{O(d \cdot \log d \cdot \text{vc} \cdot 2^{3 \text{vc}})}$. Also, since Constraints 15 hold, applying Theorem 5, we can find an η -SDR for $\mathcal{F} = (N_T : T \subseteq C)$ and $\eta(T) = z_T$ in time $O(|S|^3)$. Using this SDR along with variables y_{uv} we can introduce an orientation τ on G . Also, according to the above argument in the proof of sufficiency, assigning the stars to the vertices of G using variables $x_{i,u}$ and $z_{\mathbf{b},T}$ can be done in polynomial time. Hence, the whole process can be done in $O^*(2^{O(d \cdot \log d \cdot \text{vc} \cdot 2^{3 \text{vc}})})$. \blacktriangleleft

► **Remark 15.** We can also define STAR DECOMPOSITION problem for multigraphs and multi-stars. Let $G = (V, E)$ be a loopless multigraph. Also, let (\mathbf{s}, \mathbf{a}) be a multiset. By a multi-star of length s_i , we mean a bipartite multigraph whose one part is of size one and its number of edges is equal to s_i . So, MULTI-STAR DECOMPOSITION problem is whether there exists a decomposition of G into a_1 multi-stars of length s_1, \dots, a_d multi-stars of length s_d . Note that if $G = (V, E)$ is a multigraph with vertex cover C such that all edges in $E(C, V \setminus C)$ are simple (i.e. all parallel edges are inside C), then MULTI-STAR DECOMPOSITION can be solved for G with the same runtime as in Theorem 14, because in ILP2, we can replace the constraint $y_{uv} \in \{0, 1\}$ with $y_{uv} \in [0, m_{uv}]$, where m_{uv} is the multiplicity of the edge uv and everything works accordingly. We will need this fact in the proof of Theorem 17.

In previous result, we proved that STAR DECOMPOSITION is FPT with respect to (vc, d) and in Theorem 8 and 10, we proved that STAR DECOMPOSITION is W[1]-hard with respect to vc . In the following theorem, we will prove that the problem is in XP with respect to vc .

► **Theorem 16.** *STAR DECOMPOSITION is in XP with respect to the parameter vc . More precisely, if a vertex cover of size vc is given, then STAR DECOMPOSITION can be solved in time $O((n + 5^{vc})^{5^{vc}} n^{vc})$.*

Proof. Let $G = (V, E)$ and (\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{s}) be an instance of STAR DECOMPOSITION. Also, let $C = \{u_1, \dots, u_{vc}\} \subset V$ be a minimum vertex cover of size vc and $I = V \setminus C$ (note that C can be found in FPT time). Let d' be the maximum i such that $s_i \leq vc$ and for each $A \subseteq C$, define

$$I_A = \{x \in I : N(x) = A\},$$

$$\mathcal{C}_A = \{(\mathbf{b}, B) : \mathbf{b} = (b_1, \dots, b_{d'}), \forall i \in [d'] \ b_i \leq a_i, B \subseteq A \text{ and } \sum_{i=1}^{d'} s_i b_i = |B|\}.$$

To each vertex $x \in I_A$, we assign a label (\mathbf{b}, B) in \mathcal{C}_A which means that there are exactly b_i stars of length s_i with the center x , $i \in [d']$, and B consists of all the leaves of these stars. For a fixed $A \subseteq C$, consider a solution of the following equation

$$\sum_{(\mathbf{b}, B) \in \mathcal{C}_A} \alpha_{(\mathbf{b}, B)} = |I_A|. \quad (16)$$

This means that there are exactly $\alpha_{(\mathbf{b}, B)}$ vertices in I_A with the label (\mathbf{b}, B) . Now, for each $A \subseteq C$, fix a solution of (16) and assign stars with the center x for each $x \in I_A$ according to its label (\mathbf{b}, B) . Also, let G' be the graph obtained from G by removing edges of all assigned stars (i.e. all edges in $E(x, B)$) and \mathbf{a}' be the list obtained from \mathbf{a} by subtracting the multiplicities of the assigned stars (i.e. $a'_i = a_i - b_i$ for $i \in [d']$ and $a'_i = a_i$ for $i \in [d' + 1, d]$). Now, fix an orientation τ on the edges of G' with both endpoints in C and orient all the remaining edges in G' from C to I and let G'_τ be the directed graph obtained from G' with such orientation. Now, in the final step we check that if G'_τ admits an $(\mathbf{a}', \mathbf{s})$ star decomposition. This can be done by a simple dynamic programming as follows.

For each $i \in [vc]$, let d_i be the out-degree of the vertex u_i in G'_τ . Therefore, $\mathbf{a}' \cdot \mathbf{s} = \sum_{i=1}^{vc} d_i$. We are going to distribute the remaining stars over the vertices in C such that the sum of star lengths assigned to each vertex is equal to its out-degree.

To do this, let $T = \mathbf{a}' \cdot \mathbf{1}$ be the number of remaining stars and let $\eta : [T] \rightarrow \{s_1, \dots, s_d\}$ be a function such that $|\eta^{-1}(s_i)| = a'_i$, for each $i \in [d]$, and for every $i \in \{1, \dots, T\}$ and integers $x_j \in [0, d_j]$, $j \in [vc - 1]$, define

$$f(i, x_1, \dots, x_{vc-1}) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } \exists I_1, \dots, I_{vc-1} \subset \{1, \dots, i\} \text{ s.t. } I_k \cap I_l = \emptyset, k \neq l, \\ & \text{and } \sum_{r \in I_j} \eta(r) = x_j, j \in [vc-1], \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

It is clear that G'_τ admits an $(\mathbf{a}', \mathbf{s})$ star decomposition if and only if $f(T, d_1, \dots, d_{vc-1}) = 1$. Now, we compute the function f recursively using the following dynamic programming.

First, note that $f(1, x_1, \dots, x_{vc-1}) = 1$ if and only if all x_j 's are equal to zero except at most one x_{j_0} , where $x_{j_0} = \eta(1)$. Moreover, note that if $f(i, x_1, \dots, x_{vc-1}) = 1$, then clearly we have $f(i+1, x_1, \dots, x_{vc-1}) = 1$. Also, if there is some $j \in [vc-1]$ such that $x_j \geq \eta(i+1)$ and $f(i, x_1, \dots, x_{j-1}, x_j - \eta(i+1), x_{j+1}, \dots, x_{vc-1}) = 1$, then we can replace I_j with $I_j \cup \{i+1\}$ and so again $f(i+1, x_1, \dots, x_{vc-1}) = 1$. If none of the above two cases happen, then clearly $f(i+1, x_1, \dots, x_{vc-1}) = 0$. Therefore,

$$f(i+1, x_1, \dots, x_{vc-1}) = 1 \text{ iff either } f(i, x_1, \dots, x_{vc-1}) = 1, \text{ or } \exists j \in [vc-1], \\ f(i, x_1, \dots, x_{j-1}, x_j - \eta(i+1), x_{j+1}, \dots, x_{vc-1}) = 1.$$

Hence, we can compute the function f recursively from $i = 1$ to $i = T$. It takes $O(vc)$ to compute each cell of the table. So, the running time of the dynamic programming is $O(T \cdot n^{vc-1} \cdot vc) = O(vc \cdot n^{vc+1})$, since $T \leq n^2$.

Now, we analyze the time complexity of the algorithm. For each $A \subseteq C$ and $B \subseteq A$ with $|B| = k$, the number of labels (\mathbf{b}, B) in \mathcal{C}_A is at most $(k+1)(k/2+1) \cdots (k/k+1) = (2k)!/k!$ (because $0 \leq b_i \leq k/i$). Therefore,

$$|\mathcal{C}_A| \leq \sum_{k=0}^{|A|} \binom{2k}{k} \binom{|A|}{k} \leq \sum_{k=0}^{|A|} 2^{2k} \binom{|A|}{k} = 5^{|A|} \leq 5^{vc}.$$

So, the number of solutions to Equation (16) is at most $\binom{n+5^{vc}-1}{5^{vc}-1} \leq \frac{(n+5^{vc})^{5^{vc}-1}}{(5^{vc}-1)!}$. Since we take a solution of (16) for each $A \subseteq C$ and take an orientation τ (which has at most 2^{vc^2} choices) and then solve a dynamic programming, the running time of the whole algorithm is at most

$$\frac{(n+5^{vc})^{5^{vc}-1}}{(5^{vc}-1)!} \cdot 2^{vc^2} \cdot 2^{vc} \cdot O(vc \cdot n^{vc+1}) \leq O((n+5^{vc})^{5^{vc}} n^{vc}).$$

◀

5 Fixed parameter tractability with respect to (nd, s)

In this section, we prove that STAR DECOMPOSITION is FPT with respect to (nd, s) .

► **Theorem 17.** *STAR DECOMPOSITION is FPT with respect to the parameter (nd, s) .*

In order to prove Theorem 17, we need a couple of lemmas. Let $I = (G(V, E), \mathbf{s}, \mathbf{a})$ be an instance of STAR DECOMPOSITION. First, recall from (6) the definition of the edge expansion of G denoted by $\varphi(G)$. Theorem 6 asserts that if $s \leq \varphi(G)$, then I is a yes-instance. Here, we prove a generalization of this result, which guarantees the existence of star decomposition even when $s \leq \varphi(G \setminus S)$ when S is a stable set in G .

► **Lemma 18.** *Let $I = (G(V, E), \mathbf{s}, \mathbf{a})$ be an instance of STAR DECOMPOSITION. Also, let S be a stable set in G . If $s = \max_i s_i \leq \varphi(G \setminus S)$, then I is a yes instance. In particular, G admits an (\mathbf{s}, \mathbf{a}) -star decomposition such that the center of all stars are in $V(G) \setminus S$.*

In order to prove Lemma 18, we need the following result from [27] about existence of a orientation of a graph with prescribed out-degrees.

► **Lemma 19.** [27] *Let H be a graph on the vertex set $V = [n]$ and $\mathbf{d}^+ = (d_1^+, \dots, d_n^+)$ be a sequence of nonnegative integers. For each $i \in [n]$, define $\delta(i) = \deg(i) - 2d_i^+$. There exists an orientation of H such that $\deg^+(i) = d_i^+$ for each $i \in [n]$ if and only if*

- 1) $\delta(V) = 0$,
- 2) for each $A \subseteq V$, $\delta(A) \leq |E(A, V \setminus A)|$,

where $\delta(A) = \sum_{i \in A} \delta(i)$.

Proof of Lemma 18. Let \mathcal{S} be a multiset consisting of integer s_i with multiplicity a_i , for each $i \in [d]$. Also, let $V \setminus S = [n]$. Now, partition \mathcal{S} into n multisets $\mathcal{B} = (B_1, \dots, B_n)$ and define $d'_i = \sum_{x \in B_i} x$. Moreover, for each $i \in [n]$, define $\deg'(i) = \deg_G(i) + |E(i, S)|$ (note that any edge from i to S is counted twice in $\deg'(i)$) and define $\delta'(i) = \deg'(i) - 2d'_i$. We choose \mathcal{B} such that

$$\max_i \delta'(i) - \min_i \delta'(i) \leq 2s. \quad (17)$$

This can be done, because if there are two $i, j \in [n]$ such that $\delta'(i) - \delta'(j) > 2s$, then we can move an arbitrary integer s_k from B_j to B_i and reduce $|\delta'(i) - \delta'(j)|$ and doing this iteratively we can lead to a partition satisfying Condition (17).

First, it is clear that $\delta'([n]) = 0$. Now, we prove that for each $A \subseteq [n]$, $\delta'(A) \leq d(A, [n] \setminus A)$. To see this, take a subset $A \subseteq [n]$ and let $r = |A|$ and $\mu = \delta'(A)/r$. By (17), we have $\delta'(i) \geq \mu - 2s$, for each $i \in [n]$. Therefore,

$$-\mu r = -\delta'(A) = \delta'([n] \setminus A) \geq (\mu - 2s)(n - r).$$

So, $\mu n \leq 2s(n - r)$ and thus,

$$\delta'(A) = \mu r \leq 2s \frac{r(n - r)}{n} \leq 2\varphi(G \setminus S) \frac{r(n - r)}{n} \leq d(A, [n] \setminus A).$$

Now, for each $i \in [n]$, let $d_i^+ = d'_i - |E(i, S)|$ and $\delta(i) = \deg_{G \setminus S}(i) - 2d_i^+$. It is clear that for each $i \in [n]$, $\delta'(i) = \delta(i)$. So, conditions of Lemma 19 hold for $H = G \setminus S$ and thus, there exists an orientation of $G \setminus S$ such that $\deg_{G \setminus S}^+(i) = d_i^+$ for all $i \in [n]$. Finally, we orient all edges uv , $u \in [n]$, $v \in S$, from u to v . Hence, for each $i \in [n]$, $\deg_G^+(i) = d'_i$ and we assign all stars with length in B_i to the center i and obtain an (\mathbf{s}, \mathbf{a}) -star decomposition for G . ◀

We also need the following observation regarding the edge expansion of complete and complete bipartite graphs.

► **Lemma 20.** *Let $G = (V, E)$ be a complete bipartite graph with parts X and Y such that $|X|, |Y| \geq n$. Then, we have $\varphi(G) \geq n/4$. Also, let $G = (V, E)$ be complete graph on at least n vertices. Then, we have $\varphi(G) \geq n/2$.*

Proof. Suppose that $G = (V, E)$ be the complete bipartite graph with parts X and Y , where $|X| = n_1 \geq n$ and $|Y| = n_2 \geq n$ and let $(S, V \setminus S)$ be the bipartition achieving $\varphi(G)$, and without loss of generality assume that $|S \cap X| \leq n_1/2$. Now, if $|S \cap Y| \geq n_2/2$, then, $d(S, V \setminus S) \geq n_1 n_2 / 4$ and we have

$$\varphi(G) = \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{1}{|S|} + \frac{1}{|V \setminus S|} \right) d(S, V \setminus S) \geq \frac{1}{8} \frac{n_1 n_2 (n_1 + n_2)}{|S| |V \setminus S|} \geq \frac{1}{2} \frac{n_1 n_2}{n_1 + n_2} \geq \frac{n}{4}.$$

Now, suppose that $|S \cap Y| \leq n_2/2$. Then,

$$\varphi(G) \geq \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{d(S, V \setminus S)}{|S|} \right) \geq \frac{|S \cap X| \frac{n_2}{2} + |S \cap Y| \frac{n_1}{2}}{2|S|} \geq \frac{n|S|}{4|S|} = \frac{n}{4}.$$

Thus, we always have $\varphi(G) \geq n/4$, as desired.

Finally, let $G = (V, E)$ be the complete graph on at least n vertices and $(S, V \setminus S)$ be a partition of V . Then, $d(S, V \setminus S) = |S| |V \setminus S|$ and thus

$$\varphi(G) = \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{1}{|S|} + \frac{1}{|V \setminus S|} \right) d(S, V \setminus S) \geq \frac{1}{2} \frac{|S| |V \setminus S| n}{|S| |V \setminus S|} = \frac{n}{2}.$$

◀

Now, we are ready to prove Theorem 17.

Proof of Theorem 17. Let $I = (G(V, E), \mathbf{s}, \mathbf{a})$ be an instance of STAR DECOMPOSITION such that $\text{nd}(G) = \text{nd}$ and $s = \max_i s_i$. Also, let $(V_1, \dots, V_{\text{nd}})$ be a neighborhood diversity decomposition, where $|V_1| \geq |V_2| \geq \dots \geq |V_{\text{nd}}|$.

First, note that if $s \geq \sqrt{\log \log n} / 4$, then $n \leq 2^{2^{4s}}$ and ILP1 has at most $2^{2^{4s+1}} + s 2^{2^{4s}}$ variables. Therefore, by Theorem 2, the problem can be solved in FPT time with respect to s . Thus, set $m = \sqrt{\log \log n}$ and suppose that $s \leq m/4$.


Now, suppose that $k \in [nd]$ be such that $|V_k| \geq m > |V_{k+1}|$ (note that if $|V_{nd}| \geq m$, then we take V_{nd+1} as the empty set). Now, let $\hat{V} = V_1 \cup \dots \cup V_k$. We construct a partition of \hat{V} as follows.

First, let \hat{G} be the graph whose vertices are corresponding to V_1, \dots, V_k and two vertices corresponding to V_i and V_j are adjacent if V_i is complete to V_j . Now, set $i = 1$ and do the following procedure.


- 1) Consider a non-null connected component of \hat{G} , let T be a spanning tree of this component rooted at a vertex r .
- 2) Consider a vertex $v \in V(T)$ whose all children are leaves and set B_i be the union of all sets V_j corresponding to the vertex v and all its children and remove all these vertices from T . Now, if $V(T) = \{r\}$, then add the set V_j corresponding to r to B_i . If $V(T) = \emptyset$, then go to (3), otherwise set $i = i + 1$ and repeat (2).
- 3) Repeat (1) and (2) for all non-null connected components of \hat{G} . If all remaining vertices in \hat{G} are singleton vertices, then go (4).
- 4) If there is some $v \in V(\hat{G})$ such that its corresponding set V_j is a clique, then remove v from \hat{G} and set $B_i = V_j$, $i = i + 1$ and repeat (4). Otherwise, set B_0 be the union of all sets V_j corresponding to remaining vertices in \hat{G} and halt.

Let (B_0, B_1, \dots, B_t) be the partition of \hat{V} obtained as above. It is clear that the induced graph $G[B_0]$ is an stable set and there is no edge between B_0 and $\cup_{i=1}^t B_i$. Also, $G[B_i]$ for each $i \geq 1$, either is a complete graph, or contains a complete bipartite graph as a


a) An example of a graph G with $nd = 45$ and $k = 36$.



b) The construction of the partition $(B_0, B_1, \dots, B_{13})$. The edges $\color{green}{\text{---}}$ indicate the spanning trees of connected components of \hat{G} . We obtain the sets B_i 's corresponding to the roots $V_1, V_{12}, V_{18}, V_{22}$, and V_{23} .



c) We contract every set B_i to a vertex b_i and add $|E(B_i)|$ pendant edges to b_i . The set $C = \left(\bigcup_{1 \leq i \leq 13} \{b_i\} \right) \cup \left(\bigcup_{37 \leq i \leq 45} V_i \right)$ is a vertex cover for \tilde{G} . Note that all parallel edges are between vertices b_i 's.



ht

■ **Figure 1** An example of a graph G with its neighborhood diversity decomposition and the construction of the graph \tilde{G} from G .

spanning subgraph. Now, we construct the multigraph \tilde{G} from G as follows. First, for each $i \in [t]$ contract all vertices in B_i into a single vertex b_i and add $|E(B_i)|$ pendent edges to b_i . Note that $|E(\tilde{G})| = |E(G)|$ (for an example, see the figure 1). First, we prove that I is yes instance for STAR DECOMPOSITION if and only if \tilde{I} is a yes instance for MULTI-STAR DECOMPOSITION.

First, note that if G admits an (\mathbf{s}, \mathbf{a}) -star decomposition, then by contracting G to \tilde{G} and the star decomposition to a multi-star decomposition, we can clearly see that \tilde{G} admits a multi-star decomposition. Now, assume that \tilde{I} is a yes-instance for MULTI-STAR DECOMPOSITION. The solution for \tilde{I} induces an orientation on the edges of \tilde{G} . For each $i \in [t]$, let G_i be the subgraph of G obtained from the induced subgraph $G[B_i]$ by adding all edges which are directed from B_i to $V \setminus B_i$ (corresponding to the orientation of \tilde{G}). Also, let $(\mathbf{s}_i, \mathbf{a}_i)$ be the star vectors assigned to b_i . By Lemma 20, we know that $\varphi(G[B_i]) \geq m/4 \geq s$. So, by Lemma 18, G_i admits an $(\mathbf{s}_i, \mathbf{a}_i)$ -star decomposition. Finally, in the graph \tilde{G} blow-up all vertices b_i into B_i to recover the graph G and in the multi-star decomposition of \tilde{G} , replace all stars on vertices b_1, \dots, b_t with star decompositions of G_1, \dots, G_t and keep other stars assigned to vertices in $V(G) \setminus \cup_{i=1}^t B_i$ unchanged. This gives an star decomposition of G . Therefore, I is a yes-instance, as desired.

Now, we prove that MULTI-STAR DECOMPOSITION can be solved for \tilde{I} in FPT-time with respect to (nd, d) . To see this, first note that $C = V_{k+1} \cup \dots \cup V_{nd} \cup \{b_1, \dots, b_t\}$ is a vertex cover for \tilde{G} and $\text{vc}(\tilde{G}) \leq (nd - k)m + t \leq mnd$. Also, there is no edge between B_0 and $\{b_1, \dots, b_t\}$, so every edge in $E(C, V(\tilde{G}) \setminus C)$ is simple. Thus, by Remark 15, Theorem 14 implies that the MULTI-STAR DECOMPOSITION can be solved for the instance $\tilde{I} = (\tilde{G}, \mathbf{s}, \mathbf{a})$ in time $O^*(2^{O(d \log d \cdot m \cdot nd \cdot 2^{3m \cdot nd})})$. Let $k = nd \log d$ and note that the runtime is at most $O^*(2^{O(k \cdot m \cdot 2^{3km})})$. First, if $k \geq m/6$, then $n \leq 2^{2^{36k^2}}$ and by Theorem 2, ILP1 can be solved in FPT-time with respect to k and so (nd, d) . So, suppose that $k \leq m/6$. In this case, the runtime is at most $O^*(2^{O(m^2 2^{m^2/2})}) = O^*(2^{O(\log \log n \sqrt{\log n})}) \leq O^*(2^{o(\log n)})$ which is a polynomial of n . \blacktriangleleft

References

- 1 Jørgen Bang-Jensen, Jing Huang, Gary MacGillivray, Anders Yeo, et al. *Domination in convex bipartite and convex-round graphs*. Citeseer, 1999.
- 2 Andreas Brandstädt and Dieter Kratsch. *On the restriction of some NP-complete graph problems to permutation graphs*. Springer, 1985.
- 3 Rosalind A Cameron and Daniel Horsley. Decompositions of complete multigraphs into stars of varying sizes. *Journal of Combinatorial Theory, Series B*, 145:32–64, 2020.
- 4 Ferdinando Cicalese and Eduardo Sany Laber. On the star decomposition of a graph: Hardness results and approximation for the max–min optimization problem. *Discrete Applied Mathematics*, 289:503–515, 2021.
- 5 Marek Cygan, Fedor V Fomin, Łukasz Kowalik, Daniel Lokshtanov, Dániel Marx, Marcin Pilipczuk, Michał Pilipczuk, and Saket Saurabh. *Parameterized algorithms*, volume 5. Springer, 2015.
- 6 Peter Damaschke, Haiko Müller, and Dieter Kratsch. Domination in convex and chordal bipartite graphs. *Information Processing Letters*, 36(5):231–236, 1990.
- 7 D Divya and S Vijayakumar. On star partition of split graphs. In *Conference on Algorithms and Discrete Applied Mathematics*, pages 209–223. Springer, 2024.
- 8 Dorit Dor and Michael Tarsi. Graph decomposition is np-complete: A complete proof of holyer’s conjecture. *SIAM Journal on Computing*, 26(4):1166–1187, 1997.

- 9 Oleg Duginov. Partitioning the vertex set of a bipartite graph into complete bipartite subgraphs. *Discrete Mathematics & Theoretical Computer Science*, 16(Graph Theory), 2014.
- 10 Martin E Dyer and Alan M Frieze. On the complexity of partitioning graphs into connected subgraphs. *Discrete Applied Mathematics*, 10(2):139–153, 1985.
- 11 Eduard Eiben, Robert Ganian, Dušan Knop, Sebastian Ordyniak, Michał Pilipczuk, and Marcin Wrochna. Integer programming and incidence treedepth. In *International Conference on Integer Programming and Combinatorial Optimization*, pages 194–204. Springer, 2019.
- 12 Friedrich Eisenbrand, Christoph Hunkenschröder, Kim-Manuel Klein, Martin Koutecký, Asaf Levin, and Shmuel Onn. An algorithmic theory of integer programming. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1904.01361*, 2019.
- 13 Martin Farber and J Mark Keil. Domination in permutation graphs. *Journal of algorithms*, 6(3):309–321, 1985.
- 14 Herbert Fleischner, Gert Sabidussi, and Vladimir I Sarvanov. Maximum independent sets in 3-and 4-regular hamiltonian graphs. *Discrete mathematics*, 310(20):2742–2749, 2010.
- 15 Michael R Gary and David S Johnson. Computers and intractability: A guide to the theory of np-completeness, 1979.
- 16 ST Hedetniemi, SE Goodman, and EJ Cockayne. A linear algorithm for the domination number of a tree. *Information Processing Letters*, 4:41–44, 1975.
- 17 Ian Holyer. The np-completeness of some edge-partition problems. *SIAM Journal on Computing*, 10(4):713–717, 1981.
- 18 Klaus Jansen, Stefan Kratsch, Dániel Marx, and Ildikó Schlotter. Bin packing with fixed number of bins revisited. *Journal of Computer and System Sciences*, 79(1):39–49, 2013.
- 19 Martin Koutecký and Johannes Zink. Complexity of scheduling few types of jobs on related and unrelated machines. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2009.11840*, 2020.
- 20 Michael Lampis. *Structural Graph Parameters, Fine-Grained Complexity, and Approximation*. Habilitation à diriger des recherches, Université Paris Dauphine, March 2022.
- 21 Hendrik W Lenstra Jr. Integer programming with a fixed number of variables. *Mathematics of operations research*, 8(4):538–548, 1983.
- 22 Haiko Müller and Andreas Brandstädt. The np-completeness of steiner tree and dominating set for chordal bipartite graphs. *Theoretical Computer Science*, 53(2-3):257–265, 1987.
- 23 X. Nguyen. Induced star partition of graphs with respect to structural parameters. Charles University in Prague, Technical report. 2023.
- 24 Venkatesh Raman and Saket Saurabh. Short cycles make w-hard problems hard: Fpt algorithms for w-hard problems in graphs with no short cycles. *Algorithmica*, 52:203–225, 2008.
- 25 MA Shalu, S Vijayakumar, TP Sandhya, and Joyashree Mondal. Induced star partition of graphs. *Discrete Applied Mathematics*, 319:81–91, 2022.
- 26 Michael Tarsi. Decomposition of complete multigraphs into stars. *Discrete Mathematics*, 26(3):273–278, 1979.
- 27 Michael Tarsi. On the decomposition of a graph into stars. *Discrete Mathematics*, 36(3):299–304, 1981.
- 28 Kazuhiko Ushio, Shinsei Tazawa, and Sumiyasu Yamamoto. On claw-decomposition of a complete multipartite graph. *Hiroshima Mathematical Journal*, 8(1):207–210, 1978.

- 29 Sumiyasu Yamamoto, Hideto Ikeda, Shinsei Shige-Eda, Kazuhiko Ushio, and Noboru Hamada. On claw-decomposition of complete graphs and complete bigraphs. *Hiroshima Mathematical Journal*, 5(1):33–42, 1975.