

Directed Token Sliding*

Niranka Banerjee¹, Christian Engels², and Duc A. Hoang³

¹Research Institute of Mathematical Sciences, Kyoto University,
Japan[†]

niranka@gmail.com

²National Institute of Informatics, Tokyo, Japan[‡]

christian.engels@gmail.com

³VNU University of Science, Vietnam National University, Hanoi,
Vietnam

hoanganhduc@hus.edu.vn

Reconfiguration problems involve determining whether two given configurations can be transformed into each other under specific rules. The `TOKEN SLIDING` problem asks whether, given two different set of tokens on vertices of a graph G , we can transform one into the other by sliding tokens step-by-step along edges of G such that each resulting set of tokens forms an independent set in G . Recently, Ito et al. [MFCS 2022] introduced a directed variant of this problem. They showed that for general *oriented* graphs (i.e., graphs where no pair of vertices can have directed edges in both directions), the problem remains `PSPACE`-complete, and is solvable in polynomial time on oriented trees.

In this paper, we further investigate the `TOKEN SLIDING` problem on various oriented graph classes. We show that the problem remains `PSPACE`-complete for oriented planar graphs, split graphs, bipartite graphs and bounded treewidth graphs. Additionally, we present polynomial-time algorithms for solving the problem on oriented cycles and cographs.

Keywords: Reconfiguration problem, Token sliding, Directed graph, Computational complexity, `PSPACE`-completeness, Polynomial-time algorithm.

*This work began during the visit of N. Banerjee and C. Engels to D.A. Hoang at the Vietnam Institute for Advanced Study in Mathematics (VIASM). We would like to thank VIASM for providing a productive research environment and excellent working conditions.

[†]This work was supported by JSPS KAKENHI Grant Number JP20H05967.

[‡]This work was supported by JSPS KAKENHI Grant Number JP18H05291.

1 Introduction

1.1 Reconfiguration Problems

For the last two decades, *reconfiguration problems* have emerged in different research areas, including recreational mathematics, computational geometry, constraint satisfaction, distributed algorithms, motion planning, rerouting networks, algorithmic game theory, and even quantum complexity theory [BMN+24; Heu13; MN19; Nis18]. In a reconfiguration setting, two *feasible solutions* S and T of a computational problem (e.g., SATISFIABILITY, INDEPENDENT SET, DOMINATING SET, VERTEX-COLORING, etc.) are given along with a *reconfiguration rule* that describes an *adjacency relation* between feasible solutions. The question is whether there is a sequence of adjacent feasible solutions that transforms S into T or vice versa. Such a sequence, if exists, is called a *reconfiguration sequence*.

One of the most well-studied reconfiguration problems is INDEPENDENT SET RECONFIGURATION (ISR). As its name suggests, in a reconfiguration setting for ISR, each feasible solution corresponds to a set of tokens placed on vertices of G where no vertex has more than one token and the (vertices containing) tokens form an *independent set* (i.e., a vertex-subset of pairwise non-adjacent vertices) of G . Three well-investigated reconfiguration rules are Token Sliding (TS, which involves sliding a token from one vertex to an adjacent unoccupied vertex), Token Jumping (TJ, which involves moving a token from one vertex to any unoccupied vertex), and Token Addition/Removal (TAR(k), which involves adding or removing a token while maintaining at least k tokens). ISR under TS, introduced by Hearn and Demaine [HD05], is also known as the TOKEN SLIDING problem and was the first reconfiguration problem for independent sets studied in the literature. We refer readers to the recent survey [BMN+24] and the references therein for more details on the developments of ISR and related problems.

It is worth mentioning that in almost all reconfiguration problems considered so far, reconfiguration is *symmetric*: if there is a reconfiguration sequence that transforms S into T , then by reversing this sequence, one can obtain a reconfiguration sequence that transforms T into S . From a graph-theoretic perspective, if we construct the so-called *reconfiguration graph* — a graph whose nodes are feasible solutions of a computational problem and edges are defined by the given reconfiguration rule, then by *symmetric* reconfiguration we mean the reconfiguration graph is *undirected*. On the other hand, to the best of our knowledge, *non-symmetric* reconfiguration (i.e., the reconfiguration graph is directed) has only been studied in a few contexts, such as “reconfiguration of vertex-colorings” [FHS09], “reconfiguration of independent sets” [IIK+22], and recently “token digraphs” [FLP+24].

1.2 Our Problems and Results

In particular, Ito et al. [IIK+22] proved that TOKEN SLIDING is PSPACE-complete on oriented graphs (i.e., directed graphs having no symmetric pair of directed edges), NP-complete on directed acyclic graphs, and can be solved in polynomial time on oriented trees. In this setting, a vertex-subset of an oriented graph G is *independent* if it is also

independent in the corresponding undirected version of G where all edge-directions are removed. This paper is a follow-up of [IIK+22]. Here, we consider the computational complexity of TOKEN SLIDING on some particular classes of oriented graphs.

In this paper, we show that TOKEN SLIDING remains PSPACE-complete even on oriented planar graphs, oriented split graphs, oriented bipartite graphs and oriented bounded treewidth graphs by reducing from their corresponding undirected variants, which are all known to be PSPACE-complete [BKL+21; HD05; LM19; Wro18]. (Section 3). On the positive side, we design a polynomial-time algorithm to solve TOKEN SLIDING on oriented cycles and oriented cographs (Section 4).

2 Preliminaries

For any undefined concepts and notations, we refer readers to [Die17] and the paper [IIK+22]. For an oriented graph G , the *underlying undirected graph* of G , denoted by G^{und} , is the graph obtained from G by removing all edge directions. Basically, a vertex-subset of G is *independent* if it is independent on G^{und} . Similarly, the *neighbourhoods* of a vertex v of G , denoted by $N_G(v)$, is the set of all vertices adjacent to v in G^{und} , and $N_G[v] = N_G(v) \cup \{v\}$. We sometimes omit the subscript when the graph under consideration is clear from the context.

In an instance (G, S, T) of TOKEN SLIDING, two independent sets S and T of an oriented graph G are given. The question is to decide whether there is a (ordered) sequence $\langle S = I_0, I_1, \dots, I_\ell = T \rangle$ from S to T such that each I_i ($0 \leq i \leq \ell$) is independent and I_{i+1} ($0 \leq i \leq \ell - 1$) is obtained from I_i by sliding a token from a vertex u to one of its unoccupied out-neighbor v along the *directed edge* (or *arc*) (u, v) of G , where $I_i \setminus I_{i+1} = \{u\}$ and $I_{i+1} \setminus I_i = \{v\}$, i.e., I_{i+1} is obtained from I_i by the (valid) token-slide $u \rightarrow v$. Thus, one can also write the above reconfiguration sequence as $\langle x_0 \rightarrow y_0, x_1 \rightarrow y_1, \dots, x_{\ell-1} \rightarrow y_{\ell-1} \rangle$ to indicate that for $0 \leq i \leq \ell - 1$, the set I_{i+1} is obtained from I_i by the token-slide $x_i \rightarrow y_i$. In an undirected variant, everything can be defined similarly, except that the arc (u, v) is now replaced by the undirected edge uv .

We conclude this section with the following simple remark: since Ito et al. [IIK+22] already showed that TOKEN SLIDING is in PSPACE on oriented graphs, to show the PSPACE-completeness of TOKEN SLIDING on a class of oriented graphs, it suffices to design a polynomial-time reduction from a known PSPACE-hard problem.

3 Hardness Results

3.1 Oriented Planar Graphs

This section is devoted to proving the following theorem.

Theorem 1. TOKEN SLIDING is PSPACE-complete on oriented planar graphs.

Hearn and Demaine [HD05] proved that TOKEN SLIDING is PSPACE-complete on undirected planar graphs of maximum degree three (i.e., subcubic planar graphs). Although

not explicitly stated in [HD05], their reduction uses only maximum independent sets. We present a polynomial-time reduction from this variant to TOKEN SLIDING on oriented planar graphs.

Description of Our Reduction




Figure 1: Oriented planar gadgets

From an instance (G, T_s, T_t) where T_s and T_t are maximum independent sets of a subcubic planar graph G , we construct an instance (G^*, T_s^*, T_t^*) of TOKEN SLIDING where G^* is an oriented planar graph. To achieve this, we replace each edge uv in G with either the uv -gadget or the vu -gadget as shown on the right-hand side of Fig. 1. We take one of the choices arbitrarily. It is important to note that the uv -gadget and the vu -gadget are distinct, and exactly one of them is used to replace the edge uv . In the following, we specify that “the uv -gadget is used” to indicate that in the construction of G^* , the uv -gadget is used to replace the edge uv in G . We also use G_{uv}^* to denote the unique gadget containing both u and v in G^* . Each token placement (i.e., maximum independent set) I of G is mapped to a corresponding token placement I^* of G^* as illustrated in Fig. 2.

Correctness of Our Reduction

Clearly, (G^*, T_s^*, T_t^*) can be constructed in polynomial time. We prove that (G, T_s, T_t) is a yes-instance if and only if (G^*, T_s^*, T_t^*) is a yes-instance.

Lemma 1. If (G, T_s, T_t) is a yes-instance, then so is (G^*, T_s^*, T_t^*) .

Proof. Suppose that (G, T_s, T_t) is a yes-instance. Then there exists a reconfiguration sequence \mathcal{I} from T_s to T_t . We construct a reconfiguration sequence \mathcal{I}^* from T_s^* to T_t^* as follows.

For each token-slide $u \rightarrow v$ in \mathcal{I} that transforms I into J in G , we perform the following sequence of token-slides in G^* that transforms I^* into J^* :




Figure 2: Placing tokens on the uv -gadget

- For each $v' \in N_G(v) \setminus \{u\}$, we consider the following cases:
 - If the vv' -gadget is used, we slide the token on $w_1^{vv'}$ to $w_2^{vv'}$ directly.
 - If the $v'v$ -gadget is used, a token must already be placed on $w_1^{v'v}$ (because we perform our construction iteratively based on the order of token-slides in \mathcal{I}) which is adjacent to v' , and thus we do nothing.

At this point, note that no token is placed on any neighbor of v in G .

- If the uv -gadget is used, we slide the token on w_2^{uv} to v and then the token on u to w_1^{uv} . If the vu -gadget is used, we perform the following token-slides: $u \rightarrow w_4^{vu}$, $w_1^{vu} \rightarrow w_2^{vu}$, and $w_4^{vu} \rightarrow v$.

Observe that all token-slides in G mentioned above are performed inside a gadget, and thus they do not affect the tokens placed on other gadgets except when putting on vertices from G . Using this observation, one can verify that the described token-slides in G^* always result new independent sets of G and that they transform I^* into J^* .

Thus, by iteratively combining all constructed sequences of token-slides corresponding to the token-slides in \mathcal{I} , we can construct our desired reconfiguration sequence \mathcal{I}^* . \square

Lemma 2. If (G^*, T_s^*, T_t^*) is a yes-instance, then so is (G, T_s, T_t) .

Proof. Suppose that (G^*, T_s^*, T_t^*) is a yes-instance. Then there exists a reconfiguration sequence \mathcal{I}^* from T_s^* to T_t^* . We show that there is a reconfiguration sequence \mathcal{I} from T_s to T_t .

For convenience, for a token-set I^* of G^* , we define the I^* -weight of a gadget as the total number of tokens in I^* placed on its vertices.¹ It is trivial that for any token-set I^* of G^* , a gadget can have an I^* -weight of 0, 1, or 2, but never 3 or more. A vertex u is I^* -gadget-dominated by a gadget H if H contains u and has weight exactly 2.

We now describe how to construct \mathcal{I} from \mathcal{I}^* . For each token-slide $x \rightarrow y$ in \mathcal{I}^* , we proceed as follows. Note that there must be a uv -gadget H such that $x, y \in V(H)$.

- If $y \in \{u, v\}$, we perform the token-slide $z \rightarrow y$ in G where $z \in \{u, v\} \setminus \{y\}$.
- Otherwise, we do nothing.

We claim that our constructed sequence \mathcal{I} is indeed a reconfiguration sequence in G . Let I and J be two consecutive members of \mathcal{I} where I is obtained from its predecessor J by the token-slide $x \rightarrow y$, and J and every token-set before it are maximum independent sets of G . We claim that I is also a maximum independent set of G . Clearly, $|I| = \alpha(G)$ — the size of a maximum independent set of G . Thus, it remains to show that I is independent. Let I^* be the token-set corresponding to I in G^* which is obtained from its predecessor K^* in \mathcal{I}^* by sliding a token from some neighbor $z \in V(G^*) \setminus V(G)$ of y in the gadget G_{xy}^* containing both x and y in G^* . Since the token on z can be placed on y to form a new independent set I^* of G^* , it follows that $y \notin K^*$ is K^* -gadget-dominated by

¹This includes tokens on u and v , resulting in some double counting.

at most one gadget. Otherwise, notice that if y is K^* -gadget-dominated by two or more gadgets, then one cannot put any token to y in G^* , which contradicts our assumption that $z \rightarrow y$ can be performed.

Moreover, note that there must be at least one gadget that K^* -gadget-dominates y ; otherwise, by our construction, there is no token of J placed on any vertex in $N_G[y]$, which means $J+y$ is independent, which contradicts the assumption that J is a maximum independent set of G .

If G_{xy}^* is not the unique gadget that K^* -gadget-dominates y then there must be a token in the intersection of the neighborhoods of y and the unique gadget that K^* -gadget-dominates y is different from G_{xy}^* . Because of such a token, the move $z \rightarrow y$ cannot be performed, which is a contradiction. (Recall that G_{xy}^* contains z .) Therefore, it follows from our construction that $x \in J$ and moreover $J \cap N_G[y] = \{x\}$. As a result, $I = J \setminus \{x\} \cup \{y\}$ is independent. Our proof is complete. \square

3.2 Oriented Split Graphs

This section is devoted to proving the following theorem.

Theorem 2. TOKEN SLIDING is PSPACE-complete on oriented split graphs.

We reduce from TOKEN SLIDING on undirected split graphs, which is known to be PSPACE-complete [BKL+21].

Description of Our Reduction

Let (G, S, T) be an instance of TOKEN SLIDING on an undirected split graph $G = (K_G \cup I_G, E)$, where the disjoint vertex-subsets K_G and I_G respectively induce a clique and an independent set of G .

We construct an instance (G', S', T') of TOKEN SLIDING on an oriented split graph $G' = (K_{G'} \cup I_{G'}, E')$ where the disjoint vertex-subsets $K_{G'}$ and $I_{G'}$ respectively induce a clique and an independent set of G' . The graph G' is constructed as follows. (See Fig. 3.)

- Vertices (we ignore potential edges in this part):
 - We add two disjoint copies of K_G to G' and name them $K_{G'}^1$ and $K_{G'}^2$. For convenience, the copies of $v \in K_G$ in $K_{G'}^1$ and $K_{G'}^2$ are respectively called v^1 and v^2 .
 - We add one copy of I_G to G' and name it $I_{G'}$. For convenience, the copy of $v \in I_G$ in $I_{G'}$ is also called v^1 .
 - We add two new vertices c_1, c_2 to G' and set $K_{G'} = K_{G'}^1 \cup K_{G'}^2 \cup \{c_1, c_2\}$.
 - $V(G') = K_{G'} \cup I_{G'}$.
- Edges:
 - We add the edge (c_1, c_2) to G' .




Figure 3: Illustration of our split graph reduction. The two large bold thick arrows indicate that there are arcs from all vertices of $K_{G'}^1 \cup K_{G'}^2$ to c_1 and from c_2 to all vertices of $K_{G'}^1 \cup K_{G'}^2$.

- For each $v \in K_{G'}^1 \cup K_{G'}^2$, we add the edges (v, c_1) and (c_2, v) .
- For each edge $uv \in E$ where $u, v \in K_G$, the orientations of the edges u^1v^1 , u^1v^2 , u^2v^1 , and u^2v^2 in G' can be selected arbitrarily.
- For each edge $uv \in E$ where $u \in K_G$ and $v \in I_G$, we add the edges (u^1, v^1) and (v^1, u^2) to G' .

For each independent set S of G , we define its corresponding independent set S' of G' as follows: for each $v \in S$, add v^1 to S' . By definition of G' , S' is indeed independent. The rest of the graph forms a clique by construction.

Correctness of Our Reduction

The above construction clearly can be done in polynomial time. Lemmas 3 and 4 show that (G, S, T) is a yes-instance if and only if (G', S', T') is a yes-instance.

Lemma 3. If (G, S, T) is a yes-instance, then so is (G', S', T') .

Proof. Let $\mathcal{I} = \langle S = I_0, I_1, \dots, I_p = T \rangle$ be a reconfiguration sequence between S and T in G . We shall construct a reconfiguration sequence \mathcal{I} between S' and T' in G' . As \mathcal{I} is a reconfiguration sequence, for each $i \in \{0, 1, \dots, p-1\}$, there exist $x_i, y_i \in V$ such that $I_i \setminus I_{i+1} = \{x_i\}$, $I_{i+1} \setminus I_i = \{y_i\}$, and $x_i y_i \in E$. For each $i \in \{0, \dots, p-1\}$, we add to \mathcal{I} a subsequence corresponding to $\langle I_i, I_{i+1} \rangle$ and join them together as follows. We will require the following invariant: Each subsequence will involve moving exactly one token from a vertex in $K_{G'}^1 \cup I_{G'}$ to a vertex in $K_{G'}^1 \cup I_{G'}$, possibly going through some vertices in $K_{G'}^2 \cup \{c_1, c_2\}$ if necessary. It will be clear that we always fulfill it.

- If both $x_i, y_i \in K_G$, we add the subsequence $\langle I'_i, I_{i_1}^*, I_{i_2}^*, I'_{i+1} \rangle$ where $I_{i_1}^*, I_{i_2}^*, I'_{i+1}$ are respectively obtained from their predecessors by the token-slides $x_i^1 \rightarrow c_1$, $c_1 \rightarrow c_2$, and $c_2 \rightarrow y_i^1$.
- If $x_i \in K_G$ and $y_i \in I_G$, we simply add the subsequence $\langle I'_i, I'_{i+1} \rangle$. That is, I'_{i+1} is obtained from I'_i by the token-slide $x_i^1 \rightarrow y_i^1$.
- If $x_i \in I_G$ and $y_i \in K_G$, we note that it is impossible to directly slide the token on x_i^1 to y_i^1 , because by the construction of G' , only the edge (y_i^1, x_i^1) is in E' . On the other hand, also by the construction of G' , $(x_i^1, y_i^2) \in E'$. Thus, we add the subsequence $\langle I'_i, I_{i_1}^*, I_{i_2}^*, I_{i_3}^*, I'_{i+1} \rangle$ where $I_{i_1}^*, I_{i_2}^*, I_{i_3}^*, I'_{i+1}$ are respectively obtained from their predecessors by the token-slides $x_i^1 \rightarrow y_i^2$, $y_i^2 \rightarrow c_1$, $c_1 \rightarrow c_2$, $c_2 \rightarrow y_i^1$.

Observe that there can be at most one token in $K_{G'}$ and both c_1 and c_2 are not adjacent to any vertex in $I_{G'}$. Combining with the definitions of I'_i, I'_{i+1} and the assumption that sliding a token from x_i to y_i in G always result an independent set, one can verify that each intermediate token-set $I_{i_j}^*$ in the described subsequences is independent in G' . Naturally, two subsequences are joined at their common end (which is either I'_i or I'_{i+1}). Joining all these subsequences gives us the desired reconfiguration sequence \mathcal{I} . \square

Lemma 4. If (G', S', T') is a yes-instance, then so is (G, S, T) .

Proof. Let $\mathcal{I} = \langle S' = J_0, J_1, \dots, J_q = T' \rangle$ be a reconfiguration sequence between S' and T' in G' with our previous definition of S', T' . Let $\langle J_{i_0}, J_{i_1}, \dots, J_{i_p} \rangle$ be the maximum-length subsequence extracted from \mathcal{I} such that $i_0 = 0$, $i_p = q$, $1 \leq i_1 < i_2 < \dots < i_{p-1} \leq q-1$, and $J_{i_j} \subseteq (K_{G'}^1 \cup I_{G'})$ for $1 \leq j \leq p-1$. By definition, each J_{i_j} ($1 \leq j \leq p-1$) has a corresponding independent set in G , say I_j , which can be obtained as follows: for each $u^1 \in J_{i_j}$, add u to I_j . Our desired reconfiguration sequence \mathcal{I} is constructed by joining reconfiguration sequences in G between I_j and I_{j+1} as follows.

If J_{i_j} and $J_{i_{j+1}}$ ($1 \leq j \leq p-2$) are consecutive in \mathcal{I} , for the corresponding independent sets I_j and I_{j+1} in G , it follows that $J_{i_{j+1}}$ is obtained from J_{i_j} by a token-slide between two vertices in $K_{G'}^1 \cup I_{G'}$. Thus, I_{j+1} can be obtained from I_j in G by the corresponding token-slide in G . To complete our proof, it remains to derive the same conclusion for the case that J_{i_j} and $J_{i_{j+1}}$ ($1 \leq j \leq p-2$) are not consecutive in \mathcal{I} .

Note that once a token t is placed on a vertex $u^2 \in K_{G'}^2$, by some token-slide in \mathcal{I} , one must keep moving t until it is placed on some vertex $v^1 \in K_{G'}^1$. There are two reasons. First, since t is on a vertex of $K_{G'}$, one cannot move any other token, because moving

any other token t' must involve sliding t' from a vertex in $I_{G'}$ to a vertex in $K_{G'}$, which cannot be done while t is still in $K_{G'}$. Second, since there is no edge directed from any vertex in $K_{G'}^2 \cup \{c_1, c_2\}$ to a vertex in $I_{G'}$, it is impossible to directly slide t to any vertex in $I_{G'}$ without going through a vertex in $K_{G'}^1$ first.

As a result, if J_{i_j} and $J_{i_{j+1}}$ ($1 \leq j \leq p-2$) are not consecutive in \mathcal{I} , the following scenario must happen: exactly one token t that is originally in J_{i_j} may be slid from some vertex $u^1 \in K_{G'}^1 \cup I_{G'}$ to some vertex $v^2 \in K_{G'}^2$, and then moved around among vertices in $K_{G'}$ but finally must arrive at a vertex $w^1 \in K_{G'}^1 \cap J_{i_{j+1}}$. Moreover, while t is moving in G' , no other token can move. Therefore, I_{j+1} can be obtained from I_j by iteratively applying the token-slides $u \rightarrow v$ and $v \rightarrow w$ in G . The former token-slide is possible because a token from u^1 can be moved to v^2 in G' . The latter is possible because both v and w are in K_G . (Here, it does not matter how the corresponding token is moved in G' from v^2 to w^1 .) Additionally, we note that the former token-slide is necessary only when $u^1 \in I_{G'}$; otherwise, both u and w are in K_G and one single token-slide $u \rightarrow w$ in G is enough. \square

3.3 Oriented Bipartite Graphs

This section is devoted to proving the following theorem.

Theorem 3. TOKEN SLIDING is PSPACE-complete on oriented bipartite graphs.

A result by Lokshantov and Mouawad [LM19] shows that TOKEN SLIDING is PSPACE-complete on undirected bipartite graphs. We extend this result to oriented bipartite graphs.

Description of Our Reduction

Let (G, S, T) be a TOKEN SLIDING instance on an undirected bipartite graph $G = (V, E)$. We describe how to construct an instance (G', S', T') on oriented bipartite graphs $G' = (V', E')$.

For simplicity, we will reuse the vertex names from V to construct V' . More precisely, we proceed as follows. (See Fig. 4.)

1. For each vertex $v \in V$, copy v to V' and a new corresponding vertex v' .
2. For each edge $uv \in E(G)$, add one of the directed edges (u, v) or (v, u) to E' .
3. For each directed edge $(u, v) \in E'$ where $u, v \in V$, complete the directed 4-cycle $(u, v), (v, u'), (u', v'), (v', u)$ in E' .

Naturally, we set $S' = S$ and $T' = T$. Clearly, this construction can be done in polynomial time. One can verify that the constructed graph $G' = (V', E')$ is an oriented bipartite graph and both S' and T' are independent in G' .




Figure 4: Bipartite Gadget

Correctness of Our Reduction

Before showing that our reduction is correct, we prove the following simple observation.

Lemma 5. $N_{G'}(v) = N_{G'}(v')$ for all $v \in V'$.

Proof. If there is an edge (u, v) then we know by the construction there is an edge (u, v') . As we do not add edges to v' unless preceded by an edge to v , the neighborhoods are equal. \square

We are now ready to show that (G, S, T) is a yes-instance if and only if (G', S', T') is a yes-instance.

Lemma 6. If (G, S, T) is a yes-instance, then so is (G', S', T') .

Proof. Let \mathcal{I} be a reconfiguration sequence that transforms S into T in G . We describe how to construct a reconfiguration sequence \mathcal{I}' that transforms S' into T' in G' . For each step $u \rightarrow v$ in \mathcal{I} , we construct a corresponding sequence S'_{uv} of token-slides in \mathcal{I}' as follows: If $(u, v) \in E'$, we set $S'_{uv} = \langle u \rightarrow v \rangle$ to \mathcal{I}' , and if $(v, u) \in E'$, we set $S'_{uv} = \langle u \rightarrow v', v' \rightarrow u', u' \rightarrow v \rangle$. The sequence \mathcal{I}' is obtained by iteratively concatenating these S'_{uv} sequences.

To see that \mathcal{I}' is a reconfiguration sequence in G' , it suffices to verify that the token-slides in S'_{uv} are valid in G' , i.e., each of them results an independent set. Let I and J be two independent sets of G where J is obtained from I by the token-slide $u \rightarrow v$. Thus, $N_G[v]$ contains exactly one token on u . We claim that S'_{uv} transforms I into J in G' . If $(u, v) \in E'$, since $N_G[v]$ contains exactly one token on u , our construction implies that $N_{G'}[v]$ contains exactly one token on u and thus $S'_{uv} = \langle u \rightarrow v \rangle$ is our desired reconfiguration sequence. If $(v, u) \in E'$, by Lemma 5, we have $N_{G'}[v']$ contains exactly one token on u , so the token-slide $u \rightarrow v'$ is valid. At this point, note that $N_{G'}[u]$ contains exactly one token on v' , and by Lemma 5, so does $N_{G'}[u']$. Therefore, the token-slide $v' \rightarrow u'$ is valid. Similarly, the token-slide $u' \rightarrow v$ is valid. Our proof is complete. \square

Lemma 7. If (G', S', T') is a yes-instance, then so is (G, S, T) .

Proof. Let \mathcal{I}' be a reconfiguration sequence that transforms S' into T' in G' . We describe how to construct a reconfiguration sequence \mathcal{I} that transforms S into T in G . For each step $x \rightarrow y$ in \mathcal{I}' , we construct a corresponding token-slide S_{xy} of token-slides in \mathcal{I} as follows. We set $S_{xy} = u \rightarrow v$ ($u, v \in V(G)$) if one of the following cases happens:

- $x = u \in V(G)$ and $y = v \in V(G)$.
- $x = u \in V(G)$ and $y = v' \in V(G') - V(G)$.
- $x = u' \in V(G') - V(G)$ and $y = v \in V(G)$.
- $x = u' \in V(G') - V(G)$ and $y = v' \in V(G') - V(G)$.

The sequence \mathcal{I} is constructed by iteratively concatenating S_{xy} and removing redundant token-slides that appear consecutively more than once. One can verify from our construction that \mathcal{I} is indeed a reconfiguration sequence. Our proof is complete. \square

A Simple Corollary

Note that if our original graph G is *bounded treewidth* (i.e., its treewidth is at most some positive constant c), then so is our constructed graph G' . Thus, the same reduction holds for oriented bounded treewidth graphs. Additionally, Wrochna [Wro18] proved that there exists a constant c such that TOKEN SLIDING is PSPACE-complete on graphs with treewidth at most c .² Therefore, we have the following corollary.

Corollary 1. There exists a constant c such that TOKEN SLIDING is PSPACE-complete on oriented graphs having treewidth at most c .

4 Polynomial-Time Results

4.1 Oriented Cycles

Definition 1. We define the *directed distance*, $d_{\rightarrow}(u, v)$, between two vertices as

$$d_{\rightarrow}(u, v) = \begin{cases} k & \text{if the shortest directed path from } u \text{ to } v \text{ has length } k, \\ \infty & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Definition 2. We call a token sliding problem (G, S, T) on an oriented cycle G *locked* if the following holds:

- For all vertices u, v , $d_{\rightarrow}(u, v) < \infty$.
- For every $s \in S$ there exists an $s' \in S$ with $d_{\rightarrow}(s, s') = 2$.
- $S \neq T$.

In this section, we assume that the vertices v_1, \dots, v_n of an oriented cycle are always arranged in a clockwise order (e.g., see Fig. 5). We say that the cycle is *completely clockwise* if its arcs are $(v_1, v_2), (v_2, v_3), \dots, (v_{n-1}, v_n)$, and (v_n, v_1) , and *completely counter-clockwise* if its arcs are $(v_n, v_{n-1}), \dots, (v_2, v_1)$, and (v_1, v_n) .

²Indeed, Wrochna showed a more general result for graphs with bandwidth at most c . Since any graph with bandwidth at most c also has treewidth and pathwidth at most c , his result also applies to bounded treewidth graphs.




Figure 5: Cycles (filled vertices are in S and circled vertices are in T)

Lemma 8. TOKEN SLIDING on oriented cycles that are not completely clockwise or counter-clockwise is solvable in $2T(n)$ where $T(n)$ is the running time of solving TOKEN SLIDING for oriented trees on n vertices.

Proof. Given (G, S, T) , let $G = (V, E)$ with $V = \{v_1, \dots, v_n\}$ and $(v_1, v_2), (v_1, v_n) \in E$. This has to exist as the cycle is not completely clockwise or counter-clockwise. Notice that no token can enter v_1 from $G - v_1$.

For the following we notice that solving a reconfiguration problem on an oriented path or a collection of oriented paths is easy via a simple backtracking algorithm or by the result from [IIK+22]. Now we perform a case distinction.

$v_1 \in S \cap T$: We remove v_1 from the graph and have a TOKEN SLIDING problem on an oriented forest which is easy to solve.

$v_1 \notin S \cup T$: As no token can cross from v_2 to v_n we can again, remove v_1 from the TOKEN SLIDING problem and arrive at an oriented forest.

$v_1 \in T \setminus S$: As no token can enter v_1 this problem is always unsatisfiable.

$v_1 \in S \setminus T$: Here we perform two operations and take the logical OR of their decision.

- Remove the edge (v_1, v_n) from the graph. Notice that $v_n \notin S$ as otherwise the initial configuration was invalid. Now we arrive again at a reconfiguration problem on an oriented path which is easy to solve.
- Remove the edge (v_1, v_2) from the graph. Notice again that $v_2 \notin S$ as it is a valid reconfiguration initial state. We again arrive at a problem on an oriented path which is easy to solve.

Now we take the OR of these two runs, meaning accept if at least one accepts and reject otherwise. The correctness is given as there is only one token in v_1 which has to move to $G - v_1$ and has to either take (v_1, v_2) or (v_1, v_n) .

The correctness is clear from the previous discussion. □

Theorem 4. TOKEN SLIDING is solvable in polynomial time on oriented cycles.

Proof. It is clear that testing if a cycle is locked is easy in polynomial time. Let us assume that the cycle is not locked and that it has the majority of edges clockwise as the other case is symmetric. There are now two cases.

There exists an edge (u, v) which is counter-clockwise: In this case we invoke Lemma 8.

All edges are clockwise: Notice that in this case there will always be a token that can move as we are not locked. For every $\pi : S \rightarrow T$ we can define the *total distance*:

$$\Delta(\pi, S) = \sum_{s \in S} d_{\rightarrow}(s, \pi(s)).$$

Let s_1, \dots, s_m be the tokens in order such that for each s_i , s_{i+1} minimizes the directed distance from s_i to s_{i+1} . Similarly, let us order the targets to get t_1, \dots, t_m . Let us pick the mapping such that $d_{\rightarrow}(s_1, t_i)$ is the largest.

Let S'_π be the set of all tokens that are not on their targets and let $S''_\pi \subseteq S'_\pi$ of tokens that can move and still be an independent set where both sets are with respect to a base set S_π .

Notice now that our mapping $\Delta(\tau, S_{\tau,i}) + 1 = \Delta(\tau, S_{\tau,i+1})$. This is now easy to see we can move s_1 to $\tau(s_1)$ (by perhaps moving other tokens). Each step s_1 takes will reduce the total distance by one. Each step any other token takes will also reduce the total distance by one as every token gets closer to its target (as the targets are in the same order).

As $\Delta(\tau, S) < \infty$ for all τ and all S , the tokens have always a valid way to move. This means the instance is always solvable.

□

4.2 Oriented Cographs

A *cograph* is a graph that does not contain a P_4 (a path on four vertices) as an induced subgraph. Kamiński et al. [KMM12] showed that TOKEN SLIDING on undirected cographs can be solved in linear time. By slightly modifying their algorithm, one can achieve a linear-time algorithm for the problem on oriented cographs. Though it is trivial, for the sake of completeness, we present the algorithm here.

Recall that a *co-component* of a graph G is the subgraph of G induced by vertices of a connected component of the complement graph $\overline{G} = (V, \{uv \mid u, v \in V \text{ and } uv \notin E(G)\})$. A graph G is a cograph if and only if the complement of any nontrivial connected induced subgraph of G is disconnected.

Theorem 5. TOKEN SLIDING on oriented cographs can be solved in linear time.

Proof. Let (G, S, T) be an instance of TOKEN SLIDING on an oriented cograph G . We describe a linear-time algorithm to decide whether it is a yes-instance.

If $|S| \neq |T|$ then clearly it is a no-instance. Otherwise, we consider the following cases:

- If $|S| = |T| = 1$, then we check if there is a directed path from s to t in G where $S = \{s\}$ and $T = \{t\}$. If so, it is a yes-instance (we can slide the token on s to t along the directed path). Otherwise, it is a no-instance.

- If $|S| = |T| \geq 2$, we consider whether the underlying undirected graph G^{und} of G is connected. If not, we solve for each oriented component of G^{und} separately and combine the results. Otherwise, note that an independent set of G^{und} must belong to a unique co-component. Thus, if S and T belong to two different co-components, it is a no-instance. Otherwise, we recursively solve the problem on the co-component containing S and T .

The running time and correctness of this algorithm are clear from [KMM12]. Our proof is complete. \square

References

- [BKL+21] Rémy Belmonte, Eun Jung Kim, Michael Lampis, Valia Mitsou, Yota Otachi, and Florian Sikora. “Token Sliding on Split Graphs”. In: *Theory of Computing Systems* 65.4 (2021), pp. 662–686. DOI: 10.1007/s00224-020-09967-8.
- [BMN+24] Nicolas Bousquet, Amer E. Mouawad, Naomi Nishimura, and Sebastian Siebertz. “A survey on the parameterized complexity of reconfiguration problems”. In: *Computer Science Review* 53 (2024), p. 100663. DOI: 10.1016/j.cosrev.2024.
- [Die17] Reinhard Diestel. *Graph Theory*. 5th. Vol. 173. Graduate Texts in Mathematics. Springer, 2017. DOI: 10.1007/978-3-662-53622-3.
- [FHS09] Stefan Felsner, Clemens Huemer, and Maria Saumell Mendiola. “Recoloring directed graphs”. In: *Proceedings of EGC 2009*. Prensas Universitarias de Zaragoza, 2009, pp. 91–97. URL: http://metodosestadisticos.unizar.es/~egc09/index_a
- [FLP+24] Cristina G. Fernandes, Carla N. Lintzmayer, Juan P. Peña, Giovanne Santos, Ana Trujillo-Negrete, and Jose Zamora. In: *arXiv preprint* (2024). arXiv: 2410.20189.
- [HD05] Robert A. Hearn and Erik D. Demaine. “PSPACE-Completeness of Sliding-Block Puzzles and Other Problems through the Nondeterministic Constraint Logic Model of Computation”. In: *Theoretical Computer Science* 343.1-2 (2005), pp. 72–96. DOI: 10.1016/j.tcs.2005.05.008.
- [Heu13] Jan van den Heuvel. “The Complexity of Change”. In: *Surveys in Combinatorics*. Vol. 409. London Mathematical Society Lecture Note Series. Cambridge University Press, 2013, pp. 127–160. DOI: 10.1017/cbo9781139506748.005.
- [IIK+22] Takehiro Ito, Yuni Iwamasa, Yasuaki Kobayashi, Yu Nakahata, Yota Otachi, Masahiro Takahashi, and Kunihiro Wasa. “Independent set reconfiguration on directed graphs”. In: *Proceedings of MFCS 2022*. Ed. by Stefan Szeider, Robert Ganian, and Alexandra Silva. Vol. 241. LIPIcs. Schloss Dagstuhl – Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik, 2022, 58:1–58:15. DOI: 10.4230/LIPIcs.MFCS.2022.58.
- [KMM12] Marcin Kamiński, Paul Medvedev, and Martin Milanič. “Complexity of Independent Set Reconfigurability Problems”. In: *Theoretical Computer Science* 439 (2012), pp. 9–15. DOI: 10.1016/j.tcs.2012.03.004.
- [LM19] Daniel Lokshtanov and Amer E. Mouawad. “The Complexity of Independent Set Reconfiguration on Bipartite Graphs”. In: *ACM Transactions on Algorithms* 15.1 (2019), 7:1–7:19. DOI: 10.1145/3280825.
- [MN19] C.M. Mynhardt and S. Nasserar. “Reconfiguration of colourings and dominating sets in graphs”. In: *50 years of Combinatorics, Graph Theory, and Computing*. Ed. by Fan Chung, Ron Graham, Frederick Hoffman, Ronald C. Mullin, Leslie Hogben, and Douglas B. West. 1st. CRC Press, 2019, pp. 171–191. DOI: 10.1201/9780429280092-10.
- [Nis18] Naomi Nishimura. “Introduction to Reconfiguration”. In: *Algorithms* 11.4 (2018), p. 52. DOI: 10.3390/a11040052.

- [Wro18] Marcin Wrochna. “Reconfiguration in Bounded Bandwidth and Treedepth”. In: *Journal of Computer and System Sciences* 93 (2018), pp. 1–10. DOI: 10.1016/j.jcss.2017.11.003.