




Structural Parameterization of Locating-Dominating Set and Test Cover

Dipayan Chakraborty   

Université Clermont Auvergne, CNRS, Mines Saint-Étienne, Clermont Auvergne INP, LIMOS, 63000 Clermont-Ferrand, France

Department of Mathematics and Applied Mathematics, University of Johannesburg, Auckland Park, 2006, South Africa

Florent Foucaud   

Université Clermont Auvergne, CNRS, Mines Saint-Étienne, Clermont Auvergne INP, LIMOS, 63000 Clermont-Ferrand, France

Diptapriyo Majumdar   

Indraprastha Institute of Information Technology Delhi, Delhi, India

Prafullkumar Tale   

Indian Institute of Science Education and Research Bhopal, Bhopal, India

Abstract

We investigate structural parameterizations for two identification problems in graphs and set systems: LOCATING-DOMINATING SET and TEST COVER. In the first problem, an input is a graph G on n vertices and an integer k , and one asks whether there is a subset S of k vertices such that any two distinct vertices not in S are dominated by distinct subsets of S . In the second problem, an input is a set of items U , a collection of subsets \mathcal{F} of U called *tests*, and an integer k , and one asks whether there is a solution set S of at most k tests such that each pair of items belongs to a distinct subset of tests of S . These two problems are “identification” analogues of the DOMINATING SET and SET COVER problems, respectively.

Chakraborty et al. [ISAAC 2024] proved, among other things, that both these problems admit a conditional double-exponential lower bound and a matching algorithm when parameterized by the treewidth of the input graph. We continue this line of investigation and consider parameters larger than the treewidth, like the vertex cover number and feedback edge set number. We design a nontrivial dynamic programming scheme to solve TEST COVER in “slightly super-exponential” time $2^{\mathcal{O}(|U| \log |U|)} (|U| + |\mathcal{F}|)^{\mathcal{O}(1)}$ in the number $|U|$ of items, and also LOCATING-DOMINATING SET in time $2^{\mathcal{O}(\text{vc} \log \text{vc})} \cdot n^{\mathcal{O}(1)}$, where vc is the vertex cover number and n the order of the graph. We thus show that the lower bound results with respect to treewidth from Chakraborty et al. [ISAAC 2024] cannot be extended to the vertex cover number. We also show that when parameterized by the feedback edge set number, LOCATING DOMINATING SET admits a linear kernel, thereby answering an open question from [Cappelle et al., LAGOS 2021]. Finally, we show that neither LOCATING-DOMINATING SET nor TEST COVER is likely to admit a compression algorithm returning an input with a subquadratic number of bits, unless $\text{NP} \subseteq \text{coNP}/\text{poly}$.

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

Keywords and phrases Identification Problems, Locating-Dominating Set, Test Cover, Parameterized Algorithms, Structural Parameterizations, Kernelization

Digital Object Identifier 10.4230/LIPIcs.CVIT.2016.23

Funding *Dipayan Chakraborty*: Public grant overseen by the French National Research Agency as part of the “Investissements d’Avenir” through theIMobS3 Laboratory of Excellence (ANR-10-LABX-0016), the International Research Center “Innovation Transportation and Production Systems” of the I-SITE CAP 20-25 and by the ANR project GRALMECO (ANR-21-CE48-0004).

Florent Foucaud: ANR project GRALMECO (ANR-21-CE48-0004) and the French government IDEX-ISITE initiative 16-IDEX-0001 (CAP 20-25).



© Chakraborty, Foucaud, Majumdar, Tale; licensed under Creative Commons License CC-BY 4.0

42nd Conference on Very Important Topics (CVIT 2016).

Editors: John Q. Open and Joan R. Access; Article No. 23; pp. 23:1–23:26



Leibniz International Proceedings in Informatics

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

Diptapriyo Majumdar: Supported by the Science and Engineering Research Board (SERB) Grant SRG/2023/001592

Prafullkumar Tale: Supported by INSPIRE Faculty Fellowship by DST, India and Startup Research Grant by IISER-Bhopal.

1 Introduction

We study two discrete identification problems, **LOCATING-DOMINATING SET** and **TEST COVER**, that are extensively studied since the 1970s. This type of problems, in which one aims at distinguishing all the elements of a discrete structure by a solution set, is popular in both combinatorics [6, 34] and algorithms [5, 7], and has many natural applications e.g. to network monitoring [33], medical diagnosis [32] or machine learning [12]. In a recent paper, Chakraborty et al. [10] revisited the parameterized complexity of **LOCATING-DOMINATING SET** and **TEST COVER** when parameterized by the solution size or the treewidth (**tw**) of the input graph. In the case of **TEST COVER**, the authors considered the treewidth of the natural auxiliary bipartite graph (which we specify later). They proved that **LOCATING-DOMINATING SET** and **TEST COVER** admit an algorithm running in time $2^{2^{O(\text{tw})}} \cdot \text{poly}(n)$, where n is the number of elements/vertices in the system/graph. More interestingly, they proved that these algorithms are tight, i.e., neither problem admits an algorithm running in time $2^{2^{o(\text{tw})}} \cdot \text{poly}(n)$, unless the ETH fails. These results add **LOCATING-DOMINATING SET** and **TEST COVER** to the small list of NP-complete problems, recently initiated by Foucaud et al. [23], that admit a conditional double-exponential lower bound when parameterized by the treewidth. We continue this line of research and study the parameterized complexity of these problems for parameters that are larger than the treewidth. Before moving forward, we formally define the two studied problems.

LOCATING-DOMINATING SET

Input: A graph G on n vertices and an integer k .

Question: Does there exist a locating-dominating set of size k in G , that is, a dominating set S of G such that for any two different vertices $u, v \in V(G) \setminus S$, their neighbourhoods in S are different, i.e., $N(u) \cap S \neq N(v) \cap S$?

TEST COVER

Input: A set of items U , a collection of subsets of U called *tests* and denoted by \mathcal{F} , and an integer k .

Question: Does there exist a collection of at most k tests such that for each pair of items, there is a test that contains exactly one of the two items?

As **TEST COVER** is defined over set systems, to consider structural graph parameters, we define the *auxiliary graph* of a set system (U, \mathcal{F}) in the natural way: The bipartite graph G on n vertices with bipartition $\langle R, B \rangle$ of $V(G)$ such that sets R and B contain a vertex for every set in \mathcal{F} and for every item in U , respectively, and where $r \in R$ and $b \in B$ are adjacent if and only if the set corresponding to r contains the element corresponding to b .

We refer readers to [10] for a comprehensive overview about the motivations, applicability and known literature regarding the two problems, as we only mention the most relevant results here. **LOCATING-DOMINATING SET** [13] and **TEST COVER** [26, SP6] are both NP-complete. They are also trivially FPT for the parameter solution size (see [8, 9, 17] or the discussion before Theorem 2 and Theorem 3 in [10]). Hence, it becomes interesting to study these problems under more refined angles, such as kernelization, fine-grained complexity, and alternative parameterizations. Naturally, these lines of research have been pursued in

the literature. TEST COVER was studied within the framework of “above/below guarantee” parameterizations in [4, 16, 17, 27] and kernelization in [4, 16, 27]. These results have shown an intriguing behaviour for TEST COVER, with some nontrivial techniques being developed to solve the problem [4, 17]. In the case of LOCATING-DOMINATING SET, fine-grained complexity results regarding the number of vertices and solution size were obtained in [3, 8, 9], and structural parameterizations of the input graph have been studied in [8, 9]. In particular, it was shown there that the problem admits a linear kernel for the parameter max leaf number, however (under standard complexity assumptions) no polynomial kernel exists for the solution size, combined with either the vertex cover number or the distance to clique. They also provide a double-exponential kernel for the parameter distance to cluster.

Our Contributions. We extend the above results by systematically studying the fine-grained complexity and kernelization of LOCATING-DOMINATING SET and TEST COVER for the parameters number of vertices/elements/tests as well as structural parameters. Our results contribute to the complexity landscape for structural parameterizations of LOCATING-DOMINATING SET started in [8, 9]. See Figure 1 for an overview of the known results for (structural) parameterizations of LOCATING-DOMINATING SET, using a Hasse diagram of standard graph parameters.

Our first result is an FPT algorithm for LOCATING-DOMINATING SET parameterized by the vertex cover number (vc) of the input graph, and for TEST COVER when parameterized by the number $|U|$ of items.

► **Theorem 1.** *LOCATING-DOMINATING SET admits an algorithm running in time $2^{\mathcal{O}(vc \log vc)} \cdot n^{\mathcal{O}(1)}$, where vc is the vertex cover number of the input graph. Also, TEST COVER admits an algorithm running in time $2^{\mathcal{O}(|U| \log |U|)} \cdot (|U| + |\mathcal{F}|)^{\mathcal{O}(1)}$.*

The above result shows that unlike treewidth, for which we cannot expect a running time of the form $2^{2^{\mathcal{O}(tw)}}$ [10], if we choose vc , a parameter larger than treewidth, then we can significantly improve the running time. Moreover, we show that the above result for LOCATING-DOMINATING SET also extends to the parameters distance to clique and twin-cover number. For TEST COVER, the result is reminiscent of the known $\mathcal{O}(2^{nm})$ dynamic programming scheme for SET COVER on a universe of size n and m sets (see [20, Theorem 3.10]), and improves upon the naive $2^{\mathcal{O}(|U|^2)} \cdot (|U| + |\mathcal{F}|)^{\mathcal{O}(1)}$ brute-force algorithm.

Our next result is a linear vertex kernel when feedback edge set number (fes) is considered as the parameter. It solves an open problem raised in [8, 9].

► **Theorem 2.** *LOCATING-DOMINATING SET admits a kernel with $\mathcal{O}(fes)$ vertices and edges, where fes is the feedback edge set number of the input graph.*

Our final result is about the incompressibility of both problems.

► **Theorem 3.** *Neither LOCATING-DOMINATING SET nor TEST COVER admits a polynomial compression of size $\mathcal{O}(n^{2-\epsilon})$ for any $\epsilon > 0$, unless $\text{NP} \subseteq \text{coNP}/\text{poly}$, where n denotes the number of vertices and the number of items and tests of the input, respectively.*

The reduction used to prove Theorem 3 also provides an alternative proof that LOCATING-DOMINATING SET cannot be solved in time $2^{\mathcal{O}(n)}$ (see [3] for an earlier proof), and thus, in time $2^{\mathcal{O}(vc)}$ (under the ETH). Hence, the bound of Theorem 1 is optimal up to a logarithmic factor. The reduction used to prove Theorem 3 also yields the following results. First, it proves that LOCATING-DOMINATING SET, parameterized by the vertex cover number of the input graph and the solution size, does not admit a polynomial kernel, unless $\text{NP} \subseteq \text{coNP}/\text{poly}$. Our

reduction is arguably a simpler argument than the one from [8, 9] to obtain the latter result. Second, it implies that TEST COVER, parameterized by the number of items $|U|$ and the solution size k , does not admit a polynomial kernel, unless $\text{NP} \subseteq \text{coNP}/\text{poly}$. Additionally, it also implies that TEST COVER, parameterized by the number $|\mathcal{F}|$ of tests, does not admit a polynomial kernel, unless $\text{NP} \subseteq \text{coNP}/\text{poly}$. Since we can assume $k \leq |\mathcal{F}|$ in any non-trivial instance, this improves upon the result in [27], that states that there is no polynomial kernel for the problem when parameterized by k alone.




Figure 1 Hasse diagram of graph parameters and associated results for LOCATING-DOMINATING SET. An edge from a lower parameter to a higher parameter indicates that the lower one is upper bounded by a function of the higher one. If the line is dashed, then the bound is exponential; otherwise, it is polynomial. Colors correspond to the known FPT complexity status with respect to the highlighted parameter: the upper half of the box represents the upper bound, and the lower half represents the lower bound. By “single-exponential”, “slightly super-exponential” and “double-exponential”, we mean functions of the form $2^{\mathcal{O}(p)}$, $2^{\mathcal{O}(p \log p)}$ or $2^{\mathcal{O}(p^2)}$, and $2^{2^{\mathcal{O}(p)}}$, respectively. The parameters for which the running time is not known to be tight are thus striped. The red circle in the upper-right corner means that LOCATING-DOMINATING SET does not admit a polynomial kernel when parameterized by the marked parameter unless $\text{NP} \subseteq \text{coNP}/\text{poly}$; the yellow one means that a (tight) quadratic kernel exists, and the green one, that a linear kernel exists. The bold borders highlight parameters that are covered in this paper.

Organization. We use the LOCATING-DOMINATING SET problem to demonstrate key technical concepts, and explain how to adopt the arguments for TEST COVER. We use the standard notations that are mentioned in Section 2. Theorem 1 is proved in Section 3. In the same section, we show how to modify the techniques to obtain similar results for other parameters like twin-cover number and distance to clique, and we observe that LOCATING-DOMINATING SET admits a linear kernel when parameterized by neighbourhood diversity. The proof of Theorem 2 is given in Section 4 whereas Theorem 3 is proved in Section 5. We conclude the paper with some open problems in Section 6.

2 Preliminaries

For a positive integer q , we denote the set $\{1, 2, \dots, q\}$ by $[q]$. We use \mathbb{N} to denote the collection of all non-negative integers.

Graph theory We use standard graph-theoretic notation, and we refer the reader to [19] for any undefined notation. For an undirected graph G , sets $V(G)$ and $E(G)$ denote its set of vertices and edges, respectively. We denote an edge with two endpoints u, v as uv . Unless otherwise specified, we use n to denote the number of vertices in the input graph G of the problem under consideration. Two vertices u, v in $V(G)$ are *adjacent* if there is an edge uv in G . The *open neighborhood* of a vertex v , denoted by $N_G(v)$, is the set of vertices adjacent to v . The *closed neighborhood* of a vertex v , denoted by $N_G[v]$, is the set $N_G(v) \cup \{v\}$. We say that a vertex u is a *pendant vertex* if $|N_G(v)| = 1$. We omit the subscript in the notation for neighborhood if the graph under consideration is clear. For a subset S of $V(G)$, we define $N[S] = \bigcup_{v \in S} N[v]$ and $N(S) = N[S] \setminus S$. For a subset S of $V(G)$, we denote the graph obtained by deleting S from G by $G - S$. We denote the subgraph of G induced on the set S by $G[S]$. Two vertices u, v of a graph are called *false twins* (respectively, *true twins*) if $N(u) = N(v)$ (respectively, $N[u] = N[v]$). A pair of either false twins or true twins are also typically referred to as *twins*.

Locating-Dominating Sets A subset of vertices S in graph G is called its *dominating set* if $N[S] = V(G)$. A dominating set S is said to be a *locating-dominating set* if for any two different vertices $u, v \in V(G) \setminus S$, we have $N(u) \cap S \neq N(v) \cap S$. In this case, we say vertices u and v are *distinguished* by the set S . We say a vertex u is *located* by set S if for any vertex $v \in V(G) \setminus \{u\}$, $N(u) \cap S \neq N(v) \cap S$. By extension, a set X is *located* by S if all vertices in X are located by S .

Next, we prove that it is safe to consider the locating-dominating set that contains all the vertices adjacent with pendant vertices (see also [11, Lemma 5]).

► **Observation 4.** *If S is a locating-dominating set of a graph G , then there exists a locating-dominating set S' of G such that $|S'| \leq |S|$ and S' contains all vertices that are adjacent to the pendant vertices (i.e. vertices of degree 1) in G .*

Proof. Let u be a pendant vertex which is adjacent to a vertex v of G . We now look for a locating dominating set S' of G such that $|S'| \leq |S|$ and contains the vertex v . As S is a (locating) dominating set, we have $\{u, v\} \cap S \neq \emptyset$. If $v \in S$, then take $S' = S$. Therefore, let us assume that $u \in S$ and $v \notin S$. Define $S' = (S \cup \{v\}) \setminus \{u\}$. It is easy to see that S' is a dominating set. If S' is not a locating-dominating set, then there exists w , apart from u , in the neighbourhood of v such that both u and w are adjacent with *only* v in S' . As u is a pendant vertex and v its unique neighbour, w is not adjacent with u . Hence, w was not

adjacent with any vertex in $S' \setminus \{v\} = S \setminus \{u\}$. This, however, contradicts the fact that S is a (locating) dominating set. Hence, S' is a locating-dominating set and $|S'| = |S|$. Thus, the result follows from repeating this argument for every vertex of G that is adjacent to a pendant vertex. \triangleleft

Parameterized complexity An instance of a parameterized problem Π consists of an input I , which is an input of the non-parameterized version of the problem, and an integer k , which is called the *parameter*. Formally, $\Pi \subseteq \Sigma^* \times \mathbb{N}$. A problem Π is said to be *fixed-parameter tractable*, or **FPT**, if given an instance (I, k) of Π , we can decide whether (I, k) is a YES-instance of Π in time $f(k) \cdot |I|^{\mathcal{O}(1)}$. Here, $f: \mathbb{N} \mapsto \mathbb{N}$ is some computable function depending only on k .

A parameterized problem Π is said to admit a *kernelization* if given an instance (I, k) of Π , there is an algorithm that runs in time polynomial in $|I| + k$ and constructs an instance (I', k') of Π such that (i) $(I, k) \in \Pi$ if and only if $(I', k') \in \Pi$, and (ii) $|I'| + k' \leq g(k)$ for some computable function $g: \mathbb{N} \mapsto \mathbb{N}$ depending only on k . If $g(\cdot)$ is a polynomial function, then Π is said to admit a *polynomial kernelization*. In some cases, it is possible that a parameterized problem Π is preprocessed into an equivalent instance of a different problem satisfying some special properties. Such preprocessing algorithms are also well-known in the literature. A *polynomial compression* of a parameterized problem Π into a problem $\Psi \subseteq \Sigma^*$ is an algorithm that given an instance (I, k) of Π , runs in polynomial in $|I| + k$ time, and outputs an instance I' of Ψ such that (i) $(I, k) \in \Pi$ if and only if $I' \in \Psi$, and (ii) $|I'| \leq f(k)$ for a polynomial function $f: \mathbb{N} \mapsto \mathbb{N}$. If $|\Sigma| = 2$, then the function $f(\cdot)$ is called the *bitsize* of the compression.

A *reduction rule* is a polynomial time algorithm that takes as input an instance of a problem and outputs another, usually reduced, instance. A reduction rule said to be *applicable* on an instance if the output instance and input instance are different. A reduction rule is *safe* if the input instance is a YES-instance if and only if the output instance is a YES-instance. For a detailed introduction to parameterized complexity and related terminologies, we refer the reader to the recent books by Cygan et al. [18] and Fomin et al. [21].


3 Parameterization by Vertex Cover Number

We describe an algorithm to prove Theorem 1, for **LOCATING-DOMINATING SET**, i.e., to prove that it admits an algorithm running in time $2^{\mathcal{O}(\text{vc} \log \text{vc})} \cdot n^{\mathcal{O}(1)}$, where **vc** is the vertex cover number of the input graph. Our algorithm is based on a reduction to a dynamic programming scheme for a generalized partition refinement problem, that can also be used to **TEST COVER**. We start with the following reduction rule which is applicable in polynomial time.

► **Reduction Rule 5.** *Let (G, k) be an instance of **LOCATING-DOMINATING SET**. If there exist three vertices u, v, x of G such that any two of u, v, x are twins, then delete x from G and decrease k by one.*

► **Lemma 6.** *Reduction Rule 5 is correct and can be applied in time $\mathcal{O}(n + m)$.*

Proof. We show that (G, k) is a YES-instance of **LOCATING-DOMINATING SET** if and only if $(G - \{x\}, k - 1)$ is a YES-instance of **LOCATING-DOMINATING SET**. Slater proved that for any set S of vertices of a graph G such that any two vertices in S are twins, any locating-dominating set contains at least $|S| - 1$ vertices of S [36]. Hence, any locating-dominating set must contain at least two vertices in $\{u, v, x\}$. We can assume, without loss of generality,



■ **Figure 2** An instance (G, k) of LOCATING-DOMINATING SET. Set U is a minimum-size vertex cover of G . The dotted edge denotes that a vertex is adjacent with all the vertices in the set. For the sake of brevity, we do not show all the edges. The vertices in green ellipses are part of solution because of (i) being a part of false-twins, (ii) guessed intersection with U , and (iii) the requirement of solution to be a dominating set. Note that the vertices T_L are not dominated by the partial solution Y_L . Parts P_1, P_2, P'_1, P'_2 , and P''_1 are parts of partition of $R \cup B$ induced by Y_L .

that any resolving set contains both u and x . Hence, any pair of vertices in $V(G) \setminus \{u, x\}$ that is located by x is also located by u , moreover, any vertex in $V(G) \setminus \{u, x\}$ that is dominated by x is also dominated by u . Thus, if S is a locating-dominating set of G , then $S \setminus \{x\}$ is a locating-dominating set of $G - \{x\}$. This implies that if (G, k) is a YES-instance, then $(G - \{x\}, k - 1)$ is a YES-instance. The correctness of the reverse direction follows from the fact that we can add x into a locating-dominating set of $G - \{x\}$ to obtain one of G . Since detecting twins in a graph can be done in time $\mathcal{O}(n + m)$ [28], the running time follows. ◀

Our algorithm starts by finding a minimum vertex cover, say U , of G by an algorithm in time $1.2528^{vc} \cdot n^{\mathcal{O}(1)}$ [29]. Then, $vc = |U|$. Moreover, let $R = V \setminus U$ be the corresponding independent set in G . The algorithm first applies Reduction Rule 5 exhaustively to reduce every twin-class to size at most 2. For the simplicity of notations, we continue to call the reduced instance of LOCATING-DOMINATING SET as (G, k) .

Consider an optimal but hypothetical locating-dominating set L of G . The algorithm constructs a partial solution Y_L and, in subsequent steps, expands it to obtain L . The algorithm initializes Y_L as follows: for all pairs u, v of twins in G , it adds one of them in Y_L . Slater proved that for any set S of vertices of a graph G such that any two vertices in S are twins, any locating-dominating set contains at least $|S| - 1$ vertices of S [36]. Hence, it is safe to assume that all the vertices in Y_L are present in any locating-dominating set. Next, the algorithm guesses the intersection of L with U . Formally, it iterates over all the subsets of U , and for each such set, say X_L , it computes a locating-dominating set of appropriate size that contains all the vertices in X_L and no vertex in $U \setminus X_L$. Consider a subset X_L of U and define $B = U \setminus X_L$ and $R' = R \setminus (N(X_L) \cup Y_L)$. As L is also a dominating set, it is safe to assume that $R' \subseteq L$. The algorithm updates Y_L to include $X_L \cup R'$.

At this stage, Y_L dominates all the vertices in R . However, it may not dominate all the vertices in B . The remaining (to be chosen) vertices in L are part of R and are responsible for dominating the remaining vertices in B and to locate all the vertices in $R \cup B$. See Figure 2 for an illustration. As the remaining solution, i.e., $L \setminus Y_L$, does not intersect B , it is safe to ignore the edges both of whose endpoints are in B . The vertices in Y_L induce a partition of the vertices of the remaining graph, according to their neighborhood in Y_L . We can redefine the objective of selecting the remaining vertices in a locating-dominating set as to *refine* this partition such that each part contains exactly one vertex. Partition refinement is a classic concept in algorithms, see [28]. However in our case, the partition is not standalone, as it is

induced by a solution set. To formalize this intuition, we introduce the following notation.

► **Definition 7** (Partition Induced by C and Refinement). *For a subset $C \subseteq V(G)$, define an equivalence relation \sim_C on $V' \subseteq V(G) \setminus C$ as follows: for any pair $u, v \in V'$, $u \sim_C v$ if and only if $N(u) \cap C = N(v) \cap C$. Then, for any set $V \subseteq V(G)$, the partition of V induced by C , denoted by $\mathcal{P}(C)$, is defined as follows:*

$$\mathcal{P}(C) = \{\{c\} \mid c \in V \cap C\} \cup \{S \mid S \text{ is an equivalence class of } \sim_C \text{ defined on } V \setminus C\}.$$

Moreover, for two partitions \mathcal{P} and \mathcal{Q} of V , a refinement of \mathcal{P} by \mathcal{Q} , denoted by $\mathcal{P} \pitchfork \mathcal{Q}$, is the partition defined as $\{P \cap Q : P \in \mathcal{P}, Q \in \mathcal{Q}\}$.

Suppose $V = V(G)$ and \mathcal{P} and \mathcal{Q} are two partitions of $V(G)$, then $\mathcal{P} \pitchfork \mathcal{Q}$ is also a partition of $V(G)$. In addition, it can be checked that, if $C_1, C_2 \subseteq V(G)$, then $\mathcal{P}(C_1 \cup C_2) = \mathcal{P}(C_1) \pitchfork \mathcal{P}(C_2)$ on any subset $V \subseteq V(G)$. We say a partition \mathcal{P} is the *identity partition* if every part of \mathcal{P} is a singleton set. This implies that a set $C \subseteq V(G)$ for any graph G has the property $N(u) \cap C \neq N(v) \cap C$ for all distinct $u, v \in V(G) \setminus C$ if and only if the partition $\mathcal{P}(C)$ of $V(G)$ is identity. With these definitions, we define the following auxiliary problem.

ANNOTATED RED-BLUE PARTITION REFINEMENT

Input: A bipartite graph G with bipartition $\langle R, B \rangle$ of $V(G)$; a partition \mathcal{Q} of $R \cup B$; a collection of forced solution vertices $C_0 \subseteq R$; a collection of vertices $T_L \subseteq B$ that needs to be dominated; and an integer λ .


Question: Does there exist a set C of size at most λ such that $C_0 \subseteq C \subseteq R$, C dominates T_L , and $\mathcal{Q} \pitchfork \mathcal{P}(C)$ is the identity partition of $R \cup B$?

Suppose there is an algorithm \mathcal{A} that solves ANNOTATED RED-BLUE PARTITION REFINEMENT in time $f(|B|) \cdot (|R| + |B|)^{\mathcal{O}(1)}$. Then, there is an algorithm that solves LOCATING-DOMINATING SET in time $2^{\mathcal{O}(\text{vc})} \cdot f(\text{vc}) \cdot n^{\mathcal{O}(1)}$. Consider the algorithm described so far in this subsection. The algorithm then calls \mathcal{A} as a subroutine with the bipartite graph $\langle R, B \rangle$ obtained from G , where $B = U \setminus X_L$ and $R = V \setminus U$ (notice that, since the hypothetical solution L has no vertices from B , the edges of G with both endpoints in B are irrelevant to the locating property of L). It sets \mathcal{Q} as the partition of $R \cup B$ induced by Y_L , $C_0 = Y_L \cap R$, $T_L = B \setminus N[Y_L]$, and $\lambda = k - |X_L|$. Note that T_L is the collection of vertices that are *not* dominated by the partial solution Y_L . The correctness of the algorithm follows from the correctness of \mathcal{A} and the fact that for two sets $C_1, C_2 \subseteq V(G)$, $C_1 \cup C_2$ is a locating-dominating set of G if and only if $C_1 \cup C_2$ is a dominating set and $\mathcal{P}(C_1 \cup C_2) = \mathcal{P}(C_1) \pitchfork \mathcal{P}(C_2)$ is the identity partition of $V(G)$. Hence, it suffices to prove the following lemma.

► **Lemma 8.** *There is an algorithm that solves ANNOTATED RED-BLUE PARTITION REFINEMENT in time $2^{\mathcal{O}(|B| \log |B|)} \cdot (|R| + |B|)^{\mathcal{O}(1)}$.*

The remainder of the section is devoted to prove Lemma 8. We present the algorithm that can roughly be divided into three parts. In the first part, the algorithm processes the partition \mathcal{Q} of $R \cup B$ with the goal of reaching to a refinement of partition \mathcal{Q} such that every part is completely contained either in R or in B . Then, we introduce some terms to obtain a ‘set-cover’ type dynamic programming. We also introduce three conditions that restrict the number of dynamic programming states we need to consider to $2^{\mathcal{O}(|B| \log |B|)} \cdot |R|$. Finally, we state the dynamic programming procedure, prove its correctness and argue about its running time.

Pre-processing the Partition. Consider the partition $\mathcal{P}(C_0)$ of $R \cup B$ induced by C_0 , and define $\mathcal{P}_0 = \mathcal{Q} \pitchfork \mathcal{P}(C_0)$. We classify the parts in \mathcal{P}_0 into three classes depending on whether



■ **Figure 3** Instance of the ANNOTATED RED-BLUE PARTITION REFINEMENT problem. Vertices in green ellipse denotes set C_0 whereas dotted ellipse denote vertices in T_L , and the partition $\mathcal{Q} = \{P_1, P_2, P'_1, P'_2, P''_1\}$. The vertices in the rectangles denote vertices in T_L° .

they intersect with R , B , or both. Let P_1, P_2, \dots, P_t be an arbitrary but fixed order on the parts of \mathcal{P}_0 that are completely in R . Similarly, let $P'_1, P'_2, \dots, P'_{t'}$ be an arbitrary but fixed order on the parts that are completely in B . Also, let $P''_1, P''_2, \dots, P''_{t''}$ be the collection of parts that intersect R as well as B . Formally, we have $P_j \subseteq R$ for any $j \in [t]$, $P'_{j'} \subseteq B$ for any $j' \in [t']$, and $P''_{j''} \cap R \neq \emptyset \neq P''_{j''} \cap B$ for any $j'' \in [t'']$. See Figure 3 for an illustration.

Recall that T_L is the collection of vertices in B that are required to be dominated. The algorithm first expands this set so that it is precisely the collection of vertices that need to be dominated by the solution C . In other words, at present, the required condition is $T_L \subseteq N(C)$, whereas, after the expansion, the condition is $T_L = N(C)$. Towards this, it first expands T_L to include $N(C_0)$. It then uses the property that the final partition needs to be the identity partition to add some more vertices in T_L .

Consider parts $P'_{j'}$ or $P''_{j''}$ of \mathcal{P}_0 . Suppose that $P'_{j'}$ (respectively, $P''_{j''} \cap B$) contains two vertices that are *not* dominated by the final solution C , then these two vertices would not be separated by it and hence would remain in one part, a contradiction. Therefore, any feasible solution C needs to dominate all vertices but one in $P'_{j'}$ (respectively in $P''_{j''} \cap B$).

- The algorithm modifies T_L to include $N(C_0)$. Then, it iterates over all the subsets T_L° of $B \setminus T_L$ such that for any $j' \in [t']$ and $j'' \in [t'']$, $|P'_{j'} \cap (T_L^\circ \cup T_L)| \leq 1$ and $|(P''_{j''} \cap B) \cap (T_L^\circ \cup T_L)| \leq 1$.

Consider a part P_j of \mathcal{P}_0 , which is completely contained in R . As R is an independent set and the final solution C is not allowed to include any vertex in B , for any part P_j , there is at most one vertex outside C , i.e., $|P_j \setminus C| \leq 1$. However, unlike the previous step, the algorithm cannot enumerate all the required subsets of R in the desired time. Nonetheless, it uses this property to safely perform the following sanity checks and modifications.

- Consider parts P_j or $P''_{j''}$ of \mathcal{P}_0 . Suppose there are two vertices in P_j (respectively $P''_{j''} \cap R$) that are adjacent with some vertices in $B \setminus T_L$. Then, discard this guess of T_L° and move to the next subset.
- Consider parts P_j or $P''_{j''}$ of \mathcal{P}_0 . Suppose there is a unique vertex, say r , in P_j (respectively, in $P''_{j''} \cap R$) that is adjacent with some vertex in $B \setminus T_L$. Then, modify C_0 to include all the vertices in $P_j \setminus \{r\}$ or in $(P''_{j''} \cup R) \setminus \{r\}$.

Consider a part $P''_{j''}$ of \mathcal{P}_0 and suppose $|(P''_{j''} \cap B) \setminus T_L| = 0$. Alternately, every vertex in $P''_{j''} \cap B$ is adjacent to some vertex in the final solution C . As R is an independent set and $C \subseteq R$, this domination condition already refines the partition $P''_{j''}$, i.e. every vertex in $(P''_{j''} \cap B)$ needs to be adjacent with some vertex in C whereas no vertex in $(P''_{j''} \cap R)$ can be adjacent with C . This justifies the following modification.

- For a part $P''_{j''}$ of \mathcal{P}_0 such that $|(P''_{j''} \cap B) \setminus T_L| = 0$, the algorithm modifies the input partition \mathcal{P}_0 by removing $P''_{j''}$ and adding two new parts $P_j := P''_{j''} \cap R$ and $P'_{j'} := P''_{j''} \cap B$. Consider a part $P''_{j''}$ of \mathcal{P}_0 and suppose $|(P''_{j''} \cap B) \setminus T_L| = 1$. Let b be the unique vertex in $(P''_{j''} \cap B) \setminus T_L$. Suppose there is a (unique) vertex, say r , in $(P''_{j''} \cap R)$ that is not part

23:10 Structural Parameterization of Locating-Dominating Set and Test Cover

of the final solution C . However, this implies that both b and r are in the same part, a contradiction.

- For part $P''_{j'}$ of \mathcal{P}_0 such that $|(P''_{j'} \cap B) \setminus T_L| = 1$, the algorithm includes all the vertices $(P''_{j'} \cap R)$ into C_0 (which, by definition, modifies \mathcal{P}_0). Also, it removes $P''_{j'}$ from \mathcal{P}_0 and adds $P'_{j'} := P''_{j'} \cap B$.

These modifications ensure that any part of \mathcal{P}_0 is either completely contained in R or completely contained in B .

Setting up the Dynamic Programming. Define $\ell = |R \setminus C_0|$ and suppose $\{r_1, r_2, \dots, r_\ell\}$ be the reordering of vertices in $R \setminus C_0$ such that any part in P_j contains the consecutive elements in the order. Formally, for any $i_1 < i_2 < i_3 \in \{1, 2, \dots, |R \setminus C_0|\}$ and $t^\circ \in \{1, 2, \dots, t\}$, if $r_{i_1} \in P_{t^\circ}$ and $r_{i_3} \in P_{t^\circ}$, then $r_{i_2} \in P_{t^\circ}$. Define a function $\pi : \{1, 2, \dots, |R \setminus C_0|\} \mapsto \{1, 2, \dots, t\}$ such that $\pi(r_i) = t^\circ$ if and only if vertex r_i is in part P_{t° .

For the remaining part, the algorithm relies on a ‘set cover’ type dynamic programming.¹ For every integer $i \in [0, \ell]$, define $R_i = \{r_1, r_2, \dots, r_i\}$. Then, in a ‘set cover’-type dynamic programming, tries to find the optimum size of a subset of R_i that dominates all the vertices in S , which is a subset of T . However, two different optimum solutions in R_i will induce different partitions of $R \cup B$. To accommodate this, we define the notion of *valid tuples*. For an integer $i \in [0, \ell]$ and a subset $S \subseteq T$, we say a tuple (i, \mathcal{P}, S) is a *valid tuple* if \mathcal{P} is a refinement of \mathcal{P}_0 and it satisfies the three properties mentioned below. Note that these properties are the consequences of the fact that we require \mathcal{P} to be such that, for any (partial) solution C with vertices upto r_i in the ordering of $R \setminus C_0$, we can have $\mathcal{P}(C) = \mathcal{P}$ and $N(C) = S$.

1. For any $i \in [0, \ell]$, the partition \mathcal{P} restricted to any P_j , where $j \in [\pi(i) - 1]$, is the identity partition of P_j . This is because, if on the contrary, \mathcal{P} restricted to P_j for some $j \in [\pi(i) - 1]$ is not the identity partition, it would imply that there exists a part P , say, of \mathcal{P} with $|P| \geq 2$ which cannot be refined by picking vertices of R in the final solution C (upto r_ℓ), as R is an independent set.
2. There may be at most one vertex r , say, in $P_{\pi(i)} \cap R_i$ which is not yet picked in C . This is because if two vertices r', r'' of $P_{\pi(i)} \cap R_i$ are not picked in C , the final solution C cannot induce the identity partition, since $\{r'\}, \{r''\} \notin \mathcal{P}(C)$. Thus, since for any $r' \in P_{\pi(i)} \cap R_i \setminus \{r\}$, we have $\{r'\} \in \mathcal{P}(C)$, we therefore require the partition P of \mathcal{P} to be a singleton set if $P \cap P_{\pi(i)} \cap R_i \neq \emptyset$ and $r \notin P$. Moreover, since $(\{r\} \cup P_{\pi(i)} \setminus R_i) \in \mathcal{P}(C)$, we require that for $r \in P$, the part P must be $(\{r\} \cup P_{\pi(i)} \setminus R_i) \in \mathcal{P}(C)$.
3. Since any (partial) solution upto r_i does not refine any of the parts $P_{\pi(i)+1}, \dots, P_t$, for every part $P \in \mathcal{P}$ that does not intersect $P_1 \cup P_2 \cup \dots \cup P_{\pi(i)}$, P must be of the form P_x , where $x \in [\pi(i) + 1, t]$.

From the above three properties of how the refinements \mathcal{P} of \mathcal{P}_0 can be, we find that \mathcal{P} restricted to B can be any partition on B (which can be at most $\mathcal{O}(2^{\mathcal{O}(|B| \log |B|)})$ many) and the sets $P \in \mathcal{P}$ containing the vertex $r \in P_{\pi(i)}$ can be as many as the number of vertices in $P_{\pi(i)} \cap R_i$, that is, at most $|R|$ many. Let \mathcal{X} be the collection of all the valid tuples. Then, for any $i \in [\ell]$ and any $S \subseteq T$, the number of partitions \mathcal{P} for which $(i, \mathcal{P}, S) \in \mathcal{X}$ is $\mathcal{O}(2^{\mathcal{O}(|B| \log |B|)} \cdot |R|)$.

Dynamic Programming. For every valid tuple $(i, \mathcal{P}, S) \in \mathcal{X}$, we define

¹ See [20, Theorem 3.10] for a simple $\mathcal{O}(mn2^n)$ dynamic programming scheme for SET COVER on a universe of size n and m sets.

$\text{opt}[i, \mathcal{P}, S]$ = the minimum cardinality of a set C that is *compatible* with the valid triple (i, \mathcal{P}, S) , i.e., (i) $C \subseteq R_i$ (ii) $\mathcal{P}_0 \cap \mathcal{P}(C) = \mathcal{P}$ & (iii) $N(C) = S$.

If no such (i, \mathcal{P}, S) -compatible set exists, then we let the value of $\text{opt}[i, \mathcal{P}, S]$ to be ∞ . Moreover, any (i, \mathcal{P}, S) -compatible set C of minimum cardinality is called a *minimum (i, \mathcal{P}, S) -compatible set*. The quantities $\text{opt}[i, \mathcal{P}, S]$ for all $(i, \mathcal{P}, S) \in \mathcal{X}$ are updated inductively. Then finally, the quantity $\text{opt}[\ell, \mathcal{I}(R \cup B), T]$ gives us the required output of the problem. To start with, we define the quantity $\text{opt}[0, \mathcal{P}_0, N(C_0)] = |C_0|$ and set $\text{opt}[i, \mathcal{P}, S] = \infty$ for each triple $(i, \mathcal{P}, S) \in \mathcal{X}$ such that $(i, \mathcal{P}, S) \neq (0, \mathcal{P}_0, N(C_0))$. Then, the value of each $\text{opt}[i, \mathcal{P}, S]$ updates by the following dynamic programming formula.

$$\text{opt}[i, \mathcal{P}, S] = \min \begin{cases} \text{opt}[i-1, \mathcal{P}, S], \\ 1 + \min_{\substack{\mathcal{P}' \cap \mathcal{P}(r_i) = \mathcal{P}, \\ S' \cup N(r_i) = S}} \text{opt}[i-1, \mathcal{P}', S']. \end{cases} \quad (1)$$

Proof of Correctness. We prove by induction on i that the above formula is correct. In other words, we show that, for any $i \in [\ell]$, if the values of $\text{opt}[j, \mathcal{P}', S']$ are correctly calculated for all triples $(j, \mathcal{P}', S') \in \mathcal{X}$ with $j \in [0, i-1]$, then for any couple (\mathcal{P}, S) , the above equality holds. Before this, we prove some technical properties.

▷ **Claim 9.** Let $(i, \mathcal{P}, S) \in \mathcal{X}$. Then, the following hold.

- The triple $(i-1, \mathcal{P}, S) \in \mathcal{X}$ as well. Moreover, if C is a $(i-1, \mathcal{P}, S)$ -compatible set, then C is also a (i, \mathcal{P}, S) -compatible set. In particular, $\text{opt}[i, \mathcal{P}, S] \leq \text{opt}[i-1, \mathcal{P}, S]$.
- Let $(i-1, \mathcal{P}', S') \in \mathcal{X}$ such that $\mathcal{P}' \cap \mathcal{P}(r_i) = \mathcal{P}$ and $S' \cup N(r_i) = S$. If C' is a $(i-1, \mathcal{P}', S')$ -compatible set, then $C = C' \cup \{r_i\}$ is a (i, \mathcal{P}, S) -compatible set. In particular, $\text{opt}[i, \mathcal{P}, S] \leq 1 + \text{opt}[i-1, \mathcal{P}', S']$.

Proof. We first show that $(i-1, \mathcal{P}, S) \in \mathcal{X}$. So, let $P \in \mathcal{P}$ be such that $P \cap R_{i-1} \neq \emptyset$ and $|P| \geq 2$. It implies that $P \cap R_i \neq \emptyset$ as well and hence, $P \cap P_j = \emptyset$ for all $j \in [0, \pi(i)-1]$ and $P \cap P_{\pi(i)}$ is singleton. If $\pi(i-1) < \pi(i)$, then $\pi(i-1) = \pi(i) - 1$ and hence, $P \cap P_j = \emptyset$ for all $j \in [0, \pi(i-1)]$. In other words, $P \cap R_{i-1} = \emptyset$, a contradiction to our assumption. Therefore, we must have $\pi(i-1) = \pi(i)$ and thus, clearly, $(i-1, \mathcal{P}, S) \in \mathcal{X}$. Now, let C is a $(i-1, \mathcal{P}, S)$ -compatible set. Then clearly C is also a (i, \mathcal{P}, S) -compatible set. Then, the inequality follows immediately.

Now, we prove the second point. Let C' be a $(i-1, \mathcal{P}', S')$ -compatible set. Then, we have the following.

- $C = C' \cup \{r_i\} \subset R_i$;
- $\mathcal{P}_0 \cap \mathcal{P}(C) = \mathcal{P}_0 \cap \mathcal{P}(C') \cap \mathcal{P}(r_i) = \mathcal{P}' \cap \mathcal{P}(r_i) = \mathcal{P}$; and
- $N(C) = N(C') \cup N(r_i) = S' \cup N(r_i) = S$.

This implies that the set C is a (i, \mathcal{P}, S) -compatible set. Now, if $\text{opt}[i-1, \mathcal{P}', S'] = \infty$, then, clearly, $\text{opt}[i, \mathcal{P}, S] \leq 1 + \infty = 1 + \text{opt}[i-1, \mathcal{P}, S]$. Lastly, if $\text{opt}[i-1, \mathcal{P}', S'] < \infty$ and C' is a minimum $(i-1, \mathcal{P}', S')$ -compatible set, since C is (i, \mathcal{P}, S) -compatible, we have $\text{opt}[i, \mathcal{P}, S] \leq |C| = 1 + |C'| = 1 + \text{opt}[i-1, \mathcal{P}', S']$. ◀

We now prove by induction on i that Equation (1) is correct. In other words, we show that, for any $i \in [\ell]$, if the values of $\text{opt}[j, \mathcal{P}', S']$ are correctly calculated for all triples $(j, \mathcal{P}', S') \in \mathcal{X}$ with $j \in [0, i-1]$, then for any couple (\mathcal{P}, S) , the above equality holds. Let us therefore assume that, for all triples (j, \mathcal{P}', S') with $j \in [0, i-1]$, the values of $\text{opt}[j, \mathcal{P}', S']$ are correctly calculated.

To begin with, we show that if no (i, \mathcal{P}, S) -compatible set exists, then Equation (1) must compute ∞ as the value of $\text{opt}[i, \mathcal{P}, S]$. In other words, we prove that the value of

the RHS in Equation (1) is ∞ . On the contrary, if $\text{opt}[i-1, \mathcal{P}, S] < \infty$, then there exists a $(i-1, \mathcal{P}, S)$ -compatible set C which, by Claim 9(1), is a (i, \mathcal{P}, S) -compatible set. This contradicts our assumption in this case and therefore, $\text{opt}[i-1, \mathcal{P}, S] = \infty$. Similarly, if we assume that $\text{opt}[i-1, \mathcal{P}', S'] < \infty$ for some refinement \mathcal{P}' of \mathcal{P}_0 and some subset S' of T such that $\mathcal{P}' \cap \mathcal{P}(r_i) = \mathcal{P}$ and $S' \cup N(r_i) = S$, then there exists a $(i-1, \mathcal{P}', S')$ -compatible set C' . Therefore, by Claim 9(2), the set $C = C' \cup \{r_i\}$ is a (i, \mathcal{P}, S) -compatible set. This again implies a contradiction to our assumption in this case and therefore, $\text{opt}[i-1, \mathcal{P}', S'] = \infty$. Hence, this proves that $\text{RHS} = \infty$ in Equation (1).

In view of the above argument, therefore, we assume for the rest of the proof that $\text{opt}[i, \mathcal{P}, S] < \infty$. We then show that $\text{LHS} = \text{RHS}$ in Equation (1). To begin with, we first show that $\text{LHS} \leq \text{RHS}$ in Equation (1). This is true since, by Claim 9(1), we have $\text{opt}[i, \mathcal{P}, S] \leq \text{opt}[i-1, \mathcal{P}, S]$ and, by Claim 9(2), for any $(i-1, \mathcal{P}', S') \in \mathcal{X}$ such that $\mathcal{P}' \cap \mathcal{P}(r_i) = \mathcal{P}$ and $S' \cup N(r_i) = S$, we have $\text{opt}[i, \mathcal{P}, S] \leq 1 + \text{opt}[i-1, \mathcal{P}', S']$.

We now prove the reverse, that is, the inequality $\text{LHS} \geq \text{RHS}$ in Equation (1). Recall that $\text{opt}[i, \mathcal{P}, S] < \infty$ and hence, $\text{opt}[i, \mathcal{P}, S] = |C|$ for some minimum (i, \mathcal{P}, S) -compatible set C . We consider the following two cases.

- **Case 1** ($r_i \notin C$). In this case, C is a $(i-1, \mathcal{P}, S)$ -compatible set which implies that $\text{RHS} \leq \text{opt}[i-1, \mathcal{P}, S] \leq |C| = \text{opt}[i, \mathcal{P}, S]$.
- **Case 2** ($r_i \in C$). Let $C' = C \setminus \{r_i\}$. Then, C' is a $(i-1, \mathcal{P}', S')$ -compatible set, where $\mathcal{P}' \cap \mathcal{P}(r_i) = \mathcal{P}$ and $S' \cup N(r_i) = S$. Therefore, we have $\text{opt}[i-1, \mathcal{P}', S'] \leq |C'|$ which implies that $\text{RHS} \leq 1 + \text{opt}[i-1, \mathcal{P}', S'] \leq 1 + |C'| = |C| = \text{opt}[i, \mathcal{P}, S]$.

This proves that $\text{LHS} = \text{RHS}$ in Equation (1) and hence the correctness of the algorithm.

Running Time. As mentioned before, given any $i \in [\ell]$ and any $S \subseteq T$, the number of partitions \mathcal{P} for which $(i, \mathcal{P}, S) \in \mathcal{X}$ is $2^{\mathcal{O}(|B| \log |B|)} \cdot |R|$. Moreover, the number of possible subsets S of T is at most $2^{|T|} \in 2^{\mathcal{O}(|B|)}$. Therefore, there are at most $|R| \cdot 2^{\mathcal{O}(|B| \log |B|)} \cdot |R| \cdot 2^{\mathcal{O}(|B|)} \in 2^{\mathcal{O}(|B| \log |B|)} \cdot |R|^{\mathcal{O}(1)}$ many states of the dynamic programming that need to be calculated. Moreover, to calculate each such $\text{opt}[i, \mathcal{P}, S]$, another $2^{\mathcal{O}(|B| \log |B|)} \cdot |R|^{\mathcal{O}(1)}$ number of $\text{opt}[i-1, \mathcal{P}', S']$'s are invoked according to the dynamic programming formula (1). As a result therefore, we obtain a total runtime of $2^{\mathcal{O}(|B| \log |B|)} \cdot |R|^{\mathcal{O}(1)} \times 2^{\mathcal{O}(|B| \log |B|)} \cdot |R|^{\mathcal{O}(1)}$. This completes the proof of Lemma 8.

Parameterization by the number of items for Test Cover

We find it convenient to with the auxiliary graph representation of the instance (U, \mathcal{F}, k) of TEST COVER. Recall that we define the auxiliary bipartite graph as graph G on n vertices with bipartition $\langle R, B \rangle$ of $V(G)$ such that sets R and B contain a vertex for every set in \mathcal{F} and for every item in U , respectively, and $r \in R$ and $b \in B$ are adjacent if and only if the set corresponding to r contains the item corresponding to b . TEST COVER admits a simple $|R|^{\mathcal{O}(k)} \cdot (|R| + |B|)^{\mathcal{O}(1)}$ algorithm that enumerates all the possible subsets of R and checks it for feasibility. Our goal is find an FPT algorithm parameterized by $|B|$. Note that it is safe to assume $|R| \leq 2^{|B|}$ as we can remove twin vertices from R and get an equivalent instance). Bondy's theorem [6] asserts that TEST COVER always has a solution of size at most $|B| - 1$. This implies that $k \leq |B|$ for a non-trivial instance. Hence, the brute-force algorithm mentioned above runs in time $2^{\mathcal{O}(|B|^2)} \cdot (|R| + |B|)^{\mathcal{O}(1)}$.

Using Lemma 8, we present an improved FPT algorithm, in the spirit of the known $\mathcal{O}(mn2^n)$ dynamic programming scheme for SET COVER on a universe of size n and m sets (see [20, Theorem 3.10]). We reduce TEST COVER to ANNOTATED RED-BLUE PARTITION REFINEMENT. For this, note that in a solution of TEST COVER, either every vertex of B

is dominated by the solution, or exactly one vertex of B is not dominated by the solution. Thus, we go through every possible choice of subset $T_L \subseteq B$ with $|T_L| \in \{|B| - 1, |B|\}$. We let $C_0 = \emptyset$, and define the partition \mathcal{Q} defined by taking all vertices of R as parts of size 1, and the set B as the last part. Now, it suffices to run the dynamic programming for solving ANNOTATED RED-BLUE PARTITION REFINEMENT with each of the $|B| + 1$ choices of set T_L , giving a running time of $2^{\mathcal{O}(|B| \log |B|)} \cdot (|R| + |B|)^{\mathcal{O}(1)}$.

Parameterization by Other Structural Parameters

We now consider further structural parameterizations of LOCATING-DOMINATING SET.

Extending Theorem 1 for Twin-Cover Number and Distance to Clique

The technique designed in Section 3 can in fact be used to obtain algorithms for two related parameters. The *distance to clique* of a graph is the size of a smallest set of vertices that need to be removed from a graph so that the remaining vertices form a clique. It is a dense analogue of the vertex cover number (which can be seen as the “distance to independent set”). The *twin-cover number* of a graph [25] is the size of a smallest set of vertices such that the remaining vertices is a collection of disjoint cliques, each of them forming a set of mutual twins. The twin-cover number is at most the vertex cover number, since the vertices not in the vertex cover form cliques of size 1 in the remaining graph. We can obtain running in time $2^{\mathcal{O}(\text{dc} \log \text{dc})} \cdot n^{\mathcal{O}(1)}$ and $2^{\mathcal{O}(\text{tc} \log \text{tc})} \cdot n^{\mathcal{O}(1)}$, where dc is the distance to clique of the input graph, and tc is the twin-cover cover number of the input graph. In both cases, the arguments are essentially the same as for vc .

For the twin-cover parameterization, let U be a set of vertices of size tc whose removal leaves a collection \mathcal{C} of cliques, each forming a twin-class. Observe that, since we have applied Reduction Rule 5 exhaustively, in fact every clique in \mathcal{C} has size at most 2. Moreover, recall that for any two vertices in a twin-class S , we need to select any one of them in any solution, thus those vertices are put in C_0 . Note that each such selected vertex dominates its twin in R , which thus is the only vertex of R in its part of \mathcal{Q} . Apart from this, nothing changes, and we can apply Lemma 8 as above.

For distance to clique, U is the set of vertices of size dc whose removal leaves a clique, R . Since R forms a clique, we do no longer immediately obtain a bipartite graph, and thus we need a “split graph” version of Lemma 8, where R is a clique and B remains an independent set. Here, there are some slight changes during the phase of pre-processing the partition in the proof of Lemma 8, since any vertex in C from R dominates the whole of R and can thus potentially locate some vertex of R from some vertex of B . Nevertheless, after the pre-processing, as in Lemma 8, we obtain a partition where every part is completely included either in R or in B . Then, selecting a vertex of R does not distinguish any two other vertices of R , and hence the algorithm is exactly the same from that point onwards.

A linear kernel for Neighbourhood Diversity

We now show that LOCATING-DOMINATING SET admits a linear kernel when parameterized by the neighbourhood diversity of the input graph. Recall that the *neighbourhood diversity* of a graph G is the smallest integer d such that G can be partitioned into d sets of mutual twin vertices, each set being either a clique or an independent set. It was introduced in [31] and can be computed in linear time $O(n + m)$ using modular decomposition [14]. We show the following.

► **Lemma 10.** *LOCATING-DOMINATING SET admits a kernelization algorithm that, given an instance (G, k) with $nd(G) = d$, computes an equivalent instance (G', k') with $2d$ vertices, and that runs in time $\mathcal{O}(nm)$.*

Proof. We repeatedly apply Reduction Rule 5 until there are no sets of mutual twins of size more than 2 in the graph. As each application takes time $\mathcal{O}(n + m)$ (Lemma 6), overall this take at most time $\mathcal{O}(n(n + m)) = \mathcal{O}(nm)$. Thus, after applying the rule, there are at most two vertices in each neighbourhood equivalence class. Since there are at most d such classes, the resulting graph has at most $2d$ vertices. By Lemma 6, this produces an equivalent instance (G', k') . ◀

► **Corollary 11.** *LOCATING-DOMINATING SET admits an algorithm running in time $2^{\mathcal{O}(d)} + \mathcal{O}(nm)$, where d is the neighbourhood diversity of the input graph.*

Proof. We first compute in time $\mathcal{O}(nm)$ the linear kernel from Theorem 10, that is a graph with $n' \leq 2d$ vertices. Then, a simple brute-force algorithm running in time $2^{\mathcal{O}(n')} = 2^{\mathcal{O}(d)}$ completes the proof. ◀

4 Parameterization by Feedback Edge Set Number

We next prove Theorem 2. A set of edges X of a graph is a *feedback edge set* if $G - X$ is a forest. The minimum size of a feedback edge set is known as the *feedback edge set number* fes . If a graph G has n vertices, m edges, and r components, then $\text{fes}(G) = m - n + r$ [19].

Our proof is nonconstructive, in the sense that it shows the *existence* of a large (but constant) number of gadget types with which the kernel can be constructed, however, as there are far too many gadgets, we cannot describe them individually. Missing parts of the proof are found in Appendix E. We first describe graphs of given feedback edge set number.

► **Proposition 12** ([30, Observation 8]). *Any graph G with feedback edge set number fes is obtained from a multigraph \tilde{G} with at most $2\text{fes} - 2$ vertices and $3\text{fes} - 3$ edges by first subdividing edges of \tilde{G} an arbitrary number of times, and then, repeatedly attaching degree 1 vertices to the graph, and \tilde{G} can be computed from G in $\mathcal{O}(n + \text{fes})$ time.*

By Proposition 12, we compute the multigraph \tilde{G} in $\mathcal{O}(n + \text{fes})$ time, and we let \tilde{V} be the set of vertices of \tilde{G} . For every edge v_1v_2 of \tilde{G} , we have either:

1. v_1v_2 corresponds to an edge in the original graph G , if v_1v_2 has not been subdivided when obtaining G from \tilde{G} (then $v_1 \neq v_2$ since G is loop-free), or
2. v_1v_2 corresponds to a component C of the original graph G with $\{v_1, v_2\}$ removed. Moreover, C induces a tree, with two (not necessarily distinct) vertices c_1, c_2 in C , where c_1 is the only vertex of C adjacent to v_1 and c_2 is the only vertex of C adjacent to v_2 in G . (Possibly, $v_1 = v_2$ and the edge v_1v_2 is a loop of \tilde{G} .)

To avoid dealing with the case of loops, for every component C of $G \setminus \{v_1\}$ with a loop at v_1 in \tilde{G} and with c_1, c_2 defined as above, we select an arbitrary vertex x of the unique path between c_1 and c_2 in $G[C]$ and add x to \tilde{V} . As there are at most fes loops in \tilde{G} , we can assume that \tilde{G} is a loopless multigraph with at most $3\text{fes} - 2$ vertices and $4\text{fes} - 3$ edges.

► **Observation 13.** *We may assume that the multigraph \tilde{G} computed in Proposition 12 has at most $3\text{fes} - 2$ vertices and $4\text{fes} - 3$ edges, and no loops.*

The kernelization has two steps. First, we need to handle *hanging trees*, that is, parts of the graph that induce trees and are connected to the rest of the graph via a single edge. Those correspond to the iterated addition of degree 1 vertices to the graph from \tilde{G} described in Proposition 12. Step 2 will deal with the subgraphs that correspond to the edges of \tilde{G} .

Step 1 – Handling the Hanging Trees. It is known that there is a linear-time dynamic programming algorithm to solve LOCATING-DOMINATING SET on trees [35] (see also [2] for a more general algorithm for block graphs, that also solves several types of problems related to LOCATING-DOMINATING SET). To this end, one can in fact define the following five types of (partial) solutions. For a tree T rooted at a vertex v , we define five types for a subset L of $V(T)$ as follows:

- Type *A*: L dominates all vertices of $V(T) \setminus \{v\}$ and any two vertices of $V(T) \setminus (L \cup \{v\})$ are located.
- Type *B*: L is a dominating set of T and any two vertices of $V(T) \setminus (L \cup \{v\})$ are located;
- Type *C*: L is a locating-dominating set of T ;
- Type *D*: L is a locating-dominating set of T with $v \in L$;
- Type *E*: L is a locating-dominating set of T such that $v \in L$ and there is no vertex w of T with $N(w) \cap L = \{v\}$;

Next, for convenience, we consider the lexicographic ordering $A < B < C < D < E$. Note that these five types of solution are increasingly constrained (so, if $X < X'$, if L is a solution of type X' , it is also one of type X). For a tree T rooted at v and $X \in \{A, B, C, D, E\}$, we denote by $opt_X(T, v)$ the minimum size of a set $L \subseteq V(T)$ of type X . Note that $opt_C(T, v)$ is equal to the location-domination number of T .

The following proposition can be proved by using the same ideas as in the dynamic programming algorithms from [2, 35].

► **Proposition 14.** *There is a linear-time dynamic programming algorithm that, for any tree T and root v , conjointly computes $opt_X(T, v)$ for all $X \in \{A, B, C, D, E\}$.*

► **Lemma 15.** *Let T be a tree with vertex v , and let $X, X' \in \{A, B, C, D, E\}$ with $X < X'$. We have $opt_{X'}(T, v) \leq opt_X(T, v) \leq opt_{X'}(T, v) + 1$.*

Proof. The first inequality follows immediately by noticing that the conditions for types A to E are increasingly constrained. Moreover, all types are feasible by considering $L = V(T)$, so $opt_X(T, v)$ is always well-defined. This implies that the first inequality is true.

For the second inequality, assume we have $X' \in \{A, B\}$ and L is an optimal solution of type X' . Then, $L \cup \{v\}$ is a solution of type E . If $X' \in \{C, D\}$, let L be an optimal solution of type X' . If $v \notin L$ (then $X' = C$), then again $L \cup \{v\}$ is a solution of type E . If $v \in L$, possibly some (unique) vertex w of T satisfies $N(w) \cap L = \{v\}$. Then, $L \cup \{w\}$ is a solution of type E . Thus, $opt_X(T, v) \leq opt_E(T, v) \leq opt_{X'}(T, v) + 1$. In all cases, we have $opt_X(T, v) \leq opt_E(T, v) \leq opt_{X'}(T, v) + 1$, as claimed. ◀

By Lemma 15, for any rooted tree (T, v) , the five values $opt_X(T, v)$ (for $X \in \{A, B, C, D, E\}$) differ by at most one, and we know that they increase along with X : $opt_A(T, v) \leq opt_B(T, v) \leq \dots \leq opt_E(T, v)$. Hence, for any rooted tree (T, v) , there is one value $X \in \{A, B, C, D, E\}$ so that, whenever $X' \leq X$, we have $opt_{X'}(T, v) = opt_X(T, v)$, and whenever $X' > X$, we have $opt_{X'}(T, v) = opt_X(T, v) + 1$. Thus, we can introduce the following definition, which partitions the set of rooted trees according to one of five such possible behaviours.

► **Definition 16** (Rooted tree classes). *For $X \in \{A, B, C, D, E\}$, we define the class \mathcal{T}_X as the set of pairs (T, v) such that T is a tree with root v , and there is an integer k with*

23:16 Structural Parameterization of Locating-Dominating Set and Test Cover

	$\circ v_A$	$\circ v_B$	$\circ v_C$	$\circ v_D$	$\circ v_E$
	T_A	T_B	T_C	T_D	T_E
opt_A	0	1	2	1	3
opt_B	1	1	2	1	3
opt_C	1	2	2	1	3
opt_D	1	2	3	1	3
opt_E	1	2	3	2	3

■ **Table 1** The five rooted tree gadgets with their values of the five opt_X functions.

$opt_{X'}(T, v) = k$ whenever $X' \leq X$, and $opt_{X'}(T, v) = k + 1$ whenever $X' > X$ (note that k may differ across the trees in \mathcal{T}_X).

Note that for the trees in \mathcal{T}_E , all five types of optimal solutions have the same size.

It is clear by Lemma 15 that the set of all possible pairs (T, v) where T is a tree and v a vertex of T , can be partitioned into the five classes \mathcal{T}_X , where $X \in \{A, B, C, D, E\}$. Moreover, it is not difficult to construct small rooted trees for each of these five classes. We provide five such small rooted trees in Table 1, each in a different class.

► **Definition 17** (Rooted tree gadgets). For $X \in \{A, B, C, D, E\}$, let (T_X, v_X) be the rooted tree of class \mathcal{T}_X from Table 1, and let $k_X = opt_X(T_X, v_X)$.

We are now ready to present our first reduction rule.

► **Reduction Rule 18.** Let (G, k) be an instance of LOCATING-DOMINATING SET such that G can be obtained from a graph G' and a tree T , by identifying a vertex v of T with a vertex w of G' , such that (T, v) is in class \mathcal{T}_X with $X \in \{A, B, C, D, E\}$, and with $opt_X(T, v) = t$. Then, we remove all vertices of $T \setminus \{v\}$ from G (this results in G'), we consider G and a copy of the rooted tree gadget (T_X, v_X) , and we identify v_X with v , to obtain G'' . The reduced instance is $(G'', k - t + k_X)$.

► **Lemma 19.** For an instance (G, k) of LOCATING-DOMINATING SET, Reduction Rule 18 can be applied exhaustively in time $\mathcal{O}(n^2)$, and for each application, (G, k) is a YES-instance of LOCATING-DOMINATING SET if and only if $(G'', k - t + k_X)$ is a YES-instance of LOCATING-DOMINATING SET.

Proof. To apply Reduction Rule 18, one can find all vertices of degree 1 in G , mark them, and iteratively mark degree 1 vertices in the subgraph induced by unmarked vertices. Note that a connected subset S of marked vertices induces a tree with a single vertex v_S adjacent to a non-marked vertex w . Moreover, at the end of the marking process, the subgraph induced by non-marked vertices has minimum degree 2. This process can be done in $\mathcal{O}(n^2)$ time.

We form the set of candidate trees T by taking the union S_w of all marked subsets that are connected to some common unmarked vertex w , together with w . Note that all these candidate trees are vertex-disjoint. Again, this can be done in $\mathcal{O}(n^2)$ time. Let (T, v) be such a rooted tree, and let G' be the subgraph induced by $V(G) \setminus S_v$. Then, we apply the linear-time dynamic programming algorithm of Proposition 14 to (T, v) to determine the class \mathcal{T}_X to which (T, v) belongs to, for some $X \in \{A, B, C, D, E\}$, as well as $opt_X(T, v) = t$

for each $X \in \{A, B, C, D, E\}$. Constructing $(G'', k - t + k_X)$ by replacing T by T_X in G can then be done in time $\mathcal{O}(|V(T)|)$. Thus, overall applying the reduction rule to all trees takes $\mathcal{O}(n^2)$ time.

Now, we prove the second part of the statement. Assume we have applied Reduction Rule 18 to a single tree (T, v) to G , that (G, k) is a YES-instance of LOCATING-DOMINATING SET, and let L be an optimal locating-dominating set of G of size at most k . Assume that $L \cap V(T)$ is of type X' for $X' \in \{A, B, C, D, E\}$ with respect to (T, v) . Notice that the only interactions between the vertices in $V(T)$ and $V(G')$ are through the cut-vertex v . If $X' \leq X$, then, as L is optimal, we have $|L \cap V(T)| = t$; if $X' > X$, then by Lemma 15, we have $|L \cap V(T)| = t + 1$. Now, we obtain a solution of G'' from $L' = L \cap V(G')$ by adding an optimal solution $S_{X'}$ of type X' of (T_X, v_X) to L' . This has size k_X if $X' \leq X$ and $k_X + 1$ if $X' > X$. As $S_{X'}$ behaves the same as $L \cap V(T)$ with respect to L' , L is a valid locating-dominating set of G'' . Its size is either $|L| - (t + 1) + k_X + 1$ if $X' > X$, or $|L| - t + k_X$ if $X \leq X'$, which in both cases is at most $k - t + k_X$, thus $(G'', k - t + k_X)$ is a YES-instance.

The proof of the converse follows by the same argument: essentially, the trees (T, v) and (T_X, v_X) are interchangeable. \blacktriangleleft

We now use Lemma 19 to apply Reduction Rule 18 exhaustively in time $\mathcal{O}(n^2)$, before proceeding to the second part of the algorithm.

Step 2 – Handling the subgraphs corresponding to edges of \tilde{G} . In the second step of our algorithm, we construct tree gadgets similar to those defined in Step 1, but with *two* distinguished vertices. We thus extend the above terminology to this setting. Let (T, v_1, v_2) , be a tree T with two distinguished vertices v_1, v_2 . We define types of trees as in the previous subsection. To do so, we first define the types for each of v_1 and v_2 , and then we combine them. For $X \in \{A, B, C, D, E\}$, a subset L of $V(T)$ is of *type $(X, -)$ with respect to v_1* if:

- Type $(A, -)$: L dominates all vertices of $V(T) \setminus \{v_1, v_2\}$ and any two vertices of $V(T) \setminus (L \cup \{v_1, v_2\})$ are located.
- Type $(B, -)$: L dominates all vertices of $V(T) \setminus \{v_2\}$ and any two vertices of $V(T) \setminus (L \cup \{v_1, v_2\})$ are located;
- Type $(C, -)$: L dominates all vertices of $V(T) \setminus \{v_2\}$ and any two vertices of $V(T) \setminus (L \cup \{v_2\})$ are located;
- Type $(D, -)$: L dominates all vertices of $V(T) \setminus \{v_2\}$, $v_1 \in L$, and any two vertices of $V(T) \setminus (L \cup \{v_2\})$ are located;
- Type $(E, -)$: L dominates all vertices of $V(T) \setminus \{v_2\}$, $v_1 \in L$, any two vertices of $V(T) \setminus (L \cup \{v_2\})$ are located, and there is no vertex w of $V(T) \setminus \{v_2\}$ with $N(w) \cap L = \{v_1\}$;

Thus, the idea for a set L of type $(X, -)$ with respect to v_1 is that there are specific constraints for v_1 , but no constraint for v_2 (and the usual domination and location constraints for the other vertices). We say that L is of type (X, Y) with respect to (T, v_1, v_2) if L is of type $(X, -)$ with respect to v_1 and of type $(Y, -)$ with respect to v_2 . Thus, we have a total of 25 such possible types.

We let $opt_{X,Y}(T, v_1, v_2)$ be the smallest size of a subset L of T of type (X, Y) . Here as well, there is a linear-time dynamic programming algorithm that, for any tree T and two vertices v_1, v_2 , jointly computes $opt_{X,Y}(T, v_1, v_2)$ for all $X, Y \in \{A, B, C, D, E\}$.

► **Proposition 20.** *There is a linear-time dynamic programming algorithm that, for any tree T and two vertices v_1, v_2 , jointly computes $opt_{X,Y}(T, v_1, v_2)$ for all $X, Y \in \{A, B, C, D, E\}$.*

Proof. The dynamic programming is similar to that of Proposition 14. We root T at v_1 . The main difference is that extra care must be taken around v_2 to only keep the solutions of type $(-, Y)$ for the subtrees that contain v_2 . ◀

Next, similarly to Lemma 15, we show that for a triple (T, v_1, v_2) , the optimal solution values for different types, may vary by at most 2.

► **Lemma 21.** *Let T be a tree with vertices v_1, v_2 of T , and let $X, X', Y, Y' \in \{A, B, C, D, E\}$ with $X \leq X'$ and $Y \leq Y'$. If $X = X'$ and $Y < Y'$ or $X < X'$ and $Y = Y'$, we have $\text{opt}_{X,Y}(T, v_1, v_2) \leq \text{opt}_{X',Y'}(T, v_1, v_2) \leq \text{opt}_{X,Y}(T, v_1, v_2) + 1$. If $X < X'$ and $Y < Y'$, we have $\text{opt}_{X,Y}(T, v_1, v_2) \leq \text{opt}_{X',Y'}(T, v_1, v_2) \leq \text{opt}_{X,Y}(T, v_1, v_2) + 2$.*

Proof. The proof is similar to that of Lemma 15. As before, the lower bound is clear since the conditions for type (X', Y') are more constrained than those for (X, Y) . For the upper bound, assume first that $X = X'$ or $Y = Y'$ (without loss of generality, $Y = Y'$). Then, as before, given a solution S of type (X, Y) , we can add to S a single vertex in the closed neighbourhood of v_1 to obtain a solution of type (E, Y) . Similarly, if both $X < X'$ and $Y < Y'$, we can add to S a vertex to the closed neighbourhoods of each of v_1 and v_2 and obtain a solution of type (E, E) . ◀

By Lemma 21, we can introduce the following definition. Note that for a triple (T, v_1, v_2) , the minimum value of $\text{opt}_{X,Y}(T, v_1, v_2)$ over all $X, Y \in \{A, B, C, D, E\}$ is reached for $X = Y = A$ (and the maximum, for $X = Y = E$).

► **Definition 22** (Doubly rooted tree classes). *For a function $g : \{A, B, C, D, E\}^2 \rightarrow \{0, 1, 2\}$, we define the class \mathcal{T}_g as the set of triples (T, v_1, v_2) such that T is a tree, v_1, v_2 are two of its vertices, and for every $(X, Y) \in \{A, B, C, D, E\}^2$, we have $\text{opt}_{X,Y}(T, v_1, v_2) - \text{opt}_{A,A}(T, v_1, v_2) = g(X, Y)$.*

There are at most 3^{25} possible classes of triples, since that is the number of possible functions g . By Lemma 21, these classes define a partition of all sets of triples (T, v_1, v_2) .²

We next define suitable tree gadgets for the above classes of triples. As there is a very large number of possible types of triples, we cannot give a concrete definition of such a gadget, but rather, an existential one.

► **Definition 23** (Doubly-rooted tree gadgets). *For a function $g : \{A, B, C, D, E\}^2 \rightarrow \{0, 1, 2\}$, let (T_g, v_X, v_Y) be the smallest tree in \mathcal{T}_g (if such a tree exists), and let $k_g = \text{opt}_{A,A}(T_g, v_X, v_Y)$.*

We are now ready to present our second reduction rule, which replaces certain triples (T, v_1, v_2) by gadgets from Definition 23.

► **Reduction Rule 24.** *Let (G, k) be an instance of LOCATING-DOMINATING SET, with:*

- an induced subgraph G' of G with two vertices w_1, w_2 ;
- a tree T with two vertices v_1, v_2 with (T, v_1, v_2) in class \mathcal{T}_g with $g : \{A, B, C, D, E\}^2 \rightarrow \{0, 1, 2\}$, and with $\text{opt}_{A,A}(T, v_1, v_2) = t$;
- w_1, w_2 do not belong to a hanging tree of G ;
- G can be obtained by taking a copy of T and a copy of G' and identifying, respectively, v_1 with w_1 , and v_2 with w_2 .

² Some of these classes are actually empty, since, for example, by Lemma 21, $\text{opt}_{X,Y}(T, v_1, v_2)$ increases with X and Y ; however, an empirical study shows that the number of nonempty classes is very large.

Then, we remove all vertices of $T \setminus \{v_1, v_2\}$ from G (that is, we compute G'), we consider G' and a copy of doubly-rooted tree gadget (T_g, v_X, v_Y) , and we identify v_X with v_1 and v_Y with v_2 , to obtain G'' . The reduced instance is $(G'', k - t + k_g)$.

► **Lemma 25.** *For an instance (G, k) of LOCATING-DOMINATING SET, Reduction Rule 24 can be applied to every tree component corresponding to an edge of \tilde{G} in time $\mathcal{O}(n\text{fes})$, and (G, k) is a YES-instance of LOCATING-DOMINATING SET if and only if $(G'', k - t + k_g)$ is a YES-instance of LOCATING-DOMINATING SET.*

Proof. To apply the reduction rule as stated, we compute the multigraph \tilde{G} in time $\mathcal{O}(n + \text{fes})$ using Proposition 12; by Observation 13, we can assume it has no loops and at most $4\text{fes} - 3$ edges. Now, for every edge xy of \tilde{G} , we select the neighbour v_1 of x and the neighbour v_2 of y in G , that lie on the xy -path corresponding to the edge xy of \tilde{G} . The tree (T, v_1, v_2) is the subgraph of G corresponding to the edge xy of \tilde{G} , and G' is the subgraph of G obtained by removing $T \setminus \{v_1, v_2\}$ from G . Computing all these subgraphs can be done in time $\mathcal{O}(n\text{fes})$. Computing the type \mathcal{T}_g of (T, v_1, v_2) can be done in time $\mathcal{O}(|T|)$ by Proposition 20, so overall, the running time of this step is $\mathcal{O}(n\text{fes})$.

Note that all the computed subgraphs are vertex-disjoint, we can thus now apply Reduction Rule 24 in time $\mathcal{O}(|T|)$ to each tree T , noting that the gadget T_g is of constant size.

For the second part of the statement, the arguments are the same as those of Lemma 19: since they belong to the same class \mathcal{T}_g , the trees (T, v_1, v_2) and (T_g, v_X, v_Y) have the same behaviour with respect to LOCATING-DOMINATING SET and the overall solution for the graph. ◀

Completion of the proof. By Lemma 19 and Lemma 25, we can apply Reduction Rule 18 and Reduction Rule 24 in time $\mathcal{O}(n^2 + n\text{fes}) = \mathcal{O}(mn)$. Since \tilde{G} has at most $3\text{fes} - 2$ vertices and $4\text{fes} - 3$ edges, we replaced each vertex of \tilde{G} by a constant-size tree-gadget from Definition 17 and each edge of \tilde{G} by a constant-size doubly-rooted tree gadget from Definition 23, the resulting graph has $\mathcal{O}(\text{fes})$ vertices and edges, as claimed. The running time is $2^{\mathcal{O}(\text{fes})} + n^{\mathcal{O}(1)}$ by first computing the kernel and then solving LOCATING-DOMINATING SET in time $2^{\mathcal{O}(n)} = 2^{\mathcal{O}(\text{fes})}$ on that kernel. This completes the proof.

5 Incompressibility of Locating-Dominating Set

In this section, we prove Theorem 3 for LOCATING-DOMINATING SET and TEST COVER, i.e., we prove that neither LOCATING-DOMINATING SET admits a polynomial compression of size $\mathcal{O}(n^{2-\epsilon})$ for any $\epsilon > 0$, unless $\text{NP} \subseteq \text{coNP}/\text{poly}$. We transfer the incompressibility of DOMINATING SET to LOCATING-DOMINATING SET. It will be convenient to reduce from the RED-BLUE DOMINATING SET problem, a restricted version of DOMINATING SET, which also does not admit a compression with $\mathcal{O}(n^{2-\epsilon})$ bits unless $\text{NP} \subseteq \text{coNP}/\text{poly}$ [1, Proposition 2]. The input to the RED-BLUE DOMINATING SET is a bipartite graph G' with bipartition $\langle R', B' \rangle$ and an integer k . The question asks whether there is a set $S' \subseteq R'$ of at most k' vertices such that $B' \subseteq N(S')$.

It is safe to assume that G' does not contain an isolated vertex. Indeed, if there is an isolated vertex in R , one can delete it to obtain an equivalent instance. If B contains an isolated vertex, it is a trivial NO-instance. Moreover, it is also safe to assume that $|R'| \leq 2^{|B'|}$ as it is safe to remove one of the two false twins in R' . Also, $k' \leq |R'|$ as otherwise given instance is a trivial YES-instance.

Reduction. The reduction takes as input an instance $(G', \langle R', B' \rangle, k')$ of RED-BLUE DOMINATING SET and constructs an instance (G, k) of LOCATING-DOMINATING SET. Suppose we have $R' = \{r'_1, r'_2, \dots, r'_{|R|}\}$ and $B' = \{b'_1, b'_2, \dots, b'_{|B|}\}$. The reduction constructs graph G in the following steps. See Figure 4 for an illustration.

- It adds sets of vertices R and B to G , where R contains a vertex corresponding to each vertex in R' and B contains two vertices corresponding to each vertex in B' . Formally, $R = \{r_i \mid i \in [|R|]\}$ and $B = \{b_i^\circ, b_i^* \mid i \in [|B|]\}$.
- The reduction adds a *bit representation gadget* to locate set R . Informally, it adds some supplementary vertices such that it is safe to assume these vertices are present in a locating-dominating set, and they locate every vertex in R .
 - First, set $q := \lceil \log(|R|) \rceil + 1$. This value for q allows to uniquely represent each integer in $[|R|]$ by its bit-representation in binary when started from 1 and not 0.
 - For every $i \in [q]$, the reduction adds two vertices $y_{i,1}$ and $y_{i,2}$ and edge $(y_{i,1}, y_{i,2})$.
 - For every integer $\ell \in [|R|]$, let $\mathbf{bit}(\ell)$ denote the binary representation of ℓ using q bits. It connects $r_\ell \in R$ with $y_{i,1}$ if the i^{th} bit in $\mathbf{bit}(\ell)$ is 1.
 - It adds two vertices $y_{0,1}$ and $y_{0,2}$, and edge $(y_{0,1}, y_{0,2})$, and makes every vertex in R adjacent with $y_{0,1}$.
Let $\mathbf{bit}\text{-rep}(R)$ be the collection of the vertices $y_{i,1}$ for all $i \in \{0\} \cup [q]$ added in this step.
- Similarly, the reduction adds a bit representation gadget to locate set B . However, it adds vertices such that for any pair b_j°, b_j^* , the supplementary vertices adjacent to them are identical.
 - The reduction sets $p := \lceil \log(|B|/2) \rceil + 1$ and for every $i \in [p]$, it adds two vertices $z_{i,1}$ and $z_{i,2}$ and edge $(z_{i,1}, z_{i,2})$.
 - For every integer $j \in [|B|/2]$, let $\mathbf{bit}(j)$ denote the binary representation of j using p bits. Connect $b_j^\circ, b_j^* \in B$ with $z_{i,1}$ if the i^{th} bit in $\mathbf{bit}(j)$ is 1.
 - It add two vertices $z_{0,1}$ and $z_{0,2}$, and edge $(z_{0,1}, z_{0,2})$. It also makes every vertex in B adjacent with $z_{0,1}$.
Let $\mathbf{bit}\text{-rep}(B)$ be the collection of the vertices $z_{i,1}$ for all $i \in \{0\} \cup [p]$ added in this step.
- Finally, the reduction adds edges across R and B as follows: For every pair of vertices $r'_i \in R'$ and $b'_j \in B'$,
 - if r'_i is *not* adjacent with b'_j then it adds both edges (r_i, b_j°) and (r_i, b_j^*) to $E(G)$, and
 - if r'_i is adjacent with b'_j then it adds (r_i, b_j°) only, i.e., it does not add an edge with endpoints r_i and b_j^* .


This completes the construction of G . The reduction sets

$$k = k' + |\mathbf{bit}\text{-rep}(R)| + |\mathbf{bit}\text{-rep}(B)| = k' + \lceil \log(|R|) \rceil + 1 + 1 + \lceil \log(|B|/2) \rceil + 1 + 1,$$

and returns (G, k) as an instance of LOCATING-DOMINATING SET.

► **Lemma 26.** $(G', \langle R', B' \rangle, k')$ is a YES-instance of RED-BLUE DOMINATING SET if and only if (G, k) is a YES-instance of LOCATING-DOMINATING SET.

Proof. (\Rightarrow) Suppose $(G', \langle R', B' \rangle, k')$ is a YES-instance and let $S' \subseteq R'$ be a solution. We prove that $S = S' \cup \mathbf{bit}\text{-rep}(R) \cup \mathbf{bit}\text{-rep}(B)$ is a locating-dominating set of size at most k . The size bound follows easily. By the property of a set representation gadget, every vertex in R is adjacent with a unique set of vertices in $\mathbf{bit}\text{-rep}(R) \setminus \{y_{0,1}\}$. Consider a vertex r_i in R such that the bit-representation of i contains a single 1 at j^{th} location. Hence, $y_{j,2}$ and r_i are adjacent with the same vertex, viz $y_{j,1}$ in $\mathbf{bit}\text{-rep}(R) \setminus \{y_{0,1}\}$. However, this



■ **Figure 4** An illustrative example of the graph constructed by the reduction used in Section 5. Adjacency to $y_{1,1}$, $y_{2,1}$, $y_{3,1}$ correspond to 1 in the bit representation from left to right (most significant to least significant) bits. In the above example, the bit representation of r_1 is $\langle 1, 0, 0 \rangle$, r_2 is $\langle 0, 1, 0 \rangle$, r_3 is $\langle 1, 1, 0 \rangle$, etc. For brevity, we only show the edges incident on r_3 . The dotted line represents a non-edge. In this example, r'_3 is only adjacent to b_2° in G' . It is easy to see that r_3 can only resolve pair $(b_2^{\circ}, b_2^{\star})$.

pair of vertices is resolved by $y_{0,1}$ which is adjacent with r_i and *not* with $y_{j,2}$. Also, as the bit-representation of vertices starts from 1, there is no vertex in R which is adjacent with only $y_{0,1}$ in $\text{bit-rep}(R)$. Using similar arguments and the properties of the set representation gadget, we can conclude that $\text{bit-rep}(R) \cup \text{bit-rep}(B)$ resolves all pairs of vertices, apart from those pairs of the form $(b_j^{\circ}, b_j^{\star})$.


By the construction of G , a vertex $r_i \in R$ resolves a pair vertices b_j° and b_j^{\star} if and only if r'_i and b'_j are adjacent. Since S' dominates B , S' resolves every pair of the form $(b_j^{\circ}, b_j^{\star})$. Hence, $S' \cup \text{bit-rep}(R) \cup \text{bit-rep}(B)$ is a locating-dominating set of G of the desired size.

(\Leftarrow) Suppose S is a locating-dominating set of G of size at most k . By Observation 4, it is safe to consider that S contains $\text{bit-rep}(R) \cup \text{bit-rep}(B)$, as every vertex in it is adjacent to a pendant vertex.

Next, we modify S to obtain another locating-dominating set S_1 such that $|S_1| \leq |S|$ and all vertices in $S_1 \setminus (\text{bit-rep}(R) \cup \text{bit-rep}(B))$ are in R . Without loss of generality, suppose $b_j^{\circ} \in S$. As discussed in the previous paragraph, $\text{bit-rep}(R) \cup \text{bit-rep}(B)$ resolves all the pair of vertices apart from the pair of the form $(b_j^{\circ}, b_j^{\star})$. As there is no edge between the vertices in B , if $b_j^{\circ} \in S$ then it is useful only to resolve the pair $(b_j^{\circ}, b_j^{\star})$. As there is no isolated vertex in G' , every vertex in B' is adjacent with some vertex in R' . Hence, by the construction of G , there is a vertex r_i in R such that r_i is adjacent with b_j° but not with b_j^{\star} . Consider set $S_1 = (S \setminus \{b_j^{\circ}\}) \cup r_i$. By the arguments above, $|S_1| \leq |S|$, S_1 is a locating-dominating set of G , and $|S_1 \cap B| < |S \cap B|$. Repeating this step, we obtain set S_1 with desired properties.

It is easy to verify that $|S_1 \cap R| = |S_1 \cap R'| \leq k'$ and that for every vertex b_j in B' , there is a vertex in $S_1 \cap R'$ which is adjacent with b_j . Hence, the size of $S_1 \cap R$ is at most k , and it dominates every vertex in B . ◀

Proof of Theorem 3 for Locating-Dominating Set . Suppose there exists a polynomial-time algorithm \mathcal{A} that takes as input an instance (G, k) of LOCATING-DOMINATING SET and produces an equivalent instance I' , which requires $\mathcal{O}(n^{2-\epsilon})$ bits to encode, of some problem Π . Consider the compression algorithm \mathcal{B} for RED-BLUE DOMINATING SET that uses the reduction mentioned in this section and then the algorithm \mathcal{A} on the reduced instance. For an instance $(G', \langle R', B' \rangle, k')$ of RED-BLUE DOMINATING SET, where the number of vertices in G' is n' , the reduction constructs a graph G with at most $3n'$ vertices. Hence, for



■ **Figure 5** An illustrative example of the graph constructed by the reduction for TEST COVER. Red (squared) nodes denote the tests whereas blue (filled circle) nodes the items. The adjacencies across B and $\text{bit-rep}(B)$ are the same as the ones from the reduction for LOCATING-DOMINATING SET. For brevity, we only show the edges incident on r_3 . The dotted line represents a non-edge. In this example, test corresponding to r_3 only contains item corresponding to b_2 . It is easy to see that r_3 can only distinguish between the pair (b_2^circ, b_2^*) .

this input algorithm, \mathcal{B} constructs an equivalent instance with $\mathcal{O}(n^{2-\epsilon})$ bits, contradicting $\text{NP} \subseteq \text{coNP}/\text{poly}$ [1, Proposition 2]. Hence, LOCATING-DOMINATING SET does not admit a polynomial compression of size $\mathcal{O}(n^{2-\epsilon})$ for any $\epsilon > 0$, unless $\text{NP} \subseteq \text{coNP}/\text{poly}$. ◀

Other Consequences of the Reduction. Note that $\text{bit-rep}(R) \cup \text{bit-rep}(B) \cup B$ is a vertex cover of G of size $\log(|R|) + \log(|B|) + |B|$. As $k' \leq |B'|$ (as otherwise we are dealing with a trivially YES-instance of RED-BLUE DOMINATING SET.), $|R'| \leq 2^{|B'|}$, we have $\text{vc}(G) + k \leq (\log(|R|) + \log(|B|) + |B|) + k' + \mathcal{O}(\log(|R|) + \log(|B|) + |B|) = \mathcal{O}(|B|)$. It is known that RED-BLUE DOMINATING SET, parameterized by the number of blue vertices, does not admit a polynomial kernel unless $\text{NP} \subseteq \text{coNP}/\text{poly}$. See, for example, [18, Lemma 15.19]. This, along with the arguments that are standard to parameter-preserving reductions, implies that LOCATING-DOMINATING SET, when parameterized jointly by the solution size and the vertex cover number of the input graph, does not admit a polynomial kernel unless $\text{NP} \subseteq \text{coNP}/\text{poly}$.

Incompressibility of Test Cover

Now, we prove Theorem 3 for TEST COVER. Our reduction is a modification (and also a simplification) of the reduction mentioned in Section 5. We transfer the incompressibility of RED-BLUE DOMINATING SET to TEST COVER. Once again, it is safe to assume that G' does not contain an isolated vertex, $R' \leq 2^{|B'|}$, and $k' \leq |B'|$.

Reduction For notational convenience, instead of specify an instance of TEST COVER, we specify the auxiliary graph as mentioned in the definition. The reduction takes as input an instance $(G', \langle R', B' \rangle, k')$ of RED-BLUE DOMINATING SET and constructs an instance $(G, \langle R, B \rangle, k)$ of TEST COVER. Suppose we have $R' = \{r'_1, r'_2, \dots, r'_{|R'|}\}$ and $B' = \{b'_1, b'_2, \dots, b'_{|B'|}\}$. The reduction constructs graph G in the following steps. See Figure 4 for an illustration.

- It adds sets of vertices R and B to G , where R contains a vertex corresponding to each

vertex in R' and B contains two vertices corresponding to each vertex in B' . Formally, $R = \{r_i \mid i \in [|R'|\!]\}$ and $B = \{b_i^o, b_i^* \mid i \in [|B'|\!]\}$.

- The reduction adds a bit representation gadget to locate set B . It adds vertices such that for any pair b_j^o, b_j^* , the supplementary vertices adjacent to them are identical.
 - The reduction sets $p := \lceil \log(|B|/2) \rceil + 1$ and for every $i \in [p]$, it adds two vertices $z_{i,1}$ and $z_{i,2}$ and edge $(z_{i,1}, z_{i,2})$. It adds all $z_{i,1}$'s to R and all $z_{i,2}$'s to B .
 - For every integer $j \in [|B|/2]$, let $\text{bit}(j)$ denote the binary representation of j using p bits. Connect $b_j^o, b_j^* \in B$ with $z_{i,1}$ if the i^{th} bit (going from left to right) in $\text{bit}(j)$ is 1.
 - It add two vertices $z_{0,1}$ and $z_{0,2}$, and edge $(z_{0,1}, z_{0,2})$. It adds $z_{0,1}$ to R and $z_{0,2}$ to B . It also makes every vertex in B adjacent with $z_{0,1}$. Let $\text{bit-rep}(B)$ be the collection of vertices of type $z_{i,1}$ for $j \in \{0\} \cup [p]$.
- The reduction adds edges across R and B as follows: For every pair of vertices $r'_i \in R'$ and $b'_j \in B'$,
 - if r'_i is *not* adjacent with b'_j then it adds both edges (r_i, b_j^o) and (r_i, b_j^*) to $E(G)$, and
 - if r'_i is adjacent with b'_j then it adds (r_i, b_j^o) only, i.e., it does not add an edge with endpoints r_i and b_j^* .
- Finally, it adds an isolated blue vertex b_0 .

This completes the construction of G . The reduction sets

$$k = k' + |\text{bit-rep}(B)| = k' + \log(|B|/2) + 1 = \mathcal{O}(|B|),$$

and returns $(G, \langle R, B \rangle, k)$ as an instance of TEST COVER.

It is easy to verify that $(G, \langle R, B \rangle, k)$ is a valid instance of TEST COVER. We present a brief overview of the proof of correctness. Suppose $(G', \langle R', B' \rangle, k')$ is a YES-instance of RED-BLUE DOMINATING SET and let set $S' \subseteq R'$ be a solution. We argue that $S' \cup \text{bit-rep}(B)$ is a locating-dominating set of G of size at most k . Note that red vertex $z_{0,1}$ ensures that all the pendant vertices that are adjacent with some vertex in $\text{bit-rep}(B)$ has unique neighbour in S . Hence, apart from the vertex pairs of the form (b_j^o, b_j^*) , every other pair of vertices is resolved by vertices in $\text{bit-rep}(B)$. Now, by the construction of G , a vertex $r_i \in R$ resolves a pair vertices b_j^o and b_j^* if and only if r'_i and b'_j are adjacent with each other. This concludes the forward direction of the proof. In the reverse direction, note that b_0 is an isolated blue vertex. Hence, all the red vertices in $\text{bit-rep}(B)$ are forced into any solution, say S_1 , as they are unique red vertices that are adjacent with some blue vertex. Hence, by the property mentioned above, it is easy to see that $S_1 \setminus \text{bit-rep}(B)$ is a desired dominating set in graph G' . This concludes the overview.

The proof of Theorem 3 for TEST COVER follows with identical arguments as presented in Section 5. Recall that RED-BLUE DOMINATING SET, parameterized by the number of blue vertices, does not admit a polynomial kernel unless $\text{NP} \subseteq \text{coNP}/\text{poly}$. See, for example, [18, Lemma 15.19]. Moreover, when parameterized by the number of red vertices, it does not admit a polynomial kernel unless $\text{NP} \subseteq \text{coNP}/\text{poly}$. See, for example, [18, Exercise 15.4.10]. This, along with the arguments that are standard to parameter preserving reductions, imply that TEST COVER, parameterized by (i) the number of items $|U|$ and the solution size k , or (ii) the number of sets $|\mathcal{F}|$ does not admit a polynomial kernel, unless $\text{NP} \subseteq \text{coNP}/\text{poly}$.

6 Conclusion

We investigated the structural parameterization of LOCATING-DOMINATING SET and TEST COVER. We presented several results about the algorithmic complexity of these two problems.

However, our main technical contribution is an FPT algorithm when parameterized by the vertex cover number, a linear kernel when parameterized by the feedback edge set number, and a non-compressibility result. Our first two results imply that the double-exponential lower bound when parameterized by treewidth in [10] cannot be extended to larger parameters like vertex cover number and feedback edge set number. The reduction used to prove the third result also provides simplified proofs of some known results.

We do not know whether our $2^{\mathcal{O}(\text{vc} \log \text{vc})} n^{\mathcal{O}(1)}$ -time FPT algorithm for LOCATING-DOMINATING SET parameterized by vertex cover (and similarly, the algorithm for TEST COVER parameterized by $|U|$) is optimal, or whether there exist single-exponential algorithms. Another open question in this direction, is whether this algorithm can be generalized to the parameter distance to cluster. As our linear kernel for parameter feedback edge set number is not explicit, it would be nice to obtain a concrete kernel.

References

- 1 Akanksha Agrawal, Lawqueen Kanesh, Saket Saurabh, and Prafullkumar Tale. Paths to trees and cacti. *Theor. Comput. Sci.*, 860:98–116, 2021. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tcs.2021.01.033>, doi:10.1016/J.TCS.2021.01.033.
- 2 Gabriela R. Argiroffo, Silvia M. Bianchi, Yanina Lucarini, and Annegret Katrin Wagler. Linear-time algorithms for three domination-based separation problems in block graphs. *Discret. Appl. Math.*, 281:6–41, 2020.
- 3 Florian Barbero, Lucas Isenmann, and Jocelyn Thiebaut. On the distance identifying set meta-problem and applications to the complexity of identifying problems on graphs. *Algorithmica*, 82(8):2243–2266, 2020.
- 4 Manu Basavaraju, Mathew C. Francis, M. S. Ramanujan, and Saket Saurabh. Partially polynomial kernels for set cover and test cover. *SIAM J. Discret. Math.*, 30(3):1401–1423, 2016.
- 5 Piotr Berman, Bhaskar DasGupta, and Ming-Yang Kao. Tight approximability results for test set problems in bioinformatics. *J. Comput. Syst. Sci.*, 71(2):145–162, 2005.
- 6 John A Bondy. Induced subsets. *Journal of Combinatorial Theory, Series B*, 12(2):201–202, 1972.
- 7 Koen M. J. De Bontridder, Bjarni V. Halldórsson, Magnús M. Halldórsson, Cor A. J. Hurkens, Jan Karel Lenstra, R. Ravi, and Leen Stougie. Approximation algorithms for the test cover problem. *Math. Program.*, 98(1-3):477–491, 2003.
- 8 Márcia R. Cappelle, Guilherme de C. M. Gomes, and Vinícius Fernandes dos Santos. Parameterized algorithms for locating-dominating sets. *CoRR*, abs/2011.14849, 2020. URL: <https://arxiv.org/abs/2011.14849>, arXiv:2011.14849.
- 9 Márcia R. Cappelle, Guilherme C. M. Gomes, and Vinícius Fernandes dos Santos. Parameterized algorithms for locating-dominating sets. In Carlos E. Ferreira, Orlando Lee, and Flávio Keidi Miyazawa, editors, *Proceedings of the XI Latin and American Algorithms, Graphs and Optimization Symposium, LAGOS 2021, Online Event / São Paulo, Brazil, May 2021*, volume 195 of *Procedia Computer Science*, pages 68–76. Elsevier, 2021.
- 10 Dipayan Chakraborty, Florent Foucaud, Diptapriyo Majumdar, and Prafullkumar Tale. Tight (double) exponential bounds for identification problems: Locating-dominating set and test cover. *CoRR*, abs/2402.08346, 2024. URL: <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2402.08346>, arXiv:2402.08346, doi:10.48550/ARXIV.2402.08346.
- 11 Dipayan Chakraborty, Anni Hakanen, and Tuomo Lehtilä. The $n/2$ -bound for locating-dominating sets in subcubic graphs, 2024. URL: <https://arxiv.org/abs/2406.19278>, arXiv:2406.19278.
- 12 Bogdan S. Chlebus and Sinh Hoa Nguyen. On finding optimal discretizations for two attributes. In *Proceedings of the First International Conference on Rough Sets and Current Trends in Computing*, volume 1424, pages 537–544, Berlin, Heidelberg, 1998. Springer Berlin Heidelberg.

- 13 C. Colbourn, P. J. Slater, and L. K. Stewart. Locating-dominating sets in series-parallel networks. *Congressus Numerantium*, 56:135–162, 1987.
- 14 David Coudert, Guillaume Ducoffe, and Alexandru Popa. Fully polynomial FPT algorithms for some classes of bounded clique-width graphs. *ACM Trans. Algorithms*, 15(3):33:1–33:57, 2019. doi:10.1145/3310228.
- 15 Bruno Courcelle. The monadic second-order logic of graphs. I. Recognizable sets of finite graphs. *Information and Computation*, 85(1):12–75, 1990.
- 16 Robert Crowston, Gregory Z. Gutin, Mark Jones, Gabriele Muciaccia, and Anders Yeo. Parameterizations of test cover with bounded test sizes. *Algorithmica*, 74(1):367–384, 2016.
- 17 Robert Crowston, Gregory Z. Gutin, Mark Jones, Saket Saurabh, and Anders Yeo. Parameterized study of the test cover problem. In Branislav Rován, Vladimiro Sassone, and Peter Widmayer, editors, *Mathematical Foundations of Computer Science 2012 - 37th International Symposium, MFCS 2012, Bratislava, Slovakia, August 27-31, 2012. Proceedings*, volume 7464 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 283–295. Springer, 2012.
- 18 Marek Cygan, Fedor V. Fomin, Lukasz Kowalik, Daniel Lokshtanov, Dániel Marx, Marcin Pilipczuk, Michal Pilipczuk, and Saket Saurabh. *Parameterized Algorithms*. Springer, 2015. doi:10.1007/978-3-319-21275-3.
- 19 Reinhard Diestel. *Graph Theory, 4th Edition*, volume 173 of *Graduate texts in mathematics*. Springer, 2012. URL: <https://dblp.org/rec/books/daglib/0030488.bib>.
- 20 Fedor V. Fomin and Dieter Kratsch. *Exact Exponential Algorithms*. Texts in Theoretical Computer Science. An EATCS Series. Springer, 2010. doi:10.1007/978-3-642-16533-7.
- 21 Fedor V Fomin, Daniel Lokshtanov, Saket Saurabh, and Meirav Zehavi. *Kernelization: theory of parameterized preprocessing*. Cambridge University Press, 2019.
- 22 Florent Foucaud. Decision and approximation complexity for identifying codes and locating-dominating sets in restricted graph classes. *J. Discrete Algorithms*, 31:48–68, 2015.
- 23 Florent Foucaud, Esther Galby, Liana Khazaliya, Shaohua Li, Fionn Mc Inerney, Roohani Sharma, and Prafullkumar Tale. Problems in NP can admit double-exponential lower bounds when parameterized by treewidth or vertex cover. In Karl Bringmann, Martin Grohe, Gabriele Puppis, and Ola Svensson, editors, *51st International Colloquium on Automata, Languages, and Programming, ICALP 2024, July 8-12, 2024, Tallinn, Estonia*, volume 297 of *LIPICs*, pages 66:1–66:19. Schloss Dagstuhl - Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik, 2024. URL: <https://doi.org/10.4230/LIPICs.ICALP.2024.66>, doi:10.4230/LIPICs.ICALP.2024.66.
- 24 Florent Foucaud, George B Mertzios, Reza Naserasr, Aline Parreau, and Petru Valicov. Identification, location-domination and metric dimension on interval and permutation graphs. II. algorithms and complexity. *Algorithmica*, 78(3):914–944, 2017.
- 25 Robert Ganian. Twin-cover: Beyond vertex cover in parameterized algorithmics. In Dániel Marx and Peter Rossmanith, editors, *Parameterized and Exact Computation - 6th International Symposium, IPEC 2011, Saarbrücken, Germany, September 6-8, 2011. Revised Selected Papers*, volume 7112 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 259–271. Springer, 2011. doi:10.1007/978-3-642-28050-4_21.
- 26 M. R. Garey and D. S. Johnson. *Computers and Intractability - A guide to NP-completeness*. W.H. Freeman and Company, 1979.
- 27 Gregory Z. Gutin, Gabriele Muciaccia, and Anders Yeo. (non-)existence of polynomial kernels for the test cover problem. *Inf. Process. Lett.*, 113(4):123–126, 2013.
- 28 Michel Habib, Christophe Paul, and Laurent Viennot. A synthesis on partition refinement: A useful routine for strings, graphs, boolean matrices and automata. In *Proceedings of the 15th Annual Symposium on Theoretical Aspects of Computer Science (STACS 1998)*, pages 25–38, Berlin, Heidelberg, 1998. Springer-Verlag.
- 29 David G. Harris and N. S. Narayanaswamy. A faster algorithm for vertex cover parameterized by solution size. In Olaf Beyersdorff, Mamadou Moustapha Kanté, Orna Kupferman, and Daniel Lokshtanov, editors, *41st International Symposium on Theoretical Aspects of Computer Science, STACS 2024, March 12-14, 2024, Clermont-Ferrand, France*, volume 289 of *LIPICs*,

- pages 40:1–40:18. Schloss Dagstuhl - Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik, 2024. URL: <https://doi.org/10.4230/LIPIcs.STACS.2024.40>, doi:10.4230/LIPIcs.STACS.2024.40.
- 30 Leon Kellerhals and Tomohiro Koana. Parameterized complexity of geodetic set. *J. Graph Algorithms Appl.*, 26(4):401–419, 2022.
- 31 Michael Lampis. Algorithmic meta-theorems for restrictions of treewidth. *Algorithmica*, 64(1):19–37, 2012. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00453-011-9554-x>, doi:10.1007/S00453-011-9554-x.
- 32 Bernard M. E. Moret and Henry D. Shapiro. On minimizing a set of tests. *SIAM Journal on Scientific and Statistical Computing*, 6(4):983–1003, 1985.
- 33 N.S.V. Rao. Computational complexity issues in operative diagnosis of graph-based systems. *IEEE Transactions on Computers*, 42(4):447–457, 1993.
- 34 Alfred Rényi. On random generating elements of a finite boolean algebra. *Acta Scientiarum Mathematicarum Szeged*, 22:75–81, 1961.
- 35 Peter J. Slater. Domination and location in acyclic graphs. *Networks*, 17(1):55–64, 1987.
- 36 Peter J. Slater. Dominating and reference sets in a graph. *Journal of Mathematical and Physical Sciences*, 22(4):445–455, 1988.