
Algorithms and Hardness Results for the (k, ℓ) -Cover Problem[‡]

Amirali Madani[‡] Anil Maheshwari[‡] Babak MirafTAB[‡] Bodhayan Roy[‡]

ABSTRACT. A connected graph has a (k, ℓ) -cover if each of its edges is contained in at least ℓ cliques of order k . Motivated by recent advances in extremal combinatorics and the literature on edge modification problems, we study the algorithmic version of the (k, ℓ) -cover problem. Given a connected graph G , the (k, ℓ) -cover problem is to identify the smallest subset of non-edges of G such that their addition to G results in a graph with a (k, ℓ) -cover. For every constant $k \geq 3$, we show that the $(k, 1)$ -cover problem is NP -complete for general graphs. Moreover, we show that for every constant $k \geq 3$, the $(k, 1)$ -cover problem admits no polynomial-time constant-factor approximation algorithm unless $\mathbb{P} = \text{NP}$. However, we show that the $(3, 1)$ -cover problem can be solved in polynomial time when the input graph is chordal. For the class of trees and general values of k , we show that the $(k, 1)$ -cover problem is NP -hard even for spiders. However, we show that for every $k \geq 4$, the $(3, k-2)$ -cover and the $(k, 1)$ -cover problems are constant-factor approximable when the input graph is a tree.

Keywords: Computational complexity, Graph algorithms, Optimal algorithms, Edge modification problems, and Approximation algorithms.

1 Introduction

In recent years, research on *edge modification problems* has gained a lot of attention. The area of edge modification problems spans many definitions. Still, many such problems ask for the optimal way of editing an input graph G to another graph G' with a desired property, usually through edge additions to G [10]. The minimization objective is often defined in the literature as the number of added edges. Edge modification problems have been studied for many graph properties. For instance, some works have studied editing graphs into being Eulerian, regular, or having a specific degree sequence through edge additions and removals [14, 15, 18]. For a more comprehensive survey of edge modification problems, see [10].

This paper is specifically motivated by the intersection of edge modification problems and the community search problem, the latter of which has numerous applications in data science. Extensive research has been conducted on transforming input graphs into *cluster graphs* through edge additions and removals [4, 7, 16, 19]. A cluster graph is a graph whose

[‡]Preliminary version accepted to CALDAM 2025

[‡]School of Computer Science, Carleton University, Ottawa, Ontario, Canada. Supported by the Natural Sciences and Engineering Research Council of Canada (NSERC). Emails: amiralimadani@cmail.carleton.ca, anil@scs.carleton.ca, and bobby.mirafTAB@gmail.com

[‡]Department of Mathematics, Indian Institute of Technology Kharagpur, India. Supported by the Science and Engineering Research Board (SERB) via the project MTR/2021/000474. Email: bodhayan.roy@gmail.com.

every connected component is a complete graph (a clique). These graphs have various applications, such as modeling different communities and grouping similar items within a network into the same cluster [20]. In community search, cohesive subgraphs are commonly used to model communities. Many studies define the cohesiveness of a subgraph by its minimum degree [1], while others consider a subgraph cohesive if each of its edges is covered by cliques of order three [23]. For the former measure of cohesion, Fomin, Sagunov, and Simonov [12], along with Chitnis and Talmon [8], have studied relevant edge modification problems. These problems aim to construct large subgraphs with a specified minimum degree by adding a few edges.

Graphs with local covering conditions on edges or vertices have also attracted significant interest in extremal graph theory. Burkhardt, Faber, and Harris [3] established asymptotically tight lower bounds on the number of edges in connected graphs where every edge lies in at least ℓ triangles. Chakraborti and Loh [5] provided tight lower bounds, along with characterizations of extremal graphs, on the number of edges in graphs where every vertex belongs to a clique of order $k \geq 3$. Motivated by these results and the many applications of graphs with local edge covering conditions in big graph-based data analysis, Chakraborti et al. [6] introduced the concept of (k, ℓ) -covers. A connected graph G has a (k, ℓ) -cover if every edge of G lies in at least ℓ copies of K_k (a clique of order k). They proved tight lower bounds and structural characterizations of graphs with $(k, 1)$ -covers ($k \geq 3$) and graphs with $(3, 2)$ -covers. Motivated by all of this, we study the algorithmic version of the (k, ℓ) -cover problem.

1.1 Preliminaries

We present some definitions.

Definition 1. Let $G = (V, E)$ be a graph and let $E' \subseteq (V \times V) \setminus E$ be a set of non-edges of G . E' is a (k, ℓ) -completion set of G if $G \cup E'$ has a (k, ℓ) -cover.

For simplicity, we refer to a $(k, 1)$ -completion set as a k -completion set.

Definition 2. The (k, ℓ) -cover problem: Given a connected graph $G = (V, E)$, two integers $k \geq 3$ and $t \geq 0$, does G have a (k, ℓ) -completion set of size at most t ?

A graph G is chordal if it does not have the cycle of length at least four as an induced subgraph. Unless specified otherwise, $G = (V, E)$ always serves as a connected graph with $n \geq 3$ vertices throughout this paper. For an edge $e \in E$, we say e is k -unsaturated if it is not contained in any cliques of order k in G for $k \geq 3$.

We call a graph G *non-trivial* if it has at least two vertices. For a graph G and subset $S \subseteq V(G)$ of its vertices, we denote the subgraph of G induced on S by $G[S]$. For G and $v \notin V$, we denote the operation $V \cup \{v\}$ by $G \cup v$. Similarly, the operation $G \cup e$ for an edge $e = (u, v)$ results in a graph $G' = (V', E')$ with $V' = V \cup \{u, v\}$ and $E' = E \cup \{(u, v)\}$. Within our algorithms, we sometimes initialize an empty graph as $H \leftarrow \emptyset$. This operation constructs a graph $H = (V, E)$ with $V = E = \emptyset$. For further graph-theoretic and algorithmic notations and definitions not defined in the paper, we refer the reader to [2] and [9].

1.2 New Results

Our first set of hardness results ([Theorem 1](#), [Theorem 2](#), and [Theorem 3](#)) state that for every constant $k \geq 3$, the $(k, 1)$ -cover problem is \mathbb{NP} -complete for general graphs and admits no constant-factor approximation algorithm running in polynomial time unless $\mathbb{P} = \mathbb{NP}$. However, we show that the $(3, 1)$ -cover problem can be solved in polynomial time when its input graph is restricted to the class of chordal graphs ([Theorem 5](#)). For general values of k , we show in [Theorem 4](#) that the $(k, 1)$ -cover problem remains \mathbb{NP} -hard on trees, even when the tree is restricted to the class of spiders. However, we show that for every $k \geq 4$, the $(k, 1)$ -cover and the $(3, k - 2)$ -cover problems are constant-factor approximable for trees ([Theorem 6](#) and [Theorem 7](#)).

The remainder of this paper is organized as follows. [Section 2](#) contains our hardness results for general graphs and trees. In [Section 2.1](#), we study the hardness of the $(k, 1)$ -cover problem on general graphs for $k = 3$ ([Section 2.1.1](#)) and $k \geq 4$ ([Section 2.1.2](#)). In [Section 2.1.3](#), we show the hardness of approximation for the $(k, 1)$ -cover problem on general graphs. We conclude [Section 2](#) in [Section 2.2](#) by proving the \mathbb{NP} -hardness of the $(k, 1)$ -cover problem for spiders and general values of k . In [Section 3](#), we first present an optimal algorithm for the $(3, 1)$ -cover problem for the class of trees ([Section 3.1](#), [Proposition 1](#)). We use the algorithm for trees to present an optimal algorithm for the class of chordal graphs in [Section 3.2](#). Our approximation algorithms for trees are described in [Section 4](#). Finally, we conclude the paper in [Section 5](#) by presenting some potential avenues for future research.

2 Hardness Results

In this section, we show some hardness results for the $(k, 1)$ -cover problem for general graphs ([Section 2.1](#)) and the class of trees ([Section 2.2](#)).

2.1 Hardness Results for General Graphs

In this section, we show that for every constant $k \geq 3$, a connected graph $G = (V, E)$, and an integer t , it is \mathbb{NP} -complete to decide whether there exists a set $S \subseteq (V \times V) \setminus E$ with $|S| \leq t$ such that $G \cup S$ has a $(k, 1)$ -cover. Moreover, we show these problems are also hard to approximate within a constant factor.

We reduce the well-known problem of SET-COVER to the $(k, 1)$ -cover problem for every $k \geq 3$. The decision problem of SET-COVER is formally stated as follows. An instance $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{F}, t)$ of SET-COVER consists of a finite set \mathcal{X} of items, a family of subsets \mathcal{F} of \mathcal{X} such that no set in \mathcal{F} is empty and every item in \mathcal{X} belongs to at least one set from \mathcal{F} , and an integer t . Given an instance of SET-COVER, the problem is to determine whether there exists a subset $\mathcal{S} \subseteq \mathcal{F}$ with $|\mathcal{S}| \leq t$ such that the sets in \mathcal{S} cover all items of \mathcal{F} , i.e., $\bigcup_{S \in \mathcal{S}} S = \mathcal{X}$. We say that a subset $S \in \mathcal{F}$ *covers* its items, and each item $x_i \in \mathcal{X} \cap S$ is *covered* by S . It is well known that SET-COVER is \mathbb{NP} -complete [[17](#)]. We provide two separate \mathbb{NP} -completeness proofs for $k = 3$ and $k \geq 4$, where both reductions are from SET-COVER. We do so because the second reduction can be generalized to any $k \geq 4$, but the reduction graph already has a $(3, 1)$ -cover.

The remainder of this section is organized as follows. In [Section 2.1.1](#) and [Section 2.1.2](#), we prove the \mathbb{NP} -completeness of the $(k, 1)$ -cover problem for $k = 3$ and $k \geq 4$, respectively. Using the same reductions of [Section 2.1.1](#) and [Section 2.1.2](#), in [Section 2.1.3](#) we prove that for every constant $k \geq 3$, the $(k, 1)$ -cover problem cannot be approximated within a constant factor unless $\mathbb{P} = \mathbb{NP}$.

2.1.1 Reduction for $k = 3$

Given an instance $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{F}, t)$ of SET-COVER, we construct a graph $\mathbb{G} = (\mathbb{V}, \mathbb{E})$ as follows (see [Figure 1](#) for an illustration).

1. Initially, $\mathbb{V} = \emptyset$ and $\mathbb{E} = \emptyset$.
2. For every set $S_j \in \mathcal{F}$, we add a vertex S_j to \mathbb{V} . We refer to such vertices as *set vertices*.
3. For every item $x_i \in \mathcal{X}$, we add a subgraph I_i to \mathbb{G} . Each I_i is a disjoint union of $2|\mathcal{X}|$ isolated vertices. We refer to each I_i as an *item subgraph*. We update \mathbb{V} accordingly.
4. For each $x_i \in \mathcal{X}$ and every $S_j \in \mathcal{F}$, if $x_i \in S_j$, we connect $S_j \in \mathbb{V}$ to all $2|\mathcal{X}|$ vertices of I_i , i.e., $\forall v \in V(I_i) : \mathbb{E} \leftarrow \mathbb{E} \cup \{(S_j, v)\}$.
5. For every edge (S_j, v) added in the previous step, we add a new vertex w to \mathbb{V} by setting $\mathbb{V} \leftarrow \mathbb{V} \cup \{w\}$. Furthermore, we set $\mathbb{E} \leftarrow \mathbb{E} \cup \{(S_j, w), (v, w)\}$. At the end of this step, all edges of \mathbb{G} are contained in triangles. We refer to these vertices w as *auxiliary vertices*.
6. We add a vertex P to \mathbb{G} , $\mathbb{V} \leftarrow \mathbb{V} \cup \{P\}$. For every item subgraph I_i , we connect every vertex of I_i to this new vertex, i.e., $\forall I_i \forall v \in V(I_i) : \mathbb{E} \leftarrow \mathbb{E} \cup \{(v, P)\}$. We refer to vertex P as *the common vertex*.

Note that all edges incident to the common vertex P are 3-unsaturated. Let $x_i (S_j)$ be some item (set) with $x_i \in S_j$. Observe that adding the edge (S_j, P) to \mathbb{G} saturates all edges (v, P) for all $v \in V(I_i)$. Note that \mathbb{G} has exactly $|\mathcal{F}|$ set vertices, $2|\mathcal{X}|^2$ item vertices, one common vertex P , and at most $2|\mathcal{X}|(|\mathcal{X}| \cdot |\mathcal{F}|) = 2|\mathcal{X}|^2 \cdot |\mathcal{F}|$ auxiliary vertices. Therefore, the size of the reduction graph is polynomial in $|\mathcal{X}| + |\mathcal{F}|$, as stated in the following observation.

Observation 1. Given an instance $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{F}, t)$ of SET-COVER, the reduction graph \mathbb{G} has at most $\mathcal{O}(|\mathcal{X}|^2 \cdot |\mathcal{F}|)$ vertices. Furthermore, due to the existence of the common vertex P , \mathbb{G} is connected.

We present the following definition.

Definition 3. Given an instance $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{F}, t)$ of SET-COVER, let E' be a completion set of its corresponding reduction graph \mathbb{G} . We define R as the set of all non-edges of \mathbb{G} between the set vertices and the common vertex, i.e., $R = \{(S_j, P) \mid S_j \in \mathcal{F}\}$. If $E' \subseteq R$, we say E' is a **good 3-completion set** of \mathbb{G} .




Figure 1: An example of the reduction graph \mathbb{G} for $\mathcal{F} = \{S_1, S_2, S_3\}$, $\mathcal{X} = \{x_1, x_2, x_3\}$, $S_1 = \{x_1, x_2\}$, $S_2 = \{x_2, x_3\}$, and $S_3 = \{x_3\}$. Every black edge in this graph is contained in a triangle consisting of its endpoints plus one other auxiliary vertex omitted from this figure for simplicity (see Step 5 of the construction). Therefore, only the red edges of this graph are not contained in any triangles.

For an instance \mathcal{I} of SET-COVER, the next lemma helps us in constructing a set cover for \mathcal{I} from a good 3-completion set of its corresponding graph \mathbb{G} .

Lemma 1. *Any good 3-completion set E' of \mathbb{G} corresponds to a set cover of size $|E'|$ for the corresponding SET-COVER instance.*

Proof. Let E' be a good 3-completion set of \mathbb{G} . For every edge $(S_j, P) \in E'$, we select the set S_j to be included in the set cover. Since E' is a 3-completion set, the unsaturated edges connecting each item subgraph I_i to the common vertex P must be covered by at least one edge $(S_j, P) \in E'$ with $x_i \in S_j$. Therefore, the sets corresponding to the edges in E' collectively cover all items in the SET-COVER instance. \square

To prove the hardness result, we show that any 3-completion set E' can be transformed into a good 3-completion set E'' , where $|E''| \leq |E'|$, using [Algorithm 1](#).

Algorithm 1

- 1: **Input:** \mathbb{G}, E' (a 3-completion set of \mathbb{G})
 - 2: **Output:** E'' , a good 3-completion set of \mathbb{G} with $|E''| \leq |E'|$
 - 3: **Initialization:** $E'' \leftarrow \emptyset$
 - 4: **Step 1:** For every item $x_i \in \mathcal{X}$, let $S_j \in \mathcal{F}$ be a set with $x_i \in S_j$. If E' has an edge (u, v) such that $\{u, v\} \subseteq V(I_i)$ for its corresponding item subgraph I_i , then add (S_j, P) to E'' , i.e., $E'' \leftarrow E'' \cup \{(S_j, P)\}$.
 - 5: **Step 2:** Add the *good* subset of E' to E'' , i.e., $E'' \leftarrow E'' \cup (E' \cap \{(S_j, P) \mid S_j \in \mathcal{F}\})$.
 - 6: **Step 3:** For each item $x_i \in \mathcal{X}$, if I_i has an unsaturated edge $(u, P) \in \mathbb{E}$ (with $u \in V(I_i)$) in $\mathbb{G} \cup E''$, then add the edge (S_j, P) to E'' for some set $S_j \in \mathcal{F}$ with $x_i \in S_j$.
 - 7: **return** E''
-

Lemma 2. *Let E' be a 3-completion set of the described graph \mathbb{G} . [Algorithm 1](#) returns a good 3-completion set E'' of \mathbb{G} in time polynomial in $(|\mathcal{X}| + |\mathcal{F}|)$ with $|E''| \leq |E'|$ where $|\mathcal{X}|$ and $|\mathcal{F}|$ denote the number of items and sets of the corresponding SET-COVER instance, respectively.*

Proof. Since [Algorithm 1](#) only adds edges of type (S_j, P) and continues until all edges of \mathbb{G} are saturated, E'' is a good completion set of \mathbb{G} . Furthermore, [Algorithm 1](#) runs in time polynomial in $|\mathcal{F}| + |\mathcal{X}|$.

We now show that $|E''| \leq |E'|$. To show this inequality, for every edge added to E'' , we *match* it to a unique edge in E' such that every edge in E' is matched to at most one edge in E'' . As a result, $|E''| \leq |E'|$.

Indeed, this matching is easy to see for Step 1 and Step 2 of [Algorithm 1](#). In Step 1, if an edge (S_j, P) is added to E'' , we match it to some edge $(u, v) \in E'$ with $\{u, v\} \subseteq V(I_i)$ and $x_i \in S_j$. In Step 2, if some edge (S_j, P) is added to E'' (and was not added in the previous step), then we match it to its copy in E' , i.e., $(S_j, P) \in E'$. Therefore, in the first two steps, the edges of E'' are matched to unique edges from E' . To show this matching for Step 3, we prove the following claim.

Claim 1. *At the beginning of Step 3, if $\mathbb{G} \cup E''$ has an unsaturated edge (u, P) such that $u \in V(I_i)$ for some item x_i , then E' has at least $2|\mathcal{X}|$ edges that were not matched to any edge from E'' in Step 1 and Step 2.*

Proof. Suppose such an edge exists. Notice that for any two distinct vertices $u, v \in V(I_i)$, we must have $(u, v) \notin E'$, because otherwise [Algorithm 1](#) would have caught this edge in Step 1 and added an edge (S_j, P) for $x_i \in S_j$, saturating all such edges (u, P) . Similarly and using Step 2, we have $(S_j, P) \notin E'$ for any $S_j \in \mathcal{F}$ with $x_i \in S_j$. Since E' is a completion set of \mathbb{G} , it is easy to see that $2|\mathcal{X}|$ edges $\{(u, P) \mid u \in V(I_i)\}$ were covered by at least $2|\mathcal{X}|$ edges in E' , not of the types matched in the first two steps. \square

We now conclude the proof of [Lemma 2](#). If, after Step 2, no such unsaturated edge (u, P) exists, then we are done. If such an edge exists, then using [Claim 1](#), E' still has at least $2|\mathcal{X}|$ unmatched edges. Since we add at most $|\mathcal{X}|$ edges to E'' in Step 3 (one for each item in \mathcal{X}), we can easily match these edges to the ones described in [Claim 1](#). \square

Theorem 1. *The (3, 1)-cover problem is \mathbb{NP} -complete.*

Proof. It is easy to see that the (3, 1)-cover problem belongs to \mathbb{NP} since given a set of non-edges of an input graph G , it can be verified in polynomial time whether that set is a 3-completion set of G of size at most t . We now show that the (3, 1)-cover problem is \mathbb{NP} -hard. Let $\mathcal{I} = (\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{F}, t)$ be an instance of the SET-COVER problem. Construct the graph \mathbb{G} . Constructing this graph using [Observation 1](#) takes polynomial time in $|\mathcal{X}|$ and $|\mathcal{F}|$. We claim that \mathcal{I} has a set cover of size at most t if and only if \mathbb{G} has a 3-completion set of size at most t . Indeed, if \mathcal{I} has a set cover of size at most t , then we can construct a 3-completion set for \mathbb{G} consisting of edges (S_j, P) for every set S_j in this set cover. Conversely, if \mathbb{G} has a 3-completion set E' of size at most t , then using [Lemma 2](#) and [Algorithm 1](#), we can construct a good 3-completion set E'' with $|E''| \leq |E'| \leq t$ which corresponds to a set cover of size $|E''| \leq t$ using [Lemma 1](#). Therefore, the (3, 1)-cover problem is \mathbb{NP} -hard. \square

2.1.2 Reduction for $k \geq 4$

Given an instance $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{F}, t)$ of the SET-COVER problem and an integer $k \geq 4$, we construct a graph $\mathbb{G} = (\mathbb{V}, \mathbb{E})$ as follows (see Figure 2 for an illustration).

1. Initially, $\mathbb{V} = \emptyset$ and $\mathbb{E} = \emptyset$.
2. For each item $x_i \in \mathcal{X}$, we add two vertices x_i and x'_i to \mathbb{V} . Moreover, we add the edge (x_i, x'_i) to \mathbb{E} . We refer to such vertices and edges as *item vertices and edges*, respectively.
3. For each set $S_j \in \mathcal{F}$, we create a graph \mathbb{G}_j isomorphic to K_{k-2} without one edge and add \mathbb{G}_j to \mathbb{G} . Denote the missing edge of this subgraph by (S_j, S'_j) . We refer to such subgraphs \mathbb{G}_j as *set subgraphs*. We update \mathbb{V} and \mathbb{E} accordingly by adding the $k-2$ vertices and $\binom{k-2}{2} - 1$ edges for each set subgraph to \mathbb{V} and \mathbb{E} , respectively.
4. For each item $x_i \in \mathcal{X}$, and every set $S_j \in \mathcal{F}$ with $x_i \in S_j$, we connect x_i and x'_i to every vertex of $V(\mathbb{G}_j)$, i.e., we set $\mathbb{E} \leftarrow \mathbb{E} \cup \{(u, v) \mid u \in \{x_i, x'_i\}, v \in V(\mathbb{G}_j)\}$.
5. For each edge $e_i \in \mathbb{E} \setminus \{(x_1, x'_1), \dots, (x_{|\mathcal{X}|}, x'_{|\mathcal{X}|})\}$, we add a k -clique to \mathbb{G} , consisting of the endpoints of e_i plus $k-2$ new vertices. We then update \mathbb{V} and \mathbb{E} .
6. We add a vertex P to \mathbb{V} . For every set $S_i \in \mathcal{F}$, we add the edge (S_i, P) to \mathbb{E} . We refer to P as *the common vertex* of \mathbb{G} . For every newly added edge (S_i, P) , we cover it in a k -clique consisting of S_i , P , and $k-2$ new vertices. This step ensures that \mathbb{G} is connected.

It is easy to see that after the fourth step, for any $S_j \in \mathcal{F}$ and any $x_i \in \mathcal{X} \cap S_j$, the subgraph of \mathbb{G} induced on $V(\mathbb{G}_j) \cup \{x_i, x'_i\}$ is a complete graph on k vertices minus one edge, the one between S_j and S'_j . Due to Step 5 and Step 6, all edges except the ones created in the second step $(\{(x_1, x'_1), \dots, (x_{|\mathcal{X}|}, x'_{|\mathcal{X}|})\})$ are covered in k -cliques.

The next lemma states that when k is constant, the described graph can be constructed in time polynomial in $|\mathcal{F}|$ and $|\mathcal{X}|$.

Lemma 3. *Let $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{F}, t)$ be an instance of the SET-COVER problem. Then, for an integer $k \geq 4$, the procedure described above builds the graph \mathbb{G} in $\mathcal{O}(|\mathcal{X}| \cdot |\mathcal{F}| \cdot k^4)$ time. Furthermore, \mathbb{G} is connected.*

Proof. Step 2 and Step 3 can be executed in $\mathcal{O}(|\mathcal{X}|)$ and $\mathcal{O}(|\mathcal{F}| \cdot k^2)$ time, respectively. In Step 4, we need to check at most $\mathcal{O}(|\mathcal{F}| \cdot |\mathcal{X}|)$ pairs of item-sets, and at each step, we create at most $\mathcal{O}(k^2)$ new vertices. Therefore, Step 4 takes $\mathcal{O}(|\mathcal{F}| \cdot |\mathcal{X}| \cdot k^2)$ time. After Step 4, there are at most $\mathcal{O}(|\mathcal{F}| \cdot |\mathcal{X}| \cdot k^2)$ edges and creating a k -clique on each of them takes a total of $\mathcal{O}(|\mathcal{F}| \cdot |\mathcal{X}| \cdot k^4)$ time in Step 5. Finally, Step 6 ensures that \mathbb{G} is connected and can be done in $\mathcal{O}(|\mathcal{F}| \cdot k^2)$ time. \square




Figure 2: An example of the reduction graph \mathbb{G} for $k = 4$, $\mathcal{F} = \{S_1, S_2, S_3\}$, $\mathcal{X} = \{x_1, x_2, x_3\}$, $S_1 = \{x_1, x_2\}$, $S_2 = \{x_2, x_3\}$, and $S_3 = \{x_3\}$. Every black edge in this graph is contained in a k -clique consisting of its endpoints plus $k - 2$ other vertices omitted from this figure for simplicity (see Step 5 and Step 6 of the construction). Therefore, only the red edges of this graph are not contained in any k -cliques.

We have the following observations regarding the graph \mathbb{G} .

Observation 2. Let \mathbb{G} be the graph described above and let R be the set of k -unsaturated edges of \mathbb{G} . Then, $R = \{(x_1, x'_1), \dots, (x_{|\mathcal{X}|}, x'_{|\mathcal{X}|})\}$

Before describing our key lemma of this section, we present one notation.

Notation 1. Let $G = (V, E)$ be any graph. For an edge $e = (u, v) \in E$, we denote all vertices w such that w and e form a triangle as $V_T(e)$, i.e., $V_T(e) := \{w \in V \mid (u, w), (v, w) \in E\}$.

In the next observation, we classify the triangles of each edge (x_i, x'_i) :

Observation 3. Let \mathbb{G} be the reduction graph. For an item $x_i \in \mathcal{X}$, let $\{S_1, \dots, S_m\} \subseteq \mathcal{F}$ be the sets in \mathcal{F} that cover x_i , i.e., $x_i \in S_1 \cap \dots \cap S_m$. We have $V_T((x_i, x'_i)) \subseteq \bigcup_{j=1}^m V(\mathbb{G}_j)$ in \mathbb{G} , where $\mathbb{G}_1, \dots, \mathbb{G}_m$ are the corresponding set subgraphs (see Step 3 of the construction) of S_1, \dots, S_m , respectively.

In other words, **Observation 3** states that in \mathbb{G} , the third vertex of any triangle containing (x_i, x'_i) must necessarily come from some set subgraph \mathbb{G}_j (with $x_i \in S_j$) as created in Step 3. We present a definition.

Definition 4. Let E' be a k -completion set for the graph \mathbb{G} . Then, E' is a **good k -completion set** if $E' \subseteq \{(S_1, S'_1), \dots, (S_{|\mathcal{F}|}, S'_{|\mathcal{F}|})\}$.

Similar to **Lemma 1**, we have the following:

Lemma 4. Any good completion set E' of \mathbb{G} corresponds to a set cover of size $|E'|$ for the corresponding SET-COVER instance.

Lemma 5. *Let \mathbb{G} be the described graph. Then, any k -completion set E' of \mathbb{G} can be transformed into a good k -completion set E'' with $|E''| \leq |E'|$. Furthermore, this transformation can be done in $\mathcal{O}(|E'| + |\mathcal{F}|^2 \cdot k^2 + |\mathcal{X}|^2 \cdot |\mathcal{F}| \cdot k^4)$ time for any $k \geq 4$.*

Proof. This construction is done in steps and described in greater detail in [Algorithm 2](#). We first show the time complexity. Trivially, Line 4 can be done $\mathcal{O}(|E'|)$ time. In Lines 5 to 9, we check all pairs of set subgraphs and there are $\mathcal{O}(|\mathcal{F}|^2)$ pairs in total, where each pair can be checked in $\mathcal{O}(k^2)$ time. In Lines 10 to 20, we check $\mathcal{O}(|\mathcal{X}|)$ item edges and handle each edge in $\mathcal{O}(|\mathcal{X}| \cdot |\mathcal{F}| \cdot k^4)$ time (in the worst case, we have to check every vertex of \mathbb{G}). Moreover, since [Algorithm 2](#) only adds edges of type (S_j, S'_j) and continues until all edges of \mathbb{G} are saturated, it is easy to see that E'' is a good k -completion set of \mathbb{G} .

To show that $|E''| \leq |E'|$, similar to the proof of [Lemma 2](#), for every edge added to E'' , we match it to a unique edge in E' such that every edge in E' is matched to at most one edge in E'' . For Line 4, this matching is easy to see, for every such edge (S_j, S'_j) added to E'' , we match it to its copy in E' ($(S_j, S'_j) \in E'$). Similarly, if an edge (S_j, S'_j) is added to E'' (and was not added in previous steps) in Line 7, then we can match (S_j, S'_j) to $(u, v) \in E'$ (as described in Line 6). Because of the way we pick $(u, v) \in E'$ in Line 6, it could not have been matched to another edge $(S_i, S'_i) \in E''$ before $(S_j, S'_j) \in E''$ (with $i \neq j$).

Before describing the matching for Lines 10 to 20, we show the following claim.

Claim 2. *As long as we have a k -unsaturated item edge (x_i, x'_i) in $\mathbb{G} \cup E''$ in Line 10, there exists a vertex $v \in V_T((x_i, x'_i))$ in $\mathbb{G} \cup E'$ with $|\mathbb{E} \cap \{(x_i, v), (x'_i, v)\}| \leq 1$ in Line 11. Moreover, the edges of $\{(x_i, v), (x'_i, v)\} \cap E'$ have not been matched to any edges in E'' in the previous steps.*

Proof. Consider the initial k -completion set E' and the first such unsaturated edge (x_i, x'_i) (we will address subsequent edges later). If the edges in E' create any new triangles-i.e., triangles that exist in $\mathbb{G} \cup E'$ but not in \mathbb{G} -containing (x_i, x'_i) , then such a vertex v trivially exists in $\mathbb{G} \cup E'$.

Now, assume to the contrary that such a vertex v does not exist, i.e., $V_T((x_i, x'_i))$ in \mathbb{G} is the same as $V_T((x_i, x'_i))$ in $\mathbb{G} \cup E'$. This would imply that E' has created a k -clique containing x_i, x'_i , and $k - 2$ other vertices from $V_T((x_i, x'_i))$ in \mathbb{G} . Observe that these $k - 2$ vertices from $V_T((x_i, x'_i))$ must form a $(k - 2)$ -clique in $\mathbb{G} \cup E'$ and let C denote this $(k - 2)$ -clique. By [Observation 3](#), there are two possible cases for C :

Case I: Assume that $V(C) = V(\mathbb{G}_j)$ for some set subgraph \mathbb{G}_j with $x_i \in S_j$. This case implies that $(S_j, S'_j) \in E'$. However, this leads to a contradiction since [Algorithm 2](#) would have caught this edge in Line 4 and saturated (x_i, x'_i) by adding (S_j, S'_j) to E'' (since $x_i \in S_j$).

Case II: Assume $V(C) \subseteq V(\mathbb{G}_j) \cup V(\mathbb{G}_\ell)$ for two set subgraphs \mathbb{G}_j and \mathbb{G}_ℓ with $j < \ell$ and $x_i \in S_j \cap S_\ell$. This case implies that E' contains at least one edge between the vertices of \mathbb{G}_j and \mathbb{G}_ℓ . This is a contradiction, because [Algorithm 2](#) would have caught this edge in Line 5 and saturated (x_i, x'_i) by adding (S_j, S'_j) to E'' in Line 7 (since $x_i \in S_j$).

Therefore, such a vertex v exists for the first k -unsaturated item edge (x_i, x'_i) . Moreover, in Lines 4 to 9, no edge from E' with an endpoint in $\{x_i, x'_i\}$ is ever matched to an edge in E'' . Thus, prior to processing (x_i, x'_i) in Line 10, the edges in $\{(x_i, v), (x'_i, v)\} \cap E'$ are not

matched to any edge in E'' . Therefore, for the first k -unsaturated item edge (x_i, x'_i) of Line 10, we can match the edges added to E'' in Lines 15 and 18 to the ones from E' described in Lines 14 and 17, respectively.

For any subsequent k -unsaturated edge (x_i, x'_i) processed in Line 10, we can apply the same reasoning to conclude that $V_T((x_i, x'_i))$ in \mathbb{G} is not equal to $V_T((x_i, x'_i))$ in $\mathbb{G} \cup E'$. Moreover, the edges in $\{(x_i, v), (x'_i, v)\} \cap E'$ have not been matched to any edges in E'' during the previous steps. This remains true even after Line 15 of a previous iteration. If $(x_i, x'_i) = (x_\ell, x'_\ell)$ in Line 13 for some previous iteration, then (x_i, x'_i) would not be k -unsaturated in the current iteration, as it would have already been saturated in Line 15 of that previous iteration.

This completes the proof of [Claim 2](#). \square

Using [Claim 2](#), we can wrap up the proof of [Lemma 5](#). Note that we can match the edges added to E'' in Lines 15 and 18 to the ones from E' described in Lines 14 and 17, respectively. \square

Algorithm 2 The construction method of [Lemma 5](#)

```

1: Input:  $\mathbb{G}, E'$  (a  $k$ -completion set of  $\mathbb{G}$ )
2: Output:  $E''$ , a good  $k$ -completion set of  $\mathbb{G}$  (see Definition 4) with  $|E''| \leq |E'|$ 
3: Initialization:  $E'' \leftarrow \emptyset$ 
4: Add the good subset of  $E'$  to  $E''$ , i.e.,  $E'' \leftarrow E' \cap \{(S_1, S'_1), \dots, (S_{|\mathcal{F}|}, S'_{|\mathcal{F}|})\}$ 
5: for any two sets  $S_j, S_\ell \in \mathcal{F}$  with  $j < \ell$  do
6:   if exists  $e = (u, v)$  in  $E'$  with  $u \in V(\mathbb{G}_j)$  and  $v \in V(\mathbb{G}_\ell)$  then
7:     Add  $(S_j, S'_j)$  to  $E''$ , i.e.,  $E'' \leftarrow E'' \cup \{(S_j, S'_j)\}$ .
8:   end if
9: end for
10: while there exists a  $k$ -unsaturated item edge  $(x_i, x'_i)$  in  $\mathbb{G} \cup E''$  do
11:   Let  $v \in V_T((x_i, x'_i))$  in  $\mathbb{G} \cup E'$  with  $|\mathbb{E} \cap \{(x_i, v), (x'_i, v)\}| \leq 1$ 
12:   Let  $S_i \in \mathcal{F}$  be a set with  $x_i \in S_i$ 
13:   if  $v \in \{x_\ell, x'_\ell\}$  for some other  $k$ -unsaturated item edge  $(x_\ell, x'_\ell)$  in  $\mathbb{G} \cup E''$  then
14:     In this case, we have  $\{(x_i, v), (x'_i, v)\} \subseteq E'$ , let  $S_\ell \in \mathcal{F}$  be a set with  $x_\ell \in S_\ell$ 
15:     Add  $(S_i, S'_i)$  and  $(S_\ell, S'_\ell)$  to  $E''$ , i.e.,  $E'' \leftarrow E'' \cup \{(S_i, S'_i), (S_\ell, S'_\ell)\}$ . This saturates
        $(x_i, x'_i)$  and  $(x_\ell, x'_\ell)$  in  $\mathbb{G} \cup E''$ .
16:   else
17:     In this case, there exists an edge  $e \in E' \cap \{(x_i, v), (x'_i, v)\}$ 
18:     Add  $(S_i, S'_i)$  to  $E''$ , i.e.,  $E'' \leftarrow E'' \cup \{(S_i, S'_i)\}$ 
19:   end if
20: end while

```

Theorem 2. *The $(k, 1)$ -cover problem is NP -complete for every constant $k \geq 4$.*

Proof. It is easy to see that for any constant $k \geq 4$, the $(k, 1)$ -cover problem belongs to NP . Furthermore, in time polynomial in $|\mathcal{X}| + |\mathcal{F}|$, we can build the graph \mathbb{G} using [Lemma 3](#)

and the fact that k is constant.

The NP -hardness proof is similar to the proof of [Theorem 1](#), and we skip the details for brevity. Note that every set cover of the corresponding SET-COVER instance corresponds to a good completion set for \mathbb{G} of the same size. Moreover, using [Algorithm 2](#), every completion set E' (with $|E'| \leq t$) of \mathbb{G} can be converted into a good completion set E'' with $|E''| \leq |E'| \leq t$, which corresponds to a set cover of size at most t for the underlying SET-COVER instance. \square

2.1.3 Inapproximability of the $(k, 1)$ -Cover Problem for General Graphs

In this section, we prove that it is hard to approximate the $(k, 1)$ -cover problem within a constant factor for any constant $k \geq 3$.

We first restate a result on the inapproximability of SET-COVER.

Lemma 6. [[11](#), [Corollary 4](#)]

For every $\varepsilon > 0$, it is NP -hard to approximate SET-COVER by a $((1 - \varepsilon) \cdot \ln|\mathcal{X}|)$ factor.

Theorem 3. *For any constant $k \geq 3$, it is NP -hard to approximate the $(k, 1)$ -cover problem within a factor of c for any constant $c > 1$.*

Proof. For the sake of contradiction, suppose $\mathbb{P} \neq \text{NP}$ and there exists a polynomial-time c -approximation algorithm A for the $(k, 1)$ -cover problem for some constants $c > 1$ and $k \geq 3$, where $c \in \mathbb{R}$ and $k \in \mathbb{Z}$. For any instance $\mathcal{I} = (\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{F}, t)$ of the SET-COVER problem, let OPT_S be the size of the optimal set cover, and for its corresponding reduction graph \mathbb{G} , let OPT_G denote the size of its optimal completion set. Note that $\text{OPT}_S = \text{OPT}_G$. Every set cover for \mathcal{I} corresponds to a completion set for \mathbb{G} , so $\text{OPT}_G \leq \text{OPT}_S$. On the other hand, we also have $\text{OPT}_S \leq \text{OPT}_G$, because otherwise we would have $\text{OPT}_G < \text{OPT}_S$ and using [Algorithm 1](#), [Algorithm 2](#), [Lemma 1](#), [Lemma 2](#), [Lemma 4](#), and [Lemma 5](#), \mathcal{I} would have a set cover of size strictly less than OPT_S , a contradiction. Therefore, we have $\text{OPT}_G = \text{OPT}_S$.

Given algorithm A , we now show how to approximate any instance of SET-COVER within a factor of c in polynomial time. Given any such instance $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{F})$, we construct the reduction graph \mathbb{G} in time polynomial in $|\mathcal{F}| + |\mathcal{X}|$ ([Observation 1](#) and [Lemma 3](#)). We run A on \mathbb{G} that gives us a k -completion set E' with $|E'| \leq c \times \text{OPT}_G$ in time polynomial in the size of \mathbb{G} and hence in $|\mathcal{X}|$ and $|\mathcal{F}|$. Using [Algorithm 1](#) (for $k = 3$) and [Algorithm 2](#) (for $k \geq 4$), we can transform E' to another good k -completion set E'' with $|E''| \leq |E'|$ in time polynomial in $|\mathcal{X}|$ and $|\mathcal{F}|$ (note that $|E'|$ is polynomial in $|\mathcal{X}| + |\mathcal{F}|$). However, E'' is a good k -completion set that corresponds to a set cover of size $|E''|$ with

$$|E''| \leq |E'| \leq c \times \text{OPT}_G = c \times \text{OPT}_S$$

Therefore, this results in a polynomial-time constant-factor approximation algorithm for SET-COVER. However, from [Lemma 6](#), we know that for every $\varepsilon > 0$, it is NP -hard to devise an $((1 - \varepsilon) \cdot \ln|\mathcal{X}|)$ -approximation to SET-COVER, a contradiction. \square

2.2 NP-Hardness for Trees

In this section, we prove that for general values of k , the $(k, 1)$ -cover problem is NP-hard, even when its input is a spider. A *spider* is a tree with exactly one vertex of degree at least 3, to which we refer as the *center* of the spider. A spider has *legs* which are paths of varying sizes meeting at the center of the spider. We reduce the NP-complete problem of 3-PARTITION to our problem on spiders. We use some ideas from [22] and extend them with some structural properties of extremal graphs with $(k, 1)$ -covers.

We start by formally defining the 3-PARTITION problem.

Definition 5. *Given a multiset $S = \{a_1, \dots, a_{3p}\}$ of $3p$ positive integers, an integer $s > 0$ such that each a_i satisfies $s/4 < a_i < s/2$ and $\sum_{i=1}^{3p} a_i = sp$, an instance $\mathcal{I} = (S, s)$ of 3-PARTITION asks whether there exists a partition of S into p subsets of size exactly three, such that each subset sums up to s .*

3-PARTITION is strongly NP-complete, i.e., it remains NP-complete even if all integers are polynomially bounded in the size of the input [13]. For completeness, we also define the following decision problem for trees.

Definition 6. *Given a tree $T = (V, E)$, two integers $k \leq |V|$ and $t \geq 0$, an instance $\mathcal{I} = (T, k, t)$ of TREE-COMPLETION asks whether T has a k -completion set of size t .*

We now describe a reduction from 3-PARTITION to TREE-COMPLETION. For an instance $\mathcal{I} = (S, s)$ of 3-PARTITION, we construct a spider $\mathbb{T} = (\mathbb{V}, \mathbb{E})$ as follows.

1. Initially, we set $\mathbb{V} = \emptyset$ and $\mathbb{E} = \emptyset$.
2. We add a vertex r to \mathbb{V} . r will be the center of this spider.
3. For each $a_i \in S$, we add a leg with a_i edges to r and update \mathbb{V} and \mathbb{E} accordingly.

The following observation states that the described spider \mathbb{T} can be constructed in time polynomial in the size of the corresponding 3-PARTITION instance.

Observation 4. For an instance $\mathcal{I} = (S, s)$ of 3-PARTITION, the described tree $\mathbb{T} = (\mathbb{V}, \mathbb{E})$ is a spider with $|\mathbb{V}| = sp + 1$ and $|\mathbb{E}| = sp$. Furthermore, since s and p are polynomially bounded in the size of the input, the size of \mathbb{T} is polynomial in the size of \mathcal{I} .

To prove our main hardness result of this section, we need the following structural result. This result can be deduced by analyzing Theorem 1 in [6] for the case of $r = k - 1$.

Lemma 7. *Let $k \geq 3$ and $G = (V, E)$ be a connected n -vertex graph with a $(k, 1)$ -cover such that $n - k = q(k - 1) + r$ where $q \geq 0$ and $r = k - 1$. If $|E| = (q + 2)\binom{k}{2}$, then there exist $q + 2$ subgraphs C_1, \dots, C_{q+2} of G such that*

- (i) *Each C_i is isomorphic to a k -clique.*

(ii) These subgraphs are pairwise edge-disjoint, i.e., for any two distinct C_i and C_j we have $E(C_i) \cap E(C_j) = \emptyset$.

(iii) Every edge of G belongs to some C_i , i.e., $\bigcup_{i=1}^{q+2} E(C_i) = E$.

The following lemma is essential for proving the NP -hardness.

Lemma 8. For an instance $\mathcal{I} = (S, s)$ of 3-PARTITION, let $\mathbb{T} = (\mathbb{V}, \mathbb{E})$ be the described spider. Then, the following statements are equivalent.

(i) \mathcal{I} is a YES instance of 3-PARTITION.

(ii) \mathbb{T} has an $(s+1)$ -completion set E' of size $\frac{ps(s-1)}{2}$.

(iii) \mathbb{E} can be partitioned into p edge-disjoint trees, such that each tree has exactly s edges.

Proof. We show (i) \implies (ii) \implies (iii) \implies (i).

(i) \implies (ii): Suppose S can be partitioned into p subsets of size three such that each subset sums up to s . Then, for each such subset, we pick three legs of \mathbb{T} corresponding to the three integers of that subset. These three legs with the center r make up a spider with exactly s edges. We can convert this smaller spider into an $(s+1)$ -clique by adding exactly $\binom{s+1}{2} - s = \frac{s(s-1)}{2}$ edges to E' (initially, $E' \leftarrow \emptyset$). Since there are p subsets in total, there are p spiders with three legs that collectively cover \mathbb{E} . Converting each such spider into an $(s+1)$ -clique can be done by adding exactly $\frac{ps(s-1)}{2}$ edges to E' in total, making E' an $(s+1)$ -completion set of size $\frac{ps(s-1)}{2}$ for \mathbb{T} .

(ii) \implies (iii): Suppose such an $(s+1)$ -completion set E' exists, and let $\mathbb{T}' := \mathbb{T} \cup E'$. \mathbb{T}' has an $(s+1, 1)$ -cover, with $|V(\mathbb{T}')| = sp + 1$ and $E(\mathbb{T}') = sp + \frac{ps(s-1)}{2} = \frac{ps(s+1)}{2}$. Furthermore, we have

$$sp + 1 - (s + 1) = (p - 2)s + s \quad (1)$$

We now apply Lemma 7. In Lemma 7, set $k = s + 1$, $n = sp + 1$, $q = p - 2$ and $r = s$. Since \mathbb{T}' has an $(s + 1, 1)$ -cover with exactly $(q + 2)\binom{k}{2} = p\binom{s+1}{2} = \frac{ps(s+1)}{2}$ edges, it follows that \mathbb{T}' has p $(s + 1)$ -cliques C_1, \dots, C_p with the properties described in Lemma 7(i)-(iii). Using Lemma 7(ii) and Lemma 7(iii), these cliques define an edge partition of \mathbb{T}' . For any such C_i , define $x_i = |E(C_i) \cap E(\mathbb{T})|$. Since $|V(C_i)| = s + 1$ for all C_i , we have $0 \leq x_i \leq s$ and

$$|E'| = \frac{ps(s-1)}{2} = \sum_{i=1}^p \binom{s+1}{2} - x_i, \text{ subject to } 0 \leq x_i \leq s \text{ for all } i. \quad (2)$$

However, (2) holds if and only if $x_i = s$ for all i , i.e., when each C_i holds exactly s edges of \mathbb{T} . Since $x_i = s$ and $|V(C_i)| = s + 1$, it follows that for each C_i , $C_i \cap \mathbb{T}$ is a sub-tree of \mathbb{T} with s edges. Therefore, $\forall i \in \{1, \dots, p\} C_i \cap \mathbb{T}$ defines a partition of \mathbb{E} into p edge-disjoint sub-trees with s edges each.

(iii) \implies (i): Suppose such an edge partition exists. First, observe that since each leg L_i of T has strictly less than s edges, all edges of every leg L_i of \mathbb{T} must belong to the same tree of the partition. Moreover, every tree of this partition must consist of exactly three legs of \mathbb{T} , because each a_i satisfies $s/4 < a_i < s/2$. It follows that the edges of \mathbb{T} can be partitioned into p trees such that each tree has exactly s edges and three legs of \mathbb{T} . This edge partition implies that \mathcal{I} is a YES-instance of 3-PARTITION. \square

From [Observation 4](#) and the equivalence of [Lemma 8\(i\)](#) and [Lemma 8\(ii\)](#), the NP-hardness of TREE-COMPLETION follows.

Theorem 4. *TREE-COMPLETION is NP-hard, even when the input tree is a spider.*

3 An Optimal Algorithm for Chordal Graphs for the (3, 1)-Cover Problem

This section presents an optimal algorithm for the (3, 1)-cover problem on chordal graphs. For convenience, throughout this section, we refer to 3-unsaturated edges and 3-completion sets as unsaturated edges and completion sets, respectively.

3.1 An Optimal Algorithm for the (3, 1)-Cover of Trees

Before presenting our main result, we briefly describe how we can optimally solve the (3, 1)-cover problem when the input graph is a tree. We will later use the algorithm for trees to solve the problem for chordal graphs.

We begin by restating a known result.

Lemma 9. [[3](#), [Theorem 8](#)] *Let $M_{n,\ell}$ be the minimum number of edges in a connected graph on n vertices with a $(3, \ell)$ -cover, we have*

$$(n-1)\left(1 + \frac{\ell}{2}\right) \leq M_{n,\ell} \leq n\left(1 + \frac{\ell}{2}\right) + \Theta(\ell^2).$$

[Lemma 9](#) implies the following corollary, giving us a lower bound on the size of any optimal $(3, k-2)$ -completion set of an n -vertex tree for $k \geq 3$.

Corollary 1. *Let T be any tree with $|V(T)| = n$. Let OPT be the size of an optimal $(3, k-2)$ -completion set of T for $k \geq 3$. Then, we have*

$$(n-1)\left(\frac{k-2}{2}\right) \leq \text{OPT} \tag{3}$$

[Corollary 1](#) results from the simple fact that any n -vertex tree has $n-1$ edges.

Let us denote the n -vertex path by P_n . We show that the edges of every n -vertex tree T ($n \geq 3$) can be partitioned into $\lceil \frac{n-1}{2} \rceil$ sub-trees, such that all but at most one sub-tree is isomorphic to P_3 as the following lemma states.

Lemma 10. *Let $T = (V, E)$ be a tree with $|V| = n \geq 3$. There exists an algorithm running in $\mathcal{O}(n)$ time that partitions the edges of E into $\lceil \frac{n-1}{2} \rceil$ sub-trees of T with the following structure. If $|E| = n - 1$ is even, all these sub-trees are isomorphic to P_3 . If $|E|$ is odd, all but one sub-trees are isomorphic to P_3 , and the remaining sub-tree is isomorphic to K_2 .*

Proof. Suppose T is rooted at an arbitrary node $r \in V$. Create an array A of length $d + 1$, where d is the depth of T with respect to r . For any $0 \leq i \leq d$, $A[i]$ holds a linked list containing all vertices at depth i in T .

The algorithm proceeds in iterations. For every iteration $j \geq 1$, we find the deepest leaf v of T . This leaf can be found in the last non-empty cell of A . We then extract a sub-tree T_j of T in the following way. Let u be the parent of v in T . If v has a sibling v_1 , we set $T_j \leftarrow T[\{u, v, v_1\}]$. If v has no siblings and T has at least three nodes, we set $T \leftarrow T[\{u, v, w\}]$ where w is the parent of u . If T has exactly two nodes left, we set $T_j \leftarrow T[\{v, u\}]$.

It is easy to see that $T \setminus E(T_j)$ has at most one non-trivial component. There may be some nodes u with $d_T(u) > 0$ and $d_{T \setminus E(T_j)}(u) = 0$. These nodes are marked as *deleted*. We then set T to be the only non-trivial component of $T \setminus E(T_j)$. If $T \setminus E(T_j)$ does not have any non-trivial components, we terminate the algorithm.

In subsequent iterations, whenever a node u is extracted from the last non-empty cell of A , we check if u is marked as deleted. If so, u is discarded, and the process continues until a non-deleted node is extracted. It can be verified that as long as T has at least three vertices remaining, T_j is isomorphic to P_3 . Therefore, if $n - 1$ is even, we have $T_j \cong P_3$ for $\frac{n-1}{2}$ many j . If $n - 1$ is odd, we have $T_j \cong P_3$ for $\lfloor \frac{n-1}{2} \rfloor$ many j , and $T_j \cong K_2$ for the last iteration. Regarding the time complexity, for finding sub-trees T_j we visit every edge of T exactly once; therefore, we spend $\mathcal{O}(n)$ time in total for finding all sub-trees. At every iteration j , we need to check a constant number of nodes to determine whether they need to be marked as deleted. Moreover, every deleted node is discarded at most once, and updating A can be done in $\mathcal{O}(n)$ time in total. Since we never increase any node's depth, finding the last non-empty cell of A can be done in $\mathcal{O}(n)$ time in total since A has length at most n . \square

We now show that a tree's optimal $(3, 1)$ -cover can be computed efficiently.

Proposition 1. *Let $T = (V, E)$ be a tree with $|V| = n \geq 3$. In $\mathcal{O}(n)$ time, we can solve the $(3, 1)$ -cover problem optimally for T by producing a completion set of size $\lceil \frac{n-1}{2} \rceil$.*

Proof. Use the algorithm of Lemma 10 to find a partition of E into many copies of P_3 and at most one K_2 (if $|E|$ is odd). For each sub-tree isomorphic to P_3 , we can add the missing edge to the completion set, transforming the P_3 into a K_3 . For the sub-tree isomorphic to K_2 , we can add one edge to the completion set that will cover the edge in this sub-tree within a triangle. It is easy to see that the described algorithm adds exactly $\lceil \frac{n-1}{2} \rceil$ edges, and it is optimal, using the bound in (3). \square

3.2 An Optimal Algorithm for the (3,1)-Cover of Chordal Graphs

We now describe our algorithm for chordal graphs. Let $G = (V, E)$ be a connected chordal graph on at least three vertices. Note that if an edge e is not a bridge of a chordal graph G , it must belong to a cycle and, consequently, a triangle. We have the following notation.

Notation 2. Let $G = (V, E)$ be a chordal graph. Denote by T_1, \dots, T_c the maximal connected subgraphs on the bridges of G .

For convenience, we refer to these subgraphs as *the trees of G* , see Figure 3.




Figure 3: An example of a chordal graph and its trees (depicted in red). The outer and boundary vertices are depicted in black and blue, respectively.

For a chordal graph G , we call the

vertices that belong to no trees *the outer vertices*. Moreover, we refer to the vertices of G that belong to a tree and are incident to at least one non-bridge as the *boundary vertices*. Our algorithm for chordal graphs is described in Algorithm 3.

Algorithm 3 An optimal algorithm for chordal graphs

- 1: **Input:** A connected chordal graph $G = (V, E)$ with $|V| \geq 3$
 - 2: **Output:** An optimal completion set E' of G
 - 3: **Initialization:** Find the trees T_1, \dots, T_c of G (see Notation 2), set $E' := \emptyset$.
 - 4: For every tree T_i with $|V(T_i)| \geq 3$, convert it to graph with a (3,1)-cover using the algorithm of Proposition 1. Update E' accordingly.
 - 5: For any tree T_i isomorphic to K_2 , let $V(T_i) = \{u, v\}$ and without loss of generality, let u be a boundary vertex of G . Add (v, w) to E' , where $w \neq v$ is a neighbour of u in G .
 - 6: **return** E'
-

We present a notation before proving the optimality of Algorithm 3.

Notation 3. Let E' be any completion set of G . We denote by $E'_{i,j}$ the set of edges of E' between the vertices of T_i and T_j , i.e., $E'_{i,j} = \{(u,v) \in E' \mid u \in V(T_i), v \in V(T_j), \text{ where } i \neq j\}$. The edges in $E'_{i,j}$ are referred to as **cross edges**.

Lemma 11. Let $G = (V, E)$ be any connected graph on at least three vertices, and let E' be any optimal completion set of G . For every edge $e' \in E'$, there exists a triangle in $G \cup E'$ containing e' such that at least one edge of this triangle is unsaturated in G (from the set E).

Proof. For the sake of contradiction, assume that there exists a non-empty subset $S \subseteq E'$ of edges that do not participate in any such triangles. Let $E'' = E' \setminus S$. It can be seen that $G \cup E''$ has a $(3, 1)$ -cover with $|E''| < |E'|$, which contradicts the optimality of E' . \square

To prove the correctness of [Algorithm 3](#), we show that for a chordal graph G , any optimal completion set E' can be transformed into another completion set E'' of the type described in [Algorithm 3](#), i.e., the edges of each tree T_j with $|V(T_j)| \geq 3$ are only covered by edges completely within T_j . Moreover, the edge in any T_j with $|V(T_j)| = 2$ is covered by exactly one edge, as described in Line 5 of [Algorithm 3](#).

We present this transformation in the next two lemmas. Before describing these lemmas, we first provide an example to motivate them. The example is shown in [Figure 4](#) for a chordal graph G with two trees T_1 and T_2 . Two completion sets E' and E'' are depicted in [Figure 4\(a\)](#) and [Figure 4\(b\)](#), respectively. Both completion sets are optimal with $|E'| = |E''| = 4$; however, $|E'_{1,2}| = 2$ and $|E''_{1,2}| = 0$. [Lemma 12](#) provides a procedure to transform E' into E'' by moving the edges (w_1, b_2) and (w_2, b_1) within T_1 and T_2 , respectively. Before describing the modification process, we make an observation on an edge between the boundary vertices of T_i and T_j in a chordal graph.

Observation 5. If there is an edge $e = (u, v) \in E$ between T_i and T_j such that $u \in V(T_i)$ and $v \in V(T_j)$, then u and v are boundary vertices of T_i and T_j , respectively.

For instance, in the graph of [Figure 4](#), (b_1, b_2) serves as the edge described in [Observation 5](#) for two boundary vertices $b_1 \in V(T_1)$ and $b_2 \in V(T_2)$.

We consider multiple cases for the aforementioned transformation of edges in E' .

Case I: Edges that lie between two distinct trees T_i and T_j with $|V(T_i)| \geq 3$ and $|V(T_j)| \geq 3$

Case II: Edges that lie between two distinct trees T_i and T_j with $|V(T_i)| = 2$

Case III: Edges that lie between a tree T_i and some outer vertex u .

We start by considering Case I in [Lemma 12](#) and explain how other cases can be handled similarly.




Figure 4: An example of a chordal graph G with trees T_1 and T_2 , and two completion sets E' (a) and E'' (b). Solid edges belong to G , and the blue dashed edges are the edges of the completion sets.

Lemma 12. *Let $G = (V, E)$ be any chordal graph and let E' be any optimal completion set of G . For any pair of distinct trees T_i and T_j of G with $|V(T_i)| \geq 3$, $|V(T_j)| \geq 3$, and $|E'_{i,j}| > 0$, we can transform E' into another optimal completion set E'' with $|E''_{i,j}| = 0$ by replacing $E'_{i,j}$ with edges within $V(T_i)$ and $V(T_j)$.*

Proof. Let $|E'_{i,j}| = d > 0$. We describe a procedure to modify E' , without increasing its size while still keeping it a completion set, so that $|E'_{i,j}| < d$. This procedure, described in [Procedure 1](#), replaces a subset of $E'_{i,j}$ with edges within $V(T_i)$ and $V(T_j)$. We keep applying this procedure to T_i and T_j until $|E'_{i,j}| = 0$, completing the proof.

The modification procedure progresses in iterations and updates E' by adding and removing edges.

We continue this process until $G \cup E'$ has no unsaturated edges $e = (u, v) \in E$. By [Lemma 11](#), we do not need to worry about unsaturated edges in E' . If all edges in E are saturated, we can safely remove all unsaturated edges from E' using [Lemma 11](#), yielding a smaller completion set, which contradicts the optimality of E' .

At the beginning of iteration ℓ , we have a forest $F_\ell \subseteq G$ with some useful properties, which we will explain later. In each iteration, we remove exactly one cross edge and add it to a set $\mathbb{C} \subseteq E'_{i,j}$. At the beginning of iteration $\ell \geq 2$, the set \mathbb{C} contains all cross edges removed during iterations $1, \dots, \ell - 1$.

The procedure is as follows.

Procedure 1. Reconfiguring an Optimal Completion Set.

Initialization: $F_0 = \emptyset$ and $\mathbb{C} = \emptyset$.

Iteration 1. Pick a cross edge $e_c = (u_c, v_c) \in E'_{i,j}$ using the rules stated in (i) and (ii) and modify E' as described in (iii) and (iv).

- (i) Suppose G has an edge $(b_i, b_j) \in E$ between boundary vertices $b_i \in V(T_i)$ and $b_j \in V(T_j)$ such that (b_i, b_j) is contained in a triangle in $G \cup E'$ containing an edge from $E(T_i) \cup E(T_j)$. Suppose (b_i, b_j) , an edge $(u, v) \in E(T_i) \cup E(T_j)$, and a cross edge $(u_c, v_c) \in E'_{i,j}$ form a triangle (i.e., a K_3) in $G \cup E'$. Define $e_c = (u_c, v_c)$ and $e = (u, v)$.
- (ii) Suppose no such edge $(b_i, b_j) \in E$ exists. Then, let $e_c = (u_c, v_c)$ be any edge from $E'_{i,j}$. By [Lemma 11](#), e_c must belong to a triangle in $G \cup E'$ containing an edge from $E(T_i) \cup E(T_j)$. Let $e = (u, v) \in E(T_i) \cup E(T_j)$ be this edge.
- (iii) After selecting e_c and e from (i) or (ii), remove e_c from E' . If e becomes unsaturated, find a P_3 in T_i (if $e \in E(T_i)$) or T_j (if $e \in E(T_j)$) such that e is an edge of this P_3 . Convert this P_3 into a K_3 by adding the missing edge e' , i.e., update E' as $E' \leftarrow (E' \setminus \{e_c\}) \cup \{e'\}$.
- (iv) Set $F_1 \leftarrow (F_0 \cup e) \cup v_c$ (where $e_c = (u_c, v_c) = (v, v_c)$), $\mathbb{C} \leftarrow \mathbb{C} \cup \{e_c\}$, and terminate the first iteration.

Iteration ℓ ($\ell \geq 2$). At the beginning of Iteration ℓ , let $F_{\ell-1}$ be the forest from the previous iteration.

- (i) Suppose $G \cup E'$ has an unsaturated edge $e \in E$, where $e = (u, v) \in E(T_i) \cup E(T_j)$ with $u \in V(F_{\ell-1})$ and $v \notin V(F_{\ell-1})$.
- (ii) Find an edge $e_c = (u_c, v_c) \in E'_{i,j}$ such that $u_c = v$ and $v_c \in V(F_{\ell-1})$.
- (iii) Find a P_3 in T_i (if $e \in E(T_i)$) or T_j (if $e \in E(T_j)$) such that e is an edge of this P_3 . Set $E' \leftarrow (E' \setminus \{e_c\}) \cup \{e'\}$ where e' is the missing edge of this P_3 (convert this P_3 into a K_3).
- (iv) Set $F_\ell \leftarrow F_{\ell-1} \cup e$ and $\mathbb{C} \leftarrow \mathbb{C} \cup \{e_c\}$.

Terminate the procedure when $G \cup E'$ has no unsaturated edge $e \in E$.

As an example of [Iteration 1](#), let G and E' be as depicted in [Figure 4\(a\)](#). Since $G \cup E'$ has an edge (b_1, b_2) with the conditions of [Iteration 1\(i\)](#), we can set $e_c \leftarrow (w_1, b_2)$, $e = (u, v) \leftarrow (b_1, w_1)$, $F_1 \leftarrow \{(b_1, w_1), b_2\}$, $\mathbb{C} = \{e_c\} = \{(w_1, b_2)\}$. Observe how the operations of [Iteration 1](#) do not increase the size of E' . In the example of [Figure 4](#), $e_c = (w_1, b_2)$ is removed from E' ([Figure 4\(a\)](#)), and replaced with $e' = (z, b_1)$ ([Figure 4\(b\)](#)). An example of [Procedure 1](#) is depicted in [Figure 5](#).

We now make some observations on this procedure. First, observe that at the beginning of each iteration $\ell \geq 2$, if $G \cup E'$ has an unsaturated edge $e = (u, v)$, then it must have

become unsaturated due to removing edges \mathbb{C} in iterations 1 to $\ell - 1$, thus $e \in E(T_i) \cup E(T_j)$. Moreover, $e \notin E(F_{\ell-1})$ since we explicitly cover each edge in $E(F_{\ell-1})$ by adding edges e' . Therefore, by [Observation 5](#) and [Iteration 1\(i\)](#), if $e = (u, v)$ is unsaturated at the beginning of iteration ℓ , it must have the properties described in [Iteration \$\ell\$ \(i\)](#) and there must exist an edge $e_c \in E'_{i,j}$ as detailed in [Iteration \$\ell\$ \(ii\)](#). Thus, the forest F_ℓ maintains some invariants described in the following observation.

Observation 6. At the end of each iteration $\ell \geq 1$, F_ℓ has the following properties.

- (i) $F_\ell \subseteq T_i \cup T_j$ and F_ℓ has exactly two components, $F_\ell \cap T_i$ and $F_\ell \cap T_j$.
- (ii) The set \mathbb{C} of cross edges removed in iterations $1, \dots, \ell$ lie between the two components of F_ℓ as stated in (i).

Since we remove exactly one edge in each iteration and add at most one, the size of E' never increases. The procedure terminates when $G \cup E'$ has no unsaturated edges left, at which point $|E'_{i,j}| < d$. □




Figure 5: An example of [Iteration \$\ell\$](#) for $\ell = 3$: Solid red edges are the edges of $F_{\ell-1}$. Green edges belong to T_j and T_i but not to $F_{\ell-1}$. We remove the red dashed edges and replace them with the blue dashed ones. In this example, $\mathbb{C} = \{e_1, e_2, e_3\}$ at the end of iteration ℓ . Moreover, we add e'_1 , e'_2 , and e'_3 in the first three iterations after removing e_1 , e_2 , and e_3 , respectively. Observe how $F_{\ell-1} \cup (u, v)$ remains a forest with exactly two components.

Recall the definition of outer vertices. To handle Case II and Case III, we can show the following lemma analogously to [Lemma 12](#). We omit some of the details to avoid duplication.

Lemma 13. *Let G be any connected chordal graph on at least three vertices. Then, we can modify any optimal completion set E' of G into another optimal completion set E'' such that after adding E'' to G*

- (i) *For any pair of distinct trees T_i and T_j of G with $|V(T_i)| \geq 3$ and $|V(T_j)| = 2$, no triangles containing the edges of $E(T_i)$ contain a vertex from $V(T_j)$. Furthermore, every tree T_j with $|V(T_j)| = 2$ and $E(T_j) = \{e = (u, v)\}$ is covered by one edge, between u (resp. v) and a distance-two neighbour of u (resp. v) in G (as described in [Line 5](#) of [Algorithm 3](#)).*

(ii) the endpoints of no edge in E'' lie between an outer vertex u of G and a vertex $v \in V(T_i)$ with $|V(T_i)| \geq 3$.

Proof. For convenience, we abuse [Notation 2](#) and assume that each outer vertex of G is a tree on one vertex.

We first show [Lemma 13\(i\)](#). Let T_i and T_j be any two distinct trees of G . Using [Procedure 1](#), we can assert that $|E'_{i,j}| \leq 2$ and $|E'_{i,j}| = 1$ only if $|V(T_j)| = 2$ and $e_c \in E'_{i,j}$ is the unique edge in E' covering $e_j \in E(T_j)$ in a triangle (exactly as described in Line 5 in [Algorithm 3](#)). Furthermore, $|E'_{i,j}| = 2$ only if $|V(T_i)| = |V(T_j)| = 2$ and distinct edges $e_c \in E'_{i,j}$ and $e'_c \in E'_{i,j}$ are the unique edges covering $e_i \in E(T_i)$ and $e_j \in E(T_j)$ in triangles, respectively (exactly as described in Line 5 in [Algorithm 3](#)). Suppose T_i and T_j violate the conditions mentioned above. We keep applying [Procedure 1](#) to T_i and T_j until the conditions are satisfied. If in some iteration ℓ the unsaturated edge $e = (u, v)$ (see [Iteration \$\ell\$ \(i\)](#)) is in $E(T_j)$ with $|V(T_j)| = 2$, then we ensure that the newly-added edge e' is between u (resp. v) and a distance-two neighbour w of u (resp. v) such that $w \notin V(T_i)$. Such a vertex w always exists.

We now show [Lemma 13\(ii\)](#). If there exist a tree T_i and an outer vertex u that violate [Lemma 13\(ii\)](#), we let $T_j = u$ and keep applying [Procedure 1](#) to T_i and T_j until $|E'_{i,j}| = 0$. □

We summarize our result in the following.

Theorem 5. *Let $G = (V, E)$ be a connected chordal graph on at least three vertices. [Algorithm 3](#) produces an optimal completion set for G in $\mathcal{O}(n + m)$ time, where $n = |V|$ and $m = |E|$.*

Proof. Using [Lemma 12](#) and [Lemma 13](#), we can reduce the $(3, 1)$ -cover problem on G to solving the problem locally for each tree of G . Therefore, [Algorithm 3](#) is optimal.

As for the running time of [Algorithm 3](#), all trees of G can be located by first identifying the non-bridges in G in $\mathcal{O}(n + m)$ time (using Tarjan's algorithm [21]) and removing them from G . The non-trivial components of the resulting graph correspond to the trees of G . For each tree T_i of G , we can compute its optimal $(3, 1)$ -cover in $\mathcal{O}(|V(T_i)|)$ time by [Proposition 1](#). Thus, in $\mathcal{O}(n + m)$ time, we can construct an optimal $(3, 1)$ -cover of G . □

4 The $(k, 1)$ -Cover and the $(3, k - 2)$ -Cover Problem for Trees

In this section, we present constant-factor approximation algorithms for the $(k, 1)$ -cover and the $(3, k - 2)$ -cover problems for $k \geq 5$ ([Section 4.1](#)) and $k = 4$ ([Section 4.2](#)). Since every graph with a $(k, 1)$ -cover (with $k \geq 3$) trivially has a $(3, k - 2)$ -cover, the lower bound of (3) also holds for any k -completion set. Therefore, in the remainder of this paper, we use this lower bound to prove our approximation ratios for trees.

4.1 An Approximation Algorithm for $k \geq 5$

The algorithm is presented in [Algorithm 4](#). In each iteration, [Algorithm 4](#) extracts a maximal k -sub-forest from T , turns it into a k -clique by adding edges, and removes the edges of this sub-forest from T . It then repeats this procedure on the remaining forest until no edges are left. We say a forest is a *k -forest* if it has at most k vertices and no singleton components, i.e., all of its components are non-trivial. Let G be any forest. We say k -forest H is a *maximal k -sub-forest* of G if $H \subseteq G$ and there exists no k -forest $H' \neq H$ such that $H' \subseteq G$ and $H \subseteq H'$. We first make a remark on Line 5 of [Algorithm 4](#).

Remark 1. *The maximal sub-forest F_j mentioned in Line 5 of [Algorithm 4](#) can be found in the following way. Initially, $F_j \leftarrow \emptyset$. If $T \setminus (E_0 \cup \dots \cup E_{j-1})$ has a tree T_i with $|V(T_i)| \geq k$, then using a simple traversal, we can find a sub-tree of T_i with exactly k vertices (see [Example 1](#)). If for every tree T_i of $T \setminus (E_0 \cup \dots \cup E_{j-1})$ we have $|V(T_i)| < k$, then we set $F_j \leftarrow F_j \cup T_i$ for some tree T_i of $T \setminus (E_0 \cup \dots \cup E_{j-1})$ with $|V(T_i)| > 1$. We then recurse on $(T \setminus (E_0 \cup \dots \cup E_{j-1})) \setminus T_i$ and search for a maximal $(k - |V(T_i)|)$ -sub-forest of $(T \setminus (E_0 \cup \dots \cup E_{j-1})) \setminus T_i$ (see [Example 2](#)). This process is continued until F_j cannot be extended further, i.e., it is maximal.*

Example 1. *An example of the procedure described in [Remark 1](#) is depicted in [Figure 6](#) for $k = 7$. In [Figure 6](#), $T \setminus (E_0 \cup \dots \cup E_{j-1}) = T_1 \cup T_2$ (we ignore the singleton components), and $(T \setminus (E_0 \cup \dots \cup E_{j-1})) \cap F_j$ is depicted in red. Since $T \setminus (E_0 \cup \dots \cup E_{j-1})$ has a tree T_1 with $|V(T_1)| \geq 7$, then F_j is set to be a sub-tree of T_1 on seven vertices. This sub-tree of T_1 can be found by applying any traversal algorithm (e.g., BFS) to T_1 .*




Figure 6: An example of the procedure of [Remark 1](#) as described in [Example 1](#). $T \setminus (E_0 \cup \dots \cup E_{j-1}) = T_1 \cup T_2$, and $(T \setminus (E_0 \cup \dots \cup E_{j-1})) \cap F_j$ is depicted in red.

Example 2. *Another example of the procedure of [Remark 1](#) for $k = 7$ is depicted in [Figure 7](#). Similar to [Example 1](#), $T \setminus (E_0 \cup \dots \cup E_{j-1}) = T_1 \cup T_2$ (ignoring the singleton components), and $(T \setminus (E_0 \cup \dots \cup E_{j-1})) \cap F_j$ is depicted in red. Since we have $|V(T_1)| = |V(T_2)| < 7$, in the first step, the procedure of [Remark 1](#) sets $F_j \leftarrow F_j \cup T_1$. Then, the procedure looks for a forest with at most $k - |V(T_1)| = 7 - 5 = 2$ vertices from $(T \setminus (E_0 \cup \dots \cup E_{j-1})) \setminus T_1 = T_2$. This is done by traversing T_2 and extracting a sub-tree on two vertices.*



Figure 7: An example of the procedure of Remark 1 as described in Example 2. $T \setminus (E_0 \cup \dots \cup E_{j-1}) = T_1 \cup T_2$, and $(T \setminus (E_0 \cup \dots \cup E_{j-1})) \cap F_j$ is depicted in red.

Algorithm 4 The approximation algorithm of Section 4.1

- 1: **Input:** A tree $T = (V, E)$ and an integer $k \geq 5$ with $k \leq |V|$
 - 2: **Output:** A k -completion set S of T .
 - 3: **Initialization:** $S \leftarrow \emptyset$, $j \leftarrow 1$, $E_0 \leftarrow \emptyset$
 - 4: **while** $E \setminus (E_0 \cup \dots \cup E_{j-1}) \neq \emptyset$ **do**
 - 5: Find a maximal k -sub-forest with no singleton components (where every component is non-trivial) of $T \setminus (E_0 \cup \dots \cup E_{j-1})$. Let $F_j = (V_j, E_j)$ denote this sub-forest (see Remark 1).
 - 6: Turn F_j into a k -clique by adding edges and update S accordingly. If $|V_j| < k$, let V'_j be $k - |V_j|$ arbitrary vertices from $V \setminus V_j$. Set $F_j \leftarrow F_j \cup V'_j$, turn F_j into a k -clique by adding edges, and update S accordingly.
 - 7: $j \leftarrow j + 1$
 - 8: **end while**
 - 9: **return** S
-

We now show the correctness of Algorithm 4 in the following theorem.

Theorem 6. *Let $k \geq 5$ be any integer. Algorithm 4 is an $(\frac{8}{3})$ -approximation for the $(k, 1)$ -cover and the $(3, k - 2)$ -cover problems when the input graph is any tree on at least k vertices.*

Furthermore, when the input graph is an n -vertex tree, Algorithm 4 runs in $\mathcal{O}(nk)$ time.

Proof. In this proof, we assume that the input graph is a tree $T = (V, E)$ with $|V| = n$. It is easy to see that for the returned set S in Line 9, $T \cup S$ must necessarily have a $(k, 1)$ -cover. Therefore, in the remainder of the proof, we focus on proving the approximation ratio.

Since the sub-forest F_j in Line 5 of Algorithm 4 is a maximal one whose every component has at least two vertices, the following claim is easy to show.

Claim 3. *Let F_j be the maximal k -sub-forest in Line 5 of Algorithm 4 for any iteration j . The following statements are true.*

(a) *If k is even and $|E(T \setminus (E_0 \cup \dots \cup E_{j-1}))| \geq \frac{k}{2}$, then $|E_j| \geq \frac{k}{2}$.*

(b) *If k is odd and $|E(T \setminus (E_0 \cup \dots \cup E_{j-1}))| \geq \frac{k-1}{2}$, then $|E_j| \geq \frac{k-1}{2}$.*

We consider two cases for the approximation ratio.

Case I: k is even. Suppose $|E| = n - 1 \geq 2k$, we will return to the case with $|E| < 2k$ later. Let ALG denote the number of edges added to T by [Algorithm 4](#), and let I denote the total number of iterations of the main loop of [Algorithm 4](#). During each iteration j , [Algorithm 4](#) adds at most $\binom{k}{2} - |E_j|$ edges to S . We have

$$\begin{aligned} \text{ALG} &\leq \sum_{j=1}^I \left(\binom{k}{2} - |E_j| \right) \\ &= I \times \binom{k}{2} - \sum_{j=1}^I |E_j| = I \times \binom{k}{2} - |E| = I \times \binom{k}{2} - (n - 1). \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

Therefore, ALG is maximized when I is maximized. Let $|E| = (n - 1) = q \times \left(\frac{k}{2}\right) + r$ with $0 \leq r < \frac{k}{2}$ and $0 \leq q$. Using [Claim 3\(a\)](#), for every iteration $j < I$ we have $|E_j| \geq \frac{k}{2}$. Since at every iteration we process a subset of E and the loop terminates when all edges are processed, then it is easy to see that $I \leq q + 1$ because at every iteration we process at least $\frac{k}{2}$ edges. Furthermore, it is easy to see that $I \leq q$ when $r = 0$ and $I \leq q + 1$ when $0 < r < \frac{k}{2}$. From (3) and $n - 1 = q \times \frac{k}{2} + r$ we get

$$\text{OPT} \geq (n - 1) \times \left(\frac{k - 2}{2} \right) = \frac{q \times k \times (k - 2)}{4} + r \times \frac{(k - 2)}{2} \quad (5)$$

when $r = 0$, $I \leq q$ and (4) is maximized when $|E_j| = \frac{k}{2}$ for q many iterations with

$$\text{ALG} \leq q \times \left(\binom{k}{2} - \frac{k}{2} \right) = \frac{q \times k \times (k - 2)}{2} = 2 \times \text{OPT} \quad (\text{see (5)})$$

Now suppose $0 < r < \frac{k}{2}$. We have $I \leq q + 1$ and (4) is maximized when $|E_j| = \frac{k}{2}$ for q many iterations and $|E_j| = r$ for one iteration. Therefore, we have

$$\text{ALG} \leq q \times \left(\binom{k}{2} - \frac{k}{2} \right) + \binom{k}{2} - r = \frac{q \times k \times (k - 2)}{2} + \frac{k \times (k - 1)}{2} - r \quad (6)$$

$$\leq \frac{2 \times q \times k \times (k - 2) + 2 \times k \times (k - 1) - 4 \times r}{q \times k \times (k - 2) + 2 \times r \times (k - 2)} \times \text{OPT} \quad (7)$$

$$\leq \left(2 + \frac{2 \times (k - 1) \times (k - 2 \times r)}{(k - 2) \times (k \times q + 2 \times r)} \right) \times \text{OPT} \quad (8)$$

$$\leq \left(2 + \frac{2 \times (k - 1)}{(k - 2) \times q} \right) \times \text{OPT} \quad (9)$$

$$\leq (2.625) \times \text{OPT} \quad (10)$$

where (6) to (7) holds due to (5). Moreover, (7) to (8) and (8) to (9) hold for any $q > 0$, $k > 5$, and $0 < r < \frac{k}{2}$. Since $n - 1 \geq 2k$ by assumption, we have $q \geq 4$. Therefore, (9) to (10) holds for any $k \geq 6$ and $q \geq 4$.

Now when $n - 1 < 2k$, note that the procedure described in Line 5 of [Algorithm 4](#) for extracting maximal forests always returns a k -vertex tree in the first iteration, i.e., $|E_1| = k - 1$. Therefore, when $n - 1 = |E| \leq 2 \times k$, [Algorithm 4](#) terminates in at most two iterations when $2 \leq q < 3$ (with $\text{ALG} \leq 2\binom{k}{2} - (n - 1)$), and in at most three iterations when $3 \leq q < 4$ (with $\text{ALG} \leq 3\binom{k}{2} - (n - 1)$). In any case, it can be shown that $\text{ALG} \leq 2\text{OPT}$. We omit the proof of this last claim to avoid duplication.

This concludes the proof for the case when k is even.

Case II: k is odd.

We write $|E|$ as $|E| = (n - 1) = q \times \left(\frac{k-1}{2}\right) + r$ with $0 \leq r < \frac{k-1}{2}$ and $0 \leq q$. Similar to (5), we have

$$\text{OPT} \geq \left(\frac{k-2}{2}\right) \times (n-1) = q \times \frac{(k-1) \times (k-2)}{4} + r \times \left(\frac{k-2}{2}\right) \quad (11)$$

We tighten our analysis for this case. Note that the procedure described in Line 5 of [Algorithm 4](#) for extracting maximal forests always returns a k -vertex tree in the first iteration, i.e., $|E_1| = k - 1$. Therefore, $T \setminus E(T_1)$ has exactly $q \times \left(\frac{k-1}{2}\right) + r - (k-1) = (q-2) \times \left(\frac{k-1}{2}\right) + r$ with $0 \leq r < \frac{k-1}{2}$ and $q - 2 \geq 0$. Using [Claim 3\(b\)](#), [Algorithm 4](#) runs for at most $q - 2 + 1$ iterations after the first iteration and in total $I \leq q$. By setting $I = q$ in (4) we get

$$\begin{aligned} \text{ALG} &\leq q \times \binom{k}{2} - (n-1) = \frac{q \times k \times (k-1)}{2} - \left(q \times \frac{k-1}{2} + r\right) \\ &\leq q \times \frac{(k-1)^2}{2} \end{aligned} \quad (12)$$

Using (11) and (12) we get

$$\begin{aligned} \text{ALG} &\leq \frac{2 \times q \times (k-1)^2}{q \times (k-1) \times (k-2) + 2 \times r \times (k-2)} \times \text{OPT} \\ &\leq \frac{2 \times q \times (k-1)^2}{q \times (k-1) \times (k-2)} \times \text{OPT} \\ &= \frac{2 \times (k-1)}{(k-2)} \times \text{OPT} \\ &\leq \frac{8}{3} \times \text{OPT} \end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality holds for any $k \geq 5$.

To finalize the proof, we show that [Algorithm 4](#) runs in $\mathcal{O}(nk)$ time. From [Claim 3](#), we know that there are at most $\mathcal{O}\left(\frac{n}{k}\right)$ iterations. During each iteration j , finding the maximal subgraph F_j and building a k -clique on F_j can each be done in $\mathcal{O}(k^2)$ time. Therefore, the time complexity of [Algorithm 4](#) is $\mathcal{O}\left(\frac{n}{k}k^2\right) = \mathcal{O}(nk)$. \square

4.2 A Better Approximation Algorithm for $k = 4$

In this section, we present a 2-approximation Algorithm for the $(4, 1)$ -cover and $(3, 2)$ -cover problems for trees. As seen in Section 4.1, greedily extracting sub-forests from the input tree T results in an $(\frac{8}{3})$ -approximation algorithm for the $(k, 1)$ -cover problem. In this section, we show that cutting each subgraph of T more carefully improves this approximation ratio for the case of $(4, 1)$ -cover and $(3, 2)$ -cover problems.

We now briefly describe our algorithm, which is presented in Algorithm 5. Algorithm 5 extracts a 4-vertex sub-tree T_j of T at every step of the main loop (Line 5), turns T_j into a 4-clique, and removes the edges of T_j from T . If the biggest non-trivial component $T_{\max}^{(j)}$ of $T \setminus E(T_j)$ has at least four vertices, Algorithm 5 sets $T \leftarrow T_{\max}^{(j)}$. Otherwise, it sets $T \leftarrow \emptyset$ which terminates the main loop. Since each iteration of the main loop of Algorithm 5 only recurses on the biggest non-trivial component of $T \setminus E(T_j)$, the edges that are ignored by the main loop get stored in a forest F (Line 24 and Line 26). When the main loop terminates, these edges are handled by applying Algorithm 4 to F in Line 30 of Algorithm 5.

Algorithm 5 The approximation algorithm of Section 4.2

```

1: Input: A tree  $T = (V, E)$  rooted at a vertex  $r$  with  $|V| \geq 4$ 
2: Output: A 4-completion set  $S$  of  $T$ 
3: Initialization:  $S \leftarrow \emptyset, j \leftarrow 1, F \leftarrow \emptyset$ 
4: while  $E(T) \neq \emptyset$  do
5:   Let  $v_j$  be the deepest leaf in  $T$  with the greatest number of siblings. Let  $u$  be the parent of
    $v_j$ . Find a 4-vertex sub-tree  $T_j = (V_j, E_j)$  of  $T$  in the following way.
6:   if  $v_j$  has at least two siblings then
7:     Let  $v_1$  and  $v_2$  be two such siblings. Set  $T_j \leftarrow T[\{v_j, v_1, v_2, u\}]$ 
8:   end if
9:   if  $v_j$  has exactly one sibling then
10:    Let  $v_1$  be this sibling and let  $w$  be the parent of  $u$ . Set  $T_j \leftarrow T[\{v_j, v_1, u, w\}]$ 
11:   end if
12:   if  $v_j$  has no siblings then
13:     Let  $u, w, x$  be the immediate ancestors of  $v_j$  (in the same order)
14:     if  $u$  has a sibling  $u_1$  then
15:       Set  $T_j \leftarrow T[\{v_j, u, u_1, w\}]$ 
16:     end if
17:     if  $u$  has no siblings then
18:       Set  $T_j \leftarrow T[\{v_j, u, w, x\}]$ 
19:     end if
20:   end if
21:   Turn  $T_j$  into a 4-clique by adding edges. Update  $S$  accordingly.
22:   Let  $T_{\max}^{(j)}$  be the biggest non-trivial component of  $T \setminus E(T_j)$ . If  $T \setminus E(T_j)$  has no non-trivial
   components, set  $T_{\max}^{(j)} \leftarrow \emptyset$ .
23:   if  $|V(T_{\max}^{(j)})| \geq 4$  then
24:      $F \leftarrow F \cup (E(T) \setminus (E(T_j) \cup E(T_{\max}^{(j)})))$  and  $T \leftarrow T_{\max}^{(j)}$ 
25:   else
26:      $F \leftarrow F \cup (E(T) \setminus E(T_j))$  and  $T \leftarrow \emptyset$ 
27:   end if
28:    $j \leftarrow j + 1$ 
29: end while
30: Run the main loop of Algorithm 4 on  $F$  with  $k = 4$  and update  $S$  accordingly.
31: return  $S$ 

```

Before proving the correctness, we make one final note on Line 5 of [Algorithm 5](#). We assume that the input tree T is rooted at an arbitrary node r , and each node except r has a parent. In Line 5, we first find the deepest leaf v_j of the current tree T or the furthest node from r in T . If there are two or more such leaves, we pick the one with the most siblings. The tree T_j is obtained by the conditions in Lines 6 to 20 of [Algorithm 5](#). The next lemma is essential for proving the approximation ratio.

Lemma 14. *After selecting T_j in any iteration j of [Algorithm 5](#), $T \setminus E(T_j)$ has at most two non-trivial components. Furthermore, if $T \setminus E(T_j)$ has exactly two non-trivial components, it has at least one component isomorphic to K_2 .*

Proof. Let v_j be the chosen leaf in Line 5 of iteration j . There are only a few cases to consider as described in Lines 6 to 20 of [Algorithm 5](#). If the two immediate ancestors of v_j are of degree two in T , then T_j is a path on four vertices containing v_j and its ancestors ([Figure 8\(a\)](#)) and $T \setminus E(T_j)$ has at most one non-trivial component $T_{\max}^{(j)}$ (this corresponds to Lines 17 to 19 of [Algorithm 5](#)). If v_j has at least two other siblings in T , then T_j is isomorphic to $K_{1,3}$ where the middle vertex is the parent of v_j and the other vertices are the siblings of v_j ([Figure 8\(b\)](#)) and $T \setminus E(T_j)$ has at most one non-trivial component $T_{\max}^{(j)}$ (this corresponds to Lines 6 to 8 of [Algorithm 5](#)). Similarly, if v_j has only one sibling, T_j will be isomorphic to $K_{1,3}$ with v_j 's parent in the middle and two other vertices including the other sibling of v_j and the second ancestor of v_j ([Figure 8\(c\)](#)) (this corresponds to Lines 9 to 11 of [Algorithm 5](#)).

We now focus on Lines 14 to 16 of [Algorithm 5](#). Let w denote the second ancestor of v_j in T . The cases where v_j has no siblings but w has at least one sibling are depicted in [Figure 8\(d\)](#) and [Figure 8\(e\)](#). Let u_1 denote the other child of w (other than u). Since v_j is the deepest leaf of T , the sub-tree rooted at u_1 is of depth at most one. Furthermore, since v_j is the deepest leaf with the most siblings (Line 5 of [Algorithm 5](#)), u_1 can have at most one child. If u_1 has no children, then T_j is isomorphic to a path on three vertices containing v_j , u , w and u_1 and $T \setminus E(T_j)$ has at most one non-trivial component $T_{\max}^{(j)}$ ([Figure 8\(d\)](#)). Similarly, if u_1 has exactly one child, then T_j will have a similar structure and $T \setminus E(T_j)$ will have at most two non-trivial components $T_{\max}^{(j)}$ and T'_j , where T'_j is isomorphic to K_2 ([Figure 8\(e\)](#)). \square




Figure 8: An illustration of the proof of [Lemma 14](#).

In the next lemma, we characterize the forest F right after the loop of Lines 4 to 29 of [Algorithm 5](#). Recall that P_k denotes a path on k vertices.

Lemma 15. *Once the main loop of Lines 4 to 29 of [Algorithm 5](#) terminates, the non-trivial components of F are isomorphic to a disjoint union of K_2 's, with at most one P_3 .*

Proof. From [Lemma 14](#) recall that each iteration of the main loop of [Algorithm 5](#) leaves at most one non-trivial component uncovered, as depicted in [Figure 8\(e\)](#). Therefore, for every iteration except the last one, the non-trivial components of F are isomorphic to a disjoint union of K_2 's. Furthermore, since the main loop continues until $|V(T)| \geq 4$, if the else condition in Line 25 of the last iteration is satisfied, then F will have another K_2 or a P_3 . \square

We are now ready to prove the correctness of [Algorithm 5](#).

Theorem 7. *[Algorithm 5](#) is a 2-approximation algorithm for the $(4,1)$ -cover and the $(3,2)$ -cover problems when the input is an n -vertex tree $T = (V, E)$. Moreover, [Algorithm 5](#) terminates in $\mathcal{O}(n \log n)$ time.*

Proof. Note that once [Algorithm 5](#) terminates, all edges of $T \cup S$ are in 4-cliques (and trivially at least two triangles).

We start by proving the time complexity. The deepest leaf with the most siblings (Line 5 in [Algorithm 5](#)) can be found using the following data structure. We maintain an array A , where $A[i]$ contains a max-heap that stores the non-leaf nodes at depth i . The nodes in each heap are organized based on the number of children they have. In the first iteration, we locate the last non-empty cell of A and extract a node u from its heap. Any child v of u is the deepest leaf with the maximum number of siblings. After extracting T_j , some nodes may become singletons or leaves. These nodes are deleted from their corresponding heaps. Moreover, if some non-leaf node

Note that we never change the depth of any node during the algorithm. If the number of children of a node changes, we update the corresponding heap in $\mathcal{O}(\log n)$ time. The overall time complexity of the algorithm is $\mathcal{O}(n \log n)$. This is achieved because there are at most n iterations, and each heap operation requires $\mathcal{O}(\log n)$ time for a constant number of heap changes per iteration.

We now prove the approximation ratio. Similar to the proof of [Theorem 6](#), let OPT denote the size of any optimal solution to the $(4,1)$ -cover and $(3,2)$ -cover problems, and we denote $|S|$ by ALG . Furthermore, let I denote the total number of iterations of [Algorithm 5](#), that is the number of iterations of the loop of Lines 4 to 29, plus the number of iterations of [Algorithm 4](#) as invoked in Line 30 of [Algorithm 5](#). For each such iteration $j \in \{1, \dots, I\}$, we denote by E_j the set of edges covered in that iteration, see Line 5 of [Algorithm 5](#) and Line 5 of [Algorithm 4](#). In the remainder of this proof, we refer to the loop in Lines 4 to 29 of [Algorithm 5](#) as *the first phase* of [Algorithm 5](#), and the loop of [Algorithm 4](#) as invoked on Line 30 of [Algorithm 5](#) as *the second phase* of [Algorithm 5](#).

We have the following claims.

Claim 4. For every iteration j of the first phase of [Algorithm 5](#), we have $|E_j| = 3$. One of the iterations of the second phase may have $|E_j| = 1$, and for every other iteration, $|E_j| = 2$.

Proof. Immediate from [Lemma 15](#) and [Algorithm 4](#). □

Claim 5. Let T be any tree input to [Algorithm 5](#) and let I be the total number of iterations. Then, I is maximized when the number of iterations of the first phase is minimized.

Proof. Let I_1 and I_2 denote the number of iterations of the first and second phases of [Algorithm 5](#), respectively. Since in the first phase we have $|E_j| = 3$ for every iteration j ([Claim 4](#)), [Algorithm 5](#) covers $3 \times I_1$ edges in the first phase. By the second part of [Claim 4](#), we have $I_2 = \left\lceil \frac{|E| - 3 \times I_1}{2} \right\rceil$. It follows that $I = I_1 + I_2 = I_1 + \left\lceil \frac{|E| - 3 \times I_1}{2} \right\rceil$ and it is easy to see that for any value of $|E|$, I is maximized when I_1 is minimized. □

The following observation states that for any n -vertex tree, the first phase has at least $\left\lfloor \frac{n-1}{4} \right\rfloor$ iterations.

Observation 7. Let I_1 and I_2 denote the number of iterations of the first and the second phases of [Algorithm 5](#), respectively. For any tree n -vertex tree T , let $n - 1 = q \times 4 + r$ with $0 \leq r < 4$ and $0 \leq q$. Then, $q \leq I_1$ if $r < 3$ and $q + 1 \leq I_1$ if $r = 3$. Furthermore, these lower bounds can be achieved if every iteration of the first phase except at most one (the last one) results in the case described in [Lemma 14](#) and depicted in [Figure 8\(e\)](#).

We present one final claim.

Claim 6. The maximum value of ALG for any n -vertex tree is obtained when every iteration of the first phase results in the case depicted in [Figure 8\(e\)](#).

Proof. Let I_1 and I_2 denote the total number of iterations of the first and second phases, respectively. Similar to the proof of [Theorem 6](#), we can write

$$\begin{aligned} \text{ALG} &\leq \sum_{j=1}^I \binom{4}{2} - |E_j| \\ &= 6I - \sum_{j=1}^I |E_j| = 6I - |E| = 6I - (n - 1) \end{aligned} \tag{13}$$

where $I = I_1 + I_2$. Therefore, ALG is maximized when I is maximized. Using [Claim 5](#), I is maximized when I_1 is minimized. By [Observation 7](#), the minimum value of I_1 over all n -vertex trees is attained when the case in [Figure 8\(e\)](#) happens at every iteration of the first phase. □

We now prove the approximation ratio by proving an upper bound on ALG when the input is any tree $T = (V, E)$. Since the worst-case scenario for ALG is valid for any n -vertex

tree, we only count the number of edges added in the situation described in [Claim 6](#). Let us write

$$n - 1 = 4 \times q + r, \quad 0 \leq r < 4, \quad 0 \leq q \quad (14)$$

$$q = 2 \times q' + r', \quad 0 \leq r' < 2, \quad 0 \leq q' \quad (15)$$

By (14), (15), and (3) we have

$$\text{OPT} \geq n - 1 = 8 \times q' + 4 \times r' + r \quad (16)$$

Based on the values of $0 \leq r < 4$ and $0 \leq r' < 2$, there are a total of eight cases to consider. Here, we only consider three interesting cases. The remaining cases can be shown analogously.

Case I: $r' = 0$ and $r = 0$. In this case, [Algorithm 5](#) adds $3 \times q$ edges to S in the first phase (because the first phase has q many iterations j with $|E_j| = 3$), and at most $4 \times q'$ edges in the second phase (because the second phase has q' many iterations j with $|E_j| = 2$). We have

$$\frac{\text{ALG}}{\text{OPT}} \leq \frac{3 \times q + 4 \times q'}{8 \times q'} = \frac{6 \times q' + 4 \times q'}{8 \times q'} = \frac{5}{4}$$

Case II: $r' = 0$ and $r = 1$. In this case, [Algorithm 5](#) adds $3 \times q$ edges to S in the first phase, and at most $4 \times q' + 5$ edges in the second phase. We have

$$\frac{\text{ALG}}{\text{OPT}} \leq \frac{3 \times q + 4 \times q' + 5}{8 \times q' + 1} = \frac{10 \times q' + 5}{8 \times q' + 1} \leq \frac{5}{4} + \frac{15}{4 \times (8 \times q' + 1)} \leq \frac{5}{4} + \frac{15}{36}$$

where the last inequality holds for any $q' \geq 1$. If $q' = 0$, then from (15) we have $q = 0$ and from (14) we deduce $n - 1 = 1$, a contraction since $n - 1 \geq 3$.

Case III: $r' = 0$ and $r = 2$. In this case, [Algorithm 5](#) adds $3 \times q$ edges to S in the first phase, and $4 \times (q' + 1)$ edges in the second phase. We have

$$\frac{\text{ALG}}{\text{OPT}} \leq \frac{3 \times q + 4 \times q' + 4}{8 \times q' + 2} = \frac{10 \times q' + 4}{8 \times q' + 2} \leq \frac{5}{4} + \frac{3}{4 \times (4 \times q' + 1)} \leq 2$$

where the last inequality holds for $q' \geq 0$.

For every other case not described above, we always have $\frac{\text{ALG}}{\text{OPT}} \leq \frac{5}{4} + \frac{a}{b \times (4 \times q' + c)}$ for some constants a , b , and c , and by setting $q' = 0$ it is observed that the ratio is bounded by two. \square

Remark 2. Since in all cases of the proof of [Theorem 7](#) the ratio is bounded by $\frac{\text{ALG}}{\text{OPT}} \leq \frac{5}{4} + \frac{a}{b \times (4 \times q' + c)}$ for $q' \in \Theta(n)$ and constants a , b , and c , [Algorithm 5](#) is a $(\frac{5}{4} + o(1))$ -approximation algorithm for the (4,1)-cover and the (3,2)-cover problems. For example, when $n \geq 500$, [Algorithm 5](#) is a (1.26)-approximation algorithm.

Remark 3. To prove the approximation ratio in [Theorem 7](#), we compared the worst-case scenario of [Algorithm 5](#) (as stated in [Claim 6](#)) with the best possible graph-theoretic bounds as stated in (3). For every n , there exists an n -vertex tree T such that inputting T to [Algorithm 5](#) can result

in the worst-case scenario of [Claim 6](#). Consider the spider graph with the central vertex v as the root. If $n - 1$ is even, we add $\frac{n-1}{2}$ legs to v , each with two edges. If $n - 1$ is odd, we add $\lfloor \frac{n-1}{2} \rfloor$ legs of length two and one leg of length one to v . An example for $n = 15$ is depicted in [Figure 9](#) with each v_j and T_j highlighted (see [Line 5 of Algorithm 5](#)).




Figure 9: The example described in [Section 4.2](#).

5 Conclusion

In this paper, we studied the algorithmic version of the $(k, 1)$ -cover problem. We proved that the $(k, 1)$ -cover problem is NP -complete for general graphs. However, we showed that for chordal graphs, the $(3, 1)$ -cover problem can be solved in polynomial time. Specifically, we provided an algorithm that runs in $\mathcal{O}(n + m)$ time, where n and m are the number of vertices and edges, respectively. For the class of trees and general values of k , we showed that the $(k, 1)$ -cover problem remains NP -hard, even for spiders. Moreover, we presented an $\frac{8}{3}$ -approximation algorithm for both the $(k, 1)$ -cover and the $(3, k - 2)$ -cover problems, which runs in $\mathcal{O}(nk)$ time for trees, where $k \geq 5$ and for $k = 4$, a 2-approximation algorithm that runs in $\mathcal{O}(n \log n)$ time.

We close the paper with some open questions.

- Is there an approximation algorithm for the $(k, 1)$ -cover problem on general graphs with a non-trivial approximation ratio?
- Can the approximation ratios of [Theorem 6](#) and [Theorem 7](#) be improved?
- For what classes of graphs can we solve the $(k, 1)$ -cover problem optimally?

References

- [1] Nicola Barbieri, Francesco Bonchi, Edoardo Galimberti, and Francesco Gullo. Efficient and effective community search. *Data Min. Knowl. Discov.*, 29(5):1406–1433, 2015. doi:10.1007/S10618-015-0422-1.

-
- [2] John Adrian Bondy and Uppaluri Siva Ramachandra Murty. *Graph theory with applications*. American Elsevier Publishing Co., Inc., New York, 1976.
- [3] Paul Burkhardt, Vance Faber, and David G. Harris. Bounds and algorithms for graph trusses. *J. Graph Algorithms Appl.*, 24(3):191–214, 2020. doi: [10.7155/jgaa.00527](https://doi.org/10.7155/jgaa.00527).
- [4] Yixin Cao and Jianer Chen. Cluster editing: Kernelization based on edge cuts. *Algorithmica*, 64(1):152–169, 2012. doi: [10.1007/S00453-011-9595-1](https://doi.org/10.1007/S00453-011-9595-1).
- [5] Debsoumya Chakraborti and Po-Shen Loh. Extremal graphs with local covering conditions. *SIAM Journal on Discrete Mathematics*, 34(2):1354–1374, 2020.
- [6] Debsoumya Chakraborti, Amirali Madani, Anil Maheshwari, and Babak Mirraftab. Sparse graphs with local covering conditions on edges. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2409.11216*, 2024.
- [7] Jianer Chen and Jie Meng. A 2k kernel for the cluster editing problem. *J. Comput. Syst. Sci.*, 78(1):211–220, 2012. doi: [10.1016/J.JCSS.2011.04.001](https://doi.org/10.1016/J.JCSS.2011.04.001).
- [8] Rajesh Chitnis and Nimrod Talmon. Can we create large k-cores by adding few edges? In Fedor V. Fomin and Vladimir V. Podolskii, editors, *Computer Science - Theory and Applications - 13th International Computer Science Symposium in Russia, CSR 2018, Moscow, Russia, June 6-10, 2018, Proceedings*, volume 10846 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 78–89. Springer, 2018. doi: [10.1007/978-3-319-90530-3_8](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-90530-3_8).
- [9] Thomas H. Cormen, Charles E. Leiserson, Ronald L. Rivest, and Clifford Stein. *Introduction to algorithms*. MIT Press, Cambridge, MA, 3rd edition, 2009.
- [10] Christophe Crespelle, Pål Grønås Drange, Fedor V. Fomin, and Petr A. Golovach. A survey of parameterized algorithms and the complexity of edge modification. *Comput. Sci. Rev.*, 48:100556, 2023. doi: [10.1016/J.COSREV.2023.100556](https://doi.org/10.1016/J.COSREV.2023.100556).
- [11] Irit Dinur and David Steurer. Analytical approach to parallel repetition. In *Proceedings of the forty-sixth annual ACM symposium on Theory of computing*, pages 624–633. 2014.
- [12] Fedor V Fomin, Danil Sagunov, and Kirill Simonov. Building large k-cores from sparse graphs. *Journal of Computer and System Sciences*, 132:68–88, 2023.
- [13] Michael R Gary and David S Johnson. *Computers and intractability: A guide to the theory of np-completeness*. 1979.
- [14] Petr A. Golovach. Editing to a connected graph of given degrees. *Inf. Comput.*, 256:131–147, 2017. doi: [10.1016/J.IC.2017.04.013](https://doi.org/10.1016/J.IC.2017.04.013).
- [15] Prachi Goyal, Pranabendu Misra, Fahad Panolan, Geevarghese Philip, and Saket Saurabh. Finding even subgraphs even faster. *J. Comput. Syst. Sci.*, 97:1–13, 2018. doi: [10.1016/J.JCSS.2018.03.001](https://doi.org/10.1016/J.JCSS.2018.03.001).
-

-
- [16] Jiong Guo, Christian Komusiewicz, Rolf Niedermeier, and Johannes Uhlmann. A more relaxed model for graph-based data clustering: s-plex cluster editing. *SIAM J. Discret. Math.*, 24(4):1662–1683, 2010. doi: [10.1137/090767285](https://doi.org/10.1137/090767285).
- [17] Richard M Karp. On the computational complexity of combinatorial problems. *Networks*, 5(1):45–68, 1975.
- [18] Luke Mathieson and Stefan Szeider. Editing graphs to satisfy degree constraints: A parameterized approach. *J. Comput. Syst. Sci.*, 78(1):179–191, 2012. doi: [10.1016/J.JCSS.2011.02.001](https://doi.org/10.1016/J.JCSS.2011.02.001).
- [19] Ron Shamir, Roded Sharan, and Dekel Tsur. Cluster graph modification problems. *Discret. Appl. Math.*, 144(1-2):173–182, 2004. doi: [10.1016/J.DAM.2004.01.007](https://doi.org/10.1016/J.DAM.2004.01.007).
- [20] Roded Sharan, Adi Maron-Katz, and Ron Shamir. Click and expander: a system for clustering and visualizing gene expression data. *Bioinformatics*, 19(14):1787–1799, 2003.
- [21] Robert Tarjan. Depth-first search and linear graph algorithms. *SIAM journal on computing*, 1(2):146–160, 1972.
- [22] Bang Ye Wu, Hung-Lung Wang, Shih Ta Kuan, and Kun-Mao Chao. On the uniform edge-partition of a tree. *Discrete Applied Mathematics*, 155(10):1213–1223, 2007.
- [23] Yuanyuan Zhu, Qian Zhang, Lu Qin, Lijun Chang, and Jeffrey Xu Yu. Cohesive subgraph search using keywords in large networks. *IEEE Trans. Knowl. Data Eng.*, 34(1):178–191, 2022. doi: [10.1109/TKDE.2020.2975793](https://doi.org/10.1109/TKDE.2020.2975793).