

# An Overview of Techniques for Designing Parameterized Algorithms

Christian Sloper      Jan Arne Telle  
Department of Informatics, University of Bergen, Norway

## **Abstract**

A survey of the most important and general techniques in parameterized algorithm design is given. Each technique is explained with a meta-algorithm, its use is illustrated by examples, and it is placed in a taxonomy under the four main headings of Branching, Kernelization, Induction and Win/Win.

# Contents

|          |   |           |
|----------|---|-----------|
| <b>1</b> | <b>Introduction</b>   | <b>3</b>  |
| <b>2</b> | <b>Branching Algorithms</b>                                   | <b>4</b>  |
| 2.1      | Bounded Search Trees . . . . .                                | 5         |
| 2.1.1    | Example: $k$ -Independent set and $k$ -Vertex Cover . . . . . | 5         |
| 2.1.2    | How is it used in practice? . . . . .                         | 7         |
| 2.2      | Greedy Localization . . . . .                                 | 7         |
| 2.2.1    | Example: $k$ -Packing of $k$ -cycles . . . . .                | 9         |
| 2.2.2    | How is it used in practice? . . . . .                         | 10        |
| 2.3      | Color Coding . . . . .  | 10        |
| 2.3.1    | Example: $k$ -cycle . . . . .                                 | 10        |
| 2.3.2    | How is it used in practice? . . . . .                         | 12        |
| <b>3</b> | <b>Kernelization</b>  | <b>12</b> |
| 3.1      | Local Reductions . . . . .                                    | 13        |
| 3.1.1    | Example: $k$ -Vertex Cover and $k$ -Dominating set . . . . .  | 13        |
| 3.1.2    | How is it used in practice? . . . . .                         | 14        |
| 3.2      | Global Reduction Rules - Crown Reduction . . . . .            | 14        |
| 3.2.1    | Example: $k$ -Vertex Cover . . . . .                          | 16        |
| 3.2.2    | How is it used in practice? . . . . .                         | 17        |
| <b>4</b> | <b>FPT by Induction</b>                                       | <b>17</b> |
| 4.1      | For Minimization - Iterative Compression . . . . .            | 17        |
| 4.1.1    | Example: $k$ -Feedback Vertex Set . . . . .                   | 19        |
| 4.1.2    | How is it used in practice? . . . . .                         | 20        |
| 4.2      | For Maximization - The Extremal Method . . . . .              | 20        |
| 4.2.1    | Example: $k$ -Packing of $K_{1,3}$ . . . . .                  | 22        |
| 4.2.2    | How is it used in practice? . . . . .                         | 23        |
| <b>5</b> | <b>Win/Win</b>  | <b>23</b> |
| 5.1      | Well-quasi-ordering and Graph Minors . . . . .                | 23        |
| 5.1.1    | Example: $k$ -Feedback Vertex Set . . . . .                   | 25        |
| 5.1.2    | How is it used in practice? . . . . .                         | 25        |
| 5.2      | Imposing FPT structure and Bounded treewidth . . . . .        | 25        |
| 5.2.1    | Example: $k$ -Dominating set . . . . .                        | 25        |
| 5.2.2    | How is it used in practice? . . . . .                         | 26        |

# 1 Introduction

The field of parameterized algorithms continues to grow. It is a sign of its success that in the literature today there exists over twenty differently named techniques for designing parameterized algorithms<sup>1</sup>. Many parameterized algorithms build on the same ideas, and as a problem solver it is important to be familiar with these general themes and ideas. Aside from several survey articles [F03, DFRS04] there have been at least two comprehensive texts written on parameterized algorithm design: Downey and Fellows’s seminal book ‘Parameterized Complexity’ [DF99] and the more recent ‘Invitation to Fixed-Parameter Algorithms’ [N06] by Niedermeier. The first of these books came very early in the history of parameterized complexity, and does therefore not include newer ideas. The second book is dedicated to algorithmic techniques, and singles out Bounded Search Trees and Kernelization as the two major ones, while the generic heading ‘Further Algorithmic Techniques’ is devoted to Integer Linear Programming, Color Coding, Dynamic Programming and Tree Decompositions.

In this paper we survey what we consider to be the nine most important general techniques, namely: Bounded Search Trees, Greedy Localization, Color Coding, Local Reductions, Global Reductions (crown reductions), Iterative Compression, Extremal Method, Well-quasi-ordering (graph minors) and Imposing FPT structure (treewidth). We classify these techniques under the four main themes of Branching, Kernelization, Induction and Win/Win, see Figure 1. In addition to its pedagogic value, we believe that such a taxonomy could help in developing both new techniques and new combinations of known techniques. The four main themes are described in separate sections. Each technique is introduced with a meta-algorithm, examples of its use are given, and we end with a brief discussion of its practicality. Regarding practicality, let us right away remark that in our opinion the most important decision is the choice of parameter. However, this issue is orthogonal to the algorithmic technique used and will thus not be discussed here.

Some aspects of this classification are novel, for example the grouping of Greedy Localization and Color Coding together with Bounded Search Trees under the heading of Branching algorithms, and the placement of the Extremal Method as the maximization counterpart of Iterative Compression under the heading of Induction. We give a generic and formal description of Greedy Localization that encompasses problems hitherto not known to be FPT solvable by this technique. Sometimes a technique is known under different names<sup>2</sup> or it is a variant of a more general technique<sup>3</sup>. Clearly, the fastest FPT algorithm

---

<sup>1</sup> This includes Bounded Search Trees [DF99], Data Reduction [?], Kernelization [DF99], The Extremal Method [FMRS00], The Algorithmic Method [P05], Catalytic Vertices [FMRS00], Crown Reductions [CFJ04], Modelled Crown Reductions [DFRS04], Either/Or [PS03], Reduction to Independent Set Structure [PS05], Greedy Localization [DFRS04], Win/Win [F03], Iterative Compression [DFRS04], Well-Quasi-Ordering [DF99], FPT through Treewidth [DF99], Search Trees [?], Bounded Integer Linear Programming [?], Color Coding [AYZ95], Method of Testsets [DF99], Interleaving [NR00]

<sup>2</sup>This is the case with Data Reduction=Local Reduction Rules, Either/Or=Win/Win, Search Trees=Bounded Search Trees and other names like Hashing [DF99]=Color Coding which do not seem to be in use anymore

<sup>3</sup> This is the case with Catalytic Vertices  $\subseteq$  Local Reduction Rules, The Algorithmic Method  $\subseteq$




Figure 1: The first two levels of the taxonomy, labelled by section number.

for a problem will usually combine several techniques. In some cases such a combination has itself been given a separate name<sup>4</sup>. We do not consider all these variations of the most general techniques, and our discussion is restricted to the first two levels of the hierarchy in Figure 1.

A note on notation: the chosen parameter for a problem is usually not stated explicitly, instead we use the convention that the variable name  $k$  always denotes the parameter. We use standard notation for graphs and focus on graph problems, particularly the following handful of quite famous ones:  $k$ -Vertex Cover (are there  $k$  vertices incident to all edges?),  $k$ -Dominating set (are there  $k$  vertices adjacent to all vertices?),  $k$ -Independent set (are there  $k$  pairwise non-adjacent vertices?),  $k$ -Feedback Vertex set (are there  $k$  vertices whose removal gives an acyclic graph?),  $k$ -Packing of  $H$  (are there  $k$  vertex disjoint copies of  $H$ ?). All these problems are NP-hard, and our goal is an FPT algorithm, meaning that on input  $(G, k)$  for a graph  $G$  on  $n$  vertices it solves the problem in time  $f(k)n^{\mathcal{O}(1)}$ . Using the  $\mathcal{O}^*$  notation that hides not only constants but also polynomial dependencies this runtime is simply expressed as  $\mathcal{O}^*(f(k))$ .

## 2 Branching Algorithms

We start by considering algorithm techniques that use a branching strategy to create a set of subproblems such that at least one of the subproblems is a yes-instance if and only if the original problem is a yes-instance. Techniques that create branching algorithms are Bounded Search Trees, Greedy Localization and Color Coding. For a branching algorithm to have FPT running time it suffices to require that

- each node in the execution tree has polynomial running time

---

Extremal Method, Modelled Crown Reductions  $\subseteq$  Crown reductions, FPT by Treewidth  $\subseteq$  Imposing FPT structure, Reduction to Independent set structure  $\subseteq$  Imposing FPT structure, Method of Testsets  $\subseteq$  Imposing FPT structure.

<sup>4</sup>This is the case with Interleaving which combines Bounded Search Trees and Local Reduction Rules. The technique known as Bounded Integer Linear Programming can in a similar way be viewed as a combination of a Branching algorithm with Local Reduction Rules.

- there are  $\mathcal{O}((\log n)^{g(k)} f(k))$  branches at each step
- it reaches a polynomial time base case in at most  $h(k)$  nested calls

The running time of an algorithm that uses branching is bounded by the number of nodes of the execution tree times the running time for each node. Since we assume polynomial running time at each node in the execution tree, only the size of the tree contributes in  $\mathcal{O}^*$ -notation. It is normal that an algorithm checks for several different branching rules and branches according to one of the cases that applies. Although branching algorithms can have many branching rules it is usually straightforward to calculate the worst case. For the functions given above, the execution tree will have  $\mathcal{O}(((\log n)^{g(k)} f(k))^{h(k)})$  nodes. To show that this is an FPT-function we prove the following:

**Observation 1** *There exists a function  $f(k)$  such that  $(\log n)^k \leq f(k)n$  for all  $n$  and  $k$ .*

**Proof.** First recall that a logarithmic function grows slower than any root-function. That is,  $\log n = o(n^{1/k}) \quad \forall k$ , which implies that

$$\forall k \geq 1 \exists n_0 \geq 1 \text{ such that } \forall n \geq n_0 \quad \log n < n^{1/k}$$

Thus there must be a function  $h(k) : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}^+$  such that  $\forall k \forall n \geq h(k) \quad \log n < n^{1/k}$  and  $\forall k \forall n \geq h(k) \quad \log n < n$ .

So now the situation is that for all  $n > h(k)$  we have that  $(\log n)^k < n$  and the theorem holds. If on the other hand  $n \leq h(k)$ , then  $\log n \leq \log h(k)$  and  $(\log n)^k \leq (\log h(k))^k$ . We thus have  $(\log n)^k \leq \max\{1, (\log h(k))^k\} \cdot n$ .  $\square$

It is easy to extend this to show that  $\mathcal{O}((\log n)^{g(k)})$  is also an FPT-function.

## 2.1 Bounded Search Trees

The method of Bounded Search Trees is arguably the most common and successful parameterized algorithm design technique. We can define it as a branching algorithm which is strictly recursive. A branching rule  $B_i$  identifies a certain structure in the graph (that we may call the left hand side  $LHS_i$ ) and creates  $c \in \mathcal{O}((\log n)^{g(k)} f(k))$  new instances  $(G_1, k_1), (G_2, k_2), \dots, (G_c, k_{c_i})$  such that the instance  $(G, k)$  is a 'Yes'-instance if and only if at least one instance  $(G_j, k_j), 1 \leq j \leq c_i$  is a 'Yes'-instance. See the meta-algorithm given in Figure 2.

### 2.1.1 Example: $k$ -Independent set and $k$ -Vertex Cover

We present two simple examples of bounded search tree algorithms.: an  $\mathcal{O}^*(6^k)$  algorithm for  $k$ -Independent Set in a planar graph and an  $\mathcal{O}^*(1.466^k)$  algorithm for  $k$ -Vertex Cover.

**Observation 2**  *$k$ -Independent Set can for a planar graph  $G$  be solved by a BST algorithm in time  $\mathcal{O}^*(6^k)$ .*

---

**Meta-algorithm** BST for rules of type  $B_i : LHS_i \rightarrow (G_1, k_1), \dots, (G_{c_i}, k_{c_i})$

**Input** Graph  $G$ , integer  $k$

**if**  $G$  contains some  $LHS_i$  **then** Call BST on instances  $(G_1, k_1), \dots, (G_{c_i}, k_{c_i})$   
**else** Solve  $(G, k)$  in polynomial time, if 'Yes' then output 'Yes' and **halt**

Answer 'No'

---

Figure 2: A meta-algorithm for Bounded Search Tree.

**Proof.** In an instance  $(G, k)$  of  $k$ -Independent Set we know that for any maximal independent set  $S \subseteq V(G)$  and for any  $v \in V(G)$  it is true that  $N[v] \cap S \neq \emptyset$ . If this was not the case, we could include  $v$  to obtain a larger set, contradicting maximality. This together with the well known fact that any planar graph contains a vertex  $v$  of degree at most 5, allows us to continually branch on such a low degree vertex  $v$  selecting either  $v$  or one of its neighbors to be in the independent set. When selecting a vertex for the independent set we remove it and all its neighbors from the graph and lower the parameter by one. This leaves us with at most six smaller instances, each with parameter  $k' = k - 1$ . As the problem is trivial when the parameter is 0, the size of the tree  $T(k)$  is bounded by  $6 \cdot T(k - 1)$ . This recurrence relation resolves to  $T(k) \leq 6^k$ .  $\square$




Figure 3: Illustrating Observations 2 and 3. A graph  $G$  with vertex  $a$  having 3 neighbors, and two levels of the bounded search trees for  $k$ -Independent Set in Planar Graphs and for  $k$ -Vertex Cover. Any maximal independent set will contain either vertex  $a$  or at least one of its neighbors, while any vertex cover will contain either vertex  $a$  or all 3 neighbors.

**Observation 3** *k-Vertex Cover can be solved by a BST algorithm in time  $\mathcal{O}^*(1.466^k)$ .*

**Proof.** To prove this we make two initial observations. First, that any valid vertex cover must contain either a vertex  $v$  or all its neighbors  $N(v)$ . Second, if a graph has only vertices of degree two or less, then  $k$ -Vertex Cover is linear time solvable. The second observation gives us a clear goal: we will try to reach a linear time instance by branching on any vertex of degree higher than two. We can do this as each high degree vertex  $v$  creates only two branches, where one branch decreases the parameter by one and the other decreases the parameter by  $|N(v)|$  (three or more). The recursive function  $T(k) \leq T(k-1) + T(k-3)$  gives a bound on the size of the tree. This recursive function can be solved by finding the largest root of its characteristic polynomial  $\lambda^k = \lambda^{k-1} + \lambda^{k-3}$ . Using standard computer tools, this root can be estimated to 1.466, giving the desired result.  $\square$

### 2.1.2 How is it used in practice?

This is arguably the most successful parameterized algorithm design technique. The powerful  $k$ -Vertex Cover algorithm by Chen, Kanj and Jia [CKJ01], running in time  $\mathcal{O}(1.286^k n)$ , is a bounded search tree algorithm and remains one of the most cited results in the field.

Also for practical implementations bounded search tree algorithms remain one of the best design techniques, achieving very good running times [L04]. However, we would like to note that the effectiveness of a practical implementation of a bounded search tree algorithm may be dependent on the number of cases the algorithm attempts. If the algorithm checks for just a handful of cases, the running time of the algorithm is usually low, and its implementation feasible. However, there are cases in the literature where the number of cases reach the tens of thousands [R01]. Although this allows for very good theoretical performance the unavoidable overhead will slow down any practical implementation. Some very good implementations of the vertex cover algorithm deliberately skip some of the more advanced cases as they in most practical instances only slow the algorithm down, as reported in [L04].

## 2.2 Greedy Localization

Greedy Localization is a technique that uses a clever first branching to start off the recursive search for the solution. It was introduced in [CFJK04, JZC04] and popularized in an IWPEC'04 paper [DFRS04]. Our aim is to show that if a parameterized problem satisfies the following conditions 1 and 2 then Greedy Localization will give an FPT algorithm.

1. The problem can be formulated as that of finding  $k$  pairwise non-overlapping 'objects' in an input instance  $G$ , with objects being special subsets of size depending only on  $k$  of a ground set  $W$  of  $G$ .

---

**Meta-algorithm** GREEDY LOCALIZATION /\* non-deterministic \*/  
**Input:** Instance  $G$  with ground set  $W$ , and an integer  $k$   
**Output:** Yes if  $G$  has  $k$  non-overlapping objects, otherwise No  
**compute** an inclusion maximal non-overlapping set of objects  $A$   
**if**  $A$  contains at least  $k$  objects then **halt** and **answer** 'Yes'  
**else if**  $|W_A| < k$  then **halt** and **answer** 'No'  
**else guess**  $\{v_1, v_2, \dots, v_k\} \subseteq W_A$  and let  $B_i$  be partial object on  $v_i$  ( $1 \leq i \leq k$ )  
BRANCHING( $B = \{B_1, B_2, \dots, B_k\}$ )

**Subroutine** BRANCHING  
**Input:** Set of partial objects  $B = \{B_1, B_2, \dots, B_k\}$   
**Output:** Yes if  $B$  can be extended to a set of full objects, otherwise No  
 $F = S = \emptyset$   
**for**  $j = 1$  to  $k$   
    **if**  $B_j$  not full then {  
         $S = \text{EXTEND}(B_j, W_B \cup F)$   
        **if**  $S == \emptyset$  then **break**  
        **else**  $F = F \cup S$   
    }  
**if** all objects could be extended then **halt** and **answer** 'Yes'  
**else if**  $F == \emptyset$  then **halt** and **answer** 'No'  
**else guess**  $v \in F$  and add  $v$  to  $B_j$  /\*  $j$  is value of parameter at break \*/  
BRANCHING( $B = \{B_1, B_2, \dots, B_k\}$ )

**Subroutine** EXTEND  
**Input:** Partial object  $B_i$ , unavailable ground elements  $X$   
**Output:** Ground elements  $S \subseteq W \setminus X$  whose addition to  $B_i$  gives a full object  
or  $S = \emptyset$  if this is not possible

---

Figure 4: A meta-algorithm for Greedy Localization, in non-deterministic style

2. For any  $R \subseteq W$  and  $X \subseteq W$  we can decide in FPT time if there exists  $S \subseteq W \setminus X$  such that  $S \cup R$  is an object.

Not all bounded-size subsets of  $W$  are objects, and an obvious requirement for the problem to have an FPT algorithm is that for any  $R \subseteq W$  we must be able to decide in FPT time if  $R$  is an object or not. Condition 2 can be seen as a strengthening of this obvious requirement and we will refer to  $S$  as an 'extension' of the 'partial object'  $R$  to a 'full object'  $R \cup S$  avoiding  $X$ .

The figure on the next page gives the Greedy Localization algorithm, in non-deterministic style, for a problem satisfying these two conditions. It uses the notation that for a set of partial objects  $B = \{B_1, B_2, \dots, B_k\}$  the ground elements contained in  $B$  are denoted by  $W_B = \bigcup_{B_i \in B} B_i$ .



**Theorem 1** *If a parameterized problem satisfies conditions 1 and 2 above then the algorithm 'GREEDY LOCALIZATION' is an FPT algorithm for this problem.*

**Proof.** The algorithm starts by computing an inclusion maximal non-overlapping set of objects  $A$ . By condition 2 this first step can be done in FPT time as follows: repeatedly extend the emptyset to a full object while avoiding a set  $X$ , by calling subroutine  $\text{EXTEND}(\emptyset, X)$  with  $X$  initially empty, and adding the extension to  $X$  before the next iteration. When no extension exists we are assured that the sequence of extensions found must be an inclusion maximal non-overlapping set of objects  $A$ .

The crucial aspect that makes the algorithm correct is that if  $A$  and  $B$  are two inclusion maximal non-overlapping sets of objects then for any object  $B_i$  in  $B$  there is an object  $A_j$  in  $A$  such that  $A_j$  and  $B_i$  overlap, since otherwise  $A$  is not maximal. Thus, if the instance contains such a set  $B$  of at least  $k$  objects, then we can guess  $k$  ground elements appearing in  $A$ , with  $A$  constructed in the first step of the algorithm, such that these ground elements belong to  $k$  separate objects of  $B$ . The Branching subroutine is called on these  $k$  one-element partial objects and we greedily try to extend them to full objects. If this fails for some object  $B_j$ , after having added extension elements  $F$  to objects  $B_1, B_2, \dots, B_{j-1}$ , then there must exist an element  $v$  from  $F$  that should have instead been used to extend  $B_j$ . We then simply guess the element  $v$  and try again.

For a deterministic algorithm the guesses are replaced by branchings, and we give a No answer iff all branches answer No. The first branching is of size  $\binom{|W_A|}{k}$ , the remainder of the branches are of size  $|F|$ , and the total height of the tree is bounded by  $k$  times the maximum size of an object since at each level one new ground element is added to  $W_B$ . All these are bounded by a function depending on  $k$  as we assumed in condition 1 that each object had size depending on  $k$  only. The calls to the Extend subroutine are FPT by condition 2. Hence the algorithm is FPT.  $\square$

### 2.2.1 Example: $k$ -Packing of $k$ -cycles

Using Theorem 1 we can easily argue that deciding if a graph  $G$  contains  $k$  vertex-disjoint cycles on  $k$  vertices is FPT by Greedy Localization. The ground set  $W$  will be the vertex set of  $G$  and the objects will be subsets of  $k$  vertices inducing a subgraph containing a  $k$ -cycle, to satisfy condition 1. Given  $R, X \subseteq W$  we can by an FPT algorithm designed using the Color Coding technique, see the next section, decide if there exists  $S \subseteq W \setminus X$  such that  $R \cup S$  induces a subgraph containing a  $k$ -cycle, to satisfy condition 2. By Theorem 1 the Greedy Localization meta-algorithm therefore solves the problem in FPT time. For packing of edge-disjoint cycles a similar argument holds, with  $W$  being the edge set of the graph.

### 2.2.2 How is it used in practice?

Since we do not know of any practical implementation of this technique we simply give our opinion on the practical usefulness of this design technique. Observe that the running time of this algorithm depends on the running time of the EXTEND subroutine and the maximum size of the objects. The size of objects determine the size of our branching tree and also the number of times the EXTEND subroutine is executed. This, together with the inherent running time of  $\mathcal{O}^*(c^{k \log k})$ , lead us to believe that Greedy Localization is impractical for anything but small constant sized objects.

## 2.3 Color Coding

Color Coding is a technique that was introduced by Alon, Yuster, and Zwick in their paper 'Color Coding' [AYZ95] and is characterized by a powerful first branching step. For example, given an input to a parameterized graph problem we may in a first branching color the vertices with  $k$  colors such that the structure we are looking for will interact with the color classes in a specific way. To do this we create many branches of colored graphs, using a family of perfect hash functions for the coloring.

**Definition 1** *A  $k$ -perfect family of hash functions is a family  $\mathcal{H}$  of functions from  $\{1, \dots, n\}$  onto  $\{1, \dots, k\}$  such that for each  $S \subset \{1, \dots, n\}$  with  $|S| = k$  there exists an  $h \in \mathcal{H}$  that is bijective when restricted to  $S$ .*

Schmidt and Siegal [SS90] describe a construction of a  $k$ -perfect family of hash functions of size  $2^{\mathcal{O}(k)} \log^2 n$ , and [AYZ95] describes how to obtain an even smaller one of size  $2^{\mathcal{O}(k)} \log n$ .

The technique could for example apply a family of perfect hash functions to partition vertices of the input graph into  $k$  color classes. By the property of perfect hash families we know that for any  $k$ -sized subset  $S$  of the vertices, one of the hash functions in the family will color each vertex in  $S$  with a different color. Thus, if we seek a  $k$ -set  $C$  with a specific property (e.g., containing a  $k$ -cycle), we know that if there is such a set  $C$  in the graph then its vertices will, for at least one function in the hash family, be colored with each of the  $k$  colors. See the meta-algorithm in Figure 5. The color coding technique gives an FPT algorithm whenever this colored subproblem can be solved in FPT time.

### 2.3.1 Example: $k$ -cycle

To give a simple example of how to use color coding we give an algorithm for the  $k$ -cycle problem, which asks if an input graph has a cycle of length exactly  $k$ . This problem is obviously NP-complete since it is equivalent to Hamiltonian Cycle for  $k = n$ . Let us consider the ' $k$ -cycle algorithm' in Figure 6.

**Observation 4** *The ' $k$ -cycle algorithm' is correct and runs in time  $\mathcal{O}^*(2^{\mathcal{O}(k)} k!)$ .*

---

**Meta-algorithm** Color Coding**Input:** A graph  $G = (V, E)$  and an integer  $k$ .**Output:** A 'Yes' or a 'No' answerLet  $\mathcal{F}$  be a family of perfect hash functions from  $\{1, \dots, |V|\}$  to  $\{1, \dots, k\}$ **For** each function  $f \in \mathcal{F}$     Use  $f$  to color  $V$  using  $k$  colors.    **run** algorithm for the colored problem    **if** 'Yes' **then** Answer 'Yes' and **halt****End For**

Output a 'No' Answer.

---

Figure 5: A meta-algorithm for 'Color Coding'**Proof.** Given an instance  $(G, k)$  we prove that the algorithm outputs a  $k$ -cycle if and only if  $G$  contains a  $k$ -cycle.

In one direction the algorithm answers 'Yes' and outputs a cycle. As the edges not deleted from the graph go from color-class  $c_i$  to  $c_{i+1 \pmod k}$ , the shortest cycle in the graph is of length  $k$  and since the breadth first search only test for lengths up to  $k$ , we will not find cycles longer than  $k$ . Thus if the algorithm outputs a cycle, it must be of length  $k$ .

For the other direction, assume in contradiction that  $G$  has a  $k$ -cycle  $S = \langle s_1, s_2, \dots, s_k, s_1 \rangle$ , while the algorithm produces a 'No' answer. Since  $\mathcal{F}$  is a perfect hash family, there exists a function  $f \in \mathcal{F}$  such that the vertices  $\{s_1, s_2, \dots, s_k\}$  all received different colors when  $f$  was used as the coloring function. Since the algorithm tries every possible ordering of the color classes, it will try  $\langle f(s_1), f(s_2), \dots, f(s_k) \rangle$ . Under this ordering, none of the edges in the cycle  $S$  will be removed, and since we test every vertex of one color class  $f(s_i)$ , we will at some point test if there exists a cycle from  $s_i$  to itself and output a 'Yes'-answer, contradicting the assumption.

To calculate the running time, we know by [AYZ95] that we have a perfect hash family of size  $2^{\mathcal{O}(k)} \log n$ . Thus, the result follows as the number of orderings of the  $k$  color classes is  $k!$ , and the rest is a polynomial factor.  $\square$

Note that instead of investigating each possible ordering of the color classes in order to find a cycle we could use a dynamic programming strategy. This would improve the running time, but we have chosen this simpler version because we wish to emphasize the color coding part of the algorithm.

---

**Algorithm**  $k$ -cycle

**Input:** A graph  $G = (V, E)$  and an integer  $k$ .

**Output:** A subgraph of  $G$ , isomorphic to a cycle of size  $k$ , or a 'No' answer

Let  $\mathcal{F}$  be a family of perfect hash functions from  $\{1, \dots, |V|\}$  to  $\{1, \dots, k\}$

**For** each function  $f \in \mathcal{F}$

Use  $f$  to color  $V$  using  $k$  colors

**For** each ordering  $c_1, c_2, \dots, c_k$  of the  $k$  colors

Construct a directed graph as follows:

**for each** edge  $(u, v) \in E$

**if**  $f(u) = c_i$  and  $f(v) = c_{i+1 \pmod k}$  for some  $i$

**then** replace edge with arc  $\langle u, v \rangle$

**else** delete edge  $uv$

**For** all  $v$  such that  $f(v) = c_1$

Use breadth first search to look for cycle  $C$  from  $v$  to  $v$  of length  $k$

If such  $C$  exists then output  $C$  and **halt**

**End For**

**End For**

**End For**

Output 'No'

---

Figure 6: An algorithm for the  $k$ -Cycle problem.

### 2.3.2 How is it used in practice?

Perhaps the strongest theoretical results using Color Coding are obtained in [FKNRSTW04] where it is combined with kernelization to give FPT algorithms for a large variety of packing problems. In general, a major drawback of these algorithms is that while the hash family has an asymptotically good size, the  $\mathcal{O}$ -notation hides a large constant. Thus, from a practical viewpoint the color coding algorithms would for reasonable input sizes normally be slower than a  $2^{k \log k}$  algorithm obtained through other techniques. We believe that this algorithm design technique is unsuitable in practice.

## 3 Kernelization

Under the heading of kernelization we combine techniques that reduce a general instance into an equivalent *kernel*, i.e., an instance whose total size is bounded by a function depending only on the parameter. We distinguish between *local reductions* and *global reductions*.

---

**Meta-algorithm** Complete set  $R$  of reduction rules  $R_i : LHS_i \rightarrow RHS_i$

**Input** Graph  $G$ , integer  $k$

**while**  $G$  contains some  $LHS_i$

    remove  $LHS_i$  from  $G$  and replace by  $RHS_i$

**end while**

**run** a brute force algorithm on the reduced graph

---

Figure 7: A meta-algorithm for a complete set of reduction rules.

### 3.1 Local Reductions

The main tool to facilitate the reduction is the *reduction rule*. Each reduction rule identifies a certain structure LHS (the left-hand-side) in the instance and modifies it to RHS (the right-hand-side), possibly by deletion ( $RHS = \emptyset$ ). This must be done in such a way that the original instance  $(G, k)$  has a positive solution iff the reduced instance  $(G', k')$  has one. The identified structure and resulting change is usually of a fixed size, and we then call it a local reduction rule.

If a reduction rule  $A$  cannot be applied to an instance we say that the instance is *irreducible for  $A$* . That an instance is irreducible implies that it does not have the structure the reduction rule applies to. In this way, we can use reduction rules to remove a certain structure from an instance. This allows us to shed away trivial and/or polynomial solvable parts of an instance, thus revealing the combinatorial hard core.

Normally a single reduction rule is not sufficient to reduce a problem to a kernel. We usually require a set of reduction rules, where each rule in the set removes one type of problematic structure. If a set of reduction rules is sufficient to reduce any instance of a problem to a kernel we call it a *complete set of reduction rules*. Given such a set we can devise a simple algorithm as seen in Figure 7.

#### 3.1.1 Example: $k$ -Vertex Cover and $k$ -Dominating set

Here we will give the classical example of a quadratic kernelization algorithm for Vertex Cover. It is by far the simplest algorithm using reduction rules known to us and illustrates the technique very well. We will make use of a reduction rule applicable to vertices of degree larger than  $k$ , due to S. Buss [DF99]. It is easily seen to be true and says that

**Rule 1** Assume  $v \in V(G)$  with  $\deg(v) > k$ . Then  $G$  has a Vertex Cover of  $k$  vertices if and only if  $G - v$  has a Vertex Cover of  $k - 1$  vertices.

**Observation 5** The singleton set containing Reduction Rule 1 is a complete set of Reduction Rules for  $k$ -Vertex Cover and will in linear time give a kernel

of  $\mathcal{O}(k^2)$  vertices.

**Proof.** Let us examine the reduced graph  $G'$  that remains after we have deleted all vertices of degree more than  $k$ . This instance  $G'$  (with the parameter  $k'$ ) has been obtained from the input  $(G, k)$  by repeatedly applying Reduction Rule 1. Thus by correctness of Reduction Rule 1 we know that  $G'$  has a vertex cover of size  $k'$  if and only if  $G$  has a vertex cover of size  $k$ . Since the reduced graph  $G'$  has vertices of degree at most  $k$ , any vertex in  $V(G')$  can cover at most  $k$  edges. Thus the total number of edges a vertex cover of size  $k'$  can cover is at most  $k' \cdot k$ , thus it is at this point safe to reject any graph  $G'$  with more edges than  $k' \cdot k$ . It is easy to see that the algorithm works in linear time. It simply scans through the vertices and deletes the vertices of degree more than  $k$ .  $\square$

For some problems obtaining a kernel is trivial. In the following example we consider  $k$ -dominating sets in cubic graphs, i.e. where all vertices have degree three. Thus no vertex can dominate more than 4 vertices (itself and its three neighbors) and we can safely answer No whenever the input graph has more than  $4k$  vertices. Note that we did not apply any reduction rule at all to find this kernel of  $4k$  vertices and  $12k$  edges. For many problems this would be a very good result, but here it is terrible. By the same argument we see that no cubic graph has a dominating set of size less than  $n/4$ . Thus for any non-trivial problem instance we have  $k \geq n/4$  and thus  $4k \geq n$ , and the bound  $4k$  obtained from the kernel is larger than the size of the instance itself. This shows that it is important to be aware of the lower and upper bounds on interesting instances of the problem one is working on. This can be of great help in finding trivial kernels and estimating the quality of a suggested kernel.

### 3.1.2 How is it used in practice?

The idea of pre-processing an input forms a heuristic for many real-world problems. Kernelization is a sibling of this idea where we have a guarantee on its effectiveness. It can be extremely useful in practical implementations as it allows for a fast reduction of the input size. For many instances the reduction rules works much better than the worst case analysis would indicate [W00].

## 3.2 Global Reduction Rules - Crown Reduction

Lately there has been a focus on reduction rules that do not follow the pattern of finding a local structure of constant size. In this section we describe reduction rules based on finding *crown decompositions* in graphs. See Figure 8.

**Definition 2** A crown decomposition of a graph  $G = (V, E)$  is a partitioning of  $V$  into sets  $C, H, R$ , where  $C$  and  $H$  are both nonempty, such that:

1.  $C$  is an independent set.
2. There is no edge between a vertex in  $C$  and a vertex in  $R$ .




Figure 8: Example of a crown decomposition. The matched edges are dashed

3. *There exists an injective map  $m : H \rightarrow C$ , such that  $m(a) = b$  implies that  $ab$  is an edge. We call  $ab$  a matched edge if  $m(a) = b$ .*

When using a crown decomposition  $(C, H, R)$  in a reduction rule for a graph  $G$  we usually show that we can remove or modify  $(C \cup H)$  to obtain a reduced instance  $(G', k')$  which is a Yes-instance if and only if  $(G, k)$  is a Yes-instance. For example, it is easy to see that  $G$  has a Vertex Cover of size  $k$  iff the graph  $G'$  resulting from removing  $C \cup H$  has a Vertex Cover of size  $k - |H|$ . Usually more complicated reduced instances and arguments are necessary. For example, an FPT algorithm for  $k$ -Internal Spanning Tree [PS05] uses crown reduction rules that remove only the vertices of  $C$  not incident to a matched edge.

Although it is possible to determine if a graph has a crown decomposition in polynomial time [ACFL04], this technique is often combined with the following lemma by Chor, Fellows, and Juedes [CFJ04]

**Lemma 1** *If a graph  $G = (V, E)$  has an independent set  $I$  such that  $|N(I)| < |I|$ , then a crown decomposition  $(C, H, R)$  for  $G$  such that  $C \subseteq I$  can be found in time  $\mathcal{O}(|V| + |E|)$ .*

The notation  $N(I)$  denotes vertices in  $V \setminus I$  that are adjacent to a vertex in  $I$ . Since it is W[1]-hard to find a large independent set we cannot directly apply Lemma 1. To see how the Lemma can be used, we consider  $k$ -Vertex Cover on a graph  $G$  in the next subsection.

Although crown reduction rules were independently discovered by Chor, Fellows, and Juedes [CFJ04] one should note that a similar type of structure has been studied in the field of boolean satisfiability problems (SAT). An *autarky* is a partial truth assignment (assigning true/false to only a subset of the variables) such that each clause that contains a variable determined by the partial truth assignment is satisfied. In a *matching autarky* we require in addition that the clauses satisfied and the satisfying variables form a matching cover in the natural bipartite graph description of the satisfiability problem. It is easy to see that the matching autarky is a crown decomposition in this bipartite graph. The main protagonist in this field is Oliver Kullmann [K00, K03], who has developed an extensive theory on different types of autarkies.

---

**Algorithm** Crown Kernelization for Vertex Cover  
**Input:** A graph  $G = (V, E)$  and an integer  $k$ .  
**Output:** A kernel of size at most  $4k$  or a 'No' answer

```

do Create a maximal matching  $M$  in  $G$ 
  if  $|V(M)| > 2k$  then output answer 'No' and halt
  else
    if  $|V(G) - V(M)| \leq 2k$  then output  $(G, k)$  and halt
    else
      Create crown decomposition  $(C, H, R)$ 
      Let  $G = G[V - (C \cup H)]$ , and  $k = k - |H|$ 
repeat

```

---

Figure 9: A  $4k$  kernelization algorithm for vertex cover.

### 3.2.1 Example: $k$ -Vertex Cover

We have already remarked the following quite simple crown reduction rule:

**Rule 2** *Given a crown decomposition  $(C, H, R)$  of a graph  $G = (V, E)$ , then  $G$  has a Vertex Cover of size  $k$  if and only if  $G' = G[V - (C \cup H)]$  has a Vertex Cover of size  $k' = k - |H|$ .*

In Figure 3.2.1 this rule is applied to  $k$ -Vertex Cover with a simple Win/Win argument.

**Observation 6** *The algorithm Crown Kernelization in Figure 3.2.1 either terminates with a correct answer or produces a kernel of at most  $4k$  vertices for  $k$ -Vertex Cover.*

**Proof.** To see that the algorithm always terminates, observe that the graph either gives an output or reduces the graph. Since we can have at most  $\mathcal{O}(n)$  reductions, the algorithm will eventually terminate.

We first show that a 'No' answer is always correct. The algorithm will only output 'No' if there is a maximal matching  $M$  in  $G$  where  $|V(M)| > 2k$ . Since we have to pick at least one vertex from each edge, the vertex cover for this graph is greater than  $k$ .

The algorithm modifies the instance  $(G, k)$ , so we have to make sure we do not introduce or remove any solutions. At any stage of the algorithm the current graph and parameter has been obtained by repeated applications of the crown reduction rule. By Rule 2, we are thus guaranteed that the reduced instance is a 'Yes'-instance if and only if the input instance is a 'Yes'-instance.

We have  $|V(G)| = |V(M)| + |V(G) - V(M)| \leq 2k + 2k = 4k$ , so the algorithm outputs only graphs of at most  $4k$  vertices. Thus, the observation is correct.  $\square$



### 3.2.2 How is it used in practice?

Crown decompositions have been used with great success in the vertex cover problem. Although it does not always reach as good kernel as the competitive linear programming or network flow algorithms it uses only a fraction of the time and it is often worth using a crown reduction rule as a preprocessing for the more time consuming methods, as reported by implementations in [ACFL04].

## 4 FPT by Induction

We discuss techniques closely related to mathematical induction. If we are provided a solution for a smaller instance  $(G, k)$  we can for some problems use the information to determine the solution for one of the larger instances  $(G+v, k)$  or  $(G, k+1)$ . We will argue that the two techniques Iterative Compression and Extremal Method are actually two facets of this inductive technique, depending on whether the problem is a minimization problem or a maximization problem.

In his book *Introduction to Algorithms* [M89] Udi Manber shows how induction can be used as a design technique to create remarkably simple algorithms for a range of problems. He suggests that one should always try to construct a solution based on the inductive assumption that we have a solution to smaller problems. For example, this leads to the well known Insertion Sort algorithm by noting that we can sort sequences of  $n$  elements by first sorting  $n-1$  elements and then inserting the last element at its correct place.

This inductive technique may also be applied to the design of FPT algorithms but more care must be taken on two accounts: (a) we have one or more parameters and (b) we are dealing with decision problems. The core idea of the technique is based on using the information provided by a solution for a smaller instance. When an instance contains both a main input and a parameter input, we must be clear about what we mean by 'smaller' instances. Let  $(G, k)$  be an instance, where  $G$  is the main input and  $k$  the parameter. We can now construct three distinctly different 'smaller' instances  $(G-v, k)$ ,  $(G, k-1)$  and  $(G-v, k-1)$ . Which one of these to use?

We first show that using smaller instances of the type  $(G-v, k)$  is very suitable for minimization problems and leads to a technique known as Iterative Compression. Then we show that using smaller instances of the type  $(G, k-1)$  can be used to construct algorithms for maximization problems and is in fact the technique known as the Extremal Method.

### 4.1 For Minimization - Iterative Compression

In this section we present Iterative Compression which works well on certain parameterized minimization problems. Let us assume that we can inductively (recursively) compute the solution for the smaller instance  $(G-v, k)$ . Since our problems are decision problems, we get either a 'Yes'-answer or a 'No'-answer. In both cases we must use the information provided by the answer to compute the solution for  $(G, k)$ . We must assume that for a 'Yes'-instance we also have




Figure 10: Three ways, of which only two correspond to known techniques, to design an FPT algorithm by induction.

a certificate that verifies that the instance is a 'Yes'-instance and it is this certificate that must be used to compute the solution for  $(G, k)$ . However, for a 'No'-answer we may receive no extra information. A class of problems where 'No'-answers carry sufficient information is the class of *monotone* problems in which the 'No'-instances are closed under element addition. Thus if a problem is monotone we can immediately answer 'No' for  $(G, k)$  whenever  $(G - v, k)$  is a 'No'-instance. Given a monotone problem we can use a meta-algorithm as seen in Figure 11.

The algorithm will recursively call itself at most  $|V(G)|$  times, thus the running time of an algorithm of this type is  $\mathcal{O}(n)$  times the time it takes to compute a solution given a smaller solution.

---

**Meta-algorithm** Iterative Compression

**Input:** Graph  $G$ , integer  $k$

**if**  $|V(G)| < k$  **then run** brute force algorithm, return answer and **halt**

Choose arbitrary vertex  $v$

Recursively call problem on instance  $(G - v, k)$ , obtain solution  $S$

**if**  $S = \text{'No'}$  **then** answer 'No'

**else** Compute in FPT time a solution for  $(G, k)$  based on  $S$

---

Figure 11: A meta-algorithm for Iterative Compression on a monotone graph minimization problem.

Note that many minimization problems are not monotone, like  $k$ -Dominating Set where the addition of a universal vertex always changes a 'No' answer to 'Yes' (unless  $k \geq n$ ). For such problems we believe that Iterative Compression is ill suited.

### 4.1.1 Example: $k$ -Feedback Vertex Set

We will give an algorithm for the problem  $k$ -Feedback Vertex Set using the technique described in the previous section. Feedback Vertex Set (is there a  $k$ -set  $S$  such that  $G[V - S]$  is acyclic?) is a monotone problem as adding new vertices will never help to cover existing cycles. Consider the 'Feedback Vertex Set Algorithm' in Figure 12.

---

**Algorithm FVS**

**Input:** Graph  $G$ , integer  $k$

**if**  $|V(G)| \leq k$  **then return** 'Yes' and **halt**

Choose arbitrary vertex  $v \in G$

$S = FVS(G - v, k)$

**if**  $S = \text{'No'}$  **then answer** 'No' and **halt**

Let  $T = G - (S \cup v)$ , note that  $T$  is a forest.

Create tree decomposition  $(X, I)$  of  $T$ .

Add  $S \cup v$  to each bag in  $X$  to obtain tree dec.  $(X', I)$  of width at most  $k + 2$ .

**run** Treewidth algorithm for feedback vertex set on tree decomposition  $(X', I)$

**output** answer from treewidth algorithm.

---

Figure 12: An inductive algorithm for  $k$ -Feedback Vertex Set.

**Observation 7** *Algorithm 'FVS' is correct, and solves  $k$ -Feedback Vertex Set in FPT time.*

**Proof.** We will first prove that the algorithm does not incorrectly decide the answer before running the treewidth sub routine. If the algorithm answers 'Yes' because  $|V(G)| \leq k$ , it is correct as we can select  $V$  as our feedback vertex set. If the algorithm answers 'No' because  $(G - v, k)$  is a 'No'-instance, it is correct as  $k$ -Feedback Vertex Set is a monotone problem.

We assume the treewidth subroutine is correct so it remains to show that the algorithm computes a tree decomposition of the graph with bounded treewidth. The algorithm computes the graph  $T = G - (S \cup v)$  which is a forest, and it is easy to construct a tree decomposition of width 1 from this forest, having one bag for each edge. The algorithm then adds  $S \cup v$  to each bag to obtain a correct tree decomposition of width  $k + 2$ .

It follows from results in [ALS91] that  $k$ -Feedback Vertex Set is solvable in FPT time if the treewidth is the parameter. This gives the desired result.  $\square$

Two other papers that use this type of induction are [RSV03] and [DFRS04]. In [RSV03], Reed, Smith, and Vetta managed to show that the problem  $k$ -Odd Cycle Cover (is there a  $k$ -set  $S$  such that  $G[V - S]$  is bipartite?) is in FPT, thus settling a long open problem in the field. By the induction hypothesis, assume

that we can determine if  $(G - v, k)$  is a 'No' or a 'Yes' instance for  $k$ -Odd Cycle Cover. The induction step is then in two parts. First, the trivial part: to show that if  $(G - v, k)$  is a 'No'-instance then the inclusion of another vertex cannot improve the situation. The second part deals with the situation when we have a positive certificate  $S$  consisting of the  $k$  vertices to be deleted from  $(G - v, k)$  to make it bipartite. If we have such a certificate  $S$ , we can conclude that  $S \cup \{v\}$  is a solution of size at most  $k + 1$  for  $G$ . The authors then show, by a fairly complicated argument which we will not explain here, that given a solution of size at most  $k + 1$  it is possible to determine in FPT time whether or not there exists a solution of size  $k$ .

A very similar use of induction is seen in [DFRS04] where Dehne, Fellows, Rosamond and Shaw give a  $2k$  kernel for  $k$ -Vertex Cover without using the complicated Nemhauser-Trotter results [NT75]. By induction assume we can determine if  $(G - v)$  has a  $k$ -Vertex Cover, if no such cover exists we cannot find one for  $G$  either. On the other hand if  $(G - v)$  has a  $k$ -Vertex Cover  $S$  then  $S \cup \{v\}$  is a  $k + 1$ -Vertex Cover for  $G$  and by implication has a  $n - (k + 1)$ -Independent Set. As long as  $|V(G)| > 2k + 2$  we know by Lemma 1 that  $G$  has a crown decomposition, which in turn leads to a reduction in  $G$  as seen in Lemma 2. This reduction continues until the graph has size at most  $2k + 2$ , at which point we can test for  $k$ -Vertex Cover using a brute force algorithm.

#### 4.1.2 How is it used in practice?

The general practical effectiveness of this design technique depends directly on how well the induction step can be implemented. For the Vertex Cover problem above we use an effective crown reduction algorithm and thus the accompanying algorithm would run well in practice. We hope that implementations testing this technique in practice will appear soon.

## 4.2 For Maximization - The Extremal Method

For maximization problems we consider smaller instances of the type  $(G, k - 1)$ , and induct on  $k$  instead of  $n$ . We say that a problem is *parameter monotone* if the 'No'-instances are closed under parameter increment, i.e. if instance  $(G, k)$  is a 'No'-instance then  $(G, k')$  is also a 'No'-instance for all  $k' > k$ . For a parameter monotone problem we can modify the meta-algorithm from the previous section to obtain an inductive algorithm for maximization problems. See Figure 13.

The *Method of Extremal Structure*<sup>5</sup> is a design technique that works well for parameter monotone maximization problems. In this technique we do not focus on any particular instance  $(G, k)$ , but instead investigate the structure of graphs that are 'Yes'-instances for  $k$ , but 'No'-instances for  $k + 1$ . Let  $\mathcal{G}(k)$  be the class of such graphs, i.e.,  $\mathcal{G}(k) = \{G \mid (G, k) \text{ is a 'Yes'-instance, and } (G, k + 1) \text{ is a 'No'-instance}\}$ .

Our ultimate goal is to prove that there exists a function  $f(k)$  such that  $\max\{|V(G)| \mid G \in \mathcal{G}(k)\} \leq f(k)$ . This is normally not possible without some

---

<sup>5</sup>An exposition of this design technique can be found in E. Prieto's PhD-thesis [P05]

---

**Meta-algorithm** Extremal Method**Input:** Graph  $G$ , integer  $k$ **if**  $k = 0$  **then run** brute force algorithm, return answer and **halt**Inductively call problem on instance  $(G, k - 1)$ , obtain solution  $S$ **if**  $S = \text{'No'}$  **then** answer 'No'**else** Compute in FPT time a solution  $S'$  for  $(G, k)$  based on  $S$  and return  $S'$ 

---

Figure 13: A meta-algorithm for parameter monotone problems.

refinement of  $\mathcal{G}(k)$ , to do this we make a set of observations  $E$  of the following type:

Since  $(G, k)$  is a 'Yes'-instance, but  $(G, k + 1)$  is a 'No'-instance,  $G$  has property  $p$ . (1)

Given a set of such observations  $E$  and consequently a set of properties  $P$  we try to devise a set of reduction rules  $R$  that apply specifically to large graphs having the properties  $P$ . We call our refined class  $\mathcal{G}_R(k) = \{G \mid \text{no reduction rule in } R \text{ applies to } (G, k), \text{ and } (G, k) \text{ is a 'Yes'-instance, and } (G, k + 1) \text{ is a 'No'-instance}\}$ . If we can add enough observations to  $E$  and reductions rules to  $R$  to prove that there is a function  $f(k)$  such that  $\max\{|V(G)| \mid G \in \mathcal{G}_R(k)\} \leq f(k)$  we have proven that:

if i) no rule in  $R$  applies to  $(G, k)$  and ii)  $(G, k)$  is a 'Yes'-instance and iii)  $(G, k + 1)$  is a 'No'-instance, then  $|V(G)| \leq f(k)$

Given such a boundary lemma and the fact that the problem is a *parameter monotone* maximization problem a *kernelization* lemma follows, saying that 'If no rule in  $R$  applies to  $(G, k)$  and  $|V(G)| > f(k)$ , then  $(G, k)$  is a 'Yes'-instance.'

It is not immediately obvious that this can be viewed as an inductive process, but we will now make this clear by presenting the *Algorithmic Method*, a version of the 'Extremal Method'. Here the 'Extremal Method' can be used as the inductive step, going from  $k$  to  $k + 1$ , in an inductive algorithm.

As its base case, the algorithm decides  $(G, 0)$ , which is usually a trivial 'Yes'-instance for a maximization problem. Our induction hypothesis is that we can decide  $(G, k')$ . Then as long as  $k' + 1 \leq k$  we try to compute  $(G, k' + 1)$ . If  $(G, k')$  is a 'No'-instance we can immediately answer 'No' for  $(G, k' + 1)$  as the problem is parameter monotone. Otherwise we can now make an algorithmic use of observations of the type defined for extremal method ((1) above). For each of the properties  $p \in P$  we check if  $G$  has the property  $p$ . If  $G$  does not have property  $p$  then since  $(G, k')$  is a 'Yes'-instance it follows that  $(G, k' + 1)$  is also a 'Yes'-instance. By the same reductions and observations (although the reader should observe that we here require properties to be FPT time verifiable), we obtain that

If no observation in  $E$  or reduction rule  $R$  applies to  $(G, k' + 1)$  then  $|V(G)| < f(k)$ .

At that point we can invoke a brute force algorithm to obtain either a solution  $S$  or a 'No'-answer for  $(G, k' + 1)$ . This answer for  $(G, k' + 1)$  can then be used in the next step,  $k' + 2$ , of our inductive algorithm.

#### 4.2.1 Example: $k$ -Packing of $K_{1,3}$

Here we will give an inductive algorithm for deciding if a graph has a subgraph isomorphic to  $k$  vertex disjoint copies of  $K_{1,3}$ . First note the obvious reduction rule that removes edges whose endpoints both have degree at most two and that can therefore not participate in any  $K_{1,3}$ .

**Rule 3** *If  $\exists vu \in E(G)$  such that  $\deg(v) \leq \deg(u) \leq 2$  then  $(G, k)$  is a 'Yes'-instance if and only if  $(G' = (V(G), E(G) \setminus vu), k)$  is a 'Yes'-instance.*

Vertices of degree larger than  $4(k - 1) + 3$  can on the other hand always be the center node in a  $K_{1,3}$ -star as there cannot be more than  $4(k - 1)$  remaining vertices used in the  $k$ -packing.

**Rule 4** *If  $\exists v \in V(G)$  such that  $\deg(v) > 4k - 1$  then  $(G, k)$  is a 'Yes'-instance if and only if  $(G' = G[V \setminus v], k - 1)$  is a 'Yes'-instance.*

**Observation 8**  *$k$ -Packing of  $K_{1,3}$  is FPT.*

**Proof.** We prove this by inducting on  $k$ .  $(G, 0)$  is a trivial 'Yes'-instance. Let the induction hypothesis be that we can decide instance  $(G, k' - 1)$  in FPT time and in case of a 'Yes'-instance also give the  $(k' - 1)$  packing. We now prove the induction step from an arbitrary  $k' - 1$  to  $k'$ . By the induction hypothesis we can decide  $(G, k' - 1)$ . If  $(G, k' - 1)$  is a 'No'-instance then  $(G, k')$  is also a 'No'-instance as the problem is parameter monotone. Otherwise we have, by the induction hypothesis, a  $(k - 1) - K_{1,3}$ -packing. Let  $W$  be the vertices of this packing. Reduce the graph  $G$  until none of the two rules above apply.

First observe that the max degree in  $G[V - W]$  is at most 2, as otherwise  $W$  is not inclusion-maximal and  $(G, k')$  becomes a trivial 'Yes'-instance. This together with the two reduction rules is enough to prove that the reduced instance is a kernel.

From the second rule above it follows that  $N(W) \leq 4k(4k - 1)$ . From the first rule we can conclude that  $R = V - (W \cup N(W))$  is an independent set. Since  $R$  is an independent set, each vertex in  $R$  must have at least one adjacent vertex in  $N(W)$ . Thus from the observation above we have that  $|R| \leq 2|N(W)|$ . In total:  $|V| = |W| + |N(W)| + |R| \leq 4k + 3 \cdot 4k(4k - 1) = 48k^2 - 8k$ . We can now compute a solution on this kernel in a brute force manner to determine a solution for  $(G, k')$ . This completes the induction step.  $\square$

### 4.2.2 How is it used in practice?

This technique, either the 'Extremal Method' or its variant the 'Algorithmic Method', has been applied successfully to a range of problems, such as:  $k$ -Max Cut [P04],  $k$ -Leaf Spanning Tree [P05],  $k$ -Non-Blocker [P05],  $k$ -Edge-disjoint Triangle-Packing [MPS04],  $k$ - $K_{1,s}$ -packing [PS04],  $k$ - $K_3$ -packing [FHRST04],  $k$ -Set Splitting [DFR03], and  $k$ -Internal Spanning Tree [PS05].

We do not know of any practical implementation of algorithms of this type, but the kernelization results that can be obtained from 'Extremal Method' argumentation is generally quite good. This, together with the general simplicity of the technique, indicates that the technique could be successful in practice.

## 5 Win/Win

Imagine that we solve our problem by first calling an FPT algorithm for another problem and use both its 'Yes' and 'No' answer to decide in FPT time the answer to our problem. Since we then 'win' if its answer is 'Yes' and we also 'win' if its answer is 'No', this is called a 'Win/Win' situation. In this section we focus on techniques exploiting this behavior.

Consider the meta-algorithm shown in Figure 14. We run our decision algorithm  $\Phi$  for problem  $B$  on input  $I$ . If  $\Phi$  returns a 'No' answer, we know by the relationship between  $A$  and  $B$  that  $A$  is a 'Yes'-instance (this can sometimes yield a non-constructive result where we know that  $A$  is a yes-instance but we have no certificate). Otherwise we have obtained the knowledge that  $I$  is a 'Yes'-instance for  $B$ , and if  $\Phi$  is constructive, we also have a certificate. We then proceed to solve  $A$  with the extra information provided. In the following subsection, we give examples of how this has been done in the literature.

---

**Meta-algorithm** Win/Win algorithm for problem  $A$  using problem  $B$

**Input:** Graph  $G$ , parameter  $k$

**run** FPT algorithm  $\Phi$  for  $B$  on  $(G, k)$

**if**  $(G, k)$  is a 'No'-instance for  $B$  **then** Output 'Yes'

**else run** use structure given by  $\Phi$  to solve  $A$  on  $G$ .

---

Figure 14: The classical Win/Win algorithm structure, although other Yes/No relationships between  $A$  and  $B$  may be used.

### 5.1 Well-quasi-ordering and Graph Minors

Robertson and Seymour have shown that i) the set of finite graphs are well-quasi-ordered under minors and ii) the  $H$ -Minor problem that checks if  $H$  is a minor of some input graph, with  $k = |V(H)|$ , is FPT. These two facts suffice

---

**Meta-algorithm** Graph Minors**Input:** A graph  $G = (V, E)$  and an integer  $k$ .**Output:** A 'Yes' or a 'No' answerLet  $MFM$  be the forbidden minors for the specified problem and given  $k$ .**for** each minor  $H \in MFM$     **if**  $H \preceq_m G$  **then answer** 'No' **and halt****end for****answer** 'Yes'

---

Figure 15: A meta-algorithm for the graph minors technique, applicable when the class  $\{G \mid (G, k) \text{ is a 'Yes'-instance}\}$  is closed under minors.

to prove that any parameterized graph problem whose Yes-instances (or No-instances) are closed under minors is FPT. If analogous structural results could be shown for some other relation, besides minors, then for problems closed under this other relation we would also get FPT algorithms. Thus the general technique is called 'well-quasi-ordering'. We consider this a Win/Win algorithm as we relate the problem we wish to solve to the FPT problem of checking if one of the forbidden minors (or whatever other relation is involved) appear in our problem instance.

Let us briefly explain the main ideas. A well-quasi-ordering is a reflexive and transitive ordering which has no infinite antichain, meaning that any set of elements no two of which are comparable in the ordering must be finite. A graph  $H$  is a *minor* of a graph  $G$ , denoted  $H \preceq_m G$ , if a graph isomorphic to  $H$  can be obtained from contracting edges of a subgraph of  $G$ . The Graph Minors Theorem [RS99] states that 'The set of graphs are well-quasi-ordered by the minor relation'. Combined with  $H$ -minor testing this can be used to prove existence of an FPT algorithm for any problem  $A$  with the property that for any  $k$  the 'Yes'-instances are closed under minors. In other words, let us assume that if  $A_k$  is the class of graphs  $G$  such that  $(G, k)$  is a 'Yes'-instance to problem  $A$  and  $H \preceq_m G$  for some  $G \in A_k$  then  $H \in A_k$  as well. Consider the Minimal Forbidden Minors of  $A_k$ , denoted  $MFM(A_k)$ , defined as follows:  $MFM(A_k) = \{G \mid G \notin A_k \text{ and } (\forall H \preceq_m G, H \in A_k \vee H = G)\}$ .

By definition,  $MFM(A_k)$  is an antichain of the  $\preceq_m$  ordering of graphs so by the Graph Minors Theorem it is finite. Beware that the non-constructive nature of the proof of the Graph Minors Theorem implies that we can in general not construct the set  $MFM(A_k)$  and thus we can only argue for the existence of an FPT algorithm. We do this by noting that  $(G, k)$  is a Yes-instance of problem  $A$  iff there is no  $H \in MFM(A_k)$  such that  $H \preceq_m G$ . Since  $MFM(A_k)$  is independent of  $|G|$ , though dependent on  $k$ , we can therefore decide if  $(G, k)$  is a Yes-instance in FPT time by  $|MFM(A_k)|$  calls of  $H$ -Minor.



### 5.1.1 Example: $k$ -Feedback Vertex Set

Armed with this powerful tool, all we have to do to prove that a parameterized graph problem is FPT is to show that the Yes-instances are closed under the operations of edge deletion, vertex deletion and edge contraction, Consider the problem  $k$ -Feedback Vertex Set, where we ask for  $k$  vertices whose removal creates an acyclic graph. Deleting an edge or vertex does not create any new cycles in the graph. After contracting the edge  $uv$  into a new vertex  $x$  the vertex  $x$  will be a part of any cycle that was previously covered by both  $u$  and  $v$ , and no new cycles apart from these are introduced by the contraction..

**Observation 9** *If  $(G, k)$  is a 'Yes'-instance for  $k$ -Feedback Vertex Set and  $H \preceq_m G$ , then  $(H, k)$  is a 'Yes'-instance for  $k$ -Feedback Vertex Set*

We now have enough information to conclude that  $k$ -Feedback Vertex Set is in FPT.

### 5.1.2 How is it used in practice?

Although its extreme simplicity makes the technique very useful as a method for proving membership in FPT, the number of forbidden minors is often quite large and even worse, usually unknown. Thus, this technique is rarely viable as a tool for designing practical algorithms.

## 5.2 Imposing FPT structure and Bounded treewidth

In the literature on parameterized graph algorithms there are several notable occurrences of a Win/Win strategy that imposes a tree-like structure on the class of problematic graphs, in particular by showing that they must have treewidth bounded by a function of the parameter. This is then combined with the fact that many NP-hard problems are solvable in FPT time if the parameter is the treewidth of the input graph.

### 5.2.1 Example: $k$ -Dominating set

Let us briefly explain this technique in the case of finding  $k$ -dominating sets in planar graphs, where a very low treewidth bound on Yes-instances gives very fast FPT algorithms. In [ABFKN02] it is shown that a planar graph that has a  $k$ -dominating set has treewidth at most  $c\sqrt{k}$  for an appropriate constant  $c$ . Thus we have a win/win relationship, since we can check in polynomial time if a planar graph has treewidth at most  $c'\sqrt{k}$  [ST94], for some slightly larger constant  $c'$ , and if so find a tree-decomposition of this width. If the treewidth is higher we can safely reject the instance, and otherwise we can run a dynamic programming algorithm on its tree-decomposition, parameterized by  $c'\sqrt{k}$ , to find in FPT time the optimal solution. In total this gives a  $\mathcal{O}^*(c''\sqrt{k})$  algorithm for deciding if a planar graph has a dominating set of size  $k$ .

A series of papers have lowered the constant  $c''$  of this algorithm, by several techniques, like moving to branchwidth instead of treewidth, by improving the constant  $c$ , and by improving the FPT runtime of the dynamic programming stage. Yet another series of papers have generalized these 'subexponential in  $k$ ' FPT algorithms from dominating set to all so-called bidimensional parameters and also from planar graphs to all graphs not having a fixed graph  $H$  as minor [DH05].

### 5.2.2 How is it used in practice?

According to [DH05] the only known algorithms with sub-exponential running time  $\mathcal{O}^*(c^{\sqrt{k}})$  are algorithms based on imposing treewidth and branchwidth structure on the complicated cases, and these fall into the Win/Win category.

We cannot say much about the practical usefulness of this design technique in general. The running time of a Win/Win algorithm depends on two things: the nature of the observation that ties one problem to another, and the running time to solve the other problem. Normally the observation can be checked in polynomial time, but to have a practical implementation it must also give a reasonable parameter value for the other problem.

## References

- [ACFL04] F. Abu-Khzam, R. Collins, M. Fellows and M. Langston. Kernelization Algorithms for the Vertex Cover Problem: Theory and Experiments. *Proceedings ALENEX 2004*, Springer-Verlag, *Lecture Notes in Computer Science* (2004), to appear.
- [ABFKN02] J. Alber, H. L. Bodlaender, H. Fernau, T. Kloks, and R. Niedermeier. Fixed parameter algorithms for dominating set and related problems on planar graphs, *Algorithmica*, vol. 33, pages 461–493, 2002.
- [ALS91] S. Arnborg, J. Lagergren, and D. Seese. Easy problems for tree-decomposable graphs, *Journal of Algorithms*, Vol 12, issue 2, pages 308–340, 1991.
- [AYZ95] N. Alon, R. Yuster, and U. Zwick. Color-Coding, *Journal of the ACM*, Volume 42(4), pages 844–856, 1995.
- [CFJ04] B. Chor, M. Fellows, and D. Juedes. Linear Kernels in Linear Time, or How to Save  $k$  Colors in  $\mathcal{O}(n^2)$  steps. *Proceedings of WG2004, LNCS*, 2004.
- [CFJK04] J.Chen, D.Friesen, W.Jia, I. Kanj, Using nondeterminism to design efficient deterministic algorithms, *Algorithmica* 40, 83-97, 2004
- [CKJ01] J. Chen, I. Kanj, and W. Jia. Vertex cover: Further Observations and Further Improvements, *Journal of Algorithms* Volume 41 , pages 280–301, 2001.

- [DF99] R. Downey and M. Fellows. Parameterized Complexity, *Springer-Verlag*, 1999.
- [DFR03] F. Dehne, M. Fellows, and F. Rosamond. An FPT Algorithm for Set Splitting, in *Proceedings WG2004 - 30th Workshop on Graph Theoretic Concepts in Computer science*, LNCS. Springer Verlag, 2004.
- [DFRS04] F. Dehne, M. Fellows, F. Rosamond, P. Shaw. Greedy Localization, Iterative Compression and Modeled Crown Reductions: New FPT Techniques and Improved Algorithms for Max Set Splitting and Vertex Cover, *Proceedings of IWPEC04*, LNCS 3162, pages 271–281, 2004
- [DH05] E. Demaine and M. Hajiaghayi. Bidimensionality: New Connections between FPT Algorithms and PTASs, *Proceedings of the 16th Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms (SODA 2005)*, January 23–25, pages 590–601, 2005.
- [F03] M. Fellows. Blow-ups, Win/Wins and Crown Rules: Some New Directions in FPT, *Proceedings WG 2003*, Springer Verlag LNCS 2880, pages 1–12, 2003.
- [FKNRSTW04] M. Fellows, C. Knauer, N. Nishimura, P. Ragde, F. Rosamond, U. Stege, D. Thilikos, and S. Whitesides. Faster fixed-parameter tractable algorithms for matching and packing problems, *Proceedings of the 12th Annual European Symposium on Algorithms (ESA 2004)*, 2004.
- [FHRST04] M. Fellows, P. Heggernes, F. Rosamond, C. Sloper, J. A. Telle, Finding  $k$  disjoint triangles in an arbitrary graph. To appear in proceedings *30th Workshop on Graph Theoretic Concepts in Computer Science (WG '04)*, Springer Lecture Notes in Computer Science, (2004).
- [FMRS00] M. R. Fellows, C. McCartin, F. Rosamond, and U. Stege. Coordinatized Kernels and Catalytic Reductions: An Improved FPT Algorithm for Max Leaf Spanning Tree and Other Problems, *Foundations of Software Technology and Theoretical Computer Science*, 2000.
- [JZC04] W. Jia, C. Zhang and J. Chen. An efficient parameterized algorithm for  $m$ -set packing, *Journal of Algorithms*, 2004, vol. 50(1), pages 106–117
- [K00] O. Kullmann. Investigations on autark assignments, *Discrete Applied Mathematics*, vol. 107, pages 99–138, 2000.
- [K03] O. Kullmann. Lean clause-sets: Generalizations of minimally unsatisfiable clause-sets, *Discrete Applied Mathematics*, vol 130, pages 209–249, 2003.
- [L04] M. Langston. Private communication.
- [MPS04] L. Mathieson, E. Prieto, P. Shaw. Packing Edge Disjoint Triangles: A Parameterized View. *Proceedings of IWPEC 04*, 2004, LNCS 3162, pages 127–137.

- [M89] U. Manber. Introduction to algorithms, a creative approach, *Addison Wesley Publishing*, 1989.
- [MR99] M. Mahajan, V. Raman. Parameterizing above guaranteed values: MaxSat and MaxCut, *Journal of Algorithms*, vol. 31, issue 2, pages 335-354, 1999.
- [N06] R. Niedermeier. Invitation to Fixed-Parameter Algorithms. Oxford University Press, 2006.
- [NR00] R. Niedermeier and P. Rossmanith. A general method to speed up fixed parameter algorithms, *Information Processing Letters*, 73, pages 125–129, 2000.
- [NT75] G. Nemhauser and L. Trotter Jr. Vertex Packings: Structural properties and algorithms, *Mathematical Programming*, 8, pages 232–248, 1975.
- [P04] E. Prieto. The Method of Extremal Structure on the  $k$ -Maximum Cut Problem. *Proc. Computing: The Australasian Theory Symposium (CATS 2005). Conferences in Research and Practice in Information Technology*, 2005, vol. 41, pages 119-126.
- [P05] E. Prieto. Systematic kernelization in FPT algorithm design. *PhD thesis, University of Newcastle, Australia*
- [PS03] E. Prieto, C. Sloper. Either/Or: Using Vertex Cover Structure in designing FPT-algorithms - the case of  $k$ -Internal Spanning Tree, *Proceedings of WADS 2003*, LNCS vol 2748, pages 465–483.
- [PS04] E. Prieto, C. Sloper. Looking at the Stars, *Proceedings of International Workshop on Parameterized and Exact Computation (IWPEC 04)*, LNCS vol. 3162, pages 138-149, 2004.
- [PS05] E. Prieto, C. Sloper. Reducing to Independent Set Structure — the Case of  $k$ -INTERNAL SPANNING TREE', *Nordic Journal of Computing*, 2005, vol 12, nr 3, pp. 308-318.
- [R01] Robson. Finding a maximum independent set in time  $\mathcal{O}(2^{n/4})$ ? Manuscript.
- [RS99] N. Robertson, P.D. Seymour. Graph Minors XX Wagner's conjecture. *To appear*.
- [RSV03] B.Reed, K.Smith, and A. Vetta. Finding Odd Cycle Transversals, *Operations Research Letters*, 32, pages 299-301, 2003.
- [S06] C.Sloper. Techniques in Parameterized Algorithm Design. *PhD thesis, University of Bergen*, 2006, (<http://www.ii.uib.no/~sloper>).
- [SS90] J.P. Schmidt and A. Siegel. The spatial complexity of oblivious  $k$ -probe hash functions. *SIAM Journal of Computing*, 19(5), pages 775-786, 1990.

- [ST94] P. D. Seymour and R. Thomas. Call routing and the ratcatcher. *Combinatorica*, vol 14(2), pages 217 – 241, 1994.
- [W00] K. Weihe. On the Differences Between Practical and Applied (invited paper), *Proc. WAE 2000*, Springer-Verlag, Lecture Notes in Computer Science 1982, 110, 2001.