



# Parameterized algorithms for load coloring problem



Gregory Gutin\*, Mark Jones

Department of Computer Science, Royal Holloway University of London, Egham, Surrey TW20 0EX, UK

## ARTICLE INFO

### Article history:

Received 8 August 2013

Received in revised form 10 March 2014

Accepted 19 March 2014

Available online 24 March 2014

Communicated by J. Torán

### Keywords:

Design of algorithms

Fixed-parameter tractable

Kernel

Load coloring

## ABSTRACT

One way to state the Load Coloring Problem (LCP) is as follows. Let  $G = (V, E)$  be graph and let  $f : V \rightarrow \{\text{red}, \text{blue}\}$  be a 2-coloring. An edge  $e \in E$  is called red (blue) if both end-vertices of  $e$  are red (blue). For a 2-coloring  $f$ , let  $r'_f$  and  $b'_f$  be the number of red and blue edges and let  $\mu_f(G) = \min\{r'_f, b'_f\}$ . Let  $\mu(G)$  be the maximum of  $\mu_f(G)$  over all 2-colorings.

We introduce the parameterized problem  $k$ -LCP of deciding whether  $\mu(G) \geq k$ , where  $k$  is the parameter. We prove that this problem admits a kernel with at most  $7k$ . Ahuja et al. (2007) proved that one can find an optimal 2-coloring on trees in polynomial time. We generalize this by showing that an optimal 2-coloring on graphs with tree decomposition of width  $t$  can be found in time  $O^*(2^t)$ . We also show that either  $G$  is a Yes-instance of  $k$ -LCP or the treewidth of  $G$  is at most  $2k$ . Thus,  $k$ -LCP can be solved in time  $O^*(4^k)$ .

© 2014 Elsevier B.V. All rights reserved.

## 1. Introduction

For a graph  $G = (V, E)$  with  $n$  vertices,  $m$  edges and maximum vertex degree  $\Delta$ , the load distribution of a 2-coloring  $f : V \rightarrow \{\text{red}, \text{blue}\}$  is a pair  $(r_f, b_f)$ , where  $r_f$  is the number of edges with at least one end-vertex colored red and  $b_f$  is the number of edges with at least one end-vertex colored blue. We wish to find a coloring  $f$  such that the function  $\lambda_f(G) := \max\{r_f, b_f\}$  is minimized. We will denote this minimum by  $\lambda(G)$  and call this problem LOAD COLORING PROBLEM (LCP). The LCP arises in Wavelength Division Multiplexing, the technology used for constructing optical communication networks [1,9]. Ahuja et al. [1] proved that the problem is NP-hard and gave a polynomial time algorithm for optimal colorings of trees. For graphs  $G$  with genus  $g > 0$ , Ahuja et al. [1] showed that a 2-coloring  $f$  such that  $\lambda_f(G) \leq \lambda(G)(1 + o(1))$  can be computed in  $O(n + g \log n)$ -time, if the maximum degree satisfies  $\Delta = o(\frac{m^2}{ng})$  and an embedding is given.

For a 2-coloring  $f : V \rightarrow \{\text{red}, \text{blue}\}$ , let  $r'_f$  and  $b'_f$  be the number of edges whose end-vertices are both red and blue, respectively (we call such edges *red* and *blue*, respectively). Let  $\mu_f(G) := \min\{r'_f, b'_f\}$  and let  $\mu(G)$  be the maximum of  $\mu_f(G)$  over all 2-colorings of  $V$ . It is not hard to see (and it is proved in Remark 1.1 of [1]) that  $\lambda(G) = m - \mu(G)$  and so the LCP is equivalent to maximizing  $\mu_f(G)$  over all 2-colorings of  $V$ .

In this paper we introduce and study the following parameterization of LCP.

### $k$ -LOAD COLORING PROBLEM ( $k$ -LCP)

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

**Parameter:**  $k$

**Question:** Is  $\mu(G) \geq k$ ? (Equivalently, is  $\lambda(G) \leq m - k$ ?)

We provide basics on parameterized complexity and tree decompositions of graphs in the next section. In Section 3, we show that  $k$ -LCP admits a kernel with at most  $7k$  vertices. Interestingly, to achieve this linear bound, only two simple reduction rules are used. In Section 4, we generalize the result of Ahuja et al. [1] on trees by showing

\* Corresponding author.

E-mail addresses: gutin@cs.rhul.ac.uk (G. Gutin), markj@cs.rhul.ac.uk (M. Jones).

that an optimal 2-coloring for graphs with tree decomposition of width  $t$  can be obtained in time  $2^t n^{O(1)}$ . We also show that either  $G$  is a Yes-instance of  $k$ -LCP or the treewidth of  $G$  is at most  $2k$ . As a result,  $k$ -LCP can be solved in time  $4^k n^{O(1)}$ . We conclude the paper in Section 5 by stating some open problems.

**2. Basics on fixed-parameter tractability, kernelization and tree decompositions**

A *parameterized problem* is a subset  $L \subseteq \Sigma^* \times \mathbb{N}$  over a finite alphabet  $\Sigma$ .  $L$  is *fixed-parameter tractable* if the membership of an instance  $(x, k)$  in  $\Sigma^* \times \mathbb{N}$  can be decided in time  $f(k)|x|^{O(1)}$ , where  $f$  is a function of the parameter  $k$  only. It is customary in parameterized algorithms to often write only the exponential part of  $f(k)$ :  $O^*(t(k)) := O(t(k)(kn)^{O(1)})$ .

Given a parameterized problem  $L$ , a *kernelization* of  $L$  is a polynomial-time algorithm that maps an instance  $(x, k)$  to an instance  $(x', k')$  (the *kernel*) such that (i)  $(x, k) \in L$  if and only if  $(x', k') \in L$ , (ii)  $k' \leq g(k)$ , and (iii)  $|x'| \leq g(k)$  for some function  $g$ . The function  $g(k)$  is called the *size* of the kernel.

It is well-known that a parameterized problem  $L$  is fixed-parameter tractable if and only if it is decidable and admits a kernelization. Due to applications, low degree polynomial size kernels are of main interest. Unfortunately, many fixed-parameter tractable problems do not have kernels of polynomial size unless the polynomial hierarchy collapses to the third level, see, e.g., [2–4]. For further background and terminology on parameterized complexity we refer the reader to the monographs [5,6,8].

**Definition 1.** A *tree decomposition* of a graph  $G = (V, E)$  is a pair  $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{T})$ , where  $\mathcal{T} = (I, F)$  is a tree and  $\mathcal{X} = \{X_i : i \in I\}$  is a collection of subsets of  $V$  called *bags*, such that:

1.  $\bigcup_{i \in I} X_i = V$ ;
2. For every edge  $xy \in E$ , there exists  $i \in I$  such that  $\{x, y\} \subseteq X_i$ ;
3. For every  $x \in V$ , the set  $\{i : x \in X_i\}$  induces a connected subgraph of  $\mathcal{T}$ .

The *width* of  $(\mathcal{T}, \mathcal{X})$  is  $\max_{i \in I} |X_i| - 1$ . The *treewidth* of a graph  $G$  is the minimum width of all tree decompositions of  $G$ .

To distinguish between vertices of  $G$  and  $\mathcal{T}$ , we call vertices of  $\mathcal{T}$  *nodes*. We will often speak of a bag  $X_i$  interchangeably with the node  $i$  to which it corresponds in  $\mathcal{T}$ . Thus, for example, we might say two bags are *neighbors* if they correspond to nodes in  $\mathcal{T}$  which are neighbors. We define the *descendants* of a bag  $X_i$  as follows: every child of  $X_i$  is a descendant of  $X_i$ , and every child of a descendant of  $X_i$  is a descendant of  $X_i$ .

**Definition 2.** A *nice tree decomposition* of a graph  $G = (V, E)$  is a tree decomposition  $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{T})$  such that  $\mathcal{T}$  is a rooted tree, and each node  $i$  falls under one of the following classes:

- **$i$  is a Leaf node:** Then  $i$  has no children;
- **$i$  is an Introduce node:** Then  $i$  has a single child  $j$ , and there exists a vertex  $v \notin X_j$  such that  $X_i = X_j \cup \{v\}$ ;
- **$i$  is a Forget node:** Then  $i$  has a single child  $j$ , and there exists a vertex  $v \in X_j$  such that  $X_i = X_j \setminus \{v\}$ ;
- **$i$  is a Join node:** Then  $i$  has two children  $h$  and  $j$ , and  $X_i = X_h = X_j$ .

It is known that any tree decomposition of a graph can be transformed into a nice tree decomposition of the same width.

**Lemma 1.** (See [7].) *Given a tree decomposition with  $O(n)$  nodes of a graph  $G$  with  $n$  vertices, we can construct, in time  $O(n)$ , a nice tree decomposition of  $G$  of the same width and with at most  $4n$  nodes.*

**3. Linear kernel**

For a vertex  $v$  of a graph  $G = (V, E)$  and set  $X \subseteq V$ , let  $\deg_X(v)$  denote the number of neighbors of  $v$  in  $X$ . If  $X = V$ , we will write  $\deg(v)$  instead of  $\deg_V(v)$ .

**Lemma 2.** *Let  $G = (V, E)$  be a graph with no isolated vertices, with maximum degree  $\Delta \geq 2$  and let  $|V| \geq 5k$ . If  $|V| \geq 4k + \Delta$ , then  $(G, k)$  is a Yes-instance of  $k$ -LCP.*

**Proof.** Suppose that  $|V| \geq 4k + \Delta$ , but  $(G, k)$  is a No-instance of  $k$ -LCP.

Let  $M$  be a maximum matching in  $G$  and let  $Y$  be the set of vertices which are not end-vertices of edges in  $M$ . If  $M$  has at least  $2k$  edges, then we may color half of them blue and half of them red, so we conclude that  $|M| < 2k$ .

For an edge  $e = uv$  in  $M$ , let  $\deg_Y(e) = \deg_Y(u) + \deg_Y(v)$ , that is the number of edges between a vertex in  $Y$  and a vertex of  $e$ .

**Claim.** *For any  $e$  in  $M$ ,  $\deg_Y(e) \leq \max\{\Delta - 1, 2\}$ .*

**Proof of Claim.** Suppose that  $\deg_Y(e) \geq \Delta$  and let  $e = uv$ . As  $u$  and  $v$  are adjacent,  $d_Y(u)$  and  $d_Y(v)$  are each less than  $\Delta$ . But as  $\deg_Y(u) + \deg_Y(v) = \deg_Y(e) \geq \Delta$ , it follows that  $\deg_Y(u) \geq 1$  and  $\deg_Y(v) \geq 1$ . Then either  $u$  and  $v$  have only one neighbor in  $Y$ , which is adjacent to both of them (in which case  $\deg_Y(e) = 2$ ), or there exist vertices  $x \neq y \in Y$  such that  $x$  is adjacent to  $u$  and  $y$  is adjacent to  $v$ . Then  $M$  is not a maximum matching, as  $xuvy$  is an augmenting path, which proves the claim.  $\square$

Now let  $M'$  be a subset of edges of  $M$  such that

$$\sum_{e' \in M'} \deg_Y(e') \geq k - |M'|, \tag{1}$$

and

$$\left[ \sum_{e' \in M'} \deg_Y(e') \right] - \deg_Y(e) < k - |M'|, \quad \text{for any } e \in M'. \tag{2}$$

Download English Version:

<https://daneshyari.com/en/article/427454>

Download Persian Version:

<https://daneshyari.com/article/427454>

[Daneshyari.com](https://daneshyari.com)