Contents lists available at [ScienceDirect](http://www.elsevier.com/locate/dam)

## Discrete Applied Mathematics

journal homepage: [www.elsevier.com/locate/dam](http://www.elsevier.com/locate/dam)

# Counting independent sets in tree convex bipartite graphs

### Min-Sheng Lin[∗](#page-0-0) , Chien-Min Chen

*Department of Electrical Engineering, National Taipei University of Technology, Taipei 106, Taiwan*

#### a r t i c l e i n f o

*Article history:* Received 18 March 2016 Received in revised form 26 July 2016 Accepted 26 August 2016 Available online 1 December 2016

*Keywords:* Tree convex bipartite graphs Independent sets Maximal independent sets Independent perfect dominating sets Counting problem

#### a b s t r a c t

The problems of counting independent sets, maximal independent sets, and independent perfect dominating sets are #P-complete for bipartite graphs, but can be solved in polynomial time for convex bipartite graphs, which are a subclass of bipartite graphs This paper studies these problems for tree convex bipartite graphs, which are a class of graphs between bipartite graphs and convex bipartite graphs. A bipartite graph *G* with bipartition (*X Y*) is called tree convex, if a tree *T* defined on *X* exists, such that for every vertex *y* in *Y*, the neighbors of *y* form a subtree of *T* If the associated tree *T* is simply a path, then *G* is just a convex bipartite graph. This paper first proves that the problems of counting independent sets, maximal independent sets, and independent perfect dominating sets remain #P-complete for tree convex bipartite graphs even when the associated tree *T* is only a comb or a star. This paper then presents polynomial-time algorithms to solve these problems for tree convex bipartite graphs when the associated tree *T* is restricted to a triad, which consists of three paths with one common endpoint.

© 2016 Elsevier B.V. All rights reserved.

#### **1. Introduction**

Let  $G = (V, E)$  be a graph with set of vertices *V* and set of edges *E*. An *independent set* (IS) in *G* is a subset *D* of *V* such that no two vertices of *D* are mutually adjacent. The *maximal independent set* (MIS) is an IS that is not a subset of any other IS. A *dominating set* in *G* is a subset *D* of *V* such that every vertex that is not in *D* is adjacent to at least one vertex in *D*. An *independent dominating set* in *G* is a set of vertices of *G* that is both independent and dominating in *G*. Since every dominating set that is independent must be maximal independent, independent dominating sets are identically MISs. An independent dominating set *D* is an *independent perfect dominating set* (IPDS) if every vertex that is not in *D* is adjacent to exactly one vertex in *D*. Let *IS*(*G*), *MIS*(*G*), and *IPDS*(*G*) be the sets of all ISs, MISs, and IPDSs in *G*, respectively. Then, the inclusions *IPDS*(*G*)  $\subset$  *MIS*(*G*)  $\subset$  *IS*(*G*) hold by definitions.

This paper investigates the problems of computing the numbers of ISs, MISs, and IPDSs in a graph, denoted as #IS, #MIS, and #IPDS, respectively. Provan and Ball [\[10\]](#page--1-0) verified that the problem #IS is #P-complete for general graphs and even for bipartite graphs. Valiant [\[13\]](#page--1-1) defined the class of #P problems as those that involve counting access computations for problems in NP, and the class of #P-complete problems includes the hardest problems in #P. As is well known, all exact algorithms for solving #P-complete problems have exponential time complexity, so efficient exact algorithms for solving this class of problems are unlikely to exist. However, this complexity can be reduced by considering only a restricted subclass of #P-complete problems.

The complexities of the problems #IS, #MIS, and #IPDS have been extensively studied on various graphs such as bipartite graphs [\[10\]](#page--1-0), interval graphs [\[7\]](#page--1-2), chordal graphs [\[9\]](#page--1-3), and tolerance graphs [\[8\]](#page--1-4), and these complexities are presented in [Fig. 1.](#page-1-0)

<http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.dam.2016.08.017> 0166-218X/© 2016 Elsevier B.V. All rights reserved.







<span id="page-0-0"></span><sup>∗</sup> Corresponding author. *E-mail address:* [mslin@ee.ntut.edu.tw](mailto:mslin@ee.ntut.edu.tw) (M.-S. Lin).

<span id="page-1-0"></span>

<span id="page-1-2"></span>**Fig. 1.** Inclusion relations between some graph classes. A → B means that class A contains class B. Label at right of box that corresponds to each class indicates complexity of problems #IS (top), #MIS (middle), and #IPDS (bottom). #P-c and P denote #P-complete and polynomial-time, respectively. Symbol \* indicates a main contribution of this paper.



**Fig. 2.** Example of [Constructions 1](#page-1-1) and [2.](#page--1-5)

This paper concerns the class of *tree convex bipartite* graphs [\[5,](#page--1-6)[11](#page--1-7)[,6](#page--1-8)[,2\]](#page--1-9), which lies between bipartite graphs and convex bipartite graphs [\[3\]](#page--1-10). A bipartite graph  $G = (X, Y, E)$  is called *tree convex* if there exists a tree  $T = (X, F)$  such that, for each *y* in *Y*, the neighbors of *y* induce a subtree in *T* . When *T* is a star or a comb, *G* is called *star convex bipartite* or *comb convex bipartite*, respectively. A *comb graph* is a graph that is obtained by attaching a pendant leaf (tooth) to each vertex of a path (backbone). When *T* is a *triad tree*, which consists of three paths with a common end, *G* is called *triad convex bipartite*. When *T* is a path, *G* is called path convex bipartite or just *convex bipartite*.

This paper shows that the problems #IS, #MIS, and #IPDS are #P-complete even for star convex bipartite graphs and comb convex bipartite graphs, but all of these problems can be solved in polynomial time for triad convex bipartite graphs with given a triad tree.

#### **2. Hardness results**

This section proves that the problems #IS, #MIS, and #IPDS for comb convex bipartite graphs and star convex bipartite graphs are #P-complete, immediately implying that all such problems for tree convex bipartite graphs are #P-complete. Before proceeding, some notation must be introduced. For a graph  $G = (V, E)$ , let  $N_G(v) = \{u \in V | (u, v) \in E\}$  represent the neighborhood of a vertex v in *G* and  $N_G[v] = \{v\} \cup N_G(v)$  represent the closed neighborhood of a vertex v in *G*. For  $v \in V$ and *V* <sup>∗</sup> ⊆ *V*, let *G* − v represent the subgraph of *G* that is induced by the vertices of *V* \ {v} and let *G* − *V* ∗ represent the subgraph of *G* that is induced by the vertices of  $V \setminus V^*$ .

#### *2.1. Comb convex bipartite graphs*

<span id="page-1-3"></span>**Theorem 1.** *The problem #IS for comb convex bipartite graphs is #P-complete.*

**Proof.** The reduction is performed from the problem of counting the ISs in a bipartite graph, which has been proven to be #P-complete in [\[10\]](#page--1-0).

<span id="page-1-1"></span>**Construction 1.** Let  $G = (X, Y, E)$  be a bipartite graph with  $X = \{x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_n\}$  and  $Y = \{y_1, y_2, \ldots, y_m\}$ . A bipartite graph  $G_1 = (X \cup Z, Y, E \cup E')$  is constructed from G, with  $Z = \{z_1, z_2, \ldots, z_n\}$  and  $E' = \{(z, y) | z \in Z, y \in Y\}$ . This construction is similar to the so-called *canonical transformation* [\[2\]](#page--1-9). [Fig. 2](#page-1-2) shows an example of [Construction 1.](#page-1-1)

<span id="page-1-4"></span>The proof of [Theorem 1](#page-1-3) can be split into proofs of [Claims 1.1](#page-1-4) and [1.2.](#page--1-11)

**Claim 1.1.** *G*<sup>1</sup> *is a comb convex bipartite graph.*

Download English Version:

# <https://daneshyari.com/en/article/4949825>

Download Persian Version:

<https://daneshyari.com/article/4949825>

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