

The Generalized Independent and Dominating Set Problems on Unit Disk Graphs

Sangram K. Jena · Ramesh K. Jallu · Gautam K. Das ·
Subhas C. Nandy

Received: date / Accepted: date

Abstract In this article, we study a generalized version of the maximum independent set and minimum dominating set problems, namely, the maximum d -distance independent set problem and the minimum d -distance dominating set problem on unit disk graphs for a positive integer $d > 0$. We first show that the maximum d -distance independent set problem and the minimum d -distance dominating set problem belongs to NP-hard class. Next, we propose a simple polynomial-time constant-factor approximation algorithms and PTAS for both the problems.

Keywords Independent set · Dominating set · Approximation algorithm · Approximation scheme

1 Introduction

The *independent set problem* is one of the well known classical combinatorial optimization problems in graph theory due to its many important applications, including but not limited to networks, map labeling, computer vision, coding theory, scheduling, clustering. Like *independent set problem*, *dominating set problem* is also an important well studied combinatorial optimization problem in graph theory. The dominating set problem has a wide range of applications including wireless networking, facility location problems etc.

Given an unweighted graph $G = (V, E)$, a non-empty subset of pairwise non-adjacent vertices of G is known as an *independent set* of G . The maximum independent set problem asks to find an independent set of maximum size in a given unweighted graph G , and such a set is called as *maximum independent set* (MIS) of G . For an integer $d \geq 2$, a *distance- d independent set* (DdIS) of an unweighted graph $G = (V, E)$ is an independent set I of G such that the shortest path distance (i.e., the number of edges on a shortest path) between every pair of vertices in I is at least d . For a given unweighted graph G , the objective

Preliminary version of this paper appeared in FAW, 2018

Ramesh K. Jallu was supported by the Czech Science Foundation, grant number GJ19-06792Y, and by institutional support RVO:67985807

Sangram K. Jena
Department of Mathematics
Indian Institute of Technology Guwahati
E-mail: sangram@iitg.ac.in

Ramesh K. Jallu
The Czech Academy of Sciences, Institute of Computer Science
E-mail: jallu@cs.cas.cz

Gautam K. Das
Department of Mathematics
Indian Institute of Technology Guwahati
E-mail: gkd@iitg.ac.in

Subhas C. Nandy
Indian Statistical Institute, Kolkata
E-mail: nandysc@isical.ac.in

of the maximum distance- d independent set problem is to find a DdIS of maximum cardinality in G . A DdIS of maximum possible size is called as *maximum distance- d independent set* (MDdIS). Observe that the DdIS problem is a generalization of the MIS problem and in fact for $d = 2$, the DdIS problem and MIS problem are the same.

In a simple unweighted graph $G = (V, E)$, dominating set is defined as a set of vertices $V' \subseteq V$ such that for each vertex $u \in V$, either (i) $u \in V'$, or (ii) there exist $v \in V'$ such that v is a neighbor of u . The dominating set of minimum cardinality in a graph G is called the minimum dominating set (MDS) of G . The objective of MDS problem is to find a dominating set of minimum cardinality in G . We define a generalized version of MDS problem as distance- d dominating set (DdDS) problem. A DdDS for an integer $d \geq 1$ in a simple unweighted graph $G = (V, E)$ is defined as a set of vertices $V' \subseteq V$ such that, for each vertex $u \in V$, either (i) $u \in V'$, or (ii) $v \in V'$ such that, the shortest path distance between u and v is at most d . The objective of the *minimum distance- d dominating set* (MDdDS) problem is to find a DdDS of minimum cardinality in a given graph G .

Given a set $P = \{p_1, p_2, \dots, p_n\}$ of n points in the plane, a *unit disk graph* (UDG) corresponding to the point set P is a simple graph $G = (V, E)$ such that $V = P$, and $E = \{(p_i, p_j) \mid d(p_i, p_j) \leq 1\}$, where $d(p_i, p_j)$ denotes the Euclidean distance between p_i and p_j . In other words, a unit disk graph is an intersection graph of disks of unit diameter centered at the points in P .

An algorithm for a minimization (resp. maximization) problem is said to be a ρ -factor approximation algorithm if for every instance of the problem the algorithm produces a feasible solution whose value is within a factor of ρ (resp. at least a factor of $\frac{1}{\rho}$) of the optimal solution value and runs in polynomial-time of the input size. Here, ρ is called the *approximation factor* or *approximation ratio* of the algorithm and the optimization problem is said to have a ρ -factor approximation algorithm. A *polynomial-time approximation scheme* (PTAS) for an optimization problem is a collection of algorithms $\{\mathcal{A}_\epsilon\}$ such that for a given $\epsilon > 0$, \mathcal{A}_ϵ is a $(1 + \epsilon)$ -factor approximation algorithm in case of minimization problem ($(1 - \epsilon)$ in case of maximization). The running time of \mathcal{A}_ϵ is required to be polynomial in the size of the problem depending on ϵ .

2 Related work

The MIS problem is known to be NP-hard for general graphs [19] including many sub-class of planar graphs, namely planar graphs of maximum degree 3 [18], planar graphs of large girth [36], cubic planar graphs [20], triangle-free graphs [40], $K_{1,4}$ -free graphs [34], etc.

Tarjan and Trojanowski [43] presented a naive algorithm for finding maximum independent set in a graph having n -vertices in $O(2^{\frac{n}{3}})$ time. Later Robson [42] improved the complexity to $O(2^{0.276n})$. Xiao and Nagamochi [44] gave a better bound for finding the maximum independent set problem in $1.1996^n n^{O(1)}$ time and in polynomial space. For the graphs with maximum degree 6 and 7, they gave algorithms to find MIS, which run in $1.1893^n n^{O(1)}$ time and $1.1970^n n^{O(1)}$ time, respectively. Johnson et al. [30] presented an algorithm, which produces lexicographic ordering of all maximal independent sets of a graph having polynomial delay between two successive independent sets with exponential space complexity. In that paper, they also proved that there is no such polynomial-delay algorithm exists for generating all maximal independent sets in reverse lexicographic order, unless $P=NP$.

Andrade [2] gave the first local search algorithm for finding independent set of a graph. Later the problem studied on pseudo-disks in the plane by Chan and Har-Peled [7]. They analysed the problem for both weighted and unweighted cases and gave a PTAS via local-search algorithm for unweighted case and for weighted case, they gave a constant-factor approximation by an LP based rounding scheme.

In general, the MIS problem cannot be approximated within a constant factor unless $P=NP$ [3]. However, the problem is polynomially solvable for bipartite graphs, outerplanar graphs, perfect graphs, claw-free graphs, chordal graphs, etc. [21, 26]. The MIS problem is well studied on UDGs too and is shown to be NP-hard [9]. Unlike in general graphs, the problem admits approximation algorithms [31, 23, 33, 11, 28, 37] and approximation schemes [13, 39, 11, 28].

The distance- d independent set (DdIS) problem, for any fixed $d \geq 3$, is known to be NP-hard for bipartite graphs [8] and planar bipartite graphs of maximum degree 3 [14]. It is also known that getting an $n^{\frac{1}{2}-\epsilon}$ -factor approximation result, for any $\epsilon > 0$, on bipartite graphs is NP-hard (this result also holds for chordal graphs when $d \geq 3$ is an odd number) [14]. The problem is polynomially solvable for some intersection graphs, such as interval graphs, trapezoid graphs, and circular arc graphs [1]. If the input graph

is restricted to be a chordal graph, then the problem is solvable in polynomial time for any even $d \geq 2$; on the other hand, the problem is NP-hard for any odd $d \geq 3$ [14]. Eto et al. [15] studied the problem on r -regular graphs and planar graphs. The authors showed that for $d \geq 3$ and $r \geq 3$, the DdIS problem on r -regular graphs is APX-hard, and proposed $O(r^{d-1})$ and $O(\frac{r^{d-2}}{d})$ -factor approximation algorithms. When $d = r = 3$, they enhanced their $O(\frac{r^{d-2}}{d})$ -factor result to a 2-factor approximation result (later, the approximation factor is improved to 1.875 [16]). Finally, they proposed a PTAS in case of planar graphs. Montealegre and Todinca studied the problem in graphs with few minimal separators [35].

The minimum dominating set (MDS) problem is known to be NP-hard [19]. Raz and Safra [41] proved the inapproximability for the MDS problem by showing that there does not exist any approximation algorithm better than $O(n \log n)$ -factor approximation algorithm unless $P=NP$. Due to lack of scope in better approximation result in general graphs, researchers tried geometric version of MDS problem to get better approximation factor.

The MDS problem is studied on UDG and proved to be NP-hard [9]. Nieberg and Hurink [38] proved that the problem admits a $(1 + \epsilon)$ -factor approximation algorithm for $0 < \epsilon \leq 1$. By assigning $\epsilon = 1$, a 2-approximation algorithm can be obtained, which is fastest. The running time of this algorithm is $O(n^{81})$ [12]. Gibson and Pirwani [22] gave a PTAS for MDS problem of arbitrary size disk graph, which runs in $n^{O(\frac{1}{\epsilon^2})}$ time.

For the MDS problem in unit disk graphs, a 5-factor approximation algorithm is proposed by Marathe et al. [32] in $O(n^2)$ time. Carmi et al. [6] proposed a 5-factor approximation algorithm for the MDS problem in arbitrary size disk graph. Fonseca et al. [17] improved the factor to $\frac{44}{9}$ for MDS problem in unit disk graph by using the local improvement technique, which runs in $O(n \log n)$ time. De et al. [12] proposed a 12-factor approximation algorithm for the MDS problem in unit disk graph with running time $O(n \log n)$. In the same paper, they improvised the approximation factors to 4-factor, and 3-factor in time $O(n^8 \log n)$, and $O(n^{15} \log n)$ respectively. Carmi et al. [5] improved the time complexity of 4-factor approximation algorithm to $O(n^6 \log n)$. They also proposed a simple 5-factor approximation algorithm in $O(n \log k)$ time for this problem, where k is the size of the output. In the same paper, they also proposed $\frac{14}{3}$ -factor, 3-factor and $\frac{45}{13}$ -factor approximation algorithm for MDS problem in unit disk graphs with time complexity $O(n^5 \log n)$, $O(n^{11} \log n)$ and $O(n^{10} \log n)$ respectively. Finally, with the help of shifting lemma, they proposed a $\frac{5}{2}$ -factor approximation algorithm in $O(n^{20} \log n)$ time.

2.1 Our work

In this paper, we study the distance- d independent set (DdIS) problem and distance- d dominating set (DdDS) problem on unit disk graphs, where position of the disk centers are known. We call the geometric version of DdIS problem as *geometric distance- d independent set* (GDdIS) problem and DdDS problem as *the geometric distance- d dominating set* (GDdDS) problem. We show that the decision version of the GDdIS problem (for $d \geq 3$) is NP-complete on unit disk graphs (refer to Section 3). We proposed a simple 4-factor approximation algorithm for GDdIS problem in Section 4, and a PTAS for this problem in Section 5. We also show that the decision version of the GDdDS problem (for $d \geq 2$) is NP-complete on unit disk graphs (refer to Section 6). We proposed a simple 4-factor approximation algorithm for GDdDS problem in Section 7, and a PTAS for GDdDS problem in Section 8. Finally, we conclude the paper in Section 9.

3 The GDdIS Problem on Unit Disk Graphs

For an integer $d \geq 3$, we define the GDdIS problem as follows:

Given an unweighted unit disk graph $G = (V, E)$ corresponding to a point set $P = \{p_1, p_2, \dots, p_n\}$ in the plane, find a maximum cardinality subset $I \subseteq V$, such that for every pair of vertices $p_i, p_j \in I$ the length (number of edges) of the shortest path between p_i and p_j in G is at least d .

For a fixed constant $d \geq 3$, the decision version D(GDdIS) of the GDdIS problem is defined as follows:

Input. An unweighted unit disk graph $G = (V, E)$ defined on a point set P and a positive integer $k \leq |V|$.

Question. Does there exist a distance- d independent set of size at least k in G ?

Lemma 1 *The problem belongs to class NP due to following reason.*

Proof Given any subset $V' \subseteq V$, we can verify whether each pair of vertices in V' is d -distance independent or not in polynomial time using Floyd-Warshall's all-pair shortest path algorithm [10].

Now, we show that the D(GDdIS) ($d \geq 3$) problem belongs to NP-hard class by polynomial time reduction of D(GDdIS) from *distance- d independent set problem* ($d \geq 3$) on *planar bipartite graphs with girth¹ at least d and maximum degree 3*, which is known to be NP-hard.

DECISION VERSION OF DdIS PROBLEM ON PLANAR BIPARTITE GRAPHS

Input. An unweighted planar bipartite graph $G = (V, E)$ with girth at least d and maximum vertex degree 3, and a positive integer $k \leq |V|$.

Question. Does there exist a distance- d independent set of size at least k in G ?

In [14], it has been shown that the distance- d independent set problem on planar bipartite graphs with maximum degree 3 is NP-hard using polynomial time reduction of it from the distance-2 independent set problem on planar cubic graphs, which is known to be NP-hard [29]. In fact, the reduced graph in their reduction has girth at least d and hence the distance- d independent set problem on planar bipartite graphs with maximum degree 3 and girth at least d is NP-hard.

Our reduction is based on the concept of planar embedding of planar graphs. The following lemma is very useful in our reduction.

Lemma 2 [9] *A planar graph $G = (V, E)$ with maximum degree 4 can be embedded in the plane using $O(|V|^2)$ area in such a way that its vertices are at integer coordinates and its edges are drawn using axis-parallel line segments at integer coordinates (i.e., edges lie on the lines $x = i_1, i_2, \dots$ and/or $y = j_1, j_2, \dots$, where $i_1, i_2, \dots, j_1, j_2, \dots$ are integers).*

Corollary 1 *Let $G = (V, E)$ be a planar bipartite graph with maximum degree 3 and girth at least d ($d \geq 3$). G can be embedded on a grid in the plane, whose each grid cell is of size $d \times d$, so that its vertices lie at points of the form $(i * d, j * d)$ and its edges are drawn using a sequence of consecutive line segments drawn on the vertical lines of the form $x = i * d$ and/or horizontal lines of the form $y = j * d$, for some integers i and j (see Figure. 1).*

Proof Lemma 2 suggests that, any planar graph G of maximum degree 4 can be embedded on a grid in the plane so that;

1. Each vertex v_i of G is associated with a point with integer coordinates in the plane.
2. An edge of G is represented as a sequence of alternating horizontal and/or vertical line segments drawn on the grid lines. For example, see edges (v_1, v_4) or (v_2, v_6) in Figure. 1(a). The edge (v_1, v_4) is drawn as a sequence of four vertical line segments and four horizontal line segments in the embedding (see (x_1, x_4) in Figure. 1(b)). Similarly, the edge (v_2, v_6) is drawn as a sequence of two vertical line segments in the embedding.
3. No two sets of consecutive line segments correspond to two distinct edges of G have a common point unless the edges incident at a vertex in G .

This kind of embedding is known as *orthogonal drawing* of a graph. Biedl and Kant [4] gave a linear time algorithm that produces an orthogonal drawing of a given graph with the property that the number of bends along each edge is at most 2.

Let $G = (V, E)$ be an arbitrary instance of DdIS for planar bipartite graph having maximum degree three and girth at least d . Let $V = \{v_1, v_2, \dots, v_n\}$ and $E = \{e_1, e_2, \dots, e_m\}$. We denote the shortest path distance between two vertices v_i and v_j in G by $d_G(v_i, v_j)$ and v_i, v_j are said to be distance- d independent in G if and only if $d_G(v_i, v_j) \geq d$.

We construct a graph $G' = (V', E')$ by embedding G on a grid in which each cell is of size $d \times d$ as described in Corollary 1. Let $V' = \{x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n\}$ be the vertices in G' corresponding to v_1, v_2, \dots, v_n in G . The coordinate of each member in V' is of the form $(d.i, d.j)$, where i, j are integers, and shown using big dots in Figure. 2(c). Let ℓ be the number of line segments used for drawing all the edges in G' . To make G' a UDG we introduce a set Y of extra points on the segments used to draw the edges

¹ the length of a smallest cycle in the graph




Fig. 1 (a) A planar bipartite graph G of maximum degree 3, (b) its embedding G' on a grid of cell size 3×3 , (c) adding of extra points to G' , (d) the obtained UDG G'' .

of G' . Thus, the set of points in V' (hereafter denoted by X) together with Y form a UDG G'' . Let (x_i, x_j) be an edge in G' corresponding to the edge (v_i, v_j) in G and has ℓ' grid segments. We introduce $\ell'd$ points on the polyline denoting the edge (x_i, x_j) in such a way that (i) after adding the extra points, the length of the path from x_i to x_j is exactly $\ell'd + 1$, (ii) a point is placed at each of the co-ordinates

of the form $(d \cdot i, d \cdot j)$, where i and j are integers (shown using small squares in Figure. 2(c)), (iii) the segment adjacent to the point x_i or x_j contains exactly d newly added points and other segments on the path from x_i to x_j have $d-1$ points (shown using small circles in Figure. 2(c)), and (iv) only consecutive points on the path $x_i \rightsquigarrow x_j$ are within unit distance apart.

Now, we construct a UDG $G'' = (V'', E'')$, where $V'' = X \cup Y$, and $E'' = \{(p_i, p_j) \mid p_i, p_j \in V'' \text{ and } d(p_i, p_j) \leq 1\}$. Here $|V''| = |X| + |Y| = n + \ell d$, and $|E''| = \ell d + m$, where m is the number of edges in G . Thus, G'' can be constructed in polynomial time. We will use the term d -grid for a grid whose each cell is of size $d \times d$.

The notion of points and vertices of G'' are used interchangeably in the rest of the paper. Unless otherwise specified, the term distance refers to graph-distance.

Lemma 3 *Any DdIS of G'' contains at most ℓ points from Y .*

Proof For each segment in the d -grid used to draw G' , the number of points of Y appearing on it is d or $d-1$. Thus, each segment may contain at most one point from Y in the DdIS of G'' . In particular, if two end-points of a segment η of the d -grid (that are vertices of G'') are chosen in DdIS, then no point of Y lying on η will be chosen. Now, the result follows from the fact that ℓ many segments of the d -grid are used to draw G' .

Lemma 4 *G has a DdIS of cardinality at least k if and only if G'' has a DdIS of cardinality at least $k + \ell$.*

Proof (Necessity) Let G have a DdIS D of size at least k . Let $X' = \{x_i \in X \mid v_i \in D\}$. Let $G_{i,\alpha}$ denote a spanning tree of G with the set of vertices $V_{i,\alpha} = \{v_j \in V(G) \mid d_G(v_i, v_j) \leq \alpha\}$. For each $v_i \in D$ start traversing from x_i in G'' . Let $Y_i = \{y_\theta \in Y \mid d_{G''}(x_i, y_\theta) = d \cdot \theta, \forall \theta = 1, 2, \dots, \ell'\}$, where ℓ' is the number of segments between x_i and x_j , where x_j corresponds to $v_j \in V_{i, \lfloor \frac{d}{2} \rfloor}$. Let $Y' = \bigcup_{x_i \in X'} Y_i$. The set $X' \cup Y'$ is a DdIS in G'' . Observe that there are some segments (corresponding to the edges which are not part of any $G_{i, \lfloor \frac{d}{2} \rfloor}$) that have not been traversed in the above process. Now, we consider every such segment and choose the $\lceil \frac{d}{2} \rceil$ -th point on it. Let Y'' be the set of chosen points. Needless to say, Y'' is also a DdIS of G'' .

By the way, we obtained the sets Y' and Y'' , there exists no pair of points $y_\alpha \in Y'$ and $y_\beta \in Y''$ such that $d_{G''}(y_\alpha, y_\beta) < d$. On the contrary, suppose $d_{G''}(y_\alpha, y_\beta) < d$. Implies, y_α and y_β are from two segments, each having one, incident at some $x_j \in X \setminus X'$, where x_j corresponds to a leaf $v_j \in G_{i, \lfloor \frac{d}{2} \rfloor}$. Note that $d_{G''}(y_\alpha, x_j) \geq \lfloor \frac{d}{2} \rfloor$ and $d_{G''}(x_j, y_\beta) \geq \lceil \frac{d}{2} \rceil$. Implies, $d_{G''}(y_\alpha, y_\beta) \geq d$, arrived at a contradiction. Let $D' = X' \cup Y' \cup Y''$. As per our selection method each segment contributes one point in $Y' \cup Y''$. Thus, $|D'| \geq k + \ell$ since $|X'| \geq k$ and $|Y' \cup Y''| = \ell$.

(Sufficiency) Let G'' have a DdIS D' of cardinality at least $k + \ell$ and $D = \{v_i \in V \mid x_i \in D' \cap X\}$. Observe that $|D' \cap Y| \leq \ell$ (due to Lemma 3); so $|D| \geq k$. We shall show that, by suitably modifying D (i.e., by removing or changing some of the vertices in D), we get at least k points from X such that the set of corresponding vertices in G is a DdIS of G . Consider a pair of vertices $v_i, v_j \in D$ such that $d_G(v_i, v_j) = d' < d$ in G (if there is no such pair, then D is a DdIS of G with $|D| \geq k$). Let $x_i, x_j \in D' \cap X$ be the vertices in G'' corresponding to $v_i, v_j \in D$, respectively. Also, let $\hat{\ell}$ be the number of segments on the path $x_i \rightsquigarrow x_j$ corresponding to the shortest path $v_i \rightsquigarrow v_j$. As each segment can contribute at most one point (from Y) in any solution, D' can contain at most $\hat{\ell} + 1$ points (including x_i and x_j) from the path $x_i \rightsquigarrow x_j$.

As per our construction of G'' , the distance between x_i and x_j is $\hat{\ell} \cdot d + 1$ in G'' . We update the solution along the path $x_i \rightsquigarrow x_j$ as follows: delete x_j and other points of the path from D' . Start traversing the path from x_i and add every $(d \cdot \theta)$ -th point to D' , where $1 \leq \theta \leq \hat{\ell}$. The last point chosen is the point which is d' distance away from x_j . The number of points in D' on the path $x_i \rightsquigarrow x_j$ is $\hat{\ell} + 1$. Thus, D' a new feasible solution in G'' whose size is at least as that of the previous solution. Observe that, the points in D' that are on the segments outside the path $x_i \rightsquigarrow x_j$ will not be effected by the newly chosen points, and $|D'| \geq k + \ell$.

We repeat the same for all pair of points in D for which the shortest path distance in G is less than d . Therefore, $|D| \geq k$ (from Lemma 3) and D is a distance- d independent set in G .

Theorem 1 *GDdIS problem is NP-complete for unit disk graphs.*

Proof Follows from Lemma 11 and Lemma 13.




Fig. 2 A horizontal and vertical partition of the strips of width d

4 Approximation Algorithm

In this section, we discuss a simple 4-factor approximation algorithm for the GDdIS problem, for a fixed constant $d \geq 3$. Let \mathcal{R} be the rectangular region containing the point set P (disk centers). From now on we deal with the point set P rather than the UDG G defined on P . We partition \mathcal{R} into disjoint horizontal strips H_1, H_2, \dots, H_ν , each of width d (H_ν may be of width less than d). The basic idea behind our algorithm is as follows:

- (i) Compute a feasible solution for each non-empty strip H_i ($1 \leq i \leq \nu$) independently as stated below:
We split the horizontal strip into squares of size $d \times d$. In each square, we compute an optimum solution of the GDdIS problem defined by the points set inside that square. We consider all odd numbered squares and compute the union S_{odd}^i of optimum solutions of these squares. Similarly, the union S_{even}^i of optimum solutions of all even numbered squares are also computed. Each of these is a feasible solution of GDdIS problem in H_i as the minimum distance between each pair of considered squares is at least d . We choose $S^i = S_{even}^i$ or S_{odd}^i such that $|S^i| = \max(|S_{even}^i|, |S_{odd}^i|)$ as the desired feasible solution for the strip H_i .
- (ii) Compute S_{even} and S_{odd} , which are the union of the solutions of even and odd strips respectively, and
- (iii) Report $S^* = S_{even}$ or S_{odd} such that $|S^*| = \max(|S_{even}|, |S_{odd}|)$ as a solution to the GDdIS problem.

Note that, thus, the solution obtained in the above process is a feasible solution for the entire problem.

Lemma 5 *If OPT is an optimum solution for the GDdIS problem, then $\max(|S_{even}|, |S_{odd}|) \geq \frac{1}{4}|OPT|$.*

Proof Let us denote by OPT^i an optimum solution of the non-empty strip H_i . Since any two even (resp. odd) numbered strips, say H_i and H_j , are at least d distance apart, the feasible solutions computed in any method for H_i and H_j are independent². Thus, both $OPT_{even} = \bigcup_{i \text{ is even}} OPT^i$ and $OPT_{odd} = \bigcup_{i \text{ is odd}} OPT^i$ are feasible solutions for the given GDdIS problem.

² by independent we mean for any $p_i \in H_i \cap P$ and $p_j \in H_j \cap P$, p_i and p_j are distance- d independent and also, $OPT^i \cap OPT^j = \emptyset$

Note that $|OPT| \leq |OPT_{even}| + |OPT_{odd}| \leq 2|OPT_*|$, where $OPT_* = OPT_{even}$ if $|OPT_{even}| > |OPT_{odd}|$; otherwise $OPT_* = OPT_{odd}$.

Also, note that we have not computed OPT^i for the strip H_i . Instead, we have computed S_{even}^i and S_{odd}^i by splitting the strip H_i into $d \times d$ squares, and accumulating the optimum solutions of even and odd numbered squares separately. By the same argument as stated above, we have $|OPT^i| \leq 2|S^{i*}|$, where $S^{i*} = S_{even}^i$ if $|S_{even}^i| \geq |S_{odd}^i|$; otherwise $S^{i*} = S_{odd}^i$.

Combining both the inequalities, we have $|OPT| \leq 4 \max(|S_{even}|, |S_{odd}|)$.

4.1 Solving a $d \times d$ square optimally

Let $\mathcal{Q} \subseteq P$ be the set of points inside a $d \times d$ square χ , and G_χ be the UDG defined on \mathcal{Q} . Let C_1, C_2, \dots, C_l be the connected components of G_χ . Without loss of generality we assume that any two components in G_χ are at least d distance apart³ in G .

Lemma 6 *The worst case number of different connected components in G_χ is $O(d^2)$.*

Proof Partition χ into $O(d^2)$ cells, each of size $\frac{\sqrt{3}}{2} \times \frac{1}{2}$. The result follows from the fact that the points lying inside each cell are mutually connected.

In order to have the worst case size of a DdIS in G_χ , we need to have an idea about the worst case size of a DdIS in a connected component in G_χ .

Lemma 7 *Let C be any component of G_χ . The number of mutually distance- d independent points in C is bounded by $O(d)$.*

Proof Consider the square region χ' of size $3d \times 3d$ whose each side is d distance away from the corresponding side of χ . Let $\mathcal{Q}' \subseteq P$ be the subset of points in χ' . Partition χ' into cells of size $\frac{1}{2\sqrt{2}} \times \frac{1}{2\sqrt{2}}$. Thus, the number of cells in χ' is $O(d^2)$, and in each cell the unit disks centered at the points inside that cell are mutually connected. Let a pair of points $p_i, p_j \in C$ which are distance- d independent. The shortest path $p_i \rightsquigarrow p_j$ between p_i and p_j entirely lies inside χ' . If there is another point $p_k \in C$ which is distance- d independent with both p_i and p_j , then p_k is at least distance $\frac{d}{2}$ away from each point on the path $p_i \rightsquigarrow p_j$. Thus, the path from p_k to any point on the path $p_i \rightsquigarrow p_j$ occupies at least $O(d)$ cells, and none of the points from these cells are distance- d independent to all the points p_i, p_j, p_k . Thus, the addition of each point in the set of mutually distance- d independent points in χ prohibits points in $O(d)$ cells to belong in that set, and hence the lemma follows.

Lemma 8 *An optimal (i.e., maximum size) DdIS in χ can be computed in $d^2 n^{O(d)}$ time.*

Proof We first construct a weighted complete graph $G' = (V', E')$ where V' corresponds to the points in \mathcal{Q}' . For each edge $(v_i, v_j) \in E'$, the weight $w(v_i, v_j) = 1$ if $d(p_i, p_j) \leq 1$; otherwise $w(v_i, v_j) = \infty$. Next, we compute the all pair shortest paths between every pair of vertices in G' , and store them in a matrix M .

By definition, intersection of distance- d independent sets of any two components is empty. Thus, a DdIS of maximum size in G_χ can be computed by considering all components of the UDG G_χ , and computing the union of the DdIS of maximum sizes of those components. We consider each component of G_χ separately. For each component C , we consider all possible tuples of size at most $O(d)$ (due to Lemma 7) and for each tuple, we check whether they form a DdIS or not by consulting the matrix M in $O(d^2)$ time. Thus, a maximum size DdIS in C can be computed in $O(d^2 |C|^{O(d)})$ time and the total time for computing a maximum size DdIS in G_χ is $O(d^2 \sum_{C \in G_\chi} |C|^{O(d)}) = d^2 n_\chi^{O(d)}$, where $n_\chi = \sum_{C \in G_\chi} |C|$, the number of vertices in G_χ .

Theorem 2 *Given a set P of n points in the plane, we can always compute a DdIS of size at least $\frac{1}{4}|OPT|$ in $d^2 n^{O(d)}$ time, where $|OPT|$ is the maximum cardinality of a GDdIS.*

Proof Follows from Lemma 6, Lemma 7 and Lemma 8.

³ if there are two components having distance less than d in G , then we can view them as a single component




Fig. 3 Horizontal and vertical partition of the strips

5 Approximation Scheme

In this section, using the shifting strategy [24], we propose a polynomial time approximation scheme (PTAS) for the GDdIS problem, for a given fixed constant $d \geq 3$. Let \mathcal{R} be an axis parallel rectangular region containing the point set P (i.e., centers of the disks of the given UDG). We use two-level nested shifting strategy. The first level executes k iterations, where $k \gg d$. The i -th iteration ($1 \leq i \leq k$) of the first level is as follows:

- Assuming \mathcal{R} is left-open, partition \mathcal{R} into vertical strips such that (a) first strip is of width i , (b) every even strip is of width d , and (c) every odd strip, except the first strip, is of width k .
- Without loss of generality, assume that the points lying on the left boundary of a strip belong to the adjacent strip to its left (i.e., every strip is left open and right closed).
- Compute some desired feasible solutions for the odd strips (of width k). These solutions can be merged to produce a solution of the entire problem since these odd numbered strips are distance- d apart.

The second level of the nested shifting strategy is used to find a solution for an iteration in the first level. We consider each non-empty odd strip separately, and execute k iterations. In the i -th iteration, we partition it horizontally as in the first level (mentioned in the first bullet above). We get a solution of a strip by solving each $k \times k$ square in that strip optimally. The union of the solutions of all the odd numbered squares/rectangles in that strip is the desired solution of that vertical strip of the first level. Finally, we take the union of the solutions of all the odd vertical strips to compute the solution of that iteration of the first level. Thus, we have the solutions of all the iterations of the first level. We report the one having the maximum cardinality as the solution of the given GDdIS problem. Compute a matrix \mathcal{M} containing the cost of all pair shortest paths in a complete graph defined with the points in P where the edge costs are as defined in Section 4.1. The method of computing an optimum solution inside a $k \times k$ square is described below.




Fig. 4 A strip of width $4d$ around the vertical line ℓ_v (shown in dotted lines)

5.1 Computing an optimum solution in a $k \times k$ square

We apply a divide and conquer strategy to compute an optimum solution of the GDdIS problem defined on a set of points $\mathcal{Q} \subseteq P$ inside a square χ of size $k \times k$. We partition χ into four sub-squares, each of size $\frac{k}{2} \times \frac{k}{2}$, using a horizontal line ℓ_h and a vertical line ℓ_v (see Figure. 4). Let $\mathcal{Q}_1 \subseteq \mathcal{Q}$ be the subset of points in χ which are at most d distance away from ℓ_h and/or ℓ_v . Let \mathcal{Q}_2 be a maximum cardinality subset of \mathcal{Q}_1 such that all the points in \mathcal{Q}_2 are pair wise distance- d independent in p .

Lemma 9 $|\mathcal{Q}_2| \leq O(k)$.

Proof The proof follows from the similar combinatorial argument discussed in the proof of Lemma 7.

We apply the divide and conquer strategy on χ as follows:

Step 1: Choose all possible subsets of points of sizes at most $O(k)$ in \mathcal{Q}_1 .

Step 2: For each subset, do the following:

- Check whether they are mutually distance- d independent by consulting the table \mathcal{M} . If so, then they form \mathcal{Q}_2 .
- Consult the matrix \mathcal{M} to delete the points in χ which are at most distance $d - 1$ away from each member in \mathcal{Q}_2 .
- Recursively solve the four independent sub-problems defined by the points of $\mathcal{Q} \setminus \mathcal{Q}_1$ in the four quadrants $\chi_1, \chi_2, \chi_3, \chi_4$ defined by ℓ_h and ℓ_v .
- Return $\mathcal{Q}_2 = \mathcal{Q}_2 \cup \left(\bigcup_{i=1}^4 \mathcal{Q}_2^i \right)$, where \mathcal{Q}_2^i is the solution of the sub-problem on the points of χ_i .

- Retain the solution for the present subset if it is better than the solutions produced by earlier choices of \mathcal{Q}_2 .

Lemma 10 *The solution produced for the cell χ (of size $k \times k$) in the aforesaid process is optimum, and the time complexity of the proposed algorithm is $k^2 m^{O(k)}$, where $m = |\mathcal{Q}|$.*

Proof Let OPT_χ be an optimal solution for the points lying in χ . Note that our process checks all combinations of points of size $|OPT_\chi|$. Thus, the combination of points in OPT_χ must appear at some stage in the process.

If $T(m, k)$ denote the time complexity of computing the distance- d independent set in χ , then $T(m, k) = 4 \times T(m, \frac{k}{2}) \times m^{O(k)} + O(k^2)$, which is $k^2 \times m^{O(k)}$ in the worst case.

Using the analysis of [24], we have the following result.

Theorem 3 *Given a set P of n points (centers of the unit disks) in the plane and an integer $k > 1$, the proposed scheme produces a DdIS of size at least $\frac{1}{(1+\frac{1}{k})^2} |OPT|$ in $k^2 n^{O(k)}$ time, where $|OPT|$ is the maximum cardinality of a GDdIS.*

6 The Hardness Result of GDdDS Problem on Unit Disk Graphs

The decision version of the GDdDS problem, denoted by $D(GDdDS)$, for a fixed integer $d \geq 2$, is defined as follows:

Input. An unweighted unit disk graph $G = (V, E)$ defined on a point set P and a positive integer $k \leq |V|$.
Question. Does there exist a distance- d dominating set of size at most k in G ?

Lemma 11 *$D(GDdDS)$ problem is NP.*

Proof For a given set of vertices, we can verify whether all the vertices of the input graph are distance- d dominated or not in polynomial time using Floyd-Warshall's all-pair shortest path algorithm [10]. Hence $D(GDdDS) \in NP$.

Now, for proving the problem belongs to NP-hard class, we do polynomial time reduction from a known NP-hard problem, the *vertex cover* problem [19] defined on planar graphs with maximum degree 3, to it. The decision version of the vertex cover problem defined on planar graphs with maximum degree 3, denoted by $D(VC_p)$, is defined as follows:

The vertex cover problem on planar graphs (VC_p)

Input: An undirected planar graph G with maximum degree 3 and a positive integer k .

Question: Does there exist a vertex cover D of G such that $|D| \leq k$?

The following corollary follows from Lemma 2:

Corollary 2 *A planar graph $G = (V, E)$ with maximum degree 3 can be embedded on a plane having grid cell of size $2d \times 2d$, so that its vertices lie at points of the form $(i * 2d, j * 2d)$ and its edges are drawn using a sequence of consecutive line segments drawn on the vertical lines of the form $x = i * 2d$ and/or horizontal lines of the form $y = j * 2d$, for some integers i and j (see Figure 5).*

Lemma 12 *Let $G = (V, E)$ be an instance of $D(VC_p)$ with maximum degree 3. An instance $G' = (V', E')$ of $D(GDdDS)$ can be constructed from G in polynomial-time.*

Proof Embed the instance G on the plane as discussed in corollary 2, using one of the algorithms in [25, 27]. An edge in the embedding is a sequence of connected line segment(s) of length $2d$ units each. Let ℓ be the total number of line segments in the embedding. We add points $P = \{p_1, p_2, \dots, p_n\}$ corresponding to the vertices $V = \{v_1, v_2, \dots, v_n\}$ in the embedding. To make G' a UDG we introduce a set Q of extra points on the segments used to draw the edges of G' . Thus, the set of points in P together with Q form a UDG G' . Let (p_i, p_j) be an edge in G' corresponding to the edge (v_i, v_j) in G and has ℓ' grid segments.

Case-1: If $\ell' = 1$, then we add $3d$ points $p_{ij}^1, p_{ij}^2, \dots, p_{ij}^{3d}$ on the segment such that the Euclidean distance of p_i to p_{ij}^1 and p_{ij}^{3d} to p_j is 0.72 and the Euclidean distance between p_{ij}^t and p_{ij}^{t+1} is $\frac{2d-1.44}{3d-1} > 0.5$




Fig. 5 (a) A planar graph G of maximum degree 3, (b) its embedding G' on a grid of cell size 4×4 , (c) adding of extra points to G' , (d) the obtained UDG G' .

for $t = 1, 2, 3, \dots, 3d - 1$. Therefore, the length of the path from p_i to p_j is exactly $3d + 1$ (for $d = 2$, see the edge (p_1, p_4) in Figure 5(c)).

Case-2: If $\ell' > 1$, then we consider all joint points of each pair of consecutive segments other than the points of P and add a point for each joint points to the set Q (see the square points in the edge (p_1, p_3) in Figure 5(c)). Then, we add $3d$ points (see Case-1) in one of the two segments for which one end is associated either with p_i or p_j and $2d$ points $p_{ij}^1, p_{ij}^2, \dots, p_{ij}^{2d}$ on the segment such that the Euclidean distance of p_{ij}^1 and p_{ij}^{2d} from the end points of the segment is 0.75 and the Euclidean distance between p_{ij}^t and p_{ij}^{t+1} is $\frac{2d-1.5}{2d-1} > 0.5$ for $t = 1, 2, 3, \dots, 2d - 1$ in the remaining $\ell' - 1$ segments in such a way that after adding the extra points, the length of one segment is $3d + 1$ and the length of all other segments is $2d + 1$ (see the edge (p_2, p_3) in Figure 5(c)).

Note that in both the cases, only consecutive points on the path $p_i \rightsquigarrow p_j$ are within unit distance apart. Let Q be the set of points generated in these two cases.

Observe that $G' = (V', E')$ is a UDG, where $V' = P \cup Q$, and $E' = \{(p_i, p_j) \mid p_i, p_j \in V' \text{ and } d(p_i, p_j) \leq 1\}$. Here $|V'| = |P| + |Q| \leq n + 3\ell d$, and $|E'| \leq 3\ell d + m$, where m is the number of edges in G and ℓ is bounded by n . Thus, G' can be constructed in polynomial time.

Lemma 13 *G has a vertex cover of size at most k if and only if G' has a distance- d dominating set of size at most $k + \ell$.*

Proof (Necessity) Let there exist a vertex cover D of size at most k for the graph G . Let \mathcal{S} be the collection of points from P in G' corresponding to the vertices of D in G , i.e., $\mathcal{S} = \{p_i \in P \mid v_i \in D\}$. Note that $|\mathcal{S}| = |D|$. We choose one point from each segment in such a way (see next paragraph) that the selected points along with \mathcal{S} form a distance- d dominating set of G' and the size of \mathcal{S} is at most $k + \ell$.

Note that, every edge in G has at least one of its end vertices in D (D is a vertex cover in G). For each edge (v_i, v_j) in G , start traversing from the corresponding vertex p_i in G' (if $v_i \in D$ or from p_j , if $v_j \in D$) in the embedding and select each $2d + 1$ -th vertex in \mathcal{S} encountered from p_i to p_j in the traversal (see (p_2, p_3) in Figure 5(d)). The big vertices are part of \mathcal{S} while traversing from p_2). Observe that, \mathcal{S} is a distance- d dominating set in G' having $|\mathcal{S}| \leq k + \ell$ as we have chosen one vertex from each segment in the embedding and the way we have chosen \mathcal{S} , for any $p_i \in V'$ there is always exist at least one point $p_j \in \mathcal{S}$ such that $d(p_i, p_j) \leq d$.




Fig. 6 (a) p_j is only connected with p_i , (b) p_i connected with p_k and p_j connected with p_l .

(Sufficiency) Let $\mathcal{S} \subseteq V'$ be a GDdDS of size at most $k + \ell$ in G' . We need to prove that G has a vertex cover of size at most k . Let $D = \{v_i \in V \mid p_i \in \mathcal{S} \cap P\}$. Observe that $|D| \leq k$ as the length of each segment in G' is at least $2d + 1$ there must be at least one point from each segment chosen in \mathcal{S} . It remains to prove that D is a vertex cover of G . If any edge (v_i, v_j) in G has none of its end vertices in D , then consider the points p_i and p_j corresponding to v_i and v_j respectively.

Case (i): If p_j is the only vertex that is connected with p_i in G' , then the chain of segments (say ℓ') in the path $p_i \rightsquigarrow p_j$ in G' has at least $\ell' + 1$ vertices in \mathcal{S} (see Figure 6(a) for example). In this case, we delete one point from the segment containing two points in \mathcal{S} and introduce p_i in \mathcal{S} .

Case (ii): If both p_i and p_j are connected with some points p_k and p_l respectively in G' , then either the chain of segments (say ℓ') in the path $p_i \rightsquigarrow p_j$ in G' has at least $\ell' + 1$ vertices in \mathcal{S} (see Case (i)) or the chain of segments (say ℓ') in the path $p_i \rightsquigarrow p_k$ or $(p_j \rightsquigarrow p_l)$ in G' has at least $\ell' + 1$ vertices in \mathcal{S} (see Figure 6(b) for example). In this case, we choose the segment having two points in \mathcal{S} and remove one point of the segment from \mathcal{S} and introduce p_j in \mathcal{S} if $p_k \in \mathcal{S}$ otherwise introduce p_i in \mathcal{S} . Update D and repeat the process till every edge has at least one of its end vertices in D . Note that, in both the cases, we delete at most one point from such segments having two of its points in the solution and there does not exist a segment in G' having none of its points in \mathcal{S} , which leads the proof that D is a vertex cover in G with $|D| \leq k$.

Lemma 14 *$D(\text{GDdDS})$ problem is NP-hard.*

Proof Follows from Lemma 12 and Lemma 13.

Theorem 4 $D(\text{GDdDS})$ problem is NP-complete.

Proof From Lemma 11, $D(\text{GDdDS}) \in \text{NP}$ and from Lemma 14, $D(\text{GDdDS}) \in \text{NP-hard}$. Therefore, $D(\text{GDdDS}) \in \text{NP-complete}$.

7 Approximation Algorithm for GDdDS Problem

In this section, we explain a 4-factor approximation algorithm for distance- d dominating set problem. Let \mathcal{R} be the smallest rectangular region containing the point set P (disk centers). We partition \mathcal{R} into squares having side length $\frac{3}{\sqrt{2}}d \times \frac{3}{\sqrt{2}}d$ (see Figure 7(a)). The basic idea behind our algorithm is as follows:

- color the partitioning squares with 4-colors such that the distance between two same colored squares are more than $2d$ (see Figure 7(a)).
- find the optimal solution of each squares (see Subsection 7.1).
- let OPT_i denotes the optimal solution generated by our algorithm for the squares having color i , for $i = 1, 2, 3, 4$.
- Let OPT be the minimum distance- d dominating set of the graph. Therefore, $|OPT_i| \leq |OPT|$. Thus $\sum_i |OPT_i| \leq 4 * |OPT|$.




Fig. 7 (a) partition of \mathcal{R} into smaller cells of size $\frac{3}{\sqrt{2}}d \times \frac{3}{\sqrt{2}}d$, (b) one cell partitioned into $O(d^2)$ sub-cells, and (c) one cell surrounded with d width region.

7.1 Computing a minimum DdDS in a $\frac{3}{\sqrt{2}}d \times \frac{3}{\sqrt{2}}d$ square

Let χ be a single $\frac{3}{\sqrt{2}}d \times \frac{3}{\sqrt{2}}d$ cell with $P_\chi \subseteq P$ be the set of points inside χ , and G_χ be the UDG defined on P_χ . Let C_1, C_2, \dots, C_ℓ be the different connected components of G_χ with the constraint that each C_i

$(1 \leq i \leq \ell)$ are d -distance apart from each other in G (i.e., the UDG corresponding to points set P). If the distance between any two components is less than d , then combine these two components as a single component.

Lemma 15 *The worst case number of different connected components in G_χ is $O(d^2)$.*

Proof Partition χ into sub-cells of size $\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \times \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}$ (see Figure 7(b)). Therefore, the total number of sub-cells is $O(d^2)$. Every pair of points within a sub-cell are connected as they are at most unit distance apart. Therefore, the points lying inside each sub-cell are in a same connected component. Thus, the lemma follows.

Lemma 16 *The size of MDdDS in any connected component $C \in \{C_1, C_2, \dots, C_\ell\}$ of G_χ is bounded by $O(d)$.*

Proof The proof follows from Lemma 7, with the fact that the minimum distance- d dominating set in any graph is bounded by the maximum cardinality distance- d independent set of the same graph. The same result holds for any sub-graphs also.

Lemma 17 *The time complexity to compute the optimal DdDS in χ is $d^2 n^{O(d)}$.*

Proof Consider a d -width region around a cell χ as χ' (see Figure 7(c)), having point set $P'_\chi \subseteq P$. Let $G_{P'_\chi}$ be a weighted complete graph with the vertex set corresponding to point set P'_χ and edge costs are as defined in Section 4.1. Apply all-pairs shortest path algorithm [10] on graph $G_{P'_\chi}$ and store the result in a matrix \mathcal{M} .

Observe that, for computing a MDdDS in graph G_χ , we need to compute a MDdDS in each and every component $C_i \in G_\chi$. As per the definition of components, all the components are d -distance apart from each other. So, taking the union of the computed solutions of each component leads to a MDdDS for the graph G_χ . For computing an optimum solution in a component C_i , we consider all possible tuples of size at most $O(d)$ (refer Lemma 16) and check whether the selected tuple is a feasible solution or not with the help of matrix \mathcal{M} in $O(d^2)$ time. So, MDdDS can be computed in a single component C_i in $O(d^2 |C_i|^{O(d)})$ time. Hence, computing an MDdDS in G_χ takes $O(d^2 \sum_{C_i \in G_\chi} |C_i|^{O(d)}) = d^2 n^{O(d)}$ time, where n is the number of vertices in G_χ .

Theorem 5 *Given a set P of n points in the plane \mathcal{R} , a distance- d dominating set of size at most $4|OPT|$ can be computed in $d^2 n^{O(d)}$ time, where OPT is a minimum distance- d dominating set.*

Proof Follows from Lemma 15, Lemma 16 and Lemma 17.

8 Approximation scheme for GDdDS Problem

In this section, using the technique of shifting strategy [24], we propose a polynomial time approximation scheme (PTAS) for the DdDS problem, for a given constant d . Given a point set P (centers of the UDG) in a rectangular region \mathcal{R} and a fixed integer $k \gg d$. We use two-level nested shifting strategy as follows:

- first, we apply shifting strategy in the horizontal direction. The i -th iteration ($1 \leq i \leq k$) of the first level, partition \mathcal{R} into horizontal strips such that (i) first strip is of width i , and (ii) remaining strips are of width k . Note that width of last strip may be less than k .
- without loss of generality, assume that each points lying on the left boundary of a strip belong to its left adjacent strip.
- consider each non-empty horizontal strip H , and apply second level of shifting strategy on the vertical direction.
- in the second level, the j -th iteration ($1 \leq j \leq k$) partition each non-empty horizontal strip H into square/rectangular cells of size (i) $j \times \ell$ for the first cell, and (ii) $k \times \ell$ for all other cells, where ℓ defines the width of the strip H ($\ell = i$ for the first strip and $\ell = k$ for all other strips).

We solve each $k \times k$ square (conceptually extend the smaller cells to $k \times k$ square) optimally. Take the union of each $k \times k$ square in a horizontal strip to get a feasible solution of each strip. Finally, we take the union of solutions of each non-empty horizontal strip to get a feasible solution of the problem

in a single iteration. In the same process, we get the feasible solutions of all the iterations in the first level. We report the solution D , having minimum cardinality among all the solutions generated in each iterations as the solution of the DdDS problem.

Now, we discuss the process of getting solution from each $k \times k$ square optimally. Before discussing the process, we compute a matrix \mathcal{M} containing the cost of all pair shortest paths in a complete graph defined with the points in P where the edge costs are as defined in Section 4.1.

8.1 Computing an optimum solution in a $k \times k$ square

We apply the same strategy as described in Sub-section 5.1 on the point set $P_\chi \subseteq P$ inside a square χ of size $k \times k$. Let $P'_\chi \subseteq P_\chi$ denote the point set which are at most d distance away from ℓ_h and ℓ_v (the horizontal and vertical lines which divides χ into 4 squares). Let P''_χ be a minimum cardinality subset of P'_χ such that all the points in P'_χ are distance- d dominated by the point set P''_χ .

Lemma 18 $|P''_\chi| \leq O(k)$

Proof Follows from Lemma 16 with some similar combinatorial argument.

We use similar divide and conquer strategy as discussed in the Sub-section 5.1 for obtaining the optimum solution on χ .

Lemma 19 *The optimum solution produced by our algorithm for each $k \times k$ square (χ) takes $k^2 n_\chi^{O(k)}$ time, where $n_\chi = |P_\chi|$ is the number of points inside χ .*

Proof As our algorithm checks all combinations of points of size $|OPT_\chi|$, where OPT_χ is an optimal solution for χ , there must be a case that the combination of points in OPT_χ appear in the process.

The time complexity follows from Lemma 10.

Theorem 6 *Given a set P of n points (center of the unit disks) in \mathcal{R} and an integer $k \gg d$, a distance- d dominating set of size at most $(1 + \frac{1}{k})^2 \times |OPT|$ can be computed in $k^2 n^{O(k)}$ time, where OPT is the optimum solution.*

Proof Let OPT be a minimum DdDS for the point set P in UDG G , and $OPT' \subseteq OPT$ be the points chosen in OPT , which d -distance dominates the points outside the boundary of all the cells in an iteration (first level i -th iteration and second level j -th iteration). Let D^* be a solution obtained by our algorithm in an iteration.

Then, $|D^*| \leq |OPT| + |OPT'|$. For all the iterations of (i, j) ($1 \leq i, j \leq k$), we have

$$\sum_{i=1}^k \sum_{j=1}^k |D^*| \leq k^2 |OPT| + \sum_{i=1}^k \sum_{j=1}^k |OPT'|.$$

Since any point from a cell χ chosen in OPT can d -distance dominate points from no more than one horizontal strip (or vertical strip), and at most k times each horizontal (or vertical) boundary appears throughout the algorithm, we have

$$\sum_{i=1}^k \sum_{j=1}^k |OPT'| \leq k |OPT| + k |OPT|.$$

Thus,

$$\sum_{i=1}^k \sum_{j=1}^k |D^*| \leq k^2 |OPT| + 2k |OPT| = (k^2 + 2k) |OPT|.$$

$$\text{Thus, } \min \sum_{i=1}^k \sum_{j=1}^k |D^*| \leq (1 + \frac{1}{k})^2 \times |OPT|.$$

the time complexity result follows from Lemma 19.

9 Conclusion

In this article, we studied the DdIS problem, a variant and generalized version of the independent set problem and DdDS problem, a generalized version of dominating set problem, on unit disk graphs. We proved that both GDdIS and GDdDS problems are NP-complete on unit disk graphs. We proposed a simple 4-factor approximation algorithms for both the problems. We also proposed polynomial time approximation schemes (PTAS) for each of the problems.

References

1. Agnarsson, G., Damaschke, P., Halldórsson, M.M.: Powers of geometric intersection graphs and dispersion algorithms. *Discrete Applied Mathematics* **132**(1), 3–16 (2003)
2. Andrade, D.V., Resende, M.G., Werneck, R.F.: Fast local search for the maximum independent set problem. *Journal of Heuristics* **18**(4), 525–547 (2012)
3. Arora, S., Lund, C., Motwani, R., Sudan, M., Szegedy, M.: Proof verification and the hardness of approximation problems. *Journal of the ACM (JACM)* **45**(3), 501–555 (1998)
4. Biedl, T., Kant, G.: A better heuristic for orthogonal graph drawings. *Computational Geometry* **9**(3), 159–180 (1998)
5. Carmi, P., Das, G.K., Jallu, R.K., Nandy, S.C., Prasad, P.R., Stein, Y.: Minimum dominating set problem for unit disks revisited. *International Journal of Computational Geometry & Applications* **25**(3), 227 (2015)
6. Carmi, P., Katz, M.J., Lev-Tov, N.: Polynomial-time approximation schemes for piercing and covering with applications in wireless networks. *Computational Geometry* **39**(3), 209–218 (2008)
7. Chan, T.M., Har-Peled, S.: Approximation algorithms for maximum independent set of pseudo-disks. *Discrete & Computational Geometry* **48**(2), 373–392 (2012)
8. Chang, G.J., Nemhauser, G.L.: The k -domination and k -stability problems on sun-free chordal graphs. *SIAM Journal on Algebraic Discrete Methods* **5**(3), 332–345 (1984)
9. Clark, B.N., Colbourn, C.J., Johnson, D.S.: Unit disk graphs. *Discrete mathematics* **86**(1-3), 165–177 (1990)
10. Cormen, T.H., Leiserson, C.E., Rivest, R.L., Stein, C.: Introduction to algorithms. MIT press (2009)
11. Das, G.K., De, M., Kolay, S., Nandy, S.C., Sur-Kolay, S.: Approximation algorithms for maximum independent set of a unit disk graph. *Information Processing Letters* **115**(3), 439–446 (2015)
12. De, M., Das, G.K., Carmi, P., Nandy, S.C.: Approximation algorithms for a variant of discrete piercing set problem for unit disks. *International Journal of Computational Geometry & Applications* **23**(06), 461–477 (2013)
13. Erlebach, T., Jansen, K., Seidel, E.: Polynomial-time approximation schemes for geometric intersection graphs. *SIAM Journal on Computing* **34**(6), 1302–1323 (2005)
14. Eto, H., Guo, F., Miyano, E.: Distance- d independent set problems for bipartite and chordal graphs. *Journal of Combinatorial Optimization* **27**(1), 88–99 (2014)
15. Eto, H., Ito, T., Liu, Z., Miyano, E.: Approximability of the distance independent set problem on regular graphs and planar graphs. In: *International Conference on Combinatorial Optimization and Applications*, vol. 10043, pp. 270–284. Springer (2016)
16. Eto, H., Ito, T., Liu, Z., Miyano, E.: Approximation algorithm for the distance-3 independent set problem on cubic graphs. In: *International Workshop on Algorithms and Computation*, vol. 10167, pp. 228–240. Springer (2017)
17. da Fonseca, G.D., de Figueiredo, C.M.H., de Sá, V.G.P., Machado, R.: Linear time approximation for dominating sets and independent dominating sets in unit disk graphs. In: *Approximation and Online Algorithms - 10th International Workshop, WAOA 2012*, pp. 82–92 (2012)
18. Garey, M.R., Johnson, D.S.: The rectilinear steiner tree problem is np-complete. *SIAM Journal on Applied Mathematics* **32**(4), 826–834 (1977)
19. Garey, M.R., Johnson, D.S.: Computers and intractability: A guide to the theory of NP-completeness. W. H. Freeman and company (1978)
20. Garey, M.R., Johnson, D.S., Stockmeyer, L.: Some simplified NP-complete problems. In: *Proceedings of the sixth annual ACM symposium on Theory of computing*, pp. 47–63. ACM (1974)
21. Gavril, F.: Algorithms for minimum coloring, maximum clique, minimum covering by cliques, and maximum independent set of a chordal graph. *SIAM Journal on Computing* **1**(2), 180–187 (1972)
22. Gibson, M., Pirwani, I.A.: Algorithms for dominating set in disk graphs: breaking the logn barrier. In: *European Symposium on Algorithms*, pp. 243–254. Springer (2010)
23. Halldórsson, M.M.: Approximating discrete collections via local improvements. In: *Proceedings of the sixth annual ACM-SIAM symposium on Discrete algorithms*, vol. 95, pp. 160–169. Society for Industrial and Applied Mathematics (1995)
24. Hochbaum, D.S., Maass, W.: Approximation schemes for covering and packing problems in image processing and VLSI. *Journal of the ACM (JACM)* **32**(1), 130–136 (1985)
25. Hopcroft, J., Tarjan, R.: Efficient planarity testing. *Journal of the ACM (JACM)* **21**(4), 549–568 (1974)
26. Hsu, W.L., Nemhauser, G.L.: Algorithms for minimum covering by cliques and maximum clique in claw-free perfect graphs. *Discrete Mathematics* **37**(2-3), 181–191 (1981)
27. Itai, A., Papadimitriou, C.H., Szwarcfter, J.L.: Hamilton paths in grid graphs. *SIAM Journal on Computing* **11**(4), 676–686 (1982)
28. Jallu, R.K., Das, G.K.: Improved algorithm for maximum independent set on unit disk graph. In: *Conference on Algorithms and Discrete Applied Mathematics*, vol. 9602, pp. 212–223. Springer (2016)
29. Johnson, D., Garey, M., Stockmeyer, L.: Some simplified np-complete graph problems. *Theoretical Computer Science* **1**(3), 237–267 (1976)
30. Johnson, D.S., Yannakakis, M., Papadimitriou, C.H.: On generating all maximal independent sets. *Information Processing Letters* **27**(3), 119–123 (1988)
31. Marathe, M.V., Breu, H., Hunt, H.B., Ravi, S.S., Rosenkrantz, D.J.: Simple heuristics for unit disk graphs. *Networks* **25**(2), 59–68 (1995)
32. Marathe, M.V., Breu, H., Hunt III, H.B., Ravi, S.S., Rosenkrantz, D.J.: Simple heuristics for unit disk graphs. *Networks* **25**(2), 59–68 (1995)
33. Matsui, T.: Approximation algorithms for maximum independent set problems and fractional coloring problems on unit disk graphs. In: *Discrete and Computational Geometry*, vol. 1763, pp. 194–200. Springer (1998)
34. Minty, G.J.: On maximal independent sets of vertices in claw-free graphs. *Journal of Combinatorial Theory, Series B* **28**(3), 284–304 (1980)
35. Montealegre, P., Todinca, I.: On distance- d independent set and other problems in graphs with “few” minimal separators. In: *International Workshop on Graph-Theoretic Concepts in Computer Science, Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, vol. 9941, pp. 183–194. Springer (2016)

36. Murphy, O.J.: Computing independent sets in graphs with large girth. *Discrete Applied Mathematics* **35**(2), 167–170 (1992)
37. Nandy, S.C., Pandit, S., Roy, S.: Faster approximation for maximum independent set on unit disk graph. *Information Processing Letters* **127**, 58–61 (2017)
38. Nieberg, T., Hurink, J.: A ptas for the minimum dominating set problem in unit disk graphs. In: *International Workshop on Approximation and Online Algorithms*, pp. 296–306. Springer (2005)
39. Nieberg, T., Hurink, J., Kern, W.: A robust PTAS for maximum weight independent sets in unit disk graphs. In: *Graph-theoretic concepts in computer science*, vol. 3353, pp. 214–221. Springer (2005)
40. Poljak, S.: A note on stable sets and colorings of graphs. *Commentationes Mathematicae Universitatis Carolinae* **15**(2), 307–309 (1974)
41. Raz, R., Safra, S.: A sub-constant error-probability low-degree test, and a sub-constant error-probability pcg characterization of np. In: *STOC*, vol. 97, pp. 475–484. Citeseer (1997)
42. Robson, J.M.: Algorithms for maximum independent sets. *Journal of Algorithms* **7**(3), 425–440 (1986)
43. Tarjan, R.E., Trojanowski, A.E.: Finding a maximum independent set. *SIAM Journal on Computing* **6**(3), 537–546 (1977)
44. Xiao, M., Nagamochi, H.: Exact algorithms for maximum independent set. *Information and Computation* **255**, 126–146 (2017)