

p -Edge/Vertex-Connected Vertex Cover: Parameterized and Approximation Algorithms

Carl Einarson¹, Gregory Gutin¹, Bart M. P. Jansen², Diptapriyo Majumdar¹, and Magnus Wahlström¹

¹*Royal Holloway, University of London, Egham, United Kingdom,*
einarsoncarl@gmail.com, {g.gutin/diptapriyo.majumdar/magnus.wahlstrom}@rhul.ac.uk

²*Eindhoven University of Technology, Netherlands, b.m.p.jansen@tue.nl*

Abstract

We introduce and study two natural generalizations of the Connected Vertex Cover (VC) problem: the p -Edge-Connected and p -Vertex-Connected VC problem (where $p \geq 2$ is a fixed integer). Like Connected VC, both new VC problems are FPT, but do not admit a polynomial kernel unless $\text{NP} \subseteq \text{coNP/poly}$, which is highly unlikely. We prove however that both problems admit time efficient polynomial sized approximate kernelization schemes. We obtain an $\mathcal{O}(2^{\mathcal{O}(pk)}n^{\mathcal{O}(1)})$ -time algorithm for the p -Edge-Connected VC and an $\mathcal{O}(2^{\mathcal{O}(k^2)}n^{\mathcal{O}(1)})$ -time algorithm for the p -Vertex-Connected VC. Finally, we describe a $2(p+1)$ -approximation algorithm for the p -Edge-Connected VC. The proofs for the new VC problems require more sophisticated arguments than for Connected VC. In particular, for the approximation algorithm we use Gomory-Hu trees and for the approximate kernels a result on small-size spanning p -vertex/edge-connected subgraph of a p -vertex/edge-connected graph obtained independently by Nishizeki and Poljak (1994) and Nagamochi and Ibaraki (1992).

1 Introduction

For a graph $G = (V, E)$, a set $C \subseteq V$ is a *vertex cover* if for every edge $uv \in E$ at least one of the vertices u, v belongs to C . The well-known classical VERTEX COVER problem is the problem of deciding whether a graph G has a vertex cover of size at most k . This problem is NP-complete and thus was studied from parameterized (it is usually parameterized by k) and approximation algorithms view points. VERTEX COVER and its generalizations have been important in developing basic and advanced methods and approaches for parameterized and approximation algorithms. Thus, in particular it was named the *Drosophila* of fixed-parameter algorithmics [17].

It is well-known that VERTEX COVER is fixed-parameter tractable and admits a kernel with $2k$ vertices [2,8]. However, a connectivity variation of VERTEX COVER, CONNECTED VERTEX COVER was shown to have no polynomial kernel unless $\text{NP} \subseteq \text{coNP/poly}$ [4] (in CONNECTED VERTEX COVER, the vertex cover has to be connected). This immediately rules out the possibility of admitting a polynomial kernel for several problems that generalize CONNECTED VERTEX COVER. In their pioneering work, Lokshantov et al. [13]

considered several problems that are known not to admit polynomial kernels (unless $\text{NP} \subseteq \text{coNP/poly}$) and presented an α -approximate polynomial kernel for these problems for every fixed $\alpha > 1$. In particular, they proved that **CONNECTED VERTEX COVER** admits an α -approximate polynomial kernel for every fixed α .

In this paper, we introduce the following two natural generalization of **CONNECTED VERTEX COVER**, the **p -EDGE-CONNECTED VERTEX COVER** and **p -CONNECTED VERTEX COVER** problems as follows. For both problem, p is a fixed positive integer.

p -EDGE-CONNECTED VERTEX COVER (p -EDGE-CVC)

Input: An undirected graph G , and an integer k

Parameter: k

Problem: Does G have a set of at most k vertices that is a vertex cover and induces a p -edge-connected subgraph?

p -CONNECTED VERTEX COVER (p -CVC)

Input: An undirected graph G , and an integer k

Parameter: k

Problem: Does G have a set of at most k vertices that is a vertex cover and induces a p -connected subgraph?

To the best of our knowledge, none of these problems were studied in the fields of parameterized and approximation algorithms before. These problems may be of interest in the following security setting. We have a network whose links (edges) have to be protected by monitors positioned in its nodes against an attacker targeting the links. To allow us to overview all the links and inform all other monitors about the attack, the monitors should form a connected vertex cover C . Higher vertex and edge connectivities of C provide a higher degree of resiliency in the monitoring system when monitors/links can be disabled.

Graph theoretic problems with 2-vertex/edge-connectivity constraint has been studied before. Li et al. [11] proved structural results for **2-EDGE-CONNECTED DOMINATING SET** and **2-NODE CONNECTED DOMINATING SET**. Recently, Nutov [19] obtained an approximation algorithm with expected ratio $\tilde{O}(\log^4 n)$ for **BICONNECTED DOMINATION**. Note that no study has investigated p -vertex/edge-connectivity constraint for $p > 2$.

Our results. After showing that both p -Edge-CVC and p -CVC do not admit polynomial kernels unless $\text{NP} \subseteq \text{coNP/poly}$, we prove that there are $(1 + \varepsilon)$ -approximate polynomial kernels for both problems for every $0 < \varepsilon < 1$ (the upper bounds of the sizes are slightly different). We provide necessary terminology and notation on approximate kernels in Section 3.2. In fact, our results of $(1 + \varepsilon)$ -approximate kernels are as follows.

Theorem 1. *For every $0 < \varepsilon < 1$ and every fixed $p \geq 2$, p -EDGE-CONNECTED VERTEX COVER admits a $(1 + \varepsilon)$ -approximate kernel with $\mathcal{O}((1 + \varepsilon)k^{\mathcal{O}(p/\varepsilon)})$ vertices.*

Theorem 2. *For every $0 < \varepsilon < 1$ and every fixed $p \geq 2$, p -CONNECTED VERTEX COVER admits a $(1 + \varepsilon)$ -approximate kernel with $\mathcal{O}((1 + \varepsilon)p^2 k^{\mathcal{O}(p^2/\varepsilon)})$ vertices.*

For both problems, we partition the vertex set of the input graph as $V(G) = H \uplus I \uplus R$, where H is a vertex set which has to be in every p -vertex/edge-connected vertex cover of G , $I = \{v \in V(G) \setminus H : N_G(v) \subseteq H\}$ and $R = V(G) \setminus (H \cup I)$. The sizes of H and R are bounded by k and $2k^2$, respectively, but the size of I can be unbounded in k . We show how to select a subset L of I of size bounded in k such that if we replace I in G by L and add a pendant vertex to every vertex of H , then we obtain a new graph G' with the number of vertices bounded by a function of k and such that the minimum size of p -vertex/edge-connected vertex cover in G' is at most $1 + \varepsilon$ times the minimum size of p -vertex/edge-connected vertex cover in G .

Note that a key ingredient in the proves of the two above theorems is the following result of Nishizeki and Poljak [18] and Nagamochi and Ibaraki [16] on a small-size spanning p -vertex/edge-connected subgraph of a p -vertex/edge-connected graph (the problem of finding such a subgraph with minimum number of edges in **NP**-complete).

Theorem 3. *Let G be a p -vertex/edge-connected graph. Then, there exists a polynomial time algorithm that computes a p -vertex/edge-connected spanning subgraph H of G such that H has at most $p|V(G)|$ edges.*

It is not hard to obtain simple FPT algorithms for both p -EDGE-CONNECTED VERTEX COVER and p -CONNECTED VERTEX COVER. But, the running time of such algorithms is $\mathcal{O}^*(2^{\mathcal{O}(k^2)})^1$. For the sake of completeness, we give a short proof for the existence of such an algorithm for p -CONNECTED VERTEX COVER. However, for p -EDGE-CONNECTED VERTEX COVER we can do better: our next main result is a single exponential fixed-parameter algorithm for p -EDGE-CONNECTED VERTEX COVER using dynamic programming on matroids and some specific characteristics of p -edge-connected subgraphs.

Theorem 4. *For every fixed $p \geq 2$, p -EDGE-CONNECTED VERTEX COVER can be solved in $\mathcal{O}(2^{\mathcal{O}(pk)}n^{\mathcal{O}(1)})$ deterministic time and space.*

Our algorithm for p -EDGE-CVC is as follows. First, we enumerate all minimal vertex covers of G of size at most k . The number of such vertex covers is at most 2^k , and they can be enumerated in $\mathcal{O}^*(2^k)$ time, and space (see [15]). Then, for every minimal vertex cover H of G , we use representative sets to check if it can be extended to a p -edge-connected vertex cover $S \supseteq H$ of size at most k .

Unfortunately, our approach to prove Theorem 4 does not work for p -CONNECTED VERTEX COVER.

Our last main result is the following:

Theorem 5. *For every fixed $p \geq 2$, p -EDGE-CONNECTED VERTEX COVER admits a $2(p+1)$ -factor approximation algorithm.*

The proof of this theorem uses the notion of p -blocks which can be obtained from Gomory-Hu tree. Unfortunately, our approach for proving it is not applicable to p -CONNECTED VERTEX COVER and the existence of a fixed-factor approximation algorithm for p -CONNECTED VERTEX COVER is an open problem (recall that p is a fixed positive integer).

¹The \mathcal{O}^* notation suppresses the polynomial factors.

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, we provide additional terminology and notation on sets, graphs, parameterized algorithms and kernelization. In Section 3, we show that neither p -CONNECTED VERTEX COVER nor p -EDGE-CONNECTED VERTEX COVER has a polynomial kernel and we also prove our first two main results, Theorem 1, and Theorem 2. In Section 4, we show our next main result, Theorem 4. In Section 5, we give our constant factor approximation algorithm. We conclude the paper with Section 6, where we discuss some open problems on the topic.

Related Work on Connected Hitting Set problems. Ghadikolaei et al. [10] studied a variant of CONNECTED VERTEX COVER problem where a minimal connected vertex cover has to contain a fixed set of vertices. Ramanujan [21] proved that for every $\alpha > 1$, CONNECTED FEEDBACK VERTEX SET has an α -approximate polynomial kernel. Eiben et al. [6] obtained a similar result for the CONNECTED \mathcal{H} -HITTING SET problem, where \mathcal{H} is a fixed set of graphs. Eiben et al. [7] also obtained an approximate kernelization for the CONNECTED DOMINATING SET problem.

2 Additional Terminology and Notation

Sets For $r \in \mathbb{N}$, we use $[r]$ to denote the set $\{1, 2, \dots, r\}$. Let U be a set of elements, and \mathcal{F} a family of subsets of U . (A *family* may have multiple copies of the same subset.) Then \mathcal{F} is said to be a *laminar family*, if for every $X, Y \in \mathcal{F}$, either $X \subseteq Y$, or $Y \subseteq X$, or $X \cap Y = \emptyset$.

Graph Theory Let G be a graph. A graph is *p -connected* if there are at least p vertex-disjoint paths between every pair of vertices. A graph is *p -edge-connected* if there are at least p edge-disjoint paths between every pair of vertices. For $S \subseteq V(G)$, $G[S]$ denotes the subgraph of G induced by S . Given a connected graph $G = (V, E)$, a set of vertices $S \subseteq V(G)$ is called a *separator* of G if $G - S$ is a disconnected graph. For two disjoint vertex sets A and B of G , an (A, B) -*cut* is a set F of edges such that $G - F$ is disconnected and no vertex of A belongs to the same connectivity component of $G - F$ which contains the vertices of B .

Parameterized Algorithms and Kernels A *parameterized problem* Π is a subset of $\Sigma^* \times \mathbb{N}$ for some finite alphabet Σ . An instance of a parameterized problem is a pair (x, k) where k is called the *parameter* and x is the *input*. We assume that k is *given in unary* and without loss of generality $k \leq |x|$, $|x|$ is the length of the input.

Definition 1 (Fixed-Parameter Tractability). A *parameterized problem* $\Pi \subseteq \Sigma^* \times \mathbb{N}$ is said to be *fixed-parameter tractable* (or FPT) if there exists an algorithm for solving the problem Π that on input (x, k) , runs in $f(k)|x|^c$ time where $f : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ is a computable function and c is a constant.

Definition 2 (Kernelization). Let $\Pi \subseteq \Sigma^* \times \mathbb{N}$ be a parameterized problem. *Kernelization* is a polynomial time procedure that replaces the input instance (x, k) by a reduced instance (x', k') such that **(1)** $|x'| + k' \leq g(k)$ for some function g depending only on k , and **(2)** $(x, k) \in \Pi$ if and only if $(x', k') \in \Pi$.

It is well-known [3] that a decidable parameterized problem is FPT if and only if it has a polynomial kernel.

Kernelization can be viewed as a theoretical foundation of computational preprocessing and thus we are interested in investigating when a parameterized problem admits a kernel of small size. We are especially interested in *polynomial kernels* for which the bound $g(k)$ is a polynomial and thus in classifying which parameterized problems admit polynomial kernels or not. Over the last decade, the area of kernelization has developed of a large number of approaches to design polynomial kernels as well as a number of tools for proving lower bounds based on assumptions from complexity theory. The lower bounds rule out the existence of polynomial kernels for many parameterized problems. We refer the reader to the textbooks [3, 5] for an introduction to the field of parameterized algorithms and to [8] for a recent introduction to kernelization.

3 Approximate Kernels

This section is partitioned into five parts. In Section 3.1, we prove that both p -CONNECTED VERTEX COVER and p -EDGE-CONNECTED VERTEX COVER do not admit a polynomial kernel unless $\text{NP} \subseteq \text{coNP/poly}$. In Section 3.2, we give terminology and notation on approximate kernels. In Section 3.3, we provide material which is very similar for both p -vertex-connectivity and p -edge-connectivity and used in the next two sections. In Sections 3.4 and 3.5, we obtain an approximate kernel for p -EDGE-CONNECTED VERTEX COVER and p -CONNECTED VERTEX COVER, respectively. In these sections, we assume that $p \geq 2$ and $\varepsilon < 1$.

3.1 Non-existence of Polynomial Kernels

We will first show that p -CONNECTED VERTEX COVER admits no polynomial kernel unless $\text{NP} \subseteq \text{coNP/poly}$ using the fact that CONNECTED VERTEX COVER admits no polynomial kernel unless $\text{NP} \subseteq \text{coNP/poly}$ [4].

Theorem 6. *p -CONNECTED VERTEX COVER admits no polynomial kernel unless $\text{NP} \subseteq \text{coNP/poly}$.*

Proof. Let (G, k) be an instance of CONNECTED VERTEX COVER. We construct an instance of p -CONNECTED VERTEX COVER as follows. We add $p - 1$ new vertices v_1, \dots, v_{p-1} to (G, k) and edges $\{uv_i | i \in [p - 1], u \in V(G)\}$ obtaining a new graph G' . Observe that G' can be computed in polynomial time. Furthermore, (G, k) is a yes-instance of CONNECTED VERTEX COVER if and only if $(G', k + p - 1)$ is a yes-instance of p -CONNECTED VERTEX COVER. Hence, p -CONNECTED VERTEX COVER does not admit a polynomial kernel unless $\text{NP} \subseteq \text{coNP/poly}$. \square

The reduction in the next theorem is from RED BLUE DOMINATING SET. In the problem, given a bipartite graph G with partite sets B and R , we are to decide whether there is $B' \subseteq B$ such that $|B'| \leq k$ and $N_G(B') = R$. Dom et al. [4] proved that RED BLUE DOMINATING SET parameterized by $k + |R|$ does not admit a polynomial kernel unless $\text{NP} \subseteq \text{coNP/poly}$.

Theorem 7. *p -EDGE-CONNECTED VERTEX COVER has no polynomial kernel unless $\text{NP} \subseteq \text{coNP/poly}$.*

Proof. Let $(G = (R \uplus B, E), k + |R|)$ be an instance of RED BLUE DOMINATING SET and let $R = \{r^1, r^2, \dots, r^t\}$. Without loss of generality, we may assume that for every $v \in B$, there exists $u \in R$ such that $uv \in E(G)$ (otherwise we can just delete v). Similarly, we may assume that for every $v \in R$, there exists $u \in B$ such that $uv \in E(G)$ (otherwise, there is no feasible solution). We will also assume that $t \geq p$, $k \geq p$ and $p \geq 2$. Construct a new graph H from G as follows.

- Add a complete graph K_p with vertex set $A = \{a_1, \dots, a_p\}$ such that $V(G) \cap A = \emptyset$, and edges $a_i b$ for every $i \in [p]$ and $b \in B$.
- Replace every vertex r^j of R by a complete graph K_p with vertices $\{r_1^j, \dots, r_p^j\}$ such that if $br^j \in E(G)$ then $br_i^j \in E(H)$ for every $i \in [p]$. Thus, R is replaced by \hat{R} of size pt .
- Attach a pendant vertex to every vertex in $\hat{R} \cup A$.
- Set $k' = k + p(t + 1)$. Note that since p is a fixed constant, we have that k' is $\mathcal{O}(k + t)$.

To complete the proof, it suffices to prove that $(G, k + t)$ is a yes-instance of RED BLUE DOMINATING SET if and only if (H, k') is a yes-instance of p -EDGE-CONNECTED VERTEX COVER.

(\Leftarrow) Let S be a p -edge-connected vertex cover of H such that $|S| \leq k'$. Observe that $\hat{R} \cup A \subseteq S$ since all of the vertices in $\hat{R} \cup A$ have pendant neighbors. Since every vertex in \hat{R} have just $p - 1$ neighbors in \hat{R} and $G[S]$ is p -edge-connected, S must contain at least one neighbor in B of every vertex of \hat{R} . Since $|\hat{R} \cup A| = p(t + 1)$, $k' = |\hat{R} \cup A| + k$ and so there must be a subset B' of B of size at most k such that $N_G(B') = R$. Hence, (G, k) is a yes-instance of RED BLUE DOMINATING SET.

(\Rightarrow) Let $B^* \subseteq B$ with $|B^*| = k$ such that $N_G(B^*) = R$. Let $B^* = \{b_1, \dots, b_k\}$, recall that $k \geq p$. We claim that $A \cup B^* \cup \hat{R}$ is a p -edge-connected vertex cover of H . Clearly, it is a vertex cover, so it remains to prove that $H[A \cup B^* \cup \hat{R}]$ is p -edge-connected. Let u, v be vertices of $A \cup B^* \cup \hat{R}$. It suffices to prove that there are p edge-disjoint paths between u and v for every choice of u and v . Subject to symmetry, it suffices to consider six cases:

$$\begin{aligned} &u, v \in A; u, v \in B^*; u, v \in \hat{R}; \\ &u \in A, v \in B^*; u \in A, v \in \hat{R}; u \in B^*, v \in \hat{R}. \end{aligned}$$

Below we will consider these cases one by one.

$u, v \in A$. Without loss of generality, let $u = a_1$ and $v = a_2$. Then $a_1 a_2, a_1 a_q a_2, 3 \leq q \leq p$ and $a_1 b_1 a_2$ are p edge-disjoint paths between u and v .

$u, v \in B^*$. Without loss of generality, let $u = b_1$ and $v = b_2$. Then $b_1 a_i b_2, i \in [p]$ are p edge-disjoint paths between u and v .

$u, v \in \hat{R}$. We will first consider the subcase when u, v are from the same clique in \hat{R} . Without loss of generality, let $u = r_1^1, v = r_2^1$ and $b_1 r^1 \in E(G)$. Then $r_1^1 r_2^1, r_1^1 r_q^1 r_2^1, 3 \leq q \leq p$ and $r_1^1 b_1 r_2^1$ are p edge-disjoint paths between u and v .

Now consider the subcase when u, v are from different cliques in \hat{R} . Without loss of generality, let $u = r_1^1, v = r_1^2$. For every $i \in [p]$, let $P_i = b_j$ if r^1 and r^2 are adjacent to a common vertex b_j in G and $P_i = b_{i'}a_i b_{i''}$ otherwise, where $b_{i'}r^1, b_{i''}r^2 \in E(G)$. Then $r_1^1 P_1 r_1^2, r_1^1 r_i^1 P_i r_i^2 r_1^2, 2 \leq i \leq p$ are p edge-disjoint paths between u and v .

$u \in A, v \in B^*$. There are p edge-disjoint paths between u and v since $A \cup \{v\}$ forms a clique with $p + 1$ vertices.

$u \in A, v \in \hat{R}$. Without loss of generality, let $u = a_1, v = r_1^1$ and $b_1 r' \in E(G)$. Then $a_1 b_1 r_1^1, a_1 a_i b_1 r_i^1 r_1^1 (2 \leq i \leq p)$ are p edge-disjoint paths between u and v .

$u \in B^*, v \in \hat{R}$. Without loss of generality, let $u = b_1$ and $v = r_1^1$. We will first consider the subcase when $b_1 r' \in E(G)$. Then $Q_1 = b_1 r_1^1, Q_i = b_1 r_i^1 r_1^1 (2 \leq i \leq p)$ are p edge-disjoint paths between u and v . Now consider the subcase when $b_j r' \in E(G)$ for some $j > 1$. Then $b_1 a_i b_j Q'_i (i \in [p])$ are p edge-disjoint paths between u and v , where $Q'_i = Q_i - b_1$ and Q_i is defined in the previous subcase.

This completes the proof. \square

3.2 Parameterized Optimization Problems and Approximate Kernelization

Informally, an α -approximate kernelization is a polynomial time algorithm that, given an instance (I, k) of a parameterized problem, outputs an instance (I', k') (called an α -approximate kernel) such that $|I'| + k' \leq g(k)$ for some computable function g , and any c -approximate solution to the instance (I', k') can be turned into a $(c\alpha)$ -factor approximate solution of (I, k) in polynomial time. α -approximate kernelization is a new area of parameterized complexity and it is important to understand which parameterized problems admit α -approximate kernels and which are not. Now we will mainly follow Lokshantov et al. [13] to formally introduce approximate kernelization. (Several other recent papers have dealt with approximate kernelization, e.g., [6, 7, 13, 21].)

Definition 3. A parameterized optimization (*maximization or minimization*) problem is a computable function $\Pi : \Sigma^* \times \mathbb{N} \times \Sigma^* \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \cup \{\pm\infty\}$.

The *instances* of a parameterized optimization problem Π are pairs $(x, k) \in \Sigma^* \times \mathbb{N}$, and a *solution* to (x, k) is simply a string $s \in \Sigma^*$ such that $|s| \leq |x| + k$. The *value* of the solution s is $\Pi(x, k, s)$. The problems we deal with in this paper are all minimization problems. Therefore, we state the definitions only in terms of minimization problems when the definition of maximization problems are analogous. Consider p -EDGE-CONNECTED VERTEX COVER parameterized by solution size. This is a minimization problem where the optimization function $pECVC : \Sigma^* \times \mathbb{N} \times \Sigma^* \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \cup \{\infty\}$ is defined as follows.

$$pECVC(G, k, S) = \begin{cases} \infty & \text{if } S \text{ is not a } p\text{-edge-connected vertex cover of } G, \\ \min\{|S|, k + 1\} & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

For p -CONNECTED VERTEX COVER, $pCVC(G, k, S)$ can be defined similarly.

Definition 4. For a parameterized minimization problem Π , the optimum value of an instance $(x, k) \in \Sigma^* \times \mathbb{N}$ is $\text{OPT}_\Pi(x, k) = \min_{s \in \Sigma^*, |s| \leq |x| + k} \Pi(x, k, s)$.

Naturally for the case of p -EDGE-CONNECTED VERTEX COVER, we denote

$$\text{OPT}(G, k) = \min_{S \subseteq V(G)} p\text{ECVC}(G, k, S).$$

Similarly, for p -CONNECTED VERTEX COVER.

Definition 5. Let $\alpha \geq 1$ be a real number and Π a parameterized minimization problem. An α -approximate polynomial time preprocessing algorithm \mathcal{A} for Π is a pair of polynomial time algorithms as follows. The first one is called the reduction algorithm that computes a map $\mathcal{R}_\mathcal{A} : \Sigma^* \times \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \Sigma^* \times \mathbb{N}$. Given an input instance (x, k) of Π , the reduction algorithm outputs another instance $(x', k') = \mathcal{R}_\mathcal{A}(x, k)$.

The second algorithm is called the solution lifting algorithm. This algorithm takes an input instance (x, k) , the output instance (x', k') , and a solution s' to the output instance (x', k') . The solution lifting algorithm works in polynomial time in $|x|, k, |x'|, k'$, and s' , and outputs a solution s to (x, k) such that the following holds.

$$\frac{\Pi(x, k, s)}{\text{OPT}(x, k)} \leq \alpha \cdot \frac{\Pi(x', k', s')}{\text{OPT}(x', k')}$$

The size of the reduction algorithm \mathcal{A} is a function $\text{size}_\mathcal{A} : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ defined as $\text{size}_\mathcal{A}(k) = \sup\{|x'| + k' : (x', k') = \mathcal{R}_\mathcal{A}(x, k), x \in \Sigma^*\}$.

Definition 6. Let $\alpha \geq 1$ be a real number. An α -approximate kernelization (and (x', k') is an α -approximate kernel) for a parameterized optimization problem Π , is an α -approximate polynomial time preprocessing algorithm \mathcal{A} for Π such that $\text{size}_\mathcal{A}$ is upper bounded by a computable function $g : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$. We say that (x', k') is an α -approximate polynomial kernel if g is a polynomial function.

Definition 7. A polynomial size approximate kernelization scheme (PSAKS) for a parameterized optimization problem Π is a family of α -approximate polynomial kernelization algorithms, one such algorithm for every $\alpha > 1$.

Definition 8. A PSAKS is said to be time efficient if both the reduction algorithm and the solution lifting algorithm run in time $f(\alpha)|x|^c$ for some function f and a constant c independent of $|x|, k$, and α .

3.3 Lemmas and Reduction Rule for Both Types of Connectivity

We will use the following useful lemma whose vertex-connectivity part is proved in [23] (Lemma 4.2.2). We were unable to find a proof of the edge-connectivity part of the lemma in the literature and thus provide a short proof here.

Lemma 1. If G is a p -vertex-connected (p -edge-connected, respectively) graph and G' is obtained from G by adding a new vertex y adjacent with at least p vertices of G , then G' is p -vertex-connected (p -edge-connected, respectively).

Proof. Let C be a cut in G' . If $C = (y, V(G))$ then by construction $|C| \geq p$. Otherwise, $C - y$ is a cut in G and $|C| \geq p$. \square

The next lemma will help us to identify whether a graph $G = (V, E)$ has a p -vertex/edge-connected vertex cover or not.

Lemma 2. *Let $G = (V, E)$ be a graph, L the set of vertices of G with degree at most $p - 1$ and $S = V(G - L)$. Then G has a p -vertex/edge-connected vertex cover if and only if S is a p -vertex/edge-connected vertex cover of G .*

Proof. The backward direction (\Leftarrow) of the proof is trivial.

We will prove the forward direction (\Rightarrow). Let S^* be a p -vertex/edge-connected vertex cover of G . If $S^* = V(G - L)$, then we are done. Hence, we may assume that $S^* \neq V(G - L)$. Observe that $S^* \cap L = \emptyset$ as otherwise for every $u \in S^* \cap L$ deleting the vertices adjacent to u (the edges incident to u) will make $G[S^*]$ disconnected. Let $A = V(G) \setminus (S^* \cup L)$ and note that A is an independent set as S^* is a vertex cover. Hence, by Lemma 1 adding A to S^* will result in a p -vertex/edge-connected vertex cover of G . So, $S = S^* \cup A$ is a p -vertex/edge-connected vertex cover of G , which completes the proof. \square

We now start describing a $(1 + \varepsilon)$ -approximate kernel for both p -EDGE-CONNECTED VERTEX COVER and p -CONNECTED VERTEX COVER. Let (G, k) be an input instance. Using Lemma 2, we can check in polynomial time if a graph G has a p -vertex/edge-connected vertex cover. If (G, k) does not have a p -vertex/edge-connected vertex cover, then we just return $(2K_2, 1)$ as the output instance. Otherwise, (G, k) has a p -vertex/edge-connected vertex cover. Observe that any vertex with degree at least $k + 1$ must be present in any feasible solution of size at most k . Similarly, if v is a vertex with degree at most $p - 1$, then $N_G(v)$ must be part of any feasible solution. We call these vertices *necessary vertices* and initialize $H := \emptyset$. Based on this discussion, we apply the following reduction rule which is correct.

Reduction Rule 1. *Remove all isolated vertices from G . Add every vertex of degree at least $k + 1$ to H . For every vertex v with degree at most $p - 1$, add $N(v)$ to H .*

Afterwards we partition $V(G) = H \uplus I \uplus R$, where

- $I = \{u \in V(G) \mid N_G(u) \subseteq H\}$, and
- $R = V(G) \setminus (H \cup I)$.

Observe that any vertex in R has at least one neighbor in R , and possibly some neighbor in H . By definition, I is an independent set. Also, any vertex $v \in R$ has degree at most k in G . If $|H| > k$ or $G[R]$ has more than k^2 edges, then (G, k) cannot have any feasible solution with at most k vertices. In this case, we return $(K_{2p}, 1)$ as the output instance. Otherwise, $|H| \leq k$, and $G[R]$ has at most k^2 edges. Hence, $|R| \leq 2k^2$.

3.4 Approximate Kernel for p -EDGE-CONNECTED VERTEX COVER

Set $d = \lceil 2p/\varepsilon \rceil$ and first run Algorithm 1 on (G, k) to mark some vertices in I . Note that for every subset of H of size at most $2d + 2p + 2$, we mark at most $\lceil (1 + \varepsilon)k^2 \rceil$ vertices of I . For the rest of this section, we will be using ‘a vertex $v \in L$ ’ or ‘a marked vertex v ’ to mean the same thing.

Algorithm 1 (Marking vertices in I)

input : (G, k) and $k \in \mathbb{N}$

output : (G', k') , where G' satisfies some additional properties

$L \leftarrow \emptyset$;

$I_p \leftarrow \{u \in I \mid \deg_G(u) \geq p\}$;

for every set $S \in \binom{H}{\leq 2(d+p+1)}$ **do**

if $|(\bigcap_{u \in S} N_G(u)) \cap I_p| \geq (1 + \varepsilon)k^2$ **then**

 Mark $\lceil (1 + \varepsilon)k^2 \rceil$ vertices in $(\bigcap_{u \in S} N_G(u)) \cap I_p$;

 Add these marked vertices to L ;

end

else

 Mark all vertices in $(\bigcap_{u \in S} N_G(u)) \cap I_p$;

$L \leftarrow L \cup ((\bigcap_{u \in S} N_G(u)) \cap I_p)$;

end

end

for every vertex $x \in H$ **do**

 add a new pendant vertex x' to I such that xx' is an edge;

$L \leftarrow L \cup \{x'\}$;

 Mark x' ;

end

$k' \leftarrow k(1 + \varepsilon)$;

$G' \leftarrow G[H \cup R \cup L]$;

Output (G', k') as the reduced instance;

Recall that $d = \lceil 2p/\varepsilon \rceil$ and for every subset of H of size at most $2d + 2p + 2$, we mark at most $\lceil (1 + \varepsilon)k^2 \rceil$ vertices of I . Therefore, $|L| \leq \lceil (1 + \varepsilon)k^2 \rceil k^{2\lceil 2p/\varepsilon \rceil + 2p + 2}$. Also, $G[R]$ has k^2 edges. Therefore, $|R| \leq 2k^2$. Hence, $|V(G')| \leq \lceil (1 + \varepsilon)k^2 \rceil k^{2\lceil 2p/\varepsilon \rceil + 2p + 2} + 2k^2 + 2k$.

Let us recall the following theorem of Nishizeki and Poljak [18].

Theorem 3. *Let G be a p -vertex/edge-connected graph. Then, there exists a polynomial time algorithm that computes a p -vertex/edge-connected spanning subgraph H of G such that H has at most $p|V(G)|$ edges.*

We apply Theorem 3 to prove the following lemma, which we will use to prove our main result of this subsection.

Lemma 3. *Let (G, k) be the input instance of p -EDGE-CONNECTED VERTEX COVER and (G', k') be the output instance after applying Algorithm 1. Then, the following statements hold true.*

1. *If $\text{OPT}(G, k) \leq k$, then $\text{OPT}(G', k') \leq (1 + \varepsilon)\text{OPT}(G, k)$.*
2. *If A is a p -edge-connected vertex cover of (G', k') , then A is also a p -edge-connected vertex cover of (G, k) .*

Proof. We prove the statements in the given order.

1. Let X be an optimal p -edge-connected vertex cover of (G, k) and $|X| \leq k$. Since $|X| \leq k$, $H \subseteq S$. If $X \subseteq V(G')$, then X is also a p -edge-connected vertex cover of G' . Hence, $\text{OPT}(G', k') \leq |X| = \text{OPT}(G, k)$. So, we may assume that there exists a vertex $u \in X$ such that $u \notin V(G')$. Recall that by construction, L is the set of all marked vertices from I and the additional marked pendant vertices. This ensures that H is contained in any feasible solution of (G', k') .

By Theorem 3, $G[X]$ has a p -edge-connected spanning subgraph F having at most $p|X|$ edges. We initialize $X' := X$ and replace one by one all vertices of X which are not in G' by vertices of G' forming a new set X' , which will be proved to be p -edge-connected and of size at most $(1 + \varepsilon)|X|$. (Note that all replaced vertices form an independent set and the order of replacing them is immaterial.) Let $u \in X \setminus V(G')$, $B = N_F(u)$ and consider the step when u is replaced by vertices in G' . We will use the fact that $|X'| \leq (1 + \varepsilon)|X|$, the bound which will be shown in the last part of the proof. Let us consider two cases.

Case $|B| \leq 2d$. Since $|X'| \leq (1 + \varepsilon)k$, and we have marked $\lceil (1 + \varepsilon)k^2 \rceil$ vertices whose neighborhood contains B , (in other words, u is unmarked, $u \in \bigcap_{w \in B} N_G(w)$, $|\bigcap_{w \in B} N_G(w) \cap L| = \lceil (1 + \varepsilon)k^2 \rceil$) there is a marked vertex $v \notin X'$ such that $B \subseteq N(v)$. (or in other words, $v \in \bigcap_{w \in B} N_G(w)$). We set $X' := (X' \setminus \{u\}) \cup \{v\}$. In this case, we replace one unmarked vertex by one marked vertex in X' .

Case $|B| > 2d$. We partition B into r sets B_1, B_2, \dots, B_r such that $|B_1| = \dots = |B_{r-1}| = d$ and $d \leq |B_r| < 2d$. Recall that $d = \lceil 2p/\varepsilon \rceil$ and $\varepsilon < 1$. Hence $d \geq 2p + 1$. For every $i \in [r]$, let $U_i = B_i \cup A_{i,1} \cup A_{i,2}$ where $A_{i,1}$ is an arbitrary set of $p+1$ vertices from B_{i-1} , and $A_{i,2}$ is an arbitrary set of $p+1$ vertices from B_{i+1} . Here i is taken modulo r , i.e., $r+1 = 1$ and $0 = r$. Recall that for all $i \in [r]$, $U_i \subseteq N_F(u) \subseteq N_G(u)$. Since u is unmarked, $|\bigcap_{w \in U_i} N_G(w) \cap L| = \lceil (1 + \varepsilon)k^2 \rceil$. However, X' covers at most $\lceil (1 + \varepsilon)k \rceil$ marked vertices from $\bigcup_{i=1}^r (\bigcap_{w \in U_i} N_G(w) \cap L)$. Hence, we have r distinct marked vertices $v_1, \dots, v_r \notin X'$ such that for all $i \in [r]$, v_i is marked, $U_i \subseteq N_G(v_i)$ (or equivalently $v_i \in \bigcap_{w \in U_i} N_G(w)$), but $v_i \notin X'$. We replace u by v_1, \dots, v_r by setting $X' := (X' \setminus \{u\}) \cup \{v_1, \dots, v_r\}$. So, in this case, we replace one unmarked vertex by r distinct marked vertices. Observe that $r \leq \lceil |B|/d \rceil = \lceil \deg_F(u)/d \rceil$. Also, observe that by construction the sets of marked vertices replacing two unmarked vertices do not intersect.

We claim that $G'[X']$ is a p -edge-connected subgraph. We prove this by contradiction. In particular we prove that “If $G'[X']$ is not a p -edge-connected subgraph, then F is not a p -edge-connected subgraph.”

Let us consider a minimum cut (X'_1, X'_2) of $G'[X']$ with at most $p-1$ edges. We construct an edge-cut (X_1, X_2) of F . We initialize $X_1 := X'_1$, and $X_2 := X'_2$. We process all the unmarked vertices from $X \setminus X'$ one by one as follows. Consider an arbitrary unmarked vertex $u \in X \setminus X'$. Either u is replaced by exactly one marked vertex, or a u is replaced by r marked vertices $v_1, \dots, v_r \in I$ (but not both). Suppose that u is replaced by exactly one marked vertex $u^* \in X'$. Then, it must have been because $|N_F(u)| \leq 2d$ and $N_F(u) \subseteq N_{G'}(u^*)$. If $u^* \in X'_1$, we set

$X_1 := X_1 \cup \{u\} \setminus \{u^*\}$. Otherwise, $u^* \in X_2'$. Then, we set $X_2 := X_2 \cup \{u\} \setminus \{u^*\}$. Observe that $N_F(u) \subseteq N_{G'}(u^*)$. Therefore, this step does not increase the number of edges of the form x_1x_2 with $x_1 \in X_1, x_2 \in X_2$. Otherwise, u is replaced by r distinct marked vertices v_1, \dots, v_r . First, observe by construction that for all $i < j$, there are $(p+1)$ edge-disjoint paths from v_i to v_j passing through v_{i+1}, \dots, v_{j-1} . If $j = i+1$, then it is trivial. Because, $U_i \subseteq N_{G'}(v_i), U_j \subseteq N_{G'}(v_j)$. Since, $|U_i \cap U_j| \geq p+1$, v_i and v_j have at least $p+1$ common neighbors. Similarly, v_1 and v_r has at least $p+1$ common neighbors. Otherwise, $j \geq i+2$ consider the sets $A_{i,2}, \dots, A_{j-1,2}$. These sets are all pairwise disjoint. Observe that for all $i \in [r]$, we have $A_{i,2} \in \binom{B_{i+1}}{p+1}$ and $A_{i,2} \subseteq N(v_i) \cap N(v_{i+1})$. Similarly, $A_{j-1,2} \subseteq N(v_{j-1}) \cap N(v_j)$. Therefore, there are at least p edge-disjoint paths from v_i to v_j . Since (X_1', X_2') is a minimum cut of $G'[X']$, either $\{v_1, \dots, v_r\} \subseteq X_1'$ or $\{v_1, \dots, v_r\} \subseteq X_2'$ (but not both). If $\{v_1, \dots, v_r\} \subseteq X_1'$, then we set $X_1 := (X_1 \cup \{u\}) \setminus \{v_1, \dots, v_r\}$. Otherwise $\{v_1, \dots, v_r\} \subseteq X_2'$. Then, we set $X_2 := (X_2 \cup \{u\}) \setminus \{v_1, \dots, v_r\}$. Observe that $N_F(u) \subseteq N_{G'}(\{v_1, \dots, v_r\})$. Therefore, this step also does not increase the number of edges of the form x_1x_2 such that $x_1 \in X_1, x_2 \in X_2$.

Note that the above process removes all vertices of $X' \setminus X$ and adds all vertices of $X \setminus X'$ in sequence to compute a cut (X_1, X_2) . Moreover, by construction, we have $|E(X_1, X_2)| \leq |E(X_1', X_2')| \leq p-1$. Then, F is also not p -edge-connected graph that is a contradiction. Therefore, $G'[X']$ induces a p -edge-connected subgraph.

We have argued that $G'[X']$ is also a p -edge-connected subgraph. Recall that in each the replacement steps, we replace an unmarked vertex $u \in I$ by a collection of marked vertices from I . But $|X| \leq k$, and therefore, $H \subseteq X$. So, X' is also a vertex cover of (G', k') .

Now we will complete the proof by showing that $|X'| \leq (1+\varepsilon)|X|$. Recall that F has at most $p|X|$ edges. At every step, our procedure replaces an unmarked vertex $u \in X \cap I$ by at most r marked vertices such that $1 \leq r \leq \lceil \deg_F(u)/d \rceil$. Also recall that $d = \lceil 2p/\varepsilon \rceil$. Hence, we have

$$\begin{aligned} |X'| &\leq |X \cap X'| + |X \setminus X'| + \sum_{u \in X \setminus X'} \left(\left\lceil \frac{\deg_F(u)}{d} \right\rceil - 1 \right) \leq |X| + \sum_{u \in X \setminus X'} \frac{\deg_F(u)}{d} \\ &= |X| + \frac{\sum_{u \in X \setminus X'} \deg_F(u)}{d} = |X| + \frac{2|E(F)|}{d} \leq |X| + \frac{2p|X|}{d} \leq (1+2p/d)|X| \leq (1+\varepsilon)|X|. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, $\text{OPT}(G', k') \leq |X'| \leq (1+\varepsilon)|X| = (1+\varepsilon)\text{OPT}(G, k)$.

2. Let A be a p -edge-connected vertex cover of (G', k') . By construction, for every $x \in H$, there is $x' \in I$ such that x' is a pendant neighbor of x in G' . Since $p \geq 2$, A cannot contain any pendant vertex of G' . Hence, $H \subseteq A$. Consider an arbitrary vertex $u \in V(G) \setminus V(G')$. By construction, $u \in I$. Since $H \subseteq A$, and $N_G(u) \subseteq H$, we have that $N_G(u) \subseteq A$. Hence, A is also a vertex cover of (G, k) . Since $G'[A]$ is p -edge-connected, $A \subseteq V(G)$ and $G[A] = G'[A]$, we have that $G[A]$ is also a p -edge-connected graph. Therefore, A is a p -edge-connected vertex cover of (G, k) as well.

This completes the proof of the lemma. □

We are now ready to prove the main result of this section, Theorem 1 (we restate it here).

Theorem 1. *For every $0 < \varepsilon < 1$ and every fixed $p \geq 2$, p -EDGE-CONNECTED VERTEX COVER admits a $(1 + \varepsilon)$ -approximate kernel with $\mathcal{O}((1 + \varepsilon)k^{\mathcal{O}(p/\varepsilon)})$ vertices.*

Proof. The approximate kernelization algorithm has two parts. First part is a reduction algorithm, and the second part is a solution lifting algorithm. Let (G, k) be an input instance of p -EDGE-CONNECTED VERTEX COVER.

- **Reduction algorithm:** First we invoke Lemma 2 to check if G has a p -edge-connected vertex cover or not. If G has no p -edge-connected vertex cover, then we return $(2K_2, 1)$ as the output instance. Otherwise, we first apply Reduction Rule 1. Reduction Rule 1 obtains a new instance (G_1, k) by deleting isolated vertices from G . Then it computes H and $V(G_1) = H \uplus I \uplus R$. Observe that $G[R] = G_1[R]$. If $|H| > k$, or $G_1[R]$ (equivalently $G[R]$) has more than k^2 edges, then $\text{OPT}(G, k) = k + 1$ and we return $(K_{2p}, 1)$ as the output instance. Otherwise, $|H| \leq k$, and $G[R]$ has at most k^2 edges. Since Reduction Rule 1 removes only isolated vertices, $\text{OPT}(G, k) = \text{OPT}(G_1, k)$ and for any $S \subseteq V(G_1)$, $p\text{ECVC}(G, k, S) = p\text{ECVC}(G_1, k, S)$.

In this situation, if $|V(G_1)| \leq \lceil (1 + \varepsilon)k^2 \rceil k^{2\lceil 2p/\varepsilon \rceil + 2p+2} + 2k^2 + 2k$, we output (G_1, k) itself. Otherwise, $|V(G_1)| > \lceil (1 + \varepsilon)k^2 \rceil k^{2\lceil 2p/\varepsilon \rceil + 2p+2} + 2k^2 + 2k$. Then, we apply Algorithm 1 on (G_1, k) to construct (G', k') and return (G', k') as an output instance.

- **Solution lifting algorithm:** Let S^* be the given solution to (G', k') . If S^* is not a p -edge-connected vertex cover of (G', k') , then we return \emptyset as the solution to (G, k) . Otherwise, given S^* as a feasible p -edge-connected vertex cover of (G', k') , we return S^* as a solution for the instance (G, k) .

Running time: Observe that Reduction Rule 1 can be implemented in $\mathcal{O}(n^{\mathcal{O}(1)})$ time. The marking algorithm (Algorithm 1) is implemented only when $n > (1 + \varepsilon)k^{2\lceil 2p/\varepsilon \rceil + 2p+2} + 2k^2 + 2k$. The marking algorithm can be implemented in $\mathcal{O}(k^{2\lceil 2p/\varepsilon \rceil + 2p+4} n^{\mathcal{O}(1)})$ time. Since $n > \lceil (1 + \varepsilon)k^2 \rceil k^{2\lceil 2p/\varepsilon \rceil + 2p+2} + 2k^2 + 2k$, the marking algorithm can be implemented in $\mathcal{O}(n^{\mathcal{O}(1)})$ time. Therefore, the reduction algorithm can be implemented in $\mathcal{O}(n^{\mathcal{O}(1)})$ time. By construction, the solution lifting algorithm can be implemented in $\mathcal{O}(n^{\mathcal{O}(1)})$ time. Therefore, our approximate kernel is time-efficient.

Analysis: We argue now that the reduction algorithm and the solution lifting algorithm together provide a $(1 + \varepsilon)$ -approximate kernel. If S^* is not a p -edge-connected vertex cover of (G', k') , then $p\text{ECVC}(G', k', S^*) = \infty$ and $p\text{ECVC}(G, k, \emptyset) \leq \infty$. Hence, $\frac{p\text{ECVC}(G, k, S^*)}{\text{OPT}(G, k)} \leq \frac{p\text{ECVC}(G', k', S^*)}{\text{OPT}(G', k')}$. Otherwise, S^* is a p -edge-connected vertex cover in (G', k') . By Lemma 3, S^* is also a p -edge-connected vertex cover of (G_1, k) . Reduction Rule 1 removes only isolated vertices from (G, k) , therefore, any feasible solution of (G_1, k) is also a feasible solution of (G, k) . Therefore, S^* is a p -edge-connected vertex cover of (G, k) . By Lemma 3, if $\text{OPT}(G_1, k) \leq k$, then $\text{OPT}(G', k') \leq (1 + \varepsilon)\text{OPT}(G_1, k)$. But, as we have argued before, $\text{OPT}(G_1, k) = \text{OPT}(G, k)$. Hence, if $\text{OPT}(G, k) \leq k$, then $\text{OPT}(G', k') \leq (1 + \varepsilon)\text{OPT}(G, k)$. We will use this fact to prove our theorem's statement. We explain by case analysis that if we are given a c -approximate feasible solution to (G', k') , then we would be able to give a $c(1 + \varepsilon)$ -approximate feasible solution to (G, k) .

- **Case 1:** $|S^*| > k' \geq k$. Then $pECVC(G', k', S^*) = k' + 1$. Hence, $pECVC(G, k, S^*) = k + 1 \leq k' + 1 = pECVC(G', k', S^*)$. If $\text{OPT}(G, k) \leq k$ then, as we have argued, $\text{OPT}(G', k') \leq (1 + \varepsilon)\text{OPT}(G, k)$. Hence, we have the following:

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{pECVC(G, k, S^*)}{\text{OPT}(G, k)} &= \frac{k + 1}{\text{OPT}(G, k)} \leq (1 + \varepsilon) \frac{k' + 1}{\text{OPT}(G', k')} \\ &= (1 + \varepsilon) \frac{pECVC(G', k', S^*)}{\text{OPT}(G', k')} \end{aligned}$$

Otherwise, $\text{OPT}(G, k) = k + 1$. Then,

$$\frac{pECVC(G, k, S^*)}{\text{OPT}(G, k)} = \frac{k + 1}{k + 1} = 1 \leq (1 + \varepsilon) \frac{pECVC(G', k', S^*)}{\text{OPT}(G', k')}$$

- **Case 2:** $k + 1 \leq |S^*| \leq k'$. Then $pECVC(G', k', S^*) = |S^*|$, and $pECVC(G, k, S^*) = \min\{k + 1, |S^*|\} = k + 1$. If $\text{OPT}(G, k) \leq k$, then as we have argued before, $\text{OPT}(G', k') \leq (1 + \varepsilon)\text{OPT}(G, k)$. Then, we have the following:

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{pECVC(G, k, S^*)}{\text{OPT}(G, k)} &= \frac{k + 1}{\text{OPT}(G, k)} \leq (1 + \varepsilon) \frac{k + 1}{\text{OPT}(G', k')} \\ &\leq (1 + \varepsilon) \frac{|S^*|}{\text{OPT}(G', k')} = (1 + \varepsilon) \frac{pECVC(G', k', S^*)}{\text{OPT}(G', k')} \end{aligned}$$

Otherwise $\text{OPT}(G, k) = k + 1$. Then,

$$\frac{pECVC(G, k, S^*)}{\text{OPT}(G, k)} = \frac{k + 1}{k + 1} = 1 \leq (1 + \varepsilon) \frac{pECVC(G', k', S^*)}{\text{OPT}(G', k')}$$

- **Case 3:** $|S^*| \leq k$. Then $pECVC(G, k, S^*) = |S^*| = pECVC(G', k', S^*)$. In this case, $\text{OPT}(G, k) \leq k$. So, we get the following by using the fact that $\text{OPT}(G', k') \leq (1 + \varepsilon)\text{OPT}(G, k)$.

$$\frac{pECVC(G, k, S^*)}{\text{OPT}(G, k)} = \frac{pECVC(G', k', S^*)}{\text{OPT}(G, k)} \leq (1 + \varepsilon) \frac{pECVC(G', k', S^*)}{\text{OPT}(G', k')}$$

By construction, (G', k') has $\mathcal{O}((1 + \varepsilon)k^{2\lceil 2p/\varepsilon \rceil + 2p + 4})$ vertices. Since, p is fixed, our result implies a time efficient PSAKS with the claimed bound. This completes the proof. \square

3.5 Approximate Kernel for p -CONNECTED VERTEX COVER

We set $d = \lceil 2p^2/\varepsilon \rceil$ and run Algorithm 2 to mark some vertices in I . Note that for every subset of H of size at most $2d + 2p + 2$, we mark at most $\lceil (1 + \varepsilon)(p + 1)^2 k^2 \rceil$ vertices of I . Similar to Section 3.4, we use ‘a vertex $v \in L$ ’ or ‘a marked vertex v ’ to mean the same thing.

Since, $d = \lceil 2p^2/\varepsilon \rceil$, we have $|L| \leq \lceil (1 + \varepsilon)(p + 1)^2 k^2 \rceil k^{2\lceil 2p^2/\varepsilon \rceil + 2p + 2}$. Also, $G[R]$ has k^2 edges, and hence $|R| \leq 2k^2$. Hence, $|V(G')| \leq \lceil (1 + \varepsilon)(p + 1)^2 k^2 \rceil k^{2\lceil 2p^2/\varepsilon \rceil + 2p + 2} + 2k^2 + 2k$.

We apply Theorem 3 to prove the following lemma. We will use this following lemma to prove the main result of this section.

Algorithm 2 (Marking vertices in I)

input : $G = (V, E)$ and $k \in \mathbb{N}$

output : (G', k') , where G' satisfies some additional properties

$L \leftarrow \emptyset$;

$I_p \leftarrow \{u \in I \mid \deg_G(u) \geq p\}$;

for every set $S \in \binom{H}{\leq 2(d+p+1)}$ **do**

if $|\left(\bigcap_{u \in S} N_G(u)\right) \cap I_p| \geq (1 + \varepsilon)(p + 1)^2 k^2$ **then**

 Mark $\lceil (1 + \varepsilon)(p + 1)^2 k^2 \rceil$ vertices in $\left(\bigcap_{u \in S} N_G(u)\right) \cap I_p$;

 Add these marked vertices to L ;

end

else

 Mark all vertices in $\left(\bigcap_{u \in S} N_G(u)\right) \cap I_p$;

$L \leftarrow L \cup \left(\bigcap_{u \in S} N_G(u)\right) \cap I_p$;

end

end

for every vertex $x \in H$ **do**

 add a new pendant vertex x' to I such that xx' is an edge;

$L \leftarrow L \cup \{x'\}$;

 Mark x' ;

end

$k' \leftarrow k(1 + \varepsilon)$;

$G' \leftarrow G[H \cup R \cup L]$;

Output (G', k') as the reduced instance;

Lemma 4. *Let (G, k) be the input instance of p -CONNECTED VERTEX COVER, and let (G', k') be the output instance after applying Algorithm 2. Then, the following statements hold true.*

1. *If A is a p -connected vertex cover of (G', k') , then A is also a p -connected vertex cover of (G, k) .*
2. *If $\text{OPT}(G, k) \leq k$, then $\text{OPT}(G', k') \leq (1 + \varepsilon)\text{OPT}(G, k)$.*

Proof. We prove the statements in the given order.

1. We can prove this statement using arguments similar to the proof of Lemma 3(2).
2. Let X be an optimal p -connected vertex cover of (G, k) such that $|X| \leq k$. Since, $|X| \leq k$, $H \subseteq S$. If $X \subseteq V(G')$, then $\text{OPT}(G', k') \leq |X| = \text{OPT}(G, k)$. So, we may assume that there exists a vertex $u \in X$ such that $u \notin V(G')$. Recall that by construction, L is the set of all marked vertices from I , and the additional marked pendant vertices. By Theorem 3, $G[X]$ has a p -connected spanning subgraph F with at most $p|X|$ edges. We initialize, $X' := X$ and replace one by one all vertices of X which are not in G' by vertices of G forming a new set X' . We will then prove that $G'[X']$ is a p -connected vertex cover and $|X'| \leq (1 + \varepsilon)|X| \leq (1 + \varepsilon)k$. Observe that the replaced vertices form independent set, and therefore, order of replacing them does not make any difference. Let $u \in X \setminus V(G')$, $B = N_F(u)$ and consider the

step when u is replaced by vertices in G' . We will use the fact that $|X'| \leq (1 + \varepsilon)k$, the bound which will be shown in the last part of the proof.

Case (i): $|B| \leq 2d$. Since, $|X'| \leq (1 + \varepsilon)k$, the vertex u is unmarked, $u \in \cap_{x \in B} N_G(x) \cap I_p$, it holds true that $|\cap_{x \in B} N_G(x) \cap L| = \lceil (1 + \varepsilon)(p + 1)^2 k^2 \rceil$. So, there is a marked vertex $v \notin X'$ such that $v \in \cap_{x \in B} N_G(x) \cap L$. We set $X' := (X \setminus \{u\}) \cup \{v\}$. In this case, we replace one unmarked vertex by one marked vertex in X' .

Case (ii): $|B| > 2d$. We partition $B = B_1 \uplus B_2 \uplus \dots \uplus B_r$ such that $|B_1| = \dots = |B_r| = d$, and $d \leq |B_r| \leq 2d - 1$. Recall that $d = \lceil 2p^2/\varepsilon \rceil$ and $0 < \varepsilon < 1$. Hence, $d \geq 2p^2 + 1$. For every $i \in [r]$, let $U_i = B_i \cup A_{i,1} \cup A_{i,2}$ where $A_{i,1}$ is an arbitrary set of $p + 1$ vertices from B_{i-1} , and $A_{i,2}$ is an arbitrary set of $p + 1$ vertices from B_{i+1} . Here i is taken modulo r . Recall that for all $i \in [r]$, $U_i \subseteq N_F(u) \subseteq N_G(u)$. Since u is unmarked but $u \in \cap_{x \in U_i} N_G(x)$, we have that $|\cap_{x \in U_i} N_G(x) \cap L| = \lceil (1 + \varepsilon)(p + 1)^2 k^2 \rceil$. But, X' covers at most $(1 + \varepsilon)k$ of these marked vertices from $\bigcup_{i=1}^r (\cap_{x \in U_i} N_G(x) \cap L)$. Hence, we have pr many distinct marked vertices $v_{1,1}, \dots, v_{1,p}, v_{2,1}, \dots, v_{2,p}, \dots, v_{r,1}, \dots, v_{r,p} \notin X$ such that for all $i \in [r]$, we have $v_{i,1}, \dots, v_{i,p} \in \cap_{x \in U_i} N_G(x) \cap L$. So, we replace u by $v_{1,1}, \dots, v_{1,p}, v_{2,1}, \dots, v_{2,p}, \dots, v_{r,1}, \dots, v_{r,p}$. Thus, we set $X' := (X \setminus \{u\}) \cup \{v_{1,1}, \dots, v_{1,p}, v_{2,1}, \dots, v_{2,p}, \dots, v_{r,1}, \dots, v_{r,p}\}$. So, in this case, we have replaced one unmarked vertex by rp marked vertices. Observe that $r = \lfloor |B|/d \rfloor = \lfloor \deg_F(u)/d \rfloor$.

Also observe that the sets of marked vertices replacing two distinct unmarked vertices do not intersect. We prove that $G'[X']$ is a p -connected subgraph. We prove this by contradiction. In particular, we prove that “if $G'[X']$ is not a p -connected subgraph, then F is also not a p -connected subgraph”. Consider a minimum vertex separator T' of $G'[X']$ such that $|T'| \leq p - 1$. Let $X' = X'_1 \uplus X'_2 \uplus T'$ such that T' separates X'_1 from X'_2 in $G'[X']$. We will compute a partition $X = X_1 \uplus X_2 \uplus T$ of F such that T separates X_1 from X_2 in F . We initialize $X_1 := X'_1, X_2 := X'_2$, and $T := T'$. We process all the unmarked vertices from $X \setminus X'$ one by one as follows. Consider an arbitrary unmarked vertex $u \in X \setminus X'$. Either u is replaced by exactly one marked vertex or u is replaced by pr marked vertices $v_{1,1}, \dots, v_{1,p}, \dots, v_{r,1}, \dots, v_{r,p} \in L$, but not both. Suppose that u is replaced by pr marked vertices $v_{1,1}, \dots, v_{1,p}, \dots, v_{r,1}, \dots, v_{r,p} \in L$. For every $i \in [r]$, we define $D_i = \{v_{i,1}, \dots, v_{i,p}\}$. Furthermore, let us denote $D_u = D_1 \cup \dots \cup D_r$. Let $x, y \in D_i$. Observe that $U_i \subseteq N_{G'}(x) \cap N_{G'}(y)$ and $|U_i| > p$. Hence, there are at least p vertex-disjoint paths between two vertices of D_i . Hence, for every $i \in [r]$, either $D_i \subseteq X'_1 \cup T'$ or $D_i \subseteq X'_2 \cup T'$. Otherwise, if for two distinct $x, y \in D_i$, if $x \in X'_1, y \in X'_2$, then $|T'| \geq p$ which is a contradiction.

Also, let us argue that for $i < j$, there are at least p vertex-disjoint paths from $x \in D_i$ to $y \in D_j$. If $j = i + 1$, then it is trivial because $A_{i,2} \subseteq N_{G'}(x) \cap N_{G'}(y)$ and $|A_{i,2}| = p + 1$. Similarly, there are p vertex-disjoint paths between $x \in D_1$ and $y \in D_r$. Consider when $j \geq i + 2$. Then, consider the sets $A_{i,2}, D_{i+1}, A_{i+1,2}, D_{i+2}, \dots, A_{j-2,2}, D_{j-1}, A_{j-1,2}$. These sets are all pairwise disjoint. And observe that for every $z \in A_{j',2}$, for every $w \in D_{j'+1}$, $zw \in E(G')$. Similarly, for every $z \in A_{j',2}$, for every $w \in D_{j'}$,

$zw \in E(G')$. Hence, there are at least p vertex-disjoint paths from $x \in D_i$ to $y \in D_j$ for all $i < j$. Therefore, for $x \in D_i, y \in D_j$, it cannot happen that $x \in X'_1$ and $y \in X'_2$. Based on the above discussion, for every $i, j \in [r]$ with $i \neq j$, either $D_i \cup D_j \subseteq X'_1 \cup T'$ or $D_i \cup D_j \subseteq X'_2 \cup T'$, but not both. Therefore, either $D_1 \cup \dots \cup D_r \subseteq X'_1 \cup T'$ or $D_1 \cup \dots \cup D_r \subseteq X'_2 \cup T'$. We replace these vertices of D_u by u as follows. There are four situation that can arise.

- **Case 1:** If $D_u \subseteq X_1 \cup T$ and $T \cap D_u \neq \emptyset$, then set $T := (T \cup \{u\}) \setminus D_u$. Also, we set $X_1 := X_1 \setminus D_u$.
- **Case 2:** If $D_u \subseteq X_2 \cup T$, and $T \cap D_u \neq \emptyset$. Then we set $T := (T \cup \{u\}) \setminus D_u$. Also, we set $X_2 := X_2 \setminus D_u$.
- **Case 3:** If $D_u \subseteq X_1$, then set $X_1 := (X_1 \cup \{u\}) \setminus D_u$.
- **Case 4:** If $D_u \subseteq X_2$, then set $X_2 := (X_2 \cup \{u\}) \setminus D_u$.

Observe that the above case analysis is exhaustive. Since, $N_F(u) \subseteq N_{G'}(D_u)$, this step of replacement (even when u is added to X_1 or to X_2) cannot create any edge between X_1 and X_2 in the graph F .

On the other hand, when u is replaced by exactly one marked vertex $u^* \in X'$, then it holds true that $N_F(u) \subseteq N_{G'}(u^*)$. Then, we do the following. If $u^* \in T$, then set $T := T \cup \{u\} \setminus \{u^*\}$. If $u^* \in X_1$, then set $X_1 := X_1 \cup \{u\} \setminus \{u^*\}$. If $u^* \in X_2$, then set $X_2 := X_2 \setminus \{u^*\} \cup \{u\}$. Since $N_F(u) \subseteq N_{G'}(u^*)$, this procedure also cannot create any edge between X_1 and X_2 in the graph F .

Moreover, by construction, $|T| \leq |T'|$ and as argued, none of the replacement steps in the construction can create an edge from X_1 to X_2 . Therefore, T is a set of vertices that separates X_1 from X_2 . But, then F is also not p -connected. This is a contradiction. Hence, $G'[X']$ is p -connected.

We have shown that $G'[X']$ is a p -connected subgraph. Since the removed vertices of X are from an independent set, X' is a vertex cover as well. Hence, X' is a p -connected vertex cover.

Recall that F has at most $p|X|$ edges. At every step, one unmarked vertex is replaced by at most pr marked vertices. Recall that $d = \lceil 2p^2/\varepsilon \rceil$ and $1 \leq r = \lfloor \deg_F(u)/d \rfloor$. Hence, we have

$$\begin{aligned} |X'| &\leq |X \cap X'| + |X \setminus X'| + \sum_{u \in X \setminus X'} \left(p \left\lfloor \frac{\deg_F(u)}{d} \right\rfloor - 1 \right) \leq |X| + \sum_{u \in X \setminus X'} \frac{p \cdot \deg_F(u)}{d} \\ &= |X| + \frac{p \sum_{x \in X \setminus X'} \deg_F(x)}{d} \leq |X| + \frac{2p \cdot |E(F)|}{d} \leq |X| + \frac{2p^2|X|}{d} \leq (1 + \varepsilon)|X| \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, $\text{OPT}(G', k') \leq |X'| \leq (1 + \varepsilon)|X| = (1 + \varepsilon)\text{OPT}(G, k)$.

This completes the proof of the lemma. □

Now, we are ready to prove the main result of this section, i.e. Theorem 2 (we restate it here).

Theorem 2. *For every $0 < \varepsilon < 1$ and every fixed $p \geq 2$, p -CONNECTED VERTEX COVER admits a $(1 + \varepsilon)$ -approximate kernel with $\mathcal{O}((1 + \varepsilon)p^2k^{\mathcal{O}(p^2/\varepsilon)})$ vertices.*

Proof. The approximate kernelization algorithm has two parts. The first part is reduction algorithm, and the second part is solution lifting algorithm.

- **Reduction Algorithm:** Let (G, k) be an input instance for p -CONNECTED VERTEX COVER. First, we invoke Lemma 2 to check if G has a p -connected vertex cover or not. If G does not have any p -connected vertex cover, then we return $(2K_2, 1)$ as the output instance. Otherwise, we apply Reduction Rule 1 and obtain (G_1, k) . Then, we construct $V(G_1) = H \uplus I \uplus R$. If $|H| > k$ or $G[R]$ has more than k^2 edges, then $\text{OPT}(G, k) = k + 1$ and we return $(K_{3p}, 1)$ as the output instance. Otherwise, we have $|H| \leq k$ and $G[R]$ has k^2 edges. If $|V(G_1)| \leq \lceil (1 + \varepsilon)(p + 1)^2k^2 \rceil k^{2\lceil 2p^2/\varepsilon \rceil + 2p + 2} + 2k^2 + 2k$, then we output (G_1, k) itself. Otherwise, $|V(G_1)| > \lceil (1 + \varepsilon)(p + 1)^2k^2 \rceil k^{2\lceil 2p^2/\varepsilon \rceil + 2p + 2} + 2k^2 + 2k$. In this situation, we apply Algorithm 2 on (G_1, k) and obtain (G', k') . We return (G', k') as the output instance.
- **Solution Lifting Algorithm:** Let S^* be a given solution to (G', k') . If S^* is not p -connected vertex cover of (G', k') , then we return \emptyset as a solution to (G, k) . Otherwise, S^* is a p -connected vertex cover of (G', k') and we return S^* as a feasible solution to (G, k') .

Again observe that Reduction Rule 1 only removes isolated vertices. Hence, $\text{OPT}(G, k) = \text{OPT}(G_1, k)$ and any feasible p -connected vertex cover of (G_1, k) is also a p -connected vertex cover of (G, k) . Similarly, due to Lemma 4, if $\text{OPT}(G_1, k) \leq k$, then $\text{OPT}(G', k') \leq (1 + \varepsilon)\text{OPT}(G_1, k)$. Therefore, if $\text{OPT}(G, k) \leq k$, then $\text{OPT}(G', k') \leq (1 + \varepsilon)\text{OPT}(G, k)$. We use this fact and the arguments similar to that of Theorem 1 that if S^* is a c -approximate solution to (G', k') , then S^* is a $c(1 + \varepsilon)$ -approximate solution to (G, k) . Also, by similar arguments as in Theorem 1, we can prove that this gives a time efficient PSAKS. By construction G' has $\mathcal{O}((1 + \varepsilon)p^2k^{\mathcal{O}(p^2/\varepsilon)})$ vertices. Hence, this is a time efficient PSAKS with the claimed bound. This completes the proof. \square

4 FPT Algorithms

In this section, we obtain FPT algorithms for the two problems. While the algorithm for p -CONNECTED VERTEX COVER described in Section 4.3 is quite simple and runs in time $\mathcal{O}^*(2^{\mathcal{O}(k^2)})$, the one for p -EDGE-CONNECTED VERTEX COVER is based on more advanced techniques and is of complexity $\mathcal{O}^*(2^{\mathcal{O}(pk)})$.

4.1 Matroid preliminaries

Our algorithm for p -EDGE-CONNECTED VERTEX COVER uses notions of matroid theory, which we briefly recall the basics for here. For more information, see Oxley [20].

Definition 9 (Matroid). Let U be a universe and $\mathcal{I} \subseteq 2^U$. Then, (U, \mathcal{I}) is said to be a matroid if the following conditions are satisfied.

1. $\emptyset \in \mathcal{I}$,
2. if $A \in \mathcal{I}$, then for all $A' \subseteq A$, $A' \in \mathcal{I}$, and
3. if there exist $A, B \in \mathcal{I}$ with $|A| < |B|$, then there exists $x \in B \setminus A$ such that $A \cup \{x\} \in \mathcal{I}$.

A set $A \in \mathcal{I}$ is called an independent set.

Note that all maximal independent sets of a matroid M are of the same size, called the *rank* of M and denoted by $\text{rank}(M)$. A maximal independent set is called a *basis* of M .

We recall some useful standard constructions. Let U be a universe with n elements and $\mathcal{I} = \{A \subseteq U : |A| \leq r\}$. Then, (U, \mathcal{I}) is a matroid called a *uniform matroid*. Next, let $G = (V, E)$ be an undirected graph and let $\mathcal{I} = \{F \subseteq E(G) \mid G' = (V, F) \text{ is a forest}\}$. Then, (E, \mathcal{I}) is a matroid called a *graphic matroid*. Finally, let U be partitioned as $U = U_1 \cup \dots \cup U_r$ and let $\mathcal{I} = \{A \subseteq U : |A \cap U_i| \leq 1 \forall i \in [r]\}$. Then, (U, \mathcal{I}) is a matroid called a *partition matroid*.

A matroid M is said to be *representable over a field* \mathbb{F} if there is a matrix \hat{M} over \mathbb{F} and a bijection $f : U \rightarrow \text{col}(\hat{M})$, where $\text{col}(\hat{M})$ is the set of columns of \hat{M} , such that $B \subseteq U$ is an independent set in M if and only if $\{f(b) \mid b \in B\}$ is linearly independent over \mathbb{F} . Clearly the rank of M is the rank of the matrix \hat{M} . A matroid representable over a field \mathbb{F} is called a *linear matroid* over \mathbb{F} . A graphic matroid and partition matroid can be represented over any field [20], while a uniform matroid (U, \mathcal{I}) with $|U| = n$, can be represented over any field \mathbb{F}_p for $p > n$ [20]. Furthermore, all these representations can be constructed in deterministic polynomial time. See also [3, 14] for expositions of the issues closer to our current needs.

Given a matroid $M = (U, \mathcal{I})$, the *truncation* of M to rank r is the matroid $M' = (U, \mathcal{I}')$ where a set $A \subseteq U$ is independent in M' if and only if $A \in \mathcal{I}$ and $|A| \leq r$. Given a representation of M , a representation of a truncation of M can be computed relatively easy in randomized polynomial time [14], but can also be computed in deterministic polynomial time through more involved methods [12].

4.2 Single Exponential Algorithm for p -Edge-Connected Vertex Cover

In this subsection, we provide a single exponential algorithm for p -EDGE-CONNECTED VERTEX COVER using dynamic programming and the method of *representative sets*. This method was introduced to FPT-algorithms by Marx [14]; Fomin et al. [22] presented additional applications and a faster method of computing such sets. We recall the definitions.

Definition 10. Let $M = (E, \mathcal{I})$ be a matroid and $X, Y \subseteq E$. We say that X extends Y in M if $X \cap Y = \emptyset$ and $X \cup Y \in \mathcal{I}$. Furthermore, let \mathcal{S} be a family of subsets of E . A subfamily $\hat{\mathcal{S}} \subseteq \mathcal{S}$ is q -representative for \mathcal{S} if the following holds: for every set $Y \subseteq E$ with $|Y| \leq q$, there is a set $X \in \mathcal{S}$ that extends Y if and only if there is a set $X \in \hat{\mathcal{S}}$ that extends Y .

Theorem 8 (Fomin et al. [22]). *Let $M = (E, \mathcal{I})$ be a linear matroid of rank $p + q = k$ over some field \mathbb{F} and let $\mathcal{S} = \{S_1, \dots, S_t\}$ be a family of independent sets in M , each of cardinality p . A representative subset $\hat{\mathcal{S}} \subseteq \mathcal{S}$ of size $|\hat{\mathcal{S}}| \leq \binom{p+q}{p}$ can be computed in $\mathcal{O}(k^{\mathcal{O}(1)} \binom{p+q}{p}^{\omega-1} t)$ field operations. Here, $\omega < 2.37$ is the matrix multiplication exponent.*

Our algorithm is based on the following result, due to Agrawal et al. [1]. Recall that an *out-branching* of a digraph is a spanning subgraph which is a tree, where every arc is oriented away from the root; or equivalently, where every vertex has at most one incoming arc.

Lemma 5 (Agrawal et al. [1]). *Let $G = (V, E)$ be an undirected graph and let $v_r \in V$. Define a digraph $D_G = (V, A_E)$ by adding the arcs $(u, v), (v, u)$ to A_E for every edge $uv \in E$. Then G is p -edge-connected if and only if D_G has p pairwise arc-disjoint out-branchings rooted in v_r .*

As previous work, we will use representative sets to facilitate a fast dynamic programming algorithm. We begin by recalling how out-branchings are realized using matroid tools. Let $G = (V, E)$ and $D_G = (V, A_E)$ be as above and let $v_r \in V$. Let the *out-partition matroid* (with root v_r) for a digraph D with $v_r \in V(D)$ refer to the partition matroid for $A(D)$ where arcs are partitioned according to their heads and where arcs (u, v_r) are dependent; i.e., an arc set F is independent in the out-partition matroid if and only if v_r has in-degree 0 in F and every other vertex has in-degree at most one in F .

Proposition 1. *F is the arc set of an out-branching rooted in v_r if and only if $|F| = |V(G)| - 1$ and F is independent in both the out-partition matroid for D_G with root v_r and the graphic matroid for G .*

Here, two arcs (u, v) and (v, u) in $A(D)$ represent copies of the same underlying edge uv of the graphic matroid for G .

We extend this to construct a matroid that can be used to verify the condition of Lemma 5.

Lemma 6. *Let $v_r \in V(G)$ be fixed. Let M be the disjoint union of $2p + 1$ matroids M_i as follows. Matroids $M_1, M_3, \dots, M_{2p-1}$ are copies of the graphic matroid of G over a ground set of A_E , where each arc represents its underlying undirected edge. Matroids M_2, M_4, \dots, M_{2p} are copies of the out-partition matroid for D_G with root v_r . Matroid M_{2p+1} is the uniform matroid over A_E with rank $p(k - 1)$. Let $F \subseteq A_E$. The following are equivalent.*

1. *F is the arc set of p pairwise arc-disjoint out-branchings rooted in v_r in $D_G[S]$ for some $|S| = k$ with $v_r \in S$*
2. *$|V(F)| = k$, $|F| = p(k - 1)$, $v_r \in V(F)$, and there is an independent set I in M where every arc $a \in F$ occurs in I precisely in its copies in matroids M_{2i-1} , M_{2i} and M_{2p+1} for some $i \in [p]$.*

Furthermore, a representation of M can be constructed in deterministic polynomial time.

Proof. Let M and M_i , $i \in [2p + 1]$ be as described. We note that graphic matroids, partition matroids (hence out-partition matroids), and uniform matroids all have deterministic representations [20]. Specifically, graphic matroids and partition matroids are

representable over any field, and uniform matroids over any sufficiently large field. Hence a representation of M can be constructed as a diagonal block matrix with $2p + 1$ blocks, where each block i is a representation of the matroid M_i over some sufficiently large field \mathbb{F} (e.g., $\text{GF}(q)$ for some prime $q > p(k - 1)$).

On the one hand, let F meet the conditions in the first item. Since F is spanning for $D_G[S]$ we have $|V(F)| = k$ and $v_r \in V(F)$, and furthermore $|F| = p(k - 1)$ since each out-branching is spanning. Furthermore, any arc set of an out-branching is independent in both the graphic matroid and the out-partition matroid by Prop. 1. Letting $F = F_1 \cup \dots \cup F_p$ where F_i is the arc set of an out-branching for every $i \in [p]$, we can then construct I by letting an arc $a \in F_i$ be present in I in matroids M_{2i-1} , M_{2i} and M_{2p+1} . Hence all conditions in the second item are met.

Now assume that F meets the conditions in the second item. Partition $F = F_1 \cup \dots \cup F_p$ where F_i , $i \in [p]$ contains those arcs of F that are represented in matroids M_{2i-1} and M_{2i} . By a counting argument, $|F_i| = k - 1$ for every $i \in [p]$. Furthermore, F_i is the arc set of an out-forest (since its underlying undirected edge set is acyclic and every vertex has in-degree at most 1 in F_i). But then F_i must form a spanning tree of $V(F)$ by counting, hence an out-branching of $D_G[V(F)]$ by Prop. 1. Furthermore $v_r \in V(F)$ and every arc into v_r is dependent in M_{2i} ; thus every out-branching F_i is rooted in v_r . \square

For use in the representative set computation, we need to modify M so that the set I being described is a basis of M , not just an independent set. This is more technical, but can be done deterministically using the operation of deterministic truncation, due to Lokshtanov et al. [12], as noted in Section 4.1.

Lemma 7. *We can in deterministic polynomial time compute a linear representation of a matroid M as in Lemma 6, except truncated so that any independent set I as described is a basis of M .*

Proof. The operation of *truncation* on a matroid is the operation of restricting its rank, i.e., defining from $M = (E, \mathcal{I})$ a new matroid $M' = (E, \mathcal{I}')$ where $\mathcal{I}' = \{S \in \mathcal{I} \mid |S| \leq r\}$ for some $r < |E|$. Hence, a matroid M as described is produced by the truncation of M from Lemma 6 to rank $r = 3p(k - 1)$. By Lokshtanov et al. [12], this can be done deterministically by moving to a larger field. \square

Our algorithm for p -EDGE-CVC works as follows. First, we enumerate all minimal vertex covers of G of size at most k . The number of such minimal vertex covers is at most 2^k , and can be enumerated in $\mathcal{O}^*(2^k)$ time, and space (see [15]). Then, for every minimal vertex cover H of G , we use representative sets and the above characterization to check if it can be extended to a feasible p -edge-connected vertex cover $S \supseteq H$ of size at most k . In detail, consider a graph G with a vertex cover H which is not p -edge-connected, where we are looking for a set $S \supset H$ such that $G[S]$ is p -edge-connected and $|S| \leq k$. By iteration over k , we may assume that $|S| < k$ is impossible. Let us fix $v_r \in H$. By the above lemma, there then exists such a set S if and only if there is an independent set I in M meeting the following conditions:

1. $H \subset V(I)$ and $|V(I)| = k$
2. $|I| = 3p(k - 1)$

3. Every arc which is represented in I is represented in precisely three matroids M_{2i-1} , M_{2i} , M_{2p+1} in M .

Furthermore, the first condition can be relaxed to $|V(I) \setminus H| = k - |H|$ (since any forest on $k - 1$ edges contained in $S \cup H$ for $S \subseteq V(G) \setminus H$ and $|S| = k - |H|$ must span $S \cup H$).

We can address this via dynamic programming. The dynamic program is set up via a table keeping track of $|V(I)|$ and $|I|$, and we ensure that every time we add some arc a to a set I we add it in precisely three layers, as described. Thanks to the use of representative sets, each table entry in the dynamic programming only needs to contain $2^{\mathcal{O}(pk)}$ partial solutions.

We provide the details of this scheme in the proof of the main result of this section, i.e. Theorem 4 (we restate it here).

Theorem 4. *For every fixed $p \geq 2$, p -EDGE-CONNECTED VERTEX COVER can be solved in $\mathcal{O}(2^{\mathcal{O}(pk)} n^{\mathcal{O}(1)})$ deterministic time and space.*

Proof. As outlined above, we may assume that we have a vertex cover H that is not p -edge-connected and have already tested that there is no p -edge-connected vertex cover with at most $k - 1$ vertices. Number the vertices of $V(G) \setminus H$ as $S = \{v_1, \dots, v_{n'}\}$. We create a dynamic programming table $T[(i, j, q)]$ with entries indexed by (i, j, q) for $i \leq k$, $j \leq n'$ and $q \leq 3p(k - 1)$. Every table slot $T[(i, j, q)]$ contains independent sets I in M such that $|V(I) \setminus H| = i$, the largest-index vertex of S occurring in $V(I)$ is v_j , and $|I| = q$. Furthermore, for every independent set I in the table, every arc occurring in I occurs in precisely three layers, as described above. We may then check for a solution by checking whether any slot $T[(k - |H|, j, 3p(k - 1))]$ is non-empty. Construct M as in Lemma 7.

For an arc $a \in A_E$, define $F_{a,i}$ to be the set consisting of the copies of a in M_{2i-1} , M_{2i} and M_{2p+1} .

We initialize the slots $T[(0, 0, q)]$ by a dynamic programming process within $D_G[H]$. Initialise $T[(0, 0, 0)] = \{\emptyset\}$. Enumerate the arcs of $D_G[H]$ as $a_1, \dots, a_{m'}$. Then, for every $q = 3, 6, \dots$ fill in the slot $T[(0, 0, q)]$ from $T[(0, 0, q - 3)]$ as follows:

1. For every $I \in T[(0, 0, q - 3)]$, every arc a_j , and every $i \in [p]$ such that $F_{a_j,i}$ extends I , add $I \cup F_{a_j,i}$ to $T[(0, 0, q)]$
2. Reduce $T[(0, 0, q)]$ to a $(3p(k - 1) - q)$ -representative set in M .

This is a polynomial number of steps, where every set $I \in T[(0, 0, q)]$ is used in a polynomially bounded number of new sets, hence every time we apply Theorem 8 at a level q , we do so with $t \leq (k + p)^{\mathcal{O}(1)} \binom{3p(k-1)}{q}$, hence up to polynomial factors each step takes time $\binom{3p(k-1)}{q}^\omega = 2^{\mathcal{O}(pk)}$.

For slots $T[(i, j, q)]$, we process vertices v_j one at a time. The process is slightly more complex since each vertex v_j can be incident to $\mathcal{O}(k)$ arcs in A_E , but the principle is the same. We process slots $T[(i, j, q)]$ in lexicographic order by (i, j, q) . Before we process the sets in a slot $T[(i, j, q)]$, we reduce them to a $(3p(k - 1) - q)$ -representative set in M . Then we proceed as follows. For every independent set I in $T[(i, j, q)]$ and every j' with $j < j' \leq n'$, we combine I and $v_{j'}$ as follows.

1. Let $d \leq 2|H|$ be the number of arcs of A_E incident with $v_{j'}$. Create a set F for every one out of the $(p + 1)^d$ options of (1) adding $F_{a,b}$ to F for some $b \in [p]$, or (2) not adding any set $F_{a,b}$ to F , for every arc a incident with $v_{j'}$.

2. For every such non-empty set F , and every independent set I of $T[(i, j, q)]$ such that F extends I in M , add $I \cup F$ to $T[(i, j', q + |F|)]$.

To roughly bound the running time, we note that the number of slots in the table is polynomial, and for every set I in a slot, at most $(p + 1)^{2|H|}$ sets $I' = I \cup F$ are added to other slots of the table. Furthermore, after the representative set reduction, every slot contains at most $2^{3p(k-1)}$ sets. Thus every time we apply Theorem 8, we have

$$|T[(i, j, q)]| < (p + k)^{\mathcal{O}(1)} 2^{3pk} (p + 1)^{2k} = 2^{\mathcal{O}(pk)},$$

hence the total time usage, up to a polynomial factor, is $2^{\mathcal{O}(pk)}$.

It remains to prove correctness. Let $I \in T[(i, j, q)]$ for some (i, j, q) and let $S = V(I) \setminus H$. We note the invariants $|S| = i$, $\max_a \{v_a \in S\} = j$ and $|I| = q$ hold by induction. Furthermore, by construction I is independent in M . With these observations, we proceed. First assume that there is a set $I \in T[(k - |H|, j, 3p(k - 1))]$ for some j . Then $|V(I) \setminus H| = k - |H|$ and $|I| = 3p(k - 1)$ by the invariants. Furthermore, every arc a represented in I occurs in precisely three copies by construction. Indeed, every time we grow a set I we do so by adding a collection of sets $F_{a,i}$ to it. Hence every arc occurs at least three times, and furthermore, since $F_{a,i}$ always contains a copy of a in M_{2p+1} , we will never add two distinct sets $F_{a,i}, F_{a,i'}$ to the same set I . Hence Lemma 6 implies that $D_G[H \cup V(I)]$ has p pairwise arc-disjoint out-branchings rooted in v_r , which by Lemma 5 implies that $G[H \cup V(I)]$ is p -edge-connected.

On the other hand, assume that $G[H \cup S]$ is p -edge-connected for some $S \subseteq V(G) \setminus H$ with $|S| = k - |H|$. By Lemma 5 there exist p pairwise edge-disjoint out-branchings in $D_G[H \cup S]$ rooted in v_r , hence by Lemma 6 there is an independent set I in M formed using a set of arcs $F \subseteq A_E$ with $|F| = p(k - 1)$ and $|I| = 3p(k - 1)$ as described. Let j be the largest index such that $v_j \in V(I)$; then I is a candidate for the table slot $T[(k - |H|, j, 3p(k - 1))]$. We prove by induction that $T[(k - |H|, j, 3p(k - 1))]$ is non-empty. Observe that I is the disjoint union of sets $F_{a,i}$. We partition I according to lexicographical order of (i, j, q) as follows. First, let $F_{a_1, i_1}, \dots, F_{a_t, i_t}$ enumerate the sets $F_{a,i}$ contained in I for which a is contained in $D_G[H]$. For $r \in [t]$, let

$$I'_r = I \setminus \bigcup_{j=1}^r F_{a_j, i_j}$$

be the subset of I which is encountered “after” F_{a_r, i_r} in the natural ordering. We show by induction that for each $r \in [t]$, the slot $T[(0, 0, 3r)]$ contains a set which extends I'_r . For $r = 0$ this holds trivially. Hence, assume the statement holds for $T[(0, 0, 3r)]$ for some $r < t$, and let $I_0 \in T[(0, 0, 3r)]$ be a set which extends I'_r . While processing $(0, 0, 3r)$, the set $F_{a_{r+1}, i_{r+1}}$ is considered in the loop, and clearly it extends I_0 since $F_{a_{r+1}, i_{r+1}} \subseteq I'_r$. Hence $T[(0, 0, 3r + 3)]$ contains the set $I_1 = I_0 \cup F_{a_{r+1}, i_{r+1}}$ before the representative set computation is performed. By assumption I_1 extends I'_{r+1} . Hence by the correctness of Theorem 8, $T[(0, 0, 3r + 3)]$ contains some set I_2 that extends I'_{r+1} , as required. Hence the claim holds up to the set $T[(0, 0, 3t)]$.

We can now complete the proof using the same outline for entries $T[(i, j_i, q_i)]$. Enumerate S as $S = \{v_{j_1}, \dots, v_{j_{k-|H|}}\}$ in increasing order of indices j_i and for each $i \in [k - |H|]$ let I_i be the union of sets $F_{a,i}$ of I for which a is incident with v_{j_i} . Let $I_{\geq i} = \bigcup_{j=i}^{k-|H|} I_j$. We show by induction in lexicographical order that $T[(i, j_i, q_i)]$ for some q_i contains a set

which extends $I_{\geq i+1}$, for each i . As a base case, the claim holds for $T[(0, 0, 3t)]$ as has already been shown. For the inductive step, the proof is precisely as above. For every $i = 1, \dots, k - |H|$, let $I'_{i-1} \in T[(i-1, j_{i-1}, q_{i-1})]$ be a set which extends $I_{\geq i}$. Then in particular I_i extends I'_{i-1} and is added to table $T[(i, j_i, q_i)]$ in the exhaustive enumeration loop from $T[(i-1, j_{i-1}, q_{i-1})]$. Thus before the call to Theorem 8 there was a set in $T[(i, j_i, q_i)]$ which extends I'_{i+1} , hence the same holds after the representative set reduction. By induction, the table slot $T[(k - |H|, j, 3p(k-1))]$ is indeed non-empty for some j . This completes the proof of the theorem. \square

4.3 Basic Algorithm for p -CONNECTED VERTEX COVER

Theorem 9. p -CONNECTED VERTEX COVER is fixed parameter tractable with an algorithm running in time $\mathcal{O}^*(2^{\mathcal{O}(k^2)})$.

Proof. Suppose that (G, k) is the input instance of p -CONNECTED VERTEX COVER. First, we remove all isolated vertices of G . Then we compute a set H of vertices which have to be in a vertex cover as follows. We put a vertex into H if the degree of this vertex is at least $k+1$ or it is a neighbor to a vertex v such that $\deg_G(v) \leq p-1$. If $|H| > k$ then (G, k) is a negative instance, so we may assume that $|H| \leq k$. Now, we partition the vertices of $G - H$ into two parts. We put a vertex u into I if $N_G(u) \subseteq H$. Otherwise, we put u into R . Observe that I is an independent set. Since any vertex in R has degree at most k , if the number of edges incident to R is more than k^2 then (G, k) is a negative instance. Thus, $|R| \leq 2k^2$.

If for some $u \neq v \in I$, $N_G(v) = N_G(u)$, then say that u and v are *false twins*. If a vertex v has more than $k+1$ false twins, then we delete v . Hence, for any $A \subseteq V(G)$, there are at most $k+1$ vertices in I whose neighborhood equals A . Hence, $|I| = \mathcal{O}(2^k(k+1))$. Now it is not hard to see that $H \cup I \cup R$ is a kernel and $|H| + |R| + |I| = \mathcal{O}(2^k k)$. We can consider all subsets of $H \cup I \cup R$ with at most k vertices and either output a p -connected vertex cover or that the instance is negative. This algorithm runs in time $\mathcal{O}^*(2^{\mathcal{O}(k^2)})$. \square

5 Constant Factor Approximation Algorithm for p -EDGE-CONNECTED VERTEX COVER

In this section, we describe a $2(p+1)$ -approximation algorithm for p -EDGE-CONNECTED VERTEX COVER. We begin by recalling the notion of a *Gomory-Hu tree*.

Definition 11 (Gomory-Hu Tree). Let $G = (V, E)$ be a graph, and let $c(u, v) \geq 0$ be the capacity of edge $uv \in E$. Denote the minimum capacity of an s - t cut by λ_{st} for each $s, t \in V(G)$. Let $T = (V_T, E_T)$ be a tree with $V_T = V(G)$, and let us denote the set of edges in the s - t path in T by P_{st} for each $s, t \in V_T$. Then T is said to be a Gomory-Hu tree of G if $\lambda_{st} = \min_{e \in P_{st}} c(S_e, T_e)$ for all $s, t \in V(G)$, where

- S_e and T_e are sets of vertices of the two connected components of $T - e$ such that $s \in S_e$ and $t \in T_e$, and
- $c(S_e, T_e)$ is the capacity of the cut in G .

The capacity of an edge uv of T is equal to λ_{uv} .

Theorem 10. [9] *Every weighted graph (G, c) has a Gomory-Hu tree which can be constructed in polynomial time.*

For an unweighted graph $G = (V, E)$, we can introduce weights by setting $c(uv) = 1$ for every $uv \in E$. Let T be a Gomory-Hu tree of G . Then, by Definition 11, for every pair of vertices $u, v \in V(G)$, the size of a minimum edge cut between u and v in G is the minimum capacity of an edge cut between u and v in T . For $i \in [p]$, consider the set E_i of all the edges of total capacity at most $i - 1$ in T . Deleting E_i disconnects T into several subtrees. We call the vertex set of each such subtree an i -segment in G . Thus, a subset of vertices $S \subseteq V(G)$ is an i -segment in G if and only if for every $u, v \in S$, there are at least i edge-disjoint paths between u and v in G and S is a maximal such subset. It is obvious from the construction that the i -segments of G form a partition of the vertex set of G , and can be computed in polynomial time.

Now let $G = (V, E)$ be an undirected graph, and $X \subseteq V(G)$. For $i \in [p]$, let an i -block of X in G be a maximal subset $X' \subseteq X$ such that for every $u, v \in X'$, there are at least i edge-disjoint paths between u and v in G . We can use the Gomory-Hu tree to compute the i -blocks of X in G , as follows.

Lemma 8. *Let $G = (V, E)$ be an undirected graph, and $X \subseteq V(G)$. The i -blocks of X in G are precisely the sets $X \cap S$ over all i -segments S of G .*

Proof. Let T be the Gomory-Hu tree of G , and let $u, v \in X$ be distinct vertices. By the definition of a Gomory-Hu tree, $\lambda_{uv}(G) \geq i$ if and only if there is no edge e on the path from u to v in T with capacity $c(e)$ less than i . Since this is also equivalent to u and v being in the same i -segment of G , the statement follows. \square

Based on Lemma 8, we can compute the collection of i -blocks in polynomial time using Gomory-Hu tree of G .

Recall that a family of subsets of a set U is called *laminar* if for every pair A, B of subsets of U one of the following holds: (i) $A \cap B = \emptyset$, (ii) $A \subseteq B$, or (iii) $B \subseteq A$. (A family may have several copies of the same subset.)

Lemma 9. *Let G be a graph, $X \subseteq V(G)$, and p be a fixed integer. Then the collection of all i -blocks of X for all $i = 1, \dots, p$ forms a laminar family.*

Proof. Note first that for every i , the i -segments of G form a partition of the vertex set, hence similarly, the i -blocks of X form a partition of X for every $i \in [p]$. Furthermore, let $i, j \in [p]$ with $1 \leq i < j \leq p$. It is obvious from the definition that the j -segments of G form a refinement of the i -segments of G , since they are formed from the Gomory-Hu tree by deleting an additional set of edges. Hence the j -blocks of X also form a refinement of the i -blocks of X in G by Lemma 8, and the statement follows. \square

The proof of Lemma 9 leads to Algorithm 3 which sets all i -blocks of X , $i \in [p]$, as nodes of a (laminar) tree.

Lemma 10. *Let G be a graph, $u \in V(G)$ and let $A, B \subseteq V(G - u)$ such that $A \cap B = \emptyset$. If the size of a minimum (A, B) -cut in $G - u$ is i and $\min\{|N(u) \cap A|, |N(u) \cap B|\} = j$ then the size of a minimum (A, B) -cut in G is at least $i + j$.*

Algorithm 3: LaminarTree($G = (V, E), X, p$)
input : $G = (V, E), X \subseteq V(G), p$
output : A laminar tree of X in G
Initialize a tree $T := \emptyset$;
for $i = 1, \dots, p$ **do**
 | Compute the set of all i -blocks of X in G ;
 | $\mathcal{A}_i \leftarrow$ the set of all i -blocks of X in G ;
end
Set X as the root of T ;
Make all 1-blocks the children of X ;
for $i = 2, \dots, p$ **do**
 | **for** every $Y \in \mathcal{A}_i$ **do**
 | Make Y a child of $W \in \mathcal{A}_{i-1}$ in T such that $Y \subseteq W$;
 | **end**
end
Output T as the laminar tree of X in G ;

Proof. Consider a minimum (A, B) -cut (S, T) in G ; $A \subseteq S$ and $B \subseteq T$. Assume without loss of generality that $u \in S$. Suppose that the size of (S, T) is at most $i + j - 1$. Consider $(S \setminus \{u\}, T)$, which is a cut in $G - u$. Since $|N(u) \cap B| \geq j$, we have that the size of the cut $(S \setminus \{u\}, T)$ is at most $i - 1$, but this contradicts the fact that the size of a minimum (A, B) -cut in $G - u$ is i . \square

We are ready to prove the main result of this section, Theorem 5 (we restate it here).

Theorem 5. For every fixed $p \geq 2$, p -EDGE-CONNECTED VERTEX COVER admits a $2(p + 1)$ -factor approximation algorithm.

Proof. We will show that Algorithm 4 is a $2(p + 1)$ -approximation algorithm.

Observe that the first output “No feasible solution” is correct due to Lemma 2. Note $X = N_G(L) \cup V(M)$ is a vertex cover of G . Suppose that T has more than one leaf and there is no vertex $u \in V(G) \setminus (Y \cup L)$ such that $N_G(u)$ intersects two distinct p -blocks in T . Then even adding all vertices of $V(G) \setminus (Y \cup L)$ to Y will not make Y p -edge-connected vertex cover of G since there will be the same number of p -blocks of X in $G[Y]$ before and after the addition because the vertices of $V(G) \setminus (Y \cup L)$ are not vertices of M and thus form an independent set. However, this is impossible as $V(G - L)$ is a p -edge-connected vertex cover of G . Thus, as long as T has more than one leaf there is a vertex $u \in V(G) \setminus (Y \cup L)$ such that $N_G(u)$ intersects two distinct p -blocks in T .

When T has just one leaf, G has only one p -block of X in $G[Y]$. This means that for every pair x, y of vertices in X there are p edge-disjoint paths in $G[Y]$ between x and y . Let $u, v \in Y \setminus X$. Since $|N_G(u)| \geq p$ and $|N_G(v)| \geq p$ by Menger’s theorem, there are p edge-disjoint paths in $G[Y]$ between $N_G(u)$ and $N_G(v)$ with distinct end-vertices and hence p edge-disjoint paths in $G[Y]$ between u and v . Similarly, we can see that there are p edge-disjoint paths in $G[Y]$ between u and any $x \in X$. Therefore, Y is a p -edge-connected vertex cover of G .

Let us analyze how T changes after $u \in V(G) \setminus (Y \cup L)$ is added to Y . First we consider T before u is added to Y . By the description of Algorithm 4, u has neighbors in two

Algorithm 4: Approximation algorithm for p -Edge-CVC
input : $G = (V, E)$
output : An approximate p -edge-connected vertex cover of G
 $L \leftarrow \{v \in V(G) \mid \deg_G(v) < p\};$
if $V(G - L)$ is not a p -edge-connected vertex cover of G **then**
 | *Output “No feasible solution”;*
end
Compute a maximal matching M of $G - N_G[L]$;
 $X \leftarrow N_G(L) \cup V(M);$
 $T \leftarrow \text{LaminarTree}(G[X], X, p);$
 $Y \leftarrow X;$
while T has at least two leaves **do**
 | **if** $u \in V(G) \setminus (Y \cup L)$ s.t. $N_G(u)$ intersects two distinct p -blocks in T
 | **then**
 | $Y \leftarrow Y \cup \{u\};$
 | $T \leftarrow \text{LaminarTree}(G[Y], X, p);$
 | **end**
 | **end**
end
Output Y as a solution;

distinct p -blocks X_1, X_2 of X in $G[Y]$. Let X_0 be the least common ancestor of X_1 and X_2 in T and let X_0 be an i -block of X in $G[Y]$. Observe that X_0 has two children X_a and X_b such that $X_1 \subseteq X_a$ and $X_2 \subseteq X_b$. Note that X_a and X_b are $(i + 1)$ -blocks of X in $G[Y]$ and the minimum size of a (X_a, X_b) -cut is i (otherwise, X_0 is not an i -block of X in $G[Y]$). Now consider what happens just after u is added to Y . By Lemma 10, the size of any (X_a, X_b) -cut increases by at least one. Thus, the minimum size of a (X_a, X_b) -cut becomes $i + 1$ and so X_a and X_b become part of a new $(i + 1)$ -block of X in $G[Y]$. Thus, the number of the nodes of T decreases.

Let us now bound the approximation factor of Algorithm 4. The number of leaves in T becomes one only when there is just one node on each level of T , i.e., T has $p + 1$ vertices. Initially, T may have up to $p|X| + 1$ nodes. Thus, at most $p(|X| - 1)$ nodes will be added to X before a solution Y is obtained. Hence, $|Y| \leq |X| + p(|X| - 1) \leq (p + 1)|X|$. Since M is a maximal matching of $G - N_G(L)$, at least one endpoint of each edge of M has to be in any vertex cover of G . Thus, $\text{OPT}(G) \geq |N_G(L)| + |M|$, where $\text{OPT}(G)$ is the minimum number of vertices in a p -edge-connected vertex cover of G . Since $|X| = 2|M| + |N_G(L)|$, $|X| \leq 2\text{OPT}(G)$. Therefore, $|Y| \leq (p + 1)|X| \leq 2(p + 1)\text{OPT}(G)$. \square

6 Conclusions

We obtained time efficient polynomial sized approximate kernelization schemes (PSAKS) for both p -EDGE-CONNECTED VERTEX COVER and p -CONNECTED VERTEX COVER. We also provide a $\mathcal{O}^*(2^{\mathcal{O}(pk)})$ time algorithm for p -EDGE-CONNECTED VERTEX COVER. But, unfortunately, the approach we use in this FPT algorithm does not work for p -vertex-connectivity. Hence, an interesting open problem would be to provide a singly exponential FPT algorithm for p -CONNECTED VERTEX COVER.

We also obtain a polynomial time $2(p+1)$ -factor approximation algorithm for p -EDGE-CONNECTED VERTEX COVER. Unfortunately, the main idea used in this approximation algorithm does not work for p -CONNECTED VERTEX COVER. Although for $p = 2$, there is a block decomposition of the graph. Hence, a constant factor approximation algorithm is possible to obtain for BICONNECTED VERTEX COVER using an approach that is much simpler than p -EDGE-CONNECTED VERTEX COVER. But, it is currently unknown how to get such a result for p -CONNECTED VERTEX COVER for any arbitrary fixed $p \geq 3$. Finally, another interesting open problem would be to obtain a size efficient PSAKS for p -EDGE-CONNECTED VERTEX COVER, and for p -CONNECTED VERTEX COVER but this is also open for CONNECTED VERTEX COVER.

References

- [1] Akanksha Agrawal, Pranabendu Misra, Fahad Panolan, and Saket Saurabh. Fast exact algorithms for survivable network design with uniform requirements. In *WADS*, volume 10389 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 25–36. Springer, 2017.
- [2] Marek Cygan. Deterministic parameterized connected vertex cover. In *Proceedings of SWAT 2012*, pages 95–106, 2012.
- [3] Marek Cygan, Fedor V. Fomin, Lukasz Kowalik, Daniel Lokshtanov, Dániel Marx, Marcin Pilipczuk, Michal Pilipczuk, and Saket Saurabh. *Parameterized Algorithms*. Springer, 2015.
- [4] Michael Dom, Daniel Lokshtanov, and Saket Saurabh. Kernelization lower bounds through colors and IDs. *ACM Trans. Algorithms*, 11(2):13:1–13:20, 2014.
- [5] Rodney G. Downey and Michael R. Fellows. *Fundamentals of Parameterized Complexity*. Texts in Computer Science. Springer, 2013.
- [6] Eduard Eiben, Danny Hermelin, and M. S. Ramanujan. On approximate preprocessing for domination and hitting subgraphs with connected deletion sets. *J. Comput. Syst. Sci.*, 105:158–170, 2019.
- [7] Eduard Eiben, Mithilesh Kumar, Amer E. Mouawad, Fahad Panolan, and Sebastian Siebertz. Lossy kernels for connected dominating set on sparse graphs. *SIAM J. Discrete Math.*, 33(3):1743–1771, 2019.
- [8] Fedor V Fomin, Daniel Lokshtanov, Saket Saurabh, and Meirav Zehavi. *Kernelization: Theory of Parameterized Preprocessing*. Cambridge University Press, 2019.
- [9] R. E. Gomory and T. C. Hu. Multi-terminal network flows. *Journal of the Society for Industrial and Applied Mathematics*, 9, 1961.
- [10] Mehdi Khosravian Ghadikolaei, Nikolaos Melissinos, Jérôme Monnot, and Aris Pagourtzis. Extension and Its Price for the Connected Vertex Cover Problem. In *Proceedings of IWOCA 2019*, pages 315–326, 2019.
- [11] Hengzhe Li, Yuxing Yang, and Baoyindureng Wu. 2-edge connected dominating sets and 2-connected dominating sets of a graph. *J. Comb. Optim.*, 31(2):713–724, 2016.

- [12] Daniel Lokshantov, Pranabendu Misra, Fahad Panolan, and Saket Saurabh. Deterministic truncation of linear matroids. *ACM Trans. Algorithms*, 14(2):14:1–14:20, 2018.
- [13] Daniel Lokshantov, Fahad Panolan, M. S. Ramanujan, and Saket Saurabh. Lossy kernelization. In *Proceedings of STOC 2017*, pages 224–237, 2017.
- [14] Dániel Marx. A parameterized view on matroid optimization problems. *Theor. Comput. Sci.*, 410(44):4471–4479, 2009.
- [15] Daniel Mölle, Stefan Richter, and Peter Rossmanith. Enumerate and expand: Improved algorithms for connected vertex cover and tree cover. *Theory Comput. Syst.*, 43(2):234–253, 2008.
- [16] Hiroshi Nagamochi and Toshihide Ibaraki. A linear-time algorithm for finding a sparse k -connected spanning subgraph of a k -connected graph. *Algorithmica*, 7:583–596, 1992.
- [17] Rolf Niedermeier. *Invitation to Fixed-Parameter Algorithms*. Oxford University Press, 2006.
- [18] Takao Nishizeki and Svatopluk Poljak. k -Connectivity and Decomposition of Graphs into Forests. *Discret. Appl. Math.*, 55(3):295–301, 1994.
- [19] Zeev Nutov. 2-node-connectivity network design. *CoRR*, abs/2002.04048, 2020.
- [20] James Oxley. *Matroid Theory*. Oxford University Press, 2011.
- [21] M. S. Ramanujan. An approximate kernel for connected feedback vertex set. In *Proceedings of ESA 2019*, pages 77:1–77:14, 2019.
- [22] Fomin Fedor V., Daniel Lokshantov, Fahad Panolan, and Saket Saurabh. Efficient computation of representative families with applications in parameterized and exact algorithms. *Journal of the ACM (JACM)*, 63(4):29:1–29:60, 2016.
- [23] Douglas B. West. *Introduction to Graph Theory*. Prentice Hall, 1 edition, 1996.