

On Structural Parameterizations of the Offensive Alliance Problem

Ajinkya Gaikwad and Soumen Maity

Indian Institute of Science Education and Research, Pune, India
ajinkya.gaikwad@students.iiserpune.ac.in; soumen@iiserpune.ac.in

Abstract. The OFFENSIVE ALLIANCE problem has been studied extensively during the last twenty years. A set $S \subseteq V$ of vertices is an offensive alliance in an undirected graph $G = (V, E)$ if each $v \in N(S)$ has at least as many neighbours in S as it has neighbours (including itself) not in S . We study the parameterized complexity of the OFFENSIVE ALLIANCE problem, where the aim is to find a minimum size offensive alliance. Our focus here lies on parameters that measure the structural properties of the input instance. We enhance our understanding of the problem from the viewpoint of parameterized complexity by showing that the problem is $W[1]$ -hard parameterized by a wide range of fairly restrictive structural parameters such as the feedback vertex set number, treewidth, pathwidth, and treedepth of the input graph.

Keywords: Defensive and Offensive alliance · Parameterized Complexity · FPT · $W[1]$ -hard · treewidth

1 Introduction

In real life, an alliance is a collection of people, groups, or states such that the union is stronger than individual. The alliance can be either to achieve some common purpose, to protect against attack, or to assert collective will against others. This motivates the definitions of defensive and offensive alliances in graphs. The properties of alliances in graphs were first studied by Kristiansen, Hedetniemi, and Hedetniemi [16]. They introduced defensive, offensive and powerful alliances. The alliance problems have been studied extensively during last twenty years [9,21,2,19,22], and generalizations called r -alliances are also studied [20]. Throughout this article, $G = (V, E)$ denotes a finite, simple and undirected graph of order $|V| = n$. The subgraph induced by $S \subseteq V(G)$ is denoted by $G[S]$. For a vertex $v \in V$, we use $N_G(v) = \{u : (u, v) \in E(G)\}$ to denote the (open) neighbourhood of vertex v in G , and $N_G[v] = N_G(v) \cup \{v\}$ to denote the closed neighbourhood of v . The degree $d_G(v)$ of a vertex $v \in V(G)$ is $|N_G(v)|$. For a subset $S \subseteq V(G)$, we define its closed neighbourhood as $N_G[S] = \bigcup_{v \in S} N_G[v]$ and its open neighbourhood as $N_G(S) = N_G[S] \setminus S$. For a non-empty subset $S \subseteq V$ and a vertex $v \in V(G)$, $N_S(v)$ denotes the set of neighbours of v in S , that is, $N_S(v) = \{u \in S : (u, v) \in E(G)\}$. We use $d_S(v) = |N_S(v)|$ to denote the degree of vertex v in $G[S]$. The complement of the vertex set S in V is denoted

by S^c .

A non-empty set $S \subseteq V$ is a *defensive alliance* in G if $d_S(v) + 1 \geq d_{S^c}(v)$ for all $v \in S$. Since each vertex in a defensive alliance S has at least as many vertices from its closed neighbor in S as it has in S^c , by strength of numbers, we say that every vertex in S can be *defended* from possible attack by vertices in S^c .

Definition 1. A non-empty set $S \subseteq V$ is an offensive alliance in G if $d_S(v) \geq d_{S^c}(v) + 1$ for all $v \in N(S)$.

Since each vertex in $N(S)$ has more neighbors in S than in S^c , we say that every vertex in $N(S)$ is *vulnerable* to possible attack by vertices in S . Equivalently, since an attack by the vertices in S on the vertices in $V \setminus S$ can result in no worse than a “tie” for S , we say that S can effectively attack $N(S)$.

Definition 2. A non-empty set $S \subseteq V$ is a strong offensive alliance in G if $d_S(v) \geq d_{S^c}(v) + 2$ for all $v \in N(S)$.

In this paper, we consider OFFENSIVE ALLIANCE, EXACT OFFENSIVE ALLIANCE and STRONG OFFENSIVE ALLIANCE problems under structural parameters. We define these problems as follows:

OFFENSIVE ALLIANCE

Input: An undirected graph $G = (V, E)$ and an integer $k \geq 1$.

Question: Is there an offensive alliance $S \subseteq V(G)$ such that $1 \leq |S| \leq k$?

EXACT OFFENSIVE ALLIANCE

Input: An undirected graph $G = (V, E)$ and an integer $k \geq 1$.

Question: Is there an offensive alliance $S \subseteq V(G)$ such that $|S| = k$?

STRONG OFFENSIVE ALLIANCE

Input: An undirected graph $G = (V, E)$ and an integer $k \geq 1$.

Question: Is there a strong offensive alliance $S \subseteq V(G)$ such that $1 \leq |S| \leq k$?

For standard notations and definitions in graph theory, we refer to West [23]. For the standard concepts in parameterized complexity, see the recent textbook by Cygan et al. [3]. The graph parameters we explicitly use in this paper are vertex cover number, feedback vertex set number, pathwidth, treewidth and treedepth.

Definition 3. The *vertex cover number* is the size of a minimum vertex cover in a graph G and it is denoted by $vc(G)$.

Definition 4. For a graph $G = (V, E)$, the parameter *feedback vertex set* is the cardinality of a smallest set $S \subseteq V(G)$ such that the graph $G - S$ is a forest and it is denoted by $fvs(G)$.

We now review the concept of a tree decomposition, introduced by Robertson and Seymour in [18]. Treewidth is a measure of how “tree-like” the graph is.

Definition 5. [18] A *tree decomposition* of a graph $G = (V, E)$ is a tree T together with a collection of subsets X_t (called bags) of V labeled by the vertices t of T such that $\bigcup_{t \in T} X_t = V$ and (1) and (2) below hold:

1. For every edge $(u, v) \in E(G)$, there is some t such that $\{u, v\} \subseteq X_t$.
2. (Interpolation Property) If t is a vertex on the unique path in T from t_1 to t_2 , then $X_{t_1} \cap X_{t_2} \subseteq X_t$.

Definition 6. [5] The *width* of a tree decomposition is the maximum value of $|X_t| - 1$ taken over all the vertices t of the tree T of the decomposition. The treewidth $tw(G)$ of a graph G is the minimum width among all possible tree decomposition of G .

Definition 7. If the tree T of a tree decomposition is a path, then we say that the tree decomposition is a *path decomposition*, and similarly the *pathwidth* of a graph G is the minimum width among all possible path decomposition of G .

A rooted forest is a disjoint union of rooted trees. Given a rooted forest F , its *transitive closure* is a graph H in which $V(H)$ contains all the nodes of the rooted forest, and $E(H)$ contain an edge between two vertices only if those two vertices form an ancestor-descendant pair in the forest F .

Definition 8. The *treedepth* of a graph G is the minimum height of a rooted forest F whose transitive closure contains the graph G . It is denoted by $td(G)$.

1.1 Our Main Results

We show that the OFFENSIVE ALLIANCE and EXACT OFFENSIVE ALLIANCE problems are W[1]-hard parameterized by any of the following parameters: the feedback vertex set number, treewidth, pathwidth, and treedepth of the input graph.

1.2 Known Results

The decision version for several types of alliances have been shown to be NP-complete. For an integer r , a nonempty set $S \subseteq V(G)$ is a *defensive r -alliance* if for each $v \in S$, $|N(v) \cap S| \geq |N(v) \setminus S| + r$. A set is a defensive alliance if it is a defensive (-1) -alliance. A defensive r -alliance S is *global* if S is a dominating set. The defensive r -alliance problem is NP-complete for any r [20]. The defensive alliance problem is NP-complete even when restricted to split, chordal and bipartite graph [13]. For an integer r , a nonempty set $S \subseteq V(G)$ is an *offensive r -alliance* if for each $v \in N(S)$, $|N(v) \cap S| \geq |N(v) \setminus S| + r$. An offensive 1-alliance is called an offensive alliance. An offensive r -alliance S is *global* if S is a dominating set. Fernau et al. showed that the offensive r -alliance and global offensive r -alliance problems are NP-complete for any fixed r [8]. They also proved that

for $r > 1$, r -offensive alliance is NP-hard, even when restricted to r -regular planar graphs. There are polynomial time algorithms for finding minimum alliances in trees [1,13]. A polynomial time algorithm for finding minimum defensive alliance in series parallel graph is presented in [12]. Fernau and Raible showed in [7] that the defensive and offensive alliance problems and their global variants are fixed parameter tractable when parameterized by the solution size k . Kiyomi and Otachi showed in [14], the problems of finding smallest alliances of all kinds are fixed-parameter tractable when parameterized by the vertex cover number. The problems of finding smallest defensive and offensive alliances are also fixed-parameter tractable when parameterized by the neighbourhood diversity [10]. Enciso [6] proved that finding defensive and global defensive alliances is fixed parameter tractable when parameterized by domino treewidth.

2 Hardness Results

In this section we show that OFFENSIVE ALLIANCE is W[1]-hard parameterized by a vertex deletion set to trees of height at most seven, that is, a subset D of the vertices of the graph such that every component in the graph, after removing D , is a tree of height at most seven. On the way towards this result, we provide hardness results for several interesting versions of the OFFENSIVE ALLIANCE problem which we require in our proofs. The problem OFFENSIVE ALLIANCE^F generalizes OFFENSIVE ALLIANCE where some vertices are forced to be outside the solution; these vertices are called forbidden vertices. This variant can be formalized as follows:

OFFENSIVE ALLIANCE^F

Input: An undirected graph $G = (V, E)$, an integer r and a set $V_{\square} \subseteq V(G)$ of forbidden vertices such that each degree one forbidden vertex is adjacent to another forbidden vertex and each forbidden vertex of degree greater than one is adjacent to a degree one forbidden vertex.

Question: Is there an offensive alliance $S \subseteq V$ such that (i) $1 \leq |S| \leq r$, and (ii) $S \cap V_{\square} = \emptyset$?

STRONG OFFENSIVE ALLIANCE^{FN} is a generalization of STRONG OFFENSIVE ALLIANCE^F that, in addition, requires some “necessary” vertices to be in S . This variant can be formalized as follows:

STRONG OFFENSIVE ALLIANCE^{FN}

Input: An undirected graph $G = (V, E)$, an integer r , a set $V_{\Delta} \subseteq V$, and a set $V_{\square} \subseteq V(G)$ of forbidden vertices such that each degree one forbidden vertex is adjacent to another forbidden vertex and each forbidden vertex of degree greater than one is adjacent to a degree one forbidden vertex.

Question: Is there a strong offensive alliance $S \subseteq V$ such that (i) $1 \leq |S| \leq r$, (ii) $S \cap V_{\square} = \emptyset$, and (iii) $V_{\Delta} \subseteq S$?

While the OFFENSIVE ALLIANCE problem asks for offensive alliance of size at most r , we also consider the EXACT OFFENSIVE ALLIANCE problem that concerns offensive alliance of size exactly r . Analogously, we also define exact versions of STRONG OFFENSIVE ALLIANCE presented above. To prove Lemma 2, we consider the following problem:

MULTIDIMENSIONAL RELAXED SUBSET SUM (MRSS)
Input: Two integers k and k' , a set $S = \{s_1, \dots, s_n\}$ of vectors with $s_i \in \mathbb{N}^k$ for every i with $1 \leq i \leq n$ and a target vector $t \in \mathbb{N}^k$.
Parameter: $k + k'$
Question: Is there a subset $S' \subseteq S$ with $|S'| \leq k'$ such that $\sum_{s \in S'} s \geq t$?

Lemma 1. [11] MRSS is W[1]-hard when parameterized by the combined parameter $k + k'$, even if all integers in the input are given in unary.

We now show that the STRONG OFFENSIVE ALLIANCE^{FN} problem is W[1]-hard parameterized by the size of a vertex deletion set into trees of height at most 5, via a reduction from MRSS.

Lemma 2. The STRONG OFFENSIVE ALLIANCE^{FN} problem is W[1]-hard when parameterized by the size of a vertex deletion set into trees of height at most 5.

Proof. To prove this we reduce from MRSS, which is known to be W[1]-hard when parameterized by the combined parameter $k + k'$, even if all integers in the input are given in unary [11]. Let $I = (k, k', S, t)$ be an instance of MRSS. We construct an instance $I' = (G, r, V_\Delta, V_\square)$ of STRONG OFFENSIVE ALLIANCE^{FN} in the following way. See Figure 1 for an illustration. First, we introduce a set of k forbidden vertices $U = \{u_1, u_2, \dots, u_k\}$. For each vector $s = (s(1), s(2), \dots, s(k)) \in S$, we introduce a tree T_s into G . We define $\max(s) = \max_{1 \leq i \leq k} \{s(i)\}$. The vertex set of tree T_s is defined as follows:

$$V(T_s) = A_s \cup B_s \cup A_s^\square \cup B_s^\square \cup C_s \cup Z_s \cup \{x_s, y_s, z_s\}$$

where $A_s = \{a_1^s, \dots, a_{\max(s)+1}^s\}$, $B_s = \{b_1^s, \dots, b_{\max(s)+1}^s\}$, $A_s^\square = \{a_1^{\square s}, \dots, a_{\max(s)+1}^{\square s}\}$, $B_s^\square = \{b_1^{\square s}, \dots, b_{\max(s)+1}^{\square s}\}$ and $C_s = \{c_1^s, \dots, c_{2\max(s)+2}^s\}$ are five sets of vertices, and the set $Z_s = \{z_1^{\Delta s}, z_2^{\Delta s}, z_3^{\Delta s}, z_4^{\Delta s}, z_5^{\Delta s}, z^{\square s}\}$ contains five necessary vertices and one forbidden vertex. We now create the edge set of T_s .

$$E(T_s) = \bigcup_{i=1}^{\max(s)+1} \{(a_i^{\square s}, b_i^{\square s}), (a_i^{\square s}, a_i^s), (a_i^{\square s}, b_i^s), (x_s, a_i^{\square s})\} \\ \bigcup_{i=1}^5 \{(z_s, z_i^{\Delta s}), (z_s, z^{\square s})\} \bigcup \{(x_s, z_s), (z_s, y_s)\} \bigcup_{i=1}^{2\max(s)+2} (y_s, c_i^s)$$




Fig. 1. The graph G in the proof of Lemma 2 constructed for MRSS instance $S = \{(2, 1), (1, 1), (1, 2)\}$, $t = (3, 3)$, $k = 2$ and $k' = 2$.

Next we introduce a vertex a and a set of four vertices $A = \{a_1^\Delta, a_2^\Delta, a_3^\Delta, a^\square\}$ containing three necessary vertices and one forbidden vertex. Make a adjacent to all the vertices in A . For each $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, k\}$ and for each $s \in S$, we make u_i adjacent to exactly $s(i)$ many vertices of A_s in arbitrary manner. For each $s \in S$, we make a adjacent to all the vertices of $A_s \cup B_s \cup C_s$. For every $u_i \in U$, we create a set $V_{u_i^\square}$ of $\sum_{s \in S} s(i)$ forbidden vertices and a set $V_{u_i^\Delta}$ of $2 \sum_{s \in S} s(i) - 2t(i) + 2$ necessary vertices; and make u_i adjacent to every vertex of $V_{u_i^\square} \cup V_{u_i^\Delta}$. We define

$$V_\Delta = \bigcup_{i=1}^k V_{u_i^\Delta} \cup A \setminus \{a^\square\} \cup \bigcup_{s \in S} Z_s \setminus \{z^{\square s}\}$$

and

$$V_{\square} = U \cup \{a, a^{\square}\} \bigcup_{i=1}^k V_{u_i \square} \bigcup_{s \in S} A_s^{\square} \cup B_s^{\square} \cup \{z_s, z^{\square s}\}.$$

We set $r = \sum_{i=1}^k 2 \left(\sum_{s \in S} s(i) - t(i) + 1 \right) + \sum_{s \in S} 2(\max(s) + 1) + 5n + 3 + k'$. Observe that if we remove the set $U \cup \{a\}$ of $k + 1$ vertices from G , each connected component of the resulting graph is a tree with height at most 5. Note that, I' can be constructed in polynomial time. The reason is this. As all integers in I are bounded by a polynomial in n , the number of vertices in G is also polynomially bounded in n .

It remains to show that I is a yes instance if and only if I' is a yes instance. Towards showing the forward direction, let S' be a subset of S such that $|S'| \leq k'$ and $\sum_{s \in S'} s \geq t$. We claim

$$R = V_{\Delta} \bigcup_{s \in S'} A_s \cup B_s \cup \{x_s\} \bigcup_{s \in S \setminus S'} C_s$$

is a strong offensive alliance of G such that $|R| \leq r$, $V_{\Delta} \subseteq R$, and $V_{\square} \cap R = \emptyset$. Observe that $N_G(R) = U \cup \{a\} \bigcup_{s \in S} \{z_s\} \bigcup_{s \in S \setminus S'} \{y_s\} \bigcup_{s \in S'} A_s^{\square}$. Let $u_i \in U$, then we show that $d_R(u_i) \geq d_{R^c}(u_i) + 2$. As $\sum_{s \in S'} s(i) - t(i) \geq 0$, we get

$$\begin{aligned} d_R(u_i) &= \sum_{s \in S'} s(i) + |V_{u_i \Delta}| \\ &= \sum_{s \in S'} s(i) + 2 \sum_{s \in S} s(i) - 2t(i) + 2 \\ &= \left(\sum_{s \in S'} s(i) - t(i) \right) + \sum_{s \in S} s(i) - t(i) + \sum_{s \in S} s(i) + 2 \\ &\geq \sum_{s \in S} s(i) - t(i) + \sum_{s \in S} s(i) + 2 \\ &= \sum_{s \in S \setminus S'} s(i) + \left(\sum_{s \in S'} s(i) - t(i) \right) + \sum_{s \in S} s(i) + 2 \\ &\geq \sum_{s \in S \setminus S'} s(i) + \sum_{s \in S} s(i) + 2 = \sum_{s \in S \setminus S'} s(i) + |V_{u_i \square}| + 2 \\ &= d_{R^c}(u_i) + 2. \end{aligned}$$

For the remaining vertices x in $N(R)$, it is easy to see that $d_R(x) \geq d_{R^c}(x) + 2$. Therefore, R is a strong offensive alliance.

Towards showing the reverse direction of the equivalence, suppose G has a strong offensive alliance R of size at most r such that $V_{\Delta} \subseteq R$ and $V_{\square} \cap R = \emptyset$. From the definition of V_{Δ} and V_{\square} , it is easy to note that $U \subseteq N(R)$. We know

V_Δ contains $\sum_{i=1}^k \left(\sum_{s \in S} 2s(i) - 2t(i) \right) + 5n + 3$ vertices; thus besides the vertices of V_Δ , there are at most $\sum_{s \in S} 2(\max(s) + 1) + k'$ vertices in R . Since $a \in N(V_\Delta)$ and $d_G(a) = \sum_{s \in S} 4(\max(s) + 1) + 4$ where a is adjacent to three necessary vertices, it must have at least $\sum_{s \in S} 2(\max(s) + 1)$ many neighbours in R from the set $\bigcup_{s \in S} (A_s \cup B_s \cup C_s)$. It is to be noted that if a vertex from the set $A_s \cup B_s$ is in the solution then the whole set $A_s \cup B_s \cup \{x_s\}$ lie in the solution. Otherwise $v \in A_s^\square \subseteq N(R)$ will have $d_R(v) < d_{R^c}(v) + 2$ which is a contradiction as R is a strong offensive alliance. This shows that at most k' many sets of the form $A_s \cup B_s \cup \{x_s\}$ contribute to the solution as otherwise the size of solution exceeds r . Therefore, any strong offensive alliance R of size at most r can be transformed to another strong offensive alliance R' of size at most r as follows:

$$R' = V_\Delta \bigcup_{x_s \in R} A_s \cup B_s \cup \{x_s\} \bigcup_{x_s \in V(G) \setminus R} C_s.$$

We define a subset $S' = \{s \in S \mid x_s \in R'\}$. Clearly, $|S'| \leq k'$. We claim that $\sum_{s \in S'} s(i) \geq t(i)$ for all $1 \leq i \leq k$. Assume for the sake of contradiction that $\sum_{s \in S'} s(i) < t(i)$ for some $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, k\}$. Then, we have

$$\begin{aligned} d_{R'}(u_i) &= \sum_{s \in S'} s(i) + |V_{u_i \Delta}| \\ &= \sum_{s \in S'} s(i) + 2 \sum_{s \in S} s(i) - 2t(i) + 2 \\ &= \sum_{s \in S'} s(i) - t(i) + \sum_{s \in S} s(i) - t(i) + \sum_{s \in S} s(i) + 2 \\ &< \sum_{s \in S} s(i) - t(i) + \sum_{s \in S} s(i) + 2 \\ &= \sum_{s \in S \setminus S'} s(i) + \left(\sum_{s \in S'} s(i) - t(i) \right) + \sum_{s \in S} s(i) + 2 \\ &< \sum_{s \in S \setminus S'} s(i) + \sum_{s \in S} s(i) + 2 = \sum_{s \in S \setminus S'} s(i) + |V_{u_i \square}| + 2 \\ &= d_{R'^c}(u_i) + 2 \end{aligned}$$

and we also know $u_i \in N(R')$, which is a contradiction to the fact that R' is a strong offensive alliance. This shows that I is a yes instance.

We have the following corollaries from Lemma 2.

Corollary 1. The STRONG OFFENSIVE ALLIANCE^{FN} problem is W[1]-hard when parameterized by the size of a vertex deletion set into trees of height at most 5, even when $|V_\Delta| = 1$.

Proof. Given an instance $I = (G, r, V_\Delta, V_\square)$ of $\text{STRONG OFFENSIVE ALLIANCE}^{\text{FN}}$, we construct an equivalent instance $I' = (G', r', V'_\Delta, V'_\square)$ with $|V'_\Delta| = 1$. See Figure 2 for an illustration.




Fig. 2. An illustration of the gadget used in the proof of Corollary 1.

Let v_1, v_2, \dots, v_ℓ be vertices of V_Δ where we assume that $\ell > 1$. We introduce two vertices x and y where x is a forbidden vertex and y is a necessary vertex; and make x and y adjacent. We make x adjacent to all the vertices in V_Δ . We also introduce a set V_{x^\square} of $\ell - 1$ forbidden vertices and make them adjacent to x . Set $r' = r + 1$. Define $V'_\Delta = \{y\}$ and $V'_\square = \{x\} \cup V_{x^\square} \cup V_\square$. We also define G' as follows

$$V(G') = V(G) \cup \{x, y\} \cup V_{x^\square}$$

and

$$E(G') = E(G) \cup \{(x, y), (x, \alpha), (x, \beta) \mid \alpha \in V_{x^\square}, \beta \in V_\Delta\}.$$

Let H be a vertex deletion set of G into trees of height at most 5. Clearly, if H has at most k vertices then the set $H \cup \{x\}$ has at most $k + 1$ vertices and is a vertex deletion set of G' into trees of height at most 5. It is easy to see that I and I' are equivalent instances. \square

We can get an analogous result for the exact variant.

Corollary 2. The $\text{EXACT STRONG OFFENSIVE ALLIANCE}^{\text{FN}}$ problem is $W[1]$ -hard when parameterized by the size of a vertex deletion set into trees of height at most 5 even when $|V_\Delta| = 1$.

Next, we give an FPT reduction that eliminates necessary vertices.

Lemma 3. The $\text{OFFENSIVE ALLIANCE}^{\text{F}}$ problem is $W[1]$ -hard when parameterized by the size of a vertex deletion set into trees of height at most 5.

Proof. To prove this we reduce from the $\text{STRONG OFFENSIVE ALLIANCE}^{\text{FN}}$ problem, which is $W[1]$ -hard when parameterized by the size of a vertex deletion set into trees of height at most 5, even when $|V_\Delta| = 1$. See Corollary 1. Given

an instance $I = (G, r, V_\Delta = \{x\}, V_\square)$ of $\text{STRONG OFFENSIVE ALLIANCE}^{\text{FN}}$, we construct an instance $I' = (G', r', V'_\square)$ of $\text{OFFENSIVE ALLIANCE}^{\text{F}}$ the following way. See Figure 3 for an illustration. Let n be the number of vertices in G and




Fig. 3. The reduction from $\text{STRONG OFFENSIVE ALLIANCE}^{\text{FN}}$ to $\text{OFFENSIVE ALLIANCE}^{\text{F}}$ in Lemma 3. Note that the set $\{v_1, \dots, v_{n'}\}$ may contain forbidden vertices of degree greater than one.

let $V(G) = \{x, v_1, v_2, \dots, v_{n'}, f_1, \dots, f_{n''}\}$ where $F = \{f_1, \dots, f_{n''}\}$ is the set of degree one forbidden vertices in $V(G)$. We introduce two vertices t^\square, x^\square into G' . We create a set $V_t^\square = \{t_1^\square, \dots, t_{4n}^\square\}$ of $4n$ forbidden vertices into G' and make them adjacent to t^\square . We introduce a set V_x^\square of n forbidden vertices and make them adjacent to x^\square . Finally we create a set $T = \{t_1, \dots, t_{4n}\}$ of $4n$ vertices and make the vertices in T adjacent to t^\square and x^\square , and make the vertices in $V(G) \setminus F$ adjacent to x^\square . We also add an edge (x, t^\square) . Set $r' = r + 4n$. We define G' as follows:

$$V(G') = V(G) \cup T \cup V_t^\square \cup V_x^\square \cup \{t^\square, x^\square\}$$

and

$$E(G') = E(G) \cup \left\{ (t^\square, \alpha) : \alpha \in T \cup V_t^\square \cup \{x\} \right\} \\ \cup \left\{ (x^\square, \beta) : \beta \in T \cup V_x^\square \cup V(G) \setminus F \right\}$$

We define $V'_\square = V_\square \cup V_t^\square \cup V_x^\square \cup \{t^\square, x^\square\}$. Observe that there exists a set of at most $k + 2$ vertices in G' whose deletion makes the resulting graph a forest containing trees of height at most 5. We can find such a set because there exists a vertex deletion set H of G into trees of height at most 5. We just add $\{x^\square, t^\square\}$ to the set H , then the resulting set is of size $k + 2$ whose deletion makes the resulting graph a forest containing trees of height at most 5.

We now claim that I is a yes-instance if and only if I' is a yes-instance. Assume first that R is a strong offensive alliance of size at most r in G such that $\{x\} \subseteq R$ and $V_\square \cap R = \emptyset$. We claim $R' = R \cup T$ is an offensive alliance of size at most $r + 4n$ in G' such that $V'_\square \cap R' = \emptyset$. Clearly, $N(R') = \{t^\square, x^\square\} \cup N(R)$. For each $v \in N(R)$, we know that $d_R(v) \geq d_{R^c}(v) + 2$ in G . Therefore in graph

G' , we get $d_{R'}(v) \geq d_{R^c}(v) + 1$ for each $v \in N(R)$ due to the vertex x^\square . For $v \in \{x^\square, t^\square\}$, it is clear that $d_{R'}(v) \geq d_{R^c}(v) + 1$. This shows that I' is a yes instance.

To prove the reverse direction of the equivalence, suppose R' is an offensive alliance of size at most $r' = r + 4n$ in G' such that $R' \cap V_\square = \emptyset$. We claim that $x \in R'$. In fact, we show that $T \cup \{x\} \subseteq R'$. Since R' is non empty, it must contain a vertex from the set $V(G) \cup T$. Then $x^\square \in N(R')$. Due to n forbidden vertices in the set V_x^\square , node x^\square must have at least $n + 1$ neighbours in R' . This implies that R' contains at least one vertex from T . Then $t^\square \in N(R')$ and it satisfies the condition $d_{R'}(t^\square) \geq d_{R^c}(t^\square) + 1$. Since $|V_t^\square| = 4n$, the condition $d_{R'}(t^\square) \geq d_{R^c}(t^\square) + 1$ forces the set $\{x\} \cup T$ to be inside the solution. Consider $R = R' \cap V(G)$. Clearly $|R| \leq r$, $x \in R$, $R \cap V_\square = \emptyset$ and we show that R is a strong offensive alliance in G . For each $v \in N(R') \cap V(G) = N(R)$, we have $N_{R'}(v) \geq N_{R^c}(v) + 1$ in G' . Notice that we do not have x^\square in G which is adjacent to all vertices in $N(R)$. Thus for each $v \in N(R)$, we get $N_R(v) \geq N_{R^c}(v) + 2$ in G . Therefore R is a strong offensive alliance of size at most r in G such that $x \in R$ and $R \cap V_\square = \emptyset$. This shows that I is a yes instance. \square

We are now ready to show our main hardness result for OFFENSIVE ALLIANCE using a reduction from OFFENSIVE ALLIANCE^F.

Theorem 1. The OFFENSIVE ALLIANCE problem is W[1]-hard when parameterized by the size of a vertex deletion set into trees of height at most 7.

Proof. We give a parameterized reduction from OFFENSIVE ALLIANCE^F which is W[1]-hard when parameterized by the size of a vertex deletion set into trees of height at most 5. Let $I = (G, r, V_\square)$ be an instance of OFFENSIVE ALLIANCE^F. Let $n = |V(G)|$. We construct an instance $I' = (G', r')$ of OFFENSIVE ALLIANCE the following way. We set $r' = r$. Recall that each degree one forbidden vertex is adjacent to another forbidden vertex and each forbidden vertex of degree greater than one is adjacent to a degree one forbidden vertex. Let u be a degree one forbidden vertex in G and u is adjacent to another forbidden vertex v . For each degree one forbidden vertex $u \in V_\square$, we introduce a tree T_u rooted at u of height 2 as shown in Figure 4. The forbidden vertex v has additional neighbours from the original graph G which are not shown here. We define G' as follows:

$$V(G') = V(G) \bigcup_{u \in V_\square} \left\{ V(T_u) \mid \text{where } u \text{ is a degree one forbidden vertex in } G \right\}$$

and

$$E(G') = E(G) \bigcup_{u' \in V_\square} E(T_{u'}).$$

We claim I is a yes instance if and only if I' is a yes instance. It is easy to see that if R is an offensive alliance of size at most r in G then it is also an offensive alliance of size at most $r' = r$ in G' .




Fig. 4. Our tree gadget T_u for each degree one forbidden vertex $u \in V_\square$

To prove the reverse direction of the equivalence, suppose that G' has an offensive alliance R' of size at most $r' = r$. We claim that no vertex from the set $V_\square \cup \bigcup_{u \in V_\square} V(T_u)$ is part of R' . It is easy to see that if any vertex from the set $V_\square \cup \bigcup_{u \in V_\square} V(T_u)$ is in R' then the size of R' exceeds $2r$. This implies that $R = R' \cap G$ is an offensive alliance such that $R \cap V_\square = \emptyset$ and $|R| \leq r$. This shows that I is a yes instance. \square

We have the following consequences.

Corollary 3. The EXACT OFFENSIVE ALLIANCE problem is $W[1]$ -hard when parameterized by the size of a vertex deletion set into trees of height at most 7.

Clearly trees of height at most seven are trivially acyclic. Moreover, it is easy to verify that such trees have pathwidth [15] and treedepth [17] at most seven, which implies:

Theorem 2. The OFFENSIVE ALLIANCE and EXACT OFFENSIVE ALLIANCE problems are $W[1]$ -hard when parameterized by any of the following parameters:

- the feedback vertex set number,
- the treewidth and pathwidth of the input graph,
- the treedepth of the input graph.

3 Conclusions

In this work we proved that the OFFENSIVE ALLIANCE problem is $W[1]$ -hard parameterized by a wide range of fairly restrictive structural parameters such as the feedback vertex set number, treewidth, pathwidth, and treedepth of the input graph thus not FPT (unless $FPT = W[1]$). This is especially interesting because most “subset problems” that are FPT when parameterized by solution size turned out to be FPT for the parameter treewidth [4], and moreover OFFENSIVE ALLIANCE is easy on trees. In the future it may be interesting to study if our ideas can be useful for different kinds of alliances from the literature such as powerful alliances and defensive alliances. It would be interesting to consider the parameterized complexity with respect to twin cover. The parameterized

complexity of offensive and defensive alliance problems remain unsettled when parameterized by other important structural graph parameters like clique-width and modular-width.

References

1. C.-W. Chang, M.-L. Chia, C.-J. Hsu, D. Kuo, L.-L. Lai, and F.-H. Wang. Global defensive alliances of trees and cartesian product of paths and cycles. *Discrete Applied Mathematics*, 160(4):479 – 487, 2012.
2. M. Chellali and T. W. Haynes. Global alliances and independence in trees. *Discuss. Math. Graph Theory*, 27(1):19–27, 2007.
3. M. Cygan, F. V. Fomin, L. Kowalik, D. Lokshtanov, D. Marx, M. Pilipczuk, M. Pilipczuk, and S. Saurabh. *Parameterized Algorithms*. Springer, 2015.
4. M. Dom, D. Lokshtanov, S. Saurabh, and Y. Villanger. Capacitated domination and covering: A parameterized perspective. In M. Grohe and R. Niedermeier, editors, *Parameterized and Exact Computation*, pages 78–90, Berlin, Heidelberg, 2008. Springer Berlin Heidelberg.
5. R. G. Downey and M. R. Fellows. *Parameterized Complexity*. Springer, 2012.
6. R. Enciso. *Alliances in graphs: Parameterized algorithms and on partitioning series-parallel graphs*. PhD thesis, USA, 2009.
7. H. Fernau and D. Raible. Alliances in graphs: a complexity-theoretic study. In *Proceeding Volume II of the 33rd International Conference on Current Trends in Theory and Practice of Computer Science*, 2007.
8. H. Fernau, J. A. Rodríguez, and J. M. Sigarreta. Offensive r-alliances in graphs. *Discrete Applied Mathematics*, 157(1):177 – 182, 2009.
9. G. Fricke, L. Lawson, T. Haynes, M. Hedetniemi, and S. Hedetniemi. A note on defensive alliances in graphs. *Bulletin of the Institute of Combinatorics and its Applications*, 38:37–41, 2003.
10. A. Gaikwad, S. Maity, and S. K. Tripathi. Parameterized complexity of defensive and offensive alliances in graphs. In D. Goswami and T. A. Hoang, editors, *Distributed Computing and Internet Technology*, pages 175–187, Cham, 2021. Springer International Publishing.
11. R. Ganian, F. Klute, and S. Ordyniak. On structural parameterizations of the bounded-degree vertex deletion problem. *Algorithmica*, 83(1):297–336, 2021.
12. L. H. Jamieson. *Algorithms and Complexity for Alliances and Weighted Alliances of Various Types*. PhD thesis, USA, 2007.
13. L. H. Jamieson, S. T. Hedetniemi, and A. A. McRae. The algorithmic complexity of alliances in graphs. *Journal of Combinatorial Mathematics and Combinatorial Computing*, 68:137–150, 2009.
14. M. Kiyomi and Y. Otachi. Alliances in graphs of bounded clique-width. *Discrete Applied Mathematics*, 223:91 – 97, 2017.
15. T. Kloks. *Treewidth, Computations and Approximations*, volume 842 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*. Springer, 1994.
16. P. Kristiansen, M. Hedetniemi, and S. Hedetniemi. Alliances in graphs. *Journal of Combinatorial Mathematics and Combinatorial Computing*, 48:157–177, 2004.
17. J. Nešetřil and P. O. de Mendez. *Sparsity: Graphs, Structures, and Algorithms*. Springer Publishing Company, Incorporated, 2014.
18. N. Robertson and P. Seymour. Graph minors. iii. planar tree-width. *Journal of Combinatorial Theory, Series B*, 36(1):49 – 64, 1984.

19. J. Rodríguez-Velázquez and J. Sigarreta. Global offensive alliances in graphs. *Electronic Notes in Discrete Mathematics*, 25:157 – 164, 2006.
20. J. Sigarreta, S. Bermudo, and H. Fernau. On the complement graph and defensive k -alliances. *Discrete Applied Mathematics*, 157(8):1687 – 1695, 2009.
21. J. Sigarreta and J. Rodríguez. On defensive alliances and line graphs. *Applied Mathematics Letters*, 19(12):1345 – 1350, 2006.
22. J. Sigarreta and J. Rodríguez. On the global offensive alliance number of a graph. *Discrete Applied Mathematics*, 157(2):219 – 226, 2009.
23. D. B. West. *Introduction to Graph Theory*. Prentice Hall, 2000.