

# Generating faster algorithms for $d$ -Path Vertex Cover<sup>\*</sup>

Radovan Červený<sup>[0000–0003–4528–9525]</sup> and Ondřej Suchý<sup>[0000–0002–7236–8336]</sup>

Department of Theoretical Computer Science, Faculty of Information Technology,  
Czech Technical University in Prague, Prague, Czech Republic  
{radovan.cerveny,ondrej.suchy}@fit.cvut.cz

**Abstract.** For a constant  $d$ , the  $d$ -PATH VERTEX COVER problem ( $d$ -PVC) is as follows: Given an undirected graph and an integer  $k$ , find a subset of at most  $k$  vertices of the graph, such that their deletion results in a graph not containing a path on  $d$  vertices as a subgraph. We develop a framework to automatically generate parameterized branching algorithms for the problem and obtain algorithms outperforming those previously known for  $3 \leq d \leq 8$ . E.g., we show that 5-PVC can be solved in  $O(2.7^k \cdot n^{O(1)})$  time.

**Keywords:** graph algorithms ·  $d$ -PATH VERTEX COVER · parameterized algorithms · automated algorithm generation

## 1 Introduction

The problem of  $d$ -PATH VERTEX COVER,  $d$ -PVC lies in determining a subset  $S$  of vertices of a given graph  $G = (V, E)$  such that  $G \setminus S$  does not contain a path on  $d$  vertices (even not a non-induced one). The problem was first introduced by Brešar et al. [1], but its NP-completeness for any  $d \geq 2$  follows already from the meta-theorem of Lewis and Yannakakis [14]. The 2-PVC problem corresponds to the well known VERTEX COVER problem and the 3-PVC problem is also known as MAXIMUM DISSOCIATION SET or BOUNDED DEGREE-ONE DELETION. The  $d$ -PVC problem is motivated by the field of designing secure wireless communication protocols [15] or in route planning and speeding up shortest path queries [9].

Since the problem is NP-hard, any algorithm solving the problem exactly is expected to have exponential running time. If one measures the running time solely in terms of the input size, then several efficient (faster than trivial enumeration) exact algorithms are known for 2-PVC and 3-PVC. In particular, 2-PVC (VERTEX COVER) can be solved in  $\mathcal{O}(1.1996^n)$  time and polynomial space due to Xiao and Nagamochi [23] and 3-PVC can be solved in  $\mathcal{O}(1.4613^n)$  time and polynomial space due to Chang et al. [2] or in  $\mathcal{O}(1.3659^n)$  time and exponential space due to Xiao and Kou [21].

---

<sup>\*</sup> The authors acknowledge the support of the OP VVV MEYS funded project CZ.02.1.01/0.0/0.0/16\_019/0000765 “Research Center for Informatics” and the Grant Agency of the CTU in Prague funded grant No. SGS20/208/OHK3/3T/18.

In this paper we aim on the parameterized analysis of the problem, that is, to confine the exponential part of the running time to a specific parameter of the input, presumably much smaller than the input size. Algorithms achieving running time  $f(k)n^{O(1)}$  are called *parameterized*, *fixed-parameter tractable*, or *FPT*. See Cygan et al. [4] for a broader introduction to parameterized algorithms.

When parameterized by the size of the solution  $k$ , the  $d$ -PVC problem is directly solvable by a trivial FPT algorithm that runs in  $\mathcal{O}^*(d^k)$  time.<sup>1</sup> However, since  $d$ -PVC is a special case of  $d$ -HITTING SET, it was shown by Fomin et al. [7] that for any  $d \geq 4$  we have an algorithm solving  $d$ -PVC in  $\mathcal{O}^*((d - 0.9245)^k)$  and for  $d \geq 6$  algorithms with even better running times are presented in the work of Fernau [6]. In order to find more efficient solutions, the problem has been extensively studied in a setting where  $d$  is a small constant. For the 2-PVC (VERTEX COVER) problem, the algorithm of Chen, Kanj, and Xia [3] has the currently best known running time of  $\mathcal{O}^*(1.2738^k)$ . For 3-PVC, Tu [19] used iterative compression to achieve a running time  $\mathcal{O}^*(2^k)$ .

This was later improved by Katrenič [11] to  $\mathcal{O}^*(1.8127^k)$ , by Xiao and Kou [22] to  $\mathcal{O}^*(1.7485^k)$  by using a branch-and-reduce approach and finally by Tsur [17] to  $\mathcal{O}^*(1.713^k)$ . For the 4-PVC problem, Tu and Jin [20] again used iterative compression and achieved a running time  $\mathcal{O}^*(3^k)$  and Tsur [18] gave the current best algorithm that runs in  $\mathcal{O}^*(2.619^k)$  time. The authors of this paper developed an  $\mathcal{O}^*(4^k)$  algorithm for 5-PVC. For  $d = 5, 6,$  and  $7$  Tsur [16] claimed algorithms for  $d$ -PVC with running time  $\mathcal{O}^*(3.945^k)$ ,  $\mathcal{O}^*(4.947^k)$ , and  $\mathcal{O}^*(5.951^k)$ , respectively.

The motivation behind this paper is to renew the interest in computer aided design of algorithms which was initiated by Gramm et al. [10]. Many of the cited algorithmic results, including ours, follow roughly the same pattern: 1) perform a meticulous case analysis; 2) based on the analysis, construct branching and reduction rules; 3) argue that once the rules cannot be applied, some specific structure is achieved. Also, depending on how “deeply” you perform the case analysis, you may slightly improve the running time of the algorithm, but bring nothing new to the table.

This paper aims to provide a framework which could help in the first two steps of the pattern at least for some problems. We phrase the framework for a more general problem which is as follows. For any nonempty finite set of connected graphs  $\mathcal{F}$  we define the problem  $\mathcal{F}$ -SUBGRAPH VERTEX DELETION,  $\mathcal{F}$ -SVD which, similarly to  $d$ -PVC, lies in determining a subset  $S$  of vertices of a given graph  $G = (V, E)$  such that  $G \setminus S$  does not contain any graph from  $\mathcal{F}$  as a subgraph (again, not even as a non-induced one). The advantage of phrasing the framework for  $\mathcal{F}$ -SVD is twofold. First, it makes it easier to apply it to other problems. Second, the general notation introduced makes the description less cluttered. The framework consists of two cooperating algorithms that aim to generate an efficient branching algorithm for given  $\mathcal{F}$ -SVD, i.e., an algorithm that solves the  $\mathcal{F}$ -SVD in some desired time  $\mathcal{O}^*(\beta^k)$ .

---

<sup>1</sup> The  $\mathcal{O}^*(\ )$  notation suppresses all factors polynomial in the input size.

Table 1: Improved running times of some  $d$ -PVC problems.

$d$ -PVC	Previously known	Our result	Our # of rules
2-PVC	$\mathcal{O}^*(1.2738^k)$ [3]	$\mathcal{O}^*(1.3551^k)$	195,619
3-PVC	$\mathcal{O}^*(1.713^k)$ [17]	$\mathcal{O}^*(1.712^k)$	722,388
4-PVC	$\mathcal{O}^*(2.619^k)$ [18]	$\mathcal{O}^*(2.151^k)$	289,077
5-PVC	$\mathcal{O}^*(3.945^k)$ [16]	$\mathcal{O}^*(2.695^k)$	160,432
6-PVC	$\mathcal{O}^*(4.947^k)$ [16]	$\mathcal{O}^*(3.45^k)$	289,340
7-PVC	$\mathcal{O}^*(5.951^k)$ [16]	$\mathcal{O}^*(4.872^k)$	261,341
8-PVC	$\mathcal{O}^*(7.0237^k)$ [6]	$\mathcal{O}^*(5.833^k)$	269,888

The fundamental novelty of our framework in comparison to that of Gramm et al. [10] is that we track which vertices of the subgraph under consideration can still have neighbors outside the subgraph and which do not. Using this additional information, we can then eliminate some of the branches of the constructed branching rule, improving its branching factor.

We then apply the general framework to the problem of  $d$ -PVC and we are able to present algorithms with improved running times for some  $d$ -PVC problems when parameterized by the size of the solution  $k$ . The results are summarized in Table 1.

The only other approach to generating algorithms with provable worst-case running time upper bounds we are aware of is limited to algorithms for SAT [5,12,13].

## 2 Preliminaries

In this paper we are going to assume that vertex sets of all graphs are finite subsets of  $\mathbb{N}$ , i.e., we have a set of all graphs. Furthermore, when adding a graph into a set of graphs, we only add the graph if none of the graphs already in the set is isomorphic to it. Similarly, when forming a set of graphs we only add one representative for each isomorphism class. Finally, when subtracting a graph from a set, we remove from the set all graphs isomorphic to it.

For any nonempty finite set of connected graphs  $\mathcal{F}$  we define the problem:

$\mathcal{F}$ -SUBGRAPH VERTEX DELETION, $\mathcal{F}$ -SVD	
INPUT:	A graph $G = (V, E)$ , an integer $k \in \mathbb{Z}_0^+$ .
OUTPUT:	A set $S \subseteq V$ , such that $ S  \leq k$ and no subgraph of $G \setminus S$ is isomorphic to a graph in $\mathcal{F}$ .

We call  $\mathcal{F}$  of  $\mathcal{F}$ -SVD a *bump-inducing set*. We call a graph  $G$  *bumpy* if it contains some graph from the bump-inducing set  $\mathcal{F}$  as a subgraph. We call a vertex subset  $S$  a *solution* (for a graph  $G = (V, E)$ ), if the graph  $G \setminus S$  is not bumpy.

**Definition 1.** Let  $H$  be a connected graph. For  $i \in \mathbb{N}$  let  $U_i = V(H) \cup W_i$ , where  $W_i \subseteq \mathbb{N} \setminus V(H)$  and  $|W_i| = i$ . Let  $\sigma_i(H)$  denote the set of connected supergraphs  $G$  of  $H$  on the vertex set  $U_i$  such that  $G[V(H)] = H$  (note again that we take

only one representative for each isomorphism class). As shorthand, we will use  $\sigma(H) = \sigma_1(H)$ . Let  $\sigma^*(H) = \bigcup_{i \in \mathbb{N}} \sigma_i(H)$  denote the set of all finite connected supergraphs of  $H$  (inducing  $H$  on its vertex set).

**Definition 2.** A subgraph branching rule is a triple  $(H, R, \mathcal{B})$ , where  $H$  is a connected bumpy graph,  $R \subseteq V(H)$  is a set of red vertices, and  $\mathcal{B} \subseteq (2^{V(H)} \setminus \{\emptyset\})$  is a non-empty set of branches.

We say that a subgraph branching rule  $(H, R, \mathcal{B})$  applies to graph  $G$ , if  $G$  contains an induced subgraph  $H'$  isomorphic to  $H$  by isomorphism  $\phi : V(H) \rightarrow V(H')$  and for every  $r \in R$  we have  $N_G(\phi(r)) \subseteq V(H')$ . I.e., the vertices corresponding to red vertices only have neighbors inside the subgraph. If the rule applies and the current instance is  $(G, k)$ , then the algorithm makes for each  $B \in \mathcal{B}$  a recursive call with instance  $(G \setminus \phi(B), k - |B|)$ .

A subgraph branching rule  $(H, R, \mathcal{B})$  is correct, if for every  $G$  and every solution  $S$  for  $G$  such that  $(H, R, \mathcal{B})$  applies to  $G$  and  $\phi : V(H) \rightarrow V(H')$  is the witnessing isomorphism, there exists a solution  $S'$  for  $G$  with  $|S'| \leq |S|$  and a branch  $B \in \mathcal{B}$  such that  $\phi(B) \subseteq S'$ .

For any subgraph branching rule  $(H, R, \mathcal{B})$  let  $\text{bf}((H, R, \mathcal{B}))$  be the branching factor of the branches in  $\mathcal{B}$ , i.e., the unique real solution of the equation:  $1 = \sum_{B \in \mathcal{B}} x^{-|B|}$  (see [8, Chapter 2.1 and Theorem 2.1] for more information on (computing) branching factors).

**Observation 1** For any connected bumpy graph  $H$  and any  $R \subseteq V(H)$  there always can be constructed at least one correct subgraph branching rule.

*Proof.* Let  $G$  be a connected bumpy graph. Consider the rule  $\varrho = (H, R, \mathcal{B})$  where  $\mathcal{B} = \{\{v\} \mid v \in H\}$  and assume that it applies to  $G$  and  $\phi$  is the witnessing isomorphism. Let  $H'$  be the induced subgraph of  $G$  to which  $\varrho$  applies. As the graph  $H$  is bumpy, graph  $H'$  must be also bumpy. Thus for any solution  $S$  for  $G$  we have  $S \cap V(H') \neq \emptyset$ . Since each branch of the rule  $\varrho$  contains one single vertex of  $H$ , for at least one of the branches  $\{v\} \in \mathcal{B}$  we have  $\phi(v) \in S \cap V(H')$ . Therefore the rule  $\varrho$  is correct.

**Definition 3.** A brancher is a function which assigns to any connected bumpy graph  $H$  and  $R \subseteq V(H)$  a correct branching rule  $\tau(H, R) = (H, R, \mathcal{B})$  for some non-empty set  $\mathcal{B} \subseteq (2^{V(H)} \setminus \{\emptyset\})$ . For a brancher  $\tau$  as a shorthand let  $\tau(H) = \tau(H, \emptyset)$ . For a set of graphs  $\{H_1, H_2, \dots, H_r\}$  we will have  $\tau(\{H_1, H_2, \dots, H_r\}) = \{\tau(H_1), \tau(H_2), \dots, \tau(H_r)\}$ .

The above observation shows that at least one brancher exists.

**Definition 4.** Let  $L = (e_1, e_2, \dots, e_r)$  be an ordered list of elements of any type. The type will always be specified or derivable from the context.

For two lists  $L_1 = (e_1, e_2, \dots, e_r)$  and  $L_2 = (e'_1, e'_2, \dots, e'_{r'})$  consider the list  $L = (e''_1, e''_2, \dots, e''_{r+r'})$  where  $e''_i = e_i, i \in \{1, 2, \dots, r\}$  and  $e''_{r+j} = e'_j, j \in \{1, 2, \dots, r'\}$ . The list  $L$  will be called a concatenation of lists  $L_1$  and  $L_2$  and we will denote this operation by the operator  $\circ$ , i.e.  $L = L_1 \circ L_2$ .

To remove an element  $e_i$  from list  $L = (e_1, e_2, \dots, e_i, \dots, e_r)$  we will use the notation  $L \setminus e_i$ , i.e.,  $L \setminus e_i = (e_1, e_2, \dots, e_{i-1}, e_{i+1}, \dots, e_r)$ .

Whenever we use a set in a place where an ordered list is expected, we construct an ordered list from the set choosing an arbitrary order. Whenever we use an ordered list in a place where a set is expected, we naturally throw away the ordering.

**Definition 5.** For an ordered list of subgraph branching rules  $\mathcal{L} = (\varrho_1, \varrho_2, \dots, \varrho_r)$  where  $\varrho_i = (H_i, R_i, \mathcal{B}_i)$  we will denote  $\Psi(\mathcal{L}) = \max\{|V(H_i)| \mid (H_i, R_i, \mathcal{B}_i) \in \mathcal{L}\}$  the maximum number of vertices among the graphs of the subgraph branching rules in  $\mathcal{L}$ .

In our algorithms, apart from rules generated by the generating algorithm, we will be using some handmade reduction or branching rules. The rules help the algorithm and allow to steer it away from some difficult corner cases. Typically, these rules ensure that some substructures do not appear in the input graph any more. We will denote the set of the handmade rules  $\mathcal{A}$ .

**Definition 6.** An ordered list of subgraph branching rules  $\mathcal{L} = (\varrho_1, \varrho_2, \dots, \varrho_r)$  is called *exhaustive* with respect to  $\mathcal{A}$  if every rule  $\varrho_i$  is correct and for every connected bumpy graph  $G$  to which no handmade rule in  $\mathcal{A}$  applies and which has at least  $\Psi(\mathcal{L})$  vertices there is a subgraph branching rule  $\varrho_i$  in  $\mathcal{L}$  that applies to  $G$ . If the list is exhaustive with respect to  $\emptyset$ , that is, even without any handmade rules, we will omit the “with respect to  $\mathcal{A}$ ” clause.

The following observation identifies our starting list of graphs.

**Observation 2** Let  $\mathcal{F}$  be the bump-inducing set of some  $\mathcal{F}$ -SVD problem. Let  $f = \max_{H \in \mathcal{F}} |V(H)|$ . Let  $F = \{F_1, F_2, \dots, F_r\}$  be the set of all connected bumpy graphs with  $f$  vertices. Let  $\tau$  be a brancher. Then the ordered list of subgraph branching rules  $\mathcal{L} = \tau(F)$  is *exhaustive*.

*Proof.* Let  $G$  be a connected bumpy graph which has at least  $\Psi(\mathcal{L}) = f$  vertices. As  $G$  is bumpy, connected and has at least  $f$  vertices, there exists an induced subgraph  $G'$  of  $G$  such that  $G'$  is bumpy, connected and has *exactly*  $f$  vertices. Since the set  $F$  contains all connected bumpy graphs with  $f$  vertices, one of them,  $F_i$ , is isomorphic to  $G'$ . As  $\mathcal{L}$  was constructed from the set  $F$ , the rule  $\tau(F_i) = \tau(F_i, \emptyset)$  from  $\mathcal{L}$  applies to  $G$ . Because all the rules in  $\mathcal{L}$  are by definition correct, we have that the list  $\mathcal{L}$  is exhaustive.

### 3 $(\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{A}, \beta)$ -Algorithm

For a fixed  $\mathcal{F}$ -SVD problem the input of the algorithm are the bump-inducing set  $\mathcal{F}$ , an ordered list of handmade branching and reduction rules  $\mathcal{A}$ , and the target branching factor  $\beta \in \mathbb{R}$ . We assume that the handmade rules in  $\mathcal{A}$  are correct in the context of the given  $\mathcal{F}$ -SVD problem, they can be applied in polynomial time, and that the branching rules have branching factors at most  $\beta$ .

The output of the algorithm is an ordered list of subgraph branching rules  $\mathcal{L}$ , exhaustive with respect to  $\mathcal{A}$ , such that every rule in  $\mathcal{L}$  has branching factor at most  $\beta$ . The algorithm maintains an ordered list and a set of connected bumpy graphs named  $L_{good}$  and  $L_{bad}$  respectively and uses three functions: *Expand*, *Color*, and *Generate*. The descriptions of the functions follow.

**Expand function** Let  $L$  and  $F$  be sets of connected graphs. Let  $F^* = \bigcup_{H_F \in F} \sigma^*(H_F)$ . The function *Expand*( $L, F$ ) returns the set of graphs  $S = \bigcup_{H_L \in L} \sigma(H_L) \setminus F^*$ . Note that  $S$  is obtained from  $\bigcup_{H_L \in L} \sigma(H_L)$  by removing all graphs isomorphic to a graph from  $F^*$ .

**Lemma 1.** *Let  $\tau$  be a brancher and  $L_{good}, L_{bad}$  be two ordered lists of graphs such that the concatenation of ordered lists of subgraph branching rules  $\mathcal{L} = \tau(L_{good}) \circ \tau(L_{bad})$  is exhaustive. Let  $L'_{bad}$  be the result of calling the function *Expand*( $L_{bad}, L_{good}$ ). Then the concatenation of ordered lists of subgraph branching rules  $\mathcal{L}' = \tau(L_{good}) \circ \tau(L'_{bad})$  is exhaustive.*

*Proof.* Let  $G$  be a connected bumpy graph to which no handmade rule in  $\mathcal{A}$  applies and which has at least  $\Psi(\mathcal{L}')$  vertices. For contradiction assume that  $\mathcal{L}'$  is not exhaustive. Since by definition all the rules in  $\mathcal{L}'$  are correct, there must be no rule in  $\mathcal{L}'$  which applies to  $G$ . Let  $\varrho$  be the first rule in  $\mathcal{L}$  which applies to  $G$ , such a rule must exist since  $\mathcal{L}$  is exhaustive. If  $\varrho \in \mathcal{L}'$ , then we get a contradiction. Thus suppose that  $\varrho \notin \mathcal{L}'$ . This means that  $\varrho \in \tau(L_{bad})$ . Assume that  $\varrho = (H, R, \mathcal{B})$ . Let  $G'$  be the induced subgraph of  $G$  to which  $\varrho$  applies. As  $\Psi(\tau(L_{bad})) < \Psi(\tau(L'_{bad})) \leq \Psi(\mathcal{L}')$  and  $G$  is connected, there exists a vertex  $v \in V(G)$  such that  $v \notin V(G')$  and  $G[V(G') \cup \{v\}]$  is connected. By construction,  $L'_{bad}$  contains all the connected supergraphs of  $H$  of size  $|V(H)| + 1$  except those that contain some graph from  $L_{good}$  as an induced subgraph. There must be a graph  $H' \in L'_{bad}$  isomorphic to  $G[V(G') \cup \{v\}]$ . Suppose that there is not. That would mean that some graph from  $L_{good}$  is an induced subgraph of  $H'$  and consequently some rule from  $\tau(L_{good})$  would apply to  $G[V(G') \cup \{v\}]$ , which is a contradiction with  $\varrho$  being the first rule in  $\mathcal{L}$  which applies to  $G$ . As  $H'$  is isomorphic to  $G[V(G') \cup \{v\}]$ , the rule  $\tau(H')$  applies to  $G$ . And since  $\tau(H') \in \tau(L'_{bad})$  and therefore  $\tau(H') \in \mathcal{L}'$ , we arrive at a contradiction with the fact that no rule in  $\mathcal{L}'$  applies to  $G$ .

**Color function** Let  $H$  be a connected graph and  $F$  be a set of connected graphs. Let  $F^* = \bigcup_{H_F \in F} \sigma^*(H_F)$ . For every  $v \in V(H)$  define the set  $L_v = \{H' \mid H' \in \sigma(H), V(H') = V(H) \cup \{w\}, \{v, w\} \in E(H')\}$ . The function *Color*( $H, F$ ) returns the set  $R = \{v \in V(H) \mid L_v \setminus F^* = \emptyset\}$ .

**Lemma 2.** *Let  $\tau$  be a brancher and let  $L = (H_1, H_2, \dots, H_r)$  be an ordered list of graphs such that  $\mathcal{L} = \tau(L)$  is exhaustive. Define the set  $L_{<i} = \{H_j \mid j < i\}$  and let  $R_i = \text{Color}(H_i, L_{<i})$ . Construct the list  $\mathcal{L}' = \tau(H_1, R_1) \circ \tau(H_2, R_2) \circ \dots \circ \tau(H_r, R_r)$ . Then the list  $\mathcal{L}'$  is exhaustive.*

*Proof.* We will proceed with induction from  $i = r$  to  $i = 1$  to show that  $\mathcal{L}_i = \tau((H_1, H_2, \dots, H_{i-1})) \circ \tau(H_i, R_i) \circ \tau(H_{i+1}, R_{i+1}) \circ \dots \circ \tau(H_r, R_r)$  is exhaustive. Note that  $\mathcal{L}_1 = \mathcal{L}'$ . To simplify the proof, we denote  $\mathcal{L}_{r+1} = \mathcal{L}$ . Then the claim holds for  $i = r + 1$  by assumption, constituting the base case of the induction.

Now, let  $1 \leq i \leq r$ , assume that the claim holds for all strictly greater  $i$ 's and, for contradiction, that  $\mathcal{L}_i = \tau((H_1, H_2, \dots, H_{i-1})) \circ \tau(H_i, R_i) \circ \tau(H_{i+1}, R_{i+1}) \circ \dots \circ \tau(H_r, R_r)$  is not exhaustive. All the rules in  $\mathcal{L}_i$  are correct by definition. Let  $G$  be a connected bumpy graph with at least  $\Psi(\mathcal{L}_i) = \Psi(\mathcal{L})$  vertices to which none of the rules in  $\mathcal{L}_i$  applies. Let  $\varrho = (H_j, R_j, \mathcal{B}_j)$  be the first rule in  $\mathcal{L}_{i+1}$  that applies to  $G$ . If  $j \neq i$ , then  $\varrho \in \mathcal{L}_i$  and we get a contradiction. Therefore, it must be that  $j = i$ , i.e., we have that  $\varrho = \tau(H_i)$  applies to  $G$  and  $\tau(H_i, R_i)$  does not.

Let  $G'$  be the induced subgraph of  $G$  to which  $\tau(H_i)$  applies and let  $\phi$  be the witnessing isomorphism. Since  $\tau(H_i, R_i)$  does not apply to  $G'$ , there must be a vertex  $v \in V(G')$  such that  $\phi^{-1}(v) \in R_i$  and for which there exists a vertex  $u \in V(G)$  such that  $u \notin V(G')$  and edge  $\{v, u\} \in E(G)$ . But as  $\phi^{-1}(v) \in R_i$ , by the construction of  $R_i$ , for each supergraph  $H'$  in the set  $\{H' \mid H' \in \sigma(H_i), V(H') = V(H_i) \cup \{w\}, \{\phi^{-1}(v), w\} \in E(H')\}$  there must be a graph in  $\mathcal{L}_{<i}$  that is an induced subgraph of  $H'$ . Consequently, there must be some rule in  $\tau(\mathcal{L}_{<i})$  which applies to  $G[V(G') \cup \{v\}]$ , which is a contradiction with the fact that  $\varrho$  is the first rule in  $\mathcal{L}_{i+1}$  that applies to  $G$ .

### Generate function

**Definition 7.** Let  $H$  be a connected bumpy graph and  $R \subseteq V(H)$ . Let  $(H, R, \mathcal{B})$  be any correct subgraph branching rule constructed for the pair  $H, R$ . Let  $G$  be an input graph of any instance of given  $\mathcal{F}$ -SVD problem. The pair  $H, R$  is called handled with respect to  $\mathcal{A}$  if whenever the rule  $(H, R, \mathcal{B})$  would apply to  $G$ , some rule from  $\mathcal{A}$  would also apply to  $G$ .

Let  $H$  be a connected bumpy graph and  $R \subseteq V(H)$ . The function  $Generate_{\mathcal{A}}(H, R)$  returns either a correct subgraph branching rule  $(H, R, \mathcal{B})$ , or determines that the pair  $H, R$  is handled with respect to  $\mathcal{A}$ . This fact is signaled by returning "HANDLED". The way the subgraph branching rules are constructed, i.e., the function  $Generate_{\mathcal{A}}$ , will be described in Section 4. For the purpose of the analysis of the algorithm, we also use function  $Generate'_{\mathcal{A}}$  which returns the same rule as  $Generate_{\mathcal{A}}$  if  $Generate_{\mathcal{A}}(H, R) \neq \text{HANDLED}$  and the rule from Observation 1 otherwise. By definition,  $Generate'_{\mathcal{A}}$  is a brancher.

Now we are ready to provide the pseudocodes of the  $(\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{A}, \beta)$ -Algorithm in Algorithm 1 and the pseudocode of the  $(\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{A}, \beta)$ -Output Algorithm in Algorithm 2 and prove their correctness.

**Theorem 1.** If the call to  $(\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{A}, \beta)$ -Algorithm finishes its computation, then the returned ordered list  $\mathcal{L}$  of subgraph branching rules is exhaustive with respect to  $\mathcal{A}$  and for every  $\varrho \in \mathcal{L}$  we have  $bf(\varrho) \leq \beta$ .

**Algorithm 1**  $(\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{A}, \beta)$ -Algorithm

---

```

1:  $i \leftarrow 0$ 
2:  $\mathcal{L} \leftarrow \emptyset$ 
3:  $\mathcal{L}' \leftarrow \emptyset$ 
4:  $L_{good} \leftarrow \emptyset$ 
5:  $L_{bad} \leftarrow$  the set  $F$  from Observation 2 for  $\mathcal{F}$ .
6: while  $L_{bad} \neq \emptyset$  do
7:    $L_{bad} \leftarrow Expand(L_{bad}, L_{good})$ 
8:   for  $H \in L_{bad}$  do
9:      $R = Color(H, L_{good})$ 
10:     $\varrho = Generate_{\mathcal{A}}(H, R)$ 
11:    if  $bf(\varrho) \leq \beta$  or  $\varrho = \text{HANDLED}$  then
12:       $i \leftarrow i + 1$ 
13:       $H_i = H, \varrho_i = \varrho,$ 
14:       $\varrho'_i = Generate'_{\mathcal{A}}(H_i, R),$ 
15:       $L_{good} \leftarrow L_{good} \circ (H_i)$ 
16:       $L_{bad} \leftarrow L_{bad} \setminus H_i$ 
17:       $\mathcal{L}' \leftarrow \mathcal{L}' \circ \varrho'_i$ 
18:      if  $\varrho \neq \text{HANDLED}$  then
19:         $\mathcal{L} \leftarrow \mathcal{L} \circ \varrho_i$ 
20:      end if
21:    restart the forcycle
22:  end if
23: end for
24: end while
25: return  $\mathcal{L}$ .
```

---

*Proof.* We are going to start by proving the following statement. Let  $\tau$  be a brancher. Then the concatenation  $\tau(L_{good}) \circ \tau(L_{bad})$  is exhaustive at every step of the computation. The proof will be done by induction on the number of steps of the computation. Firstly, at the start of the computation the statement holds due to Observation 2. Next, observe, that the only place when the concatenation changes during the computation is on the line 7 where the *Expand* function is called. By induction the statement holds before the expansion takes place and due to Lemma 1 the statement holds after the expansion takes place. Therefore the statement holds at every step of the computation.

Now focus on the contents of  $L_{good}$ ,  $L_{bad}$ , and  $\mathcal{L}'$  at the end of the computation. Let  $r$  be the value of  $i$  at the end of the computation. We have that  $L_{good} = (H_1, H_2, \dots, H_r)$ ,  $L_{bad} = \emptyset$ . As we have established above, since  $Generate'_{\mathcal{A}}$  is a brancher, the list  $Generate'_{\mathcal{A}}(L_{good}) \circ Generate'_{\mathcal{A}}(L_{bad}) = Generate'_{\mathcal{A}}(L_{good})$  is exhaustive. Observe, that for each  $\varrho_j = (H_j, R_j, \mathcal{B}_j) \in \mathcal{L}'$ ,  $j \in \{1, 2, \dots, r\}$  we have that  $R_j$  is exactly  $Color(H_j, \{H_k \mid k < j\})$ . Indeed, at that moment when the rule  $\varrho'_j$  is added to the list  $\mathcal{L}'$ , we have  $L_{good} = (H_1, H_2, \dots, H_{j-1})$ . This means that at the end of the computation, we have  $L_{good} = (H_1, H_2, \dots, H_r)$  and  $\mathcal{L}' = Generate'_{\mathcal{A}}(H_1, R_1) \circ Generate'_{\mathcal{A}}(H_2, R_2) \circ \dots \circ Generate'_{\mathcal{A}}(H_r, R_r)$ . As  $Generate'_{\mathcal{A}}(L_{good})$  is exhaustive, by Lemma 2,  $\mathcal{L}'$  is exhaustive.



Finally, it suffices to observe that  $\mathcal{L}$  is missing exactly the rules from  $\mathcal{L}'$  that were handled by some rule in  $\mathcal{A}$ , which means that whenever such rule could be applied to some graph  $G$ , some handmade rule in  $\mathcal{A}$  could also be applied to  $G$ . And therefore  $\mathcal{L}$  is exhaustive with respect to  $\mathcal{A}$ .

The branching factor of the rules follows directly from the computation of the algorithm.

**Theorem 2.** *Let  $\mathcal{A}$  be a list of handmade rules and  $\mathcal{L}$  be a list of subgraph branching rules. If  $\mathcal{L}$  is exhaustive with respect to  $\mathcal{A}$ , all rules in  $\mathcal{A}$  are correct and can be applied in polynomial time, and each branching rule in  $\mathcal{A} \circ \mathcal{L}$  has branching factor at most  $\beta$ , then the  $(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{L})$ -Algorithm for  $\mathcal{F}$ -SVD is correct and runs in  $\mathcal{O}^*(\beta^k)$  time.*

Note that the output  $\mathcal{L}$  of the  $(\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{A}, \beta)$ -Algorithm satisfies the assumptions of Theorem 2.

*Proof.* We prove the correctness by induction on the height of the recursion tree. If the answer is obtained directly by the recursion stopping conditions on lines 3 to 11 then it is correct. The correctness of an answer from lines 12 to 15 follows from the correctness of the handmade rules in  $\mathcal{A}$  and, possibly, by induction hypothesis. Since all graphs in  $\mathcal{F}$  are connected, lines 16 to 24 are also correct.

If the computation reaches the line 25, as no handmade rule from  $\mathcal{A}$  can be applied to  $G$  and the graph  $G[C]$  has at least  $\Psi(\mathcal{L}) + 1$  vertices, there must be a rule in  $\mathcal{L}$  that can be applied to  $G[C]$  as the list  $\mathcal{L}$  is exhaustive. Let  $\varrho = (H, R, \mathcal{B})$  be the first rule that applies and  $\phi$  be the witnessing isomorphism.

On one hand, if for any  $B \in \mathcal{B}$  the call  $\text{SolveRecursively}(G \setminus \phi(B), k - |B|)$  outputs YES, then, by induction hypothesis, there is a solution  $S'$  for  $G \setminus \phi(B)$  of size at most  $k - |B|$ . Then, however,  $S = S' \cup \phi(B)$  is of size at most  $k$  and a solution for  $G$ , since  $G \setminus S = (G \setminus \phi(B)) \setminus S'$ . Therefore the answer YES is correct in this case.

On the other hand, if  $S$  is a solution for  $G$  of size at most  $k$ , then, since  $\varrho$  is correct, there is a solution  $S'$  for  $G$  and  $B \in \mathcal{B}$  such that  $\phi(B) \subseteq S'$  and  $|S'| \leq |S| \leq k$ . Then  $S'' = S' \setminus \phi(B)$  is of size at most  $k - |B|$ . Furthermore, it is a solution for  $G \setminus \phi(B)$ , as  $(G \setminus \phi(B)) \setminus S'' = G \setminus (\phi(B) \cup S'') = G \setminus S'$  and  $S'$  is a solution for  $G$ . Therefore, in this case the call  $\text{SolveRecursively}(G \setminus \phi(B), k - |B|)$  will answer YES by induction hypothesis and hence also this call will answer correctly.

It is assumed that the rules in  $\mathcal{A}$  can be applied in polynomial time and have branching factors at most  $\beta$ . The optimal solution of each bumpy connected component of  $G$  with at most  $\Psi(\mathcal{L})$  vertices can be computed in polynomial time. Finally, all the rules in  $\mathcal{L}$  can be applied in polynomial time and have branching factors at most  $\beta$ . Therefore, the running time is  $\mathcal{O}^*(\beta^k)$ .

## 4 Generating subgraph branching rules

The input of the  $\text{Generate}_{\mathcal{A}}$  function is the graph  $H$  together with its red vertices  $R \subseteq V(H)$ . The  $\text{Generate}_{\mathcal{A}}$  function aims to create a correct subgraph branching

rule for the given pair  $H, R$  with as small branching factor as possible. The task of finding the rule with the optimal branching factor is nontrivial and thus instead of computing the optimal subgraph branching rule, we use heuristics which provide branching rules with reasonable branching factors with affordable computational effort. The process of construction of a single subgraph branching rule is split between four functions: *Handled $_{\mathcal{A}}$* , *Minimal*, *DominanceFree*, and *Adjusted*.

**Handled $_{\mathcal{A}}$  function** The purpose of this function is to determine whether the pair  $H, R$  is already handled by some handmade rule in  $\mathcal{A}$ . Since the application of handmade rules in  $\mathcal{A}$  takes precedence before any subgraph branching rules in the  $(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{L})$ -Algorithm for  $\mathcal{F}$ -SVD, this means that before any application of the rule  $(H, R, \mathcal{B})$  would take place, some other handmade rule from  $\mathcal{A}$  would be applied instead. This results in  $(H, R, \mathcal{B})$  never being applied and thus there is no need to include any subgraph branching rule for the pair  $H, R$  in the resulting ordered list. The function returns *YES* if the pair  $H, R$  is handled and *NO* otherwise.

**Minimal function** The input of this function is a connected bumpy graph  $H$  and  $R \subseteq V(H)$ . Let  $\mathcal{B}^* = \{S \mid S \subseteq V(H) \wedge S \text{ is a solution for } H\}$ . Now construct the branches  $\mathcal{B}_{min}$  as the set of all minimal elements of  $\mathcal{B}^*$  according to the  $\subseteq$  relation on  $\mathcal{B}^*$ . That is, a set  $B \in \mathcal{B}^*$  is included in  $\mathcal{B}_{min}$  if there is no set  $B' \in \mathcal{B}^*$  with  $B' \subsetneq B$ . The *Minimal* function returns the branches  $\mathcal{B}_{min}$ .

**Lemma 3.** *The subgraph branching rule  $(H, R, \mathcal{B}_{min})$  is correct.*

*Proof.* Let  $G$  be a graph such that  $\varrho = (H, R, \mathcal{B}_{min})$  applies to  $G$  and let  $S$  be the solution for  $G$ . Let  $G' = G[\phi(H)]$  be the induced subgraph to which  $\varrho$  applies and  $\phi$  be the witnessing isomorphism. Since  $H$  is bumpy,  $G'$  is also bumpy and  $S \cap V(G') \neq \emptyset$ . Let  $S_H = \phi^{-1}(S \cap V(G'))$ . Observe that  $S_H$  must be a solution for  $H$  and, hence, is in  $\mathcal{B}^*$ . Therefore one of the branches  $B \in \mathcal{B}_{min}$  must be a subset of  $S_H$ . But then  $\phi(B) \subseteq \phi(S_H) = S \cap V(G') \subseteq S$ . Thus the rule  $\varrho$  is correct.

**DominanceFree function** The input of this function is a connected bumpy graph  $H$ ,  $R \subseteq V(H)$ , and  $\mathcal{B}$  such that  $(H, R, \mathcal{B})$  is a correct subgraph branching rule.

**Definition 8.** *Let  $(H, R, \mathcal{B})$  be a correct subgraph branching rule. We say that branch  $B \in \mathcal{B}$  is dominated by branch  $B_d \in \mathcal{B}$  if  $B_d \neq B$  and there exists a subset  $B^{del} \subsetneq B$  such that for  $H' = H \setminus B^{del}$ ,  $R' = R \setminus B^{del}$  there exists a subset  $R^* \subseteq R'$ ,  $R^* \neq \emptyset$  such that the following holds:*

1.  $H[R^*]$  is not bumpy,
2.  $|R^* \cap B| \geq |N_{H'}(R^*) \setminus R^*| \geq 1$ ,
3.  $B_d \subseteq (B \cup N_{H'}(R^*)) \setminus R^*$ .

Note that if  $N_{H'}(R^*) \setminus R^* = \emptyset$ , then  $B_d \subseteq B$ , a case handled by the previous function.

**Lemma 4.** *If  $(H, R, \mathcal{B})$  is a correct subgraph branching rule and branch  $B \in \mathcal{B}$  is dominated by branch  $B_d \in \mathcal{B}$ , then  $(H, R, \mathcal{B} \setminus \{B\})$  is a correct subgraph branching rule.*

*Proof.* For contradiction suppose that  $(H, R, \mathcal{B} \setminus \{B\})$  is not correct. As  $(H, R, \mathcal{B})$  is correct, there must be a graph  $G$  to which  $(H, R, \mathcal{B})$  applies and a solution  $S$  for  $G$  for which only for branch  $B$  there exists a solution  $S'$ ,  $|S'| \leq |S|$  such that  $\phi(B) \subseteq S'$  where  $\phi$  is the witnessing isomorphism. Let  $G'$  be the induced subgraph of  $G$  such that  $G' = \phi(H)$  and we have that  $N_G(\phi(R)) \subseteq V(G')$ .

Let  $B^{del}$  and  $R^*$  be the appropriate sets that satisfy the properties for domination of  $B$  by  $B_d$  and let  $H' = H \setminus B^{del}$ ,  $R' = R \setminus B^{del}$ . We are going to show that  $S_d = (S' \setminus \phi(B)) \cup \phi((B \cup N_{H'}(R^*)) \setminus R^*) = (S' \setminus \phi(B \cap R^*)) \cup \phi(N_{H'}(R^*) \setminus R^*)$  is also a solution for  $G$  and  $|S_d| \leq |S|$ . As  $\phi(B_d) \subseteq \phi((B \cup N_{H'}(R^*)) \setminus R^*)$ , this will contradict our choice of  $S$ .

Suppose that  $S_d$  is not a solution for  $G$ . Then  $G \setminus S_d$  is bumpy and  $G \setminus S_d$  contains some graph from the bump-inducing  $\mathcal{F}$  as a subgraph, let that subgraph be  $F$ . There must be a vertex  $v \in V(F)$  such that  $v \in \phi(B \cap R^*)$ , otherwise  $S_d$  would be a solution for  $G$ . Moreover, there must also exist a vertex  $u \in V(F)$  such that  $u \in V(F) \setminus \phi(R^*)$ , otherwise we have  $V(F) \subseteq \phi(R^*)$ , but  $G[\phi(R^*)]$  is not bumpy as  $H[R^*]$  is not bumpy. As  $v \in \phi(R^*)$ ,  $u \notin \phi(R^*)$ , and  $F$  is connected, we have  $F \cap (N_G(\phi(R^*)) \setminus \phi(R^*)) \neq \emptyset$ . Since  $N_G(\phi(R^*)) \subseteq V(G')$  we have  $N_G(\phi(R^*)) \setminus \phi(R^*) = \phi(N_{H'}(R^*) \setminus R^*)$ . Finally, we have that  $N_H(R^*) \setminus R^* \subseteq B^{del} \cup (N_{H'}(R^*) \setminus R^*)$  and we conclude that  $F \cap \phi((B^{del} \cup N_{H'}(R^*)) \setminus R^*) \neq \emptyset$ . Thus  $F \cap S_d \neq \emptyset$  and we arrive at a contradiction with  $F$  being a subgraph of  $G \setminus S_d$ .

Since  $S_d = (S' \setminus \phi(B)) \cup \phi((B \cup N_{H'}(R^*)) \setminus R^*) = (S' \setminus \phi(B \cap R^*)) \cup \phi(N_{H'}(R^*) \setminus R^*)$  and  $|R^* \cap B| \geq |N_{H'}(R^*) \setminus R^*|$  we have that  $|S_d| \leq |S|$ , concluding the proof.

Now, consider the following oriented graph  $G_{\mathcal{B}} = (\mathcal{B}, E_{\mathcal{B}})$  such that  $(B_i, B_j) \in E_{\mathcal{B}}$  if and only if  $B_i$  is dominated by  $B_j$ . Let  $C_1, C_2, \dots, C_c$  be the strongly connected components of  $G_{\mathcal{B}}$ . By  $rep(C_i)$  we will denote any one branch  $B \in C_i$ . A component  $C_i$  is called a *sink* component if there is no other component  $C_j, i \neq j$  such that there exists an edge  $(B_i, B_j) \in E_{\mathcal{B}}$  where  $B_i \in C_i$  and  $B_j \in C_j$ . Construct the set of branches  $\mathcal{B}_{df} = \{rep(C_i) \mid i \in \{1, 2, \dots, c\} \wedge C_i \text{ is a sink component}\}$ . The *DominanceFree* function returns the branches  $\mathcal{B}_{df}$ .

**Lemma 5.** *The subgraph branching rule  $(H, R, \mathcal{B}_{df})$  is correct.*

*Proof.* We will construct a linear ordering of the branches  $B \in (\mathcal{B} \setminus \mathcal{B}_{df})$  such that by repeatedly applying Lemma 4 alongside this ordering we arrive at a sequence of correct subgraph branching rules which starts with  $(H, R, \mathcal{B})$  and ends with  $(H, R, \mathcal{B}_{df})$ .

Observe that for each  $B \in (\mathcal{B} \setminus \mathcal{B}_{df})$  there exists an oriented path  $(B_1, B_2, \dots, B_p)$  in  $G_{\mathcal{B}}$  such that  $B_1 = B$  and  $B_p \in \mathcal{B}_{df}$ . Let  $\delta(B)$  be the shortest distance of

$B$  to some vertex in  $\mathcal{B}_{df}$  and let  $\Delta = \max_{B \in (\mathcal{B} \setminus \mathcal{B}_{df})} \delta(B)$ . The ordering we are looking for is then  $(B_1^\Delta, \dots, B_{d_\Delta}^\Delta, B_1^{\Delta-1}, \dots, B_{d_{\Delta-1}}^{\Delta-1}, \dots, B_1^1, \dots, B_{d_1}^1)$  where for  $i \in \{\Delta, \Delta-1, \dots, 1\}, j \in \{1, 2, \dots, d_i\}, \delta(B_j^i) = i$ .

To prove the fact that each rule in the resulting sequence of subgraph branching rules is correct, suppose that we want to eliminate branch  $B_j^i$ . Take a look at the oriented path  $(B_1, B_2, \dots, B_p)$  where  $B_1 = B_j^i$  and  $B_p \in \mathcal{B}_{df}$ . As  $\delta(B_j^i) = i$  we have that  $B_2 \in \{B_k^{i-1} \mid k \in \{1, 2, \dots, d_{i-1}\}\}$  which means that  $B_2$  has not been eliminated yet. Therefore  $B_1$  is dominated by  $B_2$  and Lemma 4 applies.

**Adjusted function** The input of this function is a connected bumpy graph  $H$ ,  $R \subseteq V(H)$ , and  $\mathcal{B}$  such that  $(H, R, \mathcal{B})$  is a correct subgraph branching rule.

**Lemma 6.** *Let  $(H, R, \mathcal{B})$  be a correct subgraph branching rule. For any  $B^* \subseteq V(H), B^* \neq \emptyset$  construct the branches  $\mathcal{B}^* = \{B \in \mathcal{B} \mid B \wedge B^* \not\subseteq B\} \cup \{B^*\}$ . The subgraph branching rule  $(H, R, \mathcal{B}^*)$  is correct.*

*Proof.* For contradiction suppose that  $(H, R, \mathcal{B}^*)$  is not correct. Let  $G$  be a graph to which  $(H, R, \mathcal{B}^*)$  applies,  $\phi$  the witnessing isomorphism, and  $S$  a solution for  $G$  such that there is no branch  $B \in \mathcal{B}^*$  and a solution  $S', |S'| \leq |S|$  such that  $\phi(B) \subseteq S'$ . As  $(H, R, \mathcal{B})$  is correct, let  $B \in \mathcal{B}$  be the branch for which there exists a solution  $S', |S'| \leq |S|$  such that  $\phi(B) \subseteq S'$ . If  $B \in \mathcal{B}^*$ , then we get a contradiction, so suppose that  $B \notin \mathcal{B}^*$ . By construction of  $\mathcal{B}^*$  this means that  $B^* \subseteq B$  which immediately gives us that  $\phi(B^*) \subseteq S'$  which is a again contradiction.

Now consider the pseudocode of the *Adjusted* function in Algorithm 3. The *Adjusted* function returns the branches  $\mathcal{B}_{adj}$ .

**Lemma 7.** *Let  $(H, R, \mathcal{B})$  be a correct subgraph branching rule. Let  $\mathcal{B}_{adj}$  be the result of *Adjusted* $(H, R, \mathcal{B})$ . The subgraph branching rule  $(H, R, \mathcal{B}_{adj})$  is correct.*

*Proof.* The construction of branches  $\mathcal{B}_A$  on line 4 exactly follows the construction in Lemma 6 and therefore the resulting subgraph branching rule  $(H, R, \mathcal{B}_A)$  is correct. Since this is the only place in the algorithm where the branches change, the returned rule must be correct.

**Complete Generate function** The order of calls to the the four functions is described in the pseudocode Algorithm 4

**Theorem 3.** *If the Generate function returns a subgraph branching rule  $(H, R, \mathcal{B})$ , the subgraph branching rule  $(H, R, \mathcal{B})$  is correct.*

*Proof.* The statement immediately follows from Lemmata 3, 5, and 7.

## 5 Applying $(\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{A}, \beta)$ -Algorithm to $d$ -PVC

We are now going to show the specifics of applying the  $(\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{A}, \beta)$ -Algorithm to the  $d$ -PATH VERTEX COVER problem.

A  $d$ -path, denoted as an ordered  $d$ -tuple  $P_d = (p_1, p_2, \dots, p_d)$ , is a path on  $d$  vertices  $\{p_1, p_2, \dots, p_d\}$ . A  $P_d$ -free graph is a graph that does not contain a  $P_d$  as a subgraph. The  $d$ -PATH VERTEX COVER problem is formally defined as follows:

$d$ -PATH VERTEX COVER, $d$ -PVC	
INPUT:	A graph $G = (V, E)$ , an integer $k \in \mathbb{Z}_0^+$ .
OUTPUT:	A set $S \subseteq V$ , such that $ S  \leq k$ and $G \setminus S$ is a $P_d$ -free graph.

It is easy to see that  $d$ -PVC equals  $\mathcal{F}$ -SVD for  $\mathcal{F} = \{P_d\}$ . For the  $(\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{A}, \beta)$ -Algorithm to work for interesting values of  $\beta$ , we need to provide a set of handmade rules  $\mathcal{A}$  that are correct for  $d$ -PVC and run in desired time. We are going to provide only two handmade reduction rules. After we present the rules, we also discuss how they influence the  $Handled_{\mathcal{A}}$  function.

**Red component reduction for  $d$ -PVC** Let  $(G, k)$  be the instance of  $d$ -PVC. Let  $v \in V(G)$  be a vertex such that there are at least two  $P_d$ -free connected components  $C_1, C_2$  in  $G \setminus v$ . If there is a  $P_d$  in  $G[\{v\} \cup V(C_1) \cup V(C_2)]$ , reduce  $(G, k)$  to instance  $(G \setminus (\{v\} \cup V(C_1) \cup V(C_2)), k - 1)$  which corresponds to taking  $v$  into a solution. Otherwise, let  $P_i^1$  be the longest path in  $G[\{v\} \cup V(C_1)]$  starting in  $v$  and let  $P_j^2$  be the longest path in  $G[\{v\} \cup V(C_2)]$  starting in  $v$ . Assume, without loss of generality, that  $i \leq j$ . Then, reduce the instance  $(G, k)$  to  $(G \setminus V(C_1), k)$ .

*Proof (Proof of correctness).* Set  $A_v = \{v\} \cup V(C_1) \cup V(C_2)$ . Observe, that any  $P_d$  in  $G$  that uses some of the vertices in  $A_v$  must include  $v$  as the components  $C_1$  and  $C_2$  are  $P_d$ -free.

For the first case, we need to show that  $(G, k)$  has a solution if and only if  $(G \setminus A_v, k - 1)$  has a solution.

As there is a  $P_d$  in  $G[A_v]$ , at least one of the vertices in  $A_v$  must be in  $S$ . Then,  $S' = S \setminus A_v$  is a solution for  $G \setminus A_v$  of size at most  $k - 1$  as  $(G \setminus A_v) \setminus S'$  is a subgraph of  $G \setminus S$ .

Conversely, if  $S'$  is a solution for  $G \setminus A_v$  of size at most  $k - 1$ , then  $S = S' \cup \{v\}$  is a solution for  $G$  of size at most  $k$  as, by the above observation, any  $P_d$  in  $G \setminus S'$  must include  $v$ .

For the second case, we need to show that  $(G, k)$  has a solution if and only if  $(G \setminus V(C_1), k)$  has a solution.

Let  $S$  be a solution for  $G$  of size at most  $k$ . Then  $S \setminus V(C_1)$  is a solution for  $G \setminus V(C_1)$  as it is a subgraph of  $G$ .

For the other direction, let  $S'$  be a solution for  $G \setminus V(C_1)$  of size at most  $k$ . Now, assume that  $S'$  is not a solution for  $G$  and there is a  $d$ -path  $P$  in  $G \setminus S'$ . The path  $P$  must be of the following form:  $(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_p, v, c_1, c_2, \dots, c_q)$  where  $\{x_1, x_2, \dots, x_p\} \subseteq (V(G) \setminus A_v)$  and  $\{c_1, c_2, \dots, c_q\} \subseteq V(C_1)$ .

Firstly, assume that  $S' \cap V(C_2) = \emptyset$ . Recall that we assumed that there is a path  $P_j^2$  in  $G[\{v\} \cup V(C_2)]$  starting in  $v$  which is longer than any path in  $G[\{v\} \cup V(C_1)]$  starting in  $v$ , in particular, longer than  $(v, c_1, c_2, \dots, c_q)$ . Let  $P_j^2 = (v, y_1, y_2, \dots, y_{j-1})$ . But then a  $d$ -path  $P' = (x_1, x_2, \dots, x_p, v, y_1, y_2, \dots, y_{d-p-1})$  exists in  $(G \setminus V(C_1)) \setminus S'$  which is a contradiction with  $S'$  being a solution for  $G \setminus V(C_1)$ .

Lastly, we have that  $S' \cap V(C_2) \neq \emptyset$ . In this case, by the above observation,  $S'' = (S' \setminus V(C_2)) \cup \{v\}$  is also a solution for  $G \setminus V(C_1)$  and of size at most  $k$ . But then  $S'' \cap P \neq \emptyset$  and therefore  $S''$  is a solution for  $G$  of size at most  $k$ .

**Red star reduction for  $d$ -PVC,  $d \geq 4$**  Let  $(G, k)$  be the instance of  $d$ -PVC. Suppose there exists a subset  $C \subseteq V(G)$ ,  $|C| \leq \lfloor \frac{d}{2} \rfloor - 1$  for which there is a subset  $L \subseteq V(G)$  such that  $\forall v \in L, N(v) = C$  and  $|L| \geq 2|C|$ . Let  $x \in L$ . Then reduce instance  $(G, k)$  to instance  $(G \setminus \{x\}, k)$ .

*Proof (Proof of correctness).* We need to show that  $(G, k)$  has a solution if and only if  $(G \setminus \{x\}, k)$  has a solution. Consider the direction from left to right. If  $S$  is a solution for  $G$ , then  $S \setminus \{x\}$  is a solution for  $G \setminus x$  since  $(G \setminus x) \setminus (S \setminus \{x\}) = G \setminus S$ .

For the other direction, let  $S'$  be a solution for  $G' = G \setminus \{x\}$ ,  $|S'| \leq k$ . Suppose that  $S'$  is not a solution for  $G$ . Then in  $G \setminus S'$  there must be a path  $P_d = (v_1, v_2, \dots, v_d)$  with  $v_i = x$ . We show that  $|P_d \cap L| \leq |C|$ . Indeed, for  $P_d$  to use more than  $|C|$  vertices in  $L$ , it would have to start and end in  $G[L]$  and alternate between vertices from  $C$  and  $L$ . Which means that  $P_d$  would be contained in  $G[L \cup C]$ . But as the length  $l$  of the longest path possible in  $G[L \cup C]$  is  $2|C| + 1$  and  $|C| \leq \lfloor \frac{d}{2} \rfloor - 1$ , we have that  $l \leq 2\lfloor \frac{d}{2} \rfloor - 1 \leq d - 1$ , which contradicts the fact that  $P_d$  contains  $d$  vertices. As  $|P_d \cap L| \leq |C|$  and  $2|C| \leq |L|$ , we have that  $|L \setminus P_d| \geq |C|$ . Let  $y \in L \setminus P_d$ . Suppose that  $y \notin S'$ . But then in  $G' \setminus S'$  there would be a path  $P'_d = (v'_1, v'_2, \dots, v'_d)$  such that  $v'_j = v_j$  for  $j \neq i$  and  $v'_i = y$ , which is a contradiction with  $S'$  being a solution for  $G'$ . Therefore we have that  $L \setminus P_d \subseteq S'$ . Finally, observe that any  $d$ -path that uses some vertex from  $L$  must also use a vertex from  $C$  and thus  $S = (S' \setminus (L \setminus P_d)) \cup C$  is a solution for  $G$  and  $|S| \leq |S'|$  as  $|L \setminus P_d| \geq |C|$ .

Now that we have established that our reduction rules are correct for  $d$ -PVC, we now have to discuss their operation in the  $(\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{A}, \beta)$ -Algorithm. Note that as a part of  $\mathcal{A}$ , if the rule applies, we would make a call of  $\text{SolveRecursively}(G \setminus (\{v\} \cup V(C_1) \cup V(C_2)), k - 1)$ ,  $\text{SolveRecursively}(G \setminus V(C_1), k)$ , or  $\text{SolveRecursively}(G \setminus \{x\}, k)$ , respectively, and return the answer obtained.

**Lemma 8.** *For the case of the red component reduction rule, let  $H$  be a connected bumpy graph and  $R \subseteq V(H)$  be its red vertices. If there is a vertex  $v \in V(H)$  for which there are at least two  $d$ -path free connected components  $C_1, C_2$  in  $H \setminus v$  with  $V(C_1), V(C_2) \subseteq R$  then the pair  $H, R$  is handled by the red component reduction rule, i.e., whenever any subgraph branching rule  $(H, R, \mathcal{B})$  would apply to a graph  $G$ , the red component reduction rule would also apply to  $G$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $G$  be a connected bumpy graph and let  $\varrho = (H, R, \mathcal{B})$  be any rule constructed for the pair  $H, R$ . Suppose that  $(H, R, \mathcal{B})$  applies to  $G$ . Let  $G' = G[\phi(H)]$  be the induced subgraph to which  $\varrho$  applies and  $\phi$  be the witnessing isomorphism.

Focus on the components  $C_1, C_2$ . As  $V(C_1), V(C_2) \subseteq R$  and they are connected components of  $H \setminus v$ , we have that  $N_G(\phi(C_1)) = \{\phi(v)\}$  and  $N_G(\phi(C_2)) = \{\phi(v)\}$ . That means that  $\phi(C_1), \phi(C_2)$  are  $d$ -path free connected components of  $G \setminus \phi(v)$  and the conditions of the red component reduction rule are satisfied and therefore the red component reduction rule applies to  $G$ .

**Lemma 9.** *For the case of  $d$ -PVC,  $d \geq 4$ . Let  $H$  be a connected bumpy graph and  $R \subseteq V(H)$  be its red vertices. If there is a subset  $C \subseteq V(H)$ ,  $|C| \leq \lfloor \frac{d}{2} \rfloor - 1$  for which there is a subset  $L \subseteq R$  such that  $\forall v \in L, N(v) = C$  and  $2|C| \leq |L|$ , then the pair  $H, R$  is handled by the red star reduction rule.*


*Proof.* Let  $G$  be a connected bumpy graph and let  $\varrho = (H, R, \mathcal{B})$  be any rule constructed for the pair  $H, R$ . Suppose that  $(H, R, \mathcal{B})$  applies to  $G$ . Let  $G' = G[\phi(H)]$  be the induced subgraph to which  $\varrho$  applies and  $\phi$  be the witnessing isomorphism.

Focus on the vertices in  $L$ . As  $L \subseteq R$  we have that  $\forall v \in L, N_G(\phi(v)) = \phi(C)$ . But then sets  $\phi(C)$  and  $\phi(L)$  satisfy the conditions of the red star reduction rule and therefore the red star reduction rule applies to  $G$ .

With careful implementation the  $(\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{A}, \beta)$ -Algorithm together with our hand-made reduction rules is able to achieve the the results as summarized in Table 1. The full source code is available at <https://github.com/rcervený/generating-dpvc>. As you can see, sadly, we were not able to improve the running time of 2-PVC, but we do not know whether it is a limitation of the algorithm itself or a limitation of time, space, and resources.

To better understand the behavior of the generating algorithm, we provide plots of the number of branching rules and time it takes to achieve target branching factor. The runs depicted in the plots were performed on a virtual super-computer with 255 CPU cores and 128GB of RAM hosted within HPE Superdome Flex supercomputer (576 CPU threads provided by Intel Xeon Gold CPUs up to 4 GHz, 6 TB DDR4-2933 MHz RAM). As the plots are not meant for a comparison with other algorithms, we only performed a single run for each branching factor.

Interestingly, sometimes better branching factors can be achieved faster. This can be caused, e.g., by obtaining less good rules in the early stages of the algorithm which speeds up the filtering of the subgraphs in the later stages.





---

**Algorithm 2**  $(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{L})$ -Algorithm for  $\mathcal{F}$ -SVD

---

```

1: Let  $\mathcal{A}$  be a list of handmade rules and  $\mathcal{L}$  be a list of subgraph branching rules.
2: function SOLVERECURSIVELY( $G, k$ )
3:   if  $k < 0$  then
4:     Return NO.
5:   end if
6:   if  $G$  is not bumpy then
7:     Return YES.
8:   end if
9:   if  $k = 0$  then
10:    Return NO.
11:  end if
12:  if Some rule from  $\mathcal{A}$  can be applied to  $G$  then
13:    Find the first rule  $\varrho_A$  from  $\mathcal{A}$  that can be applied to  $G$ 
14:    Apply  $\varrho_A$  to  $G$  and return the corresponding answer.
15:  end if
16:  if Each bumpy connected component of  $G$  has at most  $\Psi(\mathcal{L})$  vertices then
17:    Find the optimal solution for each component separately by brute-force.
18:    Let the solutions be  $S_1, S_2, \dots, S_c$ .
19:    if  $\sum_{i=1}^c |S_i| \leq k$  then
20:      Return YES.
21:    else
22:      Return NO.
23:    end if
24:  end if
25:  Let  $C$  be the vertices of the bumpy connected component of  $G$  with at least
   $\Psi(\mathcal{L}) + 1$  vertices.
26:  Find the first branching rule  $(H, R, \mathcal{B})$  on the list  $\mathcal{L}$  that can be applied to  $G[C]$ .
27:  Let  $\phi$  be the corresponding isomorphism.
28:  for  $B \in \mathcal{B}$  do
29:    if SolveRecursively( $G \setminus \phi(B), k - |B|$ ) outputs YES then
30:      Return YES.
31:    end if
32:  end for
33:  Return NO.
34: end function

```

---

---

**Algorithm 3** *Adjusted* function

---

```

1: function ADJUSTED( $H, R, \mathcal{B}$ )
2:    $\mathcal{B}_{adj} \leftarrow \mathcal{B}$ 
3:    $\mathcal{A} \leftarrow \bigcup_{B \in \mathcal{B}_{adj}} 2^B \setminus \{\emptyset\}$ 
4:   Find  $A \in \mathcal{A}$  that minimizes  $bf((H, R, \mathcal{B}_A))$ , where  $\mathcal{B}_A = \{B \mid B \in \mathcal{B} \wedge A \not\subseteq B\} \cup \{A\}$ .
5:   if  $bf((H, R, \mathcal{B}_A)) < bf((H, R, \mathcal{B}_{adj}))$  then
6:      $\mathcal{B}_{adj} \leftarrow \mathcal{B}_A$ 
7:     go to 3
8:   end if
9:   return  $\mathcal{B}_{adj}$ 
10: end function

```

---



---

**Algorithm 4** *Generate<sub>A</sub>* function

---

```

1: Let  $H$  be a connected bumpy graph and  $R \subseteq V(H)$ .
2: function GenerateA( $H, R$ )
3:   if HandledA( $H, R$ ) = YES then
4:     Return HANDLED.
5:   end if
6:    $\mathcal{B}_{min} \leftarrow Minimal(H, R)$ 
7:    $\mathcal{B}_{df} \leftarrow DominanceFree(H, R, \mathcal{B}_{min})$ 
8:    $\mathcal{B}_{adj} \leftarrow Adjusted(H, R, \mathcal{B}_{df})$ 
9:   return ( $H, R, \mathcal{B}_{adj}$ )
10: end function

```

---

## References

1. Brešar, B., Kardoš, F., Katrenič, J., Semanišin, G.: Minimum  $k$ -path vertex cover. *Discrete Applied Mathematics* **159**(12), 1189–1195 (2011), <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.dam.2011.04.008>
2. Chang, M., Chen, L., Hung, L., Liu, Y., Rossmanith, P., Sikdar, S.: Moderately exponential time algorithms for the maximum bounded-degree-1 set problem. *Discret. Appl. Math.* **251**, 114–125 (2018), <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.dam.2018.05.032>
3. Chen, J., Kanj, I.A., Xia, G.: Improved upper bounds for vertex cover. *Theor. Comput. Sci.* **411**(40-42), 3736–3756 (2010), <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tcs.2010.06.026>
4. Cygan, M., Fomin, F.V., Kowalik, L., Lokshtanov, D., Marx, D., Pilipczuk, M., Pilipczuk, M., Saurabh, S.: *Parameterized Algorithms*. Springer (2015), <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-21275-3>
5. Fedin, S.S., Kulikov, A.S.: Automated proofs of upper bounds on the running time of splitting algorithms. In: *Parameterized and Exact Computation, First International Workshop, IWPEC 2004, Bergen, Norway, September 14-17, 2004, Proceedings*. Lecture Notes in Computer Science, vol. 3162, pp. 248–259. Springer (2004), [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-540-28639-4\\_22](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-540-28639-4_22)
6. Fernau, H.: Parameterized algorithmics for  $d$ -hitting set. *Int. J. Comput. Math.* **87**(14), 3157–3174 (2010), <https://doi.org/10.1080/00207160903176868>
7. Fomin, F.V., Gaspers, S., Kratsch, D., Liedloff, M., Saurabh, S.: Iterative compression and exact algorithms. *Theor. Comput. Sci.* **411**(7-9), 1045–1053 (2010), <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tcs.2009.11.012>
8. Fomin, F.V., Kratsch, D.: *Exact Exponential Algorithms*. Springer (2010), <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-16533-7>
9. Funke, S., Nusser, A., Storandt, S.: On  $k$ -path covers and their applications. *VLDB J.* **25**(1), 103–123 (2016), <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00778-015-0392-3>
10. Gramm, J., Guo, J., Hüffner, F., Niedermeier, R.: Automated generation of search tree algorithms for hard graph modification problems. *Algorithmica* **39**(4), 321–347 (2004), <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00453-004-1090-5>
11. Katrenič, J.: A faster FPT algorithm for 3-path vertex cover. *Inf. Process. Lett.* **116**(4), 273–278 (2016), <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ipl.2015.12.002>
12. Kojevnikov, A., Kulikov, A.S.: A new approach to proving upper bounds for MAX-2-SAT. In: *Proceedings of the Seventeenth Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms, SODA 2006, Miami, Florida, USA, January 22-26, 2006*. pp. 11–17. ACM Press (2006), <http://dl.acm.org/citation.cfm?id=1109557.1109559>
13. Kulikov, A.S.: Automated generation of simplification rules for SAT and MAXSAT. In: *Theory and Applications of Satisfiability Testing, 8th International Conference, SAT 2005, St. Andrews, UK, June 19-23, 2005, Proceedings*. Lecture Notes in Computer Science, vol. 3569, pp. 430–436. Springer (2005), [https://doi.org/10.1007/11499107\\_35](https://doi.org/10.1007/11499107_35)
14. Lewis, J.M., Yannakakis, M.: The node-deletion problem for hereditary properties is NP-complete. *J. Comput. Syst. Sci.* **20**(2), 219–230 (1980), [https://doi.org/10.1016/0022-0000\(80\)90060-4](https://doi.org/10.1016/0022-0000(80)90060-4)
15. Novotný, M.: Design and analysis of a generalized canvas protocol. In: *Proc. WISTP 2010*. pp. 106–121 (2010), [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-12368-9\\_8](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-12368-9_8)
16. Tsur, D.:  $l$ -path vertex cover is easier than  $l$ -hitting set for small  $l$ . *CoRR abs/1906.10523* (2019), <http://arxiv.org/abs/1906.10523>

17. Tsur, D.: Parameterized algorithm for 3-path vertex cover. *Theor. Comput. Sci.* **783**, 1–8 (2019), <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tcs.2019.03.013>
18. Tsur, D.: An  $o^*(2.619k)$  algorithm for 4-path vertex cover. *Discret. Appl. Math.* **291**, 1–14 (2021), <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.dam.2020.11.019>
19. Tu, J.: A fixed-parameter algorithm for the vertex cover  $P_3$  problem. *Inf. Process. Lett.* **115**(2), 96–99 (2015), <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ipl.2014.06.018>
20. Tu, J., Jin, Z.: An FPT algorithm for the vertex cover  $P_4$  problem. *Discrete Applied Mathematics* **200**, 186–190 (2016), <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.dam.2015.06.032>
21. Xiao, M., Kou, S.: Exact algorithms for the maximum dissociation set and minimum 3-path vertex cover problems. *Theor. Comput. Sci.* **657**, 86–97 (2017), <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tcs.2016.04.043>
22. Xiao, M., Kou, S.: Kernelization and parameterized algorithms for 3-path vertex cover. In: *Proc. TAMC 2017*. pp. 654–668 (2017), [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-55911-7\\_47](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-55911-7_47)
23. Xiao, M., Nagamochi, H.: Exact algorithms for maximum independent set. *Inf. Comput.* **255**, 126–146 (2017), <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ic.2017.06.001>