

Parameterized Complexity of Submodular Minimization under Uncertainty

Naonori Kakimura 

Department of Mathematics, Keio University, Japan

Ildikó Schlotter 

HUN-REN Centre for Economic and Regional Studies, Hungary
Budapest University of Technology and Economics, Hungary

Abstract

This paper studies the computational complexity of a robust variant of a two-stage submodular minimization problem that we call ROBUST SUBMODULAR MINIMIZER. In this problem, we are given k submodular functions $f_1, \dots, f_k$ over a set family 2^V , which represent k possible scenarios in the future when we will need to find an optimal solution for one of these scenarios, i.e., a minimizer for one of the functions. The present task is to find a set $X \subseteq V$ that is close to *some* optimal solution for each f_i in the sense that some minimizer of f_i can be obtained from X by adding/removing at most d elements for a given integer $d \in \mathbb{N}$. The main contribution of this paper is to provide a complete computational map of this problem with respect to parameters k and d , which reveals a tight complexity threshold for both parameters:

- ROBUST SUBMODULAR MINIMIZER can be solved in polynomial time when $k \leq 2$, but is NP-hard if k is a constant with $k \geq 3$.
- ROBUST SUBMODULAR MINIMIZER can be solved in polynomial time when $d = 0$, but is NP-hard if d is a constant with $d \geq 1$.
- ROBUST SUBMODULAR MINIMIZER is fixed-parameter tractable when parameterized by (k, d) .

We also show that if some submodular function f_i has a polynomial number of minimizers, then the problem becomes fixed-parameter tractable when parameterized by d . We remark that all our hardness results hold even if each submodular function is given by a cut function of a directed graph.

2012 ACM Subject Classification Theory of computation $\rightarrow$ Submodular optimization and polymatroids; Theory of computation $\rightarrow$ Fixed parameter tractability; Mathematics of computing $\rightarrow$ Combinatorial optimization

Keywords and phrases Submodular minimization, optimization under uncertainty, parameterized complexity, cut function.

Funding *Naonori Kakimura*: Supported by JSPS KAKENHI Grant Numbers JP22H05001, JP20H05795, and JP21H03397, Japan and JST ERATO Grant Number JPMJER2301, Japan.

Ildikó Schlotter: Supported by the Hungarian Academy of Sciences under its János Bolyai Research Scholarship and its Momentum Programme (LP2021-2).

Acknowledgements The authors are grateful to the organizers of the 14th Emléktábla Workshop which took place in Vác, Hungary in 2023, and provided a great opportunity for our initial discussions.

1 Introduction

This paper proposes a two-stage robust optimization problem under uncertainty. Suppose that we want to find a minimum cut on a directed graph under uncertainty. The uncertainty here is represented by k directed graphs $G_1, \dots, G_k$ on the same vertex set $V \cup \{s, t\}$. That is, we have k possible scenarios of graph realizations in the future. At the moment, we want to choose an (s, t) -cut in advance, so that after the graph is revealed, we will be able to obtain a minimum (s, t) -cut in the graph with small modification. Therefore, our aim is to find an (s, t) -cut that is close to some minimum (s, t) -cut in each graph G_i for $i = 1, \dots, k$.

Let us formalize this problem. For a vertex set X in a directed graph $G = (V \cup \{s, t\}, E)$, the *cut function* $f : 2^V \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}$ is the number of out-going edges from X . Let us denote the family of minimum (s, t) -cuts in G by $\mathcal{C}_{s,t}(G)$, that is, $\mathcal{C}_{s,t}(G) = \{Y \subseteq V : f(Y) \leq f(Y') \ \forall Y' \subseteq V\}$. Given directed graphs $G_1, \dots, G_k$ over a common vertex set $V \cup \{s, t\}$, we want to find a subset $X \subseteq V$ and sets $Y_i \in \mathcal{C}_{s,t}(G_i)$ for each $i \in [k]$ that minimizes $\max_{i \in [k]} |X \Delta Y_i|$ where Δ stands for symmetric difference and $[k]$ denotes $\{1, \dots, k\}$ for any positive integer k .

We study a natural generalization of this problem where, instead of the cut functions of directed graphs which are known to be submodular [27], we consider arbitrary submodular set functions over some non-empty finite set V . Let $f_1, \dots, f_k : 2^V \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be k submodular functions. Let $\arg \min f_i = \{Y \subseteq V : f_i(Y) \leq f_i(Y') \ \forall Y' \subseteq V\}$ refer to the set of minimizers of f_i . We want to find a subset $X \subseteq V$ and sets $Y_i \in \arg \min f_i$ for all $i \in [k]$ that

$$\text{minimize} \quad \max_{i \in [k]} |X \Delta Y_i|.$$

We call the decision version of this problem **ROBUST SUBMODULAR MINIMIZER**.

ROBUST SUBMODULAR MINIMIZER:

Input: A finite set V , submodular functions $f_1, \dots, f_k : 2^V \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, and an integer $d \in \mathbb{N}$.
Task: Find a set $X \subseteq V$ such that for each $i \in [k]$ there exists $Y_i \in \arg \min f_i$ with $|X \Delta Y_i| \leq d$, or detect if no such set exists.

We remark that the min-sum variant of the problem, that is, the problem obtained by replacing the condition $\max_{i \in [k]} |X \Delta Y_i| \leq d$ with $\sum_{i \in [k]} |X \Delta Y_i| \leq d$, was introduced by Kakimura et al. [16], who showed that it can be solved in polynomial time.

1.1 Our Contributions and Techniques

Our contribution is to reveal the complete computational complexity of **ROBUST SUBMODULAR MINIMIZER** with respect to the parameters k and d . We also provide an algorithm for the case when one of the submodular functions has only polynomially many minimizers. Our results are as follows:

1. **ROBUST SUBMODULAR MINIMIZER** can be solved in polynomial time when $k \leq 2$ (Theorem 6), but is **NP-hard** if k is a constant with $k \geq 3$ (Corollary 24).
2. **ROBUST SUBMODULAR MINIMIZER** can be solved in polynomial time when $d = 0$ (Observation 4), but is **NP-hard** if d is a constant with $d \geq 1$ (Theorem 20).
3. **ROBUST SUBMODULAR MINIMIZER** is fixed-parameter tractable when parameterized by (k, d) .
4. **ROBUST SUBMODULAR MINIMIZER** is fixed-parameter tractable when parameterized by d , if the size of $\arg \min f_i$ for some $i \in [k]$ is polynomially bounded.

When $k = 1$, **ROBUST SUBMODULAR MINIMIZER** is equivalent to the efficiently solvable submodular function minimization problem [19], in which we are given a single submodular function $f : 2^V \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ and want to find a set $X \subseteq V$ in $\arg \min f$. It is not difficult to observe that **ROBUST SUBMODULAR MINIMIZER** for $d = 0$ can also be solved in polynomial time by computing a minimizer of the submodular function $\sum_{i=1}^k f_i$; see Section 3.1.

The rest of our positive results are based on Birkhoff's representation theorem on distributive lattices [1] that allows us to maintain the family of minimizers of a submodular function in a compact way. Specifically, even though the number of minimizers may be exponential in the input size, we can represent all minimizers as a family of cuts in a directed acyclic graph with polynomial size. As we show in Section 3.1, we can use this representation

to solve an instance I of ROBUST SUBMODULAR MINIMIZER with $k = 2$ by constructing a directed graph with two distinct vertices, s and t , in which a minimum (s, t) -cut yields a solution for I . More generally, Birkhoff’s compact representation allows us to reduce ROBUST SUBMODULAR MINIMIZER for arbitrary k to the so-called MULTI-BUDGETED DIRECTED CUT problem, solvable by an algorithm due to Kratsch et al. [17], leading to a fixed-parameter tractable algorithm for the parameter (k, d) . We note that a similar construction was used to show that the min-sum variant of the problem is polynomial-time solvable [16].

In Section 3.3, we consider the case when one of the k submodular functions has only polynomially many minimizers. As mentioned in [16], ROBUST SUBMODULAR MINIMIZER is NP-hard even when each submodular function f_i has a unique minimizer. In fact, the problem is equivalent to the CLOSEST STRING problem over a binary alphabet, shown to be NP-hard under the name MINIMUM RADIUS by Frances and Litman [11]. For the case when $|\arg \min f_i|$ is polynomially bounded for some $i \in [k]$, we present a fixed-parameter tractable algorithm parameterized only by d . Our algorithm guesses a set in $\arg \min f_i$ and uses it as an “anchor,” then solves the problem recursively by the bounded search-tree technique.

Section 4 contains our NP-hardness results for the cases when either d is a constant at least 1, or k is a constant at least 3. We present reductions from an intermediate problem that may be of independent interest: in this problem, we are given k set families $\mathcal{F}_1, \dots, \mathcal{F}_k$ over a universe V containing two distinguished elements, s and t , with each $\mathcal{F}_i$ containing pairwise disjoint subsets of V ; the task is to find a set $X \subseteq V$ containing s but not t that has a bounded distance from each family $\mathcal{F}_i$ for a specific distance measure.

1.2 Related Work

ROBUST SUBMODULAR MINIMIZER is related to the *robust recoverable* combinatorial optimization problem, introduced by Liebchen et al. [21]. It is a framework of mathematical optimization that allows recourse in decision-making to deal with uncertainty. In this framework, we are given a problem instance with some scenarios and a recovery bound d , and the task is to find a feasible solution X (the first-stage solution) to the instance that can be transformed to a feasible solution Y_i (the second-stage solutions) in each scenario i respecting the recovery bound (e.g., $|X \triangle Y_i| \leq d$ for each i). The cost of the solution is usually evaluated by the sum of the cost of X and the sum of the costs of Y_i ’s. Robust recoverable versions have been studied for a variety of standard combinatorial optimization problems. Examples include the shortest path problem [5], the assignment problem [10], the travelling salesman problem [12], and others [14, 18, 20]. The setting was originally motivated from the situation where the source of uncertainty was the cost function which changes in the second stage. We consider another situation dealing with *structural uncertainty*, where some unknown set of input elements can be interdicted [8, 15]. Recently, a variant of robust recoverable problems has been studied where certain operations are allowed in the second stage [13].

Reoptimization is another concept related to ROBUST SUBMODULAR MINIMIZER. In general reoptimization, we are given an instance I of a combinatorial optimization problem and an optimal solution X for I . Then, for a slightly modified instance I' of the problem, we need to make a small change to X so that the resulting solution X' is an optimal (or a good approximate) solution to the modified instance I' . Reoptimization has been studied for several combinatorial optimization problems such as the minimum spanning tree problem [4], the traveling salesman problem [22], and the Steiner tree problem [2].

2 Preliminaries

Graphs and Cuts

Given a directed graph $G = (V, E)$, we write uv for an edge pointing from u to v . For a subset $X \subseteq V$ of vertices in G , let $\delta_G(X)$ denote the set of edges leaving X . If G is an undirected graph, then $\delta_G(X)$ for some set X of vertices denotes the set of edges with exactly one endpoint in X . We may simply write $\delta(X)$ if the graph is clear from the context.

For two vertices s and t in a directed or undirected graph $G = (V, E)$, an (s, t) -cut is a set X of vertices such that $s \in X$ but $t \notin X$. A *minimum* (s, t) -cut in G is an (s, t) -cut X that minimizes $|\delta(X)|$. Given a cost function $c: E \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+ \cup \{+\infty\}$ on the edges of G where $\mathbb{R}_+$ is the set of all non-negative real numbers, the *(weighted) cut function* $\kappa_G: 2^V \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+ \cup \{+\infty\}$ is defined by

$$\kappa_G(X) = \sum_{e \in \delta(X)} c(e). \quad (1)$$

A *minimum-cost* (s, t) -cut is an (s, t) -cut X that minimizes $\kappa_G(X)$.

Distributive Lattices

In this paper, we will make use of properties of finite distributive lattices on a ground set V .

A *distributive lattice* is a set family $\mathcal{L} \subseteq 2^V$ that is closed under union and intersection, that is, $X, Y \in \mathcal{L}$ implies $X \cup Y \in \mathcal{L}$ and $X \cap Y \in \mathcal{L}$. Then $\mathcal{L}$ is a partially ordered set with respect to set inclusion $\subseteq$, and has a unique minimal element and a unique maximal element.

Birkhoff's representation theorem is a useful tool for studying distributive lattices.

► **Theorem 1** (Birkhoff's representation theorem [1]). *Let $\mathcal{L} \subseteq 2^V$ be a distributive lattice. Then there exists a partition of V into $U_0, U_1, \dots, U_b, U_\infty$, where U_0 and U_∞ can possibly be empty, such that the following hold:*

- (1) *Every set in $\mathcal{L}$ contains U_0 .*
- (2) *Every set in $\mathcal{L}$ is disjoint from U_∞ .*
- (3) *For every set $X \in \mathcal{L}$, there exists a set $J \subseteq [b]$ of indices such that $X = U_0 \cup \bigcup_{j \in J} U_j$.*
- (4) *There exists a directed acyclic graph $G(\mathcal{L})$ that has the following properties.*
 - (a) *The vertex set is $\{U_0, U_1, \dots, U_b\}$.*
 - (b) *U_0 is a unique sink¹ of $G(\mathcal{L})$.*
 - (c) *For a non-empty set Z of vertices in $G(\mathcal{L})$, Z has no out-going edge if and only if $\bigcup_{U_j \in Z} U_j \in \mathcal{L}$.*

For a distributive lattice $\mathcal{L} \subseteq 2^V$, we call the directed acyclic graph $G(\mathcal{L})$ above a *compact representation* of $\mathcal{L}$. Note that the size of $G(\mathcal{L})$ is $O(|V|^2)$ while $|\mathcal{L}|$ can be as large as $2^{|V|}$.

Submodular Function Minimization

Let V be a non-empty finite set. A function $f: 2^V \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is *submodular* if $f(X) + f(Y) \geq f(X \cup Y) + f(X \cap Y)$ for all $X, Y \subseteq V$. A typical example of submodular functions is the cut function κ_G of a directed (or undirected) edge-weighted graph G as defined in (1). If the graph $G = (V \cup \{s, t\}, E)$ contains two distinct vertices, s and t , then we can restrict the cut function to the domain of (s, t) -cuts in the following sense: each $X \subseteq V$ corresponds to an (s, t) -cut

¹ A *sink* is a vertex of out-degree zero.

$X \cup \{s\}$ in G ; then the function $\lambda_G : 2^V \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+ \cup \{+\infty\}$ defined by $\lambda_G(X) = \kappa_G(X \cup \{s\})$ is submodular.

When we discuss computations on a submodular function $f : 2^V \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, we assume that we are given a *value oracle* of f . A value oracle takes $X \subseteq V$ as an input, and returns the value $f(X)$. Assuming that we are given a value oracle, we can minimize a submodular function in polynomial time. The currently fastest algorithm for submodular function minimization was given by Lee et al. [19] and runs in $\tilde{O}(n^3 \text{EO} + n^4)$ time, where $n = |V|$ and EO is the query time of a value oracle.

Let $f : 2^V \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a submodular function. A subset $Y \subseteq V$ is a *minimizer* of the function f if $f(Y) \leq f(Y')$ for all $Y' \subseteq V$. The set of minimizers of f is denoted by $\arg \min f$. The following is a well-known fact on submodular functions.

► **Lemma 2** (See e.g., [27]). *Let $f : 2^V \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a submodular function. Then $\arg \min f$ forms a distributive lattice.*

A compact representation of the distributive lattice $\arg \min f$ can be constructed in $\tilde{O}(n^5 \text{EO} + n^6)$ time via Orlin's submodular function minimization algorithm [24]. See [23, Notes 10.11–10.12]. Unless otherwise stated, we will assume that the submodular functions given in our problem instances are given via their compact representation.

As a special case, consider minimum (s, t) -cuts in a directed graph $G = (V \cup \{s, t\}, E)$ with a positive cost function c on its edges. By Lemma 2, the family of minimum (s, t) -cuts forms a distributive lattice. A compact representation for this lattice can be constructed from a maximum flow in the (s, t) -network in linear time [25]. Thus the running time is dominated by the maximum flow computation, and this can be done in $|E|^{1+o(1)}$ time [6].

Parameterized Complexity

In parameterized complexity, each input instance I of a *parameterized problem* Q is associated with a *parameter* k , usually an integer or a tuple of integers, and we consider the running time of any algorithm solving Q as not only a function of the input length $|I|$, but also as a function of the parameter k . An algorithm for Q is *fixed-parameter tractable* or FPT, if it runs in time $g(k)|I|^{O(1)}$ for some computable function g . Such an algorithm can be efficient in practice if the parameter is small. See the books [7, 9] for more background.

3 Algorithms for Robust Submodular Minimizer

In this section, we present algorithms for ROBUST SUBMODULAR MINIMIZER. We start with a construction that we will use in most of our algorithms. Let $I_{\text{RSM}} = (V, f_1, \dots, f_k, d)$ be our input instance.

For each $i \in [k]$, let $\mathcal{L}_i = \arg \min f_i$ denote the set of minimizers. By Lemma 2, using Birkhoff's representation theorem we may assume that f_i is given through a compact representation $G(\mathcal{L}_i)$ of $\mathcal{L}_i$, whose vertex set is $\{U_0^i, U_1^i, \dots, U_{b_i}^i\}$ with $U_\infty^i = V \setminus \bigcup_{j=0}^{b_i} U_j^i$.

We then construct a directed graph G^i from $G(\mathcal{L}_i)$ by expanding each vertex in $G(\mathcal{L}_i)$ to a complete graph. More precisely, G^i has vertex set $V^i \cup \{s, t\}$ where $V^i = \{v^i : v \in V\}$ is a copy of V , and its edge set E^i is defined as follows.

- $u^i v^i \in E^i$ if $u, v \in U_j^i$ for some $j \in \{0, 1, \dots, b_i, \infty\}$.
- $u^i v^i \in E^i$ for any $u \in U_j^i$ and $v \in U_{j'}^i$, if $G(\mathcal{L}_i)$ has an edge from U_j^i to $U_{j'}^i$.
- $u^i s \in E^i$ and $s u^i \in E^i$ if $u \in U_0^i$.
- $u^i t \in E^i$ and $t u^i \in E^i$ if $u \in U_\infty^i$.

Recall that G^i can be computed in $O(|V|^5 \text{EO}_i + |V|^6)$ time where EO_i denotes the query time of a value oracle for function f_i .

We define the function $\lambda_i : 2^{V^i} \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}_+$ so that $\lambda_i(X) = |\delta_{G^i}(X \cup \{s\})|$ for a subset $X \subseteq V^i$. Then it is observed below that each subset $X \subseteq V^i$ with $\lambda_i(X) = 0$ corresponds to a minimizer of f_i .

► **Lemma 3** ([16, Lemma 3.2]). *Let X be a subset in V , and $X^i = \{v^i \in V^i : v \in X\}$ its copy in G^i . Then $\lambda_i(X^i) = 0$ if and only if $X \in \mathcal{L}_i$.*

The rest of the section is organized as follows. In Section 3.1 we present polynomial-time algorithms for the cases $d = 0$ and $k = 2$. In Section 3.2 we give an FPT algorithm for the combined parameter (k, d) . Section 3.3 deals with the case when some function f_i has only polynomially many minimizers, allowing for an FPT algorithm with parameter d .

3.1 Polynomial-time algorithms

We start by observing that the case $d = 0$ is efficiently solvable by computing a minimizer for the function $\sum_{i \in [k]} f_i$ which is also submodular; for this result, it will be convenient to use value oracles.

► **Observation 4.** *ROBUST SUBMODULAR MINIMIZER for $d = 0$ can be solved in time $O(|V|^3 \sum_{i=1}^k \text{EO}_i + |V|^4)$ where EO_i is the query time of a value oracle for f_i for $i \in [k]$.*

Proof. Let $I = (V, f_1, \dots, f_k, 0)$ be our input. Since the addition of submodular functions yields a submodular function, the function $f = \sum_{i \in [k]} f_i$ is also submodular. Clearly, if some set X is contained in $\arg \min f_i$ for each $i \in [k]$, then $X \in \arg \min f$. Conversely, if some X is contained in $\arg \min f$ but $X \notin \arg \min f_i$ for some $i \in [k]$, then there is no common minimizer Y of the functions $f_1, \dots, f_k$. Indeed, such a set Y would also necessarily minimize f , implying

$$f(Y) = f_i(Y) + \sum_{j \in [k], j \neq i} f_j(Y) < f_i(X) + \sum_{j \in [k], j \neq i} f_j(Y) = f(X)$$

where the inequality follows from our assumption that X is not a minimizer for f_i . However, this means that $X \notin \arg \min f$, a contradiction.

Therefore, to solve our input instance I , it suffices to compute a minimizer X for the function f , which can be done in polynomial time, due to the submodularity of f . Then we check whether $X \in \arg \min f_i$ for each $i \in [k]$ (by computing any minimizer for each function f_i). If $X \in \arg \min f_i$ holds for each f_i , then we return X ; otherwise we output “No.”

The claimed running time follows from the fact that the value of f on some subset of V can be computed in $\sum_{i=1}^k \text{EO}_i$ time, and thus we can minimize f in time $O(|V|^3 \sum_{i=1}^k \text{EO}_i + |V|^4)$ using the algorithm by Lee et al. [19]. ◀

From now on, we will assume that the functions $f_1, \dots, f_k$ are given through a compact representation. Under this condition, we next show that the problem is polynomial-time solvable when $k = 2$. We will need the following intuitive fact.

► **Proposition 5.** *Let Y_1, Y_2 be two subsets of a set V . Then $|Y_1 \triangle Y_2| \leq 2d$ if and only if there exists a set $X \subseteq V$ such that $|X \triangle Y_i| \leq d$ for each $i \in \{1, 2\}$.*

Proof. To prove the sufficiency, suppose that $|Y_1 \triangle Y_2| > 2d$. Then for any set $X \subseteq V$,

$$2d < |Y_1 \triangle Y_2| \leq |Y_1 \triangle X| + |X \triangle Y_2|.$$

Hence at least one of $|Y_1 \triangle X|$ and $|X \triangle Y_2|$ is more than d . Thus no subset X satisfies $|X \triangle Y_i| \leq d$ for both $i = 1, 2$.

For the necessity, suppose that $|Y_1 \triangle Y_2| \leq 2d$. We denote $d_1 = |Y_1 \setminus Y_2|$ and $d_2 = |Y_2 \setminus Y_1|$. We choose arbitrary subsets $Z_1 \subseteq Y_1 \setminus Y_2$ with size $\lfloor d_1/2 \rfloor$ and $Z_2 \subseteq Y_2 \setminus Y_1$ with size $\lfloor d_2/2 \rfloor$. Note that $|Y_1 \triangle Y_2| = d_1 + d_2 \leq 2d$.

Define $X = (Y_1 \cap Y_2) \cup Z_1 \cup Z_2$. We claim that X satisfies that $|X \triangle Y_i| \leq d$ for both $i = 1, 2$. In fact, it holds that

$$|X \triangle Y_1| = |(Y_1 \setminus Y_2) \setminus Z_1| + |Z_2| = (d_1 - \lfloor d_1/2 \rfloor) + \lfloor d_2/2 \rfloor = \lceil d_1/2 \rceil + \lfloor d_2/2 \rfloor. \quad (2)$$

If d_1 is even, then we get $|X \triangle Y_1| + d_1/2 + \lfloor d_2/2 \rfloor \leq (d_1 + d_2)/2 \leq d$. Suppose that d_1 is odd and d_2 is odd. Then (2) implies that

$$|X \triangle Y_1| = (d_1 + 1)/2 + (d_2 - 1)/2 = (d_1 + d_2)/2 \leq d.$$

Finally, suppose that d_1 is odd and d_2 is even. Then, since $d_1 + d_2 \leq 2d$, we see that $d_1 + d_2 \leq 2d - 1$ also holds. Hence, by (2) we get

$$|X \triangle Y_1| = (d_1 + 1)/2 + d_2/2 = (d_1 + d_2 + 1)/2 \leq d.$$

Thus $|X \triangle Y_1|$, and by symmetry this shows also that $|X \triangle Y_i| \leq d$ for each $i \in \{1, 2\}$. ◀

► **Theorem 6.** *ROBUST SUBMODULAR MINIMIZER for $k = 2$ can be solved in polynomial time via a maximum flow computation.*

Proof. Let our instance be $I_{\text{RSM}} = (V, f_1, f_2, d)$. Using the method explained at the beginning of Section 3, we construct the directed graphs $G^1 = (V^1 \cup \{s, t\}, E^2)$ and $G^2 = (V^2 \cup \{s, t\}, E^2)$ for f_1 and f_2 . We then construct a directed graph $\tilde{G} = (\tilde{V}, \tilde{E})$ by identifying s , as well as t , in G^1 and G^2 , and then connecting the corresponding copies of each vertex with a bidirected edge. That is, $\tilde{V} = V^1 \cup V^2 \cup \{s, t\}$ and $\tilde{E} = E^1 \cup E^2 \cup E'$ where $E' = \{v^1 v^2, v^2 v^1 : v \in V\}$. We set $c(e) = +\infty$ for all edges $e \in E^1 \cup E^2$, and we set $c(e) = 1$ for all edges $e \in E'$.

We next compute a minimum-cost (s, t) -cut Z in the graph $\tilde{G}$ with cost function c using standard flow techniques. Let $\kappa_{\tilde{G}}$ denote the cut function in this graph. We will show below that $\kappa_{\tilde{G}}(Z) \leq 2d$ if and only if the answer is “yes”.

First suppose that $\kappa_{\tilde{G}}(Z) \leq 2d$. Let $Y_1 = \{v \in V : v^1 \in Z\}$ and $Y_2 = \{v \in V : v^2 \in Z\}$. Since $\delta_{\tilde{G}}(Z)$ has no edges in $E^1 \cup E^2$, we see that $\lambda_i(\{v^i \in V^i : v \in Y_i\}) = 0$ for both $i = 1, 2$, and therefore the set Y_i is in $\mathcal{L}_i$ by Lemma 3. Since $|Y_1 \triangle Y_2| = \kappa_{\tilde{G}}(Z) \leq 2d$, we can compute a set X such that $|X \triangle Y_i| \leq d$ for both $i = 1, 2$ by Proposition 5.

Conversely, let $X \subseteq V$ and $Y_i \in \mathcal{L}_i$ for each $i = 1, 2$ such that $|X \triangle Y_i| \leq d$. Define $Z = \{s\} \cup \{v^1 \in V^1 : v \in Y_1\} \cup \{v^2 \in V^2 : v \in Y_2\}$. Due to Lemma 3 we know that $\lambda_i(\{v^i \in V^i : v \in Y_i\}) = 0$ for both $i = 1, 2$. This implies $\kappa_{\tilde{G}}(Z) = |Y_1 \triangle Y_2| \leq 2d$ where the inequality follows from Proposition 5. ◀

3.2 FPT algorithm for parameter (k, d)

We propose a fixed-parameter tractable algorithm for ROBUST SUBMODULAR MINIMIZER parameterized by k and d ; let $I_{\text{RSM}} = (V, f_1, \dots, f_k, d)$ denote our instance.

► **Theorem 7.** *ROBUST SUBMODULAR MINIMIZER can be solved in FPT time when parameterized by (k, d) .*

To this end, we reduce our problem to the MULTI-BUDGETED DIRECTED CUT problem [17], defined as follows. We are given a directed graph $D = (V, E)$ with distinct vertices s and t , together with pairwise disjoint edge sets $A_1, \dots, A_k$, and positive integers $d_1, \dots, d_k$. The task is to decide whether D has an (s, t) -cut X such that $|\delta(X) \cap A_i| \leq d_i$ for each $i \in [k]$.

► **Proposition 8** (Kratsch et al. [17]). *The MULTI-BUDGETED DIRECTED CUT problem can be solved in FPT time when the parameter is $\sum_{i=1}^k d_i$.*

In fact, we will need to use *forbidden* edges, so let us define the MULTI-BUDGETED DIRECTED CUT WITH FORBIDDEN EDGES problem as follows. Given an instance I_{MBC} of MULTI-BUDGETED DIRECTED CUT and a set F of forbidden edges, find a solution X for I_{MBC} such that $\delta(X)$ is disjoint from F . It is straightforward to solve this problem using the results by Kratsch et al. [17], after replacing each forbidden edge with an appropriate number of parallel edges. Hence, we get the following.

► **Proposition 9.** *The MULTI-BUDGETED DIRECTED CUT WITH FORBIDDEN EDGES problem can be solved in FPT time when the parameter is $\sum_{i=1}^k d_i$.*

Proof. Let $I = (D, s, t, A_1, \dots, A_k, d_1, \dots, d_k)$ be our instance with a set F of forbidden edges in D . First, we create a set $A_{k+1} = F \setminus \bigcup_{i=1}^k A_i$ and let $d_{k+1} = 1$. Next, for each $i \in [k+1]$ and each forbidden edge $f \in F \cap A_i$, we replace f with $d_i + 1$ parallel copies of f in D .² Let D' be the resulting directed graph, and consider the instance $I' = (D', s, t, A_1, \dots, A_{k+1}, d_1, \dots, d_{k+1})$ of MULTI-BUDGETED DIRECTED CUT. Clearly, if a set X of vertices is a solution for I' , then $\delta(X)$ cannot contain a forbidden edge or a copy of a forbidden edge, as then it would have to contain *all* copies of that forbidden edge, and thus would violate $|\delta(X) \cap A_i| \leq d_i$ for some $i \in [k+1]$. Thus, a set X of vertices in D is a solution for our original instance (I, F) of MULTI-BUDGETED DIRECTED CUT WITH FORBIDDEN EDGES if and only if X is a solution for the instance I' of MULTI-BUDGETED DIRECTED CUT. Note that this construction increases the parameter by exactly one. Hence, the algorithm provided by Proposition 8 can be used to solve MULTI-BUDGETED DIRECTED CUT WITH FORBIDDEN EDGES in FPT time. ◀

Reduction to Multi-Budgeted Directed Cut with Forbidden Edges

Compute the graph G^i for each $i \in [k]$, as described at the beginning of Section 3. We construct a large directed graph $\tilde{G} = (\tilde{V}, \tilde{E})$ as follows. We identify all vertices s (and t , respectively) in the graphs G^i into a single vertex s (and t , respectively). We further prepare another copy of V , which is denoted by $V^* = \{v^* : v \in V\}$. Thus the vertex set of $\tilde{G}$ is defined by $\tilde{V} = \bigcup_{i=1}^k V^i \cup V^* \cup \{s, t\}$. The edge set of $\tilde{G}$ consists of E^i and bidirected edges connecting v^* and the copy v^i of v in G^i , for each $i \in [k]$. That is,

$$\tilde{E} = \bigcup_{i=1}^k (E^i \cup A^i) \quad \text{where} \quad A^i = \{v^* v^i, v^i v^* : v \in V\}.$$

² To avoid using parallel edges, one can alternatively replace each edge $f = uv \in F \cap A_i$ with a set of $d_i + 1$ paths of length two, i.e., with vertices $p_f^1, p_f^2, \dots, p_f^{d_i+1}$ and edges $\{up_f^j, p_f^j v : j \in [d_i + 1]\}$.

We also set $d_i = d$ for each $i \in [k]$. Consider the instance $I_{\text{MBC}} = (\tilde{G}, s, t, \{A^i\}_{i=1}^k, \{d_i\}_{i=1}^k)$ of MULTI-BUDGETED DIRECTED CUT with $F = \bigcup_{i=1}^k E^i$ as forbidden edges; note that its parameter is $k \cdot d$. Theorem 7 immediately follows from Proposition 9 and Lemma 10 below.

► **Lemma 10.** *There exists a solution for I_{RSM} if and only if there exists a solution for the instance (I_{MBC}, F) of MULTI-BUDGETED DIRECTED CUT WITH FORBIDDEN EDGES.*

Proof. Suppose that (I_{MBC}, F) admits a solution. That is, there exists a subset X of $\tilde{V}$ containing s but not t such that $\delta_{\tilde{G}}(X)$ is disjoint from F and satisfies $|\delta_{\tilde{G}}(X) \cap A^i| \leq d_i$ for each $i \in [k]$. Define $Y^i = X \cap V^i$ for $i = 1, \dots, k$. Observe that all edges within G^i leaving $Y^i \cup \{s\}$ also leave X in $\tilde{G}$, since $s \in X$ but $t \notin X$. Since all edges in E^i are forbidden edges, we see that $\lambda_i(Y^i) = 0$. Let $Y_i = \{v \in V : v^i \in Y^i\}$, so that Y^i contains the copy of each vertex of Y_i in G^i . Then Y_i is in $\mathcal{L}_i$ by Lemma 3.

Define the subset $X^* = \{v : v^* \in X\}$ of V . Observe that

$$\delta_{\tilde{G}}(X) \cap A^i = \{v^* v^i : v \in X^*, v \notin Y_i\} \cup \{v^i v^* : v \notin X^*, v \in Y_i\}.$$

Therefore, we get that $|X^* \triangle Y_i| = |\delta_{\tilde{G}}(X) \cap A^i| \leq d_i = d$ for each $i \in [k]$ as required, so X^* is a solution to our instance I_{RSM} of ROBUST SUBMODULAR MINIMIZER.

Conversely, let $X \subseteq V$ and $Y_i \in \mathcal{L}_i$ for each $i \in [k]$ such that $|X \triangle Y_i| \leq d$. Define $X^* = \{v^* \in V^* : v \in X\}$ and $Y^i = \{v^i \in V^i : v \in Y_i\}$. Then the set $\tilde{X} = \{s\} \cup X^* \cup \bigcup_{i=1}^k Y^i$ is an (s, t) -cut of $\tilde{G}$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} \delta_{\tilde{G}}(\tilde{X}) \cap A^i &= \{v^* v^i : v^* \in X^*, v \notin Y^i\} \cup \{v^i v^* : v^* \notin X^*, v^i \in Y^i\} \\ &= \{v^* v^i : v \in X, v \notin Y_i\} \cup \{v^i v^* : v \notin X, v \in Y_i\} = X \triangle Y_i. \end{aligned}$$

Hence we obtain $|\delta_{\tilde{G}}(\tilde{X}) \cap A^i| = |X \triangle Y_i| \leq d = d_i$ for each $i \in [k]$. Since Y_i is in $\mathcal{L}_i$, by Lemma 3 we know $\lambda_i(Y^i) = 0$ for each $i \in [k]$. Thus $\delta_{\tilde{G}}(\tilde{X})$ is disjoint from the set F of forbidden edges, and therefore $\tilde{X}$ is indeed a solution to our instance (I_{MBC}, F) of MULTI-BUDGETED DIRECTED CUT WITH FORBIDDEN EDGES. ◀

3.3 Polynomially many minimizers: FPT algorithm parameterized by d

In this section, we present a fixed-parameter tractable algorithm for the case when our threshold d is small, assuming that $|\mathcal{L}_1|$ can be bounded by a polynomial of the input size. Note that even with a much stronger assumption, ROBUST SUBMODULAR MINIMIZER remains intractable (see also [16]):

► **Observation 11.** *ROBUST SUBMODULAR MINIMIZER is NP-hard even if $|\mathcal{L}_i| = 1$ for each $i \in [k]$.*

Proof. If $|\mathcal{L}_i| = 1$ for each $i \in [k]$, then there is a unique minimizer $Y_i \subseteq V$ for each f_i , and the problem is equivalent with finding a set $X \subseteq V$ whose symmetric difference is at most d from each of the sets Y_i , $i \in [k]$. This is the CLOSEST STRING problem over a binary alphabet, shown to be NP-hard under the name MINIMUM RADIUS by Frances and Litman [11]. ◀

► **Theorem 12.** *ROBUST SUBMODULAR MINIMIZER can be solved in $|\mathcal{L}_1|g(d)n^c$ time where c is a constant and g is a computable function.*

Let us consider a slightly more general version of ROBUST SUBMODULAR MINIMIZER which we call ANCHORED SUBMODULAR MINIMIZER. In this problem, in addition to an

instance $I_{\text{RSM}} = (V, f_1, \dots, f_k, d)$ of ROBUST SUBMODULAR MINIMIZER, we are given a set $Y_0 \subseteq V$ and integer $d_0 \leq d$, and we aim to find a subset X such that

$$|X \triangle Y_0| \leq d_0 \quad \text{and} \quad (3)$$

$$|X \triangle Y_i| \leq d \quad \text{for some } Y_i \in \mathcal{L}_i, \text{ for each } i \in [k]. \quad (4)$$

Observe that we can solve our instance $I_{\text{RSM}} = (V, f_1, \dots, f_k, d)$ by solving the instance $(V, f_2, \dots, f_k, d, Y_0, d_0)$ of ANCHORED SUBMODULAR MINIMIZER for each $Y_0 \in \mathcal{L}_1$ and $d_0 = d$. Hence, Theorem 12 follows from Theorem 13 below.

► **Theorem 13.** *ANCHORED SUBMODULAR MINIMIZER can be solved in FPT time when parameterized by d .*

To prove Theorem 13, we will use the technique of bounded search-trees. Given an instance $I = (V, f_1, \dots, f_k, d, Y_0, d_0)$, after checking whether Y_0 itself is a solution, we search for a minimizer $Y_i \in \mathcal{L}_i$ for which $d < |Y_0 \triangle Y_i| \leq d + d_0$. It is not hard to see the following.

► **Observation 14.** *If X is a solution for an instance $I = (V, f_1, \dots, f_k, d, Y_0, d_0)$ of ANCHORED SUBMODULAR MINIMIZER, and $Y_i \in \mathcal{L}_i$ fulfills $|X \triangle Y_i| \leq d$, then for all $T \subseteq Y_0 \triangle Y_i$ with $|T| > d$ it holds that there exists some $v \in T$ with $v \in X \triangle Y_0$.*

Proof. Indeed, assuming that the claim does not hold, we have that $T \cap (Y_0 \setminus Y_i) \subseteq X$ and that $(T \cap (Y_i \setminus Y_0)) \cap X = \emptyset$. From the former, $T \cap (Y_0 \setminus Y_i) \subseteq X \setminus Y_i$ follows, while the latter implies $T \cap (Y_i \setminus Y_0) \subseteq Y_i \setminus X$. Thus,

$$X \triangle Y_i = (X \setminus Y_i) \cup (Y_i \setminus X) \supseteq (T \cap (Y_0 \setminus Y_i)) \cup (T \cap (Y_i \setminus Y_0)) = T \cap (Y_0 \triangle Y_i) = T.$$

Hence, $|X \triangle Y_i| \geq |T| > d$, contradicting our assumption that X is a solution for I . ◀

Our algorithm will compute in $O^*(2^d)$ time³ a set $T \subseteq Y_0 \setminus Y_i$ of size $d < |T| \leq d + d_0$ that contains some element v fulfilling the above conditions. Then, by setting $Y_0 \leftarrow Y_0 \triangle \{v\}$ and reducing the value of d_0 by one, we obtain an equivalent instance I' of ANCHORED SUBMODULAR MINIMIZER which we solve by applying recursion.

Description of our algorithm.

Our algorithm will make “guesses”; nevertheless, it is a deterministic one, where guessing a value from a given set U is interpreted as branching into $|U|$ branches. We continue the computations in each branch, and whenever a branch returns a solution for the given instance, we return it; if all branches reject the instance (by outputting “No”), we also reject it. See Algorithm ASM for a pseudo-code description.

We start by checking whether Y_0 is a solution for our instance $I = (V, f_1, \dots, f_k, d, Y_0, d_0)$, that is, whether it satisfies (4). This can be done in polynomial time, since the set function $\gamma_i(Z) = \min\{|Z \triangle Y_i| : Y_i \in \mathcal{L}_i\}$ is known to be submodular and can be computed via a maximum flow computation [16]. If Y_0 satisfies (4), i.e., $\gamma_i(Y_0) \leq d$ for each $i \in [k]$, then we output Y_0 ; note that (3) is obviously satisfied by Y_0 , so Y_0 is a solution for I .

Otherwise, if $d_0 = 0$, then we output “No” as in this case the only possible solution could be Y_0 . We proceed by fixing an index $i \in [k]$ such that $\gamma_i(Y_0) > d$, that is, $|Y_0 \triangle Y_i| > d$ for all minimizers $Y \in \mathcal{L}_i$.

³ The $O^*(\cdot)$ notation hides polynomial factors.

► **Observation 15.** *If X is a solution for I that satisfies $|X \triangle Y_i| \leq d$ for some $Y_i \in \mathcal{L}_i$, then $|Y_i \triangle Y_0| \leq d + d_0$.*

Proof. Since X is a solution for I , we have $|X \triangle Y_0| \leq d_0$, and thus the triangle inequality implies $|Y_i \triangle Y_0| \leq |X \triangle Y_i| + |X \triangle Y_0| \leq d + d_0$. ◀

By our choice of i and Observation 15, we know that $d < |Y_0 \triangle Y_i| \leq d + d_0$. We are going to compute a set $T \subseteq Y_0 \triangle Y_i$ with the same bounds on its cardinality, i.e., $d < |T| \leq d + d_0$.

To this end, we compute a compact representation $G(\mathcal{L}_i)$ of the distributive lattice $\mathcal{L}_i$; let $\mathcal{P} = \{U_0, U_1, \dots, U_b, U_\infty\}$ be the partition of V in this representation.

Next, we proceed with an iterative procedure which also involves a set of guesses. We start by setting $Y = Y_0$ and $T = \emptyset$. We will maintain a family of *fixed sets* from $\mathcal{P}$ for which we already know whether they are in Y_i or not (according to our guesses); initially, no set from $\mathcal{P}$ is fixed.

After this initialization, we start an iteration where at each step we check whether $Y \in \mathcal{L}_i$ or $|T| > d$. If yes, then we stop the iteration. If not, then it can be shown that one of the following conditions holds:

Condition 1: there exists a set $S \in \mathcal{P}$ such that $S \cap Y \neq \emptyset$ and $S \setminus Y \neq \emptyset$;

Condition 2: there exists an edge (S, S') in $G(\mathcal{L}_i)$ for which $S \subseteq Y$ but $S' \cap Y = \emptyset$.

If Condition 1 holds for some set $S \in \mathcal{P}$, then we guess whether S is contained in Y_i . If $S \subseteq Y_i$ according to our guesses, then we add $S \setminus Y$ to T ; otherwise, we add $S \cap Y$ to T . In either case, we declare S as fixed, and proceed with the next iteration.

By contrast, if Condition 1 fails, but Condition 2 holds for some edge (S, S') in $G(\mathcal{L}_i)$ with endpoints $S, S' \in \mathcal{P}$, then we proceed as follows. If both S and S' are fixed, then we stop and reject the current set of guesses. If S is fixed but S' is not, then we add all elements of S' to T . If S' is fixed but S is not, then we add S to T . If neither S nor S' is fixed, then we guess whether S is contained in Y_i or not, and in the former case we add S' to T , while in the latter case we add S to T . In all cases except for the last one, we declare both S and S' as fixed; in the last case declare only S as fixed.

Next, we modify Y to reflect the current value of T by updating Y to $Y_0 \triangle T$. If $|T| > d + d_0$, then we reject the current branch. If $d < |T| \leq d + d_0$, then we finish the iteration; otherwise, we proceed with the next iteration.

Finally, when the iteration stops, we guess a vertex $v \in T$, define $Y'_{0,v} = Y_0 \triangle \{v\}$ and call the algorithm recursively on the instance $I'_v := (V, f_1, \dots, f_k, d, Y'_{0,v}, d_0 - 1)$.

Proof of Theorem 13. We first prove the correctness of the algorithm. Clearly, for $d_0 = 0$, the algorithm either correctly outputs the solution Y_0 , or rejects the instance. Hence, we can apply induction on d_0 , and assume that the algorithm works correctly when called for an instance with a smaller value for d_0 .

We show that any set X returned by the algorithm is a solution for I . First, this is clear if $X = Y_0$, as the algorithm explicitly checks whether $\gamma_i(Y_0) \leq d$ holds for each $i \in [k]$; second, if X was returned by a recursive call on some instance I'_v , then by our induction hypothesis we know that X is a solution for $I'_v = (V, f_1, \dots, f_k, d, Y'_{0,v}, d_0 - 1)$. Hence, X satisfies (4); moreover, by $|X \triangle Y'_{0,v}| \leq d_0 - 1$, it also satisfies $|X \triangle Y_0| \leq d_0$, because $|Y_0 \triangle Y'_{0,v}| = 1$.

Let us now prove that if I admits a solution X , then the algorithm correctly returns a solution for I . Let $Y_i \in \mathcal{L}_i$ be a minimizer such that $|X \triangle Y_i| \leq d$ where i is the index fixed for which $\gamma_i(Y_0) > d$.

► **Claim 16.** Assuming that all guesses made by the algorithm are correct, in the iterative process of modifying T and Y it will always hold that

■ **Algorithm ASM** Solving ANCHORED SUBMODULAR MINIMIZER on $I = (V, f_1, \dots, f_k, d, Y_0, d_0)$.

```

1: for all  $j \in [k]$  do compute the value  $\gamma_j = \min\{|Y_0 \triangle Y| : Y \in \arg \min f_j\}$ .
2: if  $\gamma_j \leq d$  for each  $j \in [k]$  then return  $Y_0$ .
3: if  $d_0 = 0$  then return “No”.
4: Fix an index  $i \in [k]$  such that  $\gamma_i > d$ .
5: Compute the graph  $G(\mathcal{L}_i)$ , and let  $\mathcal{P}$  be its vertex set.
6: Set  $T := \emptyset$  and  $Y := Y_0$ , and  $\text{fixed}(S) := \text{false}$  for each  $S \in \mathcal{P}$ .
7: while  $Y \notin \mathcal{L}_i$  and  $|T| \leq d$  do
8:   if  $\exists S \in \mathcal{P} : S \cap Y_0 \neq \emptyset, S \setminus Y_0 \neq \emptyset$  then
9:     Guess  $\text{contained}(S)$  from  $\{\text{false}, \text{true}\}$ .
10:    if  $\text{contained}(S) = \text{true}$  then set  $T := T \cup (S \setminus Y)$ .
11:    else set  $T := T \cup (S \cap Y)$ .
12:    Set  $\text{fixed}(S) := \text{true}$ .
13:  else Find an edge  $(S, S') \in G(\mathcal{L}_i)$  such that  $S \subseteq Y$  and  $S' \cap Y = \emptyset$ .
14:    if  $\text{fixed}(S) = \text{true}$  then
15:      if  $\text{fixed}(S') = \text{true}$  then return “No”.
16:      else set  $T := T \cup S'$  and  $\text{fixed}(S') := \text{true}$ .
17:    else ▷  $\text{fixed}(S) = \text{false}$ .
18:      if  $\text{fixed}(S') = \text{true}$  then set  $T := T \cup S$  and  $\text{fixed}(S) := \text{true}$ .
19:      else guess  $\text{contained}(S)$  from  $\{\text{false}, \text{true}\}$ .
20:        if  $\text{contained}(S) = \text{true}$  then set  $T := T \cup S'$ ,  $\text{fixed}(S) := \text{fixed}(S') := \text{true}$ .
21:        else set  $T := T \cup S$  and  $\text{fixed}(S) := \text{true}$ .
22:  Set  $Y := Y_0 \triangle T$ .
23:  if  $|T| > d + d_0$  then return “No”.
24:  Guess a vertex  $v$  from  $T$ .
25:  Set  $Y'_{0,v} = Y_0 \triangle \{v\}$  and  $I'_v = (V, f_1, \dots, f_k, d, Y'_{0,v}, d_0 - 1)$ .
26: return  $\text{ASM}(I'_v)$ .

```

- (i) $T \subseteq Y_i \triangle Y_0$, and
- (ii) for each $S \in \mathcal{P}$:
 - (a) if S is fixed, then $S \subseteq Y \iff S \subseteq Y_i$, and $S \cap Y = \emptyset \iff S \cap Y_i = \emptyset$, and
 - (b) if $v \in S$ and S is not fixed, then $v \in Y \iff v \in Y_0$.

Proof. The claim clearly holds initially, when $T = \emptyset$, $Y = Y_0$ and no set is fixed. Consider now the j -th run of the iteration for some $j > 0$. Let T and Y be as at the beginning of the iteration. Note that $Y = Y_0 \triangle T$ due to the last step of the $(j - 1)$ -st run of the iteration on line 22.

Suppose that Condition 1 holds for some set $S \in \mathcal{P}$. Using Birkhoff’s representation theorem, we know that either $S \subseteq Y_i$ or $S \cap Y_i = \emptyset$. By Condition 1 and claim (ii/a) of our induction hypothesis ($\mathcal{IH}$ for short), S is not fixed. If $S \subseteq Y_i$, then by claim (ii/b) of our $\mathcal{IH}$ (applicable as S is not fixed), we know $S \setminus Y = S \setminus Y_0 \subseteq Y_i \triangle Y_0$. Similarly, if $S \cap Y_i = \emptyset$, then we get $S \cap Y = S \cap Y_0 \subseteq Y_i \triangle Y_0$. Assuming that the algorithm correctly guesses which among these two cases holds, the elements added to T on line 10 or 11 are indeed contained in $Y_i \triangle Y_0$, proving that (i) remains true in this case.

Suppose now that Condition 2 holds for some edge (S, S') in $G(\mathcal{L}_i)$. By our inductive hypothesis, S and S' cannot both be fixed (assuming correct guesses), since $S \subseteq Y_i$ and

$S' \cap Y_i = \emptyset$ would then contradict Birkhoff's representation theorem, as the edge (S, S') would leave the closed set $\mathcal{P}(Y_i) := \{S : S \in \mathcal{P}, S \subseteq Y_i\}$ in $G(\mathcal{L}_i)$.

Now, if S is fixed, then by claim (ii/a) of our $\mathcal{IH}$, $S \subseteq Y$ implies $S \subseteq Y_i$. This means that $S' \subseteq Y_i$ must hold as well, since $\mathcal{P}(Y_i)$ is closed. Moreover, if S' is not fixed, then $S' \cap Y = \emptyset$ implies $S' \cap Y_0 = \emptyset$ due to claim (ii/b) of the $\mathcal{IH}$; hence $S' \subseteq Y_i \triangle Y_0$. The same arguments hold for the case when initially neither S nor S' is fixed, and the algorithm correctly guesses that S is contained in Y_i . We obtain that the vertices added to T on line 16 or 20 are indeed contained in $Y_i \triangle Y_0$.

By contrast, if S is not fixed, then claim (ii/b) of our $\mathcal{IH}$ and $S \subseteq Y$ imply $S \subseteq Y_0$. Now, if S' is fixed, then claim (ii/a) of our $\mathcal{IH}$ means that $S' \cap Y_i = \emptyset$; hence we get $S \notin \mathcal{P}(Y_i)$, because $\mathcal{P}(Y_i)$ is closed in $G(\mathcal{L}_i)$. Then $S \subseteq Y_i \triangle Y_0$ follows, so the set added to T on line 18 is indeed contained in $Y_i \triangle Y_0$. The only remaining case is when neither S nor S' is fixed initially, and the algorithm guesses $S \not\subseteq Y_i$. Recall that by claim (ii/b) of the $\mathcal{IH}$, we have $S \subseteq Y_0$, so a correct guess immediately yields $S \subseteq Y_i \triangle Y_0$, and thus the set added to T on line 21 is in $Y_i \triangle Y_0$ as well. This proves that (i) remains true at the end of the j -th run of the algorithm as well.

Observe that whenever the algorithm puts some element $v \in V$ into Y , it also declares the set in $\mathcal{P}$ containing v fixed; from this, it immediately follows that claim (ii/b) remains true. To see that claim (ii/a) is maintained well, note first that the algorithm never removes or adds vertices of a fixed set from Y or to Y , respectively. Therefore, we only need to check those sets that we declared fixed during this iteration. By the above arguments, it is not hard to verify that whenever we declare some set S as fixed, then we also ensure $S \subseteq Y \iff S \subseteq Y_i$ when updating Y to $Y_0 \triangle T$. This finishes the proof of the claim. $\triangleleft$

Next, we show that in each run of the iteration, Condition 1 or Condition 2 holds. Indeed, if neither holds, then (1) $Y = \bigcup_{U \in \mathcal{P}'} U$ for some $\mathcal{P}' \subseteq \mathcal{P}$, and (2) no edge leaves $\mathcal{P}'$ in $G(\mathcal{L}_i)$. Hence, $Y \in \mathcal{L}_i$ by Birkhoff's representation theorem. However, since $|T| \leq d$ holds at the beginning of each iteration, $|Y \triangle Y_0| = |T| \leq d$ follows, contradicting our choice of i .

Therefore, in each run of the iteration, at least one element of V is put into T . Thus, the iteration stops after at most $d + 1$ runs, at which point the obtained set T has size greater than d . Using now statement (i) of Claim 16, Observation 14 yields that T contains at least one vertex from $X \triangle Y_0$. Assuming that the algorithm guesses such a vertex v correctly, it is clear that our solution X for I will also be a solution for the instance I'_v . Using our inductive hypothesis, we obtain that the recursive call returns a correct solution for I'_v which, as discussed already, will be a solution for I as well. Hence, our algorithm is correct.

Finally, let us bound the running time. Consider the search tree $\mathcal{T}$ where each node corresponds to a call of Algorithm ASM. Note that the value of d_0 decreases by one in each recursive call, and the algorithm stops when $d_0 = 0$. Hence $\mathcal{T}$ has depth at most d_0 . Consider the guesses made during the execution of a single call of the algorithm (without taking into account the guesses in the recursive calls): we make at most one guess in each iteration on line 9 or on line 19, leading to at most 2^{d+1} possibilities. Then the algorithm further guesses a vertex from T , leading to a total of at most $2^{d+1}|T| \leq 2^{d+1}(d + d_0) = 2^{O(d)}$ possibilities; recall that $d_0 \leq d$. We get that the number of nodes in our search tree is $2^{d_0 O(d)}$. Since all computations for a fixed series of guesses take polynomial time, we obtain that the running time is indeed fixed-parameter tractable with parameter d . $\blacktriangleleft$

4 Hardness Results

We first introduce a separation problem that we will use as an intermediary problem in our hardness proofs. Given a subset $X \subseteq V$ of some universe V that contains two distinguished elements, s and t , and a family Π of pairwise disjoint subsets of V , we define the *distance* of the set X from Π as $\sum_{S \in \Pi} \text{dist}_{s,t}(X, S)$ where

$$\text{dist}_{s,t}(X, S) = \begin{cases} \min\{|S \setminus X|, |S \cap X|\} & \text{if } s \notin S, t \notin S; \\ |S \setminus X| & \text{if } s \in S, t \notin S; \\ |S \cap X| & \text{if } s \notin S, t \in S; \\ +\infty & \text{if } s \in S, t \in S. \end{cases}$$

Given a collection of set families $\Pi_1, \dots, \Pi_k$, the goal is to find a set $X \subseteq V$ that separates s from t in the sense that $s \in X$ but $t \notin X$, and subject to this constraint, minimizes the maximum distance of X from the given set families. Formally, the problem is:

ROBUST SEPARATION:

Input: A finite set V with two elements $s, t \in V$, set families $\Pi_1, \dots, \Pi_k$ where each Π_i is a collection of pairwise disjoint subsets of V , and an integer $d \in \mathbb{N}$.

Task: Find a set $X \subseteq V$ containing s but not t such that for each $i \in [k]$

$$\sum_{S \in \Pi_i} \text{dist}_{s,t}(X, S) \leq d, \quad (5)$$

or output “No” if no such set X exists.

Given an instance $(V, s, t, \Pi_1, \dots, \Pi_k, d)$ of ROBUST SEPARATION, the reduction proving Lemma 17 below constructs a graph G_i over V for each $i \in [k]$ in which each set in Π_i forms a clique, and defines a submodular function f_i based on the cut function of G_i .

► **Lemma 17.** *ROBUST SEPARATION can be reduced to ROBUST SUBMODULAR MINIMIZER in polynomial time via a reduction that preserves the values of both k and d .*

Proof. Let us be given an instance $I_{\text{RSep}} = (V, s, t, \Pi_1, \dots, \Pi_k, d)$ of ROBUST SEPARATION. Clearly, we may assume that no set family Π_i contains a set S that contains both s and t , as that would imply $\text{dist}_{s,t}(X, S) = +\infty$ for all sets $X \subseteq V$, in which case we can clearly answer “No”.

Let $\tilde{V} = V \setminus \{s, t\}$. For each $i \in [k]$ we construct a directed graph $G_i = (V, E_i)$ from Π_i by setting

$$E_i = \{uv : \exists S \in \Pi_i, u, v \in S\}.$$

We set the cost of every edge in E_i to be $+\infty$. Observe that an (s, t) -cut $X \subseteq V$ is a minimum (s, t) -cut in G_i if and only if for each $S \in \Pi_i$ either X contains S , or is disjoint from S . Let κ_i denote the (weighted) cut function for G_i , and define $f_i : 2^{\tilde{V}} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ such that $f_i(X) = \kappa_i(X \cup \{s\})$ for each $X \subseteq \tilde{V}$. Then f_i is submodular.

We claim that for each set $X \subseteq \tilde{V}$, the set $X \cup \{s\}$ is a solution for our instance I_{RSep} of ROBUST SEPARATION if and only if X is a solution for the instance $I_{\text{RSubMin}} = (\tilde{V}, f_1, \dots, f_k, d)$ of ROBUST SUBMODULAR MINIMIZER.

To see this, first assume that $X \subseteq V$ contains s but not t , and fulfills (5) for each $i \in [k]$. For an element $v \in V$, let $\Pi_i(v)$ be the unique set in Π_i containing v , if there is such a set,

otherwise set $\Pi_i(v) = \emptyset$. By our assumption that no set in Π_i contains both s and t , we know that $\Pi_i(s) \neq \Pi_i(t)$ unless both of them are empty. Define

$$Y_i = X \cup \Pi_i(s) \setminus \Pi_i(t) \setminus \left(\bigcup \{S \in \Pi_i : |S \cap X| < |S \setminus X|, s \notin S\} \right) \\ \cup \left(\bigcup \{S \in \Pi_i : |S \cap X| \geq |S \setminus X|, t \notin S\} \right).$$

Notice that when constructing Y_i , each set in Π_i is either fully added to Y_i , or fully removed from it. Moreover, it is an (s, t) -cut, since no set containing s is ever removed from X , and similarly, no set containing t is ever added to X . Therefore, Y_i is a minimum (s, t) -cut in G_i by the observations above.

Since both X and Y_i are (s, t) -cuts, let us define $\tilde{X} = X \setminus \{s\}$ and $\tilde{Y}_i = Y_i \setminus \{s\}$; since Y_i is a minimum (s, t) -cut, we have $\tilde{Y}_i \in \arg \min f_i$. Moreover,

$$\begin{aligned} |\tilde{X} \triangle \tilde{Y}_i| &= |X \triangle Y_i| = |X \setminus Y_i| + |Y_i \setminus X| \\ &= |\Pi_i(t) \cap X| + \left| \bigcup \{S \cap X : S \in \Pi_i, |S \cap X| < |S \setminus X|, s \notin S, t \notin S\} \right| \\ &\quad + |\Pi_i(s) \setminus X| + \left| \bigcup \{S \setminus X : S \in \Pi_i, |S \cap X| \geq |S \setminus X|, s \notin S, t \notin S\} \right| \\ &= \text{dist}_{s,t}(X, \Pi_i(s)) + \text{dist}_{s,t}(X, \Pi_i(t)) + \sum_{S \in \Pi_i, s \notin S, t \notin S} \min\{|S \setminus X|, |S \cap X|\} \\ &= \sum_{S \in \Pi_i} \text{dist}_{s,t}(X, S) \leq d \end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality holds because X satisfies (5). Hence, $\tilde{X}$ is indeed a solution for I_{RSubMin} .

For the other direction, let $X \subseteq \tilde{V}$ be a solution for I_{RSubMin} . Then for each $i \in [k]$ there exists a set $Y_i \in \arg \min f_i$ that satisfies $|X \triangle Y_i| \leq d$; define Y_i among all such sets so that $|X \triangle Y_i|$ is minimized. Recall that $Y_i \in \arg \min f_i$ means that $Y_i \cup \{s\}$ is a minimum (s, t) -cut in G_i ; let us use the notation $Y'_i = Y_i \cup \{s\}$. Note that if some element $v \in \tilde{V}$ is not contained in any set of Π_i , then adding it to, or removing it from, a minimum (s, t) -cut in G_i also yields a minimum (s, t) -cut. This implies that $Y_i \cap (V \setminus \bigcup_{S \in \Pi_i} S) = X \cap (V \setminus \bigcup_{S \in \Pi_i} S)$, as otherwise we could replace $Y_i \cap (V \setminus \bigcup_{S \in \Pi_i} S)$ with $X \cap (V \setminus \bigcup_{S \in \Pi_i} S)$ in Y_i to obtain another minimizer for f_i that is closer to X than Y_i ; we refer to this as fact (f1).

Recall also that since Y'_i is a minimum (s, t) -cut in G_i , for each $S \in \Pi_i$ it either contains S or is disjoint from it. We refer to this observation as fact (f2).

Let us define $X' = X \cup \{s\}$. We now prove that X' is a solution for the instance I_{RSep} . Applying facts (f1) and (f2), for each $i \in [k]$ we get

$$\begin{aligned} d &\geq |X \triangle Y_i| \stackrel{(f1)}{=} |\{v : v \in S, S \in \Pi_i, v \in X \triangle Y_i\}| \\ &\stackrel{(f2)}{=} |\{v : v \in S, S \in \Pi_i, S \subseteq Y'_i, v \in X \triangle Y_i\}| \\ &\quad + |\{v : v \in S, S \in \Pi_i, S \cap Y'_i = \emptyset, v \in X \triangle Y_i\}| \\ &= |\{v : v \in S, S \in \Pi_i, S \subseteq Y'_i, v \in (S \cap Y_i) \setminus X\}| \\ &\quad + |\{v : v \in S, S \in \Pi_i, S \cap Y'_i = \emptyset, v \in S \cap X\}| \\ &= |(\Pi_i(s) \setminus \{s\}) \setminus X| + \left| \bigcup \{S \setminus X : s \notin S \in \Pi_i, S \subseteq Y_i\} \right| \\ &\quad + \left| \bigcup \{S \cap X : S \in \Pi_i, S \cap Y'_i = \emptyset\} \right| \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= |\Pi_i(s) \setminus X'| + \left| \bigcup \{S \setminus X' : s \notin S \in \Pi_i, S \subseteq Y_i\} \right| \\
&\quad + \left| \bigcup \{S \cap X' : S \in \Pi_i, S \cap Y_i' = \emptyset\} \right| \\
&\geq \text{dist}_{s,t}(X', \Pi_i(s)) + \sum_{S \in \Pi_i, s \notin S, t \notin S} \min\{|S \setminus X|, |S \cap X|\} + \text{dist}_{s,t}(X', \Pi_i(t)) \\
&= \sum_{S \in \Pi_i} \text{dist}_{s,t}(X', S).
\end{aligned}$$

Hence, X' is indeed a solution for the instance I_{RSep} of ROBUST SEPARATION, as promised. This proves the correctness of our reduction. $\blacktriangleleft$

4.1 NP-hardness for a constant $d \geq 1$

In this section, we prove that ROBUST SUBMODULAR MINIMIZER is NP-hard for each constant $d \geq 1$. To this end, we first prove the NP-hardness of ROBUST SEPARATION in the case $d = 1$, and then extend this result to hold for any constant $d \geq 1$.

For the case $d = 1$, we present a reduction from the 1-IN-3 SAT problem. In this problem, we are given a set V of variables and a set $\mathcal{C}$ of clauses, with each clause $C \in \mathcal{C}$ containing exactly three distinct literals; here, a *literal* is either a variable $v \in V$ or its negation $\bar{v}$. Given a truth assignment $\phi : V \rightarrow \{\text{true}, \text{false}\}$, we automatically extend it to the set $\bar{V} = \{\bar{v} : v \in V\}$ of negative literals by setting $\phi(\bar{v}) = \text{true}$ if and only if $\phi(v) = \text{false}$. We say that a truth assignment is *valid*, if it maps *exactly* one literal in each clause to **true**. The task in the 1-IN-3 SAT problem is to decide whether a valid truth assignment exists. This problem is NP-complete [26].

► **Theorem 18.** *ROBUST SEPARATION is NP-hard even when $d = 1$.*

Proof. Suppose that we are given an instance of the 1-IN-3 SAT problem with variable set V and clause set $\mathcal{C} = \{C_1 \dots, C_m\}$. We construct an instance I_{RS} of ROBUST SEPARATION as follows. In addition to the set V of variables and the set $\bar{V} = \{\bar{v} : v \in V\}$ of negative literals, we introduce our two distinguished elements, s and t . We further introduce a set $R_j = \{r_{j,1}, r_{j,2}, r_{j,3}\}$ together with an extra element z_j for each clause $C_j \in \mathcal{C}$ to form our universe U . We let $R = R_1 \cup \dots \cup R_m$ and $Z = \{z_1, \dots, z_m\}$, so that


$$U = V \cup \bar{V} \cup \{s, t\} \cup \bigcup_{j \in [m]} (R_j \cup \{z_j\}) = V \cup \bar{V} \cup \{s, t\} \cup R \cup Z.$$

Next, for each variable, we introduce two set families, Π_v and $\Pi_{\bar{v}}$, where

$$\Pi_v = \{\{s, v, \bar{v}\} \cup R\} \quad \text{and} \quad \Pi_{\bar{v}} = \{\{v, \bar{v}, t\}\}.$$

For simplicity, we write $\Pi(V) = \langle \Pi_v, \Pi_{\bar{v}} : v \in V \rangle$ to denote the $2|V|$ -tuple formed by these set families. For each clause $C_j \in \mathcal{C}$, we fix an arbitrary ordering of its literals, and we denote the first, second, and third literals in C_j as $\ell_{j,1}, \ell_{j,2}$ and $\ell_{j,3}$. We define three set families (see also Figure 1):

$$\begin{aligned}
\Pi_{C_j} &= \{S_j\} & \text{where } S_j &= C_j \cup \{t\} = \{\ell_{j,1}, \ell_{j,2}, \ell_{j,3}, t\}, \\
\Pi_{C_j}^\alpha &= \{S_j^{\alpha,1}, S_j^{\alpha,2}\} & \text{where } S_j^{\alpha,1} &= \{\ell_{j,1}, z_j\}, \\
& & S_j^{\alpha,2} &= \{\ell_{j,2}, r_{j,2}\}; \\
\Pi_{C_j}^\beta &= \{S_j^{\beta,1}, S_j^{\beta,2}\} & \text{where } S_j^{\beta,1} &= \{r_{j,1}, z_j\}, \\
& & S_j^{\beta,2} &= \{\ell_{j,3}, r_{j,3}\}.
\end{aligned}$$



■ **Figure 1** The set families Π_{C_j} , $\Pi_{C_j}^\alpha$, and $\Pi_{C_j}^\beta$ defined for some clause C_j . The three figures depict the construction of the set X depending on which of the literals takes **true** value; elements of the set X are shown as black circles.

We also write $\Pi(\mathcal{C}) = \langle \Pi_C, \Pi_C^\alpha, \Pi_C^\beta : C \in \mathcal{C} \rangle$ to denote the $3|\mathcal{C}|$ -tuple formed by these set families in an arbitrarily fixed ordering. We set our threshold as $d = 1$. Thus, our instance of ROBUST SEPARATION is $I_{RS} = (U, s, t, \Pi(V), \Pi(\mathcal{C}), 1)$.

We will show that the constructed instance I_{RS} has a solution if and only if our instance $(V, \mathcal{C})$ of the 1-IN-3 SAT problem is solvable.

First suppose that there is a valid truth assignment ϕ for $(V, \mathcal{C})$. Consider the set

$$X = \{s\} \cup R \cup \{\ell : \ell \in V \cup \bar{V}, \phi(\ell) = \mathbf{true}\} \cup \{z_j : z_j \in Z, \phi(\ell_{j,3}) = \mathbf{false}\}.$$

Note that X contains s , but not t (see again Figure 1 for an illustration). We are going to show that X is a solution for I_{RS} . Since ϕ maps exactly one literal in $\{v, \bar{v}\}$ to **true** for each $v \in V$, by $R \cup \{s\} \subseteq X$ we get that

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{S \in \Pi_v} \text{dist}_{s,t}(X, S) &= |(\{s, v, \bar{v}\} \cup R) \setminus X| = |\{v, \bar{v}\} \setminus X| = 1 \quad \text{and} \\ \sum_{S \in \Pi_{\bar{v}}} \text{dist}_{s,t}(X, S) &= |(\{v, \bar{v}, t\}) \cap X| = |\{v, \bar{v}\} \cap X| = 1. \end{aligned}$$

For the distance of X from the set families associated with some clause $C_j \in \mathcal{C}$, by the validity of ϕ we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{S \in \Pi_{C_j}} \text{dist}_{s,t}(X, S) &= |(C_j \cup \{t\}) \cap X| = 1; \\ \sum_{S \in \Pi_{C_j}^\alpha} \text{dist}_{s,t}(X, S) &= \min\{|S_j^{\alpha,1} \setminus X|, |S_j^{\alpha,1} \cap X|\} + \min\{|S_j^{\alpha,2} \setminus X|, |S_j^{\alpha,2} \cap X|\} \\ &= \min\{|\{\ell_{j,1}, z_j\} \setminus X|, |\{\ell_{j,1}, z_j\} \cap X|\} \\ &\quad + \min\{|\{\ell_{j,2}, r_{j,2}\} \setminus X|, |\{\ell_{j,2}, r_{j,2}\} \cap X|\} \\ &= \begin{cases} \min\{0, 2\} + \min\{1, 1\} = 1 & \text{if } \phi(\ell_{j,1}) = \mathbf{true} \\ \min\{1, 1\} + \min\{0, 2\} = 1 & \text{if } \phi(\ell_{j,2}) = \mathbf{true} \\ \min\{2, 0\} + \min\{1, 1\} = 1 & \text{if } \phi(\ell_{j,3}) = \mathbf{true} \end{cases} = 1; \\ \sum_{S \in \Pi_{C_j}^\beta} \text{dist}_{s,t}(X, S) &= \min\{|S_j^{\beta,1} \setminus X|, |S_j^{\beta,1} \cap X|\} + \min\{|S_j^{\beta,2} \setminus X|, |S_j^{\beta,2} \cap X|\} \\ &= \min\{|\{r_{j,1}, z_j\} \setminus X|, |\{r_{j,1}, z_j\} \cap X|\} \\ &\quad + \min\{|\{\ell_{j,3}, r_{j,3}\} \setminus X|, |\{\ell_{j,3}, r_{j,3}\} \cap X|\} \end{aligned}$$

$$= \left\{ \begin{array}{ll} \min\{0, 2\} + \min\{1, 1\} = 1 & \text{if } \phi(\ell_{j,1}) = \mathbf{true} \\ \min\{0, 2\} + \min\{1, 1\} = 1 & \text{if } \phi(\ell_{j,2}) = \mathbf{true} \\ \min\{1, 1\} + \min\{0, 2\} = 1 & \text{if } \phi(\ell_{j,3}) = \mathbf{true} \end{array} \right\} = 1.$$

Hence, X satisfies constraint (5) for each set family, and thus is a solution for I_{RS} .

For the other direction, suppose that there exists a subset $X \subseteq U$, containing s but not t , whose distance from each set family in I_{RS} is at most 1. Let us define a truth assignment ϕ by setting $\phi(v) = \mathbf{true}$ if and only if $v \in X$ for each variable $v \in V$; we are going to show that ϕ is valid.

To this end, let us first observe that

$$\begin{aligned} 1 = d &\geq \sum_{S \in \Pi_v} \text{dist}_{s,t}(X, S) = |(\{s, v, \bar{v}\} \cup R) \setminus X| \quad \text{and} \\ 1 = d &\geq \sum_{S \in \Pi_{\bar{v}}} \text{dist}_{s,t}(X, S) = |\{v, \bar{v}, t\} \cap X|. \end{aligned} \tag{6}$$

This implies that

$$|\{v, \bar{v}\} \setminus X| \leq 1 \quad \text{and} \quad |\{v, \bar{v}\} \cap X| \leq 1. \tag{7}$$

By $|\{v, \bar{v}\} \setminus X| + |\{v, \bar{v}\} \cap X| = |\{v, \bar{v}\}| = 2$, we obtain that all inequalities in (7), and hence also in (6), must hold with equality. That is, for each variable $v \in V$, exactly one of the literals v and $\bar{v}$ is contained in X . In other words, a literal $\ell \in V \cup \bar{V}$ is set to $\mathbf{true}$ by ϕ if and only if $\ell \in X$. Moreover, we must also have $R \subseteq X$ due to the equality in (6).

Consider now the set family Π_C for some $C \in \mathcal{C}$, and recall that $t \notin X$:

$$1 \geq d = \sum_{S \in \Pi_C} \text{dist}_{s,t}(X, S) = \text{dist}_{s,t}(X, S_j) = |(C \cup \{t\}) \cap X| = |C \cap X|.$$

This means that ϕ sets at most one literal to $\mathbf{true}$ in each clause $C \in \mathcal{C}$. To prove that ϕ is valid, let us assume for the sake of contradiction that $C_j \cap X = \emptyset$ for some $C_j \in \mathcal{C}$. In this case we have $\{\ell_{j,1}, \ell_{j,2}, \ell_{j,3}\} \cap X = \emptyset$; keep in mind also that $R \subseteq X$. On the one hand, if $z_j \in X$, then we get

$$\begin{aligned} 1 &\geq \sum_{S \in \Pi_{C_j}^\alpha} \text{dist}_{s,t}(X, S) = \min\{|S_j^{\alpha,1} \setminus X|, |S_j^{\alpha,1} \cap X|\} + \min\{|S_j^{\alpha,2} \setminus X|, |S_j^{\alpha,2} \cap X|\} \\ &= \min\{|\{\ell_{j,1}, z_j\} \setminus X|, |\{\ell_{j,1}, z_j\} \cap X|\} + \min\{|\{\ell_{j,2}, r_{j,2}\} \setminus X|, |\{\ell_{j,2}, r_{j,2}\} \cap X|\} \\ &= \min\{1, 1\} + \min\{1, 1\} = 2, \end{aligned}$$

a contradiction. On the other hand, if $z_j \notin X$, then we get

$$\begin{aligned} 1 &\geq \sum_{S \in \Pi_{C_j}^\beta} \text{dist}_{s,t}(X, S) = \min\{|S_j^{\beta,1} \setminus X|, |S_j^{\beta,1} \cap X|\} + \min\{|S_j^{\beta,2} \setminus X|, |S_j^{\beta,2} \cap X|\} \\ &= \min\{|\{r_{j,1}, z_j\} \setminus X|, |\{r_{j,1}, z_j\} \cap X|\} + \min\{|\{\ell_{j,3}, r_{j,3}\} \setminus X|, |\{\ell_{j,3}, r_{j,3}\} \cap X|\} \\ &= \min\{1, 1\} + \min\{1, 1\} = 2, \end{aligned}$$

which is again a contradiction. This proves that ϕ is indeed a valid truth assignment for our instance of 1-IN-3 SAT, and so the claim holds. $\blacktriangleleft$

Using Theorem 18, it is not hard to show that ROBUST SEPARATION remains NP-hard for any constant $d \geq 1$.

► **Lemma 19.** *ROBUST SEPARATION is NP-hard for each constant $d \geq 1$.*

Proof. We present a reduction from ROBUST SEPARATION with $d = 1$ which is NP-hard by Theorem 18. Let $I = (V, s, t, \Pi_1, \dots, \Pi_k, 1)$ be our input instance. We compute a modified instance I' of ROBUST SEPARATION with threshold $d \geq 1$ as follows. First, we introduce a set D of dummy $2d$ items and add them to our universe. Next, we add two new set families, each containing a single set: namely, we let $\Pi_{k+1} = \{\{D \cup \{s\}\}\}$ and $\Pi_{k+2} = \{\{D \cup \{t\}\}\}$. Furthermore, let $\hat{D}$ be an arbitrarily fixed subset of D of size $2d-1$. For each $i \in [k]$ we define $\Pi'_i = \Pi_i \cup \{\hat{D}\}$, that is, we add the set $\hat{D}$ to Π_i . Let $I' = (V \cup D, s, t, \Pi'_1, \dots, \Pi'_k, \Pi_{k+1}, \Pi_{k+2}, d)$ be our constructed instance.

We claim I admits a solution if and only if I' admits one.

First, let X be a solution for I . Let us fix some $D' \subseteq \hat{D}$ with $|D'| = d$, and define $X' = X \cup D'$. Then for each $i \in [k]$ and $S \in \Pi_i$, since $S \cap D = \emptyset$ we get $S \setminus X' = S \setminus X$ and $S \cap X' = S \cap X$; this yields $\text{dist}_{s,t}(X', S) = \text{dist}_{s,t}(X, S)$. Hence, for each $i \in [k]$ we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{S \in \Pi'_i} \text{dist}_{s,t}(X', S) &= \sum_{S \in \Pi_i} \text{dist}_{s,t}(X', S) + \text{dist}_{s,t}(X', \hat{D}) \\ &= \sum_{S \in \Pi_i} \text{dist}_{s,t}(X, S) + \text{dist}_{s,t}(X', \hat{D}) \\ &\leq 1 + \min\{|\hat{D} \setminus X'|, |\hat{D} \cap X'|\} = 1 + \min\{d-1, d\} = d \end{aligned}$$

where the inequality holds by our assumption on X . Moreover, since $s \in X \subseteq X'$, the distance of X' from Π_{k+1} is

$$\sum_{S \in \Pi_{k+1}} \text{dist}_{s,t}(X', S) = \text{dist}_{s,t}(X', D \cup \{s\}) = |(D \cup \{s\}) \setminus X'| = |D \setminus D'| = d$$

and similarly, since $t \notin X$ implies $t \notin X'$, the distance of X' from Π_{k+2} is

$$\sum_{S \in \Pi_{k+2}} \text{dist}_{s,t}(X', S) = \text{dist}_{s,t}(X', D \cup \{t\}) = |(D \cup \{t\}) \cap X'| = |D \cap D'| = d.$$

Hence, X' is indeed a solution for I' .

For the other direction, let X' be a solution for I' . Since X' contains s but not t , we have

$$\begin{aligned} d &\geq \sum_{S \in \Pi_{k+1}} \text{dist}_{s,t}(X', S) = \text{dist}_{s,t}(X', D \cup \{s\}) = |(D \cup \{s\}) \setminus X'| = |D \setminus X'| \quad \text{and} \\ d &\geq \sum_{S \in \Pi_{k+2}} \text{dist}_{s,t}(X', S) = \text{dist}_{s,t}(X', D \cup \{t\}) = |(D \cup \{t\}) \cap X'| = |D \cap X'|. \end{aligned}$$

However, using $|D \setminus X'| + |D \cap X'| = |D| = 2d$, we obtain that both of the above inequalities hold with equality. Therefore, X' contains exactly d dummy elements from D . Recall that $|\hat{D}| = 2d-1$. This implies that $|\hat{D} \cap X'| \in \{d-1, d\}$ and $|\hat{D} \setminus X'| \in \{d-1, d\}$. From this, it follows that $\text{dist}_{s,t}(X', \hat{D}) = \min\{|\hat{D} \setminus X'|, |\hat{D} \cap X'|\} \geq d-1$. We obtain that for each $i \in [k]$

$$d \geq \sum_{S \in \Pi'_i} \text{dist}_{s,t}(X', S) = \sum_{S \in \Pi_i} \text{dist}_{s,t}(X', S) + \text{dist}_{s,t}(X', \hat{D}) \geq \sum_{S \in \Pi_i} \text{dist}_{s,t}(X', S) + d-1$$

which implies that the distance of X' from Π_i is $\sum_{S \in \Pi_i} \text{dist}_{s,t}(X', S) \leq 1$.

Let $X = X' \cap V$. Again, recall that for each $i \in [k]$ and $S \in \Pi_i$ we know $S \subseteq V$, since S contains no dummies. Thus $S \cap X' = S \cap X$, and $S \setminus X' = S \setminus X$, from which $\text{dist}_{s,t}(X', S) = \text{dist}_{s,t}(X, S)$ follows. Hence, we obtain that $\sum_{S \in \Pi_i} \text{dist}_{s,t}(X, S) \leq 1$ holds for each $i \in [k]$, and so X is a solution for the original instance I . ◀

► **Corollary 20.** *ROBUST SUBMODULAR MINIMIZER is NP-hard for each constant $d \geq 1$.*

4.2 NP-hardness for a constant $k \geq 3$

In this section we prove that ROBUST SEPARATION, and hence, ROBUST SUBMODULAR MINIMIZER is NP-hard even for $k = 3$. To this end, we are going to define another intermediary problem. First consider the MOST BALANCED MINIMUM CUT problem, proved to be NP-complete by Bonsma [3]. The input of this problem is an undirected graph $G = (V, E)$ with two distinguished vertices, s and t , and a parameter ℓ . The task is to decide whether there exists a minimum (s, t) -cut $X \subseteq V$ in G such that $\min\{|X|, |V \setminus X|\} \geq \ell$; recall that a set of vertices $X \subseteq V$ is a minimum (s, t) -cut in the *undirected* graph G if $s \in X, t \notin X$ and subject to this, the value $|\delta(X)|$, i.e., the number of edges between X and $V \setminus X$, is minimized.

Instead of the MOST BALANCED MINIMUM CUT problem, it will be more convenient to use a variant that we call PERFECTLY BALANCED MINIMUM CUT where we seek a minimum (s, t) -cut that contains exactly half of the vertices. Formally, its input is an undirected graph $G = (V, E)$ with two distinguished vertices, s and t , and its task is to find a minimum (s, t) -cut X with $|X| = |V|/2$. Since MOST BALANCED MINIMUM CUT can be reduced to PERFECTLY BALANCED MINIMUM CUT by simply adding a sufficient number of isolated vertices, we obtain the following.

► **Lemma 21.** *PERFECTLY BALANCED MINIMUM CUT is NP-complete.*


Proof. We give a reduction from MOST BALANCED MINIMUM CUT. Let $I = (G, s, t, \ell)$ with $G = (V, E)$ be our input instance. We may assume $\ell \leq |V|/2$, as otherwise I is clearly a “no”-instance. We construct an instance $I' = (G', s, t)$ of PERFECTLY BALANCED MINIMUM CUT by simply adding $|V| - 2\ell$ isolated vertices to G , so that the number of vertices in G' is $2|V| - 2\ell$. Clearly, if there is a minimum (s, t) -cut X such that $\min\{|X|, |V| - |X|\} \geq \ell$, then adding $|V| - \ell - |X| \geq 0$ vertices yields a minimum (s, t) -cut in G' that contains exactly half of the vertices of G' . Conversely, if X' is a minimum (s, t) -cut in G' that contains half of the vertices, i.e., $|V| - \ell$ vertices, then removing the newly added isolated vertices from it yields a minimum (s, t) -cut X in G with $|V| - \ell - (|V| - 2\ell) = \ell \leq |X| \leq |V| - \ell$. ◀

► **Theorem 22 (*)**. *ROBUST SEPARATION is NP-hard even when $k = 3$.*

Proof. We present a reduction from the PERFECTLY BALANCED MINIMUM CUT problem. Let $I = (G, s, t)$ be our input instance where $G = (V, E)$. Clearly, we may assume that $|V|$ is even, as otherwise I is trivially a “no”-instance. First we compute the number of edges in a minimum (s, t) -cut using standard flow techniques; let δ^* denote this value, that is, $\delta^* = \min_{Y: s \in Y \subseteq V \setminus \{t\}} |\delta(Y)|$.

Second, we modify G in order to ensure that there are at least $2\delta^* + 2$ vertices in the graph; if this holds already for G , then we set $G' = G$. Otherwise, we construct a new graph $G' = (V', E')$ by adding two sets of vertices, A_s and A_t , to the graph with $|A_s| = |A_t| = \lceil (2\delta^* + 2 - |V|)/2 \rceil$, and connecting each vertex in A_s to s , as well as each vertex in A_t to t , with an edge. Observe that all minimum (s, t) -cuts in G' contain A_s and are disjoint from A_t . Moreover, any minimum (s, t) -cut X in G corresponds to a minimum (s, t) -cut $X \cup A_s$ in G' and vice versa. Thus, $I' = (G', s, t)$ is an instance of PERFECTLY BALANCED MINIMUM CUT equivalent with I . Let $2n + 2$ denote the number of vertices in G' , so that $\tilde{V} := V' \setminus \{s, t\}$ has $2n$ vertices. By our choice of $|A_s| = |A_t|$, we know that the number of vertices in G' is $|V'| = 2n + 2 \geq |V| + (2\delta^* + 2 - |V|) = 2\delta^* + 2$, as promised.

Let us construct an instance J of ROBUST SEPARATION. We define our universe U as follows. For each $v \in V'$ we introduce a set $P(v) = \{\hat{v}\} \cup \{v^u : uv \in E\}$, and we



■ **Figure 2** Set families Π_1 and Π_2 defined in the proof of Theorem 22. The figure depicts each set $P(v)$ as a star with its center corresponding to $\hat{v}$; however, note that the connections within $P(v)$ are used only for presentational purposes, and are not part of the construction itself (as the constructed instance involves set families and no graphs).

additionally define a copy $V^* = \{v^* : v \in V\}$ of V , a set R of size $|R| = n - \delta^*$, and a copy $R' = \{r' : r \in R\}$ of R . Thus, we have

$$U = \bigcup_{v \in V'} P(v) \cup V^* \cup R \cup R'.$$

We set s^* and t^* , both in V^* , as our two distinguished vertices.

We define our three families for J as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \Pi_1 &= \{S_1\} & \text{where } S_1 &= V^* \setminus \{t^*\} \cup R \cup P(s); \\ \Pi_2 &= \{S_2\} \cup \{S_2^v : v \in \tilde{V}\} & \text{where } S_2 &= V^* \setminus \{s^*\} \cup R' \cup P(t), \\ & & S_2^v &= P(v) \quad \forall v \in \tilde{V}; \\ \Pi_3 &= \{S_3^v : v \in \tilde{V}\} \cup \{S_3^e : e \in E'\} \cup \{S_3^r : r \in R\} & \text{where } S_3^v &= \{\hat{v}, v^*\} \quad \forall v \in \tilde{V}, \\ & & S_3^e &= \{u^v, v^u\} \quad \forall e = uv \in E', \\ & & S_3^r &= \{r, r'\} \quad \forall r \in R. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, Π_1 contains only a single set, Π_2 contains $|\tilde{V}| + 1$ pairwise disjoint sets, and Π_3 contains $|\tilde{V}| + |E'| + |R|$ pairwise disjoint sets. See Figures 2 and 3 for better understanding. We finish the definition of our instance J by setting $d = n$ as our threshold, so that $J = (U, s^*, t^*, \Pi_1, \Pi_2, \Pi_3, n)$.


We claim that G' admits a minimum (s, t) -cut containing exactly $n + 1$ vertices if and only if J is a “yes”-instance of ROBUST SEPARATION.

Direction “ $\implies$ ”. Let us first suppose that X is a minimum (s, t) -cut in G' with $|X| = n + 1$; recall that there must be exactly δ^* edges between X and $V' \setminus X$. Define

$$Z = \bigcup_{v \in X} (P(v) \cup \{v^*\}) \cup R.$$

Since $s \in X$ but $t \notin X$, we know $P(s) \subseteq Z$ and $P(t) \cap Z = \emptyset$; in particular, $s^* \in Z$ but $t^* \notin Z$. By $s^* \in S_1$ we get

$$\text{dist}_{s^*, t^*}(Z, S_1) = |S_1 \setminus Z| = |\{v^* : v \in V' \setminus \{t\} \setminus X\}| = 2n + 1 - (n + 1) = n,$$



■ **Figure 3** Illustration of the set family Π_3 , using the notation of Figure 2. The figure assumes that uv is an edge in the input graph G .

implying that

$$\sum_{S \in \Pi_1} \text{dist}_{s^*, t^*}(Z, S) = n. \quad (8)$$

Similarly, by $t^* \in S_2$ we get

$$\text{dist}_{s^*, t^*}(Z, S_2) = |S_2 \cap Z| = |\{v^* : v \in (V' \setminus \{s\}) \cap X\}| = |X \setminus \{s\}| = n.$$

Observe also that for each $v \in \tilde{V}$, the set $S_2^v = P(v)$ is either contained in Z , or is disjoint from it. Taking into account that $P(v)$ contains neither s^* nor t^* , we get that for each $v \in \tilde{V}$

$$\text{dist}_{s^*, t^*}(Z, S_2^v) = \min\{|S_2^v \setminus Z|, |S_2^v \cap Z|\} = 0,$$

and hence

$$\sum_{S \in \Pi_2} \text{dist}_{s^*, t^*}(Z, S) = \text{dist}_{s^*, t^*}(Z, S_2) + \sum_{v \in \tilde{V}} \text{dist}_{s^*, t^*}(Z, S_2^v) = n. \quad (9)$$

Consider now the set family Π_3 . First, note that for each $v \in \tilde{V}$, the set $S_3^v = \{\hat{v}, v^*\} \subseteq P(v) \cup \{v^*\}$ is either contained in Z , or is disjoint from it. Hence,

$$\text{dist}_{s^*, t^*}(Z, S_3^v) = \min\{|S_3^v \setminus Z|, |S_3^v \cap Z|\} = \min\{|\{\hat{v}, v^*\} \setminus Z|, |\{\hat{v}, v^*\} \cap Z|\} = 0. \quad (10)$$

Second, for each edge $e = uv \in E'$ we know that $|\{u^v, v^u\} \cap Z| = 1$ if and only if exactly one among u and v is contained in X . This implies

$$\begin{aligned} \text{dist}_{s^*, t^*}(Z, S_3^e) &= \min\{|S_3^e \setminus Z|, |S_3^e \cap Z|\} = \min\{|\{u^v, v^u\} \setminus Z|, |\{u^v, v^u\} \cap Z|\} \\ &= \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } e \text{ runs between } X \text{ and } V' \setminus X \text{ in } G', \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \end{aligned} \quad (11)$$

Third, observe that for each $r \in R$, we have $r \in Z$ but $r' \notin Z$, so

$$\text{dist}_{s^*, t^*}(Z, S_3^r) = \min\{|S_3^r \setminus Z|, |S_3^r \cap Z|\} = \min\{|\{r, r'\} \setminus Z|, |\{r, r'\} \cap Z|\} = 1. \quad (12)$$

Using the bounds (10), (11), and (12), we get that the distance of Z from Π_3 is

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{S \in \Pi_3} \text{dist}_{s^*, t^*}(Z, S) &= \sum_{v \in \tilde{V}} \text{dist}_{s^*, t^*}(Z, S_3^v) + \sum_{e \in E'} \text{dist}_{s^*, t^*}(Z, S_3^e) + \sum_{r \in R} \text{dist}_{s^*, t^*}(Z, S_3^r) \\ &= \delta^* + |R| = \delta^* + (n - \delta^*) = n. \end{aligned}$$

Taking into account (8) and (9) as well, this implies that Z has distance at most $n = d$ from each of the set families Π_1 , Π_2 , and Π_3 . Thus, Z is indeed a solution for the instance J of ROBUST SEPARATION.

Direction “ $\Leftarrow$ ”. For the other direction, assume now that Z is a solution for J ; we are going to construct a minimum (s, t) -cut for G' that contains exactly half of its vertices, i.e., $n + 1$ vertices.

To this end, let us first observe that by $s^* \in S_1$ and $t^* \in S_2$ we have

$$n = d \geq \sum_{S \in \Pi_1} \text{dist}_{s^*, t^*}(Z, S) = \text{dist}_{s^*, t^*}(Z, S_1) = |S_1 \setminus Z| \quad \text{and} \quad (13)$$

$$n = d \geq \sum_{S \in \Pi_2} \text{dist}_{s^*, t^*}(Z, S) \geq \text{dist}_{s^*, t^*}(Z, S_2) = |S_2 \cap Z| \quad (14)$$

Since $V^* \setminus \{s^*, t^*\} \setminus Z \subseteq S_1 \setminus Z$ and $V^* \setminus \{s^*, t^*\} \cap Z \subseteq S_2 \cap Z$, the bounds in (13) and in (14), respectively, imply that

$$n \geq |V^* \setminus \{s^*, t^*\} \setminus Z| \quad \text{and} \quad n \geq |V^* \setminus \{s^*, t^*\} \cap Z|. \quad (15)$$

However,

$$n + n \geq |V^* \setminus \{s^*, t^*\} \setminus Z| + |V^* \setminus \{s^*, t^*\} \cap Z| = |V^* \setminus \{s^*, t^*\}| = 2n,$$

and consequently, all inequalities in (13), (14) and (15) must hold with equality; moreover, we must also have $S_1 \setminus Z = V^* \setminus \{s^*, t^*\} \setminus Z$ and $S_2 \cap Z = V^* \setminus \{s^*, t^*\} \cap Z$. This means that

$$R \cup P(s) \subseteq Z \quad \text{and} \quad (R' \cup P(t)) \cap Z = \emptyset. \quad (16)$$

Let us define a set X as follows:

$$X = \{v \in V' : v^* \in Z\}.$$

Since Z contains s^* but not t^* , we know that X contains s but not t ; in other words, X is an (s, t) -cut. Moreover, since both inequalities in (15) hold with equality, it follows that $|X| = n + 1$, that is, it contains half of the vertices of G' . It remains to show that X is a minimum (s, t) -cut.

To this end, first recall that $R \subseteq Z$ but $R' \cap Z = \emptyset$ by fact (16). This yields

$$\sum_{r \in R} \text{dist}_{s^*, t^*}(Z, S_3^r) = \sum_{r \in R} \min\{|\{r, r'\} \setminus Z|, |\{r, r'\} \cap Z|\} = |R| = n - \delta^*. \quad (17)$$

Recall now that all inequalities in (14) hold with equality, which implies that for each $v \in \tilde{V}$ we must have $\text{dist}_{s, t}(Z, S_2^v) = 0$, i.e., the set $S_2^v = P(v)$ is either contained in Z , or is disjoint from Z . Let us define the set $\hat{X} = \{v : \hat{v} \in Z\}$; we are going to prove that $X = \hat{X}$. Note that $s \in \hat{X}$ but $t \notin \hat{X}$, due to fact (16). Hence, $\hat{X}$ is an (s, t) -cut in G' .

Now, for each edge $e = uv \in E'$, the set $S_3^e = \{u^v, v^u\}$ is either contained in Z , is disjoint from Z , or $e = uv$ runs between $\hat{X}$ and $V' \setminus \hat{X}$ in G' . Thus, we have that

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{e \in E'} \text{dist}_{s^*, t^*}(Z, S_3^e) &= \sum_{e=uv \in E'} \min\{|\{u^v, v^u\} \setminus Z|, |\{u^v, v^u\} \cap Z|\} \\ &= |\{uv \in E' : |\{u, v\} \cap \hat{X}| = 1\}| = |\delta(\hat{X})| \geq \delta^*, \end{aligned} \quad (18)$$

by the definition of δ^* , and since $\hat{X}$ is an (s, t) -cut. Taking into account (17) we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned} n &\geq \sum_{S \in \Pi_3} \text{dist}_{s^*, t^*}(Z, S) = \sum_{v \in \tilde{V}} \text{dist}_{s^*, t^*}(Z, S_3^v) + \sum_{e \in E'} \text{dist}_{s^*, t^*}(Z, S_3^e) + \sum_{r \in R} \text{dist}_{s^*, t^*}(Z, S_3^r) \\ &\geq \sum_{v \in \tilde{V}} \text{dist}_{s^*, t^*}(Z, S_3^v) + \delta^* + (n - \delta^*) = \sum_{v \in \tilde{V}} \text{dist}_{s^*, t^*}(Z, S_3^v) + n. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, all inequalities above must hold with equality. On the one hand, this yields that (18) also holds with equality, and so $|\delta(\hat{X})| = \delta^*$ implies that $\hat{X}$ is a minimum (s, t) -cut. On the other hand, we also obtain that $\text{dist}_{s^*, t^*}(Z, S_3^v) = 0$ for each vertex $v \in \tilde{V}$. This means that

$$\text{dist}_{s^*, t^*}(Z, S_3^v) = \min\{|\{\hat{v}, v^*\} \setminus Z|, |\{\hat{v}, v^*\} \cap Z|\} = 0,$$

and thus either both $\hat{v}$ and v^* are contained in Z , or neither of them is contained in Z . In other words, $v \in X$ if and only if $v \in \hat{X}$ holds for each $v \in \tilde{V}$, proving $X = \hat{X}$. Therefore, X is a minimum (s, t) -cut as well, as promised. This proves the correctness of our reduction. ◀

Clearly, we can increase the value of parameter k without changing the solution set of our instance of ROBUST SEPARATION by repeatedly adding a copy of, say, the first set family Π_1 . Using also Lemma 17, we have the following easy consequences of Theorem 22:

► **Corollary 23.** *ROBUST SEPARATION is NP-hard for each constant $k \geq 3$.*

► **Corollary 24.** *ROBUST SUBMODULAR MINIMIZER is NP-hard for each constant $k \geq 3$.*

5 Conclusion

In this paper, we studied the computational complexity of ROBUST SUBMODULAR MINIMIZER, and provided a complete computational map of the problem with respect to the parameters k and d , offering dichotomies for the case when one of these parameters is a constant, and giving an FPT algorithm for the combined parameter (k, d) . Regarding the case when one of the functions f_i has only polynomially bounded minimizers, there are a few questions left open: First, what is the computational complexity of this variant when parameterized by k ? Second, is there an algorithm for this case with running time $2^{O(d)}|I|^{O(1)}$ on some instance I instead of the running time $2^{O(d^2)}|I|^{O(1)}$ we obtained based on the algorithm for Theorem 13?

We remark that our algorithmic results can be adapted in a straightforward way to a slightly generalized problem: given k submodular functions $f_1, \dots, f_k$ with non-negative integers $d_1, \dots, d_k$, we aim to find a set X such that, for each $i \in [k]$, there exists some set $Y_i \in \arg \min f_i$ with $|X \triangle Y_i| \leq d_i$ for each $i \in [k]$. As mentioned in Section 1.2, ROBUST SUBMODULAR MINIMIZER is related to recoverable robustness. We can consider the robust recoverable variant of submodular minimization: given submodular functions $f_0, f_1, \dots, f_k$, we aim to find a set X that minimizes

$$f_0(X) + \max_{i \in [k]} \min_{Y_i: |Y_i \triangle X| \leq d} f_i(X_i).$$

The optimal value is lower-bounded by $f_0(Y_0) + \max_{i \in [k]} f_i(Y_i)$ where $Y_i \in \arg \min f_i$ for each $i \in \{0, 1, \dots, k\}$. Our results imply that we can decide efficiently whether the optimal value attains this lower bound or not, when d and k are parameters, or when f_0 has polynomially many minimizers.

References

- 1 Garrett Birkhoff. Rings of sets. *Duke Math. J.*, 3(3):443–454, 1937. doi:10.1215/S0012-7094-37-00334-X.
- 2 Hans-Joachim Böckenhauer, Karin Freiermuth, Juraj Hromkovic, Tobias Mömke, Andreas Sprock, and Björn Steffen. Steiner tree reoptimization in graphs with sharpened triangle inequality. *J. Discrete Algorithms*, 11:73–86, 2012. doi:10.1016/J.JDA.2011.03.014.

- 3 Paul Bonsma. Most balanced minimum cuts. *Discrete Applied Mathematics*, 158:261–276, 2010. doi:[10.1016/j.dam.2009.09.010](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.dam.2009.09.010).
- 4 Nicolas Boria and Vangelis Th. Paschos. Fast reoptimization for the minimum spanning tree problem. *J. Discrete Algorithms*, 8(3):296–310, 2010. doi:[10.1016/J.JDA.2009.07.002](https://doi.org/10.1016/J.JDA.2009.07.002).
- 5 Christina Büsing. Recoverable robust shortest path problems. *Networks*, 59(1):181–189, 2012. doi:[10.1002/NET.20487](https://doi.org/10.1002/NET.20487).
- 6 Li Chen, Rasmus Kyng, Yang P. Liu, Richard Peng, Maximilian Probst Gutenberg, and Sushant Sachdeva. Almost-linear-time algorithms for maximum flow and minimum-cost flow. *Commun. ACM*, 66(12):85–92, 2023. doi:[10.1145/3610940](https://doi.org/10.1145/3610940).
- 7 Marek Cygan, Fedor V. Fomin, Łukasz Kowalik, Daniel Lokshantov, Dániel Marx, Marcin Pilipczuk, Michał Pilipczuk, and Saket Saurabh. *Parameterized algorithms*. Springer, Cham, 2015. doi:[10.1007/978-3-319-21275-3](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-21275-3).
- 8 Mitre Costa Dourado, Dirk Meierling, Lucia Draque Penso, Dieter Rautenbach, Fábio Protti, and Aline Ribeiro de Almeida. Robust recoverable perfect matchings. *Networks*, 66(3):210–213, 2015. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1002/net.21624>, doi:[10.1002/NET.21624](https://doi.org/10.1002/NET.21624).
- 9 Rod G. Downey and Michael R. Fellows. *Fundamentals of Parameterized Complexity*. Texts in Computer Science. Springer, London, 2013. doi:[10.1007/978-1-4471-5559-1](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4471-5559-1).
- 10 Dennis Fischer, Tim A. Hartmann, Stefan Lendl, and Gerhard J. Woeginger. An investigation of the recoverable robust assignment problem. In Petr A. Golovach and Meirav Zehavi, editors, *16th International Symposium on Parameterized and Exact Computation, IPEC 2021, September 8-10, 2021, Lisbon, Portugal*, volume 214 of *LIPICs*, pages 19:1–19:14. Schloss Dagstuhl - Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik, 2021. doi:[10.4230/LIPICs.IPEC.2021.19](https://doi.org/10.4230/LIPICs.IPEC.2021.19).
- 11 Moti Frances and Ami Litman. On covering problems of codes. *Theory Comput. Syst.*, 30(2):113–119, 1997. doi:[10.1007/s002240000044](https://doi.org/10.1007/s002240000044).
- 12 Marc Goerigk, Stefan Lendl, and Lasse Wulf. On the recoverable traveling salesman problem. *CoRR*, abs/2111.09691, 2021. arXiv:[2111.09691](https://arxiv.org/abs/2111.09691).
- 13 Felix Hommelsheim, Nicole Megow, Komal Muluk, and Britta Peis. Recoverable robust optimization with commitment. *CoRR*, abs/2306.08546, 2023. arXiv:[2306.08546](https://arxiv.org/abs/2306.08546).
- 14 Mikita Hradovich, Adam Kasperski, and Pawel Zielinski. Recoverable robust spanning tree problem under interval uncertainty representations. *J. Comb. Optim.*, 34(2):554–573, 2017. doi:[10.1007/S10878-016-0089-6](https://doi.org/10.1007/S10878-016-0089-6).
- 15 Takehiro Ito, Naonori Kakimura, Naoyuki Kamiyama, Yusuke Kobayashi, and Yoshio Okamoto. A parameterized view to the robust recoverable base problem of matroids under structural uncertainty. *Oper. Res. Lett.*, 50(3):370–375, 2022. doi:[10.1016/J.ORL.2022.05.001](https://doi.org/10.1016/J.ORL.2022.05.001).
- 16 Naonori Kakimura, Naoyuki Kamiyama, Yusuke Kobayashi, and Yoshio Okamoto. Submodular reassignment problem for reallocating agents to tasks with synergy effects. *Discret. Optim.*, 44(Part):100631, 2022. doi:[10.1016/j.disopt.2021.100631](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.disopt.2021.100631).
- 17 Stefan Kratsch, Shaohua Li, Dániel Marx, Marcin Pilipczuk, and Magnus Wahlström. Multi-budgeted directed cuts. *Algorithmica*, 82(8):2135–2155, 2020. doi:[10.1007/S00453-019-00609-1](https://doi.org/10.1007/S00453-019-00609-1).
- 18 Thomas Lachmann, Stefan Lendl, and Gerhard J. Woeginger. A linear time algorithm for the robust recoverable selection problem. *Discret. Appl. Math.*, 303:94–107, 2021. doi:[10.1016/J.DAM.2020.08.012](https://doi.org/10.1016/J.DAM.2020.08.012).
- 19 Yin Tat Lee, Aaron Sidford, and Sam Chiu-wai Wong. A faster cutting plane method and its implications for combinatorial and convex optimization. In *IEEE 56th Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science, FOCS 2015, Berkeley, CA, USA, 17–20 October, 2015*, pages 1049–1065, 2015. doi:[10.1109/FOCS.2015.68](https://doi.org/10.1109/FOCS.2015.68).
- 20 Stefan Lendl, Britta Peis, and Veerle Timmermans. Matroid bases with cardinality constraints on the intersection. *Math. Program.*, 194(1):661–684, 2022. doi:[10.1007/S10107-021-01642-1](https://doi.org/10.1007/S10107-021-01642-1).
- 21 Christian Liebchen, Marco E. Lübbecke, Rolf H. Möhring, and Sebastian Stiller. The concept of recoverable robustness, linear programming recovery, and railway applications. In Ravindra K.

- Ahuja, Rolf H. Möhring, and Christos D. Zaroliagis, editors, *Robust and Online Large-Scale Optimization: Models and Techniques for Transportation Systems*, volume 5868 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 1–27. Springer, 2009. doi:10.1007/978-3-642-05465-5_1.
- 22 Jérôme Monnot. A note on the traveling salesman reoptimization problem under vertex insertion. *Inf. Process. Lett.*, 115(3):435–438, 2015. doi:10.1016/J.IPL.2014.11.003.
- 23 Kazuo Murota. *Discrete Convex Analysis*. SIAM, 2003. doi:10.1137/1.9780898718508.
- 24 James B. Orlin. A faster strongly polynomial time algorithm for submodular function minimization. *Math. Program.*, 118(2):237–251, 2009. doi:10.1007/s10107-007-0189-2.
- 25 Jean-Claude Picard and Maurice Queyranne. On the structure of all minimum cuts in a network and applications. *Mathematical Programming Studies*, 13:8–16, 1980. doi:10.1007/BFb0120902.
- 26 Thomas J Schaefer. The complexity of satisfiability problems. In *Proceedings of the Tenth ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing (STOC '78)*, pages 216–226. ACM, 1978. doi:10.1145/800133.804350.
- 27 Alexander Schrijver. *Combinatorial Optimization: Polyhedra and Efficiency*. Springer, Berlin, 2003.