

Locally Searching for Large Induced Matchings

Maximilian Fürst, Marilena Leichter, Dieter Rautenbach

Institut für Optimierung und Operations Research, Universität Ulm, Ulm, Germany

`maximilian.fuerst@uni-ulm.de`

`marilena.leichter@online.de`

`dieter.rautenbach@uni-ulm.de`

Abstract

It is an easy observation that a natural greedy approach yields a $(d - O(1))$ -factor approximation algorithm for the maximum induced matching problem in d -regular graphs. The only considerable and non-trivial improvement of this approximation ratio was obtained by Gotthilf and Lewenstein using a combination of the greedy approach and local search, where understanding the performance of the local search was the challenging part of the analysis. We study the performance of their local search when applied to general graphs, C_4 -free graphs, $\{C_3, C_4\}$ -free graphs, C_5 -free graphs, and claw-free graphs. As immediate consequences, we obtain approximation algorithms for the maximum induced matching problem restricted to the d -regular graphs in these classes.

Keywords: Induced matching; strong matching; local search

1 Introduction

Finding a maximum induced matching in a given graph is a well-studied difficult problem [10], which remains hard even when restricted to regular graphs [5], regular bipartite graphs [4], or claw-free graphs [7]. Next to efficient algorithms for special graph classes [1, 2, 5, 8], and fixed parameter tractability [4], approximation algorithms have been studied.

Duckworth, Manlove, and Zito [5, 11] showed that simple and natural greedy strategies yield $(d - O(1))$ -factor approximation algorithms for the maximum induced matching problem restricted to d -regular graphs. Up to the constant term, this is an immediate consequence of the two easy observations fact that every induced matching in a d -regular graph G contains at most $\frac{m(G)}{2d-1}$ edges, and that every maximal induced matching in G contains at least $\frac{m(G)}{2d^2-2d+1}$ edges, which already implies an approximation ratio of $\frac{2d^2-2d+1}{2d-1} = d - \frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{4d-2}$. The only considerable and non-trivial improvement of this approximation ratio was obtained by Gotthilf and Lewenstein [6] who described a $(0.75d + 0.15)$ -factor approximation algorithm for d -regular graphs that combines a greedy approach with local search. As shown in [9], for $\{C_3, C_5\}$ -free d -regular graphs, the approximation factor of their method can be improved to $0.708\bar{3}d + 0.425$.

Taking a closer look at the algorithm Gotthilf and Lewenstein, it turns out that its greedy part `GREEDY(f)` (cf. Algorithm 2 below) is a kind of preprocessing, which is rather easy to analyze yet ensures an important structural property that allows for a better analysis of the local search part `LOCAL SEARCH` (cf. Algorithm 1 below). Their approach can actually improve the approximation ratio by at most a factor of 2, and is limited by the analysis of `LOCAL SEARCH`.

LOCAL SEARCH

Input: A graph G .

Output: An induced matching M of G .

$M \leftarrow \emptyset$;

repeat

if $M \cup \{e\}$ is an induced matching of G for some edge $e \in E(G) \setminus M$ **then**

$M \leftarrow M \cup \{e\}$;

end

if $(M \setminus \{e\}) \cup \{e', e''\}$ is an induced matching of G for some three distinct edges $e \in M$ and $e', e'' \in E(G) \setminus M$ **then**

$M \leftarrow (M \setminus \{e\}) \cup \{e', e''\}$;

end

until $|M|$ does not increase during one iteration;

return M ;

Algorithm 1: The algorithm LOCAL SEARCH.

Since LOCAL SEARCH tries to enlarge the induced matching M by exchanging one edge in M against two other edges in $E(G) \setminus M$, it ensures that the subgraph formed by the so-called *private conflict edges* of each individual edge in M is $2K_2$ -free; a structural property that appears quite naturally in the context of induced matchings and the derived strong edge colorings [3].

In the present paper we analyze the performance of LOCAL SEARCH when applied to general graphs, C_4 -free graphs, $\{C_3, C_4\}$ -free graphs, C_5 -free graphs, and claw-free graphs. As immediate consequences, we obtain approximation algorithms for the maximum induced matching problem restricted to the d -regular graphs in these classes. A byproduct of our results is a much shorter proof of the original result of Gotthilf and Lewenstein [6].

Before we proceed to our results, we collect some notation and terminology. We consider only simple, finite, and undirected graphs. The vertex set and the edge set of a graph G are denoted by $V(G)$ and $E(G)$, respectively. For a vertex u in a graph G , the neighborhood of u in G is $N_G(u) = \{v \in V(G) : uv \in E(G)\}$, the closed neighborhood of u in G is $N_G[u] = \{u\} \cup N_G(u)$, and the degree of u in G is $d_G(u) = |N_G(u)|$. A graph is d -regular if all vertices have degree d . For two disjoint sets X and Y of vertices of a graph G , let $E_G(X, Y)$ be the set of edges uv of G with $u \in X$ and $v \in Y$, and let $m_G(X, Y) = |E_G(X, Y)|$. For a set X of vertices of G , let $E_G(X)$ be the edge set of the subgraph of G induced by X , and let $m_G(X) = |E_G(X)|$.

For a set M of edges of a graph G , let $V(M)$ denote the set of vertices that are incident with an edge in M . The set M is an induced matching if the subgraph $G[V(M)]$ of G induced by $V(M)$ is 1-regular. For a set \mathcal{F} of graphs, a graph G is \mathcal{F} -free if it contains no graph in \mathcal{F} as an induced subgraph. If \mathcal{F} contains only one graph F , then we write F -free instead of \mathcal{F} -free. The cycle of order n is denoted by C_n . The square G^2 of a graph G has the same vertex set as G , and two vertices are adjacent in G^2 if their distance in G is one or two. The line graph $L(G)$ of G is the graph whose vertices are the edges of G , and in which two vertices are adjacent exactly if they share an incident vertex as edges of G . Note that induced matchings in G correspond to independent sets in $L(G)^2$.

For an edge e of a graph G , let

$$C_G(e) = \{e\} \cup N_{L(G)^2}(e) = \{f \in E(G) : \text{dist}_{L(G)}(e, f) \leq 2\},$$

and let $c_G(e) = |C_G(e)|$.

For a set M of edges of G and an edge e in M , let

$$PC_G(M, e) = C_G(e) \setminus \bigcup_{f \in M \setminus \{e\}} C_G(f),$$

and let $pc_G(M, e) = |PC_G(M, e)|$. The set $C_G(e)$ contains e as well as all edges of G that are in *conflict* with e , that is, that cannot be in an induced matching together with e . The set $PC_G(M, e)$ contains the *private conflict* edges of e with respect to some set M , which will typically be an induced matching of G .

2 Results

Throughout this section, let G be a graph of maximum degree d for some d at least 3, and let M be an induced matching produced by applying LOCAL SEARCH to G .

The two essential properties of M are that

$$\text{for every edge } f \text{ of } G, \text{ there is some edge } e \text{ in } M \text{ with } f \in C_G(e) \quad (1)$$

and that

$$e'' \in C_G(e') \text{ for every edge } e \text{ in } M, \text{ and every two edges } e' \text{ and } e'' \text{ in } PC_G(M, e). \quad (2)$$

Property (1) means that M is a maximal induced matching, and a violation of property (2) would allow LOCAL SEARCH to replace M with the larger induced matching $(M \setminus \{e\}) \cup \{e', e''\}$.

One ingredient of the analysis of LOCAL SEARCH is the following upper bound on the number $c_G(xy)$ of edges conflicting with any edge xy of G . If $n_{xy} = |N_G(x) \cap N_G(y)|$ and $m_{xy} = m_G((N_G(x) \cup N_G(y)) \setminus \{x, y\})$, then

$$\begin{aligned} c_G(xy) &\leq |\{xy\}| + d \left| (N_G(x) \cup N_G(y)) \setminus \{x, y\} \right| - m_{xy} \\ &= |\{xy\}| + d \left(\underbrace{|N_G(x) \cap N_G(y)|}_{=n_{xy}} + \underbrace{|N_G(x) \setminus N_G(y)|}_{\leq d-1-n_{xy}} + \underbrace{|N_G(y) \setminus N_G(x)|}_{\leq d-1-n_{xy}} \right) - m_{xy} \\ &\leq 1 + dn_{xy} + 2d(d-1-n_{xy}) - m_{xy} \\ &= 2d^2 - 2d + 1 - (dn_{xy} + m_{xy}). \end{aligned} \quad (3)$$

Another ingredient of the analysis of LOCAL SEARCH are upper bounds on the number of private conflict edges for the edges in M . Such bounds are the main concern of the following results.

Let xy be an edge in M .

Our first lemma summarizes structural properties of the graph formed by the edges in $PC_G(M, xy)$.

Let

- N_1 be the set of vertices u in $(N_G(x) \cup N_G(y)) \setminus \{x, y\}$ that are incident with an edge in $PC_G(M, xy)$, and let
- N_2 be the set of vertices u in $V(G) \setminus (N_G[x] \cup N_G[y])$ that are incident with an edge in $PC_G(M, xy)$.

Lemma 1 *If G , M , xy , N_1 , and N_2 are as above, then the following statements hold.*

(i) $PC_G(M, xy) = E_G(\{x, y\} \cup N_1) \cup E_G(N_1, N_2)$.

(ii) N_2 is independent.

(iii) If $u \in N_G(x) \cap N_1$ is such that $|N_G(u) \cap N_2|$ is maximum, then

$$m_G(N_G(x) \cap N_1, N_2) \leq d - 1 + (d - 3)n_{xu} + m_{ux}.$$

Proof: (i) By the definition of N_1 and N_2 , we have $PC_G(M, xy) \subseteq E_G(\{x, y\} \cup N_1) \cup E_G(N_1, N_2)$, and it remains to show the inverse inclusion. Since M is an induced matching, we have $xy \in PC_G(M, xy)$. If uv is an edge in $C_G(xy)$ such that u as well as v are both incident with an edge in $PC_G(M, xy)$, then uv also belongs to $PC_G(M, xy)$. This implies $E_G(\{x, y\} \cup N_1) \cup E_G(N_1, N_2) \subseteq PC_G(M, xy)$, which completes the proof of (i).

(ii) If vw is an edge between two vertices v and w in N_2 , then vw belongs neither to M nor to $C_G(xy)$. By (1), we obtain $vw \in C_G(e)$ for some edge e in M that is distinct from xy , which implies the contradiction that v or w cannot be incident with an edge in $PC_G(M, xy)$.

(iii) Clearly, $m_G(\{u\}, N_2) \leq d - 1 - n_{ux}$. Let $A = (N_G(x) \cap N_1) \cap N_G(u)$ and $B = (N_G(x) \cap N_1) \setminus N_G(u)$. Every vertex in A has at most $d - 2$ neighbors in N_2 , and $|A| \leq n_{ux}$, because every vertex in A is a common neighbor of x and u . By (2), the choice of u implies that $N_G(v) \cap N_2 \subseteq N_G(u) \cap N_2$ for every vertex v in B , which implies $m_G(B, N_2) \leq m_{ux}$. Altogether, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} m_G(N_G(x) \cap N_1, N_2) &= m_G(\{u\}, N_2) + m_G(A, N_2) + m_G(B, N_2) \\ &\leq (d - 1 - n_{ux}) + (d - 2)|A| + m_G(B, N_2) \\ &\leq d - 1 + (d - 3)n_{xu} + m_{ux}. \end{aligned}$$

□

Our next result establishes a first upper bound on the number $pc_G(M, xy)$ of private conflict edges of xy , and is slightly more general than the analysis in [6].

Theorem 2 *Let G and M be as above.*

If $c_G(xy) \geq f$, and $n_{xy} \geq g$ for every edge xy of G , then the following statements hold.

$$(i) \sum_{xy \in M} pc_G(M, xy) \leq (4d^2 - 1 - 2f - 6g)|M| + \sum_{xy \in M} m_{xy}.$$

$$(ii) |M| \geq \frac{m(G)}{3d^2 - d - f - \left(\frac{d+6}{2}\right)g}.$$

Proof: (i) Let xy be an edge in M . Let N_1 and N_2 be as above. Let u be as in Lemma 1(iii). By (3), we have $f \leq c_G(ux) \leq 2d^2 - 2d + 1 - (dn_{xu} + m_{xu})$, which implies $d - 1 + (d - 3)n_{xu} + m_{xu} \leq 2d^2 - d - f - 3g$. Now, by symmetry between x and y , Lemma 1 implies

$$\begin{aligned} pc_G(M, xy) &= |PC_G(M, xy)| \\ &\leq |\{xy\}| + m_G(\{x, y\}, N_1) + m_G(N_1) + m_G(N_G(x) \cap N_1, N_2) + m_G(N_G(y) \cap N_1, N_2) \\ &\leq 1 + (2d - 2) + m_{xy} + (2d^2 - d - f - 3g) + (2d^2 - d - f - 3g) \\ &= 4d^2 - 1 - 2f - 6g + m_{xy}. \end{aligned}$$

Adding this inequality over all edges in M yields the desired bound.

(ii) If p is the number of pairs (e, f) with $e \in M$ and $f \in C_G(e)$, then

$$p \leq \sum_{xy \in M} c_G(xy) \stackrel{(3)}{\leq} (2d^2 - 2d + 1 - dg)|M| - \sum_{xy \in M} m_{xy}.$$

Furthermore, since the only edges f of G , for which there is only one edge e in M with $f \in C_G(e)$, are those in $\bigcup_{xy \in M} PC_G(M, xy)$, we obtain

$$p \geq 2m(G) - \sum_{xy \in M} pc_G(M, xy) \stackrel{(i)}{\geq} 2m(G) - (4d^2 - 1 - 2f - 6g)|M| - \sum_{xy \in M} m_{xy}.$$

Combining the upper and lower bounds on p yields the desired bound. \square

With Theorem 2 at hand, it is now easy to recover the result of Gotthilf and Lewenstein [6].

Corollary 3 (Gotthilf and Lewenstein [6]) *There is a polynomial time $\left(\frac{3}{4}d + \frac{1}{8} + \frac{1}{16d-8}\right)$ -factor approximation algorithm for the maximum induced matching problem in d -regular graphs.*

Proof: Let G be a given d -regular graph. Applying $\text{GREEDY}(f)$ to G with $f = \frac{3d^2-d}{2}$ yields an output (M, G') with $|M| \geq \frac{m(G)-m(G')}{f}$, and $c_{G'}(xy) \geq f$ for every edge xy of G' . Now, by Theorem 2(ii), applying LOCAL SEARCH to G' yields an induced matching M' of G' with $|M'| \geq \frac{m(G')}{3d^2-d-f} = \frac{m(G')}{f}$, where the last equality follows from the choice of f . It is easy to see (cf. [9]) that $M \cup M'$ is an induced matching of G with $|M \cup M'| \geq \frac{m(G)}{f}$. Since $\nu_s(G) \leq \frac{m(G)}{2d-1}$, we obtain $\frac{\nu_s(G)}{|M \cup M'|} \leq \frac{f}{2d-1} = \frac{3}{4}d + \frac{1}{8} + \frac{1}{16d-8}$, which completes the proof. \square

$\text{GREEDY}(f)$

Input: A graph G .

Output: A pair (M, G') such that M is an induced matching of G , and G' is a subgraph of G .

$M \leftarrow \emptyset; G_0 \leftarrow G; i \leftarrow 1;$

while $\min\{c_{G_{i-1}}(e) : e \in E(G_{i-1})\} \leq f$ **do**

 Choose an edge e_i of G_{i-1} with $c_{G_{i-1}}(e_i) \leq f;$
 $M \leftarrow M \cup \{e_i\}; G_i \leftarrow G_{i-1} - C_{G_{i-1}}(e_i); i \leftarrow i + 1;$

end

return $(M, G_{i-1});$

Algorithm 2: The algorithm $\text{GREEDY}(f)$.

Note that first applying $\text{GREEDY}(f)$ corresponds to a preprocessing ensuring a lower bound on $\min\{c_G(xy) : xy \in E(G)\}$, which is important for the performance of LOCAL SEARCH .

Our next two results concern the performance of LOCAL SEARCH for C_4 -free and $\{C_3, C_4\}$ -free graphs. Both rely on the two step approach from Theorem 2 of upper bounding $pc_G(M, xy)$, and double-counting p .

Theorem 4 *Let G and M be as above.*

If G is C_4 -free, then the following statements hold.

(i) *If xy is an edge in M , and N_1 and N_2 are as above, then $m_G(N_1, N_2) \leq \max\left\{d, \frac{d^2}{4}\right\}$.*

(ii) $|M| \geq \frac{m(G)}{\max\left\{d^2 + \frac{d}{2}, \frac{9}{8}d^2\right\}}$.

Proof: (i) Let N'_1 be the set of those u in N_1 that have a neighbor in N_2 . Let $N_x = N'_1 \setminus N_G(y)$, $N_y = N'_1 \setminus N_G(x)$, and $N_{xy} = N'_1 \cap N_G(x) \cap N_G(y)$.

Suppose, for a contradiction, that u and u' are two non-adjacent vertices in $N_x \cup N_{xy}$. Let v be a neighbor of u in N_2 , and let v' be a neighbor of u' in N_2 . Since G is C_4 -free, the vertices u and u' have no common neighbor in N_2 ; in particular, the vertices v and v' are distinct. Since, by Lemma 1(ii), the vertices v and v' are non-adjacent, we obtain a contradiction to (2). Hence, $N_x \cup N_{xy}$, and, by symmetry, also $N_y \cup N_{xy}$ are cliques in G .

Suppose, for a contradiction, that the two vertices u in N_x and u' in N_y both have at least two neighbors in N_2 . Since G is C_4 -free, the vertices u and u' are non-adjacent. By (2), and since, by Lemma 1(ii), the set N_2 is independent, it follows that u and u' have two common neighbors in N_2 , contradicting the C_4 -freeness of G . Hence, we may assume, by symmetry between x and y , that each vertex in N_y has exactly one neighbor in N_2 .

It follows that, if $d_x = |N_x|$, $d_{xy} = |N_{xy}|$, and $d_y = |N_y|$, then

- every vertex in N_x has at most $(d-1) - (d_x + d_{xy} - 1)$ neighbors in N_2 ,
- every vertex in N_{xy} has at most $(d-2) - (d_x + d_{xy} + d_y - 1)$ neighbors in N_2 , and
- every vertex in N_y has one neighbor in N_2 .

Note that $d_x + d_{xy} \leq d_G(x) - 1 \leq d - 1$ and $d_y + d_{xy} \leq d_G(y) - 1 \leq d - 1$, and that

$$\text{the function } x \mapsto (d-x)x \text{ has its unique maximum } d^2/4 \text{ at } x = d/2. \quad (4)$$

First, we assume that d_x and d_y are both positive. If $u \in N_x$ and $v \in N_y$, then, by (2), $uv \in C_G(e)$ for every edge e in $PC_G(M, xy)$ incident with u , which implies that v is adjacent to every neighbor of u in N_2 . Since v has exactly one neighbor, say w , in N_2 , and the choice of u within N_x was unrestricted, it follows that $N_G(u) \cap N_2 = \{w\}$ for every vertex u in N_x . Now, by (recovered) symmetry between x and y , it follows that $N_G(v) \cap N_2 = \{w\}$ for every vertex v in N_y .

If $d_x + d_{xy} + d_y \geq d - 1$, then

$$m_G(N_1, N_2) \leq d_x + \underbrace{\left((d-2) - (d_x + d_{xy} + d_y - 1) \right)}_{\leq 0} d_{xy} + d_y \leq d_x + d_y \leq d_G(w) \leq d.$$

If $d_x + d_{xy} + d_y < d - 1$, then

$$\begin{aligned} m_G(N_1, N_2) &\leq d_x + \underbrace{\left((d-2) - (d_x + d_{xy} + d_y - 1) \right)}_{\geq 1} d_{xy} + d_y \\ &\leq \left(d-1 - (d_x + d_{xy} + d_y) \right) (d_x + d_{xy} + d_y) \\ &\stackrel{(4)}{\leq} \frac{(d-1)^2}{4}. \end{aligned}$$

Next, we assume that $d_y = 0$. In this case, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} m_G(N_1, N_2) &\leq \left((d-1) - (d_x + d_{xy} - 1) \right) d_x + \left((d-2) - (d_x + d_{xy} + d_y - 1) \right) d_{xy} \\ &\leq \left(d - (d_x + d_{xy}) \right) (d_x + d_{xy}) \end{aligned}$$

$$\stackrel{(4)}{\leq} \frac{d^2}{4}.$$

Finally, if $d_x = 0$, then a similar argument implies $m_G(N_1, N_2) \leq \frac{d^2}{4}$, which completes the proof of (i).

(ii) By (i), we obtain, similarly as in the proof of Theorem 2(i),

$$pc_G(M, xy) \leq 1 + (2d - 2) + m_{xy} + m_G(N_1, N_2) \stackrel{(i)}{\leq} \max \left\{ 3d - 1, \frac{d^2}{4} + 2d - 1 \right\} + m_{xy},$$

and, hence,

$$\sum_{xy \in M} pc_G(M, xy) \leq \max \left\{ 3d - 1, \frac{d^2}{4} + 2d - 1 \right\} |M| + \sum_{xy \in M} m_{xy}$$

Counting the p pairs as in the proof of Theorem 2(ii), we obtain $p \leq (2d^2 - 2d + 1)|M| - \sum_{xy \in M} m_{xy}$

and $p \geq 2m(G) - \max \left\{ 3d - 1, \frac{d^2}{4} + 2d - 1 \right\} |M| - \sum_{xy \in M} m_{xy}$, which yields the desired bound. \square

Theorem 5 *Let G and M be as above.*

If G is $\{C_3, C_4\}$ -free, then the following statements hold.

(i) *If xy is an edge in M , then $pc_G(M, xy) \leq 2d - 1$.*

(ii) *$|M| \geq \frac{m(G)}{d^2}$.*

Proof: (i) Let N_1 and N_2 be as above. Since G is C_3 -free, the set N_1 partitions into the two independent sets $N_x = N_1 \cap N_G(x)$ and $N_y = N_1 \cap N_G(y)$. If one of the two sets N_x or N_y contains two vertices with a neighbor in N_2 , then we obtain a similar contradiction as in the proof of Theorem 4(i). Hence, both sets contain at most one such vertex.

If both sets N_x and N_y contain no vertex with a neighbor in N_2 , then $pc_G(M, xy) \leq 2d - 1$. If N_x contains a vertex with a neighbor in N_2 but N_y does not, then N_y is empty, and, hence, $pc_G(M, xy) \leq 2d - 1$. Finally, if the vertex u in N_x as well as the vertex v in N_y both have a neighbor in N_2 , then, since, by (2), $xu \in C_G(e)$ for every edge e in $PC_G(M, xy)$ that is incident with v , and $yv \in C_G(f)$ for every edge f in $PC_G(M, xy)$ that is incident with u , it follows that the vertices u and v both have exactly the same neighbors in N_2 . Since G is $\{C_3, C_4\}$ -free, the vertices u and v have a unique neighbor w in N_2 , in particular, $N_2 = \{w\}$. If N_x contains a vertex u' distinct from u , then $xu' \notin C_G(vw)$, which is a contradiction to (2). Hence, N_x , and, by symmetry, also N_y both contain exactly one vertex, and $pc_G(M, xy) = 5 \leq 2d - 1$.

(ii) If p is as in the previous proofs, we obtain $p \leq (2d^2 - 2d + 1)|M|$ and $p \geq 2m(G) - (2d - 1)|M|$, which yields the desired bound. \square

Since Theorem 4 and Theorem 5 do not require a lower bound on $\max\{c_G(xy) : xy \in E(G)\}$, they imply that LOCAL SEARCH alone is an approximation algorithm in the regular case.

Corollary 6 LOCAL SEARCH is

(i) *a polynomial time $\left(\frac{9}{16}d + \frac{33}{80}\right)$ -factor approximation algorithm for the maximum induced matching problem in d -regular C_4 -free graphs, and*

(ii) *a polynomial time $\left(\frac{d}{2} + \frac{1}{4} + \frac{1}{8d-4}\right)$ -factor approximation algorithm for the maximum induced matching problem in d -regular $\{C_3, C_4\}$ -free graphs.*

Proof: Using Theorem 4(ii), part (i) follows as in Corollary 3, since $\frac{\max\{d^2 + \frac{d}{2}, \frac{9}{8}d^2\}}{2d-1} \leq \frac{9}{16}d + \frac{33}{80}$ for $d \geq 3$. Similarly, part (ii) follows from Theorem 5(ii). \square

Next, we consider C_5 -free graphs. As it turns out, a better bound can be obtained for these graphs, if the lower and upper bounds on p are not handled separately.

Theorem 7 *Let G and M be as above.*

If G is C_5 -free, then the following statements hold.

(i) *If xy is an edge in M , and N_1 and N_2 are as above, then*

$$m_G(N_1, N_2) \leq (d-1-d_y)d_x + (d-2)d_{xy} + (d-1-d_x)d_y$$

for non-negative integers d_x, d_{xy} , and d_y with $d_x + d_{xy} \leq d-1$, $d_y + d_{xy} \leq d-1$, and $d_{xy} \leq n_{xy}$.

(ii) $|M| \geq \frac{m(G)}{\frac{3}{2}d^2 - d + \frac{1}{2}}$.

Proof: (i) Let $N_x, N_y, N_{xy}, d_x, d_y$, and d_{xy} be as in the proof of Theorem 4(i). Clearly, $d_x + d_{xy} \leq d_G(x) - 1 \leq d-1$ and $d_y + d_{xy} \leq d_G(y) - 1 \leq d-1$. Furthermore, $n_{xy} = |N_G(x) \cap N_G(y)| \geq d_{xy}$.

Since G is C_5 -free, (2) implies that every vertex in N_x is adjacent to every vertex in N_y , that is, every vertex in N_x has at most $d-1-d_y$ neighbors in N_2 , and every vertex in N_y has at most $d-1-d_x$ neighbors in N_2 . Since every vertex in N_{xy} has at most $d-2$ neighbors in N_2 , part (i) follows.

(ii) For every edge xy in M , (i) implies

$$pc_G(M, xy) \leq 1 + (2d-2) + m_{xy} + \left((d-1-d_y)d_x + (d-2)d_{xy} + (d-1-d_x)d_y \right), \quad (5)$$

where d_x, d_y , and d_{xy} are non-negative integers that depend on xy , and satisfy the restrictions stated in (i).

If p is as in the previous proofs, then

$$2m(G) - \sum_{xy \in M} pc_G(M, xy) \leq p \leq \sum_{xy \in M} (2d^2 - 2d + 1 - dd_{xy} - m_{xy}),$$

where the second inequality follows from (3) using $d_{xy} \leq n_{xy}$. By (5), we obtain

$$\sum_{xy \in M} \left(2d^2 - dd_{xy} + (d-1-d_y)d_x + (d-2)d_{xy} + (d-1-d_x)d_y \right) \geq 2m(G). \quad (6)$$

Since $\max\{(d-1-y)x + (d-1-x)y : 0 \leq x, y \leq d-1\} = (d-1)^2$, we obtain, using (6) and $d_{xy} \geq 0$, that $(2d^2 + (d-1)^2)|M| \geq 2m(G)$, which completes the proof of (ii). \square

For regular graphs, we obtain an approximation guarantee as above.

Corollary 8 LOCAL SEARCH is a polynomial time $\left(\frac{3}{4}d - \frac{1}{8} + \frac{3}{16d-8}\right)$ -factor approximation algorithm for the maximum induced matching problem in d -regular C_5 -free graphs.

Proof: This follows by evaluating $\frac{\frac{3}{2}d^2 - d + \frac{1}{2}}{2d-1}$. \square

Now, we consider claw-free graphs. Our next result illustrates the consequences of applying the above arguments to these graphs.

Lemma 9 *If G and M are as above, and G is $K_{1,3}$ -free, then $|M| \geq \frac{m(G)}{d^2+d-1}$.*

Proof: If xy is an edge in M , and N_1 and N_2 are as above, then claw-freeness and Lemma 1(ii) together imply that every vertex in N_1 has at most one neighbor in N_2 , which implies $m_G(N_1, N_2) \leq |N_1| \leq 2d - 2$, and, hence, $pc_G(M, xy) \leq 1 + (2d - 2) + m_{xy} + (2d - 2) = 4d - 3 + m_{xy}$. Double-counting p as before yields the desired result. \square

In contrast to the classes of graphs that we considered before, no edge xy in a claw-free graph G of maximum degree d can have up to $2d^2 + O(d)$ many conflict edges, that is, claw-freeness implies a better upper bound on $c_G(xy)$, which implies that already maximal induced matchings cannot be too small. The next result quantifies this observation.

Recall that two vertices u and v are *true twins* in a graph G if $N_G[u] = N_G[v]$.

Theorem 10 *If G is a claw-free graph of maximum degree at most d for some d at least 3, and M is a maximal induced matching, then $|M| \geq \frac{m(G)}{\frac{1}{6}d^2+d}$.*

Proof: Let xy be an edge in M . Let $N_x = N_G(x) \setminus N_G[y]$, $N_y = N_G(y) \setminus N_G[x]$, and $N_{xy} = N_G(x) \cap N_G(y)$, and let $d_x = |N_x|$, $d_y = |N_y|$, and $d_{xy} = |N_{xy}|$.

Since $c_G(xy) \leq 1 + d(d_x + d_{xy} + d_y) - m_{xy}$, in order to upper bound $c_G(xy)$, we need a lower bound on m_{xy} . Let $H = G[N_x \cup N_{xy} \cup N_y]$. By definition, $m_{xy} = m(H)$.

Since G is claw-free,

- (i) N_x and N_y are cliques in H , and
- (ii) $\alpha(H[N_x \cup N_{xy}]) \leq 2$ and $\alpha(H[N_{xy} \cup N_y]) \leq 2$.

Claim 1 $m(H) \geq \binom{d_x}{2} + \binom{p}{2} + \binom{d_{xy}-p}{2} + \binom{d_y}{2} + p(d_x + d_y)$ for some non-negative integer $p \leq \frac{d_{xy}}{2}$.

Proof of Claim 1: Suppose that, subject to (i) and (ii), the graph H is such that $m(H)$ is minimum. Our first goal is to show that $H[N_{xy}]$ is the disjoint union of cliques. Suppose, for a contradiction, that uvw is an induced path of order three in $H[N_{xy}]$. If $d_H(u) < d_H(v)$, then removing v , and introducing a new vertex that is a true twin of u yields a graph with less edges than H that satisfies (i) and (ii), which is a contradiction. If $d_H(u), d_H(w) \geq d_H(v)$, then removing u and w , and introducing two new vertices that are true twins of v yields a graph with less edges than H that satisfies (i) and (ii), which is a contradiction. Hence, by (ii), the graph $H[N_{xy}]$ is the union of two cliques, C_1 of order p and C_2 of order $d_{xy} - p$, where $0 \leq p \leq \frac{d_{xy}}{2}$. Note that $p = 0$ corresponds to the case that $G[N_{xy}]$ is just one clique. By (ii), every vertex in N_x is adjacent to all vertices in C_1 or to all vertices in C_2 . By the choice of H , and symmetry between N_x and N_y , we obtain, that $N_x \cup N_y$ is completely joined to C_1 , and the desired lower bound on $m(H)$ follows. \square

Let $\bar{d}_x = \frac{d_x}{d}$, $\bar{d}_{xy} = \frac{d_{xy}}{d}$, $\bar{d}_y = \frac{d_y}{d}$, and $\bar{p} = \frac{p}{d}$. Since $\frac{1}{d^2} + \frac{d_x+p+(d_{xy}-p)+d_y}{2d^2} \leq \frac{1}{d^2} + \frac{2d-2}{2d^2} = \frac{1}{d}$, Claim 1 implies

$$\begin{aligned}
c_G(xy) &\leq 1 + d(d_x + d_{xy} + d_y) - m(H) \\
&\leq 1 + d(d_x + d_{xy} + d_y) - \binom{d_x}{2} - \binom{p}{2} - \binom{d_{xy}-p}{2} - \binom{d_y}{2} - p(d_x + d_y) \\
&\leq d^2 \left(\underbrace{\bar{d}_x + \bar{d}_{xy} + \bar{d}_y - \frac{1}{2}\bar{d}_x^2 - \frac{1}{2}\bar{p}^2 - \frac{1}{2}(\bar{d}_{xy} - \bar{p})^2 - \frac{1}{2}\bar{d}_y^2 - \bar{p}(\bar{d}_x + \bar{d}_y) + \frac{1}{d}}_{=: f(\bar{d}_x, \bar{d}_{xy}, \bar{d}_y, \bar{p})} \right), \quad (7)
\end{aligned}$$

where

$$\bar{d}_x + \bar{d}_{xy} \leq 1, \quad (8)$$

$$\bar{d}_y + \bar{d}_{xy} \leq 1, \quad (9)$$

$$\bar{p} \leq \frac{\bar{d}_{xy}}{2}, \text{ and} \quad (10)$$

$$\bar{d}_x, \bar{d}_{xy}, \bar{d}_y, \bar{p} \geq 0. \quad (11)$$

Suppose that, subject to (8) to (11), the values of \bar{d}_x , \bar{d}_{xy} , \bar{d}_y , and \bar{p} are chosen such that $f(\bar{d}_x, \bar{d}_{xy}, \bar{d}_y, \bar{p})$ assumes its maximum value f_{\max} . Since $f(\bar{d}_x, \bar{d}_{xy}, \bar{d}_y, \bar{p})$ equals $-\frac{1}{2}\bar{d}_x^2 + (1 - \bar{p})\bar{d}_x$ plus a function that does not depend on \bar{d}_x , and, hence, $\frac{\partial}{\partial \bar{d}_x} f(\bar{d}_x, \bar{d}_{xy}, \bar{d}_y, \bar{p}) = 1 - \bar{p} - \bar{d}_x$, it follows that condition (8), and, by symmetry, also condition (9) holds with equality. Setting $g(\bar{d}_{xy}, \bar{p}) := f(1 - \bar{d}_{xy}, \bar{d}_{xy}, 1 - \bar{d}_{xy}, \bar{p})$, we obtain

$$g(\bar{d}_{xy}, \bar{p}) = 1 - \frac{3}{2}\bar{d}_{xy}^2 - \bar{p}^2 + \bar{d}_{xy} - 2\bar{p} + 3\bar{d}_{xy}\bar{p}.$$

First, suppose that $\bar{d}_{xy} \leq \frac{2}{3}$. Since $\frac{\partial}{\partial \bar{d}_{xy}} g(\bar{d}_{xy}, \bar{p}) = 1 + 3\bar{p} - 3\bar{d}_{xy}$, we obtain that $\bar{d}_{xy} = \bar{p} + \frac{1}{3}$, and that $0 \leq \bar{p} \leq \frac{1}{3}$. Note that in this case

$$g\left(\bar{p} + \frac{1}{3}, \bar{p}\right) = \frac{7}{6} - \bar{p} + \frac{1}{2}\bar{p}^2 \leq \frac{7}{6}. \quad (12)$$

Next, suppose that $\bar{d}_{xy} \geq \frac{2}{3}$. Since $\frac{\partial}{\partial \bar{p}} g(\bar{d}_{xy}, \bar{p}) = 3\bar{d}_{xy} - 2 - 2\bar{p}$, we obtain that $\bar{p} = \frac{3}{2}\bar{d}_{xy} - 1$, and that $\frac{2}{3} \leq \bar{d}_{xy} \leq 1$. Note that in this case

$$g\left(\bar{d}_{xy}, \frac{3}{2}\bar{d}_{xy} - 1\right) = 2 - 2\bar{d}_{xy} + \frac{3}{4}\bar{d}_{xy}^2 \leq 1. \quad (13)$$

In view of (12) and (13), we obtain $f_{\max} = \frac{7}{6}$, which, by (7), implies $c_G(xy) \leq \frac{7}{6}d^2 + d$. If p is as in the previous proofs, then $p \leq \sum_{xy \in M} c_G(xy) \leq \left(\frac{7}{6}d^2 + d\right)|M|$, and, by the maximality of M , we obtain $p \geq m(G)$, which implies the desired lower bound on $|M|$. \square

We close with the obvious corollary.

Corollary 11 LOCAL SEARCH is a polynomial time $\left(\frac{1}{2}d + \frac{3}{4} - \frac{1}{8d-4}\right)$ -factor approximation algorithm for the maximum induced matching problem in claw-free d -regular graphs. Furthermore, choosing any maximal induced matching is a polynomial time $\left(\frac{7}{12}d + \frac{19}{24} + \frac{19}{48d-24}\right)$ -factor approximation algorithm for the same problem.

It seems possible to generalize Theorem 10 and Corollary 11 to $K_{1,r}$ -free graphs. Combining LOCAL SEARCH with some greedy preprocessing might further improve the approximation guarantees obtained in this paper.

References

- [1] A. Brandstädt and R. Mosca, On distance-3 matchings and induced matchings, *Discrete Appl. Math.* 159 (2011) 509-520.
- [2] K. Cameron, Induced matchings in intersection graphs, *Discrete Math.* 278 (2004) 1-9.
- [3] F.R.K. Chung, A. Gyárfás, Zs. Tuza, and W.T. Trotter, The maximum number of edges in $2K_2$ -free graphs of bounded degree, *Discrete Math.* 81 (1990) 129-135.
- [4] K.K. Dabrowski, M. Demange, and V.V. Lozin, New results on maximum induced matchings in bipartite graphs and beyond, *Theor. Comput. Sci.* 478 (2013) 33-40.
- [5] W. Duckworth, D.F. Manlove, and M. Zito, On the approximability of the maximum induced matching problem, *J. Discrete Algorithms* 3 (2005) 79-91.
- [6] Z. Gotthilf and M. Lewenstein, Tighter approximations for maximum induced matchings in regular graphs, *Lect. Notes Comput. Sci.* 3879 (2006) 270-281.
- [7] D. Kobler and U. Rotics, Finding Maximum Induced Matchings in Subclasses of Claw-Free and P_5 -Free Graphs, and in Graphs with Matching and Induced Matching of Equal Maximum Size, *Algorithmica* 37 (2003) 327-346.
- [8] V.V. Lozin, On maximum induced matchings in bipartite graphs, *Inf. Process. Lett.* 81 (2002) 7-11.
- [9] D. Rautenbach, Two greedy consequences for maximum induced matchings, *Theor. Comput. Sci.* 602 (2015) 32-38.
- [10] L.J. Stockmeyer and V.V. Vazirani, NP-completeness of some generalizations of the maximum matching problem, *Inf. Process. Lett.* 15 (1982) 14-19.
- [11] M. Zito, Induced matchings in regular graphs and trees, *Lect. Notes Comput. Sci.* 1665 (1999) 89-100.