

Enumerating minimal dominating sets in the (in)comparability graphs of bounded dimension posets*

Marthe Bonamy¹, Oscar Defrain²,
Piotr Micek³, and Lhouari Nourine²

¹*CNRS, LaBRI, Université de Bordeaux, France.*

²*LIMOS, Université Clermont Auvergne, France.*

³*Theoretical Computer Science Department,
Faculty of Mathematics and Computer Science,
Jagiellonian University, Kraków, Poland.*

April 15, 2020

Abstract

Enumerating minimal transversals in a hypergraph is a notoriously hard problem. It can be reduced to enumerating minimal dominating sets in a graph, in fact even to enumerating minimal dominating sets in an incomparability graph.

We provide an output-polynomial time algorithm for incomparability graphs whose underlying posets have bounded dimension. Through a different proof technique, we also provide an output-polynomial algorithm for their complements, i.e., for comparability graphs of bounded dimension posets.

Our algorithm for incomparability graphs is based on flashlight search and relies on the geometrical representation of incomparability graphs with bounded dimension, as given by Golumbic et al. in 1983. It runs with polynomial delay and only needs polynomial space. Our algorithm for comparability graphs is based on the flipping method introduced by Golovach et al. in 2015. It performs in incremental-polynomial time and requires exponential space.

In addition, we show how to improve the flipping method so that it requires only polynomial space. Since the flipping method is a key tool for the best known algorithms enumerating minimal dominating sets in a number of graph classes, this yields direct improvements on the state of the art.

Keywords: minimal dominating sets, algorithmic enumeration, comparability graphs, incomparability graphs

*The first author has been supported by the ANR project GrR ANR-18-CE40-0032 (2019-2023). The second and last authors have been supported by the ANR project GraphEn ANR-15-CE40-0009. The third author has been supported by the Polish National Science Center grant (BEETHOVEN; UMO-2018/31/G/ST1/03718).

1 Introduction

The problem we consider in this paper is the enumeration of all (inclusion-wise) minimal dominating sets of a graph, denoted by DOM-ENUM. A *dominating set* in a graph G is a set of vertices D such that every vertex of G is either in D , or is adjacent to a vertex in D . It is (inclusion-wise) *minimal* if no strict subset of D is a dominating set. Due to its equivalence with the problem of enumerating all (inclusion-wise) minimal transversals of a hypergraph, denoted by TRANS-ENUM, DOM-ENUM has been widely studied this last decade. Latest publications on the problem include [GHK⁺18, KKP18, BDHR19, DN19, GKLS19].

As an n -vertex graph G may contain a number $|\mathcal{D}(G)|$ of minimal dominating sets which is exponential in n , one can only aim to provide algorithms running in time exponential in n , or, to provide algorithms whose running time is polynomial in $n + |\mathcal{D}(G)|$. We only focus here on algorithms of the second type, and refer to [FGPS08, CHvHK13, GKLS19] for input exponential-time algorithms for the problem we consider in this paper. An algorithm of the second type—running in polynomial time in the sizes of both the input and the output—is called *output-polynomial*. It is said to be running in *incremental-polynomial time* if it moreover outputs the i^{th} solution in a time which is bounded by a polynomial in n plus i , for all i . If the running times before the first output, between any two consecutive outputs, and after the last output, are bounded by a polynomial in n only, then the algorithm is said to be running with *polynomial delay*. We refer the reader to [JYP88, CKP⁺19, Str19] for a more detailed introduction on the complexity of enumeration algorithms.

The existence of an output-polynomial time algorithm for DOM-ENUM (or TRANS-ENUM) is a long-standing open question [EG95, EMG08, KLMN14]. To date, the best known algorithm is due to Fredman and Khachiyan and comes from the dualization of monotone Boolean functions [FK96]. It runs in output quasi-polynomial time $N^{o(\log N)}$ where $N = n + |\mathcal{D}(G)|$. Output-polynomial time algorithms are known for several classes of graphs, including $\log(n)$ -degenerate graphs [EGM03] and triangle-free graphs [BDHR19], later extended to K_t -free, paw-free, and diamond-free graphs in [BDH⁺19]. Incremental-polynomial time algorithms are known for chordal bipartite graphs [GHK⁺16], $\{C_6, C_8\}$ -free bipartite graphs [KKP18], graphs of bounded conformality [BEGK04], and unit square graphs [GHK⁺18]. Polynomial-delay algorithms are known for bounded degeneracy graphs [EGM03], for chordal, and line graphs [KLM⁺15a, KLM⁺15b]. Finally, linear-delay algorithms are known for graphs of bounded cliquewidth [Cou09], permutation and interval graphs [KLM⁺13], split and P_7 -free chordal graphs [KLMN14, DN19]. In terms of negative results, DOM-ENUM is as hard in co-bipartite graphs as in general [KLMN14].

The graph classes we consider in the following are related to partially ordered sets, in short posets. If P is a poset on the set of elements V , then the *comparability graph* of P is the graph G defined on vertex set $V(G) = V$ and where two distinct vertices u and v are adjacent if they are comparable in P . The *incomparability graph* of P is the complement: u and v are adjacent if they are incomparable in P . Note that every bipartite graph is a comparability graph, hence every co-bipartite graph is an incomparability graph. The dimension, introduced in 1941 by Dushnik and Miller [DM41], is a key measure of complexity of posets and an analogue of the chromatic number for graphs. The *dimension* of a poset P is the least integer d such that elements of P can be embedded into \mathbb{R}^d in such a way that $x \leq y$ in P if and only if the point of x is below the point of y with respect to the product order of \mathbb{R}^d (the component-wise comparison of coordinates). Alternatively, the dimension of a poset can be defined as the least integer d such that P is the intersection of d linear orders \leq_1, \dots, \leq_d on same ground set, i.e., $x \leq y$ in P if and only if $x \leq_1 y, \dots, x \leq_d y$.

Since DOM-ENUM is as hard in incomparability graphs as in general, an output-polynomial algorithm would be a major, albeit unlikely, breakthrough. Algorithms for natural subclasses of incomparability graphs, such as interval graphs (incomparability graphs of interval orders) and permutations graphs (incomparability graphs of 2-dimensional posets), were obtained in [KLM⁺13]. Our contribution is as follows.

Theorem 1.1. *For any fixed integer d , there is a polynomial space, output-polynomial time algorithm enumerating minimal dominating sets in the incomparability graphs of posets with dimension at most d , represented as the intersection of d linear orders.*

The algorithm for incomparability graphs is based on *flashlight search* and relies on the geometrical representation of incomparability graphs of bounded dimension, which was given by Golombic et al. in [GRU83]. It runs with polynomial delay and needs polynomial space.

DOM-ENUM in comparability graphs is also widely open: only the subcase of bipartite graphs (comparability graphs of posets of height at most 2) has been solved recently [BDHR19]. However, there is no reason to believe that DOM-ENUM is as hard for comparability graphs as in general. We prove that it is tractable when the underlying poset has bounded dimension, as follows.

Theorem 1.2. *For any fixed integer d , there is an output-polynomial time algorithm enumerating minimal dominating sets in the comparability graphs of posets with dimension at most d .*

The algorithm for comparability graphs is based on the *flipping method* recently introduced by Golovach et al. in [GHKV15]. It performs in incremental-polynomial time and requires exponential space, using as a blackbox the algorithm of Khachiyan et al. in [KBEG07] for the dualization in hypergraphs of bounded conformality. It also covers the comparability graphs of S_t -free posets.

In addition to these contributions, we show with Lemma 3.3 how the flipping method can be improved to work only using polynomial space. While this is not enough to make Theorem 1.2 run in polynomial space, it turns existing algorithms for line graphs [GHKV15], graphs of girth at least 7, chordal bipartite graphs [GHK⁺16], and unit-square graphs [GHK⁺18], into incremental polynomial time algorithms using polynomial space.

The paper is organized as follows. In Section 2 we introduce definitions and notation from graph and order theory that will be used throughout the paper. In Section 3, we recall the flipping method from [GHKV15] and show how it can be improved to run using polynomial space. We then show in Section 4 how the method can be reduced to red-blue domination—a variant of domination—in comparability graphs. In Section 5, we show how red-blue domination can be solved in the comparability graphs of posets of bounded dimension, and conclude with our first algorithm. The algorithm for incomparability graphs is presented in Section 6. We conclude the paper with discussions and open problems in Section 7.

2 Preliminaries

The objects considered in this paper are finite. If A and B are sets, we denote by 2^A the set of all subsets of A , and by $A \times B$ the Cartesian product $\{(a, b) \mid a \in A, b \in B\}$.

We start with some basic notions from graph theory. A *graph* G is a pair $(V(G), E(G))$ with $V(G)$ its set of vertices (or *ground set*) and $E(G) \subseteq \{\{u, v\} \mid u, v \in V(G), u \neq v\}$ its set of edges. Edges are denoted by uv (or vu) instead of $\{u, v\}$. Two vertices u, v of G are called *adjacent* if $uv \in E(G)$. A *clique* (respectively an *independent set*) in a graph G is a set of

pairwise adjacent (respectively non-adjacent) vertices. A *biclique* is a set of vertices that can be partitioned into two independent sets A, B such that every vertex in A is adjacent to every vertex in B . We denote K_t to be the clique on t elements, and $K_{t,t}$ to be the biclique on $2t$ elements of partition A, B such that $|A| = |B| = t$. The subgraph of G induced by $X \subseteq V(G)$, denoted by $G[X]$, is the graph $(X, E(G) \cap \{\{u, v\} \mid u, v \in X, u \neq v\})$; $G - X$ is the graph $G[V(G) \setminus X]$. For every graph H , we say that G is H -free if no induced subgraph of G is isomorphic to H .

Domination

Let G be a graph and u be a vertex of G . The *neighborhood* of u is the set $N(u) = \{v \in V(G) \mid uv \in E(G)\}$. The *closed neighborhood* of u is the set $N[u] = N(u) \cup \{u\}$. For a subset $X \subseteq V(G)$ we define $N[X] = \bigcup_{x \in X} N[x]$ and $N(X) = N[X] \setminus X$. Let $D, X \subseteq V(G)$ be two subsets of vertices of G . We say that D *dominates* X if $X \subseteq N[D]$. It is (inclusion-wise) minimal if $X \not\subseteq N[D \setminus \{x\}]$ for any $x \in D$. A (minimal) *dominating set* of G is a (minimal) dominating set of $V(G)$. The set of all minimal dominating sets of G is denoted by $\mathcal{D}(G)$. The problem of enumerating $\mathcal{D}(G)$ given G by DOM-ENUM. For a graph G , we denote by $\text{MIS}(G)$ the set of all its (inclusion-wise) maximal independent sets, and by MIS-ENUM the problem of generating $\text{MIS}(G)$ from G . It is easily observed that every maximal independent set is a minimal dominating set, hence that $\text{MIS}(G) \subseteq \mathcal{D}(G)$. However, MIS-ENUM appears to be much more tractable than DOM-ENUM, as witnessed by the many efficient algorithms that are known for the problem [TIAS77, JYP88, MU04]. These last two observations are the starting point of the flipping method introduced in [GHKV15] which we describe at Section 3.

Let $u \in D$. A vertex v that is adjacent only to u in D , i.e., for which $N[v] \cap D = \{u\}$, is a *private neighbor* of u with respect to D . Note that u can be its own private neighbor (we say that u is *self-private*). The set of private neighbors of $u \in D$ is denoted by $\text{Priv}(D, u)$. A set $I \subseteq V(G)$ is called *irredundant* if $\text{Priv}(I, x) \neq \emptyset$ for all $x \in I$. Then D is a minimal dominating set of G if and only if it is both a dominating set, and an irredundant set.

A graph G together with two disjoint subsets $R, B \subseteq V(G)$ constitutes a *red-blue graph* $G(R, B)$, where we consider vertices in R to be *red* and those in B to be *blue*. We do not require for R and B to partition $V(G)$. A *red dominating set* of $G(R, B)$ is a red set $D \subseteq R$ that dominates B , i.e., that is such that $B \subseteq N[D]$. It is (inclusion-wise) minimal if $B \not\subseteq N[D \setminus \{x\}]$ for any $x \in D$. We denote $\mathcal{D}_G(R, B)$ to be the set of all minimal red dominating sets of $G(R, B)$, and RED-BLUE-DOM-ENUM the problem of enumerating $\mathcal{D}_G(R, B)$ given G, R and B . The index may be dropped when the graph G is clear from the context. In the context of red-blue domination, we implicitly restrict our attention to the dominating sets that contain only red vertices, and to private neighbors that are blue.

Posets

A *partially ordered set* (or *poset*) $P = (V, \leq)$ is a pair where V is a set and \leq is a binary relation on V that is reflexive, anti-symmetric and transitive. Two elements u and v of P are said to be *comparable* if $u \leq v$ or $v \leq u$, otherwise they are said to be *incomparable*, denoted $u \parallel v$. A *chain* in a poset P is a set of pairwise comparable elements in P . An *antichain* in a poset P is a set of pairwise incomparable elements in P . A poset P is called a *total order* (or *linear order*) if V is a chain. Posets are represented by their Hasse diagram; see Figure 1.

The *comparability graph* of a poset $P = (V, \leq)$ is the graph G defined on same ground set $V(G) = V$ and where two vertices u and v are made adjacent if they are comparable in P . The




Figure 1: The Hasse diagram of a poset (left), its comparability graph (middle), and incomparability graph (right).

incomparability graph (or *co-comparability graph*) of P is the complement: u and v are made adjacent if they are incomparable in P , see Figure 1.

We now define notations from order theory that will be used in the context of a poset and its *comparability graph* only. Let G be the comparability graph of a poset $P = (V, \leq)$. The *ideal* of u is the set $\downarrow u = \{v \in V \mid v \leq u\}$, and the *filter* of u is the dual $\uparrow u = \{v \in V \mid u \leq v\}$. Note that $N[u] = \downarrow u \cup \uparrow u$. These notions extend to subsets $S \subseteq V$ as follows: $\downarrow S = \bigcup_{u \in S} \downarrow u$, $\uparrow S = \bigcup_{u \in S} \uparrow u$. We note $\text{Min}(S)$ and $\text{Max}(S)$ the sets of minimal and maximal elements in S with respect to \leq . Clearly, $\text{Min}(S)$ and $\text{Max}(S)$ define antichains of P for every $S \subseteq V$. In this context, a (minimal) dominating set of G is a (minimal) set $D \subseteq V$ such that $\uparrow D \cup \downarrow D = V$, and a (maximal) independent set of G is a (maximal) antichain of P .

The *dimension* of a poset $P = (V, \leq)$ is the least integer t such that P is the intersection of t linear orders \leq_1, \dots, \leq_t on V , i.e., $x \leq y$ if and only if $x \leq_1 y, \dots, x \leq_t y$.

We call the poset induced by $X \subseteq V$, denoted $P[X]$, the suborder restricted on the elements of X only. A poset $P = (V, \leq)$ is *bipartite* if V can be partitioned into two sets A, B such that $a < b$ implies $a \in A$ and $b \in B$. We denote S_t , the *standard example of order t* , to be a poset with bipartition $A = \{a_1, \dots, a_t\}$ and $B = \{b_1, \dots, b_t\}$ such that $a_i < b_j$ for all $i \neq j \in \{1, \dots, t\}$. See Figure 2 for an example of these posets. It is well known that S_t has dimension t [DM41]. Note that dimension is monotone under taking induced suborders. Therefore, posets containing a large standard example as a suborder have large dimension. The converse is however not true, as there are posets of unbounded dimension with no S_2 as an induced suborder, see [Tro92] for a comprehensive study and references.




Figure 2: The standard example of order four.

Hypergraphs

A *hypergraph* \mathcal{H} is a pair $(V(\mathcal{H}), \mathcal{E}(\mathcal{H}))$ with $V(\mathcal{H})$ its set of vertices (or *ground set*) and $\mathcal{E}(\mathcal{H}) \subseteq 2^{V(\mathcal{H})}$ its set of edges (or *hyperedges*). A hypergraph \mathcal{H} is called *Sperner* if $E_1 \not\subseteq E_2$ for any two distinct hyperedges in \mathcal{H} . A *transversal* of \mathcal{H} is a set $T \subseteq V(\mathcal{H})$ that intersects every hyperedge in \mathcal{H} . It is (inclusion-wise) *minimal* if $T \setminus \{x\}$ is not a transversal of \mathcal{H} for any $x \in T$. The sets of all minimal transversals of \mathcal{H} is denoted by $\text{Tr}(\mathcal{H})$, and the problem of enumerating $\text{Tr}(\mathcal{H})$ given \mathcal{H} by TRANS-ENUM.

Note that DOM-ENUM appears as a particular case of TRANS-ENUM when considering the hypergraph $\mathcal{N}(G)$ of closed neighborhoods of a given graph G , defined by $V(\mathcal{N}(G)) = V(G)$ and $\mathcal{E}(\mathcal{N}(G)) = \{N[x] \mid x \in V(G)\}$. Indeed, a minimal dominating set of G is a minimal set intersecting every neighborhood of G , and hence $\text{Tr}(\mathcal{N}(G)) = \mathcal{D}(G)$. In fact, the two problems were shown polynomially equivalent¹ by Kanté et al. in [KLMN14] even when restricted to co-bipartite graphs. This in particular shows that DOM-ENUM in co-bipartite graphs is as hard as for general graphs. As for TRANS-ENUM and RED-BLUE-DOM-ENUM, it is easily seen that they are polynomially equivalent even when restricted to red-blue bipartite graphs of bipartition red and blue. First, every red-blue graph $G(R, B)$ corresponds to a hypergraph \mathcal{H} , defined by $V(\mathcal{H}) = R$ and $\mathcal{E}(\mathcal{H}) = \{N(x) \cap R \mid x \in B\}$, satisfying $\text{Tr}(\mathcal{H}) = \mathcal{D}(R, B)$. Then, every instance \mathcal{H} of TRANS-ENUM corresponds to a bipartite instance $G(R, B)$ of RED-BLUE-DOM-ENUM, defined by $R = V(\mathcal{H})$, $B = \{y_E \mid E \in \mathcal{E}(\mathcal{H})\}$, with an edge xy_E if and only if $x \in E$, which satisfies $\mathcal{D}(R, B) = \text{Tr}(\mathcal{H})$.

3 Polynomial-space flipping method

Golovach, Heggernes, Kratsch and Villanger introduced in [GHKV15] the so-called *flipping method* to efficiently enumerate minimal dominating sets in line graphs. This method was later used with much success [GHK⁺16, GHK⁺18, KKP18]. A key step in this method is the *flipping operation*. We recall it below and in the process, we show that the flipping method can be improved to run with polynomial space (in contrast to exponential space from the original version).

3.1 The flipping operation

Let G be an n -vertex graph and v_1, \dots, v_n be any ordering of vertices in G . We note that this order induces a lexicographical order on the family $2^{V(G)}$. Let D be a minimal dominating set of G such that $G[D]$ contains at least one edge incident to some vertex u . The following procedure is illustrated in Figure 3. Since D is a minimal dominating set, the set $\text{Priv}(D, u)$ is not empty. Let $v \in \text{Priv}(D, u)$. Since u is adjacent with another vertex from D , we have $u \notin \text{Priv}(D, u)$, so $v \neq u$. We want to replace u with v (*flip* u, v) and obtain another minimal dominating set. Let $X_{uv} \subseteq \text{Priv}(D, u) \setminus N[v]$ be the lexicographically smallest maximal independent set in $G[\text{Priv}(D, u) \setminus N[v]]$. In other words, X_{uv} is obtained from the empty set by iteratively adding a vertex of smallest index in $\text{Priv}(D, u) \setminus N[\{v\} \cup X_{uv}]$, until no such vertex exists. Consider the set $D' = (D \setminus \{u\}) \cup X_{uv} \cup \{v\}$. Note that D' is a (not necessarily minimal) dominating set of G . Some vertices of D' may have no private neighbors, however every vertex of $X_{uv} \cup \{v\}$ is self-private. Let Z_{uv} be the lexicographically smallest set which has to be removed from D' in order to make it minimal. In other words, Z_{uv} is obtained from the empty set by iteratively adding a vertex z of smallest index in $D' \setminus Z_{uv}$ such that z has no private neighbor with respect to $D' \setminus Z_{uv}$, until no such vertex exists. Since the elements of $X_{uv} \cup \{v\}$ are self-private in D' , the sets $X_{uv} \cup \{v\}$ and Z_{uv} are disjoint, and non-adjacent. Let us finally set $D^* = ((D \setminus \{u\}) \cup X_{uv} \cup \{v\}) \setminus Z_{uv}$. Then D^* is a minimal dominating set of G .

Observe that since X_{uv} and Z_{uv} are selected greedily with respect to v_1, \dots, v_n , this procedure is deterministic. Therefore, the procedure assigns to every minimal dominating set

¹Two enumeration problems Π_A and Π_B are said to be *polynomially equivalent* when there is an output-polynomial time algorithm solving Π_A if and only if there is one solving Π_B . If there is an output-polynomial time algorithm solving Π_A whenever there is one solving Π_B , then we say that Π_A is (*at least*) *as hard as* Π_B .




Figure 3: An illustration of the flipping operation on a dominating set D such that $G[D]$ contains at least one edge incident to some vertex u , here depicted by uw . Black vertices are elements of D , white vertices are some elements of $\text{Priv}(D, u)$. Dashed discs represent closed neighborhoods, and plain disks represent private neighborhoods.

D of G , and to every two vertices u, v such that u is in D and is not isolated in $G[D]$, and $v \in \text{Priv}(D, u)$, a unique set D^* . We call D^* the *parent of D with respect to flipping u and v* , and denote it by $\text{Parent}_{uv}(D)$. Conversely, we denote by $\text{Children}(D^*)$ the set of all minimal dominating sets D such that $D^* = \text{Parent}_{uv}(D)$ for some edge uv , and call *child of D^** any element of $\text{Children}(D^*)$. Note that, in the procedure, every edge in $G[D^*]$ is also an edge in $G[D]$, while there is at least one edge incident with u that appears in $G[D]$ and not in $G[D^*]$. This simple but important observation was formalized as follows.

Proposition 3.1 ([GHKV15]). *Let $D, D^* \in \mathcal{D}(G)$ be such that $D^* = \text{Parent}_{uv}(D)$ for some edge uv . Then $E(G[D^*]) \subsetneq E(G[D])$ and v is an isolated vertex of $G[D^*]$.*

The *flipping operation* is then defined to be the reverse of how $D^* = \text{Parent}_{uv}(D)$ was generated from D . This means, given D^* with an isolated element $v \in D^*$ and u a neighbor of v , the operation removes X_{uv} and adds back Z_{uv} , to obtain a child D of D^* with respect to flipping u and v . Obviously, the difficulty is to guess appropriate sets for X_{uv} and Z_{uv} when we are given only D^* , u , and v .

3.2 The flipping method

We now describe the flipping method as originally introduced in [GHKV15]. Assume that there exists an algorithm A that, given $D^* \in \mathcal{D}(G)$, enumerates a family \mathcal{D} of minimal dominating sets of G such that $\text{Children}(D^*) \subseteq \mathcal{D} \subseteq \mathcal{D}(G)$. We stress the fact that \mathcal{D} may contain minimal dominating sets that are not actual children of D^* . The *flipping method*, then, consists of a depth-first search (DFS) on a directed supergraph² \mathcal{G} whose nodes are minimal dominating sets of G , with one additional special node r , called the root, which has no in-neighbors. The out-neighbors of the root are the maximal independent sets of G (which are minimal dominating sets), and there is an arc from a minimal dominating set $D^* \in V(\mathcal{G})$ to another one $D \in V(\mathcal{G})$ if A generates D from D^* . At first, the DFS is initiated at the root. Its out-neighbors are generated with polynomial delay using the algorithm of Tsukiyama et al. [TIAS77]. The out-neighbors of the other nodes are generated using A . Since A outputs (in particular) every child of a given node, we can argue using Proposition 3.1 that every minimal dominating set

²While this is the standard term in this context, one may be more comfortable thinking of it as an “auxiliary graph”.

is reachable from r . More solutions may however be output by A, and all the difficulty lies in handling the inherent repetitions.

In [GHKV15] and later papers [GHK⁺16, GHK⁺18], a list of already visited nodes of \mathcal{G} is maintained in order to handle repetitions, inexorably requiring space that is linear in $\mathcal{D}(G)$, thus potentially exponential in n . The stack of an arbitrary DFS from the root r to the current visited node D may also require exponential space. The achieved time complexity, on the other hand, is incremental-polynomial.

Lemma 3.2 ([GHKV15]). *Let G be a graph. Suppose that there is an algorithm A that, given $D^* \in \mathcal{D}(G)$, enumerates with polynomial delay a family \mathcal{D} of minimal dominating sets of G such that $\text{Children}(D^*) \subseteq \mathcal{D} \subseteq \mathcal{D}(G)$. Then there is an algorithm that enumerates with incremental delay the set $\mathcal{D}(G)$ of all minimal dominating sets of G .*

We would like to mention that a similar proof allows for “incremental delay” instead of “polynomial delay” in the hypothesis of this statement. We further strengthen the statement in the following.

3.3 A polynomial-space flipping method

We show here that guiding the DFS toward the children, together with a folklore trick (see e.g. [BDH⁺19, Lemma 5.1]) on running the algorithm again at each output, allows us to handle repetitions with polynomial space at the cost of an increased—but still incremental-polynomial—complexity.

The next lemma is central to the next section and may be regarded as a space improvement of Lemma 3.2. It is also of general interest as far as the flipping method is concerned.

Lemma 3.3. *Let G be an n -vertex graph, let $p: \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ and $s \in \mathbb{N}$. Suppose that there is an algorithm A that, given $D^* \in \mathcal{D}(G)$, enumerates a family \mathcal{D} with delay $p(t)$ and space s , where $\text{Children}(D^*) \subseteq \mathcal{D} \subseteq \mathcal{D}(G)$, p is a non-decreasing function, and t is the number of elements of \mathcal{D} already generated. Then there is an algorithm that enumerates the set $\mathcal{D}(G)$ of all minimal dominating sets of G with delay*

$$O(n^9) \cdot i^3 \cdot p(i)^2$$

and space $O(n^2) \cdot s$, where i is the number of already generated minimal dominating sets.

Proof. In the following, let \mathcal{G}' be the directed graph³ on vertex set $V(\mathcal{G}') = \mathcal{D}(G) \cup \{r\}$ and edge set $E(\mathcal{G}') = \{(r, D) \mid D \in \text{MIS}(G)\} \cup \{(D^*, D) \mid D \in \text{Children}(D^*)\}$, where r is a special vertex referred to as the *root*.

Let us first argue that every minimal dominating set D is reachable from r in \mathcal{G}' , by induction on the number of edges in it. If D contains no edge, it is a maximal independent set, thus an out-neighbor of r . If D contains an edge uw , we can flip u and one of its private neighbors v . Let $D^* = \text{Parent}_{uw}(D)$. By Proposition 3.1, D^* has fewer edges than D and is thus reachable from r . There is an arc from D^* to D in \mathcal{G}' , hence the conclusion. Therefore, a DFS of \mathcal{G}' initiated at r visits all minimal dominating sets of G .

Furthermore, for every minimal dominating set D and every directed path from r to D the length of the path is at most $|E(G[D])| \leq n^2$.

³This forms a subgraph of \mathcal{G} as defined in Section 3.2: Informally, the directed graph \mathcal{G}' is what \mathcal{G} would be if A was reliable, i.e., only generated children of D^* .

We now describe an algorithm B that enumerates, possibly with repetitions, the set $\mathcal{D}(G)$ of all minimal dominating sets of G . When B outputs a set that was not output before we call this output a *first occurrence*. The algorithm B will output first occurrences with a delay

$$O(n^7) \cdot i \cdot p(i)$$

and space $O(n^2) \cdot s$, where i is the number of first occurrences output so far. Algorithm B proceeds as follows. First, it outputs every out-neighbor of r without duplication using the algorithm of Tsukiyama et al. in [TIAS77]. Then, it proceeds with what boils down to a DFS of \mathcal{G}' initiated at r , as follows. When visiting a node $D^* \in V(\mathcal{G}')$, B seeks the children of D^* by running A. Each set D returned by A is then output by B. Then B checks if D is a child of D^* . If so, B “pauses” the execution of A on D^* , and launches A on D . When the execution of A on D is complete, B “resumes” the execution of A on D^* .

Before, we discuss the delays between consecutive first occurrences output by B, we take a pause to determine the following: given D and D^* in \mathcal{G}' , how fast can we determine if D is a child of D^* ? The brute force approach we choose goes as follows: (1) guess the vertex u in D (such that there is an edge incident to u in $G[D]$); (2) guess the vertex v in $\text{Priv}(D, u)$; (3) perform the flipping operation along the uv edge; (4) check if the resulting set is D^* . Note that the number of possible guesses in (1) and (2) is at most n^2 . In order to make a flip when u and v are fixed, we need to compute the sets X_{uv} and Z_{uv} . The straightforward approach does it in $O(n^3)$ time. Therefore, we can determine if D is a child of D^* in $O(n^5)$ time and $O(n^2)$ space (as for convenience, we work with the adjacency matrix).

We now examine the delay of B between two consecutive first occurrences. The outputs generated by the algorithm of Tsukiyama et al., so the maximal independent sets of G , are produced within $O(n^3)$ time and $O(n^2)$ space, see [TIAS77].

Let D be a first occurrence output by B that is produced by a call of A on a node D^* in \mathcal{G}' . Say that D is the i -th first occurrence in order output by B. Thus D is a child of D^* . To obtain the next first occurrence output by B, we consider the path from r to D in \mathcal{G}' . The algorithm B continues launching A on D and for each node of the path, except r and D , B has on the stack a paused execution of A called on the node. In the worst case scenario, all the executions will be resumed and each of them will output at most i sets, all of them being already output by B before. Since the length of the path from r to D^* is bounded by n^2 and since p is a non-decreasing function, there are at most $n^2 \cdot i \cdot p(i)$ sets output by the executions of A. Each set is checked by B to see if it is a child of the respective node of \mathcal{G}' . A single check takes $O(n^5)$ time, so in total in $O(n^7) \cdot i \cdot p(i)$ time the algorithm B outputs the next first occurrence.

We note that since the time spent between the i -th and $(i+1)$ -th first occurrence produced by B is $O(n^7) \cdot i \cdot p(i)$, and since the total number of first occurrences is $|\mathcal{D}(G)| \leq 2^n$, there is a small constant c such that B runs for at most $\text{poly}(n + 2^n) \leq 2^{cn}$ time.

The space consumed by B is dominated by the space taken by at most n^2 paused executions of A and the adjacency matrix of G . Thus B runs in $O(n^2) \cdot s$ space.

We are now ready to describe an algorithm C that enumerates $\mathcal{D}(G)$ without repetitions and within the desired time and space constraints. Algorithm C proceeds as follows. First, it launches a master instance of B. It also maintains a counter keeping track of the number of steps (i.e., elementary steps counted by the time complexity) of the master instance of B. Since B runs for at most 2^{cn} steps, a cn -bits long counter suffices. Whenever the master instance outputs a new set D , and the counter of steps indicates i , the algorithm C launches a new instance of B, runs it for $i-1$ steps, and compares each of its output with D . The new instance of B is killed after exactly $i-1$ steps. If D did not appear as the output of the new instance, then we conclude that it is a first occurrence of the master instance, and the algorithm C outputs D .

If D has appeared as one of the outputs of the new instance, then C ignores it and continues the simulation of the master instance. In that way, every set of $\mathcal{D}(G)$ is output by C without repetitions.

We now examine the delay of C between the output of the i -th and $(i + 1)$ -th minimal dominating sets. Consider the simulation of the master instance of B from the i -th to the $(i + 1)$ -th first appearance. During that time, recall that at most $n^2 \cdot i \cdot p(i)$ sets are output by the executions of A . Thus, the number of new instances of B launched by C between the two outputs is bounded by $n^2 \cdot i \cdot p(i)$. Every such instance runs for at most $i \cdot O(n^7) \cdot i \cdot p(i)$ time (as p is non-decreasing). In total, C runs for at most

$$n^2 \cdot i \cdot p(i) \cdot i \cdot O(n^7) \cdot i \cdot p(i) = O(n^9) \cdot i^3 \cdot p(i)^2$$

time steps.

The space consumed by C is determined by the space required by at most two independent instances of B running in the same time which is $2 \cdot O(n^2) \cdot s$, and the size of the counter which is $O(n)$. Thus C runs in $O(n^2) \cdot s$ space. \square

The algorithms given in [GHKV15, GHK⁺16, GHK⁺18] for line graphs, graphs of girth at least 7, chordal bipartite graphs, and unit-square graphs rely on the flipping method and run in incremental-polynomial time and exponential space. By directly plugging in Lemma 3.3 instead of Lemma 3.2 in the procedure, we obtain the following.

Corollary 3.4. *There is an incremental-polynomial time and polynomial-space algorithm enumerating minimal dominating sets in line graphs, graphs of girth at least 7, chordal bipartite graphs, and unit-square graphs.*

4 Flipping method in comparability graphs

We now show how the flipping method, and more particularly the existence of an algorithm as required in Lemma 3.3, can be reduced to red-blue domination in comparability graphs.

Recall that Lemma 3.3 is stated for general graphs and that the family \mathcal{D} to be constructed can contain arbitrarily many solutions that are not actual children. In [GHKV15], [GHK⁺16] and [GHK⁺18], the authors were able to provide such an algorithm A in line graphs, graphs of girth seven, chordal bipartite graphs and unit square graphs. In these last two cases, they proved that to obtain an efficient A , it suffices to design an efficient algorithm that enumerates all the minimal red dominating sets of an appropriate subgraph within the same class. We conduct a similar analysis to show that, in comparability graphs, it suffices to design an efficient algorithm that enumerates all the minimal red dominating sets of a subgraph in which blue vertices are minimal with respect to the associated poset.

Lemma 4.1. *Let G be the comparability graph of a poset $P = (V, \leq)$. Suppose that there is an algorithm B that, given an antichain B of P and a set $R \subseteq \uparrow B \setminus B$, enumerates with polynomial delay and polynomial space the set $\mathcal{D}(R, B)$ of minimal red dominating sets of $G(R, B)$. Then there is an algorithm A' that, given $D^* \in \mathcal{D}(G)$ and $u, v \in V(G)$, enumerates with polynomial delay a family $\mathcal{D} \subseteq \mathcal{D}(G)$ of minimal dominating sets of G with the property that \mathcal{D} contains all minimal dominating sets D such that $D^* = \text{Parent}_{uv}(D)$.*

Proof. The proof is conducted in the fashion of [GHK⁺16]. We are given a minimal dominating set D^* of G , an isolated vertex v of $G[D^*]$, and a neighbor u of v . Let us assume in the following that $u \leq v$ in P . The dual situation is handled by flipping upside-down the poset.




Figure 4: A minimal dominating set D (on the left) and its parent $D^* = \text{Parent}_{uv}(D)$ (on the right) represented by black vertices in the underlying poset of a comparability graph. The edge induced by D and incident to u is depicted by uv .

This situation is depicted in Figure 4 (right). We aim to compute using \mathcal{B} a family of sets \mathcal{D} such that $\{D \in \mathcal{D}(G) \mid D^* = \text{Parent}_{uv}(D)\} \subseteq \mathcal{D} \subseteq \mathcal{D}(G)$.

Let $R_1 \subseteq \uparrow u \cap D^*$ be the set of upper-neighbors x of u in D^* such that $x \in \text{Priv}(D^*, x)$, i.e., these vertices are self-private in D^* . Note that in particular, R_1 is an antichain of P , and it contains v . Let $B = V(G) \setminus N[(D^* \setminus R_1) \cup \{u\}]$ be the set of all vertices that are not dominated anymore when replacing R_1 with u in D^* . Note that $B \subseteq \downarrow R_1 \setminus R_1$. Finally, let $R_2 = \uparrow B \setminus N[R_1]$. In particular, there are no edges between R_1 and R_2 . Let us finally set $R = (R_1 \setminus \{v\}) \cup R_2$. Informally, R forms the set of vertices we can use to dominate B . We exclude v from that set, since the whole point of the operation is to delete v . We obtain $R \subseteq \uparrow B \setminus B$, and in fact $B \subseteq \downarrow R \setminus R$. Note that B is not necessarily an antichain, so we restrict our attention to the maximal elements of B .

The notation $\mathcal{D}(R \cap \uparrow \text{Max}(B), \text{Max}(B))$ is blatantly cumbersome. To simplify the upcoming arguments, we first prove that $\mathcal{D}(R \cap \uparrow \text{Max}(B), \text{Max}(B))$ is in fact equal to the conceptually simpler $\mathcal{D}(R, B)$.

Claim 4.2. *The sets $\mathcal{D}(R, B)$ and $\mathcal{D}(R \cap \uparrow \text{Max}(B), \text{Max}(B))$ are equal.*

Proof. We recall that $B \subseteq \downarrow R \setminus R$. As a consequence, $R \subseteq \uparrow \text{Max}(B)$, and it suffices to argue that $\mathcal{D}(R, B) = \mathcal{D}(R, \text{Max}(B))$.

We first note that every dominating set of $\text{Max}(B)$ in $\uparrow \text{Max}(B)$ is a dominating set of B . Indeed, for any $x \in B$, $y \in \text{Max}(B)$, and $z \in \uparrow \text{Max}(B)$, if xy and yz are both edges, then $x \leq y$ and $y \leq z$, so that xz is an edge. This guarantees $\mathcal{D}(R, \text{Max}(B)) \subseteq \mathcal{D}(R, B)$.

The converse is straightforward in the sense that every dominating set of B is in particular a dominating set of $\text{Max}(B)$. As we argued above, any subset that dominates $\text{Max}(B)$ dominates B . Therefore, by minimality, no proper subset of a set in $\mathcal{D}(R, B)$ dominates $\text{Max}(B)$. Every minimal dominating set of B in R is a minimal dominating of $\text{Max}(B)$, hence $\mathcal{D}(R, B) \subseteq \mathcal{D}(R, \text{Max}(B))$ and the conclusion. \square

Let us now describe \mathcal{A}' . We enumerate all minimal red dominating sets in $\mathcal{D}(R, B)$ using \mathcal{B} with Claim 4.2. For each minimal red dominating set $X \in \mathcal{D}(R, B)$, we consider the set $D' = (D^* \setminus R_1) \cup \{u\} \cup X$ of vertices of G . Note that X may be empty, in which case $B = \emptyset$ and $\mathcal{D}(R, B) = \{\emptyset\}$; that is not an issue. We greedily reduce D' into an irredundant set D of G , and output D .

This may seem counter-intuitive in an enumeration context, as a greedy reduction typically does not explore all options. However, we will argue later (see Claim 4.6) that D' is already

irredundant in all relevant cases, so $D = D'$ and the greedy reduction does not affect the pool of children.

Let \mathcal{D} be the set of all generated sets; we prove in the following four claims that \mathcal{D} has the desired properties. Namely, the correctness of A' follows from Claims 4.3 and 4.6. We conclude the proof with the complexity analysis of A' .

Claim 4.3. *All elements of \mathcal{D} are minimal dominating sets of G . Furthermore, there is no repetitions in \mathcal{D} , and $|\mathcal{D}| = |\mathcal{D}(R, B)|$.*

Proof. There is a natural bijection between minimal red dominating sets $\mathcal{D}(R, B)$ and outputs \mathcal{D} (taken with multiplicity). We only need to argue two things: that every output is a minimal dominating set, and that there is no repetitions.

There is nothing to argue in the case where $\mathcal{D}(R, B) = \emptyset$, and we assume from now on that $\mathcal{D}(R, B)$ is non-empty. Let $X \in \mathcal{D}(R, B)$. To argue that its corresponding output is a minimal dominating set, it suffices to argue that $(D^* \setminus R_1) \cup \{u\} \cup X$ is a dominating set. Let w be a vertex not dominated by $(D^* \setminus R_1) \cup \{u\}$. By definition, it belongs to B , so $w \in N[X]$. Therefore, $(D^* \setminus R_1) \cup \{u\} \cup X$ is a dominating set. Since we output an irredundant subset of $(D^* \setminus R_1) \cup \{u\} \cup X$, it follows that the output is a minimal dominating set.

Finally, observe that when greedily reducing $(D^* \setminus R_1) \cup \{u\} \cup X$ into a minimal dominating set D , we maintain $X \subseteq D$ as each element of X has a private neighbor in B . In fact, we have $D \cap R = X$, which guarantees that a different choice of X would yield a different output D . \square

Claim 4.4. *For any set $D \in \mathcal{D}(G)$ such that $D^* = \text{Parent}_{uv}(D)$, let X_{uv} and Z_{uv} be the disjoint sets defined in the Parent relation, so that $D = (D^* \cup \{u\} \cup Z_{uv}) \setminus (X_{uv} \cup \{v\})$. We have $X_{uv} \subseteq R_1 \setminus \{v\}$ and $Z_{uv} \subseteq R_2$. Additionally, for $Y_{uv} = \bigcup_{z \in Z_{uv}} \text{Priv}(D, z)$, we have $Y_{uv} \subseteq B$.*

Proof. Recall that Z_{uv} is defined as a set of vertices that lose their private neighbors with respect to D when adding $X_{uv} \cup \{v\}$ to $D \setminus \{u\}$. These private neighbors are the elements of the set Y_{uv} .

By definition of the Parent relation, $G[D]$ contains an edge uw , and v is selected in the set $\text{Priv}(D, u)$. Since uw is an edge, one of $u \leq w$ and $w \leq u$ holds. As $v \in \text{Priv}(D, u)$ and $w \in D$, the vertices v and w are incomparable. Since $u \leq v$, the case $w \leq u$ would lead to a contradiction, and we derive $u \leq w$.

Let us first argue that $X_{uv} \subseteq R_1 \setminus \{v\}$. We have $v \notin X_{uv}$, so we focus on proving $X_{uv} \subseteq R_1$. Recall that $X_{uv} \subseteq \text{Priv}(D, u) \setminus N[v]$ by definition. Since $u \leq v$, we derive $X_{uv} \subseteq \uparrow u \cap D^*$. It remains to argue that $x \in \text{Priv}(D^*, x)$ for every $x \in X_{uv}$. Since X_{uv} is an independent set by construction, we have $x \in \text{Priv}(X_{uv}, x)$. Since $X_{uv} \cap N[v] = \emptyset$, we have $x \in \text{Priv}(X_{uv} \cup \{v\}, x)$. Since $X_{uv} \subseteq \text{Priv}(D, u)$, we derive $x \in \text{Priv}(X_{uv} \cup \{v\} \cup (D \setminus \{u\}), x)$, hence $x \in R_1$. It follows that $X_{uv} \subseteq R_1$.

Let us now argue that $Z_{uv} \subseteq R_2$ and $Y_{uv} \subseteq B$. Consider $z \in Z_{uv}$, and a private neighbor y of z with respect to D . Note that $y \in Y_{uv}$ and that y is considered without loss of generality since every element of Y_{uv} is the private neighbor of some element in Z_{uv} with respect to D . Therefore, it suffices to argue that $z \in R_2$ and $y \in B$. Recall that z has no private neighbor with respect to $(D \setminus \{u\}) \cup X_{uv} \cup \{v\}$, though y is a private neighbor of z with respect to D , which contains u . It follows that y is in the neighborhood of $X_{uv} \cup \{v\}$, but not in that of u . Since $X_{uv} \cup \{v\} \subseteq \uparrow u$ and $y \notin \uparrow u$, we have $y \notin \uparrow(X_{uv} \cup \{v\})$. We derive that $y \in \downarrow(X_{uv} \cup \{v\}) \setminus N[u]$. If $y \geq z$, then $z \in \downarrow(X_{uv} \cup \{v\})$, which contradicts the fact that the vertices in $X_{uv} \cup \{v\}$ are private neighbors of u with respect to D . Consequently, $y \leq z$. Note that $z \notin N[R_1]$. Since $R_2 = \uparrow B \setminus N[R_1]$, the fact that $z \in R_2$ follows from $y \in B$, which we argue below.

We have $N(y) \cap D^* \subseteq X_{uv} \cup \{v\}$, as the only neighbor of y in D is z . As shown earlier, $X_{uv} \subseteq R_1$, hence $N(y) \cap D^* \subseteq R_1$. Since $u \notin N(y)$ and $B = V(G) \setminus N[(D^* \setminus R_1) \cup \{u\}]$, we derive $y \in B$, as desired. It follows that $Y_{uv} \subseteq B$ and $Z_{uv} \subseteq R_2$. \lrcorner

Claim 4.5. *For any set $D \in \mathcal{D}(G)$ such that $D^* = \text{Parent}_{uv}(D)$, let X_{uv} and Z_{uv} be the disjoint sets defined in the Parent relation, so that $D = (D^* \cup \{u\} \cup Z_{uv}) \setminus (X_{uv} \cup \{v\})$. Then the set $R_1 \cup Z_{uv} \setminus (X_{uv} \cup \{v\})$ is a minimal red dominating set of $G(R, B)$.*

Proof. Let $X = R_1 \cup Z_{uv} \setminus (X_{uv} \cup \{v\})$. By Claim 4.4, we obtain that $X \subseteq (R_1 \setminus \{v\}) \cup R_2 = R$. Therefore, it only remains to argue two things: that X dominates B , and that X is minimal, i.e., that every vertex in X has a private neighbor in B with respect to X .

Let $y \in B$. By definition of B , we have $N(y) \cap D^* \subseteq R_1 \cup \{v\}$ and $y \notin N[u]$. Since D is a dominating set and given how D and D^* relate, the vertex y has a neighbor either in $R_1 \setminus (X_{uv} \cup \{v\})$ or in Z_{uv} . In either case, the vertex y has a neighbor in X . We conclude that X dominates B .

Let us now argue that every vertex x in X has a private neighbor in B with respect to X . Note that $x \in D$ and $\text{Priv}(D, x) \neq \emptyset$.

Let us first consider the case $x \in R_1 \setminus (X_{uv} \cup \{v\})$. Since $u \in D$, we have $\text{Priv}(D, x) \subseteq N[x] \setminus N[u]$. Since moreover $x \in \uparrow u$ we have that $\text{Priv}(D, x) \subseteq \downarrow x \setminus N[u]$. In particular $x \notin \text{Priv}(D, x)$. Let $y \in \text{Priv}(D, x)$. Then $N(y) \cap D = \{x\}$ and so $N(y) \cap D^* \subseteq \{x\} \cup X_{uv} \cup \{v\} \subseteq R_1 \cup \{v\}$. Hence $y \in B$. Therefore, every vertex in $X \cap (R_1 \setminus (X_{uv} \cup \{v\}))$ has a private neighbor in B with respect to X .

We now consider the case $x \in Z_{uv}$. Let $y \in \text{Priv}(D, x)$. Recall that $X_{uv} \cup \{v\}$ and Z_{uv} are non-adjacent. Also y is dominated by D^* but not by $D^* \setminus (X_{uv} \cup \{v\})$, and so $y \neq x$. Hence $y \in N(X_{uv} \cup \{v\})$ and so $y \in N(R_1 \cup \{v\})$. As $N(y) \cap D = \{x\}$ and $x \notin D^*$, we have $N(y) \cap D^* \subseteq X_{uv} \cup \{v\} \subseteq R_1 \cup \{v\}$. Hence $y \in B$. Consequently every $x \in X$ has a private neighbor in B , and so $X \in \mathcal{D}(R, B)$. \lrcorner

The core statement now follows easily.

Claim 4.6. *The set \mathcal{D} contains every $D \in \mathcal{D}(G)$ such that $D^* = \text{Parent}_{uv}(D)$.*

Proof. Let $D \in \mathcal{D}(G)$ be such that $D^* = \text{Parent}_{uv}(D)$. Then $D^* = ((D \setminus \{u\}) \cup X_{uv} \cup \{v\}) \setminus Z_{uv}$, where X_{uv} and Z_{uv} are the disjoint sets defined in the Parent relation. Consider the set $Y_{uv} = \bigcup_{z \in Z_{uv}} \text{Priv}(D, z)$.

From Claim 4.5, we obtain that $R_1 \cup Z_{uv} \setminus (X_{uv} \cup \{v\})$ is a minimal dominating set of $G(R, B)$. Consequently, B outputs $R_1 \cup Z_{uv} \setminus (X_{uv} \cup \{v\})$, which prompts A' to consider the set $(D^* \setminus R_1) \cup \{u\} \cup (R_1 \cup Z_{uv} \setminus (X_{uv} \cup \{v\})) = (D^* \cup \{u\} \cup Z_{uv}) \setminus (X_{uv} \cup \{v\}) = D$ as a candidate to be output after being greedily reduced into an irredundant set. Note that the set is already irredundant, so D is generated. In other words, we have $D \in \mathcal{D}$ as desired. \lrcorner

Each of the sets R_1, R_2, R and B can be constructed in polynomial time in n . The same goes for computing and reducing D' into a minimal dominating set given $X \in \mathcal{D}(R, B)$. In addition, $R \cap \uparrow \text{Max}(B)$ and $\text{Max}(B)$ can be computed in polynomial time in n , and by Claim 4.2 the set $\mathcal{D}(R, B)$ can be generated with polynomial delay using B .

This concludes the proof. \square

We conclude this section with the following corollary of Lemma 3.3 and Lemma 4.1, observing that the antichain B of a poset P is minimal in $P[\uparrow B]$. Note that while the algorithm A' only computes the children for a fixed pair u, v , there are at most n^2 such pairs. By running A' for every pair consecutively, we output all children, with each child being repeated possibly

n^2 times. We repeat the trick of Section 3.3 and get rid of repetitions, to the cost of squaring the time complexity. The obtained algorithm now performs in incremental-polynomial time and polynomial space, as desired.

Theorem 4.7. *Let \mathcal{G} be a graph class where every graph is comparability. If there is an incremental-polynomial time and polynomial-space algorithm enumerating minimal red dominating sets in red-blue graphs of \mathcal{G} whose blue vertices are minimal with respect to the associated poset, then there is one enumerating minimal dominating sets in graphs of \mathcal{G} .*

5 Red-blue domination in comparability graphs

We mentioned in Section 2 that RED-BLUE-DOM-ENUM is already as hard as TRANS-ENUM even restricted to bipartite graphs, hence to comparability graphs. We show nevertheless that the problem can be solved in incremental-polynomial time under various restrictions on the red and blue sets (satisfying those of Lemma 4.1), as well as on the underlying poset. More precisely, we show that, for any fixed integer t , RED-BLUE-DOM-ENUM is tractable in the comparability graph of S_t -free posets, whenever the blue elements are minimal in the poset. Since posets of bounded dimension do not contain any S_p for some large enough p , we can derive the same for bounded dimension posets.

The key observation is that instances of red-blue domination in that case are of bounded conformality. As a corollary, we can use the algorithm of Khachiyan et al. in [KBEG07] to solve them in incremental-polynomial time. This yields by Theorem 4.7 an incremental-polynomial time algorithm enumerating minimal dominating sets in the comparability graphs of these posets.

Let us recall the notion of conformality introduced by Berge in [Ber84]. Informally, a hypergraph has small conformality when the property of not being contained in a hyperedge is witnessed by small subsets, in the sense that if a set is not contained in any hyperedge, then some small subset of it is not either. More formally, let c be an integer and \mathcal{H} be a hypergraph. We say that \mathcal{H} is of *conformality* c if the following property holds for every subset $X \subseteq V(\mathcal{H})$: X is contained in a hyperedge of \mathcal{H} whenever each subset of X of cardinality at most c is contained in a hyperedge of \mathcal{H} . Remember from Section 2 that a hypergraph \mathcal{H} is Sperner if $E_1 \not\subseteq E_2$ for any two distinct hyperedges E_1, E_2 in \mathcal{H} .

Khachiyan, Boros, Elbassioni, and Gurvich proved the following.

Theorem 5.1 ([KBEG07]). *The minimal transversals can be enumerated in incremental-polynomial time but using exponential space in Sperner hypergraphs of bounded conformality.*

Our result is a corollary of the following, which basically says that in our setting, hypergraphs with large conformality induce large S_t in the underlying poset.

Lemma 5.2. *Let $P = (V, \leq)$ be a poset and $B = \text{Min}(P)$. Let \mathcal{H} be the Sperner hypergraph defined by $V(\mathcal{H}) = P - B$ and $\mathcal{E}(\mathcal{H}) = \text{Min}_{\subseteq} \{\uparrow x \setminus \{x\} \mid x \in B\}$. If \mathcal{H} is not of conformality $t - 1$ for some integer t , then P contains S_t as a suborder.*

Proof. Assume that \mathcal{H} is not of conformality $t - 1$, i.e., there is a red subset $X \subseteq V(\mathcal{H})$ that is not contained in a hyperedge of \mathcal{H} , and such that every subset $Y \subseteq X$ of size at most $t - 1$ is contained in a hyperedge of \mathcal{H} . We consider $X = \{x_1, \dots, x_p\}$ of minimum cardinality. Then $p \geq t$ and to every $x_i \in X$ corresponds a hyperedge E_i of \mathcal{H} such that $E_i \cap X = \{X \setminus \{x_i\}\}$. Indeed, if no such E_i exists for some $x_i \in X$, then $X' = X \setminus \{x_i\}$ is not contained in a hyperedge of \mathcal{H} , and still every subset $Y \subseteq X'$ of size at most $t - 1$ is, contradicting the minimality of X .

Let us show that X is an antichain of P . Suppose toward a contradiction that X is not an antichain and contains two elements x_i, x_j such that $x_i < x_j$. As $R \subseteq \uparrow B \setminus B$, every hyperedge of \mathcal{H} that contains x_i contains x_j . We conclude that $X \subseteq E_i$, a contradiction. Hence X is an antichain.

Consider now the antichain $\{e_1, \dots, e_p\} \subseteq B$ corresponding to E_1, \dots, E_p in the poset P , i.e., such that $E_i = \uparrow e_i \setminus \{e_i\}$ for $i \in \{1, \dots, p\}$. Then the set $\{e_1, x_1, \dots, e_p, x_p\}$ induces S_p as suborder, $p \geq t$. \square

Lemmas 3.3, 4.1, and 5.2 together yield the following corollary.

Corollary 5.3. *There is an algorithm enumerating, for every fixed integer t , the minimal dominating sets in comparability graphs of S_t -free posets.*

Theorem 1.2 follows from Corollary 5.3 and the observation that a poset containing S_t has dimension at least t . Unfortunately, as the algorithm in [KBEG07] requires exponential space, Corollary 5.3 does not yield a polynomial-space algorithm.

Finally, we note that while it is not clear whether the comparability graphs of bounded dimension posets are of bounded LMIM-width (and hence covered by the algorithm in [GHK⁺18] using similar methods), comparability graphs of S_t -free posets are not.

6 Flashlight search in incomparability graphs

We give a polynomial-delay algorithm enumerating minimal dominating sets in the incomparability graphs of bounded dimension posets, given with linear extensions witnessing the dimension. Although it is not necessary, we present a geometrical representation of the incomparability graphs that we find useful while working with them.

Let $P = (V, \leq)$ be a poset on n elements and of dimension at most d . Let \leq_1, \dots, \leq_d be a sequence of linear orders witnessing it. Thus, we have $x \leq y$ in P if and only if $x \leq_i y$ for each $i \in \{1, \dots, d\}$. Consider d distinct vertical lines L_1, \dots, L_d in the plane, sorted from left to right in that order. For each $i \in \{1, \dots, d\}$, we distinguish n points on L_i and label them bottom-up with elements of P sorted by \leq_i . Now for each element v in P , we define a piecewise linear curve \bar{v} consisting of $d - 1$ segments and connecting points labelled v on consecutive lines. It is a folklore observation, see e.g. [GRU83], that the incomparability graph of P is the intersection graph of this family of curves. An example for $d = 4$ is given in Figure 5.

In the remaining of this section, we assume that a poset $P = (V, \leq)$ of dimension d is given and we are also given the total orders \leq_1, \dots, \leq_d witnessing the dimension of P . As described above we fix the lines L_1, \dots, L_d , and the piecewise linear curves representing each element of P . Let G be the incomparability graph of P .

For a non-empty subset S of elements of P and $i \in \{1, \dots, d\}$, we define $L_i(S)$ to be the maximum element of S in \leq_i . We call *vertices upwards from S* the elements of the set

$$U(S) = \{v \in V \setminus S \mid L_i(S) <_i v \text{ for some } i \in \{1, \dots, d\}\}.$$

A set D is an *upward extension* of S if $S \subseteq D$ and $D \setminus S \subseteq U(S)$.

Let S be a subset of elements of P of size at least $3d$. We call the *first layer* of S the tuple $\mathbf{A}(S) = (a_1, \dots, a_d)$ so that $a_1 = L_1(S)$, and for every $i \in \{2, \dots, d\}$,

$$a_i = L_i(S \setminus \{a_1, \dots, a_{i-1}\}).$$

Note that by this definition it might happen that $a_i \neq L_i(S)$. This is in particular the case if $L_i(S) = L_j(S)$ for some $i, j \in \{1, \dots, d\}$ with $j < i$. The *second layer* of S is the set $\mathbf{B}(S) =$




Figure 5: A poset P and its incomparability graph G as an intersection graph of curves induced by four linear extensions witnessing the dimension.

$\mathbf{A}(S \setminus \mathbf{A}(S))$. The *third layer* of S is the set $\mathbf{C}(S) = \mathbf{A}(S \setminus (\mathbf{A}(S) \cup \mathbf{B}(S)))$. Note that since $|S| \geq 3d$, the three layers are well-defined. We call the *border* of S the concatenation

$$\mathbf{T}(I) = (a_1, \dots, a_d, b_1, \dots, b_d, c_1, \dots, c_d)$$

of these three layers.

We say that I can be *extended upwards into a minimal dominating set* whenever there is an upward extension of I that is a minimal dominating set of G . In the following, we aim to decide in polynomial time whether a given irredundant set I in G can be extended upwards into a minimal dominating set. When the given set I is of size at most $3d$, say $I = \{x_1, \dots, x_p\}$ and $p \leq 3d$, then this can be done efficiently by checking for all the tuples $(y_1, \dots, y_p) \in \text{Priv}(I, x_1) \times \dots \times \text{Priv}(I, x_p)$ whether $\mathbf{U}(I) \setminus N[y_1, \dots, y_p]$ dominates $G - N[I]$ or not. A single tuple like that could be verified in $O(n^2)$ time. Since the number of tuples is no more than n^p , the total time is $O(n^{3d+2})$. If there is such a tuple (y_1, \dots, y_p) , then $\mathbf{U}(I) \setminus N[y_1, \dots, y_p]$ can be greedily reduced into a minimal set X so that $I \cup X$ is a minimal dominating set of G . Otherwise, we know that I cannot be extended as we explored all the possibilities for I to keep its private neighbors in an upward extension. We show that the same technique can be applied for irredundant sets of arbitrary size. The key insight is that it is enough to check whether we can extend I into a dominating set so that all elements in the border $\mathbf{T}(I)$ keep a private neighbor.

Theorem 6.1. *Let I be an irredundant set of G of size at least $3d$ and let $\mathbf{T}(I) = (t_1, \dots, t_{3d})$. Then I can be extended upwards into a minimal dominating set of G if and only if there exists a tuple $(w_1, \dots, w_{3d}) \in \text{Priv}(I, t_1) \times \dots \times \text{Priv}(I, t_{3d})$ such that $\mathbf{U}(I) \setminus N[w_1, \dots, w_{3d}]$ is a dominating set of $G - N[I]$.*

Proof. First, we prove the forward implication. Suppose that I can be extended upwards into a minimal dominating set of G and let X be an upward extension of I such that $D = I \cup X$ is a minimal dominating set of G . Then X dominates $G - N[I]$ and $\text{Priv}(D, u) \neq \emptyset$ for every $u \in D$. Since D is a minimal dominating set there exists (w_1, \dots, w_{3d}) in $\text{Priv}(D, t_1) \times \dots \times$

$\text{Priv}(D, t_{3d})$. Note that $\text{Priv}(D, t_i) \subseteq \text{Priv}(I, t_i)$ for each $i \in \{1, \dots, 3d\}$. This completes the proof of the forward implication.

We turn to argue the backward implication. Suppose that there exists $(w_1, \dots, w_{3d}) \in \text{Priv}(I, t_1) \times \dots \times \text{Priv}(I, t_{3d})$ such that $X := \mathbf{U}(I) \setminus N[w_1, \dots, w_{3d}]$ dominates $G - N[I]$. Thus $D = I \cup X$ dominates G . In order to conclude that I extends upwards into a minimal dominating set of G , all we need to see is that each element u in I has a private neighbor with respect to D , i.e., $\text{Priv}(D, u) \neq \emptyset$. Since X avoids $N[w_1, \dots, w_{3d}]$, we have that $w_i \in \text{Priv}(D, t_i)$ for each $i \in \{1, \dots, 3d\}$. Consider any element u in $I \setminus \mathbf{T}(I)$. Since I is irredundant, we can fix $v \in \text{Priv}(I, u)$. We shall show that $v \in \text{Priv}(D, u)$.

For convenience, we split the sequence (t_1, \dots, t_{3d}) into (a_1, \dots, a_d) , (b_1, \dots, b_d) , and (c_1, \dots, c_d) , so it relates to the initial layers $\mathbf{A}(I)$, $\mathbf{B}(I)$, and $\mathbf{C}(I)$, respectively.

In order to get a contradiction, suppose that there is $x \in X$ such that x and v are adjacent in G , i.e., \bar{x} and \bar{v} intersect. In particular, there is some $q \in \{1, \dots, d\}$ such that $x <_q v$.

We claim that

$$v < b_k \text{ in } P \text{ for every } k \in \{1, \dots, d\}.$$

Since $v \in \text{Priv}(I, u)$ and $b_k \in I$, \bar{v} and $\overline{b_k}$ do not intersect. Therefore, either $v < b_k$ in P or $v > b_k$ in P . Assume toward a contradiction that $b_k < v$ in P . Since \bar{u} and \bar{v} intersect, we can fix $p \in \{1, \dots, d\}$ such that $v <_p u$. Recall that $u \in I \setminus \mathbf{T}(I)$. Thus, by the definition of the third layer $\mathbf{C}(I)$ we have $u <_p c_p$. Hence $v <_p u <_p c_p$. Since $v \in \text{Priv}(I, u)$ and $c \in I$, we have that \bar{c}_p and \bar{v} stay disjoint. We deduce that $v < c_p$ in P . This contradicts our assumption as $b_k < v < c_p$ in P but no element of the second layer can be below an element of the third layer. This completes the proof of the claim.

In particular, we have $x <_q v <_q b_k$ for every $k \in \{1, \dots, d\}$.

Consider the tuple $(s_1, \dots, s_d) = (w_{d+1}, \dots, w_{2d})$ of private neighbors of the elements of (b_1, \dots, b_d) . We claim that there exist indices $\alpha, \beta \in \{1, \dots, d\}$ such that

$$b_\alpha <_q s_\beta.$$

Towards the contradiction, assume that $s_i <_q b_j$ for all $i, j \in \{1, \dots, d\}$. Since s_i stays disjoint from b_j for $i \neq j$, we conclude that $s_i < b_j$ in P for every $i \neq j$. Since \bar{s}_i intersects \bar{b}_i , there is an index $t(i)$ so that $b_i <_{t(i)} s_i$, for each $i \in \{1, \dots, d\}$. Clearly, the values $t(i)$ must be all distinct for $i \in \{1, \dots, d\}$. This way, we need to take d distinct values for t_i 's and because of our assumption all of them are in $\{1, \dots, d\} \setminus \{q\}$, a contradiction. This proves the claim.

We concluded so far that

$$x <_q v <_q b_\alpha <_q s_\beta.$$

Now recall that $x \in X \subseteq \mathbf{U}(I)$. Thus, there must be some $p \in \{1, \dots, d\}$ with

$$\mathbf{L}_p(I) <_p x.$$

Recall also that \bar{s}_β intersects \bar{b}_β , so we can fix $t \in \{1, \dots, d\}$ such that $s_\beta <_t b_\beta$. By the definition of the first two layers, we have that $b_\beta <_t a_t$. Thus, $s_\beta <_t a_t$. Since $s_\beta \in \text{Priv}(I, b_\beta)$ and $a_t \in I$, we get that s_β and a_t are disjoint. Therefore, $s_\beta < a_t$ in P . In particular, we get $s_\beta <_p a_t$ and

$$s_\beta <_p a_t \leq_p \mathbf{L}_p(I) <_p x.$$

The two inequalities $s_\beta >_q x$ and $s_\beta <_p x$ imply that \bar{x} intersects \bar{s}_β . Thus x and s_β are adjacent in G . This contradicts the assumption that $X \subseteq \mathbf{U}(I) \setminus N[s_\beta]$ and completes the proof of the backward implication. \square

We deduce the next corollary, by guessing a good tuple (w_1, \dots, w_{3d}) as in Theorem 6.1 in case when $|I| \geq 3d$, and checking for such a tuple whether the set $\mathbf{U}(I) \setminus N[w_1, \dots, w_{3d}]$ is a dominating set of $G - N[I]$. Space is polynomial as we only iterate through neighborhoods.

Corollary 6.2. *There is an algorithm that, given an irredundant set I of G , decides in $O(n^{3d+2})$ time and polynomial space whether I can be extended upwards into a minimal dominating set.*

We are now ready to describe an algorithm based on *flashlight search* enumerating minimal dominating sets in the incomparability graphs of bounded dimension posets. We refer the reader to [CS18, SM19] for more details on this classical technique. The following Parent relation will be used by the algorithm to construct the minimal dominating sets one vertex at a time, starting from the emptyset.

Definition 6.3. *Let I be a non-empty irredundant set of G that can be extended upwards into a minimal dominating set. We call parent of I the unique irredundant set $I^* = \text{Parent}(I)$ obtained by removing vertex $\mathbf{L}_1(I)$ from I , i.e., the greatest vertex v in I with respect to $<_1$.*

Observe that every minimal dominating set D of G is an irredundant set of G that can be extended upwards into a minimal dominating set (the extension being D itself), with no children. Conversely, an irredundant set that can be extended upwards into a minimal dominating set, with no children, is necessarily a minimal dominating set.

Consequently, the Parent relation as introduced in Definition 6.3 defines a tree T whose nodes are irredundant sets of G that can be extended upwards into minimal dominating sets, root is the empty set, leaves are minimal dominating sets of G , and where there is an edge between two irredundant sets I^* and I if $I^* = \text{Parent}(I)$. As in Section 3, the enumeration proceeds with what boils down to a DFS of T initiated at the empty set. When visiting a node $I^* \in V(T)$, the algorithm seeks the children of I^* as follows. It checks for every candidate vertex $v \in \mathbf{U}(I^*)$ whether $I^* \cup \{v\}$ can be extended upwards into a minimal dominating set, using Corollary 6.2, and whether the obtained set is a child of I^* , using Definition 6.3. Whenever it is the case, the algorithm “pauses” the generation of children of I^* , and generates children of $I^* \cup \{v\}$. When the generation on $I^* \cup \{v\}$ is complete, the algorithm “resumes” the generation on I^* . During this procedure, only the leaves of T , hence the minimal dominating sets of G , are output by the algorithm. Duplications are implicitly avoided by the structure of T .

The delay time complexity is bounded by twice the depth of the tree (the maximal distance between two leaves in T), times the time complexity of solving the extension problem and checking the Parent relation for every candidate vertex v . This sums up to

$$2n \cdot O(n^{3d+2} + n^2) \cdot n = O(n^{3d+4})$$

Space complexity is polynomial as we only need to store for each node $W \in T$ from the root to the current node $I^* \in T$ the data of the (paused) execution of the children generation on node W .

We conclude to Theorem 1.1 that we restate here with the complexity.

Theorem 6.4. *There is an algorithm that, given the incomparability graph G of an n -element poset P of dimension d , together with d linear orders witnessing the dimension of P , enumerates all minimal dominating sets of G with delay $O(n^{3d+4})$ and using polynomial space.*

7 Discussions

We provided an incremental-polynomial (resp. polynomial-delay) algorithm enumerating the minimal dominating sets in the comparability (resp. incomparability) graphs of bounded dimension posets. Recall that the complexity of TRANS-ENUM, which reduces to DOM-ENUM in co-bipartite graphs, remains widely open. As incomparability graphs include co-bipartite graphs, dropping the dimension in Theorem 1.1 is one of the most important algorithmic challenges in enumeration. On the other hand, dropping the dimension in Theorem 1.2 seems a more tractable, though fascinating challenge.

The algorithm provided by Corollary 5.3 covers in fact all comparability graphs of S_t -free posets, not just those of bounded dimension. The two first authors initiated in [BDH⁺19] a characterization of the complexity of DOM-ENUM in H -free graphs. Despite the fact that they encapsulate all the hardness of DOM-ENUM, incomparability graphs have a restrictive structure. What can we say about H -free incomparability graphs? Due to co-bipartite graphs, this question is only interesting for a co-bipartite H . To match Theorem 1.2, it is tempting to wonder what happens for incomparability graphs of S_t -free posets. Our proof clearly does not extend naturally, as it crucially relies on the bounded dimension representation—recall that not all S_t -free posets have small dimension [Tro92]. However, we believe that an extension would be possible with different tools.

Conjecture 7.1. *For every t , there is an output-polynomial time algorithm for DOM-ENUM in incomparability graphs of S_t -free posets.*

A directly easier conjecture is the following:

Conjecture 7.2. *For every p , there is an output-polynomial time algorithm for DOM-ENUM in $2K_p$ -free incomparability graphs.*

Indeed, note that an S_{2p} suborder in a poset yields a $2K_p$ in the corresponding incomparability graph. Symmetrically, Corollary 5.3 implies that for every p , there is an output-polynomial time algorithm for DOM-ENUM in $K_{p,p}$ -free comparability graphs. Conjecture 7.2 holds trivially for $p = 1$ (all such graphs are cliques). It is in fact also true for $p = 2$, as $2K_2$ -free graphs admit an output-polynomial time algorithm [BDH⁺19]. The case $p = 3$ is widely open without the incomparability assumption [BDH⁺19].

Questions abound around Conjecture 7.2, mainly by considering other simple cases of a co-bipartite H . The case $H = C_4$ is the smallest open case for general graphs, but C_4 -free incomparability graphs are interval graphs [GH64]; there DOM-ENUM admits a linear delay algorithm [KLM⁺13]. A natural generalization would be the case of H being two cliques with a matching between them, or H being a clique minus a matching. Instead of debating which generalizations are most sensible, we state the following bold conjecture:

Conjecture 7.3. *For any co-bipartite H , there is an output-polynomial time algorithm for DOM-ENUM in H -free incomparability graphs.*

There is in fact no blatant reason why the incomparability condition would be necessary here. Other natural parameters for the classes considered in this paper concern the height and width of the poset. The *height* (resp. *width*) of a poset is the size of its maximum chain (resp. antichain). Since those are related to the largest size of a clique, the algorithm in [BDH⁺19] covers the comparability graphs of posets of bounded height and the incomparability graphs of posets of bounded width. We can show easily that DOM-ENUM is tractable in the comparability graphs of posets of bounded width.

Proposition 7.4. *Let G be the comparability graph of a poset $P = (V, \leq)$ of width α , and D be a minimal dominating set of G . Then $|D| \leq 2\alpha$.*

Proof. Consider for a contradiction a minimal dominating set D of G with $|D| > 2\alpha$. Then D contains three elements x, y, z such that $x < y < z$. As a consequence, $N[y] \subseteq N[x] \cup N[z]$, which contradicts $\text{Priv}(D, y) \neq \emptyset$. \square

Proposition 7.4 guarantees that a brute-force test of all small subsets yields a polynomial-time algorithm enumerating minimal dominating sets in the comparability graph of posets of bounded width.

As for incomparability graphs of posets of height 2, we consider the incompatibilities of a bipartite order and observe that all co-bipartite graphs can be represented as incomparability graphs of a poset of height at most 2. Therefore, bounded height is not a helpful parameter for incomparability graphs. A more interesting question is perhaps whether restricting posets to lattices yields efficient algorithms, both for comparability and incomparability graphs.

Our algorithm for incomparability graphs of bounded dimension relies heavily on their geometric representation. Geometric graphs seem to be understudied in this context, and the smallest open case is presumably that of unit disk graphs.

References

- [BDH⁺19] Marthe Bonamy, Oscar Defrain, Marc Heinrich, Michał Pilipczuk, and Jean-Florent Raymond. Enumerating minimal dominating sets in K_t -free graphs and variants. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1810.00789*, to appear in *ACM Transactions on Algorithms*, 2019.
- [BDHR19] Marthe Bonamy, Oscar Defrain, Marc Heinrich, and Jean-Florent Raymond. Enumerating minimal dominating sets in triangle-free graphs. In *36th International Symposium on Theoretical Aspects of Computer Science*. Schloss Dagstuhl-Leibniz-Zentrum fuer Informatik, 2019.
- [BEGK04] Endre Boros, Khaled Elbassioni, Vladimir Gurvich, and Leonid Khachiyan. Generating maximal independent sets for hypergraphs with bounded edge-intersections. In *Latin American Symposium on Theoretical Informatics*, pages 488–498. Springer, 2004.
- [Ber84] Claude Berge. *Hypergraphs: combinatorics of finite sets*, volume 45. Elsevier, 1984.
- [CHvHK13] Jean-François Couturier, Pinar Heggernes, Pim van’t Hof, and Dieter Kratsch. Minimal dominating sets in graph classes: combinatorial bounds and enumeration. *Theoretical Computer Science*, 487:82–94, 2013.
- [CKP⁺19] Nadia Creignou, Markus Kröll, Reinhard Pichler, Sebastian Skritek, and Heribert Vollmer. A complexity theory for hard enumeration problems. *Discrete Applied Mathematics*, 2019.
- [Cou09] Bruno Courcelle. Linear delay enumeration and monadic second-order logic. *Discrete Applied Mathematics*, 157(12):2675–2700, 2009.
- [CS18] Florent Capelli and Yann Strozecki. Enumerating models of dnf faster: breaking the dependency on the formula size. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1810.04006*, 2018.

- [DM41] Ben Dushnik and Edwin W. Miller. Partially ordered sets. *American journal of mathematics*, 63(3):600–610, 1941.
- [DN19] Oscar Defrain and Lhouari Nourine. Neighborhood inclusions for minimal dominating sets enumeration: Linear and polynomial delay algorithms in P_7 -free and P_8 -free chordal graphs. In *30th International Symposium on Algorithms and Computation*. Schloss Dagstuhl-Leibniz-Zentrum fuer Informatik, 2019.
- [EG95] Thomas Eiter and Georg Gottlob. Identifying the minimal transversals of a hypergraph and related problems. *SIAM Journal on Computing*, 24(6):1278–1304, 1995.
- [EGM03] Thomas Eiter, Georg Gottlob, and Kazuhisa Makino. New results on monotone dualization and generating hypergraph transversals. *SIAM Journal on Computing*, 32(2):514–537, 2003.
- [EMG08] Thomas Eiter, Kazuhisa Makino, and Georg Gottlob. Computational aspects of monotone dualization: A brief survey. *Discrete Applied Mathematics*, 156(11):2035–2049, 2008.
- [FGPS08] Fedor V. Fomin, Fabrizio Grandoni, Artem V. Pyatkin, and Alexey A. Stepanov. Combinatorial bounds via measure and conquer: Bounding minimal dominating sets and applications. *ACM Transactions on Algorithms*, 5(1):9, 2008.
- [FK96] Michael L. Fredman and Leonid Khachiyan. On the complexity of dualization of monotone disjunctive normal forms. *Journal of Algorithms*, 21(3):618–628, 1996.
- [GH64] Paul C. Gilmore and Alan J. Hoffman. A characterization of comparability graphs and of interval graphs. *Canadian Journal of Mathematics*, 16:539–548, 1964.
- [GHK⁺16] Petr A. Golovach, Pinar Heggernes, Mamadou M. Kanté, Dieter Kratsch, and Yngve Villanger. Enumerating minimal dominating sets in chordal bipartite graphs. *Discrete Applied Mathematics*, 199:30–36, 2016.
- [GHK⁺18] Petr A. Golovach, Pinar Heggernes, Mamadou M. Kanté, Dieter Kratsch, Sigve H. Sæther, and Yngve Villanger. Output-polynomial enumeration on graphs of bounded (local) linear MIM-width. *Algorithmica*, 80(2):714–741, 2018.
- [GHKV15] Petr A. Golovach, Pinar Heggernes, Dieter Kratsch, and Yngve Villanger. An incremental polynomial time algorithm to enumerate all minimal edge dominating sets. *Algorithmica*, 72(3):836–859, 2015.
- [GKLS19] Petr A. Golovach, Dieter Kratsch, Mathieu Liedloff, and Mohamed Yosri Sayadi. Enumeration and maximum number of minimal dominating sets for chordal graphs. *Theoretical Computer Science*, 783:41–52, 2019.
- [GRU83] Martin C. Golumbic, Doron Rotem, and Jorge Urrutia. Comparability graphs and intersection graphs. *Discrete Mathematics*, 43(1):37–46, 1983.
- [JYP88] David S. Johnson, Mihalis Yannakakis, and Christos H. Papadimitriou. On generating all maximal independent sets. *Information Processing Letters*, 27(3):119–123, 1988.

- [KBEG07] Leonid Khachiyan, Endre Boros, Khaled Elbassioni, and Vladimir Gurvich. On the dualization of hypergraphs with bounded edge-intersections and other related classes of hypergraphs. *Theoretical Computer Science*, 382(2):139–150, 2007.
- [KKP18] Mamadou M. Kanté, Kaveh Khoshkhah, and Mozhgan Pourmoradnasseri. Enumerating minimal transversals of hypergraphs without small holes. In *43rd International Symposium on Mathematical Foundations of Computer Science*. Schloss Dagstuhl-Leibniz-Zentrum fuer Informatik, 2018.
- [KLM⁺13] Mamadou M. Kanté, Vincent Limouzy, Arnaud Mary, Lhouari Nourine, and Takeaki Uno. On the enumeration and counting of minimal dominating sets in interval and permutation graphs. In *International Symposium on Algorithms and Computation*, pages 339–349. Springer, 2013.
- [KLM⁺15a] Mamadou M. Kanté, Vincent Limouzy, Arnaud Mary, Lhouari Nourine, and Takeaki Uno. A polynomial delay algorithm for enumerating minimal dominating sets in chordal graphs. In *International Workshop on Graph-Theoretic Concepts in Computer Science*, pages 138–153. Springer, 2015.
- [KLM⁺15b] Mamadou M. Kanté, Vincent Limouzy, Arnaud Mary, Lhouari Nourine, and Takeaki Uno. Polynomial delay algorithm for listing minimal edge dominating sets in graphs. In *Workshop on Algorithms and Data Structures*, pages 446–457. Springer, 2015.
- [KLMN14] Mamadou M. Kanté, Vincent Limouzy, Arnaud Mary, and Lhouari Nourine. On the enumeration of minimal dominating sets and related notions. *SIAM Journal on Discrete Mathematics*, 28(4):1916–1929, 2014.
- [MU04] Kazuhisa Makino and Takeaki Uno. New algorithms for enumerating all maximal cliques. In *Scandinavian workshop on algorithm theory*, pages 260–272. Springer, 2004.
- [SM19] Yann Strozecki and Arnaud Mary. Efficient enumeration of solutions produced by closure operations. *Discrete Mathematics & Theoretical Computer Science*, 21, 2019.
- [Str19] Yann Strozecki. Enumeration complexity. *Bulletin of EATCS*, 1(129), 2019.
- [TIAS77] Shuji Tsukiyama, Mikio Ide, Hiromu Ariyoshi, and Isao Shirakawa. A new algorithm for generating all the maximal independent sets. *SIAM Journal on Computing*, 6(3):505–517, 1977.
- [Tro92] William T. Trotter. *Combinatorics and partially ordered sets*. Johns Hopkins Series in the Mathematical Sciences. Johns Hopkins University Press, Baltimore, MD, 1992. Dimension theory.