

Exact Algorithms for No-Rainbow Coloring and Phylogenetic Decisiveness

Ghazaleh Parvini¹ and David Fernández-Baca²

¹College of Information & Computer Sciences, University of
Massachusetts Amherst, Amherst, MA 01003, USA

²Department of Computer Science, Iowa State University, Ames, IA
50011, USA

Abstract

The input to the no-rainbow hypergraph coloring problem is a hypergraph H where every hyperedge has r nodes. The question is whether there exists an r -coloring of the nodes of H such that all r colors are used and there is no rainbow hyperedge — i.e., no hyperedge uses all r colors. The no-rainbow hypergraph r -coloring problem is known to be NP-complete for $r \geq 3$. The special case of $r = 4$ is the complement of the phylogenetic decisiveness problem. Here we present a deterministic algorithm that solves the no-rainbow r -coloring problem in $O^*((r-1)^{(r-1)n/r})$ time and a randomized algorithm that solves the problem in $O^*((\frac{r}{2})^n)$ time.

1 Introduction

The hypergraph no-rainbow r -coloring problem asks whether there is an assignment to one of r colors to each of the nodes in a hypergraph such that all r colors are used, but no edge has r nodes with distinct colors. The problem is perhaps the most well known in the class of “surjective constraint satisfaction problems” [2]. It was recently shown to be NP-complete [10], even for $r = 3$.

The case $r = 4$ is of interest in building phylogenetic trees from incomplete data. References [9, 6] formulate the question of determining whether such data suffices to reconstruct a unique tree as a combinatorial problem, termed “decisiveness.” The decisiveness problem is equivalent to the complement of the no-rainbow 4-coloring problem [5].

In [5] we presented exact algorithms for no-rainbow r -coloring for $r = 3$ and $r = 4$, that run in time $O^*(1.89^n)$ and $O^*(2.81^n)$ time, respectively¹. Here we present more efficient randomized and deterministic algorithms based on local search. We note that

¹The O^* -notation is a variant of O -notation that ignores polynomial factors [3].

local search has been applied earlier to obtain exact algorithms for the k -SAT problem [7, 4] (see also [8]).

2 Preliminaries

We write $[r]$ to denote the set $\{1, 2, \dots, r\}$, for some positive integer r .

A *hypergraph* H is a pair $H = (X, E)$, where X is a set of elements called *nodes* or *vertices*, and E is a set of non-empty subsets of X called *hyperedges* or *edges* [1]. Two nodes $u, v \in V$ are *neighbors* if $\{u, v\} \subseteq e$, for some $e \in E$. A hypergraph $H = (X, E)$ is *r -uniform*, for some integer $r > 0$, if each hyperedge of H contains exactly r nodes.

Let $H = (X, E)$ be a hypergraph and r be a positive integer. An *r -coloring* of H is a mapping $c : X \rightarrow [r]$. For node $v \in X$, $c(v)$ is the *color* of v . Throughout this paper, r -colorings are assumed to be *surjective*; that is, for each $i \in [r]$, there is at least one node $v \in X$ such that $c(v) = i$. The *Hamming distance* between two colorings c and c' of H , denoted $d(c, c')$, equals the number of nodes $v \in X$ such that $c(v) \neq c'(v)$. Two colorings c and c' of H *agree* on set $F \subseteq X$ if $c(v) = c'(v)$ for all $v \in F$.

Let c be an r -coloring of H . Edge $e \in E$ is a *rainbow edge with respect to c* if, for each $i \in [r]$, there is at least one $v \in e$ such that $c(v) = i$. Coloring c *induces a rainbow edge* if there is an edge $e \in E$ such that e is a rainbow edge with respect to c . A *no-rainbow r -coloring* of H is a surjective r -coloring c of H such that c induces no rainbow edge. Given an r -uniform hypergraph $H = (X, E)$, the *no-rainbow r -coloring problem* asks whether H has a no-rainbow r -coloring [2].

3 Deterministic Local Search

Our deterministic algorithm for the no-rainbow r -coloring (Algorithm 1) consists of a procedure `DetNRC` that conducts multiple searches for a no-rainbow coloring, starting from different colorings, by invoking a procedure `DetLocalSearch`. `DetNRC` takes as its argument an r -uniform hypergraph $H = (X, E)$ and returns 1 (true) if H has a no-rainbow r -coloring, and 0 (false) otherwise². To explain our algorithm in detail, we need to introduce some concepts.

A *candidate pair* for $H = (X, E)$ is a pair (c, F) where c is an r -coloring of H and F is a subset of X such that for each $i \in [r]$ there is a node $v \in F$ such that $c(v) = i$ (thus, c is surjective and $|F| \geq r$). Once a node is added to set F , its color is not allowed to change. We refer to the nodes in F as *frozen nodes*.

Starting from an initial candidate pair, `DetLocalSearch` performs a series of steps, where each step takes us from the current candidate pair (c, F) to a new candidate pair (c', F') , where c' is obtained by changing the color of some node $v \notin F$ to one of the other $r - 1$ colors and where $F' = F \cup \{v\}$. A step may lead to a dead end — a candidate pair (c, F) where c induces a rainbow edge e and every node in e is frozen. In this case, we backtrack and try another candidate pair.

²For simplicity, our algorithm only returns true or false. The algorithm can be easily modified to return a no-rainbow coloring, if one exists.

Algorithm 1: A deterministic algorithm for no-rainbow r -coloring.

```

DetNRC( $H$ ):
  foreach initial candidate pair  $(c, F)$  do
    if DetLocalSearch( $H, (c, F), \frac{(r-1)n}{r}$ ) then return 1
  return 0

DetLocalSearch( $H, (c, F), g$ ):
  if  $g = 0$  and  $c$  induces a rainbow edge in  $H$  then return 0
  if  $c$  induces a rainbow edge  $e$  such that  $e \subseteq F$  then return 0
  if  $c$  is a no-rainbow coloring then return 1
  if  $|e \cap F| \neq r - 1$  for every  $e \in E$  then return 1
  Choose any rainbow hyperedge  $e \in E$  such that  $|e \cap F| = r - 1$ 
  Let  $v$  be the node of  $e$  such that  $v \notin F$ 
  foreach  $j \in [r] \setminus \{c(v)\}$  do
    Let  $c'$  be the coloring of  $H$  where  $c'(v) = j$  and  $c'(u) = c(u)$  for all
       $u \in X \setminus \{v\}$ 
    if DetLocalSearch( $H, (c', F \cup \{v\}), g - 1$ ) then return 1
  return 0

```

To limit the running time of `DetLocalSearch`, we put a bound on the *search radius* to be explored; that is, on the maximum Hamming distance allowed between the initial coloring and any coloring encountered during the search. To guarantee correctness, we must choose the starting candidate pairs and the search radius appropriately.

An *initial candidate pair* for $H = (X, E)$ is a candidate pair (c, F) where $|F| = r$ and every node in $X \setminus F$ has the same color (which, obviously, must be the same as that of one of the nodes in F). Note that the number of initial candidate pairs is $\binom{n}{r} \cdot r$, which is polynomial for fixed r .

Lemma 1. *Let $H = (X, E)$ be an r -uniform hypergraph with n nodes. Suppose H has a no-rainbow r -coloring c^* . Then, there exists an initial candidate pair (c, F) such that c and c^* agree on F and $d(c, c^*) \leq \frac{(r-1)n}{r}$.*

Proof. Let (c, F) be the initial candidate pair constructed as follows. Set F consists of any r nodes in X that are assigned distinct colors by c^* . For each $v \in F$, let $c(v) = c^*(v)$. For each $v \in X \setminus F$, let $c(v) = i$, where color $i \in [r]$ is chosen arbitrarily among the colors used at least $\frac{n}{r}$ times by c^* . Then, (c, F) is an initial candidate pair with $d(c, c^*) \leq (r - 1)n/r$. \square

The previous lemma puts a limit on the search radius that must be explored, provided we start with the right candidate pair. In fact, during the search, we may find candidate pairs (c, F) where c induces a rainbow edge, but yet we can immediately conclude that a rainbow coloring exists. The next lemma characterizes this situation.

Lemma 2. *Let $H = (X, E)$ be an r -uniform hypergraph. Suppose that (c, F) is a candidate pair for H such that there does not exist a rainbow edge e where $e \subseteq F$. If $|e \cap F| \neq r - 1$ for each edge $e \in E$, then H admits a no-rainbow r -coloring that agrees with c on F .*

Proof. Let c^* be the r -coloring of H where $c^*(v) = c(v)$ for all $v \in F$ and $c^*(v) = 1$ for all $v \in X \setminus F$. Then c^* is a no-rainbow r -coloring of H because (a) c^* is surjective, (b) no edge $e \in E$ such that $|e \cap F| = r$ is a rainbow edge, and (c) for each $e \in E$ such that $|e \cap F| \leq r - 2$, c assigns the same color to at least two nodes in e . \square

Let (c, F) be a candidate pair for a hypergraph $H = (X, E)$. We say that (c, F) is *within g of a no-rainbow coloring*, for some integer $g \geq 0$, if there exists a candidate pair (c', F') where $F \subseteq F'$ such that c and c' agree on F , $d(c, c') \leq g$, and either c' is a no-rainbow r -coloring of H or $|e \cap F'| \neq r - 1$ for each edge $e \in E$.

Lemma 3. *Let H be an r -uniform hypergraph, (c, F) be a candidate pair for H and g be a positive integer. Then, $\text{DetLocalSearch}(H, (c, F), g)$ returns 1 if (c, F) is within g of a no-rainbow coloring, and 0 otherwise. The running time of DetLocalSearch is $O^*((r - 1)^g)$.*

Proof. The first four **if** statements of DetLocalSearch successively consider the base cases. If $g = 0$ and c induces a rainbow edge, no further color changes are allowed, so the answer must be 0. If c induces a rainbow edge e such that $e \subseteq F$, then we are not allowed to change any of the colors in e , so the answer must again be 0. If c is a no-rainbow coloring, then we must obviously return 1. If $|e \cap F| \neq r - 1$ for every edge e , then, by Lemma 2, H has a no-rainbow r -coloring, so DetLocalSearch returns 1.

For the recursion, suppose (c, F) is within g of a no-rainbow coloring and that e is any rainbow edge such that $|e \cap F| = r - 1$. Let v be the single unfrozen node in $e - F$. Then, there are only $r - 1$ possible colors for v . By setting v to one of these alternative colors and adding v to F , we obtain a candidate pair that is within $g - 1$ of a no-rainbow coloring.

The running time of DetLocalSearch is $O^*((r - 1)^g)$, since the depth of its recursion tree is g , each node has 0 or $r - 1$ children, and the work per node is polynomial. \square

Theorem 1. *Given an n -node r -uniform hypergraph H , algorithm DetNRC returns 1 if H admits a no-rainbow, and 0 otherwise. The worst-case running time of DetNRC is $O^*((r - 1)^{(r-1)n/r})$. In particular, the worst-case running time is $O^*(1.59^n)$ for $r = 3$ and $O^*(2.28^n)$ for $r = 4$.*

Proof. Suppose H has a no-rainbow r -coloring c^* . Then, by Lemma 1, one of the initial candidate pairs is within $(r - 1)n/r$ of c^* . Since DetLocalSearch tries all possible initial candidates, DetNRC is correct.

By Lemma 3, since DetLocalSearch is invoked with search radius $g = \frac{(r-1)n}{r}$, each call to DetLocalSearch $O^*((r-1)^{(r-1)n/r})$ time. Since DetNRC calls DetLocalSearch a polynomial number of times, the claimed running time follows. \square

4 Randomized Algorithm

Our randomized algorithm for the no-rainbow r -coloring problem (Algorithm 2) consists of a procedure RandNRC whose outer **for** loop conducts a series of trials. Each trial invokes a randomized procedure RandLocalSearch to search for a no-rainbow

r -coloring starting from different candidate pairs. We will prove that, given an n -node r -uniform hypergraph H and a number $\alpha > 1$, $\text{RandNRC}(H, \alpha)$ finds a no-rainbow r -coloring of H , if such a coloring exists, with probability at least $1 - \frac{1}{e^\alpha}$.

Algorithm 2: A randomized algorithm for no-rainbow r -coloring.

```

RandNRC( $H, \alpha$ ):
  for  $j = 1$  to  $\alpha \cdot \binom{r}{2}^n$  do
    foreach  $F \subseteq X$  such that  $|F| = r$  do
      Let  $c$  be the coloring obtained by assigning distinct colors to the
      nodes of  $F$  and assigning each node in  $X \setminus F$  a color chosen
      uniformly at random from  $[r]$ 
      if RandLocalSearch( $H, c, F$ ) then return 1
  return 0

RandLocalSearch( $H, c, F$ ):
  for  $i = 1$  to  $n - r$  do
    if  $c$  induces a rainbow edge such that  $e \subseteq F$  then return 0
    if  $c$  is a no-rainbow coloring then return 1
    if  $|e \cap F| \neq r - 1$  for every edge  $e$  then return 1
    Pick an arbitrary rainbow hyperedge  $e$  such that  $|e \cap F| = r - 1$ 
    Let  $v$  be the node of  $e$  such that  $v \notin F$ 
    Pick a color  $j \in [r] \setminus \{c(v)\}$  uniformly at random
     $c(v) = j$ 
     $F = F \cup \{v\}$ 
  return 0

```

We begin by bounding the probability that RandLocalSearch finds a no-rainbow r -coloring, provided we start it at the right point.

Lemma 4. *Let $H = (X, E)$ be an n -node r -uniform hypergraph. Suppose (c, F) is a candidate pair such that $|F| = 4$ and for each node $v \in X \setminus F$, $c(v)$ is chosen at random. If H has a no-rainbow r -coloring that agrees with c on F , then, with probability at least $\left(\frac{2}{r}\right)^n$, $\text{RandLocalSearch}(H, c, F)$ will find a no-rainbow r -coloring for H .*

Proof. Suppose H has a no-rainbow r -coloring that agrees with c on F . RandLocalSearch starts from (c, F) and at each step determines that either (1) it has reached a dead end, because there exists a rainbow edge all whose nodes are frozen, (2) c is a no-rainbow r -coloring, (3) (c, F) satisfies the conditions of Lemma 2 and, therefore H admits a no-rainbow r -coloring or (4) there is a rainbow edge, say e , with exactly one unfrozen node. In case (1), we say that RandLocalSearch *fails*, while in cases (2) and (3) it *succeeds*. In case (4) RandLocalSearch recolors the unfrozen node, say v , in e with a randomly chosen color, adds v to F and continues the search.

The probability that RandLocalSearch succeeds is the probability that it reaches cases (2) or (3). Let (c^*, F^*) be a candidate pair such that c^* agrees with c on F and $F \subseteq F^*$ such that either c^* is a rainbow coloring or (c^*, F^*) satisfies the conditions of Lemma 2. By assumption, (c^*, F^*) must exist. If at some iteration of RandLocalSearch we have $(c, F) = (c^*, F^*)$, then RandLocalSearch succeeds.

Let A_k be the event that the initial assignment c disagrees with c^* on exactly k vertices. By assumption, c agrees with c^* on at least r nodes. Thus, letting $m = n - r$, we have

$$\Pr[A_k] = \binom{m}{k} (r-1)^k r^{-m}.$$

The probability p that `RandLocalSearch` succeeds is at least the probability that each iteration reduces the distance between c and c^* by 1, until $c = c^*$. The probability of getting closer to c^* at each step is $\frac{1}{r-1}$. Thus, we have

$$p \geq \sum_{k=0}^m \binom{m}{k} (r-1)^k r^{-m} \left(\frac{1}{r-1}\right)^k = r^{-m} \sum_{k=0}^m \binom{m}{k} = \left(\frac{2}{r}\right)^m \geq \left(\frac{2}{r}\right)^n,$$

as claimed. □

Theorem 2. *Given an r -uniform hypergraph $H = (X, E)$ and a number $\alpha > 1$, `RandNRC` finds a no-rainbow r -coloring of H , if one exists, with probability at least $1 - \frac{1}{e^\alpha}$. The worst-case running time of `RandNRC` is $O^*\left(\left(\frac{r}{2}\right)^n\right)$. In particular, for $r = 3$ and $r = 4$, the worst-case running times are $O^*(1.5^n)$ and $O^*(2^n)$, respectively.*

Proof. If H has a no-rainbow r -coloring, there must exist a set $F \subseteq X$ with $|F| = r$ such that the nodes in F have r different colors. Thus, by Lemma 4, at least one of the calls to `RandLocalSearch` has probability at least $\left(\frac{2}{r}\right)^n$ of success. It follows from standard results (see, e.g., [8, p. 151]) that by conducting $\alpha \cdot \left(\frac{r}{2}\right)^n$ trials of `RandNRC`'s outer **for** loop, the probability of success is at least $1 - \frac{1}{e^\alpha}$. The time bound follows by noting that the running time of `RandLocalSearch` is polynomial and, for each j , the number of executions of `RandNRC`'s inner **for** loop is polynomial for fixed r . □

References

- [1] Claude Berge. *Hypergraphs: combinatorics of finite sets*, volume 45 of *North-Holland Mathematical Library*. Elsevier, 1989.
- [2] Manuel Bodirsky, Jan Kára, and Barnaby Martin. The complexity of surjective homomorphism problems—a survey. *Discrete Applied Mathematics*, 160(12):1680–1690, 2012.
- [3] Fedor V. Fomin and Dieter Kratsch. *Exact Exponential Algorithms*. Springer, Berlin, Heidelberg, 2010.
- [4] Robin A Moser and Dominik Scheder. A full derandomization of Schönning's k -SAT algorithm. In *Proceedings of the 43rd Annual ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing*, pages 245–252, 2011.
- [5] Ghazaleh Parvini, Katherine Braught, and David Fernández-Baca. Checking phylogenetic decisiveness in theory and in practice. In Zhipeng Cai, Ion I. Mandoiu, Giri Narasimhan, Pavel Skums, and Xuan Guo, editors, *Bioinformatics Research*

and Applications - 16th International Symposium, ISBRA 2020, Moscow, Russia, December 1-4, 2020, Proceedings, volume 12304 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 189–202. Springer, 2020.

- [6] Michael J. Sanderson, Michelle M. McMahon, and Mike Steel. Terraces in phylogenetic tree space. *Science*, 333(6041):448–450, 2011.
- [7] Uwe Schöning. A probabilistic algorithm for k-sat and constraint satisfaction problems. In *40th Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science (Cat. No. 99CB37039)*, pages 410–414. IEEE, 1999.
- [8] Uwe Schöning and Jacobo Torán. *The Satisfiability Problem: Algorithms and Analyses*, volume 3 of *Mathematik für Anwendungen*. Lehmanns Media, Berlin, 2013.
- [9] Mike Steel and Michael J. Sanderson. Characterizing phylogenetically decisive taxon coverage. *Applied Mathematics Letters*, 23(1):82–86, 2010.
- [10] Dmitriy Zhuk. No-rainbow problem is NP-hard, March 2020. arXiv preprint <https://arxiv.org/abs/2003.11764>.