

An Approximation Algorithm for K -best Enumeration of Minimal Connected Edge Dominating Sets with Cardinality Constraints^{*}

Kazuhiro Kurita¹[0000-0002-7638-3322] and Kunihiro Wasa²[0000-0001-9822-6283]

¹ National Institute of Informatics, Tokyo, Japan, kurita@nii.ac.jp

² Toyohashi University of Technology, Aichi, Japan, wasa@cs.tut.ac.jp

Abstract. K -best enumeration, which asks to output k best solutions without duplication, plays an important role in data analysis for many fields. In such fields, data can be typically represented by graphs, and thus subgraph enumeration has been paid much attention to. However, k -best enumeration tends to be intractable since, in many cases, finding one optimum solution is NP-hard. To overcome this difficulty, we combine k -best enumeration with a new concept of enumeration algorithms called *approximation enumeration algorithms*, which has been recently proposed. As a main result, we propose an α -approximation algorithm for minimal connected edge dominating sets which outputs k minimal solutions with cardinality at most $\alpha \cdot \overline{\text{OPT}}$, where $\overline{\text{OPT}}$ is the cardinality of a *minimum* solution which is *not* outputted by the algorithm, and α is constant. Moreover, our proposed algorithm runs in $O(nm^2\Delta)$ delay, where n , m , Δ are the number of vertices, the number of edges, and the maximum degree of an input graph.

1 Introduction

Enumeration is one of the most classical tasks. A kind of enumeration has been used in operations research [14], machine learning [4, 12, 13], data mining [8, 26], and database theory [2, 10, 19, 25]. In the theory of enumeration algorithms, we measure the efficiency of enumeration algorithms by the number of outputs and the input size. The *delay* of enumeration algorithm is one of the measures for the efficiency of enumeration algorithms. It is defined by the maximum time between two consecutive solutions. One of the main interests in the field of enumeration algorithms is the development of algorithms with small delay. However, since the number of outputs may be exponentially larger than the input size, theoretically efficient algorithms require a huge computational time even if the delay is extremely small. Therefore, to reduce the huge computation time of enumeration, we need to reduce the number of outputs by not outputting unnecessary or useless solutions.

^{*} Partially supported by JST CREST Grant Number JPMJCR18K3, JSPS KAKENHI Grant Numbers JP19H01133, JP19K20350, JP20H05793, JP21K17812, and JP21H05861, and JST ACT-X Grant Number JPMJAX2105, Japan.

One way to reduce the number of useless outputs is *k-best enumeration*. The task of *k-best enumeration* is to output k solutions $\{S_1, \dots, S_k\}$ such that for any other solution S' , $|S_i| \leq |S'|$ (or $|S_i| \geq |S'|$) holds. There are several algorithms for enumerating *k-best* solution of (maximal) matchings, *s-t* paths, and spanning trees [11, 21, 22, 24]. Eppstein gave a comprehensive survey of *k-best enumeration* [9]. Unfortunately, *k-best enumeration* problems are NP-hard in many cases since 1-best enumeration is equal to an optimization problem. Therefore, it is difficult to design efficient *k-best enumeration* algorithms.

Main result: As another approach to avoid outputting useless solutions, we introduce a new viewpoint of approximation for *k-best enumeration* algorithms. We call an enumeration algorithm \mathcal{A} a *c-approximation k-best enumeration algorithm* if \mathcal{A} outputs *k-solutions* $\{S_1, \dots, S_k\}$ that satisfies $|S| \leq c \cdot \overline{\text{OPT}}$ for any $S \in \{S_1, \dots, S_k\}$, where $\overline{\text{OPT}}$ is the cardinality of a minimum solution which is *not* outputted by the algorithm.

In this paper, we consider *k-best enumeration* of the minimal connected edge dominating sets. Enumeration of minimal (edge) dominating sets is a central topic of the field of enumeration. Thus, without cardinality constraints, the problem has hardness results and positive results for various graph classes [5, 15–17]. For minimal edge dominating set enumeration, Kanté et al. have been developed a polynomial-delay and polynomial-space algorithm [18]. As a first natural question, we consider whether there exists a polynomial-delay *k-best enumeration* algorithm for minimal connected edge dominating sets. It is known that finding a minimum connected edge dominating set is NP-hard [23](p. 102, Lemma 4.4.3). Therefore, a polynomial-delay *k-best enumeration* of the minimal connected edge dominating set is intractable.

As the main result of this paper, we show that we can enumerate *k-best* minimal connected edge dominating sets approximately with polynomial delay. Note that our algorithm also achieves a polynomial-delay enumeration of “all” minimal connected edge dominating sets. We summarize our main results in the following theorem and corollary.

Theorem 1. *There is an algorithm that approximately enumerates k-best minimal connected edge dominating sets with a constant approximation ratio in polynomial delay.*

Corollary 2. *There is an algorithm that enumerates all minimal connected edge dominating sets with polynomial delay.*

Related works: Recently, approximative approaches to enumeration have been studied. In the database area, a variant of *k-best enumeration* has been introduced by Fagin [10], called θ -approximation order enumeration. For a sequence of outputs (S_1, S_2, \dots, S_M) , we say that it is a θ -approximation order if $|S_i| \leq \theta |S_j|$ for any $i < j$. In this problem setting, Ajami et al. developed a polynomial-delay θ -approximation order enumeration algorithm for weighted set covers [2].

Another approach of approximative enumeration is introduced by Kobayashi et al. and Agrawal et al., independently, called *approximation enumeration* [1, 20]. In this problem setting, we enumerate all solutions with weight at most

a given threshold t . However, we allow outputting a solution with weight at most ct . We call such an enumeration algorithm a c -approximation enumeration algorithm. Note that if we have a θ -approximation ordered enumeration algorithm, then it is a θ -approximation enumeration algorithm of the problem. Thus, approximation enumeration is a relaxed version of approximation order enumeration. For a designing c -approximation enumeration algorithm, the *CKS property* is important³. As a remarkable result, Kobayashi et al. show that if the monotone property has the CKS property, then there is a polynomial delay $(c + 1)$ -approximation enumeration algorithm [20].

2 Preliminaries

A graph $G = (V, E)$ is a pair of a set of vertices and a set of edges. In this paper, we assume that G is connected and simple, that is, G has no-self loops and multiple edges. Thus, $|E| \geq |V| - 1$ holds. We denote $|V|$ and $|E|$ as n and m , respectively. For vertex $v \in V$, a vertex u adjacent to v if E has an edge $\{u, v\}$. A vertex u is called a *neighbor of v* . For an edge $e = \{u, v\}$, u and v are *endpoints of e* and e is an *incident edge of u and v* . We denote a set of neighbors of v and a set of incident edges of v as $N_G(v)$ and $\Gamma_G(v)$, respectively. A *degree of v* is defined as the cardinality of $N_G(v)$ and it is denoted as $d_G(v)$. We say that v is a *pendant vertex* if $|N_G(v)|$ is equal to one. Similarly, we say that the edge incident to a pendent is the *pendant edge*. Moreover, the degree of G is defined as $\max_{v \in V} d_G(v)$ and it is denoted as Δ_G . If there is no confusion arises, we drop the subscript. For a set of vertices $N(u) \cup \{u\}$ is called a *closed neighbor of u* and it denoted as $N[u]$. Moreover, for a set of vertices U , we define neighbor of U as $\bigcup_{u \in U} N(u) \setminus U$. Similarly, a set of vertices $N(U) \cup U$ is called a *closed neighbor of U* and it denoted as $N[U]$.

A graph $H = (U, F)$ is called a *subgraph of G* if $U \subseteq V$ and $F \subseteq E$. Moreover, if $U = \bigcup_{f \in F} f$, then H is called an *edge induced subgraph*. We denote an edge induced subgraph $H = (U, F)$ as $G[F]$. If a subgraph H is a tree, that is, H has no cycles, then H is called a *subtree of G* . We call a graph $H = (U, F)$ of $G = (V, E)$ is an *induced subgraph of G* if $U \subseteq V$ and $F = \{\{u, v\} \in E \mid u, v \in U\}$. A sequence of vertices $P = (u_1, u_2, \dots, u_k)$ is called a *path* if u_i is adjacent to u_{i+1} for any $1 \leq i < k$ and all the vertices are distinct. A sequence of vertices $C = (u_1, u_2, \dots, u_k)$ is called a *cycle* if u_i is adjacent to u_{i+1} for any $1 \leq i \leq k$, where u_{k+1} is considered as u_1 , and all the vertices except for pair $\{u_1, u_{k+1}\}$ are distinct. We say that a graph G is connected if for any pair of vertices $u, v \in V(G)$, G has a u - v path. A graph H is called *tree* if G has no cycles.

For edges e and f , we say that e *dominates f* if e and f share one endpoint. Similarly, for vertices v and u , we say that v *dominate u* if u is a neighbor of v . A set of edges F is called *edge dominating set* if any edge in G is dominated by an edge in F . Similarly, for a set of vertices U , U is called *dominating set* if $N[U]$ is equal to V . Moreover, F is called *connected edge dominating set*

³ See [6, 7] for the details of the definition of the CKS property.




Fig. 1. An example of a trivial case. The left graph has three minimal solutions with two edges represented by dotted edges, gray edges, and black edges.

if $G[F]$ is connected and F is an edge dominating set of G . For a connected edge dominating set F , an edge $e = \{u, v\} \notin F$ is a *private edge* of $f \in F$ if $(\Gamma(u) \cup \Gamma(v)) \cap F = \{f\}$. A connected edge dominating set F is called a *minimal connected edge dominating set* if for any $f \in F$, $F \setminus \{f\}$ is not a connected edge dominating set. We can easily see that the following proposition.

Proposition 3. *Let F be a connected edge dominating set. Then, $G[F]$ forms a tree if F is minimal.*

3 Enumeration of all minimal connected edge dominating sets

To achieve polynomial-delay enumeration of k -best minimal connected edge dominating sets, we first give a polynomial-delay enumeration algorithm for “all” minimal connected edge dominating sets. In this paper, we assume that the cardinality of a *minimum* connected edge dominating set is at least two. If G has a minimum connected edge dominating set with cardinality one, then the enumeration of minimal connected edge dominating sets can be done in polynomial time. This is because for a minimum connected edge dominating set e^* any edge in G is incident to at least one endpoint of e^* , and every minimal connected edge dominating set contains at most one edge incident to each endpoint of e^* , that is, these cardinality is at most two. Thus, we can enumerate all minimal connected edge dominating set in $O(m\Delta)$ time. See Figure 1 for an example.

To design a polynomial-delay enumeration algorithm, we adopt the *supergraph technique* [20,21] as the basic idea. In this technique, we define a directed graph $\mathcal{G} = (\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{E})$, called a *supergraph*, whose vertex set \mathcal{V} consists of the set of all minimal connected edge dominating sets in an input graph. If \mathcal{G} is strongly connected, then by starting from an arbitrary solution, we can enumerate solutions by applying a standard graph traverse procedure on \mathcal{G} . Thus, the key of the supergraph technique is how we define the edge set \mathcal{E} of \mathcal{G} .

We define directed edges in \mathcal{G} by three types of neighbors for each minimal connected edge dominating set X . The common idea is simple: We firstly remove an edge e from X , next add several edges to $X \setminus \{e\}$, and then, obtain a minimal connected edge dominating set from the resultant set. To obtain a minimal connected edge dominating set, we use $\mu(\cdot)$ defined as follows: $\mu(\cdot)$ is an arbitrary deterministic procedure such that $\mu(\cdot)$ receives a connected edge dominating set X and outputs a minimal connected edge dominating set Y contained in X . From the following proposition, we can compute $\mu(\cdot)$ in linear time.

Proposition 4. *Let X be a connected edge dominating set of a graph G . Then, X is minimal if and only if any pendant edge has at least one private edge.*

Proof. Suppose that X is minimal. We assume that X has a pendant edge e having no private edges. Then, $X \setminus \{e\}$ dominates all edges. Moreover, since e is a pendant edge of X , $X \setminus \{e\}$ is connected. This contradicts the assumption and completes the if part.

We next show the only if part. Suppose that any pendant edge in X has at least one private edge. We prove by contradiction. Let Y be a connected edge dominating set contained in X . If Y contains all pendant edges in X , then Y is not a tree since any non-pendant edge is a bridge. Thus, Y does not contain some pendant edge in X . However, it contradicts that Y is a connected edge dominating set. \square

Lemma 5. *Let X be a connected edge dominating set. Then, we can compute a minimal connected edge dominating set contained in X in $O(m)$ time.*

Proof. We first compute a spanning tree T of $G[X]$. Clearly, $E(T)$ is a connected edge dominating set in G and can be obtained in linear time. We show that, for any subset $T' \subseteq T$, if T' is a connected edge dominating set, then T' contains all non-pendant edges in T . For any edge $e \in T$, $G[T \setminus \{e\}]$ has two connected components C_1 and C_2 . Both $E(C_1)$ and $E(C_2)$ are not edge dominating sets for G since any edge in C_1 is not dominated by C_2 and vice versa. Thus, we cannot remove any non-pendant edge.

In the following, we determine whether we can remove a pendant edge e from T . Let ℓ be a pendant vertex in $G[X]$ that has e as an incident edge. If the other endpoint of any edge in $\Gamma_G(\ell)$ is in $V(T)$, that is, e has no private edges, then we remove e from T and set $T = T \setminus \{e\}$. Otherwise, we keep e in T . This can be done in $O(d(\ell))$ time. We repeat this procedure until all pendant edges in T are examined. Note that any pendant edge is examined at most once. Any pendant edge in the resultant tree T has a private edge. Thus, by Proposition 4, T is minimal and the total time complexity is $O(m)$. \square

Next, we define three types of neighbors of a minimal connected edge dominating set X . For any pendant edge e in $G[X]$, we denote by $W(X, e)$ the set of vertices such that these are not endpoints of e and are incident to a private edge h of e such that h is not a pendant edge in G .

Type-I neighbor: Suppose that e is a bridge in $G[X]$ and f is an incident edge of $V(G[X \setminus \{e\}])$. Let C_1 and C_2 be two connected components in $G[X \setminus \{e\}]$. Without loss of generality, f incidents to $V(C_1)$. Let P be the subset of $\Gamma_G(v)$ such that for each edge g in P , the other endpoint of g is in $V(C_2)$. Then, for each $g \in P$, we say that $\mu((X \setminus \{e\}) \cup \{f, g\})$ is a *type-I neighbor of X with respect to the edge pair (e, f)* . Note that f may equal to g .

Type-II neighbor: Suppose $e = \{u, v\}$ is a pendant edge in $G[X]$ such that v is a pendant vertex in $G[X]$. Let \mathcal{P} be the set of all paths from v to $V(G[X \setminus \{e\}])$ in G with length at most two. For each $P \in \mathcal{P}$, we say $\mu((X \setminus \{e\}) \cup E(P))$ is a *neighbor-II of X with respect to e* .




Fig. 2. Examples for three types of neighbors of a minimal connected edge dominating set X . (a) depicts X . Black bold lines indicate the edges in X . (b) depicts a type-I neighbor Y_1 of X . Y_1 is obtained by removing a dashed edge corresponding e and adding a wavy path corresponding $\{f, g\}$. The bottom edge is removed by applying $\mu(\cdot)$. (c) and (d) are a type-II and a type-III neighbor of X , respectively. Similarly, the neighbors are obtained by removing a dashed edge and adding wavy edges.

Type-III neighbor: Suppose that $e = \{u, v\}$ is a pendant edge in $G[X]$ such that v is a pendant vertex in $G[X]$ and v has no pendant edges in G . Suppose that any vertex $w \in W(X, e)$ has the degree two or more. Let F be an edge set obtained as follows: for each w in $W(X, e)$, we pick an edge f between w and $V(G[X \setminus \{e\}])$ and add f to F . Then, we say that $\mu((X \setminus \{e\}) \cup F)$ is the *neighbor-III* of X with respect to e . Note that $|W(X, e)| = |F|$ and a type-III neighbor of X with respect to e is unique.

See Figure 2 for examples. Intuitively speaking, to obtain a type-I neighbor, we first destroy the connectivity constraint only, and then add a path (f, g) so that the resultant edge set is connected again. Similarly, to obtain a type-II or type-III neighbor, we first destroy the domination constraint only, and then add some edges so that the resultant edge set satisfies the domination constraint. By the following lemmas, the obtained edge sets are actually minimal connected edge dominating sets.

Lemma 6. *Let X be a minimal connected edge dominating set and e be a pendant edge in $G[X]$. Then, a vertex $w \in W(X, e)$ has degree two or more in G and $\Gamma_G(w)$ has an edge that connects w and $V(G[X \setminus \{e\}])$.*

Proof. From the definition of $W(X, e)$, w has an incident edge h that is a private edge of e in $G[X]$. Moreover, since h is not a pendant edge in G , the degree of w is two or more.

Let v be a pendent vertex such that v is an endpoint of e , and let f be an edge $\{v, w\}$. $\Gamma(w)$ has an edge g since the degree of w is two or more. Since X is a connected edge dominating set and e is a pendant edge, g is dominated by an edge in X both of whose endpoints are not v . Thus, g connects w and $V(G[X \setminus \{e\}])$. \square

Lemma 7. *Let X be a minimal connected edge dominating set and Y be a neighbor of X . Then, Y is a minimal connected edge dominating set.*

Proof. Suppose that Y is a type-I neighbor of X with respect to (e, f) . Since e is a bridge, $V(G[X])$ is equal to $V(G[X \setminus \{e\}])$. Moreover, from the definition of g , $G[(X \setminus \{e\}) \cup \{f, g\}]$ is connected. Thus, $(X \setminus \{e\}) \cup \{f\} \cup E(P)$ is a connected edge dominating set.

Suppose that Y is a type-II neighbor of X with respect to $e = \{u, v\}$, where v is a pendant vertex in $G[X]$. Since we add $E(P)$ that incident to v , $V(G[(X \setminus \{e\}) \cup E(P)]) \supseteq V(G[X])$. Note that $E(P)$ may contain e . Thus, $(X \setminus \{e\}) \cup E(P)$ is a connected edge dominating set.

Suppose that Y is a type-III neighbor of X with respect to e . Let h be a private edge of e . From the definition of Y , there is an edge g in F such that h and g share a vertex in $W(X, e)$. Moreover, by Lemma 6, g is dominated by $X \setminus \{e\}$. Thus, $(X \setminus \{e\}) \cup F$ is a connected edge dominating set. In each case, Y is obtained by applying $\mu(\cdot)$ to a connected edge dominating set. Hence, the lemma holds. □

Let $\mathbf{neigh}(X)$ be the set of all types of neighbors of X . We simply say that Y is a *neighbor* of X if $Y \in \mathbf{neigh}(X)$. Now, we define directed edges in \mathcal{G} as follows: There is a directed edge (X, Y) in \mathcal{G} if and only if $Y \in \mathbf{neigh}(X)$. Note that $X \in \mathbf{neigh}(Y)$ may not hold.

We next show the strong connectivity of \mathcal{G} . To this end, for a pair of two minimal connected edge dominating sets X and Y , we define a function $\delta(X, Y)$ as the size of the union $\delta(X, Y) := |X \cup Y|$ of X and Y . Intuitively speaking, this function expresses the ‘‘closeness’’ of X and Y . The following proposition is easily derived but essential.

Proposition 8. *For any pair of minimal connected edge dominating sets X and Y , $\delta(X, Y) = |X| = |Y|$ if and only if $X = Y$.*

Thus, to show the strong connectivity of \mathcal{G} , it is sufficient to show that for any pair of minimal connected edge dominating sets X and Y , there exists a minimal connected edge dominating set Z such that there is a directed path from X to Z in \mathcal{G} satisfying $\delta(X, Y) > \delta(Z, Y)$. That is, Z is ‘‘closer’’ to Y than X with respect to $\delta(\cdot, \cdot)$. As shown in the following lemmas, if $G[X \cup Y]$ has at least one cycle, then \mathcal{G} contains a directed edge (X, Z) .

Lemma 9. *Let X and Y be minimal connected edge dominating sets. Suppose that $G[X \cup Y]$ contains a cycle. Then, $G[X \cup Y]$ has a cycle C such that (1) C can be respectively decomposed into two paths P and Q contained in X and Y , (2) the length of Q is at most two, and (3) any non-endpoint vertex of Q is not in $V(G[X])$.*

Proof. Let $C = \{v_1, \dots, v_k\}$ be a cycle in $G[X \cup Y]$ such that v_1 is in X and Y . Without loss of generality, we can assume that C can be decomposed into a sequence of paths (R_1, \dots, R_ℓ) such that (1) R_i is contained in X if i is odd, and (2) R_i is contained in Y if i is even. Let $Q = R_i$ such that i is even. Since both endpoints of Q are in $V(G[X])$, $G[X]$ has a path P connecting them. Thus, $P \cup Q$ contains a cycle C' . Moreover, if the length of Q is more than two, then

Q has a non-endpoint vertex contained in $V(G[X])$. Otherwise, it contracts that X is an edge dominating set. Thus, we can obtain a shorter cycle C contained in $P \cup Q$ satisfying the condition mentioned in the statement. \square

Lemma 10. *Let X and Y be a pair of minimal connected edge dominating sets such that $X \neq Y$. Suppose that $G[X \cup Y]$ has a cycle C . For any edge e in $(E(C) \cap X) \setminus Y$, X has a neighbor Z contained in $(X \cup Y) \setminus \{e\}$.*

Proof. Let C be a cycle in $G[X \cup Y]$. By Lemma 9, C can be respectively decomposed into two paths P and Q contained in X and Y , and the length of Q is at most two. In what follows, we assume that e is an edge in P .

Suppose that e is a bridge in $G[X]$. Let f be an edge in Q . Note that f is incident to one of the connected components in $G[X \setminus \{e\}]$. From the definition of a type-I neighbor, X has a neighbor $Z = \mu((X \setminus \{e\}) \cup \{f\} \cup (E(Q) \setminus \{f\}))$. Since Q is contained in Y , Z is a subset of $(X \cup Y) \setminus \{e\}$.

Suppose that the remaining case, that is, $e = \{u, v\}$ is a pendant edge in $G[X]$. Without loss of generality, v is a pendant vertex in $G[X]$. Then, Q contains an edge incident to v . Hence, from the definition of a type-II neighbor and $Q \subseteq Y$, $Z = \mu((X \setminus \{e\}) \cup E(Q))$ is a neighbor of X , and Z is a subset of $(X \cup Y) \setminus \{e\}$. \square

From the above lemma, we can immediately obtain the following lemma.

Lemma 11. *Let X and Y be a pair of minimal connected edge dominating sets such that $X \neq Y$. Suppose that $G[X \cup Y]$ has a cycle. Then, X has a neighbor Z that satisfies $\delta(X, Y) > \delta(Z, Y)$.* \square

Note that in the above case, Z is obtained by adding an edge on a cycle in $G[X \cup Y]$. Hence, we need to show the remaining case that $G[X \cup Y]$ has no cycles. Moreover, if $G[X \cup Y]$ has at least two connected components, it contradicts that both X and Y are connected edge dominating sets since every edge $e \in X$ is not dominated by Y . Thus, $G[X \cup Y]$ is a tree.

Let e be an edge $X \setminus Y$ in $G[X]$. Now, we consider the type-III neighbor of X with respect to e . The following lemma shows that e is a pendant edge.

Lemma 12. *Let X and Y be minimal connected edge dominating sets. If $G[X \cup Y]$ is a tree, then any edge in $X \setminus Y$ is a pendant edge in $G[X]$.*

Proof. We prove by contradiction. Suppose that $e = \{u, v\} \in X \setminus Y$ is not a pendant edge in $G[X]$. Without loss of generality, Y has an edge incident to v . Since $G[X \cup Y]$ is a tree, Y has no edges incident to u . However, X has an edge $f = \{u, w\}$ incident to u since e is not a pendant edge in $G[X]$. Since Y is an edge dominating set, Y has an edge incident to w . It contradicts that $G[X \cup Y]$ is a tree, and the statement holds. \square

Let Z' be the type-III neighbor of X with respect to $e \in X \setminus Y$ and w be a pendant vertex in $G[X]$ that has e as an incident edge. Since $G[X \cup Y]$ is a tree and Y is an edge dominating set, w has no pendant edges in G . Otherwise, it contradicts that Y is an edge dominating set. Thus, we can pick e for obtaining

a type-III neighbor of X . However, $\delta(Z', Y) \geq \delta(X, Y)$ may hold since the added edge set $F \subseteq Y$ may not hold. In the following, we show that we can remove edges in $F \setminus Y$ from Z' by repeatedly obtaining type-I or type-II neighbors.

Lemma 13. *Let X and Y be a pair of minimal connected edge dominating sets, v be a pendent vertex in $G[X]$, e_x be a pendant edge $\{v, a\}$ in $G[X]$, and e_y be an edge $\{v, b\}$ in $G[Y]$. If $e_x \in X \setminus Y$ and $e_y \in Y \setminus X$ hold, then $G[X \cup Y]$ contains at least one cycle that contains e_x .*

Proof. If Y has an edge incident to a , then $G[Y]$ has a a - b path, and the statement holds. Suppose that Y has no edges incident to a . Since a is not a pendent vertex in $G[X]$, $\Gamma_{G[X]}(a) \setminus \{e_x\}$ has an edge $f = \{a, c\}$. Since Y is an edge dominating set and Y has no edges incident to a , Y has an edge incident to c . Thus, $G[Y]$ has a v - c path, and the statement holds. \square

Lemma 14. *Let X and Y be minimal connected edge dominating sets. If $X \setminus Y$ contains a non-pendant edge $e = \{u, v\}$ in $G[X]$, then $G[X \cup Y]$ has a cycle containing e .*

Proof. Since Y is an edge dominating set, Y contains an edge incident to u or v . Without loss of generality, we assume that Y contains an edge incident to v . If Y contains an edge incident to u , then the statement holds since $e \notin Y$. Suppose that Y does not contain edges incident to u . Therefore, Y contains an edge incident to for any $N(u) \setminus \{v\}$. Since e is a non-pendant edge in $G[X]$, $N(u) \setminus \{v\} \neq \emptyset$. Thus, $G[Y]$ has a w - v path for any $w \in N(u) \setminus \{v\} \neq \emptyset$ since Y is a minimal connected edge dominating set. Hence, the statement holds. \square

Lemma 15. *Let X and Y be a pair of minimal connected edge dominating sets such that $X \neq Y$. Suppose that $G[X \cup Y]$ is a tree. Then, \mathcal{G} has a directed path from X to Z such that Z is a minimal connected edge dominating set satisfying $\delta(X, Y) > \delta(Z, Y)$.*

Proof. Let e be an edge in $X \setminus Y$ and $F \setminus Y = \{f_1, \dots, f_\ell\}$. From Lemma 12, e is a pendant edge in $G[X]$. Let v be a pendent vertex of $G[X]$ that has e as an incident edge.

Let Z' be a type-III neighbor of X with respect to e , and let F be a set of edges that is added to X for obtaining Z' . From the construction, Z' is a subset of $(X \cup Y \cup F) \setminus \{e\}$. As mentioned before, $\delta(Z', Y) > \delta(X, Y)$ may hold. To overcome this situation, we show that for a minimal connected edge dominating set $T \subseteq (X \cup Y \cup F) \setminus \{e\}$, T has a neighbor $T' \subseteq (X \cup Y \cup (F \cap T)) \setminus \{e, f\}$ for some edge f in $(F \setminus Y) \cap T$. If this holds, then by repeatedly obtaining such neighbors, we can show that \mathcal{G} has a directed path from Z' to a minimal connected edge dominating set Z satisfying $Z \subseteq (X \cup Y) \setminus \{e\}$ since Z' and T' are subsets of $(X \cup Y \cup F) \setminus \{e\}$.

Let f be an edge in $(F \setminus Y) \cap T$. We firstly suppose that f is a non-pendant edge in $G[T]$. Then, $G[T \cup Y]$ contains a cycle C such that $f \in E(C)$ by Lemma 14. Thus, by Lemma 10, there is a neighbor T' satisfying $T' \subseteq (T \cup Y) \setminus \{f\} \subseteq (X \cup Y \cup (F \cap T)) \setminus \{e, f\}$.

Algorithm 1: An algorithm enumerates all minimal connected edge dominating sets in $O(nm^2\Delta)$ delay.

```

1 Procedure MTC( $G$ )
2    $T^* \leftarrow$  an arbitrary minimal connected edge dominating set  $G$ 
3   Push  $T^*$  to an empty queue  $\mathcal{Q}$  and add  $T^*$  to an empty set  $\mathcal{S}$ 
4   while  $\mathcal{Q}$  is not empty do
5      $T \leftarrow$  a minimal connected edge dominating set in  $\mathcal{Q}$ 
6     Output  $T$  and delete  $T$  from  $\mathcal{Q}$ 
7     foreach neighbor  $T'$  of  $T$  do
8       if  $T' \notin \mathcal{S}$  then Add  $T'$  to  $\mathcal{Q}$  and to  $\mathcal{S}$ 

```

We next suppose that $f = \{a, w\}$ is a pendant edge in $G[T]$, where $w \in W(X, e)$. We firstly show that the following claim.

Claim. $\Gamma(a) \cap X \neq \emptyset$ and $\Gamma(w) \cap Y \neq \emptyset$.

Proof of Claim. If $\Gamma(w) \cap X \neq \emptyset$, then this contradicts since e has a private edge whose endpoint is w . Thus, $\Gamma(a) \cap X \neq \emptyset$ to dominate f by X .

If $\Gamma(w) \cap Y = \emptyset$, then to dominate a private edge h of e by Y such that $h = \{v, w\}$, Y contains an edge whose endpoint is v . Recall that $e \notin Y$, $e \in X$, and e is a pendant edge in $G[X]$. This implies that by Lemma 9, $G[X \cup Y]$ has a cycle and a contradiction occurs. Thus, $\Gamma(w) \cap Y \neq \emptyset$. \triangleleft

Recall that $f \notin Y$. In addition, since f is a pendant edge, either a or w is a pendant vertex in $G[T]$. Thus, from Lemma 13 and the above claim, $G[T \cup X]$ or $G[T \cup Y]$ contains a cycle C such that $f \in E(C)$. Hence, by the same argument in the above, there is a neighbor T' satisfying $T' \subseteq (X \cup Y \cup (F \cap T)) \setminus \{e, f\}$. Therefore, the lemma holds. \square

From Lemmas 11 and 15, the following lemma holds immediately.

Lemma 16. *For any pair of minimal connected edge dominating sets X and Y such that $X \neq Y$, \mathcal{G} has a directed path from X to Z , where Z is a minimal connected edge dominating set satisfying $\delta(X, Y) > \delta(Z, Y)$.* \square

Proposition 8 and Lemma 16 imply that \mathcal{G} is strongly connected. Thus, by using a standard graph search algorithm, we can traverse all vertices in \mathcal{G} starting from an arbitrary solution. Algorithm 1 depicts the pseudocode.

Next, we consider the delay of Algorithm 1. To this end, we analyze the maximum out-degree of \mathcal{G} . If the maximum out-degree is bounded by polynomial in n then we can output all the solutions with polynomial-delay by using a breadth-first search for \mathcal{G} . The number of type-I neighbors is bounded by $O(nm\Delta)$ since we have n choices for e , m choices for f , and Δ choices for g . Since the number of paths with length at most two is $\sum_{v \in V} d(v)^2 \leq m\Delta$, the number of type-II neighbors is $O(nm\Delta)$. Recall that the type-III neighbor of a minimal connected edge dominating set with respect to e is unique. Hence, the number of type-III

Algorithm 2: A k -best enumeration algorithm for minimal connected edge dominating sets in $O(nm^2\Delta)$ delay with approximation factor 4.

```

1 Procedure MTC-Best( $G, k$ )
2   Let  $T^*$  be a minimal connected edge dominating set of  $G$  founded by a
   2-approximation algorithm in [3]
3   Add  $T^*$  to a priority queue  $\mathcal{Q}$  and to set  $\mathcal{S}$ 
4   while  $\mathcal{Q}$  is not empty  $\wedge k > 0$  do
5     Let  $T$  be a minimal connected edge dominating set in  $\mathcal{Q}$ 
6     Output  $T$ , decrease  $k$  by one, and delete  $T$  from  $\mathcal{Q}$ 
7     foreach  $T'$  is a neighbor of  $T$  do
8       | if  $T' \notin \mathcal{S}$  then Add  $T'$  to  $\mathcal{Q}$  and to  $\mathcal{S}$ 

```

neighbors is $O(m)$. Thus, the maximum out-degree in \mathcal{G} is $O(nm\Delta)$, and we obtain the following theorem.

Theorem 17. *There is an $O(nm^2\Delta)$ -delay and exponential space algorithm for enumerating all minimal connected edge dominating sets.*

Proof. The correctness holds from Lemma 16. We analyze the delay of the algorithm. The bottleneck of Algorithm 1 is enumeration of all neighbors and checking for duplicates. Since we can compute $\mu(\cdot)$ in $O(m)$ time by Lemma 5 and the number of neighbors is $O(nm\Delta)$, we can enumerate all neighbors in $O(nm^2\Delta)$ time. By using a standard data structure, i.e., a radix tree, we can check the duplication in $O(m)$ time and we can insert a solution in $O(m)$ time. Since the number of neighbors is $O(nm\Delta)$, duplication checking can be done in $O(nm^2\Delta)$ time in total. Thus, the delay of the algorithm is $O(nm^2\Delta)$. \square

4 K -best enumeration of minimal connected edge dominating sets

In this section, we modify Algorithm 1 so that the modified algorithm approximately outputs k -best minimal connected edge dominating sets. To achieve this, we use a priority queue instead of the queue used in Algorithm 1. See Algorithm 2 for the details. To show the correctness of Algorithm 2, we analyze the cardinality of solutions on a path between minimal connected edge dominating sets X and Y in the supergraph \mathcal{G} . When the cardinality of each minimal connected edge dominating set on the path is sufficiently small, we can approximately solve the k -best enumeration problem.

Lemma 18. *For any pair of minimal edge dominating sets X and Y , \mathcal{G} has a directed path $\pi = (Z_1 = X, \dots, Z_k = Y)$ from X to Y such that any solution on π have cardinality at most $|X| + 2|Y|$.*

Proof. Let Z be a minimal connected edge dominating set such that $Z \subseteq X \cup Y$. From Lemma 11, if $G[Z \cup Y]$ has a cycle C , then Z has a neighbor \tilde{Z} that satisfies $\tilde{Z} \subseteq Z \cup Y \subseteq X \cup Y$.

Suppose that $G[Z \cup Y]$ has no cycles. Then, by Lemma 15, we can find a path from Z to \tilde{Z} such that (1) Z' is the type-III neighbor of Z with respect to some pendant edge e in $Z \setminus Y$, and (2) $\tilde{Z} \subseteq X \cup Y$. According to the definition of type-III neighbors, we first add an edge set F to Z . The size of F is at most $|Y| + 1$ since Y dominates edges in F and $G[Y]$ is connected. Thus, $|Z| \leq |Z'| + |F| - 1 \leq |Z'| + |Y|$. Moreover, according to the proof of Lemma 15, on a path from Z' to \tilde{Z} , any minimal connected edge dominating set Z'' on the path satisfies that $Z'' \subseteq (X \cup Y \cup F)$.

From the above discussion, we can decompose π to subpaths π_1, π_2, \dots so that for any i , the first and last minimal connected edge dominating sets of π_i are subsets of $X \cup Y$ and any intermediate minimal connected edge dominating set of π_i has size at most $|X \cup Y| + |Y|$. Thus, the maximum cardinality of a minimal connected edge dominating set on π is at most $|X \cup Y| + |Y| \leq |X| + 2|Y|$. \square

Finally, we show that our algorithm can solve the k -best minimal connected edge dominating set enumeration problem. To this end, we use a priority queue instead of a queue. Thus, the following theorem holds.

Theorem 19. *Suppose that there is an $f(n, m)$ -time c -approximation algorithm for a minimum connected edge dominating set. Then, we can approximately enumerate k -best minimal connected edge dominating sets in $O(nm^2\Delta)$ delay with approximation ratio $c + 2$ after an $f(n, m)$ -time preprocessing.*

Proof. We prove by induction of k . When k is equal to one, the statement holds since we have an $f(n, m)$ -time c -approximation algorithm for the minimum connected edge dominating set problem. Thus, we consider the induction step.

Let \mathcal{S} be a set of minimal connected edge dominating sets that are already outputted and Y be a minimum connected edge dominating set that is not contained in \mathcal{S} . Let X be a minimum connected edge dominating set in \mathcal{S} . Since we have c -approximate solutions, $|X| \leq ct \leq c|Y|$ holds, where t is the cardinality of a minimum connected edge dominating set. From Lemma 16, \mathcal{G} has a path π from X to Y . Moreover, from Lemma 18, the cardinality of each minimal connected edge dominating set on π is at most $|X| + 2|Y|$. Thus, any minimal connected edge dominating set pushed into \mathcal{S} on π has the cardinality at most $(c + 2)|Y|$.

Finally, we analyze the delay of the algorithm. The algorithm is the same as Algorithm 1 except that a queue is changed to a priority queue. Moreover, since the number of solutions is at most 2^m , we can insert a new solution in $O(m)$ time. Thus, the delay of the algorithm is $O(nm^2\Delta)$ after $f(n, m)$ -time preprocessing. \square

Note that Arkin et al. [3] give a polynomial-time 2-approximation algorithm for a minimum connected edge dominating set. Thus, by using their algorithm as a preprocessing, we can immediately obtain an $O(nm^2\Delta)$ -delay approximate enumeration algorithm for k -best minimal connected edge dominating sets an approximation ratio 4.

References

1. Pankaj K. Agarwal, Xiao Hu, Stavros Sintos, and Jun Yang. Dynamic enumeration of similarity joins. In *Proc. ICALP 2021*, volume 198 of *LIPICs*, pages 11:1–11:19. Schloss Dagstuhl - Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik, 2021.
2. Zahi Ajami and Sara Cohen. Enumerating minimal weight set covers. In *Proc. ICDE 2019*, pages 518–529. IEEE, 2019.
3. Esther M. Arkin, Magnús M. Halldórsson, and Refael Hassin. Approximating the tree and tour covers of a graph. *Inf. Process. Lett.*, 47(6):275–282, 1993.
4. Julien Baste, Michael R. Fellows, Lars Jaffke, Tomás Masarík, Mateus de Oliveira Oliveira, Geevarghese Philip, and Frances A. Rosamond. Diversity of solutions: An exploration through the lens of fixed-parameter tractability theory. In *Proc. IJCAI 2020*, pages 1119–1125. ijcai.org, 2020.
5. Marthe Bonamy, Oscar Defrain, Marc Heinrich, Michal Pilipczuk, and Jean-Florent Raymond. Enumerating minimal dominating sets in K_t -free graphs and variants. *ACM Trans. Algorithms*, 16(3):39:1–39:23, 2020.
6. Yixin Cao. Enumerating maximal induced subgraphs. *CoRR*, abs/2004.09885, 2020.
7. Sara Cohen, Benny Kimelfeld, and Yehoshua Sagiv. Generating all maximal induced subgraphs for hereditary and connected-hereditary graph properties. *J. Comput. Syst. Sci.*, 74(7):1147–1159, 2008.
8. Alessio Conte, Tiziano De Matteis, Daniele De Sensi, Roberto Grossi, Andrea Marino, and Luca Versari. D2K: scalable community detection in massive networks via small-diameter k-plexes. In *Proc. KDD 2018*, pages 1272–1281. ACM, 2018.
9. David Eppstein. k -best enumeration. In *Encyclopedia of Algorithms*, pages 1003–1006. Springer New York, 2016.
10. Ronald Fagin, Amnon Lotem, and Moni Naor. Optimal aggregation algorithms for middleware. *J. Comput. Syst. Sci.*, 66(4):614–656, 2003.
11. Harold N. Gabow. Two Algorithms for Generating Weighted Spanning Trees in Order. *SIAM J. Comput.*, 6(1):139–150, 1977.
12. Tesshu Hanaka, Yasuaki Kobayashi, Kazuhiro Kurita, and Yota Otachi. Finding diverse trees, paths, and more. In *Proc AAAI 2021*, pages 3778–3786. AAAI Press, 2021.
13. Satoshi Hara and Masakazu Ishihata. Approximate and exact enumeration of rule models. In Sheila A. McIlraith and Kilian Q. Weinberger, editors, *Proc. AAAI 2018*, pages 3157–3164. AAAI Press, 2018.
14. Arne Herzel, Stefan Ruzika, and Clemens Thielen. Approximation methods for multiobjective optimization problems: A survey. *INFORMS Journal on Computing*, 2021.
15. Mamadou Moustapha Kanté, Vincent Limouzy, Arnaud Mary, and Lhouari Nourine. Enumeration of minimal dominating sets and variants. In *Proc. FCT 2011*, volume 6914 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 298–309. Springer, 2011.
16. Mamadou Moustapha Kanté, Vincent Limouzy, Arnaud Mary, and Lhouari Nourine. On the enumeration of minimal dominating sets and related notions. *SIAM J. Discret. Math.*, 28(4):1916–1929, 2014.
17. Mamadou Moustapha Kanté, Vincent Limouzy, Arnaud Mary, Lhouari Nourine, and Takeaki Uno. A polynomial delay algorithm for enumerating minimal dominating sets in chordal graphs. In *Proc. WG 2015*, pages 138–153. Springer, 2015.

18. Mamadou Moustapha Kanté, Vincent Limouzy, Arnaud Mary, Lhouari Nourine, and Takeaki Uno. Polynomial delay algorithm for listing minimal edge dominating sets in graphs. In *Proc. WADS 2015*, volume 9214 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 446–457. Springer, 2015.
19. Benny Kimelfeld and Yehoshua Sagiv. Efficiently enumerating results of keyword search over data graphs. *Inf. Syst.*, 33(4-5):335–359, 2008.
20. Yasuaki Kobayashi, Kazuhiro Kurita, and Kunihiro Wasa. Efficient constant-factor approximate enumeration of minimal subsets for monotone properties with cardinality constraints. *CoRR*, abs/2009.08830, 2020.
21. Yasuaki Kobayashi, Kazuhiro Kurita, and Kunihiro Wasa. Polynomial-delay enumeration of large maximal matchings. *CoRR*, abs/2105.04146, 2021.
22. Eugene L. Lawler. A Procedure for Computing the K Best Solutions to Discrete Optimization Problems and Its Application to the Shortest Path Problem. *Manage. Sci.*, 18(7):401–405, 1972.
23. Andrea Munaro. *On some classical and new hypergraph invariants*. PhD thesis, Université Grenoble Alpes, 2016.
24. Katta G. Murty. Letter to the Editor—An Algorithm for Ranking all the Assignments in Order of Increasing Cost. *Oper. Res.*, 16(3):682–687, 1968.
25. Liron Sade and Sara Cohen. Diverse enumeration of maximal cliques. In *Proc. CIKM 2020*, pages 3321–3324. ACM, 2020.
26. Takeaki Uno, Masashi Kiyomi, and Hiroki Arimura. LCM ver. 2: Efficient mining algorithms for frequent/closed/maximal itemsets. In *Proc. FIMI 2004*, volume 126 of *CEUR Workshop Proceedings*. CEUR-WS.org, 2004.