## The Complexity Landscape of Fixed-Parameter Directed Steiner Network Problems

Dániel Marx

Institute for Computer Science and Control, Hungarian Academy of Sciences (MTA SZTAKI) Budapest, Hungary

(Joint work with Andreas Feldmann)

SIWAG 2016 Polignano a Mare September 26, 2016

## STEINER TREE

### STEINER TREE Given an edge-weighted graph G and set $T \subseteq V(G)$ of terminals, find a minimum-weight tree in G containing every vertex of T.



## STEINER TREE

Some known results:

- NP-hard
- Easy 2-approximation: use a minimum spanning tree.
- 1.386-approximation [Byrka et al. 2013].
- 3<sup>k</sup> · n<sup>O(1)</sup> time algorithm for k terminals using dynamic programming (i.e., fixed-parameter tractable parameterized by the number of terminals)
- Can be improved to 2<sup>k</sup> · n<sup>O(1)</sup> time using fast subset convolution [Björklund et al. 2006].

### STEINER FOREST

#### STEINER FOREST

Given an edge-weighted graph G and a list  $(s_1, t_1), \ldots, (s_k, t_k)$  of pairs of terminals, find a minimum-weight forest in G that connects  $s_i$  and  $t_i$  for every  $1 \le i \le k$ .



Fixed-parameter tractable parameterized by k: Guess a partition of the 2k terminals  $(k^{O(k)} = 2^{O(k \log k)})$  possibilities) and solve a STEINER TREE for each class of the partition.

## Variants of STEINER TREE





STEINER FOREST



Create connections satisying every request

# Variants of STEINER TREE



### DIRECTED STEINER vs. $\mathrm{SCSS}$

The DP for  $\ensuremath{\operatorname{Steiner}}$   $\ensuremath{\operatorname{Tree}}$  generalizes to the directed version:

DIRECTED STEINER TREE with k terminals can be solved in time  $2^k \cdot n^{O(1)}$ .

### DIRECTED STEINER vs. SCSS

The DP for STEINER TREE generalizes to the directed version:

DIRECTED STEINER TREE with k terminals can be solved in time  $2^k \cdot n^{O(1)}$ .

 $\operatorname{SCSS}$  seems to be much harder:

Theorem [Feldman and Ruhl 2006]

STRONGLY CONNECTED STEINER SUBGRAPH with k terminals can be solved in time  $n^{O(k)}$ .

#### Theorem [Chitnis, Hajiaghayi, and M. 2014]

Assuming ETH, STRONGLY CONNECTED STEINER SUBGRAPH is W[1]-hard and has no  $f(k)n^{o(k/\log k)}$  time algorithm for any function f.

## DIRECTED STEINER NETWORK

Theorem [Feldman and Ruhl 2006]

DIRECTED STEINER NETWORK with k requests can be solved in time  $n^{O(k)}$ .

**Corollary:** STRONGLY CONNECTED STEINER SUBGRAPH with k terminals can be solved in time  $n^{O(k)}$ .

Proof is based on a "pebble game": O(k) pebbles need to reach their destinations using certain allowed moves, tracing the solution.

### DIRECTED STEINER NETWORK

A new combinatorial result:

Theorem [Feldmann and M. 2016]

[The underlying undirected graph of] every minimum cost solution of DIRECTED STEINER NETWORK with k requests has cutwidth and treewidth O(k).

### DIRECTED STEINER NETWORK

A new combinatorial result:

Theorem [Feldmann and M. 2016]

[The underlying undirected graph of] every minimum cost solution of DIRECTED STEINER NETWORK with k requests has cutwidth and treewidth O(k).

A new algorithmic result:

Theorem [Feldmann and M. 2016]

If a DIRECTED STEINER NETWORK instance with k requests has a minimum cost solution with treewidth w [of the underlying undirected graph], then it can be solved in time  $f(k, w) \cdot n^{O(w)}$ .

**Corollary:** A new proof that DSN and SCSS can be solved in time  $f(k)n^{O(k)}$ .

# Special cases of DIRECTED STEINER NETWORK

DIRECTED STEINER TREE and STRONGLY CONNECTED STEINER SUBGRAPH are both restrictions of DIRECTED STEINER NETWORK to certain type of patterns:



**Goal:** characterize the patterns that give rise to  $\mathsf{FPT}/\mathsf{W}[1]$ -hard problems.

### Question:

What is the complexity of  $\ensuremath{\mathsf{DIRECTED}}$  STEINER Network for this pattern?



### Question:

What is the complexity of  $\ensuremath{\mathsf{DIRECTED}}$  STEINER Network for this pattern?



#### Answer:

DIRECTED STEINER NETWORK has an  $n^{O(k)}$  algorithm for k requests, so it is polynomial-time solvable for every fixed pattern.

**Goal:** For every class of  $\mathcal{H}$  of directed patterns, characterize the complexity of DIRECTED STEINER NETWORK when restricted to demand patterns from  $\mathcal{H}$ .

### Example:

- If  $\mathcal{H}$  is the class of all directed in-stars (or out-stars), then  $\mathcal{H}$ -DSN is FPT.
- If  $\mathcal{H}$  is the class of all directed cycles, then  $\mathcal{H}$ -DSN is W[1]-hard.

**Goal:** For every class of  $\mathcal{H}$  of directed patterns, characterize the complexity of DIRECTED STEINER NETWORK when restricted to demand patterns from  $\mathcal{H}$ .

### Example:

- If  $\mathcal{H}$  is the class of all directed in-stars (or out-stars), then  $\mathcal{H}$ -DSN is FPT.
- If  $\mathcal{H}$  is the class of all directed cycles, then  $\mathcal{H}$ -DSN is W[1]-hard.

### Main result:

### Theorem [Feldmann and M. 2016]

For any class  $\mathcal H$  of directed patterns,

- $\bullet$  if  ${\cal H}$  has combinatorial property X, then  ${\cal H}\text{-}{\rm DSN}$  and
- $\mathcal{H}$ -DSN is W[1]-hard otherwise.

What classes  $\mathcal{H}$  give FPT cases of  $\mathcal{H}$ -DSN?



### We know that out-stars are FPT.



What classes  $\mathcal{H}$  give FPT cases of  $\mathcal{H}$ -DSN?

### This is also FPT: minimal solutions have bounded treewidth.



What classes  $\mathcal{H}$  give FPT cases of  $\mathcal{H}$ -DSN?

This is also FPT: minimal solutions have bounded treewidth.



What classes  $\mathcal{H}$  give FPT cases of  $\mathcal{H}$ -DSN?

 $\mathcal{C}_{\lambda}$ : in- or out-caterpillar of length  $\lambda$ .

#### Lemma

If the pattern is in  $C_{\lambda}$ , then every minimal solution has treewidth  $O(\lambda^2)$ .





What about this pattern?





#### Lemma

If the pattern is **transitively equivalent** to a member of  $C_{\lambda}$ , then every minimal solution has treewidth  $O(\lambda^2)$ .

What classes  $\mathcal{H}$  give FPT cases of  $\mathcal{H}$ -DSN?



 $\mathcal{C}_{\lambda,\delta}$ : in- or out-caterpillar of length  $\lambda$  with  $\delta$  additional edges.

#### Lemma

If the pattern is **transitively equivalent** to a member of  $C_{\lambda,\delta}$ , then every minimal solution has treewidth  $O((1 + \lambda)(\lambda + \delta))$ .

### Theorem

If every  $H \in \mathcal{H}$  is **transitively equivalent** to a member of  $\mathcal{C}_{\lambda,\delta}$  for some constants  $\lambda, \delta \geq 0$ , then  $\mathcal{H}$ -DSN is FPT.



Does this cover all the FPT cases?

### Theorem

If every  $H \in \mathcal{H}$  is transitively equivalent to a member of  $\mathcal{C}_{\lambda,\delta}$  for some constants  $\lambda, \delta \geq 0$ , then  $\mathcal{H}$ -DSN is FPT.



Does this cover all the FPT cases?

# W[1]-hard special cases

We show that the following classes  $\mathcal{H}$  make  $\mathcal{H}$ -DSN W[1]-hard:



flawed out-diamonds

flawed in-diamonds

# Identifying terminals

If H' is obtained from H by identifying terminals, then the problem cannot be harder for H' than for H:



 $\Rightarrow$  We can assume that  $\mathcal{H}$  is closed under identifying terminals.

# Combinatorial classification

The following combinatorial result connects the algorithmic and the hardness results:

### Theorem

Let  $\mathcal{H}$  be a class of patterns closed under identifying terminals and transitive equivalence. Then exactly one of the following holds:

- There are constants  $\lambda, \delta$  such that every  $H \in \mathcal{H}$  is transitively equivalent to a member of  $\mathcal{C}_{\lambda,\delta}$
- $\bigcirc$   $\mathcal{H}$  contains either
  - all directed cycles,
  - all in-diamonds,
  - all out-diamonds,
  - all flawed in-diamonds, or
  - all flawed out-diamonds.

Our main result:

Theorem [Feldmann and M. 2016]

Let  $\mathcal{H}$  be a class of patterns.

- If there are constants  $\lambda, \delta$  such that every  $H \in \mathcal{H}$  is transitively equivalent to a member of  $\mathcal{C}_{\lambda,\delta}$ , then  $\mathcal{H}$ -DSN is FPT,
- 2 and it is W[1]-hard otherwise.