

Characterization and complexity of Thin Strip Graphs

Abdeslam El-Haman Abdeslam¹

Department of Computer Science

Universite Libre de Bruxelles

aelhaman@gmail.com¹

Advisor: Jean Cardinal

May 24, 2018

ABSTRACT

Abstract

1 Graphs and intersections

1.1 Graphs

A graph G is defined as $G = (V, E)$, where V is the set of vertices and E the set of edges, where $E \subseteq \binom{V}{2}$. The vertices $v, w \in V$ such that $e = vw \in E$ links are called the *endpoints* of e .

Definition 1 *An embedding of a graph G into a surface Σ is a mapping of G in Σ where the vertices correspond to distinct points and the edges correspond to simple arcs connecting the images of their endpoints. [GF].*

A graph G is planar if there is an embedding of this graph that does not have any crossing between the edges.

Definition 2 *Let $G = (V, E)$ and $S \subset V$, an induced subgraph is a graph H of G whose vertex set is S and its edge set $F = \{vw : v, w \in S, vw \in E\}$.*

Definition 3 *H is called a minor of G if H can be constructed by deleting edges and vertices, or contracting edges.*

Theorem 4 (Kuratowski) *A graph G is planar if and only if it doesn't contain K_5 or $K_{3,3}$ as a minor or a induced subgraph.*

Definition 5 *A path P_n in a graph G is a sequence of vertices $v_1v_2v_3 \dots v_n$ such that $v_iv_{i+1} \in E$.*

Definition 6 *A cycle C_n in a graph $G = (V, E)$ is a path $v_1 \dots v_n$ such that $v_1 = v_n$.*

Definition 7 *A chord of a cycle C_n is an edge that connects two non consecutive vertices of C_n .*

Definition 8 *A graph $G = (V, E)$ is complete if every pair of distinct $v_1, v_2 \in V$ are adjacent. This is denoted K_n with n the number of elements. If G is an induced graph of H then G is a clique of H .*

Definition 9 *A graph G is bipartite if there are two disjoint independent sets $A, B \subset V$ such that every vertex of A connects to one in B .*

Definition 10 *A bipartite graph G with bipartitions A and B is complete bipartite if every pair of vertices $v \in A, w \in B$ are adjacent. It is denoted as $K_{n,m}$, being n and m the size of each bipartition.*

1.2 Intersection graphs

Definition 11 *The intersection graph of a collection ζ of objects is the graph (ζ, E) such that $c_1c_2 \in E \Leftrightarrow c_1 \cap c_2 \neq \emptyset$.*

Definition 12 *A partial order set is a binary relation \leq over a set A satisfying these axioms:*

- $a \leq a$ (reflexivity).
- if $a \leq b$ and $b \leq a$ then $a = b$ (antisymmetry).
- if $a \leq b$ and $b \leq c$ then $a \leq c$ (transitivity).

Definition 13 *A partially ordered set or poset (S, \leq) where S a set and \leq a partial order on S .*

Definition 14 *A graph $G = (V, E)$ is a comparability graph if there exists a partial order \leq such that $vw \in E \Leftrightarrow v \leq w$ or $w \leq v$. Equivalently, G is a comparability graph if it is the comparability graph of a poset. For example, the Hasse diagram (figure 1) is a comparability graph where the relation is inclusion.*




Figure 1: On the left, Hasse diagram of a poset of the power set of 2 elements ordered by inclusion. On the right, the comparability graph of this poset.

1.2.1 Interval graphs

An interval graph is a graph G that is the intersection graph of a collection of closed intervals in \mathbb{R} . If the length of each interval is unitary, then G is a unit interval graph (UIG).

Theorem 15 *G is an interval graph if and only if every simple cycle of four or more points has a chord.* [Fis]

Theorem 16 *An interval graph is a unit interval graph if and only if it has no induced subgraph $K_{1,3}$* [Rob].

Another interesting class of interval graphs are mixed unit interval graphs, where each interval can be closed, open, open-closed or closed-open. In this paper we will denote those four classes like this:

$$\mathcal{I}^{++} = \{[x, y] : x, y \in \mathbb{R}, x \leq y\}$$

$$\mathcal{I}^{--} = \{(x, y) : x, y \in \mathbb{R}, x \leq y\}$$

$$\mathcal{I}^{+-} = \{[x, y) : x, y \in \mathbb{R}, x \leq y\}$$

$$\mathcal{I}^{-+} = \{(x, y] : x, y \in \mathbb{R}, x \leq y\}$$

\mathcal{I} will be replaced by \mathcal{U} when we are talking about unit mixed interval graphs and their class is denoted MUIG.

Theorem 17 *The classes of the graphs \mathcal{U}^{--} , \mathcal{U}^{++} , \mathcal{U}^{-+} , \mathcal{U}^{+-} , and $\mathcal{U}^{-+} \cup \mathcal{U}^{+-}$ are the same (equivalent for \mathcal{I}).* [DLP⁺]

Unlike for UIG class, $K_{1,3}$ is a MUIG as seen in figure 2.




Figure 2: Representation of $K_{1,3}$ as a MUIG.




Figure 3: Realization of a UDG (Unit Disk Graph).

1.2.2 Disks

A unit disk graph G is a graph that is an intersection graph of unit disks on the plane. This class of graphs is important for this thesis, as the Thin Strip Graphs are a sub-class of Unit Disk Graphs (section 4).

We will refer to the Unit Disk Graph class as UDG and an example of a realization can be found in the figure 3.

Properties of UDG...

2 Complexity

Complexity theory has the objective to establish lower bounds on how efficient an algorithm can be for a given problem [Sip]. This approach let us have a reference point to establish the difficulty of a problem.

Definition 18 Let Σ be a finite alphabet, Σ^* every word derived from Σ , $L \subseteq \Sigma^*$ is a decision problem.

Definition 19 A decider for a decision problem A is an deterministic algorithm V where

$$A = \{w | V \text{ accepts } w\}$$

A is polynomially decidable if it has a polynomial time decider [Sip].

Definition 20 A verifier for a decision problem A is an deterministic algorithm V where

$$A = \{w | V \text{ accepts } \langle w, c \rangle \text{ for some string } c\}$$

A is polynomially verifiable if it has a polynomial time verifier [Sip].

2.1 P vs NP

Definition 21 A problem $L \in \mathcal{P}$ if L is polynomially decidable.

Definition 22 A problem $L \in \mathcal{NP}$ if L is polynomially verifiable. Thus, $\mathcal{P} \subseteq \mathcal{NP}$.

To prove a bound of complexity on an unknown problem L we have to find other problems with already known complexity and find equivalences between those two. This can be achieved through *reductions*.

Definition 23 A reduction of a problem L to a problem M is a mapping of an instance of L (I_L) to an instance of M (I_M) such that I_L is true for the problem L if and only if I_M is true for the problem M . This is noted $L \leq M$ and $L \leq_P M$ if the reduction is done in polynomial time.

With this concept we can define new complexity classes. \mathcal{NP} -hard is the set of problems so that we can reduce every \mathcal{NP} problem to. The set of problems that are \mathcal{NP} -hard and \mathcal{NP} are called \mathcal{NP} -complete. This is generalized to every complexity class (\mathcal{P} , $\exists\mathbb{R}$, RP , etc...)

Satisfiability problem The satisfiability problem (SAT) is to decide the satisfiability of a CNF formula ϕ . A CNF formula is a boolean formula that is a conjunction of multiple clauses c_k . A clause is a disjunction of multiple literals. A literal may be a variable or a negation of a variable.

Theorem 24 (Cook-Levin) SAT is \mathcal{NP} -complete.

Clique problem The clique problem is to find a maximum clique of a graph G .

Theorem 25 CLIQUE is \mathcal{NP} -complete. [Kar]

Theorem 26 (Clark-Colbourn) CLIQUE is \mathcal{P} when applied to unit disk graphs. [CCJ]

2.2 $\exists\mathbb{R}$ complexity class

$\exists\mathbb{R}$ is the class that describes the problems that can be reduced to *the existential theory of the reals*[Exi]. The existential theory of the reals is the problem of deciding if a sentence of this form is true:

$$(\exists X_1 \dots \exists X_n) : F(\exists X_1, \dots, \exists X_n)$$

where F is a quantifier-free formula in the reals. In other words, it is a conjunction of clauses where each clause is a real polynomial inequality where each variable X_k is a real number. We can see that ETR is NP-hard because SAT can be reduced to it.

Proof. Let's take an instance of SAT ϕ_{SAT} with clauses c_k and variables x_k , we can construct an instance of ETR ϕ_{ETR} where we can construct variables in the domain $\{0, 1\}$ with this equality, so for each variable X_k :

$$X_k - X_k^2 = 0$$

Each literal of each clause will be positive or negative depending if the literal is cancelled in ϕ_{SAT} :

$$\begin{aligned} x_k \rightarrow l &= X_k \\ \neg x_k \rightarrow l &= (1 - X_k) \end{aligned}$$

Then for each clause we can have a polynomial for which the sum of the values of every literal in the clause must be greater than one, so that at least one literal is true:

$$\sum_{l \in c_k} l \geq 1$$

With this proof, it is easy to see that ϕ_{ETR} is valid if and only if ϕ_{SAT} is also valid. \square

This result can show us that $P \subseteq NP \subseteq \exists\mathbb{R}$.

2.2.1 Problems in $\exists\mathbb{R}$

In this section we will describe some problems that are $\exists\mathbb{R}$ -complete and will give an overview of the proof.

The art gallery problem Given a simple polygon P (without crossings between every side), we introduce *guards*. A guard g is a point such that every point of the polygon is watched by a guard. A point p is watched by a point q if the segment pq is contained in P . The subset G , being G the set of guards and $G \subseteq P$, is optimum if it has the minimal cardinality covering the whole polygon.

The art gallery problem is to decide, given a polygon P and a number of guards k , whether there exists a configuration of k guards in G guarding the whole polygon. The art gallery problem is $\exists\mathbb{R}$ -complete [AAM].

Proof idea First of all, we can see that the art gallery problem is in $\exists\mathbb{R}$ if we reduce this problem to ETR. If we have an instance (P, k) of the art gallery problem we can have a formula [EHP] like this:

$$\phi = \{\exists x_1 y_1, \dots, x_k y_k \forall p_x p_y : \text{INSIDE-POLYGON}(p_x, p_y) \rightarrow \bigvee_{1 \leq i \leq k} \text{SEES}(x_i, y_i, p_x, p_y)\}$$

Where INSIDE-POLYGON returns 1 if $(p_x, p_y) \in P$ and SEES returns 1 if the segment $(x, y)(p_x, p_y) \in P$. ϕ is not a ETR formula, so we would like to construct a quantifier-free formula with the idea of ϕ . To achieve this, the main idea is to have a small set of points $Q \subseteq P$ such that if these points are watched, the whole polygon is watched. This subset Q is called the *witness set*. The only thing is now to create a polynomial for each point that ensures that the point is watched by a guard.

To finish the proof we have to prove that the art gallery problem is $\exists\mathbb{R}$ -hard. For this part an $\exists\mathbb{R}$ -complete problem has been deducted from ETR. For the problem ETR-INV we have a set of variables $\{x_1, \dots, x_n\}$ and a set of equations of this form:

$$x = 1, \quad x + y = z, \quad x \cdot y = 1$$

and the problem decides if it exists a solution to this set of equations such that the value of each variable is real in $[\frac{1}{2}, 2]$.

A reduction of ETR-INV is found to the art gallery problem by constructing a polygon P and finding a number g for that polygon such that the instance of ETR-INT is true if and only if P is covered by at most g guards.

Stretchability A pseudoline is a simple closed curve in the plane. Given a pseudoline arrangement, is it equivalent to an arrangement of straight lines?

Proof idea ETR can be reduced to STRETCHABILITY due to Mnev's universality theorem. [Scha]

Unit Disk Graph recognition The Unit Disk Graph recognition is the problem that decides if a graph G is a Unit Disk Graph. Unit Disk Graph recognition is $\exists\mathbb{R}$ -complete. [Schb]

Proof idea UDG recognition is a corollary of deciding whether a graph with a given length is realizable. This problem is $\exists\mathbb{R}$ -complete.

The reduction is done from STRETCHABILITY [Schb]. The reduction is done by adding a vertex to V for each pseudoline intersection. For each three consecutive points u_1, u_2, u_3 along a pseudoline a widget that will be only realizable if and only if the pseudoline can be stretched with the same arrangement.

3 Geometry

The intersection of convex objects is a matter well studied for multiple subjects. In our case, it is interesting to know some properties about the intersection of disks, those being convex objects.

A set S is convex if:

$$\forall p, q \in S \forall \lambda \in [0, 1] : (1 - \lambda)p + \lambda q \in S$$

.

3.1 Stabbing

A *stabbing* is a point that traverses a set of intersecting objects. A lot of research has been done [Schc] on the minimal amount of stabblings to cover every object in a set. Stabblings can also be done with more complex structures than points, in that case we're talking about *coverings*.

Theorem 27 (Helly) *Given a set Q of objects in \mathbb{R}^d , if for each subset of Q of size $d + 1$ their intersection is non empty, then $\bigcap_{q \in Q} q \neq \emptyset$. [Hel]*

Koebe's planar \subseteq disk = Planar graph duality

4 Thin Strip Graphs

c -strip graphs are unit disk graphs such that the centers of the disks belong to $\{(x, y) : -\infty < x < \infty, 0 < y \leq c\}$. The class is denoted by $\text{SG}(c)$. We have $\text{SG}(0) = \text{UIG}$ and $\text{SG}(\infty) = \text{UDG}$. [HKO⁺]




Figure 4: A construction of $K_{1,3}$ with a disk realization, being this graph a TSG.

Definition 28 *Thin strip graphs are defined as $TSG = \bigcap_{c>0} SG(c)$.*

Remark 29 $SG(0) \neq TSG$. We can construct a $K_{1,3}$ such that we have 3 vertices with the coordinates $(1, 0)$, $(0, 0)$, $(1, 0)$ and a last one $(0, \varepsilon)$ with $\varepsilon > 0$ as seen in Figure 4.

It has been proven that $MUIG \subsetneq TSG$.

Denote that there's not constant t such that $SG(t) = TSG$.

Unfettered unit interval graphs = $UUIG$

$MUIG \subsetneq TSG \subsetneq UUIG$

$UUIG \subseteq$ co-comparability graphs (to prove).

Proof Let's have a relation of non-increasing order \leq between the left endpoints of each interval v ($l(v)$). This relation will (nope, find another proof...).

4.1 Open questions about Thin Strip Graphs

In this section we state the problems that are being studied for the thesis.

Forbidden subgraphs of Thin Strip Graphs We've proven that $\text{MUIG} \subsetneq \text{TSG} \subsetneq \text{UUIG}$. Knowing the (Why F_k is a co-comparability unit disk graph?)

Complexity class for TSG recognition We've shown in section 2 that some intersection geometric problems are in $\exists\mathbb{R}$ (unit disk graph recognition problem or the stretchability problem) and we'd like to know if TSG recognition or even $\text{SG}(c)$ recognition is in NP knowing that $\text{TSG} \subseteq \text{UDG} \cap \text{UUIG}$.

Complexity class of graph problems applied in TSG We've shown in section 2 that CLIQUE is in \mathcal{P} for unit disk graphs. Knowing that $\text{TSG} \subseteq \text{UDG} \cap \text{UUIG}$ we know that CLIQUE is also polynomial for TSG. The question is, is there any problem that for the superclasses UUIG (and also co-comparability graphs) and UDG such that their complexity is reduced when applied to TSGs?

References

- [AAM] Mikkel Abrahamsen, Anna Adamaszek, and Tillmann Miltzow. The Art Gallery Problem is $\exists\mathbb{R}$ -complete.
- [CCJ] Brent N. Clark, Charles J. Colbourn, and David S. Johnson. Unit Disk Graphs. 86(1):165–177.
- [DLP⁺] Mitre C. Dourado, Van Bang Le, Fabio Protti, Dieter Rautenbach, and Jayme L. Szwarcfiter. Mixed unit interval graphs. 312(22):3357–3363.
- [EHP] Alon Efrat and Sarel Har-Peled. Guarding galleries and terrains. 100(6):238–245.
- [Exi] Existential Theory of the Reals. In *Algorithms in Real Algebraic Geometry*, volume 10, pages 505–532. Springer Berlin Heidelberg.
- [Fis] Peter C. Fishburn. Interval graphs and interval orders. 55(2):135–149.
- [GF] Palash Goyal and Emilio Ferrara. Graph Embedding Techniques, Applications, and Performance: A Survey.
- [Hel] E. Helly. Über Mengen konvexer Körper mit gemeinschaftlichen Punkten. 32:175–176. cited By 187.

- [HKO⁺] Takashi Hayashi, Akitoshi Kawamura, Yota Otachi, Hidehiro Shinohara, and Koichi Yamazaki. Thin Strip Graphs. 216:203–210.
- [Kar] Richard M. Karp. Reducibility among Combinatorial Problems. In Raymond E. Miller, James W. Thatcher, and Jean D. Bohlinger, editors, *Complexity of Computer Computations: Proceedings of a Symposium on the Complexity of Computer Computations, Held March 20–22, 1972, at the IBM Thomas J. Watson Research Center, Yorktown Heights, New York, and Sponsored by the Office of Naval Research, Mathematics Program, IBM World Trade Corporation, and the IBM Research Mathematical Sciences Department*, pages 85–103. Springer US.
- [Rob] Fred S Roberts. *Representations of Indifference Relations*. Department of Mathematics, Stanford University.
- [Scha] Marcus Schaefer. Complexity of Some Geometric and Topological Problems. In David Eppstein and Emden R. Gansner, editors, *Graph Drawing*, pages 334–344. Springer Berlin Heidelberg.
- [Schb] Marcus Schaefer. Realizability of Graphs and Linkages. In Jnos Pach, editor, *Thirty Essays on Geometric Graph Theory*, pages 461–482. Springer New York.
- [Schc] L.M. Schlipf. *Stabbing and Covering Geometric Objects in the Plane*.
- [Sip] Michael Sipser. *Introduction to the Theory of Computation*. Course Technology, second edition.