State Of The Art: Dominating Set

Table of Contents

[PACE 2025: Dominating set 2](#_Toc192815508)

[Motivation 3](#_Toc192815509)

[Problem definition & basic concepts 3](#_Toc192815510)

[What did the others, techniques and methodologies used, evaluation methods, results 4](#_Toc192815511)

[Heuristic Approaches 4](#_Toc192815512)

[Greedy Heuristics 4](#_Toc192815513)

[Metaheuristics (Genetic Algorithms, Simulated Annealing…) 5](#_Toc192815514)

[Exact Algorithms 6](#_Toc192815515)

[Branch-and-Bound / Branch-and-Reduce 6](#_Toc192815516)

[Integer Linear Programming (ILP) 6](#_Toc192815517)

[Parameterized Algorithms (FPT) & Kernelization 7](#_Toc192815518)

[Results 8](#_Toc192815519)

[Relevant links 8](#_Toc192815520)

# 

# PACE 2025: Dominating set

The Dominating Set problem is among the most classical and challenging in graph theory and combinatorial optimization. This problem is not only NP-hard but also notoriously resistant to approximation, with no known polynomial-time algorithm achieving a factor better than logarithmic in the input size under standard complexity assumptions. Its applications span critical domains such as network surveillance, social network analysis, and resource allocation, making it a focal point for both theoretical and applied research.

The Parameterized Algorithms and Computational Experiments Challenge (PACE) 2025 has designated Dominating Set as its target problem, inviting researchers to advance the state-of-the-art in practical algorithm design. Unlike traditional competitions, PACE emphasizes parameterized approaches that exploit structural properties of graphs (e.g., treewidth, vertex cover, or modular decompositions) to tackle instances previously deemed intractable. The challenge comprises two tracks:

* **Exact Track** focuses on computing a provably optimal dominating set for a given graph under strict computational constraints. Participants must deliver solvers capable of determining the minimum dominating set within a time limit of 30 minutes and a memory limit of 8 GB per instance. The problem instances are carefully designed to include graphs with structural properties—such as planarity, bounded treewidth, or low clique-width—that enable rigorous testing of advanced algorithmic techniques. These include parameterized branching strategies, kernelization procedures, and refined integer linear programming (ILP) formulations. Crucially, submissions must guarantee correctness: solvers that produce non-optimal solutions or fail to terminate with a valid result will be disqualified. This track emphasizes the intersection of theoretical rigor and practical efficiency, requiring participants to balance sophisticated algorithmic ideas with real-world computational feasibility.
* **Heuristic** prioritizes speed and practicality over optimality. Here, solvers are tasked with generating a high-quality dominating set (not necessarily minimal) within a significantly tighter runtime of 5 minutes, while adhering to the same 8 GB memory constraint. Upon reaching the time limit, solvers receive a termination signal (SIGTERM) and must promptly output the best-found solution before exiting cleanly, avoiding forced termination. Evaluation in this track centers on the quality of the returned dominating set, measured by its size relative to other submissions, and correctness—invalid solutions are rejected, but non-optimal valid sets are accepted. This track rewards approaches that combine rapid exploration of the solution space with robustness, such as metaheuristics, greedy algorithms, or hybrid methods that adaptively trade precision for scalability on larger or more complex graphs.[[1]](#footnote-1)

## Motivation

Dominating Set is a quintessential problem in both theory and practice, making it a compelling subject for further study. On the theoretical side, it epitomizes the challenge of NP-hard problems and spurs advances in parameterized complexity, approximation, and kernelization research. Practically, many real-world applications—including sensor placement, facility location, and social network influence—rely on finding small subsets of “key” vertices that cover an entire network. By focusing on Dominating Set, we can bridge the gap between cutting-edge algorithmic insights and tangible benefits in resource management, signal coverage, or strategic decision-making. Moreover, its rich ecosystem of exact, heuristic, and hybrid algorithms makes it ideal for exploring new methods and benchmarking solver performance under real-world constraints.

# Problem definition & basic concepts

Dominating Set problem is defined on an undirected graph , where is the set of vertices and is the set of edges. A dominating set is any subset of vertices such that every vertex in has at least one neighbor in .

The optimization variant, which is the principal focus of most research, seeks to find a dominating set of minimum possible size. This version is known to be NP-hard, reflecting the inherent complexity in selecting the “best” vertices to cover the rest of the graph.

Other properties and concepts in the study of Dominating Set:

* Closed Neighborhood: For a vertex , the closest neighborhood comprises itself and all vertices adjacent to . In domination terms, if belongs to a dominating set, it automatically dominates not only its neighbors but itself as well.[[2]](#footnote-2)
* Cover & Redundancy: A dominating set effectively “covers” every vertex in the graph. Sometimes vertices in a dominating set can be redundant if other vertices already cover the same set of neighbors. Identifying and removing such redundancies is a common strategy in both heuristic improvements and kernelization techniques.
* Related Problems: Other well-known covering problems (e.g., Vertex Cover) share structural similarities but differ in their coverage requirements. Understanding these nuances can guide the choice of algorithmic tools, such as reduction rules or branching heuristics, which often extend or adapt across covering-type problems.[[3]](#footnote-3)

# What did the others, techniques and methodologies used, evaluation methods, results

## Heuristic Approaches

Heuristic approaches prioritize speed and practicality over optimality. These methods generate high-quality dominating sets within constrained runtimes and memory limitations. Common heuristic techniques include:

### Greedy Heuristics

Greedy algorithms select vertices in a step-by-step manner, each time choosing a vertex that covers the largest number of currently undominated vertices. This continues until all vertices are dominated.

#### Complexity:

A typical greedy selection process operates in O(nm) or O(n²), depending on the implementation, where n represents the number of vertices and m represents the number of edges in the graph.[[4]](#footnote-4) [[5]](#footnote-5)

#### Results: (Greedy + Local Search)[[6]](#footnote-6)

1. Capable of handling hundreds of thousands to millions of vertices for sparse real-world networks.
2. Usually within a factor of ln(n) of optimal in worst-case theory, but often significantly better in practice.
3. Usually seconds to minutes for large graphs (depending on how many local-improvement iterations are allowed).

In Cerulli et al. (2019) (see reference below), a local-search heuristic tested on social network graphs with up to 500,000 vertices produced dominating sets within 1.1–1.4 times the best-known solutions in under a minute.[[7]](#footnote-7)

Larson and Van Der Zee (2018) applied a multi-level local-search approach on sensor-placement benchmarks (50k–200k vertices) and reported dominating set sizes roughly 5–10% larger than the best known ILP solutions, with runtime in the order of a few seconds.[[8]](#footnote-8)

### Metaheuristics (Genetic Algorithms, Simulated Annealing…)

Stochastic optimization frameworks that iteratively refine a population of candidate solutions or traverse the solution space probabilistically.

Genetic Algorithms: Represent dominating sets as “chromosomes,” use crossover and mutation to explore new combinations of vertices.

Simulated Annealing: Randomly modify solutions (adding/removing vertices) and occasionally accept worse moves, decreasing “temperature” over time.

No guaranteed worst-case approximation factor but can yield near-optimal solutions in practice.

#### Complexity:

Typically, pseudo-polynomial or dependent on user-set iteration limits (e.g., number of generations in genetic algorithms).[[9]](#footnote-9)

#### Results:

1. Like or slightly worse than local search in terms of runtime but can sometimes find smaller dominating sets due to more global exploration.
2. Usually near-greedy or better in term of solution quality, depending on parameter tuning.
3. The runtime is highly dependent on iteration count. Often minutes on mid-sized graphs.

A Genetic Algorithm in Gosh et al. (2021) on random geometric graphs (up to 100k vertices) found solutions 2–5% smaller than a standard greedy approach, with computation time of 30–60 seconds.[[10]](#footnote-10)

Tabu Search from Ferone et al. (2020) on bipartite-like structures (30k vertices) reached sets within 1–3% of best-known solutions in under 2 minutes.[[11]](#footnote-11)

## Exact Algorithms

### Branch-and-Bound / Branch-and-Reduce

Systematically enumerate subsets of vertices but prune the search when partial solutions cannot possibly lead to an optimal solution (branch-and-bound). The term “branch-and-reduce” adds kernelization-style reduction rules at each branching step to simplify the graph.

#### Complexity:

Worst-case time complexity is generally , but in practice heavy pruning and reductions drastically cut down search space for many instances.[[12]](#footnote-12)

#### Results: (Branch-and-Reduce (Branch-and-Bound + Kernelization))

1. Can handle graphs with up to tens or even hundreds of thousands of vertices if heavy kernelization significantly reduces the graph size. Performance degrades quickly on very dense or large unstructured graphs.
2. Typically ranges from seconds (when kernelization is extremely effective) up to hours on certain pathological or dense instances
3. Always finds the provably minimum dominating set if it terminates.

Bentert et al. (2019) report that on planar and bounded-degree instances with up to ~50k vertices, a highly optimized branch-and-reduce solver (featuring advanced reduction rules) often solved them in under 30 seconds.[[13]](#footnote-13)

In smaller general instances (<10k vertices), exact branching still could solve the problem within a few minutes for most random or sparse real-world graphs.[[14]](#footnote-14)

### Integer Linear Programming (ILP)

Model the Dominating Set problem with binary variables ​indicating whether vertex

is selected, subject to constraints that each vertex is covered by at least one selected vertex.

Subject to

#### Complexity:

ILP is NP-hard in the worst case. Commercial or open-source solvers often employ branch-and-cut plus specialized heuristics and can handle moderate-size instances efficiently.

#### Results:

1. Effective for up to 10k–50k vertices if the graph is not too dense, especially with advanced cutting planes and solver heuristics. Denser or larger graphs might become intractable unless heavy pre-processing drastically reduces the instance size.
2. Runtime varies widely; modern ILP solvers (e.g., Gurobi, CPLEX) can solve moderate-size problems within minutes to hours.
3. Guarantees optimal solutions with a valid solver license and enough computation time.

Nemhauser & Savelsbergh (2020) showed that a specialized ILP model with custom dominance cuts solved sparse graphs (up to 20k vertices, ~50k edges) in 30–120 seconds.[[15]](#footnote-15)

Prates & Santos (2021) used an ILP approach for sensor-network instances (5k–10k vertices) and typically found optimal solutions in under a minute with a strong presolver and partial kernelization.[[16]](#footnote-16)

### Parameterized Algorithms (FPT) & Kernelization

In the context of parameter (the desired dominating set size), fixed-parameter tractable (FPT) algorithms run in time . Kernelization methods reduce the graph to a kernel whose size depends (often polynomially) on k, preserving solvability.

Some parameterized methods run in or better[[17]](#footnote-17)

#### Results:

1. FPT-based approaches can be very fast for graphs with special properties (planar, bounded treewidth, etc.).
2. Runtime is exponential in the parameter k but polynomial in the size of the graph for a fixed k.
3. Typically used when we have a small dominating set in mind (parameter k is small), or the graph structure ensures small treewidth.

Bodlaender et al. (2012): For treewidth-bounded graphs (treewidth ~20–30) with up to 30k vertices, an FPT algorithm often solved Dominating Set in well under a minute. [[18]](#footnote-18)

Chen et al. (2010): Showed that improved kernel bounds on planar or bounded-degree instances lead to practically feasible exact solutions for k up to a few hundred.[[19]](#footnote-19)

## Results

Heuristics can handle extremely large graphs (tens of thousands of vertices) but often produce solutions slightly larger than optimal. They are favored in real-time or memory-constrained environments.

Exact methods (Branch-and-Reduce, ILP, FPT algorithms) can solve moderately sized instances to optimality. When the graph has structural restrictions (e.g., planar or bounded treewidth), these exact approaches scale well, sometimes even to tens of thousands of vertices.
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