

Algorithms and Complexity of Hedge Cluster Deletion Problems

Athanasios L. Konstantinidis* Charis Papadopoulos† Georgios Velissaris‡

Abstract

A hedge graph is a graph whose edge set has been partitioned into groups called hedges. Here we consider a generalization of the well-known CLUSTER DELETION problem, named HEDGE CLUSTER DELETION. The task is to compute the minimum number of hedges of a hedge graph so that their removal results in a graph that is isomorphic to a disjoint union of cliques. From the complexity point of view, unlike the classical CLUSTER DELETION problem, we prove that HEDGE CLUSTER DELETION is NP-complete on non-trivial graphs which contain all graphs having a large size of vertex-disjoint 3-vertex-paths as subgraphs. To complement this, we show that for graphs that contain bounded size of vertex-disjoint 3-vertex-paths as subgraphs, HEDGE CLUSTER DELETION can be solved in polynomial time.

Regarding its approximability, we prove that the problem is tightly connected to the related complexity of the MIN HORN DELETION problem, a well-known boolean CSP problem. Our connection shows that it is NP-hard to approximate HEDGE CLUSTER DELETION within factor $2^{O(\log^{1-\epsilon} r)}$ for any $\epsilon > 0$, where r is the number of hedges in a given hedge graph. We also address the parameterized complexity of the problem. While HEDGE CLUSTER DELETION is fixed-parameter tractable with respect to the solution size (i.e., the number of removal hedges), we prove that it does not admit a polynomial kernel, unless $\text{NP} \subseteq \text{coNP}/\text{poly}$.

Based on its classified (in)approximability and the difficulty imposed by the structure of almost all non-trivial graphs, we consider the hedge underlying structure. We give a polynomial-time algorithm with constant approximation ratio for HEDGE CLUSTER DELETION whenever each triangle of the input graph is covered by at most two hedges. On the way to this result, an interesting ingredient that we solved efficiently is a variant of the VERTEX COVER problem in which apart from the desired vertex set that covers the edge set, a given set of vertex-constraints should also be included in the solution. Moreover, as a possible workaround for the existence of efficient exact algorithms, we propose the hedge intersection graph which is the intersection graph spanned by the hedges. Towards this direction, we give a polynomial-time algorithm for HEDGE CLUSTER DELETION whenever the hedge intersection graph is acyclic.

*Department of Mathematics, University of Ioannina, Greece. a.konstantinidis@uoi.gr.

†Department of Mathematics, University of Ioannina, Greece. charis@uoi.gr

‡Department of Mathematics, University of Ioannina, Greece. g.velissaris@uoi.gr

1 Introduction

Edge deletion problems are motivated by applications in denoising data derived from imprecise experimental measurements and, therefore, have been extensively studied from classical, approximation, and parameterized complexity. The objective is usually concerned with the property of being H -free graph for some fixed graph H and almost a complete classification with respect to H is known [46, 15, 6, 8, 4]. However, little is known when generalizing the concept from edge deletion problems to set deletion problems. Considering groups of edges as potential sets that can be removed is captured by the notion of hedge graphs.

Hedge graphs represent situations where a set of edges might fail together due to some underlying dependency. In particular, a hedge graph is a graph whose edges are partitioned into groups called *hedges*. Motivated by the fact that edge failures might appear simultaneously, hedge graphs appear naturally in a network design problem, known as HEDGE CUT. In this problem, the task is to remove a minimum number of hedges that disconnects a given hedge graph. Indeed, in a series of recent papers there has been an increasing interest in identifying whether HEDGE CUT is polynomial-time solvable or quasipolynomial-time solvable or NP-complete [18, 24, 25, 29, 38].

Edge failures that occur simultaneously do not affect only the graph connectivity. It appears to be of interest even when similarities between objects need to be identified [34, 35]. Here we combine the effect of grouping edges with the task of partitioning the vertices into clusters in such a way that there should be many grouped edges within each cluster and relatively few grouped edges between the clusters. In particular, we consider the HEDGE CLUSTER DELETION problem: given a hedge graph, the goal is to remove a minimum number of hedges that result in a disjoint union of cliques.

We mention few representative domains in which the problem is well-suited. Under the term cluster graph, which refers to a disjoint union of cliques, one may find a variety of applications that have been extensively studied [5, 19, 51]. In social networks it is natural to detect communities with strong relationships [27]. These relationships can be of various types, for example, colleagues, neighbors, schoolmates, football-mates, etc., that may be represented by a different hedge. Another area of interest lies within protein interaction networks, in which the edges represent interactions occurring when two or more proteins bind together to carry out their biological function [7]. Such interactions can be of different types, for example, physical association or direct interaction, and clusters should mainly contain edges with the same label as colocalization, that have the ability to represent a group of proteins that interact with each other at the same time and place [47]. Similar concepts that capture the idea that edge failures occur in cascades can be applied whenever the characterization of each edge corresponds to network frequencies.

Here we concentrate on the complexity of the HEDGE CLUSTER DELETION problem, in terms of polynomial-time algorithms, NP-completeness or approximation guarantees. Let us first discuss some observations. We denote by ℓ the number of hedges. It is clear that ℓ is at most the number of edges m of the considered graph. In fact, if $\ell = m$, that is, all hedges contain a single edge, then HEDGE CLUSTER DELETION is equivalent to the classical formulation known as CLUSTER DELETION. On the other hand, if ℓ is bounded then the problem can be solved in polynomial time by enumerating all possible subsets of the hedges. Even further, it is not difficult to see that the problem is fixed parameter tractable (FPT) parameterized by the number of removal hedges, i.e., by the solution size. This follows by using the main idea given in [14]: whenever we find a P_3 , we branch at most on two hedges involved within the P_3 . The branching will generate at most two such instances and the depth of the search tree is bounded by the solution size. The main difference with the algorithm given in [14] is that a single hedge removal is performed by multiple edge removals.

1.1 Related work

As already mentioned, hedge graphs were inspired by the HEDGE CUT and closely related problems [18, 24, 25, 29, 38]. Interestingly, several hedge variants of the problem were discussed. Their main focus is on connectivity problems in order to understand the classical complexity of HEDGE CUT. A quasipolynomial-time algorithm was proposed for detecting a cycle of minimum submodular cost on multigraphs [29, 26]. As the partitioning function into hedges is submodular (i.e., the number of hedges covering an edge subset), the same algorithm can be applied for the HEDGE MINIMUM CYCLE problem in which the task is to detect a cycle that contains a minimum number of hedges [29, 26]. However, the hedge cut function is not necessarily submodular [29]. A recent approach that overcomes such difficulty related to hedge cut problems uses alternative measures of connectivity and proposes a polymatroid perspective of hedge graphs [17].

In the CLUSTER DELETION problem we seek to delete a minimum number of edges of a given graph such that the resulting graph is a vertex-disjoint union of cliques (cluster graph). It is known that the problem is NP-hard on general graphs [52]. Settling its complexity status has attracted several researchers. If the input graph is restricted on well-known graph classes the problem remains NP-hard [13, 28, 31, 44, 45], although there are graph classes where the problem is polynomial solvable [12, 13, 28, 32, 44, 45]. In Table 1, we summarize the complexity of the problem on the corresponding graph classes. CLUSTER DELETION has been studied extensively from the perspective of approximation algorithms. A greedy approach of selecting a maximum clique provides a 2-approximation algorithm, though not necessarily in polynomial time [21]. Other constant factor approximation algorithms for CLUSTER DELETION were based on rounding a linear programming (LP) relaxation [19, 50, 54, 55], with the current-best approximation factor of 2 achieved in [55].

As CLUSTER DELETION is an H -FREE EDGE DELETION problem with $H = P_3$, we also mention complexity results regarding hardness of approximation for almost every fixed graph H [8]. In particular, if H is a 3-connected graph with at least two non-edges, or a cycle on at least four vertices or a path on at least five vertices, then H -FREE EDGE DELETION does not admit $\text{poly}(\text{OPT})$ -approximation unless $P = NP$ [8]. Regarding its parameterized variation, several results are known when the parameter is mainly the solution size k . The classical result of Cai [14] implies that H -FREE EDGE DELETION can be solved in time $c^k \cdot n^{O(1)}$, where c is a constant that depends only on the size of H . Moreover, the running time is essential optimal: Aravind, Sandeep, and Sivadasan [4] showed that whenever H contains at least two edges, there is no algorithm with running time $2^{o(k)} \cdot n^{O(1)}$ unless the exponential time hypothesis (ETH) fails. For the kernelization complexity of H -FREE EDGE DELETION, Cai and Cai [15] showed that polynomial kernels do not exist (under $NP \not\subseteq \text{coNP}/\text{poly}$) whenever H is 3-edge-connected and has at least two non-edges. Still, there are polynomial kernels whenever H is a small path [16, 33].

Moreover, clustering problems have been studied on edge-colored graphs. In [11] the CHROMATIC CORRELATION CLUSTERING problem was introduced. The input of the problem is an edge-labeled graph and the objective is to derive a partition of the vertices such that the relations among vertices in the same cluster are as much homogeneous as possible in terms of the labels [2, 11, 43]. Another related problem is the MAX k -COLORED CLUSTERING problem, where given an edge-colored graph, the aim is to find a clustering of the vertices maximizing the number of matched edges, i.e., edges having the same color [1, 3, 40]. In our setting we do not require to have small number of hedges that appear in the same cluster.

	Restriction (graph classes)	CLUSTER DELETION	HEDGE CLUSTER DELETION
NP-hard or poly-time	Bipartite	Poly-time (trivial)	NP-hard (Theorem 3.2)
	Interval	Poly-time [45]	
	Cograph	Poly-time [28]	
	Split	Poly-time [13]	
	P_5 -free	NP-hard [13, 45]	NP-hard
	Planar	NP-hard [31]	
	$\Delta \geq 4$	NP-hard [44]	
	Special bipartite ¹	Poly-time (trivial)	Poly-time (Theorem 3.3)
	Special split ²	Poly-time [13]	
	Acyclic hedge intersection	Poly-time (trivial)	Poly-time (Theorem 6.7)
Approxim. guarantees	No restriction	Constant factor [55]	MIN HORN DELETION-complete (Theorem 4.7)
	Bi-hedge graphs	–	Constant factor (Theorem 5.7)
Parameter. complexity	Parameterized by the solution size	Polynomial kernel [16, 33]	No polynomial kernel (Theorem 4.12)

Table 1: Overview of our results on HEDGE CLUSTER DELETION related to the complexity of CLUSTER DELETION and restricted on particular graph classes. Lemma 3.1 (which is also used within Theorem 3.2) shows that HEDGE CLUSTER DELETION is NP-complete on bipartite graphs, interval graphs and cographs. For the class of split graphs, Theorem 3.2 shows the NP-completeness on $K_n - e$ graphs. ¹Bipartite graphs with bounded size in one partition: such graphs contain a bounded number of vertex-disjoint P_3 's. ²Split graphs with bounded clique number: every P_3 or K_3 contains a vertex from the clique, implying that any collection of vertex-disjoint three-vertex connected subgraphs has bounded size. Moreover, if HEDGE CLUSTER DELETION coincides with CLUSTER DELETION then every edge belongs to a distinct hedge and the hedge intersection graph is exactly the line graph of the original graph. Regarding the parameterized complexity, it is known that no subexponential-time algorithm exists for CLUSTER DELETION unless ETH fails [44] and such a refutation transfers for HEDGE CLUSTER DELETION, as well. The non-existence of a polynomial kernel is claimed under the assumption $\text{NP} \not\subseteq \text{coNP/poly}$.

1.2 Overview of our results and techniques

Here we provide a high-level description of our results. Table 1 summarizes our main results. For necessary terminology and formal definitions concerning specially notions and terms used on hedge graphs, we refer to Section 2. However, in the following overview it is enough to recall that the edges of a hedge graph are partitioned into hedges and the underlying graph corresponds to the simple graph obtained from a hedge graph by ignoring the hedges.

Hardness results As HEDGE CLUSTER DELETION is a generalization of CLUSTER DELETION, it is natural to identify classes of graphs with the same or different complexity behavior. We begin by considering the underlying graph structure of a hedge graph. Clearly, if CLUS-

TER DELETION is NP-complete on a certain graph class, so is HEDGE CLUSTER DELETION on the same class. Our results imply that in a wide range of non-trivial graph classes HEDGE CLUSTER DELETION is NP-complete, whereas CLUSTER DELETION admits polynomial-time solution, highlighting a complexity different behavior (Theorem 3.2). More precisely, we show that if there is a subgraph that contains a large enough number of vertex-disjoint P_3 's then HEDGE CLUSTER DELETION is NP-complete. Such graphs contain long paths or trees of constant height or almost cliques (graphs obtained from a clique by removing a single edge). Thus, in almost every interesting graph class, HEDGE CLUSTER DELETION remains NP-complete.

Tractable results Moreover, we reveal a connection between the subgraph of disjoint P_3 characterization and the complexity of the problem. In particular, we show that if the largest subgraph of vertex-disjoint P_3 's is bounded, then HEDGE CLUSTER DELETION is polynomial-time solvable (Theorem 3.3). For doing so, we prove that the graph obtained after removing the particular subgraph contains only an induced matching and isolated vertices. Then, by enumerating all subsolutions on the bounded-size subgraph, we are able to bound all cluster subgraphs. As a representative family of graphs that are applicable for the polynomial-time algorithm, we only mention complete bipartite graphs with bounded one of the two sizes, which admit trivial solution for CLUSTER DELETION.

(In)approximability We next consider the approximation complexity of the problem. Our initial goal is to classify the problem as APX-complete or poly-APX-complete. The existence of a poly(OPT)-approximation algorithm means that there is a polynomial-time algorithm that returns a solution of cost bounded by some polynomial function of the optimum. Even though we are not able to fully classify the approximation complexity, we show that HEDGE CLUSTER DELETION is tightly connected to a class of equivalent poly-APX problems that are still unclassified with respect to the approximation complexity. From the given class of problems there is a representative problem related to CSP, known as MIN HORN DELETION: given is a boolean formula ϕ in CNF that contains only unary clauses and clauses with three literals out of which exactly one is negative, the task is to compute the minimum number of *ones* (i.e., variables assigned to **true**) such that ϕ is satisfied. In their pioneered work of approximability of CSPs, Khanna, Sudan, Trevisan, and Williamson proved that a MIN HORN DELETION-complete problem is poly-APX-hard if and only if each MIN HORN DELETION-complete problem is poly-APX-hard [41]. However, they also showed that it is NP-hard to approximate a MIN HORN DELETION-complete problem within factor $2^{O(\log^{1-\epsilon} n)}$ for any $\epsilon > 0$, where n is the number of variables in a given CNF formula.

Here we prove that HEDGE CLUSTER DELETION is MIN HORN DELETION-complete under A -reductions, i.e., corresponding reductions required for the MIN HORN DELETION-completeness. Intuitively, A -reductions preserve approximability problems up to a constant factor (or higher). For the exact meaning of related notions, we refer to Section 4.1. We point out that showing MIN HORN DELETION-completeness, neither rules out the possibility of the existence of poly(OPT)-approximation nor shows that such an approximation exists. Despite this fact, few problems are classified as MIN HORN DELETION-complete. Interestingly, the edge-deletion problem $(K_d - e)$ -EDGE DELETION was shown to be MIN HORN DELETION-complete in which the goal is to delete as few edges as possible from a given graph so that the resulting graph does not contain an induced subgraph isomorphic to K_d without an edge, for any $d \geq 5$ [8]. Subsequently, Belova and Bliznets [6] showed that the editing variation of the latter problem still remains MIN HORN DELETION-complete.

To show MIN HORN DELETION-completeness for the HEDGE CLUSTER DELETION problem, our initial MIN HORN DELETION-complete problem is the MINONES(\mathcal{F}): given a set of

boolean variables and a family of characteristic constraints \mathcal{F} over the variables, find a variable assignment that satisfy all of the constraints while minimizing the number of variables set to one (i.e., variables assigned to **true**). We refer to *characteristic constraints*, to mean that every constraint f is constructed from \mathcal{F} by applying certain rules on some tuple of the variables. For a suitable choice of \mathcal{F} so that certain properties are satisfied, it is known that $\text{MINONES}(\mathcal{F})$ is MIN HORN DELETION-complete [41].

We show that there is an A -reduction from the $\text{MINONES}(\mathcal{F}')$ to the HEDGE CLUSTER DELETION (Lemma 4.4) and there is an A -reduction from the HEDGE CLUSTER DELETION to the $\text{MINONES}(\mathcal{F}'')$ (Lemma 4.6). The key aspect of the reductions is a careful choice for the families of constraints \mathcal{F}' and \mathcal{F}'' that encapsulate the description of HEDGE CLUSTER DELETION, but at the same time both \mathcal{F}' and \mathcal{F}'' fulfill the necessary hardness conditions of the MINONES problem. Then, by the results of [41] we conclude that it is NP-hard to approximate HEDGE CLUSTER DELETION within the claimed factor (Corollary 4.8). Moreover, the proved completeness (Theorem 4.7) implies that HEDGE CLUSTER DELETION problem can be $\text{poly}(\text{OPT})$ -approximated if and only if every MIN HORN DELETION-complete problem can be $\text{poly}(\text{OPT})$ -approximated (Corollary 4.9).

Incompressibility Interesting connections arise with respect to parameterized complexity. Recall that HEDGE CLUSTER DELETION is easily shown to be FPT parameterized by the solution size with running time $2^k n^{O(1)}$. In fact, the running time is essentially the best one can hope for because CLUSTER DELETION has no subexponential-time algorithm [44]. However, polynomial kernels for CLUSTER DELETION do exist [16, 33]. Therefore, it is natural to ask whether HEDGE CLUSTER DELETION admits a polynomial kernel. We answer negative to this question under reasonable hierarchy assumptions, which highlights another complexity difference between the two problems.

More general, there seems to be a connection between the existence of polynomial kernel and $\text{poly}(\text{OPT})$ -approximation for a problem, because usually one can find $\text{poly}(\text{OPT})$ -approximation having polynomial kernel, and vice versa. Although this fact is not formal and there are problems that act differently [30], it is quite possible that such connection exists for edge deletion problems: up to now, the existence of $\text{poly}(\text{OPT})$ -approximation algorithms are similar to results for kernelization complexity [8, 6, 15]. We establish the incompressibility of HEDGE CLUSTER DELETION by ppt-reduction from an incompressible constraint satisfiability problem (Theorem 4.12). This specific problem describes propagational behaviors on Boolean variables and clauses after certain events occur, which encompasses the situation in hedge graphs after each hedge removal. We do so, by representing Boolean formulas by three-vertex components that ensure the consistency of P_3 -freeness in a similar way to the $\text{MINONES}(\mathcal{F})$ problem. Interestingly, we also show a connection between the $\text{MINONES}(\mathcal{F})$ problem and the incompressible constraint satisfiability problem via the HEDGE CLUSTER DELETION problem (Theorem 7.1).

Constant-factor approximation algorithm Based on the classified (in)approximability and the hardness of HEDGE CLUSTER DELETION imposed by the structure of the underlying graph, we consider structural insights for establishing approximation guarantees or polynomial-time algorithms. In order to achieve a constant factor approximation, we restrict ourselves to hedge graphs in which no triangle is covered by more than two hedges. By our previous results (Theorem 3.2), we note that the problem still remains NP-complete even in this special class of hedge graphs. However, we now exploit an interesting property related to HEDGE CLUSTER DELETION. Whenever a hedge is removed, we know how to compute the set of hedges that span new P_3 because of the hedge removal (Lemma 5.2). For a hedge x , we denote by $R(x)$ all hedges that inherit such property. We show that not only

we can compute $R(x)$ in polynomial time, but there is a structural property behind these sets: (P1) for any $y \in R(x)$, we have $R(y) \subseteq R(x)$ (Lemma 5.1).

The previous property allows us to consider an auxiliary graph with its vertex set representing the hedges of the original hedge graph. Two vertices (that correspond to two hedges) are adjacent in the auxiliary graph if there is a P_3 spanned by edges of the two hedges. Each vertex x also carries the set $R(x)$. Now our task is to find a vertex cover of the auxiliary graph that also takes into account the set $R(x)$ for each vertex x belonging to the cover (Lemma 5.3). Though this problem sounds like a natural variant of the VERTEX COVER problem, we are not aware if this variant of VERTEX COVER can be approximated within a constant factor. However, we take advantage that in our problem, the considered sets $R(x)$ satisfy property (P1).

Our next step is to show that the problem on the auxiliary graph is equivalent to a purely VERTEX COVER problem having no constraints on the vertices. If between an edge $\{x, y\}$ of the auxiliary graph the sets $R(x)$ and $R(y)$ are disjoint, then we can perform edge additions that preserve the constraint that $R(x)$ or $R(y)$ is included in the solution. Fortunately, we show that this is indeed the case: consider a hedge z such that $z \in R(x) \cap R(y)$. Since the edge $\{x, y\}$ must be covered by x or y , no matter which hedge is chosen in the solution, z belongs to the solution as well (Observation 5.4). Having this into account, we include all common hedges in a solution and then perform the following edge additions between the endpoints x and y . We add all necessary edges so that the graph induced by $R(x) \cup R(y)$ (containing x and y) is complete bipartite. Then we are in position to claim that in the resulting graph our goal is to compute a *minimal* VERTEX COVER (Lemma 5.5). As VERTEX COVER is known to admit an α -approximation algorithm with $\alpha \leq 2$ [39, 53], we conclude with a polynomial-time 2-approximation algorithm for HEDGE CLUSTER DELETION (Theorem 5.7).

Hedge intersection graph In order to understand further implications that might lead to the tractability of HEDGE CLUSTER DELETION, we consider the natural underlying structure formed by the hedges. Our goal is to exploit properties of the hedge intersection graph that are sufficient to deduce a polynomial-time algorithm for HEDGE CLUSTER DELETION. Here we take a first step towards this direction by developing a polynomial-time algorithm for HEDGE CLUSTER DELETION whenever the hedge intersection graph is acyclic.

Before reaching the details of our algorithm, let us mention some non-trivial classes of hedge graphs with unbounded number of hedges that admit acyclic hedge intersection graph. As a first example, consider any hedge graph with the edges in each biconnected component belonging to at most two hedges and all other edges belong to a distinct hedge. For dense graphs, consider a (subgraph of a) clique which is formed by a matching of unbounded size where each edge of the matching belongs to a distinct hedge and all other edges of the clique belong to the same hedge. Thus, there are some interesting classes of hedge graphs that admit an acyclic hedge intersection graph.

The hedge intersection graph \mathcal{F} of a hedge graph is defined as follows: its vertex set is the set of hedges and two hedges in \mathcal{F} are adjacent if the corresponding hedges contain a common vertex in the original hedge graph. We note that since we consider \mathcal{F} to be acyclic, at most two hedges cover any triangle of the hedge graph. We also note that several properties explained earlier hold in this situation as well. In particular, the sets $R(x)$ can be computed efficiently and property (P1) is fulfilled. However, here we have to be careful because between hedges in \mathcal{F} there are edges caused by triangles of the hedge graph.

It is not difficult to see that between two hedges in \mathcal{F} there are two types of edges: (i) edges formed by hedges that cover only triangles or (ii) edges formed by hedges that cover only P_3 . Of course, there are edges that belong to both types. In fact, for the latter type of edges we can deduce which of the two endpoints (hedge of the original hedge graph) should

belong to any solution (Lemma 6.1). This is based on the fact that in any triangle one of the two hedges dominates the other, meaning that the removal of one of the two hedges always cause a P_3 .

By removing such vertices from \mathcal{F} , the edges are partitioned into the two types. We now partition the vertices of \mathcal{F} into the connected components spanned only by edges of type (i). Between such components we show that there is at most one edge of type (ii), because \mathcal{F} is acyclic (Lemma 6.2). We then construct a graph, that we denote by F_2 , in which we can compute a solution in polynomial time: for each type (i) edge $\{x, y\}$ of \mathcal{F} , we add all necessary edges in F_2 to make $R(x) \cup R(y)$ complete bipartite. Then we show that it is enough to compute a minimum vertex cover of F_2 (Lemma 6.5). In order to achieve this in polynomial time, we deduce that the constructed graph F_2 is bipartite (Lemma 6.6). Based on the fact that a minimum vertex cover can be computed in polynomial time in bipartite graphs [48, 49], we thus conclude the claimed polynomial-time algorithm (Theorem 6.7).

2 Preliminaries

All graphs considered here are simple and undirected. We use standard graph-theoretic terminology and refer to the textbook [22].

Basic definitions A graph is denoted by $G = (V, E)$ with vertex set V and edge set E . We use the convention that $n = |V|$ and $m = |E|$. The *neighborhood* of a vertex v of G is $N(v) = \{x \mid vx \in E\}$ and the *closed neighborhood* of v is $N[v] = N(v) \cup \{v\}$. For $S \subseteq V$, $N(S) = \bigcup_{v \in S} N(v) \setminus S$ and $N[S] = N(S) \cup S$. A graph G' is a *subgraph* of G if $V(G') \subseteq V(G)$ and $E(G') \subseteq E(G)$. For $X \subseteq V(G)$, the subgraph of G *induced* by X , $G[X]$, has vertex set X , and for each vertex pair u, v from X , uv is an edge of $G[X]$ if and only if $u \neq v$ and uv is an edge of G . For $R \subseteq E(G)$, $G \setminus R$ denotes the graph $(V(G), E(G) \setminus R)$, that is a subgraph of G and for $S \subseteq V(G)$, $G - S$ denotes the graph $G[V(G) - S]$, that is an induced subgraph of G .

For two disjoint sets of vertices A and B , we write $E(A, B)$ to denote all edges that have one endpoint in A and the other endpoint in B : $E(A, B) = \{\{a, b\} : a \in A \text{ and } b \in B\}$. A *matching* in G is a set of edges having no common endpoint.

A *clique* of G is a set of pairwise adjacent vertices of G , and a *maximal clique* of G is a clique of G that is not properly contained in any clique of G . An *independent set* of G is a set of pairwise non-adjacent vertices of G . The complete graph on n vertices is denoted by K_n and the chordless path on three vertices is denoted by P_3 . If the vertices a, b, c induce a P_3 with $\{a, c\} \notin E(G)$, we write $P_3 = (a, b, c)$. Since we mainly deal with P_3 and K_3 , we also write $K_3 = (a, b, c)$ to denote that the vertices a, b, c induce a K_3 .

A graph is *connected* if there is a path between any pair of vertices and a *connected component* of G is a maximal connected subgraph of G . A *cluster graph* is a graph in which every connected component is a clique. A *maximal cluster subgraph* of G is a maximal spanning subgraph of G that is isomorphic to a cluster graph. In the CLUSTER DELETION problem we seek to delete a minimum number of edges of a given graph to result in a cluster graph.

A set of vertices S is called *vertex cover* of G if every edge of G has at least one endpoint in S . The VERTEX COVER problem seeks for the smallest vertex cover set.

Approximation algorithms Let f be a fixed nondecreasing function on positive integers. An $f(\text{OPT})$ -approximation algorithm for a minimization problem Π is an algorithm that finds a solution of size at most $f(\text{OPT}) \cdot \text{OPT}$, where OPT is the size of an optimal solution

for a given instance of Π . We say that Π *admits $f(\text{OPT})$ -approximation* if there exists an $f(\text{OPT})$ -approximation algorithm for Π that runs in polynomial time.

Kernelization lower bounds Here we include definitions from the parameterized complexity theory and kernelization; for further details we refer to [20, 23]. A problem with input size n and parameter k is *fixed parameter tractable* (FPT), if it can be solved in time $f(k) \cdot n^{O(1)}$ for some computable function f . Respectively, the complexity class FPT is composed by all fixed parameter tractable problems. A kernelization for a parameterized decision problem Q is a polynomial-time preprocessing algorithm that reduces any parameterized instance (x, k) into an instance (x', k') whose size is bounded by a function $g(k)$ and which has the same answer for Q . The function g defines the size of the kernel and the *kernel has polynomial size* if g is polynomial on k .

A *polynomial compression* of a parameterized problem P into a (nonparameterized) problem Q is a polynomial algorithm that takes as an input an instance (x, k) of P and returns an instance x' of Q such that (i) (x, k) is a yes-instance of P if and only if x' is a yes-instance of Q and (ii) the size of x' is bounded by $p(k)$ for a polynomial p . Clearly, the existence of a polynomial kernel implies that the problem admit a polynomial compression but not the other way around.

It is well-known that every decidable parameterized problem is FPT if and only if it admits a kernel, but it is unlikely that every problem in FPT has a polynomial kernel or polynomial compression. In particular, the standard *composition* and *cross-composition* techniques [9, 10] allow to show that certain problems have no polynomial compressions, unless $\text{NP} \subseteq \text{coNP/poly}$. We will apply the following reduction, known as *polynomial parameter transformation* (*ppt-reduction* in short), which plays a central role in demonstrating incompressibility (and, hence, no polynomial kernel) [10]. A *ppt-reduction* from a parameterized problem P to another parameterized problem P' is an algorithm that, for input $(I, k) \in P$, takes time polynomial in $|I| + k$ and outputs an instance $(I', k') \in P'$, such that

- (i) (I, k) is a yes-instance of P if and only if (I', k') is a yes-instance of P' ,
- (ii) parameter k' is bounded by a polynomial of k .

It is known that if there is a ppt-reduction from a parameterized problem P to another parameterized problem P' , then P' admits no polynomial compression (hence no polynomial kernel) whenever P admits no polynomial compression [10].

Hedge graphs A hedge graph $H = (V, \mathcal{E})$ consists of a set of vertices V and a set of hedges $\mathcal{E} = \{E_1, \dots, E_\ell\}$. Each hedge E_i of \mathcal{E} is a collection of subsets of size exactly two of V that are called the *components* of E_i (in view of graph terminology, each component corresponds to an edge). We require the components of any two hedges to be distinct (in view of graph terminology, the edges of a simple graph are partitioned into hedges). Notice that a vertex may appear in several components of the same hedge, as well as in components of different hedges. Translating the components as edges of a graph H , we reach the equivalent definition of a hedge graph: the edges $E(H)$ have been partitioned into hedges E_1, \dots, E_ℓ ¹. The *underlying graph* of a hedge graph H is the simple graph obtained from H by simply ignoring the hedges and its edge set is exactly the union of the edges from all hedges.

¹The typical definition of hedge graphs (see e.g., [24, 25, 29]) does not require any component of a hedge to have size exactly two and two hedges may share the same component, implying parallel edges in the underlying graph. However, in our problem, components of size different than two are irrelevant and furthermore we ignore multiple edges. Nevertheless, the equivalent definition through the edge partitioning of a simple graph still applies for all considered problems.

We consider a hedge graph H as a simple graph (which corresponds to the underlying graph of H) in which the edges of $E(H)$ have been partitioned into ℓ hedges E_1, \dots, E_ℓ , denoted by $H = (V, \mathcal{E})$, where $\mathcal{E}(H) = \{E_1, \dots, E_\ell\}$. Thus, each edge of H belongs to exactly one hedge E_i . The removal of a hedge E_i results in a hedge graph that we denote by $H \setminus E_i$ which is obtained from the graph H by removing all edges of E_i and consists of the hedge set $(E_1, \dots, E_\ell) \setminus E_i$.

Definition 2.1 (hedge-subgraph). Given a hedge graph $H = (V, \mathcal{E})$, a *hedge-subgraph* H' of H consists of the same vertex set, i.e., $V(H') = V(H)$, and contains some of its hedges, i.e., $\mathcal{E}(H') \subseteq \mathcal{E}(H)$. Equivalently, for a subset of hedges $U \subseteq \{E_1, \dots, E_\ell\}$ the hedge graph $H \setminus U$ denotes the hedge-subgraph of H having hedge set $(E_1, \dots, E_\ell) \setminus U$ with its underlying graph $(V(H), E(H) \setminus E(U))$ where $E(U)$ corresponds to the set of edges of H that belong to the hedges of U . The size $|U|$ of U is the total number of hedges in U .

Definition 2.2 (cluster hedge-subgraph). A *cluster hedge-subgraph* H' of H is a hedge-subgraph of H with its underlying graph being isomorphic to a cluster graph.

We next formalize HEDGE CLUSTER DELETION, as a decision problem.

HEDGE CLUSTER DELETION
Input: A hedge graph $H = (V, \mathcal{E})$ and a non-negative integer k .
Task: Decide whether there is a subset of hedges $U \subseteq \mathcal{E}(H)$ such that $H \setminus U$ is a cluster hedge-subgraph of H and $|U| \leq k$.

In the optimization setting, the task of HEDGE CLUSTER DELETION is to turn the given hedge graph H into a cluster hedge graph by deleting the minimum number of hedges. Let us discuss the complexity of HEDGE CLUSTER DELETION with respect to the number of hedges ℓ . It is not difficult to see that recognizing whether a given graph is a cluster graph can be done in linear time. If $\ell = |E(H)|$, that is, all hedges of H contain a single edge of H , then HEDGE CLUSTER DELETION is equivalent to CLUSTER DELETION. On the other hand, one can construct all hedge-subgraphs of H in $2^\ell n^{O(1)}$ time, which means that if the number of hedges is bounded then HEDGE CLUSTER DELETION is solved in polynomial time. In what follows, we assume that the number of hedges is not bounded.

A natural difference that appears in the hedge variation of the problem, comes from the fact that maximal cluster subgraphs are enough to consider for the CLUSTER DELETION problem. However, in HEDGE CLUSTER DELETION one has to explore all cluster hedge-subgraphs rather than the maximal ones. Given a subgraph H' with edge set $E(H') \subseteq E(H)$, we can identify if H' is a valid solution for HEDGE CLUSTER DELETION, i.e., whether H' is a cluster hedge-subgraph of H . In fact, the following algorithm implies that if the number of cluster subgraphs of H is polynomial then HEDGE CLUSTER DELETION can be solved in polynomial time: for each cluster subgraph of the underlying graph, we realize if it is indeed a cluster hedge-subgraph of the given hedge graph and keep the valid solution with a maximum number of hedges.

Observation 2.3. *Given a subgraph H' of a hedge graph H with $E(H') \subseteq E(H)$, there is an $O(\ell m + n)$ -time algorithm that decides whether H' is a cluster hedge-subgraph of H , where ℓ and m are the number of hedges and edges, respectively, of H .*

Proof. We begin by checking if H' is a cluster graph in $O(m + n)$ time. Then we search for any non-valid hedge $E_i \in \mathcal{E}(H)$ with the following properties: $E_i \cap E(H') \neq \emptyset$ and $E_i \cap (E(H) \setminus E(H')) \neq \emptyset$. If such a hedge exists, then H' is not a hedge subgraph of H , since there is an edge in $E(H')$ that does not belong to any hedge that is fully contained in H' . Thus, if all hedges of H are valid in H' , then H' is indeed a hedge-subgraph of H , which means that H' is a cluster hedge-subgraph of H . \square

Since cluster graphs are exactly the graphs that do not contain any P_3 , we distinguish such paths with respect to the hedges of H . We say that a hedge E_i spans an *internal* P_3 if there is a P_3 in H having both of its edges in E_i . Otherwise, we refer to the induced P_3 of H as a simple P_3 , which means that two hedges are involved in the P_3 of H . By definition, we have the following.

Observation 2.4. *Let U be any solution for HEDGE CLUSTER DELETION and let E_i be a hedge of H that spans an internal P_3 . Then, $E_i \subseteq U$.*

In order to solve HEDGE CLUSTER DELETION, it is not difficult to see that the important subgraphs of a hedge graph H are exactly the P_3 's and K_3 's that are contained in the underlying graph of H . We will rely on this fact several times. Thus we state it formally as follows.

Lemma 2.5. *Let H be a hedge graph on n vertices. There is an $O(n^3)$ -time algorithm that constructs another hedge graph H' with $O(n^3)$ vertices having the following properties:*

- (i) *every connected component of H' consists of exactly three vertices (so that it is either a P_3 or a K_3), and*
- (ii) *any solution for HEDGE CLUSTER DELETION on H is a solution on H' and vice versa.*

Proof. We will use the following observation. Let R be a set of edges and let $H \setminus R$ be the subgraph of H . The vertices of a P_3 in $H \setminus R$ induce either a P_3 or a K_3 in H . Based on this observation, let us assume that H does not contain any connected component with at most two vertices. If such components exist, then we obtain a solution by ignoring all corresponding vertices, since they are not involved in any P_3 or K_3 in H . Note also that we ignore hedges that contain only edges of connected components with exactly two vertices. Thus we henceforth assume that each connected component of H has at least three vertices.

We enumerate all three-vertex subgraphs of H that are isomorphic to P_3 or K_3 . Let \mathcal{P}_3 be the set of all P_3 's and let \mathcal{K}_3 be the set of all K_3 's. For every element of $\mathcal{P}_3 \cup \mathcal{K}_3$, we add a connected component on three vertices in H' that is isomorphic to P_3 or K_3 , respectively. Observe that an edge $\{x, y\}$ of H may appear as $\{x', y'\}$ in several connected components in H' , and an edge $\{x', y'\}$ of H' corresponds to exactly one edge $\{x, y\}$ in H . Notice that by the previous assumption on H , any edge of H belongs to some element of $\mathcal{P}_3 \cup \mathcal{K}_3$. Moreover, we keep exactly the same set of hedges between H and H' : each edge $\{x', y'\}$ of H' belongs to the hedge of H that contains the corresponding edge $\{x, y\}$. Thus, H' contains exactly k vertices and at most k edges, where $k = 3(|\mathcal{P}_3| + |\mathcal{K}_3|)$, and property (i) is satisfied by construction.

To complete the justification for property (ii), notice the following. The sets of all P_3 's and K_3 's coincide in both graphs H and H' . Thus $\mathcal{P}_3 \cup \mathcal{K}_3$ contains the necessary structures to obtain a valid solution for HEDGE CLUSTER DELETION, since the set of hedges are exactly the same on H and H' . Furthermore, any edge removal $\{x, y\}$ on H results in removing all corresponding edges of the form $\{x', y'\}$ on H' because they belong to the same hedge of $\{x, y\}$. Similarly, removing a hedge of H' corresponds to removing all occurrences $\{x', y'\}$ of an edge $\{x, y\}$ in H , as they belong to the same hedge by construction. Therefore, the solutions on H and H' are equivalent. \square

Regarding the algorithm of Lemma 2.5, we note that there is an enumeration algorithm that runs in $O(m + |\mathcal{P}_3| + |\mathcal{K}_3|)$ time, where $|\mathcal{P}_3|$ and $|\mathcal{K}_3|$ are the number of P_3 's and K_3 's, respectively [36]. Moreover, it is known that $|\mathcal{K}_3| = O(m^{3/2})$ by the results in [37]. Still, our bound given in Lemma 2.5 is enough for the considered problem.




Figure 1: Illustration of the reduction given in Lemma 3.1. On the left side, we show an input graph G for VERTEX COVER and on the right side, we depict the corresponding hedge graph H , according to the construction.

3 Hardness result implied by the underlying structure

Here we explore the complexity of HEDGE CLUSTER DELETION. Clearly, if CLUSTER DELETION is NP-complete on a certain graph class then HEDGE CLUSTER DELETION remains NP-complete on the same class of graphs. Interestingly, we show that in a wide range of graph classes for which CLUSTER DELETION is solved in polynomial time, HEDGE CLUSTER DELETION is NP-complete.

For $\delta \geq 0$, we denote by δP_3 the graph obtained from the union of δ vertex-disjoint P_3 's.

Lemma 3.1. *HEDGE CLUSTER DELETION is NP-complete on hedge graphs with underlying graph isomorphic to δP_3 .*

Proof. Due to Observation 2.3 the problem is in NP. We provide a polynomial reduction from the NP-complete VERTEX COVER problem. Without loss of generality, we assume that the input graph G for VERTEX COVER does not contain any isolated vertex. Given a graph $G = (V, E)$ on n vertices and m edges for the VERTEX COVER problem, we construct a hedge graph $H = \delta P_3$ with $|V(H)| = 3m$, $|\mathcal{E}(H)| = n$ and $2m$ edges, as follows:

- For each edge $e = \{x, y\} \in E(G)$, we add three vertices e_{xy}, e_x and e_y to $V(H)$. Moreover, we add the edges $\{e_{xy}, e_x\}$ and $\{e_{xy}, e_y\}$.
- For every vertex z of G , we add the hedge $E_z \in \mathcal{E}(H)$ where E_z contains all the edges of the form $\{e_{uz}, e_z\} \in E(H)$.

For an illustration, we refer to Figure 1. Observe that every connected component of H is isomorphic to a P_3 and, thus, H is indeed a δP_3 graph with $\delta = m$. Moreover, notice that there is a one-to-one correspondence between the edges of G and the connected components of H .

We claim that G has a vertex cover S with $|S| \leq k$ if and only if there is a set of U hedges in H with $|U| \leq k$ such that $H \setminus U$ is a cluster hedge-subgraph of H .

Assume that $S \subseteq V(G)$ is a vertex cover of G . We show that $U = \{E_z \mid z \in S\}$ is a valid solution for HEDGE CLUSTER DELETION on H . By construction, $H \setminus U$ is a hedge-subgraph of H . If $H \setminus U$ is not a cluster hedge-subgraph then there is a connected component $C = \{e_x, e_{xy}, e_y\}$ of $H \setminus U$ such that $E(C) \cap E(U) = \emptyset$. Since the two edges of C belong to the hedges E_x and E_y , we have $E_x, E_y \notin U$. Thus, $x, y \notin S$. Then, however, there is an edge $\{x, y\}$ of G which is not covered by a vertex of S and we reach a contradiction. Therefore $H \setminus U$ results in a cluster hedge-subgraph and $|S| = |U|$.

For the opposite direction, suppose that U is a solution for HEDGE CLUSTER DELETION. We claim that $S = \{z \mid E_z \in U\}$ is a vertex cover for G . By construction, for every edge $\{x, y\}$ of G there is a vertex e_{xy} in H that is incident to two edges $\{e_{xy}, e_x\}$ and $\{e_{xy}, e_y\}$. The two edges belong to the hedges E_x and E_y , respectively. Thus, for every connected component

of H , at least one of its two hedges belongs to U , since every connected component is a P_3 in H . This means that for every edge $\{x, y\}$ of G that corresponds to a connected component containing the vertex e_{xy} of H , at least one of E_x, E_y belongs to U , so that $x \in S$ or $y \in S$. Therefore S is a vertex cover of G and $|S| = |U|$. \square

Now we are ready to extend our result on a wide range of graph classes. We note that [Lemma 3.1](#) alone is not enough to be applicable on larger underlying graphs (i.e., graphs containing union of P_3 's), since the rest of the edges need to be included in some of the hedges. For instance, connected graphs are not applicable by [Lemma 3.1](#), though they contain a large enough union of P_3 's.

Observe that for an underlying graph G , there are many hedge graphs (exponential in m) for which their underlying graph is isomorphic to G . We collect all such hedge graphs, as follows. Given a graph G , we denote by $\mathcal{H}(G)$ the class of hedge graphs that contains all hedge graphs for which their underlying graph is isomorphic to G .

Given two graphs F and G , an F -packing in G is a collection of pairwise vertex-disjoint copies of F in G . An F -packing in G is called *perfect* if it covers all the vertices of G . We write F_3 to denote the graph on three vertices that is connected, i.e., $F_3 \in \{P_3, K_3\}$. It should be noted that the decision problem of whether a graph G has a perfect F_3 -packing is NP-complete [\[42\]](#). However, there are simple classes of graphs in which a perfect F_3 -packing can be computed efficiently, such as trees or complete graphs.

Now we are ready to state our claimed NP-completeness result. We take advantage of a perfect F_3 -packing of the underlying graph and spread the hedges in a particular way that exhibits the difficulty shown in [Lemma 3.1](#). We stress that we do not claim NP-completeness on any non-cluster graph, but insist on non-cluster graphs for which a perfect F_3 -packing can be computed in polynomial-time.

Theorem 3.2. *For any non-cluster graph G with a perfect F_3 -packing, HEDGE CLUSTER DELETION is NP-complete on the class of $\mathcal{H}(G)$ hedge graphs.*

Proof. We give a polynomial reduction from the HEDGE CLUSTER DELETION problem on hedge graphs proved to be NP-complete in [Lemma 3.1](#). Let H' be a hedge graph with its underlying graph isomorphic to $\delta'P_3$ having ℓ' hedges and n' vertices. As we claim the construction for any non-cluster underlying graph, we will use H' only to define the hedges of the given underlying graph G . Let C_1, \dots, C_δ be the collection of the three-vertex connected subgraphs in the given perfect F_3 -packing of G , where $n = 3\delta$. Since G is non-cluster, there is a $P_3 = (x, y, z)$ in G . We denote by X be the set of the connected subgraphs of the collection having at least one vertex from the P_3 , that is, $X = \{C_i \mid C_i \cap \{x, y, z\} \neq \emptyset\}$. Note that $|V(X)| \in \{3, 6, 9\}$. Now we describe the hedge graph H such that $\delta = \delta' + |X|$ and $n = n' + |V(X)|$. Let $C_j \in \{C_1, \dots, C_\delta\} \setminus X$. Observe that C_j contains two or three edges. We arbitrarily map two edges of C_j into two edges of a connected component of H' (recall that $H' = \delta'P_3$). According to the mapping for each C_j , we construct ℓ' hedges $E_1, \dots, E_{\ell'}$ in H that respect the corresponding hedges of H' . For any other edge of H that it is not mapped, we include it into a single hedge $E_{\ell'+1}$. In particular, notice that the two edges of the $P_3 = (x, y, z)$ belong to $E_{\ell'+1}$. Thus H contains $\ell' + 1$ hedges. Now we claim that (H', k) is a yes-instance if and only if $(H, k + 1)$ is a yes-instance for HEDGE CLUSTER DELETION.

If U' is a solution for HEDGE CLUSTER DELETION on H' then $H \setminus (U' \cup \{E_{\ell'+1}\})$ is a cluster hedge-subgraph because all vertices of $V(X) = H - H'$ are trivial clusters and H' is a cluster hedge-subgraph. For the opposite direction, let U be a solution for HEDGE CLUSTER DELETION on H . By [Observation 2.4](#), we have $E_{\ell'+1} \subseteq U$ due to the internal P_3 induced by $\{x, y, z\}$. Thus $U \setminus \{E_{\ell'+1}\}$ contains k hedges. Since H' is a hedge-subgraph of H , we conclude that $H' \setminus (U \setminus \{E_{\ell'+1}\})$ is a cluster hedge-subgraph. \square

As an application of [Theorem 3.2](#), we require hedge graphs for which their underlying graph admits a polynomial-time algorithm to compute a perfect F_3 -packing. Typical examples of graph classes that fall in the previous characterization are long paths and almost cliques (graphs isomorphic to K_n without a single edge). Both examples reveal an interesting complexity difference with the classical variation of the problem, because on such graphs CLUSTER DELETION is known to be solved in polynomial time, whereas by [Theorem 3.2](#) HEDGE CLUSTER DELETION remains NP-complete.

We next conclude the section with a polynomial-time algorithm with respect to the F_3 -packing characterization. The size of an F_3 -packing refers to the number of vertex-disjoint subgraphs in the collection. For a graph G , we denote by δ_{\max} the size of the largest F_3 -packing. If G admits a perfect F_3 -packing then $\delta_{\max} = n/3$, whereas if G is a tree of height one then $\delta_{\max} = 1$. For a hedge graph H , we also write δ_{\max} to refer to the actual number of its underlying graph. We show that if δ_{\max} is constant then HEDGE CLUSTER DELETION admits a polynomial-time solution. In particular, our claimed algorithm has running time $n^{O(\delta_{\max})}$. To mention few classes of graphs with small δ_{\max} , we note complete bipartite graphs with bounded one side or trees with bounded number of vertex-disjoint P_3 's.

Theorem 3.3. *HEDGE CLUSTER DELETION is polynomial-time solvable on hedge graphs for which $\delta_{\max} = O(1)$.*

Proof. Let H be a hedge graph and let $\delta = \delta_{\max}$. We show the claimed polynomial-time algorithm whenever δ is a fixed small number. First we show how to compute such a collection of vertex-disjoint connected subgraphs on 3 vertices of H of size δ . We enumerate all subgraphs of H on three vertices in $O(n^3)$ time. From all three-vertex subgraphs with at least two edges, we choose δ to check if they are vertex-disjoint. In total, we need $O(n^{3\delta})$ time to compute the largest δ and the corresponding F_3 -packing of H .

We now describe how to compute a solution for HEDGE CLUSTER DELETION. In fact, we will show that all possible cluster subgraphs of H can be enumerated in polynomial time. This leads to a polynomial-time algorithm by [Observation 2.3](#). Let H_δ be the subgraph of H that is isomorphic to δP_3 . By the F_3 -packing in H , such a subgraph always exist. The 3δ vertices of H_δ are denoted by V_δ . We partition the vertices of $V(H) \setminus V_\delta$ into two sets: M the vertices that form a maximum matching in $H - H_\delta$ and Q the vertices that do not belong to M . We claim that there are no other edges in $H[M \cup Q]$ except the ones belonging to the matching. To see this, observe the following:

- any edge between vertices of Q results in a matching of larger size.
- any edge between vertices of M that are not matched results in a larger δP_3 .
- any edge between a vertex of M and a vertex of Q results in a larger δP_3 .

Thus any claimed edge reaches a contradiction to the maximum δ or to the maximum matching of the vertices of M .

This means that in any cluster subgraph of H at most two vertices of $M \cup Q$ belong to the same cluster. We enumerate all possible partitions of V_δ and for each such partition we add at most two vertices from $M \cup Q$ into each set of the partition. Since the number of sets of a given partition is at most 3δ and $|M| + |Q| \leq n$, we have at most $O((n^2)^{3\delta}) = O(n^{6\delta})$ such choices. For each possible choice, we keep the ones that form a cluster subgraph of H . Then we check in polynomial time if such a cluster subgraph is a valid solution for HEDGE CLUSTER DELETION on H by [Observation 2.3](#). Therefore, since δ is a fixed small number, all steps can be performed in polynomial time. \square

4 (In)approximability and Incompressibility

Here we show that HEDGE CLUSTER DELETION is MIN HORN DELETION-complete and has no polynomial kernel (or polynomial compression), unless $\text{NP} \subseteq \text{coNP}/\text{poly}$. When we consider the approximability, we naturally refer to the optimization version of the problem, whereas for the kernelization we refer to the decision version parameterized by the size of the solution (i.e., the number of hedge removals). In both directions we will apply boolean constraint satisfaction problems. Before introducing some relevant notation, let us first describe where the difficulty occurs when approaching the problem in both situations.

It is not difficult to see that HEDGE CLUSTER DELETION is closely related to VERTEX COVER (just consider only the P_3 's in Lemma 3.1). However, it appears that one needs to solve a vertex cover in a “dynamic manner”: whenever a cover solution is found (for P_3 -freeness), its removal results in new P_3 's that are not nicely structured in the original graph (except the fact that they appear in K_3 's). In some sense, the obstacles can propagate in the graph under each hedge removal. This chain of implications might result in a solution that is far from optimal and not within a reasonable guarantee. Thus, the main obstacle is that of introducing new induced copies of P_3 when we delete hedges, which causes a propagation of hedge deletions. This propagation phenomenon also arises in CSP problems when assigning **true** to Boolean variables in certain formulas that we describe next.

We employ standard notation related to constraint satisfiability problems. A CNF formula ϕ is a conjunction of clauses where each clause is a disjunction of literals. A satisfying assignment for ϕ is an assignment on its Boolean variables such that each clause in ϕ is satisfied. For each Boolean variable, we interchange the value of one to represent **true** and zero to represent **false**. The *degree of a Boolean variable* is the number of its occurrences in ϕ and ϕ is called *3-regular* if all of its variables have degree 3. Moreover, the *weight* of a truth assignment for ϕ is the number of ones in the assignment.

For each clause in ϕ , we will apply a Boolean constraint or function f as follows. As we deal with 3CNF, that is, each clause is the disjunction of at most three literals, for $f(x, y, z)$ the conjunctive formula ϕ is of the form $f(x_1, y_1, z_1) \wedge \cdots \wedge f(x_m, y_m, z_m)$, where each $f(x_i, y_i, z_i)$ is a clause of ϕ .

4.1 (In)approximability of Hedge Cluster Deletion

In this section, we consider the approximability of HEDGE CLUSTER DELETION. Our goal is to settle the approximation complexity of the problem with respect to $\text{poly}(\text{OPT})$ -approximation (i.e., an algorithm that returns a solution of cost bounded by some polynomial function of the optimum) and poly-APX -hardness. However we are able to show that HEDGE CLUSTER DELETION is poly-APX -hard if and only if each problem of a particular class, known as MIN HORN DELETION-complete problems, is poly-APX -hard.

Let us formally define the notion that preserves MIN HORN DELETION-completeness. The *A*-reduction applies on combinatorial optimization problems in which (i) their instances and solutions can be recognized in polynomial time, (ii) their solutions are polynomially bounded in the input size, and (iii) the objective function can be computed in polynomial time from an instance and a solution.

Definition 4.1 (*A*-reduction). A problem P *A-reduces* to a problem Q if there exist two polynomial-time computable functions F and G and a constant α such that for any instance I of P the following hold:

- (1) $F(I)$ is an instance of Q ;
- (2) $G(I, S')$ is a feasible solution for I , where S' is any feasible solution for $F(I)$;

- (3) if S is an r -approximate solution for $F(I)$, then $G(I, S)$ is an $(\alpha \cdot r)$ -approximate solution for I , for any $r \geq 1$.

Though A -reductions preserve approximability problems up to a constant factor (or higher), we will actually apply A -reductions as natural polynomial-time reductions. In fact we show that there is a polynomial-time reduction from a MIN HORN DELETION-complete problem to HEDGE CLUSTER DELETION (and vice versa), that preserves the same size of the solutions. Our starting point is the MIN HORN DELETION-complete problem $\text{MINONES}(\mathcal{F})$: given a set of boolean variables and a family of characteristic constraints \mathcal{F} over the variables, find a variable assignment that satisfy all of the constraints while minimizing the number of variables set to one (i.e., variables assigned to **true**). We refer to *characteristic constraints*, to mean that every constraint f is constructed from \mathcal{F} by applying certain rules on some tuple of the variables. To be more precise, we define the necessary properties of boolean constraints.

- a constraint f is *0-valid* if the all-zeroes assignment satisfies it.
- a constraint f is $\text{IHS-}B^+$ if it can be expressed using a CNF formula in which the clauses are all of one of the following types: $x_1 \wedge \cdots \wedge x_k$ for some positive integer $k \leq B$, or $\neg x_1 \wedge x_2$, or $\neg x_1$. $\text{IHS-}B^-$ constraints are defined analogously, with every literal being replaced by its complement. Moreover, $\text{IHS-}B$ constraint is either $\text{IHS-}B^+$ or $\text{IHS-}B^-$.
- a constraint f is *weakly positive* if it can be expressed using a CNF formula that has at most one negated variable in each clause.

The above constraints can be extended to a family of constraints. For a family of constraints \mathcal{F} , we say that \mathcal{F} is one of the above classes if all of its constraints belong to the same class. Observe that A -reductions are transitive. For two problems P and Q , we say that P is *Q -complete under A -reductions* if there are A -reductions from P to Q and from Q to P . Now we are in position to formally state the following result.

Theorem 4.2 ([41]). *If a family of constraints \mathcal{F} is weakly positive, but it is neither 0-valid nor $\text{IHS-}B$ for any constant B , then $\text{MINONES}(\mathcal{F})$ is MIN HORN DELETION-complete under A -reductions. Consequently, it is NP-hard to approximate $\text{MINONES}(\mathcal{F})$ within factor $2^{O(\log^{1-\epsilon} n)}$ for any $\epsilon > 0$, where n is the number of variables in the given instance.*

We turn our attention to HEDGE CLUSTER DELETION. For a hedge graph H we enumerate all P_3 's and K_3 's and apply Lemma 2.5. We will build a family of constraints in a way that every boolean variable x corresponds to exactly one hedge E_x and a variable x is set to 1 if and only if the corresponding hedge E_x is removed. Depending on the number of hedges that cover each P_3 and K_3 , we define the following constraints:

- $f_1(x_1, x_2, x_3)$ is equal to zero if and only if exactly one of the variables x_1, x_2, x_3 is set to 1. That is, $f_1(x_1, x_2, x_3) = (\neg x_1 \vee x_2 \vee x_3) \wedge (x_1 \vee \neg x_2 \vee x_3) \wedge (x_1 \vee x_2 \vee \neg x_3)$. We will use f_1 to encapsulate a K_3 that is covered by exactly three hedges.
- $g_1(x_1, x_2)$ is equal to zero if and only if exactly x_1 is set to 1. That is, $g_1(x_1, x_2) = (\neg x_1 \vee x_2)$. We will use g_1 to encapsulate a K_3 that is covered by exactly two hedges in which the two edges of the K_3 belong to the hedge x_1 .
- $g_2(x_1, x_2)$ is equal to zero if and only if both x_1 and x_2 are set to 0. That is, $g_2(x_1, x_2) = (x_1 \vee x_2)$. We will use g_2 to encapsulate a P_3 that is covered by two hedges.
- $f_2(x) = x$. We will use f_2 to encapsulate a P_3 that is covered by exactly one hedge.

Notice that we do not define a constraint for a triangle that is covered by exactly one hedge.

Lemma 4.3 ([8]). *The family of constraints $\mathcal{F}' = \{f_1, f_2\}$ is weakly positive, and at the same time it is neither 0-valid nor IHS-B for any B .*

Therefore, [Theorem 4.2](#) and [Lemma 4.3](#) imply that $\text{MINONES}(\mathcal{F}')$ is MIN HORN DELETION-hard under A-reductions. We now show the first reduction from $\text{MINONES}(\mathcal{F}')$.

Lemma 4.4. *Let $\mathcal{F}' = \{f_1, f_2\}$. Then, $\text{MINONES}(\mathcal{F}')$ A-reduces to HEDGE CLUSTER DELETION.*

Proof. We give a polynomial-time computable transformation from an instance of $\text{MINONES}(\mathcal{F}')$ to an instance of HEDGE CLUSTER DELETION. Given a formula ϕ , for each variable x in ϕ we create a hedge in H , denoted by X . Now, for every constraint, we construct a specific K_3 or P_3 in H .

- For every constraint $f_1(x_1, x_2, x_3)$, we construct a vertex-disjoint K_3 in H , where its three edges belong to X_1, X_2, X_3 , respectively.
- For each constraint $f_2(x)$, we construct a vertex-disjoint P_3 whose two edges belong to hedge X .

Observe that there is a one-to-one correspondence between the hedges of H and the variables of ϕ . Moreover, every connected component is K_3 or P_3 and the number of connected components is at most the number of constraints.

We claim that there is a satisfying assignment for ϕ that sets exactly k variables to 1 if and only if there is a set of hedges U in H such that $H \setminus U$ is a cluster hedge-subgraph of H and $|U| = k$. Notice that the constant α of the A-reduction given in [Definition 4.1](#) is equal to 1.

Assume that there exists a satisfying assignment for ϕ with exactly k variables set to 1. We show that it is enough to delete the corresponding hedges from H , that is $U = \{X \mid x = 1\}$. We know that for each constraint of type f_1 , the formula is evaluated to 0 if and only if exactly one of the variables x_1, x_2, x_3 is set to 1. Consequently:

- If none of the variables are set to 1, no hedge is deleted from the corresponding K_3 in H .
- If exactly two variables are set to 1, the two corresponding hedges are deleted, leaving a K_2 and an isolated vertex in H , which constitute a valid cluster.
- If all three variables are set to 1, all hedges of the corresponding K_3 are deleted, resulting in three isolated vertices, each of which forms a valid cluster.

For each constraint of type f_2 , the corresponding variable is always set to 1. Consequently, the associated hedge is deleted, and each initial P_3 of the construction corresponds to three isolated vertices, since both of its edges belong to the same hedge, which is guaranteed to be removed.

Hence, no new P_3 structures can emerge from any K_3 in H after the deletions, as the presence of such a path would imply that, for some constraint of type f_1 , exactly one variable was assigned the value 1, which contradicts the assumption that ϕ is satisfied.

For the opposite direction, assume a solution U for HEDGE CLUSTER DELETION on H with exactly k hedges. We claim that for every hedge of U , it is enough to set the corresponding variable to 1. Let x be a variable that is set to 1 with the corresponding

hedge $X \in U$. If the constraint is of type f_2 , then there is a connected component in H isomorphic to P_3 with both of its edges belonging to the hedge X . Thus $X \in U$ which means that f_2 is satisfied. Now consider a constraint of type f_1 . Assume that there is a constraint f_1 that is not satisfied. By definition, f_1 is equal to zero if and only if exactly one of its three variables is set to 1. Without loss of generality, assume that $x_1 \in U$ and $x_2, x_3 \notin U$. Then, however, the corresponding connected component of f_1 spans a P_3 in $H \setminus U$ which contradicts the fact that $H \setminus U$ is a cluster hedge-subgraph. Therefore, the claimed assignment satisfies ϕ , as desired. \square

Next we consider the completeness with respect to A -reductions. We extend the family \mathcal{F}' to include all defined constraints.

Lemma 4.5. *The family of constraints $\mathcal{F}'' = \{f_1, g_1, g_2, f_2\}$ is weakly positive, and at the same time it is neither 0-valid nor IHS- B for any B .*

Proof. Observe that $\{f_1, f_2\} = \mathcal{F}' \subset \mathcal{F}'' = \{f_1, g_1, g_2, f_2\}$. Thus \mathcal{F}'' is neither 0-valid nor IHS- B for any B by Lemma 4.3. We show that \mathcal{F}'' is weakly positive. Each clause appearing in g_1 and g_2 contains at most one negated literal. Since f_1, f_2 are weakly positive by Lemma 4.3, we conclude that the entire family \mathcal{F}'' satisfies the claimed properties. \square

Again, notice that Theorem 4.2 and Lemma 4.5 show that $\text{MINONES}(\mathcal{F}'')$ is MIN HORN DELETION-hard under A -reductions. Next, we show a reduction in the other direction, from HEDGE CLUSTER DELETION to $\text{MINONES}(\mathcal{F}'')$.

Lemma 4.6. *Let $\mathcal{F}'' = \{f_1, g_1, g_2, f_2\}$. Then, HEDGE CLUSTER DELETION A -reduces to $\text{MINONES}(\mathcal{F}'')$.*

Proof. Let H be a hedge graph given as an instance of HEDGE CLUSTER DELETION. By Lemma 2.5, we assume that every connected component of H contains exactly three vertices. We show how to construct an instance of $\text{MINONES}(\mathcal{F}'')$ from H . In order to construct a formula ϕ we consider every K_3 or P_3 in each connected component of H and add the appropriate constraint according to the configuration of their hedges:

- For every K_3 whose three edges belong to distinct hedges, we add the constraint $f_1(x_1, x_2, x_3)$, where the variables x_1, x_2 , and x_3 correspond to hedges X_1, X_2 , and X_3 , respectively.
- For every K_3 where two edges belong to the same hedge and the remaining edge belongs to a different hedge, we add the constraint $g_1(x_1, x_2)$, where x_2 represents the hedge X_2 containing two of the edges and x_1 represents the hedge X_1 containing the remaining edge.
- For every K_3 whose three edges belong to a single hedge, we do not add any constraint and ignore such a connected component.
- For every P_3 whose two edges belong to different hedges, we add the constraint $g_2(x_1, x_2)$, where the variables x_1 and x_2 correspond to hedges X_1 and X_2 , respectively.
- For every P_3 whose two edges both belong to the same hedge, we add the constraint $f_2(x)$, where x represents the hedge X .

This completes the construction of the instance ϕ for $\text{MINONES}(\mathcal{F}'')$ (see also Figure 2). It is not difficult to see that all steps can be performed in polynomial time.

Let ℓ be the number of hedges in H . We claim the following: for any $I \subseteq \{1, \dots, \ell\}$, $H \setminus U$ where $U = \{X_i \mid i \in I\}$ is a cluster hedge-subgraph if and only if the assignment $\{x_i = 1 \mid i \in I\}$ satisfies ϕ .

If U is a solution for HEDGE CLUSTER DELETION on H then the original P_3 's in H are not present in $H \setminus U$. This means that the constraints g_2 and f_2 have at least one of their variables set to 1. Now consider the constraints f_1 and g_1 that correspond to connected components isomorphic to K_3 . For a K_3 , let $H(K_3)$ be the set of hedges covered by the K_3 . If $|H(K_3)| = 3$ then we know that one of the following cases occur in $H \setminus U$: $|H(K_3) \cap U| \in \{0, 2, 3\}$. This is exactly described by the constraint f_1 , whenever f_1 is satisfied. Now assume that $|H(K_3)| = 2$ and let X_1, X_2 be the hedges covered by the K_3 , where X_2 covers two of the edges of the K_3 . If $X_1 \in U$ and $X_2 \notin U$ then $H \setminus U$ is not a cluster hedge-subgraph as there is a P_3 spanned by edges of X_2 . Otherwise, constraint g_1 is satisfied. Therefore, the claimed assignment satisfies ϕ .

For the opposite direction, assume that the assignment $\{x_i = 1 \mid i \in I\}$ satisfies ϕ . We show that every connected component of H is a cluster graph in $H \setminus U$. Constraints g_2 and f_2 guarantee that each connected component of H isomorphic to P_3 in H does not contain at least one of its two edges in $H \setminus U$. For every connected component of H isomorphic to K_3 , we apply constraints f_1 or g_1 depending on the number of hedges that covers the K_3 . We note that if the K_3 is covered by exactly one hedge X then regardless of whether $X \in U$ or not, the three vertices of the connected component induce a cluster graph in $H \setminus U$. If the K_3 is covered by two hedges X_1, X_2 with X_1 the hedge that covers the unique edge of K_3 , then the constraint g_2 forces that $X_1 \in U$ and $X_2 \notin U$ never occurs. Otherwise, the K_3 is covered by three hedges and the constraint f_1 is responsible not to remove exactly one of the two edges. Therefore, $H \setminus U$ is a cluster hedge-subgraph of H , as claimed. \square

By combining [Lemmas 4.4](#) and [4.6](#) and [Theorem 4.2](#) we conclude with the following result.

Theorem 4.7. HEDGE CLUSTER DELETION is MIN HORN DELETION-complete under A -reductions.

We also state the claimed results. In particular, [Lemmas 4.3](#) and [4.4](#) and [Theorem 4.2](#) imply [Corollary 4.8](#), whereas [Theorems 4.2](#) and [4.7](#) and A -reductions imply [Corollary 4.9](#).

Corollary 4.8. It is NP-hard to approximate HEDGE CLUSTER DELETION within factor $2^{O(\log^{1-\epsilon} r)}$ for any $\epsilon > 0$, where r is the number of hedges in the given hedge graph.

Corollary 4.9. HEDGE CLUSTER DELETION admits an n^{δ_1} -approximation algorithm for any $\delta_1 > 0$ if and only if each MIN HORN DELETION-complete problem admits an n^{δ_2} -approximation algorithm for any $\delta_2 > 0$.

4.2 Incompressibility of Hedge Cluster Deletion

Recall that with a simple brute-force algorithm HEDGE CLUSTER DELETION can be solved in $2^k \cdot n^{O(1)}$ time. Here we show that HEDGE CLUSTER DELETION does not have a polynomial kernel parameterized by k unless the polynomial hierarchy collapses.

A ternary boolean function $f(x, y, z)$, where x, y and z are either boolean variables or constants 0 or 1, is *propagational* if it satisfies

- $f(1, 0, 0) = 0$ and
- $f(0, 0, 0) = f(1, 0, 1) = f(1, 1, 0) = f(1, 1, 1) = 1$.

It is not difficult to see that the following Boolean function is propagational [15, 46]:

$$\text{Not-1-in-3}(x, y, z) = f_1(x, y, z) = (\neg x \vee y \vee z) \wedge (x \vee \neg y \vee z) \wedge (x \vee y \vee \neg z).$$

Note that f_1 is symmetric ternary function and the order of the three arguments in f_1 is not important. Within the list of arguments, we write first the constants (i.e., $f_1(0, x, y) = f_1(x, 0, y)$, $f_1(0, 1, x) = f_1(1, 0, x)$). Also notice that $f_1 \in \mathcal{F}' \cap \mathcal{F}''$ in our previous considered MINONES problem which was used to encode every K_3 that contains three hedges.

We will reduce from the PROPAGATIONAL- f SATISFIABILITY that is defined as follows: given a conjunctive formula ϕ of a propagational ternary function f with distinct variables inside each clause of ϕ and an integer parameter $k \geq 0$, the task is to decide whether there exists a satisfying truth assignment for ϕ of weight at most k . Cai and Cai [15] introduced the problem and proved that it has no polynomial kernel under plausible hierarchy assumptions.

Theorem 4.10 ([15]). *For any propagational ternary boolean function f , PROPAGATIONAL- f SATISFIABILITY on 3-regular conjunctive formulas admits no polynomial compression, hence no polynomial kernel, unless $NP \subseteq coNP/poly$.*

In what follows, we set f_1 as a propagational function and consider the PROPAGATIONAL- f_1 SATISFIABILITY problem. For technical reasons, it is more convenient to deal with ϕ that does not contain a function of the form $f_1(0, 0, x)$. Next we show how this assumption is achieved.

Lemma 4.11. *Let (ϕ, k) be an instance of PROPAGATIONAL- f_1 SATISFIABILITY. In polynomial time we can compute a Boolean formula ϕ' from ϕ such that $f_1(0, 0, x) \notin \phi'$ and (ϕ, k) is a yes-instance if and only if (ϕ', k) is a yes-instance.*

Proof. We construct ϕ' from ϕ by removing certain clauses. For each Boolean variable x , we check whether $f_1(0, 0, x) \in \phi$. If this is not the case for every x , then $\phi' = \phi$ and we conclude with the instance (ϕ', k) . Assume that $f_1(0, 0, x) \in \phi$. By the definition of f_1 , observe that ϕ is satisfied only if $x = 0$. We construct ϕ' from ϕ by replacing every occurrence of x with the constant 0 in ϕ . Since we have not assigned one to any variable during this construction, it is not difficult to see that ϕ is satisfied by at most k ones if and only if ϕ' is satisfied by at most k ones. Notice also that clauses in ϕ' that contain only constants can be safely removed, because if we encounter $f_1(0, 0, 1) \in \phi'$ then (ϕ, k) is a no-instance; otherwise we just ignore such clauses (as they are always **true**). By applying such a transformation for every variable, we conclude with a valid ϕ' such that $f_1(0, 0, x) \notin \phi'$. \square

We next establish the claimed incompressibility of HEDGE CLUSTER DELETION mainly by a ppt-reduction from PROPAGATIONAL- f_1 SATISFIABILITY. The proof is similar to the reduction given in Lemma 4.4.

Theorem 4.12. *HEDGE CLUSTER DELETION parameterized by the solution size admits no polynomial compression, hence no polynomial kernel, unless $NP \subseteq coNP/poly$.*

Proof. We give a ppt-reduction from PROPAGATIONAL- f_1 SATISFIABILITY to the parameterized problem of HEDGE CLUSTER DELETION. Let (ϕ, k) be an instance of PROPAGATIONAL- f_1 SATISFIABILITY. By Lemma 4.11, we assume that $f_1(0, 0, x) \notin \phi$. As f_1 is symmetric ternary and propagational function, the following forms can only occur in ϕ : $f_1(0, 1, x)$, $f_1(1, 1, x)$, $f_1(0, x, y)$, $f_1(1, x, y)$, $f_1(x, y, z)$, where x, y, z are Boolean variables. We construct a hedge graph H from ϕ in which each hedge E_x of H corresponds to exactly one Boolean variable x of ϕ . For each clause in ϕ , we construct some connected components in H where every connected component has exactly three vertices in H (so that every component is a P_3 or a K_3). Depending on the five formulations of f_1 , we construct vertex-disjoint connected components as follows:




Figure 2: Illustrating CNF formulas for MINONES(\mathcal{F}'') and PROPAGATIONAL- f_1 SATISFIABILITY, alongside the corresponding hedge graph given in Lemma 4.6 and Theorem 4.12, respectively. Note that the K_3 spanned solely by hedge x_6 does not correspond to any constraint in the MINONES(\mathcal{F}'') formulation.

- $f_1(0, 1, x)$: add a P_3 that is covered by exactly one hedge E_x .
- $f_1(1, 1, x)$: add a K_3 that is covered by exactly one hedge E_x .
- $f_1(0, x, y)$: add two K_3 's where the edges of the two components are covered by exactly two hedges E_x and E_y , such that the two edges of the one component belong to E_x and the two edges of the other component belong to E_y .
- $f_1(1, x, y)$: add a P_3 that is covered by exactly two hedges E_x, E_y .
- $f_1(x, y, z)$: add a K_3 that is covered by exactly three hedges E_x, E_y, E_z .

This concludes the construction of H (see also Figure 2). It is not difficult to see that the construction can be performed in polynomial time. Now we claim that (ϕ, k) is a yes-instance of PROPAGATIONAL- f_1 SATISFIABILITY if and only if (H, k) is a yes-instance of HEDGE CLUSTER DELETION.

Let X' be a subset of the Boolean variables such that $\{x = 1 \mid x \in X'\}$ satisfies ϕ . We show that $H \setminus E(X')$ is a cluster hedge-subgraph where $E(X') = \{E_x \mid x \in X'\}$. Assume for contradiction that there is $P_3 = (u, v, w)$ in $H \setminus E(X')$. This means that the hedges E_x and E_y of the edges $\{u, v\}$ and $\{v, w\}$, respectively, do not belong to $E(X')$, so that for the corresponding variables we have $x = y = 0$ (notice that E_x, E_y are not necessarily different hedges). Moreover, if $\{u, w\}$ is an edge of H then we know that $E_z \notin \{E_x, E_y\}$ where E_z is the hedge of the edge $\{u, w\}$ and for its corresponding variable we have $z = 1$. Depending on whether $E_x = E_y$ and $\{u, w\} \in E(H)$, we conclude that a particular clause in ϕ is not satisfied:

- $E_x = E_y$ and $\{u, w\} \notin E(H)$. Then $f_1(0, 1, x) = 0$, because $x = 0$;
- $E_x = E_y$ and $\{u, w\} \in E(H)$. Then $f_1(0, x, z) = 0$, because $x = 0$ and $z = 1$;
- $E_x \neq E_y$ and $\{u, w\} \notin E(H)$. Then $f_1(1, x, y) = 0$, because $x = y = 0$;

- $E_x \neq E_y$ and $\{u, w\} \in E(H)$. Then $f_1(x, y, z) = 0$, because $x = y = 0$ and $z = 1$.

Therefore, in each case we conclude with a clause that is not satisfied, leading to a contradiction, which implies that there is no P_3 in $H \setminus E(X')$.

For the opposite direction, let $H' = H \setminus E(X')$ be a cluster hedge-subgraph where $E(X')$ is a subset of the hedges of H . Then we claim that $\{x = 1 \mid x \in E(X')\}$ satisfies ϕ . We show that in each formulation of f_1 in ϕ , $f_1(x, y, z)$ is satisfied.

- $f_1(0, 1, x)$: the corresponding P_3 is not present in H' , so that $x \in E(X')$ and $x = 1$ which means that $f_1(0, 1, x)$ is satisfied.
- $f_1(1, 1, x)$: there are two cases to consider in H' . Either the corresponding K_3 remains the same ($x = 0$) or the three vertices belong to singleton clusters ($x = 1$). Thus, $f_1(1, 1, x)$ is satisfied.
- $f_1(0, x, y)$: there are two cases to consider in H' . Either the two corresponding components are untouched ($x = 0$ and $y = 0$) or all six vertices belong to singleton clusters ($x = 1$ and $y = 1$). Thus, $f_1(0, x, y)$ is satisfied.
- $f_1(1, x, y)$: the corresponding P_3 is not present in H' , so that $x \in E(X')$ and $x = 1$ or $y \in E(X')$ and $y = 1$ (or both belong to $E(X')$ and $x = y = 1$). Thus, $f_1(1, x, y)$ is satisfied.
- $f_1(x, y, z)$: either all edges of the corresponding K_3 are present in H' ($x = y = z = 0$) or at least two of its edges are removed ($x = y = 1$). Thus, $f_1(x, y, z)$ is satisfied.

Therefore, all clauses of ϕ are satisfied as claimed. \square

5 Towards a constant-factor approximation

Here we consider approximating HEDGE CLUSTER DELETION up to a constant factor, by restricting to a certain class of hedge graphs. In order to achieve a constant factor approximation, we require a relationship between the hedges and the triangles of the underlying graph. In particular, we consider hedge graphs in which every triangle of the underlying graph is covered by at most two hedges. We refer to such hedge graphs as *bi-hedge graphs*. By Lemma 3.1, observe that HEDGE CLUSTER DELETION remains NP-complete on bi-hedge graphs.

To avoid heavy notation and without affecting consistency, we refer to a hedge of $\mathcal{E}(H)$ both as x or E_x , whenever there is no ambiguity. For a hedge x , we denote by $SK_3(x)$ (single- K_3) the set of triangles $K_3 = (a, b, c)$ in H such that exactly one of the three edges belongs to E_x , that is $\{a, b\} \in E_x$ and $\{a, c\}, \{b, c\} \notin E_x$. Since every triangle contains at most two hedges, notice that both $\{a, c\}$ and $\{b, c\}$ belong to a single hedge $E_y \neq E_x$. Let $D(x)$ be the set of hedges that appear in $SK_3(x)$. We say that a hedge y *dominates* a hedge x if there is a sequence of hedges $\langle y = h_1, \dots, h_p = x \rangle$ with $p \geq 1$ such that $h_i \in D(h_{i+1})$, for all $1 \leq i < p$. We denote by $R(x)$ all hedges that dominate x . Notice that $x \in R(x)$. Figure 3 illustrates the corresponding notions.

The intuition behind the previous definitions is that whenever the hedge E_x is deleted from H , all hedges that dominate x span new P_3 in $H \setminus \{E_x\}$. In fact, we will show that all such hedges do not create new P_3 in the hedge graph $H \setminus R(x)$.

Lemma 5.1. *Let H be a bi-hedge graph and let $x \in \mathcal{E}(H)$ be a hedge of H . Then, the following hold.*

- (i) *For a hedge $y \in \mathcal{E}(H)$, we have $y \in R(x)$ if and only if $R(y) \subseteq R(x)$.*




Figure 3: Illustrating the domination relation. On the left side, a hedge graph is shown by enumerating all P_3 and K_3 in the underlying graph. On the right side, the domination relation is depicted among the hedges by introducing a graph representation: for any two hedges h and h' (i) there is a directed edge from h to h' whenever $h \in D(h')$ and (ii) there is an edge $\{h, h'\}$ whenever there is a P_3 with edges spanned by h and h' . Observe that if we remove the hedge x_5 then all hedges x_1, x_2, x_3 must be removed which constitute the hedges that dominate x_5 , that is, $R(x_5) = \{x_1, x_2, x_3, x_5\}$. All hedges of $R(x_5)$ reach x_5 with a directed path in this graph representation.

(ii) Let U be a solution for HEDGE CLUSTER DELETION on H . If $x \in U$ then $R(x) \subseteq U$.

(iii) Any P_3 in the underlying graph of $H \setminus R(x)$ is a P_3 in the underlying graph of H .

Proof. We start with the first claim. Assume that $y \in R(x)$ and there is a hedge $z \in R(y)$ such that $z \notin R(x)$. Since $z \in R(y)$, z dominates y , which implies that there is a sequence $\langle z = h_1, \dots, h_p = y \rangle$. Moreover, $y \in R(x)$ implies that there is a sequence $\langle y = f_1, \dots, f_q = x \rangle$. By combining the two sequences, we get z dominates x and so $z \in R(x)$ which contradicts our assumption. For the opposite direction, by definition $y \in R(y)$. Since $R(y) \subseteq R(x)$, we get $y \in R(x)$.

We continue with the second one. Assume $x \in U$. Let $\langle h_1, \dots, h_j = y, \dots, h_p = x \rangle$ be a sequence that dominates x and let y be the rightmost hedge for which holds $y \notin U$. This means $h_{j+1} \in U$. Moreover, $y \in D(h_{j+1})$ which implies there is a $K_3 \in SK_3(h_{j+1})$ with the two other edges of K_3 belong to hedge y . Since $h_{j+1} \in U$, there is a P_3 in $H \setminus U$ that is formed by the two edges that belong to hedge y . Hence, there is a contradiction since U is a solution for HEDGE CLUSTER DELETION.

Next, assume for contradiction that there is a P_3 in the underlying graph of $H \setminus R(x)$ that is not a P_3 in the underlying graph of H . This means that the vertices of P_3 form a K_3 in the underlying graph of H . Since H is a bi-hedge graph, the K_3 belongs to $SK_3(y)$ for some $y \in R(x)$. Thus, the other two edges of the K_3 belong in the same hedge, we call this hedge z . Hence, $z \in D(y)$ which implies $z \in R(y)$ and, thus, by (i) we get $z \in R(x)$. Therefore, there is no such P_3 in the underlying graph of $H \setminus R(x)$. \square

Moreover, it is not difficult to see that computing all domination relations between the hedges can be done in polynomial time.

Lemma 5.2. *Given a bi-hedge graph H , there is a polynomial-time algorithm to compute $R(x)$ for any hedge x of H .*

Proof. We begin by enumerating all triangles of the underlying graph of H in $O(n^3)$ time. We then compute $D(x)$ by exploring the set of triangles $SK(x)$. Then, for any triangle we know that there are at most two hedges involved, since H is bi-hedge. Thus we can create an auxiliary directed graph (with bi-directional edges allowed) that encapsulates all relations for the set $D(x)$. To compute the domination relation it is enough to find all vertices that reach x in the auxiliary graph by [Lemma 5.1](#). Such computations can be done in $O(n^3\ell)$ time, where ℓ is the number of hedges in H . \square

For the approximation algorithm, we will reduce HEDGE CLUSTER DELETION to VERTEX COVER in two steps. In particular, we first define a variant of VERTEX COVER where apart from the given graph G , a set of vertex-lists $\mathcal{L} = \{L(v) \subseteq V(G) \mid v \in V(G)\}$ is also given and the goal is to find a minimum vertex cover $S \subseteq V(G)$ such that $\bigcup_{v \in S} L(v) = S$. For a set X of vertices, we write $L(X)$ to denote $\bigcup_{x \in X} L(x)$. We refer to the latter problem as MULTI-VERTEX COVER which is formally defined as follows.

MULTI-VERTEX COVER

Input: A graph G , $L(v) \subseteq V(G)$ for all $v \in V(G)$, and a non-negative integer k .

Task: Decide whether there is a vertex cover $S \subseteq V(G)$ such that $L(S) = S$ and $|S| \leq k$.

We are not aware if MULTI-VERTEX COVER can be approximated within a constant factor. Instead, we show it is enough to consider a restricted variation of MULTI-VERTEX COVER that fulfills the following property on the vertex-lists:

(P1) for every $x \in L(y)$, we have $L(x) \subseteq L(y)$.

Notice that such a property is stated within [Lemma 5.1](#) (i) with respect to the domination relation of the hedges. We now give the claimed reduction. For technical reasons, by [Observation 2.4](#) we can assume there is no hedge that spans an internal P_3 in the bi-hedge graph.

Lemma 5.3. *Let H be a bi-hedge graph in which no hedge spans an internal P_3 . There exists a polynomial time algorithm that, given an instance (H, k) for HEDGE CLUSTER DELETION, produces an equivalent instance for MULTI-VERTEX COVER that satisfies (P1).*

Proof. Let $H = (V, \mathcal{E})$ be a bi-hedge graph. From H , we construct a graph G and a set \mathcal{L} for MULTI-VERTEX COVER as follows. For every $E_x \in \mathcal{E}$, there is a corresponding vertex x in $V(G)$ and there is an edge between x and y if the corresponding hedges E_x and E_y form a P_3 in H . Moreover, for every vertex $v \in V(G)$, we have $L(v) = R(E_v)$ for the corresponding hedge E_v . Observe that the construction takes polynomial time because $V(G)$ is exactly $|\mathcal{E}|$ and every $L(v)$ can be computed in polynomial time by [Lemma 5.2](#) and has size at most $|\mathcal{E}|$. Notice also that, by construction, the statements for the hedges of [Lemma 5.1](#) hold for the corresponding vertices in G . Thus, property (P1) is satisfied for the vertex-lists of G . We claim that there is a solution U for HEDGE CLUSTER DELETION of size at most k if and only if there is a solution S for MULTI-VERTEX COVER in G of size at most k .

Let U be a solution for HEDGE CLUSTER DELETION with k hedges. For every P_3 , there exists a hedge x such that $x \in U$. We claim that $S = U$ is a solution for MULTI-VERTEX COVER in G . By construction, for every P_3 in H there is an edge in G . Hence, we have that S is a vertex cover for G , since there are no edges in $G - S$. Moreover, by [Lemma 5.1](#) (ii) we have that $R(E_x) \subseteq U$ for any hedge E_x . In terms of the vertex-lists of G , this means that $L(S) = S$, because $x \in L(x)$ for any vertex of G . Therefore, S is a vertex cover for G with $L(S) = S$ and $|S| \leq k$.

For the opposite direction, assume that there is a vertex cover S of size at most k for G such that $L(S) = S$ and the vertex-lists satisfy property (P1). We claim that $U = S$ is a




Figure 4: This graph corresponds to the graph obtained from Figure 3 towards the construction given in Lemma 5.3 for the MULTI-VERTEX COVER problem. Every vertex v is equipped with a list $L(v)$; the unique vertex with $v \in L(v)$ is shown underlined. We also highlight the difference between a minimum vertex cover (represented by the black vertices) and a minimum multi-vertex cover (indicated by the shaded region).

solution for HEDGE CLUSTER DELETION. Assume for contradiction that there is at least one P_3 in $H \setminus U$. Suppose that the underlying graph of $H \setminus U$ contains a $P_3 = (a, b, c)$ induced by the vertices a, b, c . Let E_x be a hedge of $H \setminus U$ such that $\{a, b\} \in E_x$. If a, b, c induce a P_3 in H , then we have $\{b, c\} \in E_y$ with $E_x \neq E_y$, since there are no hedges in H that span an internal P_3 . Thus x or y belongs to S , because S is a vertex cover of G . Hence, the vertices a, b, c form a K_3 in H . As H is bi-hedge, there are two hedges involved in the K_3 . Since $\{a, c\}$ is not an edge of $H \setminus U$, the single hedge of the K_3 contains the edge $\{a, c\}$, so that $\{a, b, c\} \in SK(y)$. We conclude that $\{a, b\}, \{b, c\} \in E_x$, $\{a, c\} \in E_y$, and $E_y \in U$. Thus, by definition we have $x \in D(y)$, which implies $x \in R(y)$. This leads to a contradiction by Lemma 5.1 (ii), since $y \in U$ and $R(y) \not\subseteq U$. Therefore, U is a solution for HEDGE CLUSTER DELETION. \square

We turn our attention to solve MULTI-VERTEX COVER that satisfies property (P1). We take advantage of the following result.

Observation 5.4. *For every edge $\{x, y\} \in E(G)$, we have $L(x) \cap L(y) \subseteq S$, where S is any solution of MULTI-VERTEX COVER.*

Proof. Let z be a vertex such that $z \in L(x) \cap L(y)$. Assume for contradiction that $z \notin S$. Since $\{x, y\}$ is an edge of G , either x or y belongs to S . Without loss of generality, assume that $x \in S$. By the fact that $L(S) = S$ and $x \in S$, we have $L(x) \subseteq S$. The latter leads to a contradiction since $z \notin S$ and $z \in L(x)$. Hence, $L(x) \cap L(y) \subseteq S$. \square

We say that a solution S is *minimal* for MULTI-VERTEX COVER if for every vertex $x \in S$,

- there is an edge $\{x, y\} \in E(G)$ with $y \notin S$, or
- there is a vertex $y \in S$ such that $x \in L(y)$ and $\{y, z\} \in E(G)$ with $z \notin S$.

Lemma 5.5. *If property (P1) is satisfied then there exists a 2-approximation polynomial-time algorithm for MULTI-VERTEX COVER.*

Proof. Given a graph G and a set \mathcal{L} for MULTI-VERTEX COVER that satisfies (P1), we construct an auxiliary graph G' as follows:

$$V(G') = V(G) \setminus \{z \mid z \in L(x) \cap L(y) \text{ with } \{x, y\} \in E(G)\}.$$

For every edge $\{x, y\} \in E(G)$ with $x, y \in V(G')$, we add all edges between $L(x)$ and $L(y)$ to $E(G')$, that is, $E(L(x), L(y)) \subseteq E(G')$. This completes the description of G' . Observe that

not only the given sets $L(x)$ and $L(y)$ are vertex-disjoint as vertices that belong to G' , but for any two vertices $x' \in L(x)$ and $y' \in L(y)$, we know that $L(x')$ and $L(y')$ are vertex-disjoint by property (P1). Also notice that the subgraph of G induced by the vertices $V(G')$, is a subgraph of G' . In particular, we have the following observation by construction: for every edge $\{x', y'\} \in E(G')$ there is an edge $\{x, y\} \in (E(G') \cap E(G))$ such that $x' \in L(x)$ and $y' \in L(y)$.

Claim 5.6. *For any x, y of $V(G')$ with $L(x) \subseteq L(y)$ on G , we have $N_{G'}(x) \supseteq N_{G'}(y)$.*

Proof: Since $L(x) \subseteq L(y)$, we have $x \in L(y)$ by $x \in L(x)$ and property (P1). Let z be a neighbor of y in G' . By the construction of G' , we know that $z \in L(w)$ for some vertex w of G' and $\{y, w\} \in E(G)$, so that $\{y, z\} \in E(L(y), L(w))$. As $x \in L(y)$, we have that $\{x, z\} \in E(L(y), L(w))$, which concludes the claim. \diamond

We now map the MULTI-VERTEX COVER problem on G to the VERTEX COVER problem on G' . Our goal is to prove the following: if S' is an α -approximate solution for VERTEX COVER on G' then there is a polynomial-time algorithm to construct an α -approximate solution S for MULTI-VERTEX COVER on G . Instead of looking at any solution, we consider the *minimal* ones. We claim that there is a minimal solution S for MULTI-VERTEX COVER if and only if there is a minimal solution S' for VERTEX COVER in G' and such a mapping between S and S' can be done in polynomial time.

Let S be a minimal solution for MULTI-VERTEX COVER. We show that $S' = S \cap V(G')$ is a minimal vertex cover for G' . We begin by showing that S' is a vertex cover for G' . Suppose that there is an edge $\{x', y'\}$ in G' such that $x', y' \notin S'$. Then, we know that there is an edge $\{x, y\} \in (E(G) \cap E(G'))$ such that $x' \in L(x)$ and $y' \in L(y)$. This means that x or y belongs to S , and, by the fact that $L(S) = S$, we have x' or y' belonging to S . Since x', y' are both vertices of G' , we conclude that S' contains at least one of them. Hence, S' is a vertex cover for G' .

Next, we show the minimality for S' . Let $x \in S \cap V(G')$. We show that there exists a vertex w in G' such that $w \notin S'$ with $\{x, w\} \in E(G')$. By construction, $x \in S$. Since S is minimal, we have two cases to consider. Assume that there is a vertex $y \notin S$ such that $\{x, y\} \in E(G)$. Then y is a vertex of G' , because for all vertices of $V(G) \setminus V(G')$ we know that they belong to S by [Observation 5.4](#). Thus $\{x, y\} \in E(G')$ by construction, which means that S' is minimal because $y \notin S'$ and $x \in S$. Assume that there is a vertex $y \in S$ such that $x \in L(y)$ and $\{y, z\} \in E(G)$ with $z \notin S$. Again, $z \notin S$ implies that $z \in V(G')$. Now if $y \notin V(G')$ then by property (P1) we have $x \notin V(G')$, which is not possible. Thus x, y, z are vertices of G' , which implies that $\{x, z\} \in E(G')$ by [Claim 5.6](#), since $x \in L(y)$. Therefore, S' is a minimal vertex cover for G' .

For the opposite direction, assume a minimal vertex cover S' for G' . We show that $S = S' \cup \{z \mid z \in L(x) \cap L(y) \text{ with } \{x, y\} \in E(G)\}$ is a minimal solution of MULTI-VERTEX COVER. By [Observation 5.4](#), all vertices of $L(x) \cap L(y)$ with $\{x, y\} \in E(G)$ belong to S . Since S' is a minimal vertex cover for G' , there exists a vertex $x' \in S'$ and a vertex $y' \notin S'$ for some edge $\{x', y'\} \in G'$. By the discussion above, we know that there is an edge $\{x, y\} \in (E(G') \cap E(G))$ such that $x' \in L(x)$ and $y' \in L(y)$. We show that $x \in S$. To see this, observe that there is the edge $\{x, y'\} \in E(G')$ by construction. Since $y' \notin S'$ and S' is a vertex cover, we conclude that $x \in S'$ which implies that $x \in S$. We further show that $y \notin S'$. If $y \in S'$, there is an edge $\{y, z\} \in E(G')$ such that $z \notin S'$ because S' is minimal. Since $y' \in L(y)$, we have $\{y', z\} \in E(G')$. However, $y', z \notin S'$ leads to a contradiction, since S' is a vertex cover for G' . Hence, $y \notin S'$ which means that $y \notin S$. To conclude, for any edge $\{x, y\}$ of $E(G)$, we have $x \in S$ and $y \notin S$, or $x \in S$ and there is a vertex $x' \in S$ such that $x \in L(x')$ and $\{x', y\} \in E(G)$ with $y \notin S$. This is exactly the definition of the minimal solution and we conclude that S' is indeed a minimal solution for MULTI-VERTEX COVER.

It is known that there is a 2-approximation algorithm for VERTEX COVER [53]. Let S^* be a 2-approximate solution for VERTEX COVER on G' . We turn S^* into a minimal vertex cover S' on G' by removing from S^* all unnecessary vertices (that is, vertices v with $N_{G'}(v) \subseteq S'$) and construct S' in polynomial time. Since $S' \subseteq S^*$, the approximation ratio remains the same for S' . From a 2-approximate solution S' for VERTEX COVER on G' , we can compute a 2-approximate solution S for MULTI-VERTEX COVER on G by setting $S = S' \cup \{z \mid z \in L(x) \cap L(y) \text{ with } \{x, y\} \in E(G)\}$. Correctness follows from the previous discussion. Therefore, MULTI-VERTEX COVER can be 2-approximated in polynomial time. \square

Now, we are ready to give the claimed constant-factor approximation algorithm for HEDGE CLUSTER DELETION on bi-hedge graphs.

Theorem 5.7. *There is a polynomial-time 2-approximation algorithm for HEDGE CLUSTER DELETION on bi-hedge graphs.*

Proof. Let H be the given hedge graph. We show how to compute an α -approximate solution U for HEDGE CLUSTER DELETION on H with $\alpha = 2$ by using an α -approximation algorithm for VERTEX COVER². We begin by computing the hedges Z that span internal P_3 . By [Observation 2.4](#), we know that all hedges of Z belong to any solution. Given the instance $(H \setminus Z, k)$ for HEDGE CLUSTER DELETION, we construct an equivalent instance (G, \mathcal{L}, k) for MULTI-VERTEX COVER by [Lemma 5.3](#) in polynomial time. Moreover, by [Lemma 5.5](#) we compute a minimal solution S for MULTI-VERTEX COVER on (G, \mathcal{L}, k) . Then, we use the solution S of MULTI-VERTEX COVER to compute an equivalent solution U for HEDGE CLUSTER DELETION. Since the solution S for MULTI-VERTEX COVER is an α -approximate solution, the solution U for HEDGE CLUSTER DELETION on $(H \setminus Z, k)$ is also an α -approximate solution by [Lemma 5.3](#). Therefore, $U \cup Z$ is an α -approximate solution for HEDGE CLUSTER DELETION on H . \square

6 Acyclic hedge intersection graph

Here we consider the natural underlying structure formed by the hedges that we call *hedge intersection graph* intended to represent the pattern of intersections among the hedges. Our main result is a polynomial-time algorithm whenever the hedge intersection graph is acyclic.

Let $H = (V, \mathcal{E})$ be a hedge graph. The *hedge intersection graph* of H is denoted by \mathcal{F} and defined as a simple graph with the following sets of vertices and edges: $V(\mathcal{F}) = \mathcal{E}$ and two vertices (that correspond to the hedges of H) E_i and E_j of \mathcal{F} are adjacent if $i \neq j$ and there are two edges e_i, e_j in $E(H)$ that have a common endpoint such that $e_i \in E_i$ and $e_j \in E_j$. We note that \mathcal{F} can be constructed in polynomial time. Here we consider hedge graphs H for which \mathcal{F} is acyclic. The underlying graph on the right side in [Figure 3](#) is the hedge intersection graph of the considered hedge graph which happens to be in this case acyclic.

In our algorithm we consider mainly the hedge intersection graph \mathcal{F} of a hedge graph H . We refer to the elements of $V(\mathcal{F})$ and $E(\mathcal{F})$, as vertices (that correspond to the hedges $\mathcal{E}(H)$) and edges. For a vertex $x \in V(\mathcal{F})$, we refer to E_x as the corresponding hedge of $\mathcal{E}(H)$. By definition, an edge $\{x, y\}$ of \mathcal{F} is characterized as follows: there are edges $\{u, v\} \in E_x$ and $\{v, w\} \in E_y$ in H . This means that there is either a P_3 in H or a K_3 whenever $\{u, w\}$ belongs to a hedge of H . In the latter, observe that every triangle of the underlying graph contains at most two hedges, because \mathcal{F} is acyclic. Thus, $\{u, w\} \in (E_x \cup E_y)$.

²We use α to denote that any α -approximation algorithm for VERTEX COVER results in an α -approximation algorithm for our problem, as well. We state our results for $\alpha = 2$, though it is known that VERTEX COVER can be approximated within factor $\alpha \leq 2$ [39, 53].

Moreover, we notice that [Lemma 5.1](#) still applies, since \mathcal{F} is acyclic. We say that two hedges x and y *span a P_3* if there are edges $\{a, b\} \in E_x$ and $\{b, c\} \in E_y$ such that $\{a, c\} \notin E(H)$. Similarly, we say that two hedges x and y *span a K_3* if there are edges $\{a, b\} \in E_x$ and $\{b, c\} \in E_y$ such that $\{a, c\} \in (E_x \cup E_y)$.

Next we consider the edges of $E(\mathcal{F})$. An edge $\{x, y\}$ of \mathcal{F} belongs to exactly one of the following sets:

- E_P : E_x and E_y span a P_3 in H but there is no K_3 spanned by edges of E_x and E_y .
- E_Δ : E_x and E_y span a K_3 in H but there is no P_3 spanned by edges of E_x and E_y .
- $E_{P,\Delta}$: E_x and E_y span both a P_3 and a K_3 in H .

We now borrow the notation given in [Section 5](#). For any edge $\{x, y\}$ of E_Δ or $E_{P,\Delta}$, we know that $y \in D(x)$ or $x \in D(y)$ because there is a triangle with edges only of $E_x \cup E_y$. A vertex x of \mathcal{F} is called *mixed vertex* if x is incident to an edge $\{x, y\}$ of $E_{P,\Delta}$ such that $x \in D(y)$. In what follows, to avoid repeating ourselves we let U be a solution for HEDGE CLUSTER DELETION on a hedge graph H that admits an acyclic hedge intersection graph \mathcal{F} .

Lemma 6.1. *Let Z be the set of hedges that span an internal P_3 in H and let $X_{P,\Delta}$ be the set of all mixed vertices of \mathcal{F} . Then, $Z \cup X_{P,\Delta} \subseteq U$.*

Proof. By [Observation 2.4](#), we know that $Z \subseteq U$. We now show that any mixed vertex x belongs to U . Let $\{x, y\}$ be the edge of $E_{P,\Delta}$ incident to x . Since there is a P_3 spanned by edges of $E_x \cup E_y$, we know that x or y or both belong to U . Assume that $y \in U$. Then, we show that $x \in U$. To see this, assume for contradiction that $x \notin U$. Observe that $x \in D(y)$ implies that there is a K_3 with two of its edges in E_x and the other edge in E_y . Since $y \in U$ and $x \notin U$, we have an internal P_3 spanned by edges only of E_x . Therefore we conclude that $x \in U$. \square

According to [Lemma 6.1](#), we can safely remove the vertices of $Z \cup X_{P,\Delta}$ and consider the remaining graph. Let $F_1 = \mathcal{F} - (Z \cup X_{P,\Delta})$. As F_1 is an induced subgraph of \mathcal{F} , we know that F_1 remains acyclic. Moreover observe that the edges of F_1 are partitioned into the sets E_P and E_Δ . Since $Z \cup X_{P,\Delta}$ are hedges of H , $H' = H \setminus (Z \cup X_{P,\Delta})$ is a hedge-subgraph of H .

We partition the vertices of F_1 as follows. Let V_1, \dots, V_q be the vertices of the connected components of $F_1 \setminus E_P$. Each V_i is called a *component* of F_1 .

Lemma 6.2. *Between two components of F_1 there is at most one edge.*

Proof. Let V_i, V_j be two components of F_1 . If there is an edge incident to a vertex $x \in V_i$ and $y \in V_j$ then $\{x, y\} \in E_P$, because (E_P, E_Δ) is a partition of the edges of F_1 and V_i, V_j are different connected components of $F_1 \setminus E_P$. Now observe that two edges $\{x, y\}, \{x', y'\}$ between V_i, V_j with $x, x' \in V_i$ and $y, y' \in V_j$ would result in a cycle in F_1 , since there is a path of E_Δ edges between x and x' and, similarly, there is a path of E_Δ edges between y and y' . Therefore, there is at most one edge between two components of F_1 . \square

We denote by $R_{H'}(x)$ all hedges that dominate x in H' .

Lemma 6.3. *For any vertex x in F_1 such that $x \in V_i$, we have $R_{H'}(x) \subseteq V_i$.*

Proof. Recall that all edges of F_1 are characterized as either in E_P or in E_Δ and all vertices of the same component have a path with edges only from E_Δ . We show that all hedges of $R_{H'}(x)$ are connected by edges of E_Δ . If a vertex y dominates x , then there is a sequence

of vertices $\langle y = h_1, \dots, h_p = x \rangle$ with $p \geq 1$ such that $h_i \in D(h_{i+1})$, for all $1 \leq i < p$. For any $h_i \in D(h_{i+1})$ we have that h_i, h_{i+1} belong to same triangle K_3 of H' . This means that there is an edge of E_Δ with endpoints in h_i and h_{i+1} . Thus all vertices of the sequence have a path with edges only from E_Δ which implies that all vertices that dominate x belong to the same component with x . \square

Now let us construct a graph F_2 from F_1 as follows:

- Remove all edges that have both endpoints in the same component. Notice that such edges constitute the set E_Δ in F_1 .
- For each edge $\{x, y\} \in E_P$ such that $x \in V_i$ and $y \in V_j$, add all edges $E(R_{H'}(x), R_{H'}(y))$.

Observe that for any two vertices x, y of the same component of F_1 it is not necessarily that $x \in R_{H'}(y)$ or $y \in R_{H'}(x)$. However, the following result holds for vertices that are in a domination relation.

Lemma 6.4. *All vertices of the same component form an independent set in F_2 . Moreover, for any two vertices x, y of the same component of F_2 such that $x \in R_{H'}(y)$, we have $N_{F_2}(y) \subseteq N_{F_2}(x)$.*

Proof. By definition, there is no edge of E_P that has both endpoints in the same component. Thus, by Lemma 6.3 and the fact that the components form a partition of the vertices, all the vertices of the same component form an independent set in F_2 . For the second statement, observe that for any edge $\{a, b\}$ of F_2 , the vertices a and b belong to different components. To justify that $N_{F_2}(y) \subseteq N_{F_2}(x)$, we show that any neighbor z of y is a neighbor of x . Let V_i and V_j be the components of y and z , respectively. Now observe that $\{y, z\} \in E(R_{H'}(y'), R_{H'}(z'))$, because there are vertices $y' \in V_i$ (not necessarily, $y' \neq y$) and $z' \in V_j$ (not necessarily, $z' \neq z$) such that $y \in R_{H'}(y')$ and $z \in R_{H'}(z')$. By Lemma 5.1 (i), we have $R_{H'}(y) \subseteq R_{H'}(y')$. Since $x \in R_{H'}(y)$, we have $x \in V_i$ by Lemma 6.3 and $\{x, z\} \in E(R_{H'}(y'), R_{H'}(z'))$. Therefore, z is a neighbor of x , as required. \square

The connection between the constructed graph F_2 and the hedge graph H is given in the following result. We note that a vertex cover of F_2 that is not minimal does not necessarily correspond to a cluster hedge-subgraph of H' .

Lemma 6.5. *For any minimal solution U' for HEDGE CLUSTER DELETION on H' , there is a minimal vertex cover S of F_2 such that $S = U'$. Conversely, for any minimal vertex cover S of F_2 there is a minimal solution U' for HEDGE CLUSTER DELETION on H' such that $U' = S$.*

Proof. By construction, note that the hedges of H' are in 1-to-1 correspondence with the vertices of F_2 . Also observe that for any edge $\{x, y\}$ of F_2 we have the following:

- $x \in V_i, y \in V_j$ (all edges are between components) and
- there are vertices $x' \in V_i, y' \in V_j$ such that there is an edge $\{x', y'\} \in E_P$ in F_1 and $x \in R_{H'}(x'), y \in R_{H'}(y')$.

Notice that the vertices x', y' between the components V_i and V_j are unique, due to Lemma 6.2. Moreover, due to Lemma 6.1, there is no hedge in H' that spans an internal P_3 in H' .

Let U' be a minimal solution for HEDGE CLUSTER DELETION on H' . We show that $S = U'$ is a minimal vertex cover of F_2 . Assume, for contradiction, that there is an edge $\{x, y\}$ in F_2 such that $x, y \notin S$. By the previous properties on the edges of F_2 , we know that there are vertices $x' \in V_i, y' \in V_j$ such that there is an edge $\{x', y'\} \in E_P$ in F_1 and

$x \in R_{H'}(x'), y \in R_{H'}(y')$. Since $\{x', y'\} \in E_P$, $E_{x'}$ and $E_{y'}$ span a P_3 in H' . Thus x' or y' belong to U' , because $H' \setminus U'$ is a cluster hedge-subgraph. Without loss of generality, suppose that $x' \in U'$. By Lemma 5.1 (ii), we have $R_{H'}(x') \subseteq U'$. Then, however, we reach a contradiction to $x \in S$, since $x \in R_{H'}(x')$. Therefore, $S = U$ is a minimal vertex cover of F_2 .

Let S be a minimal vertex cover of F_2 . We show that $U' = S$ is a minimal solution for HEDGE CLUSTER DELETION on H' . Clearly, $H' \setminus U'$ is a hedge-subgraph of H' . To show that $H' \setminus U'$ is indeed a cluster hedge-subgraph, assume for contradiction that its underlying graph contains a $P_3 = a, b, c$ induced by the vertices a, b, c . Let E_x be a hedge of H' such that $\{a, b\} \in E_x$. Then $E_x \notin U'$.

Suppose that the P_3 is induced in H' . If $\{b, c\} \in E_x$ then E_x spans an internal P_3 which is not possible by Lemma 6.1. Thus $\{b, c\} \in E_y$ with $E_x \neq E_y$ and $E_y \notin U'$. This means that there is an edge $\{x, y\} \in E_P$, so that $\{x, y\}$ is an edge in F_2 , by construction. Since S is a minimal vertex cover of F_2 , we have $x \in S$ or $y \in S$ which contradicts the existence of the P_3 .

Next suppose that P_3 is induced in $H' \setminus U'$, but not induced in H' . This particularly means that $\{a, c\}$ being an edge in H' . Since $E_x \notin U'$, we have $\{a, c\} \in E_y$ with $E_y \in U'$. If $\{b, c\} \notin E_x$ then $\{b, c\} \in E_y$ because there is a triangle in H' and F_1 is acyclic. This, however, contradicts the fact that $E_y \in U'$. Thus $\{b, c\} \in E_x$. Now observe that E_x and E_y span a K_3 in H which implies that $\{x, y\}$ is an edge of E_Δ or $E_{P,\Delta}$. If $\{x, y\} \in E_{P,\Delta}$ then $x \in D(y)$, so that $x \in X_{P,\Delta}$. This, however, implies that x is not a vertex of F_2 due to Lemma 6.1. Thus $\{x, y\} \in E_\Delta$. In particular, x dominates y and both vertices belong to the same component of F_2 by Lemma 6.3. Since S is a minimal vertex cover and $y \in S$, there is a vertex $z \notin S$ such that $\{y, z\}$ is an edge of F_2 . Due to Lemma 6.4, there is an edge $\{x, z\}$ in F_2 . Then, however we reach a contradiction to the fact that S being a vertex cover of F_2 because $x, z \notin S$. Therefore, $U' = S$ is a minimal solution for HEDGE CLUSTER DELETION on H' . \square

In order to compute a minimum vertex cover of F_2 in polynomial time, we take advantage of the following.

Lemma 6.6. *The graph F_2 is bipartite.*

Proof. Since F_1 is an induced subgraph of an acyclic graph \mathcal{F} , F_1 is acyclic and, thus, bipartite. Let V_1, \dots, V_q be the components of F_1 and let F'_1 be the subgraph of F_1 that does not contain any edge between vertices of the same component V_i . Let (V_A, V_B) be a bipartition of the vertices of F'_1 where all vertices of the same component belong to V_A or V_B . That is, for any V_i , we have $V_i \subseteq V_A$ or $V_i \subseteq V_B$. This can be achieved by simply contracting each component into a single vertex, take any bipartition, and then uncontract the components. We claim that (V_A, V_B) is a bipartition of the vertices of F_2 . For this, observe that by Lemma 6.4 all vertices of V_i form an independent set and for any vertex $x \in V_i$ we have $R_{H'}(x) \subseteq V_i$ by Lemma 6.3. Thus all edges of F_2 do not have endpoints in the same component V_i . Moreover, by the construction of F_2 , whenever there are edges incident to vertices of $E(R_{H'}(x), R_{H'}(y))$, we know that $x \in V_i, y \in V_j$ such that $\{x, y\} \in E_P$. Thus, $V_i \in V_A$ and $V_j \in V_B$ or $V_j \in V_A$ and $V_i \in V_B$, since all edges of E_P belong to F'_1 . Therefore, F_2 admits a bipartition (V_A, V_B) of its vertices. \square

Now we are ready to obtain our main result of this section, namely a polynomial-time algorithm for HEDGE CLUSTER DELETION whenever the hedge intersection graph is acyclic.

Theorem 6.7. *Let H be a hedge graph that admits an acyclic hedge intersection graph. Then, there is a polynomial-time algorithm for HEDGE CLUSTER DELETION on H .*

Algorithm 1 A minimum set of hedges for the HEDGE CLUSTER DELETION problem

Input: a hedge graph H that admits an acyclic hedge intersection graph

Output: a minimum set of hedges U of H s.t. $H \setminus U$ is a cluster hedge-subgraph

- 1: Compute the hedge intersection graph \mathcal{F} of H
 - 2: Partition the edges of \mathcal{F} into the three sets: $E_P, E_\Delta, E_{P,\Delta}$
 - 3: Apply [Lemma 5.2](#) to compute $R(x)$ for any hedge x of H
 - 4: Let Z be the hedges that span internal P_3 in H
 - 5: Let $X_{P,\Delta}$ be the mixed vertices of \mathcal{F}
 - 6: Compute the graph $H' = H \setminus (Z \cup X_{P,\Delta})$ and update accordingly $R(x)$
 - 7: Compute the components V_1, \dots, V_q of $F_1 = \mathcal{F} - (Z \cup X_{P,\Delta})$
 - 8: Construct the graph F_2 from F_1 as follows:
 - 9: remove all edges $\{x, y\}$ with $x, y \in V_i$
 - 10: for each edge $\{x, y\} \in E_P$ with $x \in V_i$ and $y \in V_j$, add all edges $E(R_{H'}(x), R_{H'}(y))$
 - 11: Let U' be a minimum vertex cover of F_2
 - 12: **Return** $U = Z \cup X_{P,\Delta} \cup U'$
-

Proof. We describe the steps in [Algorithm 1](#). Given H , we begin by computing the hedge intersection graph \mathcal{F} in $O(\ell m + n)$ time, where ℓ, m, n stand for the number of hedges, edges, and vertices, respectively. We also enumerate all P_3 and K_3 of the underlying graph in $O(n^3)$ time. Having the enumerated subgraphs, we characterize each edge of \mathcal{F} as E_P, E_Δ , or $E_{P,\Delta}$. For the domination relation between the hedges, we can compute $R(x)$ in polynomial time by [Lemma 5.2](#).

We collect all hedges that span an internal P_3 and all mixed vertices that correspond to $Z \cup X_{P,\Delta}$. We compute the graph F_2 in $O(\ell^2)$ time and then compute a minimum vertex cover U' of F_2 in polynomial time [[48, 49](#)], since F_2 is a bipartite graph by [Lemma 6.6](#). We finally return the set $U' \cup Z \cup X_{P,\Delta}$. Correctness follows from [Lemmas 6.1](#) and [6.5](#). Therefore, all steps can be carried out in polynomial time. \square

7 Concluding remarks

In this paper, we introduced the HEDGE CLUSTER DELETION problem. Our analysis for the complexity of the problem reveals that in almost every non-trivial underlying structure of a hedge graph the problem remains difficult. Aiming towards a $\text{poly}(\text{OPT})$ -approximation, we showed that the problem is MIN HORN DELETION-complete. From the parameterized perspective, we showed that the variant of the problem parameterized by the solution size does not admit polynomial kernel under reasonable hierarchy assumptions. On the positive side, we studied the hedge intersection graph. We have proposed a constant factor approximation algorithm whenever at most two hedges appear in any triangle. Moreover, for any acyclic hedge intersection graph we have given a polynomial-time algorithm. We believe that our results reveal an interesting path for future work on hedge optimization problems.

We conclude with some additional remarks and open problems related to our results. It is an open problem whether any MIN HORN DELETION-complete problem is actually poly-APX-complete [[41, 8](#)]. The MIN HORN DELETION-completeness of HEDGE CLUSTER DELETION adds a natural deletion problem into the class of such unclassified problems. Moreover, interesting connections arise with respect to parameterized complexity. We are not sure whether the parameterized variant of *every* MIN HORN DELETION-complete problem does not admit a polynomial kernel (under the assumption $\text{NP} \not\subseteq \text{coNP/poly}$). Towards such a direction, one may need to turn the A -reduction into a ppt-reduction that preserves the approximation guarantee into a polynomial-size kernel. However, we are able to show that the

optimization variant of PROPAGATIONAL- f SATISFIABILITY is indeed MIN HORN DELETION-complete. We are not aware of any approach concerning the approximation complexity of PROPAGATIONAL- f SATISFIABILITY in terms of an optimal solution. Thus the following result interestingly settles a natural lower bound related to the approximation guarantee.

Theorem 7.1. PROPAGATIONAL- f SATISFIABILITY is MIN HORN DELETION-complete under A -reductions.

Proof. By Theorem 4.7, it is enough to show A -reductions from HEDGE CLUSTER DELETION to PROPAGATIONAL- f SATISFIABILITY and from PROPAGATIONAL- f SATISFIABILITY to HEDGE CLUSTER DELETION. The latter is given in the ppt-reduction of Theorem 4.12 with the propagational function $f = f_1$, which serves as an A -reduction as well. Note that the described reduction is a polynomial-time reduction, hence an A -reduction, from PROPAGATIONAL- f_1 SATISFIABILITY to HEDGE CLUSTER DELETION, as the sizes of the corresponding solutions are exactly the same. For the other direction, we employ a proof similar to Lemma 4.6.

In particular, we show that there is an A -reduction from HEDGE CLUSTER DELETION to PROPAGATIONAL- f' SATISFIABILITY, where $f'(x, y, z) = \neg x \vee y \vee z$. It is not difficult to see that f' is indeed a propagational function (see also [15]). Let H be a hedge graph given as an instance of HEDGE CLUSTER DELETION, where every connected component of H contains exactly three vertices by Lemma 2.5. We show how to construct a formula ϕ from H such that every clause of ϕ is of the form $f'(x, y, z)$. We correspond every hedge in H to exactly one Boolean variable in ϕ . For every P_3 or K_3 of H , we add a constant number of clauses in ϕ as explained below. Let X, Y, Z be the hedges that appear in each component.

- For every K_3 whose three edges belong to three distinct hedges X, Y, Z , we add three clauses $f'(x, y, z), f'(y, x, z), f'(z, x, y)$ in ϕ . It is not difficult to see that $f_1(x, y, z) = f'(x, y, z) \wedge f'(y, x, z) \wedge f'(z, x, y)$, where f_1 is the function defined in Section 4.2.
- For every K_3 where two of its edges belong to hedge X and the other edge belongs to Y , we add the clause $f'(y, x, 0)$ in ϕ . This can be translated as follows: whenever y is set to 1 it also enforces x to 1; otherwise, $y = 0$ and $f'(y, x, 0)$ is satisfied, regardless of the assignment for x .
- For every P_3 whose two edges belong to two distinct hedges X, Y , we add the clause $f'(1, x, y)$ in ϕ . This is justified by the fact that at least one of x or y must be set to 1.
- For every P_3 where both of its edges belong to the same hedge X , we add the clause $f'(1, 0, x)$ in ϕ . As explained in Observation 2.4, x must be set to 1.

Note that if there is a K_3 whose edges belong to a single hedge then we ignore such component. This completes the construction of ϕ which can be done in polynomial time. Similarly to the proof of Lemma 4.6, we conclude that for any subset U of hedges in H , $H \setminus U$ is a cluster hedge-subgraph if and only if the one-assignment on the corresponding Boolean variables of U satisfies ϕ . Therefore, the polynomial-time transformation serves as an A -reduction, as claimed. \square

Another interesting point for future work is to consider the sizes of the hedges (i.e., the number of edges in each hedge) instead of the total number of hedges, as a natural candidate for the objective of the problem. Then notice that within the corresponding extremities of the suggested objective the behavior is well-understood: if the number of edges in each hedge is large enough then the total number of hedges is rather small, which means that the problem can be solved efficiently; otherwise, if each hedge contains exactly one edge

then the problem coincides with CLUSTER DELETION. This naturally suggests to exploit the complexity with respect to the variety on the sizes of the hedges. Furthermore, intriguing questions related to the complexity of HEDGE CLUSTER DELETION arise when considering structural parameters of the hedge intersection graph such as treewidth or cliquewidth. Our algorithm on acyclic hedge intersection graphs can be seen as a first step towards such an approach.

References

- [1] Yousef M. Alhamdan and Alexander Kononov. Approximability and inapproximability for maximum k -edge-colored clustering problem. In *Computer Science – Theory and Applications*, pages 1–12, 2019. [3](#)
- [2] Yael Anava, Noa Avigdor-Elgrabli, and Iftah Gamzu. Improved theoretical and practical guarantees for chromatic correlation clustering. In *Proceedings of the 24th International Conference on World Wide Web, WWW 2015, Florence, Italy, May 18-22, 2015*, pages 55–65. ACM, 2015. [3](#)
- [3] E. Angel, E. Bampis, A. Kononov, D. Paparas, E. Pountourakis, and V. Zissimopoulos. Clustering on k -edge-colored graphs. *Discrete Applied Mathematics*, 211:15–22, 2016. [3](#)
- [4] N. R. Aravind, R. B. Sandeep, and Naveen Sivadasan. Dichotomy results on the hardness of h -free edge modification problems. *SIAM J. Discret. Math.*, 31(1):542–561, 2017. [2](#), [3](#)
- [5] N. Bansal, A. Blum, and S. Chawla. Correlation clustering. *Machine Learning*, 56:89–113, 2004. [2](#)
- [6] Tatiana Belova and Ivan Bliznets. Hardness of approximation for h -free edge modification problems: Towards a dichotomy. In *33rd International Symposium on Algorithms and Computation, ISAAC 2022, December 19-21, 2022, Seoul, Korea*, volume 248, pages 24:1–24:15, 2022. [2](#), [5](#), [6](#)
- [7] Amir Ben-Dor, Ron Shamir, and Zohar Yakhini. Clustering gene expression patterns. *J. Comput. Biol.*, 6:281–297, 1999. [2](#)
- [8] Ivan Bliznets, Marek Cygan, Pawel Komosa, and Michal Pilipczuk. Hardness of approximation for H -free edge modification problems. *ACM Trans. Comput. Theory*, 10(2):9:1–9:32, 2018. [2](#), [3](#), [5](#), [6](#), [17](#), [31](#)
- [9] H. L. Bodlaender, R. G. Downey, M. R. Fellows, and D. Hermelin. On problems without polynomial kernels. *J. Comput. Syst. Sci.*, 75(8):423–434, 2009. [9](#)
- [10] H. L. Bodlaender, B. M. P. Jansen, and S. Kratsch. Kernelization lower bounds by cross-composition. *SIAM J. Discrete Math.*, 28(1):277–305, 2014. [9](#)
- [11] Francesco Bonchi, Aristides Gionis, Francesco Gullo, Charalampos E. Tsourakakis, and Antti Ukkonen. Chromatic correlation clustering. *ACM Trans. Knowl. Discov. Data*, 9(4):34:1–34:24, 2015. [3](#)
- [12] F. Bonomo, G. Durán, A. Napoli, and M. Valencia-Pabon. A one-to-one correspondence between potential solutions of the cluster deletion problem and the minimum sum coloring problem, and its application to P_4 -sparse graphs. *Inf. Proc. Lett.*, 115:600–603, 2015. [3](#)

- [13] F. Bonomo, G. Durán, and M. Valencia-Pabon. Complexity of the cluster deletion problem on subclasses of chordal graphs. *Theor. Comp. Science*, 600:59–69, 2015. [3](#), [4](#)
- [14] L. Cai. Fixed-parameter tractability of graph modification problems for hereditary properties. *Inf. Process. Lett.*, 58:171–176, 1996. [2](#), [3](#)
- [15] Leizhen Cai and Yufei Cai. Incompressibility of h-free edge modification problems. *Algorithmica*, 71(3):731–757, 2015. [2](#), [3](#), [6](#), [20](#), [32](#)
- [16] Yixin Cao and Jianer Chen. Cluster editing: Kernelization based on edge cuts. *Algorithmica*, 64(1):152–169, 2012. [3](#), [4](#), [6](#)
- [17] Karthekeyan Chandrasekaran, Chandra Chekuri, Weihang Wang, and Weihao Zhu. Hedgegraph polymatroids. *CoRR*, abs/2510.25043, 2025. [3](#)
- [18] Karthekeyan Chandrasekaran, Chao Xu, and Xilin Yu. Hypergraph k -cut in randomized polynomial time. In *Proceedings of the Twenty-Ninth Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms, SODA 2018, New Orleans, LA, USA, January 7-10, 2018*, pages 1426–1438. SIAM, 2018. [2](#), [3](#)
- [19] M. Charikar, V. Guruswami, and A. Wirth. Clustering with qualitative information. In *Proceedings of FOCS 2003*, pages 524–533, 2003. [2](#), [3](#)
- [20] Marek Cygan, Fedor V. Fomin, Lukasz Kowalik, Daniel Lokshtanov, Dániel Marx, Marcin Pilipczuk, Michal Pilipczuk, and Saket Saurabh. *Parameterized Algorithms*. Springer, 2015. [9](#)
- [21] A. Dessmark, J. Jansson, A. Lingas, E.-M. Lundell, and M. Persson. On the approximability of maximum and minimum edge clique partition problems. *Int. J. Found. Comput. Sci.*, 18:217–226, 2007. [3](#)
- [22] Reinhard Diestel. *Graph Theory*. Springer Publishing Company, Incorporated, 5th edition, 2017. [8](#)
- [23] Rodney G. Downey and Michael R. Fellows. *Fundamentals of Parameterized Complexity*. Texts in Computer Science. Springer, 2013. [9](#)
- [24] Fedor V. Fomin, Petr A. Golovach, Tuukka Korhonen, Daniel Lokshtanov, and Saket Saurabh. Fixed-parameter tractability of hedge cut. In *Proceedings of the 2025 Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms, SODA 2025*, pages 1402–1411, 2025. [2](#), [3](#), [9](#)
- [25] Fedor V. Fomin, Petr A. Golovach, Tuukka Korhonen, Daniel Lokshtanov, and Giannos Stamoulis. Shortest cycles with monotone submodular costs. In *Proceedings of the 2023 ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms, SODA 2023*, pages 2214–2227, 2023. [2](#), [3](#), [9](#)
- [26] Fedor V. Fomin, Petr A. Golovach, Tuukka Korhonen, Daniel Lokshtanov, and Giannos Stamoulis. Shortest cycles with monotone submodular costs. *ACM Trans. Algorithms*, 20(1):2:1–2:16, 2024. [3](#)
- [27] Santo Fortunato. Community detection in graphs. *Physics Reports*, 486(3):75–174, 2010. [2](#)
- [28] Y. Gao, D. R. Hare, and J. Nastos. The cluster deletion problem for cographs. *Discrete Mathematics*, 313:2763–2771, 2013. [3](#), [4](#)

- [29] Mohsen Ghaffari, David R. Karger, and Debmalya Panigrahi. Random contractions and sampling for hypergraph and hedge connectivity. In *Proceedings of the Twenty-Eighth Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms, SODA 2017*, pages 1101–1114, 2017. [2](#), [3](#), [9](#)
- [30] Archontia C. Giannopoulou, Daniel Lokshantov, Saket Saurabh, and Ondrej Suchý. Tree deletion set has a polynomial kernel but no $\text{opt}^{o(1)}$ approximation. *SIAM J. Discret. Math.*, 30(3):1371–1384, 2016. [6](#)
- [31] Petr A. Golovach, Pinar Heggernes, Athanasios L. Konstantinidis, Paloma T. Lima, and Charis Papadopoulos. Parameterized aspects of strong subgraph closure. *Algorithmica*, 82(7):2006–2038, 2020. [3](#), [4](#)
- [32] Niels Grüttemeier and Christian Komusiewicz. On the relation of strong triadic closure and cluster deletion. *Algorithmica*, 82:853–880, 2020. [3](#)
- [33] Sylvain Guillemot, Frédéric Havet, Christophe Paul, and Anthony Perez. On the (non-)existence of polynomial kernels for P_l -free edge modification problems. *Algorithmica*, 65(4):900–926, 2013. [3](#), [4](#), [6](#)
- [34] P. Hansen and B. Jaumard. Cluster analysis and mathematical programming. *Math. Programming*, 79:191–215, 1997. [2](#)
- [35] J. Hartigan. *Clustering Algorithms*. Wiley, New York, 1975. [2](#)
- [36] Chính T. Hoàng, Marcin Kaminski, Joe Sawada, and R. Sritharan. Finding and listing induced paths and cycles. *Discret. Appl. Math.*, 161(4-5):633–641, 2013. [11](#)
- [37] Alon Itai and Michael Rodeh. Finding a minimum circuit in a graph. *SIAM J. Comput.*, 7(4):413–423, 1978. [11](#)
- [38] Lars Jaffke, Paloma T. Lima, Tomáš Masarík, Marcin Pilipczuk, and Uéverton S. Souza. A tight quasi-polynomial bound for global label min-cut. In *Proceedings of the 2023 ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms, SODA 2023, Florence, Italy, January 22-25, 2023*, pages 290–303. SIAM, 2023. [2](#), [3](#)
- [39] George Karakostas. A better approximation ratio for the vertex cover problem. *ACM Trans. Algorithms*, 5(4):41:1–41:8, 2009. [7](#), [27](#)
- [40] Leon Kellerhals, Tomohiro Koana, Pascal Kunz, and Rolf Niedermeier. Parameterized algorithms for colored clustering. *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, 37(4):4400–4408, Jun. 2023. [3](#)
- [41] Sanjeev Khanna, Madhu Sudan, Luca Trevisan, and David P. Williamson. The approximability of constraint satisfaction problems. *SIAM J. Comput.*, 30(6):1863–1920, 2001. [5](#), [6](#), [16](#), [31](#)
- [42] David G. Kirkpatrick and Pavol Hell. On the complexity of general graph factor problems. *SIAM J. Comput.*, 12(3):601–609, 1983. [13](#)
- [43] Nicolas Klodt, Lars Seifert, Arthur Zahn, Katrin Casel, Davis Issac, and Tobias Friedrich. A color-blind 3-approximation for chromatic correlation clustering and improved heuristics. In *Proceedings of the 27th ACM SIGKDD Conference on Knowledge Discovery & Data Mining, KDD '21*, page 882–891, New York, NY, USA, 2021. [3](#)

- [44] C. Komusiewicz and J. Uhlmann. Cluster editing with locally bounded modifications. *Discrete Applied Mathematics*, 160:2259–2270, 2012. [3](#), [4](#), [6](#)
- [45] Athanasios L. Konstantinidis and Charis Papadopoulos. Cluster deletion on interval graphs and split related graphs. *Algorithmica*, 83(7):2018–2046, 2021. [3](#), [4](#)
- [46] Stefan Kratsch and Magnus Wahlström. Two edge modification problems without polynomial kernels. *Discret. Optim.*, 10(3):193–199, 2013. [2](#), [20](#)
- [47] Chuan Lin, Young-Rae Cho, Woo-Chang Hwang, Pengjun Pei, and Aidong Zhang. *Clustering Methods in a Protein–Protein Interaction Network*, chapter 16, pages 319–355. John Wiley & Sons, Ltd, 2007. [2](#)
- [48] Silvio Micali and Vijay V. Vazirani. An $O(\sqrt{|V|} |E|)$ algorithm for finding maximum matching in general graphs. In *21st Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science, Syracuse, New York, USA, 13-15 October 1980*, pages 17–27. IEEE Computer Society, 1980. [8](#), [31](#)
- [49] James B. Orlin. Max flows in $O(nm)$ time, or better. In *Proceedings of the Forty-Fifth Annual ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing, STOC '13*, page 765–774, 2013. [8](#), [31](#)
- [50] Gregory J. Puleo and Olga Milenkovic. Correlation clustering with constrained cluster sizes and extended weights bounds. *SIAM Journal on Optimization*, 25(3):1857–1872, 2015. [3](#)
- [51] S. E. Schaeffer. Graph clustering. *Computer Science Review*, 1(1):27–64, 2007. [2](#)
- [52] R. Shamir, R. Sharan, and D. Tsur. Cluster graph modification problems. *Discrete Applied Mathematics*, 144:173–182, 2004. [3](#)
- [53] Vijay V Vazirani. *Approximation algorithms*, volume 1. Springer, 2001. [7](#), [27](#)
- [54] Nate Veldt. Correlation clustering via strong triadic closure labeling: Fast approximation algorithms and practical lower bounds. In *Proceedings of the 39th International Conference on Machine Learning*, volume 162, pages 22060–22083, 2022. [3](#)
- [55] Nate Veldt, David F. Gleich, and Anthony Wirth. A correlation clustering framework for community detection. In *Proceedings of the 2018 World Wide Web Conference on World Wide Web, WWW 2018*, pages 439–448, 2018. [3](#), [4](#)