

Fixed-Parameter Complexity of Minimum Profile Problems

Gregory Gutin*

Stefan Szeider†

Anders Yeo‡

Abstract

Let $G = (V, E)$ be a graph. An ordering of G is a bijection $\alpha : V \rightarrow \{1, 2, \dots, |V|\}$. For a vertex v in G , its closed neighborhood is $N[v] = \{u \in V : uv \in E\} \cup \{v\}$. The profile of an ordering α of G is $\text{prf}_\alpha(G) = \sum_{v \in V} (\alpha(v) - \min\{\alpha(u) : u \in N[v]\})$. The profile $\text{prf}(G)$ of G is the minimum of $\text{prf}_\alpha(G)$ over all orderings α of G . It is well-known that $\text{prf}(G)$ is the minimum number of edges in an interval graph H that contains G as a subgraph. Since $|V| - 1$ is a tight lower bound for the profile of connected graphs $G = (V, E)$, the parametrization above the guaranteed value $|V| - 1$ is of particular interest. We show that deciding whether the profile of a connected graph $G = (V, E)$ is at most $|V| - 1 + k$ is fixed-parameter tractable with respect to the parameter k . We achieve this result by reduction to a problem kernel of linear size.

1 Introduction

A parameterized problem Π can be considered as a set of pairs (I, k) where I is the *problem instance* and k (usually an integer) is the *parameter*. Π is called *fixed-parameter tractable (FPT)* if membership of (I, k) in Π can be decided in time $O(f(k)|I|^c)$, where $|I|$ is the size of I , $f(k)$ is a computable function, and c is a constant independent from k and I .

Let $G = (V, E)$ be a graph. An *ordering* of G is a bijection $\alpha : V \rightarrow \{1, 2, \dots, |V|\}$. We denote the set of orderings of G by $\text{OR}(G)$. For a vertex v in G , its *neighborhood* is $N(v) = \{u \in V : uv \in E\}$ and its *closed neighborhood* is $N[v] = N(v) \cup \{v\}$. The *profile of a vertex* z of G in an ordering α of G is $\text{prf}_\alpha(G, z) = \alpha(z) - \min\{\alpha(w) : w \in N[z]\}$. The *profile of a set* $Z \subseteq V$ in an ordering α of G is $\text{prf}_\alpha(G, Z) = \sum_{z \in Z} \text{prf}_\alpha(G, z)$. The *profile of an ordering* α of G is $\text{prf}_\alpha(G) = \text{prf}_\alpha(G, V)$. An ordering α of G is *optimal* if $\text{prf}_\alpha(G) = \min\{\text{prf}_\beta(G) : \beta \in \text{OR}(G)\}$. If α is optimal, then $\text{prf}(G) = \text{prf}_\alpha(G)$ is called the *profile* of G .

In [4] Fomin and Golovach established equivalence of $\text{prf}(G)$ to other parameters including one important in graph searching. Further areas of application of the profile and equivalent parameters include computational biology [2, 6], archaeology [9] and clone fingerprinting [8]. The following is a well-known NP-complete problem [3, 10].

*Corresponding author. Department of Computer Science, Royal Holloway University of London, Egham, Surrey TW20 0EX, UK, gutin@cs.rhul.ac.uk and Department of Computer Science, University of Haifa, Israel

†Department of Computer Science, Durham University Science Labs, South Road, Durham DH1 3LE, UK, stefan.szeider@durham.ac.uk

‡Department of Computer Science, Royal Holloway University of London, Egham, Surrey TW20 0EX, UK, anders@cs.rhul.ac.uk

Minimum Profile Problem (MPP)*Instance:* A graph $G = (V, E)$ and a positive integer k .*Question:* Does G have an ordering of profile $\leq k$?

In fact this problem is equivalent to the following problem that have been proved to be NP-complete even earlier (see [5]). A graph $G = (V, E)$ is *interval* if we can associate each vertex $v \in V$ with a closed interval I_v in the real line such that two distinct vertices x and y are adjacent in G if and only if $I_x \cap I_y \neq \emptyset$.

Interval Graph Completion (IGC)*Instance:* A graph $G = (V, E)$ and a positive integer $k \geq |E|$.*Question:* Is there a supergraph G' of G such that G' is an interval graph and it contains at most k edges?

The equivalence between MPP and IGC follows from the next result:

Theorem 1.1 [1] *For any graph G $\text{prf}(G)$ equals the smallest number of edges in an interval supergraph of G .*

Thus, for every graph G , $\text{prf}(E(G)) \geq |E|$. Hence, the following parameterized problem is FPT.

Profile Problem (PP)*Instance:* A graph $G = (V, E)$. *Parameter:* A positive integer k .*Question:* Does G have an ordering of profile $\leq k$?

Several authors consider the following much more interesting and problem; in fact, it is unknown whether the problem is FPT (private communications with L. Cai, F. Fomin and H. Kaplan).

Profile Above Guaranteed Value (PAGV)*Instance:* A graph $G = (V, E)$. *Parameter:* A positive integer k .*Question:* Does G have an ordering of profile $\leq |E| + k$?

Unfortunately, we are not able to determine the complexity of this problem. In this paper, we consider a somewhat weaker version of MPAGV. We restrict ourselves to connected graphs (the case of general graphs can be reduced to connected graphs). Since $|E| \geq |V| - 1$ for a connected graph $G = (V, E)$, consider the following:

Profile Above Vertex Guaranteed Value (PAVGV)*Instance:* A connected graph $G = (V, E)$. *Parameter:* A positive integer k .*Question:* Does G have an ordering of profile $\leq |V| - 1 + k$?

This problem is of interest also because of Problem VAP by Serna and Thilikos [11] (see Section 5). We will prove by means of a kernelization scheme that the problem PAVGV is fixed-parameter tractable.

2 Preliminary Results

Let $G = (V, E)$ be a graph. If $X \subseteq V$ and α is an ordering of G , then let α_X denote the ordering of $G - X$ in which $\alpha_X(u) < \alpha_X(v)$ if and only if $\alpha(u) < \alpha(v)$ for all $u, v \in V(G) - X$. If $X = \{x\}$, then we simply write α_x instead of $\alpha_{\{x\}}$.

Lemma 2.1 *Let $G = (V, E)$ be a graph of order n and let X be a set of vertices such that $G - X$ is connected. If an optimal ordering α has $\{\alpha^{-1}(1), \alpha^{-1}(n)\} \subseteq V(G - X)$ then $\text{prf}_\alpha(G, V - X) \geq \text{prf}_{\alpha_X}(G - X) + |X|$.*

Proof: Let $X = \{x_1, x_2, \dots, x_r\}$ and define $X_i = \{x_1, x_2, \dots, x_i\}$ for all $0 \leq i \leq r$. We will by induction show the following: (*) $\text{prf}_{\alpha_{X_i}}(G - X_i, V - X) \geq \text{prf}_{\alpha_X}(G - X) + |X| - i$. The above is clearly true when $i = r$ as $X_r = X$ and $|X| = r$. If we can show that (*) is true for $i = 0$, then we are done. We will assume that (*) is true for some $i > 0$.

Since $G - X$ is connected and $\{\alpha^{-1}(1), \alpha^{-1}(n)\} \subseteq V(G - X)$, there is an edge $uv \in E(G - X)$ such that $\alpha_{X_{i-1}}(u) > \alpha_{X_{i-1}}(x_i) > \alpha_{X_{i-1}}(v)$. This implies that the profile of u is one larger in $\alpha_{X_{i-1}}$ than it is in α_{X_i} . This implies the following:

$$\text{prf}_{\alpha_{X_{i-1}}}(G - X_{i-1}, G - X) \geq \text{prf}_{\alpha_{X_i}}(G - X_i, G - X) + 1 \geq \text{prf}_{\alpha_X}(G - X) + |X| - i + 1.$$

We are now done by induction. □

Lemma 2.2 [10] (i) *If G is a connected graph with n vertices, then $\text{prf}(G) \geq n - 1$.*

(ii) *Let C_n denote a cycle with n vertices. Then $\text{prf}(C_n) = 2n - 3$.*

For a vertex x , $d(x)$ denotes its degree, i.e., $d(x) = |N(x)|$. A slightly weaker version of the following lemma is stated in [10] without a proof.

Lemma 2.3 *If G is an arbitrary graph of order n , $x \in V(G)$ and α is an optimal ordering of G , then $\text{prf}_\alpha(G) \geq \text{prf}_{\alpha_x}(G - x) + d(x)$.*

Proof: Let α be an optimal ordering of G and let $X = \{\alpha^{-1}(1), \alpha^{-1}(2), \dots, \alpha^{-1}(\alpha(x) - 1)\}$. Note that for all $a \in N(x) - X$ we have $\text{prf}_\alpha(G, a) \geq \text{prf}_{\alpha_x}(G - x, a) + 1$. Furthermore, $\text{prf}_\alpha(G, x) \geq |N(x) \cap X|$. Thus,

$$\begin{aligned} \text{prf}_\alpha(G) - \text{prf}_{\alpha_x}(G - x) &\geq \text{prf}_\alpha(G, x) + \sum_{a \in N(x) - X} (\text{prf}_\alpha(G, a) - \text{prf}_{\alpha_x}(G - x, a)) \\ &\geq |N(x) \cap X| + |N(x) - X| = d(x) \end{aligned}$$

Hence, $\text{prf}_\alpha(G) \geq \text{prf}_{\alpha_x}(G - x) + d(x)$. □

Theorem 2.5 gives a lower bound of the profile of a 2-edge-connected graph, which is important for our FPT algorithm. Lin and Yuan [10] used a concise and elegant argument to show that $\text{prf}(G) \geq k(2n - k - 1)/2$ for every k -connected graph G of order n . Their argument uses Menger's Theorem in a clever way, yet the argument cannot be used to prove our bound. Instead of Menger's Theorem we will apply the following well-known decomposition of 2-edge-connected graphs (see, e.g., Theorem 4.2.10 in [12]) called a *closed-ear decomposition*.

Theorem 2.4 *Any 2-edge-connected graph G has a partition of its edges E_1, E_2, \dots, E_r , such that $G_i = G[E_1 \cup E_2 \cup \dots \cup E_i]$ is 2-edge-connected for all $i = 1, 2, 3, \dots, r$. Furthermore, E_j induces either a path with its endpoints in $V(G_{j-1})$ but all other vertices in $V(G_j) - V(G_{j-1})$ or a cycle with one vertex in $V(G_{j-1})$ but all other vertices in $V(G_j) - V(G_{j-1})$ for every $j = 2, 3, \dots, r$. Moreover, G_1 is a cycle and every cycle of G can be G_1 .*

Theorem 2.5 *If G is a 2-edge-connected graph of order n , then $\text{prf}(G) \geq \frac{3n-3}{2}$.*

Proof: Let α be an optimal ordering of $V(G)$ and let y be the vertex with $\alpha(y) = n$. Since G is 2-edge-connected, y is contained in a cycle C . By Theorem 2.4, G has an ear-decomposition E_1, E_2, \dots, E_r such that $G[E_1] = C$. Let $G_i = G[E_1 \cup E_2 \cup \dots \cup E_i]$, which by Theorem 2.4 are 2-edge-connected for all $i = 1, 2, \dots, r$. We will prove this theorem by induction. If $r = 1$ then the Theorem holds by Lemma 2.2 (ii), as $n \geq 3$. So assume that $r \geq 2$. Let $n_i = |V(G_i)|$ for all $i = 1, 2, \dots, r$ and note that by induction we know that $\text{prf}(G_{r-1}) \geq \frac{3n_{r-1}-3}{2}$. If $n_r = n_{r-1}$ then E_r is just one edge and we are done as $\text{prf}(G_r) \geq \text{prf}(G_{r-1})$. So assume that $a = n_r - n_{r-1} > 0$. If $a = 1$ and $V(G_r) - V(G_{r-1}) = \{x\}$, then by Lemma 2.3 we obtain the following:

$$\text{prf}(G) \geq \text{prf}(G_{r-1}) + d(x) \geq \frac{3n_{r-1}-3}{2} + 2 > \frac{3n-3}{2}.$$

So we may assume that $a \geq 2$. Let P be the path $G_r - V(G_{r-1})$, let x and z be the endpoints of P such that $\alpha(x) < \alpha(z)$, and let u be the neighbor of x in G_{r-1} . Let $j = \min\{\alpha(q) : q \in V(G_{r-1})\}$, and let $Q = \{p \in V(P) : \alpha(p) > j\}$ and $M = \{p \in V(P) : \alpha(p) < j\}$, which is a partition of $V(P)$. (Note that $\alpha^{-1}(j) \in V(G_{r-1})$ and recall that $\alpha^{-1}(n) = y \in V(G_{r-1})$.) Furthermore let β denote the ordering α restricted to P (i.e., $\beta = \alpha_{V(G_{r-1})}$) and let $H = G - M$. By Lemma 2.1 (with $X = Q$) we obtain the following:

$$\text{prf}_{\alpha_M}(H, V(H) - Q) \geq \text{prf}_{\alpha_{(M \cup Q)}}(H - Q) + |Q| = \text{prf}_{\alpha_{V(P)}}(G_{r-1}) + |Q|.$$

Now assume that $\alpha(x) < j$ and note that $\text{prf}_{\alpha}(G, u) \geq \text{prf}_{\alpha_M}(H, u) + j - \alpha(x)$, as $\text{prf}_{\alpha_M}(H, u) \leq \alpha(u) - j$ and $\text{prf}_{\alpha}(G, u) = \alpha(u) - \alpha(x)$. As $|Q| = |V(P)| - j + 1$ and $\text{prf}_{\alpha}(G, V(P)) \geq \text{prf}_{\beta}(P)$ we obtain the following:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{prf}_{\alpha}(G) &= \text{prf}_{\alpha}(G, V(H) - Q) + \text{prf}_{\alpha}(G, V(P)) \\ &\geq \text{prf}_{\alpha_M}(H, V(H) - Q) + j - \alpha(x) + \text{prf}_{\beta}(P) \\ &\geq \text{prf}_{\alpha_{V(P)}}(G_{r-1}) + |Q| + j - \alpha(x) + \text{prf}_{\beta}(P) \\ &= \text{prf}_{\alpha_{V(P)}}(G_{r-1}) + |V(P)| - \alpha(x) + 1 + \text{prf}_{\beta}(P) \end{aligned}$$

Now assume that $\alpha(x) > j$. Analogously to the above we get the following:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{prf}_{\alpha}(G) &= \text{prf}_{\alpha}(G, V(H) - Q) + \text{prf}_{\alpha}(G, V(P)) \\ &\geq \text{prf}_{\alpha_M}(H, V(H) - Q) + \text{prf}_{\beta}(P) \\ &\geq \text{prf}_{\alpha_{V(P)}}(G_{r-1}) + |Q| + \text{prf}_{\beta}(P) \\ &\geq \text{prf}_{\alpha_{V(P)}}(G_{r-1}) + |V(P)| - \alpha(x) + 1 + \text{prf}_{\beta}(P) \end{aligned}$$

So, we always have $\text{prf}_{\alpha}(G) \geq \text{prf}_{\alpha_{V(P)}}(G_{r-1}) + |V(P)| - \alpha(x) + 1 + \text{prf}_{\beta}(P)$.

Add an artificial vertex u' to the end of the ordering β and add the edges $u'x$ and $u'z$. This results in an ordering β' of $V(P) \cup \{u'\}$ where $\beta'(u') = |V(P)| + 1$. Since we have created a cycle we note that $\text{prf}_{\beta'}(P \cup u') \geq 2(|V(P)| + 1) - 3$, by Lemma 2.2 (ii). Since the profile of u' in β' is $|V(P)| + 1 - \alpha(x)$ we note that $\text{prf}_{\beta}(P) \geq 2(|V(P)| + 1) - 3 - (|V(P)| + 1 - \alpha(x))$. We now obtain the following:

$$\text{prf}_{\alpha}(G) \geq \text{prf}_{\alpha_{V(P)}}(G_{r-1}) + |V(P)| - \alpha(x) + 1 + 2(|V(P)| + 1) - 3 - (|V(P)| + 1 - \alpha(x)).$$

By reducing this formula and using the fact that $\text{prf}_{\alpha_{V(P)}}(G_{r-1}) \geq \frac{3n_{r-1}-3}{2}$, we get the following:

$$\text{prf}(G) = \text{prf}_{\alpha}(G) \geq \frac{3n_{r-1}-3}{2} + 2|V(P)| - 1.$$

Since $|V(P)| = a \geq 2$ we note that $2|V(P)| - 1 \geq \frac{3a}{2}$, which implies the desired result. \square

Theorem 2.6 *Let $G = (V, E)$ be a connected graph of order n , let $\text{prf}(G) \leq n - 1 + k$ and let α be an optimal ordering of G . Let V_1, V_2, \dots, V_t be a partition of V such that $|V_1|, |V_t| \geq k + 2$ and there is only one edge $x_i y_i$ between $G[V_1 \cup V_2 \cup \dots \cup V_i]$ and $G[V_{i+1} \cup V_{i+2} \cup \dots \cup V_t]$ for each $i = 1, 2, \dots, t - 1$. Let $x_i \in V_i$ and $y_i \in V_{i+1}$ for each $i = 1, 2, \dots, t - 1$ and let $\alpha^{-1}(1) \in V_1$ or $\alpha^{-1}(n) \in V_t$. Let an ordering α' of G be defined as follows: $\alpha'_{V-V_i} = \alpha_{V-V_i}$ for each $i = 1, 2, \dots, t$, and $\alpha'(v_i) < \alpha'(v_{i+1})$ for each $i = 1, 2, \dots, t - 1$. Then α' is optimal.*

Proof: Consider first the case of $t = 2$. Let $xy = x_1 y_1$, $X = V_1$, $Y = V_2$. Let α be an optimal ordering of G and let $\alpha^{-1}(n) = y' \in Y$ (the case $\alpha^{-1}(1) \in X$ is treated similarly). Let x' be the vertex with $\alpha(x') = 1$. If $x' \in Y$, then Lemma 2.1 implies that $\text{prf}_\alpha(G, Y) \geq \text{prf}_{\alpha_X}(G - X, Y) + |X|$. Since $\text{prf}_\alpha(G, X) \geq \text{prf}_{\alpha_Y}(G[X]) \geq |X| - 1$ and $\text{prf}_{\alpha_X}(G[Y]) \geq |Y| - 1$ (both by Lemma 2.2 (i)) and $|X| \geq k + 2$, we conclude that $\text{prf}_\alpha(G) \geq |X| + |Y| + k$, a contradiction. Therefore, $x' \in X$.

Let $i = \min\{\alpha(y'') : y'' \in Y\}$ and let $j = \max\{\alpha(x'') : x'' \in X\}$. Assume for the sake of contradiction that $i < j$. Let $I = \alpha^{-1}(\{i, i + 1, \dots, j\})$. Recall that α' is defined as follows: $\alpha'_X = \alpha_X$ and $\alpha'_Y = \alpha_Y$ but $\alpha'(x'') < \alpha'(y'')$ for all $x'' \in X$ and $y'' \in Y$. We will prove that α' is optimal.

Let $L = G[X \cup (Y \cap I)]$ and let $G' = L$ if $xy \notin E(L)$ and $G' = L - xy$, otherwise. Let $\beta = \alpha_{V(G) - V(G')}$ (so β is equal to α , except we have deleted the last $n - j$ vertices in the ordering). Note that by Lemma 2.1 (used with the set $Y \cap I$) we get that $\text{prf}_\beta(G', V(G') - (Y \cap I)) \geq \text{prf}_{\beta_{Y \cap I}}(V(G') - (Y \cap I)) + |Y \cap I|$. This implies the following: $\text{prf}_\alpha(G - xy, X) \geq \text{prf}_{\alpha_Y}(G[X]) + |Y \cap I|$.

Analogously we obtain that $\text{prf}_\alpha(G - xy, Y) \geq \text{prf}_{\alpha_X}(Y) + |X \cap I|$, which implies the following:

$$\text{prf}_\alpha(G - xy) \geq \text{prf}_{\alpha_Y}(X) + \text{prf}_{\alpha_X}(Y) + |I| = \text{prf}_{\alpha'}(G - xy) + (j - i + 1) \quad (1)$$

If $\alpha(x) > \alpha(y)$, then the above implies the following contradiction, as $\alpha'(y) - \alpha'(x) < j - i + 1$.

$$\text{prf}_\alpha(G) \geq \text{prf}_\alpha(G - xy) \geq \text{prf}_{\alpha'}(G - xy) + (j - i + 1) > \text{prf}_{\alpha'}(G).$$

Therefore we may assume that $\alpha(x) < \alpha(y)$. Let $l = \min\{\alpha(z) : z \in N[y] - \{x\}\}$ and let $L = \alpha^{-1}(\{\alpha(x), \alpha(x) + 1, \alpha(x) + 2, \dots, l - 1\})$. Note that $L = \emptyset$ if $l < \alpha(x)$. By the definition of L and the inequality in (1), we get the following:

$$\text{prf}_\alpha(G) = \text{prf}_\alpha(G - xy) + |L| \geq \text{prf}_{\alpha'}(G - xy) + |I| + |L|$$

When we add the edge xy to $G - xy$, we observe that, in the ordering α' , the profile of y will increase by one for every vertex from Y with an α -value less than l and every vertex in X with an α -value larger than $\alpha(x)$. This is exactly the set $R_1 \cup R_2 \cup R_3 \cup R_4$, where

$$\begin{aligned} R_1 &= \{y'' \in Y : \alpha(y'') < l \text{ and } \alpha(x) < \alpha(y'')\} \\ R_2 &= \{x'' \in X : \alpha(x) < \alpha(x'') \text{ and } \alpha(x'') < l\} \\ R_3 &= \{y'' \in Y : \alpha(y'') < l \text{ and } \alpha(y'') < \alpha(x)\} \\ R_4 &= \{x'' \in X : \alpha(x) < \alpha(x'') \text{ and } l < \alpha(x'')\} \end{aligned}$$

Since $R_1 \cup R_2 \subseteq L$ and $R_3 \cup R_4 \subseteq I$ (as $\alpha^{-1}(l) \in Y$) we conclude that

$$\text{prf}_\alpha(G) \geq \text{prf}_{\alpha'}(G) + |I| + |L| - |R_1| - |R_2| - |R_3| - |R_4| \geq \text{prf}_{\alpha'}(G).$$

Now let $t \geq 3$. Let $X = \cup_{i=1}^{t-1} V_i$ and $Y = V_t$. By the case $t = 2$, the following ordering β is optimal: $\beta_X = \alpha_X$, $\beta_Y = \alpha_Y$, and $\beta(x) < \beta(y)$ for each $x \in X, y \in Y$. Now let $X' = \cup_{i=1}^{t-2} V_i$, $Y' = V_{t-1} \cup V_t$. By the case $t = 2$, the following ordering β' is optimal: $\beta'_{X'} = \beta_{X'}$, $\beta'_{Y'} = \beta_{Y'}$, and $\beta'(x') < \beta'(y')$ for each $x' \in X', y' \in Y'$. Combining the properties of β and β' , we obtain that $\beta'_{Y'} = \alpha_{Y'}$, $\beta'_{V_{t-1}} = \alpha_{V_{t-1}}$, $\beta'_{V_t} = \alpha_{V_t}$, and $\beta'(x') < \beta'(v_{t-1}) < \beta'(v_t)$ for each $x' \in X', v_{t-1} \in V_{t-1}, v_t \in V_t$. Continuation of this argument allows us to show that α' is an optimal ordering. \square

A *bridgeless component* of a graph G is a maximal induced subgraph of G with no bridges. We call a connected graph G a *chain of length t* if the following holds: (a) G has bridgeless components C_i , $1 \leq i \leq t$ such that $V(G) = \cup_{i=1}^t V(C_i)$, and (b) C_i is linked to C_{i+1} by a bridge, $1 \leq i \leq t-1$. A component C_i is *nontrivial* if $|V(C_i)| > 1$, and *trivial*, otherwise. An ordering α of G is *special* if for any two vertices $x, y \in V(G)$ and $x \in V(C_i), y \in V(C_j), i < j$ implies $\alpha(x) < \alpha(y)$.

Lemma 2.7 *Let G be a chain of order n and let η be the total number of vertices in the nontrivial bridgeless components of G . Let α be a special ordering of G with $\text{prf}_\alpha(G) \leq n - 1 + k$. Then $\eta \leq 3k$.*

Proof: We show $\eta \leq 3k$ by induction on n . Suppose that G has a trivial component. If C_1 is trivial, then $G - C_1$ is a chain with $\text{prf}_{\alpha_{V(C_1)}}(G - C_1) \leq n' - 1 + k$, where $n' = n - 1$. Thus, by induction hypothesis, $\eta \leq 3k$. Similarly, we prove $\eta \leq 3k$ when C_t is trivial. Assume that C_i , $1 < i < t$, is trivial. Let C_i be adjacent to $x \in V(C_{i-1})$ and $y \in V(C_{i+1})$. Consider G' obtained from G by deleting C_i and appending edge xy . Observe that G' is a chain and $\text{prf}_{\alpha_{V(C_i)}}(G') \leq n' - 1 + k$, where $n' = n - 1$. Thus, by induction hypothesis, $\eta \leq 3k$. So, now we may assume that $\eta = n$.

Let C_1, \dots, C_t denote the bridgeless components of G as in the definition above. Let $n_i = |V(C_i)|$. If $t = 1$, then by Lemma 2.5 we have $n \leq 2k + 1$ and we are done as $k \geq 1$. Now assume $t \geq 2$. Let $G' = G - V(C_t)$ and $n' = n - n_t$. Observe that G' is a chain and $\alpha_{V(C_t)}$ is a special ordering of G' . Let $k_t = \text{prf}_\alpha(G, V(C_t)) - n_t + 1$ and let $k' = \text{prf}_\alpha(G, V(G')) - n' + 1$. We have $k_t + k' - 1 \leq k$. Lemma 2.5 implies that

$$n_t - 1 + k_t = \text{prf}_\alpha(G, V(C_t)) \geq \text{prf}(C_t) + 1 \geq \frac{3n_t - 3}{2} + 1 = \frac{3n_t - 1}{2},$$

and thus $k_t \geq \frac{n_t + 1}{2}$ and $n_t \leq 2k_t - 1$. Since $n_t \geq 3$, we have $k_t \geq 2$. By induction hypothesis, $n' \leq 3k'$. Thus $n = n' + n_t \leq 3(k - k_t + 1) + 2k_t - 1 \leq 3k - k_t + 2 \leq 3k$. \square

A connected component of a graph G is called *nontrivial* if it has more than one vertex.

Lemma 2.8 *Let $G = (V, E)$ be a connected graph of order n , let $X \subseteq V$ such that $G[X]$ is connected. Let G_1, \dots, G_r denote the nontrivial connected components of $G - X$. Assume that $|V(G_i)| \leq |V(G_{i+1})|$ for $1 \leq i \leq r-1$. If $k + n - 1 \geq \text{prf}(G)$, then $k + 2 \geq r$ and $2k \geq \sum_{i=1}^{r-2} |V(G_i)|$.*

Proof: The result holds vacuously true if $r < 3$, hence assume $r \geq 3$. Let α be an optimal ordering of G . Let $I = \{1 \leq i \leq r : V(G_i) \cap \{\alpha^{-1}(1), \alpha^{-1}(n)\} = \emptyset\}$. Clearly $|I| \geq r - 2$. Let $Y = X \cup \cup_{i \notin I} V(G_i)$ and $Z = V \setminus Y$. Observe that $G[Y] = G - Z$ is connected and $G_i, i \in I$, are exactly the nontrivial components of $G - Y$. Since also $\{\alpha^{-1}(1), \alpha^{-1}(n)\} \subseteq Y$, Lemma 2.1 applies.

Thus we get

$$\text{prf}(G) = \text{prf}_\alpha(G) \geq \text{prf}_\alpha(G, V - Z) + \sum_{i \in I} \text{prf}_\alpha(G, V(G_i)) \geq \text{prf}(G - Z) + |Z| + \sum_{i \in I} \text{prf}(G_i).$$

Furthermore, by Lemma 2.2 (i),

$$\begin{aligned} k &\geq \text{prf}(G) - n + 1 \geq \text{prf}(G - Z) + |Z| - |Y| + \left(\sum_{i \in I} \text{prf}(G_i) - |V(G_i)| \right) + 1 \\ &\geq (\text{prf}(G[Y]) - |Y|) + |Z| - |I| + 1 \geq -1 + |Z| - |I| + 1. \end{aligned}$$

Hence $k \geq |Z| - |I|$. However, since the components G_i are nontrivial, $|Z| \geq 2|I|$. Thus, $|I| \leq k$ and $|Z| \leq k + |I| \leq 2k$. \square

3 Vertices of degree 1

In this section, G denotes a connected graph of order n . For an ordering α of G let $E_\alpha(G)$ denote the set of edges uv of G such that $\alpha(u) = \min_{w \in N[v]} \alpha(w)$ and $u \neq v$. The *length* $\ell_\alpha(uv)$ of an edge $uv \in E(G)$ relative to α is $|\alpha(u) - \alpha(v)|$ if $uv \in E_\alpha(G)$, and 0 if $uv \notin E_\alpha(G)$. Observe that $\text{prf}_\alpha(G) = \sum_{e \in E(G)} \ell_\alpha(e)$.

Let X, Y be two disjoint sets of vertices of G and let α be an ordering of G . We say that (X, Y) is an α -consecutive pair if there exist integers a, b, c with $1 \leq a < b < c \leq n$ so that $X = \{x \in V(G) : a \leq \alpha(x) \leq b - 1\}$ and $Y = \{y \in V(G) : b \leq \alpha(y) \leq c\}$. By $\text{swap}_{Y, X}(\alpha)$ we denote the ordering obtained from α by swapping the α -consecutive pair (X, Y) . For a set $X \subseteq V(G)$ let $E_\alpha^r(X)$ (respectively, $E_\alpha^l(X)$) denote the set of edges $uv \in E_\alpha$ with $u \in X$, $v \in V(G) \setminus X$, and $\alpha(u) < \alpha(v)$ (respectively, $\alpha(u) > \alpha(v)$).

Lemma 3.1 *Let α be an ordering of G and (X, Y) an α -consecutive pair such that there are no edges between X and Y . If $|E_\alpha^l(X)| \leq |E_\alpha^r(X)|$ and $|E_\alpha^l(Y)| \geq |E_\alpha^r(Y)|$, then for $\beta = \text{swap}_{Y, X}(\alpha)$ we have $\text{prf}_\beta(G) \leq \text{prf}_\alpha(G)$.*

Proof: Observe that $E_\alpha(G) = E_\beta(G)$. Moreover, the only edges of $E_\alpha(G)$ that have different length in α and in β are the edges in $E_\alpha^l(Y) \cup E_\alpha^r(Y) \cup E_\alpha^l(X) \cup E_\alpha^r(X)$. Observe that $\ell_\beta(e) = \ell_\alpha(e) + |Y|$, $\ell_\beta(e') = \ell_\alpha(e') - |Y|$, $\ell_\beta(f) = \ell_\alpha(f) - |X|$, $\ell_\beta(f') = \ell_\alpha(f') + |X|$ for each $e \in E_\alpha^l(X)$, $e' \in E_\alpha^r(X)$, $f \in E_\alpha^l(Y)$ and $f' \in E_\alpha^r(Y)$. Using these relations and the inequalities $|E_\alpha^l(X)| \leq |E_\alpha^r(X)|$ and $|E_\alpha^l(Y)| \geq |E_\alpha^r(Y)|$, we obtain $\text{prf}_\beta(G) \leq \text{prf}_\alpha(G)$. \square

Lemma 3.2 *Let α be an ordering of G and $(\{x\}, Y)$ an α -consecutive pair such that x has a neighbor z of degree 1 with $\alpha(z) > \alpha(y)$ for all $y \in Y$. If $|E_\alpha^l(Y)| \geq |E_\alpha^r(Y)|$, then for $\beta = \text{swap}_{Y, \{x\}}(\alpha)$ we have $\text{prf}_\beta(G) \leq \text{prf}_\alpha(G)$.*

Proof: If there are no edges between x and vertices in Y then the result follows from Lemma 3.1 since $|E_\alpha^l(\{x\})| \leq 1 \leq |E_\alpha^r(\{x\})|$.

Now consider the case where $E_\alpha^l(\{x\}) = \{wx\}$ for a vertex w . It follows that $E_\beta(G) \subseteq E_\alpha(G)$. Moreover, we have $\sum_{e \in E_\beta^l(Y) \cup E_\beta^r(Y)} \ell_\beta(e) \leq \sum_{e \in E_\alpha^l(Y) \cup E_\alpha^r(Y)} \ell_\alpha(e)$ and $\ell_\beta(wx) + \ell_\beta(xz) \leq \ell_\alpha(wx) + \ell_\alpha(xz)$. Hence the result also holds true in that case.

It remains to consider the case where x has neighbors in Y and $E_\alpha^l(\{x\}) = \emptyset$. Let y, y' be the neighbors of x in Y with largest $\alpha(y)$ and smallest $\alpha(y')$. Now $E_\beta(G) \setminus E_\alpha(G) = \{xy'\}$, and $\ell_\beta(xy') + \ell_\beta(xz) \leq \ell_\alpha(xz)$. Thus, $\text{prf}_\beta(G) \leq \text{prf}_\alpha(G)$. \square

Lemma 3.3 *Let α be an ordering of G and let $(\{x\}, Y)$ be an α -consecutive pair. Let all vertices in Y be of degree 1 and adjacent with x . Then for $\beta = \text{swap}_{Y, \{x\}}(\alpha)$ we have $\text{prf}_\beta(G) \leq \text{prf}_\alpha(G)$.*

Proof: Let y, y' denote the vertex in Y with largest $\alpha(y)$ and smallest $\alpha(y')$. Observe $\ell_\alpha(yx) = |Y|$. First assume that $E_\alpha^l(\{x\})$ contains an edge zx . We have $E_\beta(G) \subseteq E_\alpha(G) \setminus \{xy\}$, and $\ell_\beta(e) \leq \ell_\alpha(e)$ holds for all $e \in E_\beta(G) \setminus \{xz\}$. Since $\ell_\beta(zx) = \ell_\alpha(zx) + \ell_\alpha(xy)$, the result follows.

Next assume that $E_\alpha^l(\{x\}) = \emptyset$. We have $E_\beta(G) \subseteq (E_\alpha(G) \setminus \{xy\}) \cup \{xy'\}$, and $\ell_\beta(e) \leq \ell_\alpha(e)$ holds for all $e \in E_\beta(G) \setminus \{xy'\}$. Since $\ell_\beta(xy') = \ell_\alpha(xy)$, the result follows. \square

For $x \in V(G)$ let $N_1(x)$ denote the set of neighbors of x that have degree 1. We say that an ordering α of G is *conformal for a vertex x* of G if $\{\alpha(w) : w \in N_1(x)\}$ forms a (possibly empty) interval and $\alpha(w) < \alpha(x)$ holds for all $w \in N_1(x)$. We say that α is *conformal for a graph G* if it is conformal for all vertices of G .

Theorem 3.4 *For every connected graph G there exists an optimal ordering which is conformal.*

Proof: Let α be an optimal ordering of G . Let x be a vertex of G for which α is not conformal. We apply the following steps to α , until we end up with an optimal ordering which is conformal for x . In each step we transform α into an optimal ordering β in such a way that whenever α is conformal for a vertex x' , so is β . Hence, we can repeat the procedure for all the vertices one after the other, and we are finally left with an optimal ordering which is conformal.

Let $w_1, w_2 \in N_1(x) \cup \{x\}$ with minimal $\alpha(w_1)$ and maximal $\alpha(w_2)$. We call a set $B \subseteq N_1(x)$ a *block* if $\{\alpha(b) : b \in B\}$ is a nonempty interval of integers. A block is *maximal* if it is not properly contained in another block.

Step 1. Assume that there exist α -consecutive pairs $(\{x\}, Y)$, (Y, Z) with the following properties: (a) Y and Z are nonempty; (b) $Y \cap N_1(x) = \emptyset$; (c) Z is a maximal block. By assumption, there is a $z \in Z$ such that $xz \in E(G)$ and $\alpha(z) > \alpha(y)$ holds for all $y \in Y$. Moreover, there are no edges between Y and Z and $E_\alpha^r(Z) = \emptyset$. If $|E_\alpha^l(Y)| \geq |E_\alpha^r(Y)|$, then we put $\beta = \text{swap}_{Y, \{x\}}(\alpha)$, otherwise we put $\beta = \text{swap}_{Z, Y}(\alpha)$. It follows from Lemmas 3.2 and 3.1, respectively, that β is optimal.

Step 2. Assume that there exists an α -consecutive pair $(\{x\}, Y)$ such that Y is a maximal block. We put $\beta = \text{swap}_{Y, \{x\}}(\alpha)$. It follows by Lemma 3.3 that β is optimal.

Remark. If neither Step 1 nor Step 2 can be applied, then $\alpha(w_2) < \alpha(x)$.

Step 3. Assume that there exist α -consecutive pairs (X, Y) , (Y, Z) with the following properties: (a) X and Z are maximal blocks; (b) $Y \subseteq V(G) \setminus N_1(x)$; (c) $w_1 \in X$. Note that there are no edges between X and Y and no edges between Y and Z . Furthermore, we have $E_\alpha^l(X) = \emptyset$ and $E_\alpha^r(Z) = \emptyset$ (the latter follows from Property (c)). If $|E_\alpha^l(Y)| \geq |E_\alpha^r(Y)|$, then we put $\beta = \text{swap}_{Y, X}(\alpha)$, otherwise we put $\beta = \text{swap}_{Z, Y}(\alpha)$. In both cases it follows from Lemma 3.1 that β is optimal.

Remark. If none of the above Steps 1, 2, or 3, applies, then α is conformal for x . \square

Note that when applying the procedure of the above proof, it is possible that we end up with exactly one maximal block X such that for a nonempty set Y the pairs (X, Y) and $(Y, \{x\})$ are α -consecutive. If $|E_\alpha^l(Y)| < |E_\alpha^r(Y)| < |E_\alpha^r(\{x\})|$, then we can neither swap X and Y nor Y and $\{x\}$ without increasing the cost of the profile.

4 Kernelization

For technical reasons, in this section we will deal with a special kind of weighted graphs, but they will be nothing else but compact representations of (unweighted) graphs.

We consider a *weighted graph* $G = (V, E, \rho)$ whose vertices v of degree 1 have an arbitrary positive integral weight $\rho(v)$, vertices u of degree greater than one have weight $\rho(u) = 1$. The *weight* $\rho(G)$ of $G = (V, E, \rho)$ is the sum of weights of all vertices of G . An *ordering* of a weighted graph $G = (V, E, \rho)$ is an injective mapping $\alpha : V \rightarrow \{1, \dots, \rho(G)\}$ such that for every vertex $v \in V$ of degree 1 we have $\alpha(v) \neq \rho(G)$ and for all $u \in V$ we have $\alpha(u) \notin \{\alpha(v) + 1, \dots, \alpha(v) + \rho(v) - 1\}$. The *profile* $\text{prf}(G)$ of a weighted graph is defined exactly as the profile of an unweighted graph.

A weighted graph $G = (V, E, \rho)$ corresponds to an unweighted graph G^u , which is obtained from G by replacing each vertex v of degree 1 (v is adjacent to a vertex w) with $\rho(v)$ vertices adjacent to w . By Theorem 3.4 and the definitions above, $\text{prf}(G) = \text{prf}(G^u)$ and an optimal ordering of G can be effectively transformed into an optimal ordering of G^u . Also, $\rho(G) = |V(G^u)|$. The correspondence between G and G^u allows us to use the results given in the previous sections.

Kernelization Rule 4.1 *Let G be a weighted graph and x a vertex of G with $N_1(x) = \{v_1, \dots, v_r\}$, $r \geq 2$. We obtain the weighted graph $G_0 = (V_0, E_0, \rho_0)$, where $G_0 = G - \{v_2, \dots, v_r\}$ and $\rho_0(u) = \rho(u)$ for $u \in V_0 \setminus \{v_1\}$ and $\rho_0(v_1) = \sum_{i=1}^r \rho(v_i)$.*

The next lemma follows from Theorem 3.4.

Lemma 4.2 *Let G be a weighted connected graph and G_0 the weighted graph obtained from G by Kernelization Rule 4.1. Then $\text{prf}(G) = \text{prf}(G_0)$, and an optimal ordering α_0 of G_0 can be effectively transformed into an optimal ordering α of G .*

Let e be a bridge of a weighted connected graph G and let G_1, G_2 denote the connected components of $G - e$. We define the *order* of e as $\min\{\rho(G_1), \rho(G_2)\}$.

Let v be a vertex of a (weighted) graph G . We say that v is *k -suppressible* if the following conditions hold: (a) v forms a trivial bridgeless component of G ; (b) v is of degree 2 or 3; (c) there are exactly two bridges e_1, e_2 of order at least $k + 2$ incident with v ; (d) if there is a third edge $e_3 = vw$ incident with v , then w is a vertex of degree 1.

Kernelization Rule 4.3 (w.r.t. parameter k) *Let v be a k -suppressible vertex of a weighted graph $G = (V, E, \rho)$ and let xv, yv be the bridges of order at least $k + 2$. From G we obtain a weighted graph by removing $\{v\} \cup N_1(v)$ and adding the edge xy .*

Lemma 4.4 *Let $G = (V, E, \rho)$ be a weighted connected graph with $\text{prf}(G) \leq \rho(G) - 1 + k$ and G' the weighted graph obtained from G by means of Kernelization Rule 4.3 with respect to parameter*

k. Then $\text{prf}(G) - \rho(G) = \text{prf}(G') - \rho(G')$, and an optimal ordering α' of G' can be effectively transformed into an optimal ordering α of G .

Proof: Let v be a k -suppressible vertex of G^u and let xv, yv be the bridges of order at least $k + 2$. We consider the case when $N_1(v) = \{w_1, \dots, w_r\} \neq \emptyset$; the proof for the case when $N_1(v) = \emptyset$ is similar. Let $G^u[X]$ and $G^u[Y]$ denote the components of $G^u - v$ that contain x and y , respectively. Consider an optimal ordering α of G^u and assume that $\alpha^{-1}(n) \in Y$. By Theorem 3.4, we may assume that $\alpha(w_i) < \alpha(v)$ for every $1 \leq i \leq r$. Now by Theorem 2.6, we can find an optimal ordering α' of G^u such that $\alpha'(x') < \alpha'(w_i) < \alpha'(v) < \alpha'(y')$ for each $x' \in X$, $y' \in Y$ and $i = 1, 2, \dots, r$.

Now it will be more convenient to argue using the weighted graphs G and G' . Using Kernelization Rule 4.1, we transform α' into the corresponding optimal ordering of G . For simplicity we denote the new ordering α' as well. Observe that $\text{prf}_{\alpha'_{\{v,w\}}}(G', y) = \text{prf}_{\alpha'}(G, y) + \text{prf}_{\alpha'}(G, v) - 1 - \rho(w)$. Hence, $\text{prf}(G') - \rho(G') \leq \text{prf}_{\alpha'_{\{v,w\}}}(G') - \rho(G') = \text{prf}(G) - \rho(G)$.

Conversely, let α' be an optimal ordering of G' . Since the bridge xy of G' is of order at least $k + 2$, we may assume by Theorem 2.6 that either for all $x' \in X$ and $y' \in Y$ we have $\alpha'(x') < \alpha'(y')$. It is straightforward to extend α' into an ordering α of G such that $\alpha_{\{v,w\}} = \alpha'$ and $\text{prf}_{\alpha}(G) = \text{prf}_{\alpha'}(G') + 1 + \rho(w)$. Hence $\text{prf}(G) - \rho(G) \leq \text{prf}_{\alpha}(G) - \rho(G) = \text{prf}_{\alpha'}(G') - \rho(G')$. Thus, $\text{prf}(G') - \rho(G') = \text{prf}(G) - \rho(G)$. \square

Theorem 4.5 *Let $G = (V, E, \rho)$ be a weighted connected graph with $n = |V|$ and $m = |E|$. Let k be a positive integer such that $\text{prf}(G) \leq \rho(G) - 1 + k$. Either one of the Kernelization Rules 4.1 and 4.3 can be applied with respect to parameter k , or $n \leq 12k + 6$ and $m \leq 13k + 5$.*

Proof: For a weighted graph $G = (V, E, \rho)$ let G^* be an unweighted graph with $V(G^*) = V$ and $E(G^*) = E$. Observe that $\text{prf}(G^*) \leq \text{prf}(G)$. Thus, in the rest of the proof we consider G^* rather than G , but for the simplicity of notation we use G instead of G^* .

Assume that none of the Kernelization Rules 4.1 and 4.3 can be applied with respect to parameter k . We will show that the claimed bounds on n and m hold. By Theorem 1.1 we have $m \leq \text{prf}(G) \leq n - 1 + k$. Thus, $n \leq 12k + 6$ implies $m \leq 13k + 5$. Therefore, it suffices to prove that $n \leq 12k + 6$. If G is bridgeless, then by Lemma 2.5, we have $n - 1 + k \geq \text{prf}(G) \geq \frac{3n-3}{2}$ and, thus, $n \leq 2k + 1$. Hence, we may assume that G has bridges. Let C_i , $i = 1, \dots, t$, denote the bridgeless components of G such that at least one vertex in C_i is incident with a bridge of order at least $k + 2$. We put $X = \bigcup_{i=1}^t V(C_i)$.

Suppose that there is a component C_i incident with three or more bridges of order at least $k + 2$. Then, we may assume that there are three bridges e_2, e_3, e_4 of order at least $k + 2$ that connect a subgraph F_1 of G with subgraphs F_2, F_3, F_4 , respectively, and $V = \bigcup_{i=1}^4 V(F_i)$. Let α be an optimal ordering of G . Assume without loss of generality that $\alpha^{-1}(1) \notin V(F_2)$ and $\alpha^{-1}(n) \notin V(F_2)$. Let $X = V(F_2)$ and note that $G - X$ is connected. Therefore Lemmas 2.1 and 2.2 (i) imply the following:

$$\text{prf}(G) = \text{prf}_{\alpha}(G, X) + \text{prf}_{\alpha}(G, V - X) \geq |X| - 1 + (|V| - |X| - 1) + |X| \geq n + k,$$

which is a contradiction.

Since G is connected, it follows that $G[X]$ is connected. Thus, $G[X]$ is a chain and we may assume that C_i and C_{i+1} are linked by a bridge b_i of for each $i = 1, 2, \dots, t-1$. Notice that each b_i is of order at least $k+2$ in G .

Let G_1, \dots, G_r be the connected components of $G - X$. Observe that each G_i ($1 \leq i \leq r$) is linked with exactly one C_j ($1 \leq j \leq t$) with a bridge e_{ij} . The bridge e_{ij} must be of order less than $k+2$, since otherwise $V(G_i) \cap X \neq \emptyset$. Hence (**) $|V(G_i)| \leq k+1$ follows for all $i \in \{1, \dots, r\}$. For each j , let $IG(j)$ be the set of indices i such that G_i is linked to C_j .

Let $N = \{1 \leq i \leq t : |V(C_i)| > 1\}$ and $T = \{1 \leq i \leq t : |V(C_i)| = 1\}$, i.e., C_i is nontrivial for $i \in N$ and trivial for $i \in T$. For $i \in T$ let x_i denote the single vertex in C_i . Similarly, let $N' = \{1 \leq i \leq r : |V(G_i)| > 1\}$ and $T' = \{1 \leq i \leq r : |V(G_i)| = 1\}$. Let $H_j = G[\cup_{i \in IG(j)} V(G_i) \cup V(C_j)]$ for each $j = 1, 2, \dots, t$. By Theorem 2.6, we may assume that there exists an optimal ordering β such that $\beta(h_i) < \beta(h_j)$ for all $i < j$, $h_i \in V(H_i)$, $h_j \in V(H_j)$. Let $\gamma = \beta_{V(G)-X}$. Clearly, γ is a special ordering of the chain $G[X]$, i.e., $\gamma(c_i) < \gamma(c_j)$ for all $i < j$, $c_i \in V(C_i)$, $c_j \in V(C_j)$.

If G_i is nontrivial, then it has a vertex z such that $G_i - z$ is connected and z is not incident to the bridge between G_i and $G[X]$. If G_i is trivial, let $z = V(G_i)$. In both cases, by Lemma 2.3, $\text{prf}_{\beta_z}(G-z) \leq (n-1) - 1 + k$. Repeating this argument, we conclude that $\text{prf}_{\gamma}(G[X]) \leq |X| - 1 + k$. Now by Lemma 2.7, $\sum_{i \in N} |V(C_i)| \leq 3k$. Lemma 2.8 yields that $|N'| \leq k+2$. Observe that for each $i \in T$, x_i is linked by a bridge $x_i y_{\pi(i)}$ to at least one nontrivial $G_{\pi(i)}$, where $\pi(i) \neq \pi(i')$ whenever $i \neq i'$. Hence, $|T| \leq k+2$. Thus, $|X| = \sum_{i \in N} |V(C_i)| + |T| \leq 3k + (k+2) = 4k+2$. Using (**) and Lemma 2.8, we have that $\sum_{i \in N'} |V(G_i)| \leq 2(k+1) + 2k = 4k+2$.

Let $Y = \cup_{i=1}^r V(G_i)$. Since Kernelization Rule 4.1 cannot be applied, every vertex in X is adjacent with at most one G_i with $i \in T'$. Hence $|T'| \leq |X| \leq 4k+2$. Consequently $|Y| \leq 2(4k+2) = 8k+4$. Hence $n = |X| + |Y| \leq 4k+2 + 8k+4 = 12k+6$ follows. \square

Corollary 4.6 *The problem PAVGV is fixed-parameter tractable.*

Remark 4.7 *We see that PAVGV can be solved in time $O(|V|^2 + f(k))$, where $f(k) = (12+6)!$. It would be interesting to significantly decrease $f(k)$, but even as it is now our algorithm is of practical interest because the kernel produced by the two kernelization rules can be solved using fast heuristics.*

5 NP-completeness

Serna and Thilikos [11] asked whether the following problem is FPT.

Vertex Average Profile (VAP)

Instance: A graph $G = (V, E)$. *Parameter:* A positive integer k .

Question: Does G have an ordering of profile $\leq k|V|$?

The following result was announced in [7] without a proof. It implies that VAP is not FPT unless $P=NP$.

Theorem 5.1 *Let $k \geq 2$ be a fixed integer. Then it is NP-complete to decide whether $\text{prf}(H) \leq k|V(H)|$ for a graph H .*

Proof: Let G be a graph and let r be an integer. We know that it is NP-complete to decide whether $\text{prf}(G) \leq r$. Let $n = |V(G)|$. Let k be a fixed integer, $k \geq 2$. Define G' as follows: G' contains k copies of G , j isolated vertices and a clique with i vertices (all of these subgraphs of G' are vertex disjoint). We have $n' = |V(G')| = kn + i + j$. Observe that $\text{prf}(K_i) = \binom{i}{2}$. By the definition of G' , $k \cdot \text{prf}(G) = \text{prf}(G') - \text{prf}(K_i) = \text{prf}(G') - \binom{i}{2}$. Therefore, $\text{prf}(G) \leq r$ if and only if $\text{prf}(G') \leq kr + \binom{i}{2}$. If there is a positive integer i such that $kr + \binom{i}{2} = kn'$ and the number of vertices in G' is bounded from above by a polynomial in n , then G' provides a reduction from VAP with the fixed k . Observe that $kr + \binom{i}{2} \geq k(kn + i)$ for $i = 2kn$. Thus, by setting $i = 2kn$ and $j = r + \frac{1}{k} \binom{i}{2} - kn - i$, we ensure that G' exists and the number of vertices in G' is bounded from above by a polynomial in n . \square

References

- [1] A. Billionnet, On interval graphs and matrix profiles. *RAIRO Tech. Oper.* 20 (1986), 245–256.
- [2] H.L. Bodlaender, R.G. Downey, M.R. Fellows, M.T. Hallett and H.T. Wareham, Parameterized complexity analysis in computational biology. *Comput. Appl. Biosci.* 11 (1995), 49–57.
- [3] J. Diaz, A. Gibbons, M. Paterson and J. Toran, The minsumcut problem. *Lect. Notes Comput. Sci.* 519 (1991), 65–79.
- [4] F.V. Fomin and P.A. Golovach, Graph searching and interval completion. *SIAM J. Discrete Math.* 13 (2000), 454–464.
- [5] M. R. Garey and D. R. Johnson, *Computers and Intractability*, Freeman, N.Y., 1979.
- [6] P.W. Goldberg, M.C. Golumbic, H. Kaplan and R. Shamir, Four strikes against physical mapping of DNA. *J. Comput. Biol.* 2 (1995), 139–152.
- [7] G. Gutin, A. Rafey, S. Szeider and A. Yeo, The Linear Arrangement Problem Parameterized Above Guaranteed Value. To appear in *Theory of Computing Systems*.
- [8] R.M. Karp, Mapping the genome: some combinatorial problems arising in molecular biology. In *Proc. 25th Annual Symp. Theory Comput.* (1993), 278–285.
- [9] D.G. Kendall, Incidence matrices, interval graphs, and seriation in archeology. *Pacific J. Math.* 28 (1969), 565–570.
- [10] Y. Lin and J. Yuan, Profile minimization problem for matrices and graphs. *Acta Math. Appl. Sinica, English-Series, Yingyong Shuxue-Xuebas* 10 (1994), 107–112.
- [11] M. Serna and D.M. Thilikos, Parameterized complexity for graph layout problems. *EATCS Bulletin* 86 (2005), 41–65.
- [12] D.B. West, *Introduction to Graph Theory*, Prentice Hall, Upper Saddle River, 2001.