

Parameterized Local Search for Max c -Cut

Jaroslav Garvardt¹, Niels Grüttemeier², Christian Komusiewicz¹, and
Nils Morawietz¹

¹Friedrich Schiller University Jena, Institute of Computer Science,
Germany

²Fraunhofer Institute of Optronics, System Technologies and Image
Exploitation, Germany

{jaroslav.garvardt, c.komusiewicz, nils.morawietz}@uni-jena.de
niels.gruettemeier@iosb-ina.fraunhofer.de

Abstract

In the NP-hard MAX c -CUT problem, one is given an undirected edge-weighted graph G and aims to color the vertices of G with c colors such that the total weight of edges with distinctly colored endpoints is maximal. The case with $c = 2$ is the famous MAX CUT problem. To deal with the NP-hardness of this problem, we study parameterized local search algorithms. More precisely, we study LS MAX c -CUT where we are also given a vertex coloring and an integer k and the task is to find a better coloring that changes the color of at most k vertices, if such a coloring exists; otherwise, the given coloring is k -optimal. We show that, for all $c \geq 2$, LS MAX c -CUT presumably cannot be solved in $f(k) \cdot n^{\mathcal{O}(1)}$ time even on bipartite graphs. We then present an algorithm for LS MAX c -CUT with running time $\mathcal{O}((3e\Delta)^k \cdot c \cdot k^3 \cdot \Delta \cdot n)$, where Δ is the maximum degree of the input graph. Finally, we evaluate the practical performance of this algorithm in a hill-climbing approach as a post-processing for a state-of-the-art heuristic for MAX c -CUT. We show that using parameterized local search, the results of this state-of-the-art heuristic can be further improved on a set of standard benchmark instances.

1 Introduction

Graph coloring and its generalizations are among the most famous NP-hard optimization problems with numerous practical applications [22]. In one prominent problem variant, we want to color the vertices of an edge-weighted graph with c colors so that the sum of the weights of all edges that have endpoints with different colors is maximized. This problem is known as MAX c -CUT [12, 23] or MAXIMUM COLORABLE SUBGRAPH [35]. Applications of MAX c -CUT include data clustering [5, 10], computation of rankings [5], design of experimental studies [1], sampling of public opinions

in social networks [21], channel assignment in wireless networks [38], module detection in genetic interaction data [32], and scheduling of TV commercials [16]. In addition, MAX c -CUT is closely related to the energy minimization problem in Hopfield neural networks [42, 26, 43]. An equivalent formulation of the problem is to ask for a coloring that minimizes the weight sum of the edges whose endpoints receive the same color; this formulation is known as GENERALIZED GRAPH COLORING [41]. The main difference is that for instances of GENERALIZED GRAPH COLORING, one usually assumes that all edge weights are non-negative, whereas for MAX c -CUT, one usually also allows negative weights.

From an algorithmic viewpoint, even restricted cases of MAX c -CUT are hard: The special case $c = 2$ is the MAX CUT problem which is NP-hard even for positive unit weights [24, 13], even on graphs with maximum degree 3 [3]. Moreover, for all $c \geq 3$ the GRAPH COLORING problem where we ask for a coloring of the vertices with c colors such that the endpoints of every edge receive different colors is NP-hard [24]. As a consequence, MAX c -CUT is NP-hard for all $c \geq 3$, again even when all edges have positive unit weight. While MAX c -CUT admits polynomial-time constant factor approximation algorithms [12], there are no polynomial-time approximation schemes unless $P = NP$ [35], even on graphs with bounded maximum degree [3]. Due to these hardness results, MAX c -CUT is mostly solved using heuristic approaches [11, 32, 33, 46].

A popular heuristic approach for MAX c -CUT is hill-climbing local search [11, 32] with the 1-flip neighborhood. Here, an initial solution (usually computed by a greedy algorithm) is replaced by a better one in the 1-flip neighborhood as long as such a better solution exists. Herein, the 1-flip neighborhood of a coloring is the set of all colorings that can be obtained by changing the color of one vertex. A coloring that has no improving 1-flip is called 1-optimal and the problem of computing 1-optimal solutions has also received interest from a theoretical standpoint: Finding 1-optimal solutions for MAX CUT is PLS-complete on edge-weighted graphs [36] and thus presumably not efficiently solvable in the worst case. This PLS-completeness result for the 1-flip neighborhood was later extended to GENERALIZED GRAPH COLORING, and thus to MAX c -CUT, for all c [41]. For graphs where the absolute values of all edge weights are constant, however, a simple hill climbing algorithm terminates after $\mathcal{O}(m)$ improvements, where m is the number of edges in the input graph. Here, a different question arises: Can we replace the 1-flip neighborhood with a larger efficiently searchable neighborhood, to avoid being stuck in a bad local optimum? A natural candidate is the k -flip neighborhood where we are allowed to change the color of at most k vertices. As noted by Kleinberg and Tardos [26], a standard algorithm for searching the k -flip neighborhood takes $\Theta(n^k \cdot m)$ time where n is the number of vertices. This led Kleinberg and Tardos to conclude that the k -flip neighborhood is impractical. In this work, we ask whether we can do better than the brute-force $\Theta(n^k \cdot m)$ -time algorithm or, in other words, whether the dismissal of k -flip neighborhood may have been premature.

The ideal framework to answer this question is parameterized local search, where the main goal would be to design an algorithm that in $f(k) \cdot n^{\mathcal{O}(1)}$ time either finds a better solution in the k -flip neighborhood or correctly answers that the current solution is k -optimal. Such a running time is preferable to $\mathcal{O}(n^k \cdot m)$ since the degree of the polynomial running time part does not depend on k and thus the running time scales

better with n . The framework also provides a toolkit for negative results that allows to conclude that an algorithm with such a running time is unlikely by showing $W[1]$ -hardness. In fact, most parameterized local search problems turn out to be $W[1]$ -hard with respect to the search radius k [4, 7, 9, 18, 19, 15, 28, 34, 39]. In contrast to these many, mostly negative, theoretical results, there are so far only few encouraging experimental studies [14, 17, 20, 25]. The maybe most extensive positive results so far were obtained for LS VERTEX COVER where the input is an undirected graph G with a vertex cover S and the question is whether the k -swap neighborhood¹ of S contains a smaller vertex cover. The key to obtain practical parameterized local search algorithms is to consider parameterization by k and the maximum degree Δ of the input graph. As shown by Katzmann and Komusiewicz [25], LS VERTEX COVER can be solved in $(2\Delta)^k \cdot n^{\mathcal{O}(1)}$ time. An experimental evaluation of this algorithm showed that it can be tuned to solve the problem for $k \approx 20$ on large sparse graphs, and that k -optimal solutions for $k \geq 9$ turned out to be optimal for almost all graphs considered in the experiments.

Our Results. We study LS MAX c -CUT, where we want to decide whether a given coloring has a better one in its k -flip neighborhood. We first show that LS MAX c -CUT is presumably not solvable in $f(k) \cdot n^{\mathcal{O}(k)}$ time and transfer this lower-bound also to local search versions of related partition problems like *Min Bisection* and *Max Sat*. We then present an algorithm to solve LS MAX c -CUT in time $\mathcal{O}((3e\Delta)^k \cdot c \cdot k^3 \cdot \Delta \cdot n)$, where Δ is the maximum degree of the input graph. To put this running time bound into context, two aspects should be discussed: First, the NP-hardness of the special case of MAX c -CUT with $\Delta = 3$ implies that a running time of $f(\Delta) \cdot n^{\mathcal{O}(1)}$ is impossible unless $P = NP$. Second, only the parameter k occurs in the exponent; we say that the running time grows mildly with respect to Δ and strongly with respect to k . This is desirable as k is a user-determined parameter whereas Δ depends on the input; a broader discussion of this type of running times is given by Komusiewicz and Morawietz [29].

The algorithm is based on two main observations: First, we show that minimal improving flips are connected in the input graph. This allows to enumerate candidate flips in $\mathcal{O}((e\Delta)^k \cdot k \cdot n)$ time. Second, we show that, given a set of k vertices to flip, we can determine an optimal way to flip their colors in $\mathcal{O}(3^k \cdot c \cdot k^2 + k \cdot \Delta)$ time. We then discuss several ways to speed up the algorithm, for example by computing upper bounds for the improvement of partial flips. We finally evaluate our algorithm experimentally when it is applied as post-processing for a state-of-the-art MAX c -CUT heuristic [33]. In this application, we take the solutions computed by the heuristic and improve them by hill-climbing with the k -flip neighborhood for increasing values of k . We show that, for a standard benchmark data set, a large fraction of the previously best solutions can be improved by our algorithm, leading to new record solutions for these instances. The post-processing is particularly successful for the instances of the data set with $c > 2$ and both positive and negative edge weights.

¹The k -swap neighborhood of a vertex cover S of G is the set of all vertex covers of G that have a symmetric difference of at most k with S .

2 Preliminaries

Notation. For integers i and j with $i \leq j$, we define $[i, j] := \{k \in \mathbb{N} \mid i \leq k \leq j\}$. For a set A , we denote with $\binom{A}{2} := \{\{a, b\} \mid a \in A, b \in A\}$ the collection of all size-two subsets of A . For two sets A and B , we denote with $A \oplus B := (A \setminus B) \cup (B \setminus A)$ the *symmetric difference* of A and B . An r -partition of a set C is an r -tuple (B_1, \dots, B_r) of subsets of C , such that each element of C is contained in exactly one set of (B_1, \dots, B_r) . For $r = 2$, we may call a 2-partition (A, B) simply a *partition*. Let $f : A \rightarrow B$ and $g : A \rightarrow B$ be functions and let $C \subseteq A$, then we say that f and g *agree* on S , if for each element $s \in S$, $f(s) = g(s)$.

An (undirected) graph $G = (V, E)$ consists of a vertex set V and an edge set $E \subseteq \binom{V}{2}$. For vertex sets $S \subseteq V$ and $T \subseteq V$ we denote with $E_G(S, T) := \{\{s, t\} \in E \mid s \in S, t \in T\}$ the edges between S and T and with $E_G(S) := E_G(S, S)$ the edges between vertices of S . Moreover, we define $G[S] := (S, E_G(S))$ as the *subgraph of G induced by S* . A vertex set S is *connected* if $G[S]$ is a connected graph. For a vertex $v \in V$, we denote with $N_G(v) := \{w \in V \mid \{v, w\} \in E\}$ the *open neighborhood* of v in G and with $N_G[v] := N_G(v) \cup \{v\}$ the *closed neighborhood* of v in G . Analogously, for a vertex set $S \subseteq V$, we define $N_G[S] := \bigcup_{v \in S} N_G[v]$ and $N_G(S) := \bigcup_{v \in S} N_G(v) \setminus S$. If G is clear from context, we may omit the subscript. We say that *vertices v and w have distance at least i* if the length of the shortest path between v and w is at least i .

Problem Formulation. Let X and Y be sets and let $\chi, \chi' : X \rightarrow Y$. The *flip* between χ and χ' is defined as $D_{\text{flip}}(\chi, \chi') := \{x \in X \mid \chi(x) \neq \chi'(x)\}$ and the *flip distance* between χ and χ' is defined as $d_{\text{flip}}(\chi, \chi') := |D_{\text{flip}}(\chi, \chi')|$. For an integer c and a graph $G = (V, E)$, a function $\chi : V \rightarrow [1, c]$ is a c -coloring of G . Let χ be a c -coloring of G , we define the set $E(\chi)$ of *properly colored edges* as $E(\chi) := \{\{u, v\} \in E \mid \chi(u) \neq \chi(v)\}$. For an edge-weight function $\omega : E \rightarrow \mathbb{Q}$ and an edge set $E' \subseteq E$, we let $\omega(E')$ denote the total weight of all edges in E' . Let χ and χ' be c -colorings of G . We say that χ and χ' are k -neighbors if $d_{\text{flip}}(\chi, \chi') \leq k$. If $\omega(E(\chi)) > \omega(E(\chi'))$, we say that χ is *improving* over χ' . Finally, a c -coloring χ is k -*(flip-)optimal* if χ has no improving k -neighbor χ' . The problem of finding an improving neighbor of a given coloring can now be formalized as follows.

LS MAX c -CUT

Input: A graph $G = (V, E)$, $c \in \mathbb{N}$, a weight function $\omega : E \rightarrow \mathbb{Q}$, a c -coloring χ , and $k \in \mathbb{N}$.

Question: Is there a c -coloring χ' such that $d_{\text{flip}}(\chi, \chi') \leq k$ and $\omega(E(\chi')) > \omega(E(\chi))$?

The special case of LS MAX c -CUT where $c = 2$ can alternatively be defined as follows by using partitions instead of colorings.

LS MAX CUT

Input: A graph $G = (V, E)$, a weight function $\omega : E \rightarrow \mathbb{Q}$, a partition (A, B) of V , and $k \in \mathbb{N}$.

Question: Is there a set $S \subseteq V$ of size at most k such that $\omega(E(A, B)) < \omega(E(A \oplus S, B \oplus S))$?

While these problems are defined as decision problems, our algorithms solve the search problem that returns an improving k -flip if it exists.

Let χ and χ' be c -colorings of a graph G . We say that χ' is an *inclusion-minimal improving k -flip* for χ , if χ' is an improving k -neighbor of χ and if there is no improving k -neighbor $\tilde{\chi}$ of χ with $D_{\text{flip}}(\chi, \tilde{\chi}) \subsetneq D_{\text{flip}}(\chi, \chi')$. Let (A, B) be a partition of G . In the context of LS MAX CUT, we call a vertex set S *inclusion-minimal improving k -flip* for (A, B) , if $|S| \leq k$, $\omega(E(A \oplus S, B \oplus S)) > \omega(E(A, B))$, and if there is no vertex set $S' \subsetneq S$ such that $\omega(E(A \oplus S', B \oplus S')) > \omega(E(A, B))$.

In this work, we also consider the *permissive version* of the above local search problems. In such a permissive version [15], we get the same input as in the normal local search problem, but the task is now to (i) find *any* better solution or (ii) correctly output that there is no better solution in the k -neighborhood.

3 W[1]-hardness and a tight ETH lower bound for LS MAX c -CUT and related problems

We first show our intractability result for LS MAX CUT. More precisely, we show that LS MAX CUT is W[1]-hard when parameterized by k even on bipartite graphs with unit weights. This implies that even on instances where an optimal partition can be found in linear time, LS MAX CUT presumably cannot be solved within $f(k) \cdot n^{\mathcal{O}(1)}$ time for any computable function f . Afterwards, extend the intractability results even to the permissive version of LS MAX c -CUT on general graphs. Finally, we can then also derive new intractability results for local search versions for the related partition problems MIN BISECTION, MAX BISECTION, and MAX SAT.

To prove the intractability results for the strict version, we introduce the term of *blocked vertices* in instances with unit weights. Intuitively, a vertex v is blocked for a color class i if we can conclude that v does not move to i in any optimal k -neighbor of the current solution just by considering the graph neighborhood of v . This concept is formalized as follows.

Definition 1. Let $G = (V, E)$ be a graph, let χ be a c -coloring of G , and let k be an integer. Moreover, let v be a vertex of V and let $i \in [1, c] \setminus \{\chi(v)\}$ be a color. The vertex v is (i, k) -blocked in G with respect to χ if v has at least $2k + 1$ more neighbors of color i than of color $\chi(v)$ with respect to χ , that is, if $|\{w \in N(v) \mid \chi(w) = i\}| \geq |\{w \in N(v) \mid \chi(w) = \chi(v)\}| + 2k - 1$.

Note that a partition $P := (B_1, B_2)$ can be interpreted as the 2-coloring χ_P defined for each vertex $v \in V$ by $\chi_P(v) := i$, where i is the the unique index of $\{1, 2\}$ such that $v \in B_i$. Hence, we may also say that a vertex v is (B_i, k) -blocked in G with respect to (B_1, B_2) , if v is (i, k) -blocked in G with respect to χ_P .

3.1 Hardness for the strict version of LS MAX c -CUT

Lemma 1. *Let $G = (V, E)$ be a graph, let χ be a c -coloring of G , let k be an integer. Moreover, let v be a vertex in V which is (i, k) -blocked in G with respect to χ . Then, there is no inclusion-minimal improving k -neighbor χ' of χ with $\chi'(v) = i$.*

Proof. Let χ' be a c -coloring of G with $d_{\text{flip}}(\chi, \chi') \leq k$ and $\chi'(v) = i$. Hence, $v \in D_{\text{flip}}(\chi, \chi')$ and thus $D_{\text{flip}}(\chi, \chi')$ contains at most $k - 1$ neighbors of v . Consequently, at most $k - 1$ more neighbors of v receive color $\chi(v)$ under χ' than under χ . Similarly, at most $k - 1$ more neighbors of v receive color i under χ than under χ' . Since v is (i, k) -blocked in G with respect to χ , this then implies that v has more neighbors of color i than of color $\chi(v)$ under χ' . Let χ^* be the c -coloring of G that agrees with χ' on all vertices of $V \setminus \{v\}$ and where $\chi^*(v) := \chi(v)$. Note that $E(\chi') \setminus E(\chi^*) = \{\{w, v\} \in E \mid \chi'(w) = \chi(v)\}$ and $E(\chi^*) \setminus E(\chi') = \{\{w, v\} \in E \mid \chi'(w) = i\}$. This implies that χ^* is a better c -coloring for G than χ' , since

$$|E(\chi^*)| - |E(\chi')| = |E(\chi^*) \setminus E(\chi')| - |E(\chi') \setminus E(\chi^*)| > 0.$$

Hence, χ' is not an inclusion-minimal improving k -neighbor of χ , since $D_{\text{flip}}(\chi, \chi^*) = D_{\text{flip}}(\chi, \chi') \setminus \{v\} \subsetneq D_{\text{flip}}(\chi, \chi')$. \square

The idea of blocking a vertex by its neighbors finds application in the construction for the W[1]-hardness from the next theorem.

Theorem 1. *LS MAX CUT is W[1]-hard when parameterized by k on bipartite 2-degenerate graphs with unit weights.*

Proof. We reduce from CLIQUE, where we are given an undirected graph G and $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and ask whether G contains a clique of size k . CLIQUE is W[1]-hard when parameterized by the size k of the sought clique [8, 6].

Let $I := (G = (V, E), k)$ be an instance of CLIQUE. We construct an equivalent instance $I' := (G' = (V', E'), \omega', A', B', k')$ of LS MAX CUT with $\omega' : E' \rightarrow \{1\}$ as follows. We start with an empty graph G' and add each vertex of V to G' . Next, for each edge $e \in E$, we add two vertices u_e and w_e to G' and make both u_e and w_e adjacent to each endpoint of e in G' . Afterwards, we add a vertex v^* to G' and for each edge $e \in E$, we add vertices x_e and y_e and edges $\{w_e, x_e\}, \{w_e, y_e\}$, and $\{x_e, v^*\}$ to G' . Finally, we add a set V_z of $|E| - 2 \cdot \binom{k}{2} + 1$ vertices to G' and make each vertex of V_z adjacent to v^* .

In the following, for each $\alpha \in \{u, w, x, y\}$, let V_α denote the set of all α -vertices in G' , that is, $V_\alpha := \{\alpha_e \mid e \in E\}$. We set

$$B' := V_w \cup \{v^*\} \cup V_z, A' := V' \setminus B', \text{ and}$$

$$k' := 2 \cdot \binom{k}{2} + k + 1.$$

To ensure that some vertices are blocked in the final graph G' , we add the following further vertices to A' and B' : For each vertex $v' \in V_u \cup V_y$, we add a set of $2k' + 2$ vertices to B' that are only adjacent to v' and for each vertex $v' \in V_z$, we add a




Figure 1: The connections between the different vertex sets in G' . Two vertex sets X and Y are adjacent in the figure if $E(X, Y) \neq \emptyset$. Each vertex v in a vertex set with a rectangular node is k' -blocked from the opposite part of the partition. The vertex set V_Γ is not shown.

set of $2k' + 2$ vertices to A' that are only adjacent to v' . Let V_Γ be the set of those additional vertices. Figure 1 shows a sketch of the vertex sets and their connections in G' . Note that G' is bipartite and 2-degenerate.

Note that each vertex in $V_u \cup V_y$ is contained in A' , has at most two neighbors in A' , and at least $2k' + 2$ neighbors in B' . Moreover, each vertex in V_z is contained in B' , has one neighbor in B' , and $2k' + 2$ neighbors in A' . Hence, each vertex in $V_u \cup V_y$ is (B', k') -blocked and each vertex in V_z is (A', k') -blocked. Consequently, due to Lemma 1, no inclusion-minimal improving k' -flip for (A', B') contains any vertex of $V_u \cup V_y \cup V_z$. As a consequence, no inclusion-minimal improving k' -flip for (A', B') contains any vertex of V_Γ . In other words, only vertices in V , V_w , V_x , and the vertex v^* can flip their colors.

Before we show the correctness, we provide some intuition. By the above, intuitively, a clique S in the graph G then corresponds to a flip of vertex v^* , the vertices of S , and the vertices w_e and x_e for each edge e of the clique. The key mechanism is that each inclusion-minimal improving flip has to contain v^* , so that edges between v^* and V_z become properly colored. To compensate for the edges between V_x and v^* that are not properly colored after flipping v^* , for some edges e of G , the corresponding vertices of V_x and V_w and both endpoints of e have to flip their color. The size of V_z ensures that this has to be done for at least $\binom{k}{2}$ such edges of G . Since we only allow a flip of size k' , this then ensures that the edges of G whose corresponding vertices flip their color belong to a clique of size k in G .

Next, we show that I is a yes-instance of CLIQUE if and only if I' is a yes-instance of LS MAX CUT.

(\Rightarrow) Let $S \subseteq V$ be a clique of size k in G . Hence, $\binom{S}{2} \subseteq E$. We set $S' := S \cup \{w_e, x_e \mid e \in \binom{S}{2}\} \cup \{v^*\}$. Note that S' has size $k + 2 \cdot \binom{k}{2} + 1 = k'$. Let $C := E(A', B')$ and let $C' := E(A' \oplus S', B' \oplus S')$. It remains to show that C' contains more edges than C . To this end, note that C and C' differ only on edges that have at least one endpoint in S' .

First, we discuss the edges incident with at least one vertex of $S = S' \cap V$. For each vertex $v \in S$ and each vertex $v' \in N_G(v) \setminus S$, the edge $\{v, w_{\{v, v'\}}\}$ is contained in C but not in C' and the edge $\{v, u_{\{v, v'\}}\}$ is contained in C' but not in C . For each other neighbor $v' \in N_G(v) \cap S$, the edge $\{v, u_{\{v, v'\}}\}$ is contained in C' but not in C and the

edge $\{v, w_{\{v,v'\}}\}$ is contained in both C and C' . Next, we discuss the remaining edges incident with some vertex of $\{w_e, x_e \mid e \in \binom{S}{2}\}$. For each edge $e \in \binom{S}{2} \subseteq E$, the edges $\{w_e, x_e\}$ and $\{x_e, v^*\}$ are contained in both C and C' and the edge $\{w_e, y_e\}$ is contained in C but not in C' . Finally, we discuss the remaining edges incident with v^* . For each edge $e \in E \setminus \binom{S}{2}$, the edge $\{v^*, x_e\}$ is contained in C but not in C' and for each vertex $z \in V_z$, the edge $\{v^*, z\}$ is contained in C' but not in C . Hence,

$$\begin{aligned} C \setminus C' &= \{\{v, w_{\{v,v'\}}\} \mid v \in S, v' \in N_G(v) \setminus S\} \\ &\cup \{\{w_e, y_e\} \mid e \in \binom{S}{2}\} \\ &\cup \{\{v^*, x_e\} \mid e \in E \setminus \binom{S}{2}\}. \end{aligned}$$

Furthermore, we have

$$C' \setminus C = \{\{v, u_{\{v,v'\}}\} \mid v \in S, v' \in N_G(v)\} \cup \{\{v^*, z\} \mid z \in V_z\}.$$

Since $|V_z| = |E| - 2 \cdot \binom{k}{2} + 1$, we get

$$\begin{aligned} |C' \setminus C| - |C \setminus C'| &= |\{\{v, u_{\{v,v'\}}\} \mid v \in S, v' \in N_G(v)\}| \\ &\quad - |\{\{v, w_{\{v,v'\}}\} \mid v \in S, v' \in N_G(v) \setminus S\}| \\ &\quad + |\{\{v^*, z\} \mid z \in V_z\}| \\ &\quad - |\{\{w_e, y_e\} \mid e \in \binom{S}{2}\}| - |\{\{v^*, x_e\} \mid e \in E \setminus \binom{S}{2}\}| \\ &= 2 \cdot \binom{k}{2} + |E| - 2 \cdot \binom{k}{2} + 1 - |E| = 1. \end{aligned}$$

Consequently, C' contains exactly one edge more than C . Hence, I' is a yes-instance of LS MAX CUT.

(\Leftarrow) Let $S' \subseteq V'$ be an inclusion-minimal improving k' -flip for (A', B') . Due to Lemma 1, we can assume that $S' \subseteq V \cup V_w \cup V_x \cup \{v^*\}$ since all other vertices of $V' \setminus V_\Gamma$ are blocked from the opposite part of the partition and for each vertex $x \in V_\Gamma$, the unique neighbor of x in G' is thus not contained in S' . By construction of G' , each vertex $v \in V$ is adjacent to $|N_G(v)|$ vertices of A' and adjacent to $|N_G(v)|$ vertices of B' . Since S' is inclusion-minimal and contains no vertex of $\{u_e \mid e \in E\}$, for each vertex $v \in S' \cap V$, there is at least one edge $e \in E$ incident with v in G such that S' contains the vertex w_e , as otherwise, removing v from S' still results in an even better partition than $(A' \oplus S', B' \oplus S')$, that is,

$$|E(A' \oplus (S' \setminus \{v\}), B' \oplus (S' \setminus \{v\}))| \geq |E(A' \oplus S', B' \oplus S')| > |E(A', B')|.$$

Moreover, recall that B' contains all vertices of V_w and each vertex $w_e \in V_w$ is adjacent to the four vertices $\{x_e, y_e\} \cup e$ of A' and is adjacent to no vertex of B' . Since S' is inclusion-minimal and contains no vertex of V_y , for each vertex $w_e \in S' \cap V_w$, all three vertices of $\{x_e\} \cup e$ are contained in S' , as otherwise, removing w_e from S' does not result in a worse partition than $(A' \oplus S', B' \oplus S')$, that is,

$$|E(A' \oplus (S' \setminus \{w_e\}), B' \oplus (S' \setminus \{w_e\}))| \geq |E(A' \oplus S', B' \oplus S')| > |E(A', B')|.$$

Furthermore, A' contains all vertices of V_x and each vertex $x_e \in V_x$ is adjacent to the vertices w_e and v^* in B' and adjacent to no vertex in A' . Since S' is inclusion-minimal, for each vertex $x_e \in S' \cap V_x$, both w_e and v^* are contained in S' , as otherwise, removing x_e from S' does not result in a worse partition than $(A' \oplus S', B' \oplus S')$, that is,

$$|E(A' \oplus (S' \setminus \{x_e\}), B' \oplus (S' \setminus \{x_e\}))| \geq |E(A' \oplus S', B' \oplus S')| > |E(A', B')|.$$

Note that the above statements imply that S' contains v^* . This is due to the facts that

- a) S' is non-empty,
- b) S' contains only vertices of $V \cup V_w \cup V_x \cup \{v^*\}$,
- c) if S' contains a vertex of V , then S' contains a vertex of V_w ,
- d) if S' contains a vertex of V_w , then S' contains a vertex of V_x , and
- e) if S' contains a vertex of V_x , then S' contains the vertex v^* .

Recall that v^* is adjacent to the $|E|$ vertices V_x in A' and to the $|E| - 2 \cdot \binom{k}{2} + 1$ vertices V_z in B' . Hence, since S' is inclusion-minimal and no vertex of V_z is contained in S' , S' contains at least $\binom{k}{2}$ vertices of V_x , as otherwise,

$$|E(A' \oplus (S' \setminus \{v^*\}), B' \oplus (S' \setminus \{v^*\}))| \geq |E(A' \oplus S', B' \oplus S')| > |E(A', B')|.$$

Concluding, S' contains v^* and for at least $\binom{k}{2}$ edges $e \in E$ the vertices x_e, w_e , and the endpoints of e . Let $S := S' \cap V$. Since S' has size at most $k' = 2 \cdot \binom{k}{2} + k + 1$, the above implies that S has size at most k . Since S' contains the endpoints of at least $\binom{k}{2}$ edges $e \in E$, we conclude that S is a clique of size k in G . Hence, I is a yes-instance of CLIQUE. \square

This implies that even on instances where an optimal solution can be found in polynomial time, local optimality cannot be verified efficiently. This property was also shown for LS-VERTEX COVER. Namely, LS-VERTEX COVER was shown to be W[1]-hard with respect to the search radius even on bipartite graphs [15].

Next, we describe how to adapt the above reduction can to prove W[1]-hardness of LS MAX c -CUT for each fixed $c \geq 2$ when parameterized by k .

Consider the instance $I := (G, \omega, (A, B), k)$ of LS MAX CUT that has been constructed in the proof of Theorem 1 and let $c > 2$. For every vertex v of G , we add further degree-one neighbors. More precisely, for every color $i \in [3, c]$, the vertex v receives additional neighbors of color i such that v is (i, k) -blocked. Let G' be the resulting graph.

Then, for any inclusion-minimal improving k -flip χ' for χ of G' , we have $S := D_{\text{flip}}(\chi, \chi') \subseteq A \cup B$, $\chi'(a) = 2$ for each $a \in A \cap S$, and $\chi'(b) = 1$ for each $b \in B \cap S$. Hence, I is a yes-instance of LS MAX CUT if and only if the instance I' is a yes-instance of LS MAX c -CUT. Since we only added degree-one vertices, the graph is still bipartite and 2-degenerate.

Corollary 1. *For every $c \geq 2$, LS MAX c -CUT is W[1]-hard when parameterized by k on bipartite 2-degenerate graphs with unit weights.*




Figure 2: Two solutions for the instance of LS MAX CUT constructed in the proof of Lemma 2. In both solutions, the parts of the respective partitions are indicated by the color of the vertices. The left partition shows the initial solution and the right partition shows an improving solution, if one exists. The flip between these partitions is an independent set of size k in G together with the vertex v^* .

3.2 Hardness for the permissive version of LS MAX c -CUT

Next, we present a running-time lower bound for LS MAX c -CUT based on the ETH. This lower-bound holds even for the permissive version of LS MAX c -CUT.

Lemma 2. *Even the permissive version of LS MAX CUT does not admit an FPT-algorithm when parameterized by k , unless $\text{FPT} = \text{W}[1]$ and cannot be solved in $f(k) \cdot n^{o(k)}$ time for any computable function f , unless the ETH fails. More precisely, this hardness holds even if there is an optimal solution in the k -flip neighborhood of the initial solution.*

Proof. We reduce from INDEPENDENT SET, where we are given an undirected graph G and $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and ask whether G contains an independent set of size k . INDEPENDENT SET is $\text{W}[1]$ -hard when parameterized by the size k of the sought independent set even if the size of a largest independent set in the input graph is at most k [8, 6]. Furthermore, even under these restrictions, INDEPENDENT SET cannot be solved in $f(k) \cdot n^{o(k)}$ time for any computable function f , unless the ETH fails [6].

Let $I := (G = (V, E), k)$ be an instance of INDEPENDENT SET and let $n := |V|$ and $m := |E|$. We construct an equivalent instance $I' := (G' = (V', E'), \omega', A, B, k')$ of LS MAX CUT with $\omega' : E' \rightarrow \{1\}$ as follows. We initialize G' as a copy of G . Next, we add two vertex sets X and Y of size n^3 each to G' . Additionally, we add a vertex v^* to G' . Next, we describe the edges incident with at least one newly added vertex. We add edges to G' such that v^* is adjacent to each vertex of V and $n - k + 1$ arbitrary vertices of X . Moreover, we add edges to G' such that each vertex of X is adjacent to each vertex of Y . Finally, we add edges to G' such that each vertex $v \in V$ is adjacent with exactly $|N_G(v)|$ arbitrary vertices of X in G' . This completes the construction of G' . It remains to define the initial partition (A, B) of V' and the search radius k' . We set $A := V \cup Y$, $B := X \cup \{v^*\}$, and $k' := k + 1$. This completes the construction of I' . Note that each vertex of V has exactly one neighbor more in B than in A . Moreover, v^* has $2k - 1$ more neighbors in A than in B .

Intuitively, the only way to improve over the partition (A, B) is to flip an independent set in G of size k from A to B . Then, v^* has exactly one neighbor more in B than

in A and flipping v^* from B to A improves over the initial partition (A, B) by exactly one edge. See Figure 2 for an illustration. Next, we show that this reduction is correct.

(\Rightarrow) Let S be an independent set of size k in G . We set $A' := (A \setminus S) \cup \{v^*\}$ and $B' := V' \setminus A' = (B \cup S) \setminus \{v^*\}$ and show that (A', B') improves over (A, B) . Note that $E(A, B) = E(Y, X) \cup E(V, \{v^*\}) \cup E(V, X)$ which implies that

$$|E(A, B)| = |Y| \cdot |X| + |V| + \sum_{v \in V} |N_G(v)| = n^6 + n + 2m.$$

Moreover, note that

$$E(A', B') = E(Y, X) \cup E(\{v^*\}, S) \cup E(\{v^*\}, X) \cup E(V \setminus S, S) \cup E(V \setminus S, X).$$

Since S is an independent set in G and G' , for each vertex $v \in S$, $V \setminus S$ contains all neighbors of v in G . Consequently, $|E(V \setminus S, S)| = \sum_{v \in S} |N_G(v)|$. Since S has size k , the above implies that

$$\begin{aligned} |E(A', B')| &= |Y| \cdot |X| + |S| + n - k + 1 + \sum_{v \in S} |N_G(v)| + \sum_{v \in V \setminus S} |N_G(v)| \\ &= n^6 + n + 2m + 1. \end{aligned}$$

Hence, the partition (A', B') improves over the partition (A, B) which implies that I' is a yes-instance of LS MAX CUT.

(\Leftarrow) Let (A', B') be an optimal partition of G' and suppose that (A', B') improves over (A, B) . We show that I is a yes-instance of INDEPENDENT SET. Due to the first direction, this then implies that I' is a yes-instance of LS MAX CUT which further implies that the initial partition (A, B) is an optimal partition for G' if and only if (A, B) is k' -flip optimal. To show that I is a yes-instance of INDEPENDENT SET, we first analyze the structure of the optimal partition (A', B') for G' .

First, we show that all vertices of X are on the opposite part of the partition (A', B') than all vertices of Y .

Claim 1. A' contains all vertices of Y and B' contains all vertices of X , or A' contains all vertices of X and B' contains all vertices of Y .

Proof. We show that if neither of these statements holds, then $E(A', B')$ contains less edges than $E(A, B)$. This would then contradict the fact that (A', B') is an optimal partition. We distinguish two cases.

If all vertices of $X \cup Y$ are on the same part of the partition (A', B') , then $E(A', B')$ contains at most $|N_{G'}(V)| + |N_{G'}(v^*)| < n^3$ edges. Hence, $E(A', B')$ contains strictly less edges than $E(A, B)$ which contradicts the fact that (A', B') is an optimal partition. Otherwise, if not all vertices of $X \cup Y$ are on the same part of the partition (A', B') and not all vertices of X are on the opposite part of the partition than all vertices of Y , then both A' and B' contain at least one vertex of X each, or both A' and B' contain at least one vertex of Y each. In both cases, at least $\min(|X|, |Y|) = n^3$ edges of $E(X, Y)$ are not contained in $E(A', B')$. Hence, $E(A', B')$ has size at most $|E| - n^3$. Again, since E contains at most $|N_{G'}(V)| + |N_{G'}(v^*)| < n^3$ edges outside of $E(X, Y)$, this implies that $E(A', B')$ contains strictly less edges than $E(A, B)$. This contradicts the

fact that (A', B') is an optimal partition. Consequently, the statement holds. \blacksquare

By Claim 1, we may assume without loss of generality that A' contains all vertices of Y and B' contains all vertices of X . Next, we show that v^* is contained in A' . Assume towards a contradiction that v^* is contained in B' . Hence, each vertex $v \in V$ has $|N_G(v)| + 1$ neighbors in B' . By construction, each vertex $v \in V$ has exactly $2 \cdot |N_G(v)| + 1$ neighbors in G' . Hence, each vertex of V has more neighbors in B' than in A' . Consequently, A' contains all vertices of V , since (A', B') is an optimal partition for G' . This implies that $A' := Y \cup V = A$ and $B' := X \cup \{v^*\} = B$ which contradicts the assumption that (A', B') improves over (A, B) . Consequently, v^* is contained in A' together with all vertices of Y . It remains to determine the partition of the vertices of V into A' and B' .

Let $S := B' \cap V$. We show that S is an independent set of size k in G . First, assume towards a contradiction that S is not an independent set in G . Then, there are two adjacent vertices u and w of V in B' . Hence, u has at least $|N_G(u)| + 1$ neighbors in B' , since u is adjacent to $|N_G(u)|$ vertices of X . Since the degree of u in G' is $2 \cdot |N_G(u)| + 1$, flipping vertex u from B' to A' would result in an improving solution. This contradicts the fact that (A', B') is an optimal partition of G' . Hence, S is an independent set in G . By assumption, the size of the largest independent set in G is at most k . Hence, to show that S is an independent set of size k , it suffices to show that S has size at least k . To this end, we analyze the number of edges of $E(A', B')$. Recall that $A' := (A \setminus S) \cup \{v^*\}$ and $B' := (B \cup S) \setminus \{v^*\}$. Hence, analogously to the first direction of the correctness proof, $E(A', B') = E(Y, X) \cup E(\{v^*\}, S) \cup E(\{v^*\}, X) \cup E(V \setminus S, S) \cup E(V \setminus S, X)$. Since S is an independent set, this implies that

$$\begin{aligned} |E(A', B')| &= |Y| \cdot |X| + |S| + n - k + 1 + \sum_{v \in S} |N_G(v)| + \sum_{v \in V \setminus S} |N_G(v)| \\ &= n^6 + n - k + 1 + 2m + |S|. \end{aligned}$$

Since we assumed that the partition (A', B') improves over (A, B) and $|E(A, B)| = n^6 + n + 2m$, this implies that S has size at least k . Consequently, S is an independent set of size k in G , which implies that I is a yes-instance of INDEPENDENT SET.

This also implies that, if (A, B) is not an optimal partition for G' , then there is an optimal partition for G' with flip-distance exactly k' from (A, B) . Hence, the reduction is correct. Recall that INDEPENDENT SET is $W[1]$ -hard when parameterized by k and cannot be solved in $f(k) \cdot n^{o(k)}$ time for any computable function f , unless the ETH fails. Since $|V'| \in \mathcal{O}(n^3)$ and $k' \in \mathcal{O}(k)$, this implies that the permissive version of LS MAX CUT (i) does not admit an FPT-algorithm when parameterized by k' , unless $\text{FPT} = W[1]$ and (ii) cannot be solved in $f(k') \cdot |V'|^{o(k')}$ time for any computable function f , unless the ETH fails. \square

These intractability results can be transferred to each larger constant value of c .

Theorem 2. *For every $c \geq 2$, even the permissive version of LS MAX c -CUT does not admit an FPT-algorithm when parameterized by k , unless $\text{FPT} = W[1]$ and cannot*

be solved in $f(k) \cdot n^{o(k)}$ time for any computable function f , unless the ETH fails. This holds even on graphs with unit weights.

Proof. Let $I := (G = (V, E), \omega, A, B, k)$ be an instance of LS MAX CUT with $\omega(e) = 1$ for each edge $e \in E$, such that there is an optimal partition (A', B') for G with flip-distance at most k with (A, B) and let $n := |V|$ and $m := |E|$. Due to Lemma 2, even under these restrictions, LS MAX CUT does not admit an FPT-algorithm when parameterized by k , unless FPT = W[1] and cannot be solved in $f(k) \cdot n^{o(k)}$ time for any computable function f , unless the ETH fails.

Fix a constant $c > 2$. We describe how to obtain in polynomial time an equivalent instance $I' := (G' := (V', E'), c, \omega', \chi, k)$ of LS MAX c -CUT. We obtain the graph G' by adding for each $i \in [1, c]$ an independent set X_i of size n^2 to G and adding edges such that each vertex of X_i is adjacent with each vertex of $\{v \in X_j \mid j \in [1, c] \setminus \{i\}\}$. Additionally, for each $i \in [3, c]$, we add edges between each vertex of X_i and each vertex of V . This completes the construction of G' . Again, each edge receives weight 1 with respect to the weight function ω' . Finally, we define the c -coloring χ of G' . For each $i \in [1, c]$, we set $\chi(v) := i$ for each vertex $v \in X_i$. Additionally, for each vertex $v \in A$, we set $\chi(v) := 1$ and for each vertex $w \in B$, we set $\chi(w) := 2$. This completes the construction of I' .

Note that $E'(\chi)$ contains all edges of $E' \setminus E$ and thus misses less than n^2 edges of G' in total. Intuitively, this ensures that only vertices of V may flip their color and only to the colors 1 or 2, since in each other c -coloring, at least n^2 edges are missing. In other words, the large independent sets X_i ensure that to improve over χ , one can only flip vertices of V from color 1 to 2 or vice versa. This is then improving if and only if the corresponding flip on the LS MAX CUT-instance I is improving.

Next, we show the correctness of the reduction.

(\Rightarrow) Let (A', B') be an optimal partition of G that improves over (A, B) and let S be the flip between (A, B) and (A', B') . By assumption, we know that S has size at most k . We define a c -coloring χ^* for G' as follows: The colorings χ and χ^* agree on all vertices of $V' \setminus S$, for each vertex $v \in A \cap S$, we set $\chi^*(v) := 2$, and for each vertex $w \in B \cap S$, we set $\chi^*(w) := 1$. Note that $D_{\text{flip}}(\chi, \chi^*) = S$ which implies that χ^* and χ have flip-distance at most k . Moreover, note that $A' = \{v \in V \mid \chi^*(v) = 1\}$ and $B' = \{v \in V \mid \chi^*(v) = 2\}$. It remains to show that χ^* improves over χ . To this end, note that both $E'(\chi)$ and $E'(\chi^*)$ contain all edges of $E' \setminus E$. Hence, χ^* improves over χ if and only if $|E'(\chi^*) \cap E| > |E'(\chi) \cap E|$. Note that $E'(\chi^*) \cap E = E(A', B')$ and $E'(\chi) \cap E = E(A, B)$. Hence, the assumption that (A', B') is a better partition for G than (A, B) implies that χ^* improves over χ . Consequently, I' is a yes-instance of LS MAX c -CUT.

(\Leftarrow) Let χ^* be an optimal c -coloring for G' and assume that χ^* improves over χ . To show that there is a better partition for G than (A, B) , we first prove that each optimal c -coloring χ^* for G' contains all edges of $E' \setminus E$.

Claim 2. *It holds that $E'(\chi^*)$ contains all edges of $E' \setminus E$.*

Proof. Assume towards a contradiction that $E'(\chi^*)$ does not contain all edges of $E' \setminus E$. Since $E'(\chi^*)$ does not contain all edges of $E' \setminus E$, there is an $i \in [1, c]$ and a

vertex $x \in X_i$, such that at least one edge incident with x is not contained in $E'(\chi^*)$. We distinguish two cases.

Case 1: There is a vertex $y \in X_i$, such that each edge incident with y is contained in $E'(\chi^*)$. Consider the c -coloring χ' for G' obtained from χ^* by flipping the color of vertex x to $\chi^*(y)$. Since x and y have the exact same neighborhood by definition of G' and are not adjacent, each edge incident with x is contained in $E'(\chi')$. Consequently, χ' is a better c -coloring for G' than χ^* . This contradicts the fact that χ^* is an optimal c -coloring for G' .

Case 2: Each vertex of X_i is incident with at least one edge that is not contained in $E'(\chi^*)$. Since X_i is an independent set in G' , this directly implies that $E'(\chi^*)$ misses at least $|X_i| = n^2$ edges of E' . Hence, $E(\chi^*)$ contains less edges than $E'(\chi)$ and is thus not an optimal c -coloring for G' , a contradiction. ■

By the above, we know that χ^* contains all edges of $E' \setminus E$. Since $G' - V$ is a complete c -partite graph with c -partition (X_1, \dots, X_c) , there is a bijection $\pi: [1, c] \rightarrow [1, c]$, such that for each $i \in [1, c]$, each vertex of X_i receives color $\pi(i)$ under χ^* . Moreover, since for each $j \in [3, c]$, each vertex $v \in V$ is adjacent with each vertex of X_j , each vertex of V receives either color $\pi(1)$ or color $\pi(2)$ under χ^* . For simplicity, we assume in the following that π is the identity function, that is, for each $i \in [1, c]$, each vertex of X_i receives color i under χ^* and each vertex of V receives either color 1 or color 2 under χ^* . Let $A' := \{v \in V \mid \chi^*(v) = 1\}$ and let $B' := \{v \in V \mid \chi^*(v) = 2\}$. Note that $|E'(\chi^*)| = |E' \setminus E| + |E(A', B')|$ and that $|E'(\chi)| = |E' \setminus E| + |E(A, B)|$. Hence, χ^* is a better c -coloring for G' than χ if and only if (A', B') is a better partition of G than (A, B) . Since χ^* improves over χ , this implies that (A, B) is not an optimal partition for G . By assumption there is an optimal partition for G having flip-distance at most k with (A, B) . Hence, I is a yes-instance of LS MAX CUT. By the first direction, this further implies that I' is a yes-instance of LS MAX c -CUT if χ is not an optimal c -coloring for G' .

Note that this implies that there is an optimal c -coloring for G' having flip-distance at most k with χ . Hence, the reduction is also correct for the permissive version of LS MAX c -CUT. Recall that LS MAX CUT does not admit an FPT-algorithm when parameterized by k , unless $\text{FPT} = \text{W}[1]$ and cannot be solved in $f(k) \cdot n^{o(k)}$ time for any computable function f , unless the ETH fails. Since $|V'| \in n^{O(1)}$, this implies that even the permissive version of LS MAX c -CUT does not admit an FPT-algorithm when parameterized by k , unless $\text{FPT} = \text{W}[1]$ and cannot be solved in $f(k) \cdot |V'|^{o(k)}$ time for any computable function f , unless the ETH fails. □

3.3 Hardness for related partition problems

Based on Lemma 2, we are also able to show hardness for a previously considered local search version of MIN BISECTION and MAX BISECTION [9]. In both these problems, the input is again an undirected graph G and the goal is to find a balanced partition (X, Y) of the vertex set of G that minimizes (maximizes) the edges in $E(X, Y)$. Here, a partition (X, Y) is *balanced* if the size of X and the size of Y differ by at most one. Due to the close relation to LS MAX CUT, the proposed local neighborhood for these problems is also the k -flip-neighborhood. The corresponding local search

problems in which we ask for a better balanced partition of flip-distance at most k are denoted by LS MIN BISECTION and LS MAX BISECTION, respectively. It was shown that both these local search problems can be solved in $2^{\mathcal{O}(k)} \cdot n^{\mathcal{O}(1)}$ time on restricted graph classes [9] but W[1]-hardness on general graphs was not shown so far.

Corollary 2. *LS MIN BISECTION and LS MAX BISECTION are W[1]-hard when parameterized by k and cannot be solved in $f(k) \cdot n^{o(k)}$ time for any computable function f , unless the ETH fails. This running time lower-bound holds even for the permissive version of both problems and both permissive versions do not admit FPT-algorithms when parameterized by k , unless $\text{FPT} = \text{W}[1]$.*

Proof. First, we show the statement for LS MAX BISECTION. Afterwards, we discuss how to obtain the similar intractability result for LS MIN BISECTION. Let $I := (G = (V, E), \omega, A, B, k)$ be an instance of LS MAX CUT with $\omega(e) = 1$ for each edge $e \in E$, such that there is an optimal partition (A', B') for G with flip-distance at most k with (A, B) and let $n := |V|$. Due to Lemma 2, even under these restrictions LS MAX CUT is W[1]-hard when parameterized by k and cannot be solved in $f(k) \cdot n^{o(k)}$ time for any computable function f , unless the ETH fails.

We obtain an equivalent instance $I' := (G', X, Y, k')$ of LS MAX BISECTION, by simply adding a large independent set to G . That is, we obtain the graph $G' = (V', E')$ by adding a set Z of $n + 2k$ isolated vertices to G , setting $X := A \cup Z_A$ and $Y := B \cup (Z \setminus Z_A)$ for some arbitrary vertex set $Z_A \subseteq Z$ of size $|B| + k$, and setting $k' := 2k$. Note that G and G' have the exact same edge set and that X and Y have the same size and contain at least k vertices of Z each. Intuitively, this ensures that we can perform an improving k -flip on the vertices of V and afterwards end back at a balanced partition by flipping at most k additional vertices of Z to the smaller part of the resulting potentially not balanced partition.

Note that for each partition (X', Y') of G' , $E'(X', Y') = E(X \cap V, Y \cap V)$. This directly implies that (X, Y) is an optimal balanced partition for G' if $(X \cap V, Y \cap V) = (A, B)$ is an optimal partition for G . Hence, I' is a no-instance of LS MAX BISECTION if I is a no-instance of LS MAX CUT, since by assumption, (A, B) is an optimal partition for G if and only if I is a no-instance of LS MAX CUT. It thus remains to show that I' is a yes-instance of LS MAX BISECTION if I is a yes-instance of LS MAX CUT. By the above, this then implies that I' is a no-instance of LS MAX BISECTION if and only if (X, Y) is an optimal balanced partition for G' .

Assume that I is a yes-instance of LS MAX CUT. This implies that (A, B) is not an optimal partition of G . Let (A', B') be an optimal partition of G . By assumption, we can assume that (A', B') has flip-distance at most k with (A, B) . Let $\widehat{X} := A' \cup Z_A$ and $\widehat{Y} := B' \cup (Z \setminus Z_A)$. Note that $(\widehat{X}, \widehat{Y})$ has flip-distance at most k with (X, Y) and is a better partition for G' than (X, Y) . Still, $(\widehat{X}, \widehat{Y})$ might not be a balanced partition. But since $(\widehat{X}, \widehat{Y})$ has flip-distance at most k with (X, Y) , the size of \widehat{X} and the size of \widehat{Y} differ by at most k . Hence, we can obtain a balanced partition (X', Y') for G' by flipping at most k vertices from Z from the larger part of the partition to the smaller part. This is possible, since by construction both X and Y contain at least k vertices of Z . Since (X', Y') is obtained from $(\widehat{X}, \widehat{Y})$ by flipping only isolated vertices, (X', Y') is also a better partition for G' than (X, Y) and has flip-distance at

most $2k = k'$ with (X, Y) . Consequently, I' is a yes-instance of LS MAX BISECTION if I is a yes-instance of LS MAX CUT.

Hence, I' is a no-instance of LS MAX BISECTION if and only if (X, Y) is an optimal balanced partition for G' . This implies that the reduction also works for the permissive version of LS MAX BISECTION. Recall that LS MAX CUT is W[1]-hard when parameterized by k and cannot be solved in $f(k) \cdot n^{o(k)}$ time for any computable function f , unless the ETH fails. Since $|V'| \in n^{\mathcal{O}(1)}$ and $k' \in \mathcal{O}(k)$, this implies that (i) the strict version of LS MAX BISECTION is W[1]-hard when parameterized by k' , (ii) the permissive version of LS MAX BISECTION does not admit an FPT-algorithm when parameterized by k' , unless FPT = W[1], and (iii) both versions of LS MAX BISECTION cannot be solved in $f(k) \cdot |V'|^{o(k')}$ time for any computable function f , unless the ETH fails.

The reduction to LS MIN BISECTION works analogously by not considering the graph G' as the input graph, but the complement graph $G'' := (V', E'')$ of G' . Consequently, for each balanced partitions (X', Y') of G'' , $|E''(X', Y')| = |V'|^2/4 - |E'(X', Y')|$. In other words, (X', Y') is a better partition for G'' than (X, Y) if and only if (X', Y') is a better partition for G' than (X, Y) . Hence, the intractability results also hold for the strict and permissive versions of LS MIN BISECTION. \square

Additionally, based on the close relation of MAX 2-SAT and MAX CUT, we can also transfer new hardness results to the strict and permissive version of local search for MAX SAT with respect to the k -flip-neighborhood. This problem was considered by Szeider [39] under the name of k -FLIP MAX SAT. Here, the input is a boolean formula F in CNF, an assignment τ of the variables of F , and an integer k , and we ask for an assignment τ' of the variables of F for which $d_{\text{flip}}(\tau, \tau') \leq k$ and that satisfies more clauses of F than τ . Szeider [39] showed that (i) the strict version of k -FLIP MAX SAT is W[1]-hard when parameterized by k even on formulas where each clause has size two and (ii) the permissive version of k -FLIP MAX SAT does not admit an FPT-algorithm when parameterized by k , unless FPT = W[1], even when each clause has size at most three and the formula is either Horn or anti-Horn².

Theorem 3. *Even on formulas F where each clause has size two and contains exactly one positive and one negative literal, both the strict and the permissive versions of k -FLIP MAX SAT cannot be solved in $f(k) \cdot |F|^{o(k)}$ time for any computable function f , unless the ETH fails, the strict version of k -FLIP MAX SAT is W[1]-hard when parameterized by k , and the permissive version of k -FLIP MAX SAT does not admit an FPT-algorithm when parameterized by k , unless FPT = W[1].*

Proof. We present a reduction from LS MAX 2-CUT, for which the desired intractability results hold even for the permissive version due to Lemma 2. Let $I := (G = (V, E), \omega, \chi, k)$ be an instance of LS MAX CUT with $\omega(e) = 1$ for each edge $e \in E$. We define a formula F as follows: The variables of F are exactly the vertices of V and for each edge $\{u, v\} \in E$, F contains the clauses $\{u, \neg v\}$ and $\{\neg u, v\}$.

Let $\tau : V \rightarrow \{1, 2\}$ be a 2-coloring of V . We interpret τ as an assignment for F , where color 1 (2) represents the truth value “true” (“false”). Note that by construction,

²Here, a formula is Horn (anti-Horn), if each clause contains at most one positive (negative) literal.

for each edge $\{u, v\} \in E$, τ satisfies at least one of the clauses $\{u, \neg v\}$ and $\{\neg u, v\}$. Moreover, τ satisfies both clauses $\{u, \neg v\}$ and $\{\neg u, v\}$ if and only if the edge $\{u, v\}$ is properly colored under τ . This implies that τ satisfies $|E| + |E(\tau)|$ clauses of F . Consequently, an assignment τ' of F satisfies more clauses of F than the 2-coloring χ if and only if $|E(\tau')| > |E(\chi)|$. Hence, I is a yes-instance of LS MAX 2-CUT if and only if (F, χ, k) is a yes-instance of k -FLIP MAX SAT. \square

Hence, in comparison to the hardness results presented by Szeider [39], Theorem 3 provides a tight ETH lower bound as well as hardness for formulas that are 2-Sat, Horn and anti-Horn simultaneously.

4 Algorithms

In this section, we complement the running time lower bound of Theorem 2 by presenting an algorithm for LS MAX c -CUT that runs in $\Delta^{\mathcal{O}(k)} \cdot c \cdot n$ time, where Δ denotes the maximum degree of the input-graph. Our algorithm for LS MAX c -CUT follows a simple framework: Generate a collection of candidate sets S that may improve the coloring if the vertices in S flip their colors. For each such candidate set S , we only know that the colors of the vertices of S change, but we do not yet know which new color the vertices receive. To answer this question, that is, to find whether there is any coloring of S that leads to an improving coloring, we present an algorithm based on dynamic programming.

We first describe the subroutine that we use to find a best coloring for a given candidate set S of vertices to flip.

Theorem 4. *Let $G = (V, E)$ be a graph, let $\omega : E \rightarrow \mathbb{Q}$ be an edge-weight function, let χ be a c -coloring of G , and let $S \subseteq V$ be a set of size at most k . One can compute in $\mathcal{O}(3^k \cdot c \cdot k^2 + k \cdot \Delta(G))$ time a c -coloring χ' of G such that $D_{\text{flip}}(\chi, \chi') \subseteq S$ and $\omega(E(\chi'))$ is maximal among all such colorings.*

Proof. We use dynamic programming. Initially, we compute for each vertex $v \in S$ and each color $i \in [1, c]$ the weight θ_v^i of edges between v and vertices of $V \setminus S$ that do not receive color i under χ , that is, $\theta_v^i := \omega(\{\{v, w\} \in E \mid w \in N(v) \setminus S, \chi(w) \neq i\})$. Moreover, we compute the weight ω_S of all properly colored edges of $E(S, N[S])$ as $\omega_S := \omega(\{\{u, v\} \in E(S, N[S]) \mid \chi(u) \neq \chi(v)\})$. This can be done in $\mathcal{O}(c \cdot k + k \cdot \Delta(G))$ time.

The table T has entries of type $T[S', c']$ for each vertex set $S' \subseteq S$ and each color $c' \in [1, c]$. Each entry $T[S', c']$ stores the maximum total weights of properly colored edges with at least one endpoint in S' and no endpoint in $S \setminus S'$ such that the following holds:

1. the vertices in S' have some color in $[1, c']$, and
2. every vertex $v \in V \setminus S$ has color $\chi(v)$.

We start to fill the dynamic programming table by setting $T[S', 1] := \sum_{v \in S'} \theta_v^1$ for each vertex set $S' \subseteq S$.

For each vertex set $S' \subseteq S$ and each color $c' \in [2, c]$, we set

$$T[S', c'] := \max_{S'' \subseteq S'} T[S' \setminus S'', c' - 1] + \omega(E(S'', S' \setminus S'')) + \sum_{v \in S''} \theta_v^{c'}.$$

Intuitively, to find the best way to assign colors of $[1, c']$ to the vertices of S' , we search for the best vertex set $S'' \subseteq S'$, assign color c' to all vertices of S'' , and find the best way to assign the colors of $[1, c' - 1]$ to the vertices of $S' \setminus S''$. The maximal improvement $\omega(E(\chi')) - \omega(E(\chi))$ for any c -coloring χ' with $D_{\text{flip}}(\chi, \chi') \subseteq S$ can then be found by evaluating $T[S, c] - \omega_S$: this term corresponds to the maximum total weight of properly colored edges we get when distributing the vertices of S among all color classes minus the original weights when every vertex of S sticks with its color under χ . The corresponding c -coloring can be found via traceback.

The formal correctness proof is straightforward and thus omitted. Hence, it remains to show the running time. The dynamic programming table T has $2^k \cdot c$ entries. Each of these entries can be computed in $\mathcal{O}(2^{|S'|} \cdot k^2)$ time. Consequently, all entries can be computed in $\mathcal{O}(\sum_{i=0}^k \binom{k}{i} \cdot 2^i \cdot c \cdot k^2) = \mathcal{O}(3^k \cdot c \cdot k^2)$ time in total. Hence, the total running time is $\mathcal{O}(3^k \cdot c \cdot k^2 + k \cdot \Delta(G))$. \square

For LS MAX CUT, if we enforce that each vertex of S changes its color, the situation is even simpler: When given a set $S \subseteq V$ of k vertices that must flip their colors, the best possible improvement can be computed in $\mathcal{O}(k \cdot \Delta(G))$ time, since every vertex of S must replace its color with the unique other color.

Recall that the idea of our algorithms for LS MAX CUT and LS MAX c -CUT is to iterate over possible candidate sets of vertices that may flip their colors. With the next lemma we show that it suffices to consider those vertex sets that are connected in the input graph.

Lemma 3. *Let $I := (G = (V, E), c, \omega, \chi, k)$ be an instance of LS MAX c -CUT. Then, for every inclusion-minimal improving k -flip χ' for χ , the vertex set $D_{\text{flip}}(\chi, \chi')$ is connected in G .*

Proof. Let χ' be an inclusion-minimal improving k -flip for χ . Let $S' := D_{\text{flip}}(\chi, \chi')$ be the vertices χ and χ' do not agree on and let \mathcal{C} denote the connected components in $G[S']$. We show that if there are at least two connected components in \mathcal{C} , then there is an improving k -neighbor $\tilde{\chi}$ of χ with $D_{\text{flip}}(\chi, \tilde{\chi}) \subsetneq D_{\text{flip}}(\chi, \chi')$. For each connected component $C \in \mathcal{C}$, let $E_C^+ := (E(C, V) \cap E(\chi')) \setminus E(\chi)$ denote the set of properly colored edges in $E(\chi') \setminus E(\chi)$ that have at least one endpoint in C and let $E_C^- := (E(C, V) \cap E(\chi)) \setminus E(\chi')$ denote the set of properly colored edges in $E(\chi) \setminus E(\chi')$ that have at least one endpoint in C . Note that $E(\chi') \setminus E(\chi) = \sum_{C \in \mathcal{C}} E_C^+$ and that $E(\chi) \setminus E(\chi') = \sum_{C \in \mathcal{C}} E_C^-$. Hence, the improvement of χ' over χ is

$$\omega(E(\chi')) - \omega(E(\chi)) = \sum_{C \in \mathcal{C}} \omega(E_C^+) - \sum_{C \in \mathcal{C}} \omega(E_C^-) = \sum_{C \in \mathcal{C}} (\omega(E_C^+) - \omega(E_C^-))$$

Since χ' improves over χ , this implies that there is at least one connected component $S \in \mathcal{C}$ with $\omega(E_S^+) - \omega(E_S^-) > 0$. Let $\tilde{\chi}$ be the c -coloring of G that agrees with χ on all vertices of $V \setminus S$ and agrees with χ' on all vertices of S . Hence, $\tilde{\chi}$ is an improving k -neighbor of χ with $D_{\text{flip}}(\chi, \tilde{\chi}) \subsetneq D_{\text{flip}}(\chi, \chi')$. \square

We next combine Theorem 4 and Lemma 3 to obtain our algorithm for LS MAX c -CUT.

Theorem 5. LS MAX c -CUT can be solved in $\mathcal{O}((3 \cdot e)^k \cdot (\Delta(G) - 1)^{k+1} \cdot c \cdot k^3 \cdot n)$ time.

Proof. Let $I = (G, c, \omega, \chi, k)$ be an instance of LS MAX c -CUT. By Lemma 3, I is a yes-instance of LS MAX c -CUT if and only if χ has an improving k -neighbor χ' where $S := D_{\text{flip}}(\chi, \chi')$ is connected. Since we can enumerate all connected vertex sets S of size at most k in G in $\mathcal{O}(e^k \cdot (\Delta(G) - 1)^k \cdot k \cdot n)$ time [30, 31] and we can compute for each such set S a c -coloring χ' with $D_{\text{flip}}(\chi, \chi') \subseteq S$ that maximizes $\omega(E(\chi'))$ in $\mathcal{O}(3^k \cdot c \cdot k^2 + \Delta(G) \cdot k)$ time due to Theorem 4, we obtain the stated running time. \square

Alternatively, one can also find for each given candidate set S of size at most k a best c -colorings χ' with $D(\chi, \chi') = S$ by enumerating all such colorings. Note that for each candidate set S of size at most k , this can be done in $\mathcal{O}((c - 1)^k \cdot \Delta(G) \cdot k)$ time since each vertex v of S has to change its color to one of the colors of $[1, c] \setminus \{\chi(v)\}$. This implies the following even better running time for LS MAX CUT and LS MAX 3-CUT.

Corollary 3. LS MAX CUT can be solved in $\mathcal{O}(e^k \cdot (\Delta(G) - 1)^{k+1} \cdot k^2 \cdot n)$ time and LS MAX 3-CUT can be solved in $\mathcal{O}((2 \cdot e)^k \cdot (\Delta(G) - 1)^{k+1} \cdot k^2 \cdot n)$ time.

Hill-Climbing Algorithm To obtain not only a single improvement of a given coloring but a c -coloring with a total weight of properly colored edges as high as possible, we introduce the following hill-climbing algorithm.

Given an initial coloring χ , we set the initial value of k to 1. In each step, we use the above-mentioned algorithm for LS MAX c -CUT to search for an improving coloring in the k -flip neighborhood of the current coloring. Whenever the algorithm finds an improving k -neighbor χ' for the current coloring χ , the current coloring gets replaced by χ' and k gets set back to one. If the current coloring is k -optimal, the value of k is incremented and the algorithm continues to search for an improvement in the new k -flip neighborhood. This is done until a given time limit is reached.

ILP Formulation. In our experiments, we also use the following ILP formulation for MAX c -CUT. For each vertex $v \in V$ and each color $i \in [1, c]$, we use a binary variable $x_{v,i}$ which is equal to one if and only if $\chi'(v) = i$. We further use for each edge $e \in E$ a binary variable y_e to indicate whether e is properly colored with respect to χ' . Thus, for each edge $\{u, v\} \in E$, the variable $y_{\{u, v\}}$ is set to one if and only if for each color $i \in [1, c]$, $x_{u,i} = 0$ or $x_{v,i} = 0$. This is ensured by the constraint $x_{u,i} + x_{v,i} + y_{\{u, v\}} = 1$.

maximize $\sum_{e \in E} y_e \cdot \omega(e)$ subject to

$$\begin{aligned}
& \sum_{i \in [1, c]} x_{v, i} = 1 && \text{for each vertex } v \in V && (1) \\
& x_{u, i} + x_{v, i} + y_{\{u, v\}} \leq 2 && \text{for each edge } \{u, v\} \in E \\
& && \text{with } \omega(\{u, v\}) > 0 \\
& && \text{and each color } i \in [1, c] && (2) \\
& x_{u, i} + \sum_{j \in [1, c] \setminus \{i\}} x_{v, j} - y_{\{u, v\}} \leq 1 && \text{for each edge } \{u, v\} \in E \\
& && \text{with } \omega(\{u, v\}) < 0 \\
& && \text{and each color } i \in [1, c] && (3) \\
& x_{v, i} \in \{0, 1\} && \text{for each vertex } v \in V \\
& && \text{and each color } i \in [1, c] \\
& y_e \in \{0, 1\} && \text{for each edge } e \in E
\end{aligned}$$

Note that by adding the additional constraint $\sum_{v \in V} x_{v, \chi(v)} \geq |V| - k$, the ILP searches for a best c -coloring of the input graph having flip-distance at most k with some initial c -coloring χ . In other words, by adding this single constraint, the ILP solves LS MAX c -CUT instead of MAX c -CUT.

5 Speedup Strategies

We now introduce several speedup strategies that we use in our implementation to avoid enumerating all candidate sets. First we describe how to speed up the algorithm for LS MAX c -CUT.

5.1 Upper Bounds

To prevent the algorithm from enumerating all possible connected subsets of size at most k , we use upper bounds to determine for any given connected subset S' of size smaller than k , if S' can possibly be extended to a set S of size k such that there is an improving c -coloring χ' for G where S is exactly the set of vertices χ and χ' do not agree on. If there is no such possibility, we prevent our algorithm from enumerating supersets of S' . With the next definition we formalize this concept.

Definition 2. Let $I := (G, c, \omega, \chi, k)$ be an instance of LS MAX c -CUT and let S' with $|S'| < k$ be a subset of vertices of G . A value $b(I, S')$ is an upper bound if for each c -coloring χ' of G , with $S' \subsetneq D_{\text{flip}}(\chi, \chi')$ and $d_{\text{flip}}(\chi, \chi') = k$,

$$b(I, S') \geq \omega(E(\chi')).$$

In our implementation, we use upper bounds as follows: Given a set S' we compute the value $b(I, S')$ and check if it is not larger than $\omega(E(\chi))$ for the current coloring χ . If this is the case, we abort the enumeration of supersets of S' , otherwise, we continue.

We introduce two upper bounds; one for $c = 2$ and one for $c \geq 3$. To describe these upper bounds, we introduce the following notation: Given a vertex v and a color i , we let $\omega_v^i := \omega(\{\{v, w\} \mid w \in N(v), \chi(w) \neq i\})$ denote the total weight of properly colored edges incident with v if we change the color of v to i in the c -coloring χ . Thus, the term $\omega_v^i - \omega_v^{\chi(v)}$ describes the improvement obtained by changing only the color of v to i . Furthermore, let $\omega_{\max} := \max_{e \in E} |\omega(e)|$ denote the maximum absolute edge weight.

Upper Bound for $c = 2$. Let I be an instance of LS MAX \overline{c} -CUT with $c = 2$ and let S' be a vertex set of size less than k . Since $c = 2$, we let $\overline{\chi}(v)$ denote the unique color distinct from $\chi(v)$ for each vertex v . For a vertex set $A \subseteq V$, let χ_A denote the coloring where $\chi_A(v) := \chi(v)$ for all $v \notin A$ and $\chi_A(v) = \overline{\chi}(v)$, otherwise. Intuitively, χ_A is the coloring resulting from χ when exactly the vertices in A change their colors. For each vertex $v \in V \setminus S'$, we define $\alpha_v := \omega_v^{\overline{\chi}(v)} - \omega_v^{\chi(v)} + \beta_v$, where

$$\beta_v := \sum_{e \in E(v, S') \cap E(\chi)} 2 \cdot \omega(e) - \sum_{e \in E(v, S') \setminus E(\chi)} 2 \cdot \omega(e).$$

Intuitively, $\alpha_v - \beta_v$ is an upper bound for the improvement obtained when we choose to change only the color of v to $\overline{\chi}(v)$. The term β_v corresponds to the contribution of the edges between v and the vertices of S' . In the definition of β_v , we take into account the edges between v and S' that are falsely counted twice, once when extending $\chi_{S'}$ with v and a second time in the term $\omega_v^{\overline{\chi}(v)} - \omega_v^{\chi(v)}$. Hence, α_v is the improvement over the coloring $\chi_{S'}$ obtained by changing only the color of v . Let $Y \subseteq V \setminus S'$ be the $k - |S'|$ vertices from $V \setminus S'$ with largest α_v -values. We define the upper bound by

$$b_{c=2}(I, S') := \underbrace{\omega(E(\chi_{S'}))}_{(1)} + \underbrace{2 \binom{k - |S'|}{2} \omega_{\max}}_{(2)}.$$

Recall that the overall goal is to find a set X such that changing the colors of $S' \cup X$ results in a better coloring. The summand (1) corresponds to an overestimation of all weights of edges incident with exactly one vertex of X by fixing the falsely counted edges between X and S' due to the included β_v summands. The summand (2) corresponds to an overestimation of the weight of properly colored edges with both endpoints in X . We next show that $b_{c=2}$ is in fact an upper bound.

Proposition 1. *If $c = 2$, then $b_{c=2}(I, S')$ is an upper bound.*

Proof. Let χ' be a coloring with $S' \subsetneq D_{\text{flip}}(\chi, \chi')$ and $d_{\text{flip}}(\chi, \chi') = k$, and let $X := D_{\text{flip}}(\chi, \chi') \setminus S'$. We show that $\omega(E(\chi')) \leq b_{c=2}(I, S')$. To this end, we consider the coloring $\chi_{S'}$ that results from χ when exactly the vertices in S' change their colors and analyze how $\omega(E(\chi'))$ differs from $\omega(E(\chi_{S'}))$.

$$\begin{aligned}
\omega(E(\chi')) &= \omega(E(\chi_{S'})) + \underbrace{\sum_{v \in X} (\omega_v^{\overline{\chi(v)}} - \omega_v^{\chi(v)})}_{(1)} \\
&+ \underbrace{\sum_{\substack{e \in E(X, S') \\ e \in E(\chi)}} 2 \cdot \omega(e) - \sum_{\substack{e \in E(X, S') \\ e \notin E(\chi)}} 2 \cdot \omega(e)}_{(2)} \\
&+ \underbrace{\sum_{\substack{e \in E(X) \\ e \in E(\chi)}} 2 \cdot \omega(e) - \sum_{\substack{e \in E(X) \\ e \notin E(\chi)}} 2 \cdot \omega(e)}_{(3)}
\end{aligned}$$

By adding (1) to $\omega(E(\chi_{S'}))$, we added the weight of all properly colored edges if only v changes its color for every vertex $v \in X$. The difference between $\omega(E(\chi'))$ and $\omega(E(\chi_{S'})) + (1)$ then consists of all edge-weights that were falsely counted in (1) since both endpoints were moved. To compensate this, the summand (2) and (3) need to be added. Summand (2) corresponds to falsely counted edges with one endpoint in X and one endpoint in S' , while (3) corresponds to falsely counted edges with both endpoints in X . Observe that every falsely counted edge weight was counted for both of its endpoints within $\omega(E(\chi_{S'})) + (1)$. Thus, each edge weight in (2) and (3) needs to be multiplied by 2.

Note that (3) is upper bounded by $2 \cdot \binom{k-|S'|}{2} \cdot \omega_{\max}$. Furthermore, note that (1) + (2) = $\sum_{v \in X} \alpha_v$. Recall that Y consists of the $k - |S'|$ vertices from $V \setminus S'$ with largest α_v -values. Hence, (1) + (2) $\leq \sum_{v \in Y} \alpha_v$. This implies that $\omega(E(\chi')) \leq b_{c=2}(I, S')$. Consequently, $b_{c=2}(I, S')$ is an upper bound. \square

Upper Bound for $c \geq 3$. We next present an upper bound $b_{c \geq 3}$ that works for the case where $c \geq 3$. Recall that the upper bound $b_{c=2}$ relies on computing $\omega(E(\chi_{S'}))$, where $\chi_{S'}$ is the coloring resulting from χ when exactly the vertices in S' change their colors. This was possible since for $c = 2$, there is only one coloring for which the flip with χ is exactly S' . In case of $c \geq 3$, each vertex in S' has $c - 1 \geq 2$ options to change its color. Our upper bound $b_{c \geq 3}$ consequently contains a summand $b(S')$ that overestimates the edge weights when only the vertices in S' change their colors.

To specify $b(S')$, we introduce the following notation: Given a vertex $v \in S'$ and a color i , we let

$$\theta_v^i := \omega(\{\{v, w\} \mid w \in N(v) \setminus S', \chi(w) \neq i\}).$$

Analogously to ω_v^i , the value θ_v^i describes the weight of properly colored edges when

changing the color of v to i , but excludes all edges inside S' . We define the term

$$b(S') := \omega(E(\chi)) + \binom{|S'|}{2} \cdot \omega_{\max} - \sum_{\substack{e \in E(S') \\ e \in E(\chi)}} \omega(e) \\ + \sum_{v \in S'} \left(\max_{i \neq \chi(v)} \theta_v^i - \theta_v^{\chi(v)} \right).$$

As mentioned above, for $b_{c \geq 3}$ the summand $b(S')$ replaces the summand $\omega(E(\chi_{S'}))$ which was used for $b_{c=2}$. Intuitively, the sum $\sum_{v \in S'} (\max_{i \neq \chi(v)} \theta_v^i - \theta_v^{\chi(v)})$ is an over-estimation of the improvement for properly colored edges with exactly one endpoint in S' , the term $\binom{|S'|}{2} \cdot \omega_{\max}$ overestimates the properly colored edges inside S' , and the remaining terms overestimate the properly colored edges outside S' .

Analogously to $b_{c=2}$, for each vertex $v \in V \setminus S'$, we define a value $\alpha_v := \max_{i \neq \chi(v)} (\omega_v^i - \omega_v^{\chi(v)}) + \beta_v$ with

$$\beta_v := \sum_{e \in E(v, S')} 2 \cdot |\omega(e)|.$$

Again, let $Y \subseteq V \setminus S'$ be the $k - |S'|$ vertices with biggest α_v -values of $V \setminus S'$. We define the upper bound by

$$b_{c \geq 3}(I, S') := b(S') + \sum_{v \in Y} \alpha_v + 2 \binom{k - |S'|}{2} \cdot \omega_{\max}$$

and show that it is in fact an upper bound.

Proposition 2. *If $c \geq 3$, then $b_{c \geq 3}(I, S')$ is an upper bound.*

Proof. Let χ' be a coloring with $S' \subsetneq D_{\text{flip}}(\chi, \chi')$ and $d_{\text{flip}}(\chi, \chi') = k$, and let $X := D_{\text{flip}}(\chi, \chi') \setminus S'$. We show that $\omega(E(\chi')) \leq b_{c \geq 3}(I, S')$. To this end, let $\chi_{S'}$ denote the coloring that agrees with χ on all vertices of $V \setminus S'$ and that agrees with χ' on all vertices of S' . To show $\omega(E(\chi')) \leq b_{c \geq 3}(I, S')$ we analyze how $\omega(E(\chi'))$ differs from $\omega(E(\chi_{S'}))$.

$$\omega(E(\chi')) \leq \omega(E(\chi_{S'})) + \underbrace{\sum_{v \in X} (\omega_v^{\chi'}(v) - \omega_v^{\chi(v)})}_{(1)} \\ + \underbrace{\sum_{e \in E(S', X)} 2 \cdot |\omega(e)|}_{(2)} + \underbrace{\sum_{e \in E(X)} 2 \cdot |\omega(e)|}_{(3)}$$

By adding (1) to $\omega(E(\chi_{S'}))$, we added the weight of all properly colored edges if only v changes its color for every vertex $v \in X$. The difference between $\omega(E(\chi'))$ and $\omega(E(\chi_{S'})) + (1)$ then consists of all edge-weights that were falsely counted in (1)

since both endpoints were moved. To compensate this, the summand (2) and (3) were added. Summand (2) overestimates the weight of falsely counted edges with one endpoint in X and one endpoint in S' , while (3) overestimates the weight of falsely counted edges with both endpoints in X . Observe that every falsely counted edge weight may be counted for both of its endpoints within $\omega(E(\chi|_{S'})) + (1)$. Thus, each edge weight in (2) and (3) needs to be multiplied by 2.

Note that $(1) + (2) \leq \sum_{v \in X} \alpha_v \leq \sum_{v \in Y} \alpha_v$ and that $(3) \leq 2 \binom{k-|S'|}{2} \cdot \omega_{\max}$. Therefore, it remains to show that $\omega(E(\chi_{S'})) \leq b(S')$. To this end, note that $\omega(E(\chi_{S'}))$ can be expressed by the sum of $\omega(E(\chi))$, improvement of the weight of properly colored edges inside S' between χ and $\chi_{S'}$, and $\sum_{v \in S'} (\theta_v^{\chi'(v)} - \theta_v^{\chi(v)})$:

$$\begin{aligned} \omega(E(\chi_{S'})) &= \omega(E(\chi)) + \sum_{\substack{e \in E(S') \\ e \in E(\chi_{S'})}} \omega(e) - \sum_{\substack{e \in E(S') \\ e \in E(\chi)}} \omega(e) \\ &\quad + \sum_{v \in S'} (\theta_v^{\chi'(v)} - \theta_v^{\chi(v)}). \end{aligned}$$

Since $\binom{|S'|}{2} \cdot \omega_{\max}$ is at least as big as the sum of the weights of properly edges inside S' under $\chi_{S'}$, we conclude $\omega(E(\chi_{S'})) \leq b(S')$. Hence, $b_{e \geq 3}$ is an upper bound. \square

5.2 Prevention of Redundant Flips

We introduce further speed-up techniques that we used in our implementation of the hill-climbing algorithm. Roughly speaking, the idea behind these speed-up techniques is to exclude vertices that are not contained in an improving flip $D_{\text{flip}}(\chi, \chi')$ of any k -neighbor χ' of χ . To this end, we introduce for each considered value of k an *auxiliary vertex set* V_k containing all remaining vertices that are potentially part of an improving flip of a k -neighbor of χ . For each value of k , the set V_k is initialized once with V , when we search for the first time for an improving k -neighbor.

It is easy to see that all vertices x that are (i, k) -blocked for all $i \neq \chi(x)$ can be removed from V_k if each edge of G has weight 1. This also holds for general instances when considering an extension of the definition of (i, k) -blocked vertices for arbitrary weight functions. Moreover, whenever our algorithm has verified that a vertex v is in no improving k -flip $D_{\text{flip}}(\chi, \chi')$, then we may remove v from V_k .

Recall that we set the initial value of k to one and increment k if the current coloring χ is k -optimal. If at any time our algorithm replaces the current coloring χ by a better coloring χ' , we set k back to one and continue by searching for an improving k -neighbor of the new coloring χ' , where k again is incremented if necessary. Now, for each value of k' that was already considered for a previous coloring, we only consider the remaining vertices of $V_{k'}$ together with vertices that have a small distance to the flip between χ' and the last previously encountered $(k' - 1)$ -optimal coloring. This idea is formalized by the next lemma.

Lemma 4. *Let $G = (V, E)$ be a graph, let $\omega : E \rightarrow \mathbb{Q}$ be an edge-weight function, and let k be an integer. Moreover, let χ and χ' be $(k-1)$ -optimal c -colorings of G and let v be a vertex within distance at least $k+1$ to each vertex of $D_{\text{flip}}(\chi, \chi')$. If there is no improving k -neighbor $\hat{\chi}$ of χ with $v \in D_{\text{flip}}(\chi, \hat{\chi})$, then there is no improving k -neighbor $\tilde{\chi}$ of χ' with $v \in D_{\text{flip}}(\chi', \tilde{\chi})$.*

Proof. We prove the lemma by contraposition. Let $\tilde{\chi}$ be an improving k -neighbor of χ' with $v \in D_{\text{flip}}(\chi', \tilde{\chi})$. We show that there is an improving k -neighbor $\hat{\chi}$ of χ with $v \in D_{\text{flip}}(\chi, \hat{\chi})$.

The c -coloring $\hat{\chi}$ agrees with $\tilde{\chi}$ on all vertices of $D_{\text{flip}}(\chi', \tilde{\chi})$ and agrees with χ on all other vertices of V . Hence, $D_{\text{flip}}(\chi, \hat{\chi})$ contains the vertex v . Moreover, $\hat{\chi}$ and χ disagree on at most $d_{\text{flip}}(\chi', \tilde{\chi}) \leq k$ positions which implies that $\hat{\chi}$ is a k -neighbor of χ . It remains to show that $\hat{\chi}$ improves over χ . To this end, we analyze the edge set $X \subseteq E$ of all edges with at least one endpoint in $D_{\text{flip}}(\chi', \tilde{\chi})$. Consider the following claim about properly colored edges.

Claim 3. *It holds that*

- a) $E(\tilde{\chi}) \setminus X = E(\chi') \setminus X$ and $E(\hat{\chi}) \setminus X = E(\chi) \setminus X$,
- b) $E(\tilde{\chi}) \cap X = E(\hat{\chi}) \cap X$ and $E(\chi) \cap X = E(\chi') \cap X$.

Proof. a) Let e be an edge of $E \setminus X$. Note that both endpoints of e are elements of $V \setminus D_{\text{flip}}(\chi', \tilde{\chi})$. Thus, the endpoints of e have distinct colors under $\tilde{\chi}$ if and only if they have distinct colors under χ' . Consequently, $E(\tilde{\chi}) \setminus X = E(\chi') \setminus X$. Furthermore, by definition of $\hat{\chi}$, $D_{\text{flip}}(\chi, \hat{\chi}) = D_{\text{flip}}(\chi', \tilde{\chi})$, which implies that $E(\hat{\chi}) \setminus X = E(\chi) \setminus X$.

b) Since χ' is $(k-1)$ -optimal and $\tilde{\chi}$ is an improving k -neighbor of χ' , the set $D_{\text{flip}}(\chi', \tilde{\chi})$ contains exactly k vertices. Thus, we may assume by Lemma 3 that $D_{\text{flip}}(\chi', \tilde{\chi})$ is connected. Consequently, each vertex of $D_{\text{flip}}(\chi', \tilde{\chi})$ has distance at most $k-1$ from v , since v is contained in $D_{\text{flip}}(\chi', \tilde{\chi})$.

Let e be an edge of X . Since each vertex of $D_{\text{flip}}(\chi', \tilde{\chi})$ has distance at most $k-1$ from v , both endpoints of e have distance at most k from v . Together with the fact that v has distance at least $k+1$ from $D_{\text{flip}}(\chi, \chi')$, this implies that no endpoint of e is contained in $D_{\text{flip}}(\chi, \chi')$. Hence, χ and χ' agree on both endpoints of e . Consequently, the edge e is properly colored under χ if and only if e is properly colored under χ' . This then implies that $E(\chi) \cap X = E(\chi') \cap X$.

By the definition of $\hat{\chi}$ and the fact that χ and χ' agree on the endpoints of each edge of X , $\hat{\chi}$ and $\tilde{\chi}$ agree on the endpoints of each edge of X . This then implies that $E(\tilde{\chi}) \cap X = E(\hat{\chi}) \cap X$. \diamond ■

We next use Claim 3 to show that $\hat{\chi}$ is an improving neighbor of χ . Since $\tilde{\chi}$ is an improving neighbor of χ' we have $\omega(E(\tilde{\chi})) > \omega(E(\chi'))$, which implies

$$\omega(E(\tilde{\chi}) \cap X) + \omega(E(\tilde{\chi}) \setminus X) > \omega(E(\chi') \cap X) + \omega(E(\chi') \setminus X).$$

Together with Claim 3 a), we then have

$$\omega(E(\tilde{\chi}) \cap X) > \omega(E(\chi') \cap X).$$

Moreover, due to Claim 3 b), we have

$$\omega(E(\widehat{\chi}) \cap X) > \omega(E(\chi) \cap X).$$

Finally, since $E(\widehat{\chi}) \setminus X = E(\chi) \setminus X$ by Claim 3 a), we may add the weights of all edges in $E(\widehat{\chi}) \setminus X$ to the left side of the inequality and the weight of all edges in $E(\chi) \setminus X$ to the right side. We end up with the inequality $\omega(E(\widehat{\chi})) > \omega(E(\chi))$ which implies that $\widehat{\chi}$ is an improving k -neighbor of χ . \square

We next describe how we exploit Lemma 4 in our implementation: We start with a coloring χ and search for improving k -neighbors of χ for increasing values of k starting with $k = 1$. Whenever we find an improving neighbor χ' of χ we continue by searching for an improving neighbor χ'' of χ' starting with $k = 1$ again. We use Lemma 4 as follows: if we want to find an improving k -neighbor for a $(k - 1)$ -optimal coloring χ' , we take the last previously encountered $(k - 1)$ -optimal coloring χ and add only the vertices to V_k that have distance at most k from $D_{\text{flip}}(\chi, \chi')$, instead of setting V_k back to V . This is correct since every vertex which is not in V_k , is not part of any improving k -flip of χ and therefore according to Lemma 4, the only vertices outside of V_k that can possibly be in an improving k -flip of χ' are those with distance at most k from $D_{\text{flip}}(\chi, \chi')$.

Next, we provide a further technique to identify vertices that can be removed from V_k . The idea behind this technique can be explained as follows: if a vertex can be excluded from V_k , then all equivalent vertices can also be excluded, where equivalence is defined as follows.

Definition 3. Let $G = (V, E)$ be a graph, let $\omega : E \rightarrow \mathbb{Q}$ be an edge-weight function. Two vertices v and w of G are weighted twins if $N(v) \setminus \{w\} = N(w) \setminus \{v\}$ and $\omega(\{v, x\}) = \omega(\{w, x\})$ for each $x \in N(v) \setminus \{w\}$.

Lemma 5. Let $G = (V, E)$ be a graph, let $\omega : E \rightarrow \mathbb{Q}$ be an edge-weight function, and let k be an integer. Moreover, let χ be a c -coloring of G and let v and w be weighted twins in G with $\chi(v) = \chi(w)$. If there is no improving k -neighbor χ' of χ with $v \in D_{\text{flip}}(\chi, \chi')$, then there is no improving k -neighbor $\widetilde{\chi}$ of χ with $w \in D_{\text{flip}}(\chi, \widetilde{\chi})$.

Proof. Assume towards a contradiction that there is an improving k -neighbor $\widetilde{\chi}$ of χ with $w \in D_{\text{flip}}(\chi, \widetilde{\chi})$. By assumption, $v \notin D_{\text{flip}}(\chi, \widetilde{\chi})$. Let χ' be the c -coloring that agrees with $\widetilde{\chi}$ on $V \setminus \{v, w\}$ and where $\chi'(v) := \widetilde{\chi}(w)$ and $\chi'(w) := \widetilde{\chi}(v) = \chi(v)$. Recall that $\omega(\{v, x\}) = \omega(\{w, x\})$ for each $x \in N(v) \cap N(w)$ and that $N(v) \setminus \{w\} = N(w) \setminus \{v\}$. For each $x \in N(v) \cap N(w)$, let $E_x := \{\{v, x\}, \{w, x\}\}$. Note that since $\widetilde{\chi}(v) \neq \widetilde{\chi}(w)$, at least one edge of E_x is contained in $E(\widetilde{\chi})$. If both edges of E_x are contained in $E(\widetilde{\chi})$, then $\chi'(x) = \widetilde{\chi}(x) \notin \{\chi'(v), \chi'(w)\}$ and thus both edges of E_x are contained in $E(\chi')$. If only one edge of E_x is contained in $E(\widetilde{\chi})$, then $E(\chi')$ contains exactly the other edge of E_x since $\chi'(v) = \widetilde{\chi}(w)$, $\chi'(w) = \widetilde{\chi}(v)$, and $\chi'(x) = \widetilde{\chi}(x)$. Since the weight of both edges of E_x are the same for each $x \in N(v) \cap N(w)$, we have $\omega(E(\chi')) = \omega(E(\widetilde{\chi}))$. Hence, χ' is an improving k -neighbor of χ with $v \in D_{\text{flip}}(\chi, \chi')$, a contradiction. \square

Consequently, when our algorithm removes a vertex v from V_k for some k because no improving k -neighbor χ' of χ contains v , then it also removes all weighted twins of v with the same color as v from V_k .

Table 1: The graphs from the G-set for which LS or ILP found an improved coloring, or for which we verified that MOH colorings are optimal (for $c = 3$). MOH shows the value of the published solutions of [33], LS and ILP show the best solution of our hill-climbing algorithm and any of the two ILP-runs, respectively. The best coloring is bold. Finally, UB shows the better upper bound computed during the two ILP-runs. For empty entries, no improved coloring was found. For bold UB entries, some found solution matches this upper bound, verifying its optimality.

data	$ V $	$ E $	MOH	LS	ILP	UB
g11	800	1600	669	—	671	671
g12	800	1600	660	661	663	663
g13	800	1600	686	687	688	688
g15	800	4661	3984	3985	3985	4442
g24	2000	19990	17162	17163	—	19989
g25	2000	19990	17163	17164	—	19989
g26	2000	19990	17154	17155	—	19989
g27	2000	19990	4020	4021	—	9840
g28	2000	19990	3973	3975	—	9822
g31	2000	19990	4003	4005	—	9776
g32	2000	4000	1653	1658	1666	1668
g33	2000	4000	1625	1628	1636	1640
g34	2000	4000	1607	1609	1616	1617
g35	2000	11778	10046	10048	—	11711
g37	2000	11785	10052	10053	10053	11691
g40	2000	11766	2870	2871	—	5471
g41	2000	11785	2887	2888	—	5452
g48	3000	6000	6000	—	—	6000
g49	3000	6000	6000	—	—	6000
g50	3000	6000	6000	—	—	6000
g55	5000	12498	12427	12429	12432	12498
g56	5000	12498	4755	4757	—	6157
g57	5000	10000	4080	4092	4103	4154
g59	5000	29570	7274	7276	—	14673
g61	7000	17148	6858	6861	—	8728
g62	7000	14000	5686	5710	5706	5981
g63	7000	41459	35315	35318	—	41420
g64	7000	41459	10429	10437	—	20713
g65	8000	16000	6489	6512	6535	6711
g66	9000	18000	7414	7442	7443	7843
g67	10000	20000	8088	8116	8141	9080
g70	10000	9999	9999	—	—	9999
g72	10000	20000	8190	8224	8244	9166
g77	14000	28000	11579	11632	11619	13101
g81	20000	40000	16326	16392	16374	18337

6 Implementation and Experimental Results

Our hill-climbing algorithm (LS) is implemented in JAVA/Kotlin and uses the graph library JGraphT. To enumerate all connected candidate sets, we use a JAVA implementation of a polynomial-delay algorithm for enumerating all connected induced subgraphs of a given size [30].

We used the graphs from the G-set benchmark³, an established benchmark data set for MAX c -CUT with $c \in \{2, 3, 4\}$ (and thus also for MAX CUT) [2, 11, 33, 37, 44, 46]. The data set consists of 71 graphs with vertex-count between 800 and 20,000 and a density between 0.02% and 6%.

As starting solutions, we used the solutions computed by the MOH algorithm of Ma and Hao [33] for each graph of the G-set and each $c \in \{2, 3, 4\}$. For $c = 3$ and $c = 4$, these are the best known solutions for all graphs of the G-set. MOH is designed to quickly improve substantially on starting solutions but after a while progress stalls (we provide more details on this below). In contrast, our approach makes steady progress but is not as fast as MOH concerning the initial improvements, as preliminary experiments showed. Hence, we focus on evaluating the performance of LS as a

³<https://web.stanford.edu/~yyye/yyye/Gset/>

Table 2: The number of instances where LS or ILP found improved solutions. Column ‘improvable’ shows how many best known MOH colorings [33] *might* be suboptimal (as they do not meet the ILP upper bounds). Columns LS and ILP show how many of these solutions were improved by the respective approaches. Columns I_1 , I_2 , and I_3 show for how many instances the first improvement was found by LS within 10 seconds, between 10 and 60 seconds, and after more than 60 seconds, respectively.

	improvable	I_1	I_2	I_3	LS	ILP
unit $c = 2$	31	2	1	0	3	2
unit $c = 3$	30	8	0	0	8	3
unit $c = 4$	28	5	3	1	9	4
signed $c = 2$	29	1	1	0	2	6
signed $c = 3$	36	19	2	1	22	14
signed $c = 4$	34	20	5	0	25	14
sum	188	55	12	2	69	43

post-processing for MOH by trying to improve their solutions quickly.

For one graph (g23) and each $c \in \{2, 3, 4\}$, there is a large gap between the value of the published coloring and the stated value of the corresponding coloring (for example, for $c = 3$, the published coloring has a value of 13 275 whereas it is stated that the coloring has a value of 17 168). To not exploit this gap in our evaluation, we only considered the remaining 70 graphs. These 70 graphs are of two types: 34 graphs are unit graphs (where each edge has weight 1) and 36 graphs are signed graphs (where each edge has either weight 1 or -1). For each of these graphs, we ran experiments for each $c \in \{2, 3, 4\}$ with a time limit of 30 minutes and the published MOH solution as initial solution. In addition to LS, for each instance we ran standard ILP-formulations for MAX c -CUT (again for 30 minutes) using the Gurobi solver version 9.5, once without starting solution and once with the MOH solution as starting solution. Each run of an ILP provides both a best found solution and an upper bound on the maximum value of any c -coloring for the given instance. Each experiment was performed on a single thread of an Intel(R) Xeon(R) Silver 4116 CPU with 2.1 GHz, 24 CPUs and 128 GB RAM.

The ILP upper bounds verified the optimality of 22 MOH solutions. Thus, of the 210 instances, only 188 instances are interesting in the sense that LS or the ILP can find an improved solution. The upper bounds also verified the optimality of 8 further improved solutions found by LS or ILP.

In total, the ILP found better colorings than the MOH coloring for 43 of the 188 instances. In comparison, our hill-climbing algorithm was able to improve on the MOH solutions for 69 instances of the 188 instances. Table 1 gives the results for $c = 3$, showing those instances where the MOH coloring was verified to be optimal by the ILP or where LS or the ILP found an improved coloring. The full overview for $c \in \{2, 3, 4\}$ is shown in Tables 3 to 5.

Over all $c \in \{2, 3, 4\}$, on 35 instances, both LS and the ILP found improved colorings compared to the MOH coloring. For $c > 2$, both approaches find new record colorings. More precisely, for 23 instances, only the ILP found a new record coloring;

Table 3: The solutions of the best found c -coloring for any of the G-set graphs for $c = 2$. The column MOH shows the value of the published solutions of Ma and Hao [33].

data	n	m	MOH	LS	ILP	UB	ILP ₁	UB ₁	ILP ₂	UB ₂
g1	800	19176	11624	—	—	16188	—	16188	—	16225
g2	800	19176	11620	—	—	15915	—	15915	—	16254
g3	800	19176	11622	—	—	15766	—	15766	—	16058
g4	800	19176	11646	—	—	16059	—	16217	—	16059
g5	800	19176	11631	—	—	16182	—	16182	—	16220
g6	800	19176	2178	—	—	6387	—	6627	—	6387
g7	800	19176	2006	—	—	6225	—	6339	—	6225
g8	800	19176	2005	—	—	6209	—	6209	—	6215
g9	800	19176	2054	—	—	6106	—	6106	—	6379
g10	800	19176	2000	—	—	6315	—	6315	—	6322
g11	800	1600	564	—	—	564	—	564	—	564
g12	800	1600	556	—	—	556	—	556	—	556
g13	800	1600	582	—	—	582	—	582	—	582
g14	800	4694	3064	—	—	3158	—	3158	—	3158
g15	800	4661	3050	—	—	3139	—	3148	—	3139
g16	800	4672	3052	—	—	3144	—	3144	—	3148
g17	800	4667	3047	—	—	3144	—	3144	—	3153
g18	800	4694	992	—	—	1137	—	1140	—	1137
g19	800	4661	906	—	—	1044	—	1046	—	1044
g20	800	4672	941	—	—	1069	—	1074	—	1069
g21	800	4667	931	—	—	1072	—	1074	—	1072
g22	2000	19990	13359	—	—	17677	—	17888	—	17677
g24	2000	19990	13337	—	—	17905	—	17905	—	18070
g25	2000	19990	13340	—	—	17993	—	17993	—	18049
g26	2000	19990	13328	—	—	17744	—	18236	—	17744
g27	2000	19990	3341	—	—	8273	—	8394	—	8273
g28	2000	19990	3298	—	—	7505	—	8194	—	7505
g29	2000	19990	3405	—	—	7594	—	7594	—	8382
g30	2000	19990	3413	—	—	8033	—	8033	—	8354
g31	2000	19990	3310	—	—	7688	—	8253	—	7688
g32	2000	4000	1410	—	—	1410	—	1410	—	1410
g33	2000	4000	1382	—	—	1382	—	1382	—	1382
g34	2000	4000	1384	—	—	1384	—	1384	—	1384
g35	2000	11778	7687	—	—	8985	—	9242	—	8985
g36	2000	11766	7680	—	—	9125	—	9199	—	9125
g37	2000	11785	7691	—	—	9056	—	9056	—	9265
g38	2000	11779	7688	—	—	8923	—	8923	—	9130
g39	2000	11778	2408	—	—	3214	—	3254	—	3214
g40	2000	11766	2400	—	—	3157	—	3157	—	3218
g41	2000	11785	2405	—	—	3196	—	3196	—	3199
g42	2000	11779	2481	—	—	3228	—	3228	—	3229
g43	1000	9990	6660	—	—	8055	—	8264	—	8055
g44	1000	9990	6650	—	—	8228	—	8228	—	8287
g45	1000	9990	6654	—	—	8146	—	8182	—	8146
g46	1000	9990	6649	—	—	8148	—	8168	—	8148
g47	1000	9990	6657	—	—	8075	—	8146	—	8075
g48	3000	6000	6000	—	—	6000	—	6000	—	6000
g49	3000	6000	6000	—	—	6000	—	6000	—	6000
g50	3000	6000	5880	—	—	5880	—	5880	—	5880
g51	1000	5909	3848	—	—	3992	—	4160	—	3992
g52	1000	5916	3851	—	—	4095	—	4111	—	4095
g53	1000	5914	3850	—	—	3971	—	3971	—	4090
g54	1000	5916	3852	—	—	4073	—	4073	—	4082
g55	5000	12498	10299	—	—	11692	—	11692	—	11755
g56	5000	12498	4016	—	—	5378	—	5378	—	5418
g57	5000	10000	3494	—	—	3494	—	3494	—	3494
g58	5000	29570	19289	19290	19290	24833	—	24833	19290	25197
g59	5000	29570	6086	—	—	10372	—	10372	—	10577
g60	7000	17148	14190	—	—	16528	—	16547	—	16528
g61	7000	17148	5797	—	—	8144	—	8144	—	8199
g62	7000	14000	4868	4870	4872	4872	4872	4872	4872	4872
g63	7000	41459	27033	27037	—	35046	—	35046	—	35703
g64	7000	41459	8747	8748	—	15137	—	15137	—	15929
g65	8000	16000	5560	—	5562	5568	—	5568	5562	5568
g66	9000	18000	6360	—	6364	6368	6364	6368	6364	6369
g67	10000	20000	6942	—	6948	6952	—	6957	6948	6952
g70	10000	9999	9544	9551	9575	9714	—	9714	9575	9723
g72	10000	20000	6998	—	7004	7013	7004	7013	7002	7014
g77	14000	28000	9928	—	—	9948	—	9948	—	9951
g81	20000	40000	14036	—	14044	14078	—	14078	14044	14080

Table 4: The solutions of the best found c -coloring for any of the G-set graphs for $c = 3$.

data	n	m	MOH	LS	ILP	UB	ILP ₁	UB ₁	ILP ₂	UB ₂
g1	800	19176	15165	—	—	19148	—	19148	—	19159
g2	800	19176	15172	—	—	19160	—	19160	—	19160
g3	800	19176	15173	—	—	19134	—	19134	—	19158
g4	800	19176	15184	—	—	19117	—	19135	—	19117
g5	800	19176	15193	—	—	19146	—	19146	—	19164
g6	800	19176	2632	—	—	9441	—	9453	—	9441
g7	800	19176	2409	—	—	9242	—	9253	—	9242
g8	800	19176	2428	—	—	9228	—	9228	—	9230
g9	800	19176	2478	—	—	9261	—	9275	—	9261
g10	800	19176	2407	—	—	9233	—	9233	—	9267
g11	800	1600	669	—	671	671	671	671	671	674
g12	800	1600	660	661	663	663	663	663	663	663
g13	800	1600	686	687	688	688	688	688	688	688
g14	800	4694	4012	—	—	4497	—	4497	—	4510
g15	800	4661	3984	3985	3985	4442	—	4442	3985	4474
g16	800	4672	3990	—	—	4458	—	4465	—	4458
g17	800	4667	3983	—	—	4413	—	4413	—	4457
g18	800	4694	1207	—	—	1962	—	1962	—	1991
g19	800	4661	1081	—	—	1833	—	1859	—	1833
g20	800	4672	1122	—	—	1888	—	1888	—	1889
g21	800	4667	1109	—	—	1827	—	1827	—	1875
g22	2000	19990	17167	—	—	19989	—	19989	—	19989
g24	2000	19990	17162	17163	—	19989	—	19989	—	19989
g25	2000	19990	17163	17164	—	19989	—	19989	—	19989
g26	2000	19990	17154	17155	—	19989	—	19990	—	19989
g27	2000	19990	4020	4021	—	9840	—	9841	—	9840
g28	2000	19990	3973	3975	—	9822	—	9827	—	9822
g29	2000	19990	4106	—	—	9947	—	9948	—	9947
g30	2000	19990	4117	—	—	9929	—	9929	—	9933
g31	2000	19990	4003	4005	—	9776	—	9861	—	9776
g32	2000	4000	1653	—	1666	1668	1666	1668	1664	1670
g33	2000	4000	1625	1628	1636	1640	1636	1640	1636	1640
g34	2000	4000	1607	1609	1616	1617	1616	1617	1615	1618
g35	2000	11778	10046	10048	—	11711	—	11711	—	11714
g36	2000	11766	10039	—	—	11702	—	11702	—	11703
g37	2000	11785	10052	10053	10053	11691	—	11753	10053	11691
g38	2000	11779	10040	—	—	11703	—	11745	—	11703
g39	2000	11778	2903	—	—	5457	—	5457	—	5551
g40	2000	11766	2870	2871	—	5471	—	5471	—	5471
g41	2000	11785	2887	2888	—	5452	—	5472	—	5452
g42	2000	11779	2980	—	—	5551	—	5567	—	5551
g43	1000	9990	8573	—	—	9985	—	9985	—	9988
g44	1000	9990	8571	—	—	9957	—	9957	—	9980
g45	1000	9990	8566	—	—	9983	—	9983	—	9986
g46	1000	9990	8568	—	—	9983	—	9985	—	9983
g47	1000	9990	8572	—	—	9966	—	9966	—	9983
g48	3000	6000	6000	—	—	6000	—	6000	—	6000
g49	3000	6000	6000	—	—	6000	—	6000	—	6000
g50	3000	6000	6000	—	—	6000	—	6000	—	6000
g51	1000	5909	5037	—	—	5708	—	5712	—	5708
g52	1000	5916	5040	—	—	5703	—	5703	—	5726
g53	1000	5914	5039	—	—	5694	—	5694	—	5746
g54	1000	5916	5036	—	—	5667	—	5667	—	5682
g55	5000	12498	12427	12429	12432	12498	—	12498	12432	12498
g56	5000	12498	4755	4757	—	6157	—	6157	—	6176
g57	5000	10000	4080	4092	4103	4154	—	4154	4103	4176
g58	5000	29570	25195	—	—	29556	—	29556	—	29560
g59	5000	29570	7274	7276	—	14673	—	14673	—	14678
g60	7000	17148	17075	—	—	17148	—	17148	—	17148
g61	7000	17148	6858	6861	—	8728	—	8728	—	8735
g62	7000	14000	5686	5710	5706	5981	—	6033	5706	5981
g63	7000	41459	35315	35318	—	41420	—	41420	—	41435
g64	7000	41459	10429	10437	—	20713	—	20747	—	20713
g65	8000	16000	6489	6512	6535	6711	—	6711	6535	6970
g66	9000	18000	7414	7442	7443	7843	—	7843	7443	8246
g67	10000	20000	8088	8116	8141	9080	—	9089	8141	9080
g70	10000	9999	9999	—	—	9999	—	9999	—	9999
g72	10000	20000	8190	8224	8244	9166	—	9243	8244	9166
g77	14000	28000	11579	11632	—	13101	—	13101	—	13104
g81	20000	40000	16326	16392	16374	18337	—	18515	16374	18337

Table 5: The solutions of the best found c -coloring for any of the G-set graphs for $c = 4$.

data	n	m	MOH	LS	ILP	UB	ILP ₁	UB ₁	ILP ₂	UB ₂
g1	800	19176	16803	—	—	19176	—	19176	—	19176
g2	800	19176	16809	—	—	19176	—	19176	—	19176
g3	800	19176	16806	—	—	19176	—	19176	—	19176
g4	800	19176	16814	—	—	19176	—	19176	—	19176
g5	800	19176	16816	—	—	19176	—	19176	—	19176
g6	800	19176	2751	—	—	9544	—	9544	—	9583
g7	800	19176	2515	—	—	9343	—	9430	—	9343
g8	800	19176	2525	—	—	9397	—	9423	—	9397
g9	800	19176	2585	—	—	9410	—	9410	—	9477
g10	800	19176	2510	—	—	9380	—	9429	—	9380
g11	800	1600	677	—	—	677	—	677	—	677
g12	800	1600	664	—	665	665	665	665	665	665
g13	800	1600	690	—	—	690	—	690	—	690
g14	800	4694	4440	—	—	4670	—	4671	—	4670
g15	800	4661	4406	—	—	4622	—	4622	—	4644
g16	800	4672	4415	—	—	4630	—	4635	—	4630
g17	800	4667	4411	—	—	4625	—	4636	—	4625
g18	800	4694	1261	1262	1262	2122	—	2140	1262	2122
g19	800	4661	1121	—	—	2045	—	2050	—	2045
g20	800	4672	1168	—	—	2049	—	2049	—	2074
g21	800	4667	1155	—	—	2023	—	2052	—	2023
g22	2000	19990	18776	—	—	19990	—	19990	—	19990
g24	2000	19990	18769	18772	—	19990	—	19990	—	19990
g25	2000	19990	18775	18776	—	19990	—	19990	—	19990
g26	2000	19990	18767	18770	—	19990	—	19990	—	19990
g27	2000	19990	4201	4202	—	9928	—	9951	—	9928
g28	2000	19990	4150	4157	—	9888	—	9888	—	9919
g29	2000	19990	4293	4294	—	10010	—	10022	—	10010
g30	2000	19990	4305	4308	—	10019	—	10019	—	10024
g31	2000	19990	4171	4176	—	9910	—	9914	—	9910
g32	2000	4000	1669	1671	1679	1679	1679	1679	1679	1679
g33	2000	4000	1638	1640	1644	1644	1644	1644	1644	1644
g34	2000	4000	1616	1617	1623	1623	1623	1623	1623	1625
g35	2000	11778	11111	—	—	11775	—	11776	—	11775
g36	2000	11766	11108	—	11109	11763	—	11763	11109	11764
g37	2000	11785	11117	11118	—	11785	—	11785	—	11785
g38	2000	11779	11108	11109	—	11778	—	11778	—	11778
g39	2000	11778	3006	3007	—	5736	—	5794	—	5736
g40	2000	11766	2976	2978	—	5665	—	5669	—	5665
g41	2000	11785	2983	2986	2984	5751	—	5751	2984	5758
g42	2000	11779	3092	3095	—	5787	—	5800	—	5787
g43	1000	9990	9376	9377	9377	9990	—	9990	9377	9990
g44	1000	9990	9379	—	—	9990	—	9990	—	9990
g45	1000	9990	9376	9377	9377	9990	—	9990	9377	9990
g46	1000	9990	9378	—	—	9990	—	9990	—	9990
g47	1000	9990	9381	—	—	9990	—	9990	—	9990
g48	3000	6000	6000	—	—	6000	—	6000	—	6000
g49	3000	6000	6000	—	—	6000	—	6000	—	6000
g50	3000	6000	6000	—	—	6000	—	6000	—	6000
g51	1000	5909	5571	5572	5572	5871	—	5881	5572	5871
g52	1000	5916	5584	—	—	5891	—	5891	—	5891
g53	1000	5914	5574	—	—	5887	—	5887	—	5888
g54	1000	5916	5579	—	—	5889	—	5889	—	5889
g55	5000	12498	12498	—	—	12498	—	12498	—	12498
g56	5000	12498	4931	4935	—	6213	—	6213	—	6213
g57	5000	10000	4112	4132	4145	4220	4141	4305	4145	4220
g58	5000	29570	27885	—	—	29569	—	29569	—	29570
g59	5000	29570	7539	7546	—	14731	—	14731	—	14731
g60	7000	17148	17148	—	—	17148	—	17148	—	17148
g61	7000	17148	7110	7114	—	8748	—	8751	—	8748
g62	7000	14000	5743	5758	5788	6534	5774	6534	5788	6541
g63	7000	41459	39083	39089	—	41459	—	41459	—	41459
g64	7000	41459	10814	10819	—	20775	—	20775	—	20792
g65	8000	16000	6534	6561	6579	7256	6573	7256	6579	7349
g66	9000	18000	7474	7495	7522	8497	7505	8497	7522	8500
g67	10000	20000	8155	8185	8220	9299	—	9299	8220	9303
g70	10000	9999	9999	—	—	9999	—	9999	—	9999
g72	10000	20000	8264	8296	8337	9357	—	9357	8337	9376
g77	14000	28000	11674	11712	11691	13296	—	13296	11691	13455
g81	20000	40000	16470	16525	16485	19088	—	19088	16485	19580

Table 6: For each value of k , the number of instances for which an improving flip of size exactly k was found.

	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13
unit $c = 2$	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
unit $c = 3$	3	1	3	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
unit $c = 4$	2	0	3	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
signed $c = 2$	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
signed $c = 3$	0	4	0	2	3	1	1	8	3	0	0	0
signed $c = 4$	1	2	4	3	6	5	4	0	0	0	0	0
sum	6	7	11	10	10	8	5	8	3	0	0	1

Table 7: For each value of k , the number of instances for which the first improving flip that was found had size exactly k .

	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
unit $c = 2$	1	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0
unit $c = 3$	4	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
unit $c = 4$	5	0	1	2	1	0	0	0	0
signed $c = 2$	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0
signed $c = 3$	7	10	1	3	0	0	0	0	1
signed $c = 4$	3	13	5	2	2	0	0	0	0
sum	20	26	9	9	3	1	0	0	1

for 6 instances, both approaches found a new record coloring, and for 38 instances only LS found a new record coloring. Thus, LS finds improvements also for very hard instances on which MOH provided the best known solutions so far.

The MOH solutions were obtained within a time limit of 30, 120, and 240 minutes for small, medium, and large instances, respectively. Each such run was repeated at least 10 times. The average time MOH took to find the best solution was 33% of the respective time limit. Hence, on average, after MOH found their best solution, in the remaining time (at least 20 minutes), MOH did not find any better solution. For all instances where LS was able to improve on the MOH solution, the average time to find the first improving flip was 15.17 seconds. Table 2 shows an overview on the number of improved instances and the time when LS found the first improvement. It is also interesting to see for which value of k the first improvement was found (in other words, the smallest value k such that the MOH solutions are not k -flip optimal). Table 7 shows for how many instances which value of k was the smallest to obtain an improvement. On average, this value of k was 3.39. Hence, it is indeed helpful to consider larger values of k than the commonly used values of 1 or 2.

We summarize our main experimental findings as follows. First, parameterized local search can be used successfully as a post-processing for state-of-the-art heuristics for MAX c -CUT, in many cases leading to new record solutions for $c > 2$ (see Tables 4 and 5). Second, the number of instances where an improvement was found is larger for LS than for the ILP approaches. Third, to find improved solutions, it is frequently

necessary to explore k -flip neighborhoods for larger values of k (see Tables 6 and 7). Finally, this can be done within an acceptable amount of time by using our algorithm for LS MAX c -CUT and our speed-up strategies.

7 Conclusion

In this work we analyzed LS MAX c -CUT from both a theoretical and practical point of view. From a negative point of view, we showed that both the strict and the permissive version of LS MAX c -CUT cannot be solved in $f(k) \cdot n^{o(k)}$ time for any computable function f , unless the ETH fails. From a positive point of view, we presented an algorithm that solves these problems in $\Delta^{\mathcal{O}(k)} \cdot n^{\mathcal{O}(1)}$ time. Moreover, we implemented this algorithm and evaluated its performance as a post-processing for a state-of-the-art heuristic for MAX c -CUT. Our experimental findings indicate that parameterized local search might be a promising technique in the design of local search algorithms and that its usefulness should be explored for further hard problems, in particular as post-processing for state-of-the-art heuristics to improve already good solutions.

Open questions. Our results in this work leave several questions open and give raise to new research directions. From a practical point of view, it would be interesting to consider a combined implementation of the MoH algorithm with our hill-climbing algorithm based on the k -flip neighborhood. In such a combined implementation, one could for example consider two different time limits t_1 and t_2 : First, until time limit t_1 is reached, we let the MoH-algorithm run. Afterwards, we take the best found solution by MoH as starting solution for our hill-climbing algorithm which we then run until time limit t_2 is reached. It would be interesting to analyze the final solution quality with respect to these two time limits. In other words, it would be interesting to analyze when switching from MoH to our hill-climbing algorithm is promising. Such an approach could also be considered with respect to combinations of other state-of-the-art heuristics for MAX c -CUT. For example for $c = 2$, that is, for MAX CUT, one could consider analyzing the usefulness of our hill-climbing algorithm as a post-processing algorithm for algorithms like TS-UBQP [27] or TSHEA [45].

Regarding the practical evaluation of parameterized local search algorithms, we believe that some of the techniques introduced in this chapter might find successful applications also for other problems. In particular, the technique we introduced to prevent redundantly checking candidates (see Lemma 4) seems promising: We can ignore candidates that contain a vertex v for which no vertex of distance $\mathcal{O}(k)$ has changed since the last time we verified that v is not contained in any improving candidate. This technique was already successfully adapted in a local search solver for WEIGHTED VERTEX COVER [40] and we believe that it might find successful application for local search versions of problems like MAX SAT [39] or HITTING SET.

From a theoretical point of view, one could ask for a smaller parameter in the basis of the worst-case running time. For example, one may ask whether we can replace the maximum degree in the basis by the h -index of the input graph, that is, if we can solve MAX c -CUT in $h^{\mathcal{O}(k)} \cdot n^{\mathcal{O}(1)}$ time. In the aim of developing an algorithm with such a running time, one could for example branch into all possible ways to flip up

to k high-degree vertices. For each such branch, one then needs to find a coloring that improves over the initial coloring that only flips low-degree vertices. This would then necessitate solving a gap-version of MAX c -CUT similar to the one introduced by Komusiewicz and Morawietz [29] for the local search version of VERTEX COVER.

Based on the W[1]-hardness results for LS MIN BISECTION and LS MAX BISECTION with respect to the search radius k , one might also consider revisiting the parameterized complexity of these problems with respect to k plus some additional parameter ℓ . So far, the only known algorithm for LS MIN BISECTION and LS MAX BISECTION run in FPT-time with respect to k on graphs on bounded local treewidth [9]. These algorithms imply that LS MIN BISECTION and LS MAX BISECTION can be solved in $2^{\Delta^{\mathcal{O}(k)}} \cdot n^{\mathcal{O}(1)}$ time, but the existence of algorithms for these problems that run in $\Delta^{\mathcal{O}(k)} \cdot n^{\mathcal{O}(1)}$ time are open. Based on the restriction that each part of the partition is equally-sized in any solution of these problems, one might need to consider candidates to flip that are not connected in the input graph to achieve a better solution.

Acknowledgements

Nils Morawietz was supported by the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft (DFG), project OPERAH, KO 3669/5-1.

Contribution Statement

The research for this article was done while all authors were members of Philipps-Universität Marburg, Department of Mathematics and Computer Science.

References

- [1] David Arbour, Drew Dimmery, and Anup B. Rao. Efficient Balanced Treatment Assignments for Experimentation. In *Proceedings of the 24th International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics (AISTATS '21)*, volume 130 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pages 3070–3078. PMLR, 2021.
- [2] Una Benlic and Jin-Kao Hao. Breakout Local Search for the Max-Cut problem. *Engineering Applications of Artificial Intelligence*, 26(3):1162–1173, 2013.
- [3] Piotr Berman and Marek Karpinski. On Some Tighter Inapproximability Results (Extended Abstract). In *Proceedings of the 26th International Colloquium on Automata, Languages and Programming (ICALP '99)*, volume 1644 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 200–209. Springer, 1999.
- [4] Édouard Bonnet, Yoichi Iwata, Bart M. P. Jansen, and Lukasz Kowalik. Fine-Grained Complexity of k -OPT in Bounded-Degree Graphs for Solving TSP. In *Proceedings of the 27th Annual European Symposium on Algorithms (ESA '19)*, volume 144 of *LIPICs*, pages 23:1–23:14. Schloss Dagstuhl - Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik, 2019.

- [5] Vaggos Chatziafratis, Mohammad Mahdian, and Sara Ahmadian. Maximizing Agreements for Ranking, Clustering and Hierarchical Clustering via MAX-CUT. In *Proceedings of the 24th International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics (AISTATS '21)*, volume 130 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pages 1657–1665. PMLR, 2021.
- [6] Marek Cygan, Fedor V. Fomin, Lukasz Kowalik, Daniel Lokshtanov, Dániel Marx, Marcin Pilipczuk, Michal Pilipczuk, and Saket Saurabh. *Parameterized Algorithms*. Springer, 2015.
- [7] Martin Dörnfelder, Jiong Guo, Christian Komusiewicz, and Mathias Weller. On the parameterized complexity of consensus clustering. *Theoretical Computer Science*, 542:71–82, 2014.
- [8] Rodney G. Downey and Michael R. Fellows. *Fundamentals of Parameterized Complexity*. Texts in Computer Science. Springer, 2013.
- [9] Michael R. Fellows, Fedor V. Fomin, Daniel Lokshtanov, Frances A. Rosamond, Saket Saurabh, and Yngve Villanger. Local search: Is brute-force avoidable? *Journal of Computer and System Sciences*, 78(3):707–719, 2012.
- [10] Pedro Felzenszwalb, Caroline Klivans, and Alice Paul. Clustering with Semidefinite Programming and Fixed Point Iteration. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 23(190):1–23, 2022.
- [11] Paola Festa, Panos M. Pardalos, Mauricio G. C. Resende, and Celso C. Ribeiro. Randomized heuristics for the Max-Cut problem. *Optimization Methods and Software*, 17(6):1033–1058, 2002.
- [12] Alan M. Frieze and Mark Jerrum. Improved Approximation Algorithms for MAX k -CUT and MAX BISECTION. *Algorithmica*, 18(1):67–81, 1997.
- [13] M. R. Garey and David S. Johnson. *Computers and Intractability: A Guide to the Theory of NP-Completeness*. W. H. Freeman, 1979.
- [14] Serge Gaspers, Joachim Gudmundsson, Mitchell Jones, Julián Mestre, and Stefan Rümmele. Turbocharging Treewidth Heuristics. *Algorithmica*, 81(2):439–475, 2019.
- [15] Serge Gaspers, Eun Jung Kim, Sebastian Ordyniak, Saket Saurabh, and Stefan Szeider. Don’t Be Strict in Local Search! In *Proceedings of the 26th Annual AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence (AAAI '12)*. AAAI Press, 2012.
- [16] Daya Ram Gaur, Ramesh Krishnamurti, and Rajeev Kohli. Conflict Resolution in the Scheduling of Television Commercials. *Operations Research*, 57(5):1098–1105, 2009.
- [17] Niels Grüttemeier, Christian Komusiewicz, and Nils Morawietz. Efficient Bayesian Network Structure Learning via Parameterized Local Search on Topological Orderings. In *Proceedings of the 35th Annual AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence (AAAI '21)*, pages 12328–12335. AAAI Press, 2021.

- [18] Jiong Guo, Sepp Hartung, Rolf Niedermeier, and Ondrej Suchý. The Parameterized Complexity of Local Search for TSP, More Refined. *Algorithmica*, 67(1):89–110, 2013.
- [19] Jiong Guo, Danny Hermelin, and Christian Komusiewicz. Local search for string problems: Brute-force is essentially optimal. *Theoretical Computer Science*, 525:30–41, 2014.
- [20] Sepp Hartung and Rolf Niedermeier. Incremental list coloring of graphs, parameterized by conservation. *Theoretical Computer Science*, 494:86–98, 2013.
- [21] Weiran Huang, Liang Li, and Wei Chen. Partitioned Sampling of Public Opinions Based on Their Social Dynamics. In *Proceedings of the 31st Annual AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence (AAAI '17)*, pages 24–30. AAAI Press, 2017.
- [22] Tommy R Jensen and Bjarne Toft. *Graph coloring problems*, volume 39. John Wiley & Sons, 2011.
- [23] Viggo Kann, Sanjeev Khanna, Jens Lagergren, and Alessandro Panconesi. On the Hardness of Approximating Max k -Cut and its Dual. *Chicago Journal of Theoretical Computer Science*, 1997(2), 1997.
- [24] Richard M. Karp. Reducibility among combinatorial problems. In *Proceedings of a Symposium on the Complexity of Computer Computations*, The IBM Research Symposia Series, pages 85–103. Plenum Press, New York, 1972.
- [25] Maximilian Katzmann and Christian Komusiewicz. Systematic Exploration of Larger Local Search Neighborhoods for the Minimum Vertex Cover Problem. In *Proceedings of the 31st Annual AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence (AAAI '17)*, pages 846–852. AAAI Press, 2017.
- [26] Jon M. Kleinberg and Éva Tardos. *Algorithm design*. Addison-Wesley, 2006.
- [27] Gary A. Kochenberger, Jin-Kao Hao, Zhipeng Lü, Haibo Wang, and Fred W. Glover. Solving large scale Max Cut problems via tabu search. *Journal of Heuristics*, 19(4):565–571, 2013.
- [28] Christian Komusiewicz, Simone Linz, Nils Morawietz, and Jannik Schestag. On the Complexity of Parameterized Local Search for the Maximum Parsimony Problem. In *Proceedings of the 34th Annual Symposium on Combinatorial Pattern Matching (CPM '23)*, volume 259 of *LIPICs*, pages 18:1–18:18. Schloss Dagstuhl - Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik, 2023.
- [29] Christian Komusiewicz and Nils Morawietz. Parameterized Local Search for Vertex Cover: When Only the Search Radius Is Crucial. In *Proceedings of the 17th International Symposium on Parameterized and Exact Computation (IPEC '22)*, volume 249 of *LIPICs*, pages 20:1–20:18. Schloss Dagstuhl - Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik, 2022.

- [30] Christian Komusiewicz and Frank Sommer. Enumerating connected induced subgraphs: Improved delay and experimental comparison. *Discrete Applied Mathematics*, 303:262–282, 2021.
- [31] Christian Komusiewicz and Manuel Sorge. An algorithmic framework for fixed-cardinality optimization in sparse graphs applied to dense subgraph problems. *Discrete Applied Mathematics*, 193:145–161, 2015.
- [32] Mark D. M. Leiserson, Diana Tatar, Lenore J. Cowen, and Benjamin J. Hescott. Inferring Mechanisms of Compensation from E-MAP and SGA Data Using Local Search Algorithms for Max Cut. *Journal of Computational Biology*, 18(11):1399–1409, 2011.
- [33] Fuda Ma and Jin-Kao Hao. A multiple search operator heuristic for the max-k-cut problem. *Annals of Operations Research*, 248(1-2):365–403, 2017.
- [34] Dániel Marx. Searching the k -change neighborhood for TSP is $W[1]$ -hard. *Operations Research Letters*, 36(1):31–36, 2008.
- [35] Christos H. Papadimitriou and Mihalis Yannakakis. Optimization, Approximation, and Complexity Classes. *Journal of Computer and System Sciences*, 43(3):425–440, 1991.
- [36] Alejandro A. Schäffer and Mihalis Yannakakis. Simple Local Search Problems That are Hard to Solve. *SIAM Journal on Computing*, 20(1):56–87, 1991.
- [37] VP Shylo, F Glover, and IV Sergienko. Teams of global equilibrium search algorithms for solving the weighted maximum cut problem in parallel. *Cybernetics and Systems Analysis*, 51(1):16–24, 2015.
- [38] Anand Prabhu Subramanian, Himanshu Gupta, Samir R. Das, and Jing Cao. Minimum Interference Channel Assignment in Multiradio Wireless Mesh Networks. *IEEE Transactions on Mobile Computing*, 7(12):1459–1473, 2008.
- [39] Stefan Szeider. The parameterized complexity of k -flip local search for SAT and MAX SAT. *Discrete Optimization*, 8(1):139–145, 2011.
- [40] Felix Ullmann. Engineering a Local Search Solver for Weighted Vertex Cover. Bachelor’s thesis, Philipps-Universität Marburg, 2023.
- [41] Tjark Vredeveld and Jan Karel Lenstra. On local search for the generalized graph coloring problem. *Operations Research Letters*, 31(1):28–34, 2003.
- [42] Jiří Šíma, Pekka Orponen, and Teemu Antti-Poika. Some Afterthoughts on Hopfield Networks. In *Proceedings of the 26th Conference on Current Trends in Theory and Practice of Informatics (SOFSEM ’99)*, volume 1725 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 459–469. Springer, 1999.
- [43] Jiahai Wang. An improved discrete Hopfield neural network for Max-Cut problems. *Neurocomputing*, 69(13-15):1665–1669, 2006.

- [44] Yang Wang, Zhipeng Lü, Fred Glover, and Jin-Kao Hao. Probabilistic GRASP-Tabu search algorithms for the UBQP problem. *Computers & Operations Research*, 40(12):3100–3107, 2013.
- [45] Qinghua Wu, Yang Wang, and Zhipeng Lü. A tabu search based hybrid evolutionary algorithm for the max-cut problem. *Applied Soft Computing*, 34:827–837, 2015.
- [46] Wenxing Zhu, Geng Lin, and M. Montaz Ali. Max- k -Cut by the Discrete Dynamic Convexized Method. *INFORMS Journal on Computing*, 25(1):27–40, 2013.