

Parameterized algorithms for Eccentricity Shortest Path Problem^{*}

Sriram Bhyravarapu¹, Satyabrata Jana¹, Lawqueen Kanesh², Saket Saurabh^{1,3},
and Shaily Verma¹

¹ The Institute of Mathematical Sciences, HBNI, Chennai, India
{sriram, satyabrataj, saket, shailyverma}@imsc.res.in

² Indian Institute of Technology Jodhpur, India
lawqueen@iitj.ac.in

³ University of Bergen, Norway

Abstract. Given an undirected graph $G = (V, E)$ and an integer ℓ , the ECCENTRICITY SHORTEST PATH (ESP) problem asks to check if there exists a shortest path P such that for every vertex $v \in V(G)$, there is a vertex $w \in P$ such that $d_G(v, w) \leq \ell$, where $d_G(v, w)$ represents the distance between v and w in G . Dragan and Leitert [Theor. Comput. Sci. 2017] studied the optimization version of this problem which asks to find the minimum ℓ for ESP and showed that it is NP-hard even on planar bipartite graphs with maximum degree 3. They also showed that ESP is W[2]-hard when parameterized by ℓ . On the positive side, Kučera and Suchý [IWOCA 2021] showed that ESP is fixed-parameter tractable (FPT) when parameterized by modular width, cluster vertex deletion set, maximum leaf number, or the combined parameters disjoint paths deletion set and ℓ . It was asked as an open question in the same paper, if ESP is FPT parameterized by disjoint paths deletion set or feedback vertex set. We answer these questions and obtain the following results:

1. ESP is FPT when parameterized by disjoint paths deletion set, split vertex deletion set, or the combined parameters feedback vertex set and ℓ .
2. A $(1 + \epsilon)$ -factor FPT approximation algorithm when parameterized by the feedback vertex set number.
3. ESP is W[2]-hard parameterized by the chordal vertex deletion set.

Keywords: Shortest path, Eccentricity, Chordal, Split, Feedback vertex set, FPT, W[2]-hardness

1 Introduction

Given a graph $G = (V, E)$ and a path P , the *distance* from a vertex $v \in V(G)$ to P is $\min\{d_G(v, w) \mid w \in V(P)\}$, where $d_G(v, w)$ is the distance between v and w

^{*} A subset of the results of this paper were accepted to be presented at the 34th International Workshop on Combinatorial Algorithms (IWOCA 2023)

in G . Given a graph G and a path P , the *eccentricity* of P , denoted by $\text{ecc}_G(P)$, with respect to G is defined as the maximum over all of the shortest distances between each vertex of G and P . Formally, $\text{ecc}_G(P) = \max\{d_G(u, P) | u \in V(G)\}$. Dragan and Leitert [8] introduced the problem of finding a shortest path with minimum eccentricity, called the MINIMUM ECCENTRICITY SHORTEST PATH problem (for short MESP) in a given undirected graph. They found interesting connections between MESP and the MINIMUM DISTORTION EMBEDDING problem and obtained a better approximation algorithm for MINIMUM DISTORTION EMBEDDING. MESP may be seen as a generalization of the DOMINATING PATH Problem [9] that asks to find a path such that every vertex in the graph either belongs to the path or has a neighbor in the path. In MESP, the objective is to find a shortest path P in G such that the eccentricity of P is minimum. Throughout the paper, we denote the minimum value over the eccentricities of all the shortest paths in G as the *eccentricity of the graph G* , denoted by $\text{ecc}(G)$. MESP has applications in transportation planning, fluid transportation, water resource management, and communication networks.




Fig. 1. The hierarchy of parameters explored in this work. Arrow points from parameter a to parameter b indicates $b \leq f(a)$, for some computable function f . Parameters in red are studied in this paper. The symbol “*” attached to the feedback vertex set means it is FPT in combination with the desired eccentricity. The grey box represents the result implied by those obtained.

Dragan and Leitert [7] demonstrated that fast algorithms for MESP imply fast approximation algorithms for MINIMUM LINE DISTORTION, and the existence of low eccentricity shortest paths in special graph classes will imply low approximation bounds for those classes. They also showed that MESP is NP-hard on planar bipartite graphs with maximum degree 3. In parameterized settings, they showed that MESP is W[2]-hard for general graphs and gave an XP algorithm for the problem when parameterized by eccentricity. Furthermore, they designed 2-approximation, 3-approximation, and 8-approximation algorithms for MESP running in time $O(n^3)$, $O(nm)$, and $O(m)$ respectively, where

n and m represents the number of vertices and edges of the graph. The latter 8-approximation algorithm uses the double-BFS technique. In 2016, Birmelé et al. [1] showed that the algorithm is, in fact, a 5-approximation algorithm by a deeper analysis of the double-BFS procedure and further extended the idea to get a 3-approximation algorithm, which still runs in linear time. Furthermore, they study the link between MESP and the laminarity of graphs introduced by Volké et al. [11] in which the covering path is required to be a diameter and established some tight bounds between MESP and the laminarity parameters. Dragan and Leitert [7] showed that MESP can be solved in linear time on distance-hereditary graphs and in polynomial time on chordal and dually chordal graphs. Recently, Kučera and Suchý [10] studied MESP with respect to some structural parameters and provided FPT algorithms for the problem with respect to modular width, cluster vertex deletion (cld), maximum leaf number, or the combined parameters disjoint paths deletion (dpc) and eccentricity (ecc). We call the decision version of MESP, which is to check if there exists a shortest path P such that for each $v \in V(G)$, the distance between v and P is at most ℓ , as the *Eccentricity Shortest Path Problem* (for short ESP). In this paper, we further extend the study of MESP in the parameterized setting.

1.1 Our Results and Discussion

In this paper, we study the parameterized complexity of ESP with respect to the structural parameters: feedback vertex set (fvs), disjoint paths deletion set (dpc), split vertex deletion set (svd), and chordal vertex deletion set (cld). We call this version as ESP/ ρ , where ρ is the parameter. We now formally define ESP/fvs + ecc (other problems can be defined similarly).

ESP/fvs + ecc	Parameter: $k + \ell$
Input: An undirected graph G , a set $S \subseteq V(G)$ of size k such that $G - S$ is a forest, and an integer ℓ .	
Question: Does there exist a shortest path P in G such that for each $v \in V(G)$, $dist_G(v, P) \leq \ell$?	

First, we show an algorithm for ESP/fvs + ecc, in Section 3, that runs in $2^{\mathcal{O}(k \log k)} \ell^k n^{\mathcal{O}(1)}$ time where ℓ is the eccentricity of the graph and k is the size of a feedback vertex set. In Section 4, we design a $(1 + \epsilon)$ -factor FPT algorithm for ESP/fvs. Then, in Section 5 we design an algorithm for ESP/dpc running in time $2^{\mathcal{O}(k \log k)} \cdot n^{\mathcal{O}(1)}$.

In addition, we show that ESP/svd admits an FPT algorithm. We then explore the problem on cld which is a generalization of fvs, svd, cld and show that ESP/cld is $W[2]$ -hard. These results are presented in Sections 6 and 7 respectively.

2 Preliminaries

All the graphs considered in this paper are finite, unweighted, undirected, and connected. For standard graph notations, we refer to the graph theory book

by R. Diestel [5]. For parameterized complexity terminology, we refer to the parameterized algorithms book by Cygan et al. [3]. For $n \in \mathbb{N}$, we denote the sets $\{1, 2, \dots, n\}$ and $\{0, 1, 2, \dots, n\}$ by $[n]$ and $[0, n]$ respectively. For a graph $G = (V, E)$, we use n and m to denote the number of vertices and edges of G . Given an integer ℓ , we say that a path P covers a vertex v if there exists a vertex $u \in V(P)$ such that the distance between the vertices u and v , denoted by, $d_G(v, u)$, is at most ℓ . A *feedback vertex set* of a graph G is a set $S \subseteq V(G)$ such that $G - S$ is acyclic.

In addition to feedback vertex set, we have considered the following structural parameters:

1. A *disjoint paths deletion set (dpd)* is a set $S \subseteq V(G)$ such that $G - S$ is a set of disjoint paths.
2. A *split vertex deletion set* is a set $S \subseteq V(G)$ such that $G - S$ is a split graph, where a *split graph* is a graph such that vertices of G can be partitioned into two sets: one induces an independent set and other induce a clique.
3. A *chordal vertex deletion set* is a set $S \subseteq V(G)$ such that $G - S$ is a chordal graph, where a chordal graph is a graph with no induced cycle of length at least 4.

Given a graph G , a feedback vertex set [3], a disjoint path deletion set [10], a split vertex deletion set [4], and a chordal vertex deletion set [2], of size k can be found in FPT time parameterized by k .

Next, we state a few known results.

Lemma 1 (Dragan and Leitert [8]). *If a given graph G contains a shortest path with eccentricity ℓ , the MESP problem can be solved for G in $\mathcal{O}(n^{2\ell+2}m)$ time, where m is the number of edges in G .*

Lemma 2 (Kučera and Suchý [10]). *For any graph $G = (V, E)$, any set $M \subseteq V$, and any vertex $s \in V$, at most one permutation $\pi = (m_1, \dots, m_{|M|})$ of the vertices in M exists, such that, there is a shortest path P with the following properties: The first vertex on P is s , P contains all vertices of M , and the vertices from M appear on P in exactly the order given by π . Moreover, given a precomputed distance matrix for G , the permutation π can be found in $\mathcal{O}(|M| \log |M|)$ time.*

3 Parameterized by Feedback Vertex Set and Eccentricity

In this section, we design an FPT algorithm for ESP/fvs+ecc. The main theorem of this section is formally stated as follows.

Theorem 1. *There is an algorithm for ESP/fvs + ecc running in time $\mathcal{O}(2^{\mathcal{O}(k \log k)} \ell^k n^{\mathcal{O}(1)})$.*

Outline of the Algorithm. Given a graph G and a feedback vertex set S of size k , we reduce ESP/fvs + ecc to a “path problem” (which we call COLORFUL PATH-COVER) on an auxiliary graph G' (a forest) which is a subgraph of $G[V \setminus S]$, using some reduction rules and two intermediate problems called SKELETON TESTING and EXT-SKELETON TESTING. In Section 3.1, we show that ESP/fvs + ecc and SKELETON TESTING are FPT-equivalent. Next, in Section 3.3, we reduce SKELETON TESTING to EXT-SKELETON TESTING. Then in Section 3.4, we reduce EXT-SKELETON TESTING to COLORFUL PATH-COVER. Finally, in Section 3.5, we design a dynamic programming based algorithm for COLORFUL PATH-COVER that runs in $\mathcal{O}(\ell^2 2^{\mathcal{O}(k \log k)} n^{\mathcal{O}(1)})$ time. Together with the time taken for the reductions to the intermediate problems, we get our desired FPT algorithm. A flow chart for the steps of the algorithm is shown in Figure 2.




Fig. 2. Flow chart of the Algorithm for ESP/fvs + ecc.

3.1 Reducing to SKELETON TESTING

The input to the problem is an instance (G, S, k, ℓ) where $S \subseteq V(G)$ is a feedback vertex set of size k in G . Let (G, S, k, ℓ) be a yes instance, and P be a solution path which is a shortest path such that for each $v \in V(G)$, there exists $u \in V(P)$ such that $d_G(u, v) \leq \ell$. Our ultimate goal is to construct such a path P . Towards this, we try to get as much information as possible about P in time $f(k, \ell)n^{\mathcal{O}(1)}$. Observe that if S is an empty set, then we can obtain P by just knowing its endpoints as there is a unique path in a tree between any two vertices. Generalizing this idea, given the set S , we define the notion of *skeleton* of P .

Definition 1 (Skeleton). A skeleton of P , denoted by \mathbb{S} , is the following set of information.

- End-vertices of P , say $u, v \in V(G)$.
- A subset of $S \setminus \{u, v\}$, say M , of vertices that appear on P . That is, $V(P) \cap (S \setminus \{u, v\}) = M$.




Fig. 3. Example of a skeleton of P . Here P is a shortest path (blue edges) between two red colored vertices u and v through green colored internal vertices. For the vertices x_1, x_2 and x_3 , $f(x_1) = f(x_2) = 1$, $f(x_3) = 2$, $g(x_1) = 3$, $g(x_2) = g(x_3) = (3, 4)$.

- The order in which the vertices of M appear on P , is given by an ordering $\pi = m_1, m_2, \dots, m_{|M|}$. For notational convenience, we denote u by m_0 and v by $m_{|M|+1}$.
- A distance profile (f, g) for the set $X = S \setminus M$, is defined as follows: The function $f : X \rightarrow [\ell]$ such that $f(x)$ denotes the shortest distance of the vertex x from P , and the function $g : X \rightarrow \{0, 1, \dots, |M| + 1, (0, 1), (1, 2), \dots, (|M|, |M| + 1)\}$ such that $g(x)$ stores the information about the location of the vertex on P , that is closest to x . That is, if the vertex closest to P belongs to $\{m_0, m_1, \dots, m_{|M|}, m_{|M|+1}\}$ then $g(x)$ stores this by assigning the corresponding index. Else, the closest vertex belongs to the path segment between m_i, m_{i+1} , for some $0 \leq i \leq |M|$, which $g(x)$ stores by assigning $(i, i + 1)$.

An illustration of a skeleton is given in Fig. 3. By following the definition of skeletons, we get an upper bound on them.

Observation 1 *The number of skeletons is upper bounded by $n^2 2^k k! \ell^k (2k + 2)^k$.*

We say that a path P realizes a skeleton \mathbb{S} if the following holds.

1. $M = S \cap V(P)$, $X \cap V(P) = \emptyset$, the ordering of vertices in M in P is equal to π , endpoints of P are m_0 and $m_{|M|+1}$,
2. For each $v \in V(G)$, there exists a vertex $u \in V(P)$ such that $d_G(u, v) \leq \ell$,
3. For each $v \in X$, $d_G(v, w) \geq f(v)$ for all $w \in V(P)$ (where $f(v)$ is the shortest distance from v to any vertex on P in G), and
4. For each $v \in X$, if $g(v) = i$, where $i \in [0, |M| + 1]$, then $d_G(v, m_i) = f(v)$ and if $g(v) = (i, i + 1)$ where $i \in [0, |M|]$, then there exists a vertex u on a subpath m_i to m_{i+1} in P such that $u \notin \{m_i, m_{i+1}\}$ and $d_G(u, v) = f(v)$.

Now, given an input (G, S, k, ℓ) and a skeleton \mathbb{S} , our goal is to test whether the skeleton can be realized into a desired path P . This leads to the following problem.

SKELETON TESTING
Parameter: $k + \ell$

Input: A graph G , a set $S \subseteq V(G)$ of size k such that $G - S$ is a forest, an integer ℓ , and a skeleton \mathbb{S} .

Question: Does there exist a shortest path P in G that realizes \mathbb{S} ?

Our next lemma shows a reduction from ESP/fvs + ecc to SKELETON TESTING problem.

Lemma 3. (G, S, k, ℓ) is a yes instance of ESP/fvs + ecc, if and only if there exists a skeleton \mathbb{S} such that $(G, S, k, \ell, \mathbb{S})$ is a yes instance of SKELETON TESTING.

Proof. For the forward direction, suppose that (G, S, k, ℓ) is a yes instance of ESP/fvs + ecc and let P be its solution path. Let $M = V(P) \cap S$, $|M| = t$ and $X = S \setminus M$. Let π be the ordering of vertices in M on P . Let $m_0, m_{|M|+1}$ be the first and last endpoints of P , respectively. We define $f : X \rightarrow [\ell]$ such that for a vertex $v \in X$, $f(v)$ is the minimum distance from v to path P . Let u be the vertex in path P such that $d(v, u) = f(v)$. Note that f only assigns values from the set $[\ell]$. We define a function $g, g : X \rightarrow \{0, 1, \dots, t+1, (0, 1), (1, 2), \dots, (t, t+1)\}$ as follows: $g(v) = i$ if $u = m_i$ for some $i \in [0, t+1]$, and $g(v) = (i, i+1)$ if u is contained in m_i to m_{i+1} subpath for some $i \in [0, t]$. Note that g only assigns values from the set $\{0, 1, \dots, t+1, (0, 1), (1, 2), \dots, (t, t+1)\}$. Observe that the tuple $(M, X, \pi, m_0, m_{t+1}, f, g)$ is a skeleton of P . Hence, $(G, S, k, \ell, \mathbb{S})$ is a yes instance of SKELETON TESTING, where $\mathbb{S} = (M, X, \pi, m_0, m_{t+1}, f, g)$.

In the backward direction, suppose that $\mathbb{S} = (M, X, \pi, m_0, m_{t+1}, f, g)$ is a skeleton such that $(G, S, k, \ell, \mathbb{S})$ is a yes instance of SKELETON TESTING and let P be its solution. Observe that P is also a solution to (G, S, k, ℓ) of ESP/fvs + ecc, as for every $v \in V(G)$, there is a vertex $u \in V(P)$ such that $d_G(u, v) \leq \ell$. \square

Observation 1 upper bounds the number of skeletons by $2^{\mathcal{O}(k(\log k + \log \ell))} n^2$. This together with Lemma 3, implies that ESP/fvs + ecc and SKELETON TESTING are FPT-equivalent. Thus, from now onwards, we focus on SKELETON TESTING.

3.2 Algorithm for SKELETON TESTING

Let $(G, S, k, \ell, \mathbb{S})$ be an instance of SKELETON TESTING, where $\mathbb{S} = (M, X, \pi, m_0, m_{|M|+1}, f, g)$. Our algorithm works as follows. First, the algorithm performs a simple sanity check by reduction rule. In essence, it checks whether the different components of the skeleton \mathbb{S} are valid.

Reduction Rule 1 (Sanity Test 1) Return that $(G, S, k, \ell, \mathbb{S})$ is a no instance of SKELETON TESTING, if one of the following holds:

1. For $i \in [0, |M|]$, $m_i m_{i+1}$ is an edge in G and $g^{-1}((i, i+1)) \neq \emptyset$. (g is not valid.)
2. For a vertex $v \in X$, there exists a vertex $u \in M \cup \{m_0, m_{|M|+1}\}$ such that $d_G(u, v) < f(v)$. (f is not valid.)

3. For a vertex $v \in X$, $g(v) = i$ and $d_G(v, m_i) > f(v)$. (f is not valid.)
4. For an $i \in [0, |M|]$, $m_i m_{i+1}$ is not an edge in G , and there is either no m_i to m_{i+1} path in $G - (S \setminus \{m_i, m_{i+1}\})$ or the length of the path is larger than the shortest path length of m_i to m_{i+1} path in G . (π is not valid.)
5. For $i, j \in [0, |M|]$, $i < j$, there exists m_i to m_{i+1} shortest path P_i in $G - (S \setminus \{m_i, m_{i+1}\})$ and a m_j to m_{j+1} shortest path P_j in $G - (S \setminus \{m_j, m_{j+1}\})$ such that if $j = i + 1$, then $(V(P_i) \setminus \{m_{i+1}\}) \cap (V(P_j) \setminus \{m_j\}) \neq \emptyset$, otherwise $V(P_i) \cap V(P_j) \neq \emptyset$. (π is not valid – shortest path claim will be violated.)
6. For $i \in [0, |M|]$ such that $m_i m_{i+1} \notin E(G)$, $g^{-1}((i, i + 1)) \neq \emptyset$, and for every connected component C in $G - S$, and for every m_i to m_{i+1} path P in $G[V(C) \cup \{m_i, m_{i+1}\}]$ there exists a vertex $u \in g^{-1}((i, i + 1))$ such that there is no vertex $v \in V(P) \setminus \{m_i, m_{i+1}\}$ for which $d_G(u, v) = f(u)$. (g is not valid.)

Lemma 4. *Reduction rule 1 is safe.*

Proof. Proof of (1) follows from the fact that, to maintain the shortest path property of the solution, the edge $m_i m_{i+1}$ must be in solution. It contradicts that for every $v \in g^{-1}((i, i + 1))$, there exists a vertex u in m_i to m_{i+1} subpath of the solution path such that $u \notin \{m_i, m_{i+1}\}$ and $d_G(u, v) = f(v)$. Proof of (2) follows from the fact that otherwise, the property of the function g will be violated in the solution path. Proof of (4) follows from the shortest path property of the solution. Proofs of (3) and (6) are trivial as it is impossible to find a solution path in these cases.

Proof of (5): Suppose that $(G, S, k, \ell, \mathbb{S})$ is a yes instance of SKELETON TESTING and P be its solution. For $i, j \in [0, |M|]$, $i < j$, there exists m_i to m_{i+1} shortest path P_i in $G - (S \setminus \{m_i, m_{i+1}\})$ and a m_j to m_{j+1} shortest path P_j in $G - (S \setminus \{m_j, m_{j+1}\})$. Suppose that $j = i + 1$, then $(V(P_i) \setminus \{m_{i+1}\}) \cap (V(P_j) \setminus \{m_j\}) \neq \emptyset$. Let $v^* \in (V(P_i) \setminus \{m_{i+1}\}) \cap (V(P_j) \setminus \{m_j\})$ be the last intersecting vertex on paths P_i, P_j by ordering on path P_i . Observe that distance of m_i to v^* in P_i is strictly less than m_i to m_{i+1} subpath on P , that is $d_{P_i}(m_i, v^*) < d_P(m_i, m_{i+1})$, as $v^* \neq m_{i+1} = m_j$ and both P_i and m_i to m_{i+1} subpath on P are shortest m_i to m_{i+1} paths in G . Similarly, $d_{P_j}(v^*, m_{j+1}) \leq d_P(m_j, m_{j+1})$, as both P_j and m_j to m_{j+1} subpath on P are shortest m_j to m_{j+1} paths in G . This implies that $d_P(m_i, m_{j+1}) > d_{P_i}(m_i, v^*) + d_{P_j}(v^*, m_{j+1})$. By replacing m_i to m_{j+1} subpath in P by the subpaths m_i to v^* of P_i and v^* to m_{j+1} of P_j we obtain a shorter path in G , which contradicts the shortest path property of the solution P . The case when $j \neq i + 1$ can be argued analogously. \square

Reducing the components of $G - S$: Now, we describe our marking procedure and reduction rules that are applied on the connected components in $G - S$. Let P_i be a path segment (subpath) of P , between m_i and m_{i+1} , with at least two edges. Further, let P_i^{int} be the subpath of P_i , obtained by deleting m_i and m_{i+1} . Then, we have that P_i^{int} is a path between two vertices in $G - S$ (that is, a path in the forest $G - S$). This implies that P is made up of S and at most $k + 1$ paths of forest $G - S$. Let these paths be $\mathbb{P} = P_1^{int}, \dots, P_q^{int}$, where $q \leq k + 1$. Next, we try to understand these $k + 1$ paths of forest $G - S$. Indeed, if there exists

a component C in $G - S$ such that it has a vertex that is far away from every vertex in S , then C must contain one of the paths in \mathbb{P} (*essential components*). The number of such components can be at most $k + 1$. The other reason that a component contains a path from \mathbb{P} is to select a path that helps us to satisfy constraints given by the g function (*g -satisfying components*). Next, we give a procedure that marks $\mathcal{O}(k)$ components, and later, we show that all unmarked components can be safely deleted.

Marking Procedure: Let \mathcal{C}^* be the set of marked connected components of $G - S$. Initially, let $\mathcal{C}^* = \emptyset$.

- **Step 1.** If there exists a connected component C in $G - (S \cup V(\mathcal{C}^*))$, such that it contains a vertex v with $d_G(v, m_i) > \ell$, for all $m_i \in M$, and $d_G(v, u) > \ell - f(u)$, for all $u \in X$, then add C to \mathcal{C}^* . (Marking essential components)
- **Step 2.** For $i = 0$ to $|M|$ proceed as follows: Let C be some connected component in $G - (S \cup V(\mathcal{C}^*))$ such that there exists a m_i to m_{i+1} path P_i in $G[V(C) \cup \{m_i, m_{i+1}\}]$, which is a shortest m_i to m_{i+1} path in G and for every vertex $v \in g^{-1}((i, i + 1))$, there exists a vertex $u \in V(P_i) \setminus \{m_i, m_{i+1}\}$ for which $d_G(u, v) = f(v)$. Then, add C to \mathcal{C}^* and increase the index i . (Marking g -satisfying components)

Let \mathcal{C}_1 be the set of connected components added to \mathcal{C}^* in Step 1. We now state a few reduction rules the algorithm applies exhaustively in the order in which they are stated.

Reduction Rule 2 *If $|\mathcal{C}_1| \geq k + 2$, then return that $(G, S, k, \ell, \mathbb{S})$ is a no instance of SKELETON TESTING.*

Lemma 5. *Reduction rule 2 is safe.*

Proof. For each component C in \mathcal{C}_1 , C contains a vertex v such that $d_G(v, m_i) > \ell$, for all $m_i \in M$ and $d_G(v, u) > \ell - f(u)$, for all $u \in X$, which implies we must add a path from component C in solution path as a subpath such that it contains a vertex that covers v . Observe that we can add at most $|M| + 1$ subpaths in the solution path. Therefore, $|\mathcal{C}_1| \leq |M| + 1$ if $(G, S, k, \ell, \mathbb{S})$ is a yes instance of SKELETON TESTING. We obtain the required bound as $|M| \leq k$. \square

Reduction Rule 3 *If there exists a connected component C in $G - S$ such that $C \notin \mathcal{C}^*$, then delete $V(C)$ from G . The resultant instance is $(G - V(C), S, k, \ell, \mathbb{S})$.*

Lemma 6. *Reduction rule 3 is safe.*

Proof. We show that $(G, S, k, \ell, \mathbb{S})$ is a yes instance of SKELETON TESTING if and only if $(G - V(C), S, k, \ell, \mathbb{S})$ is a yes instance of SKELETON TESTING. Recall that $\mathbb{S} = (M, X, \pi, m_0, m_{|M|+1}, f, g)$. In the forward direction, consider that $(G, S, k, \ell, \mathbb{S})$ is a yes instance of SKELETON TESTING and P be its solution. Suppose that P contains a m_i to m_{i+1} subpath P^* such that P^* is a path in $G[V(C) \cup \{m_i, m_{i+1}\}]$. Since C is not in \mathcal{C}^* , there exists a connected component $C' \in \mathcal{C}^*$ such that there exists a m_i to m_{i+1} path P' in $G[V(C') \cup \{m_i, m_{i+1}\}]$,

such that P' is a shortest m_i to m_{i+1} path in G and for every vertex $v \in g^{-1}((i, i+1))$, $d_G(v, P' - \{m_i, m_{i+1}\}) = f(v)$. We replace subpath P^* from P by subpath P' . Let P'' is the resultant path. We claim that P'' is also a solution to $(G, S, k, \ell, \mathbb{S})$. Observe that P'' satisfies functions f and g . Suppose that there is a vertex $v \in V(G)$ such that $d_G(v, P'') > \ell$. Then v must be in C . Since C is not added to \mathcal{C}^* in Step 1 of the marking procedure, every vertex in C is either at distance at most ℓ from some $m_i, i \in [0, |M| + 1]$ or $d_G(v, u) \leq \ell - f(u)$ for some $u \in X$. Hence v is covered by some vertex on P'' , a contradiction. So P'' is also a solution to $(G, S, k, \ell, \mathbb{S})$ and P'' does not contain any vertex from C . As every vertex of C gets covered, P'' is also a solution to $(G - V(C), S, k, \ell, \mathbb{S})$. If P contains no vertex from C then by the similar procedure we can obtain a solution path \hat{P} for $(G, S, k, \ell, \mathbb{S})$ which doesn't contain any vertex of C . Observe that \hat{P} is also a solution to $(G - V(C), S, k, \ell, \mathbb{S})$ of SKELETON TESTING.

In the backward direction suppose that $(G - V(C), S, k, \ell, \mathbb{S})$ is a yes instance of SKELETON TESTING and let P be its solution. Since C is not added to \mathcal{C}^* in Step 1 of the marking procedure, every vertex in C is either distance at most ℓ from some $m_i, i \in [0, |M| + 1]$ or $d_G(v, u) \leq \ell - f(u)$ for some $u \in X$, therefore every vertex in C is covered by some vertex on P . This implies that P is also a solution to $(G, S, k, \ell, \mathbb{S})$. This completes the proof. \square

Observe that when Reduction rule 2 and Reduction rule 3 are no longer applicable, the number of connected components in $G - S$ is bounded by $2(k+1)$. This is because $|\mathcal{C}_1| \leq k+1$ and there exists a path (that is part of the solution) from each component in $\mathcal{C}^* - \mathcal{C}_1$ and therefore $|\mathcal{C}^* - \mathcal{C}_1| \leq k+1$. Otherwise, the given instance is a no instance of SKELETON TESTING. Notice that all our reduction rules can be applied in $n^{\mathcal{O}(1)}$ time.

3.3 Reducing SKELETON TESTING to EXT-SKELETON TESTING:

Let $(G, S, k, \ell, \mathbb{S})$ be a reduced instance of SKELETON TESTING. That is, an instance on which Reduction Rules 1, 2 and 3 are no longer applicable. This implies that the number of connected components in $G - S$ is at most $2k+2$. Next, we enrich our skeleton by adding a function γ , which records an index of a component in $G - S$ that gives the m_i to m_{i+1} subpath in P or records that $m_i m_{i+1}$ is an edge in the desired path P , where $i \in [0, |M|]$.

Definition 2 (Enriched Skeleton). *An enriched skeleton of a path P , denoted by \mathbb{ES} , contains \mathbb{S} and a segment profile of paths between m_i and m_{i+1} , for $i \in [0, M]$. Let C_1, C_2, \dots, C_q be the connected components in $G - S$. Then, the segment profile is given by a function $\gamma : [0, |M|] \rightarrow [0, q]$. The function γ represents the following: For each $i \in [0, |M|]$, if $\gamma(i) = 0$, then the pair m_i, m_{i+1} should be connected by an edge in the solution path P , otherwise if $\gamma(i) = j$, then in P , the m_i to m_{i+1} subpath is contained in $G[V(C_j) \cup \{m_i, m_{i+1}\}]$. Also, \mathbb{ES} is said to be enriching the skeleton \mathbb{S} .*

Let \mathbb{S} be a skeleton. The number of \mathbb{ES} , that enrich \mathbb{S} is upper bounded by $(q+1)^{k+1}$. Thus, this is not useful for us unless q is bounded by a function of k, ℓ .

Fortunately, the number of connected components in $G - S$ is at most $2k + 2$, and thus the number of \mathbb{ES} is upper bounded by $2^{\mathcal{O}(k \log k)}$.

We say that a path P *realizes* an enriched skeleton \mathbb{ES} enriching \mathbb{S} , if P realizes \mathbb{S} and satisfies γ . Similar to SKELETON TESTING, we can define EXT-SKELETON TESTING, where the aim is to test if a path exists that realizes an enriched skeleton \mathbb{ES} . Further, it is easy to see that SKELETON TESTING and EXT-SKELETON TESTING are FPT-equivalent, and thus we can focus on EXT-SKELETON TESTING. Let $(G, S, k, \ell, \mathbb{ES})$ be an instance of EXT-SKELETON TESTING, where $G - S$ has at most $2k + 2$ components. Similarly, as SKELETON TESTING, we first apply some sanity testing on an instance of EXT-SKELETON TESTING.

Reduction Rule 4 (Sanity Test 2) *Return that $(G, S, k, \ell, \mathbb{ES})$ is a no instance of EXT-SKELETON TESTING, if one of the following holds:*

1. $m_i m_{i+1}$ is an edge in G and $\gamma(i) \neq 0$, (or) $m_i m_{i+1}$ is not an edge in G and $\gamma(i) = 0$.
2. For an $i \in [|M|]$, $\gamma(i) = j \neq 0$ and there is,
 - No m_i to m_{i+1} path in $G[V(C_j) \cup \{m_i, m_{i+1}\}]$, (or)
 - No m_i to m_{i+1} path in $G[V(C_j) \cup \{m_i, m_{i+1}\}]$ which is also a shortest m_i to m_{i+1} path in G , (or)
 - There does not exist a m_i to m_{i+1} path P_i in $G[V(C_j) \cup \{m_i, m_{i+1}\}]$ which is also a shortest m_i to m_{i+1} path in G and satisfies the property that for every vertex $v \in g^{-1}((i, i + 1))$, there exists a vertex $u \in V(P_i) \setminus \{m_i, m_{i+1}\}$ for which $d_G(u, v) = f(v)$.

The safeness of the above rule follows from Definition 2.

3.4 Reducing EXT-SKELETON TESTING to COLORFUL PATH-COVER

Let $(G, S, k, \ell, \mathbb{ES})$ be an instance of EXT-SKELETON TESTING on which Reduction Rule 4 is no longer applicable. Further, let us assume that the number of components in $G - S$ is $k' \leq 2k + 2$ and $\gamma : [0, |M|] \rightarrow [0, k']$ be the function in \mathbb{ES} . Our objective is to find a path P that realizes \mathbb{ES} . Observe that for an $i \in [0, |M|]$, if $\gamma(i) = j \neq 0$, then the *interesting* paths to connect m_i, m_{i+1} pair are contained in component C_j in $G - S$. Moreover, among all the paths that connect m_i to m_{i+1} in C_j , only the shortest paths that satisfy the function g are the interesting paths. Therefore, we enumerate all the feasible paths for each m_i, m_{i+1} pair in a family \mathcal{F}_i and focus on finding a solution that contains subpaths from this enumerated set of paths only. Notice that now our problem is reduced to finding a set of paths \mathcal{P} in $G - S$ which contains exactly one path from each family of feasible paths and covers all the vertices in $G - S$ which are far away from S . In what follows, we formalize the above discussion. First, we describe our enumeration procedure.

For each $i \in [0, |M|]$ where $\gamma(i) = j \neq 0$, we construct a family \mathcal{F}_i of *feasible paths* as follows. Let P_i be a path in $G[V(C_j) \cup \{m_i, m_{i+1}\}]$, such that (i) P_i is a shortest m_i to m_{i+1} path in G , (ii) for every vertex $v \in g^{-1}((i, i + 1))$,

$d_G(v, P_i - \{m_i, m_{i+1}\}) = f(v)$. Let m'_i, m'_{i+1} be the neighbours of m_i, m_{i+1} , respectively in P_i . Then we add m'_i to m'_{i+1} subpath to \mathcal{F}_i . Observe that a family \mathcal{F}_i of feasible paths satisfies the following properties: (1) $V(\mathcal{F}_i) \cap V(\mathcal{F}_{i'}) = \emptyset$, for all $i, i' \in \gamma^{-1}(j), i \neq i'$, as item 5 of reduction Rule 1 is not applicable, and we add only shortest paths in families. (2) \mathcal{F}_i contains paths from exactly one component in $G - S$ (by the construction). Let \mathcal{F} be the collection of all the families of feasible paths.

The above discussion leads us to the following problem.

COLORFUL PATH-COVER

Input: A forest F , a set $B \subseteq V(F)$, an integer ℓ , and a family $\mathcal{F} = \{\mathcal{F}_1, \mathcal{F}_2, \dots, \mathcal{F}_t\}$ of t disjoint families of feasible paths.

Question: Is there a set \mathcal{P} of t paths such that for each $\mathcal{F}_i, i \in [t], |\mathcal{P} \cap \mathcal{F}_i| = 1$ and for every vertex $v \in B$, there exists a path $P \in \mathcal{P}$ and a vertex $u \in V(P)$, such that $d_F(u, v) \leq \ell$?

Let F be the forest obtained from $G - S$ by removing all the components C_j in $G - S$ such that $\gamma^{-1}(j) = \emptyset$, that is, components which do not contain any interesting paths. Notice that the number of components that contain interesting paths is at most $2k + 2$. We let $B \subseteq V(F)$ be the set of vertices which is not covered by vertices in S , that is, it contains all the vertices $v \in V(F)$ such that $d_G(v, m_i) > \ell$, for all $i \in [0, |M| + 1]$ and $d_G(v, u) > \ell - f(u)$, for all $u \in X$. We claim that it is sufficient to solve COLORFUL PATH-COVER on instance $(F, B, \ell, \mathcal{F})$ where F consists of at most $2k + 2$ trees. The following lemma shows a reduction formally and concludes that EXT-SKELETON TESTING parameterized by k and COLORFUL PATH-COVER problem parameterized by k , are FPT-equivalent.

Lemma 7. $(G, S, k, \ell, \mathbb{ES})$ is a yes instance of EXT-SKELETON TESTING if and only if $(F, B, \ell, \mathcal{F})$ is a yes instance of COLORFUL PATH-COVER.

Proof. Recall that $\mathbb{S} = (M, X, \pi, m_0, m_{|M|+1}, f, g)$ and $\mathbb{ES} = (\mathbb{S}, \gamma)$. In the forward direction, suppose that $(G, S, k, \ell, \mathbb{ES})$ is a yes instance of SKELETON TESTING and let P be its solution. Consider a connected component C_j in $G - S$. If $\gamma^{-1}(j) = \emptyset$, then by the properties of P , there does not exist $i \in [0, |M|]$ such that m_i to m_{i+1} path is contained in $G[V(C_j) \cup \{m_i, m_{i+1}\}]$. Otherwise for every $i \in \gamma^{-1}(j)$, let P_i be the subpath in P from m_i to m_{i+1} . Let m'_i, m'_{i+1} be the neighbours of m_i, m_{i+1} in P_i and Let P'_i be m'_i to m'_{i+1} subpath in P_i . We have that P'_i is contained in C_j and satisfies function g . Let $\mathcal{P} = \{P'_i | i \in [0, |M|], V(P'_i) \subseteq V(G - S)\}$. By the construction of \mathcal{F}_i , we have that $\mathcal{P} \cap \mathcal{F}_i = P'_i$, that is $|\mathcal{P} \cap \mathcal{F}_i| = 1$ due to Item 5 of Reduction Rule 1. As P realizes \mathbb{S} , and for every vertex $v \in B$, $d_G(v, m_i) > \ell$, for all $i \in [0, |M| + 1]$ and $d_G(v, u) > \ell - f(u)$, for all $u \in X$. Therefore, there exists a path in \mathcal{P} which contains a vertex v' such that $d_G(v, v') \leq \ell$. This implies that \mathcal{P} is a solution to $(F, B, \ell, \mathcal{F})$ of COLORFUL PATH-COVER, and hence $(F, B, \ell, \mathcal{F})$ is a yes instance of COLORFUL PATH-COVER.

In the backward direction, suppose that $(F, B, \ell, \mathcal{F})$ is a yes instance of COLORFUL PATH-COVER and let \mathcal{P} be its solution. Let $P'_i = \mathcal{F}_i \cap \mathcal{P}$ and m'_i, m'_{i+1} be its end vertices such that $m_i m'_i, m'_{i+1} m_{i+1} \in E(G)$. Let P_i be the m_i to m_{i+1} path containing edges $m_i m'_i, m'_{i+1} m_{i+1}$ and path P'_i . We construct a path P by concatenating paths P_i in \mathcal{P} if $\gamma(i) \neq 0$ and edges $m_i m_{i+1}$ when $\gamma(i) = 0$. By the construction of \mathcal{F}_i 's, P satisfies functions g, f, γ and ordering π of M . Observe that for every vertex $v \in V(G) \setminus B$, $d_G(v, m_i) \leq \ell$, for some $i \in [0, |M| + 1]$ or $d_G(v, u) \leq \ell - f(u)$, for some $u \in X$. Therefore every vertex in $V(G) \setminus B$ is covered by P . Clearly, P covers every vertex in B . Since we add only shortest paths in \mathcal{F} and as Reduction Rule 4 is not applicable, P is also a shortest path in G . This implies that P is a solution to $(G, S, k, \ell, \mathbb{E}S)$ of EXT-SKELETON TESTING and hence $(G, S, k, \ell, \mathbb{E}S)$ is a yes instance of EXT-SKELETON TESTING \square

We design a dynamic programming-based algorithm for the COLORFUL PATH-COVER problem parameterized by k . Since the number of trees is at most $2k + 2$, and the number of families of feasible paths is $|\mathcal{F}| = t$, we first guess the subset of families of feasible paths that comes from each tree in \mathcal{F} in $\mathcal{O}(k^t)$ time. Now we are ready to work on a tree with its guessed family of feasible paths. We first present an overview of the algorithm and then present the algorithm in Section 3.6.

Lemma 8. COLORFUL PATH-COVER can be solved in time $\mathcal{O}(\ell^2 \cdot 2^{\mathcal{O}(k \log k)} n^{\mathcal{O}(1)})$ when F is a forest with $\mathcal{O}(k)$ trees.

3.5 Overview of the Algorithm for COLORFUL PATH-COVER

Consider an instance $(T, B, \ell, \mathcal{F} = \{\mathcal{F}_1, \mathcal{F}_2, \dots, \mathcal{F}_t\})$ of COLORFUL PATH-COVER problem where T is a tree, $B \subseteq V(T)$, and $\ell \in \mathbb{N}$ and \mathcal{F} is a disjoint family of feasible paths. The aim is to find a set \mathcal{P} of t paths such that for each $\mathcal{F}_i, i \in [t]$, $|\mathcal{P} \cap \mathcal{F}_i| = 1$ and for every vertex $v \in B$, there exists a path $P \in \mathcal{P}$ and a vertex $u \in V(P)$, such that $d_T(u, v) \leq \ell$.

For a vertex $v \in V(T)$, the bottom-up dynamic programming algorithm considers subproblems for each child w of v which are processed from left to right. To compute a partial solution at the subtree rooted at a child of v , we distinguish whether there exists a path containing v that belongs to \mathcal{P} or not. For this purpose, we define a variable that captures a path containing v in \mathcal{P} . If there exists such a path, we guess the region where the endpoints of the path belong, which includes the cases that the path contains: (i) only the vertex v , (ii) the parent of v and one of its endpoints belongs to the subtree rooted at w or v 's child that is to the left of w or v 's child that is to the right of w , (iii) both its endpoints belong to the subtrees of the children which are to the left or the right of w , and (iv) one of the endpoints belongs to the subtree rooted at w while the other belongs to the subtree of the child to the left or the right of w . An illustration of these cases is given in Fig. 4.

At each node v , we store the distance of the nearest vertex (say w') in the subtree of v , that is, on a path in \mathcal{P} , from v . We store this with the hope that

w' can cover vertices of B that come in the future. In addition, we also store the farthest vertex (say w'') in the subtree of v that is not covered by any chosen paths of \mathcal{P} in the subtree. Again, we store this with the hope that $w'' \in B$ can be covered by a future vertex, and the current solution leads to a solution overall.

At each node v , we capture the existence of the following: there exists a set of $t' \leq t$ paths Y , one from each \mathcal{F}_i , that either includes v or not on a path from Y in \mathcal{P} satisfying the distances of the nearest vertex w' and the farthest vertex w'' (from v) that are on Y and already covered and not yet covered by Y , respectively. To conclude the existence of a colorful path cover at the root node, we check for the existence of an entry that consists of a set Y of t paths, one from each \mathcal{F}_i , and all the farthest distance of an uncovered vertex is zero.

3.6 Algorithm for COLORFUL PATH-COVER

In this section, we design a dynamic programming-based FPT algorithm for the COLORFUL PATH-COVER problem parameterized by k . Since the number of trees is at most $2k + 2$, and the number of families of feasible paths is $|\mathcal{F}| = t$, we first guess the subset of families of feasible paths that comes from each tree in \mathcal{F} in $\mathcal{O}(k^t)$ time. Now we are ready to work on a tree with its guessed family of feasible paths. Consider an instance $(T, B, \ell, \mathcal{F} = \{\mathcal{F}_1, \mathcal{F}_2, \dots, \mathcal{F}_t\})$ of COLORFUL PATH-COVER problem where T is a tree, $B \subseteq V(T)$, and $\ell \in \mathbb{N}$ and \mathcal{F} is a disjoint family of feasible paths. The aim is to find a set \mathcal{P} of t paths such that for each \mathcal{F}_i , $i \in [t]$, $|\mathcal{P} \cap \mathcal{F}_i| = 1$ and for every vertex $v \in B$, there exists a path $P \in \mathcal{P}$ and a vertex $u \in V(P)$, such that $d_T(u, v) \leq \ell$.

First, we give a description of our algorithm. The algorithm starts by arbitrarily rooting tree T at a vertex $r \in V(T)$. In the following, we state some notations used in the algorithm. For a vertex $v \in V(T)$, we denote the number of children of v in T by $\text{deg}(v)$. By T_v , we denote the subtree of T rooted at v . Also, the i th child of v is denoted by ch_i^v . For a vertex $v \in T$, and $0 \leq i \leq \text{deg}(v)$, we define $T_{v,i}$ as the subtree of T containing vertex v and subtrees rooted at its first i children (in order of index). Also, $T_{\text{ch}_i^v}$ is the subtree of T containing vertex v and subtree rooted at its i th child. Recall that every vertex $v \in V(T)$ can be contained in at most one \mathcal{F}_i , $i \in [t]$. For each vertex $v \in V(T)$, we assign a value $F(v) \in [0, t]$ to v as follows: $F(v) = i$, if $v \in V(\mathcal{F}_i)$, 0 otherwise (when no path in any \mathcal{F}_i , $i \in [t]$ contain v). Recall that a path P covers a vertex v if there exists a vertex $u \in V(P)$ such that $d_G(v, u) \leq \ell$. For a vertex $v \in V(T)$, the dynamic programming algorithm considers subproblems for each child of v . We process its children from left to right (in index ordering) and at i th child, we consider the subtree $T_{v,i}$. Before we define an entry in the table, we give the definition of the variables used for an entry.

Consider $v \in V(T)$ and $i \in [\text{deg}(v)]$. To compute a partial solution at subtree $T_{v,i}$, we must distinguish whether v is contained in a path in the solution. If it is contained in a path in the solution, then we also guess the endpoints of the path. For this purpose, we define a variable tp which can take a value from the set $\{1, 2, \dots, 11\}$, where each value represents a different case defined as follows:

- **tp=1:** Paths containing v are not in the solution.
- **tp=2:** The vertex v itself is a path that is contained in the solution.
- **tp ∈ {3, 4, 5, 6}:** For all these cases, we have the parent of v in the solution, in addition to satisfying their respective properties.
 - **tp=3:** One of its endpoints is v itself.
 - **tp=4:** One of its endpoints is in $T_{v,i-1}$ ($\neq v$).
 - **tp=5:** One of its endpoints is in $T_{\text{ch}_i^v}$ ($\neq v$).
 - **tp=6:** One of its endpoints is in $T_{\text{ch}_j^v}$ for some $j > i$ ($\neq v$).
- **tp=7:** Both of its endpoints are in $T_{v,i-1}$ (at least one endpoint is not equal to v).
- **tp=8:** One of its endpoints is in $T_{v,i-1}$, and the other in $T_{\text{ch}_i^v}$ ($\neq v$).
- **tp=9:** One of its endpoints is in $T_{v,i-1}$, and the other in $T_{\text{ch}_j^v}$ for some $j > i$ ($\neq v$).
- **tp=10:** One of its endpoints is in $T_{\text{ch}_i^v}$, and the other in $T_{\text{ch}_j^v}$ for some $j > i$ ($\neq v$).
- **tp=11:** One of its endpoints is in $T_{\text{ch}_j^v}$ for some $j > i$, and the other in $T_{\text{ch}_{j'}^v}$ for some $j' > i$ ($\neq v$).

We have a variable $(\text{sg})\eta$. Here sg represents sign of η , which can be either $+$ or $-$, and $(\text{sg})\eta$ can take a value from the set $\{(-)\ell - 1, \dots, (-)1, (-)0, (+)0, (+)1, \dots, (+)\ell\}$. The “ $-$ ” sign represents that there are uncovered vertices in $V(T_{v,i}) \cap B$ which needs to be covered in future, and “ $+$ ” sign represents that all the vertices in $V(T_{v,i}) \cap B$ are covered and the partial solution may cover more vertices outside $T_{v,i}$. The value $(-)\eta$ represents that the maximum distance of a vertex $u \in B$ from v in subtree $T_{v,i}$ such that u is not covered by the partial solution is η . It means that vertices up to distance η from v in $V(T_{v,i}) \cap B$ needs to be covered by some paths in future. We consider values only till $\ell - 1$ distance, as it is a trivial observation that any vertex at distance at least ℓ from v in $T_{v,i}$ cannot be covered by any path that is not in $T_{v,i}$. The value $(+)\eta$ represents that the minimum distance of a vertex u in subtree $T_{v,i}$ (u need not belong to B) such that distance from u to v is $\ell - \eta$ and u is contained in a path in the solution. It means that vertices in B which are at a distance at most η from v (at most ℓ from u) in T can be covered by a path containing u in the solution.

In the following definition, we state the entries in our dynamic programming routine.

Definition 3. For each $v \in V(T)$, $d \in [\text{deg}(v)]$, $Y \subseteq [t]$, $\text{tp} \in \{1, 2, \dots, 11\}$, $(\text{sg})\eta \in \{(-)\ell - 1, \dots, (-)1, (-)0, (+)0, (+)1, \dots, (+)\ell\}$ we create an entry $c[v, d, Y, \text{tp}, (\text{sg})\eta]$ in our table which stores true if and only if the following holds:

- There exists a set $\mathcal{P}_{v,d}$ of $|Y|$ paths such that for each $j \in Y$, $|\mathcal{P}_{v,d} \cap \mathcal{F}_j| = 1$, if $F(v) \in Y$, then path in $\mathcal{P}_{v,d} \cap \mathcal{F}_{F(v)}$ should satisfy definition of **tp**, and all paths in $\mathcal{P}_{v,d}$ except maybe path containing v should be contained in the subtree $T_{v,d}$.




Fig. 4. Illustration of the tp cases based on its value. The “blue” color indicates the path in \mathcal{F} that is a part of the solution path.

- If sg is $-$, then there exists a vertex $u \in B$ at distance η from v in $T_{v,d}$ which is not covered by any paths in $\mathcal{P}_{v,d}$ but can be covered in future (is not at distance greater than ℓ from v). For every vertex $u \in B$ at distance at least $\eta + 1$ from v in subtree $T_{v,d}$ there exists a path in $\mathcal{P}_{v,d}$ which covers u .
- If sg is $+$, then there exists a vertex u , in $\mathcal{P}_{v,d}$, at distance $\ell - \eta$ from v in $T_{v,d}$. And u can cover vertices (in future) that are at distance at most η from v . All other vertices in $\mathcal{P}_{v,d}$ are at distance at least $\ell - \eta$ from v . Further all vertices in $T_{v,d} \cap B$ are covered by $\mathcal{P}_{v,d}$.

Otherwise $c[v, d, Y, tp, \eta]$ stores false.

Observe that $(T, B, \ell, \mathcal{F} = \{\mathcal{F}_1, \mathcal{F}_2, \dots, \mathcal{F}_t\})$ is a yes instance of COLORFUL PATH-COVER if and only if there exists an entry $c[r, deg(r), \{1, 2, \dots, t\}, tp^*, (+)\eta^*]$, $tp^* \in \{1, 2, 7, 8\}$ and $\eta^* \in [0, \ell]$, which is set to true.

Next, we give (recursive) formulas for the computation of entries in our dynamic programming table. Consider $v \in V(T)$, $d \in [deg(v)]$, $Y \subseteq [t]$, $tp \in [11]$, $(sg)\eta \in \{(-)\ell - 1, \dots, (-)1, (-)0, (+)0, (+)1, \dots, (+)\ell\}$, we compute the entry $c[v, d, Y, tp, (sg)\eta]$ based on the following cases:

Leaf vertex: v is a leaf vertex. Set $c[v, d, Y, \text{tp}, (\text{sg})\eta] = \text{true}$, if one of the following holds: (a1) $\text{tp} = 1$, $(\text{sg})\eta = (-)0$, $v \in B$, or (a2) $\text{tp} \in \{2, 3\}$, $(\text{sg})\eta = (+)\ell$. Otherwise, set the entry to false. Correctness follows trivially from the definition of entry.

Non-leaf vertex: v is not a leaf vertex. We consider following cases depending on tp variable:

Case $\text{tp} = 1$: We further consider following cases.

(1) If $\text{sg} = -$, then set $c[v, d, Y, 1, (-)\eta] = \text{true}$ if there exists a partition $Y_1 \uplus Y_2$ of Y such that one of the following holds: (a1) $c[v, d-1, Y_1, 1, (\text{sg})\eta_1] = \text{true}$, $(\text{sg})\eta_1 \in \{(-)\eta, \dots, (+)\eta-1\}$ and (a2) $c[\text{ch}_d^v, \text{deg}(\text{ch}_d^v), Y_2, 1, (-)\eta-1] = \text{true}$, (b1) $c[v, d-1, Y_1, 1, (-)\eta] = \text{true}$, and (b2) $c[\text{ch}_d^v, \text{deg}(\text{ch}_d^v), Y_2, 1, (\text{sg})\eta_2] = \text{true}$, $(\text{sg})\eta_2 \in \{(-)\eta-1, \dots, (+)\eta\}$.

(1.1) If $\text{sg} = +$, then set $c[v, d, Y, 1, (+)\ell-1] = \text{true}$ if there exists a partition $Y_1 \uplus Y_2$ of Y such that one of the following holds: (a1) $c[v, d-1, Y_1, 1, (\text{sg})\eta_1] = \text{true}$, $(\text{sg})\eta_1 \in \{(-)\ell-1, \dots, (+)\ell-1\}$ and (a2) $c[\text{ch}_d^v, \text{deg}(\text{ch}_d^v), Y_2, \text{tp}_2, (+)\ell] = \text{true}$, $\text{tp}_2 \in \{2, 7, 8\}$, or, (b1) $c[v, d-1, Y_1, 1, (+)\ell-1] = \text{true}$, and (b2) $c[\text{ch}_d^v, \text{deg}(\text{ch}_d^v), Y_2, \text{tp}_2, (\text{sg})\eta_2] = \text{true}$, $\text{tp}_2 \in \{1, 2, 7, 8\}$, $(\text{sg})\eta_2 \in \{(-)\ell-2, \dots, (+)\ell\}$.

(1.2) If $\text{sg} = +$ and $\eta < \ell - 1$, then set $c[v, d, Y, 1, (+)\eta] = \text{true}$ if there exists a partition $Y_1 \uplus Y_2$ of Y such that one of the following holds: (a1) $c[v, d-1, Y_1, 1, (\text{sg})\eta_1] = \text{true}$, $(\text{sg})\eta_1 \in \{(-)\eta, \dots, (+)\eta\}$ and (a2) $c[\text{ch}_d^v, \text{deg}(\text{ch}_d^v), Y_2, 1, (+)\eta+1] = \text{true}$, or (b1) $c[v, d-1, Y_1, 1, (+)\eta] = \text{true}$, and (b2) $c[\text{ch}_d^v, \text{deg}(\text{ch}_d^v), Y_2, 1, (\text{sg})\eta_2] = \text{true}$, $(\text{sg})\eta_2 \in \{(-)\eta, \dots, (+)\eta+1\}$.

Correctness of Case $\text{tp} = 1$ (1): $\text{sg} = -$: Consider the case when (a1) and (a2) are true, then there exists a set of paths \mathcal{P}_1 which set (a1) to true and there is a set of paths \mathcal{P}_2 which set (a2) to true. We claim that $\mathcal{P} = \mathcal{P}_1 \cup \mathcal{P}_2$ is a solution to $c[v, d, Y, 1, (-)\eta] = \text{true}$. Observe that no path containing v is in \mathcal{P} , as $\text{tp} = 1$ in (a1). The condition (a2) implies that there exists an uncovered vertex $u \in T_{\text{ch}_d^v}$ at distance η from v . If $\text{ch}_d^v \in \mathcal{P}_2$, then u will be covered by ch_d^v and u need not wait for future vertices to cover it. Hence $\text{tp} = 1$ in (a2). Since $Y = Y_1 \uplus Y_2$, we have that for each $i \in Y$, we have exactly one path in $\mathcal{P} \cap \mathcal{F}_i$. Next, observe that there exists a vertex $u \in B$ at distance η from v in $T_{\text{ch}_d^v}$, which is not covered by paths in \mathcal{P}_1 and \mathcal{P}_2 . Also $(\text{sg})\eta_1 \in \{(-)\eta, \dots, (+)\eta-1\}$, u is not covered by \mathcal{P}_1 , as any vertex in \mathcal{P}_1 requires at least $\eta+1$ distance to reach u . Observe that every vertex at distance at least $\eta+1$ from v in $T_{v,d}$ is covered by paths in \mathcal{P} . Analogous arguments follows for the case when (b1) and (b2) are true.

Correctness of Case $\text{tp} = 1$ (1.1): $\text{sg} = +$: Since $\text{tp} = 1$, $v \notin \mathcal{P}$. Hence, we do not consider the entry $c[v, d, Y, 1, (+)\ell]$. Consider the case when (a1) and (a2) are true, then there exists a set of paths \mathcal{P}_1 which set (a1) to true and there is a set of paths \mathcal{P}_2 which set (a2) to true. We claim that $\mathcal{P} = \mathcal{P}_1 \cup \mathcal{P}_2$ is a solution to $c[v, d, Y, 1, (+)\ell-1] = \text{true}$. As $\text{tp}_2 \in \{2, 7, 8\}$ and no path in \mathcal{P}_1 contain v , we have that no path containing v is in \mathcal{P} . Since $Y = Y_1 \uplus Y_2$, we have that for each $i \in Y$, we have exactly one path in $\mathcal{P} \cap \mathcal{F}_i$. Next, observe that every vertex in $T_{\text{ch}_d^v}$ is covered by \mathcal{P}_2 and since $(\text{sg})\eta_1 \in \{(-)\ell-1, \dots, (+)\ell-1\}$, every vertex in $T_{v,d-1}$ is covered either by \mathcal{P}_1 or \mathcal{P}_2 . By (a2) we also satisfy $(+)\ell$, that

is vertices at distance at most ℓ is covered by \mathcal{P}_2 . Analogous arguments follows for the case when (b1) and (b2) are true.

Correctness of $\text{tp} = 1$ (1.2): $\text{sg} = +$: Since $\eta < \ell - 1$, none of the children of v can be in \mathcal{P} . Hence $\text{tp} = 1$ in both (a1) and (a2). Consider the case when (a1) and (a2) are true, then there exists a set of paths \mathcal{P}_1 which set (a1) to true and there is a set of paths \mathcal{P}_2 which set (a2) to true. We claim that $\mathcal{P} = \mathcal{P}_1 \cup \mathcal{P}_2$ is a solution to $c[v, d, Y, 1, (+)\eta] = \text{true}$. Since $Y = Y_1 \uplus Y_2$, we have that for each $i \in Y$, we have exactly one path in $\mathcal{P} \cap \mathcal{F}_i$. Next, observe that every vertex in $T_{\text{ch}_d^v}$ is covered by \mathcal{P}_2 and since $(\text{sg})\eta_1 \in \{(-)\eta, \dots, (+)\eta\}$, every vertex in $T_{v, d-1}$ is covered either by \mathcal{P}_1 or \mathcal{P}_2 . By (a2) we also satisfy $(+)\eta$, that is vertices at distance at most η is covered by \mathcal{P}_2 . Analogous arguments follows for the case when (b1) and (b2) are true.

Case $\text{tp} = 2$: If $F(v) \notin Y$, or $\text{sg} = (-)$, or $\eta \neq \ell$, or v is not a path in $\mathcal{F}_{F(v)}$, then set $c[v, d, Y, 2, (\text{sg})\eta] = \text{false}$. Correctness follows trivially. Otherwise we set $c[v, d, Y, 2, (+)\ell] = \text{true}$ if there exists a partition $Y_1 \uplus Y_2$ of $Y \setminus \{F(v)\}$ such that the following holds: (a1) $c[v, d-1, Y_1 \cup \{F(v)\}, 2, (+)\ell] = \text{true}$ and (a2) $c[\text{ch}_d^v, \text{deg}(\text{ch}_d^v), Y_2, \text{tp}_2, (\text{sg})\eta_2] = \text{true}$, $(\text{sg})\eta_2 \in \{(-)\ell-1, \dots, (+)\ell\}$, $\text{tp}_2 \in \{1, 2, 7, 8\}$.

Correctness of Case $\text{tp} = 2$: Suppose that (a1) and (a2) are true, then there exists a set of paths \mathcal{P}_1 which set (a1) to true and there is a set of paths \mathcal{P}_2 which set (a2) to true. We claim that $\mathcal{P} = \mathcal{P}_1 \cup \mathcal{P}_2 \cup \{v\}$ is a solution to $c[v, d, Y, 2, (+)\ell] = \text{true}$. Since $Y = Y_1 \uplus Y_2 \uplus \{F(v)\}$, we have that for each $i \in Y$, we have exactly one path in $\mathcal{P} \cap \mathcal{F}_i$. Next, observe that every vertex in $T_{\text{ch}_d^v} \cup T_{v, d-1}$ is covered by \mathcal{P} since $(\text{sg})\eta_2 \in \{(-)\ell-1, \dots, (+)\ell\}$ and path containing v is in \mathcal{P} , hence every vertex in $T_{v, d}$ is covered by \mathcal{P} .

Case $\text{tp} = 3$: If $F(v) \notin Y$, or $\text{sg} = (-)$, or $\eta \neq \ell$, or there is no path in $\mathcal{F}_{F(v)}$ containing v , parent of v and has one of its endpoints as v , then set $c[v, d, Y, 3, (\text{sg})\eta] = \text{false}$. Correctness follows trivially. Otherwise we set $c[v, d, Y, 3, (+)\ell] = \text{true}$ if there exists a partition $Y_1 \uplus Y_2$ of $Y \setminus \{F(v)\}$ such that the following holds: (a1) $c[v, d-1, Y_1 \cup \{F(v)\}, 3, (+)\ell] = \text{true}$ and (a2) $c[\text{ch}_d^v, \text{deg}(\text{ch}_d^v), Y_2, \text{tp}_2, (\text{sg})\eta_2] = \text{true}$, $\text{tp}_2 \in \{1, 2, 7, 8\}$, $(\text{sg})\eta_2 \in \{(-)\ell-1, \dots, (+)\ell\}$. The correctness can be argued similar to Case 2.

Case $\text{tp} = 4$: If $F(v) \notin Y$, or $\text{sg} = (-)$, or $\eta \neq \ell$, or there is no path in $\mathcal{F}_{F(v)}$ containing v , parent of v and has one of its endpoints in $T_{v, d-1}$ (endpoint is not v), then set $c[v, d, Y, 4, (\text{sg})\eta] = \text{false}$. Correctness follows trivially. Otherwise we set $c[v, d, Y, 4, (+)\ell] = \text{true}$ if there exists a partition $Y_1 \uplus Y_2$ of $Y \setminus \{F(v)\}$ such that the following holds: (a1) $c[v, d-1, Y_1 \cup \{F(v)\}, 4, (+)\ell] = \text{true}$, and (a2) $c[\text{ch}_d^v, \text{deg}(\text{ch}_d^v), Y_2, \text{tp}_2, (\text{sg})\eta_2] = \text{true}$, $\text{tp}_2 \in \{1, 2, 7, 8\}$, $(\text{sg})\eta_2 \in \{(-)\ell-1, \dots, (+)\ell\}$. The correctness can be argued similar to Case 2.

Case $\text{tp} = 5$: If $F(v) \notin Y$, or $\text{sg} = (-)$, or $\eta \neq \ell$, or there is no path in $\mathcal{F}_{F(v)}$ containing v , parent of v and has one of its endpoints in $T_{\text{ch}_d^v}$ (endpoint is not v), then set $c[v, d, Y, 5, (\text{sg})\eta] = \text{false}$. Correctness follows trivially. Otherwise we set $c[v, d, Y, 5, (+)\ell] = \text{true}$ if there exists a partition $Y_1 \uplus Y_2$ of $Y \setminus \{F(v)\}$ such that the following holds: (a1) $c[v, d-1, Y_1 \cup \{F(v)\}, \text{tp}_1, (+)\ell] = \text{true}$, $\text{tp}_1 = 6$ and (a2) $c[\text{ch}_d^v, \text{deg}(\text{ch}_d^v), Y_2 \cup \{F(v)\}, \text{tp}_2, (+)\ell] = \text{true}$, $\text{tp}_2 \in \{3, 4, 5\}$.

Correctness of the Case $\text{tp} = 5$: Suppose that (a1) and (a2) are true, then there exists a set of paths \mathcal{P}_1 which set (a1) to true and there is a set of paths \mathcal{P}_2 which set (a2) to true. Let $P_1 \in \mathcal{P}_1 \subseteq \mathcal{F}_F(v)$ and let $P_2 \in \mathcal{P}_2 \subseteq \mathcal{F}_F(v)$. Observe that $\mathcal{P}_1^* = (\mathcal{P}_1 \setminus \{P_1\}) \cup \{P_2\}$ also sets (a1) to true. We claim that $\mathcal{P} = \mathcal{P}_1^* \cup \mathcal{P}_2$ is also a solution to $c[v, d, Y, 5, (+)\ell] = \text{true}$. since $Y = Y_1 \uplus Y_2 \uplus \{F(v)\}$, and $\text{tp}_1 = 6$ and $\text{tp}_2 \in \{3, 4, 5\}$, and exactly one path containing v is in \mathcal{P} , we have that for each $i \in Y$, we have exactly one path in $\mathcal{P} \cap \mathcal{F}_i$. Next, observe that every vertex in $T_{\text{ch}_d^v} \cup T_{v, d-1}$ is covered by \mathcal{P} , hence every vertex in $T_{v, d}$ is covered by \mathcal{P} .

Case $\text{tp} = 6$: If $F(v) \notin Y$, or $d = \text{deg}(v)$, or $\text{sg} = (-)$, or $\eta \neq \ell$, or there is no path in $\mathcal{F}_{F(v)}$ containing v , parent of v and has one of its endpoints in $T_{\text{ch}_{d'}^v}$, $d' > d$ (endpoint is not v), then set $c[v, d, Y, 6, (\text{sg})\eta] = \text{false}$. Correctness follows trivially. Otherwise we set $c[v, d, Y, 6, (+)\eta] = \text{true}$ if there exists a partition $Y_1 \uplus Y_2$ of $Y \setminus \{F(v)\}$ such that the following holds: (a1) $c[v, d-1, Y_1 \cup \{F(v)\}, \text{tp}_1, (+)\ell] = \text{true}$, and (a2) $c[\text{ch}_i^v, \text{deg}(\text{ch}_i^v), Y_2, \text{tp}_2, (+)\ell] = \text{true}$, where $\text{tp}_1, \text{tp}_2 = 6$. The correctness can be argued similar to Case 5.

Case $\text{tp} = 7$: If $F(v) \notin Y$, or $\text{sg} = (-)$, or $\eta \neq \ell$, or there is no path in $\mathcal{F}_{F(v)}$ containing v , and both of its endpoints in $T_{d, i-1}$ (at least one endpoint is not v), then set $c[v, d, Y, 7, (\text{sg})\eta] = \text{false}$. Correctness follows trivially. Otherwise we set $c[v, d, Y, 7, (+)\ell] = \text{true}$ if there exists a partition $Y_1 \uplus Y_2$ of $Y \setminus \{F(v)\}$ such that the following holds: (a1) $c[v, d-1, Y_1 \cup \{F(v)\}, \text{tp}_1, (+)\ell] = \text{true}$, $\text{tp}_1 \in \{7, 8\}$ and (a2) $c[\text{ch}_d^v, \text{deg}(\text{ch}_d^v), Y_2, \text{tp}_2, (\text{sg})\eta_2] = \text{true}$, $\text{tp}_2 \in \{1, 2, 7, 8\}$, $(\text{sg})\eta_2 \in \{(-)\ell - 1, \dots, (+)\ell\}$. The correctness can be argued similar to Case 5.

Case $\text{tp} = 8$: If $F(v) \notin Y$, or $\text{sg} = (-)$, or $\eta \neq \ell$, or there is no path in $\mathcal{F}_{F(v)}$ containing v , and one of its endpoints in $T_{d, i-1}$ and other endpoint is in $T_{\text{ch}_d^v}$ (endpoint is not v), then set $c[v, d, Y, 8, (\text{sg})\eta] = \text{false}$. Correctness follows trivially. Otherwise we set $c[v, d, Y, 8, (+)\ell] = \text{true}$ if there exists a partition $Y_1 \uplus Y_2$ of $Y \setminus \{F(v)\}$ such that the following holds: (a1) $c[v, d-1, Y_1 \cup \{F(v)\}, \text{tp}_1, (+)\ell] = \text{true}$, $\text{tp}_1 = 9$ and (a2) $c[\text{ch}_i^v, \text{deg}(\text{ch}_i^v), Y_2 \cup \{F(v)\}, \text{tp}_2, (+)\ell] = \text{true}$, $\text{tp}_2 \in \{3, 4, 5\}$, $(\text{sg})\eta_2 \in \{(-)\ell - 1, \dots, (+)\ell\}$. The correctness can be argued similar to Case 5.

Case $\text{tp} = 9$: If $F(v) \notin Y$, or $d = \text{deg}(v)$ or $\text{sg} = (-)$, or $\eta \neq \ell$, or there is no path in $\mathcal{F}_{F(v)}$ containing v , and one of its endpoints in $T_{d, i-1}$ and other endpoint is in $T_{\text{ch}_{d'}^v}$, for some $d' > d$ (endpoint is not v), then set $c[v, d, Y, 9, (\text{sg})\eta] = \text{false}$. Correctness follows trivially. Otherwise we set $c[v, d, Y, 9, (+)\ell] = \text{true}$ if there exists a partition $Y_1 \uplus Y_2$ of $Y \setminus \{F(v)\}$ such that the following holds: (a1) $c[v, d-1, Y_1 \cup \{F(v)\}, \text{tp}_1, (+)\ell] = \text{true}$, $\text{tp}_1 = 9$ and (a2) $c[\text{ch}_d^v, \text{deg}(\text{ch}_d^v), Y_2, \text{tp}_2, (+)\ell] = \text{true}$, $\text{tp}_2 \in \{1, 2, 7, 8\}$, $(\text{sg})\eta_2 \in \{(-)\ell - 1, \dots, (+)\ell\}$. The correctness can be argued similar to Case 5.

Case $\text{tp} = 10$: If $F(v) \notin Y$, or $d = \text{deg}(v)$, or $\text{sg} = (-)$, or $\eta \neq \ell$, or there is no path in $\mathcal{F}_{F(v)}$ containing v , and one of its endpoints is in $T_{\text{ch}_d^v}$, and other endpoint is in $T_{\text{ch}_{d'}^v}$, for some $d' > d$ (endpoint is not v), then set $c[v, d, Y, 10, (\text{sg})\eta] = \text{false}$. Correctness follows trivially. Otherwise we set $c[v, d, Y, 10, (+)\ell] = \text{true}$ if there exists a partition $Y_1 \uplus Y_2$ of $Y \setminus \{F(v)\}$ such that the following holds: (a1) $c[v, d-1, Y_1 \cup \{F(v)\}, \text{tp}_1, (+)\ell] = \text{true}$, $\text{tp}_1 = 11$ and (a2) $c[\text{ch}_d^v, \text{deg}(\text{ch}_d^v), Y_2 \cup$

$\{F(v)\}, \text{tp}_2, (+)\ell] = \text{true}$, $\text{tp}_2 = 10$. The correctness can be argued similar to Case 5.

Case tp = 11: If $F(v) \notin Y$, or $d = \text{deg}(v)$, or $\text{sg} = (-)$, or $\eta \neq \ell$, or there is no path in $\mathcal{F}_{F(v)}$ containing v , one its endpoints is in $T_{\text{ch}_{d'}^v}$ for some $d' > d$, and other endpoint is in $T_{\text{ch}_{d''}^v}$ for some $d'' > d$ (endpoint is not v), then set $c[v, d, Y, 11, (\text{sg})\eta] = \text{false}$. Correctness follows trivially. Otherwise we set $c[v, d, Y, 11, (+)\ell] = \text{true}$ if there exists a partition $Y_1 \uplus Y_2$ of $Y \setminus \{F(v)\}$ such that the following holds: (a1) $c[v, d-1, Y_1 \cup \{F(v)\}, \text{tp}_1, (+)\ell] = \text{true}$, $\text{tp}_1 = 11$ and (a2) $c[\text{ch}_d^v, \text{deg}(\text{ch}_d^v), Y_2, \text{tp}_2, (+)\ell] = \text{true}$, $\text{tp}_2 \in \{1, 2, 7, 8\}$, $(\text{sg})\eta_2 \in \{(-)\ell - 1, \dots, (+)\ell\}$. The correctness can be argued similar to Case 5.

This completes the description of the (recursive) formulas and their correctness for computing all entries of the dynamic programming table. The correctness of the algorithm follows from the correctness of the (recursive) formulas, and the fact $(T, B, \ell, \mathcal{F} = \{\mathcal{F}_1, \mathcal{F}_2, \dots, \mathcal{F}_t\})$ is a yes instance of COLORFUL PATH-COVER if and only there exists an entry $c[r, \text{deg}(r), \text{tp}^*, (+)\eta^*]$, $\text{tp}^* \in \{1, 2, 7, 8\}$ and $\eta^* \in [0, \ell]$, which is set to true. Next, we analyse the running time of our algorithm. Recall that $|\mathcal{F}| \leq t$ and for each $i \in [t]$ we have that $|\mathcal{F}_i| \leq n^2$. Observe that each of our table entries can be computed in time $\mathcal{O}(\ell^2 \cdot 2^{2t} n^{\mathcal{O}(1)})$ time. The number of entries is bounded by $\mathcal{O}(\ell \cdot 2^t n^{\mathcal{O}(1)})$.

Since we guessed the subset of families of feasible paths that come from each tree in \mathcal{F} in $\mathcal{O}(k^t)$ time, the running time of our algorithm is bounded by $\mathcal{O}(\ell^2 \cdot 2^{\mathcal{O}(t \log k)} n^{\mathcal{O}(1)})$. Since $t \leq k$, we get the desired running time.

3.7 Proof of Theorem 1

ESP/fvs + ecc and SKELETON TESTING are FPT-equivalent from Lemma 3. Observation 1 upper bounds the number of skeletons by $2^{\mathcal{O}(k(\log k + \log \ell))} n^2$. Then, we show that SKELETON TESTING and EXT-SKELETON TESTING are FPT-equivalent and for each skeleton we have at most $2^{\mathcal{O}(k \log k)}$ enriched skeletons. Finally, given an instance of EXT-SKELETON TESTING, we construct an instance of COLORFUL PATH-COVER in polynomial time. The COLORFUL PATH-COVER problem can be solved in $\mathcal{O}(\ell^2 \cdot 2^{\mathcal{O}(k \log k)} n^{\mathcal{O}(1)})$ time, and this completes the proof of Theorem 1.

4 $(1+\epsilon)$ -factor parameterized by feedback vertex set

Theorem 2. *For any $\epsilon > 0$, there is an $(1+\epsilon)$ -factor approximation algorithm for ESP/fvs running in time $\mathcal{O}(2^{\mathcal{O}(k \log k)} n^{\mathcal{O}(1)})$.*

We make use of our algorithm in Theorem 1 that runs in $\mathcal{O}(2^{\mathcal{O}(k \log k)} \ell^k n^{\mathcal{O}(1)})$ time. Notice that, ℓ^k comes because of the number of skeletons (Observation 1). Specifically, for the function $f : X \rightarrow [\ell]$ that maintains a distance profile of the set of vertices of S that do not appear on P . To design a $(1+\epsilon)$ -factor FPT approximation algorithm, we replace the image set $[\ell]$ with a set of fixed size using ϵ such that we approximate the shortest distance of the set of vertices of S

that do not appear on P , with the factor $(1 + \epsilon)$. The rest is similar to Theorem 1. Below we describe the result, the procedure and its correctness in detail. Let the function $f : X \rightarrow \{\epsilon\ell, \ell\}$ denote the approximate shortest distance of each vertex $x \in X$ from a hypothetical solution P of ESP/fvs. Formally,

$$f(v) = \begin{cases} \epsilon\ell & \text{if } d_G(v, P) < \epsilon\ell, \\ \ell & \text{if } \epsilon\ell \leq d_G(v, P) \leq \ell. \end{cases}$$

Correctness. Suppose that P^* is a shortest path, with eccentricity ℓ and the function f as defined in the proof of Theorem 1, returned by the algorithm in Theorem 1. We prove that for each vertex $v \in V(G)$, $d_G(v, P) \leq (1 + \epsilon)\ell$. Observe that for a vertex $x \in X$, if $1 \leq d_G(x, P^*) < \epsilon\ell$, then for a correct guess of f , $f(x) = \epsilon\ell$ and $d_G(x, P^*) < \epsilon\ell$. Also if $\epsilon\ell \leq d_G(x, P^*) \leq \ell$, then for a correct guess of f , $f(x) = \ell$ and $d_G(x, P^*) \leq \ell$. Recall that, in the algorithm when we construct instances for a good function γ (reducing to instance of COLORFUL PATH-COVER), we remove such vertices to construct an instance of COLORFUL PATH-COVER. The assumption (or guess) we made was that the eccentricity requirement for v is satisfied using x . More explicitly, we use the following conditions: if $f(x) = \epsilon\ell$ (resp, $f(x) = \ell$), then the eccentricity requirement for the vertex v is satisfied using x if $d_G(v, x) \leq \ell$ (resp, $d_G(v, x) \leq \epsilon\ell$). Now consider a vertex $v \in V(G) \setminus S$. Suppose that there exists a shortest path from v to P^* containing no vertex from S , then by the description and correctness of algorithm of Theorem 1, we obtain that $d_G(v, P) \leq \ell$. Next, suppose that the shortest path from v to P^* contains a vertex $x \in X$, then $d_G(v, x) + d_G(x, P^*) \leq \ell$. Therefore, for such vertices, while $d_G(x, v) \leq \ell$ and $d_G(x, P) < \epsilon\ell$, we obtain that $d_G(v, P) \leq d_G(x, v) + d_G(x, P) \leq \ell + \epsilon\ell = (1 + \epsilon)\ell$ and similarly, if $d_G(x, v) \leq \epsilon\ell$ and $d_G(x, P) \leq \ell$, then $d_G(v, P) \leq d_G(x, v) + d_G(x, P) \leq \epsilon\ell + \ell = (1 + \epsilon)\ell$. This completes the correctness of the proof of Theorem 2.

5 Disjoint Paths Deletion Set

In this section, we design an FPT algorithm for the ESP problem parameterized by the disjoint paths deletion set (*dpd*).

Theorem 3. *There is an algorithm for ESP/dpd running in time $\mathcal{O}(2^{\mathcal{O}(k \log k)} n^{\mathcal{O}(1)})$.*

We make use of the algorithm for ESP/fvs + ecc (Theorem 1) that runs in $\mathcal{O}(2^{\mathcal{O}(k \log k)} \ell^k n^{\mathcal{O}(1)})$ time. Notice that, the eccentricity parameter ℓ occurs in the running time due to the size of skeletons that contain ℓ^k (observation 1) term. Now this ℓ^k term comes because of the function $f : X \rightarrow [\ell]$ that is defined to maintain a distance profile of the set of vertices of S that do not appear on P . For the case of *dpd*, we can show that there is a set $Q \subseteq [\ell]$ with $|Q| \leq 2k^2$ (lemma 9 which we prove below). We can define a function $f : X \rightarrow Q$ that will maintain the distance profile of the set of vertices of S that do not appear on P . The rest of the algorithm is exactly as similar as for theorem 1. Hence we obtain the following result.

Lemma 9. *Let (G, S, k) be a yes instance of ESP/dpd, and P be a hypothetical solution. Then there is a set $Q \subseteq [\ell]$ of size $\leq 2k^2$ such that for each $w \in S$, $d_G(w, P) \in Q$. Moreover, one can construct such a Q in $O(k^2n^2)$ time.*

Proof. Let Q be the set defined as $Q = \{d_G(x, y), d_G(x, y) + 1, d_G(x, y) - 1 : x, y \in S\}$. Clearly, $|Q| \leq 2k^2$ and the set Q can be computed in $O(k^2n^2)$ time. Now it remains to show that for any solution path P for a yes instance (G, S, k) of ESP/dpd problem, we have that for every $w \in S$, $d_G(w, P) \in Q$. Firstly, observe that if $w \in S \cap P$, then $d_G(w, P) = 0$ and clearly the value $0 \in Q$, as $d(x, x) = 0$ for any $x \in S$. Now for each $w \in S \setminus P$, let P_w be a shortest path from w to P and let $w^* = P \cap P_w$ and z be the nearest vertex in S to w^* on P_w . Clearly, $z \in S \cap P_w$ and $d_G(w, P) = d_G(w, z) + d_G(z, w^*)$. Let $M = P \cap S$. Now consider the following three cases. (the cases are illustrated in Figure 5)

Case 1. If $w^* \in S$, then $z = w^*$. And the value $d_G(w, P)$ is essentially $d_G(w, w^*)$. As $w, w^* \in S$ so $d_G(w, w^*) \in \{d_G(x, y) : x, y \in S\} \subseteq Q$.

Case 2. If $w^* \notin S$ and $w^* \notin N(M)$, then there must be a subpath P_j of some pair (m_j, m_{j+1}) such that $w^* \in P_j$. Since w^* is not an endpoint of the subpath P_j , we have that $d_G(z, w^*) = 1$ and $d_G(w, w^*) = d_G(w, z) + 1$. As $w, z \in S$, so $d_G(w, w^*) \in \{1 + d_G(x, y) : x, y \in S\}$ which is a subset of Q .

Case 3. If $w^* \notin S \cap P$ and $w^* \in N(M)$, then there must be a subpath P_j of some pair (m_j, m_{j+1}) such that $w^* \in P_j$. Since w^* is an endpoint of the subpath P_j , we have that the value $d_G(w, w^*)$ must be either $d_G(w, m_j) - 1$ or $d_G(w, m_{j+1}) - 1$. As $w, m_j, m_{j+1} \in S$, so $d_G(w, w^*) \in \{d_G(x, y) - 1 : x, y \in S\}$ which is a subset of Q . \square




Fig. 5. Illustration of the proof of lemma 9. The dashed line, the dotted line and the dashed dotted line describes the Cases 1, 2 and 3 respectively. The green colored vertices indicate the vertex w' in the respective cases. The blue colored vertices represent the vertex set Z . The subpath between m_j and m_{j+1} is represented P_j .

6 Split Vertex Deletion Set

In this section, we design an FPT algorithm for the ESP problem parameterized by the split vertex deletion set (svd). Let (G, S, k, ℓ) be a yes instance of ESP/ svd , and P be a hypothetical solution where S is a split vertex deletion

set. Our main objective is to get P . Towards that, our main idea is to partition the vertices from S that does not appear in P into a constant number of parts such that we have an assurance that any solution (if it exists) respecting the partition gives us a solution. In particular, we partition the vertices from S that does not appears in P , say X into five disjoint sets $X_{=1}, X_{=2}, X_{=3}, X_{=4}$ and $X_{\geq 5}$ such that $X_{=i}, i \in [4]$ is the set of vertices of X that are at a distance exactly i from the hypothetical solution path, and $X_{\geq 5}$ is the set of vertices that are at a distance at least five from the hypothetical solution path. Rest of the process we describe below explicitly. The following is the main result of this section.

Theorem 4. *There is an algorithm for ESP/svd running in time $O(2^{O(k \log k)} \cdot n^{O(1)})$.*

Proof. Consider an instance (G, S, k) of ESP/svd. Let $C \uplus I$ be partition of $V(G - S)$ such that C and I induce a clique and independent set, respectively. First, we describe our algorithm. We assume that G is a connected graph, else it is a trivial no instance. The algorithm first guesses a set $M \subseteq S$ which is an (exact) intersection of S with the vertex set of the hypothetical solution. Observe that $|V(P) \cap C| \leq 2$, as every shortest path in the graph is also an induced path in the graph. The algorithm guesses a set $C^* \subseteq V(C)$ of size at most 2 which is an (exact) intersection of C with the vertex set of the hypothetical solution. Next, the algorithm uses lemma 2 to find the (unique) ordering π of the vertices in $M \cup C^*$ on the hypothetical solution path. Let $|M \cup C^*| = t$ and $\{m_1, m_2, \dots, m_t\}$ be the guessed ordering π of vertices of $M \cup C^*$ in the hypothetical solution path and let $X = S \setminus M$. Next, we guess endpoints of the solution path. Let m_0, m_{t+1} be the guessed endpoints of the hypothetical solution path such that m_0 is the *first* vertex and m_{t+1} is the *last* vertex on the hypothetical solution path (we might also obtain m_1, m_{t+1} such that $m_0 = m_1$ or $m_t = m_{t+1}$, or $m_0 = m_{t+1}$). Observe that for a correct guess M, C^*, m_0, m_{t+1} and ordering m_0, m_1, \dots, m_{t+1} , following must be satisfied, else we discard the combination of ordering M, C^*, m_0, m_{t+1} and make another combination of guesses. If $m_i m_j$ is an edge in G , then $j = i + 1$. We assume that minimum eccentricity is greater than four; otherwise, we can solve the problem in polynomial time (by lemma 1).

Next, we guess a partition \mathcal{X} of the set X in 5 disjoint sets $X_{=1}, X_{=2}, X_{=3}, X_{=4}$ and $X_{\geq 5}$ such that $X_{=i}, i \in [4]$ is the set of vertices of S that are at a distance exactly i from the hypothetical solution path, and $X_{\geq 5}$ is the set of vertices that are at a distance at least five from the hypothetical solution path. For a vertex $v \in X_{=i}, i \in [4]$ (resp. $X_{\geq 5}$), if $d_G(v, m_j) < i$ (resp. $d_G(x, m_j) < 5$), for some $j \in [0, t + 1]$ then we discard such partition and guess another partition of X . Let $X' = X_{=1} \cup X_{=2} \cup X_{=3} \cup X_{=4} \subseteq X$ be the set of all vertices in X such that for each $v \in X', d_G(v, m_j) > i$, where $v \in X_{=i}$ where $i \in [4]$ for all $j \in [0, t + 1]$. In this case, for each vertex in X' there should exist a vertex in m_j to m_{j+1} subpath in the hypothetical solution that comes from $G[(V(G) \setminus S) \cup \{m_j, m_{j+1}\}]$, for some $j \in [0, t + 1]$. Recall that for every $j \in [0, t]$, if $m_j m_{j+1}$ is an edge in G then $m_j m_{j+1}$ is an edge in the hypothetical solution also.

Next, we guess a function $g : X' \rightarrow [0, t]$. Where for a vertex $v \in X'$, $g(v) = j$ represents the guessed pair (m_j, m_{j+1}) such that there exists a vertex $u \in I$ in m_j to m_{j+1} subpath such that $d_G(u, v) = i$, if $v \in X_{=i}$. If a function g satisfies the following, then we discard that guess of g . For some $j \in [0, t]$ and $v \in g^{-1}(j)$, there does not exist any vertex $u \in I$ satisfying (i) u is adjacent to both m_j and m_{j+1} where $(m_j, m_{j+1}) \notin E$, (ii) $d(u, v) = i$, where $v \in X_{=i}$ for some $i \in [4]$. For each $M \subseteq S$, $X = S \setminus M$, $C^* \subseteq C$, $m_0, m_{|M \cup C^*|+1} \in V(G)$, a partition $\mathcal{X} = X_{=1} \uplus X_{=2} \uplus X_{=3} \uplus X_{=4} \uplus X_{\geq 5}$ of X , X' as defined above, and a function $g : X' \rightarrow [0, t]$, which are as described above and not discarded by the above description we proceed as follows: For each i such that $m_i m_{i+1}$ is not an edge in G , we arbitrarily pick a vertex $u \in I$ such that u is adjacent to both m_j and m_{j+1} and $d_G(v, u) = i$ whenever $v \in X_{=i}$ and $v \in g^{-1}(j)$ together holds. This completes the description of the algorithm. We output the path P by concatenating $m_i m_{i+1}$ edge or $m_j u m_{j+1}$ subpaths for every $j \in [0, t]$.

Running time: Next, we analyze the running time of our algorithm. The number of subsets of S is 2^k , which gives us 2^k choices for M . The number of choices for $C^*, m_0, m_{|M|+1}$ is at most $\mathcal{O}(n^4)$. To find the permutation (ordering) of $M \cup C^*$ we have only one choice, which can be found in $\mathcal{O}(n^{\mathcal{O}(1)})$ time by lemma 2. The choices for partition \mathcal{X} are bounded by $\mathcal{O}(5^k)$. The choices for the function g are bounded by $\mathcal{O}(k^k)$. Therefore, we obtain running time in $\mathcal{O}(2^{\mathcal{O}(k \log k)} n^{\mathcal{O}(1)})$ of our algorithm.

Correctness: Next, we prove the correctness of our algorithm. We show that a shortest path P is a solution to (G, S, k) of ESP/svd if and only if there exists a $M \subseteq S$, $X = S \setminus M$, $C^* \subseteq C$, $m_0, m_{|M \cup C^*|+1} \in V(G)$, a partition $\mathcal{X} = X_{=1} \uplus X_{=2} \uplus X_{=3} \uplus X_{=4} \uplus X_{\geq 5}$ of X , X' as defined above, and a function g , such that P satisfies the properties of $M, X, C^*, m_0, m_{|M \cup C^*|+1}, \mathcal{X}, X', g$.

In the forward direction suppose that P is a solution to (G, S, k) of ESP/svd. Let $M \subseteq V(P) \cap S$, $X = S \setminus M$, $C^* = V(P) \cap C$. Let π be the ordering of vertices in $M \cup C^*$ on P . Let $m_0, m_{|M \cup C^*|+1}$ be the first and last endpoints of P , respectively. Let $\mathcal{X} = X_{=1} \uplus X_{=2} \uplus X_{=3} \uplus X_{=4} \uplus X_{\geq 5}$ be partition of X according to distances of vertices from P . Let $X' \subseteq X$ be the set of all vertices in X such that for each $v \in X'$, $d_G(v, m_j) > i, i \in [4]$ for all $j \in [0, t+1]$. For defining function g , if for a vertex $v \in X'$ there exists u_i in m_j to m_{j+1} path, then set $g(v) = j$. Observe that P satisfies properties of $M, X, C^*, m_0, m_{|M \cup C^*|+1}, \mathcal{X}, X', g$.

In the backward direction suppose that there exists a $M \subseteq S$, $X = S \setminus M$, $C^* \subseteq C$, $m_0, m_{|M \cup C^*|+1} \in V(G)$, a partition $\mathcal{X} = X_{=1} \uplus X_{=2} \uplus X_{=3} \uplus X_{=4} \uplus X_{\geq 5}$ of X , X' as defined above, and a function g , such that P is a shortest path that satisfies the properties of $M, X, C^*, m_0, m_{|M \cup C^*|+1}, \mathcal{X}, X', g$. We claim that P is a solution to (G, S, k) of ESP/svd. Towards a contradiction, suppose that P is not a solution (G, S, k) of ESP/svd and there exists a shortest path P_1 which is a solution to (G, S, k) of ESP/svd such that ℓ is the minimum integer such that for all $u \in V(G)$, $d_G(u, P_1) \leq \ell$. Let $v \in V(G)$ such that $d_G(v, P_1) \leq \ell$ and $d_G(v, P) > \ell$. Observe that for a correct guess of \mathcal{X} , for every vertex $u \in X^* = \cup_{i=1}^4 X_{=i}$, distance of u to P is optimal, that is for any solution P^* of (G, S, k) , $d_G(u, P^*) = d_G(u, P)$. Therefore, $v \notin X^*$. Recall that $\ell \geq 5$, otherwise

the algorithm would have solved the instance completely using lemma 1. Let P_1^v be a shortest path from v to P_1 . Observe, that since $G - S$ is a split graph, every induced path is of length at most 3. As P_1^v is a shortest path of length at least 5 ($\ell \geq 6$), then by induced property of shortest path, we have that there is a vertex $u \in S$ on P_1^v such that $d_G(u, P) = j \leq 4$. As \mathcal{X} is a correct guess so for each $u \in X_{=i}, i \in [4]$, we have that $d_G(u, P) = i$. By the observation that $d_G(u, v) \leq \ell - i$ (along the path P_1^v), we obtain that $d_G(v, P) \leq \ell$, a contradiction. Hence P is also a solution to (G, S, k) . This completes the proof of correctness of our algorithm and hence proof of theorem 4. \square

7 W[2]-hardness for ESP/cvd

In this section, we show that ESP/cvd is W[2]-hard. This construction is based on [8] where the authors prove that ESP/ecc is W[2]-hard.

Theorem 5. *ESP/cvd is W[2]-hard.*

Proof. Towards proving that the ESP/cvd is W[2]-hard, we give a polynomial time parameter preserving reduction from DOMINATING SET (DS in short) parameterized by solution size to ESP/cvd. In DS, we are given a graph G , and an integer k , the aim is to decide whether there exists a set $S \subseteq V(G)$ of size at most k such that for every vertex $v \in V(G)$, $N[v] \cap S \neq \emptyset$. It is well known that DS is W[2]-hard parameterized by the solution size k [6].

Consider an instance (G, k) of DS. First, we describe construction of an instance (H, S, k') of ESP/cvd. Let $V(G) = \{v_1, \dots, v_n\}$. To construct the graph H we apply the following procedure (see fig. 6 for an illustration of the construction).

1. Initialize $V(H) = V(G)$, that means, we add a vertex v_i in $V(H)$ corresponding to each vertex v_i in G . For each pair $v_i, v_j \in V(H), i \neq j$, we add $v_i v_j$ edge in H . Let V^* be the set of vertices added in this step to $V(H)$.
2. Add k sets U_1, U_2, \dots, U_k , where $U_i = \{u_{i1}, u_{i2}, \dots, u_{in}\}$ to $V(H)$. Each $U_i, i \in [k]$ is a set of n vertices. The vertex u_{ij} in each set U_i where $i \in [k], j \in [n]$, represents i th representative of j th vertex in G and we add k representatives for each vertex.
3. Add a set of $(k - 1)$ vertices $\{z_1, z_2, \dots, z_{k-1}\}$ to $V(H)$. For each $i \in [k - 1]$, make all vertices in $U_i \cup U_{i+1}$ adjacent to z_i , that is, add the set $\{u_{ij} z_i, u_{(i+1)j} z_i : i \in [k], j \in [n]\}$ of edges to $E(H)$.
4. Add four vertices, s, a, b , and t to $V(H)$, also add two sets $A = \{a_1, a_2, \dots, a_k\}$ and $B = \{b_1, b_2, \dots, b_k\}$ each of k vertices to $V(H)$. Add edge sets $\tilde{A} = \{a_i a_{i+1} : i \in [k - 1]\} \cup \{s a_1, a_k a\}$ and $\tilde{B} = \{b_i b_{i+1} : i \in [k - 1]\} \cup \{t b_1, b_k b\}$ to $V(H)$. Observe that we have added a path from s to a of length $k + 1$ using set A of vertices and edges \tilde{A} . Similarly we have added a path from b to t of length $k + 1$ using set B of vertices and edges \tilde{B} .
5. Make the vertex a adjacent to all vertices in U_1 and make the vertex b adjacent to all vertices in U_k . That is add the set $\{u_{1j} a, u_{kj} b : j \in [n]\}$ of edges to $E(H)$.

6. For each vertex $u_{ij} \in U_i, i \in [k], j \in [n]$ and each vertex $v_t \in N_G[v_j]$ add a set $W_{v_t}^{ij} = \{w_{t1}^{ij}, w_{t2}^{ij}, \dots, w_{t(k)}^{ij}\}$ of k vertices to $V(H)$. Add edge set $\tilde{W}_{v_t}^{ij} = \{w_{tp}^{ij}w_{t(p+1)}^{ij} : p \in [k-1]\} \cup \{u_{ij}w_{t1}^{ij}, w_{t(k)}^{ij}v_t\}$ of edges to $E(H)$. Observe that we have added a u_{ij} to v_t path of length $k+1$ using vertex set $W_{v_t}^{ij}$ and edge set $\tilde{W}_{v_t}^{ij}$, for each $i \in [k], j \in [n], v_t \in N_G[v_j]$. Intuitively if v_jv_t is an edge in the graph G (or $t = j$, as we consider closed neighbourhood of v_j), then we add a path of length $k+1$ between each vertex corresponding to v_j that we have added in sets $U_i, i \in [k]$ in step 2, and vertex corresponding to vertex $v_t \in V^*$ that we have added in step 1.
7. (Make a ladder for i th representative of v_j vertex with the vertices corresponding to $N[v_j]$ in V^* .) Next, we take the u_{ij} to v_t paths added in the above step, $u_{ij} \in U_i, i \in [k], j \in [n]$ and $v_t \in N_G[v_j]$, we further add more edges to vertices in these paths and construct a *ladder* structure. In particular we do as follows. For each vertex $u_{ij} \in U_j, i \in [k], j \in [n]$ and each pair of vertices $v_tv_{t^*} \in N_G[v_j]$ we take the u_{ij} to v_t path and u_{ij} to v_{t^*} path added in above step. We have $W_{v_t}^{ij} = \{w_{t1}^{ij}, w_{t2}^{ij}, \dots, w_{tk}^{ij}\}$ vertex set corresponding to u_{ij} to v_t path and $W_{v_{t^*}}^{ij} = \{w_{t^*1}^{ij}, w_{t^*2}^{ij}, \dots, w_{t^*k}^{ij}\}$ vertex set corresponding to u_{ij} to v_{t^*} path in the above step. We further add edges $\hat{W}_{v_tv_{t^*}}^{ij} = \bigcup_{p \in [k]} w_{tp}^{ij}w_{t^*(p)}^{ij} \cup \{w_{tq}^{ij}w_{t^*(q+1)}^{ij} : q \in [k-1]\} \cup \{w_{tk}^{ij}v_{t^*}\}$ to $E(H)$. We say that the graph H induced on vertex sets $W_{v_t}^{ij} \cup W_{v_{t^*}}^{ij} \cup \{u_{ij}, v_t, v_{t^*}\}$ together with edge set $\tilde{W}_{v_t}^{ij} \cup \tilde{W}_{v_{t^*}}^{ij} \cup \{v_tv_{t^*}\}$ is a *ladder* between u_{ij} and v_t, v_{t^*} .

This completes the description of the graph H . Observe that the number of vertices in H is polynomial in n and k , and the construction can be done in polynomial time. Let $X = \{z_1, z_2, \dots, z_{k-1}\} \cup \{a, b\}$. Clearly $|X| = k+1$. Let $k' = k+1$. This completes the description of the construction of (H, k') . We claim that G has a dominating set of size at most k if and only if H has a shortest path P with eccentricity at most $(k+1)$.

Correctness. We show that (H, S, k') is a valid instance of ESP/cvd. First, we show that X is a chordal deletion set of H .

Claim. $H - X$ is a chordal graph.

Proof. Let C be a cycle of length at least four in $H \setminus X$. As $\{v_1, v_2, \dots, v_n\}$ forms a clique in G so C can have at most two vertices from V^* . Now in each component of $H \setminus (X \cup V^*)$ has at most one vertex from $U = \bigcup_{i=1}^k U_i$. As V^* induces a clique, so there is no induced cycle having more than one vertices from U . Let $u_i^j \in U_j$ be an arbitrary vertex in C , by our construction neighbors of u_{ij} are vertices of type w_{t1}^{ij} , which is first vertex in u_{ij} to $v_t \in N_G[v_j]$ path (step 5) or of type $w_{t1}^{i'j}$, which is first vertex in $u_{i'j}$ to $v_t \in N_G[v_j]$ path (step 7). Observe that by our construction of ladders in step 6 and 7, every pair of vertices in neighbourhood of u_i^j in H is adjacent (such edges are added in $E(H)$ by \hat{Y} type sets). Now let, $w_{tt'}^{ij}$ be one of the nearest neighbour (say distance t') of u_i^j in C . If we look at

the neighbour of $w_{tt'}^{ij}$ in C , as C is a cycle of length at least 4 so the only choice is $w_{t^{*}t'}^{ij}$ and $w_{t(t'+1)}^{ij}$. Now $w_{tt'}^{ij}$ is one neighbour of $w_{t^{*}t'}^{ij}$ in C , let w be the other neighbour of $w_{t^{*}t'}^{ij}$, clearly $d_H(u_i^j, w) = t'$ or $t' + 1$. In any of the cases, as our construction there is an edge between $w_{tt'}^{ij}$ and w . That leads to a contradiction. So, there is no induced cycle of length at least four in $H \setminus X$. Hence, we have that H is a chordal graph.




Fig. 6. Reduction from DS to ESP/cvd. Illustration to the proof of theorem 5.

Claim. G has a dominating set of size at most k if and only if H has a shortest path P with eccentricity at most $(k + 1)$.

Proof. In the forward direction, suppose that the graph G has a dominating set D of size k . Let $D = \{v_{t_1}, v_{t_2}, \dots, v_{t_k}\}$ and $D^* = \{a, u_{1t_1}, z_1, u_{2t_2}, z_2, \dots, z_{k-1}, u_{kt_k}, b\}$, where u_{it_i} is the i th representative of vertex t_i in set U_i added in step 2 of our construction of H . Observe that $P = H[D^*]$ is an induced path by our construction. Since D is a dominating set in G , for each vertex $v_{t_i} \in D$, we have that each vertex $v_t \in N_G[v_i]$ is at distance $(k + 1)$ from u_{it_i} in H . By construction, for the remaining vertices in H , there is a shortest path from P of length at most $(k + 1)$.

For the backward direction, note that each shortest path that does not contain the vertices a or b have eccentricity more than $k + 1$, as distance from s

to a (resp, t to b) is exactly $k + 1$. Moreover, as $d_H(a, b) = 2k$ and any path between a and b passing through V^* exceeds the value $2k$ so each shortest path must intersect all set U_i and pass through all vertices $z_{i'}$ where $i \in [k]$ and $i' \in [k - 1]$. Suppose that there exists a shortest path P with eccentricity $k + 1$ in H . That means for every vertex $v \in H$ there exists a vertex $u \in P$ such that $d_H(u, v) \leq (k + 1)$. Let v be an arbitrary vertex in V^* , and there exists a vertex $u_{ij} \in P$ such that $d(v, u_{ij}) = k + 1$. This implies, $v \in N_G[v_j]$. As we choose v arbitrarily, so the set $D = \{v_j : u_{ij} \in V(P) \cap U_i, i \in [k]\}$ is a dominating set for G with size at most k . This completes the proof.

This completes the proof of theorem 5. □

References

1. Etienne Birmelé, Fabien de Montgolfier, and Léo Planche. Minimum eccentricity shortest path problem: An approximation algorithm and relation with the k -laminarity problem. In *International Conference on Combinatorial Optimization and Applications*, pages 216–229. Springer, 2016.
2. Yixin Cao and Dániel Marx. Chordal editing is fixed-parameter tractable. *Algorithmica*, 75(1):118–137, 2016.
3. Marek Cygan, Fedor V Fomin, Łukasz Kowalik, Daniel Lokshtanov, Dániel Marx, Marcin Pilipczuk, Michał Pilipczuk, and Saket Saurabh. *Parameterized algorithms*, volume 5. Springer, 2015.
4. Marek Cygan and Marcin Pilipczuk. Split vertex deletion meets vertex cover: new fixed-parameter and exact exponential-time algorithms. *Information Processing Letters*, 113(5-6):179–182, 2013.
5. Reinhard Diestel. Graph theory. *Graduate texts in mathematics*, 173, 2017.
6. Rodney G Downey and Michael R Fellows. *Fundamentals of parameterized complexity*, volume 4. Springer, 2013.
7. Feodor F Dragan and Arne Leitert. Minimum eccentricity shortest paths in some structured graph classes. In *International Workshop on Graph-Theoretic Concepts in Computer Science*, pages 189–202. Springer, 2015.
8. Feodor F Dragan and Arne Leitert. On the minimum eccentricity shortest path problem. *Theoretical Computer Science*, 694:66–78, 2017.
9. Ralph J Faudree, Ronald J Gould, Michael S Jacobson, and Douglas B West. Minimum degree and dominating paths. *Journal of Graph Theory*, 84(2):202–213, 2017.
10. Martin Kučera and Ondřej Suchý. Minimum Eccentricity Shortest Path Problem with Respect to Structural Parameters. In *International Workshop on Combinatorial Algorithms*, pages 442–455. Springer, 2021.
11. Finn Völkell, Eric Bapteste, Michel Habib, Philippe Lopez, and Chloe Vigliotti. Read networks and k -laminar graphs. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1603.01179*, 2016.