

The complexity of convexity number and percolation time in the cycle convexity^{*}

Carlos V.G.C. Lima^a, Thiago Marcilon^{a,*}, Pedro Paulo de Medeiros^b

^a*CCT, Universidade Federal do Cariri, Juazeiro do Norte, Brazil*

^b*Departamento de Matemática, Universidade Federal do Ceará, Fortaleza, Brazil*

Abstract

The subject of graph convexity is well explored in the literature, the so-called interval convexities above all. In this work, we explore the cycle convexity, an interval convexity whose interval function is $I(S) = S \cup \{u \mid G[S \cup \{u\}] \text{ has a cycle containing } u\}$. In this convexity, we prove that determine whether the convexity number of a graph G is at least k is NP-complete and W[1]-hard when parameterized by the size of the solution when G is a thick spider, but polynomial when G is an extended P_4 -laden graph. We also prove that determining whether the percolation time of a graph is at least k is NP-complete even for fixed $k \geq 9$, but polynomial for cacti or for fixed $k \leq 2$.

Keywords: graph convexity, cycle convexity, convexity number, percolation time

1. Introduction

We assume the reader possesses basic knowledge in Graph Theory and Complexity Theory, citing [1, 2, 3] as references for further exploration of these subjects. For a graph $G = (V, E)$, let $V(G) = V$, and $E(G) = E$. For any $v \in V(G)$ and $S \subseteq V(G)$, let $G[S]$ be the subgraph of G induced by the subset of vertices S , $G - v = G[V \setminus \{v\}]$ and $G - S = G[V \setminus S]$. Henceforth, we consider only simple and finite graphs.

^{*}We would like to thank CNPq 313153/2021-3 and Capes for the financial support.

^{*}Corresponding author

Email addresses: `vinicius.lima@ufca.edu.br` (Carlos V.G.C. Lima), `thiago.marcilon@ufca.edu.br` (Thiago Marcilon), `pedropmed1@gmail.com` (Pedro Paulo de Medeiros)

A *convexity space*, or simply *convexity*, is an ordered pair (V, \mathcal{C}) where V is a set and \mathcal{C} is a subset family of V , called *convex sets*, satisfying the following properties: **(C1)** $V, \emptyset \in \mathcal{C}$; **(C2)** for all $\mathcal{C}' \subseteq \mathcal{C}$, we have $\bigcap \mathcal{C}' \subseteq \mathcal{C}$; and **(C3)** every nested union of convex sets is convex. When V is finite, we can disregard property **(C3)**.

If $S \subseteq V$ is a convex set, we say that $V \setminus S$ is *co-convex*. The *convex hull* of a set $S \subseteq V$ concerning (V, \mathcal{C}) is the smallest convex set $C \in \mathcal{C}$ such that $C \supseteq S$, and we denote the convex hull of the set S by $H(S)$. If $H(S) = V$, we say that S is a hull set. Convexity spaces generalize the notion of convexity in Euclidian space, making it applicable to a broader range of mathematical structures. In this paper, we exclusively refer to convexity spaces (V, \mathcal{C}) , where V denotes the vertex set of some finite graph, which are called graph convexities.

If I is a function, let $I^0(S) = S$ and $I^k(S) = I(I^{k-1}(S))$. When V is the vertex set of a graph G , a common way to define a graph convexity (V, \mathcal{C}) on G is by defining an *interval function* $I : 2^V \rightarrow 2^V$ such that $S \subseteq I(S)$, and the convex hull of a set S is defined as $H(S) = I^k(S)$, for any $k \geq 1$ such that $I^k(S) = I^{k-1}(S)$. In this case, we call it an *interval convexity*. By this definition, the convex hull of a set S can be obtained by applying the interval function iteratively to S until the resulting set no longer expands. As a consequence of that, in an interval convexity with interval function I , S is a convex set if and only if $I(S) = S$. Henceforth, if S is a convex set/hull set in a convexity on a graph G , we simply say that S is a convex set/hull set of G , since the convexity is always clear from context.

Typically, in interval convexities, $I(S)$ contains all vertices in S and all vertices in any path with endpoints in S that have some specific property. Three of the most studied interval convexities are the P_3 *convexity* [4, 5], the *geodesic convexity* [6, 7, 8] and the *monophonic convexity* [9, 10, 11], where $I(S)$ contains, in addition to all vertices in S , all vertices in some P_3 with endpoints in S , all vertices in some shortest path with endpoints in S , and all vertices in some induced path with endpoints in S , respectively.

In this paper, we work with the recently defined cycle convexity. The *cycle convexity* [12] is an interval convexity such that $I(S) = S \cup \{u \mid G[S \cup \{u\}] \text{ has a cycle containing } u\}$. According to Araujo *et al.*, the main motivation behind the conception of the cycle convexity stemmed from its application in the examination of the tunnel number of a knot or link within Knot Theory.

In [12], the interval number of a graph in the cycle convexity is investigated. The *interval number* of a graph G , denoted by $in(G)$, is the size of a

smallest hull set S of G such that $I(S) = V(G)$. The authors proved some bounds for $in(G)$, also exploring this parameter on some types of grids. They showed that the problem to determine whether $in(G) \leq k$ is NP-complete for split graphs or bounded-degree planar graphs and W[2]-hard for bipartite graphs when the problem is parameterized by k . On the other hand, they showed that the problem is polynomial for outerplanar graphs, cobipartite graphs and interval graphs, and is FPT when parameterized by the treewidth or the neighborhood diversity of G or by q in $(q, q - 4)$ -graphs.

In [13], Araujo *et al.* examined the hull number in the cycle convexity. The *hull number* of a graph G , denoted by $hn(G)$, is the size of a smallest hull set S of G . They showed some bounds for $hn(G)$ when G is a 4-regular graph. Furthermore, they proved that the problem to determine whether $hn(G) \leq k$ is NP-complete, even when G is a planar graph, but it is polynomial when G is a chordal graph, P_4 -sparse, or a grid.

Given a graph $G = (V, E)$, we say that $S \subseteq V$ is *convexly dependent* in G if there exists $v \in S$ such that $v \in H(S \setminus \{v\})$. Otherwise, we say that S is *convexly independent* in G . The rank of a graph G , denoted by $rk(G)$, is the size of a largest convexly independent set in G . Let $lf(G)$ be the size of a largest subset of vertices of G that induces a forest. Before we present our main contributions, we make the following observation.

Observation 1. *In the cycle convexity, $rk(G) = lf(G)$.*

This proposition comes from the easily verifiable fact that, in the cycle convexity, S is convexly independent in G if and only if $G[S]$ is a forest. This implies that the problem of determining whether $rk(G) \geq k$ is essentially the same as the problem of determining whether $lf(G) \geq k$, which is NP-complete and W[1]-hard when parameterized by k [14].

In this paper, we explore the convexity number and the percolation time of a graph in the cycle convexity. The *convexity number* [15, 16] of a graph $G = (V, E)$, denoted by $con(G)$, is the size of a largest convex set of G excluding V itself. The *percolation time* [17] of a graph G , denoted by $pn(G)$, is defined as the largest integer $k > 0$ such that there exists a hull set S of G where $I^{k-1}(S) \neq V$ if such an integer k exists; otherwise, $pn(G) = 0$. We show that determining whether $con(G) \geq k$ is NP-complete and W[1]-hard when parameterized by k , even when G is a thick spider, but it is polynomial when G is an extended P_4 -laden graph. Additionally, we establish that determining whether $pn(G) \geq k$ is NP-complete for any fixed $k \geq 9$, but it is polynomial for any fixed $k \leq 2$, or when G is a cactus.

2. Results on the Convexity Number

In this section, we present our results regarding the convexity number in the cycle convexity. We determine the convexity number of G , when G is the union/join of two graphs, a pseudo-split graph, and a quasi-spider. With that, we are able to obtain the two main results of this section. We prove that the following problem is **NP**-complete and **W[1]**-hard when parameterized by k for thick spiders and polynomial for extended P_4 -laden graphs.

CONVEXITY NUMBER

Input: A graph $G = (V, E)$ and an integer $k > 0$.
 Question: $\text{con}(G) \geq k$?

Denote by $\alpha(G)$ and $\delta(G)$ respectively the size of a largest independent set of G and the minimum degree of a vertex of G . Let the union of two graphs $G_1 = (V_1, E_1)$ and $G_2 = (V_2, E_2)$ be $G_1 \cup G_2 = (V_1 \cup V_2, E_1 \cup E_2)$, and the join be $G_1 \vee G_2 = (V_1 \cup V_2, E_1 \cup E_2 \cup \{uv \mid u \in V_1, v \in V_2\})$.

Lemma 2. *Let $G_1 = (V_1, E_1)$ and $G_2 = (V_2, E_2)$ be two graphs and c_i be the size of the smallest connected component of G_i for $i \in \{1, 2\}$. Then, $\text{con}(G_1 \cup G_2) = \max(|V_1| + \text{con}(G_2), \text{con}(G_1) + |V_2|)$ and*

$$\text{con}(G_1 \vee G_2) = \begin{cases} \max(\alpha(G_1), \alpha(G_2)) & \text{if } |V_1|, |V_2| \geq 2 \\ \max(\alpha(G_2), |V_2| - c_2 + 1) & \text{if } |V_1| = 1 \\ \max(\alpha(G_1), |V_1| - c_1 + 1) & \text{if } |V_2| = 1 \end{cases}$$

Proof. Let T_i be a largest convex set of G_i different from V_i for $i \in \{1, 2\}$. Both sets $T_1 \cup V_2$ and $T_2 \cup V_1$ are convex sets of $G_1 \cup G_2$ and different from $V_1 \cup V_2$. Thus, $\text{con}(G_1 \cup G_2) \geq \max(|V_1| + \text{con}(G_2), \text{con}(G_1) + |V_2|)$. Now, let T be a set of vertices of size at least $1 + \max(|V_1| + \text{con}(G_2), \text{con}(G_1) + |V_2|)$, $T_1 = T \cap V_1$, and $T_2 = T \cap V_2$. Since $|T| > |V_1| + \text{con}(G_2)$ and $|T| > \text{con}(G_1) + |V_2|$, we have $|T_1| > \text{con}(G_1)$ and $|T_2| > \text{con}(G_2)$. Thus, $H(T) = H(T_1 \cup T_2) \supseteq H(T_1) \cup H(T_2) = V_1 \cup V_2 = V(G)$. Thus, we have that T is either not convex or equal to $V(G)$. As a result, $\text{con}(G_1 \cup G_2) = \max(|V_1| + \text{con}(G_2), \text{con}(G_1) + |V_2|)$.

Let $G = G_1 \vee G_2$. Assume that $V_1 = \{v\}$ and let C be the smallest connected component of G_2 . A largest independent set of G_2 is also a convex set of G and is different from $V(G)$ as it certainly does not include v . Furthermore, no vertex $u \in V(C)$ is in a cycle in $G[\{u\} \cup (V(G) \setminus V(C))]$, since C

is a connected component of $G - v$. Thus, the set $T = V(G) \setminus V(C) \neq V(G)$ is a convex set of G . Hence, we conclude that $\text{con}(G_1 \vee G_2) \geq \max(\alpha(G_2), |V_2| + 1 - c_2)$. Now, let T be a set of vertices of G such that $|T| \geq 1 + \max(\alpha(G_2), |V_2| + 1 - c_2)$. Since $|T| \geq 1 + \alpha(G_2)$, if $v \notin T$, T is not an independent set of G_2 and thus $v \in I(T)$. Furthermore, since $|T| \geq 1 + (|V_2| + 1 - c_2)$ and c_2 is the size of C , which is the smallest connected component of G_2 , T has at least one vertex in each connected component of G_2 . Therefore, since $v \in H(T)$, $H(T) = V(G)$, which implies that T is not convex or equal to $V(G)$. We can then conclude that $\text{con}(G_1 \vee G_2) = \max(\alpha(G_2), |V_2| + 1 - c_2)$ if $|V_1| = 1$. The case where $|V_2| = 1$ is symmetrical to this case.

Now, assume that $|V_1|, |V_2| \geq 2$. A largest independent set of G_1 or G_2 is also an independent set of $G = G_1 \vee G_2$ and consequently a convex set different from $V(G)$. Therefore, $\text{con}(G_1 \vee G_2) \geq \max(\alpha(G_1), \alpha(G_2))$.

Note that if $v \in V_1$ and $u, w \in V_2$, then $I(\{v, u, w\}) \supseteq V_1$, since any vertex in V_1 forms a C_4 with v, u and w . This implies that $I^2(\{v, u, w\}) = V(G)$, since $|V_1| > 1$ and any vertex in $V_2 \setminus \{u\}$ forms a C_4 with u, v , and any other vertex in V_1 . Similarly, this also happens if $v \in V_2$ and $u, w \in V_1$.

Let T be a set of vertices of G such that $|T| \geq 1 + \max(\alpha(G_1), \alpha(G_2))$. Let $T_i = T \cap V_i$ for $i \in \{1, 2\}$. If T_1 is not an independent set of G_1 , let $uw \in E_1$ such that $u, w \in T_1$. Then, $I(T_1) \supseteq I(\{u, w\}) \supseteq V_2$, which implies that $I^2(T_1) \supseteq V(G)$, since $u, w \in V_1$ and $|V_2| \geq 2$. It follows that $H(T) = V(G)$. So, T is not convex or $T = V(G)$. With symmetrical arguments, we can reach the same conclusion when T_2 is not an independent set of G_2 .

Let T_i be an independent set of G_i for $i \in \{1, 2\}$. Let $i \neq j \in \{1, 2\}$. Since $|T| \geq 1 + \alpha(G_i)$, $|T_j| \geq 1$. Furthermore, if T_i is not a largest independent set of G_i , then $|T_j| \geq 2$. This implies that $H(T) = V(G)$, since $|T_i| \geq 1$, and thus T is not convex or $T = V(G)$. So, T_1 and T_2 are largest independent sets of G_1 and G_2 respectively. Also, if either $|T_1| \geq 2$ or $|T_2| \geq 2$, then either T is not convex or $T = V(G)$, since $|T_1|, |T_2| \geq 1$.

Therefore, assume that T_1 and T_2 are largest independent sets of G_1 and G_2 respectively, and $|T_1| = |T_2| = 1$, from which we can infer that G_1 and G_2 are complete graphs. Thus, $G = G_1 \vee G_2$ is a complete graph itself, which implies that $H(T) = V(G)$, since $|T| = |T_1| + |T_2| = 2$ and G is a complete graph. Hence, we have that T is not convex or $T = V(G)$.

Therefore, we can conclude that $\text{con}(G_1 \vee G_2) = \max(\alpha(G_1), \alpha(G_2))$ if $|V_1|, |V_2| \geq 2$. \square

A pseudo-split graph is a graph $G = (V, E)$ whose vertex set can be partitioned into three subsets S, C and R such that (i) $|C|, |S| \geq 2$, S is an independent set, and C is a clique; (ii) there are no edges with one endpoint in S and the other in R and there is an edge between each vertex in C and each vertex in R ; and (iii) every vertex in C has at least one neighbor in S and every vertex in S has at least one non-neighbor in C . Note that R can be empty. We call a pseudo-split graph with vertex-set partition in the sets S, C and R an (S, C, R) -pseudo-split graph.




Figure 1: Example of a quasi-spider obtained from an (S, C, R) -thick spider by replacing a vertex from S by a K_2 with the vertices v and u .

A spider [18] is a pseudo-split graph such that $|S| = |C|$, and there is a bijection $f : C \rightarrow S$ such that for every $v \in C$, either $N(v) = \{f(v)\}$, in which case G is a thin spider; or $N(v) = S \setminus \{f(v)\}$, in which case G is a thick spider. We refer to a (thick/thin) spider with vertex-set partitioned in the sets S, C and R as an (S, C, R) -(thick/thin) spider.

A quasi-spider is obtained from an (S, C, R) -spider by replacing one vertex in $S \cup C$ by a K_2 or $\overline{K_2}$. Fig. 1 illustrates a quasi-spider obtained from an (S, C, R) -thick spider by replacing a vertex from S by a K_2 .

Lemma 3. *Let either G be an (S, C, R) -pseudo-split graph or G' be an (S, C, R) -spider and G be a quasi-spider obtained from G' by either replacing $v \in S$ with a K_2 , or replacing $v \in C$ with a $\overline{K_2}$. Then*

$$\text{con}(G) = \begin{cases} |V(G)| - 1 & \text{if } \delta(G) = 1 \\ \alpha(G[R]) + |S| & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

Proof. If there is a vertex v of G such that $N(v) = 1$, then $V(G) \setminus \{v\}$ is a convex set different from $V(G)$, which implies that $\text{con}(G) = |V(G)| - 1$.

Henceforth, suppose that $\delta(G) \geq 2$. If G is a quasi-spider obtained from an (S, C, R) -spider G' , let $V(G) = C \cup R \cup S \cup \{v'\}$, where either $v \in S$ was replaced by a K_2 formed by the vertices v and v' , or $v \in C$ was replaced by a $\overline{K_2}$ formed by the vertices v and v' .

Let Q be a largest independent set of $G[R]$. Since $T = Q \cup S$ is an independent set of G , whether G is a pseudo-split graph or a quasi-spider graph, then T is a convex set of G different from $V(G)$. Hence, $\text{con}(G) \geq \alpha(G[R]) + |S|$.

Now, let $T \subseteq V(G)$ such that $|T| \geq \alpha(G[R]) + |S| + 1$ and denote $T_S = T \cap S$, $T_C = T \cap C$ and $T_R = T \cap R$. First, let G be a (S, C, R) -pseudo-split graph. If $|T_R| > \alpha(G[R])$, T is not an independent set of G . On the other hand, if $|T_R| \leq \alpha(G[R])$, either $|T_C| \geq 2$, or if $|T_C| = 1$, $T_S = S$, which also implies that T is not an independent set of G .

For any two neighbors $v, w \in C \cup R$, $I(\{v, w\}) \supseteq C$, which implies that $I^2(\{v, w\}) = V(G)$, since every vertex in S has at least two neighbors in C . Furthermore, for similar reasons, for any two neighbors $v \in C$ and $w \in S$, $I^2(\{v, w\}) \supseteq C$, which implies that $I^3(\{v, w\}) = V(G)$. With that, we can infer that no convex set of G different from $V(G)$ can contain two neighbors. Since T is not an independent set, either T is not convex or $T = V(G)$. We then conclude that $\text{con}(G) = \alpha(G[R]) + |S|$ if G is an (S, C, R) -pseudo-split graph.

Now, let G be a quasi-spider obtained from an (S, C, R) -spider G' by replacing either $v \in S$ with a K_2 , or $v \in C$ with a $\overline{K_2}$. Since $\delta(G) \geq 2$ and $|S| \geq 2$, G' is not a thin spider, which implies that $|S| = |C| \geq 3$. If $v \in S$, we can use the same reasoning we used in the case where G is a pseudo-split graph to prove that T is not an independent set, and for any two neighbors u and w , $H(\{u, w\}) = V(G)$. This allows us to reach the same conclusion that either T is not a convex set of G , or $T = V(G)$. The only additional case that must be observed in order to conclude that $H(\{u, w\}) = V(G)$ is when $v \in S$, $u = v$ and $w = v'$. However, in this case, since $|S| \geq 3$ and G' is a thick spider, $I^3(\{u, w\}) = V(G)$.

Finally, let $v \in C$ and denote $C' = C \cup \{v'\}$ and $T_{C'} = T \cap C'$. For any two neighbors u and w , $H(\{u, w\}) = V(G)$, since $I(\{u, w\}) \supseteq C' \setminus \{v, v'\}$, and $I^2(\{u, w\}) \supseteq C'$. Thus, no convex set of G different from $V(G)$ can contain two neighbors. Suppose by contradiction that T is an independent set. Since $|T| \geq \alpha(G[R]) + |S| + 1$ and T is an independent set, $1 \leq |T_{C'}| \leq 2$.

If $|T_{C'}| = 2$, $T_{C'} = \{v, v'\}$ and $|T_S| \geq |S| - 1 \geq 2$. Thus, since G' is a thick spider, there is at least one vertex in T_S that is adjacent to v and v' , a contradiction. If $|T_{C'}| = 1$, $|T_S| = |S|$, which again implies that there is some vertex in T_S that is adjacent to the vertex in $T_{C'}$, a contradiction. Hence, we have that T is not an independent set, which implies that either T is not convex or $T = V(G)$.

Therefore, we conclude that $\text{con}(G) = \alpha(G[R]) + |S|$ if G is a quasi-spider obtained from an (S, C, R) -spider by replacing either $v \in S$ with a K_2 , or $v \in C$ with a $\overline{K_2}$. \square

Note that a quasi-spider obtained from an (S, C, R) -spider by either replacing a vertex from S by a $\overline{K_2}$ or replacing a vertex from C by a K_2 is not a spider, but it is a pseudo-split graph. Thus, [Lemma 3](#) actually includes all quasi-spiders, since G is either a pseudo-split graph or a quasi-spider obtained from an (S, C, R) -spider by either replacing a vertex from S by a K_2 or replacing a vertex from C by a $\overline{K_2}$.

The INDEPENDENT SET Problem is a well-known NP-complete and W[1]-complete problem when parameterized by k [\[3\]](#) that consists in, given a graph G and an integer k , determining whether $\alpha(G) \geq k$. The following complexity result follows from [Lemma 3](#).

Theorem 4. *CONVEXITY NUMBER is NP-complete and W[1]-hard when parameterized by k for thick spiders.*

Proof. This theorem follows directly from the fact that, given a graph H and an integer k , $\alpha(H) = k$ if and only if $\text{con}(G) = \alpha(H) + |S| = k + 3$, where G is an (S, C, R) -thick spider such that $|S| = |C| = 3$ and $G[R]$ is isomorphic to H . This equivalence, in turn, follows directly from [Lemma 3](#). \square

Created by Giakoumakis, extended P_4 -laden graphs [\[19\]](#) bear a close relationship to pseudo-split graphs. A graph is an *extended P_4 -laden* graph if every induced subgraph with at most six vertices that contains more than two induced P_4 s is a pseudo-split graph. The motivation to derive algorithms for extended P_4 -laden graphs arises from the fact that it resides atop a widely studied hierarchy of classes containing graphs with few P_4 's, illustrated in [Fig. 2](#), including cographs, P_4 -sparse, P_4 -lite, P_4 -laden and P_4 -tidy graphs. In fact, the following theorem provides a natural way to derive efficient algorithms for this class by showing a convenient way to decompose an extended P_4 -laden graph that can be obtained in linear time.




Figure 2: Hierarchy of graphs with few P_4 's.

Theorem 5 (Giakoumakis [19]). *A graph G is extended P_4 -laden if and only if exactly one of the following conditions is satisfied:*

- *G is the union or join of two extended P_4 -laden graphs;*
- *G is a (S, C, R) -pseudo-split graph or a quasi-spider obtained from an (S, C, R) -spider, and, in both cases, $G[R]$ is an extended P_4 -laden;*
- *G is isomorphic to C_5, P_5 or $\overline{P_5}$;*
- *G has at most one vertex.*

Theorem 6. *Let G be an extended P_4 -laden. Then, $\text{con}(G)$ can be computed in polynomial time.*

Proof. By decomposing G according to Theorem 5 in linear time, our algorithm could compute $\text{con}(G)$ recursively. However, the only case where it would need to recursively compute the convexity number of any of its extended P_4 -laden subgraphs is the case where $G = G_1 \cup G_2$. Therefore, our algorithm simply calculates $\text{con}(C)$ for each $C \in \mathcal{C}(G)$, where $\mathcal{C}(G)$ is the set of all connected components of G , in the following manner:

- if C has at most one vertex, $\text{con}(C) = 0$;

- if C is a C_5 or $\overline{P_5}$, $con(C) = 3$;
- if C is a P_5 , $con(C) = 4$;
- If C is a join of two extended P_4 -laden graphs, our algorithm computes $con(C)$ according to [Lemma 2](#);
- If C is either a pseudo-split graph or a quasi-spider, our algorithm computes $con(C)$ according to [Lemma 3](#).

Then, our algorithm computes $con(G) = \max_{C \in \mathcal{C}(G)} |V(G)| - |V(C)| + con(C)$ according to [Lemma 2](#) applied to any number of unions.

Note that, depending on the case, in order to compute the convexity number of each connected component, our algorithm simply has to compute the size of given subgraphs, which can be done in linear time, and/or the size of a largest independent set of a given extended P_4 -laden subgraph, which can be done in polynomial time [\[19, 20\]](#). \square

3. Results on the Percolation Time

In this section, we present our results regarding the percolation time in the cycle convexity. We prove that the following problem is NP-complete for any fixed $k \geq 9$, but polynomial for fixed $k \leq 2$ or when G is a cactus.

PERCOLATION TIME

Input: A graph $G = (V, E)$ and an integer $k \geq 0$.
 Question: $pn(G) \geq k$?

All graphs in this section are connected, as the percolation time of a graph is the maximum percolation time of its connected components.

3.1. Percolation Time is linear on cacti

Let us begin by presenting a linear algorithm that computes $pn(G)$ when G is a cactus. Let G be a cactus with at least one cycle. We define the graph $T_G = (\mathcal{C}, A)$ where each vertex in \mathcal{C} is a cycle of G and we have an edge between two nodes C_1 and C_2 of T_G if and only if C_1 and C_2 share a vertex in G . We say that a cycle is terminal if it has at most one articulation point in G . Also, let $lp(G)$ be the longest induced path in G .

Lemma 7. *Given a cactus $G = (V, E)$, $lp(T_G)$ can be computed in linear time in the size of G .*

Proof. Let \mathcal{C} be the set of cycles of G and $T'_G = (\mathcal{C} \cup V, A)$ be the forest we get when \mathcal{C} and V are independent sets and we have an edge between $w \in V$ and $C \in \mathcal{C}$ if and only if C contains w in G . Any path in T'_G alternates between a vertex in V and a vertex in \mathcal{C} . Furthermore, since G is a cactus, any maximal path in T'_G , which is a path that cannot be further extended, starts and ends at a vertex in V and thus has an odd size. Also, the size of T'_G is linear in the size of G , since the number of cycles in a cactus is linear in its number of vertices.

By the definition of T'_G and the fact that any two cycles in G share at most one vertex, it follows that, if $v_0, C_0, v_1, C_1, \dots, C_k, v_{k+1}$ is a path of T'_G , then C_0, C_1, \dots, C_k is an induced path in T_G and, conversely, if C_0, C_1, \dots, C_k is an induced path in T_G , then there are vertices $v_0, v_1, v_2, \dots, v_{k+1}$ such that $v_0, C_0, v_1, C_1, \dots, C_k, v_{k+1}$ is a path of T'_G .

This implies that, $lp(T_G) = \frac{k-1}{2}$, where k is the length of a maximum path of T'_G . Since there are a linear number of cycles in G , T'_G can be constructed from G in linear time. Thus, since we can compute the maximum path of T'_G , which is a forest, in linear time, we conclude that $lp(T_G)$ can be computed in linear time in the size of G . \square

Lemma 8. *Let $G = (V, E)$ be a cactus with at least one cycle. Then $pn(G) = lp(T_G) + 1$.*

Proof. Let $G = (V, E)$ be a cactus with at least one cycle and k an integer. Let us prove that $pn(G) \geq k + 1$ if and only if there is an induced path of size k in T_G .

Suppose that there exists a hull set S of G and a vertex v_{k+1} such that $v_{k+1} \in I^{k+1}(S) \setminus I^k(S)$. By the definition of a hull set in the cycle convexity, if $w \in I^x(S) \setminus I^{x-1}(S)$, there exists a cycle containing w such that all other vertices of the cycle are in $I^{x-1}(S)$. Moreover, if $x > 1$, at least one vertex in the cycle must be in $I^{x-1}(S) \setminus I^{x-2}(S)$.

In fact, using this reasoning, given $v_{k+1} \in I^{k+1}(S) \setminus I^k(S)$, we can define inductively the following sequence of cycles in G : for all $i = k, k-1, \dots, 0$, let C_i be a cycle that contains the vertex v_{i+1} such that all other vertices of C_i are in $I^i(S)$, and, if $i > 0$, there is a vertex v_i in $I^i(S) \setminus I^{i-1}(S)$. [Fig. 3](#) illustrates an example of cactus G and vertices v_1, v_2 and v_3 based on a hull set S , with each cycle of the sequence C_2, C_1, C_0 highlighted. Note that any

two consecutive cycles C_j and C_{j-1} of this sequence share the vertex v_j and any two non-consecutive cycles of this sequence do not share vertices, since G is a cactus. Thus, that this sequence of cycles also denotes an induced path of size k in T_G .




Figure 3: An example hull set S of a cactus, represented by gray vertices. The vertices v_1, v_2 and v_3 and sequence of cycles C_2, C_1, C_0 are presented as defined.

Now, let us prove that if there is an induced path of size k in T_G , $pn(G) \geq k + 1$. If G is a cactus with at least one cycle, we define L_G to be the set of vertices that belong to only one cycle and this cycle is the end of some maximum induced path of T_G , that is, this cycle is terminal. To demonstrate what we want, let us prove by induction on $k \geq 0$ that, for any cactus G with at least one cycle such that $lp(T_G) = k$ and any $v \in L_G$, there is a hull set S of G such that $v \in I^{k+1}(S) \setminus I^k(S)$.

Let G be a cactus such that $lp(T_G) = 0$ and $v \in L_G$. Since $lp(T_G) = 0$, G has exactly one cycle, and thus v is in this cycle. Hence, the set $S = V(G) \setminus \{v\}$ is a hull set such that $v \in I(S) \setminus S$.

Now, let $k \geq 1$ and suppose that for any cactus G such that $lp(T_G) = k - 1$ and $v \in L_G$, there exists a hull set S of G such that $v \in I^k(S) \setminus I^{k-1}(S)$. Let G be a cactus such that $lp(T_G) = k$ and $v \in L_G$. Let C_k be the unique cycle to which v belongs, C_0, C_1, \dots, C_k be a maximum induced path of T_G , and v' be the only vertex common to cycles C_k and C_{k-1} . Finally, let $G' = G - (L_G \setminus V(C_0))$. Note that neither the cycle C_k nor the vertex v is present in G' , but v' is and $v' \in L_{G'}$.

By the definitions of L_G and the fact that C_0, C_1, \dots, C_k is a maximum induced path of T_G , $lp(T_{G'}) = k - 1$ and thus the path C_0, C_1, \dots, C_{k-1} is induced and maximum in $T_{G'}$. Therefore, by the inductive hypothesis, there is a hull set S' of G' such that $v' \in I^k(S') \setminus I^{k-1}(S')$ as $v' \in L_{G'}$. Let

$S = S' \cup (L_G \setminus (V(C_0) \cup Q))$, where Q is any set of vertices containing v and exactly one vertex from each cycle of G that is not in G' , except the cycle C_k , that is not an articulation point of G . Fig. 4 illustrates an example with the sequence of cycles C_0, C_1, \dots, C_k , for $k = 2$, the vertices v and v' , and the sets S', L_G and Q represented by vertices colored black, outlined in red and colored gray respectively.




Figure 4: An example with the sequence of cycles C_0, C_1, \dots, C_k , for $k = 2$, the vertices v and v' , and the sets S', L_G and Q represented by the black vertices, vertices outlined in red and gray vertices respectively.

As $V(C_0) \subseteq V(G')$ and $V(G') \subseteq H(S') \subseteq H(S)$, to show that S is a hull set of G , we just need to show that the vertices in Q are in $H(S)$. Since, for each $w \in Q$, considering C_w as the cycle that contains w in G , we have that (i) there is a vertex in C_w that is in $H(S')$ and, consequently, is in $H(S)$, which is the only vertex that is also a vertex of G' ; and (ii) all other vertices of C_w , with the exception of w , are in the set S itself, we can indeed conclude that $Q \subseteq H(S)$ and thus S is a hull set of G .

Since $S \setminus S'$ contains only vertices in terminal cycles and it neither contains the articulation point of such cycles nor all vertices of any terminal cycle, for any $w \in V(G')$, we have that $w \in I^k(S')$ if and only if $w \in I^k(S)$. Hence, since $v' \in I^k(S') \setminus I^{k-1}(S')$, this implies that $v' \in I^k(S) \setminus I^{k-1}(S)$ and then we can conclude that $v \in I^{k+1}(S) \setminus I^k(S)$. \square

Theorem 9. *Given a cactus G , $pn(G)$ can be computed in linear time.*

Proof. The theorem follows directly from Lemmas 7 and 8, and the fact that $pn(G) = 0$ if and only if G has no cycles. \square

3.2. Percolation Time is polynomial for fixed $k \leq 2$

In this subsection, we present a cubic algorithm to solve the PERCOLATION TIME problem when $k \leq 2$. For any graph G , $pn(G) \geq 0$, and $pn(G) \geq 1$ if and only if G has at least one cycle. Thus, for fixed $k \leq 1$, the problem can be solved in linear time. Henceforth in this subsection, we focus on the case where $k = 2$.

Let $G = (V, E)$ be a graph and $v, w \in V$ two neighbors. We define $R_G(v, w)$ as the set of all subgraphs of G induced by a set of vertices $A \cup B$, where A and B are not necessarily disjoint, such that $G[A]$ is a chordless cycle containing the edge vw , $G[B]$ is a (not necessarily induced) cycle that contains w and does not contain v , and v has at most one neighbor in the set $B \setminus \{w\}$.

Lemma 10. *Let $G = (V, E)$ be a graph. There are neighbors $v, w \in V$ such that $R_G(v, w) \neq \emptyset$ if and only if there is a set $S \subseteq V$ such that $I^2(S) \setminus I(S) \neq \emptyset$. Furthermore, given two neighbors $v, w \in V$ such that $R_G(v, w) \neq \emptyset$, such set S can be computed in linear time in the size of G .*

Proof. Let $v, w \in V(G)$ be two neighbors and let $G[R] \in R_G(v, w)$ be an induced subgraph of G , where $R = V(C) \cup V(C')$, C is an induced cycle that contains the edge vw and C' is a cycle that contains w and does not contain v such that v has at most one neighbor in the set $V(C') \setminus \{w\}$.

If v has only one neighbor u in the set $V(C') \setminus \{w\}$, we have that the set $S = V(C') \setminus \{w\}$ is such that $v \in I^2(S) \setminus I(S)$. This happens because (i) v has only one neighbor in S and thus $v \notin I(S)$, and (ii) $v \in I^2(S)$, since $w \in I(S)$, there is a path from u to w through C' , and both vertices are adjacent to v . An example of this case is illustrated in Fig. 5.




Figure 5: An example of the case where v has exactly one neighbor in the set $V(C') \setminus \{w\}$. The cycle C is denoted by the blue edges, the cycle C' by the red edges and S by the gray vertices.

If v has no neighbors in the set $V(C') \setminus \{w\}$, let $S = R \setminus \{v, w\}$. Since, $V(C') \setminus \{w\} \subseteq S$, $w \in I(S)$, which implies that $v \in I^2(S)$. On the other

hand, since v has only one neighbor in S , which is its neighbor in C other than w , $v \notin I(S)$. An example of this case is illustrated in Fig. 6.




Figure 6: An example of the case where v has no neighbors in the set $V(C') \setminus \{w\}$. The cycle C is denoted by the blue edges, the cycle C' by the red edges and S by the gray vertices.

Suppose there are a vertex $v' \in V(G)$ and a set $S \subseteq V(G)$ such that $v' \in I^2(S) \setminus I(S)$. This implies that v' there is a cycle containing v' . Let C be a smallest cycle of G that contains v' such that, for all $q \in V(C) \setminus \{v'\}$, $q \in I(S)$, and there exists $w' \in V(C) \setminus \{v'\}$ such that $w' \in I(S) \setminus S$. Let D be a cycle that contains w' such that, for all $q \in V(D) \setminus \{w'\}$, $q \in S$. Since $v' \in I^2(S) \setminus I(S)$, v' has at most one neighbor in $V(D) \setminus \{w'\}$. Note that the cycles C and D do exist, since $v' \in I^2(S) \setminus I(S)$ and $w' \in I(S) \setminus S$. Also, since C is the smallest cycle of G that contains v' such that, for all $q \in V(C) \setminus \{v'\}$, $q \in I(S)$, and there is no cycle Q that contains v' such that, for all $q \in V(Q) \setminus \{v'\}$, $q \in S$, then we can infer that C is an induced cycle.

We can see the induced cycle C as two vertex-disjoint paths both with ends at v' and w' , one of which we name P . Define v as the first vertex that is not in D and has at most one neighbor in $V(D) \setminus \{w'\}$ we find when we go through P starting at w' , and let w be its neighbor in P that is closest to w' . Since v' is not in D and has at most one neighbor in $V(D) \setminus \{w'\}$, such pair of vertices v and w are well defined.

First, suppose that $w \in V(D)$. If, $w' = w$, v has at most one neighbor in $V(D) \setminus \{w\}$, as v has at most one neighbor in $V(D) \setminus \{w'\}$. If $w' \neq w$, v has exactly one neighbor in $V(D) \setminus \{w'\}$, which is w . Hence, v has at most one neighbor in $V(D) \setminus \{w\}$. Thus, either way, v has at most one neighbor in $V(D) \setminus \{w\}$ and $v \notin V(D)$, which implies that $G[V(C) \cup V(D)] \in R(v, w)$. Fig. 7 illustrates this case.

Now, suppose that $w \notin V(D)$. Then, by its own definition, w has two or more neighbors in $V(D) \setminus \{w'\}$ because, otherwise, w would be actually v and not w . Let x and y be such neighbors of w in $V(D) \setminus \{w'\}$. Since D




Figure 7: An example for the case where $w \in V(D)$, where $w \neq w'$. Set S is represented by the gray vertices. The cycle C is denoted by the blue edges and the cycle D by the red edges.

is a (not necessarily chordless) cycle, there exists a path P with ends in x and y in D that avoids w' entirely. Let C' be the cycle formed by P and the vertex w . Note that $V(P) \subseteq V(D)$, which implies that $V(C') \setminus \{w\} \subseteq V(D)$. So, since v has at most one neighbor in $V(D) \setminus w'$ and $w' \notin V(C')$, then v also has at most one neighbor in $V(C') \setminus w$. We then conclude that v has at most one neighbor in $V(C') \setminus \{w\}$ and $v \notin V(D)$, which implies that $G[V(C) \cup V(C')] \in R(v, w)$. Fig. 8 illustrates this case.




Figure 8: An example for the case where $w \notin V(D)$. Set S contains the vertices in the color gray. The cycle C is denoted by the blue edges, the cycle D by the red edges, and the cycle C' by the dashed edges.

Given neighbors $v, w \in V$, in order to determine whether $R(v, w) \neq \emptyset$ or not and, if in fact $R(v, w) \neq \emptyset$, to construct a subgraph in set $R(v, w)$, we just need to construct, if it exists, an induced cycle C that contains the edge vw and then construct, if it exists, a cycle C' that contains w and does not contain v such that v has at most one neighbor in the set $V(C') \setminus \{w\}$. If there are such C and C' , $G[V(C) \cup V(C')] \in R(v, w)$, otherwise, $R(v, w) = \emptyset$. Checking the existence of C and C' can be done independently and in linear time both with simple modifications of the standard DFS. \square

Lemma 11. *Let $G = (V, E)$ be a graph, $v \in V$ and $Q \subseteq V$. If $v \in I^2(Q) \setminus I(Q)$, then there exists a hull set $S \supseteq Q$ of G such that $v \in I^2(S) \setminus I(S)$. Additionally, such hull set S can be computed in cubic time.*

Proof. Suppose that $v \in I^2(Q) \setminus I(Q)$. Let $R_0 = \{v\}$. Also, let $V' = \{v\} \cup Q \cup (V \setminus H(Q))$, that is, V' is the set of vertices consisting in the vertex v and all the vertices that are not in $H(Q) \setminus Q$. Define, for $i \geq 1$, w_i to be a vertex in $V \setminus H(Q)$ that belongs to some cycle C of $G[V' \setminus R_{i-1}]$ which also contains v if such a cycle exists. If such a cycle C exists, let $R_i = R_{i-1} \cup \{w_i\}$. If, for a given value of $i = k + 1$, such a cycle C does not exist, the sequence of sets R_i ends at the index k and we define $S = V' \setminus (\{v\} \cup R_k)$. The Fig. 9 illustrates an example with the vertex v and the sets $Q, H(Q), R_k$ and S .




Figure 9: An example of a graph with the vertex v and the sets Q , represented by the gray vertices, $H(Q)$, R_3 and $S = Q \cup T$.

Note that $Q \subseteq S$, which implies that $H(Q) \subseteq H(S)$. This also implies that either $v \in I(S)$ or $v \in I^2(S) \setminus I(S)$, since $v \notin S$ and $v \in I^2(Q) \setminus I(Q)$. Therefore, in order to prove what we want, we just need to show that S is a hull set and $v \notin I(S)$.

Thus, first, let us prove that S is a hull set. To do this, we have to show that $V \setminus H(Q) \subseteq H(S)$, since $H(Q) \subseteq H(S)$. Let k be the last index of the sequence of sets R_i and let $R_k = \{w_1, w_2, \dots, w_k\}$. Each vertex in $V \setminus H(Q)$ is either in R_k or in S , so, in fact, we just need to show that $R_k \subseteq H(S)$. First, Remember that $V' = \{v\} \cup Q \cup (V \setminus H(Q))$, which is the set consisting of basically every vertex that is not in $H(Q)$, except for v and the vertices in Q . Let $T = V \setminus (H(Q) \cup R_k)$ and thus $V' \setminus R_k = \{v\} \cup Q \cup T$. Since $T \cup Q \subseteq S$ and $v \in H(S)$, then $V' \setminus R_k \subseteq H(S)$.

Now, let us show by induction on $i = k, k-1, \dots, 0$ that $V' \setminus R_i \subseteq H(S)$, which implies that $R_k \subseteq H(S)$, since $R_k \subseteq V' \setminus R_0$. We already proved that $V' \setminus R_k \subseteq H(S)$. Let $0 \leq i \leq k-1$ and assume that $V' \setminus R_{i+1} \subseteq H(S)$. Since w_{i+1} is in a cycle in the subgraph $G[V' \setminus R_i]$ and $V' \setminus R_{i+1} \subseteq H(S)$, we have $w_{i+1} \in H(S)$, which implies that $V' \setminus R_i \subseteq H(S)$. We then conclude that S is a hull set.

Additionally, notice that v does not belong to any cycle composed only of elements of S , as v does not belong to any cycle composed only of the vertices of the subgraph $G[V' \setminus R_k]$ does not have cycles containing v , since the set R_k is the last one of its sequence. Therefore, we conclude that $v \notin I(S)$ as we wanted.

Given G, v and Q , we can compute $H(Q)$ in cubic time, by computing, for each $k > 0$ and $q \notin I^{k-1}(Q)$, whether $q \in I^k(Q)$ in linear time with a DFS. Finally, we can compute R_k , and consequently S , with an additional quadratic time by initially doing $R = \emptyset$ and successively computing whether there is a cycle in the subgraph $G[V' \setminus R]$ that has a vertex $v \in V \setminus H(Q)$ with a DFS. If there is such cycle, we add v to the set R . Otherwise, the algorithm stops and returns $S = Q \cup (V \setminus (H(Q) \cup R))$. Each iteration can be done in linear time due to the DFS, and we have $O(V(G))$ such iterations. This procedure computes S from v, Q , and G in cubic time. \square

Theorem 12. *It is possible to determine a hull set S of a graph G such that $I(S) \neq V(G)$, or that such hull set does not exist in cubic time.*

Proof. Let $G = (V, E)$ be the input graph. The algorithm that computes a hull set S of a graph G such that $I(S) \neq V(G)$ if such set exists, consists initially of checking whether there is a pair of vertices v e w such that $R_G(v, w) \neq \emptyset$ in cubic time. If there is no such pair of vertices, the algorithm stops indicating that there is no hull set S of G such that $I(S) \neq V(G)$. Otherwise, the algorithm computes in linear time a set S such that $I^2(S) \setminus I(S) \neq \emptyset$, and, finally, in cubic time, extends this set S into a hull set $S' \supseteq S$ such that $I(S') \neq V(G)$. The correctness and complexity of the algorithm follow directly from [Lemmas 10](#) and [11](#). \square

The following corollary is a direct consequence of [Theorem 12](#).

Corollary 13. *The problem PERCOLATION TIME can be decided in cubic time for $k = 2$.*

3.3. Percolation Time is NP-complete for fixed $k \geq 9$

In this subsection, we show that the problem PERCOLATION TIME is NP-complete even when $k \geq 9$ is fixed. First, let us prove the following about the gadget in Fig. 10, which we call a *perpetuation gadget*.




Figure 10: Perpetuation gadget.

Lemma 14. *Let G be a graph containing an induced subgraph H isomorphic to the graph in Fig. 10 such that all vertices of H , except possibly for p , have no neighbors outside of H . For any hull set S of G , $V(H) \subseteq I^4(S)$.*

Proof. Without loss of generality, assume that S is a minimal hull set of G , that is, any subset of S is not a hull set of G , and let $S' = S \cap (V(H) \setminus \{p\})$. Let $A = \{p_1, p_2, p_3\}$, $B = \{p_4, p_5, p_6\}$, and $C = \{p_2, p_3, p_4, p_5\}$, where the vertices p_1, p_2, p_3, p_4, p_5 and p_6 are as indicated in Fig. 10.

We can infer that $|S'| > 1$ because, otherwise, since p is an articulation point of G , we could never have $V(H) \subseteq H(S)$. Furthermore, for any $u \neq v$ in $V(H)$, if either $u, v \in A$ or $u, v \in B$, then $H(\{u, v\}) = V(H)$. So, if $|S'| \geq 3$, S would not be minimal, since, by the pigeonhole principle, if $|S'| \geq 3$, or $|S \cap A| \geq 2$ or $|S \cap B| \geq 2$ and hence we can either choose any two vertices $v, w \in S' \cap A$ or any two vertices $v, w \in S' \cap B$ so the set $(S \setminus S') \cup \{v, w\}$ is a hull set.

As a result, $S' = \{u, v\}$. This implies that or $u, v \in A$, or $u, v \in B$, or even $u, v \in C$, because only then $V(H) \subseteq H(S)$ even if $p \in S$. Thus, regardless of which of the three sets u and v are, $V(H) \subseteq I^4(S')$, which implies that $V(H) \subseteq I^4(S)$. \square

Given that the vertex p and two of its neighbors u and v form a K_3 , the purpose of a perpetuation gadget is simply to ensure that for any $k \geq 4$, if $v \in I^k(S) \setminus I^{k-1}(S)$, then $u \in I^{k+1}(S)$. Now, we can prove the main result of this subsection.

Theorem 15. *PERCOLATION TIME is NP-complete for any fixed $k \geq 9$.*

Proof. Clearly, the problem is in NP, since a hull set S of the graph G such that $I^k(S) \neq V(G)$ is a valid certificate for the instance (G, k) of the problem which can be verified in polynomial time.

Next, we introduce a polynomial reduction from the 3-SAT for $k = 9$. At the end, we show how to generalize the reduction for any fixed $k > 9$. Let φ be an instance of 3-SAT, where the set of its clauses is denoted by $\mathcal{C} = \{C_1, C_2, \dots, C_m\}$. Here, $C_i = \{\ell_1^i, \ell_2^i, \ell_3^i\}$ represents the literals of the i -th clause of φ , and the set of its variables is denoted by $\mathcal{X} = \{X_1, X_2, \dots, X_n\}$. We proceed by constructing a graph G instance of the PERCOLATION TIME for $k = 9$.

- For each clause C_i , we construct the gadget in Fig. 11, where the loops at the vertices $q_1^i, q_2^i, q_3^i, r_1^i, r_2^i, r_3^i$ and z^i represent the perpetuation gadget, with each of these vertices at the same position as the vertex p . Let V_i be the set of vertices in the clause gadget C_i ;
- For each pair of opposite literals ℓ_a^i and ℓ_b^j of the same variable, add the vertices $y_{i,a,j,b}$ and $y'_{i,a,j,b}$. Form a K_3 with the vertices w_a^i, w_b^j and $y_{i,a,j,b}$ and add a perpetuation gadget with $y'_{i,a,j,b}$ at the same position as the vertex p . Let Y be the set of vertices $y_{i,a,j,b}$ and Y' be the set of vertices $y'_{i,a,j,b}$ added in this step;
- Add a vertex x and, for each pair of vertices $y_{i,a,j,b}$ and $y'_{i,a,j,b}$, form a K_3 with the vertices $y_{i,a,j,b}, y'_{i,a,j,b}$ and x .

The construction has a polynomial number of vertices and edges with respect to the size of φ , and the construction has polynomial complexity. Let us prove that φ is satisfiable if and only if there exists a hull set S of G such that $I^8(S) \neq V(G)$.

Suppose φ is satisfiable. Given an assignment that satisfies φ , let S be the subset of vertices of G consisting of the vertices u_a^i for each literal ℓ_a^i evaluated to true in clause C_i and the vertices p_1 and p_2 of each perpetuation gadget in G . Each vertex $q_1^i, q_2^i, q_3^i, r_1^i, r_2^i, r_3^i, z^i \in I^4(S)$ and $Y' \subseteq I^4(S)$. Thus, $u_1^i, u_2^i, u_3^i \in I^5(S)$, $v_1^i, v_2^i, v_3^i \in I^6(S)$, and, consequently, $w_1^i, w_2^i, w_3^i \in I^7(S)$. We therefore conclude that, for all i , $V_i \subseteq I^7(S)$. Furthermore, since we cannot have two vertices u_a^i and u_b^j in S such that ℓ_a^i and ℓ_b^j are literal




Figure 11: The gadget for C_i . Each loop in a vertex x represents a perpetuation gadget with x being in the same position as the vertex p .

opposites, for two such literals, at least one of the two vertices w_a^i and w_b^i are in $I^7(S) \setminus I^6(S)$. This implies that $Y \subseteq I^8(S) \setminus I^7(S)$ and, consequently, since $Y' \subseteq I^4(S)$, $x \in I^9(S) \setminus I^8(S)$. In conclusion, we have that $V(G) = I^9(S)$ and $I^8(S) \neq V(G)$.

Conversely, let S be a hull set of G such that $I^8(S) \neq V(G)$. Let us prove that φ is satisfiable. According to Lemma 14, $\{q_1^i, q_2^i, q_3^i, r_1^i, r_2^i, r_3^i, z^i\} \subseteq I^4(S)$ for each i , and $Y' \subseteq I^4(S)$. Let $U_i = \{u_1^i, u_2^i, u_3^i, v_1^i, v_2^i, v_3^i\}$, for each i . Note that, for any i , U_i is co-convex set of G , that is, for any $s \in U_i$, there is no path in $G - U_i$ whose ends are both adjacent to the same vertex in U_i . This implies that, for each i , at least one of the vertices in U_i is also in S .

From the structure of the gadget in Fig. 11, we infer that $V_i \subseteq I^7(S)$, independent of the vertex of U_i belongs to S , which implies that $Y \subseteq I^8(S)$ and thus $V(G) \setminus \{x\} \subseteq I^8(S)$. Thus, as $I^8(S) \neq V(G)$, $x \in I^9(S) \setminus I^8(S)$, which implies that $Y \subseteq I^8(S) \setminus I^7(S)$. Hence, since each vertex $y_{i,a,j,b} \in I^8(S) \setminus I^7(S)$, we have that each pair of vertices w_a^i and w_b^j that represent opposite literals of the same variable cannot be both in $I^6(S)$.

We then define the following assignment for the variables in \mathcal{X} : for each

w_a^i , if $w_a^i \in I^6(S)$, then we set X_k to false if and only if $\ell_a^i = \neg X_k$, where X_k is the variable that corresponds to the literal ℓ_a^i ; and if after making these assignments, there are still variables remaining without a value assigned, we set them all to true. Note that this assignment is well defined, since, if it is assigned both true and false to any given variable, we would have some vertex of Y in $I^7(S)$, leading to a contradiction. Furthermore, for each i , there is at least one value $a \in \{1, 2, 3\}$ such that $w_a^i \in I^6(S)$, since $S \cap U_i \neq \emptyset$. Thus, we conclude that there is at least one literal evaluating to the value true in each clause, which implies that the defined assignment satisfies φ .

To achieve a reduction for any fixed $k > 9$, we simply repeat the following procedure $k - 9$ times in the constructed graph: we add one perpetuation gadget along with an additional vertex t , and we add the necessary edges to form a K_3 with the vertices x , t and the vertex p of the newly added perpetuation gadget, designating t as the new vertex x . The proof of equivalence between the instances follows the same reasoning as the one presented for $k = 9$. \square

4. Final Remarks

In this paper, we show that CONVEXITY NUMBER is NP-complete and W[1]-hard when parameterized by the solution size k for thick spiders, but polynomial for extended P_4 -laden graphs. Furthermore, for the PERCOLATION TIME, we present a linear algorithm when the input graph is a cactus and a polynomial algorithm for fixed $k \leq 2$. On the negative side, we show that it is NP-complete even when k is fixed at any value at least 9.

We leave open for further investigation the complexity of CONVEXITY NUMBER for classes related to the hierarchy of classes with few P_4 s, such as P_5 -free graphs and P_6 -free graphs, as well as other well-known classes of graphs such as planar graphs and bipartite graphs.

Furthermore, we leave open the complexity of PERCOLATION TIME for bipartite graphs and for any fixed value of k between 3 and 8. In fact, given the nature of the cycle convexity, which seems to be more complex than the P_3 convexity, we conjecture that this problem is NP-complete for any fixed $k \geq 4$ and for any fixed $k \geq 5$ in bipartite graphs as is the case in the P_3 convexity [17, 21].

References

- [1] J. Bondy, U. Murty, Graph theory, in: Graduate Texts in Mathematics, Vol. 244, Springer, 2008, p. 663.
- [2] M. Garey, D. Johnson, Computers and Intractability: A Guide to the Theory of NP-Completeness, W. H. Freeman and Co., 1979.
- [3] M. Cygan, F. V. Fomin, L. Kowalik, D. Lokshtanov, D. Marx, M. Pilipczuk, M. Pilipczuk, S. Saurabh, Parameterized Algorithms, 1st Edition, Springer, 2015.
- [4] B. Bollobás, O. Riordan, Percolation, Cambridge University Press, 2006.
- [5] R. M. Barbosa, E. M. Coelho, M. C. Dourado, D. Rautenbach, J. L. Szwarcfiter, On the Carathéodory number for the convexity of paths of order three, SIAM Journal on Discrete Mathematics 26 (3) (2012) 929–939.
- [6] I. Pelayo, Geodesic Convexity in Graphs, Springer, 2013.
- [7] M. G. Everett, S. B. Seidman, The hull number of a graph, Discrete Mathematics 57 (3) (1985) 217–223.
- [8] M. Farber, R. E. Jamison, On local convexity in graphs, Discrete Mathematics 66 (3) (1987) 231–247.
- [9] M. C. Dourado, F. Protti, J. L. Szwarcfiter, Complexity results related to monophonic convexity, Discrete Applied Mathematics 158 (12) (2010) 1268–1274.
- [10] P. Duchet, Convex sets in graphs, II. Minimal path convexity, Journal of Combinatorial Theory, Series B 44 (3) (1988) 307–316.
- [11] M. Farber, R. E. Jamison, Convexity in graphs and hypergraphs, SIAM Journal on Algebraic Discrete Methods 7 (3) (1986) 433–444.
- [12] J. Araujo, G. Ducoffe, N. Nisse, K. Suchan, On interval number in cycle convexity, Discret. Math. Theor. Comput. Sci. 20 (1(1)) (2018) 1–28.
- [13] J. Araujo, V. Campos, D. Girão, J. Nogueira, A. Salgueiro, A. Silva, On the hull number on cycle convexity of graphs, Information Processing Letters 183 (2024) 106420.

- [14] L. Jaffke, O. Kwon, J. Telle, Mim-width ii. the feedback vertex set problem, *Algorithmica* 82 (2020) 118–145.
- [15] G. Chartrand, P. Zhang, Convex sets in graphs, *Congr. Numer.* 136 (1999) 19–32.
- [16] G. Chartrand, C. Wall, P. Zhang, The convexity number of a graph, *Graphs and Combin.* 18 (2) (2002) 209–217.
- [17] F. Benevides, V. Campos, M. C. Dourado, R. M. Sampaio, A. Silva, The maximum time of 2-neighbour bootstrap percolation: Algorithmic aspects, *European Journal of Combinatorics* 48 (2015) 88–99, selected Papers of EuroComb’13.
- [18] C. T. Hoàng, A class of perfect graphs, Master’s thesis, McGill University (2015).
- [19] V. Giakoumakis, P4-laden graphs: A new class of brittle graphs, *Information Processing Letters* 60 (1) (1996) 29–36.
- [20] V. Chvátal, C. T. Hoàng, N. V. R. Mahadev, D. D. Werra, Four classes of perfectly orderable graphs, *Journal of Graph Theory* 11 (4) (1987) 481–495.
- [21] T. Marcilon, R. Sampaio, The maximum time of 2-neighbor bootstrap percolation: Complexity results, *Theoretical Computer Science* 708 (2018) 1–17.