

Shortest Reconfiguration Sequence for Sliding Tokens on Spiders

Duc A. Hoang¹ Amanj Khorramian² Ryuhei Uehara¹ August 26–27, 2018

¹School of Information Science, JAIST, Japan

 $^2 {\sf University}$ of Kurdistan, Sanandaj, Iran



Reconfiguration and Sliding Tokens

Reconfiguration: An Overview









15-puzzle

Rubik's Cube

RUSH-HOUR

They are all examples of Reconfiguration Problems:



two configurations, and a specific rule describing how a configuration can be transformed into a (slightly) different one



whether one can transform one configuration into another by applying the given rule repeatedly

The figures were originally downloaded from various online sources, especially Wikipedia



New insights into the computational complexity theory



Two configurations A, B, and a transformation rule Decide if A can be transformed into BA transformation sequence between them? A shortest transformation sequence between them?

See also the "Masterclass Talk: Algorithms and Complexity for Japanese Puzzles" by R. Uehara at ICALP 2015 The figures were originally downloaded from various online sources, especially Wikipedia





See also the "Masterclass Talk: Algorithms and Complexity for Japanese Puzzles" by R. Uehara at ICALP 2015 The figures were originally downloaded from various online sources, especially Wikipedia



Assignment \equiv Vertex-Coloring Re-assign \equiv Re-color Vertices Robots & Obstacles \equiv Tokens Moving Robots \equiv Sliding Tokens





Surveys on Reconfiguration

Jan van den Heuvel (2013). "The Complexity of Change". In: *Surveys in Combinatorics*. Vol. 409. London Mathematical Society Lecture Note Series. Cambridge University Press, pp. 127–160. DOI: 10.1017/CB09781139506748.005

Naomi Nishimura (2018). "Introduction to Reconfiguration". In: *Algorithms* 11.4. (article 52). DOI: 10.3390/a11040052

Online Web Portal

http://www.ecei.tohoku.ac.jp/alg/core/

The SLIDING TOKEN problem



SLIDING TOKEN [Hearn and Demaine 2005]



Ask

two independent sets (token sets) I, J of a graph G, and the Token Sliding (TS) rule whether there is a TS-sequence that transforms I into J (and vice versa)



A TS-sequence that transforms $I = I_1$ into $J = I_5$. Vertices of an independent set are marked with black circles (tokens).

Note: This is a variant of SLIDING-BLOCK PUZZLE

The Shortest Sliding Token problem







Ask

a yes-instance (G, I, J) of SLIDING TOKEN, where I, J are independent sets of a graph G find a shortest TS-sequence that transforms I into J (and vice versa)



A shortest TS-sequence that transforms $I = I_1$ into $J = I_5$. Vertices of an independent set are marked with black circles (tokens).

Note: This is a variant of SLIDING-BLOCK PUZZLE



Theorem (Kamiński et al. 2012)

It is is NP-complete to decide if there is a TS-sequence having at most ℓ token-slides between two independent sets I, J of a perfect graph G even when ℓ is polynomial in |V(G)|.

Theorem (Kamiński et al. 2012)

SHORTEST SLIDING TOKEN can be solved in linear time for cographs (P_4 -free graphs).

Theorem (Yamada and Uehara 2016)

SHORTEST SLIDING TOKEN can be solved in polynomial time for proper interval graphs, trivially perfect graphs, and caterpillars.



Very recently, it has been announced that

Theorem (Sugimori, AAAC 2018)

SHORTEST SLIDING TOKEN can be solved in O(poly(n)) when the input graph is a tree T on n vertices.

- Sugimori-san's algorithm uses a dynamic programming approach. (We believe that it is correct.)
- The order of poly(n) seems to be large.



Very recently, it has been announced that

Theorem (Sugimori, AAAC 2018)

SHORTEST SLIDING TOKEN can be solved in O(poly(n)) when the input graph is a tree T on n vertices.

- Sugimori-san's algorithm uses a dynamic programming approach. (We believe that it is correct.)
- The order of poly(n) seems to be large.

Theorem (Our Result)

SHORTEST SLIDING TOKEN can be solved in $O(n^2)$ when the input graph is a spider G (i.e., a tree having exactly one vertex of degree at least 3) on n vertices.

• We hope that our algorithm provides new insights into improving Sugimori-san's algorithm.



SHORTEST SLIDING TOKEN for Spiders

Spider Graphs





A spider graph

A spider G is specified in terms of

- $\bullet\,$ a body vertex v whose degree is at least 3; and
- $d = \deg_G(v)$ legs L_1, L_2, \dots, L_d attached to v



The body vertex \boldsymbol{v} is crucial. Roughly speaking, we explicitly construct a shortest TS-sequence when

- $\max\{|I \cap N_G(v)|, |J \cap N_G(v)|\} = 0$ No token is in the neighbor $N_G(v)$ of v
- $\max\{|I \cap N_G(v)|, |J \cap N_G(v)|\} \leq 1$ At most one token (from either *I* or *J*) is in the neighbor $N_G(v)$ of v
- $\max\{|I \cap N_G(v)|, |J \cap N_G(v)|\} \ge 2$ At least two tokens (from either *I* or *J*) are in the neighbor $N_G(v)$ of v



A target assignment is simply a bijective mapping $f:I\rightarrow J.$ Observe that

- Any TS-sequence S induces a target assignment f_S .
- Thus, each S uses at least $\sum_{w \in I} {\rm dist}_G(w, f_S(w))$ token-slides.

Indeed,

Lemma (Key Lemma)

One can construct in linear time a target assignment f that minimizes $\sum_{w \in I} \text{dist}_G(w, f(w))$, where $\text{dist}_G(x, y)$ denotes the distance between two vertices x, y of a spider G.

Case 1: $\max\{|I \cap N_G(v)|, |J \cap N_G(v)|\} = 0$





Observation

In the figure above, w can be moved to f(w) along the shortest path $P_{wf(w)}$ between them only after both x and y are moved.

Case 1: $\max\{|I \cap N_G(v)|, |J \cap N_G(v)|\} = 0$





Observation

In the figure above, w can be moved to f(w) along the shortest path $P_{wf(w)}$ between them only after both x and y are moved.

Theorem

When $\max\{|I \cap N_G(v)|, |J \cap N_G(v)|\} = 0$, one can construct a (shortest) TS-sequence using M^* token-slides between I and J, where $M^* = \min_{target assignment f} \sum_{w \in I} \operatorname{dist}_G(w, f(w))$. Moreover, this construction takes $O(|V(G)|^2)$ time. **Hint:** The Key Lemma allows us to pick a "good" target assignment, and the above observation tells us which token should be moved first.

Detour



We say that a TS-sequence S makes detour over an edge $e = xy \in E(G)$ if S at some time moves a token from x to y, and at some other time moves a token from y to x.



S makes detour over $e = v_4 v_5$

Case 2: $\max\{|I \cap N_G(v)|, |J \cap N_G(v)|\} \le 1$



Special Case

- w and f(w) are both placed in $N_G(v) \cap V(L_i)$;
- the number of *I*-tokens and *J*-tokens in *L_i* are equal.



In this case, any TS-sequence must (at least) make detour over either e_1 or e_2 .

- To handle this case, simply move both w and f(w) to v. The problem now reduces to **Case 1**.
- This is not true when each leg of G contains the same number of I-tokens and J-tokens. However, this case is easy and can be handled separately.
- When the above case does not happen, slightly modify the instance to reduce to **Case 1**.

Case 3: $\max\{|I \cap N_G(v)|, |J \cap N_G(v)|\} \ge 2$



We consider only the case $|I \cap N_G(v)| \ge 2$ and $|J \cap N_G(v)| \le 1$. Other cases are similar.



Take S_i with minimum length

- For any TS-sequence S, exactly one of the $d = \deg_G(v)$ situations (as in the above example) must happen.
- Applying the above trick (regardless of *J*-tokens) reduces the problem to known cases (either **Case 1** or **Case 2**).

Case 3: $\max\{|I \cap N_G(v)|, |J \cap N_G(v)|\} \ge 2$

JAPAN advanced institute of science and technolog

Issue

We don't know exactly how many detours the constructed sequence ${\cal S}$ performs.

Involve the following directed auxiliary graph A(G, I, J).

•
$$V(A(G, I, J)) = V(G)$$
; and

•
$$E(A(G, I, J)) = \left\{ (x, y) : xy \in E(G) \text{ and } |I \cap V(G_y^x)| \le |J \cap V(G_y^x)| \right\},$$

where G_y^x is the subtree induced by y and its descendants when regarding x as root.



Case 3: $\max\{|I \cap N_G(v)|, |J \cap N_G(v)|\} \ge 2$

JARN ADVANCED INSTITUTE OI SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOG

Issue

We don't know exactly how many detours the constructed sequence ${\cal S}$ performs.

Involve the following directed auxiliary graph A(G, I, J).

•
$$V(A(G, I, J)) = V(G)$$
; and

•
$$\begin{split} E(A(G,I,J)) &= \bigg\{ (x,y) : xy \in \\ E(G) \text{ and } \big| I \cap V(G_y^x) \big| \leq \\ \big| J \cap V(G_y^x) \big| \bigg\}, \end{split}$$

where G_y^x is the subtree induced by y and its descendants when regarding x as root.





Conclusion

Conclusion



- We provided a $O(n^2)$ -time algorithm for solving SHORTEST SLIDING TOKEN for spiders on n vertices.
- A shortest TS-sequence is explicitly constructed, along with the number of detours it makes.
- Our algorithm is optimal in the number of token-slides, as there exists a TS-sequence having $\Omega(n^2)$ token-slides (see Demaine et al. 2015).

Future Work

Extend the framework in order to improve Sugimori-san's algorithm for SHORTEST SLIDING TOKEN for trees.

Bibliography i



Demaine, Erik D., Martin L. Demaine, Eli Fox-Epstein, Duc A. Hoang, Takehiro Ito, Hirotaka Ono, Yota Otachi, Ryuhei Uehara, and Takeshi Yamada (2015). "Linear-time algorithm for sliding tokens on trees". In: Theoretical Computer Science 600, pp. 132-142. DOI: 10.1016/j.tcs.2015.07.037.

Hearn, Robert A. and Erik D. Demaine (2005). "PSPACE-Completeness of Sliding-Block Puzzles and Other Problems through the Nondeterministic Constraint Logic Model of Computation". In: Theoretical Computer Science 343.1-2, pp. 72–96. DOI: 10.1016/j.tcs.2005.05.008.



Heuvel, Jan van den (2013). "The Complexity of Change". In: Surveys in Combinatorics. Vol. 409. London Mathematical Society Lecture Note Series. Cambridge University Press, pp. 127–160. DOI: 10.1017/CB09781139506748.005.



- Kamiński, Marcin, Paul Medvedev, and Martin Milanič (2012).
 "Complexity of independent set reconfigurability problems". In: *Theoretical Computer Science* 439, pp. 9–15. DOI: 10.1016/j.tcs.2012.03.004.
 Nishimura, Naomi (2018). "Introduction to Reconfiguration". In:
 - Nishimura, Naomi (2018). "Introduction to Reconfiguration". In: *Algorithms* 11.4. (article 52). DOI: 10.3390/a11040052.
 - Yamada, Takeshi and Ryuhei Uehara (2016). "Shortest reconfiguration of sliding tokens on a caterpillar". In: *Proceedings of WALCOM 2016*. Ed. by Mohammad Kaykobad and Rossella Petreschi. Vol. 9627. LNCS. Springer, pp. 236–248. DOI: 10.1007/978-3-319-30139-6_19.