

# Linear kernels for $k$ -tuple and liar's domination in bounded genus graphs

Arijit Bishnu  
ACM Unit  
Indian Statistical Institute  
Kolkata, INDIA  
arijit@isical.ac.in

Arijit Ghosh <sup>\*†</sup>  
D1: Algorithms & Complexity  
Max-Planck-Institut für Informatik  
Saarbrücken, Germany  
agosh@mpi-inf.mpg.de

Subhabrata Paul  
ACM Unit  
Indian Statistical Institute  
Kolkata, INDIA  
paulsubhabrata@gmail.com

August 19, 2014

## Abstract

A set  $D \subseteq V$  is called a *k-tuple dominating set* of a graph  $G = (V, E)$  if  $|N_G[v] \cap D| \geq k$  for all  $v \in V$ , where  $N_G[v]$  denotes the closed neighborhood of  $v$ . A set  $D \subseteq V$  is called a *liar's dominating set* of a graph  $G = (V, E)$  if

- (i)  $|N_G[v] \cap D| \geq 2$  for all  $v \in V$ , and
- (ii) for every pair of distinct vertices  $u, v \in V$ ,  $|(N_G[u] \cup N_G[v]) \cap D| \geq 3$ .

Given a graph  $G$ , the decision versions of  $k$ -TUPLE DOMINATION PROBLEM and the LIAR'S DOMINATION PROBLEM are to check whether there exists a  $k$ -tuple dominating set and a liar's dominating set of  $G$  of a given cardinality, respectively. These two problems are known to be NP-complete [LC03, Sla09]. In this paper, we study the parameterized complexity of these problems. We show that the  $k$ -TUPLE DOMINATION PROBLEM and the LIAR'S DOMINATION PROBLEM are W[2]-hard for general graphs but they admit linear kernels for graphs with bounded genus.

**Keywords.**  $k$ -tuple domination, liar's domination, planar graphs, bounded genus graphs, kernelization, and W[2]-hard

---

<sup>\*</sup>Supported by the Indo-German Max Planck Center for Computer Science (IMPECS).

<sup>†</sup>Part of this work was done when the author was a visiting scientist in ACM Unit, Indian Statistical Institute, Kolkata.

# 1 Introduction

Let  $G = (V, E)$  be a graph. For a vertex  $v \in V$ , let  $N_G(v) = \{u \in V \mid uv \in E\}$  and  $N_G[v] = N_G(v) \cup \{v\}$  denote the open and closed neighborhoods of  $v$ , respectively. A set  $D \subseteq V$  is called a *dominating set* of a graph  $G = (V, E)$  if  $|N_G[v] \cap D| \geq 1$  for all  $v \in V$ . The *domination number* of a graph  $G$ , denoted by  $\gamma(G)$ , is the minimum cardinality of a dominating set of  $G$ . The concept of domination has been well studied. Depending upon various applications, different variations of domination have appeared in the literature [HHS98a, HHS98b].

Among different variations of domination,  $k$ -tuple domination and liar's domination are two important and well studied type of domination [HH00, LC02, LC03, RS09, Sla09]. A set  $D \subseteq V$  is called a  *$k$ -tuple dominating set* of a graph  $G = (V, E)$  if each vertex  $v \in V$  is dominated by at least  $k$  number of vertices in  $D$ , that is,  $|N_G[v] \cap D| \geq k$  for all  $v \in V$ . The concept of  $k$ -tuple domination in graphs was introduced in [HH00]. For  $k = 2$  and  $3$ , it is called *double domination* and *triple domination* respectively. The  *$k$ -tuple domination number* of a graph  $G$ , denoted by  $\gamma_k(G)$ , is the minimum cardinality of a  $k$ -tuple dominating set of  $G$ . It is a simple observation that for the existence of a  $k$ -tuple dominating set, we need  $\delta(G) \geq k - 1$ , where  $\delta(G)$  is the minimum degree of  $G$ . On the other hand, liar's domination is a new variation of domination and was introduced in 2009 by Slater [Sla09]. A set  $D \subseteq V$  is called a *liar's dominating set* of a graph  $G = (V, E)$  if the following two conditions are met:

**condition (i)**  $|N_G[v] \cap D| \geq 2$  for all  $v \in V$

**condition (ii)** for every pair of distinct vertices  $u, v \in V$ ,  $|(N_G[u] \cup N_G[v]) \cap D| \geq 3$

In a network guarding scenario, if sentinels are placed in the vertices of the dominating set, then the graph (network) is guarded. Consider the situation where a single sentinel is unreliable or lies and we do not know the exact sentinel that lies. We then need a liar's dominating set to guard the network. The *liar's domination number* of a graph  $G$ , denoted by  $\gamma_{LR}(G)$ , is the minimum cardinality of a liar's dominating set of  $G$ . Formally, the decision versions of  $k$ -TUPLE DOMINATION PROBLEM and LIAR'S DOMINATION PROBLEM are defined as follows.

## $k$ -TUPLE DOMINATION PROBLEM

*Instance:* A graph  $G = (V, E)$  and a nonnegative integer  $p$ .

*Question:* Does there exist a  $k$ -tuple dominating set of cardinality at most  $p$ ?

## LIAR'S DOMINATION PROBLEM

*Instance:* A graph  $G = (V, E)$  and a nonnegative integer  $p$ .

*Question:* Does there exist a liar's dominating set of cardinality at most  $p$ ?

Note that, every liar's dominating set is a double dominating set and every triple dominating set is a liar's dominating set. Hence, liar's domination number lies between double and triple domination number, that is,  $\gamma_2(G) \leq \gamma_{LR}(G) \leq \gamma_3(G)$ .

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. Section 2 introduces some pertinent definitions and preliminary results that are used in the rest of the paper and a brief review on the progress in the study of parametrization for domination problems. Section 3 deals with the hardness results of both  $k$ -tuple domination problem and liar's domination problem. In Section 4, we show that

both  $k$ -TUPLE DOMINATION PROBLEM and LIAR'S DOMINATION PROBLEM admit linear kernel in planar graphs. In Section 5, we extend the results for bounded genus graphs. Finally, Section 6 concludes the paper.

## 2 Preliminaries

Let  $G = (V, E)$  be a graph. Let  $G[S]$ ,  $S \subseteq V$  denote the induced subgraph of  $G$  on the vertex set  $S$ . The *distance* between two vertices  $u$  and  $v$  in a graph  $G$  is the number of edges in a shortest path connecting them and is denoted as  $d_G(u, v)$ . The degree of a vertex  $v \in V(G)$ , denoted by  $deg_G(v)$ , is the number of neighbors of  $v$ .

### 2.1 Graphs on surfaces

In this subsection, we recall some basic facts about graphs on surfaces following the discussion in [FT04]. The readers are referred to [MT01] for more details. A *surface*  $\Sigma$  is a compact 2-manifold without boundary. Let  $\Sigma_0$  denote the sphere  $\{(x, y, z) \mid x^2 + y^2 + z^2 = 1\}$ . A *line* and *O-arc* are subsets of  $\Sigma$  that are homeomorphic to  $[0, 1]$  and a circle respectively. A subset of  $\Sigma$  meeting the drawing only in vertices of  $G$  is called *G-normal*. If an O-arc is G-normal, then it is called a *noose*. The length of a noose is the number of its vertices. The *representativity* of  $G$  embedded in  $\Sigma \neq \Sigma_0$  is the smallest length of a non-contractible noose in  $\Sigma$  and it is denoted by  $rep(G)$ .

The classification theorem for surfaces states that, any surface  $\Sigma$  is homeomorphic to either a surface  $\Sigma^h$  which is obtained from a sphere by adding  $h$  handles (orientable surface), or a surface  $\Sigma^k$  which is obtained from a sphere by adding  $k$  crosscaps (non-orientable surface) [MT01]. The *Euler genus* of a non-orientable surface  $\Sigma$ , denoted by  $eg(\Sigma)$ , is the number of crosscaps  $k$  such that  $\Sigma \cong \Sigma^k$  and for an orientable surface,  $eg(\Sigma)$  is twice the number of handles  $h$  such that  $\Sigma \cong \Sigma^h$ . Given a graph  $G$ , Euler genus of  $G$ , denoted by  $eg(G)$ , is the minimum  $eg(\Sigma)$ , where  $\Sigma$  is a surface in which  $G$  can be embedded. The *Euler characteristic* of a surface  $\Sigma$  is defined as  $\chi(\Sigma) = 2 - eg(\Sigma)$ . For a graph  $G$ ,  $\chi(G)$  denotes the largest number  $t$  for which  $G$  can be embedded on a surface  $\Sigma$  with  $\chi(\Sigma) = t$ . Let  $G = (V, E)$  be a 2-cell embedded graph in  $\Sigma$ , that is, all the faces of  $G$  is homeomorphic to an open disk. If  $F$  is the set of all faces, then *Euler's formula* tells that  $V - E + F = \chi(\Sigma) = 2 - eg(\Sigma)$ .

Next we define a process called *cutting along a noose*  $N$ . Although the formal defi is given in [MT01], we follow a more intuitive defi given in [FT04]. Let  $N$  be a noose in a  $\Sigma$ -embedded graph  $G = (V, E)$ . Suppose for any  $v \in N \cap V$ , there exists an open disk  $\Delta$  such that  $\Delta$  contains  $v$  and for every edge  $e$  adjacent to  $v$ ,  $e \cap \Delta$  is connected. We also assume that  $\Delta - N$  has two connected components  $\Delta_1$  and  $\Delta_2$ . Thus we can define partition of  $N_G(v) = N_G^1(v) \cup N_G^2(v)$ , where  $N_G^1(v) = \{u \in N_G(v) \mid uv \cap \Delta_1 \neq \emptyset\}$  and  $N_G^2(v) = \{u \in N_G(v) \mid uv \cap \Delta_2 \neq \emptyset\}$ . Now for each  $v \in N \cap V$  we do the following:

1. remove  $v$  and its incident edges
2. introduce two new vertices  $v^1, v^2$  and
3. connect  $v^i$  with the vertices in  $N_G^i$ ,  $i = 1, 2$ .

The resulting graph  $\mathcal{G}$  is obtained from  $\Sigma$ -embedded graph  $G$  by cutting along  $N$ . The following lemma is very useful in the proofs by induction on the genus.

**Lemma 1** [FT04] *Let  $G$  be a  $\Sigma$ -embedded graph and let  $\mathcal{G}$  be a graph obtained from  $G$  by cutting along a non-contractible noose  $N$ . Then one of the following holds*

- $\mathcal{G}$  is the disjoint union of graphs  $G_1$  and  $G_2$  that can be embedded in surfaces  $\Sigma_1$  and  $\Sigma_2$  such that  $eg(\Sigma) = eg(\Sigma_1) + eg(\Sigma_2)$  and  $eg(\Sigma_i) > 0, i = 1, 2$ .
- $\mathcal{G}$  can be embedded in a surface with Euler genus strictly smaller than  $eg(\Sigma)$ .

A planar graph  $G = (V, E)$  is a graph that can be embedded in the plane. We term such an embedding as a *plane graph*.

## 2.2 Parameterization and domination

A *parameterized problem* is a language  $L \subseteq \Sigma^* \times \mathbb{N}$ , where  $\Sigma^*$  denotes the set of all finite strings over a finite alphabet  $\Sigma$ . A parameterized problem  $L$  is *fixed-parameter tractable* if the question “ $(x, p) \in L$ ” can be decided in time  $f(p) \cdot |x|^{O(1)}$ , where  $f$  is a computable function on nonnegative integers,  $x$  is the instance of the problem and  $p$  is the parameter. The corresponding complexity class is called FPT. Next we define a reducibility concept between two parameterized problems.

**Definition 2** [DF99, Nie06] *Let  $L, L' \subseteq \Sigma^* \times \mathbb{N}$  be two parameterized problems. We say that  $L$  reduces to  $L'$  by a standard parameterized m-reduction if there are functions  $p \mapsto p'$  and  $p \mapsto p''$  from  $\mathbb{N}$  to  $\mathbb{N}$  and a function  $(x, p) \mapsto x'$  from  $\Sigma^* \times \mathbb{N}$  to  $\Sigma^*$  such that*

1.  $(x, p) \mapsto x'$  is computable in time  $p''|x|^c$  for some constant  $c$  and
2.  $(x, p) \in L$  if and only if  $(x', p') \in L'$ .

A parameterized problem is in the class  $W[i]$ , if every instance  $(x, p)$  can be transformed (in fpt-time) to a combinatorial circuit that has height at most  $i$ , such that  $(x, p) \in L$  if and only if there is a satisfying assignment to the inputs, which assigns 1 to at most  $p$  inputs. A problem  $L$  is said to be *W[i]-hard* if there exists a standard parameterized m-reduction from all the problems in  $W[i]$  to  $L$  and in addition, if the problem is in  $W[i]$ , then it is called *W[i]-complete*.

Next we define the reduction to problem kernel, also simply referred to as *kernelization*.

**Definition 3** [Nie06] *Let  $L$  be a parameterized problem. By reduction to problem kernel, we mean to replace instance  $I$  and the parameter  $p$  of  $L$  by a “reduced” instance  $I'$  and by another parameter  $p'$  in polynomial time such that*

- $p' \leq c \cdot p$ , where  $c$  is a constant,
- $I' \leq g(p)$ , where  $g$  is a function that depends only on  $p$ , and
- $(I, p) \in L$  if and only if  $(I', p') \in L$ .

The reduced instance  $I'$  is called the *problem kernel* and the size of the problem kernel is said to be bounded by  $g(p)$ .

In parameterized complexity, domination and its variations are well studied problems. The decision version of domination problem is  $W[2]$ -complete for general graphs [DF99]. But this problem is FPT when restricted to planar graphs [AFN04a] though it is still NP-complete for this

graph class [GJ79]. Furthermore, for bounded genus graphs, which is a super class of planar graphs, domination problem remains FPT [FT04]. It was proved that dominating set problem possesses a linear kernel in planar graphs [AFN04a] and in bounded genus graphs [FT04]. Also domination problem admits polynomial kernel on graphs excluding a fixed graph  $H$  as a minor [Gut09] and on  $d$ -degenerated graphs [PRS12]. A search tree based algorithm for domination problem on planar graphs, which runs in  $O(8^p n)$  time, is proposed in [AFF<sup>+</sup>05]. For bounded genus graphs, similar search tree based algorithm is proposed in [EFF04] and has a time complexity of  $O((4g + 40)^p n^2)$ , where  $g$  is the genus of the graph. Algorithms with running time of  $O(c\sqrt{p}n)$  for domination problem on planar graphs have been devised in [ABF<sup>+</sup>02, AFN04b, FT03, FT04]. Like domination problem,  $k$ -TUPLE DOMINATION PROBLEM and LIAR'S DOMINATION PROBLEM are both NP-complete [LC03, Sla09] for general graphs. However, these problems have been polynomially solved for different graph classes [LC02, LC03, PP13a, PP13b]. But for planar graphs and hence for graphs with bounded genus,  $k$ -TUPLE DOMINATION PROBLEM remains NP-complete [LC08]. In [Sla09], though the NP-completeness proof is given for general graphs, it can be verified that using the same construction one can find the NP-completeness of LIAR'S DOMINATION PROBLEM in planar graphs, see Lemma 26 in Appendix 7.

Some generalization of classical domination problem have been studied in the literature from parameterized point of view. Among those problems,  $k$ -dominating threshold set problem,  $[\sigma, \rho]$ -dominating set problem (also known as generalized domination) are generalized version of  $k$ -tuple dominating set problem. In [GV08], it is proved that  $k$ -dominating threshold set problem is FPT in  $d$ -degenerated graphs.  $[\sigma, \rho]$ -domination is studied in [CP14, TP97, vRBR09]. A set  $D$  of vertices of a graph  $G$  is  $[\sigma, \rho]$ -dominating set if for any  $v \in D$ ,  $|N(v) \cap D| \in \sigma$  and for any  $v \notin D$ ,  $|N(v) \cap D| \in \rho$  for any two sets  $\sigma$  and  $\rho$ . It is known that  $[\sigma, \rho]$ -domination is FPT when parameterized by treewidth [vRBR09]. By Theorem 32 of [ABF<sup>+</sup>02], it follows that  $k$ -tuple domination is FPT on planar graphs. But there is no explicit kernel for both  $k$ -tuple domination and liar's domination problem in the literature.

There have been successful efforts in developing meta-theorems like the celebrated Courcelle's theorem [Cou92] which states that all graph properties definable in monadic second order logic can be decided in linear time on graphs of bounded tree-width. This also implies FPT algorithms for bounded tree-width graph for these problems. In case of kernelization in bounded genus graphs, Bodlaender et al. give two meta-theorems [BFL<sup>+</sup>09]. The first theorem says that all problems expressible in counting monadic second order (CMSO) logic and satisfying a coverability property admit a polynomial kernel on graphs of bounded genus and the second theorem says that all problems that have a finite integer index and satisfy a weaker coverability property admit a linear kernel on graphs of bounded genus. It is easy to see that both  $k$ -tuple and liar's domination problems can be expressed in CMSO logic. Let  $G = (V, E)$  be an instance of a graph problem  $\Pi$  such that  $G$  is embeddable in a surface of Euler genus at most  $r$ . The basic idea of quasi-coverable property for  $\Pi$  is that there exists a set  $S \subseteq V$  satisfying the conditions of  $\Pi$  such that the tree-width of  $G \setminus R_G^r(S)$  is at most  $r$  where  $R_G^r(S)$  is a special type of reachability set from  $S$ . In domination type of problems, this reachability set is actually the whole graph and hence these problems satisfy the quasi-coverable property. The basic idea of strong monotonicity for a graph problem  $\Pi$  is roughly as follows: Let  $\mathcal{F}_i$  be a class of graphs  $G$  having a specific set of vertices  $S$  termed as the boundary of  $G$  such that  $|S| = i$ . The glued graph  $G = G_1 \oplus G_2$  of  $G_1$  and  $G_2$  is the graph which is obtained by taking the disjoint union of  $G_1$  and  $G_2$  and joining  $i$  edges between the vertices of the boundary sets. A problem  $\Pi$  is said to satisfy the strong monotonicity if for every

boundaried graph  $G = (V, E) \in \mathcal{F}_i$ , there exists a set  $W \subseteq V$  of a specific cardinality which satisfy the property of  $\Pi$  such that for every boundaried graph  $G' = (V', E') \in \mathcal{F}_i$  with a set  $W' \subseteq V'$ , satisfying the property of  $\Pi$ , the vertex set  $W \cup W'$  satisfies the property of  $\Pi$  for the glued graph  $G = G \oplus G'$ . It can be verified easily that both  $k$ -tuple domination and liar's domination problems satisfy the strongly monotone property. The strongly monotone property implies the finite integer index for these problems. Hence, by the second meta-theorem in [BFL<sup>+</sup>09], both  $k$ -tuple and liar's domination problems admit linear kernels for graphs on bounded genus. Though these meta-theorems provide simple criteria to decide whether a problem admits a linear or polynomial kernel, finding a linear kernel with reasonably small constants for a specific problem is a worthy topic of further research [BFL<sup>+</sup>09]. In this paper, we have obtained linear kernels with small constants for both the problems on bounded genus graphs. We have also proved the W[2]-hardness for  $k$ -tuple and liar's domination for general graphs.

### 3 Hardness results in general graphs

In this section, we show that  $k$ -TUPLE DOMINATION PROBLEM and LIAR'S DOMINATION PROBLEM are W[2]-hard. In [CP14], it is proved that  $[\sigma, \rho]$ -domination problem for any recursive sets  $\sigma$  and  $\rho$  is W[2]-hard. This implies the hardness for  $k$ -tuple domination in general graphs. But in this paper, we have come up with a simple W[2]-hardness proof for  $k$ -tuple domination in general graphs. To prove this, we show standard parameterized m-reductions from DOMINATION PROBLEM, which is known to be W[2]-complete [DF99], to  $k$ -TUPLE DOMINATION PROBLEM and LIAR'S DOMINATION PROBLEM, respectively.

**Theorem 4**  $k$ -TUPLE DOMINATION PROBLEM is W[2]-hard.

*Proof* We show a standard parameterized m-reduction from DOMINATION PROBLEM to  $k$ -TUPLE DOMINATION PROBLEM. Let  $\langle G = (V, E), p \rangle$  be an instance of DOMINATION PROBLEM. We construct an instance  $\langle G' = (V', E'), p' \rangle$  of the  $k$ -TUPLE DOMINATION PROBLEM as follows:  $V' = V \cup V_k$  where  $V_k = \{u_1, u_2, \dots, u_k\}$  and  $E' = E \cup \{v_i u_j \mid v_i \in V \text{ and } u_j \in V_k \setminus u_k\} \cup \{u_i u_j \mid u_i, u_j \in V_k, i \neq j\}$ . Also set  $p' = p + k$ . The construction of  $G'$  from  $G$  in case of triple domination is illustrated in Figure 1.




Figure 1: Construction of  $G'$  from  $G$  for triple domination

**Claim 5**  $G$  has a dominating set of size at most  $p$  if and only if  $G'$  has a  $k$ -tuple dominating set of size at most  $p'$ .

*Proof* Let  $D$  be a dominating set of  $G$  of cardinality at most  $p$  and  $D' = D \cup V_k$ . Each  $v_i \in V$  is dominated by at least one vertex from  $D$  and by  $k - 1$  vertices from  $V_k$ . Each  $u_i \in V_k$  is dominated by  $k$  vertices of  $V_k$ . Thus,  $D'$  is a  $k$ -tuple dominating set of  $G'$  of cardinality at most  $p'$ .

Conversely, let  $D'$  be a  $k$ -tuple dominating set of  $G'$  of cardinality at most  $p'$ . Note that each  $k$ -tuple dominating set contains the set  $V_k$  because to dominate  $u_k$  by  $k$  vertices we must select all the vertices of  $V_k$ . Let  $D = D' \setminus V_k$ . Clearly  $D \subseteq V$  and  $|D| \leq p$ . Now for each  $v \in V$ ,  $|N_G[v] \cap D| \geq 1$  because otherwise, there exists a vertex  $v \in V$  such that  $|N_{G'}[v] \cap D'| = k - 1$ . This is a contradiction because  $D'$  is a  $k$ -tuple dominating set of  $G'$ . Thus  $D$  is a dominating set of  $G$  of cardinality at most  $p$ .

Hence,  $G$  has a dominating set of size at most  $p$  if and only if  $G'$  has a  $k$ -tuple dominating set of size at most  $p'$ . □

Thus,  $k$ -TUPLE DOMINATION PROBLEM is  $W[2]$ -hard. □

Next we show the  $W[2]$ -hardness of LIAR'S DOMINATION PROBLEM.

**Theorem 6** LIAR'S DOMINATION PROBLEM is  $W[2]$ -hard.

*Proof* We show a standard parameterized m-reduction from DOMINATION PROBLEM to LIAR'S DOMINATION PROBLEM. Let  $\langle G = (V, E), p \rangle$  be an instance of DOMINATION PROBLEM. We construct an instance  $\langle G' = (V', E'), p' \rangle$  of the LIAR'S DOMINATION PROBLEM as follows:  $V' = V \cup \{u, u', v, v', w\}$  and  $E' = E \cup \{v_i u \mid v_i \in V\} \cup \{v_i v \mid v_i \in V\} \cup \{uu', vv', wu, wv\}$ . Also  $p' = p + 4$ . The construction of  $G'$  from  $G$  is illustrated in Figure 2.




Figure 2: Construction of  $G'$  from  $G$

**Claim 7**  $G$  has a dominating set of size at most  $p$  if and only if  $G'$  has a liar's dominating set of size at most  $p'$ .

*Proof* Let  $D$  be a dominating set of  $G$  of cardinality at most  $p$  and  $D' = D \cup \{u, u', v, v'\}$ . It is easy to verify that for each vertex  $x \in V'$ ,  $|N_{G'}[x] \cap D'| \geq 2$  and for every pair of vertices  $x, y \in V'$ ,  $|(N_{G'}[x] \cup N_{G'}[y]) \cap D'| \geq 3$ . Hence  $D'$  is a liar's dominating set of  $G'$  of cardinality at most  $p + 4 = p'$ .

Conversely, let  $D'$  be a liar's dominating set of  $G'$  of cardinality at most  $p'$ . Each liar's dominating set must contain the set  $\{u, u', v, v'\}$  because to doubly dominate  $u'$  and  $v'$  we must select the vertices  $\{u, u', v, v'\}$ .

Let  $X \subseteq V$  denote the set of vertices that are dominated by exactly two vertices ( $u$  and  $v$ ) from  $D'$ . We claim  $|X| \leq 1$ . If there exists two such vertices  $x, y \in V$ , then  $|(N_{G'}[x] \cup N_{G'}[y]) \cap D'| = 2$  which violates condition (ii) of liar's domination. We now deal with two cases:

$|X| = 1$ : Let  $X = \{x\}$ . Here  $|N_{G'}[x] \cap D'| = 2$ . This implies  $w \in D'$ , otherwise the pair  $x$  and  $w$  violates condition (ii) of liar's domination. We set  $D'' = (D' \setminus \{w\}) \cup \{x\}$ .  $D''$  is also a liar's dominating set of  $G'$  of cardinality at most  $p'$ . Note that all vertices in  $V$  is triply dominated by  $D''$  and it does not contain  $w$ .

$|X| = 0$ : In this case each vertex of  $V$  is triply dominated by  $D'$ . Now if  $w \notin D'$ , we are done. Otherwise the set  $D' \setminus \{w\}$  forms a liar's dominating set of  $G'$  of cardinality at most  $p'$  such that each vertex of  $V$  is triply dominated by  $D' \setminus \{w\}$ .

Hence without loss of generality, we assume that there is a liar's dominating set  $D'$  of  $G'$  of cardinality at most  $p'$  such that every vertex in  $V$  is triply dominated by  $D'$  and  $w \notin D'$ . Let  $D = D' \setminus \{u, u', v, v'\}$ . Clearly  $D \subseteq V$  and  $|D| \leq p$ . Now for each  $x \in V$ ,  $|N_G[x] \cap D| \geq 1$  because otherwise, there exists a vertex  $x \in V$  such that for the pair  $x$  and  $w$ , condition (ii) of liar's domination is violated. This is a contradiction because  $D'$  is a liar's dominating set of  $G'$ . Thus  $D$  is a dominating set of  $G$  of cardinality at most  $p$ .

Hence,  $G$  has a dominating set of size at most  $p$  if and only if  $G'$  has a liar's dominating set of size at most  $p'$ . □

Thus, LIAR'S DOMINATION PROBLEM is W[2]-hard. □

## 4 Linear kernels for planar graphs

Having seen that  $k$ -tuple and liar's domination are W[2]-hard in general graphs, we focus on planar graphs in this section and show that they are FPT.

### 4.1 Double domination

In this subsection we show that DOUBLE DOMINATION PROBLEM in planar graphs possesses a linear kernel. Our proof technique uses the region decomposition idea of Alber et al. [AFN04a]. First we describe the reduction rules for kernelization.

#### 4.1.1 Reduction rule

Let  $G = (V, E)$  be the instance for DOUBLE DOMINATION PROBLEM. Consider a pair of vertices  $u, v \in V$ . Let  $N_G(u, v) = N_G(u) \cap N_G(v)$ . We partition the vertices of  $N_G(u, v)$  in to three parts



as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
N_G^1(u, v) &= \{x \in N_G(u, v) \mid N_G(x) \setminus \{N_G(u, v) \cup \{u, v\}\} \neq \emptyset\}; \\
N_G^2(u, v) &= \{x \in N_G(u, v) \setminus N_G^1(u, v) \mid N_G(x) \cap N_G^1(u, v) \neq \emptyset\}; \\
N_G^3(u, v) &= N_G(u, v) \setminus (N_G^1(u, v) \cup N_G^2(u, v)).
\end{aligned}$$

**Reduction Rule:** For every pair of distinct vertices  $u, v \in V$ , if  $N_G^3(u, v) \neq \emptyset$ , then

- delete all the vertices of  $N_G^2(u, v)$  and
- delete all vertices of  $N_G^3(u, v)$  except one vertex.

**Lemma 8** *Let  $G = (V, E)$  be a graph and  $G' = (V', E')$  be the resulting graph after having applied the reduction rule to  $G$ . Then  $\gamma_2(G) = \gamma_2(G')$ .*

*Proof* Let  $u, v \in V$  such that  $N_G^3(u, v) \neq \emptyset$ . Now if  $N_G^2(u, v) = \emptyset$  and  $|N_G^3(u, v)| = 1$ , then  $G'$  is same as  $G$ . So, without loss of generality, assume that  $|N_G^3(u, v)| > 1$  and  $N_G^2(u, v) \neq \emptyset$ . Note that a vertex  $x$  of  $N_G^3(u, v)$  can be doubly dominated by any two vertices from  $N_G[x] \subseteq \{N_G^2(u, v) \cup N_G^3(u, v) \cup \{u, v\}\}$ . Again for any two vertices  $x, y \in N_G^2(u, v) \cup N_G^3(u, v) \cup \{u, v\}$ ,  $N_G[x] \cup N_G[y] \subseteq N_G[u] \cup N_G[v]$ . This shows that we can double dominate each vertex of  $N_G^3(u, v)$  in an optimal way by selecting  $u$  and  $v$  only. This selection of  $u$  and  $v$  was forced by the only vertex  $w \in N_G^3(u, v)$  that remained in  $G'$ . We claim that  $G$  contains a minimum double dominating set  $D$  which does not contain any vertex from  $N_G^2(u, v) \cup N_G^3(u, v)$ . First observe that there can not be three or more vertices from  $N_G^2(u, v) \cup N_G^3(u, v)$  in  $D$ . If it were, then we could replace those three or more vertices by  $u$  and  $v$ , thus contradicting the minimality of  $D$ . Now for those two (or one) vertices from  $N_G^2(u, v) \cup N_G^3(u, v)$  in  $D$ , we can replace them by  $u$  and (or)  $v$ . Therefore,  $G$  contains a minimum double dominating set  $D$  which does not contain any vertex from  $N_G^2(u, v) \cup N_G^3(u, v)$ . Clearly, this set  $D$  also forms a minimum double dominating set of  $G'$ . Hence,  $\gamma_2(G) = \gamma_2(G')$ .  $\square$

In this reduction, for a pair of distinct vertices  $u, v \in V$ , we have actually deleted at most  $\min\{\deg_G(u), \deg_G(v)\}$  vertices. So, the time taken is  $\sum_{u, v \in V} \min\{\deg_G(u), \deg_G(v)\}$  for the whole reduction process. Since for a planar graph  $\sum_{v \in V} \deg_G(v) = O(n)$ , where  $n$  is the number of vertices, we have the following lemma.

**Lemma 9** *For a planar graph having  $n$  vertices, the reduction rule can be carried out in  $O(n^3)$  time.*

#### 4.1.2 A linear kernel

In this subsection, we show that the reduction rule given in the previous section yields a linear kernel for DOUBLE DOMINATION PROBLEM in planar graphs. For this proof, first we find a “maximal region decomposition” of the vertices  $V'$  of the reduced graph  $G' = (V', E')$  and then we show that  $|V'| = O(\gamma_2(G'))$ . We start with some definitions regarding maximal region decomposition following Alber et al. [AFN04a].

**Definition 10** *Let  $G = (V, E)$  be a plane graph. A closed subset of the plane is called a region  $R(u, v)$  between two vertices  $u, v$  if the following properties are met:*

1. the boundary of  $R(u, v)$  is formed by two simple paths  $P$  and  $Q$  between  $u$  and  $v$  of length at most two edges, and
2. all the vertices which are strictly inside the region  $R(u, v)$  are from  $N_G(u) \cap N_G(v)$ .

The definition of a region is slightly different from the definition given in [AFN04a], where all the vertices which are strictly inside the region  $R(u, v)$  are from  $N_G(u) \cup N_G(v)$ . Note that by the above definition, paths of length one or two between  $u$  and  $v$  can form a region  $R(u, v)$ . For a region  $R = R(u, v)$ , let  $\partial(R)$  denote the boundary of  $R$  and  $V(R)$  denote the vertices inside or on the boundary of  $R$ , i.e.,  $V(R) = \{u \in V \mid u \text{ is inside } R \text{ or on } \partial(R)\}$ .

**Definition 11** Let  $G = (V, E)$  be a plane graph and  $D \subseteq V$ . A  $D$ -region decomposition of  $G$  is a set  $\mathcal{R}$  of regions between pairs of vertices in  $D$  such that

1. for  $R(u, v) \in \mathcal{R}$  no vertices of  $D$  (except  $u$  and  $v$ ) lies in  $V(R(u, v))$ , and
2. for two regions  $R_1, R_2 \in \mathcal{R}$ ,  $(R_1 \cap R_2) \subseteq (\partial(R_1) \cup \partial(R_2))$ , i.e., they can intersect only at the vertices on the boundary.

For a  $D$ -region decomposition  $\mathcal{R}$ , we define  $V(\mathcal{R}) = \cup_{R \in \mathcal{R}} V(R)$ . A  $D$ -region decomposition  $\mathcal{R}$  is called maximal if there is no region  $R$  such that  $\mathcal{R}' = \mathcal{R} \cup R$  is a  $D$ -region decomposition, where  $V(\mathcal{R})$  is a strict subset of  $V(\mathcal{R}')$ .

First we observe an important property of a maximal  $D$ -region decomposition.

**Lemma 12** Let  $G = (V, E)$  be a plane graph with a double dominating set  $D$  and let  $\mathcal{R}$  be a maximal  $D$ -region decomposition. Then  $V = V(\mathcal{R})$ .

*Proof* Let  $v \in V$  be a vertex such that  $v \notin V(\mathcal{R})$ . There can be two cases –  $v \in D$  and  $v \notin D$ . First, let us assume that  $v \in D$ . Since  $D$  is a double dominating set of  $G$ , there exists another vertex  $x \in D$  such that  $vx \in E$ . Now, the path  $P = (x, v)$  forms a region  $R$ . Clearly  $\mathcal{R} \cup R$  forms a  $D$ -region decomposition of  $G$  which contradicts the maximality of  $\mathcal{R}$ . Let us now consider the other case  $v \notin D$ . Since  $D$  is a double dominating set of  $G$ , there exists  $x, y \in D$  such that  $vx, vy \in E$ . In this case, the path  $P = (x, v, y)$  forms a region  $R$ . Here also,  $\mathcal{R} \cup R$  forms a  $D$ -region decomposition of  $G$  which contradicts the maximality of  $\mathcal{R}$ . Thus each vertex of  $V$  is in  $V(\mathcal{R})$ , that is,  $V \subseteq V(\mathcal{R})$ . Thus  $V = V(\mathcal{R})$ .  $\square$

It is obvious that, for a plane graph  $G = (V, E)$  with a double dominating set  $D$ , there exists a maximal  $D$ -region decomposition  $\mathcal{R}$ . Based on Lemma 12, we propose a greedy algorithm to compute a maximal  $D$ -region decomposition, which is given in Algorithm 1. The algorithm basically ensures the properties of the region decomposition mentioned in Definitions 10 and 11.

Clearly Algorithm 1 output a maximal  $D$ -region decomposition in polynomial time. Next, we show that for a given plane graph  $G$  with a double dominating set  $D$ , every maximal  $D$ -region decomposition contains at most  $O(|D|)$  many regions. For that purpose, we observe that a  $D$ -region decomposition induces a graph in a very natural way.

**Definition 13** The induced graph  $G_{\mathcal{R}} = (V_{\mathcal{R}}, E_{\mathcal{R}})$  of a  $D$ -region decomposition  $\mathcal{R}$  of  $G$  is the graph with possible multiple edges which is defined as follows:  $V_{\mathcal{R}} = D$  and  $E_{\mathcal{R}} = \{(u, v) \mid \text{there is a region } R(u, v) \in \mathcal{R} \text{ between } u, v \in D\}$ .

---

**Algorithm 1:** REGION\_DECOMPOSITION( $G, D$ )

---

**Input:** A plane graph  $G = (V, E)$  and a double dominating set  $D \subseteq V$ .

**Output:** A maximal  $D$ -region decomposition  $\mathcal{R}$  of  $G$ .

**begin**

$V_{used} \leftarrow \emptyset, \mathcal{R} \leftarrow \emptyset;$

**while**  $V_{used} \neq V$  **do**

    Select a vertex  $x$  from  $V \setminus V_{used}$ ;

    Consider the set  $\mathcal{R}_x$  of all regions  $S$  with the following properties:

        1.  $S$  is a region between  $u$  and  $v$ , where  $u, v \in D$ .

        2.  $S$  contains  $x$ .

        3. no vertex from  $D \setminus \{u, v\}$  is in  $V(S)$ .

        4.  $(S \cup R) \subseteq (\partial(S) \cup \partial(R))$  for all  $R \in \mathcal{R}$ .

    Choose a region  $S_x \in \mathcal{R}_x$  which is maximal in terms of vertices;

$\mathcal{R} \leftarrow \mathcal{R} \cup \{S_x\};$

$V_{used} \leftarrow V_{used} \cup V(S_x);$

**return**( $\mathcal{R}$ );

---

Note that, since by Definition 11 the regions of a  $D$ -region decomposition do not intersect, the induced graph  $G_{\mathcal{R}}$  of a  $D$ -region decomposition  $\mathcal{R}$  is a planar graph with multiple edges. Next we bound the number of regions in a maximal  $D$ -region decomposition using the concept of *thin planar graph* following Alber et al. [AFN04a].

**Definition 14** A planar graph  $G = (V, E)$  with multiple edges is *thin* if there exists a planar embedding such that if there are two edges  $e_1, e_2$  between a pair of distinct vertices  $v, w \in V$ , then there must be two further vertices  $u_1, u_2 \in V$  which sit inside the two disjoint areas of the plane that are enclosed by  $e_1$  and  $e_2$ .

**Lemma 15** Let  $D$  be a double dominating set of a planar graph  $G = (V, E)$ . Then the induced graph  $G_{\mathcal{R}} = (V_{\mathcal{R}}, E_{\mathcal{R}})$  of a maximal  $D$ -region decomposition  $\mathcal{R}$  of  $G$  is a thin planar graph.

*Proof* Let  $R_1$  and  $R_2$  be two regions between two vertices  $v, w \in D$  and  $e_1$  and  $e_2$  be the corresponding multiple edges between two vertices  $v, w \in V_{\mathcal{R}}$ . Let  $A$  be an area enclosed by  $e_1$  and  $e_2$ . If  $A$  contains a vertex  $u \in D$ , we are done. Suppose there is no vertex of  $D$  in  $A$ . Now consider the following cases:

**There is no vertex from  $V \setminus D$  in  $A$ :** In this case, by combining the regions  $R_1$  and  $R_2$ , we can form a bigger region which is a contradiction to the maximality of  $\mathcal{R}$ .

**There is a vertex  $x \in (V \setminus D)$  in  $A$ :** In this case, if  $x$  is double dominated by  $v$  and  $w$ , then again we can combine the two regions  $R_1$  and  $R_2$  to get a bigger region. So, assume that  $x$  is dominated by some vertex  $u$  other than  $v$  and  $w$ . Since  $G$  is planar,  $u$  must be in  $A$  which contradicts the fact that  $A$  does not contain any vertex from  $D$ .

Hence, combining both the cases we see that  $G_{\mathcal{R}}$  is a thin planar graph.  $\square$

In [AFN04a], it is proved that for a thin planar graph  $G = (V, E)$ , we have  $|E| \leq 3|V| - 6$ . Hence we have the following lemma.

**Lemma 16** *For a plane graph  $G$  with a double dominating set  $D$ , every maximal  $D$ -region decomposition  $\mathcal{R}$  contains at most  $3|D|$  many regions.*

Now, if we can bound the number of vertices that belongs to any region  $R(u, v)$  of a maximal  $D$ -region decomposition  $\mathcal{R}$  by some constant factor, we are done. However, achieving this constant factor bound is not possible for any plane graph  $G$ . But in a reduced plane graph, we can obtain this bound, as shown in the following lemma.

**Lemma 17** *A region  $R$  of a plane reduced graph contains at most 6 vertices, that is,  $|V(R)| \leq 6$ .*

*Proof* Let  $R$  be the region between  $u$  and  $v$  and  $\partial(R) = \{u, x, v, y\}$ . First note that  $R$  contains at most two vertices from  $N_{G'}^1(u, v)$  and the only possibility of such vertices are  $x$  and  $y$ . If there exists a vertex  $w \in N_{G'}^1(u, v)$ , apart from  $x$  and  $y$ , then  $w$  has to have a neighbor  $z \notin N_{G'}(u, v)$ .  $z$  should be inside the region  $R$  and hence, cannot be double dominated. Now, because of the reduction rule, we can say that  $|N_{G'}^3(u, v)| \leq 1$ . We consider the two cases:

**Case I** ( $|N_{G'}^3(u, v)| = 1$ ): In this case,  $|N_{G'}^2(u, v)| = \emptyset$  by the reduction rule. Hence,  $|V(R)| \leq 5$ .

**Case II** ( $|N_{G'}^3(u, v)| = 0$ ): In this case, we claim that there can be at most two vertices from  $N_{G'}^2(u, v)$ . If possible, let  $p, q, r \in N_{G'}^2(u, v)$ . Now all these three vertices must be adjacent to either  $x$  or  $y$ , which is not possible because of planarity. Hence, in this case  $|V(R)| \leq 6$ .

□

First observe that, for a reduced graph  $G'$  with a minimum double dominating set  $D$ , by Lemma 16, there exists a maximal  $D$ -region decomposition  $\mathcal{R}$  with at most  $3 \cdot \gamma_2(G')$  regions. Also by Lemma 12, we have  $V' = V(\mathcal{R})$  and by Lemma 17, we have for each region  $|V(R)| \leq 6$ . Thus we have  $|V'| = |V(\mathcal{R})| = |\cup_{R \in \mathcal{R}} V(R)| \leq \sum_{R \in \mathcal{R}} |V(R)| \leq 6 \cdot |\mathcal{R}| \leq 18 \cdot \gamma_2(G')$ . Hence, we have the following theorem.

**Theorem 18** *For a reduced planar graph  $G' = (V', E')$ , we have  $|V'| \leq 18 \cdot \gamma_2(G')$ , that is, DOUBLE DOMINATION PROBLEM on planar graph admits a linear kernel.*

## 4.2 Liar's and $k$ -tuple domination

We first show that the number of vertices in a plane graph,  $|V| = O(\gamma_{LR}(G))$ . In this respect, first we note that both the results in Lemma 12 and Lemma 16 are valid for any plane graph  $G$  and any double dominating set  $D$ . Since every liar's dominating set is also a double dominating set, similar type of results hold for any plane graph  $G$  and any liar's dominating set  $L$ . We claim that the number of vertices in a region  $R$  of a  $L$ -region decomposition is bounded above by a constant. Let  $R$  be a region between  $u$  and  $v$  and  $\partial(R) = \{u, x, v, y\}$ . Note that in  $V(R)$  there are two vertices ( $u$  and  $v$ ) from  $L$ . Now, if there exists two vertices  $p, q \in V(R) \setminus \partial(R)$ , then for the pair  $p$  and  $q$  condition (ii) of liar's domination is violated. Hence, there is at most one vertex in  $V(R) \setminus \partial(R)$ . Therefore,  $|V(R)| \leq 5$ . Thus we have  $|V| = |V(\mathcal{R})| = |\cup_{R \in \mathcal{R}} V(R)| \leq \sum_{R \in \mathcal{R}} |V(R)| \leq 5 \cdot |\mathcal{R}| \leq 15 \cdot |L| \leq 15 \cdot \gamma_{LR}(G)$ . Hence, we have the following theorem

**Theorem 19** *For a planar graph  $G = (V, E)$ ,  $|V| \leq 15 \cdot \gamma_{LR}(G)$ .*

Since every  $k$ -tuple dominating set for  $k \geq 3$  is a liar's dominating set, we can use Theorem 19. But, we can improve the constant a little bit.

**Theorem 20** *For a planar graph  $G = (V, E)$ ,  $|V| \leq 12 \cdot \gamma_k(G)$ , where  $k \geq 3$ .*

*Proof* Let  $D$  be a minimum  $k$ -tuple dominating set of  $G = (V, E)$ . Since every  $k$ -tuple dominating set is a double dominating set, by Lemma 16 we can form a maximal  $D$ -region decomposition  $\mathcal{R}$  of  $G$  containing at most  $3 \cdot |D|$  many regions. Again by Lemma 12, we have  $V = V(\mathcal{R})$ . Since each region contains only two vertices of  $D$ , we have  $|V(R)| \leq 4$ . Otherwise there exists one vertex in  $V(R)$  which is not dominated by  $k$  vertices of  $D$ . Hence  $|V| \leq 4 \cdot |\mathcal{R}| \leq 12 \cdot |D| \leq 12 \cdot \gamma_k(G)$ .  $\square$

## 5 Linear kernels for bounded genus graphs

In this section, we extend our results to bounded genus graphs to show that  $k$ -TUPLE DOMINATION PROBLEM and LIAR'S DOMINATION PROBLEM admit a linear kernel. The notations in this section follow Section 2.1.

For double domination problem, we apply the same reduction rule on a graph  $G$  with bounded genus  $g$  to obtain the reduced graph  $G'$ . Note that the reduced graph  $G'$  is also of bounded genus  $g$ . Let  $G = (V, E)$  be an  $n$ -vertex  $\Sigma$ -embedded graph. It is easy to observe that, since  $\sum_{v \in V} \deg_G(v) = O(n + \text{eg}(\Sigma))$ , the reduced graph  $G' = (V', E')$  can be computed in  $O(n^3 + n^2 \cdot \text{eg}(\Sigma))$  time, where  $|V| = n$ . Next we show that  $|V'| = O(\gamma_2(G') + g)$  which implies DOUBLE DOMINATION PROBLEM admits a linear kernel in bounded genus graphs.

To prove the above, we consider two cases. In the first case, we assume that the reduced  $\Sigma$ -embedded graph has representativity strictly greater than 4. In the case when  $\text{rep}(G) \leq 4$ , we go by induction on the Euler genus of surface  $\Sigma$ . In the first case, the graphs are locally planar, i.e., all the contractable noose are of length less or equal to 4. Since the boundary of the regions in planar case is less than or equal to 4, the boundary  $\partial(R)$  of any region  $R$  of a  $D$ -region decomposition  $\mathcal{R}$  is contractible. Hence the proof in the planar case can be extended in this case. Hence we have the following lemma.

**Lemma 21** *Let  $G' = (V', E')$  be a reduced  $\Sigma$ -embedded graph where  $\text{rep}(G') > 4$ . Then  $|V'| \leq 18(\gamma_2(G') + \text{eg}(\Sigma))$ .*

*Proof* Let  $D$  be a double dominating set of  $G'$  and  $\mathcal{R}$  is a maximal  $D$ -region decomposition of  $G'$ . Forming a induced graph,  $G_{\mathcal{R}}$  as in case of double domination problem in planar graphs (Section 4.1.2), we have  $|\mathcal{R}| \leq 3 \cdot (|D| + \text{eg}(\Sigma))$ . Also, in this case, every vertex of  $V'$  belongs to at least one region of  $\mathcal{R}$  and for a region  $R$ ,  $|V(R)| \leq 6$ . Hence, we have  $|V'| \leq 18(\gamma_2(G') + \text{eg}(\Sigma))$ .  $\square$

Next consider the case where  $3 \leq \text{rep}(G') \leq 4$ . For a noose  $N$  in  $\Sigma$ , we define the graph  $G_N = (V_N, E_N)$  as follows. First we consider the graph  $\mathcal{G}$  obtained from  $G' = (V', E')$  by cutting along  $N$ . Then for every  $v \in N \cap V'$  if  $v^i$ ,  $i = 1, 2$ , is not adjacent to a pendant vertex, then we add a pendant vertex  $u^i$  adjacent to  $v^i$  to form  $G_N$ . Clearly  $G_N$  has genus less than that of  $G'$ . If we add all the vertices of  $V_N \setminus V'$  to a double dominating set  $D$  of  $G'$ , then we clearly obtain a double dominating set of  $G_N$  and as,  $\text{rep}(G') \leq 4$ ,  $|V_N \setminus V'| \leq 16$ . Hence,  $\gamma_2(G_N) \leq \gamma_2(G') + |N \cap V'| \leq \gamma_2(G') + 16$ . Also note that if  $G'$  is a reduced graph, then so is  $G_N$ . Using these facts, we prove that DOUBLE DOMINATION PROBLEM possesses a linear kernel when restricted to graphs with bounded genus.

**Lemma 22** For any reduced  $\Sigma$ -embedded graph  $G' = (V', E')$  with  $\text{eg}(\Sigma) \geq 1$ ,  $|V'| \leq 18(\gamma_2(G') + 32 \cdot \text{eg}(\Sigma) - 16)$ .

*Proof* We prove this result by induction on  $\text{eg}(\Sigma)$ . Suppose  $\text{eg}(\Sigma) = 1$ . If  $\text{rep}(G') > 4$ , then the result follows from Lemma 21. Otherwise Lemma 1 implies that the graph  $G_N$ , described above, is planar. Hence by Theorem 18, we have  $|V_N| \leq 18 \cdot \gamma_2(G_N)$ . Thus  $|V'| \leq |V_N| \leq 18(\gamma_2(G') + 16)$ .

Assume that  $|V'| \leq 18(\gamma_2(G') + 32 \cdot \text{eg}(\Sigma) - 16)$  for any  $\Sigma$ -embedded reduced graph  $G'$  with  $\text{eg}(\Sigma) \leq g - 1$ . Consider a reduced  $\Sigma$ -embedded graph  $G'$  with  $\text{eg}(\Sigma) = g$ . Now if  $\text{rep}(G') > 4$ , then again by Lemma 21, we are done. Hence assume that  $\text{rep}(G') \leq 4$ . By Lemma 1, either  $G_N$  is the disjoint union of graphs  $G_1$  and  $G_2$  that can be embedded in surfaces  $\Sigma_1$  and  $\Sigma_2$  such that  $\text{eg}(\Sigma) = \text{eg}(\Sigma_1) + \text{eg}(\Sigma_2)$  and  $\text{eg}(\Sigma_i) > 0$ ,  $i = 1, 2$  (this is the case when  $N$  is surface separating curve), or  $G_N$  can be embedded in a surface with Euler genus strictly smaller than  $\text{eg}(\Sigma)$  (this holds when  $N$  is not surface separating).

Let us consider the case where  $G_N$  is the disjoint union of graphs  $G_1 = (V_1, E_1)$  and  $G_2 = (V_2, E_2)$  that can be embedded in surfaces  $\Sigma_1$  and  $\Sigma_2$ . Since  $\text{eg}(\Sigma_i) \leq g - 1$  for  $i = 1, 2$ , we can apply the induction hypothesis on  $G_i$ . Thus we have,

$$\begin{aligned} |V'| &\leq |V_N| = |V_1| + |V_2| \\ &\leq \sum_{i=1}^2 18(\gamma_2(G_i) + 32 \cdot \text{eg}(\Sigma_i) - 16) \\ &\leq 18(\gamma_2(G_N) + 32 \cdot \text{eg}(\Sigma) - 32) && \text{as } G_1 \text{ and } G_2 \text{ are disjoint} \\ &\leq 18(\gamma_2(G') + 32 \cdot \text{eg}(\Sigma) - 16). \end{aligned}$$

Next we consider the case where  $G_N$  can be embedded in a surface  $\Sigma'$  with Euler genus strictly smaller than  $g$ . In this case too, we can apply induction hypothesis on  $G_N$ . Thus we have,

$$\begin{aligned} |V'| &\leq |V_N| \leq 18(\gamma_2(G_N) + 32 \cdot \text{eg}(\Sigma') - 16) \\ &\leq 18(\gamma_2(G_N) + 32 \cdot (\text{eg}(\Sigma) - 1) - 16) \\ &\leq 18(\gamma_2(G') + 32 \cdot \text{eg}(\Sigma) - 32) && \text{as } \gamma_2(G_N) \leq \gamma_2(G') + 16 \\ &\leq 18(\gamma_2(G') + 32 \cdot \text{eg}(\Sigma) - 16). \end{aligned}$$

Thus we have proved that,  $|V'| \leq 18(\gamma_2(G') + 32 \cdot \text{eg}(\Sigma) - 16)$  for every  $\Sigma$ -embedded graph  $G' = (V', E')$ .  $\square$

Hence by Lemma 21 and Lemma 22, we have the main result of this subsection.

**Theorem 23** DOUBLE DOMINATION PROBLEM admits a linear kernel for bounded genus graphs.

For liar's domination problem, by Theorem 19, we have  $|V| \leq 15 \cdot \gamma_{LR}(G)$  in case of a planar graph  $G = (V, E)$ . Proceeding exactly in the same way as in the case of double domination, we can have the following theorem for a  $\Sigma$ -embedded graph  $G$ .

**Theorem 24** Let  $G = (V, E)$  be a  $\Sigma$ -embedded graph. Then  $|V| \leq 15(\gamma_{LR}(G) + 32 \cdot \text{eg}(\Sigma))$ .

Since for any graph that admits a  $k$ -tuple dominating set ( $k \geq 3$ ),  $\gamma_{LR}(G) \leq \gamma_k(G)$ , we have the following corollary of Theorem 24.

**Corollary 25** For a  $\Sigma$ -embedded graph  $G = (V, E)$ ,  $|V| \leq 15(\gamma_k(G) + 32 \cdot \text{eg}(\Sigma))$ .

## 6 Conclusion

In this paper, we first have proved that  $k$ -TUPLE DOMINATION PROBLEM and LIAR'S DOMINATION PROBLEM are  $W[2]$ -hard for general graphs. Then we have shown that these two problems admit linear kernel for planar graphs and also for bounded genus graphs. It would be interesting to look for other graph classes where these problems admit efficient parameterized algorithms.

## Acknowledgements

The authors want to thank Venkatesh Raman and Saket Saurabh for some of their nice introductory expositions to parametrization.

## 7 Appendix

**Lemma 26** LIAR'S DOMINATION PROBLEM is NP-complete for planar graphs.

*Proof* The reduction is from DOMINATION PROBLEM in planar graphs, which is known to be NP-complete[GJ79]. Let  $G = (V, E)$  be a planar graph with  $V = \{v_1, v_2, \dots, v_n\}$  and  $k$  be an integer. We construct an instance  $G' = (V', E')$  and  $k'$  of LIAR'S DOMINATION PROBLEM as follows: We add a set of  $3n$  new vertices  $S = \{x_i, y_i, z_i | 1 \leq i \leq n\}$  to the vertex set of  $V$ , i.e.,  $V' = V \cup S$  and the edge set of  $G'$  is given by  $E' = E \cup \{v_i x_i, x_i y_i, y_i z_i | 1 \leq i \leq n\}$ . Note that, since  $G$  is planar, so is  $G'$ . Also assume that  $k' = k + 3n$ . In [Sla09], it is proved that  $G$  has a dominating set of cardinality at most  $k$  if and only if  $G'$  has a liar's dominating set of cardinality at most  $k' = k + 3n$ .

Thus, LIAR'S DOMINATION PROBLEM is NP-complete for planar graphs.  $\square$

## References

- [ABF<sup>+</sup>02] J. Alber, H. L. Bodlaender, H. Fernau, T. Kloks, and R. Niedermeier. Fixed parameter algorithms for dominating set and related problems on planar graphs. *Algorithmica*, 33(4):461–493, 2002.
- [AFF<sup>+</sup>05] J. Alber, H. Fan, M. R. Fellows, H. Fernau, R. Niedermeier, F. A. Rosamond, and U. Stege. A refined search tree technique for dominating set on planar graphs. *J. Comput. Syst. Sci.*, 71(4):385–405, 2005.
- [AFN04a] J. Alber, M. R. Fellows, and R. Niedermeier. Polynomial-time data reduction for dominating set. *J. ACM*, 51(3):363–384, 2004.
- [AFN04b] J. Alber, H. Fernau, and R. Niedermeier. Parameterized complexity: exponential speed-up for planar graph problems. *J. Algorithms*, 52(1):26–56, 2004.
- [BFL<sup>+</sup>09] H. L. Bodlaender, F. V. Fomin, D. Lokshtanov, E. Penninkx, S. Saurabh, and D. M. Thilikos. (Meta) Kernelization. In *Proceedings of the 2009 50th Annual IEEE Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science*, FOCS '09, pages 629–638, Washington, DC, USA, 2009. IEEE Computer Society.

- [Cou92] B. Courcelle. The monadic second-order logic of graphs iii: tree-decompositions, minor and complexity issues. *Inform. Théor. Appl.*, 26:257–286, 1992.
- [CP14] D. Cattanéo and S. Perdrix. The parameterized complexity of domination-type problems and application to linear codes. In T. V. Gopal, M. Agrawal, A. Li, and S. B. Cooper, editors, *Theory and Applications of Models of Computation*, volume 8402 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 86–103. Springer International Publishing, 2014.
- [DF99] R. G. Downey and M. R. Fellows. *Parameterized Complexity*. Springer-Verlag, 1999. 530 pp.
- [EFF04] J. A. Ellis, H. Fan, and M. R. Fellows. The dominating set problem is fixed parameter tractable for graphs of bounded genus. *J. Algorithms*, 52(2):152–168, 2004.
- [FT03] F. V. Fomin and D. M. Thilikos. Dominating sets in planar graphs: branch-width and exponential speed-up. In *SODA*, pages 168–177, 2003.
- [FT04] F. V. Fomin and D. M. Thilikos. Fast parameterized algorithms for graphs on surfaces: Linear kernel and exponential speed-up. In *ICALP*, pages 581–592, 2004.
- [GJ79] M. R. Garey and D. S. Johnson. *Computers and Intractability: A Guide to the Theory of NP-Completeness*. W. H. Freeman, 1979.
- [Gut09] S. Gutner. Polynomial kernels and faster algorithms for the dominating set problem on graphs with an excluded minor. In J. Chen and F. V. Fomin, editors, *Parameterized and Exact Computation*, volume 5917 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 246–257. Springer Berlin Heidelberg, 2009.
- [GV08] P. A. Golovach and Y. Villanger. Parameterized complexity for domination problems on degenerate graphs. In Hajo Broersma, Thomas Erlebach, Tom Friedetzky, and Daniel Paulusma, editors, *Graph-Theoretic Concepts in Computer Science*, volume 5344 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 195–205. Springer Berlin Heidelberg, 2008.
- [HH00] Frank Harary and Teresa W. Haynes. Double domination in graphs. *Ars Comb.*, 55, 2000.
- [HHS98a] T.W. Haynes, S.T. Hedetniemi, and P.J. Slater. *Fundamentals of Domination in Graphs*. Marcel Dekker, 1998.
- [HHS98b] T.W. Haynes, S.T. Hedetniemi, and P.J.B. Slater. *Domination in Graphs: Advanced Topics*. Marcel Dekker, Incorporated, 1998.
- [LC02] C.-S. Liao and G. J. Chang. Algorithmic aspects of  $k$ -tuple domination in graphs. *Taiwanese Journal of Mathematics*, 6(3):415–420, 2002.
- [LC03] C.-S. Liao and G. J. Chang.  $k$ -tuple domination in graphs. *Inf. Process. Lett.*, 87(1):45–50, 2003.
- [LC08] C.-M. Lee and M.-S. Chang. Variations of  $y$ -dominating functions on graphs. *Discrete Mathematics*, 308(18):4185 – 4204, 2008.



- [MT01] B. Mohar and C. Thomassen. *Graphs on Surfaces*. Johns Hopkins series in the mathematical sciences. Johns Hopkins University Press, 2001.
- [Nie06] R. Niedermeier. *Invitation to Fixed-Parameter Algorithms*. Oxford Lecture Series in Mathematics and Its Applications. OUP Oxford, 2006.
- [PP13a] B. S. Panda and S. Paul. Liar’s domination in graphs: Complexity and algorithm. *Discrete Applied Mathematics*, 161(7-8):1085–1092, 2013.
- [PP13b] B. S. Panda and S. Paul. A linear time algorithm for liar’s domination problem in proper interval graphs. *Information Processing Letters*, 113:815–822, 2013.
- [PRS12] G. Philip, V. Raman, and S. Sikdar. Polynomial kernels for dominating set in graphs of bounded degeneracy and beyond. *ACM Trans. Algorithms*, 9(1):11:1–11:23, Dec 2012.
- [RS09] M. L. Roden and P. J. Slater. Liar’s domination in graphs. *Discrete Mathematics*, 309(19):5884–5890, 2009.
- [Sla09] Peter J. Slater. Liar’s domination. *Networks*, 54(2):70–74, 2009.
- [TP97] J. A. Telle and A. Proskurowski. Algorithms for vertex partitioning problems on partial  $k$ -trees. *SIAM J. Disc. Math*, 10(4):529–550, 1997.
- [vRBR09] J. M. M. van Rooij, H. L. Bodlaender, and P. Rossmanith. Dynamic programming on tree decompositions using generalised fast subset convolution. In A. Fiat and P. Sanders, editors, *Algorithms - ESA 2009*, volume 5757 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 566–577. Springer Berlin Heidelberg, 2009.