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#### Abstract

In the Minimum Consistent Subset (MCS) problem, we are presented with a connected simple undirected graph $G=(V, E)$, consisting of a vertex set $V$ of size $n$ and an edge set $E$. Each vertex in $V$ is assigned a color from the set $\{1,2, \ldots, c\}$. The objective is to determine a subset $V^{\prime} \subseteq V$ with minimum possible cardinality, such that for every vertex $v \in V$, at least one of its nearest neighbors in $V^{\prime}$ (measured in terms of the hop distance) shares the same color as $v$. The decision problem, indicating whether there exists a subset $V^{\prime}$ of cardinality at most $l$ for some positive integer $l$, is known to be NP-complete even for planar graphs. In this paper, we establish that the MCS problem for trees, when the number of colors $c$ is considered an input parameter, is NP-completg ${ }^{10}$. We propose a fixed-parameter tractable (FPT) algorithm for MCS on trees running in $O\left(2^{6 c} n^{6}\right)$ time, significantly improving the currently best-known algorithm whose running time is $O\left(2^{4 c} n^{2 c+3}\right)$. In an effort to comprehensively understand the computational complexity of the MCS problem across different graph classes, we extend our investigation to interval graphs. We show that it remains NP-complete for interval graphs, thus enriching graph classes where MCS remains intractable.
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## 1 Introduction

For many supervised learning algorithms, the input comprises a colored training dataset $T$ in a metric space ( $\mathcal{X}, d$ ) where each element $t \in T$ is assigned a color $C(t)$ from the set of colors $[c]$. The objective is to preprocess $T$ in a manner that enables rapid assignment of color to any uncolored element in $\mathcal{X}$, satisfying specific optimality criteria. One commonly used optimality criterion is the nearest neighbor rule, where each uncolored element $x$ is assigned a color based on the colors of its $k$ nearest neighbors in the training dataset $T$ (where $k$ is a fixed integer). The efficiency of such an algorithm relies on the size of the training dataset. Therefore, it is crucial to reduce the size of the training set while preserving distance information. This concept was formalized by Hart [2] in 1968 as the minimum consistent

[^0]subset (MCS) problem. In this problem, given a colored training dataset $T$, the objective is to find a subset $S \subseteq T$ of minimum cardinality such that for every point $t \in T$, the color of $t$ is the same as the color of one of its nearest neighbors in $S$. Since its inception, the MCS problem has found numerous applications, as can be judged by over 2800 citations to [2] in Google Scholar.
The MCS problem for points in $\Re^{2}$ under the Euclidean norm is shown to be NP-complete if at least three colors color the input points. Furthermore, it remains NP-complete even for two colors [3, 4]. Recently, it has been shown that the MCS problem is W[1]-hard when parameterized by the output size [5]. For some algorithmic results on the MCS problem in $\Re^{2}$, see [6, 3].
In this paper, we have explored the minimum consistent subset problem when $(\mathcal{X}, d)$ is a graph metric. Consider any graph $G$ and an arbitrary vertex coloring function $C: V(G) \rightarrow[c]$. For a subset of vertices $U$, let $C(U)$ represent the set of colors of the vertices in $U$, formally denoted as $C(U)=\{C(u): u \in U\}$. For any two vertices $u, v \in V(G)$, the shortest path distance between $u$ and $v$ in $G$ is denoted by $d(u, v)$. For a vertex $v \in V(G)$ and any subset of vertices $U \subseteq V(G)$, let $d(v, U)=\min _{u \in U} d(v, u)$. The nearest neighbors of $v$ in the set $U$ are denoted as $\operatorname{NN}(v, U)$, formally defined as $\mathrm{NN}(v, U)=\{u \in U \mid d(v, u)=d(v, U)\}$. A subset of vertices $S \subseteq V(G)$, is called a consistent subset for $(G, C)$ if for every $v \in V(G), C(v) \in C(\mathrm{NN}(v, S))$. The consistent subset problem on graphs is defined as follows:

## Consistent Subset Problem on Graphs(CSPG)

Input: A graph $G$, a coloring function $C: V(G) \rightarrow[c]$, and an integer $\ell$.
Question: Does there exist a consistent subset of size $\leq \ell$ for $(G, C)$ ?

A consistent subset of minimum size is called a minimum consistent subset (MCS). Banerjee et al. [7] proved that the CSPG is W[2]-hard when parameterized by the size of the minimum consistent set, even when limited to two colors. Thus refuting the possibility of an FPT algorithm parameterized by $(c+\ell)$ under standard complexity-theoretic assumptions for general graphs. This naturally raises the question of determining the simplest graph classes where the problem remains computationally intractable. Dey et al. [8] presented a polynomial-time algorithm for CSPG on paths. The CSPG has gained significant research attention in recent years when the underlying graph is a tree. Dey et al. [9] presented a polynomial-time algorithm for bi-colored trees. Arimura et al. [10] presented an XP algorithm parameterized by the number of colors $c$, with a running time of $\mathcal{O}\left(2^{4 c} n^{2 c+3}\right)$.
New Results: The most intriguing question yet to be answered is whether CSPG remains NP-hard for trees or not [10, 9]. In this paper, we decisively answer this question in the affirmative. This is particularly noteworthy given the scarcity of naturally occurring problems known to be NP-hard on trees. Our contribution includes a reduction from the MAX-2SAT problem, detailed in Section 3 . Next, we show that CSPG is fixed-parameter tractable (FPT) for trees on $n$ vertices, significantly improving the results presented in Arimura et al. [10]. Our intricate dynamic programming algorithm runs in $\mathcal{O}\left(2^{6 c} n^{6}\right)$ time, whereas [10] requires $\mathcal{O}\left(2^{4 c} n^{2 c+3}\right)$ time; see Section 4 .
Moreover, in Section 55, we show that CSPG on interval graphs is NP-hard. While interval graphs are unrelated to trees, our hardness result for interval graphs raises new questions about the fixed-parameter tractability of CSPG on this distinct graph class.

## 2 Notation and Preliminary Results

Notations. Without loss of generality, we will use $[n]$ to denote the set of integers $\{1, \ldots, n\}$. For any graph $G$, we denote the set of vertices of $G$ by $V(G)$ and the set of edges by $E(G)$. For any two vertices $u, v \in V(G)$, we use $d(u, v)$ to denote the shortest path distance (number of edges in the shortest path) between $u$ and $v$ in $G$. For any graph $G$ and any vertex $v \in V$ let $N(v)=\{u \mid u \in V,(u, v) \in E\}$ denotes the set of neighbours of $v$ and $N[v]=\{v\} \cup N(v)$. We denote the distance between two subgraphs $G_{1}$ and $G_{2}$ in $G$ by $d\left(G_{1}, G_{2}\right)=\min \left\{d\left(v_{1}, v_{2}\right) \mid v_{1} \in V\left(G_{1}\right), v_{2} \in V\left(G_{2}\right)\right\}$. For any subset of vertices $U \subseteq V$ in a graph $G, G[U]$ denotes the subgraph of $G$ induced on $U$. Most of the symbols and notations of graph theory used are standard and taken form [11].
As an elementary result, we prove that MCS is log-APX-hard. We reduce the dominating set problem to the consistent subset problem (CSPG). In the dominating set problem given a graph $G$ and an integer $k$ the objective is to find out whether there exists a subset $U \subseteq V$ of size $k$ such that for any vertex $v \in V, N[v] \cap U \neq \emptyset$. It is known that the Set Cover problem is log-APX-hard, or in other words, it is NP-hard to approximate the Set Cover problem within a $c \cdot \log n$ factor [12]. As there exists an $L$-reduction from set cover to dominating set problem, the dominating set problem is known to be log-APX-hard. Let $(G, k)$ be any arbitrary instance of the dominating set problem with a graph $G$ and an integer $k$. We construct an instance $(H, C, k+1)$ of CSPG as follows. $V(H)=V(G) \cup\{x\}$ and $E(H)=E(G) \cup\{(x, v) \mid v \in V(G)\}$. For all $v \in V(G)$, We set $C(v)=1$, and set $C(x)=2$. For the sake of completeness, we state the following known lemma with proof.


Figure 1: An example of construction of $\left(T_{\theta}, C_{\theta}\right)$ where $\left.\theta=\left(x_{1} \vee x_{2}\right) \wedge\left(x_{1} \vee \overline{x_{3}}\right) \wedge\left(\overline{x_{2}} \vee \overline{x_{3}}\right)\right)$. For the assignment $x_{1}=x_{2}=x_{3}=$ FALSE, we have shown the corresponding CS with a red box around the vertices. For the mentioned assignment, $\left(x_{1} \vee x_{2}\right)$ is not satisfied whereas the rest of the clauses are satisfied

Lemma 2.1. There exists a dominating set for $G$ of size at most $k$ if and only if there is a consistent subset of size at most $k+1$ for the graph $H$.

Proof. Let $D$ be a dominating set of size $k$ for the graph $G$. We claim that $D^{\prime}=\{x\} \cup D$ is a consistent subset of $H$. If not, then there be a vertex $v_{i} \in V(H) \backslash D^{\prime}$ such that $d\left(v_{i}, D\right)>d\left(v_{i}, x\right)=1$. This contradicts that $D$ is a dominating set for $G$ and the claim holds.
On the other hand, suppose $D^{\prime}$ is a consistent subset of size $k+1$ in the graph $H$. Observe that $x \in D^{\prime}$ as $x$ is the only vertex with color 2 . We claim that $D=D^{\prime} \backslash\{x\}$ is a dominating set of $G$. If not, then there is a vertex $v \in V(G) \backslash D$ such that $N(v) \cap D=\emptyset$. Thus $d\left(v, D^{\prime}\right)>1$ but $d(v, x)=1$ and $C(v) \neq C(x)$. It contradicts the assumption that $C$ is a consistent subset and hence the claim holds.

From Lemma 2.1, we have the following theorem.
Theorem 2.2. There exists a constant $c>0$ such that it is NP-hard to approximate the Minimum Consistent Set problem within a factor of $c \cdot \log n$.

## 3 NP-hardness of MCS for Trees

In this section, we prove that CSPG is NP-hard even when the input graph is a tree. We present a reduction from MAX-2SAT problem to CSPG. Let $\theta$ be a given MAX-2SAT formula with $n$ variables $\left\{x_{1}, \ldots, x_{n}\right\}$ and $m$ clauses $\left\{c_{1}, \ldots, c_{r n}\right\}, n, m \geq 50$. We construct an instance $\left(T_{\theta}, C_{\theta}\right)$ of the MCS problem from $\theta$ as follows.

## Construction of $\left(T_{\theta}, C_{\theta}\right)$.

The constructed tree $T_{\theta}$ is composed of variable and clause gadgets.

## Variable Gadget.

A variable gadget $X_{i}$ for the variable $x_{i} \in \theta$ has two components, each component has a literal path, and $M$ pairs of stabilizer vertices, as described below (see Figure 1), where $M$ is very large.
Literal paths: The two literal paths of the variable gadget $X_{i}$ are $P_{i}^{\ell}=\left\langle x_{i}^{1}, x_{i}^{2}, x_{i}^{3}, x_{i}^{4}\right\rangle$ and $\bar{P}_{i}^{\ell}=$ $\left\langle\bar{x}_{i}^{1}, \bar{x}_{i}^{2}, \bar{x}_{i}^{3}, \bar{x}_{i}^{4}\right\rangle$, each consisting of four vertices; these are referred to as positive literal path, and negative literal path respectively. Here, by a path of $k(>2)$ vertices, we mean a connected graph with $k-2$ nodes having degree 2 and the remaining two nodes having degree 1 . All the vertices on the path $P_{i}^{\ell}$ are of color $c_{i}^{\ell}$ and all the vertices on the path $\bar{P}_{i}^{\ell}$ are of color $\bar{c}_{i}^{\ell}$.
Stabilizer vertices: $M$ pairs of vertices $\left\{s_{i}^{1}, \bar{s}_{i}^{1}\right\}, \ldots,\left\{s_{i}^{M}, \bar{s}_{i}^{M}\right\}$ (we will define the exact value of $M$ later), where the color of each pair of vertices $\left\{s_{i}^{j}, \bar{s}_{i}^{j}\right\}$ is $c^{s}(i, j)$. We denote the set of vertices $S_{i}=\left\{s_{i}^{1}, \ldots, s_{i}^{M}\right\}$ as positive stabilizer vertices and the set of vertices $\bar{S}_{i}=\left\{\bar{s}_{i}^{1}, \ldots, \bar{s}_{i}^{M}\right\}$ as negative stabilizer vertices. Each vertex in $S_{i}$ is connected to $x_{i}^{1}$ and each vertex in $\bar{S}_{i}$ is connected to $\bar{x}_{i}^{1}$.
The intuition behind this set of stabilizer vertices is that by setting a large value of $M$ we ensure that either $\left\{s_{i}^{1}, \ldots, s_{i}^{M}\right\}$ or $\left\{\bar{s}_{i}^{1}, \ldots, \bar{s}_{i}^{M}\right\}$ is present in any "small" sized solution.

## Clause Gadget.

For each clause $c_{i}=\left(y_{i} \vee z_{i}\right)$, where $y_{i}$ and $z_{i}$ are two (positive/negative) literals, we define the clause gadget $C_{i}$ as follows. It consists of three paths, namely left occurrence path $P_{i}^{Y}=\left\langle y_{i}^{1}, \cdots y_{i}^{7}\right\rangle$, right occurrence path $P_{i}^{Z}=\left\langle z_{i}^{1}, \cdots z_{i}^{7}\right\rangle$, and clause path $P_{i}^{W}=\left\langle w_{i}^{1}, \cdots w_{i}^{7}\right\rangle$ (see Figure 1). All the vertices in $P_{i}^{Y}$ (resp. $P_{i}^{Z}$ ) have the same color as that of the corresponding literal path in their respective variable gadgets, i.e. for any literal, say $y_{i}$, in $C_{i}$ if $y_{i}=x_{i}$ (resp. $\overline{x_{i}}$ ) then we set the color of the vertices of $P_{i}^{Y}$ as $c_{i}^{x}$ (resp. $\bar{c}_{i}^{x}$ ). The color of the vertices on the path $P_{i}^{Z}$ is set in the same manner. We color the vertices in $P_{i}^{W}$ by $c_{i}^{w}$, which is different from that of the vertices in $P_{i}^{Y}$ and $P_{i}^{Z}$. We create the clause gadget $C_{i}$ by connecting $y_{i}^{1}$ with $w_{i}^{2}$ and $z_{i}^{1}$ with $w_{i}^{6}$ by an edge (see Figure 1).
Central Vertex Gadget.
We also have a central path $P^{v}=\left\langle v_{1}, v_{2}, v_{3}\right\rangle$. The color of all the vertices in $P^{v}$ are same, say $c^{v}$, which is different from the color of all other vertices in the construction. For each variable gadget $X_{i}, x_{i}^{1}$ and $\bar{x}_{i}^{1}$ are connected with the vertex $v_{1}$ (see Figure 11. For each clause $C_{i}, w_{i}^{4}$ is connected with $v_{1}$. Color of the vertices of $P^{v}$ is $c^{v}$.

Our objective is to show that there exists an MCS of size at most $N(k)=n(M+2)+2 k+3(m-k)+1$ in the tree $T_{\theta}$ if at least $k$ clauses of $\theta$ are satisfied; otherwise, it is strictly greater than $N(k)$. We now prove a set of auxiliary claims about a minimum consistent subset for $\left(T_{\theta}, C_{\theta}\right)$.
Lemma 3.1, stated below, says that by judiciously choosing the vertices in a variable gadget, the vertices of the tree corresponding to that variable gadget can be consistently covered by choosing its only one set of stabilizer vertices.
Lemma 3.1. For any consistent subset $V_{C}$ of size at most $N(k)=n(M+2)+2 k+3(m-k)+1$ in the tree $T_{\theta}$, the following are true.

- For any variable $x_{i}$, exactly one of the following is true.
- $S_{i} \subset V_{C}, \bar{S}_{i} \cap V_{C}=\emptyset$, and $x_{i}^{2}, \bar{x}_{i}^{4} \in V_{C}$.
- $\bar{S}_{i} \subset V_{C}, S_{i} \cap V_{C}=\emptyset$, and $\bar{x}_{i}^{2}, x_{i}^{4} \in V_{C}$, and
- $v_{3} \in V_{C}$.

Proof. For a variable $x_{i}$, let $S_{i} \cap V_{C} \neq \emptyset$. Let $s_{i}^{j} \in S_{i} \cap V_{C}$. But then every vertex $v \in S_{i} \backslash\left\{s_{i}^{j}\right\}$ must have a vertex within distance 2 of its own color, since $\operatorname{dist}\left(s_{i}^{j}, v\right)=2$. Hence $S_{i} \subset V_{C}$. One can similarly prove that $\bar{S}_{i} \cap V_{C} \neq \emptyset \Longrightarrow \bar{S}_{i} \subseteq V_{C}$. Also, every variable gadget contains $M$ uniquely colored vertices and hence has at least $M$ vertices in $V_{C}$. So, if $M \gg n$, we have that $N(k)<(n+1) M$, and there exists no variable gadget that contains vertices from both $S_{i}$ and $\bar{S}_{i}$. In other words exactly one of the following holds for every variable gadget corresponding to a variable $x_{i}$ :

- $S_{i} \subset V_{C}, \bar{S}_{i} \cap V_{C}=\emptyset$
- $\bar{S}_{i} \subset V_{C}, S_{i} \cap V_{C}=\emptyset$,

Below, we look into one of these cases, and a similar argument may be made for the other case as well.
Case 1: $S_{i} \subset V_{C}, \bar{S}_{i} \cap V_{C}=\emptyset$

Notice that there must be a vertex in the literal path $\left\{x_{i}^{1}, x_{i}^{2}, x_{i}^{3}, x_{i}^{4}\right\}$ from $\left\{x_{i}^{1}, x_{i}^{2}\right\}$ of the variable gadget $X_{i}$ since $\operatorname{dist}\left(S_{i}, x_{i}^{1}\right)=1$ and the distance to any other vertex of the same color (other than these two vertices) is more than 1. But $x_{i}^{1} \notin V_{C}$, as $\bar{S}_{i} \cap V_{C}=\emptyset$ and $\operatorname{dist}\left(x_{i}^{1}, \bar{S}_{i}\right)<\operatorname{dist}\left(S_{i}, \bar{S}_{i}\right)$. Hence $x_{i}^{2} \in V_{C}$.
Similarly there must be a vertex in the literal path $\left\{\bar{x}_{i}^{1}, \bar{x}_{i}^{2}, \bar{x}_{i}^{3}, \bar{x}_{i}^{4}\right\}$ of the variable gadget $X_{i}$ since $\operatorname{dist}\left(S_{i}, \bar{x}_{i}^{1}\right)=3$ and the distance to any other vertex of the same color (other than $\left\{\bar{x}_{i}^{2}, \bar{x}_{i}^{3}, \bar{x}_{i}^{4}\right\}$ ) is more than 3 . And the distance of 4 between $S_{i}$ and $\overline{S_{i}}$ eliminates the possibility of belonging any of the vertices $\bar{x}_{i}^{1}, \bar{x}_{i}^{2}, \bar{x}_{i}^{3}$ in $V_{C}$. Thus, $\bar{x}_{i}^{4} \in V_{C}$
Case 2: $\bar{S}_{i} \subset V_{C}, S_{i} \cap V_{C}=\emptyset$
Case 2 may be argued in a manner similar to Case 1.
Moreover, there needs to be a vertex within the set $\left\{v_{1}, v_{2}, v_{3}\right\}$. However, the distance of 4 between $S_{i}$ and $\overline{S_{i}}$ rules out the possibility of either $v_{1}$ or $v_{2}$ being in $V_{C}$. Consequently, $v_{3} \in V_{C}$.

To satisfy the inequality in the above lemma, we now set the value of $M$ as $n^{3}$. In the next lemma, we present a bound on the vertices from each clause gadget that are contained in a consistent subset of size at most $N(k)$. For any clause $C_{i}$, denote the corresponding clause gadget by $T_{i}^{C}=G\left[\left\{w_{i}^{a}, y_{i}^{a}, z_{i}^{a} \mid 1 \leq a \leq 7\right\}\right]$.
Lemma 3.2. In any consistent subset $V_{C}$ of the tree $T_{\theta}$, for each clause $C_{i}, 2 \leq\left|V\left(T_{i}^{C}\right) \cap V_{C}\right|$.
Proof. There needs to be a vertex among the vertices $\left\{w_{i}^{a} \mid 1 \leq a \leq 7\right\}$ since they are distinctly colored from all other vertices. If this vertex belongs to $\left\{w_{i}^{a} \mid 1 \leq a \leq 4\right\}$, then there must also be a vertex in $\left\{y_{i}^{a} \mid 1 \leq a \leq 7\right\}$ since the nearest vertex of the same color (any $y_{i}^{a}$ ) is farther away than the vertex with the color of any $w_{i}^{a}$. Similarly, if this vertex belongs to $\left\{w_{i}^{a} \mid 4 \leq a \leq 7\right\}$, then there must be a vertex in $\left\{z_{i}^{a} \mid 1 \leq a \leq 7\right\}$. Therefore, $2 \leq\left|V\left(T_{i}^{C}\right) \cap V_{C}\right|$.

Theorem 3.3. There exists a truth assignment of the variables in $\theta$ which satisfies at least $k$ clauses if and only if there exists a consistent subset of size at most $N(k)$ for $\left(T_{\theta}, C_{\theta}\right)$.

Proof. $(\Rightarrow)$ For the forward direction, let there exist an assignment $A$ to the variables of $\theta$ that satisfies $k$ clauses. Consider the following set of vertices $V_{A}$. For each variable $x_{i}$ if $x_{i}$ is TRUE, include all the vertices of $S_{i}$ in $V_{A}$. Also include $x_{i}^{2}$ and $\bar{x}_{i}^{4}$ in $V_{A}$. If $x_{i}=$ FALSE then include all the vertices of $\bar{S}_{i}$ in $V_{A}$. Also include $x_{i}^{4}$ and $\bar{x}_{i}^{2}$ in $V_{A}$.
For every satisfied clause $C_{i}=\left(y_{i} \vee z_{i}\right)$ with respect to $A$ we include the following vertices in $V_{A}$. Without loss of generality assume that $y_{i}=$ TRUE. We include $w_{i}^{7}$ and $z_{i}^{1}$ in $V_{A}$. For every unsatisfied clause $C_{i}=\left(y_{i} \vee z_{i}\right)$, we include $w_{i}^{1}, y_{i}^{1}$ and $z_{i}^{7}$ in $V_{A}$. We also include $v_{3}$ in $V_{A}$.
Observe that the cardinality of $V_{A}$ is $N(k)=n(M+2)+2 k+3(m-k)+1$. Next, we prove that $V_{A}$ is a consistent subset for $T_{\theta}$. Observe that for any pair of vertices $\left(s_{i}^{j}, \bar{s}_{i}^{j}\right)$, exactly one of them is in $V_{A}$. Without loss of generality assume that $s_{i}^{j} \in V_{A}$. Observe that $d\left(s_{i}^{j}, \bar{s}_{i}^{j}\right)=d\left(\bar{s}_{i}^{j}, V_{A}\right)=4$. If $x_{i}=$ TRUE then $d\left(x_{i}^{j}, x_{i}^{2}\right) \leq d\left(x_{i}^{j}, V_{A}\right)$ and $d\left(\bar{x}_{i}^{j}, \bar{x}_{i}^{4}\right) \leq d\left(\bar{x}_{i}^{j}, V_{A}\right)$. The case when $x_{i}=$ FALSE is symmetric.
For any clause gadget either $w_{i}^{1}$ or $w_{i}^{7}$ is in $V_{A}$. Without loss of generality assume that $w_{i}^{1} \in V_{A}$. Observe that for every vertex $w_{i}^{j}, d\left(w_{i}^{j}, w_{i}^{1}\right)=d\left(w_{i}^{j} . V_{A}\right)$. Let $C_{i}=\left(y_{i} \vee z_{i}\right)$ be a satisfied clause and without loss of generality assume that $y_{i}=x_{j}=$ TRUE. Observe that $d\left(y_{i}^{1}, x_{j}^{2}\right)=6$, and $d\left(y_{i}^{3}, V_{A}\right)=6$, and $d\left(y_{i}^{a}, x_{j}^{2}\right)=d\left(y_{i}^{a}, V_{A}\right)$. For any unsatisfied clause $C_{i}=\left(y_{i} \vee z_{i}\right)$ observe that $d\left(y_{i}^{a}, x_{j}^{2}\right)=d\left(y_{i}^{a}, V_{A}\right)$. Also for any $v_{j}$ where $1 \leq j \leq 3 d\left(v_{j}, v_{3}\right)=d\left(v_{j}, V_{A}\right)$. Therefore $V_{A}$ is a consistent subset for $T_{\theta}$.
$(\Leftarrow)$ In the backward direction, let there be a consistent subset $V_{C}$ of size at most $N(k)$ for $\left(T_{\theta}, C_{\theta}\right)$. We know from Lemma 3.1 that either $S_{i} \subset V_{C}$ or $\bar{S}_{i} \subset V_{C}$. From Lemma 3.1 any such solution has at least $n(M+2)+1$ facilities outside the clause gadgets leaving at most $2 k+3(m-k)$ that may be chosen from the clause gadgets.
Each clause gadget comprises of vertices of three distinct colors: one color exclusive to the clause itself and two colors dedicated to literals. An essential insight is that if there are no facilities of colors specific to the literals from a clause in the variable gadgets, then such a clause gadget must contain at least three facilities. This assertion is valid because the distance between two sets of vertices of the same color (corresponding to the same literal in two clauses) across any two clauses is at least 8 , while facilities of clause-specific colors are at a distance of at most 6 .
This fact coupled with Lemma 3.2 implies that there are at least k clauses for whom colors specific to at least one of their literals have facilities of same color in $V_{C}$ from the variable gadgets. Making the same literals true and setting other variables aribitrarily gives us an assignment that satisfies at least $k$ clauses.

## 4 MCS for Trees: A Parameterized Algorithm

In this section, we consider the optimization version of the MCS problem for the trees.

Minimum Consistent Subset for Trees

## Parameter: $c$

Input: A rooted tree $T$, whose vertices $V$ are coloured with a set $C$ of $c$ colours.
Question: Find the minimum possible size of a consistent subset (MCS) for $T$ ?
We consider $T$ as a rooted tree by taking an arbitrary vertex $r$ as its root. We use (i) $V\left(T^{\prime}\right)$ to denote the vertices of a subtree $T^{\prime}$ of $T$, (ii) $C(U) \subseteq C$ to denote the subset of colors assigned to subset of vertices $U \subseteq V$, and $C(u)$ to denote the color attached to the vertex $u \in V(T)$. For any vertex $v$, let $\eta_{v}$ denote the number of children of $v$ and we denote the children of $v$ by $v_{1}, v_{2}, \cdots, v_{\eta_{v}}$. We denote the subtree rooted at a vertex $v$ by $T(v)$. For any vertex $v$ and any integer $i<\eta_{v}$, we use $T_{i+}(v)$ to denote the union of subtrees rooted at $v_{i+1}$ to $v_{\eta_{v}}$, and $T_{i}(v)$ to denote the subtree rooted at $v$ and containing first $i$ many children of $v$. Thus, $T_{i+}(v)=\cup_{i+1 \leq j \leq \eta_{v}} T\left(v_{j}\right)$, which is a forest, and $T_{i}(v)=T(v) \backslash T_{i+}(v)$. In Figure 2 the light yellow part is $T_{i}(v)$, and the light sky-colored part is $T_{i+}(v)$.


Figure 2: Illustration of the bottom-up dynamic programming routine: The tree inside the triangle is $T_{i}(v)$, and the forest inside the rectangle is $T_{i+}(v)$

For any positive integer $d$ and for any vertex $v \in V(T)$, a set of vertices $U \subset V(T)$ is called $d$-equidistant from $v$ if $d\left(u_{i}, v\right)=d$ for all $u_{i} \in U$. Any subset of vertices $U$ spans a set of colors $C^{\prime} \subseteq C$ if $C(U)=C^{\prime}$. For any vertex $v \in V(T)$, we use $\mathcal{E}_{i}^{\text {SIB }}\left(v, d, C^{\prime}\right)\left(\right.$ resp. $\mathcal{E}_{i}^{\text {oUT }}\left(v, d, C^{\prime}\right)$ ) to denote the set of subsets of vertices in $T_{i+}(v)($ resp. $T \backslash T(v)$ ), which are $d$-equidistant from $v$ and span the colors in $C^{\prime}$. Next, we define a (partial) consistent subset for a subtree $T_{i}(v)$.
Definition 4.1. Let $d^{\text {IN }} \in \mathbb{Z}_{0}^{+}$, $d^{\mathrm{OUT}}, d^{\mathrm{SIB}} \in \mathbb{Z}^{+}$, and three subsets of colors $C^{\mathrm{IN}}, C^{\mathrm{OUT}}, C^{\mathrm{SIB}} \subseteq C$. A (partial) consistent subset of the subtree $T_{i}(v)$ with respect to the parameters $d^{\mathrm{IN}}, d^{\mathrm{OUT}}, d^{\mathrm{SIB}}, C^{\mathrm{IN}}, C^{\text {OUT }}, C^{\mathrm{SIB}}$ is defined as a set of vertices $W \subseteq V\left(T_{i}(v)\right)$ such that for any arbitrary subset $X \in \mathcal{E}_{i}^{\mathrm{SIB}}\left(v, d^{\mathrm{SIB}}, C^{\mathrm{SIB}}\right)$ and $Y \in \mathcal{E}_{i}^{\mathrm{OUT}}\left(v, d^{\mathrm{OUT}}, C^{\text {OUT }}\right)$ (assuming they exist), $W$ satisfies the following (see Figure 3):

- $d(v, W)=d^{\text {IN }}$. (i.e., the distance of $v$ to its nearest member $(s)$ in $W$ is $d^{\text {IN }}$ )
- $C(\mathrm{NN}(v, W))=C^{\mathrm{IN}}$. (i.e., $C^{\mathrm{IN}}$ is the set of colors of the nearest members of $v$ in the set $W$
- For every vertex $u \in T_{i}(v), C(u) \in C(\mathrm{NN}(u, W \cup X \cup Y))$.

Note that for some values of $d^{\text {IN }}, d^{\text {OUT }}, d^{\text {SIB }}, C^{\text {IN }}, C^{\text {OUT }}, C^{\text {SIB }}$ there may not exist any (partial) consistent subset for $T_{i}(v)$, in such a case we define it to be undefined. Also note that, for some values, the (partial) consistent subset can be empty as well, such as when $d^{\text {IN }}=\infty$ and $C(u) \in C(\operatorname{NN}(u, X \cup Y))$ for every vertex $u \in T_{i}(v)$. For ease of notation, we will denote a (partial) consistent subset for $T_{i}(v)$ as a consistent subset with respect to the parameters $d^{\text {IN }}, d^{\text {OUT }}, d^{\text {SIB }}, C^{\text {IN }}, C^{\text {OUT }}, C^{\text {SIB }}$.
Consider an arbitrary consistent subset $S_{T}$ of $T$, an arbitrary vertex $v \in V(T)$ and an integer $i \in\left[\eta_{v}\right]$ (see Figure 3). For any vertex $v \in V(T)$ and $1 \leq i \leq \eta_{v}$, define $S_{v}^{\text {IN }}=S_{T} \cap V\left(T_{i}(v)\right)$, $S_{v}^{\text {SIB }}=S_{T} \cap V\left(T_{i+}(v)\right)$, and $S_{v}^{\text {OUT }}=$ $S_{T} \cap V(T \backslash T(v))$. Also define $\delta_{S}^{\mathrm{IN}}=d\left(v, S_{v}^{\mathrm{IN}}\right), C_{S}^{\mathrm{IN}}=C\left(\mathrm{NN}\left(v, S_{v}^{\mathrm{IN}}\right)\right), \delta_{S}^{\mathrm{SIB}}=d\left(v, S_{v}^{\mathrm{SIB}}\right), C_{S}^{\mathrm{SIB}}=C\left(\mathrm{NN}\left(v, S_{v}^{\mathrm{SIB}}\right)\right)$, $\delta_{S}^{\text {out }}=d\left(v, S_{v}^{\text {out }}\right), C_{S}^{\text {out }}=C\left(\mathrm{NN}\left(v, S_{v}^{\text {out }}\right)\right)$. Let $W$ be any arbitrary (partial) consistent subset with respect to the parameters $\delta_{S}^{\text {IN }}, \delta_{S}^{\text {ouT }}, \delta_{S}^{\text {SIB }}, C_{S}^{\text {IN }}, C_{S}^{\text {ouT }}, C_{S}^{\text {SIB }}$ (see Definition4.1). Next we have the following lemma.
Lemma 4.1. $S_{W}=\left(S_{T} \backslash S_{v}^{\mathrm{IN}}\right) \cup W$ is a consistent subset for $T$.
Proof. Suppose that $A=W \cup \mathrm{NN}\left(v, S_{v}^{\mathrm{SIB}}\right) \cup \mathrm{NN}\left(v, S_{v}^{\text {out }}\right)$ is the set of vertices which are either in $W$ or in the nearest neighbor of $v$ outside $T_{i}(v)$ in $S_{W}$. We will show that for any vertex $u \in T_{i}(v), N N\left(u, S_{W}\right) \subseteq A$ and there is a vertex in $N N(u, A)$ of the color same as $u$. Similarly, let $B=\left(S_{W} \backslash W\right) \cup \operatorname{NN}(v, W)$. We show that for any vertex $w$


Figure 3: $\square$ vertices denotes consistent subset. $\delta_{S}^{\mathrm{NN}}=1, \delta_{S}^{\text {OUT }}=2, \delta_{S}^{\mathrm{SIB}}=1$
outside $T_{i}(v), N N\left(w, S_{W}\right) \subseteq B$ and there is a vertex in $N N(w, B)$ of the color same as $w$. Please note that $A$ and $B$ are not necessarily disjoint.
Consider a vertex $u \in T_{i}(v)$ and $w \in T \backslash T_{i}(v)$. Since $N N\left(v, S_{v}^{\mathrm{SIB}}\right) \in \mathcal{E}_{i}^{\mathrm{SIB}}\left(v, \delta_{S}^{\mathrm{SIB}}, C_{S}^{\mathrm{SIB}}\right)$, $\mathrm{NN}\left(v, S_{v}^{\text {OUT }}\right) \in$ $\mathcal{E}_{i}^{\text {out }}\left(v, \delta_{S}^{\text {out }}, C_{S}^{\text {out }}\right)$, and $W$ is a consistent subset with respect to the parameters $\delta_{S}^{\text {IN }}, \delta_{S}^{\text {out }}, \delta_{S}^{\text {SIB }}, C_{S}^{\text {IN }}, C_{S}^{\text {out }}, C_{S}^{\text {SIB }}$, we have $C(u) \in C\left(\mathrm{NN}\left(u, W \cup \mathrm{NN}\left(v, S_{v}^{\mathrm{SIB}}\right) \cup \mathrm{NN}\left(v, S_{v}^{\mathrm{OUT}}\right)\right)\right)=C(\mathrm{NN}(u, A))$. Also, as $S_{T}$ is a consistent subset, we have $C(w) \in C\left(\mathrm{NN}\left(w, S_{T} \backslash S_{v}^{\mathrm{IN}}\right) \cup C_{S}^{\mathrm{IN}}\right.$. From the properties of $W$, we have $C(\mathrm{NN}(v, W))=C_{S}^{\mathrm{IN}}$. Hence, $C(w) \in C(\mathrm{NN}(w, B))$. Thus to prove the result, it is enough to show that (i) no vertex from $B \backslash A$ can be the closest to the vertex $u$ in the set $S_{W}$, and (ii) no vertex from $A \backslash B$ can be the closest vertex of $w$ in the set $S_{W}$. We prove these two claims by contradiction.
Let Claim (i) be false. Then, there will be a vertex $x \in B \backslash A$, which is closest to $u$. Note that, $(B \backslash A) \cap\left(\left(T_{i}(v) \cup\right.\right.$ $\left.\mathrm{NN}\left(v, S_{v}^{\text {SIB }}\right) \cup \mathrm{NN}\left(v, S_{v}^{\text {out }}\right)\right)=\emptyset$. Hence we have, $d(u, x)=d(u, v)+d(v, x), d(v, x)>\min \left(\delta_{S}^{\text {SIB }}, \delta_{S}^{\text {out }}\right)$. This is a contradiction as the closest vertex from $v$ in $S_{W} \cup\left(T \backslash T_{i}(v)\right)$ (if it exists) is at distance $\min \left(\delta_{S}^{\text {SIB }}, \delta_{S}^{\text {OUT }}\right)=$ $d\left(v, \mathrm{NN}\left(v, S_{v}^{\mathrm{SIB}}\right) \cup \mathrm{NN}\left(v, S_{v}^{\mathrm{OUT}}\right)\right)$. Hence, $x$ cannot be the closest vertex of $u$ in $S_{W}$. Thus, Claim (i) follows.
Now, let Claim (ii) be false. Then there is a vertex $y \in A \backslash B$, which is closest to $w$. As $w \notin T_{i}(v)$ and $y \in T_{i}(v)$, we have $d(w, y)=d(w, v)+d(v, y)$. Since $d(v, \mathrm{NN}(v, W))=\delta_{S}^{\text {IN }}$ and $w \in(A \backslash B=W \backslash \mathrm{NN}(v, W))$, we have $d(v, y)>\delta_{S}^{\mathrm{IN}}$. This contradicts the fact that the closest vertex from $v$ in $S_{W} \cup T_{i}(v)$ (if it exists) is at distance $\delta^{\mathrm{IN}}$ from
$v$. Hence Claim (ii) is true.
Motivated by Lemma 4.1, we design the following algorithm based on dynamic programming technique. For each choice of $v \in V(T), i \in\left[\eta_{v}\right], \delta_{v}^{\mathrm{IN}} \in[n] \cup\{0, \infty\}, \delta_{v}^{\text {out }} \in[n] \cup\{\infty\}, \delta_{v}^{\mathrm{SIB}} \in[n] \cup\{\infty\}$, and $C_{v}^{\mathrm{IN}}, C_{v}^{\text {out }}, C_{v}^{\mathrm{SIB}} \subseteq C$, we define a subproblem which computes the cardinality of a minimum sized (partial) consistent subset for the subtree $T_{i}(v)$ with respect to the parameters $\left\langle\delta_{v}^{\text {IN }}, \delta_{v}^{\text {oUT }}, \delta_{v}^{\text {SIB }}, C_{v}^{\text {IN }}, C_{v}^{\text {OUT }}, C_{v}^{\text {SIB }}\right\rangle$, and denote its size by $P\left(T_{i}(v), \delta_{v}^{\text {IN }}, \delta_{v}^{\text {oUT }}, \delta_{v}^{\text {SIB }}, C_{v}^{\text {IN }}, C_{v}^{\text {oUT }}, C_{v}^{\text {SIB }}\right)$. Let us use $\delta_{v}^{\text {MIN }}=\min \left(\delta_{v}^{\text {IN }}, \delta_{v}^{\text {out }}, \delta_{v}^{\text {SIB }}\right)$.

$$
A=\left\{\begin{array}{l}
C_{v}^{\mathrm{IN}} \text { if } \delta_{v}^{\mathrm{IN}}=\delta_{v}^{\mathrm{MIN}}, \quad B=\left\{\begin{array}{l}
C_{v}^{\mathrm{SIB}} \text { if } \delta_{v}^{\mathrm{SIB}}=\delta_{v}^{\mathrm{MIN}}, \\
\emptyset \text { Otherwise } \\
\emptyset \text { Otherwise }
\end{array} \quad D=\left\{\begin{array}{l}
C_{v}^{\mathrm{ouT}} \text { if } \delta_{v}^{\mathrm{ouT}}=\delta_{v}^{\mathrm{MIN}}, \\
\emptyset \text { Otherwise }
\end{array},\right.\right.
\end{array}\right.
$$

We define $C_{v}^{\text {min }}=A \cup B \cup D$.
Note that $\delta_{v}^{\text {MIN }}$ is the distance of the closest vertex to $v$ in the consistent subset, and $C_{v}^{\text {MIN }}$ denotes the colors of all such vertices.
To compute any DP entry, we take into account the following six cases. The first two cases are for checking whether a DP entry is valid. The third case considers the scenario in which $v$ is part of the solution; the fourth, fifth, and sixth cases collectively consider the scenario in which $v$ is not in the solution
Case 1: If $C(v) \notin C_{v}^{\text {MIN }}$, return $\infty$.
Case 2: $\delta_{v}^{\mathrm{IN}}=0$ and $C_{v}^{\mathrm{IN}} \neq\{C(v)\}$. Here, return $\infty$.


Figure 4: Illustration of the Case 3, where $\delta_{v}^{\mathrm{IN}}=0$
Case 3: $\delta_{v}^{\mathrm{IN}}=0$ and $C_{v}^{\mathrm{IN}}=\{C(v)\}$. Here, return $P\left(T_{i}(v), \delta_{v}^{\mathrm{IN}}, \delta_{v}^{\text {ouT }}, \delta_{v}^{\mathrm{SIB}}, C_{v}^{\mathrm{IN}}, C_{v}^{\text {out }}, C_{v}^{\mathrm{SIB}}\right)=$

$$
1+\sum_{1 \leq j \leq i}\left\{\min _{\delta, C^{\prime}} P\left(T_{\eta_{v_{j}}}\left(v_{j}\right), \delta, 1, \infty, C^{\prime},\{C(v)\}, \emptyset\right)\right\}
$$

Explanation: Case 1 and Case 2 are self-explanatory. Case 3 implies that the vertex $v$ is included in the consistent subset. Consequently, for the optimal solution, we need to determine a consistent subset for each tree rooted at a child $v_{j}$ of $v$, independently of each other, assuming that $v$ is part of the consistent subset (refer to Figure 4). For every child $v_{j}$ of $v$, we iterate through all possible choices of $C^{\prime} \subseteq C$ and $\delta_{v_{j}}^{\text {IN }}=\delta \in\left\{1, \ldots, h\left(T\left(v_{j}\right)\right\} \cup\{\infty\}\right.$ where $h\left(T\left(v_{j}\right)\right)$ is the height of the tree rooted at $v_{j}$, to identify the minimum consistent subset for $T_{\eta_{v_{j}}}\left(v_{j}\right)$. This is done with the constraints that the closest vertex in the consistent subset inside $T_{\eta_{v_{j}}}\left(v_{j}\right)$ is at a distance $\delta$ and spans $C^{\prime}$. For any vertex in $T\left(v_{j}\right)$, the path of the closest vertex of its own color outside $T_{i}(v)$ has to pass through $v$, which is considered to be in the consistent subset and has color $C(v)$. Thus, $\delta_{v}^{\text {out }}=1$ is taken for the tree $T_{\eta_{v_{j}}}\left(v_{j}\right)$. Since we are solving for the complete tree rooted at $v_{j}$ with no siblings, we set the distance to the closest sibling vertex as $\delta_{v}^{\text {sIB }}=\infty$ and the corresponding color set as $\emptyset$.
In the rest of the section, we consider three more cases where $\delta_{v}^{\text {IN }}>0$, and hence $\delta_{v}^{\text {IN }}, \delta_{v}^{\text {ouT }}, \delta_{v}^{\text {SIB }}>0$. Intuitively, while solving the problem recursively, we will recursively solve MCS in $T_{i-1}(v)$ and $T_{\eta_{v_{i}}}\left(v_{i}\right)$. We try all possible sets of choices of $C_{a}, C_{b}$ with $C_{v}^{\mathrm{IN}}=C_{a} \cup C_{b}$, and recursively solve for a solution assuming that the nodes of colors in $C_{a}$ are present in $T_{i-1}(v)$ at distance $\delta_{v}^{\text {IN }}$ (if $C_{a} \neq \emptyset$ and such choices are feasible) and nodes of colors in $C_{b} \subseteq C_{v}^{\text {IN }}$ are present in $T_{\eta_{v_{i}}}\left(v_{i}\right)$ at distance $\delta_{v}^{\text {IN }}-1$ from $v_{i}$ (if $C_{b} \neq \emptyset$ and such choices are feasible).
Note that in the following case, the closest colored vertices in the consistent subset from $v$ in both $T_{i-1}(v)$ and $T_{\eta\left(v_{i}\right)}\left(v_{i}\right)$ are located at a distance of precisely $\delta_{v}^{\mathrm{IN}}$

Case 4: $C_{a}, C_{b} \neq \emptyset$.
We define the following. Let $\delta_{x}=\min \left(\delta_{v}^{\mathrm{IN}}, \delta_{v}^{\mathrm{SIB}}\right)$ and $\delta_{\min }=\min \left(\delta_{v}^{\mathrm{IN}}, \delta_{v}^{\mathrm{SIB}}, \delta_{v}^{\mathrm{ouT}}\right)$.

$$
C_{i-1}^{\mathrm{SIB}}= \begin{cases}C_{b} & \text { if } \delta_{v}^{\mathrm{IN}}<\delta_{v}^{\mathrm{SIB}} \text { and } C_{b} \neq \emptyset \\ C_{b} \cup C_{v}^{\mathrm{SIB}} & \text { if } \delta_{v}^{\mathrm{IN}}=\delta_{v}^{\mathrm{SIB}} \\ C_{v}^{\mathrm{SIB}} & \text { otherwise }\end{cases}
$$

Here $\delta_{x}$ is the distance of the closest vertices in the consistent subset from $v$ that lies in $T_{(i-1)+}(v)$ and $C_{i-1}^{\mathrm{sIB}}$ is the color set of those vertices. Hence they function as the distance of closest vertices (and their colors) in the consistent subset that lies in the sibling branches of $v$ for the tree $T_{(i-1)}(v)$. Also, define $C_{i}^{\text {ouT }}=A \cup B \cup D$, where

$$
A=\left\{\begin{array}{l}
\mathcal{C}_{a} \text { if } \delta_{v}^{\mathrm{IN}}=\delta_{\min }, \\
\emptyset \text { Otherwise }
\end{array} \quad B=\left\{\begin{array}{l}
C_{v}^{\mathrm{SIB}} \text { if } \delta_{v}^{\mathrm{SIB}}=\delta_{\min }, \\
\emptyset \text { Otherwise }
\end{array} \quad D=\left\{\begin{array}{l}
C_{v}^{\mathrm{ouT} \text { if } \delta_{v}^{\mathrm{ouT}}=\delta_{\min }} \\
\emptyset \text { Otherwise }
\end{array}\right.\right.\right.
$$

Return $P\left(T_{i}(v), \delta_{v}^{\mathrm{IN}}, \delta_{v}^{\text {ouT }}, \delta_{v}^{\mathrm{SIB}}, C_{v}^{\mathrm{IN}}, C_{v}^{\text {ouT }}, C_{v}^{\mathrm{SIB}}\right)=\min _{C_{a}, C_{b}}\left(P\left(T_{i-1}(v), \delta_{v}^{\mathrm{IN}}, \delta_{v}^{\text {ouT }}, \delta_{x}, C_{a}, C_{v}^{\text {ouT }}, C_{i-1}^{\mathrm{SIB}}\right)+\right.$

$$
\left.P\left(T_{\eta_{v_{i}}}\left(v_{i}\right), \delta_{v}^{\mathrm{IN}}-1, \delta_{\min }+1, \infty, C_{b}, C_{i}^{\mathrm{ouT}}, \emptyset\right)\right)
$$



Figure 5: Illustration of the Case 4

Explanation: In this case we iterate over all possible choices of $C_{a}$ and $C_{b}$, assuming $C_{a}, C_{b} \neq \emptyset$ and $C_{a} \cup C_{b}=C_{v}^{\mathrm{IN}}$. In the first part of the recursive formula, we recursively solve the problem for the tree $T_{i-1}(v)$ with the restriction that we have to include a set of vertices of color $C_{a}$ in $T_{i-1}(v)$ at distance $\delta_{v}^{\text {IN }}$ from $v$ (see Figure 5 ) Restriction on $C_{v}^{\text {out }}$ and $\delta_{v}^{\text {out }}$ among the vertices in $T \backslash T(v)$ remain same as that of the parent problem. Regarding $C_{v}^{\text {SIB }}$ and $\delta_{v}^{\text {SIB }}$, observe that vertices in $T\left(v_{i}\right)$ and $T_{i+}$ are part of $T_{(i-1)+}$. Therefore the parameters for the sibling depend on the value of $\delta_{v}^{\text {IN }}$ and $\delta_{v}^{\mathrm{SIB}}$, and accordingly, we have defined $C_{i-1}^{\mathrm{SIB}}$.
In the second part of the recursive formula, we are solving the problem recursively for the tree $T_{\eta_{v_{i}}}\left(v_{i}\right)$, with the restriction that, in the consistent set in the consistent set we have to include a set of vertices from $T_{\eta_{v_{i}}}\left(v_{i}\right)$ which are of colors $C_{b}$, and at distance $\delta_{v}^{\text {IN }}-1$ from $v_{i}$. Observe that the vertices in $T_{i-1}(v), T_{i+}(v)$ and $T \backslash T(v)$ are all outside $T\left(v_{i}\right)$. Thus the restriction on the distance to the vertices on the consistent subset outside $T\left(v_{i}\right)$ and their colors depend on the values of $\delta_{v}^{\text {IN }}, \delta_{v}^{\text {SIB }}$ and $\delta_{v}^{\text {OUT }}$. Thus the distance $\delta_{v}^{\text {ouT }}$ of this subproblem is defined as $\delta_{\min }=\min \left(\delta_{v}^{\text {IN }}, \delta_{v}^{\mathrm{SIB}}, \delta_{v}^{\text {OUT }}\right)$, and the set of colors $C_{i}^{\text {out }}$ is defined accordingly. As we are solving for the whole tree rooted at $v_{i}$, there are no siblings; so $\delta_{v}^{\mathrm{SIB}}=0$ and $C_{i}^{\mathrm{SIB}}=\emptyset$.
Case 5: $C_{a}=\emptyset$ and $C_{b}=C_{v}^{\mathrm{IN}}$.
Observe that in this case, the closest vertex in the consistent subset in $T_{i-1}(v)$ should be at a distance at least $\delta_{v}^{\text {IN }}+1$. We iterate over all values $\delta>\delta_{v}^{\text {IN }}$ and all possible choices of colors to find the size of a minimum consistent subset. We define $\delta_{x}$ and $C_{i-1}^{\text {SIB }}$ same as in Case 4 . For any values $\delta>\delta_{v}^{\text {IN }}$ and $C \subseteq[c]$, we define $\delta_{\text {min }}(\delta, C)=\min \left(\delta, \delta_{v}^{\text {SIB }}, \delta_{v}^{\text {ouT }}\right)$, and $C_{i}^{\text {out }}(\delta, C)=A \cup B \cup D$ where

$$
A=\left\{\begin{array}{l}
\mathcal{C} \text { if } \delta=\delta_{\min }, \\
\emptyset \text { Otherwise }
\end{array} \quad B=\left\{\begin{array}{l}
C_{v}^{\mathrm{SIB}} \text { if } \delta_{v}^{\mathrm{SIB}}=\delta_{\min }, \\
\emptyset \text { Otherwise }
\end{array} \quad D=\left\{\begin{array}{l}
C_{v}^{\text {out if } \delta_{v}^{\text {out }}=\delta_{\min }} \\
\emptyset \text { Otherwise }
\end{array}\right.\right.\right.
$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { Return } P\left(T_{i}(v), \delta_{v}^{\mathrm{IN}}, \delta_{v}^{\mathrm{ouT}}, \delta_{v}^{\mathrm{SIB}}, C_{v}^{\mathrm{IN}}, C_{v}^{\mathrm{ouT}}, C_{v}^{\mathrm{SIB}}\right)=\min _{\delta>\delta_{v}^{\mathrm{IN}}, C \subseteq[c]}\left(P\left(T_{i-1}(v), \delta, \delta_{v}^{\mathrm{ouT}}, \delta_{x}, C, C_{v}^{\text {ouT }}, C_{i-1}^{\mathrm{SIB}}\right)+\right. \\
&\left.P\left(T_{\eta_{v_{i}}}\left(v_{i}\right), \delta_{v}^{\mathrm{IN}}-1, \delta_{\min }(\delta, C)+1, \infty, C_{b}, C_{i}^{\text {ouT }}(\delta, C), \emptyset\right)\right)
\end{aligned}
$$

Explanation: It is the same as Case 4 except for the fact that we have to make sure that the closest vertex chosen in the consistent subset from $T_{i-1}(v)$ is at distance at least $\delta_{v}^{\text {IN }}+1$.
Case 6: $C_{b}=\emptyset$ and $C_{a}=C_{v}^{\mathrm{IN}}$.
Next, we consider the case when $C_{b}=\emptyset$ and $C_{a}=C_{v}^{\mathrm{IN}} . \delta_{\min }(\delta, C)=\min \left(\delta_{v}^{\mathrm{IN}}, \delta_{v}^{\mathrm{SIB}}, \delta_{v}^{\text {out }}\right)$. We define $C_{i}^{\text {out }}(\delta, C)=A \cup B \cup D$ where

$$
A=\left\{\begin{array}{l}
\mathcal{C}_{a} \text { if } \delta_{v}^{\mathrm{IN}}=\delta_{\min }, \\
\emptyset \text { Otherwise }
\end{array} \quad B=\left\{\begin{array}{l}
C_{v}^{\mathrm{SIB}} \text { if } \delta_{v}^{\mathrm{SIB}}=\delta_{\mathrm{min}}, \\
\emptyset \text { Otherwise }
\end{array} \quad D=\left\{\begin{array}{l}
C_{v}^{\mathrm{ouT}} \text { if } \delta_{v}^{\mathrm{ouT}}=\delta_{\mathrm{min}} \\
\emptyset \text { Otherwise }
\end{array}\right.\right.\right.
$$

For any values $\delta>\delta_{v}^{\text {IN }}$ and $C \subseteq[c]$ we define $\delta_{x}(\delta, C)=\min \left(\delta_{v}^{\text {SIB }}, \delta\right)$ We define $C_{i-1}^{\text {SIB }}(\delta, C)=E \cup F$ where

$$
E=\left\{\begin{array}{l}
\mathcal{C} \text { if } \delta=\delta_{x}(\delta, C), \\
\emptyset \text { Otherwise }
\end{array} \quad F=\left\{\begin{array}{l}
C_{v}^{\mathrm{SIB}} \text { if } \delta_{v}^{\mathrm{SIB}}=\delta_{x}(\delta, C), \\
\emptyset \text { Otherwise }
\end{array}\right.\right.
$$

Return $P\left(T_{i}(v), \delta_{v}^{\mathrm{IN}}, \delta_{v}^{\text {ouT }}, \delta_{v}^{\mathrm{SIB}}, C_{v}^{\mathrm{IN}}, C_{v}^{\text {ouT }}, C_{v}^{\mathrm{SIB}}\right)=$

$$
\min _{\delta>\delta_{v}^{\mathrm{NN}, C \subseteq[c]}}\left(P\left(T_{i-1}(v), \delta_{v}^{\mathrm{IN}}, \delta_{v}^{\mathrm{ouT}}, \delta_{x}(\delta, C), C_{a}, C_{v}^{\mathrm{ouT}}, C_{i-1}^{\mathrm{SIB}}(\delta, C)\right)+P\left(T_{\eta_{v_{i}}}\left(v_{i}\right), \delta, \delta_{\min }+1, \infty, C_{b}, C, \emptyset\right)\right)
$$

Explanation: It is the same as the previous two cases.

## Running time of the algorithm

The total number of choices of $\delta_{v}^{\text {IN }}, \delta_{v}^{\text {OUT }}, \delta_{v}^{\text {SIB }}, C_{v}^{\text {IN }}, C_{v}^{\text {OUT }}$ and $C_{v}^{\text {SIB }}$ is bounded by $n^{3} 2^{3 c}$. For each choice $C_{a}$ and $C_{b}$, the algorithm takes at-most $n 2^{c}$ time to go through all possible entries of $\delta$ and $C$ (in case 5 and case 6) and there are at-most $2^{2 c}$ choices of $C_{a}$ and $C_{b}$. The recursion runs for at most $n^{2}$ times. Hence, the worst-case running time of the algorithm is $\mathcal{O}\left(2^{6 c} n^{6}\right)$.

## 5 NP-hardness of MCS for Interval Graphs

A graph $H$ is said to be an interval graph if there exists an interval layout of the graph $H$, or in other words, for each node, $v_{i} \in V(H)$ one can assign an interval $\alpha_{i}$ on the real line such that $\left(v_{i}, v_{j}\right) \in E(H)$ if and only if $\alpha_{i}$ and $\alpha_{j}$ (completely or partially) overlap in the layout of those intervals.
We prove that the Minimum Consistent Subset problem is NP-complete even when the input graph is an interval graph. We present a reduction from the Vertex Cover problem for cubic graphs. It is known that Vertex Cover remains NP-complete even for cubic graphs [13]. For any set of intervals $\mathcal{I}$, let $G(\mathcal{I})$ be the interval graph corresponding to the set of intervals $\mathcal{I}$.

## Interval Graph Construction.

Let $G$ be any cubic graph, where $V(G)=\left\{v_{1}, \ldots, v_{n}\right\}$ is the set of vertices, and $E(G)=\left\{e_{1}, \ldots, e_{m}\right\}$ is the set of edges in $G$. We create the set of intervals $\mathcal{I}_{G}$ for $G$ on a real line $\mathcal{L}$. The set of intervals in $\mathcal{I}_{G}$ is represented by intervals of three different sizes, medium, small and large, where each medium interval is of unit length, each small interval is of length $\epsilon \ll \frac{1}{2 n^{3}}$ and the length of the large interval is $\ell \gg 2 n$.
We define $\mathcal{I}_{G}=\mathcal{I}_{1} \cup \mathcal{I}_{2} \cup \mathcal{I}_{3} \cup \mathcal{I}_{4}$ where $\mathcal{I}_{1}$ contains $2 m$ many medium size intervals (two intervals for each edge) and defined as $\mathcal{I}_{1}=\left\{I\left(e_{i}, v_{j}\right) \mid e_{i}=\left(v_{j}, y\right) \in E(G), y \in V(G)\right\}$. We set color $c_{i}$ to the interval $I\left(e_{i}, v_{j}\right)$. $\mathcal{I}_{2}$ contain $n \cdot n^{3}$ many small intervals of color $c_{m+1}$, and $\mathcal{I}_{3}$ contain $n \cdot n^{4}$ many small intervals of color $c_{m+1}$. $\mathcal{I}_{4}$ contains one large interval $I_{\ell}$ of color $c_{1}$.
We create the following vertex gadget $X_{i}$ for each vertex $v_{i} \in V(G) . X_{i}$ contains the following medium size intervals $\left\{I\left(e, v_{i}\right) \mid e=\left(v_{i}, x\right) \in E(G)\right\}$ corresponding to the edges that are incident on $v_{i}$. These intervals span the same region $s_{i}$ of unit length on the real line $\mathcal{L}$; hence they are mutually completely overlapping. In the vertex gadget $X_{i}$, we also include a total of $n^{3}$ mutually non-overlapping small intervals in the set $\mathcal{I}_{2}$. Span of all the small intervals in $X_{i}$ is contained in the span $s_{i}$ of the medium sized intervals in $X_{i}$ (see Figure 6).
Each vertex gadget is placed one after another (in a non-overlapping manner) along the line $\mathcal{L}$ in an arbitrary order, such that a total of $n^{4}$ mutually non-overlapping small intervals can be drawn between two consecutive vertex gadgets. Thus, $\mathcal{I}_{3}$ contains $n$ many sets of $n^{4}$ many non-overlapping small intervals. Finally, $\mathcal{I}_{4}$ contains a single large interval $I_{\ell}$ that contains all the intervals in $\mathcal{I}_{1} \cup \mathcal{I}_{2} \cup \mathcal{I}_{3}$. This completes the construction.

In the rest of the section with a slight abuse of notations, we will denote the vertex in $G\left(\mathcal{I}_{G}\right)$ corresponding to an interval $I \in \mathcal{I}_{G}$ by $I$.
Lemma 5.1. The graph $G$ has a vertex cover of size at most $k$ if and only if the corresponding interval graph $G\left(\mathcal{I}_{G}\right)$ has a consistent subset of size at most $K=k\left(3+n^{3}\right)$.

Proof. $(\Rightarrow)$ Let $A \subseteq V(G)$ be a vertex cover of $G$. Consider the set of intervals $\mathcal{I}_{A}=\bigcup_{v_{i} \in A} X_{i}$. We prove that $\mathcal{I}_{A}$ is a consistent subset of $G\left(\mathcal{I}_{G}\right)$. Note that as $\left|X_{i}\right|=3+n^{3},\left|\mathcal{I}_{A}\right|=k\left(3+n^{3}\right)$.
As the vertices in $A$ cover all the edges in $G, \mathcal{I}_{A}$ must contain at least one interval of each color $\left\{c_{1} \cdots, c_{m}\right\}$. As the unit intervals in $X_{i}$ associated with a vertex $v_{i} \in A$ are of colors different from the color of the small intervals in $X_{i}, \mathcal{I}_{A}$ contains at least $n^{3}$ many small intervals. Therefore $\mathcal{I}_{A}$ contains at least one interval from each color in $\left\{c_{1}, \ldots c_{m+1}\right\}$. Observe that, (i) the interval $I_{\ell} \in \mathcal{I}_{4}$ of color $c_{1}$ contains an interval of color $c_{1}$ that corresponds to the edge $e_{1}$, and (ii) the distance between any two nodes corresponding to medium intervals in two different vertex gadgets of $G\left(\mathcal{I}_{G}\right)$ is 2 (via the node corresponding to the interval $I_{\ell}$ in $G\left(\mathcal{I}_{G}\right)$ ). Thus, $\mathcal{I}_{A}$ is a consistent subset.
$(\Leftarrow)$ Let $\mathcal{I}_{B} \subseteq \mathcal{I}_{G}$ be any consistent subset of $G\left(\mathcal{I}_{G}\right)$ of cardinality $\left(3+n^{3}\right) k$. Now, if $\mathcal{I}_{B}$ contains $I_{\ell}$ then $\mathcal{I}_{B}=\mathcal{I}_{G}$, which contradicts the fact that $\left|\mathcal{I}_{B}\right|=\left(3+n^{3}\right) k$. Thus, we have $I_{\ell} \notin \mathcal{I}_{B}$.
By the definition, $\mathcal{I}_{B}$ contains at least one color from $\left\{c_{1}, \cdots, c_{m}, c_{m+1}\right\}$. Also, if $\mathcal{I}_{B}$ contains one interval from the gadget $X_{i}$ of any vertex $v_{i}$, then it must contain all the intervals from $X_{i}$, otherwise it can not be a consistent subset.

$\mathcal{I}_{G}$
Figure 6: An example reduction

Thus $\mathcal{I}_{B}$ is the union $\mathcal{X}$ of at most $k$ many sets from $\left\{X_{i} \mid i \in[n]\right\}$, and it contains at least one interval from each color $\left\{c_{1}, \cdots, c_{m}\right\}$, and a few intervals of color $c_{m+1}$. Now, consider the set $V_{B}=\left\{v_{i} \mid X_{i} \in \mathcal{X}\right\}$, which is a vertex cover for the graph $G$ of size at most $k$.
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