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#### Abstract

In this paper, we study the complexity and the approximation of the $k$ most vital edges (nodes) and min edge (node) blocker versions for the minimum spanning tree problem (MST). We show that the $k$ most vital edges MST problem is $N P$-hard even for complete graphs with weights 0 or 1 and 3 -approximable for graphs with weights 0 or 1 . We also prove that the $k$ most vital nodes MST problem is not approximable within a factor $n^{1-\epsilon}$, for any $\epsilon>0$, unless $N P=Z P P$, even for complete graphs of order $n$ with weights 0 or 1. Furthermore, we show that the min edge blocker MST problem is $N P$-hard even for complete graphs with weights 0 or 1 and that the min node blocker MST problem is $N P$-hard to approximate within a factor 1.36 even for graphs with weights 0 or 1 .
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## 1 Introduction

For problems of security or reliability, it is important to assess the capacity of a system to resist to a destruction or a failure of a number of its entities. This amounts to identifying critical entities which can be determined with respect to a measure of performance or a cost associated to the system. Modeling the network as a weighted connected graph where entities are edges or nodes and costs are weights associated to edges, one way of identifying critical entities is to determine a subset of edges or nodes whose removal from the graph causes the largest cost increase. Another way is to find a subset of edges or nodes of minimum cardinality whose removal involves that the optimal cost in the residual network is larger than a given threshold. In the literature these problems are referred to respectively as the $k$ most vital edges/nodes problem and min edge/node blocker problem. In this paper the $k$ most vital edges/nodes and min edge/node blocker versions for the minimum spanning tree problem are investigated.

The problem of finding the $k$ most vital edges of a graph has been studied for various problems including shortest path [2, 10, 14], maximum flow [18, 15, 19], 1-median and 1center [4]. For the minimum spanning tree problem, Frederickson et al. [6] showed that $k$ Most Vital Edges MST is $N P$-hard and proposed an $O(\log k)$-approximation algorithm. For a fixed $k$, the problem is obviously polynomial. The case $k=1$ has been largely studied in
the literature [8, 9, 17]. Several exact algorithms based on an explicit enumeration of possible solutions have been proposed $[12,13,16,3]$.

After introducing some preliminaries in Section 2, we show in Section 3 that $k$ Most Vital Edges MST is $N P$-hard even for complete graphs with weights 0 or 1 and 3 -approximable for graphs with weights 0 or 1 . We also prove, in Section 4 , that $k$ Most Vital Nodes MST is not approximable within a factor $n^{1-\epsilon}$, for any $\epsilon>0$, unless $N P=Z P P$, even for complete graphs of order $n$ with weights 0 or 1. In Section 5, we establish that Min Edge Blocker MST is $N P$-hard even for complete graphs with weights 0 or 1. In Section 6, we show that Min Node Blocker MST is $N P$-hard to approximate within a factor 1.36 even for graphs with weights 0 or 1 . Final remarks are provided in Section 7.

## 2 Basic concepts and preliminary results

Let $G=(V, E)$ be a weighted undirected connected graph where $|V|=n,|E|=m$ and $w(e) \geq 0$ is the integer weight of each edge $e \in E$. Denote by $G-R$ the graph obtained from $G$ by removing the subset $R$ of edges or nodes.

We consider in this paper the $k$ most vital edges (nodes) and min edge (node) blocker versions of the minimum spanning tree problem. These problems are defined as follows:

## $k$ Most Vital Edges (resp. Node) MST

Input: A connected weighted graph $G=(V, E)$ where each edge $e \in E$ has an integer weight $w_{e} \geq 0$ and a positive integer $k$.
Output: A subset $S^{*} \subseteq E$ (resp. $S^{*} \subseteq V$ ), with $\left|S^{*}\right|=k$, such that the weight of a minimum spanning tree in $G-S^{*}$ is maximum.

For an instance of $k$ Most Vital Edges MST defined on a graph $G$, we consider that $k \leq \lambda(G)-1$ where $\lambda(G)$ is the edge-connectivity of $G$. Otherwise, any selection of $k$ edges including the edges of a minimum cardinality cut would lead to a solution with infinite value since we disconnect $G$.

For an instance of $k$ Most Vital Nodes MST defined on a graph $G$, we consider that $k \leq \kappa(G)-1$, where $\kappa(G)$ is the node-connectivity of $G$. Otherwise, any selection of $k$ nodes including the nodes of a minimum node separator would lead to a solution with infinite value since we disconnect $G$.

Min Edge (resp. Node) Blocker MST
Input: A connected weighted graph $G=(V, E)$ where each edge $e \in E$ has an integer weight $w_{e} \geq 0$ and a positive integer $U$.
Output: A subset $S^{*} \subseteq E$ (resp. $S^{*} \subseteq V$ ) of minimum cardinality such that the weight of a minimum spanning tree in $G-S^{*}$ is greater than or equal to $U$.

An optimal solution $S^{*}$ of an instance of Min Edge (resp. Node) Blocker MST defined on a graph $G$ is such that $\left|S^{*}\right| \leq \lambda(G)$ (resp. $\left|S^{*}\right| \leq \kappa(G)$ ) since, at worst, it is necessary to disconnect $G$ so as to exceed the threshold $U$.

Given an optimization problem in NPO and an instance $I$ of this problem, we use $|I|$ to denote the size of $I$, opt $(I)$ to denote the optimum value of $I$, and $\operatorname{val}(I, S)$ to denote the value of a feasible solution $S$ of instance $I$. The performance ratio of $S$ (or approximation factor) is $r(I, S)=\max \left\{\frac{\operatorname{val(I,S)}}{o p t(I)}, \frac{o p t(I)}{\operatorname{val(I,S)}\}}\right\}$. The error of $S, \varepsilon(I, S)$, is defined by $\varepsilon(I, S)=r(I, S)-1$.

For a function $f$, an algorithm is an $f(|I|)$-approximation, if for every instance $I$ of the problem, it returns a solution $S$ such that $r(I, S) \leq f(|I|)$.

The notion of a gap-reduction was introduced in [1] by Arora and Lund. A maximization problem $\Pi$ is called gap-reducible to a maximization problem $\Pi^{\prime}$ with parameters ( $c, \rho$ ) and $\left(c^{\prime}, \rho^{\prime}\right), \rho, \rho^{\prime} \geq 1$, if there exists a polynomial time computable function $f$ which maps any instance $I$ of $\Pi$ to an instance $I^{\prime}$ of $\Pi^{\prime}$, while satisfying the following properties.

- If $o p t(I) \geq c$ then $o p t\left(I^{\prime}\right) \geq c^{\prime}$
- If $\operatorname{opt}(I)<\frac{c}{\rho}$ then $\operatorname{opt}\left(I^{\prime}\right)<\frac{c^{\prime}}{\rho^{\prime}}$

The interest of a gap-reduction is that if $\Pi$ is not approximable within a factor $\rho$ then $\Pi^{\prime}$ is not approximable within a factor $\rho^{\prime}$.

The notion of an E-reduction (error-preserving reduction) was introduced by Khanna et al. [11]. A problem $\Pi$ is called $E$-reducible to a problem $\Pi^{\prime}$, if there exist polynomial time computable functions $f, g$ and a constant $\beta$ such that

- $f$ maps an instance $I$ of $\Pi$ to an instance $I^{\prime}$ of $\Pi^{\prime}$ such that opt $(I)$ and $o p t\left(I^{\prime}\right)$ are related by a polynomial factor, i.e. there exists a polynomial $p$ such that $\operatorname{opt}\left(I^{\prime}\right) \leq p(|I|) \operatorname{opt}(I)$,
- $g$ maps any solution $S^{\prime}$ of $I^{\prime}$ to one solution $S$ of $I$ such that $\varepsilon(I, S) \leq \beta \varepsilon\left(I^{\prime}, S^{\prime}\right)$.

An important property of an $E$-reduction is that it can be applied uniformly to all levels of approximability; that is, if $\Pi$ is $E$-reducible to $\Pi^{\prime}$ and $\Pi^{\prime}$ belongs to $\mathcal{C}$ then $\Pi$ belongs to $\mathcal{C}$ as well, where $\mathcal{C}$ is a class of optimization problems with any kind of approximation guarantee (see also [11]).

A problem $\Pi$ is called $E$-equivalent to a problem $\Pi^{\prime}$ if $\Pi$ is $E$-reducible to $\Pi^{\prime}$ and $\Pi^{\prime}$ is $E$-reducible to $\Pi$.

## $3 k$ Most Vital Edges MST

Frederikson and Solis-Oba [6] show that $k$ Most Vital Edges MST is $N P$-hard even for graphs with weights 0 or 1 and that the problem is $O(\log k)$-approximable for graphs with arbitrary weights. In this section, we strengthen the $N P$-hardness result of Frederickson and Solis-Oba by specifying a more restricted class of instances for which the problem remains $N P$-hard. Moreover, we establish a constant approximation result for graphs with weights 0 or 1.

First we show that we can decide in polynomial time if the optimum value is a fixed constant.

Proposition 1 For any fixed value $c \geq 0$, it can be checked in polynomial time if the optimum value of $k$ Most Vital Edges MST on graphs with weights 0 or 1 on edges is $c$.

Proof: Consider an instance $I$ of $k$ Most Vital Edges MST formed by a weighted graph $G=(V, E)$, with weights 0 or 1 , and by a positive integer $k$. Denote by $G_{0}=\left(V, E_{0}\right)$ the subgraph induced by the edges of weight 0 . Let $E_{1}=E \backslash E_{0}$ and $m_{1}=\left|E_{1}\right|$.

We have that $\operatorname{opt}(I)=0$ if and only if $G_{0}$ is $(k+1)$ edge-connected. Indeed, if $\operatorname{opt}(I)=0$ then $G_{0}$ must be $(k+1)$ edge-connected otherwise opt $(I)>0$. Conversely, if $G_{0}$ is $(k+1)$ edge-connected, then removing any subset of $k$ edges from $G_{0}$ induces a minimum spanning tree of weight 0 . Consequently, it is polynomial to verify if $\operatorname{opt}(I)=0$ since it is polynomial to determine the edge-connectivity of a given graph. Once we checked iteratively that $\operatorname{opt}(I) \neq \ell$, for $0 \leq \ell \leq c-1$, we consider all the $\binom{m_{1}}{c}$ graphs $G_{0} \cup R$, for any subset $R \subseteq E_{1}$ with $|R|=c$. We can decide in polynomial time if $\operatorname{opt}(I)=c$ by verifying if $G_{0} \cup R$ is $(k+1)$ edge-connected.

We show in the following that $k$ Most Vital Edges MST is $E$-equivalent to Max Component defined as follows.

## Max Component

Input: a connected graph and a positive integer $k$.
Output: a subset of $k$ edges to be removed such that the number of connected components in the obtained graph is maximum.

Theorem $1 k$ Most Vital Edges MST for graphs with weights 0 or 1 is E-equivalent to Max Component.

Proof: We first show that Max component is $E$-reducible to $k$ Most Vital Edges MST. Given an instance $I$ of Max component formed by a graph $G=(V, E)$ with $n$ nodes, we construct an instance $I^{\prime}$ of $k$ Most Vital Edges MST consisting of a complete graph $G^{\prime}=\left(V, E^{\prime}\right)$ where each edge $(i, j) \in E^{\prime}$ is assigned a weight 0 if $(i, j) \in E$ and 1 otherwise.

Let $S^{*} \subseteq E$ be a subset of $k$ edges whose deletion from $G$ generates a maximum number of connected components. By removing $S^{*}$ from $G^{\prime}$, all the connected components of $G-S^{*}$ are linked in $G^{\prime}-S^{*}$ by edges of weight 1 . Thus, the weight of a minimum spanning tree in $G^{\prime}-S^{*}$ is equal to the number of connected components in $G-S^{*}$ minus 1 . Therefore, we have $\operatorname{opt}\left(I^{\prime}\right) \geq o p t(I)-1$.

Let $S^{\prime} \subseteq E^{\prime}$ be a subset of $k$ edges whose deletion from $G^{\prime}$ generates a minimum spanning tree in $G^{\prime}-S^{\prime}$ of weight $v$. If $S^{\prime}$ contains edges of weight 1 then by replacing these edges by edges of weight 0 , either the weight of a minimum spanning tree in the modified graph remains unchanged or it increases. Thus, considering $S$ defined from $S^{\prime}$ by replacing edges of weight 1 with edges from $E^{\prime} \backslash S^{\prime}$ of weight 0 , se define a subset $S \subseteq E$ such that $G-S$ contains at least $v+1$ connected components. Hence, $\operatorname{val}(I, S) \geq \operatorname{val}\left(I^{\prime}, S^{\prime}\right)+1$. In particular, when $S$ is an optimum solution, we have $\operatorname{opt}\left(I^{\prime}\right)+1 \leq \operatorname{val}(I, S) \leq \operatorname{opt}(I)$. It follows from the previous result that opt $(I)=o p t\left(I^{\prime}\right)+1$.
Therefore, we have $o p t\left(I^{\prime}\right) \leq o p t(I)$ and $\varepsilon(I, S)=\frac{o p t(I)}{v a l(I, S)}-1 \leq \frac{o p t\left(I^{\prime}\right)+1}{v a l\left(I^{\prime}, S^{\prime}\right)+1}-1=\frac{o p t\left(I^{\prime}\right)-v a l\left(I^{\prime}, S^{\prime}\right)}{v a l\left(I^{\prime}, S^{\prime}\right)+1}$ $\leq \frac{o p t\left(I^{\prime}\right)-v a l\left(I^{\prime}, S^{\prime}\right)}{\operatorname{val}\left(I^{\prime}, S^{\prime}\right)}=\varepsilon\left(I^{\prime}, S^{\prime}\right)$.

We show now that $k$ Most Vital Edges MST is $E$-reducible to Max component. Consider an instance $I$ of $k$ Most Vital Edges MST formed by a graph $G=(V, E)$ with edges of weight 0 or 1 . From Proposition 1, we can consider that $\operatorname{opt}(I)>0$. We construct an instance $I^{\prime}$ of Max component consisting of the graph $G^{\prime}=\left(V, E^{\prime}\right)$ obtained from $G$ by considering only edges of weight 0 .

Let $S^{*}$ be a subset of $k$ edges whose removal from $G$ generates a minimum spanning tree $T$ in $G-S^{*}$ of maximum weight. The weight of $T$ being equal to the number of edges of $T$
of weight 1 , by deleting edges of $S^{*} \cap E^{\prime}$ plus any $k-\left|S^{*} \cap E^{\prime}\right|$ edges from $E^{\prime}$, the number of connected components in $G^{\prime}-S^{*}$ is at least equal to the weight of $T$ plus 1. Thus, we have $o p t\left(I^{\prime}\right) \geq o p t(I)+1$.

Consider a subset $S^{\prime}$ of $k$ edges whose deletion from $G^{\prime}$ partitions $G^{\prime}$ into $\operatorname{val}\left(I^{\prime}, S^{\prime}\right)$ connected components. If $\operatorname{val}\left(I^{\prime}, S^{\prime}\right)=1$ then we can replace $S^{\prime}$ by another solution with value at least 2 obtained by selecting $k$ edges including a minimum cut since from Proposition $1, G^{\prime}$ is not $(k+1)$ edge-connected. Thus, we can assume that $\operatorname{val}\left(I^{\prime}, S^{\prime}\right) \geq 2$. By removing $S^{\prime}$ from $G$, all connected components of $G^{\prime}-S^{\prime}$ are linked in $G-S^{\prime}$ by edges of weight 1 . Thus, the weight of a minimum spanning tree in $G-S^{\prime}$ is equal to $\operatorname{val}\left(I^{\prime}, S^{\prime}\right)-1$. Then, $\operatorname{val}\left(I, S^{\prime}\right) \geq \operatorname{val}\left(I^{\prime}, S^{\prime}\right)-1$. In particular, when $S^{\prime}$ is an optimum solution in $G^{\prime}$, we have $\operatorname{val}\left(I, S^{\prime}\right)=\operatorname{opt}\left(I^{\prime}\right)-1$ and thus $\operatorname{opt}(I) \geq \operatorname{opt}\left(I^{\prime}\right)-1$. It follows from the previous result that $o p t\left(I^{\prime}\right)=o p t(I)+1$.
Therefore, since $\operatorname{opt}(I)>0$, we have $\operatorname{opt}\left(I^{\prime}\right) \leq 2 \operatorname{opt}(I)$ and $\varepsilon\left(I, S^{\prime}\right)=\frac{\operatorname{opt}(I)}{\operatorname{val}\left(I, S^{\prime}\right)}-1 \leq$ $\frac{\operatorname{opt}\left(I^{\prime}\right)-1}{\operatorname{val}\left(I^{\prime}, S^{\prime}\right)-1}-1=\frac{\operatorname{opt}\left(I^{\prime}\right)-v a l\left(I^{\prime}, S^{\prime}\right)}{\operatorname{val}\left(I^{\prime}, S^{\prime}\right)-1}=\frac{\operatorname{val}\left(I^{\prime}, S^{\prime}\right)}{\operatorname{val}\left(I^{\prime}, S^{\prime}\right)-1} \frac{\operatorname{opt}\left(I^{\prime}\right)-\operatorname{val}\left(I^{\prime}, S^{\prime}\right)}{\operatorname{val}\left(I^{\prime}, S^{\prime}\right)} \leq 2 \frac{\operatorname{opt}\left(I^{\prime}\right)-\operatorname{val}\left(I^{\prime}, S^{\prime}\right)}{\operatorname{val}\left(I^{\prime}, S^{\prime}\right)}=2 \varepsilon\left(I^{\prime}, S^{\prime}\right)$.

From Theorem 1, we obtain the two following results. First, we slightly strengthen the $N P$-hardness result of Frederickson and Solis-Oba [6] by specifying a more restricted class of instances for which the problem remains $N P$-hard.

Corollary $1 k$ Most Vital Edges MST is NP-hard even for complete graphs with weights 0 or 1.

Proof: The $E$-reduction from Max Component to $k$ Most Vital Edges MST constructs from any graph $G$ a complete graph $G^{\prime}$ with weights 0 or 1 . Since Max Component is $N P$ hard [6], the results follows.

Second, we establish a constant approximation result for graphs with weights 0 or 1 .
Corollary $2 k$ Most Vital Edges MST is 3-approximable for graphs with weights 0 or 1.
Proof: In the $E$-reduction from $k$ Most Vital Edges MST to Max component, we have shown that any solution $S$ of $I^{\prime}$ is such that $\varepsilon(I, S) \leq 2 \varepsilon\left(I^{\prime}, S\right)$. Thus, $r(I, S)-1 \leq$ $2\left(r\left(I^{\prime}, S\right)-1\right)$ and then $r(I, S) \leq 2 r\left(I^{\prime}, S\right)-1$. Since $r\left(I^{\prime}, S\right)=2$ as established in [6], we have $r(I, S) \leq 3$.

## $4 \quad k$ Most Vital Nodes MST

We study in this section the complexity of $k$ Most Vital Nodes MST. First we show that $k$ Most Vital Nodes MST is at least as hard as $k$ Most Vital Edges MST by establishing an $E$-reduction from the edge version to the node version. As far as we know, this is the first result in the literature that establishes a direct relationship between the $k$ most vital edge version and the $k$ most vital node version of a problem. Using the $N P$-hardness of the edge version even for graphs with weights 0 or $1[6]$, this reduction implies the $N P$-hardness of $k$ Most Vital Nodes MST on the same class of graphs. We strengthen this result by proving that $k$ Most Vital Nodes MST is not approximable within a factor $n^{1-\epsilon}$, for any $\epsilon>0$, if $N P \neq Z P P$, even for complete graphs with weights 0 or 1 .

Theorem $2 k$ Most Vital Edges MST is E-reducible to $k$ Most Vital Nodes MST.
Proof: Consider an instance $I$ of $k$ Most Vital Edges MST formed by a weighted graph $G=(V, E)$ with $V=\left\{v_{1}, \ldots, v_{n}\right\}$ and $|E|=m$. We construct an instance $I^{\prime}$ of $k$ Most Vital Nodes MST formed by a graph $G^{\prime}=\left(V^{\prime}, E^{\prime}\right)$ as follows (see Figure 1). We consider in $G^{\prime}$ the nodes of $V$ and $m$ nodes $r_{1}, \ldots, r_{m}$. Let $R=\left\{r_{1}, \ldots, r_{m}\right\}$. To each edge $e_{\ell}=\left(v_{i}, v_{j}\right) \in E$ of weight $w_{i j}, \ell=1, \ldots, m$ and $i<j$, we associate two edges in $E^{\prime}:\left(v_{i}, r_{\ell}\right)$ of weight $w_{i j}$ and ( $r_{\ell}, v_{j}$ ) of weight 0 . Let $K_{k}^{v_{i}}$, for $i=1, \ldots, n$, be $n$ complete graphs of size $k$ with $X_{v_{i}}=\left\{v_{i}^{1}, \ldots, v_{i}^{k}\right\}$ and weights 0 on their edges. We connect each node $v_{i}$, for $i=1, \ldots, n$, to the $k$ nodes of $K_{k}^{v_{i}}$ and assign a weight 0 to these added edges. We also add, for each edge $\left(v_{i}, r_{\ell}\right) \in E^{\prime}$ the edges $\left(v_{i}^{h}, r_{\ell}\right)$, for $h=1, \ldots, k$, with the same weight as the weight of the edge $\left(v_{i}, r_{\ell}\right)$.


Figure 1: Construction of an instance of $k$ Most Vital Nodes MST from an instance of $k$ Most Vital Edges MST

Suppose first that there exists a subset $S^{*} \subseteq E$, with $\left|S^{*}\right|=k$, such that a minimum spanning tree $T$ in $G-S^{*}$ has a maximum weight. We set $N^{*}=\left\{r_{\ell}: e_{\ell} \in S^{*}\right\}$. By deleting $N^{*}$ from $G^{\prime}$, we construct a spanning tree $T^{\prime}$ in $G^{\prime}-N^{*}$ as follows : we take for each edge $e_{\ell}=\left(v_{i}, v_{j}\right) \in T$ with $i<j$, the edges $\left(v_{i}, r_{\ell}\right)$ and $\left(r_{\ell}, v_{j}\right)$ in $T^{\prime}$, for each edge $e_{h}=\left(v_{i}, v_{j}\right) \notin T$ with $i<j$, the edge $\left(r_{h}, v_{j}\right)$ in $T^{\prime}$, and we add the paths $v_{i}, v_{i}^{1}, \ldots, v_{i}^{k}, i=1, \ldots, n$. We prove, by contradiction, that $T^{\prime}$ is a minimum spanning tree in $G^{\prime}-N^{*}$. Suppose that there exists a spanning tree $T^{\prime \prime}$ in $G^{\prime}-N^{*}$ of weight strictly inferior to that of $T^{\prime}$. Then, the spanning tree constituted by the edges $e_{\ell}=\left(v_{i}, v_{j}\right)$ such that $\left(v_{i}, r_{\ell}\right) \in T^{\prime \prime}$ has a smaller weight than $T$ in $G-S^{*}$, contradicting the optimality of $T$. Thus, $T^{\prime}$ is a minimum spanning tree in $G^{\prime}-N^{*}$. Therefore, we have $\operatorname{opt}\left(I^{\prime}\right) \geq \operatorname{opt}(I)$.

Consider now a subset $N$, with $|N|=k$, and a minimum spanning tree $T^{\prime}$ in $G^{\prime}-N$. If $N$ contains $v_{i}$ or one node $v_{i}^{h}$, for a given $i$ and $h$, then the weight of a MST in $G^{\prime}-N$ is the same as in $G^{\prime}-\left(N \backslash\left\{v_{i}\right\}\right)$ or $G^{\prime}-\left(N \backslash\left\{v_{i}^{h}\right\}\right)$. When removing all nodes $v_{i}, v_{i}^{h}$ from $N$ we
obtain a subset $N^{\prime} \subseteq R,\left|N^{\prime}\right| \leq k$. Since $N^{\prime}$ corresponds to edges in $G$, any subset $N^{\prime \prime} \subseteq R$ containing $N^{\prime}$ such that $\left|N^{\prime \prime}\right|=k$ is such that the weight of a MST in $G^{\prime}-N^{\prime \prime}$ is at least as large as the weight of a MST in $G^{\prime}-N^{\prime}$. Let $S=\left\{e_{\ell}: r_{\ell} \in N^{\prime \prime}\right\}$. Consider $T$ the spanning tree in $G-S$ constituted by the edges $e_{\ell}=\left(v_{i}, v_{j}\right)$ such that the edge $\left(v_{i}, r_{\ell}\right) \in T^{\prime} . T$ is optimal, since otherwise, the existence of a spanning tree $T^{\prime \prime}$ of weight strictly inferior to that of $T$ would imply that the corresponding spanning tree constructed from $T^{\prime \prime}$ in $G^{\prime}-N^{\prime \prime}$, as explained above, has a weight strictly inferior to that of $T^{\prime}$. Thus, $T$ is a minimum spanning tree in $G-S$ of the same weight as $T^{\prime}$. Hence, $\operatorname{val}(I, S)=\operatorname{val}\left(I^{\prime}, N^{\prime \prime}\right)$. In particular, when $N^{\prime \prime}$ is an optimal solution in $G^{\prime}$, we have $\operatorname{opt}\left(I^{\prime}\right)=\operatorname{val}(I, S) \leq \operatorname{opt}(I)$. It follows from the previous result that $\operatorname{opt}(I)=\operatorname{opt}\left(I^{\prime}\right)$. Therefore, we have $\varepsilon(I, S)=\varepsilon\left(I^{\prime}, N^{\prime \prime}\right)$.

Theorem $3 k$ Most Vital Nodes MST is not approximable within a factor $n^{1-\epsilon}$, for any $\epsilon>0$, unless $N P=Z P P$, even for complete graphs of order $n$ with weights 0 or 1 .

Proof: We propose a gap-reduction from Max independent set to $k$ Most Vital Nodes MST.

Denote by $\alpha(G)$ the cardinality of maximum independent set of $G$. Let $g$ be the non approximation gap of Max independent set. Thus, for a given integer $\ell$, it is $N P$-hard to decide if $\alpha(G)=\ell$ or $\alpha(G)<\frac{\ell}{g}$.

Given an instance $I$ of Max independent set formed by a graph $G=(V, E)$, we construct an instance $I^{\prime}$ of $k$ Most Vital Nodes MST constituted by a complete graph $G^{\prime}=\left(V, E^{\prime}\right)$ where each edge $(i, j) \in E^{\prime}$ is assigned a weight 0 if $(i, j) \in E$ and 1 otherwise (see Figure 2). We set $k=n-\ell$. We show that:

1. $\alpha(G)=\ell \Rightarrow \operatorname{opt}\left(I^{\prime}\right) \geq \ell-1$
2. $\alpha(G)<\frac{\ell}{g} \Rightarrow \operatorname{opt}\left(I^{\prime}\right)<\frac{\ell-1}{g}$


Figure 2: Construction of an instance of $k$ Most Vital Nodes MST from an instance of Max Independent Set

1. Suppose first that there exists an independent set $V^{*}$ in $G$ of cardinality $\ell$ and let $N^{*}=V \backslash V^{*}$. By removing $N^{*}$ from $G^{\prime}$, all nodes of $G^{\prime}-N^{*}$ are connected by edges of weight 1 only. Thus, we obtain a minimum spanning tree in $G^{\prime}-N^{*}$ of value $\ell-1$. Therefore, opt $\left(I^{\prime}\right) \geq \ell-1$.
2. Suppose now that $\alpha(G)<\frac{\ell}{g}$. Hence, there exists a maximum independent set $V^{*}$ such that $\left|V^{*}\right|<\frac{\ell}{g}$. If the node set $N^{*}$ of cardinality $n-\ell$ to be removed from $G^{\prime}$ is such that $N^{*} \cap V^{*}=\emptyset$ then let $V_{1}=V \backslash\left(N^{*} \cup V^{*}\right)$. Each node of $V_{1}$ is at least connected to one node of $V^{*}$ by an edge of weight 0 , otherwise $V^{*} \cup\{v\}$ would be an independent
set in $G$ of larger cardinality. Thus, the weight of a minimum spanning tree in $G^{\prime}-N^{*}$ cannot exceed $\frac{\ell}{g}-1$. Since $g>1$, we have $\frac{\ell}{g}-1<\frac{\ell-1}{g}$. Therefore if $\alpha(G)<\frac{\ell}{g}$ then $\operatorname{opt}\left(I^{\prime}\right)<\frac{\ell-1}{g}$. If $N^{*} \cap V^{*} \neq \emptyset$ then a minimum spanning tree in $G^{\prime}-N^{*}$ would have a weight strictly inferior to $\frac{\ell}{g}-1$.

Since Max independent set is not approximable within a factor $n^{1-\epsilon}$, for any $\epsilon>$ 0 , unless $N P=Z P P$ [7], we deduce that $k$ Most Vital Nodes MST is also not $n^{1-\epsilon_{-}}$ approximable, for any $\epsilon>0$, unless $N P=Z P P$.

From Theorem 3 and Corollary 2, we can give the following result.
Corollary 3 There is no E-reduction from $k$ Most Vital Nodes MST for graphs with weights 0 or 1 to $k$ Most Vital Edges MST for graphs with weights 0 or 1.

## 5 Min Edge Blocker MST

We present in the following a relationship between $k$ Most Vital Edges MST and Min Edge Blocker MST.

Proposition $2 k$ Most Vital Edges MST and Min Edge Blocker MST are polynomialtime equivalent.

Proof: If an algorithm $\mathcal{A}_{k}$ solves $k$ Most Vital Edges MST defined on graph $G$ for all $1 \leq k \leq \lambda(G)-1$, then we can run $\mathcal{A}_{k}$ for $k=1, \ldots, \lambda(G)-1$ and choose the smallest $k$ yielding optimum at least $U$. If no $k$ exists then the optimum for Min Edge Blocker MST is $\lambda(G)$. Conversely, if an algorithm $\mathcal{B}_{U}$ solves Min Edge Blocker MST with any bound $U$, we can apply binary search to locate the largest $U$ that requires the removal of at most $k$ nodes.

Theorem 4 Min Edge Blocker MST is NP-hard even for complete graphs with weights 0 or 1 .

Proof: Follows from Proposition 2 and Corollary 1.

## 6 Min Node Blocker MST

The equivalent of Proposition 2 applied to nodes also holds (with a similar proof).
Proposition $3 k$ Most Vital Nodes MST and Min Node Blocker MST are polynomialtime equivalent.

Theorem 5 Min Node Blocker MST is NP-hard even for complete graphs with weights 0 or 1.

Proof: Follows from Proposition 3 and Theorem 3.
This result could also be established by the following gap-reduction from Min Edge Blocker MST.

Theorem 6 Min Edge Blocker MST is gap-reducible to Min Node Blocker MST.
Proof: Consider an instance $I$ for Min Edge Blocker MST formed by a graph $G=(V, E)$, with $|V|=n$ and $|E|=m$, and a positive integer $U$. We construct an instance $I^{\prime}$ for Min Node Blocker MST, constituted by a graph $G^{\prime}=\left(V^{\prime}, E^{\prime}\right)$ and a positive integer $U$, using the same construction as in Theorem 2, but we modify the size of the $n$ complete graphs which we set to be $m+1$. We show that

1. $\operatorname{opt}(I) \leq c \Rightarrow o p t\left(I^{\prime}\right) \leq c$
2. $\operatorname{opt}(I)>c \rho \Rightarrow \operatorname{opt}\left(I^{\prime}\right)>c \rho$
3. Let $S^{*} \subseteq E$ be a subset of minimum cardinality such that a minimum spanning tree $T$ in $G-S^{*}$ has a weight at least $U$. We set $N^{*}=\left\{r_{\ell}: e_{\ell} \in S^{*}\right\}$. By deleting $N^{*}$ from $G^{\prime}$, we construct a minimum spanning tree $T^{\prime}$ in $G^{\prime}-N^{*}$ of the same weight as that of $T$ as explained in Theorem 2. Thus, the weight of $T^{\prime}$ is at least $U$. Therefore, $o p t\left(I^{\prime}\right) \leq o p t(I) \leq c$.
4. Suppose now that $\operatorname{opt}(I)>c \rho$. When we remove all nodes of $R$ from $G^{\prime}$, the weight of a minimum spanning tree is infinite. Hence, $\operatorname{opt}\left(I^{\prime}\right) \leq m$. Let $N \subseteq V^{\prime}$ be an optimal solution whose deletion generates a minimum spanning tree $T^{\prime}$ in $G^{\prime}-N$ of weight at least $U$. If $N$ contains $v_{i}$ or one node $v_{i}^{h}$, for a given $i$ and $h$, then $N$ must contain all the $m+1$ nodes $v_{i}$ and $X_{v_{i}}$, since otherwise the weight of a minimum spanning in $G^{\prime}-N$ is the same as in $G^{\prime}-\left(N \backslash\left\{v_{i}\right\}\right)$ or $G^{\prime}-\left(N \backslash\left\{v_{i}^{h}\right\}\right)$. Therefore, since $\operatorname{opt}\left(I^{\prime}\right) \leq m$, we can consider that $N \subseteq R$. Let $S=\left\{e_{\ell}: r_{\ell} \in N\right\}$. We construct a minimum spanning tree $T$ in $G-S$ as explained in Theorem 2. The weight of $T$ being equal to the weight of $T^{\prime}$ is at least $U$. Hence, $\operatorname{opt}(I) \leq \operatorname{val}(I, S)=\operatorname{val}\left(I^{\prime}, N\right)=\operatorname{opt}\left(I^{\prime}\right)$ and thus $o p t\left(I^{\prime}\right)>c \rho$.

In the absence of known inapproximability results for Min Edge Blocker MST, we can only exploit the above $g a p$-reduction to establish the $N P$-hardness of Min Node Blocker MST. Nevertheless, we can obtain the following stronger result.

Theorem 7 Min Node Blocker MST is NP-hard to approximate within a factor 1.36 even for graphs with weights 0 or 1 .

Proof: We propose a gap-reduction from Min Vertex Cover. Consider an instance $I$ of Min Vertex Cover formed by a graph $G=(V, E)$ with $V=\left\{v_{1}, \ldots, v_{n}\right\}$. We construct from $I$, an instance $I^{\prime}$ of Min Node Blocker MST constituted by a graph $G^{\prime}=\left(V^{\prime}, E^{\prime}\right)$ and a positive integer $U$ as follows (see Figure 3). $G^{\prime}$ is a copy of $G$ to which we add a path $x_{1}, x_{2}, \ldots, x_{n}$ with $X=\left\{x_{1}, \ldots, x_{n}\right\}$ and we connect each node $x_{i}$ to the nodes $x_{i}^{1}, \ldots, x_{i}^{n}$ of a complete graph $K_{n}^{i}$ of size $n$. We also connect each node $x_{i}^{r}$ to node $x_{i+1}$ and each node $x_{i}$ to node $x_{i+1}^{r}$ for $i=1, \ldots, n-1$ and $r=1, \ldots, n$. We connect each node $v_{i}$ to nodes $x_{i}$ and $x_{i}^{r}$, for $i=1, \ldots, n$ and $r=1, \ldots, n$. We associate a weight 1 to all edges of the path $\left(x_{1}, x_{2}\right),\left(x_{2}, x_{3}\right), \ldots,\left(x_{n-1}, x_{n}\right)$ and to edges $\left(x_{i}^{r}, x_{i+1}\right)$ and $\left(x_{i}, x_{i+1}^{r}\right)$ for $i=1, \ldots, n-1$ and $r=1, \ldots, n$, and a weight 0 to all other edges in $E^{\prime}$. We set $U=n-1$.

We show that


Figure 3: Construction of an instance of Min Node Blocker MST from an instance of Min Vertex Cover

1. $\operatorname{opt}(I) \leq c \Rightarrow \operatorname{opt}\left(I^{\prime}\right) \leq c$
2. $\operatorname{opt}(I)>c \rho \Rightarrow \operatorname{opt}\left(I^{\prime}\right)>c \rho$
which establishes that Min Node Blocker MST is $N P$-hard to approximate within a factor 1.36, since Min Vertex Cover is $N P$-hard to approximate within a factor 1.36 [5].
3. Let $V^{*} \subseteq V$ be a minimum vertex cover in $G$. By deleting the nodes of $V^{*}$ from $G^{\prime}$, the nodes of $V \backslash V^{*}$ form an independent set in $G^{\prime}-V^{*}$. Then, connecting any two nodes $x_{i}, x_{j}$ in $G^{\prime}-V^{*}$ requires to use a path of weight at least 1 . Thus, a minimum spanning tree in $G^{\prime}-V^{*}$, of weight $U=n-1$, is obtained by connecting the nodes $x_{i}$ through the path $x_{1}, x_{2}, \ldots, x_{n}$ and each node $v_{i} \in V \backslash V^{*}$ and $x_{i}^{r}$ to node $x_{i}$, for $i=1, \ldots, n$ and $r=1, \ldots, n$. Therefore, we get $o p t\left(I^{\prime}\right) \leq o p t(I) \leq c$.
4. Suppose now that $o p t(I)>c \rho$. When we remove all nodes $v_{i}, i=1, \ldots, n$ from $G^{\prime}$, the weight of a minimum spanning tree in the resulting graph is $U$. Hence, opt $\left(I^{\prime}\right) \leq n$. Let $N \subseteq V^{\prime}$ be an optimal solution. If $N$ contains nodes $x_{i}$ or $x_{i}^{\ell}$ for a given $i$ and $\ell$, then $N$ must contain all the nodes $x_{i}$ and $x_{i}^{r}$ for $r=1, \ldots, n$, otherwise the weight of a minimum spanning tree in $G^{\prime}-N$ is the same as in $G^{\prime}-\left(N \backslash\left\{x_{i}\right\}\right)$ or $G^{\prime}-\left(N \backslash\left\{x_{i}^{\ell}\right\}\right)$. Therefore, since $\operatorname{opt}\left(I^{\prime}\right) \leq n$, we can consider in the following that $N$ is included in $V$. We show in the following that $N$ is a vertex cover in $G$. Suppose that there exists an edge $\left(v_{i}, v_{j}\right) \in E$ such that $v_{i} \notin N$ and $v_{j} \notin N$. By deleting $N$ from $G^{\prime}$, the weight of a minimum spanning tree in $G^{\prime}-N$ is at most equal to $n-2$. Indeed, in such a minimum spanning tree the nodes $x_{i}, v_{i}, v_{j}, x_{j}$ are not connected by the edges $\left(v_{i}, x_{i}\right),\left(x_{j}, v_{j}\right)$ and the path on $X$ from $x_{i}$ to $x_{j}$ but by the path $\left(x_{i}, v_{i}\right),\left(v_{i}, v_{j}\right),\left(v_{j}, x_{j}\right)$ of weight 0 , thus contradicting the fact that the weight of a minimum spanning tree in $G^{\prime}-N$ must be at least $n-1$. Thus, $N$ is a vertex cover in $G$ and $\operatorname{opt}(I) \leq \operatorname{val}(I, N)=\operatorname{val}\left(I^{\prime}, N\right)=\operatorname{opt}\left(I^{\prime}\right)$ and then $\operatorname{opt}\left(I^{\prime}\right)>c \rho$.

## 7 Conclusions

As a first result, we established or strengthened the $N P$-hardness of the four studied problems. Regarding approximation, negative results were obtained only for the node related versions and positive results were obtained only for $k$ Most Vital Edges MST. This situation, combined with our reductions from edge related versions to node related versions (see Theorems 2 and 6, and Corollary 3) clearly shows that node related versions are more difficult than edge related versions. An interesting perspective is to look for approximability results for $k$ Most Vital Nodes MST and Min Edge (Node) blocker MST and for inapproximability results for edge related versions.
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