

# Fast Biclustering by Dual Parameterization

Pål Grønås Drange      Felix Reidl  
 Fernando Sánchez Villaamil      Somnath Sikdar

July 15, 2021

## Abstract

We study two clustering problems, `STARFOREST EDITING`, the problem of adding and deleting edges to obtain a disjoint union of stars, and the generalization `BICLUSTER EDITING`. We show that, in addition to being NP-hard, none of the problems can be solved in subexponential time unless the exponential time hypothesis fails.

Misra, Panolan, and Saurabh (MFCS 2013) argue that introducing a bound on the number of connected components in the solution should not make the problem easier: In particular, they argue that the subexponential time algorithm for editing to a fixed number of clusters (`p-CLUSTER EDITING`) by Fomin et al. (J. Comput. Syst. Sci., 80(7) 2014) is an *exception* rather than the rule. Here,  $p$  is a secondary parameter, bounding the number of components in the solution.

However, upon bounding the number of stars or bicliques in the solution, we obtain algorithms which run in time  $2^{5\sqrt{pk}} + O(n+m)$  for `p-STARFOREST EDITING` and  $2^{O(p\sqrt{k} \log(pk))} + O(n+m)$  for `p-BICLUSTER EDITING`. We obtain a similar result for the more general case of `t-PARTITE p-CLUSTER EDITING`. This is subexponential in  $k$  for a fixed number of clusters, since  $p$  is then considered a constant.

Our results even out the number of multivariate subexponential time algorithms and give reasons to believe that this area warrants further study.

## 1 Introduction

Identifying clusters and biclusters has been a central motif in data mining research [21] and forms the cornerstone of algorithmic applications in e.g. biology [24] and expression data analysis [7]. Cai [6] showed that clustering—among many other graph modification problems of similar flavor—is solvable in fixed-parameter tractable time. Parallel to these general results, some progress was made in the area of graphs of topological nature: many problems are, when restricted to classes characterized by a finite set of forbidden minors, solvable in *subexponential parameterized time*, i.e. they admit algorithms with time complexity  $2^{o(k)} \cdot \text{poly}(n)$ .

The complexity class of problems admitting such an algorithm is called `SUBEPT` and was defined by Flum and Grohe in the seminal textbook on parameterized complexity [13]. They simultaneously noticed that most natural

problems did, in fact, *not* live in this complexity class: The classical NP-hardness reductions paired with the *exponential time hypothesis* of Impagliazzo, Paturi and Zane [19] is enough to show that no  $2^{o(k)} \cdot \text{poly}(n)$  algorithm exists.

In this context, Jianer Chen posed the following open problem in the field of parameterized algorithms [5]: Are there examples of natural problems on graphs, that do not have such a topological constraint, and also have subexponential parameterized running time? Alon, Lokshtanov and Saurabh [1] partially answered this question in the positive by providing a subexponential time algorithm for FEEDBACK ARC SET on tournament graphs. However, tournament graphs form a rather atypical class of graphs<sup>1</sup>, so Chen’s question cannot be considered fully answered—are there problems which are in SUBEPT on general graphs?

This is indeed the case. Fomin and Villanger [15] showed that MINIMUM FILL-IN was solvable in time  $2^{O(\sqrt{k} \log k)} + \text{poly}(n)$ . MINIMUM FILL-IN is the problem of completing a graph into a chordal graph, adding as few edges as possible. Following this, a line of research was established investigating whether more graph modification problems admit such algorithms. It proved to be a fruitful area; Since the result by Fomin and Villanger, we now know that several graph modification problems towards classes such as split graphs [16], threshold graphs [10], trivially perfect graphs [11], (proper) interval graphs [3, 4] and more admit subexponential time algorithms.

While these classes are rather “simple”, they certainly are much more complex than simple cluster or bicluster graphs. Therefore, the problems CLUSTER EDITING and CLUSTER DELETION were logical candidates for subexponential time algorithms. Surprisingly, we cannot expect that such algorithms exist. Komusiewicz and Uhlmann gave an elegant reduction proving that both parameterized and exact subexponential time algorithms were not achievable, unless ETH fails [20]. On the other hand, the problem  $p$ -CLUSTER EDITING, where the number of components in the target class is fixed to be at most  $p$ —rather surprisingly—does indeed admit a subexponential parameterized time algorithm; This was shown by Fomin et al. [14], who designed an algorithm solving this problem in time  $2^{O(\sqrt{pk})} \cdot \text{poly}(n)$ .

Misra, Panolan, and Saurabh [22] explicitly stated their surprise about this result: In their opinion, bounding the number of components in the target graph should in general *not* facilitate subexponential time algorithms (ibid.): “*We show that this sub-exponential time algorithm for the fixed number of cliques is rather an exception than a rule.*”

We show that the related problem BICLUSTER EDITING and its generalization  $t$ -PARTITE  $p$ -CLUSTER EDITING as well as the special case STARFOREST EDITING also belong to this exceptional class of problems where a bound on the number of target components greatly improves their algorithmic tractability. Since BICLUSTER EDITING is an important tool in molecular biology and biological data analysis<sup>2</sup> and the necessary second parameter is not outlandish in these settings, we feel that this is a noteworthy insight. We complement these results with NP-completeness proofs for BICLUSTER EDITING and  $t$ -PARTITE  $p$ -CLUSTER

<sup>1</sup>For instance, DOMINATING SET is W[2]-hard on tournament graphs, but not expected to be NP-hard.

<sup>2</sup>For more motivations for biclustering problems, we refer to the two surveys related to biological research, by Madeira and Oliveira [21], and by Tanay, Sharan and Shamir [24].

EDITING on subcubic graphs and further show that, unless ETH fails, no parameterized or exact subexponential algorithm is possible without the secondary parameter. That a bound on the maximal degree does not contribute towards making these problems more tractable contrasts many other graph modification problems (like modifications towards split and threshold graphs [23]) which are polynomial time solvable in this setting.

Previously, it was known BICLUSTER EDITING in general is NP-complete [2], and Guo, Hüffner, Komusiewicz, and Zhang [17] studied the problem from a parameterized point of view, giving a linear problem kernel with  $6k$  vertices, and an algorithm solving the problem in time  $O(3.24^k + m)$ .

**Our contribution.** In this paper, we study both the very general  $t$ -PARTITE  $p$ -CLUSTER EDITING as well as editing to the aforementioned special cases. On the positive side, we show that

- $p$ -STARFOREST EDITING is solvable in time  $O(2^{5\sqrt{pk}} + n + m)$ , and
- both  $p$ -BICLUSTER EDITING and the more general  $t$ -PARTITE  $p$ -CLUSTER EDITING are solvable in time  $2^{O(p\sqrt{k}\log(pk))} + O(n + m)$  facilitated by a kernel of size  $O(ptk)$ , where  $t = 2$  in the case of  $p$ -BICLUSTER EDITING.

In many cases,  $p$  is considered a constant, and in this case our kernel has size linear in  $k$ . We supplement these algorithms with hardness results; Specifically, we show that

- assuming ETH, STARFOREST EDITING and BICLUSTER EDITING cannot be solved in time  $2^{o(k)} \cdot \text{poly}(n)$  and thus neither can  $t$ -PARTITE CLUSTER EDITING, and
- $p$ -STARFOREST EDITING is W[1]-hard if parameterized by  $p$  alone.

**Organization of the paper.** In Section 3 we give a subexponential time parameterized algorithm for the STARFOREST EDITING problem when parameterized by the editing budget and the number of stars in the solution simultaneously.

A necessary ingredient for our subexponential algorithms is a polynomial kernel. A kernel for BICLUSTER EDITING exists already [17] and we provide one for the  $t$ -partite case in Section 4. In Section 5 we show that  $p$ -BICLUSTER EDITING is solvable in subexponential time in  $k$ ; We give a  $2^{O(p\sqrt{k}\log(pk))} + O(n + m)$  algorithm and generalize it to editing to  $t$ -partite  $p$ -cluster graphs. The parameter  $p$  is usually considered to be a fixed constant, hence the running time is truly subexponential,  $2^{o(k)} + O(n + m)$  in the editing budget  $k$ . However, for a more fine-grained complexity analysis and for lower bounds, we treat  $p$  as a parameter.

In Section 6 we show that we cannot expect such an algorithm without an exponential dependency on  $p$ ; The problem is not solvable in time  $2^{o(k)}n^{O(1)}$  unless ETH fails. Further, we show that STARFOREST EDITING is W[1]-hard if parameterized by  $p$  alone, before we conclude in Section 7.

## 2 Preliminaries

We consider only finite simple graphs  $G = (V, E)$  and we use  $n$  and  $m$  to denote the size of the vertex set and edge set, respectively. We denote by  $N_G(v)$  the set of neighbors of  $v$  in  $G$ , and let  $\deg_G(v) = |N_G(v)|$ . We omit subscripts when the graph in question is clear from context. We refer to the monograph by Diestel [9] for graph terminology and notation not defined here. For information on parameterized complexity, we refer to the textbook by Flum and Grohe [13]. We consider an edge in  $E(G)$  to be a set of size two, i.e.,  $e \in E(G)$  is of the form  $\{u, v\} \subseteq V(G)$  with  $u \neq v$ . We denote by  $[V(G)]^2$  the set of all size two subsets of  $G$ . When  $F \subseteq [V(G)]^2$ , we write  $G \Delta F$  to denote  $G' = (V, E \Delta F)$ , where  $\Delta$  is the *symmetric difference*, i.e.,  $E \Delta F = (E \setminus F) \cup (F \setminus E)$ . When the graph is clear from context, we will refer to  $F$  simply as a set of edges rather than  $F \subseteq [V(G)]^2$ .

Let us fix the following terminology: A *star graph* is a tree of diameter at most two (a graph isomorphic to  $K_{1,\ell}$  for some  $\ell$ ). The degree-one vertices are called *leaves* and the vertex of higher degree the *center*. A *starforest* is a forest whose connected components are stars or, equivalently, a graph that does not contain  $\{K_3, P_4, C_4\}$  as induced subgraphs. A *biclique* is a complete bipartite graph  $K_{a,b}$  for some  $a, b \in \mathbb{N}$ , and a *bicluster graph* is a disjoint union of bicliques. A  $t$ -partite clique graph is a graph whose vertex set can be partitioned into at most  $t$  independent sets, all pairwise fully connected, and a  $t$ -partite cluster graph is a disjoint union of  $t$ -partite cliques. The problem of editing towards a starforest (resp. bicluster and  $t$ -partite cluster) is the algorithmic problem of adding and deleting as few edges as possible to convert a graph  $G$  to a starforest (resp. bicluster and  $t$ -partite cluster).

**Exponential time hypothesis.** To show that there is no subexponential time algorithm for STARFOREST EDITING we give a linear reduction from 3SAT, that is, a reduction which constructs an instance whose parameter is bounded linearly in the size of the input formula. The constructed instance will also have *size* bounded linearly in the size of the formula, and we use this to also rule out an exact subexponential algorithm of the form  $2^{o(n+m)} \cdot \text{poly}(n)$ . Pipelining such a reduction with an assumed subexponential parameterized algorithm for the problem would give a subexponential algorithm for 3SAT, contradicting the complexity hypothesis of Impagliazzo, Paturi, and Zane [19]. Their Sparsification Lemma shows that, unless ETH fails, 3SAT cannot be solved in time  $2^{o(n+m)}$ , where  $n$  and  $m$  here refer to the number of variables and the number of clauses, respectively.

## 3 Editing to starforests in subexponential time

A first natural step in handling modification problems related to bicluster graphs is modification towards the subclass of bicluster graphs called starforest. Recall that a graph is a starforest if it is a bicluster where every biclique has one side of size exactly one, or equivalently, every connected component is a star.

STARFOREST EDITING

*Input:* A graph  $G = (V, E)$  and a non-negative integer  $k$ .  
*Parameter:*  $k$   
*Question:* Is there a set of at most  $k$  edges  $F$  such that  $G \Delta F$  is a disjoint union of stars?

The problem where we only allow to *delete* edges is referred to as STARFOREST DELETION. These two problems can easily be observed to be equivalent; Adding an edge to a forbidden induced subgraph will create one of the other forbidden subgraphs, or simply put, it never makes sense to add an edge.

In Section 6 we show that this problem is NP-hard, and that it is not solvable in time  $2^{o(k)}n^{O(1)}$  unless the exponential time hypothesis fails.

**Multivariate analysis.** Since no subexponential algorithm is possible under ETH, we introduce a secondary parameter by  $p$  which bounds the number of connected components in a solution graph. This has previously been done with success in the CLUSTER EDITING problem [14]. Hence, we define the following multivariate variant of the above problem.

$p$ -STARFOREST EDITING

*Input:* A graph  $G = (V, E)$  and a non-negative integer  $k$ .  
*Parameter:*  $p, k$   
*Question:* Is there a set  $F$  of edges of size at most  $k$  such that  $G \Delta F$  is a disjoint union of exactly  $p$  stars?

Observe that this problem is *not* the same as  $p$ -STARFOREST DELETION since we might need to merge stars to achieve the desired value  $p$  for the number of connected components. In Section 6 we show that the problem is W[1]-hard parameterized by  $p$  alone, and that we therefore need to parameterize on both  $p$  and  $k$ .

**Lemma 1.** *Let  $(G, k)$  be input to  $p$ -STARFOREST EDITING. If  $(G, k)$  is a yes-instance, there can be at most  $p + 2k$  vertices with degree at least 2.*

*Proof.* Suppose  $H = G \Delta F$  is a disjoint union of  $p$  stars with  $|F| \leq k$ . Let  $C$  be the set of  $p$  centers. Now,  $V(H) \setminus C$  is a set of leaves of which at most  $2k$  can be incident to  $F$  in  $G$ . Since all other leaves must already have degree one in  $G$ , the claim follows.  $\square$

The following bound will be key to obtain the subexponential running time.

**Proposition 2** ([14]). *If  $a$  and  $b$  are non-negative integers, then  $\binom{a+b}{a} \leq 2^{2\sqrt{ab}}$ .*

**Lemma 3.** *Given a graph  $G$  and a vertex set  $S$ , we can compute in linear time  $O(n+m)$  an optimal editing set  $F$  such that  $G \Delta F$  is a starforest, when restricted to have  $S$  as the set of centers in the solutions.*

*Proof.* Observe that we need to delete every edge whose endpoints either lie both inside  $S$  or both outside of  $S$ . What remains is a bipartite graph with  $S$  being one side of the bipartition. To complete the editing, for every vertex  $v \in V \setminus S$ , with  $\deg(v) > 1$ , we delete all but one edge, and for every isolated vertex, we arbitrarily attach it to some vertex of  $S$ . It is easy to see that this solution is optimal.  $\square$

We now describe an algorithm which solves  $p$ -STARFOREST EDITING in time  $O(2^{5\sqrt{pk}} + n + m)$ .

**The algorithm.** Let  $(G, k)$  be an input instance for  $p$ -STARFOREST EDITING. If the number of vertices of degree at least two is greater than  $p + 2k$ , we say no in accordance with Lemma 1. Otherwise we split the graph into  $G_1$  and  $G_2$  as follows: Let  $X \subseteq V(G)$  be the collection of vertices contained in connected components of size one or two, i.e.,  $G[X]$  is a collection of isolated vertices and edges. Let  $G_1 = G[X]$  and  $G_2 = G[V(G) \setminus X]$ . Clearly, there are no edges going out of  $X$  in  $G$ . We will treat  $G_1, G_2$  as (almost) independent subinstances by guessing the budgets  $k_1 + k_2 = k$  and the number of components in their respective solutions  $p_1 + p_2 = p$ . The only time we cannot treat them as independent instances is when  $p_1$  or  $p_2$  is zero; Let  $p_i^*$  be the number of stars completely contained in  $G_i$  in an optimal solution. If both  $p_i^* > 0$ , then there always exist an optimal solution that does not add any edge between  $G_1$  and  $G_2$ .

**Solving  $(G_1, k_1)$  with  $p_1$  components:** Assume  $G_1$  contains  $s$  isolated edges and  $t$  isolated vertices, with  $p_1 > 0$ . If  $|V(G_1)| < p_1$ , we immediately say no, since we need exactly  $p_1$  connected components. Depending on the values of  $s$  and  $t$ , we execute the following operations as long as the budget  $k_1$  is positive. If  $s \leq p_1$  and  $s + t \leq p_1$ , we have too few stars, and we arbitrarily delete edges to increase the number of connected components to  $p_1$ .

If  $s = 0$  we turn the isolated vertices arbitrarily into  $p_1$  stars. Otherwise, fix an arbitrary endpoint  $c$  of an isolated edge. Assume that  $s \leq p_1$ : then we connect enough isolated vertices to  $c$  such that the number of stars is  $p_1$ . Finally, if  $s > p_1$ , we first dissolve  $s - p_1$  edges and continue as in the previous case. It is easy to check that the above solutions are optimal.

**Solving  $(G_2, k_2)$  with  $p_2$  components:** By Lemma 1, the number of vertices of degree at least two is bounded by  $p_2 + 2k_2$ . Every vertex of degree one in  $G_2$  is adjacent to a vertex of larger degree, thus it never makes sense to choose it as a center (its neighbor will always be cheaper). Hence, it suffices to enumerate every set  $S_2$  of  $p_2$  vertices of degree larger than one and test in linear time, as per Lemma 3, whether a solution inside the budget  $k_2$  is possible. Using Proposition 2 we can bound the running time by

$$\binom{p_2 + 2k_2}{p_2} \cdot pk + O(n + m) = O(2^{5\sqrt{p_2 k_2}} + n + m).$$

We are left with the cases where  $p_1$  or  $p_2$  are equal to zero: then the only possible solution is to remove *all* edges within  $G_1$  or  $G_2$ , respectively, and connect all the resulting isolated vertices to an arbitrary center in the other instance. We either follow through with the operation, if within the respective budget, or deduce that the subinstance is not solvable. We conclude that the above algorithm will at some point guess the correct budgets for  $G_1$  and  $G_2$  and thus find a solution of size at most  $k$ . The theorem follows.

**Theorem 4.**  $p$ -STARFOREST EDITING is solvable in time  $O(2^{5\sqrt{pk}} + n + m)$ .

## 4 A polynomial kernel for $t$ -partite $p$ -cluster editing

We show a simple  $O(ktp)$  kernel for the  $t$ -PARTITE  $p$ -CLUSTER EDITING problem—which will be the foundation of the subsequent subexponential algorithms—with a single rule, Rule 1, which can be exhaustively applied in time  $O(n + m)$ . The problem at hand is the following generalization of  $p$ -BICLUSTER EDITING:

$t$ -PARTITE  $p$ -CLUSTER EDITING

*Input:* A graph  $G = (V, E)$  and a non-negative integer  $k$ .

*Parameter:*  $p, k$

*Question:* Is there a set  $F \subseteq [V]^2$  of edges of size at most  $k$  such that  $G \Delta F$  is a disjoint union of exactly  $p$  complete  $t$ -partite graphs?

For our rule, we say that a set  $X \subseteq V(G)$  is a *non-isolate twin class* if for every  $v$  and  $v'$  in  $X$ ,  $N_G(v) = N_G(v') \neq \emptyset$ . Note that this is by definition a *false twin class*, i.e.,  $vv' \notin E(G)$ , or in other words, a non-isolate twin class is an independent set.

**Rule 1.** *If there is a non-isolate twin class  $X \subseteq V(G)$  of size at least  $2k + 2$ , then delete all but  $2k + 1$  of them.*

**Lemma 5.** *Rule 1 is sound and can be exhaustively applied in linear time.*

*Proof.* To reduce the number of connected components by one we need to add at least one edge. Hence, a yes-instance cannot contain more than  $p + k$  connected components.

It is sufficient to observe that a non-isolated class of false twins  $X$  of size at least  $2k + 1$  will never be touched by a minimal solution; Let  $(G, k)$  be a yes instance with  $F$  a solution. Suppose  $X$  is a non-isolated class of false twins of size at least  $2k + 1$ . At most  $2k$  vertices are touched by  $X$ , and we claim that  $F'$ , the set of edges of  $F$  not incident to any vertex of  $X$  is a solution. Let  $x \in X$  be a vertex not incident on  $F$ . This means that  $N_G(x)$  is exactly the entire complete  $t$ -partite component except its own part. But since  $t$ -partite  $p$ -clusters are closed under adding non-isolated false twins, we may add as many false twins to  $x$  in  $G$  as we want without changing the solution. It follows that we may assume that its false twins will not be touched by  $F$  and hence  $F'$  is a solution as well.

The rule can be applied in linear time by first computing a modular decomposition of the input graph, which can be done in linear time [18], and marking all the vertices to be deleted.  $\square$

The following result is an immediate consequence of the above rule and its correctness.

**Theorem 6.** *The problem  $t$ -PARTITE  $p$ -CLUSTER EDITING admits a kernel with  $pt(2k + 1) + 2k = O(ptk)$  vertices.*

*Proof.* We now count the number of vertices we can have in a yes instance after the rule above has been applied. We claim that if  $G$  has more than  $pt(2k + 1) + 2k$  vertices, it is a no instance.

Let  $(G, k)$  be the reduced instance according to Rule 1 and let  $F$  be a solution of size at most  $k$ . At most  $2k$  vertices can be touched by  $F$ , so the rest of the graph remains as it is, and is a disjoint union of at most  $p$  complete  $t$ -partite graphs, each of which has at most  $t$  non-isolate twin classes. It follows that in a yes instance,  $G$  has at most  $pt(2k + 1) + 2k = O(ptk)$  vertices.  $\square$

## 5 Editing to bicluster graphs in subexponential time

In this section we lift the result of Section 3 by showing that the following problem is solvable in time  $2^{O(p\sqrt{k}\log(pk))} + O(n + m)$ . Observe that we lose the subexponential dependence on  $p$ , however, contrary to the result of Misra et al. [22], for fixed (or small, relative to  $k$ )  $p$ , this still is truly subexponential parameterized by  $k$ .

### $p$ -BICLUSTER EDITING

*Input:* A graph  $G = (V, E)$  and a non-negative integer  $k$ .  
*Parameter:*  $p, k$   
*Question:* Is there a set  $F \subseteq [V]^2$  of edges of size at most  $k$  such that  $G \Delta F$  is a disjoint union of  $p$  complete bipartite graphs?

We denote a biclique of  $G$  as  $C = (A, B)$  and call the sets  $A, B$  the *sides* of  $C$ . Before describing the algorithm for the general problem, we show that the following simpler problem is solvable in linear time using a greedy algorithm:

### ANNOTATED BICLUSTER EDITING

*Input:* A bipartite graph  $G = (A, B, E)$ , a partition  $\mathcal{A} = \{A_1, A_2, \dots, A_p\}$  of  $A$  and a non-negative integer  $k$ .  
*Question:* Is there a set  $F \subseteq [V]^2$  of edges of size at most  $k$  such that  $G \Delta F$  is a disjoint union of  $p$  complete bipartite graphs with each one side in  $\mathcal{A}$ ?

**Lemma 7.** ANNOTATED BICLUSTER EDITING is solvable in time  $O(n + m)$ .

*Proof.* Let  $G = (A, B, E)$ ,  $\mathcal{A} = \{A_1, \dots, A_p\}$ ,  $k$  be an instance of ANNOTATED BICLUSTER EDITING. Consider a vertex  $v \in B$  and define  $\text{cost}_i(v)$  to be the cost of placing  $v$  in  $B_i$  where  $C_i = (A_i, B_i)$  is the  $i$ th biclique of the solution, i.e.,

$$\text{cost}_i(v) = |A_i| - 2 \deg_{A_i}(v) + \deg(v),$$

where  $\deg_{A_i}(v) = |N(v) \cap A_i|$ . We prove the following claim which implies that we can greedily assign each vertex  $v \in B$  to a biclique of minimum cost.

**Claim 8.** An optimal solution will always have  $v \in B$  in a biclique  $C_i = (A_i, B_i)$  which minimizes  $\text{cost}_i(v)$ .

Suppose that  $\text{cost}_i(v)$  is minimal but  $v$  is placed by a solution  $F$  in a biclique  $C_j = (A_j, B_j)$  with  $\text{cost}_j(v) > \text{cost}_i(v)$ . Deleting from  $F$  all edges  $E_j$  between  $v$  and  $A_j$  and adding all edges  $E_i$  between  $v$  and  $A_i$  creates a new solution  $F' = (F \setminus E_j) \cup E_i$ . Since  $\text{cost}_j(v) > \text{cost}_i(v)$ , we have that  $|F| > |F'|$  hence  $F$  is not optimal. This concludes the proof of the claim and the lemma.  $\square$



## 5.1 Subexponential time algorithm

We now show that the problem  $p$ -BICLUSTER EDITING is solvable in subexponential time by using the kernel from Theorem 6, guessing the annotated sets and applying the polynomial time algorithm for the annotated version of the problem. The important ingredient will be *cheap* vertices, by which we mean vertices that are known to receive very few edits. Intuitively, a cheap vertex is a “pin” that in subexponential time reveals for us its neighborhood in the solution, and thus can be leveraged to uncover parts of said solution.

We adopt the following notation and vocabulary. For an instance  $(G, k)$  of  $p$ -BICLUSTER EDITING, and a solution  $F$ , we call  $H = G \triangle F$  the *target* graph. A vertex  $v$  is called *cheap* with respect to  $F$  if it receives at most  $\sqrt{k}$  edits. Observe that any set  $X$  of size larger than  $2\sqrt{k}$  has a cheap vertex. We call such a set *large* and all sets that contain at most  $2\sqrt{k}$  vertices *small*. We will further classify the bicliques in the target graph into two different classes: A biclique is small if its vertex set is small and large otherwise.

The algorithm now works as follows. Given an input instance  $(G, k)$  of  $p$ -BICLUSTER EDITING, we try all combinations of  $p_s + p_\ell = p$ , with the intended meaning that  $p_s$  is the number of small bicliques and  $p_\ell$  is the number of large bicliques in the target graph.

**Handling small bicliques.** We enumerate a set of  $p_s$  sets  $\mathcal{A}_s \subseteq 2^V$  with the property that they are pairwise disjoint, and each of size at most  $2\sqrt{k}$ . Furthermore,  $G[\bigcup \mathcal{A}_s]$  contains at most  $k$  edges. Delete all edges in  $\mathcal{A}_s$  and reduce the budget accordingly. These are going to be all the left sides in small bicliques. This enumeration takes time

$$(2\sqrt{k})^{p_s} \binom{n}{2\sqrt{k}}^{p_s} \leq (2\sqrt{k})^p \binom{pk + k^2}{2\sqrt{k}}^p = 2^{O(p\sqrt{k} \log(pk))}.$$

**Handling large bicliques.** The large bicliques have the following nice property. Since the vertex set of each such biclique is large, every biclique contains a cheap vertex. We guess a set  $\mathcal{B}_\ell$  of size  $p_\ell$ . For the biclique  $C_i$ , the vertex  $v_i$  of  $\mathcal{B}_\ell$  will be a cheap vertex in  $B_i$ . Now, we enumerate all combinations of  $p_\ell$  sets  $\mathcal{N} = \langle N_1, N_2, \dots, N_{p_\ell} \rangle$ , each of size at most  $2\sqrt{k}$  which will be the edited neighborhood of each cheap vertex, and we conclude that  $A_i = N_H(v_i) = N_G(v_i) \triangle N_i$ . The enumeration of this asymptotically takes time

$$\binom{n}{p_\ell} \cdot (2\sqrt{k})^{p_\ell} \binom{n}{2\sqrt{k}}^{p_\ell} \leq \binom{pk + k^2}{p} \cdot (2\sqrt{k})^p \binom{pk + k^2}{2\sqrt{k}}^p = 2^{O(p\sqrt{k} \log(pk))}.$$

**Putting things together.** With the above two steps, in time  $2^{O(p\sqrt{k} \log(pk))}$  we obtained all the left sides  $\mathcal{A}$ , partitioned into  $\mathcal{A}_s$  and  $\mathcal{A}_\ell$ . Using this information, we can in polynomial time compute whether the ANNOTATED BICLUSTER EDITING instance  $(G, k, \mathcal{A})$  is a yes-instance. If so, we conclude yes, otherwise, we backtrack.

**Theorem 9.**  $p$ -BICLUSTER EDITING is solvable in time  $2^{O(p\sqrt{k} \log(pk))} + O(n+m)$ .

*Proof.* We now show that the algorithm described above correctly decides  $p$ -BICLUSTER EDITING given an instance  $(G, k)$ . Suppose that the algorithm above concludes that  $(G, k)$  is a yes instance. The only time it outputs yes, is when ANNOTATED BICLUSTER EDITING for a given set  $\mathcal{A}$  and a given budget  $k'$  outputs yes. Since this budget is the leftover budget from making  $A$  an independent set, it is clear that any ANNOTATED BICLUSTER EDITING solution of size at most  $k'$  gives a yes instance for  $p$ -BICLUSTER EDITING.

Suppose now for the other direction that  $(G, k)$  is a yes instance for  $p$ -BICLUSTER EDITING and let  $F$  be a solution. Consider the left sides  $A_1, \dots, A_p$  of  $G \triangle F$  with the restriction that the smaller of the two sides in  $C_i$  is named  $A_i$ . First we observe that during our subexponential time enumeration of sets, all the  $A_i$ s that are of size at most  $2\sqrt{k}$  will be enumerated in one of the branches where  $p_s$  is set to the number of small bicliques. Furthermore, if  $A_j$  is large, then both are large, and then, for each of the large bicliques, there is a branch where we selected exactly one cheap vertex for each of the largest sides. Given these cheap vertices, there is a branch where we guess exactly the edits affecting each of the cheap vertices, hence we can conclude that in some branch, we know the entire partition  $\mathcal{A}$ . From Lemma 7, we can conclude that the algorithm described above concludes correctly that we are dealing with a yes-instance.  $\square$

## 5.2 The $t$ -partite case

We can in fact obtain similar (we treat  $t$  here as a constant so the results are up to some constant factors in the exponents) results for the more general case of  $t$ -PARTITE  $p$ -CLUSTER EDITING. Again we need the polynomial kernel described in Theorem 6. The only difference now to the bicluster case is that we define a cluster to be small if *every side* is small. In this case, we can enumerate  $\binom{n}{\sqrt{k}}^{tp}$  sets, which will form the small clusters.

In the other case a cluster  $C = (A_1, A_2, \dots, A_t)$  is divided into  $A_1, A_2, \dots, A_{t_s}$  small sides and  $A_{t_s+1}, A_{t_s+2}, \dots, A_t$  large sides. For this case, we guess *all* the small sides and for each of the large sides we guess a cheap vertex. Guessing the neighborhoods  $N_{t_s+1}, N_{t_s+2}, \dots, N_t$  for the cheap vertices  $v_{t_s+1}, v_{t_s+2}, \dots, v_t$  gives us complete information on  $C$ ; To compute what  $A_j$  is, if  $j > t_s$ , we simply take the intersection  $\bigcap_{t_s < i \leq t, i \neq j} N_i$  and remove  $\bigcup_{i \leq t_s} A_i$ . We arrive at the following lemma whose proof is directly analogous to that of Theorem 9.


**Theorem 10.** *The problem  $t$ -PARTITE  $p$ -CLUSTER EDITING is solvable in subexponential time  $2^{O(p\sqrt{k} \log(pk))} + O(n + m)$ .*

## 6 Lower bounds

We show that (a) STARFOREST EDITING is NP-hard and that we cannot expect a subexponential algorithm unless the ETH fails; and (b) that  $p$ -STARFOREST EDITING is W[1]-hard parameterized only by  $p$ .

### 6.1 Starforest editing

In the following we describe a linear reduction from 3SAT to STARFOREST EDITING. Furthermore, the instance we reduce to has maximal degree three, thus not only showing that STARFOREST EDITING is NP-hard on graphs of



(a) Parts of a variable gadget  $x$  and its connection when occurring positively in  $c$ .

(b) Deletion when  $x$  is chosen to satisfy the clause. If we chose not to delete the edge connecting the clause vertex with  $G_y$  we would have gotten an induced  $P_4$ .

Figure 1: Reduction from 3SAT to STARFOREST EDITING on subcubic graphs.

bounded degree, but also not solvable in subexponential time on subcubic graphs.

**Theorem 11.** *The problem STARFOREST EDITING is NP-complete and, assuming ETH, does not admit a subexponential parameterized algorithm when parameterized by the solution size  $k$ , i.e., it cannot be solved in time  $O^*(2^{o(k)})$ , nor in exact exponential time  $O^*(2^{o(n+m)})$ , even when restricted to subcubic graphs.*

To prove the theorem above we will reduce from 3SAT. But to obtain the result, it is crucial that in our reduction, both the parameter  $k$ , and the size of the instance  $G$  are bounded in linearly in  $n$  and  $m$ . Such results have been shown earlier, in particular by Komusiewicz and Uhlmann for CLUSTER EDITING [20] and Drange and Pilipczuk for TRIVIALY PERFECT EDITING [12]. Thus we resort to similar reductions as used there, however, the reductions here are tweaked to work for the problem at hand. We also achieve lower bounds for subcubic graphs. See Figures 1a and 1b for figures of the gadgets.

**Variable gadget.** Let  $\varphi$  be an input instance of 3SAT, and denote its variable set and clause set as  $\mathcal{V}(\varphi)$  and  $\mathcal{C}(\varphi)$ , respectively. We construct for  $x \in \mathcal{V}(\varphi)$  a graph  $G_x \cong C_{6p_x}$  where  $p_x$  is the number of clauses in  $\varphi$  which  $x$  appears in. The vertices of  $G_x$  are labeled, consecutively,  $\top_i^x, \perp_i^x, A_i^x, B_i^x, C_i^x, D_i^x$  for  $i \in [0, p_x - 1]$ .

There are exactly three ways of deleting  $G_x$  into a starforest using at most  $k_x = 6p_x$  edges. Clearly a collection of  $P_3$ s is a starforest and is our target graph. We will define the  $\top$ -deletion for  $G_x$  as the deletion set  $S_{\top}^x = \{C_i^x D_i^x, \perp_i^x A_i^x \mid i \leq p_x - 1\}$  and the  $\perp$ -deletion for  $G_x$  as the deletion set  $S_{\perp}^x = \{A_i^x B_i^x, D_i^x \top_{i+1}^x \mid i \leq p_x - 1\}$ , taking the  $i + 1$  in the index of  $\top_{i+1}^x$  modulo  $p_x$ . In other words, in the gadget  $G_x$ , we are *keeping* the edges

- $D_{i-1}^x \top_i^x \perp_i^x, A_i^x B_i^x C_i^x$ , when  $x$  is set to true, and

- $\top_i^x \perp_i^x A_i^x, B_i^x C_i^x D_i^x$ , when  $x$  is set to false.

Observe that when  $x$  is set to true, we will have paths on three vertices, where  $\top_i^x$  is the middle vertex, and if  $x$  is set to false, we will have paths on three vertices with  $\perp_i^x$  being the middle vertex. Later, we will see that if  $x$  satisfies a clause  $c$ , the  $i$ th clause  $x$  appears in, then either  $\top_i^x$  or  $\perp_i^x$  will be the middle vertex of a claw, depending on whether  $x$  appears positively or negatively in  $c$ .

**Observation 12.** *In an optimal edge edit of a cycle of length divisible by 6, no edge is added and exactly every third consecutive edge is deleted.*

**Clause gadget.** A clause gadget simply consists of one vertex, i.e., for a clause  $c \in \mathcal{C}(\varphi)$ , we construct the vertex  $v_c$ . This vertex will be connected to  $G_x, G_y$  and  $G_z$ , for  $x, y, z$  being its variables, in appropriate places, depending on whether or not the variable occurs negated in  $c$ . In fact, it will be connected to  $\top_i^x$  if  $c$  is the  $i$ th clause  $x$  appears in, and  $x$  appears positively in  $c$ , and it is connected to  $\perp_i^x$  if  $c$  is the  $i$ th clause  $x$  appears in, and  $x$  appears negatively in  $c$ .

Let  $k_\varphi = 2|\mathcal{C}| + 2 \sum_x p_x = 2|\mathcal{C}| + 3 \cdot 2|\mathcal{C}| = 8|\mathcal{C}|$  be the budget for a formula  $\varphi$ . We now observe that the budget is tight.

**Lemma 13.** *The graph  $G_\varphi$  has no starforest editing set of size less than  $k_\varphi$ , and if the editing set has size  $k_\varphi$  it contains only deletions.*

*Proof.* It is straightforward to verify that for each induced variable gadget  $G_x$  we need at least  $2p_x$  edges. Since every clause contains three variables, we have  $|\mathcal{C}|/3$  such gadgets, and their necessary budget sum up to exactly  $\sum_x 2p_x \cdot 3 = 6|\mathcal{C}|$ .

Since no two consecutive edges in  $G_x$  will be deleted, by the previous observation, we have that for each clause, after deleting edges in the variable gadgets, we will have an induced subdivided claw with the clause vertex as its center, and this graph needs at least two edits to become a star forest. This can be verified by observing that we have three induced  $P_5$ s, and at most two of them can be removed by one edge edit.

From the above analysis, we can conclude that  $G_\varphi$  needs at least  $6|\mathcal{C}| \cdot 2|\mathcal{C}| = 8|\mathcal{C}| = k_\varphi$  edits to become a starforest graph.  $\square$

We now continue to the main lemma, from which Theorem 11 follows.

**Lemma 14.** *A 3SAT instance  $\varphi$  is satisfiable if and only if  $(G_\varphi, k_\varphi)$  is a yes instance for STARFOREST EDITING.*

*Proof.* Suppose  $\varphi$  was satisfiable and let  $\alpha: \mathcal{V}(\varphi) \rightarrow \{\top, \perp\}$  be a satisfying assignment. We show that  $G - F$  for  $F$  defined below is a starforest graph and that  $|F| \leq k_\varphi$  (since the budget is tight, we have equality). For  $x \in \mathcal{V}(\varphi)$  we define  $F_x$  to be the following set of edges:

- $F_x = \{C_i^x D_i^x, \perp_i^x A_i^x \mid i \leq p_x - 1\}$ , if  $\alpha(x) = \top$ .
- $F_x = \{A_i^x B_i^x, D_i^x \top_{i+1}^x \mid i \leq p_x - 1\}$ , if  $\alpha(x) = \perp$ .

Finally, for a clause  $c \in \mathcal{C}(\varphi)$ , let  $x_c$  be a variable satisfying  $c$ . Define  $F_c$  to be the two edges not incident to  $x_c$ .

We now show that  $F = \bigcup_{x \in \mathcal{V}} F_x \cup \bigcup_{c \in \mathcal{C}} F_c$  is our solution. It should at this point be clear that  $|F| \leq k_\varphi$ . Since  $G_x - F_x$  is a collection of  $P_3$ s, we only need

to verify that no clause gadget  $c$  is in an obstruction. Let  $c$  be an arbitrary clause gadget and let  $x_c$  be the variable that is still incident to  $c$ . Clearly, since  $c$  is of degree 1, it has to be in an obstruction with  $x_c$ . However, since  $x_c$  satisfies  $c$ , and (for the moment) assuming that  $x_c$  appears positively in  $c$ ,  $\alpha(x) = \top$  and from  $G_x$ , we deleted  $C_i^x D_i^x$  and  $\perp_i^x A_i^x$  for every  $i$ . Since  $c$  connects to some vertex  $\top_i^x$ , the connected component containing  $c$  is a claw centered in  $\top_i^x$  with leaves  $c$ ,  $D_i^x$  and  $\perp_i^x$ . Hence  $c$  cannot be in an obstruction. The case when  $x_c$  appears negatively is symmetric. This concludes the forward direction of the proof.

For the reverse direction, suppose  $(G_\varphi, k_\varphi)$  is a yes-instance for STARFOREST EDITING and let  $F$  be a solution. Since the budget is tight, by the above lemma and observation, we know that  $F$  contains only deletions. There are unique ways of deleting all the  $G_x$ s for the variable gadgets, so construct an assignment for the variables of  $\varphi$ ,  $\alpha_F: \mathcal{V}(\varphi) \rightarrow \{\top, \perp\}$  by letting  $\alpha_F(x) = \top$  if for some  $i$ , the edge  $\perp_i^x A_i^x$  is deleted, and let  $\alpha_F(x) = \perp$  otherwise. We claim that  $\alpha_F$  is a satisfying assignment. Suppose that a clause  $c$  is not satisfied by any of its variables, and consider  $x_c$ , the variable  $c$  is still adjacent to. We know it must be adjacent to at least one vertex since the budget is tight (not all three edges were deleted). Suppose  $x_c$  appeared positively in  $c$  (thus the vertex for  $c$  is adjacent to some  $\top_i^x$ ). Since  $G - F$  is a starforest (recall that  $F$  can only contain deletions in the given budget), we know that in the subgraph  $G_x$  to which  $x_c$  belongs, we must have deleted the edge  $\perp_i^x A_i^x$ , for otherwise, since every third edge is deleted, the edges  $D_{i-1}^x \top_i^x$  and  $C_{i-1}^x D_i^x$  would remain and form an induced  $P_4$ , contradicting the assumption that  $G - F$  was a starforest graph. But since  $\perp_i^x A_i^x$  was deleted, by the construction of  $\alpha_F$ , we set  $x$  to true, so  $x$  indeed satisfies  $c$  contradicting the initial assumption. The case where  $x_c$  appears negatively in  $c$  is symmetric.  $\square$

Observing that the maximum degree of  $G_\varphi$  is three—the clause vertices have exactly degree three, and the variable gadgets are cycles with some vertices connected to at most one clause vertex—this concludes the proof of Theorem 11. From the discussions above, the following result is an immediate consequence:

**Corollary 15.** *The problem STARFOREST DELETION is NP-complete and not solvable in subexponential time under ETH, even on subcubic graphs.*

Before going into parameterized lower bounds of STARFOREST EDITING, we show that the exact same reduction above simultaneously proves similar results for the bicluster case. We note that the NP-hardness was shown by Amit [2], but their reduction suffers a quadratic blowup and is therefore not suitable for showing subexponential lower bounds.

**Corollary 16.** *The problems BICLUSTER EDITING and BICLUSTER DELETION are NP-complete and not solvable in subexponential time under ETH, even on subcubic graphs.*

*Proof.* We show that every optimum solution of  $(G_\varphi, k_\varphi)$  for the above constructed  $G_\varphi$  and  $k_\varphi$  will yield a starforest and hence the corollary follows from the above result. We first show that Observation 12 also holds for the BICLUSTER EDITING case, that is, for budget  $k_x$ , there is a unique (up to rotation) solution which consists of deleting every third edge. First, we observe that deleting every third edge indeed is a solution as starforests are a subclass of biclusters. Second,

we can pack  $3p_x$  paths of length four such that each pair of  $P_4$ s share at most one edge, and such that any edit can eliminate at most two obstructions. Hence we need at least  $2 \cdot 3p_x = k_x$  edges to eliminate all the  $P_4$ s. Since the budget is tight for  $G_x$ , we now show that we still need at least two edges to eliminate  $G_c$ .

Consider a clause-gadget. Since we have the same situation as above, i.e., it contains three induced  $P_5$ s, we observe that at least two edits inside the gadget are necessary. Suppose that one of the edits is an edge addition (needed to make a biclique that is not a star), then we must use that edge to construct a  $C_4$ . But this edit leaves one induced  $P_5$  which cannot be resolved by the remaining edit.

By combining the arguments for  $G_x$  and  $G_c$ , we conclude that  $G_\varphi, k_\varphi$  is a yes instance if and only if  $\varphi$  is satisfiable and furthermore that the solution will only delete edges, thus yielding a starforest.  $\square$

## 6.2 W[1]-hardness parameterized by $p$

In this section we show that the parameterization by  $k$  is necessary, even for the case of  $p$ -STARFOREST EDITING. That is, we show that when we parameterize by  $p$  alone, the problem becomes W[1]-hard, and we can thus not expect any algorithms of the form  $f(p) \cdot \text{poly}(n)$  for any function  $f$  solving  $p$ -STARFOREST EDITING. We reduce from the problem MULTICOLORED REGULAR INDEPENDENT SET. An instance of this problem consists of a regular graph colored into  $p$  color classes, each color class inducing a complete graph, and we are asked to find an independent set of size  $p$ .

**Proposition 17** ([8, Corollary 14.23]). *The problem MULTICOLORED REGULAR INDEPENDENT SET is W[1]-complete.*

Since each color class is complete, any independent set will be of size at most  $p$  and any independent set of size  $p$  is maximum. The reduction is direct; In fact we have that given a budget  $k = (n - p)(d - 1)$ , where  $d$  is the regularity degree, the following direct translation between the two problems holds:

**Lemma 18.** *Let  $G$  be a  $d$ -regular graph on  $n$  vertices,  $p \leq n$  and  $k = (n - p)(d - 1)$ . Then  $(G, p)$  is a yes instance for MULTICOLORED REGULAR INDEPENDENT SET if and only if  $(G, k)$  is a yes instance for  $p$ -STARFOREST EDITING.*

*Proof.* In the forwards direction, suppose  $S$  is an independent set of size  $p$  in  $G$ . Then, since  $S$  is maximal, every vertex in  $G - S$  is adjacent to  $S$ . For every vertex  $v \notin S$ , delete  $d - 1$  edges, but keep one connected to a vertex in  $S$ . Since there are  $n - p$  vertices outside  $S$ , and since  $S$  is an independent set, this is exactly all the edges we need keep and we obtain a starforest editing with exactly budget  $k$ .

For the reverse direction, let us assume that  $G$  does not contain an independent set of size  $p$ . Hence, any set of  $p$  centers contains at least one edge; the total budget needed to edit to a starforest is then at least  $(n - p)(d - 1) + 1 > k$  and hence the answer for  $(G, k)$  is no, as well.  $\square$

Combining Proposition 17 with Lemma 18 yields the following result:

**Theorem 19.**  *$p$ -STARFOREST EDITING is W[1]-hard when parameterized by  $p$  alone.*

## 7 Conclusion

We presented subexponential time algorithms for editing problems towards bicluster graphs, and more generally,  $t$ -partite cluster graphs when the number of connected components in the target graph is bounded. We supplemented these findings with lower bounds, showing that this dual parameterization is indeed necessary.

As an interesting open problem, we pose the question of whether  $t$ -PARTITE  $p$ -CLUSTER EDITING can be solved in time  $2^{O(\sqrt{pk})}n^{O(1)}$ , i.e., in subexponential time with respect to both parameters. It is known that BICLUSTER EDITING admits a linear kernel, but when introducing the secondary parameter, we only obtain a kernel whose size is bounded by the product of both parameters; Recall that we got a  $tp(2k+1)+2k$  kernel, which in the bicluster case is  $p(4k+2)+2k$ . Does BICLUSTER EDITING admit a truly linear kernel, i.e., a kernel with  $O(p+k)$  vertices?

**Acknowledgments.** We thank Daniel Lokshtanov for pointing us in the direction of REGULAR INDEPENDENT SET [8]. We would like to thank the anonymous reviewers for their feedback which greatly improved the quality of this paper.

Pål Grønås Drange has received funding from the European Research Council under the European Union’s Seventh Framework Programme (FP/2007-2013) / ERC Grant Agreement n. 267959.

Fernando Sánchez Villaamil supported by DFG Project RO 927/13-1 “Pragmatic Parameterized Algorithms”.

## References

- [1] N. Alon, D. Lokshtanov, and S. Saurabh. Fast FAST. In *ICALP*. Springer, 2009.
- [2] N. Amit. The bicluster graph editing problem. Master’s thesis, Tel Aviv University, 2004.
- [3] I. Bliznets, F. V. Fomin, M. Pilipczuk, and M. Pilipczuk. A subexponential parameterized algorithm for interval completion. *CoRR*, abs/1402.3473, 2014.
- [4] I. Bliznets, F. V. Fomin, M. Pilipczuk, and M. Pilipczuk. A subexponential parameterized algorithm for proper interval completion. In *ESA*. Springer, 2014.
- [5] H. L. Bodlaender, L. Cai, J. Chen, M. R. Fellows, J. A. Telle, and D. Marx. Open problems in parameterized and exact computation, 2006. IWPEC.
- [6] L. Cai. Fixed-parameter tractability of graph modification problems for hereditary properties. *Inf. Proc. Lett.*, 58(4):171–176, 1996.

- [7] Y. Cheng and G. M. Church. Biclustering of expression data. In *ISMB*, 1999.
- [8] M. Cygan, F. V. Fomin, Ł. Kowalik, D. Lokshтанov, D. Marx, M. Pilipczuk, M. Pilipczuk, and S. Saurabh. *Parameterized Algorithms*. Springer, 2015.
- [9] R. Diestel. *Graph theory (Graduate texts in mathematics)*. Springer, 2005.
- [10] P. G. Drange, M. Dregi, D. Lokshтанov, and Blair D. Sullivan. On the threshold of intractability. In *ESA*. Springer, 2015.
- [11] P. G. Drange, F. V. Fomin, M. Pilipczuk, and Y. Villanger. Exploring subexponential parameterized complexity of completion problems. In *STACS*. Schloss Dagstuhl, 2014.
- [12] P. G. Drange and M. Pilipczuk. A polynomial kernel for trivially perfect editing. In *ESA*. Springer, 2015.
- [13] J. Flum and M. Grohe. *Parameterized complexity theory*. Springer, 2006.
- [14] F. V. Fomin, S. Kratsch, M. Pilipczuk, M. Pilipczuk, and Y. Villanger. Tight bounds for parameterized complexity of Cluster Editing with a small number of clusters. *J. Comput. Syst. Sci.*, 80(7):1430–1447, 2014.
- [15] F. V. Fomin and Y. Villanger. Subexponential parameterized algorithm for minimum fill-in. *SIAM J. Comput.*, 42(6):2197–2216, 2013.
- [16] E. Ghosh, S. Kolay, M. Kumar, P. Misra, F. Panolan, A. Rai, and M. S. Ramanujan. Faster parameterized algorithms for deletion to split graphs. *Algorithmica*, 71(4):989–1006, 2015.
- [17] J. Guo, F. Hüffner, C. Komusiewicz, and Y. Zhang. Improved algorithms for bicluster editing. In *TAMC*. Springer, 2008.
- [18] M. Habib and C. Paul. A survey of the algorithmic aspects of modular decomposition. *Computer Science Review*, 4(1):41–59, 2010.
- [19] R. Impagliazzo, R. Paturi, and F. Zane. Which problems have strongly exponential complexity? *J. Comput. Syst. Sci.*, 63(4):512–530, 2001.
- [20] C. Komusiewicz and J. Uhlmann. Cluster editing with locally bounded modifications. *Discrete Appl. Math.*, 160(15):2259–2270, 2012.
- [21] S. C. Madeira and A. L. Oliveira. Biclustering algorithms for biological data analysis: a survey. *ACM Trans. Comput. Biol. Bioinform*, 1(1):24–45, 2004.
- [22] N. Misra, F. Panolan, and S. Saurabh. Subexponential algorithm for  $d$ -cluster edge deletion: Exception or rule? In *MFCS*. Springer, 2013.
- [23] A. Natanzon, R. Shamir, and R. Sharan. Complexity classification of some edge modification problems. *Discrete Appl. Math.*, 113(1):109–128, 2001.
- [24] A. Tanay, R. Sharan, and R. Shamir. Biclustering algorithms: A survey. *Handbook of Comp. Mol. Biol.*, 9(1-20):122–124, 2005.