

Enumerating minimal dominating sets and variants in chordal bipartite graphs*

Emanuel Castelo¹, Oscar Defrain¹, and Guilherme C. M. Gomes^{2,3}

¹Aix-Marseille Université, CNRS, LIS, 13009 Marseille, France

²LIRMM, Université de Montpellier, CNRS, Montpellier, France

³Universidade Federal de Minas Gerais, Belo Horizonte, Brazil

February 2025

Abstract

Enumerating minimal dominating sets with polynomial delay in bipartite graphs is a long-standing open problem. To date, even the subcase of chordal bipartite graphs is open, with the best known algorithm due to Golovach, Heggernes, Kanté, Kratsch, Sæther, and Villanger running in incremental-polynomial time. We improve on this result by providing a polynomial delay and space algorithm enumerating minimal dominating sets in chordal bipartite graphs. Additionally, we show that the total and connected variants admit polynomial and incremental-polynomial delay algorithms, respectively, within the same class. This provides an alternative proof of a result by Golovach et al. for total dominating sets, and answers an open question for the connected variant. Finally, we give evidence that the techniques used in this paper cannot be generalized to bipartite graphs for (total) minimal dominating sets, unless $\mathbf{P} = \mathbf{NP}$, and show that enumerating minimal connected dominating sets in bipartite graphs is harder than enumerating minimal transversals in general hypergraphs.

Keywords: algorithmic enumeration, minimal dominating sets, connected dominating sets, total dominating sets, chordal bipartite graphs, sequential method, polynomial delay.

1 Introduction

Hypergraphs are encountered in countless areas of computer science or discrete mathematics. Formally, they consist of a pair $\mathcal{H} = (V(\mathcal{H}), E(\mathcal{H}))$ where

*The second author is supported by the ANR project PARADUAL (ANR-24-CE48-0610-01). The last author is supported by the European Union, project PACKENUM, grant number 101109317. Views and opinions expressed are however those of the author only and do not necessarily reflect those of the European Union. Neither the European Union nor the granting authority can be held responsible for them.

$V(\mathcal{H})$ is a set of elements called *vertices*, and $E(\mathcal{H})$ is a family of subsets of $V(\mathcal{H})$ called hyperedges (or simply edges). Hypergraphs are known as *graphs* when their edges are of size precisely two. A *transversal* in a hypergraph \mathcal{H} is a set $T \subseteq V(\mathcal{H})$ which intersects every edge of \mathcal{H} . It is called *minimal* if it is inclusion-wise minimal, i.e., if *none* of its proper subsets is a transversal. The problem of enumerating the minimal transversals of a hypergraph, usually denoted by TRANS-ENUM, is one of the most important problems in algorithmic enumeration, for it has far-reaching implications in various areas of computer science such as logic, database theory, data profiling, or artificial intelligence [KPS93, EG95, GMKT97, BFL⁺22]; we refer the reader to [EG95] and the surveys [EMG08, GDVL17] for a comprehensive overview on the fundamental and practical aspects of this problem.

In a typical enumeration problem such as TRANS-ENUM, a first observation to be made is that the number of solutions can be exponential in both n , the number of vertices, and m , the number of edges. Thus, asking for running times which are polynomial in $n + m$ is meaningless. Rather, we are interested in algorithms performing in output-polynomial time, i.e., that run in a time which is polynomial in both the input size, and the output size. More strict notions of tractability can be required, such as incremental-polynomial times, and polynomial delay. We say that an algorithm runs in *incremental-polynomial* time if it produces the i^{th} solution in a time which is polynomial in the input size plus i . An algorithm is said to run with *polynomial delay* if the times before the first output, after the last output, and in between two consecutive outputs are bounded by a polynomial in the input size only. To date, the best-known algorithm solving TRANS-ENUM is due to Fredman and Khachiyan [FK96] and runs in quasi-polynomial incremental time. Since then, output-polynomial time algorithms were obtained for several important classes, including those generalizing that of bounded degree [EGM03], or bounded edge size [KBEG07].

Dominating sets are among the most studied objects in graphs. A *dominating set* in a graph G is a set $D \subseteq V(G)$ such that every vertex is either in D , or adjacent to a vertex of D . Again, it is called *minimal* if it is inclusion-wise minimal. The problem of enumerating minimal dominating sets in graphs is denoted by DOM-ENUM. Note that being a dominating set of G can be rephrased as being a transversal of each closed neighborhood of G , so, DOM-ENUM is a special case of TRANS-ENUM with a linear number of hyperedges.

The problem DOM-ENUM has gained lots of interest since it has been shown, perhaps surprisingly, to be polynomially equivalent to TRANS-ENUM, even when restricted to cobipartite graphs [KLMN14]. In particular, this work has initiated a fruitful line of research of characterizing which graph classes admit output-polynomial algorithms, in the hope of better understanding the underlying structure that makes TRANS-ENUM tractable. For example, polynomial-delay algorithms were obtained for various graph classes including chordal graphs [KLM⁺15a] (with linear delay on some subclasses [KLMN14, DN19]), graphs of bounded degeneracy [EGM03], line graphs [KLM⁺15b], graphs of bounded clique-width [Cou09], or graph classes related to permutation graphs and their generalizations [KLMN12, GHK⁺18, BDMN20]. Incremental-polynomial time

algorithms were obtained for graphs of bounded conformality [KBEG07], $C_{\leq 6}$ -free graphs [GHKV15], chordal bipartite graphs [GHK⁺16a], (C_4, C_5, claw) -free graphs [KLMN12], or graphs arising in geometrical contexts [ERR19, GHK⁺18] including unit-disk and unit-square graphs. Output-polynomial time algorithms are known for log n -degenerate graphs [EGM03], and graphs of bounded clique number [BDH⁺20].

In [KLMN14], the authors also include two natural variants of domination in their study: total and connected dominating sets. A *total dominating set* is a set D such that every vertex of G has a neighbor in D . In other words, elements of D cannot “dominate” themselves and need a neighbor in the set. A *connected dominating set* is a dominating set that induces a connected subgraph. Note that any connected dominating set is a total dominating set, as long as it has more than one element, making the intersection of these two notions irrelevant to study. Perhaps not surprisingly, the authors in [KLMN14] show that the problems of enumerating minimal total and connected dominating sets, denoted TDOM-ENUM and CDOM-ENUM, respectively, are equivalent to TRANS-ENUM when restricted to split graphs. These equivalences on a relatively restricted graph class suggest that these variants of DOM-ENUM are challenging, and may explain why they have received less attention in the literature.

Regarding total dominating sets, a first observation is that they are transversals of open neighborhoods. This implies an incremental quasi-polynomial time algorithm for the problem using the results of Fredman and Khachiyan [FK96]. However, few output-polynomial time algorithms are known for specific instances of TDOM-ENUM. Among them, we cite the class of chordal bipartite graphs, which admits a polynomial-delay algorithm for the problem [GHK⁺16a].

Concerning connected dominating sets, it is not known whether the problem reduces to TRANS-ENUM. It has in fact been conjectured that this is not the case in [BBHK15]. Rather, it has been shown in [KLMN14] that the problem reduces to the enumeration of minimal transversals of an implicit hypergraph given by the minimal separators of the graph. However, the number of such separators may be exponential, and are intractable to compute [BDK⁺24]. The only work known to us dealing with connected dominating sets enumeration, apart from [KLMN14], falls under the input-sensitive approach [GHK16b, GHKS20, AKFG⁺22] where one aims at small exponential times. Still, we note that some essential questions concerning output-sensitive enumeration were addressed in [AKFG⁺22] such as the NP-hardness of the associated extension problem, i.e., deciding if a given set $U \subseteq V(G)$ is contained in some minimal connected dominating set.

Note that, in the literature, particular attention has been put into characterizing the status of these problems on bipartite, split, and cobipartite graphs. This is because such instances contain the incidence graph of any hypergraph, which is fundamentally challenging and makes interesting links with TRANS-ENUM. However, and in contrast to the split and cobipartite cases, the case of bipartite graphs has been particularly challenging with the question of the (in)tractability of these problems raised in various works [KN14, GHK⁺16a]. Only recently has an output-polynomial time algorithm been provided for DOM-

ENUM in a generalization of bipartite graphs [BDH⁺20]. Still the problem is not known to admit a polynomial-delay algorithm. Concerning TDOM-ENUM and CDOM-ENUM, it is also open, to the best of our knowledge, whether they can be solved with polynomial delay, or even in output-polynomial time, in bipartite graphs. Among natural subclasses of bipartite graphs, the case of chordal bipartite graphs has been studied as it admits nice structural properties analogous to chordal graphs, such as perfect elimination orderings and linearly many minimal separators. We note, however, that even in this particular class, the existence of a polynomial-delay algorithm for DOM-ENUM seems open, and has been left open in [GHK⁺16a].

The following two natural questions arise from the literature.

Question 1. *Can the minimal dominating sets of a chordal bipartite graph be enumerated with polynomial delay?*

Question 2. *Can the minimal connected dominating sets of a chordal bipartite graph be enumerated in output-polynomial time?*

Only the case of minimal total dominating sets has been settled for chordal bipartite graphs, with the following result.

Theorem 1 ([GHK⁺16a]). *The minimal total dominating sets of a chordal bipartite graph can be enumerated with polynomial delay.*

Our results and techniques. This paper is devoted to providing a positive answer to [Questions 1](#) and [2](#), almost completing the picture for chordal bipartite graphs. Collaterally, we provide an alternative proof of [Theorem 1](#) involving small modifications of our algorithm for minimal dominating sets; we note that the obtained algorithm has similar time bounds as the one in [GHK⁺16a].

Our algorithms for DOM-ENUM ([Theorem 3](#)) and TDOM-ENUM ([Theorem 1](#)) are based on the *ordered generation* framework (also known as *sequential method* in various works) which has been introduced in [EGM03] as a generalization of the algorithm in [TIAS77] (see also [JYP88] for a concise description). This approach has since then proved to be fruitful in various contexts related to domination and minimal transversals [CKMU19, BDH⁺20, DNV21]. Roughly, the idea is to decompose the instance with respect to an ordering of its elements, and, given the partial solutions of the instance induced by the i first elements, to extend them to the next element of the instance. To achieve polynomial delay, a parent-child relation on partial solutions is defined. Then, the resulting tree is traversed in a DFS manner, and only the leaves (which correspond to actual solutions) are output. Overall, the technique allows to reduce the general enumeration to the enumeration of the children of a partial solution, and is particularly suitable for instances admitting good elimination orderings. In our case, we use the weak-elimination ordering of chordal bipartite graphs (see [Section 2](#)) to solve children generation in polynomial time, yielding a polynomial-delay algorithm for DOM-ENUM and TDOM-ENUM in that class.

Concerning CDOM-ENUM, we show that the minimal separators of a chordal bipartite graph define a hypergraph of bounded conformality (Lemma 5), a parameter introduced by Berge [Ber84] and successfully used in the design of tractable algorithms for domination [KLMN12] and minimal transversals enumeration [KBEG07]. This, combined with the fact that chordal bipartite graphs have polynomially many minimal separators, which can be listed in polynomial time (see Section 2), allows us to obtain an incremental-polynomial time algorithm for CDOM-ENUM in that class (Theorem 5).

Additionally, we give evidence that the sequential method cannot be directly used to generalize our results to bipartite graphs. More specifically, we show that the problem of generating the children of a given partial solution is intractable for DOM-ENUM (Lemma 6) and TDOM-ENUM (Lemma 7). For CDOM-ENUM we make a stronger statement (Theorem 6): the problem is at least as hard as TRANS-ENUM, which was not known to the best of our knowledge, despite the reduction being straightforward.

Organization of the paper. We introduce preliminary notions and properties dealing with chordal bipartite graphs and minimal separators in Section 2. We describe the sequential approach in Section 3, and provide our algorithms for DOM-ENUM and TDOM-ENUM in Section 4. The arguments for an incremental-polynomial time algorithm for CDOM-ENUM in chordal bipartite graphs are given in Section 5. Limitations of the sequential method in bipartite graphs are discussed in Section 6, and the reduction from TRANS-ENUM to CDOM-ENUM in bipartite graphs is given in Section 7. We discuss open questions in Section 8.

2 Preliminary notions

We assume familiarity with standard terminology from graph and hypergraph theory, and refer to [Die12, Ber84] for notations not included below.

Graphs. All graphs considered in this paper are simple and finite. Given $X \subseteq V(G)$, $G[X] := (X, \{uv \in E(G) \mid u, v \in X\})$ is the subgraph of G induced by X . Given $v \in V(G)$, we denote by $N(v)$ its open neighborhood, by $N[v]$ its closed neighborhood, and define its *distance-2 neighborhood* as $N^2(v) := N[N[v]] \setminus N[v]$. The first two notions are naturally extended to subsets by $N[S] := \bigcup_{v \in S} N[v]$ and $N(S) := (\bigcup_{v \in S} N[v]) \setminus S$. An *independent set* is a set of pairwise non-adjacent vertices. A graph is *bipartite* if its vertex set $V(G)$ can be partitioned into two independent sets X, Y . It is called *bipartite chain* if, in addition, there exist orderings x_1, \dots, x_p and y_1, \dots, y_q of X and Y , respectively, such that $N(x_i) \subseteq N(x_j)$ for all $1 \leq i < j \leq p$, and $N(y_i) \supseteq N(y_j)$ for all $1 \leq i < j \leq q$. Note that bipartite chain graphs are closed under taking induced subgraphs.

Hypergraphs. Let \mathcal{H} be a hypergraph. Given a vertex $v \in V(\mathcal{H})$, the set of edges that contain v , also called edges *incident* to v , is denoted by $\text{inc}(v)$. The hypergraph induced by a set $X \subseteq V(\mathcal{H})$ of vertices is defined as $\mathcal{H}[X] = (X, \{E \in E(\mathcal{H}) : E \subseteq X\})$. A *transversal* of \mathcal{H} is a subset $T \subseteq V(\mathcal{H})$ such that $E \cap T \neq \emptyset$ for all $E \in E(\mathcal{H})$, i.e., every edge is incident to (or *hit* by) a vertex

of T . It is *minimal* if it is minimal by inclusion, or equivalently, if $T \setminus \{v\}$ is not a transversal for any $v \in T$. The set of minimal transversals of \mathcal{H} is denoted by $Tr(\mathcal{H})$. The *private edges* of an element v in a transversal T are those edges of \mathcal{H} which are only hit by v in T ; we denote the set of such edges by $\text{priv}(T, v)$. It is well-known (see e.g., [Ber84]) that a set $T \subseteq V(\mathcal{H})$ is a minimal transversal of \mathcal{H} if and only if T is a transversal and every v in T has a private edge. We formally state the problem of enumerating minimal transversals of a hypergraph as follows.

MINIMAL TRANSVERSALS ENUMERATION (TRANS-ENUM)

Input: A hypergraph \mathcal{H} .

Output: The set $Tr(\mathcal{H})$.

Note that in the problem above, \mathcal{H} can be considered inclusion-wise minimal (or *Sperner*) as this does not change its set of minimal transversals, and removing non-minimal hyperedges can be performed in polynomial time [EMG08].

Domination. We recall the different notions of domination given in the introduction. A *dominating set* (or DS for short) in a graph G is a set $D \subseteq V(G)$ such that $V(G) = N[D]$. It is called *connected* if the graph $G[D]$ is connected. A *total dominating set* in G is a set $D \subseteq V(G)$ such that $V(G) = \bigcup_{v \in D} N(v)$. A (resp. connected, total) dominating set is said to be *minimal* if it is inclusion-wise minimal. We denote by $\text{MDS}(G)$ (resp. $\text{MCDS}(G)$, $\text{MTDS}(G)$) the families of minimal such sets in a graph G .

In this paper, we are interested in the following enumeration problems.

MINIMAL DS ENUMERATION (DOM-ENUM)

Input: A graph G .

Output: The set $\text{MDS}(G)$.

MINIMAL TOTAL DS ENUMERATION (TDOM-ENUM)

Input: A graph G .

Output: The set $\text{MTDS}(G)$.

MINIMAL CONNECTED DS ENUMERATION (CDOM-ENUM)

Input: A graph G .

Output: The set $\text{MCDS}(G)$.

We recall that the precise complexity status of each of the problems above is widely open, the first one admitting a quasi-polynomial time algorithm [FK96, KLMN14], while the third is conjectured to be intractable [BBHK15]. Their study has been initiated in [KLMN14], where it is noted that each of the problems is a particular instance of TRANS-ENUM: using the family of (closed and open) neighborhoods for the first two, and a more involved hypergraph for the third one, as formalized in Propositions 1–3. See also [Ber84].

Proposition 1. *For every graph G , $\text{MDS}(G) = Tr(\{N[v] : v \in V(G)\})$.*

Proposition 2. *For every graph G , $\text{MTDS}(G) = Tr(\{N(v) : v \in V(G)\})$.*

Minimal separators. A *separator* in a graph G is a subset $S \subseteq V(G)$ such that $G - S$ is disconnected. In the following, let $\mathcal{S}(G) := \{S \subseteq V : G - S \text{ is not connected and } \forall S' \subset S, G - S' \text{ is connected}\}$ denote the set of (inclusion-wise) minimal separators of G . Then we have the following.

Proposition 3 ([KLMN14]). *For every graph G , $\text{MCDS}(G) = \text{Tr}(\mathcal{S}(G))$.*

Minimal separators are not to be confused with the slightly different notion of *minimal a - b separators* which are minimal sets S such that a and b lie in different components of $G - S$. Indeed, while every minimal separator is a minimal a - b separator, the converse is not always true: minimal a - b separators may contain another c - d separator as a subset; see [Gol04] for an early mention of this observation, and [BDK⁺24] for a thorough discussion on this matter. A simple example is the cycle on four vertices with a pendant edge [BDK⁺24]. Moreover, while enumerating a - b minimal separators can be done with polynomial delay [SL97, KK98, BBC00], enumerating minimal separators is a hard task [BDK⁺24]. However, and as is noted in [KLMN14], CDOM-ENUM reduces to TRANS-ENUM for graph classes admitting polynomially many a - b separators.¹ Let \mathcal{G} be the hypergraph where each hyperedge is an a - b minimal separator of G ; using the above-cited algorithms for enumerating a - b minimal separators, we can construct \mathcal{G} in polynomial time on $|\mathcal{G}| + |V(G)| + |E(G)|$; moreover, note that $\mathcal{S}(G) = \text{Min}_{\subseteq} \mathcal{G}$. Indeed, recall that $\text{Tr}(\mathcal{H}) = \text{Tr}(\mathcal{G})$ for any pair of hypergraphs \mathcal{H}, \mathcal{G} such that for any $E \in E(\mathcal{G})$ there exists $E' \in E(\mathcal{H})$ with $E' \subseteq E$. In other words, $\text{Tr}(\mathcal{H}) = \text{Tr}(\text{Min}_{\subseteq} \mathcal{H})$ for any hypergraph \mathcal{H} [Ber84].

Chordal bipartite graphs. A bipartite graph is *chordal bipartite* if it does not contain induced cycles of length greater than four [Gol04]. Note that chordal bipartite graphs are *not* chordal, as they may contain the induced cycle on four vertices. This terminology should be regarded as an analogue to bipartite graphs of chordality, as bicliques are to cliques.

A vertex v in a graph G is called *weak-simplicial* if $N(v)$ is an independent set, and for any two $x, y \in N(v)$, we have $N(x) \subseteq N(y)$ or $N(y) \subseteq N(x)$; two such vertices x, y are said to be *comparable*. Note that this is precisely to say that the graph $G[N(v) \cup N^2(v)]$ induced by the vertices at distance at most 2 from v is a bipartite chain; see [KWUA19, Lemma 3]. A *weak-simplicial elimination ordering* of G is an ordering v_1, \dots, v_n of its vertices such that, for all $1 \leq i \leq n$, v_i is weak-simplicial in $G_i = G[\{v_1, \dots, v_i\}]$. The following characterization is due to [KWUA19] and may be regarded as a simplification of an earlier characterization and recognition algorithm by Uehara [Ueh02].

Proposition 4 ([Ueh02, KWUA19]). *A graph is chordal bipartite if and only if it admits a weak-simplicial elimination ordering, which can be computed in polynomial time.*

¹It should be noted that the statement [KLMN14, Corollary 33] presents an inaccuracy where by *minimal separators* it should be understood *minimal a - b separators*. Indeed, listing minimal separators is hard [BDK⁺24] while enumerating minimal a - b separators is tractable [KK98]. The present inaccuracy comes from an ambiguity and common confusion in the literature around this terminology [SL97, KLP11].

Another characterization of chordal bipartite graphs based on separators is given in [GG78], where it is proved that a bipartite graph is chordal bipartite if and only if every minimal *edge* separator induces a complete bipartite subgraph. In [KLP11], the following analogue of the forward implication is given for minimal *a-b* separators (hence for minimal separators).

Proposition 5 ([KLP11]). *If G is chordal bipartite and S is an a - b minimal separator then $G[S]$ is complete bipartite.*

In the same paper, the authors show that chordal bipartite graphs have at most $O(n + m)$ minimal *a-b* separators [KLP11]. Since they can be listed with polynomial delay [KK98], we derive a polynomial time procedure listing *a-b* minimal separators and filtering out the non-minimal ones. We formalize this in the next statement that will be of use in Section 5.

Proposition 6. *Let G be an n -vertex chordal bipartite graph. Then its set $\mathcal{S}(G)$ of minimal separators can be enumerated in polynomial time in n .*

Finally, we will need two extra properties of minimal separators in general and in chordal bipartite graphs. Let S be a separator of G and C be a component of $G - S$. We say that C is *close* to S if every vertex in S has at least one neighbor in C . It is folklore that minimal *a-b* separators S are characterized by the existence of two close components in $G - S$; see [SL97, Gol04, KLP11] or [KK94] for a proof. We derive one implication for minimal separators since, in particular, they are *a-b* minimal separators for some specific pairs a, b of vertices. Note however that the converse is not true.

Proposition 7. *Let G be a graph and S be a minimal separator of G . Then there exist two components C_1, C_2 in $G - S$ that are close to S .*

Finally, the following will be of use in Section 5. We state it for minimal separators but this more generally holds for minimal *a-b* separators [KLP11].

Proposition 8 ([KLP11]). *Let G be chordal bipartite with bipartition (A, B) . Let S be a minimal separator of G and C be a component of $G - S$ that is close to S . If $S \cap A \neq \emptyset$ then there exists a vertex x in C with $N(x) \cap S = S \cap A$.*

3 The sequential method

We describe the *sequential method*. As by Propositions 1–3, the problems DOM-ENUM, TDOM-ENUM, and CDOM-ENUM can be seen as particular instances of TRANS-ENUM we choose to follow the presentation of [BDM24], and refer the reader to [EGM03, EHR08, BDH⁺20] for more details on this approach.

Let $\mathcal{H} \subseteq 2^V$ be a hypergraph on vertex set $V = \{v_1, \dots, v_n\}$. For $1 \leq i \leq n$ we denote by $V_i := \{v_1, \dots, v_i\}$ the set of its first i vertices, by $\mathcal{H}_i := \mathcal{H}[V_i]$ the hypergraph induced by V_i , and set $V_0 := \mathcal{H}_0 := Tr(\mathcal{H}_0) := \emptyset$. In addition, for $S \subseteq V_i$ and $v \in S$, we note $\text{priv}_i(S, v)$ the set of private edges of v with respect to S in \mathcal{H}_i . Given a minimal transversal $T \in Tr(\mathcal{H}_{i+1})$ for $i < n$, we denote by

$\text{parent}(T, i + 1)$ the *parent of T with respect to $i + 1$* obtained after repeatedly removing from T the vertex of smallest index v such that $\text{priv}_i(T, v) = \emptyset$. By definition, every T has a unique parent. Lastly, we denote by $\text{children}(T^*, i)$, for $T^* \in \text{Tr}(\mathcal{H}_i)$, the family of $T \in \text{Tr}(\mathcal{H}_{i+1})$ such that $T^* = \text{parent}(T, i + 1)$.

The next two lemmas are central to the description of the algorithm: they define a tree structure where nodes are pairs (T, i) with $T \in \text{Tr}(\mathcal{H}_i)$ and that will be traversed in a DFS manner in order to produce every leaf $T \in \text{Tr}(\mathcal{H}) = \text{Tr}(\mathcal{H}_n)$ as a solution. We refer to [BDM24] for the proofs of these statements, which follow from the definition of the *parent* relation.

Lemma 1. *Let $0 \leq i \leq n - 1$ and $T \in \text{Tr}(\mathcal{H}_{i+1})$, then $\text{parent}(T, i + 1) \in \text{Tr}(\mathcal{H}_i)$.*

Lemma 2. *Let $0 \leq i \leq n - 1$ and $T^* \in \text{Tr}(\mathcal{H}_i)$, then either:*

- $T^* \in \text{Tr}(\mathcal{H}_{i+1})$ and consequently $\text{parent}(T^*, i + 1) = T^*$; or
- $T^* \cup \{v_{i+1}\} \in \text{Tr}(\mathcal{H}_{i+1})$ and $\text{parent}(T^* \cup \{v_{i+1}\}, i + 1) = T^*$.

Finally, the whole framework culminates in the following statement that reduces TRANS-ENUM to the enumeration of the children of a given pair (T, i) with $T \in \text{Tr}(\mathcal{H}_i)$, $i < n$, while preserving polynomial delay and space.

Theorem 2. *Let $f, s : \mathbb{N}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}_+$ be two functions. If there is an algorithm that, given a hypergraph \mathcal{H} on vertex set $V = \{v_1, \dots, v_n\}$ and m edges, an integer $i \in \{1, \dots, n - 1\}$, and $T^* \in \text{Tr}(\mathcal{H}_i)$, enumerates $\text{children}(T^*, i)$ with delay $f(n, m)$ and using $s(n, m)$ space, then there is an algorithm that enumerates $\text{Tr}(\mathcal{H})$ with $O(nf(n, m))$ delay and $O(ns(n, m))$ space.*

In the following, given T^* and i as above, let

$$\Delta_{i+1} := \{E \in \mathcal{H}_{i+1} : E \cap T^* = \emptyset\} \subseteq \text{inc}_{i+1}(v_{i+1})$$

be the family of hyperedges of \mathcal{H}_{i+1} that are not hit by T^* . The following shows that children may be found by considering minimal extensions to \mathcal{H}_{i+1} of minimal transversals of \mathcal{H}_i .

Lemma 3. *If $T \in \text{children}(T^*, i)$ then $T = T^* \cup X$ for some $X \in \text{Tr}(\Delta_{i+1})$.*

Proof. Let $T \in \text{children}(T^*, i)$. Then T^* is obtained from T by greedily removing elements that have no private edge in \mathcal{H}_i . Let X be the set of removed elements. Note that since T^* is transversal of \mathcal{H}_i , X may only have private edges among those $E \in \mathcal{H}_{i+1}$ that are not intersected by T^* , i.e., among Δ_{i+1} . Then, either $\Delta_{i+1} = \emptyset$ in which case $T = T^*$ by Lemma 2, or X is non empty and intersects each edge in Δ_{i+1} . By minimality of T , we derive that X is minimal with this property, as desired. \square

As a corollary, in order to enumerate $\text{children}(T^*, i)$ for some $i \in \{1, \dots, n - 1\}$ and $T^* \in \text{Tr}(\mathcal{H}_i)$, one can simply enumerate all the minimal transversals of Δ_{i+1} and filter out those that do not provide children of T^* . In the following, we call such sets *minimal extensions* of (T^*, i) . Note, however that the number

of minimal transversal of Δ_{i+1} may be greater (typically exponential) than the number of actual children, hence that this approach fails to efficiently produce children in general. Moreover, this approach is intractable in general, with instances admitting non-trivial children if and only if NP-complete problems admit a positive answer; see [BDM24] or Section 6. We nevertheless have the following which says that the approach is still tractable if we can bound the number of minimal extension by a polynomial in the input size, and which is in essence what is done in [EGM03].

Corollary 1. *If there is an algorithm that, given $T^* \in \text{Tr}(\mathcal{H}_i)$, $i < n$, enumerates all $X \in \text{Tr}(\Delta_{i+1})$ in time and space which are polynomial in $n + m$, then there is one that lists $\text{Tr}(\mathcal{H})$ with polynomial delay and space.*

Note that, if \mathcal{H} is d -degenerate and v_1, \dots, v_n is an optimal degeneracy ordering, then minimal extensions have size at most d . In [EGM03], the authors use this fact to provide a polynomial delay algorithm that lists minimal transversals in $O(1)$ -degenerate hypergraphs relying on Corollary 1. See [EGM03, BDM24] for the definition of these notions. In this paper, we combine this corollary together with the elimination ordering of chordal bipartite graphs provided by Proposition 4 to show that DOM-ENUM and TDOM-ENUM can be solved with polynomial delay as well in this class.

4 Minimal extension for (total) dominating sets

In this section, we apply the sequential method to TRANS-ENUM restricted to hypergraphs of closed neighborhoods of chordal bipartite graphs to show that Question 1 admits a positive answer. More specifically, we use the weak-simplicial elimination ordering of chordal bipartite graphs to restrict the instance of minimal extensions enumeration to a variant of domination in bipartite chain graphs, which is tractable. By Corollary 1, this allows us to obtain Theorem 3.

In the following, let G be a chordal bipartite graph on n vertices and v_1, \dots, v_n be a weak-simplicial ordering of its vertices as provided by Proposition 4. Let \mathcal{H} be its hypergraph of closed neighborhoods, $i \in \{1, \dots, n-1\}$ be an integer and T be a minimal transversal of \mathcal{H}_i as in the statement of Corollary 1. We will show how to enumerate the minimal transversals of Δ_{i+1} in polynomial time and space, to derive the desired result.

First note that since the edges of Δ_{i+1} belong to \mathcal{H}_{i+1} and are incident to v_{i+1} , they may be equal to $N[v_{i+1}]$ if $N[v_{i+1}] \subseteq V_{i+1}$, or to $N[u]$ for some neighbor u of v_{i+1} if $N[u] \subseteq V_{i+1}$. Note that in the later case, the set $N[u]$ may contain vertices at distance 2 from v_{i+1} . From now on, let B be the set of vertices $u \in N(v_{i+1})$ such that $N[u] \in \Delta_{i+1}$, and let

$$R := \left(\bigcup \{E : E \in \Delta_{i+1}\} \right) \setminus B$$

be the remaining vertices that lie in some edge of Δ_{i+1} . Consequently $B \subseteq N(v_{i+1})$ and $R \subseteq N(v_{i+1}) \cup N^2(v_{i+1})$. Thus the graph $H = G_i[R \cup B]$ is




Figure 1: The bipartite chain instance induced by X and Y with v_{i+1} depicted as well. Blue vertices are those whose closed neighborhoods are incident to v_{i+1} and included in V_{i+1} as a subset. Red vertices in X have neighbors out of V_i .

an induced subgraph of $G_i[N(v_{i+1}) \cup N^2(v_{i+1})]$ which, by [Proposition 4](#), is a bipartite chain. Hence H is a bipartite chain. We denote by (X, Y) the bipartition of H where $B \subseteq X \subseteq N(v_{i+1})$, and by x_1, \dots, x_p and y_1, \dots, y_q the respective orderings of X and Y satisfying $N(x_j) \cap Y \subseteq N(x_\ell) \cap Y$ and $N(y_\ell) \cap X \subseteq N(y_j) \cap X$ for all $j < \ell$; see [Section 2](#) and [Figure 1](#) for an illustration of the situation.

In what remains we shall call *blue* the vertices in B , *red* those in R , and characterize minimal transversals of Δ_{i+1} as particular sets analogous to red-blue dominating sets where red and blue vertices may be selected in order to dominate blue vertices.

Proposition 9. *Let $Z \in \text{Tr}(\Delta_{i+1})$. Then*

- $|Z \cap R \cap N(v_{i+1})| \leq 1$; and
- $|Z \cap N^2(v_{i+1})| \leq 1$.

Proof. First, note that if x belongs to $Z \cap R \cap N(v_{i+1})$ then it is incident to at most one edge in Δ_{i+1} (as H is bipartite), namely $N[v_{i+1}]$, in which case $N[v_{i+1}]$ is a private edge of x . Hence, no two distinct vertices x, y may lie in $Z \cap R \cap N(v_{i+1})$ by minimality of Z , yielding the first inequality.

Now, recall that $N^2(v_{i+1}) \subseteq Y$ hence that one of $N(y) \cap X \subseteq N(y') \cap X$ or $N(y) \cap X \supseteq N(y') \cap X$ holds for any pair $y, y' \in N^2(v_{i+1})$. Since edges of Δ_{i+1} are of the form $N[x]$ for some $x \in X$, no two distinct y, y' can have private edges in Δ_{i+1} simultaneously. Hence, $|Z \cap N^2(v_{i+1})| \leq 1$ as claimed. \square

Lemma 4. *Let $Z \in \text{Tr}(\Delta_{i+1})$. Then exactly one of the following holds:*

1. $Z = \{v_{i+1}\}$;
2. $Z \subseteq B$ in which case $Z = B$;
3. $Z \subseteq R$ in which case $|Z| \leq 2$; or
4. $Z = \{r\} \cup (B \setminus N(r))$ for some $r \in N^2(v_{i+1})$.

Proof. First, note that all the cases are mutually distinct. Hence, we may consider some $Z \in \text{Tr}(\Delta_{i+1})$, assume that $Z \neq \{v_{i+1}\}$, and prove the conclusion for each of **Items 2–4**. Note that each $x \in X$ hits a single edge $N[x]$ in Δ_{i+1} , as X is an independent set. Hence, if $Z \subseteq B$ then $Z = B$ concluding **Item 2**. If $Z \subseteq R$ then we have that $|Z| \leq 2$ by **Proposition 9** deriving **Item 3**. We are thus left with proving **Item 4**. Suppose that $Z \cap B \neq \emptyset$ and $Z \cap R \neq \emptyset$. Note that if $x \in X \cap R$, then it may be incident to at most one edge in Δ_{i+1} , namely $N[v_{i+1}]$. However, since $Z \cap B \neq \emptyset$ by assumption of this last case, and since each element in B is adjacent to v_{i+1} , the edge $N[v_{i+1}]$ may not be the private edge of such an x in Z . Hence $Z \cap X \cap R = \emptyset$, that is, $Z \cap R \subseteq Y$. By **Proposition 9** there is exactly one vertex, call it y , belonging to $Z \cap Y$. Finally, note that in addition to $N[v_{i+1}]$, each $b \in B$ hits a single edge $N[b] \in \Delta_{i+1}$ that only b can hit in X . Hence $B \setminus N(r) \subseteq Z$ and **Item 4** follows. \square

Note that the conditions of the items in **Lemma 4** can be checked in polynomial time, and provide an upper bound of $O(n^2)$ on the number of minimal transversals of Δ_{i+1} . Clearly these minimal transversals can be constructed within the same time and using polynomial space. We formalize this as follows.

Corollary 2. *The set $\text{Tr}(\Delta_{i+1})$ can be listed in polynomial time and space.*

We conclude the following by combining **Corollaries 1** and **2**. This answers positively **Question 1**.

Theorem 3. *There is a polynomial delay and space algorithm enumerating minimal dominating sets in chordal bipartite graphs.*

Let us now argue that with small modifications we can get a polynomial-delay algorithm for TDOM-ENUM on the same class. Note that the minimal extension problem is almost identical, with the caveat that the hyperedges we must hit are now of the form $N(x)$ for $x = v_{i+1}$ or $x \in X$, i.e., we are now dealing with open instead of closed neighborhoods. A similar analysis as conducted in the proof of **Lemma 4** shows that minimal extensions are red subsets dominating blue elements plus v_{i+1} if $N(v_{i+1}) \subseteq V_{i+1}$. We note that this becomes an instance of proper red-blue domination (where only red elements may be picked) which is precisely what is solved in **[GHK+16a]** for chordal bipartite graphs. However in our case, due to the instance being a bipartite chain graph, the problem is trivial. Indeed, it may be seen that solutions have size at most two, intersecting X and Y on at most one vertex. As such, we have an alternative proof of **Theorem 1**, which was already known by **[GHK+16a]**.

Theorem 1 (**[GHK+16a]**). *The minimal total dominating sets of a chordal bipartite graph can be enumerated with polynomial delay.*

5 Minimal connected dominating sets

Recall that CDOM-ENUM amounts to list the minimal transversals of the (implicit) hypergraph of minimal separators of a given graph G , i.e., **Proposition 3**.

By [Proposition 6](#), this hypergraph can be constructed in polynomial time if G is chordal bipartite. In this section, we moreover show that this hypergraph has bounded conformality in that case. As a corollary, we can use the algorithm of Khachiyan et al. in [\[KBEG07\]](#) to list minimal connected dominating sets in incremental-polynomial time in chordal bipartite graphs, providing a positive answer to [Question 2](#).

Let us define the notion of conformality introduced by Berge in [\[Ber84\]](#). We say that a hypergraph \mathcal{H} is of *conformality* c if the following property holds for every subset $X \subseteq V(\mathcal{H})$: X is contained (as a subset) in a hyperedge of \mathcal{H} whenever each subset of X of cardinality at most c is contained (as a subset) in a hyperedge of \mathcal{H} . See also [\[Ber84, KBEG07\]](#) for other equivalent characterizations of bounded conformality. We recall that a hypergraph \mathcal{H} is called Sperner if $E_1 \not\subseteq E_2$ for any two distinct hyperedges E_1, E_2 in \mathcal{H} .

Khachiyan, Boros, Elbassioni, and Gurvich proved the following.

Theorem 4 ([\[KBEG07\]](#)). *The minimal transversals of a Sperner hypergraph of bounded conformality can be enumerated in incremental-polynomial time.*

We show that the family of minimal separators has bounded conformality in chordal bipartite graphs.

Lemma 5. *If G is chordal bipartite then $\mathcal{S}(G)$ has conformality 5.*

Proof. Let us put $\mathcal{H} := \mathcal{S}(G)$. Assume that \mathcal{H} is not of conformality 5, i.e., there is a subset $X \subseteq V(\mathcal{H})$ that is not contained in a hyperedge of \mathcal{H} , but each of its subsets $Y \subseteq X$ of size at most 5 are contained in a hyperedge of \mathcal{H} . Here, by *contained* we mean as a subset. We consider $X = \{x_1, \dots, x_p\}$ of minimum cardinality. Then $p \geq 6$ as otherwise, by assumption, X would be contained in a hyperedge of \mathcal{H} . Moreover, for every $x_i \in X$, note that there must exist a hyperedge E_i of \mathcal{H} such that $E_i \cap X = X \setminus \{x_i\}$: we prove this depending on the value of p . In the first case, if $p \geq 7$, the nonexistence of such E_i implies that $X' = X \setminus \{x_i\}$ is not contained in a hyperedge of \mathcal{H} , and still every subset $Y \subseteq X'$ of size at most 5 is, contradicting the minimality of X ; if, however, $p = 6$, by definition we have that every $Y \subsetneq X$ of size 5 is contained in some $E_Y \in \mathcal{E}(\mathcal{H})$, but $X \not\subseteq E_Y$ since \mathcal{H} is not of conformality 5.

Since X has cardinality at least 6, there exist at least three vertices a_1, a_2, a_3 in X lying in one side of the bipartition of G , call it A . Let E_1 be an edge of \mathcal{H} , i.e., a minimal separator of G that does not contain a_1 , which exists by our previous arguments; moreover, $E_1 \cap X = X \setminus \{a_1\}$, implying $a_2, a_3 \in E_1$. By the minimality of E_1 and [Proposition 7](#) there are at least two components that are close to E_1 . Let C_1 be one that does *not* contain a_1 . By [Proposition 8](#) there exists c_1 in C_1 that satisfies $N(c_1) \cap A = E_1 \cap A$, and so c_1 is adjacent to both a_2 and a_3 . However note that c_1 is not adjacent to a_1 as we chose C_1 to be the component not containing a_1 .

Consider now the separator E_2 . Again, by minimality there are at least two components that are close to E_2 . Let C_2 be the one that does not contain a_2 . By [Proposition 8](#) there exists c_2 in C_2 that is adjacent to both a_1 and a_3 . However a_2 and c_2 are non adjacent.

We repeat this procedure for E_3 and obtain c_3 that is adjacent to both a_1 and a_2 but not a_3 . Note that as a_1, a_2, a_3 lie in A , c_1, c_2, c_3 lie in the other side of the bipartition and are thus pairwise non adjacent. We obtain an induced cycle $(a_1, c_1, a_2, c_2, a_3, c_3, a_1)$ contradicting the fact that G is $C_{\geq 6}$ -free. \square

We derive the following as a corollary of [Theorem 4](#) and [Lemma 5](#).

Theorem 5. *The minimal connected dominating sets of a chordal bipartite graph can be listed in incremental polynomial time.*

6 Limitations of the sequential method

It is already known that the sequential method may not directly provide output-polynomial time algorithms for TRANS-ENUM in general; see e.g. [\[BDM24\]](#) for explicit statements. We adapt the construction in [\[BDM24\]](#) to show that this still holds for hypergraphs of (open or closed) neighborhoods of bipartite graphs, i.e., that we may not expect to get tractable algorithms for TDOM-ENUM and DOM-ENUM using this technique.

We begin with DOM-ENUM and later detail the modifications to be performed for the statement to hold for TDOM-ENUM. In the following by $\mathcal{N}(G)$ we mean the hypergraph of closed neighborhoods of G , whose minimal transversals are precisely the minimal dominating sets of G ; see [Section 2](#).

Recall that in MULTICOLORED INDEPENDENT SET problem, we are given a graph G , an integer k , and a partition $\mathcal{V} = (V_1, V_2, \dots, V_k)$ of $V(G)$ such that V_i is an independent set for every $1 \leq i \leq k$. Sets V_1, \dots, V_k are usually referred to as color classes. The goal is then to decide whether there exists an independent set in G containing precisely one vertex from each V_i , i.e., that is multicolored. See [\[CFK⁺15\]](#) for more details on this problem.

Lemma 6. *Let (G, \mathcal{V}) be an instance of MULTICOLORED INDEPENDENT SET. Then there exists a bipartite graph H , an ordering v_1, \dots, v_n of its vertices, and a minimal transversal T^* of $\mathcal{N}(H)_{n-2}$, such that the sets in $\text{children}(T^*, n-2)$ are all multicolored independent sets of G except for one.*

Proof. Let (G, \mathcal{V}) be an instance of MULTICOLORED INDEPENDENT SET where $\mathcal{V} = (V_1, \dots, V_k)$ is a partition of G and each V_i is one of k color classes, $n = |V(G)|$ and $m = |E(G)|$. We describe the construction of a bipartite graph H from G as follows, and create a set T^* of vertices along the way. See [Figure 2](#) for an illustration.

We start by adding to H the set of vertices $V(G)$, but none of the edges of G . For each color class V_i , $1 \leq i \leq k$ we create a special vertex c_i that we make adjacent to all vertices of V_i . Then, again for each color class, we create a path on four vertices x_1, x_2, x_3, x_4 and attach it to c_i by adding the edge $c_i x_4$. We add x_2 and x_3 to T^* . The role of this gadget is to leave c_j non-dominated by T^* , yet to forbid c_j in a minimal dominating set containing T^* . In the following, we define $C = \{c_i : i \in \{1, \dots, k\}\}$.




Figure 2: The construction of H , where vertices are ordered arbitrarily except for α and β which are put last, in this order. Color classes V_1, \dots, V_k induce independent sets in H . The dashed edge denote an edge of G that is not part of H . Black vertices represent T^* . Note that there is one copy of the depicted gadgets for each color class, vertex, and edge of G .

For every edge uv in G we construct a subdivided claw $y_1, y_2, y_3, y_4, y_5, u, v$, with $N(y_2) = \{y_1, y_3\}$, $N(y_4) = \{y_3, u\}$, $N(y_5) = \{y_3, v\}$ and no other edges touch the y vertices. Also, we add y_2 and y_3 to T^* . The objective of this gadget is to forbid the selection of *both* endpoints u and v of an edge in a minimal dominating set containing T^* . Note that we construct one such gadget per edge of G , but that the vertices u and v are shared by other edge gadgets.

For every vertex v of G , we create a distinct path on four vertices z_1, z_2, z_3, z_4 , and attach it to v with the edge vz_3 . We add z_2 and z_3 to T^* . This ensures that each such v is dominated by T^* . Moreover, note that picking v in a minimal dominating set containing T^* will not steal private neighbors of an element in T^* , and will dominate c_i for i such that $v \in V_i$.

Finally, we create two additional vertices α and β with α adjacent to each c_i , $1 \leq i \leq k$, and β only adjacent to α . We fix the ordering of vertices of H to be arbitrary but ending with α, β in this order.

This completes the construction of H . It has $O(n + m)$ vertices and edges. Moreover, it is easily seen that H is bipartite, by taking $V(G)$ on one side of the bipartition, and noting that except for α and β the gadgets only create even paths between pairs of vertices attached to $V(G)$. Then α is made adjacent to the c_j 's which lie in the opposite partition of $V(G)$, and β is a pendant vertex. Thus they do not create odd cycles. See also [Figure 2](#) for a representation of H in layers where each edge is between consecutive layers.

Let us define $\mathcal{H} := \mathcal{N}(H)$ and show that T^* is a minimal transversal of $\mathcal{H}_{n-2} = \mathcal{H}[V(H) \setminus \{\alpha, \beta\}]$. First note that all neighborhoods except for those

of c_i 's, α and β are included in the $n - 2$ first vertices, hence belong to \mathcal{H}_{n-2} . Moreover, all these neighborhoods are intersected by T^* as every gadget is dominated by T^* by construction, and each vertex $v \in V(G)$ is dominated by the vertex z_3 of its corresponding vertex gadget. Furthermore, T^* is minimal with that property as each of its element t has a private neighbor in its corresponding gadget, whose edge is thus only intersected by t in T^* .

Let us now consider the different possibilities for a minimal transversal T of \mathcal{H}_{n-1} to contain T^* as a subset. Note that only the neighborhoods of c_i for each $1 \leq i \leq k$ are to be dominated. To do so, we either pick α , or must select a subset X of $V(G) \cup C$ in order to minimally hit $N[c_i]$ for all $1 \leq i \leq k$. Note however that as x_4 is the only private neighbor of x_3 in the color class gadget of V_i , X cannot contain c_i nor x_1 for any color. Hence $X \subseteq V(G)$. Note also that no two distinct elements of X intersect a same color class V_i as their only private neighbor would be c_i , and hence one of the two would be redundant. Moreover by the edge gadget, since y_4 and y_5 are the only two private neighbors of y_3 , X cannot contain both u and v for any edge uv of G . Thus X intersects each color class precisely once, and does not contain two vertices u, v with $uv \in E(G)$. We conclude that X is a multicolored independent set of G , hence that T^* can be extended into a minimal transversal of \mathcal{H}_{n-1} using a different set than $\{\alpha\}$ if and only if G contains a multicolored independent set.

Finally, recall that by [Lemma 2](#) and [Lemma 3](#) either $\text{children}(T^*, n - 2) = \{T^*\}$, or sets in $\text{children}(T^*, n - 2)$ are of the form $T^* \cup X$ for some $X \in \text{Tr}(\Delta_{n-1})$ where

$$\Delta_{n-1} := \{E \in \mathcal{H}_{n-1} : E \cap T^* = \emptyset\} = \{N[c_i] : 1 \leq i \leq k\}.$$

Since T^* is not a transversal of \mathcal{H}_{n-1} we are in the second case. Moreover, by the above discussion, each such $X \in \text{Tr}(\Delta_{n-1})$ is either $\{\alpha\}$ or is a multicolored independent set of G . We thus need to show that any multicolored independent set of G yields a children to conclude the proof.

Let X be a multicolored independent set of G and suppose that $T^* \cup X$ is not a child of $(T^*, n - 2)$. Then during the computation of the parent of $T^* \cup X$, some element $v \in T^*$ is removed. Hence such a v belongs to one of the edge, vertex, or color class gadgets. But for these element to lose a private neighbor it should be that X contains two elements of a same color class, or two endpoints of an edge, a contradiction. \square

A consequence of [Lemma 6](#) is that the sequential approach may not be directly applied to solve DOM-ENUM, even in bipartite graphs. Moreover, note that in our construction, no vertex v of T^* is made self-private, i.e., no v has its closed neighborhood as a private edge. Furthermore, the elements in the color classes are dominated by T^* , and their role is thus limited to dominate the c_i 's in an extension. Hence, by keeping the same construction, all the arguments of the above proof hold for the hypergraph of *open* neighborhoods of G . We derive that the sequential approach may not be directly be used for TDOM-ENUM neither, as summarized in [Lemma 7](#), where $\mathcal{N}^o(H)$ is the hypergraph of open neighborhoods of H .

Lemma 7. *Let (G, \mathcal{V}) be an instance of MULTICOLORED INDEPENDENT SET. Then there exists a bipartite graph H , an ordering v_1, \dots, v_n of its vertices, and a minimal transversal T^* of $\mathcal{N}^o(H)_{n-2}$, such that the sets in $\text{children}(T^*, n-2)$ are all multicolored independent sets of G except for one.*

7 Trans-Enum and bipartite graphs²

Our final result is a proof that TRANS-ENUM reduces to CDOM-ENUM on bipartite graphs, which we are not aware of being previously known or directly implied by other results. In fact, by [Proposition 3](#), if we can construct a graph where (almost) every minimal separator is in a one to one correspondence to our hyperedges, we are done.

Let \mathcal{H} be the input hypergraph to TRANS-ENUM with $E(\mathcal{H}) = \{E_1, \dots, E_m\}$ and $V(\mathcal{H}) = \{u_1, \dots, u_n\}$ and assume w.l.o.g. that \mathcal{H} is a Sperner hypergraph. To obtain G , the input to CDOM-ENUM, we start with the incidence bipartite graph of \mathcal{H} , that is, $\{v_1, \dots, v_n\}, \{e_1, \dots, e_m\} \subset V(G)$, where v_i corresponds to $u_i \in V(\mathcal{H})$ and e_j corresponds to $E_j \in E(\mathcal{H})$, and $v_i e_j \in E(G)$ if and only if $u_i \in E_j$. To conclude the construction of G , we add two vertices v' and v^* , the edge $v'v^*$, and the edges v^*v_i for all $1 \leq i \leq n$.

Lemma 8. *The minimal separators of G are $N(e_1), \dots, N(e_m)$ and $\{v^*\}$.*

Proof. To see that $\{v^*\} \in \mathcal{S}(G)$, observe that $G \setminus \{v^*\}$ has two connected components: $\{v'\}$ and $V(G) \setminus \{v', v^*\}$. As such, no other $S \in \mathcal{S}(G)$ contains v^* , so it holds that every $v_i \notin S$ is in the same connected component as v^* and v' . Let $E_j \in E(\mathcal{H})$ and observe that $N(e_j)$ separates e_j from the rest of $G \setminus N(e_j)$; moreover, note that, since \mathcal{H} is a Sperner hypergraph, every other $e_\ell \in V(G)$ has a neighbor $v_k \notin N(e_j)$ (as no two hyperedges satisfy a containment relation), so it holds that $G \setminus N(e_j)$ has exactly two components: $\{e_j\}$ and the rest of the graph. Thus, if we add back one vertex from $N(e_j)$, e_j is no longer disconnected as it creates a e_j - v^* path. Now, towards a contradiction, assume that there is another $S \in \mathcal{S}(G)$ that is different from every $N(e_j)$ and from $\{v^*\}$. Let $\{v', v^*, v_1, \dots, v_n\} \setminus S \subseteq C_1$ be a non-empty connected component of $G \setminus S$; note that, because $V(G) \setminus (S \cup C_1) \subseteq \{e_1, \dots, e_m\}$, the other connected components of $G \setminus S$ (which must exist as S is a separator) must have size one, but this implies that each $e_j \notin C_1 \cup S$ has $N(e_j) = N(e_j) \subseteq S$, a contradiction. \square

Theorem 6. *CDOM-ENUM on bipartite graphs is at least as hard as TRANS-ENUM.*

Proof. By our construction and [Lemma 8](#), each $T_G \in \text{Tr}(\mathcal{S}(G))$ contains v^* and $T_G \setminus \{v^*\}$ minimally hits each $N(e_j) = \{v_i : u_i \in E_j\}$; thus $T_{\mathcal{H}}(T_G) = \{u_i : v_i \in T_G \setminus \{v^*\}\}$ is a bijection between $\text{Tr}(\mathcal{S}(G))$ and $\text{Tr}(\mathcal{H})$. By [Proposition 3](#),

²After the submission of this work, it has come to our attention that there is a recent stronger result on the subject [[KKMO24](#)]. We nevertheless leave the proof as is since it is simple and for self-containment.

$\text{MCDS}(G) = \text{Tr}(\mathcal{S}(G))$, so there is a bijection between $\text{MCDS}(G)$ and $\text{Tr}(\mathcal{H})$ and the result follows. \square

8 Discussion

In this paper, we investigated the complexity of DOM-ENUM and its two variants TDOM-ENUM and CDOM-ENUM in chordal bipartite graphs. We obtained polynomial-delay algorithms for the first two problems, and an incremental-polynomial time algorithm for the last problem. Then we gave evidence that the techniques used for DOM-ENUM and TDOM-ENUM may not be pushed directly to bipartite graphs. As of CDOM-ENUM, we proved a stronger statement that CDOM-ENUM is as hard as TRANS-ENUM in bipartite graphs, with the later problem being open since more than forty years [EG95].

We leave open the existence of polynomial-delay algorithms for DOM-ENUM and TDOM-ENUM in bipartite graphs, and for CDOM-ENUM in chordal bipartite graphs. Concerning this last case, we note that obtaining polynomial delay is open for TRANS-ENUM on hypergraph of bounded dimension, which define a proper subclass of hypergraphs of bounded conformality. Hence, in order to improve [Theorem 5](#), one either has to find another strategy, or should aim at improving the results in [EG95, KBEG07] first.

References

- [AKFG⁺22] Faisal N. Abu-Khzam, Henning Fernau, Benjamin Gras, Mathieu Liedloff, and Kevin Mann. Enumerating minimal connected dominating sets. In *30th Annual European Symposium on Algorithms (ESA 2022)*. Schloss Dagstuhl-Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik, 2022.
- [BBC00] Anne Berry, Jean-Paul Bordat, and Olivier Cogis. Generating all the minimal separators of a graph. *International Journal of Foundations of Computer Science*, 11(03):397–403, 2000.
- [BBHK15] Hans Bodlaender, Endre Boros, Pinar Heggenes, and Dieter Kratsch. *Open Problems of the Lorentz Workshop, "Enumeration Algorithms using Structure"*. Department of Information and Computing Sciences Utrecht University, Utrecht, The Netherlands, 2015.
- [BDH⁺20] Marthe Bonamy, Oscar Defrain, Marc Heinrich, Michał Pilipczuk, and Jean-Florent Raymond. Enumerating minimal dominating sets in K_t -free graphs and variants. *ACM Transactions on Algorithms (TALG)*, 16(3):1–23, 2020.
- [BDK⁺24] Caroline Brosse, Oscar Defrain, Kazuhiro Kurita, Vincent Limouzy, Takeaki Uno, and Kunihiro Wasa. On the hardness of

- inclusion-wise minimal separators enumeration. *Information Processing Letters*, 185:106469, 2024.
- [BDM24] Valentin Bartier, Oscar Defrain, and Fionn Mc Inerney. Hypergraph dualization with FPT-delay parameterized by the degeneracy and dimension. In *International Workshop on Combinatorial Algorithms*, pages 111–125. Springer, 2024.
- [BDMN20] Marthe Bonamy, Oscar Defrain, Piotr Micek, and Lhouari Nourine. Enumerating minimal dominating sets in the (in)comparability graphs of bounded dimension posets. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2004.07214*, 2020.
- [Ber84] Claude Berge. *Hypergraphs: combinatorics of finite sets*, volume 45. Elsevier, 1984.
- [BFL⁺22] Thomas Bläsius, Tobias Friedrich, Julius Lischeid, Kitty Meeks, and Martin Schirneck. Efficiently enumerating hitting sets of hypergraphs arising in data profiling. *Journal of Computer and System Sciences*, 124:192–213, 2022.
- [CFK⁺15] Marek Cygan, Fedor V. Fomin, Łukasz Kowalik, Daniel Lokshтанov, Dániel Marx, Marcin Pilipczuk, Michał Pilipczuk, and Saket Saurabh. *Parameterized algorithms*. Springer, 2015.
- [CKMU19] Alessio Conte, Mamadou M. Kanté, Andrea Marino, and Takeaki Uno. Maximal irredundant set enumeration in bounded-degeneracy and bounded-degree hypergraphs. In *International Workshop on Combinatorial Algorithms*, pages 148–159. Springer, 2019.
- [Cou09] Bruno Courcelle. Linear delay enumeration and monadic second-order logic. *Discrete Applied Mathematics*, 157(12):2675–2700, 2009.
- [Die12] Reinhard Diestel. *Graph Theory*. Springer Berlin, Heidelberg, 2012.
- [DN19] Oscar Defrain and Lhouari Nourine. Neighborhood inclusions for minimal dominating sets enumeration: Linear and polynomial delay algorithms in P_7 -free and P_8 -free chordal graphs. In *30th International Symposium on Algorithms and Computation (ISAAC 2019)*. Schloss Dagstuhl-Leibniz-Zentrum fuer Informatik, 2019.
- [DNV21] Oscar Defrain, Lhouari Nourine, and Simon Vilmin. Translating between the representations of a ranked convex geometry. *Discrete Mathematics*, 344(7):112399, 2021.
- [EG95] Thomas Eiter and Georg Gottlob. Identifying the minimal transversals of a hypergraph and related problems. *SIAM Journal on Computing*, 24(6):1278–1304, 1995.

- [EGM03] Thomas Eiter, Georg Gottlob, and Kazuhisa Makino. New results on monotone dualization and generating hypergraph transversals. *SIAM Journal on Computing*, 32(2):514–537, 2003.
- [EHR08] Khaled Elbassioni, Matthias Hagen, and Imran Rauf. Some fixed-parameter tractable classes of hypergraph duality and related problems. In *Parameterized and Exact Computation: Third International Workshop, IWPEC 2008, Victoria, Canada, May 14-16, 2008. Proceedings 3*, pages 91–102. Springer, 2008.
- [EMG08] Thomas Eiter, Kazuhisa Makino, and Georg Gottlob. Computational aspects of monotone dualization: A brief survey. *Discrete Applied Mathematics*, 156(11):2035–2049, 2008.
- [ERR19] Khaled Elbassioni, Imran Rauf, and Saurabh Ray. A global parallel algorithm for enumerating minimal transversals of geometric hypergraphs. *Theoretical Computer Science*, 767:26–33, 2019.
- [FK96] Michael L. Fredman and Leonid Khachiyan. On the complexity of dualization of monotone disjunctive normal forms. *Journal of Algorithms*, 21(3):618–628, 1996.
- [GDVL17] Andrew Gainer-Dewar and Paola Vera-Licona. The minimal hitting set generation problem: algorithms and computation. *SIAM Journal on Discrete Mathematics*, 31(1):63–100, 2017.
- [GG78] Martin Charles Golumbic and Clinton F. Goss. Perfect elimination and chordal bipartite graphs. *Journal of Graph Theory*, 2(2):155–163, 1978.
- [GHK⁺16a] Petr A. Golovach, Pinar Heggernes, Mamadou M. Kanté, Dieter Kratsch, and Yngve Villanger. Enumerating minimal dominating sets in chordal bipartite graphs. *Discrete Applied Mathematics*, 199:30–36, 2016.
- [GHK16b] Petr A. Golovach, Pinar Heggernes, and Dieter Kratsch. Enumerating minimal connected dominating sets in graphs of bounded chordality. *Theoretical Computer Science*, 630:63–75, 2016.
- [GHK⁺18] Petr A. Golovach, Pinar Heggernes, Mamadou M. Kanté, Dieter Kratsch, Sigve H. Sæther, and Yngve Villanger. Output-polynomial enumeration on graphs of bounded (local) linear MIM-width. *Algorithmica*, 80(2):714–741, 2018.
- [GHKS20] Petr A. Golovach, Pinar Heggernes, Dieter Kratsch, and Reza Saei. Enumeration of minimal connected dominating sets for chordal graphs. *Discrete Applied Mathematics*, 278:3–11, 2020.

- [GHKV15] Petr A. Golovach, Pinar Heggernes, Dieter Kratsch, and Yngve Villanger. An incremental polynomial time algorithm to enumerate all minimal edge dominating sets. *Algorithmica*, 72(3):836–859, 2015.
- [GMKT97] Dimitrios Gunopulos, Heikki Mannila, Roni Khardon, and Hannu Toivonen. Data mining, hypergraph transversals, and machine learning. In *PODS*, pages 209–216. ACM, 1997.
- [Gol04] Martin Charles Golumbic. *Algorithmic graph theory and perfect graphs*. Elsevier, 2004.
- [JYP88] David S. Johnson, Mihalis Yannakakis, and Christos H. Papadimitriou. On generating all maximal independent sets. *Information Processing Letters*, 27(3):119–123, 1988.
- [KBEG07] Leonid Khachiyan, Endre Boros, Khaled Elbassioni, and Vladimir Gurvich. On the dualization of hypergraphs with bounded edge-intersections and other related classes of hypergraphs. *Theoretical Computer Science*, 382(2):139–150, 2007.
- [KK94] Ton Kloks and Dieter Kratsch. Finding all minimal separators of a graph. In *STACS 94: 11th Annual Symposium on Theoretical Aspects of Computer Science Caen, France, February 24–26, 1994 Proceedings 11*, pages 759–768. Springer, 1994.
- [KK98] Ton Kloks and Dieter Kratsch. Listing all minimal separators of a graph. *SIAM Journal on Computing*, 27(3):605–613, 1998.
- [KKMO24] Yasuaki Kobayashi, Kazuhiro Kurita, Yasuko Matsui, and Hiro-taka Ono. Enumerating minimal vertex covers and dominating sets with capacity and/or connectivity constraints. In Adele Anna Rescigno and Ugo Vaccaro, editors, *Combinatorial Algorithms*, pages 232–246, Cham, 2024. Springer Nature Switzerland.
- [KLM⁺15a] Mamadou M. Kanté, Vincent Limouzy, Arnaud Mary, Lhouari Nourine, and Takeaki Uno. A polynomial delay algorithm for enumerating minimal dominating sets in chordal graphs. In *International Workshop on Graph-Theoretic Concepts in Computer Science*, pages 138–153. Springer, 2015.
- [KLM⁺15b] Mamadou M. Kanté, Vincent Limouzy, Arnaud Mary, Lhouari Nourine, and Takeaki Uno. Polynomial delay algorithm for listing minimal edge dominating sets in graphs. In *Workshop on Algorithms and Data Structures*, pages 446–457. Springer, 2015.
- [KLMN12] Mamadou M. Kanté, Vincent Limouzy, Arnaud Mary, and Lhouari Nourine. On the neighbourhood helly of some graph classes and applications to the enumeration of minimal dominating sets. In

- International Symposium on Algorithms and Computation*, pages 289–298. Springer, 2012.
- [KLMN14] Mamadou M. Kanté, Vincent Limouzy, Arnaud Mary, and Lhouari Nourine. On the enumeration of minimal dominating sets and related notions. *SIAM Journal on Discrete Mathematics*, 28(4):1916–1929, 2014.
- [KLP11] Ton Kloks, Ching-Hao Liu, and Sheung-Hung Poon. Feedback vertex set on chordal bipartite graphs. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1104.3915*, 2011.
- [KN14] Mamadou M. Kanté and Lhouari Nourine. Minimal dominating set enumeration. In Ming-Yang Kao, editor, *Encyclopedia of Algorithms*, pages 1–5. Springer US, Boston, MA, 2014.
- [KPS93] Dimitris Kavvadias, Christos H. Papadimitriou, and Martha Sideri. On Horn envelopes and hypergraph transversals. In *International Symposium on Algorithms and Computation*, pages 399–405. Springer, 1993.
- [KWUA19] Kazuhiro Kurita, Kunihiro Wasa, Takeaki Uno, and Hiroki Arimura. An efficient algorithm for enumerating chordal bipartite induced subgraphs in sparse graphs. In *International Workshop on Combinatorial Algorithms*, pages 339–351. Springer, 2019.
- [SL97] Hong Shen and Weifa Liang. Efficient enumeration of all minimal separators in a graph. *Theoretical computer science*, 180(1-2):169–180, 1997.
- [TIAS77] Shuji Tsukiyama, Mikio Ide, Hiromu Ariyoshi, and Isao Shirakawa. A new algorithm for generating all the maximal independent sets. *SIAM Journal on Computing*, 6(3):505–517, 1977.
- [Ueh02] Ryuhei Uehara. Linear time algorithms on chordal bipartite and strongly chordal graphs. In *Automata, Languages and Programming: 29th International Colloquium, ICALP 2002 Málaga, Spain, July 8–13, 2002 Proceedings 29*, pages 993–1004. Springer, 2002.