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#### Abstract

The Minimum Vertex Cover (MVC) problem is a classic graph optimization NP - complete problem. In this paper a competent algorithm, called Vertex Support Algorithm (VSA), is designed to find the smallest vertex cover of a graph. The VSA is tested on a large number of random graphs and DIMACS benchmark graphs. Comparative study of this algorithm with the other existing methods has been carried out. Extensive simulation results show that the VSA can yield better solutions than other existing algorithms found in the literature for solving the minimum vertex cover problem.
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## I. Introduction

THE classical minimum vertex cover problem involves graph theory and finite combinatorics and is categorized under the class of NP - complete problems in terms of its computational complexity. In 1972, in a landmark paper Karp has shown that the vertex cover problem is NP - complete [12], meaning that it is exceedingly unlikely that to find an algorithm with polynomial worst - case running time. The minimum vertex cover problem remains NP - complete even for certain restricted graphs, for example, the bounded degree graphs [10]. Minimum vertex cover has attracted researchers and practitioners not only because of the NP - completeness but also because of many difficult real - life problems which can be formulated as instances of the minimum vertex cover. Examples of such areas where the minimum vertex cover problem occurs in real world applications are communications, particularly in wireless telecommunications, civil, electrical engineering, especially in multiple sequence alignments for computational biochemistry [19].

Due to computational intractability of the MVC problem, many researchers have instead focused their attention on the design of approximation algorithm for delivering quality solutions in a reasonable time. Garey and Johnson [9] presented a simple approximation algorithm based on maximal matching gave an approximation ratio 2 for the general graphs. The first fixed parameter tractable algorithm for k - vertex problem (decision version: Given a graph G , deciding if G has a vertex cover of $k$ vertices, $k$ being the parameter), was done by Fellows [8]. Recently, Dehne et al [6] have reported that they used fixed parameter tractable algorithm to solve the
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Fig. 1. (a) Possible vertex cover of G (b) Minimum vertex cover of G
minimum vertex cover problem on coarse-grained parallel machines successfully. Khuri et al [14] presented an evolutionary heuristic for the minimum vertex cover problem. For a comprehensive survey on the analysis of approximation algorithms for MVC, the reader is referred to Hochbaum [11], Monien and Speckenmeyer [16], Berman and Fujito [2], Tang et al [20], Shyu, Yin and Lin [18], Xu and Ma [23], Aggarwal et al[1], Bourjolly et al[4] Katayama et al[13]and Pullan[17].

In this paper for efficiently solving minimum vertex cover problem, a competent algorithm called Vertex Support Algorithm (VSA) is proposed. The proposed algorithm designed with the term called support of vertices, which involves the sum of the degrees of adjacency vertices, to get a near smallest vertex cover of the graph. Its effectiveness is shown by conducting extensive computational experiments on a large number of random graphs[1][23] and DIMACS benchmark graphs [7]. The simulation results show that the VSA can find the optimum solution.

The paper is organized as follows. Section 2 briefly describes the minimum vertex cover problem and its theoretical background. Section 3 outlines the VSA. In Section 4 graph models used in the experiments is briefly described. Section 5 provides experiments done and their results. Section 6 summarizes and concludes the paper.

## II. Minimum Vertex Cover Problem

Let $G=(V, E)$ be an undirected graph, a set $S \subseteq V$ is a minimum vertex cover of $G$ if (i) for every edge ( $u, v$ ) $\in E$, either $u \in S$ or $v \in S$ or both $u, v \in S$ and (ii) among all covers of $\mathrm{E}, \mathrm{S}$ has the minimum cardinality, i.e., $\Sigma_{v \in S} v$ is minimum.

To illustrate the minimum vertex cover problem, consider the problem of placing guards with associated costs of guards [21] in a museum where corridors in the museum correspond to edges and task is to place a minimum number of guards so that there is at least one guard at the end of each corridor. Fig. 1 depicts the problem in brief.

Minimum vertex cover problem is a special case of set cover problem[5] which takes as input an arbitrary collection of subsets $S=\left\{S_{1}, S_{2}, \ldots, S_{n}\right\}$ of the universal set V, and
the task is to find a smallest subsets from S whose union is V. The minimum vertex cover problem also closely related to many other hard graph problems and so it is of interest to the researchers in the field of design of optimization and approximation algorithms. For instance the independent set problem[12][10] is similar to the minimum vertex cover problem because a minimum vertex cover defines a maximum independent set(MIS) and vice versa. The MIS and MVC problems are related in that the maximum independent set contains all those vertices that are not in the minimum vertex cover of the graph. Another interesting problem that is closely related to the minimum vertex cover is the edge cover which seeks the smallest set of edges such that each vertex is included in one of the edges.

There are two versions of the vertex cover problem: the decision and optimization versions. In the decision version, the task is to verify for a given graph $G$ whether there exists a vertex cover of a specified size but in the optimization version the task is to find a vertex cover of minimum size. In this paper we consider the optimization version of the minimum vertex cover with the goal of obtaining optimum solution. Now the minimum vertex cover problem is formulated as an integer programming problem by using the following conditions: Binary variables $\mathrm{a}_{i j}(\mathrm{i}=1,2,3, \ldots, \mathrm{n} ; \mathrm{j}=1,2,3, \ldots, \mathrm{n})$ form the adjacency matrix of the graph G. Each variable has only two values ( 1 or 0 ) according as an edge exists or not. In other words, if an edge $\left(\mathrm{v}_{i}, \mathrm{v}_{j}\right)$ is in E , then $\mathrm{a}_{i j}$ is 1 else $\mathrm{a}_{i j}$ is 0 . For example the graph of Fig. 1 has the following adjacency matrix

$$
\mathrm{A}=\left[\begin{array}{llllllllll}
0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0
\end{array}\right]
$$

The output of the program expresses the vertex $v_{i}$ is in the vertex cover or not. $v_{i}=1$ if it is in the vertex cover otherwise $\mathrm{v}_{i}=0$. Thus the total number of vertices in the vertex cover can be expressed by $\mathrm{Z}=\Sigma v_{i}, 1 \leq i \leq n$. At least one vertex of the edge $\left(v_{i}, v_{j}\right)$ must be included in the vertex cover, so we have the constrained condition of the minimum vertex cover can be written as $v_{i}+v_{j} \geq 1$. Thus the problem can be mathematically transformed into the following optimization problem as
$\operatorname{Min} \mathrm{Z}=\Sigma v_{i}$
Subject to

$$
\begin{aligned}
& v_{i}+v_{j} \geq 1 \forall\left(v_{i}, v_{j}\right) \in \mathrm{E} \\
& v_{i} \in\{0,1\} \forall v_{i} \in \mathrm{~V}
\end{aligned}
$$

## III. Terminologies, Algorithm and COMPUTATIONAL COMPLEXITY

Neighborhood of a vertex: Let $G=(V, E), V$ is a vertex set and E is an edge set, be an undirected graph and let $|V|=\mathrm{n}$ and $|E|=\mathrm{m}$. Then for each $\mathrm{v} \in \mathrm{V}$, the neighborhood of v is defined by $N(v)=\{u \in V / u$ is adjacent to $v\}$ and $\mathrm{N}[\mathrm{v}]=$ $\mathrm{v} \cup \mathrm{N}(\mathrm{v})$.

Degree of a vertex: The degree of a vertex $v \in \mathrm{~V}$, denoted by $d(v)$ and is defined by the number of neighbors of $v$.

Support of a vertex: The support of a vertex $v \in V$ is defined by the sum of the degree of the vertices which are adjacent to v , i.e., $\operatorname{support}(\mathrm{v})=\mathrm{s}(\mathrm{v})=\Sigma_{u \in N(v)} d_{G}(u)$.

## A. Vertex Support Algorithm (VSA)- Proposed

The following algorithm is designed to find the general minimum vertex cover of a graph G. Adjacency matrix $\left(a_{i j}\right)$ of the given graph $G$ of $n$ vertices and $m$ edges are given as the input of the program. The degree $\mathrm{d}(\mathrm{v})$ and support $s(v)$ of each vertex $v \in V$ are calculated. Support of the vertex calculated by the relation $\Sigma_{u \in N(v)} d_{G}(u)$. Add the vertex which has the maximum value of $s(v)$ into the vertex cover $V_{c}$. If one or more vertices have equal maximum value of the $\mathrm{s}(\mathrm{v})$, in this case if $\left(\mathrm{d}\left(\mathrm{v}_{i}\right) \geq \mathrm{d}\left(\mathrm{v}_{j}\right)\right)$, add the vertex $\mathrm{v}_{i}$ into the vertex cover $V_{c}$ otherwise add $\mathrm{v}_{j}$ into $V_{c}$. Update the adjacency matrix of $G$ by putting zero in to the row and column entries of the corresponding vertex $v \in V_{c}$. Proceed the above process until the edge set E has no edges. i.e., up to $a_{i j} \neq 0 \forall i, j$. The pseudo-code of the proposed algorithm is given below.

Input: G (V, E)
Output: $\mathrm{Z}=\Sigma_{v_{i} \in V_{c}} v_{i}$
while $\mathrm{E} \neq \phi$ do
step 1:
for $\mathrm{i} \leftarrow 1$ to n
for $\mathrm{j} \leftarrow 1$ to n
$d_{G}\left(v_{i}\right)=\Sigma_{j} a_{i j}=d\left(v_{i}\right)$
step 2:
for $\mathrm{i} \leftarrow 1$ to n
for $\mathrm{j} \leftarrow 1$ to n
$s_{G}\left(v_{i}\right)=\Sigma_{v_{j} \in N\left(v_{i}\right)} d_{G}\left(v_{j}\right)=s\left(v_{i}\right)$
step 3:
$\max =s\left(v_{1}\right) ;$
$\mathrm{k}=1$;
select the vertex which has the maximum value of $s(v)$
in to $V_{c}$
for $\mathrm{i} \leftarrow 2$ to n
$\mathbf{i f}\left(\max <s\left(v_{i}\right)\right)$
$\max =s\left(v_{i}\right)$;
$\mathrm{t}=\mathrm{i}$;
$V_{c} \leftarrow V_{c} \cup v_{i}$
end if
if multiple vertices have equal maximum value of $\mathrm{s}(\mathrm{v})$
then follow step 3a
step 3a:
$\mathbf{i f}\left(\left(\max =s\left(v_{i}\right) \&\left(d\left(v_{i-k}\right)<=d\left(v_{i}\right)\right)\right)\right.$
max $=s\left(v_{i}\right)$;

```
\(\mathrm{t}=\mathrm{i} ;\)
\(V_{c} \leftarrow V_{c} \cup v_{i}\)
end if
\(\mathbf{i f}\left(\left(\max =s\left(v_{i}\right) \&\left(d\left(v_{i-k}\right)>d\left(v_{i}\right)\right)\right)\right.\)
\(\max =s\left(v_{i-k}\right)\);
\(\mathrm{t}=\mathrm{i}-\mathrm{k}\);
\(V_{c} \leftarrow V_{c} \cup v_{i-k}\)
end if
\(\mathrm{k}=\mathrm{k}+1\);
end for
step 4:
for \(\mathrm{i} \leftarrow 1\) to n
\(\left(a_{t i}\right)=0\);
\(\left(a_{i t}\right)=0\);
end for
end while.
for \(\mathrm{i} \leftarrow 1\) to n
if \(\left(v_{i} \in V_{c}\right)\)
\(v_{i}=1\);
else
\(v_{i}=0\);
end for
end
```


## B. Computational Complexity

The worst case complexity of finding the solution of the minimum vertex cover problem using VSA can be obtained as follows: Assume that there are $n$ vertices and $m$ edges, in the proposed algorithm, calculation of degree of vertices in step 1 and support of vertices in step 2 requires $\mathrm{O}\left(n^{2}\right)$ and $\mathrm{O}\left(n^{2}\right)$ running time respectively. To pick the vertex which has the maximum value of $\mathrm{s}(\mathrm{v})$ in step 3 requires $\mathrm{O}(n-1)$ running time. The procedure of the algorithm goes up to m steps (worst case). So the overall running time of the procedure of SRA can be deduced as follows: $\mathrm{m}\left(\mathrm{O}\left(n^{2}\right)+\mathrm{O}\left(n^{2}\right)+\mathrm{O}(n-1)\right)=$ $\mathrm{O}\left(m n^{2}+m n^{2}+m(n-1)\right)=\mathrm{O}\left(m n^{2}\right)$.

## IV. Graph Models

This section outlines the graph models used to assess the effectiveness of the proposed algorithm in previous section. The graph models used are (i) $G(n, p)$ graphs[3] and (ii) $\mathrm{G}(\mathrm{n}, \mathrm{m})$ graphs[3][22]. The models are standard random graph models from the graph theory and all the graphs are undirected.

## A. $G(n, p)$ Model

The $G(n, p)$ model is also called Erdos Renyi random graph model[3], consists of graphs of $n$ vertices for which the probability of an edge between any pair of nodes is given by a constant $p>0$. To ensure that graphs are almost always connected, p is chosen so that $p \gg \frac{\log (n)}{n}$. To generate a $\mathrm{G}(\mathrm{n}, \mathrm{p})$ graph we start with an empty graph. Then we iterate through all pairs of nodes and connect each of these pairs with probability p .

1) Algorithm to generate ( $G, n, p$ )graphs: The pseudo code for generating $G(n, p)$ graphs as follows
initialize graph $G(V, E)$
for $\mathrm{i} \leftarrow 1$ to n
for $\mathrm{j} \leftarrow \mathrm{i}+1$ to n
add edge ( $\mathrm{i}, \mathrm{j}$ ) to E with probability p
return (G).
The expected number of edges of $\mathrm{G}(\mathrm{n}, \mathrm{p})$ graph is $p n(n-$ $1) / 2$ and expected degree is np . Graphs are generated for different p and n values.

## B. $G(n, m)$ Model

The $G(n, m)$ model consists of all graphs with $n$ vertices and $m$ edges. The number of vertices $n$ and the number of edges m are related by $\mathrm{m}=\mathrm{nc}$, where $\mathrm{c}>0$ is constant. To generate a random $G(n, m)$ graph, we start with a graph with no edges. Then, cn edges are generated randomly using uniform distribution over all possible graphs with en edges. Each node is thus expected to connect to 2 c other nodes on average. The pseudo-code for the random graph generation is shown in the following algorithm.

1) Algorithm to generate ( $G, n, c$ )graphs: The pseudo code for generating $\mathrm{G}(\mathrm{n}, \mathrm{m})$ graphs as follows
initialize graph $G(V, E)$
$m \leftarrow n * c$
for $\mathrm{i} \leftarrow 1$ to m
repeat
$\mathrm{e} \leftarrow$ random edge
until e not present in E
$\mathrm{E} \leftarrow \mathrm{E} \cup\{e\}$
return (G).

## V. Experimental Results and analysis

All the procedures of VSA have been coded in C++ language. The experiments were carried out on an Intel Pentium Core2 Duo 1.6 GHz CPU and 1 GB of RAM. The effectiveness of the VSA heuristic was evaluated using 136 instances. These instances are divided into 3 sets as shown in the TABLE I. Simulations are carried out on three types of graphs: the randomly generated small size, moderate and large scale graphs for the minimum vertex cover problem.

TABLE I
MVC Instances

| Problem <br> set | No. of <br> Instances | Scale | Graph <br> Model | Optimal <br> Solution |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | 36 | small-large | G(n, p) | Unknown |
| 2 | 80 | small-large | DIMACS | Known |
| 3 | 20 | moderate | G(n, m) | Unknown |

## A. Results for random graphs

We first tested the VSA on 36 random graphs generated based on the concept explained in Section 4.1. The result we recorded for each test graph and their information are shown in the TABLE II and these results are compared with
the theoretical evaluation of expected MIS(MVC) for $G(n, p)$ random graphs, shown in [15], and it is guaranteed that the proposed algorithm estimations are quite well to the expected size of the minimum vertex cover. In the 36 instances tested the maximum time taken of 29 seconds, ( $3000,0.8 ; 4000,0.9 \&$ $5000,0.8$ ), is an encouraging one but also it is comparatively very less time for finding the MVC of random graphs of large number of vertices with high density. So, it is interest to see the performance of the proposed algorithm on benchmark graphs with known optimal (best known) solutions.

TABLE II
Simulation results for the 1 Set of Instances

| Graph |  | VSA |  | Graph |  | VSA |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| n | p | $V_{c}$ | Time(s) | n | p | $V_{c}$ | Time(s) |
| 100 | 0.7 | 85 | $<1$ | 700 | 0.7 | 654 | 6 |
|  | 0.8 | 80 | $<1$ |  | 0.8 | 648 | 3 |
|  | 0.9 | 69 | $<1$ |  | 0.9 | 628 | 12 |
| 150 | 0.8 | 127 | $<1$ | 1000 | 0.7 | 917 | 17 |
|  | 0.9 | 113 | 3 |  | 0.8 | 893 | 8 |
|  | 0.95 | 96 | 2 |  | 0.9 | 888 | 28 |
| 200 | 0.7 | 181 | $<1$ | 2000 | 0.7 | 1871 | 23 |
|  | 0.8 | 174 | 3 |  | 0.8 | 1858 | 18 |
|  | 0.9 | 157 | 5 |  | 0.9 | 1841 | 27 |
| 300 | 0.7 | 279 | 2 | 3000 | 0.7 | 2857 | 15 |
|  | 0.8 | 271 | $<1$ |  | 0.8 | 2833 | 29 |
|  | 0.9 | 249 | 5 |  | 0.9 | 2811 | 17 |
| 400 | 0.7 | 377 | $<1$ | 4000 | 0.7 | 3827 | 28 |
|  | 0.8 | 369 | 2 |  | 0.8 | 3794 | 27 |
|  | 0.9 | 347 | 4 |  | 0.9 | 3764 | 29 |
| 500 | 0.7 | 468 | $<1$ | 5000 | 0.7 | 4773 | 23 |
|  | 0.8 | 459 | 5 |  | 0.8 | 4751 | 29 |
|  | 0.9 | 441 | 3 |  | 0.9 | 4717 | 24 |

## B. Results for DIMACS benchmark graphs

To test the performance of VSA approach, further we have tested the proposed algorithm on benchmark graphs with known results, they have been extracted from DIMACS[7] challenge suite. That suite structured from the perspective of finding maximum cliques, so we considered the benchmark graphs as $\bar{G}$. We compare the heuristic performance with implementation of the algorithms KLS[13], OCH[1] and the results were shown in the TABLES III \& IV. The first two columns reports the type of the instances such as name, cardinality of the instances; the third gives the best results obtained in the challenge, the forth,fifth and sixth gives the minimum vertex cover found by corresponding algorithms. Sixth column reports the optimality achieved by proposed algorithm, in which * indicates the instances where proposed algorithm fail to reach the optimality, mostly in MANN type of instances. In TABLES V and VI, we listed the CPU time (in seconds) and success rate to find the MVC of the DIMACS instances. TABLES III, IV, V \& VI shows that proposed algorithm could find the optimal solution for most of the DIMACS benchmark graphs i.e., out of 80 instances tested the proposed algorithm reaches the optimum value for 73 instances.

TABLE III
Simulation results for DIMACS benchmark graphs

| $\bar{G}$ | $\|V\|$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Optimum } \\ V_{C} \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { KLS } \\ V_{C} \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline \mathrm{OCH} \\ V_{c} \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline \mathrm{VSA} \\ V_{c} \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| brock200_1 | 200 | 179 | 181 | - | 179 |
| brock200_2 | 200 | 188 | 190 | 188 | 188 |
| brock200_3 | 200 | 185 | 187 | - | 185 |
| brock200_4 | 200 | 183 | 186 | 183 | 183 |
| brock400_1 | 400 | 373 | 380 | 373 | 373 |
| brock400_2 | 400 | 371 | 377 | 371 | 371 |
| brock400_3 | 400 | 369 | 377 | 369 | 369 |
| brock400_4 | 400 | 367 | 377 | 367 | 367 |
| brock800_1 | 800 | 777 | 777 | 780 | 777 |
| brock800_2 | 800 | 776 | 776 | 776 | 776 |
| brock800_3 | 800 | 775 | 775 | 775 | 775 |
| brock800_4 | 800 | 774 | 774 | 777 | 774 |
| C125.9 | 125 | 91 | - | 91 | 91 |
| C250.9 | 250 | 206 | - | 206 | 206 |
| C500.9 | 500 | $\leq 443$ | - | 443 | 443 |
| C1000.9 | 1000 | $\leq 932$ | - | 932 | 932 |
| C2000.5 | 2000 | $\leq 1984$ | - | 1984 | 1984 |
| C2000.9 | 2000 | $\leq 1923$ | - | 1923 | 1923 |
| C4000.5 | 4000 | $\leq 3982$ | - | - | 3982 |
| c-fat200-1 | 200 | 188 | 188 | - | 188 |
| c-fat200-2 | 200 | 176 | 176 | - | 176 |
| c-fat200-5 | 200 | 142 | - | - | 144* |
| c-fat500-1 | 500 | 486 | 486 | - | 486 |
| c-fat500-2 | 500 | 474 | 474 | - | 474 |
| c-fat500-5 | 500 | 446 | 448 | - | 446 |
| c-fat500-10 | 500 | 126 | 127 | 126 | 126 |
| DSJC500.5 | 500 | $\leq 487$ | 487 | 487 | 487 |
| DSJC1000.5 | 1000 | $\leq 985$ | 985 | 985 | 985 |
| gen200_p0.9_44 | 200 | 156 | - | 156 | 156 |
| gen200_p0.9_55 | 200 | 145 | - | 145 | 145 |
| gen400_p0.9_55 | 400 | 345 | - | 347 | 345 |
| gen400_p0.9_65 | 400 | 335 | - | 335 | 335 |
| gen400_p0.9_75 | 400 | 325 | - | 325 | 325 |
| Hamming6-2 | 64 | 32 | 30 | 32 | 32 |
| Hamming6-4 | 64 | 60 | 60 | 60 | 60 |
| Hamming8-2 | 256 | 128 | 128 | 128 | 128 |
| Hamming8-4 | 256 | 240 | 240 | 240 | 240 |
| Hamming 10-2 | 1024 | 512 | 512 | 512 | 512 |
| Hamming 10-4 | 1024 | 984 | - | 984 | 984 |
| Johnson8-2-4 | 28 | 24 | 24 | 24 | 24 |

Since we know the optimal solution value for each instance we tested, we can measure the quality of the solution derived by an algorithm by computing ratio between them. That is, we define the quality measure ratio as value/optimum, where value is the value of a solution found by an algorithm and optimum is the optimal solution value. We note that smaller the ratio indicates that the performance of an algorithm is guaranteed one. In TABLE VII we sum up the information concerning the ratios.

## C. Results for $G(n, m)$ random graphs

In this experiment the parameter set opted like small-large scale problems, that is V varied from 50 to 1000 . Here we used

TABLE IV
Simulation results for Dimacs benchmark graphs

| $\bar{G}$ | $\|V\|$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { Optimum } \\ V_{C} \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { KLS } \\ V_{C} \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline \mathrm{OCH} \\ V_{C} \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { VSA } \\ V_{c} \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Johnson8-4-4 | 70 | 56 | 56 | 56 | 56 |
| Johnson16-2-4 | 120 | 112 | 112 | 112 | 112 |
| Johnson32-2-4 | 496 | 480 | - | 481 | 480 |
| keller4 | 171 | 160 | 164 | 160 | 160 |
| keller5 | 776 | 749 | 750 | 749 | 749 |
| keller6 | 3361 | $\leq 3302$ | - | 3303 | 3307* |
| MANN_a9 | 45 | 29 | 29 | 29 | 29 |
| MANN_a27 | 378 | 252 | 261 | 258 | 253* |
| MANN_a45 | 1035 | 690 | - | 697 | 692* |
| MANN_a81 | 3321 | $\leq 2221$ | - | 2228 | 2237* |
| p_hat300-1 | 300 | 292 | 292 | 292 | 292 |
| p_hat300-2 | 300 | 275 | 275 | 275 | 275 |
| p_hat300-3 | 300 | 274 | 274 | 274 | 274 |
| p_hat500-1 | 500 | 491 | 491 | 491 | 491 |
| p_hat500-2 | 500 | 464 | 464 | 464 | 464 |
| p_hat500-3 | 500 | 450 | 453 | 453 | 450 |
| p_hat700-1 | 700 | 689 | 693 | 689 | 689 |
| p_hat700-2 | 700 | 656 | 656 | 657 | 656 |
| p_hat700-3 | 700 | 638 | 641 | 640 | 639* |
| p_hat1000-1 | 1000 | 900 | 900 | 900 | 900 |
| p_hat1000-2 | 1000 | 954 | 956 | 955 | 954 |
| p_hat1000-3 | 1000 | 934 | 938 | 937 | 935* |
| p_hat1500-1 | 1500 | 1488 | 1490 | 1488 | 1488 |
| p_hat1500-1 | 1500 | $\leq 1435$ | 1436 | 1436 | 1435 |
| p_hat1500-1 | 1500 | $\leq 1406$ | 1409 | 1409 | 1406 |
| san200-0.7.1 | 200 | 170 | 185 | 170 | 170 |
| san200-0.7.2 | 200 | 182 | 188 | 188 | 188 |
| san200-0.9.1 | 200 | 130 | 155 | 135 | 130 |
| san200-0.9.2 | 200 | 140 | 161 | 143 | 140 |
| san200-0.9.3 | 200 | 156 | 169 | 156 | 156 |
| san400-0.5.1 | 400 | 387 | 393 | 387 | 387 |
| san400-0.7.1 | 400 | 360 | 380 | 360 | 360 |
| san400-0.7.2 | 400 | 370 | 385 | 370 | 370 |
| san400-0.7.3 | 400 | 378 | 388 | 378 | 378 |
| san400-0.9.1 | 400 | 300 | 350 | 304 | 300 |
| san 1000 | 1000 | 900 | - | 900 | 900 |
| sanr200-0.7 | 200 | 282 | 284 | 282 | 282 |
| sanr200-0.9 | 200 | 158 | 159 | 158 | 158 |
| sanr400-0.5 | 400 | 387 | 387 | 387 | 387 |
| sanr400-0.7 | 400 | 379 | 379 | 379 | 379 |

the $G(n, m)$ graph model to generate the random graphs. For most of the test instances the optimal solutions are unknown, we obtained the time (in sec.) taken by the VSA for finding the minimum vertex cover of the graph. These results are shown in the Fig. 2 where the major axis represents the size (in terms of number of vertices) of the 20 test instance's and for each test instances the time taken by VSA were plotted as points and for each instances their points are linked by a line. It is clear from the Fig. 2 that the time taken by the VSA to find the optimum value of each of the MVC instances increases steadily when the size of the problem increases and the maximum time taken is 7.41 sec . With this figure we show that the proposed algorithm took very less time to produce a

TABLE V
Time taken (sec.) and Success rate for DIMACS Insatnces

| $\bar{G}$ | Density | Time(s) | Success $(\%)$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| brock200_1 | 0.745 | $<1$ | 100 |
| brock200_2 | 0.496 | $<1$ | 100 |
| brock200_3 | 0.605 | $<1$ | 100 |
| brock200_4 | 0.658 | $<1$ | 100 |
| brock400_1 | 0.748 | $<1$ | 100 |
| brock400_2 | 0.749 | $<1$ | 100 |
| brock400_3 | 0.748 | $<1$ | 100 |
| brock400_4 | 0.749 | $<1$ | 100 |
| brock800_1 | 0.649 | 2 | 100 |
| brock800_2 | 0.651 | 2 | 100 |
| brock800_3 | 0.649 | 5 | 100 |
| brock800_4 | 0.65 | 4 | 100 |
| C125.9 | 0.898 | $<1$ | 100 |
| C250.9 | 0.899 | $<1$ | 100 |
| C500.9 | 0.9 | 6 | 100 |
| C1000.9 | 0.901 | 13 | 100 |
| C2000.5 | 0.5 | 18 | 100 |
| C2000.9 | 0.9 | 26 | 100 |
| C4000.5 | 0.5 | 30 | 100 |
| c-fat200-1 | 0.077 | $<1$ | 100 |
| c-fat200-2 | 0.163 | $<1$ | 100 |
| c-fat200-5 | 0.426 | $<1$ | 96 |
| c-fat500-1 | 0.036 | $<1$ | 100 |
| c-fat500-2 | 0.073 | $<1$ | 100 |
| c-fat500-5 | 0.186 | $<1$ | 100 |
| c-fat500-10 | 0.374 | $<1$ | 100 |
| DSJC500.5 | 0.5 | 13 | 100 |
| DSJC1000.5 | 0.5 | 20 | 100 |
| gen200_p0.9_44 | 0.9 | $<1$ | 100 |
| gen200_p0.9_55 | 0.9 | $<1$ | 100 |
| gen400_p0.9_55 | 0.9 | 6 | 100 |
| gen400_p0.9_65 | 0.9 | 9 | 100 |
| gen400_p0.9_75 | 0.9 | 8 | 100 |
| Hamming6-2 | 0.905 | $<1$ | 100 |
| Hamming6-4 | 0.349 | $<1$ | 100 |
| Hamming8-2 | 0.969 | 3 | 100 |
| Hamming8-4 | 0.639 | 2 | 100 |
| Hamming10-2 | 0.99 | 9 | 100 |
| Hamming10-4 | 0.829 | 23 | 100 |
| Johnson8-2-4 | 0.556 | $<1$ | 100 |
|  |  |  |  |

minimum vertex cover for each of the test instances of $G(n$, $m)$ graph model also.

## VI. CONCLUSION

A new VSA for MVC of graphs using vertex cover has been proposed and its effectiveness has been shown by simulation experiments. The terminology support of a vertex introduced in the new model, with that, the new model can find the minimum vertex cover effectively. Experimental result shows that this approach greatly reduce the execution time and in addition, the simulation results show that the new VSA can yield better solutions than KLS and OCH heuristics found in the literature. At the same time, our approach gives best solutions for DIMACS benchmark graph instances and also for random graphs. The proposed algorithm has led to give near optimal solutions for most of the test instances where we know the optimal solutions. Furthermore attractiveness of this heuristic is its outstanding performance in the optimization of MVC.

TABLE VI
Time taken (SEC.) and Success rate for DIMACS Instances

| $\bar{G}$ | Density | Time(s) | Success(\%) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| keller6 | 0.818 | 25 | 91 |
| MANN_a9 | 0.927 | $<1$ | 100 |
| MANN_a27 | 0.99 | 12 | 99 |
| MANN_a45 | 0.996 | 33 | 99 |
| MANN_a81 | 0.999 | 43 | 98 |
| p_hat300-1 | 0.244 | $<1$ | 100 |
| p_hat300-2 | 0.489 | $<1$ | 100 |
| p_hat300-3 | 0.744 | $<1$ | 100 |
| p_hat500-1 | 0.253 | 2 | 100 |
| p_hat500-2 | 0.505 | 5 | 100 |
| p_hat500-3 | 0.752 | 3 | 100 |
| p_hat700-1 | 0.249 | $<1$ | 100 |
| p_hat700-2 | 0.498 | 15 | 100 |
| p_hat700-3 | 0.748 | 18 | 98 |
| p_hat1000-1 | 0.245 | 8 | 100 |
| p_hat1000-2 | 0.49 | 23 | 100 |
| p_hat1000-3 | 0.744 | 30 | 98 |
| p_hat1500-1 | 0.253 | 23 | 100 |
| p_hat1500-1 | 0.506 | 26 | 100 |
| p_hat1500-1 | 0.754 | 24 | 100 |
| san200-0.7.1 | 0.7 | $<1$ | 100 |
| san200-0.7.2 | 0.7 | $<1$ | 100 |
| san200-0.9.1 | 0.9 | 5 | 100 |
| san200-0.9.2 | 0.9 | 17 | 100 |
| san200-0.9.3 | 0.9 | 23 | 100 |
| san400-0.5.1 | 0.5 | 6 | 100 |
| san400-0.7.1 | 0.7 | $<1$ | 100 |
| san400-0.7.2 | 0.7 | $<1$ | 100 |
| san400-0.7.3 | 0.7 | 19 | 100 |
| san400-0.9.1 | 0.9 | 8 | 100 |
| san1000 | 0.502 | $<1$ | 100 |
| sanr200-0.7 | 0.697 | $<1$ | 100 |
| sanr200-0.9 | 0.898 | $<1$ | 100 |
| sanr400-0.5 | 0.501 | $<1$ | 100 |
| sanr400-0.7 | 0.7 | $<1$ | 100 |
|  |  |  |  |

TABLE VII
AVERAGES AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS OF THE RATIO VALUES

| Algorithm | Min. | Average | Max. | Std. Dev. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| VSA | 1.00 | 1.06 | 1.18 | 0.06 |
| OCH | 1.00 | 1.26 | 1.45 | 0.13 |
| KLS | 1.15 | 1.40 | 1.70 | 0.17 |
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