

# A polynomial kernel for 3-leaf power deletion

Jungho Ahn<sup>2,1</sup>, Eduard Eiben<sup>3</sup>, O-joung Kwon<sup>4,1</sup>, and Sang-il Oum<sup>1,2</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Discrete Mathematics Group, Institute for Basic Science (IBS),  
Daejeon, South Korea

<sup>2</sup>Department of Mathematical Sciences, KAIST,  
Daejeon, South Korea

<sup>3</sup>Department of Informatics, University of Bergen, Bergen, Norway

<sup>4</sup>Department of Mathematics, Incheon National University,  
Incheon, South Korea

*Email addresses:* junghoahn@kaist.ac.kr, Eduard.Eiben@uib.no,  
ojoungkwon@gmail.com, sangil@ibs.re.kr

November 12, 2019

## Abstract

A graph  $G$  is an  $\ell$ -leaf power of a tree  $T$  if  $V(G)$  is equal to the set of leaves of  $T$ , and distinct vertices  $v$  and  $w$  of  $G$  are adjacent if and only if the distance between  $v$  and  $w$  in  $T$  is at most  $\ell$ . Given a graph  $G$ , 3-LEAF POWER DELETION asks whether there is a set  $S \subseteq V(G)$  of size at most  $k$  such that  $G \setminus S$  is a 3-leaf power of some tree  $T$ . We provide a polynomial kernel for this problem. More specifically, we present a polynomial-time algorithm for an input instance  $(G, k)$  to output an equivalent instance  $(G', k')$  such that  $k' \leq k$  and  $G'$  has at most  $O(k^{14} \log^{12} k)$  vertices.

## 1 Introduction

Nishimura, Ragde, and Thilikos [26] introduced an  $\ell$ -leaf power of a tree to understand the structure of phylogenetic trees in computational biology. A graph  $G$  is an  $\ell$ -leaf power of a tree  $T$  if  $V(G)$  is equal to the set of leaves of

---

<sup>1</sup>JA, OK, and SO are supported by IBS-R029-C1. OK is also supported by the National Research Foundation of Korea (NRF) grant funded by the Ministry of Education (No. NRF-2018R1D1A1B07050294).

$T$ , and distinct vertices  $v$  and  $w$  of  $G$  are adjacent if and only if the distance between  $v$  and  $w$  in  $T$  is at most  $\ell$ . We say that  $G$  is an  $\ell$ -leaf power if  $G$  is an  $\ell$ -leaf power of some tree. Note that an  $\ell$ -leaf power could have more than one component. For instance, an  $\ell$ -leaf power of a path of length at least  $\ell + 1$  has two distinct trivial components. We are interested in the following *vertex deletion* problem.

**3-LEAF POWER DELETION**

**Input :** A graph  $G$  and a non-negative integer  $k$ .

**Question :** Is there a set  $S \subseteq V(G)$  with  $|S| \leq k$  such that  $G \setminus S$  is a 3-leaf power?

Vertex deletion problems include some of the best studied NP-hard problems in theoretical computer science, including VERTEX COVER and FEEDBACK VERTEX SET. In general, the problem asks whether it is possible to delete at most  $k$  vertices from an input graph so that the resulting graph belongs to a specified graph class. Lewis and Yannakakis [23] showed that every vertex deletion problem to a non-trivial hereditary (i.e., closed under taking induced subgraphs) graph class is NP-hard. Since the class of 3-leaf powers is non-trivial and hereditary, it follows that 3-LEAF POWER DELETION is NP-hard.

We study 3-LEAF POWER DELETION through the parameterized complexity paradigm [12, 15], which measures the performance of algorithms not only with respect to the input size but also with respect to an additional numerical parameter. The notion of vertex deletion allows a highly natural choice of the parameter, specifically the size of the deletion set  $k$ . From the characterization by Dom et al. [13], it follows that every 3-leaf power is *chordal* and *distance-hereditary*. CHORDAL DELETION is a problem of deciding whether a graph has a vertex set of size at most  $k$  whose deletion makes it chordal. Marx [25] showed that CHORDAL DELETION is fixed-parameter tractable by presenting an algorithm with running time  $f(k) \cdot n^{O(1)}$  where  $n$  is the number of vertices of an input graph, and Cao and Marx [8] improved this result by presenting an algorithm with running time  $2^{O(k \log k)} \cdot n^{O(1)}$ . DISTANCE-HEREDITARY DELETION is a problem of deciding whether a graph has a vertex set of size at most  $k$  whose deletion makes it distance-hereditary. Eiben, Ganian, and Kwon [17] presented a single-exponential fixed-parameter tractable algorithm for DISTANCE-HEREDITARY DELETION, that is an algorithm with running time  $O(c^k \cdot n^{O(1)})$  for input size  $n$  and some constant  $c$ . To obtain our first result, we observe that if an input graph  $G$  does not contain a *small obstruction*, that is a minimal induced subgraph of size at most 5 that is not a 3-leaf power, then  $G$  is a

3-leaf power if and only if  $G$  is distance-hereditary. Hence, after branching on small obstructions, we can use the algorithm by Eiben, Ganian, and Kwon [17] as a black-box. This immediately gives us the following theorem:

**Theorem 1.1.** *Given an instance  $(G, k)$ , we can correctly solve 3-LEAF POWER DELETION in time  $O(37^k |V(G)|^7 (|V(G)| + |E(G)|))$ .*

After we establish the fixed-parameter tractability of 3-LEAF POWER DELETION, one of the most natural follow-up questions in parameterized complexity is whether the problem admits a polynomial kernel. A *kernel* is basically a polynomial-time preprocessing algorithm that transforms the given instance of the problem into an equivalent instance whose size is bounded above by some function  $f(k)$  of the parameter. The function  $f(k)$  is usually referred to as the *size* of the kernel. A *polynomial kernel* is then a kernel with size bounded above by some polynomial in  $k$ . The existence of polynomial kernels for vertex deletion problems has been widely investigated [4, 14, 19, 24]. Jansen and Pilipczuk [20] presented a kernel with  $O(k^{161} \log^{58} k)$  vertices for CHORDAL DELETION, and Agrawal et al. [2] improved this result by presenting a kernel with  $O(k^{12} \log^{10} k)$  vertices. Kim and Kwon [21] presented a kernel with  $O(k^{30} \log^5 k)$  vertices for DISTANCE-HEREDITARY DELETION. This leads us to the main result of our paper:

**Theorem 1.2.** *3-LEAF POWER DELETION admits a kernel with  $O(k^{14} \log^{12} k)$  vertices.*

The first step of our kernel is to find a “good” approximate solution, that is a set  $S \subseteq V(G)$  of size  $O(k^2 \log^2 k)$  such that  $G \setminus (S \setminus \{v\})$  is a 3-leaf power for each vertex  $v$  in  $S$ . To construct such a set  $S$  in polynomial time, we use Theorem 1.1 in Kim and Kwon [22], Lemma 1.3 in Jansen and Pilipczuk [20], and Theorem 2 in Agrawal et al.[1]. Afterward, we design a series of reduction rules that allows us to bound the number and size of components of  $G \setminus S$ . We remark that Bessy, Paul, and Perez [5] presented a kernel with  $O(k^3)$  vertices for 3-leaf power edge modification problems including editing, completion, and edge-deletion.

We organize this paper as follows. In Section 2, we summarize some terminologies in graph theory and parameterized complexity, and introduce 3-leaf powers, distance-hereditary graphs, and a relation between them. In Section 3, we present a single-exponential fixed-parameter tractable algorithm for 3-LEAF POWER DELETION. In Section 4, we introduce a good modulator of a graph, and present an algorithm that either confirms that an input instance  $(G, k)$  is a no-instance, or constructs a small good modulator of  $G$ . In Sections 5 and 6, we design a series of reduction rules that

allows us to bound the number of vertices outside of a good modulator of a graph. In Section 7, we combine the above steps to prove our main result. In Section 8, we conclude this paper with some open problems.

## 2 Preliminaries

In this paper, all graphs are finite and simple. For a vertex  $v$  and a set  $X$  of vertices of a graph  $G$ , let  $N_G(v)$  be the set of neighbors of  $v$  in  $V(G)$ ,  $N_G(X)$  be the set of vertices not in  $X$  that are adjacent to some vertices in  $X$ , and  $N_G[X] := N_G(X) \cup X$ . We may omit the subscripts of these notations if it is clear from the context. For disjoint sets  $X$  and  $Y$  of vertices of  $G$ , we say that  $X$  is *complete to*  $Y$  if each vertex in  $X$  is adjacent to all vertices in  $Y$ , and  $X$  is *anti-complete to*  $Y$  if each vertex in  $X$  is non-adjacent to all vertices in  $Y$ . Let  $G \setminus X$  be a graph obtained from  $G$  by removing all vertices in  $X$  and all edges incident with some vertices in  $X$ , and  $G[X] := G \setminus (V(G) \setminus X)$ . We may write  $G \setminus v$  instead of  $G \setminus \{v\}$  for each vertex  $v$  of  $G$ . For a set  $T$  of edges of  $G$ , let  $G \setminus T$  be a graph obtained from  $G$  by removing all edges in  $T$ .

A graph  $G$  is *trivial* if  $|V(G)| = 1$ , and *non-trivial*, otherwise. A *clique* is a set of pairwise adjacent vertices. A graph is *complete* if every pair of two distinct vertices is adjacent, and *incomplete*, otherwise. An *independent set* is a set of pairwise non-adjacent vertices. Distinct vertices  $v$  and  $w$  of  $G$  are *twins* in  $G$  if  $N_G(v) \setminus \{w\} = N_G(w) \setminus \{v\}$ . Twins  $v$  and  $w$  in  $G$  are *true* if  $v$  and  $w$  are adjacent, and *false* if  $v$  and  $w$  are non-adjacent. A *twin-set* in  $G$  is a set of pairwise twins in  $G$ . A twin-set is *true* if it is a clique, and *false* if it is an independent set.

A vertex of a graph is *isolated* if it has no neighbors. A node of a tree is a *leaf* if it has exactly one neighbor, and is *branching* if it has at least three neighbors. For graphs  $G_1, \dots, G_m$ , a graph  $G$  is  $(G_1, \dots, G_m)$ -*free* if  $G$  has no induced subgraphs isomorphic to one of  $G_1, \dots, G_m$ .

We say that a reduction rule is *safe* if each input instance is equivalent to the resulting instance obtained from the input instance by applying the rule.

### 2.1 Parameterized problems and kernels

For a fixed finite set  $\Sigma$  of alphabets, an *instance* is an element in  $\Sigma^* \times \mathbb{N}$ . For an instance  $(I, k)$ ,  $k$  is called a *parameter*. A *parameterized problem* is a set  $L \subseteq \Sigma^* \times \mathbb{N}$ . A parameterized problem  $\Pi$  is *fixed-parameter tractable* if there is an algorithm, called a *fixed-parameter tractable algorithm* for  $\Pi$ , that correctly decides whether an input instance  $(I, k) \in \Pi$  in time  $O(f(k) \cdot n^c)$




Figure 1: A bull, a dart, a gem, a house, and a domino.

for a computable function  $f : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$  and a constant  $c$  where  $n$  is the size of  $I$ . A fixed-parameter tractable algorithm for a parameterized problem is *single-exponential* if it takes  $O(\alpha^k \cdot n^c)$  time for some constants  $\alpha > 1$  and  $c$ .

An instance  $(I, k)$  is a *yes-instance* for a parameterized problem  $\Pi$  if  $(I, k) \in \Pi$ , and a *no-instance*, otherwise. Instances  $(I, k)$  and  $(I', k')$  are *equivalent* with respect to  $\Pi$  if  $(I, k)$  is a yes-instance for  $\Pi$  if and only if  $(I', k')$  is a yes-instance for  $\Pi$ . A *kernel* for  $\Pi$  is a polynomial-time algorithm that given an instance  $(I, k)$ , outputs an instance  $(I', k')$  equivalent to  $(I, k)$  with respect to  $\Pi$  such that  $|I'| + k' \leq g(k)$  for some computable function  $g : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ . Such a function  $g(k)$  is the *size* of the kernel. A *polynomial kernel* for  $\Pi$  is a kernel for  $\Pi$  with the size as some polynomial in  $k$ . We may omit the term “for  $\Pi$ ” and “with respect to  $\Pi$ ” of all these definitions if it is clear from the context. There is a relationship between the fixed-parameter tractability and the existence of a kernel for parameterized problems.

**Theorem 2.1** (See Downey and Fellows [15]). *A parameterized problem  $\Pi$  is fixed-parameter tractable if and only if  $\Pi$  admits a kernel.*

## 2.2 Characterizations of 3-leaf powers

Brandstädt and Le [6] presented a linear-time algorithm to recognize 3-leaf powers.

**Theorem 2.2** (Brandstädt and Le [6, Theorem 15]). *Given a graph  $G$ , we can either confirm that  $G$  is not a 3-leaf power, or find a tree of which  $G$  is a 3-leaf power in linear time.*

Figure 1 shows three graphs called a *bull*, a *dart*, and a *gem*. A *hole* is an induced cycle of length at least 4. A graph is *chordal* if it has no holes. Dom, Guo, Hüffner, and Niedermeier [13] presented the following characterization of 3-leaf powers.

**Theorem 2.3** (Dom, Guo, Hüffner, and Niedermeier [13, Theorem 1]). *A graph  $G$  is a 3-leaf power if and only if  $G$  is (bull, dart, gem)-free and chordal.*

We say that a graph  $H$  is an *obstruction* if  $H$  is not a 3-leaf power, and every proper induced subgraph of  $H$  is a 3-leaf power. An obstruction  $H$  is *small* if  $|V(H)| \leq 5$ . We see the following six observations about obstructions.

**Observation 1** (O1). *No obstructions have true twins.*

**Observation 2** (O2). *No obstructions have independent sets of size at least 4.*

**Observation 3** (O3). *No obstructions have  $K_4$  or  $K_{2,3}$  as a subgraph.*

**Observation 4** (O4). *If an obstruction  $H$  has false twins  $v$  and  $w$ , then both  $v$  and  $w$  have degree 2 in  $H$ .*

**Observation 5** (O5). *If a vertex  $v$  of an obstruction  $H$  has exactly one neighbor  $w$  in  $V(H)$ , then  $w$  has degree at least 3 in  $H$ .*

**Observation 6** (O6). *A graph  $H$  is an obstruction having three distinct vertices of degree 2 in  $H$  if and only if  $H$  is a hole.*

Brandstädt and Le [6] showed that a graph  $G$  is a 3-leaf power if and only if  $G$  is obtained from some forest  $F$  by replacing each node  $u$  of  $F$  with a non-empty clique  $B_u$  of arbitrary size, and each edge  $vw$  of  $F$  with the edges whose one end is in  $B_v$ , and the other end is in  $B_w$ . We rephrase this characterization by using the following definition.

A *tree-clique decomposition* of a graph  $G$  is a pair  $(F, \{B_u : u \in V(F)\})$  of a forest  $F$  and a family  $\{B_u : u \in V(F)\}$  of non-empty subsets of  $V(G)$  satisfying the following two conditions.

- (1) The family  $\{B_u : u \in V(F)\}$  is a partition of  $V(G)$ .
- (2) Distinct vertices  $x$  and  $y$  of  $G$  are adjacent if and only if  $F$  has either a node  $u$  such that  $\{x, y\} \subseteq B_u$ , or an edge  $vw$  such that  $x \in B_v$  and  $y \in B_w$ .

We call  $B_u$  a *bag* of  $u$  for each node  $u$  of  $F$ . We say that  $B$  is a *bag* of  $G$  if  $B$  is a bag of some node of  $F$ . We remark that each bag is a clique by (2).

**Theorem 2.4** (Brandstädt and Le [6, Theorem 9]). *A graph  $G$  is a 3-leaf power if and only if  $G$  has a tree-clique decomposition. Moreover, if  $G$  is connected and incomplete, then  $G$  has a unique tree-clique decomposition.*

We remark that every connected incomplete 3-leaf power has at least three bags. Brandstädt and Le [6] showed that for a connected incomplete 3-leaf power  $G$ , distinct vertices  $v$  and  $w$  of  $G$  are in the same bag of  $G$  if and only if  $v$  and  $w$  are true twins in  $G$ . Thus, for such a graph  $G$ ,  $B$  is a bag of  $G$  if and only if  $B$  is a maximal true twin-set in  $G$ .

### 2.3 Characterizations of distance-hereditary graphs

A graph  $G$  is *distance-hereditary* if for every connected induced subgraph  $H$  of  $G$  and vertices  $v$  and  $w$  of  $H$ , the distance between  $v$  and  $w$  in  $H$  is equal to the distance between  $v$  and  $w$  in  $G$ . Figure 1 shows two graphs called a *house* and a *domino*. Bandelt and Mulder [3] presented the following characterization of distance-hereditary graphs.

**Theorem 2.5** (Bandelt and Mulder [3, Theorem 2]). *A graph  $G$  is distance-hereditary if and only if  $G$  is (house, domino, gem)-free, and has no holes of length at least 5.*

Since both the house and the domino have a hole of length 4, every 3-leaf power is distance-hereditary by Theorems 2.3 and 2.5. The following lemma shows when graphs are not distance-hereditary. A proof of the following lemma is readily derived from the definition of a distance-hereditary graph.

**Lemma 2.6.** *Let  $P$  be an induced path of length at least 3 in a graph  $G$ . If  $G$  has a vertex  $v$  adjacent to both ends of  $P$ , then  $G[V(P) \cup \{v\}]$  is not distance-hereditary.*

## 3 Single-exponential fixed-parameter tractable algorithms

A set  $S$  of vertices of a graph  $G$  is a *modulator* of  $G$  if  $G \setminus S$  is a 3-leaf power. If  $G$  has a modulator of size at most  $k$ , then it has rank-width at most  $k+1$  because every 3-leaf power is distance-hereditary, which has rank-width at most 1 [27]. This already allows us to construct a fixed-parameter tractable algorithm for 3-LEAF POWER DELETION by using an algorithm for graphs of bounded rank-width solving monadic second-order logic [10]. We improve this further by showing that a single-exponential fixed-parameter tractable algorithm exists for 3-LEAF POWER DELETION. To do so, we use the following theorem of Eiben, Ganian, and Kwon [17].

**Theorem 3.1** (Eiben, Ganian, and Kwon [17, Theorem 1.1]). *For a graph  $G$  and a non-negative integer  $k$ , we can decide whether there is a set  $S \subseteq V(G)$  with  $|S| \leq k$  such that  $G \setminus S$  is distance-hereditary in time  $O(37^k |V(G)|^7 (|V(G)| + |E(G)|))$ .*

*Proof of Theorem 1.1.* We proceed by induction on  $k$ . If  $k = 0$ , then 3-LEAF POWER DELETION is solved in linear time by Theorem 2.2. Thus, we may

assume that  $k > 0$ . We investigate every 5-element subset of  $V(G)$  to find a small obstruction in time  $O(|V(G)|^5)$ . If we find a small obstruction  $H$  in  $G$ , then we branch on each vertex of  $H$  to be included in the solution, and solve each of the at most five instances in time  $O(37^{k-1}|V(G)|^7(|V(G)| + |E(G)|))$  by the induction hypothesis. Otherwise, we apply Theorem 3.1 for  $(G, k)$ . Then since  $G$  has no small obstructions, an induced subgraph of  $G$  is a 3-leaf power if and only if it is distance-hereditary, and therefore the answer for 3-LEAF POWER DELETION is equal to the answer obtained from  $G$  and  $k$  by Theorem 3.1. This can be done in time  $O(37^k|V(G)|^7(|V(G)| + |E(G)|))$ .  $\square$

## 4 Good modulators

A modulator  $S$  of a graph  $G$  is *good* if  $G \setminus (S \setminus \{v\})$  is a 3-leaf power for each vertex  $v$  in  $S$ . Note that if  $G$  has a modulator  $S$ , then for every induced subgraph  $G'$  of  $G$ ,  $S \cap V(G')$  is a modulator of  $G'$ . This means that if  $(G, k)$  is a yes-instance, then so is  $(G', k)$ . We remark that if  $G$  has an obstruction  $H$  and a good modulator  $S$ , then  $H$  has at least two vertices in  $S$ . To find a small good modulator, we first find a modulator by combining a maximal packing of small obstructions with outcomes of the following approximation algorithms for CHORDAL DELETION by Kim and Kwon [22], and by Agrawal et al. [1]:

**Theorem 4.1** (Kim and Kwon [22, Theorem 1.1]). *Given a graph  $G$  and a positive integer  $k$ , we can either find  $k + 1$  vertex-disjoint holes in  $G$ , or find a set  $S \subseteq V(G)$  of size  $O(k^2 \log k)$  such that  $G \setminus S$  is chordal in time bounded above by a polynomial in  $|V(G)|$ .*

**Theorem 4.2** (Agrawal, Lokshantov, Misra, Saurabh, and Zehavi [1, Theorem 2]). *For a graph  $G$  and a non-negative integer  $k$ , we can either confirm that there is no set  $S \subseteq V(G)$  with  $|S| \leq k$  such that  $G \setminus S$  is chordal, or find a set  $S \subseteq V(G)$  of size  $O(k \log^2 |V(G)|)$  such that  $G \setminus S$  is chordal in time bounded above by a polynomial in  $|V(G)|$ .*

**Corollary 4.3.** *Given an instance  $(G, k)$  with  $k > 0$ , we can either confirm that  $G$  has no modulators of size at most  $k$ , or find a modulator of  $G$  having size  $O(\min(k^2 \log k, k \log^2 |V(G)|))$  in time bounded above by a polynomial in  $|V(G)|$ .*

*Proof.* We can find a maximal packing  $H_1, \dots, H_m$  of vertex-disjoint small obstructions in  $G$  in time  $O(|V(G)|^6)$ . If  $m \geq k + 1$ , then we confirm that  $G$  has no modulators of size at most  $k$ . Thus, we may assume that  $m \leq k$ .



Let  $X := \bigcup_{i \in \{1, \dots, m\}} V(H_i)$ . We apply Theorems 4.1 and 4.2 for  $G \setminus X$  and  $k$ . Note that  $|X| \leq 5k$ , and  $G \setminus X$  has no small obstructions.

If any of the algorithms in Theorems 4.1 and 4.2 confirms that  $G \setminus X$  has no set  $S$  of size at most  $k$  such that  $G \setminus (X \cup S)$  is chordal, then we confirm that  $G$  has no modulators of size at most  $k$ . Thus, let  $S_1$  be the output of the algorithm in Theorem 4.1 having size  $O(k^2 \log k)$ , and  $S_2$  be the output of the algorithm in Theorem 4.2 having size  $O(k \log^2 |V(G)|)$ . Then we choose  $S$  as one of  $S_1$  and  $S_2$  so that  $|S| = \min(|S_1|, |S_2|)$ . Then  $X \cup S$  is a modulator of  $G$ , and therefore  $|X \cup S| = |X| + |S| \leq 5k + O(\min(k^2 \log k, k \log^2 |V(G)|)) = O(\min(k^2 \log k, k \log^2 |V(G)|))$ .  $\square$

With a modulator of size  $O(\min(k^2 \log k, k \log^2 |V(G)|))$  at hand, we are ready to find a small good modulator. We note that, in principle, a small good modulator might not exist, but if that is the case, we are able to identify a vertex that has to be in every modulator of size at most  $k$ . Then we can remove it from the input graph, and decrease the parameter  $k$  by 1.

**Reduction Rule 1 (R1).** *Given an instance  $(G, k)$  with  $k > 0$ , if  $G$  has  $k+1$  obstructions  $H_1, \dots, H_{k+1}$  and a vertex  $v$  of  $G$  such that  $V(H_i) \cap V(H_j) = \{v\}$  for every distinct  $i$  and  $j$  in  $\{1, \dots, k+1\}$ , then replace  $(G, k)$  with  $(G \setminus v, k-1)$ .*

*Proof of Safeness.* It suffices to show that if  $G$  has a modulator  $S$  of size at most  $k$ , then  $S$  contains  $v$ . Suppose not. Then  $S$  contains at least one vertex of  $H_i \setminus v$  for each  $i \in \{1, \dots, k+1\}$ . Therefore,  $|S| \geq k+1$ , a contradiction.  $\square$

To find the obstructions  $H_1, \dots, H_{k+1}$ , we make use of the following lemma, which we slightly rephrase to better fit our application.

**Lemma 4.4** (Jansen and Pilipczuk [20, Lemma 1.3]). *Given a graph  $G$ , a non-negative integer  $k$ , and a vertex  $v$ , if  $G \setminus v$  is chordal, then we can either find holes  $H_1, \dots, H_{k+1}$  in  $G$  such that  $V(H_i) \cap V(H_j) = \{v\}$  for every distinct  $i$  and  $j$  in  $\{1, \dots, k+1\}$ , or find a set  $S \subseteq V(G) \setminus \{v\}$  of size at most  $12k$  such that  $G \setminus S$  is chordal in time bounded above by a polynomial in  $|V(G)|$ .*

**Lemma 4.5.** *Given an instance  $(G, k)$  with  $k > 0$ , we can find an equivalent instance  $(G', k')$  such that  $|V(G')| \leq |V(G)|$  and  $k' \leq k$ , and a good modulator of  $G'$  having size  $O(\min(k^3 \log k, k^2 \log^2 |V(G)|))$  in time bounded above by a polynomial in  $|V(G)|$ .*

*Proof.* We first try to find a modulator  $S$  of  $G$  having size  $O(\min(k^2 \log k, k \log^2 |V(G)|))$  by using Corollary 4.3. If it fails, then  $(G, k)$  is a no-instance, and therefore we take  $(K_{2,2}, 0)$  as  $(G', k')$  and  $V(K_{2,2})$  as a good modulator of  $G'$ . Otherwise, for each vertex  $v$  in  $S$ , let  $G_v := G \setminus (S \setminus \{v\})$ , and  $F_1^v, \dots, F_{m(v)}^v$  be a maximal packing of small obstructions in  $G_v$  such that  $V(F_i^v) \cap V(F_j^v) = \{v\}$  for every distinct  $i$  and  $j$  in  $\{1, \dots, m(v)\}$ . Finally, let  $G'_v := G_v \setminus ((V(F_1^v) \cup \dots \cup V(F_{m(v)}^v)) \setminus \{v\})$ . If  $m(v) \geq k + 1$  for some vertex  $v \in S$ , then we apply our algorithm recursively for  $(G \setminus v, k - 1)$ . This is safe, because (R1) is safe. Therefore, we may assume that  $m(v) \leq k$  for every vertex  $v \in S$ .

By Lemma 4.4 for  $G'_v$ ,  $k - m(v)$ , and  $v$ , we can either

- (1) find  $k - m(v) + 1$  holes  $H_1^v, \dots, H_{k-m(v)+1}^v$  in  $G'_v$  such that  $V(H_i^v) \cap V(H_j^v) = \{v\}$  for every distinct  $i$  and  $j$  in  $\{1, \dots, k - m(v) + 1\}$ , or
- (2) find a set  $S'_v \subseteq V(G'_v) \setminus \{v\}$  of size at most  $12(k - m(v))$  such that  $G'_v \setminus S'_v$  is chordal.

If (1) holds, then we apply our algorithm recursively for  $(G \setminus v, k - 1)$ . This is safe, because (R1) is safe. Therefore, we may assume that (2) holds for every vertex  $v$  in  $S$ . Then let  $S_v := (V(F_1^v) \cup \dots \cup V(F_{m(v)}^v) \cup S'_v) \setminus \{v\}$ . Note that  $|S_v| \leq 4m(v) + 12(k - m(v)) \leq 12k$  and  $G_v \setminus S_v$  is a 3-leaf power.

We take  $(G, k)$  as  $(G', k')$  and  $X := S \cup \bigcup_{v \in S} S_v$  as a good modulator of  $G$ . Clearly,  $|X| \leq |S| + 12k|S| = O(\min(k^3 \log k, k^2 \log^2 |V(G)|))$ . It remains to argue that  $X$  is a good modulator of  $G$ . Suppose that  $H$  is an obstruction in  $G$ . Since  $S$  is a modulator of  $G$ ,  $H$  has a vertex  $v \in S$ . If  $|V(H) \cap S| = 1$ , then  $H$  is an induced subgraph of  $G_v$ , and therefore  $H$  has at least one vertex in  $S_v$ . Since  $S_v$  and  $S$  are disjoint,  $H$  has at least two vertices in  $X$ . Therefore,  $X$  is a good modulator of  $G$ .  $\square$

## 5 Bounding the number of components outside of a good modulator

Let  $S$  be a good modulator of a graph  $G$ . In this section, we bound the number of non-trivial components of  $G \setminus S$ .

In Subsection 5.1, we introduce a complete split of a graph, and present two lemmas observing obstructions with a complete split of a graph. Then we define a blocking pair for a set of vertices, and present a characterization of a complete split of a graph and a lemma observing obstructions with a common blocking pair for two sets of vertices. All lemmas introduced in

this subsection will be used in the next subsection to bound the number of non-trivial components of  $G \setminus S$ .

In Subsection 5.2, we partition  $S$  into  $S^+$  and  $S^-$ , and bound the number of components of  $G \setminus S$  having neighbors of  $S^-$ . Afterward, we design a reduction rule to bound the number of non-trivial components of  $G \setminus S$  having no neighbors of  $S^-$ .

In Subsection 5.3, we bound the number of isolated vertices of  $G \setminus S$ .

### 5.1 Complete splits and blocking pairs

Cunningham [11] introduced a split of a graph. A *split* of a graph  $G$  is a partition  $(A, B)$  of  $V(G)$  such that  $|A| \geq 2$ ,  $|B| \geq 2$ , and  $N(A)$  is complete to  $N(B)$ . We say that a split  $(A, B)$  of  $G$  is *complete* if  $N(A) \cup N(B)$  is a clique. The following two lemmas observe obstructions from the view of a complete split of a graph.

**Lemma 5.1.** *Let  $(A, B)$  be a complete split of a graph  $G$ . If  $G$  has a hole  $H$ , then  $V(H) \cap A = \emptyset$  or  $V(H) \cap B = \emptyset$ .*

*Proof.* Suppose not. Since  $N(A) \cup N(B)$  is a clique,  $H$  has at most two vertices in  $N(A) \cup N(B)$ , because otherwise  $H$  has  $K_3$  as a subgraph. Since both  $V(H) \cap A$  and  $V(H) \cap B$  are non-empty, and  $H$  is connected,  $H$  has at least two vertices in  $N(A) \cup N(B)$ . Therefore,  $H$  has exactly two vertices  $x_1$  and  $x_2$  in  $N(A) \cup N(B)$ , a contradiction, because  $H \setminus x_1x_2$  is disconnected.  $\square$

**Lemma 5.2.** *Let  $(A, B)$  be a complete split of a graph  $G$ . If  $G$  has an obstruction  $H$  having exactly two vertices  $a_1$  and  $a_2$  in  $A$ , then  $a_1$  is adjacent to  $a_2$ , one of  $a_1$  and  $a_2$  has degree 1 in  $H$ , and the other vertex has degree 3 in  $H$ .*

*Proof.* Suppose that both  $a_1$  and  $a_2$  have neighbors in  $B$ . Since  $N(A) \cup N(B)$  is a clique,  $a_1$  and  $a_2$  are adjacent, and have the same set of neighbors in  $B$ . Then  $a_1$  and  $a_2$  are true twins in  $H$ , a contradiction by (O1). Therefore, either  $a_1$  or  $a_2$ , say  $a_1$ , has no neighbors in  $B$ . Since  $H$  is connected,  $a_1$  is adjacent to  $a_2$ . Thus,  $a_1$  has degree 1 in  $H$ . By (O3),  $a_2$  has at most three neighbors in  $H$ . By (O5),  $a_2$  has at least three neighbors in  $H$ . Therefore,  $a_2$  has degree 3 in  $H$ .  $\square$

We remark that for a complete split  $(A, B)$  of a graph  $G$ , if  $G$  has an obstruction  $H$  having exactly two vertices in  $A$ , then  $H$  is isomorphic to the bull.

Now, we define a blocking pair for a set  $X \subseteq V(G)$ . A *blocking pair* for  $X$  is an unordered pair  $\{v, w\}$  of distinct vertices in  $N(X)$  such that if  $v$  and  $w$  are adjacent, and  $N(v) \cap X = N(w) \cap X$ , then  $N(v) \cap X$  is not a clique. Note that if  $v, w \in N(X)$  are not adjacent, or  $N(v) \cap X \neq N(w) \cap X$ , then  $\{v, w\}$  is a blocking pair for  $X$ . We say that  $X$  is *blocked by*  $\{v, w\}$  if  $\{v, w\}$  is a blocking pair for  $X$ . We remark that if  $N(X)$  has a blocking pair  $\{v, w\}$  for some subset of  $X$ , then  $X$  is blocked by  $\{v, w\}$  as well. This definition is motivated by the following lemma.

**Lemma 5.3.** *Let  $(A, B)$  be a partition of the vertex set of a graph  $G$  such that  $|A| \geq 2$  and  $|B| \geq 2$ . Then  $(A, B)$  is a complete split of  $G$  if and only if  $N(B)$  is a clique, and  $B$  has no blocking pairs for  $A$ .*

*Proof.* It is clear that if  $(A, B)$  is a complete split of  $G$ , then  $N(B)$  is a clique, and  $B$  has no blocking pairs for  $A$ .

Conversely, suppose that  $N(B)$  is a clique, and  $B$  has no blocking pairs for  $A$ . We may assume that  $|N(A)| \geq 2$ , because otherwise  $N(A) \cup N(B)$  is a clique, and  $(A, B)$  is a complete split of  $G$ . Since  $B$  has no blocking pairs for  $A$ ,  $N(A)$  is a clique, because if  $N(A)$  has a non-edge  $vw$ , then  $\{v, w\}$  is a blocking pair for  $A$ . Moreover,  $N(v) \cap A = N(w) \cap A$  for all vertices  $v$  and  $w$  in  $N(A)$ , because otherwise  $\{v, w\}$  is a blocking pair for  $A$ . This means that  $N(A)$  is complete to  $N(B)$ . Therefore,  $N(A) \cup N(B)$  is a clique, and  $(A, B)$  is a complete split of  $G$ .  $\square$

The following lemma shows that a blocking pair  $\{v, w\}$  for a set  $X \subseteq V(G)$  tells us not only that  $(X, V(G) \setminus X)$  is not a complete split of  $G$ , but also that  $G$  is not a 3-leaf power if  $G[X]$  has two distinct components whose vertex sets are blocked by  $\{v, w\}$ .

**Lemma 5.4.** *Let  $(A, B)$  be a partition of the vertex set of a graph  $G$  such that  $|A| \geq 2$  and  $|B| \geq 2$ . If  $G[A]$  has distinct components  $C_1$  and  $C_2$  such that both  $V(C_1)$  and  $V(C_2)$  are blocked by  $\{v, w\}$  of vertices in  $B$ , then  $G[V(C_1) \cup V(C_2) \cup \{v, w\}]$  is not a 3-leaf power.*

*Proof.* If  $N_G(v) \cap V(C_1) \neq N_G(w) \cap V(C_1)$ , then we may assume that  $C_1$  has a vertex  $u_1$  adjacent to  $v$  and non-adjacent to  $w$ , because otherwise we can swap  $v$  and  $w$ . Let  $u_2$  be a neighbor of  $v$  in  $V(C_2)$ , and  $P$  be an induced path in  $G[V(C_1) \cup V(C_2) \cup \{w\}]$  from  $u_1$  to  $u_2$ . Note that the length of  $P$  is at least 3, because  $P$  must intersect  $w$  that is non-adjacent to  $u_1$ . Since  $v$  is adjacent to both ends of  $P$ ,  $G[V(P) \cup \{v\}]$  is not distance-hereditary by Lemma 2.6. Therefore,  $G[V(C_1) \cup V(C_2) \cup \{v, w\}]$  is not a 3-leaf power.

Therefore,  $N_G(v) \cap V(C_i) = N_G(w) \cap V(C_i)$  for  $i = 1, 2$ . If  $v$  and  $w$  are non-adjacent, then for a neighbor  $u_1$  of  $v$  in  $V(C_1)$  and a neighbor  $u_2$  of  $v$  in  $V(C_2)$ ,  $G[\{v, w, u_1, u_2\}]$  is a hole. Therefore, we may assume that  $v$  and  $w$  are adjacent. Then since  $\{v, w\}$  is a blocking pair for  $V(C_1)$ ,  $N_G(v) \cap V(C_1)$  has a non-edge  $u_1u_2$ . Let  $P$  be an induced path in  $C_1$  from  $u_1$  to  $u_2$ . Since  $v$  is adjacent to both ends of  $P$ , we may assume that the length of  $P$  is exactly 2 by Lemma 2.6. Let  $u_3$  be a common neighbor of  $u_1$  and  $u_2$  in  $V(P)$ , and  $u_4$  be a neighbor of  $v$  in  $V(C_2)$ . Then  $G[\{v, u_1, u_2, u_3, u_4\}]$  is isomorphic to the dart if  $u_3$  is adjacent to  $v$ , and has a hole of length 4 if  $u_3$  is non-adjacent to  $v$ . Therefore,  $G[V(C_1) \cup V(C_2) \cup \{v, w\}]$  is not a 3-leaf power.  $\square$

## 5.2 The number of non-trivial components

Let  $S^+$  be the set of vertices  $v$  in  $S$  such that for each component  $C$  of  $G \setminus S$ ,  $N_G(v) \cap V(C)$  is a true twin-set in  $C$ , and  $S^- := S \setminus S^+$ . The following proposition shows that  $G \setminus S$  has at most  $|S^-|$  components having neighbors of  $S^-$ .

**Proposition 5.5.** *Let  $S$  be a good modulator of a graph  $G$ ,  $v$  be a vertex in  $S$ , and  $C$  be a component of  $G \setminus S$ . If  $N_G(v) \cap V(C)$  contains distinct vertices  $w_1$  and  $w_2$  that are not true twins in  $C$ , then no components of  $G \setminus S$  different from  $C$  have neighbors of  $v$ .*

*Proof.* Suppose that there is a component of  $G \setminus S$  different from  $C$  having a neighbor  $w$  of  $v$ . If  $w_1$  and  $w_2$  are adjacent, then we may assume that  $C$  has a vertex  $w_3$  adjacent to exactly one of  $w_1$  and  $w_2$ , because  $w_1$  and  $w_2$  are not true twins in  $C$ . Then  $G[\{v, w, w_1, w_2, w_3\}]$  is isomorphic to the dart if  $w_3$  is adjacent to  $v$ , and the bull if  $w_3$  is non-adjacent to  $v$ , a contradiction, because it has exactly one vertex  $v$  in  $S$ , which is a good modulator of  $G$ .

Therefore,  $w_1$  and  $w_2$  are non-adjacent. Let  $P$  be an induced path in  $C$  from  $w_1$  to  $w_2$ . Since  $v$  is adjacent to both ends of  $P$ , and  $S$  is a good modulator of  $G$ , we may assume that the length of  $P$  is exactly 2 by Lemma 2.6. Let  $w_3$  be a common neighbor of  $w_1$  and  $w_2$  in  $V(P)$ . Then  $G[\{v, w, w_1, w_2, w_3\}]$  is isomorphic to the dart if  $w_3$  is adjacent to  $v$ , and has a hole of length 4 if  $w_3$  is non-adjacent to  $v$ , a contradiction, because it has exactly one vertex  $v$  in  $S$ .  $\square$

We present a reduction rule to bound the number of non-trivial components of  $G \setminus S$  having no neighbors of  $S^-$ . We will use the following definition to design such a reduction rule.

Let  $X$  be a set of vertices of a graph  $Q$ . For a non-negative integer  $\ell$ , a set  $M \subseteq E(Q)$  is an  $(X, \ell)$ -*matching* of  $Q$  if every vertex in  $X$  is incident with at most  $\ell$  edges in  $M$ , and every vertex in  $V(Q) \setminus X$  is incident with at most one edge in  $M$ .

**Reduction Rule 2 (R2).** *Given an instance  $(G, k)$  with  $k > 0$  and a non-empty good modulator  $S$  of  $G$ , let  $S^+$  be the set of vertices  $u$  in  $S$  such that for each component  $C$  of  $G \setminus S$ ,  $N_G(u) \cap V(C)$  is a true twin-set in  $C$ ,  $X$  be the set of 2-element subsets of  $S^+$ , and  $Y$  be the set of non-trivial components of  $G \setminus S$  having no neighbors of  $S \setminus S^+$ . Let  $Q$  be a bipartite graph on  $(X \times \{1, 2, 3\}, Y)$  such that the following three statements are true.*

- (1) *Elements  $(\{v, w\}, 1) \in X \times \{1\}$  and  $C \in Y$  are adjacent in  $Q$  if and only if  $V(C)$  is blocked by  $\{v, w\}$ .*
- (2) *Elements  $(\{v, w\}, 2) \in X \times \{2\}$  and  $C \in Y$  are adjacent in  $Q$  if and only if  $C$  has a vertex adjacent to both  $v$  and  $w$ .*
- (3) *Elements  $(\{v, w\}, 3) \in X \times \{3\}$  and  $C \in Y$  are adjacent in  $Q$  if and only if  $C$  has an edge  $xy$  such that  $x$  is adjacent to both  $v$  and  $w$ , and  $y$  is non-adjacent to both  $v$  and  $w$ .*

*If  $Q$  has a maximal  $(X \times \{1, 2, 3\}, k+2)$ -matching  $M$  avoiding some element  $U$  in  $Y$ , then replace  $(G, k)$  with  $(G \setminus E(U), k)$ .*

*Proof of Safeness.* Let  $G' := G \setminus E(U)$ . We need to show that  $(G, k)$  is a yes-instance if and only if  $(G', k)$  is a yes-instance.

Suppose that  $G$  has a modulator  $S'$  of size at most  $k$ , and  $G' \setminus S'$  has an obstruction  $H$ . Since  $G \setminus S'$  is a 3-leaf power,  $H$  has vertices  $b_1$  and  $b_2$  such that  $b_1 b_2 \in E(U \setminus S')$ . Thus,  $|V(U) \setminus S'| \geq 2$ .

**Claim 1.** We claim that  $(V(U) \setminus S', V(G) \setminus (V(U) \cup S'))$  is a split of  $G' \setminus S'$ .

We first show that  $|V(G) \setminus (V(U) \cup S')| \geq 2$ . If  $H$  is a hole of length 4, then  $H$  has at most two vertices of  $U \setminus S'$ , because no holes of length 4 have independent sets of size at least 3, and  $V(U) \setminus S'$  is an independent set of  $G' \setminus S'$ . Therefore,  $H$  has at least two vertices of  $G \setminus (V(U) \cup S')$ .

If  $H$  is not a hole of length 4, then  $|V(H)| \geq 5$ . By (O2),  $H$  has at most three vertices of  $U \setminus S'$ , because  $V(U) \setminus S'$  is an independent set of  $G' \setminus S'$ . Therefore,  $H$  has at least two vertices of  $G \setminus (V(U) \cup S')$ , and  $|V(G) \setminus (V(U) \cup S')| \geq 2$ .

Now, suppose that  $(V(U) \setminus S', V(G) \setminus (V(U) \cup S'))$  is not a split of  $G' \setminus S'$ . Then  $G \setminus (V(U) \cup S')$  has vertices  $v$  and  $w$  such that both  $v$  and  $w$  have neighbors in  $V(U) \setminus S'$ , and  $N_G(v) \cap (V(U) \setminus S') \neq N_G(w) \cap (V(U) \setminus S')$ . Thus,  $\{v, w\}$

is a blocking pair for  $V(U)\setminus S'$ , so for  $V(U)$ . Then  $U$  is adjacent to  $(\{v, w\}, 1)$  in  $Q$ . Since  $M$  is maximal,  $Y$  has distinct elements  $C_1, \dots, C_{k+2}$  different from  $U$  such that  $V(C_i)$  is blocked by  $\{v, w\}$  for each  $i \in \{1, \dots, k+2\}$ . Since  $|S'| \leq k$ , two of them, say  $C_1$  and  $C_2$ , have no vertices in  $S'$ . Then  $G[V(C_1) \cup V(C_2) \cup \{v, w\}]$  is not a 3-leaf power by Lemma 5.4, a contradiction, because it is an induced subgraph of  $G\setminus S'$ , and this proves the claim.

Since  $V(U)\setminus S'$  is an independent set of  $G'\setminus S'$ , and  $H$  is connected, both  $b_1$  and  $b_2$  have neighbors in  $V(G)\setminus(V(U) \cup S')$ . Then by Claim 1,  $b_1$  and  $b_2$  are false twins in  $G'\setminus S'$ . By (O4), both  $b_1$  and  $b_2$  have degree 2 in  $H$ . Let  $z_1$  and  $z_2$  be the neighbors of  $b_1$  in  $V(H) \cap S$ . Then  $U$  is adjacent to  $(\{z_1, z_2\}, 2)$  in  $Q$ . Since  $M$  is maximal,  $Y$  has distinct elements  $C'_1, \dots, C'_{k+2}$  different from  $U$  such that  $C'_i$  has a vertex adjacent to both  $z_1$  and  $z_2$  for each  $i \in \{1, \dots, k+2\}$ . Since  $|S'| \leq k$ , two of them, say  $C'_1$  and  $C'_2$ , have no vertices in  $S'$ . Note that  $S'$  has no vertices of  $H$ , because  $H$  is an induced subgraph of  $G'\setminus S'$ .

If  $z_1$  and  $z_2$  are non-adjacent, then  $G[V(C'_1) \cup V(C'_2) \cup \{z_1, z_2\}]$  has a hole of length 4, a contradiction, because it is an induced subgraph of  $G'\setminus S'$ . Therefore,  $z_1$  and  $z_2$  are adjacent. Since  $G[\{b_1, z_1, z_2\}]$  is isomorphic to  $K_3$ ,  $H$  is not a hole, and therefore  $|V(H)| = 5$ . Let  $a$  be a vertex of  $H$  different from  $b_1, b_2, z_1$ , and  $z_2$ . We may assume that  $a$  is not in  $V(C'_1)$ , because otherwise we may swap  $C'_1$  and  $C'_2$ . Let  $c$  be a vertex of  $C'_1$  adjacent to both  $z_1$  and  $z_2$ . Note that  $G[\{b_1, b_2, z_1, z_2\}]$  is isomorphic to  $K_4 \setminus b_1 b_2$ .

Since the dart and a hole of length 4 are the only obstructions having false twins,  $H$  is isomorphic to the dart. Thus, we may assume that  $N_H(a) = \{z_1\}$ . Then  $G[\{a, b_1, c, z_1, z_2\}]$  is isomorphic to the gem if  $c$  is adjacent to  $a$ , and the dart if  $c$  is non-adjacent to  $a$ , a contradiction, because it is an induced subgraph of  $G'\setminus S'$ . Therefore, if  $(G, k)$  is a yes-instance, then so is  $(G', k)$ .

Conversely, suppose that  $G'$  has a modulator  $S'$  of size at most  $k$ , and  $G'\setminus S'$  has an obstruction  $H$ . Since  $G'\setminus S'$  is a 3-leaf power,  $H$  has an edge of  $U\setminus S'$ . Thus,  $|V(U)\setminus S'| \geq 2$ . Since  $S$  is a good modulator of  $G$ ,  $H$  has at least two vertices in  $S\setminus S'$ . Then  $|V(G)\setminus(V(U) \cup S')| \geq 2$ , because  $S\setminus S' \subseteq V(G)\setminus(V(U) \cup S')$ .

**Claim 2.** We claim that  $(V(U)\setminus S', V(G)\setminus(V(U) \cup S'))$  is a complete split of  $G\setminus S'$ .

Suppose not. We first show that  $V(G)\setminus(V(U) \cup S')$  has a blocking pair for  $V(U)\setminus S'$ . Since  $U$  is a component of  $G\setminus S$ , and has no neighbors of  $S\setminus S^+$ , it suffices to show that  $S^+\setminus S'$  has a blocking pair for  $V(U)\setminus S'$ . We may assume

that for all vertices  $v$  and  $w$  in  $S^+ \setminus S'$  having neighbors in  $V(U) \setminus S'$ ,  $v$  and  $w$  are adjacent, and have the same set of neighbors in  $V(U) \setminus S'$ , because otherwise  $\{v, w\}$  is a blocking pair for  $V(U) \setminus S'$ . For each vertex  $v$  in  $S^+ \setminus S'$  having neighbors in  $V(U) \setminus S'$ , the set of neighbors of  $v$  in  $V(U) \setminus S'$  is a true twin-set in  $U \setminus S'$ , that is, a clique. Therefore,  $N_G(S^+ \setminus S') \cap (V(U) \setminus S')$  is a clique of  $U \setminus S'$ . Thus, by Lemma 5.3,  $S^+ \setminus S'$  has a blocking pair  $\{v, w\}$  for  $V(U) \setminus S'$ , so for  $V(U)$ .

Since  $V(U)$  is blocked by  $\{v, w\}$ ,  $U$  is adjacent to  $(\{v, w\}, 1)$  in  $Q$ . Since  $M$  is maximal,  $Y$  has distinct elements  $C_1, \dots, C_{k+2}$  different from  $U$  such that  $V(C_i)$  is blocked by  $\{v, w\}$  for each  $i \in \{1, \dots, k+2\}$ . Since  $|S'| \leq k$ , two of them, say  $C_1$  and  $C_2$ , have no vertices in  $S'$ . Then  $G[V(C_1) \cup V(C_2) \cup \{v, w\}]$  is not a 3-leaf power by Lemma 5.4, a contradiction, because it is an induced subgraph of  $G' \setminus S'$ , and this proves the claim.

Since both  $U \setminus S'$  and  $G \setminus (V(U) \cup S')$  have vertices of  $H$ ,  $H$  is not a hole by Lemma 5.1 and Claim 2, and therefore  $|V(H)| = 5$ . Let  $t_1, \dots, t_p$  be the vertices of  $H$  in  $V(U) \setminus S'$ , and  $s_1, \dots, s_q$  be the vertices of  $H$  in  $V(G) \setminus (V(U) \cup S')$ . Note that both  $p$  and  $q$  are at least 2. Since  $|V(H)| = 5$ ,  $(p, q) = (3, 2)$  or  $(p, q) = (2, 3)$ .

If  $(p, q) = (3, 2)$ , then we may assume that  $N_H(s_1) = \{s_2\}$  and  $N_H(s_2) = \{s_1, t_1, t_2\}$  by Lemma 5.2 and Claim 2. Since  $U$  has no neighbors of  $S \setminus S^+$ ,  $s_2$  is in  $S^+$ . Thus,  $t_1$  and  $t_2$  are true twins in  $U \setminus S'$ , a contradiction by (O1).

Therefore,  $(p, q) = (2, 3)$ . By Lemma 5.2 and Claim 2, we may assume that  $N_H(t_1) = \{t_2\}$  and  $N_H(t_2) = \{t_1, s_1, s_2\}$ . Note that  $s_1$  and  $s_2$  are in  $S \setminus S'$ . Then  $U$  is adjacent to  $(\{s_1, s_2\}, 3)$  in  $Q$ . Since  $M$  is maximal,  $Y$  has distinct elements  $C''_1, \dots, C''_{k+2}$  different from  $U$  such that  $C''_i$  has an edge  $x_i y_i$  such that  $x_i$  is adjacent to both  $s_1$  and  $s_2$ , and  $y_i$  is non-adjacent to both  $s_1$  and  $s_2$  for each  $i \in \{1, \dots, k+2\}$ . Since  $|S'| \leq k$ , two of them, say  $C''_1$  and  $C''_2$ , have no vertices in  $S'$ . We may assume that  $s_3$  is not in  $V(C''_1)$ , because otherwise we may swap  $C''_1$  and  $C''_2$ . We remark that the bull is the only possible graph to which  $H$  is isomorphic. Thus,  $s_1$  and  $s_2$  are adjacent, and  $s_3$  is adjacent to exactly one of  $s_1$  and  $s_2$  in  $H$ . Then  $G[\{x_1, y_1, s_1, s_2, s_3\}]$  is isomorphic to the gem if both  $x_1$  and  $y_1$  are adjacent to  $s_3$ , the bull if both  $x_1$  and  $y_1$  are non-adjacent to  $s_3$ , and the dart if  $x_1$  is adjacent to  $s_3$  and  $y_1$  is non-adjacent to  $s_3$ , and has a hole of length 4 if  $x_1$  is non-adjacent to  $s_3$  and  $y_1$  is adjacent to  $s_3$ , a contradiction, because it is an induced subgraph of  $G' \setminus S'$ . Therefore, if  $(G', k)$  is a yes-instance, then so is  $(G, k)$ .  $\square$

**Proposition 5.6.** *Given an instance  $(G, k)$  with  $k > 0$  and a non-empty good modulator  $S$  of  $G$ , if (R2) is not applicable to  $(G, k)$ , then  $G \setminus S$  has at*



most  $2(k+2)|S|^2$  non-trivial components.

*Proof.* Let  $S^+$  be the set of vertices  $u$  in  $S$  such that for each component  $C$  of  $G \setminus S$ ,  $N_G(u) \cap V(C)$  is a true twin-set in  $C$ , and  $S^- := S \setminus S^+$ . By Proposition 5.5, each vertex in  $S^-$  is adjacent to at most one component of  $G \setminus S$ . Therefore,  $G \setminus S$  has at most  $|S^-|$  non-trivial components having neighbors of  $S^-$ .

Let  $Q$  and  $M$  be defined as in (R2). Since (R2) is not applicable to  $(G, k)$ , each non-trivial component of  $G \setminus S$  having no neighbors of  $S^-$  is incident with exactly one edge in  $M$ . Since each edge in  $M$  is incident with some element in  $X \times \{1, 2, 3\}$ , and each element in  $X \times \{1, 2, 3\}$  is incident with at most  $k+2$  edges,  $|M| \leq (k+2) \cdot |X \times \{1, 2, 3\}| \leq (k+2) \cdot 3 \binom{|S^+|}{2} \leq 3(k+2)|S|^2/2$ . Then  $|S^-| + |M| \leq |S| + 3(k+2)|S|^2/2 \leq (k+2)|S|^2/2 + 3(k+2)|S|^2/2 = 2(k+2)|S|^2$ , and therefore  $G \setminus S$  has at most  $2(k+2)|S|^2$  non-trivial components.  $\square$

### 5.3 The number of isolated vertices

We present a reduction rule to bound the number of isolated vertices of  $G \setminus S$ .

**Reduction Rule 3 (R3).** *Given an instance  $(G, k)$  with  $k > 0$  and a non-empty good modulator  $S$  of  $G$ , let  $\mathcal{A}$  be the set of ordered pairs  $(A_1, A_2)$  of disjoint subsets of  $S$  such that  $2 \leq |A_1| + |A_2| \leq 4$ , and  $X$  be the set of isolated vertices of  $G \setminus S$ . For each element  $(A_1, A_2)$  in  $\mathcal{A}$ , let  $X_{A_1, A_2}$  be a maximal set of vertices  $v$  in  $X$  such that  $N_G(v) \cap (A_1 \cup A_2) = A_1$  and  $|X_{A_1, A_2}| \leq k+3$ . If  $X$  has a vertex  $u$  not in  $\bigcup_{(A_1, A_2) \in \mathcal{A}} X_{A_1, A_2}$ , then replace  $(G, k)$  with  $(G \setminus u, k)$ .*

*Proof of Safeness.* We need to show that if  $(G \setminus u, k)$  is a yes-instance, then so is  $(G, k)$ . Suppose that  $G \setminus u$  has a modulator  $S'$  of size at most  $k$ , and  $G \setminus S'$  has an obstruction  $H$ . Then  $u \in V(H)$ , because  $G \setminus (S' \cup \{u\})$  is a 3-leaf power.

If  $H$  is a hole, then  $u$  has exactly two neighbors  $v_1$  and  $v_2$  in  $V(H) \cap S$  such that  $v_1$  is non-adjacent to  $v_2$ . By the construction of  $X_{\{v_1, v_2\}, \emptyset}$ ,  $X_{\{v_1, v_2\}, \emptyset}$  contains distinct vertices  $u_1, \dots, u_{k+3}$  different from  $u$ . Note that  $H$  has at most one of  $u_1, \dots, u_{k+3}$ , because  $v_1$  and  $v_2$  have at most two common neighbors in  $V(H)$  including  $u$ . Then since  $|S'| \leq k$ , two of them, say  $u_1$  and  $u_2$ , are not in  $S' \cup V(H)$ . Thus,  $G[\{v_1, v_2, u_1, u_2\}]$  is a hole, a contradiction, because it is an induced subgraph of  $G \setminus (S' \cup \{u\})$ .

Suppose that  $H$  is isomorphic to the bull, the dart, or the gem. Then  $2 \leq |S \cap V(H)| \leq 4$ , because  $H$  has exactly five vertices including  $u$ , and

$S$  is a good modulator of  $G$ . Let  $B_1 := (S \cap V(H)) \cap N_G(u)$ , and  $B_2 := (S \cap V(H)) \setminus N_G(u)$ . By the construction of  $X_{B_1, B_2}$ ,  $X_{B_1, B_2}$  contains distinct vertices  $u_1, \dots, u_{k+3}$  different from  $u$ . Since  $|V(H)| = 5$  and  $2 \leq |S \cap V(H)| \leq 4$ ,  $H$  has at most three vertices in  $X$  including  $u$ . Thus,  $H$  has at most two of  $u_1, \dots, u_{k+3}$ . Then since  $|S'| \leq k$ , one of them, say  $u_1$ , is not in  $S' \cup V(H)$ . Thus,  $G[(V(H) \setminus \{u\}) \cup \{u_1\}]$  is isomorphic to  $H$ , a contradiction, because it is an induced subgraph of  $G \setminus (S' \cup \{u\})$ .  $\square$

**Proposition 5.7.** *Given an instance  $(G, k)$  with  $k > 0$  and a non-empty good modulator  $S$  of  $G$ , if (R3) is not applicable to  $(G, k)$ , then  $G \setminus S$  has at most  $2(k+3)|S|^4/3$  isolated vertices.*

*Proof.* Let  $\mathcal{A}$ ,  $X$ , and  $X_{A_1, A_2}$  be defined as in (R3). If  $|S| \leq 1$ , then  $\bigcup_{(A_1, A_2) \in \mathcal{A}} X_{A_1, A_2}$  is empty, and therefore  $X$  is empty. Thus, we may assume that  $|S| \geq 2$ . Let  $s := |S|$ . For each  $m$ -element subset  $T$  of  $S$  with  $2 \leq m \leq 4$ ,  $\mathcal{A}$  contains exactly  $2^m$  elements  $(A_1, A_2)$  such that  $T = A_1 \cup A_2$ . Therefore,  $|\mathcal{A}|$  is at most

$$\begin{aligned} 2^4 \cdot \binom{s}{4} + 2^3 \cdot \binom{s}{3} + 2^2 \cdot \binom{s}{2} &\leq \frac{2}{3}(s-1)^4 + \frac{4}{3}(s-1)^3 + 2s(s-1) \\ &= \frac{2}{3}(s-1)^2((s-1)^2 + 2(s-1)) + 2s(s-1) \\ &\leq \frac{2}{3}(s-1)^2 s^2 + 2s(s-1) \\ &= 2s(s-1)(s^2 - s + 3)/3 \\ &\leq 2s(s-1)(s^2 + s)/3 = 2s^2(s^2 - 1)/3 \leq 2s^4/3. \end{aligned}$$

For each element  $(A_1, A_2)$  in  $\mathcal{A}$ ,  $|X_{A_1, A_2}| \leq k+3$ . Therefore,  $|\bigcup_{(A_1, A_2) \in \mathcal{A}} X_{A_1, A_2}| \leq 2(k+3)|S|^4/3$ . Since (R3) is not applicable to  $(G, k)$ , every isolated vertex of  $G \setminus S$  is in  $\bigcup_{(A_1, A_2) \in \mathcal{A}} X_{A_1, A_2}$ . Therefore,  $G \setminus S$  has at most  $2(k+3)|S|^4/3$  isolated vertices.  $\square$

## 6 Bounding the size of components outside of a good modulator

Let  $S$  be a good modulator of a graph  $G$ . In this section, we bound the size of each component of  $G \setminus S$ . Subsection 6.1 is about complete components of  $G \setminus S$ , and Subsection 6.2 is about incomplete components of  $G \setminus S$ .

## 6.1 The size of each complete component

We present a reduction rule to bound the size of each complete component of  $G \setminus S$ .

**Reduction Rule 4 (R4).** *Given an instance  $(G, k)$  with  $k > 0$  and a non-empty good modulator  $S$  of  $G$ , let  $\mathcal{A}$  be the set of ordered pairs  $(A_1, A_2)$  of disjoint subsets of  $S$  such that  $2 \leq |A_1| + |A_2| \leq 4$ , and  $C$  be a complete component of  $G \setminus S$ . For each element  $(A_1, A_2)$  in  $\mathcal{A}$ , let  $X_{A_1, A_2}$  be a maximal set of vertices  $v$  of  $C$  such that  $N_G(v) \cap (A_1 \cup A_2) = A_1$  and  $|X_{A_1, A_2}| \leq k + 3$ . If  $C$  has a vertex  $u$  not in  $\bigcup_{(A_1, A_2) \in \mathcal{A}} X_{A_1, A_2}$ , then replace  $(G, k)$  with  $(G \setminus u, k)$ .*

*Proof of Safeness.* We need to show that if  $(G \setminus u, k)$  is a yes-instance, then so is  $(G, k)$ . Suppose that  $G \setminus u$  has a modulator  $S'$  of size at most  $k$ , and  $G \setminus S'$  has an obstruction  $H$ . Then  $u \in V(H)$ , because  $G \setminus (S' \cup \{u\})$  is a 3-leaf power.

Suppose that  $H$  is a small obstruction. Since  $H$  has at most five vertices including  $u$ , and  $S$  is a good modulator of  $G$ ,  $2 \leq |S \cap V(H)| \leq 4$ . Let  $B_1 := (S \cap V(H)) \cap N_G(u)$ , and  $B_2 := (S \cap V(H)) \setminus N_G(u)$ . By the construction of  $X_{B_1, B_2}$ ,  $X_{B_1, B_2}$  contains distinct vertices  $u_1, \dots, u_{k+3}$  different from  $u$ . Since  $|V(H)| \leq 5$  and  $2 \leq |S \cap V(H)| \leq 4$ ,  $H$  has at most three vertices of  $C$  including  $u$ . Thus,  $H$  has at most two of  $u_1, \dots, u_{k+3}$ . Then since  $|S'| \leq k$ , one of them, say  $u_1$ , is not in  $S' \cup V(H)$ . Thus,  $G[(V(H) \setminus \{u\}) \cup \{u_1\}]$  is isomorphic to  $H$ , a contradiction, because it is an induced subgraph of  $G \setminus (S' \cup \{u\})$ .

Therefore,  $H$  is a hole of length at least 6. Note that  $H$  has at most two vertices of  $C$ , because  $C$  is complete. Suppose that  $H$  has exactly one vertex  $u$  of  $C$ . In this case,  $u$  is adjacent to distinct vertices  $v_1$  and  $v_2$  in  $V(H) \cap S$ . Then  $H \setminus u$  is an induced path of length at least 4 from  $v_1$  to  $v_2$ . By the construction of  $X_{\{v_1, v_2\}, \emptyset}$ ,  $X_{\{v_1, v_2\}, \emptyset}$  contains distinct vertices  $u_1, \dots, u_{k+3}$  different from  $u$ . Since  $|S'| \leq k$ , one of them, say  $u_1$ , is not in  $S'$ . Then  $G[(V(H) \setminus \{u\}) \cup \{u_1\}]$  is not distance-hereditary by Lemma 2.6, a contradiction, because it is an induced subgraph of  $G \setminus (S' \cup \{u\})$ .

Therefore,  $H$  has exactly two vertices  $u$  and  $u'$  of  $C$ . In this case,  $u$  is adjacent to a vertex  $v_1$  in  $V(H) \cap S$ , and  $u'$  is adjacent to another vertex  $v_2$  in  $V(H) \cap S$ . Note that  $u'$  is non-adjacent to  $v_1$ . Then  $H \setminus u$  is an induced path of length at least 4 from  $v_1$  to  $u'$ . By the construction of  $X_{\{v_1\}, \{v_2\}}$ ,  $X_{\{v_1\}, \{v_2\}}$  contains distinct vertices  $u_1, \dots, u_{k+3}$  different from  $u$ . Since  $|S'| \leq k$ , one of them, say  $u_1$ , is not in  $S'$ . Then  $G[(V(H) \setminus \{u\}) \cup \{u_1\}]$  is not distance-hereditary by Lemma 2.6, a contradiction, because it is an induced subgraph

of  $G \setminus (S' \cup \{u\})$ . Therefore, if  $(G \setminus u, k)$  is a yes-instance, then so is  $(G, k)$ .  $\square$

**Proposition 6.1.** *Given an instance  $(G, k)$  with  $k > 0$  and a non-empty good modulator  $S$  of  $G$ , if (R4) is not applicable to  $(G, k)$ , then every complete component of  $G \setminus S$  has at most  $2(k + 3)|S|^4/3$  vertices.*

*Proof.* Let  $\mathcal{A}$ ,  $C$ , and  $X_{A_1, A_2}$  be defined as in (R4). Since (R4) is not applicable to  $(G, k)$ , every vertex of  $C$  is in  $\bigcup_{(A_1, A_2) \in \mathcal{A}} X_{A_1, A_2}$ . If  $|S| \leq 1$ , then  $\bigcup_{(A_1, A_2) \in \mathcal{A}} X_{A_1, A_2}$  is empty, contradicting the assumption that every vertex of  $C$  is in  $\bigcup_{(A_1, A_2) \in \mathcal{A}} X_{A_1, A_2}$ . Thus,  $|S| \geq 2$ . For each  $m$ -element subset  $T$  of  $S$  with  $2 \leq m \leq 4$ ,  $\mathcal{A}$  contains exactly  $2^m$  elements  $(A_1, A_2)$  such that  $T = A_1 \cup A_2$ . Therefore,  $|\mathcal{A}| \leq 2^4 \cdot \binom{|S|}{4} + 2^3 \cdot \binom{|S|}{3} + 2^2 \cdot \binom{|S|}{2} \leq 2|S|^4/3$ , as in the proof of Proposition 5.7. For each element  $(A_1, A_2)$  in  $\mathcal{A}$ ,  $|X_{A_1, A_2}| \leq k + 3$ . Therefore,  $|\bigcup_{(A_1, A_2) \in \mathcal{A}} X_{A_1, A_2}| \leq 2(k + 3)|S|^4/3$ , and  $C$  has at most  $2(k + 3)|S|^4/3$  vertices.  $\square$

## 6.2 The size of each incomplete component

We present a reduction rule to bound the size of each true twin-set in  $G$ .

**Reduction Rule 5 (R5).** *Given an instance  $(G, k)$  with  $k > 0$ , if  $G$  has a true twin-set  $X$  such that  $v \in X$  and  $|X| \geq k + 2$ , then replace  $(G, k)$  with  $(G \setminus v, k)$ .*

*Proof of Safeness.* We need to show that if  $(G \setminus v, k)$  is a yes-instance, then so is  $(G, k)$ . Suppose that  $G \setminus v$  has a modulator  $S$  of size at most  $k$ , and  $G \setminus S$  has an obstruction  $H$ . Then  $v \in V(H)$ , because  $G \setminus (S \cup \{v\})$  is a 3-leaf power. By (O1),  $V(H) \cap X = \{v\}$ . Since  $|S| \leq k$ ,  $X$  contains a vertex  $w$  not in  $S \cup \{v\}$ . Then  $G[(V(H) \setminus \{v\}) \cup \{w\}]$  is isomorphic to  $H$ , a contradiction, because it is an induced subgraph of  $G \setminus (S \cup \{v\})$ .  $\square$

We present a reduction rule to remove some bags of  $G \setminus S$  anti-complete to  $S$ .

**Reduction Rule 6 (R6).** *Given an instance  $(G, k)$  with  $k > 0$  and a non-empty good modulator  $S$  of  $G$ , let  $B$  be a non-empty true twin-set in  $G \setminus S$ . If  $G \setminus (S \cup B)$  has a component  $D$  having no neighbors of  $S$  such that  $V(D) \setminus N_G(B)$  is non-empty, then replace  $(G, k)$  with  $(G \setminus (V(D) \setminus N_G(B)), k)$ .*

*Proof of Safeness.* Let  $G' := G \setminus (V(D) \setminus N_G(B))$ . We need to show that if  $(G', k)$  is a yes-instance, then so is  $(G, k)$ . Suppose that  $G'$  has a modulator  $S'$  of size at most  $k$ , and  $G' \setminus S'$  has an obstruction  $H$ . Since  $G' \setminus S'$  is a 3-leaf power,  $H$  has at least one vertex of  $D \setminus N_G(B)$ . Since  $H$  is connected, and  $D$

has no neighbors of  $S$ ,  $H$  has at least one vertex in  $V(D) \cap N_G(B)$ . Thus,  $H$  has at least two vertices of  $D$ . Since  $V(H) \cap S \neq \emptyset$ ,  $V(H) \cap B$  is a clique cut-set of  $H$  and therefore  $H$  is not a hole. (A *clique cut-set* of a connected graph is a clique whose deletion makes disconnected.) Thus,  $|V(H)| = 5$ . Since  $S$  is a good modulator of  $G$ ,  $|V(H) \cap S| = 2$ ,  $|V(H) \cap B| = 1$ , and  $|V(H) \cap V(D)| = 2$ , a contradiction, because no obstruction has a cut vertex partitioning its vertex set into two sets both having size 2.  $\square$

We present two reduction rules to reduce the number of bags of  $G \setminus S$ .

**Reduction Rule 7 (R7).** *Given an instance  $(G, k)$  with  $k > 0$  and a non-empty good modulator  $S$  of  $G$ , let  $B$  be a non-empty true twin-set in  $G \setminus S$ . If  $G \setminus (S \cup B)$  has distinct components  $D_1, \dots, D_{k+4}$  such that  $N_G(V(D_1)) = \dots = N_G(V(D_{k+4}))$ , and either  $V(D_1) \cup \dots \cup V(D_{k+4}) \subseteq N_G(B)$ , or  $\emptyset \neq V(D_i) \cap N_G(B) \neq V(D_i)$  for each  $i \in \{1, \dots, k+4\}$ , then replace  $(G, k)$  with  $(G \setminus V(D_1), k)$ .*

To show that (R7) is safe, we will use the following two lemmas. Lemma 6.2 will be useful because it implies that for a good modulator  $S$  of  $G$ , a subset  $B$  of  $V(G) \setminus S$  is a true twin-set in  $G \setminus S$  if and only if it is a true twin-set in  $G$ .

**Lemma 6.2.** *Let  $G$  be a 3-leaf power having a vertex  $v$  such that  $G \setminus v$  is connected and incomplete. Then vertices  $t_1$  and  $t_2$  in  $V(G) \setminus \{v\}$  are true twins in  $G$  if and only if  $t_1$  and  $t_2$  are true twins in  $G \setminus v$ .*

*Proof.* It is clear that if  $t_1$  and  $t_2$  are true twins in  $G$ , then so are in  $G \setminus v$ .

Conversely, suppose that  $t_1$  and  $t_2$  are true twins in  $G \setminus v$ , and  $v$  is adjacent to  $t_1$ , and non-adjacent to  $t_2$ . Note that  $|N_G(t_2)| \geq 2$ , because otherwise  $G \setminus v$  is isomorphic to  $K_2$ .

If  $N_G(t_2)$  is a clique, then  $G \setminus v$  has at least one vertex not in  $N_G(t_2)$ , because otherwise  $G \setminus v$  is complete. Thus,  $G$  has an edge  $xy$  such that  $x$  is adjacent to both  $t_1$  and  $t_2$ , and  $y$  is non-adjacent to both  $t_1$  and  $t_2$ , because  $G \setminus v$  is connected. Then  $G[\{v, x, y, t_1, t_2\}]$  is isomorphic to the gem if both  $x$  and  $y$  are adjacent to  $v$ , the bull if both  $x$  and  $y$  are non-adjacent to  $v$ , and the dart if  $x$  is adjacent to  $v$  and  $y$  is non-adjacent to  $v$ , and has a hole of length 4 if  $x$  is non-adjacent to  $v$  and  $y$  is adjacent to  $v$ , a contradiction, because it is an induced subgraph of  $G$ .

Therefore,  $t_2$  has distinct neighbors  $x$  and  $y$  such that  $x$  is non-adjacent to  $y$ . Then  $G[\{v, x, y, t_1, t_2\}]$  has a hole of length 4 if both  $x$  and  $y$  are adjacent to  $v$ , and is isomorphic to the gem if exactly one of  $x$  and  $y$  is adjacent to  $v$ ,

and the dart if both  $x$  and  $y$  are non-adjacent to  $v$ , a contradiction, because it is an induced subgraph of  $G$ .  $\square$

**Lemma 6.3.** *Let  $(A, B)$  be a complete split of a graph  $G$ , and  $S$  be a non-empty good modulator of  $G$ . If  $G$  has an obstruction  $H$ , and  $S \subseteq B \setminus N(A)$ , then  $H$  has at most one vertex in  $A$ .*

*Proof.* Suppose not. Since  $S$  is a good modulator of  $G$ ,  $H$  has at least two vertices in  $S$ . Thus,  $H$  has vertices in both  $A$  and  $B$ . Since  $(A, B)$  is a complete split of  $G$ ,  $H$  is not a hole by Lemma 5.1, and therefore  $|V(H)| = 5$ . Then  $|V(H) \cap N(A)| \leq 5 - |V(H) \cap A| - |V(H) \cap S| \leq 5 - 2 - 2$ , a contradiction, because no obstruction has a cut vertex partitioning its vertex set into two sets both having size 2.  $\square$

*Proof of Safeness of (R $\gamma$ ).* We need to show that if  $(G \setminus V(D_1), k)$  is a yes-instance, then so is  $(G, k)$ . Suppose that  $G \setminus V(D_1)$  has a modulator  $S'$  of size at most  $k$ , and  $G \setminus S'$  has an obstruction  $H$ . Since  $G \setminus (V(D_1) \cup S')$  is a 3-leaf power,  $H$  has at least one vertex of  $D_1$ . Since  $S$  is a good modulator of  $G$ ,  $G \setminus (S \setminus \{v\})$  is a 3-leaf power for each vertex  $v$  in  $S$ . Thus, if  $v$  has a neighbor in a true twin-set  $X$  in  $G \setminus S$ , then  $\{v\}$  is complete to  $X$  by Lemma 6.2. This means that every true twin-set in  $G \setminus S$  is a true twin-set in  $G$  as well.

We claim that for each  $i \in \{1, \dots, k+4\}$ ,  $V(D_i) \cap N_G(B)$  is a true twin-set in  $G \setminus S$ . Suppose that  $V(D_i) \cap N_G(B)$  contains two vertices  $x$  and  $y$  such that  $x$  is non-adjacent to  $y$ . Let  $P$  be an induced path in  $D_i$  from  $x$  to  $y$ . We may assume that  $P$  has length exactly 2 by Lemma 2.6. Let  $z$  be a common neighbor of  $x$  and  $y$  in  $V(P)$ . We may assume that  $z \in N_G(B)$ , because otherwise  $V(P)$  with a vertex in  $B$  induces a hole of length 4. Then for a vertex  $v$  in  $B$ , and  $v'$  in  $V(D_j) \cap N_G(B)$  for some  $j \in \{1, \dots, k+4\} \setminus \{i\}$ ,  $G[\{v, v', x, y, z\}]$  is isomorphic to the dart, contradicting the assumption that  $S$  is a modulator of  $G$ . Therefore,  $V(D_i) \cap N_G(B)$  is a clique. Now, suppose that  $G \setminus S$  has a vertex  $w$  adjacent to a vertex  $t_1 \in V(D_i) \cap N_G(B)$  and non-adjacent to a vertex  $t_2 \in V(D_i) \cap N_G(B)$ . Note that  $w$  is a vertex of  $D_i \setminus N_G(B)$ . Then for a vertex  $v$  in  $B$  and a vertex  $v'$  of  $V(D_j) \cap N_G(B)$  for some  $j \in \{1, \dots, k+4\} \setminus \{i\}$ ,  $G[\{v, v', w, t_1, t_2\}]$  is isomorphic to the bull, a contradiction, and this proves the claim.

Suppose that  $V(D_1) \cup \dots \cup V(D_{k+4}) \subseteq N_G(B)$ . By (O1), for each  $i \in \{1, \dots, k+4\}$ ,  $D_i$  has at most one vertex of  $H$ . By (O2), at most three of  $D_1, \dots, D_{k+4}$  have vertices of  $H$ . Since  $|S'| \leq k$ , one of  $D_2, \dots, D_{k+4}$ , say  $D_j$ , has no vertices in  $S' \cup V(H)$ . Let  $t$  be a vertex in  $D_j$ . Since  $N_G(V(D_1)) = N_G(V(D_j))$ ,  $s$  and  $t$  have the same set of neighbors in  $V(H)$ .

Then  $G[(V(H)\setminus\{s\})\cup\{t\}]$  is isomorphic to  $H$ , a contradiction, because it is an induced subgraph of  $G\setminus(V(D_1)\cup S')$ .

Therefore,  $\emptyset \neq V(D_i) \cap N_G(B) \neq V(D_i)$  for each  $i \in \{1, \dots, k+4\}$ . We first show that  $D_i \setminus N_G(B)$  has no neighbors of  $S$ . Suppose that  $D_i \setminus N_G(B)$  has a neighbor  $p_i$  of some vertex  $v$  in  $S$ . Let  $j \in \{1, \dots, k+4\} \setminus \{i\}$ . Since  $N_G(V(D_i)) = N_G(V(D_j))$ ,  $D_j$  has a neighbor  $p_j$  of  $v$ . Since some vertex in  $B$  has neighbors in both  $D_i$  and  $D_j$ ,  $G \setminus S$  has a path  $P$  from  $p_i$  to  $p_j$ . Note that the length of  $P$  is at least 3, because  $p_i$  is not in  $N_G(B)$ . Since  $v$  is adjacent to both ends of  $P$ ,  $G[V(P) \cup \{v\}]$  is not distance-hereditary by Lemma 2.6, a contradiction, because it is an induced subgraph of  $G \setminus (S \setminus \{v\})$ , and this proves the claim.

For each  $i \in \{1, \dots, k+4\}$ , since  $V(D_i) \cap N_G(B)$  is a true twin-set in  $G$ ,  $H$  has at most one vertex in  $V(D_i) \cap N_G(B)$  by (O1). Let  $D_{i,1}, \dots, D_{i,m(i)}$  be the components of  $D_i \setminus N_G(B)$  for each  $i \in \{1, \dots, k+4\}$ . We claim that for each  $j \in \{1, \dots, m(i)\}$ , if  $|V(D_{i,j})| \geq 2$ , then  $(V(D_{i,j}), V(G) \setminus V(D_{i,j}))$  is a complete split of  $G$ . Since  $V(D_i) \cap N_G(B)$  is a true twin-set, and  $D_i \setminus N_G(B)$  has no neighbors of  $S$ , it suffices to show that  $N_G(N_G(B)) \cap V(D_{i,j})$  is a clique. Suppose that  $N_G(N_G(B)) \cap V(D_{i,j})$  contains vertices  $x$  and  $y$  such that  $x$  and  $y$  are non-adjacent. Let  $P$  be an induced path in  $D_{i,j}$  from  $x$  to  $y$ . We may assume that  $P$  has length exactly 2 by Lemma 2.6. Let  $z$  be a common neighbor of  $x$  and  $y$  in  $V(P)$ . We may assume that  $z \in N_G(N_G(B))$ , because otherwise  $P$  with a vertex  $v$  in  $N_G(B) \cap V(D_i)$  induces a hole of length 4. Then for a vertex  $v'$  in  $B$ ,  $G[\{v, v', x, y, z\}]$  is isomorphic to the dart, a contradiction, and this proves the claim.

Therefore, each component of  $D_i \setminus N_G(B)$  has at most one vertex of  $H$  by Lemma 6.3. Each  $V(D_i) \cap N_G(B)$  has at most one vertex of  $H$ , because  $V(D_i) \cap N_G(B)$  is a true twin-set. Therefore, at most one component of  $D_i \setminus N_G(B)$  has a vertex of  $H$ , because  $H$  cannot have false twins of degree at most 1. By (O2), at most three of  $D_1, \dots, D_{k+4}$  have vertices of  $H$ . Since  $|S'| \leq k$ , one of  $D_2, \dots, D_{k+4}$ , say  $D_i$ , has no vertices in  $S' \cup V(H)$ . Note that  $H$  has a vertex  $s_1$  in  $V(D_1) \cap N_G(B)$ , because  $D_1 \setminus N_G(B)$  has no neighbors of  $S$ ,  $H$  is connected, and has vertices in both  $S$  and  $V(D_1)$ . Let  $t_1 t_2$  be an edge of  $D_i$  such that  $t_1 \in V(D_i) \cap N_G(B)$  and  $t_2 \in V(D_i) \setminus N_G(B)$ . Since  $N_G(V(D_1)) = N_G(V(D_i))$ , and both  $V(D_1) \cap N_G(B)$  and  $V(D_i) \cap N_G(B)$  are true twin-sets,  $s_1$  and  $t_1$  have the same set of neighbors in  $V(H) \setminus V(D_1)$ . If  $H$  has a vertex  $s_2$  in  $V(D_1) \setminus N_G(B)$ , then  $V(D_1) \cap V(H) = \{s_1, s_2\}$ , because both  $V(D_1) \cap N_G(B)$  and  $V(D_1) \setminus N_G(B)$  have at most one vertex of  $H$ . Then  $G[(V(H) \setminus \{s_1, s_2\}) \cup \{t_1, t_2\}]$  is isomorphic to  $H$ , a contradiction, because it is an induced subgraph of  $G \setminus (V(D_1) \cup S')$ . Therefore,  $H$  has no vertices in  $V(D_1) \setminus N_G(B)$ . Then  $G[(V(H) \setminus \{s_1\}) \cup \{t_1\}]$  is isomorphic to  $H$ ,

a contradiction, because it is an induced subgraph of  $G \setminus (V(D_1) \cup S')$ .  $\square$

**Reduction Rule 8 (R8).** *Given an instance  $(G, k)$  with  $k > 0$  and a non-empty good modulator  $S$  of  $G$ , let  $B_1, \dots, B_m$  be pairwise disjoint non-empty true twin-sets in  $G \setminus S$  for  $m \geq 6$  such that  $N_G(B_i) = B_{i-1} \cup B_{i+1}$  for each  $i \in \{2, \dots, m-1\}$ . Let  $\ell$  be an integer in  $\{3, \dots, m-2\}$  such that  $|B_\ell| \leq |B_i|$  for each  $i \in \{3, \dots, m-2\}$ , and  $G'$  be a graph obtained from  $G \setminus ((B_3 \cup \dots \cup B_{m-2}) \setminus B_\ell)$  by making every vertex in  $B_\ell$  adjacent to all vertices in  $B_2 \cup B_{m-1}$ . Then replace  $(G, k)$  with  $(G', k)$ .*

To show that (R8) is safe, we will use the following two lemmas.

**Lemma 6.4.** *Let  $G$  be a graph with disjoint true twin-sets  $B_1, \dots, B_m$  for  $m \geq 5$  such that  $N(B_i) = B_{i-1} \cup B_{i+1}$  for each  $i \in \{2, \dots, m-1\}$ . Then  $G$  is a 3-leaf power if and only if  $G \setminus (B_3 \cup \dots \cup B_{m-2})$  is a 3-leaf power, and has no paths from a vertex in  $B_2$  to a vertex in  $B_{m-1}$ .*

*Proof.* It is clear that if  $G$  is a 3-leaf power, then  $G \setminus (B_3 \cup \dots \cup B_{m-2})$  is a 3-leaf power, and has no paths from a vertex in  $B_2$  to a vertex in  $B_{m-1}$ , because otherwise  $G$  has a hole.

Conversely, suppose that  $G \setminus (B_3 \cup \dots \cup B_{m-2})$  is a 3-leaf power, and has no paths from a vertex in  $B_2$  to a vertex in  $B_{m-1}$ , and  $G$  has an obstruction  $H$ . Since  $G \setminus (B_3 \cup \dots \cup B_{m-2})$  is a 3-leaf power,  $H$  has at least one vertex in  $B_3 \cup \dots \cup B_{m-2}$ . For each  $i \in \{1, \dots, m\}$ , since  $B_i$  is a true twin-set in  $G$ ,  $H$  has at most one vertex in  $B_i$  by (O1). Then every vertex of  $H$  in  $B_2 \cup \dots \cup B_{m-1}$  has degree at most 2 in  $H$ . If  $H$  has a vertex  $v$  in  $B_j$  for some  $j \in \{3, \dots, m-2\}$ , then both  $B_{j-1}$  and  $B_{j+1}$  have vertices of  $H$  by (O5). This means that  $B_i$  contains exactly one vertex of  $H$  for each  $i \in \{2, \dots, m-1\}$ . Then  $H$  has vertices in each  $B_1$  and  $B_m$  as well by (O5). Thus,  $V(H) \cap (B_2 \cup \dots \cup B_{m-1})$  contains at least three vertices of degree 2 in  $H$ . Then  $H$  is a hole by (O6), a contradiction, because  $H \setminus (B_3 \cup \dots \cup B_{m-2})$  is a path in  $G \setminus (B_3 \cup \dots \cup B_{m-2})$  from a vertex in  $B_2$  to a vertex in  $B_{m-1}$ . Therefore,  $G$  is a 3-leaf power.  $\square$

**Lemma 6.5.** *If  $G$  has a modulator  $S$  and a true twin-set  $X$  such that  $X \setminus S$  is non-empty, then  $S \setminus X$  is a modulator of  $G$ .*

*Proof.* We may assume that  $S \cap X$  is non-empty. Suppose that  $G \setminus (S \setminus X)$  has an obstruction  $H$ . Since  $G \setminus S$  is a 3-leaf power,  $H$  has at least one vertex in  $S \cap X$ . Then  $H$  has exactly one vertex  $v$  in  $S \cap X$  by (O1). Let  $w$  be a vertex in  $X \setminus S$ . Then  $G[(V(H) \setminus \{v\}) \cup \{w\}]$  is isomorphic to  $H$ , a contradiction, because it is an induced subgraph of  $G \setminus S$ .  $\square$



*Proof of Safeness of (R8).* First, let us show that if  $(G, k)$  is a yes-instance, then so is  $(G', k)$ . Suppose that  $G$  has a minimal modulator  $S'$  of size at most  $k$ . Since  $S'$  is minimal,  $S' \cap B_i = \emptyset$  or  $S' \cap B_i = B_i$  for each  $i \in \{1, \dots, m\}$  by Lemma 6.5. We claim that if  $S' \cap (B_1 \cup \dots \cup B_m)$  is empty, then  $S'$  is a modulator of  $G'$ . Since  $G \setminus S'$  is a 3-leaf power,  $G \setminus (B_3 \cup \dots \cup B_{m-2} \cup S')$  is a 3-leaf power, and has no paths from a vertex in  $B_2$  to a vertex in  $B_{m-1}$  by Lemma 6.4. Since  $G \setminus (B_3 \cup \dots \cup B_{m-2} \cup S')$  is isomorphic to  $G' \setminus (B_\ell \cup S')$ ,  $G' \setminus S'$  is a 3-leaf power by Lemma 6.4, and this proves the claim.

We claim that if  $S' \cap (B_1 \cup B_2 \cup B_{m-1} \cup B_m)$  is non-empty, then  $S' \cap V(G')$  is a modulator of  $G'$ . Suppose that  $G' \setminus (S' \cap V(G'))$  has an obstruction  $H$ . Since  $G \setminus (B_3 \cup \dots \cup B_{m-2} \cup S')$  is a 3-leaf power, and is isomorphic to  $G' \setminus (B_\ell \cup (S' \cap V(G')))$ ,  $G' \setminus (B_\ell \cup (S' \cap V(G')))$  is a 3-leaf power. Therefore,  $H$  has at least one vertex in  $B_\ell$ . For each  $i \in \{1, 2, \ell, m-1, m\}$ , since  $B_i$  is a true twin-set in  $G'$ ,  $H$  has at most one vertex in  $B_i$  by (O1). Then every vertex of  $H$  in  $B_2 \cup B_\ell \cup B_{m-1}$  has degree at most 2 in  $H$ . Thus, for each  $i \in \{1, 2, \ell, m-1, m\}$ ,  $B_i$  contains exactly one vertex of  $H$  by (O5). Then  $S' \cap V(G')$  contains at least one vertex of  $H$ , a contradiction, because  $H$  is an induced subgraph of  $G' \setminus (S' \cap V(G'))$ , and this proves the claim.

Thus, we may assume that  $S' \cap (B_1 \cup B_2 \cup B_{m-1} \cup B_m)$  is empty, and  $S' \cap (B_3 \cup \dots \cup B_{m-2})$  is non-empty. Let  $T := (S' \setminus (B_3 \cup \dots \cup B_{m-2})) \cup B_\ell$ . Since  $G \setminus (B_3 \cup \dots \cup B_{m-2} \cup S')$  is a 3-leaf power, and is isomorphic to  $G' \setminus T$ ,  $G' \setminus T$  is a 3-leaf power. Then  $B_i \subseteq S'$  for some  $i \in \{3, \dots, m-2\}$ , and therefore  $|T| = |T \setminus (B_3 \cup \dots \cup B_{m-2})| + |B_\ell| \leq |S' \setminus (B_3 \cup \dots \cup B_{m-2})| + |B_i| \leq |S'| \leq k$ . Therefore, if  $(G, k)$  is a yes-instance, then so is  $(G', k)$ .

Secondly, we will show that if  $(G', k)$  is a yes-instance, then so is  $(G, k)$ . Suppose that  $G'$  has a minimal modulator  $S'$  of size at most  $k$ . Since  $S'$  is minimal,  $S' \cap B_i = \emptyset$  or  $S' \cap B_i = B_i$  for each  $i \in \{1, 2, \ell, m-1, m\}$  by Lemma 6.5. We claim that  $S'$  is a modulator of  $G$ .

Since  $G' \setminus S'$  is a 3-leaf power, if  $S' \cap (B_1 \cup B_2 \cup B_{m-1} \cup B_m)$  is empty, then  $G' \setminus (B_\ell \cup S')$  is a 3-leaf power, and has no paths from a vertex in  $B_2$  to a vertex in  $B_{m-1}$  by Lemma 6.4. Since  $G' \setminus (B_\ell \cup S')$  is isomorphic to  $G \setminus (B_3 \cup \dots \cup B_{m-2} \cup S')$ ,  $G \setminus S'$  is a 3-leaf power by Lemma 6.4.

Thus, we may assume that  $S' \cap (B_1 \cup B_2 \cup B_{m-1} \cup B_m)$  is non-empty, and  $G' \setminus S'$  has an obstruction  $H$ . Since  $G' \setminus (B_\ell \cup S')$  is a 3-leaf power, and is isomorphic to  $G \setminus (B_3 \cup \dots \cup B_{m-2} \cup S')$ ,  $G \setminus (B_3 \cup \dots \cup B_{m-2} \cup S')$  is a 3-leaf power. Therefore,  $H$  has at least one vertex in  $B_3 \cup \dots \cup B_{m-2}$ . For each  $i \in \{1, \dots, m\}$ , since  $B_i$  is a true twin-set in  $G$ ,  $H$  has at most one vertex in  $B_i$  by (O1). Then every vertex of  $H$  in  $B_2 \cup \dots \cup B_{m-1}$  has degree at most 2 in  $H$ . If  $H$  has a vertex  $v$  in  $B_j$  for some  $j \in \{3, \dots, m-2\}$ , then both

$B_{j-1}$  and  $B_{j+1}$  have vertices of  $H$  by (O5). This means that  $B_i$  contains exactly one vertex of  $H$  for each  $i \in \{2, \dots, m-1\}$  by (O5), and both  $B_1$  and  $B_m$  have vertices of  $H$  as well by (O5). Thus,  $S'$  contains at least one vertex of  $H$ , a contradiction, and this proves the claim. Therefore, if  $(G', k)$  is a yes-instance, then so is  $(G, k)$ .  $\square$

Now, we are ready to prove that after applying some reduction rules exhaustively to  $(G, k)$  with a good modulator  $S$  of  $G$ , each incomplete component of  $G \setminus S$  has bounded size.

**Proposition 6.6.** *Given an instance  $(G, k)$  with  $k > 0$  and a non-empty good modulator  $S$  of  $G$ , if (R2), (R5), (R6), (R7), and (R8) are not applicable to  $(G, k)$ , then each incomplete component of  $G \setminus S$  has at most  $(k+1)(k+4)|S|(|S|+2k+14)$  vertices.*

To prove Proposition 6.6, we will use the following lemma and its corollary.

**Lemma 6.7.** *Let  $G$  be a 3-leaf power. If  $G$  has a vertex  $v$  of degree at least 1 such that  $G \setminus v$  is a tree, then  $G \setminus v$  has a vertex  $u$  such that  $N_G(v) = \{u\}$  or  $N_G(v) = N_G[u] \setminus \{v\}$ .*

*Proof.* We may assume that  $v$  has at least two neighbors, and  $G \setminus v$  has at least three vertices, because otherwise the statement clearly holds.

If  $v$  has exactly two neighbors  $u_1$  and  $u_2$ , then  $u_1$  and  $u_2$  are adjacent, because otherwise  $G$  has a hole. Since  $G \setminus v$  has at least three vertices, one of  $u_1$  and  $u_2$ , say  $u_2$ , is not a leaf of  $G \setminus v$ . If  $u_1$  is not a leaf of  $G \setminus v$ , then for a neighbor  $u'_1$  of  $u_1$  different from  $u_2$  and a neighbor  $u'_2$  of  $u_2$  different from  $u_1$ ,  $G[\{v, u_1, u'_1, u_2, u'_2\}]$  is isomorphic to the bull, a contradiction. Therefore,  $u_1$  is a leaf of  $G \setminus v$ , and  $N_G(v) = N_G[u_1] \setminus \{v\}$ .

If  $v$  has at least three neighbors, then  $G[N_G(v)]$  is connected, because otherwise  $G$  has a hole. If  $v$  has distinct neighbors  $u_1, u_2, u_3$ , and  $u_4$  inducing a path, then  $G[\{v, u_1, u_2, u_3, u_4\}]$  is isomorphic to the gem, a contradiction. Therefore,  $G \setminus v$  has a vertex  $u$  such that  $N_G(v) \subseteq N_G(u)$ . If  $u$  has a neighbor  $u_1$  that is non-adjacent to  $v$ , then for distinct neighbors  $u_2$  and  $u_3$  of  $v$  different from  $u$ ,  $G[\{v, u, u_1, u_2, u_3\}]$  is isomorphic to the dart, a contradiction. Therefore, every neighbor of  $u$  different from  $v$  is adjacent to  $v$ , and  $N_G(v) = N_G[u] \setminus \{v\}$ .  $\square$

**Corollary 6.8.** *Let  $G$  be a 3-leaf power. If  $G$  has a vertex  $v$  of degree at least 1 such that  $G \setminus v$  is connected, then  $G \setminus v$  has a true twin-set  $B$  such that  $N_G(v) = B$  or  $N_G(v) = N_G[B] \setminus \{v\}$ .*

*Proof.* We may assume that  $G \setminus v$  is incomplete. Then every true twin-set in  $G \setminus v$  is also a true twin-set in  $G$  by Lemma 6.2. We proceed by induction on  $|G|$ . Suppose that  $G \setminus v$  has true twins  $u$  and  $u'$ . Since  $u$  and  $u'$  are true twins,  $G \setminus \{v, u\}$  is connected, and  $v$  has a neighbor in  $V(G) \setminus \{u\}$ . Then by applying the induction hypothesis,  $G \setminus \{u, v\}$  has a true twin-set  $B'$  such that  $N_G(v) \setminus \{u\}$  is equal to  $B'$  or  $N_G[B'] \setminus \{u, v\}$ . Let

$$B = \begin{cases} B' \cup \{u\} & \text{if } u' \in B', \\ B' & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Since  $u$  and  $u'$  are true twins in  $G \setminus v$ ,  $B$  is a true twin-set of  $G \setminus v$ . It is easy to see that if  $N_G(v) \setminus \{u\} = B'$ , then  $N_G(v) = B$ , because  $u$  and  $u'$  are true twins in  $G$ . If  $N_G(v) \setminus \{u\} = N_G[B'] \setminus \{u, v\}$ , then  $N_G[B'] \setminus \{v\} = N_G[B] \setminus \{v\}$  by the same reason.

Thus, we may assume that  $G \setminus v$  has no true twins. By Theorem 2.4, since  $G \setminus v$  is connected,  $G \setminus v$  is a tree. Then by Lemma 6.7, the statement holds.  $\square$

*Proof of Proposition 6.6.* Let  $C$  be an incomplete component of  $G \setminus S$  with a tree-clique decomposition  $(F, \{B_u : u \in V(F)\})$ . Since  $S$  is a good modulator of  $G$ ,  $G[V(C) \cup \{v\}]$  is a 3-leaf power for each vertex  $v$  in  $S$ . Thus, if  $S$  has a vertex  $w$  having a neighbor in a bag  $B$  of  $C$ , then  $\{w\}$  is complete to  $B$  by Lemma 6.2. This means that every bag of  $C$  is a true twin-set in  $G$ . Since (R5) is not applicable to  $(G, k)$ , each bag of  $C$  contains at most  $k + 1$  vertices. Therefore, in the remaining of this proof, we are going to bound the number of bags of  $C$ .

**Claim 1.** We claim that the maximum degree of  $F$  is at most  $|S| + 2k + 6$ .

Suppose that  $F$  has a node  $u$  of degree at least  $|S| + 2k + 7$  in  $F$ . For each vertex  $w$  in  $S$ , if at least two components of  $C \setminus B_u$  have neighbors of  $w$ , then all components of  $C \setminus B_u$  have neighbors of  $w$  by Corollary 6.8. Thus, for each vertex  $w$  in  $S$ , we can choose a component of  $C \setminus B_u$  such that either all other components of  $C \setminus B_u$  have neighbors of  $w$ , or no other components of  $C \setminus B_u$  have neighbors of  $w$ . Since  $C \setminus B_u$  has at least  $|S| + 2k + 7$  components,  $C \setminus B_u$  has distinct components  $D_1, \dots, D_{2k+7}$  such that for each vertex  $w$  in  $S$ , either all or none of them have neighbors of  $w$ . Thus,  $N_G(V(D_1)) = \dots = N_G(V(D_{2k+7}))$ . By the pigeonhole principle,  $V(D_i) \subseteq N_G(B_u)$  or  $\emptyset \neq V(D_i) \cap N_G(B_u) \neq V(D_i)$  is satisfied by at least  $k + 4$  values of  $i$ , contradicting the assumption that (R7) is not applicable to  $(G, k)$ , and this proves the claim.

Let  $X$  be the set of leaves of  $F$  whose bags are anti-complete to  $S$ .

**Claim 2.** We claim that if  $u$  is a node of  $F \setminus X$  having degree at most 1 in  $F \setminus X$ , then  $B_u$  contains a neighbor of  $S$ .

If  $N_F(u) \subseteq X$ , then  $B_u$  contains a neighbor of  $S$ , because otherwise  $C$  has no neighbors of  $S$ , and (R2) is applicable to  $(G, k)$ . If  $N_F(u) \setminus X$  is non-empty, then  $N_F(u) \setminus X$  contains exactly one node  $u_1$ , because  $u$  has degree at most 1 in  $F \setminus X$ . If  $B_u$  contains no neighbors of  $S$ , then (R6) is applicable to  $(G, k)$  by taking  $B_{u_1}$  as  $B$ . Therefore,  $B_u$  contains a neighbor of  $S$ , and this proves the claim.

For each vertex  $v$  in  $S$ , let  $X_v$  be the set of nodes of  $F \setminus X$  whose bags contain neighbors of  $v$ ,  $S_1$  be the set of vertices  $v$  in  $S$  such that  $X_v$  contains some leaf of  $F \setminus X$ , and  $S_2 := S \setminus S_1$ . Let  $F'$  be a tree obtained from  $F \setminus X$  by contracting all edges in  $F[X_v]$  for each vertex  $v$  in  $S$ . Note that  $F'$  has at most  $|S_1|$  leaves, and therefore it has at most  $\max(|S_1| - 2, 0)$  branching nodes. Let  $Y$  be the set of nodes of  $F'$  which come from  $X_v$  for some vertex  $v \in S$ , and  $Z$  be the set of branching nodes of  $F'$ . Then  $|Y \cup Z| \leq |Y| + |Z| \leq |S| + \max(|S_1| - 2, 0) \leq 2|S|$ . Since (R8) is not applicable to  $(G, k)$ , each component of  $F' \setminus (Y \cup Z)$  has at most three nodes. Therefore,  $|V(F' \setminus (Y \cup Z))| \leq 6|S|$ . Then  $|V(F \setminus X)|$  is at most

$$\begin{aligned} |Y|(|S| + 2k + 7) + |Z| + |V(F' \setminus (Y \cup Z))| &\leq |S|(|S| + 2k + 7) + |S| + 6|S| \\ &= |S|(|S| + 2k + 14). \end{aligned}$$

Since (R7) is not applicable to  $(G, k)$ , each node of  $F \setminus X$  is adjacent to at most  $k + 3$  nodes in  $X$ . Thus,  $|V(F)| \leq (k + 4)|S|(|S| + 2k + 14)$ . By (R5), each bag of  $C$  has at most  $k + 1$  nodes. Therefore,  $|V(C)| \leq (k + 1)(k + 4)|S|(|S| + 2k + 14)$ .  $\square$

## 7 The proof of the main theorem

In this section, we prove Theorem 1.2.

*Proof of Theorem 1.2.* By Theorem 2.2, we can find all maximal true twin-sets in a 3-leaf power in linear time. Thus, we can apply (R2),  $\dots$ , (R8) in polynomial time to an input instance  $(G, k)$  with a good modulator  $S$  of  $G$  by investigating small subsets of  $V(G)$  or true twin-sets in  $G \setminus S$ . Therefore, Algorithm 1 is a polynomial-time algorithm.

We claim that for the instance  $(G, k)$  obtained in Line 10,  $G$  has at most  $O(k^2|S|^6)$  vertices. Note that  $|S| \geq k + 1$ . By Proposition 5.6,  $G \setminus S$  has at most  $2(k + 2)|S|^2$  non-trivial components. By Proposition 6.1, each complete component of  $G \setminus S$  has at most  $2(k + 3)|S|^4/3$  vertices. By Proposition 6.6,

---

**Algorithm 1** Kernelization for 3-LEAF POWER DELETION

---

```
1: function COMPRESS( $G, k$ )
2:   if  $k = 0$  then
3:     if  $G$  is a 3-leaf power then return  $(K_1, 0)$ .
4:     else return  $(K_{2,2}, 0)$ .
5:     end if
6:   else Find an instance  $(G', k')$  equivalent to  $(G, k)$ , and a good modu-
7:     lator  $S$  of  $G'$  having size  $O(\min(k^3 \log k, k^2 \log^2 |V(G)|))$  by Lemma 4.5.
8:     if  $|S| \leq k$  then return  $(K_1, 0)$ .
9:     else if  $(G', k') \neq (G, k)$  then return COMPRESS( $G', k'$ ).
10:    else if Rule (R $i$ ) for some  $i \in \{2, \dots, 8\}$  is applicable to  $(G, k)$ 
11:    then return COMPRESS( $G'', k''$ ) where  $(G'', k'')$  is the resulting instance
12:    obtained from  $(G, k)$  with  $S$  by applying the rule (R $i$ ).
13:    else return  $(G, k)$ .
14:  end if
15: end function
```

---

each incomplete component of  $G \setminus S$  has at most  $(k+1)(k+4)|S|(|S|+2k+14)$  vertices. Therefore, each non-trivial component of  $G \setminus S$  has at most  $O(k|S|^4)$  vertices. Then the union of all non-trivial components of  $G \setminus S$  has at most  $2(k+2)|S|^2 \cdot O(k|S|^4) = O(k^2|S|^6)$  vertices. By Proposition 5.7,  $G \setminus S$  has at most  $2(k+3)|S|^4/3$  isolated vertices. Therefore,  $|V(G)| \leq |S| + 2(k+3)|S|^4/3 + O(k^2|S|^6) = O(k^2|S|^6)$ , and this proves the claim.

For an instance  $(G, k)$  obtained from Line 10,  $|S|$  is at most

$$\begin{aligned} O(\min(k^3 \log k, k^2 \log^2 |V(G)|)) &\leq O(\min(k^3 \log k, k^2 \log^2 (k^2 |S|^6))) \\ &\leq O(\min(k^3 \log k, k^2 \log^2 (k^2 (k^3 \log k)^6))) \\ &\leq O(\min(k^3 \log k, k^2 \log^2 k)) = O(k^2 \log^2 k) \end{aligned}$$

by Lemma 4.5 and the claim. Therefore,  $G$  has at most  $O(k^{14} \log^{12} k)$  vertices.  $\square$

## 8 Conclusions

In this paper, we show that 3-LEAF POWER DELETION admits a fixed-parameter tractable algorithm with running time as  $O(37^k |V(G)|^7 (|V(G)| + |E(G)|))$ , and a kernel with  $O(k^{14} \log^{12} k)$  vertices. It would be an interesting

problem to significantly reduce the size of the kernel for 3-LEAF POWER DELETION.

For an integer  $\ell \geq 4$ , one may investigate about  $\ell$ -LEAF POWER DELETION, that is a problem of deciding whether deleting at most  $k$  vertices makes a graph an  $\ell$ -leaf power. There are linear-time algorithms to recognize 4-, 5-, or 6-leaf powers [7, 9, 16].

Gurski and Wanke [18] stated that for each  $\ell$ ,  $\ell$ -leaf powers have bounded clique-width. Rautenbach [28] presented a characterization of 4-leaf powers with no true twins as chordal graphs with ten forbidden induced subgraphs. This can be used to express, in monadic second-order logic, whether a graph is a 4-leaf power and whether there is a vertex set of size at most  $k$  whose deletion makes the graph a 4-leaf power. Therefore, by using the algorithm in [10], we deduce that 4-LEAF POWER DELETION is fixed-parameter tractable when parameterized by  $k$ , and therefore it admits a kernel. It is natural to ask whether 4-LEAF POWER DELETION admits a polynomial kernel. For  $\ell \geq 5$ , we do not know whether we can express  $\ell$ -leaf powers in monadic second-order logic. If it is true for some  $\ell$ , then not only  $\ell$ -LEAF POWER DELETION is fixed-parameter tractable, but also  $\ell$ -LEAF POWER RECOGNITION can be solved in polynomial time, which is still open for  $\ell \geq 7$ .

## References

- [1] Akanksha Agrawal, Daniel Lokshtanov, Pranabendu Misra, Saket Saurabh, and Meirav Zehavi, *Polylogarithmic approximation algorithms for weighted- $\mathcal{F}$ -deletion problems*, Approximation, randomization, and combinatorial optimization. Algorithms and techniques, LIPIcs. Leibniz Int. Proc. Inform., vol. 116, Schloss Dagstuhl. Leibniz-Zent. Inform., Wadern, 2018, pp. Art. No. 1, 15. MR 3857239
- [2] ———, *Feedback vertex set inspired kernel for chordal vertex deletion*, ACM Trans. Algorithms **15** (2019), no. 1, Art. 11, 28. MR 3914442
- [3] Hans-Jürgen Bandelt and Henry Martyn Mulder, *Distance-hereditary graphs*, J. Combin. Theory Ser. B **41** (1986), no. 2, 182–208. MR 859310
- [4] Stéphane Bessy, Fedor V. Fomin, Serge Gaspers, Christophe Paul, Anthony Perez, Saket Saurabh, and Stéphan Thomassé, *Kernels for feedback arc set in tournaments*, J. Comput. System Sci. **77** (2011), no. 6, 1071–1078. MR 2858010

- [5] Stéphane Bessy, Christophe Paul, and Anthony Perez, *Polynomial kernels for 3-leaf power graph modification problems*, Discrete Appl. Math. **158** (2010), no. 16, 1732–1744. MR 2679772
- [6] Andreas Brandstädt and Van Bang Le, *Structure and linear time recognition of 3-leaf powers*, Inform. Process. Lett. **98** (2006), no. 4, 133–138. MR 2211095
- [7] Andreas Brandstädt, Van Bang Le, and R. Sritharan, *Structure and linear-time recognition of 4-leaf powers*, ACM Trans. Algorithms **5** (2009), no. 1, Art. 11, 22. MR 2479182
- [8] Yixin Cao and Dániel Marx, *Chordal editing is fixed-parameter tractable*, Algorithmica **75** (2016), no. 1, 118–137. MR 3492058
- [9] Maw-Shang Chang and Ming-Tat Ko, *The 3-Steiner root problem*, Graph-theoretic concepts in computer science, Lecture Notes in Comput. Sci., vol. 4769, Springer, Berlin, 2007, pp. 109–120. MR 2428569
- [10] Bruno Courcelle, Johann A. Makowsky, and Udi Rotics, *Linear time solvable optimization problems on graphs of bounded clique-width*, Theory Comput. Syst. **33** (2000), no. 2, 125–150. MR 2001e:68146
- [11] William H. Cunningham, *Decomposition of directed graphs*, SIAM J. Algebraic Discrete Methods **3** (1982), no. 2, 214–228. MR 655562
- [12] Marek Cygan, Fedor V. Fomin, Łukasz Kowalik, Daniel Lokshtanov, Dániel Marx, Marcin Pilipczuk, Michał Pilipczuk, and Saket Saurabh, *Parameterized algorithms*, Springer, Cham, 2015. MR 3380745
- [13] Michael Dom, Jiong Guo, Falk Hüffner, and Rolf Niedermeier, *Error compensation in leaf power problems*, Algorithmica **44** (2006), no. 4, 363–381.
- [14] Michael Dom, Jiong Guo, Falk Hüffner, Rolf Niedermeier, and Anke Truss, *Fixed-parameter tractability results for feedback set problems in tournaments*, J. Discrete Algorithms **8** (2010), no. 1, 76–86. MR 2558881
- [15] Rodney G. Downey and Michael R. Fellows, *Fundamentals of parameterized complexity*, Texts in Computer Science, Springer, London, 2013. MR 3154461

- [16] Guillaume Ducoffe, *The 4-Steiner root problem*, Graph-theoretic concepts in computer science, Lecture Notes in Comput. Sci., vol. 11789, Springer, Berlin, 2019, pp. 14–26.
- [17] Eduard Eiben, Robert Ganian, and O-joung Kwon, *A single-exponential fixed-parameter algorithm for distance-hereditary vertex deletion*, J. Comput. System Sci. **97** (2018), 121–146. MR 3832000
- [18] Frank Gurski and Egon Wanke, *The clique-width of tree-power and leaf-power graphs (extended abstract)*, Graph-theoretic concepts in computer science, Lecture Notes in Comput. Sci., vol. 4769, Springer, Berlin, 2007, pp. 76–85. MR 2428566
- [19] Bart M. P. Jansen and Hans L. Bodlaender, *Vertex cover kernelization revisited: upper and lower bounds for a refined parameter*, Theory Comput. Syst. **53** (2013), no. 2, 263–299. MR 3063926
- [20] Bart M. P. Jansen and Marcin Pilipczuk, *Approximation and kernelization for chordal vertex deletion*, SIAM J. Discrete Math. **32** (2018), no. 3, 2258–2301. MR 3852710
- [21] Eun Jung Kim and O-joung Kwon, *A polynomial kernel for distance-hereditary vertex deletion*, Algorithms and data structures, Lecture Notes in Comput. Sci., vol. 10389, Springer, Cham, 2017, pp. 509–520. MR 3690913
- [22] ———, *Erdős-Pósa property of chordless cycles and its applications*, Proceedings of the Twenty-Ninth Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms, SIAM, Philadelphia, PA, 2018, pp. 1665–1684. MR 3775897
- [23] John M. Lewis and Mihalis Yannakakis, *The node-deletion problem for hereditary properties is NP-complete*, J. Comput. System Sci. **20** (1980), no. 2, 219–230, ACM-SIGACT Symposium on the Theory of Computing (San Diego, Calif., 1978). MR 574592
- [24] Diptapriyo Majumdar, Venkatesh Raman, and Saket Saurabh, *Kernels for structural parameterizations of vertex cover—case of small degree modulators*, 10th International Symposium on Parameterized and Exact Computation, LIPIcs. Leibniz Int. Proc. Inform., vol. 43, Schloss Dagstuhl. Leibniz-Zent. Inform., Wadern, 2015, pp. 331–342. MR 3452432



- [25] Dániel Marx, *Chordal deletion is fixed-parameter tractable*, *Algorithmica* **57** (2010), no. 4, 747–768. MR 2629495
- [26] Naomi Nishimura, Prabhakar Ragde, and Dimitrios M. Thilikos, *On graph powers for leaf-labeled trees*, *J. Algorithms* **42** (2002), no. 1, 69–108. MR 1874637
- [27] Sang-il Oum, *Rank-width and vertex-minors*, *J. Combin. Theory Ser. B* **95** (2005), no. 1, 79–100. MR 2156341
- [28] Dieter Rautenbach, *Some remarks about leaf roots*, *Discrete Math.* **306** (2006), no. 13, 1456–1461. MR 2237730