arXiv:2002.08659v1 [cs.DS] 20 Feb 2020

Maximum Edge-Colorable Subgraph and Strong Triadic Closure Parameterized by Distance to Low-Degree Graphs

Niels Grüttemeier
Philipps-Universität Marburg, Fachbereich Mathematik und Informatik, Marburg, Germany
niegru@informatik.uni-marburg.de

Christian Komusiewicz
Philipps-Universität Marburg, Fachbereich Mathematik und Informatik, Marburg, Germany
komusiewicz@informatik.uni-marburg.de

Nils Morawietz
Philipps-Universität Marburg, Fachbereich Mathematik und Informatik, Marburg, Germany
morawietz@informatik.uni-marburg.de

Abstract

Given an undirected graph G and integers c and k, the Maximum Edge-Colorable Subgraph problem asks whether we can delete at most k edges in G to obtain a graph that has a proper edge coloring with at most c colors. We show that Maximum Edge-Colorable Subgraph admits, for every fixed c, a linear-size problem kernel when parameterized by the edge deletion distance of G to a graph with maximum degree $c-1$. This parameterization measures the distance to instances that, due to Vizing's famous theorem, are trivial yes-instances. For $c \leq 4$, we also provide a linear-size kernel for the same parameterization for Multi Strong Triadic Closure, a related edge coloring problem with applications in social network analysis. We provide further results for Maximum Edge-Colorable Subgraph parameterized by the vertex deletion distance to graphs where every component has order at most c and for the list-colored versions of both problems.

2012 ACM Subject Classification Theory of computation → Parameterized complexity and exact algorithms; Theory of computation → Fixed parameter tractability

Keywords and phrases Graph coloring, social networks, parameterized complexity, kernelization

1 Introduction

Edge coloring and its many variants form a fundamental problem family in algorithmic graph theory [4, 11, 12, 13]. In the classic Edge Coloring problem, the input is a graph G and an integer c and the task is to decide whether G has a *proper edge coloring*, that is, an assignment of colors to the edges of a graph such that no pair of incident edges receives the same color, with at most c colors. The number of necessary colors for a proper edge coloring of a graph G is closely related to the degree of G: Vizing's famous theorem states that any graph G with maximum degree Δ can be edge-colored with $\Delta + 1$ colors [25], an early example of an additive approximation algorithm. Later it was shown that Edge Coloring is NP-hard for $c = 3$ [12], and in light of Vizing's result it is clear that the hard instances for $c = 3$ are exactly the subcubic graphs. Not surprisingly, the NP-hardness extends to every fixed $c \geq 3$ [20].

In the more general Maximum Edge-Colorable Subgraph (ECS) problem, we are given an additional integer k and want to decide whether we can delete at most k edges in the input graph G so that the resulting graph has a proper edge coloring with c colors. ECS is NP-hard for $c = 2$ [6] and it has received a considerable amount of interest for small constant values of c such as $c = 2$ [6, 17], $c = 3$ [17, 18, 21], and $c \leq 7$ [14]. Feige et al. [6] mention that ECS has applications in call admittance in telecommunication networks. Given

the large amount of algorithmic literature on this problem, it is surprising that there is, to the best of our knowledge, no work on fixed-parameter algorithms for ECS. This lack of interest may be rooted in the NP-hardness of Edge Coloring for every fixed $c \geq 3$, which implies that ECS is not fixed-parameter tractable with respect to $k + c$ unless P=NP.

Instead of the parameter k, we consider the parameter ξ_{c-1} which we define as the minimum number of edges that need to be deleted in the input graph to obtain a graph with maximum degree $c - 1$. This is a distance-from-triviality parameterization [10]: Due to Vizing's Theorem, the answer is always yes if the input graph has maximum degree $c - 1$. We parameterize by the edge-deletion distance to this trivial case. Observe that the number of vertices with degree at least c is at most $2\xi_{c-1}$. If we consider Edge Coloring instead of ECS, the instances with maximum degree larger than c are trivial no-instances. Thus, in non-trivial instances, the parameter ξ_{c-1} is essentially the same as the number of vertices that have degree c. This is, arguably, one of the most natural parameterizations for Edge Coloring. We achieve a kernel that has linear size for every fixed c.

▶ **Theorem 1.1.** ECS *admits a problem kernel with at most* $4\xi_{c-1} \cdot c$ *vertices and* $\mathcal{O}(\xi_{c-1} \cdot c^2)$ *edges that can be computed in* $\mathcal{O}(n + m)$ *time.*

Herein, n denotes the number of vertices of the input graph G and m denotes the number of edges. This kernel is obtained by making the following observation about the proof of Vizing's Theorem: When proving that an edge can be safely colored with one of c colors, we only need to consider the closed neighborhood of one endpoint of this edge. This allows us to show that all vertices which have degree at most $c - 1$ and only neighbors of degree at most $c - 1$ can be safely removed.

Next, we consider ECS parameterized by the size λ_c of a smallest vertex set D such that deleting D from G results in a graph where each connected component has at most c vertices. The parameter λ_c presents a different distance-from-triviality parameterization, since a graph with connected components of order at most c can trivially be colored with c edge colors. Moreover, observe that λ_c is never larger than the vertex cover number which is a popular structural parameter. Again, we obtain a linear-vertex kernel for λ_c when c is fixed.

▶ **Theorem 1.2.** ECS *admits a problem kernel with* $\mathcal{O}(c^3 \cdot \lambda_c)$ *vertices.*

We then consider Multi Strong Triadic Closure (Multi-STC) a closely related edge coloring problem with applications in social network analysis [23]. In Multi-STC, we are given a graph G and two integers k and c and aim to find a coloring of the edges with one *weak* and at most c *strong colors* such that every pair of incident edges that forms an induced path on three vertices does not receive the same strong color and the number of weak edges is at most k. The idea behind this problem is to uncover the different strong relation types in social networks by using the following assumption: if one person has for example two colleagues, then these two people know each other and should also be connected in the social network. In other words, if a vertex has two neighbors that are not adjacent to each other, then this is evidence that either the strong interaction types with these two neighbors are different or one of the interaction types is merely weak.

Combinatorically, there are two crucial differences to ECS: First, two incident edges may receive the same strong color if the subgraph induced by the endpoints is a triangle. Second, instead of deleting edges to obtain a graph that admits such a coloring, we may label edges as weak. In ECS this does not make a difference; in Multi-STC, however, deleting an edge may destroy triangles which would add an additional constraint on the coloring of the two remaining triangle edges.

Table 1 A summary of our results for the two problems. Herein, ξ_{c-1} denotes the edge-deletion distance to graphs with maximum degree at most $c-1$, and λ_c denotes the vertex-deletion distance to graphs where every connected component has order at most c.

Parameter	ECS	Multi-STC
(ξ_{c-1}, c)	$\mathcal{O}(\xi_{c-1}c)$-vertex kernel (Thm. 1.1)	$\mathcal{O}(\xi_{c-1})$-edge kernel (Thm. 4.16), if $c \leq 4$
(λ_c, c)	$\mathcal{O}(c^3 \cdot \lambda_c)$-vertex kernel (Thm. 1.2)	No poly Kernel, even for $c = 1$ [9]

In contrast to ECS, Multi-STC is NP-hard already for $c = 1$ [23]. This special case is known as Strong Triadic Closure (STC). Not surprisingly, Multi-STC is NP-hard for all fixed $c \geq 2$ [1]. Moreover, for $c \geq 3$ Multi-STC is NP-hard even if $k = 0$, that is, even if every edge has to be colored with a strong color. STC and Multi-STC have received a considerable amount of interest recently [23, 8, 9, 1, 15, 16].

Since the edge coloring for Multi-STC is a relaxed version of a proper edge coloring, we may observe that Vizing's Theorem implies the following: If the input graph G has degree at most $c-1$, then the instance is a yes-instance even for $k = 0$. Hence, it is very natural to apply the parameterization by ξ_{c-1} also for Multi-STC. We succeed to transfer the kernelization result from ECS to Multi-STC for $c \leq 4$. In fact, our result for $c = 3$ and $c = 4$ can be extended to the following more general result.

▶ **Theorem 1.3.** Multi-STC *admits a problem kernel with* $\mathcal{O}(\xi_{\lfloor \frac{c}{2} \rfloor+1} \cdot c)$ *vertices and* $\mathcal{O}(\xi_{\lfloor \frac{c}{2} \rfloor+1} \cdot c^2)$ *edges, when limited to instances with* $c \geq 3$. *The kernel can be computed in* $\mathcal{O}(n+m)$ *time.*

For $c = 5$, this gives a linear-size kernel for the parameter ξ_3, for $c = 6$, a linear-size kernel for the parameter ξ_4 and so on. Our techniques to prove Theorem 1.3 are very loosely inspired by the proof of Vizing's Theorem but in the context of Multi-STC several obstacles need to be overcome. As a result, the proof differs quite substantially from the one for ECS. Moreover, in contrast do ECS, Multi-STC does not admit a polynomial kernel when parameterized by the vertex cover number [9] which excludes almost all popular structural parameters.

We then show how far our kernelization for ξ_t can be lifted to generalizations of ECS and Multi-STC where each edge may choose its color only from a specified list of colors, denoted as Edge List ECS (EL-ECS) and Edge List Multi-STC (EL-Multi-STC). We show that for ξ_2 we obtain a linear kernel for every fixed c.

▶ **Theorem 1.4.** *For all* $c \in \mathbb{N}$, EL-ECS *and* EL-Multi-STC *admit an* $11\xi_2$*-edge and* $10\xi_2$*-vertex kernel for* EL-ECS *that can be computed in* $\mathcal{O}(n^2)$ *time.*

For $c = 3$, this extends Theorem 1.1 to the list colored version of ECS. For $c > 3$ parameterization by ξ_2 may seem a bit uninteresting compared to the results for ECS and Multi-STC. However, Theorem 1.4 is unlikely to be improved by considering ξ_t for $t > 2$.

▶ **Proposition 1.5.** EL-ECS *and* EL-Multi-STC *are NP-hard for all* $c \geq 3$ *on triangle-free cubic graphs even if* $\xi_3 = k = 0$.

A summary of our results is shown in Table 1.

Organization of the Paper. In Section 2, we set the notation for this work and present the formal definition of all problems under consideration. In Section 3, we show the kernels for ECS parameterized by the edge-deletion distance to low-degree graphs and the vertex-deletion

distance to graphs with small connected components. In Section 4, we show the kernels for Multi-STC parameterized by the edge-deletion distance to low-degree graphs. Finally, in Section 5, we consider the edge deletion distance to degree-two graphs for the problem variants with edge lists.

2 Preliminaries

Notation. We consider simple undirected graphs $G = (V, E)$ where $n := |V|$ denotes the number of vertices and $m := |E|$ denotes the number of edges in G. For a vertex $v \in V$, we denote by $N_G(v) := \{u \in V \mid \{u, v\} \in E\}$ the *open neighborhood of* v and by $N_G[v] := N_G(v) \cup \{v\}$ the *closed neighborhood of* v. For a given set $V' \subseteq V$, we define $N_G(V') := \bigcup_{v \in V'} N_G(v)$ as the *neighborhood of* V'. Moreover, let $\deg_G(v) := |N(v)|$ be the *degree* of a vertex v in G and $\Delta_G := \max_{v \in V} \deg_G(v)$ denote the *maximum degree* of G. For any two vertex sets $V_1, V_2 \subseteq V$, we let $E_G(V_1, V_2) := \{\{v_1, v_2\} \in E \mid v_1 \in V_1, v_2 \in V_2\}$ denote the set of edges between V_1 and V_2. For any vertex set $V' \subseteq V$, we let $E_G(V') := E_G(V', V')$ denote the set of edges between the vertices of V'. The *subgraph induced by a vertex set* S is denoted by $G[S] := (S, E_G(S))$. For a given vertex set $V' \subseteq V$, we let $G - V' := G[V \setminus V']$ denote the graph that we obtain after deleting the vertices of V' from G. We may omit the subscript G if the graph is clear from the context.

A *finite sequence* $A = (a_0, a_1, \ldots, a_{r-1})$ of length $r \in \mathbb{N}_0$ is an r-tuple of specific elements a_i (for example vertices or numbers). For given $j \in \{0, \ldots, r-1\}$, we refer to the jth element of a finite sequence A as $A(j)$. A *path* $P = (v_0, \ldots, v_{r-1})$ is a finite sequence of vertices $v_0, \ldots, v_{r-1} \in V$, where $\{v_i, v_{i+1}\} \in E$ for all $i \in \{0, \ldots, r-2\}$. A path P is called *vertex-simple*, if no vertex appears twice on P. A path is called *edge-simple*, if there are no distinct $i, j \in \{0, \ldots, r-2\}$ such that $\{P(i), P(i+1)\} = \{P(j), P(j+1)\}$. For a given path $P = (P(0), \ldots, P(r-1))$ we define the sets $V(P) := \{P(j) \mid j \in \{0, \ldots, r-1\}\}$ and $E(P) := \{\{P(j), P(j+1)\} \mid j \in \{0, \ldots, r-2\}\}$ as the set of vertices or edges on P.

For the standard definitions of parameterized complexity refer to [5].

Problem Definitions. We now formally define the two main problems considered in this work, ECS and Multi-STC, as well as their extensions to input graphs with edge lists.

▶ **Definition 2.1.** *A* c-colored labeling $L = (S_L^1, \ldots, S_L^c, W_L)$ *of an undirected graph* $G = (V, E)$ *is a partition of the edge set* E *into* $c+1$ *color classes. The edges in* S_L^i, $i \in \{1, \ldots, c\}$, *are* strong *and the edges in* W_L *are* weak.

1. *A* c-colored labeling L *is a* proper labeling *if there exists no pair of edges* $e_1, e_2 \in S_L^i$ *for some strong color* i, *such that* $e_1 \cap e_2 \neq \emptyset$.
2. *A* c-colored labeling L *is an* STC-labeling *if there exists no pair of edges* $\{u, v\} \in S_L^i$ *and* $\{v, w\} \in S_L^i$ *such that* $\{u, w\} \notin E$.

We consider the following two problems.

Edge-Colorable Subgraph (ECS)
Input: An undirected graph $G = (V, E)$ and integers $c \in \mathbb{N}$ and $k \in \mathbb{N}$.
Question: Is there a c-colored proper labeling L with $|W_L| \leq k$?

Multi Strong Triadic Closure (Multi-STC)
Input: An undirected graph $G = (V, E)$ and integers $c \in \mathbb{N}$ and $k \in \mathbb{N}$.
Question: Is there a c-colored STC-labeling L with $|W_L| \leq k$?

If c is clear from the context, we may call a c-colored labeling just *labeling*. Two labelings $L = (S_L^1, \dots, S_L^c, W_L)$, and $L' = (S_{L'}^1, \dots, S_{L'}^c, W_{L'})$ for the same graph $G = (V, E)$ are called *partially equal* on a set $E' \subseteq E$ if and only if for all $e \in E'$ and $i \in \{1, \dots, c\}$ it holds that $e \in S_L^i \Leftrightarrow e \in S_{L'}^i$. If two labelings L and L' are partially equal on E' we write $L|_{E'} = L'|_{E'}$. For given path $P = (P(0), \dots, P(r-1))$ and labeling $L = (S_L^1, \dots, S_L^c, W_L)$, we define the *color sequence* Q_L^P of P under L as a finite sequence $Q_L^P = (q_0, q_1, \dots, q_{r-2})$ of elements in $\{0, \dots, c\}$, such that $\{P(i), P(i+1)\} \in S_L^{q_i}$ if $q_i \geq 1$ and $\{P(i), P(i+1)\} \in W_L$ if $q_i = 0$. Throughout this work we call a c-colored STC-labeling L (or proper labeling, respectively) *optimal (for a graph G)* if the number of weak edges $|W_L|$ is minimal.

Edge-Deletion Distance to Low-Degree Graphs and Component Order Connectivity. We consider parameters related to the edge deletion-distance ξ_t to low-degree graphs and the vertex-deletion distance λ_t to graphs with small connected components; they are formally defined as follows.

First, we define the parameter ξ_t. For a given graph $G = (V, E)$ and a constant $t \in \mathbb{N}$, we call $D_t \subseteq E$ an *edge-deletion set of G and t* if the graph $(V, E \setminus D_t)$ has maximum degree t. We define the parameter ξ_t as the size of the minimum edge-deletion set of G and t. Note that an edge-deletion set of G and t of size ξ_t can be computed in polynomial time [7]. More importantly for our applications, we can compute a 2-approximation D_t' for an edge-deletion set of size ξ_t in linear time as follows: Add for each vertex v of degree at least $t+1$ an arbitrary set of $\deg(v) - t$ incident edges to D_t'. Then $|D_t'| \leq \sum_{v \in V} \max(\deg(v) - t, 0)$. This implies that D_t' is a 2-approximation since $\sum_{v \in V} \max(\deg(v) - t, 0) \leq 2\xi_t$ as every edge deletion decreases the degree of at most two vertices. A given edge-deletion set D_t induces the following important partition of the vertex set V of a graph.

▶ **Definition 2.2.** *Let $t \in \mathbb{N}$, let $G = (V, E)$ be a graph, and let $D_t \subseteq E$ be an edge-deletion set of G and t. We call $\mathscr{C} = \mathscr{C}(D_t) := \{v \in V \mid \exists e \in D_t : v \in e\}$ the set of* core vertices *and $\mathscr{P} = \mathscr{P}(D_t) := V \setminus \mathscr{C}$ the set of* periphery vertices *of G.*

Note that for arbitrary $t \in \mathbb{N}$ and G we have $|\mathscr{C}| \leq 2|D_t|$ and for every $v \in \mathscr{P}$ it holds that $\deg_G(v) \leq t$. Moreover, every vertex in $\mathscr{C}$ is incident with at most t edges in $E \setminus D_t$. In context of ECS and Multi-STC, for a given instance (G, c, k) we consider some fixed edge deletion set D_t of the input graph G and some integer t which depends on the value of c.

Second, we define the parameter λ_t. For a given graph $G = (V, E)$ and a constant $t \in \mathbb{N}$, we call $D \subseteq V$ an *order-t component cover* if every connected component in $G - D$ contains at most t vertices. Then, we define the *component order connectivity* λ_t to be the size of a minimum oder-t component cover. In context of ECS we study λ_c, for the amount of colors c. A $(c+1)$-approximation of the minimal order-c-component cover can be computed in polynomial time [19].

Note that the parameters are incomparable in the following sense: In a path P_n the parameter λ_c can be arbitrary large when n increases while $\xi_{c-1} = 0$ for all $c \geq 3$. In a star S_n the parameter ξ_{c-1} can be arbitrary large when n increases while $\lambda_c = 1$.

3 Problem Kernelizations for Edge-Colorable Subgraph

In this section, we provide problem kernels for ECS parameterized by the edge deletion distance ξ_{c-1} to graphs with maximum degree $c-1$, and the size λ_c of a minimum order-c component cover. We first show that ECS admits a kernel with $\mathcal{O}(\xi_{c-1} \cdot c)$ vertices and $\mathcal{O}(\xi_{c-1} \cdot c^2)$ edges that can be computed in $\mathcal{O}(n+m)$ time. Afterwards, we consider λ_c

and show that ECS admits a problem kernel with $\mathcal{O}(c^3\lambda_c)$ vertices, which is a linear vertex kernel for every fixed value of c. Note that if $c = 1$ we can solve ECS by computing a maximal matching in polynomial time. Hence, we assume $c \geq 2$ for the rest of this section. In this case the problem is NP-hard [6].

3.1 Edge Deletion-Distance to Low-Degree Graphs

The kernelization presented inhere is based on Vizing's Theorem [25]. Note that Vizing's Theorem implies, that an ECS instance (G, c, k) is always a yes-instance if $\xi_{c-1} = 0$. Our kernelization relies on the following lemma. This lemma is a reformulation of a known fact about edge colorings [24, Theorem 2.3] which, in turn, is based on the so-called *Vizing Fan Equation* [24, Theorem 2.1].

▶ **Lemma 3.1.** *Let $G = (V, E)$ be a graph and let $e := \{u, v\} \in E$. Moreover, let $c := \Delta_G$ and let L be a proper c-colored labeling for the graph $(V, E \setminus \{e\})$ such that $W_L = \emptyset$. If for all $Z \subseteq N_G(u)$ with $|Z| \geq 2$ and $v \in Z$ it holds that $\sum_{z \in Z}(\deg_G(z) + 1 - c) < 2$, then there exists a proper c-colored labeling L' for G such that $W_{L'} = \emptyset$.*

We now use Lemma 3.1 as a plug-in for ECS to prove the next lemma which is the main tool that we need for our kernelization. In the proof, we exploit the fact that, given any proper labeling L for a graph $G = (V, E)$, the labeling $(S_L^1, \ldots, S_L^c, \emptyset)$ is a proper labeling for the graph $(V, E \setminus W_L)$.

▶ **Lemma 3.2.** *Let $L := (S_L^1, S_L^2, \ldots, S_L^c, W_L)$ be a proper labeling with $|W_L| = k$ for a graph $G := (V, E)$. Moreover, let $e := \{u, v\} \subseteq V$ such that $e \notin E$ and let $G' := (V, E \cup \{e\})$ be obtained from G by adding e. If for one endpoint $u \in e$ it holds that every vertex $w \in N_{G'}[u]$ has degree at most $c - 1$ in G', then there exists a proper labeling L' for G' with $|W_{L'}| = k$.*

Proof. Consider the auxiliary graph $G_{\text{aux}} := (V, E \setminus W_L)$. Since L is a proper labeling for G, we conclude that $L_{\text{aux}} := (S_L^1, \ldots, S_L^c, \emptyset)$ is a proper labeling for G_{aux}. Let $H_{\text{aux}} := (V, E_H)$ where $E_H := (E \setminus W_L) \cup \{e\}$. In order to prove the lemma, we show that there exists a proper labeling L'_{aux} for H_{aux} such that $W_{L'_{\text{aux}}} = \emptyset$.

To this end, we first consider the maximum degree of H_{aux}. Observe that $\deg_{H_{\text{aux}}}(w) \leq \deg_{G'}(w)$ for all $w \in V$. Hence, the property that $\deg_{G'}(w) \leq c - 1$ for all $w \in N_{G'}[u]$ implies $\Delta_{H_{\text{aux}}} = \max(\Delta_{G_{\text{aux}}}, c - 1)$. Since L_{aux} is a proper c-colored labeling for G_{aux} we know that $\Delta_{G_{\text{aux}}} \leq c$ and therefore we have $\Delta_{H_{\text{aux}}} \leq c$. So, to find a proper c-colored labeling without weak edges for H_{aux} it suffices to consider the following cases.

Case 1: $\Delta_{H_{\text{aux}}} \leq c - 1$. Then, there exists a proper labeling L'_{aux} for H_{aux} such that $W_{L'_{\text{aux}}} = \emptyset$ due to Vizing's Theorem.

Case 2: $\Delta_{H_{\text{aux}}} = c$. In this case we can apply Lemma 3.1: Observe that $(V, E_H \setminus \{e\}) = G_{\text{aux}}$ and L_{aux} is a proper labeling for G_{aux} such that $W_{L_{\text{aux}}} = \emptyset$. Consider an arbitrary $Z \subseteq N_{H_{\text{aux}}}(u)$ with $|Z| \geq 2$ and $v \in Z$. Note that $Z \subseteq N_{H_{\text{aux}}}(u)$ implies $\deg_{H_{\text{aux}}}(z) \leq c - 1$ for all $z \in Z$. It follows that $\sum_{z \in Z}(\deg_{H_{\text{aux}}}(z) + 1 - c) < 2$. Since Z was arbitrary, Lemma 3.1 implies that there exists a proper labeling L'_{aux} for H_{aux} such that $W_{L'_{\text{aux}}} = \emptyset$.

We now define $L' := (S^1_{L'_{\text{aux}}}, S^2_{L'_{\text{aux}}}, \ldots S^c_{L'_{\text{aux}}}, W_L)$. Note that the edge set $E \cup \{e\}$ of G' can be partitioned into W_L and the edges of G'_{aux}. Together with the fact that L'_{aux} is a labeling for G'_{aux} it follows that every edge of G' belongs to exactly one color class of L'. Moreover, it obviously holds that $|W_{L'}| = |W_L| = k$. Since there is no vertex with two incident edges in the same strong color class $S^i_{L'_{\text{aux}}}$, the labeling L' is a proper labeling for G'. ◀

We now introduce the kernelization rule. Recall that $\mathscr{C}$ is the set of vertices that are incident with at least one of the ξ_{c-1} edge-deletions that transform G into a graph with maximum degree $c-1$. We make use of the fact that edges that have at least one endpoint u that is not in $\mathscr{C} \cup N(\mathscr{C})$ satisfy $\deg(w) \leq c-1$ for all $w \in N[u]$. Lemma 3.2 guarantees that these edges are not important to solve an instance of ECS.

▶ **Rule 3.1.** *Remove all vertices in $V \setminus (\mathscr{C} \cup N(\mathscr{C}))$ from G.*

▶ **Proposition 3.3.** *Rule 3.1 is safe.*

Proof. Let $(G' = (V', E'), c, k)$ be the reduced instance after applying Rule 3.1. We prove the safeness of Rule 3.1 by showing that there is a proper labeling with at most k weak edges for G if and only if there is a proper labeling with k weak edges for G'.

($\Rightarrow$) Let $L = (S_L^1, S_L^2, \ldots, S_L^c, W_L)$ be a proper labeling with $|W_L| \leq k$ for G. Then, obviously $L' := (S_L^1 \cap E', S_L^2 \cap E', \ldots, S_L^c \cap E', W_L \cap E')$ is a proper labeling for G' with $|W_{L'}| \leq |W_L| \leq k$.

($\Leftarrow$) Conversely, let $L' = (S_{L'}^1, S_{L'}^2, \ldots, S_{L'}^c, W_{L'})$ be a proper labeling with $|W_{L'}| \leq k$ for G'. Let $E \setminus E' = \{e_1, e_2, \ldots, e_p\}$. We define $p+1$ graphs $G_0, G_1, G_2, \ldots, G_p$ by $G_0 := (V, E')$, and $G_i := (V, E' \cup \{e_1, \ldots, e_i\})$ for $i \in \{1, \ldots, p\}$. Note that $G_p = G$, $\deg_{G_i}(v) \leq \deg_G(v)$, and $N_{G_i}(v) \subseteq N_G(v)$ for every $i \in \{0, 1, \ldots, p\}$, and $v \in V$. We prove by induction over i that all G_i have a proper labeling with at most k weak edges.

Base Case: $i = 0$. Then, since G_0 and G' have the exact same edges, L' is a proper labeling for G_0 with at most k weak edges.

Inductive Step: $0 < i \leq p$. Then, by the inductive hypothesis, there exists a proper labeling L_{i-1} for $G_{i-1} = (V, E' \cup \{e_1, \ldots, e_{i-1}\})$ with at most k weak edges. From $E' = E(\mathscr{C} \cup N(\mathscr{C}))$ we conclude $e_i \in E \setminus E(\mathscr{C} \cup N(\mathscr{C})) = E(\mathscr{P}) \setminus E(N(\mathscr{C}))$. Hence, for at least one of the endpoints u of e it holds that $N_G[u] \subseteq \mathscr{P}$. Therefore $\deg_G(w) \leq c-1$ for all $w \in N_G[u]$. Together with the facts that $\deg_{G_i}(w) \leq \deg_G(w)$ and $N_{G_i}(w) \subseteq N_G(w)$ we conclude $\deg_{G_i}(w) \leq c-1$ for all $w \in N_{G_i}[u]$. Then, by Lemma 3.2, there exists a proper labeling L_i for G_i such that $|W_{L_i}| = |W_{L_{i-1}}| \leq k$. ◀

It remains to state the kernel result.

▶ **Theorem 1.1.** ECS *admits a problem kernel with at most $4\xi_{c-1} \cdot c$ vertices and $\mathcal{O}(\xi_{c-1} \cdot c^2)$ edges that can be computed in $\mathcal{O}(n+m)$ time.*

Proof. Let (G, c, k) be an instance of ECS. We apply Rule 3.1 on (G, c, k) as follows: First, we compute a 2-approximation D'_{c-1} of the smallest possible edge-deletion set D_{c-1} in $\mathcal{O}(n+m)$ time as described in Section 2. Let $\mathscr{C} := \mathscr{C}(D'_{c-1})$ and note that $|D'_{c-1}| \leq 2\xi_{c-1}$. We then remove all vertices in $V \setminus (\mathscr{C} \cup N_G(\mathscr{C}))$ from G which can also be done in $\mathcal{O}(n+m)$ time. Hence, applying Rule 3.1 can be done in $\mathcal{O}(n+m)$ time.

We next show that after this application of Rule 3.1 the graph consists of at most $4\xi_{c-1} \cdot c$ vertices and $\mathcal{O}(\xi_{c-1} \cdot c^2)$ edges. Since D'_{c-1} is a 2-approximation of the smallest possible edge-deletion set we have $|\mathscr{C}| \leq 4\xi_{c-1}$. Since every vertex in $\mathscr{C}$ has at most $c-1$ neighbors in $V \setminus \mathscr{C}$, we conclude $|\mathscr{C} \cup N(\mathscr{C})| \leq 4\xi_{c-1} \cdot c$. In $E(\mathscr{C} \cup N(\mathscr{C}))$ there are obviously the at most $4\xi_{c-1}$ edges of D'_{c-1}. Moreover, each of the at most $4\xi_{c-1} \cdot c$ vertices might have up to $c-1$ incident edges. Hence, after applying Rule 3.1, the reduced instance has $\mathcal{O}(\xi_{c-1} \cdot c^2)$ edges. ◀

If we consider Edge Coloring instead of ECS, we can immediately reject if one vertex has degree more than c. Then, since there are at most $|\mathscr{C}| \leq 2\xi_{c-1}$ vertices that have a degree of at least c, Theorem 1.1 implies the following.

▶ **Corollary 3.4.** *Let h_c be the number of vertices with degree c.* Edge Coloring *admits a problem kernel with $\mathcal{O}(h_c \cdot c)$ vertices and $\mathcal{O}(h_c \cdot c^2)$ edges that can be computed in $\mathcal{O}(n + m)$ time.*

3.2 Component Order Connectivity

In this section we present a problem kernel for ECS parameterized by the number of strong colors c and the component order connectivity λ_c. We prove that ECS admits a problem kernel with $\mathcal{O}(c^3 \cdot \lambda_c)$ vertices, which is a linear vertex kernel for every fixed value of c. Our kernelization is based on the Expansion Lemma [22], a generalization of the Crown Rule [3]. We use the formulation given by Cygan et al. [5].

▶ **Lemma 3.5** (Expansion Lemma)**.** *Let q be a positive integer and G be a bipartite graph with partite sets A and B such that $|B| \geq q|A|$ and there are no isolated vertices in B. Then there exist nonempty vertex sets $X \subseteq A$ and $Y \subseteq B$ with $N(Y) \subseteq X$. Moreover, there exist edges $M \subseteq E(X, Y)$ such that*

a) every vertex of X is incident with exactly q edges of M, and
b) $q \cdot |X|$ vertices in Y are endpoints of edges in M.

The sets X and Y can be found in polynomial time.

To apply the Expansion Lemma on an instance of ECS, we need the following definition for technical reasons.

▶ **Definition 3.6.** *For a given graph $G = (V, E)$, let D be an order-c component cover. We say that D is* saturated *if for every $v \in D$ it holds that $E_G(\{v\}, V \setminus D) \neq \emptyset$.*

Note that every order-c component cover D' can be transformed into a saturated order-c component cover by removing any vertex $v \in D'$ with $N(v) \subseteq D'$ from D' while such a vertex exists. Let $(G = (V, E), c, k)$ be an instance of ECS and let $D \subseteq V$ be a saturated order-c component cover. Furthermore, let $I := V \setminus D$ be the remaining set of vertices. Consider the following simple reduction rule.

▶ **Rule 3.2.** *If there exists a set $J \subseteq I$ such that J is a connected component in G, remove all vertices in J from G.*

Rule 3.2 is safe since $|J| \leq c$ and therefore the graph $G[J]$ has maximum degree $c - 1$ and can be labeled by Vizing's Theorem with c colors. For the rest of this section we assume that (G, c, k) is reduced regarding Rule 3.2. The following proposition is a direct consequence of the Expansion Lemma.

▶ **Proposition 3.7.** *Let $(G = (V, E), c, k)$ be an instance of* ECS *that is reduced regarding Rule 3.2, let D be a saturated order-c component cover of G, and let $I := V \setminus D$. If $|I| \geq c^2 \cdot |D|$, then there exist nonempty sets $X \subseteq D$ and $Y \subseteq I$ with $N(Y) \subseteq X \cup Y$. Moreover, there exists a set $M \subseteq E(X, Y)$ such that*

a) every vertex of X is incident with exactly c edges of M, and
b) $c \cdot |X|$ vertices in Y are endpoints of edges in M and every connected component in $G[Y]$ contains at most one such vertex.

The sets X and Y can be computed in polynomial time.

Proof. We prove the proposition by applying Lemma 3.5. To this end we define an equivalence relation $\sim$ on the vertices of I: Two vertices $v, u \in I$ are equivalent, denoted $u \sim v$ if and only if u and v belong to the same connected component in $G[I]$. Obviously, $\sim$ is an equivalence relation. For a given vertex $u \in I$, let $[u] := \{v \in I \mid v \sim u\}$ denote the equivalence class of u. Note that $|[u]| \leq c$ since D is an order-c component cover.

We next define the auxiliary graph G_{aux}, on which we will apply Lemma 3.5. Intuitively, we obtain G_{aux} from G by deleting all edges in $E_G(D)$ and merging the at most c vertices in every equivalence class in I. Formally $G_{\text{aux}} := (D \cup I^*, E_{\text{aux}})$, with $I^* := \{[u] \mid u \in I\}$ and

$$E_{\text{aux}} := \{\{[u], v\} \mid [u] \in I^*, v \in \bigcup_{w \in [u]} (N_G(w) \setminus I)\}.$$

Note that G_{aux} can be computed from G in polynomial time and that $|I| \geq |I^*| \geq \frac{1}{c}|I|$.

Observe that G_{aux} is bipartite with partite sets D and I^*. Since G is reduced regarding Rule 3.2, every $[u] \in I^*$ is adjacent to some $v \in D$ in G_{aux}. Furthermore, since D is saturated, every $v \in D$ is adjacent to some $u \in I$ in G and therefore $\{v, [u]\} \in E_{\text{aux}}$. Hence, G_{aux} is a bipartite graph without isolated vertices. Moreover, from $|I| \geq c^2|D|$ and $|I^*| \geq \frac{1}{c}|I|$ we conclude $|I^*| \geq c \cdot |D|$. By applying Lemma 3.5 on G_{aux} we conclude that there exist nonempty vertex sets $X' \subseteq D$ and $Y' \subseteq I^*$ with $N_{G_{\text{aux}}}(Y') \subseteq X'$ that can be computed in polynomial time such that there exists a set $M' \subseteq E_{G_{\text{aux}}}(X', Y')$ of edges, such that every vertex of X' is incident with exactly c edges of M', and $c \cdot |X'|$ vertices in Y' are endpoints of edges in M'.

We now describe how to construct the sets X, Y, and M from X', Y', and M'. We set $X := X' \subseteq D$, and $Y := \bigcup_{[u] \in Y'} [u] \subseteq I$. We prove that $N_G(Y) \subseteq X \cup Y$. Let $y \in Y$. Note that all neighbors of y in I are elements of Y by the definition of the equivalence relation $\sim$ and therefore

$$N_G(y) \subseteq N_{G_{\text{aux}}}([y]) \cup Y \subseteq X' \cup Y = X \cup Y.$$

Next, we construct $M \subseteq E_G(X, Y)$ from M'. To this end we define a mapping $\pi : M' \to E_G(X, Y)$. For every edge $\{[u], v\} \in M'$ with $[u] \in Y'$ and $v \in X'$ we define $\pi(\{[u], v\}) := \{w, v\}$, where w is some fixed vertex in $[u]$. We set $M := \{\pi(e') \mid e' \in M'\}$. It remains to show that the statements a) and b) hold for M.

a) Observe that $\pi(\{[u_1], v_1\}) = \pi(\{[u_2], v_2\})$ implies $[u_1] = [u_2]$ and $v_1 = v_2$ and therefore, the mapping π is injective. We conclude $|M| = |M'|$. Moreover, observe that the edges of M have the same endpoints in X as the edges of M'. Thus, since every vertex of X' is incident with exactly c edges of M' it follows that statement a) holds for M.

b) By the conditions a) and b) of Lemma 3.5, no two edges in M' have a common endpoint in Y'. Hence, in every connected component in $G[Y]$ there is at most one vertex incident with an edge in M. Moreover, since $|M| = |M'|$ and there are exactly $c \cdot |X'|$ vertices in Y' that are endpoints of edges in M' we conclude that statement b) holds for M. ◀

The following rule is the key rule for our kernelization.

▶ **Rule 3.3.** *If $|I| \geq c^2 \cdot |D|$, then compute the sets X and Y from Proposition 3.7, delete all vertices in $X \cup Y$ from G, and decrease k by $|E_G(X, V)| - c \cdot |X|$.*

▶ **Proposition 3.8.** *Rule 3.3 is safe.*

Proof. Let $G' = (V', E') := G - (X \cup Y)$ be the graph after applying Rule 3.3. Note that $V' = V \setminus (X \cup Y)$, and $E' = E \setminus (E_G(X \cup Y, V))$. Moreover, let $k' := k - |E_G(X, V)| + c \cdot |X|$.

We show that there exists a proper labeling L with $|W_L| \leq k$ for G if and only if there is a proper labeling L' with $|W_{L'}| \leq k'$ for G'.

($\Rightarrow$) Let L be a proper labeling for G with $|W_L| \leq k$. We define a labeling L' for G' by $L' := (S_L^1 \cap E', S_L^2 \cap E', \ldots, S_L^c \cap E', W_L \cap E')$. Obviously, no vertex in V is incident with two edges of the same strong color under L, and therefore no vertex in $V' \subseteq V$ is incident with two edges of the same strong color under L'. Hence, L' is a proper labeling for G'. It remains to show that $|W_{L'}| \leq k'$. Obviously, every vertex $x \in X$ is incident with at most c edges of distinct strong colors under L, since L is a proper labeling. Hence, the maximum number of strong edges in $E_G(X, V)$ is $c \cdot |X|$. Thus, we have $|W_L \cap E_G(X, V)| \geq |E_G(X, V)| - c \cdot |X|$. Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} |W_{L'}| &= |W_L \cap E'| = |W_L| - |W_L \cap E_G(X \cup Y, V)| \\ &\leq |W_L| - |W_L \cap E_G(X, V)| \leq k - |E_G(X, V)| + c \cdot |X| = k'. \end{aligned}$$

($\Leftarrow$) Conversely, let L' be a proper labeling for G' with $|W_{L'}| \leq k'$. We now describe how to construct a labeling L for G with $|W_L| \leq k$ from L'. We set $W_L := W_{L'} \cup (E_G(X, V) \setminus M)$. This implies

$$|W_L| = |W_{L'}| + |E_G(X, V)| - |M| \leq k' + |E_G(X, V)| - c|X| = k.$$

Next, we describe to which strong color classes of L we add the remaining edges of G. Since $N_G(Y) \subseteq X \cup Y$ it remains to label all edges in $E' \setminus W_{L'} \cup E_G(Y) \cup M$.

First, consider the edges in $E' \setminus W_{L'}$. Every edge $e \in E' \setminus W_{L'}$ has a strong color i under L'. We then add e to S_L^i. Note that this implies $L|_{E'} = L'|_{E'}$.

Second, consider the edges in M. For each $x \in X$ we define a set $B_x^M := \{e \in M \mid x \in e\} \subseteq M$. By Proposition 3.7 a), every $x \in X$ is incident with exactly c edges in M. Thus, $|B_x^M| = c$ and we let $e_x^1, e_x^2, \ldots, e_x^c$ denote be the elements of B_x^M. For every $x \in X$ we add e_x^i to the strong color class S_L^i. Note that by Proposition 3.7, there are $c|X|$ vertices in Y that are incident with edges in M. Hence, the family $\{B_x^M \subseteq M \mid x \in X\}$ forms a partition of M and therefore every edge in M belongs to exactly one strong color class of L.

Finally, consider the edges in $E_G(Y)$. Let $J \subseteq Y$ be a connected component in $G[Y]$. Note that $N_G(J) \subseteq J \cup X$ and observe that by Proposition 3.7 b) there is at most one vertex $v \in J$ that is an endpoint of some edge in M. Hence, there is at most one edge in $E_G(J, X)$ that belongs to some strong color class S_L^i. Since D is an order-c component cover, we know that $|J| \leq c$, and therefore $\Delta_{G[J]} \leq c - 1$. Consequently, there exists a proper labeling $L'' = (S_{L''}^1, \ldots, S_{L''}^c, W_{L''})$ for $G[J]$ due to Vizing's Theorem. Without loss of generality we can assume that v is not incident with an edge in $S_{L''}^i$: If there exists an edge $\{v, w\} \in S_{L''}^i$, there exists one strong color class $S_{L''}^j$ that contains no edge incident with v since $\deg_{G[J]}(v) \leq c - 1$ and we simply interchange the edges in $S_{L''}^i$ and $S_{L''}^j$. Then, for every $t \in \{1, \ldots, c\}$ we add all edges in $S_{L''}^t$ to the strong color class S_L^t.

It remains to show that L is a proper labeling. To this end, we show for every vertex $v \in V$, that v is not incident with two edges of the same strong color under L. Consider the following case distinction.

Case 1: $v \in V \setminus (X \cup Y)$**.** Then, since $E_G(\{v\}, Y) = \emptyset$, and $E_G(\{v\}, X) \subseteq W_L$, every strong edge incident with v has the same strong color under L as it has under L'. Since L' is a proper labeling, the vertex $v \in V \setminus (X \cup Y)$ is not incident with two edges of the same strong color under L.

Case 2: $v \in X$**.** Then, since $E_G(\{v\}, V \setminus Y) \subseteq W_L$, and $E_G(\{v\}, Y) \setminus B_v^M \subseteq W_L$, all strong edges incident with v are elements of B_v^M. Since $B_v^M = \{e_v^1, \ldots, e_v^c\}$, and every $e_v^i \in S_L^i$, the vertex v is not incident with two edges of the same strong color under L.

Case 3: $v \in Y$**.** Let $J \subseteq Y$ be a connected component in $G[Y]$ such that $v \in J$. Note that $N_G(v) \subseteq X \cup J$. First, consider the case, that v has no strong neighbors in X. Then, there are no ECS violations since $L|_{E_G(J)}$ is a proper labeling for $G[J]$ by Vizing's Theorem. Second, consider the case that v has strong neighbors in X. Then, by Proposition 3.7, there is exactly one edge in $E_G(\{v\}, X)$ that belongs to M and therefore is in some strong color class S_L^i. By the construction of L, all edges in $E_G(\{v\}, J)$ have pairwise distinct strong colors which are all distinct from i under L. Therefore, the vertex v is not incident with two edges of the same strong color under L. ◀

Rules 3.2 and 3.3 together with the fact that we can compute a $(c+1)$-approximation of the minimum order-c component cover in polynomial time [19] give us the following.

▶ **Theorem 1.2.** ECS *admits a problem kernel with* $\mathcal{O}(c^3 \cdot \lambda_c)$ *vertices.*

Proof. We first consider the running time. We use a $(c+1)$-approximation for the minimum oder-c component cover and compute an order-c component cover D' in polynomial time [19]. Afterwards we remove any vertex $v \in D'$ with $N(v) \subseteq D'$ from D' while such a vertex exists and we end up with a saturated order-c component cover $D \subseteq D'$. Afterwards, consider Rules 3.2 and 3.3. Obviously, one application of Rule 3.2 can be done in polynomial time if D is known. Moreover, Rule 3.3 can also be applied in polynomial time due to Proposition 3.7. Since every application of one of these two rules removes some vertices, we can compute an instance that is reduced regarding Rules 3.2 and 3.3 from an arbitrary input instance of ECS in polynomial time.

We next consider the size of a reduced instance $(G = (V, E), c, k)$ of ECS regarding Rules 3.2 and 3.3. Let $D \subseteq V$ be a $(c+1)$-approximate saturated order-c component cover, and let $I := V \setminus D$. Since no further application of Rule 3.3 is possible, we conclude $|I| < c^2 \cdot |D|$. Thus, we have $|V| = |I| + |D| < (c^2+1) \cdot |D| \leq (c^2+1) \cdot (c+1) \cdot \lambda_c \in \mathcal{O}(c^3 \lambda_c)$. ◀

4 Multi-STC parameterized by Edge Deletion-Distance to Low-Degree Graphs

In this section we provide a problem kernelization for Multi-STC parameterized by ξ_{c-1} when $c \leq 4$. Before we describe the problem kernel, we briefly show that Multi-STC does not admit a polynomial kernel for the component order connectivity ξ_{c-1} even if $c = 1$: If NP $\not\subseteq$ coNP/poly, STC does not admit a polynomial kernel if parameterized by the number of strong edges [9] which—in nontrivial instances—is bigger than the size of a maximal matching M. Since the vertex cover number s is never larger than $2|M|$, this implies that Multi-STC has no polynomial kernel if parameterized by s unless NP $\subseteq$ coNP/poly. Since $\lambda_c \leq s$, we conclude that Multi-STC does not admit a polynomial kernel for λ_c unless NP $\subseteq$ coNP/poly.

Next, consider parameterization by ξ_{c-1}. Observe that Rule 3.1 which gives a problem kernel for ECS does not work for Multi-STC; see Figure 1 for an example. Furthermore, for Multi-STC we need a fundamental new approach: For STC-labelings the maximum degree and the number of colors are not as closely related as in ECS, and therefore, Lemma 3.1 might not be helpful for Multi-STC. Moreover, in the proof of Lemma 3.2 we exploit that in ECS we may remove weak edges from the instance, which does not hold for Multi-STC since removing a weak edge may produce P_3s. However, the results for ECS parameterized by (ξ_{c-1}, c) can be lifted to the seemingly harder Multi-STC for $c \in \{1, 2, 3, 4\}$. We will first discuss the cases $c = 1$ and $c = 2$. For the cases $c \in \{3, 4\}$ we show the more general statement that Multi-STC admits a problem kernel with $\mathcal{O}(\xi_{\lfloor \frac{c}{2} \rfloor + 1} \cdot c)$ vertices.




Figure 1 Left: A graph where in any STC-labeling with four strong colors and without weak edges, the edges e_1, e_2, e_3, and e_4 are part of the same strong color class. Right: A no-instance of Multi-STC with $c = 4$ and $k = 0$, where Rule 3.1 does not produce an equivalent instance: The inner rectangles correspond to two copies of the gadget on the left. Observe that all blue edges must have a common strong color, and all red edges must have a common strong color distinct that is not blue. Hence, for any STC-labeling of $G[\mathscr{C} \cup N(\mathscr{C})]$ it is not possible to extend the labeling to the dotted edges without violating STC. However, Rule 3.1 converts this no-instance into a yes-instance.

If $c = 1$, the parameter $\xi_{c-1} = \xi_0$ equals the number m of edges in G. Hence, Multi-STC admits a trivial ξ_{c-1}-edge kernel in this case. If $c = 2$, any input graph consists of core vertices $\mathscr{C}$, periphery vertices in $N(\mathscr{C})$ and isolated vertices and edges. We can compute an equivalent instance in linear time by deleting these isolated components. The safeness of this rule is obvious.Afterwards, the graph contains at most $2\xi_{c-1}$ core vertices. Since each of these vertices has at most one neighbor outside $\mathscr{C}$, we have a total number of $4\xi_{c-1}$ vertices.

To extend this result to $c \in \{3, 4\}$, we now provide a problem kernel for Multi-STC parameterized by $(c, \xi_{\lfloor \frac{c}{2} \rfloor + 1})$. Let (G, c, k) be an instance of Multi-STC with edge-deletion set $D := D_{\lfloor \frac{c}{2} \rfloor + 1}$, and let $\mathscr{C}$ and $\mathscr{P}$ be the core and periphery of G. A subset $A \subseteq \mathscr{P}$ is called *periphery component* if it is a connected component in $G[\mathscr{P}]$. Furthermore, for a periphery component $A \subseteq \mathscr{P}$ we define the subset $A^* \subseteq A$ of *close vertices* in A as $A^* := N(\mathscr{C}) \cap A$, that is, the set of vertices of A that are adjacent to core vertices. The key technique of our kernelization is to move weak edges along paths inside periphery components.

▶ **Definition 4.1.** *Let (G, c, k) be an instance of* Multi-STC *with core vertices $\mathscr{C}$ and periphery vertices $\mathscr{P}$. A periphery component $A \subseteq \mathscr{P}$ is called* good*, if for every STC-labeling $L = (S_L^1, \ldots, S_L^c, W_L)$ for G with $E(A) \subseteq W_L$ there exists an STC-labeling $L' = (S_{L'}^1, \ldots, S_{L'}^c, W_{L'})$ for G such that*

1. *$L'|_{E \setminus E(A)} = L|_{E \setminus E(A)}$, and*
2. *$W_{L'} \cap E(A) = \emptyset$.*

Intuitively, a good periphery component A is a periphery component where the edges in $E(A)$ can always be added to some strong color classes of an STC-labeling, no matter how the other edges of G are labeled. The condition $E(A) \subseteq W_L$ is a technical condition that makes the proof of the next proposition easier.

▶ **Proposition 4.2.** *Let (G, c, k) be an instance of* Multi-STC *with core vertices $\mathscr{C}$ and periphery vertices $\mathscr{P}$. Furthermore, let $A \subseteq \mathscr{P}$ be a good periphery component. Then, (G, c, k) is a yes-instance if and only if $(G - (A \setminus A^*), c, k)$ is a yes-instance.*

Proof. Let $\tilde{G} = (\tilde{V}, \tilde{E}) := (G - (A \setminus A^*), c, k)$. We show that G has a c-colored STC-labeling with at most k weak edges if and only if $\tilde{G}$ has a c-colored STC-labeling with at most k weak edges.

Let $L = (S_L^1, \dots, S_L^c, W_L)$ be a c-colored STC-labeling for G such that $|W_L| \leq k$. Then, define by $\tilde{L} := (S_L^1 \cap \tilde{E}, \dots, S_L^c \cap \tilde{E}, W_L \cap \tilde{E})$ a c-colored labeling for $\tilde{G}$. Obviously $|W_L \cap \tilde{E}| \leq k$. It remains to show that $\tilde{L}$ satisfies STC. Since $\tilde{G}$ is an induced subgraph of G, every two edges $e_1, e_2 \in \tilde{E}$ forming a P_3, a path on three vertices, in $\tilde{G}$ also form a P_3 in G. Hence, from the fact that L satisfies STC we conclude that $\tilde{L}$ satisfies STC.

Conversely, let $\tilde{L} = (S_{\tilde{L}}^1, \dots, S_{\tilde{L}}^c, W_{\tilde{L}})$ be a c-colored STC-labeling for $\tilde{G}$ such that $|W_{\tilde{L}}| \leq k$. We define a c-colored labeling $L := (S_L^1, \dots, S_L^c, W_L)$ for G by $S_L^j := S_{\tilde{L}}^j \setminus E(A)$ and $W_L := W_{\tilde{L}} \cup E(A)$. Note that $L|_{E \setminus E(A)} = \tilde{L}|_{E \setminus E(A)}$ and $E(A) \subseteq W_L$. Then, by the definition of good periphery components there exists an STC-labeling $L' = (S_{L'}^1, \dots, S_{L'}^c, W_{L'})$ for G such that $L'|_{E \setminus E(A)} = L|_{E \setminus E(A)} = \tilde{L}|_{E \setminus E(A)}$, and $W_{L'} \cap E(A) = \emptyset$. We next show that $|W_{L'}| \leq k$. Since $W_{L'} \cap E(A) = \emptyset$ every weak edge of L' is an element of $E \setminus E(A)$. From the facts that $L'|_{E \setminus E(A)} = \tilde{L}|_{E \setminus E(A)}$ and $|W_{\tilde{L}}| \leq k$ it follows $|W_{L'}| \leq k$. Therefore, L' is an STC-labeling for G with at most k weak edges. ◀

In the following, we show that for instances (G, c, k) with $c \geq 3$ we can compute an equivalent instance of size $\mathcal{O}(\xi_{\lfloor \frac{c}{2} \rfloor + 1} c)$. We first consider all cases where $c \geq 3$ is odd. In this case, we can prove that all periphery components are good.

▶ **Proposition 4.3.** *Let (G, c, k) be an instance of* Multi-STC*, where $c \geq 3$ is odd. Moreover, let $A \subseteq \mathscr{P}$ be a periphery component. Then, A is good.*

Proof. Let L be an arbitrary STC-labeling for G with $E(A) \subseteq W_L$. We prove that there is an STC-labeling which is partially equal to L on $E \setminus E(A)$ and has no weak edges in $E(A)$.

Let L' be an STC-labeling for G with $L'|_{E \setminus E(A)} = L|_{E \setminus E(A)}$. If $W_{L'} \cap E(A) = \emptyset$, nothing more needs to be shown. So, assume there is an edge $\{u, v\} \in W_{L'} \cap E(A)$. Since $u, v \in A$, it holds that $\deg(u) \leq \lfloor \frac{c}{2} \rfloor + 1$ and $\deg(v) \leq \lfloor \frac{c}{2} \rfloor + 1$. Then, since c is odd, the edge $\{u, v\}$ is incident with at most $2 \cdot \lfloor \frac{c}{2} \rfloor < c$ edges in G. Consequently, there exists a strong color $i \in \{1, \dots, c\}$, such that $\{u, v\}$ can be added to the strong color class $S_{L'}^i$ and be removed from $W_{L'}$ without producing any STC violations. This way, we transformed L' into an STC-labeling L'', such that $L''|_{E \setminus \{\{u,v\}\}} = L|_{E \setminus \{\{u,v\}\}}$ and $|W_{L''}| = |W_{L'}| - 1$. Since L was arbitrary, the periphery component A is good by definition. ◀

The Propositions 4.2 and 4.3 guarantee the safeness of the following rule:

▶ **Rule 4.1.** *If c is odd, remove $A \setminus A^*$ from all periphery components $A \subseteq \mathscr{P}$.*

▶ **Proposition 4.4.** *Let $(G = (V, E), c, k)$ be an instance of* Multi-STC *where $c \geq 3$ is odd. Then, we can compute an instance $(G' = (V', E'), c, k)$ in $\mathcal{O}(n + m)$ time such that $|V'| \leq 2 \cdot \xi_{\lfloor \frac{c}{2} \rfloor + 1} \cdot (\lfloor \frac{c}{2} \rfloor + 1)$, and $|E'| \in \mathcal{O}(\xi_{\lfloor \frac{c}{2} \rfloor + 1} \cdot c^2)$.*

Proof. Let $\mathscr{C}$ be the set of core vertices of G, and $\mathscr{P}$ the set of periphery vertices of G. We compute $(G' = (V', E'), c, k)$ from G by applying Rule 4.1 exhaustively. This can be done by computing $G[\mathscr{C} \cup N(\mathscr{C})]$ in $\mathcal{O}(n + m)$ time. We next analyze the size of $\mathscr{C} \cup N(\mathscr{C})$.

Since $|\mathscr{C}| \leq 2\xi_{\lfloor \frac{c}{2} \rfloor + 1}$, and every $v \in \mathscr{C}$ has at most $\lfloor \frac{c}{2} \rfloor + 1$ neighbors in $\mathscr{P}$, there are at most $2 \cdot \xi_{\lfloor \frac{c}{2} \rfloor + 1} \cdot (\lfloor \frac{c}{2} \rfloor + 1)$ vertices in V'. Since each vertex is incident with at most $\lfloor \frac{c}{2} \rfloor + 1$ edges, we conclude $|E'| \in \mathcal{O}(\xi_{\lfloor \frac{c}{2} \rfloor + 1} \cdot c^2)$. ◀

It remains to consider instances where c is an even number and $c \geq 4$. In this case, not every periphery component is good (Figure 1 shows an example), so we need to identify good periphery components more carefully. The first rule removes isolated periphery components.

▶ **Rule 4.2.** *Remove periphery components $A \subseteq \mathscr{P}$ with $A^* = \emptyset$ from G.*

▶ **Proposition 4.5.** *Rule 4.2 is safe.*

Proof. We prove that periphery components A with $A^* = \emptyset$ are good. Safeness of Rule 4.2 then follows by Proposition 4.2.

Let $L = (S_L^1, \ldots, S_L^c, W_L)$ be an STC-labeling with $E(A) \subseteq W_L$. Since $c \geq 4$ every vertex in A has degree at most $\lfloor \frac{c}{2} \rfloor + 1 \leq c - 1$. Thus, there exists an STC-labeling $L' = (S_{L'}^1, \ldots, S_{L'}^c, W_{L'})$ for $G[A]$ with $W_{L'} = \emptyset$ due to Vizing's Theorem. We define a labeling

$$L'' := (S_L^1 \cup S_{L'}^1, \ldots, S_L^c \cup S_{L'}^c, W_L \setminus E(A)).$$

Since $E(A, V \setminus A) = \emptyset$, L'' is an STC-labeling. Moreover, it holds that $L''|_{E \setminus E(A)} = L|_{E \setminus E(A)}$ and $W_{L''} \cap E(A) = \emptyset$. Therefore, A is a good periphery component. ◀

The intuition for the next lemma is that the small degree of vertices in periphery components can be used to 'move' weak edges inside periphery components, the key technique of our kernelization. More precisely, if there is an edge-simple path in a periphery component, that starts with a weak edge, we can either move the weak edge to the end of that path by keeping the same number of weak edges or find a labeling with fewer weak edges.

▶ **Lemma 4.6.** *Let $A \subseteq \mathscr{P}$, let L be an STC-labeling of G, and let $e \in W_L \cap E(A)$ be a weak edge in $E(A)$. Furthermore, let $P = (v_1, v_2, \ldots, v_{r-1}, v_r)$ be an edge-simple path in $G[A]$ with $\{v_1, v_2\} = e$ and color sequence $Q_L^P = (q_1 = 0, q_2, q_3, \ldots, q_{r-1})$ under L. Then, there exists an STC-labeling L' with $L'|_{E \setminus E(P)} = L|_{E \setminus E(P)}$ such that*

$$Q_{L'}^P = (q_2, q_3, \ldots, q_{r-1}, 0) \text{ or } |W_{L'}| < |W_L|.$$

Proof. We prove the statement by induction over the length r of P.

Base Case: $r = 2$. Then, $P = (v_1, v_2)$ and $Q_L^P = (0)$. We can trivially define the labeling L' by setting $L' := L$.

Inductive Step: Let $P = (v_1, \ldots, v_r)$ be an edge-simple path with color sequence $Q_L^P = (0, q_2, \ldots, q_{r-1})$ under L. Consider the edge-simple subpath $P' = (v_1, \ldots, v_{r-1})$. By induction hypothesis there exists an STC-labeling L'' for G with $L''|_{E \setminus E(P')} = L|_{E \setminus E(P')}$, such that $Q_{L''}^{P'} = (q_2, q_3, \ldots, q_{r-2}, 0)$ or $|W_{L''}| < |W_L|$.

Case 1: $|W_{L''}| < |W_L|$. Then, we define L' by $L' := L''$.

Case 2: $|W_{L''}| \geq |W_L|$. Then, $Q_{L''}^{P'} = (q_2, q_3, \ldots, q_{r-2}, 0)$. Since $Q_{L''}^{P'}$ contains the same elements as $Q_L^{P'}$ and $L''|_{E \setminus E(P')} = L|_{E \setminus E(P')}$, we have $|W_{L''}| = |W_L|$.

Case 2.1: There exists an edge $e \neq \{v_{r-1}, v_r\}$ with $e \in S_{L''}^{q_{r-1}}$ that is incident with $\{v_{r-2}, v_{r-1}\}$. From the fact that $\deg(v_{r-2}) \leq \lfloor \frac{c}{2} \rfloor + 1$ and $\deg(v_{r-1}) \leq \lfloor \frac{c}{2} \rfloor + 1$, we conclude that $\{v_{r-2}, v_{r-1}\}$ is incident with at most c other edges of G. Since two of these incident edges have the same strong color q_{r-1} under L'', the edge $\{v_{r-2}, v_{r-1}\}$ is incident with at most $c-1$ edges of distinct strong colors under L''. Consequently, there exists a strong color $i \in \{1, \ldots, c\}$, such that $\{v_{r-2}, v_{r-1}\}$ can safely be added to the strong color class $S_{L''}^i$ and be removed from $W_{L''}$ without producing any strong P_3. This way, we transformed L'' into an STC-labeling L', such that $L'|_{E \setminus E(P')} = L|_{E \setminus E(P')}$ and $|W_{L'}| < |W_L|$.

Case 2.2: There is no edge $e \neq \{v_{r-1}, v_r\}$ with $e \in S_{L''}^{q_{r-1}}$ that is incident with $\{v_{r-2}, v_{r-1}\}$. We then define L' by

$$W_{L'} := W_{L''} \cup \{\{v_{r-1}, v_r\}\} \setminus \{\{v_{r-2}, v_{r-1}\}\}, \text{ and}$$
$$S_{L'}^{q_{r-1}} := S_{L''}^{q_{r-1}} \cup \{\{v_{r-2}, v_{r-1}\}\} \setminus \{\{v_{r-1}, v_r\}\}.$$

Note that $Q_{L'}^P = (q_2, q_3, \ldots, q_{r-1}, 0)$ and $L'|_{E \setminus E(P)} = L|_{E \setminus E(P)}$. Moreover, since P is edge-simple, the edge $\{v_{r-1}, v_r\}$ does not lie on P' and since $L''|_{E \setminus E(P')} = L|_{E \setminus E(P')}$, it holds

that $\{v_{r-1}, v_r\} \in S_{L''}^{q_{r-1}}$. Therefore, every edge has exactly one color under L'. It remains to show that L' satisfies STC. Assume towards a contradiction, that this is not the case. Then, since L'' satisfies STC, there exists an induced P_3 on $\{v_{r-2}, v_{r-1}\} \in S_{L'}^{q_{r-1}}$ and some edge $e \in S_{L'}^{q_{r-1}}$. Since $\{v_{r-1}, v_r\} \in W_{L'}$ and $L'|_{E\setminus\{\{v_{r-2},v_{r-1}\},\{v_{r-1},v_r\}\}} = L''|_{E\setminus\{\{v_{r-2},v_{r-1}\},\{v_{r-1},v_r\}\}}$, the edge $e \neq \{v_{r-1}, v_r\}$ is incident with $\{v_{r-2}, v_{r-1}\}$ and it holds that $e \in S_{L''}^{q_{r-1}}$. This contradicts the condition of Case 2.2. ◀

We will now use Lemma 4.6 to show useful properties of periphery components. First, if there are two weak edges in one periphery component A, we can make these two weak edges incident, which then helps us to define a new labeling that has fewer weak edges in A:

▶ **Proposition 4.7.** *Let $A \subseteq \mathscr{P}$ be a periphery component and let L be an STC-labeling for G. Then, there exists an STC-labeling L' with $L'|_{E\setminus E(A)} = L|_{E\setminus E(A)}$ and $|W_{L'} \cap E(A)| \leq 1$.*

Proof. If $|W_L \cap E(A)| \leq 1$ the statement already holds for $L' = L$. So, assume there are two distinct edges $e_1, e_2 \in W_L \cap E(A)$. In this case, we construct an STC-labeling which is partially equal to L on $E \setminus E(A)$ and has strictly fewer weak edges in $E(A)$ than L, which then proves the claim.

Since periphery components are connected components in $G[\mathscr{P}]$, there exists an edge-simple path $P = (v_1, \ldots, v_r)$ in $G[A]$ such that $e_1 = \{v_1, v_2\}$ and $e_2 = \{v_{r-1}, v_r\}$. Applying Lemma 4.6 on the edge-simple subpath $P' = (v_1, \ldots, v_{r-1})$ gives us an STC-labeling L' with $L'|_{E\setminus E(P)} = L|_{E\setminus E(P)}$ such that $|W_{L'}| < |W_L|$ or $Q_{L'}^{P'} = (q_2, q_3, \ldots, q_{r-2}, 0)$.

In case of $|W_{L'}| < |W_L|$, nothing more needs to be shown. So, assume $|W_{L'}| = |W_L|$. It follows that $Q_{L'}^{P'} = (q_2, q_3, \ldots, q_{r-2}, 0)$ and therefore $Q_{L'}^{P} = (q_2, q_3, \ldots, q_{r-2}, 0, 0)$. Then, e_1 and e_2 are weak under L'. Since $\deg(v_{r-1}) \leq \lfloor \frac{c}{2} \rfloor + 1$ and $\deg(v_r) \leq \lfloor \frac{c}{2} \rfloor + 1$, the edge e_2 is incident with at most c edges. Since at least one of these incident edges is weak, e_2 is incident with at most $c-1$ edges of distinct strong colors. Consequently, there exists a strong color color $i \in \{1, \ldots, c\}$ such that e_2 can be added to the strong color class $S_{L'}^i$ and deleted from $W_{L'}$ without violating STC. This way, we transformed L' into an STC-labeling L'' such that $L''|_{E\setminus E(A)} = L|_{E\setminus E(A)}$ and $|W_{L''} \cap E(A)| < |W_L \cap E(A)|$. ◀

Next, we use Proposition 4.7 to identify specific good components.

▶ **Proposition 4.8.** *Let $A \subseteq \mathscr{P}$ be a periphery component such that there exists an edge $\{u, v\} \in E(A)$ which forms an induced P_3 with less than c other edges in G. Then, A is good.*

Proof. Let L be an arbitrary STC-labeling for G with $E(A) \subseteq W_L$. We prove that there is an STC-labeling which is partially equal to L on $E \setminus E(A)$ and has no weak edges in $E(A)$.

Let L' be an STC-labeling for G with $L'|_{E\setminus E(A)} = L|_{E\setminus E(A)}$. If $W_{L'} \cap E(A) = \emptyset$, nothing more needs to be shown. So, let $W_{L'} \cap E(A) \neq \emptyset$. By Proposition 4.7 we can assume that there is one unique edge $e \in W_{L'} \cap E(A)$. Since A is a connected component in $G[\mathscr{P}]$, there exists an edge-simple path $P = (v_1, \ldots, v_r)$ such that $\{v_1, v_2\} = e$, and $\{v_{r-1}, v_r\} = \{u, v\}$ with $Q_{L'}^P = (0, q_2, \ldots, q_{r-1})$. By Lemma 4.6, there exists an STC-labeling L'' with $L''|_{E\setminus E(A)} = L|_{E\setminus E(A)}$ such that $|W_{L''}| < |W_L|$ or $Q_{L''}^P = (q_2, \ldots, q_{r-1}, 0)$. In case of $|W_{L''}| < |W_L|$, nothing more needs to be shown. Otherwise, the edge e is weak under L''. Since e is part of less than c induced P_3s in G, there exists one strong color $i \in \{1, \ldots, c\}$, such that e can safely be added to $S_{L''}^i$ and be removed from $W_{L''}$ without violating STC. This way, we transform L'' into an STC-labeling L''' with $L'''|_{E\setminus E(A)} = L|_{E\setminus E(A)}$ and $W_{L'''} \cap E(A) = \emptyset$.

Since L was arbitrary, the periphery component A is good by definition. ◀

▶ **Proposition 4.9.** *Let $A \subseteq \mathscr{P}$ be a periphery component such that there exists a vertex $v \in A$ with $\deg_G(v) < \lfloor \frac{c}{2} \rfloor + 1$. Then, A is good.*

Proof. If $|A| = 1$, then A is obviously good, since $E(A) = \emptyset$. Let $|A| \geq 2$. Since A contains at least two vertices and forms a connected component in $G[\mathscr{P}]$ there exists a vertex $u \in A$, such that $\{u, v\} \in E(A)$. Since $\deg_G(v) < \lfloor \frac{c}{2} \rfloor + 1$, and $\deg_G(u) \leq \lfloor \frac{c}{2} \rfloor + 1$, the edge $\{u, v\}$ forms induced P_3s with less than c other edges in G. Then, by Proposition 4.8 we conclude that A is good. ◀

Propositions 4.2 and 4.9 guarantee the safeness of the following rule.

▶ **Rule 4.3.** *If there is a periphery component $A \subseteq \mathscr{P}$ with $A \setminus A^* \neq \emptyset$ such that there exists a vertex $v \in A$ with $\deg(v) < \lfloor \frac{c}{2} \rfloor + 1$, then delete $A \setminus A^*$ from G.*

▶ **Proposition 4.10.** *Let $A \subseteq \mathscr{P}$ be a periphery component such that there exists an edge $\{u, v\} \in E(A)$ which is part of a triangle $G[\{u, v, w\}]$ in G. Then, A is good.*

Proof. Since $u, v \in A$, we know $\deg_G(u) \leq \lfloor \frac{c}{2} \rfloor + 1$ and $\deg_G(v) \leq \lfloor \frac{c}{2} \rfloor + 1$. Since u, v are part of a triangle in G, it follows that $\{u, v\}$ forms an induced P_3 with less than c other edges in G. Then, by Proposition 4.8 we conclude that A is good. ◀

Propositions 4.2 and 4.10 guarantee the safeness of the following rule.

▶ **Rule 4.4.** *If there is a periphery component $A \subseteq \mathscr{P}$ with $A \setminus A^* \neq \emptyset$ such that there exists an edge $\{u, v\} \in A$ which is part of a triangle $G[\{u, v, w\}]$ in G, then delete $A \setminus A^*$ from G.*

For the rest of this section we consider instances (G, c, k) for Multi-STC, that are reduced regarding Rules 4.2–4.4. Observe that these instances only contain triangle-free periphery components A where every vertex $v \in A$ has $\deg(v) = \lfloor \frac{c}{2} \rfloor + 1$. Since ECS and Multi-STC are the same on triangle-free graphs one might get the impression that we can use Vizing's Theorem to prove that all periphery components in G are good. Consider the example in Figure 1 to see that this is not necessarily the case.

We now continue with the description of the kernel for Multi-STC. Let (G, c, k) be an instance of Multi-STC that is reduced regarding Rules 4.2–4.4. We analyze the periphery components of G that contain cycles. In this context, a *cycle* (of length r) is an edge-simple path $P = (v_0, v_1, \ldots, v_{r-1}, v_0)$ where the last vertex and the first vertex of P are the same, and all other vertices occur at most once in P. We will see that acyclic periphery components—which are periphery components $A \subseteq \mathscr{P}$ where $G[A]$ is a tree—are already bounded in c and $\xi_{\lfloor \frac{c}{2} \rfloor + 1}$. To remove the other components, we show that periphery components with cycles are always good. To this end we show two lemmas. The intuitive idea behind Lemmas 4.11 and 4.12 is, that we use Lemma 4.6 to rotate weak and strong edge-colors around a cycle.

▶ **Lemma 4.11.** *Let $A \subseteq \mathscr{P}$ be a periphery component, and let L be an STC-labeling for G. Moreover, let $P = (v_0, v_1, \ldots, v_{r-1}, v_0)$ be a cycle in A such that $W_L \cap E(P) \neq \emptyset$ and let $Q_L^P = (q_0, q_1, \ldots, q_{r-1})$ be the color sequence of P under L. Then, there exist STC-labelings $L_0, L_1, L_2, \ldots, L_{r-1}$ for G such that $L_i|_{E \setminus E(P)} = L|_{E \setminus E(P)}$ and*

$$Q_{L_i}^P(j) = q_{(i+j) \bmod r} \text{ or } |W_{L_i}| < |W_L|$$

for all $i, j \in \{0, \ldots, r-1\}$.

Proof. Without loss of generality we assume that $\{v_0, v_1\} \in W_L$ and therefore $q_0 = 0$. We prove the existence of the labelings L_i with $i \in \{0, 1, \ldots, r-1\}$ by induction over i.

Base Case: $i = 0$. In this case we set $L_0 := L$.

Inductive Step: By inductive hypothesis, there is a labeling L_{i-1} with $|W_{L_{i-1}}| < |W_L|$ or

$$Q_{L_{i-1}}^P(j) = q_{(i-1+j) \bmod r}.$$

If $|W_{L_{i-1}}| < |W_L|$, then we define L_i by $L_i := L_{i-1}$ and nothing more needs to be shown. Otherwise, we consider $P' = (v_{r-i+1}, v_{r-i+2}, \ldots, v_{r-1}, v_0, v_1, \ldots, v_{r-i+1})$. Note that P' describes the same cycle as P by rotating the vertices. More precisely,

$$P(j) = P'((j+i-1) \bmod r).$$

Therefore, P' is edge-simple and has the color sequence $Q^{P'}_{L_{i-1}} = (q_0 = 0, q_1, \ldots, q_{r-1})$. By Lemma 4.6, there exists an STC-labeling L_i with $L_i|_{E\setminus E(P)} = L_{i-1}|_{E\setminus E(P)}$, such that $|W_{L_i}| < |W_{L_{i-1}}|$ or

$$Q^{P'}_{L_i}(j) = q_{(j+1) \bmod r}.$$

In case of $|W_{L_i}| < |W_{L_{i-1}}|$, nothing more needs to be shown. Otherwise, observe that

$$Q^{P}_{L_i}(j) = Q^{P'}_{L_i}((j+i-1) \bmod r) = q_{(j+i) \bmod r}$$

which completes the inductive step. ◀

▶ **Lemma 4.12.** *Let $A \subseteq \mathscr{P}$ be a periphery component, let L be an STC-labeling. Moreover, let $P = (v_0, v_1, \ldots, v_{r-1}, v_0)$ be a cycle in A with $W_L \cap E(P) \neq \emptyset$, and let $e_1, e_2 \in E(P)$ with $e_2 \in S^q_L$ for some strong color $q \in \{1, \ldots, c\}$. Then, there exists an STC-labeling L' with $L'|_{E\setminus E(P)} = L|_{E\setminus E(P)}$ such that $e_1 \in S^q_{L'}$ or $|W_{L'}| < |W_L|$.*

Proof. Let $Q^P_L := (q_0, q_1, \ldots, q_{r-1})$. Without loss of generality assume that $\{v_0, v_1\} \in W_L$ and $e_2 = \{v_t, v_{t+1}\}$ for some $t \in \{1, \ldots, r-1\}$. It then holds, that $q_0 = 0$, and $q = q_t$. Furthermore, since $e_1 \in E(P)$ we have $e_1 = \{P(j), P(j+1)\}$ for some $j \in \{0, 1, \ldots, r-1\}$.

Consider the STC-labelings $L_0, L_1, L_2, \ldots L_{r-1}$ from Lemma 4.11. If for one such labeling L_i it holds that $|W_{L_i}| < |W_L|$, then nothing more needs to be proven. Otherwise, set $i := (t-j) \bmod r$. We show that $e_1 \in S^{q_t}_{L_i}$ by proving $Q^P_{L_i}(j) = q_t$ as follows:

$$Q^P_{L_i}(j) = q_{(i+j) \bmod r} = q_{((t-j) \bmod r)+j) \bmod r} = q_{(t-j+j) \bmod r} = q_t.$$

◀

We next use Lemma 4.12 to prove that periphery components with cycles are good.

▶ **Proposition 4.13.** *Let $(G = (V, E), c, k)$ be a reduced instance of* Multi-STC *regarding rules 4.2–4.4, where $c \geq 4$ is even. Let $A \subseteq \mathscr{P}$ be a periphery component in G such that $A \setminus A^* \neq \emptyset$ and there is a cycle $P = (v_0, v_1, \ldots, v_{r-1}, v_0)$ in $G[A]$. Then, A is good.*

Proof. Without loss of generality, we assume that the cycle P has no chords. Otherwise we replace P by the shorter cycle. Let L be an arbitrary STC-labeling for G with $E(A) \subseteq W_L$. We prove that there is an STC-labeling which is partially equal to L on $E \setminus E(A)$ and has no weak edges in $E(A)$.

Let L' be an STC-labeling for G with $L'|_{E\setminus E(A)} = L|_{E\setminus E(A)}$. If $W_{L'} \cap E(A) = \emptyset$, nothing more needs to be shown. So, let $W_{L'} \cap E(A) \neq \emptyset$. Then, by Proposition 4.7 we can assume that there exists one unique $e \in W_{L'} \cap E(A)$. Moreover, by Lemma 4.6 we assume without loss of generality that $e = \{v_0, v_1\}$. Then, P is a cycle with $E(P) \cap W_{L'} \neq \emptyset$ in $G[A]$.

We will use Lemma 4.12 to transform L' into an STC-labeling without weak edges in $E(A)$. To this end, we need to introduce some notation: For a vertex $v \in V(P)$, we let $\mathrm{out}(v) := \{i \in \{1, \ldots, c\} \mid \exists e \in E \setminus E(P) : e \cap V(P) = \{v\} \wedge e \in S^i_{L'}\}$ denote the set of strong colors of incident edges of v that are not in $E(P)$. Consider the following case distinction.

Case 1: There exists an edge $\{P(j), P(j+1)\} \in E(P)$ that has a strong color $q \in \bigcup_{v \in P} \text{out}(v)$ under L. Let $v \in P$ be a vertex with $q \in \text{out}(v)$, and let $e \in E(P)$ with $v \in e$ be an edge incident with v. Since $\{P(j), P(j+1)\} \in S^q_{L'}$, Lemma 4.12 guarantees the existence of an STC-labeling L'' with $L''|_{E \setminus E(P)} = L'|_{E \setminus E(P)}$, such that $e \in S^q_{L''}$ or $|W_{L''}| < |W_{L'}|$.

Assume towards a contradiction that $e \in S^q_{L''}$. Then, since $L''|_{E \setminus E(P)} = L'|_{E \setminus E(P)}$ and $q \in \text{out}(v)$, the vertex v has two incident edges with the same strong color. Furthermore, since G is reduced regarding Rule 4.4, no edge in $E(A)$ is part of a triangle. Hence, v is the central vertex of an induced P_3 where both edges have strong color q under L''. This contradicts the fact that L'' is an STC-labeling. We conclude $|W_{L''}| < |W_{L'}|$, which implies $L''|_{E \setminus E(A)} = L|_{E \setminus E(A)}$ and $E(A) \cap W_{L''} = \emptyset$. Since L was arbitrary, the periphery component A is good by definition.

Case 2: There is no edge in $E(P)$ that has a strong color $q \in \bigcup_{v \in P} \text{out}(v)$.

Case 2.1: There is a strong color q, such that for some $j \in \{0, \ldots, r-1\}$ it holds that $q \in \text{out}(P(j)) \cap \text{out}(P(j+1))$. In this case, consider the edge-simple subpath $P' = (v_0, v_1, \ldots, v_j, v_{j+1})$. Observe that $Q^{P'}_{L'}(0) = 0$, since $\{v_0, v_1\} \in W_{L'}$. By Lemma 4.6, there exists an STC-labeling L'' with $L''|_{E \setminus E(P')} = L'|_{E \setminus E(P')}$ such that $|W_{L''}| < |W_{L'}|$ or $Q^{P'}_{L''}(j) = 0$. In case of $|W_{L''}| < |W_{L'}|$, nothing more needs to be shown. Otherwise, $Q^{P'}_{L''}(j) = 0$ implies $\{P(j), P(j+1)\} \in W_{L''}$. Since $q \in \text{out}(P(j)) \cap \text{out}(P(j+1))$ and $\deg(P(j)) = \deg(P(j+1)) = \lfloor \frac{c}{2} \rfloor + 1$, the edge $\{P(j), P(j+1)\}$ is incident with at most $c-1$ edges of distinct strong colors under L''. Consequently, we can transform L'' into an STC-labeling L''' with $L'''|_{E \setminus E(A)} = L''_{E \setminus E(A)}$ and $W_{L'''} \cap E(A) = \emptyset$. Hence, A is a good periphery component.

Case 2.2: For every $j \in \{0, \ldots, r-1\}$ it holds that $\text{out}(P(j)) \cap \text{out}(P(j+1)) = \emptyset$. To handle this case, we need to prove two (in-)equalities, that we state in the following claim.

▷ Claim 4.14. It holds that

a) $|\text{out}(v)| = \frac{c}{2} - 1$ for every $v \in V(P)$, and
b) $|\bigcup_{v \in P} \text{out}(v)| \leq c - 2$.

Proof. a) Since (G, c, k) is reduced regarding Rule 4.3, and every vertex $v \in V(P)$ has exactly two neighbors in $V(P)$ it holds that $|\text{out}(v)| \leq \frac{c}{2} - 1$ for every $v \in V(P)$. Since there is no weak edge under L' in $E(A) \setminus E(P)$, we conclude $|\text{out}(v)| = \frac{c}{2} - 1$.

b) Since L' satisfies STC, and (G, c, k) is reduced regarding Rule 4.4, there are at least two different edges in $E(P)$ that are labeled with distinct strong colors under L'. By the condition that no edge in $E(P)$ has a strong color in $\bigcup_{v \in P} \text{out}(v)$, we conclude $|\bigcup_{v \in P} \text{out}(v)| \leq c - 2$. ◁

Consider the set $\text{out}(P(j))$ for some $P(j) \in V(P)$. By Claim 4.14 a), $|\text{out}(P(j))| = \frac{c}{2} - 1$. Since $|\bigcup_{v \in P} \text{out}(v)| \leq c - 2$ by Claim 4.14 b), there are exactly $c - 2 - (\frac{c}{2} - 1) = \frac{c}{2} - 1$ colors in $|\bigcup_{v \in P, v \neq P(j)} \text{out}(v)|$. Since $\text{out}(P(j)) \cap \text{out}(P(j+1)) = \emptyset$ for every $j \in \{1, \ldots, r\}$ we conclude $\text{out}(P((j-1) \bmod r)) = \text{out}(P((j+1) \bmod r))$. Therefore, there are exactly two disjoint sets X_1 and X_2 such that

$$\text{out}(v_i) = \begin{cases} X_1 & i \text{ is even} \\ X_2 & i \text{ is odd.} \end{cases}$$

This also implies that P is a cycle of even length.

We continue with some intuition for the rest of the proof. We will use Lemma 4.6 to move exactly one strong color from $\bigcup_{v \in P} \text{out}(v)$ into $E(P)$. Since there are two alternating out-sets and the length of the cycle P is at least four (since P has even length), we obtain a

labeling where one strong color occurs in $E(P)$ and $\bigcup_{v \in P} \text{out}(v)$, which we already handled in Case 1. To this end, consider the following claim.

▷ Claim 4.15. There is $v \in V(P)$ such that v has a neighbor $w \in N_G(v)$ with $w \in A \setminus V(P)$.

Proof. Assume towards a contradiction, that there is no such vertex $v \in V(P)$. Then, for every $v \in V(P)$ it holds that $N_G(v) \subseteq \mathscr{C} \cup V(P)$. Then, $V(P)$ is a connected component in $G[\mathscr{P}]$. By definition of periphery components, this implies $A = V(P)$. Moreover, since (G, c, k) is reduced regarding Rule 4.3, we have $\deg(v) = \lfloor \frac{c}{2} \rfloor + 1$ for every $v \in V(P)$. From the fact that $\lfloor \frac{c}{2} \rfloor + 1 > 2$ we conclude $N_G(v) \cap \mathscr{C} \neq \emptyset$ and therefore, every $v \in V(P)$ is a close vertex of A. This contradicts the fact that $A \setminus A^* \neq \emptyset$. ◁

Now, let $v_j \in V(P)$ be a vertex such that there exists such $w \in N_G(v)$ with $w \in A \setminus V(P)$ as described in Claim 4.15. Note that $\{v_j, w\} \in S^q_{L'}$ for some strong color q. Also note that there exists a vertex $v' \in V(P)$ such that v' is distinct from v and $q \in \text{out}(v')$.

Consider the path $P' = (v_0, v_1, \ldots, v_j, w)$ in $G[A]$. Since P is edge-simple so is P'. Let $Q^{P'}_{L'} = (q_0, q_1, \ldots, q_j)$ be the color sequence of P' under L'. Note that $q_0 = 0$, and $q_j = q$. Then, by Lemma 4.6 there exists an STC-labeling L'' with $L''|_{E \setminus E(P)} = L'|_{E \setminus E(P)}$ such that $|W_{L''}| < |W_{L'}|$ or $Q^{P'}_{L''} = (q_1, \ldots, q_{j-1}, q, 0)$. In case of $|W_{L''}| < |W_{L'}|$, nothing more needs to be proven. Otherwise, from $Q^{P'}_{L''} = (q_1, \ldots, q_{j-1}, q, 0)$ we conclude $\{v_{j-1}, v_j\} \in S^q_{L''}$ and $\{v_j, w\} \in W_{L''}$. Then, consider the path $P'' = (w, v_j, v_{j+1}, \ldots, v_r, v_0, v_1)$. Since P is edge-simple so is P''. Note that $\{v_{j-1}, v_j\} \notin E(P'')$, and $Q^{P''}_{L''}(1) = 0$. Then, by Lemma 4.6, there exists an STC-labeling L''' with $L'''|_{E \setminus E(P)} = L''|_{E \setminus E(P)}$ such that $|W_{L'''}| < |W_{L''}|$ or $Q^{P''}_{L'''} = (q_j, \ldots, q_r, 0)$. In case of $|W_{L'''}| < |W_{L''}|$ nothing more needs to be shown. Otherwise, from $L'''|_{E \setminus E(P)} = L''|_{E \setminus E(P)}$ and $Q^{P''}_{L'''} = (q_j, \ldots, q_r, 0)$ it follows that $\{v_0, v_1\} \in W_{L'''}$, and there exists an edge $\{v_{j-1}, v_j\} \in S^q_{L'''}$ and a vertex $v' \in V(P)$ which is incident with an edge $e' \notin E(P)$ with $e \in S^q_{L'''}$. Then, L''' fulfills the conditions of Case 1. ◀

Propositions 4.13 and 4.2 imply the safeness of the final rule which together with Rules 4.2–4.4 gives the kernel.

▶ **Rule 4.5.** *If there is a periphery component $A \subseteq \mathscr{P}$ with $A \setminus A^* \neq \emptyset$ such that there exists a cycle P in $G[A]$, then delete $A \setminus A^*$ from G.*

▶ **Theorem 4.16.** Multi-STC *restricted to instances with $c \geq 3$ admits a problem kernel with $\mathcal{O}(\xi_{\lfloor \frac{c}{2} \rfloor + 1} \cdot c)$ vertices and $\mathcal{O}(\xi_{\lfloor \frac{c}{2} \rfloor + 1} \cdot c^2)$ edges that can be computed in $\mathcal{O}(n + m)$ time.*

Proof. Throughout this proof let $\xi := 2\xi_{\lfloor \frac{c}{2} \rfloor + 1}$ denote the size of a 2-approximate set D_t. From Proposition 4.4 we know, that if $c \geq 3$ is odd, we can compute a problem kernel with at most $2 \cdot \xi \cdot (\lfloor \frac{c}{2} \rfloor + 1)$ vertices, and $\mathcal{O}(\xi \cdot c^2)$ in $\mathcal{O}(n+m)$ time. Let $(G = (V, E), c, k)$ be an instance of Multi-STC, where $c \geq 4$ is an even number. We compute an instance $(G' = (V', E'), c, k)$ as follows: We start by applying Rules 4.2 and 4.3 exhaustively. This can be done in $\mathcal{O}(n+m)$ time by computing all connected components of $G[\mathscr{P}]$ and checking whether they have close vertices or vertices of low degree. Afterwards, we apply the Rules 4.4 and 4.5 exhaustively. This can also be done in $\mathcal{O}(n + m)$ time by testing if the connected components in $G[\mathscr{P}]$ with non-close vertices contain cycles. Note that at this point it is not important whether a cycle is a triangle or a cycle of length bigger than three.

We next show $|V'| \leq (c + 7) \cdot \xi$. Let $\mathscr{C}$ be the set of core vertices of G' and $\mathscr{P}$ be the set of periphery vertices of G'. Since $|\mathscr{C}| \leq 2\xi$, and every $v \in \mathscr{C}$ is incident with at most $\frac{c}{2} + 1$ edges, there are $2\xi + 2\xi(\frac{c}{2} + 1) = \xi c + 4\xi$ vertices in $\mathscr{C} \cup N(\mathscr{C})$. It remains to show that

there are at most 3ξ non-close vertices in $\mathscr{P}$. Consider the following family of periphery components.

$$\mathcal{A} := \{A \subseteq \mathscr{P} \mid A \text{ is periphery component with } A \setminus A^* \neq \emptyset\}$$

Since G' is reduced regarding Rules 4.3, 4.4, and 4.5, every $G[A]$ with $A \in \mathcal{A}$ is a tree, where every vertex $v \in A$ has degree $\deg_G(v) = \frac{c}{2} + 1$ in G. We define a *leaf vertex* as a vertex $v \in \bigcup_{A\in\mathcal{A}} A$ with $\deg_{G[\mathscr{P}]}(v) = 1$. Note that these vertices are exactly the leaves of a tree $G[A]$ for some $A \in \mathcal{A}$, and all leaf vertices are close vertices in $\mathscr{P}$. Let p be the number of leaf vertices. We show that $p \leq 3\xi$. Since (G', c, k) is reduced regarding Rule 4.3, every vertex $v \in \bigcup_{A\in\mathcal{A}} A$ has a degree of $\deg_G(v) = \frac{c}{2} + 1$, hence every leaf vertex has exactly $\frac{c}{2}$ neighbors in $\mathscr{C}$. We thus have

$$p \cdot \frac{c}{2} \leq |E(\mathscr{C}, N(\mathscr{C}))| \leq 2\xi(\frac{c}{2} + 1),$$

and therefore $p \leq 2\xi + \frac{4\xi}{c} \leq 3\xi$, since $c \geq 4$. Recall that every non-close vertex v in some tree $G[A]$ satisfies $\deg_{G[A]}(v) = \frac{c}{2} + 1 > 2$. Since a tree has at most as many vertices with degree at least three as it has leaves, we conclude $|(\bigcup_{A\in\mathcal{A}} A) \setminus (\bigcup_{A\in\mathcal{A}} A^*)| \leq 3\xi$. Hence, there are at most 3ξ non-close vertices in $\mathscr{P}$. Then, G' contains of at most $(c+7)\cdot\xi \in \mathcal{O}(\xi c)$ vertices, as claimed. Since each vertex is incident with at most $\frac{c}{2} + 1$ edges, G' has $\mathcal{O}(\xi c^2)$ edges. ◀

5 ECS and Multi-STC with Lists

In this section we present linear-size kernels for EL-Multi-STC and EL-ECS parameterized by ξ_2 for all c. The formal problem definitions are as follows.

▶ **Definition 5.1.** *Let $G = (V, E)$ be a graph, $\Psi : E \to 2^{\{1,2,\ldots,c\}}$ a mapping for some value $c \in \mathbb{N}$ and $L = (S_L^1, \ldots, S_L^c, W_L)$ a c-colored STC-labeling. We say that an edge $e \in E$* satisfies the Ψ-list property under L *if $e \in W_L$ or $e \in S_L^\alpha$ for some $\alpha \in \Psi(e)$. We call a c-colored labeling* Ψ-satisfying *if every edge $e \in E$ satisfies the Ψ-list property under L.*

Edge-List Edge-Colorable Subgraph (EL-ECS)
Input: An undirected graph $G = (V, E)$, integers $c \in \mathbb{N}$ and $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and edge lists $\Psi : E \to 2^{\{1,2,\ldots,c\}}$.
Question: Is there a Ψ-satisfying labeling L with $|W_L| \leq k$?

Edge-List Multi Strong Triadic Closure (EL-Multi-STC)
Input: An undirected graph $G = (V, E)$, integers $c \in \mathbb{N}$ and $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and edge lists $\Psi : E \to 2^{\{1,2,\ldots,c\}}$.
Question: Is there a Ψ-satisfying STC-labeling L with $|W_L| \leq k$?

Before showing the kernelization, we motivate the parameter ξ_2 with the following negative result.

▶ **Proposition 1.5.** EL-ECS *and* EL-Multi-STC *are NP-hard for all $c \geq 3$ on triangle-free cubic graphs even if $\xi_3 = k = 0$.*

Proof. We reduce from ECS on triangle-free cubic graphs which is known to be NP-hard [2] to EL-ECS.

Let $G = (V, E), k = 0, c = 3$ be an instance of ECS such that G is a triangle-free cubic graph. Let $k := 0$ and $\Psi(e) := \{1, 2, 3\}$ for all $e \in E$. Since every edge $e \in E$ is only allowed

to be colored in either $1, 2$, or 3, it is obvious that (G,c,Ψ,k) is a yes-instance of EL-ECS if and only if G is three-edge-colorable. Thus EL-ECS is NP-hard for all $c \geq 3$ on triangle-free cubic graph even if $\xi_3 = k = 0$.

Since EL-Multi-STC corresponds to EL-ECS on triangle-free graphs, the reduction to EL-Multi-STC is completely analogous. ◀

Next, we will present the linear kernel for the parameter ξ_2. We first show the kernel for EL-ECS and then show that (after some preprocessing) all rules are also safe for EL-Multi-STC. Let (G, c, Ψ, k) be an instance of EL-ECS with edge-deletion set $D := D_{\xi_2}$, and let $\mathscr{C}$ and $\mathscr{P}$ be the core and periphery of G as defined in Section 3. Every periphery component $A \subseteq \mathscr{P}$ is either an isolated cycle, an isolated vertex, or a path. To differentiate between paths that are part of an isolated cycle and those that are not, we give the following definition.

▶ **Definition 5.2.** *A bounded-degree path (BDP) $P = (v_1, \ldots, v_r), r > 1$, in G is a simple inclusion maximal path in G such that P is not part of an isolated cycle and $\deg(v_i) \leq 2$ for every $v_i \in V(P)$. If at least one endpoint of P has degree one, then a BDP is called open. Furthermore, we call a path P a bounded-degree subpath (BDSP) if P is a (not necessarily proper) subpath of a BDP.*

By our definition, it is possible that endpoints of a BDP are core vertices. Obviously, the set of isolated cycles and the set of BDPs is unique and can be computed in $O(n + m)$ time by finding all vertices $v \in V$ with $1 \leq \deg(v) \leq 2$, and then computing all induced subgraphs of these vertices that are not isolated vertices. Since all following rules only work on isolated cycles and BDSPs, we do not need to know D, $\mathscr{C}$, or $\mathscr{P}$ in advance.

With Algorithm 1 we will give a polynomial-time algorithm for finding an optimal labeling for isolated cycles and isolated BDPs which we will use to remove all of them. Thus the following rules aim to reduce the size of BDPs that are connected with at least one core vertex. In the following, let $I_G(e)$ denote the incident edges of an edge e in G. If G is clear from the context, we just write $I(e)$. Observe that $|I(e)| \leq 2$ for every edge e that is on a BDP. Furthermore, for a given labeling L, an edge set E, and a vertex v, let $\mathrm{out}_L^E(v) := \{L(e) \in \{1, \ldots, c\} \mid e \in E, v \in e\}$ denote the set of strong colors of edges $e \in E$ incident with v under L. For a better use, we also extend the definition of out_L^E to edges by setting $\mathrm{out}_L^E(\{u, v\}) := \mathrm{out}_L^E(u) \cup \mathrm{out}_L^E(v)$. Observe that $|\mathrm{out}_L^{E \setminus E(P)}(e)|$ is at most two for every edge e that is on a BDSP P and at most one if P has also length at least 3.

▶ **Rule 5.1.** *If (G, Ψ, k) contains an edge e on a BDP $P = (v_1, \ldots, v_r)$ such that P has length at least three or is an open BDP, then remove e if at least one of the following holds:*

1. $\Psi(e) = \emptyset$,
2. $|\Psi(e)| > |I(e)|$ *or*
3. $\Psi(e) \setminus \left(\bigcup_{e' \in I(e)} \Psi(e')\right) \neq \emptyset, v_1 \notin e$, *and* $v_r \notin e$

and set $\Psi := \Psi|_{E \setminus \{e\}}$. If $\Psi(e) = \emptyset$, also decrease k by one.

▶ **Proposition 5.3.** *Rule 5.1 is safe and can be exhaustively applied in $\mathcal{O}(n^2)$ time.*

Proof. Let (G, Ψ, k) be an EL-ECS instance with an edge e satisfying the conditions of Rule 5.1. Furthermore, let (G', Ψ', k') be the modified instance of EL-ECS constructed by Rule 5.1. First, we show that (G, Ψ, k) is a yes-instance if and only if (G', Ψ', k') is a yes-instance.

Case 1: $\Psi(e) = \emptyset$. In this case, $k' = k - 1$.

($\Rightarrow$) Let L be a proper Ψ-satisfying labeling for G with at most k weak edges. We define $L' := L|_{E\setminus\{e\}}$. Since $\Psi(e) = \emptyset$ it is obvious that $L(e) = 0$. Thus L' has at most $k-1 = k'$ weak edges. It is obvious that L' is a proper Ψ'-satisfying labeling for G' since L is a proper Ψ-satisfying labeling for G.

($\Leftarrow$) Let L' be a proper Ψ'-satisfying edge labeling for G' with at most k' weak edges. We define L by setting $L(e) := 0$ and $L|_{E\setminus\{e\}} := L'|_{E\setminus\{e\}}$. Obviously, L is a proper Ψ-satisfying labeling with at most $k' + 1 = k$ weak edges for G.

Cases 2 and 3. In these cases, $k' = k$.

($\Rightarrow$) Let L be a proper Ψ-satisfying labeling for G with at most k weak edges. We define $L' := L|_{E\setminus\{e\}}$. It is obvious that L' is a proper Ψ'-satisfying labeling for G' with at most $k = k'$ weak edges.

($\Leftarrow$) Let L' be a proper Ψ'-satisfying labeling for G' with at most k' weak edges and let $e := \{v_1, v_2\}$. We choose an arbitrary color $c_x \in \Psi(e) \setminus (\text{out}_{L'}^{E'}(e))$. This set is non-empty because of the conditions of Cases 2 and 3. We define L by setting $L(e) := c_x$ and $L|_{E\setminus\{e\}} := L'|_{E\setminus\{e\}}$. Since $c_x \in \Psi(e)$ is a strong color such that no incident edge of e is colored in c_x under L, it follows directly that L is a proper Ψ-satisfying labeling with at most $k' = k$ weak edges.

Next, we show the running time. Finding an edge e that satisfies the condition of Case 3 can only be done in $\mathcal{O}(n)$ time if the sizes of the allowed lists of colors of e and its incident edges is constant. So we assume that Case 1 and Case 2 are exhaustively applied, before we apply Case 3. Every application of Rule 5.1 removes one edge from G and an edge can be found in $\mathcal{O}(n)$ time with the previous argumentation. Consequently, Rule 5.1 can be exhaustively applied in $\mathcal{O}(n^2)$ time. ◀

From this point onwards we assume that Rule 5.1 is exhaustively applied. Let P be a BDP of length at least 3 or an open BDP, then for every edge $e \in E(P)$ it now holds that $|\Psi(e)| \leq 2$ since $|I(e)| \leq 2$ and Case 2 is exhaustively applied. In combination with Case 1 it is obvious that $1 \leq |\Psi(e)| \leq 2$. Furthermore, we get that there is no BDSP $P' = (v_1, v_2, v_3, v_4)$ where $e_i := \{v_i, v_{i+1}\}$ for all $i \in \{1, 2, 3\}$ such that $\Psi(e_1) = \Psi(e_3), \Psi(e_1) \neq \Psi(e_2)$, and $|\Psi(e_2)| = 2$ because this implies that $\Psi(e_2) \setminus \left(\bigcup_{e' \in I(e_2)} \Psi(e')\right) \neq \emptyset$ which is not possible after Case 3 is exhaustively applied.

The next rule splits the center vertex v_2 in a BDSP of length three into two new vertices with one incident edge each, if the allowed colors of both incident edges of v_2 are disjoint. Hence, this rule splits some BDP into two open BDPs.

▶ **Rule 5.2.** *If (G, Ψ, k) contains a BDSP $P = (v_1, v_2, v_3)$ with $\Psi(e_1) \cap \Psi(e_2) = \emptyset$ where $e_1 := \{v_1, v_2\}, e_2 := \{v_2, v_3\}$, then remove v_2 from G, add two new vertices u, w, two new edges $e_1' := \{v_1, u\}$ and $e_2' := \{w, v_3\}$ to G and set $\Psi(e_1') := \Psi(e_1)$ and $\Psi(e_2') := \Psi(e_2)$.*

▶ **Proposition 5.4.** *Rule 5.2 is safe and can be exhaustively applied in $\mathcal{O}(n^2)$ time.*

Proof. Let (G, Ψ, k) be an EL-ECS instance with $P = (v_1, v_2, v_3)$ satisfying the conditions of Rule 5.2. Furthermore, let (G', Ψ', k) be the modified instance of EL-ECS constructed by Rule 5.2. First, we show that (G, Ψ, k) is a yes-instance if and only if (G', Ψ', k) is a yes-instance.

($\Rightarrow$) Let L be a proper Ψ-satisfying labeling for G with at most k weak edges. We define $L'(e_1') := L(e_1), L'(e_2') := L(e_2), L'|_{E\setminus E(P)} := L|_{E\setminus E(P)}$. First, we show that L' is a proper Ψ'-satisfying labeling with at most k weak edges. From the definition of L' and Ψ' it is obvious that L' is Ψ'-satisfying, since L is Ψ-satisfying and $\Psi'(e_1') = \Psi(e_1)$ and $\Psi'(e_2') = \Psi(e_2)$. It is also clear that L' has at most k weak edges because L has at

most k weak edges. It remains to show that L' is a proper labeling. Since L is a proper labeling and $I_{G'}(e'_i) \subseteq I_G(e_i)$ for all $i \in \{1,2\}$ this condition also holds.

($\Leftarrow$) Let L' be a proper Ψ'-satisfying labeling for G' with at most k weak edges. We define L by setting $L(e_1) := L'(e'_1), L(e_2) := L'(e'_2)$, and $L|_{E\setminus E(P)} := L'|_{E\setminus E(P)}$. First, we show that L is a proper Ψ-satisfying labeling with at most k weak edges. Since L' is a proper labeling and $I_G(e_i) = I_{G'}(e'_i) \cup E(P) \setminus \{e_i\}$ for all $i \in \{1,2\}$ it is clear that the only conflict of two incident edges receiving the same strong color under L could be the edges of $E(P)$. But since $\Psi(e_1) \cap \Psi(e_2) = \emptyset$ it follows that e'_1 and e'_2 receive different strong colors under L' and hence also under L. Thus it is is clear that L is a proper labeling. Clearly, L is also Ψ-satisfying and has at most k weak edges.

Next, we show the running time. Since every edge e in a BDP has at most two incident edges, it can only be on at most two BDSPs that satisfy the condition of Rule 5.2. So Rule 5.2 can be applied at most $\mathcal{O}(n)$ times and a BDSP P that fulfills the conditions of Rule 5.1 can be found in $\mathcal{O}(n)$ time. Consequently, Rule 5.2 can be exhaustively applied in $\mathcal{O}(n^2)$. ◀

From this point onwards we assume that Rule 5.2 is exhaustively applied.

The next rule moves all edges with a list of size one in a BDP P to one side of the BDP and all other edges to the other side. To prevent this rule to be applied infinitely often, we define an order on the vertices of every BDP. Let $P = (v_1, \ldots, v_r), r \geq 2$, be a BDP and assume without loss of generality that $\deg(v_1) \geq \deg(v_r)$, then we define an order $\prec_P$: $V(P) \times V(P)$ in a way that $v_i \prec_P v_j :\Leftrightarrow i < j$.

▶ **Rule 5.3.** *If (G, Ψ, k) contains a BDP P and a subpath $P' = (v_1, v_2, v_3)$ of P with $v_1 \prec_P v_2, |\Psi(e_1)| = 2$ and $|\Psi(e_2)| = 1$ where $e_1 := \{v_1, v_2\}, e_2 := \{v_2, v_3\}$, then set $\Psi(e_1) := \Psi(e_1) \setminus \Psi(e_2)$ and $\Psi(e_2) := \Psi(e_1)$.*

▶ **Proposition 5.5.** *Rule 5.3 is safe and can be exhaustively applied in $\mathcal{O}(n^2)$ time.*

Proof. Let (G, Ψ, k) be an EL-ECS instance with $P' = (v_1, v_2, v_3)$ satisfying the conditions of Rule 5.3. Furthermore, let (G, Ψ', k) be the modified instance of EL-ECS constructed by Rule 5.3. First, we show that (G, Ψ, k) is a yes-instance if and only if (G, Ψ', k) is a yes-instance.

($\Rightarrow$) Let L be a proper Ψ-satisfying labeling for G with at most k weak edges. Since Rule 5.2 is applied exhaustively, we can assume without loss of generality that $\Psi(e_1) = \{1,2\}, \Psi(e_2) = \{1\}$ and thus $\Psi'(e_1) = \{2\}$ and $\Psi'(e_2) = \{1,2\}$. Because L is a proper labeling, e_1 and e_2 are not colored in the same strong color. Hence, $Q_L^{P'} \in (\{w,1,2\} \times \{w,1\}) \setminus \{(1,1)\}$.

Case 1: $Q_L^{P'} \neq (1,0)$: Obviously, L is already a Ψ'-satisfying labeling for G with at most k weak edges.

Case 2: $Q_L^{P'} = (1,0)$: Let c_x be an arbitrary color of $\Psi'(e_2) \setminus \text{out}_L^{E\setminus E(P')}(e_2)$. We define $L'(e_1) := 0$ and $L'(e_2) := c_x$ and $L'|_{E\setminus E(P')} := L|_{E\setminus E(P')}$. Obviously, L' is a proper Ψ'-satisfying labeling for G with at most $k - 1 + 1 = k$ weak edges.

($\Leftarrow$) Since we do not use the order $\prec_P$, this direction is completely analogous to the first one.

Next, we show the running time. Rule 5.3 can be interpreted as a "swap" of the Ψ-values of two incident edges, so we can exhaustively apply Rule 5.3 on every BDP P in time $\mathcal{O}(|V(P)|^2)$ with a modified version of Bubblesort. Since there are at most $|V(P)|$ edges that lie on BDPs in G and thus $\sum_{P:P \text{ is BDP}} |V(P)|^2 \in \mathcal{O}(|V|^2)$, Rule 5.3 can be exhaustively applied in $\mathcal{O}(n^2)$ time. ◀

After Rule 5.3 is exhaustively applied, every BDP $P = (v_1, \ldots, v_r), r \geq 2$, starts with edges that have only one allowed color and since Rule 5.2 is exhaustively applied, this unique

color is the same for all these edges. From a specific vertex v_t onwards all edges have an allowed set of two colors. So the following rules aim to reduce the length of these two subpaths of P to a constant size. Observe that if P is open, then it holds that $\deg(v_r) = 1$ and so $|I(e_{r-1})| \leq 1$ where $e_{r-1} := \{v_{r-1}, v_r\}$. Thus $|\Psi(e_{r-1})| = 1$ since otherwise Rule 5.1 is applies. Consequently, after Rule 5.3 is exhaustively applied, for every open BDP P it holds that $|\Psi(e)| = 1$ for all $e \in E(P)$. So the next rule reduces each open BDPs to one of length at most one, so that we only have to handle non-open BDPs afterwards.

▶ **Rule 5.4.** *If (G, Ψ, k) contains a BDSP $P = (v_1, v_2, v_3)$ with $\Psi(e_1) = \Psi(e_2), |\Psi(e_1)| = 1$ and $\deg(v_3) = 1$ where $e_1 := \{v_1, v_2\}, e_2 := \{v_2, v_3\}$, then remove v_2, v_3 from G and decrease k by one. Furthermore, set $\Psi := \Psi|_{E \setminus E(P)}$*

▶ **Proposition 5.6.** *Rule 5.4 is safe and can be exhaustively applied in $\mathcal{O}(n^2)$ time.*

Proof. Let (G, Ψ, k) be an EL-ECS instance with $P = (v_1, v_2, v_3)$ satisfying the conditions of Rule 5.4. Furthermore, let $(G', \Psi', k-1)$ be the modified instance of EL-ECS constructed by Rule 5.4. First, we show that (G, Ψ, k) is a yes-instance if and only if $(G', \Psi', k-1)$ is a yes-instance.

($\Rightarrow$) Let L be a proper Ψ-satisfying labeling for G with at most k weak edges. Since $\Psi(e_1) = \Psi(e_2)$, and $|\Psi(e_1)| = 1$ at least one of these two edges is weak under L and thus it is obvious that $L' := L|_{E \setminus E(P)}$ is a Ψ'-satisfying labeling for G' with at most $k-1$ weak edges.

($\Leftarrow$) Let L' be a proper Ψ'-satisfying labeling for G' with at most $k-1$ weak edges and let c_x be the unique color of $\Psi(e_1)$. We define L with $L(e_1) := 0, L(e_2) := c_x$ and $L|_{E \setminus E(P)} := L'|_{E \setminus E(P)}$. Since $\deg(v_3) = 1$ it follows that $I(e_2) = \{e_1\}$ and thus that L is a proper Ψ-satisfying labeling for G with at most $k - 1 + 1 = k$ weak edges.

Next, we show the running time. Every application of Rule 5.4 removes two edges from G and a BDSP P that fulfills the conditions of Rule 5.4 can be found in $\mathcal{O}(n)$ time. Consequently, Rule 5.4 can be exhaustively applied in $\mathcal{O}(n^2)$ time. ◀

As mentioned earlier, for every open BDP P it holds that $\Psi(e_1) = \Psi(e_2)$ and $|\Psi(e_1)| = 1$ for all $e_1, e_2 \in E(P)$. So obviously, after Rule 5.4 is exhaustively applied, P has length at most two. Furthermore if P is an isolated BDP it follows with Case 2 of Rule 5.1 that $E(P) = \emptyset$. Thus after the Rules 5.1 - 5.4 are exhaustively applied, there is no edge that lies on an isolated BDP.

▶ **Proposition 5.7.** *The number of weak edges in an optimal Ψ-satisfying labeling for an isolated BDP P can be computed in $\mathcal{O}(|V(P)|^2)$ time.*

Proof. Let P be an isolated BDP in G and $\Psi : E \to 2^{\{1,\dots,c\}}$, we set $G_2 := G[V(P)]$. Then P is obviously an isolated (and thus open) BDP in G_2. We construct the EL-ECS instance $I := (G_2, \Psi, |E|)$. Since $|E|$ is a trivial upper bound for the number of weak edges in an optimal labeling for G_2, I is a yes-instance. Let $I' := (G', \Psi', k')$ be the reduced instance after we apply Rules 5.1 - 5.4 exhaustively. Since $|E(G')| = \emptyset$ and I and I' are equivalent instances it follows that $|E| - k'$ is the minimum number of weak edges for every optimal Ψ-satisfying labeling of G. Since Rules 5.1–5.4 can all be exhaustively applied in $\mathcal{O}(|V(P)|^2)$ time, this algorithm also runs in $\mathcal{O}(|V(P)|^2)$ time. ◀

With this proposition at hand we can also compute the optimal number of weak edges for an for an isolated cycle C.

▶ **Proposition 5.8.** *Algorithm 1 is correct and runs in $\mathcal{O}(|V(C)|^2)$ time.*

Algorithm 1 EL-ECS minimum weak edges in cycle

1: **Input:** A cycle $C = (v_1, v_2, \ldots, v_r, v_1), r \geq 3$, $G = (V(C), E(C))$ and $\Psi : E \to 2^{\{1,\ldots,c\}}$
2: **Output:** The number of weak edges in an optimal Ψ-satisfying labeling for G
3: $e_x := \{v_1, v_2\}$
4: $G' := (V, E \setminus \{e_x\})$
5: $\Psi' := \Psi|_{E(G')\{e_x\}}$
6: **if** $|\Psi(e_x)| \geq 3$ **then**
7: **return** minimum number of weak edges for (G', Ψ')
8: **else**
9: $k' := 1 +$ minimum number of weak edges for (G', Ψ')
10: **for** $\alpha \in \Psi(e_x)$ **do**
11: Set $\Psi'|_{I(e_x)}(e) = \Psi(e) \setminus \{\alpha\}$
12: $k' := \min(k',$ minimum number of weak edges for $(G', \Psi'))$
13: **return** k'

Proof. First, we show the correctness. Let (C, G, Ψ) be the input of the algorithm, then e_x is an arbitrary edge of this cycle. Obviously, after removing e_x from G, the remaining graph consists of an isolated BDP for which we can find the number of weak edges in an optimal Ψ-satisfying labeling with Proposition 5.7. If $r \geq 3$, it is safe to remove e_x from G with the same argumentation as in Rule 5.1. Otherwise, we can branch over all possible colors $\alpha \in \Psi(e_x) \cup \{0\}$ by removing α from the allowed set of strong colors of the incident edges of e_x. This is correct, since for every proper Ψ-satisfying labeling L for G it holds that $L(e_x) \in \Psi(e_x) \cup \{0\}$ and $L(e_x) \notin \text{out}_L^{E \setminus E(C)}(e_x)$. Hence, one of the prelabelings is part of an optimal one.

Next, we show the running time. Since every operation in this algorithm has running time at most $\mathcal{O}(|V(C)|^2)$ and Line 10 is finished after at most two turns, the whole algorithm obviously runs in $\mathcal{O}(|V(C)|^2)$ time. ◀

With Proposition 5.8 it follows directly that the following Rule is safe and can be be exhaustively applied in $\mathcal{O}(n^2)$ time.

▶ **Rule 5.5.** *If (G, Ψ, k) contains an isolated cycle C, then compute the number of weak edges k' in an optimal $\Psi|_{E(C)}$-satisfying labeling for $G[C]$ with Algorithm 1. Remove C from G and reduce k by k'.*

From this point onwards we assume that Rule 5.5 is exhaustively applied. So every periphery component is either an isolated vertex, an open BDSP of length two that is connected with a core vertex or a non-open BDSP. So the following rules aim to reduce every non-open BDP to length at most four.

▶ **Rule 5.6.** *If (G, Ψ, k) contains a proper BDSP $P = (v_1, v_2, v_3, v_4)$ with $\Psi(e_1) = \Psi(e_2) = \Psi(e_3)$ where $e_i := \{v_i, v_{i+1}\}$ for all $i \in \{1, 2, 3\}$, then remove v_2, v_3 from G, add a new edge $e' := \{v_1, v_4\}$ and set $\Psi(e) := \Psi(e_1)$. Also decrease k by one if $|\Psi(e_1)| = 1$.*

In other words: if there is a proper BDSP of length four where all three edges have the exact same list of allowed colors, then remove all these edges and connect both endpoints directly by an edge that has the same list of allowed colors as the removed edges.

▶ **Proposition 5.9.** *Rule 5.6 is safe and can be exhaustively applied in $\mathcal{O}(n^2)$ time.*

Proof. Let (G, Ψ, k) be an EL-ECS instance with $P = (v_1, v_2, v_3, v_4)$ satisfying the conditions of Rule 5.6. Furthermore, let (G', Ψ', k') be the modified instance of EL-ECS constructed by Rule 5.6 and let $P' := (v_1, v_4)$. First, we show that (G, Ψ, k) is a yes-instance if and only if (G', Ψ', k') is a yes-instance.

Case 1: $|\Psi(e_1)| = 1$**.** We can assume without loss of generality that $\Psi(e_1) = \Psi(e_2) = \Psi(e_3) = \{1\}$ and thus $\Psi'(e') = \{1\}$.

($\Rightarrow$) Let L be a proper Ψ-satisfying labeling with at most k weak edges for G. Obviously, Q_L^P contains at least one weak color since $(1, 1, 1)$ is not a proper labeling for $E(P)$. Initialize L' with $L'|_{E\setminus E(P)} = L|_{E\setminus E(P)}$. First, assume that Q_L^P contains exactly one weak color. Then, $Q_L^P = (1, 0, 1)$ since otherwise L is not a proper labeling. We define $L'(e') = 1$. Since $1 \notin \text{out}_L^{E\setminus E(P)}(e_1) \cup \text{out}_L^{E\setminus E(P)}(e_3)$ it is obvious that L' is a proper Ψ'-satisfying labeling for G' with at most $k - 1 = k'$ weak edges. Second, assume that Q_L^P contains at least two weak colors. We define $L'(e') = 0$. Obviously, L' is a proper Ψ'-satisfying labeling for G' with at most $k - 2 + 1 = k'$ weak edges.

($\Leftarrow$) Let L' be a proper Ψ'-satisfying labeling with at most k' weak edges for G'. Initialize L with $L|_{E\setminus E(P)} = L'|_{E\setminus E(P)}$. First, assume that $L'(e') = 0$. We define $L(e_1) = L(e_3) = 0$ and $L(e_2) = 1$. It is obvious that L is a proper Ψ-satisfying labeling for G with at most $k' - 1 + 2 = k$ weak edges. Second, assume that $L'(e') = 1$. Since $1 \notin \text{out}_{L'}^{E'\setminus E(P')}(e')$, we define $L(e_1) = L(e_3) = 1$ and $L(e_2) = 0$. It is obvious that L is a proper Ψ-satisfying labeling for G with at most $k' + 1 = k$ weak edges.

Case 2: $|\Psi(e_1)| = 2$**.** We can assume without loss of generality that $\Psi(e_1) = \Psi(e_2) = \Psi(e_3) = \{1, 2\}$ and thus $\Psi'(e') = \{1, 2\}$.

($\Rightarrow$) Let L be a proper Ψ-satisfying labeling with at most k weak edges for G. Initialize L' with $L'|_{E\setminus E(P)} = L|_{E\setminus E(P)}$. First, assume that Q_L^P contains no weak color. Hence, $Q_L^P \in \{(1, 2, 1), (2, 1, 2)\}$. We assume without loss of generality that $Q_L^P = (1, 2, 1)$ and define $L'(e') = 1$. Since $1 \notin \text{out}_L^{E\setminus E(P)}(e_1) \cup \text{out}_L^{E\setminus E(P)}(e_3)$ it is obvious that L' is a proper Ψ'-satisfying labeling for G' with at most $k = k'$ weak edges. Second, assume Q_L^P contains at least one weak color. We define $L'(e') = 0$. Obviously, L' is a proper Ψ'-satisfying labeling for G' with at most $k - 1 + 1 = k'$ weak edges.

($\Leftarrow$) Let L' be a proper Ψ'-satisfying labeling with at most $k' = k$ weak edges for G'. Initialize L with $L|_{E\setminus E(P)} = L'|_{E\setminus E(P)}$. First, assume that $L'(e') = 0$. Choose an arbitrary color $c_x \in \Psi(e_3) \setminus \text{out}_{L'}^{E\setminus E(P)}(e_3)$ and let c_y be the unique remaining color in $\Psi(e_2) \setminus \{c_x\}$. We define $L(e_1) = 0, L(e_2) = c_y$ and $L(e_3) = c_x$. Obviously, L is a proper Ψ-satisfying edge with at most $k' - 1 + 1 = k$ weak edges for G. Second, assume that $L'(e') \neq 0$. Assume without loss of generality that $L'(e') = 1$. We define $L(e_1) = L(e_3) = 1$ and $L(e_2) = 2$. Since $1 \notin \text{out}_{L'}^{E'\setminus E(P')}(e')$ it is obvious that L is a proper Ψ-satisfying labeling with at most $k' = k$ weak edges for G.

Next, we show the running time. Every application of Rule 5.6 removes two edge from G and a BDSP P that fulfills the conditions of Rule 5.6 can be found in $\mathcal{O}(n)$ time. Consequently, Rule 5.6 can be exhaustively applied in $\mathcal{O}(n^2)$ time. ◀

So after Rule 5.6 is applied exhaustively, every BDP of length at least five contains at most two edges that have a list of size one. Since we aim to reduce all BDPs to length at most four, the following Rule decreases the number of edges on BDPs that have a list of allowed colors of size two by changing the lists on those edges or removing them.

▶ **Rule 5.7.** *If (G, Ψ, k) contains a proper BDSP $P = (v_1, v_2, v_3, v_4)$ with $|\Psi(e_i)| = 2, \Psi(e_1) \neq \Psi(e_3)$ and $\Psi(e_2) \neq \Psi(e_3)$ where $e_i := \{v_i, v_{i+1}\}$ for all $i \in \{1, 2, 3\}$, then increase k by one, and do the following:*

- ***If*** $\Psi(e_1) = \Psi(e_2)$*, then let* c_x *be the unique color of* $\Psi(e_2) \cap \Psi(e_3)$ *and set* $\Psi(e_1) = \Psi(e_2) = \{c_x\}$.
- ***If*** $\Psi(e_1) \neq \Psi(e_2)$ ***and*** $\Psi(e_1) \cap \Psi(e_3) = \emptyset$*, then let* c_x *be the unique color of* $\Psi(e_1) \cap \Psi(e_2)$ *and* c_y *be the unique color of* $\Psi(e_3) \setminus \Psi(e_2)$*. Set* $\Psi(e_1) = \Psi(e_2) = \{c_x\}$ *and* $\Psi(e_3) = \{c_x, c_y\}$.
- ***If*** $\Psi(e_1) \neq \Psi(e_2)$ ***and*** $\Psi(e_1) \cap \Psi(e_3) \neq \emptyset$*, then let* c_x *be the unique color of* $\Psi(e_1) \cap \Psi(e_3)$*, remove* v_3 *from* G *and add a new edge* $e' := \{v_2, v_4\}$*. Furthermore, set* $\Psi(e_1) = \Psi(e') = \{c_x\}$.

▶ **Proposition 5.10.** *Rule 5.7 is safe and can be exhaustively applied in* $\mathcal{O}(n^2)$ *time.*

Proof. Let (G, Ψ, k) be an EL-ECS instance with $P = (v_1, v_2, v_3, v_4)$ satisfying the conditions of Rule 5.7. Furthermore, let (G', Ψ', k') be the modified instance of EL-ECS constructed by Rule 5.7. First, we show that (G, Ψ, k) is a yes-instance if and only if (G', Ψ', k') is a yes-instance.

Case 1: $\Psi(e_1) = \Psi(e_2)$**.** Since Rule 5.2 is exhaustively applied, we can assume without loss of generality that $\Psi(e_1) = \Psi(e_2) = \{1, 2\}, \Psi(e_3) = \{2, 3\}$ and thus $\Psi'(e_1) = \Psi'(e_2) = \{2\}, \Psi'(e_3) = \{2, 3\}$.

($\Rightarrow$) Let L be a proper Ψ-satisfying labeling with at most k weak edges for G. Initialize L' with $L'|_{E\setminus E(P)} = L|_{E\setminus E(P)}$. First, assume that Q_L^P contains at least one weak color. We define $L'(e_1) = L'(e_3) = 0$ and $L'(e_2) = 2$. Obviously, L' is a proper Ψ'-satisfying labeling for G' with at most $k - 1 + 2 = k'$ weak edges. Second, assume that Q_L^P contains no weak color. Then, $Q_L^P \in \{(1,2,3),(2,1,2),(2,1,3)\}$. If $Q_L^P = (1,2,3)$, define $L'(e_1) = 0, L'(e_2) = 2$ and $L'(e_3) = 3$. Otherwise, define $L'(e_1) = 2, L'(e_2) = 0$ and $L'(e_3) = L(e_3)$. In both cases it is obvious that L' is a proper Ψ'-satisfying labeling for G' with at most $k + 1 = k'$ weak edges.

($\Leftarrow$) Let L' be a proper Ψ'-satisfying labeling with at most k' weak edges for G'. Since $\Psi'(e_1) = \Psi'(e_2) = \{2\}$ it follows that $Q_{L'}^P$ contains at least one weak color. Initialize L with $L|_{E\setminus E(P)} = L'|_{E\setminus E(P)}$. First, assume that $Q_{L'}^P$ contains at least two weak colors. We choose two arbitrary colors $c_x \in \Psi(e_3) \setminus \mathrm{out}_{L'}^{E\setminus E(P)}(e_3), c_y \in \Psi(e_2) \setminus \{c_x\}$ and define $L(e_1) = 0, L(e_2) = c_y, L(e_3) = c_x$. Obviously, L is a proper Ψ-satisfying labeling for G with at most $k' - 1 = k$ weak edges. Second, assume that $Q_{L'}^P$ contains exactly one weak color. Then, $Q_{L'}^P \in \{(2,0,2),(2,0,3),(0,2,3)\}$. If $Q_{L'}^P = (2,0,2)$, define $L(e_1) = L(e_3) = 2$ and $L(e_2) = 1$. Otherwise, choose an arbitrary color $c_x \in \Psi(e_1) \setminus \mathrm{out}_{L'}^{E\setminus E(P)}(e_1)$, let c_y be the unique remaining color in $\Psi(e_2) \setminus \{c_x\}$ and define $L(e_1) = c_x, L(e_2) = c_y$ and $L(e_3) = 3$. In both cases it is obvious that L is a proper Ψ'-satisfying labeling for G' with at most $k' - 1 = k$ weak edges.

Case 2: $\Psi(e_1) \neq \Psi(e_2), \Psi(e_1) \cap \Psi(e_3) = \emptyset$**.** Since Rule 5.2 is exhaustively applied, we can assume without loss of generality that $\Psi(e_1) = \{1, 2\}, \Psi(e_2) = \{2, 3\}, \Psi(e_3) = \{3, 4\}$ and thus $\Psi'(e_1) = \Psi'(e_2) = \{1\}, \Psi'(e_3) = \{1, 4\}$.

($\Rightarrow$) Let L be a proper Ψ-satisfying labeling with at most k weak edges for G. Initialize L' with $L'|_{E\setminus E(P)} = L|_{E\setminus E(P)}$. First, assume Q_L^P contains at least one weak color. We define $L'(e_1) = L'(e_3) = 0$ and $L'(e_2) = 1$. Obviously, L' is a proper Ψ'-satisfying labeling for G' with at most $k - 1 + 2 = k'$ weak edges. Second, assume that Q_L^P contains no weak color. Then, $Q_L^P \in \{(2,3,4),(1,2,3),(1,2,4),(1,3,4)\}$. If $Q_L^P = (2,3,4)$, define $L'(e_1) = 0, L'(e_2) = 1$ and $L'(e_3) = 4$. Otherwise, choose an arbitrary color $c_x \in \Psi(e_3) \setminus \mathrm{out}_L^{E\setminus E(P)}(e_3)$ and define $L'(e_1) = 1, L'(e_2) = 0$ and $L'(e_3) = c_x$. In both cases it is obvious that L' is a proper Ψ'-satisfying labeling for G' with at most $k + 1 = k'$ weak edges.

($\Leftarrow$) Let L' be a proper Ψ'-satisfying labeling with at most k' weak edges for G'. Since $\Psi'(e_1) = \Psi'(e_2) = \{1\}$ it follows that $Q^P_{L'}$ contains at least one weak color. Initialize L with $L|_{E\setminus E(P)} = L'|_{E\setminus E(P)}$. First, assume $Q^P_{L'}$ contains at least two weak colors. We choose two arbitrary colors $c_x \in \Psi(e_3) \setminus \text{out}^{E\setminus E(P)}_{L'}(e_3), c_y \in \Psi(e_2) \setminus \{c_x\}$ and we define $L(e_1) = 0, L(e_2) = c_y, L(e_3) = c_x$. Obviously, L is a proper Ψ-satisfying labeling for G with at most $k' - 1 = k$ weak edges. Second, assume that $Q^P_{L'}$ contains exactly one weak color. Then, $Q^P_{L'} \in \{(1,0,1),(1,0,4),(0,1,4)\}$. If $Q^P_{L'} = (0,1,4)$, then choose an arbitrary color $c_x \in \Psi(e_1) \setminus \text{out}^{E\setminus E(P)}_{L'}(e_1)$ and define $L(e_1) = c_x, L(e_2) = 3$ and $L(e_3) = 4$. Otherwise, choose two arbitrary colors $c_x \in \Psi(e_3) \setminus \text{out}^{E\setminus E(P)}_{L'}(e_3), c_y \in \Psi(e_2) \setminus \{c_x\}$ and define $L(e_1) = 1, L(e_2) = c_y$ and $L(e_3) = c_x$. In both cases it is obvious that L is a proper Ψ'-satisfying labeling for G' with at most $k' - 1 = k$ weak edges.

Case 3: $\Psi(e_1) \neq \Psi(e_2), \Psi(e_1) \cap \Psi(e_3) \neq \emptyset$**.** Since Rule 5.2 is exhaustively applied, we can assume without loss of generality that $\Psi(e_1) = \{1,2\}, \Psi(e_2) = \{2,3\}, \Psi(e_3) = \{3,1\}$ and thus $\Psi'(e_1) = \Psi'(e') = \{1\}$. Furthermore, let $P' := (v_1, v_2, v_4)$

($\Rightarrow$) Let L be a proper Ψ-satisfying labeling with at most k weak edges for G. Initialize L with $L|_{E\setminus E(P)} = L'|_{E\setminus E(P)}$. First, assume that Q^P_L contains at least one weak color. We define $L'(e_1) = L'(e') = 0$. Obviously, L' is a proper Ψ'-satisfying labeling for G' with at most $k - 1 + 2 = k'$ weak edges. Second, assume that Q^P_L contains no weak color. Then, $Q^P_L \in \{(1,2,1),(1,2,3),(1,3,1),(2,3,1)\}$. If $Q^P_L = (2,3,1)$, define $L'(e_1) = 0$ and $L'(e') = 1$. Otherwise, define $L'(e_1) = 1$ and $L'(e') = 0$. In both cases it is obvious that L' is a proper Ψ'-satisfying labeling for G' with at most $k + 1 = k'$ weak edges.

($\Leftarrow$) Let L' be a proper Ψ'-satisfying labeling with at most k' weak edges for G'. Since $\Psi'(e_1) = \Psi'(e') = \{1\}$ it follows that $Q^{P'}_{L'}$ contains at least one weak color and so $Q^{P'}_{L'} \in \{(0,0),(1,0),(0,1)\}$. Initialize L' with $L'|_{E\setminus E(P)} = L|_{E\setminus E(P)}$. First, assume that $Q^{P'}_{L'} = (0,0)$. We choose an arbitrary color $c_x \in \Psi(e_3) \setminus \text{out}^{E\setminus E(P)}_{L'}(e_3)$ and we define $L(e_1) = 0, L(e_2) = 2$ and $L(e_3) = c_x$. Since $2 \notin \Psi(e_3)$, it is obvious that L is a proper Ψ-satisfying labeling for G with at most $k - 2 + 1 = k$ weak edges. Second, assume that $Q^{P'}_{L'} = (1,0)$. We choose an arbitrary color $c_x \in \Psi(e_3) \setminus \text{out}^{E\setminus E(P)}_{L'}(e_3)$ and we define $L(e_1) = 1, L(e_2) = 2$ and $L(e_3) = c_x$. Since $2 \notin \Psi(e_3)$, it is obvious that L is a proper Ψ-satisfying labeling for G with at most $k' - 1 = k$ weak edges. Finally, assume that $Q^{P'}_{L'} = (0,1)$. We choose an arbitrary color $c_x \in \Psi(e_1) \setminus \text{out}^{E\setminus E(P)}_{L'}(e_1)$ and we define $L(e_1) = c_x, L(e_2) = 3$ and $L(e_3) = 1$. Since $2 \notin \Psi(e_1)$, it is obvious that L is a proper Ψ-satisfying labeling for G with at most $k' - 1 = k$ weak edges.

Next, we show the running time. Every application of Rule 5.7 decreases the number of edges that have a set of exactly two allowed colors by at least two and a BDSP P that fulfills the conditions of Rule 5.7 can be found in $\mathcal{O}(n)$ time. Consequently, Rule 5.7 can be exhaustively applied in $\mathcal{O}(n^2)$ time. ◀

From this point onwards we assume that Rules 5.1–5.7 are exhaustively applied. Since every application of Rule 5.7 decreases the number of edges that have two allowed colors by at least two, we get that every BDP P of length at least five contains at most two edges that have two allowed colors. Together with Rule 5.6 we get that P has at most two edges that have only one allowed color. This gives us that every BDP has length at most five. By this fact it is possible to show that Rules 5.1 –5.7 already give a kernel with at most $13\xi_2$ edges. But since the linear factor can be improved to $11\xi_2$, we first present a rule to reduce the length of BDP to at most four.

▶ **Rule 5.8.** *If (G, Ψ, k) contains a proper BDSP $P = (v_1, v_2, v_3, v_4)$ with $|\Psi(e_1)| = 1, |\Psi(e_2)| = |\Psi(e_3)| = 2$ where $e_i := \{v_i, v_{i+1}\}$ for all $i \in \{1,2,3\}$, do the following*

- ***If*** $\Psi(e_2) = \Psi(e_3)$***,*** *then remove* v_2, v_3*, add a new edge* $e' := \{v_1, v_4\}$ *and set* $\Psi(e') := \Psi(e_1)$*.*
- ***If*** $\Psi(e_2) \neq \Psi(e_3)$***.*** *then remove* v_3 *from* G*, add a new edge* $e' := \{v_2, v_4\}$ *and set* $\Psi(e') := (\Psi(e_2) \cup \Psi(e_3)) \setminus (\Psi(e_2) \cap \Psi(e_3))$*.*

▶ **Proposition 5.11.** *Rule 5.8 is safe and can be exhaustively applied in* $\mathcal{O}(n^2)$ *time.*

Proof. Let (G, Ψ, k) be an EL-ECS instance with $P = (v_1, v_2, v_3, v_4)$ satisfying the conditions of Rule 5.8. Furthermore, let (G', Ψ', k) be the modified instance of EL-ECS constructed by Rule 5.8. First, we show that (G, Ψ, k) is a yes-instance if and only if (G', Ψ', k) is a yes-instance.

Case 1: $\Psi(e_2) = \Psi(e_3)$**.** Since Rule 5.2 is exhaustively applied we can assume without loss of generality that $\Psi(e_1) = \{1\}, \Psi(e_2) = \Psi(e_3) = \{1, 2\}$ and thus $\Psi'(e') = \{1\}$. We set $P_2 := (v_1, v_4)$. Initialize L' with $L'|_{E \setminus E(P)} = L|_{E \setminus E(P)}$.

($\Rightarrow$) Let L be a proper Ψ-satisfying labeling with at most k weak edges for G. First, assume that Q_L^P contains no weak color. Since $\Psi(e_1) = \{1\}$ it follows that $Q_L^P = (1, 2, 1)$. We define $L'(e') = 1$. Since $1 \notin \text{out}_L^{E \setminus E(P)}(e_1) \cup \text{out}_L^{E \setminus E(P)}(e_3)$ it is obvious that L' is a proper Ψ'-satisfying labeling for G' with at most k weak edges. Second, assume that Q_L^P contains at least one weak color. We define $L'(e') = 0$. Obviously, L' is a proper Ψ'-satisfying labeling for G' with at most $k - 1 + 1 = k$ weak edges.

($\Leftarrow$) Let L' be a proper Ψ'-satisfying labeling with at most k weak edges for G'. Initialize L with $L|_{E \setminus E(P)} = L'|_{E \setminus E(P)}$. First, assume that $L'(e') = 0$. We choose an arbitrary color $c_x \in \Psi(e_3) \setminus \text{out}_{L'}^{E \setminus E(P)}(e_3)$, set c_y as the unique remaining color of $\Psi(e_2) \setminus \{c_x\}$ and we define $L(e_1) = 0, L(e_2) = c_y$ and $L(e_3) = c_x$. Obviously, L is a proper Ψ-satisfying labeling for G with at most $k - 1 + 1 = k$ weak edges. Second, assume that $L'(e') = 1$. Since $1 \notin \text{out}_{L'}^{E \setminus E(P)}(e_1) \cup \text{out}_{L'}^{E \setminus E(P)}(e_3)$ we define $L(e_1) = L(e_3) = 1$ and $L(e_2) = 2$. Obviously, L is a proper Ψ-satisfying labeling for G with at most k weak edges.

Case 2: $\Psi(e_2) \neq \Psi(e_3)$**.** Since Rule 5.2 is exhaustively applied we can assume without loss of generality that $\Psi(e_1) = \{1\}, \Psi(e_2) = \{1, 2\}, \Psi(e_3) = \{2, 3\}$ and thus $\Psi'(e') = \{1, 3\}$. We let $P_2 := (v_1, v_2, v_4)$.

($\Rightarrow$) Let L be a proper Ψ-satisfying labeling with at most k weak edges for G. Initialize L' with $L'|_{E \setminus E(P)} = L|_{E \setminus E(P)}$. First, assume that Q_L^P contains no weak color. Since $\Psi(e_1) = \{1\}$ it follows that $Q_L^P = (1, 2, 3)$ so we define $L'(e_1) = 1$ and $L'(e') = 3$. Since $1 \notin \text{out}_L^{E \setminus E(P)}(e_1), 3 \notin \text{out}_L^{E \setminus E(P)}(e_3)$ it is obvious that L' is a proper Ψ'-satisfying labeling for G' with at most k weak edges. Second, assume that Q_L^P contains at least one weak color. Choose an arbitrary color $c_x \in \Psi'(e') \setminus \text{out}_L^{E \setminus E(P)}(e_3)$ and define $L'(e_1) = 0$ and $L'(e') = c_x$. Obviously, L' is a proper Ψ'-satisfying labeling for G' with at most $k - 1 + 1 = k$ weak edges.

($\Leftarrow$) Let L' be a proper Ψ'-satisfying labeling with at most k weak edges for G'. Initialize L with $L|_{E \setminus E(P)} = L'|_{E \setminus E(P)}$. First, assume that $Q_{L'}^{P_2}$ contains no weak color. Since $\Psi(e_1) = \{1\}$ it follows that $Q_L^P = (1, 3)$ so we define $L(e_1) = 1, L(e_2) = 2$ and $L(e_3) = 3$. Since $1 \notin \text{out}_{L'}^{E \setminus E(P)}(e_1), 3 \notin \text{out}_{L'}^{E \setminus E(P)}(e_3)$ it is obvious that L is a proper Ψ-satisfying labeling for G with at most k weak edges. Second, assume that $Q_{L'}^{P_2}$ contains at least one weak color. Choose an arbitrary color $c_x \in \Psi(e_3) \setminus \text{out}_{L'}^{E' \setminus E(P_2)}(e')$ and define $L(e_1) = 0, L(e_2) = 1$ and $L(e_3) = c_x$. Obviously, L is a proper Ψ-satisfying labeling for G with at most $k - 1 + 1 = k$ weak edges since $c_x \notin \text{out}_{L'}^{E' \setminus E(P_2)}(e')$.

Next, we show the running time. Every application of Rule 5.8 decreases the number of edges in G by one and a BDSP P that fulfills the conditions of Rule 5.8 can be found in $\mathcal{O}(n)$ time. Consequently, Rule 5.8 can be exhaustively applied in $\mathcal{O}(n^2)$ time. ◀

▶ **Proposition 5.12.** *For all $c \in \mathbb{N}$,* EL-ECS *and* EL-Multi-STC *admit an $11\xi_2$-edge and $10\xi_2$-vertex kernel for* EL-ECS *that can be computed in $\mathcal{O}(n^2)$ time.*

Proof. As argued in Section 3, $|\mathscr{C}| \leq 2\xi_2$ and that there are at most $5\xi_2$ edges incident to core vertices. Since Rules 5.1 - 5.5 are exhaustively applied, every periphery component is either an isolated K_1 or contains at least one close vertex. Hence, it is easy to see that every edge that is not incident with at least one core vertex has to lie on an BDP. The set of close vertices A^* has size at most $4\xi_2$ since every core vertex has at most two neighbors that are not in the core, so there are at most $4\xi_2$ open BDPs and at most $2\xi_2$ non-open BDPs. By the facts that Rules 5.1 - 5.4 reduced the size of open BDPs to at most two, Rules 5.1 - 5.8 reduced the size of non-open BDPs to at most four, so there are at most $3 * 2\xi_2 = 6\xi_2$ edges that are not connected to core vertices. Altogether, we get that there are at most $11\xi_2$ edges and at most $10\xi_2$ vertices in the reduced instance of EL-ECS after Rules 5.1 - 5.8 are exhaustively applied. ◀

Some of the previous reduction rules may look strange in a way that they have restriction under which they should not be applied but these restrictions were neither used to prove the correctness nor the running time of these reduction rules. The reason for this is, that these reduction rules should also work for EL-Multi-STC. To prove the same kernel we first give a reduction rule that solves EL-Multi-STC on all isolated triangles in $\mathcal{O}(n)$ time and show afterwards, that if there is a non-isolated triangle in G, it is also contained in G' and vice versa.

▶ **Rule 5.9.** *If (G, Ψ, k) contains an isolated triangle consisting of the vertices v_0, v_1, v_2, then remove all three vertices from G and decrease k by the number of edges e in $G[\{v_1, v_2, v_3\}]$ with $\Psi(e) = \emptyset$.*

▶ **Proposition 5.13.** *Rule 5.9 is safe and can be exhaustively applied in $\mathcal{O}(n)$ time.*

The correctness of Rule 5.9 follows directly from the fact, that every labeling on an isolated triangle is a proper STC labeling. So we can assume from now on that Rule 5.9 is exhaustively applied and thus G does not contain any isolated triangle.

▶ **Lemma 5.14.** *Let $P = (v_1, \ldots, v_r), r \geq 2$ be a BDP in G. Then there is no $v \in V(P)$ such that v forms a triangle with two other vertices of G unless P is a non-open BDP and $r = 2$.*

Proof. Proof by contradiction. We assume that there is a vertex $v \in V(P)$ that forms a triangle with two other vertices in G and P is an open BDP or $r = 2$.

Case 1: P is an open BDP**.** We can assume without loss of generality that $\deg(v_1) < 2$. Thus it is obvious that v_1 can not form a triangle in G. Since $v_1 \in N(v_2)$ and $|N(v_2)| \leq 2$, neither can v_2. So we can prove by induction that for all $v_x \in V(P)$ it holds that v_x can not form a triangle in G. This contradicts the assumption that there is such a vertex v in an open BDP.

Case 2: $r = 3$**.** Since $v_2 \in N(v_1) \cap N(v_3)$ it remains to show that v_1, v_2, v_3 do not form a triangle in G which is equivalent to $v_3 \notin N(v_1)$. So we assume that $v_3 \in N(v_1)$. By the fact that $|N(v_i)| \leq 2$ for all $i \in \{1, 2, 3\}$, it follows that v_1, v_2, v_3 form an isolated triangle in G which contradicts the fact that P is a BDP.

Case 3: $r > 3$**.** Since $v_2 \in N(v_1) \cap N(v_3)$ and $v_3 \notin N(v_1)$ it is obvious that v_2 can not form a triangle in G with its neighbors and neither can v_1 nor v_3. By induction no $v_x \in V(P)$ can form a triangle with its neighbors and thus it cannot form a triangle in G. This contradicts the assumption that there is such a vertex v. ◀

▶ **Proposition 5.15.** *The Rules 5.1 - 5.8 are safe for* EL-Multi-STC *if the instance is already reduced with respect to Rule 5.9.*

Proof. Let (G, Ψ, k) be an EL-Multi-STC instance reduced with respect to Rule 5.9. With Lemma 5.14 we know that for every edge that lies on a BDP P and on a triangle at the same time it holds that P is a non-open BDP of length exactly two. So we will show in the following, that none of the Rules 5.1 - 5.8 modifies a non-open BDP of length two or decreases a non-open BDP to one of length of two. For Rule 5.1 this is obvious since this rule can not be applied on edges that lie on non-open BDPs of length two. Since the Rules 5.2 - 5.4 and 5.6 - 5.8 can not be applied on BDPs of length two and only decrease a BDSP to a length of two if it is a proper BDSP, all these rules are safe with respect to Lemma 5.14. The only thing left to show is that Rule 5.5 is also safe for EL-Multi-STC. By the fact that Rule 5.9 is exhaustively applied, there are no isolated triangle in G and thus, for isolated cycles C it holds that $G[C]$ is triangle-free. Since EL-Multi-STC is equivalent to EL-ECS on triangle-free graphs, it follows that Rule 5.5 is also safe for EL-Multi-STC. ◀

With this proposition, it is clear the previous reduction rules also admit the same linear edge kernel for EL-Multi-STC. Thus, Propositions 5.12 and 5.15 give our main result for this section.

▶ **Theorem 1.4.** *For all* $c \in \mathbb{N}$, EL-ECS *and* EL-Multi-STC *admit an* $11\xi_2$*-edge and* $10\xi_2$*-vertex kernel for* EL-ECS *that can be computed in* $\mathcal{O}(n^2)$ *time.*

References

1 Laurent Bulteau, Niels Grüttemeier, Christian Komusiewicz, and Manuel Sorge. Your rugby mates don't need to know your colleagues: Triadic closure with edge colors. In *Proc. 11th CIAC*, volume 11485 of *LNCS*, pages 99–111. Springer, 2019.

2 Leizhen Cai and John A. Ellis. NP-completeness of edge-colouring some restricted graphs. *Discrete Appl. Math.*, 30(1):15–27, 1991.

3 Benny Chor, Mike Fellows, and David W. Juedes. Linear kernels in linear time, or how to save k colors in $O(n^2)$ steps. In *Proc. 30th WG*, volume 3353 of *LNCS*, pages 257–269. Springer, 2004.

4 Richard Cole and John E. Hopcroft. On edge coloring bipartite graphs. *SIAM J. Comput.*, 11(3):540–546, 1982.

5 Marek Cygan, Fedor V. Fomin, Lukasz Kowalik, Daniel Lokshtanov, Dániel Marx, Marcin Pilipczuk, Michal Pilipczuk, and Saket Saurabh. *Parameterized Algorithms*. Springer, 2015.

6 Uriel Feige, Eran Ofek, and Udi Wieder. Approximating maximum edge coloring in multigraphs. In *Proc. 5th APPROX*, volume 2462 of *LNCS*, pages 108–121. Springer, 2002.

7 Harold N. Gabow. An efficient reduction technique for degree-constrained subgraph and bidirected network flow problems. In *Proc. 15th STOC*, pages 448–456. ACM, 1983.

8 Petr A. Golovach, Pinar Heggernes, Athanasios L. Konstantinidis, Paloma T. Lima, and Charis Papadopoulos. Parameterized aspects of strong subgraph closure. In *Proc. 16th SWAT*, volume 101 of *LIPIcs*, pages 23:1–23:13. Schloss Dagstuhl - Leibniz-Zentrum fuer Informatik, 2018.

9 Niels Grüttemeier and Christian Komusiewicz. On the relation of strong triadic closure and cluster deletion. In *Proc. 44th WG*, volume 11159 of *LNCS*, pages 239–251. Springer, 2018.

10 Jiong Guo, Falk Hüffner, and Rolf Niedermeier. A structural view on parameterizing problems: Distance from triviality. In *Proc. 1st IWPEC*, volume 3162 of *LNCS*, pages 162–173. Springer, 2004.

11 S. Louis Hakimi and Oded Kariv. A generalization of edge-coloring in graphs. *J. Graph Theor.*, 10(2):139–154, 1986.

12 Ian Holyer. The NP-Completeness of Edge-Coloring. *SIAM J. Comput.*, 10(4):718–720, 1981.

13 Tommy R Jensen and Bjarne Toft. *Graph coloring problems*, volume 39. John Wiley & Sons, 2011.

14 Marcin Jakub Kaminski and Lukasz Kowalik. Beyond the Vizing's bound for at most seven colors. *SIAM J. Discrete Math.*, 28(3):1334–1362, 2014.

15 Athanasios L. Konstantinidis, Stavros D. Nikolopoulos, and Charis Papadopoulos. Strong triadic closure in cographs and graphs of low maximum degree. In *Proc. 23rd COCOON*, volume 10392 of *LNCS*, pages 346–358. Springer, 2017.

16 Athanasios L. Konstantinidis and Charis Papadopoulos. Maximizing the Strong Triadic Closure in Split Graphs and Proper Interval Graphs. In *Proc. 28th ISAAC*, volume 92 of *LIPIcs*, pages 53:1–53:12. Schloss Dagstuhl–Leibniz-Zentrum fuer Informatik, 2017.

17 Adrian Kosowski. Approximating the maximum 2- and 3-edge-colorable subgraph problems. *Discrete Appl. Math.*, 157(17):3593–3600, 2009.

18 Lukasz Kowalik. Improved edge-coloring with three colors. *Theor. Comput. Sci.*, 410(38-40):3733–3742, 2009.

19 Mithilesh Kumar and Daniel Lokshtanov. A $2\ell k$ kernel for ℓ-component order connectivity. In *Proc. 11th IPEC*, pages 20:1–20:14, 2016.

20 Daniel Leven and Zvi Galil. NP completeness of finding the chromatic index of regular graphs. *J. Algorithms*, 4(1):35–44, 1983.

21 Romeo Rizzi. Approximating the maximum 3-edge-colorable subgraph problem. *Discrete Math.*, 309(12):4166–4170, 2009.

22 Elena Prieto Rodríguez. *Systematic kernelization in FPT algorithm design.* PhD thesis, The University of Newcastle, 2005.

23 Stavros Sintos and Panayiotis Tsaparas. Using strong triadic closure to characterize ties in social networks. In *Proc. 20th KDD*, pages 1466–1475. ACM, 2014.

24 Michael Stiebitz, Diego Scheide, Bjarne Toft, and Lene M Favrholdt. *Graph edge coloring: Vizing's theorem and Goldberg's conjecture*, volume 75. John Wiley & Sons, 2012.

25 Vadim G Vizing. On an estimate of the chromatic class of a p-graph. *Discret Analiz*, 3:25–30, 1964.