



# Covering minimal separators and potential maximal cliques in $P_t$ -free graphs\*

Andrzej Grzesik<sup>†</sup>   Tereza Klimošová<sup>‡</sup>   Marcin Pilipczuk<sup>§</sup>   Michał Pilipczuk<sup>¶</sup>

## Abstract

A graph is called  $P_t$ -free if it does not contain a  $t$ -vertex path as an induced subgraph. While  $P_4$ -free graphs are exactly *cographs*, the structure of  $P_t$ -free graphs for  $t \geq 5$  remains little understood. On one hand, classic computational problems such as MAXIMUM WEIGHT INDEPENDENT SET (MWIS) and 3-COLORING are not known to be NP-hard on  $P_t$ -free graphs for any fixed  $t$ . On the other hand, despite significant effort, polynomial-time algorithms for MWIS in  $P_6$ -free graphs [SODA 2019] and 3-COLORING in  $P_7$ -free graphs [Combinatorica 2018] have been found only recently. In both cases, the algorithms rely on deep structural insights into the considered graph classes.

One of the main tools in the algorithms for MWIS in  $P_5$ -free graphs [SODA 2014] and in  $P_6$ -free graphs [SODA 2019] is the so-called *Separator Covering Lemma* that asserts that every minimal separator in the graph can be covered by the union of neighborhoods of a constant number of vertices. In this note we show that such a statement generalizes to  $P_7$ -free graphs and is false in  $P_8$ -free graphs. We also discuss analogues of such a statement for covering potential maximal cliques with unions of neighborhoods.

## 1 Introduction

By  $P_t$  we denote a path on  $t$  vertices. A graph is  $H$ -free if it does not contain an induced subgraph isomorphic to  $H$ .

We are interested in classifying the complexity of fundamental computational problems, such as MAXIMUM WEIGHT INDEPENDENT SET (MWIS),  $k$ -COLORING for fixed or arbitrary  $k$ , or FEEDBACK VERTEX SET, on various hereditary graph classes, in particular on  $H$ -free graphs for small fixed graphs  $H$ . As noted by Alekseev [2], MWIS is NP-hard on  $H$ -free graphs unless every

---

\*The early stage of this research was done while Andrzej Grzesik held a post-doc position of Warsaw Centre of Mathematics and Computer Science (WCMCS), WCMCS supported a visit of Tereza Klimošová in Warsaw, Tereza Klimošová was supported by ANR project Stint under reference ANR-13-BS02-0007 and by the LABEX MILYON (ANR-10-LABX-0070) of Université de Lyon, within the program “Investissements d’Avenir” (ANR-11-IDEX-0007) operated by the French National Research Agency (ANR). Ma. Pilipczuk was supported by the Polish National Science Centre grant UMO-2013/09/B/ST6/03136, and Mi. Pilipczuk was supported by the Foundation for Polish Science (FNP) via the START stipend programme. Later stages of this research are parts of projects that have received funding from the European Research Council (ERC) under the European Union’s Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme Grant Agreements no. 648509 (A. Grzesik), no. 714704 (Ma. Pilipczuk), and no. 677651 (Mi. Pilipczuk), while Tereza Klimošová is supported by the grant no. 19-04113Y of the Czech Science Foundation (GAČR) and the Center for Foundations of Modern Computer Science (Charles Univ. project UNCE/SCI/004).

<sup>†</sup>Faculty of Mathematics and Computer Science, Jagiellonian University, Kraków, Poland, [andrzej.grzesik@uj.edu.pl](mailto:andrzej.grzesik@uj.edu.pl).

<sup>‡</sup>Department of Applied Mathematics, Charles University, Prague, Czech Republic, [tereza@kam.mff.cuni.cz](mailto:tereza@kam.mff.cuni.cz).

<sup>§</sup>Institute of Informatics, University of Warsaw, Poland, [marcin.pilipczuk@mimuw.edu.pl](mailto:marcin.pilipczuk@mimuw.edu.pl).

<sup>¶</sup>Institute of Informatics, University of Warsaw, Poland, [michal.pilipczuk@mimuw.edu.pl](mailto:michal.pilipczuk@mimuw.edu.pl).

connected component of  $H$  is a tree with at most three leaves. Similarly, 3-COLORING is known to be NP-hard on  $H$ -free graphs unless every connected component of  $H$  is a path [12]. On the other hand, it would be consistent with our knowledge if both MWIS and 3-COLORING were polynomial-time solvable on  $P_t$ -free graphs for every fixed  $t$ , however this is currently unknown. Positive results in this direction are limited only to small values of  $t$ , as explained next.

$P_4$ -free graphs, known also as *cographs*, are well-understood; in particular, they have bounded cliquewidth, which implies the existence polynomial-time algorithms for all the discussed problems.  $P_5$ -free graphs are much more mysterious and only in 2014, Lokshtanov, Vatshelle, and Villanger proposed a novel technique that uses the framework of potential maximal cliques and proved polynomial-time tractability of MWIS in this class [17]. This result was followed by a much more technically complex positive result for  $P_6$ -free graphs [14] and a recent algorithm for FEEDBACK VERTEX SET in  $P_5$ -free graphs [1]. For coloring with few colors, the state-of-the-art are polynomial-time algorithms for 3-COLORING of  $P_7$ -free graphs [4] and 4-COLORING of  $P_6$ -free graphs [10].

In full generality, the so-called *Gyárfás' path argument* gives subexponential-time algorithms for both MWIS and 3-COLORING in  $P_t$ -free graphs for any fixed  $t$  [3, 7, 13]. Using the Gyárfás' path argument and the three-in-a-tree theorem [9], it is possible to obtain a quasi-polynomial-time approximation scheme for MWIS in  $H$ -free graphs whenever every connected component of  $H$  is a tree with at most three leaves [8]. Note that this covers exactly the cases where NP-hardness is not known. The crucial property of  $P_t$ -free graphs that is used in all the works mentioned above is that, due to the aforementioned Gyárfás' path argument, every  $P_t$ -free graph admits a balanced separator consisting of at most  $t - 1$  closed neighborhoods of a vertex.

The lack of NP-hardness results on one side, and shortage of generic algorithmic tools in  $P_t$ -free graphs on the other side, calls for a deeper understanding of the structure of  $P_t$ -free graphs for larger values of  $t$ . In this note we discuss one property that appeared important in the algorithms for MWIS for  $P_5$ -free and  $P_6$ -free graphs [17, 16, 14], namely the possibility to cover a minimal separator with a small number of vertex neighborhoods.

Let  $G$  be a graph. For a set  $S \subseteq V(G)$ , a connected component  $A$  of  $G - S$  is a *full component to  $S$*  if  $N_G(A) = S$ . A set  $S$  is a *minimal separator* if it admits at least two full components. A set  $F \subseteq \binom{V(G)}{2} \setminus E(G)$  is a *chordal completion* if  $G + F := (V(G), E(G) \cup F)$  is chordal (i.e., does not contain an induced subgraph isomorphic to a cycle on at least four vertices). A set  $\Omega \subseteq V(G)$  is a *potential maximal clique (PMC)* if there exists an (inclusion-wise) minimal chordal completion  $F$  of  $G$  such that  $\Omega$  is a maximal clique of  $G + F$ . Potential maximal cliques and minimal separators are tightly connected: for example, a graph is chordal if and only if every its minimal separator is a clique, and if  $\Omega$  is a PMC in  $G$ , then for every connected component  $D$  of  $G - \Omega$  the set  $N_G(D)$  is a minimal separator with  $D$  being one of the full components.

A framework of Bouchitté and Todinca [5, 6], extended by Fomin, Todinca, and Villanger [11], allows solving multiple computational problems (including MWIS and FEEDBACK VERTEX SET) on graph classes where graphs have only a polynomial number of PMCs. While  $P_5$ -free graphs do not have this property, the crucial insight of the work of Lokshtanov, Villanger and Vatshelle [17] allows modifying the framework to work for  $P_5$ -free graphs and, with more effort, for  $P_6$ -free graphs [14].

A simple, but crucial in [17], insight about the structure of  $P_5$ -free graphs is the following lemma.

**Lemma 1** ([17]). *Let  $G$  be a  $P_5$ -free graph, let  $S$  be a minimal separator in  $G$ , and let  $A$  and  $B$  be two full components of  $S$ . Then for every  $a \in A$  and  $b \in B$  it holds that  $S \subseteq N_G(a) \cup N_G(b)$ .*

The above statement is per se false in  $P_6$ -free graphs, but the following variant is true and turned out to be pivotal in [14]:

**Lemma 2** ([14], Lemma 20 in the arXiv version). *Let  $G$  be a  $P_6$ -free graph, let  $S$  be a minimal*

separator in  $G$ , and let  $A$  and  $B$  be two full components of  $S$ . Then there exist nonempty sets  $A' \subseteq A$  and  $B' \subseteq B$  such that  $|A'| \leq 3$ ,  $|B'| \leq 3$ , and  $S \subseteq N_G(A) \cup N_G(B)$ .

That is, every minimal separator in a  $P_6$ -free graph has a dominating set of size at most 6, contained in the union of two full components of this separator.

In Section 3 we extend the result to  $P_7$ -free graphs as follows.

**Theorem 3.** *Let  $G$  be a  $P_7$ -free graph and let  $S$  be a minimal separator in  $G$ . Then there exists a set  $S' \subseteq V(G)$  of size at most 22 such that  $S \subseteq N_G[S']$ .*

Theorem 3 directly generalizes a statement proved by Lokshtanov et al. [16, Theorem 1.3], which was an important ingredient of their quasi-polynomial-time algorithm for MWIS in  $P_6$ -free graphs.

Section 5 discusses a modified example from [16] that witnesses that no statement analogous to Theorem 3 can be true in  $P_8$ -free graphs. Furthermore, observe that in the statements for  $P_5$ -free and  $P_6$ -free graphs the dominating set for the separator is guaranteed to be contained in two full components of the separator. This is no longer the case in Theorem 3 for a reason: in Section 5 we show examples of  $P_7$ -free graphs where any constant-size dominating set of a minimal separator needs to contain a vertex from the said separator.

The intuition behind the framework of PMCs, particularly visible in the quasi-polynomial-time algorithm for MWIS in  $P_6$ -free graphs [16], is that potential maximal cliques can serve as balanced separators of a graph. Here,  $X \subseteq V(G)$  is a balanced separator of  $G$  if every connected component of  $G - X$  has at most  $|V(G)|/2$  vertices. The quasi-polynomial-time algorithm of [16] tried to recursively split the graph into significantly smaller pieces by branching and deleting as large as possible pieces of such a PMC. Motivated by this intuition, in Section 4 we generalize Theorem 3 to dominating potential maximal cliques:

**Theorem 4.** *Let  $G$  be a  $P_7$ -free graph and let  $\Omega$  be a potential maximal clique in  $G$ . Then there exists a set  $\Omega' \subseteq V(G)$  of size at most 68 such that  $\Omega \subseteq N_G[\Omega']$ .*

Since every minimal separator is a subset of some potential maximal clique in a graph, Theorem 4 generalizes Theorem 3. For the same reason, our examples for  $P_8$ -free graphs also prohibit extending Theorem 4 to  $P_8$ -free graphs.

## 2 Preliminaries

For basic graph notation, we follow the arXiv version of [14]. We outline here only nonstandard notation that is not presented in the introduction.

For a set  $X \subseteq V(G)$ , by  $\text{cc}(G - X)$  we denote the family of connected components of  $G - X$ . A set  $A$  is *complete* to a set  $B$  if every vertex of  $A$  is adjacent to every vertex of  $B$ .

**Potential maximal cliques.** A set  $\Omega \subseteq V(G)$  is a *potential maximal clique* (PMC) if:

(PMC1) none of the connected components of  $\text{cc}(G - \Omega)$  is full to  $\Omega$ ; and

(PMC2) whenever  $uv$  is a non-edge with  $\{u, v\} \subseteq \Omega$ , then there is a component  $D \in \text{cc}(G - \Omega)$  such that  $\{u, v\} \subseteq N(D)$ .

In the second condition, we will say that the component  $D$  *covers* the non-edge  $uv$ . As announced in the introduction, we have the following.

**Proposition 5** (Theorem 3.15 of [5]). *For a graph  $G$ , a vertex subset  $\Omega \subseteq V(G)$  is a PMC if and only if there exists a minimal chordal completion  $F$  of  $G$  such that  $\Omega$  is a maximal clique in  $G + F$ .*

We will also need the following statement.

**Lemma 6** (cf. Proposition 8 of the arXiv version of [14]). *For every PMC  $\Omega$  of  $G$  and every  $D \in \text{cc}(G - \Omega)$ , the set  $N_G(D)$  is a minimal separator.*

**Modules.** Let  $G$  be a graph. A set  $M \subseteq V(G)$  is a *module* of  $G$  if  $N(x) \setminus M = N(y) \setminus M$  for every  $x, y \in M$ . Note that  $\emptyset$ ,  $V(G)$  and all the singletons  $\{x\}$  for  $x \in V(G)$  are modules; we call these modules *trivial*. A graph is *prime* if all its modules are trivial. A module  $M$  of  $G$  is *strong* if  $M \neq V(G)$  and  $M$  does not overlap with any other module of  $G$ , i.e., for every module  $M'$  of  $G$  we have either  $M \subseteq M'$ , or  $M' \subseteq M$ , or  $M \cap M' = \emptyset$ .

A partition  $\mathcal{M}$  of  $V(G)$  is a *modular partition* of  $G$  if  $M$  is a module of  $G$  for every  $M \in \mathcal{M}$ . The *quotient graph*  $G/\mathcal{M}$  is a graph with the vertex set  $\mathcal{M}$  and with  $M'M \in E(G/\mathcal{M})$  if and only if  $m'm \in E(G)$  for all  $m' \in M'$  and  $m \in M$  (since  $M'$  and  $M$  are modules,  $m'm$  is an edge either for all pairs  $m' \in M'$  and  $m \in M$ , or for none).

It is well-known (cf. [15, Lemma 2]) that if  $|V(G)| > 1$  then the family of (inclusion-wise) maximal strong modules of  $G$  forms a modular partition of  $G$  whose quotient graph is either an independent set (if  $G$  is not connected), a clique (if the complement of  $G$  is not connected), or a prime graph (otherwise). We denote this modular partition by  $\text{Mod}(G)$  and we let  $\text{Quo}(G) := G/\text{Mod}(G)$ . For  $D \subseteq V(G)$ , we abbreviate  $\text{Mod}(G[D])$  and  $\text{Quo}(G[D])$  with  $\text{Mod}(D)$  and  $\text{Quo}(D)$ , respectively.

### 3 Covering minimal separators in $P_7$ -free graphs

This section is devoted to the proof of Theorem 3. We need the following two results from [14].

**Lemma 7** (Bi-ranking Lemma of [14], Lemma 17 of the arXiv version). *Suppose  $X$  is a non-empty finite set and  $(X, \leq_1)$  and  $(X, \leq_2)$  are two quasi-orders. Suppose further that every pair of two different elements of  $X$  is comparable either with respect to  $\leq_1$  or with respect to  $\leq_2$ . Then there exists an element  $x \in X$  such that for every  $y \in X$  we have either  $x \leq_1 y$  or  $x \leq_2 y$ .*

**Lemma 8** (Neighborhood Decomposition Lemma of [14], Lemma 18 of the arXiv version). *Suppose  $G$  is a graph and  $D \subseteq V(G)$  is subset of vertices such that  $|D| \geq 2$  and  $G[D]$  is connected. Suppose further that vertices  $p, q \in D$  respectively belong to different elements  $M^p, M^q$  of the modular partition  $\text{Mod}(D)$  such that  $M^p$  and  $M^q$  are adjacent in the quotient graph  $\text{Quo}(D)$ . Then, for each vertex  $u \in N(D)$  at least one of the following conditions holds:*

- (a)  $u \in N[p, q]$ ;
- (b) there exists an induced  $P_4$  in  $G$  such that  $u$  is one of its endpoints, while the other three vertices belong to  $D$ ;
- (c)  $\text{Quo}(D)$  is a clique and the neighborhood of  $u$  in  $D$  is the union of some collection of maximal strong modules in  $D$ .

In particular, if  $\text{Quo}(D)$  is not a clique, then the last condition cannot hold.

Let  $G$  be a  $P_7$ -free graph, let  $S$  be a minimal separator in  $G$ , and let  $A_1$  and  $A_2$  be the vertex sets of two full components of  $S$ . If  $|A_i| = 1$  for some  $i \in \{1, 2\}$ , then we are done by setting  $S' := A_i$ ,

so assume  $|A_1|, |A_2| > 1$ . For each  $i \in \{1, 2\}$ , fix two different maximal strong modules  $M_i^p$  and  $M_i^q$  of  $G[A_i]$  that are adjacent in  $\text{Quo}(A_i)$ . Furthermore, pick arbitrary  $p_i \in M_i^p$  and  $q_i \in M_i^q$ .

For each  $i \in \{1, 2\}$ , we apply Lemma 8 to  $D := A_i$  and  $N(D) = S$ . We say that a vertex  $x \in S$  is of type  $(a)_i$  if  $x \in N(p_i) \cup N(q_i)$ . We say that a vertex  $x \in S$  is of type  $(b)_i$  if  $x$  is not of type  $(a)_i$  and there is an induced  $P_4$  in  $G$  with  $u$  being one of the endpoints and the other three vertices belonging to  $A_i$ . Finally, we say that a vertex  $x \in S$  is of type  $(c)_i$  if  $x$  is neither of type  $(a)_i$  nor  $(b)_i$ . Lemma 8 asserts that if there are vertices of type  $(c)_i$ , then  $\text{Quo}(A_i)$  is a clique and the neighborhood in  $A_i$  of every vertex of this type is the union of a collection of maximal strong modules of  $G[A_i]$ . For  $\alpha, \beta \in \{a, b, c\}$ , let  $S_{\alpha\beta}$  be the set of vertices  $x \in S$  that are of type  $(\alpha)_1$  and  $(\beta)_2$ .

We need the following claim.

**Claim 1.** *Let  $i \in \{1, 2\}$  and let  $x, y \in S$  be of type  $(c)_i$ . Then  $A_i \cap (N(x) \setminus N(y))$  is complete to  $A_i \cap (N(y) \setminus N(x))$ .*

*Proof.* By Lemma 8,  $\text{Quo}(A_i)$  is a clique and both  $A_i \cap (N(x) \setminus N(y))$  and  $A_i \cap (N(y) \setminus N(x))$  are the unions of some disjoint collections of maximal strong modules of  $G[A_i]$ . The claim follows.  $\square$

Since  $G$  is  $P_7$ -free,  $S_{bb} = \emptyset$ . Furthermore, if we set  $R_a := \{p_1, q_1, p_2, q_2\}$ , then

$$S_{aa} \cup S_{ab} \cup S_{ac} \cup S_{ba} \cup S_{ca} \subseteq N(R_a).$$

In the rest of the proof, we construct sets  $R_{bc}, R_{cb}$  and  $R_{cc}$  such that  $S_{\alpha\beta} \subseteq N[R_{\alpha\beta}]$  for  $\alpha\beta \in \{bc, cb, cc\}$ . We will conclude that  $S' := R_a \cup R_{bc} \cup R_{cb} \cup R_{cc}$  satisfies the statement of the lemma, because  $|R_a| = 4$  and we will ensure that  $|R_{bc}|, |R_{cb}| \leq 5$  and  $|R_{cc}| \leq 8$ .

We start with constructing the set  $R_{bc}$ . If  $S_{bc} = \emptyset$ , then we set  $R_{bc} = \emptyset$ . Otherwise, let  $v \in S_{bc}$  be a vertex with inclusion-wise minimal set  $A_2 \cap N(v)$ . Furthermore, let  $w \in A_2$  be an arbitrary neighbor of  $v$  in  $A_2$ ;  $w$  exists since  $A_2$  is a full component of  $S$ . Also, let  $u^1, u^2, u^3$  be vertices of an induced  $P_4$  with  $u^1, u^2, u^3 \in A_1$ ; recall here that  $v$  is of type  $(b)_1$ . We set  $R_{bc} := \{u^1, u^2, u^3, v, w\}$  and claim that  $S_{bc} \subseteq N[S_{bc}]$ .

Assume the contrary, and let  $v' \in S_{bc} \setminus N[R_{bc}]$ . By the choice of  $v$  and since  $w \in A_2 \cap (N(v) \setminus N(v'))$ , there exists  $w' \in A_2 \cap (N(v') \setminus N(v))$ . By Claim 1,  $ww' \in E(G)$ . Then,  $v' - w' - w - v - u^1 - u^2 - u^3$  is an induced  $P_7$  in  $G$ , a contradiction.

Hence, we constructed  $R_{bc} \subseteq V(G)$  of size at most 5 such that  $S_{bc} \subseteq N[R_{bc}]$ . A symmetric reasoning yields  $R_{cb} \subseteq V(G)$  of size at most 5 such that  $S_{cb} \subseteq N[R_{cb}]$ .

We are left with constructing  $R_{cc}$ . If  $S_{cc} = \emptyset$ , then we take  $R_{cc} = \emptyset$  and conclude. In the remaining case,  $S_{cc}$  is non-empty, so both  $\text{Quo}(A_1)$  and  $\text{Quo}(A_2)$  are cliques.

For each  $i \in \{1, 2\}$ , we define a quasi-order  $\leq_i$  on  $S_{cc}$  as follows. For  $x, y \in S_{cc}$ ,  $x \leq_i y$  if  $A_i \cap N(x) \subseteq A_i \cap N(y)$ . An unordered pair  $xy \in \binom{S_{cc}}{2}$  is a *butterfly* if  $x$  and  $y$  are incomparable both in  $\leq_1$  and in  $\leq_2$ , that is, if each of the following four sets is nonempty:

$$\begin{aligned} A_1 \cap (N(x) \setminus N(y)), & \quad A_1 \cap (N(y) \setminus N(x)), \\ A_2 \cap (N(x) \setminus N(y)), & \quad A_2 \cap (N(y) \setminus N(x)). \end{aligned}$$

See Figure 1 for an illustration.

Lemma 7 allows us to easily dominate subsets of  $S_{cc}$  that do not contain any butterflies:

**Claim 2.** *Let  $T \subseteq S_{cc}$  be such that there is no butterfly  $xy$  with  $x, y \in T$ . Then there exist a vertex  $a_1 \in A_1$  and  $a_2 \in A_2$  such that  $T \subseteq N(a_1) \cup N(a_2)$ .*




Figure 1: A butterfly  $xy$ . The gray grid presents the partition of  $G[A_i]$  into maximal strong modules.

*Proof.* If  $T = \emptyset$ , the claim is trivial, so assume otherwise. Let us focus on quasi-orders  $\leq_1$  and  $\leq_2$ , restricted to  $T$ . Since there are no butterflies in  $T$ , the prerequisites of Lemma 7 are satisfied for  $(T, \leq_1)$  and  $(T, \leq_2)$ . Hence, there exists  $x \in T$  with  $x \leq_1 y$  or  $x \leq_2 y$  for every  $y \in T$ . For  $i \in \{1, 2\}$ , let  $a_i$  be an arbitrary neighbor of  $x$  in  $A_i$  (it exists as  $A_i$  is a full component of  $S$ ). For every  $y \in T$ , there exists  $i \in \{1, 2\}$  such that  $x \leq_i y$ , hence  $a_i y \in E(G)$ . We conclude that  $T \subseteq N(a_1) \cup N(a_2)$ , as desired.  $\lrcorner$

If there is no butterfly at all, then we apply Claim 2 to  $T = S_{cc}$ , obtaining vertices  $a_1, a_2$  and set  $R_{cc} = \{a_1, a_2\}$ . Thus, we are left with the case where at least one butterfly exists.

Let  $xy$  be a butterfly with inclusion-wise minimal set

$$(A_1 \cup A_2) \cap N(\{x, y\}).$$

Furthermore, pick the following four vertices

$$\begin{aligned} u_1^x &\in A_1 \cap (N(x) \setminus N(y)), & u_1^y &\in A_1 \cap (N(y) \setminus N(x)), \\ u_2^x &\in A_2 \cap (N(x) \setminus N(y)), & u_2^y &\in A_2 \cap (N(y) \setminus N(x)). \end{aligned}$$

Claim 1 ensures that  $u_1^x u_1^y \in E(G)$  and  $u_2^x u_2^y \in E(G)$ .

Set

$$R' := \{x, y, u_1^x, u_1^y, u_2^x, u_2^y\}.$$

Let  $T := S_{cc} \setminus N[R']$ . We claim the following:

**Claim 3.** *There is no butterfly  $x'y'$  with  $x', y' \in T$ .*

*Proof.* Assume the contrary, and let  $x'y'$  be a butterfly with  $x', y' \in T$ . By the minimality of  $xy$ , as  $u_1^x \in (A_1 \cup A_2) \cap N(\{x, y\})$  but  $u_1^x \notin (A_1 \cup A_2) \cap N(\{x', y'\})$ , there exists  $w \in (A_1 \cup A_2) \cap (N(\{x', y'\}) \setminus N(\{x, y\}))$ . By symmetry, assume that  $w \in A_1$  and  $x'w \in E(G)$ ; see Figure 2.

By Claim 1,  $wu_1^x \in E(G)$  and  $wu_1^y \in E(G)$ . If  $xy \in E(G)$ , then  $x' - w - u_1^x - x - y - u_2^y - p_2$  would be an induced  $P_7$  in  $G$ . Otherwise, if  $xy \notin E(G)$ , then  $x' - w - u_1^x - x - u_2^x - u_2^y - y$  would be an induced  $P_7$  in  $G$ . As in both cases we have obtained a contradiction, this finishes the proof.  $\lrcorner$




Figure 2: Two cases where a  $P_7$  appears in the proof of Claim 3.

By Claim 3, we can apply Claim 2 to  $T$  and obtain vertices  $a_1 \in A_1$  and  $a_2 \in A_2$  with  $T \subseteq N(a_1) \cup N(a_2)$ . Hence, we can take  $R_{cc} := R' \cup \{a_1, a_2\}$ , thus concluding the proof of Theorem 3.

## 4 Covering PMCs in $P_7$ -free graphs

We now prove the following statement which, together with Theorem 3 and Lemma 6, immediately implies Theorem 4.

**Lemma 9.** *Let  $G$  be a  $P_7$ -free graph and let  $\Omega$  be a potential maximal clique in  $G$ . Then there exists a set  $\Omega' \subseteq \Omega$  of size at most 2 and a set  $\mathcal{D}' \subseteq \text{cc}(G - \Omega)$  of size at most 3 such that*

$$\Omega \subseteq N[\Omega'] \cup \bigcup_{D \in \mathcal{D}'} N(D).$$

*Proof.* Let  $\mathcal{D} \subseteq \text{cc}(G - \Omega)$  be an inclusion-wise minimal set of components of  $G - \Omega$  such that for every nonedge  $uv$  in  $\Omega$  there exists a component  $D \in \mathcal{D}$  that covers  $uv$ .




Figure 3: A  $P_7$  in the proof of Lemma 9.  $N(D)$  is marked with north-east strips and  $N(D_u) \cup N(D_v)$  is marked with north-west strips. Note that  $N(D_u) \cap N(D_v)$  may be nonempty, which is not depicted on the figure.

If  $\mathcal{D} = \emptyset$ , then  $\Omega$  is a clique in  $G$  and thus we can put  $\Omega' = \{v\}$  and  $\mathcal{D}' = \emptyset$  for an arbitrary  $v \in \Omega$ . Otherwise, pick any  $D \in \mathcal{D}$ . By the minimality of  $\mathcal{D}$ , there exists a nonedge  $uv$  in  $\Omega$  that is covered by  $D$  and by no other component of  $\mathcal{D} \setminus \{D\}$ .

Assume that there is no component  $D_v \in \mathcal{D} \setminus \{D\}$  with  $v \in N(D_v)$ . Then  $\Omega \setminus N(D) \subseteq N(v)$ , so  $\Omega \subseteq N(v) \cup N(D)$ . Hence, we can set  $\Omega' = \{v\}$  and  $\mathcal{D}' = \{D\}$ . Symmetrically, we are done if there is no component  $D_u \in \mathcal{D} \setminus \{D\}$  with  $u \in N(D_u)$ .

In the remaining case, pick arbitrary components  $D_v \in \mathcal{D} \setminus \{D\}$  with  $v \in N(D_v)$  and  $D_u \in \mathcal{D} \setminus \{D\}$  with  $u \in N(D_u)$ . Since  $D$  is the only component of  $\mathcal{D}$  that covers  $uv$ , we have  $u \notin N(D_v)$  and  $v \notin N(D_u)$ ; in particular,  $D_u \neq D_v$ . We claim that we can set  $\Omega' = \{u, v\}$  and  $\mathcal{D}' = \{D, D_u, D_v\}$ . That is, we claim that

$$\Omega \subseteq N[u] \cup N[v] \cup N(D) \cup N(D_u) \cup N(D_v). \quad (1)$$

Assume the contrary, and let  $x \in \Omega$  be such that  $xu \notin E(G)$ ,  $xv \notin E(G)$ ,  $x \notin N(D)$ ,  $x \notin N(D_u)$ , and  $x \notin N(D_v)$ .

Since  $xu$  is a nonedge of  $\Omega$ , there exists  $D_{xu} \in \mathcal{D}$  that covers  $xu$ . Similarly, there exists  $D_{xv} \in \mathcal{D}$  that covers  $xv$ . By the choice of  $x$ , we have  $D_{xu}, D_{xv} \notin \{D, D_u, D_v\}$ . Further, since  $D$  is the only component of  $\mathcal{D}$  covering  $uv$ ,  $v \notin N(D_{xu})$  and  $u \notin N(D_{xv})$ ; in particular,  $D_{xu} \neq D_{xv}$ . See Figure 3.

Let  $y_u$  be an arbitrary neighbor of  $u$  in  $D_u$ , let  $y_v$  be an arbitrary neighbor of  $v$  in  $D_v$ , let  $P_u$  be a shortest path from  $u$  to  $x$  with all internal vertices in  $D_{xu}$ , and let  $P_v$  be a shortest path from  $v$  to  $x$  with all internal vertices in  $D_{xv}$ . Then,  $y_u - u - P_u - x - P_v - v - y_v$  is an induced path with at least 7 vertices, a contradiction. This proves (1) and concludes the proof of Lemma 9.  $\square$






Figure 4: The first example for  $n = 5$ . In the second example we turn  $S$  into a clique.

## 5 Examples

In this section we discuss two examples showing tightness of the statement of Theorem 3: we show that it cannot be generalized to  $P_8$ -free graphs and that a small dominating set of a minimal separator may need to contain elements of the said separator. The examples are modifications of a corresponding example presented in the conclusions of [16].

**First example.** Consider the following graph  $G$ . We create three sets of  $n$  vertices each,  $A_1 = \{a_1^j \mid 1 \leq j \leq n\}$ ,  $A_2 = \{a_2^j \mid 1 \leq j \leq n\}$ , and  $S = \{s^j \mid 1 \leq j \leq n\}$ . We set  $V(G) = A_1 \cup A_2 \cup S$ . For the edge set of  $G$ , we turn  $A_1$  and  $A_2$  into cliques and add edges  $s^j a_1^j$  and  $s^j a_2^j$ , for all  $1 \leq j \leq n$ . This concludes the description of the graph  $G$ ; see Figure 4. Note that  $S$  is a minimal separator in  $G$  with  $A_1$  and  $A_2$  being two full components of  $S$ .

First, note that for every  $v \in V(G)$ ,  $|N[v] \cap S| = 1$ . Thus, any set dominating  $S$  has to contain at least  $n$  vertices.

Second, note that  $G$  is  $P_8$ -free. To see this, let  $P$  be an induced path in  $G$ . Since  $A_1$  and  $A_2$  are cliques,  $P$  contains at most two vertices from each  $A_i$ ,  $i \in \{1, 2\}$ , and these vertices are consecutive on  $P$ . Since  $S$  is an independent set in  $G$ ,  $P$  cannot contain more than one vertex of  $S$  in a row. Hence,  $P$  contains at most three vertices of  $S$ . Consequently  $|V(P)| \leq 7$ , as desired. Note that if  $n \geq 3$ , then there is an induced  $P_7$  in  $G$ , for example  $s^1 - a_1^1 - a_1^2 - s^2 - a_2^2 - a_2^3 - s^3$ .

**Second example.** Here, let us modify the graph  $G$  from the first example by turning  $S$  into a clique. Still,  $S$  is a minimal separator in  $G$  with  $A_1$  and  $A_2$  being two full components of  $S$ .

First, note that for every  $v \in A_1 \cup A_2$ , we still have  $|N[v] \cap S| = 1$ . Thus, any set dominating  $S$  that is disjoint with  $S$  has to contain at least  $n$  vertices.

Second, note that  $G$  is  $P_7$ -free. To see this, observe that  $G$  can be partitioned into three cliques,  $A_1$ ,  $A_2$ , and  $S$ , and any induced path in  $G$  contains at most two vertices from each of the cliques. Note that if  $n \geq 3$ , then there is an induced  $P_6$  in  $G$ , for example  $a_1^3 - a_1^1 - s^1 - s^2 - a_2^2 - a_2^3$ .

## References

- [1] T. Abrishami, M. Chudnovsky, M. Pilipczuk, P. Rzażewski, and P. D. Seymour. Induced subgraphs of bounded treewidth and the container method. *CoRR*, abs/2003.05185, 2020.

- [2] V. E. Alekseev. The effect of local constraints on the complexity of determination of the graph independence number. *Combinatorial-algebraic methods in applied mathematics*, pages 3–13, 1982. (in Russian).
- [3] G. Bacsó, D. Lokshtanov, D. Marx, M. Pilipczuk, Z. Tuza, and E. J. van Leeuwen. Subexponential-time algorithms for Maximum Independent Set in  $P_t$ -free and broom-free graphs. *Algorithmica*, 81(2):421–438, 2019.
- [4] F. Bonomo, M. Chudnovsky, P. Maceli, O. Schaudt, M. Stein, and M. Zhong. Three-coloring and list three-coloring of graphs without induced paths on seven vertices. *Combinatorica*, 38(4):779–801, 2018.
- [5] V. Bouchitté and I. Todinca. Treewidth and Minimum Fill-in: Grouping the minimal separators. *SIAM J. Comput.*, 31(1):212–232, 2001.
- [6] V. Bouchitté and I. Todinca. Listing all potential maximal cliques of a graph. *Theor. Comput. Sci.*, 276(1-2):17–32, 2002.
- [7] C. Brause. A subexponential-time algorithm for the Maximum Independent Set problem in  $P_t$ -free graphs. *Discret. Appl. Math.*, 231:113–118, 2017.
- [8] M. Chudnovsky, M. Pilipczuk, M. Pilipczuk, and S. Thomassé. Quasi-polynomial time approximation schemes for the Maximum Weight Independent Set problem in  $H$ -free graphs. In *Proceedings of the 31<sup>st</sup> ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms, SODA 2020*, pages 2260–2278. SIAM, 2020.
- [9] M. Chudnovsky and P. D. Seymour. The three-in-a-tree problem. *Combinatorica*, 30(4):387–417, 2010.
- [10] M. Chudnovsky, S. Spirkl, and M. Zhong. Four-coloring  $P_6$ -free graphs. In *Proceedings of the 30<sup>th</sup> Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms, SODA 2019*, pages 1239–1256. SIAM, 2019.
- [11] F. V. Fomin, I. Todinca, and Y. Villanger. Large induced subgraphs via triangulations and CMSO. *SIAM J. Comput.*, 44(1):54–87, 2015.
- [12] P. A. Golovach, D. Paulusma, and J. Song. Closing complexity gaps for coloring problems on  $h$ -free graphs. *Inf. Comput.*, 237:204–214, 2014.
- [13] C. Groenland, K. Okrasa, P. Rzażewski, A. D. Scott, P. D. Seymour, and S. Spirkl.  $H$ -colouring  $P_t$ -free graphs in subexponential time. *Discret. Appl. Math.*, 267:184–189, 2019.
- [14] A. Grzesik, T. Klimošová, M. Pilipczuk, and M. Pilipczuk. Polynomial-time algorithm for Maximum Weight Independent Set on  $P_6$ -free graphs. In *Proceedings of the 30<sup>th</sup> Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms, SODA 2019*, pages 1257–1271. SIAM, 2019. ArXiv version at <http://arxiv.org/abs/1707.05491>.
- [15] M. Habib and C. Paul. A survey of the algorithmic aspects of modular decomposition. *Computer Science Review*, 4(1):41–59, 2010.
- [16] D. Lokshtanov, M. Pilipczuk, and E. J. van Leeuwen. Independence and efficient domination on  $P_6$ -free graphs. *ACM Trans. Algorithms*, 14(1):3:1–3:30, 2018.
- [17] D. Lokshtanov, M. Vatshelle, and Y. Villanger. Independent set in  $P_5$ -free graphs in polynomial time. In *Proceedings of the 25<sup>th</sup> Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms, SODA 2014*, pages 570–581. SIAM, 2014.