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Abstract
Let \( n \) be the size of a parametrized problem and \( k \) the parameter. We present a full kernel for Path Contraction and Cluster Editing/Deletion as well as a kernel for Feedback Vertex Set whose sizes are all polynomial in \( k \), that are computable in polynomial time, and use \( O(\text{poly}(k) \log n) \) bits. By first executing the new kernelizations and subsequently the best known polynomial-time kernelizations for the problem under consideration, we obtain the best known kernels in polynomial time with \( O(\text{poly}(k) \log n) \) bits.
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1 Introduction

A parameterized problem \( P \) is a problem whose instances of size \( n \) are given with an extra parameter \( k \) such that the instance can be solved in FPT time, i.e., in time \( f(k) \cdot n^{O(1)} \) where \( f \) is some computable function independent of \( n \). One major field in parameterized complexity is kernelization, i.e., an algorithm that applies several so-called reduction rules that simplify an instance of size \( n \) to an instance of the same problem such that the size of the new instance depends only on \( k \). Most publications in the field of parameterized complexity focus on the time complexity. However, it is natural to ask if the space complexity of FPT problems can also be bounded by the given parameter. A question that is of practical as well of theoretical interest. In practice, algorithms applied on large input instance may simple crash because they run out of memory while algorithms that treat space as a scarce resource can finish the computation [37]. A theoretical motivation for studying space bounds is that these bounds may give further insights into the complexity of problems that belong to the same time complexity class [18].

Space Complexity. One of the most important classes for space complexity is the class L, the class of problems solvable by a deterministic Turing machine in logarithmic space. Since logarithmic space allows only polynomial many states, \( L \subseteq P \) where \( P \) is the class of problems solvable in polynomial time. In 1986, Cook and MacKenzie [11] showed completeness for several graph problems in the class FL (the class of function problems solvable on a deterministic Turing machine in logarithmic amount of space), which thus is a subclass of L. In detail, these graph problems are breadth/depths-first search on trees, undirected forest accessibility and the cycle-free problem. Breadth-first search and depth-first search are also often considered on graphs as they can be used to solve many problems. One of those problems is USTCON, the problem to decide if two vertices are connected by a path
in an undirected graph. Due to Reingold’s celebrated result we know that USTCON is in L. However, under natural assumptions on the computational model, DFS requires roughly \( \Omega(n) \) bits on general graphs if polynomial time is required \cite{35}. To the authors knowledge the largest graph classes with a polynomial-time sublinear-space DFS are planar graphs and graphs of treewidth \( O(n^{1-\epsilon}) \) for some \( \epsilon > 0 \) \cite{30}. These solutions require \( \Omega(n^{1/2}) \) bits.

About 5 years ago, researcher started to consider space-efficient graph algorithms, i.e., algorithms that use as little space as possible while (almost) maintaining the best known asymptotic running time for the graph problems under consideration. These space-efficient algorithms are mostly designed for problems that run already in polynomial time, i.e., we have algorithms for connectivity problems \cite{8, 19, 24}, matching \cite{15} and other graph problems \cite{17, 18, 25, 31}. Further algorithms are known for, e.g., sorting \cite{1, 34} and geometric problems \cite{1, 3}.

Parameterized Space Complexity. Cai et al. \cite{7} introduced the parameterized space-complexity class para–L (but under a different name). Elberfeld et al. \cite{18} introduced several more classes that fit into the existing complexity hierarchy and use the prefix para- to define them. A problem \( P \) parameterized by \( k \) is in a class para–C if \( P \) is in \( C \) after a precomputation on the parameter \( k \). For an overview of the classes and the exact definitions we refer to \cite{18}. In this paper we only focus on the time and space bounds of these classes and their relation to each other. In the following, we define a problem to belong to \( D[t,s] \) if it can be solved by a deterministic turning machine in time \( t \) and with \( s \) bits. Elberfeld et al. showed many relations between their parameterized classes and the standard time classes (like \( L \), \( P \) and FPT). One of which is \( D[\infty, f(k) + poly\ n] = para–L \subseteq D[f(k)\ poly\ n, f(k)\ log\ n] \subseteq para–P = FPT = D[f(k)\ poly\ n, \infty] \).

From Cai et al. \cite{7} we know that VERTEX COVER is in para–L. Flum and Grohe \cite{22} showed that all parameterized graph problems on graphs of bounded degree belong to para–L. Elberfeld et al. \cite{18} showed that FEEDBACK VERTEX SET is in \( D[f(k)\ poly\ n, f(k)\ log\ n] \), and LONGEST COMMON SUBSEQUENCE (parameterized by the number of sequences) is in \( N[f(k)\ poly\ n, f(k)\ log\ n] \), the class of problems that can be solved in \( f(k)\ poly\ n \) time and \( f(k)\ log\ n \) bits on a non-deterministic Turing machine. Bannach et al. \cite{2} studied packing, covering and clustering problems and show (among other results) that TRIANGLE PACKING, EXACT PARTIAL VERTEX COVER, VERTEX COVER, and MANY CLUSTER EDITING is in para–L (more precisely in a class called para–\( AC^0 \) \( \subseteq \) para–L) and CLUSTER EDITING is in para–L (more precisely in para–\( TC^0 \) \( \subseteq \) para–L).

Parameterized space complexity was also considered in different models. Schmidt et al. \cite{36} study space complexity of dynamic parameterized problems, i.e., problems whose instances change over time. More precisely, the instances are given together with a set of changes to the instance that change the instance in each time step. Heeger at al. \cite{20} consider a “new” parameterized view on temporal graphs (graphs whose edge sets may change with each time step) where they have to find a solution for each time step, but bound the total number of changes over all solutions. They show space upper bounds for their framework, which needs full kernels. Fafianie and Kratsch \cite{21} and Chitnis and Cormode \cite{9} presented upper and lower bounds for parameterized problems in the streaming model, i.e., a model where the input is given as a linear stream.

Models of Computation. Our model of computation is the word-RAM where we assume a word-size of \( w = \Omega(\log N) \) bits (with \( N \) being the size of the input) and that arithmetic operations (+, −, ·, /, modulo) and bit-shift operations on bit sequences of \( w \) bits can be done in constant time. This model is natural since many computational aspects of current computers are similar to a word-RAM with \( w = 32 \) or \( w = 64 \) bits. Furthermore, we
assume that our model has a read-only input memory and a read-write working memory, and provides constant-time random access to the both memories. We call such a model a read-only word-RAM. Restricting a word-RAM as described above, we obtain algorithms that can run in parallel on the input or that leave the input unchanged for the further computations, which is important for Big Data applications where it not so easy to make a copy of the data.

**Our Space Bound.** A usual kernelization uses poly($n$) log $n$ bits of working memory and produces in poly($n$) $f(k)$ time a kernel of $f(k)$ log $n$ bits where $f(k)$ is the kernel size. (Mentioning the size without the unit “bits” means the number of elements, e.g., vertices and edges, stored in the kernel.) It is of theoretical interest to show the space bound of $O(f(k) + \log n)$ bits since it shows membership in para-L. However, it is natural to allow poly($k$) log $n$ bits for the kernelization since (if possible) one is usually interested in polynomial sized kernels, which we can store with poly($k$) log $n$ bits so that further computations (of standard kernelizations) are easily possible. Summarized, our goal is (1) to bound the working memory to poly($k$) log $n$ bits, (2) to bound the kernelization to poly($n$) time, and (3) to output a kernel of the currently smallest known size. We achieve (1) and (2) by using kernelizations techniques that run in poly($n$) time and use poly($k$) log $n$ bits to produce a kernel of size poly($k$), which may not be of the best known size. To achieve (3) we run the best known polynomial time kernelizations. These kernelizations are typically not space-efficient, but since our kernel size is bound by $n' = poly(k)$ we still can guarantee (1) and (2).

**Contribution and Approach.** We present new kernelizations for Path Contraction (Section 3) and Feedback Vertex Set (Section 4). Let $n \in \mathbb{N}$ be the size of the input and $k \leq n$ be a parameter. To find a kernel for Path Contraction, one usually searches for bridges (i.e., edges whose removal of any of them disconnects the graph) and merges the endpoints of the bridge to a single vertex [27]. Bridges are usually found by running a DFS with $\Omega(\sqrt{n})$ bits [30]. Instead of this reduction rule, we only shrink induced degree-2-chains (i.e., a path whose vertices have all degree 2) as long as they consist of more than $k + 2$ vertices and show that we so get a kernel of size polynomial in $k$. To achieve our space bound additionally show that a yes-instance of Path Contraction cannot have a tree as subgraph that has more than $k + 2$ leaves. This allows us to construct a BFS algorithm that has to store at most $k + 2$ vertices at a time, allowing us to construct a kernel of size $O(k^3)$ in $O((n + k^2) \log k)$ time and using $O(k^3 \log n)$ bits. To get the currently best kernel size we subsequently apply Li et al.’s polynomial time kernelization and so get a kernel of size $3k^2 + 4$ in $O(n \log k + \text{poly}(k))$ time and using $O(\text{poly}(k) \log n)$ bits. In contrast Li et al.’s kernel for Path Contraction uses $\Theta((n + m) \log n)$ bits due to searches for bridges and to store the modification to the input instance in adherence to their reduction rules.

Due to Elberfeld et al. [13] we know that Feedback Vertex Set is in the class D[$f(k)$ poly $n$, $f(k)$ log $n$]. In detail, their algorithm runs in $\Theta(k^4 n^3)$ time and uses $O(k \log n)$ bits. We present a kernelization for Feedback Vertex Set that runs in $O(n^4 k^3 \log k)$ time (since $m = nk$ holds for any solvable Feedback Vertex Set instance), uses $O(k^{10} \log n)$ bits and outputs a kernel of $n' = 2k^2 + k$ vertices. Note that Feedback Vertex Set has no kernel of size $O(k^{2-\epsilon})$ for any constant $\epsilon > 0$ unless NP $\subseteq$ coNP/poly [16]. Since our kernels are of size poly($k$) log $n$, we can use the latest and best poly-size technique to solve the kernel instance and the space bound remains $O(\text{poly}(k) \log n)$ bits. Thus, after computing our kernel we could use the deterministic algorithm of Iwata and Kobayashi to solve it in $(3.46^k n') = (3.46^k + 2)$ time or the randomized algorithm of Li and Nederlof to solve it in $2.7^k \text{poly}(n') = 2.7^k + c$ time for some constant $c \geq 1$. Thus our approach is faster than that of Elberfeld et al. [13]. However, they manage to only use $O(k \log n)$ bits while
we use \(O(k^{10} \log n)\) bits. For a comparison between the different approaches see Table 1. Li and Nederlof and Iwata and Kobayashi do not focus on space efficiency in their search tree algorithms for Feedback Vertex Set and thus do not state a space bound. Based in their description they assume either to be able to modify the input graph or to create at least one copy of it, which gives us a lower bound of \(\Omega((n + m) \log n)\) bits. By assuming the worst case that each node of the search tree stores its own copy of the reduced graph, the two search-tree algorithms have an upper bound of \(O(k(n + m) \log n)\) bits.

Many kernelizations for Feedback Vertex Set search repeatedly for a flower, i.e., a set of \(k + 1\) cycles that are disjoint except for one common vertex \(v\). Since it is not clear how we can determine a flower with \(\text{poly}(k) \log n\) bits, we use a different approach. We first show how to compute an approximated feedback vertex set \(X\) of size \(k^2 + 3k - 1\) and with \(O(k^2 \log n)\) bits. By removing \(X\) the graph decomposes in several trees \(T\). Afterwards, we remove trees that are not relevant and shrink the remaining trees to a size polynomial in \(k\). To shrink the trees, we search for a special kind of flowers so that it can be done with \(\text{poly}(k) \log n\) bits. The idea to use an approximated feedback vertex set for the computation of a kernel for Feedback Vertex Set was also considered by Bodleander and van Dijk 6. They construct sets of vertices that may use \(\Theta(n \log n)\) bits.

We also recognize the need for full kernels, i.e., kernels that allow us to enumerate all minimal solution of at most size \(k\). Those kernels are, e.g., necessary for the application of frameworks such as shown in [26] and for parameterized enumeration [14]. We show space-efficient full kernels for Path Contraction and for Cluster Editing.

**Outline.** In Section 2 we give some definitions and auxiliary lemmas. We show a (full) kernel for Path Contraction in Section 3. We present our approximated feedback vertex set and our kernelization for Feedback Vertex Set in Section 4. In Section 5 we adapt a standard technique for Cluster Editing/Deletion to compute a full kernel of size \(O(k^2)\) in \(O(nm \log k)\) time and within \(O(k^2 \log n)\) bits.

## 2 Preliminaries

In the following, an instance of a fixed-parameter tractable problem is described by a tuple \((G, k)\) where \(G\) is a graph and \(k\) is a parameter. We call an instance a yes-instance exactly if there is a solution of maximum size \(k\). Otherwise, we call it a no-instance. We define the size of a graph as the sum of its vertices and edges and denote by \(N_G(v)\) the neighbors of \(v\) in \(G\) and set \(\deg_G(v) = |N_G(v)|\). If the graph under consideration is clear from the context, we may omit the subscript \(G\).

- **Definition 2.1.** (Kernel, full kernel) A kernel for a given instance \((G, k)\) of a fixed-parameter tractable problem is an instance \((G', k')\) with the properties that the size of \(G'\) and \(k'\) is bounded by \(f(k)\) where \(f\) is a computable function (independent of the size of \(G\)) and \((G', k')\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Authors</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Space [bits]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Li and Nederlof [32]</td>
<td>2.7(k^{\log n})</td>
<td>(\Omega((n + m) \log n))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iwata and Kobayashi [29]</td>
<td>(O(3.46^k n))</td>
<td>(\Omega((n + m) \log n))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elberfeld et al. [13]</td>
<td>(O(k^{k^2}))</td>
<td>(O(k \log n))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This paper + Iwata and Kobayashi [29]</td>
<td>(O(n^k k^3 \log k + 3.46^{k+2}))</td>
<td>(O(k^{10} \log n))</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 1** A time and space comparison between our approach, the result of Elberfeld et al. and two of the currently best results results for Feedback Vertex Set that do not focus on space.
is a yes-instance exactly if $(G, k)$ is a yes-instance. If $(G', k')$ allows the enumeration of all minimal solutions of size at most $k$ for $(G, k)$, it is called full kernel [26].

To compute a kernel a kernelization algorithm (or short only kernelization) is used. For an easier description, we allow our kernelization to output “no-instance”. From that answer, one can easily construct a trivial no-instance. Usually, a kernelization algorithm modifies $G$ step-wise by local modifications described in so-called reduction rules. A reduction rule is safe if it maintains solvability of the given instance. Our kernelizations compute a kernel $(G', k')$ of an instance $(G, k)$ by deleting some vertices and/or edges of $G$ and so obtains $G'$.

On the read-only word-RAM and with poly($k$) log $n$ bits, we can neither modify the $n$-vertex input graph $G$ nor create a mutable copy of it. Instead we compute the required information on the fly, and use them to construct $G'$. To store $G'$ we use a mutable graph structure where a runtime penalty factor logarithmic in the size of the graph has to be taken into account. Such a graph structure can be realized by a balanced heap that stores each vertex $v$ of $G'$ together with a pointer $p_v$ that points at another balanced heap storing each neighbor of $v$. By using balanced heaps instead of, e.g., linked lists, we are able to check if a vertex or edge exists in $G'$ in logarithmic time, which we will do in some of our algorithms.

In our kernelization for Feedback Vertex Set we make use of a DFS algorithm. A DFS has many applications, one is to compute a DFS-tree [12], i.e., a special kind of spanning tree of a connected graph $G$. A spanning tree $T$ is a subgraph of $G$ that consists of all vertices of the graph, but only of those edges of $G$ such that $T$ is connected and has no cycles. All edges of $G$ that are also in $T$ are called tree edges. A DFS tree (of undirected graphs) has an additional property that $G$ has no edge that connects two different root-leaf branches of $T$ (i.e., we have no so-called cross-edges). Thus, all edges of $G$ that are not tree-edges with respect to $T$ are called back edges.


> **Lemma 2.2.** (11, Theorem 2) Given an $n$-vertex tree $T$ and a node $r$ of $T$ as root there is a linear-time $O(\log n)$-bits algorithm that traverses all vertices of $T$ in depth-first-search manner.

It is known that a DFS finds a back edge in a graph only if the graph contains a cycle [12]. Cook and McKenzie [11] showed that this problem, also known as the cycle-free problem, is in the class FL under NC$^1$ reduction. They describe their proof very briefly, thus we use their key observation to determine the exact asymptotic running time.

> **Lemma 2.3.** (11, Theorem 2) Given an $n$-vertex graph $G$ and a vertex $r$, there is an $O(\log n)$-bits algorithm that answers in $O(n^2)$ time if the connected component with $r$ in $G$ is a tree or it returns a back-edge to the DFS tree rooted at $r$.

**Proof.** Assume the DFS is on an $r$-$u$ path and is about to follow an edge $\{u, v\}$. The edge is only a tree-edge if $v \neq r$ was not already discovered by the DFS and is not the direct predecessor on a $r$-$v$ path to find $u$ since, otherwise, it would imply a cycle consisting of edge $\{u, v\}$ and the $u$-$v$-subpath of the $r$-$v$ path. For every edge $\{u, w\}$ a new run of the DFS can be used to check if $\{u, w\}$ is a back edge or tree edge. However, a special case are edges $\{r, u\}$ since, with the above approach, it is not clear if the edge is a tree edge on a $r$-$u$ path used to return to $r$ or a back-edge to $r$. To resolve this remember the outgoing edge $e$ from $r$ whenever $r$ is left. If $r$ is reached by an edge $e' \neq e$, then $e'$ is a back-edge. Since the algorithm can stop whenever the first back edge is found, the algorithm considers only $O(n)$ edges (the tree-edges), thus the space and time bounds stated in the lemma hold. ▶
Path Contraction

Let $G$ be an $n$-node $m$-edge graph and $C$ be a subset of edges of $G$. We write $G/C$ for the graph obtained from $G$ by contracting each edge in $C$. Contracting an edge is done by merging its endpoints and removing any loops or parallel edges afterwards. In the path contraction problem, a graph $G = (V, E)$ is given and the task is to find a set $C \subseteq E$ such that $G/C$ is a path. In particular, $G/C$ is a connected graph with $n' \in \mathbb{N}$ vertices and $n' - 1$ edges. In the parameterized version, denoted by Path Contraction, a graph $G = (V, E)$ is given with a parameter $k \in \mathbb{N}$, and the task is to find a set $C \subseteq E$ with $|C| \leq k$ such that $G/C$ is a path.

The currently best kernelization for Path Contraction runs in polynomial time and produces a kernel consisting of $3k + 4$ vertices. It is due to Li et al. [33], and builds on Heggernes et al.'s algorithm [27]. One reduction rule used in both algorithms is an iterative contraction of a bridge that, if removed, disconnects the graph into two components of size at least $k + 2$. The standard algorithm to compute bridges uses a DFS (depth-first search) and no linear-time DFS is known that uses $O(n)$ bits. (The currently best $O(n)$-bit DFS runs in $O(m + n \log^* n)$ time [10].) Instead of computing bridges by the kernelization, we introduce new reduction rules below, whose correctness is explained subsequently. In the following, a subtree $T$ of $G$ is a subgraph of $G$ that is a tree. Moreover, let a degree-2 chain be a maximal simple path $P = v_1, \ldots, v_ℓ$ ($ℓ \in \mathbb{N}$) whose vertices $v_1, \ldots, v_ℓ$ are all of degree 2. Note that, if $P$ is not a cycle, then $v_1$ and $v_ℓ$ must have each a neighbor that is not of degree 2.

Rule 1 If $G$ contains more than $n - 1 + \frac{1}{2}(k^2 + 5k + 4)$ edges or if $G$ has a subtree with more than $k + 2$ leaves, output “no-instance”.

Rule 2 If there is a degree-2 chain $P$ that consists of at least $k + 1$ edges, contract all but $k + 1$ arbitrary edges of $P$.

Lemma 3.1. Rule 1 is safe and produces a full kernel.

Proof. Assume that $(G, k)$ is a yes-instance for path contraction. Let us say that a super vertex $w$ is a vertex obtained from a contraction of (normal) vertices $u$ and $v$ of $G$. For an easy intuition, we then say that $w$ contains $u$ and $v$.

Note that with every contraction of vertices $u$ and $v$ to a new super vertex $w$, the number of (normal and super) vertices drops by 1 and the number of edges can drop by at most $\min\{\deg(u), \deg(v)\}$ (Fact 1), which is the case exactly if $N(u) = N(v)$. This imply that, $\deg(w) \geq \max\{\deg(u), \deg(v)\} - 1$ (Fact 2). Clearly, $\deg(w') \leq 2$ for every (normal or super) vertex $w'$ in $G/C$ where $C$ is a minimal solution of $(G, k)$ (Fact 3). By Fact 2 and 3, $G$ can have no vertex $u$ with $\deg(u) \geq k + 3$ since we can run at most $k$ contractions and each such contraction can lower the degree of $u$ (and the super vertices containing $u$) by 1. More exactly, if $i$ contractions remain to solve $(G, k)$, all vertices $u$ have $\deg(u) \leq i + 2$ (Fact 4). By Fact 4, Fact 1, and since after each contraction $k$ is reduced by one, the first contraction can remove at most $k + 2$ edges, the next removes at most $k + 1$ edges, …, and the $k$th contraction removes at most 2 edges. Thus, $k$ contractions can remove at most $\sum_{x=2}^{k+2} x = \frac{1}{2}(k^2 + 5k + 4)$ edges to end up with a graph that has at most $n - 1$ edges. In other words, $G$ can have at most $n - 1 + \frac{1}{2}(k^2 + 5k + 4)$ edges.

To show that every subtree of $T$ has at most $k + 2$ leaves, we first show Fact 5: if $G'$ is obtained from $G$ by contracting an arbitrary number of edges, then $(G', k)$ is also a yes instance. By induction, it suffices to show Fact 5 for graphs $G'$ that are obtained by one contraction of an arbitrary edge $\{u, v\}$. Note that $G' = G/\{u, v\}$. Consider an optimal solution $C$ for $(G, k)$ and the path $P = G/C$. We denote by $S(u)$ and $S(v)$ the super vertices in $G/C$ containing $u$ and $v$, respectively. Note that if $S(u)$ and $S(v)$ are different, non-adjacent vertices on $P$, then
We shortly sketch a usual BFS and the construction of a BFS tree. If \( S(u) = S(v) \) or \( S(u) \) and \( S(v) \) are adjacent in \( P \), then \( C = (G/\{u,v\})/\{S(u),S(v)\} \) is a path and thus, \( C \) is a solution for \((G',k)\). If \( S(u) = S(v) \), then there is a u-v-path \( P' \) consisting only of edges in \( C \). Let \( e \) be an edge on \( P' \) and \( C' = C \backslash \{e\} \). Then \( G'/C' = G/C \) is a path and \( C' \) is a solution for \((G',k)\) since \(|C'| = |C| - 1\). To sum up, Fact 5 holds.

Assume for a contradiction that \( G \) has a subtree \( T \) with \( \ell > k + 2 \) leaves. Let \( L \) be the set of leaves of \( T \). By contracting all edges of \( T \) in \( G \) without edges that have an endpoint in \( L \) we obtain a graph \( G' \) and by Fact 5 \((G',k)\) is a yes instance. Moreover, \( G' \) has a subtree that is a star. By Rule 1, the center of that star is a vertex that has degree at least \( \ell > k + 2 \) and by Rule 4, \((G',k)\) is a no instance—a contradiction.

The application of Rule 1 implies that we have no solution and every no instance is trivially a full kernel.

\[ \blacktriangleright \textbf{Lemma 3.2.} \textbf{Rule 2 is also safe and produces a full kernel.} \]

\begin{proof}
Observe that a minimal solution either contracts all edges of \( P \) or none at all. Since we are not allowed to contract all edges of a degree-2 chain with at least \( k + 1 \) edges, a minimal solution contracts no edge of \( P \). Thus Rule 2 is save and we get a full kernel.
\end{proof}

Assume in the following that an exhaustive application of our reduction rules does not return “no-instance”. Let \( G' \) be the graph returned and \( n' = n_1 + n_2 + n_{>2} \) be its size that we want to determine where \( n_1 \) is the number of vertices of degree one, \( n_2 \) is the number of vertices of degree 2, and \( n_{>2} \) is the number of vertices of degree greater than 2. To determine \( n' \) we are going to bound \( n_1, n_2 \) and \( n_{>2} \) under adherence to Rule 1 and Rule 2. Observe that vertices of degree one are leaves in a subtree \( T \) of \( G \) and thus, by Rule 1, \( n_1 \leq k + 2 \) must hold. By Rule 1, \( G' \) has \( m' \leq n' - 1 + \frac{1}{2}(k^2 + 5k + 4) \) edges and \( n' - 1 \) are necessary to connect all vertices of \( G' \) to a single connected component. Thus, \( \frac{1}{2}(k^2 + 5k + 4) \) edges remain to increase the degree of \( k^2 + 5k + 4 \) vertices so that \( n_{>2} \leq k^2 + 5k + 4 \) holds. Finally note that every degree-2 chain must have an endpoint of degree other than 2. Therefore, we have at most \( n_1 + n_{>2} \) such chains, which have at most \( (k + 2) \) vertices by Rule 2, i.e., \( n_2 \leq (n_1 + n_{>2})(k + 2) \) and our graph is a kernel of size \( n' \leq n_1 + n_2 + n_{>2} = (n_1 + n_{>2})(k + 3) = (k^2 + 6k + 6)(k + 3) = O(k^3) \) vertices and \( m' = O(k^3) \) edges.

We next sketch our ideas to run the kernelization in \( O((n + k^2)\log k) \) time by using \( O(k^3\log n) \) bits. Our kernelization basically consists of running one BFS—see also Fig. 1. We shortly sketch a usual BFS and the construction of a BFS tree. The BFS visits the vertices of an input graph round-wise. As a preparation of the first round it puts some vertex \( u \) into a queue \( Q \) and starts a round. In a round it dequeues every vertex \( u \) of \( Q \), and marks \( u \) as visited. Moreover, it puts every unvisited vertex \( v \in N(u) \) into a queue \( Q' \). We then say that \( u \) was first discovered from \( u \) and add the edge \( \{u,v\} \) to an initial empty BFS tree. If \( Q' \) is empty at the end of the round, the BFS finishes. Otherwise, it proceeds with the next round with \( Q := Q' \) and \( Q' := \emptyset \). Instead of storing just vertices \( v \) on the BFS queue we store quadruples that we use to identify degree-2 chains and apply Rule 2. Each quadruple \( (v,p,i,v^*) \) consists of the vertex \( v \) and its predecessor \( p \) if \( v \) is not the root, the counter \( i \in \{0,\ldots,n\} \) with \( i > 0 \) being \( v \)'s position on a degree-2 chain, and the vertex \( v^* \) with \( v^* \neq \text{null} \) being the \((k + 1)\)th vertex on a degree-2 chain that contains \( v \). This way we can easily check both reduction rules above as shown in the next proof.

\[ \blacktriangleright \textbf{Theorem 3.3.} \textbf{Given an n-vertex instance} \((G,k)\) \textbf{of Path Contraction, there is an} \ O(n\log k + \text{poly}(k)) \textbf{-time,} \ O(k^3\log n) \textbf{bits kernelization that outputs a full kernel of size} \]

\[ \begin{align*}
\end{align*} \]
FPT-Space Graph Kernelizations for small kernels.
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Proof. We start the BFS at a vertex of degree other than 2. If there is no such vertex, then the BFS is a simple cycle and we output $G$ as the kernel if $m \leq k + 2$, otherwise we output “no-instance”.

The BFS visits the vertices as usual and updates its quadruples as follows. For each quadruple $(v, p, i, v^*)$, it iterates over $v^*$’s neighborhood and puts for every unvisited neighbor $v'$ the quadruple $(v', v, i, 1, \text{null})$ if $v$ is of degree other than two, and otherwise the quadruple $(v', v, i + 1, v^{**})$ where $v^{**}$ is $v$ if $i = k + 1$, otherwise $v^{**} = v^*$.

By Rule 1 we can bound the size of the BFS queue by $k + 2$ and the size of the kernel by $n' \leq (k^2 + 6k + 6)(k + 3) = O(k^3)$ vertices and $m' \leq n' - 1 + \frac{3}{2}(k^2 + 5k + 4) = O(k^3)$ edges.

To ensure Rule 1, we can easily count the number of leaves in the BFS tree while executing the BFS.

We now describe how a kernel $(G', k')$ can be constructed in adherence to Rule 2. Instead of contracting arbitrary edges we contract edges at the end of a degree-2 chain. The contraction is realized by not copying the inner vertices and edges at the end of a degree-2 chain while the BFS traverses the paths and connecting the $(k + 1)$st vertex with the last vertex of the path in the kernel. To avoid adding vertices into the queue that are already visited we maintain the vertices of the previous and the current queue inside two balanced heaps, respectively.

For the time being ignore a problem that two vertices in the BFS queue may be adjacent (i.e., the BFS starts to explore a degree-2 chain from both its endpoints). For each quadruple $(v, p, i, v^*)$, we add the vertex $v$ into $G'$ if $i \leq k + 1$ and if additionally $p \neq \text{null}$, we also add the edge $\{v, p\}$ into $G'$—the condition ensures that we do not add the full degree-2 chain into the kernel. If the degree of $v$ in $G$ is not two, then $v$ terminates a degree-2 chain and we add the edge $\{v^*, v\}$ if $i > k + 1$ (the bold edges in Fig. 1). We additionally add for every $u \in N(v)$ with $u$ is in $G'$, the edge $\{v, u\}$ into $G'$ (in Fig. 1 they are shown dashed).

We now consider the case where two vertices $v$ with $(v, p, i, v^*)$ and $v'$ with tuple $(v', p', i', v'^*)$ on the current BFS queue are connected to each other in $G$ and are both of degree two. If $i + i' > k + 2$ we move backwards on both paths until $i + i' = k + 2$ (but $i, i' \geq 0$) and modify the kernel by removing the vertices and edges used to move backwards. Add the edge $\{w, w'\}$ to the kernel where $w$ and $w'$ are the vertices at which we stopped our backward move.

It remains to show the space and time bounds of our kernelization. The size of the queues used for the BFS and our computation is bounded by $O(k)$ vertices and, thus, cannot exceed $O(k \log n)$ bits. The kernel is bounded by $O(k^3)$ vertices and $O(k^3)$ edges and thus uses $O(k^3 \log n)$ bits. In total, we use $O(k^3 \log n)$ bits. Concerning the time bound note that a
standard BFS runs in $O(n+m)$ time. By Rule 1 $m = O(n+k^2)$ or we stop. The algorithm has to check for each vertex if it is in a balanced heap (in the queue or in the kernel) of size at most $O(k^3)$, which takes $O(\log k)$ time per vertex. In total we have running time of $O((n+k^2)\log k)$. (Note that running backwards on degree-2 chains takes time linear to the length of the path and thus our asymptotic time bound remains the same.)

Our kernel is small enough to apply the poly-time kernelization algorithm of Li et al. and we obtain so a kernel of $3k+4$ vertices in $O(n\log n + \text{poly}(k))$ time using $\text{poly}(k)\log n$ bits.

4 Feedback Vertex Set

Given an $n$-vertex $m$-edge graph $G = (V,E)$ a set $F \subseteq V$ is called feedback vertex set if the removal of the vertices of $F$ from $G$ turns $G$ into an acyclic graph (also called forest). In a parameterized version, denoted by Feedback Vertex Set, a tuple $(G,k)$ is given where $G$ is a graph and $k$ is a parameter and we search for a feedback vertex set $F$ of size at most $k$ in $G$.

Iwata showed a kernelization for Feedback Vertex Set that produces a kernel consisting of at most $2k^2+k$ vertices and $4k^2$ edges and runs in $O(k^4m)$ time [28]. He mentions that all other kernelizations for Feedback Vertex Set exploit the two basic rules below and the so-called v-flower rule. A $v$-flower of order $d$ is a set of $d$ cycles pairwise intersecting exactly on vertex $v$.

Basic Rule 1 Remove a vertex $v$ with $\deg(v) \leq 1$.

Basic Rule 2 Remove a vertex $v$ that has only two incident edges $\{v,u\}$ and $\{v,w\}$ (possibly $u = w$), and add the edge $\{u,w\}$.

Flower Rule Remove a vertex $v$ if a $v$-flower of order $k+1$ exists and reduce $k$ by 1.

Elberfeld et al. [18] Theorem 4.13 showed how to implement the first two rules with $O(k\log n)$ bits. The graph $G'$ obtained by an exhaustive application of Basic Rule 1 and Basic Rule 2 does not actually has to be stored. Instead we compute the required information on demand with Lemma 4.1 which is similar to parts of the proof of [18] Theorem 4.13, but we present a more detailed analysis.

\textbf{Lemma 4.1.} Given an $n$-vertex $m$-edge graph $G = (V,E)$ and a set $X \subseteq V$ consisting of $k^{O(1)}$ vertices we can output the edges of every vertex $v$ of a graph $G'$ resulting from an exhaustive application of Basic Rule 1 and Basic Rule 2 on $G[V \setminus X]$. The iteration runs in total $O(n^4k\log k)$ time and uses $O(\log n)$ bits.

\textbf{Proof.} Take $G_X = G[V \setminus X]$. First of all, note that we can access $G_X$ (e.g., run a DFS in $G_X$) as if $G_X$ is given explicitly by accessing $G$ and “ignoring” all vertices in $X$. More exactly, we define the neighbors $N_{G_X}(v) = N_G(v) \setminus X$. Note further that the connected subgraphs that are removed from $G_X$ by an exhaustive application of Basic Rule 1 are trees, which we call tree appendages. We can identify each neighbor $u \notin X$ of a vertex $v$ that is part of a tree appendage by running the algorithm of Lemma 2.3 on $G_X - v$ with $r = u$ as input. If the algorithm returns no back-edge and does not visit $v$, $u$ is part of a tree appendage (not visiting $v$ is important since otherwise, with $v$ and the edge $\{v,u\}$ we have a cycle). Let $Q_u$ be the set of neighbors of $v$ that are not part of a tree appendage. Let $G_1$ be the graph obtained from $G_X$ after an exhaustive application of Basic Rule 1. Then $\deg_{G_1}(v) = |Q_v|$ is the degree of $v$ in $G_1$, for every $v$ with $|Q_v| > 1$. If $|Q_v| \leq 1$, then $v$ is itself part of a tree.
appendage. Otherwise, \(v\) is part of \(G_1\) and we can output all vertices of \(Q_v\) as neighbors of \(v\) as required from the lemma.

Let \(G_2\) be the graph obtained from \(G_1\) after an exhaustive application of Basic Rule 2. Observe that, if \(\deg_{G_1}(v) = 2\), then \(v\) is part of a degree-2 chain in \(G_1\) that is replaced by an edge in \(G_2\) by the exhaustive application of Basic Rule 2. A possibility is that the degree-2 chain connects two vertices \(u, w\) of \(G_1\) (possibly \(u = w\)) that are not of degree two. Then \(v\) is not part of \(G_2\). However, we cannot simple assume that every vertex \(v\) with \(\deg_{G_1}(v) = 2\) is not part of \(G_2\) since there is a special case (\(\ast\)): \(v\) may be part of simple cycle consisting of only degree-2 vertices and Basic Rule 2 may reduce the cycle to exactly one vertex \(z\) with a self-loop. The vertex \(z\) can be an arbitrary vertex of the cycle thus \(z = v\) is possible. We choose \(z\) always as the vertex with the smallest id of the cycle as and “ignore” the remaining vertices. More precisely, if \(v\) is such a vertex, then \(v\) is part of \(G_2\) and has a self-loop. If \(\deg_{G_1}(v) > 2\), then \(v\) is part of \(G_2\), but some of its edges in \(G_1\) may connect \(v\) with a degree-2 chain in \(G_1\) that is replaced by an edge in \(G_2\).

To realize the lemma iterate over each vertex \(v\) of \(G_X\): If \(Q_v\) \(\leq 1\), “ignore” \(v\). If \(\deg_{G_1}(v) = 2\), we output \(v\) only if we are in the Special Case (\(\ast\)) and \(v\) has the smallest id on its cycle. We now may assume that \(\deg_{G_1}(v) > 2\) and thus \(v\) is part of \(G_2\). For each neighbor \(u\) of \(v\) in \(G_1\) follow the potentially empty degree-2 chain from \(u\) until a vertex \(w\) with \(w = v\) or \(w \neq v \land \deg_{G_1}(w) > 2\). If \(w = v\), \(v\) has a self-loop thus, we output \(v\) as a neighbor of \(v\). If \(w \neq v \land \deg_{G_1}(w) > 2\), we output \(w\) is a neighbor of \(v\).

Checking if \(v\) is part of \(G_1\) and outputting its neighbors can be done in \(O(\deg(v)n^2 \log k)\) time: Lemmas 2.3 runs in \(O(n^2)\) time per edge incident to \(v\). However, since we have to ignore vertices and edges whose endpoints are in \(X\) an access to \(G_X\) needs an access to an heap of size \(|X|\) and thus runs in \(\log k^{O(1)} = O(\log k)\) time. We must iterate over all \(n\) vertices. Thus, the total running time is \(O(mn^2 \log k) = O(n^3k \log k)\).

To check for Basic Rule 2 we have to additionally follow degree-2 chains. Since a chain can consists of \(\Theta(n)\) vertices, this increases the running time by a factor of \(n\), resulting in a total running time of \(O(n^2k \log k)\) for Basic Rule 2.

By using \(O(k \log n)\) bits, they also showed how to find a cycle of \(2k\) vertices. To realize the flower rule we need to run along up to \(k + 1\) cycles and check if they intersect at vertices other than \(v\). If the given graph is reduced with respect to Basic Rule 1 and 2 and does not contain vertices with self-loops, then it can be guaranteed that the smallest cycle is of length at most \(2k\) (maximum girth of \(G\) with minimum degree 3 \(\leftarrow\)), but the remaining \(k\) cycles may have \(\omega(\text{poly}(k))\) vertices, so it seems to be hard to find and verify a flower with \(O(\text{poly}(k) \log n)\) bits. Iwata does not use the Flower Rule. Instead he uses a so-called \(s\)-cycle cover reduction \(\leftarrow\) Section 3] where we have to know which edges incident to \(s\) are bridges in the graph. (For space bounds to find bridges, recall Section 3.) Therefore, our approach is to use neither a \(v\)-flower nor an \(s\)-cycle.

In the following we use \(F\) as a set whose vertices are part of an exact feedback vertex set and \(X\) as a set whose vertices are part of an approximated feedback vertex set. We start to describe our general idea to find a kernel for Feedback Vertex Set with \(\text{poly}(k) \log n\) bits. In a first step, we want to find the approximated feedback vertex set \(X\) consisting of \(O(k^2)\) vertices. By definition, \(G[V \setminus X]\) is a forest. In a second step, we analyze the relation between these trees and the vertices of \(X\). This allows us to remove several trees and to shrink the remaining ones. Moreover, whenever we get the knowledge that a vertex \(v\) must be part of every solution of size at most \(k\), we put \(v\) into \(F\). Subsequently, we can simplify the instance because every vertex in \(F\) with its incident edges can be removed from the given graph. In other words, we continue to consider only the graph \(G_F = G[V_F = V \setminus F]\) and
analyze the relation between components of the graph $G_X = G[V \setminus X]$ and the vertices of $X$. We next present our idea with more details. Our implementation is given after the high-level description.

**Part A (approx. FVS X of maximum size $O(k^2)$):** Becker and Geiger [5] presented a 2-approximation algorithm for feedback vertex set in which they extend an $(2\log d)$-approximation algorithm (where $d$ is the maximum degree of the graph) by a phase that iteratively removes a vertex $v$ from the computed feedback vertex set $X$ if all cycles that intersect $v$ in $G$ also intersect $X \setminus \{v\}$. It is not clear how this can be checked with $O(poly(k \log n))$ bits or even with $O(f(k) \log n)$ bits for some function $f$ since a cycle in $G$ can consists of $\Theta(n)$ vertices and there can be $\Theta(n)$ cycles.

We instead present only an $O(k)$-approximation algorithm, but can guarantee that the algorithm runs with $O(poly(k \log n))$ bits. Starting with $(G, k)$ and initially $X = \emptyset$ as input compute a graph $G'$ by exhaustively applying Basic Rule 1 and Basic Rule 2 on $G[V \setminus X]$. If $G'$ is empty, we return $X$ since it is a feedback vertex set for $G$. Basic Rule 2 may create self-loops and multi-edges. If a vertex with a self-loop exists, put it into $X$, reduce $k$ by one, and restart. After an exhaustive application of Basic Rule 1 and Basic Rule 2 the set consisting of $3k$ vertices of largest degree contains at least one vertex of the minimal feedback vertex set [13 Lemma 3.3]. Thus, take $3k$ vertices of largest degree of $G'$ into $X$, reduce $k$ by one, and restart. If at any point $k < 0$, output “no-instance”. We so can compute a feedback vertex set $X$ consisting of at most $3k^2$ vertices. Note that we can not store $G'$. Instead we compute the required information on demand with Lemma 4.1.

Using Lemma 4.1 we can iterate over each vertex $v$ of $G'$ and its neighborhood to determine its degree and check for self-loops and so compute $X$ in time $3k \cdot O(n^4 k \log k) = O(n^4 k^3 \log k)$ and $O(|X| \log n) = O(k^2 \log n)$ bits. In fact, the bottleneck of the space bound is due to fact that we store $X$.

**Theorem 4.2.** Given an $n$-vertex $m$-edge instance $(G, k)$ of Feedback Vertex Set, there is an $O(n^4 k \log k)$-time, $O(k^2 \log n)$-bits algorithm that either returns a feedback vertex set $X$ consisting of at most $3k^2$ vertices or answers that $(G, k)$ is a no-instance.

**Part B (construct a kernel):** Let us say that a vertex $x \in X$ and a tree are in touch once if $x$ is adjacent to one vertex of the tree. Moreover, we define in touch ($\ell \in \mathbb{N}$ times) if $x$ is adjacent to $\ell$ vertices of the tree. For an easier description, we start to define a partition $\mathcal{T}_0, \mathcal{T}_1$ and $\mathcal{T}_2$ of the trees $\mathcal{T}$ in $G_X$ as follows (also see Fig. 2): $\mathcal{T}_0$ is set of trees in $G_X$ that are in touch at most once to at most one $x \in X$ and are not in touch to all other $x' \in X$. $\mathcal{T}_1$ is the set of trees $T$ in $\mathcal{T} \setminus \mathcal{T}_0$ such that each vertex $x \in X$ is in touch at most once with $T$. $\mathcal{T}_2$ is the set of the remaining trees in $G_X$. Note that, each tree in $\mathcal{T}_2$ is in touch at least twice to a vertex $x \in X$.

To bound the number of trees in our kernel, we use the Steps 1 - 3 to remove superfluous trees and the Steps 4 - 6 to shrink the trees themselves.

**Step 1** Remove all trees in $\mathcal{T}_0$.

**Step 2** For every pair $x_1, x_2 \in X$, choose up to $k + 2$ trees of $\mathcal{T}_1$ that are in touch with $x_1$ and with $x_2$ (if there are less, then choose all). Remove all trees of $\mathcal{T}_1$ that are chosen by no such pair.

**Step 3** If $x \in X$ is in touch with at least $k + 1$ different trees of $\mathcal{T}_2$, then move $x$ from $X$ into $F$, reduce $k$ by 1 and restart.

**Step 4** If at least $k + 1$ children of a vertex $v$ are the roots of maximal subtrees in a tree $T \in \mathcal{T}_1 \cup \mathcal{T}_2$ such that each subtree is in touch with the same vertex $x \in X$, take $v$ into $X$ and the pair $\{v, x\}$ into an initial empty set $Y$. If a vertex $w$ occurs in $\geq k + 1$
pairs of \( Y \), then move \( w \) from \( X \) into \( F \), reduce \( k \) by 1, and restart. Otherwise and if 
\(|Y| \geq 2k^2 + k - 1\), output no-instance.

**Step 5** If a tree \( T \) of \( G_X \) is in touch at least \( k(k+1) \) times with the same vertex \( x \in X \), 
then move \( x \) from \( X \) into \( F \), reduce \( k \) by 1 and restart.

**Step 6** Let \( V' \) be the vertices of the remaining trees in \( \mathcal{T}_1 \) and \( \mathcal{T}_2 \). Apply Basic Rule 1 and 2 
exhaustively on the graph \( G[V' \cup X] \). Let \( n' \) be the number of vertices in the graph \( G' \) 
obtained. If \( G' \) has more than \( n' - 1 + kn' \) edges, output “no-instance”, otherwise return 
\((G',k)\) as the kernel.

**Lemma 4.3.** Steps 1 – 6 are safe, i.e., each step implements a safe reduction rule.

**Proof.** Step 1 is clearly safe since no vertex of a tree being in touch at most once with at 
most one vertex of \( X \) can be part of a cycle. We want to remark that Step 1 also follows 
from Basic Rule 1. We next argue that Step 2 is safe. Assume that vertices \( x_1, x_2 \in X \) are 
in touch with a tree of \( \mathcal{T}_1 \). If another tree exists that is in touch with the same vertices, we 
have a cycle. If \( \ell \geq k + 2 \) such trees exist, then we have \( \ell \) disjoint paths from \( x_1 \) to \( x_2 \) and 
every feedback vertex set must contain \( x_1 \) or \( x_2 \). Assume that we remove a tree from \( \mathcal{T}_1 \) 
by Step 2. Note that all pairs of vertices being in touch with the tree have already at least 
k + 2 “common” trees, i.e., trees to which the vertex pair is in touch with, and let \( X' \subseteq X \) 
be the vertices that are in touch with the removed tree. Then all except one vertex of \( X' \) are 
removed in every solution and thus no cycle is passing through the removed tree. Therefore, 
Step 2 is safe. We next focus on Step 3. By definition \( x \in X \) forms a cycle with each tree 
being in touch with \( x \) at least twice. Thus, if the rule applies, we have an \( x \)-flower of order 
\((k + 1)\) and the rule is safe [6].

For Step 4, note that at least \( k + 1 \) internally vertex-disjoint paths exist between vertex \( x \) 
and \( v \). Thus, every minimal feedback vertex set must contain \( x \) or \( v \) (\( \ast \)). Assume that there 
is vertex \( w \) with pairs \( \{v_1, w\}, \ldots, \{v_{k+1}, w\} \in Y \). Since (\( \ast \)) applies to all pairs in \( Y \), we can 
conclude that \( w \) must be part of every minimal feedback vertex set. Thus, our algorithms 
correctly moves \( w \) into \( F \). Assume now that no such \( w \) exists. In this case the pairs in \( Y \) 
induce a graph \( H \) with maximum degree \( k \). We want to show that we have \( k + 1 \) pairs in \( Y \) 
such that the vertices in all pairs are pairwise disjoint. This means that \( H \) has a matching 
of size \( k + 1 \). Note that an edge \( u, u' \) part of the matching prevents at most \( k - 1 \) edges 
incident to \( u \) to be part of the matching. The same is true for \( u' \). Thus, we can easily 
construct a matching by taking one edge and removing at most \( 2(k - 1) \) adjacent edges.
Since \(|Y| \geq 2k^2 + k - 1\), we have a matching of size \( 2k^2 + k - 1/(2k - 1) = k + 1 \) pairs.

We next consider Step 5. After Step 4 at most \( k \) children of every vertex \( v \) can be the 
root of a maximal subtree in \( T \) that are in touch with the same vertex of \( X \). Let \( U \) be a set
of the vertices of $T$ that are adjacent to $x$. Ignoring the parts of $T$ that are not on a path between $u, u' \in U$, we obtain a tree with maximum degree $\Delta = k$. One can easily see that, given a tree $T = (V_T, E_T)$ with maximum degree $\Delta$ and $U \subseteq V_T$, we can find $|U|/(\Delta + 1)$ pairs of vertices in $U$ such that the paths in $T$ between each pair are vertex disjoint [20, Lemma 2.4]. This means that with $|U| \geq k(k + 1)$ we have an $x$-flower of order $|U|/k \geq k + 1$ and Step 5 is safe. Clearly, also Step 6 is safe.

We next want to show that we get a kernel of size $O(k^{10})$ after running all steps. Clearly, $|\mathcal{T}_0| = 0$ by Step 1. After Step 2, $|\mathcal{T}_1| \leq |X|^2(k + 2)$ holds because we have less than $|X|^2$ pairs, each have chosen at most $k + 2$ trees. Moreover, Step 3 guarantees us that $|\mathcal{T}_2| \leq |X|k$ since every $x$ is connected to at most $k$ trees of $\mathcal{T}_2$. In total, we have $|X|^2(k + 2) + |X|k$ trees left in $G_X$.

By Step 5, each tree $T$ is less than $k(k + 1)$ times in touch with each $x \in X$. Thus, less than $k(k + 1)|X|$ vertices of $T$ are connected to vertices of $X$. By Step 6, $T$ shrinks to at most $k(k + 1)|X|$ leaves and at most $2k(k + 1)|X|$ vertices in total. Altogether, we have $((|X|^2(k + 2) + |X|k(2k(k + 1)|X|))$ vertices in all trees. Initially $|X| = 3k^2$ and Step 4 adds one vertex to $X$ for each pair in $Y$; thus, $|X| \leq 5k^2 + k - 1 = O(k^2)$. To sum up, we get a kernel with at most $O(k^9)$ vertices and $O(k^{10})$ edges.

After computing such a kernel it remains to apply the currently best kernelization for Feedback Vertex Set on $(G', k)$ to reduce the kernel size to $2k^2 + k$ vertices.

**Theorem 4.4.** Given an $n$-vertex instance $(G, k)$ of Feedback Vertex Set, there is an $O(n^2k^3\log k)$-time, $O(k^{10}\log n)$-bits kernelization that either outputs a kernel consisting of $2k^2 + k$ vertices or returns that $(G, k)$ is a no-instance.

**Proof.** Even if we restart the computation several times we need to compute an approximated feedback vertex set $X$ only once. In the following we want to run Lemma 2.2 on $G_X$, but only have $G$, $F$ and $X$. So we modify the algorithm of Lemma 2.2 to “ignore” all edges that go to a vertex of $F \cup X$.

Next, we describe the data structures used to realize Step 1 - 3 in which we bound the number of trees in $G_X$. Due to our space bound we cannot store the selected trees, because they may have too many vertices. Instead we select a unique vertex of a tree as its representative, namely the vertex with the smallest id that is connected to a vertex of $X$. Recall that we want to count for each tuple $(x_1, x_2)$ ($x_1, x_2 \in X$) up to $k + 2$ trees of $\mathcal{T}_1$. For this we create a map $M_1$ where the keys are tuples $(x_1, x_2)$ and the values are initially empty sets containing representatives of the stored trees. (For an intuitive example consider Fig 2(b).) There, $M_1(x_1, x_2) = \{\star, \star\}, M_1(x_3, x_4) = \{\star, \star\}$ and $M_1(x_5, x_6) = \{\star\}$.) For Step 3 we want to count the trees of $\mathcal{T}_2$. We create a map $M_2$ where the keys are vertices of $X$ and the values are initially empty sets containing representatives of $\mathcal{T}_2$ trees. (For an intuitive example consider Fig 2(c) and assume $k = 2$. Then, $M_2(x) = \{\star, \star, \star\}$ stores $k + 1$ trees for $x$ and we have found an $x$-Flower of order $k + 1$.) To determine the type of a tree in $G_X$ we use an initially empty multiset $S$ that is able to report the number of times an element $x \in X$ was added to $S$.

We (re)start the algorithm with empty maps $M_1$ and $M_2$. Iterate over each vertex $x_i = x_1, \ldots \in X$ in an outer loop and over each neighbor $w$ of $x_i$ in an inner loop. Initialize an empty multiset $S$ (if one already exists, delete it). Traverse the tree in of $G_X$ with $w$ as its root, determine its representative $z$ as the vertex with smallest id, and whenever a vertex of the tree is neighbored to a vertex $x \in X$, add $x$ into $S$. Afterwards we decide the type of the tree. If $|S| \leq 1$, then $z$ represents a tree of $\mathcal{T}_0$ and thus we continue the iteration of the inner loop with the next neighbor of $x_i$. (We realize Step 1 by ignoring trees of $\mathcal{T}_0$.) If
none of the elements in \( S \) was added more then one time, the tree belongs to \( T_1 \) and we add \( z \) into \( M_2(x, x') \) for each \( x' \in S \) if \( |M_1(x, x')| < k + 2 \). (We so realize Step 2.) If \( x_i \) was added at least two times into \( S \), then the visited tree belongs to \( T_2 \). Therefore, we add \( z \) into \( M_2(x) \). After the inner loop is done we realize Rule 3 as follows: if \( |M_2(x_i)| \geq k + 1 \), remove \( x_i \) from \( X \), put \( x_i \) into \( F \), set \( k := k - 1 \) and restart the algorithm. After the outer loop is done, the sets \( M_1 \) and \( M_2 \) contain the representatives of all the non-removed trees. Note furthermore that only the trees stored in \( M_2 \) are relevant for the Steps 4 and 5.

Step 4 is realized by an outer loop over each \( x \in X \) and then in an inner loop over each vertex \( v \) in \( G_X \). First determine the representative \( z \) of the tree containing \( v \) and check if \( z \in M_2(x) \). If so, count the number of maximal subtrees below \( v \) that are in touch with \( x \). Both can be done with an application of Lemma \( \ref{lem:kernelization} \). After the inner loop we can easily realize all Step 4. For Step 5, iterate over all \( x \in X \) in an outer loop and over all \( z \in M_2(x) \). After running the algorithm of Lemma \( \ref{lem:kernelization} \) from \( z \), we can easily test the condition of Step 5 and run the required changes.

After Steps 1–5, we construct a kernel with Step 6. Let \( G' \) be an initially empty mutable graph. Iterate over all representatives \( z \in M_1 \) and \( M_2 \). Traverse the tree represented by \( z \) with \( z \) as its root. Before visiting a vertex \( w \), check with Lemma \( \ref{lem:kernelization} \) if the subtree below \( w \) is in touch with some \( x \in X \). If not, skip over \( w \). Add each non-skipped edge as well as their endpoints into \( G' \). Let \( \{u, v\} \) be the parent edge of \( w \). If the vertex \( v \) is of degree two in \( G' \) and not connected to \( X \) in \( G \), then remove \( v \) from \( G' \), connect \( u \) and \( w \) by an edge and continue with the edges of vertex \( w \). After obtaining \( G' \) execute the kernelization of Iwata \( \cite{Iwata2010} \) to get a kernel of size \( 2k^2 + k \).

The space requirements of the described algorithm is mainly determined by \( X \) that has \( O(k^2) \) entries, our map \( M_2 \), which has \( O(|X|^2k) = O(k^5) \) entries, the computation of \( X \) (Theorem \ref{thm:execution}), Lemma \( \ref{lem:kernelization} \) and the kernel \( G' \) consisting of \( O(k^9) \) vertices and \( O(k^{10}) \) edges. Thus the total space is bounded by \( O(k^{10}\log n) \) bits.

Note that the runtime-bound of our algorithms are the steps with an outer loop where we iterate over nodes of \( X \) and inner loops where iterate over the edges of \( G_X \). Moreover, in the inner loop we have a constant number of calls to Lemma \( \ref{lem:kernelization} \) with an additional logarithmic factor to check membership in \( X \cup F \). We can restart the algorithm at most \( k \) times. Thus, the runtime is \( O(k^3 k n^2n^2 \cdot (\log k) \cdot k) = O(n^3k^4 \log k) \). Together with the runtime to compute \( X \) (Theorem \ref{thm:execution}) we get a total runtime of \( O(n^3k^4 \log k) + O(n^4 k \log k) = O(n^4 k^3 \log k) \).

## 5 Cluster Editing and Cluster Deletion

Cluster Editing is formally defined as follows: given a tuple \((G, k)\) where \( G = (V, E) \) is an \( n \)-vertex \( m \)-edge graph and \( k \) is an integer (i.e., the parameter), is it possible to add or delete at most \( k \) edges so that the resulting graph becomes a union of disjoint cliques?

Recall that due to Bannach et al. \( \cite{Bannach2006} \) Cluster Editing is in para-L (more precisely a subclass of it), hence an algorithm that runs in \( \text{poly}(n) f(k) \) time and uses \( f(k) + \log n \) bits exists. Our goal is to address the need of Heeger et al. \( \cite{Heeger2010} \) for a space-efficient full kernel for Cluster Editing, which is used in their framework in a temporal setting of the cluster editing problem.

Let a conflict triple be a subgraph of \( G \) induced by the vertices \( \{u, v, w\} \) with the edges \( \{u, v\}, \{v, w\} \), and a missing edge \( \{w, u\} \). If a conflict triple exists in \( G \), then either at least one edge of \( \{u, v\}, \{v, w\} \) must be removed from \( G \), or the edge \( \{w, u\} \) must be added to \( G \).

The folklore technique for a Cluster Editing kernelization is to repeat an iteration over all conflict triples at most \( k + 1 \) times. In each iteration a counter \( C_{u,v} \) is used to count
for each vertex pair \( u \) and \( v \) the number of conflict triples in which the edge \( \{u, v\} \) appears. Analogously, a counter \( C'_{u,v} \) is used for the conflict triples with missing edges \( \{u, v\} \).

If, after one iteration, we find more than \( (k + 1)^2 \) edges for which we have a non-zero counter, then we have a no instance since adding or deleting one edge \( \{u, v\} \) can resolve at most \( k + 1 \) conflict triples in \( G \). If an edge \( \{u, v\} \) occurs or is missing in at least \( k + 1 \) conflict triples, then \( G \) must be modified accordingly (removed if the edge exists in \( G \) or added if it is missing in \( G \)) and repeat the iteration. If we still have a modification after the \((k + 1)\)th repetitions of the iteration, i.e., after having \( k \) changes, we again have a no-instance. Otherwise, the non-zero counters indicate exactly those vertices that are not part of a clique and we can return the graph induced by all vertices with a non-zero counter as a kernel. To turn the kernel into a full kernel add the \( k + 1 \) conflict triples including its edges of the \( O(k) \) repetitions into the kernel.

Theorem 5.1. Given an \( n \)-vertex \( m \)-edge instance \((G, k)\) of Cluster Editing, there is an \( O(nm \log k) \)-time \( O(k^2 \log n) \)-bits kernelization that either outputs a full kernel consisting of \((k + 1)^2\) vertices or returns that \((G, k)\) is a no-instance.

Proof. We next describe and analyze an implementation of the algorithm above. First of all, we can iterate over all vertex triples \( \{u, v, w\} \) by iterating over all edges and, for each edge \( \{u, v\} \), over all vertices \( w \in N(v) \cup N(u) \). We cannot modify \( G \) on the read-only word RAM, instead we store \( O(k) \) modifications to \( G \) in a heap and whenever there is an access to \( G \), we access the heap to check for the existence of an edge, for which we pay for with an extra factor in the running time logarithmic to the size of the heap. Thus, we can iterate over the vertex triples of the virtually modified graph \( G \) in \( O(m \log k) \) time. The time needed to update all \( O(k^2) \) counters in a heap is \( O(k^2 \log k) \)—note that we can assume without loss of generality that \( k < m \) or we have a yes-instance. Since the iteration has to be repeated at most \((k + 1)\) times, the final running time is \( O(mk \log k) \). The time \((k^2 \log k)\) to create the full kernel by adding \((k + 1)^2\) vertex pairs and edges to a mutable graph is included in the final running time.

We have to store the counters, but only the non-zero counters, the modifications to \( G \) in a heap and the kernel. Because the amount of non-zero counters is bounded by \( O(k^2) \), the number of modifications is bounded by \( O(k) \), and the kernel contains \( k(k + 2) = O(k^2) \) vertices and \( k(2k + 1) = O(k^2) \) edges and therefore, our algorithms uses \( O(k^2 \log n) \) bits. The full kernel consists of \( k(k + 3) \) vertices and \( k(2k + 3) \) edges.

We finally want to remark that Cluster Deletion where we are allowed to delete edges only, but not to add edges, can be solved in a similar way. A full kernel can be computed almost as described above. The only change is that we return a no-instance for \((G, k)\) whenever a counter \( C'_{u,v} = k + 1 \) for an edge \( \{u, v\} \). Counters \( C_{u,v} \) are still allowed to increment up to \( k + 1 \) and the corresponding conflict triples are added to our kernel.
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