

# An FPT algorithm for Matching Cut and $d$ -Cut

N R Aravind and Roopam Saxena<sup>1</sup>

Department of Computer Science and Engineering  
IIT Hyderabad, Hyderabad. India  
{aravind,cs18resch11004}@iith.ac.in,

**Abstract.** Given a positive integer  $d$ , the  $d$ -CUT problem is to decide if an undirected graph  $G = (V, E)$  has a non trivial bipartition  $(A, B)$  of  $V$  such that every vertex in  $A$  (resp.  $B$ ) has at most  $d$  neighbors in  $B$  (resp.  $A$ ). When  $d = 1$ , this is the MATCHING CUT problem. Gomes and Sau, in IPEC 2019, gave the first fixed parameter tractable algorithm for  $d$ -CUT, when parameterized by maximum number of the crossing edges in the cut (i.e. the size of edge cut). However, their paper doesn't provide an explicit bound on the running time, as it indirectly relies on a MSOL formulation and Courcelle's Theorem. Motivated by this, we design and present an FPT algorithm for the MATCHING CUT (and more generally for  $d$ -CUT) for general graphs with running time  $2^{O(k \log k)} n^{O(1)}$  where  $k$  is the maximum size of the edge cut. This is the first FPT algorithm for the MATCHING CUT (and  $d$ -CUT) with an explicit dependence on this parameter. We also observe a lower bound of  $2^{\Omega(k)} n^{O(1)}$  with same parameter for MATCHING CUT assuming ETH.

**Keywords:** Matching Cut · Fixed parameter tractable · Algorithms.

## 1 Introduction

For a graph  $G = (V, E)$ ,  $(A, B)$  is a partition of  $G$  if  $A \cup B = V$  and  $A \cap B = \emptyset$ . Further, if both  $A \neq \emptyset$  and  $B \neq \emptyset$  then  $(A, B)$  is called a *cut*. The set of all the edges with one endpoint in  $A$  and another in  $B$  denoted by  $E(A, B)$  is called an *edge cut* and size of the edge cut is defined as  $|E(A, B)|$ . A matching is an edge set  $M \subseteq E$  such that no two edges  $e_i, e_j \in M$  share any endpoint. A cut  $(A, B)$  is a matching cut if every vertex in  $A$  (resp.  $B$ ) has at most 1 neighbor in  $B$  (resp.  $A$ ). Equivalently a cut  $(A, B)$  is matching cut if edge cut  $E(A, B)$  is a matching. Note that as per these definitions matching cut can be empty, and not all matching whose removal disconnects a graph need to be a matching cut. The MATCHING CUT problem is to decide if a given undirected graph  $G$  has a matching cut or not.

Recently Gomes and Sau [3] considered a generalization of matching cut and called it  $d$ -cut. For a positive integer  $d \geq 1$ , a cut  $(A, B)$  is  $d$ -cut if every vertex in  $A$  (resp.  $B$ ) has at most  $d$  neighbor in  $B$  (resp.  $A$ ). They named  $d$ -CUT to be the problem to decide if a given graph  $G$  has a  $d$ -cut or not. They showed that for every  $d \geq 1$ ,  $d$ -CUT is NP-hard for regular graphs even when restricted

to  $(2d + 2)$ -regular graphs[3]. They considered various structural parameters to study  $d$ -CUT and provided FPT results. They also showed fixed parameter tractability of  $d$ -CUT when parameterized by maximum size of the edge cut using a reduction on results provided by Marx, O’Sullivan and Razgon [14]. However, they didn’t provide an explicit bound on the running time as the treewidth reduction technique of [14] relies on MSOL formulation and Courcelle’s Theorem [6] to show fixed parameter tractability. Marx et. al. [14] also observed that their method may actually increase the treewidth of the graph, however the treewidth will remain  $f(k)$  for some function  $f$ . This motivated us to investigate an FPT algorithm for  $d$ -CUT parameterized by maximum size of the edge cut where we can explicitly bound the dependence on parameter. In this paper we will discuss an FPT algorithm for  $d$ -CUT. Note that when  $d = 1$ , we can refer to the problem as MATCHING CUT.

Let us now formally define  $d$ -CUT in the context of parameterized complexity with maximum size of the edge cut as parameter .

*k-d-CUT:*

*Input:* An instance  $I = (G, k, d)$ . Where graph  $G = (V, E)$ ,  $|V| = n$  and  $k, d \in \mathbb{N}$ .

*Parameter:*  $k$ .

*Output:* *yes* if  $G$  contains a  $d$ -cut  $(A, B)$  such that  $|E(A, B)| \leq k$ , *no* otherwise.

### 1.1 Previous work

The matching cut problem has been extensively studied. It was first introduced by Graham [8]. Chvátal [5] proved matching cut to be NP-Complete for graphs with maximum degree 4. Bonsma [2] proved matching cut to be NP-complete for planar graphs with maximum degree 4 and with girth 5. Kratsch and Le [11] provided an exact algorithm with running time  $O^*(1.414..^n)^1$  and also provided a single exponential algorithm parameterised by the vertex cover number. Komusiewicz, Kratsch and Le [10] further improved the running time of branching based exact algorithm to  $O^*(1.3803^n)$  and also provided a SAT based  $O^*(1.3071^n)$ -time randomized algorithm. They also provided single exponential algorithm parameterized by distance to cluster and distance to co cluster. Aravind, Kalyanasundaram and Kare [1] provided fixed parameter tractable algorithms for various structural parameters including treewidth. Recently hardness and polynomial time solvable results are also obtained for various structural assumptions in [12,13,9].

### 1.2 Our Contribution

Our main contribution is the following theorem.

<sup>1</sup> We use  $O^*$  notation which suppresses polynomial factors.

**Theorem 1.**  *$k$ -d-CUT can be solved in time  $2^{O(k \log k)} n^{O(1)}$ .*

We designed a dynamic programming based algorithm for the proof of the above theorem. Cygan, Komosa, Lokshtanov, Pilipczuk, Pilipczuk, Saurabh and Wahlström [7] provided a compact tree decomposition with bounded adhesion along with a framework to design FPT algorithms and showed its application on Minimum Bisection and other problems. We used this framework and tree decomposition along with  $k$ -d-CUT specific calculations and proofs to design an algorithm for  $k$ -d-CUT.

We also observe the parameterized lower bound for MATCHING CUT.

**Theorem 2.** *Unless ETH fails, the problem to decide if a given  $n$  vertex graph has a matching cut with edge cut size at most  $k$  cannot be solved in  $2^{o(k)} n^{O(1)}$ .*

## 2 Preliminaries

### 2.1 Multiset notations:

Considering a set  $U$  as universe, a multiset is a 2-tuple  $P = (U, m_P)$  where multiplicity function  $m_P : U \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$  is a mapping from  $U$  to non negative integers such that for an element  $e \in U$ , the value  $m_P(e)$  is the multiplicity of  $e$  in  $P$  that is the number of occurrence of  $e$  in  $P$ . Cardinality of a multiset  $P$  is the sum of multiplicity of all the distinct elements of  $P$ . We write  $e \in P$  if  $m_P(e) \geq 1$ .  $P$  is considered *empty* and denoted by  $P = \emptyset$  iff  $\forall e \in U, m_P(e) = 0$ .

For two multiset  $A$  and  $B$  on universe  $U$ , let  $m_A$  and  $m_B$  be their respective multiplicity functions. We will use following operations on multisets for our purposes.

**Equality:**  $A$  is equal to  $B$  denoted by  $A = B$ , if  $\forall e \in U, m_A(e) = m_B(e)$ . We say  $A$  and  $B$  are *distinct* iff they are not equal.

**Inclusion:**  $A$  is included in  $B$  denoted by  $A \subseteq B$ , if  $\forall e \in U, m_A(e) \leq m_B(e)$ .

**Sum Union:**  $P$  is a sum union of  $A$  and  $B$  is denoted by  $P = A \uplus B$ , let  $m_P$  be the multiplicity function for  $P$ , then  $\forall e \in U, m_P(e) = m_A(e) + m_B(e)$ .

Throughout this paper, if the context is clear, for any multiset  $X$  we will use  $m_X$  to denote the multiplicity function of  $X$ .

### 2.2 Graph notations:

All the graphs we consider are simple, undirected and connected.  $G = (V, E)$  is a graph with vertex set  $V$  and edge set  $E$ .  $E(G)$  denotes the set of edges of graph  $G$ , and  $V(G)$  denotes the set of vertices of  $G$ . For  $E' \subseteq E$ ,  $V(E')$  denotes set of all vertices of  $G$  with at least one edge in  $E'$  incident on it. We use  $G' \subseteq G$  to denote that  $G'$  is a subgraph of  $G$ . For a vertex set  $V' \subseteq V$ ,  $G[V']$  denotes the induced sub graph of  $G$  on vertex set  $V'$ . For an edge set  $E' \subseteq E$ ,  $G[E']$  denotes the sub graph of  $G$  on edge set  $E'$  i.e.  $G[E'] = (V(E'), E')$ .

For disjoint vertex sets  $A \subseteq V$  and  $B \subseteq V$ ,  $E_G(A, B)$  denotes the set of all the edges of  $G$  with one endpoint in  $A$  and another in  $B$ . For a subgraph  $G' \subseteq G$ ,  $E_{G'}(A, B)$  denotes set of edges  $E_G(A, B) \cap E(G')$ . For a vertex  $v \in V$ , we use  $N_G(v)$  to denote the set of all adjacent vertices of  $v$  in  $G$ , if the context of the graph is clear we will simply use  $N(v)$ .

**Partition of a graph:** For a graph  $G = (V, E)$ ,  $(A, B)$  is a partition of  $G$  if  $A \cup B = V$  and  $A \cap B = \emptyset$ . We call a partition  $(A, B)$  trivial if either  $A = \emptyset$  or  $B = \emptyset$ .

**Cut:** For a graph  $G$ , a partition  $(A, B)$  is a cut if both  $A \neq \emptyset$  and  $B \neq \emptyset$ .

**$d$ -Cut:** A cut  $(A, B)$  is a  $d$ -cut if every vertex in  $A$  has at most  $d$  neighbors in  $B$ , vice versa every vertex in  $B$  has at most  $d$  neighbors in  $A$ .

**$d$ -Matching:** For a graph  $G = (V, E)$ , an edge set  $M \subseteq E$  is called a  $d$ -matching if every vertex  $v \in V$  has at most  $d$  edges in  $M$  incident on it. Observe that a cut  $(A, B)$  is  $d$ -cut iff  $E(A, B)$  is a  $d$ -matching.

### 2.3 Fixed parameter tractability:

Consider a language  $L \subseteq \Sigma^* \times \mathbb{N}$  where  $\Sigma$  is a fixed and finite set of alphabet. For an instance  $(x, k) \in \Sigma^* \times \mathbb{N}$ , deciding if  $(x, k) \in L$  is a parameterized problem with parameter  $k$ .  $L$  is fixed parameter tractable (FPT) if there is an algorithm  $A$  which correctly decides if  $(x, k) \in L$  in time bounded by  $f(k) \cdot |x|^c$ , where  $c$  is a constant and  $f : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$  is a computable non-decreasing function.

### 2.4 Tree decomposition:

A tree decomposition of a graph  $G$  is a pair  $(T, \beta)$ , where  $T$  is a tree and for every  $t \in V(T)$  a bag  $\beta(t) \subseteq V(G)$ . Such that:

1. For every  $e \in E(G)$  there exist a  $t \in V(T)$  such that  $V(e) \subseteq \beta(t)$ ;
2. For  $v \in V(G)$  let  $\beta^{-1}(v)$  be the set of all vertices  $t \in V(T)$  such that  $v \in \beta(t)$ , then  $T[\beta^{-1}(v)]$  is a connected subgraph of  $T$ .

If the tree  $T$  in decomposition  $(T, \beta)$  is rooted at some node  $r$ , we call it *rooted tree decomposition*.

**Definition 1. Adhesion in tree decomposition:** In a tree decomposition  $(T, \beta)$ , For an edge  $e \in E(T)$  where  $e = (t_1, t_2)$ , a set  $\sigma(e) = \beta(t_1) \cap \beta(t_2)$  is called adhesion of  $e$ . For a rooted tree decomposition  $(T, \beta)$  adhesion of a node  $t \in V(T)$  denoted by  $\sigma(t)$  is  $\sigma(t, t')$  where  $t'$  is parent node of  $t$  in  $T$ . Adhesion of a root node  $r$  is  $\emptyset$ .

**Some functions for our convenience:** For a rooted tree decomposition  $(T, \beta)$  at some node  $r$ , for  $s, t \in V(t)$  we say that  $s$  is a *descendant* of  $t$ , if  $t$  lies on the unique path from  $s$  to the  $r$ . This implies that a node is a descendant of itself.

$$\gamma(t) = \bigcup_{c: \text{descendant of } t} \beta(c), \quad \alpha(t) = \gamma(t) \setminus \sigma(t), \quad G_t = G[\gamma(t)] - E[G[\sigma(t)]].$$

**Definition 2 ([7]). Compact tree decomposition:** A rooted tree decomposition  $(T, \beta)$  of  $G$  is compact if for every non root-node  $t \in V(T) : G[\alpha(t)]$  is connected and  $N(\alpha(t)) = \sigma(t)$ .

**Definition 3 ([7]). Separation:** A pair  $(A, B)$  of vertex subsets in a graph  $G$  is a separation if  $A \cup B = V(G)$  and there is no edge with one endpoint in  $A \setminus B$  and the other in  $B \setminus A$ ; the order of the separation  $(A, B)$  is  $|A \cap B|$ .

In [7] the edge cut  $(A, B)$  is defined as a pair  $A, B \subseteq V(G)$  such that  $A \cup B = V(G)$  and  $A \cap B = \emptyset$ , which we refer to as partition  $(A, B)$ . And the order of the edge cut  $(A, B)$  is defined as  $|E(A, B)|$ . These terminologies are required for following definition.

**Definition 4 ([7]). Unbreakability:** Let  $G$  be a graph, A vertex subset  $X \subseteq V(G)$  is  $(q, k)$ -unbreakable if every separation  $(A, B)$  of order at most  $k$  satisfies  $|A \cap X| \leq q$  or  $|B \cap X| \leq q$ . A vertex subset  $Y \subseteq V(G)$  is  $(q, k)$ -edge-unbreakable if every edge cut  $(A, B)$  of order at most  $k$  satisfies  $|A \cap Y| \leq q$  or  $|B \cap Y| \leq q$ .

Observe that every set that is  $(q, k)$ -unbreakable is also  $(q, k)$ -edge-unbreakable.

**Theorem 3 ([7]).** Given an  $n$ -vertex graph  $G$  and an integer  $k$ , one can in time  $2^{O(k \log k)} n^{O(1)}$  compute a rooted compact tree decomposition  $(T, \beta)$  of  $G$  such that

1. every adhesion of  $(T, \beta)$  is of size at most  $k$ ;
2. every bag of  $(T, \beta)$  is  $(i, i)$ -unbreakable for every  $1 \leq i \leq k$ .

□

Note that since every bag of the output decomposition  $(T, \beta)$  of theorem 3 is  $(k, k)$ -unbreakable, it is also  $(k, k)$ -edge-unbreakable. Further, the construction provided for the proof of theorem 3 in [7] maintained that the number of edges in decomposition is always upper bounded by  $|V(G)|$  and hence  $|V(T)| \leq |V(G)| + 1$ .

## 2.5 Color coding tools:

**Lemma 1 ([4]).** Given a set  $U$  of size  $n$ , and integers  $0 \leq a, b \leq n$ , one can in  $2^{O(\min(a, b) \log(a+b))} n \log n$  time construct a family  $\mathcal{F}$  of at most  $2^{O(\min(a, b) \log(a+b))} \log n$  subsets of  $U$ , such that following holds: for any sets  $A, B \subseteq U$ ,  $A \cap B = \emptyset$ ,  $|A| \leq a$ ,  $|B| \leq b$ , there exist a set  $S \in \mathcal{F}$  with  $A \subseteq S$  and  $B \cap S = \emptyset$  □

## 3 FPT algorithm for $k$ -d-CUT. (Proof of theorem 1)

A disconnected graph  $G$  trivially has a  $d$ -cut of size 0 and thus,  $(G, k, d)$  is always a yes instance of  $k$ -d-CUT for every  $k, d \in \mathbb{N}$ . Thus, it remains to find if  $(G, k, d)$  is a yes instance when the graph  $G$  is connected. From here onward we will always assume that input graph  $G$  is simple and connected. Further, we can also assume that  $d < k$ , otherwise the problem become same as deciding if  $G$  has a min cut of size at most  $k$  which is polynomial time solvable.

We will start by invoking theorem 3 on input  $n$  vertex graph  $G$  with parameter  $k$ . This gives us a rooted compact tree decomposition  $(T, \beta)$  of  $G$  where every bag is  $(k, k)$ -edge-unbreakable and every node  $t \in V(T)$  has adhesion of size at most  $k$ . Consider the following definition.

**Definition 5. (Matched candidate set of a vertex set  $Q \subseteq V$ )** For a vertex set  $Q \subseteq V$  and  $d \in \mathbb{N}$ , we call a multiset  $P = (V, m_P)$  a  $d$ -matched candidate set of  $Q$  if following holds.

- $\forall v \in Q, m_P(v) \leq d,$
- $\forall v \in V \setminus Q, m_P(v) = 0,$
- $|P| \leq k.$

Note that if  $Q = \emptyset$  then an empty multiset  $P = \emptyset$  that is  $\forall v \in V, m_P(v) = 0$  is the only  $d$ -matched candidate set of  $Q$ .

**Proposition 1 ( $\star^2$ ).** Given  $Q \subseteq V$ , if  $|Q| \leq k$ , then there are at most  $2^{O(k \log k)}$  distinct  $d$ -matched candidate sets of  $Q$  and in time  $2^{O(k \log k)} n^{O(1)}$  we can list all of them.

We perform a bottom up dynamic programming on  $(T, \beta)$ . For every vertex  $t \in V(T)$ , every set  $S \subseteq \sigma(t)$ ,  $\bar{S} = \sigma(t) \setminus S$ , every  $d$ -matched candidate set  $P = (V, m_P)$  of  $\sigma(t)$  and  $n_e \in \{0, 1\}$  we compute an integer  $M[t, S, P, n_e] \in \{0, 1, 2, \dots, k, \infty\}$  with the following properties.

- (1) If  $M[t, S, P, n_e] \leq k$ , then there exist a partition  $(A, B)$  of  $G_t$  such that following holds.
  - If  $n_e = 1$  then both  $A$  and  $B$  are non empty, otherwise either  $A$  or  $B$  is empty,
  - $A \cap \sigma(t) \in \{S, \bar{S}\},$
  - $E_{G_t}(A, B)$  forms a  $d$ -matching,
  - every vertex  $v$  in  $\sigma(t)$  has at most  $m_P(v)$  neighbors in other side of the partition in  $G_t$  i.e.  $\forall v \in \sigma(t), |N_{G_t(A, B)}(v)| \leq m_P(v),$
  - $|E_{G_t}(A, B)| \leq M[t, S, P, n_e].$
- (2) For every partition  $(A, B)$  of the entire graph  $G$  that satisfies following prerequisites:
  - $A \cap \sigma(t) \in \{S, \bar{S}\},$
  - $E_G(A, B)$  forms a  $d$ -matching,
  - every vertex  $v$  in  $\sigma(t)$  has at most  $m_P(v)$  neighbors in other side of the partition in  $G_t$  i.e.  $\forall v \in \sigma(t), |N_{G_t(A, B)}(v)| \leq m_P(v),$
  - $|E_G(A, B)| \leq k.$

It holds that  $|E_{G_t}(A, B)| \geq M[t, S, P, 1]$  if both  $V(G_t) \cap A$  and  $V(G_t) \cap B$  are non empty, otherwise  $|E_{G_t}(A, B)| \geq M[t, S, P, 0]$  if either  $V(G_t) \cap A$  or  $V(G_t) \cap B$  is empty.

---

<sup>2</sup> Proofs of statements marked with  $\star$  are provided in appendix.

Note that  $|E_{G_t}(A, B)| \geq \infty$  imply that such partition  $(A, B)$  doesn't exist. Let us now formally prove that table  $M[\cdot]$  is sufficient for our purpose.

**Lemma 2.**  *$(G, k, d)$  is a yes instance of  $k$ -d-CUT if and only if  $M[r, \emptyset, \emptyset, 1] \leq k$  where  $r$  is the root of  $T$ .*

*Proof.* For the first direction, a non trivial partition  $(A, B)$  for  $G_r$  whose existence is asserted by property 1 for  $M[r, \emptyset, \emptyset, 1]$  is a  $d$ -cut of  $G$  with  $|E_G(A, B)| \leq k$ , as  $G_r = G$ .

For the other direction, let  $(A, B)$  be a  $d$ -cut of  $G$  such that  $|E_G(A, B)| \leq k$ . Since  $\sigma(r) = \emptyset$ ,  $(A, B)$  satisfies all the prerequisites of property (2) for  $t = r$ ,  $S = \emptyset$  and  $P = \emptyset$ . Further,  $V(G_r) \cap A$  and  $V(G_r) \cap B$  are both non empty as  $(A, B)$  is a non trivial partition. Thus,  $k \geq |E_{G_r}(A, B)| \geq M[r, \emptyset, \emptyset, 1]$ . This finishes the proof.  $\square$

**Proposition 2**  $(\star)$ . *For every  $t$ ,  $S$  and  $P$ , if either  $S$  or  $\bar{S}$  is empty, then  $M[t, S, P, 0] = 0$  satisfies property (1) and (2).*

**Proposition 3**  $(\star)$ . *For every  $t$ ,  $S$  and  $P$ , if both  $S$  and  $\bar{S}$  are non empty, then  $M[t, S, P, 0] = \infty$ .*

**Proposition 4**  $(\star)$ . *For every  $t$ ,  $S$  and  $P$ , if both  $S$  and  $\bar{S}$  are non empty, then  $M[t, S, P, 1] \geq 1$ .*

To prove theorem 1, it would suffice to compute the  $M[\cdot]$  table for every node  $t \in V(T)$  in time  $2^{O(k \log k)} n^{O(1)}$ . Further, as the number of nodes in  $T$  is bounded by  $O(n)$ , it would suffice if we show that for a fixed  $t \in V(T)$ , the entries  $M[t, \cdot, \cdot, \cdot]$  can be computed in  $2^{O(k \log k)} n^{O(1)}$ .

For every  $t \in V(T)$ ,  $|\sigma(t)| \leq k$ . Recalling proposition 1 the number of distinct  $d$ -matched candidate sets of  $\sigma(t)$  is bounded by  $2^{O(k \log k)}$  and we can obtain them in time  $2^{O(k \log k)} n^{O(1)}$ . Thus, the number of cells  $M[t, \cdot, \cdot, \cdot]$  at every vertex  $t \in V(T)$  are bounded by  $2^{O(k \log k)}$ . Thus, if we can show that a single cell  $M[t, S, P, n_e]$  can be computed in time  $2^{O(k \log k)} n^{O(1)}$  given entries  $M[c, \cdot, \cdot, \cdot]$  for every children  $c$  of  $t$  in  $T$ , then we can bound the time required to compute all the entries  $M[t, \cdot, \cdot, \cdot]$  for a node  $t \in V(T)$  to  $2^{O(k \log k)} \cdot 2^{O(k \log k)} n^{O(1)}$  which is essentially  $2^{O(k \log k)} n^{O(1)}$ . Thus, we focus on the calculation of a single cell  $M[t, S, P, n_e]$ .

### 3.1 Calculating the value of $M[t, S, P, n_e]$

In this section we will discuss the calculation of a single cell  $M[t, S, P, n_e]$ .

For the given  $t \in V(T)$ ,  $S \subseteq \sigma(t)$  and  $P$  such that  $P$  is a  $d$ -matched candidate set of  $\sigma(t)$ . We use proposition 2, 3 to set  $M[t, S, P, 0] \in \{0, \infty\}$ . Thus, we move on to the calculation of  $M[t, S, P, 1]$ . Let  $Z(t)$  be the set of all the children of  $t$  in  $T$ . From here on we will assume that entries  $M[c, \cdot, \cdot, \cdot]$  are calculated for every  $c \in Z(t)$ . Note that if  $t$  is a leaf vertex then  $Z(t)$  is empty.

Intuitively, in this step of dynamic programming we will focus on to partitioning  $\beta(t)$  and use entries  $M[c, ., ., .]$  as black boxes to find the best way to partition subgraphs  $G_c$ . Within this framework we can think of every edge  $e \in E(G_t[\beta(t)])$  as a subgraph of  $G_t$  and to find the best way to partition subgraph  $G[e]$  we construct a table  $M_E[e, S', P']$  for every edge  $e = (u, v) \in E(G_t[\beta(t)])$  where  $S' \subseteq \{u, v\}$ , and  $P'$  is a 1-matched candidate set of  $\{u, v\}$ . We are taking a 1-matched candidate set of  $V(e)$ , as there is only 1 edge in  $G[e]$ .

We assign following values to  $M_E[e, S', P']$ .

- $M_E[e, \emptyset, P'] = M_E[e, \{u, v\}, P'] = 0$  for every 1-matched candidate set  $P'$  of  $V(e)$ ;
- $M_E[e, \{u\}, P'] = M_E[e, \{v\}, P'] = 1$  for 1-matched candidate set  $P'$  of  $V(e)$  such that  $m_{P'}(u) = m_{P'}(v) = 1$ ;
- $M_E[e, \{u\}, P'] = M_E[e, \{v\}, P'] = \infty$  for every 1-matched candidate set  $P'$  of  $V(e)$  such that  $m_{P'}(u) = 0$  or  $m_{P'}(v) = 0$ .

Intuitively, if both  $u, v$  falls into the same side of the partition then  $M_E[e, S', P']$  costs 0. Otherwise, if  $u$  and  $v$  falls into different side of the partition and both are allowed to have a neighbor in the other side of the partition in  $G[e]$  as per  $P'$  then  $M_E[e, S', P']$  costs 1 and if at least one of  $u$  or  $v$  is not allowed to have a neighbor in the other side of the partition in  $G[e]$  as per  $P'$  then  $M_E[e, S', P']$  costs  $\infty$ . Clearly, every 1-matched candidate set of  $V(e)$  can be considered as a subset of  $V(e)$ . Thus, number of cells  $M_E[.]$  is bounded by  $n^{O(1)}$  and we can calculate it as per above assignment in time  $n^{O(1)}$ .

**Definition 6. (S-compatible set of a bag)** For  $S \subseteq \sigma(t)$  and  $\bar{S} = \sigma(t) \setminus S$ , a set  $A_s \subseteq \beta(t)$  is called an  $S$ -Compatible set of  $\beta(t)$  if

- $|A_s| \leq k$ ,
- $A_s \cap \sigma(t) \in \{S, \bar{S}\}$ ,
- $A_s$  is non-empty proper subset of  $\beta(t)$  i.e.  $A_s \neq \emptyset$  and  $A_s \neq \beta(t)$ .

For an  $S$ -compatible set  $A_s$  of  $\beta(t)$ , let  $S_c = A_s \cap \sigma(c)$  and  $\bar{S}_c = \sigma(c) \setminus S_c$  for every  $c \in Z(t)$ . And let  $S_e = A_s \cap V(e)$  and  $\bar{S}_e = V(e) \setminus S_e$  for every  $e \in E(G_t[\beta(t)])$ .

We define  $Z_{ab}^{A_s} = \{c \mid c \in Z(t) \wedge (S_c \neq \emptyset) \wedge (\bar{S}_c \neq \emptyset)\}$  and call it set of *broken children* of  $t$  with respect to  $A_s$ , and also define  $E_{ab}^{A_s} = \{e \mid e \in E(G_t[\beta(t)]) \wedge (S_e \neq \emptyset) \wedge (\bar{S}_e \neq \emptyset)\}$  and call it set of *broken edges* of  $E(G_t[\beta(t)])$  with respect to  $A_s$ . Clearly, given  $A_s$ , we can find  $Z_{ab}^{A_s}$  and  $E_{ab}^{A_s}$  in time  $n^{O(1)}$ .

**Definition 7. (P-Compatible family)** For  $t, P$  and  $A_s$  such that  $t \in V(T)$ ,  $P$  is a  $d$ -matched candidate set of  $\sigma(t)$  and  $A_s$  is an  $S$ -compatible set of  $\beta(t)$ . A family  $F_{P|A_s} = \{P_c \mid c \in Z_{ab}^{A_s}\} \cup \{P_e \mid e \in E_{ab}^{A_s}\}$  is called an  $A_s$ -restricted  $P$ -compatible family of  $t$  if the following holds:

- let  $P_z = \biguplus_{P_v \in F_{P|A_s}} P_v$ ,
- for each  $c \in Z_{ab}^{A_s}$ ,  $P_c$  is a  $d$ -matched candidate set of  $\sigma(c)$ ,



- for each  $e \in E_{ab}^{A_s}$ ,  $P_e$  is a 1-matched candidate set of  $V(e)$ ,
- $|P_z| \leq 2k$ ,
- $\forall v \in V$ ,  $m_{P_z}(v) \leq d$ ,
- $\forall v \in \sigma(t)$ ,  $m_{P_z}(v) \leq m_P(v)$ .

The intuition behind the  $A_s$ -restricted  $P$ -compatible family is as follows.  $P$ ,  $P_c$  and  $P_e$  can be considered as a restriction on the possible number of neighbors of vertices of  $\sigma(t)$ ,  $\sigma(c)$  and  $V(e)$  in other side of a partition respectively in  $G_t$ ,  $G_c$  and  $G[e]$ .  $A_s$ -restricted  $P$ -compatible family can be considered as the family of restrictions  $P_c$  and  $P_e$  which are consistent with  $P$  and maintain the property of  $d$ -matching.

We say that two  $A_s$ -restricted  $P$ -compatible families  $F_{P|A_s} = \{P_c | c \in Z_{ab}^{A_s}\} \cup \{P_e | e \in E_{ab}^{A_s}\}$  and  $F'_{P|A_s} = \{P'_c | c \in Z_{ab}^{A_s}\} \cup \{P'_e | e \in E_{ab}^{A_s}\}$  are equal iff  $\forall c \in Z_{ab}^{A_s}$ ,  $P_c = P'_c$  and  $\forall e \in E_{ab}^{A_s}$ ,  $P_e = P'_e$ . We say that  $F_{P|A_s}$  and  $F'_{P|A_s}$  are distinct iff they are not equal.

**Proposition 5 (★).** *For an  $S$ -compatible set  $A_s$  of  $\beta(t)$ , if  $|Z_{ab}^{A_s}| + |E_{ab}^{A_s}| \leq k$ , then there are at most  $2^{O(k \log k)}$  distinct  $A_s$ -restricted  $P$ -compatible families of  $t$  and in time  $2^{O(k \log k)} n^{O(1)}$  we can list all of them.*

Assuming that  $M[c, \cdot, \cdot, \cdot]$  table is calculated for every  $c \in Z(t)$  and  $M_E[e, \cdot, \cdot, \cdot]$  are available as per above assignment for every  $e \in E(G_t[\beta(t)])$ . For an  $S$ -compatible set  $A_s$  of  $\beta(t)$  and  $A_s$ -restricted  $P$ -compatible family  $F_{P|A_s} = \{P_c | c \in Z_{ab}^{A_s}\} \cup \{P_e | e \in E_{ab}^{A_s}\}$  of  $t$ , we define cost of  $A_s$  and  $F_{P|A_s}$  for  $t$  as follows.

$$cs(t, A_s, F_{P|A_s}) = \sum_{c \in Z_{ab}^{A_s}} M[c, A_s \cap \sigma(c), P_c, 1] + \sum_{e \in E_{ab}^{A_s}} M_E[e, A_s \cap V(e), P_e]. \quad (1)$$

We define minimum cost of an  $S$ -compatible set  $A_s$  of  $\beta(t)$  and  $d$ -matched candidate set  $P$  of  $\sigma(t)$  as follows:

$$mcs(t, A_s, P) = \min\{cs(t, A_s, F_{P|A_s}) | F_{P|A_s} \text{ is } A_s\text{-re. } P\text{-com. family of } t\}. \quad (2)$$

**Lemma 3 (★).** *Assuming values  $M[c, \cdot, \cdot, \cdot]$  satisfy property (1) and (2) for every  $c \in Z(t)$  then  $mcs(t, A_s, P)$  satisfies following properties.*

- (a) *If  $mcs(t, A_s, P) \leq k$ , then there exist a partition  $(A, B)$  of  $G_t$ , such that:*
  - $A \cap \beta(t) = A_s$ ,
  - $|E_{G_t}(A, B)| \leq mcs(t, A_s, P)$ ,
  - $E_{G_t}(A, B)$  forms a  $d$ -matching,
  - $\forall v \in \sigma(t)$ ,  $|N_{G_t[A, B]}(v)| \leq m_P(v)$ .

(b) For every partition  $(A, B)$  of the entire graph  $G$  that satisfy following prerequisites:

- $A \cap \beta(t) = A_s$ ,
- $|E_G(A, B)| \leq k$ ,
- $E_G(A, B)$  forms a  $d$ -matching,
- $\forall v \in \sigma(t), |N_{G[E_{G_t}(A, B)]}(v)| \leq m_P(v)$ .

It holds that  $|E_{G_t}(A, B)| \geq mcs(t, A_s, P)$ .

We note that if  $mcs(t, A_s, P) > k$  then there doesn't exist a partition  $(A, B)$  of  $G$  satisfying prerequisites of property (b).

**Proposition 6 ( $\star$ ).** For every  $A_s$ -restricted  $P$ -compatible family  $F_{P|A_s}$  of  $t$ ,  $cs(t, A_s, F_{P|A_s}) \geq |Z_{ab}^{A_s}| + |E_{ab}^{A_s}|$ .

*Claim 1 ( $\star$ ).* Assuming  $M[c, \cdot, \cdot, \cdot]$  and  $M_E[e, \cdot, \cdot]$  tables are calculated for every  $c \in Z(t)$  and every  $e \in E(G_t[\beta(t)])$ . Given an  $S$ -compatible set  $A_s$  of  $\beta(t)$  and an  $A_s$ -restricted  $P$ -compatible family  $F_{P|A_s}$  of  $t$ ,  $cs(t, A_s, F_{P|A_s})$  can be calculated in time  $2^{O(k \log k)} n^{O(1)}$ .

**Lemma 4.** For an  $S$ -compatible set  $A_s$  of  $\beta(t)$ , in time  $2^{O(k \log k)} n^{O(1)}$  we can either decide that  $mcs(t, A_s, P) > k$  or calculate  $mcs(t, A_s, P)$ .

*Proof.* Given  $A_s$ , we check if  $|Z_{ab}^{A_s}| + |E_{ab}^{A_s}| \leq k$ , if not, then using the proposition 6 we conclude that  $mcs(t, A_s, P) > k$ . Else, if  $|Z_{ab}^{A_s}| + |E_{ab}^{A_s}| \leq k$ , then we use proposition 5 to get all the  $2^{O(k \log k)}$  distinct  $A_s$ -restricted  $P$ -compatible families of  $t$  in time  $2^{O(k \log k)} n^{O(1)}$  and calculate  $mcs(t, A_s, P)$  as per equation 2. Clearly, we need to calculate  $cs(t, A_s, F_{P|A_s})$  for  $2^{O(k \log k)}$  distinct  $A_s$ -restricted  $P$ -compatible families, which we can accomplish by invoking claim 1  $2^{O(k \log k)}$  times. Thus, we conclude that calculation of  $mcs(t, A_s, P)$  would take time  $2^{O(k \log k)} n^{O(1)}$ .  $\square$

We now move on to give an assignment to  $M[t, S, P, 1]$ . Consider the following assignments.

$$MIN_c = \min\{\min\{M[c, \emptyset, P_c, 1] \mid P_c \text{ is a } d\text{-mat. can. set of } \sigma(c) \text{ such that } \forall v \in \sigma(t), m_{P_c}(v) \leq m_P(v)\} \mid c \in Z(t)\}. \quad (3)$$

If  $t$  is a leaf vertex and  $Z(t)$  is empty, then we set  $MIN_c = \infty$ .

$$MIN_{\beta(t)} = \min\{mcs(t, A_s, P) \mid A_s \text{ is an } S\text{-compatible set of } \beta(t)\}. \quad (4)$$

Consider the following assignment of  $M[t, S, P, 1]$ .

1. Case:  $S = \emptyset$  or  $S = \sigma(t)$ .

$$M[t, S, P, 1] = \min\{MIN_c, MIN_{\beta(t)}\}. \quad (5)$$

2. Case:  $S \neq \emptyset$  and  $S \neq \sigma(t)$ .

$$M[t, S, P, 1] = MIN_{\beta(t)}. \quad (6)$$

In the equation (5) and (6) if the right hand side exceed  $k$  then we set  $M[t, S, P, 1] = \infty$ .

**Lemma 5** ( $\star$ ). *Assuming values  $M[c, \cdot, \cdot, \cdot]$  satisfy property (1) and (2) for every  $c \in Z(t)$  and  $mcs(t, A_s, P)$  satisfies property (a) and (b) for every  $S$ -compatible set  $A_s$  of  $\beta(t)$ , assignment of  $M[t, S, P, 1]$  as per equation (5) and (6) satisfies property (1) and (2).*

Calculation of  $MIN_c$  is straightforward and requires to iterate over every  $M[c, \cdot, \cdot, \cdot]$  for every  $c$ . As number of cells  $M[c, \cdot, \cdot, \cdot]$  at each  $c$  are bounded by  $2^{O(k \log k)}$  and  $|Z(t)|$  can be at most  $O(n)$ , we can calculate  $MIN_c$  in  $2^{O(k \log k)} n^{O(1)}$ .

To calculate  $MIN_{\beta(t)}$  a simple brute force approach of guessing all the  $S$ -compatible sets of  $\beta(t)$  will not work, as it will breach the running time budget that we have. However, as it is required to calculate  $MIN_{\beta(t)}$  only if  $MIN_{\beta(t)} \leq k$ , we can restrict our search space.

To this end, let us assume that  $MIN_{\beta(t)} \leq k$ , and let us fix a minimizing argument  $A_s^*$ , then  $A_s^*$  is the  $S$ -compatible set such that  $MIN_{\beta(t)} = mcs(t, A_s^*, P) \leq k$ . In such a scenario due to proposition 6 we can assume  $|Z_{ab}^{A_s^*}| + |E_{ab}^{A_s^*}| \leq k$ . Recalling  $S_c = A_s^* \cap \sigma(c)$  and  $\bar{S}_c = \sigma(c) \setminus S_c$  for every  $c \in Z(t)$ . And  $S_e = A_s^* \cap V(e)$  and  $\bar{S}_e = V(e) \setminus S_e$  for every  $e \in E(G_t[\beta(t)])$ .

Let  $B^* = (\cup_{c \in Z_{ab}^{A_s^*}} \bar{S}_c) \cup (\cup_{c \in E_{ab}^{A_s^*}} \bar{S}_e)$ . Due to  $|Z_{ab}^{A_s^*}| + |E_{ab}^{A_s^*}| \leq k$  and  $|\sigma(c)| \leq k$ , we can observe that  $|B^*| \leq k^2$ . Invoking lemma 1 for the universe  $\beta(t)$  and integers  $k, k^2 + k$ , we obtain a family  $\mathcal{F}$  of subsets of  $\beta(t)$  such that there exist a set  $A_g \in \mathcal{F}$  such that  $A_g \supseteq A_s^*$  and  $A_g \cap (B^* \cup (\sigma(t) \setminus A_s^*)) = \emptyset$ . We call such set  $A_g$  a *good set*. Further, the size of  $\mathcal{F}$  is bounded by  $2^{O(k \log k)} \log n$ .

We now construct an auxiliary graph  $H$  on vertex set  $\beta(t)$  and add an edge  $(u, v) \in E[H]$  if and only if one of the following holds,

1.  $u, v \in \sigma(t)$ ;
2. there exist a  $c \in Z(t)$  such that  $u, v \in \sigma(c)$ ;
3.  $(u, v) \in E(G_t[\beta(t)])$ .

Observe that  $\sigma(t)$  forms a clique in  $H$ , similarly every  $\sigma(c)$  forms a clique in  $H$  and  $G_t[\beta(t)]$  is a sub graph of  $H$ . For  $X \subseteq \beta(t)$ , we call a connected component  $C_s$  of  $H[X]$  an  *$S$ -compatible component* if  $V(C_s)$  is an  $S$ -compatible set of  $\beta(t)$ .

**Proposition 7** ( $\star$ ). *If  $A_g$  is a good set, then there exist an  $S$ -compatible component  $C_s$  in the sub graph  $H[A_g]$  such that  $mcs(t, A_s^*, P) = mcs(t, V(C_s), P)$ .*

Proposition 7 allow us to efficiently calculate  $MIN_{\beta(t)}$ . We need to iterate over every  $A_g \in \mathcal{F}$  and for each  $S$ -compatible component  $C_s$  in  $H[A_g]$  (if such  $C_s$  exist in  $H[A_g]$ ) we need to invoke lemma 4 so that we can either calculate  $mcs(t, V(C_s), P)$  or decide if  $mcs(t, V(C_s), P) > k$ . If  $mcs(t, V(C_s), P) > k$  then we assume it to be  $\infty$ . We take the minimum value  $mcs(t, V(C_s), P)$  encountered among all the  $S$ -compatible component  $C_s$  in  $H[A_g]$  over all the choices  $A_g \in \mathcal{F}$  and assign it to  $MIN_{\beta(t)}$ . Correctness of this procedure comes due to the minimality of  $mcs(t, A_s^*, P)$  among all the  $S$ -compatible sets of  $\beta(t)$  and due to proposition 7. If we don't encounter any  $S$ -compatible component during this process then we can conclude that the assumption  $MIN_{\beta(t)} \leq k$  doesn't hold and we set  $MIN_{\beta(t)} = \infty$ .

As the size of  $\mathcal{F}$  is bounded by  $2^{O(k \log k)} \log n$  and we can obtain it using lemma 1 in time  $2^{O(k \log k)} n \log n$ . And for every  $A_g \in \mathcal{F}$ ,  $H[A_g]$  can contain at most  $n$   $S$ -compatible components and we can find all of them in time  $n^{O(1)}$  by using standard graph traversal method. Thus, we need to invoke lemma 4 for at most  $2^{O(k \log k)} n^{O(1)}$   $S$ -compatible components(sets), and each invocation takes  $2^{O(k \log k)} n^{O(1)}$ , thus, calculation of  $MIN_{\beta(t)}$  takes time  $2^{O(k \log k)} n^{O(1)}$ . Recalling that calculation of  $MIN_c$  takes  $2^{O(k \log k)} n^{O(1)}$ . This conclude that a single cell  $M[t, S, P, 1]$  can be calculated in time  $2^{O(k \log k)} n^{O(1)}$ . Further we use proposition 2 and 3 to set values of  $M[t, S, P, 0]$ . This conclude that a single cell  $M[t, S, P, n_e]$  can be calculated in time  $2^{O(k \log k)} n^{O(1)}$ . Recalling lemma 2, this suffices to conclude the proof of theorem 1.

## 4 Parameterized lower bound (Proof of Theorem 2)

Kratsch and Le (section 3.3 in [11]) have shown that for an  $n$  vertex graph, MATCHING CUT cannot be solved in  $2^{o(n)}$  assuming exponential time hypothesis (ETH). This directly implies that for an  $n$  vertex graph MATCHING CUT when parameterized by maximum size of the edge cut  $k$ , cannot be solved in  $2^{o(k)} n^{O(1)}$  time if ETH holds.

## 5 Conclusion

In this paper, we discussed a  $2^{O(k \log k)} n^{O(1)}$  time fixed parameter tractable algorithm for  $d$ -CUT where  $k$  is the maximum size of the edge cut. We also observed ETH based parameterized lower bound  $2^{\Omega(k)} n^{O(1)}$  for MATCHING\_CUT with the same parameter. It will be an interesting problem to reduce the gap between lower and upper bound of MATCHING\_CUT.

## Acknowledgement

We thank Fahad Panolan for useful discussions, in particular his suggestion of the tree decomposition that we used in the paper.

## References

1. Aravind, N.R., Kalyanasundaram, S., Kare, A.S.: On structural parameterizations of the matching cut problem. In: Gao, X., Du, H., Han, M. (eds.) *Combinatorial Optimization and Applications - 11th International Conference, COCOA 2017, Shanghai, China, December 16-18, 2017, Proceedings, Part II. Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, vol. 10628, pp. 475–482. Springer (2017). [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-71147-8\\_34](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-71147-8_34), [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-71147-8\\_34](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-71147-8_34)
2. Bonsma, P.S.: The complexity of the matching-cut problem for planar graphs and other graph classes. *J. Graph Theory* **62**(2), 109–126 (2009). <https://doi.org/10.1002/jgt.20390>, <https://doi.org/10.1002/jgt.20390>
3. de C. M. Gomes, G., Sau, I.: Finding cuts of bounded degree: Complexity, FPT and exact algorithms, and kernelization. In: Jansen, B.M.P., Telle, J.A. (eds.) *14th International Symposium on Parameterized and Exact Computation, IPEC 2019, September 11-13, 2019, Munich, Germany. LIPIcs*, vol. 148, pp. 19:1–19:15. Schloss Dagstuhl - Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik (2019). <https://doi.org/10.4230/LIPIcs.IPEC.2019.19>, <https://doi.org/10.4230/LIPIcs.IPEC.2019.19>
4. Chitnis, R.H., Cygan, M., Hajiaghayi, M., Pilipczuk, M., Pilipczuk, M.: Designing FPT algorithms for cut problems using randomized contractions. In: *53rd Annual IEEE Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science, FOCS 2012, New Brunswick, NJ, USA, October 20-23, 2012*. pp. 460–469. IEEE Computer Society (2012). <https://doi.org/10.1109/FOCS.2012.29>, <https://doi.org/10.1109/FOCS.2012.29>
5. Chvátal, V.: Recognizing decomposable graphs. *Journal of Graph Theory* **8**(1), 51–53 (1984)
6. Courcelle, B.: The monadic second-order logic of graphs. i. recognizable sets of finite graphs. *Inf. Comput.* **85**(1), 12–75 (1990). [https://doi.org/10.1016/0890-5401\(90\)90043-H](https://doi.org/10.1016/0890-5401(90)90043-H), [https://doi.org/10.1016/0890-5401\(90\)90043-H](https://doi.org/10.1016/0890-5401(90)90043-H)
7. Cygan, M., Komosa, P., Lokshantov, D., Pilipczuk, M., Pilipczuk, M., Saurabh, S., Wahlström, M.: Randomized contractions meet lean decompositions. *ACM Trans. Algorithms* **17**(1), 6:1–6:30 (2021). <https://doi.org/10.1145/3426738>, <https://doi.org/10.1145/3426738>
8. Graham, R.L.: On primitive graphs and optimal vertex assignments. *Ann. New York Acad. Sci.* **175**, 170–186 (1970)
9. Hsieh, S., Le, H., Le, V.B., Peng, S.: Matching cut in graphs with large minimum degree. In: Du, D., Duan, Z., Tian, C. (eds.) *Computing and Combinatorics - 25th International Conference, COCOON 2019, Xi'an, China, July 29-31, 2019, Proceedings. Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, vol. 11653, pp. 301–312. Springer (2019). [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-26176-4\\_25](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-26176-4_25), [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-26176-4\\_25](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-26176-4_25)
10. Komusiewicz, C., Kratsch, D., Le, V.B.: Matching cut: Kernelization, single-exponential time fpt, and exact exponential algorithms. *Discret. Appl. Math.* **283**, 44–58 (2020). <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.dam.2019.12.010>, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.dam.2019.12.010>
11. Kratsch, D., Le, V.B.: Algorithms solving the matching cut problem. *Theor. Comput. Sci.* **609**, 328–335 (2016). <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tcs.2015.10.016>, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tcs.2015.10.016>

12. Le, H., Le, V.B.: On the complexity of matching cut in graphs of fixed diameter. In: Hong, S. (ed.) 27th International Symposium on Algorithms and Computation, ISAAC 2016, December 12-14, 2016, Sydney, Australia. LIPIcs, vol. 64, pp. 50:1–50:12. Schloss Dagstuhl - Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik (2016). <https://doi.org/10.4230/LIPIcs.ISAAC.2016.50>, <https://doi.org/10.4230/LIPIcs.ISAAC.2016.50>
13. Le, H., Le, V.B.: A complexity dichotomy for matching cut in (bipartite) graphs of fixed diameter. Theor. Comput. Sci. **770**, 69–78 (2019). <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tcs.2018.10.029>, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tcs.2018.10.029>
14. Marx, D., O’Sullivan, B., Razgon, I.: Treewidth reduction for constrained separation and bipartization problems. In: Marion, J., Schwentick, T. (eds.) 27th International Symposium on Theoretical Aspects of Computer Science, STACS 2010, March 4-6, 2010, Nancy, France. LIPIcs, vol. 5, pp. 561–572. Schloss Dagstuhl - Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik (2010). <https://doi.org/10.4230/LIPIcs.STACS.2010.2485>, <https://doi.org/10.4230/LIPIcs.STACS.2010.2485>

## A Appendix

### A.1 Proof of Proposition 1

*Proof.* Consider  $d$  copies of every  $v \in Q$  and treat all of them as distinct elements, clearly if  $|Q| \leq k$  then there are at most  $kd$  such elements. Every  $d$ -matched candidate set  $P$  of  $Q$  can be considered as selection of  $|P|$  elements from these  $kd$  elements, as we can define multiplicity of each vertex  $v \in Q$  to be equal to the number of selected copies of  $v$  and multiplicity of each vertex  $v \in V \setminus Q$  as 0. Thus, number of all possible subsets of size at most  $k$  of the set of these  $kd$  elements is an upper bound for all possible  $d$ -matched candidate sets of  $S$ . Clearly, two selected subsets may produce equal  $d$ -matched candidate sets with this procedure. However, for the simplicity of the analysis we are using this procedure and the bound obtained is sufficient for our purpose.

Number of possible subsets of size at most  $k$  of set containing  $kd$  elements are bounded by  $\sum_{i=0}^k \binom{kd}{i}$  which is bounded by  $2^{O(k \log k)}$  as  $d$  is at most  $k$ . Further, we can use bounded search tree or branching method to exhaustively select  $i$  elements from these  $kd$  elements for every  $0 \leq i \leq k$  to generate every possible  $d$ -matched candidate set of  $Q$ . The running time will be bounded by  $\sum_{i=0}^k (kd)^i$  which is bounded by  $2^{O(k \log k)}$ . Further, to remove duplicate  $d$ -matched candidate sets we can use any comparison based method, where the running time will be bounded by  $2^{O(k \log k)} n^{O(1)}$ . Thus, in time  $2^{O(k \log k)} n^{O(1)}$  we can accomplish the task of obtaining all the possible distinct  $d$ -matched candidate sets of  $Q$  if  $|Q| \leq k$ .

Correctness of bound on the number of  $d$ -matched candidate sets and correctness of algorithm to generate all of them comes due to the exhaustive selection.  $\square$

### A.2 Proof of Proposition 2

*Proof.* Consider the partition  $(A = \phi, B = V(G_t))$  of  $G_t$ , it satisfies all the statements of property (1) for  $M[t, S, P, 0] = 0$  for  $S \in \{\emptyset, \sigma(t)\}$  and for every  $d$ -matched candidate set  $P$  of  $\sigma(t)$ . Further, property (2) is trivially satisfied, as for any partition  $(A, B)$  of  $G$ ,  $|E_{G_t}(A, B)| \geq 0$ .  $\square$

### A.3 Proof of Proposition 3

*Proof.* It is straightforward to see that if both  $S$  and  $\bar{S}$  are non-empty then, there cannot be a trivial partition  $(A, B)$  of  $G_t$ .  $\square$

### A.4 Proof of Proposition 4

*Proof.* If  $M[t, S, P, 1] \leq k$  then consider the partition  $(A, B)$  of  $G_t$  whose existence is asserted by property (1). Due to both  $S$  and  $\bar{S}$  being non empty, both  $A$  and  $B$  are non empty. Clearly  $t$  is non root node, as for root node adhesion  $\sigma(t) = \emptyset$ . Recalling the compactness of tree decomposition  $T$ , where  $G[\alpha(t)]$  is connected and  $N_G(\alpha(t)) = \sigma(t)$ . Thus, for any such partition,  $E_{G_t}(A, B)$  can't be empty. This finishes the proof.  $\square$

### A.5 Proof of Proposition 5

*Proof.* Consider the following procedure to generate  $A_s$ -restricted  $P$ -compatible families for  $t$ .

We define  $P^* = \{(c, v, i) | c \in Z_{ab}^{A_s} \wedge v \in \sigma(c) \wedge i \in \{1, 2, \dots, d\}\}$  and  $P_E^* = \{(e, v, 1) | e \in E_{ab}^{A_s} \wedge v \in V(e)\}$ . Here the triple  $(c, v, i)$  indicate  $i^{th}$  copy of vertex  $v \in \sigma(c)$  that can be part of  $d$ -matched candidate set of  $\sigma(c)$ . Similarly,  $(e, v, 1)$  indicate only copy of vertex  $v \in V(e)$  that can be part of 1-matched candidate set of  $V(e)$ .

Given a subset  $P_{ch}^* \subseteq (P^* \cup P_E^*)$ , we construct  $d$ -matched candidate sets of  $\sigma(c)$  for every  $c \in Z_{ab}^{A_s}$  and 1-matched candidate sets of  $V(e)$  for every  $e \in E_{ab}^{A_s}$  as follows.

$$\begin{aligned} \forall c \in Z_{ab}^{A_s}, P_c = (V, m_{P_c}) \text{ such that} \\ \forall v \in \sigma(c), m_{P_c}(v) = |\{(c', v', i) | (c', v', i) \in P_{ch}^* \wedge (c = c') \wedge (v = v')\}|; \\ \text{and } \forall v \in V \setminus \sigma(c), m_{P_c}(v) = 0. \end{aligned} \quad (7)$$

That is  $m_{P_c}(v)$  equals number of copies of vertex  $v$  that can be part of  $d$ -matched candidate set of  $\sigma(c)$ .

If  $|P_c| > k$  then we can conclude that  $|P_c|$  is not a  $d$ -matched candidate set and given  $P_{ch}^*$  cannot form  $A_s$ -restricted  $P$ -compatible family. Similarly,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\forall e \in E_{ab}^{A_s}, P_e = (V, m_{P_e}) \text{ such that} \\
&\forall v \in V(e), m_{P_e}(v) = |\{(e', v', i) | (e', v', i) \in P_{ch}^* \wedge (e = e') \wedge (v = v')\}|; \\
&\text{and } \forall v \in V \setminus V(e), m_{P_e}(v) = 0. \quad (8)
\end{aligned}$$

Once we constructed all the  $P_c$  and  $P_e$  and verified that they are valid  $d$ -matched candidate set for their respective  $\sigma(c)$  and  $V(e)$ , we can directly check if  $\{P_c | c \in Z_{ab}^{A_s}\} \cup \{P_e | e \in E_{ab}^{A_s}\}$  satisfy all the conditions of  $A_s$ -restricted  $P$ -compatible family or not. Recall for any  $A_s$ -restricted  $P$ -compatible family  $F_{P|A_s}$  where  $P_z = \biguplus_{P_v \in F_{P|A_s}} P_v$ , we have  $|P_z| \leq 2k$ . This restriction on size allow us to generate all possible  $A_s$ -restricted  $P$ -compatible families of  $t$  by considering all the subsets of  $P^* \cup P_E^*$  of size at most  $2k$  to run our procedure.

To prove that our procedure produces all possible families, assume to the contrary that  $F'_{P|A_s} = \{P_c | c \in Z_{ab}^{A_s}\} \cup \{P_e | e \in E_{ab}^{A_s}\}$  is a family that can not be produced by our procedure. Consider the set  $P_{ch} = \{(c, v, i) | c \in Z_{ab}^{A_s} \wedge v \in P_c \wedge (1 \leq i \leq m_{P_c}(v))\} \cup \{(e, v, 1) | e \in E_{ab}^{A_s} \wedge v \in P_e\}$ . Clearly  $P_{ch}$  is a subset of  $(P^* \cup P_E^*)$  of size at most  $2k$  as  $|\biguplus_{P_v \in F_{P|A_s}} P_v| \leq 2k$ . We can directly check that the  $A_s$  restricted  $P$ -compatible family produced from  $P_{ch}$  using equations (7), (8) are equal to  $F'_{P|A_s}$ , contradicting that  $F'_{P|A_s}$  can not be produced.

We note that apart from generating all the distinct  $A_s$ -restricted  $P$ -compatible families this procedure will generate some repetitions of  $A_s$ -restricted  $P$ -compatible families, but we use this procedure for simplicity of analysis and the upper bound obtained from this procedure is sufficient for our purpose.

If  $|Z_{ab}^{A_s}| + |E_{ab}^{A_s}| \leq k$ , then clearly  $|P^* \cup P_E^*| \leq dk^2 \leq k^3$  as  $d$  is at most  $k$ . And the number of subsets of  $P^* \cup P_E^*$  of size at most  $2k$  can be bounded by  $\sum_{i=0}^{2k} \binom{k^3}{i}$  which is bounded by  $2^{O(k \log k)}$ . Thus there can be at most  $2^{O(k \log k)}$  distinct  $A_s$ -restricted  $P$ -compatible families of  $t$ .

Further to list all the subsets of  $P^* \cup P_E^*$  of size at most  $2k$  we can use bounded search tree method or simply branching with bound on the depth of search tree to be the size of the subset that we want to generate. Clearly the running time will be bounded by  $\sum_{i=0}^{2k} k^{3i} n^{O(1)}$  which is bounded by  $2^{O(k \log k)} n^{O(1)}$ . Further, to remove duplicate  $A_s$ -restricted  $P$ -compatible families we can use any comparison based method, where the running time will be bounded by  $2^{O(k \log k)} n^{O(1)}$ .

Correctness of both the bound and algorithm to generate subsets come from exhaustive selection. This finishes the proof.  $\square$

## A.6 Proof of Proposition 6

*Proof.* It is sufficient to show that any  $c \in Z_{ab}^{A_s}$  or  $e \in E_{ab}^{A_s}$  contribute a positive value to the calculation of  $cs(t, A_s, F_{P|A_s})$  in equation (1). Recalling the assignment of  $M_E[., ., .]$ , it is straightforward to see that for any  $e = (u, v) \in E_{ab}^{A_s}$ ,  $M_E[e, A_s \cap V(E), P_e] \geq 1$  as  $A_s \cap V(E) = \{u\}$  or  $A_s \cap V(E) = \{v\}$ .



For any  $c \in Z_{ab}^{A_s}$ , observe that  $c$  contributes  $M[c, A_s \cap \sigma(c), P_c]$  in equation (1). For  $c \in Z_{ab}^{A_s}$  both  $A_s \cap \sigma(c)$  and  $\sigma(c) \setminus A_s$  are non empty. Recalling proposition 4 we conclude  $M[c, A_s \cap \sigma(c), P_c] \geq 1$ . This finishes the proof.  $\square$

### A.7 Proof of Claim 1

*Proof.* As discussed earlier calculation of  $Z_{ab}^{A_s}$  and  $E_{ab}^{A_s}$  will take  $n^{O(1)}$  time. Number of cells  $M[c, \cdot, \cdot, \cdot]$  are bounded by  $2^{O(k \log k)}$  for every  $c \in Z(t)$ , further there are  $O(1)$  cells  $M_E[e, \cdot, \cdot, \cdot]$  for every  $e \in E(G_t[\beta(t)])$ . To calculate  $cs(t, A_s, F_{P|A_s})$  as per equation 1, we need to retrieve desired cells  $M[c, A_s \cap \sigma(t), P_c, 1]$  for every  $c \in Z_{ab}^{A_s}$  and  $M[e, A_s \cap V(e), P_e]$  for every  $e \in E_{ab}^{A_s}$ . As  $|Z_{ab}^{A_s}| + |E_{ab}^{A_s}| \leq n^{O(1)}$  we need to retrieve at most  $n^{O(1)}$  cells for calculation as per equation 1. Assuming we do a linear search on  $2^{O(k \log k)}$   $M[c, \cdot, \cdot, \cdot]$  cells for every  $c \in Z_{ab}^{A_s}$  and  $O(1)$   $M_E[e, \cdot, \cdot, \cdot]$  cells for every  $e \in E_{ab}^{A_s}$  to retrieve desired cell. The time to retrieve desired cells is thus, bounded by  $2^{O(k \log k)} n^{O(1)}$ , once we retrieve all the desired cells, calculation of  $cs(t, A_s, F_{P|A_s})$  is straightforward.  $\square$

### A.8 Proof of Lemma 3

*Proof.* For property (a), let  $F_{P|A_s}^* = \{P_c^* | c \in Z_{ab}^{A_s}\} \cup \{P_e^* | e \in E_{ab}^{A_s}\}$  be the  $A_s$ -restricted  $P$ -compatible family for which  $mcs(t, A_s, P) = cs(t, A_s, F_{P|A_s}^*)$ . If  $cs(t, A_s, F_{P|A_s}^*) \leq k$ , then  $M[c, A_s \cap \sigma(c), P_c^*, 1] \leq k$  for every  $c \in Z_{ab}^{A_s}$ . Further, for every  $c \in Z(t) \setminus Z_{ab}^{A_s}$ , either  $A_s \cap \sigma(c) = \sigma(c)$  or  $A_s \cap \sigma(c) = \emptyset$ . And as per proposition 2 we have that  $M[c, A_s \cap \sigma(c), \emptyset, 0] = 0$  for every  $c \in Z(t) \setminus Z_{ab}^{A_s}$ .

For every  $c \in Z_{ab}^{A_s}$  let  $(A_c, B_c)$  be the partition of  $G_c$  corresponding to property (1) for  $M[c, A_s \cap \sigma(c), P_c^*, 1]$ . And for every  $c \in Z(t) \setminus Z_{ab}^{A_s}$ , let  $(A_c, B_c)$  be the partition of  $G_c$  corresponding to property (1) of  $M[c, A_s \cap \sigma(c), \emptyset, 0]$ . Let  $Z_a = \{c | c \in Z(t) \wedge (A_c \cap \sigma(c) = A_s \cap \sigma(c))\}$  and  $Z_b = \{c | c \in Z(t) \wedge (A_c \cap \sigma(c) = \sigma(c) \setminus A_s)\}$ . Observe that  $B_c \cap \sigma(c) = A_s \cap \sigma(c)$  for every  $c \in Z_b$ . We define

$$A = \left( \bigcup_{c \in Z_a} A_c \right) \cup \left( \bigcup_{c \in Z_b} B_c \right) \cup A_s$$

$$B = V(G_t) \setminus A$$

It is now remained to prove that partition  $(A, B)$  of  $G_t$  satisfies property (a).

As  $A_c \cap \sigma(c) = A_s \cap \sigma(c)$  for every  $c \in Z_a$  and  $B_c \cap \sigma(c) = A_s \cap \sigma(c)$  for each  $c \in Z_b$ , further due to  $\sigma(c)$  being the only vertices that  $V(G_c)$  share with  $\beta(t)$  for every  $c \in Z(t)$ , and  $A_s \subseteq \beta(t)$ , we get the property that  $A \cap \beta(t) = A_s$ .

For every  $c \in Z_a$ ,  $A \cap V(G_c) = A_c \cup (A \cap \beta(t) \cap \sigma(c)) = A_c \cup (A_s \cap \sigma(c)) = A_c$ . Similarly, for every  $c \in Z_b$ ,  $A \cap V(G_c) = B_c$ . Consider the following important claim.

*Claim 2.*  $E_{G_t}(A, B) \subseteq (\bigcup_{c \in Z_{ab}^{A_s}} E_{G_c}(A_c, B_c) \cup E_{ab}^{A_s})$ .

*Proof.* Assume to the contrary that there exist an edge  $e = (u, v) \in E_{G_t}(A, B)$  such that  $e \notin (\bigcup_{c \in Z_{ab}^{A_s}} E_{G_c}(A_c, B_c) \cup E_{ab}^{A_s})$ . Without loss of generality let  $u \in A$  and  $v \in B$ . If  $e \in E(G_t[\beta(t)])$  then  $u \in A_s$  and  $v \in \beta(t) \setminus A_s$  contradicting  $e \notin E_{ab}^{A_s}$ . If  $e \in E(G_c)$  for a  $c \in Z_a$  then due to  $A \cap V(G_c) = A_c$  we have  $u \in A_c$  and  $v \in B_c$  contradicting  $e \notin E_{G_c}(A_c, B_c)$  as well as contradicting that  $c \in Z(t) \setminus Z_{ab}^{A_s}$ , as for every  $c \in Z(t) \setminus Z_{ab}^{A_s}$  the corresponding partition  $(A_c, B_c)$  is trivial, that is either  $A_c$  or  $B_c$  is empty. If  $e \in G_c$  for a  $c \in Z_b$  then due to  $A \cap V(G_c) = B_c$  we have  $u \in B_c$  and  $v \in A_c$  contradicting  $e \notin E_{G_c}(A_c, B_c)$  as well as contradicting  $c \in Z(t) \setminus Z_{ab}^{A_s}$ . This finishes proof of the claim.  $\square$

For an edge  $e = (u, v) \in E_{ab}^{A_s}$ ,  $A_s \cap V(e) = \{u\}$  or  $A_s \cap V(e) = \{v\}$ . Now we can directly check that  $M_E[e, A_s \cap V(e), P_e^*] \geq 1$  as per the assigned values of  $M_E[e, \cdot, \cdot]$ . Thus,  $|E_{ab}^{A_s}|$  is at most  $\sum_{e \in E_{ab}^{A_s}} M_E[e, A_s \cap V(e), P_e^*]$ . And  $|\bigcup_{c \in Z_{ab}^{A_s}} E_{G_c}(A_c, B_c)|$  is at most  $\sum_{c \in Z_{ab}^{A_s}} M[c, A_s \cap \sigma(c), P_c^*, 1]$ . Using claim 2 we can conclude that  $|E_{G_t}(A, B)|$  is at most  $cs(t, A_s, F_{P|A_s}^*)$  which is same as  $mcs(t, A_s, P)$ .

To show that  $E_{G_t}(A, B)$  forms a  $d$ -matching it is sufficient to show that for every vertex  $v \in V(G_t)$ ,  $|N_{G[E_{G_t}(A, B)]}(v)| \leq d$ . As  $cs(t, A_s, F_{P|A_s}^*) \leq k$ , then  $M_E[e, A_s \cap V(e), P_e^*] \leq k$  for every  $e \in E_{ab}^{A_s}$ . For an edge  $e = (u, v) \in E_{ab}^{A_s}$ ,  $A_s \cap V(e) = \{u\}$  or  $A_s \cap V(e) = \{v\}$ . We can directly check that in such case  $M_E[e, A_s \cap V(e), P_e^*] = 1$  and  $m_{P_e^*}(u) = m_{P_e^*}(v) = 1$  as per the assignment of values for  $M_E[e, \cdot, \cdot]$ , this ensures that for every vertex  $v \in \beta(t)$  and for an edge  $e \in E_{ab}^{A_s}$ ,  $|N_{G[E_{G_t}(A, B) \cap e]}(v)| \leq m_{P_e^*}(v)$ .

For every  $c \in Z_{ab}^{A_s}$ , partition  $(A_c, B_c)$  of  $G_c$  satisfies property (1) of  $M[c, A_s \cap \sigma(c), P_c^*, 1]$ . Thus,  $\forall v \in \sigma(c)$ ,  $|N_{G[E_{G_c}(A_c, B_c)]}(v)| \leq m_{P_c^*}(v)$ . Recalling  $\beta(t) \cap V(G_c) = \sigma(c)$ , it holds that for every  $v \in \beta(t)$ ,  $|N_{G[E_{G_c}(A_c, B_c)]}(v)| \leq m_{P_c^*}(v)$  for every  $c \in Z_{ab}^{A_s}$ . Let  $P_z^* = \biguplus_{P_v^* \in F_{P|A_s}^*} P_v^*$ , using claim 2 we can conclude that  $\forall v \in \beta(t)$ ,  $|N_{G[E_{G_t}(A, B)]}(v)| \leq m_{P_z^*}(v)$ . As  $F_{P|A_s}^*$  is an  $A_s$ -restricted  $P$ -compatible family, it holds that  $\forall v \in V$ ,  $m_{P_z^*}(v) \leq d$ . This conclude that  $\forall v \in \beta(t)$ ,  $|N_{G[E_{G_t}(A, B)]}(v)| \leq d$ .

The assumption holds that  $E_{G_c}(A_c, B_c)$  forms a  $d$ -matching for every  $c \in Z(t)$ . Thus, for any vertex  $v \in V(G_c)$ ,  $|N_{G[E_{G_c}(A_c, B_c)]}(v)| \leq d$ . If  $v \notin \sigma(c)$  then no edge in  $E_{G_t}(A, B) \setminus E_{G_c}(A_c, B_c)$  incidents on  $v$ . Hence,  $\forall v \in (V(G_t) \setminus \beta(t))$ ,  $|N_{G[E_{G_t}(A, B)]}(v)| \leq d$ . This concludes that  $E_{G_t}(A, B)$  is a  $d$ -matching.

Recall that we have shown that  $\forall v \in \beta(t)$ ,  $|N_{G[E_{G_t}(A,B)]}(v)| \leq m_{P_z^*}(v)$ . As  $F_{P|A_s}^*$  is an  $A_s$ -restricted  $P$ -compatible family, it holds that  $\forall v \in \sigma(t)$ ,  $m_{P_z^*}(v) \leq m_P(v)$ . As  $\sigma(t) \subseteq \beta(t)$ , it holds that  $\forall v \in \sigma(t)$ ,  $|N_{G[E_{G_t}(A,B)]}(v)| \leq m_P(v)$ . This finishes proof for property (a).

For property (b), let  $(A, B)$  be a partition of  $G$  which satisfies all the prerequisites of property (b) for given  $t$ ,  $A_s$  and  $P$ . Consider following assignments.

$$\begin{aligned} \forall c \in Z_{ab}^{A_s}, P_c = (V, m_{P_c}) \text{ such that } \forall v \in \sigma(c), m_{P_c}(v) &= |N_{G[E_{G_c}(A,B)]}(v)|, \\ \text{and } \forall v \in V \setminus \sigma(c), m_{P_c}(v) &= 0. \end{aligned}$$

And

$$\begin{aligned} \forall e \in E_{ab}^{A_s}, P_e = (V, m_{P_e}) \text{ such that } \forall v \in V(e), m_{P_e}(v) &= 1, \\ \text{and } \forall v \in V \setminus V(e), m_{P_e}(v) &= 0. \end{aligned}$$

As  $E_G(A, B)$  is a  $d$ -matching,  $|N_{G[E_{G_c}(A,B)]}(v)| \leq d$  for every  $v \in \sigma(c)$ . Recalling the definition of  $G_c$  which excludes every edge with both the endpoints in  $\sigma(c)$ . Thus, every edge in  $E_{G_c}(A, B)$  can have at most one endpoint in  $\sigma(c)$  and knowing that  $|E_{G_c}(A, B)| \leq k$  we can conclude that  $|P_c| \leq k$  and  $P_c$  is a  $d$ -matched candidate set for  $\sigma(c)$  for every  $c \in Z_{ab}^{A_s}$ . Further, for every  $e \in E_{ab}^{A_s}$ ,  $P_e$  is a 1-matched candidate set for  $V(e)$ .

We now try to show that  $F_{P|A_s} = \{P_c \mid c \in Z_{ab}^{A_s}\} \cup \{P_e \mid e \in E_{ab}^{A_s}\}$  is an  $A_s$ -restricted  $P$ -compatible family. Let  $P_z = \biguplus_{P_v \in F_{P|A_s}} P_v$ . Observe that all  $G_c$  and  $G_t[\beta(t)]$  are pairwise edge disjoint sub graphs of  $G$  because of the exclusion of edges with both endpoints in  $\sigma(c)$  in  $G_c$ . Combining the fact that  $\sum_{v \in V(G)} |N_{G[E(A,B)]}(v)| = 2|E(A, B)|$ ,  $|E(A, B)|$  is at most  $k$  and  $E(A, B)$  is a  $d$ -matching, we can assert that  $|P_z| \leq 2k$  and  $m_{P_z}(v) \leq d$  for every  $v \in V$ . Further, as  $(A, B)$  satisfies prerequisites of property (b), it is known that  $|N_{G[E_{G_t}(A,B)]}(v)| \leq m_P(v)$  for every  $v \in \sigma(t)$ . Again, the observation that all  $G_c$  and  $G_t[\beta(t)]$  are pairwise edge disjoint subgraphs of  $G_t$  helps us assert that  $m_{P_z}(v) \leq m_P(v)$  for every  $v \in \sigma(t)$ . This concludes that  $F_{P|A_s}$  is an  $A_s$ -restricted  $P$ -compatible family for  $t$ .

We move on to show that  $(A, B)$  satisfies prerequisites of property (2) for  $M[c, A_s \cap \sigma(c), P_c, 1]$  for every  $c \in Z_{ab}^{A_s}$ . As  $A_s \cap \sigma(c) = A \cap \beta(t) \cap \sigma(c)$ , and as  $\sigma(c) \subseteq \beta(t)$  we have  $A \cap \sigma(c) = A_s \cap \sigma(c)$ . Satisfaction of rest of the prerequisites can be directly checked using the fact that  $(A, B)$  satisfies prerequisites of property (b) for  $mcs(t, A_s, P)$  and recalling the assignment of  $P_c$ , further it is straightforward to see that both  $A \cap V(G_c)$  and  $B \cap V(G_c)$  are non-empty for every  $c \in Z_{ab}^{A_s}$  because  $A_s \cap \sigma(c)$  and  $\sigma(c) \setminus A_s$  are both non-empty as per the definition of  $Z_{ab}^{A_s}$  and  $A \cap \sigma(c) = A_s \cap \sigma(c)$  for every  $c \in Z_{ab}^{A_s}$ .

For an edge  $e = (u, v) \in E_{ab}^{A_s}$ , we can directly check that  $M_E[t, A_s \cap V(e), P_e] = 1$  as per the assigned values of  $M_E[., ., .]$ , as in this case  $P_e(u) = P_e(v) = 1$  and  $(A_s \cap V(e)) = \{u\}$  or  $\{v\}$ . Thus, recalling every  $G_c$  and  $G_t[\beta(t)]$  are all pairwise edge disjoint, we conclude that  $|E_{G_t}(A, B)|$  is at least  $cs(t, A_s, F_{P|A_s})$  calculated as per equation (1). Further,  $mcs(t, A_s, P) \leq cs(t, A_s, F_{P|A_s})$  due to the minimality over all  $A_s$ -restricted  $P$ -compatible families. This finishes the proof.  $\square$

### A.9 Proof of Lemma 5

*Proof.* We will divide the proof in following cases.

**Case 1:**  $S = \emptyset$  or  $S = \sigma(t)$ . To prove property (1) we assume  $M[t, S, P, 1] \leq k$ . If  $M[t, S, P, 1] = MIN_{\beta(t)}$ , then let  $A_s^*$  be the  $S$ -compatible set such that  $M[t, S, P, 1] = mcs(t, A_s^*, P)$ . Let  $(A, B)$  be the partition of  $G_t$  corresponding to property (a) for  $mcs(t, A_s^*, P)$ . As  $A \cap \beta(t) = A_s^*$ , this implies  $A \cap \sigma(t) = A_s^* \cap \sigma(t)$ . And due to  $A_s^*$  being an  $S$ -compatible set, we can conclude  $A \cap \sigma(t) = S$  or  $\bar{S}$ . Rest of the statements of property (1) are directly satisfied by partition  $(A, B)$  if property (a) is satisfied by  $(A, B)$ . Further as  $A_s^*$  is non-empty proper subset of  $\beta(t)$ , both  $A$  and  $B$  are non empty.

Otherwise, if  $M[t, S, P, 1] = MIN_c$ , note that this is possible only if  $t$  is non leaf, otherwise  $MIN_c$  would have been assigned  $\infty$ , then there exist a  $c^* \in Z(t)$  and  $P_{c^*}$  such that  $\forall v \in \sigma(t), m_{P_{c^*}}(v) \leq m_P(v)$  and  $M[t, S, P, 1] = M[c^*, \emptyset, P_{c^*}, 1] \leq k$ . Let  $(A_{c^*}, B_{c^*})$  be the partition of  $G_{c^*}$  corresponding to property (1) of  $M[c^*, \emptyset, P_{c^*}, 1]$ , then either  $A_{c^*} \cap \sigma(c^*) = \emptyset$  or  $A_{c^*} \cap \sigma(c^*) = \sigma(c^*)$ . We can directly check that in the first case  $(A_{c^*}, B_{c^*} \cup (V(G_t) \setminus V(G_{c^*})))$  and in the second case  $(A_{c^*} \cup (V(G_t) \setminus V(G_{c^*})), B_{c^*})$  is a partition of  $G_t$  which satisfies all the points of property (1) for  $M[t, S, P, 1]$  as  $(A_{c^*}, B_{c^*})$  satisfies property (1) for  $M[c^*, \emptyset, P_{c^*}, 1]$  and every edge in  $E_{G_t}(A_{c^*}, B_{c^*} \cup (V(G_t) \setminus V(G_{c^*})))$  in the first case and every edge in  $E_{G_t}(A_{c^*} \cup (V(G_t) \setminus V(G_{c^*})), B_{c^*})$  in the second case belong to  $E_{G_{c^*}}(A_{c^*}, B_{c^*})$ . Further, in the first case partition  $(A_{c^*}, B_{c^*} \cup (V(G_t) \setminus V(G_{c^*})))$  and in the second case partition  $(A_{c^*} \cup (V(G_t) \setminus V(G_{c^*})), B_{c^*})$  are non trivial as  $(A_{c^*}, B_{c^*})$  is non trivial. This concludes property (1).

For property (2), let  $(A, B)$  be the partition of  $G$  which satisfies all the prerequisites of (2) for given  $t, S$  and  $P$ , and let both  $A \cap V(G_t)$  and  $B \cap V(G_t)$  are non empty. It remains to prove that  $E_{G_t}(A, B) \geq M[t, S, P, 1]$ . If  $A \cap \beta(t)$  is non-empty proper subset of  $\beta(t)$ , recalling  $(k, k)$ -edge unbreakability of  $\beta(t)$ , we have at least one of  $A \cap \beta(t) \leq k$  or  $B \cap \beta(t) \leq k$ . If  $A \cap \beta(t) \leq k$  then let  $A_s = A \cap \beta(t)$ , otherwise let  $B_s = B \cap \beta(t)$ . It is clear that  $A_s$  (otherwise  $B_s$ ) is non-empty proper subset of  $\beta(t)$  and  $|A_s|$  (otherwise  $|B_s|$ ) is at most  $k$ , thus  $A_s$  (otherwise  $B_s$ ) is an  $S$ -compatible set of  $\beta(t)$  due to the fact that  $A_s \cap \sigma(t) \in \{S, \bar{S}\}$  (otherwise  $B_s \cap \sigma(t) \in \{S, \bar{S}\}$ ) as  $A \cap \sigma(t) \in \{S, \bar{S}\}$  which also implies  $B \cap \sigma(t) \in \{\bar{S}, S\}$ . we can directly check the satisfaction of the prerequisites of property (b) for  $mcs(t, A_s, P)$  by  $(A, B)$  (otherwise  $mcs(t, B_s, P)$  by  $(B, A)$ ) due to the fact that  $(A, B)$  satisfies all the prerequisites of property (2) for  $M[t, S, P, 1]$ . Thus,  $|E_{G_t}(A, B)| \geq mcs(t, A_s, P)$

(otherwise  $|E_{G_t}(A, B)| = |E_{G_t}(B, A)| \geq mcs(t, B_s, P)$ ), and due to minimality  $M[t, S, P, 1] \leq MIN_{\beta(t)} \leq mcs(t, A_s, P)$  (otherwise  $M[t, S, P, 1] \leq MIN_{\beta(t)} \leq mcs(t, B_s, P)$ ) hence  $|E_{G_t}(A, B)| \geq M[t, S, P, 1]$ .

Else, If  $A \cap \beta(t) = \emptyset$  or  $A \cap \beta(t) = \beta(t)$ . Note that this can only be possible if  $t$  is a non leaf node, due to the assumption that both  $A \cap V(G_t)$  and  $B \cap V(G_t)$  are non empty, if  $t$  is a leaf node then  $V(G_t) = \beta(t)$  and thus,  $A \cap \beta(t) = \emptyset$  or  $A \cap \beta(t) = \beta(t)$  contradicts the assumption. Thus, in this case we assume that  $t$  is non leaf and  $Z(t)$  is non empty. Consider following assignments.

$$\begin{aligned} \forall c \in Z(t), P_c = (V, m_{P_c}) \text{ such that } \forall v \in \sigma(c), m_{P_c}(v) &= |N_{G[E_{G_c}(A, B)]}(v)|; \\ \text{and } \forall v \in V \setminus \sigma(c), m_{P_c}(v) &= 0; \end{aligned}$$

As  $E_G(A, B)$  is a  $d$ -matching,  $|N_{G[E_{G_c}(A, B)]}(v)| \leq d$  for every  $v \in \sigma(c)$ . Recalling the definition of  $G_c$  which excludes every edge with both the endpoints in  $\sigma(c)$ . Thus, every edge in  $E_{G_c}(A, B)$  can have at most one endpoint in  $\sigma(c)$  and knowing that  $|E_{G_c}(A, B)| \leq k$  we can conclude that  $|P_c| \leq k$  and  $P_c$  is a  $d$ -matched candidate set for  $\sigma(c)$  for every  $c \in Z(t)$ .

Clearly,  $\forall v \in \sigma(t)$ ,  $m_{P_c}(v) \leq m_P(v)$ , this is due to the assumption that  $(A, B)$  satisfies prerequisites of property (2) for  $M[t, S, P, .]$  and thus  $\forall v \in \sigma(t)$ ,  $|N_{G[E_{G_t}(A, B)]}(v)| \leq m_P(v)$ . And as per the above assignment of  $P_c$ ,  $\forall v \in V$ ,  $m_{P_c}(v) \leq |N_{G[E_{G_c}(A, B)]}(v)|$  adding the fact that  $G_c$  is a subgraph of  $G_t$  we conclude  $\forall v \in \sigma(t)$ ,  $m_{P_c}(v) \leq m_P(v)$ .

Now we can directly check that  $(A, B)$  satisfies all the prerequisites of property (2) for  $M[c, \emptyset, P_c, n_e]$  for every  $c \in Z(t)$ . Further there must be at least one  $c \in Z(t)$  such that both  $A \cap V(G_c)$  and  $B \cap V(G_c)$  are non empty. This is guaranteed. We will give arguments for the case when  $A \cap \beta(t) = \emptyset$ , and symmetric arguments can be used for the case when  $A \cap \beta(t) = \beta(t)$ . If  $A \cap \beta(t) = \emptyset$  then  $B \cap \beta(t) = \beta(t)$ , in this case  $B \cap V(G_c)$  is non-empty for every  $c \in Z(t)$  because for every  $c$ , adhesion  $\sigma(c)$  can not be empty due to the fact that  $G$  is connected and  $c$  is not root. However as  $A \cap \beta(t)$  is empty then the assumption that  $A \cap V(G_t)$  is not empty can only hold if  $A \cap V(G_c)$  is not empty for at least one  $c \in Z(t)$ . Let  $c^*$  be that child of  $t$  for which both  $A \cap V(G_{c^*})$  and  $B \cap V(G_{c^*})$  are non empty, then  $E_{G_{c^*}}(A, B) \geq M[c^*, \emptyset, P_{c^*}, 1]$ . As we already discussed that  $P_{c^*}$  satisfies the condition that  $\forall v \in \sigma(t)$ ,  $m_{P_c}(v) \leq m_P(v)$  due the above assignment,  $M[c^*, \emptyset, P_{c^*}, 1]$  must be considered for calculation of  $MIN_c$  in equation (3). Thus,  $MIN_c \leq M[c^*, \emptyset, P_{c^*}, 1]$ . Further, as  $E_{G_{c^*}}(A, B) \subseteq E_{G_t}(A, B)$ . We have that  $|E_{G_t}(A, B)| \geq MIN_c \geq M[t, S, P, 1]$ .

**Case 2:**  $S \neq \emptyset$  or  $S \neq \sigma(t)$ . For property (1), we assume  $M[t, S, P, 1] \leq k$ . Let  $A_s^*$  be the  $S$ -compatible set such that  $MIN_{\beta(t)} = mcs(t, A_s^*, P)$ . Let  $(A, B)$  be the partition of  $G_t$  corresponding to property (a) for  $mcs(t, A_s^*, P)$ . As  $A \cap \beta(t) = A_s^*$ , this implies  $A \cap \sigma(t) = A_s^* \cap \sigma(t)$ . And due to  $A_s^*$  being an  $S$ -compatible set, we can conclude  $A \cap \sigma(t) = S$  or  $\bar{S}$ . Rest of the statements of property (1) for  $M[t, S, P, 1]$  are directly satisfied by partition  $(A, B)$  if property (a) is

satisfied by  $(A, B)$  for  $mcs(t, A_s^*, P)$ . Further both  $A$  and  $B$  are non-empty as  $A_s^*$  is non-empty proper subset of  $\beta(t)$ .

For property (2), let  $(A, B)$  be the partition of  $G$  which satisfies all the prerequisites of (2) for given  $t$ ,  $S$  and  $P$ , and both  $A \cap V(G_t)$  and  $B \cap V(G_t)$  are non empty. It remains to prove that  $|E_{G_t}(A, B)| \geq M[t, S, P, 1]$ . We can observe that  $A \cap \beta(t)$  is non-empty proper subset of  $\beta(t)$  as  $A \cap \sigma(t) \in \{S, \bar{S}\}$  and  $S$  is non-empty proper subset of  $\sigma(t)$ . Thus, we have both  $A \cap \beta(t)$  as well as  $B \cap \beta(t)$  non-empty proper subsets of  $\beta(t)$ . Recalling  $(k, k)$ -edge unbreakability of  $\beta(t)$ , we have at least one of  $|A \cap \beta(t)| \leq k$  or  $|B \cap \beta(t)| \leq k$ . If  $|A \cap \beta(t)| \leq k$  then let  $A_s = A \cap \beta(t)$ , otherwise let  $B_s = B \cap \beta(t)$ . It is clear that  $A_s$  (otherwise  $B_s$ ) is non-empty proper subset of  $\beta(t)$  and  $|A_s|$  (otherwise  $|B_s|$ ) is at most  $k$ . then  $A_s$  (otherwise  $B_s$ ) is an  $S$ -compatible set due to the fact that  $A_s \cap \sigma(t) \in \{S, \bar{S}\}$  (otherwise  $B_s \cap \sigma(t) \in \{S, \bar{S}\}$ ). We can directly check the satisfaction of the prerequisites of property (b) for  $mcs(t, A_s, P)$  by  $(A, B)$  (otherwise  $mcs(t, B_s, P)$  by  $(B, A)$ ) due to the fact that  $(A, B)$  satisfies all the prerequisites of property (2) for  $M[t, S, P, 1]$ . Thus,  $|E_{G_t}(A, B)| \geq mcs(t, A_s, P)$  (otherwise  $|E_{G_t}(A, B)| = |E_{G_t}(B, A)| \geq mcs(t, B_s, P)$ ), and due to minimality  $M[t, S, P, 1] \leq MIN_{\beta(t)} \leq mcs(t, A_s, P)$  (otherwise  $M[t, S, P, 1] \leq MIN_{\beta(t)} \leq mcs(t, B_s, P)$ ) we have  $|E_{G_t}(A, B)| \geq M[t, S, P, 1]$ . This finishes the proof.  $\square$

## A.10 Proof of Proposition 7

*Proof.* We argue that for every connected component  $C$  in  $H[A_g]$  either  $V(C) \subseteq A_s^*$  or  $V(C) \cap A_s^* = \emptyset$ . Assume to the contrary that there exist a connected component  $C \in H[A_g]$  such that  $V(C) \not\subseteq A_s^*$  and  $V(C) \cap A_s^* \neq \emptyset$ . In such a case there must be an edge  $e = (u, v)$  in  $H[A_g]$  such that  $u \in A_s^*$  and  $v \notin A_s^*$ . Recalling the construction of  $H$ , edge  $(u, v)$  may be present due to (i) both  $u$  and  $v$  belong to  $\sigma(t)$ , in which case it contradicts that  $A_g$  is a good set because it violates the condition that  $A_g \cap (\sigma(t) \setminus A_s^*) = \emptyset$ . (ii) Both  $u$  and  $v$  belong to  $\sigma(c)$  for a same  $c \in Z(t)$ , this also contradicts that  $A_g$  is a good set as it violates the condition that  $A_g \cap B^* = \emptyset$ . (iii)  $(u, v)$  is an edge in  $E(G_t[\beta(t)])$ , this implies  $(u, v) \in E_{ab}^{A_s^*}$  which contradicts that  $A_g$  is a good set as it also violates the condition that  $A_g \cap B^* = \emptyset$ .

Let  $C_1, C_2, \dots, C_l$  be connected components in  $H[A_g]$  such that  $V(C_i) \subseteq A_s^*$  for  $1 \leq i \leq l$ , then  $A_s^* = \bigcup_{1 \leq i \leq l} V(C_i)$  as  $A_g \supseteq A_s^*$ . Let us define  $Z_i = \{c \mid c \in Z_{ab}^{A_s^*} \wedge (V(C_i) \cap \sigma(c) \neq \emptyset)\}$  and  $E_i = \{e \mid e \in E_{ab}^{A_s^*} \wedge (V(C_i) \cap V(e) \neq \emptyset)\}$ . A crucial observation is that the sets  $Z_i$  are pairwise disjoint with each other due to the construction of  $H$  where  $\sigma(c)$  forms a clique in  $H$  for every  $c$ . Similarly sets  $E_i$  are also pairwise disjoint. This implies  $A_s^* \cap \sigma(c) = V(C_i) \cap \sigma(c)$  for every  $c \in Z_i$  and  $A_s^* \cap V(e) = V(C_i) \cap V(e)$  for every  $e \in E_i$ . Let  $F_{P|A_s^*} = \{P_c \mid c \in Z_{ab}^{A_s^*}\} \cup \{P_e \mid e \in E_{ab}^{A_s^*}\}$  be the family for which  $mcs(t, A_s^*, P) = cs(t, A_s^*, F_{P|A_s^*})$ . Then,

$$\begin{aligned}
cs(t, A_s^*, F_{P|A_s}) &= \sum_{1 \leq i \leq l} \sum_{c \in Z_i} M[c, V(C_i) \cap \sigma(c), P_c] \\
&\quad + \sum_{1 \leq i \leq l} \sum_{e \in E_i} M_E[e, V(C_i) \cap V(e), P_e].
\end{aligned}$$

We now define the families  $F_{P|V(C_i)} = \{P_c \mid P_c \in F_{P|A_s^*} \wedge c \in Z_i\} \cup \{P_e \mid P_e \in F_{P|A_s^*} \wedge e \in E_i\}$ . We now consider two cases, in the first case let both  $S$  and  $\bar{S}$  are non empty. Observe that there exist a component  $C_s$  such that  $V(C_s) \cap \sigma(t) = (A_s^* \cap \sigma(t))$  which is essentially  $S$  or  $\bar{S}$ . This is guaranteed because  $A_g \cap \sigma(t) = A_s^* \cap \sigma(t)$  as  $A_g$  is disjoint from  $\sigma(t) \setminus A_s^*$  and  $\sigma(t)$  forms a clique in  $H$ , thus  $A_g \cap \sigma(t)$  should be connected in  $H[A_g]$ . Further,  $V(C_s) \subseteq A_s^*$  as we already discussed that for a component  $C$  either  $V(C) \subseteq A_s^*$  or  $V(C) \cap A_s^* = \emptyset$  if  $A_g$  is a good set, further  $V(C_s)$  is non-empty and proper subset of  $\beta(t)$  as both  $S$  and  $\bar{S}$  are non-empty. Further, as  $V(C_s) \subseteq A_s^*$  we can observe that  $|V(C_s)| \leq k$ . Thus,  $C_s$  qualifies to be an  $S$ -compatible component. Now we have,

$$\begin{aligned}
cs(t, A_s^*, F_{P|A_s}) &= cs(t, V(C_s), F_{P|V(C_s)}) + \\
&\quad \sum_{1 \leq i \leq l \wedge i \neq s} \left( \sum_{c \in Z_i} M[c, V(C_i) \cap \sigma(c), P_c, 1] + \sum_{e \in E_i} M_E[e, V(C_i) \cap V(e), P_e] \right).
\end{aligned}$$

Thus, we get  $cs(t, V(C_s), F_{P|V(C_s)}) \leq cs(t, A_s^*, F_{P|A_s^*})$ . Due to minimality,  $mcs(t, V(C_s), P) \leq cs(t, V(C_s), F_{P|V(C_s)})$ . And due to the minimality of  $mcs(t, A_s^*, P)$  among all  $S$ -compatible sets, we conclude that  $mcs(t, V(C_s), P) = mcs(t, A_s^*, P)$ .

In the second case, if either  $S$  or  $\bar{S}$  is empty, then for every  $C_i$  such that  $V(C_i) \subseteq A_s^*$ , we have that  $V(C_i) \cap \sigma(t) \in \{\sigma(t), \emptyset\}$ , which is essentially  $S$  or  $\bar{S}$ . Further,  $V(C_i) \neq \emptyset$ ,  $V(C_i) \subseteq A_s^*$  and  $A_s^* \subsetneq \beta(t)$ ,  $V(C_i)$  is a non-empty proper subset of  $\beta(t)$ . Thus, every  $C_i$  is an  $S$ -compatible set. And we have

$$cs(t, A_s^*, F_{P|A_s^*}) = \sum_{1 \leq i \leq l} cs(t, V(C_i), F_{P|V(C_i)}).$$

Consider any component  $C_i$ , if  $V(C_i) = A_s^*$  then we are done, else if  $V(C_i) \subsetneq A_s^*$ , then we have  $cs(t, V(C_i), F_{P|V(C_i)}) \leq cs(t, A_s^*, F_{P|A_s^*})$ . This implies  $mcs(t, V(C_i), P) \leq mcs(t, A_s^*, P)$ . But, due to minimality of  $cs(t, A_s^*, P)$ , we have  $mcs(t, V(C_i), P) = mcs(t, A_s^*, P)$ . This finishes the proof.  $\square$