



Anti-Factor Is FPT Parameterized by Treewidth and List Size (But Counting Is Hard)

Dániel Marx ✉ 

CISPA Helmholtz Center for Information Security, Saarbrücken, Germany

Govind S. Sankar ✉ 

Duke University, Durham, NC, USA

Philipp Schepper ✉ 

CISPA Helmholtz Center for Information Security, Saarbrücken, Germany

Abstract

In the general **ANTIFACTOR** problem, a graph G and, for every vertex v of G , a set $X_v \subseteq \mathbb{N}$ of forbidden degrees is given. The task is to find a set S of edges such that the degree of v in S is *not* in the set X_v . Standard techniques (dynamic programming plus fast convolution) can be used to show that if M is the largest forbidden degree, then the problem can be solved in time $(M + 2)^{\text{tw}} \cdot n^{\mathcal{O}(1)}$ if a tree decomposition of width tw is given. However, significantly faster algorithms are possible if the sets X_v are sparse: our main algorithmic result shows that if every vertex has at most x forbidden degrees (we call this special case **ANTIFACTOR_x**), then the problem can be solved in time $(x + 1)^{\mathcal{O}(\text{tw})} \cdot n^{\mathcal{O}(1)}$. That is, **ANTIFACTOR_x** is fixed-parameter tractable parameterized by treewidth tw and the maximum number x of excluded degrees.

Our algorithm uses the technique of representative sets, which can be generalized to the optimization version, but (as expected) not to the counting version of the problem. In fact, we show that **#ANTIFACTOR₁** is already **#W[1]**-hard parameterized by the width of the given decomposition. Moreover, we show that, unlike for the decision version, the standard dynamic programming algorithm is essentially optimal for the counting version. Formally, for a fixed nonempty set X , we denote by **X-ANTIFACTOR** the special case where every vertex v has the same set $X_v = X$ of forbidden degrees. We show the following lower bound for every fixed set X : if there is an $\epsilon > 0$ such that **#X-ANTIFACTOR** can be solved in time $(\max X + 2 - \epsilon)^{\text{tw}} \cdot n^{\mathcal{O}(1)}$ given a tree decomposition of width tw , then the Counting Strong Exponential-Time Hypothesis (**#SETH**) fails.

2012 ACM Subject Classification Theory of computation → Parameterized complexity and exact algorithms

Keywords and phrases Anti-Factor, General Factor, Treewidth, Representative Sets, SETH

Related Version *Conference Version*: doi:10.4230/LIPIcs.IPEC.2022.22 [34]

Funding Research supported by the European Research Council (ERC) consolidator grant No. 725978 **SYSTEMATICGRAPH**.

Philipp Schepper: Part of Saarbrücken Graduate School of Computer Science, Germany.

1 Introduction

Matching problems and their generalizations form a well studied class of problems in combinatorial optimization and computer science [30]. A *perfect matching* is a set S of edges such that every vertex has degree exactly 1 in S ; finding a perfect matching is known to be polynomial-time solvable [19, 24, 36]. In the f -FACTOR problem, an integer $f(v)$ is given for each vertex v and the task is to find a set of edges where every vertex v has degree exactly $f(v)$. A simple transformation reduces f -FACTOR to finding a perfect matching. Conversely, in f -ANTIFACTOR the task is to find a set S of edges where the degree of v is *not* $f(v)$ [38].

The problems above can be unified under the GENERAL FACTOR (GENFAC) problem [12, 31, 33], where one is given a graph G and an associated set of integers B_v for every vertex v of G . The objective is to find a subgraph such that every vertex v has its degree in B_v . Cornuéjols [12] showed that the complexity of GENFAC depends on the maximum gap of the sets B_v . The maximum gap of a set B (denoted by $\max\text{-gap}(B)$) is defined as the largest contiguous sequence of integers not in B but whose boundaries are in B . Cornuéjols [12] showed that if $\max\text{-gap}(B_v) \leq 1$, then GENFAC is polynomial-time solvable. In a sense, we can say that this case is the only one that is polynomial-time solvable. Formally, for a fixed, finite set B of integers, B -FACTOR is the special case of GENFAC where every vertex has the same set $B_v = B$ of allowed degrees. It follows from a result of Dalmau and Ford [16] that if B is a fixed finite set such that $\max\text{-gap}(B) > 1$, then B -FACTOR is NP-hard.

Given the hardness of B -FACTOR in general, Marx et al. [33] studied the complexity of the problem on bounded treewidth graphs. Recall the long history of study on treewidth, which is a measure for how “tree-like” a graph is, [3, 4, 6]. For a wide range of hard problems, algorithms with running time of the form $f(k) \cdot n^{\mathcal{O}(1)}$ exist if the input graph comes with a tree decomposition of width k . In many cases even the best possible form of $f(k)$ in the running time is known (under suitable complexity assumptions, such as the Strong Exponential Time Hypothesis (SETH) [26]). Marx et al. [33] use a combination of standard dynamic programming techniques with fast subset convolution (cf. [40]) to give optimal (under SETH) $(\max B + 1)^{\text{tw}} n^{\mathcal{O}(1)}$ time algorithms for the decision, optimization, and counting versions.

► **Theorem 1.1** (Theorems 1.3–1.6 in [33]). *Fix a finite, non-empty set $B \subseteq \mathbb{N}$.*

- *We can count in time $(\max B + 1)^{\text{tw}} n^{\mathcal{O}(1)}$ the solutions of a certain size for a B -FACTOR instance if we are given a tree decomposition of width tw .*
- *For any $\epsilon > 0$, there is no $(\max B + 1 - \epsilon)^{\text{pw}} n^{\mathcal{O}(1)}$ algorithm for the following problems, even if we are given a path decomposition of width pw , unless SETH (resp. #SETH) fails:*
 - *B -FACTOR and MIN- B -FACTOR if $0 \notin B$ and $\max\text{-gap}(B) > 1$,*
 - *MAX- B -FACTOR if $\max\text{-gap}(B) > 1$,*
 - *# B -FACTOR if $B \neq \{0\}$.*

We study the complementary problem of X -ANTIFACTOR for finite sets X of excluded degrees.

► **Definition 1.2** (X -ANTIFACTOR). *Let $x \in \mathbb{N}$ be fixed. ANTIFACTOR_x is the decision problem of finding for an undirected graph G where all vertices v are assigned a finite set $X_v \subseteq \mathbb{N}$ with $|X_v| \leq x$, a set $S \subseteq E(G)$ such that for all $v \in V$ we have $\deg_S(v) \notin X_v$.*

For a fixed $X \subseteq \mathbb{N}$ with $|X| = x$, we define X -ANTIFACTOR as the restriction of ANTIFACTOR_x to those graphs where all vertices are labeled with the same set X .

► **Note.** \overline{X} -FACTOR, the special case of GENFAC where every vertex has set \overline{X} , precisely corresponds to X -ANTIFACTOR where we set $\overline{X} := \mathbb{N} \setminus X$.

The decision and minimization versions are trivially solvable if $0 \notin X$ as the empty set is a valid solution. Further, if X does not contain two consecutive numbers, then \overline{X} has no gap of size at least two. In this case, by results from Cornu  jols [12] and Dudycz and Paluch [18], the decision, maximization and minimization version of \overline{X} -FACTOR are poly-time solvable.

Our Results. One could expect that similar results can be obtained for X -ANTIFACTOR as for B -FACTOR, but this is very far from the truth and the exact complexity of X -ANTIFACTOR is much less clear. In the B -FACTOR problem, a partial solution (a set of edges that we intend to further extend to a solution) can have degree at most $\max B$ at each vertex, which is the main reason one needs $(\max B + 1)^{\text{tw}} n^{\mathcal{O}(1)}$ running time. For X -ANTIFACTOR, a vertex can also have degree larger than $\max X$ in a (partial) solution, but all degrees larger than $\max X$ are equivalent in some sense. Therefore, the natural running time we expect is $(\max X + 2)^{\text{tw}} n^{\mathcal{O}(1)}$. We show that this running time can be achieved, but requires some modification of the convolution to handle the state “degree more than $\max X$.”

► **Theorem 1.3.** *Let $X \subseteq \mathbb{N}$ be finite and fixed. Given an X -ANTIFACTOR instance and its tree decomposition of width tw . Then we can count the number of solutions of size exactly s in time $(\max X + 2)^{\text{tw}} n^{\mathcal{O}(1)}$ for all s simultaneously.*

However, there are many cases where algorithms significantly faster than $(\max X + 2)^{\text{tw}} n^{\mathcal{O}(1)}$ are possible. At first, this may seem unlikely: at each node of the tree decomposition, the partial solutions can have up to $(\max X + 2)^{\text{tw}+1}$ different equivalence classes¹ and it may seem necessary to find a partial solution for each of these classes. Nevertheless, we show that the technique of *representative sets* can be used to achieve a running time lower than the number of potential equivalence classes. Representative sets were defined by Monien [37] for use in an FPT algorithm for k -PATH, and subsequently found use in many different contexts, including faster dynamic programming algorithms on tree decompositions [1, 5, 7, 20, 21, 22, 28, 35, 39]. The main idea is that we do not need to find a partial solution for each equivalence class, but it is sufficient to find a representative set of partial solutions such that if there is a partial solution that is compatible with some extension, then there is a partial solution in our set that is also compatible with this extension. Our main algorithmic result shows that if X is sparse, then this representative set can be much smaller than $(\max X + 2)^{\text{tw}+1}$, yielding improved algorithms. In particular, ANTIFACTOR_x is FPT parameterized by tw and x .

► **Theorem 1.4.** *One can decide in time $(x + 1)^{\mathcal{O}(\text{tw})} n^{\mathcal{O}(1)}$ whether there is a solution of a certain size for ANTIFACTOR_x assuming a tree decomposition of width tw is given.*

We note that Theorem 1.4 clearly distinguishes X -ANTIFACTOR from B -FACTOR. By the known lower bounds from Marx et al. [33] (cf. Theorem 1.1), a similar result for B -FACTOR is not possible. In light of Theorem 1.4, it is also far from obvious to determine the exact complexity of X -ANTIFACTOR for a fixed set X . The combinatorial properties of the set X influence the complexity of the problem in a subtle way and new algorithmic techniques seem to be needed to fully exploit this. Currently, we do not have a tight bound similar to Theorem 1.1 for every fixed X . Instead we propose a candidate for the combinatorial property that influences the complexity: We define a bipartite compatibility graph for every set X and conjecture that the maximum size of a so-called *half-induced matching* is the key

¹ Recall that in a graph with treewidth tw , the largest bag has size $\text{tw} + 1$.

property to obtain a faster algorithm via representative sets. See Conjecture 4.5 for a formal statement.

We use such half-induced matchings of large size to show a lower bound for ANTIFACTOR_x that, assuming SETH, complements the algorithm in Theorem 1.4 up to constant factors in the exponent (see Theorem 5.5). Moreover, if there is a half-induced matching of size h , then, assuming SETH, we show that there is no $(h - \epsilon)^{\text{tw}} n^{\mathcal{O}(1)}$ algorithm for $X\text{-ANTIFACTOR}$ for any $\epsilon > 0$ (Theorem 5.4). Although, in this case the representative set cannot be smaller than $(h - \epsilon)^{\text{tw}+1}$ for any $\epsilon > 0$ (Lemma 4.4) we do not have matching upper bounds at this point. There are two main reasons why it is difficult to obtain tight upper bounds:

- **Representative set bounds.** In Theorem 1.4, the upper bound on the size of representative sets are based on earlier algebraic techniques [21, 22, 28, 39]. It is not clear how they can be extended to the combinatorial notion of half-induced matchings.
- **Join nodes.** Even if we have tight bounds on the size of representative sets there is an additional issue that can increase the running time. At join nodes of the tree decomposition, we need to compute from two representative sets a third one. Doing this operation in a naive way results in a running time that is at least the *square* of the bound on the size of the representative set. If we want to have a running time that matches the size of the representative set, we need a more clever way of handling join nodes.

Representative sets of the form we study here could be relevant for other problems and tight bounds for such representative sets could be of fundamental importance. In particular, the notion of half-induced matchings could be a key property in other contexts as well.

Counting Problems. We also investigate the $\#\text{ANTIFACTOR}$ problem, where we need to count the total number of solutions satisfying the degree constraints. The idea of representative sets is fundamentally incompatible with exact counting: if we need to count every solution, then we cannot ignore certain partial solutions even if they can be always replaced by others. Therefore, the algorithm of Theorem 1.4 cannot be extended to the counting version.² In fact, we show that already $\#\text{ANTIFACTOR}_1$ is unlikely to be FPT by showing the following stronger statement for path decompositions.

► **Theorem 1.5.** *There is a fixed constant c such that $\#\text{ANTIFACTOR}_1$ cannot be solved in time $\mathcal{O}(n^{\text{pw}-c})$ on graphs with n vertices given a path decomposition of width pw , unless $\#\text{SETH}$ is false. Furthermore, $\#\text{ANTIFACTOR}_1$ is $\#\text{W}[1]$ -hard parameterized by pathwidth.*

Recall that $\#\text{SETH}$ (cf. [14, 17]) is actually a weaker assumption than SETH. Hence, the first result is stronger than a version based on SETH. Moreover, the algorithm from Theorem 1.3 is essentially optimal for $\#X\text{-ANTIFACTOR}$.

► **Theorem 1.6.** *Let $X \subseteq \mathbb{N}$ be a non-empty, finite and fixed set. For any constant $\epsilon > 0$, there is no algorithm that can solve $\#X\text{-ANTIFACTOR}$ in time $(\max X + 2 - \epsilon)^{\text{pw}} n^{\mathcal{O}(1)}$ given a graph along with a path decomposition of width pw , unless $\#\text{SETH}$ fails.*

Organization. The paper is organized as follows. Section 2 presents the algorithms of Theorems 1.3 and 1.4. Section 3 introduces representative sets and proves the results we need in our algorithms. Section 4 introduces half-induced matchings and discusses some combinatorial properties related to representative sets. Sections 5–7 present the lower bounds for the decision, optimization, and counting versions, respectively. One special case, the counting version of EDGE COVER is treated separately in Section 8.

² Counting the solutions approximately is a problem of independent interest.

2 Algorithms

In this section, we use without loss of generality “nice” tree decompositions that have *introduce edge nodes* (see, e.g., [15] for formal definitions). When given a node t of a tree decomposition, we denote by B_t the bag of t , by V_t the vertices introduced at the subtree rooted at t , and by E_t the edges introduced in the subtree rooted at t .

2.1 Parameterizing by the Maximum Excluded Degree

The proof of Theorem 1.3 follows mostly the ideas of the algorithm for GENFAC from Theorem 1.3 in [33]. The main difference is that X is finite and thus \overline{X} is cofinite. Therefore, every degree $d \geq \max X + 1$ is valid for a solution and we identify all such states d with the state $\max X + 1$, denoted by \top in the following. This modification can be handled quite easily for the leaf, introduce vertex, introduce edge and forget nodes. As the convolution technique for the join nodes does not directly transfer, we use another result from [40] which additionally involves zeta and Möbius transforms to obtain the improved running time for the cofinite case.

To simplify notation, we set $U = [0, \max X] \cup \{\top\}$ in the following.

Algorithm. The dynamic program fills a table c such that, for all nodes t of the tree decomposition, all functions $f: B_t \rightarrow U$, and all possible sizes $s \in [0, m]$, it holds that $c[t, f, s] = a$ if and only if there are a partial solutions $S \subseteq E_t$ with $|S| = s$ such that, for all $v \in V_t \setminus B_t$, $\deg_S(v) \notin X$ and, for all $v \in B_t$, we have $\deg_S(v) = f(v)$ if $f(v) \neq \top$ and $\deg_S(v) > \max X$ otherwise.

If the node t is a leaf node, introduce vertex node, introduce edge node, or forget node, then the values $c[t, f, s]$ can be easily computed from the values for $c[t', \cdot, \cdot]$ where t' is the unique child of t in the tree decomposition. For each node t , this computation takes time $(\max X + 2)^{\text{tw}} n^{\mathcal{O}(1)}$ as $m \in \mathcal{O}(n^2)$.

It remains to compute the table entries for the join nodes t . Unless mentioned otherwise, k denotes the size of the bag we consider.

► **Lemma 2.1.** *For a given join node t let t_1 and t_2 be the children. Assume we are given all values of $c[t_1, \cdot, \cdot]$ and $c[t_2, \cdot, \cdot]$. Then, for all (valid) f and s , we can compute the value of $c[t, f, s]$ in time $(\max X + 2)^{\text{tw}} n^{\mathcal{O}(1)}$.*

We define \oplus coordinatewise by extending the standard addition as follows:

$$\forall u, v \in U : u \oplus v := \begin{cases} \top & \text{if } u = \top \vee v = \top \vee u + v > \max X \\ u + v & \text{else} \end{cases}$$

Recall that, for the join node t and given f and s , we want to compute the following:

$$c[t, f, s] := \sum_{\substack{f_1, f_2: B_t \rightarrow U \\ \text{s.t. } f_1 \oplus f_2 = f}} \sum_{s_1 + s_2 = s} c[t_1, f_1, s_1] \cdot c[t_2, f_2, s_2].$$

► **Remark.** The naive computation of $c[t, \cdot, \cdot]$ takes time $|U|^k \cdot m \cdot |U|^{2k} \cdot m \cdot n^{\mathcal{O}(1)} = |U|^{3k} \cdot n^{\mathcal{O}(1)}$.

For the ease of notation, we refer to the values of the table $c[t_1, \cdot, \cdot]$ by a new table c_1 and likewise for c_2 and t_2 . We further omit t from the index of c such that this table only contains the new values we want to compute.

We follow the ideas of the proof of Theorem 2 in [40]. We impose a partial ordering \preceq on U where $u \preceq \top$, for all $u \in U$, and undefined otherwise. We extend this to functions (and also vectors) such that for $f_1, f_2: B_t \rightarrow U$ we have $f_1 \preceq f_2$ if and only if $f_1(x) \preceq f_2(x)$, for all $x \in B_t$. Observe that this partial ordering does *not* extend the standard ordering \leq .

► **Definition 2.2** (Variant of Definition 6 in [40]). *We define the zeta transform of each table $t \in \{c, c_1, c_2\}$ as follows:*

$$\zeta(t)(f, s) := \sum_{g \preceq f} t[g, s].$$

For the computation of $c[f, s]$, we make use of the following lemma.

► **Lemma 2.3** (Proposition 7 in [40]). *Given the memoisation table $A(f, x)$ indexed by state colorings $f \in U^k$ over the label set U and some additional indices x with domain I ,³ the zeta transform $\zeta(A)$ of A based on the partial order \preceq can be computed in $\mathcal{O}(|U|^k k |I|)$ arithmetic operations. Also, given $\zeta(A)$, A can be reconstructed in $\mathcal{O}(|U|^k k |I|)$ arithmetic operations.*

Using this lemma, it is clear that it suffices to compute only the zeta transform of the table c , as the original values can be recovered afterwards. This transformation introduces an additional overhead of $(\max X + 2)^k n^{\mathcal{O}(1)}$ in the running time as we choose I such that $|I| \in \text{poly}(n)$.

► **Lemma 2.4.** *For a fixed set $S \subseteq B_t$, we can compute $\zeta(c)(f, s)$, for all $s \in [0, m]$ and $f: B_t \rightarrow U$ with $f^{-1}(\top) = S$, in time $\mathcal{O}((\max X + 1)^{k-|S|} \cdot m \cdot \max X \cdot k^2 \cdot \log(m \cdot \max X))$.*

Proof. We let $\bar{S} = B_t \setminus S$ be the complement of S with respect to B_t . We decompose the function f as $f = \langle f^\top, f^0 \rangle$ where $f^\top: S \rightarrow \{\top\} \subseteq U$ and $f^0: \bar{S} \rightarrow [0, \max X] \subseteq U$.

Using the definition of the partial ordering \preceq , the zeta-transform, and the fact that $f^{-1}(\top) = S$, we get:

$$\begin{aligned} \zeta(c)(f, s) &= \sum_{g \preceq f} c[g, s] = \sum_{g^\top \preceq f^\top} c[\langle g^\top, f^0 \rangle, s] \\ &= \sum_{g^\top \preceq f^\top} \sum_{\substack{f_1, f_2: B_t \rightarrow U \\ \text{s.t. } f_1 \oplus f_2 = \langle g^\top, f^0 \rangle}} \sum_{s_1 + s_2 = s} c_1[f_1, s_1] \cdot c_2[f_2, s_2] \\ &= \sum_{g^\top \preceq f^\top} \sum_{\substack{g_1, g_2: \bar{S} \rightarrow U \\ \text{s.t. } g_1 \oplus g_2 = g^\top}} \sum_{\substack{f_1, f_2: \bar{S} \rightarrow U \\ \text{s.t. } f_1 + f_2 = f^0}} \sum_{s_1 + s_2 = s} c_1[\langle g_1, f_1 \rangle, s_1] \cdot c_2[\langle g_2, f_2 \rangle, s_2] \end{aligned}$$

Now, observe that, for each pair g_1, g_2 , there is a unique $g^\top \preceq f^\top$ such that $g_1 \oplus g_2 = g^\top$. Thus, we sum over each such pair exactly once.

$$= \sum_{g_1, g_2 \preceq f^\top} \sum_{\substack{f_1, f_2: \bar{S} \rightarrow U \\ \text{s.t. } f_1 + f_2 = f^0}} \sum_{s_1 + s_2 = s} c_1[\langle g_1, f_1 \rangle, s_1] \cdot c_2[\langle g_2, f_2 \rangle, s_2]$$

We reorder the terms using that the g_i 's are chosen independently from the f_i 's.

$$= \sum_{\substack{f_1, f_2: \bar{S} \rightarrow U \\ \text{s.t. } f_1 + f_2 = f^0}} \sum_{s_1 + s_2 = s} \left(\sum_{g_1 \preceq f^\top} c_1[\langle g_1, f_1 \rangle, s_1] \right) \cdot \left(\sum_{g_2 \preceq f^\top} c_2[\langle g_2, f_2 \rangle, s_2] \right)$$

³ I might have more than one dimension.

We exploit that $f_1^{-1}(\top) = f_2^{-1}(\top) = \emptyset$ and apply the definition of the ζ -transform.

$$= \sum_{\substack{f_1, f_2: \bar{S} \rightarrow U \\ \text{s.t. } f_1 + f_2 = f^0}} \sum_{s_1 + s_2 = s} \zeta(c_1)(\langle f^\top, f_1 \rangle, s_1) \cdot \zeta(c_2)(\langle f^\top, f_2 \rangle, s_2)$$

As the vertices v with $f(v) = \top$ are fixed by assumption, the codomain of the functions f_1 and f_2 can be restricted to $[0, \max X]$ as the value \top cannot occur anymore. Hence, the sum almost corresponds to a standard convolution.

We apply the same techniques as the one for the GENFAC-algorithm presented in [33] or originally in [40]. To simplify notation, we set $k^* := k - |S|$ in the following. We define two functions $a_1, a_2: [0, \max X]^{k^*} \times [0, k^* \max X] \times [0, m] \rightarrow \mathbb{F}_p$, for some prime $p > 2^{|E|}$. For $i = 1, 2$, for all $F \in [0, k^* \max X]$, and for all $f': \bar{S} \rightarrow [0, \max X]$, we set:

$$a_i(f, F, s) := \begin{cases} \zeta(c_i)(\langle f^\top, f' \rangle, s) & \text{if } \|f'\| = F \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \quad \text{where } \|f'\| := \sum_{v \in B_t} f'(v).$$

It suffices to compute the following cyclic (i.e., addition is done modulo $\max X + 1$) and non-cyclic convolution for all $f' \in [0, \max X]^{k^*}$, $F \in [0, k^* \max X]$, and $s \in [0, m]$:

$$a(f', F, s) := \sum_{f_1 + f_2 \equiv f'} \sum_{\substack{F_1 + F_2 = F \\ s_1 + s_2 = s}} a_1(f_1, F_1, s_1) \cdot a_2(f_2, F_2, s_2)$$

Then, for all $f': \bar{S} \rightarrow [0, \max X]$ and $s \in [0, m]$, we set $\zeta(c)(\langle f^\top, f' \rangle, s) = a(f', \|f'\|, s)$. Though the sum ranges over $f_1 + f_2 \equiv f'$ where the addition is computed modulo $\max X + 1$ for each component, we effectively just sum values if $f_1 + f_2 = f$. This is due to the fact that we otherwise have that $\|f_1\| + \|f_2\| > \|f'\|$.

By Lemma 3 in [40], we can compute all table entries $\zeta(c)(f, s)$ in time

$$\mathcal{O}\left((\max X + 1)^{k^*} \cdot m \cdot \max X \cdot k^* \cdot (k^* \log(\max X + 1) + \log(k^* m \cdot \max X))\right). \quad \blacktriangleleft$$

Now, we can prove how to compute the table entries for the join nodes.

Proof of Lemma 2.1. First, we compute the zeta transform of c_1 and c_2 by invoking Lemma 2.3. This takes time $\mathcal{O}((\max X + 2)^k km)$.

Lemma 2.4 shows how to handle the case when the set of vertices mapped to \top is fixed. Actually we do not have this assumption as we consider all possible functions f . Instead, we iterate over all subsets $S \subseteq B_t$ and guess by this the vertices v with $f(v) = \top$. Then, for each such S , we compute $\zeta(c)(f, s)$ where $f^{-1}(\top) = S$. We use the binomial theorem to bound the running time for this computation:

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{S \subseteq B_t} \mathcal{O}\left((\max X + 1)^{k - |S|} \cdot m \cdot \max X \cdot k^2 \cdot \log(m \cdot \max X)\right) \\ &= \mathcal{O}\left(m \cdot \max X \cdot k^2 \cdot \log(m \cdot \max X)\right) \cdot \sum_{s \in [0, k]} \binom{k}{s} \cdot (\max X + 1)^{k-s} \\ &= \mathcal{O}\left(m \cdot \max X \cdot k^2 \cdot \log(m \cdot \max X)\right) \cdot (\max X + 2)^k \end{aligned}$$

Using Lemma 2.3, we recover the values of c from $\zeta(c)$ in time $\mathcal{O}((\max X + 2)^k km)$. By this the final running time follows. \blacktriangleleft

2.2 Parameterizing by the Number of Excluded Degrees

In this section we prove Theorem 1.4 which shows that ANTIFACTOR_x is FPT parameterized by treewidth and the *size* x of the set. We first show a naive algorithm, i.e., the standard dynamic programming approach, solving the problem. In a second step, we improve this algorithm by using representative sets. That is, we do not store all solutions but only so much information such that we can correctly solve the decision and optimization version.

2.2.1 Naive Algorithm

Let $X_v \subseteq \mathbb{N}$ be the set assigned to vertex v with $|X_v| \leq x$. Let n be the number of vertices of G and m the number of edges of G . Let $U = [0, n]$ be the universe of the values in the following.

The idea is to fill a table $\text{ParSol}[\cdot, \cdot]$ with partial solutions. That is, for all nodes t of the tree decomposition with bag B_t of size k and all $s \in [0, m]$, we have $\text{ParSol}[t, s] \subseteq U^{B_t}$ and $a \in \text{ParSol}[t, s]$ if and only if there is a set $S \subseteq E_t$ with $|S| = s$ such that $\deg_S(v) \notin X_v$, for all $v \in V_t \setminus B_t$, and $\deg_S(v) = a[v]$, for all $v \in B_t$.

Dynamic Program. Initialize the table ParSol with \emptyset for every entry. We fill the table iteratively, for all nodes t of the tree decomposition and all $s \in [0, m]$, in the following way, depending on s and the type of t .

Leaf Node. As $B_t = \emptyset$, we set $\text{ParSol}[t, 0] := \{\emptyset\}$.

Introduce Vertex Node. Assume v is introduced at t , i.e., $B_t = B_{t'} \cup \{v\}$. We define

$$\text{ParSol}[t, s] := \{a_{v \mapsto 0} \mid a \in \text{ParSol}[t', s]\}.$$

Introduce Edge Node. Assume the edge $e = uv$ is introduced at the node t . We combine the cases where e is not selected for the solution and where e is selected. Thus, we define:

$$\text{ParSol}[t, s] := \text{ParSol}[t', s] \cup \{a_{u \mapsto a(u)+1, v \mapsto a(v)+1} \mid a \in \text{ParSol}[t', s-1]\}.$$

Forget Node. Assume vertex v is forgotten at t , i.e., $B_t = B_{t'} \setminus \{v\}$. We define

$$\text{ParSol}[t, s] := \{a|_{B_t} \mid a \in \text{ParSol}[t', s] : a[v] \notin X_v\}.$$

Join Node. Assume t_1 and t_2 are the two children of t with $B_t = B_{t_1} = B_{t_2}$. Then we define

$$\text{ParSol}[t, s] := \{a_1 + a_2 \mid a_1 \in \text{ParSol}[t_1, s_1], a_2 \in \text{ParSol}[t_2, s_2], s_1 + s_2 = s\}.$$

Let r be the root of the tree decomposition with $B_r = \emptyset$. For a given $s \in [0, m]$, the algorithm finally checks if $\text{ParSol}[r, s] \neq \emptyset$, i.e., $\text{ParSol}[r, s]$ contains the empty vector. Otherwise no solution exists. The correctness of this algorithm follows directly from its definition. Note that the computation might take time $\Omega(n^{\text{tw}+1})$ since the largest bag has size $\text{tw} + 1$.

2.2.2 Improving the Naive Algorithm

The final algorithm is based on the naive algorithm but makes use of so-called representative sets to keep the size of the set stored for each node of the tree decomposition small.

We first define the notion of representative set to state the final algorithm. In Section 3 we show how to actually compute the representative sets.

► **Definition 2.5** (*H-Compatibility*). Let $H = (U \dot{\cup} V, E)$ be an undirected (potentially infinite) bipartite graph. We say that $a \in U$ is *H-compatible* with $b \in V$, denoted by $a \sim_H b$, if $(a, b) \in E$.⁴

Based on this compatibility notation, we define the *H-representation* of a set.

► **Definition 2.6** (*H-Representation*). Let $H = (U \dot{\cup} V, E)$ be an undirected (potentially infinite) bipartite graph. For any $\mathcal{S} \subseteq U$, we say that $\mathcal{S}' \subseteq \mathcal{S}$ *H-represents* \mathcal{S} , denoted by $\mathcal{S}' \subseteq_{H\text{-rep}} \mathcal{S}$ if for every $b \in V$: $\exists a \in \mathcal{S} : a \sim_H b \iff \exists a' \in \mathcal{S}' : a' \sim_H b$.

For the algorithm we make use of this *H-compatibility* and *H-representation* where we use the following graphs.

► **Definition 2.7** (*Compatibility Graph*). For a set $B = \{v_1, \dots, v_k\}$ of k vertices with sets X_1, \dots, X_k of excluded degrees, we define the compatibility graph \mathcal{C}_B as follows:

- $V(\mathcal{C}_B) = U^k \dot{\cup} V^k$ where the elements in U, V are copies of numbers, i.e., $U, V = \mathbb{N}$.
- $E(\mathcal{C}_B) = \{((i_1, \dots, i_k), (j_1, \dots, j_k)) \mid \forall \ell \in [k] : i_\ell + j_\ell \notin X_\ell\}$.

For a node t with bag B_t of the tree decomposition, we denote by \mathcal{C}_t the graph \mathcal{C}_{B_t} .

The intuition is that the vertices in U^k represent the degrees of the constructed partial solution. The vertices in V^k correspond to the degrees of some (disjoint) partial solution one might see in the future. The edges then “check” whether both solutions can be combined, i.e., the degree of each vertex is valid with respect to the union of the solutions.

Final Algorithm. The improved algorithm applies the same operations as the naive algorithm to fill a table c . Then, the algorithm computes a \mathcal{C}_t -representative set for the table entries and just stores these values in c . Only these values are used in the next steps to compute the other table entries.

We show that this preserves the correctness of the algorithm.

▷ **Claim 2.8.** For all t, s : $c[t, s] \subseteq_{\mathcal{C}_t\text{-rep}} \text{ParSol}[t, s]$.

Proof. For ease of notation, we write $a \sim_t b$ in the following if we mean $a \sim_{\mathcal{C}_t} b$. When given an $a \in \text{ParSol}[t, s]$, we denote an arbitrary partial solution that agrees with a by $S(a)$.

Let $\hat{c}[t, s]$ be the table entry *before* the algorithm computes the representative set. By the transitivity of *H-representation*, it suffices to show that $\hat{c}[t, s] \subseteq_{\mathcal{C}_t\text{-rep}} \text{ParSol}[t, s]$ to prove the claim. As $\hat{c}[t, s] \subseteq \text{ParSol}[t, s]$, it suffices to show the forward direction from the definition of \mathcal{C}_t -representation. The proof is a structural induction on the tree decomposition.

Leaf Node. Obviously true as $\text{ParSol}[t, s]$ only contains the empty vector.

Introduce Vertex Node. Let v be the vertex introduced at t and let t' be the unique child of t . Given some $a \in \text{ParSol}[t, s]$ and some b such that $a \sim_t b$.

As v is not incident to any edges yet, $a[v] = 0$ which implies $b[v] \notin X_v$. Thus, $a|_{B_{t'}} \sim_{t'} b|_{B_{t'}}$ and $a|_{B_{t'}} \in \text{ParSol}[t', s]$. The induction hypothesis gives us some $a' \in c[t', s]$ such that $a' \sim_{t'} b|_{B_{t'}}$. Thus, $a'_{v \mapsto 0} \sim_t b$ and further $a'_{v \mapsto 0} \in \hat{c}[t, s]$.

Introduce Edges Node. Let uv be the edge introduced at t and let t' be the unique child of t . Given some $a \in \text{ParSol}[t, s]$ and some b such that $a \sim_t b$.

- If $uv \notin S(a)$, then $a \in \text{ParSol}[t', s]$ and the induction hypothesis provides some $a' \in c[t', s]$ with $a' \sim_{t'} b$. We further get $a' \in \hat{c}[t, s]$.

⁴ Though the graph is undirected, we use tuples to denote the edges. By this the first value denotes the vertex from U and the second value the vertex from V .

- If $uv \in S(a)$, let $\bar{a} = a_{u \mapsto a(u)-1, v \mapsto a(v)-1}$. Observe that $\bar{a} \in \text{ParSol}[t', s-1]$ and $\bar{a} \sim_{t'} \bar{b}$ where $\bar{b} = b_{u \mapsto b(u)+1, v \mapsto b(v)+1}$. Again, the induction hypothesis provides some $\bar{a}' \in c[t', s-1]$ such that $\bar{a}' \sim_{t'} \bar{b}$. With $a' = \bar{a}'_{u \mapsto \bar{a}'(u)+1, v \mapsto \bar{a}'(v)+1}$, we then directly get $a' \in \widehat{c}[t, s]$ and further $a' \sim_t b$.

Forget Node. Let v be the vertex forgotten at t and let t' be the unique child of t . Given some $a \in \text{ParSol}[t, s]$ and some b such that $a \sim_t b$.

There must be some $c \notin X_v$ such that $a_{v \mapsto c} \in \text{ParSol}[t', s]$. Further $a_{v \mapsto c} \sim_{t'} b_{v \mapsto 0}$. The IH provides some $a' \in c[t', s]$ such that $a' \sim_{t'} b_{v \mapsto 0}$. Hence, $a'[v] \notin X_v$ and thus, $a'|_{B_t} \in \widehat{c}[t, s]$ and $a'|_{B_t} \sim_t b$.

Join Node. Let t_1 and t_2 be the children of t . Given some $a \in \text{ParSol}[t, s]$ and some b such that $a \sim_t b$.

By the definition of the tree decomposition, $S(a)$ can be partitioned according to the decomposition. Thus, there are $a_1 \in \text{ParSol}[t_1, s_1]$ and $a_2 \in \text{ParSol}[t_2, s_2]$ such that $a_1 + a_2 = a$ and $s_1 + s_2 = s$. From the definition of \mathcal{C}_t -compatibility, we directly get $a_1 \sim_t b + a_2$ and $a_2 \sim_t b + a_1$.

The induction hypothesis provides some $a'_1 \in c[t_1, s_1]$ such that $a'_1 \sim_t b + a_2$. As this is equivalent to $a_2 \sim_t b + a'_1$, we can apply the induction hypothesis once more to get some $a'_2 \in c[t_2, s_2]$ such that $a'_2 \sim_t b + a'_1$. As this is equivalent to $a'_1 + a'_2 \sim_t b$, the claim follows since $a'_1 + a'_2 \in \widehat{c}[t, s]$. \triangleleft

► **Lemma 2.9.** Assume there is an algorithm that can, for given $B = \{v_1, \dots, v_k\}$ with $|X_v| \leq x$ for all $v \in B$, compute, for a set $S \subseteq [0, n]^k$, a new set $S' \subseteq_{\mathcal{C}_B\text{-rep}} S$ of size $\text{Size}(k)$ in time $\text{Time}(k, |S|)$, where Time and Size are allowed to depend on \mathcal{C}_B and x .

Then, we can decide, for a given ANTIFACTOR_x instance, whether there is a solution of size exactly s in time $\text{Time}(\text{tw}+1, (m+1) \cdot \text{Size}(\text{tw}+1)^2)n^{\mathcal{O}(1)}$ and $\text{Time}(\text{pw}+1, 2 \cdot \text{Size}(\text{pw}+1))n^{\mathcal{O}(1)}$ given a tree and a path decomposition of width tw and pw , respectively.

Proof. We can assume that Time and Size are non-decreasing functions and inductively that the size of the given table entries is bounded by $\text{Size}(\text{tw}+1)$. The running time follows immediately by bounding the size of $c[t, s]$ and then computing its representative set. The correctness follows directly from Claim 2.8. \blacktriangleleft

3 Computing Representative Sets

As mentioned in the previous section, one can think of \mathcal{C}_t -compatibility as checking whether the given partial solution of degree a fits together with some partial solution of degree c arriving in the future. This is done via the bipartition of the compatibility graph and the (non-)existence of the edges, i.e., checking if $a + c$ is not in X . To compute the representative set we avoid this two step procedure by defining the more standard k - q -compatibility.

► **Definition 3.1** (k - q -Compatibility). Let k and q be positive integers. For an $a \in \mathbb{N}^k$ and $b \in \binom{\mathbb{N}}{q}^k$, we say a is k - q -compatible with b , denoted by $a \sim_q^k b$, if and only if, for all $i \in [k]$, it holds that $a[i] \notin b[i]$.

For our purposes we can relate the two compatibility definitions as follows: In \mathcal{C}_t -compatibility one computes $a + c$ and checks if $a + c \notin X$. Instead k - q -compatibility checks if $a \notin X - c$. While both checks are equivalent at this point, the new compatibility version considers *all* possible sets of size at most $q = |X|$ and not just $X - c$ for all c . Hence, k - q -compatibility is independent from the sets X_v which are assigned to the vertices v of the graph.

► **Remark.** One can also define k - q -compatibility using H -compatibility for a bipartite graph H from Definition 2.6: One side of the nodes represents \mathbb{N}^k and the other side $\binom{\mathbb{N}}{q}^k$. Then, we have an edge between $a \in \mathbb{N}^k$ and $b \in \binom{\mathbb{N}}{q}^k$ if and only if $a[i] \notin b[i]$ for all $i \in [k]$.

We extend the notion of compatibility in the standard way to k - q -representation.

► **Definition 3.2** (k - q -Representation). *Let k and q be positive integers. Given a set $\mathcal{S} \subseteq \mathbb{N}^k$, and a set $\mathcal{S}' \subseteq \mathcal{S}$. We say \mathcal{S}' k - q -represents \mathcal{S} , denoted by $\mathcal{S}' \subseteq_{q\text{-rep}}^k \mathcal{S}$, if and only if for all $b \in \binom{\mathbb{N}}{q}^k$: $\exists a \in \mathcal{S} : a \sim_q^k b \iff \exists a' \in \mathcal{S}' : a' \sim_q^k b$.*

For both notations, we omit the value k from the notation if $k = 1$. It remains to check that k - q -compatibility generalizes \mathcal{C}_t -compatibility.

► **Lemma 3.3.** *Let B be a set of k vertices where each $v \in B$ is assigned a set X_v such that $|X_v| \leq x$. Then, the following holds for all $\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{S}' \subseteq \mathbb{N}^k$: If $\mathcal{S}' \subseteq_{x\text{-rep}}^k \mathcal{S}$, then $\mathcal{S}' \subseteq_{\mathcal{C}_B\text{-rep}} \mathcal{S}$.*

Proof. To simplify notation we set $\mathcal{C} = \mathcal{C}_B$ in the following.

Let $a \in \mathcal{S}$ be such that there is some $b \in \mathbb{N}^k$ with $a \sim_{\mathcal{C}} b$. This implies that $a[v] + b[v] \notin X_v$ for all $v \in B$. Rearranging terms yields $a[v] \notin X_v - b[v] := \{z - b[v] \mid z \in X_v\}$ from which we get that $a \sim_x^k (X_1 - b[v_1], \dots, X_k - b[v_k])$. As $\mathcal{S}' \subseteq_{x\text{-rep}}^k \mathcal{S}$, there is some $a' \in \mathcal{S}'$ such that $a' \sim_x^k (X_1 - b[v_1], \dots, X_k - b[v_k])$. We directly get $a'[v] \notin X_v - b[v]$ or equivalently $a'[v] + b[v] \notin X_v$, for all $v \in B$. By the definition of \mathcal{C} -representation, we get $a' \sim_{\mathcal{C}} b$. ◀

Matroids. For the computation of the representative sets we make use of matroids. They allow us to formally state the operations we are using.

► **Definition 3.4** (Matroid). *A matroid is a pair $\mathcal{M} = (E, \mathcal{I})$, where we refer to $I \subseteq 2^E$ as the independent sets of \mathcal{M} , satisfying the following axioms:*

1. $\emptyset \in \mathcal{I}$
2. if $I_1 \subseteq I_2$ and $I_2 \in \mathcal{I}$, then $I_1 \in \mathcal{I}$
3. if $I_1, I_2 \in \mathcal{I}$ and $|I_1| < |I_2|$, then there is some $x \in I_2 \setminus I_1$ such that $I_1 \cup \{x\} \in \mathcal{I}$

In this paper we consider only uniform matroids as they are sufficient for our purpose.

► **Definition 3.5** (Uniform Matroid). *Let U be some universe with n elements and $r \in \mathbb{N}$. Then, $\mathcal{U}_{r,n} = (U, \binom{U}{\leq r})$ is the uniform matroid of rank r , that is, the matroid over the ground set U where the independent sets are all subsets of U of size at most r .*

Later the rank of these uniform matroids corresponds to the number of excluded degrees (plus one). Since the matroid contains all subset of size at most the rank, we automatically consider all possibilities for upcoming solutions.

There are results proving the existence of small representative sets for matroids [21, 22, 28]. Since these results are usually for general matroids, they also apply to uniform matroids which we use here. However, as we are not considering a single matroid but the product of several matroids, the previous results can only be applied partially to our setting. Moreover, one can suspect that these results can be improved by exploiting properties of the uniform matroids. In the following we show two different approaches to compute the representative sets. Surprisingly both are incomparable to each other: The first method gives the faster algorithm when parameterizing by treewidth while the second method gives the faster algorithm when parameterizing by pathwidth.

3.1 First Method

Our first algorithm is based on a previous result for computing representative sets. Despite the fact that Lemma 3.6 is a special case of Lemma 3.4 in [28], our proof uses a completely different technique as we exploit that the given matroids are uniform.

Let ω be the matrix multiplication coefficient in the following, i.e., $\omega < 2.37286$ [2].

► **Lemma 3.6.** *Let $\mathcal{M}_1, \dots, \mathcal{M}_k$ be k uniform matroids, each of rank r , with integer universes U_1, \dots, U_k . Given a set $\mathcal{S} \subseteq U_1 \times \dots \times U_k$, we can find a set $\mathcal{S}' \subseteq_{r-1\text{-rep}}^k \mathcal{S}$ of size r^k in time $\mathcal{O}(|\mathcal{S}| \cdot r^{k(\omega-1)} k)$.*

We essentially follow the proof of Theorem 12.15 in [15] and modify it at those places where we can get better results. Before we start with the proof, we first introduce some notation and results related to matroids.

It is known that every uniform matroids $\mathcal{U} = (U, \mathcal{I})$ of rank r can be represented by a $r \times |U|$ Vandermonde matrix M (where the first row consists only of 1s) over the finite field with p elements, where p must be larger than $|U|$. Each column of M then corresponds to one element in U . If a subset of these columns is independent, then the corresponding elements form an independent set in \mathcal{I} . For all $A \subseteq U$, we define $M^{(A)}$ as the submatrix of M consisting only of those columns that correspond to elements from A .

For a matrix M with r rows, let $M[I]$ denote the submatrix of M containing only the rows indexed by the elements of $I \subseteq [r]$.

We use the following observation in the proof of Lemma 3.6.

► **Observation 3.7** (Observation 12.17 in [15]). *Let $A \in U$ and $B \subseteq U$ with $|B| = r - 1$. Then, $A \sim_{r-1} B$ if and only if $\det([M^{(A)} \mid M^{(B)}]) \neq 0$.*

Proof of Lemma 3.6. Assume that M_1, \dots, M_k are the matrix representations of the matroids $\mathcal{M}_1, \dots, \mathcal{M}_k$. Enumerate all elements I of $[r]^k$ in an arbitrary order I_1, \dots, I_{r^k} .

Then, for all $A \in \mathcal{S}$, we compute the vector v_A , where, for all $j \in [r^k]$, we set

$$v_A[j] := \prod_{i=1}^k M_i[I_j[i], A[i]].$$

Construct a $r^k \times |\mathcal{S}|$ matrix Q , where the vectors v_A are the columns of Q . Then, find a column basis B_Q of Q and output the set $\mathcal{S}' = \{A \mid v_A \in B_Q\}$ as solution. Obviously B_Q contains at most r^k elements.

Computing the vectors v_A takes time $\mathcal{O}(|\mathcal{S}| \cdot r^k \cdot k)$ in total. As the computation of the basis takes time $\mathcal{O}(|\mathcal{S}| \cdot r^{k(\omega-1)})$, the complete procedure requires time $\mathcal{O}(|\mathcal{S}| \cdot r^{k(\omega-1)} \cdot k)$.

Correctness. It remains to show that the set \mathcal{S}' indeed k - q -represents \mathcal{S} . For this we start with some observations about the vectors we just computed. Let $A \in U_1 \times \dots \times U_k$ and $B \in \binom{U_1}{r-1} \times \dots \times \binom{U_k}{r-1}$ in the following.

By Observation 3.7 and the coordinatewise definition of k - q -compatibility, we get

$$A \sim_{r-1}^k B \iff \prod_{i=1}^k \det\left([M_i^{(A[i])} \mid M_i^{(B[i])}]\right) \neq 0. \quad (1)$$

Since $|A[i]| = 1$, it holds that, for all $j \in [r^k]$,

$$v_A[j] = \prod_{i=1}^k M_i[I_j[i], A[i]] = \prod_{i=1}^k \det\left(M_i^{(A[i])}[I_j[i]]\right).$$

Now, for all I_j , we define $\bar{I}_j \in \binom{[r]}{r-1}^k$ such that $\bar{I}_j[\ell] := [r] \setminus \{I_j[\ell]\}$, for all $\ell \in [k]$. We set:

$$u_B[j] = \prod_{i=1}^k \det(M_i^{(B[i])}[\bar{I}_j[i]]).$$

To simplify notation, we set $\sigma_j = (-1)^{\sum_{i=1}^{r^k} I_j[i]}$.

Using the Laplacian expansion to rewrite the computation of the determinant in Equivalence (1), we get:

$$A \sim_{r-1}^k B \iff \sum_{j=1}^{r^k} \sigma_j v_A[j] u_B[j] \neq 0. \quad (2)$$

Let $A \in \mathcal{S}$ such that $A \sim_{r-1}^k B$ for some suitable B . We know that $\sum_{j=1}^{r^k} \sigma_j v_A[j] u_B[j] \neq 0$. As we are given a column basis B_Q for the matrix Q , we can write v_A such that

$$v_A = \sum_{A' \in \mathcal{S}'} \lambda_{A'} v_{A'}.$$

We can substitute this in the sum of Equivalence (2) to get

$$0 \neq \sum_{j=1}^{r^k} \sigma_j v_A[j] u_B[j] = \sum_{j=1}^{r^k} \sum_{A' \in \mathcal{S}'} \lambda_{A'} \sigma_j v_{A'}[j] u_B[j] = \sum_{A' \in \mathcal{S}'} \lambda_{A'} \sum_{j=1}^{r^k} \sigma_j v_{A'}[j] u_B[j].$$

Hence, there must be at least one $A' \in \mathcal{S}'$ such that $\sum_{j=1}^{r^k} \sigma_j v_{A'}[j] u_B[j] \neq 0$. By Equivalence (2), this implies that $A' \sim_{r-1}^k B$ which completes the proof. \blacktriangleleft

To finish the algorithm for ANTIFACTOR_x from Theorem 1.4, it remains, by Lemma 3.3, to compute a k - x -representative set as $|X_v| \leq x$. To achieve this we define k uniform matroids with universe $\{0, \dots, n\}$ and rank $x+1$. Then, plugging in the values from Lemma 3.6 into Lemma 2.9, directly gives the following result. Note that we can assume $x \leq n$.

► **Corollary 3.8.** *Given a tree and a path decomposition, ANTIFACTOR_x can be solved in time $(x+1)^{(\omega+1) \cdot \text{tw}} n^{\mathcal{O}(1)}$ and $(x+1)^{\omega \cdot \text{pw}} n^{\mathcal{O}(1)}$, respectively.*

3.2 Second Method

Kratsch and Wahlström showed [28, Lemma 3.4] a method to compute representative set of products of matroids when the underlying matroid is general. It is known that computing representative sets for a single uniform matroid can be done faster ([21, Section 4] and [39, Section 3]). As the result by Kratsch and Wahlström heavily depends on the algorithm for general matroids (i.e., they do not use it as a black box), we cannot combine it with the improved algorithms for uniform matroids. In the previous section we modified an algorithm to exploit the properties of uniform matroids. In this section, we directly use the faster algorithm for a single uniform matroid to give algorithms not depending on matrix multiplication.

► **Lemma 3.9** (Modified version of Theorem 4.15 in [21]). *There is an algorithm that, for a universe U of size n , given a set $\mathcal{S} \subseteq \binom{U}{p}$ and an integer q , computes in time $\mathcal{O}(|\mathcal{S}| \cdot (1-t)^{-q} \cdot 2^{o(q+p)} \cdot \log n)$ a subfamily $\mathcal{S}' \subseteq_{q\text{-rep}} \mathcal{S}$ such that $|\mathcal{S}'| \leq t^{-p} (1-t)^{-q} \cdot 2^{o(q+p)}$. Where $0 < t < 1$ can be chosen arbitrarily.*

We combine Lemma 3.9 with the result from Lemma 2.9 to prove Lemma 3.10.

► **Lemma 3.10.** *Assuming a tree and path decomposition is given, ANTIFACTOR_x can be solved in time $(x+1)^{4.1 \cdot \text{tw}} 2^{o(x \cdot \text{tw})} n^{\mathcal{O}(1)}$ and $(x+1)^{2.28 \cdot \text{pw}} 2^{o(x \cdot \text{pw})} n^{\mathcal{O}(1)}$, respectively.*

Proof. Let $U = [0, n]$. By Theorem 1.4, it remains to compute the representative set of a given set \mathcal{S} . Create k copies $U^{(1)}, \dots, U^{(k)}$ of U , that is $U^{(i)} = \{j^{(i)} \mid j \in U\}$, and define $\hat{U} = U^{(1)} \cup \dots \cup U^{(k)}$. The copies of the universe allow us to distinguish between the values for the different dimensions. For all $A \in \mathcal{S}$, we let $\hat{A} := \{u_j^{(i)} \mid A[i] = u_j\}$ and define $\hat{\mathcal{S}} := \{\hat{A} \mid A \in \mathcal{S}\}$.

Finally, we define \mathcal{M} to be the uniform matroid of rank $(x+1)k$ with universe \hat{U} of $k(n+1)$ elements. Clearly all sets in $\hat{\mathcal{S}}$ are independent sets. Then, we apply Lemma 3.9 with $p = k$ and $q = xk$ where we choose the parameter t later to get a set $\hat{\mathcal{S}}' \subseteq_{xk\text{-rep}} \hat{\mathcal{S}}$ of size $|\hat{\mathcal{S}}'| \leq t^{-k} (1-t)^{-xk} \cdot 2^{o(xk+k)}$ in time $|\hat{\mathcal{S}}'| \cdot (1-t)^{-xk} \cdot 2^{o(xk+k)} \cdot \log kn$.

It remains to set t such that the running time of the final algorithm is minimized. For the parameterization by treewidth this means minimizing

$$\left(t^{-k} (1-t)^{-xk} \cdot 2^{o(xk+k)}\right)^2 \cdot (1-t)^{-xk} \cdot 2^{o(xk+k)} \cdot \log kn \leq t^{-2k} (1-t)^{-3xk} \cdot 2^{3 \cdot o(xk)} \cdot \log n.$$

It suffices to minimize $t^{-2} (1-t)^{-3x}$ which is achieved by setting $t = 2/(3x+2)$. When replacing this in the above runtime the claim follows by simple computations. The coefficient follows from considering the case for $x = 2$, which is maximizing the runtime.⁵

For the parameterization by pathwidth we have to choose a different parameter as we can exploit that there are no join nodes. We minimize

$$2 \cdot t^{-k} (1-t)^{-xk} \cdot 2^{o(xk+k)} \cdot (1-t)^{-xk} \cdot 2^{o(xk+k)} \cdot \log kn \leq t^{-k} (1-t)^{-2xk} \cdot 2^{2 \cdot o(xk)} \cdot \log n$$

by setting $t = 1/(2x+1)$ which leads to the claimed running time. ◀

4 Half-Induced Matchings

In this section, we introduce *half-induced matchings* and show relations to compatibility graphs and representative sets. We use these properties later to prove the lower bounds for the decision and optimization version of $X\text{-ANTIFACTOR}$ and ANTIFACTOR_x .

► **Definition 4.1** (Half-induced Matching). *Let $G = (U \dot{\cup} V, E)$ be a bipartite graph. G has a half-induced matching of size ℓ if there are pairwise different $a_1, \dots, a_\ell \in U$ and pairwise different $b_1, \dots, b_\ell \in V$ such that (1) $(a_i, b_i) \in E$, for all i , but (2) $(a_i, b_j) \notin E$, for all $j > i$.*

By an abuse of notation, \mathcal{C}_X denotes the compatibility graph for a vertex with set X of forbidden degrees. We show that arithmetic progressions in the set of excluded degrees are sufficient to obtain large half-induced matchings in the corresponding compatibility graph.

► **Lemma 4.2.** *If X contains an arithmetic progression of length ℓ , but not one of length $\ell+1$, then \mathcal{C}_X has a half-induced matching of size $\ell+1$.*

Proof. Let $a, a+d, a+2d, \dots, a+(\ell-1)d \in X$ be an arithmetic progression with $d \geq 1$ such that $a+\ell d \notin X$. We construct the following half-induced matching in \mathcal{C}_X where, for all $i \in [\ell+1]$, we set $a_i := d(i-1)$ and $b_i := a + (\ell+1-i)d$.

⁵ The case where $x \leq 1$ is polynomial time solvable and thus not relevant.

Then, for all $i \in [\ell + 1]$, we have $a_i + b_i = d(i - 1) + a + (\ell + 1 - i)d = a + \ell d \notin X$ and hence, $(a_i, b_i) \in E(\mathcal{C}_X)$. Similarly, for all $i \in [\ell]$ and all $i < j \in [\ell + 1]$, we have $(a_i, b_j) \notin E(\mathcal{C}_X)$ because $a_i + b_j = d(i - 1) + a + (\ell + 1 - j)d = a + (\ell + i - j)d \in X$. \blacktriangleleft

Conversely to the previous lemma, we also prove that arithmetic progressions are necessary to obtain large half-induced matchings.

► Lemma 4.3. *Let $X \subseteq \mathbb{N}$ with $|X| = \ell \geq 2$. Suppose \mathcal{C}_X contains a half-induced matching of size $\ell + 1$. Then, X is an arithmetic progression.*

Proof. Let $a_1, \dots, a_{\ell+1}$ and $b_1, \dots, b_{\ell+1}$ be the vertices of the half-induced matching of size $\ell + 1$ in \mathcal{C}_X . Then, we have the following constraints:

$$\begin{array}{llll} a_1 + b_2 \in X, & a_1 + b_3 \in X, & \dots, & a_1 + b_{\ell+1} \in X \\ & a_2 + b_3 \in X, & \dots, & a_2 + b_{\ell+1} \in X \end{array}$$

Let $X = \{x_1, x_2, \dots, x_\ell\}$ where $x_i \leq x_{i+1}$. From $a_1 + b_j \neq a_1 + b_{j'}$ for any $j \neq j'$, we get

$$\{a_1 + b_2, a_1 + b_3, \dots, a_1 + b_{\ell+1}\} = X.$$

Now, consider the second set of constraints. As the b_j are pairwise different, there is some i such that

$$\{a_2 + b_3, a_2 + b_4, \dots, a_2 + b_{\ell+1}\} = X \setminus \{x_i\}.$$

We set $d := a_2 - a_1$. Assuming $d > 0$, we get $x_\ell + d \notin X$ and thus

$$\{x_1 + d, x_2 + d, x_3 + d, \dots, x_{\ell-1} + d\} = X \setminus \{x_i\}.$$

Now, observe that x_1 cannot belong to the left-hand side because $d > 0$ and $x_1 = \min(X)$. Thus, we have that $i = 1$. Similarly, for $a_2 - a_1 = d < 0$ we can argue that $i = \ell$. Without loss of generality consider the former case. Then, we have that $x_i + d = x_{i+1}$, for all $i \in [\ell]$. Hence, X is an arithmetic progression of length ℓ . \blacktriangleleft

For a graph \mathcal{C} and an integer $k > 1$, we extend $\sim_{\mathcal{C}}$ and $\subseteq_{\mathcal{C}\text{-rep}}$ to k dimensions, denoted by $\sim_{\mathcal{C}}^k$ and $\subseteq_{\mathcal{C}\text{-rep}}^k$, such that the \mathcal{C} -compatibility must hold for each dimension.

► Lemma 4.4. *Let $X \subseteq \mathbb{N}$, and $\epsilon > 0$ and $\ell \geq 2$ be constants. Then, there exists a constant k depending only on ϵ and ℓ such that the following holds. Suppose the compatibility graph \mathcal{C}_X contains a half-induced matching of size ℓ . Then, there is a set $\mathcal{S} \subseteq \mathbb{N}^k$ such that every representative set $\mathcal{S}' \subseteq_{\mathcal{C}_X\text{-rep}}^k \mathcal{S}$ has size $|\mathcal{S}'| \geq (\ell - \epsilon)^k$.*

Before we prove the lemma, we briefly discuss its implications. The running time of the algorithm for X -ANTIFACTOR from Theorem 1.4 depends on the size of the representative sets computed. Lemma 4.4 implies that any such algorithm using representative sets in a similar way takes time at least $(\ell - \epsilon)^{\text{pw}}$. This can be seen as an *unconditional* version of the lower bounds for the decision and optimization version shown in Theorems 5.4 and 6.2.

Proof. We set the value of k later. Let the half-induced matching be between $A, B \subseteq \mathbb{N}$ with $A = \{a_1, \dots, a_\ell\}$ and $B = \{b_1, \dots, b_\ell\}$. We define indexing functions ind_A and ind_B such that $\text{ind}_A(a_i) = \text{ind}_B(b_i) = i$. For $s \in A^k$, we define $\text{ind}_A(s) = \sum_{i \in [k]} \text{ind}_A(s[i])$. We partition A^k into sets \mathcal{S}_q with $q \in [\ell \cdot k]$ such that

$$\mathcal{S}_q = \{s \in A^k \mid \text{ind}_A(s) = q\}.$$

Hence, there exists some $q' \in [\ell \cdot k]$ such that

$$|\mathcal{S}_{q'}| \geq \frac{\ell^k}{\ell \cdot k}.$$

Let $\mathcal{S} = \mathcal{S}_{q'}$ be the set for which we want a lower bound on the size of its representative sets. To simplify notation, we let $q = q'$. Now, consider some $s \in \mathcal{S}$. We claim that s is the unique compatible element for $t \in B^k$, where

$$t[i] = b_{\text{ind}_A(s[i])}.$$

It is clear that $s \sim_{\mathcal{C}_X}^k t$. Suppose there is some other $s' \in \mathcal{S}$ such that $s' \sim_{\mathcal{C}_X}^k t$. Then, since $\text{ind}_A(s) = \text{ind}_A(s') = q$ and since $s \neq s'$, there is some index j such that $\text{ind}_A(s[j]) > \text{ind}_A(s'[j])$. The j th index of $s' + t$ is $a_{\text{ind}_A(s'[j])} + b_{\text{ind}_A(s[j])}$ because $s'[j] = a_{\text{ind}_A(s'[j])}$. However, observe that this sum must be in X from the fact that there is a half-induced matching between A and B in \mathcal{C}_X and the fact that $\text{ind}_A(s[j]) > \text{ind}_A(s'[j])$. This is a contradiction, implying that s is the only compatible partner of t . Thus, s is forced to belong to any representative set $\mathcal{S}' \subseteq_{\mathcal{C}_X\text{-rep}}^k \mathcal{S}$.

Since the above argument holds for all $s \in \mathcal{S}$, we conclude that the only representative set for \mathcal{S} is itself. Now, we set k to be large enough such that $k \log(\ell - \epsilon) \leq k \log(\ell) - \log(\ell \cdot k)$. Then, we have

$$|\mathcal{S}| \geq \frac{\ell^k}{\ell \cdot k} \geq (\ell - \epsilon)^k. \quad \blacktriangleleft$$

We conjecture that the converse of Lemma 4.4 is also true. For example, for $X = \{10, 100, 1000, \dots\}$ the largest half-induced matching in \mathcal{C}_X is of size three, a constant, (even though X itself is infinite). Intuitively, the size of the representative set itself must be small because knowing any *two* forbidden degrees of a vertex in the future solution is enough for us to deduce the degree of the vertex in the partial solution.

► **Conjecture 4.5.** *Let $X \subseteq \mathbb{N}$ and $\ell \geq 2$ be a constant. Then, there exists a constant k depending only on ℓ such that the following holds. Suppose the largest half-induced matching in \mathcal{C}_X has size ℓ . Then, every $\mathcal{S} \subseteq \mathbb{N}^k$ has a representative set $\mathcal{S}' \subseteq_{\mathcal{C}_X\text{-rep}}^k \mathcal{S}$ with $|\mathcal{S}'| \leq \ell^{k+o(k)}$.*

Recall, the runtime of the algorithm in Theorem 1.3 depends on $\max X$ but the lower bound in Theorem 5.4 on the size ℓ of the half-induced matching. With Conjecture 4.5 it seems reasonable to get algorithms for the decision and optimization version based on representative sets with a running time depending on ℓ . This would complement the lower bound. Note, by Theorem 7.3, the $(\max X + 2)^{\text{pw}n^{\mathcal{O}(1)}}$ algorithm for the counting version is essentially optimal.

5 Lower Bounds for the Decision Version

In this section we prove the lower bounds for the decision version of X -ANTIFACTOR and ANTIFACTOR_x. Instead of showing the lower bound directly, we first define the following intermediate problem and show the hardness of this problem.

► **Definition 5.1** (X -ANTIFACTOR^R). *Let $X \subseteq \mathbb{N}$ be fixed and finite. Let $G = (V_S \dot{\cup} V_C, E)$ be a vertex labeled graph such that*

- *all vertices in V_S , called simple vertices, are labeled with set X ,*
- *all vertices $v \in V_C$, called complex vertices, are labeled with a relation R_v that is given as a truth table such that $R_v \subseteq 2^{I(v)}$ where $I(v)$ is the set of edges incident to v in G .*

A set $\widehat{E} \subseteq E$ is a solution for G if (1) for $v \in V_S$: $\deg_{\widehat{E}}(v) \notin X$ and (2) for $v \in V_C$: $I(v) \cap \widehat{E} \in R_v$.

X -ANTIFACTOR WITH RELATIONS (X -ANTIFACTOR $^{\mathcal{R}}$) is the problem of deciding if such an instance G has a solution.

We show our lower bounds based on this problem definition.

► **Lemma 5.2** (Lower Bound for X -ANTIFACTOR $^{\mathcal{R}}$). *Let $X \subseteq \mathbb{N}$ be a fixed set which contains a half-induced matching of size $h \geq 2$.*

Let $f_X: \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^+$ be an arbitrary function that may depend on the set X .

For every constant $\epsilon > 0$, there is no algorithm that can solve X -ANTIFACTOR $^{\mathcal{R}}$ in time $(h - \epsilon)^{\text{pw} + f_X(\Delta^)} n^{\mathcal{O}(1)}$, where $\Delta^* = \max_{\text{bag } B} \sum_{v \in B \cap V_C} \deg(v)$, even if we are given a path decomposition of width pw , unless SETH fails.*

In a second step we remove the relations and replace them by appropriate gadgets. To be able to reuse the reduction later we introduce a slightly more general version of the problem. For two finite sets $X, Y \subseteq \mathbb{N}$, we define (X, Y) -ANTIFACTOR as the generalization of X -ANTIFACTOR where we allow the sets X and Y to be assigned to the vertices. We show hardness when $0 \in X$ and when $\max\text{-gap}(\overline{X}) > 1$. The former is to ensure that there are no trivial solutions and the latter ensures that the problem is not polynomial-time solvable [12]. Recall that $\max\text{-gap}(\overline{X})$ is the size of the largest contiguous sequence of integers not in \overline{X} but whose boundaries are in \overline{X} .

► **Lemma 5.3.** *Fix a finite set $X \subseteq \mathbb{N}$ such that $0 \in X$ and $\max\text{-gap}(\overline{X}) > 1$. Let $Y \subseteq \mathbb{N}$ be arbitrary. There is a many-one reduction from Y -ANTIFACTOR $^{\mathcal{R}}$ to (X, Y) -ANTIFACTOR such that pathwidth increases by at most $f(\Delta^*)$ and size by a factor of $f(\Delta^*)$, where $\Delta^* = \max_{\text{bag } B} \sum_{v \in B \cap V_C} \deg(v)$.*

By combining the lower bound for the intermediate problem from Lemma 5.2 with the reduction from Lemma 5.3, we can show the lower bounds for X -ANTIFACTOR and ANTIFACTOR $_x$.

► **Theorem 5.4** (Lower Bound for Decision Version I). *Fix a finite set $X \subseteq \mathbb{N}$ such that*

- $0 \in X$ and $\max\text{-gap}(\overline{X}) > 1$,
- and X contains a half-induced matching of size h .

For every constant $\epsilon > 0$, there is no algorithm that can solve X -ANTIFACTOR in time $(h - \epsilon)^{\text{pw}} n^{\mathcal{O}(1)}$ even if we are given a path decomposition of width pw , unless SETH fails.


Proof. Let H be a given X -ANTIFACTOR $^{\mathcal{R}}$ instance for which we apply Lemma 5.3 with $X = Y$ to obtain the X -ANTIFACTOR instance G .

We know $n_G \leq n_H \cdot f(\Delta_H^*)$ and $\text{pw}_G \leq \text{pw}_H + f(\Delta_H^*)$. Assume we are given a faster algorithm for X -ANTIFACTOR and run this algorithm on the instance G in the following time:

$$\begin{aligned} (h - \epsilon)^{\text{pw}_G} \cdot n_G^{\mathcal{O}(1)} &\leq (h - \epsilon)^{\text{pw}_H + f(\Delta_H^*)} \cdot (n_H \cdot f(\Delta_H^*))^{\mathcal{O}(1)} \\ &\leq (h - \epsilon)^{\text{pw}_H + f(\Delta_H^*) + f''(\Delta_H^*)} \cdot n_H^{\mathcal{O}(1)} \\ &\leq (h - \epsilon)^{\text{pw}_H + f''(\Delta_H^*)} \cdot n_H^{\mathcal{O}(1)} \end{aligned}$$

Thus, the running time directly contradicts SETH by Lemma 5.2. ◀

The following Theorem 5.5 extends Theorem 5.4 to the more general ANTIFACTOR $_x$ problem and shows a more informative lower bound.



■ **Figure 1** The transformation in the proof of Lemma 5.2. The red, orange, green, and blue edges represent the left-external, left-internal, right-internal, and right-external edges, respectively.

► **Theorem 5.5** (Lower Bound for Decision Version II). *For all $x \geq 3$ and $\epsilon > 0$, $\text{ANTI} \text{FACTOR}_x$ cannot be solved in time $(x + 1 - \epsilon)^{\text{pw}} n^{\mathcal{O}(1)}$ on graphs given with a path decomposition of width pw , unless SETH fails.*

Proof. We set $Y := \{2, 4, \dots, 2x\}$ and $X := \{0, 2, 3\}$. By Lemma 4.2, Y contains a half-induced matching of size $x + 1$. Moreover, \overline{X} contains a gap of size two.

We use Lemma 5.3 to transform a Y - $\text{ANTI} \text{FACTOR}^{\mathcal{R}}$ instance into an (X, Y) - $\text{ANTI} \text{FACTOR}^{\mathcal{R}}$ instance. From $|X|, |Y| \leq x$ and by the properties of X and Y , the claim follows directly. ◀

5.1 Replacing Finite Sets by Cofinite Sets

In this section, we prove Lemma 5.2, i.e., the lower bound for X - $\text{ANTI} \text{FACTOR}^{\mathcal{R}}$, based on a lower bound from [33] for the intermediate problem B - $\text{FACTOR}^{\mathcal{R}}$.

► **Definition 5.6** (B - $\text{FACTOR}^{\mathcal{R}}$ (Definition 4.1 in [33])). *Let $B \subseteq \mathbb{N}$ be fixed of finite size. $G = (V_S \cup V_C, E)$ is an instance of B - FACTOR WITH RELATIONS (B - $\text{FACTOR}^{\mathcal{R}}$) if all nodes in V_S are labeled with set B and all nodes $v \in V_C$ are labeled with a relation R_v that is given as a truth table such that the following holds:*

1. *Let $I(v)$ be the set of edges incident to v in G . Then $R_v \subseteq 2^{I(v)}$.*
2. *There is an even $c_v > 0$ such that for all $x \in R_v$ we have $\text{hw}(x) = c_v$.*

A set $\hat{E} \subseteq E$ is a solution for G if (1) for $v \in V_S$: $\deg_{\hat{E}}(v) \in B$ and (2) for $v \in V_C$: $I(v) \cap \hat{E} \in R_v$. B - $\text{FACTOR}^{\mathcal{R}}$ is the problem of deciding if such an instance has a solution. We call V_S the set of simple nodes and V_C the set of complex nodes.

We use the corresponding lower bound for B - $\text{FACTOR}^{\mathcal{R}}$ and the restrictions to the graph as a starting point for our construction.

► **Lemma 5.7** (Corollaries 4.7 and 4.8 in the full version of [33]). *Let $B \subseteq \mathbb{N}$ be a fixed and finite set. Given a B - $\text{FACTOR}^{\mathcal{R}}$ instance*

- *and its path decomposition of width pw with $\Delta^* = \max_{\text{bag } B} \sum_{v \in B \cap V_C} \deg(v)$,*
- *moreover the simple vertices form an independent set and each simple vertex is only connected to 2 complex nodes by exactly $\max B$ (parallel) edges each,*
- *and we are given the promise that with respect to any solution the degree of the simple vertices is exactly $\max B$.*

Assume B - $\text{FACTOR}^{\mathcal{R}}$ can be solved in such a case in $(\max B + 1 - \epsilon)^{\text{pw} + f_B(\Delta^)} n^{\mathcal{O}(1)}$ time for some $\epsilon > 0$ and some function $f_B: \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^+$ that may depend on the set B . Then SETH fails. Moreover the result also holds for $\#B$ - $\text{FACTOR}^{\mathcal{R}}$ and $\#\text{SETH}$.*

To show a lower bound for X - $\text{ANTI} \text{FACTOR}^{\mathcal{R}}$, it suffices to replace the simple vertices with set B by an appropriate gadgets consisting of simple vertices with set X and complex vertices.

Modification of the Graph. Let a_0, \dots, a_{h-1} and b_0, \dots, b_{h-1} be the labels of the half-induced matching of size h of X and let U be the maximum over these labels. Let H be a $B\text{-FACTOR}^{\mathcal{R}}$ instance as stated in Lemma 5.7 with $\max B = h - 1$.⁶ We replace each simple vertex by the following gadget and keep the other vertices unchanged (see Figure 1).

By assumption, each simple vertex v is incident to $2(h - 1)$ edges which we can partition into two sets of size $h - 1$ depending on their endpoints. We call these groups of edges the left-external and right-external edges. We remove v and connect the left-external edges to a new complex vertex v_{left} with relation R_{left} . The right-external edges are connected similarly to another new complex vertex v_{right} with relation R_{right} . As a last step, we create a new simple vertex v' with set X . We connect v' by U (parallel) edges to v_{left} and call these edges the left-internal edges. Additionally, we connect v' by U parallel edges to v_{right} and call these edges the right-internal edges.

The relation R_{left} accepts if and only if, for some $i \in [0, h - 1]$, exactly i left-external and exactly a_{h-1-i} left-internal edges are selected. Similarly, R_{right} accepts if and only if, for some $j \in [0, h - 1]$, exactly b_j right-internal and exactly j right-external edges are selected.

We claim that the above replacement does not change the existence of solutions. For this we show that the number of selected left-external edges plus the number of selected right-external edges is at most $h - 1$ for each such modification. Then, by the properties in Lemma 5.7, they sum to exactly $h - 1$ selected edges.

If i left-external edges are selected, then v' is incident to a_{h-1-i} selected left-internal edges, by definition of R_{left} . As R_{right} rejects when v_{right} is incident to exactly k selected right-internal edges where $k \neq b_j$ for all j , vertex v' must be incident to b_j right-internal edges for some j . By the definition of the half-induced matching, we get $a_{h-1-i} + b_j \in X$ if $j > h - 1 - i$. Thus, some $b_{h-1-i-i'}$ with $h - 1 - i \geq i' \geq 0$ must be chosen. The relation R_{right} maps the $b_{h-1-i-i'}$ selected right-internal edges to $h - 1 - i - i'$ selected right-external edges. Thus, the gadget is incident to $i + (h - 1 - i - i') = h - 1 - i' \leq h - 1$ edges in total.

As v was only adjacent to complex vertices, we can merge the complex vertices v_{left} and v_{right} with the existing complex vertices and thus, also the corresponding relations.

We analyze how the size and the pathwidth change. Replacing the simple vertices by the gadget does not change the pathwidth of the graph but only increases the degree of the complex vertices (due to the merging of the relations). Hence, Δ^* increases to at most $\Delta^* \cdot U$. As U only depends on the set X , it can be bounded by $\hat{f}(\max X)$ for some function \hat{f} .

Proof of Lemma 5.2. Let H be a given $B\text{-FACTOR}^{\mathcal{R}}$ instance where $B = \{h - 1\}$ for which we apply the above construction to obtain the $X\text{-ANTIFACTOR}^{\mathcal{R}}$ instance G .

Since the size and the pathwidth of G and H are the same, we denote them by n and pw in the following. From the construction we get $\Delta_G^* \leq \Delta_H^* \cdot \hat{f}(\max X)$. Assume we are given a faster algorithm for $X\text{-ANTIFACTOR}^{\mathcal{R}}$ for some function f_X . We run this algorithm on the instance G in the following time:

$$\begin{aligned} (h - \epsilon)^{\text{pw} + f_X(\Delta_G^*)} \cdot n^{\mathcal{O}(1)} &\leq (h - \epsilon)^{\text{pw} + f_X(\Delta_H^* \cdot \hat{f}(\max X))} \cdot n^{\mathcal{O}(1)} \\ &\leq ((h - 1) + 1 - \epsilon)^{\text{pw} + f'_X(\Delta_H^*)} \cdot n^{\mathcal{O}(1)} \end{aligned}$$

As X is fixed, $\hat{f}(\max X)$ can be seen as part of the function f'_X which is allowed to depend on B and thus also on X . By Lemma 5.7, the running time directly contradicts SETH. ◀

⁶ It actually suffices to set $B = \{h - 1\}$.

5.2 Replacing the Relations

It remains to prove Lemma 5.3, where we replace the relations by appropriate graphs. We use the same definition of realization as in [33].

► **Definition 5.8** (Realization (Definition 5.1 in [33])). *Let $R \subseteq \{0, 1\}^k$ be a relation. Let G be a node-labeled graph with dangling edges $D = \{d_1, \dots, d_k\} \subseteq E(G)$. We say that graph G realizes R if for all $D' \subseteq D$: $D' \in R$ if and only if there is a solution $S \subseteq E(G)$ with $S \cap D = D'$.*

By assumption we have $\max\text{-gap}(\overline{X}) > 1$ and $0 \in X$. Hence, we can use some of the constructions from [33] although a careful analysis is necessary since we are now using the cofinite set \overline{X} and the original constructions are for finite sets. Nevertheless, this makes the construction easier, as we know that \overline{X} always contains an even and an odd number, e.g., $\max X + 1$ and $\max X + 2$.

► **Definition 5.9.** *We denote by $\text{HW}_{\in S}^{(d)}$ the symmetric d -ary relation that only accepts if the Hamming weight of the input (i.e., the number of ones) is contained in S .*

To simplify notation we set $\text{HW}_{=k}^{(d)} = \text{HW}_{\in \{k\}}^{(d)}$ and $\text{EQ}_d = \text{HW}_{\in \{0, d\}}^{(d)}$. We call the latter relations also equality relations.

We write $\text{HW}_{=k}$ for the set of all relations $\text{HW}_{=k}^{(d)}$ with $d \geq 1$.

► **Lemma 5.10.** *We can realize the relations $\text{HW}_{=1}^{(1)}$ and EQ_k , for all $k \geq 1$, by simple graphs of at most $k \cdot (\max X)^{\mathcal{O}(1)}$ vertices of degree at most $\max X + 3$.*

Proof. We use ideas from Lemma 5.4 and Item 1 of Lemma 5.8 in [33].

- We first construct a $\text{HW}_{=2}^{(2)}$ gadget. For this we take a clique with $\min \overline{X} + 1 > 1$ vertices and split one edge into two dangling edges. As we know that any degree $d \leq \min \overline{X}$ is forbidden, both dangling edges must always be selected.
- Next, we realize $\text{HW}_{\in \{0, 1\}}^{(1)}$ which is equivalent to EQ_1 . For this we take a new vertex v and force $2\lceil(\max X + 1)/2\rceil$ edges to it by using $\lceil(\max X + 1)/2\rceil$ copies of a $\text{HW}_{=2}^{(2)}$ gadget. Adding one dangling edge to v gives the stated gadget, as the vertex v already has $2\lceil(\max X + 1)/2\rceil \geq \max X + 1$ neighbors and adding more neighbors does not make the solution invalid.
- For a $\text{HW}_{=1}^{(1)}$ gadget we connect a $\text{HW}_{=2}^{(2)}$ gadget and a EQ_1 gadget. The unused edge of the $\text{HW}_{=2}^{(2)}$ gadget acts as the dangling edge.
- It suffices to realize EQ_{d+1} where $d = \max\text{-gap}(\overline{X}) > 1$. Then, we can realize EQ_k for arbitrary k by connecting $\ell = \lceil(k - 2)/(d - 1)\rceil$ copies of a EQ_d gadget in a path-like manner. To $k - \ell(d - 1) - 2$ dangling edges we add one EQ_1 gadget each such that the EQ_{d+1} gadget has the correct arity.

From $\max\text{-gap}(\overline{X}) = d$, we know that there is some $a \geq 1$ such that $[a, a + d + 1] \cap X = [a + 1, a + d]$. We start with a new vertex v and force a edges to v using the $\text{HW}_{=1}^{(1)}$ relations.

Then, it suffices to add $d + 1$ dangling edges to v to realize EQ_{d+1} . ◀

We additionally need $\text{HW}_{=1}^{(k)}$ gadgets which we realize next.

► **Lemma 5.11.** *For all $k \geq 1$, we can realize the relations $\text{HW}_{=1}^{(k)}$ by simple graphs of at most $k \cdot (\max X)^{\mathcal{O}(1)}$ vertices of degree at most $\max X + 3$.*

Proof. It suffices to construct $\text{HW}_{=1}^{(2)}$ and $\text{HW}_{=1}^{(3)}$ as the case $k = 1$ transfers directly from the previous lemma. Then, we realize the other relations inductively: Assume we already realized $\text{HW}_{=\ell}^{(1)}$ for some $\ell \geq 3$. We connect a $\text{HW}_{=\ell}^{(1)}$ and a $\text{HW}_{=3}^{(1)}$ node to a common $\text{HW}_{=2}^{(1)}$ node.

Replacing the relations by their realization, completes the construction. See Lemma 5.5 in [33] for more details.

The construction of $\text{HW}_{=1}^{(2)}$ and $\text{HW}_{=1}^{(3)}$ follows the construction from Lemma 5.8 in [33]. Since \overline{X} has a gap of size at least 2, there is some $d \geq 2$ and some $a \geq 1$ such that $[a, a + d + 1] \cap \overline{X} = \{a, a + d + 1\}$. To construct $\text{HW}_{=1}^{(k)}$, for $k = 2, 3$, create two vertices u and v . Create k copies of an EQ_3 gadgets and for each copy connect one dangling edge to u , one dangling edge to v , and use the last dangling edge as a dangling edge for the $\text{HW}_{=1}^{(k)}$ gadget. Attach $a + d$ pendant nodes with relation $\text{HW}_{=1}^{(1)}$ to u and attach $a - 1$ pendant nodes with relation $\text{HW}_{=1}^{(1)}$ to v . This realizes $\text{HW}_{=1}^{(k)}$ because at most one of the k edges connecting u to the EQ_3 gadgets can be selected since $a - 1 + k \in X$ and at least 1 of the k edges connecting v to the EQ_3 gadgets has to be selected since $a + d \in X$. ◀

Based on the results in [14] and their extension to B -FACTOR in Theorem 5.2 of [33], one can easily show Lemma 5.12. These constructions use only EQ_k and $\text{HW}_{=1}^{(k)}$ gadgets which are available to us via Lemmas 5.10 and 5.11. Moreover, as we can realize EQ_k and $\text{HW}_{=1}^{(k)}$, for all k , we do not need to impose any restrictions on the relations we want to realize.

► **Lemma 5.12.** *Let $R \subseteq \{0, 1\}^e$ be any relation. Then, we can realize R by a simple graph of at most $f(e) \cdot (\max X)^{O(1)}$ vertices with degree at most $\max X + 3$.*

With Lemma 5.12 we can prove the correctness of the second step of our reduction, which removes the relations from the graph.

Proof of Lemma 5.3. For a given Y -ANTIFACTOR ^{\mathcal{R}} instance H , replace all complex vertices and their relations by the realizations guaranteed by Lemma 5.12 to get an (X, Y) -ANTIFACTOR instance G . This step uses only vertices with set X while the vertices with set Y remain unchanged.

Observe that the size of the realizations of a relation with degree d is bounded by $f(d)$ for some function f which might depend on X . By this we can bound the size of G by $n_G \leq n_H \cdot f(\Delta_H^*)$. We additionally modify the path decomposition. We replace each complex vertex in a bag B by the vertices of the realization of the corresponding relation. Thus, the size of the bags increases at most by $\Delta_H^* \cdot f(\Delta_H^*)$ which can be bounded by $f'(\Delta_H^*)$ for some appropriate f' . ◀

6 Lower Bounds for the Optimization Version

For the optimization version we need to consider the minimization and the maximization version. Observe that when assuming $0 \in X$ (i.e., the empty set is *not* a valid solution), the hardness and lower bounds for these two problems follow from the decision version. Further, the minimization version is trivial if $0 \notin X$, as the empty set is the unique smallest solution. Thus, it suffices to focus on the maximization version where $0 \notin X$, i.e., the empty set is always a valid solution. As the optimization version is polynomial time solvable if all gaps are of size at most one [18], we can assume that at least one gap has size at least two. Surprisingly it can be shown that if there is only one gap of size larger than two and this gap is from 1 to k for some $k \geq 1$, then the maximization version can be solved in polynomial time.

► **Theorem 6.1.** *Let $X = [1, k]$ for some $k \geq 1$. Then, MAX- X -ANTIFACTOR can be solved in polynomial time.*

Proof. We want to find a subset of edges such that every vertex has either 0 or at least $k + 1$ selected incident edges.

The algorithm is as follows, where V are the vertices of the given graph G and $G[W]$ returns the induced graph on the vertices of $W \subseteq V$:

1. Let $W = V$.
2. Repeatedly remove all vertices $v \in W$ with $\deg_{G[W]}(v) \leq k$ from W .
3. Return $E(G[W])$ as the solution.

Clearly the algorithm runs in polynomial time, as each vertex can be removed at most once and the check of the degree can be done in time linear in the size of the graph.

As each vertex in W has degree at least k and the vertices in $V \setminus W$ have degree 0, the output is a valid solution. Observe that all vertices in $V \setminus W$ must have degree 0 for all possible solutions. Thus, all solutions must be a subset of the edges of the induced graph $G[W]$. Hence, the returned solution is indeed maximum. \blacktriangleleft

For the case when $0 \notin X$ together with $X \neq [1, k]$, for all $k \geq 1$, we show similar lower bounds as for the decision version. These lower bounds are again based on half-induced matchings.

► **Theorem 6.2** (Lower Bound for Maximization Version I). *Fix a finite set $X \subseteq \mathbb{N}$ such that*
 ■ $\text{max-gap}(\overline{X}) > 1$
 ■ *and X contains a half-induced matching of size $h \geq 2$.*

For every constant $\epsilon > 0$, there is no algorithm that can solve MAX- X -ANTIFACTOR in time $(h - \epsilon)^{\text{pw}} n^{\mathcal{O}(1)}$ even if we are given a path decomposition of width pw , unless SETH fails.

The underlying reduction is again split into two parts. The first one is a lower bound for MAX- X -ANTIFACTOR^R and follows the same procedure as for the decision version.

► **Lemma 6.3** (Lower Bound for MAX- X -ANTIFACTOR^R). *Let $X \subseteq \mathbb{N}$ be a fixed set such that it contains a half-induced matching of size $h \geq 2$.*

Let $f_X: \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^+$ be an arbitrary function that may depend on X .

For every constant $\epsilon > 0$, there is no algorithm that can solve MAX- X -ANTIFACTOR^R in time $(h - \epsilon)^{\text{pw} + f_X(\Delta^)} n^{\mathcal{O}(1)}$, where $\Delta^* = \max_{\text{bag } B} \sum_{v \in B \cap V_C} \deg(v)$, even if we are given a path decomposition of width pw , unless SETH fails.*

As for the decision version, the second step follows the ideas from [33] but we have to modify the constructions to take care of the cofinite set of allowed degrees. We define MAX- (X, Y) -ANTIFACTOR in the natural way, as we did for the decision version.

► **Lemma 6.4.** *Fix a finite set $X \subseteq \mathbb{N}$ such that $0 \notin X$ and $\text{max-gap}(\overline{X}) > 1$ but $X \neq [1, k]$, for all $k \geq 1$. Let $Y \subseteq \mathbb{N}$ be arbitrary.*

There is a many-one reduction from MAX- Y -ANTIFACTOR^R to MAX- (X, Y) -ANTIFACTOR such that pathwidth increases by at most $f(\Delta^)$, the size by a factor of $f(\Delta^*)$, and the degree to at least $\max X + 2$, where $\Delta^* = \max_{\text{bag } B} \sum_{v \in B \cap V_C} \deg(v)$.*

Using Lemmas 6.3 and 6.4, we prove the lower bound when parameterizing by the set.

Proof of Theorem 6.2. The proof combines Lemmas 6.3 and 6.4. The analysis of the size and the running time is the same as for the decision version in Theorem 5.4. \blacktriangleleft

Additionally, we show a lower bound when parameterizing by the number of excluded degrees. Again this proof follows the one from the decision version.

► **Theorem 6.5** (Lower Bound for Maximization Version II). *For all $x \geq 3$ and $\epsilon > 0$, MAX-ANTIFACTOR _{x} cannot be solved in time $(x + 1 - \epsilon)^{\text{pw}} n^{\mathcal{O}(1)}$ on graphs given with a path decomposition of width pw , unless SETH fails.*

6.1 Replacing the Relations

We can again use some of the machinery from the lower bound for MAX-B-FACTOR in [33]. As for the decision version, we need to carefully check the construction as the set of allowed degrees is now cofinite.

We start by defining the realization of a relation for the maximization version which varies slightly from the definition for the decision version, as we cannot rule out the existence of solutions in all cases.

► **Definition 6.6** (Realization (cf. Definition 6.1 in [33])). *Let $R \subseteq \{0, 1\}^k$ be a relation. Let G be a graph with dangling edges $D = \{d_1, \dots, d_k\}$. We say that G realizes R with penalty β if we can efficiently construct/find an $\alpha > 0$ such that for every $D' \subseteq D$:*

- *If $D' \in R$, then there is a solution $S \subseteq E(G)$ such that $S \cap D = D'$ and $|S| = \alpha$.*
 - *If $D' \notin R$, then, for every solution $S \subseteq E(G)$ such that $S \cap D = D'$, we have $|S| \leq \alpha - \beta$.*
- The construction of the most basic building block, i.e., forcing edges to be in the solution, still applies since there is a gap of size at least 2 in \bar{X} .

► **Lemma 6.7** (Lemma 6.6 in [33]). *There is a function $f: \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ such that the following holds. We can realize $\text{HW}_{=2}^{(2)}$ (with distinct portal vertices) with arbitrary penalty β by simple graphs using $f(\beta)$ vertices with set X and degree at most $\max X + 1$.*

We use this as a building block to realize $\text{HW}_{=1}^{(k)}$ and EQ_k relations, following which we argue that all relations can be realized.

► **Lemma 6.8.** *There is a function $f: \mathbb{N} \times \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ such that the following holds. For any $k \geq 1$, we can realize $\text{HW}_{=1}^{(k)}$ and EQ_k with arbitrary penalty β by simple graphs using $f(\beta, k)$ vertices of degree at most $\max X + 3$.*

Proof. We know $\max\text{-gap}(\bar{X}) > 1$. Let $a \geq 0$ be such that $[a, a + d + 1] \cap X = [a + 1, a + d]$. We realize the relations in several steps since some of our constructions for $\text{HW}_{=1}^{(k)}$ depend on $\text{EQ}_{k'}$ gadgets and vice versa.

- $\text{HW}_{\in\{0,1\}}^{(1)}$:⁷ Force at least $\max X + 1$ edges to a new vertex v by $\lceil (\max X + 1)/2 \rceil$ copies of a $\text{HW}_{=2}^{(2)}$ node. Add one dangling edge to this vertex v and replace all nodes by their realizations. Note that the relation $\text{HW}_{\in\{0,1\}}^{(1)}$ is always satisfied and hence, we never need the penalty of the $\text{HW}_{=2}^{(2)}$ nodes, i.e., setting it to 1 is already sufficient.
- $\text{HW}_{=1}^{(1)}$: We connect a $\text{HW}_{=2}^{(2)}$ gadget to a $\text{HW}_{\in\{0,1\}}^{(1)}$ gadget from above. Replace both relations by their realizations with penalty $\beta + 1$. It is clear that unless the dangling edge is selected, we have a penalty of at least β because the relation $\text{HW}_{=2}^{(2)}$ is not satisfied.
- $\text{HW}_{\in\{0,d+1\}}^{(d+1)}$: Start with a new vertex and force a edges to it by making it adjacent to a copies of a $\text{HW}_{=1}^{(1)}$ node. Further, add $d + 1$ dangling edges to the new vertex and replace all nodes by their realization with a penalty of $\beta + 2$.
- $\text{HW}_{=1}^{(2)}$: Create two complex vertices v_1 and v_2 with relation $\text{HW}_{\in\{0,d+1\}}^{(d+1)}$. For all $i \in [d - 1]$ (we know $d - 1 \geq 1$), create a new vertex u_i , connect it to v_1 and v_2 , and attach $a + d$ vertices with relation $\text{HW}_{=1}^{(1)}$ to u_i . Unless the $\text{HW}_{=1}^{(1)}$ nodes incur a penalty, each u_i needs at least one of their edges to v_1 or v_2 to be selected because $a + d \in X$.

⁷ Strictly speaking this gadget does not realize $\text{HW}_{\in\{0,1\}}^{(1)}$ as the solution size varies depending on whether the dangling edge is selected or not. We write EQ_1 if we use a gadget that is indeed realizing this relation. The same holds for such gadgets of higher degree.

Now we have two cases. If $a > 0$, then connect v_1 and v_2 to a new vertex u_0 connected to $a - 1$ vertices with relation $\text{HW}_{=1}^{(1)}$. Vertex u_0 needs at most one of its edges to the $\text{HW}_{\in\{0,d+1\}}^{(d+1)}$ node to be selected because $a \notin X, a + 1 \in X$.

If $a = 0$, then we know that we have another gap between a' and $a' + d' + 1$ for some $a' > 0$ and $d' \geq 1$. Connect v_1 and v_2 to a new vertex u_0 which is connected to $a' - 1 \geq 0$ vertices with relation $\text{HW}_{=1}^{(1)}$. Similar arguments apply as before.

Finally, we replace all relations by their realizations with a penalty of $\beta + 2$.

- $\text{HW}_{=1}^{(3)}$: When $a > 0$, we can realize this in the same way as $\text{HW}_{=1}^{(2)}$ by using the construction with three $\text{HW}_{\in\{0,d+1\}}^{(d+1)}$ vertices v_i instead of two.

When $a = 0$, we first do the following: Connect a vertex to $d - 1$ nodes with relation $\text{HW}_{=1}^{(1)}$ and 3 nodes with relation $\text{HW}_{=1}^{(2)}$. Add one dangling edge to each of the $\text{HW}_{=1}^{(2)}$ gadgets. When all nodes are replaced with realizations of penalty $\beta + 3$, this realizes a $\text{HW}_{=1}^{(3)}$ or a $\text{HW}_{\in\{0,1\}}^{(3)}$ depending on whether $d + 2 \in X$. In the former case, we are done.

In the latter case, we reuse the construction for $\text{HW}_{=1}^{(2)}$ once more. Similarly as for the case $a > 0$, we use three vertices with relation $\text{HW}_{\in\{0,d+1\}}^{(d+1)}$ instead of two. Then, replace the vertex u_0 and its attached $\text{HW}_{=1}^{(1)}$ nodes by the realization of $\text{HW}_{\in\{0,1\}}^{(1)}$ which we created above. As before, we replace all vertices by their realization with penalty $\beta + 3$.

- $\text{HW}_{=1}^{(k)}$: By the previous items, the cases $k = 1, 2, 3$ are already handled. For larger k we use the same inductive construction as the one from Lemma 5.5 in [33]. We connect a $\text{HW}_{=1}^{(k)}$ gadget and a $\text{HW}_{=1}^{(3)}$ gadget to a common $\text{HW}_{=1}^{(2)}$ gadget. The degree of this gadget is $k + 1$. If either the $\text{HW}_{=1}^{(3)}$ or the $\text{HW}_{=1}^{(k)}$ gadget are incident to exactly one edge, then the other gadget is also incident to one edge because of the shared $\text{HW}_{=1}^{(2)}$ gadget. Recursively replace all gadget by their realization with penalty $\beta + 1$ as each additionally selected edge forces one more relation to be invalid.

- EQ_k : Create vertices v_1, \dots, v_k and u_1, \dots, u_k , all with relation $\text{HW}_{\in\{0,d+1\}}^{(d+1)}$. We connect v_i to v_{i+1} and u_i to u_{i+1} , for all $i \in [k - 1]$. Moreover we connect v_i and u_i to $(d + 1) - 3 \geq 0$ shared $\text{HW}_{=1}^{(2)}$ nodes by on edge each. The vertices v_1 and u_1 are connected by one more $\text{HW}_{=1}^{(2)}$ node. Similarly for v_k and u_k . Then, we make one $\text{HW}_{\in\{0,1\}}^{(1)}$ node adjacent to each u_i and add one dangling edge to each v_i . Replacing all relations by their realization with penalty $\beta + 2k(d + 1)$ completes the construction.

If zero or k dangling edges are selected, then we can select all edges incident to the u_i s or v_i s, respectively. Since v_1 and u_1 are always connected by a $\text{HW}_{=1}^{(2)}$ node,⁸ we cannot create a larger solution without violating any relation. As we can extend this selection to the realizations, the size of the solution is in both cases the same.

Now, assume that $\ell \in [k - 1]$ dangling edges are selected. Then, for any solution, we know that there must be some v_i and v_{i+1} such that at least one of these two relations is not satisfied. Hence, we loose a factor of $\beta + 2k(d + 1)$. Further observe that the graph contains $2k(d + 1)$ edges. Hence, we loose a factor of β compared to the optimal solution. For this to work we crucially need that the nodes with relation $\text{HW}_{\in\{0,d+1\}}^{(d+1)}$ and $\text{HW}_{\in\{0,1\}}^{(1)}$ are no realizations so that the dangling edges are not included in the size of the solutions. ◀

As for the decision version, it suffices to realize EQ_k and $\text{HW}_{=1}^{(k)}$. Then, we can use the same construction as in Theorem 6.2 in [33] to realize arbitrary relations. As we can realize EQ_k and $\text{HW}_{=1}^{(k)}$, for all k and not just specific k , we do not need any constraints for the relation.

⁸ If $d = 2$, the nodes v_i, u_i are not be connected for all $i \in [2, k - 1]$.

► **Lemma 6.9.** *There is a function $f: \mathbb{N} \times \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ such that the following holds. Let $R \subseteq \{0, 1\}^e$ be a relation. Then, we can realize R with arbitrary penalty β by simple graphs using $f(e, \beta)$ vertices of degree at most $\max X + 3$.*

With this lemma we can prove the second step of our reduction, namely Lemma 6.4.

Proof of Lemma 6.4. We follow the outline of the proof for the decision version from Lemma 5.3. For the realizations of the relations we set the penalty to be twice the degree of the relation. Thus, the size depends only on the degree of the relation (and the set X).

Consider the realization of a complex vertex of degree δ . Assume we try to create a larger solution by additionally selecting up to δ incident edges. Thus, if this selection does not satisfy the relation (otherwise the total size does not change by definition) we lose a factor of 2δ by the choice of the penalty. Hence, this selection does not increase the size of the solution and, therefore, all relations must be satisfied. See Lemma 6.3 in [33] for a detailed proof. ◀

7 Lower Bounds for the Counting Version

In this section we prove the two lower bounds for the counting version. While the lower bound for the decision and maximization version of X -ANTI_{FACTOR} rely on half-induced matching, we avoid this dependence for $\#X$ -ANTI_{FACTOR} by using interpolation techniques. This allows us to show a tight lower bound compared to the running time of the algorithm from Theorem 1.3. For the case when $X = \{0\}$, that is $\#$ EDGE_{COVER}, we show a completely independent but also tight lower bound in Section 8.

We also parameterize by the size x of the set of forbidden degrees. We design a new construction to prove the $\#W[1]$ -hardness of $\#$ ANTI_{FACTOR} $_x$, even if $x = 1$, when parameterizing by treewidth. Hence, $\#$ ANTI_{FACTOR} $_x$ is most likely not fixed-parameter tractable.

Both bounds use the same two-step approach as for the decision and optimization version; we first show the hardness of an intermediate problem which uses arbitrary relations and then remove these relations by a chain of reductions to obtain the actual lower bounds.

Parameterizing by the Maximum of the Set. We first show a lower bound for the intermediate problem $\#X$ -ANTI_{FACTOR} $^{\mathcal{R}}$, which is the counting version of X -ANTI_{FACTOR} $^{\mathcal{R}}$. Recall that we define $\Delta^* = \max_{\text{bag } B} \sum_{v \in B \cap V_G} \deg(v)$ for a graph which contains relations.

► **Lemma 7.1** (Lower Bound for $\#X$ -ANTI_{FACTOR} $^{\mathcal{R}}$). *Let $X \subseteq \mathbb{N}$ be a fixed, non-empty and finite set.*

For every constant $\epsilon > 0$, there is no algorithm that can solve $\#X$ -ANTI_{FACTOR} $^{\mathcal{R}}$ in time $(\max X + 2 - \epsilon)^{\text{pw}} n^{\mathcal{O}(1)}$ even if we are given a path decomposition of width pw and $\Delta^ \in \mathcal{O}(\max X)$, unless $\#$ SETH fails.*

We make use of Lemma 7.2 to remove the relations. We extend the definition of (X, Y) -ANTI_{FACTOR} in the natural way to the counting version $\#(X, Y)$ -ANTI_{FACTOR}.

► **Lemma 7.2.** *Let $X \subseteq \mathbb{N}$ be a finite set such that $X \not\subseteq \{0\}$. Let $Y \subseteq \mathbb{N}$ be arbitrary (possibly be given as input).*

There is a Turing reduction from $\#Y$ -ANTI_{FACTOR} $^{\mathcal{R}}$ to $\#(X, Y)$ -ANTI_{FACTOR} increasing the size from n to $n \cdot f(\max X)$, decreasing Δ^ to zero, and increasing pw to $\text{pw} + \Delta^* \cdot f(\max X)$.*

Combining Lemmas 7.1 and 7.2, we can prove the first lower bound for the counting version.

► **Theorem 7.3** (Lower Bound for Counting Version I). *Let $X \subseteq \mathbb{N}$ be a finite and fixed set such that $X \not\subseteq \{0\}$. For every constant $\epsilon > 0$, there is no algorithm that can solve $\#X$ -ANTIFACTOR in time $(\max X + 2 - \epsilon)^{\text{pw}} n^{\mathcal{O}(1)}$ even if we are given a path decomposition of width pw , unless $\#SETH$ fails.*

Proof. For a given $\#X$ -ANTIFACTOR $^{\mathcal{R}}$ instance H with $\Delta_H^* \in \max X$ we apply Lemma 7.2 with $X = Y$ to obtain a $\#X$ -ANTIFACTOR instance G .

We know $n_G \leq n_H \cdot f(\max X)$, and $\text{pw}_G \leq \text{pw}_H + \Delta_H^* \cdot f(\max X)$. Assume the claimed algorithm exists, for some $\epsilon > 0$, and run it on this instance:

$$\begin{aligned} (\max X + 2 - \epsilon)^{\text{pw}_G} \cdot n_G^{\mathcal{O}(1)} &\leq (\max X + 2 - \epsilon)^{\text{pw}_H + \Delta_H^* \cdot f(\max X)} \cdot (n_H \cdot f(\max X))^{\mathcal{O}(1)} \\ &\leq (\max X + 2 - \epsilon)^{\text{pw}_H + \Delta_H^* \cdot f(\max X) + f'(\max X)} \cdot n_H^{\mathcal{O}(1)} \end{aligned}$$

By our assumption, we have $\Delta_H^* \in \mathcal{O}(\max X)$. Since X is fixed, we can treat $\max X$ as a constant. Hence, the term $\Delta_H^* \cdot f(\max X) + f'(\max X)$ in the exponent contributes only a constant. Thus, the running time directly contradicts $\#SETH$ by Lemma 7.1. ◀

Parameterizing by the Size of the Set. If we do not fix the set X but only the *size* of the set, the decision and optimization version of ANTIFACTOR $_x$ are still FPT parameterized by treewidth. For $\#ANTIFACTOR_x$ the following result conditionally rules out such algorithms.

► **Lemma 7.4.** *There exists a constant c such that there is no $\mathcal{O}(n^{p-c})$ algorithm for $\#ANTIFACTOR_1^{\mathcal{R}}$ on n -vertex graphs with $\Delta^* \in \mathcal{O}(1)$, even if only one set is used and we are given a path decomposition of width p , unless $\#SETH$ is false.*

Combined with Lemma 7.2 to remove the relations, we get the hardness result in Theorem 7.5.

► **Theorem 7.5** (Lower Bound for Counting Version II). *There exists a constant c such that there is no $\mathcal{O}(n^{p-c})$ algorithm for $\#ANTIFACTOR_1$ on n -vertex graphs, even if we are given a path decomposition of width p , unless $\#SETH$ is false.*

Proof. Let G be a given $\#ANTIFACTOR_1^{\mathcal{R}}$ instance which uses just one set $Y \subseteq \mathbb{N}$ with $|Y| = 1$. Use Lemma 7.2 with $X = \{2\}$ to transform G into a $\#ANTIFACTOR_1$ instance H .

Now assume the claim is false, i.e., for all $c > 0$, there is a $\mathcal{O}(n_H^{\text{pw}_H - c})$ algorithm. Run this algorithm on the new instance H :

$$\mathcal{O}(n_H^{\text{pw}_H - c}) \leq \mathcal{O}(n_G^{\text{pw}_G + \mathcal{O}(1) - c}) \leq \mathcal{O}(n_G^{\text{pw} - (c - \mathcal{O}(1))}) \leq \mathcal{O}(n_G^{\text{pw} - c'}).$$


Hence, for all c' , there is an $\mathcal{O}(n_G^{\text{pw}_G - c'})$ algorithm for $\#ANTIFACTOR_1^{\mathcal{R}}$. This contradicts $\#SETH$ by Lemma 7.4. ◀

We prove Lemma 7.4 by a reduction from the $\#W[1]$ -hard problem COUNTING COLORFUL HITTING k -SETS. Hence, the following result holds by applying Lemma 7.2 as before.

► **Theorem 7.6.** *$\#ANTIFACTOR_1$ is $\#W[1]$ -hard.*

7.1 High-level Construction for SETH Lower Bound

We show the hardness of $\#X$ -ANTIFACTOR $^{\mathcal{R}}$, i.e., Lemma 7.1, by a reduction from $\#B$ -FACTOR. Recall, for the decision and optimization version we added some gadgets between the (simple) vertices and their neighbors. For the counting version we use a different approach which only attaches gadgets to the (simple) vertices without altering the remaining graph structure. As this modification is not directly possible, the reduction splits into multiple steps. See Figure 2 for an illustration of these steps.



■ **Figure 2** The reduction in the proof of Lemma 7.1, i.e., the lower bound of $\#X\text{-ANTIFACTOR}^{\mathcal{R}}$, follows from a chain of reduction where, for some $x \geq 0$, we have $B = \{x + 1\}$ and $X \subseteq \mathbb{N}$ is a finite and non-empty set with $\max X = x$. The combined reduction is shown by a dotted line. For each problem on the left side a lower bound is formally proved, while for the problems on the right only reductions are stated.

- The first step makes the transition from a finite set of allowed degrees (i.e., the $\#B\text{-FACTOR}$ problem) to a simple cofinite set of allowed degrees (i.e., $\#[0, x]\text{-ANTIFACTOR}$ for some $x \geq 0$). Formally, we show in Lemma 7.7 a lower bound for $\#\text{MIN-}X\text{-ANTIFACTOR}$ with $X = [0, x]$ and $x \geq 0$.
The $\#\text{MIN-}X\text{-ANTIFACTOR}$ problem is the variant of $\#X\text{-ANTIFACTOR}$ where we only count solutions of *minimum* size.
- In the second step we remove the requirement of counting only minimum solutions. In Lemma 7.8 we use interpolation techniques to reduce from $\#\text{MIN-}X\text{-ANTIFACTOR}$ to the *edge-weighted* $\#X\text{-ANTIFACTOR}$ problem where $X = [0, x]$ with $x \geq 0$.
For the edge-weighted version of the problem the edges are assigned weights by which they contribute to the solution if they are selected. The weight of a solution is the product of the weights of the selected edges. The output of the problem is the sum of all weighted solutions. The unweighted problem can be seen as assigning weight 1 to all edges.
- As a third step we transition from simple cofinite sets of allowed degrees to arbitrary cofinite sets of allowed degrees. This step introduces relations, a technique we have already seen in earlier problems. Formally, Lemma 7.9 shows a reduction from the problem of the previous step to the *edge- and relation-weighted* $\#X\text{-ANTIFACTOR}^{\mathcal{R}}$ problem.
In this problem each accepted input of a relation is assigned a (rational) weight. Then, an accepted input contributes by this weight to the solution. The weight of the solution is the product of the weights of the relations multiplied by the weights of the selected edges. The problem without relation-weights can be obtained by assigning weight 1 to all accepted inputs and weight 0 to all rejected inputs.
- The last two steps are dedicated to removing the weights from the relations and from the

edges. We remove the relation-weights in Lemma 7.10 by using additional edge-weights.

- The last step in Lemma 7.11 removes these edge-weights by an appropriate Turing-reduction combined with known techniques for the interpolation of multivariate polynomials.

The Holant Framework. We use the Holant framework (cf. [10, 11, 23, 25, 27, 32]) to contextualize several versions of #ANTIFACTOR. The framework was already extensively used in proving the #SETH lower bounds for COUNTING PERFECT MATCHINGS [14] and COUNTING GENERAL FACTORS [33].

In the Holant framework, we are given a signature graph $\Omega = (V, E)$, where every edge $e \in E$ has a weight w_e . Every vertex $v \in V$ is labeled with a signature $f_v: \{0, 1\}^{I(v)} \rightarrow \mathbb{Q}$, where $I(v)$ is the incidence vector of edges incident to v . A *solution* is a subset of edges such that the signature for each vertex is non-zero. The weight of a solution is the product of the weights of all edges in the solution multiplied by the product of the signatures of all the vertices. Then, the Holant of Ω is defined as the sum of the weights of all solutions.

$$\text{Holant}(\Omega) = \sum_{x \in \{0,1\}^{E(\Omega)}} \prod_{e \in x} w_e \prod_{v \in V(\Omega)} f_v(x|_{I(v)}).$$

The Holant problem is easily seen to be a weighted generalization of the counting versions of GENFAC and ANTIFACTOR. For example, the problem #X-ANTIFACTOR is a Holant problem on unweighted graphs where every vertex has the following symmetric relation.

$$f(z) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } \text{hw}(z) \notin X \\ 0 & \text{if } \text{hw}(z) \in X \end{cases}$$

where $\text{hw}(\cdot)$ is the Hamming weight operator. We call vertices with such functions to be $\text{HW}_{\in \overline{X}}$ nodes.

For relations R_1, \dots, R_k , we define $\text{Holant}(R_1, \dots, R_k)$ to be the set of Holant problems where every edge is unweighted and every vertex has signature R_j , for some $j \in [k]$. By an abuse of notation also let R_j be a *family* of relations. For example, we may use $\text{Holant}(\text{HW}_{=1})$ when every vertex has relation $\text{HW}_{=1}^{(k)}$, for some k .

The *edge- and relation-weighted* version of #X-ANTIFACTOR^R corresponds to a variant of the Holant problem where we have the signature $\text{HW}_{\in \overline{X}}$ for all simple vertices not having a specified signature.

The *edge-weighted* version of #X-ANTIFACTOR^R corresponds to a variant of the Holant problem where we additionally require that the value of the signatures is either 0 or 1, i.e., they only accept or reject.

The Chain of Reductions. We prove the lower bound in Lemma 7.7 by a reduction from #B-FACTOR^R where $B = \{\max X + 1\}$. Observe that a direct reduction to #X-ANTIFACTOR is non-trivial although $B \subseteq \overline{X}$: Let H be a given #B-FACTOR^R instance. When treating H as a #X-ANTIFACTOR^R instance G , each solution of H is also a solution for G because of our choice of B . However, the converse is not true. Indeed, as X is finite (and thus the set of allowed degree is cofinite), the degree of the solutions for G can be larger than $\max X + 1$. We avoid this issue by only counting solutions which have minimum size. Then, no vertex can have degree larger than $\max X + 1$ in the solution.

► **Lemma 7.7.** *Let $X = [0, x - 1]$ be a fixed set for some $x \geq 1$. For every constant $\epsilon > 0$, there is no algorithm that can, even if we are given a path decomposition of width pw , solve #MIN-X-ANTIFACTOR in time $(x + 1 - \epsilon)^{\text{pw}} n^{O(1)}$, unless #SETH fails.*

Proof. Assume the claimed algorithm for $\# \text{MIN-}X\text{-ANTI} \text{FACTOR}$ exists. We use this algorithm to give a faster algorithm for $\#B\text{-FACTOR}$ where $B := \{\max X + 1\} = \{x\}$ to contradict $\# \text{SETH}$ by Theorem 1.1.

Let H be an instance of $\#B\text{-FACTOR}$. Use Theorem 1.1 to check if H has a solution, i.e., an x -factor. If H has no such solution, then return 0 as solution. Otherwise, we replace all vertices in H with set B (of allowed degrees) by vertices with the set X (of forbidden degrees) to obtain an instance G of $\# \text{MIN-}X\text{-ANTI} \text{FACTOR}$. Then, we apply the algorithm for $\# \text{MIN-}X\text{-ANTI} \text{FACTOR}$ and return the number of solutions.

We first analyze the runtime of the algorithm for $\#B\text{-FACTOR}$. By Theorem 1.1, it can be checked in time $(\max B + 1)^{\text{pw}n} n^{\mathcal{O}(1)} = (x + 1)^{\text{pw}n} n^{\mathcal{O}(1)}$ if H has a solution. Given H , the construction of instance G takes time polynomially in the size of H . Hence, the claimed algorithm for $\# \text{MIN-}X\text{-ANTI} \text{FACTOR}$ directly contradicts Theorem 1.1 assuming the above algorithm is correct.

It remains to argue that the above procedure correctly solves $\#B\text{-FACTOR}$. By definition, we have $B \subseteq \mathbb{N} \setminus X$ and thus, every solution for H is also a solution for G . Hence, we get

$$\# \text{Sol}(H) \leq \# \text{Sol}(G)$$

To show the converse of this inequality, we can assume that H has a solution S_0 (the algorithm checked this initially). Consider a minimum solution S of G that is not an x -factor (the other case is trivial). Since $X = [0, x - 1]$, there must be some vertex $v \in V(G)$ such that $\deg_S(v) > x$. We get

$$2|S| = \sum_{v \in V(G)} \deg_S(v) > |V(G)| \cdot x.$$

Recall, we assumed that H has a solution S_0 and moreover, S_0 is an x -factor. Using that all vertices are incident to exactly x selected edges in S_0 , we have

$$2|S_0| = \sum_{v \in V(H)} \deg_{S_0}(v) = |V(H)| \cdot x.$$

Hence, S is of larger size than S_0 which contradicts the assumption that S is a minimum solution for G .

Therefore, there is no vertex v in S with $\deg_S(v) > x$ which proves that S is a solution for H and we get


$$\# \text{Sol}(G) \leq \# \text{Sol}(H)$$

which concludes the proof. ◀

As a next step we remove the restriction of counting only minimum solutions. For this we introduce edge-weights and compute the (weighted) number of solutions. Then, we recover the number of solutions for the original instance by polynomial interpolation techniques.

► **Lemma 7.8.** *Let $X = [0, x - 1] \subseteq \mathbb{N}$ be a finite and non-empty set for some $x \geq 1$. There is a Turing-reduction from $\# \text{MIN-}X\text{-ANTI} \text{FACTOR}$ to edge-weighted $\#X\text{-ANTI} \text{FACTOR}$ with a single edge-weight running in time $n^{\mathcal{O}(1)}$ without changing the pathwidth of the graph.*

Proof. Let G be an instance of $\# \text{MIN-}X\text{-ANTI} \text{FACTOR}$. For a positive integer w , we define the instance G_w of edge-weighted $\#X\text{-ANTI} \text{FACTOR}$ as the modification of G , where we put weight w on every edge of G .



■ **Figure 3** The modifications of the vertices in the different steps of the reductions (cf. Lemmas 7.9 and 7.10). The outer edges are shown in red, the inner edges are shown in blue, and the weighted edges in black.

For all $i \in [0, m]$, where m denotes the number of edges of G , we denote by a_i the number of solutions of G with respect to $\#X\text{-ANTI FACTOR}$ that have size exactly i . Note, a_i includes solutions that do not have minimum size.

With this notation, we can rewrite the number of solutions of G_w as

$$\#\text{Sol}(G_w) = \sum_{i=0}^m a_i w^i.$$

If we treat w as a variable, $\#\text{Sol}(G_w)$ can be seen as a polynomial in w of degree at most m .

We use the oracle-access to $\#X\text{-ANTI FACTOR}$ to compute $\#\text{Sol}(G_w)$ for $m + 1$ different values of w . Then we can easily, i.e., in time polynomially in m , recover the coefficients of $\#\text{Sol}(G_w)$. With $i^* = \min\{i \in [0, m] \mid a_i \neq 0\}$ we get that G has a_{i^*} solutions with respect to $\#\text{MIN-}X\text{-ANTI FACTOR}$.

Since the construction of G_w can be done in polynomial time and recovering the a_i s also takes polynomial time, this finishes the proof. ◀

The next step now drops the requirement on X to be a contiguous interval. Instead arbitrary finite sets are allowed, which results in arbitrary cofinite sets of allowed degrees. However, to remove this constraint we have to make use of (weighted) relations.

► **Lemma 7.9.** *Let $X \subseteq \mathbb{N}$ be a fixed, non-empty and finite set. There is a many-one reduction from edge-weighted $\#[0, \max X]\text{-ANTI FACTOR}$ with r weights to edge- and relation-weighted $\#X\text{-ANTI FACTOR}^{\mathcal{R}}$ with at most $r + \max X + 2$ weights such that the size increases by a constant factor, Δ^* of the resulting instances is $\max X + 1$ and pathwidth increases only by 1.*

For the reduction we construct a gadget and attach to each (simple) vertex a copy of this gadget. The gadget is such that each vertex is incident to at least $\max X + 1$ selected edges from the original graph. We define the relation-weights such that all other solutions cancel out and hence, all solutions are also valid for $\#[0, \max X]\text{-ANTI FACTOR}$. We exploit the fact that the set X does not allow certain combinations of selected incident edges but once a vertex is incident to at least $\max X + 1$ selected edges, all states are essentially equivalent (with respect to X).

Proof of Lemma 7.9. We start with an edge-weighted $\#[0, \max X]\text{-ANTI FACTOR}$ instance H and apply the following transformation, illustrated in Figures 3a and 3b, for each simple vertex \hat{v} to obtain an instance G of $\#X\text{-ANTI FACTOR}^{\mathcal{R}}$.

Transformation. We remove \hat{v} (with set B) and create a simple vertex v (with set X) and a complex vertex u_v . We connect v to all neighbors of \hat{v} in H and call these edges *outer* edges. We connect v and u_v by $\max X + 1$ parallel edges which we call *inner* edges.⁹ We assign the set X to v and the relation R to u_v . (The relation R is actually the same for all simple vertices.) For all $\beta \in [0, \max X + 1]$, relation R accepts exactly one (arbitrary) set of exactly β selected inner edges with weight w_β . All other sets of selected edges are accepted with weight 0, i.e., rejected. Before we define the weights, we provide some intuition.

The weights for relation R are chosen such that v is always incident to k selected outer edges, for some $k \geq \max X + 1$. For this we exploit that the weights w_β might also be negative. Then, the “bad” solutions cancel out and only the “good” solutions contribute to the total number of solutions.

If we denote by α the number of selected outer edges and by β the number of selected inner edges, then the weights must satisfy

$$\sum_{\substack{\beta=0 \\ \alpha+\beta \notin X}}^{\max X+1} w_\beta = \begin{cases} 1 & \alpha \geq \max X + 1 \\ 0 & \alpha \leq \max X \end{cases}. \quad (3)$$

If we consider each w_β as a variable, then the constraints from Equation (3) form a system of linear equations with $\max X + 2$ variables. Observe further that all constraints with $\alpha \geq \max X + 1$ are identical. Hence, there are $\max X + 2$ constraints. Now consider the matrix M formed by the coefficients of Equation (3). Observe that the anti-diagonal of M and all entries below are ones as $\max X + 1, \max X + 2, \dots \notin X$. Moreover, every entry one row above the anti-diagonal in M is zero by the fact that $\max X \in X$. This observation directly implies that the sums for $\alpha + 1$ and α differ by (at least) one summand, i.e., by $w_{\max X - \alpha}$. Hence, the matrix M is invertible and there is a solution to Equation (3). Moreover, when starting with the sums for $\max X + 1$ and $\max X$, we can find the value for w_0 and eliminate it from the system of linear equations. Then, we repeat this process to iteratively eliminate w_1 up to $w_{\max X+1}$.

We conclude that there are values for each w_β such that Equation (3) hold. Moreover, the above procedure already finds these values in time polynomially in the number of variables, which is $\max X + 2$.

Finalizing the Reduction. Since the weights for the gadget are chosen such that the remaining graph does not see a difference between the vertex \hat{v} and this new gadget, we can replace all simple vertices by this procedure to get an edge- and relation-weighted $\#X$ -ANTIFACTOR^R instance which we denote by G .

Recall that H is the initial edge-weighted $\#X$ -ANTIFACTOR instance. We have $n_G \leq 2n_H$, $\Delta_G^* = \max X + 1$, and $\text{pw}_G \leq \text{pw}_H + 1$. This finishes the proof. ◀

The next step of our reduction removes the weights from the relations by using additional weighted edges.

► **Lemma 7.10.** *Let $X \subseteq \mathbb{N}$ be an arbitrary set (possibly given as input).*

We can many-one reduce edge- and relation-weighted $\#X$ -ANTIFACTOR^R with r different weights to edge-weighted $\#X$ -ANTIFACTOR^R with at most r weights such that

⁹ Though these parallel edges disappear later, one could place EQ_2 nodes on them to obtain a simple graph.

- the size increases by a multiplicative factor of $\mathcal{O}(r)$,
- Δ^* increases to $\Delta^* + r + 1$,
- and pw increases to $\text{pw} + 1$.

Proof. We apply the following procedure to each complex vertex u (that uses weights). See Figure 3c for an illustration of the modification. Let R be the relation of u . Let $w_1, \dots, w_{r'}$ be the $r' < r$ different weights used by R . Assume without loss of generality that $r' = r$.

For all $i \in [r]$, we add a vertex u_i with relation $\text{HW}_{\in\{0,1\}}^{(1)}$ and make it adjacent to u by an edge of weight w_i .

Based on R , we design a new relation R' as follows: Whenever R accepts the input x with weight w_i , for some $i \in [r]$, then R' accepts x but additionally requires that the edge to u_i is selected while the edges to the other $u_{i'}$ remain unselected.

One can easily check that this modification does not change the solution. Moreover, the pathwidth increases by at most 1 and the degree of the complex vertices by at most r . ◀

In the next step of our reduction, we remove the edge weights from the graph. First observe that we do not have to change edges of weight 1. Furthermore, we can simply remove all edges with weight 0.

► **Lemma 7.11.** *Let $X \subseteq \mathbb{N}$ be a finite and non-empty set (possibly given as input). There is a Turing-reduction from edge-weighted $\#X\text{-ANTIFACTOR}^{\mathcal{R}}$ with r different weights to unweighted $\#X\text{-ANTIFACTOR}^{\mathcal{R}}$ running in time $n^{\mathcal{O}(r)}$. The reduction is such that*

- the size increases by a multiplicative factor of $\mathcal{O}(\log^2(n))$,
- the degree of the simple vertices stays the same,
- Δ^* increases to $\Delta^* + \mathcal{O}(1)$,
- and pw increases to $\text{pw} + \mathcal{O}(1)$.

Proof. We use the same interpolation technique already used in [14] and later in [33] to remove the edge weights.

We replace the edge weights w_1, \dots, w_r by variables x_1, \dots, x_r and treat the value of the solution as an r -variate polynomial P .

Observe that, for each $i \in [r]$, P has degree at most $m < n^2$ in x_i . Assume we can choose n^2 values for each x_i independently. If we can evaluate P on all $(n^2)^r$ combinations of values, then, by Lemma 1 in [13], we can recover the coefficients of P in $n^{\mathcal{O}(r)}$ time. Finally, we output $P(w_1, \dots, w_r)$.

It remains to show that we can achieve n^2 different values for each x_i . We first show how to realize edge weights of the form 2^i . We replace the edge of weight 2^i by a chain of $2i + 3$ edges where, for all $j \in [i]$, the $2j + 1$ th edge is a parallel edge.¹⁰ We assign the relation $\text{HW}_{=1}$ to all vertices that are introduced by this gadget. When the original edge was selected, we have, for each $j \in [i]$, two choices for selecting one of the $2i + 1$ th parallel edges. Moreover, these choices are independent from each other. This contributes a weight of 2^i to the solution. If the original edge was not selected, then we only have a unique solution; we select the edges that are not parallel edges, i.e., the 2nd, 4th, \dots , edge.

We use this as building block to realize arbitrary positive weights W . From the binary representation of W we get a set $S = \{s_1, \dots, s_\ell\} \subseteq \mathbb{N}$ such that $W = \sum_{i=1}^\ell 2^{s_i}$. Let the edge of weight W be between the vertices v and u . We create new vertices $v_1, v'_1, \dots, v_\ell, v'_\ell$ and $u_1, u'_1, \dots, u_\ell, u'_\ell$ all with relation $\text{HW}_{=1}$. Set $v_{\ell+1} = v$ and $u_{\ell+1} = u$. For all $i \in [\ell]$, we

¹⁰To avoid parallel edges, one can place one EQ_2 node on each parallel edge.

connect v_i to v'_i and connect v'_i to v_{i+1} and similarly for u_i, u'_i, u_{i+1} . For all $i \in [\ell]$, we add an edge of weight 2^{s_i} between v_i and u_i . We use the previous method to realize the weight of these edge. The total weight sums up to W if exactly one weighted edge can be selected at a time. Now assume the edge from v_i to u_i is selected. Then, the edges from u_i to u'_i is not selected. By the relation of u'_i , the edge from u'_i to u_{i+1} must be selected. Therefore, the weighted edge from u_{i+1} to v_{i+1} cannot be selected. As the edge u_{i+1} to u'_{i+1} also cannot be selected and the argument applies recursively to the vertices $u_{i'}$ and $u'_{i'}$ with $i' < i$, no other weighted edge can be selected.

Thus, it suffices to consider the weights from 1 to n^2 . Adding the parallel edges and the paths increases pathwidth only by a constant. The same holds for Δ^* as the degree of each vertex is at most three. The size increases by a factor of $\mathcal{O}(\log^2(n))$ as we introduce $\mathcal{O}(\log(n))$ many new vertices and the gadget for weight 2^i is of size $\mathcal{O}(i)$. ◀

► **Note.** The previous construction uses weights between 1 and n^2 . By this choice the size increases by a logarithmic factor (in n) only. Now assume that the construction would use weights from 2^1 to 2^{n^2} . This choice could lead to a polynomial blow-up of the size of the graph. While this is not an issue for the lower bound for $\#X\text{-ANTIFACTOR}$, this lemma could not be applied for the proof of the $\#W[1]$ -hardness which we give later.

Now, we can combine the previous steps and prove the lower bound for $\#X\text{-ANTIFACTOR}^{\mathcal{R}}$.

Proof of Lemma 7.1. Let H be an edge-weighted $\# \text{MIN-}X\text{-ANTIFACTOR}$ instance with $\mathcal{O}(1)$ different edge-weights. We apply Lemmas 7.8–7.11 to obtain $n_H^{\mathcal{O}(\max X)}$ instances G_i of $\#X\text{-ANTIFACTOR}^{\mathcal{R}}$. As X is fixed, there are $n_H^{\mathcal{O}(1)}$ such instances.

For each such instance G_i , we get $n_{G_i} \leq \mathcal{O}(n_H \log^2(n_H))$, $\Delta_{G_i}^* \in \mathcal{O}(\max X)$, and $\text{pw}_{G_i} \leq \text{pw}_H + \mathcal{O}(1)$. Assume a fast algorithm for $\#X\text{-ANTIFACTOR}^{\mathcal{R}}$ exists for some $\epsilon > 0$. Then, since $\Delta_{G_i}^* \in \mathcal{O}(1)$, we can run this algorithm on all these instances G_i and recover the solution for H . The total running time of this process is

$$\begin{aligned} & n_H^{\mathcal{O}(1)} \cdot \sum_i (\max X + 2 - \epsilon)^{\text{pw}_{G_i}} \cdot n_{G_i}^{\mathcal{O}(1)} \\ & \leq \sum_i (\max X + 2 - \epsilon)^{\text{pw}_H + \mathcal{O}(1)} \cdot (n_H \log^2(n_H))^{\mathcal{O}(1)} \\ & \leq (\max X + 2 - \epsilon)^{\text{pw}_H} \cdot n_H^{\mathcal{O}(1)}. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, the running time directly contradicts $\# \text{SETH}$ by Lemma 7.7. ◀

7.2 High-level construction for $\#W[1]$ -Hardness

In this section, we show the proof of Lemma 7.4, i.e., the lower bound for $\# \text{ANTIFACTOR}_1^{\mathcal{R}}$. For this we use a similar high-level idea as for the previous subsection. However, we do not start from $\# \text{SAT}$ but from COUNTING COLORFUL HITTING k -SETS ($\#k\text{-ColHS}$).

► **Definition 7.12** ($\#k\text{-ColHS}$). *Given k disjoint sets U_1, U_2, \dots, U_k of n elements each and sets A_1, A_2, \dots, A_m each a subset of $\bigcup_{i \in [k]} U_i$, find the size of the set*

$$S = \{(s_1, s_2, \dots, s_k) \in U_1 \times U_2 \times \dots \times U_k \mid \forall j \in [m] \exists i \in [k] : s_i \in A_j\}$$

We use a known lower bound for $\#k\text{-ColHS}$ as an initial step of our proof.

► **Lemma 7.13** (Lemma 6.1 from [14]). *For each fixed $k \geq 2$, the following holds. If there exists an $\epsilon > 0$ such that, for each $d \in \mathbb{N}$, there is an $\mathcal{O}(n^{k-\epsilon})$ time algorithm for $\#k\text{-ColHS}$ on instances with universe size n and $\mathcal{O}(k^d \cdot \log^d n)$ sets, then $\# \text{SETH}$ fails. Here, the constant factor in the running time may depend on d .*

The main result of this section is Lemma 7.14.

► **Lemma 7.14.** *There is a polynomial time many-one reduction from $\#k\text{-ColHS}$ with a universe size of n elements each and m sets to relation-weighted $\#\text{ANTIFACTOR}_1^{\mathcal{R}}$ with 3 different weights such that the size is bounded by $\mathcal{O}(k \cdot n \cdot m)$, the total degree of the complex nodes is $\mathcal{O}(1)$, and the pathwidth is at most $k + \mathcal{O}(1)$.*

We combine Lemma 7.14 with the intermediate steps from Section 7.1 to prove Lemma 7.4. This also proves Theorem 7.6 since all our reductions are parameter preserving and $\#k\text{-ColHS}$ is $\#\text{W}[1]$ -hard [14].

Proof of Lemma 7.4. For a given $\#k\text{-ColHS}$ instance H we apply Lemma 7.14 to get a relation-weighted $\#\text{ANTIFACTOR}_1^{\mathcal{R}}$ instance, then use Lemma 7.10 to transform this into an edge-weighted $\#\text{ANTIFACTOR}_1^{\mathcal{R}}$ instance, and finally apply Lemma 7.11 to transform this into polynomially many unweighted $\#\text{ANTIFACTOR}_1^{\mathcal{R}}$ instance G_i .

For each such instance G_i , we get $n_{G_i} \leq \mathcal{O}(n \cdot m \cdot k \cdot \log^2(n \cdot m \cdot k))$ and $\text{pw}_{G_i} = k + c_1$ for some constant $c_1 > 0$.

Note that Lemma 7.11 adds an overhead of $\mathcal{O}((n \cdot m \cdot k)^{c_2})$, for some $c_2 > 0$, to the running time. Assume that, for all $c > 0$, there is an $\mathcal{O}(N^{\text{pw}-c})$ time algorithm for $\#\text{ANTIFACTOR}_1^{\mathcal{R}}$ on instances of size N and pathwidth pw . We apply this algorithm to all instances and get the following time bound:

$$\mathcal{O}\left((n \cdot m \cdot k)^{c_2} + \sum_i n_{G_i}^{\text{pw}_{G_i}-c}\right) \leq \mathcal{O}\left((n \cdot m \cdot k)^{c_2} \cdot \left(n \cdot m \cdot k \cdot \log^2(n \cdot m \cdot k)\right)^{k+c_1-c}\right)$$

With $c_3 = c_1 + c_2$, this can be bound by

$$\begin{aligned} &\leq \mathcal{O}\left(\left(n \cdot m \cdot k \cdot \log^2(n \cdot m \cdot k)\right)^{k+c_3-c}\right) \\ &\leq \mathcal{O}\left((n \cdot m \cdot k)^{k+c_3-c} \cdot \log^{2(k+c_3-c)}(n \cdot m \cdot k)\right) \end{aligned}$$

Since $\log^a N \leq N^b$, for large enough N , we get:


$$\begin{aligned} &\leq \mathcal{O}\left((n \cdot m \cdot k)^{k+c_3-c} \cdot (n \cdot m \cdot k)^{c_4}\right) \\ &\leq \mathcal{O}\left(n^{k+c_5-c} \cdot m^{k+c_5-c} \cdot k^{k+c_5-c}\right) \\ &\leq \mathcal{O}\left(n^{k+c_5-c} (k^d \log^d n)^{k+c_5-c} \cdot k^{k+c_5-c}\right) \end{aligned}$$

We again use the above bound for the $\log^d(n)$ and the fact that k is fixed:

$$\leq \mathcal{O}(n^{k+c_5-c} n) = \mathcal{O}(n^{k+c_5+1-c}).$$

By choosing $c > c_5 + 1$, we have an algorithm for $\#k\text{-ColHS}$ that runs in time $\mathcal{O}(n^{k-\epsilon})$, for some constant $\epsilon > 0$. This contradicts Lemma 7.13. ◀

In the remaining part of the section we prove Lemma 7.14.



■ **Figure 4** High-level construction of the $\#ANTIFACTOR_1^R$ instance. The boxes containing G_i^j and J_i^j describe the gadgets F_i^j . The details of the gadgets G_i^j are shown in Figure 5.

Idea of the Construction. We reduce $\#k\text{-ColHS}$ to relation-weighted $\#ANTIFACTOR_1^R$. Let k be the number of sets U_i , n the size of the sets U_i , and m the number of set A_j we want to hit. We follow a similar high-level construction as for previous SETH based lower bounds and derive the construction from a $k \times m$ grid. The i th row corresponds to set U_i and the j th column to the set A_j . See Figure 4 for an illustration.

At the crossing point of the i th row and the j th column, the gadget F_i^j checks whether the element selected from U_i hits the set A_j . For the encoding of the elements, we connect F_i^j and F_{i+1}^j by $n - 1$ edges such that a selection of ℓ edges encodes the selection of the $\ell + 1$ th element from U_i . Moreover, F_i^j is connected to F_{i+1}^j by a single edge. This edge indicates whether A_j was hit by an element from $U_{i'}$ for some $i' \leq i$.

We first formally describe the gadgets F_i^j . Then, we construct the graph and these gadgets such that the pathwidth of the construction is not too large, i.e., bounded by $k + \mathcal{O}(1)$.

Fix a gadget F_i^j in the following. Let $\text{in}_1, \dots, \text{in}_{n-1}$ be the edges to F_i^{j-1} , let $\text{out}_1, \dots, \text{out}_{n-1}$ be the edges to F_{i+1}^j , let in_v be the (vertical) edge to F_{i-1}^j , and let out_v be the (vertical) edge to F_{i+1}^j . We define F_i^j such that it satisfies the following constraints.

1. The selection of the outgoing edges must be monotonous.
Formally, there must be an $\ell \in [n]$ such that the edges $\text{out}_1, \dots, \text{out}_{n-\ell}$ are not selected but the edges $\text{out}_{n-\ell+1}, \dots, \text{out}_{n-1}$ are selected.
2. F_i^j ensures that the information about the selected element is transferred consistently.
That is, for all $\ell \in [n]$, edge in_ℓ is selected if and only if edge out_ℓ is selected.
3. F_i^j checks whether the element from U_i hits the set A_j . This information is encoded by the edge between F_i^j and F_{i+1}^j .
If in_v is selected, then out_v is selected. Otherwise, out_v is selected if and only if there is an $\ell \in [n]$ such that exactly $\ell - 1$ edges from $\text{in}_1, \dots, \text{in}_{n-1}$ are selected and the ℓ th element in U_i is contained in A_j .

Construction of the Instance. We set $X = \{n - 2\}$ which is possible as only the *size* of X is fixed and not X itself. The graph is formally defined as follows:

- For all $i \in [k]$ and all $j \in [m]$, there is a vertex J_i^j .
- For all $i \in [k]$ and all $j \in [m]$, there is a weighted gadget G_i^j such that G_i^j is connected to J_i^j and J_{i+1}^j by $n - 1$ parallel edges each and to $G_{i\pm 1}^j$ by a single edge each. The weights are defined later.

- For all $i \in [k]$ and all $j \in [m]$, the vertex J_i^j together with the gadget G_i^j constitute the gadget F_i^j from above.
- For all $i \in [n]$, there is a monotonicity gadget whose behavior is identical to the one of the F_i^j s for edges $\text{out}_1, \dots, \text{out}_{n-1}$ (i.e., the first property from above) and attach it to J_i^1 by $n-1$ parallel edges. These gadgets are defined later as the fourth stage of G_i^j .
- For all $i \in [n]$, attach $n-1$ fresh vertices to G_i^m .
- For all $j \in [m]$, there is a vertex with relation $\text{HW}_{=0}^{(1)}$ that is adjacent to G_1^j .
- For all $j \in [m]$, there is a vertex with relation $\text{HW}_{=1}^{(1)}$ that is adjacent to G_k^j .

Proof of Correctness. Assume that we choose the weights for G_i^j such that the combined behavior of J_i^j and G_i^j corresponds to that of F_i^j as we described it above. Then, it is clear that there is a one-to-one correspondence between the solutions for the $\#k\text{-ColHS}$ instance and the solutions for the $\#X\text{-ANTIFACTOR}^{\mathcal{R}}$ instance. For this we crucially depend on the nodes with relations $\text{HW}_{=0}^{(1)}$ and $\text{HW}_{=1}^{(1)}$. The $\text{HW}_{=0}^{(1)}$ relations ensure that every set A_j is initially not hit. Since the gadgets G_i^j propagate the selection of the top edge to the bottom edge whenever the set is not hit by the selected element, there must be some $G_{i'}^j$ such that the element from $U_{i'}$ hits A_j . Otherwise the relation $\text{HW}_{=1}^{(1)}$ cannot be satisfied, but this is forbidden.

We first show how to define the weights for the G_i^j such that we can treat G_i^j and J_i^j together as the F_i^j gadget. Observe that the degree of G_i^j is large and more specifically depends on the input. Hence, we cannot treat G_i^j as a complex node. Thus, in a second step we construct the G_i^j from smaller building blocks such that pathwidth and degree are constants.

Defining the Weights. We focus on a fixed F_i^j and thus G_i^j in the following. By the monotonicity assumption, we know that we can describe the signature of F_i^j by a function $\hat{f}(\alpha, \text{in}_v, \gamma, \text{out}_v)$, where α denotes the number of selected edges from $\{\text{in}_\ell\}_\ell$ and γ denotes the number of selected edges from $\{\text{out}_\ell\}_\ell$. It actually suffices to consider the function $f(\alpha, \gamma)$, with the same meaning for α and γ as for \hat{f} where we have

$$\hat{f}(\alpha, \text{in}_v, \gamma, \text{out}_v) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{in}_v = 1 \wedge \text{out}_v = 0 \\ f(\alpha, \gamma) & \text{in}_v = \text{out}_v \\ f(\alpha, \gamma) & \text{in}_v = 0 \wedge \text{out}_v = 1 \wedge \text{the } \gamma + 1\text{th element of } U_i \text{ hits } A_j \end{cases}$$

By the definition of F_i^j , we need $f(\alpha, \alpha) = 1$, for all α , and $f(\alpha, \gamma) = 0$, whenever $\gamma \neq \alpha$.

Now, consider the signature of G_i^j and let β denote the number of selected edges between J_i^j and G_i^j . We can sue the same arguments to denote this signature by $g(\beta, \gamma)$ if we additionally impose monotonicity constraints on the ingoing and outgoing edges. From the definition of X we get:

$$f(\alpha, \gamma) = \sum_{\substack{\beta=0 \\ \alpha+\beta \neq n-2}}^{n-1} g(\beta, \gamma)$$

To satisfy the constraints for f , one can easily check that it suffices to set

- for all $\gamma \neq n-1$: $g(n-2-\gamma, \gamma) := -1$,
- for all $\delta \neq n-1$: $g(n-1, \delta) = g(\delta, n-1) := 1$,
- $g(n-1, n-1) := -(n-2)$,
- and $g(\beta, \gamma) = 0$ otherwise.

As seen above, we lift the function g to all inputs of G_i^j by imposing that the edges going to J_i^j are selected monotonically. But in contrast to the previous requirement for the edges in_ℓ of F_i^j , now, for some $\ell \in [n]$, the top/first ℓ edges $\text{out}_1, \dots, \text{out}_\ell$ are selected and the bottom $n - 1 - \ell$ edges $\text{out}_{\ell+1}, \dots, \text{out}_n$ are not selected.

Construction of the Gadgets. It remains to define the gadgets G_i^j . We decompose the gadget into four stages as shown in Figure 5. We informally describe the purpose of the stages and then define the relations formally. For this we refer to the edges as left, top, bottom, and right edges and abbreviate them by ℓ, t, b, r . If there are more than one edge on one side, we enumerate them from left to right or from top to bottom.

1. Check whether the ingoing edges are selected monotonically starting from the top. While doing this, select the ℓ th edge going to the next stage if and only if the first $\ell - 1$ edges are selected. The vertical edges encode whether all ingoing edges of the blocks above have been selected.

We formally define $M = \{\ell tb, tr, \emptyset\}$.

2. This stage assigns the different weights to the solutions depending on the number of selected ingoing and outgoing edges. By the first and last stage (monotonicity gadgets), this information is encoded by the position of the selected edge coming from the first stage and the position of the selected edge going to the third stage. The first and second vertical edge encodes whether $n - 1$ ingoing edges and $n - 1$ outgoing edges are selected, respectively.

We define $R_0 = \{\ell r, \ell t_2 b_2, t_1 b_1 r, \emptyset, t_1 b_1, t_2 b_2, t_1 t_2 b_1 b_2\}$. The input ℓr of R_0 is assigned weight -1 and all other accepted inputs are assigned weight 1 . R_W completely agrees with R_0 except that the input $t_1 t_2 b_1 b_2$ is assigned weight $-(n - 2)$.

3. If the ℓ th edge from the bottom is selected, then this corresponds to element u_ℓ being selected from U_i . We propagate this information to the next stage. If u_ℓ is contained in A_j , then we assign relation C^+ to the ℓ th block from the bottom and otherwise the relation C^0 . The vertical edges are selected if the set has been hit by any element (possibly also by some element from some $U_{i'}$ with $i' < i$).

We define $C^0 = \{\emptyset, \ell r, tb, \ell tbr\}$ and $C^+ = C^0 \cup \{\ell br\}$.

4. This stage is a rotated version of the first stage. That is, if the ℓ th edge from the bottom is selected, then we select $\ell - 1$ outgoing edges. The vertical edges now correspond to the fact whether all outgoing edges from below have been selected.


We define $M' = \{tbr, \ell b, \emptyset\}$.

▷ **Claim 7.15.** The pathwidth of the final graph is $k + \mathcal{O}(1)$.

Proof. We use a mixed search strategy to clean the graph from left to right. For this we place searchers on the vertices J_1^j , for all j , and clean the monotonicity gadgets going from top to bottom.

The remaining graph is cleaned in m rounds. For the j th round we clean the gadgets G_i^j from top to bottom. Before cleaning each G_i^j we place one searcher on J_i^{j+1} and afterwards we remove the searcher from J_i^j . Then, we continue with the next row until all G_i^j are cleaned and we proceed to the $j + 1$ th round. ◁

For the correctness of the final construction it remains to show that the gadget G_i^j together with vertex J_i^j satisfy all properties of F_i^j . For this we observe that the fourth stage of G_i^j ensures property (1) of F_i^j . The third stage ensures the third property and the first and second stage together with J_i^j ensure property (2) by the choice of the weights.




■ **Figure 5** The gadget G_i^j checks whether the element from U_i hits the set A_j (here u_3, u_4, u_6 hit A_j and the other elements not). It additionally ensures together with J_i^j that the information about this selected element is consistent in the whole graph. The different stages are separated by dashed lines.

7.3 Replacing the Relations

In this section, we show the reduction from $\#Y\text{-ANTIFACTOR}^{\mathcal{R}}$ to $\#(X, Y)\text{-ANTIFACTOR}$, i.e., we prove Lemma 7.2, by a chain of reductions (cf. Figure 6). We make use of the Holant framework, which was also used in [33], to formally state the results. The first step uses Lemmas 7.5 and 7.6 from [33]. Observe for this that the lemmas work for $\#B\text{-FACTOR}$ even when B is cofinite, that is $\#\overline{B}\text{-ANTIFACTOR}$ because the simple vertices of the instance are not changed in any way.

► **Lemma 7.16** (Lemma 7.5 and 7.6 in [33]). *There is a polynomial-time Turing reduction from $\#X\text{-ANTIFACTOR}^{\mathcal{R}}$ to $\text{Holant}(\text{HW}_{\in \overline{X}}, \text{HW}_{=1})$ such that the maximum degree increases to at least 6 and the pathwidth increases by at most a constant depending only on Δ^* , where Δ^* denotes the maximum total degree of the complex nodes in any bag of the path decomposition.*



■ **Figure 6** Steps in the chain of reductions from $\#Y\text{-ANTIFACTOR}^{\mathcal{R}}$ to $\#(X, Y)\text{-ANTIFACTOR}$, i.e., $\text{Holant}(\text{HW}_{\in \overline{Y}}, \text{HW}_{\in \overline{X}})$. Dotted lines indicate results obtained by combined reductions.

► **Note.** Lemma 7.5 in [33] requires that the relation is even, i.e., the Hamming weight of every accepted input is even. We can easily make every relation even by adding an additional input that is selected whenever the parity of the original input is odd. This additional input is then connected to a EQ_1 node, which can easily be realized by forcing $\max X + 1$ edges to a fresh vertex using $\text{HW}_{=1}^{(1)}$ nodes.

Before proceeding with the next steps, we define, for all $x, y \in \mathbb{Z}$, $w[x, y]$ as a new type of node which has one dangling edge e and the following signature:

$$f(e) = \begin{cases} x & \text{if } e \text{ is not selected} \\ y & \text{if } e \text{ is selected} \end{cases}.$$

Observe that $\text{HW}_{=1}^{(1)}$ is precisely $w[0, 1]$ and $\text{HW}_{\in\{0,1\}}^{(1)}$ corresponds to $w[1, 1]$. In the following constructions we additionally use a $w[-1, 1]$ node. We use the $w[x, y]$ notation in the following wherever possible.

► **Lemma 7.17.** *Let $X \subseteq \mathbb{N}$ be a finite set such that $X \not\subseteq \{0\}$. Let R_1, \dots, R_d be d arbitrary relations for some $d \geq 0$. There is a polynomial-time Turing reduction from*

$$\text{Holant}(R_1, \dots, R_d, \text{HW}_{\in\overline{X}}, \text{HW}_{=1}) \text{ to } \text{Holant}(R_1, \dots, R_d, \text{HW}_{\in\overline{X}}, w[1, 1], w[-1, 1], w[0, 1])$$

such that Δ^ increases to $\Delta^* \cdot f(\max X)$ and pw increases to $\text{pw} + \Delta^* \cdot f(\max X)$.*

For the proof of Lemma 7.17 we distinguish the following cases depending on the structure of X :

1. $\text{max-gap}(\overline{X}) > 1$:
 - a. $X \neq [k]$ for all $k \geq 2$
 - b. $X = [k]$ for some $k \geq 2$
2. $\text{max-gap}(\overline{X}) = 1$: In this case, X contains no two consecutive numbers but contains at least one positive integer.
3. $\text{max-gap}(\overline{X}) = 0$: In this case, there is a $k \geq 1$ such that $X = [0, k]$.

Note that the uncovered case $X = \{0\}$ corresponds to the edge-cover problem. In this case, our techniques to realize relations fail. However, we show the tight lower bound by a separate reduction in Section 8.

We group Cases 1b and 3 together such that we are left with three separate proofs. Then, Lemma 7.17 follows from Lemmas 7.18–7.20.


► **Lemma 7.18** (Case 1a of Lemma 7.17). *Let $X \subseteq \mathbb{N}$ be a finite set such that $\text{max-gap}(\overline{X}) > 1$ and $X \neq [k]$ for some $k \geq 2$. Let R_1, \dots, R_d be d arbitrary relations for some $d \geq 0$. There is a polynomial-time many-one reduction from*

$$\text{Holant}(R_1, \dots, R_d, \text{HW}_{\in\overline{X}}, \text{HW}_{=1}) \text{ to } \text{Holant}(R_1, \dots, R_d, \text{HW}_{\in\overline{X}}, w[1, 1], w[0, 1])$$

such that Δ^ increases to $\Delta^* \cdot f(\max X)$ and pw increases to $\text{pw} + \Delta^* \cdot f(\max X)$.*

Proof. Since $\text{max-gap}(\overline{X}) = d > 1$, there is some $a \geq 0$ such that $[a, a + d + 1] \cap X = [a + 1, a + d]$. We show how to get $\text{HW}_{=1}^{(2)}$ and $\text{HW}_{=1}^{(3)}$ nodes. This is enough to get $\text{HW}_{=1}^{(\ell)}$ nodes for arbitrary ℓ by using the construction from Lemma 5.11 (cf. Lemma 5.5 from [33] for more details).

We follow the process from Lemma 5.8 from [33] to first get a EQ_3 node: We first construct a EQ_{d+1} node by forcing a edges to a new vertex using $w[0, 1]$ nodes. Adding $d - 2$ copies of a $w[1, 1]$ node to this EQ_{d+1} node gives us a EQ_3 node.



■ **Figure 7** Construction of the gadget in Lemma 7.19 and Lemma 7.20.

Next we construct a $\text{HW}_{=1}^{(2)}$ node. Since $\max\text{-gap}(\overline{X}) > 1$ and $X \neq [k]$, there are $a' > 0$ and $d' > 0$ such that $[a', a' + d' + 1] \cap X = [a' + 1, a' + d']$. Take two EQ_3 nodes and set one edge of each of them as a dangling edge. Using the remaining two edges, connect each of them to two vertices u and v . Attach $a' - 1$ copies of a $w[0, 1]$ node to u and $\max X$ copies of a $w[0, 1]$ node to v . Observe that, by virtue of u , at most one EQ_3 node can have its edges selected and by virtue of v , at least one EQ_3 node must have its edges selected. Thus, exactly one dangling edge must be selected in any solution.

To get a $\text{HW}_{=1}^{(3)}$ node we distinguish two cases. If $d' \geq 2$ or $a \geq 1$ (and $d \geq 2$), we can use the same approach as for the $\text{HW}_{=1}^{(2)}$ node but using three EQ_3 nodes instead. For the case $a = 0$ and $d' = 1$, this construction is not sufficient. Then, we force $d - 1$ edges to a new vertex and add three $\text{HW}_{=1}^{(2)}$ nodes via one edge to it. The remaining edges of the $\text{HW}_{=1}^{(2)}$ nodes are the dangling edges. If $d + 2 \in X$, then we get a $\text{HW}_{=1}^{(3)}$ gadget and we are done. Otherwise we have a $\text{HW}_{\in\{0,1\}}^{(3)}$ gadget. In this case we can use the construction for the $\text{HW}_{=1}^{(2)}$ gadget with three EQ_3 nodes and replace the vertex u by this $\text{HW}_{\in\{0,1\}}^{(3)}$ gadget. ◀

► **Lemma 7.19** (Case 2 of Lemma 7.17). *Let $X \subseteq \mathbb{N}$ be a finite set such that $\max\text{-gap}(\overline{X}) = 1$. Let R_1, \dots, R_d be d arbitrary relations for some $d \geq 0$. There is a polynomial-time many-one reduction from*

$$\text{Holant}(R_1, \dots, R_d, \text{HW}_{\in\overline{X}}, \text{HW}_{=1}) \text{ to } \text{Holant}(R_1, \dots, R_d, \text{HW}_{\in\overline{X}}, w[1, 1], w[-1, 1], w[0, 1])$$

such that Δ^ increases to $\Delta^* \cdot f(\max X)$ and pw increases to $\text{pw} + \Delta^* \cdot f(\max X)$.*

Proof. Let $k = \max X$. Since $\max\text{-gap}(\overline{X}) = 1$ and $k \in X$, we have $k - 1, k + 1 \notin X$. Create a vertex v and attach $k - 1$ copies of a $w[0, 1]$ node, one $w[1, 1]$ node (by a red edge) and a $w[-1, 1]$ node (by a blue edge) to it. Finally, we add ℓ dangling edges to v . See Figure 7 for an illustration. We claim that v acts as a $\text{HW}_{=1}^{(\ell)}$ node.

Because of the $k - 1$ different $w[0, 1]$ nodes, v cannot be incident to exactly one more edge.

- Suppose no dangling edges are chosen. Then, we can extend the solution by selecting neither of the blue and red edges or selecting both of them. The number of solutions is $1 + (-1) = 0$ and therefore, this is not a possibility. ¹¹
- Suppose more than one dangling edge is chosen. Then, we can pick any combination of the red and blue edges. The number of solutions is $1 - 1 + 1 - 1 = 0$. As before, this is not a possibility.
- Suppose exactly one dangling edge is chosen. Then, we must pick at least one of the red or blue edges. The number of solutions is $1 - 1 + 1 = 1$.

¹¹ Technically this is a solution but contributes 0 to the Holant and thus can be ignored (or treated as invalid).

Thus, the only solution is to pick exactly one dangling edge. \blacktriangleleft

► **Lemma 7.20** (Cases 1b and 3 of Lemma 7.17). *For some integer k , let $X = [0, k]$ with $k \geq 1$ or $X = [k]$ with $k \geq 2$. Let R_1, \dots, R_d be d arbitrary relations for some $d \geq 0$. There is a polynomial-time Turing reduction from*

$$\text{Holant}(R_1, \dots, R_d, \text{HW}_{\in \overline{X}}, \text{HW}_{=1}) \text{ to } \text{Holant}(R_1, \dots, R_d, \text{HW}_{\in \overline{X}}, w[1, 1], w[-1, 1], w[0, 1])$$

such that Δ^ increases to $\Delta^* \cdot f(\max X)$ and pw increases to $\text{pw} + \Delta^* \cdot f(\max X)$.*

Proof. We first reduce from $\text{Holant}(\text{HW}_{\in \overline{X}}, \text{HW}_{=1})$ to $\text{Holant}(\text{HW}_{\in \overline{X}}, \text{HW}_{\in \{0,1\}})$ using Lemma 7.8 from [33]. Then, the construction is the same as for the reduction in Lemma 7.19. See Figure 7 for the construction.

We claim that v acts as a $\text{HW}_{\in \{0,1\}}^{(\ell)}$ node. Note that after attaching the $k-1$ different $w[0, 1]$ nodes, v must have at least two more selected incident edges (zero and one are not allowed).

- Suppose more than one dangling edge is chosen. Then, we can pick any combination of the red and blue edges. The number of solutions is $1 - 1 + 1 - 1 = 0$. Therefore, this is not a possibility.
- Suppose no dangling edges are chosen. Then, we can extend the solution only by selecting the blue and the red edge simultaneously. The number of solutions is 1.
- Suppose exactly one dangling edge is chosen. Then, we must pick at least one of the red or blue edges. The number of solutions is $1 - 1 + 1 = 1$.

Thus, the only solution is to pick exactly one or zero dangling edges. \blacktriangleleft

Next, we show that we can realize $w[x, y]$ nodes. In particular, we can get the $w[1, 1]$, $w[-1, 1]$, and $w[0, 1]$ nodes introduced by Lemma 7.17.

► **Lemma 7.21.** *Let $X \subseteq \mathbb{N}$ be a fixed, finite set with $X \not\subseteq \{0\}$. Let R_1, \dots, R_d be d arbitrary relations for some $d \geq 0$. The following holds for arbitrary values x and y . There is a polynomial-time Turing reduction from $\text{Holant}(R_1, \dots, R_d, \text{HW}_{\in \overline{X}}, w[x, y])$ to $\text{Holant}(R_1, \dots, R_d, \text{HW}_{\in \overline{X}})$ such that Δ^* decreases and pw increases to $\text{pw} + \Delta^* \cdot f(\max X)$.*


Proof. We use Lemma 7.11 from [33] as our prototype. However, some arguments from their proof do not follow in our case.

Let G be an instance of $\text{Holant}(\text{HW}_{\in \overline{X}}, w[x, y])$ and let U be the set of $w[x, y]$ nodes in G . Let A_i denotes the number of possible solutions in G where for exactly i of the $w[x, y]$ nodes the dangling edge is not selected and for the other $|U| - i$ nodes the dangling edge is selected. Then, we have

$$\text{Holant}(G) = \sum_{i=0}^{|U|} A_i x^i y^{|U|-i}. \quad (4)$$

For a new parameter d , we construct graphs G_d from G where we replace each $w[x, y]$ node by a gadget H_d which has exactly one dangling edge. The construction of H_d is given later as it depends on X . Let $h_0(d)$ denote the number of solutions for H_d when the dangling edge is not selected and $h_1(d)$ when the dangling edge is selected. We get

$$\text{Holant}(G_d) = \sum_{i=0}^{|U|} A_i h_0(d)^i h_1(d)^{|U|-i} = h_1(d)^{|U|} \sum_{i=0}^{|U|} A_i \left(\frac{h_0(d)}{h_1(d)} \right)^i.$$



■ **Figure 8** Gadget to realize $w[x, y]$ nodes in Case 1. Red nodes are $\text{HW}_{\{0,1\}}^{(1)}$ nodes.

Assume we can find at least $|U| + 1$ values for d such that for all values the ratios $h_0(d)/h_1(d)$ are pairwise different. After computing $\text{Holant}(G_d)$ for these values of d we can recover the value of each A_i . By Equation (4), we can finally output the value of $\text{Holant}(G)$.

It remains to construct the gadgets H_d and to find the values for d . We construct the gadgets in a way such that there are constants F_1 , F_2 , and F_3 only depending on X with

$$\begin{aligned} h_0(d) &:= F_0 \cdot h_0(d-1) + F_1 \cdot h_1(d-1) & h_0(1) &:= F_0 \\ h_1(d) &:= F_1 \cdot h_0(d-1) + F_2 \cdot h_1(d-1) & h_1(1) &:= F_1. \end{aligned}$$

Given these properties of H_d , we use Proposition 7.22 to find sufficiently many values for d .

► **Proposition 7.22** (Special Case of Proposition 7.7 in [33]). *Given three constants F_0 , F_1 , and F_2 with $F_0 F_2 \neq (F_1)^2$ and $F_0, F_1 \neq 0$. Let $\{A_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}, \{B_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ be two sequences with*

$$\begin{bmatrix} A_n \\ B_n \end{bmatrix} = M \cdot \begin{bmatrix} A_{n-1} \\ B_{n-1} \end{bmatrix} = M^n \cdot U \quad \text{where} \quad M = \begin{bmatrix} F_0 & F_1 \\ F_1 & F_2 \end{bmatrix} \quad \text{and} \quad U = \begin{bmatrix} A_0 \\ B_0 \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} F_0 \\ F_1 \end{bmatrix}.$$

Then $\{A_n/B_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ is a sequence which does not contain any repetitions.

Proof. By Proposition 7.7 in [33] we need to show that M is invertible and U is not an eigenvector of M . By assumption, M is obviously invertible. Now, assume that U is an eigenvector of M . Then, there is some $\lambda \neq 0$ such that $(F_0)^2 + (F_1)^2 = \lambda F_0$ and $F_1(F_0 + F_2) = \lambda F_1$. This implies $F_1(F_0)^2 + (F_1)^3 = F_1(F_0)^2 + F_0 F_1 F_2$ which contradicts the assumptions. ◀


As a last step we construct the H_d gadgets.

Case 1: $0 \in X$ or $1 \notin X$. We first show how to get a $\text{HW}_{\{0,1\}}^{(1)}$ node.

- If $0, 1 \notin X$, then any vertex with a dangling edge acts as a $\text{HW}_{\{0,1\}}^{(1)}$ node.
- If $0 \in X, 1 \notin X$, then attach $\max X + 1$ pendant vertices to any vertex v . Then, v acts as a $\text{HW}_{\{0,1\}}^{(1)}$ node.
- If $0 \in X, 1 \in X$, then take a clique of size $\min(\overline{X}) + 1$ and split the edge between two vertices into two dangling edges. This now acts as a $\text{HW}_{=2}^{(2)}$ node. Attaching $\lceil (\max X + 1)/2 \rceil$ copies of such a $\text{HW}_{=2}^{(2)}$ node to a new vertex with one dangling edge gives us a $\text{HW}_{\{0,1\}}^{(1)}$ node.

The gadget H_d consists of a path of d vertices with a dangling edge on the first vertex. For an integer $z \geq \max X + 1$ that we choose later, attach z pendant $\text{HW}_{\{0,1\}}^{(1)}$ nodes to each vertex in the path. See Figure 8 for an illustration. By this definition, we get

$$F_0 = \sum_{i \geq 0: i \in \overline{X}} \binom{z}{i}, \quad F_1 = \sum_{i \geq 0: i+1 \in \overline{X}} \binom{z}{i}, \quad \text{and} \quad F_2 = \sum_{i \geq 0: i+2 \in \overline{X}} \binom{z}{i}.$$



■ **Figure 9** Gadget to realize $w[x, y]$ nodes in Case 2. Red nodes are EQ_2 nodes.

We claim that there is a z such that the assumptions from Proposition 7.22 hold. If we can choose z larger than $\max X + 1$, then F_0 , F_1 , and F_2 are never equal to 0. For contradictions sake, suppose that $F_0 F_2 = (F_1)^2$. We first expand the equations above. Then for every z ,

$$\begin{aligned} \left(\sum_{i \in \overline{X}} \binom{z}{i} \right) \left(\sum_{i+2 \in \overline{X}} \binom{z}{i} \right) &= \left(\sum_{i+1 \in \overline{X}} \binom{z}{i} \right)^2 \\ \left(2^z - \sum_{i \in X} \binom{z}{i} \right) \left(2^z - \sum_{i+2 \in X} \binom{z}{i} \right) &= \left(2^z - \sum_{i+1 \in X} \binom{z}{i} \right)^2 \end{aligned}$$

which implies $2^z Q_1(z) = Q_2(z)$, where

$$\begin{aligned} Q_1(z) &= \left(2 \sum_{i+1 \in X} \binom{z}{i} - \sum_{i \in X} \binom{z}{i} - \sum_{i+2 \in X} \binom{z}{i} \right) \\ Q_2(z) &= \left(\sum_{i+1 \in X} \binom{z}{i} \right)^2 - \left(\sum_{i \in X} \binom{z}{i} \right) \left(\sum_{i+2 \in X} \binom{z}{i} \right). \end{aligned}$$

For large enough z , we argue that $Q_1(z)$ is not identically zero. Observe that the second term in $Q_1(z)$ gives a non-zero $z^{\max X}$ monomial whereas the other two terms cannot give a monomial of this degree. Now, since X is a fixed, finite set, Q_1 and Q_2 are polynomials with constant degree. Thus, $Q_1(z)$ is zero only for finitely many z . Hence, there are infinitely many (positive) z such that $Q_1(z)$ is non-zero. For each such z we have

$$|2^z Q_1(z)| = |Q_2(z)|.$$

This is immediately a contradiction since $2^z \in \omega(z^c)$, for any constant c , if z is large enough. Thus, there is some positive integral value of z such that $F_0 F_2 \neq (F_1)^2$. We use this value of z in the construction of the gadget. Note that z only depends on X and can thus be precomputed.

Case 2: $0 \notin X, 1 \in X$. In this case, we first get an EQ_2 node in the following way. We create a clique of size $\min(\overline{X} \setminus \{0\}) + 1$ and split one edge into two dangling edges.

For the gadget H_d , we create a path of length d and add a dangling edge to the first vertex. To each vertex in the path, attach z many EQ_2 nodes via both of its dangling edges, where z is chosen later such that $2z \geq \max X + 1$. See Figure 9 for an illustration. We get

$$F_0 = \sum_{i \geq 0: 2i \in \overline{X}} \binom{z}{i}, \quad F_1 = \sum_{i \geq 0: 2i+1 \in \overline{X}} \binom{z}{i}, \quad \text{and} \quad F_2 = \sum_{i \geq 0: 2i+2 \in \overline{X}} \binom{z}{i}.$$

Suppose there is no z such that $F_0 F_2 \neq (F_1)^2$. Then, for every z ,

$$\begin{aligned} \left(\sum_{2i \in \bar{X}} \binom{z}{i} \right) \left(\sum_{2i+2 \in \bar{X}} \binom{z}{i} \right) &= \left(\sum_{2i+1 \in \bar{X}} \binom{z}{i} \right)^2 \\ \left(2^z - \sum_{2i \in X} \binom{z}{i} \right) \left(2^z - \sum_{2i+2 \in X} \binom{z}{i} \right) &= \left(2^z - \sum_{2i+1 \in X} \binom{z}{i} \right)^2 \end{aligned}$$

which implies $2^z Q_1(z) = Q_2(z)$, where

$$\begin{aligned} Q_1(z) &= \left(2 \sum_{2i+1 \in X} \binom{z}{i} - \sum_{2i \in X} \binom{z}{i} - \sum_{2i+2 \in X} \binom{z}{i} \right) \\ Q_2(z) &= \left(\sum_{2i+1 \in X} \binom{z}{i} \right)^2 - \left(\sum_{2i \in X} \binom{z}{i} \right) \left(\sum_{2i+2 \in X} \binom{z}{i} \right). \end{aligned}$$

As before, $Q_1(z)$ is not identically zero for large enough z . The first term of $Q_1(z)$ gives a constant of 2, the second term cannot give a constant since $0 \notin X$, and the third term gives a constant of -1 if $2 \in X$. Thus, $Q_1(z)$ has a non-zero constant term and hence, is zero only for finitely many z . Therefore, for infinitely many positive values of z , we have

$$|2^z Q_1(z)| = |Q_2(z)|.$$

This is a contradiction since $2^z \in \omega(z^c)$, for any constant c , and Q_1 and Q_2 are polynomials of constant degree. Thus, we can choose a z such that $F_0 F_2 \neq (F_1)^2$ to do the interpolation. ◀

► **Lemma 7.23.** *Let $X \subseteq \mathbb{N}$ be a fixed, finite set with $X \not\subseteq \{0\}$. Let R_1, \dots, R_d be d arbitrary relations for some $d \geq 0$. There is a polynomial-time Turing reduction from*

$$\text{Holant}(R_1, \dots, R_d, \text{HW}_{\in \bar{X}}, w[1, 1], w[-1, 1], w[0, 1]) \text{ to } \text{Holant}(R_1, \dots, R_d, \text{HW}_{\in \bar{X}})$$

such that Δ^ decreases and pw increases to $\text{pw} + \Delta^* \cdot f(\max X)$.*

Proof. We first use Lemma 7.21 to remove the $w[1, 1]$ nodes. Observe that this can alternatively be done by a simple construction using a fresh vertex with $\max X + 1$ forced edges. Then, we apply Lemma 7.21 two more times to remove the $w[-1, 1]$ nodes and finally the $w[0, 1]$ nodes. ◀

Now, we can prove the reduction from $\#Y\text{-ANTIFACTOR}^{\mathcal{R}}$ to $\#(X, Y)\text{-ANTIFACTOR}$.

Proof of Lemma 7.2. By the reduction of Lemma 7.16, we can reduce $\#Y\text{-ANTIFACTOR}^{\mathcal{R}}$ to $\text{Holant}(\text{HW}_{\in \bar{Y}}, \text{HW}_{=1})$. This can trivially be reduced to $\text{Holant}(\text{HW}_{\in \bar{Y}}, \text{HW}_{\in \bar{X}}, \text{HW}_{=1})$ as we do not have any vertices with relation $\text{HW}_{\in \bar{X}}$. Then, we invoke Lemmas 7.17 and 7.23 such that the vertices with relation $\text{HW}_{\in \bar{Y}}$ are not changed (or used for any construction). By this we end the reduction with $\text{Holant}(\text{HW}_{\in \bar{Y}}, \text{HW}_{\in \bar{X}})$ which precisely corresponds to $\#(X, Y)\text{-ANTIFACTOR}$. ◀

8 Lower Bound for Counting Edge Covers

Observe that the construction in the previous section does not apply for the case $X = \{0\}$, which precisely corresponds to $\#EDGECOVER$. Due to its special structure, we show a different reduction in this section which still leads to the expected hardness result.

► **Theorem 8.1.** *For every constant $\epsilon > 0$, no algorithm can solve $\#EDGECOVER$ in time $(2 - \epsilon)^{pw} n^{O(1)}$ even if a path decomposition of width pw is given, unless $\#SETH$ fails.*

The main step towards proving this lower bound is to show a lower bound for $\#MAXINDSET$.

► **Definition 8.2** (Counting Maximum Independent Sets ($\#MAXINDSET$)). *Given a graph $G = (V, E)$. Let $\mathcal{I} = \{I \subseteq V \mid \forall \{u, v\} \in E : u \in I \vee v \in I\}$ and $M = \max_{I \in \mathcal{I}} |I|$. Compute $|\{I \in \mathcal{I} \mid M = |I|\}|$.*

We split the lower bound for $\#EDGECOVER$ into the following steps.

1. Lemma 8.3 reduces the counting version of SAT to a variant of SAT where we want to count the satisfying assignments given the promise that the formula is satisfiable.
2. In Lemma 8.4 we show a lower bound for $\#MAXINDSET$ on low degree graphs under $\#SETH$.
3. Lemma 8.10 extends the previous lower bound to regular graphs.
4. To prove the lower bound in Theorem 8.1, we reduce $\#MAXINDSET$ on regular graphs to $\#EDGECOVER$ using ideas from [8, 9].

We start with the reduction from $\#SAT$ to the variant of $\#SAT$.

► **Lemma 8.3.** *Given a SAT formula ϕ with n variables and m clauses, we can construct in time linear in the output size a SAT formula ψ on $n + 1$ variables and $m + n$ clauses such that $\#SAT(\phi) + 1 = \#SAT(\psi)$.*

Proof. Let x_1, \dots, x_n be the variables of ϕ and x_0 be a free variable. We define ψ such that $\psi \equiv (x_0 \vee \phi) \wedge (\neg x_0 \vee (x_1 \wedge \dots \wedge x_n))$. One can easily see that the assignment $x_0 = x_1 = \dots = x_n = \text{true}$ is satisfying for ψ . Further, for $x_0 = \text{true}$ this is the only satisfying assignment. For $x_0 = \text{false}$ the satisfying assignments of ϕ directly transfer to ψ .

One can easily transform the right-hand side into a CNF by adding x_0 to each clause of ϕ and additionally adding, for all $i \in [n]$, the clauses $(\neg x_0 \vee x_i)$. ◀

Lokshtanov, Marx and Saurabh have shown a lower bound of $(2 - \epsilon)^{pw} n^{O(1)}$ for finding some maximum independent set on graphs with pathwidth pw under $\#SETH$ [29]. However, their reduction is not parsimonious and, therefore, does not hold under $\#SETH$. We strengthen this result by showing a lower bound for $\#MAXINDSET$ based on the weaker assumption of $\#SETH$.

► **Lemma 8.4.** *For every constant $\epsilon > 0$, there is an $r > 0$ such that $\#MAXINDSET$ on graphs with maximum degree r cannot be solved in time $(2 - \epsilon)^{pw} n^{O(1)}$, even if we are given a path decomposition of width pw , unless $\#SETH$ fails.*

Proof. Let ϕ be a SAT instance with n variables and m clauses. By Lemma 8.3, we can assume that ϕ is satisfiable. We construct a graph G_ϕ which mainly consists of two types of gadgets. The first type encodes the assignment and ensures that this information is transferred consistently while the second one checks if a clause is satisfied by the encoded assignment. The ideas for both types of gadgets is that the size of the maximum independent set decreases significantly if the properties of these gadgets are not fulfilled. For this we

bound the size of the maximum independent set for each type of gadget separately. Finally, we argue that the number of maximum independent sets of G_ϕ corresponds to the number of satisfying assignments of the formula ϕ .

Encoding Assignments. We group g variables together, where g is chosen later. For each group, we encode the partial assignments by subsets of vertices such that each partial assignment corresponds to some $S \subseteq [d]$ of size $d/2$, where d is also chosen later as an even integer. The high-level construction has a grid-like structure: There are $t := \lceil n/g \rceil$ rows, one for each group of variables, and m columns, one for each clause. See Figure 10 for an illustration of the construction.

We repeat the following construction for every $i \in [t]$, denoting the group, and every $j \in [m]$, denoting the clause. We create a gadget D_i^j with d new input vertices $v_{i,1}^j, \dots, v_{i,d}^j$ which ensures the consistency of the encoded assignments.

We encode the partial assignments to the variables of the i th group by subsets of these vertices (or their indices from $[d]$). To each assignment we assign a unique subset of $[d]$ of size exactly $d/2$. This is possible as we set d such that $\binom{d}{d/2} \geq 2^g$.¹² We assign the all zeros assignment to the remaining subsets of $[d]$ of size exactly $d/2$. Then, every subset of $[d]$ of size $d/2$ or rather the corresponding selection of the input vertices encodes a partial assignment for the i th group.

To ensure the assignment is consistent for all j , we add d cliques to D_i^j , each with $\binom{d}{d/2}$ vertices. Each vertex of such a clique is identified with a unique subset of size $d/2$ from $[d]$. We denote the vertex for the set S in the ℓ th clique by $w_{i,S,\ell}^j$. For all $S \subseteq [d]$ with $|S| = d/2$ and all $\ell \in [d]$, we connect $w_{i,S,\ell}^j$ to the vertices $v_{i,k}^j$ and $v_{i,k}^{j+1}$, for all $k \in [d] \setminus S$.¹³ That is, if the vertices $\{v_{i,k}^j \mid k \in S\}$ are selected, where $S \subseteq [d]$ and $|S| = d/2$, then we can also select the vertices $\{w_{i,S,\ell}^j\}_\ell$ by the definition of the graph.

▷ **Claim 8.5.** The maximum independent sets of D_i^j have size exactly $d/2 + d$.

Proof. For arbitrary $S \subseteq [d]$ with $|S| = d/2$ (depending on the assignment), we select the vertices $\{v_{i,k}^j \mid k \in S\}$ and the vertices $w_{i,S,\ell}^j$, for all $\ell \in [d]$.

Now, assume that there is a independent set where more than $d/2 + d$ vertices are selected. Trivially each of the d cliques can contribute at most one vertex to the total number. Hence, there must be more than $d/2$ input vertices selected. Then, all sets of $d/2$ input vertices intersect with the set of selected input vertices. Thus, all vertices of the cliques are adjacent to at least one selected input vertex. As a consequence this is not an independent set and the bound is tight. ◁


As a next step, we consider, for a fixed i , all D_i^j together.

▷ **Claim 8.6.** Let $i \in [t]$ be fixed. The size of the maximum independent set in the graph induced by D_i^1, \dots, D_i^m is exactly $(d/2 + d)m$ if and only if for each D_i^j the same subset of vertices (with respect to the indices) is selected. Otherwise the size of the maximum independent set is smaller.

Proof. The “if” follows directly by the definition of the graph and by bounding the size for each D_i^j individually using Claim 8.5.

¹²Note that for different i , we could use in principle different mappings.

¹³For $j = m$, the vertices are connected only to the first set of vertices, as the vertices $v_{i,k}^{m+1}$ do not exist.



■ **Figure 10** High-Level construction of the graph for $d = 4$. The hexagons represent 6-cliques where the blue vertex corresponds to the vertex of set $S = \{1, 4\}$.

For the “only if” direction we are given an maximum independent set of size $(d/2 + d)m$. Assume there is an $j \in [m]$ and some $S, S' \subseteq [d]$ with $|S| = |S'| = d/2$ and $S \neq S'$ such that the vertices $\{v_{i,k}^j \mid k \in S\}$ and the vertices $\{v_{i,k}^{j+1} \mid k \in S'\}$ are selected. Thus, there is some $k \in S' \setminus S$ such that $w_{i,S,\ell}^j$ is connected to $v_{i,k}^{j+1}$. As we are given an independent set, either none of the vertices $w_{i,S,\ell}^j$ is selected or $v_{i,k}^{j+1}$ is not selected. Therefore, the size can be at most $(d/2 + d)m - 1$ by using the upper bound from Claim 8.5 for the remaining gadgets. \triangleleft


By Claim 8.6, for a fixed i , the assignment is actually the same for each D_i^j when considering a maximum independent set. We say that the partial assignment is consistently encoded if the maximum independent set has the size from Claim 8.6.

Encoding the Clauses. The clause gadget checks whether a specific clause is satisfied by the encoded partial assignments. See Figure 11 for an illustration of the construction. For the construction we fix some clause C_j of ϕ . We omit j as superscript from all vertices in the following to simplify notation. Without loss of generality we assume that C_j contains only variables from the first k groups.

The gadget consists of three types of vertices:

1. We create vertices u_0, \dots, u_k and s_0, \dots, s_k and connect each pair u_i, s_i by an edge. Moreover, for all $i \in [k]$, we connect s_{i-1} to u_i . The idea is that the vertices s_i represent the “satisfied” state while the vertices u_i represent the “unsatisfied” state.
2. We repeat the following procedure for all $i \in [k]$. We introduce vertices $v_{ss,i,\ell}$, $v_{uu,i,\ell}$, and $v_{\square s,i,\ell}$ which are pairwise connected for each $\ell \in [d]$, i.e., for each ℓ the vertices form a triangle. We make $v_{ss,i,\ell}$ adjacent to u_{i-1} and u_i . Likewise, we connect $v_{uu,i,\ell}$ to s_{i-1} and s_i . Additionally, we connect $v_{\square s,i,\ell}$ to u_i .

For all $\ell \in [d]$, we connect the vertices $v_{uu,i,\ell}$ and $v_{ss,i,\ell}$ to $w_{i,S,\ell}$ for each $S \subseteq [d]$ with $|S| = d/2$ that represent a *satisfying* partial assignment. Conversely, for all $\ell \in [d]$,



■ **Figure 11** The clause gadget from the lower bound for $\#MAXINDSET$ with $d = 2, k = 3$. The split hexagons correspond to the d cliques of each group where the top part contains the $w_{i,S,\ell}$ with not satisfying S and the bottom part the ones with satisfying S . Black and gray edges connect vertices of the same and different type, respectively.

we connect the vertex $v_{\square s,i,\ell}$ to $w_{i,S,\ell}$ for each S representing an *unsatisfying* partial assignment.

The idea is as follows. The vertices $v_{uu,i,\ell}$ are selected if the clause is not yet satisfied and the clause is also not satisfied by the assignment for the i th group. The vertices $v_{ss,i,\ell}$ are selected if the clause is already satisfied but not satisfied by the assignment for the i th group. The vertices $v_{\square s,i,\ell}$ are selected if the clause is satisfied by the assignment for the i th group independent from whether the clause is already satisfied.

3. We make s_0 and u_k adjacent to d new vertices, each. This ensures that in a maximum independent set the vertices s_0 and u_k are not selected. Instead, the vertices u_0 and s_k should be selected. Which corresponds to the case that the clause is initially not satisfied but eventually is satisfied.

For the proof of correctness, we only count the vertices that are newly introduced. That is, we do not count the vertices $w_{i,S,\ell}$.

▷ **Claim 8.7.** If the assignment is consistently encoded and satisfies the clause, then there is a unique maximal independent set with $(k+1) + (kd) + (2d)$ vertices.

Proof. We select $k+1$ vertices of the first type, kd vertices of the second type, and $2d$ vertices of the third type. Bounding the size of the maximum independent set for each type of vertices separately, shows that no independent set can be of larger size.

By these observations, we must select all vertices of the third type. As we must select, for all $i \in [0, k]$, either s_i or u_i , the vertex u_0 must be selected. We select the other vertices in rounds.

If u_{i-1} is selected, we cannot select $v_{ss,i,\ell}$ for the independent set. By the above observation and since we want to construct an independent set, we must select either all $v_{uu,i,\ell}$ vertices, for $\ell \in [d]$, or all $v_{\square s,i,\ell}$ vertices, for $\ell \in [d]$. Observe that we can only select the vertices $v_{\square s,i,\ell}$ if the assignment for group i is satisfying because these vertices are only connected to the vertices that represent an *unsatisfying* assignment. Conversely, the vertices $v_{uu,i,\ell}$ can only be selected if the assignment is unsatisfying, as they are connected to vertices representing a *satisfying* assignment.

If s_{i-1} is selected, we cannot select $v_{uu,i,\ell}$ for the independent set because of the adjacency of these two vertices. We know that s_i must also be selected, as u_i cannot be selected.

Therefore, either all $v_{ss,i,\ell}$ vertices, for $\ell \in [d]$, or all $v_{\square s,i,\ell}$ vertices, for $\ell \in [d]$, are selected. Depending on the assignment which we are given, we can apply the same argument as before.

By this procedure, we eventually arrive at a point, where either u_k or s_k must be selected. Since the clause is satisfied by the encoded assignment, there is some $c \in [k]$ such that u_{c-1} and s_c are selected. Thus, s_k is selected and we can also select the remaining vertices of the third type, namely the ones adjacent to u_k . \triangleleft

\triangleright **Claim 8.8.** Assume the assignment is consistently encoded. If the maximum independent set has size $(k+1) + (kd) + (2d)$, then this assignment satisfies the clause.

Proof. From the definition of the graph, we get that $k+1$ vertices of the first type, kd vertices of the second type, and $2d$ vertices of the third type must be selected.

Therefore, u_0 and s_k must be selected. Since, for all $i \in [k]$, either u_i or s_i must be selected and the fact that the vertices s_{i-1} and u_i are adjacent, there must be some $c \in [k]$ such that u_0, \dots, u_{c-1} and s_c, \dots, s_k are selected. This especially implies that none of the vertices $v_{uu,c,\ell}$ and $v_{ss,c,\ell}$, for any $\ell \in [d]$, can be selected because they are connected to s_c and u_{c-1} , respectively. Therefore, the vertices $v_{\square s,c,\ell}$ must be selected. This is only possible if, for some S corresponding to a satisfying assignment, the vertices $w_{c,S,\ell}$ are selected. Thus, the assignment satisfies the clause. \triangleleft

Analysis of the Construction. For the final part of the lower bound, it remains to analyze the pathwidth of the graph G_ϕ and to bound the largest degree. Both properties depend on the parameters d and g we still need to set.

\triangleright **Claim 8.9.** The pathwidth of the graph G_ϕ is bounded by $\lceil n/g \rceil \cdot d + \binom{d}{d/2} + d + \mathcal{O}(1)$.

Proof. We use a mixed search approach. For this reason, we iterate over all clauses and clean the clause gadget and the corresponding columns starting from the first row (which corresponds to the first group of variables). We place d searchers on the input vertices of the next gadget and then clean the cliques and clause gadget sequentially by cleaning repetition by repetition. As the cliques are not connected to each other, this requires only $\binom{d}{d/2} + \mathcal{O}(1)$ searchers. Moreover, the cliques are only connected to vertices that already have a searcher on them, that is, the vertices $v_{i,k}^j$, $v_{ss,i,\ell}$, $v_{uu,i,\ell}$, and $v_{\square s,i,\ell}$, for a fixed ℓ , as we place searcher simultaneously on them. Thus, we can clean the clause gadgets with $\mathcal{O}(1)$ searchers. \triangleleft

The degree of the vertices is bounded by $\binom{d}{d/2} + 2d + \mathcal{O}(1)$. We choose the value for the parameter r from the lemma statement to be precisely this value. As we see in the remaining proof, the value of d depends on ϵ only.

Lower Bound. Assume we are given an algorithm for $\# \text{MAXINDSET}$ with running time $(2 - \epsilon)^{\text{pw}} N^{\mathcal{O}(1)}$ for a graph with N vertices and maximum degree r for some $\epsilon > 0$. We use this algorithm to count the number of satisfying assignments of a SAT formula ϕ in time $(2 - \delta)^n n^{\mathcal{O}(1)}$ where $\delta > 0$.

We choose an $\alpha > 1$ such that $(2 - \epsilon)^\alpha \leq (2 - \delta)$ for some suitable $\epsilon > \delta > 0$. For ease of notation, we define $\epsilon' = \log(2 - \epsilon)$ and $\delta' = \log(2 - \delta)$. Hence, we have that $\epsilon' \cdot \alpha \leq \delta' < 1$. Now, we choose some $0 < \beta < 1$ such that $\alpha\beta > 1$. To sue the construction from above, we set d to be an even integer large enough such that $g := \lfloor \beta d \rfloor > 0$, $d \leq \alpha \lfloor \beta d \rfloor$, and $d \leq 2^{(1-\beta)d+1}$.

We first show that we can encode all partial assignments by our choice of parameters. For this, it suffices to bound $\binom{2b}{b}$ from below by $4^b/b$ which follows directly by induction

starting from $b = 4$. Then, we get

$$\binom{d}{d/2} \geq \frac{2^{d+1}}{d} \geq 2^{\beta d} \geq 2^g.$$

Now, for the formula ϕ , we construct the graph G_ϕ as given above and count the number of maximum independent sets. Since we know that ϕ is satisfiable, the number of maximum independent sets corresponds to the number of satisfying assignments.

The running time of the whole procedure can be bound by

$$\begin{aligned} (2 - \epsilon)^{\text{pw}}(n + m)^{\mathcal{O}(1)} &\leq (2 - \epsilon)^{\lceil \frac{n}{g} \rceil \cdot d + \binom{d}{d/2} + d + \mathcal{O}(1)}(n + m)^{\mathcal{O}(1)} \\ &\leq (2 - \epsilon)^{\frac{n}{g} \cdot d + \binom{d}{d/2} + 2d + \mathcal{O}(1)}(n + m)^{\mathcal{O}(1)}. \end{aligned}$$

Observe that d does not depend on the input formula but just on ϵ . Thus, the term $(2 - \epsilon)^{\binom{d}{d/2} + 2d + \mathcal{O}(1)}$ contributes only a constant factor to the overall running time and can be hidden by the $(n + m)^{\mathcal{O}(1)}$ term.

$$\begin{aligned} &\leq (2 - \epsilon)^{\frac{n}{g} \cdot d}(n + m)^{\mathcal{O}(1)} \\ &\leq 2^{\epsilon' \frac{n}{\lfloor \beta d \rfloor} \cdot d}(n + m)^{\mathcal{O}(1)} \end{aligned}$$

By our choice of d , α , and β we get

$$\leq 2^{\epsilon' \alpha n}(n + m)^{\mathcal{O}(1)} \leq 2^{\delta' n}(n + m)^{\mathcal{O}(1)} \leq (2 - \delta)^n(n + m)^{\mathcal{O}(1)}.$$

This running time now immediately contradicts #SETH and the claim follows. \blacktriangleleft

The next step extends the previous result to regular graphs.

► **Lemma 8.10.** *For every constant $\epsilon > 0$, there is an $r > 0$ such that #MAXINSET on r -regular graphs given with a path decomposition of width pw cannot be solved in time $(2 - \epsilon)^{\text{pw}} n^{\mathcal{O}(1)}$, unless #SETH fails.*

Proof. Let $\epsilon > 0$ be an arbitrary constant. By Lemma 8.4, there is some $r' > 0$ (just depending on ϵ) such that #MAXINSET on graphs of maximum degree r' cannot be solved in time $(2 - \epsilon)^{\text{pw}} n^{\mathcal{O}(1)}$, unless #SETH fails. Let G be such a #MAXINSET instance. We modify G such that we get a regular graph H .

Set r to be the odd number of r' and $r' + 1$. We first construct a gadget J containing a distinguished vertex v_J as portal that is “forced” to *not* be in any solution of the #MAXINSET instance. For this gadget, we first take a clique with $r + 1$ vertices and remove an edge between two arbitrary vertices. Then, add an edge from both of these vertices to a new vertex v_J . We repeat this process $(r - 1)/2 - 1$ more times resulting in $(r - 1)/2$ modified cliques. We denote the resulting gadget by J and look at v_J as the portal vertex of J . Observe that v_J has degree $r - 1$ whereas all other vertices in the gadget have degree r . Observe that J has a unique maximum independent set of size $r - 1$ which does not contain v_J , that is, the independent set where, for each of the $(r - 1)/2$ modified cliques, the two non-adjacent vertices are selected.

Now, for each vertex u in G , we introduce $r - \deg(u)$ copies of the gadget J and make all copies of v_J adjacent to u . Let H denote the resulting r -regular graph. Observe that H retains all the maximum independent sets from G .

The size of the graph H can be bounded by $\mathcal{O}(nr^3)$ and the pathwidth increases by an additive term of $r + 2$ compared to the pathwidth of G . Recall that r depends on r' which

only depends on the fixed ϵ . When running the claimed algorithm on the modified instance H , the change of the size and pathwidth contributes only a constant to the running time which asymptotically does not change the running time. By Lemma 8.4, this contradicts $\#SETH$. \blacktriangleleft

Now we have everything ready for the last step of the reduction where we reduce from $\#MAXINDSET$ on regular graphs to $\#EDGECOVER$.

Proof of Theorem 8.1. For a given $\epsilon > 0$, we know from Lemma 8.10, that there is an $r > 0$ such that $\#MAXINDSET$ on r -regular graphs cannot be solved in time $(2 - \epsilon)^{pw} n^{O(1)}$, unless $\#SETH$ fails. Let $H = (V, E)$ be such an r -regular $\#MAXINDSET$ instance. We follow the ideas from the $\#P$ -completeness proof of $\#EDGECOVER$ in [8] to obtain a Turing reduction from $\#MAXINDSET$ to $\#EDGECOVER$.

Let $I_j(H)$ be the number of independent sets of size exactly j in H . We subdivide all edges of H by placing a new vertex on each edge. Let G be the resulting graph and let U be the set of new vertices. Let $N_i(G)$ be the number of subsets $E' \subseteq E(G)$ such that i vertices of V are not covered and all vertices of U are covered. We follow a similar argument as in [8, 9] to count the number of subgraphs that contribute to $N_i(G)$.

\triangleright **Claim 8.11.** With the notation as before, it holds that

$$3^{rn/2-jr} I_j(H) = \sum_{i=j}^n \binom{i}{j} N_i(G).$$

Proof. We prove the claim by analyzing how independent sets for H can be transformed into edge covers of G . The first formulation covers with the left-hand side and the second corresponds to the right-hand side.

For some independent set $S \subseteq V(H)$ of size j in H , consider some vertex $v \in S$. Let $(v, v_1), \dots, (v, v_r)$ be the incident edges of v . Suppose these edges are subdivided to get the edges $(v, u_1), (u_1, v_1), \dots, (v, u_r), (u_r, v_r)$ for some $u_1, \dots, u_r \in U$. We select none of $(v, u_1), \dots, (v, u_r)$ and select all of $(u_1, v_1), \dots, (u_r, v_r)$ in the solution. We repeat the previous selection procedure for every $v \in S$. Now, observe that there are $rn/2 - jr$ edges in H that are not incident to a vertex from S . For each of these edges, there is a unique vertex $u \in U$ subdividing this edge in G . We select at least one of the two subdividing edges incident to u ; there are three possible ways to do this. The number of possible ways for this forms the left-hand side of the equation.

For the right-hand side, observe that the above process creates every subset of edges in G where S is not covered and all of U is covered. If a selection $E' \subseteq E(G)$ leaves exactly i vertices, say $S' \subseteq V$, uncovered in G , then the above process generates E' only if $S \subseteq S'$. This means that there are exactly $\binom{i}{j}$ sets S of size j for which the process creates E' . \triangleleft

By Claim 8.11, it suffices to recover the values of $N_i(G)$ to recover the values of $I_j(H)$.

Let $N_{ij}(G)$ be the number of edge subsets of G that leave exactly i vertices in V and exactly j vertices in U uncovered. We attach paths of length m (i.e., with m edges) to all vertices $v \in V$ and attach paths of length k to all vertices $u \in U$. Let the resulting graph be $G_{m,k}$. For a path of length ℓ (i.e., with ℓ edges), let M_ℓ be the number of edge covers of such a path. Observe that $M_\ell = M_{\ell-1} + M_{\ell-2}$ with $M_1 = M_2 = 1$ which is precisely the definition of the Fibonacci numbers.

Now, consider an edge subset E' of G that leaves exactly i vertices in V and exactly j vertices in U uncovered. (Note that E' contributes towards $N_{ij}(G)$.) We analyze how E'

can be extended to an edge cover of $G_{m,k}$. For a vertex $v \in V \cup U$ that is already covered by some edge we can choose an edge cover of the path attached to v that either covers v or not. For a vertex $v \in V \cup U$ that is not covered by any edge we must choose an edge cover of the path attached to v that also covers v . Denote by $\#EC(G_{m,k})$ the number of edge covers of $G_{m,k}$. Then, by the above observations, we get

$$\begin{aligned} \#EC(G_{m,k}) &= \sum_{i=0}^n \sum_{j=0}^{rn/2} M_m^i (M_m + M_{m-1})^{n-i} M_k^j (M_k + M_{k-1})^{rn/2-j} N_{ij}(G) \\ &= M_m^n M_k^{rn/2} \sum_{i=0}^n \left(1 + \frac{M_{m-1}}{M_m}\right)^{n-i} \sum_{j=0}^{rn/2} \left(1 + \frac{M_{k-1}}{M_k}\right)^{rn/2-j} N_{ij}(G). \end{aligned}$$

We interpret $\#EC(G_{m,k})$ as a polynomial in the two variables $1 + M_{m-1}/M_m$ and $1 + M_{k-1}/M_k$. We use the algorithm for $\#EDGECOVER$ to get the value of $\#EC(G_{m,k})$. Since the M_ℓ s correspond to Fibonacci numbers, we know that $M_\ell/M_{\ell-1}$ takes infinitely many distinct values (though the sequence is converging). Hence, we can use interpolation to recover $N_{ij}(G)$ for all values of i and j . Since $N_i(G) = N_{i0}(G)$, we can recover the number of maximum independent sets of H , that is I_{j^*} where $j^* = \max\{j' \mid I_{j'} \neq 0\}$.

The only remaining task is to argue that we do not affect the pathwidth much. Observe that we only subdivided edges and attached graphs of constant pathwidth to vertices. Both of these steps do not alter the pathwidth by more than a constant. Thus, given a $(2 - \epsilon)^{pw} n^{\mathcal{O}(1)}$ algorithm for $\#EDGECOVER$, we get a $(2 - \delta)^{pw} n^{\mathcal{O}(1)}$ algorithm for $\#MAXINDSET$ on r -regular graphs. By Lemma 8.10, this contradicts $\#SETH$. ◀

References

- 1 Akanksha Agrawal, Pallavi Jain, Lawqueen Kanesh, and Saket Saurabh. Parameterized complexity of conflict-free matchings and paths. *Algorithmica*, 82(7):1939–1965, 2020. doi:10.1007/s00453-020-00681-y.
- 2 Josh Alman and Virginia Vassilevska Williams. A refined laser method and faster matrix multiplication. In Dániel Marx, editor, *Proceedings of the 2021 ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms, SODA 2021, Virtual Conference, January 10 - 13, 2021*, pages 522–539. SIAM, 2021. doi:10.1137/1.9781611976465.32.
- 3 Hans L Bodlaender. Dynamic programming on graphs with bounded treewidth. In *International Colloquium on Automata, Languages, and Programming*, pages 105–118. Springer, 1988.
- 4 Hans L Bodlaender. Treewidth: Algorithmic techniques and results. In *International Symposium on Mathematical Foundations of Computer Science*, pages 19–36. Springer, 1997.
- 5 Hans L. Bodlaender, Marek Cygan, Stefan Kratsch, and Jesper Nederlof. Deterministic single exponential time algorithms for connectivity problems parameterized by treewidth. *Inf. Comput.*, 243:86–111, 2015. doi:10.1016/j.ic.2014.12.008.
- 6 Hans L. Bodlaender and Arie M. C. A. Koster. Combinatorial optimization on graphs of bounded treewidth. *Comput. J.*, 51(3):255–269, 2008. doi:10.1093/comjnl/bxm037.
- 7 Édouard Bonnet, Nick Brettell, O-joung Kwon, and Dániel Marx. Generalized feedback vertex set problems on bounded-treewidth graphs: Chordality is the key to single-exponential parameterized algorithms. *Algorithmica*, 81(10):3890–3935, 2019. doi:10.1007/s00453-019-00579-4.
- 8 Magnus Bordewich, Martin E. Dyer, and Marek Karpinski. Path coupling using stopping times and counting independent sets and colorings in hypergraphs. *Random Struct. Algorithms*, 32(3):375–399, 2008. doi:10.1002/rsa.20204.
- 9 Russ Bubley and Martin E. Dyer. Graph orientations with no sink and an approximation for a hard case of $\#SAT$. In Michael E. Saks, editor, *Proceedings of the Eighth Annual ACM-SIAM*

- Symposium on Discrete Algorithms, 5-7 January 1997, New Orleans, Louisiana, USA*, pages 248–257. ACM/SIAM, 1997. URL: <http://dl.acm.org/citation.cfm?id=314161.314263>.
- 10 Jin-yi Cai, Sangxia Huang, and Pinyan Lu. From Holant to #CSP and back: Dichotomy for Holant^c problems. In Otfried Cheong, Kyung-Yong Chwa, and Kunsoo Park, editors, *Algorithms and Computation – 21st International Symposium, ISAAC 2010, Jeju Island, Korea, December 15-17, 2010, Proceedings, Part I*, volume 6506 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 253–265. Springer, 2010. doi:10.1007/978-3-642-17517-6_24.
 - 11 Jin-yi Cai, Pinyan Lu, and Mingji Xia. A computational proof of complexity of some restricted counting problems. *Theor. Comput. Sci.*, 412(23):2468–2485, 2011. doi:10.1016/j.tcs.2010.10.039.
 - 12 Gérard Cornuéjols. General factors of graphs. *J. Comb. Theory, Ser. B*, 45(2):185–198, 1988. doi:10.1016/0095-8956(88)90068-8.
 - 13 Radu Curticapean. Block interpolation: A framework for tight exponential-time counting complexity. In Magnús M. Halldórsson, Kazuo Iwama, Naoki Kobayashi, and Bettina Speckmann, editors, *Automata, Languages, and Programming – 42nd International Colloquium, ICALP 2015, Kyoto, Japan, July 6-10, 2015, Proceedings, Part I*, volume 9134 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 380–392. Springer, 2015. doi:10.1007/978-3-662-47672-7_31.
 - 14 Radu Curticapean and Dániel Marx. Tight conditional lower bounds for counting perfect matchings on graphs of bounded treewidth, cliquewidth, and genus. In Robert Krauthgamer, editor, *Proceedings of the Twenty-Seventh Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms, SODA 2016, Arlington, VA, USA, January 10-12, 2016*, pages 1650–1669. SIAM, 2016. doi:10.1137/1.9781611974331.ch113.
 - 15 Marek Cygan, Fedor V. Fomin, Lukasz Kowalik, Daniel Lokshtanov, Dániel Marx, Marcin Pilipczuk, Michal Pilipczuk, and Saket Saurabh. *Parameterized Algorithms*. Springer, 2015. doi:10.1007/978-3-319-21275-3.
 - 16 Victor Dalmau and Daniel K. Ford. Generalized satisfiability with limited occurrences per variable: A study through delta-matroid parity. In Branislav Rován and Peter Vojtás, editors, *Mathematical Foundations of Computer Science 2003, 28th International Symposium, MFCS 2003, Bratislava, Slovakia, August 25-29, 2003, Proceedings*, volume 2747 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 358–367. Springer, 2003. doi:10.1007/978-3-540-45138-9_30.
 - 17 Holger Dell, Thore Husfeldt, Dániel Marx, Nina Taslamán, and Martin Wahlen. Exponential time complexity of the permanent and the Tutte polynomial. *ACM Trans. Algorithms*, 10(4):21:1–21:32, 2014. doi:10.1145/2635812.
 - 18 Szymon Dudycz and Katarzyna Paluch. Optimal general matchings. In Andreas Brandstädt, Ekkehard Köhler, and Klaus Meer, editors, *Graph-Theoretic Concepts in Computer Science – 44th International Workshop, WG 2018, Cottbus, Germany, June 27-29, 2018, Proceedings*, volume 11159 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 176–189. Springer, 2018. Full version: [arXiv:1706.07418](https://arxiv.org/abs/1706.07418). doi:10.1007/978-3-030-00256-5_15.
 - 19 Jack Edmonds. Paths, trees, and flowers. *Canadian Journal of Mathematics*, 17:449–467, 1965. doi:10.4153/CJM-1965-045-4.
 - 20 Eduard Eiben and Iyad Kanj. A colored path problem and its applications. *ACM Trans. Algorithms*, 16(4):47:1–47:48, 2020. doi:10.1145/3396573.
 - 21 Fedor V. Fomin, Daniel Lokshtanov, Fahad Panolan, and Saket Saurabh. Efficient computation of representative families with applications in parameterized and exact algorithms. *J. ACM*, 63(4):29:1–29:60, 2016. doi:10.1145/2886094.
 - 22 Fedor V. Fomin, Daniel Lokshtanov, Fahad Panolan, and Saket Saurabh. Representative families of product families. *ACM Trans. Algorithms*, 13(3):36:1–36:29, 2017. doi:10.1145/3039243.
 - 23 Heng Guo and Pinyan Lu. On the complexity of holant problems. In Andrei A. Krokhin and Stanislav Zivný, editors, *The Constraint Satisfaction Problem: Complexity and Approximability*, volume 7 of *Dagstuhl Follow-Ups*, pages 159–177. Schloss Dagstuhl – Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik, 2017. doi:10.4230/DFU.Vol7.15301.6.

- 24 John E Hopcroft and Richard M Karp. An $n^{5/2}$ algorithm for maximum matchings in bipartite graphs. *SIAM Journal on computing*, 2(4):225–231, 1973.
- 25 Sangxia Huang and Pinyan Lu. A dichotomy for real weighted holant problems. *Comput. Complex.*, 25(1):255–304, 2016. doi:10.1007/s00037-015-0118-3.
- 26 Russell Impagliazzo and Ramamohan Paturi. On the complexity of k-SAT. *J. Comput. Syst. Sci.*, 62(2):367–375, 2001. doi:10.1006/jcss.2000.1727.
- 27 Michael Kowalczyk and Jin-Yi Cai. Holant problems for 3-regular graphs with complex edge functions. *Theory Comput. Syst.*, 59(1):133–158, 2016. doi:10.1007/s00224-016-9671-7.
- 28 Stefan Kratsch and Magnus Wahlström. Representative sets and irrelevant vertices: New tools for kernelization. *J. ACM*, 67(3):16:1–16:50, 2020. doi:10.1145/3390887.
- 29 Daniel Lokshtanov, Dániel Marx, and Saket Saurabh. Known algorithms on graphs of bounded treewidth are probably optimal. *ACM Trans. Algorithms*, 14(2):13:1–13:30, 2018. doi:10.1145/3170442.
- 30 L. Lovász and M. D. Plummer. *Matching Theory*. North-Holland Publishing Co., Amsterdam, 1986. Annals of Discrete Mathematics, 29.
- 31 László Lovász. The factorization of graphs. II. *Acta Mathematica Hungarica*, 23(1-2):223–246, 1972.
- 32 Pinyan Lu. Complexity dichotomies of counting problems. *Electron. Colloquium Comput. Complex.*, 18:93, 2011. URL: <http://eccc.hpi-web.de/report/2011/093>.
- 33 Dániel Marx, Govind S. Sankar, and Philipp Schepper. Degrees and gaps: Tight complexity results of general factor problems parameterized by treewidth and cutwidth. In Nikhil Bansal, Emanuela Merelli, and James Worrell, editors, *48th International Colloquium on Automata, Languages, and Programming, ICALP 2021, July 12-16, 2021, Glasgow, Scotland (Virtual Conference)*, volume 198 of *LIPIcs*, pages 95:1–95:20. Schloss Dagstuhl - Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik, 2021. Full version: arXiv:2105.08980. doi:10.4230/LIPIcs.ICALP.2021.95.
- 34 Dániel Marx, Govind S. Sankar, and Philipp Schepper. Anti-factor is FPT parameterized by treewidth and list size (but counting is hard). In Holger Dell and Jesper Nederlof, editors, *17th International Symposium on Parameterized and Exact Computation, IPEC 2022, September 7-9, 2022, Potsdam, Germany*, volume 249 of *LIPIcs*, pages 22:1–22:23. Schloss Dagstuhl - Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik, 2022. doi:10.4230/LIPIcs.IPEC.2022.22.
- 35 Dániel Marx and Paul Wollan. An exact characterization of tractable demand patterns for maximum disjoint path problems. In Piotr Indyk, editor, *Proceedings of the Twenty-Sixth Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms, SODA 2015, San Diego, CA, USA, January 4-6, 2015*, pages 642–661. SIAM, 2015. doi:10.1137/1.9781611973730.44.
- 36 Silvio Micali and Vijay V. Vazirani. An $O(\sqrt{|V|} |E|)$ algorithm for finding maximum matching in general graphs. In *21st Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science, Syracuse, New York, USA, 13-15 October 1980*, pages 17–27. IEEE Computer Society, 1980. doi:10.1109/SFCS.1980.12.
- 37 Burkhard Monien. How to find long paths efficiently. In *Analysis and design of algorithms for combinatorial problems (Udine, 1982)*, volume 109 of *North-Holland Math. Stud.*, pages 239–254. North-Holland, Amsterdam, 1985.
- 38 András Sebő. General antifactors of graphs. *J. Comb. Theory, Ser. B*, 58(2):174–184, 1993.
- 39 Hadas Shachnai and Meirav Zehavi. Representative families: A unified tradeoff-based approach. *J. Comput. Syst. Sci.*, 82(3):488–502, 2016. doi:10.1016/j.jcss.2015.11.008.
- 40 Johan M. M. van Rooij. Fast algorithms for join operations on tree decompositions. In Fedor V. Fomin, Stefan Kratsch, and Erik Jan van Leeuwen, editors, *Treewidth, Kernels, and Algorithms - Essays Dedicated to Hans L. Bodlaender on the Occasion of His 60th Birthday*, volume 12160 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 262–297. Springer, 2020. doi:10.1007/978-3-030-42071-0_18.