

Algorithms and data structures for first-order logic with connectivity under vertex failures

Michał Pilipczuk^{*} Nicole Schirrmacher[†] Sebastian Siebertz[‡] Szymon Toruńczyk[§]
 Alexandre Vigny[¶]

Abstract

We introduce a new data structure for answering connectivity queries in undirected graphs subject to batched vertex failures. Precisely, given any graph G and integer parameter k , we can in fixed-parameter time construct a data structure that can later be used to answer queries of the form: “are vertices s and t connected via a path that avoids vertices u_1, \dots, u_k ?” in time $2^{2^{O(k)}}$. In the terminology of the literature on data structures, this gives the first deterministic data structure for connectivity under vertex failures where for every fixed number of failures, all operations can be performed in constant time.

With the aim to understand the power and the limitations of our new techniques, we prove an algorithmic meta theorem for the recently introduced *separator logic*, which extends first-order logic with atoms for connectivity under vertex failures. We prove that the model-checking problem for separator logic is fixed-parameter tractable on every class of graphs that exclude a fixed topological minor. We also show a weak converse. This implies that from the point of view of parameterized complexity, under standard complexity theoretical assumptions, the frontier of tractability of separator logic is almost exactly delimited by classes excluding a fixed topological minor.

The backbone of our proof relies on a decomposition theorem of Cygan, Lokshantov, Pilipczuk, Pilipczuk, and Saurabh [SICOMP ’19], which provides a tree decomposition of a given graph into bags that are unbreakable. Crucially, unbreakability allows to reduce separator logic to plain first-order logic within each bag individually. Guided by this observation, we design our model-checking algorithm using dynamic programming over the tree decomposition, where the transition at each bag amounts to running a suitable model-checking subprocedure for plain first-order logic. This approach is robust enough to provide also an extension to efficient enumeration of answers to a query expressed in separator logic.

This paper is a part of project BOBR that has received funding from the European Research Council (ERC) under the European Union’s Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme (grant agreement No 948057) and part of the French-German Collaboration ANR/DFG Project UTMA supported by the German Research Foundation (DFG) through grant agreement No 446200270.



^{*}University of Warsaw, Poland, michal.pilipczuk@mimuw.edu.pl

[†]University of Bremen, Germany, schirrmacher@uni-bremen.de

[‡]University of Bremen, Germany, siebertz@uni-bremen.de

[§]University of Warsaw, Poland, szymtor@mimuw.edu.pl

[¶]University of Bremen, Germany, vigny@uni-bremen.de

1 Introduction

1.1 Connectivity under vertex failures

In many applications, we do not need to answer a query once but rather need to repeatedly answer queries over dynamically changing data. A prime example are databases, where a database is repeatedly modified and queried by the users. In most cases, the modifications to the database can be expected to be small compared to its size, which suggests that in a preprocessing step, we can set up a data structure that is efficiently updated after each modification and that allows for efficient querying. In 1997, Frigioni and Italiano introduced the *dynamic subgraph model* [FI97], which allows to conveniently model such dynamic situations in the particular case of connectivity in network infrastructures that are subject to node or link failures. This model, which has been studied intensively in the data structures community under the name of *connectivity oracles under vertex failures*, is as follows. We are given a graph G and an integer k . We imagine that G is a network in which at every moment, at most k vertices (or edges) are inactive (are subject to *failures*). The goal is to construct a data structure that supports the following two operations. First, one can *update* G by resetting the set of failed vertices to a given set of size at most k . Second, one can *query* G by asking, for a given pair of vertices s and t , whether s and t can be connected by a path that avoids the failed vertices.

Following the introduction of the problem by Frigioni and Italiano [FI97] and the more general problem of batched vertex or edge failures by Pătraşcu and Thorup [PT07]¹, there has been a long line of work on data structures for connectivity oracles under vertex and edge failures. We refer to a remarkably comprehensive literature overview in the work of Duan and Pettie [DP20], which also provides the currently best bounds for the problem as far as combinatorial and deterministic data structures are concerned. Their data structure can be initialized in time $\mathcal{O}(|G| \|G\| \cdot \log |G|)$, takes $\mathcal{O}(k \|G\| \log |G|)$ space, and supports updates in $\mathcal{O}(k^3 \log^3 |G|)$ time and queries in $\mathcal{O}(k)$ time. Here $\|G\|$ is the vertex count of G and $\|G\|$ is the joint number of edges and vertices in G . These bounds can be slightly improved at the cost of allowing randomization, however, the polylogarithmic dependency on the size of the graph in the update time persists. As noted in [DP20], from known results it is possible to derive data structures with constant time complexity of operations for $k \leq 3$ (or $k \leq 4$ for edge failures), but, citing their words, “scaling these solutions up, even to an arbitrarily large constant k , becomes prohibitively complex, even in the simpler case of edge failures.”

Recently, van den Brand and Saranurak [vdBS19] proposed a very different approach to the problem, using which they obtained a randomized data structure that can be initialized in time $\mathcal{O}(|G|^\omega)$, takes $\mathcal{O}(|G|^2 \log |G|)$ space, and supports updates in $\mathcal{O}(k^\omega)$ time and queries in $\mathcal{O}(k^2)$ time. In particular, the update and the query time are constant for constant k ; to the best of our knowledge, this is the only data structure that has this property known so far. The approach is algebraic and, simplifying it substantially, boils down to storing a matrix of counts of walks between pairs of vertices and extracting answers to queries using algebraic operations on those counts. To manipulate the counts efficiently, one needs to work on their short hashes, for instance in the form of elements from a fixed finite field. This introduces randomization to the picture and avoiding it within this methodology seems difficult. We remark that the data structure of van den Brand and Saranurak [vdBS19] works even for the more general problem of reachability in directed graphs under vertex failures, and can handle arc insertions.

As the first main contribution of this paper, we prove the following theorem. Note that querying whether two vertices are connected by a path avoiding failed vertices is equivalent to an update followed by a connectivity query in the terminology of previous works [vdBS19, DP10, DP20, PT07].

Theorem 1.1. *Given a graph G and an integer k , one can in time $2^{2^{\mathcal{O}(k)}} \cdot |G|^2 \|G\|$ construct a data structure that may answer the following queries in time $2^{2^{\mathcal{O}(k)}}$: given $s, t \in V(G)$ and k vertices u_1, \dots, u_k of G , are s and t connected in G by a path that avoids the vertices u_1, \dots, u_k ? The space usage of the data structure is $2^{2^{\mathcal{O}(k)}} \cdot \|G\|$.*

¹Strictly speaking, in [PT07] Pătraşcu and Thorup considered only edge failures. To the best of our knowledge, the first to systematically investigate (batched) vertex failures on general graphs were Duan and Pettie in [DP10].

Note that in [Theorem 1.1](#), for every fixed k , all operations are supported in constant time (which is doubly-exponential in k). Also, the data structure is entirely deterministic and purely combinatorial. To the best of our knowledge, this is the first deterministic data structure with constant time queries. Note also that for a fixed k , the space usage of our data structure is linear in the size of the graph, as opposed to the quadratic dependency in the result of van den Brand and Saranurak [\[vdbS19\]](#).

Our approach to proving [Theorem 1.1](#) is completely new compared to the previous approaches [\[vdbS19, DP10, DP20, PT07\]](#). Our key combinatorial observation is that connectivity queries over a constant number k of vertex failures can be evaluated in constant time provided the underlying graph G is sufficiently well-connected. The requirement on the well-connectedness of G depends on the number k . Obviously, there is no guarantee that the input graph G satisfies this property. We therefore use a decomposition theorem of Cygan, Lokshtanov, Pilipczuk, Pilipczuk, and Saurabh [\[CLP⁺19\]](#) that (roughly) states the following (see [Theorem 3.2](#) for a precise statement). For every graph G and fixed number k , there is a tree decomposition where every intersection of adjacent bags has bounded size and every bag is well-connected for parameter k . Moreover, such a tree decomposition can be computed in time $2^{\mathcal{O}(k^2)}|G|^2\|G\|$. The data structure of [Theorem 1.1](#) is constructed around the tree decomposition \mathcal{T} provided by the theorem of Cygan et al. [\[CLP⁺19\]](#). Intuitively speaking, whether s and t are connected via a path that avoids the vertices u_1, \dots, u_k can be decided using dynamic programming over \mathcal{T} . We employ known techniques developed for answering queries on trees in constant time, for instance a deterministic variant of Simon’s factorization [\[Col07\]](#), to be able to compute the outcome of this dynamic programming efficiently for any query given on input. We provide a more detailed overview of the proof of [Theorem 1.1](#) in [Section 2](#). The full proof is provided in [Section 4](#).

The time complexity guarantees provided by [Theorem 1.1](#) can be improved by allowing larger space usage. We give a variant of [Theorem 1.1](#) ([Theorem 6.1](#)) that offers queries in time $k^{\mathcal{O}(1)}$ after initialization in time $2^{\mathcal{O}(k \log k)} \cdot |G|^{\mathcal{O}(1)}$, but assumes space usage $k^{\mathcal{O}(1)} \cdot |G|^2$. The main idea here is to use a later variant of the decomposition of Cygan et al. [\[CLP⁺19\]](#), proved in [\[CKL⁺21\]](#), that provides quantitatively better bounds on the adhesion and unbreakability of the decomposition, at the cost of relaxing a technical condition on the unbreakability (see the difference between strong and weak unbreakability, explained in [Section 3](#)). The need of dealing with this relaxation turns out to be a nuisance that, nonetheless, can be overcome in our approach.

1.2 Algorithmic meta theorems

Once an algorithmic technique has been applied to solve a specific problem, it is very desirable to understand the power and the limitations of that technique, that is, to understand which other problems can be solved with that technique and which problems cannot. An approach to this very general goal is to prove an *algorithmic meta theorem*: a theorem that establishes tractability for a whole class of problems, possibly on certain restricted input instances. As logic allows to conveniently define classes of algorithmic problems, namely, the class of all problems that can be expressed in the logic under consideration, algorithmic meta theorems are often formulated as model-checking problems for a logic. In the *model-checking problem* for a logic \mathcal{L} on a class of graphs \mathcal{C} we are given a graph $G \in \mathcal{C}$ and a sentence $\varphi \in \mathcal{L}$, and the task is to decide whether φ holds in G . The archetypal result of this form is a result of Courcelle stating that every formula of monadic-second order logic (MSO_2) can be evaluated in linear time on all graphs whose treewidth is bounded by some fixed constant [\[Cou90\]](#). This result has been extended to various other logics \mathcal{L} and graph classes \mathcal{C} .

This approach to algorithmic meta theorems can be made precise in the language of parameterized complexity, as follows. Say that \mathcal{L} is *tractable* on \mathcal{C} if the model-checking problem for \mathcal{C} and \mathcal{L} is *fixed-parameter tractable (fpt)*: it can be solved in time $f(\varphi) \cdot \|G\|^c$, for some computable function f and a constant c , both depending only on \mathcal{C} . Results about tractability of a logic \mathcal{L} on a class \mathcal{C} imply the tractability of a vast array of problems — namely all problems that can be expressed in the logic \mathcal{L} — on a given class of graphs. For instance, if model-checking *first-order logic* (FO) is fpt on a class of graphs \mathcal{C} , then in particular the dominating set problem is fpt on \mathcal{C} , since the existence of a dominating set of size k can be expressed by a first-order sentence with $k + 1$ quantifiers that range over the vertices

of the graph. Similarly, the independent set problem is then also fpt on \mathcal{C} . On the other hand, if the more powerful logic MSO_2 is tractable on a class of graphs \mathcal{C} , then the 3-colorability problem, or the hamiltonicity problem are polynomial-time solvable on \mathcal{C} , since both those problems can be expressed using an MSO_2 sentence, whose quantifiers range over sets of vertices and edges of the graph.

There has been a long line of work on fixed-parameter tractability of model-checking FO, as it is arguably the most fundamental logic. This culminated in the work of Grohe, Kreutzer and Siebertz [GKS17], who proved that this problem is fixed-parameter tractable on every class that is *nowhere dense*. Those classes include for example the class of planar graphs, or every class with bounded maximum degree, or of bounded genus. Without going into details, nowhere denseness is a general notion of uniform sparseness in graphs, and it is broader than most well-studied concepts of sparseness considered in structural graph theory, such as excluding a fixed (topological) minor. As observed by Dvořák et al. [DKT13], the result of Grohe et al. is tight in the following sense: whenever \mathcal{C} is not nowhere dense and is closed under taking subgraphs, then FO model-checking on \mathcal{C} is as hard as on general graphs, that is, $\text{AW}[\star]$ -hard. This means that as far as subgraph-closed classes are concerned, sparsity — described formally through the notion of nowhere denseness — exactly delimits the area of tractability of FO and the limits of the locality method for FO model-checking.

The aforementioned classic theorem of Courcelle [Cou90] states that the model-checking problem for MSO_2 is fixed-parameter tractable on a class \mathcal{C} if \mathcal{C} has bounded treewidth. The proof translates the given sentence into a suitable tree automaton working on a tree decomposition of the input graph; this approach brings a wide range of automata-based tools to the study of MSO_2 on graphs. Again, as shown by Kreutzer and Tazari [KT10] and Ganian et al. [GHL⁺14], under certain complexity assumptions this is (almost) the most one could hope for: on subgraph-closed classes whose treewidth is poly-logarithmically unbounded, model-checking of MSO_2 becomes intractable from the parameterized perspective. So for MSO_2 , bounded treewidth (almost) delimits the frontier of tractability, at least for subgraph-closed classes, and automata-based techniques exactly explain what can be done algorithmically.

With the aim to provide a meta theorem that captures the essence of the techniques developed to answer connectivity under vertex failures, we search for a logic that can express these queries. It is easy to see that MSO_2 is strong enough, but in fact, MSO_2 is much stronger and as explained above, it is intractable beyond graphs of bounded treewidth. On the other hand, FO can only express local properties and in particular, it cannot even express the very simple query of whether two vertices are in the same connected component. This naturally leads to an extension of FO that may use connectivity under vertex failures as atomic formulas. Interestingly, such a logic was only very recently introduced independently by Bojańczyk [Boj21] and by Schirmacher et al. [SSV21] under the name *separator logic*, and denoted FO+conn. This logic extends FO by predicates $\text{conn}_k(s, t, u_1, \dots, u_k)$ (one for each $k \geq 0$) with the following semantics: if s, t, u_1, \dots, u_k are vertices of a graph G , then $\text{conn}_k(s, t, u_1, \dots, u_k)$ holds if and only if there is a path that connects s with t and does not pass through any of the vertices u_1, \dots, u_k . Thus, separator logic involves very basic connectivity queries that have a global character, unlike plain FO, which is local. On the other hand, while $\text{conn}_k(s, t, u_1, \dots, u_k)$ predicates are expressible in MSO_2 , it is no surprise that the expressive power of FO+conn is strictly weaker than that of MSO_2 . For example, MSO_2 can express bipartiteness, while FO+conn cannot [SSV21, Theorem 3.11]. Separator logic can still express many interesting algorithmic properties, such as the feedback vertex set problem and many recently studied elimination distance problems [BD16].

As the second main result of the paper, we prove an algorithmic meta theorem for separator logic. We show that the frontier of tractability of FO+conn is almost exactly delimited by classes of graphs that exclude a fixed topological minor. More precisely, we prove the following complementary results.

Theorem 1.2. *Let \mathcal{C} be a class of graphs that exclude a fixed graph as a topological minor. Then given $G \in \mathcal{C}$ and an FO+conn sentence φ , one can decide whether φ holds in G in time $f(\varphi) \cdot \|G\|^3$, where f is a computable function depending on \mathcal{C} .*




Figure 1: Correspondences between logics and properties of graph classes. An arrow $\mathcal{L} \rightsquigarrow \mathcal{P}$ between a logic \mathcal{L} and a property \mathcal{P} of graph classes denotes a correspondence: the logic \mathcal{L} is tractable on a graph class \mathcal{C} if and, under additional assumptions, only if, the class \mathcal{C} has the property \mathcal{P} . Our result is the central correspondence $(*)$.

For the lower bound, we will need a technical assumption. We say that a class \mathcal{C} admits *efficient encoding of topological minors* if for every graph H there exists $G \in \mathcal{C}$ such that H is a topological minor of G , and, given H , such G together with a suitable topological minor model can be computed in time polynomial in $|H|$. Note that in particular such G can be only polynomially larger than H .

Theorem 1.3. *Let \mathcal{C} be a subgraph-closed class of graphs that admits efficient encoding of topological minors. Then the model-checking of FO+conn on \mathcal{C} is AW[*]-hard, even for the fragment that uses only conn_k predicates with $k \leq 2$.*

On the one hand, these results show that separator logic is a natural logic whose expressive power lies strictly between FO and MSO_2 , and which corresponds, in the sense described above, to a natural property of classes of graphs that lies between bounded treewidth and nowhere denseness, see Figure 1. On the other hand, the proof of Theorem 1.2 takes the technique of dynamic programming over tree decompositions with unbreakable parts to the limit. The tractability result generalizes several recent algorithmic results for concrete problems expressible in separator logic [AKP⁺21b, BD17, LSV20].

The proof of Theorem 1.3 is easy (see Section 2.2), so we focus on sketching the proof of Theorem 1.2, which is the main technical contribution of the second part of the paper. Let us fix an FO+conn sentence φ , and let $k+2$ be the maximum arity of connectivity predicates appearing in φ . Again, the key observation is that conn_k predicates can be rewritten to plain FO provided the graph is well-connected, and the reason for this is the same combinatorial observations that underlies the proof of Theorem 1.1. Coming back to our dynamic programming on the tree decomposition, we choose to present it using a new framework based on automata, as this brings us closer to the classic understanding of logic on tree-decomposable graphs. Intuitively, the automaton processes a given tree in a bottom-up manner, but we assume that on the children of every node there is an additional structure of a graph. We say that such trees are *augmented* with graphs. When the automaton processes a node x , it chooses a transition based on an FO query executed on the graph on the children of x , where each child is labeled with the state computed for it before in the run. Then testing whether a formula $\varphi \in \text{FO+conn}$ holds on a graph G is reduced to deciding whether an automaton constructed from φ accepts such an *augmented tree*, constructed from the tree decomposition provided by the theorem of Cygan et al. [CLP⁺19].

The benefit of this approach is that other questions related to the logic FO+conn can be reduced in the same way to questions about tree automata over augmented trees. We showcase this by proving that given an FO+conn query $\varphi(\bar{x})$ with free variables and a graph G from a fixed topological-minor-free class \mathcal{C} , the answers to $\varphi(\bar{x})$ on G can be enumerated with constant delay after fpt preprocessing (see Theorem 8.2 for a precise statement). Similarly, the formula $\varphi(\bar{x})$ can be queried in constant time after fpt preprocessing (see Theorem 8.1). In general, we believe that the framework of automata over augmented trees may be of independent interest, as it seems to be a convenient model for understanding dynamic programming procedures over tree-decomposable structures.

Similar fpt query-answering and enumeration algorithms for plain FO have been obtained for classes with bounded expansion [KS20, Tor20] and nowhere dense classes [SSV18] and for MSO_2 on trees and graphs of bounded treewidth [Bag06, KS13, ABMN19]. Our general approach based on augmented trees allows us to generalize those results to trees that are augmented with graphs coming from a nowhere dense class, and to a certain logic combining the power of MSO on trees and FO on graphs.

Let us comment on the novelty of using the decomposition theorem of Cygan et al. [CLP⁺19]. The result of Cygan et al. [CLP⁺19] has been used several times for various graph problems [CKL⁺21, CLP⁺19, LSS20, LPPS21, SZ18]. Our application is the most similar to (and in fact, draws inspiration from) the work of Lokshtanov et al. [LRSZ18], who proved the following statement: for every CMSO_2 sentence φ and $k \in \mathbb{N}$, model-checking φ on general graphs can be reduced to model-checking φ on (q, k) -unbreakable graphs, where q is a constant depending on φ and k . As FO+conn is subsumed by CMSO_2 , this result can be almost applied to establish Theorem 1.2. The caveat is that the unbreakable graph output by the reduction needs to admit efficient FO model-checking so that the considered FO+conn sentence can be decided in fpt time after rewriting it to plain FO. In essence, we show that it is possible to guarantee this provided the input graph excludes a fixed topological minor. We remark that the work of Lokshtanov et al. [LRSZ18] does not use the decomposition theorem of Cygan et al. [CLP⁺19] directly, but relies on its conceptual predecessor, the *recursive understanding* technique [CCH⁺16, KT11].

Organization. In Section 2 we give an overview of the proofs of our main results: Theorem 1.1, Theorem 1.2, and Theorem 1.3. In the main body of the paper, after formal preliminaries, we present the proof of Theorem 1.1 in Section 4 and Section 5. Section 6 presents Theorem 6.1, a variant of Theorem 1.1 that offers faster queries. The proof of Theorem 1.2 is presented in Section 7 and 8, devoted respectively to introducing the framework of automata over augmented trees and applying them to FO+conn on classes excluding a fixed topological minor. Theorem 1.3 is proved in Section 9.

2 Overview

In this section we provide an overview of the proofs of our main results: Theorem 1.1, Theorem 1.2, and Theorem 1.3. We start with Theorem 1.1, as this proof exposes all main ideas in a purely algorithmic setting. Then we discuss how the same methodology can be used for Theorem 1.2. In this introduction we assume familiarity with basic terminology of tree decompositions; see Section 3 for details.

2.1 Data structure for connectivity under vertex failures: proof of Theorem 1.1

Unbreakability. As mentioned in Section 1, the central idea of this work is to tackle problems involving connectivity predicates using a decomposition into well-connected — or, more formally, *unbreakable* — parts. We first need to recall a few definitions.

A *separation* in a graph G is a pair (A, B) of vertex subsets such that $A \cup B = V(G)$ and there are no edges in G between $A - B$ and $B - A$. The *order* of the separation is the cardinality of the *separator* $A \cap B$. A vertex subset X is (q, k) -*unbreakable* in a graph G if for every separation (A, B) in G of order at most k in G , either $|A \cap X| \leq q$ or $|B \cap X| \leq q$. So intuitively speaking, a separation of order k cannot break X in a balanced way: one of the sides must contain at most q vertices of X .

The notion of unbreakability has been implicitly introduced in the context of parameterized algorithms by Kawarabayashi and Thorup in their work on the k -WAY CUT problem [KT11]. This work has brought about the method of *recursive understanding*, which was then made explicit by Chitnis, Cygan, Hajiaghayi, Pilipczuk, and Pilipczuk in the technique of *randomized contractions* [CCH⁺16]. Intuitively, recursive understanding is a Divide&Conquer scheme using which one can reduce problems on general graphs to problems on suitably unbreakable graphs, provided certain technical conditions are satisfied. The technique was also applied in the context of model-checking: Lokshtanov, Ramanujan, Saurabh, and

Zehavi [LRSZ18] proved that the problem of deciding a property expressed in CMSO_2 in fpt time on general graphs can be reduced to the same problem on suitably unbreakable graphs. This result was used to provide algorithms for computing elimination distance to certain graph classes [AKP⁺21a, FGT21, Jd21], which is very much related to separator logic (see [SSV21, Example 3.5]).

In this work, we will not use recursive understanding or randomized contractions *per se*, but their conceptual successor: the decomposition into unbreakable parts. Precisely, the following theorem was proved by Cygan, Lokshtanov, Pilipczuk, Pilipczuk, and Saurabh [CLP⁺19].

Theorem 2.1 ([CLP⁺19]). *There is a function $q(k) \in 2^{\mathcal{O}(k)}$ such that given a graph G and $k \in \mathbb{N}$, one can in time $2^{\mathcal{O}(k^2)} \cdot |G|^2 \|G\|$ construct a (rooted) tree decomposition $\mathcal{T} = (T, \text{bag})$ of G satisfying the following.*

- *All adhesions in \mathcal{T} are of size at most $q(k)$; and*
- *every bag of \mathcal{T} , say at node x , is $(q(k), k)$ -unbreakable in the subgraph of G induced by the union of bags at all descendants² of x .*

We remark that a different variant of Theorem 2.1 was later proved by Cygan, Komosa, Lokshtanov, Pilipczuk, Pilipczuk, and Wahlström [CKL⁺21]. This variant provides much stronger unbreakability guarantees — $q(k) = k$ — at the cost of relaxing the unbreakability to hold only in the whole graph G . See Section 3 for a discussion. The variant of [CKL⁺21] can be also used in our context and this leads to improving some quantitative bounds, however for simplicity, we focus on Theorem 2.1 in this overview.

A typical usage of Theorem 2.1 is to apply bottom-up dynamic programming on the obtained tree decomposition $\mathcal{T} = (T, \text{bag})$. The subproblem for a node x of T corresponds to finding partial solutions in the subgraph of G induced by the union of bags at descendants of x , for every possible behavior of such a partial solution on the adhesion connecting x with its parent. That this adhesion has size at most $q(k)$ gives an upper bound on the number of different behaviors. To solve such a subproblem one needs to aggregate the solutions computed for the children of x by solving an auxiliary problem on the subgraph induced by the bag of x . In various problems of interest, the unbreakability of the bag becomes helpful in solving the auxiliary problem. This general methodology has been successfully used to give multiple fpt algorithms for cut problems [CLP⁺19, CKL⁺21, SZ18], most prominently for MINIMUM BISECTION [CLP⁺19]. More recent uses include a parameterized approximation scheme for the MIN k -CUT problem [LSS20] and a fixed-parameter algorithm for GRAPH ISOMORPHISM parameterized by the size of the excluded minor [LPPS21]. On a high level, we apply the same methodology here.

The case of totally unbreakable graphs. Let us come back to the problem of evaluating connectivity queries: we are given a graph G and after some preprocessing of G , we would like to be able to quickly evaluate for given vertices s, t, u_1, \dots, u_k whether $\text{conn}_k(s, t, u_1, \dots, u_k)$ holds. Consider first the following special case: the whole G is (q, k) -unbreakable for some parameter q (or more formally, $V(G)$ is (q, k) -unbreakable in G). The key observation is that then, whether $\text{conn}_k(s, t, u_1, \dots, u_k)$ holds can be easily decided in time polynomial in q and k as follows.

Run a breadth-first search from s in $G - \{u_1, \dots, u_k\}$, but terminate the search once $q + 1$ different vertices have been reached. If the search reached t , then for sure $\text{conn}_k(s, t, u_1, \dots, u_k)$ holds. If the search finished before reaching $q + 1$ different vertices and it did not reach t , then for sure $\text{conn}_k(s, t, u_1, \dots, u_k)$ does not hold. In the remaining case, perform a symmetric procedure starting from t . The key observation is that if both breadth-first searches — from s and from t — got terminated after reaching $q + 1$ different vertices, then the (q, k) -unbreakability of G implies that $\{u_1, \dots, u_k\}$ do not separate s from t . So then $\text{conn}_k(s, t, u_1, \dots, u_k)$ holds. It is straightforward to implement this procedure in time polynomial in q and k given the standard encoding of G through adjacency lists.

In the general case, we cannot expect the given graph G to be (q, k) -unbreakable for any parameter q bounded in terms of k . However, we can use Theorem 2.1 to compute a tree decomposition \mathcal{T} of G into parts that are (q, k) -unbreakable for $q \in 2^{\mathcal{O}(k)}$. The idea is that then, a query $\text{conn}_k(s, t, u_1, \dots, u_k)$ can be evaluated by bottom-up dynamic programming on \mathcal{T} . By suitably precomputing enough auxiliary information about \mathcal{T} , this evaluation can be performed in time depending only on q and k .

²We follow the convention that every node is its own ancestor and descendant.

Evaluating a query on the decomposition. Consider then the following setting: we are given the decomposition $\mathcal{T} = (T, \text{bag})$ provided by [Theorem 2.1](#), and for given s, t, u_1, \dots, u_k we would like to decide whether $\text{conn}_k(s, t, u_1, \dots, u_k)$ holds. So far let us not optimize the complexity: the goal is only to design a general algorithmic mechanism which will be later implemented efficiently using appropriate data structures.

For every node x of T , let $\text{adh}(x)$ be the adhesion between x and its parent (or \emptyset if x is the root), let $\text{cone}(x)$ be the union of the bags at the descendants of x , and let $\text{comp}(x) = \text{cone}(x) - \text{adh}(x)$. Call a node x *affected* if $\text{comp}(x)$ contains a vertex of $\{s, t, u_1, \dots, u_k\}$, and *unaffected* otherwise. Further, let $D(x) = \text{adh}(x) \cup (\text{comp}(x) \cap \{s, t\})$; note that $|D(x)| \leq q + 2$. Our goal is to compute the following (*connectivity*) *profile* for every node x of T :

$$\text{profile}(x) = \left\{ \{a, b\} \in \binom{D(x)}{2} \mid a \text{ and } b \text{ are connected in } G[\text{cone}(x) - \{u_1, \dots, u_k\}] \right\}.$$

We remark that the tree decomposition \mathcal{T} can be chosen so that it satisfies the following basic connectivity property: for every node x and vertices $a, b \in \text{adh}(x)$, there is a path connecting a and b whose all internal vertices belong to $\text{comp}(x)$. Thus, for every unaffected node x , we have that $\text{profile}(x) = \binom{D(x) - \{u_1, \dots, u_k\}}{2}$.

It is easy to see that the profile of x is uniquely determined by the profiles of the children of x and the subgraph induced by the bag of x . The following lemma shows that this can be done efficiently.

Lemma 2.2 ([Lemma 4.4](#), informal statement). *Let x be a node of T . Suppose that for each affected child z of x we are given $\text{profile}(z)$. Then, subject to suitable preprocessing of G , one can compute $\text{profile}(x)$ in time polynomial in q .*

Note that every node has at most $k + 2$ affected children, hence the input to the algorithm of [Lemma 2.2](#) is of size polynomial in q .

Let us sketch the proof of [Lemma 2.2](#). In essence, we apply the same strategy as the one from the case when the whole graph G is unbreakable. Let $\text{bgraph}(x)$ be the graph obtained from $G[\text{bag}(x)]$ by turning the adhesion $\text{adh}(z)$ into a clique, for every child z of x . Note that $\text{bgraph}(x)$ does not depend on the query, and thus can be precomputed upon initialization. As $\text{bag}(x)$ is (q, k) -unbreakable in $G[\text{cone}(x)]$, to test whether two vertices $a, b \in \text{bag}(x)$ are connected in $G[\text{cone}(x) - \{u_1, \dots, u_k\}]$ it suffices to apply breadth-first searches from a and b in $\text{bgraph}(x)$ that are terminated after reaching $q + 1$ different vertices, except that these searches are forbidden to use vertices from $\{u_1, \dots, u_k\} \cap \text{bag}(x)$ as well as those edges originating from turning adhesions of affected children into cliques that are not in respective profiles. Provided $\text{bgraph}(x)$ is precomputed and a list of affected children together with their profiles is given on input, it is easy to implement this algorithm so that it runs in time polynomial in q . Thus we can decide for every pair $\{a, b\} \in \binom{\text{adh}(x)}{2}$ whether it should be included in $\text{profile}(x)$. A similar reasoning can be applied to pairs in $\binom{D(x)}{2}$ that include s or t .

By applying [Lemma 2.2](#) bottom-up, we can compute all the profiles in time $q^{\mathcal{O}(1)} \cdot |T| \leq q^{\mathcal{O}(1)} \cdot |G|$. Then we can read whether $\text{conn}_k(s, t, u_1, \dots, u_k)$ holds by checking whether $\{s, t\}$ belongs to the profile of the root of T . Hence, the query $\text{conn}_k(s, t, u_1, \dots, u_k)$ can be evaluated in time $q^{\mathcal{O}(1)} \cdot |G|$.

Data structure. Our final goal is to enrich the decomposition \mathcal{T} with some additional information so that the mechanism presented above can be executed in time depending only on q .

For a vertex v of G , let $\text{top}(v)$ be the unique top-most node of T whose bag contains v . Let $\hat{S} := \{s, t, u_1, \dots, u_k\}$ and let $X = \{\text{top}(v) : v \in \hat{S}\}$.

Note that $|X| \leq |\hat{S}| \leq k + 2$ and that a node of T is affected if and only if it is an ancestor of a node from X . Let now Y be the *lowest common ancestor closure* of X : the set comprising X and all lowest common ancestors of pairs of vertices of X . It is well-known that then $|Y| \leq 2|X| - 1 \leq 2k + 3$. We also add the root of T to Y in case it is not already present; thus $|Y| \leq 2k + 4$. Observe that if for every vertex v we store a pointer to $\text{top}(v)$, and we set up the data structure for lowest common ancestor queries of Harel and Tarjan [[HT84](#)] on T , then for given s, t, u_1, \dots, u_k the set Y can be computed in




Figure 2: The sets X, Y and Y' . Only the nodes from $Y \cup Y'$ are marked in the figure, whereas the shaded areas indicate subtrees consisting of nodes which are not marked in the figure. Every affected node lies on a path from some $y \in Y$ to $f(y) \in Y'$.

time polynomial in k . For every node y in Y let $f(y)$ denote the closest ancestor of y whose parent belongs to Y , or y if no such ancestor exists (see Figure 2). Note that every affected node lies on a path joining y with $f(y)$, for some $y \in Y$. Let $Y' = \{f(y) \mid y \in Y\}$. Then Y' is the set of all nodes that are affected children of a node in Y . Note that every element in Y' has exactly one preimage under f , that is, there is an function $f^{-1}: Y' \rightarrow Y$ such that $f(f^{-1}(y')) = y'$ for all $y' \in Y'$. In particular, $|Y'| \leq |Y|$. Using a slight modification of the data structure of Harel and Tarjan [HT84], we can compute Y' as well as the function $f^{-1}: Y' \rightarrow Y$ in time polynomial in k .

The idea is that when evaluating query $\text{conn}_k(s, t, u_1, \dots, u_k)$, we can compute the profiles only for the nodes of $Y \cup Y'$, instead of all affected nodes of T . Note that the root of T was explicitly added to Y , so we will still be able to read the answer to $\text{conn}_k(s, t, u_1, \dots, u_k)$ from the profile of the root.

We process the nodes of $Y \cup Y'$ in a bottom-up manner. Consider then any element $x \in Y \cup Y'$; our task is to compute its profile based on the profiles of its strict descendants belonging to $Y \cup Y'$. We distinguish two cases. In the first case, $x \in Y$, so we may compute $\text{profile}(x)$ using the algorithm of Lemma 2.2. The second case is of an element $x \in Y'$; then $x = f(y)$ where $y = f^{-1}(x)$. Observe that the path from y to x consists of affected nodes, whose siblings are unaffected nodes. We now show how $\text{profile}(x)$ can be computed from $\text{profile}(y)$.

For two nodes c, d of T , where c is an ancestor of d , let $\text{torso}(c, d)$ be the set of all pairs $\{a, b\} \in \binom{\text{adh}(c) \cup \text{adh}(d)}{2}$ such that in G there is a path from a to b whose all internal vertices belong to $\text{comp}(c) - \text{cone}(d)$. Then to compute $\text{profile}(x)$ from $\text{profile}(y)$, construct an auxiliary graph with vertices $\text{adh}(x) \cup \text{adh}(y)$ and edges $\text{profile}(y) \cup \text{torso}(x, y)$. Now observe that $\text{profile}(x)$ is the reachability relation in this graph restricted to $\text{adh}(x) - \{u_1, \dots, u_k\}$. The key point implying the correctness of this observation is that there are no vertices from X in $\text{comp}(x) - \text{comp}(y)$.

Observe now that the values of $\text{torso}(c, d)$ for (c, d) ranging over ancestor/descendants pairs in T are independent of the query. Therefore, upon initialization we can compute a data structure that can be queried for those values efficiently. The statement below describes two possible implementations.

Lemma 2.3 (Lemma 6.2 and Lemma 4.2, combined and simplified). *Given \mathcal{T} , one can set up data structures that can answer $\text{torso}(c, d)$ queries with the following specifications:*

1. *initialization time $q^{\mathcal{O}(1)} \cdot |G|^2 \|G\|$, memory usage $q^{\mathcal{O}(1)} \cdot |G|^2$, query time $q^{\mathcal{O}(1)}$; or*
2. *initialization time $2^{\mathcal{O}(q^2)} \cdot |G|$, memory usage $2^{\mathcal{O}(q^2)} \cdot |G|$, query time $2^{\mathcal{O}(q^2)}$.*

The first point of Lemma 2.3 is actually straightforward: just compute and store all the $\mathcal{O}(|T|^2) = \mathcal{O}(|G|^2)$ answers to the torso queries, each in time $q^{\mathcal{O}(1)} \cdot \|G\|$ using $q^{\mathcal{O}(1)}$ applications of breadth-first search. The second point, which trades exponential dependency on q for obtaining linear memory usage and initialization time, is more interesting. Before we discuss it, let us observe that we may

now complete the proof of [Theorem 1.1](#). Indeed, using the data structure from the second point of [Lemma 2.3](#), we can compute $\text{profile}(x)$ from $\text{profile}(y)$ for each $x \in Y'$ and $y = f^{-1}(x)$. By performing this procedure for all the at most $2(2k + 4)$ nodes of $Y \cup Y'$ in a bottom-up manner, we eventually compute the profile of the root of T , from which the answer to the query can be read. The running time is dominated by $q^{\mathcal{O}(1)}$ calls to the data structure of the second point of [Lemma 2.2](#), each taking $2^{\mathcal{O}(q^2)} = 2^{2^{\mathcal{O}(k)}}$ time.

Finally, let us discuss the proof of the second point of [Lemma 2.2](#). We reduce this problem to the problem of evaluating *product queries* in a semigroup-labeled tree, defined as follows. Suppose T is a rooted tree whose edges are labeled with elements of a finite semigroup S . The task is to set up a data structure that for given nodes x, y , where x is an ancestor of y , outputs the product of the elements of S on the path in T from x to y . The problem of evaluating torso queries can be reduced to this abstract setting by considering a suitable semigroup of *bi-interface graphs*, which represent connectivity between corresponding adhesions; see [\[BP16\]](#) for the origin of this concept. This semigroup has size $2^{\mathcal{O}(q^2)}$. So it then suffices to use the following result.

Theorem 2.4 ([Theorem 5.1](#), simplified). *There is a data structure for the problem of evaluating product queries in a tree T labeled with elements of a finite semigroup S that achieves query time $|S|^{\mathcal{O}(1)}$, memory usage $|S|^{\mathcal{O}(1)} \cdot |T|$, and initialization time $|S|^{\mathcal{O}(1)} \cdot |T|$.*

[Theorem 2.4](#) can be easily derived from the deterministic variant of Simon’s factorization, due to Colcombet [\[Col07\]](#). However, in [Section 5](#) we also present a direct and arguably simpler proof that may be of independent interest.

This finishes the proof of [Theorem 1.1](#). Note that in the argumentation there are two modules that can be replaced with other solutions:

- The decomposition of [Theorem 2.1](#) can be replaced with the more recent variant from [\[CKL⁺21\]](#). This allows us to have $q = k$, implying that all the $2^{2^{\mathcal{O}(k)}}$ factors are replaced with $2^{\mathcal{O}(k^2)}$. The cost is increasing the polynomial factor of the initialization time to an unspecified term $|G|^{\mathcal{O}(1)}$ and several technical complications in the analysis, which nevertheless can be overcome.
- Instead of using the data structure of the second point of [Lemma 2.3](#), we can use the first point. This allows us to have polynomial dependency on q in the query time at the cost of quadratic dependence on $|G|$ in the memory usage.

In particular, if both these replacements are performed, we obtain a data structure with initialization time $2^{\mathcal{O}(k \log k)} \cdot |G|^{\mathcal{O}(1)}$, memory usage $k^{\mathcal{O}(1)} \cdot |G|^2$, and query time $k^{\mathcal{O}(1)}$. See [Theorem 6.1](#).

2.2 Model-checking FO+conn: Theorems 1.2 and 1.3

We now turn to the proofs of [Theorem 1.2](#) and [Theorem 1.3](#). In those theorems, we fix a class \mathcal{C} and consider the model-checking problem for the logic FO+conn, that is, the problem of deciding whether a given FO+conn sentence holds in a given graph $G \in \mathcal{C}$.

Lower bound. First let us explain why we require \mathcal{C} to exclude a fixed topological minor in [Theorem 1.2](#). Clearly, the model-checking problem for FO+conn generalizes the model-checking problem for FO, so \mathcal{C} should be in particular a class for which it is known that FO model-checking is FPT. This is the case not only for classes that exclude a topological minor but also for all nowhere dense classes [\[GKS17\]](#). So let us see why it is not enough to merely assume that \mathcal{C} is nowhere dense.

For a graph G and $k \in \mathbb{N}$, the k -subdivision $G^{(k)}$ of G is obtained from G by replacing each edge by a path of length $k + 1$. It follows from the definition of nowhere denseness that the class \mathcal{C} of all graphs of the form $G^{(n)}$, where G is an arbitrary graph on n vertices, is nowhere dense. However, a formula of FO+conn can easily recover G from $G^{(n)}$, at least when G has no vertices of degree 2. Indeed, the original vertices of G are precisely the vertices of $G^{(n)}$ that have degree at least 3, which can be expressed by an FO formula $\varphi_V(x)$. Furthermore, two such vertices u, v are adjacent in G if and only if there is some vertex z of degree 2 in $G^{(n)}$ such that for every vertex w of $G^{(n)}$, $\text{conn}(z, w, u, v)$

holds only if w has degree 2 in $G^{(n)}$. This condition can be written using an FO+conn formula $\varphi_E(u, v)$. Using this observation, any FO sentence φ can be replaced by an FO+conn sentence φ' , so that for every graph G as above, φ holds in G if and only if φ' holds in $G^{(n)}$. Essentially, φ' is obtained from φ by replacing every atomic formula $E(x, y)$ (denoting adjacency) by $\varphi_E(x, y)$, and guarding all quantifiers by $\varphi_V(x)$. Therefore, if we could efficiently model-check φ' on the nowhere dense class \mathcal{C} , we could as well model-check φ on the class of all graphs (of size at least 3 and minimum degree at least 3), as follows: given an arbitrary graph G , first construct the graph $G^{(n)} \in \mathcal{C}$ (in time polynomial in $n = |V(G)|$) and then test φ' on $G^{(n)}$. Hence, if FO+conn model-checking was fpt on \mathcal{C} , then FO model-checking would be fpt on the class of all graphs, implying $\text{FPT} = \text{AW}[\star]$. So nowhere dense graph classes are too general for the statement of [Theorem 1.2](#) to hold. Intuitively, the notion of nowhere denseness is not preserved under contracting long paths, which can be simulated in the logic FO+conn.

The same simple argument proves [Theorem 1.3](#). Indeed, the argument works not only for the graph $G^{(n)}$ obtained as the n -subdivision of G but also for any subdivision G' (obtained by replacing each edge independently by any number of vertices) of G , as long as G' can be computed from G in polynomial time. The condition that \mathcal{C} is subgraph-closed and admits efficient encoding of topological minors guarantees precisely that for any given graph G we can construct, in polynomial time, a graph G' which is a subdivision of G and belongs to \mathcal{C} . This yields [Theorem 1.3](#) (see [Section 9](#) for details).

Upper bound. We now give some details concerning the proof of [Theorem 1.2](#), which is the second main contribution of the paper.

The starting observation is that for a (q, k) -unbreakable graph G , the query $\text{conn}_k(u, v, x_1, \dots, x_k)$ can be expressed in plain FO. Indeed, this query fails if and only if there is a set A of at most q vertices which contains exactly one of the vertices u and v , and such that all neighbors of vertices of A outside of A are contained in $\{x_1, \dots, x_k\}$. The existence of such a set of q vertices can be expressed using q existential quantifiers followed by a universal quantifier. So FO+conn with connectivity queries of arity at most $k + 2$ is equally expressive as plain FO on (q, k) -unbreakable graphs, as long as q is a constant.

Now, if the graph G is not (q, k) -unbreakable, we work with the tree decomposition into (q, k) -unbreakable parts given by [Theorem 3.2](#), where $q = q(k)$ is a constant depending on k . The next observation is that the constant-time querying algorithm used in the proof of [Theorem 1.1](#) and explained above, can be seen as a formula on a suitably defined logical structure. Indeed, if we look into the data structure answering the queries $\text{conn}_k(u, v, x_1, \dots, x_k)$, we notice that each such query triggers a constant number of operations asking about the least common ancestor of two nodes in the tree decomposition, or asking about the membership of a vertex to a bag. Additionally, the algorithm may ask, for two vertices u, v belonging to a bag x , whether u and v are adjacent in the original graph, or whether they are adjacent in the bag graph $\text{bgraph}(x)$. Finally, the algorithm also performs torso queries. We may therefore construct a logical structure, corresponding to the data structure, such that this basic functionality is expressible by a first-order formula in this structure. Then the query $\text{conn}_k(u, v, x_1, \dots, x_k)$ becomes expressible using a plain FO formula in the logical structure. It will then remain to show that we can model check FO formulas in fpt on the resulting logical structure.

It is convenient to abstract away the details of our logical structure, and represent it in the following form: It is a tree T (possibly vertex-labeled), together with additional edges (possibly labeled) between some nodes which are siblings in the tree; see [Figure 5](#). We call such a structure an *augmented tree*. In such a tree, the set of children of any node v carries a structure of a graph. In the particular case of our construction, those graphs will precisely correspond to bag graphs. Recall that a bag graph is obtained from the subgraph induced by a bag by turning all adhesions towards children into cliques. It is not difficult to show (see [Lemma 3.4](#)) that if the original graph G is H -topological-minor free, then the resulting bag graphs are H' -topological-minor-free for some H' depending on H and on k . Hence, we obtain a tree augmented with H' -topological-minor-free graphs. And the original query

$\text{conn}_k(u, v, x_1, \dots, x_k)$ can be now represented as an FO formula in the augmented tree, where the FO formula may use the ancestor relation \leq on the tree nodes, as well as the adjacency relation between the siblings. Showing this basically amounts to revisiting the proof of [Lemma 2.2](#) and arguing that the atomic algorithmic operations can now be simulated by FO formulas in the augmented tree.

Let us note here that the remainder of the argument would go through even if we assumed that the resulting tree is augmented with graphs from a fixed nowhere dense class \mathcal{C}' which is not necessarily topological-minor-free. However, if the original graph G merely belongs to a nowhere dense class \mathcal{C} , then the bag graphs, and hence the graphs in the augmented tree, no longer need to belong to any fixed nowhere dense class. In fact, they may contain arbitrarily large cliques.

Continuing with the proof, now it remains to show that we can solve FO model-checking on trees augmented with H' -topological-minor-free graphs in fixed-parameter time, where the FO formulas may use the ancestor relation in the tree as well as the edge relation among the siblings. For this, we lift the usual, automata-based techniques for model-checking on trees, to the case of augmented trees. We define automata that process augmented trees in a bottom-up fashion, labeling the nodes of the tree with states from a finite set of states, starting from the leaves and proceeding towards the root. At any node x , to determine the state of the automaton at x , we consider the graph induced on the children of x in the augmented tree, vertex-labeled by the states computed earlier. Then the state at x is determined by evaluating a fixed collection of first-order sentences on this labeled graph. In this way, all nodes of the tree are labeled by states, and the automaton accepts the augmented tree depending on the state at the root.

By construction, it can be decided in fpt time whether or not a given such automaton accepts a given tree that is augmented with graphs that come from, say, a nowhere dense class. Additionally, using standard techniques, we show that for every first-order sentence φ on augmented trees there is such an automaton that determines whether φ holds in a given augmented tree. Therefore, FO model-checking is fpt on trees augmented with graphs from a nowhere dense class; this in particular applies to classes with excluded topological minors.

To summarize, to model-check a sentence φ of FO+conn on a H -topological-minor-free graph G , we perform the following reasoning:

1. Using [Theorem 2.1](#), compute a tree decomposition \mathcal{T} of G with (q, k) -unbreakable bags, where $k + 2$ is the maximal arity of the connectivity predicates in φ , and $q = q(k)$.
2. Turn \mathcal{T} into a tree \mathcal{T}' augmented with H' -topological-minor free graphs, where H' depends on H and k .
3. In the augmented tree \mathcal{T}' , the connectivity predicate $\text{conn}_k(u, v, x_1, \dots, x_k)$ can be expressed using a plain FO formula. This follows by analyzing how connectivity predicates are evaluated in constant time, and observing that the atomic operations can be performed using FO formulas in the augmented trees.
4. Therefore, also φ can be expressed as a plain FO formula φ' , which is evaluated in \mathcal{T}' .
5. Convert φ' into an automaton \mathcal{A} processing augmented trees, using standard automata-based techniques.
6. Run \mathcal{A} on \mathcal{T}' in a bottom-up fashion. This involves performing FO queries on the graphs induced on the children of any given node, and uses one of the known algorithms for FO model-checking on H' -topological-minor-free graphs.

[Section 7](#) describes the basic toolbox of automata on augmented trees, explaining in detail the last two steps above, abstracting away from the specific application, and providing further results on augmented trees, e.g. concerning query enumeration. In fact, with the same methods we can show that not only FO model-checking is fpt on trees augmented with graphs from a nowhere dense class, but also a more general logic $\text{FO}(\text{MSO}(\preceq, A) \cup \Sigma)$ combining the power of FO on the augmenting graphs with MSO on trees can be solved in fpt on augmented trees. We then show in [Section 8](#) how to express the predicates conn_k on augmented trees using this more general logic $\text{FO}(\text{MSO}(\preceq, A) \cup \Sigma)$.

3 Preliminaries

Throughout this paper we assume the standard word RAM model with machine words of length $\mathcal{O}(\log n)$, where n is the total size of the input. Recall that in this model we allow using arrays indexed by integers in the range $\{1, \dots, n^{\mathcal{O}(1)}\}$, which is sufficient for the existence of data structures for least common ancestor queries in trees in constant time [HT84].

3.1 Graphs

Basic notation. We consider finite, undirected graphs without loops. For a graph G , we write $|G|$ for $|V(G)|$ and $\|G\|$ for $|V(G)| + |E(G)|$. For a pair of vertices $u, v \in V(G)$, a u - v *path* is a path with endpoints u and v . We say that u and v are *connected* in G if there is a u - v path in G ; otherwise u and v are *disconnected*. The graph G is connected if all pairs of its vertices are connected. The *interior* of a path consists of all its vertices apart from the endpoints, and two paths are *internally vertex-disjoint* if each of them is disjoint with the interior of the other. For a vertex subset $X \subseteq V(G)$ we write $G[X]$ for the subgraph of G induced by X .

Trees and ancestors. A (rooted) tree is an acyclic and connected graph T with a distinguished root vertex r . We write $\text{parent}(x)$ for the parent of a node x of T , and $\text{children}(x)$ is the set of children of x in T . By convention we set $\text{parent}(r) = \perp$. We call a vertex $x \in V(T)$ an ancestor of a vertex $y \in V(T)$, written $x \preceq_T y$, or simply $x \preceq y$ if T is clear from the context, if x lies on the unique path between y and the root r . Note that we consider every node to be an ancestor of itself. For nodes $x, y \in V(T)$, we write $\text{lca}(x, y)$ for the least common ancestor of x and y in T . Note that x is an ancestor of y if and only if $\text{lca}(x, y) = x$. If x is a strict ancestor of y (that is, $x \preceq y$ and $x \neq y$), then we define the y -*directed child* of x to be the unique child y' of x that is an ancestor of y ; we denote it by $\text{dir}(x, y)$.

Topological minors. A *topological minor model* of a graph H in a graph G is an injective mapping η that maps vertices of H to vertices of G and edges of H to pairwise internally vertex-disjoint paths in G so that for every $uv \in E(H)$, the endpoints of $\eta(uv)$ are $\eta(u)$ and $\eta(v)$. We say that G is *H -topological-minor-free* if there is no topological minor model of H in G . A class of graphs \mathcal{C} is *topological-minor-free* if there exists a graph H such that every member of \mathcal{C} is H -topological-minor-free.

Tree decompositions. A *tree decomposition* of a graph G is a pair $\mathcal{T} = (T, \text{bag})$, where T is a rooted tree and $\text{bag}: V(T) \rightarrow 2^{V(G)}$ is a mapping that assigns to each node x of T its *bag* $\text{bag}(x)$, which is a subset of vertices of G . The following conditions have to be satisfied:

- (T1) For every $u \in V(G)$, the set of nodes $x \in V(T)$ satisfying $u \in \text{bag}(x)$ induces a connected and nonempty subtree of T .
- (T2) For every edge $uv \in E(G)$, there exists a node $x \in V(T)$ such that $\{u, v\} \subseteq \text{bag}(x)$.

Recall that if r is the root of T , then by convention $\text{parent}(r) = \perp$ and $\text{bag}(\perp) = \emptyset$.

With a tree decomposition $\mathcal{T} = (T, \text{bag})$ we associate a few auxiliary mappings. For a node $x \in V(T)$, we define the following:

- The *adhesion* of x is

$$\text{adh}(x) := \text{bag}(\text{parent}(x)) \cap \text{bag}(x).$$

- The *margin* of x is

$$\text{mrg}(x) := \text{bag}(x) - \text{adh}(x).$$

- The *cone* at x is

$$\text{cone}(x) := \bigcup_{y \succeq_T x} \text{bag}(y).$$

- The *component at x* is

$$\text{comp}(x) := \text{cone}(x) - \text{adh}(x) = \bigcup_{y \succ_T x} \text{mrg}(y).$$

It is easy to see that the margins $\{\text{mrg}(x) : x \in V(T)\}$ are pairwise disjoint and cover the whole vertex set of G . Whenever we use the notation introduced above, the tree decomposition \mathcal{T} will be always clear from the context.

The *adhesion* of a tree decomposition $\mathcal{T} = (T, \text{bag})$ is defined as the largest size of an adhesion, that is, $\max_{x \in V(T)} |\text{adh}(x)|$.

We will commonly assume (without loss of generality) that the tree decompositions that we work with satisfy some basic connectivity conditions, subsumed in the following definition. A tree decomposition $\mathcal{T} = (T, \text{bag})$ is *regular* if for every non-root node $x \in V(T)$ we have that

- (R1) the margin $\text{mrg}(x)$ is nonempty;
- (R2) the graph $G[\text{comp}(x)]$ is connected; and
- (R3) every vertex of $\text{adh}(x)$ has a neighbor in $\text{comp}(x)$.

Note that the last two conditions imply that for every node x and every pair of distinct vertices $u, v \in \text{adh}(x)$ there is a u - v path in $G[\text{cone}(x)]$ whose interior is contained in $\text{comp}(x)$.

Unbreakability. A *separation* in a graph G is a pair of vertex subsets $A, B \subseteq V(G)$ such that $A \cup B = V(G)$ and there is no edge with one endpoint in $A - B$ and the other in $B - A$. The *order* of the separation (A, B) is the size of its *separator* $A \cap B$.

For $q, k \in \mathbb{N}$, a vertex subset X in a graph G is (q, k) -*unbreakable* if for every separation (A, B) of G of order at most k , we have

$$|A \cap X| \leq q \quad \text{or} \quad |B \cap X| \leq q.$$

The notion of unbreakability can be lifted to tree decompositions by requiring it from every individual bag. There are, however, two different ways of understanding this.

Definition 3.1. Fix $q, k \in \mathbb{N}$. A tree decomposition $\mathcal{T} = (T, \text{bag})$ of a graph G is

- weakly (q, k) -unbreakable if for every $x \in V(T)$, $\text{bag}(x)$ is (q, k) -unbreakable in G ; and
- strongly (q, k) -unbreakable if for every $x \in V(T)$, $\text{bag}(x)$ is (q, k) -unbreakable in $G[\text{cone}(x)]$.

It is straightforward to see that strong (q, k) -unbreakability implies weak (q, k) -unbreakability, but the converse is not true.

We recall known results about the existence and computability of unbreakable tree decompositions (Theorem 3.2 was already stated as

Theorem 3.1 ([CKL⁺21]). For every graph G and $k \in \mathbb{N}$ there exists a weakly (k, k) -unbreakable tree decomposition of G of adhesion at most k . Moreover, given G and k , such a tree decomposition can be computed in time $2^{\mathcal{O}(k \log k)} \cdot |G|^{\mathcal{O}(1)}$.

Theorem 3.2 ([CLP⁺19]). There is a function $q(k) \in 2^{\mathcal{O}(k)}$ such that for every graph G and $k \in \mathbb{N}$ there exists a strongly $(q(k), k)$ -unbreakable tree decomposition of G of adhesion at most $q(k)$. Moreover, given G and k , such a tree decomposition can be computed in time $2^{\mathcal{O}(k^2)} \cdot |G|^2 \cdot \|G\|$.

In this paper we will mostly use [Theorem 3.2](#), as working with strong unbreakability yields a cleaner presentation of arguments. However, in [Section 6](#) we show that weak unbreakability can be used in the context of [Theorem 1.1](#), yielding a variant of the theorem that offers better time complexity for queries.

Given any weakly or strongly (q, k) -unbreakable decomposition we can, if necessary, refine it so that it becomes regular. Hence, we may assume that the tree decompositions constructed by the algorithms of [Theorem 3.1](#) and [Theorem 3.2](#) are regular. More precisely, this refinement can be achieved by applying a folklore refinement procedure for instance presented in the proof of [\[BP16, Lemma 2.8\]](#), which takes linear time. This refinement does not increase the sizes of adhesions nor spoils unbreakability, because every new bag is a subset of an old bag. Note here that [\[BP16\]](#) allows tree decompositions to be rooted forests rather than rooted trees. However, a rooted forest can be turned into a rooted tree by adding a fresh root with an empty bag, whose children are all the former roots. Note here that properties mentioned in the definition of regularity are not required from this new root.

Bag graphs. Let $\mathcal{T} = (T, \text{bag})$ be a regular tree decomposition of a graph G . With a node x of G we associate the *bag graph* $\text{bgraph}(x)$, which is the graph obtained from $G[\text{cone}(x)]$ by contracting, for each $y \in \text{children}(x)$, the set $\text{comp}(y)$ into a single vertex, identified with y . More precisely, $\text{bgraph}(x)$ is a graph defined as follows:

- The vertex set of $\text{bgraph}(x)$ is the disjoint union of $\text{bag}(x)$ and the set of children of x in T .
- For $u, v \in \text{bag}(x)$, u and v are adjacent in $\text{bgraph}(x)$ if and only if they are adjacent in G .
- For $u \in \text{bag}(x)$ and $y \in \text{children}(x)$, u and y are adjacent in $\text{bgraph}(x)$ if and only if there exists $w \in \text{comp}(y)$ that is adjacent to u in G .
- No two distinct $y, y' \in \text{children}(x)$ are adjacent in $\text{bgraph}(x)$.

Since \mathcal{T} is regular, for every $y \in \text{children}(x)$, the neighborhood of y in $\text{bgraph}(x)$ is equal to $\text{adh}(y)$.

We observe that the sizes of all bag graphs roughly sum up to the size of the graph G .

Lemma 3.3. *Let $\mathcal{T} = (T, \text{bag})$ be a regular tree decomposition of a graph G , say of adhesion a . Then*

$$\sum_{x \in V(T)} |\text{bgraph}(x)| \leq (a + 2)|G| \quad \text{and} \quad \sum_{x \in V(T)} \|\text{bgraph}(x)\| \leq \|G\| + (a + 2)^2|G|.$$

Proof. For the bound on $\sum_{x \in V(T)} |\text{bgraph}(x)|$, observe the vertex set of $\text{bgraph}(x)$ is the disjoint union of $\text{adh}(x)$, $\text{mrg}(x)$, and $\text{children}(x)$. Every adhesion has size at most a , every node of T has at most one parent, and every vertex of G is in exactly one margin. Finally, $|T| \leq |G|$, hence

$$\sum_{x \in V(T)} |\text{bgraph}(x)| \leq a|T| + |G| + |T| \leq (a + 2)|G|.$$

For the bound on $\sum_{x \in V(T)} \|\text{bgraph}(x)\|$, call an edge $uv \in E(\text{bgraph}(x))$ *vital* in the graph $\text{bgraph}(x)$ if $u, v \in \text{mrg}(x)$. Note that every edge of G is vital in at most one bag graph $\text{bgraph}(x)$, hence the sum over all $x \in V(T)$ of the number of vital edges in $\text{bgraph}(x)$ is at most $|E(G)|$. On the other hand, the non-vital edges of $\text{bgraph}(x)$ are those incident to the vertices of $\text{adh}(x)$ and those incident to the children of x . The total number of non-vital edges of the first kind is at most $a \cdot |\text{bgraph}(x)|$, as $|\text{adh}(x)| \leq a$, and the total number of edges of the second kind is at most $a \cdot |\text{children}(x)|$, as every child of x has degree at most a in $\text{bgraph}(x)$. We conclude that

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{x \in V(T)} \|\text{bgraph}(x)\| &\leq \sum_{x \in V(T)} |\text{bgraph}(x)| + |E(G)| + a \cdot \sum_{x \in V(T)} (|\text{bgraph}(x)| + |\text{children}(x)|) \\ &\leq (a + 2)|G| + |E(G)| + a(a + 2)|G| + a|T| \\ &\leq \|G\| + (a + 2)^2|G|. \end{aligned}$$

This concludes the proof. □

We observe that topological-minor-freeness of G carries over to bag graphs.

Lemma 3.4. *Let $\mathcal{T} = (T, \text{bag})$ be a regular tree decomposition of a graph G , say of adhesion a . Suppose further that G is K_t -topological-minor-free. Then for each $x \in V(T)$, the graph $\text{bgraph}(x)$ is $K_{t'}$ -topological-minor-free, where $t' = \max(t, a + 2)$.*

Proof. Suppose there is a topological minor model η of $K_{t'}$ in $\text{bgraph}(x)$. Observe that no child of x can be in the image of the vertex set of $K_{t'}$ under η , for these vertices have degree at most a in $\text{bgraph}(x)$ while $t' \geq a + 2$. Therefore, the only way any $y \in \text{children}(x)$ can participate in the image of η is that y is an internal vertex of a path $\eta(e)$, for some edge e of $K_{t'}$. We construct a topological minor model η' of $K_{t'}$ in $G[\text{cone}(x)]$ as follows:

- For each $u \in V(K_{t'})$, set $\eta'(u) = \eta(u)$.
- For each $e \in E(K_{t'})$, construct $\eta'(e)$ from $\eta(e)$ by replacing, for each $y \in \text{children}(x)$, the subpath $u - y - v$, where $u, v \in \text{bag}(x)$ are the neighbors of y on $\eta(e)$, with any $u-v$ path in $G[\text{cone}(y)]$ whose interior is entirely contained in $\text{comp}(y)$. Such a path exists by the assumption that \mathcal{T} is regular.

Since the paths in $\{\eta(e) : e \in E(K_{t'})\}$ are pairwise internally vertex-disjoint and $\text{comp}(y)$ and $\text{comp}(y')$ are disjoint for distinct $y, y' \in \text{children}(x)$, it follows that the paths in $\{\eta'(e) : e \in E(K_{t'})\}$ are also pairwise internally vertex-disjoint. Thus, η' is a topological minor model of $K_{t'}$ in $G[\text{cone}(x)]$, hence also in G ; a contradiction. \square

Finally, we need an observation about how strong unbreakability of a tree decomposition influences unbreakability properties of bag graphs. For this, it will be convenient to work with another type of a bag graph, defined as follows. Suppose $\mathcal{T} = (T, \text{bag})$ is a regular tree decomposition of a graph G , x is a node of T , and $S \subseteq \text{cone}(x)$. The S -restricted bag graph of x , denoted $\text{bgraph}_S(x)$, is the graph obtained from $\text{bgraph}(x)$ by the following operations:

- Remove every vertex of $S \cap \text{bag}(x)$.
- For every $y \in \text{children}(x)$, remove y and for every pair of vertices $\{u, v\} \in \binom{\text{adh}(y) - S}{2}$, add an edge uv provided it was not already there and in $G[\text{cone}(y)]$ there is a $u-v$ path that is disjoint with S .

For example, as \mathcal{T} is regular, $\text{bgraph}_\emptyset(x)$ is the graph obtained from $\text{bgraph}(x)$ by removing all $y \in \text{children}(x)$ and, for each of them, turning $\text{adh}(y)$ into a clique.

Lemma 3.5. *Let $\mathcal{T} = (T, \text{bag})$ be a regular and strongly (q, k) -unbreakable tree decomposition of a graph G . Let $x \in V(T)$ and $S \subseteq \text{cone}(x)$ be such that $|S| \leq k$. Then for any $u, v \in \text{bag}(x) - S$, we have the following.*

- Vertices u and v are connected in $G[\text{cone}(x)] - S$ if and only if they are connected in $\text{bgraph}_S(x)$.
- If u and v are disconnected in $\text{bgraph}_S(x)$, and C_u, C_v are the connected components of $\text{bgraph}_S(x)$ containing u and v , respectively, then either $|V(C_u)| \leq q$ or $|V(C_v)| \leq q$.

Proof. The first assertion follows directly from the construction, so we focus on the second one.

Let L consist of all vertices reachable in $G[\text{cone}(x)] - S$ from u , and let $R = \text{cone}(x) - (L \cup S)$. Thus, $(L \cup S, R \cup S)$ is a separation in $G[\text{cone}(x)]$ of order $|S| \leq k$. From the first assertion it follows that $V(C_u) \subseteq L$ and $V(C_v) \subseteq R$. As $V(C_u), V(C_v) \subseteq \text{bag}(x)$, from the strong (q, k) -unbreakability of \mathcal{T} we conclude that either $|V(C_u)| \leq q$ or $|V(C_v)| \leq q$. \square

Connectivity queries. Suppose G is a graph, k an integer, s and t are vertices of G , and S is a set of k vertices u_1, \dots, u_k of G . We say that $\text{conn}_k(s, t, u_1, \dots, u_k)$ holds in G if and only if in G there is an $s-t$ path that does not pass through any vertex of S . Note that in particular, $\text{conn}_k(s, t, u_1, \dots, u_k)$ does not hold if $\{s, t\} \cap S \neq \emptyset$. We may also write $\text{conn}(s, t, S)$.

3.2 Logic

Signatures. We will only consider finite relational signatures Σ consisting of unary (arity 1) and binary (arity 2) relation symbols. A signature consisting only of unary relation symbols will be called an alphabet. A Σ -structure \mathbf{A} consists of a finite universe $V(\mathbf{A})$ and an interpretation $R(\mathbf{A}) \subseteq V(\mathbf{A})^m$ of each m -ary relation symbol $R \in \Sigma$. When there is no ambiguity, we will not distinguish between relation symbols and their interpretations.

Graphs are represented as Σ -structures where the universe is the vertex set and Σ consists of one binary relation symbol $E(\cdot, \cdot)$, interpreted as the edge relation.

First-order logic (FO). We assume an infinite supply VAR_1 of first-order variables and an infinite supply VAR_2 of second-order set variables. First-order variables will always be denoted by small letters x, y, z, \dots , while second-order variables will be denoted by capital letters X, Y, Z, \dots .

For a fixed signature Σ , formulas of first-order logic (FO) are constructed from atomic formulas of the form $x = y$, where $x, y \in \text{VAR}_1$, and $R(x_1, \dots, x_m)$, where $R \in \Sigma$ is an m -ary relation symbol and $x_1, \dots, x_m \in \text{VAR}_1$, by applying the Boolean operators \neg, \wedge and \vee , and existential and universal quantification $\exists x$ and $\forall x$.

A variable x not in the scope of a quantifier is a free variable (we will not consider formulas with free set variables). A formula without free variables is a sentence. We write $\varphi(\bar{x})$ to indicate that the free variables of a formula φ are contained in the set of variables \bar{x} . A valuation of \bar{x} in a set A is a function $\bar{a}: \bar{x} \rightarrow A$. Let $A^{\bar{x}}$ denote the set of all valuations of \bar{x} in A .

The satisfaction relation between Σ -structures and formulas is defined as usual by structural induction on the formula. When \mathbf{A} is a Σ -structure, $\varphi(\bar{x})$ is a formula with free variables contained in \bar{x} , and $\bar{a} \in V(\mathbf{A})^{\bar{x}}$ is a valuation of \bar{x} , we write $(\mathbf{A}, \bar{a}) \models \varphi(\bar{x})$ or $\mathbf{A} \models \varphi(\bar{a})$ to denote that φ holds in \mathbf{A} when the variables are evaluated by \bar{a} . We let $\varphi(\mathbf{A}) := \{\bar{a} \in A^{\bar{x}} \mid \mathbf{A} \models \varphi(\bar{a})\}$.

Separator logic (FO+conn). Assume that Σ contains a distinguished binary relation symbol $E(\cdot, \cdot)$ that will always be interpreted as the edge relation of a graph, that is, as an irreflexive and symmetric relation. For a Σ -structure \mathbf{A} , write $G(\mathbf{A})$ for the graph $(V(\mathbf{A}), E(\mathbf{A}))$. *Separator logic* (FO+conn) is first-order logic extended by the predicates $\text{conn}_k(x, y, z_1, \dots, z_k)$, for all $k \geq 0$, where $x, y, z_1, \dots, z_k \in \text{VAR}_1$. The satisfaction relation between Σ -structures and FO+conn formulas is as for first-order logic, where the atomic formula $\text{conn}_k(x, y, z_1, \dots, z_k)$ holds in a Σ -structure \mathbf{A} with a valuation \bar{a} of the variables x, y, z_1, \dots, z_k to elements $s, t, u_1, \dots, u_k \in V(\mathbf{A})$, if: $G(\mathbf{A}) \models \text{conn}_k(s, t, u_1, \dots, u_k)$.

Monadic second-order logic (MSO). Monadic second-order logic (MSO) extends FO by existential and universal quantification $\exists X$ and $\forall Y$ over second-order set variables. We will consider MSO formulas over the signature $A \cup \{\preceq\}$, where A is a finite alphabet and \preceq is a binary relation symbol that will always be interpreted as the ancestor relation in a tree. By $\text{MSO}(\preceq, A)$ we denote the set of MSO formulas over such signatures. Hence, formulas of $\text{MSO}(\preceq, A)$ will only be evaluated over rooted trees (represented by the ancestor relation \preceq) decorated with predicates from A , and the semantics are defined as usual by structural induction on the formula.

First-order logic with MSO atoms. We will also consider FO formulas with restricted MSO atoms. Fix a signature Σ and an alphabet A . The logic $\text{FO}(\text{MSO}(\preceq, A), \Sigma)$ denotes first-order logic over signature Σ where in addition to the standard syntax, one can use formulas of $\text{MSO}(\preceq, A)$ as atomic formulas. Semantics are defined as expected.

4 Connectivity queries in general graphs: proof of Theorem 1.1

In this section we prove Theorem 1.1. The first step of the construction of the data structure is to apply the algorithm of Theorem 3.2 to compute, in time $2^{\mathcal{O}(k^2)} \cdot |G|^2 \cdot \|G\|$, a strongly (q, k) -unbreakable tree decomposition $\mathcal{T} = (T, \text{bag})$ of G of adhesion at most q , where $q = q(k) = 2^{\mathcal{O}(k)}$. As argued, we may assume that \mathcal{T} is regular. We fix the parameters k and q for the remainder of this section.

4.1 Basic ingredients

Before we proceed to the main construction, we need to set up some auxiliary data structures that enable us to navigate and query the tree decomposition \mathcal{T} .

We will need the following lemma for navigation in T . Recall that we write $\text{lca}(x, y)$ for the least common ancestor of x and y in T and $\text{dir}(x, y)$ (if x is a strict ancestor of y) for the unique child y' of x that is an ancestor of y . The proof of the following lemma relies on the classic data structure for $\text{lca}(\cdot, \cdot)$ queries of Harel and Tarjan [HT84].

Lemma 4.1. *Given a tree T , one can compute in time $\mathcal{O}(|T|)$ a data structure that may answer the $\text{lca}(x, y)$ and $\text{dir}(x, y)$ queries in time $\mathcal{O}(1)$.*

Proof. For the $\text{lca}(\cdot, \cdot)$ queries we may use the data structure of Harel and Tarjan [HT84], which can be initialized in time $\mathcal{O}(|T|)$ and supports queries in constant time. We now show that we can use this data structure as well for the $\text{dir}(\cdot, \cdot)$ queries.

For every node x of T , arbitrarily enumerate the children of x with numbers $1, \dots, d(x)$, where $d(x)$ is the number of children of x . By applying a linear-time preprocessing, we may assume that every x is supplied with an array of length $d(x)$ containing pointers to its children, in this order. Construct a tree T' from T as follows:

- Replace every node x with a path consisting of nodes $(x, 0), (x, 1), \dots, (x, d(x))$, where (x, i) is the parent of $(x, i - 1)$ for each $i \in \{1, \dots, d(x)\}$.
- For each $i \in \{1, \dots, d(x)\}$, if y is the i th child of x in T , then we make $(y, d(y))$ a child of (x, i) .

See Figure 3 for an illustration. Note that the number of nodes of T' is upper bounded by the total number of nodes and edges of T , hence $|T'| < 2|T|$.




Figure 3: Construction of T' from T in the proof of Lemma 4.1. A node v of degree d is replaced by a path $(v, d), \dots, (v, 1)$ of d nodes of degree 2, followed by a leaf node $(v, 0)$. If u is a descendant of v in T , then $\text{dir}(v, u)$ can be deduced from $\text{lca}((u, 0), (v, 0))$ in T' .

The following claim is clear.

Claim 4.1. *If x is a strict ancestor of y in T , then the least common ancestor of $(x, 0)$ and $(y, 0)$ in T' is the node (x, i) such that $\text{dir}(x, y)$ is the i th child of x in T .*

Hence, if we set up the data structure of Harel and Tarjan for the tree T' , then a $\text{dir}(x, y)$ query in T can be answered as follows: compute the least common ancestor of $(x, 0)$ and $(y, 0)$ in T' , read its second coordinate i , and output the i th child of x in T . This takes time $\mathcal{O}(1)$. \square

Next, we set up a data structure to encode and quickly evaluate connectivity in subgraphs that are “between” the adhesion of two nodes. These subgraphs are defined by the following notion of *torsos*.

Torsos. For a graph H and a subset of its vertices X , the *torso* of X in H is the graph $\text{torso}_H(X)$ on vertex set X where a pair of vertices $u, v \in X$ is adjacent if and only if in H there exists a u - v path whose interior is disjoint with X . For a pair of nodes x and y of T , where x is an ancestor of y , we define

$$\text{torso}(x, y) := \text{torso}_{G[\text{cone}(x) - \text{comp}(y)]}(\text{adh}(x) \cup \text{adh}(y)).$$

Note that $\text{torso}(x, y)$ is a graph on the vertex set $\text{adh}(x) \cup \text{adh}(y)$, which comprises of at most $2q$ vertices. Intuitively, $\text{torso}(x, y)$ encodes the connectivity pattern between the elements of $\text{adh}(x)$ and of $\text{adh}(y)$ within the subgraph induced by the context in \mathcal{T} between x and y .

We will need a data structure for evaluating the torsos quickly.

Lemma 4.2. *One can compute in time $2^{\mathcal{O}(q^2)} \cdot |G|^2 \cdot \|G\|$ a data structure that can answer the following query in time $2^{\mathcal{O}(q^2)}$: for given $x, y \in V(T)$, where x is an ancestor of y , output the graph $\text{torso}(x, y)$. The data structure takes space $2^{\mathcal{O}(q^2)} \cdot |G|$.*

The proof of Lemma 4.2 is postponed to Section 5. Here is a quick sketch. By appropriately coloring the vertices of the adhesions with colors from $\{1, \dots, q\}$, we can reinterpret each graph $\text{torso}(x, y)$ as an element of a semigroup of size $2^{\mathcal{O}(q^2)}$, in the same way as was done in [BP16]. Then $\text{torso}(x, y)$ can be obtained as the semigroup product of the graphs $\text{torso}(z_{i-1}, z_i)$ for $i = 1, \dots, \ell$, where $x = z_0 - z_1 - \dots - z_\ell = y$ is the path from x to y in T . We design a data structure for path product queries in semigroup-labeled trees. We believe that this data structure is a general tool of independent interest, hence we actually give two different proofs. The first one is based on a classic approach using deterministic Simon’s factorization of Colcombet [Col07], and can be viewed as a reinterpretation of ideas from [Col07]. The second is a self-contained, simpler argument that seems new.

4.2 Data structure

With the basic ingredients in place, we may proceed with the proof of Theorem 1.1. Let us describe the data structure we are going to use. It consists of:

- The tree decomposition \mathcal{T} , constructed using the algorithm of Theorem 3.2, with underlying tree T . Each vertex $u \in V(G)$ has a pointer to the unique node $x \in V(T)$ such that $u \in \text{mrg}(x)$.
- For each $x \in V(T)$, the \emptyset -restricted bag graph $\text{bgraph}_\emptyset(x)$.
- The data structure for $\text{lca}(x, y)$ and $\text{dir}(x, y)$ queries, provided by Lemma 4.1. Call it \mathbb{L} .
- The data structure for $\text{torso}(x, y)$ queries, provided by Lemma 4.2. Call it \mathbb{D} .

As for initialization, the time needed to compute \mathcal{T} is $2^{\mathcal{O}(k^2)} \cdot |G|^2 \cdot \|G\|$. It is straightforward to see that for each particular $x \in V(T)$, the graph $\text{bgraph}_\emptyset(x)$ can be computed in time $\mathcal{O}(q^{\mathcal{O}(1)} \cdot \|G\|) = 2^{\mathcal{O}(k)} \cdot \|G\|$, hence the construction of those graphs takes time $2^{\mathcal{O}(k)} \cdot |G| \cdot \|G\|$ in total. The time needed to construct \mathbb{D} is $2^{\mathcal{O}(q^2)} \cdot |G|^2 \cdot \|G\| = 2^{2\mathcal{O}(k)} \cdot |G|^2 \cdot \|G\|$. Finally, the time needed to construct \mathbb{L} is $\mathcal{O}(|V(T)|) \leq \mathcal{O}(|G|)$. All in all, the total initialization time is $2^{2\mathcal{O}(k)} \cdot |G|^2 \cdot \|G\|$, as promised.

We now estimate the space usage of the data structure. The data structures \mathbb{L} and \mathbb{D} take space $\mathcal{O}(|T|) \leq \mathcal{O}(|G|)$ and $2^{\mathcal{O}(q^2)} \cdot |T| \leq 2^{2\mathcal{O}(k)} \cdot |G|$, respectively, by Lemma 4.1 and Lemma 4.2. By Lemma 3.3, we have $\sum_{x \in V(T)} |\text{bag}(x)| \leq \mathcal{O}(q|G|) \leq 2^{\mathcal{O}(k)} \cdot |G|$, hence the total size of the description of the tree decomposition \mathcal{T} is $2^{\mathcal{O}(k)} \cdot |G|$ as well. Finally, by Lemma 3.3 we have $\sum_{x \in V(T)} \|\text{bgraph}(x)\| \leq$

$\mathcal{O}(q^2|G|)$. Recall that $\text{bgraph}_\emptyset(x)$ is obtained from $\text{bgraph}(x)$ by removing all the children of x and turning their neighborhoods into cliques. As each of these neighborhoods has size at most q and $\sum_{x \in V(T)} |\text{children}(x)| \leq |T| \leq |G|$, we conclude that these operations add at most $\binom{q}{2} \cdot |G|$ edges to graphs $\text{bgraph}_\emptyset(x)$ in total. It follows that $\sum_{x \in V(T)} \|\text{bgraph}_\emptyset(x)\| \leq \mathcal{O}(q^2|G|)$, so storing the graphs $\text{bgraph}_\emptyset(x)$ takes $\mathcal{O}(q^2|G|) = 2^{\mathcal{O}(k)} \cdot |G|$ space. This concludes the analysis of the space complexity.

Before continuing, we need to clarify how exactly each graph $\text{bgraph}_\emptyset(x)$, for $x \in V(T)$, is represented in the data structure. The edges of G can be partitioned into *original edges* — those existing in $G[\text{bag}(x)]$ — and *adhesion edges* — edges uv that are not present in $G[\text{bag}(x)]$, but for which there exists $y \in \text{children}(x)$ with $\{u, v\} \subseteq \text{adh}(y)$. In the latter case we say that y *supports* the adhesion edge uv . The edge set of $\text{bgraph}_\emptyset(x)$ is stored as usual using neighborhood lists: every vertex is supplied with a list of edges incident to it. However, for every edge on this list we remember whether it is an original or an adhesion edge, and in the latter case we also remember the list of all children of x supporting the edge. It is easy to see that this representation of $\text{bgraph}_\emptyset(x)$ can be computed and stored within the time and space complexity claimed above.

4.3 Implementation of queries

We are left with implementing connectivity queries using the data structure described above. Suppose we are given a query $\text{conn}(u, v, S)$ to answer, where $u, v \in V(G)$ and S is a vertex subset of size at most k . Let $\hat{S} := S \cup \{u, v\}$. Note that $|\hat{S}| \leq k + 2$.

For $x \in V(T)$, let

$$D(x) := \text{adh}(x) \cup (\{u, v\} \cap \text{cone}(x)).$$

The *profile* of x is the set $\text{profile}(x) \subseteq \binom{D(x)}{2}$ consisting of all pairs $\{a, b\} \in \binom{D(x)}{2}$ satisfying the following condition: in $G[\text{cone}(x)]$ there is an a - b path that does not pass through any vertex of S .

Let r be the root of T . Then $D(r) = \{u, v\}$ and $\text{profile}(r)$ is non-empty if and only if $G \models \text{conn}(u, v, S)$. Therefore, it suffices to compute $\text{profile}(r)$. We will do this by computing the profiles of a selection of $\mathcal{O}(k)$ nodes of T in a bottom-up manner.

Precisely, let

$$X := \{r\} \cup \{x \in V(T) \mid \text{mrg}(x) \cap \hat{S} \neq \emptyset\}.$$

Note that $|X| \leq k + 3$ and X can be computed in time $\mathcal{O}(k)$, because every vertex of G has a pointer to the node of T whose margin contains it. Further, let

$$Y := \text{least common ancestor closure of } X;$$

that is, Y comprises of X and all least common ancestors of pairs of nodes from X . Then

$$|Y| \leq 2|X| - 1 \leq 2k + 5$$

and Y is closed under taking least common ancestors. Note that Y can be computed in time $\mathcal{O}(k^2)$ using the data structure \mathbb{L} . Our goal is to compute

$$\text{profile}(x) \quad \text{for each } x \in Y$$

in a bottom-up manner. Each set $\text{profile}(x)$ is stored as a list; note that its size is at most $\binom{q+2}{2} = \mathcal{O}(q^2)$.

The next two lemmas provide the main ingredients for the computation. Here, we say that a node x of T is *affected* if $\text{comp}(x)$ contains a vertex of \hat{S} , and x is *unaffected* otherwise.

Lemma 4.3. *Suppose z is an ancestor of y in T , and \hat{S} is disjoint with $\text{comp}(z) - \text{cone}(y)$. Then given $\text{profile}(y)$, one can compute $\text{profile}(z)$ using one query to the data structure \mathbb{D} and $q^{\mathcal{O}(1)}$ additional time.*

Proof. Using a query to \mathbb{D} , compute $\text{torso}(z, y)$. Construct a graph J on vertex set $D(y) \cup \text{adh}(z)$ by defining the edge set of J to be the union of $\text{profile}(y)$ and the edge set of $\text{torso}(z, y)$. Note that $|V(J)| \leq 2q + 2$ and $D(z) \subseteq V(J)$. The following claim is clear from the construction and the assumption that \hat{S} is disjoint with $\text{comp}(z) - \text{cone}(y)$.

Claim 4.2. For every pair of vertices $a, b \in V(J)$, there is an a - b path in $G[\text{cone}(z)]$ that does not pass through any vertex of S if and only if there is such a path in the graph J .

Therefore, for every pair $\{a, b\} \in \binom{D(z)}{2}$, we can find out whether $\{a, b\} \in \text{profile}(z)$ using a breadth-first search in J . Since J had $\mathcal{O}(q)$ vertices and hence $\mathcal{O}(q^2)$ edges, this takes $\mathcal{O}(q^2)$ time per pair, hence $\mathcal{O}(q^4)$ time in total. \square

Lemma 4.4. Let x be a node of T . Suppose we are given the set Z comprising of all affected children of x and, for each $z \in Z$, we are given $\text{profile}(z)$. Then one can compute $\text{profile}(x)$ in time $q^{\mathcal{O}(1)}$.

Note that this statement holds in particular when x has no affected children.

Proof. Note that since the components at the children of Z are pairwise disjoint, we have

$$|Z| \leq |\widehat{S}| \leq k + 2.$$

Recall that the data structure contains the \emptyset -restricted bag graph $\text{bgraph}_\emptyset(x)$, represented as described at the end of Section 4.2. We now show that we can emulate the neighborhood lists of the S -restricted bag graph $\text{bgraph}_S(x)$ using this representation.

Claim 4.3. Given $a \in \text{bag}(x) - S$, one can in time $q^{\mathcal{O}(1)}$ either conclude that the degree of a in $\text{bgraph}_S(x)$ is larger than q , or list all the neighbors of a in $\text{bgraph}_S(x)$.

Proof of the claim. Note that $\text{bgraph}_S(x)$ is a subgraph of $\text{bgraph}_\emptyset(x)$. Therefore, it suffices to iterate over the neighborhood list of a in $\text{bgraph}_\emptyset(x)$ and for each edge ab on this list, decide whether it is present in $\text{bgraph}_S(x)$.

Note that the edge ab is not present in $\text{bgraph}_S(x)$ if and only if at least one of the following conditions holds:

- $b \in S$; or
- ab is an adhesion edge and for every node z supporting ab , we have $z \in Z$ and $\{a, b\} \notin \text{profile}(z)$.

We observe that the second condition can be checked in time $q^{\mathcal{O}(1)}$. Indeed, since $|Z| \leq k + 2$, if there are more than $k + 2$ nodes supporting ab , then the condition must be false. Otherwise we can iterate through the list of all nodes z supporting ab (stored along with ab in the representation of $\text{bgraph}_\emptyset(x)$), and for each of them check whether it belongs to Z and satisfies $\{a, b\} \notin \text{profile}(z)$. Implemented in a straightforward way, this takes time polynomial in q .

Hence, for every particular edge ab present in $\text{bgraph}_\emptyset(x)$ we can decide whether it is present also in $\text{bgraph}_S(x)$ in time $q^{\mathcal{O}(1)}$. The next observation is that only for at most $(k + 2) \binom{q}{2}$ edges this check will yield a negative answer. Indeed, at most $|S| \leq k$ edges ab may not be present in $\text{bgraph}_S(x)$ due to $b \in S$, and every $z \in Z$ supports at most $\binom{|\text{adh}(z)|}{2} \leq \binom{q}{2}$ edges, resulting in at most $|Z| \cdot \binom{q}{2} \leq k + (k + 2) \binom{q}{2}$ edges ab not being present in $\text{bgraph}_S(x)$ due to the second condition. Therefore, if the degree of a in $\text{bgraph}_\emptyset(G)$ is larger than $q + k + (k + 2) \binom{q}{2}$, then its degree in $\text{bgraph}_S(G)$ must be larger than q , and we may report this outcome without analyzing the neighborhood list of a . Otherwise, we process all the $\mathcal{O}(q^2 k)$ edges incident to a in $\text{bgraph}_\emptyset(G)$, and for each of them we decide whether it is present in $\text{bgraph}_S(G)$ in time $q^{\mathcal{O}(1)}$. This results in listing all edges incident to a in $\text{bgraph}_S(G)$ in time $q^{\mathcal{O}(1)}$. \triangleleft

The next claim is the key observation: connectivity in $\text{bgraph}_S(x)$ can be decided in time $q^{\mathcal{O}(1)}$, and the crux is to use Lemma 3.5.

Claim 4.4. Given $a, b \in \text{bag}(x) - S$, one can decide whether a and b are connected in $\text{bgraph}_S(x)$ in time $q^{\mathcal{O}(1)}$.

Proof of the claim. By Lemma 3.5, the following algorithm solves this problem:

- Run a breadth-first search from a in $\text{bgraph}_S(x)$, terminating the search whenever any of the following conditions is met (by *reaching* a vertex we mean that it is added to the bfs queue):
 - b has been reached;
 - a vertex of degree larger than q in $\text{bgraph}_S(x)$ is popped from the queue;
 - in total, the search has reached $q + 1$ vertices.

If the search terminated due to the queue being empty before any of the conditions above is met, conclude that a and b are not connected in $\text{bgraph}_S(x)$.

- Do the same with the roles of a and b swapped.
- If neither of the steps above reached the conclusion that a and b are not connected in $\text{bgraph}_S(x)$, then conclude that a and b are connected in $\text{bgraph}_S(x)$.

Note here that the second termination condition stated above — when a vertex of degree larger than q is popped from the queue — is also correct for the following reason: such a vertex witnesses that the connected component of $\text{bgraph}_S(x)$ on which the search is employed has more than q vertices.

Now it is straightforward to see that the algorithm presented above can be implemented in time $q^{\mathcal{O}(1)}$ with the help of Claim 4.3. Namely, when in a breadth-first search a vertex w is popped from the queue, we need to iterate through all the neighbors of w and add them to the queue provided they were not reached before. By Claim 4.3, we can either list those neighbors in time $q^{\mathcal{O}(1)}$ or conclude that the search can be immediately terminated. Since the search will not reach more than $q + 1$ vertices in total, for each of those neighbors we can check whether it was already reached in time $\mathcal{O}(q)$. At most $q + 1$ vertices will be processed in this way, resulting in the total time complexity of $q^{\mathcal{O}(1)}$. \triangleleft

Now observe that for every pair $\{a, b\} \in \binom{D(x) \cap \text{bag}(x)}{2}$, $\{a, b\}$ should be included in $\text{profile}(x)$ if and only if a and b are connected in $\text{bgraph}_S(x)$; this follows from Lemma 3.5. We can use Claim 4.4 to decide this in time $q^{\mathcal{O}(1)}$ per pair, so also also in time $q^{\mathcal{O}(1)}$ for all such pairs in total.

We are left with making the same decision for pairs $\{a, b\} \in \binom{D(x)}{2}$ where either a or b is contained in $D(x) - \text{bag}(x)$. Noting that $D(x) - \text{bag}(x) \subseteq \{u, v\}$, by symmetry suppose that $a = u$ and $u \notin \text{bag}(x)$. Let z be the child of x satisfying $u \in \text{comp}(z)$. Note that $z = \text{dir}(x, y)$ where y is such that $u \in \text{mrg}(y)$, hence z can be computed in time $\mathcal{O}(1)$ using a query to \mathbb{L} .

Suppose first that $b \in \text{bag}(x)$. Then $\{u, b\}$ should be included in $\text{profile}(x)$ if and only if there exists $w \in D(z)$ such that $\{u, w\} \in \text{profile}(z)$ and w, b are connected in $\text{bgraph}_S(x)$. This condition can be checked in time $q^{\mathcal{O}(1)}$ for each particular $w \in \text{adh}(z)$ using the algorithm of Claim 4.4, hence every pair $\{u, b\}$ as above can be decided in time $q^{\mathcal{O}(1)}$. There are $\mathcal{O}(q)$ vertices $b \in D(x) \cap \text{bag}(x)$ to check, hence these pairs can be decided in total time $q^{\mathcal{O}(1)}$.

Finally, we are left with the case when $b = v$ and $v \notin \text{bag}(x)$. Let z' be the child of x such that $v \in \text{comp}(z')$; similarly as before, we can find z' in time $\mathcal{O}(1)$ using \mathbb{L} . Then $\{u, v\}$ should be included in $\text{profile}(x)$ if and only if at least one of the following conditions is satisfied:

- $z = z'$ and $\{u, v\} \in \text{profile}(z)$.
- There exist $w \in \text{adh}(z)$ and $w' \in \text{adh}(z')$ such that $\{u, w\} \in \text{profile}(z)$, $\{w', v\} \in \text{profile}(z')$, and w, w' are connected in $\text{bgraph}_S(x)$.

The first condition can be checked in time $\mathcal{O}(q^2)$, while the second can be checked in time $q^{\mathcal{O}(1)}$ by applying the algorithm of Claim 4.4 for every pair $(w, w') \in \text{adh}(z) \times \text{adh}(z')$.

Altogether, we have decided which pairs of $\binom{D(x)}{2}$ should be included in $\text{profile}(x)$ in time $q^{\mathcal{O}(1)}$ and the proof is complete. \square

We may now implement the $\text{conn}(u, v, S)$ query using [Lemma 4.3](#) and [4.4](#). Let T_Y be the tree on node set Y with the ancestor order inherited from T ; that is, x is the parent of y in T_Y if x is a strict ancestor of y in T and the interior of the x - y path in T is disjoint with Y . Note that T_Y can be constructed in time $\mathcal{O}(k^2)$ using the data structure \mathbb{L} .

Now, we compute $\text{profile}(x)$ for all $x \in Y$ in a bottom-up manner over T_Y . Let y_1, \dots, y_ℓ be the children of x in T_Y (possibly $\ell = 0$ if x is a leaf of T_Y). For each $i \in \{1, \dots, \ell\}$, let

$$z_i := \text{dir}(x, y_i).$$

Note that each z_i can be found in time $\mathcal{O}(1)$ using a query to \mathbb{L} , hence computing z_1, \dots, z_ℓ takes time $\mathcal{O}(k)$. The following claim follows immediately from taking Y to be the least common ancestor closure of X .

Claim 4.5. *For each $i \in \{1, \dots, \ell\}$, \widehat{S} is disjoint with $\text{comp}(z_i) - \text{cone}(y_i)$.*

Note that the profiles $\text{profile}(y_i)$ for $i \in \{1, \dots, \ell\}$ have already been computed before. Therefore, we may apply [Lemma 4.3](#) ℓ times to compute the profiles $\text{profile}(z_i)$ for $i \in \{1, \dots, \ell\}$, each using one query to \mathbb{D} and $q^{\mathcal{O}(1)}$ additional time.

Finally, observe that z_1, \dots, z_ℓ are precisely the affected children of x . Therefore, we may apply [Lemma 4.4](#) to compute $\text{profile}(x)$ in time $q^{\mathcal{O}(1)}$. Remember that this works in particular when x is a leaf of T_Y and has no affected children.

At the end we compute $\text{profile}(r)$ for r being the root of T . As we argued, $G \models \text{conn}(u, v, S)$ if and only if $\text{profile}(r)$ is non-empty, hence we may now answer the query.

As for the time complexity, the whole procedure uses $\mathcal{O}(k)$ queries to \mathbb{D} and $q^{\mathcal{O}(1)}$ additional time. Since every query to \mathbb{D} takes time $2^{\mathcal{O}(q^2)}$, by [Lemma 4.2](#), and $q = 2^{\mathcal{O}(k)}$, the total running time is bounded by a doubly-exponential function of k , as promised. This concludes the proof of [Theorem 1.1](#).

5 Torso queries

In this section we give a proof of [Lemma 4.2](#). As mentioned, the main idea is to reinterpret torso queries as queries about products along paths in a tree labeled with elements of a fixed finite semigroup, and then design a data structure for this more general kind of queries. We start by introducing the setting of semigroup-labeled trees and showing how torso queries fit into this setting. Then we design a data structure for path product queries in semigroup-labeled trees. We believe that this data structure is a general tool of independent interest, hence we actually give two different proofs. The first one is based on a classic approach using deterministic Simon's factorization of Colcombet [[Col07](#)], and can be viewed as a reinterpretation of ideas from [[Col07](#)]. The second is a self-contained, simpler argument that seems new.

Semigroup-labeled trees and path product queries. Recall that a semigroup S consists of a set of elements, called the *support* and also denoted by S , and a binary associative operation on the support called the *product* and denoted \cdot . A semigroup is finite if it has finite support.

For a semigroup S , an S -labeled tree is a rooted tree T together with a map that with each edge e of T associates an element $\sigma(e) \in S$. Suppose x, y are nodes of T , where x is a strict ancestor of y . Then we define

$$\sigma(x, y) := \sigma(e_1) \cdot \sigma(e_2) \cdot \dots \cdot \sigma(e_\ell),$$

where e_1, \dots, e_ℓ are the consecutive edges of the path from x to y in T (that is, e_1 is incident with x and e_ℓ is incident with y).

The following theorem is the main result of this section: it provides an efficient data structure for path product queries, parameterized by the size of the semigroup.

Theorem 5.1. Fix a finite semigroup S and suppose we are given an S -labeled tree T . Then one can in time $|S|^{\mathcal{O}(1)} \cdot |T|$ construct a data structure that can answer the following query in time $|S|^{\mathcal{O}(1)}$ and using $|S|^{\mathcal{O}(1)}$ operations in S : given nodes $x, y \in V(T)$, where x is a strict ancestor of y , output $\sigma(x, y)$. The data structure uses $|S|^{\mathcal{O}(1)} \cdot |T|$ memory and stores $|S|^{\mathcal{O}(1)} \cdot |T|$ elements of S .

Later we give two proofs of Theorem 5.1, but let us see now how torso queries can be understood through path product queries in a semigroup-labeled tree. That is, we are going to prove Lemma 4.2 assuming Theorem 5.1.

Torso queries as path product queries. Assume the setting from the statement of Lemma 4.2. We interpret torso queries as path product queries over trees labeled with a finite semigroup of size $2^{\mathcal{O}(q^2)}$. For this, we shall use the semigroup of *bi-interface graphs*, introduced for a similar purpose in [BP16].

Let $r \in \mathbb{N}$. A *bi-interface graph* of arity r consists of a graph G and two partial mappings $\text{left}, \text{right}: V(G) \rightarrow [r]$ that are injective and satisfy the following property: if $u \in \text{dom}(\text{left}) \cap \text{dom}(\text{right})$, then $\text{left}(u) = \text{right}(u)$. The domains of the mappings $\text{dom}(\text{left})$ and $\text{dom}(\text{right})$ are called the *left interface* and the *right interface*, respectively.

A bi-interface graph is *basic* if its vertex set is a subset of $[r] \times \{L, R, S\}$, $\text{dom}(\text{left}) - \text{dom}(\text{right}) \subseteq [r] \times \{L\}$, $\text{dom}(\text{right}) - \text{dom}(\text{left}) \subseteq [r] \times \{R\}$, $\text{dom}(\text{left}) \cap \text{dom}(\text{right}) \subseteq [r] \times \{S\}$, and $V(G) = \text{dom}(\text{left}) \cup \text{dom}(\text{right})$. By B_r we denote the set of all basic bi-interface graphs of arity r . Note that

$$|B_r| \leq 2^{\mathcal{O}(r^2)},$$

as this is an upper bound on the total number of different graphs on vertex set $[r] \times \{L, R, S\}$.

Next, we define the *abstraction operation*, which takes a bi-interface graph $\mathbb{G} = (G, \text{left}, \text{right})$ and outputs the basic bi-interface graph $\llbracket \mathbb{G} \rrbracket$, of same arity, defined as follows:

- First, for a vertex $u \in \text{dom}(\text{left}) \cup \text{dom}(\text{right})$, define $\iota(u)$ as

$$\iota(u) := \begin{cases} (\text{left}(u), L) & \text{if } u \in \text{dom}(\text{left}) - \text{dom}(\text{right}), \\ (\text{right}(u), R) & \text{if } u \in \text{dom}(\text{right}) - \text{dom}(\text{left}), \text{ and} \\ (\text{left}(u), S) = (\text{right}(u), S) & \text{if } u \in \text{dom}(\text{left}) \cap \text{dom}(\text{right}). \end{cases}$$

- The vertex set of $\llbracket \mathbb{G} \rrbracket$ is $\{\iota(u) : u \in \text{dom}(\text{left}) \cup \text{dom}(\text{right})\}$.
- In $\llbracket \mathbb{G} \rrbracket$ there is an edge between $\iota(u)$ and $\iota(v)$ if and only if in G there is a path from u to v that does not pass through any other vertex of $\text{dom}(\text{left}) \cup \text{dom}(\text{right})$.
- The interface mappings $\text{left}', \text{right}'$ of $\llbracket \mathbb{G} \rrbracket$ are naturally inherited from \mathbb{G} : $\text{left}'(\iota(u)) = \text{left}(u)$ for $u \in \text{dom}(\text{left})$ and $\text{right}'(\iota(u)) = \text{right}(u)$ for $u \in \text{dom}(\text{right})$.

Thus, intuitively speaking, $\llbracket \mathbb{G} \rrbracket$ is obtained by applying the torso operation in \mathbb{G} with respect to the union of the interfaces, and reindexing the vertices according to the labels assigned to the interfaces.

Let $\mathbb{G} = (G, \text{left}_G, \text{right}_G)$ and $\mathbb{H} = (H, \text{left}_H, \text{right}_H)$ be two bi-interface graphs of arity r . The *composition* of \mathbb{G} and \mathbb{H} is the bi-interface graph $\mathbb{G} \cdot \mathbb{H} = (J, \text{left}_G, \text{right}_H)$, where J is obtained from the disjoint union of G and H by fusing a vertex $u \in \text{dom}(\text{right}_G)$ with a vertex $v \in \text{dom}(\text{left}_H)$ whenever $\text{right}_G(u) = \text{left}_H(v)$. Thus, bi-interface graphs of arity r with the composition operation form an (infinite) semigroup; call it S_r . We can now endow the basic bi-interface graphs of arity r with composition operation \odot defined as follows: for basic bi-interface graphs \mathbb{A} and \mathbb{B} , we set

$$\mathbb{A} \odot \mathbb{B} := \llbracket \mathbb{A} \cdot \mathbb{B} \rrbracket.$$

Thus, basic bi-interface graphs of arity r endowed with \odot form a semigroup of size $2^{\mathcal{O}(r^2)}$; call this semigroup B_r . It is straightforward to check that the abstraction operation $\llbracket \cdot \rrbracket$ is a semigroup homomorphism from S_r to B_r , for every $r \in \mathbb{N}$.

With the definitional layer introduced, we can state a lemma that encapsulates the translation from torso queries to queries over B_q -labeled trees. This lemma will be used not only in this section, but also later on for the purpose of viewing computation of torsos in algebraic terms.

Lemma 5.2. *Suppose we are given a tree decomposition $\mathcal{T} = (T, \text{bag})$ of a graph G of adhesion q . Then one can in time $q^{\mathcal{O}(1)} \cdot |T| \|G\|$ compute injective colorings $\{\lambda_x: \text{adh}(x) \rightarrow [2q]: x \in V(T)\}$ and a mapping $\sigma: E(T) \rightarrow B_{2q}$ such that the following properties are satisfied:*

- *If x is the parent of y in T , $u \in \text{adh}(x)$, and $v \in \text{adh}(y)$, then*

$$\lambda_x(u) = \lambda_y(v) \quad \text{if and only if} \quad u = v.$$

- *If x is a strict ancestor of y in T , and we denote*

$$\mathbb{G}(x, y) = (G[\text{cone}(x) - \text{comp}(y)], \lambda_x, \lambda_y),$$

then $\mathbb{G}(x, y)$ is a correctly defined bi-interface graph and

$$\llbracket \mathbb{G}(x, y) \rrbracket = \sigma(x, y).$$

Proof. Compute the colorings λ_x in a top-down manner as follows:

- If r is the root of T , then $\text{adh}(r)$ is empty, hence set λ_r to be the empty coloring.
- If y is a child of x and λ_x has already been defined, then construct λ_y as follows: for each $u \in \text{adh}(x) \cap \text{adh}(y)$ set $\lambda_y(u) := \lambda_x(u)$, and then color the vertices of $\text{adh}(y) - \text{adh}(x)$ using colors from $[2q] - \lambda_x(\text{adh}(x))$ in an arbitrary injective manner. Note that since $|\text{adh}(x)| \leq q$, we have $|[2q] - \lambda_x(\text{adh}(x))| \geq q$, so such an injective coloring always exists.

That the colorings $\{\lambda_x: x \in V(T)\}$ satisfy the first point from the lemma statement follows immediately from the construction. Clearly, they can be computed in time $\mathcal{O}(q|T|)$ by performing a depth-first search in T .

Next, for an edge $xy \in E(T)$, where x is the parent of y , we construct

$$\sigma(xy) := \llbracket \mathbb{G}(x, y) \rrbracket,$$

where $\mathbb{G}(x, y)$ is defined as in the lemma statement. Computing $\sigma(xy)$ boils down to running a breadth-first search in $\mathbb{G}(x, y)$ from each vertex of $\text{adh}(x) \cup \text{adh}(y)$; this can be done in time $q^{\mathcal{O}(1)} \cdot \|G\|$ per node y , so in time $q^{\mathcal{O}(1)} \cdot |T| \|G\|$ in total.

It remains to note that if x is a strict ancestor of y and $x = z_0 - z_1 - \dots - z_\ell = y$ is the path from x to y in T , then

$$\mathbb{G}(x, y) = \mathbb{G}(z_0, z_1) \cdot \mathbb{G}(z_1, z_2) \cdot \dots \cdot \mathbb{G}(z_{\ell-1}, z_\ell),$$

from which it follows that

$$\llbracket \mathbb{G}(x, y) \rrbracket = \sigma(z_0 z_1) \odot \sigma(z_1 z_2) \odot \dots \odot \sigma(z_{\ell-1} z_\ell) = \sigma(x, y). \quad \square$$

Now Lemma 4.2 follows directly from combining Lemma 5.2 and Theorem 5.1. More precisely, using Lemma 5.2 we compute the mapping σ and colorings $\{\lambda_x: x \in V(T)\}$, and then we set up the data structure for $\sigma(x, y)$ queries provided by Theorem 5.1. To answer a query about $\text{torso}(x, y)$, we first query this data structure to obtain $\sigma(x, y)$, and then we translate the names of vertices from $[q] \times \{L, R, S\}$ back to $\text{adh}(x) \cup \text{adh}(y)$ by reverting the colorings λ_x and λ_y .

We now proceed to Theorem 5.1. In both proofs we use the following easy corollary of Lemma 4.1.

Lemma 5.3. *Given a tree T and a set of nodes $L \subseteq V(T)$, one can in time $\mathcal{O}(|T|)$ construct a data structure that may answer the following query in time $\mathcal{O}(1)$: given nodes x and y , where x is an ancestor of y in T , find the topmost node on the x - y path in T that belongs to L , or report that no such node exists.*

Proof. For every $x \in V(T)$, we store whether $x \in L$. Further, let $\text{anc}(x)$ be the closest (deepest) strict ancestor of x that belongs to L , or \perp if no such ancestor exists. Note that the values of anc can be computed in time $\mathcal{O}(|T|)$ using a depth-first search in T .

Next, let T_L be the rooted tree on node set $L \cup \{\perp\}$ constructed from T as follows:

- Restrict the node set to L keeping the ancestor relation; that is, for $x, y \in L$ we have that x is an ancestor of y in T_L if and only if x is an ancestor of y in T . Thus, T_L is now a rooted forest.
- Add a fresh root \perp to T_L and make all former roots of T_L into children of \perp .

Again, T_L can be computed (through its parent relation) in time $\mathcal{O}(|T|)$ by applying a depth-first search.

Apply [Lemma 4.1](#) to the tree T_L , thus constructing a suitable data structure \mathbb{L} in time $\mathcal{O}(|T|)$. It can be now easily seen that whenever x is an ancestor of y in T , the answer to the query from the lemma statement is equal to

$$\text{dir}_{\mathbb{L}}(\text{anc}(x), \text{anc}(y)),$$

where $\text{dir}_{\mathbb{L}}(\cdot, \cdot)$ is a query to the data structure \mathbb{L} . In case $\text{anc}(x) = \text{anc}(y)$, we report y provided $y \in L$, and otherwise we report that there is no node on the x - y path that belongs to L . \square

Direct proof of Theorem 5.1. We start with a direct proof of [Theorem 5.1](#). We will reuse the ideas underlying this proof in [Section 7](#), when considering query enumeration and answering on graphs that exclude a topological minor. The following proof generalizes an idea from [[Boj09](#), Sec. 2.2] in the context of paths, to the case of trees.

For a finite set X , the *functional semigroup* F_X is the semigroup of all functions $f: X \rightarrow X$ with composition as the semigroup operation. Here, the composition of $f, g \in F_X$ is the function $f; g := \lambda a. g(f(a))$. We chose to compose functions in this order for consistency with the alternative proof of [Theorem 5.1](#).

We first prove [Theorem 5.1](#) for functional semigroups. This is captured by the following statement.

Lemma 5.4. *Fix a finite set X and suppose we are given an F_X -labeled tree T . Then one can in time $|X|^{\mathcal{O}(1)} \cdot |T|$ construct a data structure that can answer the following query in time $|X|^{\mathcal{O}(1)}$: given nodes $x, y \in V(T)$, where x is a strict ancestor of y , output $\sigma(x, y)$. The data structure uses $|X|^{\mathcal{O}(1)} \cdot |T|$ memory.*

Note that $|F_X| = |X|^{|X|}$, so the complexity guarantees offered by [Lemma 5.4](#) for the special case of functional semigroups are exponentially better than that promised by [Theorem 5.1](#). Unfortunately, the semigroup of basic bi-interface graphs is not a functional semigroup, so we cannot use [Lemma 5.4](#) directly in the proof of [Lemma 4.2](#).

Proof of Lemma 5.4. For a pair of nodes v, w of T , where v is an ancestor of w , write $f_{vw}: X \rightarrow X$ for the composition

$$\sigma(v_1 v_2); \sigma(v_1 v_2); \dots; \sigma(v_{m-1} v_m),$$

where $v_1 \dots v_m$ is the path starting at $v_1 = v$ and ending at $v_m = w$ (in particular if $v = w$ then f_{vw} is the identity on X). Then $f_{vw} = \sigma(v, w)$ and $f_{vw} = \sigma(vw)$ when v is the parent of w . Our goal is to compute in time $|X|^{\mathcal{O}(1)} \cdot |T|$ a data structure that given two nodes v and w of T , where v is an ancestor of w , outputs f_{vw} in time $|X|^{\mathcal{O}(1)}$.

Let $s := |X|$. We first construct bijections $c_v: X \rightarrow [s]$ for all $v \in V(T)$ so that the following property is satisfied: whenever v is the parent of w in T , we have

$$c_w(f_{vw}(x)) \leq c_v(x) \quad \text{for all } x \in X. \quad (1)$$

We will say that $x \in X$ has color i at a node v if $c_v(x) = i$. Therefore, (1) says that when going from a node v to its child w , the color of an element x may either remain unchanged, or decrease, when applying the function f_{vw} . This can be achieved in a top-down manner as described below, and depicted in Figure 4.




Figure 4: *Construction of the colorings.* The figure depicts the colorings $c_v: X \rightarrow [s]$ along a single branch π in the tree T . Here $|X| = s = 4$, and $[s] = \{1, 2, 3, 4\}$ is represented by the four colors depicted above. The nodes along the branch π correspond to the columns in the figure, with the left column being the root node and the right column being a leaf in T . The elements of X correspond to the rows. The functions $f: X \rightarrow X$ labeling the edges along the path π are represented by the arrows between adjacent columns. The colorings c_v are constructed from left to right, and are represented as colorings of each of the columns with the four colors. The key property is that a path of any given color has a discontinuity only when it hits a path with a smaller color. *The querying phase.* Let v and w be two columns with v preceding w (depicted in the figure), and suppose we want to compute the composition f_{vw} of the functions between v and w , applied to the element that is blue at v , using the color coding from the figure. Let $v'-v''$ be the first pair of consecutive nodes $v'-v''$ following v at which the blue path has a discontinuity (so v'' is *blue-decreasing*). The blue element (at v) is mapped by f_{vw} to the blue element (at w) if w is before v'' . Otherwise, we jump from v to the node v' , then map the blue element at v' by the function labeling the edge $v'-v''$, obtaining a color that is smaller than blue (in this case, pink), and continue tracking the pink color from v'' to w . As each jump decreases the color, the number of jumps is bounded by $s - 1 = 3$.

At the root r , pick an arbitrary bijection $c_r: X \rightarrow [s]$. Next, if c_v is already defined for a node v , and w is a child of v , then we define c_w as follows:

- First, for each $y \in f_{vw}(X)$, set

$$c_w(y) := \min(c_v(f_{vw}^{-1}(y))),$$

that is, the color of y at w is equal to the smallest color at v of any element x that is mapped to y by f_{vw} , if it exists.

- Next, extend c_w to elements $x \notin f_{vw}(X)$ arbitrarily, but so that c_w becomes a bijection.

Property (1) follows immediately from the construction. Clearly, the construction can be performed in time $|X|^{\mathcal{O}(1)} \cdot |T|$.

For an index $i \in [s]$, we say that a node w of T is *i-decreasing* if w has a parent, say v , and there exists $x \in X$ such that

$$c_v(x) = i \quad \text{and} \quad c_w(f_{vw}(x)) < i.$$

That is, the function f_{vw} maps the element that has color i at v to an element whose color becomes smaller at w . Let $L_i \subseteq V(T)$ be the set of *i-decreasing* nodes. Clearly, the sets L_i can be computed in time $|X|^{\mathcal{O}(1)} \cdot |T|$.

For each of the sets L_i , $i \in [s]$, we construct the data structure provided by [Lemma 5.3](#); call it \mathbb{K}_i . Also, we construct the data structure \mathbb{L} provided by [Lemma 4.1](#). This finishes the initialization of our data structure. We now describe how it can be used to answer queries in time $|X|^{\mathcal{O}(1)}$.

Suppose we are queried about the value of f_{vw} , where v is an ancestor of w in T . Clearly, it suffices to show how to compute $f_{vw}(x)$ for each $x \in X$ in time $|X|^{\mathcal{O}(1)}$. Fix $x \in X$, we compute $f_{vw}(x)$ as follows (see also the caption in [Figure 4](#)).

Let $i := c_v(x)$ be the color of x at v , and let $R(v, w)$ be the set of nodes lying on the v - w path in T , excluding v but including w . By a repeated use of (1) we have $c_w(f_{vw}(x)) \leq i$, and the equality holds if and only if no node of $R(v, w)$ is i -decreasing, i.e., belongs to L_i . That is, the color of $f_{vw}(x)$ may only decrease or remain unchanged as we proceed along the v - w path. We use the data structure \mathbb{K}_i to find the topmost node of $L_i \cap R(v, w)$; this amounts to applying the query to w and $\text{dir}(v, w)$. If there is no such node, then we have $f_{vw}(x) = c_w^{-1}(i)$, that is, $f_{vw}(x)$ is the unique element that has color i at w . This concludes the computation of $f_{vw}(x)$. Otherwise, let v'' be the node returned by \mathbb{K}_i and let v' be its parent. Then

$$f_{vw} = f_{vv'}; f_{v'v''}; f_{v''w}.$$

We will first compute $x' := f_{vv'}(x)$, then $x'' := f_{v'v''}(x')$, and finally $y := f_{v''w}(x'')$, which is equal to $f_{vw}(x)$. By definition of v'' we have that $c_{v'}(f_{vv'}(x)) = i$, that is, $x' = f_{vv'}(x)$ has color i at node v' . Therefore, x' can be computed in time $|X|^{\mathcal{O}(1)}$, knowing v'' and hence v' , as well as the colorings. Next, $x'' := f_{v'v''}(x')$ can be computed in time $|X|^{\mathcal{O}(1)}$, since the function $f_{v'v''}$ is the label of the edge $v'v''$. Finally, note that

$$c_{v''}(x'') < i$$

by definition of v'' . Hence, to compute $y = f_{v''w}(x'') = f_{vw}(x)$ it suffices to apply the procedure recursively to the nodes v'' and w , computing $y = f_{v''w}(x'')$. As $c_{v''}(x'') < i$, we conclude that with each recursive call, the value of i strictly decreases. Hence, the recursion depth is bounded by $s = |X|$, and the whole algorithm runs in time $|X|^{\mathcal{O}(1)}$. \square

We now use [Lemma 5.4](#) to prove [Theorem 5.1](#) in full generality. This uses the fact that any semigroup S is a subsemigroup of some functional semigroup, namely F_S .

Proof of Theorem 5.1. Let S be the given fixed semigroup. We may assume that S is a monoid, that is, there exists an element $\mathbf{1} \in S$ such that $\mathbf{1} \cdot m = m \cdot \mathbf{1} = m$ for all $m \in S$. Indeed, every semigroup can be turned into a monoid by adding a fresh element $\mathbf{1}$ satisfying the equations above.

Consider the semigroup homomorphism $\eta: S \rightarrow F_S$ defined through right multiplication:

$$\eta(a) := \lambda b.(b \cdot a) \quad \text{for } a \in S.$$

Then η is injective, as $\eta(a)(\mathbf{1}) = a$ for $a \in S$.

Let T' be the F_S -labeled tree obtained from T by mapping each label through h . Clearly, T' can be computed from S in time $|S|^{\mathcal{O}(1)} \cdot |T|$ and using that many operations in S . Apply [Lemma 5.4](#) to T' , obtaining in time $|S|^{\mathcal{O}(1)} \cdot |T|$ a suitable data structure \mathbb{D}' . Now, given nodes x, y of T where x is a strict ancestor of y , to compute $\sigma(x, y)$ it suffices to use one query to \mathbb{D}' to get $\eta(\sigma(x, y))$, and then note that $\sigma(x, y) = \eta(\sigma(x, y))(\mathbf{1})$. \square

Proof of Theorem 5.1 using deterministic Simon's factorization. We now give a proof that follows closely the combinatorial idea presented by Colcombet in [[Col07](#), Lemma 3]. See also the work of Kazana and Segoufin [[KS13](#)] that applies this idea in the context of enumeration of MSO queries on trees. We need a few definitions, which are taken directly from [[Col07](#)].

Fix a finite semigroup S . Let P be an oriented path whose edges are labeled by elements of S ; let $\sigma: E(P) \rightarrow S$ be this labeling. As P is oriented, there is a natural order $<$ on $V(P)$ signifying which vertex is earlier. For two nodes $x < y$ of P , we denote $\sigma(x, y) = \sigma(e_1) \cdot \dots \cdot \sigma(e_\ell)$, where e_1, \dots, e_ℓ are the consecutive edges of the subpath of P from x to y .

For $h \in \mathbb{N}$, a *split of height h* of P is a labeling $\lambda: V(P) \rightarrow [h]$. In such a split λ , two nodes $x < y$ of P are called *i -neighbors* if $\lambda(x) = \lambda(y) = i$ and $\lambda(z) \geq i$ for all $x < z < y$. Clearly, being i -neighbors is an equivalence relation on $\lambda^{-1}(i)$. Then the split h is called *forward Ramsey* if for all vertices x, y, x', y' that are pairwise i -neighbors and satisfy $x < y$ and $x' < y'$, we have

$$\sigma(x, y) \cdot \sigma(x', y') = \sigma(x, y).$$

Now let T be a rooted tree with edges labeled by elements of S through a labeling $\sigma: E(T) \rightarrow S$. Again, a split of height h of T is a labeling $\lambda: V(T) \rightarrow [h]$. We say that such a split is *forward Ramsey* if it is forward Ramsey when restricting it to any root-to-leaf path in T . Here, the path is oriented from the root to the leaf.

Colcombet's theorem states that in every tree there is always a forward Ramsey split of height bounded by $|S|$. The following statement follows easily from the results presented in [Col07].

Theorem 5.5 ([Col07]). *Let T be a rooted tree with edges labeled by elements of a finite semigroup S . Then there is a forward Ramsey split of T of height at most $|S|$. Moreover, such a split can be computed in time $|S|^{\mathcal{O}(1)} \cdot |T|$.*

To be more precise, Colcombet states his result in terms of the existence of a forward Ramsey split on a path that can be computed by a deterministic automaton that processes the path in the given order. As in [Col07] and multiple other applications, the tree variant stated above can be obtained by running the automaton on every root-to-leaf path of the tree. For computing the split within the promised time complexity, it suffices to construct the automaton in time $|S|^{\mathcal{O}(1)}$ and run it on the root-to-leaf paths in T using depth-first search.

With Theorem 5.5 recalled, we can proceed to the proof of Lemma 4.2. Let λ be a split of height $h := |S|$ for the input tree T , computed using the algorithm of Theorem 5.5. With every $x \in V(T)$ we will store the value $\lambda(x)$. Further, letting $L_i := \lambda^{-1}(i)$ for each $i \in [h]$, we apply Lemma 5.3 to T and the node subset L_i , thus obtaining a suitable data structure \mathbb{K}_i . Finally, we apply Lemma 4.1 to compute a suitable data structure \mathbb{L} for $\text{lca}(\cdot, \cdot)$ and $\text{dir}(\cdot, \cdot)$ queries. All of these take time $|S|^{\mathcal{O}(1)} \cdot |T|$ in total.

Recall that within \mathbb{K}_i , with every $x \in V(T)$ we store a pointer $\text{anc}_i(x)$ to the closest (deepest) strict ancestor of x that belongs to L_i ; if there is no such strict ancestor, \perp is stored instead. In case $\text{anc}_i(x)$ is well-defined, alongside it we also store the value

$$\text{val}_i(x) := \sigma(\text{anc}_i(x), x) \in S.$$

Again, using a depth-first search it is straightforward to compute all these values in time $|S|^{\mathcal{O}(1)} \cdot |T|$ and using $|S|^{\mathcal{O}(1)} \cdot |T|$ operations in S .

This concludes the definition of the data structure. Clearly, the time complexity of the construction algorithm, as well as the space complexity, are as promised. We are left with implementing the $\sigma(x, y)$ queries within the promised time complexity.

Let x and y be a pair of nodes of T , where x is a strict ancestor of y . Let $R(x, y)$ be the set of all nodes that lie on the unique path from x to y in T , including x but excluding y . Further, let

$$r(x, y) := \min\{\lambda(z) : z \in R(x, y)\}.$$

We are going to give an algorithm that computes $\sigma(x, y)$ in time $|S|^{\mathcal{O}(1)}$ and using $|S|^{\mathcal{O}(1)}$ operations in S , and makes at most one recursive call to compute $\sigma(x, z)$ for some z that is a strict ancestor of y and a strict descendant of x . We will have a guarantee that if such a call is invoked, then $r(x, z) > r(x, y)$. Since the co-domain of $r(\cdot, \cdot)$ is $[h]$, this means that the depth of the recursion is at most $h = |S|$, so the whole algorithm will run within the promised complexity.

First, for every $i \in [h]$ we would like to test whether $R(x, y)$ contains a node z with $\lambda(z) = i$, and if so, find the topmost such node. This can be done using one call to the data structure \mathbb{K}_i , applied to x and the parent of y . Using this procedure for each $i \in [h]$, we can determine the value of $r(x, y)$ in time $\mathcal{O}(|S|)$, and also find the suitable node z : the topmost node satisfying $\lambda(z) = r(x, y)$.

Next, we would like to determine whether there exists a node $z' \in R(z, y)$, $z' \neq z$, such that $\lambda(z') = r(x, y)$, and if so, to find the topmost such z' . Again, this can be done using one call to the data structure $\mathbb{K}_{r(x, y)}$, applied to z and the parent of y .

Finally, let

$$z'' := \text{anc}_{r(x, y)}(y).$$

With these definitions in place, it can be readily seen that $\sigma(x, y)$ can be expressed as

$$\sigma(x, y) = \sigma(x, z) \cdot \sigma(z, z') \cdot \sigma(z', z'') \cdot \sigma(z'', y), \quad (2)$$

where the terms

- $\sigma(x, z)$ ought to be omitted if $x = z$;
- $\sigma(z, z') \cdot \sigma(z', z'')$ ought to be omitted if z' does not exist (note that this implies that $z = z''$); and
- $\sigma(z', z'')$ ought to be omitted if $z' = z''$.

Now observe that we can compute the consecutive factors on the right hand side of (2) as follows:

- We have $\sigma(z'', y) = \text{val}_i(y)$, and this value is stored directly in the data structure.
- Similarly, provided z' exists, $\sigma(z, z') = \text{val}_i(z')$. Furthermore, if $z' \neq z''$, then z, z', z'' are all $r(x, y)$ -neighbors on the root-to- y path in T , hence $\sigma(z, z') \cdot \sigma(z', z'') = \sigma(z, z')$ by the forward-Ramseyanity of the split.
- Provided $x \neq z$, $\sigma(x, z)$ can be computed by a recursive call. Here, observe that by the definition of z , no node of $R(x, z)$ is assigned value $r(x, y)$ under λ , hence $r(x, z) > r(x, y)$, as was promised.

Therefore, using (2) we can compute $\sigma(x, y)$ using one call to $\sigma(x, z)$ with $r(x, z) > r(x, y)$ and, additionally, $|S|^{\mathcal{O}(1)}$ time and $|S|^{\mathcal{O}(1)}$ operations in S . This concludes the proof of [Theorem 5.1](#).

6 Trading space usage for query complexity

In this section we show how to modify the approach presented in [Section 4](#) to construct a data structure that offers queries in time $k^{\mathcal{O}(1)}$, at the cost of increasing the space usage to quadratic in the size of the graph. The outcome is captured in the following statement.

Theorem 6.1. *Given a graph G and an integer k , one can in time $2^{\mathcal{O}(k \log k)} \cdot |G|^{\mathcal{O}(1)}$ construct a data structure that may answer the following queries in time $k^{\mathcal{O}(1)}$: given $u, v \in V(G)$ and a set S consisting of at most k vertices of G , does $G \models \text{conn}(u, v, S)$? The space usage of the data structure is $k^{\mathcal{O}(1)} \cdot |G|^2$.*

Compared to [Theorem 1.1](#), [Theorem 6.1](#) offers a much faster implementation of queries: the complexity is polynomial in k , instead of doubly-exponential. The drawback is that while the space usage is also polynomial in k , the dependency on the total number of vertices becomes quadratic. Note that the initialization time still depends exponentially on k .

The remainder of this section is devoted to the proof of [Theorem 6.1](#). We will heavily rely on the approach presented in [Section 4](#), so we only discuss the modifications and this section needs to be read in conjunction with [Section 4](#).

The tree decomposition. The main idea of the proof is to rely only on weak unbreakability, instead of strong unbreakability as in [Section 4](#). This reduces the sizes of adhesions from exponential in k to just k . More precisely, given the input graph G and the parameter k , we apply [Theorem 3.1](#) to compute, in time $2^{\mathcal{O}(k \log k)} \cdot |G|^{\mathcal{O}(1)}$, a tree decomposition \mathcal{T} with the following properties:

- the adhesion of \mathcal{T} is at most k ; and
- every bag of \mathcal{T} is (k, k) -unbreakable in G .

Recall from the earlier discussion that we may assume that the decomposition is regular. Obviously, the fact that \mathcal{T} is only weakly unbreakable renders the bulk of correctness argumentation presented in [Section 4](#) invalid. Fixing this issue is the main technical task of this section.

Torso queries. Note that even though now the adhesion of \mathcal{T} is bounded by $q = k$, if we just used [Lemma 4.2](#) for torso queries, we would still end up with exponential dependence on k in the query time. This can be mitigated by replacing the data structure of [Lemma 4.2](#) with a trivial one that just memorizes all the answers. The drawback is that the space usage becomes quadratic in $|G|$, as this is the total number of different torso queries that can be asked.

Lemma 6.2. *One can compute in time $q^{\mathcal{O}(1)} \cdot |G|^2 \|G\|$ a data structure that can answer the following query in time $q^{\mathcal{O}(1)}$: for given $x, y \in V(T)$, where x is an ancestor of y , output the graph $\text{torso}(x, y)$. The data structure takes space $q^{\mathcal{O}(1)} \cdot |T|^2$.*

Proof. Note that there are at most $\binom{|T|}{2}$ pairs $(x, y) \in V(T)^2$ such that x is a strict ancestor of y in T , and for each of them $\text{torso}(x, y)$ can be computed in time $q^{\mathcal{O}(1)} \cdot \|G\|$ by running a breadth-first search from each vertex of $\text{adh}(x) \cup \text{adh}(y)$. Hence, all those graphs can be computed in time $q^{\mathcal{O}(1)} \cdot |G|^2 \|G\|$ and stored in a two-dimensional table indexed by nodes of T , which takes space $q^{\mathcal{O}(1)} \cdot |T|^2$. Upon query, the data structure just returns the relevant graph $\text{torso}(x, y)$. \square

We remark that in what follows, we could still use [Lemma 4.2](#) instead of [Lemma 6.2](#). This would result in a variant of [Theorem 6.1](#) where the query time complexity would be $2^{\mathcal{O}(k^2)}$ and the space usage would be $2^{\mathcal{O}(k^2)} \cdot \|G\|$.

Dealing with weak unbreakability. The data structure for [Theorem 6.1](#) is now the same as the one presented in [Section 4](#), except for the two modifications presented above: we use [Theorem 3.1](#) instead of [Theorem 3.2](#) for the computation of a tree decomposition, and we use [Lemma 6.2](#) instead of [Lemma 4.2](#) for torso queries.

It remains to show how, given this data structure, to implement a $\text{conn}(u, v, S)$ query, where $u, v \in V(G)$ and $S \subseteq V(G)$ is such that $|S| \leq k$. The algorithm is actually *exactly* the same as the one presented in [Section 4](#). As argued through [Lemma 4.3](#) and [Lemma 4.4](#), this algorithm takes time $q^{\mathcal{O}(1)}$ and uses $\mathcal{O}(k)$ queries to a data structure supporting torso queries. Since now the torso queries take $q^{\mathcal{O}(1)}$ time and $q = k$, it follows that the whole algorithm runs in $k^{\mathcal{O}(1)}$ time. So we are left with arguing that the outcome is still correct.

As in [Section 4](#), let X be the set of nodes of T whose margins intersect $\widehat{S} := S \cup \{u, v\}$ (plus the root of T), and let Y be the least common ancestor closure of X . Recall that the algorithm presented in [Section 4](#) computes, for each $x \in Y$, the set $\text{profile}(x) \subseteq \binom{D(x)}{2}$, where $D(x) = \text{adh}(x) \cup (\{u, v\} \cap \text{cone}(x))$, consisting of all pairs of vertices of $D(x)$ that are connected in $G[\text{cone}(x)] - S$.

The idea is that we relax the condition on what the algorithm computes to the following over-approximation of $\text{profile}(x)$. For a node $x \in V(T)$, we say that $\Pi_x \subseteq \binom{D(x)}{2}$ is a *semi-correct profile* at x if the following two conditions hold for all $\{a, b\} \in \binom{D(x)}{2}$:

- If a and b are connected in $G[\text{cone}(x)] - S$, then $\{a, b\} \in \Pi_x$.
- If $\{a, b\} \in \Pi_x$, then a and b are connected in $G - S$.

Thus, a semi-correct profile at x necessarily contains all the pairs that belong to $\text{profile}(x)$, but it can contain some more pairs. These additional pairs are not connected in $G[\text{cone}(x)] - S$, but we are certain that they are connected in the whole graph $G - S$.

The remainder of this section is devoted to arguing the following claim.

Claim 6.1. *Assuming \mathcal{T} is weakly (q, k) -unbreakable and the algorithm of [Section 4](#) is run to answer a query $\text{conn}(u, v, S)$, the following holds: whenever the algorithm computes the profile at any node x , this profile is semi-correct.*

Note that for the root r of T , we have $G[\text{cone}(r)] = G$, so any semi-correct profile at r is equal to $\text{profile}(r)$. Therefore, [Claim 6.1](#) implies that the outcome of the algorithm is correct. To prove [Claim 6.1](#) it suffices to argue that the assumption of semi-correctness can be pushed through the computation presented in the proofs of [Lemma 4.3](#) and [Lemma 4.4](#). This we do in the next two lemmas.

Lemma 6.3. *Suppose z is an ancestor of y in T such that \hat{S} is disjoint with $\text{comp}(z) - \text{cone}(y)$, and Π_y is a semi-correct profile for y . Let J be a graph on vertex set $D(y) \cup \text{adh}(z)$ whose edge set is the union of Π_y and the edge set of $\text{torso}(z, y)$. Further, let $\Pi_z \subseteq \binom{D(z)}{2}$ consist of all pairs $\{a, b\} \in \binom{D(z)}{2}$ that are connected in $J - S$. Then Π_z is a semi-correct profile for z .*

Proof. Suppose first that $\{a, b\} \in \binom{D(z)}{2}$ are connected in $G[\text{cone}(z)] - S$. Let P be a path witnessing this. Then P can be uniquely written as concatenation of paths P_1, P_2, \dots, P_ℓ , where each path P_i has endpoints in $V(J)$, but is otherwise vertex-disjoint with $V(J)$. Note that each path P_i has all internal vertices either contained in $\text{comp}(z) - \text{cone}(y)$, or in $\text{comp}(y)$. Paths of the first kind correspond to edges with the same endpoints present in the edge set of $\text{torso}(z, y)$, while paths of the second kind correspond to edges with the same endpoints present in Π_y , due to the semi-correctness of Π_y . It follows that a and b are connected by a path in J that avoids S , so $\{a, b\} \in \Pi_z$ by the definition of Π_z .

Conversely, suppose $\{a, b\} \in \Pi_z$. Then in J there is a path P' that connects a and b and is disjoint with S . For every edge e of P' , let P_e be a path in $G - S$ defined as follows:

- If e originates from the edge set of $\text{torso}(z, y)$, then let P_e be the path in $G[\text{cone}(z) - \text{comp}(y)]$ with the same endpoints as e that witnesses the existence of e in $\text{torso}(z, y)$. Note that P_e is disjoint with S , because all its internal vertices belong to $\text{comp}(z) - \text{cone}(y)$.
- If $e \in \Pi_y$, then by semi-correctness of Π_y , there is a path P_e in $G - S$ with the same endpoints as e .

By concatenating paths $\{P_e : e \in E(P')\}$ in order we obtain a walk connecting a and b in $G - S$. \square

[Lemma 6.3](#) proves that the procedure presented in the proof of [Lemma 4.3](#) outputs a semi-correct profile for z , provided it is supplied with a semi-correct profile for y .

Lemma 6.4. *Let $x \in Y$ and let Z be the set of affected children of x . Suppose for each $z \in Z$ we have a semi-correct profile Π_z . Let bgraph' be a graph obtained from $G[\text{bag}(x)]$ by adding the following edges:*

- for each $z \in Z$, add all pairs of Π_z as edges; and
- for each child w of x such that $w \notin Z$, add all pairs of $\binom{\text{adh}(w)}{2}$ as edges.

Then for each pair of distinct vertices $a, b \in \text{bag}(x)$, the following implications hold:

- If a and b are connected in $\text{bgraph}' - S$, then a and b are connected in $G - S$.
- If there exist $A, B \subseteq \text{bag}(x)$, each of size $q + 1$ and disjoint from S , such that $a \in A, b \in B$, $\text{bgraph}'[A]$ is connected, and $\text{bgraph}'[B]$ is connected, then a and b are connected in $G - S$.

Proof. For the first implication, observe that if P' is a path connecting a and b in $\text{bgraph}' - S$, then by the semi-correctness of profiles Π_z and regularity of \mathcal{T} , every edge of P' that is not present in $G[\text{bag}(x)] - S$ can be replaced by a path in $G - S$ connecting same endpoints. This yields a walk in $G - S$ connecting a and b .

For the second implication, the same argument as above shows that A is contained in the vertex set of a single connected component of $G - S$, and the same goes for B . Since $A, B \subseteq \text{bag}(x)$, $\text{bag}(x)$ is (q, k) -unbreakable in G , and $|S| \leq k$, it follows that this must be the same connected component for both A and B . So a and b belong to the same connected component of $G - S$. \square

It is straightforward to verify that in the algorithm presented in [Lemma 4.4](#), the considered graph bgraph_S is exactly the graph $\text{bgraph}' - S$ from [Lemma 6.4](#) (considered there for $\Pi_z = \text{profile}(z)$ for $z \in Z$). Further, a pair $\{a, b\} \in \binom{\text{bag}(x)}{2}$ is deemed connected in $G[\text{cone}(x)] - S$ if and only if one of the preconditions of the two implications mentioned in [Lemma 6.4](#) holds. Hence, if we run the algorithm supplied with the semi-correct profiles $\{\Pi_z : z \in Z\}$, then the outcome is $\Pi_x \subseteq \binom{D(x)}{2}$ satisfying the following.

- If distinct $a, b \in D(x)$ are connected in $G[\text{cone}(x)] - S$, then $\{a, b\} \in \Pi_x$. This follows from the fact that the sets $\{\Pi_z : z \in Z\}$ are supersets of the profiles $\{\text{profile}(z) : z \in Z\}$, so the edge set of the graph $\text{bgraph}' - S$ is a superset of the edge set of the graph bgraph_S considered in the proof of [Lemma 4.4](#). Consequently, every pair $\{a, b\} \in \text{profile}(x)$ is included in Π_x .
- If $\{a, b\} \in \Pi_x$, then a and b are connected in $G - S$. This follows from the construction of Π_x and [Lemma 6.4](#). (Semi-correctness of $\{\Pi_z : z \in Z\}$ needs also to be used for the corner cases when $\{a, b\} \notin \binom{\text{bag}(x)}{2}$.)

In other words, the constructed set Π_x is a semi-correct profile for x . We conclude that if the algorithm presented in the proof of [Lemma 4.4](#) is supplied with semi-correct profiles $\{\Pi_z : z \in Z\}$, then it produces a semi-correct profile Π_x for x .

Now, [Claim 6.1](#) follows by a straightforward bottom-up induction using [Lemma 6.3](#) and [Lemma 6.4](#). This concludes the proof of [Theorem 6.1](#).

7 Automata on augmented trees

We consider *augmented trees*, that are, rooted trees in which the set of children of any given node carries the structure of a graph, or more generally, a relational structure (see [Figure 5](#)).




Figure 5: A tree augmented with graphs. The root is at the top, the edges of the tree are marked black, while the edges of the graphs are marked red, and they may only connect nodes that are siblings in the tree. As a first-order relational structure, the tree is equipped with the ancestor relation induced by the tree, as well as the red edge relation.

Unranked, unordered trees are a special case of this, by assuming the children form a set with no relations, while ordered trees are a special case where the children form a total order. Here, we allow the children to carry an arbitrary structure, but in our application, this structure will be an edge- and vertex-colored graph that excludes some fixed topological minor. We also consider automata that process such trees from the leaves towards the root in a deterministic fashion, by labeling each node by a state from a finite state space. To determine whether a node v should be labeled with a state q , a first-order sentence δ_q is evaluated in the structure induced by the children of v .

Augmented trees can be viewed as relational structures equipped with the ancestor relation \preceq of the tree, as well as the relations Σ relating the children of any given node, with which the tree is augmented. Therefore, the logic $\text{FO}(\preceq, \Sigma)$ is able to mix the two structures, and express for example that every node whose children satisfy a certain $\text{FO}(\Sigma)$ -definable property has an ancestor that satisfies another $\text{FO}(\Sigma)$ -definable property.

We use those automata as a tool for solving various computation problems related to the logic $\text{FO}(\preceq, \Sigma)$. Namely, the main results of this section are:

1. every formula of $\text{FO}(\preceq, \Sigma)$ can be converted into an equivalent automaton on augmented trees ([Theorem 7.1](#)),
2. automata on augmented trees, and hence $\text{FO}(\preceq, \Sigma)$ sentences, can be efficiently evaluated on trees augmented with structures from a class \mathcal{C} , assuming that the model-checking of first-order logic can efficiently be solved on \mathcal{C} ([Theorem 7.4](#) and [Lemma 7.3](#)),

3. automata on augmented trees, and hence $\text{FO}(\preceq, \Sigma)$ formulas, can be efficiently queried on trees augmented with structures from a class \mathcal{C} , assuming first-order queries can be efficiently answered on \mathcal{C} (Theorem 7.5 and Lemma 7.6),
4. satisfying valuations to automata on augmented trees, and hence $\text{FO}(\preceq, \Sigma)$ formulas, can be efficiently enumerated on trees augmented with structures from a class \mathcal{C} , assuming first-order queries can be efficiently enumerated on \mathcal{C} (Theorem 7.11 and Lemma 7.12).

All the results proved in this section are generic and can be applied to trees augmented with various kinds of structures. More generally, they are proved for the more powerful logic $\text{FO}(\text{MSO}(\preceq, A) \cup \Sigma)$ that allows to access the tree structure using not only the relation \preceq , but indeed any MSO-definable relation on trees labeled with labels from a finite alphabet A . Our results generalize known results concerning the evaluation and enumeration of MSO queries on usual trees, e.g. [KS13].

In the next section, we use the results from this section in the context of topological minor-free graph classes. Namely, we reduce the problem of evaluating/enumerating $\text{FO}+\text{conn}$ queries on such classes to the problem of evaluating/enumerating $\text{FO}(\text{MSO}(\preceq, A) \cup \Sigma)$ queries on trees augmented with topological minor-free graph classes. However, the results obtained in this section may be of independent interest, and potentially of broader applicability.

In the algorithmic statements proved in this section, we will assume that the class \mathcal{C} with which the trees are augmented is a class for which FO model-checking, query answering or query enumeration can be solved efficiently. We remark here that all these assumptions are satisfied whenever \mathcal{C} is a topological minor-free graph class, as will happen in our applications. More generally, they are satisfied for any class with bounded expansion, by results of [KS20] or [Tor20].

7.1 Augmented trees and their automata

Fix a signature Σ and an alphabet A . We assume that $\Sigma \cap A = \emptyset$ and that Σ does not contain the symbol \preceq . Let \mathcal{C} be a class of Σ -structures. A \mathcal{C} -augmented tree over the alphabet A is a rooted tree T where each node v is labeled with a letter from A and is associated with a Σ -structure $\mathbf{A}_v \in \mathcal{C}$, called the *whorl*³ at v , whose elements are the children of v in T . In some applications, it may be convenient to each node to be labeled with a *set* of letters from A , rather than a single letter. This scenario can be modeled using the above definition, by replacing the alphabet A by 2^A .

We view an augmented tree T over the alphabet A as relational structure over the signature $\Sigma \cup \{\preceq\} \cup A$, as follows:

- the domain consists of the nodes of T ,
- the unary relation a , for $a \in A$, contains a node v if and only if v has label a ,
- $v \preceq w$ denotes that v is an ancestor of w in T (possibly $v = w$),
- for each $R \in \Sigma$ of arity t , $R(v_1, \dots, v_t)$ holds if and only if v_1, \dots, v_t have the same parent v , and $R(v_1, \dots, v_t)$ holds in the whorl \mathbf{A}_v at v .

Automata. We now define automata that input augmented trees, and process them from the leaves towards the root. As an automaton proceeds, it labels each node by a state from a finite set Q of states. To determine the new state at a node v , assuming each child of v already has an assigned state, the automaton evaluates first-order sentences on the whorl of v , which is now a Q -labeled Σ -structure (see Figure 6).

³In botany, a *whorl* is an arrangement of similar parts, e.g. branches, that radiate from a single point and surround the stem of a tree or plant.




Figure 6: A run of an automaton on a tree augmented with graphs. The underlying tree is unlabeled, that is, over an alphabet with one element. The color of a node represents the state assigned in the run. The transition sentences are described above, and can be expressed using first-order sentences. The automaton accepts those augmented trees that contain two nodes u and v such that u and v are adjacent in the (red edge) graph relation, the whorl at u contains a triangle, and the whorl at v does not contain a triangle.

Formally, an *automaton* \mathcal{A} on *augmented trees* consists of:

- an input *alphabet* A : the automaton will process augmented trees over the alphabet A ,
- a finite set of *states* Q ,
- a set of *accepting states* $F \subseteq Q$,
- for each state $q \in Q$ and letter $a \in A$, a first-order sentence $\delta_{q,a}$ in the signature $\Sigma \cup Q$, where each $q \in Q$ is viewed as a unary relation symbol, such that for every fixed $a \in A$, the sentences $(\delta_{q,a})_{q \in Q}$ are mutually inconsistent and their disjunction $\bigvee_{q \in Q} \delta_{q,a}$ is equivalent to true. The sentences $\delta_{q,a}$ are called the *transition sentences* of \mathcal{A} .

A *run* of \mathcal{A} on an augmented tree T is a labeling $\rho: V(T) \rightarrow Q$ such that for every node v with letter a and whorl \mathbf{A}_v , the state $q = \rho(v)$ is the unique state such that $\delta_{q,a}$ holds in the Q -labeled structure \mathbf{A}_v with labeling ρ restricted to \mathbf{A}_v . Formally, \mathbf{A}_v is viewed as a structure over the signature $\Sigma \cup Q$, where a predicate $q \in Q$ holds on a vertex v if and only if $\rho(v) = q$. The run is *accepting* if it labels the root with an accepting state. The automaton \mathcal{A} *accepts* an augmented tree T if it has an accepting run on it.

Note that there is exactly one run of \mathcal{A} on any given augmented tree T , by the assumption that the sentences $(\delta_{q,a})_{q \in Q}$ are mutually inconsistent and their disjunction is equivalent to true. It is undecidable if a given collection of transition sentences satisfies the requirements. However, this will not be a concern for us, as all the automata constructed in the proofs below will satisfy the required conditions by construction. Moreover, it is not difficult to come up with an equivalent model with decidable syntax, by syntactically enforcing that the transition sentences satisfy the required conditions.

7.2 From $\text{FO}(\text{MSO}(\preceq, A) \cup \Sigma)$ to automata

As we will see, automata will have the power to simulate first-order sentences over augmented trees, that is, for every first-order sentence φ in the signature of augmented trees there is an automaton \mathcal{A}_φ on augmented trees that accepts an augmented tree T if and only if T satisfies φ . We also consider automata that process trees together with valuations, in order to capture formulas $\varphi(\bar{x})$ with free variables. A tree T over an alphabet A together with a valuation $\bar{a}: \bar{x} \rightarrow V(T)$ is modeled as a tree $T \otimes \bar{a}$ over an extended alphabet, defined as follows.

Let \bar{x} be a set of variables. Given an alphabet A , construct a new alphabet $A \otimes \bar{x} := A \times 2^{\bar{x}}$. That is, an element of this alphabet is a pair (a, \bar{y}) consisting of a letter $a \in A$ and a set of variables $\bar{y} \subseteq \bar{x}$. Given a tree T with labels from A and a partial valuation (partial function) $\bar{a}: \bar{x} \rightarrow V(T)$, define a new tree $T \otimes \bar{a}$ over the alphabet $A \otimes \bar{x}$, in which a node v has label (a, \bar{y}) if and only if v has label a in T and $\bar{y} = \{x \in \bar{x} \mid \bar{a}(x) = v\}$. In particular, taking the empty partial function $\emptyset: \bar{x} \rightarrow V(T)$, we obtain the tree $T \otimes \emptyset$, in which every node v that has label a in T has label (a, \emptyset) in $T \otimes \emptyset$.

Fix a finite alphabet A and a set of variables \bar{x} . An automaton *with variables* \bar{x} on augmented trees over the alphabet A , denoted $\mathcal{A}(\bar{x})$, is an automaton \mathcal{A} on augmented trees over the alphabet $A \otimes \bar{x}$. Given an augmented tree T we may view $\mathcal{A}(\bar{x})$ as a query that given a tuple $\bar{a} \in V(T)^{\bar{x}}$ determines whether or not \mathcal{A} accepts the tree $T \otimes \bar{a}$. Let $\mathcal{A}(T) \subseteq V(T)^{\bar{x}}$ denote the set of valuations $\bar{a}: \bar{x} \rightarrow V(T)$ such that \mathcal{A} accepts $T \otimes \bar{a}$.

The following theorem states that this automata model is at least as powerful as $\text{FO}(\text{MSO}(\preceq, A) \cup \Sigma)$.

Theorem 7.1. *For every formula $\varphi(\bar{x})$ of $\text{FO}(\text{MSO}(\preceq, A) \cup \Sigma)$ there is an automaton \mathcal{A} on augmented trees over the alphabet $A \otimes \bar{x}$ such that for every augmented tree T over the alphabet A we have $\mathcal{A}(T) = \varphi(T)$. Moreover, \mathcal{A} is computable from φ .*

In the case when Σ is empty, $\text{FO}(\text{MSO}(\preceq, A) \cup \Sigma)$ boils down to $\text{MSO}(\preceq, A)$. It is well known (see e.g. [Lödl12]) that MSO on trees is captured by tree automata, where the automata may count the number of occurrences of any fixed state in the children, up to a certain threshold. This can be easily expressed using first-order sentences (in fact, boolean combinations of existential sentences) over the signature consisting only of unary predicates denoting the states. Hence, this yields a tree automaton \mathcal{A} on augmented trees for $\Sigma = \emptyset$. Therefore, the case when $\Sigma = \emptyset$ follows from known results.

Proof of Theorem 7.1. We proceed by induction on the structure of the formula $\varphi(\bar{x})$. Formally, in the induction we are considering not only the formula φ itself, but also a specified set \bar{x} of variables containing the free variables of φ . In particular, if $\bar{x} \subsetneq \bar{z}$, then $\varphi(\bar{x})$ and $\varphi(\bar{z})$ are separate cases that we need to consider. However, note that if we have an automaton \mathcal{A} over the alphabet $A \otimes \bar{x}$ for $\varphi(\bar{x})$ as in the statement and $\bar{x} \subseteq \bar{z}$, then the automaton \mathcal{A} can be also viewed as an automaton over the alphabet $A \otimes \bar{z}$, and this automaton then satisfies the statement for $\varphi(\bar{z})$.

In the inductive base, $\varphi(\bar{x})$ is an atomic formula: either $\mu(\bar{x})$ for some formula $\mu(\bar{x}) \in \text{MSO}(\preceq, A)$ or $R(x_1, \dots, x_k)$ for some $R \in \Sigma$. The first case is well-known, see the remark preceding the proof, and this yields an automaton on augmented trees in which the transition sentences do not use the relations from Σ . We consider the second case.

The automaton \mathcal{A} for $R(x_1, \dots, x_t)$, where $R \in \Sigma$, has states q_{acc} and q_{rej} , where q_{acc} is an accepting state and q_{rej} is a rejecting state. Observe that $R(a_1, \dots, a_t)$ can only be true if all a_i are elements of a fixed \mathbf{A}_v , as the relation R does not contain tuples with elements of different whorls. Hence, the automaton can proceed from the leaves, which we initiate with q_{rej} , to the root as follows. For every node v it checks if all the variables x_i are interpreted in \mathbf{A}_v (recall that the alphabet is $A \otimes \bar{x} = A \times 2^{\bar{x}}$) and satisfy R . If this is the case, then the automaton changes state to q_{acc} and propagates this state. Otherwise, it propagates the state q_{rej} . This intuition is formalized by the

following formulas

$$\delta_{q_{acc},(a,U)} = \exists y. q_{acc}(y) \vee \exists y_1, \dots, y_t. (R(y_1, \dots, y_t) \wedge \bigwedge_{i \leq t} \bigvee_{\substack{W \subseteq 2^{\bar{x}} \\ x_i \in W}} \bigvee_{a \in A} (a, W)(y_i)).$$

$$\delta_{q_{rej},(a,U)} = \neg \delta_{q_{acc},(a,U)}.$$

The case when $\varphi(\bar{x})$ is a disjunction of formulas $\alpha(\bar{x}) \vee \beta(\bar{x})$ is handled by the usual product automaton construction. Namely, let \mathcal{A} and \mathcal{B} be automata obtained by inductive assumption applied to $\alpha(\bar{x})$ and $\beta(\bar{x})$. Construct the automaton $\mathcal{A} \times \mathcal{B}$ whose states are pairs (p, q) , where p is a state of \mathcal{A} and q is a state of \mathcal{B} , and transition sentences are $\delta_{(p,q),a} \equiv \delta_{p,a}^{\mathcal{A}} \wedge \delta_{q,a}^{\mathcal{B}}$, where $\delta_{p,a}^{\mathcal{A}}$ and $\delta_{q,a}^{\mathcal{B}}$ are the transition sentences of \mathcal{A} and \mathcal{B} , respectively. The accepting states of $\mathcal{A} \times \mathcal{B}$ are pairs (p, q) such that p is accepting in \mathcal{A} or q is accepting in \mathcal{B} . Then the automaton $\mathcal{A} \times \mathcal{B}$ satisfies the condition in the statement, for the formula $\varphi(\bar{x})$.

The case when φ is a negation of a formula is handled by the usual complementation of automata, since the automata are deterministic and have exactly one run on every given tree. Hence, replacing the set F of accepting states with its complement $Q - F$, we obtain an automaton \mathcal{A}' that accepts a tree $T \otimes \bar{a}$ if and only if \mathcal{A} does not accept $T \otimes \bar{a}$.

It remains to consider the case when φ is of the form $\exists x. \psi(x, \bar{y})$, for some formula $\psi(x, \bar{y})$. To simplify notation we assume that \bar{y} is empty, so that φ is of the form $\exists x. \psi(x)$. This is also without loss of generality, since a formula with free variables $\{x\} \cup \bar{y}$ may be viewed as a formula with one free variable x , in the signature of augmented trees over the alphabet $A \otimes \bar{y}$.

For an augmented tree T and a node $v \in V(T)$, let $T \otimes v$ denote $T \otimes \bar{a}$, where \bar{a} is the valuation mapping x to v . By inductive assumption, there is an automaton \mathcal{A} that accepts an augmented tree $T \otimes v$ if and only if $\psi(v)$ holds in T . Let Q, F and $(\delta_q)_{q \in Q}$ be the components of \mathcal{A} .

Given a tree T and a node $v \in V(T)$ let T_v denote the *subtree* of T rooted at v , consisting of v and all the descendants of v , and for a valuation \bar{a} let $\text{state}(\mathcal{A}, T \otimes \bar{a})$ denote the state at the root of T in the unique run of \mathcal{A} on $T \otimes \bar{a}$.

Given an augmented tree T over the alphabet A , define a labeling $\rho': V(T) \rightarrow Q \times Q \times 2^Q \times 2^Q$, such that for every node $v \in V(T)$, the label $\rho'(v)$ is the tuple (q, q', N, R) with:

$$\begin{aligned} q &= \text{state}(\mathcal{A}, T_v \otimes \emptyset), & q' &= \text{state}(\mathcal{A}, T_v \otimes v), \\ N &= \{\text{state}(\mathcal{A}, T_v \otimes w) \mid w \text{ is a child of } v \text{ in } T\} & R &= \{\text{state}(\mathcal{A}, T_v \otimes w) \mid w \in V(T), v \prec w\}. \end{aligned}$$

Lemma 7.2. *There is an automaton \mathcal{A}' with states $Q \times Q \times 2^Q \times 2^Q$ such that for every augmented tree T over the alphabet A , the run of \mathcal{A}' on T is equal to ρ' .*

Proof. Denote by $\rho'_i(v)$ the i th component of $\rho'(v)$, for $i = 1, 2, 3, 4$. Let $\delta_{q,(a,\emptyset)}$ and $\delta_{q,(a,\{x\})}$, for $a \in A$, be the transition sentences of \mathcal{A} . Thus, for a node v with letter a , the automaton \mathcal{A} labels v by q if either v is not occupied by the variable x and $\delta_{q,(a,\emptyset)}$ holds, or v is occupied by x and $\delta_{q,(a,\{x\})}$ holds.

Let v be a node of T with label a . Then $\rho'(v)$ is equal to the unique tuple (q, q', N, R) such that the following conditions hold:

- $\delta_{q,(a,\emptyset)}$ holds in the whorl at v labeled by ρ'_1 ,
- $\delta_{q',(a,\{x\})}$ holds in the whorl at v labeled by ρ'_1 ,
- N is the set of those states $p \in Q$ such that there is some child w of v such that $\delta_{p,(a,\emptyset)}$ holds in the whorl at v labeled by ρ'_1 , except for w , which is labeled $\rho'_2(w)$.
- R is the set of those states $p \in Q$ such that $p \in N$ or there is some child w of v and state $r \in \rho'_4(w)$ such that $\delta_{p,(a,\emptyset)}$ holds in the whorl at v labeled by ρ'_1 , except for w which is labeled r .

The above conditions can be expressed by a first-order sentence $\psi_{(q,q',N,R),a}$ that is evaluated in the whorl at v labeled by ρ' .

Then the automaton \mathcal{A}' over the alphabet $A \otimes \{x\}$ with states $Q \times Q \times 2^Q \times 2^Q$ and sentences $\psi_{(q,q',N,R),a}$, for $q, q' \in Q$ and $N, R \subseteq Q$ and $a \in A$, satisfies the statement in the lemma. \square

In particular, by letting \mathcal{A}' be as in the lemma, and equipping it with accepting states of the form (q, q', N, R) , where $q, q' \in Q$ and $N, R \subseteq Q$ are such that $R \cup \{q'\}$ intersects F , we obtain an automaton \mathcal{A}' such that \mathcal{A}' accepts T if and only if there is some node w in T such that $T \otimes w$ is accepted by \mathcal{A} . By definition of \mathcal{A} , this is equivalent to saying that T satisfies $\exists x.\psi(x)$, or that T satisfies φ .

This concludes the inductive proof of the theorem. \square

In the following sections, we show how to efficiently evaluate and enumerate $\text{FO}(\text{MSO}(\prec, A) \cup \Sigma)$ -queries on \mathcal{C} -augmented trees.

7.3 Evaluation

First, we show how to evaluate automata on augmented trees. By *evaluating* an automaton \mathcal{A} on an augmented tree T we mean the problem of computing the (unique) run $\rho: V(T) \rightarrow Q$ of \mathcal{A} on T , where Q is the set of states of \mathcal{A} .

Let \mathcal{L} be a logic. We say that labeled model-checking for \mathcal{L} on a class \mathcal{C} of Σ -structures is *efficient* if there is a computable function $f: \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ and an algorithm that, given a $\Sigma \cup A$ -sentence δ (where the elements of A are viewed as unary predicates) and a structure $\mathbf{A} \in \mathcal{C}$ labeled with elements of A , determines whether it satisfies δ in time $f(|\delta|) \cdot |\mathbf{A}|$. We say that evaluation of automata on \mathcal{C} -augmented trees is *efficient* if there is a computable function $g: \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ and an algorithm that, given an automaton on augmented trees and a \mathcal{C} -augmented tree T over an alphabet A , evaluates \mathcal{A} on T in time $f(|\mathcal{A}|) \cdot |T|$. Note that for a \mathcal{C} -augmented tree T we have $|T| = \sum_{v \in V(T)} |\mathbf{A}_v| + 1$.

Lemma 7.3. *Let \mathcal{C} be a class of Σ -structures such that labeled model-checking for first-order logic is efficient on \mathcal{C} . Then automata evaluation on \mathcal{C} -augmented trees is efficient.*

Proof. Let Q be the set of states of \mathcal{A} , and $f: \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ be as in the definition of efficiency of labeled model-checking on \mathcal{C} .

Given a \mathcal{C} -augmented tree T , compute the run $\rho: V(T) \rightarrow Q$ of \mathcal{A} on T by processing the nodes v of T from the leaves towards the root. Namely, if v has label a , evaluate each of the transition sentences $\delta_{q,a}$ (for $q \in Q$) in the whorl $\mathbf{A}_v \in \mathcal{C}$ at v , labeled by ρ restricted to \mathbf{A}_v . Then exactly one of the sentences $\delta_{q,a}$ holds, and set $\rho(v)$ to q .

The total time spent on evaluating the sentences $\delta_{q,a}$ is bounded by $\sum_{q \in Q, a \in A, v \in V(T)} f(|\delta_{q,a}|) \cdot |\mathbf{A}_v|$, which is bounded by $g(|\mathcal{A}|) \cdot |T|$ for a computable function g derived from f . \square

As a corollary, by [Theorem 7.1](#), we get:

Theorem 7.4. *Let \mathcal{C} be a class of Σ -structures such that labeled model-checking for first-order logic is efficient on \mathcal{C} . Then model-checking for $\text{FO}(\text{MSO}(\prec, A) \cup \Sigma)$ is efficient on \mathcal{C} -augmented trees with labels from a finite alphabet A .*

7.4 Query answering

In the query-answering problem, a query $\varphi(\bar{x})$ and an augmented tree T are given, and the task is to compute in time linear in $|T|$ a data structure that allows to answer in constant time queries of the form: Does a given tuple $\bar{a} \in V(T)^{\bar{x}}$ satisfy $\varphi(\bar{x})$? This boils down to the query evaluation problem in case when φ has no free variables. In this section, we show how to efficiently solve the query-answering problem on \mathcal{C} -augmented trees.

Say that labeled query-answering is *efficient* for a logic \mathcal{L} on a class of Σ -structures \mathcal{C} if there is a computable function $f: \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ and an algorithm that, given a structure $\mathbf{A} \in \mathcal{C}$ vertex-labeled by elements of a finite alphabet A and a \mathcal{L} -formula $\varphi(\bar{x})$ computes in time $f(|\varphi|) \cdot |\mathbf{A}|$ a data structure that allows to answer in constant time queries of the form: Does a given tuple $\bar{a} \in V(\mathbf{A})^{\bar{x}}$ satisfy $\varphi(\bar{x})$?

Our goal now is to prove the following.

Theorem 7.5. *Let \mathcal{C} be a class of Σ -structures for which labeled query-answering of first-order queries is efficient. Then labeled query-answering of $\text{FO}(\text{MSO}(\preceq, A) \cup \Sigma)$ -queries is efficient over \mathcal{C} -augmented trees vertex-labeled with A .*

As previously, we start with reformulating our task in the language of automata. Fix a signature Σ , a class \mathcal{C} of Σ -structures, a finite alphabet A and a tuple of variables \bar{x} . Recall that given an automaton $\mathcal{A}(\bar{x})$ with variables \bar{x} and a \mathcal{C} -augmented tree T labeled with A , we may consider the query: Is a given tuple $\bar{a} \in V(T)^{\bar{x}}$ accepted by $\mathcal{A}(\bar{x})$? Equivalently, does \mathcal{A} accept $T \otimes \bar{a}$? Thus we view $\mathcal{A}(\bar{x})$ as a query.

Lemma 7.6. *Let \mathcal{C} be a class of Σ -structures for which labeled query-answering is efficient. Then labeled query-answering of automata on \mathcal{C} -augmented trees is efficient.*

Lemma 7.6 together with Theorem 7.1 yields Theorem 7.5, so it remains to prove the lemma.

Proof sketch We first give a brief sketch of the proof. The general idea is as follows. Given a tree T , first compute the run ρ_0 of \mathcal{A} over $T \otimes \emptyset$, in time linear in $|T|$. Now, given a tuple \bar{a} , the run ρ of \mathcal{A} over $T \otimes \bar{a}$ will be obtained by updating ρ_0 in a few of nodes – roughly the nodes occurring in \bar{a} and least common ancestors of any two such nodes. The number of nodes at which we recompute the new states is linear in $|\bar{x}|$, which is a constant with respect to $|T|$.

More precisely, we want to compute $\text{state}(\mathcal{A}, T \otimes \bar{a})$ in constant time. Let X be the set of nodes in that appear in the tuple \bar{a} ; then $|X| \leq |\bar{x}|$. Let Y be the closure of X under least common ancestors, and also add the root of T to Y ; then $|Y| \leq 2|X|$. Furthermore, let $Y' \supseteq Y$ be obtained from Y by adding to Y all children of elements from Y in the directions of elements of X , that is, for every $y \in Y$ and its descendant $x \in X$, the child $\text{dir}(y, x)$ of y in the direction of x is added to Y' (unless it already belongs to Y). Then $|Y'| \leq 4|X|$.

Our constant-time query-answering algorithm will recompute the states of the new run ρ of \mathcal{A} on $T \otimes \bar{a}$ in each of the nodes in Y' , in a bottom-up fashion (see Figure 7). For each lowest node v in Y' (those nodes occur in \bar{a}), the new state $\rho(v)$ in v is easily computable in constant time from the state $\rho_0(v)$ and the set of variables of \bar{x} that are mapped to that node by the valuation \bar{a} . More generally, for each node $v \in Y$, the new state $\rho(v)$ in v is inferred from the following data:

- the old state $\rho_0(v)$,
- the set of variables of \bar{x} that are mapped to that node by the valuation \bar{a} (possibly empty),
- the new state $\rho(v')$ at each child v' of v that belongs to Y' .

This inference is achieved by querying a first-order formula in the world \mathbf{A}_v at v that asks: Which of the transition sentences holds in \mathbf{A}_v labeled by ρ_0 , if we only modify the labels in the elements of \mathbf{A}_v that belong to Y' ? This can be done in constant time, assuming we have initialized an appropriate query-answering data structure for the structure $\mathbf{A}_v \in \mathcal{C}$.

Finally, for each node $v' \in Y'$, the new state in v' is inferred from the state in the closest descendant of v' that belongs to Y (possibly v' itself). The observation is that in the subtree of T rooted at v' , the new run ρ and ρ_0 only differ on those nodes w that are ancestors of v . In other words, for each node that is a sibling of a node on the path, the runs ρ and ρ_0 are identical. Therefore, recomputing the new state at v' amounts to recomputing a number of transitions along the path from v to v' , or equivalently, computing the composition of a sequence of functions mapping states to states along that path. This can be achieved in constant time using Theorem 5.1.




Figure 7: The states of the new run ρ on $T \otimes \bar{a}$ are recomputed only at the nodes marked above, basing on the run $\rho_0 \otimes \emptyset$. Here $\bar{x} = \{x_1, \dots, x_8\}$ and $\bar{a} \in V(T)^{\bar{x}}$. Note that each node in the figure above may have many children that are not affected by the recomputation, and therefore are omitted in the figure. At each node $v \in Y$ (black and red nodes) the new state $\rho(v)$ is inferred from the updated states in the children of v that have some descendant in Y , that is in the gray children of v . At each node $v' \in Y'$ (gray nodes) the new state $\rho(v')$ is inferred from the updated state at its closest descendant in Y (of v' itself if $v' \in Y$).

We start with introducing some auxiliary notions.

Entailment We now describe a subroutine of our algorithm used to propagate states along a single path. In the terminology of the description above, this subroutine will be used to compute the new state at a node $v' \in Y'$, having already computed the state at its closest descendant $v \in Y$. Referring to Figure 7, this will allow us to propagate the updated states along the gray edges.

Fix an augmented tree T over the alphabet A and let ρ_0 be the run of \mathcal{A} on $T \otimes \emptyset$. For a node $w \in V(T)$ and state $p \in Q$, let $\rho_0[w \mapsto p]$ be the labeling that assigns states from Q to nodes of T such that:

- $\rho_0[w \mapsto p]$ agrees with ρ_0 on nodes that are not ancestors of w ,
- $\rho_0[w \mapsto p]$ maps w to p , and
- $\rho_0[w \mapsto p]$ inductively maps a strict ancestor w' of w to a state q such that $\delta_{q,(a,\emptyset)}$ holds in the whorl of w' labeled by $\rho_0[w \mapsto p]$.

In other words, $\rho_0[w \mapsto p]$ is obtained from ρ_0 by enforcing the state at w to be p , and otherwise continuing with the bottom-up evaluation of \mathcal{A} on $T \otimes \emptyset$. If w' is a node of T , then write $[w \mapsto p] \vdash [w' \mapsto p']$ if $\rho_0[w \mapsto p]$ labels w' with p' .

By definition we get the following transitivity property of the entailment \vdash .

Lemma 7.7. *Let w, w', w'' be nodes in T such that w is a descendant of w' and w' is a descendant of w'' . Let p, p', p'' be states. If $[w \mapsto p] \vdash [w' \mapsto p']$ and $[w' \mapsto p'] \vdash [w'' \mapsto p'']$, then $[w \mapsto p] \vdash [w'' \mapsto p'']$.*

This, together with Theorem 5.1, yields the following algorithmic consequence.

Lemma 7.8. *There is a computable function $f: \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ and an algorithm that, given a \mathcal{C} -augmented tree T , compute in time $f(|Q|) \cdot |T|$ a data structure that can answer the following queries: given two nodes w, w' of T , where w' is an ancestor of w , and a state $p \in Q$, return $p' \in Q$ such that $[w \mapsto p] \vdash [w' \mapsto p']$.*

Proof. Fix an augmented tree T over the alphabet A .

For each pair of nodes w, w' of T , where w' is an ancestor of w , let $f_{ww'}: Q \rightarrow Q$ be the function such that $f_{ww'}(q) = q'$ if $[w \mapsto q] \vdash [w' \mapsto q']$. From Lemma 7.7 it follows that if w_1, \dots, w_n is the path from $w_1 = w$ to its ancestor $w_n = w'$ then

$$f_{ww'} = f_{w_1 w_2}; f_{w_2 w_3}; \dots; f_{w_{n-1} w_n}.$$

The algorithm is as follows. First, compute ρ_0 from T in time linear in $|T|$, using Lemma 7.3. Then apply Theorem 5.1 to the tree T in which every edge $w'w$ is labeled by the function $f_{ww'}$, treated as an element of the semigroup Q^Q of functions from Q to Q . This yields in time linear in $|T|$ a data structure that allows to query the function $f_{ww'}: Q \rightarrow Q$, for any nodes w' and w such that w' is an ancestor of w . In particular, $f_{w'w}(p)$ is the sought state p' such that $[w \mapsto p] \vdash [w' \mapsto p']$. \square

Shapes Fix an automaton $\mathcal{A}(\bar{x})$ with variables \bar{x} , that is an automaton \mathcal{A} over the alphabet $A \otimes \bar{x}$. Let Q be its set of states. A *shape* σ consists of the following (see Figure 8, left):




Figure 8: *Left:* A shape with variables $\bar{y} = \{x_1, \dots, x_8\}$ and states $\{p, q, r\}$. The nodes belonging to \bar{s} are marked red, the remaining ones are black. *Right:* A valuation \bar{a} in a tree T that matches the shape σ to the left. The nodes belonging to \bar{a} are marked red, their least common ancestors are marked black, and the children of the least common ancestors in the direction of nodes in \bar{a} are marked gray. Each node is labeled by the run ρ of $\mathcal{A}(\bar{x})$ on $T \otimes \bar{a}$.

- a set of variables \bar{y} contained in \bar{x} ,
- a rooted tree S , with the root denoted $*$;
- a labeling $L: V(S) \cup E(S) \rightarrow Q$ assigning states from Q to vertices and edges of S ,
- a valuation $\bar{s}: \bar{y} \rightarrow V(S)$ such that every node in S is either in the image of \bar{s} , or is the least common ancestor of some two nodes in the image of \bar{s} .

We may write $V(\sigma)$ for $V(S)$. We also say that a node v of S is *occupied* by a variable $x \in \bar{y}$ if $\bar{s}(x) = v$.

Thanks to the last condition above S has at most $2|\bar{y}| - 1$ nodes, and we obtain the following.

Lemma 7.9. Fix $\bar{y} \subseteq \bar{x}$. The set of shapes with variables \bar{y} is finite, and can be effectively computed, given \mathcal{A} .

Fix a tree T over the alphabet A , a shape σ as above, a valuation $\bar{a}: \bar{y} \rightarrow V(T)$, and let $\rho: V(T) \rightarrow Q$ be the (unique) run of \mathcal{A} on $T \otimes \bar{a}$. The valuation \bar{a} *matches* σ with *starting node* $v \in V(T)$ if there is a function $F: V(S) \rightarrow V(T)$ such that (see Figure 8, right):

1. F preserves least common ancestors, that is, for all $a, b, c \in V(S)$, if c is the least common ancestor of a and b in S then $F(c)$ is the least common ancestor of $F(a)$ and $F(b)$ in T . In particular, F preserves \preceq .
2. F is injective,
3. $F(\bar{s}) = \bar{a}$, that is, $F(\bar{s}(x)) = \bar{a}(x)$ for every $x \in \bar{y}$,
4. $F(*) = v$, where $*$ is the root of S ,
5. for every vertex w of S , $\rho(F(w)) = L(w)$,
6. for every edge $e = ww'$ of S between a node w and its child w' , the $F(w')$ -directed child of $F(w)$ in T satisfies $\rho(v') = L(e)$.

Note that if \bar{a} matches σ , then the function $F: V(\sigma) \rightarrow V(T)$ witnessing this is unique. Moreover, no valuation \bar{a} matches two distinct shapes, since the rooted tree S and the labeling L of its nodes and edges is uniquely determined by the valuation \bar{a} and the unique run of \mathcal{A} on $T \otimes \bar{a}$.

Efficient shape-matching We will prove the following lemma stating that shape matching can be efficiently tested. Below, \mathcal{C} is a class of Σ -structures for which labeled query-answering is efficient, and $\mathcal{A}(\bar{x})$ is an automaton with variables \bar{x} over A -labeled \mathcal{C} -augmented trees.

Lemma 7.10. *There is a computable function $f: \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ such that the following holds. For every shape $\sigma(\bar{y})$ there is an algorithm that given a \mathcal{C} -augmented tree T computes in time $f(|\mathcal{A}|) \cdot |T|$ a data structure that allows to answer the following queries in time $f(|\mathcal{A}|)$: Given a tuple $\bar{a} \in V(T)^{\bar{y}}$, does it match σ ?*

First we show how Lemma 7.10 implies Lemma 7.6.

Proof of Lemma 7.6. Let T be a \mathcal{C} -augmented tree over the alphabet A . We extend \bar{x} to $\bar{x} \cup \{z\}$ by adding a dummy variable z . The intention is that this variable will occupy the root of a shape, and on the other hand, we will want to match it with the root of a given tree T .

We may view \mathcal{A} as an automaton over the alphabet $A \otimes (\bar{x} \cup \{z\})$. Using Lemma 7.9, compute the set Δ of all shapes $\sigma(\bar{x} \cup \{z\})$ in which the root node of is occupied by the variable z (that is, $\bar{s}(z) = *$) and is labeled with an accepting state of \mathcal{A} (that is, $L(*)$ is an accepting state).

In the initialization phase, our algorithm computes for each shape $\sigma \in \Delta$ the data structure given by Lemma 7.10, in time linear in $|T|$.

In the query-answering phase, we proceed as follows. Let $\bar{a} \in V(T)^{\bar{x}}$ be a tuple given on input. Extend \bar{a} to the tuple $\bar{a}r \in V(T)^{\bar{x} \cup \{z\}}$ that maps the variable z to the root r of T . Then for each shape $\sigma(\bar{x} \cup \{z\}) \in \Delta$, query the appropriate data structure to determine whether or not $\bar{a}r$ matches $\sigma(\bar{x} \cup \{z\})$. If this is the case for some shape $\sigma \in \Delta$, then \mathcal{A} accepts $T \otimes \bar{a}$, otherwise it doesn't. \square

We now prove Lemma 7.10.

Proof of Lemma 7.10. The proof proceeds by induction on the number of nodes $|S|$ of the tree S underlying the shape σ .

In the base case, S has only one node $*$, and all the variables \bar{y} of σ are associated with that node. Suppose that \mathcal{A} has states Q . Construct an automaton \mathcal{A}' over the alphabet A with states Q^2 and with the following property: \mathcal{A}' is in state (p, q) at a node v in its run on T where $p = \text{state}(\mathcal{A}, T \otimes \emptyset)$ and $q = \text{state}(\mathcal{A}, T \otimes \bar{a})$ where $\bar{a}: \bar{y} \rightarrow V(T)$ is the valuation mapping all variables in \bar{y} to v .

Such an automaton \mathcal{A}' can be obtained by defining its transition sentences $\delta_{(p,q),a}$ for $p, q \in Q$ and $a \in A$, where $\delta_{(p,q),a}$ is the transition sentence $\delta_{p,(a,\emptyset)} \wedge \delta_{q,(a,\bar{y})}$ of \mathcal{A} , where \bar{y} are the variables of the shape σ .

In the preprocessing phase, given T compute the run of \mathcal{A}' on $T \otimes \emptyset$ using [Lemma 7.3](#). In the answering phase, given a valuation $\bar{a} \in V(T)^{\bar{y}}$, proceed as follows. If \bar{a} does not map all variables of \bar{y} to the same node of T , answer the query negatively. Otherwise, let $v \in V(T)$ be such that \bar{a} maps all variables of \bar{y} to v . If $\rho_0(v) = (p, q_*)$ where q_* is the state labeling the root $*$ of the shape σ then answer the query positively, otherwise answer negatively. This finishes the base case.

We now consider the inductive step. Let σ be a shape with underlying tree S and assume $|V(S)| > a$. Following the notation from above, we write $*$ for the root of S . Let W be the set of children of $*$ in S . For each $w \in W$ define a shape σ_w with the following components:

- the variables $\bar{y}_w := \{y \in \bar{y} \mid w \preceq \bar{s}(y)\}$,
- the subtree S_w of S rooted at w ,
- the restriction L_w of the labeling L to S_w ,
- the restriction \bar{s}_w of the valuation \bar{s} to \bar{y}_w .

Note that each shape σ_w has fewer nodes than σ , so we may apply the inductive assumption to it.

The key observation is encompassed by the following claim, whose proof is immediate by the definitions. Let q_* denote the state labeling the root $*$ of σ .

Claim 7.1. *A tuple $\bar{a} \in V(T)^{\bar{y}}$ matches $\sigma(\bar{y})$ if and only if each of the following conditions hold:*

1. *For each $w \in W$, the restriction of \bar{a} to \bar{y}_w matches the shape $\sigma_w(\bar{y}_w)$. Let v_w denote the node of T to which the root of σ_w is mapped.*
2. *There is a vertex v of T (this will be the vertex to which the root of σ is mapped to) such that for any two distinct $w, w' \in W$, the least common ancestor of v_w and $v_{w'}$ is equal to v , and furthermore v is different than v_w and $v_{w'}$.*
3. *For each $w \in W$ let u_w denote the child of v in the direction of v_w , that is $u_w = \text{dir}(v, v_w)$. Then the function $f_{v_w u_w}$ maps the root state of σ_w to the state q_w labeling the edge $*w$ in S (that is, the edge connecting the root $*$ with w).*
4. *Let $\bar{z} \subseteq \bar{y}$ be the set of variables that are occupying the root $*$ of σ , that is, $\bar{z} = \bar{s}^{-1}(*)$, where \bar{s} is the valuation comprising σ . Then \bar{a} maps each variable in \bar{z} to v .*
5. *Let $c \in A$ be the label of v in T , and let \bar{z} be as above. Then (c, \bar{z}) is a letter of the alphabet $A \otimes \bar{x}$. The final condition is that the sentence $\delta_{q_*,(c,\bar{z})}$ holds in the whorl \mathbf{A}_v at v labeled by the function ρ_0 , apart from each of the vertices u_w for $w \in W$, which is instead labeled with the state q_w labeling the edge $*w$ in S .*

We can now describe our query-answering algorithm. In the initialization phase, given a \mathcal{C} -augmented tree T , we initialize the following data structures, corresponding to the items 1, 2, and 3 above:

- the data structures for the shapes σ_w , where $w \in W$, obtained by inductive assumption,
- the data structure given by [Lemma 4.1](#) answering lca and dir queries in T ,
- the data structure given by [Lemma 7.8](#), allowing to compute the function $f_{ww'}$, given a node w and its ancestor w' .

We need one more data structure, corresponding to item 5 above. Let \bar{w} be the set W , now treated as variable names. For each $c \in A$ consider the first-order formula $\gamma_c(\bar{w})$ such that for every Q -labeled Σ -structure \mathbf{A} , a given valuation $\bar{a} \in V(\mathbf{A})^{\bar{w}}$ satisfies $\gamma_c(\bar{w})$ if and only if the transition sentence $\delta_{q_*,(c,\bar{z})}$ holds in the Q -labeled Σ -structure \mathbf{A} in which the label of $\bar{a}(w)$ is replaced by the state q_w (the state labeling the edge connecting $*$ with w in σ). It is straightforward to construct such a first-order formula $\gamma_c(\bar{w})$.

Now, given a tree T , for each node v of T initialize the data structure for answering queries to $\gamma_c(\bar{w})$, where c is the label of v . By the assumption about the class \mathcal{C} , such a data structure can be computed in time linear in $|\mathbf{A}_v|$, so jointly all of them can be computed in time linear in $|T|$.

This finishes the description of the initialization phase. In the query-answering phase, given a tuple \bar{a} , verify the conditions 1-5 listed in [Claim 7.1](#). This can be done using the precomputed data structures in time which is bounded in terms of $|\mathcal{A}|$, and which is independent of $|T|$. This finishes the inductive proof of [Lemma 7.10](#). \square

Recall that [Lemma 7.10](#) yields [Lemma 7.6](#), which together with [Theorem 7.1](#) proves [Theorem 7.5](#).

Remark 7.1. By revisiting the proof from this section, one can prove that for any automaton \mathcal{A} over augmented trees there is a finite alphabet B and sentence φ of $\text{FO}(\preceq, B \cup \Sigma)$ such that given an augmented tree T one can compute another augmented tree T' over the alphabet B such that \mathcal{A} accepts T if and only if T' satisfies φ . Moreover, if model-checking first-order logic is efficient on \mathcal{C} , the computation of T' takes time linear in $|T|$. This argument ultimately relies on the observation that the proof of [Theorem 5.1](#) yields (in linear time) a labeling of a given input tree T using a finite alphabet B , such that the composition of functions labeling the edges from a path between two given nodes v and w can be expressed in $\text{FO}(\preceq, B)$. This observation originates from [\[Col07\]](#).

7.5 Enumeration

We now extend our results to obtain efficient enumeration of FO-queries on \mathcal{C} -augmented trees.

An *enumerator* for a sequence of elements a_1, \dots, a_k is a data structure that implements a function that, when invoked for the i th time, outputs a_i if $1 \leq i \leq k$, or reports an error if $i > k$. The enumerator has *delay* T if after each invocation of the function, the output is returned in time at most T . An enumerator for a set A is an enumerator for any sequence enumerating A without repetitions. More information on enumeration algorithms, together with constant delay specifically can be found in [\[Str19, Section 2 and Section 5.3\]](#).

Say that first-order enumeration is *efficient* on a class \mathcal{C} of Σ -structures if there is a computable function $f: \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ and an algorithm that, given a structure $\mathbf{A} \in \mathcal{C}$ vertex-labeled by a finite alphabet A , and a first-order formula $\varphi(\bar{x})$ in the signature $\Sigma \cup A$ (where elements of A are viewed as unary predicates), computes in time $f(|\varphi|) \cdot |\mathbf{A}|$ an enumerator for $\varphi(\mathbf{A})$ with delay $f(|\varphi|)$.

Theorem 7.11. Suppose that first-order enumeration is efficient on \mathcal{C} . Then there is a computable function $f: \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ and an algorithm that, given a \mathcal{C} -augmented tree T over an alphabet A and a $\text{FO}(\text{MSO}(\preceq, A) \cup \Sigma)$ -formula $\varphi(\bar{x})$ computes in time $f(|\varphi|) \cdot |T|$ an enumerator for $\varphi(\mathbf{A})$ with delay $f(|\varphi|)$.

To prove the theorem, we reduce its statement to a statement about automata on augmented trees. Recall that for an automaton \mathcal{A} on augmented trees over an alphabet of the form $A \otimes \bar{x}$ and an augmented tree T over the alphabet A , by $\mathcal{A}(T)$ we denote the set of all valuations $\bar{a}: \bar{x} \rightarrow V(T)$ such that \mathcal{A} accepts $T \otimes \bar{a}$.

Lemma 7.12. Suppose that first-order enumeration is efficient on \mathcal{C} . Then there is a computable function $f: \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ and an algorithm that, given an automaton \mathcal{A} on augmented trees over an alphabet of the form $A \otimes \bar{x}$ and a \mathcal{C} -augmented tree T over the alphabet A , computes in time $f(|\varphi|) \cdot |T|$ an enumerator for $\mathcal{A}(T)$ with delay $f(|\varphi|)$.

Clearly, [Lemma 7.12](#) and [Theorem 7.1](#) imply [Theorem 7.11](#). It therefore remains to prove [Lemma 7.12](#). This is done in the remainder of this section.

We use the notion of shapes as defined in the previous section. Fix a shape σ . Our next goal is to compute for each possible starting node v an enumerator for the set of all valuations \bar{a} that match the shape σ with starting node v .

Lemma 7.13. *For every shape σ there is a constant c computable from \mathcal{A} and σ , and an algorithm that, given a tree T over the alphabet A , computes in time $c \cdot |T|$ a collection $(\mathcal{E}_v)_{v \in V(T)}$ of enumerators, where for each $v \in V(T)$, \mathcal{E}_v is an enumerator with delay c for the set of all valuations \bar{a} that match σ with starting node v .*

We first show how [Lemma 7.13](#) implies [Lemma 7.12](#). This is analogous to how [Lemma 7.10](#) implies [Lemma 7.6](#).

Proof. Let \mathcal{C} be a class of structures for which enumeration of $\text{FO}(\Sigma \cup A)$ queries is efficient for every finite alphabet A . Let \mathcal{A} be an automaton on augmented trees over an alphabet of the form $A \otimes \bar{x}$ and let T be a \mathcal{C} -augmented tree over the alphabet A . We extend \bar{x} to $\bar{x} \cup \{z\}$ by adding a dummy variable z . We view \mathcal{A} as an automaton over the alphabet $A \otimes (\bar{x} \cup \{z\})$. Using [Lemma 7.9](#), compute the set Δ of all shapes σ in which the root node of the shape carries the variable z (that is, $\bar{s}(z) = *$) and is labeled with an accepting state of \mathcal{A} (that is, $L(*)$ is an accepting state). For each such shape σ compute the enumerator \mathcal{E}_r^σ for the set of all valuations $\bar{a}: \bar{x} \cup \{z\} \rightarrow V(T)$ that match σ with starting node r , where r is the root of T . This is possible in time linear in $|T|$ by [Lemma 7.13](#).

An enumerator for $\mathcal{A}(T)$ as in the statement of [Lemma 7.12](#) is obtained by concatenating the enumerators \mathcal{E}_r^σ for all the shapes $\sigma \in \Delta$, where each output $\bar{a}: \bar{x} \cup \{z\} \rightarrow V(T)$ of each of those enumerators is post-processed by projecting it to a valuation $\bar{a}': \bar{x} \rightarrow V(T)$, that is, by removing the entry corresponding to the dummy variable z .

As remarked above (see comment following the definition of matching a shape), for distinct shapes the sets of valuations that match the shapes are disjoint. Hence, all valuations are enumerated without repetition. By choosing f appropriately this yields an enumerator that is computable in time $f(|\varphi|) \cdot |T|$ and has delay $f(|\varphi|)$. \square

It remains to prove [Lemma 7.13](#). The idea is to reverse the analysis performed when considering the query-answering problem. In a sense, for many of the basic queries used in the previous sections, we will need to devise its enumeration analogue. For instance, we will need to devise an enumeration analogue of [Theorem 5.1](#), that is an algorithm that enumerates all descendants w of a given node v such that the composition of the functions labeling the edges along the path from w to v has certain properties.

Auxiliary enumerators for trees

We will need the following lemmas regarding enumeration of specific sets on unranked trees.

For a set U of nodes of a tree T and two nodes v, w , say that w is a *minimal* descendant of v in U if $w \in U$, w is a descendant of v , and no inner node of the path from v to w belongs to U .

Lemma 7.14. *There is a constant c and an algorithm that, given a tree T and a set U of its nodes, computes in time $c \cdot |T|$ a collection $(\mathcal{E}_v)_{v \in V(T)}$ of enumerators, where for each $v \in V(T)$, \mathcal{E}_v is an enumerator with delay c for the set of minimal strict descendants w of v that belong to U .*

Proof. Assume without loss of generality that the root of T belongs to U . For each node v of T let M_v denote the set of all the minimal strict descendants of v that belong to U , and let $g(v)$ denote the \preceq -largest ancestor of v that belongs to U (with $g(v) = v$ if $v \in U$). Also, let $g'(v)$ denote the $<$ -largest strict ancestor of v that belongs to U (which is not defined for the root). Note that $M_v \subseteq M_{g(v)}$ for every node v of T .

By performing a depth-first search traversal, we can compute for each $u \in U$ and jointly in time $\mathcal{O}(|T|)$, a linked list enumerating all elements of M_u , ordered by the search. Observe now that for every v of T , the list M_v is composed of successive elements of $M_{g(v)}$. Again by performing a depth-first search traversal, we can compute, for each $v \in T$ and jointly in time $\mathcal{O}(|T|)$, the two elements $\min(M_v)$ and $\max(M_v)$, respectively the first and last element of M_v according to the order given by the search. Finally, every element u in U (except for the root) points towards its position in the linked list $M_{g'(u)}$.

Now, to obtain an enumerator for M_v given a node v of T , first lookup $\min(M_v)$ and $\max(M_v)$. Then, go to the position of $\min(M_v)$ in $M_{g(v)} = M_{g'(\min(M_v))}$. Finally, follow the list enumerating the elements of $M_{g(v)}$ until $\max(M_v)$ is reached. This enumerates M_v , with constant delay. \square

The following is an enumeration variant of [Lemma 5.4](#), and its proof follows the same ideas.

Lemma 7.15. *Fix a finite set Q of size q and two elements $x, y \in Q$. There is a constant c computable from q , and an algorithm that, given a tree T in which each edge vw is labeled by a function $f_{vw}: Q \rightarrow Q$, computes in time $c \cdot |T|$ a collection $(\mathcal{E}_v)_{v \in V(T)}$ of enumerators, where for each $v \in V(T)$, \mathcal{E}_v is an enumerator with delay c that enumerates all descendants w of v such that the composition of the functions labeling the edges of the path from v to w maps x to y .*

Proof. For two nodes v, w with $v \preceq w$ let f_{vw} denote the composition of the functions labeling the edges of the path from v to w . Let D_v^{xy} be the set of all strict descendants w of v such that $f_{vw}(x) = y$, and let $M_v^{xy} \subseteq D_v^{xy}$ be the set of *minimal* such descendants, where w is minimal if there is no $u \in D_v^{xy}$ with $v \prec u \prec w$. It suffices to compute, for each $v \in V(T)$, an enumerator for the set M_v^{xy} . Indeed, the enumerator for D_v^{xy} can be then obtained by enumerating all nodes $w \in M_v^{xy}$ and then, for each such w , recursively enumerating the set D_w^{yy} .

Proceeding from the root of T towards the leaves (see [Figure 4](#)), for each node v of T construct an injective coloring function $c_v: Q \rightarrow [q]$, so that the following property holds:

$$c_w(f_{vw}(x)) \leq c_v(x) \quad \text{for every edge } vw \text{ (} w \text{ child of } v \text{) and all } x \in Q.$$

This can be done as follows. At the root v , pick an arbitrary injection $c_v: Q \rightarrow [q]$. If c_v is defined for some node v and w is its child, then first define $c_w: f_{vw}(Q) \rightarrow [q]$ by setting $c_w(y)$, for $y \in f_{vw}(Q)$, to the least color $c \in [q]$ such that $c_v(x) = c$ for some $x \in Q$ with $f_{vw}(x) = y$. Next, extend c_w to an injection $c_w: Q \rightarrow [q]$ arbitrarily. The required property then holds by construction. The computation of the colorings c_v therefore takes time $\mathcal{O}(|T| \cdot r)$.

For any pair of nodes v and w such that v is an ancestor of w , let $f_{vw}: Q \rightarrow Q$ denote the composition of the functions along the path from v to w . Then

$$c_w(f_{vw}(x)) \leq c_v(x) \quad \text{for all } v, w \text{ with } v \preceq w \text{ and all } x \in Q. \quad (3)$$

This is proved easily by induction on the distance between w and v . In other words, starting with an element $x \in Q$ and progressing downwards along a path in the tree, applying the functions labeling the edges in the path to the current element of Q , we obtain a sequence of elements whose colors are monotonously decreasing. As the number q of colors is finite, those colors change only a bounded number of times. We exploit this observation in our enumeration algorithm.

For every $y \in Q$ and color $d \in [q]$ let $C[y/d]$ denote the set of nodes v such that $c_v(y) = d$. Then for all $x, y \in Q$, $d \in [q]$, the set

$$E_v^{xyd} := M_v^{xy} \cap C[y/d]$$

consists of those minimal descendants w of v satisfying $f_{vw}(x) = y$, such that $c_w(y) = d$.

We describe how to compute in time $\mathcal{O}_r(|V(T)|)$ a collection of constant-delay enumerators \mathcal{E}_v^{xyd} for the set E_v^{xyd} , for all $x, y \in Q$, $d \in [q]$ and all nodes $v \in V(T)$. As M_v^{xy} is the disjoint union of the sets E_v^{xyd} , for $d \in [q]$, an enumerator for M_v^{xy} can be obtained by concatenating the enumerators \mathcal{E}_v^{xyd} for all $d \in [q]$.

Fix elements $x, y \in Q$ and colors $c, d \in [q]$. We will compute (in time $\mathcal{O}_r(|V(T)|)$) constant-delay enumerators for each of the sets E_v^{xyd} , for all nodes $v \in C[x/c]$. Since the sets $(C[x/c])_{c \in [q]}$ partition $V(T)$, this will jointly give all the required enumerators. Assume in what follows that $v \in C[x/c]$, that is, $c_v(x) = c$. Our goal now is to compute an enumerator for the set E_v^{xyd} of those minimal descendants w of v satisfying $f_{vw}(x) = y$, such that $c_w(y) = d$.

Let $F_c \subseteq E(T)$ be the set of those edges vw in T such that f_{vw} maps the element of color c to an element of strictly smaller color. The set F_c can be computed in time $\mathcal{O}_r(|V(T)|)$. Write $v \sim_c w$ if the path between two nodes v and w does not contain any edge from F_c . Furthermore, compute in time $\mathcal{O}_r(|V(T)|)$ the set $C[y/d]$.

Fix a node $v \in C[x/c]$, so that $c_v(x) = c$. Assume first that $c < d$. Then $E_v^{xyd} = \emptyset$, since by (3) v has no descendant w with $f_{vw}(c) > c$. If $c = d$, then for every descendant w of v we have $w \in E_v^{xyd}$ if and only if $v \sim_c w$, $w \in C[y/d]$ and no inner node of the path from v to w belongs to $C[y/d]$. Consider the rooted forest $T - F_c$ obtained from T by removing the edges in F_c , where the root of each tree in the forest is the its smallest node with respect to the ancestor relation in T . By considering each tree in this forest separately, the problem is solved by the algorithm from Lemma 7.14 applied to that tree and the set $C[y/d]$ restricted to that tree.

We are left with the case when $c > d$. We proceed by induction on $c - d$. Intuitively, to compute E_v^{xyd} we need to enumerate all minimal descendants w of v such that the color of $f_{vw}(x)$ at w is some color c' that is smaller than c , and at each such node w invoke the enumerator for the set $E_w^{x'y d}$ where x' is the element with color c' at w , unless this set is empty. We make this more precise below.

Compute the set U of all nodes u of T with the following properties:

- u is the lower endpoint of an edge $u'u$ in F_c ,
- $M_u^{x'y} \cap C[y/d]$ is non-empty, where $x' = f_{u'u}(z)$ and $z \in Z$ is such that $c_{u'}(z) = c$.

Note that as the edge $u'u$ is in F_c it follows that $c_u(x') < c$, and we can apply the inductive assumption, thus assuming that each node u is equipped with a constant-delay enumerator for $M_u^{x'y} \cap C[y/d]$, for all $x' \in Q$. In particular we can test whether $M_u^{x'y} \cap C[y/d]$ is non-empty in constant time, and so the set U can be computed in linear time.

The following conditions are equivalent for a node $v \in C[x/c]$ and its descendant w :

- $w \in E_v^{xyd} = M_v^{xy} \cap C[y/d]$,
- v has some minimal descendant $u \in U$ such that $w \in E_u^{x'y d} = M_u^{x'y} \cap C[y/d]$, where x' is as above.

It follows that E_v^{xyd} is the disjoint union, over all minimal descendants $u \in U$ of v , of the (non-empty) set $E_u^{x'y d}$, where x' is as above. Hence, an enumerator for E_v^{xyd} can be obtained by first enumerating all minimal descendants $u \in U$ of v using the data structure from Lemma 7.14, and then, for each such u , using the enumerator for $E_u^{x'y d}$ obtained by inductive assumption. \square

In the lemma above, the functions are composed along the paths leading from an ancestor to a descendant. In our application, we will need to compose the functions in the reverse order. Hence the following.

Lemma 7.16. *Fix a finite set Q of size q and a set of functions $\mathcal{F} \subseteq Q^Q$. There is a constant c computable from q , and an algorithm that, given a tree T in which each edge vw (w child of v) is labeled by a function $f_{vw}: Q \rightarrow Q$, computes in time $c \cdot |T|$ a collection $(\mathcal{E}_v)_{v \in V(T)}$ of enumerators, where for each $v \in V(T)$, \mathcal{E}_v is an enumerator with delay c that enumerates all descendants w of v such that the composition of the functions labeling the edges of the path from w to v belongs to \mathcal{F} .*

Proof. A function $f: Q \rightarrow Q$ induces a function $\rho_f: Q^Q \rightarrow Q^Q$, defined by $\rho_f(g) = f; g$ for $g: Q \rightarrow Q$. This reverses the order of compositions: $\rho_{f_1; f_2} = \rho_{f_2}; \rho_{f_1}$. Given a tree T as above, define a new label for each edge vw , namely $F_{vw} := \rho_f$ where $f = f_{wv}$ is the original label. Then for any two nodes v, w where $v \preceq w$, the composition of the new labels along the path from v to w is a function $F: Q^Q \rightarrow Q^Q$ which is equal to ρ_f , where f is the composition of the old labels along the reverse path, from w to v . In particular, $F(\text{id}) = \rho_f(\text{id}) = f$, where id is the identity on Q .

Reassuming, for every function $f: Q \rightarrow Q$, the composition of the new labels along the path from v to w is a function F mapping id to f if and only if the composition of the old labels along the path from w to v is equal to f .

We now apply [Lemma 7.15](#) to the tree T with the new labels, and to every pair of elements $x, y \in Q^Q$ with $x = \text{id} \in Q^Q$ and $y \in \mathcal{F}$. \square

Enumerator for the entailment relation

Fix an augmented tree T and let ρ_0 be the run of \mathcal{A} on $T \otimes \emptyset$. Recall the entailment relation $[w \mapsto p] \vdash [w' \mapsto p']$ which intuitively means that enforcing the state in ρ_0 at node w to be equal to p results in the automaton \mathcal{A} reaching state p' at the node w' . We first translate [Lemma 7.16](#) to the language of entailment, obtaining an enumeration analogue of [Lemma 7.8](#).

Lemma 7.17. *Fix states $q_1, q_2 \in Q$. There is a constant c computable from \mathcal{A} and an algorithm that, given a tree T and a set $X \subseteq V(T)$ computes in time $c \cdot |T|$ two collections $(\mathcal{E}_v)_{v \in V(T)}$ and $(\mathcal{E}'_v)_{v \in V(T)}$ of enumerators with delay c , doing the following: For each $v \in V(T)$, \mathcal{E}_v is an enumerator that enumerates all children u_1 of v that have some descendant $u_2 \in X$ such that $[u_2 \mapsto q_2] \vdash [u_1 \mapsto q_1]$. For each $v \in V(T)$, \mathcal{E}'_v is an enumerator that enumerates all descendants $u_2 \in X$ of v such that $[u_2 \mapsto q_2] \vdash [v \mapsto q_1]$.*

Proof. We let $Q' := Q \dot{\cup} \{m, 0, 1\}$. We label each edge vw of T by the function $f_{wv}: Q' \rightarrow Q'$ such that

- $f_{wv}(p) = q$ if $[w \mapsto p] \vdash [v \mapsto q]$, for all $p, q \in Q$,
- $f_{wv}(m) = 1$ if $w \in X$ and $f_{wv}(m) = 0$ if $w \notin X$, and
- $f_{wv}(0) = 0$, and $f_{wv}(1) = 1$.

Observe that if w is any descendant of v , then $[w \mapsto p] \vdash [v \mapsto q]$ if and only if the composition of the functions labeling the edges along the path from w to v is a function f such that $f(p) = q$. Furthermore, this function maps m to 1 if and only if $w \in X$.

We now apply [Lemma 7.16](#) to apply in the claimed time the second collection $(\mathcal{E}'_v)_{v \in V(T)}$ of enumerators with the desired properties.

We now compute the set Y of all vertices v that have a descendant $u \in X$ such that $[u \mapsto q_2] \vdash [v \mapsto q_1]$. For this, we iterate over all $v \in V(T)$ and let \mathcal{E}'_v enumerate its first output. If \mathcal{E}'_v does not report an error, there exists a descendant $u \in X$ of v such that $[u \mapsto q_2] \vdash [v \mapsto q_1]$. Assuming that each enumeration takes a constant time c' , we can compute this set in time $c' \cdot |T|$. Now it is easy to construct the first collection $(\mathcal{E}_v)_{v \in V(T)}$ of enumerators with the desired properties (compare with the more complicated construction in the proof of [Lemma 7.14](#)). \square

Proof of [Lemma 7.13](#)

We now prove [Lemma 7.13](#).

Proof. Fix a shape σ . The proof proceeds by induction on the size of the tree S underlying σ .

In the base case $|S| = 1$ there may be at most one valuation \bar{a} that matches σ with a starting node v , namely the valuation $\bar{a}: \bar{y} \rightarrow V(T)$ that maps all the variables \bar{y} of σ to v . This valuation matches σ precisely whenever $\rho_v(v) = p$, where $\rho_v: V(T) \rightarrow Q$ is the run of \mathcal{A} on $T \otimes \bar{a}$ and $p = L(*)$. We may therefore use the same reasoning as in the base case of the inductive proof of [Lemma 7.10](#). Namely, we construct an automaton \mathcal{A}' over the alphabet A with states Q^2 (where Q are the states of \mathcal{A}) and with the following property: \mathcal{A}' is in state (q, q') at a node v in its run on T where $q = \text{state}(\mathcal{A}, T \otimes \emptyset)$ and $q' = \text{state}(\mathcal{A}, T \otimes \bar{a})$ where $\bar{a}: \bar{y} \rightarrow V(T)$ is the valuation mapping all variables in \bar{y} to v .

Given a tree T , we compute the run ρ' of \mathcal{A}' on $T \otimes \emptyset$, in time linear in $|T|$ using [Lemma 7.3](#). We now output the following enumerators $(\mathcal{E}_v)_{v \in V(T)}$. For all nodes $v \in V(T)$, if ρ' labels v by a pair in $Q \times \{p\}$, then let \mathcal{E}_v be the enumerator that outputs the unique valuation mapping all variables in \bar{y} to v , otherwise, \mathcal{E}_v is an enumerator for the empty set. This finishes the base case.

Now assume $|S| > 1$. Following the notation from above, we write $*$ for the root of S . Let W be the set of children of $*$ in S . As in the case of query answering, for each $w \in W$ define a shape σ_w with the following components:

- the variables $\bar{y}_w := \{y \in \bar{y} \mid w \preceq \bar{s}(y)\}$,
- the subtree S_w of S rooted at w ,
- the restriction L_w of the labeling L to S_w ,
- the restriction \bar{s}_w of the valuation \bar{s} to \bar{y}_w .

Note that S_w has fewer nodes than S , so we can apply the inductive assumption to σ_w , for each $w \in W$.

Let q be the label of the root in S and let $\bar{z} \subseteq \bar{y}$ be the set of those variables $y \in \bar{y}$ such that $\bar{s}(y)$ is the root $*$ in σ . Let ρ_0 be the run of \mathcal{A} on $T \otimes \emptyset$.

For a node $v \in V(T)$ with label a and injective function $G: W \rightarrow \mathbf{A}_v$, say that G is *satisfiable* if there is a function $G': W \rightarrow \mathbf{A}_v$ such that the following conditions hold (recall that L also labels edges of S and that $*w$ denotes the edge between the root $*$ of S and w):

- $\delta_{q,(a,\bar{z})}$ holds in \mathbf{A}_v labeled by ρ_0 , except for the nodes $G(w)$ for $w \in W$ that are instead labeled by $L(*w)$,
- for each $w \in W$ we have $G'(w) \succcurlyeq G(w)$ and $[G'(w) \mapsto L(w)] \vdash [G(w) \mapsto L(*w)]$, and
- for each $w \in W$ there is some valuation of \bar{y}_w that matches σ_w with starting node $G'(w)$.

Claim 7.2. *Valuations \bar{a} that match σ with starting node v are in bijective correspondence with tuples $(G, G', (\bar{a}_w)_{w \in W})$, such that $G, G': W \rightarrow \mathbf{A}_v$ and:*

1. G is satisfiable,
2. $G'(w) \succcurlyeq G(w)$ and $[G'(w) \mapsto L(w)] \vdash [G(w) \mapsto L(*w)]$ for all $w \in W$, and
3. \bar{a}_w matches σ_w with starting node $G'(w)$ for all $w \in W$.

Proof. Fix a valuation $\bar{a}: \bar{x} \rightarrow V(T)$ that matches σ with starting node v and let ρ be the run of \mathcal{A} on $T \otimes \bar{a}$. As remarked above, the function $F: V(S) \rightarrow V(T)$ witnessing that \bar{a} matches σ is unique. Define $(G, G', (\bar{a}_w)_{w \in W})$ as follows, by setting for $w \in W$:

- $G(w)$ is the $F(w)$ -directed child of $F(*)$,
- $G'(w) = F(w)$,
- \bar{a}_w is the restriction of \bar{a} to $\bar{y}_w \subseteq \bar{y}$.

As \bar{a} matches σ with starting node v , we have that $\rho(v) = q$ and the image of \bar{a} is contained in the union of $\{v\}$ and the set of descendants of either of the nodes $G(w)$, for $w \in W$. Since the run ρ is computed deterministically in a bottom-up fashion, it follows that the runs ρ and ρ_0 differ only on those vertices of \mathbf{A}_v that are in the image of G . Moreover, $\rho(G(w)) = L(*w)$ by definition of S . As $\rho(v) = q$ it follows that the formula $\delta_{q,(a,\bar{z})}$ holds in \mathbf{A}_v labeled by ρ .

Fix $w \in W$. We show that \bar{a}_w matches σ_w with starting node $G'(w)$. To this end, it is enough to observe that the restriction F_w of F to $V(S_w)$ witnesses this. In particular, this shows that G is satisfiable.

Vice versa, from a tuple $(G, G', (\bar{a}_w)_{w \in W})$ satisfying the properties of the claim we uniquely obtain the valuation \bar{a} matching σ with starting node v : $\bar{a} = \bigcup_{w \in W} \bar{a}_w \cup \bar{b}$, where \bar{b} is the valuation that maps \bar{z} (the set of variables $y \in \bar{y}$ such that $\bar{s}(y) = *$) to v .

Hence, the assignment $\bar{a} \mapsto (G, G', (\bar{a}_w)_{w \in W})$ defined above yields the bijective correspondence as stated in the claim. \square

The enumerator for the set of all valuations \bar{a} that match σ with starting node v is obtained by enumerating all triples $(G, G', (\bar{a}_w)_{w \in W})$ that satisfy the properties stated in the claim. We now argue that all components can be enumerated with constant delay.

For $w \in W$, let X_w denote the set of nodes u' such that there is a valuation that matches σ_w with starting node u' . By inductive assumption, in particular we can compute X_w in time linear in $|T|$. Apply [Lemma 7.17](#) to T and X_w and states $q_2 = L(w)$ and $q_1 = L(*w)$, to obtain, for each $v \in V(T)$, an enumerator for the set $C_w(v)$ of all children u of v such that there exists $u' \succcurlyeq u$ in X_w satisfying

$$[u' \mapsto L(w)] \vdash [u \mapsto L(*w)].$$

For each child u of v , label u by the set of all $w \in W$ such that $u \in C_w(v)$. This yields a labeling λ_v of the whorl \mathbf{A}_v .

Let \bar{w} be the set W , where now each $w \in \bar{w}$ is treated as a variable. Then there is a first-order formula $\psi(\bar{w})$ with free variables \bar{w} that holds in \mathbf{A}_v with the labeling λ_v for a valuation \bar{b} : $\bar{w} \mapsto \mathbf{A}_v$ if \bar{b} induces a function $G: W \rightarrow \mathbf{A}_v$ that is injective and satisfiable. By assumption on the class \mathcal{C} , we can compute an enumerator for the formula $\psi(\mathbf{A}_v)$, for each $v \in V(T)$. Each enumerator has delay bounded by some constant, and all those enumerators can be computed in time linear in $|T|$. In particular, in this way we obtain for each $v \in V(T)$ an enumerator with constant delay that enumerates all satisfiable functions $G: W \rightarrow \mathbf{A}_v$.

Fix $v \in V(T)$ and a satisfiable function $G: W \rightarrow \mathbf{A}_v$. Our next task is to enumerate all functions $G': W \rightarrow \mathbf{A}_v$ that certify satisfiability of G . The key observation is that this can be done by enumerating, for each $w \in W$ independently, all nodes u' of $V(T)$ with $u' \succcurlyeq G(w)$ and $[u' \mapsto L(w)] \vdash [G(w) \mapsto L(*w)]$, and such that there is some valuation of \bar{y}_w that matches σ_w with starting node u' . Note that this last condition is equivalent to $u' \in X_w$. Hence, for a fixed $w \in W$, it suffices to enumerate all descendants $u' \in X_w$ of $G(w)$ with $[u' \mapsto L(w)] \vdash [G(w) \mapsto L(*w)]$. This is done using the enumerator obtained from [Lemma 7.17](#).

More precisely, for each $w \in W$, apply [Lemma 7.17](#) to T and $X_w \subseteq V(T)$ and states $q_2 = L(w)$ and $q_1 = L(*w)$, obtaining, for each $u \in V(T)$ an enumerator for the set $Y_w(u)$ all descendants $u' \in X_w$ of u that satisfy

$$[u' \mapsto L(w)] \vdash [u \mapsto L(*w)].$$

In particular, for $u = G(w)$ we obtain an enumerator for the set $Y_w(G(w))$ of all descendants u' of $G(w)$ that belong to X_w and satisfy the above. Now, functions $G': W \rightarrow V(T)$ that certify satisfiability of G are exactly all functions $G': W \rightarrow V(T)$ such that $G'(w) \in Y_w(G(w))$, for all $w \in W$. Therefore, all such functions can be enumerated with constant delay, by taking the product of the enumerators of the sets $Y_w(G(w))$, for $w \in W$.

Hence, we may compute in time linear in $|T|$ a data structure that, given $v \in V(T)$, enumerates all pairs (G, G') such that $G: W \rightarrow \mathbf{A}_v$ is satisfiable, and $G': W \rightarrow V(T)$ certifies that. Fix such a pair (G, G') . It remains to construct a data structure that allows to enumerate all tuples $(\bar{a}_w)_{w \in W}$ such that \bar{a}_w matches σ_w with starting node $G'(w)$, for all $w \in W$. Again, this can be done by enumerating,

independently for each $w \in W$, all valuations \bar{a}_w that match σ_w with starting node $G'(w)$. Apply the inductive assumption to σ_w for each $w \in W$, yielding in time linear in $|T|$ for every node $u \in V(T)$ an enumerator with constant delay for the set $Z_w(u)$ of the set of all valuations \bar{a}_w that match σ_w with starting node u . Then tuples $(\bar{a}_w)_{w \in W}$ as above are exactly the tuples in $\prod_{w \in W} Z_w(G'(w))$. Therefore, all such tuples may be enumerated with constant delay, by taking the product of the enumerators for the sets $Z_w(G'(w))$ for $w \in W$.

Reassuming, we may compute in time linear in $|T|$ a data structure that, given $v \in V(T)$, enumerates all triples $(G, G', (\bar{a}_w)_{w \in W})$ that satisfy the condition of [Claim 7.2](#). Those correspond precisely to tuples \bar{a} that match σ with starting node v , as described in the claim. This yields the conclusion of the inductive step, and finishes the proof of [Lemma 7.13](#). \square

8 Separator logic on topological-minor-free classes

In this section, we combine all the pieces together, and show that the model-checking, querying, and enumeration problems for the logic FO+conn can be solved efficiently on graphs excluding a fixed topological minor. Precisely, we prove the following.

Theorem 1.2. *Let \mathcal{C} be a class of graphs that exclude a fixed graph as a topological minor. Then given $G \in \mathcal{C}$ and an FO+conn sentence φ , one can decide whether φ holds in G in time $f(\varphi) \cdot \|G\|^3$, where f is a computable function depending on \mathcal{C} .*

The following is a generalization to formulas with free variables.

Theorem 8.1. *Let \mathcal{C} be a class of graphs that exclude a fixed graph as a topological minor. Then given $G \in \mathcal{C}$ and an FO+conn formula $\varphi(\bar{x})$, one can compute in time $f(\varphi) \cdot \|G\|^3$ a data structure that allows to answer whether a given tuple \bar{a} satisfies $\varphi(\bar{x})$ in G in time $f(\varphi)$, where f is a computable function depending on \mathcal{C} .*

Finally, the following result computes an enumerator for all the answers to a given query.

Theorem 8.2. *Let \mathcal{C} be a class of graphs that exclude a fixed graph as a topological minor. Then given $G \in \mathcal{C}$ and an FO+conn formula $\varphi(\bar{x})$, one can enumerate all answers to $\varphi(\bar{x})$ in G with delay $f(\varphi)$ after preprocessing in time $f(\varphi) \cdot \|G\|^3$, where f is a computable function depending on \mathcal{C} .*

The two results above follow from [Theorems 7.4, 7.5 and 7.11](#), respectively, and the following lemma. The Gaifman graph of a Σ -structure \mathbf{A} is a graph with vertex set $V(\mathbf{A})$ where two distinct vertices u, v are connected by an edge if u and v appear together in a relation of Σ . We say that a Σ -structure excludes a topological minor H if its Gaifman graph excludes H as a topological minor.

Lemma 8.3. *For every graph H and FO+conn formula $\varphi(\bar{x})$ there exists a graph H' , an alphabet A , a signature Σ consisting of binary relation symbols including the edge relation symbol E , and a formula $\psi(\bar{x})$ of FO(MSO(\preceq , A), Σ) such that the following holds. Given a graph G that excludes H as a topological minor, one can in time $f(\varphi, H) \cdot \|G\|^3$ compute a tree T of size $f(\varphi, H) \cdot \|G\|$, vertex-labeled with A , and augmented with H' -topological-minor-free Σ -structures, such that $V(G) \subseteq V(T)$ and $\varphi(G) = \psi(T)$; here, f is a computable function. Moreover, $H', A, \Sigma, \psi(\bar{x})$ can be computed from H and $\varphi(\bar{x})$.*

We remark that the logic FO(MSO(\preceq , A), Σ) in the statement could be replaced by the weaker logic FO(\preceq , A , Σ). This can be deduced a posteriori from the above statement, using [Remark 7.1](#). The labels from A can be further eliminated by encoding them as gadgets in the tree, so the logic FO(\preceq , Σ) would suffice, too. However, we do not need this stronger version of the lemma here.

Proof of Theorems 1.2, 8.1 and 8.2. Let \mathcal{C} be a class of graphs that exclude a graph H as a topological minor and let $\varphi(\bar{x})$ be an FO+conn formula. Let H', A , and $\psi(\bar{x})$ be as in [Lemma 8.3](#). Let \mathcal{C}' be the class of all graphs that exclude H' as a topological minor. In particular, \mathcal{C}' has bounded expansion, and hence has efficient model-checking (by the main result of [\[DKT13\]](#)), query-answering, and query enumeration (by the main result of [\[KS20\]](#), see also [\[Tor20\]](#)).

Applying Theorems 7.4, 7.5 and 7.11 respectively to the class \mathcal{C}' , we conclude that model-checking, query-answering and query enumeration is efficient for $\text{FO}(\text{MSO}(\prec, A) \cup \Sigma)$ on \mathcal{C}' -augmented trees that are vertex-labeled with A .

Now, given a graph $G \in \mathcal{C}$ compute in time $f(\varphi, H) \cdot \|G\|^3$ a tree T , augmented with graphs from \mathcal{C}' and labeled with A , as in Lemma 8.3. Apply the appropriate (model-checking/query-answering/enumeration) algorithm to the tree T and the formula $\psi(\bar{x})$. This runs in time linear in the size of $|T|$. As $|T|$ has size at most $f(\varphi, H) \cdot \|G\|$, this time is linear in $\|G\|$. The algorithm yields the required data structure for $\psi(\bar{x})$ (that is, gives a boolean answer if ψ is a sentence, or a query-answering data structure, or an enumerator). As $\psi(T) = \varphi(G)$, this is also the required data structure for φ . \square

The remainder of this section is devoted to the proof of Lemma 8.3.

Let k be such that every conn predicate used in $\varphi(\bar{x})$ has arity at most $k + 2$, and let $q := q(k)$ be the parameter provided by Theorem 3.2. Define

$$H' := K_{\max(|H|, 2q+2)}.$$

Construction of T . We now show how, given a graph G that excludes H as a topological minor, to construct a suitable augmented tree T . The alphabet A will be defined within this construction.

First, apply the algorithm of Theorem 3.2 to the graph G , obtaining a strongly (q, k) -unbreakable tree decomposition $\mathcal{T} = (T_0, \text{bag})$ of adhesion at most q . Construct T from T_0 as follows: for each $x \in V(T_0)$ and $u \in \text{bag}(x)$, create a copy u_x of u and attach u_x as a (leaf) child of x . When x is the unique node satisfying $u \in \text{mrg}(x)$, we identify the copy u_x with u itself, so that we have $V(G) \subseteq V(T)$. Next, for every node $x \in V(T_0)$, we construct the whorl at x to be the graph $\text{bgraph}(x)$; for this we use the binary edge relation E on the children of x . By Lemma 3.4, each graph $\text{bgraph}(x)$ excludes H' as a topological minor, hence T is augmented with H' -topological-minor-free graphs.

It remains to decorate the nodes of T using a finite alphabet A and to decorate the edges of whorls $\{\text{bgraph}(x) : x \in V(T_0)\}$ using a finite signature Σ' consisting of binary symbols so that the original structure of the tree decomposition \mathcal{T} can be recovered from this decoration. This way, the whorls become Σ -structures rather than just graphs, where $\Sigma = \Sigma' \cup \{E\}$.

Apply Lemma 5.2 to the tree decomposition \mathcal{T} . This we, in time $q^{O(1)} \cdot |T| \|G\|$ we construct suitable injective colorings $\lambda_x : \text{adh}(x) \rightarrow [2q]$ for $x \in V(T_0)$ and a labeling $\sigma : E(T_0) \rightarrow B$, where $B = B_{2q}$ is the set of all basic bi-interface graphs of arity $2q$, with properties asserted by Lemma 5.2. We now define the alphabet A and signature Σ' as follows:

- A consists of unary predicates W , $\{C_i : i \in [2q]\}$, and $\{R_{\mathbb{B}} : \mathbb{B} \in B\}$.
- Σ' consists of binary predicates $\{D_i : i \in [2q]\}$.

We decorate T with those predicates as follows:

- Predicate W selects all nodes of T_0 .
- For $i \in [2q]$, predicate C_i selects all nodes $x \in V(T_0)$ such that $i \in \lambda_x(\text{adh}(x))$. Furthermore, for each such node x , C_i also selects the unique copy of the form u_x , where u is such that $\lambda_x(u) = i$.
- For every $\mathbb{B} \in B$, $R_{\mathbb{B}}$ selects all nodes $y \in V(T_0)$ that have a parent, say x , and such that

$$\sigma(xy) = \mathbb{B}.$$

- For $i \in [2q]$ and each $x \in V(T_0)$, predicate D_i selects all edges of the form yu_x , where y is a child of x in T_0 and $u \in \text{adh}(y)$ is such that $\lambda_y(u) = i$.

Note that in the last point, edges decorated with predicates D_i are already present in $\text{bgraph}(x)$, hence adding those predicates does not alter the Gaifman graph of the whorl. We now show that the above information is enough to recover the structure of G using the logic $\text{FO}(\text{MSO}(\preceq, A), \Sigma)$. Given colorings λ_x and labeling σ , it is straightforward to compute those decorations, and therefore the final augmented tree T , in time $\mathcal{O}(|B| \cdot |T|) = 2^{\mathcal{O}(q^2)} \cdot |T|$.

A node s of T is called a *representative* of a vertex $u \in V(G)$ if $s = u_x$ for the unique node $x \in V(T_0)$ satisfying $u \in \text{mrg}(x)$. Note that every vertex u of G has exactly one representative, which is exactly the node of T identified with u . We note that representatives can be conveniently distinguished and manipulated.

Claim 8.1. *There is an $\text{MSO}(\preceq, A)$ formula $\rho(s)$ that is satisfied exactly by the representatives.*

Proof of the claim. It suffices to write

$$\rho(s) := \neg W(s) \wedge \bigwedge_{i=1}^{2q} \neg C_i(s). \quad \triangleleft$$

Claim 8.2. *There is an $\text{FO}(\text{MSO}(\preceq, A), \Sigma)$ formula $\iota(x, y)$ such that $\iota(u, t)$ holds if and only if u is a representative and t is a copy of u .*

Proof of the claim. We first check that $\neg W(u)$, $\neg W(t)$, and that u is a representative using formula $\rho(u)$ provided by Claim 8.1. Next, from the properties of colorings λ_x provided by Lemma 5.2 it follows that t is a copy of u if and only if the following condition holds: either $u = t$, or u has a sibling z that is an ancestor of t and there is $i \in [2q]$ such that $D_i(u, z)$ holds and $C_i(w)$ holds for all $z \preceq w \preceq t$. It is straightforward to express this check in $\text{FO}(\text{MSO}(\preceq, A), \Sigma)$. \triangleleft

Next, we observe that the original adjacency relation in G can be defined between the representatives.

Claim 8.3. *There is an $\text{FO}(\text{MSO}(\preceq, A), \Sigma)$ formula $\alpha(x, y)$ such that $\alpha(u, v)$ holds in T if and only if u and v are representatives and $uv \in E(G)$.*

Proof of the claim. By the properties of tree decompositions, if u and v are adjacent, then either u belongs to the unique bag where v belongs to the margin, or vice versa. Therefore, it suffices to write

$$\alpha(u, v) := \rho(u) \wedge \rho(v) \wedge (\exists t. (E(u, t) \wedge \iota(v, t)) \vee \exists t. (E(v, t) \wedge \iota(u, t))).$$

Here, $\iota(x, y)$ is the formula provided by Claim 8.2. \triangleleft

Finally, the information encoded through predicates $R_{\mathbb{B}}$ can be used to express torso queries.

Claim 8.4. *For every $\mathbb{A} \in B$ there is an $\text{MSO}(\preceq, A)$ formula $\tau_{\mathbb{B}}(x, y)$ that selects all pairs of nodes (x, y) of T such that $x, y \in V(T_0)$, x is a strict ancestor of y in T_0 , and $\sigma(x, y) = \mathbb{A}$.*

Proof of the claim. Checking the first two assertions boils down to verifying that $W(x)$ and $W(y)$ hold and that $x \prec y$. For the third assertion, the idea is to compose the edge labels under σ , encoded through predicates $R_{\mathbb{B}}$, along the x - y path using monadic existential quantification.

Let P be the set of all nodes on the x - y path in T , including x but excluding y . For $\mathbb{B} \in B$, let $P_{\mathbb{B}}$ be the set of those $w \in P$ for which

$$\sigma(w, y) = \mathbb{B}.$$

Clearly, $\{P_{\mathbb{B}} : \mathbb{B} \in B\}$ is a partition of P into $2^{\mathcal{O}(q^2)}$ sets. We guess this partition using existential quantification and verify the correctness of the guess. This verification boils down to checking the following assertions:

- Sets $P_{\mathbb{B}}$ form a partition of P .
- If y' is the parent of y , then $y' \in P_{\mathbb{B}}$ for \mathbb{B} such that $R_{\mathbb{B}}(y)$ holds.
- For every $w \in P - \{x\}$, if w' is the parent of w , $w \in P_{\mathbb{B}}$, $w' \in P_{\mathbb{B}'}$, and $R_{\mathbb{C}}(w)$ holds, then

$$\mathbb{C} \odot \mathbb{B} = \mathbb{B}'.$$

It is straightforward to express these assertions in $\text{MSO}(\preceq, A)$.

Now $\tau_{\mathbb{A}}(x, y)$ should hold if and only if $x \in P_{\mathbb{A}}$. \triangleleft

Rewriting the query. The remainder of the argument is devoted to the proof of the following claim, which boils down to the statement of the theorem restricted to a single conn query.

Claim 8.5. *There is an $\text{FO}(\text{MSO}(\prec, A), \Sigma)$ formula $\chi(x, y, z_1, \dots, z_k)$ such that*

$$\text{conn}_k(G) = \chi(T).$$

Before we proceed to the proof of Claim 8.5, let us see why the theorem statement follows from it. Indeed, given a formula $\varphi(\bar{x})$ of $\text{FO} + \text{conn}$, we can rewrite it to a formula $\psi(\bar{x})$ of $\text{FO}(\text{MSO}(\prec, A), \Sigma)$ satisfying $\varphi(G) = \psi(T)$ as follows:

- Quantification is relativized to the representatives by guarding each quantifier with formula ρ provided by Claim 8.1: $\exists x.\delta$ becomes $\exists x.(\rho(x) \wedge \delta)$ and $\forall x.\delta$ becomes $\forall x.(\rho(x) \rightarrow \delta)$.
- Every atomic edge relation check $E(x, y)$ is replaced by the formula $\alpha(x, y)$ provided by Claim 8.3.
- Every occurrence of the predicate $\text{conn}_\ell(x, y, z_1, \dots, z_\ell)$, where $\ell \leq k$, is replaced with the formula $\chi(x, y, z_1, \dots, z_\ell, z_\ell, \dots, z_\ell)$ provided by Claim 8.5. Here z_ℓ is repeated $k - \ell + 1$ times.

Hence, it remains to prove Claim 8.5. The argument boils down to turning the algorithmic procedure presented in Section 4 into a formula of $\text{FO}(\text{MSO}(\prec, A), \Sigma)$.

Suppose then that we are given $s, t, u_1, \dots, u_k \in V(G)$ and we would like to verify whether $G \models \text{conn}(s, t, u_1, \dots, u_k)$. We describe a procedure that performs this verification using the data provided in T , and along the way we describe how the procedure is turned into a suitable formula χ of $\text{FO}(\text{MSO}(\prec, A), \Sigma)$. We first check that s, t, u_1, \dots, u_k are representatives, so we may proceed under this assumption.

Similarly as in Section 4, let X consist of the root of T_0 and all nodes of T_0 whose margins intersect $\hat{S} := \{s, t, u_1, \dots, u_k\}$. Further, let Y be the least common ancestor closure of X in T . Note that X and Y can be easily defined in $\text{MSO}(\prec, A)$ and recall that $|Y| \leq 2k + 5$. Recall that a node z of T is *affected* if $\text{comp}(z)$ intersects \hat{S} . Construct Y' by taking Y and adding, for each $y \in Y$, all affected children of y . It is straightforward to see that $|Y'| \leq 2|Y| - 1 \leq 4k + 9$. Note that X, Y , and Y' can be easily defined from s, t, u_1, \dots, u_k in $\text{MSO}(\prec, A)$.

As in Section 4, for $x \in V(T_0)$ we define

$$D(x) := \text{adh}(x) \cup (\{s, t\} \cap \text{cone}(x))$$

and

$$\text{profile}(x) := \left\{ \{a, b\} \in \binom{D(x)}{2} \mid \text{in } G[\text{cone}(x)] \text{ there is an } a\text{-}b \text{ path avoiding } S \right\}.$$

Recall that the procedure described in Section 4 computed sets $\text{profile}(y)$ for all $y \in Y'$ in a bottom-up manner. Each set $\text{profile}(y)$ can be encoded using $\binom{|D(y)|}{2} \leq \binom{q+2}{2}$ bits of information, denoting which pairs are included in $\text{profile}(y)$. Observe that for a given $y \in Y'$, the set $D(y)$ (encoded through a sequence of representatives) can be defined in $\text{FO}(\text{MSO}(\prec, A), \Sigma)$ with the help of formula $\iota(x, y)$ provided by Claim 8.2. Therefore, we construct the formula χ by making a disjunction over all $\prod_{y \in Y'} 2^{\binom{|D(y)|}{2}} \leq 2^{(4k+9)\binom{q+2}{2}}$ possible guesses on how the profiles of nodes of Y' exactly look like. For each guess we verify that it encodes the actual profiles of nodes of Y' , and that $\{s, t\}$ belongs to the profile of the root of T .

Therefore, it remains to show, for a given guess of the profiles, that this guess is correct. For $y \in Y'$, let $\Pi_y \subseteq \binom{D(y)}{2}$ be the guess on the profile of y . We need to verify the following two assertions:

- (C1) For every $z \in Y' - Y$, if y is the unique descendant of z that belongs to Y and such that there is no $w \in Y'$ with $z \prec w \prec y$, then the profile Π_z is obtained from the profile Π_y as described in Lemma 4.3.

(C2) For every $x \in Y$, if $Z \subseteq Y'$ is the set of affected children of x , then the profile Π_x is obtained from profiles $\{\Pi_z : z \in Z\}$ as described in Lemma 4.4.

We show how to implement those checks in $\text{FO}(\text{MSO}(\preceq, A), \Sigma)$ separately. These implementations correspond to the proofs of Lemma 4.3 and of Lemma 4.4, respectively.

Implementing (C1). Note that for a given $z \in Y' - Y$, it can be distinguished in $\text{MSO}(\preceq, A)$ which element of Y is the corresponding node y as in the statement of assertion (C1). As in the proof of Lemma 4.3, let J be the graph on vertex set $D(y) \cup \text{adh}(z)$ whose edge set is $\Pi_y \cup E(\text{torso}(z, y))$. As argued in Claim 4.2, we need to verify that Π_y is exactly the connectivity relation in the graph $J - S$, restricted to $D(z)$. Since J is a graph on at most $2q + 2$ vertices, it suffices to define the edge relation in J , since from it the connectivity relation of $J - S$ can be deduced in first-order logic. The set Π_y is assumed to be given through the guess. On the other hand, using formulas $\tau_{\mathbb{B}}(z, y)$ for $\mathbb{B} \in B$ we can deduce $\sigma(z, y)$, which is the graph $\text{torso}(z, y)$ labeled using colorings λ_z and λ_y . We may now use predicates C_i on the children of z and y , and formula $\iota(\cdot, \cdot)$ provided by Claim 8.2, to infer the edge relation of $\text{torso}(z, y)$, thereby completing the construction of the edge set of J .

Implementing (C2). Now we are given $x \in Y$, the guess Π_x for the profile of x , and, for each affected child z of y , the guess Π_z for the profile of z . We first observe that we can define the graph $\text{bgraph}_S(x)$ in $\text{FO}(\text{MSO}(\preceq, A), \Sigma)$ as follows:

- The vertex set of $\text{bgraph}_S(x)$ comprises all children of x in T that do not satisfy predicate W nor are contained in S .
- Two such vertices u and v are adjacent in $\text{bgraph}_S(x)$ if and only if they are adjacent in $\text{bgraph}(x)$, or there is a child z of y that satisfies W , is adjacent to both u and v , and either:
 - z is not affected; or
 - z is affected and $\{u, v\} \in \Pi_z$.

It is straightforward to express these checks in $\text{FO}(\text{MSO}(\preceq, A), \Sigma)$.

Once the graph $\text{bgraph}_S(x)$ is defined, we can use Lemma 3.5 to observe that the following formula correctly decides whether two vertices $a, b \in \text{bag}(x) - S$ are connected in $G[\text{cone}(x)] - S$: check whether a and b can be connected in $\text{bgraph}_S(x)$ by a path of length at most $q + 1$, or that in $\text{bgraph}_S(x)$ there exist connected sets of vertices K_a and K_b , each of size $q + 1$ and containing a and b , respectively. This can be clearly expressed in first-order logic.

Using the formula constructed above we can verify the correctness of the guess on the profile Π_x on pairs $\{a, b\} \in \binom{D(x) \cap \text{bag}(x)}{2}$. It remains to verify it also on pairs where either a or b belong to $D(x) - \text{bag}(x) \subseteq \{u, v\}$. This can be done analogously as in the proof of Lemma 4.4 using the formula τ provided by Claim 8.4; we leave the details to the reader.

This concludes the proof of Lemma 8.3. □

9 Lower bounds

We proved that the model-checking problem for separator logic is fixed-parameter tractable on classes of graphs that exclude a fixed topological minor. The next natural question is whether this result can be improved in terms of generality. In this section we prove Theorem 1.3 that shows that, under technical assumptions, this is not the case.

The reduction is based on the following lemma.

Lemma 9.1. *Let \mathcal{C} be a class of graphs that is closed under taking subgraphs and is not topological-minor-free. Then for every sentence φ of FO over graphs, there is an FO+conn sentence ψ such that for every graph G , there is a graph $H \in \mathcal{C}$ such that $G \models \varphi$ iff $H \models \psi$.*

Proof. The sentence ψ is obtained from φ by the following syntactic modifications. First, each quantifier is restricted to the set of vertices of degree at least 3. Second, we replace each atom of the form $E(x, y)$ by the following FO+conn formula, which states that x and y are connected by a path of vertices of degree 2.

$$\varphi_E(x, y) := E(x, y) \vee \exists z. \left(d^=2(z) \wedge \text{conn}(x, z) \wedge \text{conn}(y, z) \wedge \forall w. (\text{conn}(z, w, x, y) \rightarrow d^=2(w)) \right),$$

Here $d^=2(x)$ is a formula checking that x has degree two. Note that ψ is derived from φ only, it does not depend on \mathcal{C} .

Now let G be any graph, we define $H \in \mathcal{C}$ as follows. We first add two private neighbors to each vertex of G . This yields a graph G' . Since \mathcal{C} is not topological-minor-free, G' is a topological minor of some graph $H \in \mathcal{C}$. As \mathcal{C} is closed under taking subgraphs, we can assume that H is a subdivision of G' .

We finally have $G \models \varphi$ iff $H \models \psi$. To see this, note that all original vertices of G have degree at least 3 in G' ; and that, in H , two vertices of degree at least three satisfy φ_E if and only if they are adjacent or connected by a path of nodes of degree two. \square

Unfortunately, [Lemma 9.1](#) in general does not provide an fpt reduction from FO model-checking on general graphs to FO+conn model-checking on classes \mathcal{C} as in the lemma statement. This is because the graph H whose existence is guaranteed by the assumptions might not be of size polynomial in the size of G , making the reduction non-fpt.

We get around this obstacle by adding an appropriate assumption. Recall that a class \mathcal{C} admits *efficient encoding of topological minors* if for every graph G there exists $H \in \mathcal{C}$ such that G is a topological minor of H , and, given G , such H together with a suitable topological minor model can be computed in time polynomial in $|G|$. Note that in particular such H can be only polynomially larger than G . We may now prove [Theorem 1.3](#).

Theorem 1.3. *Let \mathcal{C} be a subgraph-closed class of graphs that admits efficient encoding of topological minors. Then the model-checking of FO+conn on \mathcal{C} is AW[*]-hard, even for the fragment that uses only conn_k predicates with $k \leq 2$.*

Proof. Recalling that FO model-checking on general graphs is AW[*]-complete [\[FG06\]](#), it suffices to apply the reduction presented in the proof of [Lemma 9.1](#) and note that it can be performed in polynomial time due to the assumption of polynomial embedding of topological minors. \square

It is well-known that the subgraph closure of the class of n -subdivisions of n -vertex complete graphs has bounded expansion. As this class admits efficient encoding of topological minors, we obtain the following.

Corollary 9.1. *There is a class \mathcal{C} with bounded expansion such that FO+conn model-checking on \mathcal{C} is AW[*]-hard.*

[Corollary 9.1](#) provides a separation between the parameterized complexity of FO and FO+conn model-checking, as the former problem is fixed-parameter tractable on every class of bounded expansion [\[DKT13\]](#).

10 Discussion

In this work we have added computational problems related to conn queries in graphs and the logic FO+conn to the growing list of applications of the decomposition theorem of Cygan et al. [\[CLP⁺19\]](#). Several questions can be asked about possible improvements of the obtained complexity bounds, especially regarding the data structure of [Theorem 1.1](#).

First, in both the model-checking algorithm of [Theorem 1.2](#) and the construction algorithm of the data structure of [Theorem 1.1](#), the main bottleneck for the polynomial factor is the running time of the algorithm to compute the tree decomposition of Cygan et al. (see [Theorem 3.2](#)). This running time is cubic in the size of the graph, while in both applications presented in this work, the remainder of the construction takes fpt time with at most quadratic dependence on the graph size. Therefore, it seems imperative to revisit [Theorem 3.2](#) with the purpose of improving the time complexity of the construction algorithm. We note that polynomial factor of the running time of the algorithm of [Theorem 3.1](#) is not specified in [\[CKL⁺21\]](#), but it is also at least cubic.

Second, in [Section 6](#) we showed how to improve the time complexity of queries to polynomial in k by using the weakly unbreakable tree decomposition provided by [Theorem 3.1](#). The drawback is that the space usage of the data structure becomes $k^{\mathcal{O}(1)} \cdot |G|^2$. However, the quadratic dependence on $|G|$ is caused only by the brute-force implementation of the data structure for torso queries provided by [Lemma 6.2](#). So now we have two implementations of this data structure:

- [Lemma 4.2](#) offers query time $2^{\mathcal{O}(q^2)}$ and space usage $2^{\mathcal{O}(q^2)} \cdot |T|$.
- [Lemma 6.2](#) offers query time $q^{\mathcal{O}(1)}$ and space usage $q^{\mathcal{O}(1)} \cdot |T|^2$.

Is it possible to design a data structure that would offer query time $q^{\mathcal{O}(1)}$ while keeping the space usage at $q^{\mathcal{O}(1)} \cdot |T|$? In our proof of [Lemma 4.2](#), we apply the more general [Theorem 5.1](#) to the semigroup of bi-interface graphs of arity $2q$. It is possible that a better understanding of the structure of this semigroup might lead to an improvement proposed above.

Acknowledgements. The authors thank Mikołaj Bojańczyk for helpful discussions on separator logic, as well as Anna Zych-Pawlewicz for pointers to the literature on connectivity oracles under vertex failures.

References

- [ABMN19] Antoine Amarilli, Pierre Bourhis, Stefan Mengel, and Matthias Niewerth. Enumeration on trees with tractable combined complexity and efficient updates. In *Proceedings of the 38th ACM SIGMOD-SIGACT-SIGAI Symposium on Principles of Database Systems, PODS 2019*, pages 89–103. ACM, 2019.
- [AKP⁺21a] Akanksha Agrawal, Lawqueen Kanesh, Fahad Panolan, M. S. Ramanujan, and Saket Saurabh. An FPT algorithm for elimination distance to bounded degree graphs. In *Proceedings of the 38th International Symposium on Theoretical Aspects of Computer Science, STACS 2021*, volume 187 of *LIPICs*, pages 5:1–5:11. Schloss Dagstuhl – Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik, 2021.
- [AKP⁺21b] Akanksha Agrawal, Lawqueen Kanesh, Fahad Panolan, MS Ramanujan, and Saket Saurabh. An fpt algorithm for elimination distance to bounded degree graphs. In *38th International Symposium on Theoretical Aspects of Computer Science (STACS 2021)*. Schloss Dagstuhl-Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik, 2021.
- [Bag06] Guillaume Bagan. MSO queries on tree decomposable structures are computable with linear delay. In *Proceedings of the 15th International Conference on Computer Science Logic, CSL 2006*, volume 4207 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 167–181. Springer, 2006.
- [BD16] Jannis Bulian and Anuj Dawar. Graph isomorphism parameterized by elimination distance to bounded degree. *Algorithmica*, 75(2):363–382, 2016.
- [BD17] Jannis Bulian and Anuj Dawar. Fixed-parameter tractable distances to sparse graph classes. *Algorithmica*, 79(1):139–158, 2017.

- [Boj09] Mikołaj Bojańczyk. Factorization forests. In *Proceedings of the 13th International Conference on Developments in Language Theory, DLT 2009*, volume 5583 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 1–17. Springer, 2009.
- [Boj21] Mikołaj Bojańczyk. Separator logic and star-free expressions for graphs. *CoRR*, abs/2107.13953, 2021.
- [BP16] Mikołaj Bojańczyk and Michał Pilipczuk. Definability equals recognizability for graphs of bounded treewidth. In *Proceedings of the 31st Annual ACM/IEEE Symposium on Logic in Computer Science, LICS 2016*, pages 407–416. ACM, 2016.
- [CCH⁺16] Rajesh Chitnis, Marek Cygan, MohammadTaghi Hajiaghayi, Marcin Pilipczuk, and Michał Pilipczuk. Designing FPT algorithms for cut problems using randomized contractions. *SIAM Journal on Computing*, 45(4):1171–1229, 2016.
- [CKL⁺21] Marek Cygan, Paweł Komosa, Daniel Lokshtanov, Marcin Pilipczuk, Michał Pilipczuk, Saket Saurabh, and Magnus Wahlström. Randomized contractions meet lean decompositions. *ACM Transactions on Algorithms*, 17(1):6:1–6:30, 2021.
- [CLP⁺19] Marek Cygan, Daniel Lokshtanov, Marcin Pilipczuk, Michał Pilipczuk, and Saket Saurabh. Minimum Bisection is fixed-parameter tractable. *SIAM Journal on Computing*, 48(2):417–450, 2019.
- [Col07] Thomas Colcombet. A combinatorial theorem for trees. In *Proceedings of the 34th International Colloquium Automata, Languages and Programming, ICALP 2007*, volume 4596 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 901–912. Springer, 2007.
- [Cou90] Bruno Courcelle. The Monadic Second-Order logic of graphs. I. Recognizable sets of finite graphs. *Information and Computation*, 85(1):12–75, 1990.
- [DKT13] Zdeněk Dvořák, Daniel Král, and Robin Thomas. Testing first-order properties for subclasses of sparse graphs. *Journal of the ACM*, 60(5):36:1–36:24, 2013.
- [DP10] Ran Duan and Seth Pettie. Connectivity oracles for failure prone graphs. In *Proceedings of the 42nd ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing, STOC 2010*, pages 465–474. ACM, 2010.
- [DP20] Ran Duan and Seth Pettie. Connectivity oracles for graphs subject to vertex failures. *SIAM Journal on Computing*, 49(6):1363–1396, 2020.
- [FG06] Jörg Flum and Martin Grohe. *Parameterized Complexity Theory*. Texts in Theoretical Computer Science. An EATCS Series. Springer, 2006.
- [FGT21] Fedor V. Fomin, Petr A. Golovach, and Dimitrios M. Thilikos. Parameterized complexity of elimination distance to first-order logic properties. In *Proceedings of the 36th Annual ACM/IEEE Symposium on Logic in Computer Science, LICS 2021*, pages 1–13. IEEE, 2021.
- [FI97] Daniele Frigioni and Giuseppe F. Italiano. Dynamically switching vertices in planar graphs. In *Proceedings of the 5th Annual European Symposium on Algorithms, ESA 1997*, volume 1284 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 186–199. Springer, 1997.
- [GHL⁺14] Robert Ganian, Petr Hliněný, Alexander Langer, Jan Obdržálek, Peter Rossmanith, and Somnath Sikdar. Lower bounds on the complexity of mso1 model-checking. *Journal of Computer and System Sciences*, 80(1):180–194, 2014.
- [GKS17] Martin Grohe, Stephan Kreutzer, and Sebastian Siebertz. Deciding first-order properties of nowhere dense graphs. *Journal of the ACM*, 64(3):17:1–17:32, 2017.

- [HT84] Dov Harel and Robert Endre Tarjan. Fast algorithms for finding nearest common ancestors. *SIAM Journal on Computing*, 13(2):338–355, 1984.
- [Jd21] Bart M. P. Jansen and Jari J. H. de Kroon. FPT algorithms to compute the elimination distance to bipartite graphs and more. In *47th International Workshop on Graph-Theoretic Concepts in Computer Science, WG 2021*, volume 12911 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 80–93. Springer, 2021.
- [KS13] Wojciech Kazana and Luc Segoufin. Enumeration of monadic second-order queries on trees. *ACM Transactions on Computational Logic*, 14(4):25:1–25:12, 2013.
- [KS20] Wojciech Kazana and Luc Segoufin. First-order queries on classes of structures with bounded expansion. *Log. Methods Comput. Sci.*, 16(1), 2020.
- [KT10] Stephan Kreutzer and Siamak Tazari. Lower bounds for the complexity of monadic second-order logic. In *Proceedings of the 25th Annual IEEE Symposium on Logic in Computer Science, LICS 2010*, pages 189–198. IEEE Computer Society, 2010.
- [KT11] Ken-ichi Kawarabayashi and Mikkel Thorup. The Minimum k -way Cut of bounded size is fixed-parameter tractable. In *Proceedings of the IEEE 52nd Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science, FOCS 2011*, pages 160–169. IEEE Computer Society, 2011.
- [Löd12] Christof Löding. Basics on tree automata. In *Modern Applications of Automata Theory*, pages 79–109. World Scientific, 2012.
- [LPPS21] Daniel Lokshtanov, Marcin Pilipczuk, Michał Pilipczuk, and Saket Saurabh. Fixed-parameter tractability of Graph Isomorphism in graphs with an excluded minor, 2021. Manuscript.
- [LRSZ18] Daniel Lokshtanov, M. S. Ramanujan, Saket Saurabh, and Meirav Zehavi. Reducing CMSO model checking to highly connected graphs. In *Proceedings of the 45th International Colloquium on Automata, Languages, and Programming, ICALP 2018*, volume 107 of *LIPIcs*, pages 135:1–135:14. Schloss Dagstuhl — Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik, 2018.
- [LSS20] Daniel Lokshtanov, Saket Saurabh, and Vaishali Surianarayanan. A parameterized approximation scheme for Min k -Cut. In *Proceedings of the 61st IEEE Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science, FOCS 2020*, pages 798–809. IEEE, 2020.
- [LSV20] Alexander Lindermayr, Sebastian Siebertz, and Alexandre Vigny. Elimination distance to bounded degree on planar graphs. In *Proceedings of the 45th International Symposium on Mathematical Foundations of Computer Science, MFCS 2020*, volume 170 of *LIPIcs*, pages 65:1–65:12. Schloss Dagstuhl — Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik, 2020.
- [PT07] Mihai Pătraşcu and Mikkel Thorup. Planning for fast connectivity updates. In *Proceedings of the 48th Annual IEEE Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science, FOCS 2007*, pages 263–271. IEEE Computer Society, 2007.
- [SSV18] Nicole Schweikardt, Luc Segoufin, and Alexandre Vigny. Enumeration for FO queries over nowhere dense graphs. In *Proceedings of the 37th ACM SIGMOD-SIGACT-SIGAI Symposium on Principles of Database Systems, PODS 2018*, pages 151–163. ACM, 2018.
- [SSV21] Nicole Schirrmacher, Sebastian Siebertz, and Alexandre Vigny. First-order logic with connectivity operators. *CoRR*, abs/2107.05928, 2021.
- [Str19] Yann Strozecki. Enumeration complexity. *Bulletin of the EATCS*, 129, 2019.

- [SZ18] Saket Saurabh and Meirav Zehavi. Parameterized complexity of multi-node hubs. In *Proceedings of the 13th International Symposium on Parameterized and Exact Computation, IPEC 2018*, volume 115 of *LIPIcs*, pages 8:1–8:14. Schloss Dagstuhl – Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik, 2018.
- [Tor20] Szymon Toruńczyk. Aggregate queries on sparse databases. In *Proceedings of the 39th ACM SIGMOD-SIGACT-SIGAI Symposium on Principles of Database Systems, PODS 2020*, pages 427–443. ACM, 2020.
- [vdBS19] Jan van den Brand and Thatchaphol Saranurak. Sensitive distance and reachability oracles for large batch updates. In *60th IEEE Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science, FOCS 2019*, pages 424–435. IEEE Computer Society, 2019.