

On Sparsification for Computing Treewidth^{*}

Bart M. P. Jansen¹

University of Bergen, Norway. bart.jansen@ii.uib.no

Abstract. We investigate whether an n -vertex instance (G, k) of TREEWIDTH, asking whether the graph G has treewidth at most k , can efficiently be made sparse without changing its answer. By giving a special form of OR-cross-composition, we prove that this is unlikely: if there is an $\epsilon > 0$ and a polynomial-time algorithm that reduces n -vertex TREEWIDTH instances to equivalent instances, of an arbitrary problem, with $\mathcal{O}(n^{2-\epsilon})$ bits, then $\text{NP} \subseteq \text{coNP/poly}$ and the polynomial hierarchy collapses to its third level.

Our sparsification lower bound has implications for structural parameterizations of TREEWIDTH: parameterizations by measures that do not exceed the vertex count, cannot have kernels with $\mathcal{O}(k^{2-\epsilon})$ bits for any $\epsilon > 0$, unless $\text{NP} \subseteq \text{coNP/poly}$. Motivated by the question of determining the optimal kernel size for TREEWIDTH parameterized by vertex cover, we improve the $\mathcal{O}(k^3)$ -vertex kernel from Bodlaender et al. (STACS 2011) to a kernel with $\mathcal{O}(k^2)$ vertices. Our improved kernel is based on a novel form of *treewidth-invariant set*. We use the q -expansion lemma of Fomin et al. (STACS 2011) to find such sets efficiently in graphs whose vertex count is superquadratic in their vertex cover number.

1 Introduction

The task of preprocessing inputs to computational problems to make them less dense, called *sparsification*, has been studied intensively due to its theoretical and practical importance. Sparsification, and more generally, preprocessing, is a vital step in speeding up resource-demanding computations in practical settings. In the context of theoretical analysis, the *sparsification lemma* due to Impagliazzo et al. [21] has proven to be an important asset for studying subexponential-time algorithms. The work of Dell and van Melkebeek [15] on sparsification for SATISFIABILITY has led to important advances in the area of kernelization lower bounds. They proved that for all $\epsilon > 0$ and $q \geq 3$, assuming $\text{NP} \not\subseteq \text{coNP/poly}$, there is no polynomial-time algorithm that maps an instance of q -CNF-SAT on n variables to an equivalent instance on $\mathcal{O}(n^{q-\epsilon})$ bits — not even if it is an instance of a *different* problem.

This paper deals with sparsification for the task of building minimum-width tree decompositions of graphs, or, in the setting of decision problems, of determining whether the treewidth of a graph G is bounded by a given integer k .

^{*} This work was supported by ERC Starting Grant 306992 “Parameterized Approximation”.

Preprocessing procedures for TREEWIDTH have been studied in applied [10,11,26] and theoretical settings [3,7]. A team including the current author obtained [7] a polynomial-time algorithm that takes an instance (G, k) of TREEWIDTH, and produces in polynomial time a graph G' such that $\text{TW}(G) \leq k$ if and only if $\text{TW}(G') \leq k$, with the guarantee that $|V(G')| \in \mathcal{O}(\text{vc}^3)$ (vc denotes the size of a smallest vertex cover of the input graph). A similar algorithm was given that reduces the vertex count of G' to $\mathcal{O}(\text{FVS}^4)$, where FVS is the size of a smallest feedback vertex set in G . Hence polynomial-time data reduction can compress TREEWIDTH instances to a number of vertices polynomial in their vertex cover (respectively feedback vertex) number. On the other hand, the natural parameterization of TREEWIDTH is trivially AND-compositional, and therefore does not admit a polynomial kernel unless $\text{NP} \subseteq \text{coNP/poly}$ [3,17]. These results give an indication of how far the vertex count of a TREEWIDTH instance can efficiently be reduced in terms of various measures of its complexity. However, they do not tell us anything about the question of *sparsification*: can we efficiently make a TREEWIDTH instance less dense, without changing its answer?

Our results. Our first goal in this paper is to determine whether nontrivial sparsification is possible for TREEWIDTH instances. As a simple graph G on n vertices can be encoded in n^2 bits through its adjacency matrix, TREEWIDTH instances consisting of a graph G and integer k in the range $[1 \dots n]$ can be encoded in $\mathcal{O}(n^2)$ bits. We prove that it is unlikely that this trivial sparsification scheme for TREEWIDTH can be improved significantly: if there is a polynomial-time algorithm that reduces TREEWIDTH instances on n vertices to equivalent instances of an arbitrary problem, with $\mathcal{O}(n^{2-\epsilon})$ bits, for some $\epsilon > 0$, then $\text{NP} \subseteq \text{coNP/poly}$ and the polynomial hierarchy collapses [27]. We prove this result by giving a particularly efficient form of OR-cross-composition [9]. We embed the OR of t n -vertex instances of an NP-complete graph problem into a TREEWIDTH instance with $\mathcal{O}(n\sqrt{t})$ vertices. The construction is a combination of three ingredients. We carefully inspect the properties of Arnborg et al.'s [1] NP-completeness proof for TREEWIDTH to obtain an NP-complete source problem called COBIPARTITE GRAPH ELIMINATION that is amenable to composition. Its instances have a restricted form that ensures that good solutions to the composed TREEWIDTH instance cannot be obtained by combining partial solutions to two different inputs. Then, like Dell and Marx [14], we use the layout of a $2 \times \sqrt{t}$ table to embed t instances into a graph on $\mathcal{O}(n^{\mathcal{O}(1)}\sqrt{t})$ vertices. For each way of choosing a cell in the top and bottom row, we embed one instance into the edge set induced by the vertices representing the two cells. Finally, we use ideas employed by Bodlaender et al. [8] in the superpolynomial lower bound for TREEWIDTH parameterized by the vertex-deletion distance to a clique: we compose the input instances of COBIPARTITE GRAPH ELIMINATION into a cobipartite graph to let the resulting TREEWIDTH instance express a logical OR, rather than an AND. Our proof combines these three ingredients with an intricate analysis of the behavior of elimination orders on the constructed instance. As the treewidth of the constructed cobipartite graph equals its pathwidth [23], the obtained sparsification lower bound for TREEWIDTH also applies to PATHWIDTH.

Our sparsification lower bound has immediate consequences for parameterizations of TREEWIDTH by graph parameters that do not exceed the vertex count, such as the vertex cover number or the feedback vertex number. Our result shows the impossibility of obtaining kernels of bitsize $\mathcal{O}(k^{2-\epsilon})$ for such parameterized problems, assuming $\text{NP} \not\subseteq \text{coNP/poly}$. The kernel for TREEWIDTH parameterized by vertex cover (TREEWIDTH [VC]) obtained by Bodlaender et al. [6] contains $\mathcal{O}(\text{vc}^3)$ vertices, and therefore has bitsize $\Omega(\text{vc}^4)$. Motivated by the impossibility of obtaining kernels with $\mathcal{O}(\text{vc}^{2-\epsilon})$ bits, and with the aim of developing new reduction rules that are useful in practice, we further investigate kernelization for TREEWIDTH [VC]. We give an improved kernel based on *treewidth-invariant sets*: independent sets of vertices whose elimination from the graph has a predictable effect on its treewidth. While finding such sets seems to be hard in general, we show that the q -expansion lemma, previously employed by Thomassé [25] and Fomin et al. [19], can be used to find them when the graph is large with respect to its vertex cover number. The resulting kernel shrinks TREEWIDTH instances to $\mathcal{O}(\text{vc}^2)$ vertices, allowing them to be encoded in $\mathcal{O}(\text{vc}^3)$ bits. Thus we reduce the gap between the upper and lower bounds on kernel sizes for TREEWIDTH [VC]. Our new reduction rule for TREEWIDTH [VC] relates to the old rules like the crown-rule for k -VERTEX COVER relates to the high-degree Buss-rule [12]: by exploiting local optimality considerations, our reduction rule does not need to know the value of k .

Related work. While there is an abundance of superpolynomial kernel lower bounds, few superlinear lower bounds are known for problems admitting polynomial kernels. There are results for hitting set problems [15], packing problems [14,20], and for domination problems on degenerate graphs [13].

2 Preliminaries

Parameterized complexity and kernels. A parameterized problem \mathcal{Q} is a subset of $\Sigma^* \times \mathbb{N}$. The second component of a tuple $(x, k) \in \Sigma^* \times \mathbb{N}$ is called the *parameter* [16,18]. The set $\{1, 2, \dots, n\}$ is abbreviated as $[n]$. For a finite set X and integer i we use $\binom{X}{i}$ to denote the collection of size- i subsets of X .

Definition 1 (Generalized kernelization). *Let $\mathcal{Q}, \mathcal{Q}' \subseteq \Sigma^* \times \mathbb{N}$ be parameterized problems and let $h: \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ be a computable function. A generalized kernelization for \mathcal{Q} into \mathcal{Q}' of size $h(k)$ is an algorithm that, on input $(x, k) \in \Sigma^* \times \mathbb{N}$, takes time polynomial in $|x| + k$ and outputs an instance (x', k') such that:*

- $|x'|$ and k' are bounded by $h(k)$.
- $(x', k') \in \mathcal{Q}'$ if and only if $(x, k) \in \mathcal{Q}$.

The algorithm is a kernelization, or in short a kernel, for \mathcal{Q} if $\mathcal{Q}' = \mathcal{Q}$. It is a polynomial (generalized) kernelization if $h(k)$ is a polynomial.

Cross-composition. To prove our sparsification lower bound, we use a variant of cross-composition tailored towards lower bounds on the degree of the polynomial in a kernel size bound. The extension is discussed in the journal version [9] of the extended abstract on cross-composition [6].

Definition 2 (Polynomial equivalence relation). An equivalence relation \mathcal{R} on Σ^* is called a polynomial equivalence relation if the following conditions hold:

1. There is an algorithm that given two strings $x, y \in \Sigma^*$ decides whether x and y belong to the same equivalence class in time polynomial in $|x| + |y|$.
2. For any finite set $S \subseteq \Sigma^*$ the equivalence relation \mathcal{R} partitions the elements of S into a number of classes that is polynomially bounded in the size of the largest element of S .

Definition 3 (Cross-composition). Let $L \subseteq \Sigma^*$ be a language, let \mathcal{R} be a polynomial equivalence relation on Σ^* , let $\mathcal{Q} \subseteq \Sigma^* \times \mathbb{N}$ be a parameterized problem, and let $f: \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ be a function. An OR-cross-composition of L into \mathcal{Q} (with respect to \mathcal{R}) of cost $f(t)$ is an algorithm that, given t instances $x_1, x_2, \dots, x_t \in \Sigma^*$ of L belonging to the same equivalence class of \mathcal{R} , takes time polynomial in $\sum_{i=1}^t |x_i|$ and outputs an instance $(y, k) \in \Sigma^* \times \mathbb{N}$ such that:

- The parameter k is bounded by $\mathcal{O}(f(t) \cdot (\max_i |x_i|)^c)$, where c is some constant independent of t .
- $(y, k) \in \mathcal{Q}$ if and only if there is an $i \in [t]$ such that $x_i \in L$.

Theorem 1 ([9, Theorem 6]). Let $L \subseteq \Sigma^*$ be a language, let $\mathcal{Q} \subseteq \Sigma^* \times \mathbb{N}$ be a parameterized problem, and let d, ϵ be positive reals. If L is NP-hard under Karp reductions, has an OR-cross-composition into \mathcal{Q} with cost $f(t) = t^{1/d+o(1)}$, where t denotes the number of instances, and \mathcal{Q} has a polynomial (generalized) kernelization with size bound $\mathcal{O}(k^{d-\epsilon})$, then $NP \subseteq coNP/poly$.

Graphs. All graphs we consider are finite, simple, and undirected. An undirected graph G consists of a vertex set $V(G)$ and an edge set $E(G) \subseteq \binom{V(G)}{2}$. The open neighborhood of a vertex v in graph G is denoted $N_G(v)$, while its closed neighborhood is $N_G[v]$. The open neighborhood of a set $S \subseteq V(G)$ is $N_G(S) := \bigcup_{v \in S} N_G(v) \setminus S$, while the closed neighborhood is $N_G[S] := N_G(S) \cup S$. If $S \subseteq V(G)$ then $G[S]$ denotes the subgraph of G induced by S . We use $G - S$ to denote the graph $G[V(G) \setminus S]$ that results after deleting all vertices of S and their incident edges from G . A graph is *cobipartite* if its edge-complement is bipartite. Equivalently, a graph G is cobipartite if its vertex set can be partitioned into two sets X and Y , such that both $G[X]$ and $G[Y]$ are cliques. A matching M in a graph G is a set of edges whose endpoints are all distinct. The endpoints of the edges in M are *saturated* by the matching. For disjoint subsets A and B of a graph G , we say that A has a perfect matching into B if there is a matching that saturates $A \cup B$ such that each edge in the matching has exactly one endpoint in each set. If $\{u, v\}$ is an edge in graph G , then *contracting* $\{u, v\}$ into u is the operation of adding edges between u and $N_G(v)$ while removing v . A graph H is a *minor* of a graph G , if H can be obtained from a subgraph of G by edge contractions.

Treewidth and Elimination Orders. While treewidth [2] is commonly defined in terms of tree decompositions, for our purposes it is more convenient to

work with an alternative characterization in terms of *elimination orders*. *Eliminating* a vertex v in a graph G is the operation of removing v while completing its open neighborhood into a clique, i.e., adding all missing edges between neighbors of v . An elimination order of an n -vertex graph G is a permutation $\pi: V(G) \rightarrow [n]$ of its vertices. Given an elimination order π of G , we obtain a series of graphs by consecutively eliminating $\pi^{-1}(1), \dots, \pi^{-1}(n)$ from G . The *cost* of eliminating a vertex v according to the order π , is the size of the *closed neighborhood* of v at the moment it is eliminated. The *cost of π on G* , denoted $c_G(\pi)$, is defined as the maximum cost over all vertices of G .

Theorem 2 ([2, Theorem 36]). *The treewidth of a graph G is exactly one less than the minimum cost of an elimination order for G .*

Lemma 1 ([4, Lemma 4], cf. [22, Lemma 6.13]). *Let G be a graph containing a clique $B \subseteq V(G)$, and let $A := V(G) \setminus B$. There is a minimum-cost elimination order π^* of G that eliminates all vertices of A before eliminating any vertex of B .*

Following the notation employed by Arnborg et al. [1] in their NP-completeness proof, we say that a *block* in a graph G is a maximal set of vertices with the same closed neighborhood. An elimination order π for G is *block-contiguous* if for each block $S \subseteq V(G)$, it eliminates the vertices of S contiguously. The following observation implies that every graph has a block-contiguous minimum-cost elimination order.

Observation 1 *Let G be a graph containing two adjacent vertices u, v such that $N_G[u] \subseteq N_G[v]$. Let π be an elimination order of G that eliminates v before u , and let the order π' be obtained by updating π such that it eliminates u just before v . Then the cost of π' is not higher than the cost of π .*

3 Sparsification Lower Bound for Treewidth

In this section we give the sparsification lower bound for TREEWIDTH. We phrase it in terms of a kernelization lower bound for the parameterization by the number of vertices, formally defined as follows.

n -TREEWIDTH

Input: An integer n , an n -vertex graph G , and an integer k .

Parameter: The number of vertices n .

Question: Is the treewidth of G at most k ?

The remainder of this section is devoted to the proof of the following theorem.

Theorem 3. *If n -TREEWIDTH admits a (generalized) kernel of size $\mathcal{O}(n^{2-\epsilon})$, for some $\epsilon > 0$, then $NP \subseteq coNP/poly$.*

We prove the theorem by cross-composition. We therefore first define a suitable source problem for the composition in Section 3.1, give the construction of the composed instance in Section 3.2, analyze its properties in Section 3.3, and finally put it all together in Section 3.4.

3.1 The Source Problem

The sparsification lower bound for TREEWIDTH will be established by cross-composing the following problem into it.

COBIPARTITE GRAPH ELIMINATION

Input: A cobipartite graph G with partite sets A and B , and a positive integer k , such that the following holds: $|A| = |B|$, $|A|$ is even, $k < \frac{|A|}{2}$, and A has a perfect matching into B .

Question: Is there an elimination order for G of cost at most $|A| + k$?

The NP-completeness proof extends the completeness proof for TREEWIDTH [1].

Lemma 2. COBIPARTITE GRAPH ELIMINATION is NP-complete.

Proof. Membership in NP is trivial. To establish completeness, we use the connection between treewidth and elimination orders. The instances created by the NP-completeness proof for TREEWIDTH due to Arnborg et al. [1] are close to satisfying the desired conditions. In Section 3 of their paper, Arnborg et al. [1] reduce the CUTWIDTH problem to TREEWIDTH. They show how to transform an n -vertex graph G with maximum degree Δ into a cobipartite graph G' with partite sets A and B of size $(\Delta + 1)n$, such that G has cutwidth at most k if and only if G' has treewidth at most $(\Delta + 1)(n + 1) + k - 1 = |A| + \Delta + k$. By Theorem 2 the latter happens if and only if G' has an elimination order of cost at most $|A| + \Delta + k + 1$. It is easy to verify that their construction results in a graph with a perfect matching between the sets A and B .

Using this information we prove the NP-completeness of COBIPARTITE GRAPH ELIMINATION. We reduce from CUTWIDTH3 (cf. [8, §5]), the cutwidth problem on subcubic graphs, which is known to be NP-complete [24, Corollary 2.10]. Given an instance (G, k) of CUTWIDTH3, let n be the number of vertices in G . As the cutwidth of a graph does not exceed its edge count, and a subcubic n -vertex graph has at most $3n$ edges, we may output a constant-size YES-instance if $k \geq 3n$. In the remainder we therefore have $k < 3n$. Form a new graph G^* as the disjoint union of 20 copies of G . The resulting graph G^* has $20n$ vertices, and its maximum degree is $\Delta \leq 3$. As the cutwidth of a graph is the maximum cutwidth of its connected components, graph G^* has cutwidth at most k if and only if (G, k) is a YES-instance. Now apply the transformation by Arnborg et al. to the instance (G^*, k) . It results in a cobipartite graph G' with partite sets A' and B' of size $(\Delta + 1)20n$, such that G' has an elimination order of cost $|A'| + \Delta + k + 1$ if and only if (G, k) is a YES-instance. The construction ensures that G' has a perfect matching between A' and B' . Now put $k' := \Delta + k + 1 < 4 + 3n \leq \frac{|A'|}{2}$. It is easy to see that $|A'|$ is even. The resulting instance (G', A', B', k') of COBIPARTITE GRAPH ELIMINATION therefore satisfies all constraints. As G' has an elimination order of cost at most $|A'| + k'$ if and only if (G, k) has cutwidth at most three, this completes the proof. \square

3.2 The Construction

We start by defining an appropriate polynomial equivalence relationship \mathcal{R} . Let all malformed instances be equivalent under \mathcal{R} , and let two valid instances of COBIPARTITE GRAPH ELIMINATION be equivalent if they agree on the sizes of the partite sets and on the value of k . This is easily verified to be a polynomial equivalence relation.

Now we define an algorithm that combines a sequence of equivalent inputs into a small output instance. As a constant-size NO-instance is a valid output when the input consists of solely malformed instances, in the remainder we assume that the inputs are well-formed. By duplicating some inputs, we may assume that the number of input instances t is a square, i.e., $t = r^2$ for some integer r . An input instance can therefore be indexed by two integers in the range $[r]$. Accordingly, let the input consist of instances $(G_{i,j}, A_{i,j}, B_{i,j}, k_{i,j})$ for $i, j \in [r]$, that are equivalent under \mathcal{R} . Thus the number of vertices is the same over all partite sets; let this be $n = |A_{i,j}| = |B_{i,j}|$ for all $i, j \in [r]$. Similarly, let k be the common target value for all inputs. For each partite set $A_{i,j}$ and $B_{i,j}$ in the input, label the vertices arbitrarily as $a_{i,j}^1, \dots, a_{i,j}^n$ (respectively $b_{i,j}^1, \dots, b_{i,j}^n$). We construct a cobipartite graph G' that expresses the OR of all the inputs, as follows.

1. For $i \in [r]$ make a vertex set A'_i containing n vertices $\hat{a}_i^1, \dots, \hat{a}_i^n$.
2. For $i \in [r]$ make a vertex set B'_i containing n vertices $\hat{b}_i^1, \dots, \hat{b}_i^n$.
3. Turn $\bigcup_{i \in [r]} A'_i$ into a clique. Turn $\bigcup_{i \in [r]} B'_i$ into a clique.
4. For each pair i, j with $i, j \in [r]$, we embed the adjacency of $G_{i,j}$ into G' as follows: for $p, q \in [n]$ make an edge $\{\hat{a}_i^p, \hat{b}_j^q\}$ if $\{a_{i,j}^p, b_{i,j}^q\} \in E(G_{i,j})$.

It is easy to see that at this point in the construction, graph G' is cobipartite. For any $i, j \in [r]$ the induced subgraph $G'[A'_i \cup B'_j]$ is isomorphic to $G_{i,j}$ by mapping \hat{a}_i^ℓ to $a_{i,j}^\ell$ and \hat{b}_j^ℓ to $b_{i,j}^\ell$. As $G_{i,j}$ has a perfect matching between $A_{i,j}$ and $B_{i,j}$ by the definition of COBIPARTITE GRAPH ELIMINATION, this implies that G' has a perfect matching between A'_i and B'_j for all $i, j \in [r]$. These properties will be maintained during the remainder of the construction.

5. For each $i \in [r]$, add the following vertices to G' :
 - n *checking vertices* $C'_i = \{c_i^1, \dots, c_i^n\}$, all adjacent to B'_i .
 - n *dummy vertices* $D'_i = \{d_i^1, \dots, d_i^n\}$, all adjacent to $\bigcup_{j \in [r]} A'_j$ and to C'_i .
 - $\frac{n}{2}$ *blinker vertices* $X'_i = \{x_i^1, \dots, x_i^{n/2}\}$, all adjacent to A'_i .
6. Turn $\bigcup_{i \in [r]} A'_i \cup C'_i$ into a clique A' . Turn $\bigcup_{i \in [r]} B'_i \cup D'_i \cup X'_i$ into a clique B' .

The resulting graph G' is cobipartite with partite sets A' and B' . Define $k' := 3rn + \frac{n}{2} + k$. Observe that $|A'| = 2rn$ and that $|B'| = 2rn + \frac{rn}{2}$. Graph G' can easily be constructed in time polynomial in the total size of the input instances.

Intuition. Let us discuss the intuition behind the construction before proceeding to its formal analysis. To create a composition, we have to relate elimination orders in G' to those for input graphs $G_{i,j}$. All adjacency information

of the input graphs $G_{i,j}$ is present in G' . As A' is a clique in G' , by Lemma 1 there is a minimum-cost elimination order for G' that starts by eliminating all of B' . But when eliminating vertices of some B'_{j^*} from G' , they interact simultaneously with all sets A'_i ($i \in [r]$), so the cost of those eliminations is not directly related to the cost of elimination orders of a particular instance G_{i^*,j^*} . We therefore want to ensure that low-cost elimination orders for G' first “blank out” the adjacency of B' to all but one set A'_{i^*} , so that the cost of afterwards eliminating B'_{j^*} tells us something about the cost of eliminating G'_{i^*,j^*} . To blank out the other adjacencies, we need earlier eliminations to make B' adjacent to all vertices of $\bigcup_{i \in [r] \setminus \{i^*\}} A'_i$. These adjacencies will be created by eliminating the *blinker* vertices. For an index $i \in [r]$, vertices in X'_i are adjacent to A'_i and all of B' . Hence eliminating a vertex in X'_i indeed blanks out the adjacency of B' to A'_i . The weights of the various groups (simulated by duplicating vertices with identical closed neighborhoods) have been chosen such that low-cost elimination orders of G' starting with B' , have to eliminate $r - 1$ blocks of blankers $X'_{i_1}, \dots, X'_{i_{r-1}}$ before eliminating any other vertex of B' . This creates the desired blanking-out effect. The checking vertices C'_i ($i \in [r]$) enforce that after eliminating $r - 1$ blocks of blankers, an elimination order cannot benefit by mixing vertices from two or more sets B'_i, B'_j : each set B'_i from which a vertex is eliminated, introduces new adjacencies between B' and C'_i . Finally, the dummy vertices are used to ensure that after one set $B'_i \cup D'_i$ is completely eliminated, the cost of eliminating the remainder is small because $|B'|$ has decreased sufficiently.

3.3 Properties of the Constructed Instance

The following type of elimination orders of G' will be crucial in the proof.

Definition 4. Let $i^*, j^* \in [r]$. An elimination order π' of G' is (i^*, j^*) -canonical if π' eliminates $V(G)$ in the following order:

1. first all blocks of blinker vertices X'_i for $i \in [r] \setminus \{i^*\}$, one block at a time,
2. then the vertices of B'_{j^*} , followed by dummies D'_{j^*} , followed by blankers X'_{i^*} ,
3. alternately a block B'_i followed by the corresponding dummies D'_i , until all remaining vertices of $\bigcup_{i \in [r]} B'_i \cup D'_i$ have been eliminated,
4. and finishes with the vertices $\bigcup_{i \in [r]} A'_i \cup C'_i$ in arbitrary order.

Lemma 3 shows that the crucial part of a canonical elimination order is its behavior on B'_{j^*} .

Lemma 3. Let π' be an (i^*, j^*) -canonical elimination order for G' .

1. No vertex that is eliminated before the first vertex of B'_{j^*} costs more than $3rn$.
2. When a vertex of $D'_{j^*} \cup X'_{i^*}$ is eliminated, its cost does not exceed $3rn + \frac{n}{2}$.
3. No vertex that is eliminated after X'_{i^*} costs more than $3rn$.

Proof. (1) By Definition 4, all vertices eliminated before B'_{j^*} are blinker vertices. The elimination of a vertex v in a block X'_i turns $N(v)$ into a clique and

removes v . As A' and B' are cliques from the start, no extra edges can be introduced between members of A' or between members of B' . When considering the effects of eliminating vertices from B' , we therefore only have to consider which vertices of B' become adjacent to vertices in A' . As blanker vertices are not adjacent to checking vertices, no elimination of a blanker vertex introduces adjacencies to sets C'_j for any $j \in [r]$. Eliminating X'_i effectively makes all remaining vertices in B' adjacent to A'_i , as X'_i and A'_i are adjacent by construction. With these insights we prove the first item of the lemma.

Consider the situation when $0 \leq \ell < r - 1$ blocks of blankers $X'_{i_1}, \dots, X'_{i_\ell}$ have already been eliminated, and we are about to eliminate a blanker vertex v_B in the next block $X'_{i_{\ell+1}}$. Then $N[v]$ contains all remaining vertices in B' , of which there are $|B'| - \ell \cdot \frac{n}{2} = 2rn + \frac{(r-\ell)n}{2}$. Now consider the neighborhood of v_B in A' . As observed above, $N[v_B]$ does not contain checking vertices. When it comes to adjacencies into $\bigcup_{i \in [r]} A'_i$, vertex v_B in block $X'_{i_{\ell+1}}$ is adjacent to $A'_{i_{\ell+1}}$, and to the blocks $A'_{i_1}, \dots, A'_{i_\ell}$ for the blankers $X'_{i_1}, \dots, X'_{i_\ell}$ that have previously been eliminated. Hence v_B has $(\ell+1)n$ neighbors in A' . Summing up the contributions from the two partite sets, we find $|N[v]| = 2rn + \frac{(r-\ell)n}{2} + (\ell+1)n = 3rn + \frac{(\ell-r)n}{2} + n$. The largest value is attained when the last block of blankers unequal to X'_{i^*} is about to be eliminated; at that point $\ell = r - 2$ blocks have been eliminated already, which results in a cost of $3rn$ for the first vertex of the last block that is eliminated. The other vertices $X'_{i_{\ell+1}}$ are eliminated immediately after v , by Definition 4. Hence their closed neighborhood at time of elimination is smaller than that of v : elimination of v does not introduce any new adjacencies for vertices with the same closed neighborhood as v . Hence the remaining vertices of $X'_{i_{\ell+1}}$ cost less than v . Thus the cost of eliminating the vertices before B'_{j^*} does not exceed $3rn$.

(2) Let G'_B be the graph that is obtained from G' by eliminating according to π' until just after the last vertex of B'_{j^*} . Then G'_B contains exactly one block of blankers X'_{i^*} , as all other sets have been eliminated before B'_{j^*} . It does not contain B'_{j^*} as it was just eliminated. The elimination of B'_{j^*} has made the remainder of B' adjacent to $\bigcup_{i \in [r]} A'_i$, as B'_{j^*} has a perfect matching into A'_i for all $i \in [r]$. According to Definition 4, elimination order π' eliminates D'_{j^*} just after B'_{j^*} . At that point, the neighborhood of the dummy vertices D'_{j^*} into $\bigcup_{j \in [r]} C'_j$ is exactly C'_{j^*} : they were initially adjacent, the eliminated blanker vertices were not adjacent to any checking vertices, and the eliminated vertices from B'_{j^*} see only the checking vertices C'_{j^*} , by construction. Hence the cost of eliminating the first dummy vertex in D'_{j^*} is $|bigcup_{j \in [r] \setminus \{j^*\}} B'_j \cup D'_{j^*}| + |D'_{j^*}| + |X'_{i^*}| + |\bigcup_{i \in [r]} A'_i| + |C'_{j^*}|$, which is $2(r-1)n + n + \frac{n}{2} + rn + n = 3rn + \frac{n}{2}$. As the other dummy vertices in D'_{j^*} have exactly the same closed neighborhood, their elimination is not more expensive.

By Definition 4, order π' follows the elimination of D'_{j^*} by eliminating X'_{i^*} . At the time of elimination, $N[X'_{i^*}] \cap B'$ has size $|\bigcup_{j \in [r] \setminus \{j^*\}} B'_j \cup D'_{j^*}| + |X'_{i^*}| = 2(r-1)n + \frac{n}{2}$. Vertices in X'_{i^*} are adjacent to $\bigcup_{i \in [r]} A'_i$, and to exactly one set of checking vertices, namely C'_{j^*} ; the elimination of B'_{j^*} has introduced these

adjacencies. Hence the cost of eliminating the first vertex of X'_{i^*} is $2(r-1)n + \frac{n}{2} + rn + n = 3rn - \frac{n}{2}$. As the other vertices in X'_{i^*} have the same neighborhood, they are not more expensive. In summary, no vertex of $D'_{j^*} \cup X'_{i^*}$ costs more than $3rn + \frac{n}{2}$ when eliminated.

(3) Let G'_X be the graph that is obtained from G' by eliminating according to π' until just after the last vertex of X'_{i^*} . Then G'_X does not contain any blanker vertices, as all such sets have been eliminated. Similarly, it does not contain B'_{j^*} or D'_{j^*} . The eliminations up until X'_{i^*} have made all of B' adjacent to $\bigcup_{i \in [r]} A'_i$. Vertices in a set $B'_j \cup D'_j$ for $j \neq j^*$ are adjacent to the checking vertices C'_j (by construction) and C'_{j^*} (because the elimination of B'_{j^*} introduced these adjacencies), but to no other checking vertices. Now consider the first vertex v that is eliminated after X'_{i^*} ; by Definition 4 it is contained in some set B'_j with $j \neq j^*$. As no blanker vertex remains, and $B'_{j^*} \cup D'_{j^*}$ have been eliminated, there are exactly $2rn - 2n$ vertices left in B' . Vertex v is adjacent to all rn vertices in $\bigcup_{i \in [r]} A'_i$, to C'_{j^*} and to the checking vertices corresponding to its own index. Hence the cost of v is $2rn - 2n + rn + n + n = 3rn$. The cost of the succeeding blankers D'_j in the same block is not more than that of v .

When eliminating the next group $B'_{j'}$, observe that $2n$ neighbors have been lost in B' (the set $B'_j \cup D'_j$ that was eliminated), whereas only n new neighbors have been introduced (the set $C'_{j'}$). Hence the cost of later groups of vertices $B'_{j'}$ does not exceed the cost of v , and so does not exceed $3rn$. Finally, when all of B' has been eliminated then only the vertex set A' of size $2rn$ remains. At that point, no vertex can have cost more than $2rn$ as there are only $2rn$ vertices left in the graph. Thus the cost of eliminating A' satisfies the claimed bound, after which the entire graph is eliminated. \square

The next lemma links this behavior to the cost of a related elimination order for G_{i^*,j^*} . Some terminology is needed. Consider an (i^*, j^*) -canonical elimination order π' for G' , and an elimination order π for G_{i^*,j^*} that eliminates all vertices of B_{i^*,j^*} before any vertex of A_{i^*,j^*} . By numbering the vertices in B_{i^*,j^*} (a partite set of G_{i^*,j^*}) from 1 to n , we created a one-to-one correspondence between B_{i^*,j^*} and B'_{j^*} , the first set of non-blanker vertices eliminated by π' . Hence we can compare the relative order in which vertices of B_{i^*,j^*} are eliminated in π and π' . If both π and π' eliminate the vertices of B_{i^*,j^*} in the same relative order, then we say that the elimination orders *agree on* B_{i^*,j^*} .

Lemma 4. *Let π' be an (i^*, j^*) -canonical elimination order of G' . Let π be an elimination order for G_{i^*,j^*} that eliminates all vertices of B_{i^*,j^*} before any vertex of A_{i^*,j^*} . If π' and π agree on B_{i^*,j^*} , then $c_{G'}(\pi') = 3rn + \frac{n}{2} - n + c_{G_{i^*,j^*}}(\pi)$.*

Proof. Consider the graph G'_B obtained from G' by performing the eliminations according to π' until we are about to eliminate the first vertex of B'_{j^*} . By Definition 4 this means that all blocks of blankers X'_j for $j \neq j^*$ have been eliminated, and no other vertices. Using the construction of G' it is easy to verify that these eliminations have made all remaining vertices of B' adjacent to $\bigcup_{i \in [r] \setminus \{i^*\}} A'_i$, and that no new adjacencies have been introduced to $\bigcup_{i \in [r]} C'_i$

or to A'_{i^*} . Graph $G'[A'_{i^*} \cup B'_{j^*}]$ was initially isomorphic to G_{i^*,j^*} by the obvious isomorphism based on the numbers assigned to the vertices. As no vertex adjacent to A'_{i^*} has been eliminated yet, this also holds for $G'_B[A'_{i^*} \cup B'_{j^*}]$.

Consider what happens when eliminating the first vertex v' of B'_{j^*} according to π' . Let $v \in B_{i^*,j^*}$ be the corresponding vertex in G_{i^*,j^*} . By the fact that the elimination orders agree, v is the first vertex of B_{i^*,j^*} to be eliminated under π .

The set $N_{G'_B}[v']$ contains C'_{j^*} , $\bigcup_{j \neq j^*} B'_j \cup D'_j$, $\bigcup_{i \neq i^*} A'_i$, X'_{i^*} , D'_{j^*} , and the vertices of $G'[A'_{i^*} \cup B'_{j^*}]$ that correspond exactly to $N_{G_{i^*,j^*}}[v]$ by the isomorphism. So the cost of eliminating v' from G' exceeds the cost of eliminating v from G_{i^*,j^*} by exactly $|C'_{j^*}| + |\bigcup_{j \neq j^*} B'_j \cup D'_j| + |\bigcup_{i \neq i^*} A'_i| + |X'_{i^*}| + |D'_{j^*}| = n + 2(r-1)n + (r-1)n + \frac{n}{2} + n = 3rn + \frac{n}{2} - n$. Now observe that by the isomorphism, eliminating v' from G' has exactly the same effect on the neighborhoods of B'_{j^*} into A'_{i^*} , as eliminating v from G_{i^*,j^*} has on the neighborhoods of B_{i^*,j^*} into A_{i^*,j^*} . Thus after one elimination, the remaining vertices of $A'_{i^*} \cup B'_{j^*}$ and $A_{i^*,j^*} \cup B_{i^*,j^*}$ induce subgraphs of G' and G_{i^*,j^*} that are isomorphic. Hence we may apply the same argument to the next vertex that is eliminated. Repeating this argument we establish that for each vertex in B'_{j^*} , its elimination from G' costs exactly $3rn + \frac{n}{2} - n$ more than the corresponding elimination in G_{i^*,j^*} .

Now consider the cost of π on G_{i^*,j^*} : it is at least $n+1$, as the first vertex to be eliminated is adjacent to all of B_{i^*,j^*} (the graph is cobipartite) and to at least one vertex of A_{i^*,j^*} (since the COBIPARTITE GRAPH ELIMINATION instance G_{i^*,j^*} has a perfect matching between its two partite sets). After all vertices of B_{i^*,j^*} have been eliminated from G_{i^*,j^*} , the remaining vertices cost at most n ; there are at most n vertices left in the graph at that point. Hence the cost of π on G_{i^*,j^*} is determined by the cost of eliminating B_{i^*,j^*} . For each vertex from that set that is eliminated, π' incurs a cost exactly $3rn + \frac{n}{2} - n$ higher. Hence $c_{G'}(\pi')$ is at least $(3rn + \frac{n}{2} - n) + (n+1) = 3rn + \frac{n}{2} + 1$. By Lemma 3 the cost that π' incurs before eliminating the first vertex of B'_{j^*} is at most $3rn$, the cost of eliminating $D'_{j^*} \cup X'_{i^*}$ is at most $3rn + \frac{n}{2}$, and the cost incurred after eliminating the last vertex of B'_{j^*} is at most $3rn$. Hence the cost of π' is determined by the cost of eliminating the vertices of B'_{j^*} . As this is exactly $3rn + \frac{n}{2} - n$ more than the cost of π on G_{i^*,j^*} , this proves the lemma. \square

The last technical step of the proof is to show that if G' has an elimination order of cost at most k' , then it has such an order that is canonical.

Lemma 5. *If G' has an elimination order of cost at most k' , then there are indices $i^*, j^* \in [r]$ such that G' has an (i^*, j^*) -canonical elimination order of cost at most k' .*

Proof. Let π' be an elimination order for G' of cost at most k' . As A' is a clique in G' , we may assume by Lemma 1 that π' eliminates all vertices of B' before any vertex of A' (Property 1). As each set X'_i forms a block in G' , by Observation 1 we can adapt π' such that it eliminates the vertices of a set X'_i contiguously for all $i \in [r]$ (Property 2). Note that for $i \in [r]$ and vertices $d \in D'_i$ and $u \in B'_i$, we have $N_G[u] \subseteq N_G[d]$ by construction. Hence by Observation 1 we

may assume that when a dummy $d \in D'_i$ is about to be eliminated, all vertices of the corresponding set B'_i are already eliminated (Property 3). Using these structural properties we proceed with the proof.

Consider the process of eliminating G' by π' . At some point, π' has eliminated $r - 2$ distinct blocks of blankers $X'_{i_1}, \dots, X'_{i_{r-2}}$. Consider the first vertex v_B of the blanker $X'_{i_{r-1}}$ that is eliminated after that point, and note that possibly non-blanker vertices are eliminated in between. Let G'_B be the graph obtained from G' by eliminating all vertices before v_B .

Claim 1 *Graph G'_B still contains the vertices $\bigcup_{i \in [r]} B'_i \cup D'_i$: no vertex in this set is eliminated before v_B .*

Proof. Assume for a contradiction that some vertex of $\bigcup_{i \in [r]} B'_i \cup D'_i$ is eliminated before v_B . We first show how to derive a contradiction when there is an index $i \in [r]$ such that B'_i is eliminated completely before v_B (Case 1). Afterwards we show how to derive a contradiction when at least one vertex of B'_i remains in G'_B for all $i \in [r]$ (Case 2).

Case 1. If there is an index j such that no vertex of B'_j remains in G'_B , then let j^* be the index of the first set B'_j to be eliminated from G' completely. Consider the moment when the last vertex u of B_{j^*} is eliminated. By our choice of j^* and Property 3, we know that no dummy vertex has been eliminated yet. So consider the closed neighborhood of u at the moment of its elimination. It contains all rn dummy vertices. As at least two blocks of blankers remain, $N[u]$ contains at least $\frac{2n}{2}$ blanker vertices. We claim that u has become adjacent to all vertices of $\bigcup_{i \in [r]} A'_i$. To see this, recall that u was the last vertex of B_{j^*} to be eliminated. As we observed during the construction of G' , there is a perfect matching between A'_i and B'_{j^*} for all $i \in [r]$. Hence for each vertex in $\bigcup_{i \in [r]} A'_i$, if u was not originally adjacent to it, then it has become adjacent to it by eliminating the vertex of B'_{j^*} that was matched to it. Thus u is indeed adjacent to all of $\bigcup_{i \in [r]} A'_i$. For each vertex in a set B'_j with $j \neq j^*$ that is eliminated before u , the elimination has made u adjacent to C'_j . By our choice of j^* , no such set B'_j is eliminated completely. Hence for each set B'_j with $j \neq j^*$ from which (less than n) vertices were eliminated, u has picked up n new neighbors in the set C'_j . So the number of neighbors of u in $\bigcup_{j \in [r] \setminus \{j^*\}} B'_j \cup C'_j$ is at least $(r-1)n$. Adding up the contribution of the blankers, of $\bigcup_{i \in [r]} A'_i$, of $\bigcup_{j \in [r] \setminus \{j^*\}} B'_j \cup C'_j$, and of C'_{j^*} , to $N[u]$, we find that $|N[u]| \geq \frac{2n}{2} + rn + rn + (r-1)n + n \geq 3rn + n$. This value exceeds k' , as $k < \frac{n}{2}$ by the definition of COBIPARTITE GRAPH ELIMINATION. Hence we find a contradiction to the assumption that π' has cost at most k' .

Case 2. Assume now that for each $j \in [r]$ at least one vertex of B'_j remains in G'_B , which implies by Property 3 that all dummies are present in G'_B . Recall that we assumed, for a contradiction, that some vertex u of $\bigcup_{j \in [r]} B'_j \cup D'_j$ was eliminated before v_B . As u is no dummy, it is contained in some set B'_{j^*} . By the adjacency of B'_{j^*} to C'_{j^*} , the elimination has made the blanker $X'_{i_{r-1}}$ adjacent to C'_{j^*} . We will show that this causes the cost of v_B to exceed k' .

To see this, consider the neighbors of v_B in the various sets. For each set B'_j from which vertices were eliminated, we have eliminated less than n vertices (at least one vertex remains by the precondition to this case). For those sets B'_j , the blankers $X'_{i_{r-1}}$ have picked up adjacencies to the corresponding checkers C'_j . Thus $|N[v_B] \cap (\bigcup_{j \in [r] \setminus \{j^*\}} B'_j \cup C'_j)| \geq (r-1)n$. As v_B is the first blanker vertex to be eliminated after $r-2$ blocks of blankers were already eliminated, there are two blocks of blankers left, giving $\frac{2n}{2}$ vertices in $N[v_B] \cap (\bigcup_{i \in [r]} X'_i)$. The prior eliminations of blankers $X'_{i_1}, \dots, X'_{i_{r-2}}$ made $X'_{i_{r-1}}$ adjacent to the corresponding sets $A'_{i_1}, \dots, A'_{i_{r-2}}$, and by construction $v_B \in X'_{i_{r-1}}$ is adjacent to $A'_{i_{r-1}}$. Now consider the remaining index $i_r \in [r] \setminus \{i_1, \dots, i_{r-1}\}$, and let $i^* := i_r$ for convenience.

Recall that B'_{j^*} has a perfect matching into A'_{i^*} by the construction of G' . Hence for each vertex u that was eliminated from B'_{j^*} , vertex v_B has become adjacent to u 's matching partner in the set A'_{i^*} . Hence, letting ℓ denote the number of vertices eliminated from B'_{j^*} , we know that v_B is adjacent to at least ℓ vertices in A'_{i^*} . Summing up the contributions of the blankers, the dummies, the set $(\bigcup_{i \in [r] \setminus \{j^*\}} B'_i \cup C'_i)$, the set C'_{j^*} , the set $\bigcup_{i \in [r] \setminus \{i^*\}} A'_i$, and the set $A'_{i^*} \cup B'_{j^*}$ to $|N[v_B]|$, we find that $|N[v_B]| \geq \frac{2n}{2} + rn + (r-1)n + n + (r-1)n + n \geq 3rn + n > k'$, which is a contradiction to the assumption that the cost of π' is at most k' .

As the two cases are exhaustive, we have established that when v_B is eliminated, all vertices of $\bigcup_{i \in [r]} B'_i \cup D'_i$ still remain in the graph G'_B . \diamond

We need two more claims to complete the proof of Lemma 5. As π' is block-contiguous with respect to the blankers (Property 2), after v_B it eliminates the rest of $X'_{i_{r-1}}$. Afterwards only a single group of blankers remains, say X'_{i_r} .

Claim 2 *After eliminating $X'_{i_{r-1}}$, order π' eliminates a vertex in $\bigcup_{i \in [r]} B'_i$.*

Proof. By Property 1, all vertices of B' are eliminated before any vertex of A' . Recall that B' consists of blankers $\bigcup_{i \in [r]} X'_i$ and the vertices $\bigcup_{i \in [r]} B'_i \cup D'_i$. As $X'_{i_{r-1}}$ is the $r-1$ -th block of blankers to be eliminated, afterwards the only vertices in B' remaining are X'_{i_r} and $\bigcup_{i \in [r]} B'_i \cup D'_i$. By Property 3, π' eliminates all vertices of B'_i before eliminating a dummy in the corresponding set D'_i . Hence if π' does not follow the elimination of $X'_{i_{r-1}}$ by a vertex of $\bigcup_{i \in [r]} B'_i$, it eliminates X'_{i_r} . If this is the case, then all blankers have been eliminated before eliminating any vertex of $\bigcup_{i \in [r]} B'_i \cup D'_i$. Now consider the first vertex u of $\bigcup_{i \in [r]} B'_i$ that is eliminated, and suppose it is contained in B'_{j^*} . Eliminating all blankers has made B'_{j^*} adjacent to all of $\bigcup_{i \in [r]} A'_i$. By construction B'_{j^*} is adjacent to the n checking vertices C'_{j^*} . By Property 3 it is adjacent to all dummies. Summing up the contributions of the dummies, of $\bigcup_{i \in [r]} B'_i$, of $\bigcup_{i \in [r]} A'_i$, and of the single set C'_{j^*} , to $N[u]$, we find that the cost of u is at least $rn + rn + rn + n > k'$; a contradiction. \diamond

Before proving the next claim, we make an observation. Let u be the first vertex of $\bigcup_{i \in [r]} B'_i$ that is eliminated by π' , and suppose that $u \in B'_{j^*}$. The

elimination of u makes the last group of blankers X'_{i_r} adjacent to the checking vertices C'_{j^*} , as B'_{j^*} is adjacent to C'_{j^*} . This implies that after the elimination of $u \in B'_{j^*}$, the closed neighborhood of X'_{i^*} is a superset of the closed neighborhood of a remaining vertex in B'_{j^*} . To see this, note that at that stage, X'_{i^*} is adjacent to the remainder of B' , to $\bigcup_{i \in [r] \setminus \{i^*\}} A'_i$ (by eliminating the previous blankers), to A'_{i^*} (by construction), and to C'_{j^*} (by eliminating u). On the other hand, vertices in B'_{j^*} see the remainder of B' , they see $\bigcup_{i \in [r] \setminus \{i^*\}} A'_i$, a subset of A'_{i^*} that depends on the edges in the graph G_{i^*, j^*} , and C'_{j^*} . Hence, by the same reasoning as in Observation 1, if a vertex $z \in X'_{i^*}$ is eliminated after the *first* vertex of B'_{j^*} (i.e., u) but before the *last* vertex of B'_{j^*} , then the cost of π' does not increase when eliminating all vertices of B'_{j^*} just before z . Hence we may assume that π' eliminates all of B'_{j^*} before any vertex of X'_{i^*} ; we call this Property 4. We use this in the proof of the following claim.

Claim 3 *All vertices of B'_{j^*} are eliminated before any vertex of $\bigcup_{j \in [r] \setminus \{j^*\}} B'_j$.*

Proof. By Property 4, all vertices of B'_{j^*} are eliminated before the last blanker X'_{i^*} . Now suppose that before eliminating the last vertex of B'_{j^*} , order π' eliminates some vertex $v \in B'_{j'}$ with $j' \neq j^*$. Let v be the first vertex with this property. By Property 4, all vertices in X'_{i^*} remain in the graph when v is eliminated. This causes the cost of v to exceed k' . To see this, observe that at the time of elimination, the closed neighborhood of v contains all rn dummy vertices (by Property 3), it contains the $\frac{n}{2}$ vertices of X'_{i^*} , it contains C'_{j^*} (by elimination of u) and $C'_{j'}$ (by construction), which contain n vertices each. Additionally, $N[v]$ contains $\bigcup_{i \in [r] \setminus \{j^*\}} B'_i$ by our choice of v , and $\bigcup_{i \in [r] \setminus \{i^*\}} A'_i$ by the eliminations of earlier groups of blankers, for a subtotal of $rn + \frac{n}{2} + 2n + (r-1)n + (r-1)n = 3rn + \frac{n}{2}$. If ℓ vertices have been eliminated from B'_{j^*} prior to elimination of v , then $N[v]$ contains $n - \ell$ vertices from B'_{j^*} , but has gained ℓ neighbors in A'_{i^*} by the perfect matching between A'_{i^*} and B'_{j^*} in G' . Hence the remaining vertices in $A'_{i^*} \cup B'_{j^*}$ contribute at least $\ell + (n - \ell)$ vertices to the cost of v . Thus the cost of v is at least $3rn + \frac{n}{2} + n$, which is more than k' ; a contradiction. \diamond

Using Claims 1, 2, and 3, we prove Lemma 5. By Property 1, elimination order π' eliminates B' before A' . By Claim 1, π' did not eliminate any vertex of $\bigcup_{i \in [r]} B'_i \cup D'_i$ when the first vertex of the $r - 1$ -th block of blankers is eliminated. As π' is block-contiguous with respect to the blankers, its initial behavior matches that of a canonical elimination order (Definition 4): it eliminates $r - 1$ distinct blocks of blankers $X'_{i_1}, \dots, X'_{i_{r-1}}$ before any vertex of $\bigcup_{j \in [r]} B'_j \cup D'_j$. By Claim 2 it then eliminates a vertex of $\bigcup_{j \in [r]} B'_j$, say a vertex in B'_{j^*} . By Claim 3 it completes the elimination of B'_{j^*} before touching vertices in $\bigcup_{j \in [r] \setminus \{j^*\}} B'_j$, by Property 3 it eliminates B'_{j^*} before any dummy, and by Property 4 it eliminates B'_{j^*} before the last blanker X'_{i_r} . Hence after the $r - 1$ blocks of blankers, the vertices of B'_{j^*} are eliminated consecutively.

Once this is done, the closed neighborhoods of D'_{j^*} and X'_{i^*} coincide: by the perfect matchings between B'_{j^*} and A'_i (for all $i \in [r]$) in G' , eliminating all of B'_{j^*} made D'_{j^*} and X'_{i^*} adjacent to $\bigcup_{i \in [r]} A'_i$. Furthermore, $N[D'_{j^*}] \cap \bigcup_{i \in [r]} C'_i =$

$N[X'_{i^*}] \cap \bigcup_{i \in [r]} C'_i = C'_{j^*}$: the dummies see C'_{j^*} by construction, while X'_{i^*} sees it because of the elimination of B'_{j^*} . The closed neighborhoods of D'_{j^*} and X'_{i^*} are subsets of the closed neighborhoods of the other vertices that remain in B' at that point: vertices in a set $B'_j \cup D'_j$ for $j \neq j^*$ see $\bigcup_{i \in [r]} A'_i$ together with both A'_{j^*} and A'_j , while the latter set is not seen by $D'_{j^*} \cup X'_{i^*}$. Hence by Observation 1 we may assume that after finishing B'_{j^*} , order π' eliminates D'_{j^*} followed by X'_{i^*} .

Once that is done, the only vertices remaining in B' are $\bigcup_{i \in [r] \setminus \{j^*\}} B'_i \cup D'_i$. It is easy to see that for any $j \in [r] \setminus \{j^*\}$, all vertices in $B'_j \cup D'_j$ have the same closed neighborhood at that stage, consisting of the remainder of B' together with $C'_j \cup C'_{i^*}$ and $\bigcup_{i \in [r]} A'_i$. By Observation 1 we may assume that π' is block-contiguous after eliminating X'_{i^*} , which means it eliminates the sets $B'_j \cup D'_j$ one at a time. As we may shuffle the order within a set $B'_j \cup D'_j$ without changing the cost (all closed neighborhoods of vertices from such a set are identical), we may assume that the remaining actions of π' on B' are alternately eliminating a set B'_j followed by the corresponding set D'_j , until all of B' is eliminated. Then π' finishes by eliminating A' in some order. As this form exactly matches the definition of an (i^*, j^*) -canonical elimination order, we have proved that whenever an elimination order of G' exists that has cost at most k' , then there is one that is canonical. This proves Lemma 5. \square

3.4 Proof of Theorem 3

Having analyzed the relationship between elimination orders for G' and for the input graphs $G_{i,j}$ ($i, j \in [r]$), we can complete the proof. By combining the previous lemmata it is easy to show that G' acts as the logical OR of the inputs.

Lemma 6. *G' has an elimination order of cost $\leq k' \Leftrightarrow$ there are $i, j \in [r]$ such that $G_{i,j}$ has an elimination order of cost $\leq n + k$.*

Proof. (\Rightarrow) Assume that G' has an elimination order π' of cost at most k' . By Lemma 5 we may assume that π' is (i^*, j^*) -canonical, for appropriate choices of i^* and j^* . Build an elimination order π for G_{i^*, j^*} that agrees with π' on B_{i^*, j^*} . By Lemma 4 this shows that $c_{G'}(\pi') = 3rn + \frac{n}{2} - n + c_{G_{i^*, j^*}}(\pi)$. Hence $c_{G_{i^*, j^*}}(\pi) = c_{G'}(\pi') - 3rn - \frac{n}{2} + n \leq k' - 3rn - \frac{n}{2} + n = n + k$. Thus G_{i^*, j^*} has an elimination order of cost at most $n + k$.

(\Leftarrow) In the other direction, suppose that G_{i^*, j^*} has an elimination order π of cost at most $n + k$. As A_{i^*, j^*} is a clique in G_{i^*, j^*} , by Lemma 1 we may assume that π eliminates all vertices of B_{i^*, j^*} before any vertex of A_{i^*, j^*} . Using Definition 4 it is easy to see that a canonical elimination order π' for G' exists that agrees with π on B_{i^*, j^*} . By Lemma 4 the cost of π' on G' exceeds the cost of π on G_{i^*, j^*} by exactly $3n + \frac{n}{2} - n$. So the cost of π' on G' is at most $3n + \frac{n}{2} - n + (n + k) = k'$, which proves this direction of the claim. \square

Lemma 7. *There is an OR-cross-composition of COBIPARTITE GRAPH ELIMINATION into n -TREEWIDTH of cost \sqrt{t} .*

Proof. In Section 3.2 we gave a polynomial-time algorithm that, given instances $(G_{i,j}, A_{i,j}, B_{i,j}, k_{i,j})$ of COBIPARTITE GRAPH ELIMINATION that are equivalent under \mathcal{R} for $i, j \in [r]$, constructs a cobipartite graph G' with partite sets A' and B' , and an integer k' . By Lemma 6 the resulting graph G' has an elimination order of cost k' if and only if there is a YES-instance among the inputs. By the correspondence between treewidth and bounded-cost elimination orders of Theorem 2, this shows that G' has treewidth at most $k' - 1$ if and only if there is a YES-instance among the inputs. The polynomial equivalence relationship ensured that all partite sets of all inputs have the same number of vertices. For partite sets of size n , the constructed graph G' satisfies $|A'| = 2rn$ and $|B'| = \frac{5rn}{2}$. The number of vertices in G' is $n' = \frac{9rn}{2}$. Consider the n -TREEWIDTH instance $(G', n', k' - 1)$. It expresses the logical OR of a series of $r^2 = t$ COBIPARTITE GRAPH ELIMINATION instances using a parameter value of $\frac{9n\sqrt{t}}{2} \in \mathcal{O}(n\sqrt{t})$. Hence the algorithm gives an OR-cross-composition of COBIPARTITE GRAPH ELIMINATION into n -TREEWIDTH of cost \sqrt{t} . \square

Theorem 3 follows from the combination of Lemma 7, Lemma 2, and Theorem 1. Since the pathwidth of a cobipartite graph equals its treewidth [23] and the graph formed by the cross-composition is cobipartite, the same construction gives an OR-cross-composition of bounded cost into n -PATHWIDTH.

Corollary 1. *If n -PATHWIDTH admits a (generalized) kernel of size $\mathcal{O}(n^{2-\epsilon})$, for some $\epsilon > 0$, then $NP \subseteq coNP/poly$.*

4 Quadratic-Vertex Kernel for Treewidth [VC]

In this section we present an improved kernel for TREEWIDTH [VC], which is formally defined as follows.

TREEWIDTH [VC]

Input: A graph G , a vertex cover $X \subseteq V(G)$, and an integer k .

Parameter: $|X|$.

Question: Is the treewidth of G at most k ?

Our kernelization revolves around the following notion.

Definition 5. *Let G be a graph, let T be an independent set in G , and let \hat{G}_T be the graph obtained from G by eliminating T ; the order is irrelevant as T is independent. Then T is a treewidth-invariant set if for every $v \in T$, the graph \hat{G}_T is a minor of $G - \{v\}$.*

Lemma 8. *If T is a treewidth-invariant set in G and $\Delta := \max_{v \in T} \deg_G(v)$, then $\text{TW}(G) = \max(\Delta, \text{TW}(\hat{G}_T))$.*

Proof. We prove that $\text{TW}(G)$ is at least, and at most, the claimed amount.

(\geq). As \hat{G}_T is a minor of G , we have $\text{TW}(G) \geq \text{TW}(\hat{G}_T)$ (cf. [2]). If $\text{TW}(\hat{G}_T) \geq \Delta$ then this implies the inequality. So assume that $\Delta > \text{TW}(\hat{G}_T)$. Let $v \in T$ have

degree Δ . By assumption, \hat{G}_T is a minor of $G - \{v\}$. It contains all vertices of $N_G(v)$ since T is an independent set. As $N_G(v)$ is a clique in \hat{G}_T , there is a series of minor operations in $G - \{v\}$ that turns $N_G(v)$ into a clique. Performing these operations on G rather than $G - \{v\}$ results in a clique on vertex set $N_G[v]$ of size $\deg_G(v) + 1 = \Delta + 1$: the set $N_G(v)$ is turned into a clique, and v remains unchanged. Hence G has a clique with $\Delta + 1$ vertices as a minor, which is known to imply (cf. [2]) that its treewidth is at least Δ .

(\leq). Consider an optimal elimination order $\hat{\pi}$ for \hat{G}_T , which costs $\text{TW}(\hat{G}_T) + 1$ by Theorem 2. Form an elimination order π for G by first eliminating all vertices in T in arbitrary order, followed by the remaining vertices in the order dictated by $\hat{\pi}$. Consider what happens when eliminating the graph G in the order given by π . Each vertex $v \in T$ that is eliminated incurs cost $\deg_G(v) + 1 \leq \Delta + 1$: as T is an independent set, eliminations before v do not affect v 's neighborhood. Once all vertices of T have been eliminated, the resulting graph is identical to \hat{G}_T , by definition. As π matches $\hat{\pi}$ on the vertices of $V(G) \setminus T$, and $\hat{\pi}$ has cost $\text{TW}(\hat{G}_T) + 1$, the total cost of elimination order π on G is $\max(\Delta + 1, \text{TW}(\hat{G}_T) + 1)$. By Theorem 2 this completes this direction of the proof. \square

Lemma 8 shows that when a treewidth-invariant set is eliminated from a graph, its treewidth changes in a controlled manner. To exploit this insight in a kernelization algorithm, we have to find treewidth-invariant sets in polynomial time. While it seems difficult to detect such sets in all circumstances, we show that the q -expansion lemma can be used to find a treewidth-invariant set when the size of the graph is large compared to its vertex cover number. The following auxiliary graph is needed for this procedure.

Definition 6. *Given a graph G with a vertex cover $X \subseteq V(G)$, we define the bipartite non-edge connection graph $H_{G,X}$. Its partite sets are $V(G) \setminus X$ and $\binom{X}{2} \setminus E(G)$, with an edge between a vertex $v \in V(G) \setminus X$ and a vertex $x_{\{p,q\}}$ representing $\{p,q\} \in \binom{X}{2} \setminus E(G)$ if $v \in N_G(p) \cap N_G(q)$.*

For disjoint vertex subsets S and T in a graph G , we say that S is saturated by q -stars into T if we can assign to every $v \in S$ a subset $f(v) \subseteq N_G(v) \cap T$ of size q , such that for any pair of distinct vertices $u, v \in S$ we have $f(u) \cap f(v) = \emptyset$. Observe that an empty set can trivially be saturated by q -stars.

Lemma 9. *Let (G, X, k) be an instance of TREEWIDTH [VC]. If $H_{G,X}$ contains a set $T \subseteq V(G) \setminus X$ such that $S := N_{H_{G,X}}(T)$ can be saturated by 2-stars into T , then T is a treewidth-invariant set.*

Proof. As T is a subset of the independent set $V(G) \setminus X$, the set T is independent in G . It remains to prove that for every $v \in T$, the graph \hat{G}_T is a minor of $G - \{v\}$. So consider an arbitrary vertex $v^* \in T$. We give a series of minor operations that transforms $G - \{v^*\}$ into \hat{G}_T . The crucial part of the transformation consists of contracting vertices of $T \setminus \{v^*\}$ into vertices of X , to turn $N_G(v)$ into a clique for all $v \in T$; afterwards we can simply delete all remaining vertices of $T \setminus \{v^*\}$.

Let $f: S \rightarrow \binom{T}{2}$ be a mapping that assigns to each vertex in v a set of two of v 's neighbors in T , such that the images of f are pairwise disjoint.

Consider a vertex $v \in T$ such that $N_G(v)$ is not a clique. Let $\{p, q\}$ be a non-edge in $G[N_G(v)]$. As v is adjacent to both p and q , vertex v is adjacent to the representative $x_{\{p,q\}}$ in $H_{G,X}$, implying that $x_{\{p,q\}} \in S$. Hence $x_{\{p,q\}}$ is saturated by a 2-star into T . Consider the two vertices $f(x_{\{p,q\}})$ assigned to $x_{\{p,q\}}$; at least one of them, say u , differs from v^* . As u is adjacent to $x_{\{p,q\}}$ in $H_{G,X}$ by definition of 2-star saturation, by definition of $H_{G,X}$ this implies that u is adjacent to both p and q . Hence contracting u into p creates the missing edge $\{p, q\}$. Now observe that as the images of f are pairwise disjoint, for each non-edge $\{p, q\}$ in the neighborhood of some vertex in T , there is a distinct vertex unequal to v^* that can be contracted to create the non-edge. Contracting all such vertices into appropriate neighbors therefore turns each set $N_G(v)$ for $v \in T$ into a clique. Hence we establish that \hat{G}_T is indeed a minor of $G - \{v^*\}$, proving that T is treewidth-invariant. \square

q-Expansion Lemma ([19, Lemma 12]). *Let q be a positive integer, and let m be the size of a maximum matching in a bipartite graph H with partite sets A and B . If $|B| > m \cdot q$ and there are no isolated vertices in B , then there exist nonempty vertex sets $S \subseteq A$ and $T \subseteq B$ such that S is saturated by q -stars into T and $S = N_H(T)$. Furthermore, S and T can be found in time polynomial in the size of H by a reduction to bipartite matching.*

Theorem 4. TREEWIDTH [VC] has a kernel with $\mathcal{O}(|X|^2)$ vertices that can be encoded in $\mathcal{O}(|X|^3)$ bits.

Proof. Given an instance (G, X, k) of TREEWIDTH [VC], the algorithm constructs the non-edge connection graph $H_{G,X}$ with partite sets $A = \binom{X}{2} \setminus E(G)$ and $B = V(G) \setminus X$. We attempt to find a treewidth-invariant set $T \subseteq B$. If B has an isolated vertex v , then by definition of $H_{G,X}$ the set $N_G(v)$ is a clique implying that $\{v\}$ is treewidth-invariant. If B has no isolated vertices, we apply the q -expansion lemma with $q := 2$ to attempt to find a set $S \subseteq A$ and $T \subseteq B$ such that S is saturated by 2-stars into T and $S = N_{H_{G,X}}(T)$. Hence such a set T is treewidth-invariant by Lemma 9. If we find a treewidth-invariant set T :

- If $\max_{v \in T} \deg_G(v) \geq k + 1$ then we output a constant-size NO-instance, as Lemma 8 then ensures that $\text{TW}(G) \geq \deg_G(v) > k$.
- Otherwise we reduce to (\hat{G}_T, X, k) and restart the algorithm.

Each iteration takes polynomial time. As the vertex count decreases in each iteration, there are at most n iterations until we fail to find a treewidth-invariant set. When that happens, we output the resulting instance. The q -expansion lemma ensures that at that point, $|B| \leq 2m$, where m is the size of a maximum matching in $H_{G,X}$. As m cannot exceed the size of the partite set A , which is bounded by $\binom{|X|}{2}$ as there cannot be more non-edges in a set of size $|X|$, we find that $|B| \leq 2 \binom{|X|}{2}$ upon termination. As vertex set B of the graph $H_{G,X}$ directly corresponds to $V(G) \setminus X$, this implies that G has at most $|X| + 2 \binom{|X|}{2}$ vertices after

exhaustive reduction. Thus the instance that we output has $\mathcal{O}(|X|^2)$ vertices. We can encode it in $\mathcal{O}(|X|^3)$ bits: we store an adjacency matrix for $G[X]$, and for each of the $\mathcal{O}(|X|^2)$ vertices v in $V(G) \setminus X$ we store a vector of $|X|$ bits, indicating for each $x \in X$ whether v is adjacent to it. \square

5 Conclusion

In this paper we contributed to the knowledge of sparsification for TREEWIDTH by establishing lower and upper bounds. Our work raises a number of questions.

We showed that TREEWIDTH and PATHWIDTH instances on n vertices are unlikely to be compressible into $\mathcal{O}(n^{2-\epsilon})$ bits. Are there natural problems on general graphs that do allow (generalized) kernels of size $\mathcal{O}(n^{2-\epsilon})$? Many problems admit $\mathcal{O}(k)$ -vertex kernels when restricted to *planar* graphs [5], which can be encoded in $\mathcal{O}(k)$ bits by employing succinct representations of planar graphs. Obtaining subquadratic-size compressions for NP-hard problems on classes of potentially *dense* graphs, such as unit-disk graphs, is an interesting challenge.

In Section 4 we gave a quadratic-vertex kernel for TREEWIDTH [VC]. While the algorithm is presented for the decision problem, it is easily adapted to the optimization setting (cf. [11]). The key insight for our reduction is the notion of treewidth-invariant sets, together with the use of the q -expansion lemma to find them when the complement of the vertex cover has superquadratic size. A challenge for future research is to identify treewidth-invariant sets that are not found by the q -expansion lemma; this might decrease the kernel size even further. As the sparsification lower bound proves that TREEWIDTH [VC] is unlikely to admit kernels of bitsize $\mathcal{O}(|X|^{2-\epsilon})$, while the current kernel can be encoded in $\mathcal{O}(|X|^3)$ bits, an obvious open problem is to close the gap between the upper and the lower bound. Does TREEWIDTH [VC] have a kernel with $\mathcal{O}(|X|)$ vertices? If not, then is there at least a kernel with $\mathcal{O}(|X|^2)$ rather than $\mathcal{O}(|X|^3)$ edges?

For PATHWIDTH [VC], a kernel with $\mathcal{O}(|X|^3)$ vertices is known [8]. Can this be improved to $\mathcal{O}(|X|^2)$ using an approach similar to the one used here? The obvious pathwidth-analogue of Lemma 8 fails, as removing a low-degree simplicial vertex may decrease the pathwidth of a graph. Finally, one may consider whether the ideas of the present paper can improve the kernel size for TREEWIDTH parameterized by a feedback vertex set [7].

References

1. S. Arnborg, D. G. Corneil, and A. Proskurowski. Complexity of finding embeddings in a k -tree. *SIAM J. Algebra. Discr.*, 8:277–284, 1987. doi:10.1137/0608024.
2. H. L. Bodlaender. A partial k -arboretum of graphs with bounded treewidth. *Theor. Comput. Sci.*, 209(1-2):1–45, 1998. doi:10.1016/S0304-3975(97)00228-4.
3. H. L. Bodlaender, R. G. Downey, M. R. Fellows, and D. Hermelin. On problems without polynomial kernels. *J. Comput. Syst. Sci.*, 75(8):423–434, 2009. doi:10.1016/j.jcss.2009.04.001.

4. H. L. Bodlaender, F. V. Fomin, A. M. C. A. Koster, D. Kratsch, and D. M. Thilikos. On exact algorithms for treewidth. In *Proc. 14th ESA*, pages 672–683, 2006. doi:10.1007/11841036_60.
5. H. L. Bodlaender, F. V. Fomin, D. Lokshtanov, E. Penninkx, S. Saurabh, and D. M. Thilikos. (Meta) Kernelization. In *Proc. 50th FOCS*, pages 629–638, 2009. doi:10.1109/FOCS.2009.46.
6. H. L. Bodlaender, B. M. P. Jansen, and S. Kratsch. Cross-composition: A new technique for kernelization lower bounds. In *Proc. 28th STACS*, pages 165–176, 2011. doi:10.4230/LIPIcs.STACS.2011.165.
7. H. L. Bodlaender, B. M. P. Jansen, and S. Kratsch. Preprocessing for treewidth: A combinatorial analysis through kernelization. In *Proc. 38th ICALP*, pages 437–448, 2011. doi:10.1007/978-3-642-22006-7_37.
8. H. L. Bodlaender, B. M. P. Jansen, and S. Kratsch. Kernel bounds for structural parameterizations of pathwidth. In *Proc. 13th SWAT*, pages 352–363, 2012. doi:10.1007/978-3-642-31155-0_31.
9. H. L. Bodlaender, B. M. P. Jansen, and S. Kratsch. Kernelization lower bounds by cross-composition. *CoRR*, abs/1206.5941, 2012. arXiv:1206.5941.
10. H. L. Bodlaender and A. M. C. A. Koster. Safe separators for treewidth. *Discrete Math.*, 306(3):337–350, 2006. doi:10.1016/j.disc.2005.12.017.
11. H. L. Bodlaender, A. M. C. A. Koster, and F. van den Eijkhof. Preprocessing rules for triangulation of probabilistic networks. *Comput. Intell.*, 21(3):286–305, 2005. doi:10.1111/j.1467-8640.2005.00274.x.
12. J. F. Buss and J. Goldsmith. Nondeterminism within P. *SIAM J. Comput.*, 22(3):560–572, 1993. doi:10.1137/0222038.
13. M. Cygan, F. Grandoni, and D. Hermelin. Tight kernel bounds for problems on graphs with small degeneracy. *CoRR*, abs/1305.4914, 2013. arXiv:1305.4914.
14. H. Dell and D. Marx. Kernelization of packing problems. In *Proc. 23rd SODA*, pages 68–81, 2012.
15. H. Dell and D. van Melkebeek. Satisfiability allows no nontrivial sparsification unless the polynomial-time hierarchy collapses. In *Proc. 42nd STOC*, pages 251–260, 2010. doi:10.1145/1806689.1806725.
16. R. Downey and M. R. Fellows. *Parameterized Complexity*. Monographs in Computer Science. Springer, New York, 1999.
17. A. Drucker. New limits to classical and quantum instance compression. In *Proc. 53rd FOCS*, pages 609–618, 2012. doi:10.1109/FOCS.2012.71.
18. J. Flum and M. Grohe. *Parameterized Complexity Theory*. Springer-Verlag New York, Inc., 2006.
19. F. V. Fomin, D. Lokshtanov, N. Misra, G. Philip, and S. Saurabh. Hitting forbidden minors: Approximation and kernelization. In *Proc. 28th STACS*, pages 189–200, 2011. doi:10.4230/LIPIcs.STACS.2011.189.
20. D. Hermelin and X. Wu. Weak compositions and their applications to polynomial lower bounds for kernelization. In *Proc. 23rd SODA*, pages 104–113, 2012.
21. R. Impagliazzo, R. Paturi, and F. Zane. Which problems have strongly exponential complexity? *J. Comput. Syst. Sci.*, 63(4):512–530, 2001. doi:10.1006/jcss.2001.1774.
22. B. M. P. Jansen. *The Power of Data Reduction: Kernels for Fundamental Graph Problems*. PhD thesis, Utrecht University, The Netherlands, 2013.
23. R. H. Möhring. Triangulating graphs without asteroidal triples. *Discrete Appl. Math.*, 64(3):281–287, 1996. doi:10.1016/0166-218X(95)00095-9.
24. B. Monien and I. H. Sudborough. Min cut is NP-complete for edge weighted trees. *Theor. Comput. Sci.*, 58:209–229, 1988. doi:10.1016/0304-3975(88)90028-X.

25. S. Thomassé. A $4k^2$ kernel for feedback vertex set. *ACM Trans. Algorithms*, 6(2), 2010. doi:[10.1145/1721837.1721848](https://doi.org/10.1145/1721837.1721848).
26. F. van den Eijkhof, H. L. Bodlaender, and A. M. C. A. Koster. Safe reduction rules for weighted treewidth. *Algorithmica*, 47(2):139–158, 2007. doi:[10.1007/s00453-006-1226-x](https://doi.org/10.1007/s00453-006-1226-x).
27. C.-K. Yap. Some consequences of non-uniform conditions on uniform classes. *Theor. Comput. Sci.*, 26:287–300, 1983. doi:[10.1016/0304-3975\(83\)90020-8](https://doi.org/10.1016/0304-3975(83)90020-8).