

Contracting to a Longest Path in H -Free Graphs

Walter Kern¹ and Daniël Paulusma^{2*}

¹ Department of Applied Mathematics, University of Twente, The Netherlands
 w.kern@utwente.nl

² Department of Computer Science, Durham University, Durham, UK
 daniel.paulusma@durham.ac.uk

Abstract. We prove two dichotomy results for detecting long paths as patterns in a given graph. The NP-hard problem LONGEST INDUCED PATH is to determine the longest induced path in a graph. The NP-hard problem LONGEST PATH CONTRACTIBILITY is to determine the longest path to which a graph can be contracted to. By combining known results with new results we completely classify the computational complexity of both problems for H -free graphs. Our main focus is on the second problem, for which we design a general contractibility technique that enables us to reduce the problem to a matching problem.

1 Introduction

The HAMILTONIAN PATH problem, which is to decide if a graph has a hamiltonian path, is one of the best-known problems in Computer Science and Mathematics. A more general variant of this problem is that of determining the length of a longest path in a graph. Its decision version LONGEST PATH is equivalent to deciding if a graph can be modified into the k -vertex path P_k for some given integer k by using vertex and edge deletions. Note that an alternative formulation of HAMILTON PATH is that of deciding if a graph can be modified into a path (which must be P_n) by using only edge deletions. As such, these problems belong to a wide range of graph modification problems where we seek to modify a given graph G into some graph F from some specified family of graphs \mathcal{F} by using some prescribed set of graph operations. As HAMILTONIAN PATH is NP-complete (see [18]), LONGEST PATH is NP-complete as well. The same holds for the problem LONGEST INDUCED PATH [18], which is to decide if a graph G contains an induced path of length at least k , that is, if G can be modified into a path P_k for some given integer k by using only vertex deletions.

Here we mainly focus on the variant of the above two problems corresponding to another central graph operation, namely edge contraction. This variant plays a role in many graph-theoretic problems, in particular HAMILTON PATH [31,32]. The *contraction* of an edge uv of a graph G deletes the vertices u and v and replaces them by a new vertex made adjacent to precisely those vertices that were adjacent to u or v in G (without introducing self-loops or multiple edges). A graph G contains a graph G' as a *contraction* if G can be modified into G' by a sequence of edge contractions.

LONGEST PATH CONTRACTIBILITY

Instance: a connected graph G and a positive integer k .

Question: does G contain P_k as a contraction?

The LONGEST PATH CONTRACTIBILITY problem is NP-complete as well [9]. Due to the computational hardness of LONGEST PATH, LONGEST INDUCED PATH and LONGEST PATH CONTRACTIBILITY it is natural to restrict the input to special graph classes.

* Supported by Research Project Grant RPG-2016-258 from the Leverhulme Trust.

We briefly discuss some known complexity results for the three problems under input restrictions.

A common property of most of the studied graph classes is that they are *hereditary*, that is, they are closed under vertex deletion. As such, they can be characterized by a family of forbidden induced subgraphs. In particular, a graph is *H-free* if it does not contain a graph H as an induced subgraph, and a graph class is *monogenic* if it consists of all H -free graphs for some graph H . Hereditary graph classes defined by a small number of forbidden induced subgraphs, such as monogenic graph classes, are well studied, as evidenced by studies on (algorithmic and structural) decomposition theorems (e.g. for bull-free graphs [11] or claw-free graphs [12,30]) and surveys for specific graph problems (e.g. for COLOURING [21,47]).

All the known NP-hardness results for HAMILTONIAN PATH carry over to LONGEST PATH. For instance, it is known that HAMILTONIAN PATH is NP-complete for chordal bipartite graphs and strongly chordal split graphs [46], line graphs [5] and planar graphs [19]. Unlike for HAMILTONIAN PATH, there are only a few hereditary graph classes for which the LONGEST PATH problem is known to be polynomial-time solvable; see, for example [49]. In particular, LONGEST PATH is polynomial-time solvable for circular-arc graphs [44], distance-hereditary graphs [24], and cocomparability graphs [35,45]. The latter result generalized the corresponding results for bipartite permutation graphs [50] and interval graphs [34]. The few graph classes for which the LONGEST INDUCED PATH problem is known to be polynomial-time solvable include the classes of k -chordal graphs [20,36], AT-free graphs [39], graphs of bounded clique-width [13] (see also [39]) and graphs of bounded mim-width [37]. Finding a longest induced path in an n -dimensional hypercube is known as the SNAKE-IN-THE-BOX problem [38], which has been well studied.¹

Unlike the LONGEST PATH and LONGEST INDUCED PATH problems, LONGEST PATH CONTRACTIBILITY is NP-complete even for *fixed* k (that is, k is not part of the input). In order to explain this, let F -CONTRACTIBILITY be the problem of deciding if a graph G contains some fixed graph F as a contraction. The complexity classification of F -CONTRACTIBILITY is still open (see [9,40,41,51]), but Brouwer and Veldman [9] showed that already P_4 -CONTRACTIBILITY and C_4 -CONTRACTIBILITY are NP-complete (where C_k denotes the k -vertex cycle). In fact, P_4 -CONTRACTIBILITY problem is NP-complete even for P_6 -free graphs [52], whereas Heggernes et al. [28] showed that P_6 -CONTRACTIBILITY is NP-complete for bipartite graphs.² The latter result was improved to $k = 5$ in [14]. Moreover, P_7 -CONTRACTIBILITY is NP-complete for line graphs [16]. Hence, LONGEST PATH CONTRACTIBILITY is NP-complete for all these graph classes as well. On the positive side, LONGEST PATH CONTRACTIBILITY is polynomial-time solvable for P_5 -free graphs [52].

Our interest in the LONGEST INDUCED PATH problem also stems from a close relationship to a vertex partition problem, which played a central role in the graph minor project of Robertson and Seymour [48], as we will explain.

¹ The complexity status of SNAKE-IN-THE BOX is still open. A table of world records for small values of n can be found at <http://ai1.ai.uga.edu/sib/sibwiki/doku.php/records>.

² In [28], the problem is equivalently formulated as a graph modification problem: can a graph G be modified into a graph F from some specified family \mathcal{F} by using at most ℓ edge contractions for some given integer $\ell \geq 0$? We refer to for instance [1,2,3,4,10,15,22,23,27,29,42,43,53,54], for both classical and fixed-parameter tractability results for various families \mathcal{F} including the family of paths, which form the focus in this paper.

Our Results

We first give a dichotomy for LONGEST INDUCED PATH using known results for HAMILTONIAN PATH and some straightforward observations (see Section 2 for a proof). Our main result is a dichotomy for LONGEST PATH CONTRACTIBILITY. We use ‘+’ to denote the disjoint union of two graphs, and a *linear forest* is the disjoint union of one or more paths.

Theorem 1. *Let H be a graph. If H is a linear forest, then LONGEST INDUCED PATH restricted to H -free graphs is polynomial-time solvable; otherwise it is NP-complete.*

Theorem 2. *Let H be a graph. If H is an induced subgraph of $P_2 + P_4$, $P_1 + P_2 + P_3$, $P_1 + P_5$ or $sP_1 + P_4$ for some $s \geq 0$, then LONGEST PATH CONTRACTIBILITY restricted to H -free graphs is polynomial-time solvable; otherwise it is NP-complete.*

Theorem 2 shows that LONGEST PATH CONTRACTIBILITY is polynomial-time solvable for H -free graphs only for some specific linear forests H . This is in contrast to the situation for LONGEST INDUCED PATH, as shown by Theorem 1. To extend the aforementioned results from [14,16,28,52] for LONGEST PATH CONTRACTIBILITY to the full classification given in Theorem 2 we do as follows.

First, in Section 3, we prove the four new polynomial-time solvable cases of Theorem 2. In each of these cases H is a linear forest, and proving these cases requires the most of our analysis.³ Every linear forest H is P_r -free for some suitable value of r and P_r -free graphs do not contain P_r as a contraction. Hence, it suffices to prove that for each $1 \leq k \leq r - 1$, the P_k -CONTRACTIBILITY problem is polynomial-time solvable for H -free graphs for each of the four linear forests listed in Theorem 2. In fact, as P_3 -CONTRACTIBILITY is trivial, we only have to consider the cases where $4 \leq k \leq r - 1$. Our general technique for doing this is based on transforming an instance of P_k -CONTRACTIBILITY for $k \geq 5$ into a polynomial number of instances of P_{k-1} -CONTRACTIBILITY until $k = 4$.

For $k = 4$ we cannot apply this transformation, as this case - as we outline below - is closely related to the 2-DISJOINT CONNECTED SUBGRAPHS problem. This problem takes as input a triple (G, Z_1, Z_2) , where G is a graph with two disjoint subsets Z_1 and Z_2 of $V(G)$. It asks if $V(G) \setminus (Z_1 \cup Z_2)$ has a partition into sets S_1 and S_2 , such that $Z_1 \cup S_1$ and $Z_2 \cup S_2$ induce connected subgraphs of G . Robertson and Seymour [48] proved that the more general problem k -DISJOINT CONNECTED SUBGRAPHS (for k subsets Z_i) is polynomial-time solvable as long as the union of the sets Z_i has constant size.⁴ However, in our context, Z_1 and Z_2 may have arbitrarily large size. In that case, 2-DISJOINT CONNECTED SUBGRAPHS is NP-complete even if $|Z_1| = 2$ (and only Z_2 is large) [52].

To work around this obstacle, we use the fact [52] that the two outer vertices of the P_4 , to which the input graph G must be contracted, may correspond to single vertices u and v of G . We then “guess” u and v to obtain an instance $(G - \{u, v\}, N(u), N(v))$ of 2-DISJOINT SUBGRAPHS. That is, we seek for a partition of $(V(G) \setminus \{u, v\}) \setminus ((N_u) \cup N(v))$ into sets S_u and S_v , such that $N(u) \cup S_u$ and $N(v) \cup S_v$ are connected. The latter implies that we can contract these two sets to single vertices corresponding to the two middle vertices of the P_4 .

³ This is in line with research for other graph problems restricted to H -free graphs. In fact, classes of H -free graphs, where H is a linear forest are still poorly understood. There is a whole range of graph problems, e.g. INDEPENDENT SET, 3-COLOURING, FEEDBACK VERTEX SET, ODD CYCLE TRANSVERSAL, and DOMINATING INDUCED MATCHING, for which it is not known if they are NP-complete on P_k -free graphs for some integer k , such that they are NP-complete on P_k -free graphs (see [7]).

⁴ If every Z_i has size 2, then we obtain the well-known k -DISJOINT PATHS problem.

After guessing u and v we exploit their presence, together with the H -freeness of G , for an extensive analysis of the structure of S_u and S_v of a potential solution (S_u, S_v) . To this end we introduce in Section 3.1 some general terminology and first show how to check in general for solutions in which the part of S_u or S_v that ensures connectivity of $N(u) \cup S_u$ or $N(v) \cup S_v$, respectively, has bounded size. We call such solutions constant. If we do not find a constant solution, then we exploit their absence. For the more involved cases we show that in this way we can branch to a polynomial number of instances of a standard matching problem.

In Section 4 we prove the new NP-completeness results. In particular, we prove that P_k -CONTRACTIBILITY, for some suitable value of k , is NP-complete for bipartite graphs of large girth, strengthening the known result for bipartite graphs of [28].

In Section 5 we show how to combine our new polynomial-time and NP-hardness results with the known NP-completeness results for $K_{1,3}$ -free graphs [16] and P_6 -free graphs [52] in order to obtain Theorem 2.

In Section 6, we briefly discuss the cycle variant of our problem, called the LONGEST CYCLE CONTRACTIBILITY problem [6,25,26]. Its complexity classification for H -free graphs is still incomplete, but we show that it differs from the classification of LONGEST PATH CONTRACTIBILITY for H -free graphs.

In Section 7 we pose some open problems. In particular, the complexity classification of LONGEST PATH is still open for H -free graphs, and we describe the state-of-art for this problem.

2 Preliminaries

In Section 2.1 we give some general graph-theoretic terminology and a helpful lemma for P_4 -free graphs. In Section 2.2 we give a short proof of Theorem 1. In Section 2.3 we give some terminology related to edge contractions.

2.1 General Terminology and a Lemma for P_4 -Free Graphs

We consider finite undirected graphs with no self-loops. Let $G = (V, E)$ be a graph. Let $S \subseteq V$. Then $G[S] = (S, \{uv \in E \mid u, v \in S\})$ denotes the subgraph of G induced by S . We say that S is *connected* if $G[S]$ is connected. We may write $G - S = G[V \setminus S]$. The *neighbourhood* of $v \in V$ is the set $N(v) = \{u \mid uv \in E\}$ and the *closed neighbourhood* is $N[v] = N(v) \cup \{v\}$. The *length* of a path P is its number of edges. The *distance* $\text{dist}_G(u, v)$ between vertices u and v is the length of a shortest path between them. Two disjoint sets $S, T \subset V$ are *adjacent* if there is at least one edge between them; S and T are *(anti)complete* to each other if every vertex of S is (non)adjacent to every vertex of T . The set S *covers* T if every vertex of T has a neighbour in S . The *subdivision* of an edge $e = uv$ in G replaces e by a new vertex w and two new edges uw and wv .

A graph G is *H -free* for some other graph H if G does not contain H as an induced subgraph. For a set H_1, \dots, H_p of graphs, G is (H_1, \dots, H_p) -*free* if G is H_i -free for $i = 1, \dots, p$. A graph is *complete bipartite* if it consists of a single vertex or its vertex set can be partitioned into two independent sets A and B that are complete to each other. The *claw* $K_{1,3}$ is the complete bipartite graph with $|A| = 1$ and $|B| = 3$. The graph K_n is the complete graph on n vertices.

The *disjoint union* $G_1 + G_2$ of two vertex-disjoint graphs G_1 and G_2 is the graph $(V(G_1) \cup V(G_2), E(G_1) \cup E(G_2))$; the disjoint union of r copies of a graph G is denoted rG . A *forest* is a graph with no cycles. A *linear forest* is a forest of maximum degree at most 2, that is, a disjoint union of one or more paths. The *join* operation \times adds an edge between every vertex of G_1 and every vertex of G_2 . A graph G is a *cograph* if G can be generated from K_1 by a sequence of join and disjoint union

operations. A graph is a cograph if and only if it is P_4 -free (see, e.g., [8]). The following well-known lemma follows from this fact and the definition of a cograph. In particular, to prove that a connected P_4 -free graph G has a spanning complete bipartite graph with partition classes A and B , we can do as follows: take the complement $\overline{G} = (V, \{uv \mid uv \notin E \text{ and } u \neq v\})$ of G and put the vertex set of one connected component of \overline{G} in A and all the other vertices of \overline{G} in B .

Lemma 1. *Every connected P_4 -free graph on at least two vertices has a spanning complete bipartite subgraph, which can be found in polynomial time.*

We remind the reader of the following notions. The *girth* of a graph G that is not a forest is the number of vertices in a shortest induced cycle of G . The *line graph* $L(G)$ of a graph $G = (V, E)$ has E as vertex set and there is an edge between two vertices e_1 and e_2 of $L(G)$ if and only if e_1 and e_2 have a common end-vertex in G . Every line graph is readily seen to be $K_{1,3}$ -free.

2.2 The Proof of Theorem 1

We now present a short proof for Theorem 1. We start with the following lemma.

Lemma 2. *Let $p \geq 3$ be some constant. Then LONGEST INDUCED PATH is NP-complete for graphs of girth at least p .*

Proof. We reduce from HAMILTONIAN PATH. Let G be a graph on n vertices. We subdivide each edge e of G exactly once and denote the set of new vertices v_e by V' . We denote the resulting graph by G' and note that G' is bipartite with partition classes V and V' . We claim that G has a Hamiltonian path if and only if G' has an induced path of length $2n - 2$.

First suppose that G has a Hamiltonian path $u_1u_2 \cdots u_n$. Then the path on vertices $u_1, v_{u_1u_2}, u_2, \dots, v_{u_{n-1}u_n}, u_n$ is an induced path of length $2n - 2$ in G' . Now suppose that G' has an induced path P' of length $2n - 2$. Then either P' starts and finishes with a vertex of V , or P' starts and finishes with a vertex of V' . In the first case P' contains n vertices of G , so P contains all vertices u_1, \dots, u_n of G , say in this order. Then $u_1u_2 \cdots u_n$ is a Hamiltonian path of G . In the second case P' contains $n - 1$ vertices of V , say vertices u_1, \dots, u_{n-1} in that order. As P' is an induced path and vertices of V' are only adjacent to vertices of V , this means that the end-vertices of P' are both adjacent to u_n . Hence, we find that $u_1u_2 \cdots u_n$ is a Hamiltonian path of G (and the same holds for $u_nu_1 \cdots u_{n-1}$).

We note that the girth of G' is twice the girth of G . Hence, we obtain the result by applying this trick sufficiently many times. \square

We also need the following lemma.

Lemma 3. *The LONGEST INDUCED PATH problem is NP-complete for line graphs.*

Proof. We reduce from HAMILTONIAN PATH. Let $G = (V, E)$ be a graph on n vertices. We construct the line graph $L(G)$ of G . We claim that G has a Hamiltonian path if and only if $L(G)$ has an induced path on $n - 1$ vertices. First suppose that P is a Hamiltonian path in G . Then the edges of P form an induced path of length $n - 1$ in $L(G)$. Now suppose that $L(G)$ has an induced path \hat{P} on $n - 1$ vertices. Let e_1, \dots, e_{n-1} be the $n - 1$ edges of \hat{P} in that order. As \hat{P} is induced in $L(G)$, no two edges e_i and e_j with $i < j$ have a vertex $v \in V$ in common unless $j = i + 1$. Hence, $P = \{e_1, \dots, e_{n-1}\}$ must be a Hamiltonian path in G . \square

We are now ready to prove Theorem 1.

Theorem 1. (restated) *Let H be a graph. If H is a linear forest, then LONGEST INDUCED PATH restricted to H -free graphs is polynomial-time solvable; otherwise it is NP-complete.*

Proof. Let G be an H -free graph. First suppose that H is a linear forest. Then there exists a constant k such that H is an induced subgraph of P_k . This means that the length of a longest induced path of G is at most $k - 1$. Hence, we can determine a longest path in G in $O(n^{k-1})$ time by brute force.

Now suppose that H is not a linear forest. First assume that H contains a cycle. Let g be the girth of H . We set $p = g + 1$. Then the class of H -free graphs contains the class of graphs of girth at least p . Hence, we can use Lemma 2 to find that LONGEST INDUCED PATH is NP-complete for H -free graphs. Now assume that H contains no cycle. As H is not a linear forest, H must be a forest with at least one vertex of degree at least 3. Then the class of H -free graphs contains the class of $K_{1,3}$ -free graphs. Recall that every line graph is $K_{1,3}$ -free. Hence, the class of line graphs is contained in the class of H -free graphs. Then we can use Lemma 3 to find that LONGEST INDUCED PATH is NP-complete for H -free graphs. \square

2.3 Terminology Related to Edge Contractions

Recall that the contraction of an edge uv of a graph G is the operation that deletes u and v from G and replaces them by a new vertex made adjacent to precisely those vertices that were adjacent to u or v in G (without introducing self-loops or multiple edges). We denote the graph obtained from a graph G by contracting $e = uv$ by G/e . We may denote the resulting vertex by u (or v) again and say that we *contracted* e on u (or e on v).

Recall also that a graph G contains a graph H as a contraction if G can be modified into H via a sequence of edge contractions. Alternatively, a graph G contains a graph H as a contraction if and only if for every vertex $x \in V(H)$ there exists a nonempty subset $W(x) \subseteq V(G)$ of vertices in G such that:

- (i) $W(x)$ is connected;
- (ii) the set $\mathcal{W} = \{W(x) \mid x \in V_H\}$ is a partition of $V(G)$; and
- (iii) for every $x_i, x_j \in V(H)$, $W(x_i)$ and $W(x_j)$ are adjacent in G if and only if x_i and x_j are adjacent in H .

By contracting the vertices in each $W(x)$ to a single vertex we obtain the graph H . The set $W(x)$ is called an *H -witness bag* of G for x . The set \mathcal{W} is called an *H -witness structure* of G (which does not have to be unique). A pair of (non-adjacent) vertices (u, v) of a graph G is *P_k -suitable* for some integer $k \geq 3$ if and only if G has a P_k -witness structure \mathcal{W} with $W(p_1) = \{u\}$ and $W(p_k) = \{v\}$, where $P_k = p_1 \dots p_k$; see Figure 1 for an example.




Fig. 1. Two P_4 -witness structures of a graph; the grey vertices form a P_4 -suitable pair [52].

The following known lemma shows why P_k -suitable pairs are of importance.

Lemma 4 ([52]). For $k \geq 3$, a graph G contains P_k as a contraction if and only if G has a P_k -suitable pair.

Lemma 4 leads to the following auxiliary problem, where $k \geq 3$ is a fixed integer, that is, k is not part of the input.

P_k -SUITABILITY
Instance: a connected graph G and two non-adjacent vertices u, v .
Question: is (u, v) a P_k -suitable pair?

The next, known observation follows from the fact that P_k -CONTRACTIBILITY is trivial for $k \leq 2$, whereas for $k = 3$ we can use Lemma 4 combined with the observation that P_3 -SUITABILITY is polynomial-time solvable (two non-adjacent vertices u, v form a P_3 -suitable pair in a connected graph G if and only if $G - \{u, v\}$ is connected).

Lemma 5. For $k \leq 3$, P_k -CONTRACTIBILITY can be solved in polynomial time.

We now show the following lemma, which will be helpful for proving our results.

Lemma 6. Let $k \geq 4$ and let (G, u, v) be an instance of P_k -SUITABILITY with u and v at distance $d > k$. Let P be a shortest path from u to v . Then (G, u, v) can be reduced in polynomial time to $d - 2$ instances $(G/e, u, v)$, one for each edge $e \in E(P)$ that is not incident to u and v , with $\text{dist}(u, v) = d - 1$, such that (G, u, v) is a yes-instance if and only if at least one of the new instances $(G/e, u, v)$ is a yes-instance of P_k -SUITABILITY.

Proof. First suppose that (G, u, v) is a yes-instance of P_k -SUITABILITY. Then G has a P_k -witness structure \mathcal{W} with $W(p_1) = \{u\}$ and $W(p_k) = \{v\}$. As $d \geq k$, at least one bag of \mathcal{W} will contain both end-vertices of an edge e of P . Then contracting e yields a P_k -witness structure \mathcal{W}' for $(G/e, u, v)$ with $W'(p_1) = \{u\}$ and $W'(p_k) = \{v\}$. As $W(p_1)$ and $W(p_k)$ only contain u and v , respectively, the end-vertices of e belong to some bag $W(p_i)$ with $2 \leq i \leq k - 1$. Hence, e is not incident to u and v .

Now suppose that P contains an edge e not incident to u and v such that $(G/e, u, v)$ is a yes-instance of P_k -SUITABILITY. Then G/e has a P_k -witness structure \mathcal{W}' with $W'(p_1) = \{u\}$ and $W'(p_k) = \{v\}$. Let $e = st$ and say that we contracted e on s . As e is not incident to u and v , we find that $\{s, t\} \cap \{u, v\} = \emptyset$. Hence, s belongs to some bag $W'(p_i)$ with $2 \leq i \leq k - 1$. Then in $W'(p_i)$ we uncontract e (so the new bag will contain both s and t). This yields a P_k -witness structure \mathcal{W} of G with $W(p_1) = \{u\}$ and $W(p_k) = \{v\}$. \square

In our polynomial-time algorithms for constructing P_k -witness structures (to prove Theorem 2) we put vertices in certain sets that we then try to extend to P_k -witness bags (possibly via branching) and we will often apply the following rule:

Contraction Rule. If two adjacent vertices s and t end up in the same bag of some potential P_k -witness structure, then contract the edge st .

For a graph $G = (V, E)$, we say that we *apply the Contraction Rule on some set* $U \subseteq V$ if we contract every edge in $G[U]$. The advantage of applying this rule is that we obtain a smaller instance and that we can exploit the fact that the resulting set $G[U]$ has become independent.

It is easy to construct examples that show that a class of H -free graphs is not closed under contraction if H contains a vertex of degree at least 3 or a cycle. However, all polynomial-time solvable cases of Theorem 2 involve forbidding a linear forest H . The following known lemma, which is readily seen, shows that the **Contraction Rule** does preserve H -freeness as long as H is a linear forest. Hence, we can safely apply the rule in our proofs of the polynomial-time solvable cases of Theorem 2.

Lemma 7. Let H be a linear forest and let G be an H -free graph. Then the graph obtained from G after contracting an edge is also H -free.

3 The Polynomial-Time Solvable Cases of Theorem 2

In this section we prove that LONGEST PATH CONTRACTIBILITY is polynomial-time solvable for H -free graphs if $H = P_2 + P_4$ (Section 3.2), $H = P_1 + P_2 + P_3$ (Section 3.3), $H = P_1 + P_5$ (Section 3.4) and $H = sP_1 + P_4$ for every integer $s \geq 0$ (Section 3.5). To solve LONGEST PATH CONTRACTIBILITY in each of these cases we will eventually check if the input graph can be contracted to P_4 . This turns out to be the hardest situation to deal with in our proofs. Due to Lemma 4, we can solve it by checking for each pair of distinct vertices u, v with $N(u) \cap N(v) = \emptyset$ if (G, u, v) is a yes-instance of P_4 -SUITABILITY (note that for any other pair u, v , we have that (G, u, v) is a no-instance of P_4 -SUITABILITY). In Section 3.1 we first provide a general framework by introducing some additional terminology and one general result for solving P_4 -SUITABILITY.

3.1 On Contracting a Graph to P_4

Let (G, u, v) be an instance of P_4 -SUITABILITY. For every P_4 -witness structure of G with $W(p_1) = \{u\}$ and $W(p_4) = \{v\}$ (if it exists), every neighbour of u belongs to $W(p_2)$ and every neighbour of v belongs to $W(p_3)$. Throughout our proofs we let $T(u, v) = V(G) \setminus (N[u] \cup N[v])$ denote the set of remaining vertices of G , which still need to be placed in either $W(p_2)$ or $W(p_3)$. We write $T = T(u, v)$ if no confusion is possible. We say that a partition (S_u, S_v) of T is a *solution* for (G, u, v) if $N(u) \cup S_u$ and $N(v) \cup S_v$ are both connected. Hence, a solution (S_u, S_v) for (G, u, v) corresponds to a P_4 -witness structure \mathcal{W} of G , where $W(p_1) = \{u\}$, $W(p_2) = N(u) \cup S_u$, $W(p_3) = N(v) \cup S_v$ and $W(p_4) = \{v\}$. A solution (S_u, S_v) for (G, u, v) is α -constant for some constant $\alpha \geq 0$ if the following holds: either S_u contains a set S'_u of size $|S'_u| \leq \alpha$ such that $N(u) \cup S'_u$ is connected, or S_v contains a set S'_v of size $|S'_v| \leq \alpha$ such that $N(v) \cup S'_v$ is connected. We prove the following lemma.

Lemma 8. *Let (G, u, v) be an instance of P_4 -SUITABILITY. For every constant $\alpha \geq 0$, it is possible to check in $O(n^{\alpha+2})$ time if (G, u, v) has an α -constant solution.*

Proof. We first do the following check for vertex u . For each set S of size $|S| \leq \alpha$ we check if $N(u) \cup S$ is connected and if every vertex of $N(v)$ is in the same connected component D of the subgraph of G induced by $(T \setminus S) \cup N(v)$. If so, then we put all vertices of $T \setminus V(D)$ in S_u and all vertices of $T \cap V(D)$ in S_v . As G is connected, this yields a solution (S_u, S_v) for (G, u, v) . This takes $O(n^2)$ time for each set S . As the number of sets S is $O(n^\alpha)$, the total running time is $O(n^{\alpha+2})$. We can do the same check in $O(n^{\alpha+2})$ time for vertex v . This proves the lemma. \square

Let (S_u, S_v) be a solution for an instance (G, u, v) of P_4 -SUITABILITY that is not 7-constant (the value $\alpha = 7$ comes from our proofs). If $G[S_u]$ and $G[S_v]$ each contain at least one edge, then (S_u, S_v) is *double-sided*. If exactly one of $G[S_u]$, $G[S_v]$ contains an edge, then (S_u, S_v) is *single-sided*. If both S_u and S_v are independent sets, then (S_u, S_v) is *independent*.

3.2 The Case $H = P_2 + P_4$

We now show that LONGEST PATH CONTRACTIBILITY is polynomial-time solvable for $(P_2 + P_4)$ -free graphs. As mentioned, we will do so via the auxiliary problem P_k -SUITABILITY. We first give, in Lemma 9, a polynomial-time algorithm for P_4 -SUITABILITY for $(P_2 + P_4)$ -free graphs. This is the most involved part of our algorithm. As such, we start with an outline of this algorithm.

Outline of the P_4 -Suitability Algorithm for $(P_2 + P_4)$ -free graphs.

We first observe that for an instance (G, u, v) , we may assume that u and v are of

distance at least 3, and consequently, $N(u) \cap N(v) = \emptyset$, and moreover we may assume that $N(u)$ and $N(v)$ are independent. Recall that $T = V(G) \setminus (N[u] \cup N[v])$. To get a handle on the adjacencies between T and $V(G) \setminus T$ we will apply a (constant) number of branching procedures. For example, we will prove in this way that $G[T]$ may be assumed to be P_4 -free. Each time we branch we obtain, in polynomial time, a polynomial number of new, smaller instances of P_4 -SUITABILITY satisfying additional helpful constraints, such that the original instance is a yes-instance if and only if at least one of the new instances is a yes-instance. We then consider each new instance separately. That is, we either solve, in polynomial time, the problem for each new instance or create a polynomial number of new and even smaller instances via some further branching.

Our first goal is to check if (G, u, v) has an 7-constant solution. If so then we are done. Otherwise we prove that the absence of 7-constant solutions implies that (G, u, v) has no double-sided solution either. Hence, it remains to test if (G, u, v) has a single-sided solution or an independent solution. We check single-sidedness with respect to u and v independently. We show that in both cases this leads either to a solution or to a polynomial number of smaller instances, for which we only need to check if they have an independent solution. This will enable us to branch in such a way that afterwards we may assume that T is an independent set and that the solution we are looking for is equivalent to finding a star cover of $N(u)$ and $N(v)$ with centers in T . The latter problem reduces to a matching problem, which we can solve in polynomial time.

Lemma 9. P_4 -SUITABILITY can be solved in polynomial time for $(P_2 + P_4)$ -free graphs.

Proof. Let (G, u, v) be an instance of P_4 -SUITABILITY, where G is a connected $(P_2 + P_4)$ -free graph. We may assume without loss of generality that u and v are of distance at least 3, that is, u and v are non-adjacent and $N(u) \cap N(v) = \emptyset$; otherwise (G, u, v) is a no-instance.

Recall that $T = V(G) \setminus (N[u] \cup N[v])$. Recall also that we are looking for a partition (S_u, S_v) of T that is a solution for (G, u, v) , that is, $N(u) \cup S_u$ and $N(v) \cup S_v$ must both be connected. In order to do so we will construct partial solutions (S'_u, S'_v) , which we try to extend to a solution (S_u, S_v) for (G, u, v) . We use the **Contraction Rule** from Section 2 on $N(u) \cup S'_u$ and $N(v) \cup S'_v$, so that these two sets will become independent. By Lemma 7, the resulting graph will always be $(P_2 + P_4)$ -free. For simplicity, we will denote the resulting instance by (G, u, v) again. After applying the **Contraction Rule** the size of the set T will be reduced if a vertex $t \in T$ was involved in an edge contraction with a vertex from $N(u)$ or $N(v)$. In that case we say that we *contracted t away*.

At the beginning of our algorithm, $S'_u = S'_v = \emptyset$, and we start by applying the **Contraction Rule** on $N(u)$ and $N(v)$. This leads to the following claim.

Claim 1. $N(u)$ and $N(v)$ are independent sets.

Phase 1: Exploiting the structure of $G[T]$

In the first phase of our algorithm, we will look into the structure of $G[T]$. Suppose $G[T]$ contains an induced P_4 on vertices a_1, a_2, a_3, a_4 . If there exists a vertex $t \in N(u)$ not adjacent to any vertex of $\{a_1, a_2, a_3, a_4\}$, then $\{u, t\} \cup \{a_1, a_2, a_3, a_4\}$ induces a $P_2 + P_4$ in G , a contradiction. Hence, $\{a_1, a_2, a_3, a_4\}$ must cover $N(u)$. Similarly, $\{a_1, a_2, a_3, a_4\}$ must cover $N(v)$. Suppose $G[T]$ has another induced P_4 on vertices $\{b_1, b_2, b_3, b_4\}$ such that $\{a_1, a_2, a_3, a_4\} \cap \{b_1, b_2, b_3, b_4\} = \emptyset$. By the same arguments, $\{b_1, b_2, b_3, b_4\}$ also covers $N(u)$ and $N(v)$. This means that $N(u) \cup \{a_1, a_2, a_3, a_4\}$ and $N(v) \cup \{b_1, b_2, b_3, b_4\}$ are both connected. We put each remaining vertex of T into either S_u or S_v (which is possible, as G is connected). This yields a (4-constant) solution for (G, u, v) .

From now on, assume that $G[T]$ contains no induced copy of P_4 that is vertex-disjoint from $a_1a_2a_3a_4$ (so, every other induced P_4 in $G[T]$ contains at least one vertex of $\{a_1, a_2, a_3, a_4\}$). Below we will branch into $O(n^{16})$ smaller instances in which $G[T]$ is P_4 -free, such that (G, u, v) has a solution if and only if at least one of these new instances has a solution.

Branching I ($O(n^{16})$ branches)

We branch by considering every possibility for each a_i ($1 \leq i \leq 4$) to go into either S_u or S_v for some solution (S_u, S_v) of (G, u, v) (if it exists). We do this vertex by vertex leading to a total of 2^4 branches. Suppose we decide to put a_i in S_u . If a_i is adjacent to a vertex of $N(u)$, then we apply the **Contraction Rule** on $N(u) \cup \{a_i\}$ to contract a_i away. If a_i is not adjacent to any vertex of $N(u)$, then we do as follows. For each solution (S_u, S_v) with $a_i \in S_u$, there must exist a shortest path P_i in $G[N(u) \cup S_u]$ from a_i to a vertex of $N(u)$ (as $N(u) \cup S_u$ is connected). As G is $(P_2 + P_4)$ -free, G is P_7 -free. Hence, P_i must have at most six vertices and thus at most four inner vertices. We consider all possibilities of choosing at most four vertices of T to belong to S_u as inner vertices of P_i . As we may need to do this for $i = 1, \dots, 4$, the above leads to a total of $O(n^{16})$ additional branches.

For each branch we do as follows. For $i = 1, \dots, 4$ we apply the **Contraction Rule** on $N(u) \cup \{a_i\} \cup V(P_i)$ to contract a_i and the vertices of $V(P_i)$ away. We denote the resulting instance by (G, u, v) again. Note that the property (Claim 1) that $N(u)$ and $N(v)$ are independent sets is maintained. Moreover, as every induced P_4 in $G[T]$ contained at least one vertex of $\{a_1, \dots, a_4\}$, the following claim holds now as well.

Claim 2. $G[T]$ is P_4 -free.

We now prove the following claim.

Claim 3. Let (S_u, S_v) be a solution for (G, u, v) that is not 7-constant. Let t, x_1, x_2 be three vertices of T with $tx_1 \notin E(G)$, $tx_2 \notin E(G)$ and $x_1x_2 \in E(G)$. If t, x_1, x_2 are in S_u , then every neighbour of t in $N(u)$ is adjacent to at least one of x_1, x_2 . If t, x_1, x_2 are in S_v , then every neighbour of t in $N(v)$ is adjacent to at least one of x_1, x_2 .

Proof of Claim 3. We assume without loss of generality that t, x_1, x_2 belong to S_u . Suppose t has a neighbour $w \in N(u)$ that is not adjacent to x_1 and x_2 . Suppose there exists a vertex $w' \in N(u)$ not adjacent to any of t, x_1, x_2 . Then, as $N(u)$ is independent by Claim 1, $\{x_1, x_2\} \cup \{w', u, w, t\}$ is an induced $P_2 + P_4$, a contradiction. Hence, $\{t, x_1, x_2\}$ covers $N(u)$. As $N(u) \cup S_u$ is connected, $G[N(u) \cup S_u]$ contains a shortest path P from t to x_1 . As G is $(P_2 + P_4)$ -free, G is P_7 -free. Hence, P has at most four inner vertices (possibly including x_2). As $V(P) \cup \{x_2\} \cup N(u)$ is connected and $|V(P) \cup \{x_2\}| \leq 7$, we find that (S_u, S_v) is a 7-constant solution, a contradiction. This proves the claim. \diamond

We will use the above claim at several places in our proof, including in the next stage.

Phase 2: Excluding 7-constant solutions and double-sided solutions

We first show that we may exclude double-sided solutions if we have no 7-constant solutions.

Claim 4. If (G, u, v) has a double-sided solution, then (G, u, v) also has a 7-constant solution.

Proof of Claim 4. For contradiction, assume that (G, u, v) has a double-sided solution (S_u, S_v) but no 7-constant solution. By definition, $G[S_u]$ and $G[S_v]$ contain some edges x_1x_2 and $x'_1x'_2$, respectively. Then $N(u)$ must contain a vertex w that is not adjacent to x_1 and x_2 ; otherwise the two vertices x_1, x_2 , which belong to S_u , cover $N(u)$ and this would imply that (S_u, S_v) is a 2-constant solution, and thus also a 7-constant

solution. As $N(u) \cup S_u$ is connected and $N(u)$ is an independent set by Claim 1, set S_u must contain a vertex t that is adjacent to w . Then, by Claim 3, vertex t must be adjacent to at least one of x_1, x_2 , say x_1 . For the same reason, S_v contains a vertex t' that is adjacent to at least one of x'_1, x'_2 , say x'_1 , and to some vertex $w' \in N(v)$ that is not adjacent to x'_1 and x'_2 .

Let $y \in N(v)$. If no vertex of $\{t, x_1, x_2\}$ is adjacent to y , then $\{v, y\} \cup \{u, w, t, x_1\}$ is an induced $P_2 + P_4$ in G , unless $wy \in E(G)$. However, in that case $\{x_1, x_2\} \cup \{u, w, y, v\}$ is an induced $P_2 + P_4$, a contradiction. Hence, $\{t, x_1, x_2\}$ covers $N(v)$. For the same reason we find that $\{t', x'_1, x'_2\}$ covers $N(u)$. Then (G, u, v) has a 3-constant solution (S_u^*, S_v^*) (which is 7-constant by definition) with $\{t', x'_1, x'_2\} \subseteq S_u^*$ and $\{t, x_1, x_2\} \subseteq S_v^*$, a contradiction. This proves the claim. \diamond

Recall that a solution (S_u, S_v) for (G, u, v) is single-sided if exactly one of $G[S_u]$, $G[S_v]$ contains an edge and independent if S_u, S_v are both independent sets. We now do as follows. First we check in polynomial time if (G, u, v) has a 7-constant solution by using Lemma 8. If so, then we are done. From now on assume that (G, u, v) has no 7-constant solution. Then, by Claim 4 it follows that (G, u, v) has no double-sided solution.

From the above, it remains to check if (G, u, v) has a single-sided solution or an independent solution. If (G, u, v) has a single-sided solution (S_u, S_v) that is not independent, then either S_u or S_v is independent. Our algorithm will first look for a solution (S_u, S_v) where S_u is independent. We say that it is doing a *u-feasibility check*. If afterwards we have not found a solution (S_u, S_v) where S_u is independent, then our algorithm will repeat the same steps but now under the assumption that the set S_v is independent. That is, in that case our algorithm will perform a *v-feasibility check*.

Phase 3: Doing a u-feasibility check

We start by exploring the structure of a solution (S_u, S_v) that is either single-sided or independent, and where S_u is an independent set. As S_u and $N(u)$ are both independent sets, $G[N(u) \cup S_u]$ is a connected bipartite graph. Hence, S_u contains a set S_u^* , such that S_u^* covers $N(u)$. We assume that S_u^* has minimum size. Then each $s \in S_u^*$ has a nonempty set $Q(s)$ of neighbours in $N(u)$ that are not adjacent to any vertex in $S_u^* \setminus \{s\}$; otherwise we can remove s from S_u^* , contradicting our assumption that S_u^* has minimum size. We call the vertices of $Q(s)$ the *private* neighbours of s with respect to S_u^* .

We note that $N(u) \cup S_u^*$ does not have to be connected. However, as (G, u, v) has no 7-constant solution, and thus no 1-constant solution, we find that S_u^* has size at least 2. We may assume that there is no vertex $t \in S_u \setminus S_u^*$, such that $N(t) \cap N(u)$ strictly contains $N(s) \cap N(u)$ for some $s \in S_u^*$ (otherwise we put t in S_u^* instead of s). Let Q_u be the union of all private neighbour sets $Q(s)$ ($s \in S_u^*$). As $|S_u^*| \geq 2$, we observe that $G[Q_u \cup S_u^*]$ is the disjoint union of a set of at least two stars whose centers belong to S_u^* .

First suppose that $N(u) \setminus Q_u = \emptyset$. As $N(u) \cup S_u$ is connected and $G[Q_u \cup S_u^*]$ is the disjoint union of at least two stars, there exists a vertex $t \in S_u \setminus S_u^*$ that is adjacent to vertices $z \in Q(s)$ and $z' \in Q(s')$ for two distinct vertices $s, s' \in S_u^*$. As $N(u) \setminus Q_u = \emptyset$, we find that $Q(s) = N(s) \cap N(u)$. By our choice of S_u^* , this means that $Q(s)$ contains at least one vertex w that is not adjacent to t . Similarly, $Q(s')$ contains a vertex w' that is not adjacent to t . By the definition of $Q(s)$ and $Q(s')$, we find that w and z are not adjacent to s' , and w' is not adjacent to s . Then $\{w', s'\} \cup \{w, s, z, t\}$ is an induced $P_2 + P_4$ of G , a contradiction.

From the above we find that $N(u) \setminus Q_u \neq \emptyset$. Let $y \in N(u) \setminus Q_u$. As S_u^* covers $N(u)$ and $y \notin Q_u$, we find that y must be adjacent to at least two vertices $s, s' \in S_u^*$. Suppose y is not adjacent to some vertex $s^* \in S_u^*$. Let $z \in Q(s)$ and $z^* \in Q(s^*)$. By the definition of the sets $Q(s)$ and $Q(s^*)$, we find that z is not adjacent to s' and

s^* and that z^* is not adjacent to s and s' . In particular it holds that $z \neq z^*$. Then $\{s^*, z^*\} \cup \{z, s, y, s'\}$ is an induced $P_2 + P_4$ in G , a contradiction. Hence, y must be adjacent to all of S_u^* , that is, $N(u) \setminus Q_u$ must be complete to S_u^* . Note that this implies that $N(u) \cup S_u^*$ is connected.

To summarize, if (G, u, v) has a solution (S_u, S_v) in which S_u is an independent set, then the following holds for such a solution (S_u, S_v) :

- (P) The set S_u contains a subset S_u^* of size at least 2 that covers $N(u)$, such that each vertex in S_u^* has a nonempty set $Q(s)$ of private neighbours with respect to S_u^* , and moreover, the set $N(u) \setminus Q_u$, where $Q_u = \bigcup_{s \in S_u^*} Q(s)$, is nonempty and complete to S_u^* .

Remark. We emphasize that S_u^* is unknown to the algorithm, as we constructed it from the unknown S_u , and consequently, our algorithm does not know (yet) the sets $Q(s)$.

Phase 3a: Reducing $N(u) \setminus Q_u$ to a single vertex w_u

We will now branch into a polynomial number of smaller instances, in which $N(u) \setminus Q_u$ consists of just one single vertex w_u . As we will show below, we can even identify w_u and Q_u for each of these new instances. Again, we will ensure that if one of these new instances has a solution, then (G, u, v) has as solution. If none of these new instances has a solution, then (G, u, v) may still have a solution (S_u, S_v) . However, in that case S_u is not an independent set, while S_v must be an independent set. As mentioned, we will check this by doing a v -feasibility check as soon as we have finished the u -feasibility check.

Branching II ($O(n^4)$ branches)

We will determine exactly those vertices of $N(u)$ that belong to Q_u via some branching, under the assumption that (G, u, v) has a solution (S_u, S_v) , where S_u is independent, that satisfies (P). By (P), S_u^* consists of at least two (non-adjacent) vertices s and s' . Let $w \in Q(s)$ and $w' \in Q(s')$. We branch by considering all possible choices of choosing these four vertices. This leads to $O(n^4)$ branches, which we each process in the way described below.

If we selected s and s' correctly, then s, s' belong to an independent set S_u that together with $S_v = T \setminus S_u$ forms a solution for (G, u, v) that is not 7-constant. This implies that $\{s, s'\}$ does not cover $N(u)$. Hence, we can pick a vertex $w^* \in N(u) \setminus \{w, w'\}$. If w^* is adjacent to both s and s' , then w^* must belong to $N(u) \setminus Q_u$. In the other case, that is, if w^* is adjacent to at most one of s, s' , then w^* must belong to Q_u . Hence, we have identified in polynomial time the (potential) sets Q_u and $N(u) \setminus Q_u$. Moreover, by applying the **Contraction Rule** on $N(u) \cup \{s, s'\}$ we can contract s and s' away. This also contracts all of $N(u) \setminus Q_u$ into a single vertex which, as we mentioned above, we denote by w_u . Thus w_u is complete to S_u^* .

We denote the resulting instance by (G, u, v) again. We also let $T_1 = N(w_u) \cap T$ and $T_2 = T \setminus T_1$. Note that $S_u^* \subseteq T_1$. As S_u^* covers $N(u)$ and every vertex of S_u^* is adjacent to w_u , we find that $N(u) \cup S_u^*$ is connected. Due to the latter and because every vertex of T_2 is not in S_u^* , we may put without loss of generality every vertex $t \in T_2$ with a neighbour in $N(v)$ in S_v . That is, we may contract such a vertex t away by applying the **Contraction Rule** on $N(v) \cup \{t\}$. By the same reason, we may contract every edge between two vertices in T_2 . Hence, we have proven the following claim.

Claim 5. T_2 is an independent set that is anticomplete to $N(v)$.

Note that by definition, no vertex of T_2 is adjacent to w_u either. In a later stage we will modify T_2 and this property may no longer hold. However, we will always maintain the properties that T_2 is independent and anticomplete to $N(v)$.

By Lemma 8 we check in polynomial time if (G, u, v) has a 7-constant solution. If so, then we are done. From now on suppose that (G, u, v) has no 7-constant solution. Recall that we are still looking for a single-sided or independent solution (S_u, S_v) , where S_u is an independent set. We first show that we can modify G in polynomial time such that afterwards $G[T]$ is $(K_3 + P_1)$ -free.

Suppose $G[T]$ contains an induced $K_3 + P_1$, say with vertices x_1, x_2, x_3, y and edges x_1x_2, x_2x_3, x_3x_1 . Consider a solution (S_u, S_v) for (G, u, v) , where S_u is an independent set. Recall that we already checked on 7-constant solutions. Hence, (S_u, S_v) is not 7-constant. As S_u is an independent set, at least two of x_1, x_2, x_3 , say x_1, x_2 , must belong to S_v . Then $(S_v \cap (N[x_1] \cup N[x_2])) \cup N(v)$ is connected; otherwise, as $S_v \cup N(v)$ is connected by definition, there would exist a vertex $t \in S_v \setminus (N[x_1] \cup N[x_2])$ with a neighbour in $N(v)$ that is not adjacent to x_1 and x_2 , contradicting Claim 3. As y does not belong to $N[x_1] \cup N[x_2]$, this means that y is not needed for S_v .

From the above we can do as follows. If y has a neighbour in $N(u)$, then we contract y away by applying the **Contraction Rule** on $N(u) \cup \{y\}$. Otherwise, if y has no neighbour in $N(u)$, then $y \in T_2$. As $N(u) \cup S_u^*$ is connected for some set $S_u^* \subseteq S_u \cap T_1$, this means that y is not needed for S_u either. Hence, we may contract the edge between y and an arbitrary neighbour of y (as G is connected, y has at least one such neighbour). We apply this rule, in polynomial time, for every induced copy of $K_3 + P_1$ in $G[T]$. Note that Claim 5 is maintained and that in the end the following claim holds.

Claim 6. $G[T]$ is $(K_3 + P_1)$ -free.

We will now do some further branching to obtain $O(n)$ smaller instances in which $G[T_1]$ is K_3 -free, such that the following holds. If one of these new instances has a solution, then (G, u, v) has as solution. If none of these new instances has a solution, then (G, u, v) may still have a solution (S_u, S_v) , but in that case S_u is not an independent set while S_v must be an independent set; this will be verified when we do the v -feasibility check.

Branching III ($O(n)$ branches)

We consider all possibilities of putting one vertex $t \in T_1$ in S_u . This leads to $O(n)$ branches. For each branch we do as follows. As t is adjacent to w_u (because $t \in T_1$), we can contract t away using the **Contraction Rule** on $N(u) \cup \{t\}$. As S_u is independent, every neighbour t' of t in T_1 must go to S_v . If such a neighbour t' is adjacent to a vertex of $N(v)$, this means that we may contract t' away by using the **Contraction Rule** on $N(v) \cup \{t'\}$. If t' has no neighbour in $N(v)$, then we put t' in T_2 . By the **Contraction Rule** we may contract all edges between t' and its neighbours in T_2 , such that T_2 is an independent set again that is anticomplete to $N(v)$, so Claim 5 is still valid (but T_2 may now contain vertices adjacent to w_u). We denote the resulting instance by (G, u, v) again. As $G[T]$, and consequently, $G[T_1]$ is $(K_3 + P_1)$ -free due to Claim 6, we find afterwards that the following holds for each branch.

Claim 7. $G[T_1]$ is K_3 -free.

By Lemma 8 we check in polynomial time if (G, u, v) has an 7-constant solution. If so, then we are done. From now on assume that (G, u, v) has no 7-constant solution. Note that (G, u, v) has no double-sided solution either, as then the original instance has a double-sided solution, which we already ruled out (alternatively, apply Claim 4). We will focus on the following task (recall that a solution (S_u, S_v) for (G, u, v) is independent if both S_u and S_v are independent sets).

Phase 3b: Looking for independent solutions after branching

We will now branch to $O(n^5)$ smaller instances for which the goal is to find an independent solution. As before, if one of the newly created instances has a solution,

then (G, u, v) has as solution. If none of these new instances has a solution, then (G, u, v) may still have a solution (S_u, S_v) . However, in that case S_u is not independent and S_v must be an independent set. This will be verified when we do the v -feasibility check.

We say that an instance (G, u, v) satisfies the $(*)$ -property if the following holds:

$(*)$ If (G, u, v) has a solution (S_u, S_v) where S_u is an independent set, then (G, u, v) has an independent solution.

Let D_1, \dots, D_q be the connected components of $G[T]$ for some $q \geq 1$. First suppose that every D_i consists of a single vertex. Then $G[T]$ is an independent set. Hence, any solution for (G, u, v) will be independent. We conclude that $(*)$ holds already. Now suppose that at least one of D_1, \dots, D_q , say D_1 , has more than one vertex.

We first consider the case where another D_i , say D_2 , also has more than one vertex. We claim that $(*)$ is again satisfied already. In order to see this, assume that (G, u, v) has a solution (S_u, S_v) , where S_u is an independent set, but S_v contains two adjacent vertices x_1 and x_2 . We assume without loss of generality that x_1 and x_2 belong to D_2 . Hence, $V(D_1)$ is anticomplete to $\{x_1, x_2\}$. Suppose $D_1 \cap S_v \neq \emptyset$. Let $t \in D_1 \cap S_v$. Recall that (S_u, S_v) is not a 7-constant solution, as (G, u, v) does not have such solutions. Then, by Claim 3, we find that S_v has a set S'_v that contains x_1, x_2 but not t , such that every vertex of $N(v)$ is adjacent to a vertex of S'_v and $S'_v \cup N(v)$ is connected. Hence, we may put t into S_u . Similarly, we may put every other vertex of $D_1 \cap S_v$ into S_u . As T_2 is an independent set by Claim 5, at least one vertex of D_1 belongs to T_1 and is thus adjacent to $w_u \in N(v)$ by definition. This means that $(S_u \cup (V(D_1) \cap S_v), S_v \setminus V(D_1))$ is another solution for (G, u, v) . However, this solution is double-sided, a contradiction. So, from now on, we assume that D_1 contains more than one vertex and that D_2, \dots, D_q each have exactly one vertex.

Recall that T_2 is an independent set that is anticomplete to $N(v)$ due to Claim 5. Suppose $t \in T_2$ does not belong to D_1 . Then t is an isolated vertex of $G[T]$ that is not adjacent to any vertex of $N(v)$. As G is connected, t is adjacent to at least one vertex of $N(u)$. We apply the **Contraction Rule** on $N(u) \cup \{t\}$ to contract t away. Afterwards, we find that every vertex of T_2 must belong to D_1 .

Let B_1, \dots, B_p be the connected components of $G[T_1 \cap V(D_1)]$ for some $p \geq 1$. By Claim 2, $G[T]$, and thus $G[T_1 \cap V(D_1)]$, is P_4 -free (note that we only contracted edges during the branching and thus maintained P_4 -freeness due to Lemma 7). As $G[T_1]$ is also K_3 -free by Claim 6, each B_i is a complete bipartite graph on one or more vertices due to Lemma 1.

First suppose that $p = 1$. Recall that T_2 is an independent set by Claim 5 that belongs to D_1 . In this case we show how to branch into $O(n^2)$ new and smaller instances, such that (G, u, v) has a solution (S_u, S_v) , in which S_u is an independent set, if and only if one of these new instances has such a solution. Moreover, each new instance will have the property that either $(*)$ has been obtained or $p \geq 2$ holds.

Branching IV ($O(n^2)$ branches)

We consider each possibility of choosing one vertex $t \in B_1$ to be placed in S_u . This leads to $O(n)$ branches. In each branch we contract t away by the **Contraction Rule** on $N(u) \cup \{t\}$ (note that $tw_u \in E(G)$, as $t \in T_1$). Since S_u is an independent set, we must place all neighbours of t in S_v . In order to contract these neighbours away using the **Contraction Rule** we may need to branch once more by considering every vertex that is in B_1 and that has at least one neighbour in $N(v)$. This leads to $O(n)$ additional branches. Hence, the total number of branches for this stage is $O(n^2)$. For each branch we observe that T_1 has become an independent set (as the vertices in the components D_2, \dots, D_q form an independent set as well). By applying the **Contraction Rule** we ensure that T_2 is an independent set that remains anticomplete to $N(v)$.

First suppose that $T_1 \cap V(D_1)$ consists of a single vertex t^* . If $T_2 \neq \emptyset$, then we do as follows. Recall that we are looking for a solution (S_u, S_v) with $T_2 \subseteq S_v$. As $N(v) \cup S_v$ must be connected but T_2 is anticomplete to $N(v)$ by Claim 5, vertex t^* must be placed into S_v . Hence, if t^* is not adjacent to a vertex in $N(v)$, we discard the branch. Otherwise we contract $T_2 \cup \{t^*\}$ away by applying the **Contraction Rule** on $N(v) \cup T_2 \cup \{t^*\}$. Hence, we obtained $T_2 = \emptyset$. As T_1 is an independent set, this means that $(*)$ holds.

Now suppose that $T_1 \cap V(D_1)$ consists of more than one vertex. As T_1 is an independent set, this means that $G[T_1 \cap V(D_1)]$ has $p \geq 2$ connected components. Hence, we have arrived in the case where $p \geq 2$. We denote the resulting instance by $(G, u, v,)$ again, and we let also B_1, \dots, B_p denote the connected components of $G[T_1 \cap V(D_1)]$ again.

From the above we are now in the situation where (G, u, v) is an instance for which $p \geq 2$ holds. By Lemma 1 and because D_1 is connected and P_4 -free, D_1 has a spanning complete bipartite graph B^* . As $p \geq 2$, all vertices of $V(B_1) \cup \dots \cup V(B_p)$ belong to the same partition class of B^* . By definition, these vertices are in T_1 . Hence, as T_2 is an independent set in D_1 , all vertices of T_2 form the other bipartition class of B^* . Consequently, T_2 is complete to $T_1 \cap V(D_1)$. We will do some branching.

Branching V ($O(n)$ branches)

Every vertex of T_2 will belong to S_v in any solution (S_u, S_v) where S_u is an independent set, but without having any neighbours in $N(v)$ due to Claim 5. This means that S_v contains at least one vertex t of $V(D_1) \cap T_1$. We branch by considering all possibilities of choosing this vertex t . Indeed, as T_2 is complete to T_1 , it suffices to check single vertices $t \in T_1$ that have a neighbour in $N(v)$. This leads to $O(n)$ branches. For each branch we do as follows. We contract the vertices of $T_2 \cup \{t\}$ away using the **Contraction Rule** on $N(v) \cup T_2 \cup \{t\}$. We denote the resulting instance by (G, u, v) and observe that $T_2 = \emptyset$, so $T = T_1$.

Note that $G[T] = G[T_1]$ now consists of connected components $B'_1, \dots, B'_{p'}$ for some $p' \geq 1$, where each B'_i is a complete bipartite graph. If every B'_i consists of a single vertex, then $G[T]$ is an independent set. Hence, any solution for (G, u, v) will be independent. We conclude that $(*)$ holds. Now suppose that at least one of $B'_1, \dots, B'_{p'}$, say B'_1 , has more than one vertex. If another B'_i , say B'_2 , also has more than one vertex, then $(*)$ is also satisfied already. We can show this in the same way as before, namely when we proved this for the sets D_1, \dots, D_q . From now on we may assume that B'_1 consists of more than one vertex and that $B'_2, \dots, B'_{p'}$ have only one vertex. So, in particular, B'_1 is a complete bipartite graph on at least two vertices. We will do some branching.

Branching VI ($O(n^2)$ branches)

We consider each possibility of choosing one vertex $t \in B'_1$ to be placed in S_u . This leads to $O(n)$ branches. In each branch we contract t away by applying the **Contraction Rule** on $N(u) \cup \{t\}$ (note that $tw_u \in E(G)$, as $t \in T_1$, so we can indeed do this). Since S_u is an independent set, we must place all neighbours of t in S_v . In order to contract these neighbours away using the **Contraction Rule** we proceed as follows. All neighbours of t that are adjacent to $N(v)$ we can contract away by applying the **Contraction Rule** on $N(v) \cup \{t\}$. If all neighbours of t disappeared this way, this yields $T = T_1$, an independent set as required. Otherwise, we need to include another vertex of B'_1 into S_v . So we branch on the $O(n)$ vertices $t' \in B'_1$ that are adjacent to v . Contracting such a t' away makes all other neighbours of t adjacent to $N(v)$ and we can contract them away. In any case, eventually we will end up with $T = T_1$ being independent. Consequently, S_v must be an independent set for any solution (S_u, S_v) where S_u is an independent set. This means that we achieved $(*)$.

If we have not yet found a solution, then by achieving (*), as shown above, we have reduced the problem to $O(n^5)$ instances, for which we search for an independent solution. We consider these new instances one by one. For simplicity, we denote the instance under consideration by (G, u, v) again.

Phase 3c: Searching for private solutions

In this phase we introduce a new type of independent solution that we call private. In order to define this notion, we first describe our branching procedure which will get us to this new notion.

Branching VII. ($O(n^4)$ branches)

First we process $N(v)$ in the same way as we did for $N(u)$ in Branching II. That is, in polynomial time via $O(n^4)$ branches, we find a partition of $N(v)$ into a set Q_v of private neighbours and a vertex w_v that will be complete to S_v . To be more specific, if (G, u, v) has a solution (S_u, S_v) in which S_u and S_v are independent sets, then the following holds for such a solution (S_u, S_v) :

- (P1) The independent set S_u contains a subset S_u^* of size at least 2 that covers $N(u)$, such that each $s \in S_u^*$ has a nonempty set $Q_u(s)$ of private neighbours with respect to S_u^* , and moreover, the set $N(u) \setminus Q_u$, where $Q_u = \bigcup Q_u(s)$, consists of a single vertex w_u that is complete to S_u^* .
- (P2) The independent set S_v contains a subset S_v^* of size at least 2 that covers $N(v)$, such that each $s \in S_v^*$ has a nonempty set $Q_v(s)$ of private neighbours with respect to S_v^* , and moreover, the set $N(v) \setminus Q_v$, where $Q_v = \bigcup Q_v(s)$, consists of a single vertex w_v that is complete to S_v^* .

We call an independent solution (S_u, S_v) satisfying (P1) and (P2) a *private solution*. We emphasize that by now all branches are guaranteed to have private solutions or no solutions at all. Thus in what follows we will only search for private solutions. While doing this we may modify the instance (G, u, v) , but we will always ensure that private solutions are pertained. In particular, if we contract a vertex $t \in S_u^*$ to w_u using the **Contraction Rule** on $N(u) \cup \{t\}$, then this leads to a private solution (S_u, S_v) with $t \notin S_u^*$. Then all private neighbours of t become adjacent to w_u and, by the **Contraction Rule**, they get contracted to w_u as well. However, if $t \notin S_u^*$, then contracting t to w_u will make the neighbours of t in $N(u)$ adjacent to w_u and the **Contraction Rule** contracts these to w_u . As a consequence, some vertices in S_u^* may have no private neighbours in $N(u)$ and hence leave S_u^* . If this reduces $|S_u^*|$ to 1, then we will notice this by checking for 1-constant solutions, which takes polynomial time due to Lemma 8. If we find a 1-constant solution, then we stop and conclude that our original instance is a yes-instance. Otherwise, we know that $|S_u^*| \geq 2$, and hence private solutions pertain (should such solutions exist at all). In the remainder, we will perform this test implicitly whenever we apply the **Contraction Rule**.

We now prove the following two claims.

Claim 8. *Every vertex of T is adjacent to both w_u and w_v .*

Proof of Claim 8. Consider a vertex $t \in T$. First suppose that $t \in T$ is neither adjacent to w_u nor to w_v . As G is connected, t will be adjacent to some other vertex in S_u or S_v in every solution (S_u, S_v) . Hence, (G, u, v) has no independent solutions, and thus no private solutions, and we can discard the branch. From now on assume that every vertex in T is adjacent to at least one of w_u, w_v . If $t \in T$ is adjacent to only w_u and not to w_v , then by the same argument we must apply the **Contraction Rule** on $N(u) \cup \{t\}$. Similarly, if $t \in T$ is adjacent to only w_v and not to w_u , then we must apply the **Contraction Rule** on $N(v) \cup \{t\}$. We discard a branch whenever two adjacent

vertices in T were involved in an edge contraction with some neighbour in $N(u)$, or with some neighbour in $N(v)$. \diamond

Claim 9. *If (G, u, v) has a private solution, then $G[T]$ must be the disjoint union of one or more complete bipartite graphs.*

Proof of Claim 9. If $G[T]$ is not bipartite, then (G, u, v) has no independent solution (S_u, S_v) , as $T = S_u \cup S_v$. Hence, (G, u, v) has no private solution. Assume that $G[T]$ is bipartite. By Claim 2, $G[T]$ is P_4 -free. Then the claim follows by Lemma 1. \diamond

By Claim 9 we may assume that $G[T]$ is the disjoint union of one or more complete bipartite graphs; otherwise we discard the branch.

We now prove that T can be changed into an independent set via some branching. Suppose T is not an independent set yet. Let B_1, \dots, B_r , for some $r \geq 1$, denote the connected components of $G[T]$ that have at least one edge (note that $G[T]$ may also contain some isolated vertices). By Claim 9, every B_i is complete bipartite.

Claim 10. *If (G, u, v) has a private solution, then $r \leq 3$.*

Proof of Claim 10. Assume that $r \geq 4$. We will prove that (G, u, v) has no private solution. Suppose that T contains four connected components with edges, say B_1, \dots, B_4 , for which the following holds: $V(B_1)$ covers some subset $A_1^u \subseteq N(u)$ and $V(B_2)$ covers some subset $A_2^u \subseteq N(u)$, such that $A_1^u \setminus A_2^u \neq \emptyset$, whereas $V(B_3)$ covers some subset $A_3^v \subseteq N(v)$ and $V(B_4)$ covers some subset $A_4^v \subseteq N(v)$, such that $A_3^v \setminus A_4^v \neq \emptyset$. Let $w \in A_1^u \setminus A_2^u$, say w is adjacent to vertex s of B_1 (and not to any vertex of B_2). Let x_1 and x_2 be two adjacent vertices of B_2 , which exist as B_2 contains an edge. Suppose $V(B_1) \cup V(B_2)$ does not cover $N(u)$. Then there exists a vertex w' that has no neighbour in $V(B_1) \cup V(B_2)$. However, then $\{x_1, x_2\} \cup \{s, w, u, w'\}$ is an induced $P_2 + P_4$ of G , a contradiction. Hence, $V(B_1) \cup V(B_2)$ covers $N(u)$. Similarly, we find that $V(B_3) \cup V(B_4)$ covers $N(v)$. Then, as each vertex of T is adjacent to both w_u and w_v , we find that $G[N(u) \cup V(B_1) \cup V(B_2)]$ and $G[N(u) \cup V(B_3) \cup V(B_4)]$ are connected. This is not possible, as then the original instance has a double-sided solution, which we already ruled out after Claim 4.

If two sets from $V(B_1), \dots, V(B_r)$, say $V(B_1)$ and $V(B_2)$, cover the same subset of $N(u)$ and the same subset of $N(v)$, then we can apply the **Contraction Rule** on $N(u) \cup V(B_1)$ and on $N(v) \cup V(B_2)$ to find that the original instance has a double-sided solution if it has a solution. However, as we already ruled this out, this is not possible either.

Now consider the sets B_1 and B_2 . From the above, we deduce the following. We may assume without loss of generality that $V(B_1)$ and $V(B_2)$ cover different subsets of $N(u)$. This implies that $V(B_3), \dots, V(B_r)$ all cover the same subset A of $N(v)$. We can also apply the above on B_1 and B_3 to find that B_1 and B_3 must either cover different subsets of $N(u)$ or different subsets of $N(v)$. Suppose B_1 and B_3 cover different subsets of $N(v)$. Then, again from the above, B_2, B_4, \dots, B_r must cover the same subset of $N(u)$. As B_1 and B_2 cover different subsets of $N(u)$, this means that B_1 and B_4 cover different subsets of $N(u)$. This implies that B_2 must cover the same set A as B_4, \dots, B_r . As B_3 covers A as well, this means that B_2 and B_3 cover the same subset of $N(v)$. Hence, they must cover different subsets of $N(u)$. However, the latter implies that B_1 and B_4 cover the same subset of $N(v)$. As B_4 covers A , just like B_3 , we find that B_1 and B_3 cover the same subset A of $N(v)$, a contradiction. Hence, B_1 and B_3 cover the same subset of $N(v)$, namely A , and by symmetry the same holds for B_2 .

As $V(B_1)$ covers A_1^u and $V(B_2)$ covers A_2^u such that $A_1^u \setminus A_2^u \neq \emptyset$, we can use the same arguments as before to deduce that $V(B_1)$ and $V(B_2)$ must cover $N(u)$. We put the vertices of B_1 and B_2 into S_u and the vertices of B_i for $i \geq 3$ plus all other (isolated) vertices of T into S_v . If (S_u, S_v) is a solution for (G, u, v) , then the original solution has a double-sided solution, which we already ruled out. Hence, there exists a

vertex z of $N(v)$ that is not adjacent to any vertex of $T \setminus (V(B_1) \cup V(B_2))$. However, as every $V(B_i)$ covers the same subset A of $N(v)$, no vertex of B_1 and B_2 is adjacent to z either. This implies that (G, u, v) is a no-instance, meaning that we can discard this branch. \diamond

By Claim 10 we may assume that $r \leq 3$, that is, $G[T]$ has at most three connected components B_i with an edge; otherwise we discard the branch. As $r \leq 3$, we can now do some branching to obtain $O(1)$ smaller instances in which T is an independent set, such that (G, u, v) has a private solution if and only if at least one of these new instances has a private solution.

Branching VIII ($O(1)$ branches)

For $i = 1, \dots, r$, let Y_i and Z_i be the bipartition classes of B_i . Let $1 \leq i \leq r$. As S_u and S_v must be independent sets and every B_i is complete bipartite, either Y_i belongs to S_u and Z_i belongs to S_v , or the other way around. We branch by considering both possibilities. We do this for each $i \in \{1, \dots, r\}$. This leads to $2^r \leq 2^3$ branches, as $r \leq 3$ due to Claim 10. In each branch we apply the **Contraction Rule** to contract Y_i and Z_i away (note that here our remark about pertaining private solutions applies). We consider every resulting instance separately. We denote such an instance again by (G, u, v) , for which we have proven the following claim.

Claim 11. *T is an independent set.*

We now continue as follows. As T is an independent set by Claim 11, the sets S_u and S_v of any solution (S_u, S_v) will be independent (should (G, u, v) have a solution). Recall also that $\{w_u, w_v\}$ is complete to T by Claim 8. We are looking for a private solution (S_u, S_v) , which we recall is an independent solution for which sets S_u^* and S_v^* exist so that (P1) and (P2) are satisfied. We make the following observation. Let $R = T \setminus (S_u^* \cup S_v^*)$ be the set of all other vertices of T . Consider a vertex $z \in R$. We note that if $z \in S_u$, then $(S_u \setminus \{z\}, S_v \cup \{z\})$ is also a solution for (G, u, v) ; this follows from (P1) and (P2) and the fact that w_v is adjacent to $z \in T$. Similarly, if $z \in S_v$, then $(S_u \cup \{z\}, S_v \setminus \{z\})$ is a solution as well.

We prove the following four claims.

Claim 12. *Let $w \in N(u) \cup N(v)$. Then we may assume without loss of generality that w is adjacent to at least two vertices of T .*

Proof of Claim 12. Suppose $N(u)$ or $N(v)$, say $N(u)$, contains a vertex w that is adjacent to at most one vertex of T . If w has no neighbours in T , then (G, u, v) has no solution and we discard the branch. Suppose w has exactly one neighbour $z \in T$. Then z belongs to S_u^* for every (private) solution (S_u, S_v) of (G, u, v) (assuming (G, u, v) is a yes-instance). Hence, we may apply the **Contraction Rule** on $N(u) \cup \{z\}$. We apply this operation exhaustively, while pertaining private solutions as before.

It may happen that in this process it turns out that two vertices z, z' both belong to S_u^* for every (private) solution (S_u, S_v) of (G, u, v) , while they share a neighbour in $N(u) \setminus \{w_u\}$. This contradicts (P1). Hence, in this case we find that (G, u, v) does not have a private solution and we may discard the branch. Otherwise, in the end, we have obtained in polynomial time an instance with the desired property. As we ensure that private solutions pertain, the size of S_u^* remains at least 2. \diamond

Claim 13. *Let $z \in T$. Then we may assume without loss of generality that z is non-adjacent to at least one vertex of $N(u)$ and to at least one vertex of $N(v)$.*

Proof of Claim 13. Suppose $z \in T$ is adjacent to all vertices of $N(u)$ or to all vertices of $N(v)$, say to all vertices of $N(u)$. Then we can check in polynomial time if $T \setminus \{z\}$ covers $N(v)$. If so, then $\{z, T \setminus \{z\}\}$ is a (1-constant) solution of (G, u, v) and we can stop. Otherwise z must belong to S_v for any solution (S_u, S_v) of (G, u, v) . In that case we

may apply the **Contraction Rule** on $N(v) \cup \{z\}$. We apply this operation exhaustively (we again recall that we ensure that private solutions pertain by checking for 1-constant solutions). Moreover, it may happen that during this process two vertices z, z' will end up in the same set S_u or S_v for any private solution (S_u, S_v) , while sharing a neighbour in $N(u) \setminus \{w_u\}$. As the sets S_u and S_v are independent in a private solution (S_u, S_v) , this means that (G, u, v) does not have a private solution and we may discard the branch. Otherwise, in the end, we have obtained in polynomial time an instance with the desired property. \diamond

Claim 14. *Let s and t be any two distinct vertices of T . Then we may assume without loss of generality that either $N(u) \cap N(s) \cap N(t) = \{w_u\}$; or $N(u) \cap N(s) = N(u) \cap N(t)$; or $\{s, t\}$ covers $N(u)$. Similarly, we may assume without loss of generality that either $N(v) \cap N(s) \cap N(t) = \{w_v\}$; or $N(v) \cap N(s) = N(v) \cap N(t)$; $\{s, t\}$ covers $N(v)$.*

Proof of Claim 14. By symmetry it suffices to prove only the first statement. Assume T contains two vertices s and t , for which there exist distinct vertices $w \in (N(u) \setminus \{w_u\}) \cap N(s) \cap N(t)$; $w' \in (N(u) \cap N(s)) \setminus N(t)$ and $w'' \in N(u) \setminus (N(s) \cup N(t))$. Note that $w_u \notin \{w, w', w''\}$. Recall that in this stage we are looking for private solutions for (G, u, v) . Consider an arbitrary private solution (S_u, S_v) (if it exists). Then $w'' \in Q_u(z)$ for some $z \in S_u^*$. Note that $z \notin \{s, t\}$, as neither s nor t is adjacent to w'' .

The above means that z must be adjacent to at least one of w, w' , as otherwise the set $\{w'', z\} \cup \{w', s, w, t\}$ induces a $P_2 + P_4$ in G , which is not possible. Hence, at least one of w or w' will be a private neighbour of z , that is, will belong to $Q_u(z)$. As s is adjacent to both w and w' and $N(u) \setminus Q_u = \{w_u\}$ (see property (P1) of the definition of a private solution), this means that s does not belong to S_u^* . We conclude that s belongs to $R = T \setminus (S_u^* \cup S_v^*)$ or to S_v^* for any private solution (S_u, S_v) of (G, u, v) . As s is adjacent to $w_v \in N(v)$, we may therefore apply the **Contraction Rule** on $N(v) \cup \{s\}$, ensuring persistence of private solutions (in case there are any) in the usual way. We do this exhaustively, and in the end we find that the claim holds. Note that we obtained this situation in polynomial time. \diamond

Claim 15. *Let s and t be any two distinct vertices of T that together cover $N(u)$. Then there exists a nonempty set $A(v) \subseteq N(v)$ that is complete to $\{s, t\}$ and anticomplete to $T \setminus \{s, t\}$, or (G, u, v) has a 2-constant solution. The same holds for u and v interchanged.*

Proof of Claim 15. Assume without loss of generality that $\{s, t\}$ covers $N(u)$. Then we find that $(\{s, t\}, T \setminus \{s, t\})$ is a 2-constant solution unless $N(v)$ contains a nonempty set $A(v)$ that is anticomplete to $T \setminus \{s, t\}$. By Claim 12 we find that $A(v)$ is complete to $\{s, t\}$. \diamond

We will use Claims 12–15 to prove the following claim.

Claim 16. *Let s and t be two distinct vertices in T such that $\{s, t\}$ covers $N(u) \cup N(v)$. Then (G, u, v) has a 2-constant solution.*

Proof of Claim 16. Assume that (G, u, v) has no 2-constant solution. Then by Claim 15, there is a nonempty set $A(u) \subseteq N(u)$ that is complete to $\{s, t\}$ and anticomplete to $T \setminus \{s, t\}$. Similarly, there exists a nonempty set $A(v) \subseteq N(v)$ that is complete to $\{s, t\}$ and anticomplete to $T \setminus \{s, t\}$. By Claim 13 we find that $N(u)$ contains a vertex w that is not adjacent to s . As $\{s, t\}$ covers $N(u)$, this means that w is adjacent to t . By Claim 12 we find that w is adjacent to some vertex $s' \in T \setminus \{s, t\}$. As s' is anticomplete to $A(u)$, Claim 14 tells us that $\{s', t\}$ covers $N(u)$. By the same argument, there exists a vertex t' such that $\{s, t'\}$ covers $N(v)$. Putting s', t in S_u and s, t' in S_v (together with all other vertices of T) yields a 2-constant solution (S_u, S_v) of (G, u, v) . This is a contradiction. \diamond

We continue as follows. By Lemma 8 we check in polynomial time if (G, u, v) has a 2-constant solution. If so, then we are done. Otherwise, we obtain the following claim, which immediately follows from Claim 16 and the fact that if one pair of vertices of T covers $N(u)$ and another pair covers $N(v)$, then we obtained a 2-constant solution.

Claim 17. *We may assume without loss of generality that every pair of (distinct) vertices $\{s, t\}$ in T does not cover $N(u)$; hence, $\{s, t\}$ may only cover $N(v)$.*

We call a pair of vertices s, t of T a 2-pair if $\{s, t\}$ covers $N(v)$. Let T_v be the set of vertices of T involved in a 2-pair. We continue by proving the following claim.

Claim 18. *Every vertex of T_v belongs to exactly one 2-pair.*

Proof of Claim 18. Let $s \in T_v$. By definition, s belongs to at least one 2-pair. For contradiction, suppose that s belongs to more than one 2-pair. Then there exist vertices t_1, t_2 in T_v , such that $\{s, t_1\}$ and $\{s, t_2\}$ both cover $N(v)$. As (G, u, v) has no 2-constant solution, $N(u)$ contains a nonempty set $A_1(u) \subseteq N(u)$ that is complete to $\{s, t_1\}$ and anticomplete to $T \setminus \{s, t_1\}$ due to Claim 15. By the same claim, $N(u)$ contains a nonempty set $A_2(u) \subseteq N(u)$ that is complete to $\{s, t_2\}$ and anticomplete to $T \setminus \{s, t_2\}$. Let $w_1 \in A_1(u)$ and $w_2 \in A_2(u)$; note that $w_2 \neq w_u$. Then w_1 is adjacent to s but not to t_2 , whereas $w_2 \neq w_u$ is a common neighbour of s and t_2 . As $\{s, t_2\}$ does not cover $N(u)$ due to Claim 17, this contradicts Claim 14. \diamond

We next prove that actually $T_v = \emptyset$. Suppose that $T_v \neq \emptyset$. Let $(s, t) \in T_v$. By Claim 15, there exists a nonempty subset $A(u)$ of $N(u)$ that is complete to $\{s, t\}$ and anticomplete to $T \setminus \{s, t\}$. As (G, u, v) has no 2-constant solution, s and t do not cover all of $N(u)$. By Claim 13, we find that s is not adjacent to some vertex $w \in N(v)$. As (s, t) is a 2-pair, t is adjacent to w . By Claim 12, we find that w is adjacent to a vertex $z \in T \setminus \{s, t\}$. From Claim 18 it follows that (t, z) is not a 2-pair, so t and z do not cover all of $N(v)$. By Claim 14 and the fact that t and z have a common neighbour different from w_v , namely w , this means that t and z are adjacent to the same neighbours in $N(v)$. However, then (s, z) is 2-pair, contradicting Claim 18. This means that we have indeed proven the following claim.

Claim 19. $T_v = \emptyset$.

Phase 3d: Translating the problem into a matching problem

We are now ready to translate the instance (G, u, v) into an instance of a matching problem. Recall that w_u and w_v are the vertices in $N(u)$ and $N(v)$ that are complete to T . By Claims 14 and 19 we can partition $N(u) \setminus \{w_u\}$ into sets $N_1(u) \cup \dots \cup N_q(u)$ for some $q \geq 1$ such that two vertices of $N(u)$ have the same set of neighbours in T if and only if they both belong to $N_i(u)$ for some $i \in \{1, \dots, q\}$. Similarly, we can partition $N(v) \setminus \{w_v\}$ into sets $N_1(v) \cup \dots \cup N_r(v)$ for some $r \geq 1$ such that two vertices of $N(v)$ have the same set of neighbours in T if and only if they both belong to $N_i(v)$ for some $i \in \{1, \dots, r\}$. We may remove all but one vertex of each $N_h(u)$ and each $N_i(v)$ to obtain an equivalent instance, which we denote by (G, u, v) again.

Let G' be the graph obtained from G after removing the vertices u, v, w_u, w_v and every edge between a vertex of $N(u)$ and a vertex of $N(v)$. Note that G' is bipartite with partition classes $(N(u) \setminus \{w_u\}) \cup (N(v) \setminus \{w_v\})$ and T . It remains to compute a maximum matching M in G' . We can do this by using the Hopcroft-Karp algorithm, which runs in $O(m\sqrt{n})$ -time on bipartite graphs with n vertices and m edges. If $|M| = |N(u)| + |N(v)| - 2$, then each vertex in $(N(u) \setminus \{w_u\}) \cup (N(v) \setminus \{w_v\})$ is incident to an edge of M , and hence, we found a (private) solution for (G, u, v) . If $|M| < |N(u)| + |N(v)| - 2$, then (G, u, v) has no (private) solution, and we discard the branch.

The above concludes the description of the u -feasibility check. If we found a branch with a solution, then we translate it in polynomial time to a solution for the original instance. Otherwise we perform Phase 4.

Phase 4: Doing a v -feasibility check

As mentioned, our algorithm now does a v -feasibility check, that is, it checks for the existence of a solution (S_u, S_v) , where S_v is an independent set and $G[S_u]$ may contain edges. As we can repeat exactly the same steps as in Phase 3, this phase takes polynomial time as well. This concludes the description of our algorithm.

The correctness of our algorithm follows from the above description. We now analyze its run-time. The branching is done in eight stages, namely Branching I-VIII and yields a total number of $O(n^{30})$ branches. As explained in each step above, processing each branch created in Branching I-VI until we start branching again takes polynomial time. Checking for 1-constant solutions to ensure survival of private solutions takes constant time as well. Moreover, processing each of the branches created in Branch VII takes polynomial time as well. We conclude that the total running time of our algorithm is polynomial. \square

Via Lemma 6 and a reduction to P_4 -SUITABILITY we obtain:

Lemma 10. P_5 -SUITABILITY can be solved in polynomial time for $(P_2 + P_4)$ -free graphs.

Proof. Let (G, u, v) be an instance of P_5 -SUITABILITY, where G is a connected $(P_2 + P_4)$ -free graph. We may assume without loss of generality that u and v are of distance at least 4 from each other, as otherwise (G, u, v) is a no-instance. By the **Contraction Rule** and Lemma 7 we may also assume without loss of generality that $N(u)$ and $N(v)$ are both independent sets; otherwise if, say, $G[N(u)]$ contains an edge e , then we contract e to obtain an equivalent but smaller instance (G', u, v) , where G' is also $(P_2 + P_4)$ -free due to Lemma 7.

First suppose $|N(u)| = 1$, say $N(u) = \{u'\}$ for some $u' \in V(G)$. Then we solve P_4 -SUITABILITY on instance $(G - u, u', v)$. We can do this in polynomial time due to Lemma 9.

Now suppose $|N(u)| \geq 2$. Note that $\text{dist}(u, v) \leq 5$, as G is P_7 -free. By Lemma 6 we may assume that $\text{dist}(u, v) = 4$. We will explore the structure of the P_5 -witness bags $W(p_2)$ and $W(p_3)$ should they exist. Let Z be the set that consists of all vertices z with $\text{dist}(u, z) = \text{dist}(z, v) = 2$. Then Z must be a subset of $W(p_3)$. As $N(u)$ is not connected, $W(p_2)$ must contain at least one other vertex s adjacent to some vertex $t \in N(u)$. Suppose s is non-adjacent to some other vertex $t' \in N(u)$. Let w be a neighbour of v . As $s \in W(p_2)$ and $w \in W(p_4)$, we find that s and w are not adjacent. Then the set $\{v, w\} \cup \{s, t, u, t'\}$ induces a $P_2 + P_4$ in G , a contradiction. Hence, s is adjacent to every vertex of $N(u)$. We consider all possibilities of choosing vertex s from the set $V(G) \setminus (N[u] \cup N[v] \cup Z)$. This leads to $O(n)$ branches. In each branch we contract the set $N(u) \cup \{s\}$ to a single vertex u' . Let G' be the resulting graph. Then we solve P_4 -SUITABILITY on instance (G', u', v) . As G' is $(P_2 + P_4)$ -free by Lemma 7, we can do this in polynomial time due to Lemma 9.

From the above we conclude that we can check in polynomial time if (u, v) is a P_5 -suitable pair of G . \square

We use Lemma 10 to prove Lemma 11.

Lemma 11. P_6 -SUITABILITY can be solved in polynomial time for $(P_2 + P_4)$ -free graphs.

Proof. Let (G, u, v) be an instance of P_6 -SUITABILITY, where G is a connected $(P_2 + P_4)$ -free graph. We may assume without loss of generality that u and v are of distance at least 5 from each other, as otherwise (G, u, v) is a no-instance. We may also assume without loss of generality that $N(u)$ and $N(v)$ are both independent sets; otherwise if, say, $G[N(u)]$ contains an edge e , then we contract e to obtain an equivalent but smaller instance (G', u, v) , where G' is also $(P_2 + P_4)$ -free due to Lemma 7.

First suppose $|N(u)| = 1$, say $N(u) = \{u'\}$ for some $u' \in V(G)$. Then we solve P_5 -SUITABILITY on instance $(G - u, u', v)$. We can do this in polynomial time due to Lemma 10.

Now suppose $|N(u)| \geq 2$. We assume $W(p_1) = \{u\}$ and we will explore the structure of the P_6 -witness bag $W(p_2)$ should it exist. As $N(u)$ is not connected, $W(p_2)$ must contain at least one other vertex s . Suppose that s is adjacent to some vertex $t \in N(u)$ and non-adjacent to some other vertex $t' \in N(u)$. Let w be a neighbour of v . Then the set $\{v, w\} \cup \{s, t, u, t'\}$ induces a $P_2 + P_4$ in G , a contradiction. Hence, s is adjacent to every vertex of $N(u)$. We consider all possibilities of choosing vertex s from the set $V(G) \setminus (N[u] \cup N[v])$. This leads to $O(n)$ branches. In each branch we contract the set $N(u) \cup \{s\}$ to a single vertex u' . Let G' be the resulting graph. Then we solve P_5 -SUITABILITY on instance (G', u', v) . As G' is $(P_2 + P_4)$ -free by Lemma 7, we can do this in polynomial time due to Lemma 10.

From the above we conclude that we can check in polynomial time if (u, v) is a P_6 -suitable pair of G . \square

We now combine Lemmas 4 and 5 with Lemmas 9–11 to obtain the following theorem.

Theorem 3. *The LONGEST PATH CONTRACTIBILITY problem is polynomial-time solvable for $(P_2 + P_4)$ -free graphs.*

Proof. Let G be a connected $(P_2 + P_4)$ -free graph. We may assume without loss of generality that G has at least one edge. Note that G is P_7 -free. Hence, G does not contain P_7 as a contraction. By combining Lemmas 9–11 with Lemma 4 we can check in polynomial time if G contains P_k as a contraction for $k = 6, 5, 4$. If not, then we check if G contains P_3 as a contraction by using Lemma 5 combined with Lemma 4. If not then, as G has an edge, P_2 is the longest path to which G can be contracted to. \square

3.3 The Case $H = P_1 + P_2 + P_3$

We will prove that LONGEST PATH CONTRACTIBILITY is polynomial-time solvable for $(P_1 + P_2 + P_3)$ -free graphs.

We will start by showing that P_4 -SUITABILITY is polynomial-time solvable for $(P_1 + P_2 + P_3)$ -free graphs. The proof of this result uses similar but more simple arguments than the proof of Lemma 9.

Lemma 12. *The P_4 -SUITABILITY problem can be solved in polynomial time for $(P_1 + P_2 + P_3)$ -free graphs.*

Proof. Let (G, u, v) be an instance of P_4 -SUITABILITY, where G is a connected $(P_1 + P_2 + P_3)$ -free graph. We may assume without loss of generality that u and v are of distance at least 3, that is, u and v are non-adjacent and $N(u) \cap N(v) = \emptyset$; otherwise (G, u, v) is a no-instance.

Recall that $T = V(G) \setminus (N[u] \cup N[v])$. Recall also that we are looking for a partition (S_u, S_v) of T that is a solution for (G, u, v) , that is, $N(u) \cup S_u$ and $N(v) \cup S_v$ must both be connected. In order to do so we will construct partial solutions (S'_u, S'_v) , which we try to extend to a solution (S_u, S_v) for (G, u, v) . We use the **Contraction Rule**

from Section 2 on S'_u and S'_v , so that these sets will become independent. By Lemma 7, the resulting graph will always be $(P_1 + P_2 + P_3)$ -free. For simplicity, we denote the resulting instance by (G, u, v) again. After applying the **Contraction Rule** the size of the set T may be reduced by at least one. As before, if $t \in T$ was involved in an edge contraction with a vertex from $N(u)$ or $N(v)$ when applying the rule, then we say that we contracted t away.

We start by applying the **Contraction Rule** on $N(u)$ and $N(v)$. This leads to the following claim.

Claim 1. *$N(u)$ and $N(v)$ are independent sets.*

We now check if (G, u, v) has an 8-constant solution, which we can check in polynomial time due to Lemma 8. If so, then (G, u, v) is a yes-answer and we stop. From now on suppose that (G, u, v) has no 8-constant solution. Then we prove the following claim (recall that a solution (S_u, S_v) is independent if S_u and S_v are independent sets).

Claim 2. *Every solution of (G, u, v) is independent (if (G, u, v) has solutions).*

Proof of Claim 2. Let (S_u, S_v) be a solution for (G, u, v) that is not independent, say s, t belong to S_u with $st \in E(G)$. If $\{s, t\}$ is anticomplete to a set of two neighbours w, w' of u , then $\{v\} \cup \{s, t\} \cup \{w, u, w'\}$ is an induced $P_1 + P_2 + P_3$ of G , a contradiction. Hence, $\{s, t\}$ covers all but at most one vertex of $N(u)$. Suppose that $\{s, t\}$ covers $N(u)$. Then, as s and t are adjacent in G , we find that (S_u, S_v) is a 2-constant solution and thus a 8-constant solution, which is not possible. Hence, $N(u)$ contains a unique vertex w that is not adjacent to s and t , but that is adjacent to some $z \in T \setminus \{s, t\}$. As G is $(P_1 + P_2 + P_3)$ -free, G is P_8 -free. Then $G[N(u) \cup S_u]$ contains a path P on at most seven vertices from s to z . The path P , together with vertex t that may not be on P , shows that (S_u, S_v) is a 8-constant solution, a contradiction. \diamond

We will now analyze the structure of an independent solution (S_u, S_v) . As S_u and $N(u)$ are both independent sets, $G[N(u) \cup S_u]$ is a connected bipartite graph. Hence, S_u contains a set S_u^* , such that S_u^* covers $N(u)$. We assume that S_u^* has minimum size. Then each $s \in S_u^*$ has a nonempty set $Q(s)$ of vertices in $N(u)$ that are not adjacent to any vertex in $S_u^* \setminus \{s\}$; otherwise we can remove s from S_u^* , contradicting our assumption that S_u^* has minimum size. We call the vertices of $Q(s)$ the *private* neighbours of $s \in S_u^*$ with respect to S_u^* .

As (G, u, v) has no 8-constant solution, and thus no 1-constant solution, we find that S_u^* has size at least 2. Suppose $Q(s)$ contains at least two private neighbours w_1, w_2 of some vertex $s \in S_u^*$. As $|S_u^*| \geq 2$, there exists a vertex $s' \in S_u^*$ with $s' \neq s$. Let $w_3 \in Q(s')$. Then $\{v\} \cup \{w_3, s'\} \cup \{w_1, s, w_2\}$ is an induced $P_1 + P_2 + P_3$ of G , a contradiction. Hence, each set $Q(s)$ has size 1. We denote the unique vertex of $Q(s)$ by w_u^s . So, w_u^s is adjacent to s but not to any other vertex from S_u^* . Let Q_u be the set of all vertices w_u^s . Then $G[Q_u \cup S_u^*]$ is the disjoint union of $|S_u^*|$ edges.

We claim that the set $N(u) \setminus Q_u$ is complete to S_u^* . In order to see this, let $w \in N(u) \setminus Q_u$. By definition, w is adjacent to at least two vertices s_1, s_2 of S_u^* . For contradiction, assume that w is not adjacent to some vertex $s_3 \in S_u^*$. Then $\{v\} \cup \{s_3, w_u^{s_3}\} \cup \{s_1, w, s_2\}$ induces a $P_1 + P_2 + P_3$ in G , which is not possible.

As $G[N(u) \cup S_u]$ is connected as well and S_u is an independent set, every vertex $t \in S_u \setminus S_u^*$ must be adjacent to at least one vertex of $N(u)$. However, we claim that every vertex of $S_u \setminus S_u^*$ is adjacent to at most one vertex of Q_u . For contradiction, assume that $S_u \setminus S_u^*$ contains a vertex t that is adjacent to two vertices of Q_u , say to w_u^s and $w_u^{s'}$ for some $s, s' \in S_u^*$ with $s \neq s'$. Recall that S_u is independent. Consequently, if t is non-adjacent to $w_u^{s''}$ for some $s'' \in S_u^* \setminus \{s, s'\}$, then G contains an induced $P_1 + P_2 + P_3$ with vertex set $\{v\} \cup \{w_u^{s''}, s''\} \cup \{w_u^s, t, w_u^{s'}\}$, a contradiction. Hence, t is adjacent to every vertex of Q_u . If t is adjacent to every vertex of $N(u)$, then (G, u, v) has a 1-constant solution, and this an 8-constant solution, which we ruled out already.

Hence, the set $N(u) \setminus N(t)$ is nonempty. As t is adjacent to every vertex of Q_u , the set $N(u) \setminus N(t)$ is a subset of $N(u) \setminus Q_u$. Recall that $N(u) \setminus Q_u$ is complete to S_u^* . Hence, $N(u) \setminus N(t)$ is complete to S_u^* . Let $s \in S_u^*$. Then $\{s, t\}$ covers $N(u)$, and moreover $G[N(u) \cup \{s, t\}]$ is connected. This means that (G, u, v) has a 2-constant solution and thus an 8-constant solution, which is not possible. We conclude that every vertex of $S_u \setminus S_u^*$ is adjacent to at most one vertex of Q_u .

Finally, we prove that $N(u) \setminus Q_u$ is nonempty. For contradiction, assume that $N(u) \setminus Q_u$ is empty. Then $N(u) = Q_u$. As $G[Q_u \cup S_u^*]$ is the disjoint union of a number of edges, and $G[N(u) \cup S_u]$ is connected, there must exist a vertex $t \in S_u \setminus S_u^*$ that is adjacent to at least two vertices of Q_u . However, we proved above that this is not possible. We conclude that $N(u) \setminus Q_u$ is nonempty.

We can deduce all the claims above with respect to v as well. To summarize, any independent solution (S_u, S_v) for (G, u, v) satisfies the following two properties:

- (P1) The independent set S_u contains a subset S_u^* of size at least 2 that covers $N(u)$, such that each vertex $s \in S_u^*$ has exactly one private neighbour w_u^s in $N(u)$ with respect to S_u^* , and moreover, the set $N(u) \setminus Q_u$, where $Q_u = \{w_u^s \mid s \in S_u^*\}$, is nonempty and complete to S_u^* , and every vertex of $S_u \setminus S_u^*$ is adjacent to at most one vertex of Q_u and to at least one vertex of $N(u) \setminus Q_u$.
- (P2) The independent set S_v contains a subset S_v^* of size at least 2 that covers $N(v)$, such that each vertex $s \in S_v^*$ has exactly one private neighbour w_v^s in $N(v)$ with respect to S_v^* , and moreover, the set $N(v) \setminus Q_v$, where $Q_v = \{w_v^s \mid s \in S_v^*\}$, is nonempty and complete to S_v^* , and every vertex of $S_v \setminus S_v^*$ is adjacent to at most one vertex of Q_v and to at least one vertex of $N(v) \setminus Q_v$.

Remark. We emphasize that S_u^* and S_v^* are unknown to the algorithm, as we constructed it from the unknown sets S_u and S_v , and consequently our algorithm does not know (yet) the sets Q_u and Q_v .

We will now branch into $O(n^8)$ smaller instances in which $N(u) \setminus Q_u$ and $N(v) \setminus Q_v$ consist of just one single vertex w_u and w_v , respectively, such that (G, u, v) has an independent solution if and only if at least one of the new instances has an independent solution. Moreover, we will be able to identify w_u and w_v , and consequently, the sets Q_u and Q_v , in polynomial time.

Branching ($O(n^8)$ branches)

We will determine exactly those vertices of $N(u)$ that belong to Q_u via some branching, under the assumption that (G, u, v) has an independent solution (S_u, S_v) that satisfies (P1) and (P2). By (P1), S_u^* consists of at least two (non-adjacent) vertices s and s' . By (P2), S_v^* consists of at least two (non-adjacent) vertices t and t' . We branch by considering all possible choices of choosing these four vertices together with their private neighbours $w_u^s, w_u^{s'}, w_v^t, w_v^{t'}$ (which are unique by (P1) and (P2)). This leads to $O(n^8)$ branches.

For each branch we do as follows. We discard the branch in which $G[\{s, s', w_u^s, w_u^{s'}\}]$ and $G[\{t, t', w_v^t, w_v^{t'}\}]$ are not both isomorphic to $2P_2$. We put a vertex $y \in N(u)$ in $N(u) \setminus Q_u$ if and only if y is a common neighbour of s and s' . This gives us the set Q_u . We obtain the set Q_v in the same way. If there exists a vertex in $Q_u \setminus \{w_u^s, w_u^{s'}\}$ that is adjacent to one of s, s' , then we discard the branch. We also discard the branch if there exists a vertex in $Q_v \setminus \{w_v^t, w_v^{t'}\}$ that is adjacent to one of t, t' . Moreover, by applying the **Contraction Rule** on $N(u) \cup \{s, s'\}$ we can contract s and s' away. This contracts all vertices of $N(u) \setminus Q_u$ into a single vertex which we denote by w_u due to (P1). Similarly, we branch t and t' away and this leads to the contraction of $N(v) \setminus Q_v$ into a single vertex w_v due to (P2). Note that we have identified w_u and w_v in polynomial time. We denote the resulting instance by (G, u, v) again.

Consider a vertex $z \in T$. First suppose that z is not adjacent to w_u . Then z does not belong to S_u in any independent solution (S_u, S_v) for (G, u, v) by (P1). Hence z must belong to S_v for any independent solution (S_u, S_v) for (G, u, v) . However, (P2) tells us that if z is not adjacent to w_v , then z cannot belong to the set S_v of any independent solution (S_u, S_v) for (G, u, v) . Hence, in that case we must discard the branch. Otherwise, that is, if z is adjacent to w_v , then we check the following. If z has two neighbours in $N(v) \setminus \{w_v\}$, then z does not belong to S_v in any independent solution (S_u, S_v) for (G, u, v) due to (P2). Hence, we will discard the branch. If z is adjacent to at most one vertex of $N(v) \setminus \{w_v\}$, then we apply the **Contraction Rule** on $N(v) \cup \{z\}$ to contract z away. As a side effect, the possible neighbour of z in $N(v) \setminus \{w_v\}$ will be contracted away as well. Now suppose that z is not adjacent to w_v . Then we perform the same operation with respect to u . We apply this operation exhaustively on both u and v . This takes polynomial time. In the end we either discarded the branch or have found a new instance, which we also denote by (G, u, v) again, in which every vertex of T is adjacent to w_u and to w_v .

Consider again a vertex $z \in T$. If z is adjacent to only w_u and w_v and to at most one other vertex w in $N(u) \cup N(v)$, then we apply the **Contraction Rule** on $G[N(u) \cup \{z\}]$ (if $w \in N(u)$) or $G[N(v) \cup \{z\}]$ (in the other two cases) in order to contract z away. As a side effect, the possible other neighbour of z in $(N(u) \cup N(v)) \setminus \{w_u, w_v\}$ will be contracted away as well. If z is adjacent to more than one vertex of $N(u) \setminus \{w_u\}$, then z does not belong to S_u in any independent solution (S_u, S_v) for (G, u, v) . We check if z is adjacent to more than one vertex of $N(v) \setminus \{w_v\}$. If so, then z does not belong to S_v in any independent solution (S_u, S_v) for (G, u, v) . In that case we will discard the branch. Otherwise we will apply the **Contraction Rule** on $N(v) \cup \{z\}$ to contract z away. Again, as a side effect, the possible neighbour of z in $N(v) \setminus \{w_v\}$ will be contracted away as well. If z is adjacent to more than one vertex of $N(u) \setminus \{w_u\}$, we perform a similar operation with respect to u . We apply this rule exhaustively. This takes polynomial time. In the end we find that every vertex of T is adjacent to w_u and w_v and to exactly one vertex of Q_u and to exactly one vertex of Q_v .

We now remove all edges of $G[T]$. We also remove w_u and w_v from the graph. This yields a bipartite graph G' with partition classes $N(u) \cup N(v) \setminus \{w_u, w_v\}$ and T . It remains to compute a maximum matching M in G' . We can do this by using the Hopcroft-Karp algorithm [33], which runs in $O(m\sqrt{n})$ -time on bipartite graphs with n vertices and m edges. If $|M| = |N(u)| + |N(v)| - 2$ then we found a solution for (G, u, v) ; otherwise we discard the branch. Note that we did not explicitly forbid that two adjacent vertices of T ended up in S_u or two adjacent vertices of T ended up in S_v : we have ruled out the existence of such solutions already (but they would still be perfectly acceptable if they did exist).

As mentioned, we translate a solution found for some branch into a solution for the original instance. We can do so in polynomial time. If we find no yes-answer for the instance of any branch, then we conclude that the original instance has no solution.

The correctness of our algorithm follows from the above description. We now analyze its run-time. There is only one branching procedure, which yields a total number of $O(n^8)$ branches. As explained above, processing each branch takes polynomial time. In particular, checking for 8-constant solutions takes polynomial time due to Lemma 8. We conclude that the total running time of our algorithm is polynomial. \square

We proceed in the same way as in the case where $H = P_2 + P_4$. That is, we will use Lemma 12 to prove Lemma 13. Then we use Lemma 13 to prove Lemma 14, and we use Lemma 14 to prove Lemma 15.

Lemma 13. *The P_5 -SUITABILITY problem can be solved in polynomial time for $(P_1 + P_2 + P_3)$ -free graphs.*

Proof. Let (G, u, v) be an instance of P_5 -SUITABILITY, where G is a connected $(P_1 + P_2 + P_3)$ -free graph. We may assume without loss of generality that u and v are of distance at least 4 from each other, as otherwise (G, u, v) is a no-instance. We may also assume without loss of generality that $N(u)$ and $N(v)$ are independent sets; otherwise, say $N(u)$ contains an edge, we apply the **Contraction Rule** on $N(u)$ to obtain an equivalent but smaller instance (G', u, v) , where G' is also $(P_1 + P_2 + P_3)$ -free due to Lemma 7.

If $N(u)$ consists of exactly one vertex u' , then we can instead solve P_5 -SUITABILITY on instance $(G - u, u', v)$. By Lemma 13 this takes polynomial time. Hence, we may assume that $N(u)$, and for the same reason, $N(v)$ have size at least 2.

By Lemma 6 we may assume that $\text{dist}(u, v) = 4$. Let M consist of all vertices of G that are of distance 2 from u and of distance 2 from v . Note that $M \neq \emptyset$, as $\text{dist}(u, v) = 4$. Moreover, if G has a P_5 -witness structure \mathcal{W} with $W(p_1) = \{u\}$ and $W(p_5) = \{v\}$, then $M \subseteq W(p_3)$ must hold.

Let z, z' be two vertices in $N(v)$. Suppose $x \notin M \cup \{u\}$ is adjacent to $w \in N(u)$ but not to $w' \in N(u)$. As x is not in M and adjacent to $w \in N(u)$, we find that x is not adjacent to z and z' . However, then $\{w'\} \cup \{w, x\} \cup \{z, v, z'\}$ induces a $P_1 + P_2 + P_3$ in G , a contradiction. Hence, every vertex not in $M \cup \{u\}$ is either complete to $N(u)$ or anticomplete to $N(u)$. This means that if G has a P_5 -witness structure \mathcal{W} with $W(p_1) = \{u\}$ and $W(p_5) = \{v\}$, then the following holds: $W(p_2) \setminus N(u)$ contains a vertex s , such that $N(u) \cup \{s\}$ is connected.

We now branch by considering all possibilities of choosing this vertex s ; note that we only have to consider vertices of G that are of distance 2 from u and that are not in M . This leads to $O(n)$ branches. We consider each branch separately, as follows. First we contract all edges in $G[N(u) \cup \{s\}]$. If this does not yield a single vertex u' , then we discard the branch. Otherwise we let G' be the resulting graph. The graph $G' - u'$ consists of at least two connected components, one of which consists of vertex u , and the other one contains v and $N(v)$. We contract away the vertices of any other connected component D of $G' - u'$ by applying the **Contraction Rule** on $\{u'\} \cup V(D)$. It remains to check if $(G' - u, u', v)$ is a yes-instance of P_4 -SUITABILITY. We can do this in polynomial time via Lemma 12. As there are $O(n)$ branches, the total running time of our algorithm is polynomial. \square

Lemma 14. *The P_6 -SUITABILITY problem can be solved in polynomial time for $(P_1 + P_2 + P_3)$ -free graphs.*

Proof. Let (G, u, v) be an instance of P_6 -SUITABILITY, where G is a connected $(P_1 + P_2 + P_3)$ -free graph. We may assume without loss of generality that u and v are of distance at least 5 from each other, as otherwise (G, u, v) is a no-instance. We may also assume without loss of generality that $N(u)$ and $N(v)$ are independent sets; otherwise, say $N(u)$ contains an edge, we apply the **Contraction Rule** on $N(u)$ to obtain an equivalent but smaller instance (G', u, v) , where G' is also $(P_1 + P_2 + P_3)$ -free due to Lemma 7.

If $N(u)$ consist of exactly one vertex u' , then we can instead solve P_5 -SUITABILITY on instance $(G - u, u', v)$. By Lemma 13 this takes polynomial time. Hence, we may assume that $N(u)$, and for the same reason, $N(v)$ are independent sets of size at least 2. Let z, z' be two vertices in $N(v)$. Suppose $x \notin N(u) \cup \{u\}$ is adjacent to $w \in N(u)$ but not to $w' \in N(u)$. Then $\{w'\} \cup \{w, x\} \cup \{z, v, z'\}$ induces a $P_1 + P_2 + P_3$ in G , a contradiction. Hence, every vertex not in $N(u) \cup \{u\}$ is either complete to $N(u)$ or anticomplete to $N(u)$. This means that if G has a P_5 -witness structure \mathcal{W} with $W(p_1) = \{u\}$ and $W(p_5) = \{v\}$, then the following holds: $W(p_2) \setminus N(u)$ contains a vertex s , such that $N(u) \cup \{s\}$ is connected.

We now branch by considering all possibilities of choosing this vertex s . This leads to $O(n)$ branches. We consider each branch separately, as follows. First we contract all

edges in $G[N(u) \cup \{s\}]$. If this does not yield a single vertex u' , then we discard the branch. Otherwise we let G' be the resulting graph. The graph $G' - u'$ consists of at least two connected components, one of which consists of vertex u , and the other one contains v and $N(v)$. We contract away the vertices of any other connected component D of $G' - u'$ by applying the **Contraction Rule** on $\{u'\} \cup V(D)$. It remains to check if $(G' - u, u', v)$ is a yes-instance of P_4 -SUITABILITY. We can do this in polynomial time via Lemma 13. As there are $O(n)$ branches, the total running time of our algorithm is polynomial. \square

Lemma 15. *The P_7 -SUITABILITY problem can be solved in polynomial time for $(P_1 + P_2 + P_3)$ -free graphs.*

Proof. Let (G, u, v) be an instance of P_7 -SUITABILITY, where G is a connected $(P_1 + P_2 + P_3)$ -free graph. We may assume without loss of generality that u and v are of distance at least 6 from each other, as otherwise (G, u, v) is a no-instance. Note that in fact u and v are of distance exactly 6 from each other, as otherwise G contains an induced $P_1 + P_2 + P_3$. We may also assume without loss of generality that $N(u)$ is an independent set; otherwise we apply the **Contraction Rule** on $N(u)$ to obtain an equivalent but smaller instance (G', u, v) , where G' is also $(P_1 + P_2 + P_3)$ -free due to Lemma 7.

Suppose $N(u)$ contains two vertices w and w' . As u and v are of distance 6 from each other, there exists a vertex y with $\text{dist}(u, y) = \text{dist}(v, y) = 3$. Let $z \in N(v)$. Then the set $\{y\} \cup \{v, z\} \cup \{w, u, w'\}$ induces a $P_1 + P_2 + P_3$ in G , a contradiction. Hence, $N(u)$ consist of exactly one vertex u' . We can therefore solve P_6 -SUITABILITY on instance $(G - u, u', v)$. By Lemma 14 this takes polynomial time. \square

We are now ready to prove the main result of Section 3.3.

Theorem 4. *The LONGEST PATH CONTRACTIBILITY problem is polynomial-time solvable for $(P_1 + P_2 + P_3)$ -free graphs.*

Proof. Let G be a connected $(P_1 + P_2 + P_3)$ -free graph. We may assume without loss of generality that G has at least one edge. Then G is P_8 -free. Hence, G does not contain P_8 as a contraction. By combining Lemmas 12–15 with Lemma 4 we can check in polynomial time if G contains P_k as a contraction for $k = 7, 6, 5, 4$. If not, then we check if G contains P_3 as a contraction by using Lemma 5 combined with Lemma 4. If not then, as G has an edge, P_2 is the longest path to which G can be contracted to. \square

3.4 The Case $H = P_1 + P_5$

We will prove that LONGEST PATH CONTRACTIBILITY is polynomial-time solvable for $(P_1 + P_5)$ -free graphs. This result extends a corresponding result of [52] for P_5 -free graphs. Its proof is based on the same but slightly generalized arguments as the result for P_5 -free graphs and comes down to the following lemma.

Lemma 16. *Let $k \geq 4$ and let G be a $(P_1 + P_5)$ -free graph with a P_k -suitable pair (u, v) such that $N(u)$ is an independent set. Then G has a P_k -witness structure \mathcal{W} with $W(p_1) = \{u\}$ and $W(p_k) = \{v\}$, for which the following holds: $W(p_2) \setminus N(u)$ contains a set S of size at most 2 such that $N(u) \cup S$ is connected.*

Proof. As (u, v) is a P_k -suitable pair, G has a P_k -witness structure \mathcal{W} with $W(p_1) = \{u\}$ and $W(p_k) = \{v\}$. For contradiction, assume that $W(p_2) \setminus N(u)$ contains no set S of size at most 2 such that $N(u) \cup S$ is connected. Then $W(p_2) \setminus N(u)$ contains at least three vertices x_1, x_2, x_3 such that one of the following holds:

- (i) for $i = 1, 2, 3$, vertex x_i is adjacent to some vertex $w_i \in N(u)$ with $w_i \notin N(x_h) \cup N(x_j)$, where $\{h, i, j\} = \{1, 2, 3\}$; or
- (ii) $N(u) \subseteq N(x_1) \cup N(x_2)$, but $G[N(u) \cup \{x_1\} \cup \{x_2\}]$ is not connected.

First assume that (i) holds. Recall that $N(u)$ is an independent set. Then $x_1x_2 \in E(G)$, as otherwise the set $\{v\} \cup \{x_1, w_1, u, w_2, x_2\}$ induces a $P_1 + P_5$ in G , which is not possible. However, now the set $\{v\} \cup \{w_3, u, w_2, x_2, x_1\}$ induces a $P_1 + P_5$ in G , a contradiction. Hence, (i) cannot hold. Now assume that (ii) holds. As (G, u, v) has no 1-constant solution, x_1 has a neighbour $w_1 \in N(u)$ not adjacent to x_2 and x_2 has a neighbour $w_2 \in N(u)$ not adjacent to x_1 . As $G[N(u) \cup \{x_1\} \cup \{x_2\}]$ is not connected but $N(u) \subseteq N(x_1) \cup N(x_2)$, we have that $x_1x_2 \notin E(G)$. However, then the set $\{v\} \cup \{x_1, w_1, u, w_2, x_2\}$ induces a $P_1 + P_5$ in G , a contradiction. Hence (ii) does not hold either, a contradiction. \square

As a consequence of Lemma 16, we get that P_4 -SUITABILITY is easy and that P_k -SUITABILITY reduces to P_4 -SUITABILITY, as we will see.

Lemma 17. *The P_4 -SUITABILITY problem can be solved in polynomial time for $(P_1 + P_5)$ -free graphs.*

Proof. Let (G, u, v) be an instance of P_4 -SUITABILITY, where G is a connected $(P_1 + P_5)$ -free graph. We may assume without loss of generality that u and v are of distance at least 3 from each other, as otherwise (G, u, v) is a no-instance. We may also assume without loss of generality that $N(u)$ is an independent set; otherwise we apply the **Contraction Rule** on $N(u)$ to obtain an equivalent but smaller instance (G', u, v) , where G' is also $(P_1 + P_5)$ -free due to Lemma 7. By Lemma 16 we find that if (G, u, v) has a solution, then G has a 2-constant solution. We can check the latter in $O(n^4)$ time by Lemma 8. \square

Lemma 18. *The P_5 -SUITABILITY problem can be solved in $O(n^6)$ time for $(P_1 + P_5)$ -free graphs.*

Proof. Let (G, u, v) be an instance of P_5 -SUITABILITY, where G is a connected $(P_1 + P_5)$ -free graph. We may assume without loss of generality that u and v are of distance at least 4 from each other, as otherwise (G, u, v) is a no-instance. We may also assume without loss of generality that $N(u)$ is an independent set; otherwise we apply the **Contraction Rule** on $N(u)$ to obtain an equivalent but smaller instance (G', u, v) , where G' is also $(P_1 + P_5)$ -free due to Lemma 7.

If (u, v) is a P_5 -suitable pair, then by Lemma 16, G has a P_5 -witness structure \mathcal{W} with $W(p_1) = \{u\}$ and $W(p_5) = \{v\}$, for which the following holds: $W(p_2) \setminus N(u)$ contains a set S of size at most 2, such that $N(u) \cup S$ is connected.

We now branch by considering all possibilities of choosing this set S . This leads to $O(n^2)$ branches. We consider each branch separately, as follows. First we contract all edges in $G[N(u) \cup S]$. If this does not yield a single vertex u' , then we discard the branch. Otherwise we let G' be the resulting graph. The graph $G' - u'$ consists of at least two connected components, one of which consists of vertex u , and the other one contains v and $N(v)$. If there are more components in $G' - u'$ than these two, we contract each such component D to u' by applying the **Contraction Rule** on $\{u'\} \cup V(D)$. It remains to check if $(G' - u, u', v)$ is a yes-instance of P_4 -SUITABILITY. We can do this in $O(n^4)$ time via Lemma 17. As there are $O(n^2)$ branches, the total running time of our algorithm is $O(n^6)$. \square

Lemma 19. *The P_6 -SUITABILITY problem can be solved in $O(n^8)$ time for $(P_1 + P_5)$ -free graphs.*

Proof. We reduce P_6 -SUITABILITY to P_5 -SUITABILITY in exactly the same way we reduced P_5 -SUITABILITY to P_4 -SUITABILITY in the proof of Lemma 18. This leads to $O(n^2)$ branches. For each branch we apply Lemma 18, which takes $O(n^6)$ time. Hence the total running time of $O(n^8)$. \square

We are now ready to prove the main result of Section 3.4.

Theorem 5. *The LONGEST PATH CONTRACTIBILITY problem is polynomial-time solvable for $(P_1 + P_5)$ -free graphs.*

Proof. Let G be a connected $(P_1 + P_5)$ -free graph. We may assume without loss of generality that G has at least one edge. Note that G is P_7 -free. Hence, G does not contain P_7 as a contraction. By combining Lemmas 17–19 with Lemma 4 we can check in polynomial time if G contains P_k as a contraction for $k = 6, 5, 4$. If not, then we check if G contains P_3 as a contraction by using Lemma 5 combined with Lemma 4. If not then, as G has an edge, P_2 is the longest path to which G can be contracted to. \square

3.5 The Case $H = sP_1 + P_4$

We adopt/extend the notation from Section 3.1. Let (G, u, v) be an instance of P_k -SUITABILITY with $k \geq 4$. A *solution* is a witness structure $\mathcal{W} = \{W(p_1), \dots, W(p_k)\}$ with $W(p_1) = \{u\}, W(p_2) = N(u) \cup S_u, W(p_{k-1}) = N(v) \cup S_v$ and $W(p_k) = \{v\}$. We let $T := V \setminus (N[u] \cup N[v])$. Thus S_u and S_v are disjoint subsets of T such that $N(u) \cup S_u$ and $N(v) \cup S_v$ are connected. As in Section 3.1, we call a solution α -constant if there exists a subset $S'_u \subseteq S_u$ with $N(u) \cup S'_u$ connected and $|S'_u| \leq \alpha$, or there exists $S'_v \subseteq S_v$ with $N(v) \cup S'_v$ connected and $|S'_v| \leq \alpha$.

Let $(\{u\}, N(u) \cup S_u, \dots)$ be a solution and $S'_u \subseteq S_u$ such that $N(u) \cup S'_u$ is connected. We define the *closure* $\overline{S'_u}$ of S'_u as the set of all vertices in S_u that are connected to v in G only via $N(u) \cup S'_u$.

Lemma 20. *Let $(\{u\}, N(u) \cup S_u, W(p_3), \dots, W(p_{k-1}), \{v\})$ be a solution for an instance (G, u, v) of P_k -SUITABILITY for some $k \geq 4$. If $S'_u \subseteq S_u$ such that $N(u) \cup S'_u$ is connected, then $(\{u\}, N(u) \cup \overline{S'_u}, W(p_3) \cup S_u \setminus \overline{S'_u}, \dots, W(p_{k-1}), \{v\})$ is also a solution for (G, u, v) .*

Proof. We check the three properties for witness structures. All bags in the new partition are mutually disjoint. Connectedness of $W(p_3) \cup S_u \setminus \overline{S'_u}$: Any $s \in S_u \setminus \overline{S'_u}$ is joined to v by a path P that does not pass through $N(u) \cup S'_u$ (by definition). Moreover, P does not hit $\overline{S'_u}$ since from there; by definition, we cannot reach v without passing through $N(u) \cup S'_u$. Since vertices in $W(p_2) = N(u) \cup S_u$ are only adjacent to vertices in $W(p_1) \cup W(p_2) \cup W(p_3)$, we find that P must be contained in $S_u \setminus \overline{S'_u}$ until it eventually reaches $W(p_3)$. Connectedness of $W(p_3) \cup S_u \setminus \overline{S'_u}$ follows. \square

As it turns out, it suffices to search for α -constant solutions:

Lemma 21. *An instance (G, u, v) of P_k -SUITABILITY, where G is $(sP_1 + P_4)$ -free, has a solution if and only if it has an α -constant solution, where $\alpha = (s + 2)(2s + 4)$.*

Proof. We may, as usual, assume that $N(u)$ is independent (otherwise we apply the **Contraction Rule** to $N(u)$ without any effect on S_u in solutions $(\{u\}, N(u) \cup S_u, \dots)$). First suppose that (G, u, v) has an α -constant solution. Then obviously (G, u, v) has a solution.

Now suppose that (G, u, v) has a solution $(\{u\}, N(u) \cup S_u, \dots)$. Let $t \in S_u$ and let $S_u^* \subseteq S_u$ be a minimum size subset that covers (e.g., dominates) $N(u)$. Each $z \in S_u^*$

is connected to t by some path $P_z \subseteq S_u$. Since G is $(sP_1 + P_4)$ -free, P_z has at most $2s + 4$ vertices. Hence, $S'_v := \bigcup_{z \in S_u^*} P_z$ has size at most $|S_u^*|(2s + 4)$ and is connected and covers $N(u)$ (as S_u^* does). Then (G, u, v) is an α -constant solution, unless $|S'_u| > \alpha$. From now on suppose that $|S'_u| > \alpha$, so in particular $|S_u^*| > s + 2$.

We show that S_u^* is independent. For contradiction, assume that $z, z' \in S_u^*$ are adjacent. Let $w, w' \in N(u)$ be private neighbours of z, z' , resp. Then $wzz'w'$ induces a P_4 . Since G is $(sP_1 + P_4)$ -free, $\{z, z'\}$ must cover almost all vertices in $N(u)$ (which may be assumed independent) except at most $s - 1$ vertices, say, w_1, \dots, w_{s-1} . Thus a minimum size cover S_u^* of $N(u)$ has at most $s + 1$ vertices (z, z' and at most $s - 1$ others covering w_1, \dots, w_{s-1}), contradicting the fact that $|S_u^*| > s + 2$.

Next we prove that any two vertices $z, z' \in S_u^*$ cover disjoint sets in $N(u)$. For contradiction, assume that $z, z' \in S_u^*$ have a common neighbour $w \in N(u)$. Since $z \in S_u^*$ also has a private neighbour $w' \in N(u)$, we find an induced $P_4 = w'zwz'$ and conclude that $\{z, z'\}$ must cover all but at most $s - 1$ vertices in $N(u)$, a contradiction again.

From the above we conclude that $S_u^* \cup N(u)$ is a disjoint union of stars. Recall that $|S_u^*| > s + 2 > 1$. Therefore, to be connected, S_u must contain a vertex $t \in S_u \setminus S_u^*$ connecting two vertices $z, z' \in S_u^*$. Let again w be a private neighbour of z in $N(u)$. Then $wztz'$ is a P_4 , implying that $\{t, z, z'\}$ must cover all but $s - 1$ vertices in $N(u)$, leading to a contradiction as before. Summarizing, we have shown that (S_u, \dots) is an α -constant solution. \square

Combining Lemmas 20 and 21 gives the desired result:

Theorem 6. *For every constant $s \geq 0$, the LONGEST PATH CONTRACTIBILITY problem is polynomial-time solvable for $(sP_1 + P_4)$ -free graphs.*

Proof. By Lemma 21 we may focus on α -constant solutions. If (G, u, v) has an α -constant solution $(\{u\}, N(u) \cup S_u, \dots)$ with $S'_u \subseteq S_u$ of size at most α , we may guess this set S'_u and extend it to its closure $\overline{S'_u}$ (by adding all vertices that are connected to the rest of the graph only through $N(u) \cup S'_u$ using Lemma 20) in time $O(n^{\alpha+2})$. We may then contract $\{u\} \cup \overline{S'_u}$, thereby reducing P_k -SUITABILITY to P_{k-1} -SUITABILITY. Since G is $(sP_1 + P_4)$ -free, we may assume that $k \leq 2s + 4$. (If $k \geq 2s + 5$, then every instance (G, u, v) where G is $(sP_1 + P_4)$ -free is a no-instance of P_k -SUITABILITY). Thus only $2s$ such reductions are required. \square

4 The NP-Complete Cases of Theorem 2

In this section we prove the new NP-complete cases of Theorem 2.

A *hypergraph* \mathcal{H} is a pair (Q, \mathcal{S}) , where $Q = \{q_1, \dots, q_m\}$ is a set of m elements and $\mathcal{S} = \{S_1, \dots, S_n\}$ is a set of n hyperedges, which are subsets of Q . A *2-colouring* of \mathcal{H} is a partition of Q into two (nonempty) sets Q_1 and Q_2 with $Q_1 \cap S_j \neq \emptyset$ and $Q_2 \cap S_j \neq \emptyset$ for each S_j . This leads to the following decision problem.

HYPERGRAPH 2-COLOURABILITY
Instance: a hypergraph \mathcal{H} .
Question: does \mathcal{H} have a 2-colouring?

Note that HYPERGRAPH 2-COLOURABILITY is NP-complete even for hypergraphs \mathcal{H} with $S_i \neq \emptyset$ for $1 \leq i \leq n$ and $S_n = Q$. By a reduction from HYPERGRAPH 2-COLOURABILITY, Brouwer and Veldman [9] proved that P_4 -CONTRACTIBILITY is NP-complete. That is, from a hypergraph \mathcal{H} they built a graph $G_{\mathcal{H}}$, such that \mathcal{H} has a 2-colouring if and only if $G_{\mathcal{H}}$ has P_4 as a contraction. We first recall the graph $G_{\mathcal{H}}$ from [9], which was obtained from a hypergraph \mathcal{H} with $S_i \neq \emptyset$ for $1 \leq i \leq n$ and $S_n = Q$ (see Figure 2 for an example).

- Construct the *incidence graph* of (Q, \mathcal{S}) , which is the bipartite graph with partition classes Q and \mathcal{S} and an edge between two vertices q_i and S_j if and only if $q_i \in S_j$.
- Add a set $\mathcal{S}' = \{S'_1, \dots, S'_n\}$ of n new vertices, where we call S'_j the *copy* of S_j .
- For $i = 1, \dots, m$ and $j = 1, \dots, n$, add an edge between q_i and S'_j if and only if $q_i \in S_j$.
- For $j = 1, \dots, n$ and $\ell = 1, \dots, n$, add an edge between S_j and S'_ℓ , so the subgraph induced by $\mathcal{S} \cup \mathcal{S}'$ will be complete bipartite.
- For $h = 1, \dots, m$ and $i = 1, \dots, m$, add an edge between q_h and q_i , so Q will be a clique.
- Add two new vertices t_1 and t_2 .
- For $j = 1, \dots, n$, add an edge between t_1 and S_j , and between t_2 and S'_j .




Fig. 2. An example of a graph $G_{\mathcal{H}}$ for some hypergraph \mathcal{H} [40].

As mentioned, Brouwer and Veldman [9] proved the following.

Lemma 22 ([9]). *A hypergraph \mathcal{H} has a 2-colouring if and only if $G_{\mathcal{H}}$ has P_4 as a contraction.*

A *split graph* is a graph whose vertex set can be partitioned into two (possibly empty) sets K and I , where K is a clique and I is an independent set. It is well known that a graph is split if and only if it is $(2P_2, C_4, C_5)$ -free [17]. Let \mathcal{H} be a hypergraph. Observe that the subgraphs of $G_{\mathcal{H}}$ induced by $Q \cup \mathcal{S}$ and $Q \cup \mathcal{S}'$, respectively, are split graphs. Hence, we make the following observation.

Lemma 23. *Let \mathcal{H} be a hypergraph. Then the subgraphs of $G_{\mathcal{H}}$ induced by $Q \cup \mathcal{S}$ and $Q \cup \mathcal{S}'$, respectively, are $(2P_2, C_4, C_5)$ -free.*

We will need the following known lemma from [52].

Lemma 24 ([52]). *Let \mathcal{H} be a hypergraph. Then the graph $G_{\mathcal{H}}$ is P_6 -free.*

We complement Lemma 24 with the following lemma.

Lemma 25. *Let \mathcal{H} be a hypergraph. Then the graph $G_{\mathcal{H}}$ is $(2P_1 + 2P_2, 3P_2, 2P_3)$ -free.*

Proof. We will prove that $G = G_{\mathcal{H}}$ is $(2P_1 + 2P_2, 3P_2, 2P_3)$ -free by considering each graph in $\{2P_1 + 2P_2, 3P_2, 2P_3\}$ separately.

$(2P_1 + 2P_2)$ -freeness. For contradiction, assume that G contains a subgraph H isomorphic to $2P_1 + 2P_2$. Let D_1 and D_2 be the two connected components of H that contain an edge. Let x and y denote the two isolated vertices of H . First suppose that

one of x, y , say x , belongs to $\mathcal{S} \cup \mathcal{S}'$, say to \mathcal{S} . Then D_1 and D_2 do not contain t_1 and also do not contain any vertex from \mathcal{S}' . The latter implies that D_1 and D_2 cannot contain vertex t_2 either. Hence, D_1 and D_2 only contain vertices from $\mathcal{S} \cup Q$, contradicting Lemma 23. Hence, x and y must both belong to $Q \cup \{t_1, t_2\}$. Suppose one of them, say x , belongs to Q . Then D_1 and D_2 do not contain any vertices from Q and thus only contain vertices from $\mathcal{S} \cup \mathcal{S}' \cup \{t_1, t_2\}$. However, $G[\mathcal{S} \cup \mathcal{S}' \cup \{t_1, t_2\}]$ is complete bipartite, and thus $2P_2$ -free, a contradiction. We thus found that $\{x, y\} = \{t_1, t_2\}$. Then D_1 and D_2 may not contain any vertices from $\mathcal{S} \cup \mathcal{S}'$. Consequently, D_1 and D_2 only contain vertices from Q . This is not possible, as Q is a clique. We conclude that G is $(2P_1 + 2P_2)$ -free.

3P₂-freeness. For contradiction, assume that G contains a subgraph H isomorphic to $3P_2$. Let D_1, D_2, D_3 be the three connected components of H . Suppose one of D_1, D_2, D_3 , say D_1 , contains a vertex from $\mathcal{S} \cup \mathcal{S}'$, say D_1 contains a vertex from \mathcal{S} . Then D_2 and D_3 do not contain t_1 and also do not contain any vertex from \mathcal{S}' . The latter implies that D_2 and D_3 cannot contain vertex t_2 either. Hence, D_2 and D_3 only contain vertices from $\mathcal{S} \cup Q$, contradicting Lemma 23. This means that H contains no vertex from $\mathcal{S} \cup \mathcal{S}'$. Consequently, H does not contain t_1 and t_2 either. However, then H consists of vertices from Q only. This is not possible, as Q is a clique. We conclude that G is $3P_2$ -free.

2P₃-freeness. For contradiction, assume that G contains a subgraph H isomorphic to $2P_3$. Let D_1 and D_2 be the two connected components of H . Suppose one of D_1, D_2 , say D_1 , contains a vertex from Q . As Q is a clique, this means that D_1 must contain at least one vertex of $\mathcal{S} \cup \mathcal{S}'$, say D_1 contains a vertex of \mathcal{S} . Then D_2 cannot contain any vertex from $Q \cup \{t_1\}$ or from \mathcal{S}' . The latter implies that D_2 does not contain t_2 either. Hence, D_2 only contains vertices from \mathcal{S} . This is not possible, as \mathcal{S} is an independent set. We conclude that neither D_1 nor D_2 contains a vertex from Q . Hence, H only contains vertices from $\mathcal{S} \cup \mathcal{S}' \cup \{t_1, t_2\}$. However, $G[\mathcal{S} \cup \mathcal{S}' \cup \{t_1, t_2\}]$ is complete bipartite, and thus $2P_3$ -free, a contradiction. We conclude that G is $2P_3$ -free. \square

It is readily seen that P_4 -CONTRACTIBILITY belongs to NP. Hence, we obtain the following result from Lemmas 22, 24, and 25.

Theorem 7. P_4 -CONTRACTIBILITY is NP-complete for $(2P_1 + 2P_2, 3P_2, 2P_3, P_6)$ -free graphs.

By modifying the graph $G_{\mathcal{H}}$ we prove the next theorem.

Theorem 8. Let $p \geq 4$ be some constant. Then P_{2p} -CONTRACTIBILITY is NP-complete for bipartite graphs of girth at least p .

Proof. We assume without loss of generality that p is even. We reduce again from HYPERGRAPH 2-COLOURING, using a suitable subdivision of the graph $G_{\mathcal{H}}$ in order to satisfy the bipartiteness and girth constraints. Let \mathcal{H} be a hypergraph. We first construct $G_{\mathcal{H}}$. We then subdivide edges in $G_{\mathcal{H}}$ as follows. The edge $S_n S'_n$ is *not* subdivided. All other edges $S_i S'_j$ are subdivided by an *even* number of vertices, namely by $p - 2$, each. All edges joining Q to \mathcal{S}' are also subdivided $p - 2$ times. So each of these edges becomes a path of odd length $(p - 1)$. Edges joining Q to itself or to \mathcal{S} are subdivided by an *odd* number of vertices, namely $p - 1$, each. So each of these edges becomes a path of even length (p) . In addition, we attach paths of length $p - 2$, one to each of t_1 and t_2 . Denote these paths by P_i with end-vertices t_i and, say, $\bar{t}_i, i = 1, 2$. Call the resulting graph $\bar{G}_{\mathcal{H}}$. In what follows we will denote the paths of length $p - 1$ or p obtained by subdividing an edge xy in $G_{\mathcal{H}}$ by \bar{xy} .

The distance between \bar{t}_1 and \bar{t}_2 in $\bar{G}_{\mathcal{H}}$ equals $2(p - 2) + 3 = 2p - 1$. The unique shortest path is given by $P = (P_1, S_n, S'_n, P_2)$. No other pair of vertices in $\bar{G}_{\mathcal{H}}$ is this

far apart. (For example, the distance between $S_i \in \mathcal{S}$ and $q \in Q \setminus S_i$ equals p or $2 + p$, the length of the path via t_1 and S_n .)

It is straightforward to check that $\bar{G}_{\mathcal{H}}$ is bipartite: Any path joining \mathcal{S} to \mathcal{S}' has odd length. Hence, there are no odd cycles that hit both \mathcal{S} and \mathcal{S}' . Similarly, all paths joining Q and \mathcal{S}' have odd length. So there cannot be any odd cycle in the subgraph induced by $Q \cup \mathcal{S}'$. The same argument applies to cycles in the subgraph induced by $Q \cup \mathcal{S}$. Here, again, all paths between Q and \mathcal{S} have the same parity (this time even). This shows that $\bar{G}_{\mathcal{H}}$ is indeed bipartite. The graph $\bar{G}_{\mathcal{H}}$ also has girth at least p . (Recall that any subdivided edge became a path of length at least $p - 1$.) It remains to prove that \mathcal{H} has a 2-colouring if and only if $\bar{G}_{\mathcal{H}}$ contains P_{2p} as a contraction.

First suppose that \mathcal{H} has a 2-colouring (Q_1, Q_2) . Then define a contraction of $\bar{G}_{\mathcal{H}}$ to P with corresponding witness structure $\{W(x), x \in P\}$ as follows. For each $(i, j) \neq (n, n)$ pick any subdivision vertex $v_{ij} \in \overline{S_i S'_j}$ and let P_{ij} denote the (vertices of the) subpath of $\overline{S_i S'_j}$ from S_i to v_{ij} . Similarly, let P'_{ij} denote the (vertices of) $\overline{S_i S'_j} \setminus P_{ij}$, the "other half" of the path from S_i to S'_j . Now the witnesses can be defined as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} W(t) &= \{t\} \text{ for } t \in P_1 \\ W(S_n) &= \bigcup_i \{\overline{S_i q} \mid q \in S_i \cap Q_1\} \cup \bigcup_{q, q' \in Q_1} \overline{qq'} \cup \bigcup_{(i, j) \neq (n, n)} P_{ij} \\ W(S'_n) &= \bigcup_i \{\overline{S'_i q} \mid q \in S'_i \cap Q_2\} \cup \bigcup_{q, q' \in Q_2} \overline{qq'} \cup \bigcup_{(i, j) \neq (n, n)} P'_{ij} \\ W(t) &= \{t\} \text{ for } t \in P_2 \end{aligned}$$

To check correctness, we verify the three conditions for witnesses (observing that disjointness of the bags $W(x)$ is obvious).

- $W(S_n)$ is connected: Indeed, all of P_{ij} is connected to S_i and this (as we assume $Q = Q_1 \cup Q_2$ is a 2-colouring of \mathcal{H}) contains some $q \in Q_1$, so $\overline{S_i q}$ joins S_i to q . The latter, in turn, is joined to S_n . The same arguments apply to $W(S'_n)$.
- Any two consecutive bags $W(x)$ and $W(y)$ (that is, when x and y are neighbours in P) are adjacent: Indeed, t_1 is adjacent to S_n , S_n is adjacent to S'_n , and S'_n is adjacent to t_2 .
- If x and y are non-adjacent in P , then $W(x)$ and $W(y)$ are non-adjacent in $\bar{G}_{\mathcal{H}}$: Indeed, t_1 is only adjacent to $W(S_n)$ and this in turn is only adjacent to $W(S'_n)$ and t_1 .

Thus, indeed, $\bar{G}_{\mathcal{H}}$ contains P_{2p} as a contraction.

Now suppose that $\bar{G}_{\mathcal{H}}$ contains P_{2p} as a contraction. Since \bar{t}_1 and \bar{t}_2 are the only vertices at distance $2p - 1$ in $\bar{G}_{\mathcal{H}}$, the only possibility is that $\bar{G}_{\mathcal{H}}$ contracts to $P = (P_1, S_n, S'_n, P_2)$. Let $\{W(x), x \in P\}$ be a corresponding witness structure.

Claim 1:

- (i) $S_i \in W(t_1) \cup W(S_n)$ and $S'_i \in W(t_2) \cup W(S'_n)$ for $i = 1, \dots, n$.
- (ii) $q \in W(t_1) \cup W(S_n) \cup W(S'_n) \cup W(t_2)$ for all $q \in Q$.

Proof of Claim 1. In order to have all $W(x), x \in P$ connected, the subdivision vertices on $\overline{S_i S'_j}$ must belong to the same bags $W(x)$ as either S_i or S'_j . The vertices S_i and S'_j , however, must be in different (adjacent) bags: Indeed, $S_i, S'_j \in W(x)$ would imply that both t_1 and t_2 were adjacent to (or contained in) $W(x)$, contradicting the third condition for witness structures. The same argument shows that S_i must either be in $W(t_1)$ or an adjacent bag, that is, in $W(S_n)$ or in $W(t)$, where t is the unique neighbour of t_1 in P_1 . The latter, however, is impossible: If $S_i \in W(t)$, then S_i must

be connected to t within $W(t)$. But the only path joining S_i to t in $\bar{G}_{\mathcal{H}}$ runs through t_1 , which does not belong to $W(t)$. Thus, indeed, (i) follows.

Part (ii) can be proved in the same way: If $q \in W(t)$ with $t \in P_1 \setminus \{t_1\}$, then q should be connected to t within $W(t)$. But, again, the only path connecting q and t runs through t_1 , a contradiction. \diamond

We claim that the partition $Q = Q_1 \cup Q_2$ given by $Q_1 = Q \cap (W(t_1) \cup W(S_n))$ and $Q_2 := Q \cap (W(t_2) \cup W(S'_n))$ is a 2-colouring of \mathcal{H} . That is, we will show that each $S_i \in \mathcal{S}$ contains some $q \in Q_1$ and, similarly, each $S'_i \in \mathcal{S}'$ contains some $q \in Q_2$.

Let $S_i \in \mathcal{S}$. From Claim 1 it follows that $S_i \in W(t_1) \cup W(S_n)$. For each $q \in S_i$ we follow the path $\bar{S}_i q$ from S_i to q in $\bar{G}_{\mathcal{H}}$. Let v be the last vertex on this path that belongs to $W(t_1) \cup W(S_n)$. If $v = q$, then $q \in Q \cap (W(t_1) \cup W(S_n)) = Q_1$ and we are done. Hence, assume $v \neq q$. Then, in particular, $q \notin W(t_1) \cup W(S_n)$. From Claim 1 we know that $q \in W(t_2) \cup W(S'_n)$. The path $\bar{S}_i q$ starts in $S_i \in W(t_1) \cup W(S_n)$ and ends in $q \in W(t_2) \cup W(S'_n)$. Since only $W(S_n)$ and $W(S'_n)$ are adjacent, this path must eventually pass from $W(S_n)$ to $W(S'_n)$ for the last time. Hence, $v \in W(S_n)$ and, therefore, must be connected to S_n within $W(S_n)$. As v is a subdivision vertex on $\bar{S}_i q$, this connection can only be via S_i or q . But q is not in $W(S_n)$, so the connection must be via S_i and we conclude that $S_i \in W(S_n)$. Hence, S_i must be connected to S_n within $W(S_n)$. The only paths in $\bar{G}_{\mathcal{H}}$ connecting S_i to S_n run through either t_1 (which does *not* belong to $W(S_n)$) or some S'_j (which also does not belong to $W(S_n)$) or - the last possibility - some $\tilde{q} \in S_i$. Hence, indeed, at least one such $\tilde{q} \in S_i$ must belong to $W(S_n)$. But then $\tilde{q} \in Q_1$ (by definition of Q_1), as required. \square

As a consequence of Theorem 8, LONGEST PATH CONTRACTIBILITY is NP-complete for bipartite graphs of arbitrarily large girth. This strengthens the corresponding result for bipartite graphs, which following from a result of [28]. For our dichotomy result we need the following consequence of Theorem 8.

Corollary 1. *Let H be a graph that has a cycle. Then LONGEST PATH CONTRACTIBILITY is NP-complete for H -free graphs.*

Proof. Let g be the girth of H . We set $p = g + 1$ and note that the class of H -free graphs contains the class of graphs of girth at least p . Hence, we can apply Theorem 8. \square

5 The Proof of Theorem 2

We will use the following result from [16] as a lemma (in fact this result holds even for line graphs which form a subclass of the class of $K_{1,3}$ -free graphs).

Lemma 26 ([16]). *The P_7 -CONTRACTIBILITY problem is NP-complete for $K_{1,3}$ -free graphs.*

By using the results from the previous sections and the above result we can now prove our classification theorem.

Theorem 2. (restated) *Let H be a graph. If H is an induced subgraph of $P_1 + P_5$, $P_1 + P_2 + P_3$, $P_2 + P_4$ or $sP_1 + P_4$ for some $s \geq 0$, then LONGEST PATH CONTRACTIBILITY restricted to H -free graphs is polynomial-time solvable; otherwise it is NP-complete.*

Proof. If H is an induced subgraph of $P_1 + P_5$, $P_1 + P_2 + P_3$, $P_2 + P_4$ or $sP_1 + P_4$ for some $s \geq 0$, then we use Theorems 3–6 to find that LONGEST PATH CONTRACTIBILITY is polynomial-time solvable for H -free graphs. From now on suppose H is not of this form. Below we will prove that in that case LONGEST CONTRACTIBILITY is NP-complete for H -free graphs.

If H contains a cycle, then we apply Corollary 1 to prove that LONGEST PATH CONTRACTIBILITY is NP-complete for H -free graphs. Assume that H is a forest. If H has a vertex of degree at least 3, then the class of H -free graphs contains the class of $K_{1,3}$ -free graphs. Hence, we can apply Lemma 26 to find that LONGEST PATH CONTRACTIBILITY is NP-complete for H -free graphs.

From now on we assume that H is a linear forest. As H is not an induced subgraph of $sP_1 + P_4$, we find that H contains at least one edge. We distinguish three cases.

Case 1. The number of connected components of H is at least 3.

First suppose that at least three connected components of H contain an edge. Then H contains an induced $3P_2$. This means we may apply Theorem 7 to find that LONGEST PATH CONTRACTIBILITY is NP-complete for H -free graphs.

Now suppose that exactly two connected components of H contain an edge. If H contains at least four connected components, then H contains an induced $2P_1 + 2P_2$. This means we may apply Theorem 7 to find that LONGEST PATH CONTRACTIBILITY is NP-complete for H -free graphs. Hence, $H = P_1 + P_r + P_s$ for some $2 \leq r \leq s$. If $s \geq 4$, then H contains an induced $2P_1 + 2P_2$. This means we may apply Theorem 7 to find that LONGEST PATH CONTRACTIBILITY is NP-complete for H -free graphs. If $s = 3$ and $r = 2$, then $H = P_1 + P_2 + P_3$, a contradiction. If $s = 3$ and $r = 3$, then H contains an induced $2P_3$. This means we may apply Theorem 7 to find that LONGEST PATH CONTRACTIBILITY is NP-complete for H -free graphs. Hence, $s = 2$, and thus $r = 2$. Then $H = P_1 + 2P_2$ is an induced subgraph of $P_1 + P_5$, a contradiction.

Finally suppose that exactly one connected component of H contains an edge. Then $H = sP_1 + P_r$ for some $r \geq 2$. As H is not an induced subgraph of $sP_1 + P_4$, we find that $r \geq 5$. If $r \geq 6$, then H contains an induced P_6 . This means we may apply Theorem 7 to find that LONGEST PATH CONTRACTIBILITY is NP-complete for H -free graphs. Hence, $r = 5$. As $H \neq P_1 + P_5$, we find that $s \geq 2$. Then $H = sP_1 + P_5$ contains an induced $2P_1 + 2P_2$. This means we may apply Theorem 7 to find that LONGEST PATH CONTRACTIBILITY is NP-complete for H -free graphs.

Case 2. The number of connected components of H is exactly 2.

Then $H = P_r + P_s$ for some r and s with $1 \leq r \leq s$. If $r \geq 3$ then H contains an induced $2P_3$, and if $s \geq 6$ then H contains an induced P_6 . In both cases we apply Theorem 7 to find that LONGEST PATH CONTRACTIBILITY is NP-complete for H -free graphs. From now on assume that $r \leq 2$ and $s \leq 5$. If $s \leq 4$, then H is an induced subgraph of $P_2 + P_4$, a contradiction. Hence, $s = 5$. If $r = 1$, then $H = P_1 + P_5$, a contradiction. Thus $r = 2$. Then H contains an induced $3P_2$. This means we may apply Theorem 7 to find that LONGEST PATH CONTRACTIBILITY is NP-complete for H -free graphs.

Case 3. The number of connected components of H is exactly 1.

If $H = P_r$ for some $r \leq 5$, then we use Theorem 5. Otherwise P_6 is an induced subgraph of H , and we use Theorem 7. \square

6 Longest Cycle Contractibility

The length of of a longest cycle a graph G can be contracted to is called the *co-circularity* [6] or *cyclicity* [25] of G . This leads to the following decision problem.

LONGEST CYCLE CONTRACTIBILITY

Instance: a connected graph G and an integer k .

Question: does G contain C_k as a contraction?

Hammack proved that LONGEST CYCLE CONTRACTIBILITY is NP-complete for general graphs [26] but polynomial-time solvable for planar graphs [25]. It is also known that C_6 -CONTRACTIBILITY, and thus LONGEST CYCLE CONTRACTIBILITY, is NP-complete for $K_{1,3}$ -free graphs [16] and bipartite graphs [14], and thus for C_r -free graphs if r is odd. The purpose of this section is to show that the complexities of LONGEST CYCLE CONTRACTIBILITY and LONGEST PATH CONTRACTIBILITY may not coincide on H -free graphs.

For a given hypergraph $\mathcal{H} = (Q, \mathcal{S})$ we first construct the graph $G_{\mathcal{H}}$ as before. We then add an edge between vertices t_1 and t_2 . This yields the graph $G'_{\mathcal{H}}$. We need the following result from [9].

Lemma 27 ([9]). *A hypergraph \mathcal{H} has a 2-colouring if and only if $G'_{\mathcal{H}}$ has C_4 as a contraction.*

We now prove the following lemma.

Lemma 28. *Let \mathcal{H} be a hypergraph. Then the graph $G'_{\mathcal{H}}$ is $(P_2 + P_4)$ -free.*

Proof. For contradiction, assume that $G'_{\mathcal{H}}$ contains a subgraph H isomorphic to $P_2 + P_4$. Let D_1 be the connected component of H on two vertices, and let D_2 be the connected components of H on four vertices. As the subgraph of $G'_{\mathcal{H}}$ induced by $\mathcal{S} \cup \mathcal{S}' \cup \{t_1, t_2\}$ is complete bipartite and thus P_4 -free, we find that D_2 must contain a vertex of Q . As Q is a clique, D_2 must also contain at least two vertices from $\mathcal{S} \cup \mathcal{S}'$. We may without loss of generality assume that D_2 contains a vertex from \mathcal{S} . This means that D_1 contains no vertex from $Q \cup \mathcal{S}' \cup \{t_1\}$. Hence, D_1 only contains vertices of $\mathcal{S} \cup \{t_2\}$. As the latter set is independent, this is not possible. We conclude that $G'_{\mathcal{H}}$ is $(P_2 + P_4)$ -free. \square

We note that, in line with our polynomial-time result of LONGEST PATH CONTRACTIBILITY for $(P_2 + P_4)$ -free graphs (Theorem 3), the graph $G_{\mathcal{H}}$ may not be $(P_2 + P_4)$ -free: as t_1 and t_2 are not adjacent in $G_{\mathcal{H}}$, two vertices of Q together with vertices t_1, S_j, S'_ℓ, t_2 may form an induced $P_2 + P_4$ in $G_{\mathcal{H}}$.

It is readily seen that C_4 -CONTRACTIBILITY belongs to NP. Hence, we obtain the following result from Lemmas 27 and 28.

Theorem 9. *C_4 -CONTRACTIBILITY is NP-complete for $(P_2 + P_4)$ -free graphs.*

Theorem 9 has the following consequence.

Corollary 2. *LONGEST CYCLE CONTRACTIBILITY is NP-complete for $(P_2 + P_4)$ -free graphs.*

Recall that LONGEST PATH CONTRACTIBILITY is polynomial-time solvable for $(P_2 + P_4)$ -free graphs by Theorem 2. Hence, combining this result with Corollary 2 shows that the two problems behave differently on $(P_2 + P_4)$ -free graphs.

7 Conclusions

We completely classified the complexities of LONGEST INDUCED PATH and LONGEST PATH CONTRACTIBILITY problem for H -free graphs. Such a classification is still open for LONGEST PATH and below we briefly present the state of art.

A graph is *chordal bipartite* if it is bipartite and every induced cycle has length 4. In other words, a graph is chordal bipartite if and only if it is (C_3, C_5, C_6, \dots) -free. A direct consequence of the NP-hardness of HAMILTONIAN PATH for chordal bipartite graphs and strongly chordal split graphs [46], or equivalently, strongly chordal $(2P_2, C_4, C_5)$ -free graphs [17] is that HAMILTONIAN PATH, and therefore, LONGEST PATH is NP-complete

for H -free graphs if H has a cycle or contains an induced $2P_2$. The NP-hardness of HAMILTONIAN PATH for line graphs [5], and thus for $K_{1,3}$ -free graphs, implies the same result for H -free graphs if H is a forest with a vertex of degree at least 3. On the positive side, LONGEST PATH is polynomial-time solvable for P_4 -free graphs due to the corresponding result for its superclass of cocomparability graphs [35,45]. This leaves open the following cases.

Open Problem 1 *Determine the computational complexity of LONGEST PATH for H -free graphs when:*

- $H = sP_1 + P_r$ for $3 \leq r \leq 4$ and $s \geq 1$
- $H = sP_1 + P_2$ for $s \geq 2$
- $H = sP_1$ for $s \geq 3$.

We showed that the complexities of LONGEST CYCLE CONTRACTIBILITY and LONGEST PATH CONTRACTIBILITY do not coincide for H -free graphs. However, the complexity of LONGEST CYCLE CONTRACTIBILITY for H -free graphs has not been settled yet. For instance, if H is a cycle, the cases $H = C_4$ and $H = C_6$ are still open.

References

1. A. Agrawal, D. Lokshtanov, S. Saurabh, and M. Zehavi. Split contraction: The untold story. *Proc. STACS 2017, LIPIcs*, 66:5:1–5:14, 2017.
2. A. Agrawal, S. Saurabh, and P. Tale. On the parameterized complexity of contraction to generalization of trees. *Proc. IPEC 2017, LIPIcs*, 89:1:1–1:12, 2017.
3. T. Asano and T. Hirata. Edge-contraction problems. *Journal of Computer and System Sciences*, 26(2):197–208, 1983.
4. R. Belmonte, P. A. Golovach, P. van ’t Hof, and D. Paulusma. Parameterized complexity of three edge contraction problems with degree constraints. *Acta Informatica*, 51(7):473–497, 2014.
5. A. A. Bertossi. The edge hamiltonian path problem is NP-complete. *Information Processing Letters*, 13(4/5):157–159, 1981.
6. D. Blum. *Circularity of graphs*. Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University, 1982.
7. M. Bonamy, K. K. Dabrowski, C. Feghali, M. Johnson, and D. Paulusma. Independent feedback vertex set for P_5 -free graphs. *Algorithmica*, to appear.
8. A. Brandstädt, V. B. Le, and J. P. Spinrad. *Graph Classes: A Survey*. SIAM Monographs on Discrete Mathematics and Applications. Society for Industrial and Applied Mathematics (SIAM), 1999.
9. A. E. Brouwer and H. J. Veldman. Contractibility and NP-completeness. *Journal of Graph Theory*, 11(1):71–79, 1987.
10. L. Cai and C. Guo. Contracting few edges to remove forbidden induced subgraphs. *Proc. IPEC 2013, LNCS*, 8246:97–109, 2013.
11. M. Chudnovsky. The structure of bull-free graphs II and III - A summary. *Journal of Combinatorial Theory, Series B*, 102(1):252–282, 2012.
12. M. Chudnovsky and P. D. Seymour. The structure of claw-free graphs. *Surveys in Combinatorics, LMS Lecture Note Series*, 327:153–171, 2005.
13. B. Courcelle, J. A. Makowsky, and U. Rotics. Linear time solvable optimization problems on graphs of bounded clique-width. *Theory of Computing Systems*, 33(2):125–150, 2000.
14. K. K. Dabrowski and D. Paulusma. Contracting bipartite graphs to paths and cycles. *Information Processing Letters*, 127:37–42, 2017.
15. D. Eppstein. Finding large clique minors is hard. *Journal of Graph Algorithms and Applications*, 13(2):197–204, 2009.
16. J. Fiala, M. Kaminski, and D. Paulusma. A note on contracting claw-free graphs. *Discrete Mathematics & Theoretical Computer Science*, 15(2):223–232, 2013.
17. S. Földes and P. L. Hammer. Split graphs. *Congressus Numerantium*, XIX:311–315, 1977.
18. M. R. Garey and D. S. Johnson. *Computers and Intractability: A Guide to the Theory of NP-Completeness*. W. H. Freeman & Co., New York, NY, USA, 1979.

19. M. R. Garey, D. S. Johnson, and R. E. Tarjan. The planar hamiltonian circuit problem is NP-complete. *SIAM Journal on Computing*, 5(4):704–714, 1976.
20. F. Gavril. Algorithms for maximum weight induced paths. *Information Processing Letters*, 81(4):203–208, 2002.
21. P. A. Golovach, M. Johnson, D. Paulusma, and J. Song. A survey on the computational complexity of coloring graphs with forbidden subgraphs. *Journal of Graph Theory*, 84(4):331–363, 2017.
22. P. A. Golovach, P. van 't Hof, and D. Paulusma. Obtaining planarity by contracting few edges. *Theoretical Computer Science*, 476:38–46, 2013.
23. S. Guillemot and D. Marx. A faster FPT algorithm for bipartite contraction. *Information Processing Letters*, 113(22-24):906–912, 2013.
24. Y.-L. Guo, C.-W. Ho, and M.-T. Ko. The longest path problem on distance-hereditary graphs. *Advances in Intelligent Systems and Applications*, 1:69–77, 2013.
25. R. Hammack. Cyclicity of graphs. *Journal of Graph Theory*, 32(2):160–170, 1999.
26. R. Hammack. A note on the complexity of computing cyclicity. *Ars Combinatoria*, 63, 2002.
27. P. Heggernes, P. van 't Hof, B. Lévêque, D. Lokshantov, and C. Paul. Contracting graphs to paths and trees. *Algorithmica*, 68(1):109–132, 2014.
28. P. Heggernes, P. van 't Hof, B. Lévêque, and C. Paul. Contracting chordal graphs and bipartite graphs to paths and trees. *Discrete Applied Mathematics*, 164:444–449, 2014.
29. P. Heggernes, P. van 't Hof, D. Lokshantov, and C. Paul. Obtaining a bipartite graph by contracting few edges. *SIAM Journal on Discrete Mathematics*, 27(4):2143–2156, 2013.
30. D. Hermelin, M. Mnich, E. J. van Leeuwen, and G. J. Woeginger. Domination when the stars are out. *Proc. ICALP 2011, LNCS*, 6755:462–473, 2011.
31. C. Hoede and H. J. Veldman. On characterization of hamiltonian graphs. *J. Comb. Theory, Ser. B*, 25(1):47–53, 1978.
32. C. Hoede and H. J. Veldman. Contraction theorems in hamiltonian graph theory. *Discrete Mathematics*, 34(1):61–67, 1981.
33. J. E. Hopcroft and R. M. Karp. An $n^{5/2}$ algorithm for maximum matchings in bipartite graphs. *SIAM Journal on Computing*, 2(4):225–231, 1973.
34. K. Ioannidou, G. B. Mertzios, and S. D. Nikolopoulos. The longest path problem has a polynomial solution on interval graphs. *Algorithmica*, 61(2):320–341, 2011.
35. K. Ioannidou and S. D. Nikolopoulos. The longest path problem is polynomial on cocomparability graphs. *Algorithmica*, 65(1):177–205, 2013.
36. T. Ishizeki, Y. Otachi, and K. Yamazaki. An improved algorithm for the longest induced path problem on k-chordal graphs. *Discrete Applied Mathematics*, 156(15):3057–3059, 2008.
37. L. Jaffke, O. Kwon, and J. A. Telle. Polynomial-time algorithms for the longest induced path and induced disjoint paths problems on graphs of bounded mim-width. *Proc. IPEC 2017, LNCS*, 89:21:1–21:13, 2017.
38. W. H. Kautz. Unit-distance error-checking codes. *IRE Transactions on Electronic Computers*, 7:179–180, 1958.
39. D. Kratsch, H. Müller, and I. Todinca. Feedback vertex set and longest induced path on at-free graphs. *Proc. WG 2003, LNCS*, 2880:309–321, 2003.
40. A. Levin, D. Paulusma, and G. J. Woeginger. The computational complexity of graph contractions I: polynomially solvable and NP-complete cases. *Networks*, 51(3):178–189, 2008.
41. A. Levin, D. Paulusma, and G. J. Woeginger. The computational complexity of graph contractions II: two tough polynomially solvable cases. *Networks*, 52(1):32–56, 2008.
42. D. Lokshantov, N. Misra, and S. Saurabh. On the hardness of eliminating small induced subgraphs by contracting edges. *Proc. IPEC 2013, LNCS*, 8246:243–254, 2013.
43. D. Marx, B. O'Sullivan, and I. Razgon. Finding small separators in linear time via treewidth reduction. *ACM Transactions on Algorithms*, 9(4):30:1–30:35, 2013.
44. G. B. Mertzios and I. Bezáková. Computing and counting longest paths on circular-arc graphs in polynomial time. *Discrete Applied Mathematics*, 164:383–399, 2014.
45. G. B. Mertzios and D. G. Corneil. A simple polynomial algorithm for the longest path problem on cocomparability graphs. *SIAM Journal on Discrete Mathematics*, 26(3):940–963, 2012.

46. H. Müller. Hamiltonian circuits in chordal bipartite graphs. *Discrete Mathematics*, 156(1-3):291–298, 1996.
47. B. Randerath and I. Schiermeyer. Vertex colouring and forbidden subgraphs - A survey. *Graphs and Combinatorics*, 20(1):1–40, 2004.
48. N. Robertson and P. D. Seymour. Graph minors .xiii. the disjoint paths problem. *Journal of Combinatorial Theory, Series B*, 63(1):65–110, 1995.
49. R. Uehara and Y. Uno. On computing longest paths in small graph classes. *International Journal of Foundations of Computer Science*, 18(5):911–930, 2007.
50. R. Uehara and G. Valiente. Linear structure of bipartite permutation graphs and the longest path problem. *Information Processing Letters*, 103(2):71–77, 2007.
51. P. van 't Hof, M. Kaminski, D. Paulusma, S. Szeider, and D. M. Thilikos. On graph contractions and induced minors. *Discrete Applied Mathematics*, 160(6):799–809, 2012.
52. P. van 't Hof, D. Paulusma, and G. J. Woeginger. Partitioning graphs into connected parts. *Theoretical Computer Science*, 410(47-49):4834–4843, 2009.
53. T. Watanabe, T. Ae, and A. Nakamura. On the removal of forbidden graphs by edge-deletion or by edge-contraction. *Discrete Applied Mathematics*, 3(2):151–153, 1981.
54. T. Watanabe, T. Ae, and A. Nakamura. On the NP-hardness of edge-deletion and -contraction problems. *Discrete Applied Mathematics*, 6(1):63–78, 1983.