

Core Stability in Additively Separable Hedonic Games of Low Treewidth

Tesshu Hanaka  

Kyushu University, Fukuoka, Japan

Noleen Köhler  

University of Leeds, Leeds, UK

Michael Lampis  

Université Paris-Dauphine, PSL University, CNRS UMR7243, LAMSADE, Paris, France

Abstract

Additively Separable Hedonic Game (ASHG) are coalition-formation games where we are given a graph whose vertices represent n selfish agents and the weight of each edge uv denotes how much agent u gains (or loses) when she is placed in the same coalition as agent v . We revisit the computational complexity of the well-known notion of core stability of ASHG, where the goal is to construct a partition of the agents into coalitions such that no group of agents would prefer to diverge from the given partition and form a new (blocking) coalition. Since both finding a core stable partition and verifying that a given partition is core stable are intractable problems (Σ_2^P -complete and coNP-complete respectively) we study their complexity from the point of view of structural parameterized complexity, using standard graph-theoretic parameters, such as treewidth.

We begin by presenting several results on CORE STABILITY VERIFICATION (CSV) indicating that this is an unusually intractable problem, even in very restricted cases: CSV remains coNP-complete on graphs of vertex cover 2; CSV is coW[1]-hard parameterized by vertex integrity when edge weights are polynomially bounded; and CSV is coW[1]-hard parameterized by tree-depth even if all weights are from $\{-1, 1\}$. We complement these results with essentially matching algorithms and one of the rare tractability results we present is that CSV is FPT parameterized by the treewidth tw plus the maximum degree Δ (improving a previous algorithm's dependence from $2^{O(\text{tw}\Delta^2)}$ to $2^{O(\text{tw}\Delta)}$).

We then move on to study CORE STABILITY (CS), which one would naturally expect to be even harder than CSV. We confirm this intuition by showing that CS is Σ_2^P -complete even on graphs of bounded vertex cover. On the positive side, we consider the parameterization by $\text{tw} + \Delta$ and improve the known algorithm (which was based on Courcelle's theorem) via an explicit algorithm utilizing a reduction to $\exists\forall$ -SAT. The running time of our algorithm is, unfortunately, double-exponential in $\text{tw} + \Delta$. However, we show that this is likely to be optimal, as the existence of an algorithm with less than double-exponential dependence on tw (even for bounded-degree instances) would contradict the Exponential Time Hypothesis (ETH).

Finally, we consider another natural parameter for these problems: the size k of the considered blocking (diverging) coalitions. Fixing k to be constant does lower the complexities of CSV and CS to P and NP-complete respectively, since one can then consider all coalitions of size k in polynomial time. Unfortunately, we show that a more efficient algorithm is unlikely to exist, as CSV is coW[1]-hard parameterized by k (even on unweighted graphs), while CS is NP-complete for all $k \geq 3$ (even on graphs of bounded degree with bounded edge weights).

2012 ACM Subject Classification Mathematics of computing \rightarrow Graph algorithms; Theory of Computation \rightarrow Design and Analysis of Algorithms \rightarrow Parameterized Complexity and Exact Algorithms

Keywords and phrases Hedonic games, Treewidth, Core stability

Digital Object Identifier 10.4230/LIPIcs.CVIT.2016.23

Funding *Tesshu Hanaka*: Partially supported by JSPS KAKENHI Grant Numbers JP21H05852, JP21K17707, JP22H00513, JP23H04388.

Noleen Köhler: Partially supported by ANR project ANR-18-CE40-0025-01 (ASSK).



© Jane Open Access and Joan R. Public; licensed under Creative Commons License CC-BY 4.0

42nd Conference on Very Important Topics (CVIT 2016).

Editors: John Q. Open and Joan R. Access; Article No. 23; pp. 23:1–23:40

Leibniz International Proceedings in Informatics



LIPICs Schloss Dagstuhl – Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik, Dagstuhl Publishing, Germany

Michael Lampis: Supported by ANR project ANR-21-CE48-0022 (S-EX-AP-PE-AL).

1 Introduction

Coalition formation games model situations where a group of selfish agents need to be partitioned into teams (coalitions) in such a way that takes into account their preferences. Because such games capture a vast array of interesting scenarios, they have been a subject of intense study in computational social choice and the social sciences at large. One particularly interesting and natural special case of such games is when the preferences of each agent only depend on the other agents that she is placed together with in the same coalition (and not on the placement of agents on other coalitions). Such games are referred to in the literature as *hedonic games* and have also attracted much interest from the computer science perspective ([1, 2, 6, 7, 9, 10, 11, 21, 32, 41, 47]), thanks in part to their numerous applications in, for example, social network analysis [42], scheduling group activities [17], and allocating tasks to wireless agents [46]. For more information we refer the reader to [12] and the relevant chapters of standard computational social choice textbooks [4].

Hedonic games are extremely general. Unfortunately, this generality renders them hard to study from the computer science perspective – indeed, even listing the preferences of all n agents takes space exponential in n as the naïve approach would give the ordering of each agent over all coalitions. This motivates the study of natural restrictions of hedonic games. In this paper we focus on one of the most natural such restrictions: *Additively Separable Hedonic Games* (ASHGs), where the input is an edge-weighted graph, vertices represent the agents, and the weight of the edge uv denotes the utility that agent u derives from being in the same coalition as v . The utility of an agent u in a coalition C can then be succinctly encoded as the sum of the weights of edges incident on u with their other endpoint in C .

In any situation where agents behave selfishly, it becomes critical to look for *stable* outcomes, that is, outcomes which the agents are likely to accept, based on their preferences. In the context of ASHG, the question then becomes: given an edge-weighted graph G representing the agents' preferences, can we find a stable partition of the agents into coalitions (possibly also optimizing some other social welfare goal)? The computational complexity of such questions has been amply studied ([3, 5, 20, 22, 30, 42, 43, 49]) and several natural notions of stability have been proposed. In this paper we revisit the computational complexity of one of the most well-studied such notions, which is called *core stability*. Intuitively, a partition of n agents is called *core stable*, if it is stable enough to dissuade not only individual diverging behavior but even divergence by groups of agents. More formally, given a partition \mathcal{P} of the agents, a *blocking coalition* is a set of agents X such that all $v \in X$ have strictly higher utility in X than in the initial partition \mathcal{P} . Hence, if a blocking coalition X exists, the initial partition is *unstable*, because the agents of X would prefer to form a new coalition. A partition is then called core stable if no blocking coalition (of any size) exists. Notice that core stability is a very strong (and hence very desirable) notion of stability, compared with simpler notions, such as Nash stability (which only precludes divergence by a single agent).

Attractive though it may be from the game theory point of view, the notion of core stability presents some serious drawbacks from the point of view of computational complexity. In particular, deciding if an ASHG admits a core stable outcome is not just NP-hard, but in fact Σ_2^P -complete, that is, complete for the second level of the polynomial hierarchy [50], even if the input graph is undirected, has bounded degree, and edge weights are bounded by a constant [45]. Compared to simpler notions of stability, such as Nash stability (which is “only” NP-complete [25]), core stability is therefore highly intractable, and this strongly

motivates the search for a better understanding of what the source of this intractability is and for ways to deal with it. The focus of this paper is on using notions of graph structure from parameterized complexity to achieve a more fine-grained understanding of the complexity of this problem. Throughout the paper we will concentrate on the case where agent preferences are *symmetric*, that is, the given graphs are undirected. Since most of our results are negative, this (natural) restriction only renders them stronger.

Our results In this paper we present several results that improve and clarify the state of the art on the complexity of finding core stable outcomes in ASHG. We study two closely related problems: CORE STABILITY (CS) and CORE STABILITY VERIFICATION (CSV), which correspond to deciding if a core stable partition exists and deciding if a given partition is indeed core stable respectively. Intuitively, the reason CS is complete for the second level of the polynomial hierarchy (and not just NP-complete) is that CSV is also known to be intractable (coNP-complete [15, 48]). Our high-level aim is to understand which parts of the combinatorial structure of the input are responsible for the complexity of these two problems. In order to quantify the input structure we will use standard structural tools from the toolbox of parameterized complexity, such as the notions of treewidth and related parameters¹.

We begin our investigation with CSV and ask the question which restrictions on the input are likely to render the problem tractable (or conversely, what are the sources of the problem's intractability). We identify two possible culprits: the problem could become easy if we either impose restrictions on the graph structure, for example by requiring that the input be of low treewidth or degree, or if we impose restrictions on the allowed edge weights. Our results indicate that these two sources of intractability interact in non-trivial ways:

- If we place absolutely no restrictions on the allowed weights, CSV remains hard even on severely restricted instances, that is, graphs of vertex cover 2 (Theorem 2). We find this rather surprising, as this class of graphs (which are essentially stars with one additional vertex) is rarely general enough to render problems intractable.
- One may be tempted to interpret the previous result as an artifact of the exponentially large weights we allow in the input. However, we show that even if we place the restriction that weights are polynomially bounded in the input size, CSV still remains quite hard from the parameterized perspective, and more precisely coW[1]-hard parameterized by vertex integrity (Theorem 3). Recall that graphs with small vertex integrity are graphs where there exists a small separator whose removal breaks down the graph into components of bounded size, so this parameterization is again rather restrictive and usually easily renders most problems almost as tractable as parameterizing by vertex cover [28, 38].
- Finally, we show that even if we insist on weights only being selected from the set $\{-1, 1\}$, CSV is coW[1]-hard parameterized by tree-depth (Theorem 4).

Taken together these results show that CSV is an unusually intractable problem where hardness comes from a combination of two factors: the complexity of dealing with the edge weights and the complexity of dealing with the graph-theoretic structure of the input. We complement the above with several algorithms that paint a clearer picture of the complexity of CSV showing that: (i) CSV is polynomial-time solvable on trees (Theorem 5), hence Theorem 2 cannot be extended to graphs of vertex cover 1 (ii) CSV is FPT parameterized

¹ Throughout the paper we assume the reader is familiar with the basics of parameterized complexity, as given for example in [16]

by vertex integrity plus the maximum edge weight (Theorem 7), so the hardness result of Theorem 4 cannot be extended to vertex integrity (iii) Theorem 4 is matched by an XP algorithm parameterized by treewidth with parameter dependence $(\Delta w_{\max})^{O(\text{tw})}$, that is, an XP algorithm when weights are polynomially bounded (Theorem 8) (iv) the former algorithm can be improved to an FPT running time (even for unbounded weights) if we parameterize by $\text{tw} + \Delta$ (this was already observed by Peters [44], who gave an algorithm with dependence $2^{O(\Delta^2 \text{tw})}$, but we improve this complexity to $2^{O(\Delta \text{tw})}$ in Theorem 9).

The results above paint a comprehensive and rather negative picture on the complexity of CSV, which seems to imply that our main problem, that is, *finding* core-stable partitions, is likely to be even more intractable. We confirm this intuition by showing that CS remains Σ_2^p -complete even on graphs of bounded vertex cover (Theorem 12). One encouraging piece of news, however, is that we did manage to obtain an FPT algorithm when CSV is parameterized by $\text{tw} + \Delta$, so this seems like a case worth considering for CS. Indeed, Peters [44] already showed that CS is FPT for this parameterization, without, however, giving an explicit algorithm (his argument was based on Courcelle’s theorem). We improve upon this by giving an explicit algorithm whose dependence is *double-exponential* on $\text{tw} + \Delta$, using the technique of reducing to $\exists\forall$ -SAT advocated in [36] (Theorem 13). Despite fixed-parameter tractability, it is fair to say that the running time of our algorithm is quite disappointing. Our main contribution in this part is to show that this is, unfortunately, likely to be optimal: even for instances of bounded degree, the existence of an algorithm with better than double-exponential dependence on treewidth would violate the ETH (Theorem 18). This shows another aspect where core-stability is significantly harder than Nash stability, which has “just” slightly super-exponential in $\text{tw} + \Delta$ [31]. Note that the phenomenon that problems complete for the second level of the polynomial hierarchy tend to have double-exponential complexity in treewidth has been observed before [23, 37, 40]

Finally, we conclude our paper by considering one last relevant parameter: the size of the allowed blocking coalition. We say that a partition is k -core stable if no blocking coalition of size at most k exists. The concept of k -core stability was first proposed in [21]. For small values of k this is a natural variation of the problem, which could potentially render it more tractable – indeed, for k fixed, CSV is trivially in P and CS is trivially in NP. Unfortunately, we show that not much more is gained from these parameterizations: CSV is coW[1]-hard parameterized by k (even on unweighted graphs); while k -CS is NP-complete for all fixed $k \geq 3$, even on graphs of bounded maximum degree and with bounded weights.

2 Preliminaries

Throughout the paper we use standard graph-theoretic notation and focus on undirected graphs. An Additively Separable Hedonic Game (ASHG) is represented by a graph $G = (V, E)$, where vertices of V represent the agents, and a weight function $w : E \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}$. A partition \mathcal{P} of V is a collection of disjoint subsets of V whose union includes all of V . We will call the sets of such a partition *coalitions*. Slightly abusing notation, we will write, for $u \in V$, $\mathcal{P}(u)$ to denote the set of \mathcal{P} that contains u . The utility of an agent $u \in X$ in a set $X \subseteq V$ is defined as $\text{ut}(X, u) = \sum_{v \in X} w(uv)$, while the utility of u in a partition \mathcal{P} is defined as $\text{ut}_{\mathcal{P}}(u) = \text{ut}(\mathcal{P}(u), u) = \sum_{v \in \mathcal{P}(u)} w(uv)$. Even though we defined w as a function to the integers, we will sometimes allow rational edge weights, but with denominators sufficiently small that it will always be easy to obtain an equivalent integer instance by multiplying all weights by an appropriate integer. We use w_{\max} to denote the maximum *absolute* weight of a given ASHG instance. Unless otherwise stated, we assume that w is given to us encoded in

binary (and hence w_{\max} may have value exponential in the input size).

We are chiefly interested in the following notion of stability.

► **Definition 1** (Core stability). *A partition \mathcal{P} of an ASHG (G, w) is core stable, if there exists no $X \subseteq V(G)$ such that for all $u \in X$ we have $\text{ut}(X, u) > \text{ut}_{\mathcal{P}}(u)$.*

If the set X mentioned Definition 1 does exist, then we say that \mathcal{P} is unstable and that X is a *blocking coalition*. For fixed integer values of k , we will also study the notion of k -Core Stability: a partition is k -core stable if no blocking coalition of size at most k exists.

The two computational problems we are interested in are CORE STABILITY (CS) and CORE STABILITY VERIFICATION (CSV). In the former problem we are given as input an ASHG and are asked if there exists a core stable partition; in the latter we also given a specific partition \mathcal{P} and are asked if \mathcal{P} is core stable.

We say that a partition \mathcal{P} of $V(G)$ is *connected* if $G[P]$ is connected for every $P \in \mathcal{P}$. Notice that for both CSV and CS we may assume that the partition \mathcal{P} we seek or we are given is connected, as replacing a disconnected coalition $P \in \mathcal{P}$ with a coalition for each of its components does not change $\text{ut}_{\mathcal{P}}(u)$ for any $u \in V$ and hence does not affect stability.

2.1 Graph parameters and Parameterized Complexity

We assume the reader is familiar with the basics of parameterized complexity, such as the classes FPT and W[1], as given for example in [16]. One particularity is that CSV is a coNP-complete problem, that is, a problem for which one can easily verify No certificates (blocking coalitions). As a consequence, some of our results will give coW[1]-hardness (rather than W[1]-hardness) for CSV, by which we mean that the complement of any problem in W[1] can be fpt-reduced to the problem at hand. We will say that a problem is *weakly* hard for a class, if the reduction we present uses exponentially large weights (which therefore need to be encoded in binary). Conversely, if the reduction is valid even when weights are encoded in unary (and are therefore polynomially bounded) we say that the problem is *strongly* hard.

We assume that the reader is also familiar with standard structural graph parameters. The parameters we will focus on are treewidth (tw), pathwidth (pw), tree-depth (td), vertex integrity (vi), and vertex cover (vc). For the definitions of treewidth and pathwidth, as well as the corresponding (nice) decompositions we refer the reader to [16]. The vertex integrity $\text{vi}(G)$ of a graph G is defined as the minimum k such that there exists a set $S \subseteq V(G)$ (called a $\text{vi}(k)$ -set) such that the largest component of $G - S$ has order at most $k - |S|$. The tree-depth of a graph G is defined inductively as follows: an isolated vertex has tree-depth 1; the tree-depth of a disconnected graph is the maximum of the tree-depth of its components; the tree-depth of a connected graph G is defined as $\min_{v \in V(G)} \text{td}(G - v) + 1$. The vertex cover of G is the size of the smallest set of vertices of G that intersects all edges.

It is well known that for all graphs G we have $\text{tw}(G) \leq \text{pw}(G) \leq \text{td}(G) \leq \text{vi}(G) \leq \text{vc}(G) + 1$. In terms of parameterized complexity these parameters therefore form a hierarchy: if a problem is FPT for a smaller parameter, then it is FPT for the larger ones and conversely if a problem is intractable for a large parameter, then it is intractable for a smaller one. We therefore say that larger parameters are more restrictive, with vertex cover being the most restrictive parameter we consider. We use $\Delta(G)$ to denote the maximum degree of a graph G . We omit G from notation, if it is clear from context.

3 Core Stability Verification

In this section we study the complexity of CORE STABILITY VERIFICATION (CSV). What we discover is that this is an unusually intractable problem, even for quite restricted parameterizations. In particular, we present the three following hardness results:

- CSV is weakly coNP-complete on graphs of vertex cover number 2. (Theorem 2)
- CSV is strongly coW[1]-hard parameterized by vertex integrity. (Theorem 3)
- CSV is coW[1]-hard parameterized by tree-depth, even if all weights are in $\{-1, 1\}$. (Theorem 4)

Our results indicate that, even though some of the problem's intractability can be attributed to the edge weights, a large part of its complexity is due to the graph-theoretic structure of the input, and the problem is intractable for tree-depth (and hence for pathwidth and treewidth) even for very small weights. These hardness results are complemented by several algorithms, which show that the hardness results are essentially tight. In particular:

- In Theorem 5 we show that CSV is in P for trees, therefore, Theorem 2 cannot apply to graphs of vertex cover 1.
- In Theorem 6 we show that CSV is in XP parameterized by vertex cover when weights are polynomially bounded. This implies that Theorem 2 cannot be improved to give strong coNP-completeness.
- In Theorem 7 we show that CSV is FPT parameterized by $\text{vi} + w_{\max}$, so Theorem 4 cannot be extended to CSV parameterized by vertex integrity.
- Theorem 4 is matched by an XP algorithm parameterized by treewidth with parameter dependence $(\Delta w_{\max})^{O(\text{tw})}$, i.e. an XP algorithm when weights are polynomially bounded (Theorem 8).
- The former algorithm can be improved to an FPT running time (even for unbounded weights) if we parameterize by $\text{tw} + \Delta$. This was already observed by Peters [44], who gave an algorithm with dependence $2^{O(\Delta^2 \text{tw})}$, but we improve this complexity to $2^{O(\Delta \text{tw})}$ (Theorem 9).


3.1 Hardness Results

We first prove the following three hardness results.

► **Theorem 2.** *CORE STABILITY VERIFICATION is weakly coNP-complete on graphs of vertex cover number 2.*

Proof. We give a reduction from PARTITION. Given a set of positive integers $A = \{a_1, \dots, a_n\}$, the PARTITION problem asks whether there exists a subset A' of A such that $\sum_{a \in A'} a = s/2$ where $s = \sum_{a \in A} a$. This problem is well-known to be weakly NP-complete [27].

We construct an instance of CSV. First, we create n vertices v_1, \dots, v_n corresponding to $a_1, \dots, a_n \in A$ and three vertices x, y, x', y' . Then we add edges $v_i x$ of weight $a_i + \epsilon$, $v_i y$ of weight $-a_i$, xx' of weight $3s/2$, yy' of weight $s/2$, and xy of weight $s + \epsilon$. Here, without loss of generality, let ϵ be an integer sufficiently smaller than $\min_i a_i$; this can be achieved for example by multiplying all elements of A (and s) by n , and setting $\epsilon = 1$. Let (G, w) be the constructed graph (see Figure 1). A coalition structure \mathcal{P} to verify consists of $\{x, x'\}$, $\{y, y'\}$ and singletons of other vertices. Also note that $\{x, y\}$ is a vertex cover of G .



■ **Figure 1** The graph (G, w) constructed in the proof of Theorem 6. The vertex cover is marked by blue squares. The initial partition is given by dot-dashed boxes, singletons are omitted.

If there exists $A' \subseteq A$ such that $\sum_{a \in A'} a = s/2$, then the coalition $X = \{v_i : a_i \in A'\} \cup \{x, y\}$ blocks \mathcal{P} . To see this, observe that the utility of each vertex in X increases by ϵ and thus X is a blocking coalition of \mathcal{P} .


Conversely, suppose that there exists a blocking coalition X of \mathcal{P} . Clearly, X contains neither x' nor y' . If X does not contain x , no vertex can have positive utility in X . Thus, they also do not join X . Consequently, $X = \{y\}$ holds, but this contradicts that X is a blocking coalition. Thus, X must contain x . To increase the utility of x , y must be contained in X . In particular, if y was not contained in X , then the utility of x would be at most $s + n\epsilon < 3s/2$. Since y must have utility more than $s/2$ in X , it holds that $\sum_{v_i \in X} a_i \leq s/2$. Finally, as the utility of x must increase by more than $s/2$ and ϵ is sufficiently smaller than $\min_i a_i$, X satisfies that $\sum_{v_i \in X} a_i = s/2$, which implies that there exists a subset A' of A such that $\sum_{a \in A'} a = s/2$. ◀

We use a similar but more involved construction to reduce BIN PACKING to CSV.

► **Theorem 3.** *CORE STABILITY VERIFICATION is $\text{coW}[1]$ -hard parameterized by vertex integrity even if all weights are bounded by a polynomial in the input size.*

Proof. We give a reduction from BIN PACKING. Given a set of positive integers $A = \{a_1, \dots, a_n\}$ and an integer k , the BIN PACKING problem asks whether there exists a partition $\mathcal{Q} = (Q_1, \dots, Q_k)$ of A such that $\sum_{a \in Q_i} a = s/k$ for every $i \in [k]$ where $s := \sum_{a \in A} a$. This problem is known to be $\text{W}[1]$ -hard parameterized by k , even if all integers are given in unary (that is, if weights are polynomially bounded in n) [33].

We construct an instance of CSV as follows. First we construct a weighted graph (G, w) . We create a vertex x and two cycles (y_1, \dots, y_k) and (z_1, \dots, z_k) . Every edge of the cycle (y_1, \dots, y_k) has weight $2s - s/k$ while every edge of the cycle (z_1, \dots, z_k) has weight $-s$. Now, we create an edges xy_i of weight $2s + 2s/k$ and an edge y_iz_i of weight $2s + s/k + \delta$ for every $i \in [k]$ where $\delta := \frac{1}{4}$. For every $a_i \in A$ we create a clique A_i consisting of k vertices v_i^1, \dots, v_i^k and edges of weight ρ where ρ is an integer smaller than $-(a_i + \epsilon)$. Finally, we create edges $v_i^j y_j$ of weight $a_i + \epsilon$ and edges $v_i^j z_j$ of weight $-a_i$ for every $i \in [n], j \in [k]$ where $\epsilon := \frac{1}{2n}$. Note that we can easily make all weights integer by multiplying all weights by $2n$. The coalition structure \mathcal{P} we want to verify consists of the set $\{x, y_1, \dots, y_k\}$ and singletons for every vertex $v \in V(G) \setminus \{x, y_1, \dots, y_k\}$. We now argue that (A, k) is a YES-instance of



■ **Figure 2** The graph (G, w) constructed in the proof of Theorem 3. The coalition structure \mathcal{P} is indicated by the dash-dotted box (singletons are omitted). Furthermore, the vertices of the deletion set are represented by blue squares and edges without label have weight ρ .

BIN PACKING if and only if $((G, w), \mathcal{P})$ is a NO-instance of CSV.

First assume that (A, k) is a YES-instance of BIN PACKING and $\mathcal{Q} = (Q_1, \dots, Q_k)$ is a partition such that $\sum_{a \in Q_i} a = s/k$ for every $i \in [k]$. We now claim that the set $X := \{y_1, \dots, y_k, z_1, \dots, z_k\} \cup \bigcup_{j \in [k]} \{v_i^j : a_i \in Q_j\}$ is a blocking coalition for \mathcal{P} . To verify observe that the utility of every vertex $v_i^j \in X$ increases by ϵ . Furthermore, the utility of y_i improved by $\epsilon \cdot |Q_i|$ and the utility of z_i by δ and hence X is a blocking coalition of \mathcal{P} .

Now assume that (G, \mathcal{P}) is a NO-instance of CSV and X is a blocking coalition of \mathcal{P} . First note that x cannot be in X as its utility in \mathcal{P} is maximum. Furthermore, X must contain some element from $\{y_1, \dots, y_k\}$ as every edge weight in the graph $G[\{z_1, \dots, z_k\} \cup \{v_i^j : i \in [n], j \in [k]\}]$ is negative. Now observe that the utility of y_i in the coalition $V(G) \setminus \{x\}$ is $7s - s/k + \delta + \epsilon n < 7s - s/k + 1$ for every $i \in [k]$. Since the utility of y_i is $6s$ in \mathcal{P} this implies that if $y_i \in X$ then every neighbor u of y_i for which $w(uy_i) \geq 2s - s/k$ must also be in X . Hence, $y_i \in X$ implies $y_{i-1}, y_{i+1}, z_i \in X$ (or $y_n, y_2, z_2 \in X$ in case $i = 1$ or $y_{n-1}, y_1, z_n \in X$ in case $i = n$). Combining this with our earlier argument that $X \cap \{y_1, \dots, y_k\}$ cannot be empty we obtain that $\{y_1, \dots, y_k, z_1, \dots, z_k\}$ must be a subset of X .

We now define $Q_j := \{a_i : v_i^j \in X\}$ for every $j \in [k]$. First observe that $Q_j \cap Q_{j'} = \emptyset$ for every pair $j, j' \in [k]$ as the edge $v_i^j v_i^{j'}$ having weight $\rho < -(a_i + \epsilon)$ prevents the simultaneous containment of v_i^j and $v_i^{j'}$ in X . We now argue that $|Q_i| = s/k$. For this observe that the utility of y_j in the coalition $\{y_1, \dots, y_k, z_1, \dots, z_k\}$ is $6s - s/k + \delta$. Hence $\sum_{\substack{i \in [n], \\ v_i^j \in X}} a_i + |\{i : v_i^j \in X\}| \epsilon > s/k - \frac{1}{4}$. Since $|\{i : v_i^j \in X\}| \epsilon \leq \frac{1}{2}$ and the a_i 's are integer we get that $\sum_{a_i \in Q_j} a_i = \sum_{\substack{i \in [n], \\ v_i^j \in X}} a_i \geq s/k$. On the other hand, the utility of z_j in the coalition $\{y_1, \dots, y_k, z_1, \dots, z_k\}$ is $s/k + \delta$. Since all edges of the form $z_j v_i^j$ have weight $-a_i$ this implies that $\sum_{\substack{i \in [n], \\ v_i^j \in X}} a_i < s/k + \frac{1}{4}$. Since all a_i 's are integer this condition is equivalent to $\sum_{a_i \in Q_j} a_i = \sum_{\substack{i \in [n], \\ v_i^j \in X}} a_i \geq s/k$. Hence we have argued that \mathcal{Q} is a partition of A into k parts such that $\sum_{a_i \in Q_j} a_i = s/k$ for every $j \in k$.

Finally, observe that the graph G has vertex integrity $3k$ and cluster deletion number $2k$ which is witnessed by deletion set $\{y_1, \dots, y_k, z_1, \dots, z_k\}$. \blacktriangleleft

We prove the third hardness result by a reduction from BOUNDED DEGREE DELETION.

► **Theorem 4.** *CORE STABILITY VERIFICATION is coW[1]-hard parameterized by tree-depth, even if all weights are in $\{-1, 1\}$.*

Proof . We present a reduction from BOUNDED DEGREE DELETION, which is known to be W[1]-hard parameterized by tree-depth [26, 39]. In this problem we are given a graph G and an integer Δ^* and are asked to find the largest induced subgraph of G that has maximum degree at most Δ^* (equivalently, we seek the smallest set of vertices whose deletion makes the maximum degree of G at most Δ^*).

Let (G, Δ^*, s) be an instance of BOUNDED DEGREE DELETION and suppose we want to decide if G contains an induced subgraph of maximum degree at most Δ^* with at least s vertices. We construct an instance of CSV as follows: we keep G and we assign every edge of G weight -1 ; we construct two new vertices x, x' ; we construct $s(\Delta^* + 1) - 1$ new vertices and connect each to both x and x' with edges of weight 1 ; for each $u \in V(G)$ we construct $\Delta^* + 1$ new vertices $u_1, \dots, u_{\Delta^*+1}$ and connect them to x and u with edges of

23:10 Core Stability in Additively Separable Hedonic Games of Low Treewidth

weight 1; finally we attach to each u_i , for $u \in V(G), i \in [\Delta^* + 1]$ a leaf u'_i connected to it via an edge of weight 1. The initial partition we wish to check for stability places x, x' and their common neighbors together; for each $u \in V(G), i \in [\Delta^* + 1]$ u_i, u'_i are together; while all other vertices are singletons.

It is not hard to see that the new graph has essentially the same tree-depth as G , as deleting x, x' gives us G with some paths of length 2 attached to each vertex and some isolated vertices.

For the forward direction, suppose that G does contain a set of vertices S such that $|S| \geq s$ and $G[S]$ has maximum degree at most Δ^* . We claim that if we take $S \cup \{x\}$ and add to it all u_i such that $u \in S$, then we obtain a blocking coalition. Indeed, the utility of x in the initial partition is $s(\Delta^* + 1) - 1$, while in the new coalition it is $|S|(\Delta^* + 1) \geq s(\Delta^* + 1)$. Furthermore, all vertices u_i of the new coalition previously had utility 1, whereas in the new coalition they have utility 2. Finally, each $u \in S$ now has utility $\Delta^* + 1 - |N(u) \cap S| \geq 1$ while previously u had utility 0.

For the converse direction, suppose that a blocking coalition X exists. Then, x' cannot belong in such a coalition, as its utility is already maximum, and neither can the common neighbors of x and x' . Similarly, u'_i cannot be in X . If x does not belong in X , then no u_i can be in X , as the maximum utility she could obtain is 1, which is the same as her initial utility. As all remaining vertices only have negative utilities to each other, this would lead to a contradiction. Therefore, $x \in X$. However, for x to increase her utility, it must be the case that X contains at least s vertices of G . To see this, observe that if $u \notin X$, then $u_i \notin X$ for all $i \in [\Delta^*]$. However, we need the utility of x in X to be at least $s(\Delta^* + 1)$, and since from each $u \in S$ we have at most $\Delta^* + 1$ vertices u_i which are in X , we conclude that $|X \cap V(G)| \geq s$. We now argue that $G[X \cap V(G)]$ has maximum degree at most Δ^* . Indeed, if $u \in X \cap V(G)$ has at least $\Delta^* + 1$ neighbors in $X \cap V(G)$, since each such neighbor contributes -1 to the utility of u , u cannot have strictly positive utility. We therefore have that $X \cap V(G)$ is a valid solution to the original instance. ◀

3.2 Algorithms

In this section, we prove the algorithmic results complementing the hardness results of the previous section.

► **Theorem 5.** *CORE STABILITY VERIFICATION is polynomial time solvable on trees.*

Proof. This can be shown using a simple bottom-up dynamic programming approach. Let (T, w) be a weighted tree and \mathcal{P} a coalition structure of (T, w) . We arbitrarily pick a root vertex $r \in V(T)$ to define an ancestor/descendant relationship on T . For any $u \in V(T)$ we let T_u be the sub-tree of T rooted at u . We say that a set $X \subseteq V(T_u)$ with $u \in X$ is a downwards blocking coalition if $\text{ut}(X, v) > \text{ut}_{\mathcal{P}}(v)$ for every vertex $v \in X, v \neq u$. For any $u \in V(T)$ we define $\text{ut}_{\text{below}}(u)$ to be the maximum utility u can achieve in any downwards blocking coalition $X \subseteq V(T_u)$ which contains u .

First note that $\text{ut}_{\text{below}}(u)$ of any leaf of T is 0. Furthermore, if u is a vertex, $X \subseteq V(T_u)$ a downwards blocking coalition with $u \in X$ such that $\text{ut}(X, u) = \text{ut}_{\text{below}}(u)$ and v a child of u with $w(uv) < 0$ then $v \notin X$. That is because otherwise $X \setminus V(T_v)$ will yield a downwards blocking coalition with larger utility for u . Let u be a non-leaf vertex and v_1, \dots, v_ℓ its children. Note that v_i can be contained in a downward blocking coalition $X \subseteq V(T_u)$ with

$u \in X$ if and only if $\text{ut}_{\text{below}}(v_i) + w(uv_i) > \text{ut}_{\mathcal{P}}(v_i)$. Hence,

$$\text{ut}_{\text{below}}(u) = \sum_{\substack{i \in [l] \\ w(uv_i) \geq 0 \\ \text{ut}_{\text{below}}(v_i) + w(uv_i) > \text{ut}_{\mathcal{P}}(v_i)}} w(uv_i).$$

Now note that a downwards blocking coalition $X \subseteq V(T_u)$ with $u \in X$ is a blocking coalition of \mathcal{P} if and only if $\text{ut}_{\text{below}}(u) > \text{ut}_{\mathcal{P}}(u)$. Furthermore, there is a blocking coalition X of \mathcal{P} if and only if there is $u \in V(T)$ such that $X \subseteq V(T_u)$ with $u \in X$ is a downwards blocking coalition and $\text{ut}_{\text{below}}(u) > \text{ut}_{\mathcal{P}}(u)$. That is as we can assume that any blocking coalition X is connected and hence X must contain a vertex u which is an ancestor of every vertex $v \in X$.

Hence, a bottom-up dynamic programming algorithm computing $\text{ut}_{\text{below}}(u)$ for every $u \in V(T)$ and then verifying whether there is $u \in V(T)$ with $\text{ut}_{\text{below}}(u) > \text{ut}_{\mathcal{P}}(u)$ yields a linear time algorithm for CSV. \blacktriangleleft

► **Theorem 6.** *CORE STABILITY VERIFICATION can be solved in time $(\text{vc}w_{\max})^{O(\text{vc})}\Delta^2 + O(\text{vc}n)$.*

Proof. Given a graph (G, w) and a partition \mathcal{P} of $V(G)$, we check whether there is a blocking coalition $X \subseteq V(G)$ of \mathcal{P} . In the algorithm, we first compute a minimum vertex cover S of size vc in time $O(1.2738^{\text{vc}} + \text{vc}n)$ [14]. Then we guess an intersection of X and S . The number of possible candidates of the intersection is at most $2^{|S|}$. Let $I' \subseteq V(G) \setminus S$ be the set of vertices in $V(G) \setminus S$ such that each vertex $u \in I'$ satisfies $\sum_{v \in N_G(u) \cap X \cap S} w(uv) > \text{ut}_{\mathcal{P}}(u)$. These vertices in I' could form a blocking coalition of \mathcal{P} by cooperating with the vertices in $X \cap S$. In order for X to become a blocking coalition, all the vertices in $X \cap S$ must have larger utility in X than their utility in \mathcal{P} after some vertices in I' joined X . This condition can be represented in Integer Linear Programming (ILP) as follows:

$$\sum_{v \in I'} w(uv)x_v + \sum_{v \in N_G(u) \cap X \cap S} w(uv) \geq \text{ut}_{\mathcal{P}}(u) + 1 \quad \forall u \in X \cap S \quad (1)$$

$$x_v \in \{0, 1\} \quad \forall v \in I' \quad (2)$$

where the variable x_v represents whether vertex $v \in I'$ joins X . In the left hand side of (1), $\sum_{v \in N_G(u) \cap X \cap S} w(uv)$ represents the contribution of edge weights in $X \cap S$ to the utility of u . Clearly, the ILP is feasible if and only if there is a blocking coalition X because the utility of each agent in X strictly increases. Note that we suppose that each edge weight is an integer.

Here, the feasibility check of an ILP $\{Ax = b, x \geq 0, x \in \mathbb{Z}^n\}$ can be solved in time $(m \cdot \Lambda)^{O(m)} \cdot \|b\|_{\infty}^2$ where $A \in \mathbb{Z}^{n \times m}$, $b \in \mathbb{Z}^m$, and Λ is an upper bound on each absolute value of an entry in A [19]. Since the maximum absolute value of coefficients of variables is w_{\max} , the range of $\text{ut}_{\mathcal{P}}(u)$ and $\sum_{v \in N_G(u) \cap X \cap S} w(uv)$ is $[-w_{\max}\Delta, w_{\max}\Delta]$, and the number of constraints is at most $|S|$, the ILP can be solved in time $(\text{vc}w_{\max})^{O(\text{vc})}(w_{\max}\Delta)^2 = (\text{vc}w_{\max})^{O(\text{vc})}\Delta^2$. Thus, the total running time is $O(1.2738^{\text{vc}} + \text{vc}n) + 2^{\text{vc}}(\text{vc}w_{\max})^{O(\text{vc})}\Delta^2 = (\text{vc}w_{\max})^{O(\text{vc})}\Delta^2 + O(\text{vc}n)$. \blacktriangleleft

► **Theorem 7.** *CORE STABILITY VERIFICATION is FPT parameterized by $\text{vi} + w_{\max}$.*

Proof. As with Theorem 6, given a graph (G, w) and a partition \mathcal{P} , we check whether there is a blocking coalition $X \subseteq V(G)$ of \mathcal{P} . Let S be a $\text{vi}(k)$ -set S where $k = \text{vi}$. One can find a $\text{vi}(k)$ -set S in time $O(k^{k+1}n)$ [18]. We define *types* of components of $G[V(G) \setminus S]$ with respect to isomorphisms, weights and the partition \mathcal{P} . More precisely, we say that two

23:12 Core Stability in Additively Separable Hedonic Games of Low Treewidth

components C_1 and C_2 of $G[V(G) \setminus S]$ have the same type, if there is an isomorphism ι from $G[C_1 \cup S]$ to $G[C_2 \cup S]$ such that $\iota(s) = s$ for every $s \in S$, corresponding edges have the same weight and for every $P \in \mathcal{P}$ there is $Q \in \mathcal{P}$ such that $\iota(P \cap C_1) = Q \cap C_2$. Let \mathcal{T} be a set of representatives of all component types appearing in $G[V(G) \setminus S]$ and c_t the number of components of $G[V(G) \setminus S]$ of type t for every $t \in \mathcal{T}$. In addition, we define \mathcal{X}_t to be the set of subsets of $V(t)$.

We are ready to design an algorithm for CSV. First, we guess an intersection of a blocking coalition X and the $\text{vi}(k)$ -set S . The number of subsets of S is at most 2^k . In the next step, we formulate CSV as an ILP for each intersection $X \cap S$. First, we define variables $x_{(t, X_t)}$ for any type t and any $X_t \in \mathcal{X}_t$. The variable $x_{(t, X_t)}$ represents the number of components of type t in $G[V(G) \setminus S]$ such that the blocking coalition X intersects the component in the set Q_t corresponding to X_t under the isomorphism witnessing the type. Since the number of non-isomorphic components is at most $(w_{\max})^{O(k^2)}$, the number of partitions of the vertices of a component is at most 2^{k^2} (any partition corresponds to the subsets of edges incident to vertices in the same part of the partition) and the size of \mathcal{X}_t for a type t is at most 2^k , the number of variables is at most $(w_{\max})^{O(k^2)}$. For a vertex $u \in X \cap S$, a type $t \in \mathcal{T}$, and a set $X_t \in \mathcal{X}_t$, we denote by $w_{(t, X_t, u)}$ the sum of weights of edges incident to u and a vertex in X_t . It represents the increase of the utility of u if X_t joins the blocking coalition X .

Let $\mathcal{X}'_t \subseteq \mathcal{X}_t$ be the set of subsets of $V(t)$ such that for every $X_t \in \mathcal{X}'_t$, each vertex in X_t has higher utility in $X_t \cup (X \cap S)$ than in the initial coalition \mathcal{P} . Moreover, let $\mathcal{T}' \subseteq \mathcal{T}$ be the set of types t satisfying that $\mathcal{X}'_t \neq \emptyset$. Then deciding whether there exists a blocking coalition can be formulated as the following ILP.

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{X_t \in \mathcal{X}'_t} x_{(t, X_t)} &= c_t & \forall t \in \mathcal{T}', \\ \sum_{t \in \mathcal{T}'} \sum_{X_t \in \mathcal{X}'_t} w_{(t, X_t, u)} x_{(t, X_t)} + \sum_{v \in N_G(u) \cap X \cap S} w(vu) &> \text{ut}_{\mathcal{P}}(u) & \forall u \in X \cap S. \end{aligned}$$

The first equality encodes the constraint that the numbers $X(t, X_t)$, $X_t \in \mathcal{X}_t$ should correspond to the sizes of the parts of a partition of the c_t components of type t . The second inequality represents the constraint that each vertex $u \in X \cap S$ has larger utility than the utility of u in \mathcal{P} . It is clear that the ILP is feasible if and only if there exists a blocking coalition.

For the running time of the algorithm, we first compute a $\text{vi}(k)$ -set S in time $O(k^{k+1}n)$. For S , we guess 2^k intersections $X \cap S$, determine the type count c_t for every type t in time $O(k^k n)$ and solve the ILP for each $X \cap S$. Given an intersection $X \cap S$, we can compute $w_{(t, X_t, u)}$ and $\sum_{v \in N_G(u) \cap X \cap S} w(vu)$ can be computed in polynomial time. Finally, it is known that the feasibility of ILP with p variables can be computed in FPT time parameterized by p [34, 24, 35]. Since the number of variables is at most $(w_{\max})^{O(k^2)}$, one can solve CSV in time $f(k + w_{\max})n^{O(1)}$ where f is some computable function. \blacktriangleleft

► Theorem 8. *CORE STABILITY VERIFICATION can be computed in time $(\Delta w_{\max})^{O(\text{tw})} n^{O(1)}$.*

Proof. Our algorithm relies on standard techniques (dynamic programming over tree decompositions) so we sketch some of the details. We are given as input an edge-weighted graph (G, w) , a nice tree decomposition of G , and an initial partition \mathcal{P} of $V(G)$. We are asked if there exists a blocking coalition $X \subseteq V(G)$ such that all vertices $u \in X$ have a strictly

higher utility in X than in their coalition in \mathcal{P} . We begin by calculating for each $u \in V(G)$ the utility u gains in the initial partition \mathcal{P} . This can clearly be done in polynomial time in the size of the input, that is, polynomial in $n + \log w_{\max}$.

Suppose now that the given nice tree decomposition is rooted at some arbitrary bag and consider a bag B . In order to describe the dynamic programming table that our algorithm needs to maintain for B , we define the signature of a possible blocking coalition X as a pair consisting of (i) the set $X \cap B$ (ii) a function $ut : X \cap B \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}$ which describes for each vertex u that belongs in the bag B and the blocking coalition X how much utility u gains from vertices that appear in bags below B in the tree decomposition (but not in B). The dynamic programming algorithm maintains an entry for each possible signature that tells us if there exists a coalition X that matches this signature and is feasible below B , that is, satisfying the criterion that all vertices which appear only below B in the decomposition and belong in X have strictly higher utility in X than in their coalition of \mathcal{P} .

Given the above it is now straightforward to implement the DP algorithm: for Introduce nodes we consider two cases to produce the signatures of the new bag (the introduced vertex belongs in X or not); for Join nodes we take all pairs of signatures that agree on $X \cap B$ and simply add their utility functions; while for Forget nodes, if we are forgetting vertex u we need to discard signatures where $u \in X$ but the utility of X is not strictly higher than in \mathcal{P} , while for other signatures we adjust the utilities of the neighbors of u accordingly.

What remains is to estimate the running time of the algorithm. This is dominated by the number of possible signatures, which is at most $2^{\mathbf{tw}}(2\Delta w_{\max} + 1)^{\mathbf{tw}}$. Here, the first factor is for storing a subset of B , and the second is for storing the utility of each vertex, which must necessarily be in the range $[-\Delta w_{\max}, \Delta w_{\max}]$. ◀

▶ **Theorem 9.** *CORE STABILITY VERIFICATION can be computed in time $2^{O(\mathbf{tw}\Delta)}(n + \log w_{\max})^{O(1)}$.*

Proof. This is obtained using the same algorithm as in Theorem 8 using the following observation: in the analysis of the algorithm of Theorem 8 we have a DP table which stores for each vertex u of $X \cap B$ the utility that u gains in the blocking coalition X . The range of possible values was then bounded by $[-\Delta w_{\max}, \Delta w_{\max}]$. However, we can also observe that the set of possible utilities of a vertex u with degree Δ has size at most 2^Δ , since the utility of u is obtained by the subset of its neighbors which are contained in X . As a result, our algorithm may consider only the 2^Δ possible utility values for each vertex of the bag, giving $2^{\Delta \mathbf{tw}}$ possible distinct solution signatures. The rest of the analysis is identical to that of Theorem 8. ◀

4 Core Stability

In this section we study the complexity of CORE STABILITY (CS). We first show that CS remains Σ_2^P -complete even on graphs of bounded vertex cover number (Theorem 12).

The second part of this section is dedicated to extending our understanding of the complexity of CS parameterized by $\mathbf{tw} + \Delta$. We give an algorithm for CS running in time $2^{2^{O(\Delta \mathbf{tw}^2)}} n$ (Theorem 13) and improving on the previous algorithm based on Courcelle's Theorem by Peters [44]. In order to avoid having to formulate a tedious dynamic programming algorithm, we instead obtain our algorithm via a reduction to $\exists\forall$ -SAT, which is known to be solvable in double-exponential time (in treewidth) [13]. We complement these results by giving an ETH based lower bound of $2^{2^{O(\mathbf{pw})}}$ on graphs of bounded degree (Theorem 18).

This shows that the double-exponential dependence of our algorithm on treewidth is in fact inevitable, and confirms a pattern shown by other Σ_2^P -complete problems [37].

Before we proceed, we describe a gadget that appears in several reductions.

4.1 An Auxiliary Gadget

For reductions to CS we use a gadget to control what core stable partitions (if any exist) have to look like. For this we rely on an example given in [3, Example 1] which shows a small concrete graph H (on six vertices) that does not admit any core stable partition and is minimal for this property. The intuitive idea is that we *attach* copies of H onto various vertices of our construction with the aim of forcing the vertex onto which H is attached to be in the same partition as some vertex of H . Because by assumption it is impossible to partition H in a stable way, the vertex on which a copy of H is attached *must* be placed in the same coalition as some vertex of H . Building on this idea, we also attach a copy of H on a set of vertices of G , forcing at least one of them in the same partition as a vertex of H .

To make this idea formally precise, we will use the following minimally non-stable graph (H, w_ρ) where ρ is some sufficiently small integer. Let H be K_6 with vertex set $\{h, h_1, \dots, h_5\}$. We set $w_\rho(hh_1) = w_\rho(h_2h_3) = w_\rho(h_4h_5) = 5$, $w_\rho(h_1h_2) = w_\rho(h_3h_4) = w_\rho(h_5h) = 4$ and $w_\rho(h_1h_3) = w_\rho(h_3h_5) = w_\rho(h_5h_1) = 3$. We let all remaining edges have weight ρ . Using the same argument as [3] we can show that (H, w_ρ) is not core stable if $\rho < -15$. We further observe that for the graph $(H \setminus \{h\}, w_\rho|_{\{h_1, \dots, h_5\}})$ the partition $(\{h_1, h_2, h_3\}, \{h_4, h_5\})$ is core stable if $\rho < -15$. We denote this partition of $(H \setminus \{h\}, w_\rho|_{\{h_1, \dots, h_5\}})$ by $\mathcal{P}_{(H, w_\rho)}$.

For a graph (G, w) , $S \subseteq V(G)$ an independent set in G and ρ, ξ integers, we let (G', w') be the graph obtained in the following way. The graph (G', w') consist of the disjoint union of (G, w) and (H, w_ρ) to which we add the edges hs of weight ξ for every $s \in S$ and edges $h_i s$ and ss' of weight ρ for every $i \in [5]$, $s \neq s' \in S$. We say that (G', w') is obtained from G by ξ -*attaching* (H, w_ρ) at S . In the next lemma we show that attaching the gadget (H, w_ρ) enforces certain properties for coalitions.

► **Lemma 10.** *Let (G, w) be a graph, $S \subseteq V(G)$ an independent set in G , ρ an integer smaller than $-\max_{u \in V(G')} \sum_{\substack{uv \in E(G') \\ w'(uv) > 0}} w(uv)$, $\xi \geq 9$ and (G', w') the graph obtained from (G, w) by ξ -attaching (H, w_ρ) at S . The graph (G', w') has the following properties.*

- (I1) *For every connected core stable partition \mathcal{P} of (G', w') there is $s \in S$ and $P \in \mathcal{P}$ such that $\{s, h\} \in P$ and $s' \notin P$ for every $s' \in S$, $s' \neq s$.*
- (I2) *For every connected core stable partition \mathcal{P} of (G', w') and every part $P \in \mathcal{P}$ with $P \cap \{h_1, \dots, h_5\} \neq \emptyset$ we have that $P \subseteq \{h_1, \dots, h_5\}$.*
- (I3) *For every partition \mathcal{P} of (G', w') with $\mathcal{P}_{(H, w_\rho)} \subseteq \mathcal{P}$ and $\{h, s\} \subseteq P$ for some $s \in S$ and some $P \in \mathcal{P}$, every blocking coalition X is disjoint from $V(H)$.*

Further, the properties are satisfied even if we add additional edges of weight ρ to (G', w') .

Proof. To argue the furthermore part, we assume that we arbitrarily added edges of weight ρ to (G', w') . Note that we cannot add any edges between vertices of $V(H)$ as H is complete. Let \mathcal{P} be a connected core stable partition of (G', w') . First observe that no two vertices $u, v \in V(G')$ with $w(uv) = \rho$ can be contained in the same part of the partition \mathcal{P} due to the assumption that $\rho < -\max_{u \in V(G')} \sum_{\substack{uv \in E(G') \\ w'(uv) > 0}} w(uv)$ and hence the utility of u and v in \mathcal{P} would be negative. Similarly, no two vertices $u, v \in V(G')$ with $w(uv) = \rho$ can both be contained in a blocking coalition.

Let $P \in \mathcal{P}$ be the part containing h . We first argue that any part $P' \in \mathcal{P}$, $P' \neq P$ (and hence $h \notin P'$) containing some h_i , $i \in [5]$ is a subset of $\{h_1, \dots, h_5\}$. If P' is such a part, then P' cannot contain any vertex from $N^\rho(H) = \{v \in V(G) : w(hv) = \rho \text{ for some } h \in V(H)\}$. Since removing h and N^ρ separates the vertices $\{h_1, \dots, h_5\}$ from the rest of the graph and we assumed that $G[P']$ is connected, we conclude that $P' \subseteq \{h_1, \dots, h_5\}$. Since (H, w_ρ) is not core stable this implies that the part P must contain some vertex $v \in V(G)$. But since we assumed that $G[P]$ is connected and the removal of S and $\{v \in V(G) : w(vh) = \rho\}$ separates the set of vertices $V(H)$ from the rest of the graph, P must contain some vertex from S . Since $w(ss') = \rho$ for any $s, s' \in S$, $s \neq s'$, this implies that property (II1) is true. Additionally, observe that $P \cap S \neq \emptyset$ imply that $P \cap \{h_1, \dots, h_5\} = \emptyset$ and hence property (II2) follows from our observation that $P' \subseteq \{h_1, \dots, h_5\}$ for every part $P' \in \mathcal{P}$, $P' \neq P$ containing some h_i , $i \in [5]$.

To prove property (II3) assume that \mathcal{P} is a partition of $V(G')$ with $\{h_1, h_2, h_3\}, \{h_4, h_5\} \in \mathcal{P}$ and let $P \in \mathcal{P}$ be a part and $s \in S$ be an element such that $\{h, s\} \subseteq P$. Assume X is a blocking coalition. Towards a contradiction, assume that $h \in X$. First observe that h has utility ξ in \mathcal{P} . Furthermore, h is incident to two edges of positive weight in H and these two weights sum up to $9 \leq \xi$. Hence, there has to be some vertex $u \in V(G)$ which is contained in X and $w(hu) > 0$. By construction, this implies that u has to be a vertex in S . But then no other vertex $v \in S \cup \{h_1, h_5\}$ can be contained in X as $w(uv) = \rho$ and hence the utility of h in X can be at most ξ . Therefore, $h \notin X$. Now observe that h_2 cannot join X because its utility in \mathcal{P} is the sum of its positive weight edges. But then h_1 cannot join because the sum of its positive edges excluding edges incident to h and h_2 is 6 and h_2 has utility 7 in \mathcal{P} . But then h_3 cannot join X as its the sum of its positive edges excluding edges incident to h_1 and h_2 is 7 while h_3 has utility 8 in \mathcal{P} . Finally, now h_4 and h_5 cannot join X as $\{h_4, h_5\} \subseteq X$ and hence they cannot improve their utility without further vertices from H . This concludes the proof of property (II3). \blacktriangleleft


We can also use the gadget in a slightly different way. Details are deferred to the Appendix. For a graph (G, w) , $S \subseteq V(G)$ an independent set in G , $\rho < -15$ and $\xi \geq 9$ we say that (G', w') is obtained from (G, w) by ξ -neighborhood attaching (H, w_ρ) at S if (G', w') is obtained from (G, w) by ξ -attaching (H, w_ρ) at S and adding edges hv of weight ρ for every $v \in N_G(S) \setminus S$.

► **Lemma 11.** *Let (G, w) be a graph, $S \subseteq V(G)$ an independent set, ρ and integer smaller than $-\max_{u \in V(G')} \sum_{\substack{uv \in E(G') \\ w'(uv) > 0}} w(uv)$, $\xi \geq 9$ and (G', w') the graph obtained from (G, w) by ξ -neighborhood attaching (H, w_ρ) at S . The graph (G', w') has properties (II2), (II3) and the following property.*

(II'1) *For every connected core stable partition \mathcal{P} of (G', w') there is $s \in S$ such that $\{h, s\} \in \mathcal{P}$.*

Proof. Since (G', w') was obtained from (G, w) by ξ -attaching (H, w_ρ) at S and adding some edges of weight ρ we get that (II1), (II2) and (II3) are satisfied. Assume \mathcal{P} is a connected core stable partition and $s \in S$ is an element and $P \in \mathcal{P}$ a part such that $\{s, h\} \subseteq P$. Towards a contradiction assume that there is $u \in P$ such that $u \neq s$, $u \neq h$. By property (II1) and (II2) we know that $u \in V(G) \setminus S$. As h has no neighbors in $V(G) \setminus S$ and $G[P]$ is connected, this implies that P must contain some vertex $v \in V(G) \setminus S$ which is adjacent to s . But this cannot happen as $w(hv) = \rho$. Therefore, $P = \{h, s\}$ proving property (II'1). \blacktriangleleft

Observe that if we attach multiple copies of (H, w_ρ) to some graph G , then the resulting



■ **Figure 3** The graph (G, w) constructed in the proof of Theorem 12. Here all edges without label have weight ρ . Vertex cover vertices are depicted by blue squares.

graph does not depend on the order in which we attached copies of (H, w_ρ) as long as the sets, at which we attached the copies, are disjoint.

4.2 Core stability on graphs of bounded vertex cover number

In this section we prove the following result.

► **Theorem 12.** *CORE STABILITY is Σ_2^p -complete on graphs of bounded vertex cover number.*

To obtain this result we use a variation of the constructions used to prove Theorem 2 and Theorem 3 however reducing from an appropriate variant of PARTITION.

Proof. First observe that CS is in Σ_2^p since for any guessed coalition structure \mathcal{P} of (G, w) deciding whether \mathcal{P} is core stable is in coNP. That is, given a blocking coalition X we can verify in polynomial time (by comparing utilities in X and \mathcal{P}) whether \mathcal{P} is not core stable.

We show Σ_2^p -hardness by a reduction from $\exists\forall$ -PARTITION. Given two sets of positive integers $A = \{a_1, \dots, a_n\}$ and $B = \{b_1, \dots, b_n\}$, the $\exists\forall$ -PARTITION problem asks whether there exists a subset $A' \subseteq A$ such that for every subset $B' \subseteq B$ it holds that $\sum_{c \in A' \cup B'} c \neq s/2$ where $s = \sum_{c \in A \cup B} c$. We let $s_A = \sum_{a \in A} a$ and $s_B = \sum_{b \in B} b$. Note that a variant of $\exists\forall$ -PARTITION was shown to be Σ_2^p -hard [8, Lemma 6.2.] where a target value t is given additionally and the question is whether there exists $A' \subseteq A$ such that for every $B' \subseteq B$ it holds that $\sum_{c \in A' \cup B'} c \neq t$. We can reduce this variant to $\exists\forall$ -PARTITION by adding integer $2s - t$ to A and $s + t$ to B where $s = \sum_{c \in A \cup B} c$.

We construct an instance (G, w) of CS as follows. First we let $\delta > 0$ be an integer smaller than $\min_{i \in [n]} \{a_i, b_i\}$ and $\epsilon > 0$ be an integer such that $\epsilon < \delta/n$. We can assume that such integers exist by picking a suitable positive integer and multiplying all elements in $A \cup B$ by it. We further set $\rho = -30s$. We introduce vertices x, \hat{x} and add edge $x\hat{x}$ of

weight $9.5s$. We further introduce vertices u_i, v_i for every $i \in [n]$ and add edges $u_i x$, $u_i \hat{x}$ of weight a_i , $v_i x$ of weight $-b_i$ and $v_i \hat{x}$ of weight $b_i + \epsilon$. We now take two copies (H, w_ρ) on vertex set $\{h, h_1, \dots, h_5\}$ and (\hat{H}, \hat{w}_ρ) on vertex set $\{\hat{h}, \hat{h}_1, \dots, \hat{h}_5\}$ of the graph (H, w_ρ) and $(9s + s_A - \delta)$ -attach (H, w_ρ, h) at $\{x\}$ and $(10s - \delta)$ -attach $(\hat{H}, \hat{w}_\rho, \hat{h})$ at $\{\hat{x}\}$. Additionally, we add an edge $h\hat{h}$ of weight ρ and $v_i h$, $v_i \hat{h}$ of weight ρ for every $i \in [n]$. For an illustration of the construction see Figure 3. Note that G has vertex cover number 12 which is witnessed by the vertex cover $\{x, \hat{x}, h_1, h_2, h_4, h_5, h, \hat{h}_1, \hat{h}_2, \hat{h}_4, \hat{h}_5, \hat{h}\}$. In the following we argue that (A, B) is a YES-instance of $\exists\forall$ -PARTITION if and only if (G, w) admits a core stable partition.

First assume that (A, B) is a YES-instance of $\exists\forall$ -PARTITION and let $A' \subseteq A$ be a subset such that $\sum_{c \in A' \cup B'} c \neq s/2$ for every $B' \subseteq B$. We define a partition \mathcal{P} of $V(G)$ as follows. The partition \mathcal{P} contains partitions $\mathcal{P}_{(H, w_\rho)}$ and $\mathcal{P}_{(\hat{H}, \hat{w}_\rho)}$ defined in the previous section. Furthermore, \mathcal{P} contains the sets $\{h, x\} \cup \{u_i : a_i \in A'\}$, $\{\hat{h}, \hat{x}\} \cup \{u_i : a_i \notin A'\}$ and $\{v_i\}$ for every $i \in [n]$. We claim that \mathcal{P} is core stable and argue that there is no blocking coalition.

Towards a contradiction, assume that X is a blocking coalition of \mathcal{P} . By Lemma 10 (II3) we know that $X \subseteq \{x, \hat{x}\} \cup \{u_i, v_i : i \in [n]\}$. We first argue that \hat{x} must be in X . To this end, observe that if any vertex $v_i \in X$, then $\hat{x} \in X$ as v_i has utility 0 in \mathcal{P} and the only edge incident to v_i with positive weight is $\hat{x}v_i$. Additionally, if any vertex $u_i \in X$, then $\hat{x} \in X$ as u_i has utility a_i in \mathcal{P} and the only edges incident to u_i of positive weight are xu_i and $\hat{x}u_i$ which both have weight a_i . Lastly, if $x \in X$, then $\hat{x} \in X$ as x has utility at least $9s + s_A - \delta$ in \mathcal{P} and the sum of all positive weights of edges incident to x is s if we exclude $x\hat{x}$ and hx . Note that h does not join X . Since $X \neq \emptyset$, we conclude that $\hat{x} \in X$. This implies that $x \in X$ as x has utility at least $10s - \delta$ in \mathcal{P} and the sum of all positive weights of edges incident to x if we exclude the edges $x\hat{x}$ and $h\hat{x}$ is s_A .

We set $B' = \{b_i : v_i \in X\}$ and claim that $\sum_{c \in A' \cup B'} c = s/2$. First note that x has utility $9s + s_A - \delta + \sum_{a \in A'} a$ in \mathcal{P} while x has utility $9.5s + \sum_{u_i \in X} a_i - \sum_{b \in B'} b$ in X . Since X is a blocking coalition we get that

$$9s + s_A - \delta + \sum_{a \in A'} a < 9.5s + \sum_{u_i \in X} a_i - \sum_{b \in B'} b \leq 9.5s + s_A - \sum_{b \in B'} b.$$

Hence, $s/2 \geq \sum_{c \in A' \cup B'} c$ since $\delta < \min_{i \in [n]} \{a_i, b_i\}$. Furthermore, \hat{x} has utility $10s - \delta + \sum_{a \notin A'} a$ in \mathcal{P} while \hat{x} has utility $9.5s + \sum_{u_i \in X} a_i + \sum_{b \in B'} (b + \epsilon)$ in X . As X is a blocking coalition and $\sum_{a \notin A'} a = s_A - \sum_{a \in A'} a$ we get that

$$10s - \delta + s_A - \sum_{a \in A'} a < 9.5s + \sum_{u_i \in X} a_i + \sum_{b \in B'} (b + \epsilon) \leq 9.5s + s_A + \sum_{b \in B'} b + n\epsilon.$$

Hence, $s/2 \leq \sum_{c \in A' \cup B'} c$ since $\delta < \min_{i \in [n]} \{a_i, b_i\}$ and $n\epsilon < \delta$. Combined we get that $\sum_{c \in A' \cup B'} c = s/2$ which contradicts the choice of A' .

Now assume that (G, w) is a YES-instance of CS and let \mathcal{P} be a connected, core stable partition of G . We use the following. We first argue that $\{v_i\}$ is a part in \mathcal{P} for every $i \in [n]$. First observe that v_i cannot be in the same part as \hat{x} as by Lemma 10 (II1) this part also contains \hat{h} and $w(\hat{h}, v_i) = \rho$. Furthermore, every edge incident to v_i excluding $\hat{x}v_i$ has negative weight. Hence, if $\{v_i\} \notin \mathcal{P}$ then $\{v_i\}$ would be a blocking coalition.

By Lemma 10 (II1) there are parts P, \hat{P} of \mathcal{P} such that $\{h, x\} \subseteq P$ and $\{\hat{h}, \hat{x}\} \subseteq \hat{P}$. Additionally, $P \neq \hat{P}$ as $w(h\hat{h}) = \rho$. We set $A' = \{a_i : u_i \in P\}$. In the following we argue that $\sum_{c \in A' \cup B'} c \neq s/2$ for every $B' \subseteq B$. Towards a contradiction, assume that there is $B' \subseteq B$ such that $\sum_{c \in A' \cup B'} c = s/2$. We define X to be the set of vertices

$\{x, \hat{x}\} \cup \{u_i : i \in [n]\} \cup \{v_i : b_i \in B'\}$ and claim that this is a blocking coalition. First note that the utility of every vertex v_i is 0 in \mathcal{P} as $\{v_i\} \in \mathcal{P}$. On the other hand, the utility of $v_i \in X$ is $\epsilon > 0$ since $x, \hat{x} \in X$ but $h, \hat{h} \notin X$. Similarly, the utility of every u_i is at most a_i in \mathcal{P} as x and \hat{x} are contained in different parts by Lemma 10 (II1) (h and \hat{h} are in different part) while it is $2a_i$ in X since $x, \hat{x} \in X$. The utility of x in \mathcal{P} is $9s + s_A - \delta + \sum_{a \in A'} a$ which is equal to $9.5s + s_A - \delta - \sum_{b \in B'} b$. On the other hand, the utility of x is $9.5s + s_A - \sum_{b \in B'} b > 9.5s + s_A - \delta - \sum_{b \in B'} b$ in X . Finally, \hat{x} has utility at most $10s - \delta + \sum_{a \notin A'} a = 10s - \delta + s_A - \sum_{a \in A'} a$ in \mathcal{P} . Furthermore, the utility of \hat{x} in X is $9.5s + s_A + \sum_{b \in B'} (b + \epsilon) \geq 10s + s_A - \sum_{a \in A'} a$ by the assumption that $\sum_{c \in A' \cup B'} c = s/2$. We conclude that X is a blocking coalition which contradicts the choice of \mathcal{P} . ◀

4.3 Core stability parameterized by maximum degree and treewidth

We first prove the algorithmic result of the section.

► **Theorem 13.** *CORE STABILITY can be solved in time $2^{2^{O(\Delta \text{tw})}} n^{O(1)}$.*

Before we prove Theorem 13, let us sketch our high-level strategy. Given an instance of CORE STABILITY, we want to produce an equivalent instance ϕ of $\exists\forall$ -SAT, such that ϕ has treewidth roughly Δtw , where Δ, tw are the maximum degree and treewidth of the original instance. We could then use the known (double-exponential) algorithm for $\exists\forall$ -SAT ([13]) to solve our problem. Intuitively, we would then attempt to use the existential part of ϕ to encode the “there exists a partition” part of the problem, and the universal part to encode the “all blocking coalitions fail” part.

Fundamentally, this strategy is sound and works in a relatively straightforward way for the universal part: we use a boolean variable for each vertex (to encode whether it belongs in the blocking coalition) and to check that a blocking coalition fails for a vertex v we need to place a constraint on v and all its (at most Δ) neighbors. This means that a tree decomposition of ϕ should be constructible from a tree decomposition of the square of the original graph, which would have width at most Δtw .

Where we run into some more difficulties, however, is in encoding the existential part. Intuitively, this is because encoding the partition of the vertices of a bag into coalitions requires a super-linear number of bits, hence it is not sufficient to define a variable for each vertex. Indeed, to simplify things, we define a variable for each *pair* of vertices that appear together in a bag, encoding whether they are together in a coalition. This means that the treewidth of the formula ϕ we construct is in fact not $O(\Delta \text{tw})$ but actually can only be upper-bounded by $O(\text{tw}^2 + \Delta \text{tw})$.

Nevertheless, we insist on obtaining an algorithm that is double-exponential “only” in Δtw , and not in tw^2 . In order to circumvent our difficulty we observe that the term that is super-linear in treewidth only depends on existentially quantified variables. Thankfully, we manage to show, via an argument that is more careful than that of [13], that $\exists\forall$ -SAT has a complexity that only needs to be double-exponential in the number of *universally quantified* variables of each bag (Proposition 14). Using this, we are able to show that the second exponent of the running time is “only” $O(\Delta \text{tw})$, which as we show later is optimal, even when $\Delta = O(1)$, under the ETH.

Let us now give some more details. We first recall that $\exists\forall$ -SAT is a variant of the SAT problem where we aim to decide the satisfiability of a given quantified Boolean formula (QBF) ϕ which is of the form $\exists x_1 \dots \exists x_k \forall y_1 \dots \forall y_\ell \psi$ where ψ is a DNF formula on variables $x_1, \dots, x_k, y_1, \dots, y_\ell$. Two common ways of associating structure of satisfiability problems is to consider the primal or incidence graph of the formula. The primal graph of a formula ϕ

(in CNF or DNF) is a graph on the set of variables of ϕ where two variables are adjacent if they appear in the same clause. Similarly, the incidence graph is a bipartite graph on the set of variables and clauses of ϕ where a variable is adjacent to all clauses it appears in. For convenience, we use a variant of $\exists\forall$ -SAT. We say that a QBF ϕ is in $\exists\exists$ CNF \forall DNF if ϕ can be written as

$$\phi = \exists x_1 \dots \exists x_k \bigwedge_{i=1}^{k'} d_i \quad \forall y_1 \dots \forall y_\ell \bigvee_{i=1}^{\ell'} c_i$$

for some $k, k', \ell, \ell' \in \mathbb{N}$ where d_i are disjunctive clause over variables x_1, \dots, x_k containing at most 3 literals per clause and c_i are conjunctive clauses over variables $x_1, \dots, x_k, y_1, \dots, y_\ell$. We present an algorithm for $\exists\exists$ CNF \forall DNF in several steps. First, we give an algorithm with a more careful running time than that of [13].

► **Proposition 14.** *There is an algorithm that takes as input an instance of $\exists\forall$ -SAT $\exists x \forall y \phi(x, y)$, where x, y are tuples of boolean variables, ϕ is in 3-DNF, and a tree decomposition of the primal graph of ϕ where each bag contains at most t_\exists existentially quantified variables and at most t_\forall universally quantified variables and decides if the input is satisfiable in time $2^{O(t_\exists + 2^{t_\forall})} |\phi|^{O(1)}$.*

Proof. Our strategy is to reduce the problem to CNF satisfiability, which can be solved in time single-exponential in the primal treewidth. In particular, our goal is to produce a CNF formula ψ with treewidth $O(t_\exists + 2^{t_\forall})$, so that deciding if ψ is satisfiable will be equivalent to the original problem. Since CNF satisfiability on instances with n variables and primal treewidth t can be solved in $2^{O(t)} n^{O(1)}$, and since our reduction will run in time $2^{O(t_\exists + t_\forall)} |\phi|^{O(1)}$, we will obtain an algorithm with the promised running time.

More precisely, starting from ϕ , which is a formula in 3-DNF, we would like to construct a CNF formula ψ , using the same existential variables x , as well as some new existential variables z , so that the following holds for each truth assignment to the variables x : there exists an assignment to z such that $\psi(x, z)$ is true if and only if for all assignments to y we have that $\phi(x, y)$ is true. In symbols: $\forall x (\exists z \psi(x, z) \Leftrightarrow \forall y \phi(x, y))$. It is not hard to see that if we prove this equivalence for all assignments x , then ψ is satisfiable (i.e. $\exists x \exists z \psi(x, z)$) if and only if $\exists x \forall y \phi(x, y)$ holds, so the problem reduces to deciding CNF satisfiability for ψ .

The intuitive idea of the transformation of ϕ to ψ is that we want to encode in a CNF formula the execution of an algorithm which, having fixed the assignment to x , decides if there exists an assignment to y to make $\phi(x, y)$ false. This algorithm would work using the standard DP methodology for treewidth, meaning it would store in each bag, for each assignment to the variables of y contained in this bag, a bit of information indicating whether this assignment can be extended in a way that renders the formula we have seen so far false.

More precisely, the transformation is the following: for each bag B of the tree decomposition of the primal graph of ϕ , for each assignment σ to the (at most t_\forall) universal variables of B , we construct two new variables $z_{B,\sigma}$ and $w_{B,\sigma}$. In order to explain the intended meaning of these variables, fix an assignment to x . Then, $z_{B,\sigma}$ is meant to be set to true if and only if there is an assignment to the y variables contained in the sub-tree rooted at B , consistent with σ , such that every conjunctive clause of ϕ contained in this sub-tree is made false by the joint assignment to x and y . Furthermore, $w_{B,\sigma}$ is meant to be true if all conjunctive clauses of ϕ whose variables are fully contained in B are set to false by the joint assignment to x and the assignment σ .

Let us now describe the clauses of ψ . Assume, to simplify things, that we are given a nice tree decomposition of the primal graph of ϕ , such that the leaves and the root of the

decomposition are empty bags. We construct the following clauses:

1. For each bag B , each assignment σ_1 to the existential variables of B , and each assignment σ_2 to the universal variables of B , we check if there exists a clause of ϕ which is fully contained in B and which is set to true by the joint assignments σ_1, σ_2 . If this is the case, we add to ψ a clause which is falsified exactly when the existential variables of B take assignment σ_1 , and add to this clause the literal $\neg w_{B, \sigma_2}$. If this is not the case (that is, all clauses contained in B are set to false by the joint assignment) we add to ψ a clause falsified when the existential variables take assignment σ_1 , and add to this clause the literal w_{B, σ_2} .
2. For each leaf bag B , since B is empty, there exists a unique (vacuous) assignment σ_\emptyset to its universal variables. We add to ψ the unit clause $(z_{B, \sigma_\emptyset})$.
3. For each bag B with a single child B' , for each assignment σ to the universal variables of B , if there is a unique assignment σ' to the universal variables of B' , such that σ, σ' agree on their common variables (this happens if the universal variables of B' are all contained in B), we add to ψ clauses that implement the constraint $z_{B, \sigma} \leftrightarrow (w_{B, \sigma} \wedge z_{B', \sigma'})$. Otherwise, since the decomposition is nice, B' contains a single universal variable not appearing in B and there are two assignments σ', σ'' to universal variables of B' consistent with σ . We then add to ψ clauses implementing the constraint $z_{B, \sigma} \leftrightarrow (w_{B, \sigma} \wedge (z_{B', \sigma'} \vee z_{B', \sigma''}))$.
4. Similarly, for each join bag B , with children B', B'' , for each assignment σ to the universal variables of B , we add to ψ clauses that implement the constraint $z_{B, \sigma} \leftrightarrow (w_{B, \sigma} \wedge z_{B', \sigma} \wedge z_{B'', \sigma})$.
5. In the root bag B_r , since B_r is empty, again there exists a unique vacuous assignment σ_\emptyset . We add to ψ the unit clause $(\neg z_{B, \sigma_\emptyset})$.

This completes the construction. The intuition behind the construction is that, if we fix the assignment to the x variables, then in order to satisfy ψ , for each B, σ , the variable $w_{B, \sigma}$ must correctly encode whether B contains a clause that is set to true by the assignment to the x variables in conjunction with σ (in particular, $w_{B, \sigma}$ is true if and only if all clauses contained in B are false). The variable $z_{B, \sigma}$ is meant to check if there exists some assignment to the y variables extending σ that makes all clauses of ϕ contained in the sub-tree rooted at y false; this is vacuously true for a leaf bag (as no clauses are contained in the sub-tree); in other bags this is true if and only if all clauses contained in B are false (encoded by $w_{B, \sigma}$) and an assignment consistent with σ sets all clauses contained in the sub-trees rooted at children of B to false. Finally, the given assignment to x has the property that $\forall y. \phi(x, y)$ if and only if in the root it is not possible to find an assignment to the y variables that makes all clauses false, hence the last clause of ψ . Correctness of the construction can be argued by induction using the above intuition in a standard way, so we skip the details.

The construction above can be executed in time $2^{t_\exists + t_\forall} |\phi|^{O(1)}$. In order to construct a tree decomposition of ψ we keep the decomposition of ϕ and remove all universal variables. Then, in each bag B we place all the at most $2 \cdot 2^{t_\forall}$ variables $z_{B, \sigma}, w_{B, \sigma}$ constructed for this bag. We then add to each bag B all the variables contained in one of its children. Since the decomposition is nice, so each node has at most two children, this will at most triple the size of each bag, making all bags contain at most $3t_\exists + 6 \cdot 2^{t_\forall}$ variables. Observe that now all clauses of ψ are fully contained in some bag. We now have a CNF formula ψ and a tree decomposition of its primal graph of width $O(t_\exists + 2^{t_\forall})$ such that deciding if ψ is satisfiable resolves our original problem. Using a standard DP algorithm now completes the proof. ◀

► **Proposition 15.** *There is an algorithm that takes as input an $\exists\exists$ CNF \forall DNF-SAT instance ϕ and a tree decomposition of its incidence graph of width t that contains at most t_\forall universally*

quantified variables in each bag and at most 2 clauses in each bag, and decides ϕ in time $2^{O(t2^{t^v})}|\phi|$.

Proof. We reduce $\exists\exists$ CNF \forall DNF-SAT to $\exists\forall$ -SAT and then use Proposition 14. Let ϕ be a formula in $\exists\exists$ CNF \forall DNF. Hence, ϕ can be written as $\phi = \exists x_1 \dots \exists x_k \bigwedge_{i=1}^{k'} d_i \forall y_1 \dots \forall y_\ell \bigvee_{i=1}^{\ell'} c_i$ for some $k, k', \ell, \ell' \in \mathbb{N}$ where d_i are disjunctive clauses containing at most 3 literals and c_i are conjunctive clauses. We construct an instance ψ of $\exists\forall$ -SAT as follows. The formula ψ contains existentially quantified variable x_1, \dots, x_k and universally quantified variables $y_1, \dots, y_\ell, y_{d_1}, \dots, y_{d_{k'}}, y_C$. Furthermore, ψ contains one clause (y_{d_i}, λ) for every $i \in [k']$ and every literal λ contained in the clause d_i . Additionally, ψ contains the clause $y_C \wedge c_i$ for every $i \in [\ell']$. Finally, ψ contains the clause $(\neg y_{d_1} \wedge \dots \wedge \neg y_{d_{k'}} \wedge \neg y_C)$. We now argue that ϕ is satisfiable if and only if ψ is satisfiable.

First assume that ϕ is satisfiable and let $\alpha_X : \{x_1, \dots, x_k\} \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$ be an assignment which satisfies $\bigvee_{i=1}^{k'} d_i$ and for every assignment $\alpha_Y : \{y_1, \dots, y_\ell\} \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$ the formula $\bigwedge_{i=1}^{\ell'} c_i$ is satisfied. Let $\alpha_Y : \{y_1, \dots, y_\ell, y_{d_1}, \dots, y_{d_{k'}}, y_C\} \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$ be any assignment.

First assume that $\alpha_Y(y_{d_i}) = 1$ for some $i \in [k']$. Since the disjunctive clause d_i is satisfied under the assignment α_X by assumption, there is a literal λ contained in d_i such that λ evaluates to 1 under assignment α_X . Hence, the clause (y_{d_i}, λ) is satisfied under the assignments α_X and α_Y .

Now assume that $\alpha_Y(y_{d_i}) = 0$ for every $i \in [k']$ and $\alpha_Y(y_C) = 0$. In this case the clause $(\neg y_{d_1} \wedge \dots \wedge \neg y_{d_{k'}} \wedge \neg y_C)$ is satisfied under the assignments α_X and α_Y .

Finally, assume that $\alpha_Y(y_{d_i}) = 0$ for every $i \in [k']$ and $\alpha_Y(y_C) = 1$. Observe that by assumption $\bigwedge_{i=1}^{\ell'} c_i$ is satisfied under assignments α_X and the restriction of α_Y to the set $\{y_1, \dots, y_\ell\}$. Let $i \in [\ell']$ be the index of the satisfied clause. In this case, the clause $y_C \wedge c_i$ must be satisfied under the assignment α_X and α_Y . Hence, we have argued that ψ is satisfiable.

On the other hand, assume that ψ is satisfiable and let $\alpha : \{x_1, \dots, x_k\} \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$ is an assignment such that for every assignment $\alpha_Y : \{y_1, \dots, y_\ell, y_{d_1}, \dots, y_{d_{k'}}, y_C\} \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$ either one of clauses (y_{d_i}, λ) , $i \in [k']$ and λ a literal contained in d_i or one of the clauses $y_C \wedge c_i$, $i \in [\ell']$ or the clause $(\neg y_{d_1} \wedge \dots \wedge \neg y_{d_{k'}} \wedge \neg y_C)$ is satisfied under assignment α_X and α_Y . To argue that ψ is satisfiable, let $\alpha_Y : \{y_1, \dots, y_\ell\} \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$ be any assignment. We have to argue that every clause d_i , $i \in [k']$ is satisfied and at least one clause d_i , $i \in [\ell']$ is satisfied.

Fix some $i \in [k']$ and define an assignment $\tilde{\alpha}_Y : \{y_1, \dots, y_\ell, y_{d_1}, \dots, y_{d_{k'}}, y_C\} \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$ by $\tilde{\alpha}(y_j) = \alpha_Y(y_j)$ for $j \in [\ell]$, $\tilde{\alpha}_Y(y_{d_i}) = 1$, $\tilde{\alpha}_Y(y_{d_j}) = 0$ for $j \in [k']$, $j \neq i$ and $\tilde{\alpha}_Y(y_C) = 0$. By construction, the only clauses of ψ that can be satisfied under assignments α_X and $\tilde{\alpha}_Y$ are the clauses $(d_i \wedge \lambda)$ for every literal λ in d_i . Hence, one literal of d_i evaluates to 1 under assignment α_X and therefore d_i is satisfied under assignment α_X .

Now consider the assignment $\tilde{\alpha}_Y : \{y_1, \dots, y_\ell, y_{d_1}, \dots, y_{d_{k'}}, y_C\} \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$ where $\tilde{\alpha}(y_j) = \alpha_Y(y_j)$ for $j \in [\ell]$, $\tilde{\alpha}_Y(y_{d_j}) = 0$ for every $j \in [k']$ and $\tilde{\alpha}_Y(y_C) = 1$. Hence, the only clauses of ψ that can be satisfied under assignments α_X and $\tilde{\alpha}_Y$ are the clauses $(y_C \wedge c_i)$, $i \in [\ell']$. Let $i \in [\ell']$ be the index for which $(y_C \wedge c_i)$ is satisfied. But in this case the clause c_i is satisfied concluding the argument that ϕ is satisfiable.

We now consider the incidence graph of ψ and construct a tree decomposition of that graph starting from a decomposition of the incidence graph of ϕ . First, we maintain all common variables, and for each conjunctive clause c in a bag, we replace it with the clause $(y_C \wedge c)$ which has replaced it in ψ ; we add y_C and the clause $(\neg y_{d_1} \wedge \dots \wedge \neg y_{d_{k'}} \wedge \neg y_C)$ to all

bags; for each disjunctive clause d appearing in a bag we add the three new clauses $(y_d \wedge \lambda)$, where λ is a literal of d , to the bag. Observe that we have a valid decomposition of the new incidence graph, with width $t' = O(t)$, such that each bag contains at most 7 clauses, and at most $t_\vee + 1$ universal variables.

We are now almost done, except that we need to obtain a decomposition of the primal graph of ψ to invoke Proposition 14 and also to convert ψ into 3-DNF. This, however, can be done using an algorithm of [36]. In particular, we convert ψ to 3-DNF in the standard way: as long as there exists a clause that contains at least 4 literals, say $(\lambda_1 \wedge \lambda_2 \wedge \dots \wedge \lambda_r)$, we introduce a new universally quantified variable z and replace it with the two clauses $(\lambda_1 \wedge \lambda_2 \wedge z)$ and $(\neg z \wedge \lambda_3 \wedge \dots \wedge \lambda_r)$. The difference, however, is that we select the two literals to place in the new clause in a way that keeps the treewidth of the new formula under control. In particular, we find the lowest bag B in the decomposition that contains the current clause such that the sub-tree rooted at B contains two variables of the clause and set λ_1, λ_2 to be the literals involving these two variables. It is now not hard to see that if we execute this exhaustively, the new decomposition we construct will have $O(1)$ clauses per bag, $t_\vee + O(1)$ universally quantified variables, and width $O(t)$. Now, replace each clause in the decomposition by the (at most 3) variables it contains, and we get a decomposition of the primal graph, on which we can invoke Proposition 14. \blacktriangleleft

Proof of Theorem 13. We prove Theorem 13 by a reduction to $\exists\exists$ CNF \forall DNF-SAT. Let (G, w) be an instance of CS and (T, β) be a rooted tree decomposition of G . Here, we denote the bag of a node $t \in T$ by $\beta(t)$. First we let (G', w') be the graph obtained from (G, w) by adding edges uv of weight 0 for every pair of vertices u, v appearing in a bag together. It is straightforward to see that (G, w) is a YES-instance of CS if and only if (G', w') is a YES-instance of CS. Additionally, G' is chordal and (T, β) is a tree decomposition of G' .

We construct an instance ϕ of $\exists\exists$ CNF \forall DNF-SAT. We introduce a variable x_e for every $e \in E(G')$ and a variable y_u for every vertex $u \in V(G')$. An assignment $\alpha_X : \{x_e : e \in E(G')\} \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$ represents a subset of $E(G')$ and an assignment $\alpha_Y : \{y_u : u \in V(G')\} \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$ represents a subset of $V(G')$. Intuitively, a partition of $V(G')$ corresponds to a set of edges, i.e. by including all edges that are incident to vertices from the same part. For every $t \in V(T)$ we define a formula ϕ_t , which we use to enforce sufficient criteria for the set of edges represented by an assignment $\alpha_X : \{x_e : e \in E(G')\} \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$ to correspond to a partition of $V(G')$. Let

$$\phi_t = \bigwedge_{u_1, u_2, u_3 \in \beta(t)} (x_{u_1 u_2} \wedge x_{u_2 u_3}) \rightarrow x_{u_1 u_3} = \bigwedge_{u_1, u_2, u_3 \in \beta(t)} (\neg x_{u_1 u_2} \vee \neg x_{u_2 u_3} \vee x_{u_1 u_3}).$$

For a fixed partition \mathcal{P} represented by some assignment $\alpha_X : \{x_e : e \in E(G')\} \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$ our formula needs to ensure that no blocking coalitions exist. This is realized by guaranteeing that for each assignment $\alpha_Y : \{y_u : u \in V(G')\} \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$ the set corresponding to α_Y is not blocking. Intuitively, the formula ϕ_u defined below ensures that the utility of vertex u in \mathcal{P} is at least as large as the utility of u in the coalition represented by α_Y . For $u \in V(G')$ let

$$\phi_u = \bigvee_{\substack{N, \tilde{N} \subseteq N_{G'}(u), \\ \sum_{v \in N} w(uv) \leq \sum_{v \in \tilde{N}} w(uv)}} \left(\bigwedge_{v \in N} y_v \wedge \bigwedge_{v \in N_{G'}(u) \setminus N} \neg y_v \wedge \bigwedge_{v \in \tilde{N}} x_{uv} \wedge \bigwedge_{v \in N_{G'}(u) \setminus \tilde{N}} \neg x_{uv} \right).$$

We now define the formula ϕ to be

$$\phi = \exists x_{e_1} \dots \exists x_{e_m} \bigwedge_{t \in V(T)} \phi_t \quad \forall y_{v_1} \dots \forall y_{v_n} (\neg y_1 \wedge \dots \wedge \neg y_n) \vee \bigvee_{u \in V(G')} \phi_u.$$

Observe that ϕ is in $\exists 3 \text{ CNF} \vee \text{ DNF}$. In the following we prove that (G', w') is a YES-instance of CS if and only if ϕ is satisfiable.

First assume that \mathcal{P} is a core stable partition of $V(G')$. We define an assignment $\alpha_X : \{x_e : e \in E(G')\} \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$ by setting $\alpha_X(x_e) = 1$ if e is incident to two vertices residing in the same part of \mathcal{P} and $\alpha_X(x_e) = 0$ otherwise. This assignment satisfies ϕ_t for every $t \in V(T)$ as for any three vertices $u_1, u_2, u_3 \in \beta(t)$ it holds that if $\alpha_X(x_{u_1 u_2}) = 1$ and $\alpha_X(x_{u_2 u_3}) = 1$, then u_1, u_2 and u_3 must reside in the same part of \mathcal{P} and hence $\alpha_X(x_{u_1 u_3}) = 1$. Furthermore, consider any assignment $\alpha_Y : \{y_u : u \in V(G')\} \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$ and let $X = \{u \in V(G') : \alpha_Y(y_u) = 1\}$. We have to argue that the formula $(\neg y_1 \wedge \dots \wedge \neg y_n) \vee \bigvee_{u \in V(G')} \phi_u$ is satisfied under the assignments α_X and α_Y . In case that $X = \emptyset$, the clause $(\neg y_1 \wedge \dots \wedge \neg y_n)$ is satisfied. On the other hand, if $X \neq \emptyset$, then there must be a vertex $u \in X$ whose utility in \mathcal{P} is at least as large as its utility in X as the set X cannot be a blocking coalition. Hence, for the sets $N = N_{G'}(u) \cap X$ and $\tilde{N} = N_{G'}(u) \cap P$, where $P \in \mathcal{P}$ is the part containing u , we have that $\sum_{v \in N} w(uv) \leq \sum_{v \in \tilde{N}} w(uv)$. Therefore, ϕ_u contains the clause $(\bigwedge_{v \in N} y_v \wedge \bigwedge_{v \in N_{G'}(u) \setminus N} \neg y_v \wedge \bigwedge_{v \in \tilde{N}} x_{uv} \wedge \bigwedge_{v \in N_{G'}(u) \setminus \tilde{N}} \neg x_{uv})$ and this clause is satisfied under the assignment α_X and α_Y by choice of N and \tilde{N} . This shows that ϕ is satisfiable.

On the other hand, assume that ϕ is satisfiable and let $\alpha_X : \{x_e : e \in E(G')\} \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$ be an assignment such that $\bigwedge_{t \in V(T)} \phi_t$ as well as $\forall y_{v_1} \dots \forall y_{v_n} (\neg y_1 \wedge \dots \wedge \neg y_n) \vee \bigvee_{u \in V(G')} \phi_u$ is satisfied under α_X . We let $E_X = \{e \in E(G') : \alpha_X(x_e) = 1\}$ and define a partition \mathcal{P} by letting every part of \mathcal{P} correspond to the vertices of a connected component of the graph $(V(G'), E_X)$. To show that the partition \mathcal{P} is core stable we use the following claim.

► **Claim 16.** *For every edge $uv \in E(G')$ it holds that $uv \in E_X$ if and only if u and v are contained in the same part of \mathcal{P} .*

Proof. Since the forward direction holds by definition of \mathcal{P} , assume towards a contradiction that $uv \in E(G')$ with u and v being contained in the same part of \mathcal{P} but $uv \notin E_X$. By definition of \mathcal{P} , u and v being contained in the same part implies that there is a path from u to v in the graph $(V(G'), E_X)$. Let $Q = (q_1, \dots, q_\ell)$ be a shortest such path. We aim to find an inconsistent triangle, i.e. three vertices v_1, v_2, v_3 such that $v_1 v_2, v_2 v_3 \in E_X$ but $v_1 v_3 \notin E_X$. Assume that $k \leq 2$ is the minimum number such that there is an index $i \in [\ell - k]$ for which $q_i q_{i+k} \in E(G')$. As G' is chordal, we picked k minimum $k = 2$. Furthermore, $q_i q_{i+2} \notin E_X$ as otherwise, the path $(q_1, \dots, q_i, q_{i+2}, \dots, q_\ell)$ is a path in $(V(G'), E_X)$ from u to v which is shorter than Q . Hence, q_i, q_{i+1}, q_{i+2} forms an inconsistent triangle. We now claim that there is a node $t \in V(T)$ such that $q_i, q_{i+1}, q_{i+2} \in \beta(t)$. As $q_i q_{i+1}, q_{i+1} q_{i+2}, q_i q_{i+2} \in E(G')$ we know that there are nodes $t_1, t_2, t_3 \in V(T)$ such that $\{q_i, q_{i+1}\} \subseteq \beta(t_1)$, $\{q_{i+1}, q_{i+2}\} \subseteq \beta(t_2)$ and $\{q_i, q_{i+2}\} \subseteq \beta(t_3)$. Let t be the lowest common ancestor of t_1, t_2 and t_3 in T . As the nodes of T containing a particular vertex of G' in their bags form a subtree of T , we directly obtain that $q_i, q_{i+1}, q_{i+2} \in \beta(t)$. Hence, $(x_{q_i q_{i+1}} \wedge x_{q_{i+1} q_{i+2}}) \rightarrow x_{q_i q_{i+2}}$ is a clause in $\bigwedge_{t \in V(T)} \phi_t$. Hence, $(x_{q_i q_{i+1}} \wedge x_{q_{i+1} q_{i+2}}) \rightarrow x_{q_i q_{i+2}}$ must be satisfied under the assignment α_X which contradicts $q_i q_{i+2}$ not being contained in E_X proving the claim. ◀

Towards a contradiction assume that \mathcal{P} is not core stable and let X be a blocking coalition. We define an assignment $\alpha_Y : \{y_u : u \in V(G')\} \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$ by setting $\alpha_Y(y_u) = 1$ if $u \in X$ and $\alpha_Y(y_u) = 0$ otherwise. By assumption, the DNF formula $(\neg y_1 \wedge \dots \wedge \neg y_n) \vee \bigvee_{u \in V(G')} \phi_u$ is satisfied under assignment α_X and α_Y . As X cannot be empty there is at least one $u \in V(G')$ such that $\alpha_Y(y_u) = 1$ and hence the clause $(\neg y_1 \wedge \dots \wedge \neg y_n)$ cannot be satisfied

under the assignment α_Y which implies that some clause in $\bigvee_{u \in V(G')} \phi_u$ must be satisfied. Let $u \in V(G')$ and $N, \tilde{N} \subseteq N_{G'}(u)$ with $\sum_{v \in N} w(uv) \leq \sum_{v \in \tilde{N}} w(uv)$ such that the clause $(\bigwedge_{v \in N} y_v \wedge \bigwedge_{v \in N_{G'}(u) \setminus N} \neg y_v \wedge \bigwedge_{v \in \tilde{N}} x_{uv} \wedge \bigwedge_{v \in N_{G'}(u) \setminus \tilde{N}} \neg x_{uv})$ is satisfied under assignments α_X and α_Y . This implies that $N = N_{G'}(u) \cap X$ and $\tilde{N} = \{v \in V(G') : uv \in E_X\}$. Since by Claim 16, $\{v \in V(G') : uv \in E_X\} = N_{G'}(u) \cap P$, where P is the part of \mathcal{P} containing u , this implies that the utility of u in X is less or equal to the utility of u in \mathcal{P} . As this contradict our assumption that X is a blocking coalition it follows that \mathcal{P} is core stable.

► **Claim 17.** *The formula ϕ has incidence treewidth at most $\Delta(G')\text{tw}(G') + \text{tw}(G')^2 + 2$. Furthermore, we can construct a decomposition of that width which contains at most 2 clauses per bag and at most $(\Delta(G') + 1)\text{tw}(G')$ universally quantified variables per bag.*

Proof. Let G^ϕ be the incidence graph of ϕ . For $t \in V(T)$ we denote the subtree of T rooted at t by T_t . For every $u \in V(G')$ we let $\text{lca}(u)$ be the node t such that $u \in \beta(t)$ and T_t contains every node $t' \in V(T)$ for which $u \in \beta(t')$. In other words $\text{lca}(u)$ is the lowest common ancestor of all nodes whose bag contain u . We now construct a tree decomposition (T^ϕ, β^ϕ) of G^ϕ . We obtain T_ϕ from T by the following steps.

1. For every $t \in V(T)$ and every triple $(u_1, u_2, u_3) \in \beta(t)^3$ we introduce a new node $t_{(u_1, u_2, u_3)}$.
2. For every vertex $u \in V(G)$ and every two sets $N, \tilde{N} \subseteq N_{G'}(u)$ for which $\sum_{v \in N} w(uv) \leq \sum_{v \in \tilde{N}} w(uv)$ we introduce a node $\text{lca}(u)_{(N, \tilde{N})}$.
3. For the root r of T we attach a path to r containing all nodes $r_{(u_1, u_2, u_3)}$ and all nodes $t_{(N, \tilde{N})}$ in an arbitrary order.
4. For every node $t \in V(T)$ apart from the root r , we subdivide the edge from t to its ancestor by the nodes $t_{(u_1, u_2, u_3)}$ and the nodes $t_{(N, \tilde{N})}$.

We define β^ϕ in the following way. We set $\beta^\phi(t) = \{y_u : u \in N_{G'}(\beta(t)) \cup \beta(t)\} \cup \{x_{uv} : u, v \in \beta(t)\} \cup \{c_{\neg}\}$ for every node $t \in V(T)$ where c_{\neg} is the clause $(\neg y_1 \wedge \dots \wedge \neg y_n)$. Further, we set $\beta^\phi(t_{(u_1, u_2, u_3)}) = \{c_{(u_1, u_2, u_3)}\} \cup \beta^\phi(t)$ where $c_{(u_1, u_2, u_3)}$ is the clause $(\neg x_{u_1 u_2} \vee \neg x_{u_2 u_3} \vee x_{u_1 u_3})$. Similarly, we set $\beta^\phi(t_{(N, \tilde{N})}) = \{c_{(N, \tilde{N})}\} \cup \beta^\phi(t)$ where $c_{(N, \tilde{N})}$ is the clause $(\bigwedge_{v \in N} y_v \wedge \bigwedge_{v \in N_{G'}(u) \setminus N} \neg y_v \wedge \bigwedge_{v \in \tilde{N}} x_{uv} \wedge \bigwedge_{v \in N_{G'}(u) \setminus \tilde{N}} \neg x_{uv})$.

We now argue that the pair (T^ϕ, β^ϕ) is a tree decomposition of G^ϕ . First observe that that every vertex of G^ϕ is contained in the bag of some node of T^ϕ . Next we argue that the two vertices incident to any edge appear in a bag together in (T^ϕ, β^ϕ) . Observe that any edge incident to the clause $(\neg y_1 \wedge \dots \wedge \neg y_n)$ must be contained in some bag as $(\neg y_1 \wedge \dots \wedge \neg y_n)$ is contained in every bag. Furthermore, any bag $\beta^\phi(t_{(u_1, u_2, u_3)})$ contains both $y_{u_1}, y_{u_2}, y_{u_3}$ and $(\neg x_{u_1 u_2} \vee \neg x_{u_2 u_3} \vee x_{u_1 u_3})$ and hence every edge incident to $(\neg x_{u_1 u_2} \vee \neg x_{u_2 u_3} \vee x_{u_1 u_3})$ is contained in some bag. Lastly, any bag $\beta^\phi(\text{lca}(u)_{(N, \tilde{N})})$ contains y_u, y_v for every neighbor $v \in N_{G'}(u)$ and the clause $(\bigwedge_{v \in N} y_v \wedge \bigwedge_{v \in N_{G'}(u) \setminus N} \neg y_v \wedge \bigwedge_{v \in \tilde{N}} x_{uv} \wedge \bigwedge_{v \in N_{G'}(u) \setminus \tilde{N}} \neg x_{uv})$ which implies that every edge incident to $(\bigwedge_{v \in N} y_v \wedge \bigwedge_{v \in N_{G'}(u) \setminus N} \neg y_v \wedge \bigwedge_{v \in \tilde{N}} x_{uv} \wedge \bigwedge_{v \in N_{G'}(u) \setminus \tilde{N}} \neg x_{uv})$ is contained in some bag.

Finally, we argue that the subtree induced by nodes containing a fixed vertex v in their bag, is connected for every vertex $v \in V(G^\phi)$. First note that for any clause c of ϕ the set $\{t \in V(T^\phi) : c \in \beta(t)\}$ trivially induces a subtree of T as any clause is either contained in the bags of all nodes of T^ϕ or in the bag of only one node.

Next, fix $e = uv \in E(G')$ and consider the set $S_e = \{t \in V(T^\phi) : x_e \in \beta^\phi(t)\}$. Observe, that for any node $t \in V(T)$ by construction $t \in S_e$ if and only if $u, v \in \beta(t)$. Hence, the set $S_e \cap V(T)$ induces a subtree on T as it is the intersection of two sets $\{t \in V(T) : u \in \beta(t)\}$

and $\{t \in V(T) : v \in \beta(t)\}$ which induce a subtree on T . As the graph induced by S_e on T can be obtained from the subtree of T induced by $S_e \cap V(T)$ by subdividing every edge and attaching a path at the root, we obtain that S_e must induce a tree.

Finally, fix $u \in V(G)$ and consider the set $S_u = \{t \in V(T) : y_u \in \beta^\phi(t)\}$. By construction, a node $t \in V(T)$ is contained in S_u if and only if either u or some neighbor $v \in N_{G'}(u)$ is contained in $\beta(t)$. Hence, the graph induces by $S_u \cap V(T)$ is the union of the trees $G'[\{t \in V(T) : v \in \beta(t)\}]$ for all neighbors $v \in N_{G'}(u) \cup \{u\}$. As $\{t \in V(T) : v \in \beta(t)\}$ must intersect the set $\{t \in V(T) : u \in \beta(t)\}$ (as (T, β) is a tree decomposition of G' and $uv \in E(G')$) the graph induced by $S_u \cap V(T)$ on T is a subtree of T . Similarly to the previous case, this implies that S_u induces a subtree of T^ϕ .

To argue about the width of (T^ϕ, β^ϕ) first observe that every bag contains at most two clauses. Excluding clauses, every bag of (T^ϕ, β^ϕ) consists of the set $\{y_u : u \in N_{G'}(\beta(t)) \cup \beta(t)\}$ of size $\Delta(G')\text{tw}(G') + \text{tw}(G')$ and $\{x_{uv} : u, v \in \beta(t)\}$ of size $\text{tw}(G') \cdot (\text{tw}(G') - 1)$ and hence (T^ϕ, β^ϕ) has width $\Delta(G')\text{tw}(G') + \text{tw}(G')^2 + 2$. ◀

As (T, β) , G' and the formula ϕ can be computed in time $\mathcal{O}(\text{tw}(G')^2 n)$, combining the reduction with the algorithm from Proposition 15 yields a $2^{2^{\mathcal{O}(\Delta \text{tw})}} n^{\mathcal{O}(1)}$ time algorithm. ◀

Finally, we prove our ETH based lower bound.

► **Theorem 18.** *Unless the ETH fails, there is no algorithm for CORE STABILITY running in time $2^{2^{\Theta(\text{pw})}} n$ even if G has bounded degree and weights are constant.*

We give an overview of our construction. Given an instance ϕ of (3, 3)-SAT (each variable appears at most 3 times) we construct a graph (G, w) and show that ϕ is satisfiable if and only if (G, w) is core stable. First we tweak the auxiliary gadget from Section 4.1 slightly such that if we attach (H, w_ρ) at a set of vertices S then $\{h, s\} \in \mathcal{P}$ for some $s \in S$ for every core stable partition \mathcal{P} (details are given in the Appendix).

We now describe the construction and certain partitions of $V(G)$ which we refer to as candidate partition. Every variable x_i , $i \in [n]$ of ϕ is represented by two vertices y_i and $\neg y_i$ and we attach an auxiliary gadget at $\{y_i, \neg y_i\}$. Any candidate partition \mathcal{P} has to contain either $\{h, y_i\}$ or $\{h, \neg y_i\}$ (but not both) where h is a vertex of the attached gadget. For any other vertex v without an attached auxiliary gadget (excluding vertices of auxiliary gadgets) $\{v\}$ has to be in any candidate partition. For any vertex v with attached copy (H, w_ρ) the set $\{v, h\}$ has to be in any candidate partition. Using the properties of the auxiliary gadget, we obtain that any core stable partition has to be a candidate partition. By construction, there is a correspondence between assignments and candidate partitions, i.e. $\alpha(x_i) = 1$ if and only if $\{h, y_i\} \in \mathcal{P}$ for candidate partition \mathcal{P} and the corresponding assignment α .

Any blocking coalition of a candidate partition allows us to find a clause which is not satisfied under the assignment which corresponds to the candidate partition and vice versa. This is realized as follows. We take $2m + 1$ cycles $U^1, \dots, U^m, V^1, \dots, V^m, Z$ of length approximately $3n$ where $2^m \leq 3n$ is the number of clauses of ϕ . By choosing suitable edge weights, we enforce that any blocking coalition of any candidate partition contains Z and either U^k or V^k (but not both) for every $k \in [m]$. For now, we call any set containing Z , U^k or V^k (but not both) for every $k \in [m]$ (and some other vertices we neglect here) a candidate blocking coalition. We number the clauses of ϕ in such a way that each candidate blocking coalition corresponds to a clause, i.e. the j -th clause corresponds to the candidate blocking coalition X in which $U^k \in X$ if and only if the k -th bit of j in binary is 0.

Each vertex in Z corresponds to the appearance of a variable. Assume $z \in Z$ corresponds to the appearance of variable x_i in clause c_j . We connected z to either y_i or $\neg y_i$ dependent on whether x_i appears negated in c_j . We connect z to either U^k or V^k for every $k \in [m]$ using a special gadget dependent on whether the k -th bit of j in binary is 0 or 1. The gadget enforces that z obtains a +1 towards its total utility in X if and only if the candidate blocking coalition X does not encode the clause c_j . By choice of edge weights, we ensure that vertex z can only be convinced to join a blocking coalition if it either gets +1 from its clause selection gadget or +1 from y_i (or $\neg y_i$, resp.). On the other hand, y_i ($\neg y_i$, resp.) can only be convinced to join a blocking coalition if it appears as a singleton in the the partition we are trying to block and hence the corresponding literal is false. In conclusion, for any candidate partition \mathcal{P} there is a blocking coalition X if and only if for the clause corresponding to X each literal is false. Hence, (G, w) is core stable if and only if ϕ is satisfiable.

Proof of Theorem 18. We give a reduction from (3,3)-SAT which is the variant of 3-SAT in which every variable is restricted to appear at most 3 times. Let ϕ be an instance of (3,3)-SAT on variables x_1, \dots, x_n (and hence ϕ contains at most $3n$ clauses). Without loss of generality, we can assume that no clause contains both x_i and $\neg x_i$ (because then ϕ is trivially satisfiable) and that x_i as well as $\neg x_i$ appears in ϕ for every $i \in [n]$ (as otherwise we can set the literal that appears to be true). For each $i \in [n]$ we let $b_i \in \{2, 3\}$ be the number of appearances of x_i in ϕ . We denote the clauses of ϕ by c_1, \dots, c_{2^m} , $2^m \leq 3n$. Here we assumed for easier notation that the number of clauses is a power of 2.

In the following we construct an instance (G, w) of CS of bounded degree 20 and path-width in $\mathcal{O}(\log n)$. The graph (G, w) can be constructed in polynomial time. We show that (G, w) admits a core stable partition if and only if ϕ is satisfiable. Hence, if we could decide CS in time $2^{2^{o(\text{pw}(G))}}$, then we can solve (3,3)-SAT in time $2^{o(n)}$ contradicting the ETH.

We first describe the construction of (G, w) . For this, we set $\rho = -20 - 2m$.

Variable gadget

For each $i \in [n]$ we introduce vertices $y_i, \neg y_i, z_{i,1}, \dots, z_{i,b_i}$. For each $j \in [b_i]$ we add edge $y_i z_{i,j}$ of weight 1 if the j st clause in which x_i appears contains the literal x_i and we add edge $\neg y_i z_{i,j}$ of weight 1 if the j st clause in which x_i appears contains the literal $\neg x_i$.

For every $i \in [n]$, $j \in [b_i - 1]$ we add the edge $z_{i,j} z_{i,j+1}$ of weight 5. For every $i \in [n - 1]$ we add the edge $z_{i,b_i} z_{i+1,1}$ of weight 5. Hence all $z_{i,j}$'s are contained in a path in which every edge has weight 5. For an illustration of this gadget see Figure 4c.

Clause containment gadget

For each $i \in [n]$, $j \in [b_i]$, $k \in [0, m + 1]$ we introduce a vertex $s_{i,j}^k$. Additionally, for each $i \in [n]$, $j \in [b_i]$, $k \in [0, m]$ we add a vertex $\bar{s}_{i,j}^k$. For each $i \in [n]$, $j \in [b_i]$, $k \in [0, m]$ we add edge $s_{i,j}^k \bar{s}_{i,j}^k$ of weight 10, $\bar{s}_{i,j}^k s_{i,j}^{k+1}$ of weight 9 and we add edge $s_{i,j}^{m+1} z_{i,j}$ of weight 1. Furthermore, for every $i \in [n]$, $j \in [b_i]$, $k \in [0, m]$ we introduce vertices $t_{i,j}^k, u_{i,j}^k, v_{i,j}^k$ and add edge $s_{i,j}^k t_{i,j}^k$ of weight -1 .

For every $i \in [n]$, $j \in [b_i - 1]$, $k \in [0, m]$ we add edges $u_{i,j}^k u_{i,j+1}^k$ and $v_{i,j}^k v_{i,j+1}^k$ of weight 5. For every $i \in [n - 1]$, $k \in [0, m]$ we add edges $u_{i,b_i}^k u_{i+1,1}^k$ and $v_{i,b_i}^k v_{i+1,1}^k$ of weight 5. Hence for every fixed k all $u_{i,j}^k$'s are contained in a path in which every edge has weight 5 and equally for the $v_{i,j}^k$'s.

Fix $i \in [n]$ and $j \in [b_i]$ and assume c_ℓ is the clause containing the j th appearance of x_i . Let $\sum_{k=0}^m a_{i,j}^k 2^k$ where $a_{i,j}^k \in \{0, 1\}$ be the binary representation of ℓ . For every $k \in [0, m]$

we add edge $t_{i,j}^k u_{i,j}^k$ of weight 2 if $a_{i,j}^k = 0$ and edge $t_{i,j}^k v_{i,j}^k$ of weight 2 if $a_{i,j}^k = 1$. For an illustration see Figure 4a.

Clause selection gadget

For every $k \in [0, m]$ we introduce three vertices p^k, q^k, r^k and add edges $p^k q^k$ and $p^k r^k$ of weight 1 and $q^k r^k$ of weight ρ .

We add edges $z_{n,b_n} p^0, p^m z_{1,1}$ of weight 5. Additionally, for every $k \in [0, m-1]$ we add edges $p^k p^{k+1}$ of weight 5. Hence all $z_{i,j}$'s and all p^k 's are contained in a cycle.

For every $k \in [0, m]$ we add edges $u_{n,b_n}^k q^k, q^k u_{1,1}^k$ of weight 5. Additionally, for every $k \in [0, m]$ we add edges $v_{n,b_n}^k r^k, r^k v_{1,1}^k$ of weight 5. Hence for each $k \in [0, m]$ the $u_{i,j}^k$'s together with q^k form a cycle and the $v_{i,j}^k$'s together with r^k form a cycle. For an illustration see Figure 4b.

Auxiliary gadgets

For every $i \in [n]$ we take one copy (H_i, w_ρ) of (H, w_ρ) and let h^i be the vertex h in the copy H_i . We 9-neighbourhood attach (H_i, w_ρ) at $\{y_i, \neg y_i\}$.

Furthermore, for every vertex $u \in \{\bar{s}_{i,j}^k, u_{i,j}^k, v_{i,j}^k : i \in [n], j \in [b_i], k \in [0, m]\}$ we introduce one copy (H_u, w_ρ) of (H, w_ρ) and let h_u be the vertex h in the copy H_u . We 10-neighborhood attach (H_u, w_ρ) at $\{u\}$ for every $u \in \{\bar{s}_{i,j}^k : i \in [n], j \in [b_i], k \in [0, m]\}$. Additionally, if $a_{i,j}^k = 0$ we 10-neighborhood attach (H_u, w_ρ) at $\{u\}$ for every $u \in \{u_{i,j}^k : i \in [n], j \in [b_i], k \in [0, m]\}$ and we 9-neighborhood attach (H_u, w_ρ) at $\{u\}$ for every $u \in \{v_{i,j}^k : i \in [n], j \in [b_i], k \in [0, m]\}$. Otherwise, if $a_{i,j}^k = 1$ we 9-neighborhood attach (H_u, w_ρ) at $\{u\}$ for every $u \in \{u_{i,j}^k : i \in [n], j \in [b_i], k \in [0, m]\}$ and we 10-neighborhood attach (H_u, w_ρ) at $\{u\}$ for every $u \in \{v_{i,j}^k : i \in [n], j \in [b_i], k \in [0, m]\}$.


Additionally, for every vertex $u \in \{p^k, q^k, r^k, z_{i,j} : i \in [n], j \in [b_i], k \in [0, m]\}$ we introduce one copy (H_u, w_ρ) of (H, w_ρ) and let h_u be the vertex h in the copy H_u . We 10-neighborhood attach (H_u, w_ρ) at $\{u\}$.

Finally, for every vertex $u \in \{s_{i,j}^k : i \in [n], j \in [b_i], k \in [0, m+1]\}$ we introduce one copy (H_u, w_ρ) of (H, w_ρ) and let h_u be the vertex h in the copy H_u . We 9-neighborhood attach (H_u, w_ρ) at $\{u\}$ for $u = s_{i,j}^k$. For an illustration of where the auxiliary gadgets are attached see Figure 4.

This concludes the construction of graph (G, w) . First observe that the degree of G is at most 20. To see this, observe that in $G \left[\{s_{i,j}^k : j \in [b_i], k \in [0, m+1]\} \cup \{p_k, q_k, r_k, \bar{s}_{i,j}^k, t_{i,j}^k, u_{i,j}^k, v_{i,j}^k, y_i, \neg y_i, z_{i,j} : i \in [n], j \in [b_i], k \in [0, m]\} \right]$ every vertex has degree at most 4 except $y_i, \neg y_i$ who have degree at most 2. Attaching a copy of (H, w_ρ) at a single vertex increases the degree of that vertex by 6 (attaching (H, w_ρ) at two vertices increases the degree by 7) and the degree of all its neighbours by 1, yielding a degree bound of 14 for vertices in $\{s_{i,j}^k : j \in [b_i], k \in [0, m+1]\} \cup \{p_k, q_k, \bar{s}_{i,j}^k, r_k, t_{i,j}^k, u_{i,j}^k, v_{i,j}^k, y_i, \neg y_i, z_{i,j} : i \in [n], j \in [b_i], k \in [0, m]\}$. On the other hand, the degree of vertices within any copy of (H, w_ρ) which was attach is at most 6 plus the number of neighbours of the vertex at which the copy of (H, w_ρ) was attached. Also observe, that $\rho < -\max_{u \in V(G)} \sum_{\substack{uv \in E(G) \\ w(uv) > 0}} w(uv)$ and hence we can use Lemma 11.


We first argue that G has path-width in $\mathcal{O}(\log n)$. To this end, define

$$B_0 = \{p^k, q^k, r^k : k \in [0, m]\} \cup \bigcup_{u \in \{p^k, q^k, r^k : k \in [0, m]\}} V(H_u)$$



(a) A clause containment gadget encoding that variable x_1 is contained in the second clause.

(b) The clause selection gadget.



(c) Example of a variable gadget of x_1 where x_1 appears twice in ϕ and $\neg x_1$ appears once.

■ **Figure 4** The gadgets from the construction in the proof of Theorem 18. Here auxiliary gadgets are depicted by blue hexagons, their attachment at set S is signified by a squiggly edge and red edges without weight are the edges of weight ρ .

and for every $i \in [n]$ define

$$B_i = \{s_{i,j}^k : j \in [b_i], k \in [0, m+1]\} \cup \{\bar{s}_{i,j}^k, t_{i,j}^k, u_{i,j}^k, v_{i,j}^k, y_i, \neg y_i, z_{i,j} : j \in [b_i], k \in [0, m]\} \\ \cup V(H_i) \cup \bigcup_{\substack{u \in \{s_{i,j}^k : j \in [b_i], k \in [0, m+1]\} \\ \cup \{\bar{s}_{i,j}^k, u_{i,j}^k, v_{i,j}^k, z_{i,j} : j \in [b_i], k \in [0, m]\}}} V(H_u).$$

We observe that B_0 has size $21 + 21m$ while B_i has size at most $125 + 87m$. By construction there is no edges between B_i and B_j if $|i - j| > 1$. Hence we get a path-decomposition of G of width at most $271 + 195m$ by placing all vertices of B_0, B_i, B_{i+1} in the bag of the i th vertex of the path. We now argue that (G, w) is core stable if and only if ϕ is satisfiable.

First assume that (G, w) is core stable and let \mathcal{P} be a core stable partition of $V(G)$. Without loss of generality we can assume that \mathcal{P} is connected. By Lemma 11 property (II'1), we know that $\{u, h_u\} \in \mathcal{P}$ for every $u \in \{s_{i,j}^k : j \in [b_i], k \in [0, m+1]\} \cup \{p^k, q^k, r^k, \bar{s}_{i,j}^k, u_{i,j}^k, v_{i,j}^k, z_{i,j} : i \in [n], j \in [b_i], k \in [0, m]\}$ and either $\{h^i, y_i\} \in \mathcal{P}$ or $\{h^i \neg y_i\} \in \mathcal{P}$ for every $i \in [n]$. Additionally, by Lemma 11 property (II2) we know that

$$P \subseteq \bigcup_{i \in [n]} V(H_i) \setminus \{h^i\} \cup \bigcup_{\substack{u \in \{s_{i,j}^k : j \in [b_i], k \in [0, m+1]\} \\ \cup \{p^k, q^k, r^k, \bar{s}_{i,j}^k, u_{i,j}^k, v_{i,j}^k, z_{i,j} : i \in [n], j \in [b_i], k \in [0, m]\}}} V(H_u) \setminus \{h_u\}$$

if $P \in \mathcal{P}$ contains any vertex from this union of auxiliary gadgets. As $G[\{t_{i,j}^k : i \in [n], j \in [b_i], k \in [0, m]\}]$ contains only singletons and we assumed that \mathcal{P} is connected, we further know that $\{t_{i,j}^k\} \in \mathcal{P}$ for every $i \in [n], j \in [b_i], k \in [0, m]$.

We define an assignment $\alpha : \{x_1, \dots, x_n\} \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$ in the following way. If $\{h^i, y_i\} \in \mathcal{P}$, then we set $\alpha(x_i) = 1$ and if $\{h^i \neg y_i\} \in \mathcal{P}$, then we set $\alpha(x_i) = 0$. We claim that α is a satisfying assignment for ϕ . Towards a contradiction assume that this is not the case and assume that c_ℓ is a clause which does not evaluate to 1 under the assignment α . Let $\ell = \sum_{k=0}^m a_k 2^k$ be the binary representation of ℓ . Define a set X as follows.

$$X = \left\{ p^k : k \in [0, m] \right\} \cup \left\{ q^k : k \in [0, m], a_k = 0 \right\} \cup \left\{ r^k : k \in [0, m], a_k = 1 \right\} \\ \cup \left\{ u_{i,j}^k : i \in [n], j \in [b_i], k \in [0, m], a_k = 0 \right\} \\ \cup \left\{ v_{i,j}^k : i \in [n], j \in [b_i], k \in [0, m], a_k = 1 \right\} \\ \cup \left\{ t_{i,j}^k : i \in [n], j \in [b_i], k \in [0, m], a_{i,j}^k = a_k \right\} \\ \cup \left\{ s_{i,j}^k : i \in [n], j \in [b_i], k \in [0, m+1], k \geq \min(\{k' \in [0, m] : a_{i,j}^{k'} \neq a_{k'}\} \cup \{m+2\}) \right\} \\ \cup \left\{ \bar{s}_{i,j}^k : i \in [n], j \in [b_i], k \in [0, m], k \geq \min(\{k' \in [0, m] : a_{i,j}^{k'} \neq a_{k'}\} \cup \{m+2\}) \right\} \\ \cup \left\{ y_i : i \in [n], \{y_i, h^i\} \notin \mathcal{P} \right\} \cup \left\{ \neg y_i : i \in [n], \{\neg y_i, h^i\} \notin \mathcal{P} \right\} \cup \left\{ z_{i,j} : i \in [n], j \in [b_i] \right\}.$$

In the following we argue that X is a blocking coalition of \mathcal{P} which yields a contradiction. First observe that no two vertices in X are connected by an edge of weight ρ . Furthermore, all edges in $G[X]$ have positive weight, apart from edges $s_{i,j}^k, t_{i,j}^k$. Hence, it is sufficient to only consider positive weight edges and edges of the form $s_{i,j}^k, t_{i,j}^k$. Let $i \in [n], j \in [b_i], k \in [0, m]$ be arbitrary but fixed.

First note that p^k has utility 10 in \mathcal{P} as $\{p^k, h_{p^k}\} \in \mathcal{P}$. As both $p^{k-1} \in X$ ($z_{n, b_n} \in X$ if $k = 0$) and $p^{k+1} \in X$ ($z^{1,1} \in X$ if $k = m$) and additionally either $q^k \in X$ or $r^k \in X$, we conclude that p^k has improved its utility from 10 to 11 by joining X .

Next observe that both q^k and r^k have utility 10 in \mathcal{P} . If $a_k = 0$ then $q^k \in X$ ($r^k \notin X$) and so are p^k as well as both u_{n,b_n}^k and $u_{1,1}^k$. Hence, q^k has utility 11 $>$ 10 in X . The same argument shows that r^k has utility 11 $>$ 10 in X in the case that $a_k = 1$.

Furthermore, $u_{i,j}^k$ has utility 10 if $a_{i,j}^k = 0$ and 9 otherwise. Assume that $a_k = 0$ and hence $u_{i,j}^k \in X$ (and $v_{i,j}^k \notin X$). In the case that $a_{i,j}^k = 0$, by construction $t_{i,j}^k \in X$ and $u_{i,j}^k, t_{i,j}^k \in E(G)$ and hence $u_{i,j}^k$ has utility 11 in X . On the other hand, if $a_{i,j}^k = 1$, then $u_{i,j}^k$ has utility 10 in X . In both cases $u_{i,j}^k$ improves its utility by joining X . An analogous argument shows that, if $a_k = 1$ and hence $v_{i,j}^k \in X$, then $v_{i,j}^k$ improves its utility by joining X .

As $\{t_{i,j}^k\} \in \mathcal{P}$, $t_{i,j}^k$ has utility 0 in \mathcal{P} . In case $a_{i,j}^k = a_k$ and $t_{i,j}^k \in X$ we need to consider two cases. If $a_{i,j}^k = a_k = 0$ then $t_{i,j}^k$ is adjacent to $u_{i,j}^k$, $w(t_{i,j}^k, u_{i,j}^k) = 2$ and $u_{i,j}^k \in X$. Even if $t_{i,j}^k$'s other neighbour $s_{i,j}^k \in X$, $t_{i,j}^k$ still has utility 1 in X . Equivalently, if $a_{i,j}^k = a_k = 1$, then $t_{i,j}^k$ has utility at least 1 in X .

Consider $\bar{s}_{i,j}^k$ and assume that $\bar{s}_{i,j}^k \in X$. By definition, this implies that $k \leq \min(\{k' \in [0, m] : a_{i,j}^{k'} \neq a_{k'}\} \cup \{m+2\})$ and hence both $s_{i,j}^k \in X$ and $s_{i,j}^{k+1} \in X$. Hence, $\bar{s}_{i,j}^k$ has utility 19 in X while $\bar{s}_{i,j}^k$ has utility 10 in \mathcal{P} .

Next consider $s_{i,j}^{m+1}$ and assume that $s_{i,j}^{m+1} \in X$. Hence, $m+1 \geq \min(\{k' \in [0, m] : a_{i,j}^{k'} \neq a_{k'}\} \cup \{m+2\})$. As $m+1$ cannot be equal to $\min(\{k' \in [0, m] : a_{i,j}^{k'} \neq a_{k'}\} \cup \{m+2\})$ we know that $\bar{s}_{i,j}^m \in X$. Hence the utility of $s_{i,j}^{m+1}$ in X is 10 (as $z_{i,j}$ is also in X) while the utility of $s_{i,j}^{m+1}$ is 9 in \mathcal{P} . Next consider $s_{i,j}^k$, $k \leq m$ and assume that $s_{i,j}^k \in X$ and hence $k \geq \min\{k' \in [0, m] : a_{i,j}^{k'} \neq a_{k'}\}$. First consider the case that $k = \min\{k' \in [0, m] : a_{i,j}^{k'} \neq a_{k'}\}$. As $a_{i,j}^k \neq a_k$, we know that $t_{i,j}^k \notin X$. As by construction $\bar{s}_{i,j}^k \in X$ and $w(s_{i,j}^k, \bar{s}_{i,j}^k) = 10$ we know that $s_{i,j}^k$ has utility 10 in X while its utility is 9 in \mathcal{P} . On the other hand, if $k > \min\{k' \in [0, m] : a_{i,j}^{k'} \neq a_{k'}\}$ then both $\bar{s}_{i,j}^{k-1} \in X$ and $\bar{s}_{i,j}^k \in X$ and hence $s_{i,j}^k$ has utility at least 18 (even if $t_{i,j}^k \in X$).

Now consider y_i and observe that if $y_i \in X$, then y_i has utility 0 in \mathcal{P} . As y_i has at least one neighbor in the set $\{z_{i,j} : i \in [n], j \in [b_i]\}$ (by our assumption that both literals $x_i, \neg x_i$ appear in ϕ) and the corresponding edge has positive weight, y_i improves its utility by joining X . Equivalently, for $\neg y_i$.

Finally, consider the vertex $z_{i,j}$ and observe that its utility in \mathcal{P} is 10. First assume that $s_{i,j}^{m+1} \in X$. In this case $z_{i,j}$ has utility 11 in X as $\{p^1, p^m\} \cup \{z_{i,j} : i \in [n], j \in [b_i]\} \subseteq X$. On the other hand, if $s_{i,j}^{m+1} \notin X$ then $\min(\{k' \in [0, m] : a_{i,j}^{k'} \neq a_{k'}\} \cup \{m+2\}) = m+2$ by construction of X . Hence, $a_{i,j}^{k'} = a_{k'}$ for every $k' \in [0, m]$ which implies that $\sum_{k'=0}^m a_{i,j}^{k'} 2^{k'} = \ell$. By construction this means that x_i appears in c_ℓ . Assume that the literal x_i is contained in c_ℓ (the case that the literal $\neg x_i$ is contained in c_ℓ is analogous). As x_i appears in c_ℓ and c_ℓ evaluates to 0 under the assignment α , we know that $\alpha(x_i) = 0$. By definition of α this means that $\{h^i, \neg y_i\} \in \mathcal{P}$ and hence $y_i \in X$. Therefore, $z_{i,j}$ has utility 11 in X . As $z_{i,j}$ improves its utility in both cases we have argued that X is a blocking coalition contradicting our assumption that \mathcal{P} is core stable. Hence, α is a satisfying assignment for ϕ .

On the other hand, assume that ϕ is satisfiable and let $\alpha : \{x_1, \dots, x_n\} \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$ be a satisfying assignment of ϕ . We define a partition \mathcal{P} of $V(G)$ as follows. For $i \in [n]$ we include sets $\{h^i, y_i\}$ as well as $\{\neg y_i\}$ in \mathcal{P} if $\alpha(x_i) = 1$ and we include sets $\{h^i, \neg y_i\}$ as well as $\{y_i\}$ in \mathcal{P} if $\alpha(x_i) = 0$. We further include the core stable partition of $H_i \setminus \{h^i\}$ defined in Section 4.1 in \mathcal{P} . For each vertex $u \in \{s_{i,j}^k : j \in [b_i], k \in [0, m+1]\} \cup \{p_k, q_k, \bar{s}_{i,j}^k, r_k, u_{i,j}^k, v_{i,j}^k, z_{i,j} : i \in [n], j \in [b_i], k \in [0, m]\}$ we include the set $\{u, h_u\}$ in \mathcal{P} and the core stable partition $\mathcal{P}_{(H_u, w_\rho)}$ of $H_u \setminus \{h_u\}$ defined in Section 4.1. Finally, for every $u \in \{t_{i,j}^k : i \in [n], j \in [b_i], k \in [0, m]\}$ we include the singleton $\{u\}$ in \mathcal{P} . Towards a contradiction, assume that \mathcal{P} is not a core

stable partition and X is a blocking coalition. In the following, we show that X must have a particular structure, i.e. X must be of the form as the blocking coalition in the previous direction of the proof. The property of the coalition X being blocking can then be translated into an argument that α is not a satisfying assignment yielding the desired contradiction.

We define $Z = \{p^k, z_{i,j} : i \in [n], j \in [b_i], k \in [0, m]\} \subseteq X$ and for every $k \in [0, m]$ we define $U^k = \{q^k, u_{i,j}^k : i \in [n], j \in [b_i]\}$, $V^k = \{r^k, v_{i,j}^k : i \in [n], j \in [b_i]\}$, $T_0^k = \{t_{i,j}^k : i \in [n], j \in [b_i], a_{i,j}^k = 0\}$ and $T_1^k = \{t_{i,j}^k : i \in [n], j \in [b_i], a_{i,j}^k = 1\}$. The following three claims describe precisely which compositions of vertices are valid for X .

► **Claim 19.** *For every $k \in [0, m]$ the following three statements hold.*

- (i) *If any $z \in Z$ is contained in X , then $Z \subseteq X$ and either $U^k \cup T_0^k \subseteq X$ or $V^k \cup T_1^k \subseteq X$.*
- (ii) *If any $u \in U^k \cup T_0^k$ is contained in X , then $U^k \cup T_0^k \subseteq X$ and $Z \subseteq X$.*
- (iii) *If any $v \in V^k \cup T_1^k$ is contained in X , then $V^k \cup T_1^k \subseteq X$ and $Z \subseteq X$.*

Proof. First note that the vertices of Z form a cycle C_Z and for every $k \in [0, m]$ the vertices of U^k form a cycle C_U^k and the vertices of V^k form a cycle C_V^k . Since every $u \in \bigcup_{k \in [0, m]} U^k \cup \bigcup_{k \in [0, m]} V^k$ has utility at least 9 in \mathcal{P} , if $u \in X$ then its utility has to be at least 10 in X . Fix some $u \in \bigcup_{k \in [0, m]} U^k \cup \bigcup_{k \in [0, m]} V^k$ and assume $u \in X$. By Lemma 11 property (II3), we know that $h_u \notin X$. The only remaining positive weight edges incident to u are the two edges on the respective cycle C_Z, C_U^k, C_V^k of weight 5 and at most one additional edge of weight at most 2. Hence u can only have utility 10 in X if both neighbors of u on the respective cycle C_Z, C_U^k, C_V^k are contained in X . Inductively, this proves that if any $z \in Z$ is contained in X , then $Z \subseteq X$; if $u \in U^k$ is contained in X for some $k \in [0, m]$, then $U^k \subseteq X$; and if $v \in V^k$ is contained in X for some $k \in [0, m]$, then $V^k \subseteq X$.

Towards showing (ii), we first observe the following. If $t_{i,j}^k \in X$ for some $i \in [n], j \in [b_i], k \in [0, m]$ and $a_{i,j}^k = 0$, then $u_{i,j}^k$ is the only neighbor of $t_{i,j}^k$ with positive edge weight and hence $u_{i,j}^k \in X$. But if $u_{i,j}^k \in X$ then $U^k \subseteq X$. We only have left to argue that if $U^k \subseteq X$ for some $k \in [0, m]$, then $T_0^k \subseteq X$. Hence, assume that $U^k \subseteq X$. By construction, the utility of $u_{i,j}^k$ in \mathcal{P} is 10 for every $i \in [n], j \in [b_i]$ for which $a_{i,j} = 0$. Since $u_{i,j}^k$ gets utility 10 by $U^k \subseteq X$ we know that $t_{i,j}^k \in X$ if $a_{i,j}^k = 0$. Hence $T_0^k \subseteq X$. We can prove (iii) with an analogous argument.

Towards showing (i), observe that we only have left to argue that if $Z \subseteq X$, then either $U^k \cup T_0^k \subseteq X$ or $V^k \cup T_1^k \subseteq X$ for every $k \in [0, m]$. Observe that p^k has utility 10 in \mathcal{P} for every $k \in [0, m]$. As p^k gets utility at most 10 by $Z \subseteq X$ we know that either $q^k \in X$ or $r^k \in X$. But then by our previous observation either $U^k \subseteq X$ or $V^k \subseteq X$. But then $U^k \cup T_0^k \subseteq X$ or $V^k \cup T_1^k \subseteq X$ by (ii) and (iii). ◀

► **Claim 20.** *For every $i \in [n], j \in [b_i], k \in [0, m+1]$ the following two statements hold*

- (i) *If $k \neq m+1$, $s_{i,j}^k \in X$ if and only if $\bar{s}_{i,j}^k \in X$.*
- (ii) *If $s_{i,j}^k \in X$, then $s_{i,j}^{k'} \in X$ for every $k' > k, k' \leq m+1$ and $Z \subseteq X$.*
- (iii) *If $s_{i,j}^k \in X$, then either $k \leq m$ and $t_{i,j}^k \notin X$ or $k > 0$ and $s_{i,j}^{k-1} \in X$.*

Proof. To show (i), assume $s_{i,j}^k \in X$. Observe that $s_{i,j}^k \in X$ has utility 9 in \mathcal{P} . Additionally note that $h_{s_{i,j}^k} \notin X$ by Lemma 11 property (II3) and $s_{i,j}^k$ is incident to at most two additional edges of positive weight (in case $k = 0$ it is only one edge) of which only one, the edge $s_{i,j}^k \bar{s}_{i,j}^k$, has weight larger than 9. Therefore, $\bar{s}_{i,j}^k$ must be contained in X . On the other hand, if $\bar{s}_{i,j}^k \in X$, then $s_{i,j}^k \in X$. To see this note that $\bar{s}_{i,j}^k$ has utility 10 in \mathcal{P} and (excluding the edge $\bar{s}_{i,j}^k h_{\bar{s}_{i,j}^k}$) is incident to two edges, one of weight 9 and one of weight 10. As $h_{\bar{s}_{i,j}^k} \notin X$, this implies that both $s_{i,j}^k$ and $s_{i,j}^{k+1}$ have to be included in X .

Towards showing (ii), assume that $s_{i,j}^k \in X$. First assume that $k \leq m$ and hence $\bar{s}_{i,j}^k \in X$ by (i). As argued previously, this implies that $s_{i,j}^{k+1} \in X$. Inductively, this proves that $s_{i,j}^{k'} \in X$ for every $k' > k$, $k' \leq m+1$. Additionally, $s_{i,j}^{m+1} \in X$ implies that $z_{i,j} \in X$. To see this, observe that the edges of positive weight incident to $s_{i,j}^{m+1}$ are $s_{i,j}^{m+1}h_{s_{i,j}^{m+1}}$, $s_{i,j}^{m+1}\bar{s}_{i,j}^m$ of weight 9 and $s_{i,j}^{m+1}z_{i,j}$ of weight 1. As $h_{s_{i,j}^{m+1}} \notin X$ by 11 property (II3) we get $z_{i,j} \in X$. Using Claim 19 (i), this proves (i).

To argue (iii) holds, observe that if $s_{i,j}^0 \in X$ and $t_{i,j}^0 \in X$, then the utility of $s_{i,j}^0$ in X is at most 9 as $w(s_{i,j}^0 t_{i,j}^0) = -1$ and $w(s_{i,j}^0 s_{i,j}^1) = 10$. This contradicts that the utility of $s_{i,j}^0$ is 9 in \mathcal{P} . Now assume $k > 0$, $k \leq m$ and $s_{i,j}^k \in X$. If both $t_{i,j}^k \in X$ and $s_{i,j}^{k-1} \notin X$, then the utility of $s_{i,j}^k$ in X is at most 9 as $s_{i,j}^{k-1} \notin X$ implies $\bar{s}_{i,j}^{k-1} \notin X$ by (i). As the utility of $s_{i,j}^k$ is 9 in \mathcal{P} this yields a contradiction. On the other hand, if $k = m+1$, $s_{i,j}^{m+1} \in X$ and $s_{i,j}^m \notin X$, then $s_{i,j}^{m+1}$ has utility 1 in X as $s_{i,j}^m \notin X$ implies $\bar{s}_{i,j}^m \notin X$ by (i). This yields a contradiction as $s_{i,j}^{m+1}$ has utility 10 in \mathcal{P} . Therefore, we have shown that (ii) is true. \blacktriangleleft

► **Claim 21.** For every $i \in [n]$, $j \in [b_i]$ the following three statements hold

- (i) If either $y_i \in X$ or $\neg y_i \in X$, then $Z \subseteq X$.
- (ii) If $z_{i,j} \in X$, then either $s_{i,j}^{m+1} \in X$ or either $y_i \in X$ if the clause of ϕ containing the j th appearance of x_i contains x_i or $\neg y_i \in X$ if the clause of ϕ containing the j th appearance of x_i contains $\neg x_i$.
- (iii) If $\alpha(x_i) = 1$, then y_i cannot be in X and if $\alpha(x_i) = 0$ then $\neg y_i$ cannot be in X .

Proof. To prove (i), recall that we assumed that ϕ contains both the literal x_i as well as $\neg x_i$ and hence both y_i and $\neg y_i$ must have a neighbor in Z by construction. By Lemma 11 property (II3), we know that $h^i \notin X$. Since every other edge incident to either y_i and $\neg y_i$ of positive weight is also incident to some vertex in Z , we conclude that some $z \in Z$ must be contained in X . Hence, by Claim 19 (i) $Z \subseteq X$.

Towards showing (ii), first observe that $z_{i,j}$ has utility 10 in \mathcal{P} . If $z_{i,j} \in X$, then $z_{i,j}$ needs to have utility at least 11 in X . Assume that the clause of ϕ containing the j th appearance of x_i contains x_i (the case that the clause of ϕ containing the j th appearance of x_i contains $\neg x_i$ can be argued analogously). If both $s_{i,j}^{m+1} \notin X$ and $y_i \notin X$, then $z_{i,j}$ can have utility at most 10 in X which is not sufficient. Hence, (ii) holds.

Lastly, to argue (iii), observe that if $\{y_i, h^i\} \in \mathcal{P}$, then y_i has utility 9 in \mathcal{P} and can therefore not join X . As $\{y_i, h^i\} \in \mathcal{P}$ if $\alpha(x_i) = 1$, we obtain the first part of the statement. An analogous argument shows that $\neg y_i$ cannot be in X if $\alpha(x_i) = 0$. \blacktriangleleft

By Lemma 11 property (II2) we know that $X \subseteq \{s_{i,j}^k : j \in [b_i], k \in [0, m+1]\} \cup \{p_k, q_k, r_k, \bar{s}_{i,j}^k, t_{i,j}^k, u_{i,j}^k, v_{i,j}^k, z_{i,j} : i \in [n], j \in [b_i], k \in [0, m]\}$. Since X cannot be empty, combining Claim 19, Claim 20 (i) and Claim 21 (i) we obtain that $Z \subseteq X$. Consequently, by Claim 19 (i) either $U^k \subseteq X$ or $V^k \subseteq X$ for every $k \in [0, m]$. Note that they cannot both be contained in X as $w(q^k r^k) = \rho$. For every $k \in [0, m]$ we pick $a_k \in \{0, 1\}$ as follows and define $\ell = \sum_{k=0}^m a_k 2^k$. We let a_k be 0 if $U^k \subseteq Z$ and we let a_k be 1 if $V^k \subseteq Z$. In the following, we argue that no literal contained in the clause c_ℓ is satisfied. To prove this we use the following claim. Recall that for fixed $i \in [n]$ and $j \in [b_i]$ and we defined $\sum_{k=0}^m a_{i,j}^k 2^k$ where $a_{i,j}^k \in \{0, 1\}$ be the binary representation of ℓ where c_ℓ is the clause containing the j th appearance of x_i .

► **Claim 22.** If $\ell = \sum_{k=0}^m a_{i,j}^k 2^k$ for some $i \in [n]$, $j \in [b_i]$, then $s_{i,j}^{m+1} \notin X$.

Proof. Towards a contradiction assume that $s_{i,j}^{m+1} \in X$. Let $k \in [0, m+1]$ be the minimum index such that $s_{i,j}^k \in X$, i.e., either $k = 0$ or $s_{i,j}^{k'} \notin X$ for every $k' < k$. Observe, that $k \leq m$ as if $s_{i,j}^{m+1} \in X$, then $s_{i,j}^m$ must also be in X by Claim 20 (iii). By Claim 20 (iii), k being the minimum index for which $s_{i,j}^k \in X$ means that $t_{i,j}^k \notin X$. Assume that $a_{i,j}^k = 0$ (the case that $a_{i,j}^k = 1$ works analogously) which implies that $t_{i,j}^k \in U^k$. Therefore, $U^k \not\subseteq X$ which implies that $a_k = 1$ by definition. Since $a_{i,j}^k \neq a_k$ this contradicts that $\ell = \sum_{k=0}^m a_{i,j}^k 2^k$. ◀

Now assume that for some fixed $i \in [n]$, $j \in [b_i]$ the clause c_ℓ contains the j th appearance of variable x_i and hence $\sum_{k=0}^m a_{i,j}^k 2^k = \ell$. We assume that c_ℓ contains the literal x_i (the case that c_ℓ contains the literal $\neg x_i$ works analogously). As $z_{i,j} \in X$ and $s_{i,j}^{m+1} \notin X$ by Claim 22, we get that y_i must be contained in X by Claim 21 (ii). Since $y_i \in X$ we get that $\alpha(x_i) = 0$ and hence the literal x_i contained in c_ℓ is not satisfied. Since no literal in c_ℓ can be satisfied, we obtain that c_ℓ is not satisfied contradicting the assumption that α was a satisfying assignment. ◀

5 k -Core Stability

In this section we consider the complexity of finding and verifying k -core stable partitions, when the size of the allowed blocking coalitions k is a parameter. Even though the two problems do become easier when k is a fixed constant (because we can check all possible blocking coalitions in polynomial time), we show that it is likely that not much more can be gained from this assumption: k -CSV is coW[1]-hard parameterized by k (Theorem 23), while k -CS is NP-complete even if $k \geq 3$ is a fixed constant (Theorem 25). On the positive side, we do show that finding 2-core stable partitions is in P, but it is worth noting that the fact that we consider undirected graphs is crucial to obtain even this small tractable case.

► **Theorem 23.** *k -CORE STABILITY VERIFICATION is in XP when parameterized by k whereas coW[1]-hard even on unweighted graphs.*


Proof. The upper bound can be easily shown by brute force. That is, given a coalition structure \mathcal{P} , for each coalition X of size at most k , we check if each agent v in X has higher utility than in \mathcal{P} . The running time of brute force is $n^{O(k)}$.

Then we show that k -CSV is W[1]-hard even on unweighted graphs. We give a reduction from k -CLIQUE. Given a graph G , we attach $k-2$ pendant vertices for each vertex in $V(G)$. Let P_v be the set of pendant vertices for v . We set $\mathcal{P} = \{P_v \cup \{v\} : v \in V(G)\}$ as a coalition structure to verify.

In the following, we show that there exists a k -clique in G if and only if there exists a blocking coalition for \mathcal{P} . Let C be a clique of size k in G . For C , each vertex in C has the utility $k-1$. Since $v \in V$ has the utility $k-2$ in \mathcal{P} , C is a blocking coalition for \mathcal{P} . Conversely, let X be a blocking coalition for \mathcal{P} . Since vertices in $\bigcup_{v \in V(G)} P_v$ have maximum utility 1 in \mathcal{P} , they do not join X . Thus, X is a subset of $V(G)$. Since the utility of $v \in V(G)$ is $k-2$ in \mathcal{P} and $|X| = k$, X is a clique of size k . ◀

► **Theorem 24.** *Every graph admits a 2-core stable partition and 2-CORE STABILITY can be solved in polynomial time.*

Proof. Given a weighted graph (G, w) , start with the partition where every vertex is a singleton. Order the positive-weight edges in non-increasing order e_1, e_2, \dots, e_m . For each e_i , do the following: if the endpoint of e_i are currently singletons, merge them into a cluster of



■ **Figure 5** The graph \widehat{G} constructed in the proof of Theorem 25 for an instance of 3-colouring G consisting of a single edge. In the illustration edges of weight ρ are omitted. The core stable partition indicated by dot-dashed boxes corresponds to coloring the two vertices of G with two different colors.

size 2; otherwise move to the next edge. The resulting partition \mathcal{P} is 2-core stable because if there was a blocking coalition of size 2, it would have to induce an edge $e_i = uv$. However, when e_i is considered, at least one of u, v was not a singleton. Therefore, the utility of that vertex must be larger in \mathcal{P} than in the coalition $\{u, v\}$ contradicting the assumption that $\{u, v\}$ is a blocking coalition. ◀

▶ **Theorem 25.** (\star) For any fixed $k \geq 3$, k -CORE STABILITY is NP-complete on bounded degree graphs even if the weights are constant.

Proof. First observe that k -CS is in NP by Theorem 23.

We give a reduction from bounded degree 3-COLORING. Given a sub-cubic graph G we construct an instance $(\widehat{G}, \widehat{w})$ of 3-CS as follows. We let $\rho = -104$.

Vertex gadget

For every vertex $x \in V(G)$ we introduce vertices u_1^x, \dots, u_9^x and the following edges. First we add edges $u_1^x u_2^x, u_2^x u_3^x, u_3^x u_1^x$ of weight -5 , $u_i^x u_{i+3}^x$ of weight 14 for every $i \in \{1, 2, 3\}$, $u_4^x u_8^x, u_4^x u_9^x, u_5^x u_7^x, u_5^x u_9^x, u_6^x u_7^x, u_6^x u_8^x$ of weight 20 and finally $u_i u_{i+3}$ of weight 50 for every $i \in \{4, 5, 6\}$. For every pair $i \neq j \in [9]$ for which there is no edge yet, we add an edge $u_i^x u_j^x$ of weight ρ .

Edge gadget

For every edge $e = xy \in E(G)$ we introduce vertices v_1^e, v_2^e, v_3^e and add edges $v_1^e v_2^e, v_1^e v_3^e$ and $v_2^e v_3^e$ of weight ρ . We add edges $v_i^e u_i^x, v_i^e u_i^y$ of weight 5 for every $i \in [3]$. Furthermore, for every $e \in E(G)$ we add 3 copies $(H_1^e, w_1^e), (H_2^e, w_2^e), (H_3^e, w_3^e)$ of the graph (H, w_ρ) and let h_i^e be the vertex h in the copy H_i^e for every $i \in [3]$. We 9-neighborhood attach (H_i^e, w_i^e) at $\{v_i^e\}$.

Note that since G is sub-cubic the resulting graph has degree 14 . This concludes the construction of $(\widehat{G}, \widehat{w})$. For an illustration of the construction see Figure 5. We now argue that G is 3-colorable if and only if $(\widehat{G}, \widehat{w})$ admits a k -core stable partition.

First assume that G is 3-colorable and let $c : V(G) \rightarrow [3]$ be a proper 3-coloring of G . Recall that $\mathcal{P}_{(H_i^e, w_i^e)}$ is a core stable partition of $(H_i^e \setminus \{h_i^e\}, w_i^e|_{V(H_i^e \setminus \{h_i^e\})})$ defined in Section 4.1. Consider the following partition \mathcal{P} of $V(\widehat{G})$. For every vertex $x \in V(G)$ the partition \mathcal{P} contains sets $\{u_{6+c(x)}^x\}$, $\{u_{3+c(x)}^x, u_1^x, u_2^x, u_3^x\}$ and $\{u_{3+i}^x, u_{6+i}^x\}$ for $i \in [3]$, $i \neq c(x)$. For every edge $e \in E(G)$ the partition \mathcal{P} contains set $\{h_i^e, v_i^e\}$ and \mathcal{P} contains $\mathcal{P}_{(H_i^e, w_i^e)}$ for every $i \in [3]$. For an illustration of the partition \mathcal{P} see Figure 5.

We now argue that \mathcal{P} is k -core stable. Note that it is sufficient to argue that there is no blocking coalition X such that $|X| \leq k$ and $\widehat{G}(X)$ is connected. Since every vertex $u \in V(\widehat{G})$ has positive utility in \mathcal{P} we can further assume that $|X| \geq 2$. We proceed by contradiction and assume that X is a blocking coalition such that $2 \leq |X| \leq k$. Without loss of generality we can assume that $\widehat{G}[X]$ is connected.

We now argue that for every vertex $u \in V(\widehat{G})$ that $u \notin X$. We first argue that for every $x \in V(G)$ the set $\{u_1^x, u_2^x, u_3^x\} \not\subset X$. For this note that two vertices from each set $\{u_1^x, u_2^x, u_3^x\}$ have utility 10 in \mathcal{P} . Since by construction only at most one vertex from $\{u_4^x, u_5^x, u_6^x\}$ can be in X , the utility of every vertex in $\{u_1^x, u_2^x, u_3^x\}$ can be at most 15 . Additionally, by construction only one vertex from $\{v_1^e, v_2^e, v_3^e\}$ for every edge $e \in E(G)$ can be contained in X . This implies that the utility of at most one vertex in $\{u_1^x, u_2^x, u_3^x\}$ can be 15 in X and the utility of the other two is at most 10 . Hence, only at most one vertex of the two vertices in $\{u_1^x, u_2^x, u_3^x\}$ of utility 10 in \mathcal{P} can improve its utility by joining X and therefore $\{u_1^x, u_2^x, u_3^x\} \not\subset X$. Now, observe that for every $x \in V(G)$ the vertex u_{6+i}^x for $i \in [3]$, $i \neq c(x)$ cannot be contained in X as it has maximum utility in \mathcal{P} . This implies that vertex $u = u_{3+i}^x$ for $x \in V(G)$, $i \in [3]$, $i \neq c(x)$ cannot be in X as it has utility 50 in \mathcal{P} and u could have utility at most 40 in X as $\{u_1^x, u_2^x, u_3^x\} \not\subset X$ and $u_{6+i}^x \notin X$. Furthermore, if $u = u_{3+c(x)}^x \in X$ for some $x \in V(G)$, then $u_{6+c(x)}^x \in X$ as this is the only neighbor of u with an edge to u of positive weight, which is not contained in the same part of \mathcal{P} as u . But then either $u_1^x \in X$, $u_2^x \in X$ or $u_3^x \in X$ to obtain a utility of $u_{3+c(x)}^x$ larger than 54 . But this is a contradiction as $u_{6+c(x)}^x u_i^x$ for $i \in [3]$ has weight ρ . Hence $u_{3+c(x)}^x \notin X$ for every $x \in V(G)$. This implies that also $u_{6+c(x)}^x \notin X$. Next observe that for every $x \in V(G)$ the vertices u_i^x for $i \in [3]$, $i \neq c(x)$ have utility 10 in \mathcal{P} and only one positive weighted edge of weight 5 which is not incident to any vertex which still potentially could be contained in X . Hence, $u_i^x \notin X$ for any $x \in V(G)$,

$i \in [3]$, $i \neq c(x)$. Additionally, by Lemma 11 property (Π3) X cannot contain any vertex from $V(H_i^e)$ for every $e \in E(G)$, $i \in [3]$.

In conclusion, we have argued that $X \subseteq \{v_i^e : e \in E(G), i \in [3]\} \cup \{u_{c(x)}^x : x \in V(G)\}$. Observe that by our assumption that X is connected and because $|X| \geq 2$ we get that there must be $e = xy \in E(G)$, $i \in [3]$ such that $v_i^e \in X$. Because v_i^e has utility 9 in \mathcal{P} this implies that $u_{c(x)}^x \in X$ and $u_{c(y)}^y \in X$. But then by construction of \widehat{G} we have that $c(x) = c(y)$ which is a contradiction to c being a proper coloring. Hence, $(\widehat{G}, \widehat{w})$ is a YES-instance of k -CS.

Now assume that \widehat{G} is k -core stable and let \mathcal{P} be a k -core stable partition of \widehat{G} . Without loss of generality we assume that $\widehat{G}[P]$ is connected for every set $P \in \mathcal{P}$. The following claim will be the key step for defining a proper coloring of G .

► **Claim 26.** *For every vertex $x \in V(G)$ there is $j_x \in [3]$ such that vertex $u_{j_x}^x$ has utility at most 4 in \mathcal{P} .*

Proof. Let $x \in V(G)$ be arbitrary. First note that for every edge $e \in E(G)$ and every $i \in [3]$ the set $\{v_i^e, h_i^e\} \in \mathcal{P}$ by Lemma 11. Combining this with the assumption that $\widehat{G}[P]$ is connected for every $p \in \mathcal{P}$ we obtain that every $P \in \mathcal{P}$ containing a vertex u_i^x , $i \in [9]$ must be contained in $\{u_i^x : i \in [9]\}$. Hence, we let $\mathcal{P}^x \subseteq \mathcal{P}$ be the partition of $\{u_i^x : i \in [9]\}$ obtained by restricting \mathcal{P} to sets containing vertices u_i^x , $i \in [9]$. Note that \mathcal{P}^x must be k -core stable since any blocking coalition of \mathcal{P}^x is a blocking coalition of \mathcal{P} .

For $j \in [3]$ we let B_j be the set $\{u_{3+j}^x, u_1^x, u_2^x, u_3^x\}$. First observe that if $B_j \subseteq P$ for some $P \in \mathcal{P}^x$ then $B_j = P$ since otherwise $\widehat{G}[P]$ has to contain an edge of weight ρ implying that there is a blocking coalition of size $1 \leq k$. In case there is a $j \in [3]$ such that $B_j \in \mathcal{P}^x$ we choose j_x to be j and observe that this choice satisfies the requirements stated in the claim.

Now consider the case that there is no $j \in [3]$ for which $B_j \in \mathcal{P}^x$. First note that in this case for every $j \in [3]$ the set $\{u_{3+j}^x, u_{6+j}^x\}$ must be in \mathcal{P}^x . If this is not the case then $\{u_{6+j}^x\} \in \mathcal{P}^x$ can have utility at most 40 in \mathcal{P}^x by assumption that $B_j \notin \mathcal{P}^x$. But then $\{u_{3+j}^x, u_{6+j}^x\}$ is a blocking coalition of \mathcal{P}^x of size at most k which is a contradiction. This implies that for every $j \in [3]$ the utility of u_j^x can be at most 0 in \mathcal{P}^x . Hence we can choose $j_x \in [3]$ arbitrarily. ◀

We can now define a 3-coloring $c : V(G) \rightarrow [3]$ of G . For every vertex $x \in V(G)$ we let $j_x \in [3]$ as in Claim 26 and set $c(x) := j_x$. First note that by Lemma 11 v_i^e has utility 9 in \mathcal{P} for every edge $e \in E(G)$, $i \in [3]$. Additionally, if there is an edge $e = xy \in E(G)$ for which $j := j_x = c(x) = c(y) = j_y$ then both u_j^x and u_j^y have utility at most 4 in \mathcal{P} by Claim 26. But then $\{u_j^x, u_j^y, v_j^e\}$ is a blocking coalition of \mathcal{P} of size at most k . Hence the coloring c is proper and G is a YES-instance of 3-COLORING. ◀

6 Conclusion

The general tenor of our results indicates that core stability is an algorithmically highly intractable notion: even for very restricted input structures, obtaining efficient algorithms seems out of reach; and even for the few cases where positive fixed-parameter tractability results can be obtained, complexity lower bounds still push the parameter dependence to prohibitive levels. Despite the above, we believe that a promising avenue for further research may be the further investigation of k -core stability. Even though we have shown that parameterizing the problem by k alone does not help, it would be interesting to ask whether parameterizing at the same time by both k and a structural parameter (such as

treewidth) could help us evade the lower bounds that apply to each case individually. Finally, investigating the parameterized complexity of core stability in other variants of hedonic games such as fractional hedonic games [2, 29, 21] is another promising direction.

References

- 1 Alessandro Aloisio, Michele Flammini, and Cosimo Vinci. The impact of selfishness in hypergraph hedonic games. In *The Thirty-Fourth AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence, AAAI 2020, The Thirty-Second Innovative Applications of Artificial Intelligence Conference, IAAI 2020, The Tenth AAAI Symposium on Educational Advances in Artificial Intelligence, EAAI 2020, New York, NY, USA, February 7-12, 2020*, pages 1766–1773. AAAI Press, 2020. URL: <https://aaai.org/ojs/index.php/AAAI/article/view/5542>.
- 2 Haris Aziz, Florian Brandl, Felix Brandt, Paul Harrenstein, Martin Olsen, and Dominik Peters. Fractional hedonic games. *ACM Trans. Economics and Comput.*, 7(2):6:1–6:29, 2019. doi:10.1145/3327970.
- 3 Haris Aziz, Felix Brandt, and Hans Georg Seedig. Computing desirable partitions in additively separable hedonic games. *Artif. Intell.*, 195:316–334, 2013. doi:10.1016/j.artint.2012.09.006.
- 4 Haris Aziz and Rahul Savani. Hedonic games. In *Handbook of Computational Social Choice*, pages 356–376. Cambridge University Press, 2016.
- 5 Coralio Ballester. NP-completeness in hedonic games. *Games Econ. Behav.*, 49(1):1–30, 2004.
- 6 Nathanaël Barrot, Kazunori Ota, Yuko Sakurai, and Makoto Yokoo. Unknown agents in friends oriented hedonic games: Stability and complexity. In *The Thirty-Third AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence, AAAI 2019, The Thirty-First Innovative Applications of Artificial Intelligence Conference, IAAI 2019, The Ninth AAAI Symposium on Educational Advances in Artificial Intelligence, EAAI 2019, Honolulu, Hawaii, USA, January 27 - February 1, 2019*, pages 1756–1763. AAAI Press, 2019. doi:10.1609/aaai.v33i01.33011756.
- 7 Nathanaël Barrot and Makoto Yokoo. Stable and envy-free partitions in hedonic games. In Sarit Kraus, editor, *Proceedings of the Twenty-Eighth International Joint Conference on Artificial Intelligence, IJCAI 2019, Macao, China, August 10-16, 2019*, pages 67–73. ijcai.org, 2019. doi:10.24963/ijcai.2019/10.
- 8 Piotr Berman, Marek Karpinski, Lawrence L Larmore, Wojciech Plandowski, and Wojciech Rytter. On the complexity of pattern matching for highly compressed two-dimensional texts. In *Combinatorial Pattern Matching: 8th Annual Symposium, CPM 97 Aarhus, Denmark, June 30–July 2, 1997 Proceedings 8*, pages 40–51. Springer, 1997.
- 9 Niclas Boehmer and Edith Elkind. Individual-based stability in hedonic diversity games. In *The Thirty-Fourth AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence, AAAI 2020, The Thirty-Second Innovative Applications of Artificial Intelligence Conference, IAAI 2020, The Tenth AAAI Symposium on Educational Advances in Artificial Intelligence, EAAI 2020, New York, NY, USA, February 7-12, 2020*, pages 1822–1829. AAAI Press, 2020. URL: <https://aaai.org/ojs/index.php/AAAI/article/view/5549>.
- 10 Felix Brandt, Martin Bullinger, and Anaëlle Wilczynski. Reaching individually stable coalition structures in hedonic games. In *Thirty-Fifth AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence, AAAI 2021, Thirty-Third Conference on Innovative Applications of Artificial Intelligence, IAAI 2021, The Eleventh Symposium on Educational Advances in Artificial Intelligence, EAAI 2021, Virtual Event, February 2-9, 2021*, pages 5211–5218. AAAI Press, 2021. URL: <https://ojs.aaai.org/index.php/AAAI/article/view/16658>.
- 11 Martin Bullinger and Stefan Kober. Loyalty in cardinal hedonic games. In Zhi-Hua Zhou, editor, *Proceedings of the Thirtieth International Joint Conference on Artificial Intelligence, IJCAI 2021, Virtual Event / Montreal, Canada, 19-27 August 2021*, pages 66–72. ijcai.org, 2021. doi:10.24963/ijcai.2021/10.

- 12 Katarína Cechlárová. Stable partition problem. In *Encyclopedia of Algorithms*, pages 2075–2078. Springer, 2016.
- 13 Hubie Chen. Quantified constraint satisfaction and bounded treewidth. In Ramón López de Mántaras and Lorenza Saitta, editors, *Proceedings of the 16th European Conference on Artificial Intelligence, ECAI'2004, including Prestigious Applicants of Intelligent Systems, PAIS 2004, Valencia, Spain, August 22-27, 2004*, pages 161–165. IOS Press, 2004.
- 14 Jianer Chen, Iyad A. Kanj, and Ge Xia. Improved upper bounds for vertex cover. *Theor. Comput. Sci.*, 411(40-42):3736–3756, 2010. doi:10.1016/j.tcs.2010.06.026.
- 15 Jiehua Chen, Gergely Csáji, Sanjukta Roy, and Sofia Simola. Hedonic games with friends, enemies, and neutrals: Resolving open questions and fine-grained complexity. In Noa Agmon, Bo An, Alessandro Ricci, and William Yeoh, editors, *Proceedings of the 2023 International Conference on Autonomous Agents and Multiagent Systems, AAMAS 2023, London, United Kingdom, 29 May 2023 - 2 June 2023*, pages 251–259. ACM, 2023. URL: <https://dl.acm.org/doi/10.5555/3545946.3598644>, doi:10.5555/3545946.3598644.
- 16 Marek Cygan, Fedor V. Fomin, Lukasz Kowalik, Daniel Lokshantov, Dániel Marx, Marcin Pilipczuk, Michal Pilipczuk, and Saket Saurabh. *Parameterized Algorithms*. Springer, 2015. doi:10.1007/978-3-319-21275-3.
- 17 Andreas Darmann, Edith Elkind, Sascha Kurz, Jérôme Lang, Joachim Schauer, and Gerhard J. Woeginger. Group activity selection problem with approval preferences. *Int. J. Game Theory*, 47(3):767–796, 2018. doi:10.1007/s00182-017-0596-4.
- 18 Pål Grønås Drange, Markus S. Dregi, and Pim van 't Hof. On the computational complexity of vertex integrity and component order connectivity. *Algorithmica*, 76(4):1181–1202, 2016. doi:10.1007/s00453-016-0127-x.
- 19 Friedrich Eisenbrand and Robert Weismantel. Proximity results and faster algorithms for integer programming using the steinitz lemma. *ACM Trans. Algorithms*, 16(1):5:1–5:14, 2020. doi:10.1145/3340322.
- 20 Edith Elkind, Angelo Fanelli, and Michele Flammini. Price of pareto optimality in hedonic games. *Artif. Intell.*, 288:103357, 2020.
- 21 Angelo Fanelli, Gianpiero Monaco, and Luca Moscardelli. Relaxed core stability in fractional hedonic games. In Zhi-Hua Zhou, editor, *Proceedings of the Thirtieth International Joint Conference on Artificial Intelligence, IJCAI 2021, Virtual Event / Montreal, Canada, 19-27 August 2021*, pages 182–188. ijcai.org, 2021. doi:10.24963/ijcai.2021/26.
- 22 Michele Flammini, Bojana Kodric, Gianpiero Monaco, and Qiang Zhang. Strategyproof mechanisms for additively separable and fractional hedonic games. *J. Artif. Intell. Res.*, 70:1253–1279, 2021.
- 23 Florent Foucaud, Esther Galby, Liana Khazaliya, Shaohua Li, Fionn Mc Inerney, Roohani Sharma, and Prafullkumar Tale. Tight (double) exponential bounds for np-complete problems: Treewidth and vertex cover parameterizations. *CoRR*, abs/2307.08149, 2023. arXiv:2307.08149, doi:10.48550/arXiv.2307.08149.
- 24 András Frank and Éva Tardos. An application of simultaneous diophantine approximation in combinatorial optimization. *Comb.*, 7(1):49–65, 1987. doi:10.1007/BF02579200.
- 25 Martin Gairing and Rahul Savani. Computing stable outcomes in symmetric additively separable hedonic games. *Math. Oper. Res.*, 44(3):1101–1121, 2019.
- 26 Robert Ganian, Fabian Klute, and Sebastian Ordyniak. On structural parameterizations of the bounded-degree vertex deletion problem. *Algorithmica*, 83(1):297–336, 2021. doi:10.1007/s00453-020-00758-8.
- 27 M. R. Garey and David S. Johnson. *Computers and Intractability: A Guide to the Theory of NP-Completeness*. W. H. Freeman, 1979.
- 28 Tatsuya Gima, Tesshu Hanaka, Masashi Kiyomi, Yasuaki Kobayashi, and Yota Otachi. Exploring the gap between treedepth and vertex cover through vertex integrity. *Theor. Comput. Sci.*, 918:60–76, 2022. doi:10.1016/j.tcs.2022.03.021.

- 29 Teshu Hanaka, Airi Ikeyama, and Hirotaka Ono. Maximizing utilitarian and egalitarian welfare of fractional hedonic games on tree-like graphs. In Weili Wu and Jianxiong Guo, editors, *Combinatorial Optimization and Applications - 17th International Conference, COCOA 2023, Hawaii, HI, USA, December 15-17, 2023, Proceedings, Part I*, volume 14461 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 392–405. Springer, 2023. doi:10.1007/978-3-031-49611-0\28.
- 30 Teshu Hanaka, Hironori Kiya, Yasuhide Maei, and Hirotaka Ono. Computational complexity of hedonic games on sparse graphs. In *PRIMA*, volume 11873 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 576–584. Springer, 2019.
- 31 Teshu Hanaka and Michael Lampis. Hedonic games and treewidth revisited. In Shiri Chechik, Gonzalo Navarro, Eva Rotenberg, and Grzegorz Herman, editors, *30th Annual European Symposium on Algorithms, ESA 2022, September 5-9, 2022, Berlin/Potsdam, Germany*, volume 244 of *LIPIcs*, pages 64:1–64:16. Schloss Dagstuhl - Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik, 2022. doi:10.4230/LIPIcs.ESA.2022.64.
- 32 Ayumi Igarashi, Kazunori Ota, Yuko Sakurai, and Makoto Yokoo. Robustness against agent failure in hedonic games. In Sarit Kraus, editor, *Proceedings of the Twenty-Eighth International Joint Conference on Artificial Intelligence, IJCAI 2019, Macao, China, August 10-16, 2019*, pages 364–370. ijcai.org, 2019. doi:10.24963/ijcai.2019/52.
- 33 Klaus Jansen, Stefan Kratsch, Dániel Marx, and Ildikó Schlotter. Bin packing with fixed number of bins revisited. *J. Comput. Syst. Sci.*, 79(1):39–49, 2013. doi:10.1016/j.jcss.2012.04.004.
- 34 Hendrik W. Lenstra Jr. Integer programming with a fixed number of variables. *Math. Oper. Res.*, 8(4):538–548, 1983. doi:10.1287/moor.8.4.538.
- 35 Ravi Kannan. Minkowski’s convex body theorem and integer programming. *Math. Oper. Res.*, 12(3):415–440, 1987. doi:10.1287/moor.12.3.415.
- 36 Michael Lampis, Stefan Mengel, and Valia Mitsou. QBF as an alternative to courcelle’s theorem. In Olaf Beyersdorff and Christoph M. Wintersteiger, editors, *Theory and Applications of Satisfiability Testing - SAT 2018 - 21st International Conference, SAT 2018, Held as Part of the Federated Logic Conference, FloC 2018, Oxford, UK, July 9-12, 2018, Proceedings*, volume 10929 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 235–252. Springer, 2018. doi:10.1007/978-3-319-94144-8\15.
- 37 Michael Lampis and Valia Mitsou. Treewidth with a quantifier alternation revisited. In Daniel Lokshtanov and Naomi Nishimura, editors, *12th International Symposium on Parameterized and Exact Computation, IPEC 2017, September 6-8, 2017, Vienna, Austria*, volume 89 of *LIPIcs*, pages 26:1–26:12. Schloss Dagstuhl - Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik, 2017. doi:10.4230/LIPIcs.IPEC.2017.26.
- 38 Michael Lampis and Valia Mitsou. Fine-grained meta-theorems for vertex integrity. In Hee-Kap Ahn and Kunihiko Sadakane, editors, *32nd International Symposium on Algorithms and Computation, ISAAC 2021, December 6-8, 2021, Fukuoka, Japan*, volume 212 of *LIPIcs*, pages 34:1–34:15. Schloss Dagstuhl - Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik, 2021. doi:10.4230/LIPIcs.ISAAC.2021.34.
- 39 Michael Lampis and Manolis Vasilakis. Structural parameterizations for two bounded degree problems revisited. In Inge Li Gørtz, Martin Farach-Colton, Simon J. Puglisi, and Grzegorz Herman, editors, *31st Annual European Symposium on Algorithms, ESA 2023, September 4-6, 2023, Amsterdam, The Netherlands*, volume 274 of *LIPIcs*, pages 77:1–77:16. Schloss Dagstuhl - Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik, 2023. doi:10.4230/LIPIcs.ESA.2023.77.
- 40 Dániel Marx and Valia Mitsou. Double-exponential and triple-exponential bounds for choosability problems parameterized by treewidth. In Ioannis Chatzigiannakis, Michael Mitzenmacher, Yuval Rabani, and Davide Sangiorgi, editors, *43rd International Colloquium on Automata, Languages, and Programming, ICALP 2016, July 11-15, 2016, Rome, Italy*, volume 55 of *LIPIcs*, pages 28:1–28:15. Schloss Dagstuhl - Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik, 2016. doi:10.4230/LIPIcs.ICALP.2016.28.
- 41 Kazunori Ohta, Nathanaël Barrot, Anisse Ismaili, Yuko Sakurai, and Makoto Yokoo. Core stability in hedonic games among friends and enemies: Impact of neutrals. In Carles Sierra,

- editor, *Proceedings of the Twenty-Sixth International Joint Conference on Artificial Intelligence, IJCAI 2017, Melbourne, Australia, August 19-25, 2017*, pages 359–365. ijcai.org, 2017. doi:10.24963/ijcai.2017/51.
- 42 Martin Olsen. Nash stability in additively separable hedonic games and community structures. *Theory Comput. Syst.*, 45(4):917–925, 2009.
- 43 Martin Olsen, Lars Bækgaard, and Torben Tambo. On non-trivial nash stable partitions in additive hedonic games with symmetric 0/1-utilities. *Inf. Process. Lett.*, 112(23):903–907, 2012.
- 44 Dominik Peters. Graphical hedonic games of bounded treewidth. In Dale Schuurmans and Michael P. Wellman, editors, *Proceedings of the Thirtieth AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence, February 12-17, 2016, Phoenix, Arizona, USA*, pages 586–593. AAAI Press, 2016. URL: <http://www.aaai.org/ocs/index.php/AAAI/AAAI16/paper/view/12400>.
- 45 Dominik Peters. Precise complexity of the core in dichotomous and additive hedonic games. In Jörg Rothe, editor, *Algorithmic Decision Theory - 5th International Conference, ADT 2017, Luxembourg, Luxembourg, October 25-27, 2017, Proceedings*, volume 10576 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 214–227. Springer, 2017. doi:10.1007/978-3-319-67504-6_15.
- 46 Walid Saad, Zhu Han, Tamer Basar, Mérouane Debbah, and Are Hjørungnes. Hedonic coalition formation for distributed task allocation among wireless agents. *IEEE Trans. Mob. Comput.*, 10(9):1327–1344, 2011. doi:10.1109/TMC.2010.242.
- 47 Jakub Sliwinski and Yair Zick. Learning hedonic games. In Carles Sierra, editor, *Proceedings of the Twenty-Sixth International Joint Conference on Artificial Intelligence, IJCAI 2017, Melbourne, Australia, August 19-25, 2017*, pages 2730–2736. ijcai.org, 2017. doi:10.24963/ijcai.2017/380.
- 48 Shao Chin Sung and Dinko Dimitrov. On core membership testing for hedonic coalition formation games. *Oper. Res. Lett.*, 35(2):155–158, 2007. doi:10.1016/j.orl.2006.03.011.
- 49 Shao Chin Sung and Dinko Dimitrov. Computational complexity in additive hedonic games. *Eur. J. Oper. Res.*, 203(3):635–639, 2010.
- 50 Gerhard J. Woeginger. A hardness result for core stability in additive hedonic games. *Math. Soc. Sci.*, 65(2):101–104, 2013. doi:10.1016/j.mathsocsci.2012.10.001.