

Tree decompositions meet induced matchings: beyond Max Weight Independent Set*

Paloma T. Lima

IT University of Copenhagen, Denmark
palt@itu.dk

Martin Milanič

FAMNIT and IAM,
University of Primorska, Slovenia
martin.milanic@upr.si

Peter Muršič

FAMNIT, University of Primorska, Slovenia
peter.mursic@famnit.upr.si

Karolina Okrasa

Warsaw University of Technology, Poland
karolina.okrasa@pw.edu.pl

Paweł Rzażewski

Warsaw University of Technology and
University of Warsaw, Poland
pawel.rzazewski@pw.edu.pl

Kenny Štorgel

Faculty of Information Studies and
FAMNIT, University of Primorska, Slovenia
kennystorgel.research@gmail.com

Abstract

For a tree decomposition \mathcal{T} of a graph G , by $\mu(\mathcal{T})$ we denote the size of a largest induced matching in G all of whose edges intersect one bag of \mathcal{T} . *Induced matching treewidth* of a graph G is the minimum value of $\mu(\mathcal{T})$ over all tree decompositions \mathcal{T} of G . Yolov [SODA 2018] proved that MAX WEIGHT INDEPENDENT SET can be solved in polynomial time for graphs of bounded induced matching treewidth.

In this paper we explore what other problems are tractable in such classes of graphs. As our main result, we give a polynomial-time algorithm for MIN WEIGHT FEEDBACK VERTEX SET. We also provide some positive results concerning packing induced subgraphs, which in particular imply a PTAS for the problem of finding a largest induced subgraph of bounded treewidth.

These results suggest that in graphs of bounded induced matching treewidth, one could find in polynomial time a maximum-weight induced subgraph of bounded treewidth satisfying a given CMSO₂ formula. We conjecture that such a result indeed holds and prove it for graphs of bounded *tree-independence number*, which form a rich and important family of subclasses of graphs of bounded induced matching treewidth.

We complement these algorithmic results with a number of complexity and structural results concerning induced matching treewidth.

*Lima is supported by the Independent Research Fund Denmark grant agreement number 2098-00012B. Milanič, Muršič, and Štorgel are supported in part by the Slovenian Research and Innovation Agency (Milanič: I0-0035, research program P1-0285 and research projects J1-3001, J1-3002, J1-3003, J1-4008, J1-4084, and N1-0102; Muršič: research project J1-4008; Štorgel: research program P1-0383 and research projects J1-3002 and J1-4008). Milanič is also supported in part by the research program CogniCom (0013103) at the University of Primorska. Okrasa is supported by the Polish National Science Centre grant no. 2021/41/N/ST6/01507. Rzażewski is supported by the European Research Council (ERC) under the European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme grant agreement number 948057.

Contents

1	Introduction	2
2	Overview of our results	5
2.1	Solving MAX WEIGHT INDUCED FOREST.	5
2.2	Independent packings of small subgraphs.	7
2.3	Solving (r, ψ) -MWIS for bounded tree-independence number.	9
2.4	Complexity of computing induced matching treewidth and bounds	9
3	Preliminaries	10
4	Solving MAX WEIGHT INDUCED FOREST	13
4.1	Proof of Lemma 4.1	14
4.2	Proof of Lemma 4.2	17
5	Packing independent induced subgraphs	21
5.1	Tree-independence number and induced matching treewidth of $G^\circ[\mathcal{H}]$	22
5.1.1	Algorithmic consequences	23
5.2	Tree-independence number and induced matching treewidth of graph powers . . .	24
5.2.1	Algorithmic consequences	26
6	Max Weight Induced Subgraph for graphs with bounded tree-independence number	27
6.1	CMSO ₂ : basic notions and properties	28
6.2	CMSO ₂ -definable subgraphs of graphs with small tree-independence number . . .	29
6.3	A generalization	32
6.4	Algorithmic applications and limitations	32
7	Complexity of computing induced matching treewidth and bounds	33
7.1	Remarks on complexity of computing induced matching treewidth	34
7.2	Induced matching treewidth in graphs with bounded degree	36
7.3	Two graph families with unbounded induced matching treewidth	38
8	Conclusion	39

1 Introduction

Structured graph decompositions and the corresponding graph width parameters have become one of the central tools for dealing with algorithmically hard graph problems. One of the best known and well-studied graph width parameters is *treewidth*, which was introduced independently by several groups of authors with various motivations [8, 16, 41, 64]. Roughly speaking, treewidth measures how similar the graph is to a tree. A graph G with small treewidth can be represented by a tree T whose every node holds a small subset (called *bag*) of vertices of $V(G)$, such that the connectivity properties of G are reflected in the local structure of T (and the bags). A tree decomposition \mathcal{T} consists of the tree T and a function that assigns a bag to each node of T , and the *width* of \mathcal{T} is the size of its largest bag minus 1 (this is by convention). The *treewidth* $\text{tw}(G)$ is the minimum width of a tree decomposition of G .

Having a tree decomposition of small width is excellent for algorithmic applications, as we can mimic the standard bottom-up dynamic programming on trees. For example, in order to solve MAX WEIGHT INDEPENDENT SET (MWIS), the dynamic programming table for each node of T should be indexed by all possible independent sets in the corresponding bag. Consequently, if each bag is *small*, say, its size is bounded by a constant k , the running time we obtain is $2^k \cdot (n + |V(T)|)^{\mathcal{O}(1)}$ where $n := |V(G)|$. As $|V(T)|$ can also be assumed to be polynomial in n , this yields a polynomial-time algorithm for MWIS when restricted to graphs of bounded treewidth.

Such an approach has found numerous applications in solving classic NP-hard problems on graphs with bounded treewidth; see the handbook by Cygan et al. [28, Section 7]. The richness of the family of problems that can be solved by a dynamic programming over a tree decomposition is witnessed by the celebrated meta-theorem by Courcelle [27]. It asserts that each problem expressible in *Counting Monadic Second Order Logic* (CMSO₂)¹ can be solved in polynomial time (actually, in linear time) for graphs of bounded treewidth.

An astute reader might notice a caveat in the results mentioned above: they assume that the input graph is given with a corresponding decomposition. This might be a serious obstacle, as computing an optimal tree decomposition is NP-hard [8, 18]. However, if treewidth is bounded by a constant, an optimal decomposition can be found in polynomial time [17, 47]. Actually, in the context discussed above even an approximation of an optimal decomposition is sufficient. Luckily, such approximation algorithms are known not only for treewidth [19, 45, 65], but also for other parameters discussed in the paper [29, 71]. Thus, we will implicitly assume that the instance graphs are always provided with a corresponding tree decomposition.

Let us go back to the MWIS problem, which serves as the starting point of our investigations. Notice that in the argument sketched above we do not really need the fact that the treewidth is bounded by a constant. Indeed, if the size of each bag is bounded by a *logarithmic function of n* , then the number of all independent sets in a single bag is bounded by $2^{\mathcal{O}(\log n)} = n^{\mathcal{O}(1)}$, i.e., by a polynomial, which still yields a polynomial-time algorithm for MWIS. This is one of the motivations to study classes of graphs with *logarithmic treewidth*, which has been a very active topic in structural graph theory in recent years [2, 21].

However, the crux of the algorithm above is not really the size of the bag, but the number of independent sets inside each bag. Consider, for example, the class of chordal graphs, i.e., graphs that do not contain an induced cycle with at least four vertices. Equivalently, these are graphs that admit a tree decomposition whose every bag is a clique. Even though these cliques can be arbitrarily large, they still contain very few (that is, polynomially many) independent sets and thus such a decomposition can be used to solve MWIS in polynomial time.

¹In this logic one can use vertex, edge, and (vertex or edge) set variables, check vertex-edge incidence, quantify over variables, and apply counting predicates modulo fixed integers. See Section 6 for a formal introduction.

This observation is heavily extended by the framework of *potential maximal cliques* by Boucitté and Todinca [23]. Essentially, there we work with an implicitly given tree decomposition whose every bag is promised to contain only a constant number of vertices from the optimal independent set. This approach allows us, for example, to solve MWIS and many related problems for graph classes with polynomially many minimal separators [23, 36]. With some care, it can also be used for other graph classes, e.g., graphs that exclude a fixed induced path [40, 51] or long induced cycles [3].

Another, more direct way of generalizing bounded-treewidth graphs and chordal graphs was suggested by Yolov [71] and later, independently, by Dallard, Milanič, and Štorgel [32]. We use the notation and terminology of Dallard et al. [32]. Given a tree decomposition \mathcal{T} of a graph G , by $\alpha(\mathcal{T})$ we denote the size of a largest independent set contained in a bag of \mathcal{T} . The *tree-independence number* of G , denoted by $\text{tree-}\alpha(G)$, is the minimum value of $\alpha(\mathcal{T})$ over all tree decompositions \mathcal{T} of G . Note that given a tree decomposition \mathcal{T} of G with $\alpha(\mathcal{T}) \leq k$, we can solve MWIS on G in time $n^{\mathcal{O}(k)}$, which is polynomial for constant k . Let us remark that we always have $\text{tree-}\alpha(G) \leq \text{tw}(G) + 1$ and if G is chordal, then $\text{tree-}\alpha(G) \leq 1$ (actually, the reverse implication also holds [32]). Tree-independence number proved to be a fruitful topic in recent years and attracted some attention, both with structural [1, 30] and algorithmic [29, 32] motivations.

In a recent manuscript, Dallard, Fomin, Golovach, Korhonen, and Milanič [29] showed that tree-independence number is in a sense the most general “natural” parameter of a tree decomposition whose boundedness yields a polynomial-time algorithm for MWIS. More precisely, let γ be any graph invariant satisfying $\gamma(G - v) \leq \gamma(G) \leq \gamma(G - v) + 1$ for any graph G and any $v \in V(G)$. For a tree decomposition \mathcal{T} of a graph G , define $\gamma(\mathcal{T})$ as the maximum value of $\gamma(B)$ taken over all subgraphs B induced by a single bag of \mathcal{T} . By $\gamma_{\text{tw}}(G)$ we denote the minimum value of $\gamma(\mathcal{T})$ over all tree decompositions \mathcal{T} of G .² Note that if $\gamma(G) = |V(G)| - 1$, then γ_{tw} is precisely treewidth, and if $\gamma(G)$ is the size of a largest independent set in G , then γ_{tw} is the tree-independence number. Dallard et al. [29] showed that for every invariant γ as above, either $\gamma_{\text{tw}}(G)$ is upper-bounded by a function of $\text{tree-}\alpha(G)$ (i.e., boundedness of $\gamma_{\text{tw}}(G)$ implies boundedness of $\text{tree-}\alpha(G)$), or MWIS remains NP-hard even for graphs G with constant $\gamma_{\text{tw}}(G)$.

Four years earlier, Yolov [71] (obviously unaware of the work of Dallard et al. [29]) had defined another, “stronger” parameter of a tree decomposition that can still be used to solve MWIS. Of course there is no contradiction here – Yolov’s parameter does not fall into the category of “natural” parameters considered by Dallard et al. In the original paper of Yolov [71], the parameter in question is called *minor-matching hypertree width* and is defined in a much more general setting of hypergraphs. As such a general definition is not relevant to our work, let us focus on the case of graphs; here we will call this parameter *induced matching treewidth*. For a tree decomposition \mathcal{T} of G , by $\mu(\mathcal{T})$ let us denote the size of a largest induced matching in G all of whose edges intersect a single bag of \mathcal{T} . Now, the induced matching treewidth of G , denoted by $\text{tree-}\mu(G)$, is the minimum value of $\mu(\mathcal{T})$ over all tree decompositions \mathcal{T} of G . Note that $\mu(\mathcal{T})$ does not depend only on subgraphs induced by single bags, as some edges of an induced matching defining $\mu(\mathcal{T})$ might have one endpoint outside the bag.

It follows immediately from the definitions that for every graph it holds that $\text{tree-}\mu(G) \leq \text{tree-}\alpha(G)$. On the other hand, boundedness of induced matching treewidth does not imply boundedness of tree-independence number: for a biclique $K_{n,n}$ with each part of size n we have $\text{tree-}\mu(K_{n,n}) = 1$ but, as observed by Dallard et al. [32], $\text{tree-}\alpha(K_{n,n}) = n$. Thus indeed, induced matching treewidth is a “stronger” parameter.

²While not immediately relevant for our paper, it may be worth mentioning that such tree decomposition based parameters can also be defined and studied in the more general context of hypergraphs (see [5, 53, 71]).

It is also important to note that the families of graph classes with bounded induced matching treewidth and classes of graphs with polynomially many minimal separators are incomparable. For example, the class of all graphs G_k consisting of k internally disjoint paths of length three with the same endpoints has bounded treewidth and hence bounded induced matching treewidth, but graphs in the class have exponentially many minimal separators (it is not difficult to see that the graph G_k has at least 2^k minimal separators). On the other hand, P_4 -free graphs have a polynomial number of minimal separators (see [57]) but unbounded induced matching treewidth. This follows from a construction that we will present later in the paper, in Proposition 7.10.

At first it is not clear why boundedness of induced matching treewidth is helpful in solving MWIS. However, the following structural result by Yolov [71] is the key to understanding the connection between these two notions. Let \mathcal{T} be a tree decomposition of G with $\mu(\mathcal{T}) \leq k$. Then, for any node t of \mathcal{T} , in time $n^{\mathcal{O}(k)}$ we can enumerate a family \mathbb{I}_t such that for any inclusion-wise maximal independent set I of G , the intersection of I with the bag associated with t is in \mathbb{I}_t . Since every *maximum* independent set is in particular *maximal*, this immediately implies that the number of ways an optimal solution might intersect each bag of \mathcal{T} is polynomial in n , if k is a constant. Using also the fact that given a graph with induced matching treewidth at most k , in polynomial time we can compute a tree decomposition such that $\mu(\mathcal{T}) = \mathcal{O}(k)$ (see Theorem 3.3 in Section 3), we obtain the following algorithmic result as a consequence.

Theorem 1.1. *For every fixed k , the MWIS problem on n -vertex graphs G with $\text{tree-}\mu(G) \leq k$ can be solved in time $n^{\mathcal{O}(k)}$.*

The tools developed by Yolov [71] can also be used to solve other problems that boil down to finding a constant number of (maximal) independent sets, like r -COLORING or finding a homomorphism to a fixed target graph. Even though this was not stated explicitly in [71], one can also obtain a polynomial-time algorithm for the problem of finding a largest induced r -colorable subgraph. For $r = 2$ this problem is equivalent (by taking the complement of the solution) to MIN ODD CYCLE TRANSVERSAL.

The main goal of this paper is to explore what other problems that do not fall into the above category can be solved in polynomial time in classes of bounded induced matching treewidth. Recall that for bounded-treewidth graphs, a rich family of tractable problems is provided by the meta-theorem of Courcelle [27]. For graphs G with polynomially many minimal separators, where the framework of potential maximal cliques can be applied, a somewhat similar general result is provided by Fomin, Todinca, and Villanger [36]. For fixed integer r and fixed CMSO₂ formula ψ , by (r, ψ) -MWIS we denote the following computational problem (here “MWIS” stands for MAX WEIGHT INDUCED SUBGRAPH).

(r, ψ) -MWIS

Input: A graph G equipped with a weight function $\mathfrak{w} : V(G) \rightarrow \mathbb{Q}_+$.

Task: Find a set $F \subseteq V(G)$, such that

- $G[F] \models \psi$,
- $\text{tw}(G[F]) \leq r$,
- F is of maximum weight subject to the conditions above,

or conclude that no such set exists.

Fomin, Todinca, and Villanger [36] proved that for each fixed r and ψ , the (r, ψ) -MWIS problem can be solved in time polynomial in the size of the input graph G and the number of

minimal separators in G . Thus the running time is polynomial when restricted to classes of graphs with polynomial number of minimal separators.

Algorithms for (r, ψ) -MWIS are also known for graphs excluding a fixed induced path, or graphs excluding long induced cycles [3, 37]. We conjecture that (r, ψ) -MWIS can also be solved in polynomial time for graphs of bounded induced matching treewidth.

Conjecture 1.2. *For every fixed k, r and a CMSO₂ formula ψ , the (r, ψ) -MWIS problem can be solved in polynomial time for graphs with induced matching treewidth at most k .*

Even though we are not (yet) able to prove Conjecture 1.2, we provide some substantial evidence by approaching it from three different directions.

2 Overview of our results

The paper contains three main algorithmic contributions, as well as an initial set of results regarding induced matching treewidth, including computational results and bounds. We give an overview of these four sets of results and their implications in the following subsections.

2.1 Solving MAX WEIGHT INDUCED FOREST.

As our first and main result, we show that in graphs of bounded induced matching treewidth, one can in polynomial time find an induced forest of maximum possible weight.

Theorem 2.1. *For every fixed k , the MAX WEIGHT INDUCED FOREST problem on n -vertex graphs G with $\text{tree-}\mu(G) \leq k$ can be solved in time $n^{\mathcal{O}(k)}$.*

Note that MAX WEIGHT INDUCED FOREST is equivalent to finding a maximum-weight induced subgraph of treewidth at most 1, i.e., is a special case of (r, ψ) -MWIS for $r = 1$ and ψ being any formula satisfied by all graphs. Furthermore, by complementation, MAX WEIGHT INDUCED FOREST is equivalent to the well-studied MIN WEIGHT FEEDBACK VERTEX SET problem.

Before sketching the proof of Theorem 2.1, let us recall the textbook algorithm for MAX WEIGHT INDUCED FOREST for graphs of bounded treewidth (see [28]). Let \mathcal{T} be a tree decomposition of the instance graph, t be a node of \mathcal{T} , and X_t be the bag corresponding to t . For each set $Z \subseteq X_t$ and each partition π of Z , we keep the maximum weight of an induced forest F contained in the subgraph of G induced by the bags of the subtree of \mathcal{T} rooted at t , such that:

- the intersection of $V(F)$ with X_t is exactly Z , and
- the partition π corresponds to the connected components of F .

For any induced forest F in G , we call a pair (Z, π) as above the *signature of F at t* . Now, processing \mathcal{T} in a bottom-up fashion, we can find a maximum-weight induced forest in G using the information stored for each node.

The key insight leading to the proof of Theorem 2.1 is the following structural lemma.

Lemma 2.2 (Simplified statement of Lemma 4.1). *Let k be a fixed integer. For an n -vertex graph G , a tree decomposition \mathcal{T} of G with $\mu(\mathcal{T}) \leq k$, and a node t of \mathcal{T} , in time $n^{\mathcal{O}(k)}$ we can enumerate a set \mathbb{F}_t that contains the signature at t of every maximal induced forest in G .*

Recall that an analogous result for MWIS was shown by Yolov [71]: for each bag X_t corresponding to a node t of a tree decomposition \mathcal{T} of bounded $\mu(\mathcal{T})$, in polynomial time we

can enumerate a family \mathbb{I}_t that contains an intersection of each maximal independent set in G with X_t .

As every maximum induced forest is in particular inclusion-wise maximal, Lemma 2.2 allows us to solve MAX WEIGHT INDUCED FOREST by essentially mimicking the textbook algorithm for bounded-treewidth graphs. We just need to find the set \mathbb{F}_t for each node t of \mathcal{T} , and instead of indexing the dynamic programming table by *all* possible pairs (Z, π) , we use just the pairs that are in \mathbb{F}_t .

So let us describe the proof of Lemma 2.2. Let F be a maximal induced forest in G ; we think of it as an (unknown) optimal solution. Consider a node t of \mathcal{T} and its corresponding bag X_t . The difficulty that we need to face is that the intersection of F with X_t might be arbitrarily large; for example, a component of F might be a large induced star contained in X_t . Thus we need to find some compact way to encode such possible intersections.

Let $\mathfrak{Q}(F)$ be the *skeleton of F* , i.e., the set of vertices of degree at least two in F together with an arbitrary but fixed vertex v_C of each two-vertex component C of F . By $L(F)$ and $T(F)$ we denote, respectively, the sets of vertices of degree 1 (*leaves*) and of degree 0 (*trivial* vertices) of F , with the exception that for each two-vertex component C of F we include in $L(F)$ exactly one vertex from C , namely the vertex of C different from v_C . Clearly, the sets $\mathfrak{Q}(F), L(F), T(F)$ form a partition of the vertex set of F .

The first important observation is that the set $S := \mathfrak{Q}(F) \cap X_t$ is of size bounded by a function of k . Indeed, if S was too large, we could easily extract from F an induced matching whose every edge intersects the bag. Thus we can directly enumerate all candidates for $\mathfrak{Q}(F) \cap X_t$.

So we are left with finding an encoding of the set $(L(F) \cup T(F)) \cap X_t$. Observe that $\mathfrak{L}(F) := L(F) \cup T(F)$ is an independent set in G . However, this is not very useful, as $L(F) \cup T(F)$ does not have to be maximal and we only have some information about the intersections of maximal independent sets with X_t (they have to be in \mathbb{I}_t , which is of polynomial size). Let $I^*(F)$ be some maximal independent set of G containing $\mathfrak{L}(F)$; we know that its intersection I with X_t can only be chosen in a polynomial number of ways. However, I contains some vertices that are not in the solution (called *impostors*) and we should not consider their weight when choosing an optimal solution. Why does a vertex $v \in I$ not belong to $\mathfrak{L}(F)$? As F is a maximal forest, there are two possible reasons why v is an impostor:

- $v \in \mathfrak{Q}(F)$, or
- adding v to F would create a cycle.

Note that the vertices of the first type can be easily recognized as $S = \mathfrak{Q}(F) \cap X_t$ is directly represented. On the other hand, each vertex of the second type is adjacent to at least two vertices from some connected component of F . Furthermore, we know that these two vertices are in $\mathfrak{Q}(F)$, as $\mathfrak{L}(F) \cup \{v\} \subseteq I^*(F)$ and $I^*(F)$ is independent. If these two neighbors of v in $\mathfrak{Q}(F)$ are in X_t , we are done, as we can guess the set $S = \mathfrak{Q}(F) \cap X_t$. However, the neighbors may lie outside the bag X_t .

Summing up, the type of a vertex $v \in I \setminus S$ (which may or may not belong to $\mathfrak{L}(F)$) is determined by its neighborhood in $\widehat{S} := \mathfrak{Q}(F) \cap N[X_t]$, where by $N[X_t]$ we denote the set consisting of the vertices from X_t and their neighbors. If v has no neighbors in \widehat{S} , then v is trivial, i.e., $v \in T(F)$. If v has one neighbor in \widehat{S} , then v is a leaf, i.e., $v \in L(F)$. Finally, if v has at least two neighbors in \widehat{S} , then v is an impostor, i.e., $v \in I \setminus \mathfrak{L}(F)$. If we could store the information about the set \widehat{S} explicitly, we could easily distinguish between these three types of vertices. Unfortunately, the set \widehat{S} might still be arbitrarily large. So we need to make one more step: we observe that an inclusion-wise minimal subset Q of \widehat{S} that still can distinguish between the three types of vertices in $I \setminus S$ is of size bounded by a function of k , as otherwise we could

again extract from F a large induced matching whose every edge intersects X_t . Thus we can guess every candidate for Q .

From the argument above it follows that the triple (S, I, Q) can be exhaustively guessed in a polynomial number of ways. Furthermore, thanks to the properties of Q , we can uniquely extract $L(F) \cap X_t$ and $T(F) \cap X_t$ from I . This way we can compute Z , i.e., the intersection of F with X_t .

In order to obtain π , we can exhaustively guess the partition $\hat{\pi}$ of $S \cup Q$ that corresponds to the components of F restricted to the subgraph of G induced by the bags in the subtree rooted at t . Here we use the fact that the size of $S \cup Q$ is bounded by a function of k , i.e., a constant. From $\hat{\pi}$ we can uniquely reconstruct π , as each vertex in $L(F) \cap X_t$ has a neighbor in $S \cup Q$, and each vertex in $T(F)$ forms a separate component. This completes the sketch of proof of Lemma 2.2.

2.2 Independent packings of small subgraphs.

Let $\mathcal{H} = \{H_j\}_{j \in J}$ be a family of connected subgraphs of a graph G . By $G^\circ[\mathcal{H}]$ we denote the graph with vertex set J , where two distinct vertices $j, j' \in J$ are adjacent if H_j and $H_{j'}$ have a vertex in common or there is an edge with one endpoint in H_j and the other in $H_{j'}$.³ Such a construction was considered by Cameron and Hell in [25], who focused on the particular case when \mathcal{H} is the set of all subgraphs of G isomorphic to a member of a fixed family \mathcal{F} of connected graphs; they showed that if G is a chordal graph, then so is $G^\circ[\mathcal{H}]$. Dallard et al. [32] generalized this result by showing that $\text{tree-}\alpha(G^\circ[\mathcal{H}]) \leq \text{tree-}\alpha(G)$. Other graph classes closed under taking $G^\circ[\mathcal{H}]$ are classes of graphs excluding long induced paths or long induced cycles; see Gartland et al. [38]. We show that an analogous statement holds for graphs with bounded induced matching treewidth.

Lemma 2.3 (A part of the statement of Lemma 5.3). *Let G be a graph and let \mathcal{H} be a set of connected non-null subgraphs of G . Then $\text{tree-}\mu(G^\circ[\mathcal{H}]) \leq \text{tree-}\mu(G)$.*

Lemma 2.3 yields several algorithmic corollaries. First, notice that the MWIS problem on $G^\circ[\mathcal{H}]$ (with some weight function defined on J) corresponds to the problem of packing pairwise disjoint and nonadjacent graphs from \mathcal{H} , called MAX WEIGHT INDEPENDENT PACKING. Thus, combining Lemma 5.3 with Theorem 1.1, we show that MAX WEIGHT INDEPENDENT PACKING in classes of bounded induced matching treewidth can be solved in time polynomial in the size of G and \mathcal{H} . When \mathcal{H} is the set of all subgraphs of G isomorphic to a member of a fixed family \mathcal{F} of connected graphs, then MAX WEIGHT INDEPENDENT PACKING coincides with the MAX WEIGHT INDEPENDENT \mathcal{F} -PACKING problem studied in Dallard et al. [32]. This latter problem in turn generalizes several problems studied in the literature:

- the MWIS problem, which corresponds to the case $\mathcal{F} = \{K_1\}$,
- the MAX WEIGHT INDUCED MATCHING problem (see, e.g., [6, 60]), which corresponds to the case $\mathcal{F} = \{K_2\}$,
- the DISSOCIATION SET problem (see, e.g., [58, 70, 72]), which corresponds to the case when $\mathcal{F} = \{K_1, K_2\}$ and the weight function assigns to each subgraph H_j the weight equal to $|V(H_j)|$,
- the k -SEPARATOR problem (see, e.g., [11, 48, 49]), which corresponds to the case when \mathcal{F} contains all connected graphs with at most k vertices, the graph G is equipped with a

³This extends the notation G° used in [37] for the graph $G^\circ[\mathcal{H}]$ in the particular case when \mathcal{H} is the set of all non-null connected subgraphs of G .

vertex weight function $\mathfrak{w} : V(G) \rightarrow \mathbb{Q}_+$, and the weight function on \mathcal{H} assigns to each subgraph H_j the weight equal to $\sum_{x \in V(H_j)} \mathfrak{w}(x)$.

Observe that MAX WEIGHT INDUCED FOREST for a weighted graph G is equivalent to MAX WEIGHT INDEPENDENT PACKING for an instance G, \mathcal{H} (and \mathfrak{w}), where \mathcal{H} consists of all induced subtrees of G (and the weight of H_j is the total weight of the vertices in H_j). Despite that, we note that the combination of Lemma 2.3 and Theorem 1.1 cannot be used to solve MAX WEIGHT INDUCED FOREST in polynomial time. Indeed, the size of \mathcal{H} is not bounded by a polynomial function of $|V(G)|$.

However, Lemma 2.3 might still be of use in this context. As already observed by Gartland et al. [38], we can sacrifice a small part of the optimal solution to break it into constant-size parts, which can then be handled efficiently. Indeed, for each $\epsilon > 0$ and any forest F we can remove an ϵ -fraction of the vertices of F so that the remaining components are of constant size (where this constant depends on ϵ but not on F). This approach can be used to obtain a PTAS for MAX INDUCED FOREST (the unweighted variant of MAX WEIGHT INDUCED FOREST). Actually, this reasoning goes far beyond trees and can be used to pack large induced subgraphs from any *weakly hyperfinite* class; see Section 5 for the definition. In particular, we obtain the following result which provides further evidence for Conjecture 1.2.

Corollary 2.4. *For every fixed $k, r \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\epsilon > 0$, given a graph G with induced matching treewidth at most k , in polynomial time we can find a set $F \subseteq V(G)$ such that:*

1. $\text{tw}(G[F]) \leq r$,
2. *the size of F is at least $(1 - \epsilon)\text{OPT}$, where OPT is the size of a largest set satisfying the first condition.*

Note that the problem addressed in Corollary 2.4 is a special case of (r, ψ) -MWIS obtained by taking ψ to be any formula satisfied by all graphs and \mathfrak{w} to be a uniform weight function.

Next, we generalize the polynomial-time solvability of the MAX WEIGHT INDEPENDENT PACKING problem for graphs of bounded induced matching treewidth to MAX WEIGHT DISTANCE- d PACKING: the problem of packing subgraphs at distance d , for all even positive integers d . The case $d = 2$ is precisely MAX WEIGHT INDEPENDENT PACKING. We remark that unless $\text{P} = \text{NP}$, this result cannot be generalized to odd values of d , since (as shown by Eto, Guo, and Miyano [35]), the distance-3 variant of MAX INDEPENDENT SET problem is NP-hard for chordal graphs, which have induced matching treewidth (and even tree-independence number) at most one.

This extension again follows from a structural observation that may be of interest on its own. Given a graph G and a positive integer k , we denote by G^k the k -th power of G , that is, the graph obtained from the graph G by adding to it all edges between pairs of distinct vertices at distance at most k . We show that for any graph G and any positive integer k , the induced matching treewidth of the graph G^{k+2} cannot exceed that of the graph G^k , and the same relationship holds for the tree-independence number. This is a significant generalization of a result of Duchet [34], who proved an analogous result for graphs with tree-independence number at most one: if G^k is chordal, then so is G^{k+2} . As a consequence, we obtain that for every positive integer k , the class of graphs with induced matching treewidth (resp. tree-independence number) at most k is closed under taking odd powers, which generalizes the analogous result for the class of chordal graphs proved by Balakrishnan and Paulraja [9]. We complement these results by observing that the class of even powers of chordal graphs (for any fixed power) is not contained in any nontrivial hereditary graph class. This implies in particular that any such class has unbounded tree-independence number and induced matching treewidth.

2.3 Solving (r, ψ) -MWIS for bounded tree-independence number.

Finally, we show that (r, ψ) -MWIS can be solved in polynomial time for graphs of bounded tree-independence number. As shown by Dallard et al. [30], many natural graph classes fall into this category. Furthermore, they all have bounded induced matching treewidth.

Actually, we show tractability of a more general problem, where instead of asking for a subgraph of bounded treewidth, we ask for a subgraph of clique number bounded by r ; let us call this variant $(\omega \leq r, \psi)$ -MWIS. We remark that $(\omega \leq r, \psi)$ -MWIS is a generalization of $(r - 1, \psi)$ -MWIS, as every graph of treewidth at most $r - 1$ has clique number at most r and the property of being of bounded treewidth can be expressed in CMSO_2 [38, Lemma 10]. On the other hand, there are natural classes of graphs of bounded clique number and unbounded treewidth, e.g., bipartite graphs or planar graphs. However, one can observe that for graphs of bounded tree-independence number, treewidth is upper-bounded by a function of the clique number (see [32]); this phenomenon is called (tw, ω) -*boundedness* in the literature (see, e.g., [31]). Thus we conclude that in classes of bounded tree-independence number, both $(\omega \leq r, \psi)$ -MWIS and (r, ψ) -MWIS formalisms describe the same family of problems.

Theorem 2.5 (Simplified statement of Theorem 6.3). *For every fixed k, r and a CMSO_2 formula ψ , the $(\omega \leq r, \psi)$ -MWIS for graphs with tree-independence number at most k can be solved in polynomial time.*

Some examples of problems that can be solved in polynomial time with this approach include:

- finding a largest induced planar subgraph (which is equivalent to PLANARIZATION [43, 61]),
- finding a largest induced odd cactus (which is equivalent to EVEN CYCLE TRANSVERSAL [12, 54, 59]),
- finding the maximum number of pairwise disjoint and non-adjacent cycles (for this problem we need a slightly stronger variant of Theorem 2.5 that is shown in Section 6).

We point out that the bound on the clique number of the sought-for subgraph must be constant. Indeed, the property of being a clique is easily expressible in CMSO_2 , but MAX CLIQUE is NP-hard for graphs with tree-independence number 2.

2.4 Complexity of computing induced matching treewidth and bounds

We observe that known relations between the induced matching treewidth the tree-independence number [71] together with known results on tree-independence number [29, 32] and independence number [73] imply several hardness results related to exact and approximate computation of the induced matching treewidth. In particular, for every constant $k \geq 4$, it is NP-complete to determine whether $\text{tree-}\mu(G) \leq k$ for a graph G (see Theorem 7.1 for the precise statement of the results). While the complexity of recognizing graphs with induced matching treewidth k for $k \in \{2, 3\}$ remains open, we then show that the problem is solvable in polynomial time for $k = 1$. To this end, we first prove that induced matching treewidth is monotone under induced minors, that is, it cannot decrease upon deleting a vertex or contracting an edge. Then, we use a characterization of graphs G such that the square of the line graph of G is chordal (see [67]) to characterize the class of graphs with induced matching treewidth at most 1 in terms of a finite family of forbidden induced minors. This characterization implies that the family of forbidden induced *subgraphs* for this class is very restricted, containing only finitely many graphs except for cycles of length at least 6, which immediately leads to a polynomial-time recognition algorithm.

We then consider the behavior of induced matching treewidth for graphs with bounded degree, in particular, its relation to tree-independence number and treewidth. While any graph class with unbounded induced matching treewidth is necessary of unbounded tree-independence number and hence of unbounded treewidth, it is known that the converse implications hold in the absence of a fixed complete bipartite graph as a subgraph (see p. 36 for details). In particular, for any class of graphs with bounded maximum degree, all the aforementioned parameters (induced matching treewidth, tree-independence number, and treewidth) are all equivalent to each other, in the sense that they are either all bounded or all unbounded. We strengthen this result by showing that for any class of graphs with bounded maximum degree, the three parameters are in fact linearly related to each other (see Theorem 7.6 and Corollary 7.7).

In conclusion, we consider two families of graphs with unbounded maximum degree. We give a lower bound on the induced matching treewidth of hypercube graphs and identify a family of P_4 -free graphs with unbounded induced matching treewidth.

Organization of the paper In Section 3, we provide the necessary preliminaries. In Section 4, we prove Theorem 2.1. In Section 5, we show Lemma 5.3 and discuss its algorithmic consequences, in particular, Corollary 2.4. In Section 6, we show Theorem 2.5 and its strengthened variant. In Section 7 we initiate a systematic study of induced matching treewidth, by showing several computational results and bounds. The paper is concluded with pointing out some directions for further research in Section 8.

3 Preliminaries

For an integer n , by $[n]$ we denote the set $\{1, \dots, n\}$. Let G be a graph. For a set $X \subseteq V(G)$, by $G[X]$ we denote the subgraph of G induced by X . If the graph G is clear from the context, we will identify induced subgraphs with their vertex sets.

For a vertex v of G , by $N(v)$ we denote the set of neighbors of v . For a set $X \subseteq V(G)$, by $N(X)$ we denote the set $(\bigcup_{v \in X} N(v)) \setminus X$, and by $N[X]$ we denote the set $N(X) \cup X$. For a vertex v of G , we write $N[v]$ for $N[\{v\}]$.

Let X, Y be disjoint subsets of $V(G)$. We say that they are *non-adjacent* if there is no edge with one endpoint in X and the other in Y . For $k \in \{1, 2\}$, the set Y *k-dominates* X if each vertex from X has at least k neighbors in Y .

A *clique* in a graph G is a set of pairwise adjacent vertices; an *independent set* is a set of pairwise non-adjacent vertices. The *clique number* and the *independence number* of G , denoted respectively by $\omega(G)$ and $\alpha(G)$, are defined as the maximum cardinality of a clique, resp. independent set, in G .

A *matching* in a graph G is a set M of pairwise disjoint edges. If, in addition, no two vertices from different edges in the matching M are adjacent, then the matching M is an *induced matching* in G . An edge *touches* a set $X \subseteq V(G)$ if it has at least one endpoint in X . A set M of edges *touches* X if every edge from M touches X .

The *distance* between two vertices u and v in G is denoted by $\text{dist}_G(u, v)$ and defined as the length of a shortest path between u and v (or ∞ if there is no u - v -path in G). Given a positive integer k , the *k-th power* of G is the graph G^k with vertex set $V(G)$, in which two distinct vertices u and v are adjacent if and only if $\text{dist}_G(u, v) \leq k$. Note that $G^1 = G$.

Let $\mathfrak{w}: V(G) \rightarrow \mathbb{Q}_+$ be a weight function. For a set $X \subseteq V(G)$, by $\mathfrak{w}(X)$ we denote $\sum_{v \in X} \mathfrak{w}(v)$. In particular, $\mathfrak{w}(\emptyset) = 0$.

Tree decompositions. A *tree decomposition* of a graph G is a pair $\mathcal{T} = (T, \{X_t\}_{t \in V(T)})$ where T is a tree and every node t of T is assigned a vertex subset $X_t \subseteq V(G)$ called a *bag* such

that the following conditions are satisfied: every vertex is in at least one bag, for every edge $uv \in E(G)$ there exists a node $t \in V(T)$ such that X_t contains both u and v , and for every vertex $u \in V(G)$ the subgraph of T induced by the set $\{t \in V(T) : u \in X_t\}$ is connected (that is, a tree).

Usually we consider tree decompositions to be rooted, and the root is denoted by $\text{root}(T)$. For a node t of T , by T_t we denote the subtree of T rooted at t , and by G_t we denote the subgraph of G induced by $V_t := \bigcup_{t' \in V(T_t)} X_{t'}$. A rooted tree decomposition $\mathcal{T} = (T, \{X_t\}_{t \in V(T)})$ of a graph G is *nice* if each node t is of one of the following types:

leaf a leaf in T such that $X_t = \emptyset$,

introduce an inner node with a single child t' such that $X_t = X_{t'} \cup \{v\}$ for some $v \in V(G) \setminus X_{t'}$,

forget an inner node with a single child t' such that $X_t = X_{t'} \setminus \{v\}$ for some $v \in X_{t'}$,

join an inner node with exactly two children t', t'' , such that $X_t = X_{t'} = X_{t''}$,

and $X_{\text{root}(T)} = \emptyset$. It is well known that given a tree decomposition $\mathcal{T} = (T, \{X_t\}_{t \in V(T)})$ of G , one can obtain in time $\mathcal{O}(|V(G)|^2 |V(T)|)$ a nice tree decomposition $\mathcal{T}' = (T', \{X'_t\}_{t \in V(T')})$ of G with at most $|V(G)| \cdot |V(T)|$ nodes and whose every bag is contained in some bag of \mathcal{T} (see, e.g., the textbook [28], or [32] for a treatment focused on the independence number).

Tree-independence number and induced matching treewidth. Consider a graph G and a tree decomposition $\mathcal{T} = (T, \{X_t\}_{t \in V(T)})$ of G . The *independence number* of \mathcal{T} , denoted by $\alpha_G(\mathcal{T})$, is defined as follows:

$$\alpha_G(\mathcal{T}) = \max_{t \in V(T)} \alpha(G[X_t]).$$

The *tree-independence number* of G , denoted by $\text{tree-}\alpha(G)$, is the minimum independence number among all possible tree decompositions of G . A graph G is chordal if and only if $\text{tree-}\alpha(G) \leq 1$ (see [32]).

Let again G be a graph and $\mathcal{T} = (T, \{X_t\}_{t \in V(T)})$ be its tree decomposition. Let

$$\mu_G(\mathcal{T}) = \max \{|M| : M \text{ is an induced matching in } G \text{ that touches a bag of } \mathcal{T}\}.$$

The *induced matching treewidth* of G , denoted by $\text{tree-}\mu(G)$, is the minimum value of $\mu_G(\mathcal{T})$ among all possible tree decompositions \mathcal{T} of G . Recall that every graph G satisfies $\text{tree-}\mu(G) \leq \text{tree-}\alpha(G)$.

Note that if \mathcal{T} and \mathcal{T}' are tree decompositions such that every bag of \mathcal{T}' is contained in some bag of \mathcal{T} (in particular, if \mathcal{T}' is a nice tree decomposition obtained from \mathcal{T}), then we have $\alpha_G(\mathcal{T}') \leq \alpha_G(\mathcal{T})$ and $\mu_G(\mathcal{T}') \leq \mu_G(\mathcal{T})$. If the graph G is clear from the context, we simply write $\alpha(\mathcal{T})$ and $\mu(\mathcal{T})$ for $\alpha_G(\mathcal{T})$ and $\mu_G(\mathcal{T})$, respectively.

We now recall two results by Yolov from [71], expressing each of these two parameters in terms of the value of the other parameter on a derived graph. Let $G = (V, E)$ be a graph. We denote by $L^2(G)$ the *square of the line graph* of G , that is, the graph with vertex set E in which two distinct vertices $e, f \in E$ are adjacent if and only if the subgraph of G induced by the endpoints of e and f is connected. Furthermore, by $G \odot K_1$ we denote the *corona* of G , that is, the graph obtained from G by adding a pendant edge to each vertex. Formally, $V(G \odot K_1) = V \cup V'$ where $V' = \{v' : v \in V\}$ is a set of $|V|$ new vertices, and $E(G \odot K_1) = E \cup \{vv' : v \in V\}$.

Proposition 3.1 (Yolov [71]). *For every graph G , it holds that*

$$\text{tree-}\mu(G) = \text{tree-}\alpha(L^2(G)) \quad \text{and} \quad \text{tree-}\alpha(G) = \text{tree-}\mu(G \odot K_1).$$

Furthermore, given a graph with bounded tree-independence number or bounded induced matching treewidth, we can compute in polynomial time a tree decomposition with bounded $\alpha(\mathcal{T})$ or $\mu(\mathcal{T})$, respectively. Dallard et al. showed in [29] that there is an algorithm that, given an n -vertex graph G and an integer k , in time $2^{\mathcal{O}(k^2)}n^{\mathcal{O}(k)}$ either outputs a tree decomposition of G with independence number at most $8k$, or determines that the tree-independence number of G is larger than k . This improves on an earlier analogous result of Yolov [71] giving an algorithm with running time $n^{\mathcal{O}(k^3)}$ and a bound on the independence number of $\mathcal{O}(k^3)$. A consequence of the aforementioned result is the following.

Theorem 3.2 (Dallard et al. [29]). *Let k be a positive integer and let G be an n -vertex graph satisfying $\text{tree-}\alpha(G) \leq k$. Then, in time $n^{\mathcal{O}(k)}$ we can obtain a tree decomposition \mathcal{T} of G such that $\alpha(\mathcal{T}) \leq 8k$.*

Combining Theorem 3.2 with Proposition 3.1 (and its constructive proof) yields a similar result for the induced matching treewidth.

Theorem 3.3. *Let k be a positive integer and let G be an n -vertex graph satisfying $\text{tree-}\mu(G) \leq k$. Then, in time $n^{\mathcal{O}(k)}$ we can obtain a tree decomposition \mathcal{T} of G such that $\mu(\mathcal{T}) \leq 8k$.*

Proof. By Proposition 3.1, $\text{tree-}\alpha(L^2(G)) = \text{tree-}\mu(G) \leq k$. Note that the graph $L^2(G)$ has $\mathcal{O}(n^2)$ vertices and can be computed in time $n^{\mathcal{O}(1)}$. Applying Theorem 3.2 to the graph $L^2(G)$, we obtain in time $n^{\mathcal{O}(k)}$ a tree decomposition \mathcal{T}' of $L^2(G)$ such that $\alpha(\mathcal{T}') \leq 8k$. Following the proof of [71, Theorem 4.2] (establishing $\text{tree-}\mu(G) = \text{tree-}\alpha(L^2(G))$), this tree decomposition can be turned in polynomial time into a tree decomposition \mathcal{T} of G such that $\mu(\mathcal{T}) \leq 8k$. \square

The following property of tree decompositions with bounded induced matching treewidth allows us to exploit them algorithmically, in order to solve the MWIS problem.

Theorem 3.4 (Yolov [71]). *Let k be a positive integer, let G be an n -vertex graph, and let $\mathcal{T} = (T, \{X_t\}_{t \in V(T)})$ be a tree decomposition of G such that $\mu(\mathcal{T}) \leq k$. Then for every $t \in V(T)$, in time $n^{\mathcal{O}(k)}$ one can enumerate a family \mathbb{I}_t of at most n^{2k+2} subsets of X_t with the following property: For any maximal independent set I of G , the set $I \cap X_t$ belongs to \mathbb{I}_t .*

We conclude this section with a short alternative proof of Theorem 3.4. We include it for two reasons. First, we believe it is easier to follow (at least in the context of the current paper), as the terminology and notation of [71] is quite heavy and very different from ours. Second, it serves as a warm-up for the main combinatorial result of Section 4, i.e., Lemma 4.1, which uses the same basic idea, but is significantly more complicated. We remark that the presented argument gives a slightly worse bound on the size of \mathbb{I}_t ; we do not attempt to optimize it, rather aiming for simplicity.

Proof of Theorem 3.4 (with the bound of n^{3k} on the size of \mathbb{I}_t). Fix some $t \in V(T)$. Define

$$\mathbb{I}^* = \{J: \exists \text{ a maximal independent set } I \text{ in } G \text{ s.t. } I \cap X_t = J\}.$$

We will show that in time $n^{\mathcal{O}(k)}$ we can enumerate a set \mathbb{I}_t of size at most n^{3k} that contains \mathbb{I}^* .

Fix some $J \in \mathbb{I}^*$ and let I be a maximal independent set in G such that $I \cap X_t = J$. There exists some set J' that is a maximal independent set in $G[X_t]$ and contains J . Notice that every vertex of $J' \setminus J$ is adjacent to some vertex in $I \cap N(X_t)$. Let Q be an inclusion-wise minimal subset of $I \cap N(X_t)$ such that every vertex from $J' \setminus J$ has a neighbor in Q .

Notice that by the minimality of Q each element $q \in Q$ has a *private neighbor* $r_q \in J' \setminus J$, i.e., qr_q is an edge if and only if $q = r_q$. Furthermore, as each of Q and $J' \setminus J$ is independent, we observe that the vertices $\bigcup_{q \in Q} \{q, r_q\}$ induce in G a matching of size $|Q|$ that touches X_t .

Consequently, $|Q| \leq k$. Now observe that the pair (J', Q) uniquely determines J as $J = J' \setminus N(Q)$.

By a result of Alekseev [7, Corollary 1], if a graph H has no induced matching of size larger than k , then the number of maximal independent sets in H is at most $|V(H)|^{2k}$. As $G[X_t]$ is such a graph, we conclude that the number of candidates for J' is at most n^{2k} . Furthermore, maximal independent sets can be enumerated with polynomial delay [69], so we can enumerate all candidates for J' in time $n^{\mathcal{O}(k)}$. On the other hand, there are clearly at most n^k candidates for Q and they can be enumerated in time $n^{\mathcal{O}(k)}$. This completes the proof. \square

4 Solving MAX WEIGHT INDUCED FOREST

Let F be an induced forest in G and $\mathcal{T} = (T, \{X_t\}_{t \in V(T)})$ be a tree decomposition of G . The *signature of F at $t \in V(T)$* is a pair (Z, π) , such that:

1. $Z = F \cap X_t$, and
2. π is the partition of Z such that $z_1, z_2 \in Z$ are in the same block of π if and only if there is a z_1 - z_2 -path in $F \cap V_t$.

In other words, π corresponds to connected components of the subgraph of F induced by V_t .

Note that, given a tree decomposition \mathcal{T} with $\mu(\mathcal{T}) \leq k$, we cannot bound the number of possible signatures of any induced forest at each bag of \mathcal{T} by a function of k . Indeed, it might happen that a bag induces an independent set of size linear in $n = |V(G)|$; then, every subset of such a bag forms an induced forest in G . However, this is no longer the case if we talk about *inclusion-wise maximal* induced forests; note that we can safely assume that every optimal solution is maximal. The main combinatorial insight used in the proof of Theorem 2.1 is the following lemma, which is an analogue of Theorem 3.4 for the MAX WEIGHT INDUCED FOREST problem.

Lemma 4.1. *Let k be a fixed integer. Let G be an n -vertex graph and let $\mathcal{T} = (T, \{X_t\}_{t \in V(T)})$ be a tree decomposition of G satisfying $\mu(\mathcal{T}) \leq k$. Then, for each $t \in V(T)$ there is a set \mathbb{F}_t of size at most $(12k)^{12k} \cdot n^{14k+2}$ with the following property: For every maximal induced forest F of G , the signature of F at t is in \mathbb{F}_t . Furthermore, \mathbb{F}_t can be enumerated in time $n^{\mathcal{O}(k)}$.*

Equipped with Lemma 4.1, we can basically mimic the textbook algorithm for MAX WEIGHT INDUCED FOREST [28]. This is encapsulated in the following lemma.

Lemma 4.2. *Let k be a fixed integer. Let G be an n -vertex graph equipped with a vertex weight function \mathfrak{w} and a tree decomposition $\mathcal{T} = (T, \{X_t\}_{t \in V(T)})$ satisfying $\mu(\mathcal{T}) \leq k$. Assume that for each $t \in V(T)$ we are given a set \mathbb{F}_t as in Lemma 4.1. Then, we can solve the MAX WEIGHT INDUCED FOREST problem in time $n^{\mathcal{O}(k)} \cdot |V(T)|^{\mathcal{O}(1)}$.*

Let us postpone the proofs of Lemmas 4.1 and 4.2 and now let us show that they indeed imply Theorem 2.1. Let G be a graph satisfying $\text{tree-}\mu(G) \leq k$, equipped with a weight function $\mathfrak{w}: V(G) \rightarrow \mathbb{Q}_+$. We call the algorithm from Theorem 3.3 to obtain a tree decomposition \mathcal{T}' with $\mu(\mathcal{T}') = \mathcal{O}(k)$. The running time of this algorithm is $n^{\mathcal{O}(k)}$. In polynomial time we can transform \mathcal{T}' into a nice tree decomposition $\mathcal{T} = (T, \{X_t\}_{t \in V(T)})$ with $\mu(\mathcal{T}) \leq \mu(\mathcal{T}')$. Define $k' := \mu(\mathcal{T})$.

Next, for each $t \in V(T)$ we use Lemma 4.1 to compute the set \mathbb{F}_t ; this takes total time $n^{\mathcal{O}(k')}$. Finally, we call Lemma 4.2 in order to solve MAX WEIGHT INDUCED FOREST with instance (G, \mathfrak{w}) . The overall running time is $n^{\mathcal{O}(k')} = n^{\mathcal{O}(k)}$.

4.1 Proof of Lemma 4.1

The proof is based on a structural analysis of potential signatures of an optimal solution at a node t of \mathcal{T} .

What lives in a forest. Let F be a forest. A one-vertex component of F is called *trivial*, each other component is *nontrivial*. The set of vertices of trivial components of F is denoted by $T(F)$. Let $L(F)$ consist of *leaves* of F , i.e., the vertices of degree 1, with the exception that for each component C isomorphic to K_2 we include in $L(F)$ exactly one vertex from C , breaking ties arbitrarily.⁴ The *skeleton* of F , denoted by $\mathfrak{Q}(F)$, is $F \setminus (T(F) \cup L(F))$. Clearly the sets $\mathfrak{Q}(F), T(F), L(F)$ form a partition of F , and the set $\mathcal{E}(F) := L(F) \cup T(F)$ is independent.

Skeletons of maximal induced forests. Let G be a graph, $\mathcal{T} = (T, \{X_t\}_{t \in V(T)})$ be a tree decomposition of G with $\mu(\mathcal{T}) \leq k$, and $t \in V(T)$. Let F be a maximal induced forest in G .

First, let us show that, even though $F \cap X_t$ might be large, the size of $S := \mathfrak{Q}(F) \cap X_t$ is bounded by a linear function of k .

Claim 4.2.1. $|S| \leq 8k$.

Proof of Claim. Let $S_1 \subseteq \mathfrak{Q}(F) \cap N[X_t]$ consist of those components of $\mathfrak{Q}(F) \cap N[X_t]$ that intersect X_t . Now define S_2 to be the forest obtained from S_1 by (i) repeatedly contracting all edges not intersecting X_t , and then (ii) removing leaves that are not in X_t . Observe that $S \subseteq S_2$ and every edge of S_2 touches X_t . Each vertex that was removed in step (ii) has a unique neighbor in S_2 ; denote the set of these neighbors by U .

A component of S_2 is *small* if it has at most two vertices. Let a be the number of small components of S_2 and let S_3 be obtained from S_2 by removing all small components. A *thread* in S_3 is a maximal path with all internal vertices of degree 2. Consider a thread in S_3 with consecutive vertices v_0, v_1, \dots, v_ℓ , where v_0 and v_ℓ are of degree other than 2 and $\ell \geq 5$. Let $q = \lfloor (\ell - 5)/3 \rfloor$. We mark edges v_{3i+2}, v_{3i+3} for $i \in [0, q]$. Finally, we remove all vertices v_j for $j \in [2, \dots, 3q+4]$ and add an edge between v_1 and v_{3q+5} ; note that $3q+5 \leq \ell$. In this step we marked $q+1$ edges and removed $3(q+1)$ vertices. The marked edges are pairwise non-adjacent (i.e., they form an induced matching). Furthermore, they are not incident with vertices of degree other than 2 in S_3 . Let S_4 be obtained from S_3 by the application of the step above to each thread of S_3 . Define $b := (|S_3| - |S_4|)/3$.

Finally, define c to be the number of leaves in S_4 . Note that the number of vertices of degree at least 3 in S_4 is at most c , thus S_4 has at most $2c - 1$ threads, each with at most 3 internal vertices. Consequently, S_4 has at most $2c + (2c - 1) \cdot 3 \leq 8c$ vertices.

Summing up, we obtain that

$$|S| \leq |S_2| \leq 2a + 3b + 8c. \quad (1)$$

Let A be a set of size a containing one vertex per each small component of S_2 ; note that $A \subseteq X_t$. For each $v \in A$, as $v \in \mathfrak{Q}(F)$, it must be adjacent to some other vertex $u(v)$ of F . Note that for each small component H of S_2 , the unique component of S_1 that contains H intersects X_t in no component other than H . Thus $M_A = \{vu(v) \mid v \in A\}$ is an induced matching in G of size a that touches X_t .

Let B be the set of all edges that were marked while obtaining S_4 from S_3 . Note that they induce a matching M_B in G of size b that touches X_t .

⁴For example, by fixing an arbitrary linear order on $V(G)$ and selecting as the vertex in $V(C) \cap L(F)$ the first vertex of C in the ordering.

Finally, let C be the set of leaves of S_4 . Recall that $C \subseteq X_t$ and the vertices from C are also leaves in S_2 . Furthermore, as S_4 does not contain small components, the vertices in C form an independent set in G . For each $v \in C$, define a neighbor $u(v)$ of v as follows. If $v \notin U$, then none of its neighbors got removed in step (ii) and, since the remaining steps preserve the degrees in $\mathfrak{Q}(F)$ of vertices in $(S_4 \cap X_t) \setminus U$, we infer that v is a leaf of $\mathfrak{Q}(F)$. Consequently, v is adjacent to some leaf $u(v) \in L(F)$. If $v \in U$, there exists $u(v) \in \mathfrak{Q}(F) \cap N(X_t) \cap N(v)$ that was deleted in step (ii). We observe that $M_C := \{vu(v) \mid v \in C\}$ is an induced matching in G of size c that touches X_t .

We claim that $M = M_A \cup M_B \cup M_C$ is an induced matching in G of size $a + b + c$. It is straightforward to verify that M is a matching of the desired size that touches X_t . The only nontrivial thing to verify is that there are no edges between the vertices inducing M_B and M_C . However, recall that none of the endpoints of edges marked in the process of creating S_4 from S_3 is adjacent to a vertex of degree other than 2, so M is indeed an induced matching.

We know that $a + b + c = |M| \leq k$, which, combined with (1), completes the proof. \triangleleft

Let us remark that we did not make too much effort to optimize the multiplicative constant in Claim 4.2.1. We decided to aim for simplicity as the constant is, anyway, hidden in the $\mathcal{O}(\cdot)$ notation in the final running time.

Identifying the impostors. Now we need to understand the set $\mathfrak{I}^{\ddot{}}(F) \cap X_t$; recall that it might be arbitrarily large. By Theorem 3.4 we know that the number of ways *maximal* independent sets of G might intersect X_t is polynomially bounded. We are going to exploit this. Since $\mathfrak{I}^{\ddot{}}(F)$ is an independent set, it is contained in some maximal independent set $I^*(F)$ in G , and $I^*(F) \cap X_t \in \mathbb{I}_t$. Consequently, the number of possible choices for $I := I^*(F) \cap X_t$ is bounded by n^{2k+2} .

However, we still need to be able to filter out the vertices from $I \setminus \mathfrak{I}^{\ddot{}}(F)$ using some information that can be stored and processed efficiently. We will show that this is indeed possible.

Consider a vertex $v \in I \setminus \mathfrak{I}^{\ddot{}}(F)$. By the maximality of F , there are two possible reasons why $v \notin \mathfrak{I}^{\ddot{}}(F)$:

1. $v \in \mathfrak{Q}(F)$,
2. $F \cup \{v\}$ does not induce a forest, i.e., v has two neighbors in the same component of F .

Note that the vertices of the first type can be easily detected, as, by Claim 4.2.1, we can afford to enumerate all possibilities for the set $S := \mathfrak{Q}(F) \cap X_t$ explicitly. So let us focus on the vertices of the second type; call them *impostors*. Since $T(F) \cup L(F) = \mathfrak{I}^{\ddot{}}(F) \subseteq I^*(F)$ and $I^*(F)$ is independent, we know that the neighbors of v in F must be in $\widehat{S} := N[X_t] \cap \mathfrak{Q}(F)$.

It will also be convenient to distinguish vertices from $T(F)$ and vertices from $L(F)$. Note that the latter ones have *exactly* one neighbor in \widehat{S} , while the former ones have no neighbors in \widehat{S} . Summing up, we observe that \widehat{S}

(Q1) 2-dominates all impostors and does not 2-dominate any vertex from $\mathfrak{I}^{\ddot{}}(F) \cap X_t$,

(Q2) 1-dominates all vertices from $L(F) \cap X_t$,

(Q3) is non-adjacent to $T(F) \cap X_t$.

Let $Q \subseteq \widehat{S}$ be an inclusion-wise minimal subset of \widehat{S} that still satisfies (Q1), (Q2), and (Q3).

Claim 4.2.2. $|Q| \leq 4k$.




Figure 1: Various subsets of $V(G)$ relevant in the proof of Lemma 4.1.

Proof of Claim. Define $L := L(F) \cap X_t$ and let A be the set of impostors, i.e., vertices in $I \setminus F$ (see Figure 1).

Let $Q_1 \subseteq Q$ be a minimal set that 1-dominates $L \cup A$. From the minimality of Q_1 it follows that for every $q \in Q_1$ there exists $m(q) \in L \cup A$ such that $N(m(q)) \cap Q_1 = \{q\}$. Clearly the set $M_1 := \{qm(q) \mid q \in Q_1\}$ is a matching. Furthermore, the only edges between the vertices of $\bigcup_{e \in M_1} e$ that are not in M_1 are between the vertices of Q_1 . As Q_1 is a forest, it is in particular 2-colorable, hence, there exists an independent set $Q'_1 \subseteq Q_1$ of size at least $|Q_1|/2$. Hence, $M'_1 := \{qm(q) \mid q \in Q'_1\}$ is an induced matching of size at least $|Q_1|/2$ that touches X_t .

Now let A' be the set of vertices from A that are not 2-dominated by Q_1 . We observe that the set $Q_2 := Q \setminus Q_1$ 1-dominates A' and, by the minimality of Q , is minimal with this property. Thus, similarly as in the previous paragraph we can conclude that there exists an induced matching of size at least $|Q_2|/2$ that touches X_t .

As $Q_1 \cup Q_2 = Q$, one of these sets has at least $|Q|/2$ vertices. Thus, there exists an induced matching of size at least $|Q|/4$ that touches X_t . As this matching can have at most k edges, we conclude that $|Q| \leq 4k$. \triangleleft

Construction of \mathbb{F}_t . Let S, I, Q be the sets defined as above. Furthermore, let $\hat{\pi}$ be the partition of $S \cup Q$ corresponding to the connected components of $F \cap V_t$, i.e., two vertices are in one block of $\hat{\pi}$ if and only if they are in the same connected component of $F \cap V_t$.

We claim that the quadruple $(S, I, Q, \hat{\pi})$ uniquely determines the signature (Z, π) of F at t .

Recall that $Z = F \cap X_t = (\varpi(F) \cap X_t) \cup (L(F) \cap X_t) \cup (T(F) \cap X_t)$. Indeed, we have $\varpi(F) \cap X_t = S$ by the definition of S . Next, $L(F) \cap X_t$ consists of these vertices from $I \setminus S$ that are 1-dominated but not 2-dominated by Q . Finally, $T(F)$ are the vertices from $I \setminus S$ that are non-adjacent to Q . Note that the remaining vertices from $I \setminus S$, i.e., those that are 2-dominated

by Q , are impostors.

Now let us argue how to obtain π from $\hat{\pi}$. We start with $\pi := \hat{\pi}$; we will modify this partition as follows. First, recall that each $v \in L(F) \cap X_t$ has exactly one neighbor u in F , and additionally $u \in Q$. If $u \in V_t$, then v is in the same component of $F \cap V_t$ as u , i.e., we insert v into the block of π containing u . If $u \notin V_t$, then v is an isolated vertex in $F \cap V_t$ and thus we add a new block $\{v\}$ to π . Similarly, for each $v \in T(F) \cap X_t$, we add to π a new block $\{v\}$. Finally, we remove from the blocks of π all vertices from $Q \setminus S$. Note that the last step might result in creating an empty block; we remove such blocks. This completes the construction of π .

From the description above it follows that (Z, π) is indeed the signature of F at t . We can exhaustively guess $(S, I, Q, \hat{\pi})$ which results in at most

$$n^{8k} \cdot n^{2k+2} \cdot n^{4k} \cdot (12k)^{12k} = (12k)^{12k} \cdot n^{14k+2}$$

possibilities. For each choice we construct in polynomial time one pair (Z, π) and insert it to \mathbb{F}_t . Note that some pairs could be immediately discarded, e.g., if Z is not a forest, but this is not necessary so we do not do it. This completes the proof of Lemma 4.1.

4.2 Proof of Lemma 4.2

The proof of Lemma 4.2 follows the textbook dynamic programming algorithm for MAX WEIGHT INDUCED FOREST in bounded-treewidth graphs. However, the restriction that we can only iterate on elements of \mathbb{F}_t for $t \in V(T)$ adds some extra technical complicity to the proof of correctness.

Filling the dynamic programming table. We index a dynamic programming table Tab by the nodes $t \in V(T)$ and the pairs $(Z, \pi) \in \mathbb{F}_t$ (recall that $Z \subseteq X_t$ and π is a partition of Z). The intended meaning is as follows:

- (\star) The value of $\text{Tab}_t[Z, \pi]$ is the maximum weight of an induced forest in V_t with signature (Z, π) at t , or $-\infty$ if such a forest does not exist.

Note that since $X_{\text{root}(T)} = \emptyset$, the signature of *every* induced forest in G at $\text{root}(T)$ is (\emptyset, \emptyset) . In particular, $(\emptyset, \emptyset) \in \mathbb{F}_{\text{root}(T)}$. Thus, if property (\star) is satisfied, the value $\text{Tab}_{\text{root}(T)}[\emptyset, \emptyset]$ is the weight of an optimal solution to MAX WEIGHT INDUCED FOREST.

Let $t \in V(T)$ be a node and consider an arbitrary $(Z, \pi) \in \mathbb{F}_t$. Before we proceed to the detailed description, notice that in some cases we can immediately detect that (Z, π) is not a signature of any solution. In particular, this might happen if:

- Z contains a cycle, or
- there are two adjacent vertices in Z that are in different blocks of π .

In these two cases we immediately set $\text{Tab}_t[Z, \pi] = -\infty$. So from now on assume that Z is an induced forest and π respects the components of Z , i.e., any two vertices in the same component of Z are in the same block of π . How the value of $\text{Tab}_t[Z, \pi]$ is computed depends on the type of t .

Leaf node. If t is a leaf, then $X_t = \emptyset$, thus the signature of every induced forest at t is (\emptyset, \emptyset) , so in particular $(\emptyset, \emptyset) \in \mathbb{F}_t$. We set $\text{Tab}_t[\emptyset, \emptyset] = 0$.

For all other types of nodes the value of $\text{Tab}_t[Z, \pi]$ depends on the values stored in Tab for children node(s). In the description below we use the convention that the maximum over an empty set is $-\infty$.

Introduce node. Let t be an introduce node, t' be its child in T , and let v be the unique vertex in $X_t \setminus X_{t'}$.

Case 1. $v \notin Z$. We set $\text{Tab}_t[Z, \pi] = \text{Tab}_{t'}[Z, \pi]$.

Case 2. $v \in Z$. A partition π' of $Z \setminus \{v\}$ is v -good if each vertex from $N(v) \cap Z$ is in a distinct block of π' . For a v -good partition π' of $Z \setminus \{v\}$, by $\pi' \oplus v$ we mean the partition obtained from π' by first adding a new block $\{v\}$ and then merging all blocks intersecting $N[v]$ into a single one. We set

$$\text{Tab}_t[Z, \pi] = \max_{\substack{(Z \setminus \{v\}, \pi') \in \mathbb{F}_{t'} \\ \text{s.t. } \pi' \text{ is } v\text{-good} \\ \text{and } \pi' \oplus v = \pi}} \text{Tab}_{t'}[Z \setminus \{v\}, \pi'] + \mathfrak{w}(v). \quad (2)$$

Forget node. Let t be a forget node, t' be its child in T , and let v be the unique vertex in $X_{t'} \setminus X_t$.

Let Σ be a set defined as follows. First, we include (Z, π) into Σ . Next, for each block B of π , we include to Σ the pair $(Z \cup \{v\}, \pi_B)$, where π_B is obtained from π by adding v to B . Finally, we add to Σ the pair $(Z \cup \{v\}, \pi_\emptyset)$, where π_\emptyset is obtained from π by adding a new block $\{v\}$. We set

$$\text{Tab}_t[Z, \pi] = \max_{(Z', \pi') \in \Sigma \cap \mathbb{F}_{t'}} \text{Tab}_{t'}[Z', \pi']. \quad (3)$$

Join node. Let t be a join node, and let t', t'' be its children. Recall that we have $X_t = X_{t'} = X_{t''}$.

Consider two partitions π', π'' of Z that respect the components of Z . We define an auxiliary multigraph $\text{Merge}(\pi', \pi'')$ as follows. The vertices of $\text{Merge}(\pi', \pi'')$ are the components of Z . We add an edge between two components if they are in the same block of π' , and then similarly for π'' ; note that we might create parallel edges. If $\text{Merge}(\pi', \pi'')$ is a simple forest (in particular, does not contain double edges), we define a partition $\pi' \otimes \pi''$ of Z as follows. For each component C of $\text{Merge}(\pi', \pi'')$, we add a new block to $\pi' \otimes \pi''$ containing the union of the vertex sets of the components of Z in $V(C)$. If $\text{Merge}(\pi', \pi'')$ is not a forest, then $\pi' \otimes \pi''$ is undefined.

We set

$$\text{Tab}_t[Z, \pi] = \max_{\substack{(Z, \pi') \in \mathbb{F}_{t'}, \\ (Z, \pi'') \in \mathbb{F}_{t''}, \\ \text{s.t. } \pi' \otimes \pi'' = \pi}} (\text{Tab}_{t'}[Z, \pi'] + \text{Tab}_{t''}[Z, \pi'']) - \mathfrak{w}(Z). \quad (4)$$

Running time. Recall that the number of nodes is polynomial in n , and the number of entries in Tab for each node t is exactly $|\mathbb{F}_t|$, where $|\mathbb{F}_t| = n^{\mathcal{O}(k)}$ by Lemma 4.1. Let us discuss the time needed to fill a single entry.

The unique entry for a leaf node is filled in constant time. Each entry in a forget node is clearly filled in time $n^{\mathcal{O}(1)}$. For an introduce (resp., join) node, we need to iterate over elements of $\mathbb{F}_{t'}$ (resp. $\mathbb{F}_{t'} \times \mathbb{F}_{t''}$), which gives us $n^{\mathcal{O}(k)}$ possibilities. For each of them the local computation takes time $n^{\mathcal{O}(1)}$.

Thus the total running time of the algorithm is $n^{\mathcal{O}(k)}$, as claimed.

Correctness. To show that the algorithm is correct, we need to show that the property (\star) is indeed satisfied. We will show it in the following two claims.

Claim 4.2.3. *Let F be a maximal induced forest in G and let $t \in V(T)$. Let (Z, π) be the signature of F at t . Then we have $\text{Tab}_t[Z, \pi] \geq \mathfrak{w}(F \cap V_t)$.*

Proof of Claim. The proof goes by induction on the depth of t . The base case is when t is a leaf.

Leaf node. As already mentioned, the signature of F at t is (\emptyset, \emptyset) , so by Lemma 4.1 we have $(\emptyset, \emptyset) \in \mathbb{F}_t$. Thus we correctly set $\text{Tab}_t[\emptyset, \emptyset] = 0$.

Now assume that t is not a leaf and the claim holds for all children of t .

Introduce node. Let t' be the child of t and let v be the unique vertex in $X_t \setminus X_{t'}$. Recall that $V_t = V_{t'} \cup \{v\}$. We consider two cases.

Case 1. $v \notin F$. This means that $v \notin Z$, and thus the signature of F at t' is (Z, π) . In particular, by Lemma 4.1, we know that $(Z, \pi) \in \mathbb{F}_{t'}$. We set $\text{Tab}_t[Z, \pi] = \text{Tab}_{t'}[Z, \pi] \geq \mathfrak{w}(F \cap V_{t'}) = \mathfrak{w}(F \cap V_t)$, where the “ \geq ” inequality follows by the induction hypothesis.

Case 2. $v \in F$. Let (Z', π') be the signature of F at t' . By Lemma 4.1 we have $(Z', \pi') \in \mathbb{F}_{t'}$. We note that $Z' = Z \setminus \{v\}$. Let C be the component of $F \cap V_t$ containing v , and let C_1, \dots, C_p be the components of $C \setminus \{v\}$ (possibly $p = 0$ if C has just one vertex, v). Note that each C_i contains exactly one neighbor of v . We note that blocks of π' are:

- blocks of π corresponding to components of $F \cap V_t$ other than C ; they do not contain neighbors of v , and
- p blocks, each containing the vertex set of one C_i ; each such component contains one neighbor of v .

Thus π' is v -good and $\pi' \oplus v = \pi$. Summing up, $(Z', \pi') = (Z \setminus \{v\}, \pi')$ is one of the options considered when we set the value of $\text{Tab}_t[Z, \pi]$ in (2). Therefore, by the induction hypothesis, we have

$$\text{Tab}_t[Z, \pi] \geq \text{Tab}_{t'}[Z, \pi'] + \mathfrak{w}(v) \geq \mathfrak{w}(F \cap V_{t'}) + \mathfrak{w}(v) = \mathfrak{w}(F \cap V_t),$$

as claimed.

Forget node. Let t' be the child of t and let v be the unique vertex in $X_{t'} \setminus X_t$. Recall that $V_t = V_{t'}$. We consider two cases.

Case 1. $v \notin F$. Note that in this case the signature of F at t' is (Z, π) and thus by Lemma 4.1 this pair is in $\mathbb{F}_{t'}$. Note that we have $(Z, \pi) \in \Sigma \cap \mathbb{F}_{t'}$, i.e., in the algorithm we set

$$\text{Tab}_t[Z, \pi] \geq \text{Tab}_{t'}[Z, \pi] \geq \mathfrak{w}(F \cap V_{t'}) = \mathfrak{w}(F \cap V_t),$$

where the second “ \geq ” follows by the induction hypothesis.

Case 2. $v \in F$. Let (Z', π') be the signature of F at t' ; by Lemma 4.1 we have $(Z', \pi') \in \mathbb{F}_{t'}$. Note that we have $Z' = Z \cup \{v\}$. Let B' be the block of π' containing v and denote $B' \setminus \{v\}$ by B . Since $v \in V_t \setminus X_{t'}$, the partition π is obtained from π' by replacing B' by B , or by removing B' if $B' = \{v\}$. In other words, we have $\pi' = \pi_B$ (with $B = \emptyset$ if $B' = \{v\}$). Therefore, in the algorithm we set

$$\text{Tab}_t[Z, \pi] \geq \text{Tab}_{t'}[Z \cup \{v\}, \pi_B] \geq \mathfrak{w}(F \cap V_{t'}) = \mathfrak{w}(F \cap V_t),$$

where, again, the second “ \geq ” follows by the induction hypothesis.

Join node. Let t', t'' be the children of t ; recall that we have $X_t = X_{t'} = X_{t''}$. Furthermore, it holds that $V_t = V_{t'} \cup V_{t''}$ and $V_{t'} \cap V_{t''} = X_t$.

Let (Z, π') (resp. (Z, π'')) be the signature of F at t' (resp. at t''). By Lemma 4.1 we have $(Z, \pi') \in \mathbb{F}_{t'}$ and $(Z, \pi'') \in \mathbb{F}_{t''}$. Note that both π' and π'' respect the components of Z .

We claim that $\pi' \otimes \pi'' = \pi$. First, let us show that $\text{Merge}(\pi', \pi'')$ is a forest. For contradiction, suppose it contains a cycle C . Recall that C has two types of edges: defined by blocks of π' and defined by blocks of π'' . Each edge corresponds to a path in F with endpoints in appropriate components of Z . By connectivity of each component of Z , we observe that C defines a cycle in F , which is a contradiction as F is a forest.

Note that two vertices of Z are in the same connected component of $F \cap V_t$ if and only if one of the following happens: they are in the same connected component of $F \cap V_{t'}$, or they are in the same connected component of $F \cap V_{t''}$ (both possibilities apply if they are in the same component of Z). Thus indeed we have that $\pi' \otimes \pi'' = \pi$.

This means that in the algorithm we set

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Tab}_t[Z, \pi] &\geq \text{Tab}_{t'}[Z, \pi'] + \text{Tab}_{t''}[Z, \pi''] - \mathfrak{w}(Z) \geq \mathfrak{w}(F \cap V_{t'}) + \mathfrak{w}(F \cap V_{t''}) - \mathfrak{w}(Z) \\ &= \mathfrak{w}(F \cap V_t) + \mathfrak{w}(F \cap X_t) - \mathfrak{w}(Z) = \mathfrak{w}(F \cap V_t), \end{aligned}$$

where the second “ \geq ” follows by the induction hypothesis. This completes the proof. \triangleleft

Claim 4.2.4. *Let $t \in V(T)$ and let $(Z, \pi) \in \mathbb{F}_t$ such that $\text{Tab}_t[Z, \pi] \neq -\infty$. Then there exists an induced forest F in V_t with signature (Z, π) at t satisfying $\mathfrak{w}(F) \geq \text{Tab}_t[Z, \pi]$.*

Proof of Claim. The proof again goes by induction on the depth of t . The base case is that t is a leaf node.

Leaf node. If t is a leaf node, then the only choice for (Z, π) is (\emptyset, \emptyset) , and we set $\text{Tab}_t[\emptyset, \emptyset] = 0$. Note that $F = \emptyset$ satisfies the desired properties.

So from now on we assume that t is not a leaf and the claim holds for all children of t . Again, the argument depends on the type of t .

Introduce node. Let t be an introduce node, t' be its child in T , and let v be the unique vertex in $X_t \setminus X_{t'}$. Since $\text{Tab}_t[Z, \pi] \neq -\infty$, its value was set either in Case 1 or in Case 2 of the algorithm. Consider these cases separately.

Case 1. This means that $\text{Tab}_t[Z, \pi] = \text{Tab}_{t'}[Z, \pi]$. By the induction hypothesis there is an induced forest $F \subseteq V_{t'}$ with signature (Z, π) at t' with $\mathfrak{w}(F) \geq \text{Tab}_{t'}[Z, \pi]$. Notice that the signature of F at t is (Z, π) . Moreover, F satisfies $\mathfrak{w}(F) \geq \text{Tab}_{t'}[Z, \pi] = \text{Tab}_t[Z, \pi]$, as claimed.

Case 2. This means that $\text{Tab}_t[Z, \pi] = \text{Tab}_{t'}[Z \setminus \{v\}, \pi'] + \mathfrak{w}(v)$ for some $(Z \setminus \{v\}, \pi') \in \mathbb{F}_{t'}$, such that π' is v -good and $\pi' \oplus v = \pi$, as set in (2). As $\text{Tab}_t[Z, \pi] \neq -\infty$, we also have $\text{Tab}_{t'}[Z \setminus \{v\}, \pi'] \neq -\infty$, so by the induction hypothesis there exists an induced forest $F' \subseteq V_{t'}$ with signature $(Z \setminus \{v\}, \pi')$ at t' , satisfying $\mathfrak{w}(F') \geq \text{Tab}_{t'}[Z \setminus \{v\}, \pi']$.

We aim to show that $F := F' \cup \{v\}$ satisfies the statement of the claim. First we need to argue that F is an induced forest. For contradiction suppose that F contains a cycle C . Since F' is acyclic, we observe that v belongs to C and $C - v$ is contained in one component of F' . As the neighborhood of v in $V_{t'}$ is contained in $X_{t'}$, we observe that the neighbors of v on C , say u and w , are in $Z \setminus \{v\}$. Consequently, u, w are in one block of π' and so π' is not v -good, a contradiction.

Now let us argue that the signature of F at t is (Z, π) . Clearly $F \cap V_t = F \cap (V_{t'} \cup \{v\}) = (Z \setminus \{v\}) \cup \{v\} = Z$. On the other hand, it is straightforward to verify that the partition of Z corresponding to components of F is exactly $\pi' \oplus v = \pi$. Finally, note that $\mathfrak{w}(F) = \mathfrak{w}(F') + \mathfrak{w}(v) \geq \text{Tab}_{t'}[Z \setminus \{v\}, \pi'] + \mathfrak{w}(v) = \text{Tab}_t[Z, \pi]$.

Forget node. Let t' be the child of t and let v be the unique vertex in $X_{t'} \setminus X_t$. As $\text{Tab}_t[Z, \pi] \neq -\infty$, its value was set to $\text{Tab}_{t'}[Z', \pi']$ for some $(Z', \pi') \in \Sigma \cap \mathbb{F}_{t'}$, as in (3).

Let F be an induced forest in $V_{t'}$ with signature (Z', π') at t' , such that $\mathfrak{w}(F) \geq \text{Tab}_{t'}[Z', \pi']$. Consider two cases.

Case 1. $v \notin F$. Then by the definition of Σ we observe that $Z' = Z$ and $\pi' = \pi$. The signature of F at t is (Z, π) .

Case 2. $v \in F$. Then by the definition of Σ we have that $Z' = Z \cup \{v\}$ and $\pi' = \pi_B$ for some block B of π or $\pi' = \pi_\emptyset$. Note that the signature of F at t is (Z, π) .

In both cases we have $\mathfrak{w}(F) \geq \text{Tab}_{t'}[Z', \pi'] = \text{Tab}_t[Z, \pi]$, so F satisfies the statement of the claim.

Join node. Let t', t'' be the children of t ; recall that we have $X_t = X_{t'} = X_{t''}$. Since $\text{Tab}_t[Z, \pi] \neq -\infty$, we have $\text{Tab}_t[Z, \pi] = (\text{Tab}_{t'}[Z, \pi'] + \text{Tab}_{t''}[Z, \pi'']) - \mathfrak{w}(Z)$ for some $(Z, \pi') \in \mathbb{F}_{t'}$ and $(Z, \pi'') \in \mathbb{F}_{t''}$ such that $\pi' \otimes \pi'' = \pi$, as set in (4).

Let F' (resp. F'') be an induced forest in $V_{t'}$ (resp. $V_{t''}$) with signature (Z, π') at t' (resp. (Z, π'') at t'') such that $\mathfrak{w}(F') \geq \text{Tab}_{t'}[Z, \pi']$ (resp. $\mathfrak{w}(F'') \geq \text{Tab}_{t''}[Z, \pi'']$).

We claim that $F := F' \cup F''$ is an induced forest in V_t . For contradiction, suppose that F contains a cycle. Note that such a cycle cannot be contained in Z as we know that Z induces a forest (since the entries of Tab corresponding to Z have finite values). So in particular F contains a cycle C whose intersection with every component of Z is a subpath of C . Let C' be the multigraph obtained from C by (1) contracting every edge with both endvertices in Z , and then (2) substituting every maximal path with all interior vertices outside Z by a single edge. Note that this step might have created multiple edges, but no loops, since both F' and F'' are induced forests and Z does not contain cycles. Thus C' is a cycle whose every vertex corresponds to a distinct component of Z . Every edge of C' indicates that either F' or F'' contains a path with endpoints in particular components of Z . Therefore C' is a sub(multi)graph of $\text{Merge}(\pi', \pi'')$, so in particular $\text{Merge}(\pi', \pi'')$ is not a simple forest. Consequently, $\pi' \otimes \pi''$ is not defined, so it cannot be equal to π .

Clearly $F \cap X_t = Z$. Furthermore, the partition of Z corresponding to components of F is precisely $\pi = \pi' \otimes \pi''$, so (Z, π) is the signature of F at t .

Finally we notice that $\mathfrak{w}(F) = \mathfrak{w}(F') + \mathfrak{w}(F'') - \mathfrak{w}(F' \cap F'') = \mathfrak{w}(F') + \mathfrak{w}(F'') - \mathfrak{w}(Z) \geq \text{Tab}_{t'}[Z, \pi'] + \text{Tab}_{t''}[Z, \pi''] - \mathfrak{w}(Z) = \text{Tab}_t[Z, \pi]$. This completes the proof of claim. \triangleleft

Now let us argue that Claims 4.2.3 and 4.2.4 are sufficient to prove the correctness of our algorithm. Let F be an optimal solution. We can safely assume that F is a maximal induced forest. Recall that its signature at $\text{root}(T)$ is (\emptyset, \emptyset) . By Claim 4.2.3 we have that $\text{Tab}_{\text{root}(T)}[\emptyset, \emptyset] \geq \mathfrak{w}(F)$. Now suppose for a contradiction that $\text{Tab}_{\text{root}(T)}[\emptyset, \emptyset] > \mathfrak{w}(F)$. Thus, by Claim 4.2.4, there is an induced forest F^* in G with $\mathfrak{w}(F^*) \geq \text{Tab}_{\text{root}(T)}[\emptyset, \emptyset] > \mathfrak{w}(F)$. However, this contradicts the optimality of F . Therefore, $\text{Tab}_{\text{root}(T)}[\emptyset, \emptyset]$ is indeed the weight of an optimal solution. This completes the proof of Lemma 4.2 and thus of Theorem 2.1.

5 Packing independent induced subgraphs

Recall that given a graph G and a family $\mathcal{H} = \{H_j\}_{j \in J}$ of connected subgraphs of G , we denote by $G^\circ[\mathcal{H}]$ the graph with vertex set J , in which two distinct vertices $i, j \in J$ are adjacent if and only if H_i and H_j either have a vertex in common or there is an edge in G connecting them. The starting point of our investigations will be the following result of Dallard et al. [32].

Lemma 5.1 (Dallard et al. [32]). *Let G be a graph, let $\mathcal{T} = (T, \{X_t\}_{t \in V(T)})$ be a tree decomposition of G , and let $\mathcal{H} = \{H_j\}_{j \in J}$ be a finite family of connected non-null subgraphs of G . Then $\mathcal{T}' = (T, \{X'_t\}_{t \in V(T)})$ with $X'_t = \{j \in J : V(H_j) \cap X_t \neq \emptyset\}$ for all $t \in V(T)$ is a tree decomposition of $G^\circ[\mathcal{H}]$ such that $\alpha(\mathcal{T}') \leq \alpha(\mathcal{T})$.*

Corollary 5.2 (Dallard et al. [32]). *Let G be a graph and let $\mathcal{H} = \{H_j\}_{j \in J}$ be a finite family of connected non-null subgraphs of G . Then $\text{tree-}\alpha(G^\circ[\mathcal{H}]) \leq \text{tree-}\alpha(G)$.*

5.1 Tree-independence number and induced matching treewidth of $G^\circ[\mathcal{H}]$

In this section we prove results similar to Corollary 5.2, but with a focus on induced matching treewidth. Note that while in the statement of Corollary 5.2, the family $\mathcal{H} = \{H_j\}_{j \in J}$ of subgraphs of G may be a multiset, in the first part of the next lemma we restrict ourselves to a set of subgraphs, with no repetitions allowed.

Lemma 5.3. *Let G be a graph and $\mathcal{H} = \{H_j\}_{j \in J}$ be a set of connected non-null subgraphs of G . Then, $\text{tree-}\mu(G^\circ[\mathcal{H}]) \leq \text{tree-}\mu(G)$. Furthermore, if all graphs in \mathcal{H} have at least two vertices, then $\text{tree-}\alpha(G^\circ[\mathcal{H}]) \leq \text{tree-}\mu(G)$, even if \mathcal{H} is a multiset.*

Proof. Let $k = \text{tree-}\mu(G)$ and consider a tree decomposition $\mathcal{T} = (T, \{X_t\}_{t \in V(T)})$ of the graph G such that $\mu_G(\mathcal{T}) = k$. We want to construct a tree decomposition $\mathcal{T}' = (T, \{X'_t\}_{t \in V(T)})$ for $G^\circ[\mathcal{H}]$ such that $\mu_{G^\circ[\mathcal{H}]}(\mathcal{T}') \leq k$. Note that $V(G^\circ[\mathcal{H}]) = J$. For each $t \in V(T)$, let $X'_t = \{j \in J : V(H_j) \cap X_t \neq \emptyset\}$. By Lemma 5.1, \mathcal{T}' is a tree decomposition of the graph $G^\circ[\mathcal{H}]$. We now show that $\mu_{G^\circ[\mathcal{H}]}(\mathcal{T}') \leq k$. This will establish $\text{tree-}\mu(G^\circ[\mathcal{H}]) \leq \text{tree-}\mu(G)$. Consider a bag of \mathcal{T}' , say X'_t for some $t \in V(T)$, and suppose for a contradiction that there is an induced matching M in the graph $G^\circ[\mathcal{H}]$ with cardinality $k + 1$ such that each edge of M has an endpoint in X'_t . Then, there exists a set $I \subseteq X'_t$ with $|I| = k + 1$ such that I contains precisely one endpoint of each edge of M . Consider an arbitrary edge $\{i, i'\}$ of M such that $i \in I$. Since $i \in X'_t$, there exists a vertex $v_i \in X_t \cap V(H_i)$. Since $\{i, i'\}$ is an edge in $G^\circ[\mathcal{H}]$, the union of the graphs H_i and $H_{i'}$ is a connected subgraph of G containing at least two vertices; in particular, no vertex in $H_i \cup H_{i'}$ is isolated. Let $v_{i'}$ be a neighbor of v_i in $H_i \cup H_{i'}$. Since M is an induced matching in $G^\circ[\mathcal{H}]$, note that if $\{i, i'\}, \{j, j'\} \in M$ with $i, j \in I$ and $i \neq j$, then there is no edge in G connecting a vertex of $H_i \cup H_{i'}$ to a vertex of $H_j \cup H_{j'}$. Since for each $i \in I$, $v_i v_{i'}$ is an edge of $H_i \cup H_{i'}$, we conclude that $\{v_i v_{i'} : i \in I\}$ is an induced matching in G . Furthermore, each of the edges in this matching has an endpoint in X_t . This implies that $\mu_G(\mathcal{T}) > k$, a contradiction.

Assume now that each graph in \mathcal{H} has at least two vertices, but repetitions of subgraphs in \mathcal{H} are allowed. We now show that $\text{tree-}\alpha(G^\circ[\mathcal{H}]) \leq \text{tree-}\mu(G)$. Consider the same tree decomposition of $G^\circ[\mathcal{H}]$ as before. In this case, we can show, using a similar argument as above, that $\alpha_{G^\circ[\mathcal{H}]}(\mathcal{T}') \leq k$, which will establish $\text{tree-}\alpha(G^\circ[\mathcal{H}]) \leq \text{tree-}\mu(G)$. Consider a bag of \mathcal{T}' , say X'_t for some $t \in V(T)$, and suppose for a contradiction that there is an independent set I in the graph $G^\circ[\mathcal{H}]$ with cardinality $k + 1$ such that $I \subseteq X'_t$. Consider an arbitrary $i \in I$. Since $i \in X'_t$, there exists a vertex $v_i \in X_t \cap V(H_i)$. Since the graph H_i is connected and has at least two vertices, there exists a vertex $v_{i'}$ that is adjacent to v_i in H_i . Since for each $i \in I$, the edge $v_i v_{i'}$ is an edge of H_i , the fact that I is an independent set in $G^\circ[\mathcal{H}]$ and the definition of the graph $G^\circ[\mathcal{H}]$ imply that $\{v_i v_{i'} : i \in I\}$ is an induced matching in G . Furthermore, each of the edges in this matching has an endpoint in X_t . This implies that $\mu_G(\mathcal{T}) > k$, a contradiction. \square

Remark 5.4. In the first part of Lemma 5.3, the assumption that \mathcal{H} is a set is necessary. To see this, fix a positive integer n , let G be the complete bipartite graph $K_{n,n}$, and let \mathcal{H} be the multiset of connected subgraphs of G consisting of two copies of each one-vertex induced subgraph of G . Then $G^\circ[\mathcal{H}]$ is the graph obtained from two disjoint copies of the graph nK_2 by adding all

possible edges between them, where nK_2 denotes the disjoint union of n copies of K_2 . Clearly, $\text{tree-}\mu(G) = 1$, but, as we will show in Section 7 (see Proposition 7.10), $\text{tree-}\mu(G^\circ[\mathcal{H}]) \geq n$.

The same construction also shows that the assumption that all graphs in \mathcal{H} have at least two vertices is necessary in the second part of Lemma 5.3.

As the proof of Lemma 5.3 is algorithmic, we obtain the following corollary.

Corollary 5.5. *Given a graph G , a family \mathcal{H} of connected non-null subgraphs of G , and a tree decomposition $\mathcal{T} = (T, \{X_t\}_{t \in V(T)})$ of G , in time polynomial in $|V(G)|$, $|\mathcal{H}|$, and $|V(T)|$ we can compute a tree decomposition \mathcal{T}' of $G^\circ[\mathcal{H}]$ such that $\mu_{G^\circ[\mathcal{H}]}(\mathcal{T}') \leq \mu_G(\mathcal{T})$ if \mathcal{H} is a set, and $\alpha_{G^\circ[\mathcal{H}]}(\mathcal{T}') \leq \mu_G(\mathcal{T})$ if all graphs in \mathcal{H} have at least two vertices.*

5.1.1 Algorithmic consequences

Let us now explain how Lemma 5.3 can be used algorithmically. Given a graph G and a family $\mathcal{H} = \{H_j\}_{j \in J}$ of subgraphs of G , a subfamily \mathcal{H}' of \mathcal{H} is said to be an *independent \mathcal{H} -packing* in G if every two graphs in \mathcal{H}' are vertex-disjoint and there is no edge in G between them. In other words, \mathcal{H}' corresponds to an independent set in the graph $G^\circ[\mathcal{H}]$. Assume now that the subgraphs in \mathcal{H} are equipped with a weight function $\mathfrak{w}: J \rightarrow \mathbb{Q}_+$ assigning weight \mathfrak{w}_j to each subgraph H_j . For any set $J' \subseteq J$, we define the *weight* of the family $\mathcal{H}' = \{H_j\}_{j \in J'}$ as the sum $\sum_{j \in J'} \mathfrak{w}_j$. In particular, the weight of any independent \mathcal{H} -packing is well-defined.

Given a graph G , a finite family $\mathcal{H} = \{H_j\}_{j \in J}$ of connected non-null subgraphs of G , and a weight function $\mathfrak{w}: J \rightarrow \mathbb{Q}_+$ on the subgraphs in \mathcal{H} , the MAX WEIGHT INDEPENDENT PACKING problem asks to find an independent \mathcal{H} -packing in G of maximum weight. A natural special case of the problem is when for each $j \in J$, the value of \mathfrak{w}_j is equal to the number of vertices of H_j ; we call this restriction MAX INDEPENDENT PACKING [25].

It is straightforward to verify that MAX WEIGHT INDEPENDENT PACKING for G and \mathcal{H} is equivalent to MWIS in $G^\circ[\mathcal{H}]$, where the weights of vertices of $G^\circ[\mathcal{H}]$ correspond to the weights of subgraphs in \mathcal{H} .

Theorem 5.6. *Given a graph G and a finite family $\mathcal{H} = \{H_j\}_{j \in J}$ of connected non-null subgraphs of G , and a weight function $\mathfrak{w}: J \rightarrow \mathbb{Q}_+$, the MAX WEIGHT INDEPENDENT PACKING problem can be solved in time polynomial in $|V(G)|$ and $|\mathcal{H}|$ for graphs of bounded induced matching treewidth.*

Sketch of proof. The proof follows the reasoning of Dallard et al. [32] for tree-independence number, so let us just sketch it.

Let G and \mathcal{H} be as in the statement and let $\text{tree-}\mu(G) \leq k$, where k is a constant. First we preprocess the input family $\mathcal{H} = \{H_j\}_{j \in J}$ by keeping at most one copy of each subgraph of G . Indeed, if $H_i = H_j$ for two distinct $i, j \in J$ such that $\mathfrak{w}(i) \leq \mathfrak{w}(j)$, then not both H_i and H_j can appear in an independent \mathcal{H} -packing, and discarding H_i from the family \mathcal{H} results in an equivalent instance. After this preprocessing step, the resulting family $\mathcal{H}' = \{H_j\}_{j \in J'}$ is a set. Thus, by Lemma 5.3, we have $\text{tree-}\mu(G^\circ[\mathcal{H}']) \leq \text{tree-}\mu(G) \leq k$. Finally, we compute $G^\circ[\mathcal{H}']$ and solve the MWIS problem on $G^\circ[\mathcal{H}']$ (and the restriction of \mathfrak{w} to J') using Theorem 1.1. Since k is a constant, the overall running time is polynomial in $|V(G)|$ and $|\mathcal{H}|$. \square

A class \mathcal{C} of graphs is *weakly hyperfinite* if for every $\epsilon > 0$ there is $c(\epsilon) \in \mathbb{N}$ such that in every graph $G \in \mathcal{C}$ there is a subset $X \subseteq V(G)$ of at least $(1 - \epsilon)|V(G)|$ vertices such that every connected component of $G - X$ has at most $c(\epsilon)$ vertices [56, Section 16.2]. It turns out that every class that is closed under vertex and edge deletions and admits sublinear balanced separators is weakly hyperfinite. Many well-known classes of sparse graphs are weakly hyperfinite, e.g.,

graphs of bounded treewidth, planar graphs and, more generally, graphs of bounded genus. In fact, all proper minor-closed classes are weakly hyperfinite.

Theorem 5.7. *Let \mathcal{C} be a weakly hyperfinite class of graphs closed under vertex deletion and disjoint union operations. Let $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\epsilon > 0$ be fixed. Given a graph G with induced matching treewidth at most k , in polynomial time we can find a set $F \subseteq V(G)$ such that:*

1. $G[F] \in \mathcal{C}$,
2. the size of F is at least $(1 - \epsilon)OPT$, where OPT is the size of a largest set satisfying the first condition.

Sketch of proof. We again only provide a sketch of proof and refer the reader to Gartland et al. for further details [38]. Let F^* be an optimal solution. Since \mathcal{C} is weakly hyperfinite, there exists a set $F' \subseteq F^*$ such that $|F'| \geq (1 - \epsilon)|F^*|$ and every component of F' has at most $c(\epsilon)$ vertices. As \mathcal{C} is closed under vertex deletion, we observe that $F' \in \mathcal{C}$. Let \mathcal{H} be the family of induced subgraphs of G of size at most $c(\epsilon)$ that belong to \mathcal{C} . Note that \mathcal{H} can be enumerated in time polynomial in $V(G)$ as $c(\epsilon)$ is a constant.

We call the algorithm from Theorem 5.6 for G, \mathcal{H} , and the weight function defined as the number of vertices for each of \mathcal{H} . Let F be an optimal solution for this instance. As \mathcal{C} is closed under disjoint union, we observe that $F \in \mathcal{C}$. Furthermore, we have $|F| \geq |F'| \geq (1 - \epsilon)|F^*|$. \square

As bounded-treewidth graphs form a weakly hyperfinite class, we immediately obtain the following corollary.

Corollary 2.4. *For every fixed $k, r \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\epsilon > 0$, given a graph G with induced matching treewidth at most k , in polynomial time we can find a set $F \subseteq V(G)$ such that:*

1. $\text{tw}(G[F]) \leq r$,
2. the size of F is at least $(1 - \epsilon)OPT$, where OPT is the size of a largest set satisfying the first condition.

5.2 Tree-independence number and induced matching treewidth of graph powers

Now let us turn our attention to powers of graphs of bounded induced matching treewidth.

Lemma 5.8. *Let G be a graph, and k and d be positive integers. For $v \in V(G)$, let H_v be the subgraph of G induced by the vertices at distance at most d from v , and let $\mathcal{H} = \{H_v\}_{v \in V(G)}$. Then, the graphs G^{k+2d} and $(G^k)^\circ[\mathcal{H}]$ are isomorphic.*

Proof. Let us first observe that for every vertex $v \in V(G)$, the graph H_v is a connected subgraph of G^k . Hence, the graph $(G^k)^\circ[\mathcal{H}]$ is well-defined.

Note that the graphs G^{k+2d} and $(G^k)^\circ[\mathcal{H}]$ both have vertex sets of the same size. Moreover, there is a bijection that maps each $v \in V(G^{k+2d})$ to the vertex corresponding to H_v in $(G^k)^\circ[\mathcal{H}]$. For simplicity of notation, we denote both vertex sets by $V(G)$.

We now show that for any $u, v \in V(G)$, $uv \in E(G^{k+2d})$ if and only if $uv \in E((G^k)^\circ[\mathcal{H}])$, which will allow us to conclude that the graphs G^{k+2d} and $(G^k)^\circ[\mathcal{H}]$ are isomorphic.

Suppose first that u and v are adjacent in $(G^k)^\circ[\mathcal{H}]$. Then the graphs H_u and H_v either have a vertex in common, or they are vertex-disjoint but there is an edge between them in G^k . If H_u and H_v have a vertex in common, say $x \in V(H_u) \cap V(H_v)$, then $\text{dist}_G(u, v) \leq \text{dist}_G(u, x) + \text{dist}_G(x, v) \leq 2d \leq k + 2d$, and hence u and v are adjacent in G^{k+2d} . If H_u and H_v

are vertex disjoint but there exist vertices $x \in V(H_u)$ and $y \in V(H_v)$ such that $xy \in E(G^k)$, then $\text{dist}_G(u, v) \leq \text{dist}_G(u, x) + \text{dist}_G(x, y) + \text{dist}_G(y, v) \leq d + k + d = k + 2d$, and hence u and v are adjacent in G^{k+2d} .

Suppose now that u and v are adjacent in G^{k+2d} . Then $\text{dist}_G(u, v) \leq k + 2d$. We want to show that the graphs H_u and H_v either have a vertex in common, or they are vertex-disjoint but there is an edge between them in G^k . If u and v are at distance at most $2d$ in G , then there exists a vertex $x \in V(G)$ that is at distance in G at most d from each of u and v , and hence the graphs H_u and H_v have a vertex in common. We may thus assume that $\text{dist}_G(u, v) \geq 2d + 1$ or, equivalently, that the graphs H_u and H_v are vertex-disjoint. Since $2d + 1 \leq \text{dist}_G(u, v) \leq k + 2d$, there exists a u - v -path $P = (u = u_0, u_1, \dots, u_q = v)$ in G such that $2d + 1 \leq q \leq k + 2d$. This implies that $1 \leq \text{dist}_G(u_d, u_{q-d}) \leq k$ and hence the vertices u_d and u_{q-d} are adjacent in G^k . Since u_d is at distance at most d from u , it belongs to H_u . Similarly, u_{q-d} belongs to H_v . Thus, $u_d u_{q-d} \in E(G^k)$, and hence is an edge between the subgraphs H_u and H_v . This shows that u and v are adjacent in $(G^k)^\circ[\mathcal{H}]$. \square

Lemma 5.9. *Let G be a graph with at least one edge and r a positive integer. Then*

$$\text{tree-}\mu(G^{r+2}) \leq \text{tree-}\alpha(G^{r+2}) \leq \text{tree-}\mu(G^r) \leq \text{tree-}\alpha(G^r).$$

Proof. Since $\text{tree-}\mu(H) \leq \text{tree-}\alpha(H)$ for every graph H , it suffices to show that $\text{tree-}\alpha(G^{r+2}) \leq \text{tree-}\mu(G^r)$. Suppose first that G is connected. By Lemma 5.8 (applied with $k = r$ and $d = 1$), the graph G^{r+2} is isomorphic to the graph $(G^r)^\circ[\mathcal{H}]$, where $\mathcal{H} = \{H_v\}_{v \in V(G)}$ and H_v is the subgraph of G induced by the vertices at distance at most 1 from v . Therefore, $\text{tree-}\mu(G^{r+2}) = \text{tree-}\mu((G^r)^\circ[\mathcal{H}])$. By definition, each subgraph in \mathcal{H} is connected. Furthermore, since G is a connected graph with at least two vertices, every vertex $v \in V(G)$ has a neighbor and hence H_v has at least two vertices. Hence, by Lemma 5.3, $\text{tree-}\alpha((G^r)^\circ[\mathcal{H}]) \leq \text{tree-}\mu(G^r)$, and we conclude $\text{tree-}\alpha(G^{r+2}) \leq \text{tree-}\mu(G^r)$.

Now, let us consider the general case. Let $\ell = \text{tree-}\mu(G^r)$. Since G has an edge, so does G^r and consequently $\ell \geq 1$. By the first case, each nontrivial connected component C of G satisfies $\text{tree-}\alpha(C^{r+2}) \leq \text{tree-}\mu(C^r) \leq \ell$. Since $\ell \geq 1$, each component C of G with only one vertex satisfies $\text{tree-}\alpha(C^{r+2}) \leq \ell$. By combining tree decompositions with independence number at most ℓ of each component of G^{r+2} , we obtain a tree decomposition of G^{r+2} with independence number at most ℓ . Therefore, $\text{tree-}\alpha(G^{r+2}) \leq \ell$. \square

Lemma 5.9 is a significant generalization of a result of Duchet [34], who proved that for every positive integer r , if G^r is chordal, then so is G^{r+2} . This corresponds to the case when $\text{tree-}\alpha(G^r) \leq 1$.

Corollary 5.10. *For any graph G and positive integer r , we have $\text{tree-}\alpha(G^{r+2}) \leq \text{tree-}\alpha(G^r)$ and $\text{tree-}\mu(G^{r+2}) \leq \text{tree-}\mu(G^r)$.*

Proof. If G has no vertices, then $\text{tree-}\alpha(G^r) = \text{tree-}\alpha(G^{r+2}) = \text{tree-}\mu(G^r) = \text{tree-}\mu(G^{r+2}) = 0$ and the statement holds. Assume now that G is non-null. If G is edgeless, then so are G^r and G^{r+2} ; hence $\text{tree-}\alpha(G^r) = \text{tree-}\alpha(G^{r+2}) = 1$ and $\text{tree-}\mu(G^r) = \text{tree-}\mu(G^{r+2}) = 0$ and the statement holds. Finally, assume that G has at least one edge. Then, by Lemma 5.9 we have $\text{tree-}\mu(G^{r+2}) \leq \text{tree-}\alpha(G^{r+2}) \leq \text{tree-}\mu(G^r) \leq \text{tree-}\alpha(G^r)$, which implies both stated inequalities. \square

Corollary 5.11. *Let G be a graph and r be a positive odd integer. Then $\text{tree-}\alpha(G^r) \leq \text{tree-}\alpha(G)$ and $\text{tree-}\mu(G^r) \leq \text{tree-}\mu(G)$.*

Corollary 5.11 generalizes a result due to Balakrishnan and Paulraja [9] stating that the class of chordal graphs is closed under taking odd powers.

Lemma 5.9 and a straightforward induction on r also implies the following.

Corollary 5.12. *Let G be a graph and $r \geq 3$ an odd integer. Then $\text{tree-}\alpha(G^r) \leq \text{tree-}\mu(G)$.*

Furthermore, as all our proofs are algorithmic, we obtain the following.

Corollary 5.13. *For every odd integer $r \geq 3$, there exists an algorithm that takes as input a graph G and a tree decomposition $\mathcal{T} = (T, \{X_t\}_{t \in V(T)})$ of G , and computes in time polynomial in $|V(G)|$ the graph G^r and a tree decomposition $\mathcal{T}' = (T, \{X'_t\}_{t \in V(T)})$ of G^r such that $\alpha_{G^r}(\mathcal{T}') \leq \mu_G(\mathcal{T})$.*

5.2.1 Algorithmic consequences

Let d be a positive integer, let G be a graph, let $\mathcal{H} = \{H_j\}_{j \in J}$ be a finite family of connected non-null subgraphs of G , and let $J' \subseteq J$. A *distance- d \mathcal{H} -packing* in G is a subfamily $\mathcal{H}' = \{H_j\}_{j \in J'}$ of subgraphs from \mathcal{H} that are at pairwise distance at least d in G .

Observation 5.14. *Let d be a positive integer, let G be a graph, let $\mathcal{H} = \{H_j\}_{j \in J}$ be a finite family of connected non-null subgraphs of G , and let $J' \subseteq J$. Then, the corresponding subfamily $\mathcal{H}' = \{H_j\}_{j \in J'}$ is a distance- d \mathcal{H} -packing in G if and only if \mathcal{H}' is an independent \mathcal{H} -packing in the graph G^{d-1} .*

Proof. Consider two distinct elements $i, j \in J'$. It suffices to show that $\text{dist}_G(V(H_i), V(H_j)) \geq d$ if and only if $\text{dist}_{G^{d-1}}(V(H_i), V(H_j)) \geq 2$, or, equivalently, that $\text{dist}_G(V(H_i), V(H_j)) \leq d - 1$ if and only if $\text{dist}_{G^{d-1}}(V(H_i), V(H_j)) \leq 1$.

Suppose first that $\text{dist}_G(V(H_i), V(H_j)) \leq d - 1$ and let $P = (v_0, \dots, v_r)$ be a path in G from a vertex in H_i to a vertex in H_j such that $r \leq d - 1$. If $r = 0$ then $\text{dist}_{G^{d-1}}(V(H_i), V(H_j)) = 0$. If $r > 0$, then in G^{d-1} , vertices v_0 and v_r are adjacent, and hence $\text{dist}_{G^{d-1}}(V(H_i), V(H_j)) \leq 1$.

Suppose now that $\text{dist}_{G^{d-1}}(V(H_i), V(H_j)) \leq 1$. If this distance is 0, then the graphs H_i and H_j have a vertex in common and hence $\text{dist}_G(V(H_i), V(H_j)) = 0 \leq d - 1$. If this distance is 1, then there is a path P in G of length at most $d - 1$ from a vertex in H_i to a vertex in H_j . Thus, $\text{dist}_G(V(H_i), V(H_j)) \leq d - 1$. \square

For an integer d , the input to MAX WEIGHT DISTANCE- d PACKING is a graph G , a finite family $\mathcal{H} = \{H_j\}_{j \in J}$ of connected non-null subgraphs of G , and a weight function $\mathbf{w}: J \rightarrow \mathbb{Q}_+$ on the subgraphs in \mathcal{H} . The problem asks for a maximum-weight distance- d \mathcal{H} -packing in G . By Observation 5.14, for every $J' \subseteq J$, the corresponding subfamily $\mathcal{H}' = \{H_j\}_{j \in J'}$ is a distance- d \mathcal{H} -packing in G if and only if \mathcal{H}' is an independent \mathcal{H} -packing in the graph G^{d-1} .

Theorem 5.15. *For every positive integer k and even positive integer d , given a graph G of induced matching treewidth at most k , a finite family $\mathcal{H} = \{H_j\}_{j \in J}$ of connected non-null subgraphs of G , and a weight function $\mathbf{w}: J \rightarrow \mathbb{Q}_+$ on the subgraphs in \mathcal{H} , the MAX WEIGHT DISTANCE- d PACKING problem is solvable in time polynomial in $|V(G)|$ and $|\mathcal{H}|$.*

Proof. If $d = 2$, then the MAX WEIGHT DISTANCE- d PACKING problem coincides with the MAX WEIGHT INDEPENDENT PACKING problem and the conclusion follows from Theorem 5.6. So we may assume that $d \geq 4$.

We compute the graphs G^{d-1} and $(G^{d-1})^\circ[\mathcal{H}]$; note that the latter graph is well-defined, since every graph in \mathcal{H} is a connected non-null subgraph of G^{d-1} . By Corollary 5.12, $\text{tree-}\alpha(G^{d-1}) \leq \text{tree-}\mu(G)$, and by Corollary 5.2, $\text{tree-}\alpha((G^{d-1})^\circ[\mathcal{H}]) \leq \text{tree-}\alpha(G^{d-1})$. Therefore, $\text{tree-}\mu((G^{d-1})^\circ[\mathcal{H}]) \leq \text{tree-}\alpha((G^{d-1})^\circ[\mathcal{H}]) \leq \text{tree-}\mu(G) = k$. By Observation 5.14, a subfamily

\mathcal{H}' of \mathcal{H} is a distance- d \mathcal{H} -packing in G if and only if \mathcal{H}' is an independent \mathcal{H} -packing in the graph G^{d-1} , which is also equivalent to \mathcal{H}' being an independent set in the graph $(G^{d-1})^\circ[\mathcal{H}]$. Finally, using the fact that $\text{tree-}\mu((G^{d-1})^\circ[\mathcal{H}]) \leq k$, we call Theorem 1.1 to solve the instance $((G^{d-1})^\circ[\mathcal{H}], \mathfrak{w})$ of MWIS. The overall running time is polynomial in $|V(G)|$ and $|\mathcal{H}|$, as k is a constant. \square

Note that in the last step of the above proof, instead of Theorem 1.1 we could have also used an algorithm for MWIS for graphs with bounded $\text{tree-}\alpha$ (see [32]).

We remark that unless $\text{P} = \text{NP}$, the result of Theorem 5.15 cannot be generalized to odd values of $d \geq 3$, since in this case the distance- d variant of MAX INDEPENDENT SET is NP-hard for chordal graphs (see [35]), which have induced matching treewidth (and even tree-independence number) at most one. Similarly, a result analogous to Corollary 5.11 does not hold for even powers. To this end, since the induced matching treewidth (resp. tree-independence number) of chordal graphs is at most one, it suffices to show that the k -th powers of chordal graphs may have arbitrarily large induced matching treewidth (resp. tree-independence number). The idea of the construction below comes from Eto et al. [35].

Lemma 5.16. *Let r be an even positive integer. For any graph H , there exists a chordal graph G such that G^r contains H as an induced subgraph.*

Proof. Let \widehat{H} be the graph obtained from H by subdividing each edge exactly once and adding edges so that the newly introduced vertices form a clique. For convenience, we denote the vertices of \widehat{H} not resulting from edge subdivisions by $V(H)$. Note that the vertices of $V(\widehat{H}) \setminus V(H)$ correspond to the edges of H . Then $V(H)$ is an independent set in \widehat{H} and $V(\widehat{H}) \setminus V(H)$ is a clique in \widehat{H} . Hence \widehat{H} is a split graph and thus a chordal graph. We obtain the graph G from \widehat{H} by appending to each vertex $v \in V(H)$ a path P^v of length $(r-2)/2$ (which is an integer, since r is even) such that one endpoint of P^v is v and all the other vertices of P^v are new. In particular, for any two different vertices $v, w \in V(H)$, the corresponding paths P^v and P^w are vertex-disjoint. By construction, the graph G is chordal. For each vertex $v \in V(H)$, let us denote the two endpoints of P^v by v and v' (with $v' = v$ if and only if $r = 2$), and let $X = \{v' : v \in V(H)\}$. For arbitrary two distinct vertices $u, v \in V(H)$, it holds that $u'v' \in E(G^r)$ if and only if $\text{dist}_G(u', v') \leq r$, which happens if and only if u and v are adjacent in H . Thus, the subgraph of G^r induced by X is isomorphic to H . This shows that for every graph H there exists a chordal graph G such that G^r contains an induced subgraph isomorphic to H , as claimed. \square

Since there exist graphs with arbitrarily large induced matching treewidth and tree-independence number, we obtain the following corollaries.

Corollary 5.17. *Let r be an even positive integer. There is no function f satisfying $\text{tree-}\alpha(G^r) \leq f(\text{tree-}\alpha(G))$ for all graphs G .*

Corollary 5.18. *Let r be an even positive integer. There is no function f satisfying $\text{tree-}\mu(G^r) \leq f(\text{tree-}\mu(G))$ for all graphs G .*

6 Max Weight Induced Subgraph for graphs with bounded tree-independence number

We start this section by recalling some basic notions and properties related to CMSO_2 .

6.1 CMSO₂: basic notions and properties

CMSO₂ logic on graphs. We assume that graphs are encoded as relational structures: each vertex and each edge is represented by a single variable (distinguishable by a unary predicate), and there is a single binary relation *inc* (*incident*) binding each edge with its endvertices.

MSO₂ (Monadic Second Order) logic is a logic on graphs that allows us to use vertex variables, edge variables, vertex set variables, and edge set variables, and, furthermore, to quantify over them. An example of an MSO₂ formula is the following expression checking if the chromatic number of a given graph is at most r (for constant r). Here, S_i 's are vertex set variables, e is an edge variable, and x, y are vertex variables.

$$\exists_{S_1, S_2, \dots, S_r} (\forall_x x \in S_1 \cup S_2 \dots \cup S_r) \wedge \forall_e \forall_{x, y} (\text{inc}(e, x) \wedge \text{inc}(e, y) \wedge x \neq y) \rightarrow \bigwedge_{i=1}^r (x \notin S_i \vee y \notin S_i).$$

For a positive integer p , by $\mathbf{C}_{\leq p}\text{MSO}_2$ we mean the extension of MSO₂ that allows us to use atomic formulae of the form $|S| \equiv a \pmod b$, where S is a (vertex of edge) set variable, and $a, b \leq p$ are integers. We define **CMSO₂ (Counting Monadic Second Order)** logic to be $\bigcup_{p>0} \mathbf{C}_{\leq p}\text{MSO}_2$. The *quantifier rank* of a formula is the maximum number of nested quantifiers in the formula (counting both first-order and second-order quantifiers).

Boundaried graphs and CMSO₂ types. Let $\ell > 0$ be an integer. An ℓ -boundaried graph is a pair (G, ι) , where G is a graph and ι is a partial injective function from $V(G)$ to $[\ell]$. The domain of ι , denoted by $\text{dom}(\iota)$, is called the *boundary* of (G, ι) . For $v \in \text{dom}(\iota)$, the value of $\iota(v)$ is called the *label* of v .

Let us define two natural operations on boundaried graphs. For an ℓ -boundaried graph (G, ι) and $l \in [\ell]$, the result of *forgetting the label l* is the ℓ -boundaried graph $(G, \iota_{\rightarrow l})$, here $\iota_{\rightarrow l} := \iota|_{\text{dom}(\iota) \setminus \iota^{-1}(l)}$. In other words, if the boundary of (G, ι) contains vertex v with label l , we remove the label from v , while keeping v in the graph. Note that if l is not in the image of ι , then this operation does not do anything.

For two ℓ -boundaried graphs (G_1, ι_1) and (G_2, ι_2) , the result of *gluing* them is the ℓ -boundaried graph $(G_1, \iota_1) \oplus_{[\ell]} (G_2, \iota_2)$ obtained from the disjoint union of (G_1, ι_1) and (G_2, ι_2) by identifying vertices with the same label. Note that it might happen that some label l is used in, e.g., ι_1 but not in ι_2 . Then the vertex with label l in $(G_1, \iota_1) \oplus_{[\ell]} (G_2, \iota_2)$ is the copy of the vertex with label l from (G_1, ι_1) .

It is straightforward to observe that a graph has treewidth less than ℓ if and only if it can be constructed from ℓ -boundaried graphs with at most two vertices by a sequence of forgetting and gluing operations (see, e.g., [36]).

By **CMSO₂** in ℓ -boundaried graphs we mean **CMSO₂** extended with ℓ unary predicates: for each $l \in [\ell]$ we have a predicate that selects a vertex with label l (if such a vertex exists). Let (G, ι) be an ℓ -boundaried graph and p and q be positive integers. The (p, q) -*type* of (G, ι) is the set of all $\mathbf{C}_{\leq p}\text{MSO}_2$ formulae ϕ of quantifier rank at most q such that $(G, \iota) \models \phi$. As such, the (p, q) -type of an ℓ -boundaried graph is an infinite set. However, the formulae in $\mathbf{C}_{\leq p}\text{MSO}_2$ can be normalized so that every formula can be effectively transformed into an equivalent normalized formula of the same quantifier rank. Furthermore, for every quantifier rank there are only finitely many pairwise non-equivalent normalized formulae. This result is folklore (see, e.g., [39, Lemma 6.1]) and holds for general relational structures. In the setting of ℓ -boundaried graphs, the result is given by the following proposition. The exact formulation we use here comes from Gartland et al. [38, Proposition 8].

Proposition 6.1. *For every triple of integers ℓ, p, q , there exists a finite set $\text{Types}^{\ell, p, q}$ and a function that assigns to every ℓ -boundaried graph (G, ι) a type $\text{type}^{\ell, p, q}(G, \iota) \in \text{Types}^{\ell, p, q}$ such that the following holds:*

1. *The types of isomorphic graphs are the same.*
2. *For every $\text{C}_{\leq p}\text{MSO}_2$ formula ϕ on ℓ -boundaried graphs, whether (G, ι) satisfies ϕ depends only on the type $\text{type}^{\ell, p, q}(G, \iota)$, where q is the quantifier rank of ϕ . More precisely, there exists a subset $\text{Types}^{\ell, p, q}[\phi] \subseteq \text{Types}^{\ell, p, q}$ such that for every ℓ -boundaried graph (G, ι) we have*

$$(G, \iota) \models \phi \quad \text{if and only if} \quad \text{type}^{\ell, p, q}(G, \iota) \in \text{Types}^{\ell, p, q}[\phi].$$

3. *The types of ingredients determine the type of the result of the gluing operation. More precisely, for every two types $\tau_1, \tau_2 \in \text{Types}^{\ell, p, q}$ there exists a type $\tau_1 \oplus_{\ell, p, q} \tau_2$ such that for every two ℓ -boundaried graphs $(G_1, \iota_1), (G_2, \iota_2)$, if $\text{type}^{\ell, p, q}(G_i, \iota_i) = \tau_i$ for $i = 1, 2$, then*

$$\text{type}^{\ell, p, q}((G_1, \iota_1) \oplus_{[\ell]} (G_2, \iota_2)) = \tau_1 \oplus_{\ell, p, q} \tau_2.$$

Also, the operation $\oplus_{\ell, p, q}$ is associative and commutative.

4. *The type of the ingredient determines the type of the result of the forget label operation. More precisely, for every type $\tau \in \text{Types}^{\ell, p, q}$ and $l \in [\ell]$ there exists a type τ_{-l} such that for every ℓ -boundaried graph (G, ι) , if $\text{type}^{\ell, p, q}(G, \iota) = \tau$ and (G, ι_{-l}) is the result of forgetting l in (G, ι) , then*

$$\text{type}^{\ell, p, q}(G, \iota_{-l}) = \tau_{-l}.$$

Intuitively, for any ℓ -boundaried graph (G, ι) and every $\text{C}_{\leq p}\text{MSO}_2$ formula ϕ with quantified rank at most q , whether $(G, \iota) \models \phi$ is fully determined by $\text{type}^{\ell, p, q}(G, \iota)$. Furthermore, if ϕ and ℓ are fixed, then the sets $\text{Types}^{\ell, p, q}$ and $\text{Types}^{\ell, p, q}[\phi]$ are of constant size. Finally, it is known that there is an algorithm that, given ℓ and ϕ , computes $\text{Types}^{\ell, p, q}$ and $\text{Types}^{\ell, p, q}[\phi]$ [22].

6.2 CMSO₂-definable subgraphs of graphs with small tree-independence number

Now we are ready to prove our main result concerning sparse induced subgraphs satisfying some CMSO₂-definable property. Here, ‘‘sparse’’ means having bounded clique number.

For positive integers a and b , we denote by $\text{Ramsey}(a, b)$ the smallest positive integer n such that every graph with at least n vertices contains either a clique of size a or an independent set of size b . As proved by Ramsey [63], these numbers are well-defined.

Theorem 6.2. *For every k, r , and a CMSO₂ formula ψ there exists a positive integer $f(k, r, \psi)$ such that the following holds. Let G be a graph given along with a tree decomposition $\mathcal{T} = (T, \{X_t\}_{t \in V(T)})$ of independence number at most k , and let $\omega: V(G) \rightarrow \mathbb{Q}_+$ be a weight function. Then in time $f(k, r, \psi) \cdot |V(G)|^{\mathcal{O}(\text{Ramsey}(k+1, r+1))} \cdot |V(T)|$ we can find a set $F \subseteq V(G)$, such that*

1. $G[F] \models \psi$,
2. $\omega(G[F]) \leq r$,
3. F is of maximum weight subject to the conditions above,

or conclude that no such set exists.

Proof. Let $\mathcal{T} = (T, \{X_t\}_{t \in V(T)})$ be a tree decomposition of G with independence number at most k . Recall that without loss of generality we can assume that \mathcal{T} is nice, since otherwise we can transform the given tree decomposition into a nice one in time $\mathcal{O}(|V(G)|^2|V(T)|)$. Let F be a fixed (unknown) optimal solution. Note that by removing all vertices from $V(G) \setminus F$ from each bag of \mathcal{T} , we obtain a tree decomposition of $G[F]$ with independence number at most k . As $\omega(G[F]) \leq r$, we conclude that every bag of \mathcal{T} contains fewer than $\text{Ramsey}(k+1, r+1)$ vertices of F . In particular, the treewidth of $G[F]$ is at most $\ell := \text{Ramsey}(k+1, r+1)$. This is the only way in which we use that $\omega(G[F]) \leq r$. Thus, in order to make sure that the obtained solution indeed satisfies the bound on the clique number, instead of ψ we will use the CMSO_2 formula $\phi := \psi \wedge \phi_{\omega \leq r}$, where $\phi_{\omega \leq r}$ is the formula that bounds the clique number by r :

$$\forall_{v_1, \dots, v_{r+1}} \neg \left(\bigwedge_{1 \leq i < j \leq r+1} \exists_e (\text{inc}(e, v_i) \wedge \text{inc}(e, v_j)) \right).$$

Since the treewidth of the graph $G[F]$ is at most ℓ , this graph can be constructed by a sequence of forgetting and gluing operations on ℓ -boundaried graphs.

Consider the minimum integer p such that ϕ belongs to $\text{C}_{\leq p} \text{MSO}_2$, and let q be the quantifier rank of ϕ . Let $\text{Types}^{\ell, p, q}$ and $\text{Types}^{\ell, p, q}[\phi]$ be as in Proposition 6.1. Recall that these sets are of constant size (since k, r , and ϕ are fixed); we assume that they are hard-coded in our algorithm. Similarly, we assume that the forgetting and gluing operations on types, i.e., functions

$$(\tau_1, \tau_2) \mapsto \tau_1 \oplus_{\ell, p, q} \tau_2 \quad \text{and} \quad (\tau, \ell) \mapsto \tau_{-\ell},$$

are hard-coded. Finally, our algorithm has the list of types of all ℓ -boundaried graphs with at most ℓ vertices. As ℓ, p, q are fixed throughout the algorithm, we will simplify the notation by dropping subscripts and superscripts, i.e., we will simply write Types , $\text{Types}[\phi]$, and \oplus .

Our algorithm is a standard bottom-up dynamic programming on the nice tree decomposition \mathcal{T} of G . We will describe how to compute the weight of an optimal solution; adapting our approach to return the solution itself is a standard task.

We introduce the dynamic programming table $\text{Tab}[\cdot]$ indexed by nodes t of T and *states*. Each state is a triple (S, ι, τ) , where $S \subseteq X_t$ has at most ℓ vertices, ι is an injective function from S to $[\ell]$, and $\tau \in \text{Types}$. The value of $\text{Tab}_t[S, \iota, \tau]$ will encode the maximum weight of a subset F_t of $V(G_t)$ such that

1. $F_t \cap X_t = S$,
2. $\text{type}((G[F_t], \iota)) = \tau$.

Intuitively, we think of S as the intersection of a fixed optimal solution with X_t and we look for a maximum-weight induced ℓ -boundaried subgraph of G_t with boundary S and type τ . If there is no subset F_t satisfying the conditions above, we will have $\text{Tab}_t[S, \iota, \tau] = -\infty$. Clearly, having computed all entries of $\text{Tab}[\cdot]$, the weight of the sought-for optimal solution is

$$\max_{\tau} \text{Tab}_{\text{root}(T)}[\emptyset, \emptyset, \tau], \text{ over all } \tau \in \text{Types}[\phi].$$

Let us now describe how we compute the entries $\text{Tab}_t[\cdot]$ for a node t of T . The exact way depends on the type of x .

Case: t is a leaf node. Note that in this case G_t has no vertices, and thus the values of $\text{Tab}_t[\cdot]$ can be extracted from the information that is hard-coded in the algorithm.

Case: t is an introduce node. Let t' be the child of t in T , and let v be the unique vertex in $X_t \setminus X_{t'}$. Clearly, if $v \notin S$, then $\text{Tab}_t[S, \iota, \tau] = \text{Tab}_{t'}[S, \iota, \tau]$.

So let $v \in S$, let $S' = S \setminus \{v\}$, and let $\iota' = \iota|_{S'}$. Let G_S be the subgraph of X_t induced by S . As $|S| \leq \ell$, the value $\tau_S := \text{type}((G_S, \iota))$ is hard-coded in our algorithm. Now we set

$$\text{Tab}_t[S, \iota, \tau] = \max_{\tau'} \text{Tab}_{t'}[S', \iota', \tau'],$$

where the maximum is taken over all τ' such that $\tau_S \oplus \tau' = \tau$.

Case: t is a forget node. Let t' be the child of t in \mathcal{T} , and let v be the unique vertex in $X_{t'} \setminus X_t$. Intuitively, partial solutions at t correspond to partial solutions at t' with the label of v (if any) forgotten. Thus

$$\text{Tab}_t[S, \iota, \tau] = \max \left(\text{Tab}_{t'}[S, \iota, \tau], \max_{\iota', \tau'} \text{Tab}_{t'}[S \cup \{v\}, \iota', \tau'] \right),$$

where the second term only appears if $|S| < \ell$. The maximum in the second term is computed over all pairs ι', τ' , such that $\iota'|_S = \iota$ and $\tau'_{-v} = \tau$.

Case: t is a join node. Let t', t'' be the children of t . Thus

$$\text{Tab}_t[S, \iota, \tau] = \max_{\tau', \tau''} \text{Tab}_{t'}[S, \iota, \tau'] + \text{Tab}_{t''}[S, \iota, \tau''] - \mathfrak{w}(S),$$

where the maximum is taken over all τ', τ'' such that $\tau' \oplus \tau'' = \tau$. Note that we subtract the weight of S , as it is counted both for t' and for t'' .

The correctness of the procedure above follows directly from the properties of nice tree decompositions and Proposition 6.1.

For each node t of T , the number of states is at most $|X_t|^\ell \cdot \ell! \cdot |\text{Types}|$. Each entry of $\text{Tab}[\cdot]$ can be computed in time proportional to the number of states for each node (here we use that k, r, ϕ are fixed). We conclude that the running time is $f(k, r, \psi) \cdot |V(G)|^{\mathcal{O}(\text{Ramsey}(k+1, r+1))} |V(T)|$ for some function f depending on k, r , and ψ . \square

We remark that one can easily obtain a variant of Theorem 6.2 in which a tree decomposition with small independence number is not needed in the input. Indeed, combining Theorem 6.2 with Theorem 3.2 yields Theorem 6.3 (with $g(k, r) = \mathcal{O}(\text{Ramsey}(8k + 1, r + 1))$).

Theorem 6.3. *For every k, r , and a CMSO₂ formula ψ there exist positive integers $f(k, r, \psi)$ and $g(k, r)$ such that the following holds. Let G be a graph with $\text{tree-}\alpha(G) \leq k$, and let $\mathfrak{w}: V(G) \rightarrow \mathbb{Q}_+$ be a weight function. Then in time $f(k, r, \psi) \cdot |V(G)|^{g(k, r)}$ we can find a set $F \subseteq V(G)$, such that*

1. $G[F] \models \psi$,
2. $\omega(G[F]) \leq r$,
3. F is of maximum weight subject to the conditions above,

or conclude that no such set exists.

6.3 A generalization

Theorem 6.3 can be slightly generalized so that we can maximize the weight of some carefully chosen subset of the solution. The formula ψ uses this set as a free variable.

Theorem 6.4. *For every k, r , and a CMSO_2 formula ψ with one free vertex-set variable, there exist positive integers $f(k, r, \psi)$ and $g(k, r)$ such that the following holds. Let G be a graph with $\text{tree-}\alpha(G) \leq k$, and let $\mathfrak{w}: V(G) \rightarrow \mathbb{Q}_+$ be a weight function. Then in time $f(k, r, \psi) \cdot |V(G)|^{g(k, r)}$ we can find sets $X \subseteq F \subseteq V(G)$, such that:*

1. $(G[F], X) \models \psi$,
2. $\omega(G[F]) \leq r$,
3. X is of maximum possible weight, subject to conditions above,

or conclude that no such set exists.

Proof sketch. The proof follows by a simple trick used by Gartland et al. [38, Theorem 38]. We just sketch the argument here and refer the reader to [38] for more details.

For a graph G and a subset $M \subseteq V(G)$, by \check{G} we denote the *forked version* of (G, M) , which is obtained as follows. We start the construction with a copy of G . For every vertex v of G we introduce to \check{G}^M three vertices of degree 1, each adjacent only to v . For every vertex v of M we introduce to \check{G}^M a two-edge path, whose one endvertex is identified with v . If G is equipped with weights \mathfrak{w} , we set the weights $\check{\mathfrak{w}}$ of all vertices of \check{G}^M to 0, with the exception that the value of $\mathfrak{w}(v)$ for $v \in M$ is transferred to the other endvertex of the two-edge path attached to v .

Note that if F' is a forked version of some (F, M) , then F and M can be uniquely decoded from F' . Indeed, F is the subgraph of F' induced by vertices of degree at least four, and vertices of M are those vertices of F that are adjacent (in F') to a vertex of degree 2. Furthermore, $\omega(F') \leq \max(\omega(F), 2)$.

We apply the algorithm of Theorem 3.2 to compute in time $|V(G)|^{\mathcal{O}(k)}$ a tree decomposition $\mathcal{T} = (T, \{X_t\}_{t \in V(T)})$ of G with independence number at most $8k$. Moreover, observe that, given the tree decomposition \mathcal{T} , we can easily obtain a tree decomposition $\check{\mathcal{T}} = (\check{T}, \{\check{X}_t\}_{t \in V(\check{T})})$ of $\check{G}^{V(G)}$ with $\alpha(\check{\mathcal{T}}) \leq \alpha(\mathcal{T})$. The idea is to call the algorithm from Theorem 6.2 on $\check{G}^{V(G)}$ and a formula $\check{\psi}$ that for a graph F' ensures that

- if F' is a forked version of some (F, M) , then $F' \models \check{\psi}$ if and only if $(F, M) \models \psi$,
- otherwise $F' \not\models \check{\psi}$.

Such a formula can be easily constructed in CMSO_2 [38]. We observe that the solution found by the algorithm satisfies the conditions stated in the theorem; again, see [38, Theorem 38] for details. \square

6.4 Algorithmic applications and limitations

Using the framework of Theorem 6.3 we can solve several well-studied problems for graphs of bounded tree-independence number:

- MAX WEIGHT INDEPENDENT SET,
- MAX WEIGHT INDUCED FOREST, which is equivalent by complementation to MIN WEIGHT FEEDBACK VERTEX SET,

- MAX WEIGHT INDUCED BIPARTITE SUBGRAPH, which is equivalent by complementation to MIN WEIGHT ODD CYCLE TRANSVERSAL,
- MAX WEIGHT INDUCED ODD CACTUS, which is equivalent by complementation to MIN WEIGHT EVEN CYCLE TRANSVERSAL (see e.g. [12]),
- MAX WEIGHT INDUCED PLANAR SUBGRAPH, which is equivalent to PLANARIZATION (see e.g. [61]),
- DEFECTIVE COLORING, where we ask for a vertex coloring using χ_d colors in which each color class induced a subgraph of maximum degree bounded by Δ^* , where both χ_d and Δ^* are fixed (see, e.g., [10]), and
- MAX k -DEPENDENT SET, that is, maximum set of vertices inducing a subgraph of maximum degree at most k (see, e.g., [42]), which is equivalent by complementation to BOUNDED-DEGREE VERTEX DELETION.

In particular, these results generalize Theorems 23 and 25 from [10], giving polynomial-time algorithms for DEFECTIVE COLORING for fixed χ_d and Δ^* in graphs of bounded treewidth and chordal graphs, respectively. They also solve an open problem from [42] regarding the complexity of MAX k -DEPENDENT SET on interval graphs (see [42, Table 2]).

Using the extension from Theorem 6.4 we can solve some other problems, for example:

- find the maximum number of pairwise independent induced cycles.

Note that the difference is that we maximize the *number* of cycles, and not their *total size* (or weight), as we could do using Theorem 6.3. On the other hand, the number of induced cycles in a graph might be very large, so this problem cannot be solved using Theorem 5.6 (or Theorem 5.15). However, we can solve our problem by calling Theorem 6.4 with the following parameters:

- $r = 3$,
- ψ is the formula saying that $G[F]$ is 2-regular (i.e., each component of $G[F]$ is a cycle) and each vertex from X must be in a distinct connected component of $G[F]$, and
- the weight of each vertex is 1.

In conclusion, let us point out that in Theorems 6.2 to 6.4 we need to assume that the clique number of the solution is bounded by a constant. Indeed, the property of being a clique can be easily expressed by a CMSO₂ formula as follows (here x, y are vertex variables and e is an edge variable):

$$\phi_{\text{clique}} := \forall_{x,y} (x \neq y \rightarrow \exists_e (\text{inc}(e, x) \wedge \text{inc}(e, y))).$$

However, MAX CLIQUE is NP-hard on graphs with independence number 2, and thus of tree-independence number at most 2. Indeed, this follows from the fact that MAX INDEPENDENT SET is NP-hard on triangle-free graphs [62], by complementing the input graph.

7 Complexity of computing induced matching treewidth and bounds

In this section, we collect some basic complexity and algorithmic observations about induced matching treewidth, establish its close relation to treewidth for graphs with bounded degree, and give constructions of two families of graphs with unbounded degree and unbounded induced matching treewidth.

7.1 Remarks on complexity of computing induced matching treewidth

Proposition 3.1 together with known hardness results on the tree-independence number from [29, 32] and on the independence number from [73] imply the following hardness results for induced matching treewidth.

Theorem 7.1. *The following lower bounds hold.*

1. For every constant $k \geq 4$, it is NP-complete to decide whether $\text{tree-}\mu(G) \leq k$ for a graph G .
2. For every $\varepsilon > 0$, there is no polynomial-time algorithm for approximating induced matching treewidth of an n -vertex graph to within a factor of $n^{1-\varepsilon}$ unless $P = NP$.
3. There is no constant-factor FPT-approximation algorithm for induced matching treewidth, unless $FPT = W[1]$.
4. For any computable functions f, g , there is no $g(k)$ -approximation algorithm for computing induced matching treewidth in time $f(k) \cdot n^{o(k)}$, unless the Gap-ETH fails.⁵

Proof. Fix an integer $k \geq 4$. Clearly, the problem of testing if $\text{tree-}\mu(G) \leq k$ for a given graph G belongs to NP. To establish NP-hardness, we make a reduction from the problem of testing if a given graph G satisfies $\text{tree-}\alpha(G) \leq k$. As shown by Dallard et al. [29], this problem is NP-complete. By Proposition 3.1, $\text{tree-}\alpha(G) = \text{tree-}\mu(G \circ K_1)$ and hence $\text{tree-}\alpha(G) \leq k$ if and only if $\text{tree-}\mu(G \circ K_1) \leq k$. Since computing the corona of G can be done in polynomial time, hardness follows.

To obtain the inapproximability result, let us recall the original reduction establishing NP-hardness of the problem of computing the tree-independence number due to Dallard et al. [32]. The reduction was from the independent set problem and was based on the fact that for any graph G , if G' is the graph obtained from two disjoint copies of G by adding all possible edges between them, then $\alpha(G) = \text{tree-}\alpha(G')$. Combining this result with Proposition 3.1, we obtain that $\alpha(G) = \text{tree-}\alpha(G') = \text{tree-}\mu(G' \circ K_1)$. Given an n -vertex graph G , the graph $G' \circ K_1$ can be computed in polynomial time from G and has $4n$ vertices. Now, approximately computing the induced matching treewidth of the transformed graph would imply an equally good approximation to the independence number of G .

Thus statements 2., 3., 4. follow from analogous hardness results for approximating MAX INDEPENDENT SET, shown by, respectively, Zuckerman [73], Lin [50], and Chalermsook et al. [26]. \square

Let us remark that Theorem 7.1 does not leave much space for improvements to Theorem 3.3. First, it implies that we cannot *exactly* compute induced matching treewidth, even for small values (at least 4). Second, we cannot hope for a nontrivial approximation in polynomial time. Finally, the running time of the approximation algorithm cannot be improved to $f(k) \cdot n^{o(1)}$ and even $f(k) \cdot n^{o(k)}$, under standard complexity assumptions.

Theorem 7.1 establishes NP-completeness of recognizing graphs with induced matching width at most k , for every integer $k \geq 4$. The complexity of recognizing graphs with induced matching treewidth at most k is open for $k \in \{2, 3\}$, but solvable in polynomial time for $k \leq 1$, as we discuss next. Before doing that, let us show a nice property of induced matching treewidth that is also satisfied by tree-independence number (see [32]) and by *sim-width*, a graph parameter introduced in 2017 by Kang, Kwon, Strømme, and Telle (see [44]): the parameter is monotone under induced minors. Given two graphs G and H , we say that H is an *induced minor* of G

⁵Gap-ETH states that for some constant $\epsilon > 0$, distinguishing between a satisfiable 3-SAT formula and one that is not even $(1 - \epsilon)$ -satisfiable requires exponential time (see [33, 52]).

if a graph isomorphic to H can be obtained from G by a sequence of vertex deletions and edge contractions.

Proposition 7.2. *Let G be a graph and let H be an induced minor of G . Then $\text{tree-}\mu(H) \leq \text{tree-}\mu(G)$.*

Proof. We show how to modify any tree decomposition $\mathcal{T} = (T, \{X_t\}_{t \in V(T)})$ of G into a tree decomposition \mathcal{T}' of H such that the induced matching treewidths of the two decompositions are related as follows: $\mu_H(\mathcal{T}') \leq \mu_G(\mathcal{T})$. This will imply the desired inequality $\text{tree-}\mu(H) \leq \text{tree-}\mu(G)$.

Clearly, it suffices to consider the case when H is obtained from G either by a single vertex deletion or by a single edge contraction.

Consider first the case when H is the graph obtained from G by deleting some vertex, say $v \in V(G)$. Then deleting v from all the bags of \mathcal{T} that contain v results in a tree decomposition \mathcal{T}' of H . Furthermore, since every induced matching in H is also an induced matching in G , it holds that $\mu_G(\mathcal{T}) \geq \mu_H(\mathcal{T}')$, as claimed.

Next, consider the case when H is the graph obtained from G by contracting an edge $uv \in E(G)$ into a single vertex z . In this case, it is not difficult to see that replacing each bag X_t of \mathcal{T} that contains either u or v (or both) with the bag $X'_t := (X_t \setminus \{u, v\}) \cup \{z\}$ results in a tree decomposition \mathcal{T}' of H . We show that $\mu_G(\mathcal{T}) \geq \mu_H(\mathcal{T}')$ by verifying that for every node $t \in V(T)$ and every induced matching M' in H that touches the bag X'_t , there exists an induced matching M in G that touches the bag X_t and such that $|M| = |M'|$. This will indeed suffice, since taking M' to be a maximum induced matching in H' that touches some bag, say X'_t , of \mathcal{T}' , then the corresponding induced matching M in G that touches the bag X_t will imply that $\mu_G(\mathcal{T}) \geq |M| = |M'| = \mu_H(\mathcal{T}')$.

So, let $t \in V(T)$ be a node of T and let M' be an induced matching in H that touches the bag X'_t . We consider two cases depending on whether the vertex z is an endpoint of an edge in M' or not.

Suppose first that the vertex z is not an endpoint of any edge in M' . Since the graph $H - z$ is an induced subgraph of G , the matching M' is also an induced matching in G . Furthermore, since the matching M' touches the bag X'_t in vertices different from z , the fact that $X'_t \setminus \{z\} \subseteq X_t$ implies that M' also touches the bag X_t . Hence we can take $M = M'$ in this case.

Suppose next that the vertex z is an endpoint of an edge in M' . In this case there is a unique edge $e \in M'$ such that z is an endpoint of e . We consider two further subcases depending on whether z belongs to the bag X'_t or not. Suppose first that $z \in X'_t$. In this case, $X'_t = (X_t \setminus \{u, v\}) \cup \{z\}$ and the set $M := (M' \setminus \{e\}) \cup \{uv\}$ is an induced matching in G such that $|M| = |M'|$. Furthermore, since the matching $M \setminus \{uv\} = M' \setminus \{e\}$ touches the set $X_t \setminus \{u, v\} = X'_t \setminus \{z\}$ and the edge uv touches X_t (since $z \in X'_t$), we infer that M touches X_t .

Finally, suppose that $z \notin X'_t$. Then $X'_t = X_t$. Let y be the endpoint of e other than z . Since the edge e touches the bag X_t and $z \notin X'_t$, we have $y \in X_t$. Moreover, y is a vertex of G such that $uy \in E(G)$ or $vy \in E(G)$. We may assume without loss of generality that $uy \in E(G)$. Then, the set $M := (M' \setminus \{e\}) \cup \{uy\}$ is an induced matching in G such that $|M| = |M'|$. Furthermore, since the matching $M \setminus \{uy\} = M' \setminus \{e\}$ touches the set $X_t = X'_t$ and the edge uy touches X_t , we infer that M touches X_t . This completes the proof. \square

Proposition 7.2 implies the following. For an integer $k \geq 0$, let \mathcal{F}_k denote the family of all *forbidden induced minors* for the class of graphs with induced matching treewidth at most k , that is, \mathcal{F}_k consists precisely of the graphs G such that $\text{tree-}\mu(G) > k$ but every proper induced minor H of G satisfies $\text{tree-}\mu(H) \leq k$. Then, by Proposition 7.2, a graph G has induced matching treewidth at most k if and only if G does not have any graph from \mathcal{F}_k as an induced minor.

It is not difficult to see that the only graphs with induced matching treewidth equal to 0 are exactly the edgeless graphs; hence $\mathcal{F}_0 = \{K_2\}$. To characterize graphs with induced matching treewidth at most 1, we will need the following result due to Scheidweiler and Wiederrecht [67, Theorem 3.6]. We denote by C_k the k -vertex cycle graph.

Theorem 7.3. *There exists a finite set \mathcal{F} of graphs such that for every graph G , the graph $L^2(G)$ is chordal if and only if G does not contain any graph from the set $\mathcal{F} \cup \{C_k : k \geq 6\}$ as an induced subgraph.*

We now have everything ready to prove the following.

Proposition 7.4. *The class of graphs with induced matching treewidth at most 1 is characterized by finitely many forbidden induced minors and admits a polynomial-time recognition algorithm.*

Proof. By Proposition 3.1, for every graph G , it holds that $\text{tree-}\mu(G) = \text{tree-}\alpha(L^2(G))$. Recall also that a graph G is chordal if and only if $\text{tree-}\alpha(G) \leq 1$. It follows that a graph G has induced matching treewidth at most 1 if and only if the square of its line graph is chordal. By Theorem 7.3, the class of graphs with this property is characterized by a family of forbidden induced subgraphs consisting of all cycles of length at least 6 and a family \mathcal{F} of finitely many other graphs. Since each forbidden induced minor is also a forbidden induced subgraph, the family of forbidden induced minors is a subfamily of $\mathcal{F} \cup \{C_k : k \geq 6\}$. Using also the fact that the 6-cycle is an induced minor of any longer cycle, we infer that the set \mathcal{F}_1 of forbidden induced minors for the class of graphs with induced matching treewidth at most 1 consists of the cycle C_6 and a subfamily of \mathcal{F} ; in particular, it is finite.

Given a graph G , testing if the square of its line graph is chordal can be done in polynomial time (using, e.g., [66]). Therefore, graphs with induced matching treewidth at most 1 can be recognized in polynomial time. \square

7.2 Induced matching treewidth in graphs with bounded degree

Recall that the tree-independence number of a graph is an upper bound on its induced matching treewidth, hence, any graph class with unbounded induced matching treewidth is necessarily of unbounded tree-independence number. On the other hand, large tree-independence number does not necessarily imply large induced matching treewidth, as shown, for example, by the family of complete bipartite graphs. The balanced complete bipartite graphs $K_{n,n}$ satisfy $\text{tree-}\alpha(K_{n,n}) = n$ (see [32]) and $\text{tree-}\mu(K_{n,n}) = 1$, as witnessed by the trivial tree decomposition having a unique bag equal to the entire vertex set.

Interestingly, in the absence of complete bipartite graphs as subgraphs, bounded induced matching treewidth implies bounded tree-independence number and even bounded treewidth. This follows from a result of Brettell et al. [24, Proposition 18] who proved a related result for sim-width. Brettell et al. showed that for any two integers $k, t \in \mathbb{N}$ there exists an integer r such that each graph with sim-width at most k and no subgraph isomorphic to $K_{t,t}$ has treewidth at most r . It is known that bounded induced matching treewidth implies bounded sim-width. This is explicitly shown in [14, Theorem 24] (see also [15]) but in fact the argument boils down to the proof of [44, Proposition 3.1]. The formal statement of the result for induced matching treewidth is as follows.

Theorem 7.5. *For any two integers $k, t \in \mathbb{N}$ there exists an integer r such that each graph with induced matching treewidth at most k and no subgraph isomorphic to $K_{t,t}$ has treewidth at most r .*

Note that graphs with maximum degree less than t have no subgraph isomorphic to $K_{t,t}$. Hence, Theorem 7.5 implies that any class of graphs with bounded degree and unbounded treewidth has unbounded induced matching treewidth. This includes, for example, the classes of (subdivided) square or hexagonal grids (also known as *walls*) and their line graphs.

An equivalent formulation is that in classes of graphs with bounded induced matching treewidth, bounded degree implies bounded treewidth. This implication (that bounded degree implies bounded treewidth) was recently established by Abrishami, Chudnovsky, and Vušković [4] for the class of even-hole-free graphs, and by Korhonen [46] for any class of graphs excluding some fixed grid (or equivalently, some fixed planar graph) as an induced minor, as well as for any class of graphs excluding all sufficiently large walls and their line graphs as induced subgraphs.

The proof of Theorem 7.5 via [24] is based on Ramsey-type arguments and the binding function is quite large (in particular, it is exponential in t). We now give a simple argument showing that for graphs with bounded degree, the resulting bound on treewidth is linear in k and polynomial in the maximum degree. We first show that for graphs with bounded degree, induced matching treewidth is linearly related to the tree-independence number. As usual, for a graph G , we denote by $\Delta(G)$ the maximum degree of a vertex in G .

Theorem 7.6. *For every graph G with at least one edge, it holds that $\text{tree-}\alpha(G) \leq 2\text{tree-}\mu(G) \cdot \Delta(G)^2$.*

Proof. Let G be a graph with at least one edge. If G has an isolated vertex, we can delete it without changing the value of any of the three parameters $\text{tree-}\alpha(G)$, $\text{tree-}\mu(G)$, and $\Delta(G)$, since they are all strictly positive. We may therefore assume that G has no isolated vertices. To shorten the notation we will denote $\Delta := \Delta(G)$. Let $\mathcal{T} = (T, \{X_t\}_{t \in V(T)})$ be a tree decomposition of G witnessing $\text{tree-}\mu(G)$. For all $t \in V(T)$, let $X'_t = N[X_t]$ and let $\mathcal{T}' = (T, \{X'_t\}_{t \in V(T)})$. It is straightforward to verify that \mathcal{T}' is a tree decomposition of G . We want to argue that the independence number of each bag of \mathcal{T}' is at most $2\text{tree-}\mu(G) \cdot \Delta^2$.

Consider a bag X'_t of \mathcal{T}' . It consists of X_t and $Y = N(X_t)$. Let I be a largest independent set in $G[X'_t]$ and let k be its size. We iteratively construct an induced matching M in G whose every edge intersects X_t and $|M| \geq k/(2\Delta^2)$. As $|M| \leq \text{tree-}\mu(G)$, this will give $|I| = k \leq \text{tree-}\mu(G) \cdot 2\Delta^2$.

At the beginning, the matching M is empty. In each step of the procedure we add one edge to M and discard some set of vertices. The procedure stops when all the vertices in I are discarded. At each step of the procedure we want to preserve the following properties:

1. Each $v \in I$ that is not discarded has a non-discarded neighbor in X'_t .
2. Each $v \in I \cap Y$ that is not discarded has a non-discarded neighbor in X_t .

Clearly the above properties are satisfied at the beginning, before any vertex is discarded, as the graph has no isolated vertices and every vertex from $I \cap Y$ has a neighbor in X_t .

Now pick any vertex v in I that was not discarded yet. By properties 1. and 2. v has a non-discarded neighbor w , and if $v \in Y$, then w can be chosen to be in X_t . We then include the edge vw in the induced matching M .

Next, we discard the following vertices from X'_t :

- v and w ,
- every non-discarded neighbor of v or w , and
- every non-discarded vertex in I that is at distance 2 from $\{v, w\}$ in $G[X'_t]$.

Notice that since we removed $N[\{u, v\}] \cap X'_t$, the edges chosen in every subsequent iteration will indeed form an induced matching. In each iteration we discard at most $2\Delta^2$ vertices from I , so, provided that properties 1. and 2. are preserved, the number of iterations we perform to build an induced matching M of the desired size is at most $k/(2\Delta^2)$. Note also that every edge of M intersects X_t .

Finally, we prove that at each step of the procedure properties 1. and 2. hold. To this end, it suffices to show that for each $u \in I$ that is not discarded, its entire neighborhood in X'_t is not discarded. Suppose for a contradiction that there exists some vertex $u' \in N(u) \cap X'_t$ that is discarded. Clearly $u' \notin I$, so u' must be equal or adjacent to v or w . However, this means that u is at distance at most 2 from $\{v, w\}$ in X'_t , so u got discarded, a contradiction. \square

Corollary 7.7. *For every graph G with at least one edge, it holds that*

$$\text{tw}(G) \leq 2\text{tree-}\mu(G) \cdot \Delta(G)^2(\Delta(G) + 1).$$

Proof. Let G be a graph with at least one edge, let Δ be its maximum degree and let k be its induced matching treewidth. By Theorem 7.6, G admits a tree decomposition in which each bag induces a subgraph with independence number at most $2k\Delta^2$. Since the maximum degree of any such subgraph is at most Δ , its chromatic number is at most $\Delta + 1$. Consequently, every bag has at most $2k\Delta^2(\Delta + 1)$ vertices. \square

7.3 Two graph families with unbounded induced matching treewidth

We conclude this section by identifying two graph families with unbounded maximum degree and unbounded induced matching treewidth. For the proofs, we need the following well-known property of tree decompositions (see, e.g., [32]).

Lemma 7.8. *For every graph G and every tree decomposition \mathcal{T} of G , there exists a vertex $v \in V$ such that $N[v]$ is contained in some bag of \mathcal{T} .*

For a positive integer n , the n -dimensional hypercube graph is the graph Q_n with vertex set $\{0, 1\}^n$ in which two vertices $x = (x_1, \dots, x_n)$ and $y = (y_1, \dots, y_n)$ are adjacent if and only if there exists a unique $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$ such that $x_i \neq y_i$.

Proposition 7.9. *The n -dimensional hypercube graph Q_n has $\text{tree-}\mu(Q_n) \geq \lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor$.*

Proof. Consider an arbitrary tree decomposition $\mathcal{T} = (T, \{X_t\}_{t \in V(T)})$ of Q_n . By Lemma 7.8, there exists a bag X_t that contains $N[v]$ for some $v \in V(Q_n) = \{0, 1\}^n$. By the symmetry of Q_n , we may assume without loss of generality that $v = (0, \dots, 0)$.

Let v_i denote the vertex whose only non-zero entry is at the i -th position and let $w_{i,j}$ denote the vertex whose only non-zero entries are the i -th and j -th position.

An induced matching M touching $N[v]$ (and thus touching the bag) of size $\lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor$ is as follows

$$M = \left\{ v_{2i} w_{2i, 2i-1} \mid i \in \left[\frac{n}{2} \right] \right\}.$$

This implies that $\mu(\mathcal{T})$ is at least $\lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor$. Since \mathcal{T} was arbitrary, we infer that $\text{tree-}\mu(Q_n) \geq \lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor$. \square

Our final result gives a simple construction of a family of P_4 -free graphs with unbounded induced matching number. Recall that for a positive integer n , we denote by nK_2 the disjoint union of n copies of K_2 .

Proposition 7.10. *Let n be a positive integer and let G_n denote the graph obtained from two disjoint copies of the graph nK_2 by adding all possible edges between them. Then $\text{tree-}\mu(G_n) \geq n$.*

Proof. Let $\mathcal{T} = (T, \{X_t\}_{t \in V(T)})$ be an arbitrary tree decomposition of G_n . By Lemma 7.8, there exists some bag X_t containing $N[v]$ for some $v \in V(G_n)$. By definition of G_n , the bag X_t contains all the vertices of one of the copies of nK_2 , which form an induced matching of size n . \square

8 Conclusion

The obvious direction for further research is to show Conjecture 1.2. A somewhat easier, but still very interesting problem, would be to show the following result, which is a significant common generalization of both Theorem 2.1 and Corollary 2.4.

Conjecture 8.1. *Let $k, r \in \mathbb{N}$ be fixed. Let G be a graph with induced matching treewidth at most k , equipped with a weight function $\mathbf{w}: V(G) \rightarrow \mathbb{Q}_+$. In polynomial time we can find a maximum-weight induced subgraph of G with treewidth at most r .*

We believe that the right way of approaching Conjecture 8.1 is to prove an analogue of Theorem 3.4 and Lemma 4.1: for each node of a tree decomposition of bounded induced matching treewidth, there is only a polynomial number of states of the natural dynamic programming algorithm (developed for bounded-treewidth graphs [20]) that represent an inclusion-maximal induced subgraph of treewidth at most r . However, the space of states in these algorithms is quite complicated (much more complicated than when finding a largest induced forest) and it is far from obvious how to re-interpret it in the current setting.

Another interesting question is to try to find a “better parameter” than induced matching width. If we think of a parameter useful for solving MWIS, it is natural to expect that for a simple graph such that $K_{n,n} \odot K_1$, i.e., a biclique with additional pending edge added to each vertex, such a parameter would be bounded. However, by Proposition 3.1, we have $\text{tree-}\mu(K_{n,n} \odot K_1) = \text{tree-}\alpha(K_{n,n}) = n$.

Recently, Bergognoux et al. [15] introduced *one-sided mim-width* (or *o-mim-width*), which can be seen as a unification of tree-independence number and *mim-width*, which is another well-established graph width parameter useful in solving MWIS and many other problems [13]. Just like the definition of induced matching treewidth, the definitions of *mim-width* and *one-sided mim-width* are also based on the size of a maximum induced matching in certain subgraphs of the graph (however, instead of tree decompositions they are based on branch decompositions). While induced matching treewidth lower-bounds the tree-independence number, it turns out that it is incomparable with *one-sided mim-width* (and *mim-width*). Bergognoux et al. [15] proved a result analogous to Theorem 2.1 for graphs given with a decomposition with bounded *one-sided mim-width*.

Another interesting parameter based on induced matchings and that in fact captures all these notions (*o-mim-width*, *mim-width*, tree-independence number, and induced matching treewidth) is *sim-width*. As already mentioned, bounded induced matching treewidth implies bounded *sim-width*, but not vice versa; for example, the graphs from Proposition 7.10, which have unbounded induced matching treewidth, have bounded *sim-width* (see, e.g., [44, Proposition 3.6]). One of the main open problems related to *sim-width*, first asked in [44], is whether MWIS is solvable in polynomial time for graphs with bounded *sim-width*. If the answer is positive, then results from [24, 55] imply that the same is true for MAX WEIGHT DISTANCE- d PACKING for all even d . The drawback however is that a branch decomposition of small *sim-width* is needed in input, as it is another open problem to determine whether such decompositions can be obtained in polynomial time.

The relationships between all these parameters and some others are summarized in Figure 2.




Figure 2: Relations between some graph width parameters.

Recall that classes of bounded tree-independence number are (tw, ω) -bounded, i.e., treewidth is bounded by a function of the clique number [31]. By Theorem 7.5 we know that this is also the case for classes of bounded induced matching treewidth that additionally exclude some fixed biclique as a subgraph. Furthermore, excluding bicliques is necessary, as $\text{tw}(K_{n,n}) = n$ and $\text{tree-}\mu(K_{n,n}) = 1$. We believe that the following result, which is a common generalization of Theorems 7.5 and 7.6, could also hold.

Conjecture 8.2. *For any two integers $k, t \in \mathbb{N}$ there exists an integer r such that each graph with induced matching treewidth at most k and no induced subgraph isomorphic to $K_{t,t}$ has tree-independence number at most r .*

The notion of (tw, ω) -boundedness can be seen as a variant of the extensively studied χ -boundedness, where we ask for which classes the chromatic number is upper-bounded by a function of the clique number [68]. We believe that graphs of bounded induced matching treewidth are χ -bounded.

Conjecture 8.3. *For any two integers $k, c \in \mathbb{N}$ there exists an integer r such that each graph with induced matching treewidth at most k and clique number at most c has chromatic number at most r .*

Finally, we believe that it would be interesting to explore for what natural classes of graphs induced matching treewidth is bounded. We remark that such results are known for the closely related tree-independence number [1, 30].

References

- [1] T. Abrishami, B. Alecu, M. Chudnovsky, S. Hajebi, S. Spirkl, and K. Vušković. Tree independence number for (even hole, diamond, pyramid)-free graphs. *CoRR*, abs/2305.16258, 2023.
- [2] T. Abrishami, M. Chudnovsky, S. Hajebi, and S. Spirkl. Induced subgraphs and tree decompositions III. Three-path-configurations and logarithmic treewidth. *Advances in Combinatorics*, 2022:6:1–29, 2022.

- [3] T. Abrishami, M. Chudnovsky, M. Pilipczuk, P. Rzażewski, and P. D. Seymour. Induced subgraphs of bounded treewidth and the container method. In D. Marx, editor, *Proceedings of the 2021 ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms, SODA 2021, Virtual Conference, January 10 - 13, 2021*, pages 1948–1964. SIAM, 2021.
- [4] T. Abrishami, M. Chudnovsky, and K. Vušković. Induced subgraphs and tree decompositions I. Even-hole-free graphs of bounded degree. *J. Combin. Theory Ser. B*, 157:144–175, 2022.
- [5] I. Adler. *Width functions for hypertree decompositions*. PhD thesis, Albert-Ludwigs-Universität Freiburg im Breisgau, 2006.
- [6] B. Ahat, T. Ekim, and Z. C. Taşkın. Integer programming formulations and benders decomposition for the maximum induced matching problem. *INFORMS J. Comput.*, 30(1):43–56, 2018.
- [7] V. E. Alekseev. An upper bound for the number of maximal independent sets in a graph. *Discrete Mathematics and Applications*, 17(4):355–359, 2007.
- [8] S. Arnborg, D. G. Corneil, and A. Proskurowski. Complexity of finding embeddings in a k -tree. *SIAM Journal on Algebraic Discrete Methods*, 8(2):277–284, Apr. 1987.
- [9] R. Balakrishnan and P. Paulraja. Powers of chordal graphs. *J. Austral. Math. Soc. Ser. A*, 35(2):211–217, 1983.
- [10] R. Belmonte, M. Lampis, and V. Mitsou. Defective coloring on classes of perfect graphs. *Discrete Math. Theor. Comput. Sci.*, 24(1):18, 2022. Id/No 1.
- [11] W. Ben-Ameur, M.-A. Mohamed-Sidi, and J. Neto. The k -separator problem: polyhedra, complexity and approximation results. *J. Comb. Optim.*, 29(1):276–307, 2015.
- [12] B. Bergougnoux, É. Bonnet, N. Brettell, and O. Kwon. Close relatives of feedback vertex set without single-exponential algorithms parameterized by treewidth. In Y. Cao and M. Pilipczuk, editors, *15th International Symposium on Parameterized and Exact Computation, IPEC 2020, December 14-18, 2020, Hong Kong, China (Virtual Conference)*, volume 180 of *LIPICs*, pages 3:1–3:17. Schloss Dagstuhl - Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik, 2020.
- [13] B. Bergougnoux, J. Dreier, and L. Jaffke. A logic-based algorithmic meta-theorem for mim-width. In N. Bansal and V. Nagarajan, editors, *Proceedings of the 2023 ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms, SODA 2023, Florence, Italy, January 22-25, 2023*, pages 3282–3304. SIAM, 2023.
- [14] B. Bergougnoux, T. Korhonen, and I. Razgon. New width parameters for independent set: One-sided-mim-width and neighbor-depth. *CoRR*, abs/2302.10643, 2023.
- [15] B. Bergougnoux, T. Korhonen, and I. Razgon. New width parameters for independent set: one-sided-mim-width and neighbor-depth. In *Graph-theoretic concepts in computer science*, volume 14093 of *Lecture Notes in Comput. Sci.*, pages 72–85. Springer, Cham, 2023.
- [16] U. Bertele and F. Brioschi. *Nonserial dynamic programming*. Academic Press, 1972.
- [17] H. L. Bodlaender. A linear-time algorithm for finding tree-decompositions of small treewidth. *SIAM J. Comput.*, 25(6):1305–1317, 1996.

- [18] H. L. Bodlaender, É. Bonnet, L. Jaffke, D. Knop, P. T. Lima, M. Milanić, S. Ordyniak, S. Pandey, and O. Suchý. Treewidth is NP-complete on cubic graphs (and related results). *CoRR*, abs/2301.10031, 2023.
- [19] H. L. Bodlaender, P. G. Drange, M. S. Dregi, F. V. Fomin, D. Lokshtanov, and M. Pilipczuk. A $c^k n$ 5-approximation algorithm for treewidth. *SIAM J. Comput.*, 45(2):317–378, 2016.
- [20] H. L. Bodlaender and T. Kloks. Efficient and constructive algorithms for the pathwidth and treewidth of graphs. *J. Algorithms*, 21(2):358–402, 1996.
- [21] M. Bonamy, E. Bonnet, H. Déprés, L. Esperet, C. Geniet, C. Hilaire, S. Thomassé, and A. Wesolek. Sparse graphs with bounded induced cycle packing number have logarithmic treewidth. In N. Bansal and V. Nagarajan, editors, *Proceedings of the 2023 ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms, SODA 2023, Florence, Italy, January 22-25, 2023*, pages 3006–3028. SIAM, 2023.
- [22] R. B. Borie, R. G. Parker, and C. A. Tovey. Automatic generation of linear-time algorithms from predicate calculus descriptions of problems on recursively constructed graph families. *Algorithmica*, 7(5&6):555–581, 1992.
- [23] V. Bouchitté and I. Todinca. Treewidth and minimum fill-in: Grouping the minimal separators. *SIAM J. Comput.*, 31(1):212–232, 2001.
- [24] N. Brettell, A. Munaro, D. Paulusma, and S. Yang. Comparing width parameters on graph classes. *CoRR*, abs/2308.05817, 2023.
- [25] K. Cameron and P. Hell. Independent packings in structured graphs. *Math. Program.*, 105(2-3, Ser. B):201–213, 2006.
- [26] P. Chalermsook, M. Cygan, G. Kortsarz, B. Laekhanukit, P. Manurangsi, D. Nanongkai, and L. Trevisan. From gap-exponential time hypothesis to fixed parameter tractable inapproximability: Clique, dominating set, and more. *SIAM J. Comput.*, 49(4):772–810, 2020.
- [27] B. Courcelle. The monadic second-order logic of graphs. I. Recognizable sets of finite graphs. *Inf. Comput.*, 85(1):12–75, 1990.
- [28] M. Cygan, F. V. Fomin, Ł. Kowalik, D. Lokshtanov, D. Marx, M. Pilipczuk, M. Pilipczuk, and S. Saurabh. *Parameterized algorithms*. Springer, Cham, 2015.
- [29] C. Dallard, F. V. Fomin, P. A. Golovach, T. Korhonen, and M. Milanić. Computing tree decompositions with small independence number. *CoRR*, abs/2207.09993, 2022.
- [30] C. Dallard, M. Milanić, and K. Štorgel. Treewidth versus clique number. III. tree-independence number of graphs with a forbidden structure. *CoRR*, abs/2206.15092, 2022.
- [31] C. Dallard, M. Milanić, and K. Štorgel. Treewidth versus clique number. I. Graph classes with a forbidden structure. *SIAM J. Discrete Math.*, 35(4):2618–2646, 2021.
- [32] C. Dallard, M. Milanić, and K. Štorgel. Treewidth versus clique number. II. Tree-independence number. *J. Combin. Theory Ser. B*, 164:404–442, 2024.
- [33] I. Dinur. Mildly exponential reduction from gap 3sat to polynomial-gap label-cover. *Electron. Colloquium Comput. Complex.*, TR16-128, 2016.

- [34] P. Duchet. Classical perfect graphs: an introduction with emphasis on triangulated and interval graphs. In *Topics on perfect graphs*, volume 88 of *North-Holland Math. Stud.*, pages 67–96. North-Holland, Amsterdam, 1984.
- [35] H. Eto, F. Guo, and E. Miyano. Distance- d independent set problems for bipartite and chordal graphs. *J. Comb. Optim.*, 27(1):88–99, 2014.
- [36] F. V. Fomin, I. Todinca, and Y. Villanger. Large induced subgraphs via triangulations and CMSO. *SIAM J. Comput.*, 44(1):54–87, 2015.
- [37] P. Gartland, D. Lokshtanov, M. Pilipczuk, M. Pilipczuk, and P. Rzażewski. Finding large induced sparse subgraphs in $C_{>t}$ -free graphs in quasipolynomial time. In S. Khuller and V. V. Williams, editors, *STOC '21: 53rd Annual ACM SIGACT Symposium on Theory of Computing, Virtual Event, Italy, June 21-25, 2021*, pages 330–341. ACM, 2021.
- [38] P. Gartland, D. Lokshtanov, M. Pilipczuk, M. Pilipczuk, and P. Rzażewski. Finding large induced sparse subgraphs in $C_{>t}$ -free graphs in quasipolynomial time. *CoRR*, abs/2007.11402v3, 2021.
- [39] M. Grohe and S. Kreutzer. Methods for algorithmic meta theorems. In *Model Theoretic Methods in Finite Combinatorics - AMS-ASL Joint Special Session, Washington, DC, USA, January 5-8, 2009*, volume 558 of *Contemporary Mathematics*, pages 181–206. American Mathematical Society, 2009.
- [40] A. Grzesik, T. Klimošová, M. Pilipczuk, and M. Pilipczuk. Polynomial-time algorithm for Maximum Weight Independent Set on P_6 -free graphs. *ACM Trans. Algorithms*, 18(1):4:1–4:57, jan 2022.
- [41] R. Halin. S-functions for graphs. *Journal of Geometry*, 8(1):171–186, 1976.
- [42] F. Havet, R. J. Kang, and J.-S. Sereni. Improper coloring of unit disk graphs. *Networks*, 54(3):150–164, 2009.
- [43] B. M. P. Jansen, D. Lokshtanov, and S. Saurabh. A near-optimal planarization algorithm. In C. Chekuri, editor, *Proceedings of the Twenty-Fifth Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms, SODA 2014, Portland, Oregon, USA, January 5-7, 2014*, pages 1802–1811. SIAM, 2014.
- [44] D. Y. Kang, O.-j. Kwon, T. J. F. Strømme, and J. A. Telle. A width parameter useful for chordal and co-comparability graphs. *Theoret. Comput. Sci.*, 704:1–17, 2017.
- [45] T. Korhonen. A single-exponential time 2-approximation algorithm for treewidth. In *62nd IEEE Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science, FOCS 2021, Denver, CO, USA, February 7-10, 2022*, pages 184–192. IEEE, 2021.
- [46] T. Korhonen. Grid induced minor theorem for graphs of small degree. *J. Combin. Theory Ser. B*, 160:206–214, 2023.
- [47] T. Korhonen and D. Lokshtanov. An improved parameterized algorithm for treewidth. In B. Saha and R. A. Servedio, editors, *Proceedings of the 55th Annual ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing, STOC 2023, Orlando, FL, USA, June 20-23, 2023*, pages 528–541. ACM, 2023.

- [48] E. Lee. Partitioning a graph into small pieces with applications to path transversal. In P. N. Klein, editor, *Proceedings of the Twenty-Eighth Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms, SODA 2017, Barcelona, Spain, Hotel Porta Fira, January 16-19*, pages 1546–1558. SIAM, 2017.
- [49] E. Lee. Partitioning a graph into small pieces with applications to path transversal. *Math. Program.*, 177(1-2, Ser. A):1–19, 2019.
- [50] B. Lin. Constant approximating k -clique is $W[1]$ -hard. In S. Khuller and V. V. Williams, editors, *STOC '21: 53rd Annual ACM SIGACT Symposium on Theory of Computing, Virtual Event, Italy, June 21-25, 2021*, pages 1749–1756. ACM, 2021.
- [51] D. Lokshantov, M. Vatshelle, and Y. Villanger. Independent set in P_5 -free graphs in polynomial time. In C. Chekuri, editor, *Proceedings of the Twenty-Fifth Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms, SODA 2014, Portland, Oregon, USA, January 5-7, 2014*, pages 570–581. SIAM, 2014.
- [52] P. Manurangsi and P. Raghavendra. A birthday repetition theorem and complexity of approximating dense CSPs. In I. Chatzigiannakis, P. Indyk, F. Kuhn, and A. Muscholl, editors, *44th International Colloquium on Automata, Languages, and Programming, ICALP 2017, July 10-14, 2017, Warsaw, Poland*, volume 80 of *LIPICs*, pages 78:1–78:15. Schloss Dagstuhl - Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik, 2017.
- [53] D. Marx. Tractable hypergraph properties for constraint satisfaction and conjunctive queries. *J. ACM*, 60(6):42:1–42:51, 2013.
- [54] P. Misra, V. Raman, M. S. Ramanujan, and S. Saurabh. Parameterized algorithms for even cycle transversal. In M. C. Golumbic, M. Stern, A. Levy, and G. Morgenstern, editors, *Graph-Theoretic Concepts in Computer Science - 38th International Workshop, WG 2012, Jerusalem, Israel, June 26-28, 2012, Revised Selected Papers*, volume 7551 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 172–183. Springer, 2012.
- [55] A. Munaro and S. Yang. On algorithmic applications of sim-width and mim-width of (H_1, H_2) -free graphs. *Theoret. Comput. Sci.*, 955:Paper No. 113825, 20, 2023.
- [56] J. Nešetřil and P. O. de Mendez. *Sparsity - Graphs, Structures, and Algorithms*, volume 28 of *Algorithms and combinatorics*. Springer, 2012.
- [57] S. D. Nikolopoulos and L. Palios. Minimal separators in P_4 -sparse graphs. *Discrete Math.*, 306(3):381–392, 2006.
- [58] Y. Orlovich, A. Dolgui, G. Finke, V. Gordon, and F. Werner. The complexity of dissociation set problems in graphs. *Discrete Appl. Math.*, 159(13):1352–1366, 2011.
- [59] G. Paesani, D. Paulusma, and P. Rzażewski. Feedback Vertex Set and Even Cycle Transversal for H -free graphs: Finding large block graphs. *SIAM J. Discret. Math.*, 36(4):2453–2472, 2022.
- [60] B. S. Panda, A. Pandey, J. Chaudhary, P. Dane, and M. Kashyap. Maximum weight induced matching in some subclasses of bipartite graphs. *J. Comb. Optim.*, 40(3):713–732, 2020.
- [61] M. Pilipczuk. A tight lower bound for Vertex Planarization on graphs of bounded treewidth. *Discret. Appl. Math.*, 231:211–216, 2017.

- [62] S. Poljak. A note on stable sets and colorings of graphs. *Commentationes Mathematicae Universitatis Carolinae*, 15:307–309, 1974.
- [63] F. P. Ramsey. On a problem of formal logic. *Proc. London Math. Soc. (2)*, 30:264–286, 1929.
- [64] N. Robertson and P. D. Seymour. Graph minors. III. Planar tree-width. *J. Comb. Theory, Ser. B*, 36(1):49–64, 1984.
- [65] N. Robertson and P. D. Seymour. Graph Minors .XIII. The Disjoint Paths Problem. *J. Comb. Theory, Ser. B*, 63(1):65–110, 1995.
- [66] D. J. Rose, R. E. Tarjan, and G. S. Lueker. Algorithmic aspects of vertex elimination on graphs. *SIAM Journal on Computing*, 5(2):266–283, 1976.
- [67] R. Scheidweiler and S. Wiederrecht. On chordal graph and line graph squares. *Discrete Appl. Math.*, 243:239–247, 2018.
- [68] A. Scott and P. D. Seymour. A survey of χ -boundedness. *J. Graph Theory*, 95(3):473–504, 2020.
- [69] S. Tsukiyama, M. Ide, H. Ariyoshi, and I. Shirakawa. A new algorithm for generating all the maximal independent sets. *SIAM J. Comput.*, 6(3):505–517, 1977.
- [70] M. Yannakakis. Node-deletion problems on bipartite graphs. *SIAM J. Comput.*, 10(2):310–327, 1981.
- [71] N. Yelov. Minor-matching hypertree width. In A. Czumaj, editor, *Proceedings of the Twenty-Ninth Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms, SODA 2018, New Orleans, LA, USA, January 7-10, 2018*, pages 219–233. SIAM, 2018.
- [72] J. You, J. Wang, and Y. Cao. Approximate association via dissociation. In *Graph-theoretic Concepts in Computer Science*, volume 9941 of *Lecture Notes in Comput. Sci.*, pages 13–24. Springer, Berlin, 2016.
- [73] D. Zuckerman. Linear degree extractors and the inapproximability of max clique and chromatic number. *Theory Comput.*, 3:103–128, 2007.