

Parameterized Algorithms for Balanced Cluster Edge Modification Problems

Jayakrishnan Madathil ✉

University of Glasgow, UK

Kitty Meeks ✉

University of Glasgow, UK

Abstract

We introduce CLUSTER EDGE MODIFICATION problems with *constraints on the size of the clusters* and study their complexity. A graph G is a cluster graph if every connected component of G is a clique. In a typical CLUSTER EDGE MODIFICATION problem such as the widely studied CLUSTER EDITING, we are given a graph G and a non-negative integer k as input, and we have to decide if we can turn G into a cluster graph by way of at most k edge modifications—that is, by adding or deleting edges. In this paper, we study the parameterized complexity of such problems, but with an additional constraint: The size difference between any two connected components of the resulting cluster graph should not exceed a given threshold. Depending on which modifications are permissible—only adding edges, only deleting edges, both adding and deleting edges—we have three different computational problems. We show that all three problems, when parameterized by k , admit single-exponential time FPT algorithms and polynomial kernels. Our problems may be thought of as the size-constrained or balanced counterparts of the typical CLUSTER EDGE MODIFICATION problems, similar to the well-studied size-constrained or balanced counterparts of other clustering problems such as k -MEANS CLUSTERING.

2012 ACM Subject Classification Theory of computation → Design and analysis of algorithms

Keywords and phrases graph-based clustering, balanced clustering, graph modification, cluster editing, polynomial kernel, FPT algorithms, parameterized complexity

Funding *Jayakrishnan Madathil*: Supported by the Engineering and Physical Sciences Research Council [EP/V032305/1].

Kitty Meeks: Supported by the Engineering and Physical Sciences Research Council [EP/V032305/1].

Acknowledgements We thank Jessica Enright for helpful discussions on the problems studied in this paper.

1 Introduction

The term clustering refers to a broad range of methods that aim to group data points into subgroups—or clusters, as they are often called—so that points within a cluster are “close” or “similar” to one another and points in different clusters are “distant” or “dissimilar.” See the surveys by Ezugwu et al. [20] and by Xu and Tian [56] for an overview of various clustering models and algorithms. Applications of clustering in domains such as circuit design [35], content-based image searching [4], load-balancing in wireless networks [42, 50] etc. require clusters of reasonable sizes. And while popular clustering methods such as k -MEANS explicitly prescribe the number of clusters (the k in k -MEANS stands for grouping into k clusters), there is no guarantee for the sizes of the clusters, which may result in clusters with too few data points. This prompted the study of “size-constrained” clustering that seeks to ensure size guarantees for the clusters, and in particular, “balanced” clustering that requires all clusters to be of roughly the same size; see, for example, [13, 43, 45] for results on size-constrained or balanced variants of k -MEANS clustering. In this paper, we focus on graph-based clustering with balance constraints.

CLUSTER EDITING, also called CORRELATION CLUSTERING, is the canonical graph-based clustering problem. A cluster graph is one in which every connected component is a clique, and CLUSTER EDITING asks if a given graph can be turned into a cluster graph by adding and deleting at most k edges. The problem and its several variants have been studied extensively, resulting in a large volume of literature, including approximation algorithms, parameterized algorithms and heuristics [3, 5, 7, 8, 9, 10, 14, 16, 24, 49, 51]. Notice that the problem imposes no restriction on the number of clusters or the size of each cluster. While variants of CLUSTER EDITING with constraints on the number of clusters have previously been studied [49, 24], variants involving size or balance constraints have been largely overlooked. We study CLUSTER EDITING with balance constraints. In particular, we introduce appropriate problems in this direction and design efficient parameterized algorithms and kernels (parameterized by the number of modified edges). Our work shows that having constraints on the cluster size poses fresh challenges.

Our Contribution

To formally define our problems, we introduce the following definition. For a non-negative integer η , we say that a graph G is η -balanced if the (additive) size difference between any two connected components of G is at most η ; by the size of a connected component, we mean the number of vertices in that component. Notice that the definition is equivalent to saying that the size difference between a largest connected component and a smallest connected component is at most η . Notice also that the definition of η -balanced graphs does not place any restriction on the number of components. For example, a connected graph is η -balanced for every $\eta \geq 0$; so is an edge-less graph consisting of only isolated vertices.

We study problems of the following type. Given a graph G and non-negative integers k and η , is it possible to turn G into an η -balanced cluster graph by way of at most k edge modifications? We have three different computational problems depending on which modifications are permissible—only edge additions, only edge deletions, both edge additions and deletions. We formally define the problem corresponding to edge addition as follows.

BALANCED CLUSTER COMPLETION (BCC)

Input: An n -vertex graph G and non-negative integers k and η .
Task: Decide if it is possible to add at most k edges to G so that the resulting graph is an η -balanced cluster graph.

We define the problems BALANCED CLUSTER DELETION (BCD), in which only edge deletions are permitted, and BALANCED CLUSTER EDITING (BCE), in which both edge deletions and additions are permitted, analogously. We often refer to these problems as the completion, deletion or editing versions, and we refer to the requirement that the resulting cluster graph be η -balanced as the balance constraint. We note that these problems, to the best of our knowledge, have never been studied in the literature.

Notice that each of the three problems—BCC, BCD and BCE—generalises its respective counterpart without the balance constraint; we can simply take $\eta = n$, where n is the number of vertices in the input graph, as any n -vertex graph is n -balanced. As a consequence, we can immediately conclude that BCD and BCE (i.e., the deletion and editing versions) are NP-hard; these follow respectively from the NP-hardness of CLUSTER DELETION and CLUSTER EDITING (i.e., the deletion and editing versions without the balance constraint) [49]. The case of BCC, however, is different, for without the balance constraint, the completion version is polynomial-time solvable: we simply need to add edges until each connected

component becomes a clique. But we observe that the NP-hardness of BCC follows from a hardness result due to Froese et al. [26].¹ Thus, all three problems—BCC, BCD and BCE—are NP-hard.

Our Results. We show that all three problems—BCC, BCD and BCE—when parameterized by k , admit FPT algorithms and polynomial kernels. Specifically, we prove the following results.

1. BCC admits a $2^{\mathcal{O}(k)}n^{\mathcal{O}(1)}$ time algorithm and a kernel with $10k$ vertices.
2. BCD admits a $2^k n^{\mathcal{O}(1)}$ time algorithm and a kernel with $\mathcal{O}(k^4)$ vertices.²
3. BCE admits a $2^{\mathcal{O}(k)}n^{\mathcal{O}(1)}$ time algorithm and a kernel with $\mathcal{O}(k^3)$ vertices.

Although our FPT algorithms run in single-exponential time, the big-Oh in the $2^{\mathcal{O}(k)}$ factor in the algorithms for BCC and BCE hides constants, which results in the running times being $c^k n^{\mathcal{O}(1)}$ with fairly large constants c ; if we plug in all the hidden constants, we would have $c > 20$ for BCC and $c > 40$ for BCE. This raises the immediate question whether these problems admit algorithms that run in time $c^k n^{\mathcal{O}(1)}$ for sufficiently small values of c , say $c = 2$ or $c = 3$. We make significant progress towards answering this question by using algebraic techniques.

4. We show that BCC and BCE admit algorithms that run in time $4^{k+o(k)}n^{\mathcal{O}(1)}$.

Our results add to a long line of work on the parameterized complexity of graph modification problems (see [17]), and specifically on CLUSTER EDITING and its variants [29, 11, 10, 9, 29, 21, 22, 30, 48, 14, 24]. In particular, after a series of improvements [28, 29, 11, 10], the current fastest parameterized algorithm for CLUSTER EDITING runs in time $\mathcal{O}(1.62^k + n + m)$, where n and m respectively are the number of vertices and edges in the input graph [9], and the current smallest kernel, again, after a series of improvements [29, 21, 22, 30, 48], has $2k$ vertices [14, 16]. We must also emphasise that parameterized algorithms for CLUSTER EDITING and its variants are not only theoretically significant, but have been found to be effective in practice, particularly in the clustering of biological data [47, 54]. Also, experimental evaluations indicate that pre-processing methods inspired by kernelization algorithms are useful in practice [10, 12, 37].

Overview of our challenges and techniques

Our results rely on a number of techniques—some of them well-worn and some of them novel. Before we discuss them, we first highlight some of the challenges that our problems pose, when compared to a typical graph modification problem. To begin with, for any fixed $\eta \geq 0$, the class of η -balanced graphs is not *hereditary*; a class of graphs is hereditary

¹ Froese et al. [26] showed that the following problem, called CLUSTER TRANSFORMATION BY EDGE ADDITION, is NP-hard. We are given a cluster graph G and a non-negative integer k , and we have to decide if we can add exactly k edges to G so that the resulting graph is also a cluster graph. The reduction that shows the NP-hardness of this problem [26, Theorem 6] also shows the NP-hardness of BCC. We outline a proof of this fact in Appendix A.

² Using arguments that are nearly identical to the ones in our kernel for BCE, it is also possible to design a kernel for BCD with $\mathcal{O}(k^3)$ vertices. But we choose to present a kernel with $\mathcal{O}(k^4)$ vertices as it involves new and simple arguments. In particular, our arguments yield a simple kernel with $\mathcal{O}(k^4)$ vertices for CLUSTER DELETION (i.e., the deletion version without the balance constraint), which might be of independent interest. But these arguments work only for the deletion version and do not extend to the editing version.

if it is closed under vertex deletions. For example, a graph with exactly two equal-sized components is 0-balanced, but deleting one vertex will destroy the 0-balanced property. This poses an immediate difficulty in designing kernels for our problems, as we cannot delete any “irrelevant” vertex; for example, when designing a kernel for CLUSTER EDITING, we can delete any component of the input graph that is a clique (because no edge of such a component needs to be modified), but that option is not available to us. Also, unlike CLUSTER EDITING and many other graph modification problems, for any of the three problems that we study, we cannot enumerate all minimal solutions of size at most k in FPT time as the number of such solutions may not be bounded by a function of k ; see Example 1.

► **Example 1.** Consider BCC. For fixed k , we construct a yes-instance (G, k, η) of BCC as follows. Let $k \in \mathbb{N}$ be a perfect square. Take $\eta = 1$ and n to be a sufficiently large integer so that $(n - \sqrt{k})/\sqrt{k}$ is an integer. We define an n -vertex cluster graph G as follows: G has exactly \sqrt{k} isolated vertices and exactly $(n - \sqrt{k})/\sqrt{k}$ components of size \sqrt{k} . Notice that to turn G into an η -balanced cluster graph by adding at most k edges, we must either merge all the isolated vertices into a single component by adding $\binom{\sqrt{k}}{2}$ edges, or merge each isolated vertex with a component of size \sqrt{k} , which requires the addition of $\sqrt{k} \cdot \sqrt{k} = k$ edges. For the latter option, notice that we have $\binom{(n - \sqrt{k})/\sqrt{k}}{\sqrt{k}} \cdot \sqrt{k}! = n^{\Omega(\sqrt{k})}$ ways in which we can form a solution.

Despite the challenges noted above, we are still able to make use of techniques from the existing literature. For example, we use the familiar strategy of branching on induced paths on 3 vertices in our FPT algorithms for BCD and BCE. And we use a small-sized modulator—a set of vertices whose removal will turn the input graph into a cluster graph—to design our kernel for BCE. We also crucially rely on the fact that by modifying at most k (non-)edges, we modify the adjacencies of at most $2k$ vertices. But these arguments alone are inadequate for our problems. We now briefly outline some of the new arguments that we use.

Using a largest component as a control mechanism in kernelization. Consider an instance (G, k, η) of BCC, the edge completion version. We argue that if (G, k, η) is a yes-instance, then we only need to modify the *smallest* $\mathcal{O}(k)$ components of G whose total size is also bounded by $\mathcal{O}(k)$. Yet, this does not immediately lead to a kernel because we cannot delete the remaining components; by doing so, we might turn a no-instance into a yes-instance. As mentioned, we simply cannot delete “irrelevant vertices.” But we need not keep all the irrelevant vertices either; we only need to keep the largest component as a control mechanism to help us preserve yes- and no-instances intact. We still need to reduce the size of the largest component that we keep, which requires a case analysis involving the size of that component, k and η . We use an argument along these lines in the deletion and editing versions as well, but they require a host of other arguments too. We must add that this argument also suggests that for BCC, the solution size k is perhaps too large a parameter, as the solution size limits the size of the components that are modified.

Kernel for BCD based on the bound for Ramsey number of c -closed graphs. For BCD, i.e., the deletion version, while we can design a kernel with $\mathcal{O}(k^3)$ vertices, we present a kernel with $\mathcal{O}(k^4)$ vertices instead, as this kernel uses an elegant and completely new set of arguments that rely on the recently introduced class of c -closed graphs [25]. For a non-negative integer c , a graph G is c -closed if any two distinct non-adjacent vertices in G have at most $c - 1$ common neighbours. We argue that if (G, k, η) is a yes-instance of BCD, then any two non-adjacent vertices of G have at most k common neighbours, and thus G is

$(k + 1)$ -closed. We then fashion a reduction based on a polynomial bound for the Ramsey number of c -closed graphs [39] to derive our kernel.

Enumerating all representative solutions using the partitions of an integer. Notice that our FPT algorithms run in single-exponential time, i.e., in time $2^{\mathcal{O}(k)}n^{\mathcal{O}(1)}$. In light of our kernels, algorithms that run in time $2^{k^{\mathcal{O}(1)}} + n^{\mathcal{O}(1)}$ are quite straightforward. But improving the exponential factor to $2^{\mathcal{O}(k)}$ is still non-trivial. In particular, as noted above, we cannot enumerate all minimal solutions of size at most k in FPT time, let alone in time $2^{\mathcal{O}(k)}n^{\mathcal{O}(1)}$. But we argue that we can still enumerate all “representative solutions” of size at most k in time $2^{\mathcal{O}(k)}n^{\mathcal{O}(1)}$. To do this, we use our previous observation that we only modify the adjacencies of at most $2k$ vertices if (G, k, η) is a yes-instance. Using this fact, we associate every solution with a set of integers $\ell_1, \ell_2, \dots, \ell_t$ and a partition of ℓ_i for every i ; we will have the guarantee that $\ell_1 + \ell_2 + \dots + \ell_t \leq 2k$. By enumerating all possible choices for $\ell_1, \ell_2, \dots, \ell_t$ and their partitions, we can enumerate all representative solutions. To bound the running time, we then use a result due to Hardy and Ramanujan [36] that says that the number of partitions of an integer ℓ is $2^{\mathcal{O}(\sqrt{\ell})}$.

Faster algorithms using fast polynomial multiplication. To design our algorithms for BCC and BCE that run in time $4^{k+o(k)}n^{\mathcal{O}(1)}$, we show that solving these problems amounts to solving $2^{\mathcal{O}(k)}$ many instances of an assignment problem, where we have to assign balls of different sizes to bins of different capacities subject to a cost constraint. And we show that we can encode the solutions for this assignment problem as a polynomial so that solving the problem amounts to computing a polynomial, for which we use the fact that we can multiply two polynomials of degree d in time $\mathcal{O}(d \log d)$ [46].

Related Work

Graph-based clustering in the parameterized complexity framework. CLUSTER EDITING was introduced by Ben-Dor et al. [8] and by Bansal et al. [7]. The problem is known to be NP-hard [49]. As for the parameterized complexity of CLUSTER EDITING, it is textbook knowledge that the problem admits an algorithm that runs in time $3^k \cdot n^{\mathcal{O}(1)}$ and a kernel with $\mathcal{O}(k^3)$ vertices. As mentioned earlier, there has been a steady series of improvements [28, 29, 11, 10, 21, 22, 30, 48], with the current best being a $\mathcal{O}(1.62^k + n + m)$ time algorithm [9] and a $2k$ -vertex kernel [14, 16]. Even though CLUSTER EDITING was conjectured to be solvable in subexponential time [14], this was later disproved (under the Exponential Time Hypothesis) by Komusiewicz and Uhlmann [40]. On the approximation algorithms front, the problem is known to be APX-hard [15], but constant factor approximation algorithms were obtained by Ailon et al. [3], Bansal et al. [7] and Charikar et al. [15].

The variant of CLUSTER EDITING with the additional requirement that there be p components in the resulting cluster graph has also been studied in the literature. This problem was shown to be NP-hard for every fixed $p \geq 2$ by Shamir et al. [49], and a kernel with $(p + 2)k + p$ vertices was given by Guo [30]. Fomin et al. [24] showed that the problem admits a sub-exponential algorithm running in time $\mathcal{O}(2^{\mathcal{O}(\sqrt{pk})} + n + m)$ and that for $p \geq 6$, no algorithm running in time $2^{o(\sqrt{k})}$ exists unless the Exponential Time Hypothesis fails. Froese et al. [26] studied CLUSTER EDITING under a fairness constraint: Roughly speaking, there are two kinds of vertices, red and blue, and for each color we require that the number of vertices of that color involved in the edge edits must be almost proportional to the total number of vertices of that color. Froese et al. [26] showed that this problem is NP-hard even under various restricted settings, but admits an algorithm that runs in time $2^{\mathcal{O}(k \log k)}$.

Abu-Khzam [1] introduced a variant of CLUSTER EDITING with multiple optimisation objectives, including the total number of edge edits, the number of edge additions and deletions incident with each vertex and a lower bound for the size of each connected component of the resulting cluster graph. To the best of our knowledge, this is the only work on CLUSTER EDITING involving a constraint on the size of the connected components. Abu-Khzam [1] showed that the problem is NP-hard even under restricted settings in which the only constraints are on the number of edge additions and deletions incident with each vertex. This special case has been studied by Komusiewicz and Uhlmann [40] and Gutin and Yeo [34] as well.

Lokshtanov and Marx [44] introduced graph-based clustering problems where each “cluster” has to satisfy local restrictions. They considered three main variants that ask if the vertices of a graph can be partitioned in such a way that at most q edges leave each part and (a) the size of each part is at most p , or (b) the number of non-edges in each part is at most p , or (c) the maximum number of non-neighbors a vertex has in its part is at most p . Lokshtanov and Marx [44] showed that all these variants admit algorithms that run in time $2^{\mathcal{O}(p)}n^{\mathcal{O}(1)}$ and in time $2^{\mathcal{O}(q)}n^{\mathcal{O}(1)}$. These results, as noted by the authors, are not directly comparable with results on CLUSTER EDITING and its variants as the constraints here are on the number of modifications that affect each cluster.

Clustering in the parameterized complexity framework. Apart from the graph-based clustering results mentioned above, there have also been several works that explore the parameterized complexity of various clustering problems. Recent examples include FPT-approximation algorithms for k -MEANS CLUSTERING WITH OUTLIERS [2], parameterized algorithm for CATEGORICAL CLUSTERING WITH SIZE CONSTRAINTS [23], lossy kernels for SAME SIZE CLUSTERING [6] etc., the last of which in particular deals with k -MEDIAN clustering with the additional requirement that the clusters be of equal size.

Organisation of the paper

The rest of the paper is organised as follows. In Section 2, we introduce some terminology and notation. In Section 3, we discuss our kernelization results, with a subsection dedicated to each of the three problems. Section 4 consists of our FPT algorithms, with Subsection 4.1 covering our $2^{\mathcal{O}(k)}n^{\mathcal{O}(1)}$ time algorithms for BCC and BCE, Subsection 4.2 covering our $4^{k+o(k)}n^{\mathcal{O}(1)}$ algorithms for BCC and BCE, and Subsection 4.3 covering BCD. We organise our results this way as opposed to having a section dedicated to each problem, because the FPT algorithms for BCC and BCE use common arguments. In Section 5, we conclude with some pointers for future work.

2 Preliminaries

For $n \in \mathbb{N}$, we use $[n]$ to denote the set $\{1, 2, \dots, n\}$, and $[n]_0 = [n] \cup \{0\}$. For integers a and b with $a \leq b$, we use $[a, b]$ to denote the set $\{a, a + 1, a + 2, \dots, b\}$. For a multiset X and $x \in X$, we denote the multiplicity of x in X by $\text{mul}(x, X)$.

For a graph G , we use $V(G)$ and $E(G)$ to denote the vertex set and the edge set of G , respectively. Consider a graph G . We use $|G|$ as a shorthand for $|V(G)|$, i.e., the number of vertices of G . For $F \subseteq \binom{V(G)}{2}$, we use $V(F)$ to denote the set of vertices that are the endpoints the elements of F , i.e., $V(F) = \{v \in V(G) \mid vw \in F \text{ for some } w \in V(G)\}$; for each vertex $v \in V(F)$, we say that F *modifies* v . For $F \subseteq \binom{V(G)}{2}$ and a connected component H of G , we say that F *modifies* H if F modifies at least one vertex of H . For $F \subseteq \binom{V(G)}{2} \setminus E(G)$,

by $G + F$, we mean the graph with vertex set $V(G)$ and edge set $E(G) \cup F$. For $F \subseteq E(G)$, by $G - F$, we mean the graph with vertex set $V(G)$ and edge set $E(G) \setminus F$. Also, for $F \subseteq \binom{V(G)}{2}$, by $G \Delta F$, we denote the graph obtained from G by “editing” the edges and non-edges of F ; that is, $G \Delta F$ is the graph whose vertex set is $V(G)$ and edge set is the symmetric difference of $E(G)$ and F , i.e., $E(G) \Delta F = (E(G) \setminus F) \cup (F \setminus E(G))$. **We use $\Lambda(G)$ to denote the number of vertices in a largest connected component of G ; and $\lambda(G)$ to denote the number of vertices in a smallest connected component of G .** For $\eta \geq 0$ and a connected component H of G , we say that H is an η -blocker in G if there exists a component H' of G such that $||H| - |H'|| > \eta$, i.e., the size difference between H and H' strictly exceeds η . For $\eta \geq 0$, we say that G is η -balanced if no component of G is an η -blocker; that is, G is η -balanced if the size difference between no two components exceeds η . For future reference, we record the following facts that follow immediately from the definitions of an η -blocker and an η -balanced graph.

► **Observation 2.** Consider a graph G and $\eta \geq 0$.

1. Consider a connected component H of G . Then H is an η -blocker if and only if H' is an η -blocker for every component H' of G with $|H'| = |H|$.
2. The graph G is η -balanced if and only if $\Lambda(G) - \lambda(G) \leq \eta$.

► **Observation 3.** Let G be a graph.

1. Then, $\Lambda(G') \leq \Lambda(G)$ for every subgraph G' of G .
2. Suppose that G has at least two connected components. Let H be a connected component of G , and let G'' be the graph obtained from G by deleting H . Then, $\lambda(G'') \geq \lambda(G)$.
3. Observe that the inequality in item 2 need not hold for all subgraphs G'' of G .

Throughout this paper, whenever we deal with an instance (G, k, η) of one of the three problems—BCC, BCD or BCE—by a **solution** for (G, k, η) , we mean a set $F \subseteq \binom{V(G)}{2}$ such that $|F| \leq k$ and (a) in the case of BCC, $F \subseteq \binom{V(G)}{2} \setminus E(G)$ such that $G + F$ is an η -balanced cluster graph, (b) in the case of BCD, $F \subseteq E(G)$ such that $G - F$ is an η -balanced cluster graph, and (c) in the case of BCE, $G \Delta F$ is an η -balanced cluster graph.

We use standard terminology from parameterized complexity. For terms not defined here, we refer the reader to Cygan et. al [18].

3 Polynomial Kernels for Balanced Cluster Modification Problems

In this section, we show that BCC, BCD and BCE admit polynomial kernels.

3.1 Polynomial Kernel for BALANCED CLUSTER COMPLETION

We start with BCC. First of all, notice that given an instance (G, k, η) of BCC, we can assume without loss of generality that G is a cluster graph, as every solution for (G, k, η) must necessarily contain all the edges that we must add to make G a cluster graph. So, throughout this paper, whenever we deal with BCC, we assume that the input graph is a cluster graph. Accordingly, we restate the problem BALANCED CLUSTER COMPLETION (BCC) as follows.

BALANCED CLUSTER COMPLETION (BCC)

Input: An n -vertex cluster graph G and non-negative integers k and η .
Task: Decide if there exists $F \subseteq \binom{V(G)}{2} \setminus E(G)$ such that $|F| \leq k$ and $G + F$ is an η -balanced cluster graph.

The following theorem is the main result of this subsection.

► **Theorem 4.** BALANCED CLUSTER COMPLETION *admits a kernel with at most $10k$ vertices.*

Throughout this subsection, (G, k, η) is a given instance of BCC. Consider a solution F for the instance (G, k, η) . Recall that for a vertex $v \in V(G)$, we say that F *modifies* v if $v \in V(F)$, and for a connected component H of G , we say that F *modifies* H if F modifies at least one vertex of H . We first present an outline of our kernel.

Outline of the kernel. Given an instance (G, k, η) of BCC, we proceed as follows. We first perform a couple of sanity checks (Reduction Rules 1 and 2) that eliminate obvious yes and no-instances. Let H_1, H_2, \dots, H_r be an ordering of the connected components of G such that $|H_1| \leq |H_2| \leq \dots \leq |H_r|$. For a carefully chosen index $s \in [r]$ such that $\sum_{j=1}^s |H_j| = \mathcal{O}(k)$, we keep the components H_1, H_2, \dots, H_s and H_r , and delete $H_{s+1}, H_{s+2}, \dots, H_{r-1}$ (Reduction Rule 3). This is possible because we argue that the components $H_{s+1}, H_{s+2}, \dots, H_{r-1}$ need not get modified if (G, k, η) were a yes-instance. Finally, we delete sufficiently many vertices from H_r so that we will have $|H_r| = \mathcal{O}(k)$, and we adjust η accordingly. These steps yield the required kernel with $\mathcal{O}(k)$ vertices. ◻

We now present a formal proof of Theorem 4. And we begin by applying the following reduction rule, which rules out obvious yes-instances. Recall that the input graph G is a cluster graph.

► **Reduction Rule 1.** *If G is η -balanced, then we return a trivial yes-instance.*

Assume from now on that Reduction Rule 1 is not applicable. We will use the following two facts throughout this subsection. Suppose F is a solution for (G, k, η) . (1) Since G and $G + F$ are both cluster graphs, F modifies a vertex v if and only if F modifies every vertex in the connected component of G that contains v . In fact, F modifies v if and only if F modifies every vertex in the connected component of $G + F$ that contains v . (2) As $|F| \leq k$, F modifies $|V(F)| \leq 2k$ vertices. These facts immediately lead to the following lemma.

► **Lemma 5.** *Assume that (G, k, η) is a yes-instance and let $F \subseteq \binom{V(G)}{2} \setminus E(G)$ be a solution for (G, k, η) . Let \mathcal{H} be the set of connected components of G that F modifies. Then, (1) $|H| \leq k$ for every $H \in \mathcal{H}$, and (2) $\sum_{H \in \mathcal{H}} |H| \leq 2k$.*

Proof. Consider $H \in \mathcal{H}$. Since F modifies H , F contains at least one edge incident with each vertex of H . And notice that each edge in F has at most one endpoint in $V(H)$. Thus F must contain at least $|H|$ edges incident with $V(H)$, and hence $|H| \leq |F| \leq k$. Now, notice that since $|F| \leq k$ and since each edge in F modifies exactly two vertices, the number of vertices that F modifies is at most $2|F| \leq 2k$. Notice also that F modifies a vertex v if and only if F modifies every vertex in the connected component of G that contains v . Thus F modifies every vertex of H for every $H \in \mathcal{H}$. Hence statement (2) follows. ◀

Recall that $\Lambda(G)$ and $\lambda(G)$ respectively denote the number of vertices in a largest connected component of G and the number of vertices in a smallest connected component of G . We now prove the following lemma that establishes bounds on $\lambda(G)$ and $\Lambda(G)$, if (G, k, η) were indeed a yes-instance.

► **Lemma 6.** *If (G, k, η) is a yes-instance of BCC, then $\lambda(G) \leq k$ and $\Lambda(G) \leq 2k + \eta$.*

Proof. Assume that (G, k, η) is a yes-instance of BCC, and let F be a solution for (G, k, η) . Recall that since Reduction Rule 1 is not applicable, G is not η -balanced. Let G_1 be a

smallest connected component of G and G_2 a largest connected component of G . Then $\lambda(G) = |G_1|$ and $\Lambda(G) = |G_2|$, and since G is not η -balanced, $|G_2| - |G_1| > \eta$. But then F must modify G_1 . Hence, by Lemma 5, we have $\lambda(G) = |G_1| \leq k$.

To see that $\Lambda(G) \leq 2k + \eta$, consider the graph $G' = G + F$. Since F is a solution, we have $\Lambda(G') - \lambda(G') \leq \eta$. Let G'_1 and G'_2 be the connected components of G' that contain G_1 and G_2 , respectively. (Notice that we may have $G'_1 = G'_2$.) Since F is a solution, the graph $G' = G + F$ is η -balanced, and therefore, we have $|G'_2| - |G'_1| \leq \eta$. Now, observe the following facts. (1) Since $|G_1| \leq k$ and $|F| \leq k$, we have $|G'_1| \leq |G_1| + |F| \leq 2k$. (2) We have $|G_2| \leq |G'_2|$ and hence $|G_2| - |G'_1| \leq |G'_2| - |G'_1| \leq \eta$, which implies that $|G_2| \leq |G'_1| + \eta \leq 2k + \eta$. That is, $\Lambda(G) = |G_2| \leq 2k + \eta$. ◀

We now introduce the following reduction rule, the correctness of which follows immediately from Lemma 6. Recall that we are still under the assumption that G is not η -balanced.

▶ **Reduction Rule 2.** *If $\lambda(G) \geq k + 1$ or $\Lambda(G) \geq 2k + \eta + 1$, then we return a trivial no-instance.*

Let r be the number of connected components of G . Fix an ordering (H_1, H_2, \dots, H_r) of the components of G such that $|H_1| \leq |H_2| \leq \dots \leq |H_r|$. Recall that since Reduction Rules 1 and 2 are not applicable, we have $|H_1| = \lambda(G) \leq k$. We define $s \in [r]$ as follows. **Let s be the largest index in $[r]$ such that $\sum_{j=1}^s |H_j| \leq 4k$.** We now apply the following reduction rule.

▶ **Reduction Rule 3.** *If $s + 1 < r$, then we delete the components $H_{s+1}, H_{s+2}, \dots, H_{r-1}$ from G .*

▶ **Lemma 7.** *Reduction Rule 3 is safe.*

Proof. Let G' be the graph obtained from G by applying Reduction Rule 3. We will show that (G, k, η) is a yes-instance of BCC if and only if (G', k, η) is a yes-instance.

Assume that (G, k, η) is a yes-instance. We first prove the following claim.

▷ **Claim 8.** *There exists a solution F for (G, k, η) such that F does not modify any of the components $H_{s+1}, H_{s+2}, \dots, H_{r-1}$.*

Proof. Let F be a solution for (G, k, η) such that of all the solutions for (G, k, η) , F modifies the fewest number of components from $\{H_{s+1}, H_{s+2}, \dots, H_{r-1}\}$. We will show that F does not modify any of the components $H_{s+1}, H_{s+2}, \dots, H_{r-1}$. Assume for a contradiction that F does modify H_q for some $q \in [s + 1, r - 1]$.

We first claim that there exists $q' \in [s]$ such that F does not modify $H_{q'}$. Suppose this is not true. Then F modifies H_j for every $j \in [s]$. Thus, F modifies H_1, H_2, \dots, H_s and H_q , where $q \geq s + 1$. That is, F modifies at least $|H_q| + \sum_{j=1}^s |H_j| \geq \sum_{j=1}^{s+1} |H_j| > 4k$ vertices, which, by Lemma 5, is not possible; the last inequality holds because of the definition of s . Fix $q' \in [s]$ such that F does not modify $H_{q'}$.

We now construct another solution F' from F as follows. Informally, we obtain F' from F by swapping the roles of H_q and $H_{q'}$. More formally, let $F_q \subseteq F$ be the set of edges in F that have an endpoint in H_q , and let $X_q = \bigcup_{v \in V(H_q)} \{u \in V(G) \setminus V(H_q) \mid uv \in F_q\}$; that is, X_q consists of the “non- H_q -endpoints” of the edges in F_q . Notice that since $G + F$ is a cluster graph and since H_q is a connected component of G , for a vertex $u \in V(G)$, we have $u \in X_q$ if and only if u is not adjacent to any vertex of H_q in the graph G , but adjacent to every vertex of H_q in the graph $G + F$, (in which case all the edges between u and H_q belong to $F_q \subseteq F$).

We thus have $|F_q| = |X_q||H_q|$. Now, let $F_{q'} = \{uw \in \binom{V(G)}{2} \mid u \in X_q \text{ and } w \in V(H_{q'})\}$; that is, $F_{q'}$ consists of “new edges” between $V(H_{q'})$ and all those vertices in $V(G) \setminus V(H_q)$ that are modified by F_q . Notice that $|F_{q'}| = |X_q||H_{q'}|$. Finally, we define $F' = (F \setminus F_q) \cup F_{q'}$. Notice that F' does not modify H_q and hence H_q is a component of $G + F'$.

We now show that F' is also a solution for the instance (G, k, η) . Let us first see that $|F'| \leq k$. As $q' \leq s < s + 1 \leq q$, we have $|H_{q'}| \leq |H_q|$, and hence $|F_{q'}| = |X_q||H_{q'}| \leq |X_q||H_q| = |F_q|$. Notice also that $F_q \cap F_{q'} = \emptyset$. We thus have $|F'| = |(F \setminus F_q) \cup F_{q'}| = |F| - |F_q| + |F_{q'}| \leq |F| \leq k$. Also, since $G + F$ is a cluster graph, so is $G + F'$. To show that F' is a solution for (G, k, η) , we now only need to show that $G + F'$ is η -balanced. And for this, it is enough to show that **(i)** $\Lambda(G + F') \leq \Lambda(G + F)$ and **(ii)** $\lambda(G + F') \geq \lambda(G + F)$, which will imply that $\Lambda(G + F') - \lambda(G + F') \leq \Lambda(G + F) - \lambda(G + F) \leq \eta$. To see that (i) and (ii) hold, observe that the only difference between the graphs $G + F$ and $G + F'$ are the components of these graphs that contain $V(H_q)$ and $V(H_{q'})$. Let $C_{F,q}$ be the component of $G + F$ that contains $V(H_q)$ and $C_{F',q'}$ be the component of $G + F'$ that contains $H_{q'}$. Because $|H_{q'}| \leq |H_q|$ and $C_{F,q} - V(H_q) = C_{F',q'} - V(H_{q'})$, we have $|C_{F',q'}| \leq |C_{F,q}|$. Let us first see that (i) holds.

- (a) If $C_{F',q'}$ is a largest component of $G + F'$, then $\Lambda(G + F') = |C_{F',q'}| \leq |C_{F,q}| \leq \Lambda(G + F)$.
- (b) If H_q is largest component of $G + F'$, then again, $\Lambda(G + F') = |H_q| < |C_{F,q}| \leq \Lambda(G + F)$.
- (c) If the previous two cases do not hold, then $\Lambda(G + F') = \Lambda(G + F)$, as every component H' of $G + F'$ such that $H' \neq C_{F',q'}$ and $H' \neq H_q$ is also a component of $G + F$.

In any case, (i) holds. Now, to see that (ii) holds, observe the following facts.

- (a) If $C_{F',q'}$ is a smallest component of $G + F'$, then $\lambda(G + F') = |C_{F',q'}| > |H_{q'}| \geq \lambda(G + F)$.
- (b) If H_q is a smallest component of $G + F'$, then again, $\lambda(G + F') = |H_q| \geq |H_{q'}| \geq \lambda(G + F)$.
- (c) If the previous two cases do not hold, then $\lambda(G + F') = \lambda(G + F)$, as every component H' of $G + F'$ such that $H' \neq C_{F',q'}$ and $H' \neq H_q$ is also a component of $G + F$.

Thus (ii) holds as well. We have thus shown that F' is also a solution for (G, k, η) . Notice that (i) F modifies H_q but F' does not, and (ii) for every component H_j of G with $j \in [s + 1, r - 1] \setminus \{q\}$, F modifies H_j if and only if F' modifies H_j . Thus, F' modifies strictly fewer components from $\{H_j \mid j \in [s + 1, r - 1]\}$ than F does, which contradicts the definition of F . \triangleleft

Now, consider a solution F for (G, k, η) . In light of Claim 8, we assume that F does not modify any of the components $H_{s+1}, H_{s+2}, \dots, H_{r-1}$. We now argue that F is a solution for (G', k, η) as well. (Recall that G' is the graph obtained from G by applying Reduction Rule 3). Notice first that $G' + F$ is an induced subgraph of $G + F$, and hence $G' + F$ is a cluster graph. To see that $G' + F$ is η -balanced, notice that each component of $G' + F$ is also a component of $G + F$, and hence $\Lambda(G' + F) \leq \Lambda(G + F)$ and $\lambda(G' + F) \geq \lambda(G + F)$. We thus have $\Lambda(G' + F) - \lambda(G' + F) \leq \Lambda(G + F) - \lambda(G + F) \leq \eta$. We have thus shown that (G', k, η) is a yes-instance.

Conversely, assume that (G', k, η) is a yes-instance, and let R be a solution for (G', k, η) . We claim that R is a solution for (G, k, η) as well. Notice that $G + R$ is indeed a cluster graph. So we only need to prove that $G + R$ is η -balanced. Again, to prove this, it is enough to prove that (i) $\Lambda(G + R) \leq \Lambda(G' + R)$ and (ii) $\lambda(G + R) \geq \lambda(G' + R)$, which will imply that $\Lambda(G + R) - \lambda(G + R) \leq \Lambda(G' + R) - \lambda(G' + R) \leq \eta$.

Let $C_{R,r}$ be the component of $G' + R$ that contains $V(H_r)$. Now, notice that every component of $G' + R$ is also a component of $G + R$. In addition, $G + R$ contains the

components $H_{s+1}, H_{s+2}, \dots, H_{r-1}$. Hence, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\Lambda(G + R) &= \max \{ \Lambda(G' + R), |H_{s+1}|, |H_{s+2}|, \dots, |H_{r-1}| \} \\
&= \max \{ \Lambda(G' + R), |H_{r-1}| \} && \text{(Because } |H_{s+1}| \leq |H_{s+2}| \leq \dots \leq |H_{r-1}| \text{.)} \\
&\leq \max \{ \Lambda(G' + R), |H_r| \} && \text{(Because } |H_{r-1}| \leq |H_r| \text{.)} \\
&\leq \max \{ \Lambda(G' + R), |C_{R,r}| \} && \text{(Because } |H_r| \leq |C_{R,r}| \text{.)} \\
&= \Lambda(G' + R). && \text{(Because } C_{R,r} \text{ is a component of } G' + R \text{.)}
\end{aligned}$$

Let us now prove that $\lambda(G + R) \geq \lambda(G' + R)$. As before, $\lambda(G + R) = \min \{ \lambda(G' + R), |H_{s+1}|, \dots, |H_{r-1}| \} = \min \{ \Lambda(G' + R), |H_{s+1}| \}$. There are two possible cases.

Case 1: R does not modify H_j for some $j \in [s]$. Then H_j is a component of $G' + R$. We thus have $\lambda(G' + R) \leq |H_j| \leq |H_{s+1}|$, which implies that $\lambda(G + R) = \min \{ \lambda(G' + R), |H_{s+1}| \} = \lambda(G' + R)$.

Case 2: R modifies H_j for every $j \in [s]$. Then, by Lemma 5, we have $\sum_{j \in [s]} |H_j| \leq 2k$. But then, by the definition of s , we must have $|H_{s+1}| \geq 2k + 1$. We now argue that $G' + R$ contains a component of size at most $2k$, which will imply that $\lambda(G' + R) \leq 2k$.

Since $|H_{s+1}| \geq 2k + 1$, we have $|H_r| \geq |H_{s+1}| \geq 2k + 1$. Thus, by Lemma 5, R does not modify the component H_r . But recall that the only components of G' are H_1, H_2, \dots, H_s and H_r . Since R does not modify H_r , we can conclude that $G' + R$ contains a component with at most $|G'| - |H_r| = \sum_{j=1}^s |H_j| \leq 2k$ vertices. Therefore, $\lambda(G' + R) \leq 2k < |H_{s+1}|$, which implies that $\lambda(G + R) = \min \{ \lambda(G' + R), |H_{s+1}| \} = \lambda(G' + R)$.

We have thus shown that $\Lambda(G + R) \leq \Lambda(G' + R)$ and $\lambda(G + R) \geq \lambda(G' + R)$, which implies that $\Lambda(G + R) - \lambda(G + R) \leq \Lambda(G' + R) - \lambda(G' + R) \leq \eta$. Thus $G + R$ is η -balanced, and hence (G, k, η) is a yes-instance. \blacktriangleleft

Assume from now on that Reduction Rule 3 is no longer applicable. Then G contains $s + 1$ components: H_1, H_2, \dots, H_s and H_r , and we have $\sum_{j=1}^s |H_j| \leq 4k$ and $\Lambda(G) = |H_r|$. We observe the following facts.

- **Observation 9. 1.** *If $\eta \geq |H_r| = \Lambda(G)$, then (G, k, η) is a yes-instance as G is η -balanced; and since Reduction Rule 1 is not applicable, we must have $\eta < \Lambda(G)$.*
- 2. *If $\Lambda(G) = |H_r| \leq 4k$, then we already have $|G| = |H_r| + \sum_{j=1}^s |H_j| \leq 4k + 4k = 8k$. Thus, (G, k, η) is a kernel with $8k$ vertices.*
- 3. *If $\eta \leq 4k$, then since Reduction Rule 2 is not applicable, we have $|H_r| = \Lambda(G) \leq 2k + \eta \leq 2k + 4k = 6k$. We thus have $|G| = |H_r| + \sum_{j=1}^s |H_j| \leq 6k + 4k = 10k$. Thus, (G, k, η) is a kernel with $10k$ vertices in this case.*

In light of Observation 9, we apply the following reduction rule.

► **Reduction Rule 4.** *If $\Lambda(G) = |H_r| \leq 4k$ or $\eta \leq 4k$, then we simply return the instance (G, k, η) .*

We assume from now on that Reduction Rule 4 is no longer applicable, and hence $\Lambda(G) = |H_r| > 4k$ and $\eta > 4k$. We define $\eta' = 4k$ and $N = \Lambda(G) - (\eta - 4k)$.

- **Observation 10. 1.** *Recall that we have $\eta < \Lambda(G)$ (Observation 9-1). Therefore, $N = \Lambda(G) - (\eta - 4k) > \eta - (\eta - 4k) = 4k$.*
- 2. *Recall also that we have $\Lambda(G) \leq 2k + \eta$. Therefore, $N = \Lambda(G) - (\eta - 4k) \leq 2k + \eta - (\eta - 4k) = 6k$.*

We now apply the following reduction rule once.

► **Reduction Rule 5.** *We delete $\Lambda(G) - N$ (arbitrarily chosen) vertices from H_r ; let us denote the resulting component by H' and the resulting graph by G' . We return the instance (G', k, η')*

► **Lemma 11.** *Reduction Rule 5 is safe.*

Proof. Informally, Reduction Rule 5 is safe because we deleted $\Lambda(G) - N = \eta - 4k$ vertices from H_r and we decremented η by the same amount; that is, we set $\eta' = 4k = \eta - (\eta - 4k)$. The safeness of the rule then follows from the facts that no solution for (G, k, η) modifies H_r as $|H_r| > 4k$, and no solution for (G', k, η') modifies H' as $|H'| = \Lambda(G) - (\Lambda(G) - N) = N > 4k$. We now prove this more formally.

Recall that G consists of the connected components H_1, H_2, \dots, H_s and H_r ; and G' consists of the connected components H_1, H_2, \dots, H_s and H' . Also, $\Lambda(G) = |H_r|$; and $|H'| = |H_r| - (\Lambda(G) - N) = N$. By Observation 10-1, we have $N > 4k$. That is, H' is a component of G' with at least $4k + 1$ vertices. And by the definition of s , we have $\sum_{j=1}^s |H_j| \leq 4k$. Thus H' is the unique largest component of G' , and hence $\Lambda(G') = |H'| = N$.

Assume that (G, k, η) is a yes-instance, and let F be a solution for (G, k, η) . We argue that F is a solution for (G', k, η') as well. First, since $|H_r| > 4k$, by Lemma 5, F does not modify H_r . Now, consider the graph $G' + F$; this graph is well-defined and it is indeed a cluster graph as F does not modify H_r . In particular, F does not modify H' (as $V(H') \subseteq V(H_r)$). Also, since $\sum_{j=1}^s |H_j| \leq 4k$, $|H_r| > 4k$ and $|H'| > 4k$, H_r and H' respectively are the unique largest components of $G + F$ and $G' + F$. Thus, $\Lambda(G + F) = |H_r| = \Lambda(G)$ and $\Lambda(G' + F) = |H'| = N = \Lambda(G')$. Again, since F does not modify H_r , each component of $G + F$, except H_r , is also a component of $G' + F$; and each component of $G' + F$, except H' , is also a component of $G + F$. In particular, a smallest component of $G + F$ is a smallest component of $G' + F$, and vice versa. That is, $\lambda(G + F) = \lambda(G' + F)$. Since $G + F$ is η -balanced, we have $\Lambda(G + F) - \lambda(G + F) \leq \eta$, which implies that $\Lambda(G' + F) - \lambda(G' + F) \leq \eta - (\eta - 4k)$, which implies that $N - \lambda(G' + F) \leq 4k$. That is, $\Lambda(G' + F) - \lambda(G' + F) \leq \eta'$, and thus $G' + F$ is η' -balanced.

Conversely, assume that (G', k, η') is a yes-instance, and let F' be a solution for (G', k, η') . Then, F' does not modify H' , and we can argue that F' is a solution for (G, k, η) . In fact, we have (i) $\Lambda(G + F') = |H_r| = \Lambda(G)$, (ii) $\Lambda(G' + F') = |H'| = N = \Lambda(G')$ and (iii) $\lambda(G + F') = \lambda(G' + F')$. Since $G' + F'$ is η' -balanced, we have $\Lambda(G' + F') - \lambda(G' + F') \leq \eta'$, which implies that $N - \lambda(G' + F') \leq \eta'$, which implies that $N + (\eta - 4k) - \Lambda(G' + F') \leq \eta' + (\eta - 4k)$, which implies that $\Lambda(G + F') - \lambda(G + F') \leq \eta$. Thus $G + F'$ is η -balanced. ◀

Consider the instance (G', k, η') returned by Reduction Rule 5. Recall that $\eta' = 4k$ and $|H'| = N \leq 6k$ (Observation 10). The components of G' are H_1, H_2, \dots, H_s and H' , and we thus have $|G'| = \sum_{j=1}^s |H_j| + |H'| \leq 4k + 6k = 10k$. That is, (G', k, η') is a kernel with at most $10k$ vertices. We have thus proved Theorem 4.

3.2 Polynomial Kernel for BALANCED CLUSTER DELETION

We formally define the BALANCED CLUSTER DELETION (BCD) problem as follows.

BALANCED CLUSTER DELETION (BCD)

Input: A graph G and non-negative integers k and η .

Task: Decide if there exists $F \subseteq E(G)$ such that $|F| \leq k$ and $G - F$ is an η -balanced cluster graph.

We now show that BCD admits a kernel with $\mathcal{O}(k^4)$ vertices. To design our kernel, we rely on a structural property exhibited by yes-instances: We argue that if (G, k, η) is a yes-instance, then any two non-adjacent vertices in G have at most k common neighbours. To exploit this observation algorithmically, we turn to the class of c -closed graphs, which was introduced by Fox et al. [25]. We define c -closed graphs below, and briefly summarise their properties that we will be using.

c -Closed Graphs. For a positive integer c , we say that a graph G is c -closed if any two distinct non-adjacent vertices in G have at most $c - 1$ neighbours in common. That is, for distinct $u, v \in V(G)$, we have $|N(u) \cap N(v)| \leq c - 1$ if $uv \notin E(G)$. We will use the following lemma, which relies on the fact that c -closed graphs have polynomially bounded Ramsey numbers.

► **Lemma 12** ([39]). *For $a, b, c \in \mathbb{N}$, let $R_c(a, b) = (a - 1)(b - 1) + (c - 1)\binom{b-1}{2} + 1$. There is an algorithm that, given $a, b, c \in \mathbb{N}$ and a c -closed graph G on at least $R_c(a, b)$ vertices as input, runs in polynomial time, and returns either a maximal clique in G of size at least a or an independent set in G of size b .*

Outline of the kernel. Consider an instance (G, k, η) of BCD. Our kernel has three main steps. **In the first step, we bound the number of vertices that belong to the non-clique components of G by $\mathcal{O}(k^4)$.** We first bound the number of non-clique components by k ; this is straightforward as we must delete at least one edge from each non-clique component to turn G into a cluster graph. We then bound the size of each non-clique component by $\mathcal{O}(k^3)$. To do this, we argue that if (G, k, η) is a yes-instance, then every pair of non-adjacent vertices have at most k common neighbours, and thus G is $(k + 1)$ -closed. In particular, each non-clique component of G is $(k + 1)$ -closed. To bound the size of such components, we fashion a reduction rule based on Lemma 12 that works as follows. For each non-clique component H of G of size at least $R_{k+1}(k + 2, k + 2)$, we run the algorithm of Lemma 12 on H (with $a = b = k + 2$ and $c = k + 1$). If the algorithm returns an independent set of size $k + 2$, then we argue that (G, k, η) is a no-instance. If the algorithm returns a maximal clique Q of size at least $k + 2$, then we delete all the edges with exactly one endpoint in $V(Q)$; this is possible because we argue that Q must necessarily be a connected component of $G - F$ for every solution F for (G, k, η) . When this reduction rule is no longer applicable, every non-clique component will have size at most $R_{k+1}(k + 2, k + 2) - 1 = \mathcal{O}(k^3)$.

Having dealt with non-clique components, we then turn to the clique-components of G . We classify the clique-components of G into two types—small and large. By small cliques, we mean cliques of size at most $k + 1$, and by large cliques, we mean cliques of size at least $k + 2$. **In the second step, we bound the number of vertices of G that belong to small clique-components by $\mathcal{O}(k^3)$.** To do this, we show that for each $j \in [k + 1]$, we only need to keep at most $k + 1$ clique-components of size exactly j .

In the third step, we bound the number of vertices of G that belong to large clique-components by $\mathcal{O}(k^3)$. Specifically, we apply a reduction rule that works as follows. Let H_1, H_2, \dots, H_r be the large clique-components of G such that $|H_1| \leq |H_2| \leq \dots \leq |H_r|$. If $|H_1| \leq R_{k+1}(k + 2, k + 2) = \mathcal{O}(k^3)$, then we delete the components H_2, H_3, \dots, H_{r-1} ; otherwise, we delete the components H_1, H_2, \dots, H_{r-1} . This is possible because we argue that no solution for (G, k, η) modifies the large clique-components. Finally, we bound $|H_r|$ by $\mathcal{O}(k^3)$ by deleting sufficiently many vertices from H_r , and we adjust η accordingly. These steps lead to the required kernel with $\mathcal{O}(k^4)$ vertices. \square

We now proceed to designing our kernel for BCD. Recall that for a graph G , $\Lambda(G)$ and $\lambda(G)$ respectively denote the number of vertices in a largest connected component and a smallest connected component of G . Consider an instance (G, k, η) of BCD. We first apply the following reduction rule that eliminates obvious yes-instances.

► **Reduction Rule 6.** *If G is an η -balanced cluster graph, then we return a trivial yes-instance.*

We now apply the following reduction rule, which upper bounds η by $\Lambda(G)$. The correctness of the rule follows from the observation that η need never be larger than $\Lambda(G)$.

► **Reduction Rule 7.** *If $\eta > \Lambda(G)$, then we return the instance $(G, k, \hat{\eta})$, where $\hat{\eta} = \Lambda(G)$.*

► **Lemma 13.** *Reduction Rule 7 is safe.*

Proof. Suppose that $\eta > \Lambda(G)$. Observe that for any set $F \subseteq E(G)$, the graph $G - F$ is trivially η -balanced and trivially $\hat{\eta}$ -balanced. To see this, notice that as $G - F$ is a subgraph of G , we have $\Lambda(G - F) \leq \Lambda(G) = \hat{\eta} < \eta$. Therefore, we always have $\Lambda(G - F) - \lambda(G - F) \leq \Lambda(G - F) \leq \hat{\eta} < \eta$. Thus, F is a solution for the instance (G, k, η) if and only if F is a solution for the instance $(G, k, \hat{\eta})$. ◀

Assume from now on that Reduction Rules 6 and 7 are no longer applicable. Since Rule 6 is not applicable, either G contains a non-clique component or G is a cluster graph but not η -balanced. Since Reduction Rule 7 is not applicable, we have $\eta \leq \Lambda(G)$. We now apply a series of reduction rules that deal separately with the non-clique components (Reduction Rules 8 and 10), the components that are “small cliques” (Reduction Rule 11) and the components that are “large” cliques (Reduction Rules 13-17). We begin with non-clique components, and first apply the following reduction rule. The safeness of the rule follows immediately from the fact that we must delete at least one edge from each non-clique component of G to turn G into a cluster graph.

► **Reduction Rule 8.** *If G contains at least $k + 1$ non-clique components, then we return a trivial no-instance.*

We assume from now on that Reduction Rule 8 is no longer applicable. Thus G has at most k non-clique connected components. We now introduce the following reduction rule.

► **Reduction Rule 9.** *If G contains two distinct non-adjacent vertices with at least $k + 1$ common neighbours, then we return a trivial no-instance.*

► **Lemma 14.** *Reduction Rule 9 is safe.*

Proof. To prove the lemma, it is enough to show that (G, k, η) is a no-instance if G contains two distinct non-adjacent vertices with at least $k + 1$ common neighbours. Let $u, v \in V(G)$ be distinct vertices such that $uv \notin E(G)$ and $|N(u) \cap N(v)| \geq k + 1$, and let $x_1, x_2, \dots, x_{k+1} \in V(G)$ be $k + 1$ distinct common neighbours of u and v . Suppose that (G, k, η) is a yes-instance, and let F be a solution for (G, k, η) . Then $G - F$ is a cluster graph. Since u and v are non-adjacent, u and v must be in different connected components of $G - F$. Therefore, for every $i \in [k + 1]$, F must contain either the edge ux_i or the edge vx_i . Thus $|F| \geq k + 1$, which contradicts the fact that $|F| \leq k$. ◀

Assume from now on that Reduction Rule 9 is no longer applicable. Thus any two distinct non-adjacent vertices in G have at most k common neighbours, and hence G is $(k + 1)$ -closed. We now prove the following two lemmas, which we will use to fashion a reduction rule (Reduction Rule 10) that bounds the size of non-clique components.

► **Lemma 15.** *If a connected component of G contains an independent set of size $k + 2$, then (G, k, η) is a no-instance.*

Proof. Let H be a connected component of G , and let $I \subseteq V(H)$ be an independent set of size $k + 2$ in H . Suppose now that (G, k, η) is a yes-instance, and let $F \subseteq E(G)$ be a solution for (G, k, η) . Then $G - F$ is a cluster graph, and in particular, $H - F$ is a cluster graph. Therefore, as the vertices of I are pairwise non-adjacent, every connected component of $H - F$ contains at most one vertex of I . Since $|F| \leq k$ and H is connected, the graph $H - F$ has at most $k + 1$ connected components. Then, as $|I| = k + 2$, by the pigeonhole principle, there exists a connected component of $H - F$ that contains at least two vertices of I , which is a contradiction. ◀

► **Lemma 16.** *Assume that (G, k, η) is a yes-instance. If G contains a maximal clique, say Q , of size at least $k + 2$, then Q is a connected component of $G - F$ for every solution $F \subseteq E(G)$ for (G, k, η) .*

Proof. Fix a solution F for (G, k, η) . Let Q be a maximal clique in G of size at least $k + 2$. Consider the cluster graph $G - F$. Notice that as $|Q| \geq k + 2$, we have to delete at least $k + 1$ edges from Q to separate the vertices of Q into two or more connected components. Since $|F| \leq k$, we can conclude that Q is fully contained in a connected component of $G - F$. Now, since Q is a maximal clique in G and since each component of $G - F$ is a clique, the connected component of $G - F$ that contains Q does not contain any vertex from $V(G) \setminus V(Q)$. We can thus conclude that Q is a connected component of $G - F$. ◀

Based on Lemmas 12, 15 and 16, we now introduce the following reduction rule. The correctness of the rule follows from Lemmas 15 and 16. Recall that we are under the assumption that G is $(k + 1)$ -closed.

► **Reduction Rule 10.** *For each non-clique connected component H of G of size at least $R_{k+1}(k + 2, k + 2)$, we run the algorithm of Lemma 12 on H with $c = k + 1$ and $a = b = k + 2$. If the algorithm returns an independent set of size $k + 2$, then we return a trivial no-instance. And if the algorithm returns a maximal clique, say Q , of size at least $k + 2$, then we do as follows. Let ℓ be the number of edges in G that have exactly one endpoint in $V(Q)$. If $\ell > k$, then we return a trivial no-instance; otherwise, we delete all the edges from G that have exactly one endpoint in $V(Q)$ and decrement k by ℓ .*

Assume from now on that Reduction Rule 10 is no longer applicable. We can immediately derive the following bound for the number of vertices in G that belong to non-clique components.

► **Observation 17.** *Every non-clique component of G has size at most $R_{k+1}(k + 2, k + 2) - 1 = \mathcal{O}(k^3)$. Since Reduction Rule 8 is no longer applicable, the number of non-clique components is at most k . Thus the number of vertices in G that belong to non-clique components is $\mathcal{O}(k^4)$.³*

We have thus bounded the number of vertices that belong to components that are not cliques. We now bound the number of vertices that belong to components that are cliques. To that end, we classify such components into two types as follows. Consider a connected

³ Observe that for the standard CLUSTER DELETION problem, i.e., deletion version without the balance constraint, these arguments are sufficient to yield a kernel with $\mathcal{O}(k^4)$ vertices, as we can safely delete all connected components of the input graph that are cliques.

component H of G . We say that H is *manageable* if H is a clique and $|H| \leq k + 1$. And we say that H is *unmanageable* if H is a clique and $|H| > k + 1$. Before we bound the number of vertices that belong to these components, we prove the following lemma, which says that no solution for (G, k, η) modifies an unmanageable component; this fact is essentially a corollary to Lemma 16.

► **Lemma 18.** *Assume that (G, k, η) is a yes-instance of BCD. Consider any solution $F \subseteq E(G)$ for (G, k, η) . Let H be an unmanageable component of G . Then F does not modify H ; that is, H is a connected component of $G - F$.*

Proof. First, by the definition of an unmanageable component, H is a clique of size at least $k + 2$; and since H is a connected component of G , H is a maximal clique in G . By Lemma 16, H is a component of $G - F$. As H is a component of both G and $G - F$, we can conclude that F does not modify H . ◀

We now bound the size of the components. First, to deal with manageable components, we introduce the following reduction rule.

► **Reduction Rule 11.** *For $j \in [k + 1]$, if G has at least $k + 2$ manageable components of size exactly j , then we delete one such component.*

► **Lemma 19.** *Reduction Rule 11 is safe.*

Proof. Let (G', k, η) be the instance obtained from (G, k, η) by a single application of Reduction Rule 11. Let H be the connected component of G that we deleted from G to obtain G' . Then H is a clique and $|H| = j$ for some $j \in [k + 2]$; and G contains at least $k + 1$ other manageable components of size exactly j .

Assume that (G, k, η) is a yes-instance, and let $F \subseteq E(G)$ be a minimal solution for (G, k, η) . We first prove the following claim, which says that F does not modify H .

▷ **Claim 20.** We have $F \cap E(H) = \emptyset$.

Proof. Suppose for a contradiction that $F \cap E(H) \neq \emptyset$. We will show that the set $F_H = F \setminus E(H)$ is also a solution for (G, k, η) , which will contradict the minimality of F . Observe first that $G - F_H$ is a cluster graph. To see this, notice that H is a connected component of $G - F_H$, and every other connected component of $G - F_H$ is also a connected component of $G - F$. As H is a clique and $G - F$ is a cluster graph, we can conclude that $G - F_H$ is a cluster graph. Now, to complete the proof of the claim, we only need to prove that $G - F_H$ is η -balanced. And for this, we will prove that $\Lambda(G - F_H) \leq \Lambda(G - F)$ and $\lambda(G - F_H) \geq \lambda(G - F)$, which will imply that $\Lambda(G - F_H) - \lambda(G - F_H) \leq \Lambda(G - F) - \lambda(G - F) \leq \eta$. Again, as H is a component of $G - F_H$ and every other component of $G - F_H$ is also a component of $G - F$, we have $\Lambda(G - F_H) \leq \max\{|H|, \Lambda(G - F)\}$. Notice that since $|F| \leq k$ and since G contains at least $k + 2$ manageable components of size exactly $j = |H|$, there exists a component H' of G such that $H' \neq H$, H' is a manageable component of size exactly j and F does not modify H' . Thus H' is a component of $G - F$. Therefore, $|H'| \leq \Lambda(G - F)$, which, along with the fact that $|H| = |H'| = j$, implies that $\Lambda(G - F_H) = \max\{|H|, \Lambda(G - F)\} = \Lambda(G - F)$. Now, to see that $\lambda(G - F_H) \geq \lambda(G - F)$, we consider two cases depending on whether or not H is a smallest component of $G - F_H$. If H is a smallest component of $G - F_H$, then $\lambda(G - F_H) = |H| = |H'| \geq \lambda(G - F)$; the last inequality follows from the fact that H' is a component of $G - F$. On the other hand, if H is not a smallest component of $G - F_H$, then, as every component of $G - F_H$, and in particular a smallest component of $G - F_H$, is also a component of $G - F$, we trivially have $\lambda(G - F_H) \geq \lambda(G - F)$. We thus have

$\Lambda(G - F_H) - \lambda(G - F_H) \leq \Lambda(G - F) - \lambda(G - F) \leq \eta$, and hence $G - F_H$ is η -balanced, which contradicts the assumption that F is a minimal solution for (G, k, η) . \triangleleft

We now show that F is a solution for (G', k, η) . As F does not modify H , we indeed have $F \subseteq E(H')$. Notice that each component of $G' - F$ is also a component of $G - F$, which is an η -balanced cluster graph (in addition, $G - F$ contains the component H). Therefore, $G' - F$ is a cluster graph, and we have $\Lambda(G' - F) \leq \Lambda(G - F)$ and $\lambda(G' - F) \geq \lambda(G - F)$. We thus have $\Lambda(G' - F) - \lambda(G' - F) \leq \Lambda(G - F) - \lambda(G - F) \leq \eta$, which shows that $G' - F$ is η -balanced. We have thus shown that (G', k, η) is a yes-instance.

Assume now that (G', k, η) is a yes-instance of BCD, and let $F' \subseteq E(G')$ be a solution for (G', k, η) . We claim that F' is a solution for (G, k, η) as well. Consider the graph $G - F'$. Notice that the only difference between the graphs $G - F'$ and $G' - F'$ is that $G - F'$ contains the component H whereas $G' - F'$ does not. All the other components of $G - F'$ are also components of $G' - F'$. As H is a clique and $G' - F'$ is a cluster graph, we can conclude that $G - F'$ is also a cluster graph. We now prove that $G' - F'$ is η -balanced. To prove this, notice that we only need to prove that H is not an η -blocker in $G - F'$. Recall that G contains at least $k + 2$ components of size exactly $j = |H|$. Therefore, G' contains at least $k + 1$ components of size exactly j . Then, as $|F'| \leq k$, there exists a component H'' of G' such that $|H''| = j$ and F' does not modify H'' . That is, H'' is a component of $G' - F'$, and therefore a component of $G - F'$. Since H'' is not an η -blocker in $G' - F'$ and since $|H''| = |H| = j$, we can conclude that H'' is not an η -blocker in $G - F'$. But then, by Observation 2, H is not an η -blocker in $G - F'$. This completes the proof. \blacktriangleleft

► **Observation 21.** *After an exhaustive application of Reduction Rule 11, for each $j \in [k + 1]$, G has at most $k + 1$ manageable components of size exactly j . Hence the number of manageable components of G is at most $(k + 1)^2 = \mathcal{O}(k^2)$, and the number of vertices of G that belong to manageable components is at most $\sum_{j=1}^{k+1} (k + 1)j = (k + 1) \sum_{j=1}^{k+1} j = (1/2)(k + 1)^2(k + 2) = \mathcal{O}(k^3)$.*

We assume from now on that Reduction Rule 11 is no longer applicable. We have thus bounded the number of vertices of G that belong to non-clique components (by $\mathcal{O}(k^4)$; Observation 17) or manageable components (by $\mathcal{O}(k^3)$; Observation 21). If G has no unmanageable component, then we already have $|G| = \mathcal{O}(k^4)$, and thus the instance (G, k, η) is the required kernel. (Recall that as Reduction Rule 8 is not applicable, we have $\eta \leq \Lambda(G) \leq |G|$.) This observation immediately leads to the following reduction rule.

► **Reduction Rule 12.** *If G has no unmanageable component, then we simply return the instance (G, k, η) .*

Assume from now on that Reduction Rule 12 is not applicable. So G has at least one unmanageable component. Let $r \geq 1$ be the number of unmanageable components of G , and let H_1, H_2, \dots, H_r be an ordering of the unmanageable components of G such that $|H_1| \leq |H_2| \leq \dots \leq |H_r|$. Recall that to bound $|G|$, now we only need to bound the number of vertices that belong to unmanageable components. To that end, we first introduce the following reduction rule, which rules out an obvious no-instance.

► **Reduction Rule 13.** *If $|H_r| - |H_1| > \eta$, then we return a trivial no-instance.*

► **Lemma 22.** *Reduction Rule 13 is safe.*

Proof. To prove the lemma, it is enough to prove that (G, k, η) is a no-instance if $|H_r| - |H_1| > \eta$. So suppose that $|H_r| - |H_1| > \eta$ and assume for a contradiction that (G, k, η) is a yes-instance. Let F be a solution for (G, k, η) . Then $G - F$ is η -balanced. Since H_1 and H_r

are unmanageable components, they are both cliques of size at least $k + 2$; since they are components of G , H_1 and H_r are indeed maximal cliques in G . Then, by Lemma 18, F does not modify H_1 or H_r . That is, H_1 and H_r are components of $G - F$. But this is not possible as $G - F$ is η -balanced. \blacktriangleleft

From now on, we assume that Reduction Rule 13 is not applicable. We now bound the number of unmanageable components. To that end, **we define $s \in \{0, 1\}$ as follows: $s = 0$ if $|H_1| > R_{k+1}(k + 2, k + 2)$, and $s = 1$ otherwise.**

► **Reduction Rule 14.** *If $s + 1 < r$, then we delete the components $H_{s+1}, H_{s+2}, \dots, H_{r-1}$.*

► **Lemma 23.** *Reduction Rule 14 is safe.*

Proof. Assume that $s + 1 < r$. Let (G', k, η) be the instance obtained from (G, k, η) by applying Reduction Rule 14.

Assume that (G, k, η) is a yes-instance, and let $F \subseteq E(G)$ be a solution for (G, k, η) . Recall that the components $H_{s+1}, H_{s+2}, \dots, H_{r-1}$ are all unmanageable components. By Lemma 18, F does not modify the components $H_{s+1}, H_{s+2}, \dots, H_{r-1}$. Thus $F \subseteq E(G')$. Notice now that each component of $G' - F$ is also a component of $G - F$. Thus, $\Lambda(G' - F) \leq \Lambda(G - F)$ and $\lambda(G' - F) \geq \lambda(G - F)$. We thus have $\Lambda(G' - F) - \lambda(G' - F) \leq \Lambda(G - F) - \lambda(G - F) \leq \eta$. That is, $G' - F$ is η -balanced, and hence (G', k, η) is a yes-instance.

Assume now that (G', k, η) is a yes-instance, and let $F' \subseteq E(G')$ be a solution for (G', k, η) . We claim that F' is a solution for (G, k, η) as well. Notice that each component of $G' - F'$ is also a component of $G - F'$; in addition, $G - F'$ contains the components $H_{s+1}, H_{s+2}, \dots, H_{r-1}$, which are all cliques. Thus $G - F'$ is a cluster graph. So we only need to prove that $G - F'$ is η -balanced. And for that, as $G' - F'$ is η -balanced, we only need to prove that for every $j \in [s + 1, r - 1]$, the component H_j is not an η -blocker in $G - F'$; that is, $||H_j| - |H' || \leq \eta$ for every connected component H' of $G - F'$. To prove this, we will consider several cases below. Fix $j \in [s + 1, r - 1]$. Consider H_j and any other connected component H' of $G - F'$.

Before we proceed further, we first highlight two arguments that we will repeatedly use in the following case analysis. **(A1)** In several cases that we consider below, we will show that $\lambda(G' - F') \leq |H_j|, |H'| \leq \Lambda(G' - F')$, which will imply that $||H_j| - |H' || \leq \Lambda(G' - F') - \lambda(G' - F') \leq \eta$; the last inequality follows from the fact that $G' - F'$ is η -balanced. **(A2)** Notice that H_r is a component of G' . In particular, H_r is an unmanageable component of G' . Hence, by Lemma 18, F' does not modify H_r . Thus H_r is a component of $G' - F'$, and hence $|H_r| \leq \Lambda(G' - F')$. And since $j < r$, we have $|H_j| \leq |H_r| \leq \Lambda(G' - F')$.

Suppose first that F' does not modify H' ; that is, H' is a connected component of G , and in particular, H' is a clique in G . There are two possible cases here depending on whether H' is a manageable component or an unmanageable component.

Case 1: H' is an unmanageable component of G . That is, $H' = H_i$ for some $i \in [r]$. Recall that we have $|H_1| \leq |H_2| \leq \dots \leq |H_r|$. Then, since Reduction Rule 13 is not applicable, we have $||H_j| - |H_i || \leq |H_r| - |H_1| \leq \eta$.

Case 2: H' is a manageable component of G . Hence $H' \neq H_i$ for any $i \in [r]$, and in particular, $H' \neq H_i$ for any $i \in [s + 1, r - 1]$, and therefore, H' is a component of G' . And since F' does not modify H' , we can conclude that H' is a component of $G' - F'$. Thus, $\lambda(G' - F') \leq |H'|$. Recall now that H_j is an unmanageable component of G . By the definitions of manageable and unmanageable components, we have $|H'| \leq |H_j|$. Recall also that $|H_j| \leq |H_r|$ as $j < r$. We thus have $\lambda(G' - F') \leq |H'| \leq |H_j| \leq |H_r| \leq \Lambda(G' - F')$; the last inequality follows from argument (A2) that we discussed above. We thus have

$\lambda(G' - F') \leq |H'| \leq |H_j| \leq \Lambda(G' - F')$, and thus by argument (A1) that we discussed above, we have $|H_j| - |H'| \leq \Lambda(G' - F') - \lambda(G' - F') \leq \eta$.

Suppose now that F does modify H' . Let H be the connected component of G that contains H' . Notice that $H \neq H_i$ for any $i \in [s+1, r-1]$; and in particular, H is a component of G' . Notice also that F' modifies H as H contains H' . We again split the proof into two cases depending on whether or not H is a clique.

Case 1: H is a clique. Then, as H is a component of G' , and since F' modifies H , Lemma 18 implies that H is a manageable component of G' (and hence of G). We thus have $|H| \leq |H_j|$. As $|H'| \leq |H|$, we thus have $|H'| \leq |H_j|$. By argument (A2), we have $|H_j| \leq |H_r| \leq \Lambda(G' - F')$. Finally, as H' is a component of $G' - F'$, we have $\lambda(G' - F') \leq |H'|$. Putting all these together, we have $\lambda(G' - F') \leq |H'| \leq |H_j| \leq \Lambda(G' - F')$, which by argument (A1), implies that $|H_j| - |H'| \leq \eta$.

Case 2: H is not a clique. Then, by Observation 17, $|H| \leq R_{k+1}(k+2, k+2) - 1$. Since H' , which is also a component of $G' - F'$, is contained in H , we have $\lambda(G' - F') \leq |H'| \leq |H| \leq R_{k+1}(k+2, k+2) - 1$. We further split our analysis into two cases depending on whether $s = 0$ or $s = 1$.

1. Suppose that $s = 0$. Then, by the definition of s , we have $|H_1| > R_{k+1}(k+2, k+2)$, which implies that $\Lambda(G' - F') \geq |H_r| \geq |H_j| \geq |H_1| > R_{k+1}(k+2, k+2)$; the first inequality follows from argument (A1). We thus have $\lambda(G' - F') \leq |H'| < R_{k+1}(k+2, k+2) < |H_j| \leq \Lambda(G' - F')$, which implies that $|H_j| - |H'| \leq \Lambda(G' - F') - \lambda(G' - F') \leq \eta$.
2. Suppose that $s = 1$. We will first argue that $\lambda(G' - F') \leq |H_j| \leq \Lambda(G' - F')$. Since $s = 1$, H_1 is a component of G' , and in fact, H_1 is an unmanageable component of G' . Hence, by Lemma 18, F' does not modify H_1 , and thus H_1 is a component of $G' - F'$. Therefore, $\lambda(G' - F') \leq |H_1|$. As $|H_1| \leq |H_j|$, we thus have $\lambda(G' - F') \leq |H_1| \leq |H_j|$. By argument (A2), we also have $|H_r| \leq \Lambda(G' - F')$, and since $|H_j| \leq |H_r|$, we have $|H_j| \leq |H_r| \leq \Lambda(G' - F')$. We have thus shown that $\lambda(G' - F') \leq |H_j| \leq \Lambda(G' - F')$. Let us now prove that $\lambda(G' - F') \leq |H'| \leq \Lambda(G' - F')$. And to prove this, we only need to argue that H' is a component of $G' - F'$. Recall that H' is a component of $G - F'$, and that H is the component of G that contains H' . Now, since H is not a clique, $H \neq H_i$ for any $i \in [s+1, r-1]$, and therefore, H is a component of G' ; this implies that H' is a component of $G' - F'$, and therefore, $\lambda(G' - F') \leq |H'| \leq \Lambda(G' - F')$. Since $\lambda(G' - F') \leq |H_j|$, $|H'| \leq \Lambda(G' - F')$, we have $||H_j| - |H'|| \leq \Lambda(G' - F') - \lambda(G' - F') \leq \eta$.

We have thus shown that $G - F'$ is η -balanced. Therefore, F' is a solution for (G, k, η) , and thus, (G, k, η) is a yes-instance. \blacktriangleleft

Assume from now on that Reduction Rules 6-14 are no longer applicable. Thus, G consists of non-clique components (at most k such components, with at most $R_{k+1}(k+2, k+2) - 1 = \mathcal{O}(k^3)$ vertices in each of them; Observation 17), manageable components (at most $\mathcal{O}(k^2)$ such components, with at most $k+1$ vertices in each of them; Observation 21), the component H_r , and possibly the component H_1 . Notice that G contains H_1 only if $s = 1$, in which case we have $|H_1| \leq R_{k+1}(k+2, k+2)$. To summarise, all components of G , except H_r , have size at most $R_{k+1}(k+2, k+2)$, and in particular, **the number of vertices of G that belong to components other than H_r is bounded by $\mathcal{O}(k^4)$** . Thus $|G| = |H_r| + \mathcal{O}(k^4)$. Hence, to bound $|G|$, we now need to bound only $|H_r|$. And to bound $|H_r|$, we first prove the following lemma, which says that $|H_r|$ cannot exceed $R_{k+1}(k+2, k+2) + \eta$ if (G, k, η) were indeed a yes-instance.

► **Lemma 24.** *If (G, k, η) is a yes-instance, then $|H_r| \leq R_{k+1}(k+2, k+2) + \eta$.*

Proof. Assume that (G, k, η) is a yes-instance, and let F be a solution for (G, k, η) . As H_r is an unmanageable component, by Lemma 18, F does not modify H_r , and hence H_r is a component of $G - F$. Thus $|H_r| \leq \Lambda(G - F)$. Now, since Reduction Rule 6 is not applicable, G is not an η -balanced cluster graph. Thus, either G contains a non-clique component or G is a cluster graph, but not η -balanced. In either case G contains a component \hat{H} such that $\hat{H} \neq H_r$, and hence $|\hat{H}| \leq R_{k+1}(k+2, k+2)$. Thus $\lambda(G) \leq |\hat{H}| \leq R_{k+1}(k+2, k+2)$. Now, since $G - F$ is a spanning subgraph of G , we have $\lambda(G - F) \leq \lambda(G) \leq R_{k+1}(k+2, k+2)$. Finally, since $G - F$ is η -balanced, we have $\Lambda(G - F) - \lambda(G - F) \leq \eta$, which implies that $\Lambda(G - F) \leq \lambda(G - F) + \eta$. We thus get $|H_r| \leq \Lambda(G - F) \leq \lambda(G - F) + \eta \leq R_{k+1}(k+2, k+2) + \eta$. ◀

Lemma 24 immediately yields the following reduction rule.

► **Reduction Rule 15.** *If $|H_r| > R_{k+1}(k+2, k+2) + \eta$, then we return a trivial no-instance.*

Assume from now on that Reduction Rule 15 is not applicable. Hence $|H_r| \leq R_{k+1}(k+2, k+2) + \eta$. We now observe the following facts.

- **Observation 25.**
1. *Recall that since Reduction Rule 7 is not applicable, we have $\eta \leq \Lambda(G) \leq \max\{|H_r|, R_{k+1}(k+2, k+2)\}$.*
 2. *Recall also that since Reduction Rule 15 is not applicable, we have $|H_r| \leq R_{k+1}(k+2, k+2) + \eta$.*
 3. *If $|H_r| \leq 2R_{k+1}(k+2, k+2) = \mathcal{O}(k^3)$, then $|G|$ is bounded by $\mathcal{O}(k^4)$, and thus (G, k, η) is a kernel with $\mathcal{O}(k^4)$ vertices.*
 4. *If $\eta \leq 2R_{k+1}(k+2, k+2)$, then since Reduction Rule 15 is not applicable, we have $|H_r| \leq R_{k+1}(k+2, k+2) + \eta \leq 3R_{k+1}(k+2, k+2) = \mathcal{O}(k^3)$. Thus, (G, k, η) is a kernel with $\mathcal{O}(k^4)$ vertices in this case as well.*

In light of Observation 25, we apply the following reduction rule.

► **Reduction Rule 16.** *If $|H_r| \leq 2R_{k+1}(k+2, k+2)$ or $\eta \leq 2R_{k+1}(k+2, k+2)$, then we simply return the instance (G, k, η) .*

We assume from now on that Reduction Rule 16 is no longer applicable. Hence $|H_r| > 2R_{k+1}(k+2, k+2)$ and $\eta > 2R_{k+1}(k+2, k+2)$. Then, as every component of G except H_r has size at most $R_{k+1}(k+2, k+2)$, we can conclude that H_r is the unique largest component of G , and thus $|H_r| = \Lambda(G)$. Let $\eta' = 2R_{k+1}(k+2, k+2)$ and $N = \Lambda(G) - (\eta - \eta')$.

- **Observation 26.**
1. *Recall that we have $\eta \leq \Lambda(G)$ (Observation 25-1). Therefore, $N = \Lambda(G) - (\eta - \eta') \geq \eta - (\eta - \eta') = \eta' = 2R_{k+1}(k+2, k+2)$.*
 2. *Recall also that we have $\Lambda(G) = |H_r| \leq R_{k+1}(k+2, k+2) + \eta$ (Observation 25-2). Therefore, $N = \Lambda(G) - (\eta - \eta') \leq R_{k+1}(k+2, k+2) + \eta - (\eta - \eta') = R_{k+1}(k+2, k+2) + \eta' = 3R_{k+1}(k+2, k+2)$.*

We now apply the following reduction rule *once*.

► **Reduction Rule 17.** *We delete $\Lambda(G) - N$ (arbitrarily chosen) vertices from H_r ; let us denote the resulting component by H' and the resulting graph by G' . We return the instance (G', k, η') .*

► **Lemma 27.** *Reduction Rule 17 is safe.*

Proof. Informally, Reduction Rule 17 is safe because we deleted $\Lambda(G) - N = \eta - \eta'$ vertices from H_r and we decremented η by the same amount; that is, we set $\eta' = \eta - (\eta - \eta')$. The safeness of the rule then follows from the facts that no solution for (G, k, η) modifies H_r as H_r is an unmanageable component of G , and no solution for (G', k, η') modifies H' as $|H'| = \Lambda(G) - (\Lambda(G) - N) = N \geq 2R_{k+1}(k+2, k+2) \geq k+2$, and thus H' is an unmanageable component of G' . We now prove this more formally.

Recall that each component of G except H_r is a component of G' , and each component of G' except H' is a component of G . Also, each such component $H \neq H_r, H'$ (of G or G') has size at most $R_{k+1}(k+2, k+2)$. But $|H_r| > 2R_{k+1}(k+2)$ and $|H'| = N \geq 2R_{k+1}(k+2)$, and thus H_r is the unique largest component of G and H' is the unique largest component of G' . That is, $\Lambda(G) = |H_r|$ and $\Lambda(G') = |H'|$.

We now prove that the instances (G, k, η) and (G', k, η') are equivalent. Assume first that (G, k, η) is a yes-instance, and let F be a solution for (G, k, η) . We argue that F is a solution for (G', k, η') as well. First, since H_r is an unmanageable component of G , by Lemma 18, F does not modify H_r . Now, consider the graph $G' - F$; this graph is well-defined as F does not modify H_r , and it is indeed a cluster graph. In particular, F does not modify H' (as $V(H') \subseteq V(H_r)$). Thus, F does not modify H_r or H' , and hence H_r is a component of $G - F$ and H' is a component of $G' - F$. Thus $|H_r| \leq \Lambda(G - F)$ and $|H'| \leq \Lambda(G' - F)$. Now, as $G - F$ is a subgraph of G , we have $\Lambda(G - F) \leq \Lambda(G)$, which implies that $|H_r| \leq \Lambda(G - F) \leq \Lambda(G) = |H_r|$, and thus $|H_r| = \Lambda(G - F) = \Lambda(G)$. Using similar arguments, we get $N = |H'| = \Lambda(G' - F) = \Lambda(G')$. Observe now that since Reduction Rule 6 is not applicable, G contains a component other than H_r , and hence G' contains a component other than H' . Again, since F does not modify H_r , each component of $G - F$, except H_r , is also a component of $G' - F$; and each component of $G' - F$, except H' , is also a component of $G - F$. In particular, a smallest component of $G - F$ is a smallest component of $G' - F$, and vice versa. That is, $\lambda(G - F) = \lambda(G' - F)$. Since $G - F$ is η -balanced, we have $\Lambda(G - F) - \lambda(G - F) \leq \eta$, which implies that $\Lambda(G - F) - (\eta - \eta') - \lambda(G - F) \leq \eta - (\eta - \eta')$, which implies that $N - \lambda(G' - F) \leq \eta'$. That is, $\Lambda(G' - F) - \lambda(G' - F) \leq \eta'$, and thus $G' - F$ is η' -balanced.

Conversely, assume that (G', k, η') is a yes-instance, and let F' be a solution for (G', k, η') . Then, as H' is an unmanageable component of G' , F' does not modify H' , and we can argue that F' is a solution for (G, k, η) . In fact, we have (i) $\Lambda(G - F') = |H_r| = \Lambda(G)$, (ii) $\Lambda(G' - F') = |H'| = N = \Lambda(G')$ and (iii) $\lambda(G - F') = \lambda(G' - F')$. Since $G' - F'$ is η' -balanced, we have $\Lambda(G' - F') - \lambda(G' - F') \leq \eta'$, which implies that $N - \lambda(G' - F') \leq \eta'$, which implies that $N + (\eta - \eta') - \Lambda(G' - F') \leq \eta' + (\eta - \eta')$, which implies that $\Lambda(G - F') - \lambda(G - F') \leq \eta$. Thus $G - F'$ is η -balanced. \blacktriangleleft

Consider the instance (G', k, η') returned by Reduction Rule 17. Recall that $\eta' = 2R_{k+1}(k+2, k+2)$ and $|H'| = N \leq 3R_{k+1}(k+2, k+2) = \mathcal{O}(k^3)$ (Observation 26). The components of G' are precisely those components of G , except H_r , and H' . As $|G'| = |H_r| + \mathcal{O}(k^4)$, we have $|G'| = |H'| + \mathcal{O}(k^4) = \mathcal{O}(k^4)$. That is, (G', k, η') is a kernel with $\mathcal{O}(k^4)$ vertices. We have thus proved the following result.

► **Theorem 28.** BALANCED CLUSTER DELETION admits a kernel with $\mathcal{O}(k^4)$ vertices.

3.3 Polynomial Kernel for BALANCED CLUSTER EDITING

We formally define the BALANCED CLUSTER EDITING (BCE) problem as follows.

BALANCED CLUSTER EDITING (BCE)

Input: A graph G and non-negative integers k and η .
Task: Decide if there exists $F \subseteq E(G)$ such that $|F| \leq k$ and $G \Delta F$ is an η -balanced cluster graph.

In this section, we show that BCE admits a kernel with $\mathcal{O}(k^3)$ vertices. We first briefly outline our strategy.

Outline of the kernel. Consider an instance (G, k, η) of BCE. We first construct a modulator—a set S of vertices such that $G - S$ is a cluster graph. If (G, k, η) is a yes-instance then a modulator of size $\mathcal{O}(k)$ exists, and we can find such a modulator in polynomial time. We then bound the number of components and the size of each component of $G - S$. To do this, we first consider the components of $G - S$ that have at least one neighbour in S ; we show that the number of such components is $\mathcal{O}(k^2)$, and that the size of each such component is $\mathcal{O}(k)$. Next, we consider the components of $G - S$ that have no neighbour in S ; notice that these are indeed components of G . To bound the number of vertices that belong to such components, we use arguments that are identical to the ones we used for BCD. That is, we classify the components into two types—small and large—based on their sizes, and apply a host of reduction rules to bound the number of vertices that belong to such components. \square

We now proceed to designing our kernel. To do this, we rely on the fact that a graph G is a cluster graph if and only if G does not contain P_3 as an induced subgraph, where P_3 is the path on three vertices. We say that an edge or non-edge $uv \in \binom{V(G)}{2}$ is part of an induced P_3 if there exists a vertex $w \in V(G)$ such that the subgraph of G induced by $\{u, v, w\}$ is a P_3 . Notice now that if an edge $uv \in E(G)$ is part of at least $k + 1$ distinct induced P_3 s—that is, there exist $k + 1$ distinct vertices w_1, w_2, \dots, w_{k+1} such that $G[\{u, v, w_i\}]$ is a P_3 for every $i \in [k + 1]$ —then *every* solution F for (G, k, η) must necessarily contain the edge uv ; for otherwise, for every $i \in [k + 1]$, F must contain either uw_i or vw_i , which is not possible as $|F| \leq k$. A similar reasoning applies to non-edges uv that are part of at least $k + 1$ induced P_3 s. These observations immediately lead to the following two reduction rules, which we apply exhaustively.

► **Reduction Rule 18.** *If an edge $uv \in E(G)$ is part of at least $k + 1$ induced P_3 s, then delete the edge uv from G and decrement k by 1.*

► **Reduction Rule 19.** *If a non-edge $uv \in \binom{V(G)}{2} \setminus E(G)$ is part of at least $k + 1$ induced P_3 s, then add the edge uv to G and decrement k by 1.*

We now apply the following two reduction rules. The first one rules out obvious yes-instances, and the second one bounds η .

► **Reduction Rule 20.** *If G is an η -balanced cluster graph, then we return a trivial yes-instance.*

► **Reduction Rule 21.** *If $\eta > \max\{\Lambda(G), k\}$, then we return the instance $(G, k, \hat{\eta})$, where $\hat{\eta} = \max\{\Lambda(G), k\}$.*

► **Lemma 29.** *Reduction Rule 21 is safe.*

Proof. Suppose that $\eta > \max\{\Lambda(G), k\}$. Assume that (G, k, η) is a yes-instance, and let $F \subseteq \binom{V(G)}{2}$ be a solution for (G, k, η) . We will show that $G \Delta F$ is $\hat{\eta}$ balanced. And for that, it is enough to show that $\Lambda(G \Delta F) \leq \max\{\Lambda(G), k\} = \hat{\eta}$. To prove this, consider a

connected component H of $G\Delta F$. We will show that $|H| \leq \max\{\Lambda(G), k\} = \hat{\eta}$. If H is fully contained in a connected component of G , then $|H| \leq \Lambda(G)$. So suppose this is not the case. Then H intersects r distinct connected components of G for some $r \geq 2$. Let $\{X_1, X_2, \dots, X_r\}$ be the unique partition of $V(H)$ such that for each $i \in [r]$, X_i is fully contained in a connected component of G , and for distinct $i, j \in [r]$, X_i and X_j are not contained in the same connected component of G . Then $\sum_{i \in [r]} |X_i| = |H|$. Also, for distinct $i, j \in [r]$, as X_i and X_j are contained in distinct connected components of G , $E(G)$ does not contain any edge with one endpoint in X_i and the other in X_j . But as H is a connected component of the cluster graph $G\Delta F$, H is a clique, and therefore, $E(H)$ contains all the edges between X_i and X_j . Thus, for distinct $i, j \in [r]$, we can conclude that F contains all the edges between X_i and X_j ; that is, $\bigcup_{\{i,j\} \subseteq [r]} \{u, v \mid u \in X_i, v \in X_j\} \subseteq F$. We thus have $|F| \geq \sum_{\{i,j\} \in \binom{[r]}{2}} |X_i||X_j| \geq \sum_{i \in [r]} |X_i| = |H|$. That is, $|H| \leq |F| \leq k$. As H is an arbitrary component of $G\Delta F$, we can conclude that $\Lambda(G\Delta F) \leq \max\{\Lambda(G), k\} = \hat{\eta}$, and hence $G\Delta F$ is $\hat{\eta}$ -balanced.

Recall that we are under the assumption that $\hat{\eta} = \max\{\Lambda(G), k\} < \eta$. Hence, for any $F' \subseteq \binom{V(G)}{2}$, if $G\Delta F'$ is $\hat{\eta}$ -balanced, then $G\Delta F'$ is η -balanced as well. Therefore, if $(G, k, \hat{\eta})$ is a yes-instance, then so is (G, k, η) . ◀

Assume from now on that Reduction Rules 18-21 are no longer applicable. We will now use the well-known fact that given a graph G and a non-negative integer k , in polynomial time, we can either find a set of vertices $S \subseteq V(G)$ such that $|S| \leq 3k$ and $G - S$ is a cluster graph, or conclude that (G, k) is a no-instance of CLUSTER DELETION (i.e., the deletion version without the balance constraint). If (G, k) is a no-instance of CLUSTER DELETION, then notice that (G, k, η) is a no-instance of BCD for any $\eta \geq 0$. We state this result below for future reference.

► **Lemma 30** (folklore). *There exists an algorithm that, given a graph G and a non-negative integers k and η as input, runs in polynomial time, and either returns an inclusion-wise minimal set $S \subseteq V(G)$ such that $|S| \leq 3k$ and $G - S$ is a cluster graph, or correctly returns that (G, k, η) is a no-instance of BCE.*

We invoke the algorithm of Lemma 30 on the instance (G, k, η) . If the algorithm returns that (G, k, η) is a no-instance, then we return a trivial no-instance of BCE. Otherwise, the algorithm returns an inclusion-wise minimal set S such that $|S| \leq 3k$ and $G - S$ is a cluster graph; assume from now on that the algorithm of Lemma 30 returned such a set S . We will use S and the fact that $G - S$ is a cluster graph throughout the remainder of this section. As $G - S$ is a cluster graph, every connected component of $G - S$ is a clique. Now, to bound $|G|$, we will bound the number of connected components of $G - S$ and the size of each such component.

We classify the components of $G - S$ into two types depending on whether or not a component has a neighbour in S . Consider a connected component H of $G - S$. We say that H is *visible* if a vertex in $V(H)$ is adjacent to a vertex in S ; otherwise, we say that H is *invisible*. If H is visible, then for any vertex $x \in S$ such that x is adjacent to a vertex in $V(H)$, we say that x sees the component H . We first bound the number of visible components.

► **Reduction Rule 22.** *If there exists $x \in S$ such that x sees at least $2k+2$ distinct components of $G - S$, then we return a trivial no-instance.*

► **Lemma 31.** *Reduction Rule 22 is safe.*

Proof. To prove the lemma, it is enough to prove that (G, k, η) is a no-instance if there exists $x \in S$ such that x sees at least $2k + 2$ distinct components of $G - S$. Suppose such an $x \in S$ exists, and assume for a contradiction that (G, k, η) is a yes-instance. Let F be a solution for (G, k, η) . Then, as $|F| \leq k$, F modifies at most $2k$ components of $G - S$. In particular, F modifies at most $2k$ components of $G - S$ that are seen by x . Then, since x sees at least $2k + 2$ components of $G - S$, there exists two distinct components H and H' of $G - S$ such that x sees both H and H' and F does not modify either of those components. As x sees both H and H' , there exist vertices $y \in V(H)$ and $y' \in V(H')$ such that $xy, xy' \in E(G)$. Also, since H and H' are distinct components of $G - S$, we have $yy' \notin E(G)$. Since F does not modify H or H' , we can conclude that $xy, xy' \in E(G \triangle F)$ and $yy' \notin E(G \triangle F)$. But then xyy' is a P_3 in $G \triangle F$, which contradicts the assumption that $G \triangle F$ is a cluster graph. \blacktriangleleft

Assume from now on that Reduction Rule 22 is no longer applicable. Hence, for every $x \in S$, x sees at most $2k + 1$ components of $G - S$. But notice that every visible component is seen by at least one vertex of S . We can thus conclude that the number of visible components of $G - S$ is at most $|S| \cdot (2k + 1) \leq 3k \cdot (2k + 1) = \mathcal{O}(k^2)$. We record this observation below for future reference.

► **Observation 32.** *The number of visible components of $G - S$ is at most $|S| \cdot (2k + 1) = \mathcal{O}(k^2)$.*

We now bound the size of each visible component by $\mathcal{O}(k)$. To that end, we classify the visible components into two types. Consider a visible component H of $G - S$. We say that H is a *type-1 component* if there exists $x \in S$ such that x has both a neighbour and a non-neighbour in $V(H)$; otherwise, we say that H is a *type-2 component*. Observe that if H is a type 1 component, then there exist $y, z \in V(H)$ such that xyz is an induced P_3 . And recall that as Reduction Rules 18 and 19 are not applicable, every edge and every non-edge is part of at most k P_3 s. These observations immediately lead to the following lemma.

► **Lemma 33.** *If H is a type-1 component of $G - S$, then $|H| \leq 2k$.*

Proof. Consider a type-1 component H of $G - S$. Then there exist $x \in S$ and $y, z \in V(H)$ such that $xy \in E(G)$ and $xz \notin E(G)$. Notice now that every vertex in $V(H)$ is either a neighbour or a non-neighbour of x . If $V(H)$ contains at least $k + 1$ neighbours of x , say y_1, y_2, \dots, y_{k+1} , then $xy_i z$ is an induced P_3 for every $i \in [k + 1]$. Thus the non-edge xz is part of at least $k + 1$ induced P_3 s, which is not possible, as Reduction Rule 19 is not applicable. Similarly, if $V(H)$ contains at least $k + 1$ non-neighbours of x , then the edge xy would be part of at least $k + 1$ induced P_3 s, which is not possible either, as Reduction Rule 18 is not applicable. Thus $V(H)$ contains at most k neighbours and at most k non-neighbours of x , and hence $|H| \leq k + k = 2k$. \blacktriangleleft

Observe now that if H is a type-2 component, then (H is visible and) for every $x \in S$, either x is adjacent to each vertex of H or x is not adjacent to any vertex of H . We use this observation and the minimality of S to prove the following lemma, which bounds the size of every type-2 component.

► **Lemma 34.** *If H is a type-2 component of $G - S$, then $|H| \leq k$.*

Proof. Consider a type-2 component H of $G - S$. Then H is visible, and hence there exists a vertex $x \in S$ such that x sees H . And as H is a type-2 component, x is adjacent to every vertex of H . In particular, $G[V(H) \cup \{x\}]$ is a clique. Observe now that x must see another component $H' \neq H$ of $G - S$; otherwise, $G - (S \setminus \{x\})$ is a cluster graph, which contradicts the fact that S is inclusion-wise minimal. Fix such a component H' such that $H' \neq H$ and x

sees H , and fix a vertex $y' \in V(H')$ such that $xy' \in E(H)$. Notice now that for every vertex $y \in V(H)$, xyy' is an induced P_3 . Hence, if $|H| \geq k + 1$, then the edge xy' would be part of at least $k + 1$ induced P_3 s, which is not possible as Reduction Rule 18 is not applicable. We can thus conclude that $|H| \leq k$. \blacktriangleleft

► **Observation 35.** *By Observation 32, $G - S$ has at most $|S|(2k + 1) \leq 3k(2k + 1)$ visible components. By Lemmas 33 and 34, the size of each such component is at most $2k$. Hence the number of vertices of $G - S$ that belong to the visible components is at most $3k(2k + 1) \cdot 2k = \mathcal{O}(k^3)$.*

We have thus bounded the number of vertices that belong to the visible components of $G - S$. Now we only need to bound the number of vertices that belong to the invisible components of $G - S$. To do this, we follow the same steps as we did for BALANCED CLUSTER DELETION. As the arguments are identical to that of BCD, we only briefly outline them here. Recall first that each invisible component H has no neighbours in S , and hence H is a connected component of G . Thus H is a clique and it is a connected component of G . We classify the invisible components into two types—manageable and unmanageable—depending on the size of the components. Consider an invisible component H . We say that H is *manageable* if $|H| \leq k + 1$; otherwise we say that H is *unmanageable*. Notice now that as $|F| \leq k$ for every solution F , F modifies at most $2k$ components of G , and in particular F modifies at most $2k$ manageable components. Thus, for any $j \in [k + 1]$, if G contains more than $2k + 1$ manageable components of size exactly j , then we can safely delete one of them. We thus have the following reduction rule, (which is similar to Reduction Rule 11 for BCD).

► **Reduction Rule 23.** *For $j \in [k + 1]$, if G has at least $2k + 2$ manageable components, each of size exactly j , then we delete one such component.*

► **Observation 36.** *After an exhaustive application of Reduction Rule 23, for each $j \in [k + 1]$, G has at most $2k + 1$ manageable components of size exactly j . Hence the number of manageable components of G is at most $(k + 1)(2k + 1) = \mathcal{O}(k^2)$, and the number of vertices of G that belong to manageable components is at most $\sum_{j=1}^{k+1} (2k + 1)j = (2k + 1) \sum_{j=1}^{k+1} j = (1/2)(2k + 1)(k + 1)(k + 2) = \mathcal{O}(k^3)$.*

We have so far bounded the number of vertices of G that do not belong to the unmanageable components, and now we only have to bound the number of vertices that belong to the unmanageable components. Before proceeding further, we make the following observation, which summarises the bounds we have proved thus far. This will be useful in bounding the number of vertices that belong to the unmanageable components.

► **Observation 37.** *Recall that we have already bounded the number of vertices that belong to the visible components of $G - S$ by $6k^2(2k + 1)$ (Observation 35); and the number of vertices that belong to the manageable components of G by $(1/2)(2k + 1)(k + 1)(k + 2)$ (Observation 36); and we have $|S| \leq 3k$ (Lemma 30). In other words, we have bounded the number of vertices of G that do not belong to the unmanageable components—and this number is at most $6k^2(2k + 1) + (1/2)(2k + 1)(k + 1)(k + 2) + 3k \leq 10(2k + 1)^3$.*

We now bound the number of vertices that belong to the unmanageable components. As in the case of BCD, we first show that no solution for (G, k, η) modifies an unmanageable component.

► **Lemma 38.** *Assume that (G, k, η) is a yes-instance of BCE. Consider any solution $F \subseteq \binom{V(G)}{2}$ for (G, k, η) . Let H be an unmanageable component of G . Then F does not modify H ; that is, H is a connected component of $G \Delta F$.*

Proof. Fix a solution F for (G, k, η) , and consider an unmanageable component H . Consider the cluster graph $G\Delta F$. Recall that H is a clique of size at least $k + 2$. And as $|H| \geq k + 2$, we have to delete at least $k + 1$ edges from H to separate the vertices of H into two or more connected components. Since $|F| \leq k$, and in particular $|F \cap E(G)| \leq k$, we can conclude that H is fully contained in a connected component of $G\Delta F$. Notice now that H is indeed a connected component of $G\Delta F$, for otherwise, there exists a vertex $v \in V(G) \setminus V(H)$ such that H and v are in the same connected component of $G\Delta F$. Then F , and in particular $F \cap ((V(G) \setminus E(G)))$, must contain all the edges between v and each vertex of H . That is, F must contain at least $|H| \geq k + 2$ edges. But this is not possible as $|F| \leq k$. \blacktriangleleft

We now only need to bound the number of vertices that belong to the unmanageable components. For this, we use arguments that are nearly identical to the ones we used for BCD. So, we sketch the sequence of arguments without proofs in the following itemised list.

1. Let H_1, H_2, \dots, H_r be the unmanageable components of G such that $|H_1| \leq |H_2| \leq \dots \leq |H_r|$.
2. Lemma 38 shows that no solution modifies an unmanageable component. Hence, if (G, k, η) is a yes-instance and $F \subseteq \binom{V(G)}{k}$ is a solution for (G, k, η) , then for every $i \in [r]$, H_i is also a component of $G\Delta F$. So if $|H_r| - |H_1| > \eta$, then we return a trivial no-instance (identical to Reduction Rule 13 for BCD).
3. To bound the number of unmanageable components, **we define $s \in \{0, 1\}$ as follows: $s = 0$ if $|H_1| > 10(2k + 1)^3$, and $s = 1$ otherwise.** Our choice of the bound $10(2k + 1)^3$ is based on Observation 37, which says that the number of vertices that do not belong to the unmanageable components is at most $10(2k + 1)^3$.
4. Now, if $s + 1 < r$, then we delete the components $H_{s+1}, H_{s+2}, \dots, H_{r-1}$ (identical to Reduction Rule 14 for BCD). So, to bound $|G|$, we now only need to bound $|H_r|$; in particular, we now have $|G| = \mathcal{O}(k^3) + |H_r|$.
5. We can show that if (G, k, η) is a yes-instance, then $|H_r| \leq 10(2k + 1)^3 + \eta$. To prove this, we can argue that since Reduction Rule 20 is not applicable, the graph G and consequently the graph $G\Delta F$ for any solution F for (G, k, η) , contains a component of size at most $10(2k + 1)^3$. Hence, if $|H_r| > 10(2k + 1)^3 + \eta$, then we return a trivial no instance.
6. Recall that every component of G , except possibly H_r , has size at most $10(2k + 1)^3$. If $|H_r| \leq 20(2k + 1)^3$, then since Reduction Rule 21 is not applicable, we have $\eta \leq \max\{\Lambda(G), k\} \leq 20(2k + 1)^3$, and thus (G, k, η) is a kernel with $\mathcal{O}(k^3)$ vertices.
7. If $\eta \leq 20(2k + 1)^3$, then as observed above, we have $|H_r| \leq 10(2k + 1)^3 + \eta \leq 30(2k + 1)^3$, and thus we again have a kernel with $\mathcal{O}(k^3)$ vertices.
8. In light of items 6 and 7 above, we can assume that $|H_r| > 20(2k + 1)^3$ and $\eta > 20(2k + 1)^3$. Also, as every component of G except H_r has size at most $10(2k + 1)^3$, H_r is the unique largest component of G , and thus $\Lambda(G) = |H_r|$. **We set $\eta' = 20(2k + 1)^3$ and $N = \Lambda(G) - (\eta - \eta')$.**
9. As Reduction Rule 21 is not applicable, we have $\eta \leq \max\{\Lambda(G), k\}$. As $\Lambda(G) = |H_r| > k$, we can conclude that $\eta \leq \Lambda(G)$. Therefore, $N = \Lambda(G) - (\eta - \eta') \geq \eta - (\eta - \eta') = \eta' = 20(2k + 1)^3$. We also have $\Lambda(G) = |H_r| \leq 10(2k + 1)^3 + \eta$, which implies that $N = \Lambda(G) - (\eta - \eta') \leq 10(2k + 1)^3 + \eta - (\eta - \eta') = 10(2k + 1)^3 + \eta' = 30(2k + 1)^3$. Thus, **$20(2k + 1)^3 \leq N \leq 30(2k + 1)^3$.**
10. Finally, we delete $\Lambda(G) - N$ (arbitrarily chosen) vertices from H_r ; let us denote the resulting component by H' and the resulting graph by G' . We return the instance (G', k, η') , which is the required kernel with $\mathcal{O}(k^3)$ vertices. We thus have the following theorem.

► **Theorem 39.** BALANCED CLUSTER EDITING admits a kernel with $\mathcal{O}(k^3)$ vertices.

4 FPT Algorithms for Balanced Cluster Modification Problems

In this section, we show that BCC, BCD and BCE admit FPT algorithms. We first deal with BCC and BCE as algorithms for these problems use overlapping arguments, and then deal with BCD separately.

4.1 FPT Algorithms for BALANCED CLUSTER COMPLETION and BALANCED CLUSTER EDITING

In this subsection, we design algorithms for both BCC and BCE that run in time $2^{\mathcal{O}(k)}n^{\mathcal{O}(1)}$. First, consider BCC, the edge completion version. Notice that for a yes-instance (G, k, η) of BCC, every solution $F \subseteq \binom{V(G)}{2} \setminus E(G)$ for (G, k, η) “merges” certain components of G together to form components of $G + F$. So, to solve BCC, we only need to decide which components of G are merged with which other components. Now, in light of our kernel for BCC (Theorem 4) with $\mathcal{O}(k)$ vertices—and hence $\mathcal{O}(k)$ components—we can assume without loss of generality that G has $\mathcal{O}(k)$ components. Observe that an algorithm that runs in time $2^{\mathcal{O}(k \log k)}n^{\mathcal{O}(1)}$ is then quite straightforward: We simply need to go over all possible partitions of the connected components of G , and check if we can merge each part into a clique by adding at most k edges in total, and if the resulting cluster graph is η -balanced. It is, however, less obvious if BCC admits an algorithm that runs in time $2^{\mathcal{O}(k)}n^{\mathcal{O}(1)}$. We show that BCC does indeed admit such an algorithm. To design this algorithm, we argue that we can naturally associate each solution F with a partition of $|V(F)|$, i.e., the number of vertices that F modifies, and then we leverage the fact that the number of partitions of a positive integer ℓ is $2^{\mathcal{O}(\sqrt{\ell})}$.

Partitions of an integer. For a positive integer ℓ , by a partition of ℓ , we mean writing ℓ as a sum of positive integers where we ignore the order of the summands. For example, $1 + 4 + 6 + 6$ is a partition of 17. As mentioned, the order of the summands is immaterial; so $4 + 6 + 1 + 6$, $1 + 6 + 4 + 6$, and $6 + 6 + 1 + 4$ are all the same partition of 17. For convenience, we represent a partition $x_1 + x_2 + \dots + x_t$ of ℓ by the multiset $\{x_1, x_2, \dots, x_t\}$; for example, we say that $\{1, 4, 6, 6\}$ is a partition of 17. Consider $\ell \in \mathbb{N}$. Following standard convention, we use $p(\ell)$ to denote the number of partitions of ℓ . We will use a result due to Hardy and Ramanujan [36] that bounds $p(\ell)$, and the fact that we can enumerate all partitions of a given integer ℓ in time proportional to $p(\ell)$ (see, for example, [38]).

► **Proposition 40** (follows from [36]). *There exists a constant C such that $p(\ell) \leq 2^{C\sqrt{\ell}}$ for every positive integer ℓ . Moreover, there is an algorithm that, given a positive integer ℓ as input, runs in time $2^{\mathcal{O}(\sqrt{\ell})}$, and enumerates all partitions of ℓ .*

Idea behind our algorithm for BCC. Consider a yes-instance (G, k, η) of BCC, and let $F \subseteq \binom{V(G)}{2} \setminus E(G)$ be a solution for (G, k, η) . Let G_1, G_2, \dots, G_t be the components of $G + F$ that were modified by F ; and for each $i \in [t]$, let $G_{i1}, G_{i2}, \dots, G_{ir_i}$ be the components of G that were merged together to form the component G_i of $G + F$. Now, since $|F| \leq k$, we have $|V(F)| \leq 2k$. That is, F modifies at most $2k$ vertices of G . And observe that F modifies a vertex v if and only if F modifies every vertex in the connected component of $G + F$ that contains v . We thus have $|G_1| + |G_2| + \dots + |G_t| = |V(F)|$. In other words, $\{|G_1|, |G_2|, \dots, |G_t|\}$ is a partition of $|V(F)|$. Also, for each $i \in [t]$, we have

$|G_{i1}| + |G_{i2}| + \dots + |G_{ir_i}| = |G_i|$; that is, $\{|G_{i1}|, |G_{i2}|, \dots, |G_{ir_i}|\}$ is a partition of $|G_i|$. Based on these observations, we design our algorithm, which works as follows. We guess $|V(F)|$ (at most $2k$ guesses); for each such guess, we guess the partition $\{|G_1|, |G_2|, \dots, |G_t|\}$; and for each such combination of guesses, we guess the partition $\{|G_{i1}|, |G_{i2}|, \dots, |G_{ir_i}|\}$ for each $i \in [t]$; and we check if there is indeed a solution that is consistent with our guesses. Bounding the running time requires a careful analysis, for which we use Proposition 40.

Notation and Preliminary Observations

To formally describe our algorithms, we first introduce the following terminology and state a few preparatory results.

The sum of pairwise products function spp . For each partition $X = \{x_1, x_2, \dots, x_t\}$ of a positive integer, we define $\text{spp}(X)$ as follows: if X is a singleton set, i.e., $t = 1$, then $\text{spp}(X) = 0$; otherwise, $\text{spp}(X) = \sum_{\substack{i,j \in [t] \\ i \neq j}} x_i x_j$. That is, $\text{spp}(X)$ is the sum of pairwise products of the elements of X . For example, for the partition $X = \{1, 4, 6, 6\}$ of 17, we have $\text{spp}(X) = (1 \times 4) + (1 \times 6) + (1 \times 6) + (4 \times 6) + (4 \times 6) + (6 \times 6) = 4 + 6 + 6 + 24 + 24 + 36 = 100$.

The completion of a cluster graph w.r.t. a multiset of partitions. Consider a cluster graph G and a positive integer ℓ . Let $X = \{x_1, x_2, \dots, x_t\}$ be a partition of ℓ . We say that X is G -valid if G contains t distinct connected components G_1, G_2, \dots, G_t such that $|G_i| = x_i$ for every $i \in [t]$. Now, consider G, ℓ and $X = \{x_1, x_2, \dots, x_t\}$ as before. Let X_1, X_2, \dots, X_t be such that for each $i \in [t]$, X_i is a partition of x_i . Notice then that the multiset⁴ $X' = \bigcup_{i \in [t]} X_i$ is also a partition of ℓ . For $G, \ell, X = \{x_1, x_2, \dots, x_t\}, X_1, X_2, \dots, X_t$ and X' as before such that X' is G -valid, we define a *completion of G with respect to $(X, \{X_1, X_2, \dots, X_t\})$* as follows. For each $i \in [t]$, let $X_i = \{x_{i1}, x_{i2}, \dots, x_{ir_i}\}$. As $X' = \bigcup_{i \in [t]} X_i$ is G -valid, G contains $\sum_{i \in [t]} r_i$ distinct connected components $G_{11}, G_{12}, \dots, G_{1r_1}, G_{21}, G_{22}, \dots, G_{2r_2}, \dots, G_{t1}, G_{t2}, \dots, G_{tr_t}$ such that for every $i \in [t]$, we have $|G_{ij}| = x_{ij}$ for every $j \in [r_i]$. Fix such a choice of $\sum_{i \in [t]} r_i$ components $G_{11}, G_{12}, \dots, G_{1r_1}, G_{21}, G_{22}, \dots, G_{2r_2}, \dots, G_{t1}, G_{t2}, \dots, G_{tr_t}$. By a completion of G with respect to $(X, \{X_1, X_2, \dots, X_t\})$, we mean the graph obtained from G by turning the subgraph induced by $\bigcup_{j \in [r_i]} V(G_{ij})$ into a clique for every $i \in [t]$. Notice that as G is a cluster graph, each G_{ij} is a clique, and hence to turn $\bigcup_{j \in [r_i]} V(G_{ij})$ into a clique, we need to add exactly zero edges if $r_i = 1$, and otherwise, we need to add exactly $\sum_{\substack{j,j' \in [r_i] \\ j \neq j'}} |G_{ij}| |G_{ij'}| = \sum_{\substack{j,j' \in [r_i] \\ j \neq j'}} x_{ij} x_{ij'}$ edges. In either case, we need to add exactly $\text{spp}(X_i)$ edges; recall that $\text{spp}(X_i) = 0$ if $X_i = \{x_{i1}\}$ and $\text{spp}(X_i) = \sum_{\substack{j,j' \in [r_i] \\ j \neq j'}} x_{ij} x_{ij'}$ otherwise. Thus, a completion of G with respect to $(X, \{X_1, X_2, \dots, X_t\})$ requires the addition of exactly $\sum_{i \in [t]} \text{spp}(X_i)$ edges to G . Notice that a completion of G with respect to $(X, \{X_1, X_2, \dots, X_t\})$ is also a cluster graph. Notice also that such a completion of G need not be unique as there may be multiple choices for the components $G_{11}, G_{12}, \dots, G_{1r_1}, G_{21}, G_{22}, \dots, G_{2r_2}, \dots, G_{t1}, G_{t2}, \dots, G_{tr_t}$. But notice that if G' and G'' are two distinct completions of G with respect to $(X, \{X_1, X_2, \dots, X_t\})$, then G' and G'' both have the same number of components. Moreover, for any $j \in \mathbb{N}$,

⁴ When dealing with the union of multisets A and B , by $A \cup B$, we mean the “additive union” of A and B —that is, for each element $x \in A \cup B$, the multiplicity of x in $A \cup B$ is the sum of the multiplicity of x in A and the multiplicity of x in B . For example, if $A = \{x, y, y, z, z, z\}$ and $B = \{x, x, x, y, w\}$, then $A \cup B = \{x, x, x, x, y, y, y, z, z, z, w\}$.

G' and G'' have exactly the same number of components of size exactly j ; that is, if G'_1, G'_2, \dots, G'_s are the components of G' and $G''_1, G''_2, \dots, G''_s$ the components of G'' , then $\{|G'_1|, |G'_2|, \dots, |G'_s|\} = \{|G''_1|, |G''_2|, \dots, |G''_s|\}$. In particular, G' is η -balanced if and only if G'' is η -balanced. We summarise this discussion in the following observations.

► **Observation 41.** Consider a cluster graph G , $\ell \in \mathbb{N}$, a partition $X = \{x_1, x_2, \dots, x_t\}$ of ℓ , and X_1, X_2, \dots, X_t , where X_i is a partition of x_i for every $i \in [t]$. Let X' be G -valid, where $X' = \bigcup_{i \in [t]} X_i$. Then, every completion of G with respect to $(X, \{X_1, X_2, \dots, X_t\})$ requires the addition of exactly $\sum_{i \in [t]} \text{spp}(X_i)$ edges to G . In other words, each completion of G with respect to $(X, \{X_1, X_2, \dots, X_t\})$ is precisely a supergraph $G+F$ of G , where $F \subseteq \binom{V(G)}{2} \setminus E(G)$, with the following properties: (i) $G+F$ is a cluster graph, (ii) $|F| = \sum_{i \in [t]} \text{spp}(X_i)$ and (iii) $|V(F)| = \ell$.

► **Observation 42.** Given $G, \ell, X = \{x_1, x_2, \dots, x_t\}$ and X' , where G is a cluster graph, $\ell \in \mathbb{N}$, $X = \{x_1, x_2, \dots, x_t\}$ is a partition of ℓ , X_i is a partition of x_i for every $i \in [t]$, and $X' = \bigcup_{i \in [t]} X_i$, we can perform the following operations in polynomial time.

1. Check if X' is G -valid; this only requires checking for every $x \in X'$ if G contains at least $\text{mul}(x, X')$ distinct components, each of size exactly x , where $\text{mul}(x, X')$ is the multiplicity of x in X' .
2. Compute $\sum_{i \in [t]} \text{spp}(X_i)$.
3. Construct a completion of G with respect to $(X, \{X_1, X_2, \dots, X_t\})$ (provided X' is G -valid), and check whether it is η -balanced.

We will also need the following lemma to bound the running time of our algorithms.

► **Lemma 43.** For $\ell \in \mathbb{N}$, the number of choices for the pair $(X, \{X_1, X_2, \dots, X_t\})$, where $X = \{x_1, x_2, \dots, x_t\}$ is a partition of ℓ and X_i is a partition of x_i for every $i \in [t]$, is $2^{\mathcal{O}(\ell)}$.

Proof. Recall that for every $\ell \in \mathbb{N}$, $p(\ell)$ denotes the number of partitions of ℓ . Recall also that by Proposition 40, there exists a constant C such that $p(\ell) \leq 2^{C\sqrt{\ell}}$ for every $\ell \in \mathbb{N}$.

Now, fix $\ell \in \mathbb{N}$. For convenience, for each partition X of ℓ , where $X = \{x_1, x_2, \dots, x_t\}$, let us denote the product $p(x_1)p(x_2) \cdots p(x_t)$ by $\alpha_\ell(X)$. Now, among all the partitions of ℓ , let $X^* = \{x_1^*, x_2^*, \dots, x_{t^*}^*\}$ be a partition for which the function α_ℓ attains the maximum value; that is, $\alpha_\ell(X^*) = \max_X \alpha_\ell(X)$, where the maximum is over all partitions X of ℓ .

Now, for each partition X of ℓ , where $X = \{x_1, x_2, \dots, x_t\}$, notice that there are at most $p(x_1)p(x_2) \cdots p(x_t) = \alpha_\ell(X)$ choices for the multiset $\{X_1, X_2, \dots, X_t\}$, where X_i is a partition of x_i for every $i \in [t]$. Hence the number of choices for the pair $(X, \{X_1, X_2, \dots, X_t\})$ is at most

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{\substack{X \\ X \text{ is a partition of } \ell}} \alpha_\ell(X) &\leq \sum_{\substack{X \\ X \text{ is a partition of } \ell}} \alpha_\ell(X^*) && \text{(By the definition of } X^*) \\
&= \sum_{\substack{X \\ X \text{ is a partition of } \ell}} p(x_1^*)p(x_2^*) \cdots p(x_{t^*}^*) \\
&= p(\ell)p(x_1^*)p(x_2^*) \cdots p(x_{t^*}^*) \\
&\leq 2^{C\sqrt{\ell}} \cdot 2^{C\sqrt{x_1^*}} \cdot 2^{C\sqrt{x_2^*}} \cdots 2^{C\sqrt{x_{t^*}^*}} && \text{(By Proposition 40)} \\
&= 2^{C(\sqrt{\ell} + \sqrt{x_1^*} + \sqrt{x_2^*} + \cdots + \sqrt{x_{t^*}^*})} \\
&\leq 2^{C(\ell + x_1^* + x_2^* + \cdots + x_{t^*}^*)} \\
&= 2^{\mathcal{O}(\ell)},
\end{aligned}$$

where the last equality holds because $x_1^* + x_2^* + \cdots + x_{t^*}^* = \ell$. ◀

The Main Technical Lemma for BCC

We now prove the following lemma, which will establish the correctness of our algorithm. Recall that in an instance (G, k, η) of BCC, the input graph G is a cluster graph.

► **Lemma 44.** *Consider an instance (G, k, η) of BCC. If (G, k, η) is a yes-instance, then either G is η -balanced or there exist an integer $\ell \in [2k] \setminus \{1\}$ and a partition $X = \{x_1, x_2, \dots, x_t\}$ of ℓ such that there exists a multiset $\{X_1, X_2, \dots, X_t\}$ of partitions, where X_i is a partition of x_i for each $i \in [t]$, with the following properties:*

1. X' is G -valid, where $X' = \bigcup_{i \in [t]} X_i$;
2. $\sum_{i \in [t]} \text{spp}(X_i) \leq k$; and
3. a completion of G with respect to $(X, \{X_1, X_2, \dots, X_t\})$ is η -balanced.

Proof. Consider an instance (G, k, η) of BCC. Assume that (G, k, η) is a yes-instance. If G is η -balanced, then the lemma trivially holds. So, assume that G is not η -balanced. Let $F \subseteq \binom{V(G)}{2} \setminus E(G)$ be a solution for (G, k, η) . Let $\ell = |V(F)|$; that is, ℓ is the number of vertices that F modifies. As G is not η -balanced, $F \neq \emptyset$, and hence $\ell = |V(F)| \geq 2$. Also, as $|F| \leq k$, we have $\ell = |V(F)| \leq 2k$. Thus $\ell \in [2k] \setminus \{1\}$.

We now show that F corresponds to a partition $X = \{x_1, x_2, \dots, x_t\}$ of ℓ and a multiset $\{X_1, X_2, \dots, X_t\}$ of partitions that satisfy the properties required by the lemma. Let G_1, G_2, \dots, G_t be the connected components of $G + F$ that were modified by F ; and for each $i \in [t]$, let $G_{i1}, G_{i2}, \dots, G_{ir_i}$ be the connected components of G such that $V(G_i) = \bigcup_{j \in [r_i]} V(G_{ij})$. That is, for each $i \in [t]$, F “merges” the components $G_{i1}, G_{i2}, \dots, G_{ir_i}$ together to form the component G_i of $G + F$. Thus, $F = \bigcup_{i \in [t]} F_i$, where for each $i \in [t]$, F_i is the set containing all possible edges between $V(G_{ij})$ and $V(G_{i'j'})$ for every pair of distinct $j, j' \in [r_i]$, i.e., $F_i = \{uv \mid \exists j, j' \in [r_i] \text{ with } j \neq j' \text{ such that } u \in V(G_{ij}), v \in V(G_{i'j'})\}$. Notice that $|F_i| = \sum_{\substack{j, j' \in [r_i] \\ j \neq j'}} |G_{ij}| |G_{i'j'}|$, and as the sets F_1, F_2, \dots, F_t are pairwise disjoint, we have $|F| = \sum_{i \in [t]} |F_i|$. Also, as the set of vertices that are modified by F (i.e., $V(F)$) is precisely $\bigcup_{i \in [t]} V(G_i)$, we have $|\bigcup_{i \in [t]} V(G_i)| = \sum_{i \in [t]} |G_i| = |V(F)| = \ell$.

It is now straightforward to define the partitions X and X_1, X_2, \dots, X_t , as required by the statement of the lemma. For each $i \in [t]$, let $x_i = |G_i|$ and $x_{ij} = |G_{ij}|$ for every $j \in [r_i]$. Thus $X = \{|G_1|, |G_2|, \dots, |G_t|\} = \{x_1, x_2, \dots, x_t\}$ is a partition of $\sum_{i \in [t]} |G_i| = |V(F)| = \ell$; and for each $i \in [t]$, $X_i = \{|G_{i1}|, |G_{i2}|, \dots, |G_{ir_i}|\} = \{x_{i1}, x_{i2}, \dots, x_{ir_i}\}$ is a partition of x_i . As G contains the distinct components $G_{11}, G_{12}, \dots, G_{1r_1}, G_{21}, G_{22}, \dots, G_{2r_2}, \dots, G_{t1}, G_{t2}, \dots, G_{tr_t}$, X' is G -valid, where $X' = \bigcup_{i \in [t]} X_i$. Also, observe that the graph $G + F$ is precisely a completion of G with respect to $(X, \{X_1, X_2, \dots, X_t\})$; recall that we obtain $G + F$ from G by turning each $\bigcup_{j \in [r_i]} V(G_{ij})$ into a clique for every $i \in [t]$. And as $G + F$ is η -balanced, we can conclude that a completion of G with respect to $(X; X_1, X_2, \dots, X_t)$ is η -balanced. Finally, as observed earlier, for each $i \in [t]$, we have $|F_i| = \sum_{\substack{j, j' \in [r_i] \\ j \neq j'}} |G_{ij}| |G_{i'j'}| = \sum_{\substack{j, j' \in [r_i] \\ j \neq j'}} x_{ij} x_{i'j'} = \text{spp}(X_i)$; and $k \geq |F| = \sum_{i \in [t]} |F_i| = \sum_{i \in [t]} \text{spp}(X_i)$. This completes the proof of the lemma. ◀

Algorithm for BCC

We are now ready to describe our algorithm, which we call Algo-BCC.

Algo-BCC. Given an instance (G, k, η) of BCC as input, we proceed as follows. Recall that G is a cluster graph.

Step 1. If G is η -balanced, then we return that (G, k, η) is a yes-instance, and terminate.

Step 2. If $k \leq 0$, then we return that (G, k, η) is a no-instance, and terminate.

Step 3. We use the algorithm of Proposition 40 to generate all partitions of ℓ for all $\ell \in [2k]$.

Step 4. For each $\ell \in [2k] \setminus \{1\}$, we do as follows.

Step 4.1. For each partition X of ℓ , we do as follows.

Step 4.1.1. Let $X = \{x_1, x_2, \dots, x_t\}$. For each multiset $\{X_1, X_2, \dots, X_t\}$, where X_i is a partition of x_i for every $i \in [t]$, we do as follows.

Step 4.1.1.1. We consider the partition $X' = \bigcup_{i \in [t]} X_i$ of ℓ . If X' is G -valid, $\sum_{i \in [t]} \text{spp}(X_i) \leq k$, and a completion of G with respect to $(X, \{X_1, X_2, \dots, X_t\})$ is η -balanced, then we return that (G, k, η) is a yes-instance, and terminate.

Step 5. We return that (G, k, η) is a no-instance, and terminate.

The correctness of the algorithm follows from Observation 41 and Lemma 44. We now analyse the running time.

► **Lemma 45.** *Algo-BCC runs in time $2^{\mathcal{O}(k)} n^{\mathcal{O}(1)}$.*

Proof. Observe that Steps 1, 2, 5 take only polynomial time. So does each execution of Step 4.1.1.1 (Observation 42). By Proposition 40, Step 3 takes time $2^{\mathcal{O}(\sqrt{k})}$. Now, in Step 4, we only need to go over at most $2k - 1$ choices of ℓ ; and we can assume without loss of generality that $k \leq \binom{n}{2}$. That is, there are only $n^{\mathcal{O}(1)}$ choices for ℓ . So to prove the lemma, it is enough to prove that for each choice of ℓ , the number of choices for $(X, \{X_1, X_2, \dots, X_t\})$ is at most $2^{\mathcal{O}(\ell)}$; Lemma 43 proves precisely this. The lemma now follows from the fact that we only consider $\ell \leq 2k$ in Step 4. ◀

We have thus proved the following result.

► **Theorem 46.** *BALANCED CLUSTER COMPLETION admits an algorithm that runs in time $2^{\mathcal{O}(k)} n^{\mathcal{O}(1)}$.*

► **Remark 47 (Sub-exponential FPT-approximation for the cardinality-constrained version).** While Theorem 46 says that we can solve BCC in time $2^{\mathcal{O}(k)} n^{\mathcal{O}(1)}$, it is open whether we can solve BCC in sub-exponential time, i.e., in time $2^{o(k)} n^{\mathcal{O}(1)}$. It is also open whether BCC admits a sub-exponential time FPT-approximation algorithm. But we note that by combining the ideas that we used to prove Theorem 46 with ideas from the bin packing literature, we can design a sub-exponential FPT-approximation scheme for the following problem: We are given a cluster graph G and non negative integers γ_1, γ_2 and k , and we have to decide if we can add at most k edges to G so that the resulting graph is a cluster graph, every component of which has size at least γ_1 and at most γ_2 . We call this problem **CARDINALITY-CONSTRAINED CLUSTER COMPLETION (CCCC)**. For CCCC, we can design a family of algorithms with the following guarantees. **For every $0 < \varepsilon < 1/4$, there is an algorithm that, given an instance $(G, k, \gamma_1, \gamma_2)$ of CCCC as input, runs in time $2^{\mathcal{O}(k^{1-\varepsilon})}$, and either correctly reports that we have a no-instance or returns $F \subseteq \binom{V(G)}{2} \setminus E(G)$ such that $|F| = \mathcal{O}(k^{1+4\varepsilon})$, $G + F$ is a cluster graph and every component of $G + F$ has size at least $\gamma_1/2$ and at most $2\gamma_2$.** Notice that for each ε , the running time is $2^{o(k)}$ and the solution size is $o(k^2)$. To prove this, recall that in Algo-BCC, we guessed $\ell \in [2k] \setminus \{1\}$, $X = \{x_1, x_2, \dots, x_t\}$ and $\{X_1, X_2, \dots, X_t\}$ —this is what resulted in the $2^{\mathcal{O}(k)}$ factor in the running time (Lemma 45). But now, we guess ℓ , X and *only a subset of* $\{X_1, X_2, \dots, X_t\}$ —we guess X_i only if $x_i \geq \ell^{2\varepsilon}$, and the number of such x_i s is at most $\ell^{1-2\varepsilon}$. Thus, by using Proposition 40 and the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality, we can bound the number of guesses by $2^{\mathcal{O}(\ell^{1-\varepsilon})}$. As for x_i s with $x_i < \ell^{2\varepsilon}$, we follow a greedy approach (used in the textbook 2-approximation algorithm, often called First-Fit, for the classic bin packing problem, (see for example, [52, Chapter 9]), which results in a solution with $\mathcal{O}(k^{1+4\varepsilon})$ edges and components with sizes at least $\gamma_1/2$ and at most $2\gamma_2$.

Towards our algorithm for BCE

We now deal with BCE, the editing version. Specifically, we prove the following theorem.

► **Theorem 48.** BALANCED CLUSTER EDITING admits an algorithm that runs in time $2^{\mathcal{O}(k)}n^{\mathcal{O}(1)}$.

To prove this theorem, we first argue that we can solve BCE in time $2^{\mathcal{O}(k)}n^{\mathcal{O}(1)}$ when the input graph is a cluster graph. Specifically, we prove the following theorem.

► **Theorem 49.** BCE on cluster graphs admits an algorithm that runs in time $2^{\mathcal{O}(k)}n^{\mathcal{O}(1)}$.

Assuming Theorem 49, let us first complete the proof of Theorem 48.

Proof of Theorem 48. Recall that a graph G is a cluster graph if and only if G does not contain P_3 as an induced subgraph. Given an instance (G, k, η) of BCE, our algorithm works as follows.

Step 1 If G is a cluster graph, then we use the algorithm of Theorem 49 to solve the problem.

Step 2 If Step 1 is not applicable and $k > 0$, then we branch on induced P_3 s; more precisely, we greedily find an induced P_3 , say uvw , (i.e., $u, v, w \in V(G)$ with $uv, vw \in E(G)$ and $uw \notin E(G)$) and recursively call our algorithm on the three instances $(G - uv, k - 1, \eta)$, $(G - vw, k - 1, \eta)$ and $(G + uw, k - 1, \eta)$.

Step 3 If Steps 1 and 2 are not applicable, then G is not a cluster graph and $k = 0$, and we return that (G, k, η) is a no-instance of BCE.

The correctness of this algorithm follows from the fact that we must modify every induced P_3 uvw in G by either deleting from G one of the edges uv and vw or by adding the edge uw to G . As for the running time, Step 3 runs in polynomial time; we make 3 recursive calls in each execution of Step 2, and we recurse only until $k = 0$, resulting in at most 3^k recursive calls; by Theorem 49, Step 1 takes time $2^{\mathcal{O}(k)}n^{\mathcal{O}(1)}$. Thus the overall running time is bounded by $2^{\mathcal{O}(k)}n^{\mathcal{O}(1)}$. ◀

We now prove Theorem 49, for which we adopt a familiar strategy: We associate solutions with partitions of an integer and use the bound for the number of partitions of an integer.

Idea behind our algorithm for BCE on cluster graphs. Consider an instance (G, k, η) of BCE, where G is a cluster graph. Let $F \subseteq \binom{V(G)}{2}$ be a solution for (G, k, η) , and let $F_1 \subseteq F$ be the edges that we delete from G and $F_2 \subseteq F$ be the set of edges that we add to G . We may think of the cluster graph $G \Delta F$ as obtained from G by a two-step process: first by deleting from G the edges in F_1 and then by adding to $G - F_1$ the edges in F_2 . Let $G' = G - F_1$. Then G' must be a cluster graph, and we have $G \Delta F = (G - F_1) + F_2 = G' + F_2$. Let $\ell_1 = |V(F_1)|$ and $\ell_2 = |V(F_2)|$. Similar to what we did in our algorithm for BCC, we can argue that F_1 corresponds to a partition $Y = \{y_1, y_2, \dots, y_s\}$ of ℓ_1 and a multiset $\{Y_1, Y_2, \dots, Y_s\}$, and F_2 corresponds to a partition $X = \{x_1, x_2, \dots, x_t\}$ of ℓ_2 and a corresponding multiset $\{X_1, X_2, \dots, X_t\}$. Informally, each $Y_i = \{y_{i1}, y_{i2}, \dots, y_{iq_i}\}$ is a partition of y_i and Y_i corresponds to a component of G of size exactly y_i that gets split into components of sizes $y_{i1}, y_{i2}, \dots, y_{iq_i}$ when we delete F_1 . Similarly, each $X_i = \{x_{i1}, x_{i2}, \dots, x_{ir_i}\}$ corresponds to a component of $G' + F_2 = G \Delta F$ of size x_i that was formed by merging r_i components of G' of sizes $x_{i1}, x_{i2}, \dots, x_{ir_i}$. ▽

To formalise the above idea, we now define a deletion of cluster graph with respect to a multiset of partitions, similar to a completion of a cluster graph with respect to a multiset of partitions that we defined earlier.

Deletion of a cluster graph w.r.t. a multiset of partitions. Consider a cluster graph G and a positive integer ℓ . Let $Y = \{y_1, y_2, \dots, y_s\}$ be a partition of ℓ . Recall that we say that Y is G -valid if G contains s distinct components G_1, G_2, \dots, G_s such that $|G_j| = y_j$ for every $j \in [s]$. Now, consider G, ℓ and $X = \{x_1, x_2, \dots, x_t\}$ such that Y is G -valid. Let Y_1, Y_2, \dots, Y_s be such that for each $j \in [s]$, $Y_j = \{y_{j1}, y_{j2}, \dots, y_{jq_j}\}$ is a partition of y_j . Since Y is G -valid, G contains s distinct components G_1, G_2, \dots, G_s with $|G_j| = y_j$ for each $j \in [s]$. Fix such a set of s components; recall that each G_j is a clique. By a deletion of G with respect to $(Y, \{Y_1, Y_2, \dots, Y_s\})$, we mean the subgraph of G obtained by deleting edges so that each G_j is turned into a cluster graph with exactly q_j connected components of sizes $y_{j1}, y_{j2}, \dots, y_{jq_j}$. Notice that if $q_j = 1$, i.e., $Y_j = \{y_j\}$, then G_j itself is the required cluster graph and we do not need to delete any edges; otherwise $q_j \geq 2$, and we need to delete exactly $\sum_{\substack{i, i' \in [q_j] \\ i \neq i'}} y_{ji} y_{ji'}$ edges. In either case, we need to delete exactly $\text{spp}(Y_j)$ edges to turn G_j into a cluster graph with the required component sizes. Thus a deletion of G with respect to $(Y, \{Y_1, Y_2, \dots, Y_s\})$ requires the deletion of exactly $\sum_{j \in [s]} \text{spp}(Y_j)$ edges.

The Main Technical Lemma for BCE on cluster graphs

► **Lemma 50.** *Consider an instance (G, k, η) of BCE, where G is a cluster graph. If (G, k, η) is a yes-instance, then one of the following statements holds.*

1. *The instance (G, k, η) is a yes-instance of BCC.*
2. *The instance (G, k, η) is a yes-instance of BCD.*
3. *There exist integers $\ell_1, \ell_2 \in [2k] \setminus \{1\}$ and partitions $Y = \{y_1, y_2, \dots, y_s\}$ of ℓ_1 and $X = \{x_1, x_2, \dots, x_t\}$ of ℓ_2 such that there exist multisets $\{Y_1, Y_2, \dots, Y_s\}$ and $\{X_1, X_2, \dots, X_t\}$ of partitions, where Y_j is a partition of y_j for every $j \in [s]$ and X_i is a partition of x_i for each $i \in [t]$, with the following properties:*
 - a. *Y is G -valid;*
 - b. *X' is G' -valid, where $X' = \bigcup_{i \in [t]} X_i$ and G' is a deletion of G with respect to $(Y, \{Y_1, Y_2, \dots, Y_s\})$;*
 - c. *a completion of G' with respect to $(X, \{X_1, X_2, \dots, X_t\})$ is η -balanced; and*
 - d. *$\sum_{j \in [s]} \text{spp}(Y_j) + \sum_{i \in [t]} \text{spp}(X_i) \leq k$.*

Proof Sketch. Assume that (G, k, η) is a yes-instance of BCE, where G is a cluster graph. If (G, k, η) is a yes-instance of BCC or a yes-instance of BCD, then the lemma trivially holds. So, assume that neither of those is true. Let $F \subseteq \binom{V(G)}{2}$ be a solution for (G, k, η) , and let $F_1 = F \cap E(G)$ and $F_2 = F \setminus F_1$. That is, $F = F_1 \cup F_2$ and in particular, $F_2 = F \cap ((\binom{V(G)}{2} \setminus E(G)))$.

Let $\ell_1 = |V(F_1)|$ and $\ell_2 = |V(F_2)|$; that is, ℓ_1 is the number of vertices that F_1 modifies and ℓ_2 is the number of vertices that F_2 modifies. As G is not a yes-instance of BCD, $F_1 \neq \emptyset$, and as (G, k, η) is not a yes-instance of BCC, $F_2 \neq \emptyset$, and hence $\ell_1 = |V(F_1)| \geq 2$ and $\ell_2 = |V(F_2)| \geq 2$. Also, as $|F_1| \leq |F| \leq k$ and $|F_2| \leq |F| \leq k$, we have $\ell_1 = |V(F_1)| \leq 2k$ and $\ell_2 = |V(F_2)| \leq 2k$. Thus $\ell_1, \ell_2 \in [2k] \setminus \{1\}$.

We may think of the cluster graph $G \Delta F$ as obtained from G by a two-step process: first by deleting from G the edges in F_1 and then by adding to $G - F_1$ the edges in F_2 . Let $G' = G - F_1$. Then G' is a cluster graph, and we have $G \Delta F = (G - F_1) + F_2 = G' + F_2$. We can argue that F_1 corresponds to a partition $Y = \{y_1, y_2, \dots, y_s\}$ of ℓ_1 and the corresponding multiset $\{Y_1, Y_2, \dots, Y_s\}$, and F_2 corresponds to a partition $X = \{x_1, x_2, \dots, x_t\}$ of ℓ_2 and the corresponding multiset $\{X_1, X_2, \dots, X_t\}$ of partitions that satisfy the properties required by the lemma. Intuitively, the partition $Y_j = \{y_{j1}, y_{j2}, \dots, y_{jq_j}\}$ of y_j corresponds to a component of G of size exactly y_j that was split into components of sizes

$y_{j1}, y_{j2}, \dots, y_{jq_j}$ by deleting the edges in F_1 . Consequently, G' is a deletion of G with respect to $(Y, \{Y_1, Y_2, \dots, Y_s\})$. Each $X_i = \{x_{i1}, x_{i2}, \dots, x_{ir_i}\}$ corresponds to the components of G' of sizes $x_{i1}, x_{i2}, \dots, x_{ir_i}$ that were merged into a single component of $G' + F_2 = G\Delta F$ of size x_i . That is, $G' + F_2 = G\Delta F$ is a completion of G' with respect to $(X, \{X_1, X_2, \dots, X_t\})$. These arguments will also imply that $\sum_{j \in [s]} \text{spp}(Y_j) = |F_1|$ and $\sum_{i \in [t]} \text{spp}(X_i) = |F_2|$, and thus $\sum_{j \in [s]} \text{spp}(Y_j) + \sum_{i \in [t]} \text{spp}(X_i) = |F_1| + |F_2| = |F| \leq k$. \blacktriangleleft

Algorithm for BCE on cluster graphs

We now design an algorithm for BCE on cluster graphs, which we call **Algo-BCE-C**. The correctness of the algorithm follows from Lemma 50.

Algo-BCE-C. Given an instance (G, k, η) of BCE as input, where G is a cluster graph, we proceed as follows.

Step 1. If (G, k, η) is a yes-instance of BCC or a yes-instance of BCD, we return that (G, k, η) is a yes-instance of BCE, and terminate. To do this, we use the algorithms of Theorems 46 and 64.

Step 2. If $k \leq 0$, then we return that (G, k, η) is a no-instance, and terminate.

Step 3. We use the algorithm of Proposition 40 to generate all partitions of ℓ for all $\ell \in [2k]$.

Step 4. For every choice of $\ell_1, \ell_2 \in [2k] \setminus \{1\}$, we do as follows.

Step 4.1. For each choice of partitions Y of ℓ_1 and X of ℓ_2 , we do as follows.

Step 4.1.1. Let $Y = \{y_1, y_2, \dots, y_s\}$ and $X = \{x_1, x_2, \dots, x_t\}$. For each choice of multisets $Y = \{Y_1, Y_2, \dots, Y_s\}$ and $X = \{X_1, X_2, \dots, X_t\}$, where Y_j is a partition of y_j for every $j \in [s]$ and X_i is a partition of x_i for every $i \in [t]$, we do as follows.

Step 4.1.1.1. If Y is G -valid, then we construct the graph G' , where G' is a deletion of G with respect to $(Y, \{Y_1, Y_2, \dots, Y_s\})$, and we consider the partition $X' = \bigcup_{i \in [t]} X_i$ of ℓ_2 . If X' is G' -valid, a completion of G' with respect to $(X, \{X_1, X_2, \dots, X_t\})$ is η -balanced and $\sum_{j \in [s]} \text{spp}(Y_j) + \sum_{i \in [t]} \text{spp}(X_i) \leq k$, then we return that (G, k, η) is a yes-instance, and terminate.

Step 5. We return that (G, k, η) is a no-instance, and terminate.

We now analyse the running time of **Algo-BCE-C**.

► **Lemma 51.** *Algo-BCE-C runs in time $2^{\mathcal{O}(k)} n^{\mathcal{O}(1)}$.*

Proof. Observe that Steps 2 and 5 take only polynomial time. So does each execution of Step 4.1.1.1. By Theorems 46 and 64, Step 1 takes time $2^{\mathcal{O}(k)} n^{\mathcal{O}(1)}$. By Proposition 40, Step 3 takes time $2^{\mathcal{O}(\sqrt{k})}$. Now, in Step 4, we only need to go over at most $2k - 1$ choices of ℓ_1 and at most $2k - 1$ choices of ℓ_2 ; and we can assume without loss of generality that $k \leq \binom{n}{2}$. That is, there are only $n^{\mathcal{O}(1)}$ choices for the pair (ℓ_1, ℓ_2) . In Step 4.1, we go over all possible choices of (Y, X) . As Y is a partition of ℓ_1 , by Proposition 40, Y has $p(\ell_1) = 2^{\mathcal{O}(\sqrt{\ell_1})}$ choices. Similarly, X has $p(\ell_2) = 2^{\mathcal{O}(\sqrt{\ell_2})}$ choices. Thus, there are $2^{\mathcal{O}(\sqrt{\ell_1})} \cdot 2^{\mathcal{O}(\sqrt{\ell_2})} = 2^{\mathcal{O}(\sqrt{\ell_1} + \sqrt{\ell_2})} = 2^{\mathcal{O}(\sqrt{k})}$ choices for the pair (Y, X) . Finally, by Lemma 43, for each choice of (ℓ_1, ℓ_2) , the number of choices for $((Y, \{Y_1, Y_2, \dots, Y_s\}), (X, \{X_1, X_2, \dots, X_t\}))$ is at most $2^{\mathcal{O}(\ell_1)} \cdot 2^{\mathcal{O}(\ell_2)} = 2^{\mathcal{O}(k)}$. Thus, the overall running time of the algorithm is bounded by $2^{\mathcal{O}(k)} n^{\mathcal{O}(1)}$. \blacktriangleleft

This completes the proof of Theorem 49.

4.2 Faster Algorithms for BALANCED CLUSTER COMPLETION and BALANCED CLUSTER EDITING

In Section 4.1, we designed algorithms for BCC and BCE that run in time $2^{\mathcal{O}(k)}n^{\mathcal{O}(1)}$. We now design algorithms for these problems that run in time $4^{k+o(k)}n^{\mathcal{O}(1)}$.

The high level idea. We use BCC to illustrate the high level idea behind our algorithms; these ideas extend to BCE as well. Consider a yes-instance (G, k, η) of BCC, and suppose $F \subseteq (V_2^{(G)}) \setminus E(G)$ is the solution that we are looking for; and G_1, G_2, \dots, G_t are the components of the η -balanced cluster graph $G + F$ that were modified by F , and for each $i \in [t]$, $G_{i1}, G_{i2}, \dots, G_{ir_i}$ are the components of G that were merged together to form the component G_i of G . In our previous algorithm for BCC (Algo-BCC), we guessed $|V(F)|$; then we guessed $X = \{|G_1|, |G_2|, \dots, |G_t|\}$, and for each $i \in [t]$, we guessed $X_i = \{|G_{i1}|, |G_{i2}|, \dots, |G_{ir_i}|\}$. As X is a partition of $|V(F)| \in [2k]$, and as the number of partitions of any integer ℓ is $2^{o(\ell)}$ (Proposition 40), we can guess X in time $2^{o(k)}$. But guessing each X_i is what led to the $2^{\mathcal{O}(k)}$ factor in the running time (Lemma 43); we now design a faster algorithm by avoiding this time-consuming guess. To do this, we guess $|V(F)|$ and X as before, and we guess $X' = \bigcup_{i \in [t]} X_i$ instead of guessing each X_i separately. Notice that as X and X' are partitions of $|V(F)| \in [2k]$, we only make $2k \cdot 2^{\mathcal{O}(\sqrt{k})} \cdot 2^{\mathcal{O}(\sqrt{k})} = 2^{o(k)}$ guesses. Once we make our guesses, we check in time $2^{2k} = 4^k$ if we can merge the components by adding at most k edges; this is the more non-trivial step of our algorithm.

To check if we can merge the components, we think of the components G_1, G_2, \dots, G_t of $G + F$ as bins and for all $i \in [t]$ the components $G_{i1}, G_{i2}, \dots, G_{ir_i}$ of G as balls, where the size a ball (or the capacity of a bin) is the size of the corresponding component. And in the balls-and-bins parlance, merging the components of G to form the components of $G + F$ simply means assigning balls to bins so that the total size of balls assigned to each bin does not exceed the capacity of that bin. Also, notice that to assign a ball of size $|G_{ij}|$ to a bin of capacity $|G_i|$, we need to add exactly $|G_{ij}|(|G_i| - |G_{ij}|)$ edges incident with $V(G_{ij})$; we think of this quantity as the cost of assigning this ball to this bin. So guessing the partitions X and X' means guessing the capacities of the bins and the sizes of the balls. And for each (X, X') , we simply need to check if we can assign the balls to the bins subject to capacity and cost constraints; we discuss below how we can do this in time $4^k n^{\mathcal{O}(1)}$. Notice that as X and X' are partitions of $|V(F)| \leq 2k$, we have $|X|, |X'| \leq 2k$; that is, we have at most $2k$ balls and at most $2k$ bins. \lrcorner

To exploit these ideas and design our algorithms for BCC and BCE, we first define an auxiliary problem called BALLS IN BINS (B-IN-B) and design an algorithm for B-IN-B. We then show that we can reduce BCC and BCE to B-IN-B.

4.2.1 An Algorithm for BALLS IN BINS

Consider a set of s balls (indexed by $1, 2, \dots, s$) with sizes $b_1, b_2, \dots, b_s \in \mathbb{N}$, a set of t bins (indexed by $1, 2, \dots, t$) with capacities $x_1, x_2, \dots, x_t \in \mathbb{N}$. We are interested in assigning these balls to the bins in such a way that for each bin j , the sum of the sizes of balls assigned to bin j does not exceed the capacity of that bin. Formally, consider $B \subseteq [s]$. We define the volume of B , denoted by $\text{vol}(B)$, to be the sum of the sizes of the balls in B , i.e., $\text{vol}(B) = \sum_{i \in B} b_i$ if $B \neq \emptyset$ and $\text{vol}(B) = 0$ if $B = \emptyset$. By an assignment of the balls in B to the t bins (or simply an assignment of B , for short), we mean a function $\beta : B \rightarrow [t]$ such that $\text{vol}(\beta^{-1}(j)) \leq x_j$ for every $j \in [t]$. If $\beta(i) = j$ for $i \in [s]$ and $j \in [t]$, then we say that ball i is assigned to bin j (or that the i th ball is assigned to the j th bin) under the assignment β . Now, consider a

cost function $\text{cost} : [s] \times [t] \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$, where for every $i \in [s]$ and $j \in [t]$, $\text{cost}(i, j)$ is the cost of assigning the i th ball to the j th bin. For $B' \subseteq B \subseteq [s]$, and an assignment $\beta : B \rightarrow [t]$, the cost of B' under the assignment β is $\sum_{i \in B'} \text{cost}(i, \beta(i))$, and we denote this quantity by $\text{cost}_\beta(B')$; when the assignment β is clear from the context, we may omit the subscript and simply write $\text{cost}(B')$.

We now define the following problem.

BALLS IN BINS (B-IN-B)

Input: A set of s balls (indexed by $1, 2, \dots, s$) with sizes $b_1, b_2, \dots, b_s \in \mathbb{N}$, a set of t bins (indexed by $1, 2, \dots, t$) with capacities $x_1, x_2, \dots, x_t \in \mathbb{N}$, a budget $W \in \mathbb{N}$, and a cost function $\text{cost} : [s] \times [t] \rightarrow \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}$ where $\text{cost}(i, j)$ is the cost of assigning the i th ball to the j th bin for every $i \in [s]$ and $j \in [t]$.

Task: Decide if there exists an assignment of the balls in $[s]$ to the t bins such that the cost of the assignment is at most W .

Observe that we can design a straightforward dynamic programming algorithm for B-IN-B that runs in time $\mathcal{O}^*(3^s)$ (assuming W is encoded in unary): for each subset $B \subseteq [s]$, $j \in [t]$ and $q \in [W]_0$, we simply need to check if there is an assignment of B to the first j bins with cost at most q . To execute this, we need to go over all subsets B of $[s]$, and check if there exist a subset $B' \subseteq B$ and $q' \leq q$ such that we can assign B' to the j th bin with cost at most q' and assign $B \setminus B'$ to the first $j - 1$ bins with cost at most $q - q'$, which will take time $\mathcal{O}^*(\sum_{B \subseteq [s]} 2^{|B|}) = \mathcal{O}^*(\sum_{i=0}^s \binom{s}{i} 2^i) = \mathcal{O}^*(3^s)$. We now show that we can execute this idea in time $\mathcal{O}^*(2^s)$ by resorting to algebraic techniques. Specifically, we prove the following theorem.⁵

► **Theorem 52.** *BALLS IN BINS admits an algorithm that runs in time $\mathcal{O}(2^s \cdot s^3 \cdot t \cdot W^2)$.*

To prove Theorem 52, we rely on the fact that we can efficiently multiply two polynomials.

► **Proposition 53** ([46]). *The product of two polynomials of degree d can be computed in time $\mathcal{O}(d \log d)$.*

We now introduce the following notation and terminology, which we borrow from [19, 33].

Notation and Terminology. Consider $B \subseteq [s]$. The characteristic vector of B , denoted by $\chi(B)$, is the s -length binary string whose i th bit is 1 if and only if $i \in B$. The Hamming weight of a binary string is the number of 1s in that string. Notice that we can interpret a binary string as the binary encoding of an integer and vice-versa. For example, we interpret the string $(1, 0, 0, 1, 0)$ to be the number 18 as the binary encoding of 18 is exactly 10010. For $B \subseteq [s]$, consider the monomial $z^{\chi(B)}$, where z is an indeterminate and $\chi(B)$ is the characteristic vector of B , interpreted as the binary encoding of an integer. The Hamming

⁵ BALLS IN BINS is a special case of the the GENERALISED ASSIGNMENT PROBLEM (GAP), which is often phrased in terms of assigning jobs to machines. While GAP has been studied intensively in the approximation algorithms framework, where the typical goals have been minimising the cost and makespan (the maximum time taken by any machine to complete the jobs assigned to it), we are unaware of an exact exponential time algorithm for GAP, along the lines of our algorithm in Theorem 52. We refer the reader to Williamson and Shmoys [53, Chapter 11] for approximation algorithms for GAP and its variants; and to Kundakcioglu and Alizamir [41] for an overview of literature on GAP.

weight of a monomial z^i is the Hamming weight of the binary encoding (interpreted as a binary string) of i . Consider a polynomial $P(z)$ and an integer i . The Hamming projection of $P(z)$ to i , denoted by $\mathcal{H}_i(P(z))$, is the sum of the monomials of P of Hamming weight exactly i . That is, $\mathcal{H}_i(P(z))$ is the polynomial obtained from $P(z)$ by removing all those monomials of Hamming weight not equal to i . In particular, if $P(z)$ has no monomial of Hamming weight exactly i , then $\mathcal{H}_i(P(z))$ is the zero polynomial. Finally, we define the representative polynomial of $P(z)$, denoted by $\mathcal{R}(P(z))$, to be the polynomial obtained from $P(z)$ by replacing the coefficient of each (non-zero) monomial with 1. For example, consider the polynomial $P(z) = z^8 + 2z^6 + z^5 + 3z^2 + 9$. Then $\mathcal{H}_2(P(z)) = 2z^6 + z^5$ as the binary encodings of 6 and 5 respectively are 0110 and 0101, and they both have Hamming weight 2, whereas the binary encodings of 8, 2 and 0 (the monomial 9 is $9z^0$) respectively are 1000, 0010 and 0000, none of which has Hamming weight 2. And $\mathcal{R}(P(z)) = z^8 + z^6 + z^5 + z^2 + 1$.

Outline of our algorithm for B-IN-B. Consider an instance of B-IN-B with s balls, t bins and budget W . The idea is to encode all possible assignments of balls in $[s]$ to the t bins as a polynomial, each monomial of which will correspond to an assignment. More specifically, for each $i \in [s]_0, j \in [t], q \in [W]_0$, we define a polynomial $P_{i,j,q}(z)$, where each monomial of $P_{i,j,q}(z)$ will correspond to an assignment of a subset of exactly i balls to the first j bins so that the total cost of this assignment is at most q (if at least one such assignment exists, in which case each monomial will have Hamming weight exactly i ; otherwise, $P_{i,j,q}(z)$ will just be the zero polynomial). In particular, for $B \subseteq [s]$ with $|B| = i$, the polynomial $P_{i,j,q}(z)$ will contain the monomial $z^{\chi(B)}$ if and only if there is an assignment of B to the first j bins with cost at most q . We compute these polynomials iteratively by going from smaller to larger values of j . The polynomial that we ultimately need to compute is $P_{s,t,W}(z)$, and we will have the guarantee that the given instance of B-IN-B is a yes-instance if and only if $P_{s,t,W}(z)$ contains the monomial $z^{\chi([s])}$. \square

Before proceeding to the proof of Theorem 52, we state one crucial result that we will rely on to establish the correctness of our algorithm. In our algorithm, we only check if there is an assignment of the balls to the bins; we do not guess which subset of balls is assigned to which bin. We must nonetheless ensure that the subsets of balls assigned to different bins are indeed disjoint. For that, we use the following result, which hardwires this disjointness requirement into the the polynomial $P_{i,j,q}(z)$ that we will define.

► **Proposition 54** ([19]). *Let $B_1, B_2 \subseteq [s]$. Then B_1 and B_2 are disjoint if and only if the Hamming weight of the monomial $z^{\chi(B_1) + \chi(B_2)}$ is $|B_1| + |B_2|$.*

We are now ready to prove Theorem 52.

Proof of Theorem 52. Consider an instance of B-IN-B, where we are given s balls (indexed by $1, 2, \dots, s$) with sizes b_1, b_2, \dots, b_s , t bins (indexed by $1, 2, \dots, t$) with capacities x_1, x_2, \dots, x_t , a cost function $\text{cost} : [s] \times [t] \rightarrow \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}$ and a budget $W \in \mathbb{N}$.

For each $i \in [s]_0, j \in [t], q \in [W]_0$, we will define a polynomial $P_{i,j,q}(z)$, where each monomial of $P_{i,j,q}(z)$ will correspond to a (partial) assignment of a set of exactly i balls to the first j bins such that the cost of the assignment is at most q . To that end, we will first define an auxiliary polynomial $A_{i,j,q}(z)$, each monomial of which will correspond to an assignment of a set of exactly i balls to the j th bin such that the cost of the assignment is at

most q . Formally, for every $i \in [s]_0, j \in [t], q \in [W]_0$, we define

$$A_{i,j,q}(z) = \sum_{\substack{B \subseteq [s] \\ |B|=i \\ \text{vol}(B) \leq x_j \\ \sum_{r \in B} \text{cost}(r,j) \leq q}} z^{\chi(B)}.$$

Notice that $A_{i,j,q}(z)$ contains the monomial $z^{\chi(B)}$ if and only if $|B| = i$ and the balls in B can be assigned to the j th bin with cost at most q . We now define $P_{i,j,q}(z)$ for every $i \in [s]_0, j \in [t], q \in [W]_0$ as follows. We define $P_{i,1,q}(z) = A_{i,1,q}(z)$. For $j > 1$, notice that there exists an assignment of i balls to the first j bins with cost at most q if and only if there exist an assignment of exactly i' balls to j th bin with cost at most q' and an assignment of $i - i'$ balls to the first $j - 1$ bins with cost at most $q - q'$, for some $i' \in [i]_0$ and $q' \in [q]_0$. We thus define

$$P_{i,j,q}(z) = \mathcal{R} \left(\mathcal{H}_i \left(\sum_{(i',q') \in [i]_0 \times [q]_0} A_{i',j,q'}(z) \cdot P_{i-i',j-1,q-q'}(z) \right) \right), \quad (\star\star\star)$$

where $\mathcal{H}_i(\cdot)$ is the Hamming projection to i and $\mathcal{R}(\cdot)$ is the representative polynomial. The $\mathcal{H}_i(\cdot)$ operator ensures that $P_{i,j,q}(z)$ contains only monomials of Hamming weight exactly i (which correspond to assignments of exactly i balls). And the $\mathcal{R}(\cdot)$ operator ensures that the coefficients of the polynomials we multiply always remain 1. In particular, the coefficient of each (non-zero) monomial of $P_{i,j,q}(z)$ (and $A_{i,j,q}(z)$) is 1.

We first compute $A_{i,j,q}(z)$ for every $i \in [s]_0, j \in [t]$ and $q \in [W]_0$ by going over all subsets $B \subseteq [s]$. We then compute $P_{i,j,q}(z)$ using Equation $(\star\star\star)$. In particular, we use the algorithm of Proposition 53 to compute the product $A_{i',j,q'}(z) \cdot P_{i-i',j-1,q-q'}(z)$ in Equation $(\star\star\star)$ for every choice of (i', q') . Finally, we return that the given instance of B-IN-B is a yes-instance if and only if the polynomial $P_{s,t,W}(z)$ contains the monomial $z^{\chi([s])}$. (Notice that if the given instance of B-IN-B is a yes-instance, then we can find an assignment of $[s]$ with cost at most W by backtracking from $P_{s,t,W}(z)$.)

Let us now analyse the running time of our algorithm. Since $i \in [s]_0, j \in [t]$ and $q \in [W]_0$, we compute $\mathcal{O}(s \cdot t \cdot W)$ polynomials. Each polynomial has degree at most 2^s as the number represented by any s -length binary string is at most 2^s . Also, to compute $P_{i,j,q}(z)$ using Equation $(\star\star\star)$, we go over $\mathcal{O}(s \cdot W)$ choices of (i', q') , and for each such choice, multiply two polynomials of degree at most 2^s ; by Proposition 53, we can multiply two polynomials of degree at most 2^s in time $\mathcal{O}(2^s \cdot s)$. Finally, notice that we can apply the operators $\mathcal{R}(\cdot)$ and $\mathcal{H}_i(\cdot)$ in time proportional to 2^s . Hence the total running time is bounded by $\mathcal{O}((s \cdot t \cdot W) \cdot (s \cdot W) \cdot (2^s \cdot s)) = \mathcal{O}(2^s \cdot s^3 \cdot t \cdot W^2)$.

Finally, to establish the correctness of our algorithm, we prove the following claim.

▷ **Claim 55.** For any $B \subseteq [s]$ with $|B| = i, j \in [t]$ and $q \in [W]_0$, there exists an assignment $\beta : B \rightarrow [j]$ with $\text{cost}_\beta(B) \leq q$ if and only if the polynomial $P_{i,j,q}(z)$ contains the monomial $z^{\chi(B)}$.

Assuming for now that Claim 55 holds, let us complete the proof of the theorem. Recall that our algorithm returns yes if and only if the polynomial $P_{s,t,W}(z)$ contains the monomial $z^{\chi([s])}$, which by Claim 55, holds if and only if there is an assignment of $[s]$ with cost at most W . We can thus conclude that our algorithm returns yes if and only if there is an assignment of $[s]$ with cost at most W .

Proof of Claim 55. Fix $B \subseteq [s]$ with $|B| = i$. We prove the claim by induction on j .

Consider $j = 1$. Observe that there exists an assignment β that assigns B to the first bin with cost at most q if and only if $\text{vol}(B) \leq x_1$ and $\text{cost}_\beta(B) = \sum_{r \in B} \text{cost}(r, 1) \leq q$, which, by the definition of $A_{i,1,q}(z)$, holds if and only if the polynomial $A_{i,1,q}(z) = P_{i,1,q}(z)$ contains the monomial $z^{\chi(B)}$.

Assume now that the claim holds for $j = j' - 1$. We prove that it holds for $j = j'$.

Suppose that there exists an assignment $\beta : B \rightarrow [j']$ with $\text{cost}(B) \leq q$. Let $\hat{B} \subseteq B$ be the set of balls that are assigned to bin j' under β . Let $\hat{i} = |\hat{B}|$ and $\hat{q} = \text{cost}_\beta(\hat{B})$. First, as the \hat{i} balls in \hat{B} are assigned to bin j' under β with cost \hat{q} , the polynomial $A_{\hat{i},j',\hat{q}}(z)$ contains the monomial $z^{\chi(\hat{B})}$. Second, by the definition of \hat{B} , the $i - \hat{i} = |B \setminus \hat{B}|$ balls in $B \setminus \hat{B}$ are assigned to the first $j' - 1$ balls under β with cost $\text{cost}(B) - \text{cost}(\hat{B}) \leq q - \hat{q}$. Hence, by the induction hypothesis, the polynomial $P_{i-\hat{i},j'-1,q-\hat{q}}(z)$ contains the monomial $z^{\chi(B \setminus \hat{B})}$. Therefore the product $A_{\hat{i},j',\hat{q}}(z) \cdot P_{i-\hat{i},j'-1,q-\hat{q}}(z)$ contains the monomial $z^{\chi(\hat{B}) + \chi(B \setminus \hat{B})}$. As $|\hat{B}| + |B \setminus \hat{B}| = i$ and $\text{cost}(\hat{B}) + \text{cost}(B \setminus \hat{B}) = \text{cost}(B) \leq q$, the sum on the right hand side of Equation $(\star \star \star)$ contains the summand $A_{\hat{i},j',\hat{q}}(z) \cdot P_{i-\hat{i},j'-1,q-\hat{q}}(z)$, and hence the monomial $z^{\chi(\hat{B}) + \chi(B \setminus \hat{B})}$. Finally, as the sets \hat{B} and $B \setminus \hat{B}$ are disjoint, by Proposition 54, the monomial $z^{\chi(\hat{B}) + \chi(B \setminus \hat{B})}$ has Hamming weight exactly $|\hat{B}| + |B \setminus \hat{B}| = |B| = i$. And applying the operators $\mathcal{H}_i(\cdot)$ and $\mathcal{R}(\cdot)$ does not change the Hamming weight of this monomial. Finally, notice again that as the sets \hat{B} and $B \setminus \hat{B}$ are disjoint, $\chi(\hat{B}) + \chi(B \setminus \hat{B})$ (interpreted as a binary sum) is precisely $\chi(\hat{B} \cup (B \setminus \hat{B})) = \chi(B)$. We can thus conclude that $P_{i,j',q}(z)$ contains the monomial $z^{\chi(B)}$.

Conversely, assume that the polynomial $P_{i,j',q}(z)$ contains the monomial $z^{\chi(B)}$. Then, by Equation $(\star \star \star)$, there exist $i' \in [i]_0$ and $q' \in [q]_0$ such that the product $A_{i',j',q'}(z) \cdot P_{i-i',j'-1,q-q'}(z)$ contains the monomial $z^{\chi(B)}$. For convenience, let $i'' = i - i'$ and $q'' = q - q'$. Let z^a be a monomial of $A_{i',j',q'}(z)$ and z^p be a monomial of $P_{i'',j'-1,q''}$ such that $z^a \cdot z^p = z^{a+p} = z^{\chi(B)}$. Notice that every monomial in $A_{i',j',q'}(z)$ has Hamming weight exactly i' and every monomial in $P_{i'',j'-1,q''}(z)$ has Hamming weight exactly i'' . We can therefore conclude that the monomials z^a and z^p have Hamming weights i' and i'' , respectively.

We will now show that the monomials z^a and z^p respectively correspond to assignments of subsets $B' \subseteq B$ and $B'' \subseteq [B]$ with $B' \cup B'' = B$ and $B' \cap B'' = \emptyset$. First, by the definition of $A_{i',j',q'}(z)$, each monomial of $A_{i',j',q'}(z)$ corresponds to an assignment of a set of exactly i' balls to bin j' with cost at most q' . Let $B' \subseteq [s]$ with $|B'| = i'$ be the set of exactly i' balls such that the monomial z^a of $A_{i',j',q'}(z)$ corresponds to the assignment of B' to bin j' (with cost at most q'); let this assignment be denoted by β' . In particular, we have $z^a = z^{\chi(B')}$. Second, let $B'' \subseteq [s]$ be such that $\chi(B'')$ (interpreted as the binary encoding of an integer) is precisely p . That is, $z^p = z^{\chi(B'')}$. Notice that such a set B'' exists as the monomial z^p (and in particular, the binary encoding of p) has Hamming weight $i'' \leq s$. Because of the same reason, we can conclude that $|B''| = i''$. We thus have $B', B'' \subseteq [s]$ with $|B'| = i'$, $|B''| = i'' = i - i'$ and $z^{\chi(B')} \cdot z^{\chi(B'')} = z^{\chi(B') + \chi(B'')} = z^{\chi(B)}$. As the monomial $z^{\chi(B)} = z^{\chi(B') + \chi(B'')}$ has Hamming weight $|B| = i = i' + i'' = |B'| + |B''|$, by Proposition 54, we can conclude that the sets B' and B'' are disjoint. Observe then that we must have $B', B'' \subseteq B$, for otherwise we would not have $\chi(B') + \chi(B'') = \chi(B)$. As $|B''| = i'' = i - i' = |B| - |B'|$, we can conclude further that $B'' = B \setminus B'$. We have thus argued that the polynomial $P_{i'',j'-1,q''}$ contains the monomial $z^p = z^{\chi(B'')}$. By the induction hypothesis, there exists an assignment $\beta'' : B'' \rightarrow [j' - 1]$ of B'' with $\text{cost}_{\beta''}(B'') \leq q''$.

Let $\gamma : B \rightarrow [j']$ be the assignment of B obtained by combining β' and β'' as follows: We have $\gamma(\tilde{i}) = \beta'(\tilde{i}) = j'$ if $\tilde{i} \in B'$ and $\gamma(\tilde{i}) = \beta''(\tilde{i})$ if $\tilde{i} \in B''$. As B' and B'' are disjoint and $B' \cup B'' = B$, the assignment γ is well-defined. Notice that $\text{cost}_\gamma(B) =$

$\text{cost}_{\beta'}(B') + \text{cost}_{\beta''}(B'') \leq q' + q'' = q' + (q - q'') = q$. Thus, γ is the required assignment of B to the first j' bins with cost at most q . \triangleleft

This completes the proof of Theorem 52. \blacktriangleleft

4.2.2 An Algorithm for an Annotated Variant of Cluster Modification

To show that BCC and BCE admit algorithms that runs in time $4^{k+o(k)}n^{\mathcal{O}(1)}$, we do as follows. We first define an annotated variant of CLUSTER COMPLETION called ANNOTATED CLUSTER MODIFICATION (ANNO-CM), and show that solving BCC and BCE amounts to solving $2^{o(k)}$ many instances of ANNO-CM, each instance of which can be reduced to an instance of B-IN-B with $s \leq 2k$ balls, $t \leq 2k$ bins and budget $W = 2k$. Theorem 52 will then yield $4^{k+o(k)}n^{\mathcal{O}(1)}$ time algorithms for BCC and BCE.

Notation and Terminology. For multisets A and B , by the set difference $A \setminus B$, we mean the “additive set difference” of A and B ; that is, $A \setminus B \subseteq A$ and for each $x \in A$, $\text{mul}(x, A \setminus B) = \max\{0, \text{mul}(x, A) - \text{mul}(x, B)\}$. For example, if $A = \{x, y, y, y, z, z, z\}$ and $B = \{x, x, y, w\}$, then $A \setminus B = \{y, y, z, z, z\}$. For a multiset X of non-negative integers and $\eta \geq 0$, we say that X is η -balanced if $|x - y| \leq \eta$ for every $x, y \in X$. For a graph G , by the set of component sizes of G , denoted by $\text{CS}(G)$, we mean the multiset of positive integers where for each $j \in \mathbb{N}$, the multiplicity of j in $\text{CS}(G)$ is precisely the number of components of G of size exactly j ; that is, $\text{CS}(G)$ is the multiset $\{|H| \mid H \text{ is a connected component of } G\}$. In particular, a graph G is η -balanced if and only if $\text{CS}(G)$ is η -balanced. Consider a cluster graph G and an integer $\ell \in \mathbb{N}$. Recall that for a partition $X' = \{x'_1, x'_2, \dots, x'_s\}$ of ℓ , we say that X' is G -valid if G contains s distinct components H_1, H_2, \dots, H_s such that $|H_i| = x'_i$ for every $i \in [s]$. For partitions X and X' of ℓ such that X' is G -valid, by a modification of G with respect to (X, X') , we mean a cluster graph \hat{G} obtained from G by adding edges so that $\text{CS}(\hat{G}) = (\text{CS}(G) \setminus X') \cup X$; that is, we obtain \hat{G} from G by merging components so that $|X'|$ components of G of sizes from X' are “replaced” by $|X|$ components of sizes from X . Notice that a modification of G w.r.t. (X, X') need not exist, and that a modification need not be unique if one exists. Consider a modification \hat{G} of G w.r.t. (X, X') (assuming one exists). Notice that we can identify \hat{G} with a function that maps X' to X : For each $x' \in X'$, x' is mapped to $x \in X$ if and only if the component of G corresponding to x' is merged with other components to form a component of \hat{G} of size exactly x , and we call this function a witness for the modification \hat{G} and denote it by $\text{wit}_{\hat{G}}$. That is, the witness for \hat{G} is the function $\text{wit}_{\hat{G}} : X' \rightarrow X$, where for each $x \in X$, a component of \hat{G} of size x replaces exactly $|\text{wit}^{-1}(x)|$ components of G of sizes from the multiset $\text{wit}^{-1}(x)$; we thus have $\sum_{x' \in \text{wit}^{-1}(x)} x' = x$ for every $x \in X$. \lrcorner

► Observation 56. Consider a cluster graph G , partitions $X = \{x_1, x_2, \dots, x_t\}$ and $X' = \{x'_1, x'_2, \dots, x'_s\}$ of $\ell \in \mathbb{N}$ such that X' is G -valid, and a modification \hat{G} of G w.r.t. (X, X') (assuming a modification exists). Corresponding to each $x'_i \in X'$ and $x_j \in X$ such that $\text{wit}(x'_i) = x_j$, a component H of G with $|H| = x'_i$ is merged with some other components of G to form a component \hat{H} of \hat{G} with $|\hat{H}| = x_j$. To form \hat{H} , notice that we need to add exactly $|\hat{H}| - |H| = x_j - x'_i$ edges incident with each vertex of H ; in total, we need to add exactly $|H|(|\hat{H}| - |H|) = x'_i(x_j - x'_i)$ edges incident with $V(H)$. Thus, $|E(\hat{G}) \setminus E(G)|$, i.e., the total number of edges we need to add to G to form \hat{G} is precisely $(1/2) \sum_{i \in [s]} (x'_i \cdot (\text{wit}(x'_i) - x'_i))$; the $1/2$ accounts for the fact that each edge in $E(\hat{G}) \setminus E(G)$ is counted twice in the sum $\sum_{i \in [s]} (x'_i \cdot (\text{wit}(x'_i) - x'_i))$.

We now define the following problem.

ANNOTATED CLUSTER MODIFICATION (ANNO-CM)

Input: A cluster graph, a non-negative integer k and two partitions X and X' of an integer $\ell \in \mathbb{N}$ such that X' is G -valid.
Task: Decide if there exists a modification \hat{G} of G with respect to (X, X') such that $|E(\hat{G}) \setminus E(G)| \leq k$.

► **Theorem 57.** *ANNO-CM admits an algorithm that runs in time $2^\ell \cdot n^{\mathcal{O}(1)}$.*

Proof. We will show that we can reduce ANNO-CM to B-IN-B. The theorem will then follow from Theorem 52.

Given an instance (G, k, X, X') of ANNO-CM, where $X' = \{x'_1, x'_2, \dots, x'_s\}$ and $X = \{x_1, x_2, \dots, x_t\}$ are partitions of $\ell \in \mathbb{N}$, we construct an instance of B-IN-B as follows: We take s balls indexed by $1, 2, \dots, s$ with sizes x'_1, x'_2, \dots, x'_s , and t bins indexed by $1, 2, \dots, t$ with capacities x_1, x_2, \dots, x_t , a budget $W = 2k$ and a cost function $\text{cost} : [s] \rightarrow [t]$ where $\text{cost}(i, j) = x'_i(x_j - x'_i)$ if $x_j \geq x'_i$ and $\text{cost}(i, j) = 2k + 1$ otherwise.

Notice that we can construct this instance of B-IN-B in polynomial time. Also, as X' and X are partitions of ℓ , we have $s = |X'| \leq \ell$ and $t = |X| \leq \ell$; as X' is G -valid, we also have $\ell \leq n$; finally, we can assume without loss of generality that $k \leq \binom{n}{2}$. As we have $s, t \leq \ell \leq n$ and $W = 2k \leq 2\binom{n}{2}$, Theorem 52 implies that we can solve this instance of B-IN-B in time $2^\ell n^{\mathcal{O}(1)}$. We return that the given instance of ANNO-CM is a yes-instance if and only if the constructed instance of B-IN-B is a yes-instance.

To complete the proof, we only need to show that the two instances are equivalent. This follows from the fact that every modification \hat{G} of G w.r.t. (X, X') with $|E(\hat{G}) \setminus E(G)| \leq k$ corresponds to an assignment $\beta : [s] \rightarrow [t]$ with cost at most $W = 2k$ and vice versa: For every $i \in [s]$ and $j \in [t]$, we will have $\beta(i) = j$ if and only if $\text{wit}_{\hat{G}}(x'_i) = x_j$. As it is straightforward to verify that this correspondence between \hat{G} and β indeed shows the equivalence between the two instances, we omit the technical details. ◀

4.2.3 A Faster Algorithm for BCC

We now prove the following lemma, which shows that solving BCC amounts to solving $2^{\mathcal{O}(k)}$ many instances of ANNO-CM.

► **Lemma 58.** *Consider an instance (G, k, η) of BCC. If (G, k, η) is a yes-instance, then either G is η -balanced or there exist an integer $\ell \in [2k] \setminus \{1\}$ and partitions X and X' of ℓ such that X' is G -valid, the multiset $(\text{CS}(G) \setminus X') \cup X$ is η -balanced, and (G, k, X, X') is a yes-instance of ANNO-CM.*

Proof. Consider an instance (G, k, η) of BCC. Assume that (G, k, η) is a yes-instance. If G is η -balanced, then the lemma trivially holds; recall that G is a cluster graph. So, assume that G is not η -balanced. We will show that ℓ, X and X' , as required by the statement of lemma, exist by invoking Lemma 44.

By Lemma 44, there exist $\ell \in [2k] \setminus \{1\}$ and a partition $X = \{x_1, x_2, \dots, x_t\}$ of ℓ such that for each $i \in [t]$, there exists a partition X_i of x_i with the following properties: (1) $\bigcup_{i \in [t]} X_i$ is G -valid, (2) $\sum_{i \in [t]} \text{spp}(X_i) \leq k$, and (3) a completion of G w.r.t. $(X, \{X_1, X_2, \dots, X_t\})$ is η -balanced.

Let \hat{G} be a completion of G w.r.t. $(X, \{X_1, X_2, \dots, X_t\})$. Then, by Observation 41 and property (3) above, \hat{G} is η -balanced; by Observation 41 and property (2) above,

$|E(\hat{G}) \setminus E(G)| = \sum_{i \in [t]} \text{spp}(X_i) \leq k$. We take $X' = \bigcup_{i \in [t]} X_i$. Then, by the definition of a modification of G w.r.t. (X, X') , \hat{G} is a modification of G w.r.t. (X, X') . And as $|E(\hat{G}) \setminus E(G)| \leq k$, we can conclude that (G, k, X, X') is a yes-instance of ANNO-CM. Again, as \hat{G} is a modification of G w.r.t. (X, X') , we also have $(\text{CS}(G) \setminus X') \cup X = \text{CS}(\hat{G})$, which is η -balanced as \hat{G} is an η -balanced graph. Thus, ℓ, X and X' satisfy all the properties required by the statement of the lemma. \blacktriangleleft

We are now ready to describe our algorithm for BCC, which we call Fast-Algo-BCC.

Fast-Algo-BCC. Given an instance (G, k, η) of BCC as input, we proceed as follows. Recall that G is a cluster graph.

- Step 1.** If G is η -balanced, then we return that (G, k, η) is a yes-instance, and terminate.
- Step 2.** If $k \leq 0$, then we return that (G, k, η) is a no-instance, and terminate.
- Step 3.** We use the algorithm of Proposition 40 to generate all partitions of ℓ for all $\ell \in [2k]$.
- Step 4.** For each $\ell \in [2k] \setminus \{1\}$, we do as follows.
 - Step 4.1.** For each pair of partitions X and X' of ℓ such that $(\text{CS}(G) \setminus X') \cup X$ is η -balanced, we do as follows.
 - Step 4.1.1.** We consider the instance (G, k, X, X') of ANNO-CM, and use the algorithm of Theorem 57 to solve this instance. If (G, k, X, X') is a yes-instance of ANNO-CM, then we return that (G, k, η) is a yes-instance of BCC, and terminate.
- Step 5.** We return that (G, k, η) is a no-instance, and terminate.

The correctness of Fast-Algo-BCC follows from Lemma 58. To analyse its running time, observe that the most time-consuming step is Step 4.1.1., each execution of which requires time $2^\ell n^{\mathcal{O}(1)}$ (by Theorem 57). Also, by Proposition 40, the number of partitions of an integer ℓ is $2^{\mathcal{O}(\sqrt{\ell})}$, and hence the number of pairs (X, X') that we consider in Step 4.1 is $2^{\mathcal{O}(\sqrt{\ell})} \cdot 2^{\mathcal{O}(\sqrt{\ell})} = 2^{o(\ell)}$. Finally, we go over $2k - 1$ choices of ℓ in Step 4, and as we only consider $\ell \leq 2k$, we can conclude that the total running time is bounded by $2k \cdot 2^{o(2k)} \cdot 2^{2k} n^{\mathcal{O}(1)} = 4^{k+o(k)} n^{\mathcal{O}(1)}$. We thus have the following result.

► **Theorem 59.** *BCC admits an algorithm that runs in time $4^{k+o(k)} n^{\mathcal{O}(1)}$.*

4.2.4 A Faster Algorithm for BCE

We now turn to BCE. To design an algorithm for BCE, notice that as we did earlier, we only need to design an algorithm for BCE when the input graph is a cluster graph, as we can branch on induced P_3 s otherwise. Specifically, we prove the following theorem.

► **Theorem 60.** *BCE on cluster graphs admits an algorithm that runs in time $4^{k+o(k)} n^{\mathcal{O}(1)}$.*

Assuming Theorem 60, let us first prove the following result.

► **Theorem 61.** *BCE admits an algorithm that runs in time $4^{k+o(k)} n^{\mathcal{O}(1)}$.*

Proof Sketch. The proof is nearly identical to the proof of Theorem 48.

Given an instance (G, k, η) of BCE, our algorithm works as follows. If G is a cluster graph, then we use the algorithm of Theorem 60 to solve the problem. Otherwise, we find an induced P_3 , say uvw and recursively call our algorithm on the three instances $(G - uv, k - 1, \eta)$, $(G - vw, k - 1, \eta)$ and $(G + uw, k - 1, \eta)$.

As for the running time, notice that each time we find a P_3 , we make 3 recursive calls, until k becomes 0 or the graph becomes a cluster graph G (whichever happens earlier).

Hence the total number of recursive calls is at most $\sum_{i=0}^k 3^i$. Now, on any branch of the computation, as we first make $i \in [k]_0$ edge modifications until the graph becomes a cluster graph and only then invoke the algorithm of Theorem 60 with parameter $k - i$, the latter step will only take time $4^{k-i+o(k-i)}n^{\mathcal{O}(1)}$. Thus the total running time is bounded by $\sum_{i=0}^k 3^i \cdot 4^{k-i+o(k-i)}n^{\mathcal{O}(1)} \leq 4^{k+o(k)}n^{\mathcal{O}(1)}$. \blacktriangleleft

Now we only have to prove Theorem 60. Before moving to a formal proof of Theorem 60, we highlight some of the key ideas first.

Ideas we use in our algorithm for BCE on cluster graphs. For the most part, we use a combination of arguments we already used in our previous algorithm for BCE on cluster graphs (Algo-BCE-C) and our $4^{k+o(k)}n^{\mathcal{O}(1)}$ time algorithm for BCC (Fast-Algo-BCC). But there are subtle differences. First of all, observe that a cluster graph G is completely specified by its component sizes, i.e., the multiset $\text{CS}(G)$; any two cluster graphs H and H' are isomorphic if and only if $\text{CS}(H) = \text{CS}(H')$. We will rely on this fact. Now, suppose (G, k, η) is a yes-instance of BCE, where G is a cluster graph, and suppose $F \subseteq \binom{V(G)}{2}$ is the solution that we are looking for. Let $F_1 \subseteq F$ be the set of edges that we delete from G and $F_2 = F \setminus F_1$ be the set of edges that we add to G . Then $G - F_1$ is a cluster graph. Also, F_1 corresponds to a pair of partitions (Y, Y') of $\ell_1 = |V(F_1)|$: each $y \in Y$ corresponds to a component of G of size y that was split into smaller components when we deleted F_1 , and each $y' \in Y'$ corresponds to one of the “new” components of $G - F_1$ of size y' that was formed when we deleted F_1 . Thus $\text{CS}(G - F_1) = (\text{CS}(G) \setminus Y) \cup Y'$. Once again, we obtain G' from G by deleting the edges of F_1 , or equivalently, we obtain G from $G - F_1$ by adding the edges of F_1 . In other words, $(G - F_1, |F_1|, Y, Y')$ is a yes-instance of ANNO-CM. But then, so is $(G', |F_1|, Y, Y')$ for *any* cluster graph G' with $\text{CS}(G') = \text{CS}(G - F_1)$. The rest of the arguments are identical to those in Fast-Algo-BCC. We obtain $G \triangle F$ by adding the edges of F_2 to the cluster graph $G - F_1$. That is, for appropriate partitions X and X' of $|V(F_2)|$, $(G - F_1, |F_2|, X, X')$ is a yes-instance of ANNO-CM, and therefore, $(G', |F_2|, X, X')$ is a yes-instance of ANNO-CM. So in our algorithm, we guess $|F_1|, |F_2|, |V(F_1)|, |V(F_2)|, Y, Y'$ and X, X' and we simply check if $(G', |F_1|, Y, Y')$ is a yes-instance of ANNO-CM, and if $(G', |F_2|, X, X')$ is a yes-instance of ANNO-CM, where G' is an arbitrary cluster graph with $\text{CS}(G') = \text{CS}(G) \setminus Y \cup Y'$. \blacktriangleleft

We formalise the above ideas in the following lemma, which will establish the correctness of our algorithm for BCE on cluster graphs.

► **Lemma 62.** *Consider an instance (G, k, η) of BCE, where G is a cluster graph. If (G, k, η) is a yes-instance, then one of the following statements holds.*

1. *The instance (G, k, η) is a yes-instance of BCC.*
2. *The instance (G, k, η) is a yes-instance of BCD.*
3. *There exist integers k_1, k_2, ℓ_1, ℓ_2 with $k_1 + k_2 \leq k$ and $\ell_1 \in [2k_1] \setminus \{1\}, \ell_2 \in [2k_2] \setminus \{1\}$ such that there exist partitions Y and Y' of ℓ_1 and X and X' of ℓ_2 with the following properties:*
 - a. *Y is G -valid;*
 - b. *(G', k_1, Y, Y') is a yes-instance of ANNO-CM, where G' is a cluster graph with $\text{CS}(G') = (\text{CS}(G) \setminus Y) \cup Y'$;*
 - c. *X' is G' -valid;*
 - d. *the multiset $(\text{CS}(G') \setminus X') \cup X$ is η -balanced;*
 - e. *(G', k_2, X, X') is a yes-instance of ANNO-CM.*

Proof Sketch. The proof closely follows the proof of Lemma 50. We only highlight the most salient arguments. Assume that (G, k, η) is a yes-instance of BCE, and let F be a solution

for (G, k, η) . Let $F_1 \subseteq F$ be the set of edges that we delete from G and $F_2 = F \setminus F_1$ be the set of edges that we add to G . Then $G' = G - F_1$ is a cluster graph.

We take $k_i = |F_i|$ and $\ell_i = |V(F_i)|$ for each $i \in [2]$. We associate F_1 with a pair of partitions Y and Y' of ℓ_1 ; the partition Y corresponds to the components of G that are split into smaller components when we delete F_1 , and the partition Y' corresponds to the “new” components of $G' = G - F_1$ that are formed when we delete F_1 . In other words, we obtain G from G' by adding edges, and in particular, G is a modification of G' w.r.t. (Y, Y') . As $E(G) \setminus E(G') = F_1$ and $|F_1| = k_1$, (G', k_1, Y, Y') is a yes-instance of ANNO-CM. We associate F_2 with a pair of partitions X and X' of ℓ_2 . The partition X' corresponds to the components of G' that are merged together to form the components of $G' + F_2 = G\Delta F$; the partition X corresponds to the “new” components of $G' + F_2$ that are formed by merging together components of G' . In other words, $G' + F_2 = G\Delta F$ is a modification of G w.r.t. (X, X') , and thus $\text{CS}(G\Delta F) = (\text{CS}(G' + F_2) \setminus X') \cup X$. As $E(G\Delta F) \setminus E(G') = F_2$ and $|F_2| = k_2$, (G', k_2, X, X') is a yes-instance of ANNO-CM, and as the graph $G\Delta F$ is η -balanced, the multiset $\text{CS}(G\Delta F) = (\text{CS}(G' + F_2) \setminus X') \cup X$ is η -balanced. ◀

Based on Lemma 62, we design an algorithm for BCE on cluster graphs, which we call Fast-Algo-BCE-C.

Fast-Algo-BCE-C. Given an instance (G, k, η) of BCE as input, where G is a cluster graph, we proceed as follows.

- Step 1.** If (G, k, η) is a yes-instance of BCC or a yes-instance of BCD, we return that (G, k, η) is a yes-instance of BCE, and terminate. To do this, we use the algorithms of Theorems 59 and 64.
- Step 2.** If $k \leq 0$, then we return that (G, k, η) is a no-instance, and terminate.
- Step 3.** We use the algorithm of Proposition 40 to generate all partitions of ℓ for all $\ell \in [2k]$.
- Step 4.** For every choice of $k_1, k_2 \in [k]$ with $k_1 + k_2 \leq k$ and $\ell_1 \in [2k_1] \setminus \{1\}$, $\ell_2 \in [2k_2] \setminus \{1\}$, we do as follows.
- Step 4.1.** For each pair of partitions Y and Y' of ℓ_1 and each pair of partitions X and X' of ℓ_2 , such that Y is G -valid, we do as follows.
- Step 4.1.1.** We construct a cluster graph G' with $\text{CS}(G') = (\text{CS}(G) \setminus Y) \cup Y'$.
- Step 4.1.2** If X' is G' -valid, the multiset $(\text{CS}(G') \setminus X') \cup X$ is η -balanced, and both (G', k_1, Y, Y') and (G', k_2, X, X') are yes-instances of ANNO-CM, then we return that (G, k, η) is a yes-instance of BCE, and terminate. To check if (G', k_1, Y, Y') and (G', k_2, X, X') are yes-instances of ANNO-CM, we use the algorithm of Theorem 57.
- Step 5.** We return that (G, k, η) is a no-instance, and terminate.

The correctness of the algorithm follows from Lemma 62. We now analyse the running time.

► **Lemma 63.** *Fast-Algo-BCE-C runs in time $4^{k+o(k)}n^{\mathcal{O}(1)}$.*

Proof. Observe that Steps 2 and 5 take only polynomial time. By Theorems 59 and 64, Step 1 takes time at most $4^{k+o(k)}n^{\mathcal{O}(1)}$. By Proposition 40, Step 3 takes time $2^{\mathcal{O}(\sqrt{k})} = 2^{o(k)}$. Now, in Step 4, we need to go over at most $k + 1$ choices of k_i and at most $2k_i - 1$ choices of ℓ_i for each $i \in [2]$; and we can assume without loss of generality that $k \leq \binom{n}{2}$. That is, there are only $n^{\mathcal{O}(1)}$ choices for the tuple $(k_1, k_2, \ell_1, \ell_2)$. In Step 4.1, we go over all possible choices of (Y, Y', X, X') . As Y and Y' are partitions of $\ell_1 \leq 2k_1 \leq 2k$, by Proposition 40, each of them has at most $p(2k) = 2^{\mathcal{O}(\sqrt{k})}$ choices; similarly, each of X and X' also has at most

$p(2k) = 2^{\mathcal{O}(\sqrt{k})}$ choices. Thus, there are $2^{\mathcal{O}(\sqrt{k})} \cdot 2^{\mathcal{O}(\sqrt{k})} \cdot 2^{\mathcal{O}(\sqrt{k})} \cdot 2^{\mathcal{O}(\sqrt{k})} = 2^{\mathcal{O}(\sqrt{k})} = 2^{o(k)}$ choices for the tuple (Y, Y', X, X') . Finally, in Step 4.1.2, for each choice of (Y, Y', X, X') , we invoke the algorithm of Theorem 57 twice; on the instance (G', k_1, Y, Y') , the algorithm takes time $2^{\ell_1} n^{\mathcal{O}(1)} \leq 2^{2k_1} n^{\mathcal{O}(1)} = 4^{k_1} n^{\mathcal{O}(1)}$; similarly, on the instance (G', k_2, Y, Y') , it takes time at most $4^{k_2} n^{\mathcal{O}(1)}$. Thus each execution of Step 4.1.2 takes time $4^{k_1} n^{\mathcal{O}(1)} + 4^{k_2} n^{\mathcal{O}(1)} \leq 4^{k_1+k_2} n^{\mathcal{O}(1)} = 4^k n^{\mathcal{O}(1)}$. Therefore, the overall running time of the algorithm is bounded by $4^{k+o(k)} n^{\mathcal{O}(1)}$. ◀

This completes the proof of Theorem 60.

4.3 FPT Algorithm for BALANCED CLUSTER DELETION

In this section, we show that BCD admits an algorithm that runs in time $2^k n^{\mathcal{O}(1)}$. To design this algorithm, we consider an auxiliary problem, where rather than requiring that the size difference between the components be bounded, we simply demand that the size of each component be within a specified range. Formally, for integers $\gamma_1, \gamma_2 \geq 1$, we say that a graph G is (γ_1, γ_2) -cardinality-constrained if $\gamma_1 \leq |H| \leq \gamma_2$ for every connected component H of G . We now define the CARDINALITY-CONSTRAINED CLUSTER DELETION problem as follows.

CARDINALITY-CONSTRAINED CLUSTER DELETION (CCCD)

Input: A graph G and non-negative integers γ_1, γ_2 and k .
Task: Decide if there exists $F \subseteq E(G)$ such that $|F| \leq k$ and $G - F$ is a (γ_1, γ_2) -cardinality-constrained cluster graph.

Consider an instance (G, k, η) of BCD. Notice that (G, k, η) is a yes-instance of BCD if and only if there exist positive integers γ_1 and γ_2 with $\gamma_2 - \gamma_1 \leq \eta$ such that $(G, k, \gamma_1, \gamma_2)$ is a yes-instance of CCCD. Thus, given an instance of BCD, we can guess all possible choices for γ_1 and γ_2 and solve the corresponding instance of CCCD. As $1 \leq \gamma_1, \gamma_2 \leq n$, we only have at most n^2 valid guesses. In short, to solve BCD, it is enough to solve at most n^2 instances of CCCD. Hence, assuming that we can solve CCCD in time $2^k n^{\mathcal{O}(1)}$, we have the following theorem.

▶ **Theorem 64.** BALANCED CLUSTER DELETION admits an algorithm that runs in time $2^k n^{\mathcal{O}(1)}$.

As noted above, to prove Theorem 64, it is enough to prove the following theorem.

▶ **Theorem 65.** CARDINALITY-CONSTRAINED CLUSTER DELETION admits an algorithm that runs in time $2^k n^{\mathcal{O}(1)}$.

The rest of this section is dedicated to proving Theorem 65. To that end, we first prove the following lemma, which says that CCCD is polynomial-time solvable if the input graph is a clique.

▶ **Lemma 66.** There is an algorithm that, given a clique G on n vertices and positive integers $\gamma_1, \gamma_2 \leq n$, runs in polynomial time, and either returns $|F|$, where $F \subseteq E(G)$ is a minimum-sized set of edges such that $G - F$ is a (γ_1, γ_2) -cardinality-constrained cluster graph, or correctly reports that no such set F (of any size) exists.

Proof. Let G, γ_1, γ_2 be given, where G is a clique on n vertices. Throughout this proof, by an optimal solution, we mean a minimum-sized set $F \subseteq E(G)$ such that $G - F$ is a

(γ_1, γ_2) -cardinality-constrained cluster graph (if such an F exists). First, if G is (γ_1, γ_2) -cardinality-constrained, then $F = \emptyset$ is the unique optimal solution, and we return $|F| = 0$ accordingly. So, assume that this is not the case. Then, every optimal solution F must split G into connected components, say t connected components H_1, H_2, \dots, H_t , such that H_i is a clique and $\gamma_1 \leq |H_i| \leq \gamma_2$ for every $i \in [t]$. Then $\{V(H_1), V(H_2), \dots, V(H_t)\}$ is a partition of $V(G)$, and as G is a clique and F is precisely the set of all edges in G with exactly one endpoint in $V(H_i)$ and the other in $V(H_j)$ for some distinct $i, j \in [t]$, we have $|F| = \sum_{1 \leq i < j \leq t} |H_i||H_j|$. Also, as $\gamma_1 \leq |H_i| \leq \gamma_2$ for every $i \in [t]$, we must have $n \leq t\gamma_2$ and $t\gamma_1 \leq n$, or equivalently, $\lceil n/\gamma_2 \rceil \leq t \leq \lfloor n/\gamma_1 \rfloor$. Informally, to find an optimal solution F , we guess t , i.e., the number of components of $G - F$, and find a partition $\{X_1, X_2, \dots, X_t\}$ of $V(G)$ into t parts that minimises $\sum_{1 \leq i < j \leq t} |X_i||X_j|$.⁶

In light of the above observations, our algorithm works as follows. **Step 1:** If there does not exist an integer t such that $\lceil n/\gamma_2 \rceil \leq t \leq \lfloor n/\gamma_1 \rfloor$, then we report that there does not exist $F \subseteq E(G)$ such that $G - F$ is a (γ_1, γ_2) -cardinality-constrained cluster graph. **Step 2:** Otherwise, for each t such that $\lceil n/\gamma_2 \rceil \leq t \leq \lfloor n/\gamma_1 \rfloor$, we construct the following partition $\{X_1^t, X_2^t, \dots, X_t^t\}$ of $V(G)$ into t parts. **Step 2.1:** We first initialise $X_1^t = X_2^t = \dots = X_t^t = \emptyset$. **Step 2.2:** If there exists a vertex $v \in V(G) \setminus \bigcup_{i \in [t]} X_i^t$, we assign v to one of the t sets as follows. **Step 2.2.1:** If there exists $i \in [t]$ such that $|X_i^t| < \gamma_1$, then we assign v to X_i^t where i is the least index in $[t]$ with $|X_i^t| < \gamma_1$; **Step 2.2.2:** Otherwise, we assign v to X_j^t where j is the least index in $[t]$ such that $|X_j^t| < \gamma_2$. **Step 3:** Finally, we return $\min_t \sum_{1 \leq i < j \leq t} |X_i^t||X_j^t|$, where the minimum is over all integers t with $\lceil n/\gamma_2 \rceil \leq t \leq \lfloor n/\gamma_1 \rfloor$.

Before proving that this algorithm is indeed correct, notice that for each choice of t , we can construct $\{X_1^t, X_2^t, \dots, X_t^t\}$ and compute $\sum_{1 \leq i < j \leq t} |X_i^t||X_j^t|$ in polynomial time. And as t has only at most n choices, our algorithm runs in polynomial time.

Now, to see that our algorithm is correct, fix t and consider the corresponding partition $\{X_1^t, X_2^t, \dots, X_t^t\}$ of $V(G)$ that our algorithm constructs. Notice that in Step 2.2.1, we assign exactly γ_1 vertices to each X_i^t ; and in Step 2.2.2, once $|X_i^t| = \gamma_2$, we no longer assign vertices to X_i^t . Also, in Step 2.2.2, we assign a vertex to X_j^t only if $|X_i^t| = \gamma_2$ for every $i < j$. These observations imply that the partition $\{X_1^t, X_2^t, \dots, X_t^t\}$ has the following properties.

- (A). For every $i \in [t]$, we have $\gamma_1 \leq |X_i^t| \leq \gamma_2$.
- (B). We have $|X_1^t| \geq |X_2^t| \geq \dots \geq |X_t^t|$.
- (C). Finally, exactly one of the following statements holds: (i) $n = t\gamma_2$ in which case $|X_i^t| = \gamma_2$ for every $i \in [t]$; (ii) $n = t\gamma_1$ in which case $|X_i^t| = \gamma_1$ for every $i \in [t]$; there exists a unique index $r \in [t]$ such that $|X_i^t| = \gamma_2$ for every $i < r$ and $|X_i^t| = \gamma_1$ for every $i > r$.

We now prove that the partition $\{X_1^t, X_2^t, \dots, X_t^t\}$ is indeed optimal.

▷ **Claim 67.** For each fixed integer t with $\lceil n/\gamma_2 \rceil \leq t \leq \lfloor n/\gamma_1 \rfloor$, we have $\sum_{1 \leq i < j \leq t} |X_i^t||X_j^t| = \min \sum_{1 \leq i < j \leq t} |Z_i||Z_j|$, where the minimum is over all partitions $\{Z_1, Z_2, \dots, Z_t\}$ of $V(G)$ into t parts with $\gamma_1 \leq |Z_i| \leq \gamma_2$ for every $i \in [t]$.

Proof. Fix an integer t with $\lceil n/\gamma_2 \rceil \leq t \leq \lfloor n/\gamma_1 \rfloor$ and a partition $\{Y_1, Y_2, \dots, Y_t\}$ of $V(G)$ such that $\gamma_1 \leq |Y_i| \leq \gamma_2$ for every $i \in [t]$ and $\sum_{1 \leq i < j \leq t} |Y_i||Y_j| = \min \sum_{1 \leq i < j \leq t} |Z_i||Z_j|$, where the minimum is over all partitions $\{Z_1, Z_2, \dots, Z_t\}$ of $V(G)$ into t parts with $\gamma_1 \leq |Z_i| \leq \gamma_2$ for every $i \in [t]$. Assume without loss of generality that $|Y_1| \geq |Y_2| \geq \dots \geq |Y_t|$. Notice that to prove the claim, it is enough to prove that $|X_i^t| \leq |Y_i|$ for every $i \in [t]$, which

⁶ We will show later in the proof that we need not guess t ; the quantity $\sum_{1 \leq i < j \leq t} |X_i||X_j|$ is minimised when $t = \lceil n/\gamma_2 \rceil$.

will imply that $\sum_{1 \leq i < j \leq t} |X_i^t| |X_j^t| \leq \sum_{1 \leq i < j \leq t} |Y_i| |Y_j|$; in fact, $|X_i^t| \leq |Y_i|$ for every $i \in [t]$ will imply that $|X_i^t| = |Y_i|$ for every $i \in [t]$, as $\sum_{i \in [t]} |X_i^t| = \sum_{i \in [t]} |Y_i|$, and this will in turn imply that $\sum_{1 \leq i < j \leq t} |X_i^t| |X_j^t| = \sum_{1 \leq i < j \leq t} |Y_i| |Y_j|$.

We now prove that $|X_i^t| \leq |Y_i|$ for every $i \in [t]$. Assume for a contradiction that there exists an index $r \in [t]$ such that $|X_r^t| > |Y_r|$, and assume without loss of generality that r is the least such index. Then, as $\sum_{i \in [t]} |X_i^t| = n = \sum_{i \in [t]} |Y_i|$, there exists another index $s \in [t]$ such that $|Y_s| > |X_s^t|$. We claim that $s > r$. To see this, recall that we have $\gamma_1 \leq |X_j^t|, |Y_j| \leq \gamma_2$ for every $j \in [t]$; then, as $|X_r^t| > |Y_r|$, we can conclude that $|X_r^t| > \gamma_1$. But then Property (C) above implies that $|X_j^t| = \gamma_2$ for every $j < r$, and therefore there cannot exist $s < r$ such that $|Y_s| > |X_s^t|$. We can thus conclude that there exists $s > r$ such that $|Y_s| > |X_s^t|$. Notice that we have $\gamma_2 \geq |X_r^t| > |Y_r|$ and $\gamma_1 \leq |X_s^t| < |Y_s|$. Let $\{Y'_1, Y'_2, \dots, Y'_t\}$ be the partition of $V(G)$ obtained from $\{Y_1, Y_2, \dots, Y_t\}$ by moving exactly one vertex from Y_s to Y_r . Notice then that $|Y'_s| = |Y_s| - 1 \geq \gamma_1$, $|Y'_r| = |Y_r| + 1 \leq \gamma_2$, and $|Y'_i| = |Y_i|$ for every $i \in [t] \setminus \{r, s\}$. In particular, $\gamma_1 \leq |Y'_i| \leq \gamma_2$ for every $i \in [t]$.

We will show that $\sum_{1 \leq i < j \leq t} |Y'_i| |Y'_j| < \sum_{1 \leq i < j \leq t} |Y_i| |Y_j|$, which will contradict the definition of $\{Y_1, Y_2, \dots, Y_t\}$. To prove this, observe the following facts.

1. For $i, j \in [t] \setminus \{r, s\}$, we have $|Y'_i| = |Y_i|$ and $|Y'_j| = |Y_j|$, and hence $|Y'_i| |Y'_j| = |Y_i| |Y_j|$.
2. We have $\sum_{j \in [t] \setminus \{r, s\}} (|Y'_j| |Y'_r| + |Y'_j| |Y'_s|) = \sum_{j \in [t] \setminus \{r, s\}} |Y_j| (|Y_r| + 1 + |Y_s| - 1) = \sum_{j \in [t] \setminus \{r, s\}} (|Y_j| |Y_r| + |Y_j| |Y_s|)$.
3. We have $|Y'_r| |Y'_s| < |Y_r| |Y_s|$. To see this, notice that $|Y'_r| |Y'_s| = (|Y_r| + 1)(|Y_s| - 1) = |Y_r| |Y_s| - |Y_r| + |Y_s| - 1 < |Y_r| |Y_s|$, where the last inequality holds because $|Y_r| \geq |Y_s|$ as $r < s$ and $|Y_1| \geq |Y_2| \geq \dots \geq |Y_t|$.

We thus have

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{1 \leq i < j \leq t} |Y'_i| |Y'_j| &= |Y'_r| |Y'_s| + \sum_{j \in [t] \setminus \{r, s\}} (|Y'_j| |Y'_r| + |Y'_j| |Y'_s|) + \sum_{i, j \in [t] \setminus \{r, s\}} |Y'_i| |Y'_j| \\ &< |Y_r| |Y_s| + \sum_{j \in [t] \setminus \{r, s\}} (|Y_j| |Y_r| + |Y_j| |Y_s|) + \sum_{i, j \in [t] \setminus \{r, s\}} |Y_i| |Y_j| \\ &= \sum_{1 \leq i < j \leq t} |Y_i| |Y_j|, \end{aligned}$$

which is a contradiction. \triangleleft

We have thus shown that for each t , the partition $\{X_1^t, X_2^t, \dots, X_t^t\}$ is optimal. *While this shows that our algorithm is correct and thus completes the proof of the lemma, we can improve our algorithm as follows.* In Step 2, we need not go over all possible choices of t between $\lceil n/\gamma_2 \rceil$ and $\lfloor n/\gamma_1 \rfloor$; we will argue that an optimal solution is obtained at $t = \lceil n/\gamma_2 \rceil$. That is, we will prove that

$$\sum_{1 \leq i < j \leq \lceil n/\gamma_2 \rceil} |X_i^{\lceil n/\gamma_2 \rceil}| |X_j^{\lceil n/\gamma_2 \rceil}| = \min_{\lceil n/\gamma_2 \rceil \leq t \leq \lfloor n/\gamma_1 \rfloor} \sum_{1 \leq i < j \leq t} |X_i^t| |X_j^t|. \quad (\blacklozenge\blacklozenge\blacklozenge)$$

Observe that the following claim implies Equation $(\blacklozenge\blacklozenge\blacklozenge)$.

\triangleright **Claim 68.** For each integer t with $\lceil n/\gamma_2 \rceil \leq t \leq \lfloor n/\gamma_1 \rfloor - 1$, we have $\sum_{1 \leq i < j \leq t} |X_i^t| |X_j^t| \leq \sum_{1 \leq i < j \leq t+1} |X_i^{t+1}| |X_j^{t+1}|$.

Proof. For each t with $\lceil n/\gamma_2 \rceil \leq t \leq \lfloor n/\gamma_1 \rfloor$, let $h(t) = \sum_{1 \leq i < j \leq t} |X_i^t| |X_j^t|$. Now fix t such that $\lceil n/\gamma_2 \rceil \leq t \leq \lfloor n/\gamma_1 \rfloor - 1$. We will show that $h(t) \leq h(t+1)$. Observe first that $n \leq t\gamma_2$. Consider the partitions $X_1^t, X_2^t, \dots, X_t^t$ and $X_1^{t+1}, X_2^{t+1}, \dots, X_{t+1}^{t+1}$ of $V(G)$ that our algorithm constructs. Notice that we must have $|X_{t+1}^{t+1}| = \gamma_1$ for our algorithm would not

assign a vertex to X_{t+1}^{t+1} in Step 2.2.2 as $n \leq t\gamma_2$. For every $j \in [t]$, as $|X_j^{t+1}| \leq |X_j^t|$, we also assume without loss of generality that $X_j^{t+1} = X_j^t \setminus X_{t+1}^{t+1}$.

Now, to prove that $h(t) \leq h(t+1)$, we calculate the difference $h(t+1) - h(t)$ and show that this quantity is at least 0. And to calculate $h(t+1) - h(t)$, notice that we only need to account for the contribution of edges incident with X_{t+1}^{t+1} to both $h(t)$ and $h(t+1)$; as for the other edges, notice that as $X_j^{t+1} = X_j^t \setminus X_{t+1}^{t+1}$ for every $j \in [t]$, each edge not incident with X_{t+1}^{t+1} contributes equally to both $h(t)$ and $h(t+1)$. In what follows, we will use the fact that X_{t+1}^{t+1} is the disjoint union of the t sets $X_{t+1}^{t+1} \cap X_j^t$ for all $j \in [t]$, and therefore, $\gamma_1 = |X_{t+1}^{t+1}| = \sum_{j \in [t]} |X_{t+1}^{t+1} \cap X_j^t|$.

Let us first compute the number of edges that contribute 1 to $h(t+1)$ and 0 to $h(t)$. Notice that each such edge has exactly one endpoint in X_{t+1}^{t+1} . In particular, the edge is between X_{t+1}^{t+1} and X_j^{t+1} for some $j \in [t]$. As noted above, X_{t+1}^{t+1} is the disjoint union of $(X_{t+1}^{t+1} \cap X_j^t)$ and $\bigcup_{i \in [t] \setminus \{j\}} X_{t+1}^{t+1} \cap X_i^t$. Notice also that each edge between $X_{t+1}^{t+1} \cap X_j^t$ and X_j^{t+1} contributes 1 to $h(t+1)$ and 0 to $h(t)$. And the number of such edges is $|X_{t+1}^{t+1} \cap X_j^t| \cdot |X_j^{t+1}|$. As for the remaining edges between X_{t+1}^{t+1} and X_j^{t+1} , notice that each such edge is between $X_{t+1}^{t+1} \cap X_i^t \subseteq X_i^t$ and $X_j^{t+1} \subseteq X_j^t$ for some $i \in [t] \setminus \{j\}$, and each such edge contributes 1 to both $h(t)$ and $h(t+1)$. Thus the number of edges that contribute 1 to $h(t+1)$ and 0 to $h(t)$ is precisely

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{j \in [t]} |X_{t+1}^{t+1} \cap X_j^t| \cdot |X_j^{t+1}| &\geq \gamma_1 \cdot \sum_{j \in [t]} |X_{t+1}^{t+1} \cap X_j^t| && \text{(because } |X_j^{t+1}| \geq \gamma_1) \\ &= \gamma_1 \cdot |X_{t+1}^{t+1}| \\ &= \gamma_1^2. \end{aligned}$$

Let us now compute the number of edges that contribute 1 to $h(t)$ and 0 to $h(t+1)$. Notice that each such edge has both its endpoints in X_{t+1}^{t+1} . To compute the contribution of such edges to $h(t)$, notice that for every distinct pair $i, j \in [t]$, each edge between $X_{t+1}^{t+1} \cap X_i^t$ and $X_{t+1}^{t+1} \cap X_j^t$ contributes exactly 1 to $h(t)$, and the number of such edges is exactly $|X_{t+1}^{t+1} \cap X_i^t| \cdot |X_{t+1}^{t+1} \cap X_j^t|$. The only remaining edges with both endpoints in X_{t+1}^{t+1} are those with both their endpoints in $X_{t+1}^{t+1} \cap X_i^t$ for some $i \in [t]$, and each such edge contributes exactly 0 to $h(t)$. Thus the number of edges that contribute 0 to $h(t+1)$ and 1 to $h(t)$ is precisely

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{1 \leq i < j \leq t} |X_{t+1}^{t+1} \cap X_i^t| \cdot |X_{t+1}^{t+1} \cap X_j^t| &\leq \frac{1}{2} \left(\sum_{j \in [t]} |X_{t+1}^{t+1} \cap X_j^t| \right)^2 \\ &= \frac{1}{2} (|X_{t+1}^{t+1}|)^2 \\ &= (1/2)\gamma_1^2, \end{aligned}$$

where the first inequality holds because $\sum_{1 \leq i < j \leq t} 2x_i x_j \leq \left(\sum_{j \in [t]} x_j \right)^2$ for any non-negative numbers x_1, x_2, \dots, x_t . We have thus shown that $h(t+1) - h(t) \geq \gamma_1^2 - (1/2)\gamma_1^2 \geq 0$, and therefore $h(t+1) \geq h(t)$. \triangleleft

Claim 68 implies Equation ($\blacklozenge\blacklozenge\blacklozenge$), which in turn implies that in Step 2 of our algorithm, we need to compute $\sum_{1 \leq i < j \leq t} |X_i^t| |X_j^t|$ for only $t = \lceil n/\gamma_2 \rceil$. \blacktriangleleft

Observe that we can use the algorithm of Lemma 66 to solve CCCD when the input graph is a cluster graph; we simply invoke the algorithm of Lemma 66 on each connected component of G . We thus have the following corollary.

► **Corollary 69.** *CCCD is polynomial-time solvable on cluster graphs.*

In light of Corollary 69, it is straightforward to design an FPT algorithm for CCCD on general graphs. Recall that a graph G is a cluster graph if and only if G does not contain P_3 as an induced subgraph. So, given an instance $(G, k, \gamma_1, \gamma_2)$ of CCCD, we branch on induced P_3 s until the graph becomes P_3 -free and then invoke Corollary 69. We now formally describe our algorithm, which we call Algo-CCCD.

Algo-CCCD. Given an instance $(G, k, \gamma_1, \gamma_2)$ of CCCD, we do as follows.

Step 1: If G is a cluster graph, then we use the algorithm of Corollary 69 to solve the problem.

Step 2: If Step 1 is not applicable and $k > 0$, then we greedily find an induced P_3 , say uvw (i.e., $uv, vw \in E(G)$ and $uw \notin E(G)$) and recursively call Algo-CCCD on the two instances $(G - uv, k - 1, \gamma_1, \gamma_2)$ and $(G - vw, k - 1, \gamma_1, \gamma_2)$.

Step 3: If the previous two steps are not applicable, then G is not a cluster graph and $k = 0$, and we return that $(G, k, \gamma_1, \gamma_2)$ is a no-instance.

Observe that Algo-CCCD runs in time $2^k n^{\mathcal{O}(1)}$. In each execution of Step 2, we make 2 recursive calls, and we recurse only until k becomes 0, and hence we make at most 2^k recursive calls. All the other steps of the algorithm take only polynomial time. This completes the proof of Theorem 65.

5 Conclusion

We introduced new variants of the widely studied CLUSTER EDITING problem, and designed single-exponential time FPT algorithms and polynomial kernels for them. These results add to a growing body of literature on algorithms for clustering under size or balance constraints. Our work triggers several questions for future research. First, while our kernel for the completion version has $\mathcal{O}(k)$ vertices, our kernels for the deletion and editing versions have $\mathcal{O}(k^4)$ and $\mathcal{O}(k^3)$ vertices, respectively. Can we design $\mathcal{O}(k)$ kernels for these problems as well? Second, it is known that CLUSTER EDITING and CLUSTER DELETION do not admit sub-exponential time FPT algorithms unless the Exponential Time Hypothesis (ETH) fails [40]. This lower bound applies to BCD and BCC as well. But the case of BCC is open: Can we design a sub-exponential time FPT algorithm for BCC or prove that such an algorithm does not exist unless ETH fails? We must add that Remark 47 at least indicates that a sub-exponential time FPT-approximation may be within our reach. Third, can we extend our results to similar edge modification problems under balance constraints, for example, the bipartite counterpart of CLUSTER EDITING, called BICLUSTER EDITING [31, 55] and generalizations of CLUSTER EDITING such as s -PLEX CLUSTER EDITING [32]? Fourth, apart from these theoretical questions, it would be interesting to evaluate the practical competitiveness of our algorithms, particularly the efficacy of the reduction rules that we use in our kernelization algorithms on real-world or synthetic instances.

References

- 1 Faisal N. Abu-Khzam. On the complexity of multi-parameterized cluster editing. *J. Discrete Algorithms*, 45:26–34, 2017.
- 2 Akanksha Agrawal, Tanmay Inamdar, Saket Saurabh, and Jie Xue. Clustering what matters: Optimal approximation for clustering with outliers. In *AAAI*, pages 6666–6674. AAAI Press, 2023.

- 3 Nir Ailon, Moses Charikar, and Alantha Newman. Aggregating inconsistent information: Ranking and clustering. *J. ACM*, 55(5):23:1–23:27, 2008.
- 4 Tim Althoff, Adrian Ulges, and Andreas Dengel. Balanced clustering for content-based image browsing. In *Informatiktage*, pages 27–30, 2011.
- 5 Manuel Aprile, Matthew Drescher, Samuel Fiorini, and Tony Huynh. A tight approximation algorithm for the cluster vertex deletion problem. *Math. Program.*, 197(2):1069–1091, 2023.
- 6 Sayan Bandyapadhyay, Fedor V. Fomin, Petr A. Golovach, Nidhi Purohit, and Kirill Simonov. Lossy kernelization of same-size clustering. *Theory Comput. Syst.*, 67(4):785–824, 2023.
- 7 Nikhil Bansal, Avrim Blum, and Shuchi Chawla. Correlation clustering. *Mach. Learn.*, 56(1-3):89–113, 2004.
- 8 Amir Ben-Dor, Ron Shamir, and Zohar Yakhini. Clustering gene expression patterns. *J. Comput. Biol.*, 6(3/4):281–297, 1999.
- 9 Sebastian Böcker. A golden ratio parameterized algorithm for cluster editing. *J. Discrete Algorithms*, 16:79–89, 2012.
- 10 Sebastian Böcker and Jan Baumbach. Cluster editing. In *CiE*, volume 7921 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 33–44. Springer, 2013.
- 11 Sebastian Böcker, Sebastian Briesemeister, Quang Bao Anh Bui, and Anke Truß. A fixed-parameter approach for weighted cluster editing. In *APBC*, volume 6 of *Advances in Bioinformatics and Computational Biology*, pages 211–220. Imperial College Press, 2008.
- 12 Sebastian Böcker, Sebastian Briesemeister, and Gunnar W. Klau. Exact algorithms for cluster editing: Evaluation and experiments. *Algorithmica*, 60(2):316–334, 2011.
- 13 Paul S. Bradley, Kristin P. Bennett, and Ayhan Demiriz. Constrained k-means clustering. *Microsoft Research, Redmond*, 20(0):0, 2000.
- 14 Yixin Cao and Jianer Chen. Cluster editing: Kernelization based on edge cuts. In *IPEC*, volume 6478 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 60–71. Springer, 2010.
- 15 Moses Charikar, Venkatesan Guruswami, and Anthony Wirth. Clustering with qualitative information. *J. Comput. Syst. Sci.*, 71(3):360–383, 2005.
- 16 Jianer Chen and Jie Meng. A 2k kernel for the cluster editing problem. *J. Comput. Syst. Sci.*, 78(1):211–220, 2012.
- 17 Christophe Crespelle, Pål Grønås Drange, Fedor V. Fomin, and Petr A. Golovach. A survey of parameterized algorithms and the complexity of edge modification. *Comput. Sci. Rev.*, 48:100556, 2023.
- 18 Marek Cygan, Fedor V. Fomin, Lukasz Kowalik, Daniel Lokshtanov, Dániel Marx, Marcin Pilipczuk, Michal Pilipczuk, and Saket Saurabh. *Parameterized Algorithms*. Springer, 2015.
- 19 Marek Cygan and Marcin Pilipczuk. Exact and approximate bandwidth. *Theor. Comput. Sci.*, 411(40-42):3701–3713, 2010.
- 20 Absalom E. Ezugwu, Abiodun M. Ikotun, Olaide Nathaniel Oyelade, Laith Mohammad Abualigah, Jeffrey O. Agushaka, Christopher I. Eke, and Andronicus Ayobami Akinyelu. A comprehensive survey of clustering algorithms: State-of-the-art machine learning applications, taxonomy, challenges, and future research prospects. *Eng. Appl. Artif. Intell.*, 110:104743, 2022.
- 21 Michael R. Fellows. The lost continent of polynomial time: Preprocessing and kernelization. In *IWPEC*, volume 4169 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 276–277. Springer, 2006.
- 22 Michael R. Fellows, Michael A. Langston, Frances A. Rosamond, and Peter Shaw. Efficient parameterized preprocessing for cluster editing. In *FCT*, volume 4639 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 312–321. Springer, 2007.
- 23 Fedor V. Fomin, Petr A. Golovach, and Nidhi Purohit. Parameterized complexity of categorical clustering with size constraints. *J. Comput. Syst. Sci.*, 136:171–194, 2023.
- 24 Fedor V. Fomin, Stefan Kratsch, Marcin Pilipczuk, Michal Pilipczuk, and Yngve Villanger. Tight bounds for parameterized complexity of cluster editing with a small number of clusters. *J. Comput. Syst. Sci.*, 80(7):1430–1447, 2014.

- 25 Jacob Fox, Tim Roughgarden, C. Seshadhri, Fan Wei, and Nicole Wein. Finding cliques in social networks: A new distribution-free model. *SIAM J. Comput.*, 49(2):448–464, 2020.
- 26 Vincent Froese, Leon Kellerhals, and Rolf Niedermeier. Modification-fair cluster editing. In *AAAI*, pages 6631–6638. AAAI Press, 2022.
- 27 M. R. Garey and David S. Johnson. Complexity results for multiprocessor scheduling under resource constraints. *SIAM J. Comput.*, 4(4):397–411, 1975.
- 28 Jens Gramm, Jiong Guo, Falk Hüffner, and Rolf Niedermeier. Automated generation of search tree algorithms for hard graph modification problems. *Algorithmica*, 39(4):321–347, 2004.
- 29 Jens Gramm, Jiong Guo, Falk Hüffner, and Rolf Niedermeier. Graph-modeled data clustering: Exact algorithms for clique generation. *Theory Comput. Syst.*, 38(4):373–392, 2005.
- 30 Jiong Guo. A more effective linear kernelization for cluster editing. *Theor. Comput. Sci.*, 410(8-10):718–726, 2009.
- 31 Jiong Guo, Falk Hüffner, Christian Komusiewicz, and Yong Zhang. Improved algorithms for bicluster editing. In *TAMC*, volume 4978 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 445–456. Springer, 2008.
- 32 Jiong Guo, Christian Komusiewicz, Rolf Niedermeier, and Johannes Uhlmann. A more relaxed model for graph-based data clustering: s-plex cluster editing. *SIAM J. Discret. Math.*, 24(4):1662–1683, 2010.
- 33 Sushmita Gupta, Pallavi Jain, Saket Saurabh, and Nimrod Talmon. Even more effort towards improved bounds and fixed-parameter tractability for multiwinner rules. In *IJCAI*, pages 217–223. ijcai.org, 2021.
- 34 Gregory Z. Gutin and Anders Yeo. (1,1)-cluster editing is polynomial-time solvable. *Discret. Appl. Math.*, 340:259–271, 2023.
- 35 Lars W. Hagen and Andrew B. Kahng. New spectral methods for ratio cut partitioning and clustering. *IEEE Trans. Comput. Aided Des. Integr. Circuits Syst.*, 11(9):1074–1085, 1992.
- 36 Godfrey H Hardy and Srinivasa Ramanujan. Asymptotic formulæ in combinatory analysis. *Proceedings of the London Mathematical Society*, 2(1):75–115, 1918.
- 37 Leon Kellerhals, Tomohiro Koana, André Nichterlein, and Philipp Zschoche. The PACE 2021 parameterized algorithms and computational experiments challenge: Cluster editing. In *IPEC*, volume 214 of *LIPICs*, pages 26:1–26:18. Schloss Dagstuhl - Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik, 2021.
- 38 Donald E. Knuth. *The Art of Computer Programming, Volume 4A: Combinatorial Algorithms, Part 1*. Pearson Education, 2014.
- 39 Tomohiro Koana, Christian Komusiewicz, and Frank Sommer. Exploiting $\$c\$$ -closure in kernelization algorithms for graph problems. *SIAM J. Discret. Math.*, 36(4):2798–2821, 2022.
- 40 Christian Komusiewicz and Johannes Uhlmann. Cluster editing with locally bounded modifications. *Discret. Appl. Math.*, 160(15):2259–2270, 2012.
- 41 O. Erhun Kundakcioglu and Saed Alizamir. Generalized assignment problem. In *Encyclopedia of Optimization*, pages 1153–1162. Springer, 2009.
- 42 Ying Liao, Huan Qi, and Weiqun Li. Load-balanced clustering algorithm with distributed self-organization for wireless sensor networks. *IEEE sensors journal*, 13(5):1498–1506, 2012.
- 43 Weibo Lin, Zhu He, and Mingyu Xiao. Balanced clustering: A uniform model and fast algorithm. In *IJCAI*, pages 2987–2993. ijcai.org, 2019.
- 44 Daniel Lokshantov and Dániel Marx. Clustering with local restrictions. *Inf. Comput.*, 222:278–292, 2013.
- 45 Mikko I. Malinen and Pasi Fränti. Balanced k-means for clustering. In *S+SSPR*, volume 8621 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 32–41. Springer, 2014.
- 46 Robert T. Moenck. Practical fast polynomial multiplication. In *SYMSACC*, pages 136–148. ACM, 1976.
- 47 John H. Morris, Leonard Apeltsin, Aaron M Newman, Jan Baumbach, Tobias Wittkop, Gang Su, Gary D Bader, and Thomas E Ferrin. clustermaker: a multi-algorithm clustering plugin for cytoscape. *BMC bioinformatics*, 12(1):1–14, 2011.

- 48 Fábio Protti, Maise Dantas da Silva, and Jayme Luiz Szwarcfiter. Applying modular decomposition to parameterized cluster editing problems. *Theory Comput. Syst.*, 44(1):91–104, 2009.
- 49 Ron Shamir, Roded Sharan, and Dekel Tsur. Cluster graph modification problems. *Discret. Appl. Math.*, 144(1-2):173–182, 2004.
- 50 Fengjun Shang and Yang Lei. An energy-balanced clustering routing algorithm for wireless sensor network. *Wireless Sensor Network*, 2(10):777, 2010.
- 51 Dekel Tsur. Faster parameterized algorithm for cluster vertex deletion. *Theory Comput. Syst.*, 65(2):323–343, 2021.
- 52 Vijay V. Vazirani. *Approximation algorithms*. Springer, 2001.
- 53 David P. Williamson and David B. Shmoys. *The Design of Approximation Algorithms*. Cambridge University Press, 2011.
- 54 Tobias Wittkop, Dorothea Emig, Sita Lange, Sven Rahmann, Mario Albrecht, John H Morris, Sebastian Böcker, Jens Stoye, and Jan Baumbach. Partitioning biological data with transitivity clustering. *Nature methods*, 7(6):419–420, 2010.
- 55 Mingyu Xiao and Shaowei Kou. A simple and improved parameterized algorithm for bicluster editing. *Inf. Process. Lett.*, 174:106193, 2022.
- 56 Dongkuan Xu and Yingjie Tian. A comprehensive survey of clustering algorithms. *Annals of Data Science*, 2:165–193, 2015.

A NP-hardness of BALANCED CLUSTER COMPLETION

To show that BCC is NP-hard, we use a reduction due to Froese et al. [26], which shows that a related problem called CLUSTER TRANSFORMATION BY EDGE ADDITION is NP-hard. In CLUSTER TRANSFORMATION BY EDGE ADDITION, we are given a cluster graph G and a non-negative integer k , and we have to decide if we can add *exactly* k edges to G in such a way that the resulting graph is also a cluster graph. Froese et al. [26] showed that CLUSTER TRANSFORMATION BY EDGE ADDITION is NP-hard by designing a reduction from a problem called NUMERICAL 3D-MATCHING. We will argue that this reduction also shows the NP-hardness of BCC. Below, we reproduce the reduction from [26] and outline its correctness.

In NUMERICAL 3D-MATCHING, which is known to be strongly NP-hard [27], we are given positive integers $t, a_1, a_2, \dots, a_n, b_1, b_2, \dots, b_n$ and c_1, c_2, \dots, c_n , and we have to decide if there exist bijections $\alpha, \beta, \gamma : [n] \rightarrow [n]$ such that $a_{\alpha(i)} + b_{\beta(i)} + c_{\gamma(i)} = t$ for every $i \in [n]$. We reduce NUMERICAL 3D-MATCHING to BCC. Informally, the reduction works as follows. Given an instance of NUMERICAL 3D-MATCHING, we construct a cluster graph G by introducing a “small” clique corresponding to each a_i , a “medium” clique corresponding to each b_i and a “large” clique corresponding to each c_i . We set k appropriately so that the only way we can turn G into a 0-balanced cluster graph by adding at most k is by merging together one small clique, one medium clique and one large clique.

Consider an instance $I = (t, (a_i)_{i \in [n]}, (b_i)_{i \in [n]}, (c_i)_{i \in [n]})$ of NUMERICAL 3D-MATCHING. As the problem is strongly NP-hard, we assume without loss of generality that $a_i, b_i, c_i \leq n^d$ for some constant d . We also assume that $t > a_i, b_i, c_i$ for every $i \in [n]$ and that $\sum_{i \in [t]} a_i + b_i + c_i = nt$, as otherwise I is clearly a no-instance.

We construct an instance (G, k, η) of BCC as follows. First of all, we set $\eta = 0$. Now, let $A = n^{2d}$, $B = n^{3d}$ and $C = n^{7d}$. For $i \in [n]$, let $a'_i = a_i + A$, $b'_i = b_i + B$ and $c'_i = c_i + C$, and we add three cliques of sizes a'_i, b'_i and c'_i to G ; we call these cliques small, medium and large, respectively. For convenience, we refer to these cliques by their sizes; for example, we may refer to the clique a'_i . Let $t' = t + A + B + C$, and we set

$$k = n \binom{t'}{2} - |E(G)| = n \binom{t'}{2} - \sum_{i \in [n]} \left(\binom{a'_i}{2} + \binom{b'_i}{2} + \binom{c'_i}{2} \right).$$

We now argue that I is a yes-instance of NUMERICAL 3D-MATCHING if and only if (G, k, η) is a yes-instance of BCC. The forward direction is straightforward. Assume that I is a yes-instance, and let $\alpha, \beta, \gamma : [n] \rightarrow [n]$ be bijections such that $a_{\alpha(i)} + b_{\beta(i)} + c_{\gamma(i)} = t$ for every $i \in [n]$. Then the cluster graph G' obtained from G by merging the three cliques $a'_{\alpha(i)}, b'_{\beta(i)}$ and $c'_{\gamma(i)}$ for each $i \in [n]$ is 0-balanced. And it is straightforward to verify that $|E(G') \setminus E(G)| = k$.

The backward direction is more involved. Assume that (G', k, η) is a yes-instance of BCC, and let $F \subseteq \binom{V(G)}{2}$ be a solution for (G, k, η) . As $\eta = 0$, the cluster graph $G + F$ is 0-balanced. To show that I is a yes-instance, we use the following sequence of arguments.

1. For $n \geq 3$ and $d \geq 1$, we have $n^{10d+1} \leq k \leq 2n^{d+1}$ [26, Lemma 7].
2. As a consequence, no two large cliques can be merged together, because each large clique has size $\Omega(C) = \Omega(n^{7d})$, and merging together two large cliques needs the addition of $\Omega(n^{14})$ edges [26, Lemma 8].
3. This implies that the graph $G + F$ has at least n components (one corresponding to each large clique of G).

4. As $G + F$ is 0-balanced, we must merge each small clique and each medium clique with a large clique. To see this, notice that the total number of vertices in all the small and medium cliques together is $\sum_{i \in [n]} (a'_i + b'_i) = \sum_{i \in [n]} (a_i + A + b_i + B) = nA + nB + \sum_{i \in [n]} (a_i + b_i) = \mathcal{O}(n^{2d+1} + n^{3d+1} + n^{d+1}) = \mathcal{O}(n^{3d+1})$, whereas each large clique has size $\Omega(C) = \Omega(n^{7d})$. Item 2 now implies that each small clique is merged with exactly one large clique, and similarly each medium clique is merged with exactly one large clique.
5. Items 3 and 4 together imply that $G + F$ has exactly n components.
6. As $|G + F| = |G| = \sum_{i \in [n]} (a'_i + b'_i + c'_i) = \sum_{i \in [n]} (a_i + A + b_i + B + c_i + C) = n(A + B + C + t) = nt'$, and $G + F$ is 0-balanced with exactly n components, we can conclude that each component of $G + F$ has size exactly t' .
7. But then, as $t' = t + A + B + C = t + n^{2d} + n^{3d} + n^{7d}$ and $t \leq 3n^d$, each component of $G + F$ must be formed by merging together one small, one medium and one large clique [26, Lemma 13]. In other words, there exist bijections $\alpha', \beta', \gamma' : [n] \rightarrow [n]$ such that for each $i \in [n]$, we have $a'_{\alpha'(i)} + b'_{\beta'(i)} + c'_{\gamma'(i)} = t'$.
8. Based on Item 7, it is straightforward to argue that I is a yes-instance [26, Proof of Theorem 6]. For each $i \in [n]$, we have $a_{\alpha'(i)} + b_{\beta'(i)} + c_{\gamma'(i)} = a'_{\alpha'(i)} - A + b'_{\beta'(i)} - B + c'_{\gamma'(i)} - C = t' - A - B - C = t$. This shows that I is a yes-instance of NUMERICAL 3D-MATCHING.