

The Primal Pathwidth SETH

Michael Lampis  

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

Abstract

Motivated by the importance of dynamic programming (DP) in parameterized complexity, we consider several fundamental fine-grained questions, such as the following representative examples: (i) can DOMINATING SET be solved in time $(3 - \varepsilon)^{\text{pw}} n^{O(1)}$? (where pw is the pathwidth of the input graph) (ii) can COLORING be solved in time $\text{pw}^{(1-\varepsilon)\text{pw}} n^{O(1)}$? (iii) can a short reconfiguration between two size- k independent sets be found in time $n^{(1-\varepsilon)k}$? Such questions are well-studied: in some cases the answer is No under the SETH, while in others coarse-grained lower bounds are known under the ETH. Even though questions such as the above seem “morally equivalent” as they all ask if a simple DP can be improved, the problems concerned have wildly varying time complexities, ranging from single-exponential FPT to XNLP-complete.

This paper’s main contribution is to show that, despite their varying complexities, these questions are not just morally equivalent, but in fact they are the same question in disguise. We achieve this by putting forth a natural complexity assumption which we call the Primal Pathwidth-Strong Exponential Time Hypothesis (PP-SETH) and which states that 3-SAT cannot be solved in time $(2 - \varepsilon)^{\text{pw}} n^{O(1)}$, for any $\varepsilon > 0$, where pw is the pathwidth of the primal graph of the input CNF formula. We then show that numerous fine-grained questions in parameterized complexity, including the ones above, are *equivalent* to the PP-SETH, and hence to each other. This allows us to obtain sharp fine-grained lower bounds for problems for which previous lower bounds left a constant in the exponent undetermined, but also to increase our confidence in bounds which were previously known under the SETH, because we show that breaking any one such bound requires breaking *all* (old and new) bounds; and because we show that the PP-SETH is more plausible than the SETH. More broadly, our results indicate that PP-SETH-equivalence is a meta-complexity property that cuts across traditional complexity classes, because it exactly captures the barrier impeding progress not only for problems solvable in time $c^k n^{O(1)}$ (such as 3-SAT itself), but also for problems which are considerably harder.

In more detail, we show that all of the following are equivalent to falsifying the PP-SETH:

1. Single-exponential FPT problems: solving k -COLORING in time $(k - \varepsilon)^{\text{pw}} n^{O(1)}$ or $(2^k - 2)^{\text{lcw}} n^{O(1)}$, for any $k \geq 3$, where lcw is the linear clique-width; solving DISTANCE- d -INDEPENDENT SET in time $(d - \varepsilon)^{\text{pw}} n^{O(1)}$, for any $d \geq 2$; solving DISTANCE- r -DOMINATING SET in time $(2r + 1 - \varepsilon)^{\text{pw}} n^{O(1)}$ for any $r \geq 1$; solving SET COVER in time $(2 - \varepsilon)^{\text{pw}} n^{O(1)}$.
2. Super-exponential FPT problems: solving COLORING in time $\text{pw}^{(1-\varepsilon)\text{pw}} n^{O(1)}$; solving C_4 -HITTING SET in time $(\sqrt{2} - \varepsilon)^{\text{pw}^2} n^{O(1)}$. For the latter problem we give an algorithm tightly matching this complexity.
3. XNLP-complete problems: solving LIST COLORING in time $n^{(1-\varepsilon)\text{pw}}$; finding a short word accepted by k n -state DFAs in time $n^{(1-\varepsilon)k}$; finding a short reconfiguration sequence between two size- k independent sets of an n -vertex graph in time $n^{(1-\varepsilon)k}$.

We argue that the PP-SETH is a plausible assumption by showing that it is implied not only by the SETH, but also by a maximization version of the k -Orthogonal Vectors Assumption (itself a consequence of the SETH) and by the Set Cover Conjecture, whose relation to the SETH is a major open problem. Hence, lower bounds which were previously known under the SETH, such as those of point 1 above, are now shown to also be implied by these conjectures.

2012 ACM Subject Classification Theory of computation \rightarrow Parameterized complexity and exact algorithms

Keywords and phrases SETH, Pathwidth, Parameterized Complexity, Fine-grained Complexity

Funding This work was supported by ANR project ANR-21-CE48-0022 (S-EX-AP-PE-AL).

Contents

1	Introduction	3
1.1	Background and Motivation	3
1.2	Summary of results	4
1.3	Overview of techniques	9
1.4	Previous work	11
1.5	Discussion and Directions for Further Work	13
2	Preliminaries	14
3	Robustness	16
3.1	Robustness for SAT	17
3.1.1	Lemmas Needed for Theorem 5	18
3.2	Equivalence for Larger Alphabets	23
3.3	CSPs with Monotone Multi-assignments	28
4	Evidence	34
4.1	Orthogonal Vectors	35
4.2	Subset Sum and Set Cover Conjecture	36
5	Single-exponential FPT problems	38
5.1	Coloring	41
5.2	Independent Set and Scattered Set	44
5.3	Set Cover	48
5.4	Dominating Set	49
6	Super-exponential FPT problems	53
6.1	Coloring	53
6.2	Hitting 4-cycles	56
7	XNLP-complete problems	67
7.1	List Coloring Parameterized by Pathwidth	69
7.2	DFA and NFA intersection	75
7.3	Independent Set Reconfiguration	79

1 Introduction

1.1 Background and Motivation

Our goal in this paper is to provide a better answer to the following question: “Are current parameterized algorithms based on dynamic programming over linear structures optimal?”. Before we explain how we attack this question, let us briefly review why this question is important and summarize some known results.

Dynamic Programming (DP) is a standard algorithm design technique and one of the most important tools in the parameterized algorithms toolbox. Its central role in this setting stems mainly from the fact that when we are dealing with an NP-hard graph problem and the parameter is a graph width, such as treewidth, pathwidth, or clique-width, we can very often obtain an FPT algorithm with running time $f(k)n^{O(1)}$ by a routine application of DP (see the corresponding chapter of [17]). Indeed, for many such problems we even obtain $c^k n^{O(1)}$ time algorithms, where c is a constant. Because of the wide applicability (and relative simplicity) of dynamic programming, it is a question of central interest to parameterized complexity whether the algorithms we obtain in this way are best possible. Indeed, this question has been extensively studied, so in order to summarize what is currently known, let us focus on a specific concrete problem, COLORING (we give a more extensive review of known results further below).

On the algorithmic side, COLORING is often used as a first example of the DP technique for tree decompositions. The standard algorithm needs to remember the color of each vertex of a bag. This means that, for fixed $k \geq 3$, k -COLORING can be solved in time $k^{\text{tw}}n^{O(1)}$; when k is part of the input COLORING can be solved in time $\text{tw}^{\text{tw}}n^{O(1)}$ (because $k \leq \text{tw} + 1$ without loss of generality); and when each vertex has an arbitrary list of available colors, a variant known as LIST COLORING, the algorithm runs in time $n^{\text{tw}+O(1)}$. Despite the different running times, these results are just three manifestations of the same algorithm.

Is the above algorithm optimal? It is widely believed that the answer is yes in all three cases, even if we replace treewidth by the more restrictive parameter pathwidth, but this is known with varying degrees of precision. When $k \geq 3$ is a fixed constant, Lokshtanov, Marx, and Saurabh [50] established that no $(k - \varepsilon)^{\text{pw}}n^{O(1)}$ algorithm exists, assuming the Strong Exponential Time Hypothesis (SETH). For the other two cases, it is known that under the ETH, we cannot obtain algorithms with running times $\text{pw}^{o(\text{pw})}n^{O(1)}$ and $n^{o(\text{pw})}$ respectively [51, 26]. The problem is thus only approximately resolved in the latter two cases (because the lower bounds leave an unspecified constant in the exponent) but very well-understood for constant k , albeit by relying on a strong complexity assumption.

The concrete example of COLORING exemplifies the state of the art in this area, where much work has been expended in investigating whether “simple” (and not so simple) DP algorithms are optimal. By now much has been clarified, but at least three specific weaknesses in the state of the art can be identified, which we summarize in three points as follows:

1. There is a lack of fine-grained lower bounds for harder problems.
2. The SETH is too strong.
3. All reductions are one-way.

Let us explain what we mean by these points. Regarding the first point, we mention that COLORING is typical of the state of the art in the following sense: for problems whose complexity is $c^w n^{O(1)}$, where w is a graph width and c a fixed constant, the pioneering work of [50] has spawned a long line of research which has managed to obtain lower bounds under the SETH which exactly match the constant c in the best algorithm. Unfortunately,

a similar fine-grained undertaking is currently severely lacking in the literature both for FPT problems where the parameter dependence is more than single-exponential and for XP problems. Instead, what is typically known for such problems, as we saw for the example of COLORING, are ETH-based lower bounds which at best match the complexity of the best algorithm only up to an unspecified constant in the exponent. This is clearly not as satisfactory as a fine-grained tight lower bound.

Regarding the second point, it is worth mentioning that the SETH is a hypothesis that is quite strong and currently not universally believed to hold, so it is certainly part of our motivation to base our lower bounds on a more plausible hypothesis. However, another way to see that the SETH is too strong is that it implies lower bounds for parameters so restricted that the matching algorithm is not DP, but a much simpler branching algorithm (this was recently investigated thoroughly by Esmer, Focke, Marx, and Rzazewski [25]). This means that if the question we care about is whether DP algorithms are optimal, the SETH does not provide the “right” answer (or, as [25] put it, the “real source of hardness”). We would therefore prefer to replace the SETH with a better hypothesis.

Finally, the third point is a larger weakness of modern (fine-grained) complexity theory, where unlike classical complexity theory, we rarely manage to classify problems in complexity classes, but rather usually give one-way reductions from a handful of accepted hypotheses. In our setting this is particularly disappointing, because simple DP algorithms on tree and path decompositions can be seen as facets of one global algorithm, as exemplified by the example of COLORING given above. One would naturally expect that improving upon this global algorithm for one problem should mean something for the others. However, in the current state of the art, obtaining, say a $(3 - \varepsilon)^{pw} n^{O(1)}$ algorithm for 3-COLORING would falsify the SETH, but is not known to imply anything about any other problem – in particular, even for other cases of COLORING, such an algorithm is not known to imply a faster algorithm when k is part of the input, or even when $k = 4$.

To summarize, the claim that current DP algorithms are optimal could become more convincing if (i) we were able to extend the strong precise lower bounds which are currently known for the narrow case of problems solvable in single-exponential FPT time to wider domains where DP is applied (ii) we were able to replace the SETH with a more plausible and more appropriate source of hardness and (iii) if we were able to show that the questions we care about form an equivalence class, as this would tie all lower bounds together and lessen the importance of the complexity assumption on which hardness is based.

1.2 Summary of results

In this paper we focus on parameterized DP algorithms that work on linear structures, notably (but not exclusively) path decompositions. We revisit the question of whether such algorithms are optimal. Our goal is to confirm that the answer is yes and provide fine-grained lower bounds tightly matching the performance of the best algorithms while addressing the three weak points we mentioned above. For this reason we put forth the following complexity hypothesis:

► **Conjecture 1 (PP-SETH).** *For all $\varepsilon > 0$ we have the following: there exists no algorithm which takes as input a 3-SAT instance ϕ on n variables and a path decomposition of its primal graph of width pw and correctly decides if ϕ is satisfiable in time $(2 - \varepsilon)^{pw} n^{O(1)}$.*

To give a brief idea of what we hope to achieve using the PP-SETH, let us take another look at our running example of COLORING. Among the results we present, we will prove that the following are *equivalent* to falsifying the PP-SETH: (i) obtaining, for some $k \geq 3$,

a $(k - \varepsilon)^{pw} n^{O(1)}$ algorithm for k -COLORING (ii) obtaining a $pw^{(1-\varepsilon)pw} n^{O(1)}$ algorithm for COLORING (iii) obtaining a $n^{(1-\varepsilon)pw}$ algorithm for LIST COLORING. Hence the PP-SETH will allow us to obtain new sharp bounds for cases where only ETH-based bounds were known; and to strengthen an existing SETH-based lower bound, by basing it on a more plausible hypothesis and showing that it is equivalent to the other lower bounds.

Our results are a clear improvement to the state of the art because (i) even though our hypothesis involves a single-exponential FPT problem, we are able to obtain fine-grained bounds for FPT problems with super-exponential parameter dependence and even for non-FPT (XNLP-complete) problems (ii) the PP-SETH is exactly as strong as it needs to be to obtain our bounds, and we show that it is probably much more plausible than the SETH (iii) all (new and old) lower bounds form an equivalence class, which makes them more convincing because disproving one is as hard as disproving all of them.

Importantly, a message of this work is that PP-SETH-equivalence cuts across traditional complexity classes, in the sense that (as we show) improving upon the best algorithms for some XNLP-complete problem, such as LIST COLORING, is both necessary and sufficient to improve upon the best algorithms for some FPT problems, such as COLORING or k -COLORING (for parameter pathwidth). Thus, the PP-SETH appears to be a natural complexity hypothesis that deserves significant further study because it exactly captures the fundamental question “Can simple DP algorithms over linear structures be improved even by a small amount?”, above and beyond what is captured by traditional complexity classes.

We choose to focus on linear structures (e.g. pathwidth rather than treewidth) for several reasons: First, linear structures are where “simple” DP algorithms are often expected to be optimal; for tree-like structures, even for basic problems (e.g. DOMINATING SET parameterized by treewidth), much more sophisticated techniques such as Fast Subset Convolution are needed to obtain the best algorithm (see the corresponding chapter of [17]). Therefore, we expect the study of these questions for linear parameters to be more fruitful. Second, DP over linear structures arises naturally in contexts unrelated to graph width parameters – indeed in Section 7 we identify two natural PP-SETH-equivalent questions where the parameter has nothing to do with graph decompositions – and we find it interesting that the PP-SETH is flexible enough to capture such cases. Third, since we care chiefly about proving lower bounds, sharpening or strengthening lower bounds for linear parameters, such as pathwidth, as we do in this paper, has the immediate benefit that the same improvements carry over to the more general case of tree-like parameters, such as treewidth and clique-width.

Let us now outline the results presented in this paper in more detail.

Robustness. Since the PP-SETH will be the main tool we use to unify our lower bounds, we begin our investigation by looking more closely at our formulation of the hypothesis. For this, it is important to recall that one particularly annoying aspect of the SETH is that the hypothesis appears to be very sensitive to small perturbations of its definition. For instance, the standard formulation is that for all $\varepsilon > 0$ there exists an arity q such that q -SAT cannot be solved in time $(2 - \varepsilon)^n$ [39, 40]; making the same assumption for SAT for unbounded arity is, as far as is known, a more believable but possibly not equivalent assumption; while changing the order of quantification (stating “there exists q such that for all $\varepsilon > 0 \dots$ ”) makes the hypothesis false. Similarly, it is not known whether formulating the same hypothesis for MAX-SAT (instead of SAT) renders it strictly more plausible or whether the statement remains equivalent. Even worse, the hypothesis that MAX-3-SAT is impossible to solve in time $(2 - \varepsilon)^n$ is itself also consistent with the state of the art and sometimes used as an alternative starting point for reductions (e.g. in [25]), without having

a clear relation to the SETH.

A first contribution of this paper is to show that, thankfully, the PP-SETH does not suffer from the same drawbacks, because even non-trivial perturbations of its formulation do not actually change the hypothesis. More precisely, we consider (i) allowing clauses of unbounded arity (SAT vs 3-SAT) (ii) bounding the number of occurrences of each variable (iii) optimization versions that seek to maximize the number of satisfied clauses or the weight of a satisfying assignment or both (iv) parameterizing by the pathwidth of the *incidence* graph, instead of the primal graph. No matter which combination of these variations one selects, we show that the PP-SETH remains equivalent to the original version. As we explain below, this is particularly important for the parameterization by the incidence pathwidth, because this will allow us to place domination and covering type problems in the same complexity class. Furthermore, we give equivalent formulations of the PP-SETH pertaining to Constraint Satisfaction Problems (CSPs) with non-binary alphabets. These prove invaluable in simplifying the reductions we will need to prove that various problems are harder than the PP-SETH. These results are presented in Section 3.

Supporting Evidence. The above immediately show that the PP-SETH is implied by the SETH, despite the fact that we have formulated it for 3-SAT (and not SAT). We strengthen this observation by showing that the PP-SETH is also implied by two other well-known complexity hypotheses: the k -Orthogonal Vectors Assumption (k -OVA) and the Set Cover Conjecture (SCC). The k -OVA is a known implication of the SETH and is generally considered a slightly more believable assumption, while the Set Cover Conjecture does not currently have any known relation to the SETH and indeed proving an implication in either direction is a major open problem. These results, which we present in Section 4, indicate that the PP-SETH is perhaps quite a bit more believable than the SETH.

Single-Exponential FPT Problems. Our results up to this point set up the PP-SETH as a solid foundation for establishing lower bounds. The obvious first target is then to consider problems with complexity of the same flavor as 3-SAT parameterized by pathwidth, that is, single-exponential in the parameter. These are problems for which tight SETH-based lower bounds are typically known. Our results, presented in Section 5, are that *each* of the following would be *equivalent* to falsifying the PP-SETH:

1. Obtaining, for some $k \geq 3, \varepsilon > 0$, an algorithm for k -COLORING running in $(k - \varepsilon)^{\text{pw}} n^{O(1)}$.
2. Obtaining, for some $k \geq 3, \varepsilon > 0$, an algorithm for k -COLORING running in time $(2^k - 2 - \varepsilon)^{\text{lcw}} n^{O(1)}$, where lcw is the input graph's linear clique-width.
3. Obtaining, for some $d \geq 2, \varepsilon > 0$, an algorithm for d -SCATTERED SET running in time $(d - \varepsilon)^{\text{pw}} n^{O(1)}$. d -SCATTERED SET is the problem of selecting a maximum cardinality set of vertices at pairwise distance at least d . (For $d = 2$, this is just INDEPENDENT SET.)
4. Obtaining, for some $r \geq 1, \varepsilon > 0$, an algorithm for r -DOMINATING SET running in time $(2r + 1 - \varepsilon)^{\text{pw}} n^{O(1)}$. This is the version of DOMINATING SET where a vertex is dominated if it is at distance at most r from a selected vertex; for $r = 1$ this is just DOMINATING SET.
5. Obtaining, for some $\varepsilon > 0$, an algorithm for SET COVER running in $(2 - \varepsilon)^{\text{pw}} (n + m)^{O(1)}$. Here n is the number of elements, m the number of sets, and pw is the pathwidth of the incidence graph of the given instance.

All the above lower bounds were previously known as implications of the SETH (and in the case of SET COVER also the SCC). Our contribution here is not merely to reprove these

lower bounds under a more believable conjecture, but also to give bi-directional reductions to and from the PP-SETH, proving that in fact all the above are equivalent. For example, our results show that a $(6 - \varepsilon)^{lcw} n^{O(1)}$ algorithm for 3-COLORING is possible if and only if DOMINATING SET can be solved in time $(3 - \varepsilon)^{pw} n^{O(1)}$. Such an implication was not previously known, even though if one believed the SETH, the two bounds were both known to be optimal.

The list of problems we give here is not meant to be exhaustive. In fact, we have merely selected some of the most prominent problems to sample what it means for a lower bound to be equivalent to the PP-SETH. Our wider thesis is the following: *whenever the best algorithm is “simple DP over a linear structure”, then improving this algorithm is typically PP-SETH-equivalent*. We stress here that, if we seek lower bounds which are equivalent to and not just implied by our hypothesis, it is crucial here that we focus on *linear structures* and not tree-like structures, such as tree decompositions. Indeed, if we had performed the same investigation for the treewidth equivalent of the PP-SETH, we would have arrived at a much shorter list, as we would *not* have been able to obtain the above results for DOMINATING SET and SET COVER (we discuss this in more detail in Section 1.4).

Super-Exponential FPT Problems. Even though the results we have obtained up to this point improve our confidence that several basic DP algorithms are optimal, one could argue that they are not too surprising: 3-SAT itself has parameter dependence 2^{pw} , so it is natural that it would be interreducible with other problems with dependence 2^{pw} ; somewhat less obviously, one may also expect it to be interreducible with problems with dependence c^{pw} for other constants c . An interesting aspect of the PP-SETH, however, is that its reach goes further than the class of problems that admit such algorithms. In particular, we prove that the following are equivalent to falsifying the PP-SETH:

1. Obtaining, for some $\varepsilon > 0$, an algorithm for COLORING running in time $pw^{(1-\varepsilon)pw} n^{O(1)}$.
2. Obtaining, for some $\varepsilon > 0$, an algorithm for C_4 -HITTING SET running in time $(\sqrt{2} - \varepsilon)^{pw^2} n^{O(1)}$.

Here, C_4 -HITTING SET is the problem of deleting the minimum number of vertices to destroy all cycles of length 4 in a graph. Both bounds are tight, in the sense that we can obtain algorithms with running times $pw^{pw} n^{O(1)}$ and $2^{\frac{pw^2}{2} + O(pw)} n^{O(1)}$ respectively. However, prior to this work, only coarse-grained ETH-based lower bounds were known, implying that no algorithms exist with complexities $pw^{o(pw)} n^{O(1)}$ and $2^{o(pw^2)} n^{O(1)}$ respectively [51, 60]. We stress here that it is not possible to obtain the new bounds simply by taking the existing reductions and plugging in a stronger hypothesis (e.g. the SETH in place of the ETH). Indeed, even if one believes the SETH, it was previously an open problem whether, for instance, COLORING can be solved in time $pw^{0.99pw} n^{O(1)}$ (we explain this in more detail in Section 1.4). We are able to rule out such improvements by presenting new reductions, which need to be significantly more efficient than existing ones and, especially in the case of the latter problem, become as a result much more technically involved.

XNLP-complete Problems. Encouraged by the previous results, we take a high-level view of the PP-SETH as a conjecture that states that simple DP cannot be improved upon, independent of the time complexity of the algorithm. Put this way, it becomes tempting to apply this conjecture even to problems which are not FPT (under standard assumptions). We therefore move on to study three problems which are complete for the class XNLP and hence strongly suspected not to be FPT: LIST COLORING parameterized by pathwidth,

BOUNDED- k -DFA INTERSECTION, and SHORT- k -INDEPENDENT SET RECONFIGURATION, parameterized by k . Our results, presented in Section 7, show that each of the following are equivalent to falsifying the PP-SETH:

1. Obtaining, for some $\varepsilon > 0$, an algorithm which solves LIST COLORING in time $O(n^{(1-\varepsilon)\text{pw}})$, for sufficiently large pw.
2. Obtaining, for some $\varepsilon > 0, p > 4$, an algorithm which solves LIST COLORING on instances of pathwidth p in time $O(n^{p-4-\varepsilon})$.
3. Obtaining, for some $\varepsilon > 0$, an algorithm which solves BOUNDED- k -DFA INTERSECTION in time $n^{(1-\varepsilon)k} \cdot \ell^{O(1)}$, for sufficiently large k , where ℓ is the length of the desired string.
4. Obtaining, for some $\varepsilon > 0, k > 1$, an algorithm which solves BOUNDED- k -DFA INTERSECTION in time $n^{k-\varepsilon} \cdot \ell^{O(1)}$.
5. Obtaining, for some $\varepsilon > 0$, an algorithm which solves SHORT- k -INDEPENDENT SET RECONFIGURATION in time $n^{(1-\varepsilon)k} \cdot \ell^{O(1)}$, for sufficiently large k , where ℓ is the length of the reconfiguration sequence.
6. Obtaining, for some $\varepsilon > 0, k > 3$, an algorithm which solves SHORT- k -INDEPENDENT SET RECONFIGURATION in time $n^{k-1-\varepsilon} \cdot \ell^{O(1)}$.

Here, BOUNDED- k -DFA INTERSECTION is the problem where we are given k DFAs with n states and an integer ℓ and are asked whether there exists a string of length at most ℓ accepted by all the DFAs; while SHORT- k -INDEPENDENT SET RECONFIGURATION is the problem where we are given two size- k independent sets of an n -vertex graph and an integer ℓ and are asked if there is a sequence of length at most ℓ that transforms one to the other, exchanging at each step a vertex in the set with a vertex outside, while keeping the set independent at all times.

Let us first explain the (somewhat less fine-grained) forms of the lower bounds given in points 1,3, and 5. All three problems admit algorithms of the form $n^{k+O(1)}$ via some kind of DP: for LIST COLORING this is the DP algorithm over path decompositions we have already mentioned, while for the other two problems the algorithm constructs a graph of n^k vertices (the intersection DFA or the configuration graph) and solves reachability in that graph. The lower bounds therefore state that if we assume the PP-SETH the coefficient of k in the exponent of these algorithms is exactly correct. In fact, obtaining an algorithm with complexity of the form $n^{0.99k}$ is both necessary and sufficient for disproving all lower bound results we have discussed so far. This is perhaps striking, because we tightly link the complexities of problems which are FPT on one hand and XNLP-complete on the other and, to the best of our knowledge, it is uncommon for such bi-directional relationships to be known for problems that belong in distinct complexity classes.

Going further, it is worth highlighting that we are able to obtain even more fine-grained bounds in this case, as given in points 2, 4, and 6. To see what we mean, consider the less ambitious question of whether for one of the problems we can obtain an algorithm running in, say, time $n^{k-\varepsilon}$, that is, we seek to improve the constant by an additive, rather than a multiplicative amount. Surprisingly, the answer can be yes: we show that for the independent set reconfiguration problem, there is an algorithm which uses fast matrix multiplication and runs in time $O(n^{k-3+\omega} \cdot \ell)$, where ω is the matrix multiplication constant. Hence, when we are looking for *short* reconfigurations (say, $\ell = n^{o(1)}$), we can save a factor of at least $n^{0.7}$ over the trivial n^k algorithm – and indeed if $\omega = 2$ we even arrive at n^{k-1} . Can the PP-SETH say something interesting about modest improvements of this type?

We respond to this question affirmatively by showing that under the PP-SETH it is not just impossible to improve the above algorithm for independent set reconfiguration and the

trivial algorithm for DFA intersection by a multiplicative constant; in fact even an additive constant shaved off the exponent is *equivalent* to falsifying the PP-SETH. As a consequence, our lower bounds are extremely sharp for these two problems. Furthermore, they imply that improving the basic algorithm by either a multiplicative or an additive constant in the exponent are actually the same question, which a priori does not seem obvious (why should an $n^{k-1.01}\ell^{O(1)}$ algorithm necessarily imply an $n^{0.999k}\ell^{O(1)}$ algorithm?). We are able to obtain a similar equivalence for LIST COLORING, albeit without so precisely determining the minimum additive constant improvement which triggers a falsification of the PP-SETH (we can, however, state that under the PP-SETH, the best algorithm for this problem has complexity somewhere between n^{p+1} and n^{p-4}).

1.3 Overview of techniques

Let us now briefly review the main tools we use to establish our results.

Robustness. For the results of Section 3, establishing that different variants of SAT are equivalent to each other, most reductions are straightforward and the main challenge is to organize the (numerous) variations considered. Similarly, to establish that the PP-SETH is equivalent to its natural version for CSPs with non-binary alphabets, it is sufficient to use techniques extending those for the corresponding version of the SETH given in [46]. However, things become more complicated in Section 3.3 where we consider a promise CSP that will be invaluable later. Roughly speaking, we consider here CSP instances where we are also given a path decomposition of the primal graph and an assignment may be allowed to cheat by flipping the value of a variable between bags. This is of course too powerful, so we focus on cheating assignments which must be monotone (that is, they can only increase values as we move along the decomposition) and consistent for some small set of variables. What we need is to establish that it is hard to distinguish two cases: there is a normal satisfying assignment; no satisfying assignment exists, even if we cheat in the way described. Though this type of problem may seem artificial, these are exactly the kind of properties we need to be able to adapt SETH-based reductions to PP-SETH-based reductions in Section 5. Thus, the main challenge of Section 3 is establishing that this promise problem is hard under the PP-SETH (Corollary 18).

Supporting evidence. We present two reductions to SAT, showing that if the PP-SETH were false (that is, we had a fast SAT algorithm) we would obtain algorithms falsifying the other conjectures. For the reduction from the k -ORTHOGONAL VECTORS problem, we construct a SAT instance with $k \log n$ main variables, which are meant to contain the k indices of the selected vectors. We then need to add some machinery to encode the instance, but the pathwidth of the produced formula is still roughly $k \log n$, meaning that an algorithm that falsifies the PP-SETH would solve k -ORTHOGONAL VECTORS in time $(2 - \varepsilon)^{k \log n} = n^{(1-\delta)k}$. For the reduction from the SCC we actually go through SUBSET SUM. It is known that solving SUBSET SUM with target value t and n items in time $t^{1-\varepsilon}n^{O(1)}$ would falsify the conjecture [16]. We encode such an instance with a SAT formula, where a series of tn variables encodes the value of the sum after we have considered each item. Since each sum only depends on the previous sum, the pathwidth is (essentially) t , and a fast SAT algorithm falsifies the SCC.

Single-Exponential FPT Problems. For each considered problem we need to supply reductions to and from the PP-SETH. Showing that if the PP-SETH is false we obtain faster

algorithms is straightforward in most cases, though we must stress here once again that the fact that the PP-SETH remains equivalent if defined for the incidence graph is crucial (otherwise, it would be hard to encode SET COVER and related problems). For the converse direction, we need to reduce SAT, or more commonly a CSP with an appropriate alphabet size, to our corresponding problem. It now becomes critical that we have shown that the promise CSP version discussed above is a valid starting point, because this makes it vastly easier to prove correctness for our gadgets (we explain this in more detail in Section 3.3 and Section 5). Although we often reuse the basic constructions from existing SETH-based reductions, several of our reductions are considerably simplified, compared to the original version, thanks to the preparatory work of Section 3.

Super-Exponential FPT Problems. Although much technical preparation was needed to build up to the reductions of Section 5, we had the good fortune of being able to recycle numerous problem-specific gadgets from previous reductions, because SETH-based lower bounds were already designed with a special eye for efficiency. This is no longer the case when we move to classes of problems for which only rough ETH-based lower bounds are known, such as those dealt with in Section 6. Unfortunately, adapting known reductions is not good enough to obtain our results in this case. This is true both on a high level (as we explain in Section 1.4), but also even when one considers gadget-level constructions. The reason for this is that previous bounds can afford to be a little wasteful, for instance reductions for C_4 -HITTING SET and related problems typically construct a vertex for each *literal* of a given SAT formula, rather than a vertex for each *variable* [59, 60]. This extra factor of 2 is acceptable if one does not care about the precise multiplicative constant in the exponent, but is not acceptable in our setting. We are therefore forced to redesign existing lower bounds starting from scratch, with a number of problem-specific gadgets. Thankfully, the reductions in the other direction (from our problems to SAT) are straightforward. It is worth noting that the fact that we are dealing with linear structures is again crucial: the natural DP for C_4 -HITTING SET would require Fast Subset Convolution techniques to obtain an optimal running time for tree decompositions, hence even though for pathwidth this problem is PP-SETH-equivalent, for treewidth improving the best algorithm for this problem appears harder than improving the best SAT algorithm (we discuss this in more detail in Section 1.4).

XNLP-complete Problems. Again, we need to supply reductions in both directions and for two of the three problems considered (LIST COLORING and INDEPENDENT SET RECONFIGURATION) only rough ETH-based lower bounds are known, so we need to invest some technical work to design problem-specific gadgets. The intuition of the reductions from SAT is that we want to reduce to instances where the new parameter has value k and the size of the instance is roughly $2^{\text{pw}/k}$, where pw is the pathwidth of the input CNF formula. Here, we have to be extremely careful: if the new parameter value is not k but say $k + 1$, we cannot hope to obtain a lower bound that matches the best algorithm up to the correct additive constant. Intuitively, this is why the only problem for which we fail to obtain such a super-precise bound is the one where we parameterize by pathwidth – here minor details such as the fact that the pathwidth is not equal to the size of the largest bag, but equal to that value minus one actually become important. Similarly, we have to be very careful so that the size of the graph is of the order $2^{\text{pw}/k}$ and not simply $2^{O(\text{pw}/k)}$; in particular, standard LIST COLORING gadgets, such as those used in [6] fail here, because they are inherently quadratic, and we are forced to design new ones. Interestingly, reductions in the other direction (to SAT) do not

need to be as stingy: ideally we would like to reduce an instance with parameter value k to a SAT instance with pathwidth $p = k \log n$, but achieving only $p = (k + O(1)) \log n$ or even $p = (1 + o(1))k \log n$ is good enough, because a SAT algorithm with dependence $(2 - \varepsilon)^p$ is still fast enough to give an $n^{(1-\varepsilon)k}$ algorithm for our problems (for sufficiently large k). Intuitively, this asymmetry in the rigidity of the reductions is the reason why we obtain two seemingly different versions of our lower bounds, which turn out to be equivalent.

1.4 Previous work

The results we present in this paper fall within the larger FPT and XP optimality research program, which lies at the intersection of parameterized complexity and fine-grained complexity. The goal of this program is to take problems for which the best algorithm has complexity of the form $f(k)n^{O(1)}$ (FPT) or $n^{f(k)}$ (XP) and determine precise bounds on the best function f possible. In this context, a large number of results is known assuming the Exponential Time Hypothesis (ETH) [40]. We cite as a few characteristic examples the results of [3, 10, 14, 20, 29, 30, 35, 47, 48, 51, 52, 53]. Our results are different from this line of work, because we seek more fine-grained lower bounds, that is, we do not accept to leave an unspecified constant in the exponent.

Why ETH-based bounds do not translate to our setting. An astute reader may rightfully complain here that the comparison we make between our results and the line of work on ETH-based lower bounds is unfair. Even though it is true that, say the $\text{pw}^{o(\text{pw})}n^{O(1)}$ lower bound on COLORING given in [51] is less precise than the $\text{pw}^{(1-\varepsilon)\text{pw}}n^{O(1)}$ bound we give here, this is because [51] is relying on a weaker, less fine-grained assumption, so it is natural that the obtained result is less fine-grained. One may hope that surely if we take the proof of [51] and plug in a stronger assumption (perhaps the SETH), this would give a bound as good as the one we get here.

Unfortunately, this line of reasoning is false, because this reduction (and typical reductions in this area) starts from a variant of k -CLIQUE. This is problematic not only for the practical reasons we have already discussed (e.g. the reduction must preserve k exactly and cannot afford to modify it by a multiplicative constant), nor even for the reason that the SETH is not known to imply any concrete lower bound for the complexity of k -CLIQUE; but for the simple reason that k -CLIQUE does in fact admit a non-trivial faster than brute-force algorithm with complexity $n^{\frac{\omega k}{3}}$, where ω is the matrix multiplication constant. What this means concretely is that even if we take previous reductions for COLORING [51] and LIST COLORING [26] and optimize them so that the parameter is preserved exactly, the reductions will never be able to rule out a COLORING algorithm running in $\text{pw}^{\frac{\omega \cdot \text{pw}}{3}}n^{O(1)}$ or a LIST COLORING algorithm running in $n^{\frac{\omega \cdot \text{pw}}{3}}$, because such an algorithm would at best imply a k -CLIQUE algorithm that is already known to exist. This means that the question we ask in this paper about COLORING was left unsolved by previous reductions and resolving it does require rethinking the whole approach, as we do in this paper. The same applies to previous reductions for C_4 -HITTING SET [60] and INDEPENDENT SET RECONFIGURATION [41, 55].

Closer to what we do in this paper is a line of research that tackles FPT optimality questions assuming the SETH. As mentioned, the question to determine the best base c for which various problems admit $c^k n^{O(1)}$ algorithms, for various parameters, started with [50]. Since then, numerous such results have been found, with some examples being given in the following works: [9, 15, 27, 28, 31, 37, 38, 43, 54, 57]. Relatively fewer results are known based on the SETH for determining the best complexity of an XP algorithm, with a notable

exception being the classical result of Pătraşcu and Williams stating that if the SETH is true then k -DOMINATING SET cannot be solved in time $n^{k-\varepsilon}$ [58]. A similar result of this type for (a version of) the DFA intersection problem we consider in this paper was given by Oliveira and Wehar [21], who showed that if the SETH is true then this problem cannot be solved in time $n^{k-\varepsilon}$.

Why focus on pathwidth and not treewidth. Among works in this area, it is worthwhile to particularly discuss the work of Iwata and Yoshida [42], which is a major antecedent of our work. The main animating idea of [42] is to observe, exactly as we do here, that a basic weakness of SETH-based lower bounds is that reductions are one-way. Iwata and Yoshida then go on to consider the treewidth variant of the PP-SETH as a complexity hypothesis, with the goal of showing that improving the basic DP algorithm for various problems parameterized by treewidth (or clique-width) is equivalent to this hypothesis. Despite the fact that the broad thrust of their approach is exactly the same as what we attempt in this paper, the scope of the results they present is significantly more restricted: Iwata and Yoshida are able to establish equivalence to their hypothesis only for problems for which the complexity has the form $2^{\text{tw}}n^{O(1)}$ and indeed, the only such problem in their list that is not a SAT variant is MAXIMUM INDEPENDENT SET. Nevertheless, their work is a major inspiration for what we do here and some of their ideas are extended and reused in the reductions of Section 5. In addition to their results on treewidth, Iwata and Yoshida also consider the PP-SETH (under a different name) and give a Cook-Levin type theorem proving that falsifying the PP-SETH is equivalent to the problem of deciding whether a non-deterministic Turing machine with space $k + O(\log n)$ will accept a given input, using time $(2 - \varepsilon)^k n^{O(1)}$. They call EPNL the class of FPT problems solvable by such a machine. This result fits nicely in the picture we present, as it gives further evidence that the PP-SETH is a natural complexity hypothesis.

At this point an interested reader may be wondering, given that the main idea we build upon in this work was already present in [42], why are the results of [42] so much more limited than the results we present in this paper? In particular, why does [42] cover only problems with complexity $c^{\text{tw}}n^{O(1)}$, only for $c = 2$, while we are able to extend the reach of the PP-SETH all the way to XNLP-complete problems? A partial answer is that we rely on numerous (sometimes problem-specific) technical ingredients, some of them introduced here (see Section 1.3) and some of them existing in the literature but introduced after [42]. This considerable machinery allows us to deal with bases $c > 2$ and with problems of higher complexity. However, we do not want to leave the answer at that, because there is an important point to be made here regarding our choice to focus on pathwidth.

Recall that one of the results we present in Section 5 is that solving SET COVER in time $(2 - \varepsilon)^{\text{pw}}n^{O(1)}$ is equivalent to falsifying the PP-SETH. This problem has a nice round complexity which superficially looks like it would be a good target for [42], but is still conspicuously absent from their results. We claim that the reason for this goes much deeper than missing technical machinery: rather, what is relevant here is that the best DP algorithm for SET COVER parameterized by treewidth is *not* “simple”, but relies on Fast Subset Convolution techniques. It is far from clear whether a faster than brute-force SAT algorithm could be useful to speed up such an algorithm, because such techniques rely on solving a counting problem, indicating that to improve upon this complexity we would need a fast algorithm for #SAT or perhaps \oplus SAT. This phenomenon is actually wide-spread and covers other famous and not so famous problems parameterized by treewidth (e.g. DOMINATING SET and C_4 -HITTING SET). As a result, if we were working with a treewidth variant of the PP-SETH, as Iwata and Yoshida did, it would have been impossible to obtain equivalence

for these problems (barring some algorithmic breakthrough), because for treewidth even these basic problems do not fit in the paradigm of “simple DP”. We therefore now see why it is important that in Section 3 we are able to prove that the PP-SETH remains equivalent if the parameter is the incidence pathwidth – the same does not seem likely to happen for treewidth, because again the best algorithm for SAT parameterized by incidence treewidth needs Fast Subset Convolution. This discussion indicates that the PP-SETH is in a sense the more fruitful hypothesis, explains in part the wide reach of our results, and justifies our choice to focus on linear structures.

Finally, moving to less fine-grained previous work, we mention a recent series of works, starting with [6], that studies the class XNLP, previously studied (under a different name) in [24] and in a slight variation in [33]. XNLP is the set of problems decidable by a non-deterministic Turing machine using FPT time and space $f(k) \log n$. The class XNLP was recently shown to be the natural home of many $W[1]$ -hard problems for linear structural parameters, such as pathwidth and linear clique-width. Although the problems considered are directly relevant to what we do, the class XNLP has so far been studied only from a coarse-grained perspective and, since reductions inside this class are allowed to manipulate the parameter as standard FPT reductions, XNLP-hardness for a problem does not imply any concrete fine-grained running time bounds (other than fixed-parameter intractability). However, there is a close connection between the spirit of this work and this paper, because the underlying goal is to investigate the complexity of problems parameterized by a linear structure on which one normally performs DP and then give evidence that this DP algorithm is optimal.

1.5 Discussion and Directions for Further Work

A natural question that arises from this work is what happens to versions of the PP-SETH for other widths, and in particular for treewidth. Indeed, we believe that this is a very promising direction that merits further investigation, in the same way that XNLP more recently gave rise to related classes XALP and XSLP (for treewidth [5] and tree-depth respectively [7]). However, it is important to be aware of the fact that one of the obstacles likely to be faced in this direction is that, as we discussed in Section 1.4, the primal and incidence graph versions of the conjecture are not (easily) equivalent for treewidth. The intuitive reason for this is that the “obvious” DP algorithm for SAT parameterized by treewidth has parameter dependence 3^{tw} , while obtaining an algorithm with dependence 2^{tw} requires sophisticated techniques, such as fast subset convolution. We therefore expect the treewidth version of the PP-SETH to be equivalent to fewer problems than the PP-SETH.

The discussion above brings us back to the PP-SETH and the question of which natural problems parameterized by pathwidth are *not* equivalent to this hypothesis. We expect a typical example to be problems associated with the Cut&Count technique [19], because again the corresponding DP algorithms are not “simple” and rely (in addition to randomization) on solving a counting problem. As a result, the blocking point for applying the PP-SETH here is not reducing SAT to the corresponding problem in a way that preserves pathwidth, but rather reducing the corresponding connectivity problem back to SAT. It therefore seems natural to investigate the complexity of both counting and parity versions of the PP-SETH and see if these hypotheses can be shown equivalent to (counting or parity versions of) connectivity problems. This type of hypothesis is likely to be of interest also for handling techniques such as fast subset convolution, mentioned in the previous paragraph. This of course lead to the natural question: what is the relation between the PP-SETH and the parity version thereof?

More concretely, suppose we have an algorithm falsifying the PP-SETH. Does this imply any improvement in the complexity of the best algorithm for determining the parity of the number of satisfying assignments of a CNF formula, parameterized by its primal pathwidth? This seems like a challenging problem.

2 Preliminaries

We assume that the reader is familiar with the basics of parameterized complexity, as given for example in [17]. We will consider problems parameterized by structural parameters, mainly pathwidth and linear clique-width. In all cases, we are chiefly concerned with the complexity of solving the problem, not that of computing the corresponding decomposition, so we will generally assume that appropriate decompositions are supplied in the input.

Graph widths

We recall the definitions of pathwidth and linear clique-width. A path decomposition of a graph $G = (V, E)$ is an ordered sequence of bags B_1, \dots, B_t , where each B_j for $j \in [t]$ is a subset of V , for each $xy \in E$ there exists a bag B_j with $x, y \in B_j$, and for all $x \in V$ and $j_1, j_2 \in [t]$ we have that if $x \in B_{j_1} \cap B_{j_2}$, then $x \in B_{j'}$ for all $j' \in [j_1, j_2]$. The width of a path decomposition of a graph is the maximum size of any bag minus one. The pathwidth of a graph G , denoted $\text{pw}(G)$, is the minimum width of any path decomposition. A path decomposition is *nice* if the symmetric difference of any two consecutive bags contains at most one vertex. Any path decomposition can be transformed in polynomial time into a nice path decomposition without increasing the width. We also recall the standard fact that if G contains a clique, in any decomposition there must be a bag that contains all vertices of the clique.

For an integer $k \geq 1$, a *linear clique-width expression* with k labels is a string made up of the following symbols:

1. (Introduce): $I(i)$, where $i \in [k]$
2. (Rename): $R(i \rightarrow j)$, where $i, j \in [k], i \neq j$
3. (Join): $J(i, j)$, where $i, j \in [k], i \neq j$

We can associate with each such string a graph G where each vertex is assigned a label from $[k]$ inductively as follows: (i) the empty string is associated with the empty graph (ii) for each non-empty string χ let χ' be its prefix of length $|\chi| - 1$ and G' the graph associated with χ' . Then the graph associated with χ is defined as follows: (i) if the last character of χ is $I(i)$, introduce in G' an isolated vertex with label i (ii) if the last character of χ is $R(i \rightarrow j)$, modify the labeling of G' so that all vertices with label i now have label j (iii) if the last character is $J(i, j)$, add in G' all possible edges with one endpoint with label i and the other with label j . The *linear clique-width* of a graph G , denoted $\text{lcw}(G)$, is the minimum k such that there exists a linear clique-width expression with k labels associated with some labeling of G .

Primal and Incidence Graphs

We will consider both satisfiability problems and more general constraint satisfaction problems (CSPs) over larger alphabets. The *primal graph* of such an instance is a graph that has one vertex for each variable, and an edge xy if the variables x, y appear together in some clause or

constraint. The *incidence graph* is the bipartite graph that has one vertex for each variable and each clause (or constraint) and an edge xc whenever variable x appears in constraint c .

For a SAT or CSP instance ϕ , we will denote by $\text{pw}(\phi)$ and $\text{pw}^I(\phi)$ the pathwidth of its primal and of its incidence graph respectively. We recall the standard fact that for all ϕ we have $\text{pw}^I(\phi) \leq \text{pw}(\phi) + 1$. This property is not hard to see, because in the primal graph every clause c of ϕ is a clique, therefore a path decomposition of the primal graph must contain a bag with all the variables of c . We can therefore obtain a path decomposition of the incidence graph by inserting after this bag, a copy where we also add c .

Note that the above imply that parameterizing by incidence pathwidth always produces a *harder* problem: if there is an algorithm deciding ϕ in $c^{\text{pw}^I} |\phi|^{O(1)}$, then there is an algorithm in $c^{\text{pw}} |\phi|^{O(1)}$, because $\text{pw}^I(\phi) \leq \text{pw}(\phi) + 1$.

The following lemma states that a path decomposition of the primal graph of any CNF formula can efficiently be made nice and we can injectively assign for each clause a bag that contains all its variables. The same lemma clearly holds for CSPs, because the only property we need is that for each clause (or constraint) the primal graph contains a clique on its variables.

► **Lemma 2.** *There is a linear-time algorithm that takes as input a CNF formula ψ with n variables and m clauses and a path decomposition of its primal graph of width p and outputs a nice path decomposition B_1, \dots, B_t of ψ containing at most $t = O(pm)$ bags, as well as an injective function b from the set of clauses of ψ to $[t]$ such that for each clause c , $B_{b(c)}$ contains all the variables of c .*

Proof. Assume that the initial path decomposition we have contains t' bags, numbered from left to right $B_1, \dots, B_{t'}$. For each clause c of ψ we associate a distinct bag with index $b(c)$ that contains all variables of c (note that we can easily make this association injective by repeating bags in the path decomposition). Such a bag always exists, because the variables of c form a clique in the primal graph, and it is a standard property of path decompositions that every clique must appear as a subset of a bag. It is not hard to see that a bag B_i such that there is no clause c for which $b(c) = i$ is redundant and can be removed from the decomposition. We can therefore assume that t' is equal to the number of clauses of ψ . We then make the path decomposition nice by inserting between each B_i and B_{i+1} at most $2p$ bags, so that the decomposition remains valid and we have the property that the symmetric difference of any two consecutive bags contains at most 1 variable. We renumber the bags B_1, \dots, B_t and observe that we now have at most $t' = O(pm)$ bags. ◀

The following lemma allows us to efficiently partition the variables of any CNF formula in k sets in a way that each bag is more-or-less equitably partitioned.

► **Lemma 3.** *There is a linear-time algorithm that takes as input a graph $G = (V, E)$, a nice path decomposition of G of width p , and an integer k , and outputs a partition of V into k sets V_1, \dots, V_k such that for all bags B of the decomposition and $i \in [k]$ we have $|V_i \cap B| \leq \lceil \frac{p+1}{k} \rceil$.*

Proof. We can achieve this via a simple greedy procedure: suppose that the bags of the decomposition are numbered B_0, B_1, \dots, B_t . Begin at B_0 and arbitrarily partition its (at most $p+1$) vertices into the k sets in an equitable way; consider now a bag B_j such that we have already partitioned all variables which appear in a bag before B_j . Because we have a nice path decomposition, we either have $B_j \subseteq B_{j-1}$, in which case there is nothing to do, or $B_j = B_{j-1} \cup \{v\}$. We place v into the set V_i such that $|V_i \cap B_{j-1}|$ is minimum. It is not hard to see that V_i cannot now contain more than $\lceil \frac{p+1}{k} \rceil$ variables of B_j , because otherwise $|B_{j-1} \cap V_i| \geq \lceil \frac{p+1}{k} \rceil$ for all $i \in [k]$, hence $|B_{j-1}| \geq p+1$, which would imply that $|B_j| \geq p+2$, contradiction. ◀

3 Robustness

The main topic of this paper is to investigate the implications of the PP-SETH. However, before we proceed it is natural to ask if we have formulated the hypothesis correctly. In particular, there are several other natural ways in which one may posit a hypothesis that seems “morally” the same as the PP-SETH. Our goal in this section is to explore several such variations and show that the precise choices that we make in the definition of the PP-SETH matter little. We consider this robustness as positive evidence that the PP-SETH captures a natural notion of computation and is worthy of further study.

The variations one may consider are the following: instead of 3-SAT we could formulate the PP-SETH for k -SAT for k sufficiently large, or even for SAT; we could consider maximization variants where we seek to maximize the number of satisfied clauses, or the number of True variables, or both; we could consider restrictions on the number of variable occurrences; or we could formulate any of the previous hypotheses using the pathwidth of the incidence (rather than the primal) graph as a parameter.

It is worth noting that the type of modifications we discuss are not a priori expected to be completely innocuous. Indeed, if one asks similar questions regarding the SETH, one easily arrives either at formulations of the hypothesis which are clearly false (e.g. 3-SAT can be solved significantly faster than in 2^n time) or, even worse, where it is a wide open problem whether the new version is equivalent to the original one – we state as examples that the standard formulation of the SETH is for k -SAT for k sufficiently large, but it is not known to be equivalent to the formulation for SAT, and that the corresponding assumption for MAX-SAT is considered more plausible than the SETH itself (see e.g. [1]). Given this state of the art, we consider it quite positive that the PP-SETH does not present the same drawbacks.

The first part of this section (Section 3.1) is devoted to proving that the various formulations mentioned above are equivalent to the stated form of the PP-SETH, with the results summarized in Theorem 5. Then, in Section 3.2 we consider a different reformulation choice: given that SAT can be seen as a constraint satisfaction problem over a binary alphabet, we investigate the complexity of CSPs over a larger alphabet, parameterized by the primal pathwidth. Here our motivation is more practical than philosophical: in some of the reductions we perform later we will aim to prove that the PP-SETH is equivalent to solving a problem in time $(c - \varepsilon)^k n^{O(1)}$, for c some constant and k the parameter. This type of reduction becomes quite tedious when c is not a power of 2, and indeed for many natural problems parameterized by standard parameters (pathwidth, linear clique-width, etc.) the base c often takes such values. It therefore becomes handy to have an equivalent formulation of the PP-SETH for a version of the problem where the natural running time is of the order c^{pw} , for any desired constant c . We achieve this by showing that solving CSPs of alphabet size c faster than $(c - \varepsilon)^{\text{pw}}$ is equivalent to the PP-SETH, for all $c \geq 3$. This is similar to the q -CSP- B problem, used in [46] with the same motivation.

We conclude this part in Section 3.3 where we extend our discussion of CSPs to cover a seemingly artificial promise problem, with our motivation again being strictly practical. In this setting, we consider CSP instances with two classes of variables, V_1, V_2 , where we are also supplied with a path decomposition of the primal graph in the input. The path decomposition is made up mostly of variables of V_1 – say each bag contains $O(\log n)$ variables of V_2 , so performing DP over them is not a problem. We want to decide the following promise problem: in the Yes case, the CSP instance is satisfiable as usual; while in the No case, it is not possible to satisfy it even if we “cheat” by assigning to the variables of V_1 distinct values

in different bags, but with the constraint that values must increase as we move along in the decomposition, and that variables of V_2 must be consistently assigned. The motivation for this strange version is that, as we explain in detail, for most of the reductions of Section 5 (and more generally for most SETH-based reductions for FPT problems), the state-of-the-art gadgets are only able to guarantee monotonicity, rather than consistency, in the way that CSP variables are represented. Hence, proving that this promise version of the problem is still hard (that is, solving it faster than $(B - \varepsilon)^{pw}$ falsifies the PP-SETH) will considerably simplify the reductions of Section 5, because in the converse direction we will not have to prove that our gadgets force a consistent satisfying assignment, but only a monotone one. We provide such a proof in Lemma 16 and Corollary 18 in Section 3.3.

3.1 Robustness for SAT

We consider several variations of SAT, including versions where we seek an assignment that maximizes the number of clauses satisfied, or the weight (number of True variables) of the satisfying assignment, or both. The most general version of the problem we consider is the following:

► **Definition 4.** *In the MAX- (t, w) - k -SAT problem we are given as input a k -CNF formula and two integers t, w and are asked if the formula admits an assignment that sets at least w variables to True and satisfies at least t clauses. MAX- k -SAT is the restriction of the problem when $w = 0$, while MAXW- k -SAT is the restriction of the problem where $t = m$ is the number of clauses. If we drop k from the name of a problem, this indicates that the input is a CNF formula of unbounded arity.*

The main theorem of this section is now the following:

► **Theorem 5.** *All of the following statements are equivalent to the PP-SETH (where in all cases ψ denotes the input formula).*

1. *For all $\varepsilon > 0$, 3-SAT restricted to instances where all variables appear at most 4 times cannot be solved in time $O((2 - \varepsilon)^{pw(\psi)} |\psi|^{O(1)})$.*
2. *For all $\varepsilon > 0$, MAX-2-SAT restricted to instances where all variables appear at most 16 times cannot be solved in time $O((2 - \varepsilon)^{pw(\psi)} |\psi|^{O(1)})$.*
3. *For all $\varepsilon > 0$, MAXW-3-SAT restricted to instances where all variables appear at most 4 times cannot be solved in time $O((2 - \varepsilon)^{pw(\psi)} |\psi|^{O(1)})$.*
4. *For all $\varepsilon > 0$, MAX- (t, w) -2-SAT restricted to instances where all variables appear at most 16 times cannot be solved in time $O((2 - \varepsilon)^{pw(\psi)} |\psi|^{O(1)})$.*

Furthermore, the same holds even if we modify any of the statements by making any of the following changes: we replace $pw(\psi)$ by $pw^I(\psi)$; we drop the restriction on the number of variable appearances; or we consider k -CNF formulas, for any $k \geq 3$, or CNF formulas of unbounded size.

Proof. Because we allow any combination of the mentioned modifications, this statement refers to numerous different variations of SAT. In order to organize things, we start with the four base problems given in the statement: 3-SAT, MAX-2-SAT, MAXW-3-SAT, and MAX- (t, w) -2-SAT. We observe that any of the allowed modifications can only make the considered problem harder: dropping the restriction on the number of variable appearances or the arity of clauses trivially generalizes the problem, while the inequality $pw^I(\phi) \leq pw(\phi) + 1$, which holds for any ϕ , ensures that parameterizing by incidence pathwidth is always at least as hard as by primal pathwidth.

Furthermore, we observe that if we drop the arity constraint, MAX- (t, w) -SAT is a problem that generalizes the other three problems. Furthermore, MAXW-3-SAT generalizes 3-SAT and MAX- (t, w) -2-SAT generalizes MAX-2-SAT. We have therefore arrived at a single problem which has maximal complexity among all problems considered (MAX- (t, w) -SAT without restrictions on variable occurrences, parameterized by pw^I) and two problems which have minimal complexity (3-SAT and MAX-2-SAT with the restrictions stated in the theorem). We will reduce the hardest case of MAX- (t, w) -SAT to the easiest case of 3-SAT, and then 3-SAT to the easiest case of MAX-2-SAT, using fine-grained reductions that preserve the type of algorithm we are interested in, and thus we will establish that all problems in our group have equivalent complexity and are therefore equivalent to the PP-SETH.

To ease presentation we give the claimed reductions as a collection of self-contained lemmas in Section 3.1.1. Composing Lemma 6, Lemma 7, Lemma 8, and Lemma 9 we obtain a polynomial-time algorithm that takes as input an instance ϕ of MAX- (t, w) -SAT and a path decomposition of its incidence graph of width $\text{pw}^I(\phi)$ and produces an equivalent instance ψ of 3-SAT where each variable appears at most 4 times and a path decomposition of its primal graph of width $\text{pw}^I(\phi) + O(\log |\phi|)$. As a result, solving the resulting 3-SAT instance in $((2 - \varepsilon)^{\text{pw}(\psi)} |\psi|^{O(1)})$ would produce an algorithm running in $((2 - \varepsilon)^{\text{pw}^I(\phi)} |\phi|^{O(1)})$ for the original problem. The reduction from 3-SAT to MAX-2-SAT given in Lemma 10 is just the classical reduction from [32], where we also observe that primal pathwidth is preserved. ◀

Theorem 5 shows that the PP-SETH is quite robust. Let us conclude this discussion by adding two relevant remarks. First, regarding the minimum number of variable occurrences needed to obtain hardness, we have not made an effort to optimize the constant 16 for MAX-2-SAT; the constant we obtain is a consequence of using the classical reduction of Garey, Johnson, and Stockmeyer [32]. We have, however, made an effort to optimize this constant for 3-SAT. There appears to be a natural reason why it is not easy to get this constant down to 3, which would be the expected barrier: the standard polynomial time reduction which achieves this replaces every variable x with a cycle of implications $x_1 \rightarrow x_2 \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow x_k \rightarrow x_1$. Performing this reduction then risks doubling the pathwidth, instead of increasing it by an additive constant, because in every bag where x used to appear we are likely to be forced to place two of the new variables, in order to separate the cycle. We consider it an intriguing open problem whether 3-SAT can be solved more efficiently when each variable appears at most 3 times. Second, we have only established hardness for MAXW-SAT for arity at least 3. This is because when the arity is 2 the problem is essentially MAX INDEPENDENT SET, which is handled in a different section, so the problem for arity 2 is in fact still equivalent to the PP-SETH.

3.1.1 Lemmas Needed for Theorem 5

We present here a sequence of reductions needed to prove Theorem 5. These work as follows:

1. Lemma 6 takes as input an instance of the problem where we parameterize by pw^I and seek to optimize both the weight of the selected assignment and the number of satisfied clauses. It produces an equivalent instance where we parameterize by the pathwidth of the primal graph pw and we only need to optimize the weight of the assignment (while satisfying all clauses). This is achieved by replacing clauses in the decomposition by new variables that indicate whether a clause was satisfied by a literal. The pathwidth increases by an additive constant.

2. Lemma 7 takes the previous instance and produces an equivalent instance where we are simply looking for a satisfying assignment. This is achieved by adding $n \log n$ new variables which act as counters. Pathwidth increases by $O(\log n)$.
3. Lemma 8 is just the standard reduction from SAT to 3-SAT, performed in a way that increases pathwidth by at most an additive constant.
4. Lemma 9 is a variation of the standard reduction that reduces the number of occurrences of each variable. As explained after Theorem 5 we cannot use the standard trick, as we then risk doubling the pathwidth. We use a slightly more complicated construction where each variable appears at most 4 times and pathwidth increases by at most an additive constant.
5. Lemma 10 is the standard reduction from 3-SAT to MAX-2-SAT from [32], with the observation that pathwidth increases by at most an additive constant.

► **Lemma 6.** *There exists a polynomial-time algorithm which takes as input a CNF formula ϕ and a path decomposition of its incidence graph of width p , as well as two integers t, w , and produces a CNF formula ψ , a path decomposition of the primal graph of ψ , and two integers w_1, w_2 such that we have the following:*

1. *There exists an assignment setting at least w variables of ϕ to True and satisfying at least t clauses if and only if ψ admits a satisfying assignment whose number of True variables is in the interval $[w_1, w_2]$.*
2. *The path decomposition of the primal graph of ψ has width $p + O(1)$.*

Proof. Suppose that ϕ has n variables and m clauses. We will construct ψ by taking the variables of ϕ and adding some new variables; we will then construct some clauses to represent the clauses of ϕ . Along the way, we will edit the given path decomposition, removing the clauses of ϕ and inserting into it the new variables, in a way that preserves the width and covers all new clauses.

We begin by editing the given path decomposition of the incidence graph of ϕ so that it becomes nice: if the symmetric difference of two consecutive bags B_j, B_{j+1} contains more than one element, we insert between them a sequence of bags that removes one by one the elements of $B_j \setminus B_{j+1}$ and then adds one by one the elements of $B_{j+1} \setminus B_j$. Once we do this, we number the n variables of ϕ as x_1, \dots, x_n , in such a way that for all $i_1 < i_2$ the first bag that contains x_{i_1} is before the first bag that contains x_{i_2} . Observe that this is always possible, as each bag introduces at most one new vertex. Similarly, we renumber the m clauses c_1, \dots, c_m , such that clauses with lower indices appear before clauses with higher indices in the decomposition. We now construct an injective function b from the edges of the incidence graph of ϕ to the indices of the bags of our decomposition which satisfies the following: for all $j \in [m], i_1, i_2 \in [n]$ with $i_1 < i_2$ such that c_j contains x_{i_1}, x_{i_2} , we have $b(c_j x_{i_1}) < b(c_j x_{i_2})$, that is, edges incident on variables with lower indices are mapped earlier in the decomposition. It is not hard to achieve this, because if a bag contains $\{c_j, x_{i_1}, x_{i_2}\}$ then we can make two copies of this bag and map $c_j x_{i_1}$ to the first and $c_j x_{i_2}$ to the second, while otherwise every bag that contains $\{c_j, x_{i_1}\}$ (and such a bag must exist) is before every bag containing $\{c_j, x_{i_2}\}$ by the numbering of the variables. In the remainder, suppose that the bags of the path decomposition are numbered B_1, B_2, \dots

We now do the following for each clause c_j , for $j \in [m]$. Suppose that c_j contains r variables, $x_{j_1}, x_{j_2}, \dots, x_{j_r}$. We introduce $(mn)^5$ new variables $c_{j,s}$ for $s \in \{0, \dots, (nm)^5 - 1\}$. Intuitively, the meaning of $c_{j,s}$ for $s \leq r$ is that c_j has been satisfied by one of the s variables $x_{j_1}, x_{j_2}, \dots, x_{j_s}$. We add for $s \in [r]$ the clauses $(\neg c_{j,s} \vee (\neg)x_{j_s} \vee c_{j,s-1})$, where we use the

literal $x_{j,s}$ or $\neg x_{j,s}$ that appears in c_j ; the clause $(\neg c_{j,0})$; and for $s \in \{r+1, \dots, 2n^5 - 1\}$ we add the clauses $(\neg c_{j,s} \vee c_{j,s-1})$ and $(\neg c_{j,s-1} \vee c_{j,s})$.

Observe that the clauses we have added have the following properties: fix an assignment to x_1, \dots, x_n and consider a clause c_j . If the assignment does not satisfy c_j in ϕ , then all $(mn)^5$ variables we have added must be set to False in any satisfying assignment of ψ , because all the literals involving variables x_{j_1}, \dots, x_{j_r} are falsified. If the assignment does satisfy c_j , then there is always a way to extend it to an assignment that sets at least $(mn)^5 - r > (mn)^5 - n$ of the new variables to True. Furthermore, if a $c_{j,s}$ with $s > n$ is set to True, then indeed at least $(mn)^5 - n$ of the new variables must be set to True.

To complete the construction, for each variable x_i , we introduce $(mn)^2$ new variables $x_{i,s}, \dots, x_{i,(mn)^2}$ and add the clauses $(\neg x_{i,s} \vee x_{i,s-1})$ for all $s \in \{2, \dots, n^2\}$, as well as the clause $(\neg x_{i,1} \vee x_i)$. These variables have the property that if x_i is False, all of them must be set to False.

Finally, we set $w_1 = t((mn)^5 - n) + w((mn)^2 + 1)$ and $w_2 = t(mn)^5 + n((mn)^2 + 1)$.

We have now described ψ . To describe how the path decomposition of its primal graph is constructed, begin with the path decomposition of the incidence graph of ϕ and remove all the clauses from the bags. We now need to include the new variables and cover all the newly constructed clauses. To do this, first, for each $j \in [m]$ consider clause c_j of ϕ which contains variables x_{j_1}, \dots, x_{j_r} . For each $s \in \{2, \dots, r\}$ we place variable $c_{j,s-1}$ in all bags that contained c_j in the original decomposition and have indices in the interval $[b(c_j x_{j_{s-1}}), b(c_j x_{j_s})]$. Furthermore, we place $c_{j,0}$ in bag $B_{b(c_j x_{j_1})}$ and $c_{j,r}$ in bag $B_{b(c_j x_{j_r})}$. Observe that this covers the clauses of size 3 we have constructed for c_j . To cover the remaining clauses, take the bag $B_{b(c_j x_{j_r})}$ (which contains $c_{j,r}$ and $c_{j,r-1}$), and insert after it $(mn)^5 - r$ copies, removing $c_{j,r}$ and $c_{j,r-1}$ from each. For $s \in \{r, \dots, (mn)^5 - 2\}$ we add in each bag the variables $c_{j,s}, c_{j,s+1}$. This covers all clauses added for clauses of ϕ and we observe that in all modified bags of the original decomposition we have removed one element (c_j) and added one or two elements. Furthermore, the bags where the size has increased are bags where b maps an edge incident on c_j , or newly constructed bags. Since b is an injective function, this ensures that performing this process over all $j \in [m]$ will never increase the width of the decomposition by more than 1.

To cover the variables and clauses added for variables of ϕ in the path decomposition, for each $i \in [n]$ we locate a bag that contained x_i in the decomposition of the primal graph of ϕ and insert immediately after it a sequence of $(mn)^2$ copies, adding to each a consecutive pair $x_{i,s}, x_{i,s+1}$. Again, this does not increase the width of any old bag, while new bags have at most two extra elements each. We conclude that the width of the path decomposition of the primal graph of ψ is $p + O(1)$.

To argue for correctness, for the forward direction, if we have a good assignment for ϕ , start with the same assignment for ψ . Select t of the satisfied clauses of ϕ and set the corresponding $c_{j,s}$ variables so that at least $(mn)^5 - n$ variables are set to True for each clause; for the remaining clauses set all c_j variables to False. Finally, for each $x_{i,s}$ give it the same value as x_i . It is not hard to see that this assignment is satisfying for ψ and has weight in $[w_1, w_2]$.

For the converse direction, we claim that if there is a satisfying assignment of ψ whose number of True variables is in $[w_1, w_2]$, there are exactly t clauses for which some $c_{j,s}$ variables with $s > n$ have been set to True. This is because $(t+1)((mn)^5 - n) > w_2$ and $(t-1)(mn)^5 < w_1$, for sufficiently large n, m . We now observe that if ψ has a satisfying assignment with the claimed weight, restricting the assignment to the variables of ϕ must set at least w variables to True, because $t(mn)^5 + (w-1)((mn)^2 + 1) < w_1$. ◀

► **Lemma 7.** *There exists a polynomial-time algorithm that takes as input a CNF formula ϕ and a path decomposition of its primal graph of width p , as well as two integers w_1, w_2 and outputs a CNF formula ψ and a path decomposition of its primal graph of width $p + O(\log(|\phi|))$, such that ψ is satisfiable if and only if ϕ has a satisfying assignment whose number of True variables is in the interval $[w_1, w_2]$.*

Proof. Let n be the number of variables of ϕ . Assume without loss of generality that n is a power of 2 as this can be achieved by adding dummy variables and clauses that require them to be False. Suppose that the bags of the given decomposition are numbered B_1, B_2, \dots , the decomposition is nice, and that the variables are numbered x_1, \dots, x_n in a way that variables with higher indices are introduced in later bags (this is the same as in the proof of Lemma 6 and can also be achieved using Lemma 2 and renumbering the variables in the order in which they were introduced). We will construct ψ by adding some variables and clauses to ϕ .

We now introduce $n \log n$ variables $w_{i,s}$ for $i \in [n], s \in [\log n]$. These should be thought of as counters: for a fixed i the variables $w_{i,s}$ tell us how many among the variables x_1, \dots, x_i are True in the current assignment. For each $i \in \{2, \dots, n\}$ we add clauses which for each two assignments σ, σ' to variables $w_{i-1,s}$ and $w_{i,s}$ respectively, ensure that σ, σ' cannot be selected unless σ encodes a binary number s_1 , σ' encodes a binary number s_2 , and $s_2 = s_1 + x_i$, where we interpret the boolean value of x_i as 1 if True and 0 if False. These are at most $O(n^2)$ clauses per variable, so $O(n^3)$ clauses overall. We also add clauses ensuring that $w_{1,s}$ encodes an assignment that has binary value 0 or 1, representing the value of x_1 ; and clauses that ensure that $w_{n,s}$ encodes a binary number in $[w_1, w_2]$.

This completes the construction of ψ and it is not hard to see that ψ is satisfiable if and only if ϕ had a satisfying assignment with weight in $[w_1, w_2]$.

What remains is to show that we can edit the decomposition so that we have width $p + O(\log n)$ while covering all added clauses. Let b be an injective function which for each x_i returns the index of the bag in which x_i is introduced. For $i \in \{2, \dots, n\}$ We add the variables $w_{i,s}$ in all bags with indices in the interval $[b(x_{i-1}), b(x_i)]$. We also add all variables $w_{i,1}$ in $B_{b(x_1)}$. Observe that this adds at most $2 \log n$ variables to each bag and covers all added clauses. ◀

► **Lemma 8.** *There exists a polynomial time algorithm which takes as input a CNF formula ϕ and a path decomposition of its primal graph of width p and outputs a 3-CNF formula ψ and a path decomposition of its primal graph of width $p + O(1)$, such that ϕ is satisfiable if and only if ψ is.*

Proof. As in the proof of Lemma 6 and Lemma 7 we can assume that the given path decomposition is nice, its bags are numbered B_1, B_2, \dots and that we number the variables of ϕ as x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n so that variables with higher indices are introduced in later bags (again, this can be achieved using Lemma 2 and renumbering variables in the order in which they are introduced). Furthermore, suppose we have an injective function b which takes as input a clause c_j and returns the index of a bag that contains all the literals of c_j (again, guaranteed by Lemma 2). Suppose that clauses are numbered c_1, \dots, c_m with b mapping clauses with higher indices to later bags.

We will apply the standard reduction from SAT to 3-SAT, taking care not to increase the width of the path decomposition. For each $j \in [m]$, if the arity of c_j is $k > 3$ we introduce $k - 2$ new variables $z_{j,1}, \dots, z_{j,k-2}$. Suppose that $c_j = (\ell_1 \vee \ell_2 \vee \dots \vee \ell_k)$, where the ℓ_j are literals. We replace c_j with the clauses $(\ell_1 \vee \ell_2 \vee z_{j,1}) \wedge (\neg z_{j,1} \vee \ell_3 \vee z_{j,2}) \wedge \dots \wedge (\neg z_{j,k-2} \vee \ell_k)$. It is standard that this preserves satisfiability.

What remains is to argue that we have not increased the width of the decomposition significantly. For each $j \in [m]$ for which we performed the above, if c_j has arity $k > 3$ we insert in the decomposition immediately after $B_{b(c_j)}$ another $k - 3$ bags, each containing the vertices of $B_{b(c_j)}$. We place into the first such bag $z_{i,1}, z_{i,2}$, the following bag $z_{i,2}, z_{i,3}$, and so on, covering all new clauses. Because b is injective, this will increase the size of the largest bag by at most 2. \blacktriangleleft

► **Lemma 9.** *There exists a polynomial time algorithm which takes as input a 3-CNF formula ϕ and a path decomposition of its primal graph of width p and outputs a 3-CNF formula ψ and a path decomposition of its primal graph of width $p + O(1)$, such that each variable of ψ appears at most 4 times and ϕ is satisfiable if and only if ψ is.*

Proof. We begin by invoking Lemma 2. As in the proof of Lemma 8, the bags of the decomposition are numbered B_1, B_2, \dots , the variables are numbered in the order in which they are introduced, there exists an injective function b mapping clauses to bags that contain all their variables, and clauses are numbered so that b maps clauses with higher indices to later bags.

We will construct ψ by editing ϕ and adding some new variables and clauses. For each $i \in [n]$, if x_i appears $k > 4$ times in ϕ , suppose that x_i appears in clauses $c_{i_1}, c_{i_2}, \dots, c_{i_k}$, with $i_1 < i_2 < \dots < i_k$. We introduce k new variables $x_{i,k}$ and replace x_i in c_{i_j} with $x_{i,j}$ for all $j \in [k]$. We also add $k - 1$ new variables $y_{i,s}$, for $s \in [k - 1]$. For each $s \in [k - 2]$ we add the clause $(\neg y_{i,s} \vee y_{i,s+1})$. For each $s \in [k - 1]$ we add the clause $(\neg y_{i,s} \vee x_{i,s})$. For each $s \in \{2, \dots, k\}$ we add the clause $(\neg x_{i,s} \vee y_{i,s-1})$. We also add the clauses $(\neg x_{i,1} \vee y_{i,1})$, $(\neg y_{i,k-1} \vee x_{i,k})$. The intuitive way to think about this construction is that we have a sequence of variables $x_{i,1}, y_{i,1}, x_{i,2}, y_{i,2}, \dots, y_{i,k-1}, x_{i,k}$, where each variable implies the previous one in the sequence, while each y variable implies the next y variable (and we also add the missing implications to ensure consistency for the first and last x variable). It is not hard to see that each variable appears at most 4 times in ψ if we perform this transformation exhaustively. Furthermore, since the only way to satisfy the new clauses is to give the same assignment to all $x_{i,s}$, ψ is equisatisfiable with ϕ .

What remains is to edit the path decomposition so that we cover the new clauses. For each $i \in [n]$ for which we applied the above transformation to x_i , which appeared in k clauses c_{i_1}, \dots, c_{i_k} , we do the following: remove x_i from the decomposition, since it no longer appears in the formula; for each $j \in [k]$ place $x_{i,j}$ in $B_{b(c_{i_j})}$ so that $B_{b(c_{i_j})}$ still contains all variables of c_{i_j} ; for each $j \in [k - 1]$ place $y_{i,j}$ in all bags with indices in the interval $[b(c_{i_j}), b(c_{i_{j+1}})]$. Note that this transformation may increase the size only of the bags on which b maps a clause, because the bags with indices in the interval $(b(c_{i_j}), b(c_{i_{j+1}}))$ used to contain x_i but now contain $y_{i,j}$ in its place. Since b is injective, the size of a bag $B_{b(c_j)}$ may increase at most 3 times, once for each variable of c_j . \blacktriangleleft

► **Lemma 10.** *There exists a polynomial-time algorithm that takes as input a 3-CNF formula ϕ where each variable appears at most r times and output a 2-CNF formula ψ where each variable appears at most $4r$ times and an integer t such that ϕ is satisfiable if and only if ψ has an assignment satisfying at least t variables. Furthermore, $pw(\psi) \leq pw(\phi) + 1$.*

Proof. We use the classical reduction of Garey, Johnson, and Stockmeyer [32]. Suppose we have a 3-CNF instance ϕ where each variable appears r times. For each clause $c = (\ell_1 \vee \ell_2 \vee \ell_3)$ we produce 10 clauses of size at most 2, using a new variable d_c : $\{(\ell_1), (\ell_2), (\ell_3), (d_c), (\neg \ell_1 \vee \neg \ell_2), (\neg \ell_2 \vee \neg \ell_3), (\neg \ell_1 \vee \neg \ell_3), (\ell_1 \vee \neg d_c), (\ell_2 \vee \neg d_c), (\ell_3 \vee \neg d_c)\}$. An assignment that satisfies the original clause can be extended to satisfy 7 of the new clauses, while other assignments

can satisfy at most 6, so we can compute a target number of clauses t to satisfy that is achievable if and only if the original instance is satisfiable. It is not hard to see that now each variable appears at most $4r$ times.

To bound the pathwidth of ψ recall that, given any path decomposition of ϕ we can construct an injective function that maps clauses to bags that contain all their literals (Lemma 2). For each clause c we add the variable d_c to the bag $B_{b(c)}$, and this increases the width by at most 1. ◀

3.2 Equivalence for Larger Alphabets

In this section we consider constraint satisfaction problems (CSPs) with alphabets of size larger than 2. A CSP instance over an alphabet of some fixed size $B \geq 2$ is made up of n variables which, without loss of generality, take values in $[B]$. We are given as input a collection of m constraints. Each constraint is described by an ordered tuple of the variables involved in the constraint plus a list of all the acceptable assignments to the variables that satisfy this constraint. The arity of a constraint is the number of variables involved in it. We will in general only focus on CSPs where the arity r is a fixed constant, so the space required to describe a constraint will be $O(B^r) = O(1)$. We denote by r -CSP the restriction of the CSP problem to constraints of maximum arity r .

We will also consider a slight generalization of the same problem. Suppose we are supplied with a fixed weight function $w : [B] \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$. The MAXW-CSP problem is the problem of determining whether a given CSP instance has a satisfying assignment whose total weight is at least a given target w_t . Here, when a variable is assigned a value $v \in B$, its weight is $w(v)$, and the weight of an assignment is just the sum of the weights of all the variables.

In the remainder we are chiefly concerned with the case $B \geq 3$, as for $B = 2$, 3-SAT is already a CSP with alphabet of size 2. We prove that the PP-SETH works as expected in the case of larger alphabets, even for CSPs where all constraints involve at most 2 variables.

▶ **Theorem 11.** *For each $B \geq 3$ the following statements are equivalent:*

1. *The PP-SETH is false.*
2. *There exist $\varepsilon > 0, c > 0$ and an algorithm that takes as input a 2-CSP instance ψ on alphabet $[B]$ and decides if ψ is satisfiable in time $O((B - \varepsilon)^{pw} |\psi|^c)$.*
3. *For each weight function $w : [B] \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ and arity $r \geq 2$, there exist $\varepsilon > 0, c > 0$ and an algorithm that takes as input a MAXW- r -CSP instance ψ on alphabet $[B]$ and weight function w and decides ψ in time $O((B - \varepsilon)^{pw} |\psi|^c)$.*

Proof. The implication $3 \Rightarrow 2$ is trivial, because restricting the arity and lifting the weight objective can only make the problem easier. We prove $2 \Rightarrow 1$ as Lemma 13 and $1 \Rightarrow 3$ as Lemma 14. Observe that in the statements of the two lemmas we use different formulations of the PP-SETH, which are, however, known to be equivalent by Theorem 5. ◀

Before we proceed, let us state a simple lemma that will be useful in various places and allows us to decrease the arity of any CSP with non-binary alphabet to 2.

▶ **Lemma 12.** *There is a polynomial-time algorithm that takes as input a CSP instance ψ over an alphabet of size $B \geq 3$ and outputs an equivalent 2-CSP instance ψ' over the same alphabet. Furthermore, there is a way to transform any path decomposition of the primal graph of ψ of width p to one for ψ' with width at most $p + 3$.*

Proof. We will construct ψ' by considering each constraint c of ψ of arity greater than 2 in some order, and at each step replacing c by a gadget over the variables involved in c , some new variables, and some new constraints of arity 2, such that there is a way to extend an assignment of the original variables to the new variables satisfying new constraints if and only if c was satisfied by this assignment. Doing this exhaustively will drop the arity to 2.

For each constraint c of ψ , let \mathcal{S}_c be the set of all satisfying assignments to this constraint, with $\ell_c = |\mathcal{S}_c|$. We construct ℓ_c new variables $t_{c,\sigma}$, $\sigma \in \mathcal{S}_c$, and another $\ell_c + 1$ helper variables. We place binary constraints among the $2\ell_c + 1$ new variables, so that the primal graph forms an odd cycle where no $t_{c,\sigma}$ are adjacent. We adjust these constraints to ensure that: (i) any two adjacent variables must receive distinct values (ii) $t_{c,\sigma}$ variables must receive a value in $\{1, 2, 3\}$ (iii) helper variables must receive a value in $\{1, 2\}$. For each variable x implicated in the constraint c and each $\sigma \in \mathcal{S}_c$ we add a constraint involving x and $t_{c,\sigma}$ which is always satisfied if $t_{c,\sigma}$ has value 1 or 2; while if $t_{c,\sigma}$ has value 3 this constraint is only satisfied if x receives the value dictated by σ . After performing this procedure, we remove all the old constraints and only keep the new constraints of arity 2. Note that exhaustively applying this procedure takes time polynomial in ψ , as for each constraint c we are given in the input \mathcal{S}_c .

Equivalence between ψ and ψ' is easy to see: if we have an assignment to ψ that satisfies a constraint c , it must agree with some $\sigma \in \mathcal{S}_c$; we assign value 3 to $t_{c,\sigma}$ and values 1, 2 to the other variables of the odd cycle, satisfying all new constraints. In the converse direction, since the $2\ell_c + 1$ new variables form an odd cycle, at least one variable $t_{c,\sigma}$ must have value 3. But then, the original variables involved in c must take assignment σ , which satisfies c .

To see that the pathwidth of ψ does not increase much, suppose that we start with some path decomposition of its primal graph. For each constraint c some bag must contain all variables of c . We insert in the decomposition immediately after this bag a sequence of $2\ell_c$ bags containing all the vertices of the bag plus a decomposition of the odd cycle formed by the $2\ell_c + 1$ new vertices. This process does not increase pathwidth by more than 3, because there is a path decomposition of a cycle of any length that contains 3 vertices in each bag, and because for each constraint c we can select a bag of the original decomposition containing the variables of c to perform this process. \blacktriangleleft

► **Lemma 13.** *For each $B \geq 3$, if there exist $\varepsilon > 0, c > 0$ and an algorithm that takes as input a 2-CSP instance ψ on alphabet B and decides if ψ is satisfiable in time $O((B - \varepsilon)^{pw} |\psi|^c)$, then there exist $\varepsilon' > 0, c' > 0$ such that 3-SAT on n variables can be solved in time $O((2 - \varepsilon')^{pw} n^{c'})$.*

Proof. Fix the ε, c for which we have a fast 2-CSP algorithm. We are given a 3-CNF formula ψ and a path decomposition of its primal graph of width p , on which we invoke Lemma 2 to obtain a numbering of the bags B_1, \dots, B_t , and an injective function b mapping each clause to the index of a bag that contains its variables.

We will first define positive integers γ, δ, k and a real number $\varepsilon' > 0$ such that we have the following:

$$(B - \varepsilon)^\gamma < (2 - \varepsilon')^\delta < 2^{\delta+1} < B^\gamma$$

and

$$k \leq \frac{p}{\delta} + 2$$

We will construct a 2-CSP instance ϕ that satisfies the following:

1. ϕ is satisfiable if and only if ψ is.

2. The new instance can be constructed in polynomial time.
3. We can construct a path decomposition of the new instance of width $k\gamma + O(1)$.

Before we proceed, let us explain why we obtain the lemma if we achieve the above. We will decide the 3-SAT instance by constructing the equivalent CSP instance and feeding it to the supposed algorithm. The running time will be at most $O((B - \varepsilon)^{k\gamma} |\psi|^{O(1)})$, however, $(B - \varepsilon)^{k\gamma} < (2 - \varepsilon')^{\delta k} < (2 - \varepsilon')^{p+O(1)}$, so we get the promised running time by selecting an appropriate ε' .

To see that the numbers $\gamma, \delta, k, \varepsilon'$ exist, observe that we can always select γ large enough so that $B^\gamma > 4(B - \varepsilon)^\gamma$, in particular, set $\gamma = \lceil \log_{B/(B-\varepsilon)} 4 \rceil + 1$. As a result, there exists integer δ such that $(B - \varepsilon)^\gamma < 2^\delta < 2^{\delta+1} < B^\gamma$. We now define an $\varepsilon'' > 0$ so that $2^{(1-\varepsilon'')^\delta} = (B - \varepsilon)^{\gamma/2} 2^{\delta/2}$, in particular set $\varepsilon'' = \frac{1}{2} - \frac{\gamma}{2\delta} \log(B - \varepsilon)$. Note that we do indeed have $\varepsilon'' > 0$ as $\delta > \gamma \log(B - \varepsilon) \Leftrightarrow (B - \varepsilon)^\gamma < 2^\delta$, which we know to hold. By the definition of ε'' we have $(B - \varepsilon)^\gamma < 2^{(1-\varepsilon'')^\delta} < 2^\delta$. Now set $\varepsilon' > 0$ so that $2 - \varepsilon' = 2^{(1-\varepsilon'')^\delta}$, that is, $\varepsilon' = 2 - 2^{1-\varepsilon''} > 0$. Note that $\gamma, \delta, \varepsilon'$ are absolute constants depending only on B, ε .

We now define k to be the smallest positive integer so that $\delta + 1 \geq \lceil \frac{p+1}{k} \rceil$. In particular, we have $\lceil \frac{p+1}{k-1} \rceil > \delta + 1$. We can assume without loss of generality that p is sufficiently large for k to be well-defined, as this is the interesting case. The last inequality gives $\frac{p+1}{k-1} + 1 > \delta + 1 \Leftrightarrow k < \frac{p+1}{\delta} + 1$ so $k < \frac{p}{\delta} + 2$ as desired.

Our plan is now to use Lemma 3 to partition the variables of ψ into k sets V_1, \dots, V_k , such that for all bags B_j of the decomposition we have $|B_j \cap V_i| \leq \lceil \frac{p+1}{k} \rceil \leq \delta + 1$. We will use γ CSP variables to represent the value of each group $B_j \cap V_i$. Since $2^{\delta+1} < B^\gamma$, this gives us sufficiently many CSP assignments to represent all the boolean assignments to the at most $\delta + 1$ variables of the group. We will present the reduction in two steps, where we first describe a CSP instance of arity 3γ , and then use Lemma 12 to reduce this to 2-CSP while keeping the pathwidth essentially unchanged. Let us give some more details.

We begin by fixing an injective function τ from the set $\{False, True\}^{\delta+1}$ to the set $[B]^\gamma$. Such an injective function always exists, as $2^{\delta+1} < B^\gamma$. Suppose that the bags of the decomposition are numbered B_1, \dots, B_t , the decomposition is nice, and the first bag is empty. The boolean variables are numbered y_1, \dots, y_n according to the order of their introduction in the decomposition.

1. (Variable groups): For each $i \in [k]$ and $j \in [t]$ we define γ CSP variables $x_{i,j,s}$ for $s \in [\gamma]$, meant to represent the assignment of the at most $\delta + 1$ boolean variables of the group $B_j \cap V_i$.
2. (Legal assignment): For each $i \in [k]$ and $j \in [t]$ consider every assignment σ to the γ variables $x_{i,j,s}$. If there does not exist σ' such that $\tau(\sigma') = \sigma$, then add a constraint falsified by this assignment.
3. (Consistency): For each $i \in [k]$ and $j \in [t - 1]$, consider every assignment σ_1 to the γ variables $x_{i,j,s}$ and every assignment σ_2 to the γ variables $x_{i,j+1,s}$. If there exist σ'_1, σ'_2 such that $\tau(\sigma'_1) = \sigma_1$, $\tau(\sigma'_2) = \sigma_2$, but the assignments σ'_1, σ'_2 disagree on a variable of $B_j \cap B_{j+1} \cap V_i$, add a constraint falsified by σ_1, σ_2 .
4. (Satisfaction): For each clause c of the 3-SAT instance, suppose that c uses variables from three groups $V_{i_1}, V_{i_2}, V_{i_3}$. All three variables appear in $B_{b(c)}$. For each three assignments $\sigma_1, \sigma_2, \sigma_3$ to the variables $x_{i_1,b(c),s}, x_{i_2,b(c),s}, x_{i_3,b(c),s}$ such that there exists σ'_α for which $\tau(\sigma'_\alpha) = \sigma_\alpha$, for $\alpha \in [3]$, and such that $\sigma'_1, \sigma'_2, \sigma'_3$ falsifies the clause c , add a constraint falsified by $\sigma_1, \sigma_2, \sigma_3$.

We are now almost done, except that the constraints we have added have arity at most 3γ and we would like to have constraints of arity 2. Before we deal with this, let us argue

that our reduction is correct up to this point. First, it is not hard to see that ψ is satisfiable if and only if ϕ is satisfiable: because of the constraints of step 2 we only consider CSP assignments which are in one-to-one correspondence with boolean assignments, and because of step 3 such assignments are consistent across bags. Because of the constraints of step 3 it is possible to satisfy all constraints if and only if it is possible to satisfy all clauses.

We argue that the CSP instance we have constructed so far has pathwidth $k\gamma + O(1)$. To see this, start with the same path decomposition we had for the 3-SAT instance, but place in each bag B_j the $k\gamma$ variables $x_{i,j,s}$, for $i \in [k]$ and $s \in [\gamma]$. Note that this covers constraints of steps 2 and 4. To cover constraints of step 3, consider for each $j \in [t-1]$ two consecutive bags B_j, B_{j+1} and insert between them a sequence of k bags, where at each step we first add the group of variables $x_{i,j+1,s}$ to the bag and at the subsequent bag we remove the group $x_{i,j,s}$ (that is, we are gradually transforming B_j to B_{j+1}). The largest bag has width at most $(k+1)\gamma = k\gamma + O(1)$.

Finally, to transform this to an equivalent CSP of arity 2 we invoke Lemma 12. \blacktriangleleft

► Lemma 14. *For each $B \geq 3$, and for each weight function $w : [B] \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$, if there exist $\varepsilon > 0, c > 0$ and an algorithm that solves MAXW-SAT on an instance ϕ in time $O((2-\varepsilon)^{pw}|\phi|^c)$, then there exist $\varepsilon' > 0, c' > 0$ and an algorithm that takes as input an r -CSP instance ψ on alphabet B and a target w_t and decides if ψ has a satisfying assignment of weight at least w_t in time $O((B-\varepsilon')^{pw}|\psi|^{c'})$.*

Proof. Fix the ε, c for which we have a fast algorithm for MAXW-SAT. We are given as input an r -CSP instance and a path decomposition of its primal graph of width $p = \text{pw}(\psi)$. Apply Lemma 2 to the decomposition to make it nice and obtain a function b that maps constraints of ψ to bags that contain all their variables.

We will first define positive integers γ, δ, k and a real number $\varepsilon' > 0$ such that we have the following:

$$(2-\varepsilon)^\delta < (B-\varepsilon')^\gamma < B^{\gamma+1} < 2^\delta$$

and

$$k \leq \frac{p}{\gamma} + 2$$

We will construct an instance of MAXW-SAT that satisfies the following:

1. The new instance is equivalent to the original instance.
2. The size of the new instance is polynomial in the size of the old instance.
3. We can construct a path decomposition of the new instance of width $k\delta + O(1)$.

Before we proceed, let us explain why we obtain the lemma if we achieve the above. We will decide the CSP instance by constructing the equivalent MAXW-SAT instance and feeding it to the supposed algorithm. The running time will be at most $O((2-\varepsilon)^{k\delta}|\psi|^{O(1)})$, however, $(2-\varepsilon)^{k\delta} < (B-\varepsilon')^{\gamma k} < (B-\varepsilon')^{p+O(1)}$, so we get the promised running time by selecting an appropriate c' .

To see that the numbers $\gamma, \delta, k, \varepsilon'$ exist, observe that we can always select δ large enough so that $2^\delta > B^2(2-\varepsilon)^\delta$, in particular, set $\delta = \lceil 2 \log_{2/(2-\varepsilon)} B \rceil + 1$. As a result, there exists integer γ such that $(2-\varepsilon)^\delta < B^\gamma < B^{\gamma+1} < 2^\delta$. We now define an $\varepsilon' > 0$ so that $B^{(1-\varepsilon'')\gamma} = B^{\gamma/2}(2-\varepsilon)^{\delta/2}$, in particular set $\varepsilon'' = \frac{1}{2} - \frac{\delta}{2\gamma} \log_B(2-\varepsilon)$. Note that we do indeed have $\varepsilon'' > 0$ as $\gamma > \delta \frac{\log(2-\varepsilon)}{\log B} \Leftrightarrow (2-\varepsilon)^\delta < B^\gamma$, which we know to hold. Now set $\varepsilon' > 0$ so

that $B - \varepsilon' = B^{(1-\varepsilon'')}$, that is, $\varepsilon' = B - B^{1-\varepsilon''} > 0$. Note that $\gamma, \delta, \varepsilon'$ are absolute constants depending only on B, ε .

We now define k to be the smallest positive integer so that $\gamma + 1 \geq \lceil \frac{p+1}{k} \rceil$. In particular, we have $\lceil \frac{p+1}{k-1} \rceil > \gamma + 1$. We can assume without loss of generality that p is sufficiently large for k to be well-defined, as this is the interesting case. The last inequality gives $\frac{p+1}{k-1} + 1 > \gamma + 1 \Leftrightarrow k < \frac{p+1}{\gamma} + 1$ so $k < \frac{p}{\gamma} + 2$ as desired.

Our plan is now to use Lemma 3 to partition the variables of ψ into k sets V_1, \dots, V_k , such that for all bags B_j of the decomposition we have $|B_j \cap V_i| \leq \lceil \frac{p+1}{k} \rceil \leq \gamma + 1$. We will use δ boolean variables to represent the value of each group $B_j \cap V_i$. Since $2^\delta > B^{\gamma+1}$, this gives us sufficiently many boolean assignments to represent all the assignments to the at most $\gamma + 1$ CSP variables of the group. Let us give some more details.

We begin by fixing an injective function τ from the set $[B]^{\gamma+1}$ to the set $\{False, True\}^\delta$. Such an injective function always exists, as $2^\delta > B^{\gamma+1}$. Suppose that the bags of the decomposition are numbered B_1, \dots, B_t , the decomposition is nice, and the first bag is empty. The CSP variables are numbered y_1, \dots, y_n according to the order of their introduction in the decomposition.

1. (Variable groups): For each $i \in [k]$ and $j \in [t]$ we define δ boolean variables $x_{i,j,s}$ for $s \in [\delta]$, meant to represent the assignment of the at most $\gamma + 1$ CSP variables of the group $B_j \cap V_i$.
2. (Legal assignment): For each $i \in [k]$ and $j \in [t]$ consider every assignment σ to the δ variables $x_{i,j,s}$. If there does not exist σ' such that $\tau(\sigma') = \sigma$, then add a clause falsified by this assignment.
3. (Consistency): For each $i \in [k]$ and $j \in [t-1]$, consider every assignment σ_1 to the δ variables $x_{i,j,s}$ and every assignment σ_2 to the δ variables $x_{i,j+1,s}$. If there exist σ'_1, σ'_2 such that $\tau(\sigma'_1) = \sigma_1$, $\tau(\sigma'_2) = \sigma_2$, but the assignments σ'_1, σ'_2 disagree on a variable of $B_j \cap B_{j+1} \cap V_i$, add a clause falsified by σ_1, σ_2 .
4. (Satisfaction): For each constraint c of the CSP instance, suppose that c uses $r' \leq r$ variables from r' groups $V_{i_1}, V_{i_2}, \dots, V_{i_{r'}}$. All r' variables appear in $B_{b(c)}$. For each r' assignments $\sigma_1, \sigma_2, \dots, \sigma_{r'}$ to the variables $x_{i_1, b(c), s}, x_{i_2, b(c), s}, \dots, x_{i_{r'}, b(c), s}$ such that there exist σ'_α , with $\tau(\sigma'_\alpha) = \sigma_\alpha$, for $\alpha \in [r']$, and such that $\sigma'_1, \sigma'_2, \dots, \sigma'_{r'}$ falsifies the constraint c , add a clause falsified by $\sigma_1, \sigma_2, \dots, \sigma_{r'}$.
5. (Weights): Let w_{\max} be the maximum value of the weight function. For each $j \in \{2, \dots, t\}$ such that B_j contains a variable $y_{i'}$, with $i' \in [n]$, not present in B_{j-1} , we add to the instance $(nt)^5 w_{\max}$ new variables labeled $w_{i',s}$, for $s \in [(nt)^5 w_{\max}]$. Suppose $y_{i'} \in V_i$, for $i \in [k]$. Consider every possible assignment σ to the δ variables $x_{i,j,s}$, such that there exists σ' such that $\tau(\sigma') = \sigma$, where σ' is an assignment to the variables of $V_i \cap B_j$. If σ' assigns to $y_{i'}$ a value with weight $w' \in \{0, \dots, w_{\max}\}$, construct $w_{\max}(nt)^5$ clauses which are falsified by σ and select a set of $w'(nt)^5$ variables $w_{i',s}$. Add one of each selected variable to a distinct constructed clause, and add the remaining non-selected variables *negated* one each to each remaining clause. Note that this ensures that in a satisfying assignment that agrees with σ exactly $w'(nt)^5$ of the new variables will be set to True.

If the target weight value of the given CSP instance was w_t , we set the target weight of the new instance to be $(nt)^5 w_t$. This completes the construction.

Correctness now is straightforward, because there is a one-to-one mapping between satisfying assignments of ϕ and ψ which also approximately preserves the weight. In particular, because of clauses of step 2, the assignment we give to each group $x_{i,j,s}$ must have a corresponding assignment for the variables of $V_i \cap B_j$. Because of the clauses of step

3, the assignment we extract in this way is consistent. Because of the clauses of step 4, the extracted assignment must be satisfying for both instances. Finally, in the last step, for each variable y of the CSP instance we construct a group of $(tn)^5$ variables whose assignments are forced once we fix the assignment to the group that contains y , and which contribute to the weight exactly $(tn)^5$ times as much as y contributes to the weight. Since the total contribution of all other variables is upper-bounded by their number, which is at most tn , we can infer the maximum weight of any satisfying assignment of the CSP instance by the maximum weight of the new instance divided by $(nt)^5$.

Finally, let us argue why we can obtain a path decomposition of the claimed width. For each bag B_j of the original decomposition we construct a bag containing all variables $x_{i,j,s}$, for all $i \in [k], s \in [\delta]$. This covers clauses of steps 2 and 4. To cover clauses of step 3, take two consecutive bags B_j, B_{j+1} and insert between them a sequence of k bags, at each step inserting a group $x_{i,j+1,s}$ and in the next step removing the group $x_{i,j,s}$. The maximum size of any bag up to this point is $(k+1)\delta = k\delta + O(1)$. To cover the variables and clauses of the last step, find the bag B_j where $y_{i'}$ was introduced, and insert after it $(tn)^5$ copies, each containing a distinct variable from the ones constructed in this step. ◀

3.3 CSPs with Monotone Multi-assignments

Even though our main motivation for proving Theorem 11 was that we would like to use CSP instances as starting points in our reductions of Section 5, one could argue that the question of whether CSPs over alphabets of size $B > 2$ can be solved faster than B^{pw} is a natural one, so it is good that this problem turns out to be equivalent to the PP-SETH, for all $B \geq 3$. However, we are now at a point where we will treat a CSP-related problem which, a priori, seems very artificial. Therefore, before we proceed, let us try to motivate the problem.

Most reductions which establish that a problem cannot be solved in time $(c - \varepsilon)^{\text{pw}} n^{O(1)}$ (under SETH) typically start with a problem-specific gadget: we want to reduce n -variable CSP over alphabets of size c to an instance of pathwidth (roughly) n , so we design a gadget to represent each variable of the CSP. This gadget has c distinct locally optimal configurations, one for each value of the alphabet. A common challenge now is how to propagate these choices through the construction, that is, how to ensure that if two distinct copies of the gadget are meant to represent the same variable, they must select the same local configuration.

Unfortunately, for many problems the known gadgets *do not* allow us to obtain consistency in such a strong sense, without connecting the gadgets in a way that blows up the target width. However, they often do allow us to order the gadgets in a linear fashion in a way that ensures that, even though it is possible for the optimal solution to “cheat”, flipping local configurations between consecutive copies, the cheating needs to be *monotone*. More precisely, there is some ordering of the c canonical configurations, so that we can prove that any locally optimal solution which switches between distinct configurations, must move towards a configuration that is higher in the ordering. To understand what we mean by this, recall the (by now standard) reduction proving that INDEPENDENT SET cannot be solved in $(2 - \varepsilon)^{\text{pw}}$, given by Lokshantov, Marx, and Saurabh [50] (see also [17]). In this reduction, every variable of the original instance is represented by a long path, where there are two canonical solutions: either take all odd-numbered vertices (starting from the first one), or all even-numbered vertices. It is possible for a solution to “switch” at some point, but this can only happen from a configuration of the first type, to the second type, and not vice-versa, as this would select adjacent vertices. This monotonicity property allows us to obtain consistency simply by repeating the construction a sufficiently large number of times.

This simple but ingenious trick has been reused in numerous SETH-based lower bounds (e.g. [11, 22, 23, 28, 34, 44, 45, 49]).

The challenge we face now is that the repetition trick we sketched above cannot be used to ensure consistency in our setting. We now want to reduce from a CSP instance where we keep the pathwidth constant, so any section of our construction can only represent the variables appearing in a section of the path decomposition. Repeating just this part does not help us in ensuring that a variable that appears there does not flip values in a constraint that appears outside this section; however, once we exit the section we can no longer repeat its construction, since some of the relevant variables have been forgotten. This conundrum was dealt with by Iwata and Yoshida [42] via the following method: in the beginning of each section we add $O(c \log p)$ variables which count, for each of the c configurations, how many of the gadgets (representing the p variables of a bag of the CSP) are in this configuration. At the end of each section we do the same, and we compare the two counts to make sure they are identical. The monotonicity property is crucially used here: because if some variable gadget “cheats” in the middle of the section, flipping configurations, it must assume a configuration representing a higher value, we know that if the count for the lowest value is correct, then the variables that had this value did not cheat; but then we can reapply the argument to the second value, and so on, proving that no cheating can have occurred.

Our reductions of Section 5 will rely on the strategy introduced by Iwata and Yoshida [42] sketched above. However, because it would be very tedious to reproduce this trick with problem-specific gadgets each time, we believe it is better to formalize this method through a CSP question. We therefore arrive at the following definition:

► **Definition 15.** *Suppose we have a CSP instance ψ over alphabet $[B]$, for $B \geq 2$, with variable set V , a path decomposition of its primal graph B_1, \dots, B_t , and an injective function b mapping each constraint to the index of a bag that contains all its variables. A multi-assignment is a function σ that takes as input a variable $x \in V$ and an index $j \in [t]$ such that $x \in B_j$ and returns a value in $[B]$. We will say that:*

1. *A multi-assignment σ is satisfying for ψ if for each constraint c , the assignment $\sigma_c(x) = \sigma(x, b(c))$, that is, the restriction of the multi-assignment to $b(c)$, satisfies the constraint.*
2. *A multi-assignment σ is monotone if for all $x \in V$ and $j_1 < j_2$ with $x \in B_{j_1} \cap B_{j_2}$ we have $\sigma(x, j_1) \leq \sigma(x, j_2)$.*
3. *A multi-assignment σ is consistent for $x \in V$ if for all $j_1, j_2 \in [t]$ such that $x \in B_{j_1} \cap B_{j_2}$ we have $\sigma(x, j_1) = \sigma(x, j_2)$.*

Informally, a multi-assignment to a CSP instance supplied with a path decomposition is an assignment that is allowed to cheat, assigning a distinct value to each appearance of a variable x in a bag of the decomposition. In order to call such an assignment satisfying, we only demand that for each constraint c , if we look at the values we gave to the variables in the bag $B_{b(c)}$, the constraint should be satisfied (even if some variables take other values in other bags). However, if a multi-assignment is monotone, then it cannot arbitrarily change values between distinct bags and it must instead always increase values as we move later in the decomposition.

We now present a technical lemma that captures the technique of [42] and shows that looking for monotone multi-assignments is not any easier than looking for consistent satisfying assignments.

► **Lemma 16.** *For each $B \geq 2$, there exists a polynomial time algorithm which takes as input a 4-CSP instance ψ over alphabet $[B]$, as well as a path decomposition of the primal*

graph of ψ of width p . The algorithm produces as output a new 4-CSP instance ψ' , over the same alphabet, constructed by adding variables and constraints to ψ , a path decomposition of the primal graph of ψ' , and an injective function b mapping constraints of ψ' to bags that contain all their variables, with the following properties:

1. Any satisfying assignment for ψ can be extended to a satisfying assignment for ψ' .
2. Any monotone satisfying multi-assignment for ψ' (where monotonicity is for the constructed decomposition and b) which is consistent on the new variables, is in fact consistent on all variables. Hence, its restriction to the variables of ψ satisfies ψ .
3. Each bag of the path decomposition of the primal graph of ψ' contains at most $p + 1$ variables of ψ and $O(B \log p)$ new variables.

Proof. We apply Lemma 2 to the given path decomposition to make it nice. The bags are numbered B_1, \dots, B_t and we have an injective function b that maps constraints to bags containing all their variables. Let $\rho = \lceil \log(p + 2) \rceil$ be the number of bits needed to represent every integer in $\{0, \dots, p + 1\}$.

For each $j \in [t]$ we introduce $2B(p + 1)\rho$ variables, call them $c_{i,j,v,s}^\alpha$, for $i \in [p + 1]$, $v \in [B]$, $s \in [\rho]$, and $\alpha \in \{L, R\}$. The intuitive meaning of these variables is the following: suppose that B_j contains $|B_j| \leq p + 1$ variables $x_{j_1}, x_{j_2}, \dots, x_{j_{|B_j|}}$. Then, for each $v \in [B]$, $\alpha \in \{L, R\}$, and $i \in [p + 1]$ the ρ variables $c_{i,j,v,s}^\alpha$ encode a binary number which tells us how many of the first i variables of B_j have taken value v . Therefore, for $i = p + 1$, the variables $c_{p+1,j,v,s}^\alpha$ are meant to tell us for each $v \in [B]$ how many variables of B_j have taken value v . We introduce two such groups, one for $\alpha = L$ (left) and one for $\alpha = R$ (right), because we intend to measure this twice: once immediately to the left of bag B_j and once immediately to the right. This is supposed to account for the possibility that a variable changes value in the middle of the counting phase.

To simplify presentation, assume that the variables $c_{i,j,v,s}^\alpha$ take values in $\{0, 1\}$ rather than $[B]$. This can be achieved by adding constraints ensuring that such variables only have two acceptable values in $[B]$ and then renaming these two values to $\{0, 1\}$. Furthermore, to unify presentation, define for all $j \in [t]$, $v \in [B]$, $s \in [\rho]$, $\alpha \in \{L, R\}$, a variable $c_{0,j,v,s}^\alpha$ and add constraints to ensure it takes value 0. This is consistent with our intended meaning as among the first 0 variables of B_j , 0 have taken value v .

Before we go on, let us state a useful (but trivial) technical tool for handling variables that represent binary numbers.

▷ **Claim 17.** For each $r \geq 1$, there exists a 3-CNF formula ϕ_{+1}^r with $2r$ input variables x_1, \dots, x_r and y_1, \dots, y_r and at most $2r + 1$ additional (internal) variables, which can be constructed in time polynomial in r , and which satisfies the following: $\phi_{+1}^r(x_1, \dots, x_r, y_1, \dots, y_r)$ is satisfiable, if and only if x_1, \dots, x_r represent a binary number X , y_1, \dots, y_r represent a binary number Y , and $X = Y + 1$.

Proof. Suppose that bits are ordered so that x_1, y_1 are the least significant bits. The input variables satisfy the property $X = Y + 1$ if and only if there exists $i \in [r]$ which satisfies the following: (i) $x_i = 1$ and $y_i = 0$ (ii) for all $i' < i$, $i' \in [r]$ we have $x_{i'} = 0$ and $y_{i'} = 1$ (iii) for all $i' > i$ we have $x_{i'} = y_{i'}$. If we fix an i , we can express all these constraints with $O(r)$ clauses of arity at most 2, call such a collection of clauses ϕ_i . Define now r variables z_i , $i \in [r]$. For each i we add to all clauses of ϕ_i the literal $\neg z_i$. ϕ_{+1}^r contains all clauses of each ϕ_i for $i \in [r]$.

Furthermore, we also add $r + 1$ variables w_i for $i \in \{0, \dots, r\}$. We add the clauses $(w_r), (\neg w_0)$ and for each $i \in [r]$ the clause $(\neg w_i \vee w_{i-1} \vee z_i)$. Adding these clauses to ϕ_{+1}^r

completes the construction. For one direction, if $X = Y + 1$, there exists $i \in [r]$ as described in the previous paragraph. We satisfy the formula by setting z_i to True, all other $z_{i'}$ variables to False, and $w_{i'}$ to True whenever $i' \geq i$. For the converse direction, in any satisfying assignment we must have z_i set to True for some $i \in [r]$. Then, ϕ_i is satisfied, which implies that $X = Y + 1$. \triangleleft

We now add the constraints necessary to ensure that the new variables have values consistent with their intended role:

1. For each $j \in [t]$, $v \in [B]$, $i \in [p + 1]$, $\alpha \in \{L, R\}$, construct a new variable $q_{i,j,v,\alpha}$, which takes value 1 if the i -th variable of B_j takes value v , and takes value 0 otherwise. In particular, if B_j has fewer than i variables, add a constraint forcing $q_{i,j,v,\alpha}$ to value 0.
2. For each $j \in [t]$, $v \in [B]$, $i \in [p + 1]$, $\alpha \in \{L, R\}$, add constraints ensuring that if $q_{j,i,v,\alpha} = 0$, then $c_{i,j,v,s}^\alpha = c_{i-1,j,v,s}^\alpha$ for all $s \in [\rho]$.
3. For each $j \in [t]$, $v \in [B]$, $i \in [p + 1]$, $\alpha \in \{L, R\}$, if B_j has at least i variables, add constraints ensuring that if $q_{j,i,v,\alpha} = 1$, then $c_{i,j,v,s}^\alpha$ encodes an integer that is one more than the integer encoded by $c_{i-1,j,v,s}^\alpha$. This is done by constructing the formula ϕ_{+1}^ρ of Claim 17, using input variables $c_{i,j,v,s}^\alpha, c_{i-1,j,v,s}^\alpha$ for $s \in [\rho]$, and fresh internal variables, and adding the literal $\neg q_{j,i,v,\alpha}$ to all clauses.
4. For each $j \in [t]$, $v \in [B]$, and $s \in [\rho]$ we add a constraint ensuring that $c_{p+1,j,v,s}^L = c_{p+1,j,v,s}^R$.
5. For each $j \in [t - 1]$ such that $B_j = B_{j+1}$, for each $v \in [B]$ we add constraints ensuring that for all $s \in [\rho]$ we have $c_{p+1,j,v,s}^R = c_{p+1,j+1,v,s}^L$.
6. For each $j \in [t - 1]$ such that $B_j \neq B_{j+1}$, let x be the unique element that appears in exactly one of B_j, B_{j+1} . Let j', j'' be such that $j', j'' \in \{j, j + 1\}$, and $x \in B_{j'}$ but $x \notin B_{j''}$. Let $\alpha = R$ if $j' = j$ and $\alpha = L$ if $j' = j + 1$, while $\alpha' \in \{L, R\} \setminus \{\alpha\}$. Suppose that x is the i -th variable of $B_{j'}$, for $i \in [p + 1]$. We add constraints that ensure that for all $v \in [B]$, if $q_{i,j',v,\alpha} = 0$, then $c_{p+1,j,v,s}^R = c_{p+1,j+1,v,s}^L$, for all $s \in [\rho]$. Furthermore, for all $v \in [B]$, we add constraints ensuring that if $q_{i,j',v,\alpha} = 1$, then $c_{p+1,j',v,\alpha}$ encodes an integer one higher than the one encoded by $c_{p+1,j'',v,\alpha'}$. Again this can be done by including a copy of the formula ϕ_{+1}^ρ of Claim 17, using fresh internal variables, where we add in all clauses the literal $\neg q_{i,j',v,\alpha}$.

This completes the construction and it is clear that we can perform this in polynomial time. In particular, we have added a polynomial number of new constraints, and the arity of each constraint is at most 4 (this is the case for clauses of ϕ_{+1}^ρ to which we add a literal). ψ' is obtained by adding variables and constraints to ψ , as promised. Also, by construction we have assumed that new variables take only two possible values.

Let us also describe how we obtain a path decomposition of ψ' by editing the decomposition of ψ and how to update the function b so that it remains injective and covers new constraints. For each $j \in [t]$ we insert immediately before B_j a sequence of $p + 1$ bags, call them $B_j^{L,1}, B_j^{L,2}, \dots, B_j^{L,p+1}$, and immediately after B_j a sequence of $p + 1$ bags, call them $B_j^{R,1}, B_j^{R,2}, \dots, B_j^{R,p+1}$. We place into each of these bags all the elements of B_j . For $i \in [p + 1]$, $\alpha \in \{L, R\}$, bag $B_j^{\alpha,i}$ also contains all $3B\rho$ variables $c_{i,j,v,s}^\alpha, c_{i-1,j,v,s}^\alpha, c_{p+1,j,v,s}^\alpha$, for $v \in [B], s \in [\rho]$, all variables $q_{i,j,v,\alpha}$, for $v \in [B]$, and the internal variables of the copy of ϕ_{+1}^ρ we used in step 3. We also add the $2B\rho$ variables $c_{p+1,j,v,s}^L, c_{p+1,j,v,s}^R$ to B_j . Furthermore, if B_j is an Introduce bag, and the element $x \in B_j \setminus B_{j-1}$ is the i -th variable of B_j , add the B variables $q_{i,j,v,L}$ to all bags in $B_j^{L,1}, \dots, B_j^{L,p+1}, B_j$. Symmetrically, if B_j is a Forget bag, and the element $x \in B_j \setminus B_{j+1}$ is the i -th variable of B_j , add the B variables $q_{i,j,v,R}$ to all

bags in $B_j, B_j^{R,1}, \dots, B_j^{R,p+1}$. We have now covered all constraints of steps 1,2,3, and 4, and each bag contains the elements of an old bag plus at most $O(B\rho)$ new variables.

In order to cover the remaining constraints, for each $j \in [t-1]$ we insert between $B_j^{R,p+1}$ and $B_{j+1}^{L,1}$ a bag containing $B_j^{R,p+1} \cup B_{j+1}^{L,1}$ plus the internal variables of the copy of ϕ_{+1}^ρ we may have used in step 6. This covers the constraints of steps 5 and 6, and the total number of new variables in any bag is $O(B\rho)$. One can easily check that the properties of path decompositions are satisfied. To update the function b to cover the new constraints, for each $j \in [t]$, we map the constraints of step 1 that involve the i -th variable of B_j to bags $B_j^{L,i}$ and $B_j^{R,i}$. The function b is now injective for the constraints involving any of the old variables, as all other new constraints involve only the new variables. For each remaining new constraint, find a bag B that contains all variables of c , insert after B a copy of it, and set b to map B to this copy. This ensures that b is injective. In the remainder, when we talk about the interval around a bag B_j of the original decomposition, we mean the bags $B_j^{L,1}, \dots, B_j^{L,p+1}, B_j, B_j^{R,1}, \dots, B_j^{R,p+1}$, as well as the copies of these bags added to make b injective.

We now need to argue for correctness. If ψ is satisfiable, use the same assignment for the variables of ψ' . We can now assign to the $c_{i,j,v,s}^\alpha$ variables values that correspond to their intended meaning, that is, for fixed i, j, v, α , the ρ variables $c_{i,j,v,s}^\alpha$ represent a binary number that tells us how many of the first i variables of B_j have value v , and for each i, j, v, α , the variable $q_{i,j,v,\alpha}$ has value 1 if the i -th variable of B_j has value v . It is not hard to see that this satisfies ψ' , or more precisely this can be extended to satisfy ψ' , including the clauses of all copies of ϕ_{+1}^ρ we have used.

For the converse direction, suppose we have a satisfying multi-assignment σ which is, however, monotone for the new path decomposition and b and which is consistent for the new variables $c_{i,j,v,s}^\alpha, q_{i,j,v,\alpha}$ and the internal variables of copies of ϕ_{+1}^ρ . We want to show that the assignment must also be consistent on the old variables. In order to achieve this, we first consider for each $j \in [t]$ the interval of bags around B_j , as we defined it above. We first want to establish that every old variable x is consistent in any such interval. Note that if x appears in one bag of such an interval, it must appear in B_j , therefore it must appear in the whole interval. Suppose that x is the i -th element of B_j . We observe that there are only three bags where the assignment to x possibly affects satisfaction: B_j (where b may map an old constraint involving x), $B_j^{L,i}$, and $B_j^{R,i}$ (where the new constraints of step 1 are mapped). Suppose that σ assigns to x values $v_1, v_2, v_3 \in [B]$ in bags $B_j^{L,i}, B_j, B_j^{R,i}$ respectively, with $v_1 \leq v_2 \leq v_3$ because of monotonicity. If $v_1 = v_3$, then we can actually assign value v_1 to x in the whole interval, without affecting satisfaction of any constraint or the monotonicity of σ . If $v_1 < v_3$, then x is problematic. Among all problematic variables, let x be one with minimum v_1 . We will show that if such an x exists, then some constraint is violated. By the selection of x , any other variable of B_j which is assigned a value $v' < v_1$ anywhere in the interval around B_j is actually consistent in the whole interval, retaining a value strictly smaller than v_1 . Consider now the variables $c_{i,j,v_1,s}^L, c_{i,j,v_1,s}^R$ as two counters, which are increased each time we encounter a variable with value v_1 . Variable x contributes to increasing this counter on the left, because its value in $B_j^{L,i}$ is v_1 , but it does not contribute on the right. Other variables of B_j which fail to contribute on the left do so either because their value at the moment they are considered is strictly smaller than v_1 , but then such variables do not contribute on the right either, since they are consistently assigned; or because their value is strictly larger than v_1 , in which case they fail to contribute on the right due to monotonicity. We conclude that the number encoded by $c_{p+1,j,v_1,s}^R$ must be strictly smaller than $c_{p+1,j,v_1,s}^L$, violating the constraints of step 4.

Suppose then that the multi-assignment is locally consistent for old variables, that is, all old variables in the interval around B_j receive assignments consistent for that interval, for all $j \in [t]$. We now want to argue that constraints of steps 5 and 6 ensure that σ must be consistent across consecutive intervals.

Fix a $j \in [t-1]$ and consider a variable $x \in B_j \cap B_{j+1}$ which is the i_1 -th variables of B_j and the i_2 -th variable of B_{j+1} . In the interval of bags strictly between B_j and B_{j+1} , the value assigned to x affects satisfaction only in B_j^{R,i_1} and B_{j+1}^{L,i_2} . If σ assigns to x values $v_1 < v_2$ in these two bags, we say that x is problematic. Select x among the problematic variables so as to minimize v_1 . As a result, any old variable which is assigned a value $v' < v_1$ anywhere receives a consistent assignment in all intervals where it appears. Since old variables are locally consistent around B_j and B_{j+1} , the variables $c_{p+1,j,v_1,s}^R$ and $c_{p+1,j+1,v_1,s}^L$ encode how many variables of B_j and B_{j+1} respectively received value v_1 in the interval around B_j, B_{j+1} respectively.

Recall that there is a unique vertex $y \in (B_{j+1} \setminus B_j) \cup (B_j \setminus B_{j+1})$. Let $j', j'' \in \{j, j+1\}$ such that $y \in B_{j'}$ and $y \notin B_{j''}$, and suppose y is the i -th variable of $B_{j'}$. Let $\alpha = R$ if $j' = j$ and $\alpha = L$ if $j' = j+1$, while $\alpha' \in \{L, R\} \setminus \{\alpha\}$. Recall that we have inserted a unique bag between $B_j^{R,p+1}$ and $B_{j+1}^{L,1}$ that contains $q_{i,j',v,\alpha}$, for all $v \in [B]$. These variables encode whether y received value v .


We now distinguish between several cases:

- $q_{i,j',v_1,\alpha} = 1$, that is, y is assigned the same value as x , according to $q_{i,j',v_1,\alpha}$. If $y \in B_j$, then y contributes to the counter $c_{p+1,j,v_1,s}^R$, to which x also contributes. This counter is supposed to decrease by one to satisfy the constraint of the last step, but it decreases by two (due to forgetting y and changing the value of x). Similarly, if $y \in B_{j+1}$, the constraint of the last step stipulates that the counter $c_{p+1,j+1,v_1,s}^L$ must be strictly higher than $c_{p+1,j,v_1,s}^R$; however, the value of $c_{p+1,j+1,v_1,s}^L$ cannot achieve this value, because x no longer contributes to it, and other variables that do not contribute to $c_{p+1,j,v_1,s}^R$ cannot contribute to $c_{p+1,j+1,v_1,s}^L$ either. This is due to the selection of v_1 (variables with lower values are consistent) or monotonicity (variables with higher values, retain a higher value).
- $q_{i,j',v_1,\alpha} = 0$, that is, y is assigned a different value from x , according to $q_{i,j',v_1,\alpha}$. In this case the constraint of the last step states that $c_{p+1,j,v_1,s}^R = c_{p+1,j+1,v_1,s}^L$ for all $s \in [\rho]$. However, this cannot be achieved, as x contributes to the counters for B_j, v_1 , but not to the counters for B_{j+1}, v_1 , and other variables which do not contribute to the former, also do not contribute to the latter (again, by the selection of v_1 or monotonicity).

We have now established that a monotone multi-assignment must be consistent: for any old variable x and j, j' such that $x \in B_j \cap B_{j'}$, σ assigns the same value to x in both B_j and $B_{j'}$, and the intervals of bags around them. ◀

By Lemma 16 we obtain the following:

► **Corollary 18.** *For all $\varepsilon > 0, B \geq 2$ we have the following. Suppose there is an algorithm that takes as input a 4-CSP instance ψ , a partition of its variables into two sets V_1, V_2 , a path decomposition of its primal graph of width p where each bag contains at most $O(B \log p)$ variables of V_2 , and an injective function b mapping each constraint to a bag that contains its variables. The algorithm decides if there exists a monotone satisfying multi-assignment σ , which is consistent for the variables of V_2 . If the supposed algorithm runs in time $O((B - \varepsilon)^p |\psi|^{O(1)})$, then the PP-SETH is false.*



■ **Figure 1** Summary of connections between other conjectures and the PP-SETH

Proof. We begin with an instance ϕ of 4-CSP over alphabet B (if $B = 2$ consider simply an instance of 3-SAT) and a path decomposition of its primal graph. If for some ε' we could decide ϕ in time $O((B - \varepsilon')^{\text{pw}(\phi)}|\phi|^{O(1)})$, then the PP-SETH would be falsified, by Theorem 11. We first execute the algorithm of Lemma 16 to obtain in polynomial time an instance ϕ' whose variables are partitioned into V_1 (variables of ϕ) and V_2 (new variables). Deciding if a satisfying multi-assignment with the desired conditions exists for ϕ' is equivalent to deciding ϕ and this can be done by the supposed algorithm. The width of the decomposition of the new instance is at most $p = \text{pw}(\phi) + O(B \log(\text{pw}(\phi)))$. We therefore have $(B - \varepsilon)^p < (B - \varepsilon)^{\text{pw}(\phi)} \cdot B^{O(B \log(\text{pw}(\phi)))} = (B - \varepsilon)^{\text{pw}(\phi)}|\phi|^{O(1)}$ obtaining an upper bound on the running time of the algorithm on ϕ' . Setting $\varepsilon' = \varepsilon$ gives the statement. ◀

4 Evidence

Given the results of Theorem 5, it is clear that the PP-SETH is implied by (and hence is at least as plausible as) the SETH: since for all CNF formulas ϕ on n variables, $\text{pw}(\phi) \leq n$, falsifying the PP-SETH would imply the existence of an algorithm solving SAT (and indeed, MAX- (t, w) -SAT) in time $(2 - \varepsilon)^n$. It is, however, less clear how much more believable one should consider the PP-SETH. In this section we give evidence that falsifying the PP-SETH would require significantly more effort than falsifying the SETH, because the PP-SETH is implied by two other well-established complexity assumptions, namely the k -Orthogonal Vectors Assumption (k -OVA) and the Set Cover Conjecture (SCC).

Our results are summarized below in Theorem 19 and also in Figure 1.

► **Theorem 19.** *If the PP-SETH is false, then both of the following hold:*

1. *There exist $k_0 > 1, \varepsilon > 0$, such that there exists an algorithm which for all $k > k_0$ solves k -MOST-ORTHOGONAL VECTORS in time $O(n^{(1-\varepsilon)k}d^{O(1)})$. In particular, this implies that the maximization versions of the SETH and the k -OVA are false.*
2. *There exists $\varepsilon > 0$ and an algorithm that solves SUBSET SUM on n elements with target value t in time $O(t^{1-\varepsilon}n^{O(1)})$. In particular, this implies that the SCC is false.*

Before we proceed, let us provide some further context. Recall that the k -OVA states that for all $k \geq 2, \varepsilon > 0$, there is no algorithm which takes as input k arrays, each containing n d -dimensional boolean vectors and decides if there exists a collection of k vectors, one from each array, with inner product equal to 0. The maximization version of this problem, which we denote as k -MOST-ORTHOGONAL VECTORS, asks whether there exists a collection of k vectors such that the weight of their inner product contains at least t zeroes. It is by now a classical result in fine-grained complexity that the k -OVA is implied by the SETH, going back to Williams [63]. The k -OVA, and especially its restriction to $k = 2$, is among the most prominent complexity assumptions in fine-grained complexity. We refer the reader to the survey of Vassilevska Williams for more information [62]. Note that, since maximizing the number of zeroes in the inner product is harder than deciding if the inner product can be

made equal to 0, the assumption that the optimization problem is hard is implied by the k -OVA. However, it is not clear if this is actually a harder problem, and in fact the two problems may have the same complexity for all $k \geq 2$, as indicated by the work of Chen and Williams for $k = 2$ [13]. Gao, Impagliazzo, Kolokolova, and Williams have shown that the restriction of the k -OVA to $k = 2$ is equivalent to the statement that there exists a first-order formula with k quantifiers that cannot be model checked in time $O(m^{k-1-\varepsilon})$.

Our results show that falsifying the PP-SETH is harder than falsifying (even the maximization version of) the k -OVA. This is established in Lemma 20. Hence, the PP-SETH should be thought of as more plausible than not just the SETH, but also than some of its most prominent weakenings.

The Set Cover Conjecture (SCC) states that there is no algorithm which can solve SET COVER on instances with n elements and m sets in time $(2 - \varepsilon)^n m^{O(1)}$. This conjecture was introduced in [16], where it was shown that the symmetric version of the conjecture, where we replace m with n and vice-versa, is in fact equivalent to the SETH. Despite much effort, finding a connection between the SCC and the SETH (in either direction) was left as an open problem in [16] and remains a major question to this day. One part of the work of [16] was devoted to exploring the consequences of the SCC and, among other results, it was shown that if the SCC is true, then no algorithm can solve SUBSET SUM in time $t^{1-\varepsilon} n^{O(1)}$, where n is the number of given integers and t the target sum. This important problem was later revisited by Abboud, Bringmann, Hermelin, and Shabtay [2], who showed that such a running time can also be ruled out if we assume the SETH instead of the SCC.

SCC is currently viewed as a plausible complexity assumption, somewhat orthogonal to the SETH – indeed this is what motivated the authors of [2] to reprove a bound known under one conjecture, using the other conjecture as their basis. Here we show that the PP-SETH is also implied by the SCC, giving some further, seemingly independent evidence that the problem we consider is hard. This is established in Lemma 21, where we in fact show that falsifying the PP-SETH would provide a SUBSET SUM algorithm fast enough to falsify both the SCC and the SETH.

We now proceed to the two lemmas which together imply Theorem 19.

4.1 Orthogonal Vectors

► **Lemma 20.** *If there exist $\varepsilon > 0, c > 0$ such that there exists an algorithm that solves MAXW-SAT in time $((2 - \varepsilon)^{pw} |\psi|^c)$, where ψ is the input formula, then there exist $\varepsilon' > 0, k_0 > 1, c' > 0$ and an algorithm which for all $k > k_0$ solves k -MOST-ORTHOGONAL VECTORS in time $O(n^{(1-\varepsilon')k} d^{c'})$.*

Proof. Fix the ε, c for which we have a fast algorithm solving MAXW-SAT as described. We are given k arrays A_1, \dots, A_k , each containing n boolean vectors of dimension d . We are also given a target weight d_t and are asked to select for each $i \in [k]$ an element $v_i \in A_i$ such that the inner product $\prod_{i=1}^k v_i$ contains at least d_t zeroes (note that maximizing zeroes is of course equivalent to minimizing ones).

We will construct a CNF formula ψ and a weight target w_t with the following properties:

1. ψ has a satisfying assignment setting at least w_t variables to True, if there exist k vectors, one from each array, whose inner product has at least d_t zeroes.
2. ψ can be produced in time $O(d^2 n^2)$ and we can also produce a path decomposition of its primal graph of width at most $k \log n + O(1)$.

Before we proceed, let us argue why the above imply the lemma. We will decide the k -MOST-ORTHOGONAL VECTORS instance by running the above reduction and feeding the resulting instance to the supposed algorithm for MAXW-SAT. The running time is at most $O((2-\varepsilon)^{k \log n + O(1)}(d^2 n^2)^c)$. Set $\delta > 0$ so that $2-\varepsilon = 2^{1-\delta}$, in particular, $\delta = 1 - \log(2-\varepsilon)$. The running time is then at most $O(n^{(1-\delta)k+2c}d^{2c})$. Set $k_0 = 4c/\delta$ and $c' = 2c$. If $k > k_0$ the running time is at most $O(n^{(1-\delta/2)k}d^{c'})$, so if we set $\varepsilon' = \delta/2$ we are done. Observe that $\varepsilon', k_0, \delta$ are absolute constants that depend only on ε, c .

Assume that n is a power of 2 (we can add dummy all-1 vectors in each array to achieve this) and that the elements of each array A_i are $v_{i,0}, v_{i,1}, \dots, v_{i,n-1}$. We construct a CNF formula starting with $k \log n$ variables $x_{i,s}$, for $s \in [\log n]$. The intended meaning is that for a fixed $i \in [k]$, the value of the variables of the group $x_{i,s}$ encodes the index of the selected vector of A_i .

We now add the following:

1. For each $j \in [d]$ we add a variable z_j , intended to represent whether the j -th bit of the inner product is zero. We also add n^2 variables $z_{j,s}$, $s \in [dn^2]$. For each $s \in [dn^2 - 1]$ we add the clause $(\neg z_{j,s+1} \vee z_{j,s})$. We also add the clause $(\neg z_{j,1} \vee z_j)$. We have constructed $O(n^2 d^2)$ clauses of size 2.
2. For each $i \in [k]$ and $j \in [d]$ we add a variable $w_{i,j}$. Its intended meaning is to represent if the j -th bit of the i -th selected vector is zero. For each assignment σ to the variables of $x_{i,s}$, with $s \in [\log n]$, read the assignment as a binary number s_1 . If vector v_{i,s_1} has a 1 in position j , we add a clause that is falsified by the assignment σ and add to it the literal $\neg w_{i,j}$. We have constructed $O(nd)$ clauses of size $O(\log n)$.
3. For each $j \in [d]$ add the clause $(\bigvee_{i \in [k]} w_{i,j} \vee \neg z_j)$. These are d clauses of arity k .

We set the target weight to be $d_t dn^2$. This completes the construction. Correctness is straightforward by observing that because of the clauses of the first step, setting any of the $z_{j,s}$ to True implies that z_j is True, and in such a case it is optimal to set all the $z_{j,s}$ to True. Because the number of variables outside of the variables $z_{j,s}$ is at most $O(k \log n + d + kd)$, the weight of the satisfying assignment is dominated by the number of $z_{j,s}$ variables that we set to True. We now see that for each assignment to the $k \log n$ variables $x_{i,s}$, if we read this assignment in the intended way, $w_{i,j}$ can be set to True if and only if the i -th selected vector has a 0 in position j and it is optimal to do so, as it allows us to set z_j to True.

Let us also argue why we can construct a path decomposition of the desired width. Start with d bags B_1, \dots, B_d and place all $x_{i,s}$ for $i \in [k], s \in [\log n]$ in all bags. For each $i \in [k], j \in [d]$ we place in bag B_j the variables $w_{i,j}$ and z_j . Finally, for each j , after B_j we insert a sequence of dn^2 bags $B_j^1, \dots, B_j^{dn^2}$, each of which contains all the elements of B_j . For each $s \in [dn^2 - 1]$ we add to B_j^s the variables $z_{j,s}, z_{j,s+1}$. ◀

4.2 Subset Sum and Set Cover Conjecture

► **Lemma 21.** *If there exist $\varepsilon > 0, c > 0$ such that SAT can be solved in time $O((2-\varepsilon)^{pw}|\psi|^c)$, where $|\psi|$ is the input formula, then there exists $\varepsilon' > 0$ and an algorithm that solves SUBSET SUM on n elements with target value t in time $O(t^{1-\varepsilon'} n^{O(1)})$.*

Proof. Fix the ε, c for which a fast satisfiability algorithm exists. We are given a collection of n positive integers v_1, \dots, v_n and a target value t and are asked if there exists a subset of the given integers whose sum is exactly t . We will construct a CNF formula ψ that satisfies the following:

1. ψ is satisfiable if and only if a subset of the given integers has sum exactly t .

2. ψ can be constructed in time $O(n \log t)$.
3. We can construct in the same amount of time a path decomposition of the primal graph of ψ of width $\log t + O(1)$.

Before we proceed, let us explain why the above imply the lemma. We will decide the given SUBSET SUM instance by producing ψ and feeding it into the supposed SAT algorithm. The running time of this procedure is at most $O((2 - \varepsilon)^{\log t} (n \log t)^c) = O(t^{\log(2 - \varepsilon)} (\log^c t) n^c)$. Set $\varepsilon' = (1 - \log(2 - \varepsilon))/2 > 0$ and for sufficiently large t we have $t^{\varepsilon'} > \log^c t$, so we get the promised running time as $t^{1 - 2\varepsilon'} \log^c t < t^{1 - \varepsilon'}$.

Let us now explain how to construct ψ . Let $b = \lceil \log t \rceil$ be the number of bits required to represent t . We construct the following variables:

1. n variables s_1, \dots, s_n , such that s_i for $i \in [n]$ is meant to indicate whether the solution selects integer v_i .
2. nb variables $x_{i,s}$, for $i \in [n]$, $s \in [b]$. For a given $i \in [n]$ the variables $x_{i,s}$ are supposed to encode the sum of the elements that have been selected among the integers v_1, \dots, v_i . To unify the construction of the rest of the formula, we also define b variables $x_{0,s}$, for $s \in [b]$ and add the clauses $(\neg x_{0,s})$ for all $s \in [b]$.
3. nb variables $c_{i,s}$, for $i \in [n]$, $s \in [b]$. For a given $i \in [n]$, the $c_{i,s}$ variable is supposed to calculate the i -th carry bit we obtain when adding v_i to the current sum, which is encoded in $x_{i-1,s}$. Again, to unify presentation we also construct for each $i \in [n]$ a variable $c_{i,0}$ and add the clause $(\neg c_{i,0})$.

Intuitively, the variables above are meant to capture the execution of a non-deterministic algorithm which goes through the n elements, at each step guesses if the element is selected (this guess is encoded in s_i) and keeps track of the current sum using b bits. If the current element is selected the algorithm needs to update the current sum by adding to it the current element.

In the following, when we view an integer v_i as a binary number, we suppose that the bits are numbered $\{1, \dots, b\}$, where bit 1 is the least significant bit (that is, right to left). We now add the following clauses:

1. For all $i \in [n]$ and $s \in [b]$ we add the clauses $(s_i \vee \neg x_{i-1,s} \vee x_{i,s})$ and $(s_i \vee \neg x_{i,s} \vee x_{i-1,s})$. Intuitively, these ensure that if s_i is false, then $x_{i,s-1}$ and $x_{i,s}$ encode the same integer.
2. For all $i \in [n]$ we do the following. For all $s \in [b]$, if the s -th bit of v_i is 0, then we add clauses encoding the constraint $x_{i,s} = x_{i-1,s} \oplus c_{i,s-1}$, that is, we add the four clauses corresponding to assignments that violate this constraint. Furthermore, we add the clause $(\neg c_{i,s})$. In all the clauses constructed for some $i \in [n]$ in this step we add the literal $\neg s_i$.
3. For all $i \in [n]$ we do the following. For all $s \in [b]$, if the s -th bit of v_i is 1, then we add clauses encoding the constraint $x_{i,s} = x_{i-1,s} \oplus c_{i,s-1} \oplus 1$, that is, we add the four clauses corresponding to assignments that violate this constraint. We also add clauses to encode the constraint $c_{i,s} \leftrightarrow (x_{i-1,s} \vee c_{i,s-1})$. In all the clauses constructed for some $i \in [n]$ in this step we add the literal $\neg s_i$.
4. For all $i \in [n]$ we add the clause $(\neg c_{i,b})$. Informally, this clause ensures that we never have an overflow.
5. For $s \in [b]$, if the s -th bit of t is 0 we add the clause $(\neg x_{n,s})$ otherwise we add the clause $(x_{n,s})$.

We have constructed $O(nb) = O(n \log t)$ clauses of constant arity, and the construction can be performed in time linear in the output size. Let us first argue for correctness. Suppose that a set of integers of sum t exists. We set the s_i variables to encode the integers included

in this set, and the variables $x_{i,s}$ to encode the sum of the integers selected among the first i integers of the input. Clauses of the first step are already satisfied by this assignment, as are the clauses of the last step. For a value $i \in [n]$ for which v_i was not selected, we set $c_{i,s}$ to False for all $s \in [b]$ and all clauses added in steps 2,3,4 for this i are satisfied. For the remaining values, we set $c_{i,s}$ to 1 if the result of adding the s least significant bits of v_i to the s least significant bits of the sum we have formed using the $i - 1$ first integers is at least 2^s , that is, if we have a carry at bit s when adding v_i to the current sum. This satisfies the clauses of steps 2 and 3, and clauses of step 4 are satisfied if the sum of the selected integers is indeed t , in which case we should never have an overflow. For the converse direction, using the same interpretation of the variables, we claim that any satisfying assignment that sets the variables $x_{i,s}$ to encode some binary value t_i implies that there is a subset of v_1, \dots, v_i with sum exactly t_i . This can be shown via induction and implies that, since by step 5 the variables $x_{n,s}$ encode t , we have a solution for SUBSET SUM.

Let us now argue about the pathwidth. Variables $x_{0,s}$ and $c_{i,0}$ can be omitted: we have added these variables to simplify the presentation of the construction, but since their values are forced, we can assign to them the corresponding values and simplify the formula. Note that this simplification procedure will also remove variables $c_{1,s}$, which is natural since when we (possibly) add v_1 to the initial sum (which is 0), all carries will be 0. Construct n bags B_1, \dots, B_n and place into each B_i the b variables $x_{i,s}$, as well as s_i . For each $i \in [n - 1]$ we insert a sequence of $t - 1$ bags between B_i and B_{i+1} , call them B_i^1, \dots, B_i^{t-1} , all of which contain s_i . For $s \in [t - 1]$ we add into B_i^s the variables $c_{i+1,s}, c_{i+1,s-1}, c_{i+1,s+1}$, for all $s' \in [b]$ with $s' \leq s$ we add to B_i^s the variable $x_{i+1,s'}$ and for all $s' \in [b]$ with $s' \geq s$ we add to B_i^s the variables $x_{i,s'}$. Informally, we are exchanging at each step a variable $x_{i,s}$ with a variable $x_{i+1,s}$, while making sure that these two variables appear together in some bag together with $c_{i+1,s}, c_{i+1,s-1}$. Observe that all constructed bags have size $b + O(1)$, as desired. \blacktriangleleft

5 Single-exponential FPT problems

In this section we consider a number of fundamental algorithmic problems, parameterized by a linear structure (pathwidth or linear clique-width), such as COLORING, INDEPENDENT SET, and DOMINATING SET. For all the problems we consider, fine-grained tight results are already known, if one assumes the SETH. For instance, for k -COLORING, it is known that the problem can be solved in time $k^{\text{pw}} n^{O(1)}$ and in time $(2^k - 2)^{\text{lcw}} n^{O(1)}$, while obtaining algorithms with any improvement on the bases of the exponentials is impossible under the SETH ([46, 50]). Indeed, starting with the pioneering work of Lokshtanov, Marx, and Saurabh [50], such fine-grained tight bounds are today known for a plethora of standard problems parameterized by pathwidth and other structural parameters, such as for example INDEPENDENT SET and its generalization to larger distances called d -SCATTERED SET ([50, 45]), DOMINATING SET and its generalization to large distances ([11, 44]), HAMILTONICITY ([18]), MAX CUT ([50]), ODD CYCLE TRANSVERSAL ([50, 36]), STEINER TREE, FEEDBACK VERTEX SET ([19]), BOUNDED DEGREE DELETION ([49]), and many others for various structural parameters ([9, 22, 23, 31, 34, 37, 38, 43, 57]). We note in passing that one striking aspect of the current state of the art is that for almost all these problems, the lower bound for the parameter that represents a linear structure (pathwidth, linear clique-width) matches the complexity of the best algorithm for the corresponding *tree-like* structure (treewidth, clique-width), giving the impression that the two complexities coincide.

Our goal in this section is to revisit and strengthen these results. As mentioned, one weakness of the state of the art is that all lower bound results are known only as implications

of the SETH. Therefore, if the SETH turns out to be false, we know nothing about the complexity of all the aforementioned problems, and if we obtain an improved algorithm for one of them, it would not a priori be sufficient to improve the complexity of any other problem in the list. This seems rather disappointing, because the best known algorithms for most of these problems are essentially facets of the same algorithm: perform straightforward DP on the path decomposition.

The solution we propose to this conundrum is to base our results not on the SETH, but on the PP-SETH. In addition to basing all lower bounds on a hypothesis that seems more plausible (as indicated by the results of Section 4), this has the major benefit of allowing us to obtain reductions in both directions. As a result, all lower bounds we present are not mere implications of the PP-SETH, but in fact equivalent reformulations. This means that improving the standard DP algorithm for any of the problems we consider would be *both necessary and sufficient* for falsifying the PP-SETH and for improving the DP algorithms for *all* the problems considered. The end result is a much more solid understanding of the fine-grained complexity of problems which are FPT parameterized by pathwidth or linear clique-width.

As mentioned above, the list of problems on which we could attempt to apply this approach is quite long. Our goal in this section is not to be exhaustive, but rather to showcase the power and flexibility of the framework built on top of the PP-SETH, while investigating the limits of this approach. To summarize our results, we give the following list of problems which we show to be equivalent to the PP-SETH in this section.

1. For any $k \geq 3, \varepsilon > 0$, solving k -COLORING in time $(k - \varepsilon)^{\text{pw}} n^{O(1)}$. (Lemma 22)
2. For any $k \geq 3, \varepsilon > 0$, solving k -COLORING in time $(2^k - 2 - \varepsilon)^{\text{lcw}} n^{O(1)}$. (Lemma 23 and Lemma 24)
3. For any $d \geq 2, \varepsilon > 0$, solving d -SCATTERED SET in time $(d - \varepsilon)^{\text{pw}} n^{O(1)}$. (Lemma 25 and Lemma 26)
4. For any $\varepsilon > 0$, solving SET COVER in time $(2 - \varepsilon)^{\text{pw}} (n + m)^{O(1)}$, where n is the size of the universe, m the number of sets, and pw denotes the pathwidth of the incidence graph. (Lemma 28)
5. For any $r \geq 2, \varepsilon > 0$, solving r -DOMINATING SET in time $(2r + 1 - \varepsilon)^{\text{pw}} n^{O(1)}$. (Lemma 29 and Lemma 30)

It was already known that the SETH implies that no algorithm achieving any of the above exists, so our work adapts previous reductions to the new setting, strengthening these lower bounds by showing they are equivalent to each other and to a more plausible assumption (the PP-SETH), and that they are implied by the SCC and the k -OVA (cf. Theorem 19). It is important to note, however, that the work we invested in Section 3.2 and Section 3.3 pays off handsomely in this section. Recall that we have given equivalent reformulations of the PP-SETH for CSPs with larger alphabet, via a promise problem that only requires monotone assignments in the negative case (Corollary 18). As a result, our reductions are significantly simpler and shorter than the previous reductions, even though we mostly just recycle existing gadgets. We hope that the simplification we contribute in this work will help to “democratize” the field of SETH and PP-SETH-based lower bounds and allow for the easier discovery of more PP-SETH-equivalent parameterized problems. Prior to this work, the only problem for which equivalence to the PP-SETH followed from previous work was d -SCATTERED SET for $d = 2$ (that is, INDEPENDENT SET), given in the work of Iwata and Yoshida ([42]). Our results generalize their work and allow us to go much further than is likely possible in their setting, as we explain below.

Applicability In this section we focus on only a few fundamental problems to showcase the applicability of the PP-SETH, mostly because it would not be practical to try to be more exhaustive. The selection is, however, not completely arbitrary and is meant to also trace the limits of what we expect can be done. Our results are much more general and cover more problems than those of Iwata and Yoshida [42] who based their investigation on the treewidth version of the PP-SETH – indeed the only non-SAT-related problem they consider is INDEPENDENT SET. There are two main reasons why we are able to go farther, one that is mostly practical and one that runs quite a bit deeper. The shallow practical reason is that our preparatory work on CSPs makes the formulation of reductions for problems with inconvenient complexity (that is, where the base is not a power of 2) much more tractable, and the formalization of the promise problem of Corollary 18 allows one to effortlessly generalize the technique used in [42] for INDEPENDENT SET to other problems. In other words, as far as we can see, there is no fundamental reason why it was not already known from [42] that, for example, solving d -SCATTERED SET in time $(d - \varepsilon)^{tw} n^{O(1)}$ is equivalent to the treewidth version of the PP-SETH – no fundamental reason, that is, except for the fact that formulating such a reduction would be very tedious and time-consuming, because we would have to encode in the problem instance the machinery needed both to obtain the right base, and to perform the counting part that turns monotone assignments to consistent assignments. In this sense, one contribution of this work is that we simplify the framework sufficiently to make it practical to obtain many such results without superhuman effort.

There is, however, also a deeper reason why we are able to obtain more results than [42] and this is related to the fact that Theorem 5 is flexible enough to cover also the parameterization by the *incidence* pathwidth. In the case of treewidth, the “obvious” DP for parameter tw^I has complexity $3^{tw^I} |\psi|^{O(1)}$ and obtaining an algorithm with the (likely) optimal complexity $2^{tw^I} |\psi|^{O(1)}$ requires advanced techniques, such as fast subset convolution (see [17], Chapter 11.1). As a result, it is not at all clear if the hypothesis that 3-SAT cannot be solved with dependence $(2 - \varepsilon)^{tw}$ is equivalent to the hypothesis that the dependence cannot be $(2 - \varepsilon)^{tw^I}$. This may seem like a minor inconvenience, but it implies that for many domination and covering type problems, it would be very challenging (if not impossible) to obtain an equivalence between a lower bound for their complexity parameterized by treewidth and the treewidth version of the PP-SETH. Hence, a reason we manage to show that more problems are equivalent to the PP-SETH is that covering problems, which are indeed equivalent to the PP-SETH in the pathwidth setting, require advanced techniques which are a priori not easy to translate in the treewidth setting.

On an intuitive level, a takeaway from this discussion is that the PP-SETH is expected to be equivalent to improving the complexity of problems for which the optimal algorithm is believed to be “simple DP”. Under this assumption, it is natural that many domination-type problems drop out of the equivalence class of the corresponding hypothesis for treewidth, because the best algorithm for this parameter is not “simple DP”. In other words, what fails is not the reduction from SAT to the corresponding problem, but the reduction from the problem to SAT parameterized by the width of the primal graph. This unmask a subtle fine-grained distinction between linear and tree-like parameters, which exists for many problems and is hidden by the fact that the running times of the best algorithms parameterized by pathwidth and treewidth coincide.

Limits Given the above discussion, we would in general expect the PP-SETH to give tight equivalent lower bounds for the complexity of any problem for which, when parameterized

by a linear structure width, the best algorithm is simple DP. For pathwidth and linear clique-width, where fast subset convolution techniques are usually not relevant, this covers a large swath of natural problems, for example we see no major obstacle stopping us from extending our results for k -COLORING to k -COLORABLE DELETION (as in [36]), or from INDEPENDENT SET to BOUNDED DEGREE DELETION (as in [49]). It is, however, important to discuss also a class of problems which *do not* fall in this category. These are the connectivity problems, such as STEINER TREE, FEEDBACK VERTEX SET, and CONNECTED DOMINATING SET, which are treated using advanced techniques, such as Cut&Count [19]. If we consider such a problem, the techniques of this section would likely easily allow us to adapt the current reduction and show that, say, obtaining a $(3 - \varepsilon)^{pw} n^{O(1)}$ algorithm for STEINER TREE (to take an example from [19]) would falsify the PP-SETH, rather than the SETH. However, the blocking point to obtain *equivalence* to the PP-SETH, would be reducing STEINER TREE back to SAT. Adapting the Cut&Count algorithm would more naturally provide a reduction to \oplus -SAT. Is the hypothesis that this problem is hard equivalent to the PP-SETH? This seems likely to be a very difficult question, so we suspect that proving PP-SETH-equivalence for connectivity problems parameterized by linear width parameters is, if not impossible, at least currently out of reach. Note that this is akin to the situation for the class XNLP: FEEDBACK VERTEX SET parameterized by pathwidth/ $\log n$ is known to be XNLP-hard, but not known to be contained in XNLP [4].

5.1 Coloring

In this section we consider the complexity of the k -COLORING problem, for all fixed $k \geq 3$. Recall that it is already known that if this problem admits algorithms of complexity $(k - \varepsilon)^{pw} n^{O(1)}$ or $(2^k - 2 - \varepsilon)^{lcw} n^{O(1)}$, for any $k \geq 3, \varepsilon > 0$, then the SETH is false [46, 50], while algorithms essentially matching these bounds are known for treewidth and clique-width respectively. Our goal is to strengthen these lower bounds by showing that they are *equivalent* to the PP-SETH, that is, algorithms beating these bounds can be obtained if and only if the PP-SETH is false.

We will need to present reductions in both directions. Since COLORING is a CSP problem, showing that if the PP-SETH is false, then COLORING admits a faster algorithm will be the easy direction. For the other direction, we will rely on several simple tricks from previous reductions.

First, we will actually reduce CSP (with an appropriate alphabet size) to LIST COLORING, rather than COLORING, but using everywhere lists which are subsets of $[k]$. If k is fixed, LIST COLORING can then be reduced to COLORING in a way that preserves the pathwidth (by adding to the graph a k -clique, as in [50]) and linear clique-width (Lemma 4.1 of [46]).

Second, we will use a simple gadget, called a weak edge in [46]. In a graph $G = (V, E)$ for two (not necessarily distinct) values $i_1, i_2 \in [k]$, an (i_1, i_2) -weak edge between two vertices $v_1, v_2 \in V$ is a path consisting of three new internal vertices linking v_1, v_2 , where appropriate lists are assigned to the internal vertices so that the only color combination forbidden in (v_1, v_2) is (i_1, i_2) . In other words, the internal vertex lists are appropriately constructed so that if we assign colors i_1, i_2 to v_1, v_2 the coloring fails, while in all other cases the internal vertices can be colored. We refer the reader to Definition 4.2 and Lemma 4.3 of [46] for the exact definition and proof of correctness of this gadget.

Armed with these basic tools, we are now ready to establish our results.

► **Lemma 22.** *For all $k \geq 3, \varepsilon > 0$ we have the following: there exists an algorithm solving k -COLORING in time $O((k - \varepsilon)^{pw} n^{O(1)})$ if and only if the PP-SETH is false.*

Proof. Fix k, ε . For one direction we observe that k -COLORING is a special case of 2-CSP with alphabet $[k]$. If the PP-SETH is false, by Theorem 11 we thus have an algorithm solving k -COLORING in $O((k - \varepsilon)^{\text{pw}} n^{O(1)})$.

For the converse direction, take an instance ψ of 2-CSP with alphabet $[k]$. By Theorem 11, if we can solve ψ in time $O((k - \varepsilon)^{\text{pw}(\psi)} |\psi|^{O(1)})$, then the PP-SETH is false. We will reduce this to k -COLORING in a straightforward way. For each variable of ψ we construct a vertex of a new graph G and give it list $[k]$; and for each constraint of ψ involving two variables x, y , we consider each of the at most k^2 possible assignments to x, y that falsify c . For each such $(i_1, i_2) \in [k]^2$ that falsifies c we add an (i_1, i_2) -weak edge between the vertices representing x, y . Correctness is not hard to see. It is also easy to see that the pathwidth of the new graph is at most $\text{pw}(\psi) + 1$, because we only added weak edges between x and y only if x, y already had an edge in the primal graph of ψ , and weak edges are just sub-divided edges. ◀

For linear clique-width, we need slightly (but not much) more work, so we break down the result into two parts.

► **Lemma 23.** *For all $k \geq 3$ we have the following: if the PP-SETH is false, then there exists $\varepsilon > 0$ and an algorithm solving k -COLORING in time $O((2^k - 2 - \varepsilon)^{\text{lcw}} n^{O(1)})$.*

Proof. Fix $k \geq 3$. Suppose we are given a graph G and a linear clique-width expression of G with $\text{lcw}(G)$ labels. We want to reduce the problem of k -coloring G to a CSP instance ψ over alphabet $[2^k - 2]$ such that $\text{pw}(\psi) = \text{lcw}(G) + O(1)$. If the PP-SETH is false, we will then be able to solve this instance fast enough to obtain a k -COLORING algorithm in the desired time. Suppose the given linear clique-width expression is a string χ of length $t = |\chi|$. We construct at most $t \cdot \text{lcw}(G)$ variables, call them $x_{i,j}$ for $i \in [\text{lcw}(G)], j \in [t]$. The intuitive meaning of $x_{i,j}$ is the following: if we consider a coloring of G and look at the subgraph of G associated with the length- j prefix of χ , then $x_{i,j}$ encodes the subset of colors of $[k]$ which appear in a vertex with label i . Note that we only allow the variables $x_{i,j}$ to take values which correspond to non-empty proper subsets of $[k]$, hence we have $2^k - 2$ choices.

Let us now be a little more precise. For $j \in [t]$ let G_j be the graph represented by the length- j prefix of χ . We denote $V_{i,j}$ the set of vertices with label i in G_j . We say that $V_{i,j}$ is *live* if $V_{i,j} \neq \emptyset$ and there is an edge of G incident on some vertex of $V_{i,j}$ which does not appear in G_j . It is now not hard to see that in any valid coloring of G , the set of colors used in a live set $V_{i,j}$ is a non-empty proper subset of $[k]$: the set is non-empty as $V_{i,j} \neq \emptyset$, and it is not $[k]$ as any vertex that becomes a neighbor of a vertex of $V_{i,j}$ later in the construction, must be connected to all of $V_{i,j}$. We therefore construct a variable $x_{i,j}$ only for *live* sets $V_{i,j}$. In the remainder we will look at the values of $x_{i,j}$ as subsets of $[k]$.

For the constraints we have the following:

1. If the j -th operation of χ is $I(i)$, for $i \in [k]$ and $V_{i,j-1}, V_{i,j}$ are live, we add a constraint ensuring that $x_{i,j} \supseteq x_{i,j-1}$ and $|x_{i,j}| \in [|x_{i,j-1}|, |x_{i,j-1}| + 1]$. If $V_{i,j}$ is live and $V_{i,j-1} = \emptyset$ we add the constraint that $|x_{i,j}| = 1$. For all $i' \in [k] \setminus \{i\}$ for which $V_{i',j}$ is live, add the constraint $x_{i',j} = x_{i',j-1}$.
2. If the j -th operation of χ is $R(i_1 \rightarrow i_2)$, for $i_1, i_2 \in [k]$ and $V_{i_2,j}$ is live, add a constraint ensuring that $x_{i_2,j} = x_{i_1,j-1} \cup x_{i_2,j-1}$. For all $i' \in [k] \setminus \{i_1, i_2\}$ for which $V_{i',j}$ is live, add the constraint $x_{i',j} = x_{i',j-1}$.
3. If the j -th operation of χ is $J(i_1 \rightarrow i_2)$, add the constraint $x_{i_1,j-1} \cap x_{i_2,j-1} = \emptyset$. For all $i \in [k]$ for which $V_{i,j}$ is live, add the constraint $x_{i,j} = x_{i,j-1}$.

This completes the construction of the CSP instance. It is not hard to show by induction that for all $j \in [t]$, G_j has a k -coloring if and only if there is an assignment to the variables

$x_{i,j'}$, for $i \in [\text{lcw}(G)]$, $j' \leq j$ that satisfies all constraints induced by these variables. The pathwidth of the primal graph of the produced instance is at most $\text{lcw}(G) + 2$, because the primal graph is essentially contained in a grid of dimensions $\text{lcw}(G) \times t$. ◀

► **Lemma 24.** *For all $k \geq 3, \varepsilon > 0$ we have the following: If there exists an algorithm solving k -COLORING in time $O((2^k - 2 - \varepsilon)^{\text{lcw}n} O(1))$, then the PP-SETH is false.*

Proof. We will make use of Corollary 18. Suppose we are given a 4-CSP instance ψ with alphabet size $B = 2^k - 2$, a partition of the variable set into V_a, V_b , a path decomposition of the primal graph of width p where each bag contains $O(B \log p)$ variables of V_b , and an injective function b mapping constraints to bags that contain their variables. We want to reduce the problem of deciding whether a multi-assignment that is monotone and consistent for V_b exists to k -COLORING on a graph G with $\text{lcw}(G) = p + O(B \log p)$. If we can do this, and if there exists a fast k -COLORING algorithm as stated in the lemma, then by Corollary 18 we would falsify the PP-SETH. As mentioned, we will in fact reduce to LIST COLORING, where all lists are subsets of $[k]$, and use known reductions from this problem to k -COLORING.

Assume that the given decomposition is nice (or use Lemma 2) and partition the variables of ψ into $p + 1$ sets V_1, \dots, V_{p+1} , so that each bag contains at most 1 variable from each set, using Lemma 3 for $k = p + 1$. Suppose the bags of the decomposition are numbered B_1, \dots, B_t . Without loss of generality, assume also that $B_1 = \emptyset$ (this can be achieved while keeping the decomposition nice by adding a sequence of bags in the beginning, removing one by one the elements of B_1).

We will construct a graph G and also give a corresponding linear clique-width expression using $p + O(kB^4)$ labels, of which one special label $*$ will be called a junk label (its intended meaning is that once we give a vertex this label, the vertex receives no further edges). For each $j \in \{2, \dots, t\}$, suppose we have already constructed a graph for the first $j - 1$ bags and a linear clique-width expression given by string χ_{j-1} . Furthermore, suppose that in G_{j-1} all vertices have a label from $[p + 1]$ or the junk label. G_1 is the empty graph which represents B_1 , which is an empty bag. We do the following:

1. If $B_j = B_{j-1} \setminus \{x\}$, and $x \in V_i$, for some $i \in [p + 1]$ we append to χ_{j-1} the operation $R(i \rightarrow *)$, that is, we rename vertices with label i to the junk label.
2. If $B_j = B_{j-1} \cup \{x\}$, and $x \in V_i$, for some $i \in [p + 1]$, we append to χ_{j-1} $k - 1$ operations $I(i)$. All new vertices constructed in this step have list $[k]$.
3. If there exists a (unique) constraint c that is mapped to B_j by b we consider the list of at most B^4 satisfying assignments of c , call it \mathcal{S}_c , with $\ell_c = |\mathcal{S}_c|$. For each $\sigma \in \mathcal{S}_c$ construct a vertex $t_{c,\sigma}$ with list $\{1, 2, 3\}$. Construct another $\ell_c + 1$ vertices with list $\{1, 2\}$ and connect them to the vertices $t_{c,\sigma}$ in a way that a cycle of length $2\ell + 1$ is formed in which no two $t_{c,\sigma}$ vertices are adjacent. For each $\sigma \in \mathcal{S}_c$, construct $4k$ vertices and place weak edges between these vertices and $t_{c,\sigma}$ ensuring that if $t_{c,\sigma}$ receives color 3, then for each $i \in [k]$ exactly 4 of these vertices receive color i ; otherwise the vertices can be colored in any way. Call the vertices that receive color i if $t_{c,\sigma}$ receives color 3, $t_{c,\sigma,i,\alpha}$, for $\alpha \in \{1, 2, 3, 4\}$. What we have constructed so far can easily be accomplished using $O(kB^4)$ labels in a way that each $t_{c,\sigma,i,\alpha}$ has a distinct label. Suppose that c involves variables from $V_{i_1}, V_{i_2}, V_{i_3}, V_{i_4}$. For each $\alpha \in \{1, 2, 3, 4\}$, each assignment $\sigma \in \mathcal{S}_c$, and each $i \in [k]$, if σ dictates that the variable of V_{i_α} involved in c takes a value in $[2^k - 2]$ which, when viewed as a set, does not contain i , add a Join operation between label i_1 and the label of $t_{c,\sigma,i,\alpha}$; if σ dictates that the same variable takes a value which (viewed as a set) contains i , add a Rename operation from the label of $t_{c,\sigma,i,\alpha}$. Conclude this part by renaming all vertices that still have a label outside $[p + 1]$ to the junk label $*$.

This concludes the construction and we have already argued why the graph has clique-width $p + O(kB^4) = p + O(1)$.

To prove equivalence, if there is a satisfying assignment for ψ , we obtain a coloring of G as follows: when we introduce a group of $k - 1$ vertices representing a variable x , we give them colors that correspond to the value of x in $\{2^k - 2\}$, viewed as a subset of $[k]$ (that is, if the i -th bit is 1, we color a vertex in the group i); when we introduce a vertex representing $x \in V_b$ we give it color 1 or 2 corresponding to the value of x in the satisfying assignment. We now claim that for all gadgets constructed in step 4 we can color the $O(kB^4)$ added vertices. In particular, if constraint c is satisfied via assignment σ , we give color 3 to $t_{c,\sigma}$ and use 1, 2 for the rest of the odd cycle; this eliminates all weak edges not incident on $t_{c,\sigma}$. For vertices $t_{c,\sigma,i,\alpha}$ we use the forced color, but this does not create any improperly colored edge, because any Join operation these vertices are involved with is with a set that does not contain its color; furthermore, renaming these vertices does not change the set of colors contained in any label class. For remaining vertices $t_{c,\sigma',i,\alpha}$, for $\sigma' \neq \sigma$, if we performed a Join on such a vertex we pick an arbitrary color that does not produce a monochromatic edge, while if we renamed it into a label in $[p + 1]$ we pick a color that is already present in that label class. This preserves the invariant that label class $i \in [p + 1]$ contains a set of colors representing the value of $x \in V_i \cap B_j$.

For the converse direction, we extract an assignment to V_b variables by looking at the $k - 1$ vertices introduced for each such variable and reading the set of colors used (which is a non-empty proper subset of $[k]$) as a value in $[2^k - 2]$. Note that it is crucial here that when the path decomposition introduces a variable $x \in V_b \cap V_i$, and we introduce $k - 1$ vertices with label i in the new graph, all pre-existing vertices of label i have been forgotten, since no other vertex of V_i can appear in the current bag.

For variables of V_a we extract a multi-assignment as follows: for each $x \in V_a \cap V_i$ and j such that $x \in B_j$ we look at the set of colors used by vertices with label i in the graph G_j , that is, the graph constructed after we have processed bag B_j . We claim that this assignment must satisfy any constraint c with $b(c) = j$. Indeed, because the $t_{c,\sigma}$ vertices participate in an odd cycle, one of them must have color 3, meaning that the vertices $t_{c,\sigma,i,\alpha}$ receive forced colors. These ensure that the colors present in label classes i_1, i_2, i_3 are consistent with σ , as we Join such classes with all the colors they are not supposed to contain in σ , and we add to them all the colors they are supposed to contain. Finally, observe that the multi-assignment we have extracted is monotone, as the set of colors contained in a label class can only increase, until the point when we forget the corresponding variable in the decomposition. Therefore, if there exists a list coloring of the constructed graph, we have a multi-assignment as demanded by Corollary 18. ◀

5.2 Independent Set and Scattered Set

In this section we consider a generalization of INDEPENDENT SET which is sometimes called in the literature d -SCATTERED SET. In this problem we are given a graph $G = (V, E)$ and are asked to select a maximum cardinality $S \subseteq V$ such that all vertices of S are at pairwise distance at least d . Clearly, for $d = 2$ this problem is exactly INDEPENDENT SET. We show that for all fixed $d \geq 2$, solving d -SCATTERED SET with parameter dependence better than d^{pw} is equivalent to the PP-SETH. This strengthens the lower bounds given by Katsikarelis et al. [45], who proved that no algorithm can solve this problem in time $(d - \varepsilon)^{\text{pw}} n^{O(1)}$, for any $d \geq 2, \varepsilon > 0$, assuming the SETH. Note that an algorithm with complexity $d^{\text{pw}} n^{O(1)}$ is obtained via standard DP in [45], so this result is tight.

We note also that Iwata and Yoshida [42] have shown that, for the specific case of $d = 2$,

INDEPENDENT SET is equivalent to the treewidth version of the PP-SETH, that is, the hypothesis that SAT cannot be solved with parameter dependence better than $(2 - \varepsilon)^{\text{tw}}$. Their reductions can easily go through unchanged if we start from the PP-SETH instead, so the fact that solving INDEPENDENT SET with this complexity is equivalent to the PP-SETH essentially follows from their work. Our result generalizes theirs to larger values of d . However, we prefer to give a unified proof for all cases $d \geq 2$, including $d = 2$, to showcase the flexibility of our framework.

We begin by giving a complexity upper bound.

► **Lemma 25.** *If the PP-SETH is false, then for all $d \geq 2$ there exists $\varepsilon > 0$ such that there is an algorithm that solves d -SCATTERED SET in time $O((d - \varepsilon)^{\text{pw}} n^{O(1)})$.*

Proof. For $d = 2$ the lemma is trivial, as INDEPENDENT SET can be seen as a special case of MAXW-2-SAT, which, if the PP-SETH is false, can be solved in the desired amount of time by Theorem 5. We therefore assume $d > 2$.

Given an instance $G = (V, E)$ of d -SCATTERED SET and a path decomposition of width $\text{pw}(G)$, we will reduce it to an instance of 2-CSP over an alphabet of size d , while increasing the pathwidth by at most an additive constant. If the PP-SETH is false, then the resulting instance can be solved fast enough to obtain the lemma by Theorem 11.

Suppose we have a nice path decomposition of G with the bags numbered B_1, \dots, B_t . Suppose also that for each $x, y \in V$ we have calculated the shortest path distance $d(x, y)$ in G . For $j \in [t]$ we will denote by G_j the edge-weighted graph whose vertex set is $V(G_j) = \bigcup_{j'=1}^j B_{j'}$ and where for each $x, y \in V(G_j)$ we have an edge xy with weight $d(x, y)$. In other words, G_j is constructed by first taking the metric closure of G and then keeping only vertices of the first j bags.

Let us now describe the construction of our CSP instance. For each $x \in V$ we construct t CSP variables, x_j , for $j \in [t]$. For a vertex x appearing in a bag B_j the informal meaning of x_j is that it represents the distance between x and its closest selected vertex in the graph G_j . We will allow these variables to take d possible values, in the set $\{0, \dots, d - 1\}$. We now add the following constraints:

1. For each $j \in [t]$ and $x, y \in B_j$, we add the constraints $x_j \leq y_j + d(x, y)$ and $y_j \leq x_j + d(x, y)$.
2. For each $j \in [t - 1]$ and $x \in B_j \cap B_{j+1}$ we add the constraint $x_{j+1} \leq x_j$. Furthermore, we add a constraint ensuring that if $x_{j+1} = 0$, then $x_j = 0$.
3. For each $j \in [t - 1]$ such that there exists $x \in B_{j+1} \setminus B_j$, for each $y \in B_j$, we add the constraint ensuring that if $x_j = 0$, then $y_{j+1} + d(x, y) \geq d$.
4. For each $x \in V$ such that x appears in bags with indices in $[j_1, j_2]$, we add the constraints $x_{j'} = x_{j'+1}$ for all $j' \in [j_1 - 1] \cup \{j_2, \dots, t - 1\}$.

To complete the construction we define a weight function that gives weight 1 to value 0 and weight 0 to every other value. If the target value for the scattered set was k , then we set the target weight to tk .

To prove correctness, suppose first that a d -scattered set S of size k exists in G . We assign value 0 to all x_j , such that $x \in S, j \in [t]$, achieving the target weight. For all $x \notin S$ and $j \in [t]$ such that $x \in B_j$, let y be the vertex of $S \cap V(G_j)$ that is closest to x . Then, assign to x_j value $d(x, y)$. If y does not exist, or $d(x, y) \geq d - 1$, assign to x_j value $d - 1$. Extend this assignment for all x and j for which $x \notin B_j$ in a way that satisfies constraints of the last step (give the same value as x_{j_1} to $x_{j'}$ for $j' < j$, and similarly for $j' > j$). The assignment we have constructed is satisfying for the following reasons: for constraints of the

first step, observe that the distance from x to S in G_j is at most $d(x, y)$ plus the distance from y to S ; for the second step, the distance from x to S can only decrease from G_j to G_{j+1} ; for the third step, if $x \in S$ and there existed a vertex $y \in V(G_j)$ at distance at most $d - 1 - d(x, y)$ from S in G_j , then x would be too close to another element of S .

For the converse direction, suppose we find a satisfying assignment of the new instance that sets as many variables as possible to 0. Because of the constraints of step 2, the number of such variables is a multiple of t , and if we have weight at least tk , we can extract a set $S \subseteq V$ of at least k vertices of G , which we claim is a d -scattered set. To see this, we will prove that for all $j \in [t]$ and $x \in B_j$, if $S \cap V(G_j) \neq \emptyset$, then the variable x_j must take value at most as large as the distance from x to $S \cap V(G_j)$. We can establish this by induction on j . For $j = 1$, if $S \cap B_1 = \emptyset$, then the statement is vacuous, while if $S \cap B_1 \neq \emptyset$, then the constraints of the first step assure the property because for $y \in S$ we have $y_1 = 0$. Since by constraints of step 2 the values assigned to x_j can only decrease as we increase j , if $B_{j+1} \cap S = \emptyset$ and the statement is true for G_j , then the statement is true for G_{j+1} . The remaining case is when B_{j+1} introduces a new vertex in S , call this vertex y , with $y_{j+1} = 0$. However, for all $x \in B_j$ the constraints of step 1 ensure that if x is closer to y than to $S \cap V(G_j)$, then the value x_{j+1} will decrease from x_j to (at most) $d(x, y)$. Having established the property that for $x \in B_j$ we have $x_j \leq d(x, S \cap V(G_j))$, constraints of step 3 ensure that the first time we introduce a vertex of S , we check that this vertex is not too close to any previously introduced vertex of S . This is true, because in this case the remaining vertices of the bag form a separator, so any shortest path to a previous vertex of S would have to go through them.

Finally, we need to argue that the new instance has small pathwidth. Take the path decomposition of G and replace in each B_j each vertex $x \in B_j$ with the variable x_j . This covers constraints of step 1. For each j such that there exists $x \in B_{j+1} \setminus B_j$, also place x_{j+1} in B_j . Since the decomposition is nice, this can only increase the width by 1, and we cover constraints of step 3. For each $j \in [t - 1]$, in order to cover the constraints of step 2, we insert between B_j and B_{j+1} a sequence of bags which start with B_j and at each step add a variable x_{j+1} and then remove x_j , one by one. Finally, to cover the remaining variables and constraints of step 4 it suffices for each $x \in V$ that appears in the interval B_{j_1}, \dots, B_{j_2} to insert to the left of B_{j_1} a sequence of bags that contain all of B_{j_1} and a path decomposition of the path formed by x_1, \dots, x_{j_1} , and similarly after B_{j_2} . ◀

We now proceed to the reduction in the converse direction.

► **Lemma 26.** *If for some $d \geq 2, \varepsilon > 0$ there is an algorithm that solves d -SCATTERED SET in time $O((d - \varepsilon)^{pw} n^{O(1)})$, then the PP-SETH is false.*

Proof. We present a reduction from the 4-CSP problem of Corollary 18 with alphabet size d to d -SCATTERED SET. We are given a CSP instance ψ , a partition of its variables into two sets V_1, V_2 , a path decomposition B_1, \dots, B_t of ψ of width p such that each bag contains at most $O(d \log p)$ variables of V_2 , and an injective function b mapping each constraint to a bag that contains its variables. We want to construct a d -SCATTERED SET instance G with $\text{pw}(G) = p + O(d \log p + d^6)$ and a target size k , such that if ψ is satisfiable, then G has a d -scattered set of size at least k , while if G has such a d -scattered set, ψ admits a monotone satisfying multi-assignment which is consistent for V_2 .

Suppose that the variables of ψ are numbered x_1, \dots, x_n and that the given path decomposition is nice. We construct the following graph:

1. For each $x_i \in V_2$ we construct a path P_i on d vertices, call them p_i^1, \dots, p_i^d .

2. For each $x_i \in V_1$ and $j \in [t]$ with $x_i \in B_j$ we construct a path $P_{i,j}$ on d vertices, call them $p_{i,j}^1, \dots, p_{i,j}^d$.
3. For each $j \in [t-1]$ and $x \in B_j \cap B_{j+1} \cap V_1$ we add an edge $p_{i,j}^d p_{i,j+1}^1$.
4. For each constraint c let $j = b(c)$ and suppose c involves variables $x_{i_1}, x_{i_2}, x_{i_3}, x_{i_4} \in B_j$. Consider the set \mathcal{S}_c of the at most d^4 satisfying assignments of c . Construct two sets of vertices $X_c = \{x_{c,\sigma} \mid \sigma \in \mathcal{S}_c\}$ and $Y_c = \{y_{c,\sigma} \mid \sigma \in \mathcal{S}_c\}$ and add edges so that each of the two sets induces a clique. For each $\sigma \in \mathcal{S}_c$ and $\alpha \in \{1, 2, 3, 4\}$, if $\sigma(x_{i_\alpha}) = v_\alpha$, then connect $y_{c,\sigma}$ with $p_{i_\alpha,j}^{v'_\alpha}$ (or $p_{i_\alpha}^{v'_\alpha}$, if $x_{i_\alpha} \in V_2$), for all $v' \in [d] \setminus \{v_\alpha\}$, using paths of length $\lceil \frac{d}{2} \rceil$ going through new vertices. For each $\sigma \in \mathcal{S}_c$, connect $x_{c,\sigma}$ to $y_{c,\sigma}$ using a path of length $\lfloor \frac{d}{2} \rfloor - 1$, through new vertices if necessary. For $d \leq 2$ this means that we contract the vertex $x_{c,\sigma}$ into $y_{c,\sigma}$.

We set the target d -scattered set size to be equal to be $k = L_1 + L_2 + m$, where L_1 is the number of paths constructed in step 1, L_2 is the number of paths constructed in step 2, and m is the number of constraints of ψ .

For correctness, suppose we have a satisfying assignment σ for ψ . For each $x_i \in V_2$ we select into our solution $p_i^{\sigma(x_i)}$. For each $x_i \in V_1$ and $j \in [t]$ such that $x_i \in B_j$ we select $p_{i,j}^{\sigma(x_i)}$. Finally, for each constraint c , we select x_{c,σ_c} , where $\sigma_c \in \mathcal{S}_c$ is the restriction of σ to the variables of c . The set we selected has the required size. To see that it is a d -scattered set, we first note that any path between a vertex of P_i or $P_{i,j}$ and a vertex of the cliques X_c has length at least $\lceil \frac{d}{2} \rceil$. This implies that selected vertices from cliques X_c are at pairwise distances at least d ; and that if two selected vertices from the paths P_i and $P_{i,j}$ are at distance at most $d-1$, then the shortest path connecting them must use only edges added in steps 1,2, and 3. However, it is not hard to see that if we restrict ourselves to such edges, the distances between selected vertices are at least d . Finally, to check that no selected vertex from a clique X_c is at distance at most $d-1$ to a selected vertex from a path, we observe that each $x_{c,\sigma_c} \in X_c$ is at distance at most $d-1$ only from the vertices of the paths corresponding to vertices of c which represent assignments that disagree with σ_c . Since no such vertex has been selected, we have a valid scattered set.

For the converse direction we first observe that for each c , the vertices added in step 4, namely X_c, Y_c and possibly the internal vertices of paths we constructed, are all at pairwise distances at most $d-1$. Hence, from each such set any scattered set selects at most one vertex. Similarly, for each path P_i and $P_{i,j}$ the scattered set may select at most one vertex. Therefore, a solution of the desired size must select exactly one vertex from each path and from each constraint gadget. From the vertices selected in paths we extract a multi-assignment: for $x_i \in V_1$ and $j \in [t]$ with $x_i \in B_j$ we assign to x_i value v in j if $p_{i,j}^v$ is selected; for $x_i \in V_2$ we assign x_i value v if p_i^v is selected. This assignment is monotone, because if for $x_i \in B_j \cap B_{j+1} \cap V_1$ we assign values v_1 in j and $v_2 < v_1$ in $j+1$, this means we have in the scattered set $p_{i,j}^{v_1}, p_{i,j+1}^{v_2}$, which are at distance $v_2 - v_1 + d < d$, contradiction. Let us also argue why the assignment is satisfying. Consider a constraint c with $b(c) = j$, involving four variables from $V_{i_1}, V_{i_2}, V_{i_3}, V_{i_4}$. If the assignment we have given to the four variables is not satisfying, then for each $\sigma \in \mathcal{S}_c$, the vertex $y_{c,\sigma}$ is at distance at most $\lceil \frac{d}{2} \rceil$ from a selected vertex. This means that all vertices of X_c (and therefore all vertices of the gadget) are at distance at most $\lfloor \frac{d}{2} \rfloor + \lceil \frac{d}{2} \rceil - 1 = d-1$ from a selected vertex, meaning that we cannot have selected any vertex from this constraint gadget, contradiction.

Finally, to bound the pathwidth of the graph G , start with the decomposition of the primal graph of ψ and in each B_j replace each $x_i \in V_2 \cap B_j$ with all the vertices of P_i . For each constraint c , let $b(c) = j$ and add into B_j all the at most $O(d^6)$ vertices we constructed in step 4 for c (that is, X_c, Y_c and the internal vertices of the paths). So far each bag contains

$O(d \log p + d^6)$ vertices. To cover the remaining vertices, for each $j \in [t]$ we replace the bag B_j with a sequence of bags such that all of them contain the vertices we have added to B_j so far, the first bag contains $\{p_{i,j}^1 \mid x_i \in V_1 \cap B_j\}$ and the last bag contains $\{p_{i,j}^d \mid x_i \in V_1 \cap B_j\}$. We insert a sequence of $O(pd)$ bags between these two, at each step adding a vertex $p_{i,j}^{v+1}$ and then removing $p_{i,j}^v$ in a way that covers all edges of paths of step 2. To cover the edges of step 3 it suffices to add a similar sequence of bags between the bag containing $\{p_{i,j}^d \mid x_i \in V_1 \cap B_j\}$ and the bag containing $\{p_{i,j+1}^1 \mid x_i \in V_1 \cap B_{j+1}\}$. \blacktriangleleft

We note that in Theorem 5 we skipped the case of MAXW-SAT for instances of arity 2, as hardness for such instances follows from the hardness of INDEPENDENT SET, which we just established. We therefore have the following corollary.

► **Corollary 27.** *There exists an algorithm solving MAXW-2-SAT in time $O((2-\varepsilon)^{pw}|\psi|^{O(1)})$, where ψ is the input formula, if and only if the PP-SETH is false.*

5.3 Set Cover

We present a tight PP-SETH equivalence for the complexity of solving SET COVER. Recall that in this problem we are given a universe U of n elements and a collection \mathcal{C} of m subsets of U and are asked to select a minimum cardinality collection of sets from \mathcal{C} whose union covers U . The pathwidth of such an instance is the pathwidth of the bipartite incidence graph that represents the set system, that is, the graph that has U on one side, \mathcal{C} on the other, and edges x_C , for $x \in U, c \in \mathcal{C}$ whenever $x \in C$.

We recall that it is already known that an algorithm solving SET COVER in time $(2-\varepsilon)^{pw}(n+m)^{O(1)}$ would refute both the SETH and the SCC. This is because $pw \leq \min\{n, m\}$, and it was shown in [16] that an algorithm for SET COVER running in time $(2-\varepsilon)^m n^{O(1)}$ contradicts the SETH, while for the SCC this follows from the definition of the conjecture. As shown in Section 4, the PP-SETH is weaker than both of these conjectures and in this section we establish equivalence with the PP-SETH, strengthening the lower bound.

► **Lemma 28.** *For all $\varepsilon > 0$ we have the following: SET COVER with n elements and m sets can be solved in time $O((2-\varepsilon)^{pw}(n+m)^{O(1)})$ if and only if the PP-SETH is false.*

Proof. One direction is easy: if the PP-SETH is false, by Theorem 5 we have an algorithm solving MAXW-SAT in $((2-\varepsilon)^{pw^I(\psi)}|\psi|^{O(1)})$ time, where ψ is the input formula. We construct from the SET COVER instance a formula that has a variable x_C for each $C \in \mathcal{C}$. For each element $u \in U$ we construct the clause $(\bigvee_{C:u \in C} \neg x_C)$. An assignment of maximum weight to this formula corresponds to a minimum cardinality set cover (select sets C for which x_C is False). The incidence graph of ψ is exactly the same as the incidence graph of the SET COVER instance.

For the converse direction, we perform a reduction from the 4-CSP problem of Corollary 18 for $B = 2$. Given a CSP instance ψ and a path decomposition B_1, \dots, B_t of its primal graph, with the variables partitioned into V_a, V_b , we do the following:

1. For each $x \in V_b$ we construct an element u_x and two sets $C_{x,1}, C_{x,2}$. The element u_x is placed in both of these sets and no other set.
2. For each $x \in V_a$ and $j \in [t]$ such that $x \in B_j$ we construct an element $u_{x,j}$ and two sets $C_{x,j,1}, C_{x,j,2}$. The element $u_{x,j}$ is placed in both of these sets and no other set.
3. For each $j \in [t-1]$ and variable $x \in B_j \cap B_{j+1} \cap V_a$, we construct a new element $u_{x,j,j+1}$ and place it into $C_{x,j,1}$ and $C_{x,j+1,2}$.

4. For each constraint c such that $b(c) = j$, suppose that c involves four variables $x_1, x_2, x_3, x_4 \in B_j$ and has the set of satisfying assignments \mathcal{S}_c . For each $\sigma \in \mathcal{S}_c$ we construct four elements $y_{c,\sigma,\alpha}$, for $\alpha \in \{1, 2, 3, 4\}$. For each σ , if σ assigns to x_1, x_2, x_3, x_4 values v_1, v_2, v_3, v_4 respectively, then for each $\alpha \in \{1, 2, 3, 4\}$ we place $y_{c,\sigma,\alpha}$ in the set $C_{x_{i_\alpha}, j, v_\alpha}$. We add $|\mathcal{S}_c|$ further sets: for each $\sigma \in \mathcal{S}_c$, the set $R_{c,\sigma}$ contains all elements $y_{c,\sigma',\alpha}$, for $\sigma' \in \mathcal{S} \setminus \{\sigma\}$, $\alpha \in \{1, 2, 3, 4\}$. Add a new element w_c and place it into all sets $R_{c,\sigma}$ and into no other set.

If the number of elements constructed in steps 1 and 2 is L_1, L_2 respectively, and the number of constraints of ψ is m , we set the target cover cardinality to $L_1 + L_2 + m$. This completes the construction.

To argue for correctness, assume first that we have a satisfying assignment σ to ψ . We transform it into a set cover by selecting for each $x \in V_a$ and j such that $x \in B_j$, the set $C_{x,j,\sigma(x)}$, and for each $x \in V_b$ the set $C_{x,\sigma(x)}$. For each constraint c we select the set R_{c,σ_c} , where σ_c is the restriction of σ to the variables of c . This selection clearly has the desired cardinality and covers elements of steps 1 and 2. Elements of step 3 are also covered, because the selection is consistent. Elements of step 4 are covered, because σ_c is satisfying for c , so the four elements $y_{c,\sigma_c,\alpha}$ which are not covered by R_{c,σ_c} are covered by the other sets.

For the converse direction, if we have a set cover of the desired size we observe that (i) we must select at least one set for each element of step 1 (ii) at least one set for each element of step 2 (iii) at least one set for each constraint. If we achieve the desired target all three requirements become tight, so we can extract an assignment for V_b and a multi-assignment for V_a . The multi-assignment must be monotone, because if for some j and $x \in B_j \cap B_{j+1} \cap V_a$ we have sets $C_{x,j,2}, C_{x,j+1,1}$, the element added in step 3 is not covered. The multi-assignment must be satisfying because for each c we have selected a unique $R_{c,\sigma}$, for σ a satisfying assignment to c and the elements $y_{c,\sigma,\alpha}$, which are not covered by $R_{c,\sigma}$ must therefore be covered by our selection for the variables.

Finally, let us bound the pathwidth of the new instance. For each $j \in [t]$ we replace the bag B_j of the original decomposition with a sequence of $|B_j \cap V_a| \leq p + 1$ bags $B_j^1, \dots, B_j^{|B_j \cap V_a|}$. For $\beta \in [|B_j \cap V_a|]$ the bag B_j^β contains: (i) for all $x \in V_b \cap B_j$ the elements $C_{x,1}, C_{x,2}, u_x$; (ii) if there exists c with $b(c) = j$, then B_j^β contains all the at most $O(1)$ elements and sets of step 4 constructed for c . We now add elements to this sequence of bags to cover the construction of step 2, namely, for each $x \in V_a \cap B_j$ we place $C_{x,j,2}$ in B_j^1 and $C_{x,j,1}$ in $B_j^{|B_j \cap V_a|}$; for each $x \in B_j \cap V_a$ we select a distinct bag in the sequence, we add to this bag $u_{x,j}$, we add $C_{x,j,2}$ to all bags up to and including this bag, and we add $C_{x,j,1}$ to all bags from this bag to the last. Finally, to cover the edges of step 3 it suffices to add a sequence of bags between $B_j^{|V_a \cap B_j|}$ and B_{j+1}^1 to cover the edges between the new elements $u_{x,j,j+1}$ and sets $C_{x,j,2}, C_{x,j+1,1}$, again by exchanging elements one pair at a time. The width of the resulting decomposition is $p + O(\log p)$. ◀

5.4 Dominating Set

For a positive integer $r \geq 1$, the r -DOMINATING SET problem is the problem of selecting in a graph G a set of vertices of minimum cardinality such that all remaining vertices are at distance at most r from a selected vertex. For $r = 1$ this is just DOMINATING SET. In this section we present a tight bound on the complexity of solving r -DOMINATING SET, proving that, for all $r \geq 1$, obtaining an algorithm with parameter dependence better than $(2r + 1)^{\text{pw}}$ is equivalent to the PP-SETH. This strengthens a result of Borradaile and Le [11] who proved that such an algorithm cannot be obtained under the SETH. We remark that obtaining an

algorithm with running time $(2r + 1)^{\text{pw}} n^{O(1)}$ is easy using dynamic programming, and it is possible to achieve this performance even if we parameterize by treewidth, by using fast subset convolution techniques [11].

► **Lemma 29.** *If the PP-SETH is false, then for all $r \geq 1$ there exists $\varepsilon > 0$ and an algorithm that solves r -DOMINATING SET in time $O((2r + 1 - \varepsilon)^{\text{pw}} n^{O(1)})$.*

Proof. Fix some $r \geq 1$. We will reduce a given r -DOMINATING SET instance G to MAXW-CSP over an alphabet of size $2r + 1$, while increasing the pathwidth by at most an additive constant. If the PP-SETH is false, then by Theorem 5 there is a fast algorithm for solving this MAXW-CSP instance, which will allow us to obtain the desired running time for r -DOMINATING SET.

Suppose we have a nice path decomposition of $G = (V, E)$ with the bags numbered B_1, \dots, B_t . Vertices of G are numbered $V = \{v_1, \dots, v_n\}$. We can assume that there exists an injective function $b : E \rightarrow [t]$ which maps each edge of G to the index of a bag that contains both endpoints (b can be made injective by repeating bags if necessary). Furthermore, we can assume that b maps edges to bags which are not introducing new vertices, again by repeating bags.

We will construct a CSP instance ψ over an alphabet $\{-r, \dots, r\}$ of size $2r + 1$ as follows:

1. For each $v_i \in V$ we construct t variables $x_{i,j}$, for $j \in [t]$.
2. For each $v_i \in V$ and $j \in [t - 1]$, we add a constraint which states that $|x_{i,j}| = |x_{i,j+1}|$. If no edge e has $b(e) = j + 1$ or for some edge e we have $b(e) = j + 1$ but e is not incident on v_i , then we also add the constraint $x_{i,j+1} \leq x_{i,j}$.
3. For each $v_i \in V$, if the last bag containing v_i is B_j , then for all $j' \in \{j, \dots, t - 1\}$ we add the constraint $x_{i,j'} = x_{i,j'+1}$.
4. For each $e \in E$ let $j = b(e)$ and $e = v_{i_1} v_{i_2}$ with $v_{i_1}, v_{i_2} \in B_j$. We add a constraint dictating that if $x_{i_1,j} \geq 0$, then $x_{i_1,j-1} \geq 0$ or $|x_{i_1,j}| \geq |x_{i_2,j}| + 1$. We also add the symmetric constraint for $x_{i_2,j}$.
5. For each $v_i \in V$ we add the constraint $x_{i,t} \geq 0$ and $x_{i,1} \leq 0$.

We define a weight function which gives weight 1 to all values except value 0, which receives value 0. The target weight is $(n - k)t$, where k is the target value for the r -dominating set.

For correctness, suppose we have an r -dominating set of G , call it S , of size at most k . For each $v_i \in S$ we assign to $x_{i,j}$, for $j \in [t]$ the value 0. We will not reuse value 0, so this will achieve the target weight. For each other $v_i \in V \setminus S$, we assign all $x_{i,j}$ values such that $|x_{i,j}| = d(v_i, S) \leq r$. More precisely, for each $v_i \in V \setminus S$, let e be the edge incident on v_i that is the first edge of a shortest path from v_i to S . Let $j = b(e)$. We set $x_{i,j'} = -d(v_i, S)$ for all $j' < j, j' \in [t]$ and $x_{i,j'} = d(v_i, S)$ for all remaining j' . This satisfies constraints of steps 2, 3 and 5. To see that constraints of step 4 are satisfied, we observe that if x_{i_2} is the other endpoint of e , then it must be the case that $d(v_{i_2}, S) = d(v_i, S) - 1$ so $|x_{i_1,j}| = |x_{i_2,j}| + 1$.

For the converse direction, suppose that we have a satisfying assignment with the desired weight. By constraints of step 2, each group of t variables is either assigned 0 everywhere or nowhere, therefore if we select the set $S = \{v_i \mid x_{i,j} = 0 \text{ for some } j\}$, then $|S| \leq k$. We want to argue that S is an r -dominating set. For this we will prove that for all $v_i \in V$, and $j \in [t]$, if $x_{i,j} \geq 0$, then $d(v_i, S) \leq x_{i,j}$. Since $x_{i,t} \geq 0$ for all $v_i \in V$, this will prove correctness. We prove the statement by induction on $|x_{i,j}|$. For $|x_{i,j}| = 1$, the constraints ensure that $|x_{i,j}|$ is constant throughout, $x_{i,1} < 0$, and $x_{i,t} > 0$, so there must be some j such that $x_{i,j-1} = -1$ and $x_{i,j} = 1$. Then, to avoid violating the constraints of step 2, it must be the case that there

exists e , with $b(e) = j$, such that e is incident on v_i . This implies that we have to satisfy the constraint of step 4, which can only be satisfied if the other endpoint of e is a vertex of S . For the general case, if we have $x_{i,j} > 0$ and $x_{i,j-1} < 0$, there must exist an edge e with $b(e) = j$, e is incident on v_i , and if i_2 is the other endpoint of e , then $|x_{i_2,j}| \leq x_{i,j} - 1$. Since $x_{i_2,t} = |x_{i_2,t}|$ and we have established by induction that $d(v_{i_2}, S) = |x_{i_2,j}|$, we conclude that $d(x_i, S) \leq x_{i,j}$, as desired.

Finally, let us argue about the pathwidth of ψ . Take the path decomposition of G and replace in each B_j each vertex $v_i \in B_j$ with the variable $x_{i,j}$. For each $e \in E$ such that $e = v_{i_1}v_{i_2}$ also place $x_{i_1,j}, x_{i_2,j}$ in B_{j-1} . This covers constraints of step 4, increasing the width by at most 2 (since b is injective). For each $j \in [t-1]$ we insert between B_j and B_{j+1} a sequence of bags which start with B_j and at each step add a variable $x_{i,j+1}$ and then remove $x_{i,j}$, one by one. Finally, to cover the remaining variables and constraints of steps 2,3 and 5, it suffices for each $v_i \in V$ that appears in the interval B_{j_1}, \dots, B_{j_2} to insert to the left of B_{j_1} a sequence of bags that contain all of B_{j_1} and a path decomposition of the path formed by $x_{i,1}, \dots, x_{i,j_1}$, and similarly after B_{j_2} . ◀

► **Lemma 30.** *If for some $r \geq 1$ there exists $\varepsilon > 0$ an algorithm that solves r -DOMINATING SET in time $O((2r+1-\varepsilon)^{pw}n^{O(1)})$, then the PP-SETH is false.*

Proof. We present a reduction from the 4-CSP problem of Corollary 18 with alphabet size $(2r+1)$ to r -DOMINATING SET. We are given a CSP instance ψ , a partition of its variables into two sets V_1, V_2 , a path decomposition B_1, \dots, B_t of ψ of width p such that each bag contains at most $O(d \log p)$ variables of V_2 , and an injective function b mapping each constraint to a bag that contains its variables. We want to construct an r -DOMINATING SET instance G with $\text{pw}(G) = p + O(r \log p + r^9)$ and a target size k , such that if ψ is satisfiable, then G has an r -dominating set of size at most k , while if G has such an r -dominating set, ψ admits a monotone satisfying multi-assignment which is consistent for V_2 . To ease presentation, we will be looking for a multi-assignment that is monotonically *decreasing* rather than increasing. This is equivalent to what is required by Corollary 18, as we can just flip the ordering of the bags of the given decomposition.

Before we proceed, let us define a slightly more general version of DOMINATING SET. Suppose that a subset of vertices of G is given to us marked as “optional”, meaning that we are seeking a dominating set which may select some of these vertices, but it is not mandatory to dominate them. This more general version of the problem is actually equivalent to r -DOMINATING SET. Indeed, given an instance of the problem with a set of optional vertices V_o , we can add a new vertex x , connect it with paths of length r to all vertices of V_o , attach to x a path of length r , and increase the budget by 1. Since without loss of generality any r -dominating set of the new graph selects x and no other new vertex, there is a one-to-one correspondence between optimal dominating sets that dominate non-optional vertices in the original graph and optimal dominating sets in the new graph. Observe that this construction only increases the pathwidth by an additive constant. Because of this, we will in the remainder allow ourselves to mark some vertices as optional.

Suppose that the variables of ψ are numbered x_1, \dots, x_n and that the given path decomposition is nice. We construct the following graph:

1. For each $x_i \in V_2$ we construct a path P_i on $2r+1$ vertices, call them p_i^1, \dots, p_i^{2r+1} . Construct a vertex t_i , connected to each p_i^v , for $v \in [2r+1]$ via a path of length r that goes through new optional vertices.

2. For each $x_i \in V_1$ and $j \in [t]$ with $x_i \in B_j$ we construct a path $P_{i,j}$ on $2r + 1$ vertices, call them $p_{i,j}^1, \dots, p_{i,j}^{2r+1}$. Construct a vertex $t_{i,j}$, connected to each p_i^v , for $v \in [2r + 1]$ via a path of length r that goes through new optional vertices.
3. For each $x_i \in V_1$ if the interval of bags containing x_i is B_{j_1}, \dots, B_{j_2} , we mark the vertices $p_{i,j_1}^1, \dots, p_{i,j_1}^r$ and $p_{i,j_2}^{r+1}, \dots, p_{i,j_2}^{2r+1}$ as optional.
4. For each $j \in [t - 1]$ and $x \in B_j \cap B_{j+1} \cap V_1$ we add an edge $p_{i,j}^{2r+1} p_{i,j+1}^1$.
5. For each constraint c let $j = b(c)$ and suppose c involves variables $x_{i_1}, x_{i_2}, x_{i_3}, x_{i_4} \in B_j$. Consider the set \mathcal{S}_c of the at most $(2r + 1)^4$ satisfying assignments of c . For each $\sigma \in \mathcal{S}_c$ construct four vertices $x_{c,\sigma,\alpha}$, for $\alpha \in \{1, 2, 3, 4\}$ and a vertex $y_{c,\sigma}$. Add edges so that vertices $y_{c,\sigma}$, for $\sigma \in \mathcal{S}_c$ form a clique. Construct a vertex w_c . Connect w_c to each $y_{c,\sigma}$, for $\sigma \in \mathcal{S}_c$, via paths of length r , going through $r - 1$ new vertices. For each $\sigma, \sigma' \in \mathcal{C}$ with $\sigma \neq \sigma'$, connect $y_{c,\sigma}$ with each $x_{c,\sigma',\alpha}$, for $\alpha \in \{1, 2, 3, 4\}$, through paths of length r through new vertices. For each $\sigma \in \mathcal{S}_c$ and $\alpha \in \{1, 2, 3, 4\}$, if $\sigma(x_{i_\alpha}) = v_\alpha$, then connect $x_{c,\sigma,\alpha}$ to $p_{i_\alpha}^{v_\alpha}$ (or to $p_i^{v_\alpha}$ if $x_i \in V_2$) using a path of length r through new vertices. All internal vertices of paths of length r constructed in this step are marked as optional.

We set the target r -dominating set size to be equal to be $k = L_1 + L_2 + m$, where L_1 is the number of paths constructed in step 1, L_2 is the number of paths constructed in step 2, and m is the number of constraints of ψ .

For correctness, suppose we have a satisfying assignment σ for ψ . For each $x_i \in V_2$ we select into our solution $p_i^{\sigma(x_i)}$. For each $x_i \in V_1$ and $j \in [t]$ such that $x_i \in B_j$ we select $p_{i,j}^{\sigma(x_i)}$. Finally, for each constraint c , we select y_{c,σ_c} , where $\sigma_c \in \mathcal{S}_c$ is the restriction of σ to the variables of c . The set we selected has the required size. To see that it is an r -dominating set for all non-optional vertices, we observe that for each $x_i \in V_2$ all the vertices of P_i and t_i are dominated; for each $x_i \in V_1$ and $j \in [t]$ such that $x_i \in B_j$ all the vertices of $P_{i,j}$ and $t_{i,j}$ are dominated, except possibly the optional vertices of P_{i,j_1} or P_{i,j_2} , where j_1, j_2 are as in step 3; for each constraint c , w_c is dominated, all vertices $y_{c,\sigma}$ are dominated, and for all $\sigma' \in \mathcal{S}_c \setminus \{\sigma_c\}$ and $\alpha \in \{1, 2, 3, 4\}$, $x_{c,\sigma',\alpha}$ is dominated, while the vertices $x_{c,\sigma_c,\alpha}$ are dominated by the vertices selected in the paths.

For the converse direction, we first observe that if we consider a set made up of the middle vertex of each path P_i or $P_{i,j}$ and the vertex w_c for each constraint c , we have a set of k vertices which are at pairwise distance at least $2r + 1$. This implies that a solution of size k must dominate each of these vertices exactly once, as no vertex can dominate two of them. In particular, from each path P_i or $P_{i,j}$, at most one vertex can be selected in the solution. We can now extract a multi-assignment for $x_i \in V_1$ and an assignment for $x_i \in V_2$: look at the path $P_{i,j}$ or P_i and locate the vertex p_i^v or $p_{i,j}^v$ which is in the shortest path from the middle vertex of the path to the vertex that dominates it, and assign value v to x_i . This assignment is monotonically decreasing, because if for $x_i \in B_j \cap B_{j+1} \cap V_1$ we assign values v_1 in j and $v_2 > v_1$ in $j + 1$, this means there is a sequence of $2r + 1$ consecutive vertices of the path $P_{i,j}, P_{i,j+1}$ which contain no vertex of the dominating set, hence there is a non-dominated vertex. Let us also argue why the assignment is satisfying. Consider a constraint c with $b(c) = j$, involving four variables from $V_{i_1}, V_{i_2}, V_{i_3}, V_{i_4}$. Without loss of generality, we have selected a vertex $y_{c,\sigma}$ to dominate w_c , as any other vertex that can dominate w_c covers fewer vertices. We claim that σ must be consistent with our assignment. To see this, observe that $x_{c,\sigma,\alpha}$ are not covered by $y_{c,\sigma}$, therefore, they must be covered by the vertices we have selected in the paths. If $\sigma(x_{i_\alpha}) = v_\alpha$, this can only happen if the path vertex closes to a selected vertex is $p_{i_\alpha}^{v_\alpha}$.

Finally, to bound the pathwidth of the graph G , start with the decomposition of the primal graph of ψ and in each B_j replace each $x_i \in V_2 \cap B_j$ with all the vertices of P_i . For

each constraint c , let $b(c) = j$ and add into B_j all the at most $O(r^9)$ vertices we constructed in step 5 for c . So far each bag contains $O(r \log p + r^9)$ vertices. To cover the remaining vertices, for each $j \in [t]$ we replace the bag B_j with a sequence of bags such that all of them contain the vertices we have added to B_j so far, the first bag contains $\{p_{i,j}^1 \mid x_i \in V_1 \cap B_j\}$ and the last bag contains $\{p_{i,j}^{2r+1} \mid x_i \in V_1 \cap B_j\}$. We insert a sequence of $O(pr)$ bags between these two, at each step adding a vertex $p_{i,j}^{v+1}$ and then removing $p_{i,j}^v$ in a way that covers all edges of paths of step 2. To cover the edges of step 3 it suffices to add a similar sequence of bags between the bag containing $\{p_{i,j}^{2r+1} \mid x_i \in V_1 \cap B_j\}$ and the bag containing $\{p_{i,j+1}^1 \mid x_i \in V_1 \cap B_{j+1}\}$. ◀

6 Super-exponential FPT problems

6.1 Coloring

In this section we consider the complexity of COLORING parameterized by pathwidth, when the number of colors is part of the input. It is well known (and easy to see) that on a graph of pathwidth pw it is always possible to produce a proper coloring using $\text{pw} + 1$ colors in polynomial time, hence COLORING is FPT and admits an algorithm with complexity $\text{pw}^{\text{pw}} n^{O(1)}$ via the standard DP algorithm. The question we focus on is whether this algorithm is best possible.

It is already known that if we disregard constants in the exponent, then the algorithm we mentioned cannot be significantly improved: Lokshantov, Marx, and Saurabh showed that an algorithm with running time of $\text{pw}^{o(\text{pw})} n^{O(1)}$ would falsify the ETH ([51]). However, we are asking a more fine-grained question here, which sets a more modest goal: is it possible to improve upon this algorithm even slightly, obtaining a running time of the form $\text{pw}^{(1-\varepsilon)\text{pw}} n^{O(1)}$? Our results in this section show that the answer is likely to be negative, and in fact that obtaining such an algorithm is both necessary and sufficient for falsifying the PP-SETH. In other words, we obtain a lower bound result that is sharper than that of [51], because we not only show that the dependence on treewidth has to be exponential in $\Theta(\text{pw} \log \text{pw})$, but we precisely determine that the coefficient of the leading term must be equal to 1.

To establish equivalence we need a reduction from and to SAT. We give these reductions in Lemma 31 and Lemma 32.

► **Lemma 31.** *If the PP-SETH is false, then there exists an $\varepsilon > 0$ and an algorithm solving COLORING in time $\text{pw}^{(1-\varepsilon)\text{pw}} n^{O(1)}$.*

Proof. Suppose that the PP-SETH is false, so there exists $\delta > 0$ and an algorithm that decides the satisfiability of a CNF formula ϕ in time $2^{(1-\delta)\text{pw}(\phi)} |\phi|^{O(1)}$. Suppose also that we are given a graph G on n vertices and a tree decomposition of width $\text{pw}(G)$, as well as an integer k , and we want to decide if G can be colored with k colors.

We will assume without loss of generality that $\text{pw}(G) > 2^{4/\delta}$ (otherwise, $\text{pw}(G)$ is bounded by an absolute constant and we can decide the k -colorability of G in linear time). We can also assume without loss of generality that $k \leq \text{pw}(G)$, because if $k \geq \text{pw}(G) + 1$ a k -coloring can always be found by a simple greedy algorithm, using the fact that every induced subgraph of G contains a vertex of degree at most $\text{pw}(G)$. We will construct in polynomial time an instance of SAT ϕ that satisfies the following:

1. ϕ is satisfiable if and only if G is k -colorable.
2. $\text{pw}(\phi) \leq \text{pw}(G) \log(\text{pw}(G)) + 2\text{pw}(G)$

3. $|\phi| = n^{O(1)}$

Observe that if we have the above, then we obtain the lemma. This is because we can decide k -colorability of G by invoking the supposed algorithm that falsifies the PP-SETH. We note that $(1 - \delta)\text{pw}(\phi) \leq (1 - \delta)(\text{pw}(G) \log(\text{pw}(G)) + 2\text{pw}(G)) \leq (1 - \frac{\delta}{2})\text{pw}(G) \log(\text{pw}(G)) - \text{pw}(G) (\frac{\delta}{2} \log(\text{pw}(G)) - 2) \leq (1 - \frac{\delta}{2})\text{pw}(G) \log(\text{pw}(G))$, where we use the fact that $\text{pw}(G) > 2^{4/\delta}$. But then the running time of our procedure is $2^{(1-\delta)\text{pw}(\phi)} |\phi|^{O(1)} \leq (\text{pw}(G))^{(1-\frac{\delta}{2})\text{pw}(G)} n^{O(1)}$, so it suffices to set $\varepsilon = \delta/2$.

We now describe the construction of ϕ . Let $t = \lceil \log k \rceil \leq \log \text{pw}(G) + 1$ be a number of bits sufficient to write k distinct integers (from the set $\{0, \dots, k-1\}$) in binary. For each vertex v of G we construct t variables $v_i, i \in [t]$, which informally are meant to encode the color of v in binary. If k is not a power of 2, then some of the assignments to the variables v_i encode integers outside of $\{0, \dots, k-1\}$; in this case, for each v , and for each such assignment, we construct a clause of size t that is falsified by this assignment. Now, for each edge $e = uv$ in G we construct t variables $e_i, i \in [t]$. Informally, e_i is set to True if the binary representations of the colors of u and v differ in the i -th bit. We add the clause $(e_1 \vee e_2 \vee \dots \vee e_t)$. Also, for each $i \in [t]$, we add clauses encoding the constraint $e_i \leftrightarrow (u_i \neq v_i)$. This completes the construction, which can clearly be carried out in polynomial time.

It is now not hard to see that ϕ is satisfiable if and only if G is k -colorable. For one direction, if G is k -colorable, we use the variables v_i to encode the color of v in binary and for each edge $e = uv$ we set e_i to True if and only if the binary encodings of the colors of u, v differ in the i -th bit. This satisfies all clauses of ϕ ; in particular, clauses of the form $(e_1 \vee \dots \vee e_t)$ are satisfied because if we have a proper coloring, the encodings of the colors of the endpoints of e must differ in some bit. For the converse direction, we have added clauses ensuring that from a satisfying assignment we can extract a k -coloring of $V(G)$. To see that this coloring is proper, for each $e = uv$ the clause $(e_1 \vee \dots \vee e_t)$ ensures that at least one e_i is True, but this is only possible if the encoding of the colors of u, v differ in the i -th bit and are therefore encodings of distinct colors.

Finally, to obtain the bound on the pathwidth, we start with a decomposition of G and replace each vertex v with all the t variables v_i . Suppose we have an injective mapping f from $E(G)$ to the bags of the decomposition, such that $f(e)$ contains both endpoints of e (this can be obtained by repeating bags if necessary). For each e we add to $f(e)$ the t variables $e_i, i \in [t]$. It is not hard to see that this covers all clauses and all bags contain now at most $(\text{pw}(G) + 1)t + t \leq (\text{pw}(G) + 1)(\log(\text{pw}(G)) + 1) + \log(\text{pw}(G)) + 1 \leq \text{pw}(G) \log(\text{pw}(G)) + \text{pw}(G) + 2 \log(\text{pw}(G)) + 2 \leq \text{pw}(G) \log(\text{pw}(G)) + 2\text{pw}(G)$ variables, where we use the fact that $\text{pw}(G)$ is sufficiently large to have $\text{pw}(G) \geq 2 \log(\text{pw}(G)) + 2$ (for this it suffices that $\text{pw}(G) \geq 8$, but we have already assumed that $\text{pw}(G) > 2^{4/\delta}$). ◀

For the converse reduction, we will go through LIST COLORING. Similarly to the reductions of Section 5.1, we will use the simple gadget that is called a weak edge ([46]). We recall again that in a graph $G = (V, E)$ for two (not necessarily distinct) values $i_1, i_2 \in [k]$, an (i_1, i_2) -weak edge between two vertices $v_1, v_2 \in V$ is a path consisting of three new internal vertices linking v_1, v_2 . Appropriate lists are assigned to the internal vertices so that the color combination (i_1, i_2) is forbidden and all other combinations are allowed.

► **Lemma 32.** *If there exists $\varepsilon > 0$ and an algorithm solving COLORING in time $\text{pw}^{(1-\varepsilon)\text{pw}} n^{O(1)}$, then the PP-SETH is false.*

Proof. Suppose that for some $\varepsilon \in (0, 1/2)$, we have an algorithm solving COLORING on graphs of n vertices in time $\text{pw}^{(1-\varepsilon)\text{pw}} n^{O(1)}$. We are given a 3-SAT instance ϕ of pathwidth

$p = \text{pw}(\phi)$, as well as a corresponding path decomposition. Define $s = \lceil (1 - \frac{\varepsilon}{2}) \log p \rceil$ and $k = 2^s \leq 2p^{1-\frac{\varepsilon}{2}}$. We will construct from ϕ in polynomial time a graph G satisfying the following:

1. G is k -colorable if and only if ϕ is satisfiable
2. $\text{pw}(G) \leq (1 + \varepsilon) \frac{p}{\log p}$

If we have the properties above, the supposed algorithm for COLORING would allow us to decide ϕ in time $(\text{pw}(G))^{(1-\varepsilon)\text{pw}(G)} |G|^{O(1)} \leq p^{(1-\varepsilon^2) \frac{p}{\log p}} |\phi|^{O(1)} = 2^{(1-\varepsilon^2)p} |\phi|^{O(1)}$, which falsifies the PP-SETH.

Start with a path decomposition of ϕ on which we have applied Lemma 2 and suppose the bags are numbered B_1, \dots, B_t . Let $g = \lceil \frac{p+1}{s} \rceil$ and note that $g \leq \frac{p+1}{s} + 1 \leq \frac{p}{s} + 2 \leq (1 + 2\varepsilon/3) \frac{p}{\log p} + 2$. Here, we are using the fact that $\frac{1}{1-\varepsilon/2} < 1 + 2\varepsilon/3$ for $\varepsilon < 1/2$. We invoke Lemma 3 to partition the variables of ϕ into g groups, V_1, \dots, V_g so that each group contains at most $\lceil \frac{p+1}{g} \rceil \leq s$ variables of each bag.

We will describe a reduction to LIST COLORING where the list of each vertex will be a subset of $[k]$. This can in turn easily be reduced to k -COLORING by adding to the graph a clique of size k and connecting each vertex with the vertices of the clique that correspond to colors missing from its list. This will add to the pathwidth of the graph at most $k \leq 2p^{1-\varepsilon/2}$.

Let us now describe how we construct our LIST COLORING instance. First, for each bag B_i and each group $V_j, j \in [g]$ we construct a vertex $v_{i,j}$ whose color is supposed to represent the assignment to the variables of $B_i \cap V_j$. More precisely, we fix an arbitrary mapping $\tau_{i,j}$ which for each assignment σ to the variables of $B_i \cap V_j$ gives a distinct color in $[k]$; note that since $|B_i \cap V_j| \leq s$ and $k = 2^s$ this is always possible. We assign the vertex $v_{i,j}$ as list the range of $\tau_{i,j}$, that is, the set of all values x such that there exists an assignment σ such that $\tau_{i,j}(\sigma) = x$.

We now need to add gadgets to ensure two properties: consistency and satisfaction. For consistency, for each $i \in [t-1]$ and $j \in [g]$, consider the sets of variables $B_i \cap V_j$ and $B_{i+1} \cap V_j$, which, since the path decomposition is nice, have a symmetric difference that contains at most one variable. We construct $|B_i \cap B_{i+1} \cap V_j|$ vertices, where each vertex represents a distinct variable of $B_i \cap B_{i+1} \cap V_j$, and each vertex has list $\{1, 2\}$. For each assignment σ to $B_i \cap V_j$ let $\tau_{i,j}(\sigma)$ be the corresponding color of $v_{i,j}$. For each variable $x \in B_i \cap B_{i+1} \cap V_j$ we place a weak edge between its representative vertex and $v_{i,j}$ ensuring that if $v_{i,j}$ has color $\tau_{i,j}(\sigma)$, then the vertex representing x must take color $\sigma(x) + 1$. Similarly, we place weak edges between $v_{i+1,j}$ to ensure that the color of $v_{i+1,j}$ encodes an assignment that is consistent with the 2-coloring of the vertices representing $B_i \cap B_{i+1} \cap V_j$.

Satisfaction gadgets are similar. Recall that we have an injective function b such that for each clause c , the bag $B_{b(c)}$ contains all variables of c . Consider each clause c of ϕ , and suppose that c has size 3 (repeating a literal if necessary). We construct a vertex w_c and 3 vertices w_c^1, w_c^2, w_c^3 . The vertex w_c has list $\{1, \dots, 7\}$, informally encoding the 7 possible satisfying assignments, while the vertices w_c^1, w_c^2, w_c^3 represent the three literals of c and have lists $\{1, 2\}$. We now add weak edges between w_c and w_c^α , for $\alpha \in \{1, 2, 3\}$ ensuring that the assignment encoded by the color of w_c is consistent with the one encoded by the colors of the three other vertices. Furthermore, for $\alpha \in \{1, 2, 3\}$, if the α -th variable of c belongs in V_{j_α} , then we add weak edges between $v_{b(c), j_\alpha}$ and w_c^α , ensuring that the assignment of $B_{b(c)} \cap V_{j_\alpha}$ encoded by the color of $v_{b(c), j_\alpha}$ is consistent with the assignment to the α -th variable of c encoded by w_c^α .

This completes the construction and it is straightforward to check that the graph has a valid list coloring if and only if ϕ is satisfiable. Regarding the pathwidth of the new

graph, we will treat weak edges as edges; a path decomposition of the resulting graph can be transformed into a path decomposition of the original graph while only increasing the width by adding at most 2. Now we start with the same decomposition as we have for ϕ and in bag B_i place the g vertices $v_{i,j}$, for $j \in [g]$. If there exists c such that $b(c) = i$, then we also place in the same bag w_c, w_c^1, w_c^2, w_c^3 . What remains is to cover the consistency gadgets. Between bags B_i, B_{i+1} we insert a sequence of g bags. In the first bag we place all $v_{i,j}$, for $j \in [g]$ and $v_{i+1,1}$. In each subsequent bag we remove the vertex $v_{i,j}$ with smallest j that appeared in the previous bag and replace it with $v_{i+1,j+1}$. Now, for each $j \in [g]$ we have a bag containing both $v_{i,j}$ and $v_{i+1,j}$; we add to this bag the at most s vertices representing the variables of $B_i \cap B_{i+1} \cap V_j$. It is not hard to see that we have covered all edges and no bag contains more than $g + s + 1$ vertices.

To complete the proof, if we put back the weak edges and reduce LIST COLORING to COLORING we obtain a path decomposition of the final graph of width at most $g + k + s + 4$. We have $g + k + s + 4 \leq (1 + \frac{2\varepsilon}{3}) \frac{p}{\log p} + 2p^{1-\frac{\varepsilon}{2}} + \log p + 7 < (1 + \varepsilon) \frac{p}{\log p}$. To obtain the last inequality we can assume that p is sufficiently large (more precisely, that it is larger than some value that depends only on ε), as otherwise the satisfiability of ϕ can be decided in linear time. \blacktriangleleft

6.2 Hitting 4-cycles

In this section we consider the following problem: we are given a graph G and are asked to find a minimum cardinality set of vertices S of G such that $G - S$ contains no cycle of length 4 (C_4) as a subgraph. This problem is a particular specimen in a large class of problems where one seeks to hit all copies of a given subgraph in a large graph, so the reader may be wondering why we are interested in hitting C_4 's rather than something else. The answer is, to some extent historical. After the discovery of the famous Cut&Count method, it was posed as a natural question to understand what are the problems for which this method fails to deliver single-exponential algorithms. Within a wider effort to trace the limits of this method (via a meta-theorem), Pilipczuk gave a natural example of such a problem by showing that hitting all cycles of length at least 5 cannot be solved in time $2^{o(\text{pw}^2)} n^{O(1)}$, under the ETH [59]. Pilipczuk left it as an open problem whether the same holds for cycles of length 4, but this was more recently resolved in [60], where it was shown that this problem is also unsolvable in time $2^{o(\text{pw}^2)} n^{O(1)}$. Therefore, hitting all C_4 's in a graph using the minimum number of vertices is one of the simplest natural problems for which the complexity is expected to be exponential in the square of the pathwidth. We focus on this problem because we want to show that the PP-SETH is applicable also to FPT problems where the parameter dependence is “unusual” in this way.

We ask a more fine-grained question than that asked in [59]: what is the smallest c such that finding the minimum set hitting all C_4 's can be done in time $c^{\text{pw}^2} n^{O(1)}$? We first show that the correct value of c is not 2, but in fact at most $\sqrt{2}$. This is because a straightforward DP algorithm needs to store one bit of information for each pair of vertices in the bag, which means that the dependence is at most (roughly) $2^{\binom{\text{pw}}{2}}$ (Theorem 34).

Our main result is then to show that this complexity is very likely to be correct: obtaining an algorithm with running time $(\sqrt{2} - \varepsilon)^{\text{pw}^2} n^{O(1)}$ is *equivalent* to falsifying the PP-SETH. Formally, we prove the following:

► **Theorem 33.** *There exists $\varepsilon > 0$ and an algorithm that takes as input an n -vertex graph G and a path decomposition of width p and computes a minimum-size set S such that $G - S$ has no C_4 subgraph in time $(\sqrt{2} - \varepsilon)^{\text{pw}^2} n^{O(1)}$ if and only if the PP-SETH is false.*

The proof of Theorem 33 is given in two separate lemmas (Lemma 35 and Lemma 41). We believe that these results make the problem of hitting all C_4 's an interesting specimen, because not only are we able to determine that the correct dependence is exponential in $\Theta(\text{pw}^2)$ (as was done in [60]), but in fact we determine precisely the coefficient of the leading term, and this coefficient is equal to $\frac{1}{2}$. In particular, we give an explicit algorithm with complexity that exactly matches our lower bound (Theorem 34).

Compared to previous reductions, we have to overcome several technical obstacles to achieve our results. The most basic one is that, because our reduction needs to be much more efficient, we cannot afford to encode a SAT instance by using one gadget for a variable x and a different gadget for its negation $\neg x$, as is done in [60] and [59]. We overcome this difficulty by using an intermediate version of SAT where we are only looking for assignments that set exactly half of the variables to True, in a certain controlled way.

We begin with the algorithmic part.

► **Theorem 34.** *There is an algorithm that takes as input a graph G on n vertices and a path decomposition of width p and outputs a minimum set of vertices S such that $G - S$ contains no C_4 subgraph in time $2^{\frac{p^2}{2} + O(p)} n^{O(1)}$.*

Proof. The algorithm uses standard dynamic programming, so we sketch some of the details. We are looking for a deletion set S such that $G - S$ contains no C_4 subgraph and S has minimum size. For each bag B of a path decomposition let B^{\leftarrow} be the set of vertices of G which appear in B or in a bag to the left of B (that is, a bag already processed by the algorithm). We define the signature of a partial solution as a pair consisting of two parts: (i) a subset of B , meant to represent $S \cap B$ (ii) a bit for each pair of distinct vertices $u, v \in B \setminus S$, meant to indicate whether u, v have a common neighbor in $G - S$ which appears in $B^{\leftarrow} \setminus B$. For each signature we store the minimum size of a set $S \subseteq B^{\leftarrow}$ that respects the signature and that hits all C_4 's induced by $G[B^{\leftarrow}]$.

It is now not hard to update the DP table as we process the path decomposition of G . When introducing a new vertex u , we consider the cases $u \in S$ and $u \notin S$. In the former case, we take every valid signature of the previous bag and increase the cost by 1. In the latter case, we retain all signatures with the same cost, but discard signatures which have one of the following: u is adjacent to two vertices $v_1, v_2 \in B \setminus S$ which already have a common neighbor in $B^{\leftarrow} \setminus (B \cup S)$; u is adjacent to two vertices $v_1, v_2 \in B \setminus S$ which have a common neighbor $v_3 \in B \setminus S$. For all pairs involving the new vertex we set the corresponding bit to 0. In both of these cases, discarding these signatures is justified as we have a C_4 in $G[B^{\leftarrow} \setminus S]$. When forgetting a vertex u , for each signature where $u \in S$ we produce a new signature where we have removed the information about u ; while for each signature with $u \notin S$ we produce a signature where we set to 1 the bit for each pair $v_1, v_2 \in B \setminus S$ if u is adjacent to v_1, v_2 . This algorithm will always produce a valid deletion set, because if there was a C_4 in $G - S$, we can consider its last vertex to be introduced, say u , which is adjacent to v_1, v_2 in the C_4 . By the properties of path decompositions, v_1, v_2 must be in the bag where u is introduced. Then, if the fourth vertex of the cycle is not in B we must have set the bit for the pair v_1, v_2 to 1 (hence we discard this solution); while if the fourth vertex is in B we will again discard the solution.

To compute the running time we mainly need to bound the size of the DP table, which is at most $2^{\binom{p+1}{2} + p} = 2^{\frac{p^2}{2} + O(p)}$. Since we spend polynomial time per DP entry, the total running time is then $2^{\frac{p^2}{2} + O(p)} n^{O(1)}$. ◀

► **Lemma 35.** *If the PP-SETH is false, then there exists an $\varepsilon > 0$ and an algorithm that takes as input a graph G and a path decomposition of G of width p and solves C_4 -HITTING SET in time $2^{(1-\varepsilon)\frac{p^2}{2}} n^{O(1)}$.*

Proof. The idea of this proof is to encode the workings of the algorithm of Theorem 34 as a MAXW-SAT instance and then find a satisfying assignment of maximum weight. Suppose that there is an algorithm for MAXW-SAT running in time $2^{(1-\delta)\text{pw}} |\phi|^{O(1)}$, where ϕ is the input formula. We are given a graph G on n vertices, together with a path decomposition of width p . We will construct a formula ϕ satisfying the following:

1. ϕ has size $n^{O(1)}$, and its variables are partitioned into two sets V_0, V_1 .
2. ϕ can be constructed in time $n^{O(1)}$ and a path decomposition of ϕ of width $\frac{p^2}{2} + O(p)$ can be constructed in the same time.
3. For all $k \geq 0$, there is a satisfying assignment setting at least k of the variables of V_0 to True if and only if there is a deletion set S such that $G - S$ has no C_4 subgraph and $|V(G) \setminus S| \geq k$.

We first note that we are using a slightly more general version of MAXW-SAT, because we partition the variables of ϕ into two sets, but only care about the weight of the assignment on the variables of V_0 . This does not change much, though, because we can take our ϕ , and assuming ϕ has N variables, introduce for each $x \in V_0$, N^2 copies, $x_i, i \in [N^2]$, with the clauses $(\neg x \vee x_i) \wedge (\neg x_i \vee x)$, which ensures that the copies take the same value as x . Solving standard MAXW-SAT on the new instance is equivalent to solving our instance where we only care about the weight in V_0 . The new variables only increase the pathwidth by at most 1, since we can find a distinct bag for each $x \in V_0$ and insert after it N^2 copies, inserting into each copy a distinct x_i .

Now, let us explain why if we achieve the above, then we obtain the lemma. Suppose that the decomposition of ϕ we produce has width at most $\frac{p^2}{2} + cp$, for some constant c . We assume without loss of generality that p is sufficiently large to have $(1 - \delta)(\frac{p^2}{2} + cp) < (1 - \frac{\delta}{2})\frac{p^2}{2}$ (this happens when $p > \frac{4c}{\delta}$). This assumption is without loss of generality, because if p is bounded by a constant we can solve the problem outright in polynomial time. But then, the $2^{(1-\delta)\text{pw}} |\phi|^{O(1)}$ algorithm for MAXW-SAT gives an algorithm for our problem with running time at most $2^{(1-\frac{\delta}{2})\frac{p^2}{2}} n^{O(1)}$, as required.

Suppose that the bags of the path decomposition of G are numbered B_1, \dots, B_t , and assume without loss of generality that $t \leq 2n$, because each bag introduces or forgets a vertex (otherwise the bag is redundant). We construct for each $v \in V(G)$ a variable $x_v \in V_0$. Furthermore, for each $i \in [t]$ and for each pair of distinct $v_1, v_2 \in B_i$ we construct a variable $x_{v_1, v_2, i} \in V_1$. The total number of variables is at most $n + t\binom{p+1}{2} = O(n^3)$.

The intuitive meaning of the variables x_v is that x_v is True if and only if $v \in V \setminus S$. The meaning of $x_{v_1, v_2, i}$ is that the variable is set to True if v_1, v_2 have a common neighbor in $\bigcup_{i' \in [i-1]} B_{i'} \setminus S$. We now describe the clauses of ϕ .

1. For each $v \in V(G)$ let B_i be the last bag that contains v . Then we add the clause $(\neg x_v \vee x_{v_1, v_2, i+1})$ for all pairs of distinct $v_1, v_2 \in B_i$ for which $v_1, v_2 \in N(v) \cap B_{i+1}$.
2. For each $i \in [t-1]$ and pair of distinct $v_1, v_2 \in B_i \cap B_{i+1}$ we add the clause $(\neg x_{v_1, v_2, i} \vee x_{v_1, v_2, i+1})$.
3. For each C_4 of G which has all its vertices, say v_1, v_2, v_3, v_4 , contained in a bag B_i , we construct the clause $(\neg x_{v_1} \vee \neg x_{v_2} \vee \neg x_{v_3} \vee \neg x_{v_4})$.

4. For each C_4 , say v_1, v_2, v_3, v_4 , that is not fully contained in any bag, suppose without loss of generality that the last vertex to be introduced in the decomposition is v_2 , which first appears in bag B_i (so v_1, v_3, v_4 all appear in bags $B_{i'}$ with $i' \leq i$). By the properties of path decompositions, B_i must also contain v_1, v_3 . We construct the clause $(\neg x_{v_1} \vee \neg x_{v_2} \vee \neg x_{v_3} \vee \neg x_{v_1, v_3, i})$.

We now show how a path decomposition of the primal graph of ϕ of width $\frac{p^2}{2} + O(p)$ can be constructed from the decomposition of G . We start with the decomposition of G , replace each $v \in V(G)$ in each bag with $x_v \in V_0$ and add inside each bag B_i all the variables $x_{v_1, v_2, i} \in V_1$. Furthermore, for each $i \in [t-1]$, add all variables of V_0 which are in B_i also to bag B_{i+1} . Each bag now contains at most $2p+2$ variables of V_0 . We observe that we have covered all clauses of steps 1, 3, and 4. To cover the clauses of step 2, we observe that for each $i \in [t-1]$ these edges form a matching between variable contained in B_i and variables contained in B_{i+1} . We insert a sequence of bags between B_i and B_{i+1} , where we place into all copies all variables of $B_i \cap V_0$. Consider now the (at most $\binom{p+1}{2}$) variables of $B_i \cap V_1$. We order the pairs $v_1, v_2 \in B_i$ in some arbitrary way, add in the first new bag all variables $x_{v_1, v_2, i}$ and the variables $x_{v_1, v_2, i+1}$ for the first pair v_1, v_2 . Then we gradually swap variables $x_{v_1, v_2, i}$ with variables $x_{v_1, v_2, i+1}$ covering all edges of the matching. The width of the new decomposition is therefore $\binom{p+1}{2} + O(p) = \frac{p^2}{2} + O(p)$.

To show correctness, first suppose that a satisfying assignment to ϕ sets at least k of the variables of V_0 to True. We construct a deletion set S by setting $v \in S$ if and only if x_v is False in the satisfying assignment. We claim S hits all C_4 's. C_4 's which are fully contained in a bag are hit due to clauses of step 3. For a C_4 , say v_1, v_2, v_3, v_4 that is not contained in any bag, suppose without loss of generality that v_2 is the last vertex to be introduced in the decomposition, in bag B_i , which also contains v_1, v_3 . We claim that if $v_1, v_3, v_4 \notin S$ (so $x_{v_1}, x_{v_3}, x_{v_4}$ are True), then the satisfying assignment must have $x_{v_1, v_3, i}$ set to True, therefore, x_{v_2} set to False (due to the clause of step 4), therefore $v_2 \in S$. To see that $x_{v_1, v_3, i}$ must be True, consider the last bag $B_{i'}$ that contains v_4 (we have $i' < i$). $B_{i'}$ must also contain v_1, v_3 , therefore, since $v_4 \notin S$ implies x_{v_4} is True, the clause of step 1 implies that $x_{v_1, v_2, i'+1}$ is True. Then, the clauses of step 2 imply that $x_{v_1, v_2, i''}$ is True for all $i'' \in \{i'+1, \dots, i\}$. We conclude that S is a valid hitting set.

For the converse direction, suppose that S is a valid hitting set and we obtain a satisfying assignment by setting x_v to True whenever $v \in V \setminus S$. We claim that this can be extended to a satisfying assignment for ϕ . For each variable $x_{v_1, v_2, i}$ we give it value True if and only if there exists $v \in \bigcup_{i' \in [i-1]} B_{i'}$ such that v is adjacent to both v_1, v_2 and $v \notin S$ (therefore x_v is True). This satisfies clauses of step 2 (as our assignment is non-decreasing) and step 1 (such clauses are trivially satisfied if x_v is False). Clauses of step 3 are satisfied by the assumption that S is a hitting set for all C_4 's. For clauses of step 4, suppose $x_{v_1}, x_{v_2}, x_{v_3}$ are True (otherwise the clause is satisfied), and $x_{v_1, v_3, i}$ is also True. However, if $x_{v_1, v_3, i}$ is True, this means there exists $v_4 \in \bigcup_{i' \in [i-1]} B_{i'}$ such that v_4 is adjacent to v_1, v_2 and $v_4 \notin S$. But then we have $v_1, v_2, v_3, v_4 \notin S$ and we have a C_4 that is not hit, which gives a contradiction. Hence, ϕ is satisfied by this assignment. \blacktriangleleft

We now move on to the main result of this section, which is a reduction from SAT to the problem of hitting all C_4 's that establishes a tight lower bound on the parameter dependence on pathwidth. As mentioned, our reduction needs to be significantly more efficient than previous reductions, because we want to reduce a SAT instance of pathwidth p to a graph of pathwidth $\sqrt{2p} + o(\sqrt{p})$. In particular, this means that every pair of vertices in a bag will represent a single variable, meaning that we cannot afford to use a distinct gadget for x

and for $\neg x$, as is done in previous reductions. To work around this difficulty, we will need an intermediate satisfiability problem, where the variables are given to us partitioned into groups, and we are only interested in satisfying assignments that set half of the variables of each group to True.

► **Lemma 36.** *There exists an algorithm that takes as input a 3-SAT formula ϕ on n variables and a path decomposition of its primal graph where each bag contains at most p variables and outputs a SAT formula ψ and a path decomposition of its primal graph such that we have the following (where $q = \lceil \sqrt{2p} \rceil$, $r = \lceil \sqrt{q} \rceil$):*

1. *The algorithm runs in time $2^{O(\sqrt[4]{p})} n^{O(1)}$.*
2. *The algorithm also outputs a partition of the variables of ψ into $qr + 1$ sets V_0 and V_{i_1, i_2} where $i_1 \in [q], i_2 \in [r]$.*
3. *Each bag of the decomposition of ψ contains at most $r = O(p^{1/4})$ variables of V_0*
4. *For each $i_1 \in [q]$, $i_2 \in [r]$, and each bag B of the decomposition of ψ we have that $|B \cap V_{i_1, i_2}| \leq \frac{q-i_1}{r} + 6\sqrt{r}$ and $|B \cap V_{i_1, i_2}|$ is even. Hence, for each $i_1 \in [q]$, each bag contains at most $q - i_1 + 6r\sqrt{r}$ variables of $\bigcup_{i_2 \in [r]} V_{i_1, i_2}$.*
5. *For each $i_1 \in [q]$, $i_2 \in [r]$ and consecutive bags B, B' of the decomposition of ψ we have either $B \cap V_{i_1, i_2} = B' \cap V_{i_1, i_2}$ or $B \cap V_{i_1, i_2} \cap B' = \emptyset$. Furthermore, for each pair B, B' of consecutive bags, there exists at most one pair i_1, i_2 such that $B \cap V_{i_1, i_2} \cap B' = \emptyset$.*
6. *Every clause of ψ contains at most $O(r)$ literals.*
7. *ϕ is satisfiable if and only if there exists a satisfying assignment of ψ which also has the property that for each $i_1 \in [q]$, $i_2 \in [r]$ and each bag B of the decomposition exactly $\frac{|B \cap V_{i_1, i_2}|}{2}$ variables of $B \cap V_{i_1, i_2}$ are set to True.*

Proof. We begin with some basic preprocessing of the given path decomposition. First, assume that all bags contain exactly p variables (this can be achieved by adding dummy fresh variables in smaller bags). Then, assume that the decomposition is nice, that is, for each consecutive bags B, B' we have either $B = B'$, or B' is obtained from B by removing a variable and replacing it with a new one. This can be achieved by inserting between bags whose symmetric difference is larger than two a sequence of bags that gradually swap vertices one by one. Finally, assume we have an injective function that for each clause of ϕ , maps the clause to a bag B that contains all its variables, such that the bags adjacent to B in the decomposition contain the same variables as B (this can be achieved by repeating bags if necessary). All these steps can be carried out in polynomial time.

We now group the variables of ϕ into q sets, W_1, \dots, W_q so that each set W_{i_1} , for $i_1 \in [q]$, contains at most $q - i_1 + 1$ variables from each bag. This is done as follows: In the first bag, place for each $i_1 \in [q]$, $q - i_1 + 1$ arbitrarily chosen variables of B into each W_{i_1} . Observe that $\sum_{i_1 \in [q]} (q - i_1 + 1) = \frac{q(q+1)}{2} \geq \frac{\sqrt{2p}(\sqrt{2p}+1)}{2} \geq p$, so this process partitions all variables of the first bag without placing too many variables in any W_{i_1} . Now we move along the decomposition and for each bag that is identical to the previous bag we do nothing; while for a bag B' that is after bag B such that $B' \setminus B = \{x'\}$ and $B \setminus B' = \{x\}$, we place x' in the same set W_{i_1} that contains x . We now have that for each bag B , $i_1 \in [q]$, $|B \cap W_{i_1}| \leq q - i_1 + 1$. Furthermore, for each $i_1 \in [q]$ and two bags B, B' , we have $|B \cap W_{i_1}| = |B' \cap W_{i_1}|$.

We now further break down the groups as follows: for each $i_1 \in [q]$, we want to partition W_{i_1} into r groups W_{i_1, i_2} , $i_2 \in [r]$, so that for each bag B we have $|W_{i_1, i_2} \cap B| \leq \lceil \frac{q-i_1+1}{r} \rceil$. We achieve this in a similar way as previously: In the first bag, we arbitrarily partition the at most $q - i_1 + 1$ variables of W_{i_1} into the r sets W_{i_1, i_2} , for $i_2 \in [r]$, so that each set contains at most $\lceil \frac{q-i_1+1}{r} \rceil$ variables. Then, for each bag B' that contains a variable x' which replaces

the variable x of the preceding bag B , we place x' in the same set W_{i_1, i_2} as x . We now have that for each bag B , $i_1 \in [q]$, $i_2 \in [r]$, $|B \cap W_{i_1, i_2}| \leq \lceil \frac{q-i_1+1}{r} \rceil$.

We are now ready to construct ψ and we will also along the way construct a path decomposition by editing the decomposition of ϕ . For the first bag B of the decomposition of ϕ , for each $i_1 \in [q]$, $i_2 \in [r]$, we construct a set of variables V_{i_1, i_2} of size $\lceil \frac{q-i_1+1}{r} \rceil + 2\lceil \sqrt{r} \rceil = O(r)$. The informal meaning is that the truth assignments of $W_{i_1, i_2} \cap B$ should be injectively mapped into truth assignments to $V_{i_1, i_2} \cap B$ that set exactly $\lfloor \frac{|B \cap V_{i_1, i_2}|}{2} \rfloor$ variables to True. We claim that this is always possible:

▷ **Claim 37.** For all $i_1 \in [q]$ we have $\binom{\lceil \frac{q-i_1+1}{r} \rceil + 2\lceil \sqrt{r} \rceil}{\lfloor \frac{\lceil \frac{q-i_1+1}{r} \rceil + 2\lceil \sqrt{r} \rceil}{2} \rfloor} \geq 2^{\lceil \frac{q-i_1+1}{r} \rceil}$.

Proof. Let $x = \lceil \frac{q-i_1+1}{r} \rceil$, $y = \lceil \sqrt{r} \rceil$, and we note that $x \leq \lceil \frac{q}{r} \rceil \leq r \leq y^2$. We will show that for all positive integers x, y , such that $x \leq y^2$ we have $\binom{x+2y}{\lfloor \frac{x+2y}{2} \rfloor} \geq 2^x$. We have that for all $z \in \{0, 1, \dots, x+2y\}$, $\binom{x+2y}{\lfloor \frac{x+2y}{2} \rfloor} \geq \binom{x+2y}{z}$, and that $\sum_{z=0}^{x+2y} \binom{x+2y}{z} = 2^{x+2y}$. Therefore, $\binom{x+2y}{\lfloor \frac{x+2y}{2} \rfloor} \geq \frac{2^{x+2y}}{x+2y+1} \geq 2^x \left(\frac{2^{2y}}{y^2+2y+1} \right)$. To obtain the claim it is therefore sufficient to have $2^{2y} \geq y^2 + 2y + 1$, which is true for all $y \geq 2$. For $y = 1$, since $x \leq y^2$ we must have $x = 1$, and the inequality trivially holds. ◀

Armed with Claim 37 we do the following for each $i_1 \in [q]$, $i_2 \in [r]$ starting from the first bag B : place all the (new) variables of V_{i_1, i_2} into B and fix an injective mapping from each truth assignment to $B \cap W_{i_1, i_2}$ to a truth assignment of $B \cap V_{i_1, i_2}$ that sets exactly $\lfloor \frac{|B \cap V_{i_1, i_2}|}{2} \rfloor$ variables to True; for each assignment to $B \cap V_{i_1, i_2}$ that is not in the range of this mapping construct a clause in ψ that is falsified by this assignment. If $|B \cap V_{i_1, i_2}|$ is odd, add a new (dummy) variable to $B \cap V_{i_1, i_2}$ and a clause that forces this variable to be True. Remove from B the variables of W_{i_1, i_2} (since they do not appear in ψ).

We now continue to the next bag of the decomposition of ϕ . For each bag B' , let B be the previous bag, and for each $i_1 \in [q]$, $i_2 \in [p]$ we do the following: if $B \cap W_{i_1, i_2} = B' \cap W_{i_1, i_2}$, then we do nothing; otherwise we construct $|B \cap V_{i_1, i_2}| \leq \lceil \frac{q-i_1+1}{r} \rceil + 2\lceil \sqrt{r} \rceil + 1$ new variables and place them into $B' \cap V_{i_1, i_2}$. Again, we construct an arbitrary injective mapping from assignments to $B' \cap W_{i_1, i_2}$ to assignments that set exactly half the variables of $B' \cap V_{i_1, i_2}$ to True (observe that we now know that $|B' \cap V_{i_1, i_2}|$ is even) and add clauses ensuring that we must select an assignment in the range of the mapping to satisfy ψ . We now need to ensure consistency, meaning that the assignment we select for $B' \cap V_{i_1, i_2}$ and the assignment we select for $B \cap V_{i_1, i_2}$ agree on the variables of $B \cap B' \cap W_{i_1, i_2}$. In order to achieve this, we make a fresh copy of each variable of W_{i_1, i_2} and add it to $V_0 \cap B \cap B'$. For each such variable x and each assignment σ to $B \cap V_{i_1, i_2}$ that is in the range of our injective mapping, there is a unique assignment σ' to W_{i_1, i_2} which maps to σ . We add a clause that ensures that if we set the variables of $B \cap V_{i_1, i_2}$ to σ and x to $\neg\sigma'(x)$, ψ is falsified. This ensures that the assignment we give to the new variable x is consistent with what the selected assignment to $B \cap V_{i_1, i_2}$ encodes. We add similar clauses for $B' \cap V_{i_1, i_2}$. Observe that if we add the (at most r) new variables of V_0 to B, B' , both bags satisfy condition 3, since there is only one pair i_1, i_2 for which they differ. We continue in this way, until we have processed the whole decomposition, and it is not hard to see that we have a decomposition of the formula ψ which we have constructed so far that satisfies conditions 4 and 5.

What remains is to add some clauses to ψ so that only encodings of satisfying assignments to ϕ can satisfy ψ . To do this, for each clause of ϕ we find a bag B that contains all its literals using the injective mapping we assumed previously. We add fresh copies of the three variables of the clause into $B \cap V_0$. Note that B currently contains no other variable of V_0 ,

since it is the same as its neighboring bags. We use these fresh variables to make a copy of the original clause. Now, to ensure that the assignment to the new variables is consistent with the assignments to $B \cap V_{i_1, i_2}$, we decode the assignment as in the previous paragraph. In other words, for each $x \in V_0 \cap B$ we added, if $x \in W_{i_1, i_2} \cap B$, for each assignment σ to $V_{i_1, i_2} \cap B$ that is in the range of the injective mapping we have used, there is a unique assignment σ' to $W_{i_1, i_2} \cap B$ that maps to σ . We add a clause that is falsified if we use simultaneously the assignment σ for $V_{i_1, i_2} \cap B$ and $\neg\sigma'(x)$ for x .

This completes the construction and it is not hard to see that ψ is satisfied only by assignments that set half of each $B \cap V_{i_1, i_2}$ to True. Furthermore, such a satisfying assignment can be found if and only if ϕ has a satisfying assignment. The construction can be carried out in polynomial time, except for the part where we have to consider all assignments to each W_{i_1, i_2} , but since each such set has size at most $O(r)$, we get the promised running time. ◀

Before we proceed, let us give some more intuition about why a problem such as the one given by Lemma 36 will be useful. A straightforward attempt to reduce SAT to hitting C_4 's would, for each bag of the decomposition of the formula containing p variables, construct $\sqrt{2p}$ vertices. We would then place, for each pair of such vertices, a vertex of degree 2 connected to this pair. The idea would be that deleting this vertex or not would represent the value of one variable, and we would have exactly as many pairs as we need to represent all the variables. Before adding gadgets to implement the rest of the reduction, though, it is important to observe an important flaw in this strategy: one could always simply choose to delete the $\sqrt{2p}$ vertices, rather than any of the vertices representing variables. Since $\sqrt{2p}$ is significantly smaller than p , this looks like a serious problem. The way this is handled in previous reductions is by constructing a degree 2 vertex for each *literal*, rather than variable, and then adding a C_4 that ensures one of the two literal vertices must be deleted. This is simple, but will not work in our case, because we cannot afford to waste a factor of 2 in the efficiency of our reduction.

The strategy we will use to overcome the obstacle outlined above is the following: suppose we have some (large but not too large) groups of variables for which we know the weight w of a satisfying assignment. We can then add an appropriate gadget to ensure that in any feasible solution at least w of the degree 2 vertices representing variables from this group must be deleted. By placing such gadgets for all groups of variables (since in the problem of Lemma 36 we know the desired weight for all groups), we can adjust the total deletion budget so that it is exactly equal to the sum of the weights dictated locally in each group. This ensures that there is never any budget left to delete the $\sqrt{2p}$ vertices of a bag that ensure connectivity, and the reduction works as intended.

With this intuition in mind, let us now define the budget-setting gadget we will use in our reduction. We first mention a more basic gadget which we call a *strong edge*. A strong edge with endpoints u, v is made up of four new vertices x_1, x_2, x_3, x_4 which are adjacent to u, v and not adjacent to any other vertex. Informally, a strong edge ensures that at least one of u, v must be in the deletion set. Indeed, if a solution does not delete neither u nor v it must delete at least three of the new vertices; however, in that case exchanging these vertices with u, v gives a better solution.

► **Definition 38.** Let $G = (V, E)$ be a graph, $X \subseteq V$ a set of vertices, and $b \leq |X|$ a positive integer. A budget-setter for X with budget b is the following gadget: let $f = \binom{|X|}{b}$ and we construct $3f$ sets of $2|X|$ vertices each, call them A_i, B_i, C_i for $i \in [f]$. For each $i \in [f]$ we place strong edges between all vertices of A_i and $B_i \cup C_i$, and between all vertices of B_i and C_i . For each $i \in [f - 1]$ we place strong edges between all vertices of A_i and all vertices

A_{i+1} , and strong edges between all vertices of B_i and all vertices of B_{i+1} . If f is odd, we place strong edges between all vertices of A_f and all vertices of A_1 ; and all vertices of B_f and all vertices of B_1 . If f is even, we place strong edges between all vertices of A_f and B_1 ; and strong edges between all vertices of B_f and A_1 . Finally, for each $i \in [f]$ we place strong edges between all vertices of C_i and all vertices of a distinct subset of X of size b .

We now show that the budget-setter has the required effect, namely that we force the solution to delete at least b of the vertices of X , and that if we use any set of b vertices the cost of the budget-setter is the same.


► **Lemma 39.** *Let $G = (V, E)$ be a graph, X a set of vertices, and $b \leq |X|$ a positive integer. Let G' be the graph obtained by adding a budget-setter for X with budget b to G . Then, we have the following (where $f = \binom{|X|}{b}$):*

1. *The optimal C_4 -hitting set of G' contains at least b vertices of X and at least $4f|X|$ vertices of the budget-setter.*
2. *Any C_4 -hitting set of G' of size k that includes at least b vertices of X can be extended to a hitting set of G' of size $k + 4f|X|$.*

Proof. For the first statement, it is not hard to see that for each $i \in [f]$ a C_4 -hitting set of G' must completely contain at least two of the sets A_i, B_i, C_i , because we have added strong edges between their vertices forming, essentially, a complete tripartite graph. This means that the hitting set must have size at least $4f|X|$, since each set A_i, B_i, C_i has size $2|X|$. Suppose now that a hitting set S contains at most $b - 1$ vertices of X . For all $i \in [f]$ we have that the neighborhood of C_i cannot be contained in $S \cap X$, as each C_i is connected (via strong edges) to b vertices of X . Then, for all $i \in [f]$ we have $C_i \subseteq S$. We claim that in this case we are including at least $2(2f + 1)|X|$ vertices of the budget-setter in S . To see this, consider an auxiliary graph that contains a vertex for each A_i, B_i and an edge when two sets are completely joined via strong edges. By construction, this graph has maximum independent set $f - 1$. Therefore, in the budget-setter there are at most $f - 1$ sets among the A_i, B_i which contain a vertex outside S , hence at least $2f + 1$ sets which are contained in S . We now observe that the current solution can be improved by placing all of X in the hitting set, and all the sets A_i, B_i for $i \in [f]$. The previous solution was deleting at least $2(2f + 1)|X|$ vertices, while the new solution is deleting $4f|X| + |X|$ vertices and satisfies the first condition of the lemma.

For the second condition, suppose that we have a hitting set S of G such that $|S \cap X| \geq b$. Find a $C_i \in [f]$ such that C_i is connected via strong edges only to vertices of $S \cap X$. We place all of A_i, B_i in S . We also place all $C_{i'}$ for $i' \neq i$ into S and for each $i' \neq i$ place one of $A_{i'}, B_{i'}$ completely inside S . This is always possible, because if we consider the auxiliary graph formed by the $A_{i'}, B_{i'}$ for $i' \neq i$ it is a $2 \times (f - 1)$ grid, which has an independent set of size $f - 1$. The hitting set of G' we have thus constructed has size $k + 4f|X|$. Since for any strong edge we have deleted one of its two endpoints no C_4 can go through the vertices of the budget-setter, so we have a feasible solution. ◀

► **Lemma 40.** *Let $G = (V, E)$ be an n -vertex graph, X_1, \dots, X_s be disjoint sets of vertices, b_1, \dots, b_s be positive integers with $b_i \leq |X_i|$ for all $i \in [s]$. Let $x = \max_{i \in [s]} |X_i|$ and suppose we have a path decomposition of G of width p such that for all $i \in [s]$ there is a bag that contains all of X_i . Then, if G' is the graph obtained by adding a budget-setter for each X_i with budget b_i to G , for $i \in [s]$, we can construct G' in time $2^x n^{O(1)}$ and in the same time edit the decomposition of G to obtain a decomposition of G' of width $p + O(x)$.*



■ **Figure 2** The consistency gadget used in the reduction of Lemma 41. The four boxes contain the backbone vertices v_{j,i_1} and we concentrate on a specific variable x , which is represented by the vertices $x_j, x_{j+1}, x_{j+2}, x_{j+3}$. Dashed lines represent strong edges. The intended assignment is that either we place in the hitting set $x_j, x_j^b, x_{j+1}, x_{j+1}^b, x_{j+2}, \dots$, or the vertices $x_j^a, x_j^c, x_{j+1}^a, x_{j+1}^c, \dots$. This is achieved because we give the construction sufficient budget to delete half of the vertices of the top row, and for any two consecutive vertices we have to delete at least one (as they have either a strong edge or two common neighbors). To see that the construction has the claimed pathwidth consider the sequence of bags that resemble the shaded area, that is, take $v_{j,i_1}, v_{j,i_1+1}, \dots$ and also $v_{j+1,1}, \dots, v_{j+1,i_1}$. For each strong edge in the top row, there exists such a bag such that the endpoints of the strong edge have all their neighbors in the bag.

Proof. Constructing the graph G' in the stated time is straightforward, as $\binom{|X_i|}{b_i} \leq 2^x$ for all i . We therefore focus on the construction of the path decomposition. For each $i \in [s]$ find a distinct bag B_i that contains all of X_i (this can be achieved by copying bags if necessary). We observe that the graph induced by the budget-setter vertices for X_i has pathwidth $O(|X_i|) = O(x)$. We take such a path decomposition and add B_i to all its bags, then insert the whole decomposition after B_i in our decomposition of G' . Repeating this for all $i \in [s]$ concludes the lemma. ◀

► **Lemma 41.** *If there exists an $\varepsilon > 0$ and an algorithm solving C_4 -HITTING SET in time $2^{(1-\varepsilon)\frac{pw^2}{2}} n^{O(1)}$, then the PP-SETH is false.*

Proof. Suppose we are given a 3-SAT instance ϕ and a path decomposition of its primal graph of width p . We execute the algorithm of Lemma 36 so now we have an equivalent CNF instance ψ with $q = \lceil \sqrt{2p} \rceil$, $r = \lceil \sqrt{q} \rceil$, the variables of ψ partitioned into sets V_0 and V_{i_1, i_2} for $i_1 \in [q]$ and $i_2 \in [r]$, and a path decomposition of its primal graph with the requirements stipulated in Lemma 36. We would like to construct a graph G and a target budget k such that:

- G has a C_4 -hitting set of size at most k if and only if ψ has a satisfying assignment such that for all bags of the given decomposition and for each $i_1 \in [q], i_2 \in [r]$ exactly $\frac{|B \cap V_{i_1, i_2}|}{2}$ variables are set to True.
- G can be constructed in time $|\psi|^{O(1)}$
- A path decomposition of G of width $q + O(q^{3/4})$ can be constructed in the same time.

Note that if we achieve the above, we obtain the lemma, because we can solve the original 3-SAT instance by deciding C_4 -HITTING SET on G . Indeed, we can assume without loss of generality that p (and therefore q) is large enough so that the path decomposition of G

which has width $q + O(q^{3/4})$ actually has width at most $(1 + \frac{\varepsilon}{4})q$. The running time then becomes $2^{(1-\varepsilon)(1+\frac{\varepsilon}{4})^2 \frac{q^2}{2}} |\phi|^{O(1)}$, which becomes at most $2^{(1-\frac{\varepsilon}{4})p} |\phi|^{O(1)}$.

We now describe our construction of G . Suppose that the bags of the given decomposition of ψ are numbered B_1, \dots, B_t . Furthermore, suppose we have an injective mapping of clauses of ψ to bags that contain all their literals, such that we always maps clauses to bags which contain the same vertices as the previous and next bag (this can easily be achieved by inserting before and after each bag, copies of the bag). We do the following:

1. For each variable $x \in V_0$ we construct two vertices, x and $\neg x$ and place a strong edge connecting them.
2. For each $j \in [t]$ we construct $q + 6\lceil r\sqrt{r} \rceil$ vertices, call them v_{j,i_1} for $i_1 \in [q + 6\lceil r\sqrt{r} \rceil]$. We call these vertices the *backbone* vertices.
3. For each $j \in [t]$ and $i_1 \in [q], i_2 \in [r]$ we consider the variables of $V_{i_1,i_2} \cap B_j$. For each such variable x we select the minimum index i'_1 which has not yet been selected for any variable of $\bigcup_{i_2 \in [r]} V_{i_1,i_2} \cap B_j$, such that $i_1 < i'_1 \leq q + 6\lceil r\sqrt{r} \rceil$ and construct a vertex adjacent to v_{j,i_1} and v_{j,i'_1} . We say that this new vertex represents the copy of x in bag B_j and call this vertex x_j . Note that because $|\bigcup_{i_2 \in [r]} V_{i_1,i_2} \cap B_j| \leq q - i_1 + 6r\sqrt{r}$, there exist sufficiently many indices i'_1 to perform this procedure assigning a distinct i'_1 to each variable. Though the choice of i'_1 is in part arbitrary (because we have not specified the order in which the variables of V_{i_1,i_2} are considered), we remain consistent, that is for each $x \in V_{i_1,i_2}$, if in bag B_j we represent x via a vertex adjacent to v_{j,i_1} and v_{j,i'_1} , if x appears in bag B_{j+1} we represent it via a vertex adjacent to v_{j+1,i_1} and v_{j+1,i'_1} . Furthermore, note that the indices i'_1 used for the variables of each V_{i_1,i_2} form an interval.
4. For each $j \in [t]$, $i_1 \in [q]$, and $i_2 \in [r]$, let X_{j,i_1,i_2} be the set of vertices representing copies of variables of V_{i_1,i_2} in bag B_j . We add a budget-setter on X_{j,i_1,i_2} with budget $\frac{|X_{j,i_1,i_2}|}{2}$.
5. (Consistency) For each $j \in [t-1]$ and $i_1 \in [q], i_2 \in [r]$ such that $B_j \cap V_{i_1,i_2} = B_{j+1} \cap V_{i_1,i_2}$, we add the following consistency gadget: for $x \in B_j \cap V_{i_1,i_2}$, let x_j be the vertex representing the copy of x in B_j and x_{j+1} be the vertex representing x for B_{j+1} . Recall that x_j is adjacent to v_{j,i_1}, v_{j,i'_1} and x_{j+1} is adjacent to $v_{j+1,i_1}, v_{j+1,i'_1}$, for some $i'_1 > i_1$. We add three vertices x_j^a, x_j^b, x_j^c , such that (i) x_j^a has a strong edge to x_j^b (ii) x_j^c has a strong edge to x_{j+1} (iii) x_j^a is adjacent to v_{j,i_1} and v_{j,i'_1} (iv) x_j^b and x_j^c are adjacent to v_{j,i'_1} and v_{j+1,i_1} . We refer the reader to Figure 2.
6. For each $j \in [t-1]$ and $i_1 \in [q], i_2 \in [r]$ such that $B_j \cap V_{i_1,i_2} = B_{j+1} \cap V_{i_1,i_2}$, let $X_{j,i_1,i_2}^a, X_{j,i_1,i_2}^b, X_{j,i_1,i_2}^c$ be the sets of vertices x_j^a, x_j^b, x_j^c respectively added in the previous step for these values of j, i_1, i_2 . We add a budget-setter for each of $X_{j,i_1,i_2}^a, X_{j,i_1,i_2}^b, X_{j,i_1,i_2}^c$ with budget half the cardinality of each set (all three sets have size $|B_j \cap V_{i_1,i_2}|$).
7. For each clause c of ψ , suppose that the mapping assigns c to bag B_j , that contains all its variables. Suppose that the clause contains $\rho = O(r)$ literals. We construct a set of ρ vertices, one for each literal and connect all pairs via strong edges. Consider a literal, and suppose that it involves a variable $x \in V_{i_1,i_2}$. If x appears positive in c , then we place a strong edge between the vertex representing the literal and x_j , otherwise we place a strong edge between the vertex representing the literal and x_{j-1}^c (which exists, because $B_{j-1} = B_j$). Similarly, if the literal involves a variable $x \in V_0$, if x appears positive in c , then we place a strong edge between x and the vertex representing the literal; otherwise we place the strong edge between the vertex representing the literal and $\neg x$.

We now need to set a budget for our hitting set. To compute this budget we add the total cost of all the budget setters we have used in steps 4 and 6 (including the budget itself and the internal cost of the budget-setter as given in Lemma 39). We add to this budget for

each clause c of arity ρ a budget of $\rho - 1$; and further add one more vertex for each variable of V_0 . This sum gives an integer k that is the total number of vertices that we seek to delete to hit all C_4 's in the new graph.

Before we argue for correctness, we refer the reader again to Figure 2, which illustrates the consistency gadget, which is the most involved part of the construction. The rest of the construction is straightforward, as clause gadgets can easily be seen to force the deletion of all but one literals of a clause, so we only need to check that the remaining literal is set to True. A variable x is set to True if we include in the hitting set a vertex x_j that represents it in some bag B_j .

The crucial part now is how to ensure that this assignment stays consistent throughout the construction, without increasing the pathwidth by much. To see what we mean by this, one could consider a construction where we have strong edges forming a path $x_j, x_j^a, x_{j+1}, x_{j+1}^a, x_{j+2}, \dots$. By setting an appropriate budget this could easily ensure that either we delete all x_j vertices or none. However, the pathwidth would be linear in the original pathwidth p , while we seek a pathwidth of roughly $q = \lceil \sqrt{2p} \rceil$. It is therefore necessary to pass on some of this information indirectly. This is done in Figure 2 between vertices x_j and x_j^a as well as vertices x_j^b and x_j^c , because these vertices share two common neighbors. Setting things up carefully in this way, we are able to propagate information about the p variables of bag B_j to the p variables of bag B_{j+1} , via only roughly $\sqrt{2p}$ vertices, which gives us the desired pathwidth.

Let us now formally argue that this construction achieves the desired properties. First, suppose that ψ is satisfiable by an assignment that sets exactly half of the variables of each $B_j \cap V_{i_1, i_2}$ to True. For each $x \in V_0$ we add to the hitting set the variable that corresponds to the literal involving x that is set to True by the assignment; for each clause c we pick a literal that is set to True by the assignment and place in the hitting set the vertices representing all other literals; for each $x \in V_{i_1, i_2}$, for some $i_1 \in [q], i_2 \in [r]$ we consider each bag B_j such that $x \in B_j$: if x is set to True we place in the hitting set x_j and x_j^b (if it exists), otherwise we place in the hitting set x_j^a and x_j^c . Because the assignment sets exactly half of the variables of each $B_j \cap V_{i_1, i_2}$ to True, this places in the hitting set vertices which allow us to use Lemma 39 to extend the solution to all budget-setters while using exactly the available budget. We claim that the set we have formed indeed hits all C_4 's. We first note that for each strong edge we have selected at least one of its endpoints. If we remove from the graph the selected set and all strong edges, what remains is a bipartite graph with backbone vertices v_{j, i_1} on one side and vertices of consistency gadgets on the other. Therefore, a C_4 would require two vertices from consistency gadgets that have two common backbone neighbors. However, a vertex x_j only has two common neighbors with the unique vertex x_j^a and one of the two is in the hitting set, and the argument is similar for x_j^b and x_j^c . Hence, we have a feasible solution of the desired size.

For the converse direction, if we have a hitting set, for each $x \in V_0$ it must contain one of the two literals and for each clause c of arity ρ it must contain at least $\rho - 1$ vertices representing literals, due to the strong edges. Furthermore, by Lemma 39 the solution must contain at least the expected budget of vertices from each budget-setter. Since we have set the total budget to be the sum of these values, all these inequalities are in fact equalities. In particular, this means that no backbone vertex v_{j, i_1} is in the hitting set. Consider now the sets of vertices $X_{j, i_1, i_2}, X_{j, i_1, i_2}^a, X_{j, i_1, i_2}^b, X_{j, i_1, i_2}^c$, as described in steps 4 and 6, for some specific values of j, i_1, i_2 . These sets have the same cardinality and the budget-setters ensure that we include exactly half of each in the hitting set. This implies that if there is some $x \in B_j \cap V_{i_1, i_2}$ such that x_j, x_j^a are both in the hitting set, there exist

some other $y \in B_j \cap V_{i_1, i_2}$ with neither y_j, y_j^a in the set. This would cause a contradiction, as y_j, y_j^a form a C_4 with their two common backbone neighbors. With similar reasoning, we conclude that for each $x \in B_j \cap V_{i_1, i_2}$, exactly one from each pair $\{x_j, x_j^a\}, \{x_j^a, x_j^b\}, \{x_j^b, x_j^c\}, \{x_j^c, x_{j+1}\}$ is in the hitting set. This implies that x_j is in the hitting set if and only if x_{j+1} is. We can now use this fact to extract an assignment to the variables of $\bigcup_{i_1 \in [q], i_2 \in [r]} V_{i_1, i_2}$, setting x to True if for some vertex x_j representing x , x_j is in the hitting set. We extend this assignment to V_0 in the natural way, setting a value for each $x \in V_0$ that sets to True the literal whose corresponding vertex is in the hitting set. We now claim that this assignment is satisfying, because if we take a clause c , the literal corresponding to the vertex that is not in the hitting set must be set to True. This is the case, because the literal has a strong edge to a vertex that is in the hitting set if and only if the literal is True, and since the literal vertex is not in the hitting set this vertex is.

Finally, since it is not hard to see that the new instance can be constructed in the promised time, we need to argue about the pathwidth of the constructed instance and show how a path decomposition can be built. We first note that strong edges can be dealt with as if they were edges, as this will increase pathwidth by at most 1. We now start from the path decomposition of ψ and in each bag B_j we place all backbone vertices v_{j, i_1} , for $i_1 \in [q + 6\lceil r\sqrt{r} \rceil]$. At the moment each bag has the desired width. We now explain how between B_j and B_{j+1} we can place a sequence of bags so that we cover all the consistency gadgets and so that the sets $X_{j, i_1, i_2}, X_{j, i_1, i_2}^a, X_{j, i_1, i_2}^b, X_{j, i_1, i_2}^c$ all appear fully inside a bag (this will allow us to invoke Lemma 40 to take care of the budget-setters). For each $i_1 \in [q]$ we insert in the decomposition a bag $B_j^{i_1}$ that contains $\{v_{j, i'} \mid i' \geq i_1\} \cup \{v_{j+1, i''} \mid i'' \leq i_1\}$. In other words we gradually exchange the backbone vertices of B_j with those of B_{j+1} . We place, for each $i_2 \in [r]$, $X_{j, i_1, i_2}^a \cup X_{j, i_1, i_2}^b$ inside a fresh copy of $B_j^{i_1}$. Furthermore, for each $i_1 \in [q], i_2 \in [r]$, find the minimum $i'_1 \in [q + 6\lceil r\sqrt{r} \rceil]$ such that some $x_j^c \in X_{j, i_1, i_2}^c$ is adjacent to v_{j, i'_1} and place $X_{j, i_1, i_2}^c \cup X_{j+1, i_1, i_2}$ inside a fresh copy of $B_j^{i'_1}$. This covers everything in the consistency gadgets, except sets X_{j, i_1, i_2} where $B_j \cap V_{i_1, i_2} \cap B_{j-1} = \emptyset$, but such sets are added to a fresh copy of B_j . After performing the above, the size of all bags has increased by at most $O(\sqrt{q})$ and we have covered all the consistency gadgets. It now remains to cover variables of V_0 , but these can be handled by adding, for each $x \in V_0$, both vertices $x, \neg x$ to all bags that contained x and since no bag contains more than r such variables, this also increases width by $O(\sqrt{q})$; to cover the gadget for a clause c of arity $\rho = O(r)$, where c is mapped to B_j , we add the ρ vertices representing the literals to all bags B_{j-1}, B_j, B_{j+1} and the bags we have introduced between them, and this further increases the width of the decomposition by $O(r) = O(\sqrt{q})$ (because the mapping is injective). This completes the construction of a path decomposition of the new graph of the desired width. \blacktriangleleft

7 XNLP-complete problems

In this section we show that the phenomenon of PP-SETH-equivalence is not confined to the class FPT. More specifically, we focus on three parameterized problems which are XNLP-complete and hence highly unlikely to be FPT, namely LIST COLORING parameterized by pathwidth, k -DFA INTERSECTION parameterized by k , and SHORT- k -INDEPENDENT SET RECONFIGURATION parameterized by k . All these problems admit algorithms with complexity $n^{k+O(1)}$, for k the relevant parameter. We show that obtaining even slightly faster algorithms is equivalent to the PP-SETH, that is, algorithms with complexity $n^{(1-\varepsilon)k}$ exist *if and only if* there exists a satisfiability algorithm falsifying the PP-SETH. Notice that this implies that the XNLP-complete problems of this section are in a sense equivalent

to the FPT problems of previous sections, since obtaining an algorithmic improvement for one implies an algorithmic improvement for all, despite the fact that the problems in question belong in classes strongly believed to be distinct.

It is worth noting that the lower bounds we obtain for the three XNLP-complete problems are in fact even sharper than what we described above. More precisely, we can rule out not just algorithmic improvements which improve the coefficient of k in the exponent, but even improvements which shave off a small additive constant in the exponent. This is achieved while still maintaining the property that improving upon the lower bound is equivalent to the PP-SETH. We discuss this in more detail below.

Before we present our results, let us briefly give some relevant context. The class XNLP was recently defined in [6], though it had been previously studied (under a different name) in [24] and in a slight variation in [33]. In a nutshell, XNLP is the class of problems that can be solved in FPT time and space $f(k) \log n$ by a *non-deterministic* Turing machine. The main contribution of [6], as well as the follow-up work of [4], was to show that XNLP is the natural home for intractable problems parameterized by a linear structure, such as pathwidth or linear clique-width. In retrospect, this is logical: typical intractable problems parameterized by pathwidth (and similarly for related widths) admit XP dynamic programming algorithms, which for each bag of the decomposition store $n^{f(\text{pw})}$ entries. A non-deterministic algorithm should be able to speed up this computation by guessing in each node one relevant entry of the table (hence, we need space $f(\text{pw}) \log n$) and then verifying that this is consistent with an entry in the preceding table, continuing in this way until the end. XNLP-completeness expresses a strong notion of intractability, because XNLP-complete problems are hard for all classes $W[t]$ of the W -hierarchy. This fruitful line of research has more recently led to attempts to characterize other complexity classes with respect to graph width structures, such as XALP for tree-like structures ([5]) and XSLP for tree-depth ([7]).

At this point we can remark a similarity between the aforementioned line of work on XNLP, and the Turing machine characterization of the PP-SETH given by Iwata and Yoshida ([42]). Recall that it was shown in [42] that the PP-SETH is false if and only if it is possible to decide in time $(2 - \varepsilon)^k n^{O(1)}$ if a given non-deterministic machine with space $k + O(\log n)$ accepts a certain input. In other words, the TM machine problem that Iwata and Yoshida consider is a variation of the model defining XNLP machines except that we replace $f(k) \log n$ with $k + O(\log n)$ and we ask a significantly more fine-grained question. In a way, the motivation behind both definitions is the assumption that it should not be possible to do better to predict the behavior of a bounded-space NTM than enumerating all possible configurations. Our work shows that this similarity is not superficial: there exist XNLP-complete problems which can be solved in space $k \log n$ and for which obtaining an algorithm faster than n^k would be equivalent to falsifying the PP-SETH.

Our results rely exactly on the intuition explained above. In order to reduce the XNLP-complete problems we consider to the PP-SETH, we essentially build a CNF formula that describes the workings of a non-deterministic algorithm that guesses a solution; while in the converse direction, one can think that we start the reduction from a formula with pathwidth $p = k \log n$ and reduce to an instance with parameter value (roughly) k , so that $n^{(1-\varepsilon)k}$ would be less than $(2 - \varepsilon')^p$ for some appropriate ε' , so a fast algorithm for our problem would imply a fast satisfiability algorithm.

Sharpness of lower bounds. If we look back at the results of Section 5 we can remark that all lower bound results could be formulated in two ways: we could for example state that 3-COLORING cannot be solved in time $(3 - \varepsilon)^{\text{pw}} n^{O(1)}$, or in time $3^{(1-\varepsilon)\text{pw}} n^{O(1)}$. Clearly,

this is just a cosmetic decision, as the two formulations are equivalent. Things become less clear if we are considering a problem solvable in time n^k . If we believe that this running time is optimal, does this mean that it is impossible to do $n^{(1-\varepsilon)k}$, or that it is impossible to do $n^{k-\varepsilon}$? Clearly, the latter lower bound is at least as strong, but the two statements are not obviously equivalent. Indeed, proving that the two statements are equivalent would entail showing that an algorithm running in $n^{k_0-\varepsilon}$, for some fixed k_0, ε , implies an algorithm running in time $n^{(1-\varepsilon')k}$, at least for k sufficiently large.

Despite this seeming inequivalence, the lower bounds we present are particularly sharp because we prove that PP-SETH-equivalence implies that we can freely exchange between the two types of lower bounds. To be more concrete, for the k -DFA INTERSECTION problem we prove the following: there is an algorithm solving the problem in $n^{(1-\varepsilon)k}$ if and only if there is an algorithm solving the problem in $n^{k-\varepsilon}$ (both of which happen if and only if the PP-SETH is false). Intuitively, what is happening here is that we prove that an algorithm solving the intersection problem in $n^{k-\varepsilon}$ is fast enough to refute the PP-SETH; however, if we refute the PP-SETH we can reduce the intersection problem to a SAT instance with pathwidth $k \log n$, which a $(2-\varepsilon)^{\text{pw}}$ algorithm would decide in $n^{(1-\varepsilon)k}$ (modulo some additive constants in the exponent which disappear for large k). For the DFA problem the $O(n^k)$ bound is tight, as there is an algorithm of this running time solving the problem.

The situation is more intriguing for the reconfiguration problem we consider. We show that deciding if it is possible to reconfigure an independent set of size k to another with at most ℓ moves can be done with a complexity that is slightly faster than n^k by obtaining an $O(n^{k-3+\omega} \cdot \ell)$ time algorithm using fast matrix multiplication (ω is the matrix multiplication constant). This seems to point to the possibility that the “correct” exponent of n is $k-1$. We show lower bounds that match this: obtaining an $n^{k-1-\varepsilon} \cdot \ell^{O(1)}$ time algorithm is equivalent to falsifying the PP-SETH, and also equivalent to obtaining an $n^{(1-\varepsilon)k} \ell^{O(1)}$ time algorithm. In the remaining case of LIST COLORING parameterized by pathwidth, where there is some small inevitable overhead in our reduction that prevents us from giving an equally sharp bound, we still obtain that under the PP-SETH the correct complexity of this problem is of the form n^{k+c} , for some constant c that belongs in the reasonably-sized interval $[-4, 1]$.

7.1 List Coloring Parameterized by Pathwidth

In this section we consider the LIST COLORING problem parameterized by pathwidth. LIST COLORING is one of the first problems to be shown to be W[1]-hard parameterized by structural parameters such as treewidth and pathwidth (indeed even by vertex cover) in [26]. More recently, a much more precise characterization was given by Bodlaender, Groenland, Nederlof, and Swennenhuis [6], who showed that LIST COLORING is XNLP-complete parameterized by pathwidth. As explained, there is a strong intuitive connection between the class XNLP and PP-SETH-equivalence. In this section we confirm this intuition by showing that obtaining an algorithm for LIST COLORING with complexity $O(n^{(1-\varepsilon)\text{pw}})$ would be equivalent (that is, both necessary and sufficient for) falsifying the PP-SETH. Since it is fairly straightforward to obtain an algorithm with complexity $n^{\text{pw}+1}$ using standard DP, this result is tight up to an additive constant in the exponent. Indeed, in Theorem 42 below we also give a bound on this additive constant, by showing that obtaining an algorithm of running time $O(n^{\text{pw}-4-\varepsilon})$ is already enough to falsify the PP-SETH. If the PP-SETH is true, this leaves a quite narrow range for the possible running time of the best algorithm.

Compared to previous reductions for this problem, the main obstacle we are faced with is a common one for fine-grained reductions: we need to be more efficient. We want to reduce 3-SAT to LIST COLORING and our strategy is to group the variables of each bag of a

decomposition of the given CNF formula ψ into k groups, represent each with a vertex of the LIST COLORING instance, and give this vertex roughly $2^{\text{pw}(\psi)/k}$ possible colors, one for each assignment. This strategy allows us to obtain a path decomposition of the new graph of width (roughly) k . A crucial detail, though, is that we also need the size of the whole constructed graph n to be not much larger than $2^{\text{pw}(\psi)/k}$, because, assuming an $n^{(1-\varepsilon)\text{pw}}$ algorithm for List Coloring will give a fast algorithm for 3-SAT only if $n^{(1-\varepsilon)k} < (2-\varepsilon')^{\text{pw}(\psi)}$. In particular, we cannot afford to have a construction that is quadratic in the sizes of the lists, because $(2^{2^{\text{pw}(\psi)/k})^{(1-\varepsilon)k} \approx 4^{\text{pw}(\psi)}$ which does not give a fast algorithm for 3-SAT. Typical LIST COLORING reductions, however, almost always have this quadratic blow-up, because for any pair of vertices on which we want to impose a constraint, one considers every pair of colors that represents an unacceptable combination and constructs a vertex to ensure that this combination is not picked (these are called the helper vertices in [6]). One of the main technical difficulties we need to work around is to avoid this type of super-linear construction, while still encoding the 3-SAT constraints for satisfaction and consistency.

The main result of this section is stated below.

► **Theorem 42.** *The following statements are equivalent:*

1. *The PP-SETH is false.*
2. *There exist $\varepsilon > 0, p > 4$ and an algorithm that takes as input a LIST COLORING instance on an n -vertex graph G and a path decomposition of G of width p and solves the instance in time $O(n^{p-4-\varepsilon})$.*
3. *There exist $\varepsilon > 0, p_0 > 0$ and an algorithm which for all $p > p_0$ solves LIST COLORING on instances with n vertices and pathwidth p in time $O(n^{(1-\varepsilon)p})$.*

In order to establish Theorem 42 we note that the implication $3 \Rightarrow 2$ is trivial. We prove that a fast LIST COLORING algorithm (in the sense of statement 2) falsifies the PP-SETH in Lemma 43, giving $2 \Rightarrow 1$; and that a fast SAT algorithm implies a fast LIST COLORING algorithm (in the sense of statement 3) in Lemma 44, giving $3 \Rightarrow 1$ and the theorem.

► **Lemma 43.** *If there exist $\varepsilon > 0, p > 4$ such that there exists an algorithm that takes as input an instance of LIST COLORING $G = (V, E)$ and a path decomposition of G of width p and decides the problem in time $O(|V|^{p-4-\varepsilon})$, then there exist $\varepsilon' > 0, c > 0$ such that there exists an algorithm that takes as input a 3-CNF formula ψ and decides its satisfiability in time $O((2-\varepsilon')^{\text{pw}}|\psi|^c)$.*

Proof. Fix the ε, p for which the supposed LIST COLORING algorithm exists. We are given a 3-CNF formula ψ on n variables and a path decomposition of ψ of width $\text{pw}(\psi)$. Let $k = p - 4$. We want to construct a LIST COLORING instance $G = (V, E)$ with the following properties:

1. G has a valid list coloring if and only if ψ is satisfiable.
2. $|V(G)| = O(2^{\text{pw}(\psi)/k} n^4)$ and G can be constructed in time linear in $|V(G)|$.
3. We can construct in time $O(|V(G)|)$ a path decomposition of G of width p .

Before we proceed, let us argue that the above imply the theorem. We will attempt to decide if ψ is satisfiable by constructing G and solving LIST COLORING on the resulting instance using the assumed algorithm. The running time is $O(|V(G)|^{p-4-\varepsilon}) = O(2^{\frac{\text{pw}(\psi)}{p-4}(p-4-\varepsilon)} n^{4p})$. Set ε' so that $2 - \varepsilon' = 2^{\frac{p-4-\varepsilon}{p-4}}$ and $c' = 4p$. The running time is then $O((2-\varepsilon')^{\text{pw}(\psi)} n^{c'})$, and ε', c' are constants depending only on ε, p .

Assume that we are given a path decomposition of ψ , on which we execute the algorithm of Lemma 2, so we now have a nice path decomposition of ψ of width $\text{pw}(\psi)$ with $O(n^4)$ bags B_1, \dots, B_t , as well as a function b that maps each clause to the index of a bag that contains all its variables. Using Lemma 3 we partition the set of variables of ψ into k sets V_1, \dots, V_k , such that for each bag B and $i \in [k]$ we have $|B \cap V_i| \leq \lceil \frac{\text{pw}(\psi)+1}{k} \rceil$.

For each $j \in [t]$ and $i \in [k]$ we construct a vertex $x_{i,j}$. The informal meaning is that the color of $x_{i,j}$ is supposed to represent the assignment to the variables of $B_j \cap V_i$. We give to each $x_{i,j}$ a list of $2^{|B_j \cap V_i|}$ colors which do not yet appear in the list of any other vertex. We now need to add some extra vertices which ensure that assignments remain consistent across bags and that they satisfy the formula. We add the following gadgets:

1. For each $j \in [t-1]$ and $i \in [k]$ for which $B_j \cap V_i = B_{j+1} \cap V_i$ we contract the vertex $x_{i,j+1}$ into the vertex $x_{i,j}$ and use $L(x_{i,j})$ as the list of the new vertex. Informally, this ensures that these two vertices will have the same color. Note that repeated applications of this step may contract all vertices $x_{i,j'}$ for j' belonging in some interval $[j_1, j_2]$ into the single vertex x_{i,j_1} . Any subsequent edges incident on another vertex of this interval will actually be placed incident on x_{i,j_1} .
2. (Consistency) Consider now a $j \in [t-1]$ and $i \in [k]$ such that $B_{j+1} \cap V_i = (B_j \cap V_i) \cup \{v\}$, for some variable v of the 3-SAT instance. We have that $|L(x_{i,j+1})| = 2|L(x_{i,j})|$. Let $\ell = |L(x_{i,j})|$. Recall that each element of $L(x_{i,j})$ corresponds to an assignment to the variables of $B_j \cap V_i$, and similarly for $L(x_{i,j+1})$ and $B_{j+1} \cap V_i$. By reading such assignments in binary where v is placed as the least significant bit, we number the elements of the lists as $L(x_{i,j}) = \{a_0, a_1, \dots, a_{\ell-1}\}$ and $L(x_{i,j+1}) = \{b_0, b_1, \dots, b_{2\ell-1}\}$, with the property that element $a_i \in L(x_{i,j})$ represents an assignment that is compatible with those represented by elements $b_{2i}, b_{2i+1} \in L(x_{i,j+1})$. We construct a path on $\ell-1$ vertices, call them $y_{i,j,s}$, for $s \in \{0, \dots, \ell-2\}$, connect all its vertices to $x_{i,j}$ and assign for each $s \in \{0, \dots, \ell-2\}$ the list $\{a_s, a_{s+1}\}$ to $y_{i,j,s}$. We construct a path on $2\ell-1$ vertices, call them $z_{i,j,s}$, for $s \in \{0, \dots, 2\ell-2\}$, connect all its vertices to $x_{i,j+1}$, and assign for each $s \in \{0, \dots, 2\ell-2\}$ the list $\{b_s, b_{s+1}\}$. For each $s \in \{1, \dots, \ell-2\}$ we construct a new vertex $w_{i,j,s}$ and connect it to $y_{i,j,s-1}, y_{i,j,s}, z_{i,j,2s-1}, z_{i,j,2s+1}$. We give $w_{i,j,s}$ the list $\{a_s, b_{2s-1}, b_{2s+2}\}$. For $s=0$ we construct $w_{i,j,0}$ and connect it to $y_{i,j,0}, z_{i,j,1}$, and give it list $\{a_0, b_2\}$. For $s=\ell-1$ we construct $w_{i,j,\ell-1}$, connect it to $y_{i,j,\ell-2}, z_{i,j,2\ell-3}$, and give it list $\{a_{\ell-1}, b_{2\ell-3}\}$. We refer the reader to Figure 3 for an illustration.
3. For $j \in [t-1]$ and $i \in [k]$ for which $B_j \cap V_i = (B_{j+1} \cap V_i) \cup \{v\}$ we construct the same gadget as in the previous case, exchanging the roles of B_j and B_{j+1} .
4. (Satisfaction) For each clause c of ψ , consider the bag $B_{b(c)}$. Suppose without loss of generality that c contains 3 literals, which utilize variables from the sets $V_{i_1}, V_{i_2}, V_{i_3}$ respectively, where i_1, i_2, i_3 are not necessarily distinct (if c has fewer literals, we just repeat one of its literals). Construct three vertices s_c^1, s_c^2, s_c^3 , adjacent to each other, with $L(s_c^1) = L(s_c^2) = L(s_c^3) = \{F, X, Y\}$. For each $\alpha \in \{1, 2, 3\}$ consider all the at most $2^{|B_{b(c)} \cap V_{i_\alpha}| - 1}$ assignments to the variables of $B_{b(c)} \cap V_{i_\alpha}$ which falsify the α -th literal of c . Each such assignment σ corresponds to a color of $x_{i_\alpha, b(c)}$. For each such assignment σ , we construct a vertex $t_{c,\alpha,\sigma}$, connected to s_c^α and $x_{i_\alpha, b(c)}$, with $L(t_{c,\alpha,\sigma})$ containing only the color F and the color from $L(x_{i_\alpha, b(c)})$ corresponding to σ .

This completes the construction of the LIST COLORING instance. The number of vertices of the graph we construct can be upper-bounded as follows: the $x_{i,j}$ vertices are at most $O(kn^4)$; for each $j \in [t-1]$ there is at most one consistency gadget added between B_j and B_{j+1} , which contains $O(2^{\text{pw}(\psi)/k})$ vertices, giving $O(2^{\text{pw}(\psi)/k} n^4)$ vertices in total; for

each clause c there is a unique $B_{b(c)}$ for which we construct a satisfaction gadget, which contains $O(2^{\text{pw}(\psi)/k})$ vertices, giving $O(m2^{\text{pw}(\psi)/k}) = O(n^3 2^{\text{pw}(\psi)/k})$ vertices. Thus, in total $|V(G)| = O(2^{\text{pw}(\psi)/k} n^4)$. It is also not hard to see that the construction can be performed in time linear in the number of vertices of the constructed graph.


In order to construct a path decomposition of G , we start with a decomposition B_1, \dots, B_t , where in each B_j , $j \in [t]$, we place all $x_{i,j}$, for $i \in [k]$. Recall that in step 1 of our construction we may have merged vertices $x_{i,j'}$ for $j' \in [j_1, j_2]$ into x_{i,j_1} ; in such cases we place x_{i,j_1} in all $B_{j'}$ for $j' \in [j_1, j_2]$. At this point each bag contains exactly k vertices, and each vertex appears in a connected interval, but we have not yet covered any of the vertices or edges of the consistency and satisfaction gadgets.

For the consistency gadgets, consider a $j \in [t-1]$ for which we have added a consistency gadget for $i \in [k]$. Observe that because the decomposition of ψ was nice, $B_j \setminus \{x_{i,j}\} = B_{j+1} \setminus \{x_{i,j+1}\}$, that is, B_j, B_{j+1} only differ in the i -th vertex. Therefore, $|B_j \cup B_{j+1}| = k+1$. We add a sequence of bags between B_j and B_{j+1} all of which contain $B_j \cup B_{j+1}$. Since $x_{i,j}, x_{i,j+1}$ are in all these bags, we actually only need to add here a path decomposition of the gadget, which is made up of two parallel paths with the $w_{i,j,s}$ vertices connecting them. It is not hard to see that we can produce a path decomposition of this graph containing 4 vertices in each bag. In this way we use at most $k+5$ vertices in each bag.

Finally, for the satisfaction gadget constructed for a clause c we locate the bag $B_{b(c)}$. Recall that we have constructed three vertices s_c^1, s_c^2, s_c^3 , and a large number of degree 2 vertices adjacent to one of the former vertices and a vertex of $B_{b(c)}$. Immediately after $B_{b(c)}$ we place a sequence of bags containing $B_{b(c)} \cup \{s_c^1, s_c^2, s_c^3\}$ and each bag containing a distinct degree 2 vertex adjacent to one of s_c^1, s_c^2, s_c^3 . The largest bag we have added contains $k+4$ vertices. Overall, we have a decomposition where each bag has at most $k+5$ vertices, therefore a decomposition of width $p = k+4$.

To establish that the graph G has a valid list coloring if and only if ψ is satisfiable one direction is relatively straightforward: given an assignment to ψ we can pick a color for each $x_{i,j}$, since each color of $L(x_{i,j})$ corresponds to an assignment to the variables of $B_j \cap V_i$. To extend this to consistency gadgets, there is a unique way to color the two paths $y_{i,j,s}$ and $z_{i,j,s}$ that uses all colors of $L(x_{i,j})$ and $L(x_{i,j+1})$ which are not used in $x_{i,j}, x_{i,j+1}$. Consider now a vertex $w_{i,j,s}$: if color a_s is not used in its neighborhood, we can use that color and we are done; if color a_s is used, this means that $x_{i,j}$ was *not* assigned a_s , therefore, since the assignment is consistent, $x_{i,j+1}$ was *not* assigned b_{2s} nor b_{2s+1} . Consider now the vertices $z_{i,j,2s-1}, z_{i,j,2s}, z_{i,j,2s+1}$, with lists $\{b_{2s-1}, b_{2s}\}, \{b_{2s}, b_{2s+1}\}, \{b_{2s+1}, b_{2s+2}\}$. The colors b_{2s}, b_{2s+1} do not appear in any other lists, therefore they are both used here, therefore one of b_{2s-1}, b_{2s+2} is free to use at $w_{i,j,s}$. To extend the coloring to the satisfaction gadgets, if the α -th literal of c is satisfied by the assignment we select color F for s_c^α and colors X, Y for the other two vertices of $\{s_c^1, s_c^2, s_c^3\}$. All vertices $t_{c,\alpha,\sigma}$ for which color F is available receive that color, while the remaining such vertices receive a color that represents an assignment to the variables of $B_{b(c)} \cap X_{i_\alpha}$ which falsifies the α -th literal of c . This is valid, as this color cannot have been used on $x_{i_\alpha, b(c)}$.

For the converse direction, we need to argue that if G has a valid list coloring, then we can extract a consistent satisfying assignment to the variables of ψ . The main obstacle is when we have two vertices $x_{i,j}, x_{i,j+1}$ which do not represent the same set of variables (otherwise the vertices have been merged and consistency is not a problem). We therefore need to argue that our consistency gadget ensures that if $x_{i,j}$ was assigned color a_s , then $x_{i,j+1}$ must be assigned color b_{2s} or b_{2s+1} . To see this, we first observe that each color of $L(x_{i,j})$ is either used on $x_{i,j}$ itself or one of the vertices of the path $y_{i,j,s}$. We will then



■ **Figure 3** Consistency gadget from Lemma 43. On the left we have vertex $x_{i,j}$ and on the right vertex $x_{i,j+1}$.

argue that if a color a_s is used in the path, then b_{2s} and b_{2s+1} must be used in the path $z_{i,j,s}$. To see this, consider the vertex $w_{i,j,s}$, which in this case must take one of the colors b_{2s-1}, b_{2s+2} ; however, either one of these choices forces the use of both b_{2s} and b_{2s+1} in the path $z_{i,j,s}$. Since all the colors not used in $x_{i,j}$ have their corresponding colors not used in $x_{i,j+1}$, we conclude that the assignments extracted from the colors of $x_{i,j}$ and $x_{i,j+1}$ must be compatible. We now need to argue that the extracted assignment is satisfying. Take a clause c and consider s_c^1, s_c^2, s_c^3 . One of these vertices must have color F , since they form a K_3 with list $\{F, X, Y\}$, suppose without loss of generality that s_c^1 is that vertex. Then, all the vertices $t_{c,1,\sigma}$ received a color that encodes an assignment to $x_{i_1,b(c)}$ that falsifies the first literal of c . Hence, $x_{i_1,b(c)}$ cannot have received such a color, hence the assignment we extract from $x_{i_1,b(c)}$ satisfies c . ◀

► **Lemma 44.** *If there exist $\varepsilon > 0, c > 0$ such that there exists an algorithm that takes as input a CNF formula ψ and decides its satisfiability in time $((2 - \varepsilon)^{pw} |\psi|^c)$, then there exist $p_0 > 0, \varepsilon' > 0$, such that there exists an algorithm which for any $p > p_0$ takes as input a LIST COLORING instance $G = (V, E)$ and a path decomposition of G of width p and decides the problem in time $O(|V|^{(1-\varepsilon')p})$.*

Proof. Fix the ε, c for which a fast SAT algorithm exists, and suppose we are given a graph $G = (V, E)$ on n vertices, together with a list of possible colors for each vertex, as well as a path decomposition of G of width p . We will construct from G a CNF formula ψ such that:

1. ψ is satisfiable if and only if G has a valid list coloring.
2. $|\psi| = O(n^3)$
3. ψ can be constructed in time linear in $|\psi|$.
4. $\text{pw}(\psi) = (p + 1) \log n$

Let us explain why if we achieve the above, we obtain the lemma. Given the instance $G = (V, E)$ to LIST COLORING and the corresponding decomposition, we construct ψ and execute the supposed SAT algorithm. The running time of the procedure is $O((2 - \varepsilon)^{\text{pw}(\psi)} |\psi|^c) = O((2 - \varepsilon)^{p \log n} n^{3c+1})$. Let $\delta > 0$ be such that $2 - \varepsilon = 2^{1-\delta}$, in particular set $\delta = 1 - \log(2 - \varepsilon)$. The running time is at most $O(n^{(1-\delta)p+3c+1})$. Set $p_0 = 2(3c + 1)/\delta$. If $p > p_0$ then we have that $n^{(1-\delta)p+3c+1} < n^{(1-\frac{\delta}{2})p}$, so setting $\varepsilon' = \delta/2$ we obtain an algorithm with the promised running time. Observe that p_0, ε' are constants that depend only on ε, c .

The construction of ψ is now straightforward. Assume without loss of generality that n is a power of 2 (for example, by adding isolated vertices to G , which can at most double its size). Let $V = \{v_1, \dots, v_n\}$ and assume that for each $v \in V$ we have been given a list $L(v)$ of available colors, with $|L(v)| \leq n$ (this assumption is without loss of generality, since if a vertex has a list of size $n + 1$ or more, it can always be colored, so we can remove it from the graph). For each v_j , with $j \in [n]$ we construct $\log n$ variables $x_{j,s}$ with $s \in [\log n]$, with the intended meaning that their values will encode the element of $L(v_j)$ which is selected in a valid coloring. We now need to add clauses to ensure that the assignment to these variables does indeed encode a valid coloring. We add the following clauses.

1. For each $j \in [n]$ for each assignment σ to the variables $x_{j,s}$ for $s \in [\log n]$, we interpret the assignment as a binary number. If that number is at least $|L(v_j)|$, then we add a clause that is falsified by the assignment σ .
2. For each $j, j' \in [n]$ with $v_j v_{j'} \in E$, for each pair of assignments σ, σ' to the variables $x_{j,s}$ and $x_{j',s}$ for $s \in [\log n]$, we interpret the two assignments as two binary numbers s_1, s_2 . Sort $L(v_j)$ and $L(v_{j'})$ and consider them as arrays with numbering starting at 0. If $L(v_j)[s_1] = L(v_{j'})[s_2]$, that is, if the s_1 -th element of $L(v_j)$ is the same as the s_2 -th element of $L(v_{j'})$, then we add to ψ a clause that is falsified by the assignments σ, σ' to the variables $x_{j,s}, x_{j',s}$.

In the first step we construct at most n clauses for each vertex of G , while in the second step we construct for each edge of G at most n clauses. The total size of ψ is then $O(n^3)$. Note that if the lists $L(v_j), L(v_{j'})$ are sorted, then the second step can be executed in time linear in the number of clauses produced.

To bound the pathwidth of ψ we can take the decomposition of G and replace every occurrence of a vertex v_j with the variables $x_{j,s}$, for $s \in [\log n]$. This clearly has the promised width. To see that this is a valid decomposition, observe that each clause we add contains the variables $x_{j,s}$ and $x_{j',s}$ for two vertices $v_j, v_{j'}$ which are neighbors in G , therefore must appear together in some bag.

Finally, we show that ψ is satisfiable if and only if G has a proper list coloring. The correspondence is not hard to see by interpreting the value of $x_{j,s}$ as the index of the color selected for v_j in $L(v_j)$, where $L(v_j)$ is sorted and viewed as a zero-based array. If there is a coloring of G , the corresponding assignment satisfies all clauses of the first step (because we select a color with index at most $|L(v_j)| - 1$), and of the second step, because the coloring is proper. For the converse direction, we can extract a coloring of G from a satisfying assignment in the same way. A satisfying assignment must assign to each vertex a color from its list (because of clauses of the first step), and the coloring will be proper because of clauses of the second step. ◀

To end this section, let us also briefly note that, similarly to [6], we can obtain from Theorem 42 PP-SETH-equivalence for related problems, such as PRECOLORING EXTENSION. In PRECOLORING EXTENSION we are given a graph such that some of its vertices are already colored and are asked to extend this to a proper coloring of the whole graph, while minimizing the number of colors used.

► **Corollary 45.** *There exist $\varepsilon > 0, p_0 > 0$ and an algorithm which for all $p > 0$ takes as input an instance $G = (V, E)$ of PRECOLORING EXTENSION and a path decomposition of G of width p and decides the instance in time $O(n^{(1-\varepsilon)p})$ if and only if the PP-SETH is false.*

Proof. To obtain the corollary we observe that there are simple reductions in both directions between LIST COLORING and PRECOLORING EXTENSION that preserve the pathwidth up to adding 1, as explained in [6]. ◀

7.2 DFA and NFA intersection

In this section we consider the following basic problem: we are given a collection of k (deterministic or non-deterministic) finite automata, each with n states, working over a finite alphabet Σ . We are also supplied a size bound ℓ . The question is whether there exists any string over Σ that is accepted by all k automata. This problem is called BOUNDED FA INTERSECTION NON-EMPTINESS.

Before we go on it is important to note that for DFAs this problem can easily be solved in time $O(n^k)$. To see this, we note that we can construct the intersection FA, which has n^k states (one for each tuple of the states of the given automata) and then perform BFS to calculate the shortest distance from the initial state to an accepting state. Interestingly, this running time bound does not depend at all on ℓ .

We choose to focus on the bounded version of the problem (where we are supplied with an upper bound ℓ on the desired string) because this version of the problem is XNLP-complete ([6]) and as we have mentioned there is a clear intuitive connection between XNLP-completeness and PP-SETH-equivalence. We remark that Oliveira and Wehar have already shown that an algorithm solving the intersection problem for k DFAs in time $n^{k-\varepsilon}$ would refute the SETH ([21]). Similarly to the results of Section 5, our result improves this SETH-hardness to PP-SETH-equivalence.

In the remainder, we treat NFAs (Non-deterministic Finite Automata) as directed graphs, where there is a special initial vertex, a set of accepting vertices, and each arc is labeled with a symbol from Σ . An NFA accepts a string χ if and only if there exists a path from the initial vertex to an accepting vertex, such that the concatenation of its edge labels is χ . A DFA (Deterministic Finite Automaton) is a special case of an NFA where for each vertex there exists exactly one outgoing labeled with each character of Σ .

► **Theorem 46.** *The following statements are equivalent:*

1. *The PP-SETH is false.*
2. *There exist $\varepsilon > 0, k > 1, c > 0$ and an algorithm that takes as input the descriptions of k DFAs of n states working over the alphabet $\Sigma = \{0, 1\}$ and an integer ℓ and decides if there exists a string of length at most ℓ accepted by all k DFAs in time $O(n^{k-\varepsilon}\ell^c)$.*
3. *There exist $\varepsilon > 0, k_0 > 1, c > 0$ and an algorithm which for all $k > k_0$ takes as input the descriptions of k NFAs of n states and an integer ℓ and decides if there exists a string of length at most ℓ accepted by all k NFAs in time $O(n^{(1-\varepsilon)k}\ell^c)$.*

The implication $3 \Rightarrow 2$ is trivial, so we establish the theorem in two separate lemmas showing that $2 \Rightarrow 1$ and $1 \Rightarrow 3$.

► **Lemma 47.** *If there exist $\varepsilon > 0, k > 1, c > 0$ and an algorithm that takes as input the descriptions of k DFAs of n states working over the alphabet $\Sigma = \{0, 1\}$ and an integer ℓ and decides if there exists a string of length at most ℓ accepted by all k DFAs in time $O(n^{k-\varepsilon}\ell^c)$, then there exist $\varepsilon' > 0, c' > 0$ and an algorithm that takes as input a 3-CNF formula ψ and a path decomposition of width p and decides the satisfiability of ψ in time $O((2 - \varepsilon')^p |\psi|^{c'})$.*

Proof. Fix the $\varepsilon > 0, k > 1, c$ for which the algorithm that decides the intersection non-emptiness of k DFAs exists. Suppose we are given a 3-CNF formula ψ on n variables and

a path decomposition of width p . We will construct k DFAs D_1, \dots, D_k , over an alphabet $\Sigma = [k] \cup \{T, F\}$, and an integer ℓ such that we achieve the following:

1. There exists a string of length at most ℓ accepted by all k DFAs if and only if ψ is satisfiable.
2. For all $i \in [k]$, the number of states of D_i is $O(2^{p/k} n^4)$. All DFAs have the same number of states.
3. $\ell = O(n^4)$.
4. The DFAs and ℓ can be constructed in time $O(2^{p/k} n^4)$.

Before we proceed, let us explain why the above imply the lemma. To decide ψ we will use the supposed algorithm to decide if there exists a string of length at most ℓ accepted by all DFAs. The running time of this procedure is dominated by the execution of this supposed algorithm, which takes time $O(|D_1|^{k-\varepsilon\ell c}) = O((2^{p/k} n^4)^{k-\varepsilon n^{4c}})$. Set $2 - \varepsilon' = 2^{\frac{k-\varepsilon}{k}}$ and the running time is at most $O((2 - \varepsilon')^p n^{4k+4c})$. Setting $c' = 4k + 4c$ we obtain the promised bound, and we have that ε', c' are fixed constants depending only on ε, k, c .

We also note that the lemma is stated for a binary alphabet, but we are using an alphabet of size $k + 2$. This is not important, as we can replace the transitions out of each state with a binary tree of height $\lceil \log |\Sigma| \rceil$, with the two transitions out of each node labeled 0 and 1, and associate each binary string of length $\lceil \log |\Sigma| \rceil$ with a character from Σ . For each leaf of the tree we look at the path from the root that leads to this leaf and associate a character $c \in \Sigma$ with this leaf. We can then identify this state with the state that would have been reached in the original transition for character c . The details of this construction are explained in [6]. We therefore prefer to continue with a non-binary alphabet to simplify presentation.

We invoke Lemma 2 and Lemma 3 on our decomposition to obtain a nice decomposition B_1, \dots, B_t with $t = O(n^4)$, to obtain a function b that inductively maps clauses of ψ to indices of bags that contain all their variables, and to partition the variable set of ψ into k sets V_1, \dots, V_k such that for all $i \in [k], j \in [t]$ we have $|B_j \cap V_i| \leq \lceil \frac{p+1}{k} \rceil$. Without loss of generality, we will assume that $|B_1| = 1$. This property can always be assured, because if $|B_1| > 1$, then we can add a sequence of $|B_1| - 1$ bags before B_1 , where the first bag contains one element of B_1 and we construct each subsequent bag by adding to the previous one a new element of B_1 .

Fix an $i \in [k]$. We describe the construction of the DFA D_i . For each $j \in [t]$ we consider every truth assignment σ to the variables of $V_i \cap B_j$ (there are exactly $2^{|B_j \cap V_i|}$ such assignments). For each such assignment we construct two states $s_{i,j,\sigma}^0, s_{i,j,\sigma}^1$. We also add an initial state s_i^I . We make all states $s_{i,\ell,\sigma}^1$ accepting states. We now add the following transitions:

1. (Initial state): We add a transition for s_i^I to all states $s_{i,1,\sigma}^0$. Let $B_1 = \{v\}$. If $v \notin B_i$, then there is in fact exactly one state $s_{i,1,\sigma}^0$ (for σ the empty assignment), and we label the transition from s_i^I to this state with both T and F . Otherwise, there are exactly two states $s_{i,1,\sigma}^0$ and $s_{i,1,\sigma'}^0$ where σ sets v to True and σ' sets v to False. We label the transition to the former state with T and to the latter state with F .
2. (Consistency): consider a $j \in [t-1]$ and every assignment σ to $B_j \cap V_i$ and σ' to $B_{j+1} \cap V_i$. For each such pair of assignments which are compatible, we add a transition from $s_{i,j,\sigma}^1$ to $s_{i,j+1,\sigma'}^0$. If $B_{j+1} \cap V_i \subseteq B_j \cap V_i$, there is a unique transition going out of each $s_{i,j,\sigma}^1$, which we label with both T and F . Otherwise, each $s_{i,j,\sigma}^1$ has transitions to two distinct $s_{i,j+1,\sigma'}^0$ and $s_{i,j+1,\sigma''}^0$, where σ', σ'' disagree on the value of variable $v \in B_{j+1} \setminus B_j$. We give label T to the transition leading to the assignment that sets v to True and F to the other transition.

3. (Satisfaction): for each $j \in [t]$ and all σ we add a transition from $s_{i,j,\sigma}^0$ to $s_{i,j,\sigma}^1$. If no clause c has $b(c) = j$, or if such a clause exists but σ sets one of the literals of c to True, we label the transition with $[k]$. Otherwise, that is if some c has $b(c) = j$ but σ sets no literal of c to True, we label the transition with $[k] \setminus \{i\}$.

We note that in the above there exist states s such that for some $c \in \Sigma$ no transition with label c is exiting s . For each such state, we add a junk state s_{junk} with self-loops labeled with all characters and add the missing transitions to this state. The intended meaning is that in case of a missing transition the DFA rejects. To complete the construction we set $\ell = 2t$. It is not hard to see that we have respected the time bounds and it is possible to construct the DFAs in the claimed time. It is also not hard to check that the automata are deterministic, that is, for each state s and $c \in \Sigma$ there is at most one transition with label c going out of s .

What remains is to argue for correctness. Suppose that ψ is satisfiable. We construct a string χ of length exactly ℓ , numbering its characters from left to right starting at 0. For $j \in [t-1]$ the characters at position $2j$ and $2j+1$ are determined as follows:

- If $j = 0$ or $(B_{j+1} \setminus B_j) \cap V_i \neq \emptyset$, let v be the new vertex, that is $v \in B_{j+1} \setminus B_j$ or v is the unique element of B_1 . If the satisfying assignment sets v to True, then character $2j$ is T , otherwise F . In other cases ($j > 0$ and $B_{j+1} \cap V_i \subseteq B_j$) we set character $2j$ to T .
- If there exists clause c such that $b(c) = j$, then let i be such that c contains a satisfied literal using a variable of $V_i \cap B_j$. Such an i must necessarily exist, since all variables of c are contained in B_j . Then, character $2j+1$ is i . If no such clause exists, then character $2j+1$ is 1.

We now want to argue that each DFA D_i will accept χ . For this it is sufficient to observe that we never use a non-existing transition (which would lead to a junk state), as all states at distance 2ℓ from the initial state are accepting. We claim that reading the constructed string the DFA will always be in a state $s_{i,j,\sigma}^\alpha$, with $\alpha \in \{0, 1\}$, such that σ is the restriction of the satisfying assignment to $V_i \cap B_j$. This is easy to see for $j = 1$ and can be shown by induction for all j using the construction of the string. The key observation we need here is that in all interesting transitions (from $s_{i,j,\sigma}^1$ to $s_{i,j,\sigma'}^0$ with $B_{j+1} \cap V_i$ containing a new variable) we have constructed χ so that σ' continues to agree with our satisfying assignment. We also note that after an even number of characters the DFA is at a state $s_{i,j,\sigma}^1$, where it will encounter by construction the characters T or F ; all such states have an outgoing transition for both characters. Finally, for transitions out of states $s_{i,j,\sigma}^0$, the DFA will encounter a character from $[k]$, while the state will have a transition labeled $[k]$ (in which case we have nothing to argue), or $[k] \setminus \{i\}$. In the latter case, the character of our string cannot be i , because the assignment σ falsifies all literals of the clause c with $b(c) = j$, so we must have selected another character at this position.

For the converse direction, suppose that the k DFAs accept some string χ . We extract an assignment for V_i by observing a run of D_i on χ : if the DFA enters state $s_{i,j,\sigma}^0$ we use σ for the variables of $B_j \cap V_i$. This is consistent, because of the properties of path decompositions (once a variable is forgotten, it does not reappear) and because transitions always lead to compatible assignments. We claim that the union of these k assignments satisfies ψ . To see this, take a clause c and suppose $b(c) = j$. Consider the character of χ which allows the k DFAs to advance from some $s_{i,j,\sigma}^0$ to $s_{i,j,\sigma}^1$. Suppose this character is i and we examine the construction of D_i . Because the transition from $s_{i,j,\sigma}^0$ to $s_{i,j,\sigma}^1$ is labeled $[k]$ and not $[k] \setminus \{i\}$, while $b(c) = j$, it must be the case that c contains a literal that is satisfied by the assignment σ , therefore ψ is satisfied. ◀

► **Lemma 48.** *If there exist $\varepsilon > 0, c > 0$ such that there exists an algorithm that takes as input a CNF formula ψ and decides its satisfiability in time $O((2 - \varepsilon)^{\text{pw}(\psi)} |\psi|^c)$, then there exist $\varepsilon' > 0, k_0 > 1, c' > 0$ such that there exists an algorithm which for any $k > k_0$ takes as input the descriptions of k NFAs of n states and an integer ℓ and decides if there exists a string of length at most ℓ accepted by all k NFAs in time $O(n^{(1-\varepsilon)k}) \ell^{c'}$.*

Proof. Fix the ε, c for which a fast SAT algorithm exists. Suppose we are given k NFAs, each with n states, using an alphabet Σ of constant size, and an integer ℓ . We want to construct a CNF formula ψ that satisfies the following:

1. ψ is satisfiable if and only if there exists a string of length exactly ℓ that is accepted by all k NFAs.
2. $|\psi| = O(n^2 \ell)$ and ψ can be constructed in time $O(n^2 \ell)$.
3. $\text{pw}(\psi) = (k + 1) \log n + O(|\Sigma|)$.

Before we proceed, let us explain why the above imply the lemma. We will decide if such a string exists by constructing ψ and checking whether it is satisfiable using the supposed algorithm. Because ψ is satisfiable only if a string of length *exactly* ℓ is accepted by all NFAs, while we are looking for a string of length at most ℓ , we repeat this procedure ℓ times, once for each possible length in $[\ell]$. The running time of the whole procedure is then $O((2 - \varepsilon)^{\text{pw}(\psi)} |\psi|^c \ell) = O((2 - \varepsilon)^{k \log n} n^{2c+1} \ell^{c+1})$. Let $\delta > 0$ be such that $2 - \varepsilon = 2^{1-\delta}$, in particular set $\delta = 1 - \log(2 - \varepsilon)$. The running time is at most $O(n^{(1-\delta)k+2c+1} \ell^{c+1})$. Set $k_0 = \frac{2(2c+1)}{\delta}$. If $k > k_0$ we have that $n^{(1-\delta)k+2c+1} \ell^{c+1} < n^{(1-\delta/2)k} \ell^{c+1}$ so setting $\varepsilon' = \delta/2$, $c' = c + 1$ we obtain an algorithm with the promised running time. Observe that p_0, ε', c' are constants that depends only on ε, c .

We now describe the construction of ψ . Assume n is a power of 2 (otherwise, add dummy unreachable states to each NFA, at most doubling its size). For each $j \in \{0, \dots, \ell\}$, we construct $k \log n$ variables $x_{i,j,s}$, with $i \in [k]$ and $s \in [\log n]$. Informally, the variables $x_{i,j,s}$ encode the state of the i -th NFA after reading the j first letters of the supposed string. Suppose that the states of the k NFAs are numbered $s_{i,0}, s_{i,1}, \dots, s_{i,n-1}$, for $i \in [k]$ with $s_{i,0}$ being the initial state for each $i \in [k]$. Furthermore, for each $j \in [\ell]$ and $c \in \Sigma$ we construct a variables $y_{c,j}$ which informally encodes if the j -th letter of the supposed accepted string is c .

1. (Initial states): We add clauses for each $i \in [k]$ that ensure that $x_{i,0,s}$ encodes the initial state. In particular we add for each $i \in [k]$, $n - 1$ clauses, such that the only satisfying assignment sets all of $x_{i,0,s}$ to False, which encodes the state $s_{i,0}$.
2. (Character selection): For each $j \in [\ell]$ we add the clause $\bigvee_{c \in \Sigma} y_{c,j}$, and for each $c, c' \in \Sigma$ with $c \neq c'$ the clause $(\neg y_{c,j} \vee \neg y_{c',j})$.
3. (Transitions): For each $j \in [\ell]$ and $i \in [k]$ we add clauses that ensure that the transition of the i -th NFA is correct. In particular, for each $c \in \Sigma$ and pair of assignments σ, σ' to the variables $x_{i,j-1,s}$ and $x_{i,j,s}$ we check if the state encoded by σ' can be reached from the state encoded by σ if we read character c . If this is not the case, we add a clause that is falsified if we have $y_{c,j}$ and assignments σ, σ' .
4. (Accepting states): For each $i \in [k]$ and each assignment σ to $x_{i,\ell,s}$, if σ encodes a state that is not accepting, then we add a clause that is falsified by this assignment to the variables $x_{i,\ell,s}$.

The total number of clauses we have added is at most $O(n^2 \ell)$, as step 3 dominates. It is not hard to see that the construction can be performed in time $O(n^2 \ell)$. Let us bound the pathwidth of ψ . For each $j \in \{0, \dots, \ell\}$ we construct a bag B_j which contains all $x_{i,j,s}$, as well as all $y_{c,j}$ (for $j > 0$). This covers all the clauses except those added to encode the

transitions. To cover these, for each $j \in [\ell]$ we add a sequence of bags between B_{j-1} and B_j , call them $B_j^1, B_j^2, \dots, B_j^k$. Bag B_j^i contains $y_{c,j}$ for all $c \in \Sigma$, for each $i' \in [k], i' \leq i$ the variables $x_{i',j-1,s}$, and for each $i' \in [k], i' \geq i$ the variables $x_{i',j,s}$. Observe that for each $i \in [k]$, the transition clauses constructed for i are covered in B_j^i . It is not hard to see that the largest bag has $(k+1) \log n + |\Sigma|$ variables.

Finally, the correctness of the construction is straightforward. If there exists a string of length ℓ accepted by all NFAs, we set $y_{c,j}$ to True if and only if the j -th character of that string is c . This satisfies all clauses of step 2. We set all $x_{i,0,s}$ and this satisfies clauses of step 1. Then, for each $i \in [k]$ fix an accepting run of the i -th NFA and set for each $j \in [\ell]$ the variables $x_{i,j,s}$ to encode the state of this NFA in this run after reading j characters. This satisfies the transition clauses and the clauses of the last step. For the converse direction, if ψ is satisfiable, then we can extract a string from the assignments of $y_{c,j}$, as for each $j \in [\ell]$ exactly one such variable is True. We claim that this string is accepted by all NFAs. Indeed, fix an $i \in [k]$ and we claim that the states encoded by $x_{i,j,s}$ must be an accepting run of this state for the i -th NFA. This follows because the clauses of the first step ensure that we start at $s_{i,0}$; the transition clauses ensure that we always perform legal transitions; and the clauses of the last step ensure that we end up in an accepting state. ◀

7.3 Independent Set Reconfiguration

In this section we consider a *reconfiguration* problem defined as follows: we are given a graph G on n vertices and two independent sets of G , call them S, T , each of size k , for k being a fixed integer. We would like to transform S into T via token jumping moves, where a token jumping move is an operation that replaces a vertex in the current set with a vertex currently outside the set, while keeping the current set independent at all times.

Reconfiguration problems such as this one have been extensively studied in the literature and are generally PSPACE-complete when k is allowed to vary with n (we refer the reader to the surveys by Nishimura [56] and van den Heuvel [61]). However, when k is fixed, such problems become solvable in polynomial time, as the total number of configurations is at most $\binom{n}{k}$ and we can solve reconfiguration problems by exploring the configuration graph. It is known that, under standard assumptions, this complexity cannot be improved to $f(k)n^{O(1)}$, as independent set reconfiguration is generally W[1]-hard, even if the length of the configuration is an additional parameter ([41, 55], see also the recent survey on the parameterized complexity of reconfiguration [12]). Indeed, recent work of Bodlaender, Groenland, and Swennenhuis [8] succeeded in characterizing precisely the parameterized complexity of independent set reconfiguration when the parameter is the size of the set k : the problem is XL-complete when no bound on the length of the sequence is given; XNL-complete when a bound is given in binary; XNLP-complete when a bound is given in unary; and W[1]-complete when the length is also a parameter.

The previous work summarized above seems to indicate that the $n^{O(k)}$ algorithm which constructs the configuration graph is best possible. The question we ask here is, however, more fine-grained: we would like to determine the minimum constant c for which the problem admits an n^{ck} algorithm. Note that, because previous hardness results start from k -CLIQUE (which does admit an n^{ck} -time algorithm for $c < 1$), no concrete fine-grained lower bound of this form seems to be currently known.

In this section we focus on the version of the reconfiguration problem where we are given a desired length ℓ for the reconfiguration sequence, and ℓ is not too large (this corresponds to the XNLP-complete case studied in [8]). Our main result is that it is in fact possible to do slightly better than the trivial algorithm in this case. However, going a little further than

what we achieve is likely to be very hard, as we show that significant further improvements are equivalent to falsifying the PP-SETH.

Algorithmic result Before we explain the main algorithmic result of this section, it is worthwhile to pause for a second and take a closer look at the complexity of the trivial algorithm. As mentioned, whether a bound ℓ on the length of the sequence is given or not, one way to deal with this problem is to construct a configuration graph that contains $\binom{n}{k} = O(n^k)$ vertices, one for each independent set of G , and has an edge between sets which are reachable in one token jumping move. If k is fixed, this graph has $O(n^{k+1})$ edges, because each set has $O(kn)$ neighbors (we have k choices for a vertex to remove and n choices for a vertex to add). Hence, using BFS, reconfiguration can be solved in $O(n^{k+1})$ time. This can be slightly improved as follows: we can construct a bipartite graph, with independent sets of size k on one side and independent sets of size $k - 1$ on the other, and place an edge between S_1, S_2 whenever $S_1 \subseteq S_2$. We now observe that two sets S_1, S_2 of size k are at distance 2 in the new graph if and only if they are reachable in one token jumping move. Hence, a reconfiguration sequence of length ℓ corresponds exactly to a path of length at most 2ℓ in this graph. This graph only has $O(n^k)$ edges, since each set of size k has k subsets of size $k - 1$, so running BFS on this graph saves a factor of n .

The main question we ask then is whether we can further improve this $O(n^k)$ algorithm to some running time of the form $n^{k-\varepsilon}$. The answer is positive, if we accept a small cost in terms of the length of the reconfiguration sequence: we show in Theorem 49 that, for all $k \geq 3$ the problem can be solved in time $O(n^{k-3+\omega} \cdot \ell)$, where ω is the matrix multiplication constant. In particular, this means that whenever ℓ is small (say $\ell = n^{o(1)}$), we can shave a constant off the exponent of n that is slightly less than 1 (and would be equal to 1 if $\omega = 2$).

Lower bound The above discussion naturally leads to the lower bound question we ask in this section. Suppose that the correct value of the matrix multiplication constant is $\omega = 2$. Then, the reconfiguration problem for small values of ℓ can be solved slightly faster than the easy $O(n^k)$ algorithm we described above as we obtain an algorithm of running time $O(n^{k-1} \cdot \ell)$. Is there a possibility to do even better? Our main result in this section is to give strong evidence that the answer is negative: obtaining an algorithm with complexity $n^{k-1-\varepsilon} \cdot \ell^{O(1)}$ is *equivalent* to falsifying the PP-SETH. Hence, our results indicate that (when ℓ is small) the correct dependence of the exponent of n on k is exactly $k - 1$ (modulo, of course, the standard conjecture on the value of ω). Note that our lower bound is strong in the sense that we rule out an algorithm which shaves an ε off the exponent of n , even if we allow *any* polynomial dependence on ℓ (contrast this with the linear dependence on ℓ of Theorem 49). Our lower bound, given in Theorem 50, works for all fixed values of $k \geq 4$ and as in the case of other XNLP-complete problems shows that it is equivalent to shave an additive constant ε off the exponent of n and to improve the *coefficient* of k to $(1 - \varepsilon)$ (which a priori sounds like a more important improvement).

We now go on to present the proofs of the results of this section.

► **Theorem 49.** *There exists an algorithm that takes as input a graph G on n vertices, two independent sets S, T of size $k \geq 3$, and an integer ℓ and decides if it is possible to transform S to T via at most ℓ token jumping moves in time $O(n^{k-3+\omega} \cdot \ell)$, where ω is the matrix multiplication constant.*

Proof. Suppose that a transformation sequence $S_0 = S, S_1, \dots, S_\ell = T$ exists, we will concentrate on the sequence of sets $X_i = S_{i-1} \cap S_i$, for $i \in [\ell]$, which all have $|X_i| = k - 1$.

We note that the transformation sequence is valid if we have $X_1 \subseteq S$, $X_\ell \subseteq T$, and for each $i \in [\ell - 1]$ we have that there exists x_{i+1} such that $X_{i+1} \setminus X_i = \{x_{i+1}\}$ but $X_i \cup \{x_{i+1}\}$ is an independent set. In other words, the sequence is valid if we can transform each X_i into X_{i+1} by first adding a vertex to X_i (while keeping the set independent) and then removing a vertex. We call such a move, which is slightly more restrictive than token jumping, because we need to maintain an independent set before we remove the old token, an addition/removal move.

We start by guessing X_1 (there are only k choices, as $X_1 \subseteq S$ and $|X_1| = k - 1$). We will construct a sequence of matrices R_i , which will encode which independent sets are reachable from X_1 within i addition/removal moves. The matrices R_i will have $\binom{n}{k-2} = O(n^{k-2})$ rows and n columns each, where rows are indexed by sets of vertices of size $k - 2$ and columns by vertices. We initialize $R_0[Y, x] = 1$ if and only if $Y \cup \{x\} = X_1$ and we set all other values to 0 (so R_0 contains $k - 1$ non-zero entries).

We now explain how to obtain R_{i+1} from R_i , assuming that $R_i[Y, x] = 1$ if and only if $Y \cup \{x\}$ is reachable from X_1 within at most i addition/removal moves. Let A be the complement of the adjacency matrix of G , that is A is an $n \times n$ matrix which has $A[x, y] = 1$ if and only if $xy \notin E$ (in particular, $A[x, x] = 1$ for all $x \in V$). We compute the matrix $P_i = R_i \cdot A$, where addition is replaced by binary disjunction, and multiplication by binary conjunction, and then set $R_{i+1}[Y, x] = 1$ if and only if $Y \cup \{x\}$ is an independent set and there exist Y', x' such that $Y \cup \{x\} = Y' \cup \{x'\}$ and $P_i[Y', x'] = 1$. Note that since $|Y| = k - 2$, there are only $k - 1$ combinations (Y', x') to check for each pair (Y, x) .

We claim that R_{i+1} contains the desired information, that is $R_{i+1}[Y, x] = 1$ if and only if $Y \cup \{x\}$ is an independent set that is reachable from X_1 within at most $i + 1$ addition/removal moves. First, we argue that if $Y \cup \{x\}$ is a set reachable via $i + 1$ moves from X_1 , then $R_{i+1}[Y, x] = 1$. To see this, suppose that x is the last vertex added to the set in such a configuration sequence (this is without loss of generality, because if $y \in Y$ is actually the last vertex, then $R_{i+1}[Y \setminus \{y\} \cup \{x\}, y] = 1$ by the construction of R_{i+1}). Since x is the last vertex added, the previous set in the sequence must be of the form $Y \cup \{x'\}$, which is reachable in at most i moves, so $R_i[Y, x'] = 1$. Furthermore, it must be the case that $xx' \notin E$. We then have that $P_i[Y, x] = 1$ because $P_i[Y, x] = \bigvee_{z \in V} R_i[Y, z] \wedge A[z, x]$ and the conjunction evaluates to 1 for $z = x'$. Because $Y \cup \{x\}$ is independent, we have $R_{i+1}[Y, x] = 1$ as desired.

Second, we argue that if $R_{i+1}[Y, x] = 1$, then there does exist a sequence of at most $i + 1$ addition/removal moves that transforms X_1 to $Y \cup \{x\}$. If $R_{i+1}[Y, x] = 1$, then there exist Y', x' with $Y \cup \{x\} = Y' \cup \{x'\}$ such that $P_i[Y', x'] = 1$. Suppose without loss of generality that $P_i[Y, x] = 1$. Then, since $P_i[Y, x] = \bigvee_{z \in V} R_i[Y, z] \wedge A[z, x]$ there exists $z \in V$ such that $R_i[Y, z] = 1$ and $xz \notin E$. The set $Y \cup \{z\}$ is reachable from X_1 in at most i addition/removal moves, so we make a further move, adding x to $Y \cup \{z\}$ and then removing z . Because $xz \notin E$ and $R_{i+1}[Y, x] = 1$ we have that $Y \cup \{z, x\}$ is independent, so we obtain a valid sequence of at most $i + 1$ addition/removal moves that transform X_1 to $Y \cup \{x\}$.

We now iteratively compute R_i for $i \in [\ell]$. If there exist Y, x such that $R_\ell[Y, x] = 1$ and $Y \cup \{x\} \subseteq T$ we answer Yes, otherwise we answer No. Correctness follows from the correctness of R_i for $i \in [\ell]$, so what remains is to compute the running time. We iterate over $i \in [\ell]$ and at each step we multiply a matrix of size $n^{k-2} \times n$ with a matrix of size $n \times n$. The running time of this multiplication dominates other operations for each iteration, which can be achieved in $O(n^{k-1})$ time. Calculating the product of an $n^{k-2} \times n$ matrix with an $n \times n$ matrix can be broken down into n^{k-3} multiplications of $n \times n$ matrices, so the running time is $O(n^{k-3+\omega\ell})$. ◀

► **Theorem 50.** *The following statements are equivalent:*

1. The PP-SETH is false.
2. There exist $\varepsilon > 0, k \geq 4$ and an algorithm that takes as input a graph G on n vertices, two independent sets S, T of G of size k , and an integer ℓ , and decides if S can be transformed to T via at most ℓ token jumping moves in time $n^{k-1-\varepsilon} \ell^{O(1)}$.
3. There exist $\varepsilon > 0, k_0 \geq 4$ and an algorithm which for all $k \geq k_0$ takes an input as in the previous case and returns a correct response in time $n^{(1-\varepsilon)k} \ell^{O(1)}$.

Since the implication $3 \Rightarrow 2$ is trivial (set $k = \max\{k_0, \lceil 2/\varepsilon \rceil\}$), we break down the proof of Theorem 50 into two lemmas from the implications $2 \Rightarrow 1$ and $1 \Rightarrow 3$.

► **Lemma 51.** *If the PP-SETH is false, then there exist $\varepsilon > 0, k_0 \geq 4$ and an algorithm that takes as input a graph G on n vertices, two independent sets S, T of G of size $k \geq k_0$, and an integer ℓ , and decides if S can be transformed to T via at most ℓ token jumping moves in time $n^{(1-\varepsilon)k} \ell^{O(1)}$.*

Proof. Suppose that the PP-SETH is false and there exists an algorithm that takes as input a SAT instance ϕ and a path decomposition of its primal graph of width p and decides if ϕ is satisfiable in time $O(2^{(1-\delta)p})|\phi|^{O(1)}$. Suppose we are given an instance of the reconfiguration problem for a graph G on n vertices and two sets S, T of size k , with a target length ℓ . We will construct a formula ϕ and a path decomposition of its primal graph such that:

1. ϕ is satisfiable if and only if there exists a token-jumping reconfiguration of length at most ℓ between S and T in G .
2. The constructed path decomposition of ϕ has width at most $k \log n + O(k)$.
3. ϕ has size polynomial in $n + \ell$ and can be constructed in polynomial time.

If we achieve the above we obtain the lemma, because we can decide the reconfiguration problem by constructing ϕ and then deciding its satisfiability via the supposed algorithm. Indeed, this would take time $O(2^{(1-\delta)k \log n} n^{O(1)} \ell^{O(1)}) = n^{(1-\delta)k + O(1)} \ell^{O(1)}$. Suppose now that the constant hidden in the $O(1)$ in the exponent of n is c . Let $k_0 = \lceil 2c/\delta \rceil$. Then, the running time becomes $n^{(1-\delta/2)k} \ell^{O(1)}$, giving the lemma.

Assume, to ease presentation, that n is a power of 2 (otherwise add some dummy universal vertices, increasing n by at most a factor of 2). We construct a CNF formula as follows:

1. For each $j \in [\ell], i \in [k]$ we construct k groups of $\log n$ variables each, call them $X_{j,i}$. The idea is that for a given j, i the $\log n$ variables of $X_{j,i}$ encode the index of the i -th vertex of the j -th independent set in the reconfiguration sequence.
2. For each $j \in [\ell - 1]$ we construct k variables $c_{j,i}$, for $i \in [k]$. Informally, $c_{j,i}$ is true if we intend to remove the i -th token of the j -th set of the sequence to obtain the following set.
3. For each $j \in [\ell - 1]$ and $i, i' \in [k]$ with $i \neq i'$ we add the clause $(\neg c_{j,i} \vee \neg c_{j,i'})$.
4. For each $j \in [\ell - 1]$ and $i \in [k]$ we add clauses ensuring that $X_{j,i}$ and $X_{j+1,i}$ encode the same value (this can be done with clauses of size 2 by enforcing this constraint bit by bit). We add the literal $c_{j,i}$ to all these clauses.
5. For each $j \in [\ell]$ and $i, i' \in [k]$, for each edge of G , we construct a clause involving $X_{j,i} \cup X_{j,i'}$ that is falsified if $X_{j,i}, X_{j,i'}$ encode the endpoints of the edge. Do the same for each pair (x, x) where $x \in V(G)$ (that is, perform this step as if G contains a self-loop in every vertex).
6. Add clauses ensuring that for all $i \in [k]$, $X_{1,i}$ encodes the i -th element of S (for some arbitrary ordering of S).
7. Add clauses ensuring that for all $i \in [k]$, $X_{\ell,i}$ encodes a vertex of T (that is, add a clause that is falsified if $X_{\ell,i}$ encodes the index of a vertex outside of T).

The correctness of the construction is now easy to verify. In one direction, if there is a reconfiguration sequence, we give the variables $X_{j,i}$ values that reflect the position of the i -th token in the j -th set of the sequence. We assign $c_{j,i}$ to True if and only if the i -th token of the j -th set jumps to obtain the next set. It is not hard to see that this satisfies all clauses. For the converse direction, by interpreting the assignments to $X_{j,i}$ as indices of vertices we infer a sequence of sets of size at most k . These sets must be independent and have size exactly k because of the clauses of step 5. Furthermore, if $c_{j,i}$ is False, then the j -th and $(j+1)$ -th set agree on their i -th vertex. However, at most one $c_{j,i}$ is True for each j , because of clauses of step 3. Therefore, the sets we have constructed can be obtained from each other with token jumping moves.

Finally, let us argue about the pathwidth of ϕ . We can construct a path decomposition by making a bag for each $j \in [\ell]$ and placing into it all variables of $\bigcup_{i \in [k]} X_{j,i}$ as well as the k variables $c_{j,i}$ for $i \in [k]$. This covers clauses of steps 3,5,6, and 7. To cover the remaining clauses (of step 4) it suffices to observe that the subgraph of the primal graph induced by $X_{j,i} \cup X_{j+1,i}$ is a matching, so we can construct a sequence of bags that exchanges one by one the vertices of $X_{j,i}$ with those of $X_{j+1,i}$, while keeping $c_{j,i}$ in the bags, covering clauses of step 4. \blacktriangleleft

► **Lemma 52.** *If there exist $\varepsilon > 0, k \geq 4$ and an algorithm that takes as input a graph G on n vertices, two independent sets S, T of G of size k , and an integer ℓ , and decides if S can be transformed to T via at most ℓ token jumping moves in time $n^{k-1-\varepsilon} \cdot \ell^{O(1)}$, then the PP-SETH is false.*

Proof. Suppose that there exist $\varepsilon > 0, k \geq 3$ and an algorithm that solves the reconfiguration problem in time $n^{k-1-\varepsilon} \cdot \ell^{O(1)}$. We start with an instance of 3-SAT ϕ and suppose that we are given a path decomposition of its primal graph where each bag contains at most p variables. We will construct from ϕ an instance of the reconfiguration problem, that is a graph G , an integer ℓ , and two independent sets S, T of size k such that:

1. ϕ is satisfiable if and only if S can be reconfigured to T with at most ℓ token jumping moves.
2. G has n vertices, where $n = 2^{\frac{p}{k-1}} |\phi|^{O(1)}$.
3. $\ell = |\phi|^{O(1)}$
4. Constructing G, S, T, ℓ , can be done in time at most $2^{2p/3} |\phi|^{O(1)}$.

If we achieve the above, we falsify the PP-SETH. Indeed, we can decide ϕ by performing the reduction and then using the supposed algorithm for the reconfiguration problem. The running time is dominated by the execution of the supposed algorithm, which takes time $n^{k-1-\varepsilon} \ell^{O(1)} = 2^{\frac{p}{k-1}(k-1-\varepsilon)} |\phi|^{O(1)} = (2-\delta)^p |\phi|^{O(1)}$, where $2-\delta = 2^{\frac{k-1-\varepsilon}{k-1}}$.

We now invoke Lemma 2 and Lemma 3 to obtain a nice path decomposition of ϕ , with the bags numbered B_1, \dots, B_t , with $t = |\phi|^{O(1)}$, an injective function mapping clauses of ϕ to bags that contain their variables, and a partition of the variables into $k-1$ groups V_1, \dots, V_{k-1} so that for all bags B_j we have $|B_j \cap V_i| \leq \frac{p}{k-1} + 1$. We now perform some further preprocessing to ensure that each clause of ϕ involves variables from at most 2 distinct groups V_i . To achieve this, as long as there is a clause c involving three variables x_1, x_2, x_3 which belong in distinct sets, let B_j be the bag given by the injective mapping for c . We insert in the decomposition 4 copies of B immediately after B and insert in the first three copies a new variable x'_1 which belongs in the same group as x_2 . We replace in c the variable x_1 with x'_1 and construct the clauses $(\neg x_1 \vee x'_1)$ and $(\neg x'_1 \vee x_1)$, which ensure that x_1, x'_1 must have the same value. Using the copies of B where we added x'_1 we update the mapping

function so that c and the two new clauses are mapped to distinct bags that contain their literals. Doing this exhaustively we obtain the property, while we now have that for each bag B_j and $i \in [k-1]$ that $|B_j \cap V_i| \leq \frac{p}{k-1} + 2$. We will further assume, without loss of generality, that $B_1 = B_t = \emptyset$.

In order to simplify the presentation of the rest of the construction, we will formulate it in terms of clique reconfiguration (that is, S, T are cliques of size k and we need to reconfigure them with token jumping moves while maintaining a clique at all times). Clearly, this is equivalent to the original problem if we take the complement of the graph we construct.

We now construct a graph as follows: for each $j \in [t]$ and $i \in [k-1]$ we construct a set of $2^{|B_j \cap V_i|} = O(2^{\frac{p}{k-1}})$ vertices $V_{j,i}$ which form an independent set. Each vertex represents an assignment to the variables of $B_j \cap V_i$ (in particular, if $|B_j \cap V_i| = 0$, then $V_{j,i}$ contains a unique vertex). If some such assignment falsifies a clause (whose variables are contained in $B_j \cap V_i$) we delete from the graph the corresponding vertex. We now add the following edges:

1. For all $j \in [t]$ and $i, i' \in [k-1]$ with $i \neq i'$, we connect all vertices of $V_{j,i}$ with all vertices of $V_{j,i'}$.
2. We remove some of the edges added in the previous step as follows: for each clause c that involves variables from two groups V_{i_1}, V_{i_2} , suppose that c is mapped to B_j . For each pair $(u, v) \in V_{j,i_1} \times V_{j,i_2}$ such that the assignment encoded by u, v together falsifies c , remove the edge uv from the graph.
3. For all $j \in [t-1]$, $i \in [k-1]$, and $i' \in [i-1]$ we connect all vertices of $V_{j,i}$ with all vertices of $V_{j+1,i'}$.
4. For all $j \in [t-1]$ and $i \in [k-1]$ we connect each vertex of $V_{j,i}$ with each vertex of $V_{j+1,i}$ such that the corresponding assignments agree on all variables of $B_j \cap B_{j+1} \cap V_i$.

Observe that as $B_1 = B_t = \emptyset$, the sets $V_{1,i}$ and $V_{t,i}$ are singletons which form two cliques of size $k-1$. We add a vertex s_0 and connect it to $\bigcup_{i \in [k-1]} V_{1,i}$ and a vertex t_0 and connect it to $\bigcup_{i \in [k-1]} V_{t,i}$. We set $S = \{s_0\} \cup N(s_0)$ and $T = \{t_0\} \cup N(t_0)$. We also set $\ell = (k-1)(t-1) + 1$.

It is not hard to see that the size of the graph and the value of ℓ satisfy the promised properties and that, since $k-1 \geq 3$ the graph (and its complement) can be constructed in time at most $2^{2p/3} |\phi|^{O(1)}$, because the number of possible edges is at most $2^{\frac{2p}{k-1}} |\phi|^{O(1)}$. What remains is to show correctness.

For the forward direction, suppose that ϕ is satisfiable. We identify a unique vertex of each $V_{j,i}$ which agrees with our satisfying assignment and show that we can reconfigure S to T using these vertices. Notice that for each j , this includes $k-1$ vertices, one from each $V_{j,i}$, $i \in [k-1]$, which form a clique (since the assignment is satisfying). Now, for each $j \in [t-1]$, suppose that in the current state we have tokens in one vertex of each $V_{j,i}$, for $i \in [k-1]$ and no tokens in $V_{j+1,i}$ for any $i \in [k-1]$. We take the token that is not in any $V_{j,i}$ (initially this is the token in s_0) and place it in the selected vertex of $V_{j+1,1}$; then for each $i \in [k-2]$ we take the token from $V_{j,i}$ and place it on the selected vertex of $V_{j+1,i+1}$. After these $k-1$ moves we move on to the next value of j . The last move is to take the token that is not in any $V_{t,i}$ and place it in t_0 . We have performed exactly $\ell = (t-1)(k-1) + 1$ moves. At any point we keep tokens, for some $j \in [t]$ and $i \in [k-1]$ in a single vertex from each of the sets $V_{j,i}, V_{j,i+1}, \dots, V_{j,k-1}, V_{j+1,1}, \dots, V_{j+1,i}$, which form a clique if our assignment was satisfying and consistent.

For the converse direction, Suppose there is a sequence of cliques $S_0 = S, S_1, \dots, S_\ell = T$ which represent a token jumping reconfiguration. Take a value $r \in [\ell] \setminus \{0, \ell\}$ and let us say that the set S_r is described by the pair (j, i) , for $j \in [t], i \in [k-1]$, if (j, i) is the lexicographically

smallest pair for which $V_{j,i} \cap S_r \neq \emptyset$. We now observe that if S_r is described by (j, i) then it must contain exactly one vertex from each of the sets $V_{j,i}, V_{j,i+1}, \dots, V_{j,k-1}, V_{j+1,1}, \dots, V_{j+1,i}$. This is because all sets $V_{j',i'}$ are independent (so at most one vertex from each set is in S_r); for all (j', i') which come lexicographically after $(j+1, i)$, there is no edge from $V_{j,i}$ to $V_{j',i'}$, so $S_r \cap V_{j',i'} = \emptyset$; S_r has size exactly k . Thanks to these observations we can now see that if S_r is described by (j, i) , then S_{r+1} must be described by a pair (j', i') which is lexicographically either immediately after (j, i) (that is, $j = j'$ and $i' = i+1$, or $i = k-1, i' = 1$, and $j' = j+1$), or immediately before, because sets which are not consecutive in the lexicographic ordering have symmetric difference of size at least 2. Because there are $(t-1)(k-1)$ pairs (j, i) , S_1 is described by $(1, 1)$ and $S_{\ell-1}$ by $(t-1, k-1)$, taking into account the two moves required to remove a token from s_0 and to place a token into t_0 , we conclude that the only way to obtain a feasible sequence of sets is to have exactly one set described by each pair (j, i) .

It is not hard to see that the above imply that our sequence uses exactly one vertex from each $V_{j,i}$, from which we can infer an assignment to ϕ . Specifically, for each $V_{j,i}$, there is exactly one vertex that is used at some point and we deduce from this an assignment to $B_j \cap V_i$. This assignment must be consistent with the one deduced from $V_{j+1,i}$, due to the edges of step 4; hence this assignment is consistent throughout. The assignment must be satisfying, since the removal of edges from step 2 forbids us from using vertices in the clique that would falsify clauses involving variables from two groups. ◀

References

- 1 Amir Abboud, Arturs Backurs, and Virginia Vassilevska Williams. Tight hardness results for LCS and other sequence similarity measures. In Venkatesan Guruswami, editor, *IEEE 56th Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science, FOCS 2015, Berkeley, CA, USA, 17-20 October, 2015*, pages 59–78. IEEE Computer Society, 2015. doi:10.1109/FOCS.2015.14.
- 2 Amir Abboud, Karl Bringmann, Danny Hermelin, and Dvir Shabtay. Seth-based lower bounds for subset sum and bicriteria path. *ACM Trans. Algorithms*, 18(1):6:1–6:22, 2022. doi:10.1145/3450524.
- 3 Benjamin Bergognoux, Édouard Bonnet, Nick Brettell, and O-joung Kwon. Close relatives of feedback vertex set without single-exponential algorithms parameterized by treewidth. In Yixin Cao and Marcin Pilipczuk, editors, *15th International Symposium on Parameterized and Exact Computation, IPEC 2020, December 14-18, 2020, Hong Kong, China (Virtual Conference)*, volume 180 of *LIPICs*, pages 3:1–3:17. Schloss Dagstuhl - Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik, 2020. URL: <https://doi.org/10.4230/LIPICs.IPEC.2020.3>, doi:10.4230/LIPICs.IPEC.2020.3.
- 4 Hans L. Bodlaender, Carla Groenland, Hugo Jacob, Lars Jaffke, and Paloma T. Lima. Xnlp-completeness for parameterized problems on graphs with a linear structure. In Holger Dell and Jesper Nederlof, editors, *17th International Symposium on Parameterized and Exact Computation, IPEC 2022, September 7-9, 2022, Potsdam, Germany*, volume 249 of *LIPICs*, pages 8:1–8:18. Schloss Dagstuhl - Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik, 2022. URL: <https://doi.org/10.4230/LIPICs.IPEC.2022.8>, doi:10.4230/LIPICs.IPEC.2022.8.
- 5 Hans L. Bodlaender, Carla Groenland, Hugo Jacob, Marcin Pilipczuk, and Michal Pilipczuk. On the complexity of problems on tree-structured graphs. In Holger Dell and Jesper Nederlof, editors, *17th International Symposium on Parameterized and Exact Computation, IPEC 2022, September 7-9, 2022, Potsdam, Germany*, volume 249 of *LIPICs*, pages 6:1–6:17. Schloss Dagstuhl - Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik, 2022. URL: <https://doi.org/10.4230/LIPICs.IPEC.2022.6>, doi:10.4230/LIPICs.IPEC.2022.6.
- 6 Hans L. Bodlaender, Carla Groenland, Jesper Nederlof, and Céline M. F. Swennenhuis. Parameterized problems complete for nondeterministic FPT time and logarithmic space. In *62nd IEEE Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science, FOCS 2021, Denver, CO, USA, February 7-10, 2022*, pages 193–204. IEEE, 2021. doi:10.1109/FOCS52979.2021.00027.
- 7 Hans L. Bodlaender, Carla Groenland, and Michal Pilipczuk. Parameterized complexity of binary CSP: vertex cover, treedepth, and related parameters. In Kousha Etessami, Uriel Feige, and Gabriele Puppis, editors, *50th International Colloquium on Automata, Languages, and Programming, ICALP 2023, July 10-14, 2023, Paderborn, Germany*, volume 261 of *LIPICs*, pages 27:1–27:20. Schloss Dagstuhl - Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik, 2023. URL: <https://doi.org/10.4230/LIPICs.ICALP.2023.27>, doi:10.4230/LIPICs.ICALP.2023.27.
- 8 Hans L. Bodlaender, Carla Groenland, and Céline M. F. Swennenhuis. Parameterized complexities of dominating and independent set reconfiguration. In Petr A. Golovach and Meirav Zehavi, editors, *16th International Symposium on Parameterized and Exact Computation, IPEC 2021, September 8-10, 2021, Lisbon, Portugal*, volume 214 of *LIPICs*, pages 9:1–9:16. Schloss Dagstuhl - Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik, 2021. URL: <https://doi.org/10.4230/LIPICs.IPEC.2021.9>, doi:10.4230/LIPICs.IPEC.2021.9.
- 9 Narek Bojikian, Vera Chekan, Falko Hegerfeld, and Stefan Kratsch. Tight bounds for connectivity problems parameterized by cutwidth. In Petra Berenbrink, Patricia Bouyer, Anuj Dawar, and Mamadou Moustapha Kanté, editors, *40th International Symposium on Theoretical Aspects of Computer Science, STACS 2023, March 7-9, 2023, Hamburg, Germany*, volume 254 of *LIPICs*, pages 14:1–14:16. Schloss Dagstuhl - Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik, 2023. URL: <https://doi.org/10.4230/LIPICs.STACS.2023.14>, doi:10.4230/LIPICs.STACS.2023.14.
- 10 Marthe Bonamy, Lukasz Kowalik, Jesper Nederlof, Michal Pilipczuk, Arkadiusz Socala, and Marcin Wrochna. On directed feedback vertex set parameterized by treewidth. In Andreas Brandstädt, Ekkehard Köhler, and Klaus Meer, editors, *Graph-Theoretic Concepts in Computer Science - 44th International Workshop, WG 2018, Cottbus, Germany, June 27-29,*

- 2018, *Proceedings*, volume 11159 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 65–78. Springer, 2018. doi:10.1007/978-3-030-00256-5\6.
- 11 Glencora Borradaile and Hung Le. Optimal dynamic program for r-domination problems over tree decompositions. In Jiong Guo and Danny Hermelin, editors, *11th International Symposium on Parameterized and Exact Computation, IPEC 2016, August 24-26, 2016, Aarhus, Denmark*, volume 63 of *LIPICs*, pages 8:1–8:23. Schloss Dagstuhl - Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik, 2016. doi:10.4230/LIPICs.IPEC.2016.8.
 - 12 Nicolas Bousquet, Amer E. Mouawad, Naomi Nishimura, and Sebastian Siebertz. A survey on the parameterized complexity of the independent set and (connected) dominating set reconfiguration problems. *CoRR*, abs/2204.10526, 2022. URL: <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2204.10526>, arXiv:2204.10526, doi:10.48550/ARXIV.2204.10526.
 - 13 Lijie Chen and Ryan Williams. An equivalence class for orthogonal vectors. In Timothy M. Chan, editor, *Proceedings of the Thirtieth Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms, SODA 2019, San Diego, California, USA, January 6-9, 2019*, pages 21–40. SIAM, 2019. doi:10.1137/1.9781611975482.2.
 - 14 Rajesh Hemant Chitnis, Andreas Emil Feldmann, Mohammad Taghi Hajiaghayi, and Dániel Marx. Tight bounds for planar strongly connected steiner subgraph with fixed number of terminals (and extensions). *SIAM J. Comput.*, 49(2):318–364, 2020. doi:10.1137/18M122371X.
 - 15 Radu Curticapean and Dániel Marx. Tight conditional lower bounds for counting perfect matchings on graphs of bounded treewidth, cliquewidth, and genus. In Robert Krauthgamer, editor, *Proceedings of the Twenty-Seventh Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms, SODA 2016, Arlington, VA, USA, January 10-12, 2016*, pages 1650–1669. SIAM, 2016. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1137/1.9781611974331.ch113>, doi:10.1137/1.9781611974331.CH113.
 - 16 Marek Cygan, Holger Dell, Daniel Lokshtanov, Dániel Marx, Jesper Nederlof, Yoshio Okamoto, Ramamohan Paturi, Saket Saurabh, and Magnus Wahlström. On problems as hard as CNF-SAT. *ACM Trans. Algorithms*, 12(3):41:1–41:24, 2016. doi:10.1145/2925416.
 - 17 Marek Cygan, Fedor V. Fomin, Lukasz Kowalik, Daniel Lokshtanov, Dániel Marx, Marcin Pilipczuk, Michal Pilipczuk, and Saket Saurabh. *Parameterized Algorithms*. Springer, 2015. doi:10.1007/978-3-319-21275-3.
 - 18 Marek Cygan, Stefan Kratsch, and Jesper Nederlof. Fast hamiltonicity checking via bases of perfect matchings. *J. ACM*, 65(3):12:1–12:46, 2018. doi:10.1145/3148227.
 - 19 Marek Cygan, Jesper Nederlof, Marcin Pilipczuk, Michal Pilipczuk, Johan M. M. van Rooij, and Jakub Onufry Wojtaszczyk. Solving connectivity problems parameterized by treewidth in single exponential time. *ACM Trans. Algorithms*, 18(2):17:1–17:31, 2022. doi:10.1145/3506707.
 - 20 Marek Cygan, Marcin Pilipczuk, and Michal Pilipczuk. Known algorithms for edge clique cover are probably optimal. *SIAM J. Comput.*, 45(1):67–83, 2016. doi:10.1137/130947076.
 - 21 Mateus de Oliveira Oliveira and Michael Wehar. On the fine grained complexity of finite automata non-emptiness of intersection. In Natasa Jonoska and Dmytro Savchuk, editors, *Developments in Language Theory - 24th International Conference, DLT 2020, Tampa, FL, USA, May 11-15, 2020, Proceedings*, volume 12086 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 69–82. Springer, 2020. doi:10.1007/978-3-030-48516-0\6.
 - 22 Louis Dublois, Michael Lampis, and Vangelis Th. Paschos. New algorithms for mixed dominating set. *Discret. Math. Theor. Comput. Sci.*, 23(1), 2021. doi:10.46298/dmtcs.6824.
 - 23 Louis Dublois, Michael Lampis, and Vangelis Th. Paschos. Upper dominating set: Tight algorithms for pathwidth and sub-exponential approximation. *Theor. Comput. Sci.*, 923:271–291, 2022. doi:10.1016/j.tcs.2022.05.013.
 - 24 Michael Elberfeld, Christoph Stockhusen, and Till Tantau. On the space and circuit complexity of parameterized problems: Classes and completeness. *Algorithmica*, 71(3):661–701, 2015. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00453-014-9944-y>, doi:10.1007/S00453-014-9944-Y.
 - 25 Baris Can Esmer, Jacob Focke, Dániel Marx, and Pawel Rzazewski. Fundamental problems on bounded-treewidth graphs: The real source of hardness. *CoRR*, abs/2402.07331,

2024. URL: <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2402.07331>, arXiv:2402.07331, doi:10.48550/ARXIV.2402.07331.
- 26 Michael R. Fellows, Fedor V. Fomin, Daniel Lokshtanov, Frances A. Rosamond, Saket Saurabh, Stefan Szeider, and Carsten Thomassen. On the complexity of some colorful problems parameterized by treewidth. *Inf. Comput.*, 209(2):143–153, 2011. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ic.2010.11.026>, doi:10.1016/J.IC.2010.11.026.
- 27 Jacob Focke, Dániel Marx, Fionn Mc Inerney, Daniel Neuen, Govind S. Sankar, Philipp Schepper, and Philip Wellnitz. Tight complexity bounds for counting generalized dominating sets in bounded-treewidth graphs. In Nikhil Bansal and Viswanath Nagarajan, editors, *Proceedings of the 2023 ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms, SODA 2023, Florence, Italy, January 22-25, 2023*, pages 3664–3683. SIAM, 2023. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1137/1.9781611977554.ch140>, doi:10.1137/1.9781611977554.CH140.
- 28 Jacob Focke, Dániel Marx, and Pawel Rzazewski. Counting list homomorphisms from graphs of bounded treewidth: tight complexity bounds. In *Proceedings of the 2022 ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms, SODA 2022*, pages 431–458. SIAM, 2022. doi:10.1137/1.9781611977073.22.
- 29 Fedor V. Fomin, Petr A. Golovach, Daniel Lokshtanov, Saket Saurabh, and Meirav Zehavi. Clique-width III: hamiltonian cycle and the odd case of graph coloring. *ACM Trans. Algorithms*, 15(1):9:1–9:27, 2019. doi:10.1145/3280824.
- 30 Florent Foucaud, Esther Galby, Liana Khazaliya, Shaohua Li, Fionn Mc Inerney, Roohani Sharma, and Prafullkumar Tale. Tight (double) exponential bounds for np-complete problems: Treewidth and vertex cover parameterizations. *CoRR*, abs/2307.08149, 2023. URL: <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2307.08149>, arXiv:2307.08149, doi:10.48550/ARXIV.2307.08149.
- 31 Robert Ganian, Thekla Hamm, Viktoriia Korchemna, Karolina Okrasa, and Kirill Simonov. The fine-grained complexity of graph homomorphism parameterized by clique-width. In *49th International Colloquium on Automata, Languages, and Programming, ICALP 2022*, volume 229 of *LIPICs*, pages 66:1–66:20. Schloss Dagstuhl - Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik, 2022. doi:10.4230/LIPICs.ICALP.2022.66.
- 32 M. R. Garey, David S. Johnson, and Larry J. Stockmeyer. Some simplified np-complete graph problems. *Theor. Comput. Sci.*, 1(3):237–267, 1976. doi:10.1016/0304-3975(76)90059-1.
- 33 Sylvain Guillemot. Parameterized complexity and approximability of the longest compatible sequence problem. *Discret. Optim.*, 8(1):50–60, 2011. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.disopt.2010.08.003>, doi:10.1016/J.DISOPT.2010.08.003.
- 34 Tesshu Hanaka, Ioannis Katsikarelis, Michael Lampis, Yota Otachi, and Florian Sikora. Parameterized orientable deletion. *Algorithmica*, 82(7):1909–1938, 2020. doi:10.1007/s00453-020-00679-6.
- 35 Ararat Harutyunyan, Michael Lampis, and Nikolaos Melissinos. Digraph coloring and distance to acyclicity. In Markus Bläser and Benjamin Monmege, editors, *38th International Symposium on Theoretical Aspects of Computer Science, STACS 2021, March 16-19, 2021, Saarbrücken, Germany (Virtual Conference)*, volume 187 of *LIPICs*, pages 41:1–41:15. Schloss Dagstuhl - Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik, 2021. URL: <https://doi.org/10.4230/LIPICs.STACS.2021.41>, doi:10.4230/LIPICs.STACS.2021.41.
- 36 Falko Hegerfeld and Stefan Kratsch. Towards exact structural thresholds for parameterized complexity. In Holger Dell and Jesper Nederlof, editors, *17th International Symposium on Parameterized and Exact Computation, IPEC 2022, September 7-9, 2022, Potsdam, Germany*, volume 249 of *LIPICs*, pages 17:1–17:20. Schloss Dagstuhl - Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik, 2022. URL: <https://doi.org/10.4230/LIPICs.IPEC.2022.17>, doi:10.4230/LIPICs.IPEC.2022.17.
- 37 Falko Hegerfeld and Stefan Kratsch. Tight algorithms for connectivity problems parameterized by clique-width. In Inge Li Gørtz, Martin Farach-Colton, Simon J. Puglisi, and Grzegorz Herman, editors, *31st Annual European Symposium on Algorithms, ESA 2023, September 4-6,*

- 2023, Amsterdam, The Netherlands, volume 274 of *LIPICs*, pages 59:1–59:19. Schloss Dagstuhl - Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik, 2023. URL: <https://doi.org/10.4230/LIPICs.ESA.2023.59>, doi:10.4230/LIPICs.ESA.2023.59.
- 38 Falko Hegerfeld and Stefan Kratsch. Tight algorithms for connectivity problems parameterized by modular-treewidth. In Daniël Paulusma and Bernard Ries, editors, *Graph-Theoretic Concepts in Computer Science - 49th International Workshop, WG 2023, Fribourg, Switzerland, June 28-30, 2023, Revised Selected Papers*, volume 14093 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 388–402. Springer, 2023. doi:10.1007/978-3-031-43380-1_28.
- 39 Russell Impagliazzo and Ramamohan Paturi. On the complexity of k-sat. *J. Comput. Syst. Sci.*, 62(2):367–375, 2001. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1006/jcss.2000.1727>, doi:10.1006/JCSS.2000.1727.
- 40 Russell Impagliazzo, Ramamohan Paturi, and Francis Zane. Which problems have strongly exponential complexity? *J. Comput. Syst. Sci.*, 63(4):512–530, 2001. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1006/jcss.2001.1774>, doi:10.1006/JCSS.2001.1774.
- 41 Takehiro Ito, Marcin Jakub Kaminski, Hirotaka Ono, Akira Suzuki, Ryuhei Uehara, and Katsuhisa Yamanaka. Parameterized complexity of independent set reconfiguration problems. *Discret. Appl. Math.*, 283:336–345, 2020. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.dam.2020.01.022>, doi:10.1016/J.DAM.2020.01.022.
- 42 Yoichi Iwata and Yuichi Yoshida. On the equivalence among problems of bounded width. In Nikhil Bansal and Irene Finocchi, editors, *Algorithms - ESA 2015 - 23rd Annual European Symposium, Patras, Greece, September 14-16, 2015, Proceedings*, volume 9294 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 754–765. Springer, 2015. doi:10.1007/978-3-662-48350-3_63.
- 43 Lars Jaffke and Bart M. P. Jansen. Fine-grained parameterized complexity analysis of graph coloring problems. *Discret. Appl. Math.*, 327:33–46, 2023. doi:10.1016/j.dam.2022.11.011.
- 44 Ioannis Katsikarelis, Michael Lampis, and Vangelis Th. Paschos. Structural parameters, tight bounds, and approximation for (k, r) -center. *Discret. Appl. Math.*, 264:90–117, 2019. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.dam.2018.11.002>, doi:10.1016/J.DAM.2018.11.002.
- 45 Ioannis Katsikarelis, Michael Lampis, and Vangelis Th. Paschos. Structurally parameterized d-scattered set. *Discret. Appl. Math.*, 308:168–186, 2022. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.dam.2020.03.052>, doi:10.1016/J.DAM.2020.03.052.
- 46 Michael Lampis. Finer tight bounds for coloring on clique-width. *SIAM J. Discret. Math.*, 34(3):1538–1558, 2020. doi:10.1137/19M1280326.
- 47 Michael Lampis, Nikolaos Melissinos, and Manolis Vasilakis. Parameterized max min feedback vertex set. In Jérôme Leroux, Sylvain Lombardy, and David Peleg, editors, *48th International Symposium on Mathematical Foundations of Computer Science, MFCS 2023, August 28 to September 1, 2023, Bordeaux, France*, volume 272 of *LIPICs*, pages 62:1–62:15. Schloss Dagstuhl - Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik, 2023. URL: <https://doi.org/10.4230/LIPICs.MFCS.2023.62>, doi:10.4230/LIPICs.MFCS.2023.62.
- 48 Michael Lampis and Valia Mitsou. Treewidth with a quantifier alternation revisited. In Daniel Lokshtanov and Naomi Nishimura, editors, *12th International Symposium on Parameterized and Exact Computation, IPEC 2017, September 6-8, 2017, Vienna, Austria*, volume 89 of *LIPICs*, pages 26:1–26:12. Schloss Dagstuhl - Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik, 2017. URL: <https://doi.org/10.4230/LIPICs.IPEC.2017.26>, doi:10.4230/LIPICs.IPEC.2017.26.
- 49 Michael Lampis and Manolis Vasilakis. Structural parameterizations for two bounded degree problems revisited. In Inge Li Gørtz, Martin Farach-Colton, Simon J. Puglisi, and Grzegorz Herman, editors, *31st Annual European Symposium on Algorithms, ESA 2023, September 4-6, 2023, Amsterdam, The Netherlands*, volume 274 of *LIPICs*, pages 77:1–77:16. Schloss Dagstuhl - Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik, 2023. URL: <https://doi.org/10.4230/LIPICs.ESA.2023.77>, doi:10.4230/LIPICs.ESA.2023.77.
- 50 Daniel Lokshtanov, Dániel Marx, and Saket Saurabh. Known algorithms on graphs of bounded treewidth are probably optimal. *ACM Trans. Algorithms*, 14(2):13:1–13:30, 2018. doi:10.1145/3170442.

- 51 Daniel Lokshtanov, Dániel Marx, and Saket Saurabh. Slightly superexponential parameterized problems. *SIAM J. Comput.*, 47(3):675–702, 2018. doi:10.1137/16M1104834.
- 52 Dániel Marx and Valia Mitsou. Double-exponential and triple-exponential bounds for choosability problems parameterized by treewidth. In Ioannis Chatzigiannakis, Michael Mitzenmacher, Yuval Rabani, and Davide Sangiorgi, editors, *43rd International Colloquium on Automata, Languages, and Programming, ICALP 2016, July 11-15, 2016, Rome, Italy*, volume 55 of *LIPICs*, pages 28:1–28:15. Schloss Dagstuhl - Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik, 2016. URL: <https://doi.org/10.4230/LIPICs.ICALP.2016.28>, doi:10.4230/LIPICs.ICALP.2016.28.
- 53 Dániel Marx and Michal Pilipczuk. Everything you always wanted to know about the parameterized complexity of subgraph isomorphism (but were afraid to ask). In Ernst W. Mayr and Natacha Portier, editors, *31st International Symposium on Theoretical Aspects of Computer Science (STACS 2014), STACS 2014, March 5-8, 2014, Lyon, France*, volume 25 of *LIPICs*, pages 542–553. Schloss Dagstuhl - Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik, 2014. URL: <https://doi.org/10.4230/LIPICs.STACS.2014.542>, doi:10.4230/LIPICs.STACS.2014.542.
- 54 Dániel Marx, Govind S. Sankar, and Philipp Schepper. Degrees and gaps: Tight complexity results of general factor problems parameterized by treewidth and cutwidth. In Nikhil Bansal, Emanuela Merelli, and James Worrell, editors, *48th International Colloquium on Automata, Languages, and Programming, ICALP 2021, July 12-16, 2021, Glasgow, Scotland (Virtual Conference)*, volume 198 of *LIPICs*, pages 95:1–95:20. Schloss Dagstuhl - Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik, 2021. URL: <https://doi.org/10.4230/LIPICs.ICALP.2021.95>, doi:10.4230/LIPICs.ICALP.2021.95.
- 55 Amer E. Mouawad, Naomi Nishimura, Venkatesh Raman, Narges Simjour, and Akira Suzuki. On the parameterized complexity of reconfiguration problems. *Algorithmica*, 78(1):274–297, 2017. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00453-016-0159-2>, doi:10.1007/s00453-016-0159-2.
- 56 Naomi Nishimura. Introduction to reconfiguration. *Algorithms*, 11(4):52, 2018. URL: <https://doi.org/10.3390/a11040052>, doi:10.3390/A11040052.
- 57 Karolina Okrasa and Pawel Rzazewski. Fine-grained complexity of the graph homomorphism problem for bounded-treewidth graphs. *SIAM J. Comput.*, 50(2):487–508, 2021. doi:10.1137/20M1320146.
- 58 Mihai Pătraşcu and Ryan Williams. On the possibility of faster SAT algorithms. In Moses Charikar, editor, *Proceedings of the Twenty-First Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms, SODA 2010, Austin, Texas, USA, January 17-19, 2010*, pages 1065–1075. SIAM, 2010. doi:10.1137/1.9781611973075.86.
- 59 Michal Pilipczuk. Problems parameterized by treewidth tractable in single exponential time: A logical approach. In Filip Murlak and Piotr Sankowski, editors, *Mathematical Foundations of Computer Science 2011 - 36th International Symposium, MFCS 2011, Warsaw, Poland, August 22-26, 2011. Proceedings*, volume 6907 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 520–531. Springer, 2011. doi:10.1007/978-3-642-22993-0_47.
- 60 Ignasi Sau and Uéverton dos Santos Souza. Hitting forbidden induced subgraphs on bounded treewidth graphs. *Inf. Comput.*, 281:104812, 2021. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ic.2021.104812>, doi:10.1016/J.IC.2021.104812.
- 61 Jan van den Heuvel. The complexity of change. In Simon R. Blackburn, Stefanie Gerke, and Mark Wildon, editors, *Surveys in Combinatorics 2013*, volume 409 of *London Mathematical Society Lecture Note Series*, pages 127–160. Cambridge University Press, 2013. doi:10.1017/CB09781139506748.005.
- 62 Virginia Vassilevska Williams. On some fine-grained questions in algorithms and complexity. In *Proceedings of the international congress of mathematicians: Rio de janeiro 2018*, pages 3447–3487. World Scientific, 2018.
- 63 Ryan Williams. A new algorithm for optimal 2-constraint satisfaction and its implications. *Theor. Comput. Sci.*, 348(2-3):357–365, 2005. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tcs.2005.09.023>, doi:10.1016/J.TCS.2005.09.023.