


Computational Complexity of Covering Colored Mixed Multigraphs with Simple Degree Partitions *

Jan Bok ✉ 

Department of Algebra, Faculty of Mathematics and Physics, Charles University, Prague, Czech Republic

Université Clermont Auvergne, CNRS, Mines de Saint-Étienne, Clermont-Auvergne-INP, LIMOS, 63000, Clermont-Ferrand, France

Jiří Fiala ✉ 

Department of Applied Mathematics, Faculty of Mathematics and Physics, Charles University, Prague, Czech Republic

Nikola Jedličková ✉ 

Department of Applied Mathematics, Faculty of Mathematics and Physics, Charles University, Prague, Czech Republic

Jan Kratochvíl ✉ 

Department of Applied Mathematics, Faculty of Mathematics and Physics, Charles University, Prague, Czech Republic

Michaela Seifrtová ✉ 

Department of Applied Mathematics, Faculty of Mathematics and Physics, Charles University, Prague, Czech Republic

Abstract

The notion of graph covers (also referred to as locally bijective homomorphisms) plays an important role in topological graph theory and has found its computer science applications in models of local computation. For a fixed target graph H , the H -COVER problem asks if an input graph G allows a graph covering projection onto H . Despite the fact that the quest for characterizing the computational complexity of H -COVER had been started more than 30 years ago, only a handful of general results have been known so far.

In this paper, we present a complete characterization of the computational complexity of covering coloured graphs for the case that every equivalence class in the degree partition of the target graph has at most two vertices. We prove this result in a very general form. Following the lines of current development of topological graph theory, we study graphs in the most relaxed sense of the definition. In particular, we consider graphs that are mixed (they may have both directed and undirected edges), may have multiple edges, loops, and semi-edges. We show that a strong P/NP-complete dichotomy holds true in the sense that for each such fixed target graph H , the H -COVER problem is either polynomial-time solvable for arbitrary inputs, or NP-complete even for simple input graphs.

2012 ACM Subject Classification Mathematics of computing → Graph theory

Keywords and phrases graph cover, covering projection, constrained homomorphism, semi-edges, multigraphs, computational complexity

Funding *Jan Bok*: Supported by research grant GAČR 20-15576S of the Czech Science Foundation, by the International Research Center "Innovation Transportation and Production Systems" of the I-SITE CAP 20-25 and the ANR project GRALMECO (ANR-21-CE48-0004), and by the European Union (ERC, POCOCOP, 101071674). Views and opinions expressed are however those of the author(s) only and do not necessarily reflect those of the European Union or the European Research Council Executive Agency. Neither the European Union nor the granting authority can be held responsible for them.

* The conference version of this paper appeared in the proceedings of WG'23 [9]

Jiří Fiala: Supported by research grant GAČR 20-15576S of the Czech Science Foundation.

Nikola Jedličková: Supported by research grant GAČR 20-15576S of the Czech Science Foundation and by SVV-2020-260578.

Jan Kratochvíl: Supported by research grant GAČR 20-15576S of the Czech Science Foundation.

Michaela Seifrtová: Supported by research grant GAČR 20-15576S of the Czech Science Foundation.

1 Introduction

The notion of *graph covers* stems from topology and is viewed as a discretization of the notion of covers of topological spaces. Apart from being used in combinatorics as a tool for constructing large highly symmetric graphs [3, 4, 5, 6], this notion has found computer science applications in the theory of local computation [2, 14, 15, 16, 18, 33]. In this paper we aim to contribute to the kaleidoscope of results about computational complexity of graph covers. We first briefly comment on the known results and show where our main result is placed among them. The formal definitions of graphs under consideration (Definition 2) and of graph covering projections (Definitions 3 and 4) are presented in Section 2, as well as the detailed definition of the so called degree adjusting reduction (Definition 6), the concept of the degree partition of a graph (Proposition 5) and identification of several special graphs which play the key role in our characterization in Theorem 9 (Definition 8).

Despite the efforts and attention that graph covers received in the computer science community, their computational complexity is still far from being fully understood. Bodlaender [7] proved that deciding if one graph covers another one is an NP-complete problem, if both graphs are part of the input. Abello, Fellows, and Stillwell [1] considered the variant when the target graph, say H , is fixed, i.e., a parameter of the problem.

PROBLEM: H -COVER
 INPUT: A graph G .
 QUESTION: Does G cover H ?

They showed examples of graphs H for which the problem is polynomial-time solvable as well as examples for which it is NP-complete, but most importantly, they were the first to formulate the goal of a complete characterization of the computational complexity of the H -COVER problem, depending on the target graph H . Some of the explicit questions of [1] were answered by Kratochvíl, Proskurowski, and Telle [28, 30], some of the NP-hardness results have been strengthened to planar input graphs by Bílka, Jirásek, Klavík, Tancer, and Volec [12]. A connection to a generalization of the Frequency Assignment Problem has been identified through partial covers by Fiala and Kratochvíl in [20], with further results proven in [13, 22]. The computationally even more sophisticated problem of *regular covers* has been treated in [19]. In a recent paper [10], the authors initiated the study of the complexity of H -COVER for graphs that allow multiple edges and loops, and also semi-edges. This is motivated by the recent development of topological graph theory where it has now become standard to consider this more general model of graphs [32, 34, 35, 36, 37]. The graphs with semi-edges were also introduced and used in mathematical physics, e.g. by Getzler and Karpanov [24]. It should be pointed out right away that considering loops, multiple edges and directed edges was shown necessary already in [29], where it is proven that in order to fully understand the computational complexity of H -COVER for *simple* undirected graphs H (i.e., undirected graphs without multiple edges, loops, and semi-edges), it is necessary and sufficient to understand the complexity of the problem for coloured mixed multigraphs of minimum degree greater than 2. All papers from that era restrict their attention to covers

of connected graphs. Disconnected target graphs are carefully treated in detail only in [11], where it is argued that the right way to define covers of disconnected graphs is to request that the preimages of all vertices have the same size. Such covers are called *equitable covers* in [11], and in this paper we adopt this view and require graph covers to be equitable in case of covering disconnected graphs. Apart from several isolated results (which also include a complete characterization of the complexity of H -COVER for connected simple undirected graphs H with at most 6 vertices [28], and proving that several cases of H -COVER, including $H = K_4$, are NP-complete for planar input graphs [12]), the following general results have been known about the complexity of H -COVER for infinite classes of graphs:

1. A polynomial-time algorithm for H -COVER for connected simple undirected graphs H that have at most two vertices in every equivalence class of their degree partitions [28].
2. NP-completeness of H -COVER for regular simple undirected graphs H of valency at least three [21, 30].
3. Complete characterization of the complexity of H -COVER for undirected (multi)graphs H (without semi-edges) on at most three vertices [31].
4. Complete characterization of the complexity of H -COVER for coloured mixed (multi)graphs H on at most two vertices [29] (for graphs without semi-edges) and [10] (with semi-edges allowed).

It turns out that so far all the known NP-hard instances of H -COVER remain NP-hard for simple input graphs. This has led the authors of [8] to formulate the following conjecture.

► **Conjecture** (Strong Dichotomy Conjecture for Graph Covers [8]). *For every graph H , the H -COVER problem is either polynomial-time solvable for arbitrary input graphs, or it is NP-complete for simple graphs as input.*

Here our primary objective is to revisit the result of [28] and generalize it in line with the current trends and development of topological graph theory to graphs with loops, semi-edges, and multiple edges. The main result of our paper is a complete characterization of the computational complexity of H -COVER for graphs H , each of whose equivalence classes of the degree partition has at most 2 vertices. This provides a common generalization of the aforementioned results 1 and 4.

► **Theorem 1.** *The H -COVER problem satisfies Strong Dichotomy for graphs H such that each equivalence class of the degree partition has at most 2 vertices — it is either polynomial-time solvable for general graphs on input, or it is NP-complete for simple input graphs.*

The actual characterization is rather technical and it follows from Theorem 9 in Section 2, presented after the formal definitions of all the notions and special graphs that are needed for it. The characterization extends well beyond the motivating results presented in [28, 29]. The key novel contributions are as follows:

- For simple graphs H , the H -COVER problem is always polynomial-time solvable (if H has all equivalence classes of size at most 2), while for general graphs, already graphs with 2 vertices may define NP-complete cases. Indeed, when semi-edges are allowed, some graphs on a single vertex may also yield NP-completeness.
- For simple graphs H , the polynomial time algorithm is based on 2-SAT, while in case of general graphs, our polynomial time algorithm is a blend of 2-SAT and PERFECT MATCHING algorithms; this is surprising, as these two approaches are known to be incompatible in some other situations.

- The NP-complete cases are proven for simple input graphs, which is in line with the Strong Dichotomy Conjecture [8]. This is in contrast to many previous results which allowed multiple edges and loops in the input graphs.

2 Preliminaries

2.1 Definitions

Throughout the paper we consider the most general notion of a *graph* which allows multiple edges, loops, directed edges, and also semi-edges, and whose elements — both edges and vertices — are coloured. A semi-edge is a pendant edge, incident with just one vertex (and adding just 1 to the degree of this vertex, unlike the loop, which adds 2 to the degree). In figures, semi-edges are depicted as lines with one loose end, the other one being the vertex incident to the semi-edge. To avoid any possible confusion, we present a formal definition.


► **Definition 2.** A graph is a quadruple $G = (V, \Lambda, \iota, c)$, where V is a (finite) set of vertices, $\Lambda = \overline{E} \cup \vec{E} \cup \overline{L} \cup \vec{L} \cup S$ is the set of edges of G , $\iota : \Lambda \rightarrow \binom{V}{2} \cup (V \times V) \cup V$ is the incidence mapping of edges, and $c : V \cup E \rightarrow C$ is a colouring of the vertices and edges. There are several types of edges:

- the edges of \overline{E} are called normal undirected edges and they satisfy $\iota(e) \in \binom{V}{2}$,
- the edges of \vec{E} are called normal directed edges and they satisfy $\iota(e) \in (V \times V) \setminus \{(u, u) : u \in V\}$,
- the edges of \overline{L} (\vec{L}) are called undirected (directed, respectively) loops and we have $\iota(e) \in V$ in both cases, and
- the edges of S are called semi-edges and again $\iota(e) \in V$.

The vertex set and edge set of a graph G are denoted by $V(G)$ and $\Lambda(G)$, respectively, and a similar notation is used for $\overline{E}(G)$, $\vec{E}(G)$, $\overline{L}(G)$, $\vec{L}(G)$ and $S(G)$. Since we can distinguish vertices from edges, and directed edges from the undirected ones, we assume without loss of generality that colours of vertices, of directed edges and of undirected ones are different. With a slight abuse of terminology we speak about *directed* and *undirected* edge-colours (i.e., those used on directed or on undirected edges, respectively). Note that we allow directed loops and directed normal edges to have the same colour, as well as undirected normal edges, undirected loops and semi-edges. Edges with the same value of the incidence function are called *parallel*. A graph is called *simple* if it has no parallel edges, no pair of opposite directed normal edges, no directed and undirected edges incident with the same pair of vertices, no loops and no semi-edges.

Loops are considered as cycles of length 1, and analogously, pairs of edges between two vertices as cycles of length 2; if they are directed then they shall use opposite directions. A graph is *bipartite* if its vertex set can be partitioned into two independent (i.e., edgeless) subsets; in particular, bipartite graphs contain no loops nor semi-edges. A connected graph is a *tree* if it contains no loops, no semi-edges, no two normal edges incident with the same pair of vertices and no cycles (directed or undirected).

For an undirected edge-colour α , the α -degree of a vertex u , denoted by $\deg^\alpha u$, is defined as the sum of the numbers of normal edges and semi-edges of colour α incident with u plus twice the number of loops, also of colour α , incident with u . For a directed edge-colour α , we talk about the α -indegree and α -outdegree of u , denoted by $\deg_-^\alpha u$ and $\deg_+^\alpha u$, respectively, which are defined in an analogous way. A graph is *regular* if all vertices have the same α -degree, α -indegree and α -outdegree for all edge-colours α .



■ **Figure 1** An example of a covering projection from a graph G to a graph H .

When talking about a disjoint union of graphs, we assume that the graphs are vertex (and therefore also edge) disjoint.

The following definition introduces the central notion of this paper.

► **Definition 3.** Let G and H be connected graphs coloured by the same sets of colours. A covering projection from G to H is a pair of colour-preserving mappings $f_V : V(G) \rightarrow V(H)$, $f_E : \Lambda(G) \rightarrow \Lambda(H)$ such that:

- the preimage of an undirected normal edge of H incident with vertices $u, v \in V(H)$ is a perfect matching in G spanning $f^{-1}(u) \cup f^{-1}(v)$, each edge of the matching being incident with one vertex of $f^{-1}(u)$ and with one vertex of $f^{-1}(v)$;
- the preimage of a directed normal edge of H leading from a vertex $u \in V(H)$ to a vertex $v \in V(H)$ is a perfect matching in G spanning $f^{-1}(u) \cup f^{-1}(v)$, each edge of the matching being oriented from a vertex of $f^{-1}(u)$ to a vertex of $f^{-1}(v)$;
- the preimage of an undirected loop of H incident with a vertex $u \in V(H)$ is a disjoint union of cycles in G spanning $f^{-1}(u)$ — recall that here and in the next item cycles of length 1 or 2 are also allowed;
- the preimage of a directed loop of H incident with a vertex $u \in V(H)$ is a disjoint union of directed cycles in G spanning $f^{-1}(u)$; and
- the preimage of a semi-edge of H incident with a vertex $u \in V(H)$ is a disjoint union of semi-edges and normal edges spanning $f^{-1}(u)$ — each vertex of $f^{-1}(u)$ being incident to exactly one semi-edge and no normal edges, or exactly one normal edge and no semi-edges, from the preimage.

We say that G covers H , and write $G \rightarrow H$, if there exists a covering projection from G to H . Informally speaking, if G covers H via a covering projection (f_V, f_E) and if agents move along the edges of G and in every moment see only the label $f_V(u)$ (or $f_E(e)$) of the vertex (edge) they are currently visiting, plus the labels of the incident edges (vertices, respectively), then the agents cannot distinguish whether they are moving through the covering graph G or the target graph H . Mind the significant difference between undirected loops and semi-edges. The presence of an undirected loop incident with a vertex, say u , means that there are two ways how to move from u to u along this loop, while for a semi-edge, there is just one way. The same holds true for their preimages in covering projections (undirected cycles, or isolated edges). An example of a graph and a possible cover is depicted in Figure 1.

In [10], a significant role of semi-edges was noted. A colour-preserving vertex-mapping $f_V : V(G) \rightarrow V(H)$ is called *degree-obedient* if for any edge-colour α , any vertex $u \in V(G)$ and any vertex $x \in V(H)$, the number of edges of colour α that lead from u to a vertex from $f_V^{-1}(x)$ in G is the same as the number of edges of colour α leading from $f_V(u)$ to x in H , counting those edges that may map onto each other in a covering projection. In particular, if

$x = f_V(u)$ and H has ℓ undirected loops and s semi-edges incident with x , and u is incident with k loops, n normal undirected edges with both end-vertices in $f_V^{-1}(x)$ and t semi-edges, then $t \leq s$ and $2k + n + t = 2\ell + s$; analogously for other types of edges. For an example see Figure 1 where for the two chosen vertices u and x and cyan edges we have $\ell = s = t = 1$, $k = 0$ and $n = 2$. It is proven in [10] that every degree-obedient vertex-mapping extends to a covering projection if H has no semi-edges, or when G is bipartite.

It is well known that the preimages of any two vertices in a connected graph have the same size [25, 38]. For disconnected graphs, we add this requirement to the definition (as argued in [11]).

► **Definition 4.** *Let G and H be (not necessarily connected) graphs and let $f = (f_V, f_E): G \rightarrow H$ be a pair of incidence-compatible colour-preserving mappings. Then f is a covering projection of G to H if for each component G_i of G , the restricted mapping $f|_{G_i}: G_i \rightarrow H$ is a covering projection of G_i onto some component of H , and for every two vertices $u, v \in V(H)$, $|f^{-1}(u)| = |f^{-1}(v)|$.*

Another notion we need to recall is that of the *degree partition* of a graph. This is a standard notion for simple undirected graphs, cf. [17], and it can be naturally generalized to graphs in general. A partition of the vertex set of a graph G is *equitable* if every two vertices of the same class of the partition

1. have the same colour, and
2. have the same number of neighbours along edges of the same colour in every class (including its own).

The *degree partition* of a graph is then the coarsest equitable partition. It can be found in polynomial time, and moreover, a canonical linear ordering of the classes of the degree partition comes out from the algorithm. Let $V(G) = \bigcup_{i=1}^k V_i$ be the degree partition of G , in the canonical ordering. The *degree refinement matrix* of G is a $k \times k$ matrix M_G whose entries are vectors indexed by edge-colours expressing that every vertex $u \in V_i$ has $M_{i,j,c}$ neighbours in V_j along edges of colour c (if $i = j$ and c is a colour of directed edges, then every vertex $u \in V_i$ has $M_{i,j,c}$ in-neighbours and $M_{i,j,c}$ out-neighbours in V_i along edges of colour c). The following is proven in [29] for graphs without semi-edges, and in [23] the extension to graphs with semi-edges.

► **Proposition 5.** *Let G and H be graphs and let $V(G) = \bigcup_{i=1}^k V_i$ and $V(H) = \bigcup_{i=1}^\ell W_i$ be the degree partitions of their vertex sets, in the canonical orderings. If G covers H , then $k = \ell$, the degree refinement matrices of G and H are equal, and for any covering projection $f: G \rightarrow H$, $f(V_i) = W_i$ holds true for every $i = 1, 2, \dots, k$.*

The classes of the degree partition are further referred to as *blocks*. Once we have determined the degree partition of a graph, we re-colour the vertices so that vertices in different blocks are distinguished by vertex-colours (representing the membership to blocks), and recolour and de-orient the edges so that edges connecting vertices from different blocks are undirected and so that for any edge-colour, either all edges of this colour belong to the same block, or they are connecting vertices from the same pair of blocks. The degree partition remains unchanged after such a re-colouring.

A *block graph* of G is a subgraph G' of G whose vertex set is the union of some blocks of G , and such that for every edge-colour α , G' either contains all edges of colour α that G contains, or none. A block graph G' of G is *induced* if G' contains all edges of G on the vertices of $V(G')$. A block graph is *monochromatic* if it contains edges of at most one colour. A *uniblock graph* is a block graph whose vertex set is a single block of G . An *interblock*

graph of G is a block graph whose vertices belong to two blocks of G , and each of its edges is incident with vertices from both blocks (i.e., with one vertex from each block).

Since a graph covering is defined as a local bijection, it maintains vertex degrees. In particular, vertices of degree one are mapped onto vertices of degree one and once we choose the image of such a vertex, the image of its neighbour is uniquely determined. Applied inductively, this proves the well known fact that the only connected cover of a (rooted) tree is an isomorphic copy of the tree itself [38]. (Note here, that by definition a tree is a connected graph that does not contain cycles, parallel edges, oppositely oriented directed edges, loops, and semi-edges.) As a special case, the only connected cover of a path is the path itself. These observations are the basis of the following *degree adjusting reduction* which has been introduced in [29] for graphs without semi-edges, and generalized to graphs with semi-edges in [11].

► **Definition 6.** (Degree adjusting reduction) *Let G be a connected graph not isomorphic to a tree.*

1. *Determine all vertices that belong to cycles in G or that are incident with semi-edges or that lie on paths connecting the aforementioned vertices. Determine all maximal induced subtrees pending on these vertices.*

Determine the isomorphism types of these subtrees, introduce a new vertex colour for each isomorphism type, delete each subtree and colour its root by the colour corresponding to the isomorphism type of the deleted tree. In this way we obtain a graph with minimum degree at least 2 (or a single-vertex graph).


2. *If the obtained coloured graph is a path or a cycle, quit.*
3. *Determine all maximal paths with at least one end-vertex of degree greater than 2 and all inner vertices being of degree exactly 2. Determine all colour patterns of the sequences of vertex colours, edge-colours and edge directions along such paths, and introduce a new colour for each such pattern. Replace each such path by a new edge of this colour as follows:*
 - a. *If both end-vertices of the path are of degree greater than 2 and the colour pattern, say π , is symmetric, the path gets replaced by an undirected edge (or loop) of colour π .*
 - b. *If both end-vertices of the path are of degree greater than 2 and the colour pattern π is asymmetric, the path gets replaced by a directed edge (or loop) of colour π .*
 - c. *If the path ends with a semi-edge (the other end of the path must be a vertex of degree greater than 2), replace it by a semi-edge incident with its end-vertex of degree greater than 2, and colour it with colour $\pi\alpha$, where π is the colour pattern along the path without the ending semi-edge, and α is the colour of the semi-edge. In this case, consider the colours corresponding to $\pi\alpha$ (on one sided open paths) and $\pi\alpha\pi^{-1}$ on symmetric paths ending with vertices of degree greater than 2 on both sides, as the same colour (this enables a path of colour pattern $\pi\alpha\pi^{-1}$ be mapped on the one sided open path in a covering projection).*

Denote the resulting graph by G^r . Note that G^r is a path or a cycle (if Step 2 was not performed) or has minimum degree greater than 2.

See an example of such a reduction in Figure 2.

The reduced graph can be constructed in polynomial time. The usefulness of this reduction is observed in [29] and later on in [11]:

► **Observation 7.** *Given graphs G and H , perform the degree adjusting reduction on both of them simultaneously. Then $G \rightarrow H$ if and only if $G^r \rightarrow H^r$.*



■ **Figure 2** An example of the application of the degree adjusting reduction.

Finally, for a subset $W \subseteq V(G)$, we denote by $G[W]$ the subgraph induced by W . If α is an edge-colour, then G^α denotes the spanning subgraph of G containing exactly the edges of colour α .


2.2 Our results

In order to describe the results, we introduce the formal notation of certain small graphs. We denote by

- $F(b, c)$ the one-vertex graph with b semi-edges and c loops;
- $FD(c)$ the one-vertex graph with c directed loops;
- $W(k, m, \ell, p, q)$ the two-vertex graph with ℓ parallel undirected edges joining its two vertices and with k (q) semi-edges and m (p) undirected loops incident with one (the other one, respectively) of its vertices;
- $WD(m, \ell, m)$ the directed two-vertex graph with m directed loops incident with each of its vertices, the two vertices being connected by ℓ directed edges in each direction;
- $FF(c)$ the two-vertex graph connected by c parallel undirected edges, with the two vertices being distinguishable to belong to different blocks;
- $FW(b)$ the three-vertex graph with bundles of b parallel edges connecting one vertex to each of the remaining two; and
- $WW(b, c)$ the graph on four vertices obtained from a 4-cycle by replacing the edges of a perfect matching by bundles of b parallel edges, and replacing the edges of the complementary matching by bundles of c parallel edges, the two independent sets of size 2 belonging to different blocks.

Edges of all of these graphs are uncoloured (or, equivalently, monochromatic). We shall only consider W graphs having $k + 2m = 2p + q$. See the illustration in Figure 3 for the graphs defined here.

- **Definition 8.** A regular monochromatic uniblock graph with at most two vertices is called
- harmless if it is isomorphic to $F(b, 0)$, $b \leq 2$, $F(1, c)$, $F(0, c)$, $FD(c)$, $W(2, 0, 0, 0, 2)$, $W(2, 0, 0, 1, 0)$, $W(0, c, 0, c, 0)$, $W(1, c, 0, c, 1)$, $W(0, 0, c, 0, 0)$, $W(1, 0, 1, 0, 1)$, $WD(c, 0, c)$, $WD(0, c, 0)$, $WD(1, 1, 1)$ (c being an arbitrary non-negative integer),
 - harmful if it is isomorphic to $F(b, c)$ such that $b \geq 2$ and $b + c \geq 3$, or to $W(k, m, \ell, p, q)$ such that $\ell \geq 1$ and $k + 2m + \ell = q + 2p + \ell \geq 3$, or to the disjoint union of $F(b, c)$ and $F(b', c')$ such that at least one of them is harmful, or to $WD(c, b, c)$ such that $b \geq 1$, $c \geq 1$ and $b + c \geq 3$.



■ **Figure 3** Examples of the considered small graphs.

A monochromatic interblock graph is called

- harmless if it is isomorphic to $FF(c)$ or $WW(0, c)$ (with c being an arbitrary non-negative integer), or to $FW(0)$, $FW(1)$, or $WW(1, 1)$,
- dangerous if it is isomorphic to $FW(2)$, and
- harmful if it is isomorphic to $FW(c)$ for $c \geq 3$, or to $WW(b, c)$ such that $b \geq 1$, $c \geq 1$ and $b + c \geq 3$.

The maximal harmless monochromatic uniblock and interblock graphs are depicted in Figure 4.

Note that under the assumption that each degree partition equivalence class has size at most two, every monochromatic uniblock graph as well as every monochromatic interblock graph falls in exactly one of the above described categories. The choice of the terminology is explained by the following theorem.


► **Theorem 9.** *Suppose all blocks of a connected graph H have sizes at most 2. Then the following statements hold true:*

1. *If all monochromatic uniblock and interblock graphs of H are harmless, then the H -COVER problem is solvable in polynomial time (for arbitrary input graphs).*
2. *If at least one of the monochromatic uniblock or interblock graphs of H is harmful, then the H -COVER problem is NP-complete even for simple input graphs.*
3. *If the minimum degree of H is greater than 2 and H contains a dangerous monochromatic interblock graph, then the H -COVER problem is NP-complete even for simple input graphs.*

Observe that Theorem 9 implies that H -COVER is polynomial-time solvable if and only if every monochromatic uniblock graph defines a polynomial-time solvable instance and the monochromatic interblock graphs are such that either each vertex has at most one neighbour, or each vertex has degree at most two. For the interblock graphs, this is also very close to saying that each monochromatic interblock graph itself defines a polynomial-time solvable instance, but not quite. The one and only exception is the graph $FW(2)$. Indeed, $FW(2)$ -COVER is polynomial-time solvable (since it reduces to $W(0, 0, 1, 0, 0)$ -Cover), but with the additional condition that all vertices have degrees greater than 2, the presence of $FW(2)$ in H leads to NP-completeness of H -COVER (this is shown in detail in Section 4).

3 Proof of Theorem 9 — polynomial cases

In this section we present the polynomial algorithm that proves Part 1 of Theorem 9. The algorithm clearly runs in polynomial time. We first describe an informal overview.



■ **Figure 4** The maximal harmless monochromatic uniblock (left) and interblock (right) graphs (c is an arbitrary non-negative integer).

Algorithm

1. Compute the degree partitions of G (the input graph) and H (the target graph). Reorder the equivalence classes W_i of the degree partition of H so that W_1, \dots, W_s are singletons and W_{s+1}, \dots, W_k contain two vertices each, and reorder the degree partition equivalence classes V_i of the input graph G accordingly. Denote further, for every $i = 1, \dots, s$, by a_i the vertex in W_i , and, for every $i = s + 1, \dots, k$, by b_i, c_i the vertices of W_i .
2. Check that the degree refinement matrices of G and H are indeed the same.
3. Decide if the edges within $G[V_i]$ can be mapped onto the edges of $H[W_i]$ to form a covering projection, for each $i = 1, 2, \dots, s$. (This step amounts to checking degrees and the numbers of semi-edges incident with the vertices, as well as checking that monochromatic subgraphs contain perfect matchings in case of semi-edges in the target graph.)
4. Preprocess the two-vertex equivalence classes W_i , $i = s + 1, \dots, k$ when $H[W_i]$ contains semi-edges (this may impose conditions on some vertices of V_i , whether they can map on b_i or c_i).
5. Using 2-SAT, find a degree-obedient vertex mapping from V_i onto W_i for each $i = s + 1, \dots, k$, which fulfills the conditions observed in Step 4. (For every vertex $u \in V_i$, introduce a variable x_u with the interpretation that x_u is true if u is mapped onto b_i and it is false when x_u is mapped onto c_i . The harmless block graphs are such that either all neighbours of a vertex u must be mapped onto the same vertex, and thus the value of the corresponding variables are all the same (e.g., for $WW(0, c)$), or u has exactly two neighbours which should map onto different vertices (e.g., for $WW(1, 1)$) meaning that the corresponding variables must get opposite values. All the situations that arise from harmless block graphs can be described by clauses of size 2.)
6. Complete the covering projection by defining the mapping on edges in case a degree-obedient vertex mapping was found in Step 5, or conclude that G does not cover H otherwise. (The existence and polynomial time constructability of covering projections from degree-obedient vertex mappings for such instances have been proven in [10].)

We now describe the steps of the algorithm in detail. Together with the description we provide arguments for its correctness.

Steps 1 and 2. Checking the degree refinement matrices. The degree partitions and the corresponding degree refinement matrices can be constructed in polynomial time. And having the same degree refinement matrices is a necessary condition for G to cover H .

Step 3. Checking the singleton equivalence classes. For all $i = 1, 2, \dots, s$ and for every colour α that appears on some of the edges of $H[W_i]$, do the following check. (Note that for each $u \in V_i$, $1 \leq i \leq s$, the image of u under a covering projection f is uniquely defined, it must be $f(u) = a_i$.)

Subcase 3A. If $H[W_i]^\alpha$ has at least 2 semi-edges, it must be isomorphic to $F(2, 0)$ and it is covered by $G[V_i]^\alpha$ if and only if $G[W_i]^\alpha$ is a disjoint union of cycles of even length and open paths. Output “G does not cover H” if this is not the case, and proceed otherwise.

Subcase 3B. Suppose $H[W_i]^\alpha$ has exactly 1 semi-edge (i.e., it is isomorphic to $F(1, c)$ for some c). If $G[V_i]^\alpha$ has a vertex with two or more semi-edges, output “G does not cover H”. Otherwise, let V_i^α be the vertices of V_i incident to a semi-edge of colour α . Then $H[W_i]^\alpha$ is covered by $G[V_i]^\alpha$ if and only if $G[V_i \setminus V_i^\alpha]^\alpha$ has a perfect matching. This can be checked in polynomial time. Output “G does not cover H” if $G[V_i \setminus V_i^\alpha]^\alpha$ does not have a perfect matching, and proceed otherwise.

Subcase 3C. If $H[W_i]^\alpha$ has no semi-edges (i.e., it is isomorphic to $F(0, c)$ or to $FD(c)$ for some c), output “G does not cover H” if $G[V_i]^\alpha$ has at least one semi-edge, and proceed otherwise (in both cases $G[V_i]^\alpha$ covers $H[W_i]^\alpha$ by Lemma 11).

Step 4. Preprocessing the doublets. For each $i = s + 1, \dots, k$ and for every colour α that appears on some of the edges of $H[W_i]$, do the following. Note that now for each $u \in V_i$, there are two possibilities for the image of u under a covering projection f , namely $f(u) = b_i$ or $f(u) = c_i$. For each such a vertex u we introduce a Boolean variable x_u with the intended truth valuation $\varphi(x_u) = \text{true}$ iff $f(u) = b_i$.

Subcase 4A. Suppose each vertex of $H[W_i]^\alpha$ is incident with two semi-edges, i.e., this monochromatic block graph is isomorphic to $W(2, 0, 0, 0, 2)$. Then the components of $G[V_i]^\alpha$ are cycles and open paths. The vertices of each component map onto the same vertex from W_i , and the edges can map onto the edges of $F(2, 0)$ if and only if their images alternate at every vertex of the component. Thus open paths are always fine, but odd cycles do not allow a covering projection onto $F(2, 0)$. Hence output “G does not cover H” if at least one component of $G[V_i]^\alpha$ is an odd cycle, and proceed otherwise.

Subcase 4B. Suppose $H[W_i]^\alpha$ is isomorphic to $W(2, 0, 0, 1, 0)$, i.e., this monochromatic block graph is the disjoint union of $F(2, 0)$ and $F(0, 1)$. Suppose the two semi-edges are incident with b_i and the loop with c_i (the other case is symmetric). The components of $G[V_i]^\alpha$ are cycles and open paths. The vertices of a component all map to the same vertex in the intended covering projection f . Thus the vertices of open paths must all map onto b_i and the vertices of odd cycles must map onto c_i . Hence we set $\varphi(x_u) = \text{true}$ if u belongs to an open path in $G[V_i]^\alpha$, and we set $\varphi(x_u) = \text{false}$ if u belongs to an odd cycle in $G[V_i]^\alpha$.

Subcase 4C. Suppose the vertices of $H[W_i]$ are incident with one semi-edge each, and this monochromatic block graph is disconnected, i.e., it is isomorphic to $W(1, c, 0, c, 1)$ for some $c \geq 0$. If $G[V_i]^\alpha$ has a vertex with two or more semi-edges, output “G does not cover H”. Otherwise, let V_i^α be the vertices of V_i incident to a semi-edge of colour α . Then $H[W_i]^\alpha$ can only be covered by $G[V_i]^\alpha$ if $G[V_i \setminus V_i^\alpha]^\alpha$ has a perfect matching. This can be checked in polynomial time. Output “G does not cover H” if $G[V_i \setminus V_i^\alpha]^\alpha$ does not have a perfect matching, and proceed otherwise.

Subcase 4D. Suppose the vertices of $H[W_i]$ are incident with one semi-edge each, and this monochromatic block graph is connected, i.e., it is isomorphic to $W(1, 0, 1, 0, 1)$. If $G[V_i]^\alpha$ has

a vertex with two or more semi-edges, output “G does not cover H”, and proceed otherwise.

Step 5. Setting up the 2-SAT formula. Since the variables x_u are created for vertices u that must be mapped onto vertices of the doublet equivalence classes of H , only the monochromatic block graphs of the doublets, and interblock graphs that are induced by at least one doublet block, will come into play. First we consider the monochromatic block graphs. For every $i = s + 1, \dots, k$ and every colour α that is used on some edges of $H[W_i]$, do the following.

Subcase 5A. Suppose the monochromatic block graph $H[W_i]^\alpha$ is disconnected, i.e., it is isomorphic to $W(2, 0, 0, 0, 2)$, $W(2, 0, 0, 1, 0)$, $W(1, c, 0, c, 1)$, $W(0, c, 0, c, 0)$, or $WD(c, 0, c)$ for some $c \geq 0$. Then any two adjacent vertices, say u and v , of $G[V_i]^\alpha$ must be mapped onto the same vertex of W_i by the intended covering projection f , and thus we introduce a 2-clause

$$(\varphi(x_u) \Leftrightarrow \varphi(x_v)).$$

Subcase 5B. Suppose the monochromatic block graph $H[W_i]^\alpha$ is connected and bipartite, i.e., it is isomorphic to $W(0, 0, c, 0, 0)$ or $WD(0, c, 0)$ for some $c \geq 1$. Then any two adjacent vertices, say u and v , of $G[V_i]^\alpha$ must be mapped onto different vertices of W_i by the intended covering projection f , and thus we introduce a 2-clause

$$(\varphi(x_u) \Leftrightarrow \neg\varphi(x_v)).$$

Subcase 5C. Suppose the monochromatic block graph $H[W_i]^\alpha$ is isomorphic to $W(1, 0, 1, 0, 1)$. We have already ruled out the case that $G[V_i]^\alpha$ contains a vertex incident with two semi-edges, and thus every vertex of V_i has either one or two neighbours in $G[V_i]^\alpha$. If $u \in V_i$ has exactly one neighbour, say v , in $G[V_i]^\alpha$, it is incident to a semi-edge which must map onto a semi-edge of $W(1, 0, 1, 0, 1) \simeq H[W_i]^\alpha$, and the edge uv must map onto the ordinary edge of $W(1, 0, 1, 0, 1) \simeq H[W_i]^\alpha$. Thus u and v are mapped onto different vertices of W_i , and this justifies introducing a 2-clause

$$(\varphi(x_u) \Leftrightarrow \neg\varphi(x_v)).$$

If u is adjacent to two vertices, say v and w , in $G[V_i]^\alpha$, then one of the edges uv, uw must map onto the ordinary edge of $W(1, 0, 1, 0, 1) \simeq H[W_i]^\alpha$, while the other one must map onto a semi-edge. Hence one of the vertices v, w is mapped onto the same vertex as u , and the other one on the other one. This justifies introducing a 2-clause

$$(\varphi(x_w) \Leftrightarrow \neg\varphi(x_v)).$$

Subcase 5D. Suppose α is a directed colour and the monochromatic block graph $H[W_i]^\alpha$ is isomorphic to $WD(1, 1, 1)$. Then every vertex u of V_i has two outgoing neighbours, say v, w , and two incoming neighbours, say y, z , in $G[V_i]^\alpha$. One of the outgoing edges uv, uw is mapped onto a loop and the other one onto an ordinary edge in $H[V_i]^\alpha \simeq WD(1, 1, 1)$, and hence one of the vertices v, w is mapped onto the same vertex as u , and the other one on the other one. Similarly for the incoming neighbours. This justifies introducing the 2-clauses

$$(\varphi(x_w) \Leftrightarrow \neg\varphi(x_v)) \text{ and } (\varphi(x_z) \Leftrightarrow \neg\varphi(x_y)).$$

For the interblock graphs, we process all pairs $i \neq j$, $1 \leq i \leq k, s + 1 \leq j \leq k$, and all colours α that are used on some edges of the interblock graph $H[W_i \cup W_j]^\alpha$:

Subcase 5E. Suppose $i \leq s$, i.e., W_i is a singleton and $H[W_i \cup W_j]^\alpha$ is isomorphic to $FW(1)$. Every vertex $u \in V_i$ has two neighbours, say v and w , in $G[V_i \cup V_j]^\alpha$, and these neighbours must be mapped onto different vertices of $H[W_j]$. This justifies introducing a 2-clause

$$(\varphi(x_w) \Leftrightarrow \neg\varphi(x_v)).$$

Subcase 5F. Suppose $i > s$, i.e., W_i is a doublet, and suppose that $H[W_i \cup W_j]^\alpha$ is connected, i.e., it is isomorphic to $WW(1, 1)$. Every vertex $u \in V_i$ has two neighbours, say v and w , in $G[V_i \cup V_j]^\alpha$, and these neighbours must be mapped onto different vertices of $H[W_j]$. But also every vertex $v \in V_j$ has two neighbours, say u and y , in V_i , and these must be mapped onto different vertices of W_i . This justifies introducing two 2-clauses

$$(\varphi(x_w) \Leftrightarrow \neg\varphi(x_v)) \quad \text{and} \quad (\varphi(x_u) \Leftrightarrow \neg\varphi(x_y)).$$

Subcase 5G. Suppose $i > s$, i.e., W_i is a doublet, and suppose that $H[W_i \cup W_j]^\alpha$ is disconnected, i.e., it is isomorphic to $WW(c, 0)$ for some $c > 0$. Then the image of a vertex $u \in V_i$ is uniquely determined by the mapping of any of its neighbours in $G[V_i \cup V_j]^\alpha$. For any two adjacent vertices $u \in V_i, v \in V_j$, we introduce the 2-clause

$$(\varphi(x_u) \Leftrightarrow \varphi(x_v))$$

if $H[W_i \cup W_j]^\alpha$ is such that b_i is adjacent to b_j (and c_i to c_j), while we introduce the 2-clause

$$(\varphi(x_u) \Leftrightarrow \neg\varphi(x_v))$$

otherwise (i.e., when b_i is adjacent to c_j and c_i to b_j).

Step 6. Creating the covering projection. We solve the 2-SAT problem of satisfiability of the formula whose construction we described in Step 3, which can be done in polynomial time. We output “G does not cover H” if this formula is not satisfiable, and we output “G does cover H” otherwise. If we want to construct a covering projection in the latter case, we take a satisfying truth valuation φ and define the vertex mapping by setting


$$f(u) = \begin{cases} a_i & \text{if } u \in V_i \text{ and } i \leq s \\ b_i & \text{if } u \in V_i \text{ and } i \geq s + 1 \text{ and } \varphi(x_u) = \text{true} \\ c_i & \text{if } u \in V_i \text{ and } i \geq s + 1 \text{ and } \varphi(x_u) = \text{false}. \end{cases}$$

It is easy to see that this is a degree-obedient vertex mapping from G onto H . It remains to define the edge mapping. This is forced in the case of edges $uv \in E(G)$ such that there is only one edge connecting $f(u)$ and $f(v)$ in H , of the same colour, say α , as the colour of uv in G . If there are multiple edges connecting $f(u)$ and $f(v)$ in H^α , then $G[f^{-1}(f(u)) \cup f^{-1}(f(v))]^\alpha$ is a regular graph and its edges can be distributed so that they cover the multiple edge connecting $f(u)$ and $f(v)$. This follows from the following lemmas, which are just reformulations of the famous König-Hall and Petersen theorems on factors of graphs. Lemma 11 applies to the case of $f(u) = f(v)$, while Lemma 10 applies to the case when $f(u) \neq f(v)$. (A directed graph is called k -in-regular if the in-degree of every vertex is k , it is called k -out-regular if the out-degree of every vertex is k , and it is called k -in- k -out-regular if it is k -in-regular and k -out-regular.)

► **Lemma 10.** *Every k -regular undirected bipartite graph covers $FF(k)$, and a covering projection can be found in polynomial time.*

► **Lemma 11.** *Every $2k$ -regular undirected graph with no semi-edges covers $F(k)$. Every k -in- k -out-regular directed graph covers $FD(k)$. Respective covering projections can be found in polynomial time.*

As optimizing the running time of the algorithm is not our goal, we omit an explicit running time analysis. We just mention that all steps can be performed in polynomial time.



■ **Figure 5** Illustration to covering of $WD(b, c, b)$.

4 Proof of Theorem 9 — NP-hard cases

4.1 Monochromatic uniblock graphs

- **Proposition 12.** *The following problems are NP-complete even for simple input graphs*
- $F(b, c)$ -COVER for every $b \geq 2$ and $c \geq 0$ such that $b + c \geq 3$,
 - $W(k, m, \ell, p, q)$ -COVER for $k, m, \ell, p, q \geq 0$ such that $k + 2m = 2p + q$, and either $\ell \geq 1$ and $k + 2m + \ell \geq 3$, or $\ell = 0$, $k + m \geq 3$ and $\min\{k, q\} \geq 2$, and
 - $WD(b, c, b)$ -COVER for every $b, c \geq 1$ such that $b + c \geq 3$.

Proof. The NP-completeness of $F(b, c)$ -COVER for $b \geq 2$ and $b + c \geq 3$ for simple input graphs is proven in [10], and so is the NP-completeness of $W(k, m, \ell, p, q)$ -COVER for $\ell \geq 1$ and $k + 2m + \ell \geq 3$, even for simple bipartite input graphs. The NP-completeness of $W(k, m, \ell, p, q)$ -COVER for $\ell = 0$, that is for a disconnected target graph, follows from the results of [11] which analyze in detail the concept and results on covering disconnected graphs. Note that for $\ell = 0$, $W(k, m, 0, p, q)$ is the disjoint union of $F(k, m)$ and $F(q, p)$, and $W(k, m, 0, p, q)$ -COVER is NP-complete if and only if at least one of the problems $F(k, m)$ -COVER and $F(q, p)$ -COVER is NP-complete.

For directed graphs, the NP-completeness of $WD(b, c, b)$ -COVER for $b, c \geq 1$, $b + c \geq 3$ has already been proven in [29], but not for simple input graphs. However, we can argue as follows. Take a simple $(b + c)$ -regular graph G as input to the problem (b, c) -COLOURING which asks for a 2-colouring of the vertices of G such that every vertex has b neighbours of its own colour and c neighbours of the other one. This problem is NP-complete even for bipartite graphs, as shown in [10], so assume that $V(G) = A \cup B$ are such that both A and B are independent sets. For every vertex $u \in V(G)$, introduce a new extra vertex \bar{u} , and set $\bar{A} = \{\bar{u} : u \in A\}$ and $\bar{B} = \{\bar{u} : u \in B\}$. Define a simple directed graph \vec{G} by setting

$$V(\vec{G}) = A \cup B \cup \bar{A} \cup \bar{B}$$

and

$$E(\vec{G}) = \{uv, v\bar{u}, \bar{u}\bar{v}, \bar{v}u : uv \in E(G), u \in A, v \in B\}.$$

Then \vec{G} covers $WD(b, c, b)$ if and only if G allows a (b, c) -colouring.

Suppose first that \vec{G} covers $WD(b, c, b)$ and let $f : \vec{G} \rightarrow WD(b, c, b)$ be a covering projection. Denote the vertices of $WD(b, c, b)$ by r and g and colour a vertex x of G **green** if $f(x) = g$, and colour it **red** if $f(x) = r$. Consider a vertex $u \in A$ coloured **red**. Since b of the $b + c$ directed edges that start in u are mapped to the loops incident with r , u has b **red** neighbours in B . The remaining c outgoing edges are mapped onto the bar edges connecting r and g , and hence u has c **green** neighbours in B . Similarly for a **red** vertex $v \in B$, we consider the $b + c$ incoming edges, b of them being mapped onto the b loops incident with r and c of them being mapped onto the bars connecting r and g . Thus v has b **red** and c **green** neighbours in A . An analogous argument applies to **green** vertices, and we conclude that the **red-green** colouring of $A \cup B$ is a valid (b, c) -colouring of G .

On the other hand, suppose that $\varphi : A \cup B \rightarrow \{\text{red, green}\}$ is a (b, c) -colouring of G . Define

$$f(u) = f(\bar{u}) = \begin{cases} r & \text{if } \varphi(u) = \text{red} \\ g & \text{if } \varphi(u) = \text{green}. \end{cases}$$

We see that f is a degree-obedient vertex mapping from \vec{G} onto $WD(b, c, b)$, and since \vec{G} is bipartite, the existence of a covering projection follows by arguments similar to those in the proof of Proposition 8 in [10]. Cf. the illustrative example in Figure 5 for the reduction. ◀

4.2 Monochromatic interblock graphs

The NP-hardness for the harmful interblock graphs is claimed in the following proposition.

► **Proposition 13.** *The following problems are NP-complete even for simple input graphs*

1. $FW(c)$ -COVER for every $c \geq 3$, and
2. $WW(b, c)$ -COVER for every $b, c \geq 1$ such that $b + c \geq 3$.

Proof. 1. The NP-hardness of $FW(c)$ -COVER is proven in [31], but only for multigraphs on input. To prove the stronger result, we reduce from c -IN- $2c$ -SATISFIABILITY of all-positive formulas with each variable occurring in exactly c clauses. This problem is NP-complete for every fixed $c \geq 3$ [26]. Given a formula Φ with the set C of clauses over a set X of variables such that every clause contains exactly $2c$ variables, all positive, and every variable occurs in exactly c clauses, the question is if the variables can be assigned values **true** and **false** so that every clause contains exactly c variables evaluated to **true**. We construct a graph G_Φ such that G_Φ covers $FW(c)$ if and only if Φ is c -in- $2c$ -satisfiable. The graph contains one vertex $z(s)$ for every clause $s \in C$, and this vertex is adjacent to a connecting vertex $w(x, s)$ for every variable $x \in s$. Every variable $x \in X$ is represented by a variable gadget which contains c connecting vertices $w(x, s), x \in s \in C$ and ensures that all of these map to the same vertex of $FW(c)$. More formally, we set

$$\begin{aligned} V(G_\Phi) &= \{z(s) : s \in C\} \cup \{w(x, s) : x \in s \in C\} \\ &\quad \cup \{u_i^{x,s} : x \in s \in C, i = 1, 2, \dots, c-1\} \\ &\quad \cup \{v_i^{x,j} : x \in X, i = 1, 2, \dots, c-1, j = 1, 2, \dots, 2c-1\}, \\ E(G_\Phi) &= \{z(s)w(x, s) : x \in s \in C\} \\ &\quad \cup \{w(x, s)u_i^{x,s} : x \in s \in C, i = 1, 2, \dots, c-1\} \\ &\quad \cup \{u_i^{x,s}v_i^{x,j} : x \in s \in C, i = 1, 2, \dots, c-1, j = 1, 2, \dots, 2c-1\}. \end{aligned}$$

Let the two vertices of degree c in $FW(c)$ be r and g again, and let the vertex of degree $2c$ be p . Suppose $f : G_\Phi \rightarrow FW(c)$ is a covering projection. The graph G_Φ contains $|C| + |X| \cdot c \cdot (c-1)$ vertices of degree $2c$, namely the vertices $z(s)$ and $u_i^{x,s}$. All of these must be mapped to the vertex p . Consider two clauses $s, t \in C$ that both contain a variable

x . The vertices $u_1^{x,s}$ and $u_1^{x,t}$ have $2c - 1$ common neighbours $v_1^{x,j}$, $j = 1, 2, \dots, 2c - 1$, and since both of them must have c neighbours mapped onto r and c neighbours mapped onto g , we see that their private neighbours $w(x, s)$ and $w(x, t)$ are mapped onto the same vertex. Hence a truth valuation $\varphi : X \rightarrow \{\text{true}, \text{false}\}$ set by

$$\varphi(x) = \begin{cases} \text{true} & \text{if } f(w(x, s)) = r \text{ for every } s \text{ such that } x \in s, \\ \text{false} & \text{if } f(w(x, s)) = g \text{ for every } s \text{ such that } x \in s \end{cases}$$

is correctly defined. Since every vertex $z(s)$ must see c neighbours mapped onto r and c neighbours mapped onto g , every clause s gets exactly c variables evaluated to true.

Let, on the other hand, $\varphi : X \rightarrow \{\text{true}, \text{false}\}$ be a truth valuation of Φ such that every clause contains c variables evaluated to true and c variables evaluated to false. Define a vertex mapping $f : V(G_\Phi) \rightarrow \{p, r, g\}$ by setting

$$\begin{aligned} f(z(s)) &= f(u_i^{x,s}) = p \text{ for all } s \in C, x \in s, i = 1, 2, \dots, c - 1, \\ f(v_i^{x,1}) &= \dots = f(v_i^{x,c}) = r \text{ and } f(v_i^{x,c+1}) = \dots = f(v_i^{x,2c-1}) = f(w(x, s)) = g \\ &\quad \text{for all } i = 1, 2, \dots, c - 1, x \in X, x \in s \in C \text{ such that } \varphi(x) = \text{true}, \\ f(v_i^{x,1}) &= \dots = f(v_i^{x,c}) = g \text{ and } f(v_i^{x,c+1}) = \dots = f(v_i^{x,2c-1}) = f(w(x, s)) = r \\ &\quad \text{for all } i = 1, 2, \dots, c - 1, x \in X, x \in s \in C \text{ such that } \varphi(x) = \text{false}. \end{aligned}$$

Every vertex of degree $2c$ is mapped onto p (these are the $z(s)$ and $u_i^{x,s}$ vertices) and all other vertices are of degree c and are mapped onto r or g . Every vertex of degree c has all neighbours mapped onto p . And every vertex mapped onto p has exactly c neighbours mapped onto r and c neighbours mapped onto g (the $u_i^{x,s}$ vertices by definition of f , the $z(s)$ vertices because φ is c -in- $2c$ -satisfying). Thus f is a degree-obedient vertex mapping, and since G_Φ is bipartite, it extends to a covering projection from G_Φ onto $FW(c)$.

2. For the second case, note that a bipartite graph allows a (b, c) -colouring if and only it covers $WW(b, c)$, and thus the claim follows from Theorem 18 of [10]. ◀


Since they cover all harmful monochromatic block graphs, Propositions 12 and 13 form the base cases of Part 2 of Theorem 9.

4.3 The dangerous interblock graph

Part 3 of Theorem 9 is, however, more complicated and requires a detailed analysis of the neighbourhood of a dangerous monochromatic interblock graph. This is the only case when a monochromatic block graph induces a polynomial-time solvable cover problem (indeed, $FW(2)$ -COVER is reducible to $F(0, 2)$ -COVER, which is polynomial) but just the fact that all vertices have degrees greater than 2 makes the problem NP-complete.

► **Proposition 14.** *Let H be a graph such that each block has at most 2 vertices, the minimum degree of H is greater than 2, H contains a monochromatic block graph isomorphic to $FW(2)$, but does not contain any harmful monochromatic uniblock or interblock graph. Then H contains a block graph which is reducible to one of the graphs from Figure 6.*

Proof. Let W_1, W_2 be the blocks such that $|W_1| = 1, |W_2| = 2$ and $H[W_1 \cup W_2]^\alpha \simeq FW(2)$ for some colour α (in the figures, the vertex of W_1 is purple, the vertices of W_2 are blue and the colour α is black). Since the vertices of W_2 have degree at least 3 in H , there is another edge-colour, say β , whose edges are incident with vertices of W_2 . We distinguish three possibilities:



■ **Figure 6** Block graphs forced by $FW(2)$.

Case 1. The edges of colour β connect the vertices of W_2 to the vertex of W_1 . Then $H[W_1 \cup W_2]^\beta$ is isomorphic either to $FW(1)$ or to $FW(2)$ (if there were three or more parallel edges of colour β between a vertex of W_2 and the vertex of W_1 , $H[W_1 \cup W_2]^\beta$ would be a harmful monochromatic interblock graph), and thus H contains a block graph isomorphic to A_1 or to A_2 .

Case 2. The edges of colour β connect the vertices of W_2 to themselves. In this case $H[W_1 \cup W_2]^\beta$ can be any nonempty harmless graph on the doublet block W_2 , and thus H contains a block graph isomorphic to one of the graphs $B_k, k \geq 1, C_k, k \geq 0, D_k, k \geq 1, E_{(2,2)}, E_{(2,1)}, F, L_k, k \geq 1, M_k, k \geq 1$, or N . (For the graphs parameterized by k , k expresses the multiplicity of undirected ordinary edges (in B_k , and similarly in B'_k, H_k, H'_k), or the multiplicity of loops (in C_k and D_k , and similarly in C'_k and D'_k), or the multiplicity of directed loops (in L_k and L'_k), or the multiplicity of directed ordinary edges (in M_k and M'_k)).

Case 3. The edges of colour β connect the vertices of W_2 to vertices of a new block W_3 .

Subcase 3A: $|W_3| = 1$. In this case, $H[W_2 \cup W_3]^\beta \simeq FW(k)$ for $k = 1$ or $k = 2$. If $k = 2$, $H[W_1 \cup W_2 \cup W_3]^{\alpha, \beta} \simeq J$. If $k = 1$, the edges of colour β form a path of length 2 connecting the vertices of W_2 , with the vertex of W_3 being of degree 2, and hence $H[W_1 \cup W_2 \cup W_3]^{\alpha, \beta}$ is reducible to B_1 .

Subcase 3B: $|W_3| = 2$. Since the edges of colour β do not induce a harmful interblock graph, $H[W_2 \cup W_3]^\beta$ is isomorphic either to $WW(k, 0)$ or to $WW(1, 1)$. If it is $WW(k, 0)$ for $k \geq 3$, $H[W_1 \cup W_2 \cup W_3]^{\alpha, \beta}$ is isomorphic to H_k , while for $k = 2$, $H[W_1 \cup W_2 \cup W_3]^{\alpha, \beta}$ is reducible to D_1 . If $H[W_2 \cup W_3]^\beta \simeq WW(1, 1)$, $H[W_1 \cup W_2 \cup W_3]^{\alpha, \beta}$ is reducible to B_2 .


Case 4. The last subsubcase of 3B, when $H[W_2 \cup W_3]^\beta \simeq WW(1, 0)$, is responsible for all the primed graphs of Figure 6. Vertices of W_3 are of degree greater than 1, and thus there must be another colour such that edges of this colour are incident with vertices of W_3 . We would repeat the case analysis for this edge-colour, and repeat and repeat, if necessary. This leads to the following definition. Let t be the largest integer such that there exist doublet blocks W_3, W_4, \dots, W_t and colours β_3, \dots, β_t such that $H[W_{i-1} \cup W_i]^{\beta_i} \simeq WW(1, 0)$ for all $i = 3, 4, \dots, t$. Setting $\beta_3 = \beta$, we see that t is well defined. Vertices of W_t have degree 1 in $H[W_{t-1} \cup W_t]^{\beta_t}$ and thus they must be incident with edges of another colour, say γ .

Subcase 4A. The edges of colour γ lead to a new extra block W_{t+1} . If this block is a singleton, $H[W_t \cup W_{t+1}]^\gamma$ is isomorphic either to $FW(1)$ or $FW(2)$. In the former case, $H[\bigcup_{i=2}^{t+1} W_i]^{\beta_3, \dots, \beta_t, \gamma}$ is a symmetric path with all inner vertices of degree 2, and thus $H[\bigcup_{i=1}^{t+1} W_i]^{\alpha, \beta_3, \dots, \beta_t, \gamma}$ is reducible to B_1 (cf. Figure 7 top left). Analogously, $H[\bigcup_{i=1}^{t+1} W_i]^{\alpha, \beta_3, \dots, \beta_t, \gamma}$ is reducible to J' in case of $H[W_t \cup W_{t+1}]^\gamma$ being isomorphic to $FW(2)$.

If W_{t+1} is a doublet, $H[W_t \cup W_{t+1}]^\gamma$ is isomorphic to $WW(1, 1)$ or to $WW(k, 0)$ for some $k > 1$ (it cannot be isomorphic to $WW(1, 0)$ since then t would not be maximal as defined). In the former case, $H[\bigcup_{i=1}^{t+1} W_i]^{\alpha, \beta_3, \dots, \beta_t, \gamma}$ is reducible to B'_2 (illustrated in the second row on the right of Figure 7). If $H[W_t \cup W_{t+1}]^\gamma$ is isomorphic to $WW(2, 0)$, $H[\bigcup_{i=1}^{t+1} W_i]^{\alpha, \beta_3, \dots, \beta_t, \gamma}$ is reducible to D'_1 (illustrated in Figure 7 top right). If $H[W_t \cup W_{t+1}]^\gamma \simeq WW(k, 0)$ for $k > 2$, $H[\bigcup_{i=1}^{t+1} W_i]^{\alpha, \beta_3, \dots, \beta_t, \gamma}$ is reducible to H'_k .

Subcase 4B. The edges of colour γ connect vertices inside W_t . In this case $H[W_t]^\gamma$ is a harmless monochromatic uniblock graph and $H[\bigcup_{i=1}^t W_i]^{\alpha, \beta_3, \dots, \beta_t, \gamma}$ is reducible to one of the graphs $B'_k, k \geq 1, C'_k, k \geq 0, D'_k, k \geq 1, E'_{(2,2)}, E'_{(2,1)}, F', L'_k, k \geq 1, M'_k, k \geq 1$, or N' .

Subcase 4C. The edges of colour γ lead to the vertex of W_1 . If $H[W_1 \cup W_t]^\alpha$ is isomorphic to $FW(1)$, $H[\bigcup_{i=1}^t W_i]^{\alpha, \beta_3, \dots, \beta_t, \gamma}$ is reducible to A_1 (illustrated in the second row on the left of Figure 7). Analogously, if $H[W_1 \cup W_t]^\alpha$ is isomorphic to $FW(2)$, $H[\bigcup_{i=1}^t W_i]^{\alpha, \beta_3, \dots, \beta_t, \gamma}$ is



■ **Figure 7** Illustration to the reductions of block graphs containing $FW(2)$.

reducible to A'_2 .

Subcase 4D. The edges of colour γ lead to the vertices of a block W_j for some $j, 2 \leq j \leq t-1$. Then $H[W_j \cup W_t]^\gamma$ is isomorphic to $WW(1, 1)$ or to $WW(k, 0)$ for some $k \geq 1$.

If it is isomorphic to $WW(1, 0)$, there are two possibilities. Either each edge of colour γ connects vertices within the same path, or across the paths. The block graph $H[\bigcup_{i=1}^t W_i]^\alpha, \beta_3, \dots, \beta_t, \gamma$ is reducible to L_1 or L'_1 in the former case, and to M_1 or M'_1 in the latter one. (It is L_1 or M_1 if $j = 2$ and L'_1 or M'_1 if $j > 2$.) These cases are illustrated in the third row of Figure 7.

If $H[W_j \cup W_t]^\gamma \simeq WW(1, 1)$, then the block graph $H[\bigcup_{i=1}^j W_i \cup W_t]^\alpha, \beta_3, \dots, \beta_j, \gamma$ is reducible to B'_2 (or B_2 , when $j = 2$) as illustrated in the bottom row of Figure 7.

When $H[W_j \cup W_t]^\gamma \simeq WW(k, 0)$ for $k \geq 3$, then the block graph $H[\bigcup_{i=1}^j W_i \cup W_t]^\alpha, \beta_3, \dots, \beta_j, \gamma$ is reducible to H'_k (or H_k , if $j = 2$). When $H[W_j \cup W_t]^\gamma \simeq WW(2, 0)$, the block graph $H[\bigcup_{i=1}^j W_i \cup W_t]^\alpha, \beta_3, \dots, \beta_j, \gamma$ is reducible to D'_1 (or D_1 , if $j = 2$). ◀

The next step is to show that all block graphs from Figure 6 define NP-complete covering problems. There is a large number of them, but fortunately they can be sorted into a few groups each of which can be handled en bloc. The following lemma is very useful in this direction, since it shows that we do not need to deal with the primed graphs separately.

► **Lemma 15.** *Let H' be a graph with two equivalence classes A, B of the degree partition such that $|A| = |B|$ and the induced interblock graph $H'[A \cup B]$ is a k -fold matching for some $k > 0$. Let H be the graph obtained from H' by contracting the matching edges. Then H -COVER polynomially reduces to H' -COVER, also when both problems are considered only for simple input graphs.*

A k -tuple matching is obtained from a matching by replacing every edge by k parallel edges. A contraction of a k -tuple matching results in identifying each pair of matched vertices and deleting the (formerly) matching edges. The contracted vertices are recoloured by a new extra colour to ensure that they still form a block of the degree partition. The colours of all other vertices, and of all the edges, are kept unchanged. This means that for every edge of H incident with one of the contracted vertices, it is uniquely determined (by its colour) whether it is inherited from an edge incident with a vertex from A , or from B . Note that

Lemma 15 is stated (and proven) in a general setting when $|A| = |B|$ may be arbitrarily large. However, we will only use it for $|A| = |B| = 2$ in the sequel.

Proof. Denote the vertices of A and B as $A = \{a_1, a_2, \dots, a_t\}$ and $B = \{b_1, b_2, \dots, b_t\}$ so that a_i is matched to b_i , $i = 1, 2, \dots, t$. Let c_i be the vertex obtained by contracting the multiple edge joining a_i to b_i , for every $i = 1, 2, \dots, t$, and let $C = \{c_1, \dots, c_t\}$ be the block of H containing the contracted vertices.

Let a simple graph G be the input of H -COVER and let V_C be the block of G corresponding to the block C of H . Replace every vertex $w \in V_C$ by two vertices w_a, w_b , and write $\tilde{V}_A = \{w_a : w \in V_C\}$ and $\tilde{V}_B = \{w_b : w \in V_C\}$. For every edge uw , retain the edge uw_a if the colour of uw is a colour used for edges incident with vertices of A in H , and retain the edge uw_b if that colour is a colour used for edges incident with vertices of B . (If both u and w are in V_C , we retain the edge $u_a w_a$ or $u_b w_b$, depending on whether the colour of the edge uw is a colour of edges within A or within B in H' .) Denote by \tilde{G} the graph constructed by this process. Then take k disjoint copies of \tilde{G} , with the copy of $u \in V(\tilde{G})$ in the i -th copy being denoted by u^i , for $i = 1, 2, \dots, k$. Finally, add the edges of a complete bipartite graph with bipartition classes $\{w_a^i : i = 1, 2, \dots, k\}$ and $\{w_b^i : i = 1, 2, \dots, k\}$ for every $w \in V_C$, and colour these edges with the same colour as the k -fold matching in H' connecting the vertices of A to the vertices of B . Denote the resulting graph by G' . (Note that $\bigcup_{i=1}^k \tilde{V}_A^i$ is a block of G' corresponding to A and $\bigcup_{i=1}^k \tilde{V}_B^i$ is a block of G' corresponding to B .) We claim that G' covers H' if and only if G covers H .

Suppose first that G' covers H' , and let $f' : G' \rightarrow H'$ be a covering projection. Define a mapping $f : G \rightarrow H$ as follows. Pay attention only to the first copy of \tilde{G} and forget about the others. Define the vertex mapping part of f by

$$f(w) = \begin{cases} f'(w) & \text{if } w \notin V_C, \\ c_i \text{ such that } f'(w_a^1) = a_i \text{ and } f'(w_b^1) = b_i & \text{if } w \in V_C \end{cases}$$

and define the edge mapping part of f accordingly. Observe the following. If $w \in V_C$, we have $f'(w_a^1) = a_i$ and $f'(w_b^1) = b_j$ for some i and j . Since the edge $w_a^1 w_b^1$ is mapped onto a matching edge of H' , we conclude that $i = j$, and hence f is correctly defined.

If, on the other hand, $f : G \rightarrow H$ is a covering projection, we set (for every $j = 1, 2, \dots, k$)

$$f'(u^j) = \begin{cases} f(u) & \text{if } u \notin V_C, \\ a_i \text{ such that } f(u) = c_i & \text{if } u = w_a \in \tilde{V}_A, \\ b_i \text{ such that } f(u) = c_i & \text{if } u = w_b \in \tilde{V}_B \end{cases}$$

and define the edge mapping part of f' on the copies of \tilde{G} accordingly. It remains to define the mapping f' on the edges of the added complete bipartite graphs. For every $w \in V_C$, partition the edges of the complete bipartite graph on $w_a^1, w_a^2, \dots, w_a^k, w_b^1, w_b^2, \dots, w_b^k$ into k perfect matchings and map the edges of j -th perfect matching onto the j -th edge connecting a_i to b_i in H' , for the i such that $f(w) = c_i$. It is easy to see that f' is a covering projection from G' onto H' . \blacktriangleleft

Note that if $k = 1$ in the assumption of Lemma 15, then actually H -COVER and H' -COVER are polynomially equivalent. However, for $k > 1$ this is not necessarily the case. E.g., the graph H_2 from Figure 6 defines an NP-complete H_2 -COVER problem (as we will see soon), but contracting the red double matching we get $FW(2)$ and $FW(2)$ -COVER is polynomial-time solvable.

The following lemma is tailored to graphs whose all blocks of degree partition have sizes at most 2.

► **Lemma 16.** *Let the blocks of the degree partition of a graph H be W_1, W_2, \dots, W_t and let $|W_i| \leq 2$ for all $i = 1, 2, \dots, t$. Denote the vertices of H by $r_i, g_i \in W_i$ if $|W_i| = 2$, and by $p_i \in W_i$ if $|W_i| = 1$. Let $f : G \rightarrow H$ be a covering projection from a graph G whose blocks of degree partition are V_1, V_2, \dots, V_t (in the canonical ordering corresponding to W_1, \dots, W_t). Suppose further that either*

1. G is bipartite, or
2. for every doublet block of H and every edge-colour, both vertices of this block are incident with the same number of semi-edges of this colour.

Then the vertex mapping $f' : V(G) \rightarrow V(H)$ defined by

$$f'(u) = \begin{cases} p_i & \text{if } u \in V_i \text{ and } |W_i| = 1, \\ g_i & \text{if } u \in V_i, |W_i| = 2 \text{ and } f(u) = r_i, \\ r_i & \text{if } u \in V_i, |W_i| = 2 \text{ and } f(u) = g_i \end{cases}$$

extends to a covering projection from G to H .

Proof. First observe that the vertex mapping f' is degree-obedient. In order to show this, suppose that $u \in V_i$ is a vertex of G incident to some edges of colour α . This means that in H , edges of colour α are incident with vertices of W_i . Let W_j be the other block containing vertices incident with edges of colour α (or $j = i$ if the edges of colour α lie within the block W_i).

If $|W_i| = |W_j| = 1$, we have $f(u) = f'(u)$ and also $f'(v) = f(v)$ for every vertex $v \in V(G)$ adjacent to u via an edge of colour α . Hence $\deg_G^\alpha u = \deg_H^\alpha f(u) = \deg_H^\alpha f'(u)$ if α is an undirected colour (and likewise for a directed one).

If $|W_i| = 1$ and $|W_j| = 2$, the blocks W_i and W_j are different. Then the interblock graph $H[W_i \cup W_j]^\alpha$ is isomorphic to $FW(k)$ for some k , and u is incident with k edges of colour α that lead to vertices mapped onto r_j and to k edges that lead to vertices mapped g_j by f . The mapping of these neighbours is swapped in f' , but the counts remain the same. Similarly, if $|W_i| = 2$ and $|W_j| = 1$, $H[W_i \cup W_j]^\alpha \simeq FW(k)$ for some k , and every vertex of G that is mapped to r_i (g_i , respectively) by f is incident with k edges of colour α that lead to vertices mapped onto p_j by f (and also by f'). Thus every vertex mapped to g_i (r_i , respectively) by f' is incident with k edges of colour α that lead to vertices mapped onto p_j by f' .

If $|W_i| = |W_j| = 2$ and $i \neq j$, then $H[W_i \cup W_j]^\alpha \simeq WW(b, c)$ for some b, c . Every vertex mapped by f to r_i (g_i , respectively) is incident with b edges leading to vertices mapped onto r_j (g_j , respectively) and with c edges leading to vertices mapped onto g_j (r_j , respectively) by f . With respect to f' , this means that every vertex mapped to g_i (r_i , respectively) is incident with b edges leading to vertices mapped onto g_j (r_j , respectively) and with c edges leading to vertices mapped onto r_j (g_j , respectively).

If $|W_i| = |W_j| = 2$ and, moreover, $W_i = W_j$, we have to consider two cases — $H[W_i]^\alpha \simeq W(k, m, \ell, p, q)$ for some k, m, ℓ, p, q such that $k + 2m = 2p + q$ and $H[W_i]^\alpha \simeq WD(c, b, c)$ for some b, c .

In the former case, every vertex which is mapped onto r_i (g_i , respectively) by f is incident with $k + 2m$ edges that lead to vertices mapped onto r_i (g_i , respectively) and it is incident with ℓ edges that lead to vertices mapped onto g_i (r_i , respectively). With respect to f' , this means that every vertex mapped to g_i (r_i , respectively) is incident with $2p + q = k + 2m$ edges leading to vertices mapped onto g_j (r_j , respectively) and with ℓ edges leading to vertices mapped onto r_j (g_j , respectively), by f' .

In the latter case, every vertex which is mapped onto r_i (g_i , respectively) by f is incident with c outgoing edges and c incoming ones that lead to vertices mapped onto r_i (g_i , respectively) and it is incident with b outgoing edges and b incoming ones that lead to

vertices mapped onto g_i (r_i , respectively). With respect to f' , this means that every vertex mapped to g_i (r_i , respectively) is incident with c outgoing and c incoming edges leading to vertices mapped onto g_j (r_j , respectively) and with b outgoing and b incoming edges leading to vertices mapped onto r_j (g_j , respectively), by f' .

Case 1. If G is bipartite, every degree-obedient vertex mapping can be extended to a covering projection [10].

Case 2. The condition that the vertices of each doublet block are incident with the same number of semi-edges of any colour implies that the mapping id' from H to H is an automorphism of H (here id stands for the identity mapping). Furthermore, together with the edge mapping from $\overline{E}(G) \cup \overline{L}(G) \cup S(G)$ to $\overline{E}(H) \cup \overline{L}(H) \cup S(H)$ defined by the following rule, it is a covering projection from G to H that extends f' :

- If an edge of colour α connecting u to v is mapped onto the κ 's normal edge of colour α connecting $f(u)$ and $f(v)$ (or κ 's loop or κ 's semi-edge of colour α incident with $f(u) = f(v)$), map this edge onto the κ 's edge of colour α connecting $f'(u)$ and $f'(v)$ (or κ 's loop or κ 's semi-edge of colour α incident with $f'(u) = f'(v)$, respectively). ◀

► **Proposition 17.** *Let H be any of the following graphs (see Figure 6)*

- $A_1, A_2, A'_2, B_k, k \geq 1$,
- $B'_k, k \geq 2$,
- $C_k, k \geq 0$,
- $C'_k, D_k, D'_k, k \geq 1$,
- $E_{(2,2)}, E'_{(2,2)}, E_{(2,1)}, E'_{(2,1)}, F, F', H_k, H'_k, k \geq 3$,
- $J, J', L_k, L'_k, M_k, M'_k, k \geq 1$,
- N, N' .

Then the H -COVER problem is NP-complete for simple input graphs.

Proof. In all the cases, we reduce from 2-IN-4-SAT for all positive formulas. Let the vertices of W_2 be denoted by $r = r_2$ and $g = g_2$, and the vertex of W_1 by $p = p_1$. Vertex p is connected by two parallel edges of colour α to r and by two parallel edges of colour α to g . Given a formula Φ with a set C of clauses over a set of variables X , we introduce a vertex $z(s)$ for every clause $s \in C$ and colour it so that $z(s) \in V_1$ (that means that in any covering projection $f : G_\Phi \rightarrow H$, $f(z(s)) = p$). For every pair $x \in X, s \in C$ such that $x \in s$, we introduce a connector vertex $w(x, s)$ from V_2 , and connect it by an edge of colour α to $z(s)$. The connector vertices of each variable x are interconnected by a variable gadget that ensures that $f(w(x, s)) = f(w(x, s'))$ for any two clauses s and s' containing x . This allows to define a truth valuation $\varphi : X \rightarrow \{\text{true}, \text{false}\}$ so that $\varphi(x) = \text{true}$ if $f(w(x, s)) = r$ and $\varphi(x) = \text{false}$ if $f(w(x, s)) = g$ (for some, i.e., for all clauses s such that $x \in s$). If f is a covering projection, every vertex $z(s)$ has 2 neighbours (along edges of colour α) that map onto r and 2 neighbours that map onto g , which means that every clause contains 2 variables evaluated to true and 2 variables evaluated to false by φ . The opposite direction, constructing a covering projection from a 2-in-4-satisfying truth valuation is more or less straightforward.

The variable gadgets differ for particular graphs. Also in many cases we need to take several copies and link them together as sort of a garbage collection to be able to construct the desired covering projection from a truth valuation. The following claim captures the common features of many of the cases. Recall that a colour-preserving mapping $f : G \rightarrow H$ is a *partial covering projection* if the edge mapping is compatible with the vertex mapping, and for every vertex u of G , the edges incident with it are mapped injectively into the set of edges of H incident with $f(u)$ (which implies that if $\deg_G u = \deg_H f(u)$, in which case we

say that u has *full degree*, the edges incident with u in G are mapped bijectively onto the edges incident with $f(u)$ in H).

Claim A. Suppose all blocks of H have at most two vertices and let the blocks and the vertices of H be denoted as in Lemma 16. Moreover, let the vertex p be incident only to the 4 edges of colour α leading to vertices r and g and nothing else. Suppose that either there exists a simple graph $G(a_1, a_2, \dots, a_k)$ with blocks V_1, V_2, \dots, V_t and specified vertices $a_1, a_2, \dots, a_k \in V_2$ so that either:


1. $k \geq 3$,
2. all vertices of $V(G) \setminus \{a_1, \dots, a_k\}$ have full degree,
3. each of the vertices a_1, a_2, \dots, a_k is missing exactly one edge of colour α , the degrees in all other colours are full,
4. in every partial covering projection $f : G(a_1, a_2, \dots, a_k) \rightarrow H$, $f(a_1) = f(a_2) = \dots = f(a_k)$,
5. there exists a partial covering projection $f : G(a_1, a_2, \dots, a_k) \rightarrow H$, $f(a_1) = f(a_2) = \dots = f(a_k) = r$, and
6. there exists a partial covering projection $f : G(a_1, a_2, \dots, a_k) \rightarrow H$, $f(a_1) = f(a_2) = \dots = f(a_k) = g$,

or there exists a simple graph $G(a_1, a_2, \dots, a_k; b_1, b_2, \dots, b_k)$ with blocks V_1, V_2, \dots, V_t and specified vertices $a_1, a_2, \dots, a_k, b_1, b_2, \dots, b_k \in V_2$ so that

1. $k \geq 3$,
2. all vertices of $V(G) \setminus \{a_1, \dots, a_k, b_1, \dots, b_k\}$ have full degree,
3. each of the vertices $a_1, a_2, \dots, a_k, b_1, b_2, \dots, b_k$ is missing exactly one edge of colour α , the degrees in all other colours are full,
4. in every partial covering projection $f : G(a_1, a_2, \dots, a_k) \rightarrow H$, $f(a_1) = f(a_2) = \dots = f(a_k)$,
5. there exists a partial covering projection $f : G(a_1, a_2, \dots, a_k; b_1, b_2, \dots, b_k) \rightarrow H$, $f(a_1) = f(a_2) = \dots = f(a_k) = r$ and $f(b_1) = f(b_2) = \dots = f(b_k) = g$, and
6. there exists a partial covering projection $f : G(a_1, a_2, \dots, a_k; b_1, b_2, \dots, b_k) \rightarrow H$, $f(a_1) = f(a_2) = \dots = f(a_k) = g$ and $f(b_1) = f(b_2) = \dots = f(b_k) = r$.

Then the H -COVER problem is NP-complete for simple input graphs.

Proof of the Claim. Consider a formula Φ as an input of 2-IN-4-SAT such that every variable occurs in exactly k clauses (and all these occurrences are positive). Deciding if there is a truth valuation such that every clause contains exactly 2 variables evaluated to **true** is NP-complete [26]. If there exists a graph $G(a_1, \dots, a_k)$ as described above, take a copy of it for every variable x , and denote this copy by G^x . Order the clauses that contain x arbitrarily as s_1, s_2, \dots, s_k and identify the vertices a_i and $w(x, s_i)$ for $i = 1, 2, \dots, k$. The union of $G^x, x \in X$ together with the clause vertices $z(s), s \in C$, results in the graph G_Φ . All vertices of G_Φ have full degree (each vertex $w(x, s)$ gets its degree completed to fullness by the edge of colour α leading to $z(s)$, and each vertex $z(s)$ is incident to 4 edges of colour α because the clause s contains 4 variables). Suppose G_Φ covers H , and consider a covering projection f . By the assumption on $G(a_1, \dots, a_k)$, for every variable x , all $w(x, s)$ such that $x \in s$ are mapped onto the same vertex of W_2 . Set $\varphi(x) = \text{true}$ if $f(w(x, s)) = r$ for some (and hence for all) s that contain x , and set $\varphi(x) = \text{false}$ otherwise. Since H has 2 parallel edges of colour α leading to vertex r and 2 leading to g , for every clause $s \in C$, vertex $z(s)$ is incident to 2 edges of colour α leading to vertices $w(x, s)$ such that $f(w(x, s)) = r$ and 2 edges leading to vertices $w(x, s)$ mapped onto g . Alas, s contains 2 variables evaluated to **true** and 2 variables evaluated to **false**. On the other hand, let $\varphi : X \rightarrow \{\text{true}, \text{false}\}$ be




■ **Figure 8** The Limping Tripod.

2-in-4-satisfying truth valuation of Φ . Define a covering projection f as follows. For every variable x such that $\varphi(x) = \text{true}$, take the partial covering projection from G^x onto H which maps all the vertices $w(x, s)$ onto r , and for every variable x such that $\varphi(x) = \text{false}$, take the partial covering projection from G^x onto H which maps all the vertices $w(x, s)$ onto g . Of course, $f(z(s)) = p$ for all $s \in C$. It remains to define f for the edges $z(s)w(x, s)$, $x \in s$, $s \in C$. This may require redefining the covering projection on edges of colour α inside the variable gadgets, but that can be done. The vertices that map onto p or r together with the edges of colour α form a 2-regular bipartite graph whose edges can thus be partitioned into 2 disjoint perfect matching. Map the edges of one of the matchings onto one edge of colour α joining p and r , and map the edges of the other matching onto the other edge.

If there exists a graph $G(a_1, \dots, a_k; b_1, \dots, b_k)$ as described above, we proceed analogously. We take a copy of this auxiliary graph for every variable x and denote it by G^x . Now for every clause $s \in C$, we take 2 vertices $z^1(s)$ and $z^2(s)$, and for every $x \in s$, we introduce $w^1(x, s)$ and $w^2(x, s)$ and make $w^i(x, s)$ adjacent to $z^i(s)$ via an edge of colour α , for $i = 1, 2$. If s_1, s_2, \dots, s_k are the clauses containing x , we identify $w^1(x, s_i)$ with a_i , and $w^2(x, s_i)$ with b_i of G^x . Arguments similar to those above show that the graph G_Φ that we have constructed this way, covers H if and only if Φ is 2-in-4-satisfiable.

Finally, we introduce the *limping tripod* LT as the graph obtained from $K_{2,3}$ by adding 2 pendant vertices of degree 1 adjacent to the vertices of degree 3, see Figure 8. The vertices p_1, p_2 are from V_1 , the vertices u, v, m_1, m_2, m_3 from V_2 and all edges are of colour α . A simple but crucial observation is that in every partial covering projection f from LT onto H , the vertices p_1 and p_2 have 3 common neighbours, and since both of them have 2 neighbours mapped onto r and 2 neighbours mapped onto g , necessarily $f(u) = f(v)$. This is depicted in Figure 8 right, where we use the colours red and green for indicating which of the vertices of W_2 a vertex of the source graph under consideration is mapped onto. In the middle of the figure we introduce a pictogram for LT that we involve in the more complicated constructions. When we build the variable gadget from several copies of the limping tripod, they are denoted by LT^1, LT^2, \dots and their vertices are denoted by $u^1, v^1, u^2, v^2, \dots$ accordingly.

Case C_0 . Take 2 copies LT^1 and LT^2 of the limping tripod and connect u^1 to u^2 by an edge of colour β , as well as v^1 to v^2 . In every partial covering projection f to C_0 , the vertices u^1 and v^1 are mapped onto the same vertex of W_2 because of LT^1 , while v^2 is mapped onto the same vertex as v^1 because of the edge v^1v^2 of colour β which must map onto the semi-edge incident with $f(v^1)$. Hence all vertices u^1, v^1, u^2, v^2 must be mapped onto the same vertex, and thus they play the role of a_1, a_2, a_3, a_4 in $G(a_1, a_2, a_3, a_4)$. To complete the other vertices to full degrees, add a matching between the m -vertices of the two limping tripods. A covering projection that sends all of the u^1, v^1, u^2, v^2 vertices onto the red vertex is shown in Figure 9, the existence of a covering projection that maps all of them onto the



■ **Figure 9** The reduction for C_0 .

green vertex follows from Lemma 16. Thus the fact that C_0 -COVER is NP-complete for simple input graphs follows from Claim A. The NP-completeness of C'_0 -COVER follows from Lemma 15.


Case $C_k, k > 0$. Take $2k + 2$ copies of the limping tripod and place a complete graph with edges of colour β on the vertices $x^1, x^2, \dots, x^{2k+2}$, for every $x \in V_2(LT)$. This is $G(u^1, v^1, u^2, v^2, \dots, u^{2k+2}, v^{2k+2})$, and we reduce from 2-IN-4-SAT for formulas with $4k+4 > 2$ occurrences per variable. The arguments are analogous to the previous case, it is crucial that a complete graph with even number of vertices is 1-factorizable, i.e., K_{2k+2} covers $F(2k+1, 0)$ and hence also $F(1, k)$. Thus C_k -COVER is NP-complete for simple input graphs for every fixed $k > 0$, and the NP-completeness for C'_k follows from Lemma 15.

Case $D_k, k > 0$. Uses the same idea as the previous case. Take $2k + 2$ copies of the limping tripod and add edges of colour β forming $2k$ -regular graphs on $x^1, x^2, \dots, x^{2k+2}$ for each $x \in V_2(LT)$ to create $G(u^1, v^1, u^2, v^2, \dots, u^{2k+2}, v^{2k+2})$. Reduce from 2-IN-4-SAT for formulas with every variable appearing in $4k + 4 \geq 8 > 2$ clauses, using the fact that the edges of every $2k$ -regular graph can be partitioned into k 2-factors, each of which is mapped onto one loop incident with r or g . The NP-hardness of D'_k -COVER then follows from Lemma 15.

Cases $E_{(2,1)}$ and $E_{(2,2)}$. Use the construction described in the case of D_1 , just make sure the 2-regular graph of colour β on $x^1, x^2, \dots, x^{2k+2}$ is a Hamiltonian (and hence even) cycle for each $x \in V_2(LT)$. Then $G(u^1, v^1, \dots, u^4, v^4)$ partially covers D_1 if and only if it partially covers $E_{(2,1)}$, which happens if and only if it partially covers $E_{(2,2)}$. Thus both $E_{(2,1)}$ -COVER and $E_{(2,2)}$ -COVER are NP-complete, and the NP-completeness of $E'_{(2,1)}$ -COVER and $E'_{(2,2)}$ -COVER follows from Lemma 15.

Case $H_k, k > 2$. Suppose $W_3 = \{r', g'\}$ so that r is adjacent to r' and g to g' in H_k . Take k copies of the limping tripod, add k vertices $x^1, \dots, x^k \in V_3$ and edges of colour β forming a connected k -regular bipartite graph with classes of bipartition $\{x^1, x^2, \dots, x^k\}$ and $\{x'^1, \dots, x'^k\}$ for each $x \in V_2(LT)$. This $G(u^1, v^1, \dots, u^k, v^k)$ satisfies the assumptions of Claim A, because the connectedness of the bipartite graph with edges of colour β on $u^1, \dots, u^k, u'^1, \dots, u'^k$ ensures that $f(u^1) = \dots = f(u^k) = f(v^1) = \dots = f(v^k)$ for every partial covering projection $f : G(u^1, v^1, \dots, u^k, v^k) \rightarrow H_k$. For the existence of a partial covering projection, after f is defined on the vertices and edges of the limping tripod part of $G(u^1, v^1, \dots, u^k, v^k)$, set $f(x'^j) = r'$ if $f(x^j) = r$ (and set $f(x'^j) = g'$ otherwise) for all $x \in V_2(LT)$ and $j = 1, 2, \dots, k$ and for the edge mapping on the edges of colour β use the fact that the edges of a k -regular bipartite graph can be partitioned into k perfect matchings. Hence the NP-completeness of H_k -COVER follows from Claim A, and the NP-completeness of H'_k -COVER from Lemma 15.

Case $L_k, k > 0$. Take $2k + 2$ copies of the limping tripod and for each $x \in V_2(LT)$, add



■ **Figure 10** The reduction for B_1 .

directed edges of colour β on $x^1, x^2, \dots, x^{2k+2}$ to form a k -in- k -out-regular connected graph which can be partitioned into k collections of disjoint oriented cycles (this can be achieved, e.g., by taking a $2k$ -regular undirected graph, partitioning its edge set into $2k$ perfect matchings, taking the matchings in pairs and orienting the edges so that the cycles formed by the edges of such a pair are directed cycles). Then the graph $G(u^1, \dots, u^{2k+2}, v^1, \dots, v^{2k+2})$ constructed in this way satisfies the assumptions of Claim A and the NP-completeness of L_k -COVER follows, as well as the NP-completeness of L'_k -COVER (using Lemma 15).


Case B_1 . Take 4 copies of the limping tripod and add a matching in colour β containing x^1x^2 and x^3x^4 for $x = m_1, m_2, m_3, v$ and u^1u^4 and u^2u^3 (as depicted in Figure 10). In every partial covering projection f onto B_1 , it must be $f(u^1) \neq f(u^4) = f(v^4) \neq f(v^3) = f(u^3) \neq f(u^2) = f(v^2) \neq f(v^1) = f(u^1)$ since $f(u^1u^4) = f(v^4v^3) = f(u^3u^2) = f(v^2v^1)$ is the edge of colour β connecting r and g in B_1 . Hence the constructed graph fulfills the requirements of $G(u^1, u^3, v^1, v^3; u^2, u^4, v^2, v^4)$, the construction of a partial covering projection such that $f(u^1) = f(v^1) = f(u^3) = f(v^3) = r$ and $f(u^2) = f(v^2) = f(u^4) = f(v^4) = g$ is illustrated in Figure 10 right, the existence of the swapped covering projection follows from Lemma 16. The NP-completeness of B_1 -COVER then follows from Claim A, and for B'_1 -COVER from Lemma 15.

Case B_k , $k > 1$. Take $2k$ copies of the limping tripod and add, for every $x \in V_2(LT)$, edges of colour β forming a complete bipartite graph with classes of bipartition $\{x^1, x^3, \dots, x^{2k-1}\}$ and $\{x^2, \dots, x^{2k}\}$. This graph fulfills the properties of

$$G(u^1, u^3, \dots, u^{2k-1}, v^1, v^3, \dots, v^{2k-1}; u^2, u^4, \dots, u^{2k}, v^2, v^4, \dots, v^{2k})$$

in every partial covering projection f onto B_k , the complete bipartite graphs in colour β imply that $f(u^{2i-1}) \neq f(u^{2j})$ for every $i, j = 1, 2, \dots, k$, and hence $f(u^1) = f(u^3) = \dots = f(u^{2k-1}) \neq f(u^2) = f(u^4) = \dots = f(u^{2k})$, and $f(v^i) = f(u^i)$, $i = 1, \dots, 2k$ follows from the properties of the limping tripod. A feasible colouring can be designed e.g. as follows – set $f(x^{2i-1}) = r$ and $f(x^{2i}) = g$ for $i = 1, 2, \dots, k$ and $x = u, v, m_1$, and set $f(x^{2i-1}) = g$ and $f(x^{2i}) = r$ for $i = 1, 2, \dots, k$ and $x = m_2, m_3$. Since B_k has no semi-edges, this vertex mapping can always be extended to a partial covering projection. Thus B_k -COVER is NP-complete by Claim A, and B'_k -COVER by Lemma 15.

Case M_k , $k > 0$. Take $4k$ copies of the limping tripod. For every $x \in V_2(LT)$, add edges of



■ **Figure 11** The reduction for F .


colour β forming a complete bipartite graph with classes of bipartition $\{x^1, x^3, \dots, x^{4k-1}\}$ and $\{x^2, x^4, \dots, x^{4k}\}$ and orient its edges so that it is k -in and k -out-regular (e.g., by orienting the edge $x^{2i-1}x^{2i+j}$ from x^{2i-1} to x^{2i+j} for $j = 1, 2, \dots, k$ and in the opposite direction for $j = k + 1, k + 2, \dots, 2k$ with addition in superscripts being modulo $4k$). Similarly as in the previous case, this graph fulfills the properties of

$$G(u^1, u^3, \dots, u^{4k-1}, v^1, v^3, \dots, v^{4k-1}; u^2, u^4, \dots, u^{4k}, v^2, v^4, \dots, v^{4k})$$

and NP-completeness of M_k -COVER follows from Claim A, and then M'_k -COVER is NP-complete by Lemma 15.

Case F . Take 4 copies of the limping tripod and add edges of colour β as follows: $u^i v^i, i = 1, 2, 3, 4$, $u^1 u^2, v^2 v^3, u^3 u^4, v^1 v^4$, and for every $j = 1, 2, 3$, add $m_j^1 m_j^3, m_j^2 m_j^3, m_j^2 m_j^4, m_j^1 m_j^4$. The gadget is illustrated in Figure 11 top left, for the sake of legibility only the edges of one of the m levels are shown. If f is a partial covering projection onto F , the properties of the limping tripod ensure that $f(u^i) = f(v^i)$ for $i = 1, 2, 3, 4$. Thus u^1 has one neighbour, namely v^1 , mapped by f onto the same vertex of $W_2(F)$, and so $f(u^2) \neq f(u^1)$. Analogously, $f(u^3) = f(v^3) \neq f(v^2) = f(u^2)$ and $f(u^4) \neq f(u^3)$. A covering projection that respects this pattern is depicted in Figure 11 bottom right. Hence this graph $G(u^1, v^1, u^3, v^3; u^2, v^2, u^4, v^4)$ fulfills the properties of Claim A and the NP-completeness of F -COVER follows. For the graph F' , the NP-completeness of F' -COVER follows from Lemma 15.


Case N . Take 6 copies of the limping tripod and add directed edges of colour β as follows: $u^i v^i, i = 1, 2, \dots, 6$, $u^i u^{i+1}, i = 1, 2, \dots, 5$, $u^6 u^1, v^i v^{i+1}, i = 1, 2, \dots, 5$, $v^6 v^1$, and for every $j = 1, 2, 3$, $m_j^i m_j^{i+1}, i = 1, 2, \dots, 5$, $m_j^6, m_j^1, m_j^i m_j^{i+2}, i = 1, 2, 3, 4$, $m_j^5 m_j^1, m_j^6 m_j^2$. The construction is illustrated in Figure 12 top left, where the edges of colour β are illustrated only on one of the m -levels. The properties of the limping tripod imply that for every partial covering projection f onto N , $f(u^i) = f(v_i)$ for all $i = 1, 2, \dots, 6$. Since every vertex of V_2 has two outgoing edges of colour β and their end-vertices must be mapped onto different vertices of $W_2(N)$, we have $f(u^i) \neq f(u^{i+1})$ for all $i = 1, 2, \dots, 5$. A partial covering projection




■ **Figure 12** The reduction for N .

respecting this pattern is shown in Figure 12 bottom right. Hence the constructed graph $G(u^1, v^1, u^3, v^3, u^5, v^5; u^2, v^2, u^4, v^4, u^6, v^6)$ fulfills the properties required by Claim A and the NP-completeness of N -COVER follows. The NP-completeness of N' -COVER follows by Lemma 15.


Case A_2 . We reduce from 2-IN-4-SAT for formulas with 4 occurrences per variable. Again each clause $s \in C$ is represented by a vertex $z(s) \in V_1(G_\Phi)$, but now from this vertex there are 2 edges leading to the variable gadget for every variable occurring in s , one of colour α and one of colour β . The variable gadget is built from 2 copies of the limping tripod and it is depicted in Figure 13 top left. In colour β , there are complete bipartite graphs connecting p_1^1, p_2^1 to m_1^2, m_2^2, m_3^2 and p_1^2, p_2^2 to m_1^1, m_2^1, m_3^1 , and furthermore the edges $p_1^1 v^1, p_2^1 v^2, p_1^2 u^1, p_2^2 u^2$. Thus the vertices u^1, u^2, v^1, v^2 are each missing one edge of colour α and one edge of colour β , the degrees of all other vertices are full (in both colours). In order to keep the graph G_Φ simple, the connector edges of colours α and β from the variable gadgets to the clause gadgets are shifted as follows: if a variable x occurs in clauses s_1, s_2, s_3 and s_4 , then vertex u^1 of the variable gadget of x is adjacent to $z(s_1)$ via an edge of colour α and to $z(s_3)$ via an edge of colour β . And similarly, v^1 (u^2, v^2 , respectively) is adjacent via an edge of colour α to $z(s_2)$ ($z(s_3), z(s_4)$, respectively) and via an edge of colour β to $z(s_4)$ ($z(s_1), z(s_2)$, respectively). If G_Φ covers A_2 and f is a covering projection, then the properties of limping tripods imply $f(u^1) = f(v^1) = f(u^2) = f(v^2)$ in every variable gadget, and setting $\varphi(x) = \text{true}$ iff $f(u^1) = r$ in the variable gadget of variable x guarantees that the same information about the truth valuation of x reaches every clause containing it. And in every clause $s \in C$ there are exactly 2 variables evaluated to true and exactly 2 clauses evaluated to false, $z(s)$ is adjacent to vertices of 4 variable gadgets, out of which 2 must be mapped onto r and 2 onto g by f . On the other hand, the variable gadget allows a partial covering projection onto A_2 in which all the vertices u^1, v^1, u^2, v^2 are mapped onto r (and a companion partial covering projection in which these vertices are mapped onto g) as depicted in Figure 13 bottom right. Thus if φ is truth valuation which 2-in-4-satisfies Φ , we can compose a degree-obedient vertex mapping $f : V(G_\Phi) \rightarrow \{p, r, g\}$, and since G_Φ has no semi-edges, this vertex mapping extends to a covering projection onto A_2 . This concludes the proof of NP-completeness of A_2 -COVER, and the NP-completeness of A_2' -COVER follows by Lemma 15.



■ **Figure 13** The reduction for A_2 .



■ **Figure 14** The reduction for J .



■ **Figure 15** The reduction for A_1 .

Case J . This case is similar to the case of A_2 . Denote by q the vertex of block W_3 of J . For every clause s of Φ , G_Φ has 2 vertices, $z(s) \in V_1(G_\Phi)$ and $y(s) \in V_3(G_\Phi)$. The variable gadget is based on 2 copies of the limping tripod LT^1, LT^2 with edges of colour α which are further connected by another two copies of limping tripod, these two having edges of colour β , on vertices $q_1^1, q_2^1, q_1^2, q_2^2 \in V_3(G_\Phi)$ and the u, v and m vertices of LT^1 and LT^2 as follows: edges of colour β form a complete bipartite graph with classes of bipartition $\{q_1^1, q_2^1\}$ and $\{u^2, m_1^2, m_2^2, m_3^2, v^2\}$, another one with classes of bipartition $\{q_1^2, q_2^2\}$ and $\{u^1, m_1^1, m_2^1, m_3^1, v^1\}$, and edges $q_1^1 u^1, q_2^1 u^2, q_1^2 v^1, q_2^2 v^2$. Again, each of the vertices u^1, u^2, v^1, v^2 misses one edge of colour α and one edge of colour β , all other vertices of the variable gadget are of full degree. If a variable x occurs in clauses s_1, s_2, s_3, s_4 , the variable gadget of x is connected to the clause vertices by edges $u^1 z(s_1), v^1 z(s_2), u^2 z(s_3), v^2 z(s_4)$ of colour α and by edges $u^1 y(s_1), v^1 y(s_2), u^2 y(s_3), v^2 y(s_4)$ of colour β . As in the case of A_2 , if $f : G_\Phi \rightarrow J$ is a covering projection, then $\varphi : X \rightarrow \{\text{true}, \text{false}\}$ defined by $\varphi(x) = \text{true}$ iff $f(u^1) = r$ for the copy of u^1 in the variable gadget for x , is a 2-in-4-satisfying truth valuation of Φ . On the other hand, if Φ is 2-in-4-satisfiable, a covering projection of G_Φ onto J can be built from partial covering projections depicted in Figure 14 bottom right (the variable gadget is depicted in top left of the same figure).

Case A_1 . The last reduction builds upon the ideas of the previous ones, but is slightly more involved. We reduce from 2-IN-4-SAT for formulas with 4 occurrences per variable. For every clause $s \in C$, we introduce two vertices $z(s), y(s) \in V_1(G_\Phi)$.

The variable gadget, depicted in Figure 15 top left, consists of 4 copies of the limping tripod with edges of colour α . Edges of colour β are added as follows:

$$p_1^1 m_1^4, p_1^1 m_2^4, p_1^2 m_1^1, p_1^2 m_2^1, p_1^3 m_1^2, p_1^3 m_2^2, p_1^4 m_1^3, p_1^4 m_2^3, p_2^1 u^1, p_2^1 u^2, p_2^2 u^3, p_2^2 u^4, p_2^3 v^1, p_2^3 v^4, p_2^4 v^2, p_2^4 v^3.$$

In this graph, vertices $u^i, v^i, i = 1, 2, 3, 4$ are missing one edge of colour α each, and vertices $m_3^i, i = 1, 2, 3, 4$ are missing one edge of colour β each, all other vertices are of full degree. In every partial covering projection f onto A_1 , the properties of limping tripods imply that $f(u^i) = f(v^i)$ for $i = 1, 2, 3, 4$. Since $f(p_2^1) = p$, the neighbours of p_2^1 must be mapped onto different neighbours of p in A_1 , i.e., one of them is mapped on r and the other one on g . Hence $f(u^1) \neq f(u^2)$. Analogously $f(u^2) = f(v_2) \neq f(v_3) = f(u_3)$ (because of v_2, v_3 being neighbours of p_2^3 along edges of colour β) and $f(u^3) \neq f(u^4)$ (because they are neighbours of p_2^2 along edges of colour β). Hence $f(u^1) = f(v^1) = f(u^3) = f(v^3) = r$ and $f(u^2) = f(v^2) = f(u^4) = f(v^4) = g$, or vice versa.

The connections of the variable gadgets to the clause gadgets are described in two steps. Let $x \in X$ be a variable and let s_1, s_2, s_3, s_4 be the clauses containing x . We connect the clause vertices $z(s_1), z(s_2), z(s_3)$ and $z(s_4)$ to u^1, u^3, v^1 and v^3 , respectively, and the clause vertices $y(s_1), y(s_2), y(s_3)$ and $y(s_4)$ to u^2, u^4, v^2 and v^4 , again in this order, by edges of colour α . At this point, overall in the graph G_Φ as constructed so far, we have $2|C|$ vertices ($z(s), y(s), s \in C$) that are missing 2 edges of colour β each, and $4|X|$ vertices ($m_3^i, i = 1, 2, 3, 4$ in the variable gadgets) that are missing one edge of colour β each, all other vertices are of full degree. View the later vertices grouped in pairs $\{m_3^1, m_3^2\}, \{m_3^3, m_3^4\}$ within the variable gadgets. Since $|C| = |X|$, the number of such pairs is equal to the number of clause vertices. We make each clause vertex adjacent to both vertices of one pair via edges of colour β , in an arbitrary one-to-one correspondence of the clause vertices to the pairs. This concludes the construction of G_Φ .

If $f : G_\Phi \rightarrow A_1$ is a covering projection, then $\varphi : X \rightarrow \{\text{true}, \text{false}\}$ defined by $\varphi(x) = \text{true}$ iff $f(u^1) = f(u^3) = f(v^1) = f(v^3) = r$ 2-in-4-satisfies Φ , because every vertex $z(s)$ has exactly two α -neighbours mapped onto r and exactly two of them mapped onto g , and so every clause s has exactly two variables evaluated to true.

On the other hand, take the vertex mapping indicated in Figure 15 bottom right for the variables evaluated to true, and the primed mapping (i.e., red and green vertices being swapped) for the variables evaluated to false. Then every clause vertex $z(s)$ has two neighbours mapped onto r and two neighbours mapped onto g , but so does $y(s)$ as well. The two β -neighbours of every V_1 vertex are mapped onto different vertices from $W_2(A_1)$ (for the p_j^i vertices within variable gadgets this is clear from the partial covering from the gadget onto A_1 depicted in Figure 15, for the clause vertices $z(s), y(s)$, this follows from the construction where each of these vertices has been made adjacent to a pair of red-green vertices in this partial covering). Thus, we see that G_Φ covers A_1 if and only if Φ is 2-in-4-satisfiable and the proof of NP-completeness of A_1 -COVER is concluded. ◀

4.4 Garbage collection

In this subsection we show how the puzzle of particular cases clips together and provide the proof of Parts 2 and 3 of Theorem 9. The last step is the garbage collection (i.e., completing the construction so that a covering projection from entire input graph onto the whole H exists, whenever the relevant part of the input graph covers the harmful or dangerous block graph of H). In the constructions we rely on the following simple observation.

- **Observation 18.** 1. For every k, m such that $0 < k < m, m$ even, there exists a k -edge-colourable k -regular graph on m vertices.
 2. For every k, m such that $0 < k \leq m$, there exists a k -edge-colourable k -regular bipartite graph with $2m$ vertices.

Proof. 1. It is well known that for an even m , the complete graph on m vertices is of Vizing

class 1, i.e., $(m-1)$ -regular and $(m-1)$ -edge-colourable. Take any k of the $m-1$ colours, the union of the edges of these k colours is the desired graph. Note that if $k > 1$, the colours may be chosen so that the graph is connected.

2. Analogously, it is well known that every bipartite graph is of Vizing class 1. Hence every k -regular bipartite graph is k -edge-colourable. There are many ways how to construct k -regular bipartite graphs, for the mere existence we may argue as in the previous case – take an m -edge-colouring of the complete bipartite graph $K_{m,m}$, choose k of the colours and the union of the edges of these k colours. Again, if $k > 1$, we may further require that the graph is connected. ◀

The following observation is easy but useful for simplifying the proofs below.

► **Observation 19.** *Let H' be a block graph of a graph H and let H'' be the spanning subgraph of H containing all vertices of H and exactly the edges of H' . Then H' -COVER for simple input graphs polynomially reduces to H'' -COVER for simple input graphs.*

Proof. Let G' be the simple graph for which we seek a covering onto H' . Suppose $V(H) = W_1 \cup \dots \cup W_t$ and let $V(H') = W_1 \cup \dots \cup W_h$. Identify the blocks V_1, \dots, V_h of G' and check if each $|V_i|$ is divisible by $|W_i|$ for $i = 1, 2, \dots, h$, and if the ratio $\frac{|V_i|}{|W_i|}$ is the same for all i . Reject the graph if it is not; otherwise, denote this ratio by k . In the latter case, construct G'' by adding $k \cdot (\sum_{i=h+1}^t |W_i|)$ isolated vertices, vertex coloured so that for every $i = h+1, \dots, t$, $k \cdot |W_i|$ vertices form a block V_i . It is clear that G'' covers H'' if and only if G' covers H' . ◀

► **Definition 20.** *Let H be a graph with at most 2 vertices in each equivalence class of its degree partition. Then H is called balanced if in every doublet block and every edge-colour α , the two vertices of this block are incident with the same number of semi-edges of colour α .*

► **Proposition 21.** *Let H be a graph with at most 2 vertices in each equivalence class of its degree partition and let H' be a balanced block graph of H . Then H' -COVER for simple input graphs polynomially reduces to H -COVER for simple input graphs.*

Proof. In view of Observation 19 we may assume that H' is a spanning block graph of H . Let G' be a simple graph whose covering of H' is questioned. Denote by D the maximum total degree of a vertex of H , and fix an even number $m > D$. Construct a simple graph G by taking $2m$ copies $G'_{ij}, i = 1, 2, j = 1, 2, \dots, m$ of G' and adding edges as follows:

1. The copy of a vertex $x \in V(G')$ in G'_{ij} is denoted by x_{ij} .
2. For every $x \in V(G')$, prepare a pool $\mathcal{A}(x)$ of D disjoint perfect matchings on vertices $x_{1j}, j = 1, 2, \dots, m$, a pool $\mathcal{B}(x)$ of D disjoint perfect matchings on vertices $x_{2j}, j = 1, 2, \dots, m$, and a pool $\mathcal{C}(x)$ of D disjoint perfect matchings in the complete bipartite graph with classes of bipartition $\{x_{1j} : j = 1, 2, \dots, m\}$ and $\{x_{2j} : j = 1, 2, \dots, m\}$;
3. for every two distinct $x, y \in V(G')$, prepare a pool $\mathcal{D}(x, y)$ of D disjoint perfect matchings in the complete bipartite graph with classes of bipartition $\{x_{1j} : j = 1, 2, \dots, m\}$ and $\{y_{1j} : j = 1, 2, \dots, m\}$, a pool $\mathcal{E}(x, y)$ of D disjoint perfect matchings in the complete bipartite graph with classes of bipartition $\{x_{2j} : j = 1, 2, \dots, m\}$ and $\{y_{2j} : j = 1, 2, \dots, m\}$, and a pool $\mathcal{F}(x, y)$ of D disjoint perfect matchings in the complete bipartite graph with classes of bipartition $\{x_{1j} : j = 1, 2, \dots, m\}$ and $\{y_{2j} : j = 1, 2, \dots, m\}$.
4. If $x \in V_\sigma$ such that W_σ is a singleton block of H , and α is an edge-colour that appears within W_σ , do as follows

- a. if $p_\sigma \in W_\sigma$ is incident with b semi-edges and c undirected loops of colour α in H , extract $b + 2c$ perfect matchings from $\mathcal{A}(x)$ and put them into G as edges of colour α , and do the same with the pool $\mathcal{B}(x)$,
 - b. if $p_\sigma \in W_\sigma$ is incident with d directed loops of colour α in H , extract $2d$ perfect matchings from $\mathcal{C}(x)$, orient their edges so that every vertex x_{ij} has in-degree and out-degree d and put them into G as oriented edges of colour α .
5. If $x \in V_\sigma$ such that W_σ is a doublet block of H , and α is an edge-colour that appears within W_σ , do as follows
- a. if $H[W_\sigma]^\alpha \simeq W(b, c, \ell, c', b')$, extract $b + 2c = b' + 2c'$ perfect matchings from $\mathcal{A}(x)$ and put them into G as edges of colour α , do the same with the pool $\mathcal{B}(x)$, and extract ℓ perfect matchings from $\mathcal{C}(x)$ and put them into G as edges of colour α ;
 - b. if $H[W_\sigma]^\alpha \simeq WD(b, \ell, b)$, extract $2b$ perfect matchings from $\mathcal{A}(x)$, orient their edges so that every vertex has in-degree and out-degree b and put them into G as directed edges of colour α , do the same with the pool $\mathcal{B}(x)$, and extract 2ℓ perfect matchings from $\mathcal{C}(x)$, orient the edges of ℓ of them from x_{1j} to $x_{2j'}$ and of the other ℓ matchings from x_{2j} to $x_{1j'}$ and put them into G as directed edges of colour α .
6. If W_σ and W_ρ are different singleton blocks, pair the vertices in V_σ and V_ρ (they are k of them in each of these blocks of G') and for each such pair $x \in V_\sigma, y \in V_\rho$, do as follows. If α is an edge-colour such that $H[W_\sigma \cup W_\rho]^\alpha \simeq FF(b)$, extract b disjoint perfect matchings from $\mathcal{D}(x, y)$ and add them as edges of colour α to G , and do the same with $\mathcal{E}(x, y)$.
7. If W_σ is a singleton block of H and W_ρ is one of its doublet blocks, group their vertices into disjoint triples $x \in V_\sigma, y_1, y_2 \in V_\rho$ (note that $|V_\rho| = 2 \cdot |V_\sigma|$) and do as follows. If α is an edge-colour such that $H[W_\sigma \cup W_\rho]^\alpha \simeq FW(b)$, extract b disjoint perfect matchings from $\mathcal{D}(x, y_1)$ and add them as edges of colour α to G , and do the same with $\mathcal{E}(x, y_2), \mathcal{F}(x, y_1)$ and $\mathcal{F}(y_2, x)$.
8. If W_σ and W_ρ are different doublet blocks of H , pair the vertices in V_σ and V_ρ (there are $2k$ of them in each of these blocks of G') and for each such pair $x \in V_\sigma, y \in V_\rho$, do as follows. If α is an edge-colour such that $H[W_\sigma \cup W_\rho]^\alpha \simeq WW(b, c)$, extract b disjoint perfect matchings from $\mathcal{D}(x, y)$ and add them as edges of colour α to G , do the same with $\mathcal{E}(x, y)$, and extract c disjoint perfect matchings from $\mathcal{F}(x, y)$ and add them as edges of colour α to G , and do the same with $\mathcal{F}(y, x)$.

We claim that G covers H if and only if G' covers H' . Moreover, note that it follows from the construction of G that it is a simple graph.

Clearly, if G covers H , then each copy G'_{ij} of G' must cover H' . The core of the proof is in the opposite implication.

Suppose G' covers H' and let $f : G' \rightarrow H'$ be a covering projection. Since H' is balanced, the companion mapping $f' : G' \rightarrow H'$ (cf. Lemma 16) is a covering projection as well. Use f on $G'_{1j}, j = 1, 2, \dots, m$ and f' on $G'_{2j}, j = 1, 2, \dots, m$. A somewhat tedious but straightforward case analysis shows that the vertex part of this compound mapping is degree-obedient with respect to entire H , and the way the additional edges of G were constructed from perfect matchings implies that this mapping extends to a graph covering projection of G onto H . ◀

Proof of Part 2 of Theorem 9. The undirected harmful uniblock graphs are $F(b, c)$ (with $b \geq 2$ and $b + c \geq 3$), $W(k, m, \ell, p, q)$ (with $\ell \geq 1$ and $k + 2m + \ell = q + 2p + \ell \geq 3$) and

$F(b, c) + F(b', c')$ (with $b' \leq b, b \geq 2, b + 2c = b' + 2c' \geq 3$), the directed harmful uniblock graphs are $WD(c, b, c)$ (with $b, c \geq 1, b + c \geq 3$). For each of them, the covering problem is NP-complete for simple input graphs as proven in Proposition 12. The graphs $F(b, c)$ and $WD(b, c, b)$ are balanced, and thus if H contains a harmful block graph of one of these two types, H -COVER is NP-complete for simple graphs by Proposition 21.

Consider $W(k, m, \ell, p, q)$ (with $\ell \geq 1$ and $k + 2m + \ell = q + 2p + \ell \geq 3$) being a monochromatic uniblock graph of a graph H . A bipartite graph G' covers $W(k, m, \ell, p, q)$ if and only if it allows a vertex colouring by two colours such that every vertex has exactly $k + 2m = q + 2p$ neighbours of its own colour and ℓ neighbours of the other colour, i.e., if and only if it covers $W(k + 2m, 0, \ell, 0, q + 2p)$. If $f : G' \rightarrow W(k, m, \ell, p, q)$ is a covering projection, the vertex mapping $f : V(G') \rightarrow \{r, g\}$ is such a $(k + 2m, \ell)$ -colouring of G' , and so is the companion mapping $f' : V(G') \rightarrow \{r, g\}$ defined by $f'(x) = r$ iff $f(x) = g$, which then extends to a covering projection $f' : G' \rightarrow W(k, m, \ell, p, q)$. Take a simple bipartite graph G' as an input of $(k + 2m, \ell)$ -COLOR and construct a graph G exactly as in the proof of Proposition 21. The argument about the companion vertex mapping implies that G covers H if and only if G' allows a $(k + 2m, \ell)$ -colouring. And since $(k + 2m, \ell)$ -COLOR is NP-complete for bipartite input graphs (as proven in [10]), the NP-completeness of $W(k, m, \ell, p, q)$ -COVER for simple input graphs follows.

Finally, consider $W(b, c, 0, c', b') = F(b, c) + F(b', c')$ with vertices r, g (and with parameters $b + 2c = b' + 2c' \geq 3, b \geq 2, b' \leq b$) being a monochromatic uniblock graph of a graph H . The parameters are such that $F(b, c)$ -COVER is NP-complete for simple graphs, as proven in [10]. Take a connected simple graph G'' as an input of this problem, and let $G' = 2G''$ be the union of two disjoint copies of G'' . A covering projection onto $F(b, c)$ can be straightforwardly modified to a covering projection onto $F(b', c')$ (if $k = c' - c$, it is $b - b' = 2k$ and taking the perfect matchings formed by preimages of the semi-edges of $F(b, c)$ two by two k times, and mapping the union of two perfect matchings onto one loop of $F(b', c')$ creates the covering projection onto $F(b', c')$). Hence G' covers $F(b, c) + F(b', c')$ if and only if G'' covers $F(b, c)$. Moreover, if $f : G' \rightarrow F(b, c) + F(b', c')$ is a covering projection, then the vertices of copy of G'' map onto r and the vertices of the other copy onto g , and the companion mapping f' is also a covering projection. Thus taking G' and constructing a simple graph G as in the proof of Proposition 21, we see that G covers H if and only if G' covers $F(b, c) + F(b', c')$, which happens if and only if G'' covers $F(b, c)$. Therefore H -COVER is NP-complete for simple input graphs.

The monochromatic interblock graphs are $FW(c)$ (with $c \geq 3$) and $WW(b, c)$ (with $b, c \geq 1, b + c \geq 3$). For each of them, the covering problem is NP-complete for simple input graphs as proven in Proposition 13, and since both of them are balanced, the H -COVER problem is NP-complete for any graph H that has a monochromatic interblock graph isomorphic to one of them by Proposition 20. ◀

Proof of Part 3 of Theorem 9. If H contains a harmful monochromatic uniblock or interblock graph, then H -COVER is NP-complete by Part 2 of Theorem 9. If H does not contain any harmful block graph, but contains a dangerous one, then H contains a block graph H' which is reducible to one of the graphs $A_1, A_2, A'_2, B_k, k \geq 1, B'_k, k \geq 2, C_k, k \geq 0, C'_k, k \geq 1, D_k, k \geq 1, D'_k, k \geq 1, E_{(2,2)}, E'_{(2,2)}, E_{(2,1)}, E'_{(2,1)}, F, F', H_k, k \geq 3, H'_k, k \geq 3, J, J', L_k, k \geq 1, L'_k, k \geq 1, M_k, k \geq 1, M'_k, k \geq 1, N$ and N' (Proposition 14). For each of these graphs, say H'' , the NP-completeness of H'' -COVER for simple input graphs is proven in Proposition 17. Therefore for the corresponding block graph H' (which is reducible to the H''), the H' -COVER problem is NP-complete for simple input graphs by the nature of reducibility. In all cases except of $E_{(2,1)}$ and $E'_{(2,1)}$, the graph H'' , and therefore also H' , is balanced, and hence the

NP-completeness of H -COVER for simple input graphs follows from Proposition 21.

The graphs $E_{(2,1)}$ and $E'_{(2,1)}$ need an extra care. Consider first $E_{(2,1)}$. In the proof of this case in Proposition 17, a simple graph G_Φ is constructed such that G_Φ covers $E_{(2,1)}$ if and only if it covers $E_{(2,2)}$ which happens if and only if it covers D_1 . For such an input graph, the companion vertex mapping f' to a covering projection f again extends to a covering projection onto $E_{(2,2)}$, and hence also onto $E_{(2,1)}$. Therefore, the proof of Proposition 21 applies because of the nature of the input graph, despite the fact that $E_{(2,1)}$ is not balanced. For $E'_{(2,1)}$, the argumentation is analogous. ◀

4.5 Proof of Theorem 1

Now we have everything ready to prove the main result of the paper.

Proof of Theorem 1. Suppose H is a connected graph in which each equivalence class of the degree partition contains at most two vertices. The H -COVER problem can be solved in constant or linear time if H is a tree or a cycle or a path (possibly ending with semi-edges). Otherwise, consider the reduced graph H , reduced via the degree adjusting reduction of Definition 6. It is important that H also has at most two vertices in each equivalence class of its degree partition. If H is a path or a cycle, then H -COVER is solvable in polynomial time, and so is H -COVER, due to Observation 7.

If H contains a vertex of degree greater than 2, then all vertices of H have degrees greater than 2. If all monochromatic uniblock and interblock graphs of H are harmless, then H -COVER is polynomially solvable for general input graphs, and so is H -COVER, due to Observation 7. If H contains a harmful or a dangerous uniblock or interblock graph, then H -COVER is NP-complete for simple input graphs by Parts 2 and 3 of Theorem 9. If G is a simple graph as an input to the H -COVER problem, the reverse operation to the degree adjusting reduction gives a simple graph G such that $G \rightarrow H$ if and only if $G \rightarrow H$. Hence H -COVER is also NP-complete for simple input graphs. This concludes the proof. ◀

5 Concluding remarks

The polynomial algorithm described in Section 3 combines two approaches: finding perfect matchings and solving 2-SAT. Both of these problems are well known to be solvable in polynomial time. However, it is somewhat surprising that their combination also remains polynomially solvable. This contrasts with the so-called compatible 2-factor problem [27], where instances that are solvable in polynomial time fall into two distinct categories — one solved by a reduction to perfect matching and the other solved by 2-SAT. When restrictions from both categories are present in the same instance, the problem becomes NP-complete.

Moreover, the tractability of the polynomial-time solvable cases does not depend on the target graph being fixed. If H is a graph with at most two vertices in each block of the degree partition, and all monochromatic block and interblock graphs are harmless, then the algorithm described in Section 3 remains polynomial even when H is part of the input.

We believe that the method developed above has a much wider potential and we conjecture the following:

▶ **Conjecture.** *Let H be a block graph of a graph H' . Then H -COVER for simple input graphs polynomially reduces to H' -COVER for simple input graphs.*

Ultimately, the overarching goal is to prove (or disprove) the Strong Dichotomy Conjecture for graph covers parameterized by the target graph. Ideally, this would include a comprehensive catalogue of all polynomially solvable cases.

References

- 1 James Abello, Michael R. Fellows, and John C. Stillwell. On the complexity and combinatorics of covering finite complexes. *Australasian Journal of Combinatorics*, 4:103–112, 1991. URL: <https://ajc.maths.uq.edu.au/pdf/4/ocr-ajc-v4-p103.pdf>.
- 2 Dana Angluin. Local and global properties in networks of processors. *Proceedings of the 12th ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing*, pages 82–93, 1980. doi:10.1145/800141.804655.
- 3 Norman Biggs. *Algebraic Graph Theory*. Cambridge University Press, 1974.
- 4 Norman Biggs. Covering biplanes. In *The theory and applications of graphs, Fourth International Conference, Kalamazoo*, pages 73–79. John Wiley & Sons., 1981.
- 5 Norman Biggs. Constructing 5-arc transitive cubic graphs. *Journal of London Mathematical Society II.*, 26:193–200, 1982. doi:10.1112/jlms/s2-26.2.193.
- 6 Norman Biggs. Homological coverings of graphs. *Journal of London Mathematical Society II.*, 30:1–14, 1984. doi:10.1112/jlms/s2-30.1.1.
- 7 Hans L. Bodlaender. The classification of coverings of processor networks. *Journal of Parallel Distributed Computing*, 6:166–182, 1989. doi:10.1016/0743-7315(89)90048-8.
- 8 Jan Bok, Jiří Fiala, Nikola Jedličková, Jan Kratochvíl, and Pawel Rżazewski. List covering of regular multigraphs with semi-edges. *Algorithmica*, 86(3):782–807, 2024. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00453-023-01163-7>, doi:10.1007/S00453-023-01163-7.
- 9 Jan Bok, Jiří Fiala, Nikola Jedličková, Jan Kratochvíl, and Michaela Seifrtová. Computational complexity of covering colored mixed multigraphs with degree partition equivalence classes of size at most two (extended abstract). In Daniël Paulusma and Bernard Ries, editors, *Graph-Theoretic Concepts in Computer Science - 49th International Workshop, WG 2023*, volume 14093 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 101–115. Springer, 2023. doi:10.1007/978-3-031-43380-1_8.
- 10 Jan Bok, Jiří Fiala, Petr Hliněný, Nikola Jedličková, and Jan Kratochvíl. Computational complexity of covering multigraphs with semi-edges: Small cases. In Filippo Bonchi and Simon J. Puglisi, editors, *46th International Symposium on Mathematical Foundations of Computer Science*, volume 202 of *LIPICs*, pages 21:1–21:15. Schloss Dagstuhl — Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik, 2021. doi:10.4230/LIPICs.MFCS.2021.21.
- 11 Jan Bok, Jiří Fiala, Nikola Jedličková, Jan Kratochvíl, and Michaela Seifrtová. Computational complexity of covering disconnected multigraphs. *Discrete Applied Mathematics*, 359:229–243, 2024. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.dam.2024.07.035>, doi:10.1016/J.DAM.2024.07.035.
- 12 Ondřej Bílka, Jozef Jirásek, Pavel Klavík, Martin Tancer, and Jan Volec. On the complexity of planar covering of small graphs. In Petr Kolman and Jan Kratochvíl, editors, *Graph-Theoretic Concepts in Computer Science*, volume 6986 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 83–94. Springer, 2011. doi:10.1007/978-3-642-25870-1_9.
- 13 Ondřej Bílka, Bernard Lidický, and Marek Tesař. Locally injective homomorphism to the simple weight graphs. In Mitsunori Ogiwara and Jun Tarui, editors, *Theory and Applications of Models of Computation*, volume 6648 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 471–482. Springer, 2011. doi:10.1007/978-3-642-20877-5_46.
- 14 Jérémy Chalopin. Local computations on closed unlabelled edges: the election problem and the naming problem. In Peter Vojtáš, Mária Bieliková, Bernadette Charron-Bost, and Ondřej Sýkora, editors, *SOFSEM 2005: Theory and Practice of Computer Science*, volume 3381 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 82–91. Springer, 2005. doi:10.1007/978-3-540-30577-4_11.
- 15 Jérémy Chalopin, Yves Métivier, and Wiesław Zielonka. Local computations in graphs: the case of cellular edge local computations. *Fundamenta Informaticae*, 74(1):85–114, 2006. doi:10.5555/1231199.1231204.
- 16 Jérémy Chalopin and Daniël Paulusma. Graph labelings derived from models in distributed computing: A complete complexity classification. *Networks*, 58(3):207–231, 2011. doi:10.1002/net.20432.

- 17 Derek G. Corneil and Calvin C. Godtlieb. An efficient algorithm for graph isomorphism. *Journal of the Association for Computing Machinery*, 17:51–64, 1970. doi:10.1145/321556.321562.
- 18 Bruno Courcelle and Yves Métivier. Coverings and minors: Applications to local computations in graphs. *European Journal of Combinatorics*, 15:127–138, 1994. doi:10.1006/eujc.1994.1015.
- 19 Jiří Fiala, Pavel Klavík, Jan Kratochvíl, and Roman Nedela. Algorithmic aspects of regular graph covers with applications to planar graphs. *CoRR*, abs/1402.3774, 2014.
- 20 Jiří Fiala and Jan Kratochvíl. Complexity of partial covers of graphs. In Peter Eades and Tadao Takaoka, editors, *Algorithms and Computation*, volume 2223 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 537–549. Springer, 2001. doi:10.1007/3-540-45678-3_46.
- 21 Jiří Fiala and Jan Kratochvíl. Locally constrained graph homomorphisms — structure, complexity, and applications. *Computer Science Review*, 2(2):97–111, 2008. doi:10.1016/J.COSREV.2008.06.001.
- 22 Jiří Fiala, Jan Kratochvíl, and Attila Pór. On the computational complexity of partial covers of Theta graphs. *Discrete Applied Mathematics*, 156:1143–1149, 2008. doi:10.1016/J.DAM.2007.05.051.
- 23 Jiří Fiala and Michaela Seifrtová. A novel approach to covers of multigraphs with semi-edges. *Discussiones Mathematicae Graph Theory*, accepted, in press. doi:10.7151/dmgt.2540.
- 24 Ezra Getzler and Mikhail M Kapranov. Modular operads. *Compositio Mathematica*, 110(1):65–125, 1998. doi:10.1023/A:1000245600345.
- 25 Jonathan L. Gross and Thomas W. Tucker. *Topological Graph Theory*. J. Wiley and Sons, 1987.
- 26 Jan Kratochvíl. Complexity of hypergraph coloring and Seidel’s switching. In Hans L. Bodlaender, editor, *Graph-Theoretic Concepts in Computer Science*, volume 2880 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 297–308. Springer, 2003. doi:10.1007/978-3-540-39890-5_26.
- 27 Jan Kratochvíl and Svatopluk Poljak. Compatible 2-factors. *Discrete Applied Mathematics*, 36(3):253–266, 1992. doi:10.1016/0166-218X(92)90257-B.
- 28 Jan Kratochvíl, Andrzej Proskurowski, and Jan Arne Telle. Complexity of graph covering problems. In Ernst W. Mayr, Gunther Schmidt, and Gottfried Tinhofer, editors, *Graph-Theoretic Concepts in Computer Science*, volume 903 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 93–105. Springer, 1994. doi:10.1007/3-540-59071-4_40.
- 29 Jan Kratochvíl, Andrzej Proskurowski, and Jan Arne Telle. Covering directed multigraphs I. Colored directed multigraphs. In Rolf H. Möhring, editor, *Graph-Theoretic Concepts in Computer Science*, volume 1335 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 242–257. Springer, 1997. doi:10.1007/BFB0024502.
- 30 Jan Kratochvíl, Andrzej Proskurowski, and Jan Arne Telle. Covering regular graphs. *Journal of Combinatorial Theory, Series B*, 71(1):1–16, 1997. doi:10.1006/JCTB.1996.1743.
- 31 Jan Kratochvíl, Jan Arne Telle, and Marek Tesař. Computational complexity of covering three-vertex multigraphs. *Theoretical Computer Science*, 609:104–117, 2016. doi:10.1016/j.tcs.2015.09.013.
- 32 Jin Ho Kwak and Roman Nedela. Graphs and their coverings. *Lecture Notes Series*, 17, 2007.
- 33 Igor Litovsky, Yves Métivier, and Wiesław Zielonka. The power and the limitations of local computations on graphs. In Ernst W. Mayr, editor, *Graph-Theoretic Concepts in Computer Science*, volume 657 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 333–345. Springer, 1992. doi:10.1007/3-540-56402-0_58.
- 34 Aleksander Malnič, Dragan Marušič, and Primož Potočnik. Elementary abelian covers of graphs. *Journal of Algebraic Combinatorics*, 20(1):71–97, 2004. doi:10.1023/B:JACO.0000047294.42633.25.
- 35 Aleksander Malnič, Roman Nedela, and Martin Škoviera. Lifting graph automorphisms by voltage assignments. *European Journal of Combinatorics*, 21(7):927–947, 2000. doi:10.1006/eujc.2000.0390.

- 36 Alexander D. Mednykh and Roman Nedela. *Harmonic Morphisms of Graphs: Part I: Graph Coverings*. Vydavatelstvo Univerzity Mateja Bela v Banskej Bystrici, 1st edition, 2015.
- 37 Roman Nedela and Martin Škoviera. Regular embeddings of canonical double coverings of graphs. *Journal of Combinatorial Theory, Series B*, 67(2):249–277, 1996. doi:10.1006/jctb.1996.0044.
- 38 Kurt Reidemeister. *Einführung in die kombinatorische Topologie*. Braunschweig: Friedr. Vieweg&Sohn A.-G. XII, 209 S. , 1932.