

Exact Algorithms for Distance to Unique Vertex Cover

Foivos Fioravantes¹, Dušan Knop¹, Nikolaos Melissinos¹, Michal Opler¹, and Manolis Vasilakis²

¹Department of Theoretical Computer Science, Faculty of Information Technology,
Czech Technical University in Prague, Czech Republic

²Université Paris-Dauphine, PSL University, CNRS UMR7243, LAMSADE, Paris,
France

Abstract

Horiyama et al. (AAAI 2024) studied the problem of generating graph instances that possess a unique minimum vertex cover under specific conditions. Their approach involved pre-assigning certain vertices to be part of the solution or excluding them from it. Notably, for the VERTEX COVER problem, pre-assigning a vertex is equivalent to removing it from the graph. Horiyama et al. focused on maintaining the size of the minimum vertex cover after these modifications. In this work, we extend their study by relaxing this constraint: our goal is to ensure a unique minimum vertex cover, even if the removal of a vertex may not incur a decrease on the size of said cover.

Surprisingly, our relaxation introduces significant theoretical challenges. We observe that the problem is Σ_P^2 -complete, and remains so even for planar graphs of maximum degree 5. Nevertheless, we provide a linear time algorithm for trees, which is then further leveraged to show that MU-VC is in FPT when parameterized by the combination of treewidth and maximum degree. Finally, we show that MU-VC is in XP when parameterized by clique-width while it is fixed-parameter tractable (FPT) if we add the size of the solution as part of the parameter.

1 Introduction

Addressing NP-hard problems has long been a central challenge in computer science, driving advancements in algorithmic design and computational theory. These problems, being inherently computationally intractable, have inspired diverse approaches to developing efficient and scalable solutions. Algorithmic strategies for NP-hard problems are critical to theoretical research and finding applications in areas such as network optimization, scheduling, and data analysis.

In recent years, the intersection of artificial intelligence and traditional algorithm design has opened new pathways for tackling these challenges. AI-driven techniques, including heuristic optimization, machine learning, and hybrid algorithms, offer innovative frameworks for navigating the complexities of NP-complete problems. These approaches aim to complement conventional methods, enhancing performance and adaptability in real-world applications.

A fundamental aspect of algorithmic research is the construction of robust benchmark datasets. These datasets serve for evaluating and comparing the effectiveness of different algorithms. By providing a standardized testing ground, traditional benchmarks such as TSPLIB [24], UCI Machine Learning Repository [2], SATLIB [15], MIPLIB [19], LIBSVM [5], and NetworkX graph datasets [14] have laid the groundwork for progress in this field.

More recently, modern datasets tailored to AI-driven algorithm design have emerged. Datasets like NPHardEval [11, 12] provide a dynamic benchmark for assessing the reasoning capabilities of large language models through algorithmic questions, including NP-hard problems. GraphArena [25] offers a comprehensive suite of real-world graph-based tasks, enabling the evaluation of AI algorithms in diverse computational challenges, from social networks to molecular structures. Meanwhile, MaxCut-Bench [21] provides an open-source platform to benchmark heuristics and methods based on machine learning specifically for the MAXIMUM CUT problem. These benchmarks not only expand the scope of algorithmic research, but also bridge traditional approaches with cutting-edge AI innovations.




Figure 1: Left: a graph G with minimum vertex cover of size 4. There are many such – vertex 1 and then any set of vertices of size 3 that intersects the pairs $\{2, 3\}$, $\{4, 5\}$, and $\{6, 7\}$. Middle: PAU-VC solution of size 3 (the only vertex missing at this point is 1). Right: MU-VC solution (deleted) 8, 9, and the minimum size of a vertex cover is now 3 (i.e., 5 in total); namely, 2, 4, 6 which is now unique.

Recently, the PRE-ASSIGNMENT FOR UNIFICATION OF MINIMUM VERTEX COVER (PAU-VC) problem was introduced by Horiyama et al. [16], and further studied in [1]. This problem was motivated by the need to create challenging datasets for algorithmic evaluation. Intuitively, ensuring a solution is unique adds significant complexity, as solvers have no margin for error in identifying the correct solution. A set S of vertices in a graph G is called a *vertex cover* if S intersects all edges of G . The objective of MINIMUM VERTEX COVER is to compute a vertex cover of G with the smallest cardinality possible. The UNIQUE VERTEX COVER problem extends this by ensuring that the input graph has a unique minimum vertex cover. This guarantee imposes additional constraints, making the problem particularly challenging from both theoretical and practical perspectives.

It is important to note that, in the context of vertex cover, selecting a vertex for inclusion in the cover is equivalent to deleting it from the graph along with all its incident edges. However, ensuring that a set of vertices belongs to the deletion set can inadvertently increase the size of the minimum vertex cover under this constraint, introducing further complexity. This leads to the definition of the MODULATOR TO UNIQUE MINIMUM VERTEX COVER (MU-VC for short) problem (refer to Figure 1 for an illustration of the difference in the nature of the two problems): given a graph $G = (V, E)$ and an integer k , find a set $S \subseteq V$ such that $G - S$ has a unique minimum vertex cover and $|S| \leq k$.

Unlike PAU-VC, where the solver must adapt to preselected vertices to enforce uniqueness, MU-VC simplifies this process by reverting to solving the MINIMUM VERTEX COVER problem on $G - S$. This distinction makes MU-VC particularly appealing, as it maintains the standard problem formulation while achieving uniqueness. Although this property holds for VERTEX COVER, it does not necessarily extend to other problems, such as DOMINATING SET.

Our Contribution. It is easy to see that MU-VC is NP-hard, as it generalizes the UNIQUE OPTIMAL VERTEX COVER problem (for $k = 0$), which is known to be at least as hard as UNIQUE SAT which is NP-hard [17]. Our first result is to precisely determine its complexity and show that MU-VC is actually Σ_2^P -complete, as is the case for PAU-VC [16]; in fact, in Theorem 7 we show that both problems remain so even for very restricted graph classes, namely planar graphs of maximum degree 5 (which also improves the corresponding result in [16]). Motivated by these negative results we proceed to examine MU-VC when the input graph G has an even simpler structure, that of a tree. We initially present a polynomial-time algorithm for this case in Section 3.1, which is then improved into an (optimal) linear time algorithm in Theorem 2. We then tackle the problem through the parameterized complexity point of view. Given that the natural parameterization by k cannot yield any positive results (as evidenced by the case $k = 0$), we proceed by taking into account the structure of G . We first consider the parameterization by treewidth, the most well-studied structural parameter. Building upon the algorithm of Theorem 2, in Theorem 3 we employ DP to construct an XP algorithm with running time $n^{O(2^w)}$, where w is the treewidth of G , which is then improved into an FPT algorithm in Theorem 4 when parameterized also by the maximum degree of G . Next, we consider the parameterization by clique-width and, in Theorem 5, we develop a DP algorithm showing that the problem belongs to XP and is solvable in $n^{O(2^d)}$ time, where d denotes the clique-width of G . Additionally parameterizing by the natural parameter k lifts the problem to FPT, and in Theorem 6 we develop such an algorithm of running time $k^{O(2^d)} \cdot n$.

2 Preliminaries

Throughout the paper we use standard graph notation [9]. All graphs considered are simple, undirected without loops. Given a graph G and a subset of its vertices $S \subseteq V(G)$, $G[S]$ denotes the subgraph induced by S , while $G - S$ denotes $G[V(G) \setminus S]$. For $x, y \in \mathbb{Z}$, let $[x, y] = \{z \in \mathbb{Z} \mid x \leq z \leq y\}$, while $[x] = [1, x]$. Finally, a k -labeled graph G is a triple (V, E, lab_G) where $\text{lab}_G: V \rightarrow [k]$. Let us now formally define the two problems considered in this paper.

PRE-ASSIGNMENT FOR UNIFICATION OF MINIMUM VERTEX COVER (PAU-VC)

Input: Graph $G = (V, E)$, integer k .

Task: Find a set $S \subseteq V$ of size $|S| \leq k$ such that there exists a unique minimum vertex cover of G that contains S .

MODULATOR TO UNIQUE MINIMUM VERTEX COVER (MU-VC)

Input: Graph $G = (V, E)$, integer k .

Task: Find a set $S \subseteq V$, such that $G - S$ has a unique minimum vertex cover and $|S| \leq k$.

Before moving on, allow us to further comment on the difference between PAU-VC and MU-VC. In Figure 1 we exhibit a graph G where the solutions of PAU-VC and MU-VC differ by one. In fact, we can build a family of graphs such that this difference is arbitrarily large.

Theorem 1. *For every $k \geq 3$, there exists a graph with minimum solutions P and M for PAU-VC and MU-VC respectively, where $|P| \geq k$ and $|M| = 2$.*

Proof. To ease the exposition, we denote by $P(G)$ ($M(G)$ resp.) a minimum PAU-VC (MU-VC resp.) solution of G . We will construct a graph G_k , for $k \geq 3$, such that $|P(G_k)| \geq k$ and $|M(G_k)| = 2$. For $k = 3$, the graph G_3 coincides with the one illustrated in Figure 1; let us denote by u the vertex labeled 1 and by v_1 and v_2 the vertices labeled 8 and 9 respectively in that figure. Then, starting from the graph G_{k-1} , we construct the graph G_k by introducing vertices u_k, u'_k and adding the edges uu_k and $u_k u'_k$. Before moving on, observe that for all $k \geq 3$, every minimum vertex cover of G_k must contain the vertex u , as otherwise it would have to contain both the vertices v_1 and v_2 .

We argue that for all $k \geq 3$, it holds that $|M(G_k)| = 2$. First observe that $|M(G_k)| \leq 2$. Indeed, the graph $G' = G_k - \{v_1, v_2\}$ is a star with k leaves whose edges have been subdivided once. Thus, any minimum vertex cover of G' has at least k vertices. The only such vertex cover of G' is the one that contains its k vertices of degree 2, as this is the only set that simultaneously covers all the k edges that are incident to u and the k edges that are incident to leaves. It is also straightforward to observe that deleting any single vertex from G_k does not result in a graph with a unique minimum vertex cover. Thus, $|M(G_k)| = 2$ for all $k \geq 3$.

We now argue that for all $k \geq 3$, it holds that $|P(G_k)| \geq k$. The proof of the statement is done by induction on k . For $k = 3$ the statement is correct, as illustrated by Figure 1. Assume now that the statement is correct for the graph G_i , for every $i \in [3, k - 1]$; we will show it is also correct for G_k . Towards a contradiction, assume that $|P(G_k)| \leq k - 1$. We distinguish two cases:

- $P(G_k) \cap \{u_k, u'_k\} = \emptyset$. In other words, none of the vertices added to G_{k-1} to build G_k are in the PAU-VC solution of G_k . Then, any minimum vertex cover of G_k will have to contain at least one of u_k and u'_k . Since this vertex cover is also forced to contain u , both of these options are valid. This is a contradiction to the uniqueness of the vertex cover induced by $P(G_k)$.
- $P(G_k) \cap \{u_k, u'_k\} \neq \emptyset$. Then, since $|P(G_k)| \leq k - 1$, we have that $|P'| = |P(G_k) \cap V(G_{k-1})| \leq k - 2$. This is a contradiction, as in this case P' would be a PAU-VC solution of G_{k-1} and we would have that $|P(G_{k-1})| \leq |P'| \leq k - 2$, contradicting the induction hypothesis.

This completes the proof. \square

Parametrized Complexity. The toolkit of parametrized complexity allows us to circumvent many of the limitations of classical measures of time (and space) complexity. This is achieved by considering additional measures that can affect the running time of an algorithm; these additional measures are exactly what we

refer to as *parameters*. The goal here is to construct exact algorithms that run in time $f(k) \cdot \text{poly}(n)$, where f is a computable function, n is the size of the input and k is the parameter; such algorithms are referred to as *fixed-parameter tractable* (FPT). A problem admitting such an algorithm is said to belong in FPT. Failing to achieve such an algorithm for a problem, we can instead try to show that it is *slice-wise polynomial*, i.e., that it can be determined in $n^{f(k)}$ time. Such a problem then belongs to the class XP. We refer the interested reader to now classical monographs [7, 10, 13, 22] for a more comprehensive introduction to this topic.

Structural Parameters. The most well-known structural parameter is that of *treewidth*. Allow us to define it properly.

A *tree-decomposition* of G is a pair $(T, \{B_x \mid x \in V(T)\})$, where T is a tree rooted at a node $r \in V(T)$, each node x in T is assigned a *bag* B_x , and the following conditions hold:

- for every edge $\{u, v\} \in E(G)$ there is a node $x \in V(T)$ such that $u, v \in B_x$, and
- for every vertex $v \in V$, the set of nodes x with $v \in B_x$ induces a connected subtree of T .

The *width* of a tree-decomposition $(T, \{B_x \mid x \in V(T)\})$ is $\max_{x \in V(T)} |B_x| - 1$, and the *treewidth* $\text{tw}(G)$ of a graph G is the minimum width of a tree-decomposition of G . It is known that computing a tree-decomposition of minimum width is in FPT when parameterized by the treewidth [3, 18], and even more efficient algorithms exist for obtaining near-optimal tree-decompositions [20].

A tree-decomposition $(T, \{B_x \mid x \in V(T)\})$ is *nice* if every node x in T is exactly of one of the following four types: (i) Leaf: x is a leaf of T and $|B_x| = 0$. (ii) Introduce: x has a unique child y and there exists $v \in V$ such that $B_x = B_y \cup \{v\}$. (iii) Forget: x has a unique child y and there exists $v \in V$ such that $B_y = B_x \cup \{v\}$. (iv) Join: x has exactly two children y, z and $B_x = B_y = B_z$. Every graph G admits a nice tree-decomposition of width $\text{tw}(G)$ [4].

The *clique-width* of a graph G is an important parameter that generalizes the treewidth of G [6]. A graph of clique-width d can be constructed through a sequence of the following operations on vertices that are labeled with at most d different labels. We can use (1) introducing a single vertex v of an arbitrary label i , denoted $i(v)$, (2) disjoint union of two labeled graphs, denoted $H_1 \oplus H_2$, (3) introducing edges between *all* pairs of vertices of two distinct labels i and j in a labeled graph H , denoted $\eta_{i,j}(H)$, and (4) changing the label of *all* vertices of a given label i in a labeled graph H to a different label j (i.e., collapsing the pair of labels i and j), denoted $\rho_{i \rightarrow j}(H)$. An expression describes a graph G if G the final graph given by the expression (after we remove all the labels). The *width* of an expression is the number of different labels it uses. The clique-width of a graph is the minimum width of an expression describing it.

3 Trees

Theorem 2. *The MU-VC problem can be solved in linear time $O(n)$ on trees.*

We shall be working with rooted trees where a *rooted tree* is a pair (T, r) such that T is a tree and $r \in V(T)$. Similarly, a *rooted forest* is just a pair (F, r) such that F is a forest and r is its one designated vertex. Let us define a way of representing rooted trees as algebraic terms similar to nice tree decompositions that allows us to moreover keep only one special vertex (the root) in our “bag”. First, we denote by $\text{Leaf}(r)$ the singleton rooted tree (T, r) , i.e., $V(T) = \{r\}$ and $E(T) = \emptyset$. For a rooted tree (T', r') and $r \notin V(T')$, let $\text{Extend}((T', r'), r)$ be the rooted tree (T, r) obtained from T' by adding r as the new root and joining it to r' via an edge, i.e., $V(T) = V(T') \cup \{r\}$ and $E(T) = E(T') \cup \{(r', r)\}$.

We remark that in terms of nice tree decompositions, the operation Extend corresponds to introducing the new root r and immediately afterwards forgetting the old root r' . For two rooted trees (T_1, r) and (T_2, r) such that $V(T_1) \cap V(T_2) = \{r\}$, let $\text{Join}((T_1, r), (T_2, r))$ be the rooted tree (T, r) where T is the union of T_1 and T_2 , i.e., $V(T) = V(T_1) \cup V(T_2)$ and $E(T) = E(T_1) \cup E(T_2)$. This corresponds to the usual join node in nice tree decompositions only restricted to graphs with bags of size exactly one.

We say that an expression built out of the operations Leaf , Extend , and Join is a *neat tree decomposition*. Furthermore, we say that a graph G *admits a neat tree decomposition* if there is such decomposition whose result is exactly G . It is easy to see that every rooted tree admits a neat tree decomposition that can be efficiently computed.

Observation 1. *Every rooted tree (T, r) admits a neat tree decomposition that can be, moreover, computed in time $O(|V(T)|)$.*

3.1 Polynomial algorithm

We say that a set M of vertices in a rooted forest (F, r) is of type 1 if $r \in M$ and of type 0 otherwise, i.e., if $r \notin M$. We define the *reduced size* of M to be $|M \setminus \{r\}|$, i.e., we do not count the root r . A pair of functions (α, β) where $\alpha: \{0, 1\} \rightarrow [0, n]$ and $\beta: \{0, 1\} \rightarrow [2]$ is a *characteristic* of a set $S \subseteq V(T) \setminus \{r\}$ if for both $i \in \{0, 1\}$,

- $\alpha(i)$ is the reduced size of the smallest vertex cover of type i in the rooted forest $(T - S, r)$, and
- $\beta(i) = 1$ if and only if there is a unique vertex cover of reduced size $\alpha(i)$ and type i in $(T - S, r)$.

Notice that we only consider sets S that do not contain the root. Moreover, observe that a vertex cover M of type 0 in $(T - S, r)$ can be extended to a vertex cover $M \cup \{r\}$ of the same reduced size and type 1. This implies the following inequality for the characteristic of an arbitrary set S .

Observation 2. *For a rooted tree (T, r) and a set $S \subseteq T \setminus \{r\}$ with characteristic (α, β) , we have $\alpha(1) \leq \alpha(0)$.*

Let G be the input tree and let $v \in V(G)$ be its arbitrary vertex. By Observation 1, the rooted tree (G, v) admits a neat tree decomposition ψ . The algorithm proceeds by dynamic programming along the neat tree decomposition. Specifically, for each rooted tree (T, r) generated by a subexpression of ψ , it stores a dynamic programming table $\text{DP}_T^t[\alpha, \beta]$ such that (α, β) is a possible characteristic, and the value of $\text{DP}_T^t[\alpha, \beta]$ contains the size of the smallest set of characteristic (α, β) in (T, r) , or ∞ if no such set exists.

First, we observe that the characteristic of a given set S carries enough information to decide whether S is a feasible solution to MU-VC.

Claim 1. *A set S is a feasible solution to MU-VC in a rooted tree (T, r) if and only if one of the following holds*

1. $r \notin S$ and the set S has characteristic (α, β) such that either $\alpha(0) < \alpha(1) + 1$ and $\beta(0) = 1$ or $\alpha(1) + 1 < \alpha(0)$ and $\beta(1) = 1$, or
2. $r \in S$ and the set $S \setminus \{r\}$ has characteristic (α, β) such that $\beta(1) = 1$.

Proof of the claim. First, suppose that $r \notin S$ and let (α, β) be the characteristic of S in T . If S is a feasible solution to MU-VC, then there exists a unique minimum vertex cover M in $T - S$. If M is of type 0, then $\alpha(0) = |M|$ and $\beta(0) = 1$. Furthermore, any vertex cover of type 1 must have size strictly larger than $|M|$ and thus, its reduced size is strictly larger than $|M| - 1$ and $\alpha(0) - 1 = |M| - 1 < \alpha(1)$. An analogous argument proves that if M is of type 1, then $\alpha(1) + 1 < \alpha(0)$ and $\beta(1) = 1$. Conversely, suppose that $\alpha(0) < \alpha(1) + 1$ and $\beta(0) = 1$. By definition, there is a unique minimum vertex cover M of size $\alpha(0)$ and type 0 in $T - S$. On the other hand, any vertex cover of type 1 has reduced size at least $\alpha(1) > \alpha(0) - 1$ and thus, contains at least strictly more than $\alpha(0) = |M|$ vertices. It follows that M is a unique minimum vertex cover in $T - S$. Again, an analogous argument proves that if $\alpha(1) + 1 < \alpha(0)$ and $\beta(1) = 1$, then there exists a unique minimum vertex cover in $T - S$ of size $\alpha(1) + 1$.

Now, we deal with the case when $r \in S$. Let (α, β) be the characteristic of $S \setminus \{r\}$ in T . Observe that a set $M \subseteq V(T) \setminus S$ is a vertex cover of $T - S$ if and only if $M \cup \{r\}$ is a vertex cover of $T - (S \setminus \{r\})$. It follows that $T - S$ has a unique minimum vertex cover if and only if $T - (S \setminus \{r\})$ has a unique minimum vertex cover of type 1, that is, exactly if and only if $\beta(1) = 1$. \diamond

Therefore, after we compute $\text{DP}_G^t[\cdot, \cdot]$ for the input tree G , the algorithm simply returns the minimum value out of (i) $\text{DP}_G^t[\alpha, \beta]$ such that $\alpha(0) < \alpha(1) + 1$ and $\beta(0) = 1$ or $\alpha(1) + 1 < \alpha(0)$ and $\beta(1) = 1$; and (ii) $\text{DP}_G^t[\alpha, \beta] + 1$ such that $\beta(1) = 1$.

Now, it remains to show how the individual operations act on the characteristic of a fixed set and how to use this to fill the dynamic programming tables.

Leaf node, $(T, r) = \text{Leaf}(r)$. There is only a single possible choice of a set $S \subseteq V(T) \setminus \{r\}$ as the empty set and its characteristic is $(\alpha_{\text{leaf}}, \beta_{\text{leaf}})$ where $\alpha_{\text{leaf}}(0) = \alpha_{\text{leaf}}(1) = 0$ and $\beta_{\text{leaf}}(0) = \beta_{\text{leaf}}(1) = 1$ since there are unique vertex covers of both types with reduced size 0. We set

$$\text{DP}_T^t[\alpha, \beta] = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } (\alpha, \beta) = (\alpha_{\text{leaf}}, \beta_{\text{leaf}}), \text{ and} \\ \infty & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \quad (1)$$

Join node, $(T, r) = \text{Join}((T_1, r), (T_2, r))$. Let us define a function f acting on pairs of characteristics $(\alpha_1, \beta_1), (\alpha_2, \beta_2)$ as $f((\alpha_1, \beta_1), (\alpha_2, \beta_2)) = (\alpha, \beta)$ where, for both $i \in \{0, 1\}$,

$$\begin{aligned}\alpha(i) &= \alpha_1(i) + \alpha_2(i), \text{ and} \\ \beta(i) &= \min(2, \beta_1(i) \cdot \beta_2(i)).\end{aligned}\tag{2}$$

Claim 2. Let $S_1 \subseteq V(T_1) \setminus \{r\}$ be an arbitrary set of characteristic (α_1, β_1) in T_1 , let $S_2 \subseteq V(T_2) \setminus \{r\}$ be an arbitrary set of characteristic (α_2, β_2) in T_2 , and let (α, β) be the image of $(\alpha_1, \beta_1), (\alpha_2, \beta_2)$ under f . Then $S_1 \cup S_2$ has characteristic (α, β) in T .

Proof of the claim. Let $M \subseteq V(T - S)$ and set $M_1 = M \cap V(T_1)$ and $M_2 = M \cap V(T_2)$. Observe that M is a vertex cover of $T - S$ if and only if M_1 and M_2 are vertex covers of $T_1 - S_1$ and $T_2 - S_2$ respectively and moreover, the type of M in $T - S$ is the same as the types of M_1 and M_2 in $T_1 - S_1$ and $T_2 - S_2$ respectively. It follows that for both $i \in \{0, 1\}$, M is a minimum vertex cover of type i in $T - S$ if and only if M_1 a minimum vertex cover of type i in $T_1 - S_1$ and M_2 is a minimum vertex cover of type i in $T_2 - S_2$ and hence, $\alpha(i) = \alpha_1(i) + \alpha_2(i)$. Here, it is important that $\alpha(i)$ is defined as the reduced size of the minimum vertex cover of type i and thus, we are not overcounting the root r for vertex covers of type 1. Finally, there is a unique minimum vertex cover of type i in $T - S$ if and only if there are unique minimum vertex covers of type i in both $T_1 - S_1$ and $T_2 - S_2$, that is, exactly if and only if $\beta_1(i) = \beta_2(i) = 1$. \diamond

The computation of $\text{DP}_T^t[\cdot, \cdot]$ finds the smallest sum $\text{DP}_{T_1}^t[\alpha_1, \beta_1] + \text{DP}_{T_2}^t[\alpha_2, \beta_2]$ over the preimages of (α, β) under f . That is, we set

$$\text{DP}_T^t[\alpha, \beta] = \min_{((\alpha_1, \beta_1), (\alpha_2, \beta_2)) \in f^{-1}(\alpha, \beta)} \text{DP}_{T_1}^t[\alpha_1, \beta_1] + \text{DP}_{T_2}^t[\alpha_2, \beta_2]\tag{3}$$

where we take the minimum over empty set to be ∞ .

Extend node, $(T, r) = \text{Extend}((T', r'), r)$. In the extend operation, we have two possibilities depending on whether we add the old root r' to the set S or not. Thus, we define two functions g_{id} and g_+ acting on characteristics that describe how the characteristic of a fixed set $S \subseteq V(T') \setminus \{r'\}$ translates to the characteristics of the sets S and $S \cup \{r'\}$ in T respectively. First, we define $g_{\text{id}}(\alpha', \beta') = (\alpha, \beta)^1$ where

$$\begin{aligned}\alpha(0) &= \alpha'(1) + 1 \\ \alpha(1) &= \min(\alpha'(0), \alpha'(1) + 1) \\ \beta(0) &= \beta'(1) \\ \beta(1) &= \begin{cases} \beta'(0) & \text{if } \alpha'(0) < \alpha'(1) + 1, \\ \beta'(1) & \text{if } \alpha'(0) > \alpha'(1) + 1, \text{ and} \\ 2 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}\end{aligned}\tag{4}$$

Now, we define $g_+(\alpha', \beta') = (\alpha, \beta)$ where

$$\begin{aligned}\alpha(0) &= \alpha(1) = \alpha'(1), \text{ and} \\ \beta(0) &= \beta(1) = \beta'(1).\end{aligned}\tag{5}$$

Claim 3. Let $S \subseteq V(T') \setminus \{r'\}$ be an arbitrary set with characteristic (α', β') in T' . Then S has characteristic $g_{\text{id}}(\alpha', \beta')$ in T and $S \cup \{r'\}$ has characteristic $g_+(\alpha', \beta')$ in T .

Proof of the claim. First, let (α, β) be the characteristic of S in T . Observe that $M \subseteq V(T) \setminus S$ is a vertex cover of type 0 in $T - S$ if and only if M is a vertex cover of type 1 in $T' - S$ since the edge $\{r, r'\}$ has to be covered by r' . It follows that $\alpha(0) = \alpha'(1) + 1$ and $\beta(0) = \beta'(1)$. Note that although the size of a minimum vertex cover of type 0 in $T - S$ equals the size of a minimum vertex cover of type 1 in $T' - S$, the plus 1 is due to the fact that $\alpha'(1)$ stores the *reduced* size of the vertex cover, thus not accounting for vertex r' . On the other hand, $M \subseteq V(T) \setminus S$ is a vertex cover of type 1 in $T - S$ if and only if $M \setminus \{r\}$ is a vertex cover in $T' - S$ (of either type). It follows that $\alpha(1)$ is equal to the smaller of the two values $\alpha'(0)$ and $\alpha'(1) + 1$ where the increase in the latter is again due to r' no longer being the root in T . Moreover, the

¹We omit the extra parentheses inside $g_{\text{id}}(\cdot)$ for improved readability.

minimum vertex cover of type 1 in $T - S$ is unique if and only if either (i) $\alpha(0) < \alpha(1) + 1$ and there is a unique minimum vertex cover of type 0 in $T' - S$, or (ii) $\alpha(1) + 1 < \alpha(0)$ and there is a unique minimum vertex cover of type 1 in $T' - S$. This matches exactly the definition of $g_{\text{id}}(\alpha', \beta')$.

Now, let us denote by S_+ the set $S \cup \{r'\}$ and let (α, β) be its characteristic in T . Observe that a set $M \subseteq V(T) \setminus S_+$ is a vertex cover of $T - S_+$ if and only if $M \cup \{r'\} \setminus \{r\}$ is a vertex cover of $T' - S$. It follows that for both $i \in \{0, 1\}$, $M \subseteq V(T) \setminus S_+$ is a minimum vertex cover of type i in $T - S_+$ if and only if $M \cup \{r'\} \setminus \{r\}$ is a minimum vertex cover of type 1 in $T' - S$. Observe that the reduced size of M in $T - S_+$ is exactly the same as the reduced size of $M \cup \{r'\} \setminus \{r\}$ in $T' - S$. Moreover, the minimum vertex cover of both types is unique if and only if there is a unique minimum vertex cover of type 1 in $T' - S$. We obtain $\alpha(i) = \alpha'(1)$ and $\beta(i) = \beta'(1)$ for both $i \in \{0, 1\}$ which matches the definition of $g_+(\alpha', \beta')$. \diamond

The computation of $\text{DP}_T^{\text{t}}[\cdot, \cdot]$ finds the minimum between $\text{DP}_{T'}^{\text{t}}[\alpha', \beta']$ over the preimages of (α, β) under g_{id} and $\text{DP}_{T'}^{\text{t}}[\alpha', \beta'] + 1$ over the preimages of (α, β) under g_+ . That is, we set

$$\text{DP}_T^{\text{t}}[\alpha, \beta] = \min \left(\begin{array}{c} \min_{(\alpha', \beta') \in g_{\text{id}}^{-1}(\alpha, \beta)} \text{DP}_{T'}^{\text{t}}[\alpha', \beta'], \\ \min_{(\alpha', \beta') \in g_+^{-1}(\alpha, \beta)} \text{DP}_{T'}^{\text{t}}[\alpha', \beta'] + 1 \end{array} \right) \quad (6)$$

where we take the minimum over empty set to be ∞ .

Time complexity. Let us now discuss the time complexity of the algorithm on an input tree G with n vertices. Any neat decomposition of G has clearly size $O(n)$ and the total number of possible characteristics is $O(n^2)$. Moreover, the functions f , g_{id} , and g_+ are all evaluated on a single input in constant time.

The final computation and the computation in the leaves of the neat decomposition are both done straightforwardly in $O(n^2)$ time by a single traversal of the respective table $\text{DP}_T^{\text{t}}[\cdot, \cdot]$. In an extend node, a single entry $\text{DP}_T^{\text{t}}[\alpha, \beta]$ is computed in time $O(n^2)$ by enumerating over all possible characteristics (α', β') (refer to (6)). This makes the computation of the whole table $\text{DP}_T^{\text{t}}[\alpha, \beta]$ finish in $O(n^4)$ time. Finally, the bottleneck are the join nodes where a trivial implementation would take $O(n^4)$ time per entry (refer to (3)). To improve over this, we start by initially setting every entry in the table to ∞ . Then we iterate over all possible pairs of characteristics (α_1, β_1) , (α_2, β_2) . For each pair, we first compute the value $f((\alpha_1, \beta_1), (\alpha_2, \beta_2))$, denoted by (α, β) . Afterwards, we update $\text{DP}_T^{\text{t}}[\alpha, \beta]$ to $\text{DP}_{T_1}^{\text{t}}[\alpha_1, \beta_1] + \text{DP}_{T_2}^{\text{t}}[\alpha_2, \beta_2]$ but only if it is smaller than its current value. This takes only $O(n^4)$ time in total.

Overall, the computation takes $O(n^4)$ time for each subexpression of the neat tree decomposition and thus, the whole algorithm terminates in $O(n^5)$ time.

The correctness of the algorithm follows straightforwardly from Claims 2 and 3 by a bottom-up induction over the neat tree decomposition. However, we chose to omit the full proof here and include one only for the more efficient algorithm presented in Section 3.2.

3.2 Linear algorithm

In order to speed up the algorithm of Section 3.1, we use two ideas that allow us to group the possible characteristics into constantly many classes. First, the size of the minimum vertex cover is irrelevant in MU-VC and therefore, it suffices to capture only the difference $\alpha(0) - \alpha(1)$ to see whether the minimum vertex covers of two possible types have the same size. This idea together with a reasonable implementation would already bring down the runtime to $O(n^3)$. However, we will see that it suffices to remember whether the difference $\alpha(0) - \alpha(1)$ is equal to 0, 1, or whether it is at least 2.

Formally, a *reduced characteristic* of a set $S \subseteq V(T) \setminus \{r\}$ with characteristic (α, β) in (T, r) is a pair (δ, β) where $\delta = \min(2, \alpha(0) - \alpha(1))$. By Observation 2, we see that $\delta \in \{0, 1, 2\}$. Moreover, β is one of 4 possible functions and therefore, there are only $3 \cdot 4 = 12$ possible reduced characteristics.

The algorithm follows the same scheme as before. In particular for each rooted tree (T, r) generated by a subexpression of the neat tree decomposition, it fills a dynamic programming table $\text{DP}_T^{\text{t}}[\cdot, \cdot]$ such that $\text{DP}_T^{\text{t}}[\delta, \beta]$ contains the size of the smallest set $S \subseteq V(T) \setminus \{r\}$ with reduced characteristic (δ, β) .

We start by observing that the feasibility of a given set S as a solution to MU-VC can be deduced from its reduced characteristic.

Claim 4. A set S is a feasible solution to MU-VC in a rooted tree (T, r) if and only if one of the following holds

1. $r \notin S$ and the set S has reduced characteristic (δ, β) such that either $\delta = 0$ and $\beta(0) = 1$, or $\delta = 2$ and $\beta(1) = 1$, or
2. $r \in S$ and the set $S \setminus \{r\}$ has reduced characteristic (δ, β) such that $\beta(1) = 1$.

Proof of the claim. It suffices to check that the conditions imposed on reduced characteristics exactly match the conditions imposed on full characteristics in Claim 1. \diamond

So after computing the whole table $\text{DP}_G^{\text{lt}}[\cdot, \cdot]$ for the input tree G , the algorithm returns the minimum value out of the set

$$\left\{ \text{DP}_G^{\text{lt}}[\delta, \beta] \mid \begin{array}{l} \delta = 0 \text{ and } \beta(0) = 1, \text{ or} \\ \delta = 2 \text{ and } \beta(1) = 1 \end{array} \right\} \cup \left\{ \text{DP}_G^{\text{lt}}[\delta, \beta] + 1 \mid \beta(1) = 1 \right\}.$$

The most important part is to show that reduced characteristics still allow similar scheme of computation as the full characteristics. Namely, we show how the reduced characteristic of a set changes under the Leaf, Extend, and Join operations. As before, we omit the proofs of these transformations due to space limitations.

Leaf node, $(T, r) = \text{Leaf}(r)$. We have seen that the characteristic of the only possible set $S \subseteq V(T) \setminus \{r\}$ is $(\alpha_{\text{leaf}}, \beta_{\text{leaf}})$ and thus, its reduced characteristic is $(\delta_{\text{leaf}}, \beta_{\text{leaf}})$ where $\delta_{\text{leaf}} = \alpha_{\text{leaf}}(0) - \alpha_{\text{leaf}}(1) = 0$. Again, we set

$$\text{DP}_T^{\text{lt}}[\delta, \beta] = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } (\delta, \beta) = (\delta_{\text{leaf}}, \beta_{\text{leaf}}), \text{ and} \\ \infty & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \quad (7)$$

Join node, $(T, r) = \text{Join}((T_1, r), (T_2, r))$. Let us define a function f' acting on pairs of reduced characteristics $(\delta_1, \beta_1), (\delta_2, \beta_2)$ as $f'((\delta_1, \beta_1), (\delta_2, \beta_2)) = (\delta, \beta)$ where

$$\begin{aligned} \delta &= \min(2, \delta_1 + \delta_2), \text{ and} \\ \beta(i) &= \min(2, \beta_1(i) \cdot \beta_2(i)) \text{ for both } i \in \{0, 1\}. \end{aligned} \quad (8)$$

Claim 5. Let $S_1 \subseteq V(T_1) \setminus \{r\}$ be an arbitrary set of reduced characteristic (δ_1, β_1) in T_1 , let $S_2 \subseteq V(T_2) \setminus \{r\}$ be an arbitrary set of reduced characteristic (δ_2, β_2) in T_2 . Then $S_1 \cup S_2$ has reduced characteristic $f'((\delta_1, \beta_1), (\delta_2, \beta_2))$ in T .

Proof of the claim. For both $i \in [2]$, let (α_i, β_i) be the full characteristic of S_i in T_i and moreover, let (α, β) and (δ, β) be the full and reduced characteristic of $S_1 \cup S_2$ in T respectively. First, observe that the computation of β out of β_1 and β_2 is exactly the same as in (2) and thus, its correctness follows directly from Claim 2.

We can express δ as follows

$$\begin{aligned} \delta &= \min(2, \alpha(0) - \alpha(1)) \\ &= \min(2, \alpha_1(0) + \alpha_2(0) - \alpha_1(1) - \alpha_2(1)) \\ &= \min(2, (\alpha_1(0) - \alpha_1(1)) + (\alpha_2(0) - \alpha_2(1))) \end{aligned}$$

where the first equality is the definition and the second equality is due to Claim 2.

Now, if $\delta_1 = 2$ then $\alpha_1(0) - \alpha_1(1)$ is at least 2 and the same holds for the sum $(\alpha_1(0) - \alpha_1(1)) + (\alpha_2(0) - \alpha_2(1))$ since $\alpha_2(0) - \alpha_2(1)$ is non-negative. It follows that in this case $\delta = 2$ which matches the definition of f' . The same holds analogously when $\delta_2 = 2$.

It remains to consider the case when both δ_1 and δ_2 are at most 1. In that case, we have $\delta_i = \alpha_i(0) - \alpha_i(1)$ for both i and as a consequence, $\delta = \min(2, \delta_1 + \delta_2)$ which again matches the definition of f' . \diamond

The computation of $\text{DP}_T^{\text{lt}}[\cdot, \cdot]$ follows the same scheme as in the previous case. That is, we set

$$\text{DP}_T^{\text{lt}}[\delta, \beta] = \min_{((\delta_1, \beta_1), (\delta_2, \beta_2)) \in (f')^{-1}(\delta, \beta)} \text{DP}_{T_1}^{\text{lt}}[\delta_1, \beta_1] + \text{DP}_{T_2}^{\text{lt}}[\delta_2, \beta_2] \quad (9)$$

where we take the minimum over empty set to be ∞ .

Extend node, $(T, r) = \text{Extend}((T', r'), r)$. In the extend operation, we have two possibilities depending on whether we add the old root r' to the set S or not. We again define two functions g'_{id} and g'_+ describing how the reduced characteristics of the set S and $S \cup \{r'\}$ in T depend on the reduced characteristic of a fixed set $S \subseteq V(T') \setminus \{r'\}$ in T' . First, we define g'_{id} such that $g'_{\text{id}}(\delta', \beta') = (\delta, \beta)$ where

$$\begin{aligned} \delta &= \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } \delta' \geq 1, \\ 1 & \text{otherwise, i.e., if } \delta' = 0. \end{cases} \\ \beta(0) &= \beta'(1), \text{ and} \\ \beta(1) &= \begin{cases} \beta'(0) & \text{if } \delta' = 0, \\ \beta'(1) & \text{if } \delta' \geq 2, \text{ and} \\ 2 & \text{otherwise, i.e., if } \delta' = 1. \end{cases} \end{aligned} \quad (10)$$

Now, we define g'_+ such that $g'_+(\delta', \beta') = (\delta, \beta)$ where

$$\delta = 0, \quad \beta(0) = \beta(1) = \beta'(1). \quad (11)$$

Claim 6. *Let $S \subseteq V(T') \setminus \{r'\}$ be an arbitrary set with reduced characteristic (δ', β') in T' . Then S has reduced characteristic $g'_{\text{id}}(\delta', \beta')$ in T and $S \cup \{r'\}$ has reduced characteristic $g'_+(\delta', \beta')$ in T .*

Proof of the claim. To prove the claim, it suffices to syntactically verify that the reduced characteristic obtained by g'_{id} and g'_+ in (10) and (11) matches the definition of g_{id} and g_+ in (4) and (5). The claim then follows from Claim 3.

Let (α', β') denote the full characteristic of S in T' and let (α, β) and (δ, β) denote the full and reduced characteristic of S in T respectively. If $\delta' \geq 1$, then $\alpha'(0) - \alpha'(1) \geq 1$ by definition. Therefore, we have $\alpha(0) = \alpha(1) = \alpha'(1) + 1$ by (4) and $\delta = 0$ which matches the definition of g'_{id} . On the other hand if $\delta' = 0$, then $\alpha'(0) = \alpha'(1)$ and we have $\alpha(0) = \alpha'(1) + 1$ and $\alpha(1) = \alpha'(0) = \alpha'(1)$ by (4). Hence, we obtain $\delta = 1$ which again matches the definition of g'_{id} . As for the computation of β , it suffices to notice that the conditions ' $\delta' = 0$ ', ' $\delta' \geq 2$ ', and ' $\delta' = 1$ ' are exactly equivalent to ' $\alpha'(0) < \alpha'(1) + 1$ ', ' $\alpha'(0) > \alpha'(1) + 1$ ', and ' $\alpha'(0) = \alpha'(1) + 1$ ' respectively. As a result, the function g'_{id} acts on the second coordinate of characteristics exactly in the same way as g_{id} .

Finally, it is straightforward to check that the full characteristic of $S \cup \{r'\}$ (as obtained in (5)) corresponds exactly to the reduced characteristic $g'_+(\delta', \beta')$ in (11). \diamond

The computation of $\text{DP}_T^{\text{lt}}[\cdot, \cdot]$ is again analogous to the previous algorithm. That is, we set

$$\text{DP}_T^{\text{lt}}[\delta, \beta] = \min \left(\begin{array}{c} \min_{(\alpha', \beta') \in (g'_{\text{id}})^{-1}(\alpha, \beta)} \text{DP}_{T'}^{\text{lt}}[\alpha', \beta'], \\ \min_{(\alpha', \beta') \in (g'_+)^{-1}(\alpha, \beta)} \text{DP}_{T'}^{\text{lt}}[\alpha', \beta'] + 1 \end{array} \right) \quad (12)$$

where we take the minimum over empty set to be ∞ .

This finishes the description of the computation. Now, we show the correctness of the algorithm in two separate claims. First, we show that if there is a finite value stored in the dynamic programming table $\text{DP}_T^{\text{lt}}[\cdot, \cdot]$ for a rooted tree (T, r) , there is a set $S \subseteq V(T) \setminus \{r\}$ with corresponding reduced characteristic and size.

Claim 7. *Let (T, r) be a rooted tree generated by a subexpression of the neat tree decomposition of G and let (δ, β) be arbitrary reduced characteristic. If $\text{DP}_T^{\text{lt}}[\delta, \beta] = s$ where $s \neq \infty$, then there exists a set $S \subseteq V(T) \setminus \{r\}$ of size s with reduced characteristic (δ, β) .*

Proof of the claim. We prove the claim by a bottom-up induction on the neat tree decomposition of G .

First, let $(T, r) = \text{Leaf}(r)$ be a singleton rooted tree. The only finite entry in the table $\text{DP}_T^{\text{lt}}[\cdot, \cdot]$ set in (7) is $\text{DP}_T^{\text{lt}}[\delta_{\text{leaf}}, \beta_{\text{leaf}}] = 0$. As we already argued, the reduced characteristic of the empty set in (T, r) is exactly $(\delta_{\text{leaf}}, \beta_{\text{leaf}})$ and the claim holds for leaf nodes.

Now assume that $(T, r) = \text{Join}((T_1, r), (T_2, r))$. The value $\text{DP}_T^{\text{lt}}[\delta, \beta]$ was set to s in (9) and thus, there exist reduced characteristics (δ_1, β_1) and (δ_2, β_2) such that $f((\delta_1, \beta_1), (\delta_2, \beta_2)) = (\delta, \beta)$ and $\text{DP}_{T_1}^{\text{lt}}[\delta_1, \beta_1] =$

$s_1, \text{DP}_{T_2}^{\text{lt}}[\delta_2, \beta_2] = s_2$ with $s_1 + s_2 = s$. Applying induction on T_i for both $i \in [2]$, we see that there exists a set $S_i \subseteq V(T_i) \setminus \{r\}$ of size s_i and reduced characteristic (δ_i, β_i) . We conclude by Claim 5 that $S_1 \cup S_2$ is a set of size s and reduced characteristic (δ, β) in H .

Finally, suppose that $(T, r) = \text{Extend}((T', r'), r)$. The value $\text{DP}_T^{\text{lt}}[\delta, \beta]$ was set to be s in (12) and thus, there is a reduced characteristic (δ', β') such that either

1. $g'_{\text{id}}(\delta', \beta') = (\delta, \beta)$ and $\text{DP}_{T'}^{\text{lt}}[\delta', \beta'] = s$, or
2. $g'_+(\delta', \beta') = (\delta, \beta)$ and $\text{DP}_{T'}^{\text{lt}}[\delta', \beta'] = s - 1$.

In the first case, there exists a set $S \subseteq V(T') \setminus \{r'\}$ of size s and reduced characteristic (δ', β') by induction on T' . The reduced characteristic of S in T is then precisely (δ, β) due to Claim 6. In the second case, there exists a set $S \subseteq V(T') \setminus \{r'\}$ of size $s - 1$ and reduced characteristic (δ', β') again by induction on T' . Therefore, the set $S \cup \{r'\}$ has size exactly s and reduced characteristic (δ, β) by Claim 6 in T . \diamond

Next, we show the opposite implication, that is, if there is a set S of a given reduced characteristic (δ, β) , then the computed value $\text{DP}_T^{\text{lt}}[\delta, \beta]$ is at most $|S|$.

Claim 8. *Let (T, r) be a rooted tree generated by a subexpression of the neat tree decomposition of G and let (δ, β) be an arbitrary reduced characteristic. If there exists a set $S \subseteq V(T) \setminus \{r\}$ of size s with reduced characteristic (δ, β) , then $\text{DP}_T^{\text{lt}}[\delta, \beta] \leq s$.*

Proof of the claim. We prove the claim again by a bottom-up induction on the neat tree decomposition of G .

First, let $(T, r) = \text{Leaf}(r)$ be a singleton rooted tree. The only possible choice for $S \subseteq V(T) \setminus \{r\}$ is the empty set. We already know that the reduced characteristic of the empty set is $(\delta_{\text{leaf}}, \beta_{\text{leaf}})$ and we have set $\text{DP}_T^{\text{lt}}[\delta_{\text{leaf}}, \beta_{\text{leaf}}] = 0$ in (7).

Now assume that $(T, r) = \text{Join}((T_1, r), (T_2, r))$ and for both $i \in [2]$, let S_i be the restriction of S to the vertices of T_i with a reduced characteristic (δ_i, β_i) in T_i . By applying induction on T_i and S_i for both $i \in [2]$, we see that $\text{DP}_{T_i}^{\text{lt}}[\delta_i, \beta_i] \leq |S_i|$. Claim 5 implies that $f((\delta_1, \beta_1), (\delta_2, \beta_2)) = (\delta, \beta)$ and thus, we must have set $\text{DP}_T^{\text{lt}}[\delta, \beta] \leq \text{DP}_{T_1}^{\text{lt}}[\delta_1, \beta_1] + \text{DP}_{T_2}^{\text{lt}}[\delta_2, \beta_2] \leq |S_1| + |S_2| = s$ in (9).

Finally, suppose that $(T, r) = \text{Extend}((T', r'), r)$. We consider separately two cases depending on the inclusion of r' in S . First suppose that $r' \notin S$ and let (δ', β') be the reduced characteristic of S in T' . By applying induction on T' and S , we see that $\text{DP}_{T'}^{\text{lt}}[\delta', \beta'] \leq s$. Moreover, we have $g'_{\text{id}}(\delta', \beta') = (\delta, \beta)$ by Claim 6. It follows that we must have set $\text{DP}_T^{\text{lt}}[\delta, \beta] \leq \text{DP}_{T'}^{\text{lt}}[\delta', \beta'] \leq s$ in (12). Now, suppose that $r' \in S$ and let (δ', β') be the reduced characteristic of $S \setminus \{r'\}$ in T' . By applying induction on T' and $S \setminus \{r'\}$, we see that $\text{DP}_{T'}^{\text{lt}}[\delta', \beta'] \leq s - 1$. And since Claim 6 implies that $g'_+(\delta', \beta') = (\delta, \beta)$, we must have set $\text{DP}_T^{\text{lt}}[\delta, \beta] \leq \text{DP}_{T'}^{\text{lt}}[\delta', \beta'] + 1 \leq s$ in (12). \diamond

It only remains to argue that the computation can be implemented to run in linear time.

Claim 9. *Given a tree G on input, the algorithm finishes in linear time.*

Proof of the claim. The algorithm starts by computing a neat decomposition of the input tree in $O(n)$ time. As already observed, the total number of possible reduced characteristics is 12. It follows that the table $\text{DP}_T^{\text{lt}}[\cdot, \cdot]$ in each node of the neat decomposition is of constant size. Moreover, a straightforward computation of a single entry also takes only constant time (refer to (7), (9), and (12)). It follows that the algorithm takes $O(1)$ time to compute the table $\text{DP}_T^{\text{lt}}[\cdot, \cdot]$ in every node, for a total of $O(n)$ time over the whole neat tree decomposition. \diamond

4 Treewidth

The algorithm for treewidth follows the same general scheme as the algorithms for trees in Section 3: we define a suitable characteristic of any subset S of vertices such that (i) we can decide whether S is a feasible solution just from its characteristic, (ii) the way characteristic of S changes in a node of a tree decomposition depends only on its previous characteristic, and (iii) the total number of characteristics is polynomial in the size of the input graph. We then compute by a dynamic-programming scheme in every node of a nice tree decomposition the minimum size of a set S with each possible characteristic. Note that despite the high-level idea being similar, the details of the computation are quite intricate.

Theorem 3. *The MU-VC problem can be solved by an XP-algorithm parameterised by the treewidth d of G in time $n^{O(2^d)}$.*

Proof. We first generalize rooted trees. A *terminal graph* is a pair (G, X) where G is a graph, $X \subseteq V(G)$ is a subset of its vertices, and $G[X]$ is an independent set, i.e., there are no edges between vertices of X . Note that the last part of the definition is slightly nonstandard but we shall be working only with graphs having this property. For a terminal graph (G, X) , we say that a set $M \subseteq V(G)$ is of *type D* if $M \cap X = D$. Moreover, the *reduced size* of a set $M \subseteq V(G)$ is defined as $|M \setminus X|$.

A pair of functions (α, β) where $\alpha: 2^X \rightarrow [0, n]$ and $\beta: \{0, 1\} \rightarrow [2]$ is a *characteristic* of a set $S \subseteq V(G) \setminus X$ in a terminal graph (G, X) if for every $D \subseteq X$,

- $\alpha(D)$ is the reduced size of the smallest vertex cover of type D in the terminal graph $(G - S, X)$, and
- $\beta(D) = 1$ if and only if there is a unique vertex cover of reduced size $\alpha(D)$ and type D in $(G - S, X)$.

Notice that similarly to before we only consider sets S that do not contain any vertices of X . Moreover, observe that the characteristic is well defined in the sense that there always exists a vertex cover of any type D , e.g., $V(G) \setminus X \cup D$. Finally, let us remark that a rooted tree (T, r) can be interpreted as the terminal graph $(T, \{r\})$ where the sets of type 0 and 1 in (T, r) are exactly the sets of type \emptyset and $\{r\}$ in $(T, \{r\})$ respectively.

Since we do not care about the absolute sizes of the vertex covers, we again define reduced characteristics. A *reduced characteristic* of a set $S \subseteq V(G) \setminus X$ with characteristic (α, β) in a terminal graph (G, X) is a pair of functions (δ, β) where $\delta: 2^X \rightarrow [0, n]$ such that $\delta(D) = \alpha(\emptyset) - \alpha(D)$ for every $D \subseteq X$. Note that $\alpha(\emptyset) - \alpha(D)$ is non-negative for every D because every vertex cover M of type \emptyset can be extended to a vertex cover $M \cup D$ of type D and the same reduced size. This can be seen as a direct generalization of Observation 2.

Let x be a node of a nice tree decomposition $(T, \{B_x \mid x \in V(T)\})$ of the input graph G . Let Y_x be the set of all vertices contained in the bags of the subtree rooted in t . We associate with the node x a terminal graph (G_x, B_x) such that G_x is obtained from the graph $G[Y_x]$ by removing all edges connecting two vertices of B_x . In other words, we consider an edge inside a bag only when one of its endpoints is being forgotten.

Now, we describe the high-level overview of the algorithm. We first compute a nice tree decomposition of the input graph G . The algorithm proceeds by a dynamic programming along the nice tree decomposition. Specifically for its each node x , it stores a dynamic programming table $\text{DP}_x^{\text{tw}}[\delta, \beta]$ such that (δ, β) is a possible reduced characteristic, and the value of $\text{DP}_x^{\text{tw}}[\delta, \beta]$ contains the size of the smallest set with reduced characteristic (δ, β) in (G_x, B_x) , or ∞ if no such set exists.

At this moment, it might seem pointless to focus on reduced characteristics since the full characteristics would result in an algorithm of similar efficiency and moreover, the computation would arguably be more straightforward. However, we will show later that the number of reduced characteristics drops significantly in graphs of bounded degree and therefore, the same approach yields an FPT-algorithm when we additionally parameterise by the maximum degree. Note that we could alternatively first describe the computation for full characteristic and then derive the behavior of the reduced characteristics, similar to Subsections 3.1 and 3.2. We choose to present the dynamic programming for reduced characteristics straight away.

First, we observe that the reduced characteristic of a given set S in the terminal graph (G, \emptyset) allows to decide whether S is a feasible solution to MU-VC.

Observation 3. *A set S is a feasible solution to MU-VC in a graph G if and only if the reduced characteristic (δ, β) of S in the terminal graph (G, \emptyset) satisfies $\beta(\emptyset) = 1$.*

For the root node r of the nice tree decomposition, we have $B_r = \emptyset$ and $G_r = G$ by definition. So after computing the whole table $\text{DP}_r^{\text{tw}}[\cdot, \cdot]$ for the root node, the algorithm returns the smallest entry $\text{DP}_r^{\text{tw}}[\delta, \beta]$ such that $\beta(\emptyset) = 1$.

Leaf node. Let x be a leaf node and thus, $B_x = \emptyset$. There is only one choice for both $S \subseteq V(G_x)$ and $D \subseteq B_x$, that is, the empty set. Therefore, the empty set has reduced characteristic $(\delta_\emptyset, \beta_\emptyset)$ where $\delta_\emptyset(\emptyset) = 0$ and $\beta_\emptyset(\emptyset) = 1$. We set

$$\text{DP}_x^{\text{tw}}[\delta, \beta] = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } (\delta, \beta) = (\delta_\emptyset, \beta_\emptyset), \text{ and} \\ \infty & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \quad (13)$$

Introduce node. Let x be an introduce node introducing a vertex v and let y be its child. The transformation of reduced characteristics in an introduce node is quite straightforward. We define a function f acting on reduced characteristics such that $f(\delta_y, \beta_y) = (\delta_x, \beta_x)$ where for all $D \subseteq B_x$,

$$(\delta_x(D), \beta_x(D)) = (\delta_y(D \setminus \{v\}), \beta_y(D \setminus \{v\})). \quad (14)$$

Claim 10. Let $S \subseteq V(G_y) \setminus B_y$ be an arbitrary set with reduced characteristic (δ_y, β_y) in (G_y, B_y) . Then S has reduced characteristic $f(\delta_y, \beta_y)$ in (G_x, B_x) .

Proof of the claim. Let (α_x, β_x) and (α_y, β_y) be the full characteristics of S in (G_x, B_x) and (G_y, B_y) respectively. We show that for every type $D \subseteq B_x$, we have $\alpha_x(D) = \alpha_y(D \setminus \{v\})$ and $\beta_x(D) = \beta_y(D \setminus \{v\})$. The claim then follows since

$$\delta_x(D) = \alpha_x(\emptyset) - \alpha_x(D) = \alpha_y(\emptyset \setminus \{v\}) - \alpha_y(D \setminus \{v\}) = \alpha_y(\emptyset) - \alpha_y(D \setminus \{v\}) = \delta_y(D \setminus \{v\}).$$

We split the argument into two cases. First, suppose that $v \in D$. In this case, a set $M \subseteq V(G_y - S)$ is a vertex cover of type $D \setminus \{v\}$ in $(G_y - S, B_y)$ if and only if $M \cup \{v\}$ is a vertex cover of type D in $(G_x - S, B_x)$. Moreover, the reduced size is preserved and thus, $\alpha_x(D) = \alpha_y(D \setminus \{v\})$ and $\beta_x(D) = \beta_y(D \setminus \{v\})$.

Now, assume that $v \notin D$. If M is a vertex cover of type D in $(G_x - S, B_x)$, then M is trivially also a vertex cover of type D in $(G_y - S, B_y)$ because G_y is a subgraph of G_x . On the other hand if M is a vertex cover of type D in $(G_y - S, B_y)$, then M is still a vertex cover of type D in $(G_x - S, B_x)$ because the vertex v is an isolated vertex in G_x and $E(G_x) = E(G_y)$. It follows that $\alpha_x(D) = \alpha_y(D \setminus \{v\})$ and $\beta_x(D) = \beta_y(D \setminus \{v\})$ in this case as well. \diamond

The computation of $\text{DP}_x^{\text{tw}}[\cdot, \cdot]$ follows the now familiar scheme. That is, we set

$$\text{DP}_x^{\text{tw}}[\delta, \beta] = \min_{(\delta_y, \beta_y) \in f^{-1}(\delta, \beta)} \text{DP}_y^{\text{tw}}[\delta_y, \beta_y] \quad (15)$$

where we take the minimum over empty set to be ∞ .

Join node. Let x be a join node and let y and z be its children. The way reduced characteristics are combined in join nodes remains basically the same as in the case of trees. We define a function g acting on pairs reduced characteristics such that $g((\delta_y, \beta_y), (\delta_z, \beta_z)) = (\delta_x, \beta_x)$ where

$$\begin{aligned} \delta_x(D) &= \delta_y(D) + \delta_z(D), \text{ and} \\ \beta_x(D) &= \min(2, \beta_y(D) \cdot \beta_z(D)). \end{aligned} \quad (16)$$

Claim 11. Let $S_y \subseteq V(G_y) \setminus B_y$ be an arbitrary set of reduced characteristic (δ_y, β_y) in (G_y, B_y) and let $S_z \subseteq V(G_z) \setminus B_z$ be an arbitrary set of reduced characteristic (δ_z, β_z) in (G_z, B_z) . Then $S_y \cup S_z$ has reduced characteristic $g((\delta_y, \beta_y), (\delta_z, \beta_z))$ in (G_x, B_x) .

Proof of the claim. Let (α_x, β_x) be the full characteristics of $S_x \cup S_y$ in (G_x, B_x) and let (α_y, β_y) and (α_z, β_z) be the full characteristic of S_y in (G_y, B_y) and S_z in (G_z, B_z) respectively. We show that for every type $D \subseteq B_x$, we have $\alpha_x(D) = \alpha_y(D) + \alpha_z(D)$ and $\beta_x(D) = \min(2, \beta_y(D) \cdot \beta_z(D))$. The claim then follows since

$$\delta_x(D) = \alpha_x(\emptyset) - \alpha_x(D) = \alpha_y(\emptyset) + \alpha_z(\emptyset) - \alpha_y(D) - \alpha_z(D) = \alpha_y(\emptyset) - \alpha_y(D) = \delta_y(D) + \delta_z(D).$$

The rest of the proof is analogous to the proof of Claim 2. Let $M \subseteq V(G_x - (S_y \cup S_z))$ and set $M_y = M \cap V(G_y)$ and $M_z = M \cap V(G_z)$. We observe that for any $D \subseteq B_x$, M is a minimum vertex cover of type D in $(G_x - S, B_x)$ if and only if M_y is a minimum vertex cover of type D in $(G_y - S_y, B_y)$ and M_z is a minimum vertex cover of type D in $(G_z - S_z, B_z)$ and hence, $\alpha_x(D) = \alpha_y(D) + \alpha_z(D)$. It is again important here that we store the reduced sizes in characteristics because in terms of real sizes, we have $|M| = |M_y| + |M_z| - |D|$. Finally, it follows that there is a unique minimum vertex cover of type D in $(G_x - (S_y \cup S_z), B_x)$ if and only if there are unique minimum vertex covers of type D in both $(G_y - S_y, B_y)$ and $(G_z - S_z, B_z)$, that is, exactly if and only if $\beta_y(D) = \beta_z(D) = 1$. \diamond

The algorithm finds the minimum value $\text{DP}_y^{\text{tw}}[\delta_y, \beta_y] + \text{DP}_z^{\text{tw}}[\delta_z, \beta_z]$ over all preimages (δ_y, β_y) and (δ_z, β_z) under g . That is, we set

$$\text{DP}_x^{\text{tw}}[\delta, \beta] = \min_{((\delta_y, \beta_y), (\delta_z, \beta_z)) \in g^{-1}(\delta, \beta)} \text{DP}_y^{\text{tw}}[\delta_y, \beta_y] + \text{DP}_z^{\text{tw}}[\delta_z, \beta_z] \quad (17)$$

where we take the minimum over empty set to be ∞ .

Forget node. Let x be a forget node introducing a vertex v and let y be its child. As we already discussed, the computation in forget node is more complicated because we have to both (i) take care of the edges between v and the bag B_x , and (ii) consider the situation when v belongs to the set S . Thus, we define two functions acting on characteristics that describe how the reduced characteristic of a fixed set $S \subseteq V(G_y) \setminus B_y$ translates to the reduced characteristics of the set S and $S \cup \{v\}$ in (G_x, B_x) . In the first case, the characteristic also depends on the neighborhood of v within B_x and therefore, we define the transformation specifically for the vertex v . For any set $D \subseteq B_x$, let D_+ denote the set $D \cup \{v\}$. We define h_{id}^v such that $h_{\text{id}}^v(\delta_y, \beta_y) = (\delta_x, \beta_x)$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} \delta_x(D) &= \begin{cases} \delta_y(D) - \gamma & \text{if } N_G(v) \cap B_x \subseteq D \text{ and} \\ & \delta_y(D_+) \leq \delta_y(D) + 1, \\ \delta_y(D_+) - \gamma - 1 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \\ \beta_x(D) &= \begin{cases} \beta_y(D) & \text{if } N_G(v) \cap B_x \subseteq D \text{ and} \\ & \delta_y(D_+) < \delta_y(D) + 1, \\ \beta_y(D_+) & \text{if } N_G(v) \cap B_x \not\subseteq D \text{ or} \\ & \delta_y(D_+) > \delta_y(D) + 1, \\ 2 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \end{aligned} \quad (18)$$

where

$$\gamma = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } N_G(v) \cap B_x = \emptyset \text{ and} \\ & \delta_y(\{v\}) \leq 1, \text{ and} \\ \delta_y(\{v\}) - 1 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \quad (19)$$

Now, we define h_+ such that $h_+(\delta_y, \beta_y) = (\delta_x, \beta_x)$ where

$$\begin{aligned} \delta_x(D) &= \delta_y(D \cup \{v\}) - \delta_y(\{v\}), \text{ and} \\ \beta_x(D) &= \beta_y(D \cup \{v\}). \end{aligned} \quad (20)$$

Claim 12. Let $S \subseteq V(G_y) \setminus B_y$ be an arbitrary set with reduced characteristic (δ_y, β_y) in (G_y, B_y) . Then the reduced characteristics of S in (G_x, B_x) is $h_{\text{id}}^v(\delta_y, \beta_y)$.

Proof of the claim. We first focus on the full characteristics. To that end, let (α_x, β_x) and (α_y, β_y) be the full characteristic of S in (G_x, B_x) and in (G_y, B_y) respectively. Fix a type $D \subseteq B_x$ and let D_+ denote the set $D \cup \{v\}$ as before. Our first goal is to show that

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha_x(D) &= \begin{cases} \alpha_y(D_+) + 1 & \text{if } N_{G_x}(v) \cap B_x \not\subseteq D, \\ \min \left(\begin{array}{l} \alpha_y(D), \\ \alpha_y(D_+) + 1 \end{array} \right) & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \\ \beta_x(D) &= \begin{cases} \beta_y(D) & \text{if } N_{G_x}(v) \cap B_x \subseteq D \text{ and} \\ & \alpha_y(D) < \alpha_y(D_+) + 1, \\ \beta_y(D_+) & \text{if } N_{G_x}(v) \cap B_x \not\subseteq D \text{ or} \\ & \alpha_y(D) > \alpha_y(D_+) + 1, \\ 2 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \end{aligned} \quad (21)$$

We split the argument into the two cases depending on the neighborhood of v within B_x .

First, suppose that $N_{G_x}(v) \not\subseteq D$, i.e., there exists a neighbor w of v in the bag B_x outside of D . In this case, every vertex cover of type D in $(G_x - S, B_x)$ must contain the vertex v to cover the edge $\{v, w\}$. It follows that $M \subseteq V(G_x) \setminus S$ is a vertex cover of type D in $(G_x - S, B_x)$ if and only if M is a vertex cover of type D_+ in $(G_y - S, B_y)$. The reduced size of M increases when v leaves the bag and thus, we get $\alpha_x(D) = \alpha_y(D_+) + 1$. Moreover, the uniqueness is carried over and $\beta_x(D) = \beta_y(D_+)$. Thus, the expression (21) holds for this case.

Now, suppose that $N_{G_x}(v) \subseteq D$, i.e., all neighbors of v in the bag B_x are contained in D . In this case, a set $M \subseteq V(G_x) \setminus S$ is a vertex cover of type D in $(G_x - S, B_x)$ if and only if M is vertex cover of type D or D_+ in $(G_y - S, B_y)$. It follows that a minimum vertex cover M of type D in $(G_x - S, B_x)$ has reduced size either $\alpha_y(D)$ or $\alpha_y(D_+) + 1$ depending on which of the two is smaller. Moreover, there is a unique minimum vertex cover of type D if and only if either (i) $\alpha_y(D) < \alpha_y(D_+) + 1$ and there is a unique

minimum cover of type D in $(G_y - S, B_y)$, or (ii) $\alpha_y(D_+) + 1 < \alpha_y(D)$ and there is a unique minimum cover of type D_+ in $(G_y - S, B_y)$. This finishes proof of the expression (21).

Our next step is to deduce the correctness of the computation in (18) from (21). We start by showing that the conditions are equivalent. By simple manipulation of terms, we get

$$\begin{aligned}\alpha_y(D) - \alpha_y(D_+) &= \alpha_y(D) - \alpha_y(D_+) + \alpha_y(\emptyset) - \alpha_y(\emptyset) \\ &= \delta_y(D_+) - \delta_y(D).\end{aligned}$$

It follows that $\alpha_y(D) < \alpha_y(D_+) + 1$ if and only if $\delta_y(D_+) < \delta_y(D) + 1$, and similarly $\alpha_y(D_+) + 1 < \alpha_y(D)$ if and only if $\delta_y(D_+) > \delta_y(D) + 1$. This already shows that the computation of β_x in (18) is equivalent to (21).

Next, we show that the value γ set in (19) is exactly equal to $\alpha_y(\emptyset) - \alpha_x(\emptyset)$. By (21), we have $\alpha_x(\emptyset) = \alpha_y(\emptyset)$ if and only if $N_{G_x}(v) \cap B_x = \emptyset$ and $\alpha_y(\emptyset) \leq \alpha_y(\{v\}) + 1$. As we have seen, the condition $\alpha_y(\emptyset) \leq \alpha_y(\{v\}) + 1$ exactly equivalent to $\delta_y(\{v\}) \leq \delta_y(\emptyset) + 1 = 1$ and we indeed get $\gamma = 0 = \alpha_y(\emptyset) - \alpha_x(\emptyset)$ in this case. Otherwise, we have $\alpha_x(\emptyset) = \alpha_y(\{v\}) + 1$ again by (21) and we obtain

$$\alpha_y(\emptyset) - \alpha_x(\emptyset) = \alpha_y(\emptyset) - \alpha_y(\{v\}) - 1 = \delta_y(\{v\}) - 1.$$

Plugging this into $\delta_y(D) - \gamma$ for arbitrary D , we get

$$\begin{aligned}\delta_y(D) - \gamma &= \alpha_y(\emptyset) - \alpha_y(D) - \alpha_y(\emptyset) + \alpha_x(\emptyset) \\ &= \alpha_x(\emptyset) - \alpha_y(D).\end{aligned}$$

It follows that if $N_{G_x}(v) \cap B_x \subseteq D$ and $\alpha_y(D) \leq \alpha_y(D_+) + 1$, then $\alpha_x(D) = \alpha_y(D)$ by (21) and thus, we get

$$\delta_y(D) - \gamma = \alpha_x(\emptyset) - \alpha_y(D) = \alpha_x(\emptyset) - \alpha_x(D) = \delta_x(D).$$

Otherwise, we have $\alpha_x(D) = \alpha_y(D_+) + 1$ by (21) and we see that

$$\delta_y(D_+) - \gamma - 1 = \alpha_x(\emptyset) - \alpha_y(D_+) - 1 = \alpha_x(\emptyset) - \alpha_x(D) = \delta_x(D).$$

Both cases exactly match the computation of δ_x in (18) which finishes the proof. \diamond

Claim 13. *Let $S \subseteq V(G_y) \setminus B_y$ be an arbitrary set with reduced characteristic (δ_y, β_y) in (G_y, B_y) . Then the reduced characteristics of $S \cup \{v\}$ in (G_x, B_x) is $h_+(\delta_y, \beta_y)$.*

Proof of the claim. Let S_+ denote the set $S \cup \{v\}$ and let (α_x, β_x) and (α_y, β_y) be the full characteristics of S_+ in (G_x, B_x) and S in (G_y, B_y) respectively.

Observe that M is a vertex cover in $(G_x - S_+, B_x)$ if and only if $M \cup \{v\}$ is a vertex cover in $(G_y - S, B_y)$. Moreover, their reduced sizes are the same. It follows that M is a minimum vertex cover of type D in $(G_x - S_+, B_x)$ if and only if $M \cup \{v\}$ is a minimum vertex cover in $(G_y - S, B_y)$. Therefore, we get that $\alpha_x(D) = \alpha_y(D_+)$ and $\beta_x(D) = \beta_y(D_+)$. This already matches the computation of β_x in (20). Finally, we see that

$$\delta_x(D) = \alpha_x(\emptyset) - \alpha_x(D) = \alpha_y(\{v\}) - \alpha_y(D_+) = \alpha_y(\{v\}) - \alpha_y(D_+) + \alpha_y(\emptyset) - \alpha_y(\emptyset) = \delta_y(D_+) - \delta_y(\{v\})$$

which again matches the computation in (20). This finishes the proof of this claim. \diamond

The computation of $\text{DP}_r^{\text{tw}}[\cdot, \cdot]$ is analogous to the computation of $\text{DP}^{\text{lt}}[\cdot, \cdot]$ in extend nodes. We set

$$\text{DP}_x^{\text{tw}}[\delta, \beta] = \min \left(\min_{(\delta_y, \beta_y) \in h_{\text{id}}^{-1}(\delta, \beta)} \text{DP}_y^{\text{tw}}[\delta_y, \beta_y], \min_{(\delta_y, \beta_y) \in h_+^{-1}(\delta, \beta)} \text{DP}_z^{\text{tw}}[\delta_y, \beta_y] + 1 \right) \quad (22)$$

where we take the minimum over empty set to be ∞ .

We can finally prove the correctness of the algorithm, again split into two separate claims.

Claim 14. *Let x be a node of the nice tree decomposition of G and let (δ, β) be an arbitrary reduced characteristic. If $\text{DP}_x^{\text{tw}}[\delta, \beta] = s$ where $s \neq \infty$, then there exists a set $S \subseteq V(G_x) \setminus B_x$ of size s with reduced characteristic (δ, β) .*

Proof of the claim. We prove the claim by a bottom-up induction on the nice tree decomposition of G .

First, let x be a leaf node. The only finite entry in the table $\text{DP}_x^{\text{tw}}[\cdot, \cdot]$ set in (13) is $\text{DP}_x^{\text{tw}}[\delta_\emptyset, \beta_\emptyset] = 0$. As we already argued, the reduced characteristic of the empty set in (G_x, \emptyset) is exactly $(\delta_\emptyset, \beta_\emptyset)$ and the claim holds for leaf nodes.

Now assume that x is an introduce node with a child y . The value $\text{DP}_x^{\text{tw}}[\delta, \beta]$ was set to s in (15) and hence, there exists reduced characteristic (δ_y, β_y) such that $f(\delta_y, \beta_y) = (\delta, \beta)$ and $\text{DP}_y^{\text{tw}}[\delta_y, \beta_y] = s$. Applying induction on y and (δ_y, β_y) , we see that there exists a set $S \subseteq V(G_y) \setminus B_y$ of size s and reduced characteristic (δ_y, β_y) . We conclude by Claim 10 that S is a set of size s and reduced characteristic (δ, β) in (G_x, B_x) .

Next, assume that x is a join node with children y and z . The value $\text{DP}_x^{\text{tw}}[\delta, \beta]$ was set to s in (17) and hence, there exists reduced characteristics (δ_y, β_y) and (δ_z, β_z) such that $g((\delta_y, \beta_y), (\delta_z, \beta_z)) = (\delta, \beta)$ and we have $\text{DP}_y^{\text{tw}}[\delta_y, \beta_y] = s_y$, $\text{DP}_z^{\text{tw}}[\delta_z, \beta_z] = s_z$ with $s_y + s_z = s$. Applying induction on both y and z , we see that there exist sets $S_y \subseteq V(G_y) \setminus B_y$ of size s_y and reduced characteristic (δ_y, β_y) and $S_z \subseteq V(G_z) \setminus B_z$ of size s_z and reduced characteristic (δ_z, β_z) respectively. Claim 11 implies that $S_y \cup S_z$ is a set of size s and reduced characteristic (δ, β) in (G_x, B_x) .

Finally, suppose that x is a forget node forgetting a vertex v , and let y its child. The value $\text{DP}_x^{\text{tw}}[\delta, \beta]$ was set to be s in (22) and therefore, there is a reduced characteristic (δ_y, β_y) such that either

1. $h_{\text{id}}(\delta_y, \beta_y) = (\delta, \beta)$ and $\text{DP}_y^{\text{tw}}[\delta_y, \beta_y] = s$, or
2. $h_+^v(\delta_y, \beta_y) = (\delta, \beta)$ and $\text{DP}_y^{\text{tw}}[\delta_y, \beta_y] = s - 1$.

In the first case, there exists a set $S \subseteq V(G_y) \setminus B_y$ of size s and reduced characteristic (δ_y, β_y) by induction on y . The reduced characteristic of S in (G_x, B_x) is then precisely (δ, β) due to Claim 12. In the second case, there exists a set $S \subseteq V(G_y) \setminus B_y$ of size $s - 1$ and reduced characteristic (δ_y, β_y) again by induction on y . Therefore, the set $S \cup \{v\}$ has size exactly s and reduced characteristic (δ, β) by Claim 12 in (G_x, B_x) . \diamond

Claim 15. *Let x be a node of the nice tree decomposition of G and let (δ, β) be an arbitrary reduced characteristic. If there exists a set $S \subseteq V(G_x) \setminus B_x$ of size s with reduced characteristic (δ, β) , then $\text{DP}_x^{\text{tw}}[\delta, \beta] \leq s$.*

Proof of the claim. We again proceed by a bottom-up induction on the nice tree decomposition of G .

First, let x be a leaf node. The only possible choice for S is the empty set. We already argued that the reduced characteristic of the empty set is $(\delta_\emptyset, \beta_\emptyset)$ and we have set $\text{DP}_x^{\text{tw}}[\delta_\emptyset, \beta_\emptyset] = 0$ in (13).

Now assume that x is an introduce node with a child y . We have $S \subseteq V(G_y) \setminus B_y$ and let (δ_y, β_y) be its reduced characteristic in (G_y, B_y) . By applying induction on y and S , we see that $\text{DP}_y^{\text{tw}}[\delta_y, \beta_y] \leq s$. It follows by Claim 10 that $f(\delta_y, \beta_y) = (\delta, \beta)$ and thus, we must have set $\text{DP}_x^{\text{tw}}[\delta, \beta] \leq \text{DP}_y^{\text{tw}}[\delta_y, \beta_y] = s$ in (15).

Now assume that x is a join node with children y and z . Let S_y be the restriction of S to the vertices of G_y with a reduced characteristic (δ_y, β_y) in (G_y, B_y) and similarly, let S_z be the restriction of S to the vertices of G_z with a reduced characteristic (δ_z, β_z) in (G_z, B_z) . By applying induction on both y with S_y and z with S_z , we see that $\text{DP}_y^{\text{tw}}[\delta_y, \beta_y] \leq |S_y|$ and $\text{DP}_z^{\text{tw}}[\delta_z, \beta_z] \leq |S_z|$. Claim 11 implies that $g((\delta_y, \beta_y), (\delta_z, \beta_z)) = (\delta, \beta)$ and thus, we must have set $\text{DP}_x^{\text{tw}}[\delta, \beta] \leq \text{DP}_y^{\text{tw}}[\delta_y, \beta_y] + \text{DP}_z^{\text{tw}}[\delta_z, \beta_z] \leq |S_y| + |S_z| = s$ in (17).

Finally, suppose that x is a forget node forgetting a vertex v , and let y be its child. First, assume that $v \notin S$ and let (δ_y, β_y) be the reduced characteristic of S in (G_y, B_y) . By applying induction on y and S , we see that $\text{DP}_y^{\text{tw}}[\delta_y, \beta_y] \leq s$. Moreover by Claim 12, we have $h_{\text{id}}(\delta_y, \beta_y) = (\delta, \beta)$. It follows that we must have set $\text{DP}_x^{\text{tw}}[\delta, \beta] \leq \text{DP}_y^{\text{tw}}[\delta_y, \beta_y] \leq s$ in (22). Otherwise, we have $v \in S$ and let (δ_y, β_y) be the reduced characteristic of $S \setminus \{v\}$ in (G_y, B_y) . By applying induction on y and $S \setminus \{v\}$, we see that $\text{DP}_y^{\text{tw}}[\delta_y, \beta_y] \leq s - 1$. Therefore, we must have set $\text{DP}_x^{\text{tw}}[\delta, \beta] \leq \text{DP}_y^{\text{tw}}[\delta_y, \beta_y] + 1 \leq s$ in (22) since $h_+^v(\delta_y, \beta_y) = (\delta, \beta)$ by Claim 12. \diamond

It remains to argue about the time complexity. The total number of reduced characteristic is $(n + 1)^{2^w} \cdot 2^{2^w} = n^{O(2^w)}$. It follows that the algorithm computes the table $\text{DP}_x^{\text{tw}}[\cdot, \cdot]$ in any node x in time $n^{O(2^w)}$ in all (13), (15), (17) and (22). This makes the total running time over $O(w \cdot n)$ nodes of the nice tree decomposition still $n^{O(2^w)}$. \square

Furthermore, we show that the same dynamic programming scheme yields an FPT-algorithm when we additionally parameterise by the maximum degree of the input graph.

Theorem 4. *The MU-VC problem can be solved by an FPT-algorithm parameterised by the treewidth w of G plus the maximum degree Δ in time $\Delta^{O(2^w)} \cdot n$.*

Proof. The crucial observation is that in low-degree graphs, the sizes of minimum vertex covers of different types cannot be too far away from each other.

Claim 16. *Let (G, X) be a terminal graph and let $S \subseteq V(G) \setminus X$ be a set of its vertices with reduced characteristic (δ, β) . Then we have $0 \leq \delta(D) \leq \Delta \cdot |D|$ for every $D \subseteq X$ where Δ is the maximum degree of G .*

Proof of the claim. Let (α, β) be the full characteristic of S in (G, X) . We have already observed that $0 \leq \alpha(\emptyset) - \alpha(D) = \delta(D)$. This holds since for a minimum vertex cover M of type \emptyset , the set $M \cup D$ is a vertex cover of type D and the exact same reduced size.

On the other hand, let M be a minimum vertex cover of type D in (G, X) , i.e., the reduced size of M is $\alpha(D)$. Let $M' = M \setminus D \cup N_G(D)$ be the set obtained from M by replacing vertices from D with all their neighbors. The set M' is a vertex cover of type \emptyset in (G, X) because we require X to be an independent set. Moreover, the reduced size of M' is at most $|M| + \Delta \cdot |D|$ as every vertex in D has at most Δ neighbors. It follows that $\alpha(\emptyset) \leq \alpha(D) + \Delta \cdot |D|$ and the claim holds. \diamond

Due to Claim 16, the total number of reduced characteristic in a terminal graph (G, X) is at most $(\Delta \cdot w)^{O(2^w)} = \Delta^{O(2^w)}$. Therefore, the computation of every table $\text{DP}_t^{\text{tw}}[\cdot, \cdot]$ in Theorem 3 finishes in $\Delta^{O(2^w)}$ time. The total running time is $\Delta^{O(2^w)} \cdot n$ since the nice tree decomposition has size $O(w \cdot n)$. \square

5 Clique-width

Theorem 5. *The MU-VC problem can be solved by an XP-algorithm parameterised by the clique-width d of G in $n^{O(2^d)}$ time.*

Proof. The algorithm follows a scheme analogous to the algorithms in previous sections. Our first goal is, thus, to define a suitable definition of characteristics of sets.

For a subset of vertices X of a d -labeled graph G , we denote by $\text{full}_G(X)$ the set of labels from $[d]$ that are fully contained within X , i.e., $\text{full}_G(X) = \{i \in [d] \mid \text{lab}_G^{-1}(i) \subseteq X\}$. Observe that if there are no vertices in G with some label i then $i \in \text{full}_G(X)$ for every set X . Conversely for $I \subseteq [d]$, we say that T is a *set of type I* if $\text{full}_G(T) = I$. Additionally for a type $I \subseteq [d]$ and a set T we say that T *extends type I* if $I \subseteq \text{full}_G(T)$. For any d -labeled graph H and $I \subseteq [d]$, let $\mu_H(I)$ be the size of a minimum vertex cover of type I in H if it exists and ∞ otherwise.

A pair of functions (α, β) where $\alpha: 2^{[d]} \rightarrow [0, n]$ and $\beta: 2^{[d]} \rightarrow [2]$ is a *characteristic* of a set $S \subseteq V(G)$ if for every $I \subseteq [d]$,

- $\alpha(I) = \min \{\mu_{G-S}(J) \mid I \subseteq J \subseteq [d]\}$, i.e., the size of the smallest vertex cover that extends type I in $G - S$, and
- $\beta(I) = 1$ if and only if there is a unique vertex cover of size $\alpha(I)$ that extends type I in $G - S$.

A characteristic (α, β) is *enforceable in G* if there exists a set $S \subseteq V(G)$ with characteristic (α, β) . Let us observe a subtle difference from the characteristics we defined on trees and bounded-treewidth graphs that will play an important role later. In previous algorithms, all vertex covers of the graph G were partitioned into disjoint sets depending on their interaction with the root or bag respectively, and the function α simply stored the size of a minimum vertex cover in each respective group. This is not true for the definition above, because a single vertex cover of type J might affect the value $\alpha(I)$ for all types I such that $I \subseteq J$.

The algorithm proceeds by a dynamic programming along a given clique-width d -expression ψ of G . Specifically, for each d -labeled graph H generated by a subexpression of ψ , it stores a dynamic programming table $\text{DP}_H^{\text{cw}}[\alpha, \beta]$ such that (α, β) is a possible characteristic, and the value of $\text{DP}_H^{\text{cw}}[\alpha, \beta]$ contains the size of the smallest set of characteristic (α, β) in H , or ∞ if no such set exists.

Observe that a set S with a characteristic (α, β) is a feasible solution to MU-VC if and only if $\beta(\emptyset) = 1$ because every vertex cover extends the empty type. Therefore after we compute $\text{DP}_G^{\text{cw}}[\cdot, \cdot]$ for the input graph, the algorithm simply returns the minimum value $\text{DP}_G^{\text{cw}}[\alpha, \beta]$ over all characteristics with $\beta(\emptyset) = 1$.

Now, we describe the computation separately for each of the operations allowed in a clique-width d -expression.

Singleton $H = i(v)$. There are only two possible choices of S in the singleton graph H . These have the two characteristics $(\alpha_{\text{in}}^i, \beta_{\text{in}}^i)$ and $(\alpha_{\text{out}}^i, \beta_{\text{out}}^i)$ where $\beta_{\text{in}}^i(I) = \beta_{\text{out}}^i(I) = 1$ for every $I \subseteq [d]$ and $\alpha_{\text{in}}^i, \alpha_{\text{out}}^i$ are defined as follows

$$\alpha_{\text{in}}^i(I) = 0, \quad \alpha_{\text{out}}^i(I) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } i \in I, \text{ and} \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

The characteristic $(\alpha_{\text{in}}^i, \beta_{\text{in}}^i)$ corresponds to the set $\{v\}$ while $(\alpha_{\text{out}}^i, \beta_{\text{out}}^i)$ corresponds to the empty set. No other characteristic is enforceable in H and we set

$$\text{DP}_H^{\text{cw}}[\alpha, \beta] = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } (\alpha, \beta) = (\alpha_{\text{in}}^i, \beta_{\text{in}}^i), \\ 0 & \text{if } (\alpha, \beta) = (\alpha_{\text{out}}^i, \beta_{\text{out}}^i), \text{ and} \\ \infty & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \quad (23)$$

Joining labels with edges, $H = \eta_{i,j}(H')$. For each pair of pairwise different $i, j \in [d]$, we define a function $f_{i,j}$ acting on characteristics such that $f_{i,j}(\alpha', \beta') = (\alpha, \beta)$ where

$$\alpha(I) = \begin{cases} \alpha'(I) & \text{if } I \cap \{i, j\} \neq \emptyset \\ \min(\alpha'(I \cup \{i\}), \alpha'(I \cup \{j\})) & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

$$\beta(I) = \begin{cases} \beta'(I) & \text{if } I \cap \{i, j\} \neq \emptyset, \\ \beta'(I \cup \{i\}) & \text{if } I \cap \{i, j\} = \emptyset \text{ and} \\ & \alpha'(I \cup \{i\}) < \alpha'(I \cup \{j\}), \\ \beta'(I \cup \{j\}) & \text{if } I \cap \{i, j\} = \emptyset \text{ and} \\ & \alpha'(I \cup \{i\}) > \alpha'(I \cup \{j\}), \\ 1 & \text{if } I \cap \{i, j\} = \emptyset, \alpha'(I \cup \{i\}) = \\ & \alpha'(I \cup \{j\}) = \alpha'(I \cup \{i, j\}) \\ & \text{and } \beta'(I \cup \{i, j\}) = 1, \\ 2 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Let us show that the function $f_{i,j}$ describes precisely the effect of the operation $\eta_{i,j}$ on a characteristic of a fixed set S .

Claim 17. *Let $S \subseteq V(H')$ be an arbitrary set with characteristic (α', β') in H' and let (α, β) be the image of (α', β') under $f_{i,j}$. Then S has characteristic (α, β) in H .*

Proof of the claim. Let (α'', β'') denote the characteristic of S in H . Our aim is to show that $(\alpha'', \beta'') = (\alpha, \beta)$. The labels do not change between H' and H . Therefore a set $T \subseteq V(H')$ is a set of type I in $H' - S$ if and only if it is a set of type I in $H - S$. However, H contains extra edges and thus, some vertex covers of $H' - S$ are no longer vertex covers of $H - S$. In particular, observe that any vertex cover of $H - S$ must contain all vertices with label i or all vertices with label j . Note that this holds even when either one or both of the labels do not appear in $H - S$.

First, let $I \subseteq [d]$ be a set such that $I \cap \{i, j\} \neq \emptyset$. We claim that a set $T \subseteq V(H')$ is a vertex cover of type I in $H' - S$ if and only if T is a vertex cover of type I in $H - S$. On one hand, every vertex cover of type I in $H - S$ is a vertex cover of type I in $H' - S$ since $H - S$ is obtained by adding edges to $H' - S$. For the other direction, observe that every vertex cover T of type I in $H' - S$ also covers the extra edges in $H - S$ because T contains either all vertices with label i or all vertices with label j . Therefore, the set of vertex covers extending type I in $H - S$ is exactly the same as the set of vertex covers extending type I in $H' - S$ and we have $\alpha''(I) = \alpha'(I) = \alpha(I)$ and $\beta''(I) = \beta'(I) = \beta(I)$.

Now, suppose that $I \subseteq [d]$ has an empty intersection with $\{i, j\}$. First, we claim that a vertex cover T extends type I in $H - S$ if and only if it extends type $I \cup \{i\}$ or $I \cup \{j\}$ in $H' - S$. This then immediately implies that $\alpha''(I) = \min(\alpha'(I \cup \{i\}), \alpha'(I \cup \{j\})) = \alpha(I)$. Let T be a vertex cover of type $J \supseteq I$ in

$H - S$. We know that it is a set of type J in $H' - S$. As we observed, we have necessarily $i \in J$ or $j \in J$. In the first case, we have $J \supseteq I \cup \{i\}$ and T extends type $I \cup \{i\}$ in $H' - S$ and analogously in the second case, T extends type $I \cup \{j\}$ in $H' - S$. For the other direction, notice that any vertex cover T extending type $I \cup \{i\}$ or $I \cup \{j\}$ in $H' - S$ remains a vertex cover of $H - S$ since it covers all the extra edges in $H - S$.

However, it remains to argue about the uniqueness. This is significantly more intricate because the set of vertex covers of $H' - S$ extending $I \cup \{i\}$ is not disjoint from the set of vertex covers extending $I \cup \{j\}$. In fact, their intersection contains exactly all the vertex covers extending the type $I \cup \{i, j\}$. For $\ell \in \{i, j\}$, let \mathcal{T}_ℓ denote the set of all vertex covers of the size $\alpha(I)$ extending $I \cup \{\ell\}$ in $H' - S$. By definition, we have $\beta''(I) = 1$ if and only if $|\mathcal{T}_i \cup \mathcal{T}_j| = 1$. If $\alpha'(I \cup \{i\}) < \alpha'(I \cup \{j\})$, then the set \mathcal{T}_j is empty and $\beta''(I) = \beta'(I \cup \{i\}) = \beta(I)$. Conversely if $\alpha'(I \cup \{i\}) > \alpha'(I \cup \{j\})$, then \mathcal{T}_i is empty and $\beta''(I) = \beta'(I \cup \{j\}) = \beta(I)$. The most complicated situation occurs when $\alpha'(I \cup \{i\}) = \alpha'(I \cup \{j\})$ and both \mathcal{T}_i and \mathcal{T}_j are nonempty. In this case, we claim that $|\mathcal{T}_i \cup \mathcal{T}_j| = 1$ if and only if $\alpha'(I \cup \{i, j\}) = \alpha'(I \cup \{i\}) = \alpha'(I \cup \{j\})$ and $\beta'(I \cup \{i, j\}) = 1$. It is then immediate that $\beta''(I) = \beta(I)$.

First suppose that $|\mathcal{T}_i \cup \mathcal{T}_j| = 1$ and let T be the only vertex cover in $\mathcal{T}_i \cup \mathcal{T}_j$. Clearly, we have $\alpha'(I \cup \{i\}) = \alpha'(I \cup \{j\}) = |T|$ and moreover, also $|T| = \alpha'(I \cup \{i, j\})$. Observe that any vertex cover extending $I \cup \{i, j\}$ also extends both types $I \cup \{i\}$ and $I \cup \{j\}$. Consequently, T must be a unique vertex cover of size $\alpha(I)$ extending $I \cup \{i, j\}$ in $H' - S$ and $\beta'(I \cup \{i, j\}) = 1$. On the other hand if $\beta'(I \cup \{i, j\}) = 1$, then there exists a unique vertex cover T' of size $\alpha'(I \cup \{i, j\})$ extending $I \cup \{i, j\}$ in $H' - S$. But since we have $\alpha'(I \cup \{i, j\}) = \alpha'(I \cup \{i\}) = \alpha'(I \cup \{j\})$ it must also be the unique vertex cover extending types $I \cup \{i\}$ and $I \cup \{j\}$. It follows that $\mathcal{T}_i = \mathcal{T}_j = \{T'\}$ and $|\mathcal{T}_i \cup \mathcal{T}_j| = 1$. \diamond

For a fixed characteristic (α, β) the algorithm simply finds the preimage of (α, β) under $f_{i,j}$ with the smallest value in $\text{DP}_{H'}^{\text{cw}}[\cdot, \cdot]$. That is, we set

$$\text{DP}_H^{\text{cw}}[\alpha, \beta] = \min_{(\alpha', \beta') \in \mathcal{F}_{i,j}^{-1}(\alpha, \beta)} \text{DP}_{H'}^{\text{cw}}[\alpha', \beta'] \quad (24)$$

where we additionally define the minimum over empty set to be ∞ , i.e., we have $\text{DP}_H^{\text{cw}}[\alpha, \beta] = \infty$ whenever there is no preimage of (α, β) under $f_{i,j}$.

Relabeling, $H = \rho_{i \rightarrow j}(H')$. For each pair of pairwise different $i, j \in [d]$, we define a function $g_{i \rightarrow j}$ acting on characteristics such that $g_{i \rightarrow j}(\alpha', \beta') = (\alpha, \beta)$ where

$$(\alpha(I), \beta(I)) = \begin{cases} (\alpha'(I \cup \{i\}), \beta'(I \cup \{i\})) & \text{if } j \in I, \\ (\alpha'(I \setminus \{i\}), \beta'(I \setminus \{i\})) & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Similar to before, we show that the function $g_{i \rightarrow j}$ describes exactly the effect of the operation $\rho_{i \rightarrow j}$ on a characteristic of a fixed set S .

Claim 18. *Let $S \subseteq V(H')$ be an arbitrary set with characteristic (α', β') in H' and let (α, β) be the image of (α', β') under $g_{i \rightarrow j}$. Then S has characteristic (α, β) in H .*

Proof of the claim. Let (α'', β'') denote the characteristic of S in H . Our aim is to show that $(\alpha'', \beta'') = (\alpha, \beta)$. First, observe that H' and H differ only in their labels and therefore, any arbitrary set $T \subseteq V(H)$ is a vertex cover of $H' - S$ if and only if it is a vertex cover of $H - S$. However, the type of T might differ between $H' - S$ and $H - S$.

Fix an arbitrary set $T \subseteq V(H)$. First observe that for an index $\ell \in [d] \setminus \{i, j\}$, we have $\ell \in \text{full}_{H-S}(T)$ if and only if $\ell \in \text{full}_{H'-S}(T)$ because the vertices with label ℓ remain unchanged. Moreover, we have $i \in \text{full}_{H-S}(T)$ by definition since H (and by extension $H - S$) does not contain any vertices with label i . Finally, we have $j \in \text{full}_{H-S}(T)$ if and only if $\{i, j\} \subseteq \text{full}_{H'-S}(T)$ since $\text{lab}_H^{-1}(j) = \text{lab}_{H'}^{-1}(i) \cup \text{lab}_{H'}^{-1}(j)$.

Now let $I \subseteq [d]$ be a type such that $j \in I$. Let T be again a vertex cover of $H - S$ (and thus also of $H' - S$) of type J in $H - S$ and type J' in $H' - S$. We claim that $I \subseteq J$ if and only if $I \cup \{i\} \subseteq J'$. By previous arguments, we know that $J \setminus \{i, j\} = J' \setminus \{i, j\}$. If $I \subseteq J$, then $j \in J$ and it follows that $\{i, j\} \subseteq J'$ and $I \cup \{i\} \subseteq J'$. For the other direction if $I \cup \{i\} \subseteq J'$, then $\{i, j\} \in J'$ and it follows that $j \in J$ and $I \subseteq J$. As a consequence, we see that $\alpha''(I) = \alpha'(I \cup \{i\}) = \alpha(I)$ since the set of all vertex

covers extending type I remains the same between $H - S$ and $H' - S$. The uniqueness is carried over for the same reason and we have $\beta''(I) = \beta'(I \cup \{i\}) = \beta(I)$.

It remains to consider the case when $j \notin I$. Let T be a vertex cover of $H - S$ (and thus also of $H' - S$) of type J in $H - S$ and type J' in $H' - S$. We claim that $I \subseteq J$ if and only if $I \setminus \{i\} \subseteq J'$. The equalities of $\alpha''(I) = \alpha(I)$ and $\beta''(I) = \beta(I)$ then follow from this claim analogously to the previous case. Assuming $I \subseteq J$, we get

$$I \setminus \{i\} = I \setminus \{i, j\} \subseteq J \setminus \{i, j\} = J' \setminus \{i, j\} \subseteq J'$$

where the first equality holds since $j \notin I$, the first inclusion follows from the assumption $I \subseteq J$, the second equality was observed to hold in general and the final inclusion is trivial. For the other direction assume that $I \setminus \{i\} \subseteq J'$. We see that

$$I \setminus \{i\} = I \setminus \{i, j\} \subseteq J' \setminus \{j\} \subseteq J' \setminus \{i, j\} \cup \{i\} = J \setminus \{i, j\} \cup \{i\} \subseteq J \cup \{i\}$$

where the first equality holds again since $j \notin I$, the first inclusion is implied by $I \setminus \{i\} \subseteq J'$, the second inclusion is trivial, the second equality holds in general, and the final inclusion is trivial. Additionally, recall that $i \in J$ since $\text{lab}_H^{-1}(i)$ is empty and i belongs to the type of any set in H . It follows that $I \subseteq J$ which finishes the proof. \diamond

Similar to the previous case, the algorithm simply finds the preimage of every characteristic (α, β) under $g_{i \rightarrow j}$ with the smallest value in $\text{DP}_H^{\text{cw}}[\cdot, \cdot]$. That is, we set

$$\text{DP}_H^{\text{cw}}[\alpha, \beta] = \min_{(\alpha', \beta') \in g_{i \rightarrow j}^{-1}(\alpha, \beta)} \text{DP}_{H'}^{\text{cw}}[\alpha', \beta'] \quad (25)$$

where the minimum over empty set is again ∞ .

Disjoint union, $H = H_1 \oplus H_2$. We define a function h acting on pairs of characteristics $(\alpha_1, \beta_1), (\alpha_2, \beta_2)$ as $h((\alpha_1, \beta_1), (\alpha_2, \beta_2)) = (\alpha, \beta)$ where

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha(I) &= \alpha_1(I) + \alpha_2(I), \text{ and} \\ \beta(I) &= \min(2, \beta_1(I) \cdot \beta_2(I)). \end{aligned}$$

Let us show that when given the characteristics of two sets $S_1 \subseteq V(H_1)$ and $S_2 \subseteq V(H_2)$, the function h outputs exactly the characteristic of their union $S_1 \cup S_2$ in H .

Claim 19. *Let $S_1 \subseteq V(H_1)$ be an arbitrary set of characteristic (α_1, β_1) in H_1 , let $S_2 \subseteq V(H_2)$ be an arbitrary set of characteristic (α_2, β_2) in H_2 and let (α, β) be the image of $(\alpha_1, \beta_1), (\alpha_2, \beta_2)$ under h . Then $S_1 \cup S_2$ has characteristic (α, β) in H .*

Proof of the claim. Let $T \subseteq V(H - S)$ and set $T_1 = T \cap V(H_1)$ and $T_2 = T \cap V(H_2)$. Observe that T is a vertex cover of $H - S$ if and only if T_1 and T_2 are vertex covers of $H_1 - S_1$ and $H_2 - S_2$ respectively. Moreover, we have $I \subseteq \text{full}_{H-S}(T)$ if and only if both $I \subseteq \text{full}_{H_1-S_1}(T_1)$ and $I \subseteq \text{full}_{H_2-S_2}(T_2)$. This holds since any label $i \in [d]$ is fully covered in $H - S$ by T if and only if T_1 and T_2 contain all vertices with label i in $H_1 - S_1$ and $H_2 - S_2$ respectively. Therefore, every vertex cover extending type I in $H - S$ is obtained as a union of a vertex cover extending type I in $H_1 - S_1$ with a vertex cover extending type I in $H_2 - S_2$. In particular, the value $\alpha''(I)$ is equal to the sum of the sizes of smallest vertex covers extending type I in $H_1 - S_1$ and in $H_2 - S_2$. Moreover, this smallest vertex cover is unique if and only if it is a combination of two unique such vertex covers in $H_1 - S_1$ and $H_2 - S_2$. That agrees exactly with how $\alpha(I)$ and $\beta(I)$ are computed from $\alpha_1(I), \alpha_2(I), \beta_1(I)$, and $\beta_2(I)$. \diamond

The computation of $\text{DP}_H^{\text{cw}}[\cdot, \cdot]$ is analogous to the previous two cases. That is, we set

$$\text{DP}_H^{\text{cw}}[\alpha, \beta] = \min_{((\alpha_1, \beta_1), (\alpha_2, \beta_2)) \in h^{-1}(\alpha, \beta)} \text{DP}_{H_1}^{\text{cw}}[\alpha_1, \beta_1] + \text{DP}_{H_2}^{\text{cw}}[\alpha_2, \beta_2] \quad (26)$$

where we take the minimum over empty set to be ∞ as before.

This finishes the description of the computation. Now, we show the correctness of the algorithm in two separate claims. First, we show that if there is a finite value stored in the dynamic programming table $\text{DP}_H^{\text{cw}}[\cdot, \cdot]$, there is a set $S \subseteq V(H)$ with corresponding characteristic and size.

Claim 20. *Let H be a d -labeled graph corresponding to a subexpression of the clique-width d -expression of G and let (α, β) be arbitrary characteristic. If $\text{DP}_H^{\text{cw}}[\alpha, \beta] = s$ where $s \neq \infty$, then there exists a set $S \subseteq V(H)$ of size s with characteristic (α, β) .*

Proof of the claim. We prove the claim by a bottom-up induction on the clique-width d -expression of G . First, let $H = i(v)$ be a singleton graph for some label $i \in [d]$. There are only two finite entries in the table $\text{DP}_H^{\text{cw}}[\cdot, \cdot]$ in (23), namely $\text{DP}_H^{\text{cw}}[\alpha_{\text{in}}^i, \beta_{\text{in}}^i] = 1$ and $\text{DP}_H^{\text{cw}}[\alpha_{\text{out}}^i, \beta_{\text{out}}^i] = 0$. There are also only two possible choices of $S \subseteq V(H)$. The only vertex cover of $H - \{v\}$ is the empty set with type $[d]$ that extends every type I . It follows that the characteristic of $S = \{v\}$ is exactly $(\alpha_{\text{in}}^i, \beta_{\text{in}}^i)$. On the other hand, there are two vertex covers in $H - \emptyset = H$, either the empty set or $\{v\}$, and their types are $[d] \setminus \{i\}$ and $[d]$ respectively. It follows that the smallest vertex cover extending a given type I is always unique and it has size 1 if $i \in I$ and size 0 otherwise. Therefore, the characteristic of the empty set in H is exactly $(\alpha_{\text{out}}^i, \beta_{\text{out}}^i)$ and the claim holds for singletons.

Now assume that $H = \eta_{i,j}(H')$. The value $\text{DP}_H^{\text{cw}}[\alpha, \beta]$ was set to be s in (24) and hence, there exists a characteristic (α', β') such that $f_{i,j}(\alpha', \beta') = (\alpha, \beta)$ and $\text{DP}_{H'}^{\text{cw}}[\alpha', \beta'] = s$. By applying induction on H' , there exists a set $S \subseteq V(H')$ of size s and characteristic (α', β') . The characteristic of S in H is then precisely (α, β) due to Claim 17 and we have found a set of the desired size and characteristic.

The argument for $H = \rho_{i \rightarrow j}(H')$ is analogous to the previous case. This time, there is a set of characteristic (α', β') in H' such that $g_{i \rightarrow j}(\alpha', \beta') = (\alpha, \beta)$ due to the computation in (25). The induction applied on H' together with Claim 18 then guarantees the existence of set with size s and characteristic (α, β) .

Finally, suppose that $H = H_1 \oplus H_2$. Similar to before, $\text{DP}_H^{\text{cw}}[\alpha, \beta]$ was set to s in (26) and thus, there exist characteristics (α_1, β_1) and (α_2, β_2) such that $h((\alpha_1, \beta_1), (\alpha_2, \beta_2)) = (\alpha, \beta)$ and $\text{DP}_{H_1}^{\text{cw}}[\alpha_1, \beta_1] = s_1$, $\text{DP}_{H_2}^{\text{cw}}[\alpha_2, \beta_2] = s_2$ with $s_1 + s_2 = s$. Applying induction on H_ℓ for both $\ell \in [2]$, we see that there exists a set $S_\ell \subseteq V(H_\ell)$ of size s_ℓ and characteristic $(\alpha_\ell, \beta_\ell)$. We conclude by Claim 19 that $S_1 \cup S_2$ is a set of size s and characteristic (α, β) in H . \diamond

Next, we show the opposite implication, that is, if there is a set S of a given characteristic (α, β) , then the computed value $\text{DP}_H^{\text{cw}}[\alpha, \beta]$ is at most $|S|$.

Claim 21. *Let H be a d -labeled graph corresponding to a subexpression of the clique-width d -expression of G and let (α, β) be arbitrary characteristic. If there exists a set $S \subseteq V(H)$ of size s with characteristic (α, β) , then $\text{DP}_H^{\text{cw}}[\alpha, \beta] \leq s$.*

Proof of the claim. We prove the claim again by a bottom-up induction on the clique-width d -expression of G .

First, let $H = i(v)$ be a singleton graph for some label $i \in [d]$. There are only two possible choices of $S \subseteq V(H)$. We already showed in the proof of Claim 20 that the characteristic of $\{v\}$ is exactly $(\alpha_{\text{in}}^i, \beta_{\text{in}}^i)$ while the characteristic of \emptyset is exactly $(\alpha_{\text{out}}^i, \beta_{\text{out}}^i)$. For these, we have set $\text{DP}_H^{\text{cw}}[\alpha_{\text{in}}^i, \beta_{\text{in}}^i] = 1$ and $\text{DP}_H^{\text{cw}}[\alpha_{\text{out}}^i, \beta_{\text{out}}^i] = 0$ in (23) and it follows that $\text{DP}_H^{\text{cw}}[\alpha_{\text{in}}^i, \beta_{\text{in}}^i] = |\{v\}|$ and $\text{DP}_H^{\text{cw}}[\alpha_{\text{out}}^i, \beta_{\text{out}}^i] = |\emptyset|$.

Now assume that $H = \eta_{i,j}(H')$ and let (α', β') be the characteristic of S in H' . Claim 17 implies that $f_{i,j}(\alpha', \beta') = (\alpha, \beta)$ and we see that $\text{DP}_{H'}^{\text{cw}}[\alpha', \beta'] \leq s$ by applying induction on H' and S . Thus, we can conclude that also $\text{DP}_H^{\text{cw}}[\alpha, \beta] \leq s$ since $\text{DP}_{H'}^{\text{cw}}[\alpha', \beta']$ appears in the minimum on the right side of (24).

The argument for $H = \rho_{i \rightarrow j}(H')$ is again almost identical. Let (α', β') be the characteristic of S in H' . By a combination of induction and Claim 18, we see that the $\text{DP}_H^{\text{cw}}[\alpha, \beta] \leq \text{DP}_{H'}^{\text{cw}}[\alpha', \beta'] \leq s$.

Finally, suppose that $H = H_1 \oplus H_2$ and for both $\ell \in [2]$, let S_ℓ be the restriction of S to the vertices of H_ℓ with characteristic $(\alpha_\ell, \beta_\ell)$ in H_ℓ . By applying induction on H_ℓ and S_ℓ for both $\ell \in [2]$, we have $\text{DP}_{H_\ell}^{\text{cw}}[\alpha_\ell, \beta_\ell] \leq |S_\ell|$. Moreover, Claim 19 implies that $h((\alpha_1, \beta_1), (\alpha_2, \beta_2)) = (\alpha, \beta)$. It follows that we have set $\text{DP}_H^{\text{cw}}[\alpha, \beta] \leq \text{DP}_{H_1}^{\text{cw}}[\alpha_1, \beta_1] + \text{DP}_{H_2}^{\text{cw}}[\alpha_2, \beta_2] \leq |S_1| + |S_2| = s$ in (26). \diamond

It remains to argue about the runtime of the algorithm. First, we can compute a clique-width $(8^d - 1)$ -expression of a graph G of clique-width d in time $O(g(d) \cdot |V(G)|^3)$ for some function g using the algorithm by Oum [23]. Note that similar approximations of optimal clique-width expressions can be found much more efficiently in many specific graph classes of bounded clique-width. From now on, we assume that a clique-width d -expression of the graph G is given on input.

Claim 22. *Given a clique-width d -expression ϕ of G on input, the algorithm finishes in time $O(|\phi| \cdot 2^d \cdot C_d^2)$ where C_d is the number of all possible characteristics in a d -labeled graph.*

Proof of the claim. We will show that for any d -labeled graph arising in ϕ , the table $\text{DP}_H^{\text{cw}}[\cdot, \cdot]$ can be filled in time $O(2^d \cdot C_d^2)$. The claim follows since the number of such graphs is $O(|\phi|)$. Also observe that the functions $f_{i,j}$, $g_{i \rightarrow j}$, and h can all be computed in time $O(2^d)$.

When H is a singleton, there are exactly two finite entries in $\text{DP}_H^{\text{cw}}[\cdot, \cdot]$ and we can fill the table in time $O(2^d \cdot C_d)$. Now, assume that $H = \eta_{i,j}(H')$. The algorithm simply computes $\text{DP}_H^{\text{cw}}[\alpha, \beta]$ by its definition in (24). That is, it enumerates over all possible characteristics and finds the minimum value of $\text{DP}_{H'}^{\text{cw}}[\alpha', \beta']$ over characteristic (α', β') such that $f_{i,j}(\alpha', \beta') = (\alpha, \beta)$. This enumeration takes $O(2^d)$ time per characteristic and the same is true for the computation of the function $f_{i,j}$. Therefore, it takes $O(2^d \cdot C_d)$ time to fill a single entry $\text{DP}_H^{\text{cw}}[\alpha, \beta]$ which adds up to $O(2^d \cdot C_d^2)$ time over the whole table. An analogous approach computes the table $\text{DP}_H^{\text{cw}}[\cdot, \cdot]$ when $H = \rho_{i \rightarrow j}(H')$.

However, we can no longer use the same approach when $H = H_1 \oplus H_2$, as it would take $\Omega(2^d \cdot C_d^3)$ time. Instead, we speed up this computation using the same idea as before. We start by initially setting every entry to ∞ . Then we iterate over all possible pairs of characteristics (α_1, β_1) , (α_2, β_2) . For each pair, we first compute the value $h((\alpha_1, \beta_1), (\alpha_2, \beta_2))$, let us denote it (α, β) . Afterwards, we update $\text{DP}_H^{\text{cw}}[\alpha, \beta]$ to $\text{DP}_{H_1}^{\text{cw}}[\alpha_1, \beta_1] + \text{DP}_{H_2}^{\text{cw}}[\alpha_2, \beta_2]$ but only if it is smaller than its current value. This takes $O(2^d)$ time per each pair of characteristics, for a total of $O(2^d \cdot C_d^2)$. \diamond

The total number of possible characteristics is $(n+1)^{2^d} \cdot 2^{2^d}$ since the domain of both α and β is the set $2^{[d]}$ and their ranges are $[0, n]$ and $[2]$ respectively. Plugging this into Claim 22, we see that the algorithm terminates in $n^{O(2^d)}$ time as promised. \square

Theorem 6. *The MU-VC problem can be solved by an FPT-algorithm parameterised by the clique-width d of G plus the size of solution k in time $k^{O(2^d)} \cdot n$.*

Proof. The result is obtained by truncating the dynamic programming table of the algorithm in Theorem 5. That is possible because the characteristic of a small set S cannot be too far away from the characteristic of the empty set.

Claim 23. *Let H be a d -labeled graph, let $S \subseteq V(H)$ be a subset of its vertices with characteristic (α_S, β_S) in H and let $(\alpha_\emptyset, \beta_\emptyset)$ be the characteristic of the empty set in H . Then for arbitrary type $I \subseteq [d]$, we have $0 \leq \alpha_\emptyset(I) - \alpha_S(I) \leq |S|$.*

Proof of the claim. Fix a type $I \subseteq [d]$. Let T be the smallest vertex cover in $H - S$ that extends type I , i.e., the type of T in $H - S$ is J for some $J \supseteq I$. Clearly, $T \cup S$ is a vertex cover of H of size $|T| + |S| = \alpha_S(I) + |S|$. Moreover, the type of T in H is still J because $i \in \text{full}_H(T \cup S)$ if and only if $i \in \text{full}_{H-S}(T)$. We get

$$\alpha_\emptyset(I) = \min \{ \mu_H(I') \mid I \subseteq I' \subseteq [d] \} \leq \mu_H(J) \leq |T| + |S| = \alpha_S(I) + |S|$$

where the first equality is the definition of $\alpha_\emptyset(I)$, the first inequality holds because $J \supseteq I$, the second inequality follows since $T \cup S$ is a vertex cover of type J in H , and the final equality holds because T is the smallest vertex cover extending I in $H - S$. We obtain $\alpha_\emptyset(I) - \alpha_S(I) \leq |S|$ by rearranging the inequality.

On the other hand, let T be the smallest vertex cover in H that extends type I , i.e., the type of T in H is J for some $J \supseteq I$. It is straightforward to see that $T \setminus S$ is a vertex cover of $H - S$. Let J' denote the type of $T \setminus S$ in $H - S$. Observe that if we have $i \in \text{full}_H(T)$ for some $i \in [d]$, then necessarily $i \in \text{full}_{H-S}(T \setminus S)$. This implies $J' \supseteq J \supseteq I$. We get

$$\alpha_S(I) = \min \{ \mu_{H-S}(I') \mid I \subseteq I' \subseteq [d] \} \leq \mu_{H-S}(J') \leq |T \setminus S| \leq |T| = \alpha_\emptyset(I)$$

where the first equality is the definition of $\alpha_S(I)$, the first inequality holds because $J' \supseteq I$, the second inequality holds since $T \setminus S$ is a vertex cover of type J' in $H - S$, and the final equality holds by our choice of T as the smallest vertex cover extending I in H . This wraps up the proof. \diamond

The algorithm proceeds in two passes over a clique-width d -expression ϕ of the input graph G . In the first pass, it computes the characteristic of the empty set in every d -labeled graph generated by a subexpression of ϕ . Let us denote $(\alpha_H^\emptyset, \beta_H^\emptyset)$ the characteristic of the empty set in such a d -labeled graph H . This is done simply by setting the characteristic to $(\alpha_{\text{out}}^i, \beta_{\text{out}}^i)$ whenever $H = i(v)$ and otherwise applying the functions $f_{i,j}$, $g_{i \rightarrow j}$, and h to the characteristics of the empty set in subexpressions. The correctness of this computation is warranted by Claims 17–19. Afterwards, we run the same dynamic programming algorithm as in Theorem 5 but we restrict its computation within a graph H to characteristics (α, β) such




Figure 2: The gadgets used in the proof of Theorem 7.

that $0 \leq \alpha_H^\emptyset(I) - \alpha(I) \leq k$. By Claim 23, these still capture all solutions of size at most k and thus, the correctness of the algorithm carries over. Moreover, the number of possible characteristics decreased to $(k+1)^{2^d} \cdot 2^{2^d}$ and thus the algorithm terminates in $k^{O(2^d)} \cdot n$ time by Claim 22. Let us remark that for efficient implementation, we simply use as indices into the table the differences $\alpha_H^\emptyset(I) - \alpha(I)$ instead of the values $\alpha(I)$. \square

6 Hardness on planar graphs

Theorem 7. *Both the MU-VC and PAU-VC problems are Σ_2^P -complete even when the input graph G is planar and of maximum degree 5.*

Proof. We first argue about MU-VC belonging in Σ_2^P . Recall that a decision problem is in Σ_2^P if and only if it can be decided by a non-deterministic Turing machine with the added use of an NP-oracle. Given a graph $G = (V, E)$ and integer k , assume we have guessed a set $S \subseteq V$ such that $|S| \leq k$ and $G' = G - S$ has a unique minimum vertex cover U . Then, in order to verify that U is indeed as required, it suffices to solve PAU-VC on G' for $k = 0$, which can be done in polynomial time with the help of an NP-oracle [16]. So, in what follows we focus on proving that MU-VC is Σ_2^P -hard for planar graphs of maximum degree 5. Observe that slight modifications in our proof can lead to the same hardness result for the same family of graphs for PAU-VC.

We present a reduction from UQ PLANAR 1-IN-3 SAT [8]. In that problem, we are given a 3CNF formula ϕ on the set of variables $\{x_1, \dots, x_{n_1}, y_1, \dots, y_{n_2}\}$ and clauses $C = \{c_1, \dots, c_m\}$. We say that variables in $\{x_1, \dots, x_{n_1}\}$ ($\{y_1, \dots, y_{n_2}\}$ resp.) are of *type x* (*type y* resp.). The task is to find a truth-assignment of the variables of type x such that there exists a unique truth-assignment of the variables of type y where each clause of C is satisfied by exactly one of its literals (regardless of whether that literal contains a variable of type x or y). We will construct a graph G which has an MU-VC of order n_1 if and only if ϕ is a yes-instance of UQ PLANAR 1-IN-3 SAT.

To construct the graph G , we first need to build an auxiliary graph H as follows. First, we define a *variable* (*clause* resp.) vertex for each variable (*clause* resp.) in ϕ . Then we add an edge between a variable and a clause vertex if the corresponding variable appears in the corresponding clause. Let H be the resulting graph. Observe that H is a planar graph (due to the “planarity” of ϕ). We now start modifying H to arrive to G . First, we replace each clause vertex c of H by a copy of the c -gadget illustrated in Figure 2(a). Then, we replace each variable vertex by either a y -gadget or a x -gadget, illustrated in Figures 2(b) and 2(c) respectively, according to the type of the corresponding variable in ϕ . Observe that the x - and y -gadgets are rather similar. Consider the y_i -gadget, i.e., the gadget that corresponds to the variable y_i that appears in ϕ . This gadget will have four colored vertices (see Figure 2(b)) for each appearance of y_i in ϕ ; two vertices colored red and two colored blue. That is, the index q that appears in Figure 2(b) is equal to four times the

number of appearances of y_i in ϕ . For example, if y_i appears in three clauses in a positive literal and in two clauses in a negative literal, then the y_i -gadget will have twenty colored vertices. Moreover, going in an anti-clockwise fashion, the colors of the vertices that correspond to each appearance of the y_i variable will alternate, starting with a red and finishing with a blue; for the j -th appearance of variable y_i , we say that vertices $y_i^{4(j-1)+2}$ and $y_i^{4(j-1)+3}$ denote its *inner colored vertices* (see Figure 2(b) for an example). Intuitively, the inner blue (red resp.) vertex included in the gadget for an appearance of the variable y_i will be used to model that this variable is set to false (true resp.), while the other inner colored vertices will serve as points of additional connection between the gadgets. The same holds true for the x_i -gadget, i.e., the gadget that corresponds to the variable x_i that appears in ϕ . The only difference is that, in addition, the x_i -gadget contains an extra set of colored vertices together with two pending paths, illustrated by the bold vertices and edges in Figure 2(c).

At this stage, all the original edges of H have been removed and we will now add the new edges between the gadgets. This edge-adding procedure happens in two steps. First we deal with the edges connecting the c -gadgets to the x - and/or y -gadgets. Consider a clause c and its corresponding c -gadget and assume that, in the initial graph H there was an edge between the clause vertex c and the variable vertex x_i , which corresponds to a variable of type x . Moreover, let this be the j -th appearance of the variable x_i in ϕ (according to a carefully chosen ordering of the variables). Then, going anti-clockwise, we locate the j -th quadruple Q of colored vertices of the x -gadget, that is, $Q = \{x_i^{4(j-1)+z} \mid z \in [4]\}$. We then add an edge between any vertex among $\{\ell_c^1, \ell_c^2, \ell_c^3\}$ of the c -gadget that is currently of degree three and the blue (red resp.) inner vertex of Q if x_i appears as a positive (negative resp.) literal in c . We repeat the same procedure for all the edges of H that are between the clause vertex c and any variable vertex of type y . Once we are done with the clause vertex c , we move on and repeat this procedure for every clause vertex of H . This completes the first step of adding the edges of G .

In the second step, we connect the x - and/or y -gadgets whose corresponding variables appear in a common clause. To ease the exhibition, and since we treat these gadgets in the same way, we will assume we only have to deal with x -gadgets. So, consider a clause gadget c , with the corresponding clause being comprised of three literals on the variables x_{i_1} , x_{i_2} , and x_{i_3} (for some $i_1, i_2, i_3 \in [n_1]$). According to the construction of G up to this point, there are

- a c -gadget, containing the vertices ℓ_c^1, ℓ_c^2 , and ℓ_c^3 , and
- the x_{i_1} , x_{i_2} , and x_{i_3} -gadgets, containing some inner colored vertices $x_{i_1}^\alpha, x_{i_2}^\beta$, and $x_{i_3}^\gamma$ respectively such that G contains the edges $\ell_c^1 x_{i_1}^\alpha, \ell_c^2 x_{i_2}^\beta$, and $\ell_c^3 x_{i_3}^\gamma$.

Note that since $x_{i_1}^\alpha, x_{i_2}^\beta$, and $x_{i_3}^\gamma$ are inner colored vertices, and according to the first step of the edge-adding procedure, the two colored neighbors of these vertices that lie in the x_{i_1}, x_{i_2} , and x_{i_3} -gadgets respectively are currently of degree 4. The second step of the edge-adding procedure consists in adding the edges $x_{i_3}^{\gamma-1} x_{i_1}^{\alpha+1}, x_{i_1}^{\alpha-1} x_{i_2}^{\beta+1}$, and $x_{i_2}^{\beta-1} x_{i_3}^{\gamma+1}$. This step is repeated for every clause gadget c .

The termination of the edge-adding procedure marks the end of the construction of G . Observe that by carefully choosing the ordering used in the first step and bending the edges added in the second step of the edge-adding procedure, and due to the planarity of H , we can also ensure the planarity of G . On a high level, the ordering is chosen based on the planar embedding of graph H , while the edges added in the second step between variable gadgets can be stretched to follow along the path dictated by the edge of each variable gadget towards their common clause gadget. Figure 3 illustrates an example of the above construction.

We now present some properties of the constructed graph G that will be used in the reduction. In the following we follow the naming conventions depicted in Figure 2(c).

Claim 24. *Let $S \subseteq V(G)$ with $|S| \leq n_1$ and $G - S$ having a unique minimum vertex cover. It holds that $|S \cap \{u_i^2, u_i^3, u_i^5, u_i^6\}| = 1$ for all $i \in [n_1]$.*

Proof of the claim. Recall that by construction the graph G contains n_1 copies of the x -gadget. In the following, let U denote the unique minimum vertex cover of $G - S$.

We first show that for all $i \in [n_1]$, S contains exactly one vertex among vertices $\{u_i^1, u_i^2, u_i^3, u_i^4, u_i^5, u_i^6\}$ in x_i -gadget. Towards a contradiction, assume that there exists a variable x_i such that S contains no such vertices from the x_i -gadget. Then, it holds that set U must contain at least one of the vertices in $\{u_i^1, u_i^4\}$. Assume that $u_i^1 \in U$. In that case, U must also contain any one vertex among $\{u_i^2, u_i^3\}$, and both options are valid, contradicting the uniqueness of U . The case $u_i^4 \in U$ is analogous.




Figure 3: An example of the construction for a formula ϕ containing the two clauses $c_1 = (x_1 \vee x_2 \vee \neg y_1)$ and $c_2 = (\neg x_1 \vee y_1 \vee y_2)$. The bold (olive resp.) edges represent the edges added in the first (second resp.) step of the edge-adding procedure.

Now assume that there exists $i \in [n_1]$ such that $u_i^1 \in S$. In that case due to the previous paragraph it holds that $u_i^2, u_i^3 \notin S$. Similarly to before, U must contain any one vertex among $\{u_i^2, u_i^3\}$, and both options are valid, contradicting the uniqueness of U . The case $u_i^4 \in U$ is analogous. \diamond

Next, we have the following observation.

Observation 4. *Let $S \subseteq V(G)$ such that S contains a single vertex per x -gadget and let U be a vertex cover of $G - S$. It holds that U contains at least:*

- 3 vertices from each c -gadget,
- $\frac{3g}{2}$ vertices from each y -gadget,
- $\frac{3p}{2} + 4$ vertices from each x -gadget.

Moreover, any vertex cover of $G - S$ that contains exactly as many vertices from each gadget as specified above is minimum.

In the following claim we focus on the x_i -gadget, for any $i \in [n_1]$, and specify which of its edges

Claim 25. Let $S \subseteq V(G)$ with $|S| \leq n_1$ and $G - S$ having a unique minimum vertex cover $U \subseteq V(G - S)$. For every $i \in [n_1]$, if $S \cap \{u_i^2, u_i^3\} \neq \emptyset$ then $u_i^1 \in U$, else if $S \cap \{u_i^5, u_i^6\} \neq \emptyset$ then $u_i^4 \in U$.

Proof of the claim. Fix an $i \in [n_1]$ for which we prove the statement. Recall that by Claim 24 it holds that $|S \cap \{u_i^2, u_i^3, u_i^5, u_i^6\}| = 1$. Consider the case where $S \cap \{u_i^2, u_i^3\} \neq \emptyset$. For the sake of contradiction, assume that $u_i^1 \notin U$, which implies that $u_i^4 \in U$. Then, U must also contain any one vertex among $\{u_i^5, u_i^6\}$, and both options are valid, contradicting the uniqueness of U . The case $S \cap \{u_i^5, u_i^6\} \neq \emptyset$ is analogous. \diamond

We now focus our attention on the c -gadgets. In the following we follow the naming conventions depicted in Figure 2(a).

Claim 26. Let $S \subseteq V(G)$ with $|S| \leq n_1$ and $G - S$ having a unique minimum vertex cover $U \subseteq V(G - S)$. It holds that $|U \cap \{\ell_c^1, \ell_c^2, \ell_c^3\}| = 2$ for any c -gadget in G .

Proof of the claim. Fix a c -gadget for which we prove the statement. By Claim 24, it holds that S does not contain any of its vertices. Observe that $|U \cap \{\ell_c^1, \ell_c^2, \ell_c^3\}| \geq 2$, as those three vertices induce a K_3 . Assume that $|U \cap \{\ell_c^1, \ell_c^2, \ell_c^3\}| > 2$. In this case U must also contain at least one vertex in $\{w_c, z_c\}$, and both options are valid. This contradicts the uniqueness of U . \diamond

The next property we need concerns the x - and y -gadgets. Since these gadgets behave in the same way in what follows, we will henceforth denote them as v -gadgets. That is, a v -gadget can be either a x - or a y -gadget. We will also use the superscript and subscript notations introduced in Figures 2(b) and (c) for the v -gadgets.

Claim 27. Let $S \subseteq V(G)$ with $|S| \leq n_1$ and $G - S$ having a unique minimum vertex cover $U \subseteq V(G - S)$. Let \mathcal{V} be any v -gadget and let W be the intersection of U and $V(\mathcal{V})$. Then either

- W contains all the red and no blue vertices of \mathcal{V} , or
- W contains all the blue and no red vertices of \mathcal{V} .

Proof of the claim. By Claim 24, it holds that S does not contain any red or blue vertex. Clearly, W must contain at least one vertex from each pair of adjacent red and blue vertices of \mathcal{V} , as otherwise U is not a vertex cover. Thus, it suffices to show that W does not contain both the red and blue vertices of any pair of adjacent colored vertices of \mathcal{V} . Assume that it does, that is, assume that W contains both the vertices v_i^α and $v_i^{\alpha+1}$ (for some $\alpha \in [p - 1]$ or $\alpha \in [q - 1]$). Then, W must also contain at least one vertex from $\{w_i^\alpha, z_i^\alpha\}$, and both options are valid. The case where \mathcal{V} is the x_i -gadget and W contains both the vertices in $\{u_i^1, u_i^4\}$ is treated in the same way. In any case, we obtain a contradiction to the uniqueness of U . \diamond

The final property we observe concerns the interplay between the clause and the variable gadgets. To ease the exposition of what follows, we introduce some additional notation. Consider a c -gadget of G , and let $v_{i_1}^\alpha, v_{i_2}^\beta$, and $v_{i_3}^\gamma$ be vertices belonging in the v_{i_1} -, v_{i_2} -, and v_{i_3} -gadgets respectively, such that $\ell_c^1 v_{i_1}^\alpha \in E(G)$, $\ell_c^2 v_{i_2}^\beta \in E(G)$, and $\ell_c^3 v_{i_3}^\gamma \in E(G)$. The subgraph of G that is induced by this c -gadget and the vertices $v_{i_1}^\alpha, v_{i_2}^\beta$, and $v_{i_3}^\gamma$ will henceforth be named the *important c -subgraph* of G . Notice that due to Claim 24, any set $S \subseteq V(G)$ with $|S| \leq n_1$ and $G - S$ having a unique minimum vertex cover does not include any vertices appearing in the important c -subgraph. Consequently, in this case the important c -subgraph of $G - S$ refers to the same graph.

Claim 28. Let $S \subseteq V(G)$ with $|S| \leq n_1$ and $G - S$ having a unique minimum vertex cover $U \subseteq V(G - S)$. Consider the important c -subgraph of $G - S$ for some c -gadget. It holds that $|U \cap \{v_{i_1}^\alpha, v_{i_2}^\beta, v_{i_3}^\gamma\}| = 1$.

Proof of the claim. Let $W = U \cap \{v_{i_1}^\alpha, v_{i_2}^\beta, v_{i_3}^\gamma\}$ and observe that $|W| > 0$. Indeed, let us assume that $|W| = 0$. We have from Claim 26 that at least one among $\ell_c^1, \ell_c^2, \ell_c^3$, say ℓ_c^1 , does not belong to U . Then, we have that neither ℓ_c^1 nor its adjacent vertex $v_{i_1}^\alpha$ belong to U , contradicting the fact that U is a vertex cover of $G - S$. It thus suffices to show that $|W| < 2$. Towards a contradiction, assume that $|W| \geq 2$ and let, w.l.o.g., $\{v_{i_1}^\alpha, v_{i_2}^\beta\} \subseteq W$. It follows by Claim 27 that $v_{i_1}^{\alpha-1}, v_{i_2}^{\beta+1} \notin U$. But $v_{i_1}^{\alpha-1} v_{i_2}^{\beta+1} \in E(G - S)$, contradicting the fact that U is a vertex cover of $G - S$. \diamond

By considering both Claims 26 and 28, we get that U will contain exactly two out of the three ‘‘outer’’ vertices for each c -gadget, and exactly one of the adjacent vertices of the v -gadgets that are linked to this c -gadget. Let us denote this one vertex by ν . The subtle detail that is implied by the proofs of these two

claims is that the neighbor of ν in the c -gadget we are considering is exactly the “outer” vertex of this gadget that is not included in U . Allow us to formally state this.

Corollary 7.1. *Let $S \subseteq V(G)$ with $|S| \leq n_1$ and $G - S$ having a unique minimum vertex cover $U \subseteq V(G - S)$. Consider any c -gadget and the corresponding important c -subgraph of G . Let $W = U \cap \{\ell_c^1, \ell_c^2, \ell_c^3, v_{i_1}^\alpha, v_{i_2}^\beta, v_{i_3}^\gamma\}$. Then either*

- $W = \{\ell_c^1, \ell_c^2, v_{i_3}^\gamma\}$, or
- $W = \{\ell_c^1, \ell_c^3, v_{i_2}^\beta\}$, or
- $W = \{\ell_c^2, \ell_c^3, v_{i_1}^\alpha\}$.

We are now ready to present our reduction. We first assume that we have a yes-instance of the UQ PLANAR 1-IN-3 SAT problem. That is, we have a truth-assignment τ of the variables of type x which can be uniquely extended into a truth-assignment σ of the variables of type x and y that results in ϕ being 1-in-3 satisfied. We will show that the constructed graph $G = (V, E)$ has a MU-VC of order exactly n_1 . By Claim 24, it suffices to provide a set $S \subseteq V$ such that $G' = G - S$ has a unique minimum vertex cover U , and $|S| = n_1$. We proceed as follows: for each $i \in [n_1]$, if $\tau(x_i) = \text{true}$ ($\tau(x_i) = \text{false}$ resp.), we include u_i^5 (u_i^2 resp.) in S . The set S is comprised by only these vertices. It follows that $|S| = n_1$. It remains to show that G' has a unique minimum vertex cover. Before proceeding, observe that every vertex denoted by a w , with any possible subscript and/or superscript, is contained in the unique minimum vertex cover of G' (if it exists). Indeed, every edge wz (for every possible subscript and/or superscript of z) must be covered, and any vertex cover that contains z instead of w is of order at least as big as a vertex cover that contains w . Thus, in what follows we will assume that these vertices are included in the unique minimum vertex cover and ignore them. Consider now the set U built in the following fashion:

1. For every c -gadget, include in U the two vertices from $\{\ell_c^1, \ell_c^2, \ell_c^3\}$ that correspond to literals that do not satisfy the clause c according to σ .
2. For every $i \in [n_1]$, include in U all the blue (red resp.) vertices and the vertex u_i^2 (u_i^5 resp.) if $\sigma(x_i) = \text{true}$ ($\sigma(x_i) = \text{false}$ resp.). Also, for every $i \in [n_2]$, include in U all the blue (red resp.) vertices if $\sigma(y_i) = \text{true}$ ($\sigma(y_i) = \text{false}$ resp.).

We claim that the set U is indeed the unique minimum vertex cover of G' . Since it is straightforward to check that U is indeed a vertex cover, we will focus on its minimality and its uniqueness. In order to prove that U is minimum it suffices to observe that each gadget includes a minimum number of vertices, according to the values provided in Observation 4.

We finally argue about the uniqueness of U . Towards a contradiction, assume that there exists a set U' that is also a minimum vertex cover of G' . Recall that by v -gadget we mean either a x - or a y -gadget. Observe first that any minimum vertex cover of G' should include, for any v -gadget, either all its blue or all its red vertices. This holds true for both U and U' . Now, consider the assignment σ' such that $\sigma'(v) = \text{true}$ if U' contains all the blue vertices of the v -gadget and $\sigma'(v) = \text{false}$, if U' contains all the red vertices of the v -gadget (where v is a variable either of type x or y). We claim that if U' exists, then:

- $\sigma(x_i) = \sigma'(x_i)$, for all $i \in [n_1]$,
- there exists $j \in [n_2]$ such that $\sigma(y_j) \neq \sigma'(y_j)$, and
- σ' sets exactly one literal of each clause to true .

If this holds it is a contradiction to the uniqueness of σ .

We begin by proving the first item. Assume that it is not true. W.l.o.g., assume that $\sigma(x_i) = \text{true}$ and $\sigma'(x_i) = \text{false}$, for some $i \in [n_1]$. Then U includes all the blue and U' includes all the red vertices of the x_i -gadget. In this case we claim that $|U'| > |U|$. Indeed, since $\sigma(x_i) = \text{true}$, we have that $u_i^5 \notin V(G')$. Therefore, the intersection of U' with the vertices of the x_i -gadget must include all its red vertices, all its w vertices, one vertex from the set $\{u_i^2, u_i^3\}$; and one vertex from the set $\{u_i^4, u_i^5\}$. Therefore, there exists a gadget where U' includes more than the minimum number of vertices specified in Observation 4, which means that $|U| < |U'|$.

Next we prove the second item. Let us assume it is not true, i.e., $\sigma(v) = \sigma'(v)$, for all variables. Since U is assumed different from U' , there exists a c -gadget C such that U and U' have different intersections with its vertices. Let us consider the important c -subgraph that corresponds to C . Since U and U' include the same vertices from all variable gadgets, we have that $U \cap \{v_{i_1}^\alpha, v_{i_2}^\beta, v_{i_3}^\gamma\} = U' \cap \{v_{i_1}^\alpha, v_{i_2}^\beta, v_{i_3}^\gamma\}$. Additionally, by the construction of U , we know that exactly one of $\{v_{i_1}^\alpha, v_{i_2}^\beta, v_{i_3}^\gamma\}$ belongs in U . W.l.o.g., assume that $U' \cap \{v_{i_1}^\alpha, v_{i_2}^\beta, v_{i_3}^\gamma\} = U \cap \{v_{i_1}^\alpha, v_{i_2}^\beta, v_{i_3}^\gamma\} = \{v_{i_1}^\alpha\}$. Since U and U' are minimum vertex covers, we have that they include both ℓ_c^2 and ℓ_c^3 . In order for U' to be minimum, it can include at most one extra vertex from C . This must be the vertex w_c (as otherwise it needs to include both ℓ_c^1 and z_c). However, this is exactly the same as U . This contradicts the assumption that U and U' do not include the same vertices from C . Therefore, it must exist $j \in [n_2]$ such that $\sigma(y_j) \neq \sigma'(y_j)$.

It remains to show the third item. Consider a clause c along with its c -gadget and the corresponding important c -subgraph. Assume that σ' does not satisfy c . That is, all literals of c are false by σ' . Then, $U' \cap \{v_{i_1}^\alpha, v_{i_2}^\beta, v_{i_3}^\gamma\} = \emptyset$ (by the definition of σ'). Then U' must include all of $\ell_c^1, \ell_c^2, \ell_c^3$ and one of the $\{w_c, z_c\}$, contradicting the minimality of U' . It remains to show that $|U' \cap \{v_{i_1}^\alpha, v_{i_2}^\beta, v_{i_3}^\gamma\}| < 2$. Assume otherwise and, w.l.o.g., let $v_{i_1}^\alpha, v_{i_2}^\beta \in U'$. Recall that U' cannot contain two consecutive vertices from any variable gadget as otherwise it will be bigger than U . Therefore, $v_{i_1}^{\alpha-1}, v_{i_2}^{\beta+1} \notin U'$. Thus, U' does not cover the edge $v_{i_1}^{\alpha-1}v_{i_2}^{\beta+1}$, a contradiction to U' being a vertex cover.

To sum up, we have managed to construct two truth-assignments σ and σ' , which are both extensions of τ . This contradicts the uniqueness of σ . Therefore, U is unique, completing the first direction of the reduction.

For the opposite direction, assume that we have a solution S of MU-VC of order n_1 . That is, the graph $G' = G - S$ has a unique minimum vertex cover U . We will construct a truth-assignment τ of the variables of type x that is uniquely extended into a truth assignment σ of the variables of type x and y that results in ϕ being 1-in-3 satisfied. First, it follows from Claim 24 that for every $i \in [n_1]$, the set S contains exactly one vertex u of x_i ; in particular, this vertex is either one of $\{u_i^2, u_i^3\}$ or one of $\{u_i^5, u_i^6\}$. Then, from Claim 25 we have that either $u_i^1 \in U$ and, by Claim 27, the same holds true for all the red vertices of the x_i -gadget, or $u_i^4 \in U$ and the same holds true for all the blue vertices of the x_i -gadget.

We consider the truth-assignment τ such that for each $i \in [n_1]$ we have $\tau(x_i) = \text{false}$ if $\{u_i^2, u_i^3\} \cap S \neq \emptyset$ and $\tau(x_i) = \text{true}$ if $\{u_i^4, u_i^5\} \cap S \neq \emptyset$. We claim that τ is uniquely extended into the desired truth-assignment σ .

Towards a contradiction, assume there exist two different truth-assignments σ and σ' of the variables of ϕ , both extending τ , and such that ϕ is 1-in-3 satisfied by both of them. We will prove that this results into two different minimum vertex covers of G' . Consider now the set U built in the following fashion:

1. For every c -gadget, include in U the two vertices from $\{\ell_c^1, \ell_c^2, \ell_c^3\}$ that correspond to literals that do not satisfy the clause c according to σ .
2. For every $i \in [n_1]$, include in U all the blue (red resp.) vertices and the vertex u_i^2 (u_i^5 resp.) if $\sigma(x_i) = \text{true}$ ($\sigma(x_i) = \text{false}$ resp.). Also, for every $i \in [n_2]$, include in U all the blue (red resp.) vertices if $\sigma(y_i) = \text{true}$ ($\sigma(y_i) = \text{false}$ resp.).
3. Finally we include all w vertices.

The same way, we define U' by replacing σ by σ' .

Since σ and σ' are assumed different, we have that $U \neq U'$. It now suffices to prove that both U and U' are minimum vertex cover sets of G' . It is straightforward to observe that both U and U' are indeed vertex covers of G' . Finally, both U and U' are using the minimum possible number of vertices from each gadget, according to Observation 4. Therefore, G' has two different minimum vertex covers which is a contradiction.

It remains to prove that there exists an extension σ of the assignment τ . Assume that we have the vertex cover U of $G - S$. We set $\sigma(v) = \text{true}$ if U contains all blue vertices from the v -gadget and $\sigma(v) = \text{false}$ otherwise. We claim that ϕ is 1-in-3 satisfied by σ . Consider a clause c in ϕ and let $\{v_{i_1}^\alpha, v_{i_2}^\beta, v_{i_3}^\gamma\}$ be the vertices that are adjacent to the vertices of the c -gadget. Recall that, by construction, any $v \in \{v_{i_1}^\alpha, v_{i_2}^\beta, v_{i_3}^\gamma\}$ is blue if the corresponding variable appears in c positively and red if the corresponding variable appears in c negatively. Therefore, $v \in \{v_{i_1}^\alpha, v_{i_2}^\beta, v_{i_3}^\gamma\} \cap U$ if and only if the literal that corresponds to v in c has been

set true by σ . By Corollary 7.1 we know that exactly one of the vertices $\{v_{i_1}^\alpha, v_{i_2}^\beta, v_{i_3}^\gamma\}$ will be included in U . Thus ϕ is 1-in-3 satisfied by σ . This completes the Σ_2^P -hardness for MU-VC.

For PAU-VC, the proof is almost the same. We just need to argue that the solution S we constructed (starting from the solution of UQ PLANAR 1-IN-3 SAT) together with the minimum vertex cover U of $G - S$ can give us a minimum vertex cover of G . That is, $S \cup U$ is a minimum vertex cover of G . This is indeed true as we need to contain the vertices of S in order to cover the $u_i^2 u_i^3$ (if $S \cap \{u_i^2, u_i^3\} \neq \emptyset$) and $u_i^5 u_i^6$ (if $S \cap \{u_i^5, u_i^6\} \neq \emptyset$) edges, and it is always minimum because, for the rest of the gadgets, we are using the minimum number of vertices. \square

References

- [1] S. An, Y. Chang, K. Cho, O.-j. Kwon, M. Lee, E. Oh, H. Shin, et al. Pre-assignment problem for unique minimum vertex cover on bounded clique-width graphs, 2024. To appear in AAAI 2025.
- [2] A. Asuncion, D. Newman, et al. Uci machine learning repository, 2007.
- [3] H. L. Bodlaender. A linear-time algorithm for finding tree-decompositions of small treewidth. *SIAM Journal on Computing*, 25(6):1305–1317, 1996.
- [4] H. L. Bodlaender. A partial k -arboretum of graphs with bounded treewidth. *Theoretical Computer Science*, 209(1):1–45, 1998.
- [5] C.-C. Chang and C.-J. Lin. LIBSVM: a library for support vector machines. *ACM transactions on intelligent systems and technology (TIST)*, 2(3):1–27, 2011.
- [6] B. Courcelle and S. Olariu. Upper bounds to the clique width of graphs. *Discret. Appl. Math.*, 101(1-3):77–114, 2000.
- [7] M. Cygan, F. V. Fomin, L. Kowalik, D. Lokshtanov, D. Marx, M. Pilipczuk, M. Pilipczuk, and S. Saurabh. *Parameterized Algorithms*. Springer, 2015.
- [8] E. D. Demaine, F. Ma, A. Schwartzman, E. Waingarten, and S. Aaronson. The fewest clues problem. *Theor. Comput. Sci.*, 748:28–39, 2018.
- [9] R. Diestel. *Graph Theory*, volume 173 of *Graduate texts in mathematics*. Springer, 2017.
- [10] R. G. Downey and M. R. Fellows. *Parameterized complexity*. Springer Science & Business Media, 2012.
- [11] L. Fan, W. Hua, L. Li, H. Ling, and Y. Zhang. NPHardEval: Dynamic benchmark on reasoning ability of large language models via complexity classes, 2023.
- [12] L. Fan, W. Hua, X. Li, K. Zhu, M. Jin, L. Li, H. Ling, J. Chi, J. Wang, X. Ma, and Y. Zhang. NPHardEval4V: A dynamic reasoning benchmark of multimodal large language models, 2024.
- [13] J. Flum and M. Grohe. *Parameterized Complexity Theory*. Texts in Theoretical Computer Science. An EATCS Series. Springer, 2006.
- [14] A. Hagberg, P. J. Swart, and D. A. Schult. Exploring network structure, dynamics, and function using networkx. Technical report, Los Alamos National Laboratory (LANL), Los Alamos, NM (United States), 2008.
- [15] H. H. Hoos and T. Stützle. SATLIB: An online resource for research on sat. *Sat*, 2000:283–292, 2000.
- [16] T. Horiyama, Y. Kobayashi, H. Ono, K. Seto, and R. Suzuki. Theoretical aspects of generating instances with unique solutions: Pre-assignment models for unique vertex cover. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, volume 38, pages 20726–20734, 2024.
- [17] O. Hudry and A. Lobstein. Complexity of unique (optimal) solutions in graphs: Vertex cover and domination. *Journal of Combinatorial Mathematics and Combinatorial Computing*, 110:217–240, 2019.

- [18] T. Kloks. *Treewidth, Computations and Approximations*, volume 842 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*. Springer, 1994.
- [19] T. Koch, T. Achterberg, E. Andersen, O. Bastert, T. Berthold, R. E. Bixby, E. Danna, G. Gamrath, A. M. Gleixner, S. Heinz, et al. MIPLIB 2010: Mixed integer programming library version 5. *Mathematical Programming Computation*, 3:103–163, 2011.
- [20] T. Korhonen and D. Lokshtanov. An improved parameterized algorithm for treewidth. In B. Saha and R. A. Servedio, editors, *Proceedings of the 55th Annual ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing, STOC 2023, Orlando, FL, USA, June 20-23, 2023*, pages 528–541. ACM, 2023.
- [21] A. Nath and A. Kuhnle. A benchmark for maximum cut: Towards standardization of the evaluation of learned heuristics for combinatorial optimization, 2024.
- [22] R. Niedermeier. *Invitation to Fixed-Parameter Algorithms*. Oxford University Press, 2006.
- [23] S. Oum. Approximating rank-width and clique-width quickly. *ACM Trans. Algorithms*, 5(1):10:1–10:20, 2008.
- [24] G. Reinelt. TSPLIB—a traveling salesman problem library. *ORSA journal on computing*, 3(4):376–384, 1991.
- [25] J. Tang, Q. Zhang, Y. Li, and J. Li. Grapharena: Benchmarking large language models on graph computational problems, 2024.