Finding Cuts of Bounded Degree

Guilherme C M Gomes, Ignasi Sau

Noname manuscript No.
(will be inserted by the editor)

Finding Cuts of Bounded Degree

Complexity, FPT and Exact Algorithms, and Kernelization

Guilherme C. M. Gomes · Ignasi Sau

the date of receipt and acceptance should be inserted later

Abstract A *matching cut* is a partition of the vertex set of a graph into two sets A and B such that each vertex has at most one neighbor in the other side of the cut. The Matching Cut problem asks whether a graph has a matching cut, and has been intensively studied in the literature. Motivated by a question posed by Komusiewicz et al. [Discrete Applied Mathematics, 2020], we introduce a natural generalization of this problem, which we call d-Cut: for a positive integer d, a *d-cut* is a bipartition of the vertex set of a graph into two sets A and B such that each vertex has at most d neighbors across the cut. We generalize (and in some cases, improve) a number of results for the Matching Cut problem. Namely, we begin with an NP-hardness reduction for d-Cut on $(2d+2)$-regular graphs and a polynomial algorithm for graphs of maximum degree at most $d+2$. The degree bound in the hardness result is unlikely to be improved, as it would disprove a long-standing conjecture in the context of internal partitions. We then give FPT algorithms for several parameters: the maximum number of edges crossing the cut, treewidth, distance to cluster, and distance to co-cluster. In particular, the treewidth algorithm improves upon the running time of the best known algorithm for Matching Cut. Our main technical contribution, building on the techniques of Komusiewicz et al. [DAM, 2020], is a polynomial kernel for d-Cut

G.C.M. Gomes was funded by Coordenação de Aperfeiçoamento de Pessoal de Nível Superior - Brasil (CAPES) - Finance Code 001.
I. Sau was funded by Projects DEMOGRAPH (ANR-16-CE40-0028) and ESIGMA (ANR-17-CE23-0010).
This article is permanently available at `[arXiv:1905.03134]`. A conference version appeared in the Proc. of the 14th International Symposium on Parameterized and Exact Computation (IPEC), Munich, Germany, September 2019.

G. C. M. Gomes
Universidade Federal de Minas Gerais, Departamento de Ciência da Computação, Belo Horizonte, Brazil.

G. C. M. Gomes
LIRMM, Université de Montpellier, Montpellier, France.
E-mail: gcm.gomes@dcc.ufmg.br

I. Sau
LIRMM, Université de Montpellier, CNRS, Montpellier, France.
E-mail: ignasi.sau@lirmm.fr

for every positive integer d, parameterized by the vertex deletion distance of the input graph to a cluster graph. We also rule out the existence of polynomial kernels when parameterizing simultaneously by the number of edges crossing the cut, the treewidth, and the maximum degree. Finally, we provide an exact exponential algorithm slightly faster than the naive brute force approach running in time $\mathcal{O}^*(2^n)$.

Keywords matching cut; bounded degree cut; parameterized complexity; FPT algorithm; polynomial kernel; distance to cluster.

1 Introduction

A *cut* of a graph $G = (V, E)$ is a bipartition of its vertex set $V(G)$ into two non-empty sets A and B, denoted by (A, B). The set of all edges with one endpoint in A and the other in B is the *edge cut*, or the set of *crossing edges*, of (A, B). A *matching cut* is a (possibly empty) edge cut that is a matching, that is, its edges are pairwise vertex-disjoint. Equivalently, (A, B) is a matching cut of G if and only if every vertex is incident with at most one crossing edge of (A, B) [7, 16], that is, it has at most one neighbor across the cut.

Motivated by an open question posed by Komusiewicz et al. [20] during the presentation of their article, we investigate a natural generalization that arises from this alternative definition, which we call *d-cut*. Namely, for a positive integer $d \geq 1$, a d-cut is a cut (A, B) such that each vertex has at most d neighbors across the partition, that is, every vertex in A has at most d neighbors in B, and vice-versa. Note that a 1-cut is a matching cut. As expected, not every graph admits a d-cut, and the d-Cut problem is the problem of deciding, for a fixed integer $d \geq 1$, whether or not an input graph G has a d-cut.

When $d = 1$, we refer to the problem as Matching Cut. Graphs with no matching cut first appeared in Graham's manuscript [16] under the name of *indecomposable graphs*. Graham [16] presents some examples and properties of decomposable and indecomposable graphs, leaving their recognition as an open problem. In answer to Graham's question, Chvátal [7] proved that the problem of recognizing decomposable graphs is NP-hard for graphs of maximum degree at least four and polynomially solvable for graphs of maximum degree at most three; in fact, as shown by Moshi [27], every graph of maximum degree three and at least eight vertices has a matching cut.

Chvátal's results spurred a lot of research on the complexity of the problem [1, 5, 20–23, 28]. In particular, Bonsma [5] showed that Matching Cut remains NP-hard for planar graphs of maximum degree four and for planar graphs of girth five; Le and Randerath [23] gave an NP-hardness reduction for bipartite graphs of maximum degree four; Le and Le [22] proved that Matching Cut is NP-hard for graphs of diameter at least three, and presented a polynomial-time algorithm for graphs of diameter at most two. Beyond planar graphs, Bonsma's work [5] also proves that the matching cut property is expressible in monadic second order logic and, by Courcelle's Theorem [8], it follows that Matching Cut is FPT when parameterized by the treewidth of the input graph; he concludes with a proof that the problem admits an FPT algorithm when parameterzed by cliquewidth. As pointed out by a reviewer, the monadic second order logic expression given by Bonsma [5] can be generalized to d-Cut, which implies that d-Cut is fixed-parameter tractable under cliquewidth, which in turn implies tractability under treewidth, distance to cluster, and distance to co-cluster, among other structural parameters.

Kratsch and Le [21] noted that Chvátal's original reduction also shows that, unless the Exponential Time Hypothesis [17] (ETH) fails[1], there is no algorithm solving Matching Cut in time $2^{o(n)}$ on n-vertex input graphs. Also in [21], the authors provide a first branching algorithm, running[2] in time $\mathcal{O}^*\left(2^{n/2}\right)$, a single-exponential FPT algorithm when parameterized by the vertex cover number $\tau(G)$, and an algorithm generalizing the polynomial cases of line graphs [27] and claw-free graphs [5]. Kratsch and Le [21] also asked for the existence a single-exponential algorithm parameterized by treewidth. In response, Aravind et al. [1] provided a $\mathcal{O}^*\left(12^{\mathsf{tw}(G)}\right)$ algorithm for Matching Cut using nice tree decompositions, along with FPT algorithms for other structural parameters, namely neighborhood diversity, twin-cover, and distance to split graph.

The natural parameter – the number of edges crossing the cut – has also been considered. Indeed, Marx et al. [26] tackled the Stable Cutset problem, to which Matching Cut can be easily reduced via the line graph, and through a breakthrough technique showed that this problem is FPT when parameterized by the maximum size of the stable cutset. Recently, Komusiewicz et al. [20] improved on the results of Kratsch and Le [21], providing two exact exponential algorithm for Matching Cut that make heavy use of SAT-solvers: a deterministic one running in time $\mathcal{O}^*(1.328^n)$, and a randomized one that runs in time $\mathcal{O}^*(1.3071^n)$. Komusiewicz et al. [20] also present FPT algorithms parameterized by the distance to a cluster graph and the distance to a co-cluster graph, which improve the algorithm parameterized by the vertex cover number, since both parameters are easily seen to be smaller than the vertex cover number. For the distance to cluster parameter, they also presented a quadratic kernel; while for a combination of treewidth, maximum degree, and number of crossing edges, they showed that no polynomial kernel exists unless $\mathsf{NP} \subseteq \mathsf{coNP/poly}$.

A problem closely related to d-Cut is that of Internal Partition, first studied by Thomassen [32]. In this problem, we seek a bipartition of the vertices of an input graph such that every vertex has at least as many neighbors in its own part as in the other part. Such a partition is called an *internal partition*. Usually, the problem is posed in a more general form: given functions $a, b : V(G) \to \mathbb{Z}_+$, we seek a bipartition (A, B) of $V(G)$ such that every $v \in A$ satisfies $\mathsf{deg}_A(v) \geq a(v)$ and every $u \in B$ satisfies $\mathsf{deg}_B(u) \geq b(u)$, where $\mathsf{deg}_A(v)$ denotes the number of neighbors of v in the set A. Such a partition is called an (a, b)-*internal partition*. Originally, Thomassen [32] asked whether for any pair of positive integers s, t, a graph G with $\delta(G) \geq s + t + 1$ has a vertex bipartition (A, B) with $\delta(G[A]) \geq s$ and $\delta(G[B]) \geq t$, where $\delta(H)$ is the minimum degree of H. Stiebitz [31] answered that, in fact, for any graph G and any pair of functions $a, b : V(G) \to \mathbb{Z}_+$ satisfying $\mathsf{deg}(v) \geq a(v) + b(v) + 1$ for every $v \in V(G)$, G has an (a, b)-internal partition. Stiebitz [31] also asked if given integers s, t and a triangle-free graph G with $\delta(G) \geq s + t$, it was possible to find an (s, t)-internal partition of G; this was positively answered by Kaneko [18]. More recently, Ma and Yang [25] showed that, if G is $\{C_4$, diamond, $K_4\}$-free, $s, t \geq 2$, and $\delta(G) \geq s + t - 1$, then it is always possible to find an (s, t)-internal partition. It is conjectured that, for every positive integer r, there exists some constant n_r for which every r-regular graph with more than n_r vertices has an internal partition [2, 10] (the conjecture for

[1] The ETH states that 3-SAT on n variables cannot be solved in time $2^{o(n)}$; see [17] for more details.

[2] The $\mathcal{O}^*(\cdot)$ notation suppresses factors that are bounded by a polynomial in the input size.

r even appeared first in [30]). The cases $r \in \{3, 4\}$ have been settled by Shafique and Dutton [30]; the case $r = 6$ has been verified by Ban and Linial [2]. This latter result implies that every 6-regular graph of sufficiently large size has a 3-cut.

Our results. We aim at generalizing several of the previously reported results for Matching Cut. First, we show in Section 2, by using a reduction inspired by Chvátal's [7], that for every $d \geq 1$, d-Cut is NP-hard even when restricted to $(2d+2)$-regular graphs and that, if the maximum degree of G is at most $d + 2$, then finding a d-cut can be done in polynomial time. We do not expect improvements to the degree bound in the NP-hardness reduction: if there was an NP-hardness result for d-Cut restricted to $(2d + 1)$-regular graphs, this would disprove the conjecture about the existence of internal partitions on r-regular graphs [2,10,30] for r odd, unless P = NP. We conclude the section by giving a simple exact exponential algorithm that, for every $d \geq 1$, runs in time $\mathcal{O}^*((c_d)^n)$ for some constant $c_d < 2$, hence improving over the trivial brute-force algorithm running in time $\mathcal{O}^*(2^n)$.

We then proceed to analyze the problem in terms of its parameterized complexity. Section 3 begins with a proof, using the treewidth reduction technique of Marx et al. [26], that d-Cut is FPT parameterized by the maximum number of edges crossing the cut. Even though fixed-parameter tractability is implied by Bonsma's work [5], we present multiple algorithms with specific running times that do not rely on Courcelle's Theorem, beginning with a dynamic programming algorithm for d-Cut parameterized by treewidth that runs in $\mathcal{O}^*\left(2^{\mathsf{tw}(G)}(d+1)^{2\mathsf{tw}(G)}\right)$ time; in particular, for $d = 1$ this running time is of the form $\mathcal{O}^*\left(8^{\mathsf{tw}(G)}\right)$ and improves the Matching Cut algorithm given by Aravind et al. [1], which runs in $\mathcal{O}^*\left(12^{\mathsf{tw}(G)}\right)$ time. By employing the cross-composition framework of Bodlaender et al. [4] and using a reduction similar to the one in [20], we show that, unless NP $\subseteq$ coNP/poly, there is no polynomial kernel for d-Cut parameterized simultaneously by the number of crossing edges, the maximum degree, and the treewidth of the input graph. We then present a polynomial kernel and an FPT algorithm when parameterizing by the distance to cluster, denoted by $\mathsf{dc}(G)$. This polynomial kernel is our main technical contribution, and it is strongly inspired by the technique presented by Komusiewicz et al. [20] for Matching Cut. Finally, we give an FPT algorithm parameterized by the distance to co-cluster, denoted by $\mathsf{d\overline{c}}(G)$. These results imply the existence of a polynomial kernel for d-Cut parameterized by the vertex cover number $\tau(G)$. We present in Section 4 our concluding remarks and some open questions.

1.1 Preliminaries

We use standard graph-theoretic notation, and we consider simple undirected graphs without loops or multiple edges; see [11] for any undefined terminology. When the graph is clear from the context, the degree (that is, the number of neighbors) of a vertex v is denoted by $\mathsf{deg}(v)$, and the number of neighbors of a vertex v in a set $A \subseteq V(G)$ is denoted by $\mathsf{deg}_A(v)$. The minimum degree, the maximum degree, and the vertex cover number of a graph G are denoted by $\delta(G)$, $\Delta(G)$, and $\tau(G)$, respectively. The *line graph* of a graph G, denoted by $L(G)$, is the intersection graph of the edges of G; that is $V(L(G)) = \{e_{uv} \mid uv \in E(G)\}$ and $E(L(G)) = \{e_{uv}e_{uw} \mid$

$u \in V(G), \{v, w\} \subseteq N_G(u)\}$. For a positive integer $k \geq 1$, we denote by $[k]$ the set containing every integer i such that $1 \leq i \leq k$.

We refer the reader to [9, 12] for basic background on parameterized complexity, and we recall here only some basic definitions. A *parameterized problem* is a language $L \subseteq \Sigma^* \times \mathbb{N}$. For an instance $I = (x, k) \in \Sigma^* \times \mathbb{N}$, k is called the *parameter*. A parameterized problem is *fixed-parameter tractable* (FPT) if there exists an algorithm $\mathcal{A}$, a computable function f, and a constant c such that given an instance $I = (x, k)$, $\mathcal{A}$ (called an FPT *algorithm*) correctly decides whether $I \in L$ in time bounded by $f(k) \cdot |I|^c$.

A fundamental concept in parameterized complexity is that of *kernelization*; see [14] for a recent book on the topic. A kernelization algorithm, or just *kernel*, for a parameterized problem Π takes an instance (x, k) of the problem and, in time polynomial in $|x| + k$, outputs an instance (x', k') such that $|x'|, k' \leqslant g(k)$ for some function g, and $(x, k) \in \Pi$ if and only if $(x', k') \in \Pi$. The function g is called the *size* of the kernel and may be viewed as a measure of the "compressibility" of a problem using polynomial-time preprocessing rules. A kernel is called *polynomial* (resp. *quadratic, linear*) if the function $g(k)$ is a polynomial (resp. quadratic, linear) function in k. A breakthrough result of Bodlaender et al. [3] gave the first framework for proving that certain parameterized problems do not admit polynomial kernels, by establishing so-called *composition algorithms*. Together with a result of Fortnow and Santhanam [15] this allows to exclude polynomial kernels under the assumption that NP $\not\subseteq$ coNP/poly, otherwise implying a collapse of the polynomial hierarchy to its third level [33].

2 NP-hardness, polynomial cases, and exact exponential algorithm

In this section we focus on the classical complexity of the d-Cut problem, and on exact exponential algorithms. Before stating our NP-hardness result, we need some definitions and observations.

Definition 1 A set of vertices $X \subseteq V(G)$ is said to be *monochromatic* if, for any d-cut (A, B) of G, $X \subseteq A$ or $X \subseteq B$. A subgraph H of G is *monochromatic* if $V(H)$ is monochromatic.

Observation 1 *For fixed $d \geq 1$, the graph $K_{d+1,2d+1}$ is monochromatic. Moreover, if vertex v has at least $d + 1$ neighbors in a monochromatic set S, then $S \cup \{v\}$ is monochromatic.*

Definition 2 (Spool) For $n, d \geq 1$, a (d, n)*-spool* is the graph obtained from n copies of $K_{d+1,2d+2}$ such that, for every $1 \leq i \leq n$, one vertex of degree $d+1$ of the i-th copy is identified with one vertex of degree $d + 1$ of the $(i + 1 \mod n)$-th copy, so that the two chosen vertices in each copy are distinct. The *exterior* vertices of a copy are those of degree $d + 1$ that are not used to interface with another copy. The *interior* vertices of a copy are those of degree $2d + 2$ that do not interface with another copy.

An illustration of a $(2, 3)$-spool is shown in Figure 1.

Observation 2 *For fixed $d \geq 1$, a (d, n)-spool is monochromatic.*



Fig. 1 A $(2,3)$-spool. Circled vertices are exterior vertices.

Proof Let S be a (d,n)-spool. If $n = 1$, the observation follows by combining the two statements of Observation 1. Now let $X, Y \subsetneq S$ be two copies of $K_{d+1,2d+2}$ that share exactly one vertex v. By Observation 1, $X' = X \setminus \{v\}$ and $Y' = Y \setminus \{v\}$ are monochromatic. Since v has $d+1$ neighbors in X' and $d+1$ neighbors in Y', it follows that $X \cup Y$ is monochromatic. By repeating the same argument for every two copies of $K_{d+1,2d+2}$ that share exactly one vertex, the observation follows. □

Chvátal [7] proved that Matching Cut is NP-hard for graphs of maximum degree at least four. In the next theorem, whose proof is inspired by the reduction of Chvátal [7] from 3-Uniform Hypergraph Bicoloring, we prove the NP-hardness of d-cut for $(2d+2)$-regular graphs. In particular, for $d = 1$ it implies the NP-hardness of Matching Cut for 4-regular graphs, which is a strengthening of Chvátal's [7] hardness proof.

Theorem 1 *For every integer $d \geq 1$, d-cut is NP-hard even when restricted to $(2d+2)$-regular graphs.*

Proof Our reduction is from the 3-Uniform Hypergraph Bicoloring problem, which is NP-hard; see [24]. To avoid confusion with monochromatic sets, we say that a hyperedge is *unicolored* if all vertices in it are assigned the same color.

3-Uniform Hypergraph Bicoloring
Instance: A hypergraph $\mathcal{H}$ with exactly three vertices in each hyperedge.
Question: Can we 2-color $V(\mathcal{H})$ such that no hyperedge is unicolored?

Throughout this proof, i is an index representing a color, j and k are redundancy indices used to increase the degree of some sets of vertices, and ℓ and r are indices used to refer to separations of sets of exterior vertices.

Given an instance $\mathcal{H}$ of 3-Uniform Hypergraph Bicoloring, we proceed to construct a $(2d+2)$-regular instance G of d-Cut as follows. For each vertex $v \in V(\mathcal{H})$, add a $(d, 4\mathsf{deg}(v)+1)$-spool to G. Each of the $4\mathsf{deg}(v)+1$ sets of exterior vertices receives an (arbitrarily chosen) unique label. We begin by labeling one of them with $S(v^*)$ and separating it into two parts of equal size, which we denote by $S(v^*,i)$, $i \in [2]$; afterwards, for each $i \in [2]$, we choose an arbitrary vertex of $S(v^*,i)$ and label it with $s(v^*,i)$, then add edges between $S(v^*,1) \setminus \{s(v^*,1)\}$ and $S(v^*,2) \setminus \{s(v^*,2)\}$ to form a

perfect matching (see the right side of Figure 2). Now, for each $i, j \in [2]$ and $e \in E(\mathcal{H})$ with $v \in e$, we pick one of the $4\mathsf{deg}(v)$ remaining sets, label it with $S(v, e, i, j)$, and again divide it into two equal sized parts, denoted by $S_\ell(v, e, i, j)$, $\ell \in [2]$. To conclude the construction of vertex gadgets, add every edge between $S_1(v, e, i, j)$ and $S_2(v, e, i, j)$ (see the left side of Figure 2). Note that all interior vertices of these spools have degree $2d + 2$, every vertex labeled $s(v^*, i)$ has $d + 1$ neighbors, every other vertex in $S(v^*, i)$ has $d + 2$ neighbors, and every vertex in $S(v, e, i, j)$ has degree equal to $2d + 1$.



Fig. 2 Relationships between exterior vertices of a vertex gadget ($d = 3$).

For each color $i \in [2]$, add a $(d, n + 2m)$-spool to G, which we denote by $\mathcal{C}_i$, where $n = |V(\mathcal{H})|$ and $m = |E(\mathcal{H})|$. We proceed as for vertex gadgets and assign a unique label to each set of exterior vertices. First, for each $v \in V(\mathcal{H})$, pick one exterior set and label it with $C(v, i)$, divide it into two equal sized subsets $C_1(v, i)$ and $C_2(v, i)$, and, for each $\ell \in [2]$, pick one vertex of $C_\ell(v, i)$ and label it $c_\ell(v, i)$; finally, add all edges between $c_\ell(v, i)$ and $C_\ell(v, i) \setminus \{c_\ell(v, i)\}$ and add the edge $c_\ell(v, i)c_{3-\ell}(v, i)$. For each $e \in E(\mathcal{H})$ and $j \in [2]$, pick one of the remaining $2m$ exterior sets and label it with $C(e, i, j)$. Once again, we subdivide them into two parts of the same size, $C_1(e, i, j)$ and $C_2(e, i, j)$ and, for each $\ell \in [2]$, assign to one vertex of each $C_\ell(e, i, j)$ the label $c_\ell(e, i, j)$. To conclude, make each $C_\ell(e, i, j) \setminus \{c_\ell(e, i, j)\}$ a clique, and, between $C_\ell(e, i, j) \setminus \{c_\ell(e, i, j)\}$ and $C_r(e, i, k) \setminus \{c_r(e, i, k)\}$, add edges to form a perfect matching, for $\ell, j, r, k \in [2]$ and $(\ell, j) \neq (r, k)$. That is, each $C_\ell(e, i, j) \setminus \{c_\ell(e, i, j)\}$ forms a perfect matching with three other sets of exterior vertices different from itself (see the left side of Figure 3). So far, each $c_\ell(v, i)$ has degree $(d+1)+(d-1)+1 = 2d+1$, other vertices of $C_\ell(v, i)$ have degree $d + 2$, each vertex in $C_\ell(e, i, j) \setminus \{c_\ell(e, i, j)\}$ has degree $(d + 1) + (d - 2) + 3 = 2d + 2$, and each vertex labeled $c_\ell(e, i, j)$ has degree $d + 1$.

We now add edges between vertices of different color gadgets. In particular, we add every edge between $C_1(v, 2) \setminus \{c_1(v, 2)\}$ and $C_2(v, 1) \setminus \{c_2(v, 1)\}$. This increases the degree of these vertices to $2d + 1$. An example when $d = 3$ is illustrated in Figure 3.

As a first step to connect color gadgets and vertex gadgets, we add every edge between $s(v^*, i)$ and $C_i(v, i)$, every edge between $S(v^*, i) \setminus \{s(v^*, i)\}$ and $C_i(v, i) \setminus \{c_i(v, i)\}$, a perfect matching between $S(v^*, i) \setminus \{s(v^*, i)\}$ and $C_{3-i}(v, i) \setminus \{c_{3-i}(v, i)\}$, and the edge $s(v^*, i)c_i(v, 3 - i)$. Note that this last edge is fundamental, not only because it increases the degrees to the desired value, but also because, if the gadgets $\mathcal{C}_1$ and $\mathcal{C}_2$ corresponding to the colors belong to the same side of the cut, every $s(v^*, i)$ will have the same color and, since spools are monochromatic, so would the *entire* graph, as discussed in more detail below. Also note that, aside from $s(v^*, i)$, no other vertex has more than d neighbors outside of its spool. The edges described in this paragraph increase the degree of every $s(v^*, i)$ by $d + 1$, yielding a total degree of $2d + 2$, of every vertex in $S(v^*, i) \setminus \{s(v^*, i)\}$ to $(d + 2) + (d - 1) + 1 = 2d + 2$, of every vertex in $C_i(v, i) \setminus \{c_i(v, i)\}$ to $(d+2)+d = 2d+2$, of every vertex in $C_i(v, 3-i) \setminus \{c_i(v, 3-i)\}$



Fig. 3 Relationships between exterior vertices of color gadgets ($d = 3$).

to $(2d+1)+1 = 2d+2$, and of every $c_\ell(v,i)$ to $(2d+1)+1 = 2d+2$. Figure 4 gives an example of these connections.



Fig. 4 Relationships between exterior vertices of color and vertex gadgets ($d = 3$).

For the final group of gadgets, namely hyperedge gadgets, for each $e = \{x,y,z\} \in E(\mathcal{H})$, each color i, and each pair $j,\ell \in [2]$, we add one additional vertex $c'_\ell(e,i,j)$ adjacent to $c_\ell(e,i,j)$, $S_\ell(x,e,i,j)$, $S_\ell(y,e,i,j)$, and $c'_{3-\ell}(e,i,j)$; finally, we add every edge between $c_\ell(e,i,j)$ and $S_\ell(z,e,i,j)$. See Figure 5 for an illustration. Note that $c'_\ell(e,i,j)$ has degree $2d+2$; the degree of $c_\ell(e,i,j)$ increased from $d+1$ to $2d+2$, and the degree of each vertex of $S_\ell(x,e,i,j)$ increased from $2d+1$ to $2d+2$. This concludes our construction of the $(2d+2)$-regular graph G.

Now, suppose we are given a valid bicoloring φ of $\mathcal{H}$, and our goal is to construct a d-cut (A,B) of G. Put the gadget $\mathcal{C}_1$ in A and $\mathcal{C}_2$ in B. For each vertex $v \in V(\mathcal{H})$, if $\varphi(v) = 1$, put the gadget corresponding to v in A, otherwise put it in B. Note that no vertex from a color gadget $\mathcal{C}_i$ has more than d neighbors in the vertex gadgets,



Fig. 5 Hyperedge gadget ($d = 3$).

therefore none violates the d-cut property. As to the vertices coming from the vertex gadgets, only $s_\ell(v^*, i)$ has more than d neighbors outside of its gadget; however, it has d neighbors in $\mathcal{C}_i$ and only one in $\mathcal{C}_{3-i}$. Since each color gadget is in a different side of the partition, $s_\ell(v^*, i)$ does not violate the degree constraint. For each hyperedge $e = \{x, y, z\}$, put $c'_\ell(e, i, j)$, we divide our analysis in two cases. In the first of case we have $\varphi(x) = \varphi(y) = 1$, so the gadget for vertices x, y are in A and, consequently, $c'_\ell(e, i, j)$ has $2d$ neighbors in A, so it must also be placed in A; since e is not unicolored, $\varphi(z) = 2$, the gadget for z is in B and: (i) if $i = 1$, $c_\ell(e, i, j)$ is in A and has d neighbors in B and $c'_\ell(e, i, j)$ has no neighbor outside of A, or (ii) if $i = 2$, the unique neighbor of $c_\ell(e, i, j)$ across the cut is $c'_\ell(e, i, j)$; note that $c'_1(e, i, j)$ and $c'_2(e, i, j)$ were both assigned to A, so neither of them has more than one neighbor outside of A. For the second case, we have $\varphi(x) = \varphi(z) = 1 \neq \varphi(y)$. We add $c'_\ell(e, i, j)$ to A if $i = 1$, otherwise we add it to B. By doing so, $c_1(e, i, j)$, $c'_1(e, i, j)$, $c_2(e, i, j)$, and $c'_2(e, i, j)$ are in the same side of the cut and each of them has at most d neighbors across the cut. Thus, we conclude that (A, B) is indeed a d-cut of G.

Conversely, take a d-cut (A, B) of G and construct a bicoloring of $\mathcal{H}$ such that $\varphi(v) = 1$ if and only if the spool corresponding to v is in A. Suppose that this process results in some hyperedge $e = \{x, y, z\} \in E(\mathcal{H})$ being unicolored. That is, there is some hyperedge gadget where $S_\ell(x, e, i, j)$, $S_\ell(y, e, i, j)$, and $S_\ell(z, e, i, j)$ are in A, which implies that $c'_\ell(e, i, j) \in A$ and, consequently, that $c_\ell(e, i, j) \in A$ for every $\ell, i, j \in [2]$. However, since $c_\ell(e, 1, j)$ and $c_\ell(e, 2, j)$ are in A and a color gadget is monochromatic, both color gadgets belong to A, which in turn implies that every $s(v^*, i)$ has $d + 1$ neighbors in A and, therefore, must also be in A by Observation 1. Moreover, since spools are monochromatic, every vertex gadget is in A, implying that the entire graph belongs to A, contradicting the hypothesis that (A, B) is a d-cut of G. □

The graphs constructed by Theorem 1 are neither planar nor bipartite, but they are regular, a result that we were unable to find in the literature for Matching Cut. Note that every planar graph has a d-cut for every $d \geq 5$, so only the cases $d \in \{2, 3, 4\}$ remain open, as the case $d = 1$ is known to be NP-hard [5]. Concerning graphs of bounded diameter, Le and Le [22] prove the NP-hardness of Matching Cut for graphs of diameter at least three by reducing Matching Cut to itself. It can be easily seen that the same construction given by Le and Le [22], but reducing d-Cut to itself, also proves the NP-hardness of d-Cut for every $d \geq 1$.

Corollary 1 *For every integer $d \geq 1$, d-Cut is NP-hard for graphs of diameter at least three.*

We leave as an open problem to determine whether there exists a polynomial-time algorithm for d-Cut for graphs of diameter at most two for every $d \geq 2$, as it is the case for $d = 1$ [22].

We now turn to cases that can be solved in polynomial time. Our next result is a natural generalization of Chvátal's algorithm [7] for Matching Cut on graphs of maximum degree three.

Theorem 2 *For any graph G and integer $d \geq 1$ such that $\Delta(G) \leq d + 2$, it can be decided in polynomial time if G has a d-cut. Moreover, for $d = 1$ any graph G with $\Delta(G) \leq 3$ and $|V(G)| \geq 8$ has a matching cut, for $d = 2$ any graph G with $\Delta(G) \leq 4$ and $|V(G)| \geq 6$ has a 2-cut, and for $d \geq 3$ any graph G with $\Delta(G) \leq d+2$ has a d-cut.*

Proof We may assume that G is connected, as otherwise it always admits a d-cut. If G is a tree, any edge is a cut edge and, consequently, a d-cut is easily found. So let C be a shortest cycle of G. If $d = 1$ we use Chvátal's result [7] together with the size bound of eight observed by Moshi [27]; hence, we may assume that $d \geq 2$. In the case that $V(G) = C$, we may pick any vertex v and note that $(\{v\}, C \setminus \{v\})$ is a d-cut.

Suppose first that $|C| = 3$ and $d = 2$. If $(C, V(G) \setminus C)$ is a 2-cut, we are done. Otherwise, there is some vertex $v \notin C$ with three neighbors in C (since by the hypothesis on $\Delta(G)$, every vertex in C has at most two neighbors in $V(G) \setminus C$) and, consequently, $Q := C \cup \{v\}$ induces a K_4. If $V(G) = Q$, we can arbitrarily partition Q into two sets with two vertices each and get a 2-cut of G. Also, if no other $u \notin Q$ has three neighbors in Q, $(Q, V(G) \setminus Q)$ is a 2-cut of G. If there is such a vertex u, let $R := Q \cup \{u\}$. If $V(G) = R$, then clearly G has no 2-cut. Note that $|Q| = 5$, and this will be the only case in the proof where G does not have a d-cut. Otherwise, if $V(G) \neq R$, $(R, V(G) \setminus R)$ is a 2-cut, because no vertex outside of R can be adjacent to more than two vertices in R, and we are done.

If $|C| = 3$ and $d \geq 3$, then clearly $(C, V(G) \setminus C)$ is a d-cut, and we are also done.

Otherwise, that is, if $|C| \geq 4$, we claim that $(C, V(G) \setminus C)$ is always a d-cut. For $v \in C$, note that $\deg(v) \leq d + 2$, hence v has at most d neighbors in $G - C$. For $v \in V(G) \setminus C$, if $|C| \geq 5$, necessarily $\deg_C(v) \leq 1$, as otherwise we would find a cycle in G shorter than C, and therefore $(C, V(G) \setminus C)$ is a d-cut. By a similar argument, if $|C| = 4$, then $\deg_C(v) \leq 2$, and the theorem follows as we assume that $d \geq 2$. □

Theorems 1 and 2 present a "quasi-dichotomy" for d-cut on graphs of bounded maximum degree. Specifically, for $\Delta(G) \in \{d + 3, \ldots, 2d + 1\}$, the complexity of the problem remains unknown. However, we believe that most, if not all, of these open cases can be solved in polynomial time; see the discussion in Section 4.

To conclude this section, we present a simple exact exponential algorithm which, for every $d \geq 1$, runs in time $\mathcal{O}^*(c_d^n)$ for some constant $c_d < 2$. For the case $d = 1$, the currently known algorithms [20,21] exploit structures that appear to get out of control when d increases, and so they have a better running time than the one described below.

Theorem 3 *For every fixed integer $d \geq 1$ and n-vertex graph G, there is an algorithm that solves d-Cut in time $\mathcal{O}^*((c_d)^n)$, for some constant $1 < c_d < 2$.*

Proof When an instance of size n branches into t subproblems of sizes at most $n - s_1, \ldots, n - s_t$, respectively, the vector $(s_1, \ldots, s_t)$ is called the *branching vector* of this branching rule, and the unique positive real root of the equation $x^n - \sum_{i \in [t]} x^{n-s_i} = 0$ is called the *branching factor* of the rule. The total complexity of a branching algorithm is given by $\mathcal{O}^*(\alpha^n)$, where α is the largest branching factor among all rules of the algorithm. For more on branching algorithms, we refer to [13].

Our algorithm takes as input G and outputs a d-cut (A, B) of G, if it exists. To do so, we build a branching algorithm that maintains, at every step, a tripartition of $V(G) = (A, B, D)$ such that (A, B) is a d-cut of $G \setminus D$. The central idea of our rules is to branch on small sets of vertices (namely, of size at most $d + 1$) at each step such that either at least one bipartition of the set forces some other vertex to choose a side of the cut, or we can conclude that there is at least one bipartition that violates the d-cut property. First, we present our reduction rules, which are applied following this order at the beginning of each recursive step.

R1 If (A, B) violates the d-cut property, output NO.
R2 If $D = \emptyset$, we have a d-cut of G. Output (A, B).
R3 If there is some $v \in D$ with $\deg_A(v) \geq d + 1$ and $\deg_B(v) \geq d + 1$, output NO.
R4 While there is some $v \in D$ with $\deg_A(v) \geq d + 1$ (resp. $\deg_B(v) \geq d + 1$), add v to A (resp. B).

Our branching rules, and their respective branching vectors, are listed below.

B1 If there is some $v \in A \cup B$ with $\deg_D(v) \geq d + 1$, choose a set $X \subseteq N_D(v)$ of size d and branch on all possible possible bipartitions of X. Note that, if all vertices of X are in the other side of v, at least one vertex of $N_D(v) \setminus X$ must be in the same side as v. As such, this branching vector is of the form $\{d + 1\} \times \{d\}^{2^d - 1}$.
B2 If there is some $v \in A$ (resp. B) such that $\deg_B(v) + \deg_D(v) \geq d + 1$ (resp. $\deg_A(v) + \deg_D(v) \geq d + 1$), choose a set $X \subseteq N_D(v)$ of size $s = d + 1 - \deg_B(v)$ (resp. $s = d + 1 - \deg_A(v)$) and branch on every possible bipartition of X. Since rule B1 was not applied, we have that $\deg_D(v) \leq d$, $\deg_B(v) \geq 1$ (resp. $\deg_A(v) \geq 1$), and $s \leq d$. If all vertices of X were placed in B (resp. A), we would violate the d-cut property and, thus, do not need to investigate this branch of the search. In the worst case, namely when $s = d$, this yields the branching vector $\{d\}^{2^d - 1}$.

We now claim that, if none of the above rules is applicable, we have that $(A \cup D, B)$ is a d-cut of G. To see that this is the case, suppose that there is some vertex $v \in V(G)$ that violates the d-cut property; that is, it has a set Y of $d + 1$ neighbors across the cut.

Suppose that $v \in B$. Then $Y \subseteq A \cup D$, so we have $\deg_A(v) + \deg_D(v) \geq d + 1$, in which case rule B2 could be applied, a contradiction. Thus, we have that $v \notin B$, so $Y \subseteq B$ and either $v \in A$ or $v \in D$; in the former case, by rule R1, (A, B) would not be a d-cut. In the latter case, we would have that $\deg_B(v) \geq d + 1$, but then rule R4 would still be applicable. Consequently, $v \notin A \cup B \cup D = V(G)$, so such a vertex does not exist, and thus we have that $(A \cup D, B)$ is a d-cut of G. Note that a symmetric argument holds for the bipartition $(A, B \cup D)$. Before executing the above branching algorithm, we need to ensure that $A \neq \emptyset$ and $B \neq \emptyset$. To do that, for each possible pair of vertices $u, v \in V(G)$, we execute the entire algorithm starting with $A := \{u\}$ and $B := \{v\}$.

As to the running time of the algorithm, for rule B2 we have that the unique positive real root of $x^n - (2^d - 1)x^{n-d} = 0$ is of the closed form $x = \sqrt[d]{2^d - 1} < 2$. For rule B1, we have that the polynomial associated with the recurrence relation, $p_d(x) = x^n - (2^d - 1)x^{n-d} - x^{n-d-1}$, verifies $p_d(1) = 1 - 2^d < 0$ and $p_d(2) = 2^{n-d-1} > 0$. Since it is a continuous function and $p_d(x)$ has a unique positive real root c_d, it holds that $1 < c_d < 2$. The final complexity of our algorithm is $\mathcal{O}^*(c_d^n)$, with $\sqrt[d]{2^d - 1} < c_d < 2$, since

$$p_d\left(\sqrt[d]{2^d-1}\right) = (2^d-1)^{n/d} - (2^d-1)(2^d-1)^{\frac{n-d}{d}} - (2^d-1)^{\frac{n-d-1}{d}} = -(2^d-1)^{\frac{n-d-1}{d}} < 0$$

□

Table 1 presents the branching factors for some values of d for the two branching rules of Theorem 3.

d	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
B1	1.6180	1.8793	1.9583	1.9843	1.9937	1.9973	1.9988
B2	1.0000	1.7320	1.9129	1.9679	1.9873	1.9947	1.9977

Table 1 Branching factors for some values of d.

3 Parameterized algorithms and kernelization

In this section we focus on the parameterized complexity of d-Cut. More precisely, in Section 3.1 we consider as the parameter the number of edges crossing the cut and in Section 3.3 the distance to cluster (in particular, we provide a quadratic kernel).

3.1 Crossing edges

In this section we consider as the parameter the maximum number of edges crossing the cut. In a nutshell, our approach is to use as a black box one of the algorithms presented by Marx et al. [26] for a class of separation problems. Their fundamental problem is $\mathcal{G}$-MinCut, for a fixed class of graphs $\mathcal{G}$, which we state formally, along with their main result, below.

$\mathcal{G}$-MinCut
Input: A graph G, vertices s, t, and an integer k.
Parameter: The integer k.
Question: Is there an induced subgraph H of G with at most k vertices such that $H \in \mathcal{G}$ and $V(H)$ is an $s - t$ separator?

Theorem 4 (Theorem 3.1 in [26]) *If $\mathcal{G}$ is a decidable and hereditary graph class, $\mathcal{G}$-MinCut is* FPT.

Note that $\mathcal{G}$-MinCut asks for a *vertex separator* so, in order to apply Theorem 4, we need to translate the d-cut property of the edges of our input graph G, to a property about the vertices of an auxiliary graph which, in our case, shall be the line graph of G. To perform this translation, we first need to specify a graph class to which, on the line graph, our separators correspond. We must also be careful to guarantee that the removal of a separator in the line graph leaves non-empty components in the input graph. To accomplish the latter, for each $v \in V(G)$, we add a private clique of size $2d$ adjacent only to it, and choose one arbitrary vertex v' in each of them. The algorithm asks, for each pair v', u', whether or not a "special" separator of the appropriate size between v' and u' exists. We assume henceforth that these private cliques have been added to the input graph G. For each integer $d \geq 1$, we define the graph class $\mathcal{G}_d$ as follows.

Definition 3 A graph H belongs to $\mathcal{G}_d$ if and only if its maximum clique size is at most d.

Note that $\mathcal{G}_d$ is decidable and hereditary for every integer $d \geq 1$.

Lemma 1 *G has a d-cut if and only if the line graph of G has a vertex separator belonging to $\mathcal{G}_d$ that separates e_v and e_u, where e_v corresponds to the edge $vv' \in E(G)$ and e_u to the edge $uu' \in E(G)$, for some pair $u, v \in V(G)$.*

Proof Let $H = L(G)$, (A, B) be a d-cut of G, and recall that $uv \in E(G)$ if and only if there is a corresponding $e_u v V(H)$. Moreover, let $F \subseteq V(H)$ be the set of vertices such that $e_{uv} \in F$ if and only if $u \in A$ and $v \in B$. The fact that F is a separator of H follows directly from the hypothesis that (A, B) is a cut of G. Now, to show that $H[F] \in \mathcal{G}_d$, suppose, towards a contradiction, that $H[F]$ contains a clique Q with more than d vertices, and that R is the set of edges corresponding to vertices of Q in G. That is, there are at least $d+1$ edges of G that are pairwise intersecting and with one endpoint in A and the other in B. Note, however, that for at least one of the parts, say A, there is also *at most* one vertex $w \in A$ with edges in $R \subseteq E(G)$, otherwise there would be two non-adjacent vertices in clique $Q \subseteq V(H)$. As such, we conclude that every edge in Q has an endpoint in w, but this, on the other hand, implies that w has $d+1$ neighbors in B, contradicting the hypothesis that (A, B) is a d-cut of G. Since A and B are non-empty and every vertex of G is part of a monochromatic clique with $2d+1$ vertices, there exists $u, u' \in A$ and $v, v' \in B$ and, consequently, we have that (A, B) separates edges vv' and uu', so, in $H - F$, $e_v = e_{vv'}$ is disconnected from $e_u = e_{uu'}$.

For the converse, take an $e_v - e_u$ separator $S \subseteq V(H)$ such that $H[S] \in \mathcal{G}_d$ and let E_S be the edges of G corresponding to S. To see that $G^* = G - E_S$ is disconnected, note that, otherwise, there would be a shortest path between v' and u' that uses vv' and uu', so, in $H - S$, there would be a path between e_v and e_u, a contradiction to the fact that S is an $e_v - e_u$ separator. Let G' be the graph where each vertex corresponds to a connected component of G^* and two vertices are adjacent if and only if there is an edge in E_S between vertices of the respective components. Let Q_r be an arbitrarily chosen connected component of $G - E_S$. Now, for each component at an odd distance from Q_r in G', add that component to B; all other components are placed in A. Since G^* is disconnected, G' has more than one vertex and, consequently, A and B are non-empty. We claim that (A, B) is a d-cut of G. Let $F \subseteq E_S$ be the set of edges with one endpoint in A and the other in B. Note that $G - F$ is disconnected due to the

construction of A and B. If there is some $v \in A$ with more than d neighbors in B, we obtain that there is some clique of equal size in $H[S]$, contradicting the hypothesis that this subgraph belongs to $\mathcal{G}_d$. □

Theorem 5 *For every $d \geq 1$, there is an* FPT *algorithm for d-*Cut *parameterized by k, the maximum number of edges crossing the cut.*

Proof For each pair of vertices $s, t \in V(G)$ that do not belong to the private cliques, our goal is to find a subset of vertices $S \subseteq V(L(G))$ of size at most k that separates s and t such that $L(G)[S] \in \mathcal{G}_d$. This is precisely what is provided by Theorem 4, and the correctness of this approach is guaranteed by Lemma 1. Since we perform a quadratic number of calls to the algorithm given by Theorem 4, our algorithm still runs in FPT time. □

As to the running time of the FPT algorithm given by Theorem 5, the treewidth reduction technique of [26] relies on the construction of a monadic second order logic (MSOL) expression and Courcelle's Theorem [8] to guarantee fixed-parameter tractability, and therefore it is hard to provide an explicit running time in terms of k.

3.2 Treewidth

We now present an algorithm for d-Cut parameterized by the treewidth of the input graph that; in particular, it improves the running time of the best known algorithm for Matching Cut [1].

Definition 4 (Tree decomposition) A *tree decomposition* of a graph G is a pair $(T, \mathcal{B} = \{B_j \mid j \in V(T)\})$, where T is a tree and $\mathcal{B} \subseteq 2^{V(G)}$ is a family where:

1. For every $v \in V(G)$ there is some node $x \in V(T)$ such that $v \in B_x$;
2. For every edge $uv \in E(G)$ there is some $x \in V(T)$ such that $\{u, v\} \subseteq B_x$; and
3. For every $x, y, z \in V(T)$, if z is in the path between x and y in T, then $B_x \cap B_y \subseteq B_z$.

In a tree decomposition, $(T, \mathcal{B} = \{B_j \mid j \in V(T)\})$, each $B_x \in \mathcal{B}$ is called a *bag* of the tree decomposition; G has treewidth at most t if it admits a tree decomposition such that no bag has more than t vertices. After rooting T, G_x denotes the subgraph of G induced by the vertices contained in any bag that belongs to the subtree of T rooted at bag x. One of the most useful properties of the tree decomposition is the existence of what is known as a *nice tree decomposition*, for which we define as follows.

Definition 5 (Nice tree decomposition) A tree decomposition $(T, \mathcal{B})$ of a graph G is said to be *nice* if it T is a tree rooted at an empty bag $r(T)$ and each of its bags is from one of the following four types:

1. *Leaf node*: a leaf x of T with $|B_x| = 1$.
2. *Introduce node*: an inner node x of T with one child y such that $B_y \subseteq B_x$ and $B_x \setminus B_y = \{u\}$, for some $u \in V(G)$.
3. *Forget node*: an inner node x of T with one child y such that $B_x \subseteq B_y$ and $B_y \setminus B_x = \{u\}$, for some $u \in V(G)$.
4. *Join node*: an inner node x of T with two children y, z such that $B_x = B_y = B_z$.

In the next theorem, note that the assumption that the given tree decomposition is *nice* is not restrictive, as any tree decomposition can be transformed into a nice one of the same width in polynomial time [19]. For further properties of treewidth, we refer to [9, 29].

Theorem 6 *For every integer $d \geq 1$, given a nice tree decomposition of G of width $\mathsf{tw}(G)$, d-Cut can be solved in time $\mathcal{O}^*\left(2^{\mathsf{tw}(G)}(d+1)^{2\mathsf{tw}(G)}\right)$.*

Proof As expected, we will perform dynamic programming on a nice tree decomposition. For this proof, we denote a d-cut of G by (L, R) and suppose that we are given a total ordering of the vertices of G. Let $(T, \mathcal{B})$ be a nice tree decomposition of G rooted at a node $r \in V(T)$. For a given node $x \in T$, an entry of our table is indexed by a triple $(A, \boldsymbol{\alpha}, t)$, where $A \subseteq B_x$, $\boldsymbol{\alpha} \in (\{0\} \cup [d])^{\mathsf{tw}(G)+1}$, and t is a binary value. Each coordinate a_i of α indicates how many vertices *outside* of B_x the i-th vertex of B_x has in the other side of the partition. More precisely, we denote by $f_x(A, \boldsymbol{\alpha}, t)$ the binary value indicating whether or not $V(G_x)$ has a bipartition (L_x, R_x) such that $L_x \cap B_x = A$, every vertex $v_i \in B_x$ has exactly a_i neighbors in the other side of the partition (L_x, R_x) outside of B_x, and both L_x and R_x are non-empty if and only if $t = 1$. Note that G admits a d-cut if and only if $f_r(\emptyset, \mathbf{0}, 1) = 1$. Figure 6 gives an example of an entry in the dynamic programming table and the corresponding solution on the subtree.



Fig. 6 Example for $d = 3$ of dynamic programming state and corresponding solution on the subtree. Squared (circled) vertices belong to L_x (R_x). Numbers indicate the value of α_i.

We say that an entry $(A, \boldsymbol{\alpha}, t)$ for a node x is *valid* if for every $v_i \in A$, $|N(v_i) \cap (B_x \setminus A)| + a_i \leq d$, for every $v_j \in B_x \setminus A$, $|N(v_i) \cap A| + a_j \leq d$, if $B_x \neq B_x \setminus A \neq \emptyset$ implies $t = 1$, and if $B_x = \emptyset$ then $t = 1$; note that the latter is only applicable to the root since G is connected. If neither of the above cases hold, the entry is said to be *invalid*. Moreover, note that if $f_x(A, \boldsymbol{\alpha}, t) = 1$, the corresponding bipartition (L_x, R_x) of $V(G_x)$ is a d-cut if and only if $(A, \boldsymbol{\alpha}, t)$ is valid and $t = 1$.

We now explain how the entries for a node x can be computed, assuming recursively that the entries for their children have been already computed. We distinguish the four possible types of nodes. Whenever $(A, \boldsymbol{\alpha}, t)$ is invalid or absurd (with, for example, $a_i < 0$) we define $f_x(A, \alpha, t)$ to be 0, and for simplicity we will not specify this in the equations stated below.

- Leaf node: Since $B_x = \{v\}$, set $f_x(\{v\}, \mathbf{0}, 0) = f_x(\emptyset, \mathbf{0}, 0) = 1$. These are all the possible partitions of B_x, taking $\mathcal{O}(1)$ time to be computed.
- Introduce node: Let y be the child of x and $B_x \setminus B_y = \{v_i\}$. The transition is given by the following equation, where $\boldsymbol{\alpha}^*$ has entries equal to $\boldsymbol{\alpha}$ but without the

coordinate corresponding to v_i. If $a_i > 0$, $f_x(A, \boldsymbol{\alpha}, t)$ is invalid since v_i has no neighbors in $G_x - B_x$.

$$f_x(A, \boldsymbol{\alpha}, t) = \begin{cases} f_y(A \setminus \{v_i\}, \boldsymbol{\alpha}^*, t), & \text{if } A = B_x \text{ or } A = \emptyset. \\ \max_{t' \in \{0,1\}} f_y(A \setminus \{v_i\}, \boldsymbol{\alpha}^*, t'), & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

For the first case, G_x has a bipartition (which will also be a d-cut if $t = 1$) represented by $(A, \boldsymbol{\alpha}, t)$ only if G_y has a bipartition (d-cut), precisely because, in both G_x and G_y, the entire bag is in one side of the cut. For the latter case, if G_y has a bipartition, regardless if it is a d-cut or not, G_x has a d-cut because B_x is not contained in a single part of the cut, unless the entry is invalid. The computation for each of these nodes takes $\mathcal{O}(1)$ time per entry.

– Forget node: Let y be the child of x and $B_y \setminus B_x = \{v_i\}$. In the next equation, $\boldsymbol{\alpha}'$ has the same entries as $\boldsymbol{\alpha}$ with the addition of entry a_i corresponding to v_i and, for each $v_j \in A \cap N(v_i)$, $a'_j = a_j - 1$. Similarly, for $\boldsymbol{\alpha}''$, for each $v_j \in (B_x \setminus A) \cap N(v_i)$, $a''_j = a_j - 1$.

$$f_x(A, \boldsymbol{\alpha}, t) = \max_{a_i \in \{0\} \cup [d]} \max\{f_y(A, \boldsymbol{\alpha}', t),\ f_y(A \cup \{v_i\}, \boldsymbol{\alpha}'', t)\}.$$

Note that $\boldsymbol{\alpha}'$ and $\boldsymbol{\alpha}''$ take into account the forgetting of v_i; its neighbors get an additional neighbor outside of B_x that is in the other side of the bipartition. Moreover, since we inspect the entries of y for every possible value of a_i, if at least one of them represented a feasible bipartition of G_y, the corresponding entry on $f_y(\cdot)$ would be non-zero and, consequently, $f_x(A, \boldsymbol{\alpha}, t)$ would also be non-zero. Computing an entry for a forget node takes $\mathcal{O}(d)$ time.

– Join node: Finally, for a join node x with children y and z, a *splitting* of $\boldsymbol{\alpha}$ is a pair $\boldsymbol{\alpha}_y, \boldsymbol{\alpha}_z$ such that for every coordinate a_j of $\boldsymbol{\alpha}$, it holds that the sum of j-th coordinates of $\boldsymbol{\alpha}_y$ and $\boldsymbol{\alpha}_z$ is equal to a_j. The set of all splittings is denoted by $S(\boldsymbol{\alpha})$ and has size $\mathcal{O}\Big((d+1)^{\mathsf{tw}(G)+1}\Big)$. As such, we define our transition function as follows.

$$f_x(A, \boldsymbol{\alpha}, t) = \max_{t \leq t_y + t_z \leq 2t} \max_{S(\boldsymbol{\alpha})} f_y(A, \boldsymbol{\alpha}_y, t_y) \cdot f_z(A, \boldsymbol{\alpha}_z, t_z).$$

The condition $t \leq t_y + t_z \leq 2t$ enforces that, if $t = 1$, at least one of the graphs G_y, G_z must have a d-cut; otherwise, if $t = 0$, neither of them can. When iterating over all splittings of $\boldsymbol{\alpha}$, we are essentially testing all possible counts of neighbors outside of B_y such that there exists some entry for node z such that $\boldsymbol{\alpha}_y + \boldsymbol{\alpha}_z = \boldsymbol{\alpha}$. Finally, $f_x(A, \boldsymbol{\alpha}, t)$ is feasible if there is at least one splitting and t_y, t_z such that both G_y and G_z admit a bipartition. This node type, which is the bottleneck of our dynamic programming approach, takes $\mathcal{O}\Big((d+1)^{\mathsf{tw}(G)+1}\Big)$ time per entry.

Consequently, since we have $\mathcal{O}(\mathsf{tw}(G)) \cdot n$ nodes in a nice tree decomposition, spend $\mathcal{O}\big(\mathsf{tw}(G)^2\big)$ to detect an invalid entry, have $\mathcal{O}\Big(2^{\mathsf{tw}(G)+1}(d+1)^{\mathsf{tw}(G)+1}\Big)$ entries per node, each taking $\mathcal{O}\Big((d+1)^{\mathsf{tw}(G)+1}\Big)$ time to be computed, our algorithm runs in time $\mathcal{O}\Big(\mathsf{tw}(G)^3 2^{\mathsf{tw}(G)+1}(d+1)^{2\mathsf{tw}(G)+2} \cdot n\Big)$, as claimed. □

From Theorem 6 we immediately get the following corollary, which improves over the algorithm given by Aravind et al. [1].

Corollary 2 *Given a nice tree decomposition of G of width $\mathsf{tw}(G)$,* Matching Cut *can be solved in time $\mathcal{O}^*\left(8^{\mathsf{tw}(G)}\right)$.*

3.3 Kernelization and distance to cluster

The proof of the following theorem consists of a simple generalization to every $d \geq 1$ of the construction given by Komusiewicz et al. [20] for $d = 1$.

Theorem 7 *For any fixed $d \geq 1$, d-*Cut *does not admit a polynomial kernel when simultaneously parameterized by k, Δ, and $\mathsf{tw}(G)$, unless $\mathsf{NP} \subseteq \mathsf{coNP/poly}$.*

Proof We show that the problem cross-composes into itself. Start with t instances $G_1, \ldots, G_t$ of d-Cut. First, pick an arbitrary vertex $v_i \in V(G_i)$, for each $i \in [t]$. Second, for $i \in [t-1]$, add a copy of K_{2d}, call it $K(i)$, every edge between v_i and $K(i)$, and every edge between $K(i)$ and v_{i+1}. This concludes the construction of G, which for $d = 1$ coincides with that presented by Komusiewicz et al. [20].

Suppose that (A, B) is a d-cut of some G_i and that $v_i \in A$. Note that $(V(G) \setminus B, B)$ is a d-cut of G since the only edges in the cut are those between A and B. For the converse, take some d-cut (A, B) of G and note that every vertex in the set $\{v_t\} \cup \bigcup_{i \in [t-1]} \{v_i\} \cup K(i)$ is contained in the same side of the partition, say A. Since $B \neq \emptyset$, there is some i such that $B \cap V(G_i) \neq \emptyset$, which implies that there is some i (possibly more than one) such that $(A \cap V(G_i), B \cap V(G_i))$ must be a d-cut of G_i.

Finally, note that the treewidth, maximum degree, and number of edges crossing the partition are bounded by $2dn \leq 2n^2$, where n is the maximum number of vertices of the graphs G_i, since adding the cliques between the G_i's does not increase these parameters by more than $2d \leq 2n$. □

We now proceed to show that d-Cut admits a polynomial kernel when parameterizing by the *distance to cluster* parameter, denoted by dc. A *cluster graph* is a graph such that every connected component is a clique. A graph has *distance to cluster k* if there is a set $U \subseteq V(G)$ of size k and $G - U$ is a cluster graph. Following the convention established in the literature, we refer to the maximal cliques of $G - U$ as the *clusters* of G. Our results are heavily inspired by the work of Komusiewicz et al. [20]. Indeed, most of our reduction rules are natural generalizations of theirs. However, we need some extra observations and rules that only apply for $d \geq 2$, such as Rule 8.

Throughout this section, we keep a partition of U into sets $(U_1, \ldots, U_t)$ and maintain the property that each U_i is monochromatic set; each U_i may also be referred to as as *monochromatic part* of U. Initially, we set each U_i as a singleton. In order to simplify the analysis of our instance, for each U_i of size at least two, we will have a private clique of size $2d$ adjacent to every vertex of U_i, which we call X_i. The *merge* operation between U_i and U_j is the following modification: delete $X_i \cup X_j$, set U_i as $U_i \cup U_j$, U_j as empty, and add a new clique of size $2d$, which we shall call X_i for simplicity, and make it adjacent to every element of the new U_i. We say that an operation is *safe* if the resulting instance is a YES instance if and only if the original instance was.

Observation 3 *If $U_i \cup U_j$ is monochromatic, merging U_i and U_j is safe.*

It is worth mentioning that the second case of the following rule is not needed in the corresponding rule in [20]; we need it here to prove the safeness of Rules 7 and 8.

Reduction Rule 1 *Suppose that $G - U$ has some cluster C such that*

1. *$(C, V(G) \setminus C)$ is a d-cut, or*
2. *$|C| \leq 2d$ and there is $C' \subseteq C$ such that $(C', V(G) \setminus C')$ is a d-cut.*

Then output YES.

After applying Rule 1, for every cluster C, C has some vertex with at least $d+1$ neighbors in U, or there is some vertex of U with at least $d+1$ neighbors in C. Moreover, note that no cluster C with at least $2d+1$ vertices can be partitioned in such a way that one side of the cut is composed only by a proper subset of vertices of C, i.e., C is monochromatic

The following definition is a natural generalization of the definition of the set N^2 given by Komusiewicz et al. [20]. However, there is a crucial difference that keeps us from achieving equivalent bounds both in terms of running time and size of the kernel. Namely, for a vertex to be forced into a particular side of the cut, it must have at least $d+1$ neighbors on that side; moreover, a vertex of U being adjacent to $2d$ vertices of a cluster C implies that C is monochromatic. Only if $d = 1$, i.e., when we are dealing with matching cuts, the equality $d + 1 = 2d$ holds. This gap between $d+1$ and $2d$ is the main difference between our kernelization algorithm for general d and the one shown in [20] for Matching Cut, and the main source of the differing complexities we obtain. For $d = 1$, the fourth case of the following definition is a particular case of the third one, but this is not true anymore for $d \geq 2$. Figure 7 illustrates the set of vertices introduced in Definition 6.

Definition 6 For a monochromatic part $U_i \subseteq U$, let $N^{2d}(U_i)$ be the set of vertices $v \in V(G) \setminus U$ for which at least one of the following holds:

1. v has at least $d+1$ neighbors in U_i.
2. v is in a cluster C of size at least $2d+1$ in $G - U$ such that there is some vertex of C with at least $d+1$ neighbors in U_i.
3. v is in a cluster C of $G - U$ and some vertex in U_i has $2d$ neighbors in C.
4. v is in a cluster C of $G - U$ of size at least $2d+1$ and some vertex in U_i has $d+1$ neighbors in C.



Fig. 7 The four cases that define membership in $N^{2d}(U_i)$ for $d = 2$, from left to right.

Observation 4 *For every monochromatic part U_i, $U_i \cup N^{2d}(U_i)$ is monochromatic.*

The next rules aim to increase the size of monochromatic sets. In particular, Rule 2 translates the transitivity of the monochromatic property, while Rule 3 identifies a case where merging the monochromatic sets is inevitable.

Reduction Rule 2 *If $N^{2d}(U_i) \cap N^{2d}(U_j) \neq \emptyset$, merge U_i and U_j.*

Reduction Rule 3 *If there is a set of $2d+1$ vertices $L \subseteq V(G)$ with two common neighbors u, u' such that $u \in U_i$ and $u' \in U_j$, merge U_i and U_j.*

Proof (of safeness of Rule 3) Suppose that in some d-cut (A, B), $u \in A$ and $u' \in B$, this implies that at most d elements of L are in A and at most d are in B, which is impossible since $|L| = 2d + 1$. □

We say that a cluster is *small* if it has at most $2d$ vertices, and *big* otherwise. Moreover, a vertex in a cluster is *ambiguous* if it has neighbors in more than one U_i. A cluster is *ambiguous* if it has an ambiguous vertex, and *fixed* if it is contained in some $N^{2d}(U_i)$.

Observation 5 *If G is reduced by Rule 1, every big cluster is ambiguous or fixed.*

Proof Since Rule 1 cannot be applied, every cluster C has either one vertex v with at least $d+1$ neighbors in U or there is some vertex of a set U_i with $d+1$ neighbors in C. In the latter case, by applying the fourth case in the definition of $N^{2d}(U_i)$, we conclude that C is fixed. In the former case, either v has $d+1$ neighbors in the same U_i, in which case C is fixed, or its neighborhood is spread across multiple monochromatic sets, and so v and, consequently, C are ambiguous. □

Our next goal is to bound the number of vertices outside of U.

Reduction Rule 4 *If there are two clusters C_1, C_2 contained in some $N^{2d}(U_i)$, then add every edge between C_1 and C_2.*

Proof (of safeness of Rule 4) It follows directly from the fact that adding edges between vertices of a monochromatic set preserves the existence of a d-cut. □

The next lemma follows from the pigeonhole principle and exhaustive application of Rule 4.

Lemma 2 *If G has been reduced by Rules 1 through 4, then G has $\mathcal{O}(|U|)$ fixed clusters.*

Reduction Rule 5 *If there is some cluster C with at least $2d+2$ vertices such that there is some $v \in C$ with no neighbors in U, remove v from G.*

Proof (of safeness of Rule 5) That G has a d-cut if and only if $G - v$ has a d-cut follows directly from the hypothesis that C is monochromatic in G and the fact that $|C \setminus \{v\}| \geq 2d + 1$ implies that $C \setminus \{v\}$ is monochromatic in $G - v$. □

By Rule 5, we now have the additional property that, if C has more than $2d+1$ vertices, all of them have at least one neighbor in U. The next rule provides a uniform structure between a big cluster C and the set U_i that has $C \subseteq N^{2d}(U_i)$.

Reduction Rule 6 *If a cluster C has at least $2d+1$ elements and there is some U_i such that $C \subseteq N^{2d}(U_i)$, remove all edges between C and U_i, choose $u \in U_i$, $\{v_1, \ldots, v_{d+1}\} \subseteq C$ and add the edges $\{uv_i\}_{i\in[d+1]}$ to G.*

Proof (of safeness of Rule 6) Let G' be the graph obtained after the operation is applied. If G has some d-cut (A, B), since $U_i \cup N^{2d}(U_i)$ is monochromatic, no edge between U_i and C crosses the cut, so (A, B) is also a d-cut of G'. For the converse, take a d-cut (A', B') of G'. Since C has at least $2d+1$ vertices and there is some $u \in U_i$ such that $|N(u) \cap C| = d+1$, $C \in N^{2d}(U_i)$ in G'. Therefore, no edge between C and U_i crosses the cut and (A', B') is also a d-cut of G. □

We have now effectively bounded the number of vertices in big clusters by a polynomial in $|U|$, as shown below.

Lemma 3 *If G has been reduced by Rules 1 through 6, then G has $\mathcal{O}\big(d|U|^2\big)$ ambiguous vertices and $\mathcal{O}\big(d|U|^2\big)$ big clusters, each with $\mathcal{O}(d|U|)$ vertices.*

Proof To show the bound on the number of ambiguous vertices, take any two vertices $u \in U_i$, $u' \in U_j$. Since we have $\binom{|U|}{2}$ such pairs, if we had at least $(2d+1)\binom{|U|}{2}$ ambiguous vertices, by the pigeonhole principle, there would certainly be $2d+1$ vertices in $V \setminus U$ that are adjacent to one pair, say u and u'. This, however, contradicts the hypothesis that Rule 3 has been applied, and so we have $\mathcal{O}\big(d|U|^2\big)$ ambiguous vertices.

The above discussion, along with Lemma 2 and Observation 5, imply that the number of big clusters is $\mathcal{O}\big(d|U|^2\big)$. For the bound on their sizes, take some cluster C with at least $2d+2$ vertices. Due to the application of Rule 5, every vertex of C has at least one neighbor in U. Moreover, there is at most one U_i such that $C \subseteq N^{2d}(U_i)$, otherwise we would be able to apply Rule 2.

If there is some U_i that satisfies $C \subseteq N^{2d}(u)$, by Rule 6, there is only one $u \in U_i$ that has neighbors in C; in particular, it has $d+1$ neighbors. Now, for every $j \neq i$, each $v \in U_j$ has at most d neighbors in C, otherwise $C \subseteq N^{2d}(U_j)$ and Rule 2 would have been applied. Therefore, we conclude that C has at most $(d+1)+\sum_{v\in U\setminus U_i} |N(u)\cap C| \leq (d+1) + d|U| \in \mathcal{O}(d|U|)$ vertices. □

We are now left only with an unbounded number of small clusters. A cluster C is *simple* if it is not ambiguous, that is, if for each $v \in C$, v has neighbors in at most one U_i. Otherwise, C is ambiguous and, because of Lemma 3, there are at most $\mathcal{O}\big(d|U|^2\big)$ such clusters. For a simple cluster C and a vertex $v \in C$, we denote by $U(v)$ the monochromatic part of U to which v is adjacent.

Reduction Rule 7 *If C is a simple cluster with at most $d+1$ vertices, remove C from G.*

Proof (of safeness of Rule 7) Let $G' = G - C$. Suppose G has a d-cut (A, B) and note that $A \not\subseteq C$ and $B \not\subseteq C$ since Rule 1 does not apply. This implies that $(A \setminus C, B \setminus C)$ is a valid d-cut of G'. For the converse, take a d-cut (A', B') of G', define $C_A = \{v \in C \mid U(v) \subseteq A\}$, and $C_B = C \setminus C_A$; we claim that $(A' \cup C_A, B' \cup C_B)$ is a d-cut of G. To see that this is the case, note that each vertex of C_A (resp. C_B) has at most d edges to C_B (resp. C_A) and, since C is simple, C_A (resp. C_B) has no other edges to B' (resp. A'). □

After applying the previous rule, every cluster C not yet analyzed has size $d+2 \leq |C| \leq 2d$ which, in the case of the Matching Cut problem, where $d = 1$, is empty. To deal with these clusters, given a d-cut (A, B), we say that a vertex v is in its *natural assignment* if v has no neighbors in U or if $v \cup U(v)$ is on the same side of the cut; otherwise the vertex is in its *unnatural assignment*. Similarly, a cluster is *unnaturally assigned* if it has an unnaturally assigned vertex, otherwise it is *naturally assigned*.

Observation 6 *Let $\mathcal{C}$ be the set of all simple clusters with at least $d+2$ and at most $2d$ vertices, and (A, B) a partition of $V(G)$. If there are $d|U|+1$ edges uv, $v \in C \in \mathcal{C}$ and $u \in U$, such that uv is crossing the partition, then (A, B) is not a d-cut.*

Proof Since there are $d|U|+1$ edges crossing the partition between $\mathcal{C}$ and U, there must be at least one $u \in U$ with $d+1$ neighbors in the other set of the partition. □

Corollary 3 *In any d-cut of G, there are at most $d|U|$ unnaturally assigned vertices.*

Our next lemma limits how many clusters in $\mathcal{C}$ relate in a similar way to U; we say that two simple clusters C_1, C_2 have the same *pattern* if they have the same size and there is a bijection $f : C_1 \mapsto C_2$, such that, for every $v \in C_1$, we have that $U(v) = U(f(v))$. Essentially, clusters that have the same pattern have neighbors in exactly the same monochromatic sets of U and the same multiplicity in terms of how many of their vertices are adjacent to a same monochromatic set U_i. Note that the actual neighborhood in the sets U_i's do not matter in order for two clusters to have the same pattern, it suffices that each $v \in C_1$ has a unique correspondent in C_2 that has neighbors in the same monochromatic set of U. We say that a set of clusters $\mathcal{R}$ is a *maximal set of unnaturally assigned clusters* if they all have the pattern, each cluster is unnaturally assigned, and, if we add to the graph a new cluster with the same pattern as those in $\mathcal{R}$, then it must be naturally assigned; note also that Corollary 3 bounds the size of $\mathcal{R}$, i.e. there cannot be more than $d|U|$ unnaturally assigned clusters in a d-cut of G. See Figure 8 for an example of a maximal set of unnaturally assigned clusters. As shown by the following Lemma, we may discard clusters that must be naturally assigned, as we can easily extend the kernel's d-cut, if it exists, to include them.

Lemma 4 *Let $\mathcal{C}^* \subseteq \mathcal{C}$ be a subfamily of simple clusters, all with the same pattern, with $|\mathcal{C}^*| > d|U|+1$. Let C be some cluster of $\mathcal{C}^*$, and $G' = G - C$. Then G has a d-cut if and only if G' has a d-cut.*

Proof Since by Rule 1 no subset of a small cluster is alone in a side of a partition and, consequently, so if G has a d-cut (A, B), then $V(G) \setminus C$ intersects both A and B; consequently, $(A \setminus C, B \setminus C)$ is a d-cut of G'.

For the converse, let (A', B') be a d-cut of G'. First, by Corollary 3, we know that at least one of the clusters of $\mathcal{C}^* \setminus \{C\}$, say C_{n}, is naturally assigned. Now, let $f : C \mapsto C_n$ be a bijection the certifies that C and C_n have the same pattern, and let (A, B) be the bipartition of $V(G)$ obtained from (A', B') such that $v \in C$ is in A (resp. B) if and only if $f(v) \in A'$ (resp. $f(v) \in B'$); that is, C is naturally assigned. Define $C_A = C \cap A$ and $C_B = C \cap B$. Because $|C| = |C_{\mathsf{n}}|$ and both belong to $\mathcal{C}^*$, we know that for every $u \in C_A$, it holds that $|N(u) \cap C_B| \leq d$; moreover, note that $N(u) \cap (B \setminus C) = \emptyset$. A symmetric analysis applies to every $u \in C_B$. This implies that no vertex of C has additional neighbors in the other side of the partition outside of its own cluster. Since C is naturally assigned, no vertex of U has more neighbors across the cut in G than in G'. Therefore, (A, B) is a d-cut of G. □



Fig. 8 Example for $d = 4$ of a maximal set of unnaturally assigned clusters. Squared (resp. circled) vertices would be assigned to A (resp. B).

The safeness of our last rule follows directly from Lemma 4.

Reduction Rule 8 *If there is some pattern such that the number of simple clusters with that pattern is at least $d|U| + 2$, delete all but $d|U| + 1$ of them.*

Lemma 5 *After exhaustive application of Rules 1 through 8, G has $\mathcal{O}\left(d|U|^{2d+1}\right)$ small clusters and $\mathcal{O}\left(d^2|U|^{2d+2}\right)$ vertices in these clusters.*

Proof By Rule 7, no small cluster with less than $d + 2$ vertices remains in G. Now, for the remaining sizes, for each $d + 2 \leq s \leq 2d$, and each pattern of size s, by Rule 8 we know that the number of clusters with s vertices that have the same pattern is at most $d|U| + 1$. Since we have at most $|U|$ possibilities for each of the s vertices of a cluster, we end up with $\mathcal{O}(|U|^s)$ possible patterns for clusters of size s. Summing all of them up, we get that we have $\mathcal{O}\left(|U|^{2d+1}\right)$ patterns in total, and since each one has at most $d|U| + 1$ clusters of size at most $2d$, we have at most $\mathcal{O}\left(d^2|U|^{2d+2}\right)$ vertices in those clusters. □

The exhaustive application of all the above rules and their accompanying lemmas are enough to show that indeed, there is a polynomial kernel for d-Cut when parameterized by distance to cluster.

Theorem 8 *When parameterized by distance to cluster $\mathsf{dc}(G)$, d-Cut admits a polynomial kernel with $\mathcal{O}\left(d^2 \cdot (3\mathsf{dc}(G))^{2d+2}\right)$ vertices that can be computed in $\mathcal{O}\left(d^4 \cdot (3\mathsf{dc}(G))^{2d+2}(n + m)\right)$ time.*

Proof The algorithm begins by finding a set U such that $G - U$ is a cluster graph. A set U with $|U| \leq 3\mathsf{dc}(G)$ can be found in $\mathcal{O}(\mathsf{dc}(G)(n + m))$ time: while there is some P_3 in G, we know that at least one its vertices must be removed, but since we don't know

which one, we remove all three; this produces a cluster graph since G is a cluster graph if and only if it is P_3-free. After the exhaustive application of Rules 1 through 8, by Lemma 3, $V(G) \setminus U$ has at most $\mathcal{O}\big(d^2 \cdot (3\mathsf{dc}(G))^3\big)$ vertices in clusters of size at least $2d+1$. By Rule 7, G has no simple cluster of size at most $d+1$. Ambiguous clusters of size at most $2d$, again by Lemma 3, also comprise only $\mathcal{O}\big(d^2 \cdot \mathsf{dc}(G)^2\big)$ vertices of G. Finally, for simple clusters of size between $d+2$ and $2d$, Lemmas 4 and 5 guarantee that there are $\mathcal{O}\Big(d^2 \cdot (3\mathsf{dc}(G))^{2d+2}\Big)$ vertices in small clusters and, consequently, this many vertices in G.

As to the running time, first, computing and maintaining $N^{2d}(U_i)$ takes $\mathcal{O}(d \cdot \mathsf{dc}(G)n)$ time. Rule 1 is applied only at the beginning of the kernelization, and runs in $\mathcal{O}\Big(2^{2d}d(n+m)\Big)$ time. Rules 2 and 3 can both be verified in $\mathcal{O}\big(d \cdot \mathsf{dc}(G)^2(n+m)\big)$ time, since we are just updating $N^{2d}(U_i)$ and performing merge operations. Both are performed only $\mathcal{O}\big(\mathsf{dc}(G)^2\big)$ times, because we only have this many pairs of monochromatic parts. The straightforward application of Rule 4 would yield a running time of $\mathcal{O}\big(n^2\big)$. However, we can ignore edges that are interior to clusters and only maintain which vertices belong together; this effectively allows us to perform this rule in $\mathcal{O}(n)$ time, which, along with its $\mathcal{O}(n)$ possible applications, yields a total running time of $\mathcal{O}\big(n^2\big)$ for this rule. Note that, when outputting the instance itself, we must write the edges explicitly; this does not change the final complexity of the algorithm, as each of the $\mathcal{O}\Big((3\mathsf{dc}(G))^{2d+1}\Big)$ clusters has $\mathcal{O}(d \cdot \mathsf{dc}(G))$ vertices. Rule 5 is directly applied in $\mathcal{O}(n)$ time; indeed, all of its applications can be performed in a single pass. Rule 6 is also easily applied in $\mathcal{O}(n+m)$ time. Moreover, it is only applied $\mathcal{O}(\mathsf{dc}(G))$ times, since, by Lemma 3, the number of fixed clusters is linear in $\mathsf{dc}(G)$; furthermore, we may be able to reapply Rule 6 directly to the resulting cluster, at no additional complexity cost. The analysis for Rule 7 follows the same argument as for Rule 5. Finally, Rule 8 is the bottleneck of our kernel, since it must check each of the possible $\mathcal{O}\Big((3\mathsf{dc}(G))^{2d+1}\Big)$ patterns, spending $\mathcal{O}(n)$ time for each of them. Each pattern is only inspected once because the number of clusters in a pattern can no longer achieve the necessary bound for the rule to be applied once the excessive clusters are removed. □

In the next theorems, we provide FPT algorithms for d-Cut parameterized by distance to cluster and distance to co-cluster, respectively. Both are based on dynamic programming, with the first being considerably simpler than the one given by Komusiewicz et al. [20] for $d = 1$, which applies four reduction rules and encodes the problem in a 2-SAT formula. However, for $d = 1$ our algorithm is slower, namely $\mathcal{O}^*\Big(4^{\mathsf{dc}(G)}\Big)$ compared to $\mathcal{O}^*\Big(2^{\mathsf{dc}(G)}\Big)$. Observe that the minimum distance to cluster and co-cluster sets can be computed in time $1.92^{\mathsf{dc}(G)} \cdot \mathcal{O}\big(n^2\big)$ and $1.92^{\mathsf{d\bar{c}}(G)} \cdot \mathcal{O}\big(n^2\big)$, respectively [6]. Thus, in the proofs of Theorems 9 and 10, we can safely assume that we have these sets at hand.

Theorem 9 *For every integer $d \geq 1$, there is an algorithm that solves d-Cut in time $\mathcal{O}\Big(4^d(d+1)^{\mathsf{dc}(G)}2^{\mathsf{dc}(G)}\mathsf{dc}(G)n^2\Big)$.*

Proof Let U be a set such that $G - U$ is a cluster graph, $\mathcal{Q} = \{Q_1, \ldots, Q_p\}$ be the family of clusters of $G - U$ and $\mathcal{Q}_i = \bigcup_{j \leq i} Q_j$. Essentially, the following dynamic programming algorithm attempts to extend a given partition of U in all possible ways by partitioning clusters, one at a time, while only keeping track of the degrees of vertices

that belong to U. Recall that we do not need to keep track of the degrees of the cluster vertices precisely because $G - U$ has no edge between clusters.

Formally, given a partition (A, B) of U that is a d-cut of $G[U]$, our table is a mapping $f : ([p] \cup 0) \times \mathbb{Z}^{|A|} \times \mathbb{Z}^{|B|} \to \{0, 1\}$. Each entry is indexed by $(i, \boldsymbol{d}_A, \boldsymbol{d}_B)$, where $i \in [p]$, $\boldsymbol{d}_A$ is a $|A|$-dimensional vector with the j-th coordinate being denoted by $\boldsymbol{d}_A[j]$, and $\boldsymbol{d}_B$ is defined analogously. Our goal is to have $f(i, \boldsymbol{d}_A, \boldsymbol{d}_B) = 1$ if and only if there is a partition (X, Y) of $U \cup \mathcal{Q}_i$ where $A \subseteq X$, $B \subseteq Y$, $v_a \in A$ ($v_b \in B$) has at most $\boldsymbol{d}_A[a]$ ($\boldsymbol{d}_B[b]$) neighbors in $\mathcal{Q}_i$, and each $v_\ell \in X \cap Q_i$ ($v_j \in Y \cap Q_i$) has at most d neighbors in Y (X).

We denote by $P_d(i, \boldsymbol{d}_A, \boldsymbol{d}_B)$ the set of all partitions (L, R) of Q_i such that every vertex $v_\ell \in L$ has $d_{B \cup R}(v_\ell) \leq d$, every $v_r \in R$ has $d_{A \cup L}(v_r) \leq d$, every $v_a \in A$ has $d_R(v_a) \leq \boldsymbol{d}_A[a]$ and every $v_b \in B$, $d_L(v_b) \leq \boldsymbol{d}_B[b]$; note that, due to this definition, it could be the case that $(L, R) \in P_d(i, \boldsymbol{d}_A, \boldsymbol{d}_B)$ but $(R, L) \notin P_d(i, \boldsymbol{d}_A, \boldsymbol{d}_B)$. In the following equations, which give the computations required to build our table, $\boldsymbol{d}_A(R)$ and $\boldsymbol{d}_B(L)$ are the updated values of the vertices of A and B after R is added to Y and L to X, respectively. That is, $\boldsymbol{d}_A(R)[a] = \boldsymbol{d}_A[a] - d_R(v_a)$ for every $v_a \in A$, and $\boldsymbol{d}_B(L)[b] = \boldsymbol{d}_B[b] - d_L(v_b)$ for every $v_a \in A$. We say that $\boldsymbol{d}_C \geq 0$ if, for every $v_c \in C$, $\boldsymbol{d}_C[c] \geq 0$. As a sanity check, if there is some $v_a \in A$ or $v_b \in B$ such that $\boldsymbol{d}_A[a] > d - d_B(v_a)$, $\boldsymbol{d}_B[b] > d - d_A(v_b)$, $\boldsymbol{d}_A[a] < 0$, or $\boldsymbol{d}_B[b] < 0$, i.e. we allow v_a (v_b) to have more neighbors across the partition than it could possibly have in a d-cut, we set $f(i, \boldsymbol{d}_A, \boldsymbol{d}_B) = 0$.

$$f(0, \boldsymbol{d}_A, \boldsymbol{d}_B) = 1, \text{if and only if } \boldsymbol{d}_A \geq 0 \text{ and } \boldsymbol{d}_B \geq 0. \tag{1}$$

$$f(i, \boldsymbol{d}_A, \boldsymbol{d}_B) = 0 \vee \bigvee_{(L,R) \in P_d(i, \boldsymbol{d}_A, \boldsymbol{d}_B)} f(i-1, \boldsymbol{d}_A(R), \boldsymbol{d}_B(L)) \tag{2}$$

We prove the correctness of the above by induction on i. For the base case, which is given by Equation 1, suppose first that (X, Y) is a partition of $U \cup \mathcal{Q}_0 = U$ that respects $\boldsymbol{d}_A$ and $\boldsymbol{d}_B$. In this case, we have that $X = A$, $Y = B$, which is a d-cut of $G[U]$, and for every $v_a \in A$ and $v_b \in B$, we have $0 \leq d_Y(v_a) \leq d_B(v_a) + \boldsymbol{d}_A[a] \leq d$ and $0 \leq d_X(v_b) \leq d_A(v_b) + \boldsymbol{d}_B[b] \leq d$. For the converse, it suffices to see that if $f(0, \boldsymbol{d}_A, \boldsymbol{d}_B) = 1$, then (A, B) is a partition of $U \cup \mathcal{Q}_0 = U$ that respects $\boldsymbol{d}_A$ and $\boldsymbol{d}_B$ since, for each $v_a \in A$ and $v_b \in B$, we have that $0 \leq \boldsymbol{d}_A[a] \leq d - d_B(v_a)$ and $0 \leq \boldsymbol{d}_B[b] \leq d - d_A(v_b)$.

For the general case of $i > 0$, given by Equation 2, let (X, Y) be a partition of $U \cup \mathcal{Q}_i$ that respects $\boldsymbol{d}_A$ and $\boldsymbol{d}_B$, and let $L = X \cap Q_i$ and $R = Y \cap Q_i$. Note that $(L, R) \in P_d(i, \boldsymbol{d}_A, \boldsymbol{d}_B)$ because (X, Y) is a partition where: (i) each $v_\ell \in L$ has at most d neighbors in $Y \cap N(v_\ell) \subseteq Q_i \cup B$, (ii) each $v_r \in R$ has at most d neighbors in $X \cap N(v_r) \subseteq Q_i \cup A$, (iii) each $v_a \in A$ has at most $\boldsymbol{d}_A[a]$ neighbors in R, and (iv) each $v_b \in B$ has at most $\boldsymbol{d}_B[b]$ neighbors in L. Since $(X \setminus L, Y \setminus R)$ respects $\boldsymbol{d}_A(R)$ and $\boldsymbol{d}_B(L)$, and $X \cup Y \setminus Q_i = U \cup \mathcal{Q}_{i-1}$, by the inductive hypothesis we have that $f(i-1, \boldsymbol{d}_A(R), \boldsymbol{d}_B(L)) = 1$, so $f(i, \boldsymbol{d}_A, \boldsymbol{d}_B) = 1$. Conversely, if $f(i, \boldsymbol{d}_A, \boldsymbol{d}_B) = 1$, there must be some $(L, R) \in P_d(i, \boldsymbol{d}_A, \boldsymbol{d}_B)$ where $f(i-1, \boldsymbol{d}_A(R), \boldsymbol{d}_B(L)) = 1$, so, by the inductive hypothesis, there is a partition (X', Y') of $U \cup \mathcal{Q}_{i-1}$ that respects $\boldsymbol{d}_A(R)$ and $\boldsymbol{d}_B(L)$. To see that $(X, Y) = (X' \cup L, Y' \cup R)$ respects the desired properties, note that (X', Y') is a d-cut of $G[U \cup \mathcal{Q}_{i-1}]$ where $\boldsymbol{d}_A(R)[a] \leq d - d_B(v_a) - d_R(v_a)$ and $\boldsymbol{d}_B(L)[b] \leq d - d_A(v_b) - d_L(v_b)$ for every $v_a \in A$ and $v_b \in B$. By definition,

$(L, R) \in P_d(i, \boldsymbol{d}_A, \boldsymbol{d}_B)$ implies that, in the cut (X, Y), no vertex of Q_i has more than d neighbors across the cut and, for each $v_a \in A$, we have that:

$$d_Y(v_a) = d_{Y'}(v_a) + d_R(v_a) \leq d_B(v_a) + \boldsymbol{d}_A(R)[a] + d_R(v_a) \leq d_B(v_a) + \boldsymbol{d}_A[a] \leq d$$

A similar analysis holds for $v_b \in B$, so we conclude that (X, Y) is a cut of $G[U \cup \mathcal{Q}_i]$ that satisfies our properties.

The complexity analysis is straightforward. Recalling that $|P_d(i, \boldsymbol{d}_A, \boldsymbol{d}_B)| \leq 2^{2d}$, we have that each $f(i, \boldsymbol{d}_A, \boldsymbol{d}_B)$ can be computed in time $\mathcal{O}\Big(4^d|U|n\Big)$ and, since we have $\mathcal{O}\Big((d+1)^{|A|+|B|}p\Big) \in \mathcal{O}\Big((d+1)^{|U|}p\Big)$, given a partition (A, B) of U, we can decide if there is d-cut separating A and B in $\mathcal{O}\Big(4^d(d+1)^{|U|}|U|n^2\Big)$-time. To solve d-Cut itself, we guess all $2^{|U|}$ partitions of U and, since $|U| \in \mathcal{O}(\mathsf{dc}(G))$, we obtain a total running time of $\mathcal{O}\Big(4^d(d+1)^{\mathsf{dc}(G)}2^{\mathsf{dc}(G)}\mathsf{dc}(G)n^2\Big)$. □

Theorem 10 *For every integer $d \geq 1$, there is an algorithm solving d-Cut in time $\mathcal{O}\Big(32^d 2^{\mathsf{d\bar{c}}(G)}(d+1)^{\mathsf{d\bar{c}}(G)+d}(\mathsf{d\bar{c}}(G)+d)n^2 + 2^{d^2}n^2\Big)$.*

Proof Let $U \subseteq V(G)$ be a set of $\mathcal{O}(\mathsf{d\bar{c}}(G))$ vertices such that $G - U$ is a co-cluster graph with color classes $\varphi = \{F_1, \ldots, F_t\}$. Define $\mathcal{F} = \bigcup_{i \in [t]} F_i$ and suppose we are given a d-cut (A, B) of $G[U]$. First, note that if $t \geq 2d + 1$, we have that some of the vertices of $\mathcal{F}$ form a clique Q of size $2d+1$, which is a monochromatic set; furthermore, every vertex $v \in \mathcal{F}$ but not in Q has at least $d + 1$ neighbors in Q. This implies that $Q \cup \{v\}$ is monochromatic and, thus, $\mathcal{F}$ is a monochromatic set. Checking if either $(A \cup \mathcal{F}, B)$ or $(A, B \cup \mathcal{F})$ is a d-cut can be done in $\mathcal{O}\big(n^2\big)$ time.

If the above does not apply, we have that $t \leq 2d$.

- Case 1: If $|\mathcal{F}| \leq 4d$ we can just try to extend (A, B) with each of the $2^{|\mathcal{F}|}$ bipartitions of $\mathcal{F}$ in $\mathcal{O}\Big(16^d n^2\Big)$ time.

So now, let (φ_1, φ_2) be a bipartition of the color classes, $\mathcal{F}_i = \{v \in F_j \mid F_j \in \varphi_i\}$, and, for simplicity, suppose that $|\mathcal{F}_1| \leq |\mathcal{F}_2|$.

- Case 2: If $|\mathcal{F}_1| \geq d + 1$ and $|\mathcal{F}_2| \geq 2d + 1$, we know that there is a set $Q \subseteq \mathcal{F}$ forming a (not necessarily induced) complete bipartite subgraph $K_{d+1,2d+1}$, which is a monochromatic set. Again, any $v \notin Q$ has at least $d_Q(v) \geq d+1$, from which we conclude that $Q \cup \{v\}$ is also monochromatic, implying that $\mathcal{F}$ is monochromatic.

If Case 2 is not applicable, either $|\mathcal{F}_1| \leq d$ and $|\mathcal{F}_2| \geq 2d+1$, or $|\mathcal{F}_2| \leq 2d$. For the latter, note that this implies $|\mathcal{F}| \leq 4d$, which would have been solved by Case 1. For the former, two cases remain:

- Case 3: Every $F_i \in \varphi_2$ has $|F_i| \leq 2d$. This implies that every $F \in \varphi$ has size bounded by $2d$ and that $|\mathcal{F}| \leq 4d^2$; we can simply try to extend (A, B) with each of the $\mathcal{O}\Big(2^{d^2}\Big)$ partitions of $\mathcal{F}$, which can be done in $\mathcal{O}\Big(2^{d^2}n^2\Big)$ time.
- Case 4: There is some $F_i \in \varphi_2$ with $|F_i| \geq 2d + 1$. Its existence implies that $|\mathcal{F}| - |F_i| \leq d$, otherwise we would have concluded that $\mathcal{F}$ is a monochromatic set: F_i and $L \subseteq \mathcal{F} \setminus F_i$, $L = d + 1$, induce a subgraph that can be obtained

from $K_{d+1,2d+1}$, which is monochromatic, by adding edges between vertices of the smallest part, which maintains the monochromatic property; moreover, all vertices in $\mathcal{F}\setminus(L\cup F_i)$ have at least $d+1$ neighbors in $L\cup F_i$, so $\mathcal{F}$ is indeed monochromatic. Since $\mathcal{F}\setminus F_i$ has at most d vertices, the set of its bipartitions has size bounded by 2^d. So, given a bipartition $\mathcal{F}_A \dot\cup \mathcal{F}_B = \mathcal{F}\setminus F$, we define $A' := A\cup\mathcal{F}_A$ and $B' := B\cup\mathcal{F}_B$. Finally, note that $G \setminus (A' \cup B')$ is a cluster graph where every cluster is a single vertex; that is, $\mathsf{dc}(G) \leq \mathsf{d\overline{c}}(G) + d$. In this case, we can apply Theorem 9, and obtain the running time of $\mathcal{O}\Big(4^d(d+1)^{\mathsf{d\overline{c}}(G)+d}(\mathsf{d\overline{c}}(G)+d)n^2\Big)$; we omit the term $2^{\mathsf{d\overline{c}}(G)+d}$ since we already have an initial partial d-cut (A', B').

For the total complexity of the algorithm, we begin by guessing the initial partition of U into (A, B), spending $\mathcal{O}\big(n^2\big)$ time for each of the $\mathcal{O}\Big(2^{\mathsf{d\overline{c}}(G)}\Big)$ possible bipartitions. If $t \geq 2d+1$ we give the answer in $\mathcal{O}\big(n^2\big)$ time. Otherwise, $t \leq 2d$. If $|\mathcal{F}| \leq 4d$, then we spend $\mathcal{O}\Big(16^d n^2\Big)$ time to test all partitions of $\mathcal{F}$ and return the answer. Else, for each of the $\mathcal{O}\Big(4^d\Big)$ partitions of φ, if one of them has a part with $d+1$ vertices and the other part has $2d+1$ vertices, we respond in $\mathcal{O}\big(n^2\big)$ time. Finally, for the last two cases, we either need $\mathcal{O}\Big(2^{d^2}n^2\Big)$ time, or $\mathcal{O}\Big(8^d(d+1)^{\mathsf{d\overline{c}}(G)+d}(\mathsf{d\overline{c}}(G)+d)n^2\Big)$. This yields a final complexity of $\mathcal{O}\Big(32^d 2^{\mathsf{d\overline{c}}(G)}(d+1)^{\mathsf{d\overline{c}}(G)+d}(\mathsf{d\overline{c}}(G)+d)n^2 + 2^{d^2}n^2\Big)$. □

4 Concluding remarks

We presented a series of algorithms and complexity results; many questions, however, remain open. For instance, all of our algorithms have an exponential dependency on d on their running times. While we believe that such a dependency is an intrinsic property of d-CUT, we have no proof for this claim. Similarly, the existence of a *uniform* polynomial kernel parameterized by the distance to cluster, i.e., a kernel whose degree does not depend on d, remains an interesting open question.

Also in terms of running time, we expect the constants in the base of the exact exponential algorithm to be improvable. However, exploring small structures that yield non-marginal gains as branching rules, as done by Komusiewicz et al. [20] for $d = 1$ does not seem a viable approach, as the number of such structures appears to rapidly grow along with d.

The distance to cluster kernel is hindered by the existence of clusters of size between $d+2$ and $2d$, an obstacle that is not present in the MATCHING CUT problem. Aside from the extremal argument presented, we know of no way of dealing with them. We conjecture that it should be possible to reduce the total kernel size from $\mathcal{O}\Big(d^2\mathsf{dc}(G)^{2d+1}\Big)$ to $\mathcal{O}\Big(d^2\mathsf{dc}(G)^{2d}\Big)$, matching the size of the smallest known kernel for MATCHING CUT [20].

We also leave open to close the gap between the polynomial and NP-hard cases in terms of maximum degree. We showed that, if $\Delta(G) \leq d+2$ the problem is easily solvable in polynomial time, while for graphs with $\Delta(G) \geq 2d+2$, it is NP-hard. But what about the gap $d+3 \leq \Delta(G) \leq 2d+1$? After some effort, we were unable to settle any of these cases. In particular, we are interested in 2-CUT, which has a single open case: $\Delta(G) = 5$. After some weeks of computation, we found no graph with more

than 18 vertices and maximum degree five that had no 2-cut, in agreement with the computational findings of Ban and Linial [2]. Interestingly, all graphs on 18 vertices without a 2-cut are either 5-regular or have a single pair of vertices of degree 4, which are actually adjacent. In both cases, the graph is maximal in the sense that we cannot add edges to it while maintaining the degree constraints. We recall the initial discussion about Internal Partition; closing the gap between the known cases for d-Cut would yield significant advancements on the former problem.

Acknowledgement. We would like to thank the anonymous reviewers for their very pertinent and thorough remarks that improved the presentation of the manuscript.

References

1. N. R. Aravind, S. Kalyanasundaram, and A. S. Kare. On structural parameterizations of the matching cut problem. In *Proc. of the 11th International Conference on Combinatorial Optimization and Applications (COCOA)*, volume 10628 of *LNCS*, pages 475–482, 2017.
2. A. Ban and N. Linial. Internal partitions of regular graphs. *Journal of Graph Theory*, 83(1):5–18, 2016.
3. H. L. Bodlaender, R. G. Downey, M. R. Fellows, and D. Hermelin. On problems without polynomial kernels. *Journal of Computer and System Sciences*, 75(8):423–434, 2009.
4. H. L. Bodlaender, B. M. P. Jansen, and S. Kratsch. Cross-composition: A new technique for kernelization lower bounds. In *Proc. of the 28th International Symposium on Theoretical Aspects of Computer Science (STACS)*, volume 9 of *LIPIcs*, pages 165–176, 2011.
5. P. S. Bonsma. The complexity of the matching-cut problem for planar graphs and other graph classes. *Journal of Graph Theory*, 62(2):109–126, 2009.
6. A. Boral, M. Cygan, T. Kociumaka, and M. Pilipczuk. A fast branching algorithm for cluster vertex deletion. *Theory of Computing Systems*, 58(2):357–376, 2016.
7. V. Chvátal. Recognizing decomposable graphs. *Journal of Graph Theory*, 8(1):51–53, 1984.
8. B. Courcelle. The monadic second-order logic of graphs. I. Recognizable sets of finite graphs. *Information and computation*, 85(1):12–75, 1990.
9. M. Cygan, F. V. Fomin, L. Kowalik, D. Lokshtanov, D. Marx, M. Pilipczuk, M. Pilipczuk, and S. Saurabh. *Parameterized Algorithms*. Springer, 2015.
10. M. DeVos. `http://www.openproblemgarden.org/op/friendly_partitions`, 2009.
11. R. Diestel. *Graph Theory*, volume 173. Springer-Verlag, 4th edition, 2010.
12. R. G. Downey and M. R. Fellows. *Fundamentals of Parameterized Complexity*. Texts in Computer Science. Springer, 2013.
13. F. V. Fomin and D. Kratsch. *Exact Exponential Algorithms*. Springer, 2010.
14. F. V. Fomin, D. Lokshtanov, S. Saurabh, and M. Zehavi. *Kernelization: Theory of Parameterized Preprocessing*. Cambridge University Press, 2019.
15. L. Fortnow and R. Santhanam. Infeasibility of instance compression and succinct PCPs for NP. *Journal of Computer and System Sciences*, 77(1):91–106, 2011.
16. R. L. Graham. On primitive graphs and optimal vertex assignments. *Annals of the New York academy of sciences*, 175(1):170–186, 1970.
17. R. Impagliazzo and R. Paturi. On the complexity of k-SAT. *Journal of Computer and System Sciences*, 62(2):367–375, 2001.
18. A. Kaneko. On decomposition of triangle-free graphs under degree constraints. *Journal of Graph Theory*, 27(1):7–9, 1998.
19. T. Kloks. *Treewidth. Computations and Approximations*. Springer-Verlag LNCS, 1994.
20. C. Komusiewicz, D. Kratsch, and V. B. Le. Matching cut: Kernelization, single-exponential time fpt, and exact exponential algorithms. volume 283, pages 44 – 58, 2020.
21. D. Kratsch and V. B. Le. Algorithms solving the matching cut problem. *Theoretical Computer Science*, 609:328–335, 2016.
22. H. Le and V. B. Le. On the complexity of matching cut in graphs of fixed diameter. In *Proc. of the 27th International Symposium on Algorithms and Computation (ISAAC)*, volume 64 of *LIPIcs*, pages 50:1–50:12, 2016.
23. V. B. Le and B. Randerath. On stable cutsets in line graphs. *Theoretical Computer Science*, 301(1-3):463–475, 2003.

24. L. Lovász. Coverings and colorings of hypergraphs. In *Proc. of the 4th Southeastern Conference of Combinatorics, Graph Theory, and Computing*, pages 3–12. Utilitas Mathematica Publishing, 1973.
25. J. Ma and T. Yang. Decomposing C_4-free graphs under degree constraints. *Journal of Graph Theory*, 90(1):13–23, 2019.
26. D. Marx, B. O'sullivan, and I. Razgon. Finding small separators in linear time via treewidth reduction. *ACM Transactions on Algorithms*, 9(4), Oct. 2013.
27. A. M. Moshi. Matching cutsets in graphs. *Journal of Graph Theory*, 13(5):527–536, 1989.
28. M. Patrignani and M. Pizzonia. The complexity of the matching-cut problem. In *Proc. of the 27th International Workshop on Graph-Theoretic Concepts in Computer Science (WG)*, volume 2204 of *LNCS*, pages 284–295, 2001.
29. N. Robertson and P. Seymour. Graph minors. II. Algorithmic aspects of tree-width. *Journal of Algorithms*, 7(3):309–322, 1986.
30. K. H. Shafique and R. D. Dutton. On satisfactory partitioning of graphs. *Congressus Numerantium*, pages 183–194, 2002.
31. M. Stiebitz. Decomposing graphs under degree constraints. *Journal of Graph Theory*, 23(3):321–324, 1996.
32. C. Thomassen. Graph decomposition with constraints on the connectivity and minimum degree. *Journal of Graph Theory*, 7(2):165–167, 1983.
33. C. Yap. Some consequences of non-uniform conditions on uniform classes. *Theoretical Computer Science*, 26:287–300, 1983.