

Complexity Framework for Forbidden Subgraphs II: Edge Subdivision and the “H”-graphs

Vadim Lozin ✉

University of Warwick, Coventry, United Kingdom

Barnaby Martin ✉

Durham University, Durham, United Kingdom

Sukanya Pandey ✉

Utrecht University, Utrecht, The Netherlands

Daniël Paulusma ✉ 

Durham University, Durham, United Kingdom

Mark Siggers ✉

Kyungpook National University, South Korea

Siani Smith ✉

University of Bristol and Heilbronn Institute for Mathematical Research, Bristol, United Kingdom

Erik Jan van Leeuwen ✉ 

Utrecht University, Utrecht, The Netherlands

Abstract

For a fixed set \mathcal{H} of graphs, a graph G is \mathcal{H} -subgraph-free if G does not contain any $H \in \mathcal{H}$ as a (not necessarily induced) subgraph. A recently proposed framework gives a complete classification on \mathcal{H} -subgraph-free graphs (for finite sets \mathcal{H}) for problems that are solvable in polynomial time on graph classes of bounded treewidth, NP-complete on subcubic graphs, and whose NP-hardness is preserved under edge subdivision. While a lot of problems satisfy these conditions, there are also many problems that do not satisfy all three conditions and for which the complexity in \mathcal{H} -subgraph-free graphs is unknown. We study problems for which only the first two conditions of the framework hold (they are solvable in polynomial time on classes of bounded treewidth and NP-complete on subcubic graphs, but NP-hardness is not preserved under edge subdivision). In particular, we make inroads into the classification of the complexity of four such problems: HAMILTON CYCLE, k -INDUCED DISJOINT PATHS, C_5 -COLOURING and STAR 3-COLOURING. Although we do not complete the classifications, we show that the boundary between polynomial time and NP-complete differs among our problems and also from problems that do satisfy all three conditions of the framework, in particular when we forbid certain subdivisions of the “H”-graph (the graph that looks like the letter “H”). Hence, we exhibit a rich complexity landscape among problems for \mathcal{H} -subgraph-free graph classes.

2012 ACM Subject Classification Mathematics of computing → Graph theory; Theory of computation → Graph algorithms analysis; Theory of computation → Problems, reductions and completeness

Keywords and phrases forbidden subgraph, complexity dichotomy, edge subdivision, treewidth

1 Introduction

Graph containment relations, such as the (topological) minor and induced subgraph relations, have been extensively studied both from a graph-structural and algorithmic point of view. In this paper, we focus on the *subgraph relation*. If a graph H can be obtained from a graph G by a sequence of vertex deletions and edge deletions, then G contains H as a *subgraph*; otherwise, G is *H -subgraph-free*. For a set of graphs \mathcal{H} , a graph G is *\mathcal{H} -subgraph-free* if G is H -subgraph-free for every $H \in \mathcal{H}$; if $\mathcal{H} = \{H_1, \dots, H_p\}$, then we also write that G is (H_1, \dots, H_p) -subgraph-free. Graph classes closed under deletion of edge and vertices are called *monotone* [2, 10], and every monotone graph class \mathcal{G} can be characterized by a unique (and possibly infinite) set of forbidden induced subgraph $\mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{G}}$. We determine the complexity of two connectivity problems HAMILTON CYCLE and k -INDUCED DISJOINT PATHS, and two colouring problems C_5 -COLOURING and STAR 3-COLOURING on \mathcal{H} -subgraph-free graphs for various families \mathcal{H} . We focus on families \mathcal{H} consisting of certain *subdivided “H”-graphs* \mathbb{H}_i , where \mathbb{H}_1 looks like the letter “H” (see Fig. 1 for the definition and illustration of the graphs \mathbb{H}_i). At first sight, these four problems appear to have not much in common, and the graphs \mathbb{H}_i might also seem arbitrary. However, these problems turn out to be well suited for a combined study, as they fit in a more general framework, in which the graphs \mathbb{H}_i play a crucial role.

Context. If a graph problem is computationally hard, it is natural to restrict the input to some special graph class. Ideally we would like to know exactly which properties P such a graph class \mathcal{G} must have such that any hard graph problem that satisfies some conditions C becomes easy on graphs from \mathcal{G} (here, the distinction between “easy” and “hard” could for example mean P versus NP-complete, or almost-linear versus at-least-quadratic). We first discuss some natural conditions C a graph problem Π might satisfy.


A graph is *subcubic* if every vertex has degree at most 3. For $p \geq 1$, the *p -subdivision* of an edge $e = uv$ of a graph G replaces e by a path of $p + 1$ edges with endpoints u and v . The *p -subdivision* of a graph G is the graph obtained from G after p -subdividing each edge; see also Fig. 1. For a graph class \mathcal{G} and an integer p , we let \mathcal{G}^p be the class consisting of the p -subdivisions of the graphs in \mathcal{G} . A graph problem Π is hard *under edge subdivision of subcubic graphs* if for every $j \geq 1$ there is an $\ell \geq j$ such that: if Π is hard for the class \mathcal{G} of subcubic graphs, then Π is hard for \mathcal{G}^ℓ . We can now say that a graph problem Π has property:

- C1 if Π is easy for every graph class of bounded tree-width;
- C2 if Π is hard for subcubic graphs ($K_{1,4}$ -subgraph-free graphs, where $K_{1,4}$ is the 5-vertex star);
- C3 if Π is hard under edge subdivision of subcubic graphs;
- C4 if Π is hard for planar graphs;
- C5 if Π is hard for planar subcubic graphs.

We say that Π is a C123-problem if it satisfies C1, C2 and C3, while Π is a C14-problem if it satisfies C1 and C4, and so on. Classical results of Robertson and Seymour [33] yield the following two meta-classifications. For all sets \mathcal{H} , if \mathcal{H} contains a planar graph, then every C14-problem Π is easy on \mathcal{H} -minor-free graphs, or else Π is hard. For all sets \mathcal{H} , if \mathcal{H} contains a planar subcubic graph, then every C15-problem Π is easy on \mathcal{H} -topological-minor-free graphs, or else Π is hard. No meta-classification for the induced subgraph relation exists (apart from a limited one [25] that is a direct consequence of the treewidth dichotomy [30]). However, for the subgraph relation, known results on INDEPENDENT SET [4], DOMINATING SET [4], LONG PATH [4], MAX-CUT [27] and LIST COLOURING [22] for monotone graph classes that are *finitely defined* (so, where the associated set of forbidden subgraphs \mathcal{H} is finite) were recently unified and extended in [25]. This led to a new meta-classification, where the set \mathcal{S} consists of all graphs, in which every connected component is either a path or a subcubic tree with exactly one vertex of degree 3 (see Fig. 1).

► **Theorem 1** ([25]). *For any finite set of graphs \mathcal{H} , a C123-problem Π is easy on \mathcal{H} -subgraph-free graphs if \mathcal{H} contains a graph from \mathcal{S} , or else it is hard.*

In [25] a list of 25 C123-problems was given that include, apart from the five problems above, other well-known partitioning, covering, packing, network design, width parameter and distance metric problems.



■ **Figure 1** [9] Left: A graph in \mathcal{S} : the graph $S_{3,3,3} + P_2 + P_3 + P_4$; note that $S_{3,3,3}$ is the 2-subdivision of the claw $K_{1,3}$. Right: the graphs \mathbb{H}_1 and \mathbb{H}_3 ; here, \mathbb{H}_1 is the “H”-graph, formed by an edge (the *middle edge*) joining the middle vertices of two P_3 s, and \mathbb{H}_i ($i \geq 2$) is obtained from \mathbb{H}_1 by $(i - 1)$ -subdividing the middle edge.

Our Focus. Many graph problems are not C123. See [8] and [9] for partial complexity classifications of the C123-problems SUBGRAPH ISOMORPHISM and STEINER FOREST, respectively, for H -subgraph-free graphs and [26] for partial complexity classifications of the C123-problems (INDEPENDENT) FEEDBACK VERTEX SET, CONNECTED VERTEX COVER, COLOURING (see also [23]) and MATCHING CUT for H -subgraph-free graphs (note that if a problem does not satisfy C2, then C3 is implied). Here, we consider the question: *Can we classify the complexity of C123-problems (so that do not satisfy C3) on monotone graph classes?*

Why the Graphs \mathbb{H}_i . All C1-problems are easy on \mathcal{H} -subgraph-free graphs if \mathcal{H} has a graph from \mathcal{S} [32]. The infinite set $\mathcal{M} = \{C_3, C_4, \dots, K_{1,4}, \mathbb{H}_1, \mathbb{H}_2, \dots\}$ of minimal graphs not in \mathcal{S} is a maximal antichain in the poset of connected graphs under the subgraph relation. Conditions C2 and C3 ensure that for every finite set \mathcal{M}' , C123-problems are hard on \mathcal{M}' -subgraph-free graphs if $\mathcal{M}' \subseteq \mathcal{M}$. If C3 is not satisfied, this is no longer guaranteed. Therefore, a natural starting point to answer our research question is to determine for which finite subsets $\mathcal{M}' \subseteq \mathcal{M}$, C12-problems are still easy on \mathcal{M}' -subgraph-free graphs. So consider a C12-problem Π that is not C3. Let \mathcal{M}' be a finite subset of \mathcal{M} . If $\mathcal{M}' = \{K_{1,4}\}$, then Π is hard for \mathcal{M}' -subgraph-free graphs due to C2. Hence, \mathcal{M}' must contain at least one C_s or \mathbb{H}_i . Let the *girth* of a graph that is not a forest be the length of a shortest induced cycle in it. We say that Π has property:

- C2' if for all $g \geq 4$, Π is hard for subcubic graphs of girth g ($(K_{1,4}, C_3, \dots, C_{g-1})$ -subgraph-free graphs).

So if Π is not only a C12-problem but even a C12'-problem, then Π is hard on \mathcal{M}' -subgraph-free graphs unless \mathcal{M}' contains some \mathbb{H}_i . This makes studying the graphs \mathbb{H}_i even more pressing.

Our Testbed Problems. To address our research question, we take, as mentioned, four testbed problems:

HAMILTON CYCLE. This problem is to decide if a graph G has a *Hamiltonian cycle*, i.e., a cycle containing all vertices of G . The problem is polynomial-time solvable for graphs of bounded treewidth [5] and NP-complete for bipartite subcubic graphs of girth g , for every $g \geq 3$ [2]. Hence, it is even a C12'-problem.

k -INDUCED DISJOINT PATHS. Given a graph G and pairwise disjoint vertex pairs $(s_1, t_1), (s_2, t_2), \dots, (s_k, t_k)$ for some $k \geq 2$, this problem is to decide if G has k *mutually induced* s_i - t_i -paths P^i , i.e., P^1, \dots, P^k are pairwise vertex-disjoint and there are no edges between vertices from different P^i and P^j . The problem is polynomial-time solvable for graphs of bounded treewidth by Courcelle's Theorem [13] and NP-complete for subcubic graphs for all $k \geq 2$ [29]. Hence, it is a C12-problem for all $k \geq 2$.

C_5 -COLOURING. This problem is to decide if a graph G has a *homomorphism* to the 5-cycle C_5 (also called a *C_5 -colouring*) which is a mapping $f : V(G) \rightarrow V(C_5)$ such that for every two vertices u, v it holds that $f(u)f(v) \in E(C_5)$ whenever $uv \in E(G)$. The problem is polynomial-time solvable for graphs of bounded treewidth [15] and NP-complete for subcubic graphs [18]. Hence, it is a C12-problem.

STAR 3-COLOURING. This problem is to decide if a graph G has a *star 3-colouring*, which is a mapping $f : V(G) \rightarrow \{1, 2, 3\}$ such that for every i , the set U_i of vertices of G mapped to i is independent (so, f is a *3-colouring*) and $U_1 \cup U_2, U_1 \cup U_3, U_2 \cup U_3$ all induce a disjoint union of stars. The problem is polynomial-time solvable for graphs of bounded treewidth due to Courcelle's Theorem [13] and NP-complete for bipartite planar subcubic graphs of girth at least g , for every $g \geq 3$ [37]. Hence, it is even a C12'-problem.

4 Complexity Framework For Forbidden Subgraphs II



■ **Figure 2** The tree T .

We do not know if k -INDUCED DISJOINT PATHS and C_5 -COLOURING are C12', even though C_5 -COLOURING is NP-complete for graphs of maximum degree $6 \cdot 5^{13}$ and girth at least g , for all $g \geq 3$ (see Appendix A).

All four problems violate C3. For $p \geq 3$, C_5 -COLOURING and STAR 3-COLOURING become true under p -subdivision, while HAMILTON CYCLE becomes false (unless we started with a cycle), and k -INDUCED DISJOINT PATHS reduces to the polynomial-time solvable problem k -DISJOINT PATHS [34, 38], which only requires the paths in a solution to be pairwise vertex-disjoint. See Appendix B. We also note the following. First, when k is part of the input, DISJOINT PATHS and INDUCED DISJOINT PATHS are C123-problems [25]. Second, instead of C_5 -COLOURING we could have considered C_{2i+1} -COLOURING, which is a C12-problem for all $i \geq 2$ [15, 18]. Third, STAR- k -COLOURING does not satisfy C2 for large k ; see Appendix C.

Our Results. We show that the complexity of our four problems differ from each other and also from C123-problems, when we forbid certain graphs \mathbb{H}_i . We first show that C1-problems, and thus C12-problems, are easy on $(\mathbb{H}_\ell, \mathbb{H}_{\ell+1}, \dots)$ -subgraph-free graphs for every $\ell \geq 1$ and on $(\mathbb{H}_i, \mathbb{H}_{2i}, \mathbb{H}_{3i}, \dots)$ -subgraph-free graphs for every $i \geq 1$ (so, in particular if we forbid all even \mathbb{H}_i), as all these graph classes have bounded treewidth (see Appendix D). In contrast, any hard problem for bipartite graphs in which one partition class has maximum degree 2 is hard on $(\mathbb{H}_1, \mathbb{H}_3, \dots)$ -subgraph-free graphs (so, if we forbid all odd \mathbb{H}_i): every path between vertices of degree at least 3 has even length. The NP-hardness reduction in [1] shows that STAR 3-COLOURING is such a problem (see Appendix E). We complement all these results as follows.

In Section 2 we show that HAMILTON CYCLE is polynomial-time solvable for \mathbb{H}_ℓ -subgraph-free graphs for $\ell \in \{1, 2, 3\}$ by doing this for the superclass of T -subgraph-free graphs (T is the tree shown in Figure 2).

In Section 3 we prove that for all $k \geq 2$, k -INDUCED DISJOINT PATHS is polynomial-time solvable for \mathbb{H}_ℓ -subgraph-free graphs for $\ell \in \{1, 2\}$, but NP-complete for subcubic $(\mathbb{H}_4, \dots, \mathbb{H}_\ell)$ -subgraph-free graphs for all $\ell \geq 4$. For the first result, we first apply the algorithm for k -DISJOINT PATHS [34]. If this yields a solution that is not mutually induced, we apply a reduction rule and repeat the process on a smaller instance. For the second result, we carefully adapt the proof of [29] that shows that the problem of deciding if a subcubic graph contains an induced cycle between two given degree 2-vertices is NP-complete.

In Section 4 we determine all C_5 -critical \mathbb{H}_3 -subgraph-free graphs, which are not C_5 -colourable unlike every proper subgraph of them. We show that this leads to a polynomial-time algorithm for \mathbb{H}_3 -subgraph-free graphs that is even *certifying*. In contrast, the problem is NP-complete for the ‘‘complementary’’ class of $(\mathbb{H}_1, \mathbb{H}_2, \mathbb{H}_4, \mathbb{H}_5, \mathbb{H}_7, \mathbb{H}_8, \dots)$ -subgraph-free graphs (see Appendix F).

In Section 5 we give a linear-time *certifying* algorithm for STAR 3-COLOURING on $(\mathbb{H}_2, \mathbb{H}_4, \mathbb{H}_6 \dots)$ -subgraph-free graphs, after determining all star-3-colourable bipartite $(\mathbb{H}_2, \mathbb{H}_4, \mathbb{H}_6 \dots)$ -subgraph-free graphs.

Combining the above results yields the following four state-of-the-art summaries.

► **Theorem 2.** HAMILTON CYCLE is polynomial-time solvable for $(\mathbb{H}_\ell, \mathbb{H}_{\ell+1}, \dots)$ -subgraph-free graphs ($\ell \geq 1$), for $(\mathbb{H}_i, \mathbb{H}_{2i}, \mathbb{H}_{3i}, \dots)$ -subgraph-free graphs ($i \geq 1$) and for T -subgraph-free graphs, and thus for \mathbb{H}_ℓ -subgraph-free graphs ($\ell \in \{1, 2, 3\}$).

► **Theorem 3.** For all $k \geq 2$, k -INDUCED DISJOINT PATHS is polynomial-time solvable for \mathbb{H}_ℓ -subgraph-free graphs ($\ell \in \{1, 2\}$), for $(\mathbb{H}_\ell, \mathbb{H}_{\ell+1}, \dots)$ -subgraph-free graphs ($\ell \geq 1$) and for $(\mathbb{H}_i, \mathbb{H}_{2i}, \mathbb{H}_{3i}, \dots)$ -subgraph-free graphs ($i \geq 1$), but NP-complete for subcubic $(\mathbb{H}_4, \dots, \mathbb{H}_\ell)$ -subgraph-free graphs ($\ell \geq 4$).

► **Theorem 4.** C_5 -COLOURING is polynomial-time solvable for \mathbb{H}_3 -subgraph-free graphs, for $(\mathbb{H}_\ell, \mathbb{H}_{\ell+1}, \dots)$ -subgraph-free graphs ($\ell \geq 1$) and for $(\mathbb{H}_i, \mathbb{H}_{2i}, \mathbb{H}_{3i}, \dots)$ -subgraph-free graphs ($i \geq 1$), but NP-complete for $(\mathbb{H}_1, \mathbb{H}_2, \mathbb{H}_4, \mathbb{H}_5, \mathbb{H}_7, \mathbb{H}_8, \dots)$ -subgraph-free graphs.

► **Theorem 5.** STAR 3-COLOURING is polynomial-time solvable for $(\mathbb{H}_\ell, \mathbb{H}_{\ell+1}, \dots)$ -subgraph-free graphs ($\ell \geq 1$) and $(\mathbb{H}_i, \mathbb{H}_{2i}, \mathbb{H}_{3i}, \dots)$ -subgraph-free graphs ($i \geq 1$), but NP-complete for $(\mathbb{H}_1, \mathbb{H}_3, \mathbb{H}_5 \dots)$ -subgraph-free graphs.

We note that the complexity classifications above indeed differ except perhaps for HAMILTON CYCLE and k -INDUCED DISJOINT PATHS. Hence, Theorems 2–5 give clear evidence of a rich landscape for C12-problems on \mathcal{H} -subgraph-free graphs. In Section 6 we discuss open problems resulting from our study.

2 Hamilton Cycle

Before proving Theorem 6 we note that there are trees T^* for which HAMILTON CYCLE is NP-complete over T^* -subgraph-free graphs. For example, take a complete binary tree with depth 3 (four layers), or any graph that is not a caterpillar with hairs of arbitrary length (see Section 3.2 in [28]). Proofs of missing claims in the proof of Theorem 6 are in Appendix G (throughout our paper, proofs of claims, lemmas and theorems marked with an ♠ are in the appendix).


► **Theorem 6.** HAMILTON CYCLE is polynomial-time solvable for T -subgraph-free graphs.

Proof. Let G be a T -subgraph-free graph. We call vertices of degree 2 in G *white* and vertices of degree at least 3 *black*. The *black graph* is a subgraph of G induced by black vertices and a *black component* is a connected component in the black graph.

We first describe some helpful rules to solve the problem and a set of reductions simplifying the input graph, i.e. reductions transforming G into a graph G' that has fewer edges and/or vertices and that has a Hamiltonian cycle if and only if G has. We emphasize that by deleting an edge or a vertex from an H -subgraph-free graph, we obtain an H -subgraph-free graph again. We start with some obvious rules:

- (R1) if the graph has vertices of degree 0 or 1, then stop: G has no Hamiltonian cycle.
- (R2) if the graph contains a vertex adjacent to more than two white vertices, then stop: G has no Hamiltonian cycle.
- (R3) if the graph is disconnected, then stop: G has no Hamiltonian cycle.
- (R4) if the graph contains a vertex v adjacent to exactly two white vertices, then delete the edges connecting v to all other its neighbours (if there are any).

Now we introduce a reduction applicable to a graph G containing an induced subgraph shown on the left in Figure 3, in which vertices a, b, c have degree 3 in G . The reduction depends on the degree of x . If the degree of x is also 3, the reduction consists in deleting the edges ab and xc . Otherwise, it transforms the graph as shown in Figure 3. We refer to this reduction as the *diamond reduction* and denote it by (R5).



■ **Figure 3** The diamond reduction: it is applicable to a graph G containing an induced subgraph shown on the left, in which vertices a, b, c have degree 3 in G . If the degree of x is also 3, the reduction consists in deleting the edges ab and xc . Otherwise, the reduction consists in deleting vertex b and introducing the edge ac .

▷ **Claim 7.** Let G' be a graph obtained from G by the diamond reduction. Then G has a Hamiltonian cycle if and only if G' has a Hamiltonian cycle. Moreover, if G is T -subgraph-free, then so is G' .

Proof. Assume first that the degree of x is 3 in G , in which case the reduction consists in deleting the edges ab and xc . Clearly, if G' has a Hamiltonian cycle, then the same set of edges forms a Hamiltonian cycle in G . Conversely, assume G has a Hamiltonian cycle C . It is not difficult to see that either the edges ax, xb, bc belong to C or the edges ab, xb, xc belong to C . Since vertices x and b do not have

6 Complexity Framework For Forbidden Subgraphs II

neighbours different from a and c , any of the two combinations can be chosen to create a Hamiltonian cycle. Therefore, by deleting the edges ab and xc we transform G into a graph with a Hamiltonian cycle.

Now assume that the degree of x is more than 3, in which case the reduction is illustrated in Figure 3. Suppose first that G has a Hamiltonian cycle C . Since the degree of b is 3, at least one of the edges ab and bc belong to C . If both of them belong to C , then by replacing these edges with ac we obtain a Hamiltonian cycle in G' . Otherwise, without loss of generality, $ab \in C$ and $bc \notin C$. Then $bx \in C$ and $cx \in C$ (since the degree of b and c is 3), and hence by replacing the edges ab and bx with the edge ax we obtain a Hamiltonian cycle in G' .

Now let G' have a Hamiltonian cycle C . If the edge ac belongs to C , then by replacing this edge with the edges ab and bc we obtain a Hamiltonian cycle in G . Otherwise, both edges incident to a and both edges incident to c belong to C . Therefore, by replacing ax with the edges ab and bx we obtain a Hamiltonian cycle in G .

Now we show that the transformation represented in Figure 3 preserves T -subgraph-freeness. Assume to the contrary that G' contains a copy of T as a subgraph. Then this copy contains the edge ac , since otherwise G contains T as a subgraph. If a (or c) is a leaf of T , then by replacing it with b we obtain a copy of T in G . Therefore, without loss of generality, a has degree 3 in T and c has degree 2 in T . If a represents the rightmost vertex of degree 3 in Figure 2, then by replacing in T the three edges incident to a with the three edges incident to b we obtain a copy of T in G .

Now assume that a represents the middle vertex of degree 3 in Figure 2. We denote by u_0 the neighbour of a of degree 3 in T and by u_1, u_2 the neighbours of u_0 of degree 1. Also, let v_0 be the neighbour of c of degree 3 in T (different from a) and let v_1, v_2 be the neighbours of v_0 of degree 1. Since the degree of x in G is more than 3, we may consider a vertex $y \notin \{a, b, c\}$ adjacent to x . If $y = u_0$, then the edges $u_0u_1, u_0u_2, u_0x, xc, cb, cv_0, v_0v_1, v_0v_2$ form a forbidden subgraph in G . If $y = u_1$, then the edges $au_0, ab, ax, xu_1, xc, cv_0, v_0v_1, v_0v_2$ form a forbidden subgraph in G . By symmetry, we also conclude that $y \neq u_2, v_0, v_1, v_2$. But then the edges $u_0u_1, u_0u_2, u_0a, ax, xy, xc, cb, cv_0$ form a forbidden subgraph in G . This contradiction completes the proof. ◀

One more reduction is illustrated in Figure 4. We will refer to this reduction as the *butterfly reduction* and will denote it by (R6).



■ **Figure 4** The butterfly reduction: it is applicable to a graph G containing an induced subgraph shown on the left, in which vertices a, b, c have degree 3 in G , and moreover, a and b have white neighbours.

▷ **Claim 8 (♠).** Let G' be a graph obtained from G by the butterfly reduction. Then G has a Hamiltonian cycle if and only if G' has a Hamiltonian cycle.

In our algorithm to solve the problem we implement the above rules and reductions whenever they are applicable. We now develop more reductions allowing us to bound the number of vertices in black components. We assume that none of the above rules and reductions is applicable to G .

▷ **Claim 9 (♠).** Let x be a vertex of degree at least 13. If the neighbourhood of x does not contain two adjacent vertices of degree 3, then G has no Hamiltonian cycle. Otherwise, G has a Hamiltonian cycle if and only if $G - x$ has.

Application of Claim 9 to vertices of large degree either shows that G has no Hamiltonian cycle or reduces the input graph to a graph of maximum degree 12. We will refer to this reduction as the *large degree reduction* and will denote it by (R7).

▷ **Claim 10.** The black graph has no induced paths of length 8.

Proof. Assume by contradiction that $P = (u_0, u_1, \dots, u_8)$ is an induced path consisting of black vertices. By definition, every vertex of P has a neighbour outside of P .

(★) If a vertex $v \notin P$ is adjacent to vertices u_i and u_j ($1 \leq i < j \leq 7$), then $j - i \leq 2$.

To show this, assume without loss of generality, that $i = 1$ and $j = 4$ (for other values of i and j the proof is similar). Then any neighbour $w \notin P$ of u_5 must coincide with v , since otherwise the edges $u_0u_1, u_1u_2, u_3u_4, u_4u_5, u_5u_6, u_1v, u_4v, u_5w$ form a forbidden subgraph. This contradiction shows that v is the only neighbour of u_5 outside of P , and similarly, v is the only neighbour of u_6 and u_7 outside of P . But then the diamond reduction is applicable to the subgraph induced by v, u_5, u_6, u_7 .

From (★) we conclude that u_1, u_4, u_7 have pairwise different neighbours outside of P . We denote these neighbours by v_1, v_4, v_7 , respectively.

(★★) Vertex u_2 has exactly one neighbour outside of P , which is either v_1 or v_4 . Moreover, if u_2 is adjacent to v_1 (respectively, v_4), then v_1 (respectively, v_4) is the unique neighbour of u_1 (respectively, u_4) outside of P .

To prove this, assume a neighbour $w \notin P$ of u_2 is different from v_1 and v_4 . Then the edges $u_0u_1, u_1u_2, u_2u_3, u_3u_4, u_4u_5, u_1v_1, u_4v_4, u_2w$ form a forbidden subgraph. This proves, in particular, the second sentence of (★★).

Also, if u_2 is adjacent both to v_1 and v_4 , then a neighbour $w \notin P$ of u_5 must be different from v_1 and v_4 (by (★)), in which case the edges $u_1u_2, u_3u_4, u_4u_5, u_5u_6, u_2v_1, u_2v_4, u_4v_4, u_5w$ form a forbidden subgraph.

By symmetry, similar conclusions apply to vertices u_3, u_5, u_6 .

Assume u_2 is adjacent to v_4 . Then, according (★), u_5 and u_6 are not adjacent to v_4 and hence by (★★) v_7 is the only neighbour of u_5, u_6 and u_7 outside of P . Therefore, the diamond reduction is applicable to the subgraph induced by v_7, u_5, u_6, u_7 . This contradiction shows that v_1 is the only neighbour of u_2 outside of P . Similarly, v_7 is the only neighbour of u_6 outside of P .

Now the diamond reduction is applicable either to the subgraph induced by v_1, u_1, u_2, u_3 (if u_3 is adjacent to v_1) or to the subgraph induced by v_7, u_5, u_6, u_7 (if u_5 is adjacent to v_7) or to the subgraph induced by v_4, u_3, u_4, u_5 (if u_3 is adjacent to v_4 and u_5 is adjacent to v_4). ◀

Since graphs of diameter D and maximum degree Δ have fewer than $\frac{\Delta}{\Delta-2}(\Delta-1)^D$ vertices, we conclude that after eliminating vertices of large degree, every black component has fewer than $\frac{12}{10}11^7$ vertices.

To develop more rules and reductions, assume G has a Hamiltonian cycle C . We can further assume that not all vertices of the graph are black, since otherwise the graph contains fewer than $\frac{12}{10}11^7$ vertices, in which case we can solve the problem by brute-force. A sequence of consecutive vertices of C surrounded by white vertices will be called a *black interval*. Observe that each black interval consists of at least 2 vertices (according to (R4)).

Let K be a black component of G . We will call the vertices of K that have white neighbours the *contact vertices*. Note that K may consist of one or more intervals. Each interval gives rise to exactly two contact vertices, and hence the number of contact vertices in K is even.

Let us show that for T -subgraph-free graphs, then number of intervals is at most 2.

▷ **Claim 11.** Any black component consists of at most two intervals.

Proof. Assume that a black component K has more than two intervals. Then K must contain an interval I_1 the vertices of which have neighbours in two other intervals, say in I_2 and I_3 .

8 Complexity Framework For Forbidden Subgraphs II

We denote $I_1 = (a_1, \dots, a_{k_1})$, $I_2 = (b_1, \dots, b_{k_2})$, $I_3 = (c_1, \dots, c_{k_3})$ ($k_1, k_2, k_3 \geq 2$) and let $a_i b_k$ and $a_j c_\ell$ be two chords. Without loss of generality we assume that $i \leq j$ and that $j - i$ is as small as possible. Also, we assume that if we move along C from I_1 in the anticlockwise direction, then first we meet I_2 and then I_3 . Observe that a_i and b_k are separated by at least two vertices of C , since otherwise the only vertex of C separating a_i and b_k must be white, in which case the edge $a_i b_k$ cannot belong to any Hamiltonian cycle and hence can be removed from the graph.

Case 1: $j = i + 1$. If b_k and c_ℓ are separated by at least two vertices of C , then the two edges of C incident to b_k , the two edges of C incident to c_ℓ , the two edges of C incident to a_i together with the chords $a_i b_k$ and $a_j c_\ell$ form a forbidden subgraph.

Now assume that b_k and c_ℓ are separated by a single (white) vertex x of C , say $k = 1$ and $\ell = 1$ and x is adjacent to both b_1 and c_1 . If a chord incident to b_2 connects it to a vertex not in $\{a_i, a_{i+1}, c_1, c_2\}$, then the two edges of C incident to b_2 , the two edges of C incident to x together with the edges $c_1 c_2$, $a_i b_1$, $a_{i+1} c_1$ and the chord incident to b_2 form a forbidden subgraph. If any chord incident to b_2 connects it to a vertex in $\{a_i, a_{i+1}, c_1, c_2\}$, and by symmetry any chord incident to c_2 connects it to a vertex in $\{a_i, a_{i+1}, b_1, b_2\}$, then we are in the conditions of the first paragraph of Case 1.

Case 2: $i = j$. Assume without loss of generality that b_{k+1} is black. To avoid Case 1, b_{k+1} has no neighbours in I_3 and is not adjacent to the neighbours of a_i on C . If additionally b_{k+1} is not adjacent to a_i , then the two edges of C incident to b_{k+1} , the two edges of C incident to c_ℓ together with the edges $a_i b_k$, $a_i c_\ell$, an edge of C incident to a_i and a chord incident to b_{k+1} form a forbidden subgraph (if b_{k+1} and c_ℓ have a common (white) neighbour in C , then replace the edge $a_i b_k$ with the second edge of C incident to a_i). This contradiction leads us to the conclusion that $a_i b_{k+1}$ is the only chord incident to b_{k+1} , and by symmetry $a_i b_k$ is the only chord incident to b_k , i.e. b_k and b_{k+1} have degree 3 in G . If I_2 has more than 2 vertices, say b_{k+2} is black, then for the same reason $a_i b_{k+2}$ is the only chord incident to b_{k+2} , in which case the diamond reduction is applicable to the subgraph induced by $a_i, b_k, b_{k+1}, b_{k+2}$. Thus, we conclude that I_2 consists of exactly two vertices both of which are adjacent to a_i . By symmetry I_3 consists of exactly two vertices both of which are adjacent to a_i . But now the butterfly reduction is applicable to G .

Case 3: $i + 1 < j$. Since $j - i$ is minimal possible, the vertices of I_1 between a_i and a_j have no neighbours in I_2 or I_3 . Also, to avoid Case 2, a_i has no neighbours in I_3 , while a_j has no neighbours in I_2 . As before, without loss of generality we assume that b_{k+1} is black.

Case 3.1: there is a chord $b_{k+1} x$ with $x \neq a_i$. We also consider a chord $a_{i+1} y$ and a chord $a_{i+2} z$. Note that y belongs to I_1 (to avoid Case 1).

First, we observe that $z \in \{a_{i-1}, a_i\}$, since otherwise the four edges of C incident to a_i, a_{i+1}, a_{i+2} , the two edges of C incident to b_k together with the chords $a_i b_k$ and $a_{i+2} z$ form a forbidden subgraph.

Next, we note that $x \in \{b_{k-1}, a_{i-1}\}$. To show this, assume $x \notin \{b_{k-1}, a_{i-1}\}$. If $x \neq y$, then the three edges of C incident to b_k and b_{k+1} , the two edges of C incident to a_{i+1} together with the chords $a_i b_k$, $b_{k+1} x$, $a_{i+1} y$ form a forbidden subgraph. If $x = y$, then $x \in I_1 - \{a_i, a_{i+1}, \dots, a_j\}$ (according to the above arguments). Assume x belongs to the path of C connecting a_i to b_k and avoiding I_3 (the other case is similar). Also let u be the neighbour of x on C between x and b_k (such a vertex different from b_k, b_{k+1} must exist, because x and b_k belong to different intervals; moreover, $u b_{k+1}$ is not an edge of C , since otherwise u is white, in which case the edge $b_{k+1} x$ cannot belong to any Hamiltonian cycle and hence can be removed from graph). Then the two edges of C incident to b_{k+1} , the two edges of C incident to a_{i+2} , together with the edges xu , $a_{i+1} x$, $b_{k+1} x$ and $a_{i+2} z$ form a forbidden subgraph (remember that $z \in \{a_{i-1}, a_i\}$ and $x \neq a_{i-1}$).

Finally, we conclude that $y = a_{i-1}$, since otherwise the two edges of C incident to a_{i+1} , the two edges of C incident to b_{k+1} together with the chords $a_i b_k$, $a_{i+1} y$, $a_{b+1} x$ and the edge $a_{i-1} a_i$ (if $x = b_{k-1}$) or the edge $b_{k-1} b_k$ (if $x = a_{i-1}$) form a forbidden subgraph.

Assume $x = b_{k-1}$. If $z = a_i$, then the two edges of C incident to a_{i-1} , the two edges of C incident to b_{k+1} (or to b_{k-1} if b_{k+1} is closer to I_1 than b_{k-1}) together with the chords $a_{i+1}a_{i-1}$, $a_{i+2}a_i$, $b_{k+1}b_{k-1}$, $a_i b_k$ form a forbidden subgraph. If $z = a_{i-1}$, then the two edges of C incident to a_{i-1} , the two edges of C incident to a_{i+2} , the two edges of C incident to b_k together with the chords $a_i b_k$ and $a_{i+2}a_{i-1}$ form a forbidden subgraph (observe that since a_{i-1} , b_{k-1} , b_{k+1} are black, there is at least one white vertex separating a_{i-1} from b_{k-1} , b_{k+1}).

Suppose at last that $x = a_{i-1}$. Let u be the neighbour of a_{i-1} on C different from a_i , and let v be the neighbour of b_{k+1} on C different from b_k . Note that $u \neq v$, since otherwise $u = v$ is white, in which case the edge $b_{k+1}a_{i-1}$ does not belong to any Hamiltonian cycle and hence can be removed from the graph. If $z = a_i$, then the two edges of C incident to a_{i+2} , the two edges of C incident to b_{k+1} together with the chords $a_{i+1}a_{i-1}$, $a_{i+2}a_i$, $a_{i-1}b_{k+1}$ and the edge $a_{i-1}u$ form a forbidden subgraph. We are left with the case when $a_{i+2}a_{i-1}$ is the only chord incident to a_{i+2} . In this case we can consider vertex a_{i+3} and a chord f incident to a_{i+3} . If $f \neq a_{i+3}a_{i-1}$, then the three edges of C incident to a_{i+2} and a_{i+3} , the two edges of C incident to b_{k+1} together with the chords $a_{i-1}b_{k+1}$, $a_{i-1}a_{i+2}$ and f form a forbidden subgraph. If $a_{i+3}a_{i-1}$ is the only chord incident to a_{i+3} , then the diamond reduction is applicable to the subgraph of G induced by $a_{i-1}, a_{i+1}, a_{i+2}, a_{i+3}$.

Case 3.2: the chord $b_{k+1}a_i$ is the only chord incident to b_{k+1} . By symmetry, $b_k a_i$ is the only chord incident to b_k . To avoid the diamond reduction and Case 3.1, we conclude that I_2 consists of exactly two vertices both of which are adjacent to a_i .

If a_{i+1} is incident to a chord $a_{i+1}y$ with $y \neq a_{i-1}$, then the two edges of C incident to y , the two edges of C incident to b_{k+1} together with the edges $a_i a_{i+1}$, $a_i b_{k+1}$, $a_{i+1}y$ and one of the edges $a_{i+1}a_{i+2}$ or $a_{i-1}a_i$ (depending on whether y appears in I_1 before or after a_i) form a forbidden subgraph.

If $a_{i+1}a_{i-1}$ is the only chord incident to a_{i+1} , then the butterfly reduction is applicable to the subgraph of G induced by the two vertices of I_2 and the three vertices a_{i-1}, a_i, a_{i+1} of I_1 . ◀

By Claim 11, if G has a Hamiltonian cycle, then every black component has two or four contact vertices.

- (R8) If a black component K has exactly two contact vertices, check if K has a Hamiltonian path connecting the contact vertices. If such a path does not exist, then stop: the input graph has no Hamiltonian cycle. Otherwise, choose arbitrarily a Hamiltonian path connecting the contact vertices, include the edges of the path in the solution and delete all other edges from K .

Rule (R8) destroys black components with two contact vertices, i.e. after its implementation all vertices in such components become white.

Now we discuss the case where each black component has exactly four contact vertices. Let K be such a component with contact vertices v_1, v_2, v_3, v_4 . If G has a Hamiltonian cycle, then the vertices of K can be partitioned into two parts each of which forms a path connecting a pair of contact vertices. We will call such a partition a *pairing* (of contact vertices) and will refer to a pairing as the set of edges in the two paths. Also, we will say that two pairings are of the same type, if they pair the contact vertices in the same way. Clearly, if all possible pairings in K have the same type, then it is irrelevant which one to choose, since non-contact vertices of K have no neighbours outside of K .

The above discussion justifies the following two rules.

- (R9) If a black component K with four contact vertices does not admit any pairing, then stop: the input graph has no Hamiltonian cycle.
- (R10) If in a black component K with four contact vertices all possible pairings have the same type, then choose arbitrarily any such pairing and delete all other edges from K . If this procedure disconnects the graph, then stop: the input graph has no Hamiltonian cycle.

Finally, we analyse the situation when each black component of G admits pairings of at least two different types.

▷ **Claim 12.** If each black component of the (connected) graph G admits pairings of at least two different types, then G has a Hamiltonian cycle.

Proof. Let K be a black component with contact vertices v_1, v_2, v_3, v_4 and let B and R be two pairings of different types, say B pairs v_1 with v_2 and v_3 with v_4 , while R pairs v_1 with v_3 and v_2 with v_4 . Assume that

- (1) the deletion of all edges of K except for the edges of B disconnects the graph into two components C_{12} (containing vertices v_1 and v_2) and C_{34} (containing vertices v_3 and v_4), and
- (2) the deletion of all edges of K except for the edges of R disconnects the graph into two components C_{13} (containing vertices v_1 and v_3) and C_{24} (containing vertices v_2 and v_4).

Note that (1) separates v_1 from v_3 and v_4 , while (2) separates v_1 from v_4 . Therefore, after the deletion of *all* edges of K vertex v_1 is separated from all other contact vertices. In other words, after the deletion of all edges of K , vertices v_1, v_2, v_3, v_4 belong to pairwise different connected components, say V_1, V_2, V_3, V_4 , respectively.

We observe that in each connected component V_i vertex v_i has degree 1 (it is adjacent to a white vertex only). Any other vertex of odd degree in V_i (if there is any) is black, i.e. appears in some black component K' . In the graph $G[K']$ the number of odd vertices is even (by the Handshake lemma). Attaching to $G[K']$ four white neighbours changes the parity of exactly four vertices of K' and hence leaves the number of vertices of K' with odd degrees in the graph G even. Since all vertices of K' belong to only one of the components V_i , we conclude that in each component V_i the number of vertices of odd degree is odd. This is not possible by the Handshake lemma and hence either (1) or (2) is not valid, i.e. we can keep one of the pairings and delete all other edges of K without disconnecting G . This operation destroys K , i.e. makes all vertices of K white.

Applying the above arguments to all black components, one by one, we transform G into a connected graph in which all vertices are white, i.e. to a Hamiltonian cycle. ◀


We summarize the discussion in the following algorithm to solve the problem.

1. Apply rules and reductions (R1) – (R7) as long as they are applicable.
2. If the algorithm did not stop at Step 1 and the graph has fewer than $\frac{12}{10}11^7$ vertices, then solve the problem by brute-force. Otherwise, check the number of contact vertices in black components. If there is a black component with the number of contact vertices different from 2 or 4, then stop: G has no Hamiltonian cycle.
3. If the algorithm did not stop at Step 2, then apply (R8) to black components with two contact vertices, and (R9) and (R10) to black components with four contact vertices.
4. If the algorithm did not stop at Step 3, then find a Hamiltonian cycle according to Claim 12.

Reductions (R8), (R9), (R10) can be implemented in constant time, because the number of vertices in each black component is bounded by a constant. It is also obvious that all other rules, and hence all steps of the algorithm can be implemented in polynomial time. The correctness of the algorithm follows from the proofs of the claims. ◀

3 k-Induced Disjoint Paths

Our first result essentially follows from the observation that solutions of k -INDUCED DISJOINT PATHS with long paths are solutions of k -DISJOINT PATHS, which we recall is polynomial-time solvable [34].



■ **Figure 5** Rule 1. Possible connections in our subgraph (left). What we replace this subgraph with (right). Dotted lines are possible additional edges.

► **Theorem 13** (♠). *For all $k \geq 2$, k -INDUCED DISJOINT PATHS is polynomial-time solvable for \mathbb{H}_1 -subgraph-free graphs.*

We sketch our proof for the case where $H = \mathbb{H}_2$.

► **Theorem 14** (♠). *For all $k \geq 2$, k -INDUCED DISJOINT PATHS is polynomial-time solvable for \mathbb{H}_2 -subgraph-free graphs.*

Proof sketch. First, branch on all $O(2^k n^{3k})$ options (so a polynomial number, as k is fixed) of solution paths that have at most three internal vertices. For each branch, we remove the guessed solution paths and the neighbours of the vertices on these paths. Let k still be the number of terminal pairs. We now only look for solution paths with at least four vertices. Branch on all $O(n^{4k})$ options of choosing the first two vertices a_z, b_z on the solution path from every terminal $z \in \{s_i, t_i\}$ for $i \in \{1, \dots, k\}$. In each branch, we remove all other neighbours of z, a_z from the graph, so every terminal z now has degree 1, while a_z has degree 2. We discard the branch if $(\dagger) \{a_z, b_z\} \cap \{a_{z'}, b_{z'}\} \neq \emptyset$ for some terminals z, z' or one of a_z, b_z is the same or neighbours one of $a_{z'}, b_{z'}$ for some terminals z, z' not from the same terminal pair.

We now start a recursive procedure. We first preprocess the input. If b_{s_i} and b_{t_i} are adjacent for some $i \in \{1, \dots, k\}$, then we remove the solution path $s_i, a_{s_i}, b_{s_i}, b_{t_i}, a_{t_i}, t_i$ and their neighbours from the graph. If b_z and $b_{z'}$ are adjacent for some terminals z, z' that do not form a terminal pair, we discard the branch.

We run the polynomial-time algorithm for k -DISJOINT PATHS from [34] on the remaining terminal pairs. If this results in a no-answer, then we discard the branch. Else, we found a solution P_1, \dots, P_k . We may assume that each path P_i is induced, or we may shortcut it. If P_1, \dots, P_k is also a solution of k -INDUCED DISJOINT PATHS, then we return a yes-answer. Otherwise, there is (say) an edge (x_1, x_2) between paths $x_1 \in P_1$ and $x_2 \in P_2$. We pick x_1 such that it is closest to t_1 on P_1 and under that condition we pick x_2 such that it is closest to t_2 on P_2 .

Let z_1, z_3 be the two neighbours of x_1 on P_1 and z_2, z_4 the two neighbours of x_2 on P_2 . We let $S = \{z_1, x_1, z_3, z_2, x_2, z_4\}$. Observe that S does not contain any terminal by \dagger and the preprocessing. Suppose any $z \in \{z_1, z_2, z_3, z_4\}$ has two neighbours outside of S . Then G has a \mathbb{H}_2 as a subgraph. Thus we may assume (\ddagger) that each $z \in \{z_1, z_2, z_3, z_4\}$ has at most one neighbour outside of S .

By the choice of (x_1, x_2) and the fact that P_1 is induced, z_3 has no neighbours in S except x_1 . Suppose the edge (z_1, z_2) exists and one of $\{x_1, x_2\}$ has a neighbour outside of S . Then there is an \mathbb{H}_2 with middle path x_1, z_1, z_2 since $s_2 \notin S$. Suppose the edge (z_1, z_4) exists and one of $\{x_1, x_2\}$ has a neighbour outside of S . Then there is an \mathbb{H}_2 with middle path x_1, z_1, z_4 since $s_2 \notin S$.

Now either the edges (z_1, z_2) and (z_1, z_4) do not exist (see Figure 5) or at least one of them exists and x_1, x_2 have no neighbours outside S (see Figure 6). In the former case, we will apply Rule 1, while in the latter case, we will apply Rule 2 (see Figure 5 and 6 for the description of these two rules). Using \ddagger , we can prove that Rules 1 and 2 are safe and that they both preserve \dagger and H_2 -subgraph-freeness (♠). We can recognize both rules and apply them in polynomial time. This makes the instance smaller by one vertex and we recurse. Hence, our algorithm will terminate in polynomial time. ◀




Figure 6 Rule 2. Possible connections in our subgraph (left). What we replace this subgraph with (right).




Figure 7 A (partial) C_5 -flower and the three exceptional \mathbb{H}_3 -subgraph-free C_5 -critical graphs E_1 , E_2 and E_3 .

For our next result we follow the proof from Section 2.4 in [29]. We cannot just take the p -subdivision of that construction for some fixed p . However, as we will show, *some* of the edges may be liberally subdivided.

► **Theorem 15 (♠).** *For all $k \geq 2$, k -INDUCED DISJOINT PATHS is NP-complete for subcubic $(\mathbb{H}_4, \dots, \mathbb{H}_\ell)$ -subgraph-free graphs for all $\ell \geq 4$.*

4 C_5 -Colouring

In this section, we give our polynomial-time certifying algorithm for C_5 -COLOURING on \mathbb{H}_3 -subgraph-free graphs. For this purpose we introduce the following graphs. The C_5 -flower F_n is the graph (see Figure 7) that we get from C_{3n} (for $n \geq 3$) by adding a new central vertex with an edge to every third vertex of C_{3n} . If n is odd, we call F_n an *odd C_5 -flower*, and if it is even we call F_n an *even C_5 -flower*. We refer to the graphs E_1, E_2 and E_3 shown in Figure 7 as *exceptional graphs*. The following lemma (whose proof is a simple exercise) shows that all these graphs are C_5 -critical (i.e. they are not C_5 -colourable but every proper subgraph of them is).

► **Lemma 16.** *The graph K_3 , the odd flowers F_n for odd $n \geq 3$ and the exceptional graphs E_1, E_2 and E_3 are all \mathbb{H}_3 -subgraph-free and C_5 -critical.*

We can now show the following structural result.


► **Theorem 17 (♠).** *The only \mathbb{H}_3 -subgraph-free C_5 -critical graphs are K_3 , odd flowers F_n for $n \geq 3$, and the exceptional graphs E_1, E_2 and E_3 . Equivalently, the following three statements are true:*

1. *All \mathbb{H}_3 -subgraph-free graphs of girth at least 6 are C_5 -colourable.*
2. *The only \mathbb{H}_3 -subgraph-free C_5 -critical graphs of girth 5 are E_1, E_2 and odd C_5 -flowers F_n .*
3. *The only \mathbb{H}_3 -subgraph-free C_5 -critical graph of girth 4 is E_3 .*

We can now prove the following result.

► **Theorem 18.** *There exists a polynomial-time certifying algorithm for C_5 -COLOURING on \mathbb{H}_3 -subgraph-free graphs.*

Proof. As every graph that does not map to C_5 must contain a C_5 -critical subgraph, we get from Theorem 17 that \mathbb{H}_3 -subgraph-free C_5 -colouring is solved by detecting the non-existence of the graphs K_3, E_1, E_2, E_3 and F_n (odd $n \geq 3$) in a \mathbb{H}_3 -subgraph-free input graph G . We can detect the presence of



■ **Figure 8** The graph \mathbb{A} (left) and the graph $\overline{2P_4 + 3P_6}$ (right).

the fixed graphs K_3 , E_1 , E_2 and E_3 in G in polynomial time by brute force. What we must show is that we can detect the presence of any odd C_5 -flower F_n in polynomial time. To do so, we simply observe that for a fixed centre vertex, v_0 we can make an auxiliary graph on its neighbours putting an edge between two if there is a path on three edges between them in G . Now, G contains an odd C_5 -flower with centre v_0 if and only if this auxiliary graph contains an odd cycle. We can check this in polynomial time for each v_0 , so can find an odd C_5 -flower in G polynomial time. ◀

5 Star 3-Colouring

In this section, we give our linear-time certifying algorithms for STAR 3-COLOURING for bipartite $(\mathbb{H}_2, \mathbb{H}_4, \mathbb{H}_6 \dots)$ -subgraph-free graphs and general $(\mathbb{H}_2, \mathbb{H}_4, \mathbb{H}_6 \dots)$ -subgraph-free graphs, starting with the bipartite case. Let \mathbb{A} and $\overline{2P_4 + 3P_6}$ be the graphs shown in Figure 8. We can show the following result.

► **Theorem 19** (♠). *A bipartite $(\mathbb{H}_2, \mathbb{H}_4, \mathbb{H}_6 \dots)$ -subgraph-free graph is star 3-colourable if and only if it is $(\mathbb{A}, \overline{2P_4 + 3P_6})$ -subgraph-free.*

Theorem 19 leads to a linear-time certifying algorithm, as $(\mathbb{H}_2, \mathbb{H}_4, \mathbb{H}_6 \dots)$ -subgraph-free graphs have bounded treewidth (see Appendix D) and we can then use Courcelle’s Theorem [13] to check for a subgraph isomorphic to \mathbb{A} or $\overline{2P_4 + 3P_6}$. For the general case, we apply the same arguments but we do not have an explicit list of the forbidden graphs (which we prove has finite size).

► **Theorem 20** (♠). *A $(\mathbb{H}_2, \mathbb{H}_4, \mathbb{H}_6 \dots)$ -subgraph-free graph is star 3-colourable if and only if it is \mathcal{F} -subgraph-free for some finite set of graphs \mathcal{F} .*

6 Conclusions

We took four classic problems, HAMILTON CYCLE, k -INDUCED DISJOINT PATHS, C_5 -COLOURING and STAR 3-COLOURING, that are easy on bounded treewidth, but for which we showed that their hardness on subcubic graphs is not preserved under edge subdivision. For these C12-problems we gave both polynomial and NP-completeness results for \mathcal{H} -subgraph-free graphs when \mathcal{H} is some subset of $\{\mathbb{H}_1, \mathbb{H}_2, \dots\}$. Of course, we would like to have a classification for all our problems, among all \mathcal{H} -subgraph-free classes (even where $|\mathcal{H}| = 1$), but it makes sense to understand the \mathbb{H}_i first, and below we pose relevant open problems.

First, is there a graph \mathbb{H}_ℓ such that HAMILTON CYCLE is NP-complete for \mathbb{H}_ℓ -free graphs? Second, what is the complexity of k -INDUCED DISJOINT PATHS on \mathbb{H}_3 -subgraph-free graphs? The answer would give a dichotomy for k -INDUCED DISJOINT PATHS on \mathbb{H}_i -subgraph-free graphs. Third, what is the complexity of C_5 -COLOURING on \mathbb{H}_i -subgraph-free graphs, when $i = 0 \pmod 3$? If these are in P, then we would have a dichotomy for C_5 -COLOURING on \mathbb{H}_i -subgraph-free graphs based on $i \pmod 3$. Fourth, what is the complexity of STAR 3-COLOURING on \mathbb{H}_{2i} -subgraph-free graphs for $i \geq 1$? If these are in P, then we would have a dichotomy for STAR 3-COLOURING on \mathbb{H}_i -subgraph-free graphs based on $i \pmod 2$. Moreover, even though STAR k -COLOURING is not C2 for $k \geq 10$ (see Appendix C), this is not known for $k = 4$ (in [37], Shalu and Antony ask about the complexity of STAR 4-COLOURING on subcubic graphs).

We also ask what is the complexity of k -INDUCED DISJOINT PATHS and C_5 -COLOURING for subcubic graphs of girth g for $g \geq 3$, i.e., are both C12-problems even C12' just like the other two? We also do not know the complexity of k -INDUCED DISJOINT PATHS, for $k \geq 2$, on graphs of girth at least g without a degree bound, whereas the best degree bound for C_5 -COLOURING is $6 \cdot 5^{13}$ (see Appendix A).

Finally, we note that ACYCLIC 3-COLOURING, we have the same results as for STAR 3-COLOURING in Theorem 5; see Appendix M. However, in contrast to STAR 3-COLOURING, we do not know if ACYCLIC 3-COLOURING satisfies C2 (see also [36]), and we also have no certifying algorithms for this problem.

References

- 1 Michael O. Albertson, Glenn G. Chappell, Henry A. Kierstead, André Kündgen, and Radhika Ramamurthi. Coloring with no 2-colored P_4 's. *Electronic Journal of Combinatorics*, 11(1), 2004.
- 2 Vladimir E. Alekseev, Rodica Boliac, Dmitry V. Korobitsyn, and Vadim V. Lozin. NP-hard graph problems and boundary classes of graphs. *Theoretical Computer Science*, 389:219–236, 2007.
- 3 Vladimir E. Alekseev and Dmitry V. Korobitsyn. Complexity of some problems on hereditary graph classes. *Diskretnaya Matematika*, 2:90–96, 1990.
- 4 Vladimir E. Alekseev and Dmitry V. Korobitsyn. Complexity of some problems on hereditary graph classes. *Diskretnaya Matematika*, 4:34–40 (1992)
- 5 Stefan Arnborg and Andrzej Proskurowski. Linear time algorithms for NP-hard problems restricted to partial k -trees. *Discrete Applied Mathematics*, 23:11–24, 1989.
- 6 Daniel Bienstock. On the complexity of testing for odd holes and induced odd paths. *Discrete Mathematics*, 90:85–92, 1991 (see also Corrigendum, *Discrete Mathematics* 102:109, 1992).
- 7 Daniel Bienstock, Neil Robertson, Paul D. Seymour, and Robin Thomas. Quickly excluding a forest. *Journal of Combinatorial Theory, Series B*, 52:274–283, 1991.
- 8 Hans L. Bodlaender, Tesshu Hanaka, Yasuaki Kobayashi, Yusuke Kobayashi, Yoshio Okamoto, Yota Otachi, Tom C. van der Zanden. Subgraph Isomorphism on Graph Classes that Exclude a Substructure. *Algorithmica*, 82:3566–3587, 2020.
- 9 Hans L. Bodlaender, Matthew Johnson, Barnaby Martin, Jelle J. Oostveen, Sukanya Pandey, Daniël Paulusma, Siani Smith and Erik Jan van Leeuwen. Complexity framework for forbidden subgraphs IV: The Steiner Forest problem. *CoRR*, abs/2305.01613, 2023.
- 10 Rodica Boliac and Vadim V. Lozin. On the clique-width of graphs in hereditary classes. *Proc. ISAAC 2022, LNCS*, 2518:44–54, 2002.
- 11 Christoph Brause, Petr A. Golovach, Barnaby Martin, Pascal Ochem, Daniël Paulusma, and Siani Smith. Acyclic, Star, and Injective Colouring: Bounding the diameter. *Electronic Journal of Combinatorics*, 29:P2.43, 2022.
- 12 Maria Chudnovsky, Shenwei Huang, Pawel Rzazewski, Sophie Spirkl, and Mingxian Zhong. Complexity of C_k -coloring in hereditary classes of graphs. *Proc. ESA 2019, LIPIcs*, 144:31:1–31:15, 2019.
- 13 Bruno Courcelle. The monadic second-order logic of graphs. I. Recognizable sets of finite graphs. *Information and Computation*, 85:12–75, 1990.
- 14 David P. Dailey. Uniqueness of colorability and colorability of planar 4-regular graphs are NP-complete. *Discrete Mathematics*, 30:289–293, 1980.
- 15 Rina Dechter and Judea Pearl. Tree clustering for constraint networks. *Artificial Intelligence*, 38:353–366, 1989.
- 16 Reinhard Diestel. *Graph theory*, volume 173 of *Graduate Texts in Mathematics*. Springer-Verlag, New York, 1997.
- 17 Thomas Emden-Weinert, Stefan Hougardy and Bernd Kreuter. Uniquely colourable graphs and the hardness of colouring graphs of large girth. *Combinatorics, Probability & Computing*, 7:375–386, 1998.
- 18 Anna Galluccio, Pavol Hell, and Jaroslav Nešetřil. The complexity of H -colouring of bounded degree graphs. *Discrete Mathematics*, 222:101–109, 2000.
- 19 Michael R. Garey, David S. Johnson, and Larry J. Stockmeyer. Some simplified NP-complete graph problems. *Theoretical Computer Science*, 1:237–267, 1976.

- 20 Michael R. Garey, David S. Johnson, and Robert Endre Tarjan. The Planar Hamiltonian Circuit problem is NP-complete. *SIAM Journal on Computing*, 5:704–714, 1976.
- 21 Alfred Geroldinger and Imre Z. Ruzsa. *Combinatorial Number Theory and Additive Group Theory*. Birkhäuser, 2009.
- 22 Petr A. Golovach and Daniël Paulusma. List coloring in the absence of two subgraphs. *Discrete Applied Mathematics*, 166:123–130, 2014.
- 23 Petr A. Golovach, Daniël Paulusma, and Bernard Ries. Coloring graphs characterized by a forbidden subgraph. *Discrete Applied Mathematics*, 180:101–110, 2015.
- 24 Pavol Hell and Jaroslav Nešetřil. On the complexity of H -coloring. *Journal of Combinatorial Theory, Series B*, 48:92–110, 1990.
- 25 Matthew Johnson, Barnaby Martin, Jelle J. Oostveen, Sukanya Pandey, Daniël Paulusma, Siani Smith, and Erik Jan van Leeuwen. Complexity framework for forbidden subgraphs I: The framework. *CoRR*, 2211.12887, 2022.
- 26 Matthew Johnson, Barnaby Martin, Sukanya Pandey, Daniël Paulusma, Siani Smith, and Erik Jan van Leeuwen. Complexity framework for forbidden subgraphs III: When problems are tractable on subcubic graphs. *Proc. MFCS 2023, LIPIcs*, 272:57:1-57:15, 2023.
- 27 Marcin Kamiński. Max-Cut and containment relations in graphs. *Theoretical Computer Science*, 438:89–95, 2012.
- 28 Nicholas Korpelainen, Vadim V. Lozin, Dmitriy S. Malyshev, and Alexander Tiskin. Boundary properties of graphs for algorithmic graph problems. *Theoretical Computer Science*, 412:3545–3554, 2011.
- 29 Benjamin Lévêque, David Y. Lin, Frédéric Maffray, and Nicolas Trotignon. Detecting induced subgraphs. *Discrete Applied Mathematics*, 157:3540–3551, 2009.
- 30 Vadim V. Lozin and Igor Razgon. Tree-width dichotomy. *European Journal of Combinatorics*, 103:103517, 2022.
- 31 Barnaby Martin, Daniël Paulusma, Siani Smith, and Erik Jan van Leeuwen. Few induced disjoint paths for H -free graphs. *Theoretical Computer Science*, 939:82–193, 2023.
- 32 Neil Robertson and Paul D. Seymour. Graph minors. III. Planar tree-width. *Journal of Combinatorial Theory, Series B*, 36:49–64, 1984.
- 33 Neil Robertson and Paul D. Seymour. Graph minors. V. Excluding a planar graph. *Journal of Combinatorial Theory, Series B*, 41:92–114, 1986.
- 34 Neil Robertson and Paul D. Seymour. Graph minors. XIII. The Disjoint Paths problem. *Journal of Combinatorial Theory, Series B*, 63:65–110, 1995.
- 35 Petra Scheffler. A practical linear time algorithm for disjoint paths in graphs with bounded tree-width. Preprint 396, Technische Universität Berlin, Institut für Mathematik, 1994.
- 36 M. A. Shalu, Cyriac Antony. Hardness transitions and uniqueness of acyclic colouring. *Discrete Applied Mathematics*. 345:77–98, 2024.
- 37 M. A. Shalu, Cyriac Antony. Star colouring of bounded degree graphs and regular graphs. *Discrete Mathematics*, 345:112850, 2022.
- 38 Yossi Shiloach. A polynomial solution to the undirected Two Paths problem. *Journal of the ACM*, 27:445–456, 1980.

A C_5 -Colouring for Bounded Degree and Large Girth

The k -COLOURING problem is to decide if a graph G has a k -colouring, which is a mapping $c : V(G) \rightarrow \{1, \dots, k\}$ such that $c(u) \neq c(v)$ for any two adjacent vertices u and v of G . We need a result of Emden-Weinert, Hougardy and Kreuter:

► **Theorem 21** ([17]). *For all $k \geq 3$ and all $g \geq 3$, k -COLOURING is NP-complete for graphs with girth at least g and with maximum degree at most $6k^{13}$.*

We now repeat the proof of Chudnovsky et al. [12], which comes down to replacing each edge of an input graph G of 5-COLOURING, which we may assume has girth at least g and maximum degree at most $6 \cdot 5^{13}$ due to Theorem 21, by a path of length 3. This yields a new graph G' of girth at least g , such that G and G' have the same maximum degree. Hence, we derive the following result.

► **Proposition 22.** *For every $g \geq 3$, C_5 -COLOURING is NP-complete for graphs with girth at least g and with maximum degree at most $6 \cdot 5^{13}$.*

B The Four Testbed Problems Do Not Satisfy C3

In this section we show that none of our four problems satisfy C3. We use the following notation in this section: for a graph G and an integer $p \geq 1$, let G_p be the p -subdivision of G (which we recall is the graph obtained from G after subdividing each edge of G exactly p times).

► **Proposition 23.** HAMILTON CYCLE *does not satisfy C3.*

Proof. We observe that for every graphs G and every $p \geq 1$, G_p is a no-instance of HAMILTON CYCLE unless G was a cycle. ◀

► **Proposition 24.** k -INDUCED DISJOINT PATHS *does not satisfy C3.*

Proof. Under any kind of subdivision, k -INDUCED DISJOINT PATHS reduces to k -DISJOINT PATHS over the same graph, which is in P for all $k \geq 2$, as shown in [38] for $k = 2$ and in [34] for every $k \geq 3$. ◀

► **Proposition 25.** C_5 -COLOURING *does not satisfy C3.*

Proof. We first prove that for all $p \geq 4$, and for all $x, y \in V(C_5)$, there is a walk of length p in C_5 from x to y . First let $p = 4$. To walk a distance of zero: walk two forward then two back. To walk at distance one (without loss of generality) forward: walk four backward. To walk at distance two (without loss of generality) forward: walk one back, one forward, and two forward. Now let $p = 5$. To walk a distance of zero: walk five forward. To walk at distance one (without loss of generality) forward: walk two forward, two back and one forward. To walk at distance two (without loss of generality) forward: walk one back, one forward, and three back. Finally, let $p \geq 6$. Keep moving one forward then one back until one of the two previous cases applies.

Now let G be a graph. We give each vertex in G a label from $\{1, \dots, 5\}$. From the above it follows that for every $p \geq 3$, we can extend c to a homomorphism from G_p to C_5 ; in other words, G_p is a yes-instance of C_5 -COLOURING. ◀

► **Proposition 26.** STAR 3-COLOURING *does not satisfy C3.*

Proof. Let G be a graph. We show that for all $p \geq 3$, G_p is a yes-instance of STAR 3-COLOURING. We do this by giving each vertex in G a label from $\{1, 2, 3\}$. The resulting labelling c might not be a 3-colouring, but this is not important: we will show that we can extend c to a star 3-colouring of G_p as follows.

Consider an edge e in G and let P be the corresponding path (of $p + 1$ edges) in G_p . It suffices to give two star 3-colourings of this path, so that the first three vertices are distinct colours and the last three vertices are distinct colours: one in which the first and last vertices are the same colour and one in which they are a different colour. Let us identify a 3-colouring of P by a sequence of length $p + 1$ over $\{1, 2, 3\}$. If $p + 1$ is a multiple of three, then use $(123)^{\frac{p+1}{3}}$ for the different colour and $(123)^{\frac{p+1}{3}-1}231$ for the same colour. If $p + 1$ is $1 \pmod 3$, then use $(123)^{\frac{p+1}{3}-1}2132$ for the different colour and $(123)^{\frac{p+1}{3}}1$ for the same colour. If $p + 1$ is $2 \pmod 3$, then use $(123)^{\frac{p+1}{3}-1}12$ for the different colour and $(123)^{\frac{p+1}{3}-1}21$ for the same colour. ◀

C Star k -Colouring on Subcubic Graphs for Large k

We cannot generalise our result for STAR 3-COLOURING to STAR k -COLOURING for any $k \geq 3$, as for large k the problem no longer satisfies C2. In fact, we prove even a stronger statement. A k -colouring of a graph G is said to be *injective* if for every vertex $u \in V(G)$, every neighbour of u is assigned a different colour, or in other words, the union of any two colour-classes induce a disjoint union of isolated vertices and edges. So, any injective k -colouring is a star k -colouring (but the reverse does not necessarily hold, for instance the P_3 is star 2-colourable but has no injective 2-colouring).

► **Proposition 27.** *For $k \geq 10$, all subcubic graphs have an injective 10-colouring.*

Proof. It suffices to prove the statement for $k = 10$. We do this by induction. For the base case, a graph with one vertex is star 10-colourable. Now take a vertex v in a graph G and assume $G \setminus \{v\}$ has an injective 10-colouring. As G is subcubic, v has at most three neighbours, each of which have at most two more neighbours each. Thus there are at most nine vertices whose colour we wish to avoid. As we have ten colours in total, this means that we can safely colour v . ◀

D Bounded Treewidth Results

A graph G contains H as a *minor* if G can be modified to H by a sequence of vertex deletions, edge deletions and edge contractions; if not, then G is *H -minor-free*. We need the following classic result.

► **Theorem 28** ([7]). *For every forest F , all F -minor-free graphs have pathwidth, and thus treewidth, at most $|V(F)| - 2$.*

We now make the following observation.

► **Proposition 29.** *For every $\ell \geq 1$, the class of $(\mathbb{H}_\ell, \mathbb{H}_{\ell+1}, \dots)$ -subgraph-free graphs has bounded treewidth.*

Proof. Let $\ell \geq 1$. As every $(\mathbb{H}_\ell, \mathbb{H}_{\ell+1}, \dots)$ -subgraph-free graph is H_ℓ -minor-free, we apply Theorem 28. ◀

We also prove the following result.

► **Proposition 30.** *For every $n \geq 1$, the class of $(\mathbb{H}_n, \mathbb{H}_{2n}, \mathbb{H}_{3n}, \dots)$ -subgraph-free graphs has bounded treewidth.*

Proof. We proceed by contraposition. If a class of graphs has unbounded treewidth, then every grid appears as a minor in some graph [33]. Let us explain the argument for $n = 2$ first. We consider that the 3×3 -grid appears as a minor in some graph G in our class and let f be the minor map from G to the 3×3 -grid. Consider the three vertices in the 3×3 -grid that form the central row as u, v, w (in succession). Choose $u' \in f^{-1}(u), v' \in f^{-1}(v), w' \in f^{-1}(w)$ so that u', v', w' have degree greater than 2, noting that such vertices must exist. If the distance in G between u' and v' is even, of length $2i$, then there is an \mathbb{H}_{2i} subgraph in G with central path from u' to v' . If the distance in G between v' and w' is even, of length $2i$, then there is an \mathbb{H}_{2i} subgraph in G with central path from v' to w' . Else, there is a path of even length $4i$ from u' to w' and then there is an \mathbb{H}_{4i} subgraph in G with central path from u' to w' .

For $(\mathbb{H}_n, \mathbb{H}_{2n}, \dots)$ -subgraph-free graphs, consider the Abelian group $(\mathbb{Z}/n\mathbb{Z})$. The Davenport constant of an Abelian group G is the minimum d so that any sequence of elements of G contains a non-empty consecutive subsequence of zero-sum (that adds to the identity element 0). It is known that for $(\mathbb{Z}/n\mathbb{Z})$ the Davenport constant is n (see page 24 in [21]). Take an $(n+1) \times (n+1)$ -grid and consider some row not at the top or bottom of the grid with vertices w_1, \dots, w_{n+1} in succession. Consider some $w'_1 \in f^{-1}(w_1), \dots, w'_{n+1} \in f^{-1}(w_{n+1})$ where f is the minor map as before, and the distances x_i between w'_{i+1} and w'_i . Using the Davenport constant, there is a subsequence $x_j, \dots, x_{j'}$ ($j' > j$) such that $x_j + \dots + x_{j'} = 0 \pmod n$. Now choose $w'_j, \dots, w'_{j'+1}$ as the central path in some \mathbb{H}_{in} . ◀

E The Standard NP-hardness Reduction to Star-3-Colouring

For reference, we explain the gadget from Albertson et al. [1] that yields the following result.

► **Theorem 31** ([1]). *STAR 3-COLOURING is NP-complete for planar bipartite graphs in which one partition class has size 2.*

Proof. Reduce from 3-COLOURABILITY which is known to be NP-complete even for planar graphs [14]. Let G be a planar graph. Replace each edge e by three new vertices a_e, b_e, c_e that are made adjacent only to the two end-vertices of e in G . Let G' be the resulting graph. Then every vertex of $V(G') \setminus V(G)$ has degree 2 in G' . Moreover, G' is planar and bipartite with partition classes $V(G') \setminus V(G)$ and $V(G)$. It remains to observe that G has a 3-colouring if and only if G' has a star 3-colouring. ◀

F The Standard NP-hardness Reduction to C_5 -Colouring

We make the following observation.

► **Proposition 32.** *C_5 -COLOURING is NP-complete for $(\mathbb{H}_1, \mathbb{H}_2, \mathbb{H}_4, \mathbb{H}_5, \dots)$ -subgraph-free graphs.*

Proof. It is well known [24] and easy to see that there is a reduction from K_5 -COLOURING, which is to decide if a graph has a K_5 -colouring, that is, a homomorphism from G to the complete graph K_5 on five vertices. This problem is well known to be NP-complete [24]. Let G be a graph, and let G' be the 2-subdivision of G . We note that G' is $(\mathbb{H}_1, \mathbb{H}_2, \mathbb{H}_4, \mathbb{H}_5, \dots)$ -subgraph-free (but may contain many instances of \mathbb{H}_ℓ where $\ell \equiv 0 \pmod 3$). Moreover, G has a K_5 -colouring if and only if G' has a C_5 -colouring. ◀

G Missing Proofs of Claims in Theorem 6

Here is the missing proof of Claim 8.

Claim 8 (restated). *Let G' be a graph obtained from G by the butterfly reduction. Then G has a Hamiltonian cycle if and only if G' has a Hamiltonian cycle.*

Proof. Since G' is obtained from G by deleting some edges, any Hamiltonian cycle in G' is also a Hamiltonian cycle in G . Conversely, assume C is a Hamiltonian cycle in G . If the edge ab belongs to C , then the edges ax and bx do not belong to C (remember that a and b have white neighbours), in which case C is also a Hamiltonian cycle in G' .

Suppose now that ab does not belong to C . Then ax and bx belong to C and hence cx and dx do not belong to C , implying that cd belongs to C (remember that the degree of c is 3 in G). But then G has one more Hamiltonian cycle obtained from C by replacing the edges ax, bx, cd with the edges cx, dx, ab . This second cycle is clearly a Hamiltonian cycle in G' . ◀

Here is the missing proof of Claim 9.

Claim 9 (restated). *Let x be a vertex of degree at least 13. If the neighbourhood of x does not contain two adjacent vertices of degree 3, then G has no Hamiltonian cycle. Otherwise, G has a Hamiltonian cycle if and only if $G - x$ has.*

Proof. Assume G has a Hamiltonian cycle C . We call any edge of G not in C a *chord* and the endpoints of a chord *weak neighbours*.

Let y and z be the neighbours of x on the cycle. Without loss of generality, we let y be black (otherwise (R4) is applicable to G) and v be a weak neighbour of y . Assume $v \neq z$. Since the degree of x is at least 13, x has at least 5 weak neighbours either between y and v or between z and v on the cycle C . Let u be a middle of these 5 neighbours. In the first case, two edges of C incident to y , two edges of C incident to u , two edges of C incident to v together with the edges xu and yv form a forbidden subgraph. In the second case, two edges of C incident to x , two edges of C incident to u , two edges of C incident to v together with the edges xu and yv form a forbidden subgraph. A contradiction in both cases shows that $v = z$, i.e. the degree of y is 3. By symmetry, the degree of z is 3. This proves that if the neighbourhood of x does not contain two adjacent vertices of degree 3, then G has no Hamiltonian cycle.

Now assume that the neighbourhood of x contains two adjacent vertices of degree 3. Suppose first that G has a Hamiltonian cycle. From the first part of the proof, we know that the neighbours of x on the cycle are adjacent. Therefore, by removing x from the graph we are left with a Hamiltonian cycle in $G - x$.

Conversely, let $G - x$ have a Hamiltonian cycle C . Denote by y and z two adjacent vertices of degree 3 in the neighbourhood of x . In the graph $G - x$ the vertices y and z have degree 2 and hence the edge yz belongs to C . By replacing this edge with the edges xy and xz we obtain a Hamiltonian cycle in the graph G . ◀

H The Proof of Theorem 13

Here is the missing proof of Theorem 13, which we restate below.

Theorem 13. (restated) *For all $k \geq 2$, k -INDUCED DISJOINT PATHS is polynomial-time solvable for \mathbb{H}_1 -subgraph-free graphs.*

Proof. We prove the result for $k = 2$. The extension to $k \geq 2$ will be straightforward. Let G be an instance of 2-INDUCED DISJOINT PATHS together with two terminal pairs (s_1, t_1) and (s_2, t_2) . We may assume without loss of generality that there is no edge between s_1 and t_1 and no edge between s_2 and t_2 .

We first check if there exists a solution in which one of the paths has length 2. We can do this in polynomial time as follows. We first consider all $O(n)$ options of choosing a vertex to be the middle vertex of one of these paths. We then check if the graph obtained from removing the guessed middle vertex and its two neighbouring terminals s_i and t_i as well all the neighbours of these three vertices has a connected component that contains both terminals s_j and t_j of the other pair. This takes polynomial time.

We now check if there exists a solution in which both paths have length at least 3. We consider all $O(n^4)$ options of choosing the neighbours s'_1, t'_1, s'_2, t'_2 of s_1, t_1, s_2, t_2 , respectively, on the two solution paths (should a solution exist). We discard a branch if there exists an edge between a vertex of $\{s_1, s'_1, t_1, t'_1\}$ and a vertex of $\{s_2, s'_2, t_2, t'_2\}$. Suppose this is not the case. We remove s_1, t_1, s_2, t_2 and every neighbour of a vertex in $\{s_1, t_1, s_2, t_2\}$ that does not belong to $\{s'_1, t'_1, s'_2, t'_2\}$. Afterwards, it suffices to solve 2-DISJOINT PATHS on the resulting graph G' with terminal pairs (s'_1, t'_1) and (s'_2, t'_2) . This can be seen as follows. Any solution of 2-INDUCED DISJOINT PATHS is a solution of 2-DISJOINT PATHS. Now suppose we have a solution (P_1, P_2) of 2-DISJOINT PATHS. If there exist an edge between a vertex of P_1 and a vertex of P_2 , then we find the forbidden subgraph \mathbb{H}_1 (possibly after adding the vertices s_1, t_1, s_2, t_2 back). Since the number of branches is $O(n^4)$ and each created instance of 2-DISJOINT PATHS can be solved in polynomial time [34, 38], the running time of this case is polynomial as well. ◀

I The Missing Parts of Theorem 14

Here we prove that Rules 1 and 2 displayed in Figures 5 and 6 are safe, and moreover that they both preserve \dagger and H_2 -subgraph-freeness (this was all what was left to show).

Recall that Rule 1 is applied in the situation that (z_1, z_2) and (z_1, z_4) are both not edges of the graph. The rule is to contract the edge (x_1, x_2) , removing any parallel edges that may arise; see Figure 5. We first show that Rule 1 is safe.

Suppose that we have a solution to k -INDUCED DISJOINT PATHS in G . If this solution uses no vertices in S , then it is already a solution to k -INDUCED DISJOINT PATHS in G' . Thus, it must use some vertex in S . If the solution does not use x_1 nor x_2 , then recall that by \ddagger , each of z_1, z_2, z_3, z_4 has at most one neighbour outside of S , and thus the solution must avoid thus S entirely, a contradiction. If the solution uses both x_1 and x_2 , then it must use the edge (x_1, x_2) . We can substitute the edge (x_1, x_2) in the solution to k -INDUCED DISJOINT PATHS in G with x to obtain a solution to k -INDUCED DISJOINT PATHS in G' . Hence, without loss of generality, suppose the solution uses x_1 . We can substitute this for x to obtain a solution to k -INDUCED DISJOINT PATHS in G' , unless some other solution path runs through a neighbour q of x_2 . Note q cannot be a terminal due to our preprocessing. Hence it has two neighbours p and r on this other solution path, and these are outside of $\{z_1, x_1, z_3\}$ because this path must avoid x_1 and any of its neighbours. But now $p, q, r, q, x_2, x_1, z_1, x_1, z_3$ forms an \mathbb{H}_2 (with middle path q, x_2, x_1), a contradiction.

Suppose we have a solution to k -INDUCED DISJOINT PATHS in G' . If this solution does not involve x , then it maps to a solution of k -INDUCED DISJOINT PATHS in G . Suppose now it does involve x . Suppose mapping x to either of x_1 or x_2 does not produce a solution to k -INDUCED DISJOINT PATHS in G . Then mapping x to either the edge (x_1, x_2) (or the symmetric (x_2, x_1)) must produce a solution to k -INDUCED DISJOINT PATHS in G .

Recall that Rule 2 is applied if at least one of (z_1, z_2) and (z_1, z_4) is an edge of the graph and x_1, x_2 do not have any neighbours outside S . The rule is to contract the edge (x_1, x_2) , removing any parallel edges that may arise; see Figure 6. We first show that Rule 2 is safe.

Suppose we have a solution to k -INDUCED DISJOINT PATHS in G . If it uses no vertices in S , then it is already a solution to k -INDUCED DISJOINT PATHS in G' . Thus, it must use some vertex in S . Suppose the edge (z_1, z_2) exists and the solution uses (z_1, z_2) . Then by \ddagger , the solution does not use any other vertex from S and we can keep this edge to obtain a solution for k -INDUCED DISJOINT PATHS in G' . Suppose the edge (z_1, z_4) exists and the solution uses (z_1, z_4) . Then by \ddagger , the solution does not use any other vertex from S and we can keep this edge to obtain a solution for k -INDUCED DISJOINT PATHS in G' .

If the solution uses both x_1 and x_2 , then it must use the edge (x_1, x_2) and we can substitute (x_1, x_2) in the solution to k -INDUCED DISJOINT PATHS in G with x to obtain a solution to k -INDUCED DISJOINT PATHS in G' . Suppose it uses neither of x_1 and x_2 . Then by \ddagger and the fact that S is used, the solution must use either the edge (z_1, z_4) or (z_1, z_2) and we are in a previous case.

Hence, without loss of generality, suppose the solution uses x_1 . We can substitute this for x to obtain a solution to k -INDUCED DISJOINT PATHS in G' . This is safe, as x_1, x_2 have no neighbours outside S .

Suppose we have a solution to k -INDUCED DISJOINT PATHS in G' . If this solution does not involve x then it maps to a solution of k -INDUCED DISJOINT PATHS in G . Suppose now it does involve x . Suppose mapping x to either of x_1 or x_2 does not produce a solution to k -INDUCED DISJOINT PATHS in G . Then mapping x to either the edge (x_1, x_2) (or the symmetric (x_2, x_1)) must produce a solution to k -INDUCED DISJOINT PATHS in G .

Next, we show that any graph G' , obtained after applying Rule 1 or 2 is \mathbb{H}_2 -subgraph-free as well. Suppose G' has an \mathbb{H}_2 . Then this \mathbb{H}_2 must contain x . If x is a leaf vertex in \mathbb{H}_2 , then it is clear that G already had this \mathbb{H}_2 involving either x_1 or x_2 .

Suppose x is a degree-3 vertex in this \mathbb{H}_2 . If the neighbours of x in the \mathbb{H}_2 were all neighbours of x_1

or all neighbours of x_2 in G , then it is clear that G already had this \mathbb{H}_2 , a contradiction. Let z'_1 and z'_2 be the leafs of the \mathbb{H}_2 adjacent to x in G' .

Suppose that z'_1 and z'_2 are both adjacent to x_2 and both not to x_1 . Then the middle vertex of the \mathbb{H}_2 is only adjacent to x_1 . Ideally, we would replace x by x_1 , z'_1 by z_1 and z'_2 by z_3 . This does not work if (say) z_1 is part of the \mathbb{H}_2 . However, z'_1 and z'_2 are both not z_1 , because z_1 is adjacent to x_1 and we would contradict our assumption on the adjacency of z'_1 and z'_2 . We now consider three cases, depending on where z_1 is in the \mathbb{H}_2 .

Suppose that z_1 is a leaf of the \mathbb{H}_2 . By \dagger and the inducedness of paths, its neighbouring degree-3 vertex cannot be one of z_2, z_3, z_4 . Hence, this must be the unique neighbour p of z_1 outside S . The other neighbours q, r of p on the \mathbb{H}_2 , where r is the middle vertex, are both not z_3 since P_1 is induced. Hence, G has a \mathbb{H}_2 formed by $q, p, z_1, p, r, x_1, x_2, x_1, z_3$, a contradiction.

Suppose that z_1 is the middle vertex of the \mathbb{H}_2 . By \dagger , the other degree-3 vertex of the \mathbb{H}_2 cannot be z_2 or z_4 , so it must be the unique neighbour p of z_1 outside S . The other neighbours q, r of p on the \mathbb{H}_2 , which are both leafs of the \mathbb{H}_2 , are both not z_3 since P_1 is induced. Hence, G has a \mathbb{H}_2 formed by $q, p, r, p, z_1, x_1, x_2, x_1, z_3$, a contradiction.

Suppose that z_1 is a degree-3 vertex of the \mathbb{H}_2 . Let p be the unique neighbour of z_1 outside S ; it is unique by \dagger . Then one of p, z_2, z_3 must be the middle vertex of the \mathbb{H}_2 and the other two the leafs neighbouring z_1 . If the middle vertex is z_2 , then $z'_1, x_2, z'_2, x_2, z_2, z_1, p, z_1, z_4$ is a \mathbb{H}_2 in G , a contradiction. The other cases are similar.

This concludes the argument when z'_1 and z'_2 are both adjacent to x_2 and both not to x_1 .

Suppose instead that, say z'_1 , is adjacent to x_1 and the other, z'_2 , is adjacent to x_2 . Let x', x'', z'_1, z'_2 form the remaining vertices of the \mathbb{H}_2 where x, x', x'' and z'_1, x'', z'_2 are both paths of length 2 in this \mathbb{H}_2 . Thus, $z'_1, x, z'_2, x, x', x''$ and z'_1, x'', z'_2 form the \mathbb{H}_2 in G' . Without loss of generality, suppose x' was adjacent to x_1 in G . Now it is clear that $z'_1, x_1, x_2, x_1, x', x''$ and z'_1, x'', z'_2 formed an \mathbb{H}_2 in G .


Finally, suppose that x is the degree-2 vertex in \mathbb{H}_2 . Let $z'_1, x', z'_2, x', x, x'', z'_1, x'', z'_2$ be the paths that form the \mathbb{H}_2 in G' . Suppose, without loss of generality, that x' was adjacent to x_1 in G . If x'' was also adjacent to x_1 in G , then $z'_1, x', z'_2, x', x_1, x'', z'_1, x'', z'_2$ are paths that form an \mathbb{H}_2 in G . Suppose now that x'' was adjacent to x_2 but not x_1 in G and we may also assume that x' is adjacent to x_1 but not x_2 . Now $z'_1, x', z'_2, x', x_1, x_2, z_2, x_2, z_4$ are paths that form a \mathbb{H}_2 in G , unless $\{z_2, z_4\} \cap \{z'_1, z'_2\} \neq \emptyset$. Without loss of generality, suppose $z_2 = z'_1$. Note that $z_2 \neq s_2$ (recall that S does not contain any terminal). Let p be the next vertex on the path from t_2 to s_2 after z_2 . Then $p, z_2, x_2, z_2, x', x_1, z_1, x_1, z_3$ is an \mathbb{H}_2 in G (note that $\{z_1, z_3\} \cap \{x', z_2, p\} = \emptyset$), a contradiction.

Finally, it remains to show that \dagger is preserved. Note that x_1 and x_2 cannot be z or a_z for some terminal z , as these vertices have degree 1 and 2 respectively, while x_1, x_2 have degree at least 3. Moreover, $\{x_1, x_2\} \neq \{b_z, b'_z\}$ for some terminals z, z' by our preprocessing. Hence, \dagger is preserved.

J The Proof of Theorem 15

In this section, we prove that for all $k \geq 2$, k -INDUCED DISJOINT PATHS is NP-complete for $(\mathbb{H}_4, \dots, \mathbb{H}_\ell)$ -subgraph-free graphs for all $\ell \geq 4$. Lévêque et al. [29] considered the problem 2-INDUCED CYCLE. This problem has as input a graph G with two specified vertices x and y that are not adjacent to each other and have degree 2. The question is whether G has an induced cycle containing x and y . This problem was shown to be NP-complete by Bienstock [6]. Lévêque et al. [29] proved that 2-INDUCED CYCLE is NP-complete even for subcubic graphs (under various restrictions).

We first prove that 2-INDUCED CYCLE is NP-complete for subcubic $(\mathbb{H}_4, \dots, \mathbb{H}_\ell)$ -subgraph-free graphs for all $\ell \geq 4$; afterwards, we use a lemma from [31] to prove Theorem 15. As mentioned, we follow the argument from Section 2.4 in [29] by subdividing certain edges a sufficient number of times. Indeed, our



■ **Figure 9** The literal gadget (dashed lines indicate paths of length ℓ).

gadgets are precisely those from [29] with some edges subdivided $\ell - 1$ times. These edges are drawn in dashed lines in our gadgets in Figures 9, 10 and 11. Thus, the dashed edges represent ℓ -paths.

► **Theorem 33.** *2-INDUCED CYCLE is NP-complete for subcubic $(\mathbb{H}_4, \dots, \mathbb{H}_\ell)$ -subgraph-free graphs for all $\ell \geq 4$.*

Proof. The problem is ready seen to be in NP. We will now prove NP-hardness.

Let $\ell \geq 1$ be an integer. Let ϕ be an instance of 3-SATISFIABILITY, consisting of m clauses C_1, \dots, C_m on n variables z_1, \dots, z_n . For each clause C_j ($j = 1, \dots, m$), with $C_j = y_{3j-2} \vee y_{3j-1} \vee y_{3j}$, then y_i ($i = 1, \dots, 3m$) is a literal from $\{z_1, \dots, z_n, \bar{z}_1, \dots, \bar{z}_n\}$.

Let us build a graph G_ϕ^ℓ with two specified vertices x and y of degree 2. There will be a hole containing x and y in G_ϕ if and only if there exists a truth assignment satisfying ϕ .

For each literal y_j ($j = 1, \dots, 3m$), prepare a graph $G(y_j)$ on 20 named vertices

$$\alpha, \alpha', \alpha^{1+}, \dots, \alpha^{4+}, \alpha^{1-}, \dots, \alpha^{4-}, \beta, \beta', \beta^{1+}, \dots, \beta^{4+}, \beta^{1-}, \dots, \beta^{4-},$$

together with certain paths in between using unnamed vertices, as drawn in Figure 9. (We drop the subscript j in the labels of the vertices for clarity.)


For $i = 1, 2, 3$ add paths of length ℓ between α^{i+} and $\alpha^{(i+1)+}$; α^{i-} and $\alpha^{(i+1)-}$; β^{i+} and $\beta^{(i+1)+}$; and β^{i-} and $\beta^{(i+1)-}$. Also add the edges $\alpha^{1+}\beta^{1-}$, $\alpha^{1-}\beta^{1+}$, $\alpha^{4+}\beta^{4-}$, $\alpha^{4-}\beta^{4+}$, $\alpha\alpha^{1+}$, $\alpha\alpha^{1-}$, $\alpha^4\alpha'$, $\alpha^4\alpha'$, $\alpha^4\alpha'$, $\beta\beta^{1+}$, $\beta\beta^{1-}$, $\beta^4\beta'$, $\beta^4\beta'$.

For each clause C_j ($j = 1, \dots, m$), prepare a graph $G(C_j)$ with 10 named vertices


$$c^{1+}, c^{2+}, c^{3+}, c^{1-}, c^{2-}, c^{3-}, c^{0+}, c^{12+}, c^{0-}, c^{12-},$$

together with certain paths in between using unnamed vertices, as drawn in Figure 10. (We drop the subscript j in the labels of the vertices for clarity.) Add paths of length ℓ between the following pairs of vertices: c^{12+} and c^{1+} ; c^{12+} and c^{2+} ; c^{12-} and c^{1-} ; c^{12-} and c^{2-} ; c^{0+} and c^{12+} ; c^{0+} and c^{3+} ; c^{0-} and c^{12-} ; c^{0-} and c^{3-} .


For each variable z_i ($i = 1, \dots, n$), prepare a graph $G(z_i)$ with $2z_i^- + 2z_i^+$ vertices, where z_i^- is the number of times \bar{z}_i appears in clauses C_1, \dots, C_m and z_i^+ is the number of times z_i appears in clauses C_1, \dots, C_m .



■ **Figure 10** Clause gadget and above, its interface with the literal gadget. Dashed lines are paths of length ℓ .



■ **Figure 11** The variable gadget. Dashed lines are paths of length ℓ . Dotted lines are a continuation of the gadget.



■ **Figure 12** Cases that need to be checked for omission of graphs \mathbb{H}_ℓ .

Let $G(z_i)$ consist of two internally disjoint paths P_i^+ and P_i^- with common endpoints d_i^+ and d_i^- and lengths $1 + (2\ell)z_i^-$ and $1 + (2\ell)z_i^+$, respectively. Label the vertices of P_i^+ and P_i^- as in Figure 11.

The final graph G_ϕ^ℓ will be constructed from the disjoint union of all the graphs $G(y_j)$, $G(C_i)$, and $G(z_i)$ with the following modifications:

- For $j = 1, \dots, 3m - 1$, add paths of length ℓ between the pairs: α'_j and α_{j+1} ; β'_j and β_{j+1} .
- For $j = 1, \dots, m - 1$, add a path of length ℓ between c_j^{0-} and c_{j+1}^{0+} .
- For $j = 1, \dots, n - 1$, add a path of length ℓ between d_i^- and d_{i+1}^+ .
- For $i = 1, \dots, n - 1$, let $y_{n_1}, \dots, y_{n_{z_i^-}}$ be the occurrences of \bar{z}_i over all literals. For $j = 1, \dots, z_i^-$, delete the path between $p_{i,2j-1}^+$ and $p_{i,2j}^+$ and add the four edges $p_{i,2j-1}^+ \alpha_{n_j}^{2+}$, $p_{i,2j-1}^+ \beta_{n_j}^{2+}$, $p_{i,2j}^+ \alpha_{n_j}^{3+}$, $p_{i,2j}^+ \beta_{n_j}^{3+}$.
- For $i = 1, \dots, n - 1$, let $y_{n_1}, \dots, y_{n_{z_i^+}}$ be the occurrences of z_i over all literals. For $j = 1, \dots, z_i^+$, delete the path between $p_{i,2j-1}^-$ and $p_{i,2j}^-$ and add the four edges $p_{i,2j-1}^- \alpha_{n_j}^{2+}$, $p_{i,2j-1}^- \beta_{n_j}^{2+}$, $p_{i,2j}^- \alpha_{n_j}^{3+}$, $p_{i,2j}^- \beta_{n_j}^{3+}$.
- For $i = 1, \dots, m$ and $j = 1, 2, 3$, add the edges $\alpha_{3(i-1)+j}^{2-} c_i^{j+}$, $\alpha_{3(i-1)+j}^{3-} c_i^{j-}$, $\beta_{3(i-1)+j}^{2-} c_i^{j+}$, $\beta_{3(i-1)+j}^{3-} c_i^{j-}$.
- Add a path of length ℓ between the pairs of vertices: $\alpha'_{3m} d_1^+$ and d_1^+ ; $\beta'_{3m} d_1^+$ and c_1^{0+} .
- Add the vertex x and add paths of length ℓ between the pairs of vertices: x and α_1 ; x and β_1 .
- Add the vertex y and add paths of length ℓ between the pairs of vertices: y and c_m^{0-} ; y and d_n^- .

It is easy to verify that the maximum degree of G_ϕ^ℓ is 3. Moreover, the size of G_ϕ^ℓ is polynomial (actually linear) in the size $n + m$ of ϕ , and x and y are non-adjacent, and both have degree 2.

We also claim that for $\ell \geq 4$, G_ϕ^ℓ is $\mathbb{H}_4, \dots, \mathbb{H}_\ell$ -subgraph-free, which can be seen as follows (note that G_ϕ^ℓ contains $\mathbb{H}_1, \mathbb{H}_2$ and \mathbb{H}_3 as subgraphs). Owing to the length of the ℓ -paths that populate our construction, we need only verify the omission of these graphs on the connected components of the graph G_ϕ^ℓ after the removal of these paths (except a pendant edge from the corresponding connected component at the extremities of an instance of these paths). In this fashion, we only need to check for omission of the given graphs in the non-trivial cases drawn in Figure 12. Indeed, the two cases are isomorphic. Let $i = 4, 5$. Any two vertices of degree at least three that are separated by a path of length i must be in the subgraph C_6 at distance $6 - i$ from one another. If $i = 4$ then these vertices have a common neighbour so the \mathbb{H}_i can't be completed. If $i = 5$ then these two vertices are adjacent. For $6 \leq i \leq \ell - i$ it is not possible to find two vertices of degree at least three that are separated by a path of length ℓ .

We now show that ϕ is satisfied by a truth assignment if and only if G_ϕ^ℓ contains a hole passing through x and y .

“ \Rightarrow ” First assume that ϕ is satisfied by a truth assignment $\xi \in \{0, 1\}^n$. We will pick a set of vertices that induce a hole containing x and y .

1. Pick vertices x and y .
2. For $i = 1, \dots, 3m$, pick the vertices $\alpha_i, \alpha'_i, \beta_i, \beta'_i$.
3. For $i = 1, \dots, 3m$, if y_i is satisfied by ξ , then pick the vertices $\alpha_i^{1+}, \alpha_i^{2+}, \alpha_i^{3+}, \alpha_i^{4+}, \beta_i^{1+}, \beta_i^{2+}, \beta_i^{3+}, \beta_i^{4+}$. Otherwise, pick the vertices $\alpha_i^{1-}, \alpha_i^{2-}, \alpha_i^{3-}, \alpha_i^{4-}, \beta_i^{1-}, \beta_i^{2-}, \beta_i^{3-}, \beta_i^{4-}$.
4. For $i = 1, \dots, n$, if $\xi(i) = 1$, then pick all the vertices of the path P_i^+ and all the neighbours of the vertices in P_i^+ of the form α_k^{2+} or α_k^{3+} for any k .
5. For $i = 1, \dots, n$, if $\xi(i) = 0$, then pick all the vertices of the path P_i^- and all the neighbours of the vertices in P_i^- of the form α_k^{2+} or α_k^{3+} for any k .
6. For $i = 1, \dots, m$, pick the vertices c_i^{0+} and c_i^{0-} . Choose any $j \in \{3i - 2, 3i - 1, 3i\}$ such that ξ satisfies y_j . Pick vertices α_j^{2-} and α_j^{3-} . If $j = 3i - 2$, then pick the vertices $c_j^{12+}, c_j^{1+}, c_j^{12-}, c_j^{1-}$. If $j = 3i - 1$, then pick the vertices $c_j^{12+}, c_j^{2+}, c_j^{12-}, c_j^{2-}$. If $j = 3i$, then pick the vertices c_j^{3+}, c_j^{3-} .

The given vertices do not yet induce a connected component, because we need to add the vertices of ℓ -paths in between. Thus, if p and q are vertices which we selected that have an ℓ -path between them (drawn as a dashed edge in the associated gadget), then we need to add the interior vertices of this path also.

It suffices to show that the chosen vertices induce a hole containing x and y . The only potential problem is that for some k , one of the vertices $\alpha_k^{2+}, \alpha_k^{3+}, \alpha_k^{2-}, \alpha_k^{3-}$ was chosen more than once. If α_k^{2+} and α_k^{3+} were picked in Step 3, then y_k is satisfied by ξ . Therefore, α_k^{2+} and α_k^{3+} were not chosen in Step 4 or Step 5. Similarly, if α_k^{2-} and α_k^{3-} were picked in Step 6, then y_k is satisfied by ξ and α_k^{2-} and α_k^{3-} were not picked in Step 3. Thus, the chosen vertices induce a hole in G_ϕ^ℓ containing vertices x and y .

“ \Leftarrow ” To show the reverse implication, assume G_ϕ^ℓ contains a hole H passing through x and y . The hole H must contain α_1 and β_1 , and the paths leading to them, since they are the only two path neighbours of x . Next, either both α_1^{1+} and β_1^{1+} are in H or both α_1^{1-} and β_1^{1-} are in H .


Without loss of generality, let α_1^{1+} and β_1^{1+} be in H (the same reasoning that follows will hold true for the other case). Since α_1^{1-} and β_1^{1-} are both neighbours of two members of H , they cannot be in H . Thus, α_1^{2+} and β_1^{2+} , and the paths to them, must be in H . Since α_1^{2+} and β_1^{2+} have the same neighbours outside $G(y_1)$, it follows that H must contain α_1^{3+} and β_1^{3+} , and the paths that lead to them. Also, H must contain α_1^{4+} and β_1^{4+} , and the paths that lead to them. Suppose that α_1^{4-} and β_1^{4-} are in H . Because α_1^{i-} has the same neighbour as β_1^{i-} outside $G(y_1)$ for $i = 2, 3$, it follows that H must contain $\alpha_1^{3-}, \alpha_1^{2-}, \alpha_1^{1-}$. But then H is not a hole containing x , a contradiction. Therefore, α_1^{4-} and β_1^{4-} cannot both be in H , so H must contain $\alpha'_1, \beta'_1, \alpha_2, \beta_2$, and the paths to them.

By induction, we see for $i = 1, 2, \dots, 3m$ that H must contain $\alpha_i, \alpha'_i, \beta_i, \beta'_i$. Also, for each i , either H contains $\alpha_i^{1+}, \alpha_i^{2+}, \alpha_i^{3+}, \alpha_i^{4+}, \beta_i^{1+}, \beta_i^{2+}, \beta_i^{3+}, \beta_i^{4+}$ or H contains $\alpha_i^{1-}, \alpha_i^{2-}, \alpha_i^{3-}, \alpha_i^{4-}, \beta_i^{1-}, \beta_i^{2-}, \beta_i^{3-}, \beta_i^{4-}$.

As a result, H_ϕ^ℓ must also contain d_1^+ and c_1^{0+} and the paths to them. By symmetry, we may assume H_ϕ^ℓ contains $p_{1,1}^+$ and α_k^{2+} , for some k . Since α_k^{1+} is adjacent to two vertices in H , H must contain α_k^{3+} and the path of length ℓ toward it. Similarly, H cannot contain α_k^{4+} , so H contains $p_{1,2}^+$ and $p_{1,3}^+$, as well as the paths through these. By induction, we see that H contains $p_{1,i}^+$ for $i = 1, 2, \dots, z_i^+$ and d_1^- and the ℓ -paths in between. If H contains p_{1,z_i^-} , then H must contain $p_{1,i}^-$ for $i = z_i^-, \dots, 1$, a contradiction. Thus, H must contain d_2^+ and the ℓ -path to it. By induction, for $i = 1, 2, \dots, n$, we see that H contains all the vertices of the path P_i^+ or P_i^- and by symmetry, we may assume H contains all the neighbours of the vertices in P_i^+ or P_i^- of the form α_k^{2+} or α_k^{3+} , for any k .

Similarly, for $i = 1, 2, \dots, m$, it follows that H must contain c_i^{0+} and c_i^{0-} . Also, H contains one of the following:

- $c_i^{12+}, c_i^{1+}, c_i^{12-}, c_i^{1-}$ and either α_j^{2-} and α_j^{3-} or β_j^{2-} and β_j^{3-} (where α_j^{2-} is adjacent to c_i^{1+}).
- $c_i^{12+}, c_i^{2+}, c_i^{12-}, c_i^{2-}$ and either α_j^{2-} and α_j^{3-} or β_j^{2-} and β_j^{3-} (where α_j^{2-} is adjacent to c_i^{2+}).
- c_i^{3+}, c_i^{3-} and either α_j^{2-} and α_j^{3-} or β_j^{2-} and β_j^{3-} (where α_j^{2-} is adjacent to c_i^{3+}).



■ **Figure 13** The part of the graph G^1 that corresponds to a vertex x in a graph G that has exactly two neighbours x_1 and x_2 ; figure taken from [31].

We can recover the satisfying assignment ξ as follows. For $i = 1, 2, \dots, n$, set $\xi(i) = 1$ if the vertices of P_i^+ are in H and set $\xi(i) = 0$ if the vertices of P_i^- are in H . By construction, it is easy to verify that at least one literal in every clause is satisfied, so ξ is indeed a satisfying assignment. ◀

We note that neither the gadget of Lévêque et al. [29] nor our gadget in Theorem 33 has high girth.

As mentioned, we also need the following known lemma from [31], which we rephrase more explicitly (in order to ensure $(\mathbb{H}_4, \dots, \mathbb{H}_\ell)$ -subgraph-freeness) and therefore we added its proof from [31] as well.

► **Lemma 34** ([31]). *Let $\ell \geq 4$ and G be a subcubic $(\mathbb{H}_4, \dots, \mathbb{H}_\ell)$ -subgraph-free graph with two non-adjacent vertices x and y of degree 2. It is possible to construct in polynomial time a subcubic $(\mathbb{H}_4, \dots, \mathbb{H}_\ell)$ -subgraph-free graph G' that contains vertices s_1, t_1, s_2, t_2 such that (G, x, y) is a yes-instance of 2-INDUCED CYCLE if and only if $(G', \{(s_1, t_1), (s_2, t_2)\})$ is a yes-instance of 2-INDUCED DISJOINT PATHS.*

Proof. Let x and y have neighbours x_1, x_2 and y_1, y_2 respectively. We replace x and its incident edges by the following. Create vertices $p_1, q_1, r_1, p_2, q_2, r_2, s_1, s_2$. Add edges $s_1p_1, p_1q_1, q_1x_1, q_1r_1, r_1s_2$ and $s_2r_2, r_2q_2, q_2x_2, p_2s_1, p_2q_2$. In the same way, we replace y and its incident edges by vertices $a_1, b_1, c_1, a_2, b_2, c_2, t_1, t_2$ and edges $a_1t_1, a_1b_1, b_1y_1, b_1c_1, c_1t_2$ and $a_2t_1, a_2b_2, b_2y_2, b_2c_2, c_2t_2$. Note that any vertex that is introduced has degree at most 3. For an integer $d \geq 0$, we now subdivide every incident edge of every newly introduced vertex d times. We denote the new graph by G^d and say that G^d is the d -replacement for G . Note that G^d has maximum degree 3 as well. See also Fig. 13, where we display the replacement of x for $d = 1$. It is readily seen that for every integer $d \geq 0$, G^d has maximum degree 3.

To prove the remainder of the lemma, first assume that $d = 0$. We observe that the paths s_1, p_1, q_1, x_1 and s_2, r_2, q_2, x_2 are mutually induced. The paths s_1, p_2, q_2, x_2 and s_2, r_1, q_1, x_1 are also mutually induced. Moreover, these are the only two options that can co-exist, in the following sense. A path from s_1 to x_1 that uses only edges of this gadget and that does not have s_2 as an internal vertex has to pass through q_1 . Similarly, a path from s_2 to x_2 that uses only edges of this gadget and that does not have s_1 as an internal vertex has to pass through q_2 . The same observations hold with respect to the gadget replacing vertex y . Hence, G has a hole containing x and y if and only if G^d has mutually induced paths between s_1 and t_1 and between s_2 and t_2 .

Note that any incident edges of every vertex of G^d that does not belong to G can be subdivided an arbitrary number of times without affecting the correctness of the reduction (q_1, q_2, b_1, b_2 remain

bottlenecks). So, the claim also holds for $d \geq 1$, and by taking d sufficiently large, we obtain the desired subcubic $(\mathbb{H}_4, \dots, \mathbb{H}_\ell)$ -subgraph-free graph G' . ◀

We are now ready to prove Theorem 15, which we restate below.

Theorem 15 (restated). *For all $k \geq 2$, k -INDUCED DISJOINT PATHS is NP-complete for subcubic $(\mathbb{H}_4, \dots, \mathbb{H}_\ell)$ -subgraph-free graphs for all $\ell \geq 4$.*

Proof. The proof follows from combining Theorem 33 with Lemma 34. ◀

K The Proof of Theorem 17

In this section we prove Theorem 17, which we restate below.

Theorem 17 (restate). *The only \mathbb{H}_3 -subgraph-free C_5 -critical graphs are K_3 , odd flowers F_n for $n \geq 3$, and the exceptional graphs E_1, E_2 and E_3 . Equivalently, the following three statements are true:*

1. *All \mathbb{H}_3 -subgraph-free graphs of girth at least 6 are C_5 -colourable.*
2. *The only \mathbb{H}_3 -subgraph-free C_5 -critical graphs of girth 5 are E_1, E_2 and odd C_5 -flowers F_n .*
3. *The only \mathbb{H}_3 -subgraph-free C_5 -critical graph of girth 4 is E_3 .*

For doing this, we will need the following notions for a graph G .

- A k -vertex is a vertex of degree k and a k^+ -vertex is a vertex of degree at least k .
- A k -thread (respectively, k^+ -thread) is a path consisting of k (respectively, at least k) distinct 2-vertices. (We often refer to a k -thread between endpoints not in the thread.)
- Two non-adjacent vertices are clones if they have the same neighbourhoods. A vertex u is a subclone of a nonadjacent vertex v if its neighbourhood is contained in that of v .

K.1 C_5 -critical graphs

We list some easy observations about C_5 -critical graphs.

► **Fact 1.** *The following hold for all C_5 -critical graphs G .*

1. *G cannot properly contain a C_5 -critical graph. In particular, it cannot contain a K_3 .*
2. *G is 2-connected.*
3. *G has no removable threads: 3^+ -threads.*
4. *G has no redundant threads: k -threads between end vertices that are the end vertices of a k -path that is disjoint from the k -thread.*
5. *G has no redundant vertices: clones or subclones of another vertex.*
6. *Any vertex in a C_4 is a 3^+ -vertex.*

Proof. That the first two items hold are clear. To see that C_5 -critical G cannot have a removable thread, remove the thread and C_5 -colour the remaining graph G' . As the thread has length at least k , we can extend the C_5 -colouring of G' to G ; contradicting the fact that G was C_5 -critical. To see that G cannot have a redundant thread, remove it, and get a C_5 -colouring of the remaining graph G' . We can extend this to a C_5 -colouring of G by letting the colouring on the redundant thread be the same as on the path of G' of the same length between the endpoints of the thread. That redundant vertices cannot occur in a critical graph is clear— they can always get the same colour as the vertex they are a subclone of, so removing them does not change the possible colourings. That any vertex in a C_4 is a 3^+ vertex is because a 2-vertex in a C_4 is redundant. That ◀

As G is 2-connected, we will often apply the following well known version of the classical Ear Decomposition result of Whitney. Recall that an ear of G' in G is a path in G , possibly a single edge, whose intersection with G' is its endpoints.

► **Lemma 35.** *Any 2-connected graph G that is not just a cycle can be constructed from any 2-connected subgraph by adding successive ears.*

We cannot find a direct reference to this version of the Ear Decomposition theorem. The standard version says that G can be constructed from a cycle by adding successive ears. The standard proof though, such as is found in [16], can be used to get the version we have stated.

K.2 \mathbb{H}_3 -subgraph-free graphs

Many of our arguments will require finding a copy of \mathbb{H}_3 in a graph that we have constructed. We will denote a copy of \mathbb{H}_3 in a graph as

$$\{t, t'\}, u, v, w, x, \{y, y'\}$$

where the central path of the \mathbb{H}_3 is the path u, v, w, x , the leaves adjacent to u are t and t' and those adjacent to x are y and y' .

The following basic fact can be readily seen.

► **Fact 2.** *In an \mathbb{H}_3 -subgraph-free graph, two 3^+ -vertices with a 3-path between them are at distance at most 2. They are either adjacent in a C_4 or at distance 2 in a C_5 .*

K.3 \mathbb{H}_3 -subgraph-free C_5 -critical graphs

We first prove the following lemma.

► **Lemma 36.** *The following hold for any \mathbb{H}_3 -subgraph-free C_5 -critical graph G .*

1. *Any 3^+ -vertex at distance 1 in a C_4 to a 4^+ -vertex is a 3-vertex.*
2. *Any 4^+ -vertex at distance 2 in a C_5 to 3^+ -vertex is a 4-vertex.*

Proof. Let G be \mathbb{H}_3 -subgraph-free and C_5 -critical. If it is a K_3 the lemma is vacuously true, so we may assume by criticality that it is K_3 -free.

For item (1), assume that u is a 3^+ vertex in a C_4 with its 4^+ -neighbour x , in G . As G is K_3 -free, we may assume that the C_4 is u, v, w, x , and is induced. As x is a 4^+ vertex it has neighbours y and y' not in the C_4 . If u is a 4^+ -vertex then it has neighbours t and t' not in the C_4 , and as G is K_3 -free, they are distinct from y and y' . But then $\{t, t'\}, u, v, w, x, \{y, y'\}$ is an \mathbb{H}_3 , which is impossible.

For item (2), assume that C is the 5-cycle a, b, c, d, e, a , that a is a 3^+ vertex, and that d is a 4^+ vertex. As G is K_3 -free, C is induced, and so a has neighbours x, x' not in $\{b, c, d\}$. If d has degree 5, then it has two neighbours y, y' not in $\{a, b, c, x, x'\}$ and so $\{x, x'\}, a, b, c, d, \{y, y'\}$ is an \mathbb{H}_3 . ◀

The notion of saturation will be used extensively in our proofs. A vertex v of a graph G is *saturated* in a subgraph $G' \leq G$ if all of its edges in G are in G' . A proper subgraph G' of a graph G is *saturated* if it has at least two vertices, and all but at most one of its vertices are saturated.

► **Fact 3.** *A C_5 -critical graph G contains no saturated proper subgraph.*

Proof. If C_5 -critical G contained a proper subgraph G' that was saturated, then that subgraph is disconnected from G by the removal of its one unsaturated vertex, but this contradicts the fact that G , being C_5 -critical, is 2-connected by Fact 1. ◀

K.4 Step 1

We are now ready to prove statement 1 of Theorem 17.

► **Proposition 37.** *All \mathbb{H}_3 -subgraph-free graphs of girth at least 6 are C_5 -colourable.*

Proof. Towards contradiction, let G be a \mathbb{H}_3 -subgraph-free graph of girth at least 6 that is C_5 -critical. As G has no C_5 -colouring it must contain an odd cycle, and so by assumption, it has odd girth $2k + 1 \geq 7$. Let C be a C_{2k+1} in G with vertex set $\{-k, -(k-1), \dots, 0, \dots, k\}$ for which two vertices are adjacent if they differ by 1 modulo $2k + 1$. Let X be the set of 3^+ -vertices of C .

As C is a shortest odd cycle in G it is induced, and there is no vertex $x \notin C$ adjacent to two vertices of C at distance greater than 2. So because G is \mathbb{H}_3 -subgraph-free, X contains no two vertices that are distance 3 apart. On the other hand, as G is C_5 -critical and so contains no 3-threads X contains at least one of $i - 1, i$, and $i + 1$ for every vertex i of C . It follows that if X contains i and $i + 1$, then it does not contain $i + 3$ and $i + 4$, and so it must contain $i + 2$ and $i + 5$. But these are distance 3 apart; so we conclude that X contains no two consecutive vertices.

We may assume, w.l.o.g, that X contains the vertex 0. So it contains neither -1 or 1 , or -3 or 3 . It must therefore contain -2 and 2 . Shifting this argument cyclically by 2, we see that X must contain every second vertex of C . But this is impossible as C is an odd cycle. ◀

K.5 Step 2

We now prove statement 2 of Theorem 17.

► **Proposition 38.** *The only \mathbb{H}_3 -subgraph-free graphs of girth 5 are E_1, E_2 and F_n for odd $n \geq 3$.*

Before we get started with the proof, we observe, among other things, some strengthenings we can get of Lemma 36 now that we have girth 5.

► **Lemma 39.** *The following hold for all \mathbb{H}_3 -subgraph-free C_5 -critical graphs G of girth at least 5.*

1. *Any 3^+ -vertices at distance 2 in a C_5 are 3-vertices.*
2. *Any 3^+ -vertices with a 3-path between them are 3-vertices at distance 2 in a C_5 .*
3. *Any 5-cycle in G has at least three 3^+ -vertices; some pair of them are adjacent.*

Proof. Item (1) is straightforward from the fact that G has no induced \mathbb{H}_3 or C_4 , and (2) comes from Fact 2 and item (1).


We show item (3). Any 5-cycle C in G is induced and has no 3^+ -threads, so (by an easy version of the argument in the proof of Proposition 37) must contain two 3^+ -vertices, call them 1 and 4, at distance 2 in C . By (1), these are, in fact, 3-vertices. Let a and b , be their respective neighbours not in C .

If there is no other 3^+ -vertex in C not, then remove C , and C_5 -colour $G' = G \setminus C$. The only edges from C to G' are the edges $1a$ and $4b$, and whatever colours a and b get, we can extend this colouring to a C_5 -colouring of G , contradicting the fact that G was C_5 -critical. Thus C has at least three 3^+ -vertices, as needed. ◀


We highlight some saturated graphs.

► **Fact 4.** *As subgraphs of an \mathbb{H}_3 -subgraph-free graph G of girth 5, graph S_1 from Figure 14, and all even C_5 -flowers, F_n for $n \geq 4$, are saturated and C_5 -colourable. So they cannot be subgraphs of G if it is C_5 -critical.*

Proof. To see that S_1 is saturated, note that all 3-vertices have 3-paths to other 3-vertices, so are saturated. For all 2-vertices but the one in the middle of the right cycle, there is a 3-path to a 3-vertex not in a C_5 with it. Adding an edge to such a 2-vertex, the edge would then have to go to a neighbour of the



■ **Figure 14** Saturated \mathbb{H}_3 -free (but C_5 -colourable) graph S_1



■ **Figure 15** The graphs B_1 and B_2

3-vertex, but checking each case, this would make a C_3 or C_4 . The middle 2-vertex is not saturated, but one non-saturated vertex is okay.

In an even C_5 -flower, the 3-vertices all have 3-paths to other 3-vertices, so are saturated. The 2-vertices all have 3-paths to the middle 3^+ -vertex, so if they have another edge, it must be to one of its neighbours. If this neighbour is a new vertex, we have a C_4 , and if it is a neighbour in F_n , then it is a 3-vertex, which is already saturated. So the 2-vertices are saturated. Only the middle vertex is not. But again, one unsaturated vertex is allowed. ◀

With these tools, we are now ready to prove the Proposition.

Proof of Proposition 38. Let G be an \mathbb{H}_3 -subgraph-free C_5 -critical graph of girth 5. We show that G is either E_1, E_2 or an odd C_5 -flower F_n .

We start with two claims that deal with the more difficult cases. Let B_1 and B_2 be the graphs made from two copies of C_5 shown in Figure 15.

▷ **Claim 40.** If G contains B_1 as a subgraph, then G is an odd C_5 -flower or one of the exceptional graphs E_i .

Proof. Assume that G contains a copy B of B_1 labelled with labels 0, 1, 2, 3, 4 and $2', 3', 4'$ as in Figure 15 so that ignoring the primes we get a C_5 -colouring. As G has no 3-threads, at least one of each of $\{2, 3, 4\}$ and $\{2', 3', 4'\}$ must be a 3^+ -vertex. Whichever is, it is distance 2 to one of the 3-vertices 0 or 1, so is also a 3-vertex by Lemma 39. If these two 3-vertices have a 3-path between them, then, again by Lemma 39(2), they must share a new neighbour not in the graph yet, so if one is 3 and the other is $2'$, the new vertex makes a copy of E_1 and we are done. With symmetric arguments, we are done if 3 and $2'$ or $4'$ are three vertices, or if $3'$ and 2 or 4 are. Up to symmetry, we have three cases left to consider: those where the pairs $(2, 4')$ or $(4, 4')$ or $(3, 3')$ are pairs of 3-vertices.

Case: 3 and $3'$ are 3-vertices. In this case, we may assume that the 2-vertices 2, $2', 4$ and $4'$ are all saturated in B , as if any one of them is a 3-vertex, we appeal to an earlier case. Further, the vertices 0 and 1, 3, and $3'$ are all 3-vertices by Lemma 39 because they are 3^+ -vertices with 3-paths to other

3-vertices. So only 3 and 3' are unsaturated in B , each having an edge out of B . As G is 2-connected, there is an ear from 3 to 3'. Let P be the shortest such ear.

If the ear P has length 1, 2, or 3 we have E_2 , S_1 , or an induced \mathbb{H}_3 . In the first case we are done, and in the other two would yield contradictions. So we may assume that P has length at least 4. Let a and a' be the vertices in P ear adjacent to 3 and 3' respectively. They cannot be 3^+ vertices, as they both have 3-paths to the 3-vertex 1, all of whose neighbours are saturated. So a and a' are 2-vertices. Now, B has no edges to $G \setminus B$ except $3a$ and $3'a'$, and the vertices 3 and 3' get the same colouring under any C_5 -colouring, so the graph G' we get from G by replacing all of B with one new vertex b adjacent just to a and a' has exactly the same C_5 -colourings as G does when restricted to $G \setminus B$. In particular, if G is C_5 -critical then G' is. But G' is not critical, as the 3-thread a, b, a' is removable. So G is not C_5 -critical, a contradiction.

Case: 2 and 4' are 3-vertices. The vertices 2 and 4' have a 3-path between them so by Lemma 39 share a new neighbour $3''$, and with this become saturated. The 2-vertices 3 and 3' are saturated or we can apply a previous case. The vertices 0, 1, 2 and 4' are 3-vertices with 3-paths to 3-vertices, so are saturated.

The only three unsaturated vertices are those in $X := \{2', 3'', 4\}$. They are pairwise distance 3 apart, so by girth, cannot have edges between them, and for two any of them that are 3-vertices, the third edges go to a common new third neighbour x . If all vertices of X are 3^+ -vertices, then we get a copy of E_2 with 5-cycles $x, 3'', 4', 0, 4$ and $x, 3'', 2, 1, 2'$. If only one vertex in X is a 3-vertex, then G is not 2-connected, a contradiction. So we may assume that exactly two of them are 3-vertices. They are saturated in the graph G' made so far on $B \cup \{3'', x\}$; as is the other vertex of X , because it is assumed not to be a 3^+ -vertex. So the only possibly unsaturated vertex of G' is x , making G' saturated. But G' is C_5 -colourable, so is a proper subgraph of G , contradicting Fact 3.

Case: 4 and 4' are 3-vertices. The neighbours a of 4, and a' of 4' are new and distinct by girth considerations. The 3-vertices 1, 4 and 4' have 3-paths to other 3-vertices so are saturated in the graph build on $B \cup \{a, a'\}$ by adding these edges.

The vertex $2'$ has a 3-path to 4 so if it has a third edge, this edge is to one of the neighbours 0, 3 or a of 4. In the first two cases we violate girth, and in the last case 2 and 4' are 3-vertices, which is dealt with above. So the 2-vertices 2 and 2' are saturated 2-vertices.

The vertex 3' has a 3-path to 4 so if it has a third edge, this is to one of 0, 3 or a . The first case violates girth, the second yields an E_2 , and the third case is already dealt with above. So 3' and 3 are saturated 2-vertices.

The only vertex of B that may have another edge is 0. So a and a' have no other neighbours in B .

We view the B as the start of a C_5 -flower with the vertex 0 as its centre, in which only 0 is not saturated. If we extend this to a partial C_5 -flower – a C_5 -flower from which we have removed the two adjacent 2-vertices of some petal – the argument for C_5 -flowers in Fact 4 works to argue that the only unsaturated vertices are 0 and the corner vertices c and c' : those two 3-vertices who have been made 2-vertices by the removal of the two vertices.

Let G' be the largest (partial) C_5 -flower with centre 0 that contains our original B . If G' is a full even C_5 -flower, we have a saturated subgraph of G ; this is a contradiction. If G' is a full odd C_5 -flower, then it is critical, so is G , as needed.

So we may assume that G' is a partial C_5 -flower. As G' is C_5 -colourable, there is an ear of G' in G ; and as the only three non-saturated vertices of G' are 0, c and c' , we may assume the ear begins at c . It must have length at least 3 by girth, so assume it starts with the path c, x, y, z , where x and y are necessarily new vertices. If $z = 0$ then we have a C_4 , and if $z = c'$ then this is a bigger C_5 -flower, contradicting the choice of G' , so z is also a vertex not in G' . The vertex x has a 3-path to the 3-vertex 1,

and the only non-saturated neighbour of 1 is 0, but x is not adjacent to 0 by girth, so x is saturated. As y has a 3-path to 0 it must be a 2-vertex, or it would have to share a neighbour, which we may assume is z , with 0. But this makes a larger partial C_5 -flower, contradicting the choice of G' . Thus y is a saturated 2-vertex, and z is not adjacent to 0. Having a 3-path to the 3-vertex c , z is a 2-vertex, and so we have a removable thread, contradicting the assumption that G is critical. ◀

Recall that B_2 , shown in Figure 15, consists two C_5 s whose intersection is a path of length two.

▷ **Claim 41.** G contains no copy of B_2 .

Proof. Towards contradiction, assume that G contains a copy B of B_2 . Label the vertices of B , as in the figure, so that the two 5-cycles are $4, 0, 1, 2, 3$ and $4, 0, 1, 2', 3'$. The 3-vertices 4 and 1 are saturated. At least one vertex in each of $\{2, 3\}$ and $\{2', 3'\}$ must also be a 3^+ -vertex, or we have a redundant path.

If 2 and $3'$ are 3^+ -vertices, then being distance 3 apart, they share a new common neighbour, and this makes a copy of B , so we are done by the previous lemma. The same holds if $2'$ and 3 are 3^+ -vertices. We may thus assume that 3 and $3'$ are 3^+ -vertices, and that the 2-vertices 2 and $2'$ are saturated. As 3 and $3'$ are 3^+ vertices with 3-paths to 1, they are in fact 3-vertices. The non-saturated vertices of B are 0, 3 and $3'$. The third neighbours of 3 and $3'$ can neither be 0 or a common new vertex by girth, so are distinct new vertices a and a' respectively. Adding the edges from 3 and $3'$ to a and a' to our subgraph of G , the vertices 3 and $3'$ become saturated.

If a and a' are adjacent we have a copy of B_1 , and they cannot have edges to 0 by girth. As all other vertices are saturated, they have respective neighbours b and b' not in B , which may be the same vertex. Adding these to our subgraph, the 2-vertices a and a' are saturated, as they have 3-paths to the 3-vertex 1 whose only unsaturated neighbour is 0, and they cannot have edges to 0, as it would contradict the girth.

If b has an edge to 0, then we have a B_1 with 5-cycles $0, 4, 3, a, b$ and $0, 4, 3', 2', 1$, so we may assume that b has no edge to 0. Similarly we assume that b' has no edge to 0. As b and b' are distance 3 from 4, and the only unsaturated neighbour of 4 is 0, we get that b and b' are 2-vertices.

If $b = b'$ or bb' is an edge we have a removable thread, so we may assume that b has new neighbour c . But c has a 3-path to the 3-vertex 3 all of whose neighbours are saturated. So c is also a 2-vertex and we have a removable thread. ◀

Now, we have assumed that G has girth 5. Let C be a 5-cycle in G with vertices $0, 1, 2, 3, 4$. By part (4) of Fact 3, there are at least three 3^+ -vertices in C , so we may assume that 1 and 4 are 3^+ -vertices. By girth, they have distinct neighbours, a and z respectively, that are not in C . Further, a and z are non-adjacent as an edge between them would make a B_2 , which contradicts Claim 41.

By girth, neither of a or z have a second edge to C , and they both have 3-paths to 3-vertices in C , so they are both 2-vertices. They have new neighbours b and y respectively, not necessarily distinct.

As C has at least one more 3-vertex, we may assume that b has a 3-path to this vertex i . If b is a 3-vertex, then it must have an edge to a neighbour of i , other than 1 and 4. Whatever this edge is, would make a B_1 or a B_2 , so we would be done by one of the claims. Thus b is a 2-vertex.

If $b = y$ we have a removable thread, so let c be the new neighbour of b . As c has a 3-path to 1, if it is a 3-vertex then it has an edge to 0 or 2, making a B_1 . So we may assume that c is a 2 vertex, and so we have a removable thread. Thus G is not critical, which is a contradiction. ◀

K.6 Step 3

Finally, we prove statement 3 of Theorem 17.

► **Proposition 42.** *If G is a C_5 -critical \mathbb{H}_3 -subgraph-free graph of girth 4 then it is E_3 from Figure 7.*


Before we begin the actual proof, we prove two lemma.

► **Lemma 43.** *In an \mathbb{H}_3 -subgraph-free C_5 -critical graph G , every 3^+ -vertex v has an edge to every C_4 in G . Moreover, v is in a P_2 or P_3 between non-adjacent vertices of the C_4 .*

Proof. Fix a 4-cycle C in G on the vertices $0, 1, 2, 3$. There can be no 3^+ vertex at distance exactly 3 from C as it would make an H_3 with the vertex in C closest to it.

▷ **Claim.** There can be no 3^+ -vertex at distance exactly 2 from C .

Proof. Assume that v is a 3^+ vertex at distance 2 from C . We may assume that there is a path $v \sim 0' \sim 0$ in G . As there is a 3-path from v to the 3^+ -vertex 1, we have by Fact 2 that v an edge to, or shares a neighbour with, 1. By the assumption that v has distance 2 to C , it must share a neighbour with 1, and this must be a vertex not in C or we have a K_3 . The same argument works to show that v shares neighbours not in C with 2 and 3. Thus G contains the following graph where all vertices are distinct except that $0' = 2'$ and/or $1' = 3'$. (The graph has a \mathbb{H}_3 so we must make at least one of the identifications.)



Notice that the possibly identified vertices get the same colour under the essentially unique C_5 -colouring of this graph, so whether we make one or both of these identifications, we get a C_5 -colourable graph. Making one of the identifications, say $0' = 2'$, the vertices 0 and 2 become clones, so must each have a new edge to distinct vertices $0''$ and $2''$. These must be new vertices, or we make a C_3 . We thus have an \mathbb{H}_3 on $\{3, 0''\}, 0, 1, 1', v, \{2', 3'\}$.

Making both identifications the vertices 0 and 2 are clones, as are the vertices 1 and 3. Arguing as above they each have new distinct neighbours, so we have a C_4 of 4^+ -vertices, giving an \mathbb{H}_3 . ◀

Now, there are no 3^+ -vertices at distance 2 or 3 from C . Assuming there are 3^+ -vertices at distance greater than 3 from C , and let v be a closest such vertex to C . If v has distance 5 or more from C , then since the closest 3^+ -vertex on its shortest path to C is at distance 1 from C , it contains a removable 3^+ -thread. So v must have distance 4 from C . The vertex $1'$ at distance 1 from C on a shortest path to C must then be a 2-vertex, or we have a $H_{3^-} - v$ and $1'$ would be 3^+ vertices at distance 3 and from the fact that v has distance 4 to C they cannot be adjacent or share a neighbour. So there is a removable 3-thread between v and C , a contradiction.

For the 'Moreover' statement, assume that a 3^+ -vertex v with an edge to C , has an edge to 0. As there is a 3-path to 2, then v and 2 are either adjacent or share a neighbour, and as G is C_3 -free the shared neighbour would have to be a new vertex. ◀

There is one more argument that we use several times, so we set it up as a lemma.

► **Lemma 44.** *Let G be a C_5 -critical graph. Let G' be a C_5 -colourable subgraph on the vertex set $B \cup B'$ where:*

1. $G'|_B$ is 2-connected and contains a C_4 ,
2. any $b \in B$ is saturated in G' , and

3. vertices in B' are 2-vertices of G that have degree 1 in G' .
 We can build G from G' by adding edges between vertices of B' .

Proof. Assume the setup of the lemma. As G is C_5 -critical it is 2-connected; as the subgraph B is 2-connected, Lemma 35 says that we can construct G from B by adding successive ears. Let P be a shortest ear of B in G ; say it is between vertices u and v of B . As vertices in B are saturated, P must start and end with edges u, u' and v', v to 2-vertices u' and v' in B' . As vertices of B' have degree 1 in G' , u' and v' are distinct. If there are any 3^+ -vertices on P , then they must be adjacent to the C_4 in B ; this contradicts the choice of P as the shortest ear. If there are any other 2-vertices in P , then we have a 3-thread, contradicting the criticality of G . So P is a 3-path through B' . Thus one gets P by adding an edge between vertices of B' , as needed.

When we apply this lemma to a graph to extend it, it adds an edge between vertices of B' . If the graph remains C_5 -colourable, then the resulting graph still satisfies the conditions of the lemma (with two vertices of B' moved into B), and we can apply it again. If the graph becomes non- C_5 -colourable, then it is G . ◀

We are now ready to prove the Proposition.


Proof of Proposition 42. Let G be a \mathbb{H}_3 -subgraph-free C_5 -critical graph of girth 4. We start with a pair of claims showing that G can contain no biclique other than a C_4 .

▷ Claim 45. G cannot contain a $K_{3,3}$.

Proof. Assume, towards contradiction, that G contains a $K_{3,3}$ with partite sets $\{x, y, z\}$ and $\{1, 2, 3\}$. As G , being critical, contains no clones, each vertex has at least one more neighbour, and so we get two adjacent 4^+ -vertices in a C_4 , which gives an \mathbb{H}_3 by Lemma 36. ◀

▷ Claim 46. G cannot contain a $K_{2,3}$.

Proof. Assuming that G contains a $K_{2,3}$ let $B = \{x, y\} \cup [n]$ be a maximum biclique in G , where $[n] = \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$ for some $n \geq 3$. Let X' and Y' be the sets of neighbours of x and y respectively that are not in B . These sets are disjoint by the choice of B , and non-empty or x or y would be redundant. To be non-redundant, each vertex $i \in [n]$ must also have a neighbour i' that is not in B ; this makes it a 3^+ -vertex adjacent, in a C_4 , to the 4^+ -vertex x , so has degree exactly 3 by Lemma 36.



We have seen that all vertices in X' and Y' are distinct, they are distinct from vertices of $[n]'$ as G has girth 4. So all vertices of $B' := [n]' \cup X' \cup Y'$ have degree 1 to B .

► **Subclaim.** All of the vertices in B' are 2-vertices of G .

Proof. All vertices of B' must have degree at least 2 as G is 2-connected. If $x' \in X'$ has degree at least 3, then we get an \mathbb{H}_3 on $\{z, z'\}, x', x, 1, y, \{2, 3\}$ with its two new neighbours z and z' . So vertices of $X' \cup Y'$ have degree exactly 2. The vertices in $[n]'$ have degree at least 2, so we must show they are distinct and do not have degree 3 or more.

We continue the proof in two cases. First assume that $n = 3$. If the vertices in $[3]'$ are all the same, then we have a $K_{3,3}$ contradicting Claim 45. If two are the same, say $2' = 3'$ is distinct from $1'$, then 2 and 3 are clones, so must each have another edge. This makes an \mathbb{H}_3 with central path $2, y, 1, x$. So the three vertices $1', 2'$ and $3'$ are distinct. If $2'$, say, has degree 3, then it has an edge to 3 (or 1) by Lemma 43, and ignoring the vertex $3'$ we are back in the case that $2' = 3'$ is distinct from $1'$, and are done. So all of $1', 2'$ and $3'$ have degree exactly 2.

We may therefore assume that $n \geq 4$. If $1' \in [n]'$ has degree 3, then by Lemma 43 it is adjacent to something in each of the C_4 s in B that do not contain 1. It cannot be adjacent to x or y as this would make a C_3 , and so it is adjacent to at least two of $\{2, \dots, n\}$. But then we have a $K_{3,3}$. We conclude, by symmetry, that everything in $[n]'$ has degree exactly 2. If any two vertices in $[n]'$ were the same, then they would be in a C_4 , contradicting the fact that they have degree 2. Thus they, and so all vertices of B' have degree 2. ◀

Now, as G, B and B' satisfy the setup of Lemma 44 we can get G by adding edges between vertices of B' . If we add $x'y'$ the the graph remains C_5 -colourable so we apply the Lemma to get an edge between vertices of $[n]'$ —this makes a copy of E_3 as a proper subgraph of G , which contradicts the criticality of G . So $x'y'$ is not an edge.

Adding any matching to B' that does not include the edge $x'y'$ leaves a 2-colourable graph. Adding a maximal such matching leaves at most one vertex that has degree 1. Thus we have a C_5 -colourable saturated subgraph of G , which is impossible by Fact 3. ◀


With Claim 46 proved, we are ready to finish our proof of the proposition. As G has girth 4 we may assume it contains a 4-cycle C on the vertices $0, 1, 2, 3$. Every vertex i of C has degree at least 3, so has at least one more neighbour i' . Let N_i be the set of neighbours of i in $G \setminus C$ for vertex i of C . No two vertices of C share a common neighbour not in C or we would have a C_3 or a $K_{2,3}$, so the sets N_i are disjoint; and so there are no edges from N_i to $j \in V(C)$ for $i \neq j$.

Notice the vertices of C are saturated in $C \cup \bigcup N_i$, as by definition of the N_i they can have no other neighbours in G .

▷ **Claim 47.** If all vertices in $N = \bigcup_{i \in V(C)} N_i$ have degree exactly 2, then G is E_3 .

Proof. Assume they do. By Lemma 44 with $B = V(C)$ and $B' = N$, we can get G by adding edges between vertices of B' . There can be no edge from N_i to N_{i+1} or its endpoints are in a C_4 contradicting the fact they have degree 2. So we may assume we have an edge from $1' \in N_1$ to $3' \in N_3$. The graph is still C_5 -colourable, so there is another edge between vertices of B' in G . If it is between N_1 and N_3 then the path $1 \sim 1'' \sim 3'' \sim 3$ that it makes is redundant with $1 \sim 1' \sim 3' \sim 3$. If it is between N_2 and N_0 then G is E_3 , and we are done. ◀


We may therefore assume that $1' \in N_1$ has degree at least 3. It must have an edge to some $3'$ in N_3 or we have an \mathbb{H}_3 . For $i = 1, 3$ let $N'_i = N(i') \setminus (V(C) \cup N)$. So our graph looks like this.



Now, the following hold, reducing the figure to what you get by ignoring the dashed bits.

1. N_1 and N_3 are disjoint, as otherwise we would have a $K_{2,3}$. If there is some $1^* \in N_1 \setminus \{1'\}$ and some $3^* \in N_3 \setminus \{3'\}$, then we have a \mathbb{H}_3 on $\{2, 1^*\}, 1', 3', 3, \{0, 3^*\}$. So we may assume that $N_3 = \{3'\}$.
2. If N_2 has two vertices, then we can find an \mathbb{H}_3 unless $N_1 = \{1'\}$ and N_1' and N_3' are empty. But if all these conditions hold, then taking $B = \{0, 1, 2, 3, 1', 3'\}$ and $B' = \{0', 2'\}$ in Lemma 44 we get that $0', 2'$ is an edge in G . But this makes a E_3 . So we may assume that $N_2 = \{2'\}$ and similarly that $N_0 = \{0'\}$.
3. By Lemma 43, if $2'$ were a 3^+ vertex, it would have an edge to 0 or $0'$, making a $K_{2,3}$ or a copy of E_3 respectively. Thus $2'$, and similarly $0'$, is a 2-vertex.
4. So $0'$ and $2'$ are not in any C_4 , so have no edges to $\{1', 3'\} \cup N_1^*$, and so in particular, are not in $N_1' \cup N_3'$, (meaning $N_1' \cup N_3'$ has no edges to $\{0, 2\}$).
5. No vertex in N_1 has degree greater than 3. Indeed, the only possible neighbours of a vertex v of N_1 are in $N_1' \cup N_3' \cup \{3'\}$ or are vertices not shown in the figure. So using the two of them that are not 1 or $3'$ as leaves, we have an \mathbb{H}_3 with the vertices $v, 1, 2, 3, \{0, 3'\}$. The same holds for $3'$ – it has degree at most 3.
6. A vertex $1''$ in N_1' can only have as neighbours $0', 1'$ or $2'$, or vertices not shown in the figure. If $1''$ has degree at least 3, then using the two neighbours that are not $1'$ as leaves, there is an \mathbb{H}_3 on $1', 3', 3, \{0, 2\}$. Thus vertices in N_1' and N_3' are 2-vertices.
7. If there are distinct $1^* \in N_1 \setminus \{1'\}$ and $3'' \in N_3'$, then we have a \mathbb{H}_3 on the vertices $\{1', 3''\}, 3', 3, 2, 1, \{0, 1^*\}$. So either $N_3' = N_1 \setminus \{1'\} = \{1^*\}$, or at least one of N_3' and $N_1 \setminus \{1'\}$ are empty. Assume the former. This vertex 1^* has the same two neighbours as $1'$ does, so they must both have distinct third neighbours 1^{**} and $1''$ respectively. These are 2-vertices by (6), and the vertices 1^* and $1'$ are 3-vertices by (5). Applying Lemma 44 with $B = \{0, 1, 2, 3, 1', 1^*, 3'\}$ and $B' = \{0', 2'\}$ gives that $2', 0'$ is an edge of G , but this is not true. Thus either N_3' is empty, or $N_1 = \{1'\}$.

In either case we apply Lemma 44 with $B = V(C) \cup \{3'\} \cup N_1$ and $B' = N_1' \cup \{0'\} \cup N_3' \cup \{2'\}$. (By definition, all neighbours of elements of B are in $B \cup B'$, so elements of B are saturated; elements of B' have been argued to be 2-vertices.) Edges from $0'$ to $2'$ give a proper subgraph E_3 which is impossible. Edges from N_1' to N_3' , or from $\{0', 2'\}$ to $N_1' \cup N_3'$ leave the graph C_5 -colourable, so adding them until there is at most one unsaturated vertex left gives a saturated C_5 -colourable subgraph, contradicting the criticality of G . ◀



■ **Figure 16** The graph \mathbb{R}_i .

L The Proofs of Theorems 19 and 20

We first give a general lemma (see also [11], which only proves the first part of the lemma explicitly).

► **Lemma 48.** *Suppose G is star 3-colourable and contains a C_4 as a subgraph. Then only two vertices of this C_4 can have degree greater than 2, and if they exist they must be opposite vertices of the C_4 . Moreover, in any star 3-colouring of G , the vertices in the C_4 of degree 2 must have the same colour.*

Proof. Suppose we have a C_4 in which three vertices have degree greater than 2. Two of these must be adjacent in the C_4 , let us call them u and v . If they both have private neighbours outside of the vertices of the C_4 , then G contains \mathbb{A} as a subgraph, and is a no-instance. If they have a common neighbour outside of the vertices of the C_4 , then G contains a graph built from C_4 and K_3 by identifying an edge of the former with an edge of the latter as a subgraph (which contains a C_5), and is a no-instance. If they both have their third neighbour in the vertices of the C_4 , then the vertices of the C_4 induce a K_4 in G , and this is a no-instance. Finally, is the possibility that one has a new neighbour outside of the C_4 , while the other has a new neighbour inside of the C_4 . Then G contains as a subgraph a diamond with a pendant vertex attached to one of the vertices of degree 2, and is a no-instance. ◀

Let \mathbb{R}_i be the *squash racket* graph built from a path on i vertices by identifying one of the ends of the path with some vertex on a C_4 ; see also Figure 16. In \mathbb{R}_i , we call the vertex on the C_4 that is of degree 2, and whose neighbours are also of degree 2, *distinguished*. In the following we often give a star 3-colouring when we do not know the precise length of some path. It is sufficient to cover all residues modulo 3 as we can repeat sequences abc on a path, so long as $a, b, c \in \{1, 2, 3\}$ and $|\{a, b, c\}| = 3$. We will not discuss this further.

L.1 The Bipartite Case: The Proof of Theorem 19

In this section we prove Theorem 19. We first prove the following lemma.

► **Lemma 49.** *The graphs \mathbb{A} and $\overline{2P_4 + 3P_6}$ are not star 3-colourable.*

Proof. By Lemma 48 we find that \mathbb{A} is not star 3-colourable.

We now prove that $\overline{2P_4 + 3P_6}$ is not star 3-colourable. Assume otherwise. Let x_1 be the neighbour of u on one copy of P_4 and x_2 the neighbour of v on this path. Similarly, let y_1 be the neighbour of u on the second copy of P_4 and y_2 the neighbour of v . Label the internal vertices of the first copy of P_6 $z_1 \dots z_4$ where z_1 is the neighbour of u and z_4 is the neighbour of v . Let $w_1 \dots w_4$ be the internal vertices of the second copy of P_6 such that w_1 is adjacent to u and w_4 is adjacent to v .

First consider a proper star 3-colouring c in which u and v are coloured differently, say u is coloured 1 and v is coloured 2. It must be that either $c(x_1) = 2$ or $c(x_2) = 1$. Without loss of generality, $c(x_1) = 2$.

Then $c(x_2) = 3$. Every remaining neighbour a of v then has colour 1, else we have a bichromatic P_4 with vertex set $\{a, v, x_2, x_1\}$. To avoid a bichromatic P_4 , $c(y_1) = 3$. Each further neighbour b of u then has colour 2, else we have a bichromatic P_4 with vertex set $\{b, u, y_1, y_2\}$. We now consider the first copy of P_6 . Since $c(z_1) = 2$, $c(z_2) = 3$, else there is a bichromatic P_4 with vertex set $\{x_1, u, z_1, z_2\}$. However, $c(z_3) = 3$, else we have a bichromatic P_4 with vertex set $\{z_3, z_4, v, y_2\}$. This leaves two adjacent vertices coloured 3, a contradiction.

Therefore, u and v must be coloured alike in any proper star 3-colouring c . Without loss of generality, they are both assigned colour 1. Without loss of generality, $c(x_1) = 2$ and $c(x_2) = 3$. Now consider the first copy of P_6 . First assume that $c(z_1) = 2$. Then, to avoid a bichromatic P_4 with vertex set $\{z_2, z_1, u, x_1\}$, $c(z_2) = 3$. Now, to avoid a bichromatic P_4 along this path, at least one of z_3 and z_4 must be coloured 2. If $c(z_3) = 2$ then $c(z_4) = 3$ and we have a bichromatic P_4 . Therefore, $c(z_4) = 2$ and $c(z_3) = 1$. Each remaining neighbour of v then has colour 3 to avoid a bichromatic P_4 . Since $c(w_4) = 3$, $c(w_3) = 2$, else we have a bichromatic P_4 . If $c(w_2) = 3$, then $c(w_1) = 2$ and we have a bichromatic P_4 on $\{w_1, w_2, w_3, w_4\}$. Thus, $c(w_2) = 1$, whereupon $c(w_1) = 3$ to avoid a bichromatic P_4 on $\{x_1, u, w_1, w_2\}$. The same arguments apply to the third copy of P_6 but now we have a bichromatic P_4 on 1313 with vertex set $\{u, w_1, w_2\}$ plus the first vertex on the third copy of P_6 , a contradiction.

It remains to consider the case where $c(z_1) = 3$. If $c(z_2) = 1$ then $c(z_3) = 2$ and $c(z_4) = 3$. Additionally, every remaining neighbour c of u is coloured 2 to avoid a bichromatic P_4 with vertex set $\{z_2, z_1, u, c\}$. It must then be that $c(w_1) = 2, c(w_2) = 3$. In fact, this case is covered in the previous paragraph by an automorphism of $\overline{2P_4 + 3P_6}$ that swaps u and v , as well as colours 2 and 3. Therefore $c(z_2) = 2$. To avoid a bichromatic P_4 along this copy of P_6 , $c(z_3) = 1$. Now $c(z_4) = 2$ since otherwise we have a bichromatic P_4 with vertex set $\{z_3, z_4, v, x_2\}$. However, this induces a bichromatic P_4 with vertex set $\{z_2, z_3, z_4, v\}$, a contradiction. ◀

We continue with the following lemma. For an integer d , a d^+ -vertex in a graph is a vertex of degree at least d .

► **Lemma 50.** *Let G be a bipartite connected $(\mathbb{H}_2, \mathbb{H}_4, \dots)$ -subgraph-free graph with more than two 3^+ -vertices. If G is \mathbb{A} -free, then G is star 3-colourable.*

Proof. We may assume without loss of generality that G is connected. Suppose G is \mathbb{A} -subgraph-free. Note that G cannot contain a K_3 since it is bipartite. By assumption, G has more than two 3^+ -vertices. Let us choose three in a row u, v, w on a path in that order, so as to minimise the total distance from u to w . Note it is possible that there is a path from u to w that is shorter than the path from u to w via v .¹

Suppose u, v, w are consecutive. Then u and w must have another common neighbour to avoid an \mathbb{H}_2 . Now we violate Lemma 48. Thus, u, v, w may not be consecutive.

Suppose now that u and w have two common neighbours p and q . By the minimality of the length of the path from u to v to w we may now assume that the subpaths from u to v and v to w have length at most 2, and so as u, v, w are not consecutive one of them has length 2. Without loss of generality, let us assume this is u to v . According to Lemma 48, both p and q have degree 2 and neither of these may have an edge to v , therefore v has a distinct neighbour z . Since there is a path of length 2 from u to v we have \mathbb{H}_2 as a subgraph and finish this case.

Suppose now that u and w have one common neighbour p and two distinct neighbours u' and w' , respectively. Since u, v, w are not consecutive, there is an \mathbb{H}_2 using u, p, w as the central path.

Suppose now that u and w have neighbours u', u'' and w', w'' , respectively, so that these vertices are pairwise distinct. If the total length of the path on u, v, w is even then we have some \mathbb{H}_{2i} . W.l.o.g., assume

¹ We are not aware of an example like this that is both omits all \mathbb{H}_{2i} as a subgraph and has such u, v, w minimally chosen.

the path from u to v is even, whereupon the path from v to w must be odd. There must be an edge from v to one of u', u'' (w.l.o.g. u') to avoid an \mathbb{H}_{2i} . By minimality of the path u, v, w , the distance from u to v along the path we chose must be 2 with middle vertex s . According to Lemma 48, both s and u' have degree 2 in G . If u has degree greater than 3 there is an \mathbb{H}_2 with middle path u, s, v (note that there cannot be an edge from u to the neighbour d of v along the path to w , by our original minimal choice of the path along u, v, w). Suppose u'' has no neighbours outside of $\{u, u', s, v\}$ (noting that there might be an edge from u'' to v). Then v is a cut vertex. Note that none of the paths emanating from w and not going through v can have vertices of degree greater than 2, unless they are part of a squash racket whose distinguished vertex is identified with w , as we would introduce an \mathbb{H}_{2i} . The case of the squash racket can be dealt with just like the case of an even cycle so we do not concern ourselves with it specially. Note however that there can be only one squash racket attached at w and if there is a squash racket there can be no additional even cycles or paths attached at w . If the edge u'' to v exists then there can be no new neighbours of u'' without introducing an \mathbb{A} as a subgraph. This places us in the case shown in Figure 17, and the figure shows a star 3-colouring in this case.


Suppose now that u'' has a neighbour outside $\{u, u', s, v\}$ which we call t (noting that in this case there can be no edge from u'' to v since then there would be three consecutive 3^+ vertices). Let us continue expanding from t along some path away from u'' which we enumerate $t = t_1, t_2, \dots$. Suppose no such path like this reaches w (or v) avoiding u . Note that such a path cannot now arrive at either v or s since we have uncovered all of their neighbours (if v had more neighbours then there would be an \mathbb{H}_2 with central path u, s, v). If one of the vertices t_j has degree greater than 2 then we have a \mathbb{H}_{2i} involving a central path either from t_j to v via u or from t_j to w via u . Thus we have nothing more than a path here which must terminate at some t_k . This case will be superseded by a more general case which will come later (see Figure 19).

Suppose we have a path t_1, t_2, \dots that eventually joins the path between v and w exclusive of v and w . Then we contradict minimality of the path from u to w via v . Thus we have a path t_1, t_2, \dots that eventually joins w . (Possibly it did so via, w.l.o.g., w'' .) This path must be of odd length since otherwise it would produce an \mathbb{H}_{2i} . If any vertex on this path has degree greater than 2 then it induces some \mathbb{H}_{2i} on a path to either u or w . Except in the case that it is distance 2 from w , an odd distance from u , and shares two neighbours with w (and these are w 's only neighbours). This case is drawn in Figure 18. Therefore, there is nothing but this path, except that we did not isolate the degree of w . Indeed, w may have arbitrarily high degree. Any path emanating from w and not eventually reaching v (we have accounted for all such paths) may not have a vertex c of degree greater than 2, since otherwise this vertex would produce an \mathbb{H}_{2i} with middle path to either w or v . Except in the case that c is at distance 2 from w and shares two neighbours the two neighbours w' and w'' with w , in which case c may have a path emanating from it in the form of $c = c_1, c_2, \dots$. This case, in which there is a squash racket with distinguished vertex identified with w , will be superseded by the next. Note however that there can be only one squash racket attached at w and if there is a squash racket there can be no additional even cycles or paths. It follows then that some path may leave w and terminate in a vertex of degree 1, or return to w producing a cycle of even length. We claim the graph G is a yes-instance of star 3-colouring. Let us refer to Figure 19. ◀


We now prove the following lemma, which deals with the case where G has exactly two 3^+ -vertices.

► **Lemma 51.** *Let G be a bipartite $(\mathbb{H}_2, \mathbb{H}_4, \dots)$ -subgraph-free graph with exactly two 3^+ vertices. If G is $(\mathbb{A}, \overline{2P_4 + 3P_6})$ -subgraph-free, then G is star 3-colourable.*


Proof. We may assume without loss of generality assume that G is connected. Suppose G is $(\mathbb{A}, \overline{2P_4 + 3P_6})$ -subgraph-free. Let the two 3^+ vertices be u and v . There may be many paths from u to v . Suppose one of these paths is of even length. Then, as G is bipartite, they must all be of even length. There may further be even cycles attached to u and even cycles attached to v . In order to avoid \mathbb{H}_{2i} , the number




■ **Figure 17** The second cut vertex case of Lemma 50 with its star 3-colouring. There may be a squash racket attached at w instead of even cycles or paths. The squash racket case is drawn on the bottom. For the colouring around w we draw to the left the possible colours that may appear to the left and we draw to the right two paths that need to be identified to make an even cycle of squash racket (middle right).




■ **Figure 18** The middle case of Lemma 50 with its star 3-colouring (above). One could think of this as a squash racket with distinguished vertex identified with w in which the path continues and actually reaches u . The concurrent star 3-colouring of $path_1$ and $path_2$ is given below.




■ **Figure 19** The coup de grâce of Lemma 50 with its star 3-colouring (above). The concurrent star 3-colouring of $path_1$ and $path_2$ (middle left) and any even cycles or squash rackets (middle right, merge top and bottom paths to form even cycle or squash racket). At the bottom is the special case where both paths have length $1 \pmod 3$ in which case w is coloured 2.




■ **Figure 20** The first case of Lemma 51 with its star 3-colouring. At the top and bottom the paths may be made into even cycles by the identification of two vertices. Note there is a 313 down the path of length 4 which would cause a problem were we to have another one, but we already explained this would introduce an even \mathbb{H}_{2i} .



■ **Figure 21** The case from Lemma 51 in which there is path from u to v of length 1 with its star 3-colouring. At the top and bottom the paths may be made into even cycles by the identification of two vertices.



■ **Figure 22** The case of Lemma 51 in which, from u to v , there are no paths of length 1 and at most two paths of length 5, with its star 3-colouring. There may be more paths of length 2 between u and v but no more paths of length 5. At the top and bottom the paths may be made into even cycles by the identification of two vertices.



■ **Figure 23** The final case of Lemma 51 in which, from u to v , there are no paths of length 1 and at most one path of length 3, with its star 3-colouring.

of these paths between u and v must be bounded, in particular, there can be no more than one path of length greater than or equal to 4. See Figure 20 for the 3-star colouring in this case.

Suppose, one of the paths between u and v is of odd length. Then they must all be of odd length. (There may further be even cycles attached to u and even cycles attached to v .) Suppose there are paths between u and v of length both 1 and 3. Now, u and v must have third neighbours u' and v' , respectively, that are not involved in these paths (e.g., by bipartiteness). Since $u' \neq v'$, again by bipartiteness, we have an \mathbb{A} as a subgraph and this is a no-instance.

Now we consider three cases. Firstly, that there is a path of length 1 and all other paths are of length at least 5 (see Figure 21). Secondly, that all paths are of length at least 3 and there are at most two paths of length 5 (see Figure 22). Thirdly, that all paths are of length at least 3 and there is at most one path of length 3 (see Figure 23). ◀

We are now ready to prove Theorem 19, which we restate below.

Theorem 19 (restated) *A bipartite $(\mathbb{H}_2, \mathbb{H}_4, \mathbb{H}_6 \dots)$ -subgraph-free graph is star 3-colourable if and only if it is $(\mathbb{A}, \overline{2P_4 + 3P_6})$ -subgraph-free.*

Proof. Let G be a bipartite $(\mathbb{H}_2, \mathbb{H}_4, \mathbb{H}_6 \dots)$ -subgraph-free graph. If G contains $(\mathbb{A}$ or $\overline{2P_4 + 3P_6})$ as a subgraph, we apply Lemma 49. If G is $(\mathbb{A}, \overline{2P_4 + 3P_6})$ -subgraph-free, then we can use Lemma 50 or Lemma 51 (note that the case in which there is only one or no 3^+ -vertex is covered a fortiori in the latter). ◀

L.2 The General Case: The Proof of Theorem 20

A *diamond* is a C_4 with a chord, that is, the graph with vertex set $\{a, b, c, d\}$ and edge set $\{ab, bc, cd, da, ac\}$. Let *diamond-with-pendant* be built from a diamond, with a pendant vertex added to a vertex of degree 2, that is, the graph with vertex set $\{a, b, c, d, e\}$ and edge set $\{ab, bc, cd, da, ac, be\}$. We note that the diamond-with-pendant involves a C_4 with three 3^+ -vertices. See also Figure 24.

We start with proving the following lemma.



► **Lemma 52.** *Let G be a connected graph ($\mathbb{H}_2, \mathbb{H}_4, \mathbb{H}_6 \dots$)-subgraph-free graph with at least five 3^+ -vertices. Then G contains either a graph from $\{\mathbb{A}, C_5\}$ as a subgraph or a C_4 with (at least) three 3^+ vertices.*


Proof. We will essentially follow the proof of Lemma 50 to show that, if we assume there are three 3^+ -vertices, we can never uncover more than one more, unless G contains some H_{2i} as a subgraph or contains \mathbb{A} as a subgraph or contains some C_4 with (at least) three 3^+ vertices. Of course, as we follow the proof of Lemma 50, we can no longer use bipartiteness. This means we have an important new case at the start (later on we only used it to assume that certain cycles were even).

Suppose there are three consecutive 3^+ -vertices u, v, w in a clique (the “triangle”). Suppose any two of these have a common neighbour, then the graph is not star 3-colourable by Lemma 48. Thus, they have private neighbours u', v', w' , respectively, that form with them the “net”. Since G is connected, there is a path from the net, w.l.o.g. through u' , to another 3^+ vertex t . Choose such a t closest to the triangle in the net. If t has two neighbours outside of the net, then there is an H_{2i} as a subgraph with central path either t, \dots, u (if distance from t to u even) or either of t, \dots, u, v and t, \dots, u, w (if distance from t to u odd). Thus, t has a neighbour in the net and we have discovered a path from u to (w.l.o.g.) v , avoiding w , with a 3^+ vertex at distance either 1 or 2 from v . Let us choose a minimal such path (not permitting $v' = u'$ as we already ruled this out by assumption). This minimal path induces a cycle in G . If it is C_4 or C_5 we are in a no-instance (in both cases there is a – potentially non-induced – C_5). W.l.o.g., assume it is of length at least 6.

Suppose t is at distance 1 from v and we may w.l.o.g. assume it is v' itself. If v' has an edge to anywhere in the net, then we are in a no-instance (either we have a C_5 or diamond-with-pendant). Thus, some third neighbour v'' of v' is outside the net. Now there is an H_2 with central path v', v, u . Suppose t is at distance 2 from v . We have found two neighbours of t so let t' be a third neighbour. If t' is in the net then we are in a no-instance with a C_5 ; unless $t' = v$, in which case we were not in a minimal cycle (essentially v' could be t). Thus, t' is outside the net. Now there is an H_2 with central path t, v', v .

Now let us follow the proof as in the bipartite case (Lemma 50) but no longer using bipartiteness. Suppose u, v, w are consecutive. Then u and w must have another common neighbour to avoid an H_2 . Now we violate Lemma 48. Thus, u, v, w may not be consecutive.

Suppose now that u and w have two common neighbours p and q . According to Lemma 48, both of these have degree 2 and neither of these may have an edge to v , therefore v has a distinct neighbour z . Suppose either u or w has degree greater than 3, w.l.o.g. u . Then there is an H_2 with u, p, w forming the central path. Thus, u and w are of degree 3 and v is a cut vertex. If either of the paths from u to v or v to w is even then we have an H_{2i} . Thus we may assume both are odd. If z has degree greater than 2 then the paths from v to u and v to w must be even to avoid an H_{2i} with central path (e.g.) z, v, \dots, u . But then there is an H_{2i} with central path v, \dots, u . Thus, z has degree 1 or 2. Indeed, we may follow a path $z = z_1, z_2$ etc. and never find a vertex of degree greater than 2, unless it returns to v , as it would imply either an H_{2i} with central path z_j, \dots, v (if j even) or (e.g.) z_j, \dots, v, \dots, u (if j is odd). Thus, either the path ends or it returns to v as a cycle. And there may be more than one such path or cycle. In this case, G has three 3^+ -vertices.



■ **Figure 24** The diamond (left) and the diamond-with-pendant (right).

Suppose now that u and w have one common neighbour p and two distinct neighbours u' and w' , respectively. Since u, v, w are not consecutive, there is an H_2 using u, p, w as the central path.

Suppose now that u and w have neighbours u', u'' and w', w'' , respectively, so that these vertices are pairwise distinct. If the total length of the path on u, v, w is even then we have some H_{2i} . W.l.o.g., assume the path from u to v is even, whereupon the path from v to w must be odd. There must be an edge from v to one of u', u'' (w.l.o.g. u') to avoid an H_{2i} . By minimality of the path u, v, w , the distance from u to v along the path we chose must be 2 with middle vertex s . According to Lemma 48, both s and u' have degree 2 in G . If u has degree greater than 3 there is an H_2 with middle path u, s, v (note that there cannot be an edge from u to the neighbour d of v along the path to w , by our original minimal choice of the path along u, v, w). Suppose u'' has no neighbours outside of $\{u, u', s, v\}$ (noting that there might be an edge from u'' to v). Then v is a cut vertex. Note that none of the paths emanating from w and not going through v can have vertices of degree greater than 2, unless they are part of a squash racket whose distinguished vertex is identified with w , as we would introduce an H_{2i} . The squash racket case can be dealt with just like a cycle so we do not concern ourselves with it specially. Note however that there can be only one squash racket attached at w and if there is a squash racket there can be no additional cycles or paths. If the edge u'' to v exists then there can be no new neighbours of u'' without introducing an A as a subgraph. In this case, G has three 3^+ -vertices.

Suppose now that u'' has a neighbour outside $\{u, u', s, v\}$ which we call t (noting that in this case there can be no edge from u'' to v since then there would be three consecutive 3^+ -vertices). Let us continue expanding from t along some path away from u'' which we enumerate $t = t_1, t_2, \dots$. Suppose no such path like this reaches w (or v) avoiding u . Note that such a path cannot now arrive at either v or s since we have uncovered all of their neighbours (if v had more neighbours then there would be an H_2 with central path u, s, v). If one of the vertices t_j has degree greater than 2 then we have a H_{2i} involving a central path either from t_j to v via u or from t_j to w via u . Thus we have nothing more than a path here which must terminate at some t_k . In this case, G has three 3^+ -vertices.

Suppose we have a path t_1, t_2, \dots that eventually joins the path between v and w exclusive of v and w . Then we contradict minimality of the path from u to w via v . Thus we have a path t_1, t_2, \dots that eventually joins w . (Possibly it did so via, w.l.o.g., w'' .) This path must be of odd length since otherwise it would produce an H_{2i} . If any vertex on this path has degree greater than 2 then it induces some H_{2i} on a path to either u or w . Except in the case that it is distance 2 from w , an odd distance from u , and shares two neighbours with w (and these are w 's only neighbours). In this case, G has four 3^+ -vertices.

Therefore, there is nothing but this path, except that we did not isolate the degree of w . Indeed, w may have arbitrarily high degree. Any path emanating from w and not eventually reaching v (we have accounted for all such paths) may not have a vertex c of degree greater than 2, since otherwise this vertex would produce an H_{2i} with middle path to either w or v . Except in the case that c is at distance 2 from w and shares two neighbours the two neighbours w' and w'' with w , in which case c may have a path emanating from it in the form of $c = c_1, c_2, \dots$. This case, in which there is a squash racket with distinguished vertex identified with w , will be superseded by the next. Note however that there can be only one squash racket attached at w and if there is a squash racket there can be no additional cycles or paths. It follows then that some path may leave w and terminate in a vertex of degree 1, or return to w producing a cycle. In this case, G has three 3^+ -vertices. ◀

We now prove a more general lemma. For an integer $d \geq 0$, let \mathcal{G}_d be the class of graphs that consists of graphs, in which each connected component has at most d 3^+ vertices.

► **Lemma 53.** *For every $d \geq 1$, a graph from \mathcal{G}_d is star 3-colourable if and only if it is \mathcal{F}' -subgraph-free for some finite set of graphs \mathcal{F}' .*

Proof. Let us give the proof for $d = 2$ where we consider a connected graph G from \mathcal{G}_2 that has exactly two 3^+ -vertices before we make the obvious generalisation. Let u and v be the 3^+ -vertices of G . Let P_x be

the set of paths from $x \in \{u, v\}$ that terminate with a vertex of degree 1. Let C_x be the set of paths from $x \in \{u, v\}$ that return to x making a cycle. Let $P_{u,v}$ be the set of paths from u to v . These account for all vertices of G . Recall that star colouring has the property that it can see up to distance 3 from a certain vertex in terms of the effect of colours. Consider the paths in $P_{u,v}$ that are of length $\geq 3 + 4 + 3 = 10$. In any star 3-colouring of a path of length ≥ 10 , the middle four vertices must contain a consecutive run of three distinct colours. It follows that a path of length 10 covers all longer paths of length $1 \pmod 3$. Then, paths of length 11 and 12 cover all longer paths of length 2 and $0 \pmod 3$, respectively. Thus, we may w.l.o.g. consider that the paths in $P_{u,v}$ are of length at most 12. Now, suppose there are more than $N = 3^6$ of some particular length m of path. Then in any star 3-colouring of these, some sequence of three colours at the beginning and at the end must appear more than once. Since it appears more than once it could be repeated if there were additional paths of length m over and above the N without violating the condition of star 3-colouring. In this fashion, we may assume that there are at most 3^6 copies of a path of any length. But now we reduced our graph to one of bounded size $\leq 5 \cdot 12 \cdot 12 \cdot 3^6$ (this is: #sets, #path-lengths, #vertices, #end-types, respectively) and we can check using brute force whether it is star 3-colourable. If it is not star 3-colourable then may add it to our list of forbidden subgraphs.

Now, when d is larger, we consider $P_x, C_x, P_{x,y}$ for all vertices x and y giving a quadratic number in d of sets to consider. The same bound on the length of paths applies as in the case $d = 2$. The argument again reduces any graph to a graph of size at most $f(d)$ for some function f which is $O(d^2)$ and the result follows as in the case $d = 2$. ◀

We are now ready to prove Theorem 20, which we restate below.

Theorem 20 (restated). *A $(\mathbb{H}_2, \mathbb{H}_4, \mathbb{H}_6 \dots)$ -subgraph-free graph is star 3-colourable if and only if it is \mathcal{F} -subgraph-free for some finite set of graphs \mathcal{F} .*

Proof. Let G be a $(\mathbb{H}_2, \mathbb{H}_4, \mathbb{H}_6 \dots)$ -subgraph-free graph. We may assume without loss of generality that G is connected. First suppose G has at least five 3^+ -vertices. Then, by Lemma 52, we find that G contains a subgraph isomorphic to \mathbb{A} or C_5 , or G contains a C_4 with at least three 3^+ vertices. Recall from Lemma 49 that \mathbb{A} is not star 3-colourable. It is readily seen that C_5 is not star 3-colourable. By Lemma 48, any graph that contains a C_4 with at least three 3^+ vertices is not star 3-colourable either. If G has fewer than five 3^+ -vertices, then we apply Lemma 53. ◀

M Acyclic 3-Colouring

The ACYCLIC 3-COLOURING problem is to decide if a graph G has an *acyclic 3-colouring*, which is a mapping $f : V(G) \rightarrow \{1, 2, 3\}$ such that for every i , the set U_i of vertices of G mapped to i is independent (so, f is a 3-colouring) and $U_1 \cup U_2, U_1 \cup U_3, U_2 \cup U_3$ all induce forests. Note that every star colouring is acyclic, while the reverse statement does not hold.

We note that ACYCLIC 3-COLOURING is a C1-problem that does not satisfy C3. This is because the problem is polynomial-time solvable for graphs of bounded treewidth due to Courcelle's Theorem [13], so C1 is satisfied. Moreover, it follows from Proposition 26 that for all $p \geq 3$, the p -subdivision of a graph G is star 3-colourable and thus acyclic 3-colourable, so C3 is not satisfied. As mentioned in Section 6, the complexity of ACYCLIC 3-COLOURING is still open for subcubic graphs, so it is not known if the problem satisfies C2.

We now prove a result using the same construction as in the corresponding result for STAR 3-COLOURING (Theorem 31).

► **Proposition 54.** *ACYCLIC 3-COLOURING is NP-complete for planar bipartite graphs in which one partition class has size 2.*

Proof. Let G and G' be the graphs as defined in the proof of Theorem 31. We claim that G has a 3-colouring if and only if G' has an acyclic 3-colouring. First suppose G has a 3-colouring. From the proof of Theorem 31 we find that G' has a star 3-colouring, which is an acyclic 3-colouring by definition. Now suppose G' has an acyclic 3-colouring c . Then no two adjacent vertices u and v in G can be coloured alike by c . Hence, the restriction of c to G is a 3-colouring. ◀

Our next result immediately follows from previous results.

► **Theorem 55.** *ACYCLIC 3-COLOURING is polynomial-time solvable for $(\mathbb{H}_\ell, \mathbb{H}_{\ell+1}, \dots)$ -subgraph-free graphs ($\ell \geq 1$) and $(\mathbb{H}_i, \mathbb{H}_{2i}, \mathbb{H}_{3i}, \dots)$ -subgraph-free graphs ($i \geq 1$), but NP-complete for $(\mathbb{H}_1, \mathbb{H}_3, \mathbb{H}_5 \dots)$ -subgraph-free graphs.*

Proof. The polynomial results follow from combining the above observation that the problem satisfies C1 with Propositions 29 and 30, respectively. The NP-completeness result follows from Proposition 54. ◀