

When Graph Traversal Meets Structured Preferences: Unified Framework and Complexity Results

Guozhen Rong¹, Xin Li¹, Yongjie Yang²

¹School of Computer and Communication Engineering, Changsha University of Science and Technology, Changsha 410083, China

²Department of Economics, Saarland University, Saarbrücken 66123, Germany

Abstract

Preference restrictions have played a significant role in computational social choice. This paper studies a framework that connects preference restrictions with classical graph search paradigms. We model candidates as vertices of a graph and interpret each voter’s preference ordering as the outcome of traversing the graph according to a graph search. We focus on six fundamental paradigms: breadth-first search (BFS), depth-first search (DFS), breadth-first search (LexBFS), lexicographic depth-first (LexDFS), maximum cardinality search (MCS), and maximal neighborhood search (MNS).

Within this framework, we study the problem of determining whether a given preference profile admits a graph support subject to structural restrictions, that is, whether there exists a graph such that each preference ordering can be generated by traversing the graph under the chosen paradigm. For all considered paradigms, we show that this problem is NP-hard when the graph support is required to have at most k edges, where k is a given integer. We further extend these hardness results to the case where the graph support is required to have maximum degree k . For DFS, we prove that recognizing whether a preference profile admits a tree support can be solved in polynomial time. Moreover, existing results imply polynomial-time solvability of the problem for all remaining graph traversals, except BFS and LexBFS, for which the complexity remains open.

1 Introduction

1.1 Background

The study of structured preferences is a central theme in computational social choice. Classical domain restrictions such as single-peakedness [3], single-crossingness [20, 27], and group-separability [15, 16] have been extensively studied, as they not only render many otherwise intractable computational problems polynomial-time solvable and provide a way to circumvent classical impossibility theorems, but also capture structural properties observed in many real-world applications [5, 9, 13, 32, 33]. Generalizations such as single-peakedness on trees [11, 22, 30] and on circles [23], and single-crossingness on median graphs [8] have further broadened the scope of this approach. A common feature of these domains is that they impose an underlying structure—often a graph from a specific class—that constrains how preferences can be organized. The substantial body of existing work naturally invites a broader reflection:

Perhaps the time has come to examine graph-based preferences in a more general and systematic way?

In this context, a graph search paradigm (a.k.a. graph traversal), which specifies the order in which the vertices of a graph are visited, provides a natural framework for addressing this question. Graph search paradigms such as generic search (GS), breadth-first search (BFS), depth-first search (DFS), lexicographic breadth-first search (LexBFS), lexicographic depth-first search (LexDFS), maximum cardinality search (MCS), and maximal neighborhood search (MNS) are among the most fundamental tools in graph theory and algorithm design [6, 28, 29]. The generic search GS captures the weakest requirement, ensuring that at every step the set of visited vertices induces a connected subgraph. Viewed from a preference-theoretic perspective, this requirement naturally corresponds to the idea that preferences evolve through connected local comparisons. Other paradigms can be seen as refinements of GS that introduce additional ordering principles. Consequently, for a fixed graph, any ordering obtained by traversing the graph according to one of these paradigms is also a GS-ordering of the same graph.

While graph traversals were originally developed to characterize important graph classes and to support efficient recognition algorithms, their use has expanded far beyond these classical purposes, and their potential for further applications continues to grow. For instance, BFS and DFS play a central role in querying and reasoning over knowledge graphs, where they are employed to explore semantic neighborhoods and compute path-based similarities [31, 36]. Graph search paradigms also underpin many areas of artificial intelligence, including heuristic search algorithms [18] and reasoning in abstract argumentation systems [21]. Fundamentally, these diverse applications benefit from the fact that graph traversals can be viewed procedurally as models of sequential exploration. This renders them a natural model for generating structured preference orderings from an underlying graph of alternatives. The connection is further supported by recent developments in decision-making frameworks, which increasingly model alternatives (candidates) as vertices of a graph, and relations such as interdependence, similarity, or interaction as edges [1, 17, 26, 34].

1.2 Our Contributions

In exploring the above question, the work of Escoffier, Spanjaard, and Tydrichová [12] constitutes an early step in this direction. Given a set of orderings, they studied whether there exists a graph with at most k edges (or maximum degree at most k) such that every prefix of every ordering induces a connected subgraph, and proved this problem to be NP-hard. Although not stated explicitly, their notion naturally corresponds to the generic search (GS) paradigm.

We generalize this setting by considering the problems EDGE-BOUNDED- \mathcal{S} -SP and DEG-BOUNDED- \mathcal{S} -SP, which ask whether there exists a graph with at most k edges (or maximum degree at most k) that admits all given orderings as \mathcal{S} -orderings, for a graph search paradigm \mathcal{S} . We complement the result of [12] by showing that, for $\mathcal{S} \in \{\text{DFS}, \text{BFS}, \text{LexDFS}, \text{LexBFS}, \text{MNS}, \text{MCS}\}$, both problems are NP-hard.

We also study the variant SP- \mathcal{S} -TREE, where the support is required to be a tree. For GS, this coincides with the classical problem of recognizing single-peakedness on a tree, which is polynomial-time solvable [11, 12, 30, 24]. Since GS, MNS, and MCS coincide on trees, SP- \mathcal{S} -TREE is also polynomial-time solvable for $\mathcal{S} \in \{\text{MNS}, \text{MCS}\}$. Moreover, LexBFS coincides with BFS on trees, and LexDFS with DFS, leaving BFS and DFS as the only remaining open cases. We resolve the DFS case by presenting a polynomial-time algorithm and, in doing so, establish several structural properties of DFS on trees that may be of independent interest. The complexity of the BFS case remains open.

1.3 Motivation

While the preceding sections establish the theoretical context and our formal contributions, the following discussion highlights the broader motivations of our framework.

In many real-world applications, preferences are far from arbitrary. Instead, they often exhibit strong structural regularities that can be captured by well-defined domains such as single-peaked or single-

crossing preferences. These structural restrictions are of practical and theoretical importance: on the one hand, they arise naturally in applications ranging from political elections (where candidates can often be placed along an ideological spectrum) to resource allocation and matching theory [2, 4, 25]; on the other hand, they enable efficient algorithms in settings where general preference aggregation is computationally intractable [5, 9, 13, 32, 33].

Our work is motivated by the observation that preferences can be interpreted as the outcome of a *sequential exploration* of alternatives embedded in a graph in certain scenarios. For example, in decision-making scenarios, an agent may start from a known alternative and explore others step by step, comparing each new alternative to those already considered. This process closely mirrors classical graph search paradigms and motivates the study of a unified framework in which preferences arise from traversals of an underlying graph of alternatives.

This connection is both conceptually and practically appealing. Graph search provides a rich toolbox of paradigms that model different exploration strategies. For instance, DFS corresponds to a “deep dive” into one branch of the search space before backtracking, while BFS represents a more cautious exploration level by level. More sophisticated searches such as MCS or MNS are designed may be interpreted as plausible models of decision-making in contexts where agents prioritize alternatives with larger or more informative connections. In MCS, vertices are visited in an order that successively maximizes the number of previously explored neighbors, whereas MNS prioritizes vertices whose set of visited neighbors is inclusion-wise maximal. Both procedures capture a notion of exploration guided by connectivity or information richness, rather than simple connectivity.

In addition to the aforementioned potential applications, our study is further motivated by the generality of our model, which encompasses several classical domains as special cases. For instance, a set of orderings is single-peaked if and only if it admits a GS-support that is a path. Since any set of orderings on a set V admits the clique on V as a support, the model naturally bridges many restricted preference domains with the general domain. Further connections between our framework and previously studied domains will be discussed in the next section.

2 Preliminaries

For an integer i , let $[i] = \{1, 2, \dots, i\}$ denote the set of positive integers no greater than i . A *pair* is a set of cardinality two. For a set X , we use \vec{X} to denote any arbitrary but fixed ordering of X , unless stated otherwise.

2.1 Graphs

For a graph $G = (V, E)$, its vertex set and edge set are also denoted by $V(G)$ and $E(G)$, respectively. An edge between two vertices $u, v \in V(G)$ is denoted as $\{u, v\}$. We write $N_G(v)$ for the set of *neighbors* of v in G , that is, $N_G(v) = \{u : \{u, v\} \in E(G)\}$, and let $\deg_G(v) = |N_G(v)|$ denote the degree of v in G . When the graph under consideration is clear from the context, we omit G from the notation. Vertices of degree one (respectively, zero) are referred to as *pendant* (respectively, *isolated*) vertices. If a pendant vertex v is adjacent to u , then v is called a *pendant* of u . For a vertex subset $S \subseteq V(G)$, we denote by $G - S$ the graph obtained from G by deleting all vertices in S together with their incident edges. When $S = \{v\}$ is a singleton, we simply write $G - v$.

2.2 Graph Search Paradigms

An *ordering* σ on a set V is a transitive, antisymmetric, and complete binary relation. By convention, we interpret σ from left to right. For $u, v \in V$, if u appears to the left of v in σ , we say that u *precedes* v , or equivalently, that v *succeeds* u . We denote this relation by $u <_\sigma v$. For $u, v, w \in V$ with $u <_\sigma v$ and

$v <_{\sigma} w$, we may write $u <_{\sigma} v <_{\sigma} w$, and say that v lies between u and w in σ . This notation naturally extends to sequences of arbitrary length.

The *position* of an element $v \in V$ in σ , denoted $\sigma(v)$, is the number of elements that precede v in σ , plus one. We sometimes represent an ordering by listing its elements in parentheses from left to right; for example, (a, b, c) denotes an ordering in which a, b , and c have positions 1, 2, and 3, respectively.

Let $n = |V|$. For an integer $i \in [n]$, we use $\sigma_{\leq i}$ to denote the restriction of σ to its first i elements. We call $\sigma_{\leq i}$ a *prefix* of σ , and refer to the remaining part as its *suffix*. For an element $u \in V$, $\sigma_{[\dots u]}$ denotes the subordering of σ consisting of u and all elements preceding it. For a subset $S \subseteq V$, we write $\sigma \ominus S$ for the ordering obtained from σ by deleting all vertices in S . For example, if $\sigma = (c, a, b, v, d)$, then $\sigma_{\leq 3} = \sigma_{[\dots b]}(c, a, b)$ and $\sigma \ominus \{a, v\} = (c, b, d)$.

A *graph search paradigm* is an algorithm that iteratively visits the vertices of a graph, starting from an initial vertex (chosen arbitrarily) and selecting subsequent vertices according to a specified rule. We consider six widely-studied graph search paradigms. For each, we give an intuitive explanation and present formal pseudocode in Figure 1. We also provide four-point ordering characterizations for these paradigms.

Breadth-First Search (BFS). BFS explores the vertices of a graph in order of their distance from a selected vertex. It operates by visiting all vertices at distance d from the start vertex before visiting any vertex at distance $d + 1$.

Depth-First Search (DFS). Starting from an initial vertex, DFS repeatedly visits an unvisited neighbor and continues recursively. When no such neighbor exists, it backtracks to the most recent vertex with unvisited neighbors.

Lexicographic Breadth-First Search (LexBFS). LexBFS is a refinement of BFS that uses additional information to break ties between vertices that are eligible to be visited next. As in BFS, vertices are explored layer by layer, but when several unvisited vertices are available, LexBFS prefers those that are adjacent to vertices visited earlier in the search. Intuitively, vertices that have stronger connections to earlier explored parts of the graph are visited first, resulting in a more structured traversal than standard BFS.

Lexicographic Depth-First Search (LexDFS). LexDFS is a refinement of DFS that uses additional information to break ties when several unvisited vertices are eligible to be explored next. As in DFS, the search proceeds by extending the current path as far as possible before backtracking. When multiple unvisited vertices are available, LexDFS prioritizes those that are adjacent to vertices visited more recently in the search. Intuitively, this reinforces the depth-first behavior by favoring continuations that stay close to the most recently explored parts of the graph.

Maximum Cardinality Search (MCS). At each iteration, MCS selects an unvisited vertex maximizing the number of already visited neighbors.

Maximal Neighborhood Search (MNS). At each iteration, MNS selects an unvisited vertex whose set of visited neighbors is inclusion-wise maximal among all unvisited vertices.

For a graph G and a graph search paradigm S , an ordering σ of V is called an S -ordering if it is produced by a traversal of G according to S . A prefix of an S -ordering is called a *prefix S -ordering* of G .

2.3 The Four-Point Ordering Characterizations

Let $G = (V, E)$ be a graph and let σ be an ordering of V . We say that σ *satisfies* a property if, for every $a, b, c \in V$ with $a <_{\sigma} b <_{\sigma} c$, the corresponding condition holds.

Property S: If $\{a, c\} \in E$ and $\{a, b\} \notin E$, then there exists a vertex $d \in V$ with $d <_{\sigma} b$ and $\{d, b\} \in E$.

BFS

```

1: for all  $v \in V(G)$  do
2:   label( $v$ )  $\leftarrow$  0;
3: for  $i \leftarrow 1$  to  $n$  do
4:    $v \leftarrow$  a unvisited vertex with the largest
      label;
5:    $\sigma(v) \leftarrow i$ ;
6:   for all unvisited  $u \in N_G(v)$  do
7:     label( $u$ )  $\leftarrow$  max(label( $u$ ),  $n - i$ );
8: return  $\sigma$ ;

```

DFS

```

1: for all  $v \in V(G)$  do
2:   label( $v$ )  $\leftarrow$  0;
3: for  $i \leftarrow 1$  to  $n$  do
4:    $v \leftarrow$  a unvisited vertex with the largest
      label;
5:    $\sigma(v) \leftarrow i$ ;
6:   for all unvisited  $u \in N_G(v)$  do
7:     label( $u$ )  $\leftarrow i$ ;
8: return  $\sigma$ ;

```

LexBFS

```

1: for all  $v \in V(G)$  do
2:   label( $v$ )  $\leftarrow$  0;
3: for  $i \leftarrow 1$  to  $n$  do
4:    $v \leftarrow$  a unvisited vertex with the lexico-
      graphically largest label;
5:    $\sigma(v) \leftarrow i$ ,  $j \leftarrow n - i$ ;
6:   for all unvisited  $u \in N_G(v)$  do
7:     append  $j$  to label( $u$ );
8: return  $\sigma$ ;

```

LexDFS

```

1: for all  $v \in V(G)$  do
2:   label( $v$ )  $\leftarrow$  0;
3: for  $i \leftarrow 1$  to  $n$  do
4:    $v \leftarrow$  a unvisited vertex with the lexico-
      graphically largest label;
5:    $\sigma(v) \leftarrow i$ ;
6:   for all unvisited  $u \in N_G(v)$  do
7:     prepend  $i$  to label( $u$ );
8: return  $\sigma$ ;

```

MCS

```

1: for all  $v \in V(G)$  do
2:   label( $v$ )  $\leftarrow$  0;
3: for  $i \leftarrow 1$  to  $n$  do
4:    $v \leftarrow$  a unvisited vertex with the largest
      label;
5:    $\sigma(v) \leftarrow i$ ;
6:   for all unvisited  $u \in N(v)$  do
7:     label( $u$ )  $\leftarrow$  label( $u$ ) + 1;
8: return  $\sigma$ ;

```

MNS

```

1: for all  $v \in V(G)$  do
2:   label( $v$ )  $\leftarrow$   $\emptyset$ ;
3: for  $i \leftarrow 1$  to  $n$  do
4:    $v \leftarrow$  an unvisited vertex whose label is
      inclusion-wise maximal;
5:    $\sigma(v) \leftarrow i$ ;
6:   for all unvisited  $u \in N(v)$  do
7:     label( $u$ )  $\leftarrow$  label( $u$ )  $\cup$   $\{i\}$ ;
8: return  $\sigma$ ;

```

Figure 1: Pseudocode for several graph search paradigms. Each algorithm takes as input a graph G and outputs an ordering σ of $V(G)$.




Figure 2: Illustration of four-point ordering characterizations of several graph search paradigms. Solid black edges indicate required adjacencies, dashed edges required non-adjacencies; all other adjacencies are irrelevant. The brace specifies a constrained positional scope for d relative to a and b , whose exact position depends on the paradigm. Figure adapted from [10].

Property B: If $\{a, c\} \in E$ and $\{a, b\} \notin E$, then there exists a vertex $d \in V$ with $d <_{\sigma} a$ and $\{d, b\} \in E$.

Property D: If $\{a, c\} \in E$ and $\{a, b\} \notin E$, then there exists a vertex $d \in V$ with $a <_{\sigma} d <_{\sigma} b$ and $\{d, b\} \in E$.

Property LB: If $\{a, c\} \in E$ and $\{a, b\} \notin E$, then there exists a vertex $d \in V$ with $d <_{\sigma} a$ such that $\{d, b\} \in E$ and $\{d, c\} \notin E$.

Property LD: If $\{a, c\} \in E$ and $\{a, b\} \notin E$, then there exists a vertex $d \in V$ with $a <_{\sigma} d <_{\sigma} b$ such that $\{d, b\} \in E$ and $\{d, c\} \notin E$.

Property M: If $\{a, c\} \in E$ and $\{a, b\} \notin E$, then there exists a vertex $d <_{\sigma} b$ such that $\{d, b\} \in E$ and $\{d, c\} \notin E$.

Figure 2 illustrates the above defined properties.

Lemma 2.1 ([10]). *Let G be a graph and σ an ordering of $V(G)$. Then:*

- (1) σ is a GS-ordering of G if and only if σ satisfies property S;
- (2) σ is a BFS-ordering of G if and only if σ satisfies property B;
- (3) σ is a DFS-ordering of G if and only if σ satisfies property D;
- (4) σ is a LexBFS-ordering of G if and only if σ satisfies property LB;
- (5) σ is a LexDFS-ordering of G if and only if σ satisfies property LD;
- (6) σ is a MNS-ordering of G if and only if σ satisfies property M.

We note that no analogous four-point ordering characterization exists for MCS.

Lemma 2.2 ([10]). *For every graph G , the following relations hold among graph search paradigms:*

- every BFS-, DFS-, and MNS-ordering of G is a GS-ordering of G ;
- every LexBFS-ordering of G is both a BFS-ordering and an MNS-ordering of G ;




Figure 3: Containment relationships among graph search paradigms. An arc from a search \mathcal{S} to \mathcal{S}' indicates that, for any graph G , every \mathcal{S}' -ordering of G is also an \mathcal{S} -ordering of G . Figure adapted from [10].

- every *LexDFS*-ordering of G is both a *DFS*-ordering and an *MNS*-ordering of G ;
- every *MCS*-ordering of G is an *MNS*-ordering of G .

Figure 3 illustrates these containment relationships.

Lemma 2.3. *Let σ be a *BFS*-ordering (respectively, *LexBFS*-ordering) of a graph G . Let a be the first vertex in σ , and let c be its neighbor in G . Then, all vertices between a and c in σ are adjacent to a .*

Proof. If c is the second vertex in σ , the lemma holds trivially. Otherwise, let b be a vertex between a and c in σ . Suppose for contradiction that a is not adjacent to b in G . Then, by the four-point ordering characterization of BFS, that is, Statement (2) of Lemma 2.1 (respectively, for DFS, Statement (3) of Lemma 2.1), there exists a vertex preceding a in σ that is adjacent to b . This contradicts the fact that a is the first vertex in σ . \square

The following observation is straightforward.

Observation 1. *Let \mathcal{S} be one of the graph traversals: *BFS*, *DFS*, *LexBFS*, *LexDFS*, *MCS*, or *MNS*. Let G be a connected graph on n vertices, and let σ be an \mathcal{S} -ordering of G . Then, for any $i \in [n]$, the subgraph of G induced by the first i vertices in σ is connected.*

2.4 Problem Definitions

Let \mathcal{S} be a graph search paradigm. We say that a graph G is an \mathcal{S} -support for a set Π of orderings, or that G admits Π as a set of \mathcal{S} -orderings, if every ordering in Π is an \mathcal{S} -ordering of G . An \mathcal{S} -tree support is an \mathcal{S} -support that is a tree.

We study the following decision problems, originally introduced by Escoffier, Spanjaard, and Tydričova [12] for the special case of GS, although GS is not explicitly mentioned in their paper.

EDGE-BOUNDED \mathcal{S} -SINGLE-PEAKEDNESS (EDGE-BOUNDED- \mathcal{S} -SP)

Input: A vertex set V , a set Π of orderings on V , and an integer k .

Question: Does Π admit an \mathcal{S} -support with at most k edges?

DEGREE-BOUNDED \mathcal{S} -SINGLE-PEAKEDNESS (DEG-BOUNDED- \mathcal{S} -SP)

Input: A vertex set V , a set Π of orderings on V , and an integer k .

Question: Does Π admit an \mathcal{S} -support with maximum degree at most k ?

\mathcal{S} -SINGLE-PEAKEDNESS ON TREES (\mathcal{S} -SP-TREES)

Input: A vertex set V , and a set Π of orderings on V .

Question: Does Π admit an \mathcal{S} -tree support?

3 Single-Peakedness on Graphs with Bounded Degree or Edge Count

This section establishes the NP-completeness of EDGE-BOUNDED- \mathcal{S} -SP and DEG-BOUNDED- \mathcal{S} -SP for graph search paradigms not considered by Escoffier, Spanjaard, and Tydrichová [12]. Since all problems considered below are in NP, we focus exclusively on the hardness reductions and omit explicit proofs of NP-membership in subsequent theorems.

Our hardness results are based on reductions from the VERTEX COVER problem. Given a graph $G = (V, E)$, a subset $S \subseteq V$ is said to *cover* an edge $\{u, v\} \in E$ if $\{u, v\} \cap S \neq \emptyset$. A *vertex cover* of G is a subset $S \subseteq V$ that covers all edges of G . A *clique* in G is a set of pairwise adjacent vertices.

VERTEX COVER	
Input:	A graph G and an integer κ .
Question:	Does G have a vertex cover of κ vertices?

VERTEX COVER is NP-complete even when restricted to 3-regular graphs [14], which we adopt throughout for clarity and consistency, although it is not strictly necessary for all proofs.

The following structure is frequently used in our reductions.

Definition 1. For positive integers p and q , a (p, q) -drone is a graph of $p + p \cdot q$ vertices and $\frac{p \cdot (p-1)}{2} + p \cdot q$ edges such that:

- (1) the graph contains a clique of size p ; and
- (2) every vertex in the clique has exactly q pendants.

An example is shown in Figure 4.




Figure 4: A $(4, 5)$ -drone.

Outline of the Reductions. In several of our reductions, we shall construct a set of orderings that can be classified into two groups. The first group is designed to ensure that any graph with the minimum number of edges (respectively, maximum degree) that *admits* these orderings as \mathcal{S} -orderings contain all edges in (p, q) -drones for some specific values of p and q . This is typically achieved by generating, for each edge of the corresponding (p, q) -drone, an ordering in which the two endpoints of the edge appear as the first and second vertices, respectively. In some reductions, however, the first group is constructed more carefully to serve additional technical purposes. It is worth emphasizing that, although we often define a (p, q) -drone in our reductions, the drone itself does not belong to the reduction instance. It is defined solely to facilitate the understanding of the reduction and to aid in the correctness proof. The second group encodes the solution structure of the underlying VERTEX COVER instance. Specifically, this group ensures that the input graph admits a vertex cover S of size κ if and only if every graph with at most k edges (respectively, maximum degree at most k) that admits the orderings in this group as \mathcal{S} -orderings contains all edges between S and a designated vertex z (not in the (p, q) -drone). In some

reductions, the two groups of orderings are not strictly disjoint, as certain orderings may simultaneously fulfill the roles of both classes.

We now begin our exploration of the hardness results. For clarity, we establish the following global notations that will be used throughout the proofs.

Global Notations and Assumptions. In all reductions, we consider instances of VERTEX COVER of the form $I = (G, \kappa)$, where G is a 3-regular graph. We denote by n the number of vertices of G and by m the number of edges of G ; since G is 3-regular, we have $m = 3n/2$. The vertex set and edge set of G are denoted by V and E , respectively. Moreover, $\vec{V} = (v_1, v_2, \dots, v_n)$ denotes an arbitrary fixed ordering of V , and $\vec{E} = (e_1, e_2, \dots, e_m)$ denotes an arbitrary fixed ordering of E . We assume that $n \geq 4$, $m \geq 6$, and $\kappa \geq 2$. These conventions will be used throughout without further mention.

For two orderings X and Y , we use (X, Y) to denote their concatenation. This notation extends naturally to multiple orderings; for instance, if $X = (x_1, x_2, x_3)$, $Y = (y_1, y_2)$, and $Z = (z_1, z_2)$, then $(X, Y, Z) = (x_1, x_2, x_3, y_1, y_2, z_1, z_2)$.

We now present our first hardness result.

Theorem 3.1. EDGE-BOUNDED-BFS-SP is NP-hard.

Proof. Given an instance $I = (G, \kappa)$ of VERTEX COVER, where $G = (V, E)$ is a 3-regular graph, we construct an instance of EDGE-BOUNDED-BFS-SP as follows.

We first define a set Π of $2m \cdot n^2 \cdot (n^2 - 1)$ orderings. These orderings are constructed so that any graph with the minimum number of edges that admits Π as a set of BFS-orderings must contain all edges of a specific graph G' , obtained from G by the following operations:

- (1) Add edges to make V a clique.
- (2) For each $i \in [n]$, add a set $F_i = \{f_i^1, f_i^2, \dots, f_i^{n^2}\}$ of n^2 pendants of v_i .
- (3) Add an isolated vertex z .

Clearly, $G' - z$ is an (n, n^2) -drone, and G' has $\frac{n \cdot (n-1)}{2} + n^3$ edges. We now detail the construction of the orderings in Π . For each $i \in [n]$, let $\vec{F}_i = (f_i^1, f_i^2, \dots, f_i^{n^2})$, and let $\vec{F} = (\vec{F}_1, \vec{F}_2, \dots, \vec{F}_n)$.

For every edge $\{v_i, v_j\} \in E(G)$ such that $i, j \in [n]$ and $i < j$, every $t \in [n] \setminus \{i, j\}$, and every pair $\{p, q\} \subseteq [n^2]$ with $p < q$, we construct the following four orderings of $V(G')$, all included in Π :

$$\begin{aligned} \pi((i, j), t, (p, q)) &= \left(f_i^p, v_i, \vec{F}_i \ominus \{f_i^p, f_i^q\}, f_i^q, v_j, \vec{V} \ominus \{v_i, v_j, v_t\}, v_t, z, \vec{F}_j, \vec{F} \ominus (F_i \cup F_j \cup F_t), \vec{F}_t \right), \\ \pi((i, j), t, (q, p)) &= \left(f_i^q, v_i, \vec{F}_i \ominus \{f_i^q, f_i^p\}, f_i^p, v_j, \vec{V} \ominus \{v_i, v_j, v_t\}, v_t, z, \vec{F}_j, \vec{F} \ominus (F_i \cup F_j \cup F_t), \vec{F}_t \right), \\ \pi((j, i), t, (p, q)) &= \left(f_j^p, v_j, \vec{F}_j \ominus \{f_j^p, f_j^q\}, f_j^q, v_i, \vec{V} \ominus \{v_i, v_j, v_t\}, v_t, z, \vec{F}_i, \vec{F} \ominus (F_i \cup F_j \cup F_t), \vec{F}_t \right), \\ \pi((j, i), t, (q, p)) &= \left(f_j^q, v_j, \vec{F}_j \ominus \{f_j^q, f_j^p\}, f_j^p, v_i, \vec{V} \ominus \{v_i, v_j, v_t\}, v_t, z, \vec{F}_i, \vec{F} \ominus (F_i \cup F_j \cup F_t), \vec{F}_t \right). \end{aligned}$$

Let $k = \kappa + |E(G')| = \kappa + \frac{n \cdot (n-1)}{2} + n^3$. We define the resulting instance of EDGE-BOUNDED-BFS-SP as $g(I) = (V(G'), \Pi, k)$, which can be constructed in polynomial time. We show that I is a Yes-instance of VERTEX COVER if and only if $g(I)$ is a Yes-instance of EDGE-BOUNDED-BFS-SP.

(\Rightarrow) Assume that G admits a vertex cover $S \subseteq V$ of size κ . Let H be the graph obtained from G' by adding the κ edges between z and the vertices in S . Then, H has exactly $|E(G')| + \kappa = k$ edges. It is easy to verify that every ordering in Π is a BFS-ordering of H . As an illustration, consider an ordering $\pi((i, j), t, (p, q))$ defined above, and let σ denote this ordering. Observe that $\sigma_{[\dots v_i]}$ is a partial BFS-ordering of H . The next vertex visited in σ is z . Since S is a vertex cover of G , it follows that $\{v_i, v_j\} \cap S \neq \emptyset$. Hence, at least one of v_i and v_j is adjacent to z in H . All vertices between v_i and z in σ are neighbors of v_i in H . Consequently, if z is a neighbor of v_i in H , then $\sigma_{[\dots z]}$ remains a partial

BFS-ordering of H . Otherwise, z is a neighbor of v_j . Observe that no vertex succeeding z in σ is adjacent to v_i , and that every vertex between v_j and z in σ is adjacent to v_j in H . It follows that $\sigma_{[\dots z]}$ is again a partial BFS-ordering of H . Each of the remaining vertices that succeed z in σ is a pendant of some vertex in V , and all of them are equidistant from the first visited vertex f_i^p . Therefore, regardless of the order in which these pendant vertices are visited, σ remains a BFS-ordering of H .

We now conclude the proof that $g(I)$ is a Yes-instance by constructing a Yes-witness H for it.

(\Leftarrow) Assume that $g(I)$ is a Yes-instance. Let H denote now a BFS-support of Π with the minimum number of edges. Our proof breaks down into the following claims.

Claim 1. *Let $i \in [n]$ and let $\{p, q\} \subseteq [n^2]$ with $p < q$. Then Π*

(1) *contains at least one ordering in which f_i^p is the first vertex, and f_i^q succeeds all vertices in F_i , and*

(2) *contains at least one ordering in which f_i^q is the first vertex, and f_i^p succeeds all vertices in F_i .*

Proof. Let v_j be an arbitrary neighbor of v_i in G , where $j \in [n] \setminus \{i\}$, and let t be an arbitrary element of $[n] \setminus \{i, j\}$. Since G is 3-regular and $n \geq 4$, v_j and t exist. We first prove statement (1). By the construction, if $i < j$, then the ordering $\pi((i, j), t, (p, q)) \in \Pi$ satisfies the required condition. Otherwise, the ordering $\pi((j, i), t, (p, q)) \in \Pi$ has the desired structure. The proof of statement (2) follows analogously. If $i < j$, then the ordering $\pi((i, j), t, (q, p))$ satisfies the required condition; otherwise, the ordering $\pi((j, i), t, (q, p))$ does. \square

Claim 2. *Let $i \in [n]$. Then, F_i induces either a clique or an independent set in H .*

Proof. If F_i induces an independent set in H , the claim holds. Otherwise, let $f_i^p, f_i^q \in F_i$ be adjacent in H . By Claim 1, there exists an ordering in Π where f_i^p is the first vertex, f_i^q is the last among vertices of F_i , and every other vertex of F_i lies between them. Then, by Lemma 2.3, f_i^p is adjacent to all other vertices in F_i in H . Now let $f_i^r \in F_i$ be arbitrary. By Claim 1 and Lemma 2.3 once more, f_i^r is adjacent to all vertices in $F_i \setminus \{f_i^r\}$. This implies that F_i is a clique in H . \square

Claim 3. *The graph H contains at most $n \cdot (n - 2)/2 + n^3 + n$ edges.*

Proof. Since $V(G)$ is a vertex cover of G , the correctness proof for the (\Rightarrow) direction implies that the graph obtained from G' by adding edges between z and $V(G)$ is a BFS-support of Π . Consequently, $|E(H)| \leq |E(G')| + n = n \cdot (n - 2)/2 + n^3 + n$. \square

Claim 4. *Let $i \in [n]$ and let $p \in [n^2]$. Then, f_i^p is a pendant of v_i in H .*

Proof. Suppose for contradiction that f_i^p has a neighbor x in H with $x \neq v_i$. We distinguish between two exhaustive cases.

Case 1: $x \in F_i$.

By Claim 2, the set F_i induces a clique in H , contributing $n^2 \cdot (n^2 - 1)/2$ edges within F_i . However, since $n \geq 4$, this contradicts Claim 3.

Case 2: $x \notin F_i$.

By the construction, there exists an ordering in Π in which f_i^p is the first vertex, and all vertices of F_i precede x . By Lemma 2.3, f_i^p is adjacent to every vertex in $F_i \setminus \{f_i^p\}$ in H . This reduces to Case 1 and yields a contradiction.

Therefore, f_i^p has no neighbor in H other than v_i , and is thus a pendant of v_i . \square

Claim 5. $E(G) \subseteq E(H)$.

Proof. Let $\{v_i, v_j\}$ be an edge in G with $\{i, j\} \subseteq [n]$ and $i < j$. Choose any arbitrary $t \in [n] \setminus \{i, j\}$, any pair $\{p, q\} \subseteq [n^2]$ with $p < q$, and consider the ordering $\pi((i, j), t, (p, q))$ constructed in Π . In this ordering, the first $n^2 + 1$ vertices are exactly those in $F_i \cup \{v_i\}$, and the next vertex is v_j . By Claim 4, each vertex in F_i is adjacent only to v_i in H . Since this ordering is a BFS-ordering of H , Observation 1 implies that v_j is adjacent to v_i in H . As the choice of $\{v_i, v_j\}$ was arbitrary, it follows that $E(G) \subseteq E(H)$. \square

Claim 6. *If a vertex $v_i \in V$ is adjacent to two distinct vertices $v_j, v_t \in V \setminus \{v_i\}$ in H , where $\{i, j, t\} \subseteq [n]$, then v_i is adjacent to all vertices in $V \setminus \{v_i\}$ in H .*

Proof. Let f_i^p , $p \in [n^2]$, be an arbitrary vertex from F_i , and Let v' be an arbitrary vertex from $V \setminus \{v_i, v_j, v_t\}$. Both vertices exist since $n \geq 4$. By construction, there exists an ordering $\sigma \in \Pi$ such that:

- (i) f_i^p and v_i are the first and second vertices, respectively; and
- (ii) $v_i <_\sigma v' <_\sigma v_t$.

Assume for contradiction that v_i is not adjacent to v' in H . By the four-point ordering characterization of BFS (Lemma 2.1, Statement 2) and Condition (ii), a vertex preceding v_i in σ must be adjacent to v' in H . By Condition (i), the only vertex preceding v_i is f_i^p . By Claim 4, f_i^p is a pendant of v_i in H , a contradiction.

Since v' was chosen arbitrarily, v_i is adjacent to all vertices in $V \setminus \{v_i\}$ in H . \square

Since G is 3-regular, Claim 5 implies that every vertex in V is adjacent to three vertices of V within H . By Claim 6, this implies that V induces a clique in H . By Claim 4, for every $i \in [n]$, all vertices of F_i are pendants of v_i in H . Hence, $H - z$ is an (n, n^2) -drone. Equivalently, $H - z$ and $G' - z$ are identical. Since z is isolated in G' , it follows that $E(G') = E(H - z)$.

We now show that if $g(I)$ is a Yes-instance of EDGE-BOUNDED-BFS-SP, then G admits a vertex cover of size κ . To this end, suppose that $|E(H)| \leq k = \kappa + |E(G')|$. Define $\kappa' = |E(H)| - |E(G')|$, so that $\kappa' \leq \kappa$. Let $S = N_H(z)$ denote the neighborhood of z in H . By Claim 4, we have $S \subseteq V$. Since $H - z = G' - z$, the only edges of H not contained in G' are those incident to z . Hence, $|S| = |E(H)| - |E(G')| = \kappa' \leq \kappa$.

Claim 7. *S is a vertex cover of G .*

Proof. Let $\{v_i, v_j\}$ be an arbitrary edge in G with $i, j \in [n]$ and $i < j$. Choose any arbitrary pair $\{p, q\} \subseteq [n^2]$ with $p < q$, and any $t \in [n] \setminus \{i, j\}$, both of which exist since $n \geq 4$. Consider the ordering $\pi((i, j), t, (p, q))$ constructed in Π (denoted it by σ for brevity):

$$\sigma = \left(f_i^p, v_i, \vec{F}_i \ominus \{p, q\}, f_i^q, v_j, \vec{V} \ominus \{v_i, v_j, v_t\}, v_t, z, \vec{F}_j, \vec{F} \ominus (F_i \cup F_j \cup F_t), \vec{F}_t \right).$$

If z is adjacent to v_j in H , then $v_j \in S$. Otherwise, let f_j be any vertex in F_j . By Claim 4, f_j is adjacent to v_j in H . Since $v_j <_\sigma z <_\sigma f_j$, the four-point ordering characterization of BFS (Lemma 2.1, Statement 2) implies that some vertex preceding v_j in σ , that is, some vertex in $F_i \cup \{v_i\}$, is adjacent to z in H . By Claim 4, no vertex from F_i is adjacent to z in H , and therefore v_i must be adjacent to z , implying $v_i \in S$. Since the choice of the edge $\{v_i, v_j\}$ was arbitrary, we know that S covers all edges of G . \square

By Claim 7 and the bound $|S| \leq \kappa$, we conclude that I is a Yes-instance of VERTEX COVER. \square

The above proof also applies to LexBFS.

Theorem 3.2. EDGE-BOUNDED-LEXBFS-SP is NP-hard.

Proof. We adopt the same reduction presented in Theorem 3.1.

For the correctness of the (\Rightarrow) direction, we let $S \subseteq V(G)$ denote a vertex cover of G of size κ , and prove that the graph H obtained from G' by adding edges between z and all vertices in S is a LexBFS-support of Π .

Claim 8. *Every ordering constructed in Π is a LexBFS-ordering of H .*

Proof. By symmetry, it suffices to show that the ordering $\pi((i, j), t, (p, q))$ defined in the proof of Theorem 3.1, is a LexBFS ordering of H . Let σ denote this ordering.

The first vertex in σ is f_i^p , followed by its unique neighbor v_i in H . Thus, $\sigma_{\leq 2}$ forms a partial LexBFS ordering of H . Next, σ visits all remaining vertices in F_i , which form an independent set in H ; hence $\sigma_{\leq n^2+1}$ remains a partial LexBFS-ordering of H .

Subsequently, the ordering proceeds through the remaining $n - 1$ vertices in V , which, together with v_i , form a clique in H . Note that none of the vertices in $V \setminus \{v_i\}$ is adjacent to any vertex in F_i . Consequently, $\sigma_{\leq n^2+n}$ is a partial LexBFS-ordering of H .

The next vertex visited by σ is z . Since S is a vertex cover of G , we have $\{v_i, v_j\} \cap S \neq \emptyset$, and thus z is adjacent to at least one of v_i and v_j in H . Accordingly, z has distance at most three from f_i^p . All vertices visited after z are in $\vec{F} \ominus F_i$ and have distance three from f_i^p . Moreover, no vertex in this set is adjacent in H to any vertex preceding v_j in σ , including v_i . It follows that $\sigma_{\leq n^2+n+1}$ remains a partial LexBFS-ordering of H .

The remaining suffix of σ is $(\vec{F}_j, \vec{F} \ominus (F_i \cup F_j \cup F_t), \vec{F}_t)$, for which the following properties hold:

- For every $x \in [n] \setminus \{i\}$, the vertices of F_x appear consecutively in σ .
- For any $x, y \in [n] \setminus \{i\}$, if $v_x <_\sigma v_y$, then $F_x <_\sigma F_y$.

Since for every $x \in [n]$ each vertex of F_x is a pendant of v_x in H , these properties imply that σ is a LexBFS-ordering of H . \square

For the (\Leftarrow) direction, note that every LexBFS-ordering is also a BFS-ordering of the same graph (Lemma 2.2). Therefore, the (\Leftarrow) direction follows directly from the corresponding argument in the proof of Theorem 3.1. \square

The reduction for EDGE-BOUNDED-BFS-SP can be adapted to show the hardness of the variant that bounds the maximum degree.

Theorem 3.3. *DEG-BOUNDED-BFS-SP is NP-hard.*

Proof. We adapt the reduction used in the proof of Theorem 3.1. Starting from the graph G' constructed there, we add a set Z of $n \cdot (n+1)$ pendants of z . The resulting graph G' has $n+n^2+n \cdot (n+1) = 2n+2n^2$ vertices and $n \cdot (n-1)/2 + n^3 + n \cdot (n+1)$ edges. Moreover, the subgraph $G' - (Z \cup \{z\})$ forms an (n, n^2) -drone. We now define the family Π of orderings. Let

$$\vec{Z} = (z_1, z_2, \dots, z_{n \cdot (n+1)})$$

be an arbitrary ordering of Z .

For every edge $\{v_i, v_j\} \in E(G)$ with $i < j$, every pair $\{p, q\} \subseteq [n^2]$ with $p < q$, every $t \in [n] \setminus \{i, j\}$, and every pair $\{\ell, r\} \subseteq [n \cdot (n+1)]$ with $\ell < r$, we add to Π the following orderings. Let $\alpha \in \{(i, j), (j, i)\}$ and $\beta \in \{(p, q), (q, p)\}$. For each such choice of α and β , we include

$$\begin{aligned} \pi'(\alpha, t, \beta, (\ell, r)) &= (\pi(\alpha, t, \beta), z_\ell, \vec{Z} \setminus \{z_\ell, z_r\}, z_r), \\ \pi'(\alpha, t, \beta, (r, \ell)) &= (\pi(\alpha, t, \beta), z_r, \vec{Z} \setminus \{z_\ell, z_r\}, z_\ell). \end{aligned}$$

Here, $\pi((i, j), t, (p, q))$, $\pi((i, j), t, (q, p))$, $\pi((j, i), t, (p, q))$, and $\pi((j, i), t, (q, p))$ are the orderings defined in the proof of Theorem 3.1.

Let $k = \kappa + n \cdot (n + 1)$ and define $g(I) = (V(G'), \Pi, k)$ as an instance of DEG-BOUNDED-BFS-SP. This instance can be constructed in polynomial time. We now prove the correctness of the reduction.

(\Rightarrow) Assume that G admits a vertex cover S of size κ . Let H be the graph obtained from G' by adding the edges between z and the vertices in S . In H , the vertex z has the maximum degree $\kappa + n \cdot (n + 1) = k$. By an argument analogous to that in the proof of Theorem 3.1, H is a BFS-support of Π .

(\Leftarrow) Assume that $g(I)$ is a Yes-instance of DEG-BOUNDED-BFS-SP; that is, Π admits a BFS-support H with maximum degree at most k . To show that G has a vertex cover of size κ , we establish the following structural properties of H .

Claim 9. *Let $i \in [n]$ and $p \in [n^2]$. Then, f_i^p is adjacent to v_i in H .*

Proof. By construction, there exists an ordering in Π in which f_i^p and v_i are the first and second vertices, respectively. Since H is a BFS-support of Π , Observation 1 implies that f_i^p and v_i are adjacent in H . \square

$$\text{Let } F = \bigcup_{b \in [n]} F_b.$$

Claim 10. *Let $i \in [n]$ and $p \in [n^2]$. Then, $N_H(f_i^p) \subseteq F_i \cup \{v_i\}$.*

Proof. Suppose, for contradiction, that $f_i^p \in F_i$ has a neighbor $x \notin F_i \cup \{v_i\}$ in H . We distinguish three exhaustive cases according to the location of x .

Case 1: $x \in F \setminus F_i$.

Let $t \in [n] \setminus \{i\}$ be such that $x \in F_t$. Let v_j be any neighbor of v_i in G , where $j \in [n] \setminus \{i\}$, which exists since G is 3-regular. Choose an arbitrary $q \in [n^2] \setminus \{p\}$, and any pair $\{\ell, r\} \subseteq [n \cdot (n + 1)]$ with $\ell < r$. By construction, there exists an ordering $\sigma \in \Pi$ corresponding to the edge $\{v_i, v_j\}$, the pair $\{p, q\}$, the integer t , and the pair $\{\ell, r\}$ such that:

- f_i^p appears first, and
- all vertices of F_t , including x , succeed all $n + n^2 \cdot (n - 1)$ vertices in $V \cup (F \setminus F_t)$.

Since σ is a BFS-ordering of H , Lemma 2.3 implies that f_i^p is adjacent to all vertices preceding x in σ . Therefore, the degree of f_i^p in H is at least

$$|V| + |F \setminus F_t| + 1 = n + n^2 \cdot (n - 1) + 1 > k = \kappa + n \cdot (n + 1),$$

provided $n \geq \kappa \geq 4$. This contradicts the assumption that H has maximum degree at most k .

Case 2: $x \in V \setminus \{v_i\}$.

Let $x = v_j$ for some $j \in [n] \setminus \{i\}$. As in Case 1, there exists an ordering $\sigma \in \Pi$ such that:

- some $f_j^{p'} \in F_j$, where $p' \in [n^2]$, appears first,
- v_j appears second, and
- f_i^p succeeds all $n^2 \cdot (n - 1)$ vertices in $F \setminus F_i$.

By the argument in Case 1, $f_j^{p'}$ is not adjacent to any vertex in $F \setminus F_j$, in particular not to f_i^p . Since v_j is adjacent to f_i^p , and σ is a BFS-ordering of H , the four-point ordering characterization of BFS (Lemma 2.1, Statement 2) implies that v_j is adjacent to all vertices in $F \setminus (F_i \cup F_j)$ between v_j and f_i^p in σ . Therefore, v_j has at least $1 + n^2 \cdot (n - 2)$ neighbors in H . Since $n \geq \kappa \geq 4$, this again contradicts that H has maximum degree at most k .

Case 3: $x \in Z \cup \{z\}$.

As in Case 1, there exists an ordering in Π where f_i^p appears first, and all vertices in V precede all vertices in $Z \cup \{z\}$, including x . Since f_i^p is adjacent to x in H , and the ordering is a BFS-ordering of H , the four-point ordering characterization of BFS (Lemma 2.3) implies that f_i^p is adjacent to all vertices in V . This reduces to Case 2, which has already been shown to yield a contradiction.

We conclude that $N_H(f_i^p) \subseteq F_i \cup \{v_i\}$. □

Claim 11. *No vertex in Z is adjacent to any vertex from V in H .*

Proof. Assume for contradiction that there exists $z' \in Z$ adjacent to some $v_i \in V$, where $i \in [n]$. Let f be an arbitrary vertex from F_i . There exists an ordering $\sigma \in \Pi$ in which f , v_i , and z' appear first, second, and last, respectively. By Claim 10, f is not adjacent to any vertex from $F \setminus F_i$ in H . Since σ is a BFS-ordering of H , the four-point ordering characterization of BFS (Lemma 2.1, Statement 2) implies that v_i is adjacent to all vertices in $F \setminus F_i$, and hence has degree at least $1 + n^2 \cdot (n - 1)$ in H . However, since $n \geq \kappa \geq 4$, this contradicts the assumption that H has maximum degree at most $\kappa + n \cdot (n + 1)$. □

Claim 12. *Every vertex in Z is adjacent to z in H .*

Proof. Let $z' \in Z$. There exists an ordering $\sigma \in \Pi$ in which the set of predecessors of z' is exactly $F \cup V \cup \{z\}$. Since σ is a BFS-ordering of H , z' is adjacent to at least one of its predecessors (Observation 1), and by Claims 10 and 11, this predecessor must be z . □

Let $S = N_H(z) \cap V$ be the set of neighbors of z in V within the graph H .

Claim 13. *S is a vertex cover of G .*

Proof. Let $\{v_i, v_j\}$ be an arbitrary edge of G , where $i, j \in [n]$ and $i < j$. Choose arbitrary $\{p, q\} \subseteq [n^2]$ with $p < q$ and any $t \in [n] \setminus \{i, j\}$. In the current reduction, there exists an ordering in Π whose prefix is $\pi((i, j), t, (p, q))$ defined in the proof of Theorem 3.1. The remainder of the argument is identical to the proof of Claim 7 in the proof of Theorem 3.1, which shows that $\{v_i, v_j\} \cap S \neq \emptyset$. Since the choice of $\{v_i, v_j\}$ was arbitrary, S is a vertex cover of G . □

By Claim 12 and the fact that H has maximum degree at most k , the vertex z has at most $k - |Z| = \kappa$ neighbors in V . Thus, $|S| \leq \kappa$. Any κ -subset $S' \subseteq V$ with $S \subseteq S'$ is a Yes-witness for the instance I . □

Using the same reduction, the NP-hardness proof extends to LexBFS.

Theorem 3.4. DEG-BOUNDED-LEXBFS-SP is NP-hard.

Proof. We use the same reduction as in the proof of Theorem 3.3. For the (\Rightarrow) direction, it was shown there that if G has a vertex cover S of size κ , then the graph H , obtained from G' by adding the κ edges between z and the vertices in S , has maximum degree k and is a BFS-support of Π . It therefore suffices to show that H is also a LexBFS-support of Π . Consider an ordering $\sigma = \pi'((i, j), t, (p, q), (\ell, r))$. By construction, σ has $\pi((i, j), t, (p, q))$ as a prefix. By construction, the subgraph of H induced by the vertices in this prefix is identical to that used in the proof of Theorem 3.2, which, as we have shown, admits Π as a set of LexBFS-orderings. The remaining vertices in σ are those of Z , which form an independent set and are pendants of z in H . Hence, σ is a LexBFS-ordering of H . The correctness of the (\Leftarrow) direction follows analogously to the proof of Theorem 3.3. □

We next establish NP-hardness for DFS.

Theorem 3.5. EDGE-BOUNDED-DFS-SP is NP-hard.

Proof. Given an instance $I = (G, \kappa)$ of VERTEX COVER, where $G = (V, E)$ is a 3-regular graph, we construct an instance of EDGE-BOUNDED-DFS-SP as follows. Let G' be the graph obtained from G by:

- (1) adding edges to make V a clique;
- (2) for every $i \in [n]$, adding a pendant vertex f_i adjacent to v_i ;
- (3) adding an isolated vertex z .

The graph G' has $2n + 1$ vertices and $n \cdot (n - 1)/2 + n$ edges, and $G' - z$ is an $(n, 1)$ -drone. Let $\overrightarrow{VF} = (v_1, f_1, v_2, f_2, \dots, v_n, f_n)$. We construct a set Π of orderings as follows:

- (i) For each pair $\{i, j\} \subseteq [n]$ with $i < j$, add to Π the ordering

$$\sigma_{(i,j)} = (v_i, v_j, f_j, \overrightarrow{VF} \ominus \{v_i, f_i, v_j, f_j\}, z, f_i).$$

- (ii) For each $i \in [n]$, add to Π the ordering

$$\sigma_i = (f_i, v_i, \overrightarrow{VF} \ominus \{v_i, f_i\}, z).$$

- (iii) For each edge $\{v_i, v_j\}$ in G , where $\{i, j\} \subseteq [n]$ and $i < j$, add to Π the following two orderings:

$$\begin{aligned} \sigma_{(i,j)} &= (\overrightarrow{VF} \ominus \{v_i, f_i, v_j, f_j\}, v_i, v_j, f_j, z, f_i), \\ \sigma_{(j,i)} &= (\overrightarrow{VF} \ominus \{v_j, f_j, v_i, f_i\}, v_j, v_i, f_i, z, f_j). \end{aligned}$$

We have $|\Pi| = n \cdot (n - 1)/2 + n + 2m = n \cdot (n - 1)/2 + 4n$. Let $k = \kappa + |E(G')|$, and define $g(I) = (V, \Pi, k)$. We prove below that I is an instance of VERTEX COVER if and only if $g(I)$ is an Yes-instance of EDGE-BOUNDED-DFS-SP.

(\Rightarrow) Assume that G admits a vertex cover S of κ vertices. Let H be the graph obtained from G' by adding the κ edges between z and the vertices from S . It is not difficult to verify that every ordering constructed in (i)–(ii) is a DFS-ordering of H . Consider an ordering $\sigma_{(i,j)}$ created in (iii) corresponding to an edge $\{v_i, v_j\}$ with $i < j$. The prefix of $\sigma_{(i,j)}$ preceding z forms a partial DFS-ordering of H . After visiting f_j , DFS backtracks to v_j . If z is adjacent to v_j in H , then z can be visited next, and f_i , which is a pendant of v_i in H , can be visited last. Otherwise, neither of the remaining vertices is adjacent to v_j , so the DFS backtracks further to v_i . Since S is a vertex cover, by the construction of H , z is adjacent to v_i , and hence z can be visited next, followed by f_i as the last vertex. We conclude that $\sigma_{(i,j)}$ is a DFS-ordering of H . The argument for $\sigma_{(j,i)}$ is analogous. Since H contains at most k edges, $g(I)$ is a Yes-instance of EDGE-BOUNDED-DFS-SP.

(\Leftarrow) Assume that $g(I)$ is a Yes-instance of EDGE-BOUNDED-DFS-SP, and let H be a DFS-support of Π with the minimum number of edges. Then, H contains at most $k = \kappa + \frac{n(n-1)}{2} + n$ edges. The structure of the DFS-orderings in groups (i) and (ii), particularly the placement of the first two vertices, leads to the following observation.

Observation 2. $E(G') \subseteq E(H)$.

We now conclude the proof with the following claims.

Claim 14. *Let $\{v_i, v_j\}$ be an edge in G with $i, j \in [n]$ and $i < j$. Then, in the graph H :*

- (a) z is adjacent to at least one of v_i, v_j , or f_i , and
- (b) z is adjacent to at least one of v_i, v_j , or f_j .

Proof. If z is adjacent to at least one of v_i or v_j , both statements in the claim hold. Hence, suppose that z is adjacent to neither v_i nor v_j .

Consider the last five vertices in the ordering $\sigma_{(i,j)}$ constructed in (iii), which appear in the relative order (v_i, v_j, f_j, z, f_i) . By Observation 2, we know that v_i and f_i are adjacent in H . Since $\sigma_{(i,j)}$ is a DFS-ordering of H , Lemma 2.1 (Statement 3) implies that if z is not adjacent to v_i , then it must be adjacent to at least one of v_j or f_j . By assumption, z is not adjacent to v_j , and therefore it must be adjacent to f_j , establishing Statement (b).

To prove Statement (a), consider instead the final five vertices in the order (v_j, v_i, f_i, z, f_j) from the ordering $\sigma_{(j,i)}$ introduced in (iii). By Observation 2, v_j and f_j are adjacent in H . An argument entirely analogous to that for Statement (b) shows that if z is adjacent to neither v_i nor v_j , then it must be adjacent to f_i in H . \square

Based on Claim 14, we construct a vertex cover of G as follows. Let $S_V = N_H(z) \cap V$ be the set of neighbors of z from V in H .

We iteratively construct another set S_F , initialized as the empty set, as follows: for every edge $\{v_i, v_j\}$ in G such that z is adjacent to neither v_i nor v_j in H , arbitrarily add one of v_i or v_j to S_F .

It is clear that $S_V \cup S_F$ forms a vertex cover of G . We next show that this set contains at most κ vertices.

Claim 15. $|S_V \cup S_F| \leq \kappa$.

Proof. Let $h = |S_V|$ denote the number of edges between z and vertices in V in the graph H , and let $h' = |S_F|$ denote the number of edges between z and vertices in $\{f_1, f_2, \dots, f_n\}$. Thus, $h + h'$ equals the degree of z in H .

Consider an edge $\{v_i, v_j\} \in E(G)$. By Claim 14, if z is adjacent to neither v_i nor v_j in H , then it must be adjacent to both f_i and f_j . Consequently, we have $|S_F| \leq h'$.

Since H contains at most $k = \kappa + |E(G')|$ edges and G' is a subgraph of H (by Observation 2), it follows that:

$$h + h' \leq |E(H)| - |E(G')| \leq k - |E(G')| = \kappa.$$

Therefore,

$$|S_V \cup S_F| = |S_V| + |S_F| \leq h + h' \leq \kappa,$$

which proves the claim. \square

By the above claim, we conclude that $S_V \cup S_F$ is a vertex cover of G of size at most κ , and hence the instance I is a Yes-instance of VERTEX COVER. This completes the proof of Theorem 3.5. \square

Building upon the reduction presented in the previous proof, we obtain the following result.

Theorem 3.6. DEG-BOUNDED-DFS-SP is NP-hard.

Proof. We prove the theorem by modifying the reduction presented in the proof of Theorem 3.5. Let $I = (G, \kappa)$ be an instance of VERTEX COVER, where G is a 3-regular graph. Starting from the graph G' constructed there, we add a set Z of n pendants of the vertex z . The resulting graph G' has $2n + 1$ vertices and $n \cdot (n - 1)/2 + 2n$ edges, and $G' - (Z \cup \{z\})$ forms an $(n, 1)$ -drone. Let \vec{VF} be defined as before, and let $\vec{Z} = (z_1, z_2, \dots, z_n)$ be an arbitrary ordering of Z . We now construct a set Π of vertex orderings on $V(G')$ as follows:

(i) For each $i, j \in [n]$ with $i < j$, include the ordering

$$\sigma_{(i < j)} = \left(v_i, v_j, f_j, \vec{VF} \ominus \{v_i, f_i, v_j, f_j\}, z, \vec{Z}, f_i \right).$$

(ii) For each $i \in [n]$ and each $t \in [n]$, include the ordering

$$\sigma_i = \left(f_i, v_i, \overrightarrow{VF} \ominus \{v_i, f_i\}, z, z_t, \overrightarrow{Z} \ominus \{z_t\} \right).$$

(iii) For each edge $\{v_i, v_j\}$ in G with $i < j$, include the two orderings:

$$\sigma_{(i,j)} = \left(\overrightarrow{VF} \ominus \{v_i, f_i, v_j, f_j\}, v_i, v_j, f_j, z, \overrightarrow{Z}, f_i \right),$$

$$\sigma_{(j,i)} = \left(\overrightarrow{VF} \ominus \{v_j, f_j, v_i, f_i\}, v_j, v_i, f_i, z, \overrightarrow{Z}, f_j \right).$$

Let $k = \kappa + n$, and define $g(I) = (V(G'), \Pi, k)$ as an instance of DEG-BOUNDED-DFS-SP. We show that G has a vertex cover of size κ if and only if Π admits a DFS-support of maximum degree at most k .

(\Rightarrow) Suppose G has a vertex cover $S \subseteq V(G)$ of size κ . Let H be the graph obtained from G' by adding the κ edges between z and the vertices of S . Then z has degree $\kappa + n = k$ in H , and every other vertex has degree at most $n + 2$. To complete the proof in this direction, it remains to show that all orderings constructed above are DFS-orderings of H , which is straightforward for the orderings in (i) and (ii). Now consider the two orderings in (iii) corresponding to an edge $\{v_i, v_j\} \in E(G)$ with $i < j$. For both $\sigma_{(i,j)}$ and $\sigma_{(j,i)}$, the prefix consisting of all vertices preceding z clearly forms a partial DFS-ordering of H . By the same argument as in the proof of Theorem 3.1, the next visited vertex z is adjacent to at least one of v_i or v_j , since S is a vertex cover of G . Recall also that none of the other unvisited vertices is adjacent to v_j in H . Thus, after visiting z , both orderings remain partial DFS-orderings of H . Each ordering then visits the n pendant vertices of z , followed by the remaining pendant of v_i in $\sigma_{(i,j)}$ (or of v_j in $\sigma_{(j,i)}$). Hence, both orderings are DFS-orderings of H .

(\Leftarrow) Suppose $g(I)$ is a Yes-instance of DEG-BOUNDED-DFS-SP, and let H be a DFS-support of Π with maximum degree at most $k = \kappa + n$. Observe that Observation 2 and Claim 14 from the proof of Theorem 3.5 apply unchanged. Let S_V and S_F be defined as in the proof of Theorem 3.5. By the same argument as in the proof of Claim 15, we conclude that $S_V \cup S_F$ is a vertex cover of G of size at most κ . \square

We now turn to LEXDFS. Let \mathcal{S} be a graph search paradigm studied in the paper. Given a graph G and an ordering σ on a subset $A \subseteq V(G)$, we define $\mathcal{S}(G; \sigma)$ as follows:

- (1) Construct a graph G^{\clubsuit} from G by turning A into a clique.
- (2) Run \mathcal{S} on G^{\clubsuit} to obtain an \mathcal{S} -ordering σ' of G^{\clubsuit} such that σ is a prefix of σ' . Specifically, we first visit the vertices of σ in their given order, and then proceed with the remaining vertices according to the rules of \mathcal{S} ; this is feasible since A forms a clique in G^{\clubsuit} .
- (3) Define $\mathcal{S}(G; \sigma)$ as $\sigma' \ominus A$, that is, the ordering obtained from σ' by removing all vertices in A .

Lemma 3.1. *Let G be a graph, let $A \subseteq V(G)$ be a subset of vertices, and let σ be an ordering on A . Then σ is a partial \mathcal{S} -ordering of G if and only if the concatenation $(\sigma, \mathcal{S}(G; \sigma))$ is an \mathcal{S} -ordering of G .*

Proof. The “only if” direction is immediate. For the “if” direction, let $\pi = (\sigma, \mathcal{S}(G; \sigma))$. Suppose that π is a partial \mathcal{S} -ordering of G . To prove that π is an \mathcal{S} -ordering of G , it suffices to show that for every vertex $v \in V(G) \setminus A$, the prefix $\pi_{[\dots v]}$ is a partial \mathcal{S} -ordering of G .

Let $\mathcal{S}(G; \sigma) = (v_1, v_2, \dots, v_t)$, where $t = |V(G)| - |A|$. By construction, for each $i \in [t]$, when the vertex v_i is visited during the execution as described above in (2), its already visited neighbors in G^{\clubsuit} are precisely those vertices in G that precede v_i in π and are adjacent to v_i in G . For all graph search paradigms considered in this paper, the selection of the next vertex to visit is determined entirely by the configuration of visited neighborhoods across all unvisited vertices, namely, by how their sets (or sequences) of visited neighbors compare to one another. It follows inductively that π is an \mathcal{S} -ordering of G . \square




Figure 5: Illustration of the graph G' constructed in the proof of Theorem 3.7. The three edges between each u_x and the dashed boundary indicates that u_x is adjacent to all vertices enclosed by the boundary. Vertices belonging to the same set are shown in the same color. In the reduction, we assume that G is 3-regular and contains at least ten vertices. For simplicity, the figure depicts the construction of G' from a cycle on five vertices.

We next establish our first hardness result for LEXDFS.

Theorem 3.7. EDGE-BOUNDED-LEXDFS-SP is NP-hard.

Proof. Let $I = (G, \kappa)$ be an instance of VERTEX COVER, where G is a 3-regular graph. In this proof, we assume that $n \geq 10$, which ensures that G admits a maximum matching of at least three edges. Consequently, every minimum vertex cover of G contains at least three vertices and at most $n - 1$ vertices. We therefore further assume that $3 \leq \kappa \leq n - 1$.

We now construct an instance $g(I)$ of EDGE-BOUNDED-LEXDFS-SP as follows. Throughout the proof, we use p and q as subscripts for edges of G , and h, i, j, x , and y as subscripts for vertices of G . Accordingly, $p, q \in [m]$ and $h, i, j, x, y \in [n]$. Let G' be obtained from G as follows (see Figure 5).

- (1) For each edge $e_p = \{v_i, v_j\}$ in G , where $i < j$, introduce three new vertices t_p, w_p , and u_p , and add edges as follows:
 - t_p is adjacent to both v_i and v_j ;
 - w_p is adjacent to t_p and v_i ; and
 - u_p is adjacent to t_p and to all vertices in V .

Let $T = \{t_p : p \in [m]\}$, $U = \{u_p : p \in [m]\}$, and $W = \{w_p : p \in [m]\}$.

- (2) Add edges to make V a clique.
- (3) Add a vertex z and make it adjacent to all vertices in T .

We now construct a set Π of orderings, each defined by a prefix σ and completed as $(\sigma, \text{LexDFS}(G'; \sigma))$. We specify only the prefixes and partition the orderings into the following five groups.

- (i) For every pair $\{i, j\} \subseteq [n]$ with $i < j$, choose an edge $e_p = \{v_x, v_y\}$ of G with $x < y$ such that $\{x, y\} \cap \{i, j\} = \emptyset$. Such an edge exists since G has a maximum matching of size at least three. We add to Π the ordering specified by the prefix

$$\left(v_i, v_j, \vec{V} \ominus \{v_i, v_j, v_x, v_y\}, v_x, v_y, u_p, t_p, z \right).$$

- (ii) For each edge $e_p = \{v_i, v_j\}$ of G , choose an edge $e_q = \{v_x, v_y\}$ of G that shares no endpoint with e_p ; such an edge exists by the same argument as before. We add to Π the following three orderings specified by the following prefixes:

$$\begin{aligned} & \left(t_p, v_i, u_p, v_j, \vec{V} \ominus \{v_i, v_j, v_x, v_y\}, v_x, v_y, u_q, t_q, z \right), \\ & \left(t_p, v_j, u_p, v_i, \vec{V} \ominus \{v_i, v_j, v_x, v_y\}, v_x, v_y, u_q, t_q, z \right), \\ & \left(t_p, v_i, w_p, v_j, u_p, \vec{V} \ominus \{v_i, v_j, v_x, v_y\}, v_x, v_y, u_q, t_q, z \right). \end{aligned}$$

- (iii) For every edge $e_p = \{v_i, v_j\}$ in G where $i < j$, we add to Π an ordering specified by the prefix

$$\left(\vec{V} \ominus \{v_i, v_j\}, v_i, v_j, u_p, t_p, z \right).$$

- (iv) For every edge $e_p = \{v_i, v_j\}$ in G with $i < j$ and each $v_h \in V \setminus \{v_i, v_j\}$, we add to Π an ordering with the prefix

$$\left(v_i, v_j, \vec{V} \ominus \{v_i, v_j, v_h\}, v_h, u_p, t_p, z \right).$$

In every prefix defined above, the vertex z appears last. Let $k = \kappa + |E(G')|$, and define the instance of EDGE-BOUNDED-LEXDFS-SP as $g(I) = (V(G'), \Pi, k)$. This construction is computable in polynomial time. We now prove the correctness of the reduction.

(\Rightarrow) Assume that I is a Yes-instance of VERTEX COVER, and let $S \subseteq V$ be a vertex cover of G with $|S| = \kappa$. We show that $g(I)$ is a Yes-instance of EDGE-BOUNDED-LEXDFS-SP.

Let H be obtained from G' by adding edges between z and the vertices of S , so that H has $k = \kappa + |E(G')|$ edges. We show that all orderings in Π are LexDFS-orderings of H . By the construction of Π and Lemma 3.1, it suffices to show that, for each ordering in Π , the specified prefix is a partial LexDFS-ordering of H . We consider each group of orderings separately.

- Orderings in Group (i).

Consider an ordering in Group (i) corresponding to a pair $\{i, j\} \subseteq [n]$ and an edge $e_p = \{v_x, v_y\}$ with $\{i, j\} \cap \{x, y\} = \emptyset$ and $x < y$. The ordering first visits all vertices in V , starting with v_i and v_j and ending with v_x and v_y , and then visits u_p . Since $V \cup \{u_p\}$ forms a clique in H , the restriction of the ordering to this set is a partial LexDFS-ordering of H .

The next vertex, t_p , is the only unvisited neighbor of u_p , and can therefore be visited next. At this point, t_p has two unvisited neighbors, w_p and z . By construction, the vertex w_p has exactly two visited neighbors, namely t_p and v_x . Since S is a vertex cover, it intersects $\{v_x, v_y\}$, and thus z is adjacent to at least one of v_x or v_y in H .

- If z is adjacent to v_y in H , then it has a larger lexicographic label than w_p , so z should be visited next.
- Otherwise, z is adjacent to v_x . Since G has a matching of at least three edges, there exists an edge disjoint from e_p whose endpoints both precede v_x in the ordering. Thus, z still has a larger lexicographic label than w_p , and should be visited next.

Hence, the prefix constructed in Group (i) is a partial LexDFS-ordering of H .

- Orderings in Group (ii).

We analyze the three prefixes defined in Group (ii).

In the first prefix, the first four vertices t_p, v_i, u_p, v_j form a clique in H . The prefix then visits all remaining vertices of V , ending with v_x and v_y , the endpoints of an edge e_q disjoint from $\{v_i, v_j\}$. Since $V \cup \{u_p\}$ is a clique and no vertex in $V \setminus \{v_i, v_j\}$ is adjacent to the first visited vertex t_p , the prefix remains a partial LexDFS-ordering of H after all vertices of V are visited. Then the vertices u_q, t_q , and z are visited in the order (u_q, t_q, z) . The vertex u_q is adjacent to all vertices of V in H , whereas t_q has only two visited neighbors, namely v_x and v_y . Hence, when it is visited, u_q has a larger lexicographic label than t_q . Moreover, we claim that at this moment u_q also has a larger lexicographic label than z . Indeed, if $v_y \notin S$, then z is not adjacent to v_y . Otherwise, since $\kappa \leq n - 1$, there exists a vertex in V not adjacent to z , and additionally z is not adjacent to u_p . In both cases, u_q has a larger label than z . Therefore, the first prefix is a partial LexDFS-ordering of H .

Now, consider the second prefix, which is obtained from the first by swapping v_i and v_j . The same analysis applies, and therefore it is also a partial LexDFS ordering of H .

We now turn to the third prefix. The first three visited vertices t_p, v_i , and w_p form a triangle in H . The vertex w_p has no unvisited neighbors. The next vertex in the prefix, v_j , is adjacent to t_p and v_i in H , and hence must have the maximum lexicographic label at that point. Then, u_p , being adjacent to t_p, v_i , and v_j , has the maximum label and is visited next. The remainder of the analysis is analogous to the discussion for the first prefix.

- Orderings in Group (iii).

Each ordering in this group, corresponding to an edge e_p , first visits the vertices in $V \cup \{u_p\}$, which form a clique in H , with u_p visited last. Then t_p , the only unvisited neighbor of u_p , is visited, followed by z . Thus, the ordering is a partial LexDFS-ordering of H .

- Orderings in Group (iv).

These orderings are similar to those in Group (iii), differing only in the relative positions of vertices in V . The same argument applies, and each such ordering is a partial LexDFS-ordering of H .

This completes the proof that $g(I)$ is a Yes-instance of EDGE-BOUNDED-LEXDFS-SP.

(\Leftarrow) Assume that $g(I)$ is a Yes-instance. Let H be a LexDFS-support of Π with the minimum number of edges. We have $|E(H)| \leq k = \kappa + |E(G')|$. To prove that G admits a vertex cover of size κ , we first prove the following lemma.

Claim 16. $E(G') \subseteq E(H)$.

Proof. We prove the claim by showing that all edges of G' constructed in Groups (1)–(3), as defined above, are contained in H . We first establish the result for the edges in Group (2), as this will be used in the proofs for the remaining groups.

- Edges constructed in (2), i.e., edges among vertices in V .

By the construction of orderings in Group (i), for every pair $\{i, j\} \subseteq [n]$, there exists an ordering in Π that starts with the two vertices v_i and v_j . Since this ordering is a LexDFS-ordering of H , it follows (by Observation 1) that v_i and v_j are adjacent in H . Therefore, all edges among the vertices in V exist in H .

- Edges constructed in (1), i.e., those introduced for edges in G .

Let $e_p = \{v_i, v_j\}$ be an edge in G with $i < j$. By the construction of the orderings in Group (ii), there exists one ordering in which t_x and v_i are the first two vertices, and another in which t_p and v_j are the first two vertices. This implies that the two edges between $\{t_p\}$ and $\{v_i, v_j\}$ constructed in (1) are contained in H .

Now consider the first ordering constructed in (ii), focusing on the three vertices v_i , u_p , and v_j , which appear in the second, third, and fourth positions, respectively. We show that $\{v_i, u_p\} \in E(H)$. Suppose for contradiction that v_i and u_p are not adjacent in H . As proved above, v_i and v_j are adjacent in H . Then, by the four-point ordering characterization of LexDFS (Lemma 2.1, Statement 5), there exists a vertex between v_i and u_p in the ordering that is adjacent to u_p but not adjacent to v_j in H . However, no such vertex exists between v_i and u_p in the ordering, yielding a contradiction.

By an analogous argument applied to the second ordering constructed in (ii), we can conclude that v_j and u_p are also adjacent in H .

More generally, the above reasoning implies the following fact.

Fact 1: *Let σ be a LexDFS-ordering of H , and let $a <_\sigma b <_\sigma c$ be three vertices such that there are no vertices between a and b in σ . If a and c are adjacent in H , then a and b are adjacent in H .*

We now prove that $\{t_p, u_p\} \in E(H)$. Suppose, for the sake of contradiction, that t_p and u_p are not adjacent in H . Consider the prefix (t_p, v_i, u_p, v_j) of the first ordering as defined in Group (ii). Recall that t_p is adjacent to v_j in H . Then, by Lemma 2.1, the only vertex between t_p and u_p , namely v_i , must be adjacent to u_p but not adjacent to v_j in H . However, we have already shown that v_i and v_j are adjacent in H , which is a contradiction. Hence, t_p and u_p are adjacent in H .

Next, we show that $\{w_p, v_i\}, \{w_p, t_p\} \in E(H)$. Consider the third ordering as defined in (ii), and focus on the three vertices v_i , w_p , and v_j , which appear in the second, third, and fourth positions, respectively. Since $\{v_i, v_j\} \in E(H)$, by Fact 1, we obtain $\{w_p, v_i\} \in E(H)$. Now consider the three vertices t_p, w_p , and v_j in the same ordering, where t_p appears in the first position. Suppose, for contradiction, that w_p and t_p are not adjacent in H . Since $\{t_p, v_j\} \in E(H)$, by Lemma 2.1, the only vertex between t_p and w_p , namely v_i , must be adjacent to w_p and nonadjacent to v_j . However, we have already established that $\{v_i, v_j\} \in E(H)$, yielding a contradiction. Hence, $\{w_p, t_p\} \in E(H)$.

We now show that u_p is adjacent to all vertices in V . We have already established that u_p is adjacent to both v_i and v_j in H . It remains to prove that $\{u_p, v_h\} \in E(H)$ for every $h \in [n] \setminus \{i, j\}$. Let $h \in [n] \setminus \{i, j\}$, and consider the ordering as defined in Group (iv). Since G is 3-regular, there exists an edge e_q incident to v_h in G . By the definition of this ordering, u_p appears between v_h and the vertex w_q , one of the vertices created for the edge e_q . Moreover, no vertices are between v_h and u_p in the ordering. Note that, by the previous analysis, w_q is adjacent to v_h in H . Applying Fact 1 to the three vertices v_h, u_p , and w_q , we conclude that u_p is adjacent to v_h in H . This completes the proof that u_p is adjacent to all vertices in V .

- Edges constructed in (3), i.e., those incident to z .

Finally, we show that z is adjacent to all vertices $t_p \in T$. Consider the ordering defined in Group (iii), constructed for the edge e_p . Focus on the three vertices t_p, z , and w_p . By construction, z appears between the other two vertices, and no vertex lies between t_p and z in the ordering. From the previous analysis, we know that w_p is adjacent to t_p in H . Then, by Fact 1, z must also be adjacent to t_p in H , completing the proof.

Putting all the above together, we conclude that $E(G') \subseteq E(H)$. □

By Claim 16, the vertex z has at most $|E(H)| - |E(G')| \leq \kappa$ neighbors in $V(G') \setminus T = V \cup W \cup U$, i.e.,

$$|N_H(z) \cap (V \cup W \cup U)| \leq \kappa. \quad (1)$$

We now construct a vertex cover of G as follows. Let $S = N_H(z) \cap V$. If S is a vertex cover of G , we are done. Otherwise, consider an edge $e_p = \{v_i, v_j\}$ of G with $i < j$ not covered by S , i.e., $S \cap \{v_i, v_j\} = \emptyset$. Consider the ordering constructed for e_p in Group (iii). By Claim 16, v_i and w_p are adjacent in H . In the corresponding ordering, v_i precedes w_p , and z appears between them. Since $v_i \notin S$, it is not adjacent to z in H . Then, by Lemma 2.1, there must exist a vertex between v_i and z in the ordering that is adjacent to z but not adjacent to w_p in H . This vertex cannot be v_j , as $v_j \notin S$. It also cannot be t_p , since t_p and w_p are adjacent in G' and remain adjacent in H by Claim 16. The only remaining vertex between v_i and z is u_p , so we conclude that z must be adjacent to u_p in H .

Therefore, if an edge e_p of G is not covered by S , then the corresponding vertex $u_p \in U$, introduced for this edge, is adjacent to z in H . It follows that the number of edges of G not covered by S is bounded from above by $|N_H(z) \cap U|$. Based on this observation, for every edge not covered by S in G , we expand S by adding an arbitrary endpoint of the edge. After this process, S becomes a vertex cover of G . Furthermore, the size of S is bounded by

$$|N_H(z) \cap V| + |N_H(z) \cap U| \leq |N_H(z) \cap (V \cup W \cup U)|,$$

which, by Inequality (1), is at most κ . We conclude that I is a Yes-instance of VERTEX COVER. \square

By a slight adaptation of the above reduction, we obtain the following result.

Theorem 3.8. DEG-BOUNDED-LEXDFS-SP is NP-hard.

Proof. We employ the same reduction as in the proof of Theorem 3.7, with the only modification that we set k , the maximum degree bound, to $m + \kappa$. The correctness of the reduction remains essentially unchanged. For the (\Rightarrow) direction, assume that the instance I of VERTEX COVER is a Yes-instance, that is, there exists a vertex cover $S \subseteq V$ of size κ in G . As shown previously, the graph H obtained from G' by adding the κ edges between z and the vertices in S is a LexDFS-support of Π . In this graph H , the vertex z is adjacent to all vertices in $S \cup T$, and hence has degree $\kappa + m = k$. For the (\Leftarrow) direction, the argument is identical to that in the proof of Theorem 3.2. \square

Now, let us study the graph search MCS.

Theorem 3.9. EDGE-BOUNDED-MCS-SP is NP-hard.

Proof. Let $I = (G, \kappa)$ be an instance of the VERTEX COVER problem, where G is a 3-regular graph on n vertices and $m = 3n/2$ edges. Let G' be the graph obtained from G by performing the following operations:

- (1) For every edge $e_x = \{v_i, v_j\}$, where $x \in [m]$, $\{i, j\} \subseteq [n]$, add two vertices w_x and w_{m+x} , and add four edges between $\{v_i, v_j\}$ and $\{w_x, w_{m+x}\}$. Let $W = \{w_i : i \in [2m]\}$.
- (2) Add edges to make V a clique.
- (3) For every $i \in [n]$, add a set $F_i = \{f_i^1, f_i^2, \dots, f_i^{n-i+1}\}$ of $n - i + 1$ vertices adjacent only to v_i . Let $F = \bigcup_{i \in [n]} F_i$.
- (4) Add a clique $U = \{u_x : x \in [4n]\}$ of $4n$ vertices, and add edges so that all vertices in U are adjacent to all vertices in $W \cup F$.




Figure 6: An illustration of the graph G' used in the proof of Theorem 3.9. Vertices in the shaded regions represent cliques, while vertices in the white regions form independent sets.

Notice that $W \cup F$ is an independent set in G' . Figure 6 illustrates the construction of G' .

Let

$$\begin{aligned}\vec{W} &= (w_1, w_2, \dots, w_{2m}), \\ \vec{U} &= (u_1, u_2, \dots, u_{4n}), \quad \text{and let } z = u_{4n}, \\ \vec{F}_i &= (f_i^1, f_i^2, \dots, f_i^{n-i+1}), \quad \text{for each } i \in [n], \\ \vec{F} &= (\vec{F}_1, \vec{F}_2, \dots, \vec{F}_n).\end{aligned}$$

For each $i \in [n]$, define $W(i) = N_{G'}(v_i) \cap W$. Moreover, for every pair $\{i, j\} \subseteq [n]$, define $W[i, j] = W(i) \cup W(j)$.

We now construct the set Π of orderings, grouped into six types as follows. These orderings are designed so that the first two vertices and the connectivity properties of the graph traversal ensure that any graph admitting these orderings as MCS-orderings must contain G' as a subgraph. Moreover, they remain valid MCS-orderings for any graph obtained from G' by adding edges between z and any vertex cover of G' . Specifically, Π contains the following six groups of orderings:

(i) For each $\{i, j\} \subseteq [n], i < j$, add:

$$\left(v_i, v_j, \vec{V} \ominus \{v_i, v_j\}, z, w_1, w_{m+1}, \vec{U} \ominus \{z\}, \vec{W} \ominus \{w_1, w_{m+1}\}, \vec{F} \right).$$

(ii) For each $\{i, j\} \subseteq [4n], i < j$, add:

$$\left(u_i, u_j, \vec{U} \ominus \{u_i, u_j\}, \vec{W}, \vec{F}, \vec{V} \right).$$

(iii) For each $i \in [2m], j \in [4n]$, add:

$$\left(w_i, u_j, \vec{U} \ominus \{u_j\}, \vec{W} \ominus \{w_i\}, \vec{F}, \vec{V} \right),$$

(iv) For every $i \in [n], p \in [n - i + 1]$, and $x \in [4n]$, add:

$$\left(f_i^p, u_x, \vec{U} \ominus \{u_x\}, \vec{F} \ominus \{f_i^p\}, \vec{W}, \vec{V} \right).$$

(v) For each $i \in [n]$, $p \in [n - i + 1]$, add:

$$\left(v_i, f_i^p, z, \vec{U} \ominus \{z\}, \overrightarrow{W}(i), \vec{W} \ominus W(i), \vec{F}_i \ominus \{f_i^p\}, \vec{F} \ominus F_i, \vec{V} \ominus \{v_i\} \right).$$

(vi) For each edge $e_x = \{v_i, v_j\} \in E(G)$, where $x \in [m]$, $\{i, j\} \subseteq [n]$, and $i < j$, add the following four orderings:

$$\begin{aligned} & (w_x, v_i, v_j, z, w_{m+x}), \\ & (w_{m+x}, v_i, v_j, z, w_x), \\ & (w_x, v_j, v_i, z, w_{m+x}), \\ & (w_{m+x}, v_j, v_i, z, w_x), \end{aligned}$$

followed by the same suffix:

$$\left(\vec{U} \ominus \{z\}, \overrightarrow{W}[i, j] \ominus \{w_x, w_{m+x}\}, \vec{W} \ominus W[i, j], \vec{F}_i, \vec{F}_j, \vec{F} \ominus (F_i \cup F_j), \vec{V} \ominus \{v_i, v_j\} \right).$$

Let $k = \kappa + |E(H)|$, and let $g(I) = (V(H), \Pi, k)$ be an instance of EDGE-BOUNDED-MCS-SP. We prove the correctness of the reduction as follows.

(\Rightarrow) Assume that G has a vertex cover S of κ vertices. Let H be the graph obtained from G' by adding κ edges between z and the vertices in S . Clearly, H has $|E(G')| + \kappa = k$ edges. We prove that $g(I)$ is a Yes-instance of EDGE-BOUNDED-MCS-SP by showing that every ordering constructed in Π is an MCS-ordering of H . We consider the orderings in each group separately.

- Orderings in group (i).

Let $\{i, j\} \subseteq [n]$ with $i < j$, and consider the ordering constructed for this pair. Let σ denote this ordering. The first n vertices in σ are exactly those in V , which form a clique in H , ensuring that $\sigma_{\leq n}$ is a partial MCS-ordering of H .

By the definition of H , the set V contains κ neighbors of z , two neighbors of each vertex in W , at most one neighbor of each vertex in F , and no neighbors of any vertex in U . Since $\kappa \geq 3$, z has more visited neighbors than any other unvisited vertex, ensuring that $\sigma_{\leq n+1}$ is a partial MCS-ordering. Next, each vertex in W has three visited neighbors, whereas every unvisited vertex outside W has at most two visited neighbors. The ordering selects w_1 and w_{m+1} as the next vertices to be visited (recall that W is an independent set in H). Since all vertices in U are adjacent to every vertex in W , including w_1 and w_{m+1} , each vertex in U now has two visited neighbors. The ordering then visits all vertices in U consecutively. As U forms a clique in H , this step preserves the property that the suborderings remain partial MCS-orderings of H throughout the visit of the vertices in U . At this point, each vertex in $W \setminus \{w_1, w_{m+1}\}$ has $|U| + 2$ visited neighbors, and each vertex in F has $|U| + 1$ visited neighbors. Since $W \cup F$ is an independent set, the ordering can visit the remaining vertices in W first, followed by all vertices in F , without ceasing to be a partial MCS-ordering of H at any point.

- Orderings in group (ii).

Consider the ordering constructed for a pair $\{i, j\} \subseteq [4n]$ with $i < j$. This ordering first visits all vertices of the clique U , starting with u_i and u_j . It then visits the vertices of the independent set $W \cup F$, each of which is adjacent to all vertices in U . Consequently, when any vertex from $W \cup F$ is visited, it already has $|U| = 4n$ visited neighbors. Meanwhile, every vertex $v_x \in V$ where $x \in [n]$ has at most $n - x + 8 \leq n + 7$ visited neighbors:

- at most one from U (namely, z when $v_x \in S$),

- at most six from W (since every vertex in G is incident to exactly three edges and, by the definition of H , can have at most two neighbors in W per incident edge), and
- at most $n - x + 1$ from F (namely, those from F_x).

As a consequence, for $n \geq 4$, the subordering restricted to $U \cup W \cup F$ constitutes a partial MCS-ordering of H .

Subsequently, the vertices of V are visited in the order (v_1, v_2, \dots, v_n) . Analogous to the preceding analysis, one can verify that each vertex $v_x \in V$ has either $n - x + 7$ neighbors in $U \cup W \cup F$ if $v_x \notin S$, or exactly $n - x + 8$ such neighbors if $v_x \in S$. Moreover, when v_x is visited, it is adjacent to the $x - 1$ vertices of V that precede it in the ordering. Hence, at the moment some $v_x \in V$ is visited, it has at least $n + 6$ visited neighbors, whereas each unvisited vertex v_y with $y \in [n]$ and $y > x$ has at most $(n - y + 8) + (x - 1) < n + 6$ visited neighbors. Therefore, the ordering remains a partial MCS-ordering of H throughout the visit of all vertices in V , and thus constitutes an MCS-ordering of H .

- Orderings in group (iii).

Consider the ordering constructed for some $i \in [2m]$ and $j \in [4n]$. This ordering visits w_i first, u_j second, and then proceeds to visit all remaining vertices in U , followed by the remaining vertices of W . By construction, both U and W are fully connected in H ; that is, every vertex in U is adjacent to every vertex in W . Moreover, U forms a clique in H . Consequently, throughout the visit of these vertices, the ordering remains a partial MCS-ordering of H .

Subsequently, the ordering proceeds to visit the vertices in F , followed by those in V , in the sequence (v_1, v_2, \dots, v_n) . By an argument analogous to the one presented in the previous case, one can verify that, throughout the visit of these vertices, the ordering continues to be a partial MCS-ordering of H .

- Orderings in group (iv).

Consider the ordering constructed for some $i \in [n]$, $p \in [n - i + 1]$, and $x \in [4n]$. The ordering first visits f_i^p , then u_x , and subsequently all vertices in $U \setminus \{u_x\}$. Since U forms a clique and U is fully adjacent to F in H , the ordering remains a partial MCS-ordering of H throughout the visit of these vertices.

Next, the ordering visits all vertices in $(F \setminus \{f_i^p\}) \cup W$, which together form an independent set in H . Each vertex in this set is adjacent to all $4n$ vertices of U but nonadjacent to f_i^p . Therefore, the ordering continues to be a partial MCS-ordering of H throughout this stage as well.

Finally, the ordering visits all vertices in V according to (v_1, v_2, \dots, v_n) . By an argument analogous to the one presented above, it follows that the ordering is an MCS-ordering of H .

- Orderings in group (v).

Consider the ordering constructed for some $i \in [n]$ and $p \in [n - i + 1]$. Let σ denote this ordering. It first visits the vertex v_i , followed by its neighbor f_i^p . Then, it visits all vertices in U , starting with the vertex $z = u_{4n}$.

Recall that U forms a clique in H , and every vertex in U is adjacent to f_i^p . When the first vertex z in U is visited, it has at least one visited neighbor, namely f_i^p , and possibly also v_i . All other vertices are adjacent to at most one of v_i and f_i^p . Therefore, $\sigma_{\leq 3}$ is a partial MCS-ordering of H . Since U is a clique and every vertex in $U \setminus \{z\}$ is adjacent to f_i^p but not to v_i , the ordering remains a partial MCS-ordering of H throughout the visit of vertices in $U \setminus \{z\}$.

Next, the ordering visits the vertices in $W(i)$, the set of vertices corresponding to the edges incident to v_i in G . By construction, each vertex in $W(i)$ has exactly $|\{v_i\}| + |U| = 4n + 1$ visited neighbors

at this point, and none of the remaining vertices has more visited neighbors. Since $W(i)$ forms an independent set, the ordering remains a partial MCS-ordering of H throughout the visit of the vertices in $W(i)$.

Then, the ordering proceeds to visit all remaining vertices in W . Each of these vertices has the maximum number of visited neighbors, namely $|U| = 4n$. Moreover, W forms an independent set in H . Consequently, the ordering remains a partial MCS-ordering of H throughout the visit of these vertices.

Next, the vertices in the independent set $F_i \setminus \{f_i^p\}$ are visited. Each such vertex is adjacent to exactly the $4n + 1$ vertices in $U \cup \{v_i\}$, and none of the remaining unvisited vertices in the ordering has more visited neighbors. Subsequently, the remaining vertices in F are visited, each having the maximum number $|U| = 4n$ of visited neighbors.

Afterward, the vertices in $V \setminus \{v_i\}$ are visited in increasing order of their indices. Consider the moment when some vertex v_j , where $j \in [n] \setminus \{i\}$, is visited. Recall that V forms a clique in H . Hence, v_j has $j - 1$ visited neighbors in V if $j > i$, and j visited neighbors in V otherwise. Moreover, it has exactly $|F_j| = n - j + 1$ visited neighbors in F , and six visited neighbors in W (since v_j is incident to exactly three edges in G , each contributing two neighbors in W). Furthermore, it has one visited neighbor in U if $v_j \in S$, and none otherwise. In summary, the number of visited neighbors of v_j at the moment it is visited is:

	$j < i$	$j > i$
$v_j \in S$	$n + 8$	$n + 7$
$v_j \notin S$	$n + 7$	$n + 6$

By analogous reasoning, one can verify that for any $j' \in [n]$ with $j' > j$, the number of visited neighbors of $v_{j'}$ at the moment when v_j is visited is as follows:

	$j' < i$	$j' > i$
$v_{j'} \in S$	$n + 8 + j - j'$	$n + 7 + j - j'$
$v_{j'} \notin S$	$n + 7 + j - j'$	$n + 6 + j - j'$

By a straightforward yet tedious verification, we observe that in all possible combinations of cases, each vertex $v_{j'}$ has at most as many visited neighbors as v_j . This implies that the ordering remains a partial MCS-ordering of H throughout the visit of all vertices in $V \setminus \{v_i\}$. Therefore, the ordering is an MCS-ordering of H .

We conclude that orderings reconstructed in Group (v) are MCS-orderings of H .

- Orderings in group (vi).

This group contains, for every edge $e_x = \{v_i, v_j\}$ with $i < j$, four orderings. Due to the symmetry in the construction of these four orderings, we show only that the first one is an MCS-ordering of H .

Let σ denote this ordering, which begins with the five vertices in the sequence $(w_x, v_i, v_j, z, w_{m+x})$. Since $e_x = \{v_i, v_j\}$, by construction, w_x, v_i , and v_j form a clique in H . Therefore, $\sigma_{\leq 3}$ is a partial MCS-ordering of H .

Because S is a vertex cover of G , at least one of v_i or v_j is adjacent to z . Moreover, by construction, $z \in U$ is adjacent to all vertices in W , including w_x . Thus, z has at least two visited neighbors before being visited. Note that no remaining vertex is adjacent to all three of w_x, v_i , and v_j . As a result, $\sigma_{\leq 4}$ is also a partial MCS-ordering of H .

Next, the vertex w_{m+x} is adjacent to v_i, v_j , and z , and none of the remaining vertices in the ordering has more than three neighbors among the first four vertices in σ . Therefore, $\sigma_{\leq 5}$ remains a partial MCS-ordering of H .

An ad-hoc analysis confirms that the remaining steps in σ preserve the MCS-ordering property. We omit the details.

We now know that H contains at most k edges and that all orderings in Π are MCS-orderings of H . Therefore, $g(I)$ is a Yes-instance.

(\Leftarrow) Assume that $g(I)$ is a Yes-instance, and let H be an MCS-support of Π with the minimum number of edges. Then $|E(H)| \leq k$. Observe that, for every edge in G' , we constructed an ordering in Π whose first two vertices correspond to the endpoints of that edge. As a result, we have $E(H) \subseteq E(G')$.

Consider the orderings described in group (vi). Let $e_x = \{v_i, v_j\}$ be any arbitrary edge in G , where $x \in [m]$ and $\{i, j\} \subseteq [n]$. In the first ordering associated with this edge, the first five vertices are in the sequence $(w_x, v_i, v_j, z, w_{m+x})$. After the third vertex v_j is visited, the vertex w_{m+x} has exactly two visited neighbors, namely v_i and v_j . Since z is the fourth vertex visited and the ordering is an MCS-ordering of H , it follows that z must have at least two visited neighbors at that point. Consequently, z is adjacent to at least one of v_i and v_j , the two endpoints of e_x .

By the arbitrary choice of e_x , we conclude that $N_H(z) \cap V$ forms a vertex cover of G . Because $E(G') \subseteq E(H)$ and $|E(H)| \leq k$, we obtain $|N_H(z) \cap V| \leq k - |E(G')| = \kappa$. Thus, G admits a vertex cover of size at most κ , implying that I is a Yes-instance of VERTEX COVER. \square

By appropriately adjusting the value of k in the above reduction, we immediately obtain the following result.

Theorem 3.10. DEG-BOUNDED-MCS-SP is NP-hard.

Proof. By setting $k = 2m + 4n - 1 + \frac{n(n+1)}{2} + \kappa$, which equals the degree of the vertex z in G' plus κ (the size of a vertex cover of G), the same reduction as in Theorem 3.9 establishes the result. \square

We now turn our attention to the final graph search, MNS, considered in this paper.

Theorem 3.11. EDGE-BOUNDED-MNS-SP is NP-hard.

Proof. Let $I = (G, \kappa)$ be an instance of VERTEX COVER, where $G = (V, E)$ is 3-regular. Without loss of generality, we assume that G is a connected. Define G' as the graph obtained from G by performing the following operations:

- (1) We introduce for each edge in G three vertices, and classify them into two sets. Precisely, we introduce a set $T = \{t_x : x \in [m]\}$ of m vertices, and introduce a set $W = \{w_i : i \in [2m]\}$ of $2m$ vertices.
- (2) For every edge $e_x = \{v_i, v_j\}$ in G , where $x \in [m]$, $\{i, j\} \subseteq [n]$, add the following six edges $\{v_i, w_x\}$, $\{w_x, t_x\}$, $\{t_x, w_{m+x}\}$, $\{w_{m+x}, v_j\}$, $\{v_j, t_x\}$, and $\{t_x, v_i\}$. See Figure 7.




Figure 7: An illustration of the addition of the six edges (colored in blue) in (2).

(3) Add edges to make V a clique.

(4) For every $i \in [n]$, add a vertex f_i , and add an edge between f_i and v_i . Let $F = \{f_i : i \in [n]\}$.

(5) Add a clique $U = \{u_i : i \in [3n]\}$ of $3n$ vertices, and add edges such that all vertices from U are adjacent to all vertices from T , and all vertices from $U \setminus \{u_{3n}\}$ are adjacent to all vertices from F .

By the definition, G' has $5n + 3m$ vertices, and has $6m + \frac{n \cdot (n-1)}{2} + 3n \cdot m + 3n^2$ edges. In addition, observe that W is an independent set in G' , and every vertex of W is of degree two.

Let $\vec{W} = (w_1, w_2, \dots, w_{2m})$, $\vec{T} = (t_1, t_2, \dots, t_m)$, $\vec{U} = (u_1, u_2, \dots, u_{3n})$, and $\vec{F} = (f_1, f_2, \dots, f_n)$. In addition, let $z = u_{3n}$. For each $i \in [n]$, let $T(i) = \{t_x : x \in [m], v_i \in e_x\}$. That is, $T(i)$ denotes the set of vertices in T created for edges of G incident to the vertex v_i . Additionally, for every pair $\{i, j\} \subseteq [n]$, let $T(i, j) = T(i) \cup T(j)$, and let $\overrightarrow{T(i, j)}$ be an arbitrary but fixed ordering of $T(i, j)$. Let $k = \kappa + |E(G')|$. We construct a set Π of orderings classified into six groups (i)–(vi):

(i) For each pair $\{i, j\} \subseteq [n]$ with $i < j$, add to Π the ordering

$$\left(v_i, v_j, \vec{V} \ominus \{v_i, v_j\}, z, \overrightarrow{T}, \vec{U} \ominus \{z\}, \vec{F}, \vec{W} \right).$$

(ii) For each pair $\{i, j\} \subseteq [3n]$ with $i < j$, add to Π the ordering

$$\left(u_i, u_j, \vec{U} \ominus \{u_i, u_j\}, \vec{T}, \vec{F}, \vec{V}, \vec{W} \right).$$

(iii) For each $i \in [m]$ and each $j \in [3n]$, add to Π the ordering

$$\left(t_i, u_j, \vec{U} \ominus \{u_j\}, \vec{T} \ominus \{t_i\}, \vec{F}, \vec{V}, \vec{W} \right).$$

(iv) For each $i \in [n]$ and each $j \in [3n - 1]$, add to Π the ordering

$$\left(f_i, u_j, \vec{U} \ominus \{u_j, z\}, z, \vec{T}, \vec{F} \ominus \{f_i\}, \vec{V}, \vec{W} \right).$$

(v) For each $i \in [n]$, add to Π the ordering

$$\left(v_i, f_i, \vec{U} \ominus \{z\}, \overrightarrow{T(i)}, z, \vec{T} \ominus T(i), \vec{F} \ominus \{f_i\}, \vec{V} \ominus \{v_i\}, \vec{W} \right).$$

(vi) For each edge $e_x = \{v_i, v_j\}$ in G , where $x \in [m]$ and $\{i, j\} \subseteq [n]$ with $i < j$, we define

$$\Omega = \left(\vec{U} \ominus \{z\}, \overrightarrow{T(i, j)} \ominus \{t_x\}, \vec{T} \ominus T(i, j), f_i, f_j, \vec{F} \ominus \{f_i, f_j\}, \vec{V} \ominus \{v_i, v_j\} \right),$$

and add the following six orderings to Π :

- $\left(w_x, t_x, v_i, v_j, z, \Omega, \vec{W} \ominus \{w_x\} \right)$
- $\left(w_x, v_i, t_x, v_j, z, \Omega, \vec{W} \ominus \{w_x\} \right)$
- $\left(w_{m+x}, t_x, v_j, v_i, z, \Omega, \vec{W} \ominus \{w_{m+x}\} \right)$
- $\left(w_{m+x}, v_j, t_x, v_i, z, \Omega, \vec{W} \ominus \{w_{m+x}\} \right)$
- $\left(t_x, v_i, v_j, z, \Omega, \vec{W} \right)$

- $(t_x, v_j, v_i, z, \Omega, \vec{W})$.

The purpose of this group of orderings is to ensure that every MNS-support of Π must include all edges in G' that were introduced for the edges in G (the blue edges in Figure 7). In each ordering, only the specified prefix is critical; the ordering of the remaining vertices simply follows an MNS search on G' prefixed by the first five vertices.

Let $g(I) = (V(G'), \Pi, k)$. We prove below that I is a Yes-instance of VERTEX COVER if and only if $g(I)$ is a Yes-instance of EDGE-BOUNDED-MNS-SP.

(\Rightarrow) Assume that G has a vertex cover S of κ vertices. Let H be the graph obtained from G' by the addition of the κ edges between z and all vertices from S . To prove that $g(I)$ is a Yes-instance, it suffices to show that every ordering in Π is an MNS-ordering of H . We establish this by analyzing the orderings in each of the six groups separately.

- Orderings in group (i).

Consider the ordering constructed for a pair $\{i, j\} \subseteq [n]$ with $i < j$. It first visits the vertices in V , starting with v_i and v_j . Since V forms a clique in H , the ordering remains a partial MNS-ordering of H throughout the visits of vertices from V .

Next, the vertex z is visited. Recall that z is adjacent to exactly the κ vertices in $S \subseteq V$. As no other vertex has S as a subset of its neighborhood, z has an inclusion-maximal neighborhood. Therefore, the ordering restricted to $V \cup \{z\}$ remains a partial MNS-ordering of H .

The ordering then proceeds to visit the vertices in T . Each vertex $t_x \in T$ has exactly two visited neighbors, v_i and v_j , the two endpoints of the edge e_x corresponding to t_x . Additionally, T is an independent set. Furthermore, observe that each of the remaining vertices in $F \cup W \cup (U \setminus \{z\})$ has at most one neighbor in V . Hence, the ordering remains a partial MNS-ordering of H throughout the visit of vertices from T .

Next, the vertices from the clique $U \setminus \{z\}$ are visited one after another. Since each of them is adjacent to all vertices in $T \cup \{z\}$, but not to any other previously visited vertices, the ordering remains a partial MNS-ordering of H throughout the visit of these vertices.

Subsequently, the vertices from F are visited, followed by those from W . By a similar analysis, the ordering continues to be a partial MCS-ordering of H , and therefore it is an MNS-ordering of H .

- Orderings in group (ii).

Consider the ordering constructed for a pair $\{i, j\} \subseteq [3n]$ with $i < j$ in this group. The ordering first visits the vertices of the clique U , followed by the vertices of the independent set T , where each vertex in T is adjacent to all vertices in U . Consequently, the ordering remains a partial MNS-ordering of H throughout the visit of these vertices.

Next, the ordering visits the vertices of the independent set F , where each vertex in F is adjacent to all vertices in U except z . Since no remaining unvisited vertex is adjacent to all vertices of U , the ordering remains a partial MNS-ordering of H during the visit of vertices in F .

After that, the vertices of the clique V are visited, where each vertex $v_x \in V$, $x \in [n]$, has a visited neighbor $f_x \in F$ that is not adjacent to any of the remaining vertices in W . Following the visit to V , the ordering proceeds to the vertices of the independent set W , where each vertex has exactly two already visited neighbors.

Therefore, throughout the visit of vertices in $V \cup W$, the ordering continues to be a partial MNS-ordering of H . Hence, we conclude that the entire ordering is an MNS-ordering of H .

- Orderings in group (iii).

Consider the ordering constructed for some $i \in [m]$ and $j \in [3n]$ in group (iii). The ordering first visits the $3n + 1$ vertices in the set $\{t_i\} \cup U$. By construction, this set induces a clique in H . Therefore, throughout the visit of these vertices, the ordering remains a partial MNS-ordering of H .

The remaining vertices are visited in the same relative order as in the ordering analyzed in the previous group, and the same reasoning applies.

- Orderings in group (iv).

Consider the ordering created for some $i \in [n]$ and $j \in [3n - 1]$. Let σ denote this ordering. It first visits the $3n$ vertices in the set $\{f_i\} \cup (U \setminus \{z\})$. By construction, this set induces a clique in H . As a result, $\sigma_{\leq 3n}$ is a partial MNS-ordering of H .

The next vertex visited is z , which is adjacent to all previously visited vertices except f_i . Since none of the remaining vertices is adjacent to all visited vertices, it follows that $\sigma_{\leq 3n+1}$ remains a partial MNS-ordering of H . The remaining analysis is ad hoc, as in the previous cases, and is omitted.

- Orderings in group (v).

Consider the ordering constructed for an integer $i \in [n]$ in group (v), and let σ denote this ordering. The ordering first visits v_i , followed by f_i . By construction, v_i and f_i are adjacent in H . Therefore, $\sigma_{\leq 2}$ is a partial MNS-ordering of H .

Next, the $3n - 1$ vertices in the clique $U \setminus \{z\}$ are visited, where each vertex is adjacent to all vertices in F , including f_i . Since f_i is not adjacent to any of the remaining vertices in the ordering, it follows that $\sigma_{\leq 3n+1}$ remains a partial MNS-ordering of H .

Afterward, the ordering visits all vertices in the independent set $T(i)$, which corresponds to the set of vertices associated with edges in G that are incident to v_i . By construction, each vertex in $T(i)$ is adjacent to all vertices in $\{v_i\} \cup (U \setminus \{z\})$, that is, to all previously visited vertices except f_i . Since no remaining unvisited vertex is adjacent to all currently visited vertices, the ordering continues to be a partial MNS-ordering of H throughout the visit of the vertices in $T(i)$.

Next, the specific vertex $z \in U$ is visited. Since z is adjacent to all visited vertices except f_i , and no unvisited vertex is adjacent to all visited vertices, we conclude that $\sigma_{[\dots z]}$ is a partial MNS-ordering of H .

The remaining part of the ordering follows the same pattern as in group (i). By an argument analogous to the previous analysis, it is fairly easy to verify that the entire ordering σ is an MNS-ordering of H .

- Orderings in the group (vi).

Let $e_x = \{v_i, v_j\}$ be an edge of G with $i < j$. We now show that the six orderings constructed for this edge in the group are MNS-orderings of H .

Consider the first ordering with the prefix (w_x, t_x, v_i, v_j, z) , and let σ denote this ordering. By construction, the first three vertices are pairwise adjacent in H . The fourth visited vertex v_j is adjacent to all previously visited vertices except w_x . Since w_x has degree two in H , no remaining vertex is adjacent to all the first three visited vertices. Therefore, $\sigma_{\leq 4}$ is a partial MNS-ordering of H .

After v_j , the ordering visits the vertex $z \in U$. Since S is a vertex cover, by the definition of H , the vertex z is adjacent to at least one of v_i or v_j . In addition, z is adjacent to t_x . As noted earlier, no remaining vertex in the ordering is adjacent to w_x . Thus, if z did not have an inclusion-maximal neighborhood among the unvisited vertices, there would need to exist a remaining vertex adjacent

to t_x, v_i , and v_j . Among the remaining vertices, only those in $V \setminus \{v_i, v_j\}$ can be adjacent to both v_i and v_j ; however, none of these vertices is adjacent to t_x . Hence, z indeed has an inclusion-maximal neighborhood among the visited vertices, and it follows that $\sigma_{\leq 5}$ is a partial MNS-ordering of H .

The remaining vertices are visited according to $(\Omega, \vec{W} \ominus \{w_x\})$. By arguments similar to those above, one verifies that each extension of σ preserves the partial MNS property of H . We omit the routine details for brevity.

The proofs for the second, third, and fourth orderings are analogous, as these orderings are constructed symmetrically to the first one.

Consider now the fifth ordering. It visits t_x, v_i , and v_j first. Since these three vertices form a triangle in H , this prefix is a partial MNS-ordering of H . The ordering next visits $z \in U$. By construction, z is adjacent to t_x , and it is adjacent to at least one of v_i and v_j . Moreover, no unvisited vertex is adjacent to all three previously visited vertices. Therefore, z has an inclusion-maximal visited neighborhood when it is encountered, and so the ordering remains a partial MNS-ordering of H after visiting z . The remaining checks are tedious yet straightforward and are therefore omitted.

The analysis for the sixth (last) ordering is similar to that of the fifth, as the two are constructed symmetrically.

Now we know that H is an MNS-support of Π . Since H contains $\kappa + |E(G')| = k$ edges, it follows that $g(I)$ is a Yes-instance.

(\Leftarrow) Assume that $g(I)$ is a Yes-instance, and let H be an MNS-support of Π with at most k edges. From the first two elements in all orderings constructed above, we infer that $E(G') \subseteq E(H')$. Let $e_x = \{v_i, v_j\}$ be any edge in G , where $x \in [m]$ and $\{i, j\} \subseteq [n]$. Without loss of generality, assume $i < j$. Now consider the fifth ordering in group (vi). After the vertices $\{t_x, v_i, v_j\}$ have been visited, the vertex z can be visited next only if its visited neighborhood is inclusive-maximal. Since z is adjacent to t_x , the vertex w_x is adjacent to t_x and v_i , and the vertex w_{m+x} is adjacent to t_x and v_j in H , it follows that z must be adjacent to at least one of v_i and v_j . By the arbitrary choice of the edge $e_x = \{v_i, v_j\}$, we conclude that $N_H(z) \cap V$ is a vertex cover of G . Since $E(G') \subseteq E(H')$, it follows that $|N_H(z) \cap V| \leq k - |E(H)| = \kappa$. Therefore, the instance I is a Yes-instance. \square

By introducing multiple pendant vertices attached to the vertex z in the above reduction, and adding one additional ordering for each $i \in [n]$, we obtain the following result.

Theorem 3.12. DEG-BOUNDED-MNS-SP is NP-hard.

Proof. We modify the reduction presented in the proof of Theorem 3.11 to establish the claim. Specifically, we introduce n new vertices z_1, z_2, \dots, z_n , and let $\vec{Z} = (z_1, z_2, \dots, z_n)$. We append \vec{Z} to all orderings in Π . Additionally, for each $i \in [n]$, we add to Π a new group of orderings of type (vii), defined as:

$$\left(z_i, z, \vec{Z} \ominus \{z_i\}, \vec{U} \ominus \{z\}, \vec{T}, \vec{F}, \vec{V}, \vec{W} \right).$$

The same reasoning as in the proof of Theorem 3.11 shows that $(V(H), \Pi, \kappa + m + 4n - 1)$ is a Yes-instance of DEG-BOUNDED-MNS-SP if and only if G has a vertex cover of size κ . \square

4 A Polynomial-time Algorithm for Recognizing DFS-Tree Supports

This section presents a polynomial-time algorithm for SP-DFS-TREE. Throughout, let $I = (V, \Pi)$ denote an instance, with $m = |\Pi|$ and $n = |V|$.

Algorithm outline. Our algorithm first computes an attachment graph that contains every DFS-tree support of Π as a subgraph whenever one exists, building on prior work by Peters et al. [24]. We then identify a subgraph T^* of the attachment graph that is a tree, and show that, whenever I is a Yes-instance, there exists a DFS-tree support that contains T^* and attaches all remaining vertices as leaves.

To build intuition for our algorithm, it is useful to recall an alternative, recursive characterization of DFS applied to rooted trees, which is both natural and widely used.

Definition 2 (Recursive description of DFS on trees). *Given a rooted tree T with root r , DFS proceeds as follows:*

- (1) Visit the root r .
- (2) Recursively perform DFS on each child of r , processing one subtree at a time until all children have been visited.
- (3) After finishing with one child and its entire subtree, backtrack to r and continue with the next (unvisited) child.

In other words, DFS explores each subtree as deeply as possible before moving on to the next, producing an ordering in which all vertices of a subtree appear consecutively.

We remark that when Π admits a DFS-tree support T , the tree T is inherently unrooted. Nevertheless, when interpreting the DFS traversal of T with respect to an ordering σ , we treat T as rooted at the first vertex visited in σ . With Definition 2, we can more effectively derive the following lemmas.

Lemma 4.1. *Let σ be a DFS-ordering of a tree T with vertex set V , and let r denote the first vertex in σ . Consider T as a tree rooted at r . For any $u, v \in V$ with $u <_\sigma v$, such that all vertices between u and v in σ are leaves of T , the parent of v lies on the unique path from r to u in T .*

Proof. Since $u <_\sigma v$, we have $v \neq r$, and thus v has a parent in T . Let v' denote the parent of v . Assume, for the sake of contradiction, that v' is not on the path from the root r to the vertex u in T . Then there exists a vertex v'' such that the parent of v'' lies on the path from r to u , and v' is in the subtree of T rooted at v'' . That is, v is a descendant of v'' in T . Observe that v'' must be visited after u in σ , since otherwise, by Definition 2, all vertices in the subtree rooted at v'' , including v , would be visited before u , contradicting $u <_\sigma v$. Moreover, Definition 2 also implies that $v'' <_\sigma v$. We now obtain $u <_\sigma v'' <_\sigma v$. However, by the choice of u and v in the lemma, all vertices between u and v in σ are leaves of T . This would force v'' to be a leaf of T , contradicting the fact that v'' has a descendant v . Therefore, the parent of v must lie on the path from r to u in T , completing the proof. \square

Lemma 4.2. *Let σ be a DFS-ordering of a tree T with vertex set V . Let r denote the first vertex in σ , and consider T rooted at r . For any three vertices $x, y, z \in V$ such that:*

- (1) the parents of x and y are distinct and both lie on the path from r to z in T , and
- (2) $z <_\sigma y <_\sigma x$,

the parent of y is closer to z than the parent of x in T .

Proof. Let x' and y' denote the parents of x and y in T , respectively. By Condition (1), both x' and y' lie on the path from r to z in T . Consider the DFS traversal of T corresponding to σ . After visiting z and all vertices in the subtree rooted at z , the traversal backtracks along the path from z to r . When the backtracking reaches y' , it visits all unvisited vertices in the subtree rooted at y' , which includes y . Similarly, the vertex x can be visited only when the backtracking reaches x' . By condition (2) in the lemma, y is visited before x in σ . Therefore, the backtracking must reach y' before x' . Hence y' is closer to z than x' in T . \square

4.1 Attachment Digraphs

Trick [30] presents a polynomial-time algorithm for the SP-GS-TREE problem. Building on this result, Peters et al. [24] provide a complete characterization of those families Π that admit a GS-tree support by introducing the notion of an *attachment digraph*. A key property of this digraph is that its underlying graph contains all possible GS-tree supports of Π .

For an ordering σ on V , and a subset $S \subseteq V$, let $\text{top}(\sigma, S)$, $\text{second}(\sigma, S)$, and $\text{last}(\sigma, S)$ be the first, the second, and the last vertices of S appearing in σ , respectively. When $S = V$, we drop S from the notations. For instance, $\text{top}(\sigma)$ represents exactly $\text{top}(\sigma, V)$.

For a subset $S \subseteq V$ and a vertex $x \in S$, define

$$B(\sigma, S, x) = \begin{cases} \{\text{second}(\sigma, S)\}, & \text{if } \text{top}(\sigma, S) = x, \\ \{y \in S : y <_{\sigma} x\}, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

We now introduce Algorithm 1, which takes as input a set Π of orderings on a vertex set V . In general, the algorithm operates iteratively by removing, at each step, all vertices that appear last (i.e., are bottom-ranked) in the current working set S (initially $S = V$). These vertices form the set L . For each vertex $v \in L$, the algorithm computes

$$B(v) = \bigcup_{\sigma \in \Pi} B(\sigma, S, v),$$

and introduces arcs from v to every vertex in $B(v)$. Prior work [24, 30] shows that $B(v)$ exactly captures the set of possible neighbors of v within S in any GS-tree support of Π . After creating these arcs, the vertices in L are removed from S , and the process repeats. The iteration continues until S contains only two vertices, at which point the algorithm adds a final arc between them in an arbitrary direction. The resulting digraph is referred to as an attachment digraph of Π .

It is useful to observe that whenever $|S| \geq 3$ during the execution, no vertex in L belongs to $B(v)$ for any other vertex $v \in L$. As a consequence, each instance Π can give rise to at most two distinct attachment digraphs.

Algorithm 1

Input: A set $\{\sigma_i : i \in [t]\}$ of t orderings on a set V .

Output: A digraph (V, A) .

```

1:  $A \leftarrow \emptyset;$  ▷ Initialize the arc set
2:  $S \leftarrow V;$  ▷ Initialize the working set
3: while  $|S| \geq 3$  do
4:    $L \leftarrow \{\text{last}(\sigma_i, S) : i \in [t]\}$  ▷ Select bottom-ranked elements
5:   for each  $v \in L$  do
6:      $B(v) \leftarrow \bigcap_{i \in [t]} B(\sigma_i, S, v);$  ▷ Common blockers of  $v$ 
7:     if  $B(v) \neq \emptyset$  then
8:       for each  $u \in B(v)$  do
9:         add arc  $(v, u)$  to  $A;$ 
10:   $S \leftarrow S \setminus L;$ 
11: if  $|S| = 2$  then
12:   add an arc in an arbitrary direction between the two vertices of  $S$  to  $A;$ 
13: return  $(V, A);$ 

```

For a given set Π of orderings, let $\text{AttDiG}(\Pi)$ denote an arbitrary but fixed *attachment digraph* of Π (for instance, obtained by a single execution of Algorithm 1 on Π). We write $\text{AttG}(\Pi)$ for the underlying

undirected graph of $\text{AttDiG}(\Pi)$, referred to as the *attachment graph* of Π . As established in the preceding discussion, the attachment graph of Π is uniquely determined. It is known that whenever Π admits at least one GS-tree support, $\text{AttG}(\Pi)$ contains every GS-tree support of Π as a subgraph [24].

We note that Algorithm 1 runs in polynomial time; hence an attachment digraph $\text{AttDiG}(\Pi)$ can be computed efficiently from Π .

Peters et al. [24] established the following fundamental characterization, which links the existence of GS-tree supports to the connectivity of the attachment graph.

Lemma 4.3 ([24]). *A set Π of orderings admits a GS-tree support if and only if $\text{AttG}(\Pi)$ is connected.*

They further refined this characterization as follows.

Lemma 4.4 ([24, Theorem 7.9]). *Let Π be a set of orderings on a set V . A tree T is a GS-tree support of Π if and only if it can be obtained from $\text{AttDiG}(\Pi)$ by retaining exactly one outgoing arc for each vertex with at least one outneighbor, and then replacing all remaining directed arcs by undirected edges.*

A vertex in an attachment digraph is called a *forced vertex* if it has at most one outneighbor, and a *free vertex* otherwise. As observed in [24], every attachment digraph contains at least one forced vertex. In particular, the first vertex of each ordering in Π is always forced. To see this, consider a vertex v that is the first vertex of some ordering $\sigma \in \Pi$ in Algorithm 1. By definition, $B(\sigma, S, v)$ —and hence $B(v)$ —is either empty or contains exactly one vertex, for any possible set S . The outneighbors of v in the attachment digraph are introduced precisely when v belongs to some set L during the algorithm, where L denotes the set of vertices that appear last among the vertices of S in some ordering of Π . At that moment, the outneighbors of v are exactly the vertices in $B(v)$. Afterwards, v is removed from further consideration. Therefore, v can have at most one outneighbor and is thus a forced vertex.

Lemma 4.5 ([24]). *Let Π be a set of orderings on a common ground set. Then, in every ordering of Π , the first vertex is a forced vertex of the attachment digraph of Π .*

The next lemma shows that whenever an attachment graph is connected, the forced vertices always induce a tree.

Lemma 4.6 ([24]). *For a set Π of orderings that admits at least one GS-tree support, the subgraph of $\text{AttG}(\Pi)$ induced by the forced vertices of $\text{AttDiG}(\Pi)$ is a tree.*

By Lemma 4.4, every GS-tree support of Π is a subgraph of $\text{AttG}(\Pi)$ whenever such a support exists. Since every DFS-ordering is also a GS-ordering, the same holds for DFS-tree supports. Together with Lemma 4.6, this implies that any DFS-tree support of Π must contain the subgraph induced by all forced vertices as a subtree. To streamline our exposition, we summarize these observations in the following corollary.

Let T^* be the subgraph of $\text{AttG}(\Pi)$ induced by the forced vertices of $\text{AttDiG}(\Pi)$, and let T_{Π}^{DFS} denote the set of all DFS-tree supports of Π .

Corollary 4.1. *If $T_{\Pi}^{\text{DFS}} \neq \emptyset$, then every tree in T_{Π}^{DFS} is a subgraph of $\text{AttG}(\Pi)$ and contains T^* as a subtree.*

4.2 The Polynomial-time Algorithm

Having collected the essential ingredients in the previous subsection, we are now ready to present a polynomial-time algorithm for SP-DFS-TREE. The problem is trivial when Π consists of a single ordering. Thus, we assume throughout that Π contains at least two orderings.

As a first step, we construct an attachment digraph $\text{AttDiG}(\Pi)$ of Π using Algorithm 1. For convenience, let $D = \text{AttDiG}(\Pi)$ and $G = \text{AttG}(\Pi)$.

If G is disconnected, then by Lemma 4.3, Π cannot be a set of GS-orderings for any tree, and consequently it cannot be a set of DFS-orderings either. In this case, we immediately return “No”. Assume henceforth that G is connected.

By Lemma 4.6, T^* is a tree. Moreover, by Lemma 4.5, it contains the first vertex $\text{top}(\sigma)$ of every ordering $\sigma \in \Pi$. For notational simplicity, let V^* denote the vertex set of T^* , i.e., the set of forced vertices.

By Corollary 4.1, if I is a Yes-instance, then T^* is a subtree of every DFS-tree support of Π .

The remaining challenge is to determine whether T^* extends to a DFS-tree support of Π . The next lemma provides the basis for this extension by showing how T^* can be grown through the addition of new leaves. While the choice of a suitable parent for each candidate leaf may still involve significant combinatorial complexity, the lemma greatly narrows the search space and introduces a structural constraint that guides the construction of the tree.

Lemma 4.7. *If $T_{\Pi}^{\text{DFS}} \neq \emptyset$, then there exists $T \in T_{\Pi}^{\text{DFS}}$ such that*

- T^* is a subtree of T , and
- every vertex in $V \setminus V^*$ is a leaf of T .

Proof. Suppose that $T_{\Pi}^{\text{DFS}} \neq \emptyset$. Let T' be any arbitrary tree in T_{Π}^{DFS} . By Corollary 4.1, T^* is a subtree of T' . Let T_1, T_2, \dots, T_k denote the connected components of $T' - V^*$. For each $i \in [k]$, let u_i be the vertex in T_i that is adjacent in T' to some vertex $v_i \in V^*$.

Let σ be an ordering in Π , which is a DFS-ordering of T' . by Lemma 4.5, T^* contains $\text{top}(\sigma)$. Consequently, when performing a DFS traversal of T' according to σ , all vertices of each T_i , $i \in [k]$, are visited consecutively, beginning with u_i . Equivalently, in the ordering σ , for every $i \in [k]$, the vertices of T_i appear as a consecutive block, with u_i as the first element.

Construct a new tree T by extending T^* : for each $i \in [k]$, attach all vertices of T_i as a leaf set rooted at v_i . In other words, all vertices of T_i become leaves adjacent to v_i in T .

It is easy to see that σ remains a DFS-ordering of T . Since this holds for all $\sigma \in \Pi$, the resulting tree T is a DFS-tree support of Π . The lemma follows. \square

Lemma 4.7 shows that, if a DFS-tree support exists, then all vertices outside V^* can be placed as leaves. This implies that, in such a situation, the subtree T^* necessarily forms a DFS-tree support of Π when restricted to the forced vertices, as captured in the following observation.

For a subset $V' \subseteq V$, let $\Pi|_{V'}$ denote the set of orderings obtained from Π by restricting each ordering to V' ; that is, $\Pi|_{V'}$ is obtained by removing, from every ordering in Π , all vertices in $V \setminus V'$.

Observation 3. *If T^* is not a DFS-tree support of $\Pi|_{V^*}$, then Π does not admit any DFS-tree support.*

By Observation 3, if T^* fails to be a DFS-tree support of $\Pi|_{V^*}$, we return “No”. Henceforth, we assume that every ordering in $\Pi|_{V^*}$ is a DFS-ordering of T^* .

Now the challenge is to identify the parent of each vertex not yet included in T^* . To facilitate our exposition, we introduce the following notation.

Let σ be an ordering in Π . For a free vertex v in σ , we define its *guider* as the closest forced vertex to its left in σ , and denote it by $\text{guider}(\sigma, v)$. Since the first vertex of σ is forced (Lemma 4.5), every free vertex in σ has a guider. For two forced vertices u and v , let $P_{\{u,v\}}$ denote the unique path between u and v in T^* . For a forced vertex v other than the first vertex of σ , let $\text{parent}(\sigma, v)$ denote the parent of v in T^* , when T^* is considered rooted at the first vertex of σ . If σ is a DFS-ordering of a tree, then every vertex $v \in V^*$, except the first one in σ , is adjacent to exactly one vertex that precedes v in σ , namely $\text{parent}(\sigma, v)$.

Let \mathcal{T}^* denote the set of all trees with vertex set V that contain T^* as a subtree, where all free vertices appear as leaves.

The following lemma restricts the possible neighbors of a free vertex. Intuitively, its parent must lie on the path determined by the nearest forced vertices.




Figure 8: An illustration of the ordering σ . Forced vertices are shown in black and free vertices in white. The arc represents the edge in T^* between the forced vertices w' and w . The vertex u is the guider, in σ , of all white vertices lying between u and w .

Lemma 4.8. *Let σ be an ordering of V , let v be an free vertex, and let $u = \text{guider}(\sigma, v)$. Define w as follows:*

$$w = \begin{cases} \text{top}(\sigma), & \text{if there is no forced vertex to the right of } v \text{ in } \sigma, \\ \text{parent}(\sigma, u'), & \text{otherwise, where } u' \text{ is the closest forced vertex to the right of } v \text{ in } \sigma. \end{cases}$$

If there exists a tree $\hat{T} \in \mathcal{T}^$ that admits σ as a DFS-ordering, then the unique neighbor of v in \hat{T} lies on the path $P_{\{u,w\}}$.*

Proof. We distinguish two cases.

Case 1: There is no forced vertex to the right of v in σ . In this case, w is the first vertex of σ . Let $\hat{T} \in \mathcal{T}^*$ be a tree that admits σ as a DFS-ordering, and consider the DFS traversal of \hat{T} according to σ . By Lemma 4.5, w is a forced vertex. Moreover, all vertices appearing after u in σ appear as leaves in \hat{T} . After visiting u , the traversal must backtrack along the path $P_{\{u,w\}}$ from u to w until all remaining leaves have been visited. Consequently, every free vertex appearing after u in σ , including v , must be attached as a child of some vertex on the path $P_{\{u,w\}}$.

Case 2: There exists a forced vertex u' such that $u <_{\sigma} v <_{\sigma} u'$, and no other forced vertex lies between u and u' in σ . We have $w = \text{parent}(\sigma, u')$.

Let $\hat{T} \in \mathcal{T}^*$ be a tree that admits σ as a DFS-ordering, and consider the traversal of \hat{T} according to σ , viewing \hat{T} as rooted at the first vertex of σ . Since all vertices between u and u' in σ are free, they appear as leaves in \hat{T} . By Lemma 4.1, the vertex w lies on the path between the root (the first vertex of σ) and u in \hat{T} . Because σ is a DFS-ordering of \hat{T} , the traversal, after visiting u and before visiting u' , must backtrack along the path $P_{\{u,w\}}$ from u to w until reaching the child u' of w . By Definition 2, whenever the traversal backtracks to a vertex x , it selects an unvisited child of x and visits all vertices in the subtree rooted at that child consecutively. Since all vertices between u and u' in σ , including v , are leaves of \hat{T} , the vertex v must be visited as a child of some vertex on the path $P_{\{u,w\}}$.

This completes the proof. \square

By Lemma 4.8, every free vertex v in an ordering σ is constrained to have its possible neighbors in any DFS-tree support of Π within \mathcal{T}^* on a path $P_{\{u,w\}}$ in T^* , where u and w are as specified in the lemma. Let $Q(\sigma, v)$ denote the set of vertices on this path $P_{\{u,w\}}$. We then define

$$Q(v) = \bigcap_{\sigma \in \Pi} Q(\sigma, v). \quad (2)$$

By Lemma 4.8, if Π admits a DFS-tree support $\hat{T} \in \mathcal{T}^*$, then the unique neighbor of every free vertex v in \hat{T} belongs to $Q(v)$. Since T^* is a tree and each $P_{\{u,w\}}$ is an induced path in T^* , it follows that $Q(v)$, being the intersection of these paths, is itself a subpath of every such $P_{\{u,w\}}$. Consequently, $Q(v)$ induces a path in T^* . We formalize this observation as follows.

Observation 4. *Let v be a free vertex, and let σ be an ordering in Π . Let $u = \text{guider}(\sigma, v)$, and let w be the first vertex of σ . If there exists a tree $\hat{T} \in \mathcal{T}^*$ that admits σ as a DFS-ordering, then $Q(v)$ induces a subpath of the path $P_{\{u,w\}}$ between u and w in T^* .*

If Π admits a DFS-tree support, then by Lemma 4.7 it admits one \widehat{T} that contains T^* as a subtree and places all free vertices as leaves. By Lemma 4.8, the unique neighbor of each free vertex v in \widehat{T} must lie in $Q(v)$, although its precise choice is not determined a priori. To further constrain these choices, we introduce a purification rule that refines $Q(v)$ for each free vertex v , thereby significantly reducing the search space. Before presenting this rule, we establish a lemma that underpins its correctness.

For two free vertices u and v , and a forced vertex w , we define:

- $Q_{(v,w)}^>(u)$ as the set of vertices in $Q(u)$ that are farther from w in T^* than every vertex in $Q(v)$, and
- $Q_{(v,w)}^<(u)$ as the set of vertices in $Q(u)$ that are closer to w in T^* than every vertex in $Q(v)$.

Lemma 4.9. *Let σ be an ordering on V , and let u and v be two free vertices that share the same guider w in σ , with $u <_\sigma v$. If there is a tree $\widehat{T} \in \mathcal{T}^*$ that admits σ as a DFS-ordering, then it holds that the unique neighbor of v in \widehat{T} is from $Q(v) \setminus Q_{(u,w)}^<(v)$, and the unique neighbor of u in \widehat{T} is from $Q(u) \setminus Q_{(v,w)}^>(u)$.*

Proof. Assume that there exists a tree $\widehat{T} \in \mathcal{T}^*$ that admits σ as a DFS-ordering. For brevity, let $\widehat{N}(v)$ (respectively, $\widehat{N}(u)$) denote the unique neighbor of v (respectively, u) in \widehat{T} . By Lemma 4.8, we have $\widehat{N}(v) \in Q(v)$ and $\widehat{N}(u) \in Q(u)$.

Note that \widehat{T} contains T^* as a subtree, and all free vertices as leaves. Let r be the first vertex in σ , and regard r as the root of \widehat{T} . Therefore, $\widehat{N}(v)$ and $\widehat{N}(u)$ are the parent of v and the parent of u in \widehat{T} , respectively.

Since u and v are free vertices with the same guider w in σ , and σ is a DFS-ordering of \widehat{T} , by Observation 4, either of $Q(v)$ and $Q(u)$ induces a subpath of the path between the root r and the vertex w in \widehat{T} . Therefore, both $\widehat{N}(v)$ and $\widehat{N}(u)$ are on the path between r and w in \widehat{T} . Consider the DFS-traversal of \widehat{T} with respect to σ . After visiting w , the traversal backtracks along the unique path from w to r . Since u is visited before v in σ , either $\widehat{N}(u) = \widehat{N}(v)$, or the backtracking reaches $\widehat{N}(u)$ before $\widehat{N}(v)$, which implies that $\widehat{N}(u)$ is closer to w than $\widehat{N}(v)$ in T^* . It follows that $\widehat{N}(v) \in Q(v) \setminus Q_{(u,w)}^<(v)$. Similarly, it follows that $\widehat{N}(u) \in Q(u) \setminus Q_{(v,w)}^>(u)$. \square

Based on Lemma 4.9, we introduce the following purification rule and apply it recursively to shrink each $Q(v)$, where v is a free vertex.

Purification Rule. *If there exist two free vertices u and v and an ordering $\sigma \in \Pi$ such that:*

- (i) $u <_\sigma v$,
- (ii) u and v share the same guider w in σ , and
- (iii) $Q_{(u,w)}^<(v) \cup Q_{(v,w)}^>(u) \neq \emptyset$.

Then, update $Q(v) := Q(v) \setminus Q_{(u,w)}^<(v)$ and $Q(u) := Q(u) \setminus Q_{(v,w)}^>(u)$.

The purification rule is exhaustively applied, in arbitrary order, until it no longer applies. Each application strictly reduces the size of $Q(u)$ for at least one free vertex u . Since there are at most $n - 1$ free vertices and each set $Q(u)$ has size at most $n - 1$, the rule can be applied only a polynomial number of times. Moreover, each application can be performed in polynomial time. Hence, the exhaustive application of the purification rule is polynomial-time implementable.

After exhaustively applying the purification rule, if there exists a free vertex v such that $Q(v) = \emptyset$, we immediately conclude that the instance I is a No-instance. The correctness of this conclusion is guaranteed by Lemma 4.9.

We now arrive at our final task: assigning each free vertex to a forced vertex.




Figure 9: An illustration of the relative ordering of vertices in the ordering σ used in the proof of Lemma 4.10. Dark vertices represent forced vertices, while the remaining vertices are free. The edge between w and w' in T^* is shown; all other edges are omitted for clarity.

Parent assignment phase: We first fix an arbitrary bijection $f : V \rightarrow [n]$, referred to as the *assignment function*. Then, for each free vertex v , we add v to T^* as a leaf by selecting as its neighbor the vertex $u \in Q(v)$ that minimizes the assignment function, that is, $f(u) \leq f(u')$ for all $u' \in Q(v)$.

It is straightforward to verify that the parent assignment phase can be carried out in polynomial time. We next establish the correctness of this step through the following lemmas. We emphasize that, when the algorithm enters the parent assignment phase, every ordering in Π , when restricted to the forced vertices, is a DFS ordering of T^* .

For clarity, we distinguish between the tree T^* before and after the assignment phase by using different notations. Specifically, T^* denotes the tree prior to the assignment phase, while \tilde{T} denotes the tree obtained after this phase. Observe that $\tilde{T} \in \mathcal{T}^*$.

Lemma 4.10. *Let u and v be two free vertices, and let σ be an ordering of V such that $u <_\sigma v$, and u and v have different guiders in σ . Let $u' = \text{guider}(\sigma, u)$. If there exists a tree \hat{T} in \mathcal{T}^* that admits σ as a DFS-ordering, then the following statements hold:*

- (1) $|Q(\sigma, u) \cap Q(\sigma, v)| \leq 1$.
- (2) Every vertex in $Q(\sigma, u) \setminus Q(\sigma, v)$ is closer to u' in T^* than every vertex in $Q(\sigma, v)$.
- (3) Every vertex in $Q(\sigma, u) \cap Q(\sigma, v)$ is closer to u' in T^* than every vertex in $Q(\sigma, v) \setminus Q(\sigma, u)$.

Proof. Assume that there exists $\hat{T} \in \mathcal{T}^*$ that admits σ as a DFS-ordering. Let $v' = \text{guider}(\sigma, v)$ denote the guider of v in σ , which is a forced vertex. We have $u' \neq v'$. Since $u <_\sigma v$, it follows $u' <_\sigma v'$. Furthermore, we have $u' <_\sigma u <_\sigma v' <_\sigma v$. Let r denote the first vertex in σ . Let w be the nearest forced vertex to the right of u in σ . Either $w = v'$ or $w <_\sigma v'$ holds. Let $w' = \text{parent}(w, \sigma)$ denote the parent of w in the tree T^* when it is rooted at r . Figure 9 illustrates the relative positions of these vertices in σ . We prove the three statements one by one.

We begin with the first statement. Recall that, by definition, $Q(\sigma, u)$ is the set of vertices on the path $P_{\{u', w'\}}$. Furthermore, \hat{T} contains T^* as a subtree and places all free vertices as leaves. We regard both T^* and \hat{T} as rooted at r . The statement clearly holds if $u' = w'$. Otherwise, assume that $P_{\{u', w'\}}$ contains at least two vertices, and let w'' be the neighbor of w' on this path. If $w'' = u'$, then $P_{\{u', w'\}}$ consists of exactly the two vertices u' and w' . Now, let us follow the DFS-traversal of \hat{T} according to σ . After visiting u' and before visiting w , σ backtracks along the path $P_{\{u', w'\}}$ from u' to w' . We distinguish between two cases. Recall that neither v' nor v is visited before w . Then, since σ is a DFS-ordering of \hat{T} , we can deduce that neither v' nor v could be a descendant of any vertex in $P_{\{u', w''\}}$ (see Definition 2). It follows that either the paths $P_{\{u', w'\}}$ and $P_{\{v', r\}}$ are vertex-disjoint, or they intersect in exactly the single vertex w' . The latter holds if and only if v' is a descendant of w' . By Lemmas 4.1 and 4.8, all vertices in $Q(\sigma, v)$ lie on the path $P_{\{v', r\}}$. It follows

$$|Q(\sigma, u) \cap Q(\sigma, v)| \leq |V(P_{\{u', w'\}}) \cap V(P_{\{v', r\}})| \leq 1,$$

which completes the proof of the first statement.

We now turn to the remaining two statements. As discussed, neither v' nor v is a descendant of any vertex on $P_{\{u', w'\}}$ in \widehat{T} . Consequently, for any vertex $x \in Q(\sigma, v)$, the path from x to u' in \widehat{T} contains the path from w' to u' as a subpath. Since $Q(\sigma, u)$ consists exactly of the vertices on the path $P_{\{u', w'\}}$, the second statement follows immediately. Moreover, we have shown that $Q(\sigma, u) \cap Q(\sigma, v) \in \{\emptyset, \{w'\}\}$, which establishes the third statement. \square

We are now ready to establish the correctness of the parent-assignment phase.

Lemma 4.11. *If Π admits a DFS-tree support, then \widetilde{T} is a DFS-tree support of Π .*

Proof. Assume that Π admits a DFS-tree support. For each free vertex x , let \tilde{x} denote its unique neighbor in \widetilde{T} . By construction, $\tilde{x} = \arg \min_{y \in Q(x)} f(y)$, where f is the assignment function.

Assume for contradiction that there exists an ordering $\sigma \in \Pi$ that is not a DFS-ordering of \widetilde{T} . Let k be the smallest index such that $\sigma_{\leq k-1}$ is a partial DFS-ordering of \widetilde{T} , but $\sigma_{\leq k}$ is not, and let u be the k -th vertex of σ . Since all free vertices are leaves of \widetilde{T} , and σ restricted to all forced vertices is a partial DFS-ordering of \widetilde{T} , we know that u is a free vertex. Let $r = \text{top}(\sigma)$, and let $w = \text{guider}(\sigma, u)$.

Let σ' be a DFS-ordering of \widetilde{T} which contains $\sigma_{\leq k-1}$ as a prefix. That is, the first $k-1$ vertices in σ and σ' are the same in the same relative order. Let v be the k -th vertex of σ' . By Lemma 3.1, such a DFS-ordering σ' exists. Clearly, $v \neq u$. We prove next that, like u , the vertex v is also free.

Claim 17. *The vertex v is a free vertex.*

Proof. We fix r as the root of T^* and \widetilde{T} in the following discussion. Assume, for contradiction, that v is forced. Let v^* be the parent of v in T^* . Note that there are no forced vertices between w and v in σ' , and that σ' restricted to all forced vertices is a DFS-ordering of T^* . By Lemma 4.1, it follows that v^* lies on the path between w and the root r in T^* .

Let a be the closest forced vertex to the right of u in σ ; such a vertex exists since v is forced and lies to the right of u . Let a^* be the parent of a in T^* . Observe that all vertices between a and w in σ are free. Moreover, whenever our algorithm enters the parent assignment phase, all orderings in Π , including σ , when restricted to the forced vertices, are DFS-orderings of T^* . By Lemma 4.1, it follows that a^* lies on the path between w and r in T^* .

We claim that a^* lies on the path $P_{\{v^*, w\}}$ in T^* . If a and v have the same parent, i.e., $a^* = v^*$, the claim is immediate. Otherwise, by the choice of a , we have $a <_{\sigma} v$. Since σ restricted to all forced vertices is a DFS-ordering of T^* , and $w <_{\sigma} a <_{\sigma} v$, Lemma 4.2 implies that a^* is closer to w than v^* in T^* . As both a^* and v^* lie on the path between w and r in T^* , it follows that a^* lies on $P_{\{v^*, w\}}$, as claimed.

We now derive a contradiction. Recall that σ' is a DFS-ordering of \widetilde{T} , and \tilde{u} denotes the parent of u in \widetilde{T} . Furthermore, u is a leaf in \widetilde{T} whose parent lies on the path between w and r (Lemma 4.8). In particular, \tilde{u} belongs to $Q(u)$, which is a subset of $Q(\sigma, u) = V(P_{\{a^*, w\}})$. That is, \tilde{u} is on the path between w and a^* in \widetilde{T} . Since both v and u are visited after w , and v is visited before u in σ' , Lemma 4.2 implies that the parent of v , denoted by v^* , lies on the path between the parent of u , namely \tilde{u} , and w . This is possible only when $a^* = v^* = \tilde{u}$. That is, u and v have the same parent. In this situation, replacing v with u in $\sigma'_{\leq k}$ does not make it not a DFS-ordering of \widetilde{T} restricted to the first k vertices of σ' . Since $\sigma'_{\leq k-1}$ is the same as $\sigma_{\leq k-1}$, this contradicts the definition of the integer k .

Therefore, v must be a free vertex. \square

Recall that \tilde{u} and \tilde{v} denote the unique neighbor of u and the unique neighbor of v in \widetilde{T} , respectively. Observe that $\tilde{u} \neq \tilde{v}$, since otherwise $\sigma_{\leq k}$ would form a partial DFS-ordering of \widetilde{T} , which contradicts our assumption. Now, we prove the following two statements.

- (i) In T^* , \tilde{v} lies on the path between w and \tilde{u} .
- (ii) In T^* , \tilde{u} lies on the path between w and \tilde{v} .

We first consider Statement (i). By Observation 4, we have $Q(u) \subseteq V(P_{\{w,r\}})$. Since $\tilde{u} \in Q(u)$, we know that \tilde{u} lies on the path $P_{\{w,r\}}$ between the root r and the guider w of u in σ . By the definition of v , we have that $w = \text{guider}(\sigma', v)$. Recall also that all free vertices including v are leaves of \tilde{T} . Let X be the set of the first $k - 1$ vertices in σ and σ' . After visiting the vertices of X , σ' visits v . By Lemma 4.8, we know that \tilde{v} locates on $P_{\{r,w\}}$ too. Since σ' visits v before u , and $\tilde{u} \neq \tilde{v}$, by Lemma 4.2, we have that \tilde{v} lies on the path between w and \tilde{u} .

Now we analyze Statement (ii). We distinguish between whether u and v have the same guider in σ .

Consider first the case where $\text{guider}(\sigma, u) = \text{guider}(\sigma, v)$. Since the purification rule has been exhaustively applied, in T^* , every vertex $x \in Q(u) \setminus Q(v)$ is closer to w than every vertex $y \in Q(v)$, and that every vertex $x \in Q(v) \setminus Q(u)$ is farther to w than every vertex $y \in Q(u)$. Since \tilde{T} is obtained from T^* by adding the free vertices as leaves, these also hold in \tilde{T} . Then, if $\tilde{u} \in Q(u) \setminus Q(v)$ or $\tilde{v} \in Q(v) \setminus Q(u)$, the statement in (ii) holds. Otherwise, \tilde{u} and \tilde{v} are both from $Q(u) \cap Q(v)$. By the parent assignment phase, we have that $\tilde{u} = \arg \min_{x \in Q(u)} f(x)$ and $\tilde{v} = \arg \min_{x \in Q(v)} f(x)$. It follows that $\tilde{u} = \tilde{v}$, a contradiction, implying that this cannot occur.

Consider now the second case where $\text{guider}(\sigma, u) \neq \text{guider}(\sigma, v)$. By Lemma 4.10, we have that $|Q(u) \cap Q(v) \leq 1|$ and every vertex $x \in Q(u) \setminus Q(v)$ is closer to w than every vertex of $Q(v)$, and every vertex $x \in Q(u) \cap Q(v)$ is closer to w than every vertex of $Q(v) \setminus Q(u)$. The remainder of the proof proceeds analogously to the first case.

Now, observe that, since $\tilde{u} \neq \tilde{v}$ and T^* is a tree, the two statements above contradict each other. \square

4.3 Putting All Together

We have described our polynomial-time algorithm in an expository manner, presenting each step sequentially together with a rigorous proof of its correctness. To provide a clearer overall understanding, this section presents the algorithm in its entirety (Algorithm 2) and provides a global proof of correctness by modularly combining the individual arguments established for the separate steps.

Theorem 4.1. *Let Π be a set of orderings on a set V . If Π admits a DFS-tree support, then Algorithm 2 constructs a DFS-tree support of Π in polynomial time; otherwise, it reports no.*

Proof. The algorithm first computes the attachment digraph D of Π and its underlying graph G , using the polynomial-time algorithm of [24] (Line 1).

If Π admits a DFS-tree support, it also admits a GS-tree support (Lemma 2.2). By Lemma 4.3, the attachment graph G is connected. Hence, if G is disconnected (as tested in Line 2), the algorithm can correctly return “No” in Line 3.

In Line 4, the algorithm initializes T^* as the subgraph of G induced by all forced vertices in D . Line 5 defines V^* as the set of all forced vertices. By Lemma 4.6, T^* is a tree. If Π admits a DFS-tree support, then it also admits a GS-tree support. Then, by Lemma 4.4, we know that any DFS-tree support of Π must be a spanning tree of G . Therefore, if T^* spans all vertices of V ($V^* = V$), it is the unique tree that can serve as a DFS-tree support of Π . Consequently, the algorithm correctly returns “Yes” if and only if every ordering in Π is a DFS-ordering of T^* in Lines 6–10.

The algorithm now proceeds to verify a sufficient condition for Π to admit at least one DFS-tree support in Lines 11 and 12. Specifically, if there exists an ordering in Π whose restriction to V^* is not a DFS-ordering of T^* , then Π admits no DFS-tree support. The correctness of this test follows from Observation 3.

If the algorithm has not terminated so far, then every ordering in Π , when restricted to V^* , is a DFS-ordering of T^* . By Lemmas 4.7 and 4.9, we conclude that whenever Π admits at least one DFS-tree support, it admits a DFS-tree support that contains T^* as a subtree and places all free vertices as leaves.

In Line 13, the algorithm identifies the set S of all free vertices. In Line 14, it computes the set $Q(v)$ for each free vertex v , as defined in (2), and iteratively applies the purification rule until it no longer applies.

Algorithm 2

Input: A vertex set V and a set Π of orderings on V .

Output: A DFS-tree support of Π , if one exists; otherwise, return “No”.

```
1:  $D \leftarrow \text{AttDiG}(\Pi)$ ,  $G \leftarrow \text{AttG}(\Pi)$ ;
2: if  $G$  is disconnected then
3:   return “No”;
4: let  $T^*$  be the subgraph of  $G$  induced by all forced vertices in  $D$ ;
5: let  $V^* \leftarrow V(T^*)$ ; ▷ Set of forced vertices
6: if  $V^* = V$  then
7:   if all orderings in  $\Pi$  are DFS-orderings of  $T^*$  then
8:     return  $T^*$ ;
9:   else
10:    return “No”;
11: if  $\exists \sigma \in \Pi$  whose restriction to  $V^*$  is not a DFS-ordering of  $T^*$  then
12:   return “No”;
13:  $S \leftarrow V \setminus V^*$ ; ▷ Set of free vertices
14: compute  $Q(v)$  for all  $v \in S$  as defined in (2), and iteratively apply the Purification Rule until it no longer applies;
15: if  $\exists v \in S$  such that  $Q(v) = \emptyset$  then
16:   return “No”;
17: let  $n \leftarrow |V|$  and let  $f : V \rightarrow [n]$  be any arbitrary bijection; ▷ Parent assignment starts
18: for each  $v \in S$  do
19:   let  $u \leftarrow \arg \min_{x \in Q(v)} f(x)$ ;
20:   add vertex  $v$  and edge  $\{u, v\}$  to  $T^*$ ;
21: return  $T^*$ ;
```

In Lines 15 and 16, the algorithm returns “No” whenever there exists a free vertex $v \in S$ with $Q(v) = \emptyset$. By Lemma 4.9, after exhaustive application of the purification rule, any DFS-tree support of Π that contains T^* as a subtree and the vertices in S as leaves must assign the unique neighbor of each v from $Q(v)$. Consequently, if $Q(v) = \emptyset$ for some v , no such DFS-tree support exists. By Lemma 4.7, this further implies that Π admits no DFS-tree support at all, and thus the algorithm correctly returns “No” in this case.

If $Q(v)$ is nonempty for all free vertices $v \in S$, the algorithm proceeds to the parent assignment phase, as described in Lines 17–20. The correctness of this phase has been established in Lemma 4.11. After completing the parent assignment phase, the algorithm outputs T^* in Line 21.

As noted earlier, both the exhaustive application of the purification rule, and the parent assignment phase can be carried out in polynomial time. Therefore, we conclude that the entire algorithm runs in polynomial time. □

References

- [1] L. Amgoud and S. Vesic. Rich preference-based argumentation frameworks. *Int. J. Approx. Reason.*, 55(2):585–606, 2014.
- [2] A. Beynier, N. Maudet, S. Rey, and P. Shams. Swap dynamics in single-peaked housing markets. *Auton. Agents Multi Agent Syst.*, 35(2):Nr. 20, 2021.
- [3] D. Black. On the rationale of group decision-making. *J. Polit. Econ.*, 56(1):23–34, 1948.
- [4] A. G. Bonifacio. Bribe-proof reallocation with single-peaked preferences. *Soc. Choice Welfare*, 44(3):617–638, 2015.

- [5] F. Brandt, M. Brill, E. Hemaspaandra, and L. A. Hemaspaandra. Bypassing combinatorial protections: Polynomial-time algorithms for single-peaked electorates. *J. Artif. Intell. Res.*, 53:439–496, 2015.
- [6] A. Bretscher, D. G. Corneil, M. Habib, and C. Paul. A simple linear time LexBFS cograph recognition algorithm. *SIAM J. Discrete Math.*, 22(4):1277–1296, 2008.
- [7] G. Di Caro and M. Dorigo. Antnet: Distributed stigmergetic control for communications networks. *J. Artif. Intell. Res.*, 9:317–365, 1998.
- [8] A. Clearwater, C. Puppe, and A. Slinko. Generalizing the single-crossing property on lines and trees to intermediate preferences on median graphs. In *IJCAI*, pages 32–38, 2015.
- [9] D. Cornaz, L. Galand, and O. Spanjaard. Kemeny elections with bounded single-peaked or single-crossing width. In *IJCAI*, pages 76–82, 2013.
- [10] D. G. Corneil and R. Krueger. A unified view of graph searching. *SIAM J. Discret. Math.*, 22(4):1259–1276, 2008.
- [11] G. Demange. Single-peaked orders on a tree. *Math. Soc. Sci.*, 3(3):389–396, 1983.
- [12] B. Escoffier, O. Spanjaard, and M. Tydrichová. Recognizing single-peaked preferences on an arbitrary graph: Complexity and algorithms. *Discret. Appl. Math.*, 348:301–319, 2024.
- [13] P. Faliszewski, E. Hemaspaandra, L. A. Hemaspaandra, and J. Rothe. The shield that never was: Societies with single-peaked preferences are more open to manipulation and control. *Inf. Comput.*, 209(2):89–107, 2011.
- [14] M. R. Garey, D. S. Johnson, and L. J. Stockmeyer. Some simplified NP-complete graph problems. *Theor. Comput. Sci.*, 1(3):237–267, 1976.
- [15] K.-I. Inada. A note on the simple majority decision rule. *Econometrica*, 32(4):525–531, 1964.
- [16] K.-I. Inada. The simple majority decision rule. *Econometrica*, 37(3):490–506, 1969.
- [17] A. Kleiner and B. Moldovanu. Voting agendas and preferences on trees: Theory and practice. *Am. Econ. J.: Microecon.*, 14(4):583–615, 2022.
- [18] R. E. Korf. Depth-first iterative-deepening: An optimal admissible tree search. *Artif. Intell.*, 27(1):97–109, 1985.
- [19] M. Krnc and N. Pivac. Graphs where Search Methods are Indistinguishable. In *EuroComb*, pages 351–358, 2021.
- [20] J. A. Mirrlees. An exploration in the theory of optimum income taxation. *Rev. Econ. Stud.*, 38(114):175–208, 1971.
- [21] S. Nofal, K. Atkinson, and P. E. Dunne. Algorithms for decision problems in argument systems under preferred semantics. *Artif. Intell.*, 207:23–51, 2014.
- [22] D. Peters and E. Elkind. Preferences single-peaked on nice trees. In *AAAI*, pages 594–600, 2016.
- [23] D. Peters and M. Lackner. Preferences single-peaked on a circle. *J. Artif. Intell. Res.*, 68:463–502, 2020.
- [24] D. Peters, L. Yu, H. Chan, and E. Elkind. Preferences single-peaked on a tree: Multiwinner elections and structural results. *J. Artif. Intell. Res.*, 73:231–276, 2022.
- [25] S. R. Rad and O. Roy. Deliberation, single-peakedness, and coherent aggregation. *Am. Polit. Sci. Rev.*, 115(2):629–648, 2021.
- [26] S. Rey, U. Endriss, and R. de Haan. A general framework for participatory budgeting with additional constraints. *Soc. Choice Welf.*, 64(1-2):5–41, 2025.
- [27] K. W. S. Roberts. Voting over income tax schedules. *J. Public Econ.*, 8(3):329–340, 1977.
- [28] D. J. Rose, R. E. Tarjan, and G. S. Lueker. Algorithmic aspects of vertex elimination on graphs. *SIAM J. Comput.*, 5(2):266–283, 1976.
- [29] R. E. Tarjan. Depth-first search and linear graph algorithms. *SIAM J. Comput.*, 1(2):146–160, 1972.
- [30] M. A. Trick. Recognizing single-peaked preferences on a tree. *Math. Soc. Sci.*, 17(3):329–334, 1989.
- [31] S. Yang, F. Han, Y. Wu, and X. Yan. Fast top- k search in knowledge graphs. In *ICDE*, pages 990–1001, 2016.

- [32] Y. Yang. Manipulation with bounded single-peaked width: A parameterized study. In *AAMAS*, pages 77–85, 2015.
- [33] Y. Yang and J. Guo. The control complexity of r -approval: From the single-peaked case to the general case. *J. Comput. Syst. Sci.*, 89:432–449, 2017.
- [34] Y. Yang and J. Wang. Multiwinner voting with restricted admissible sets: Complexity and strategyproofness. In *IJCAI*, pages 576–582, 2018.
- [35] K. Zhang, Z. Yang, H. Liu, T. Zhang, and T. Basar. Fully decentralized multi-agent reinforcement learning with networked agents. In *ICML*, pages 5867–5876, 2018.
- [36] C. Zhu, K. Ren, X. Liu, H. Wang, Y. Tian, and Y. Yu. A graph traversal based approach to answer non-aggregation questions over DBpedia. In *JIST*, pages 219–234, 2015.