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Abstract

A graph $H$ is a square root of a graph $G$ if $G$ can be obtained from $H$ by adding an edge between any two vertices in $H$ that are of distance 2. The Square Root problem is that of deciding whether a given graph admits a square root. This problem is known to be NP-complete for chordal graphs and polynomial-time solvable for non-trivial minor-closed graph classes and a very limited number of other graph classes. We prove that Square Root is $O(n^2)$-time solvable for graphs of maximum degree 5 and $O(n^4)$-time solvable for graphs of maximum degree at most 6.
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1. Introduction

The square $H^2$ of a graph $H = (V_H, E_H)$ is the graph with vertex set $V_H$, such that any two distinct vertices $u, v \in V_H$ are adjacent in $H^2$ if and only if $u$ and $v$ are of distance at most 2 in $H$. In this paper we study the reverse concept: a graph $H$ is a square root of a graph $G$ if $G = H^2$. There exist graphs with no square root (such as graphs with a cut-vertex), graphs with a unique
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square root (such as squares of cycles of length at least 7) as well as graphs with more than one square root (such as complete graphs).

In 1967 Mukhopadhyay [23] characterised the class of connected graphs with a square root. However, in 1994, Motwani and Sudan [22] showed that the decision problem SQUARE Root, which asks whether a given graph admits a square root, is \textit{NP}-complete. As such, it is natural to restrict the input to special graph classes in order to obtain polynomial-time results. For several well-known graph classes the complexity of SQUARE Root is still unknown. For example, Milanic and Schaudt [21] posed the complexity of SQUARE Root restricted to split graphs and cographs as open problems. In Table 1 we survey the known results.

Rows 6 and 7 in Table 1 correspond to the results in this paper. More specifically, we prove in Section 3 that SQUARE Root is linear-time solvable for graphs of maximum degree at most 5 via a reduction to graphs of bounded treewidth and in Section 4 that SQUARE Root is \(O(n^4)\)-time solvable for graphs of maximum degree at most 6 via a reduction to graphs of bounded size.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>graph class (\mathcal{G})</th>
<th>complexity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>planar graphs [19]</td>
<td>linear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>non-trivial and minor-closed [24]</td>
<td>linear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(K_4)-free graphs [12]</td>
<td>linear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>((K_r, P_t))-free graphs [12]</td>
<td>linear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-degenerate graphs [12]</td>
<td>linear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>graphs of maximum degree (\leq 5)</td>
<td>linear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>graphs of maximum degree (\leq 6)</td>
<td>polynomial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>graphs of maximum average degree (&lt; \frac{27}{11}) [11]</td>
<td>polynomial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>line graphs [20]</td>
<td>polynomial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>trivially perfect graphs [21]</td>
<td>polynomial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>threshold graphs [21]</td>
<td>polynomial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>chordal graphs [14]</td>
<td>\textit{NP}-complete</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: The known results for SQUARE Root restricted to some special graph class \(\mathcal{G}\). Note that the row for planar graphs is absorbed by the row below. The two unreferenced results are the results of this paper.

The \(\mathcal{H}\)-SQUARE Root problem, which is that of testing whether a given graph has a square root that belongs to some specified graph class \(\mathcal{H}\), has also been well studied. We refer to Table 2 for a survey of the known results on \(\mathcal{H}\)-SQUARE Root.

Finally both SQUARE Root and \(\mathcal{H}\)-SQUARE Root have been studied under the framework of parameterized complexity. The generalization of SQUARE Root that takes as input a graph \(G\) with two subsets \(R\) and \(B\) of edges that need to be included or excluded, respectively, in any solution (square root)\(^1\) has

\(^1\)We give a formal definition of this generalization in Section 4, as we need it for proving that SQUARE Root is \(O(n^4)\)-time solvable for graphs of maximum degree at most 6.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>graph class $H$</th>
<th>complexity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>trees [19]</td>
<td>polynomial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>proper interval graphs [14]</td>
<td>polynomial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bipartite graphs [13]</td>
<td>polynomial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>block graphs [17]</td>
<td>polynomial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>strongly chordal split graphs [18]</td>
<td>polynomial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ptolemaic graphs [15]</td>
<td>polynomial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-sun-free split graphs [15]</td>
<td>polynomial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cactus graphs [10]</td>
<td>polynomial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>graphs with girth at least $g$ for any fixed $g \geq 6$ [9]</td>
<td>polynomial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>graphs of girth at least 5 [8]</td>
<td>NP-complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>graphs of girth at least 4 [9]</td>
<td>NP-complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>split graphs [14]</td>
<td>NP-complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>chordal graphs [14]</td>
<td>NP-complete</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: The known results for $H$-Square Root restricted to various graph classes $H$. The result for 3-sun-free split graphs has been extended to a number of other subclasses of split graphs in [16].

a kernel of size $O(k)$ for graphs that can be made planar after removing at most $k$ vertices [11]. The problems of testing whether a connected $n$-vertex graph with $m$ edges has a square root with at most $n - 1 + k$ edges and whether such a graph has a square root with at least $m - k$ edges are both fixed-parameter tractable when parameterized by $k$ [4].

2. Preliminaries

We only consider finite undirected graphs without loops or multiple edges. We refer to the textbook by Diestel [7] for any undefined graph terminology.

Let $G$ be a graph. We denote the vertex set of $G$ by $V_G$ and the edge set by $E_G$. The length of a path or a cycle is the number of edges of the path or cycle, respectively. The distance $\text{dist}_G(u, v)$ between a pair of vertices $u$ and $v$ of $G$ is the number of edges of a shortest path between them. The diameter $\text{diam}(G)$ of $G$ is the maximum distance between two vertices of $G$. The neighbourhood of a vertex $u \in V_G$ is defined as $N_G(u) = \{v \mid uv \in E_G\}$. The degree of a vertex $u \in V_G$ is defined as $d_G(u) = |N_G(u)|$. The maximum degree of $G$ is $\Delta(G) = \max\{d_G(v) \mid v \in V_G\}$. A vertex of degree 1 and the (unique) edge incident to it are said to be a pendant vertex and pendant edge of $G$ respectively. A vertex subset of $G$ that consists of mutually adjacent vertices is called a clique.

A tree decomposition of a graph $G$ is a pair $(T, X)$ where $T$ is a tree and $X = \{X_i \mid i \in V_T\}$ is a collection of subsets (called bags) of $V_G$ such that the following three conditions hold:

i) $\bigcup_{i \in V_T} X_i = V_G$,

ii) for each edge $xy \in E_G$, $x, y \in X_i$ for some $i \in V_T$, and
iii) for each \( x \in V_G \) the set \( \{ i \mid x \in X_i \} \) induces a connected subtree of \( T \).

The width of a tree decomposition \( (\{ X_i \mid i \in V_T \}, T) \) is \( \max_{i \in V_T} \{ |X_i| - 1 \} \). The treewidth \( \text{tw}(G) \) of a graph \( G \) is the minimum width over all tree decompositions of \( G \). If \( T \) restricted to be a path, then we say that \( (X, T) \) is a path decomposition of a graph \( G \). The pathwidth \( \text{pw}(G) \) of \( G \) is the minimum width over all path decompositions of \( G \). A class of graphs \( G \) has bounded treewidth (pathwidth) if there exists a constant \( p \) such that the treewidth (pathwidth) of every graph from \( G \) is at most \( p \).

3. Graphs of Maximum Degree at Most 5

In this section we prove that \text{Square Root} can be solved in linear time for graphs of maximum degree at most 5 by showing that squares of maximum degree at most 5 have bounded pathwidth. The latter enables us to use the following two lemmas, the first of which is due to Bodlaender [1].

**Lemma 1** ([1]). For any fixed constant \( k \), it is possible to decide in linear time whether the treewidth (or pathwidth) of a graph is at most \( k \).

**Lemma 2.** The \text{Square Root} problem can be solved in time \( O(f(k)n) \) for \( n \)-vertex graphs of treewidth (or pathwidth) at most \( k \).

**Proof.** Recall that a spanning subgraph \( H = (V, E_H) \) is a square root of a graph \( G = (V, E_G) \) if and only if

1. for every edge \( uv \in E_G \), it holds that \( uv \in E_H \) or there exists a vertex \( w \in V \) such that \( uw, wv \in E_H \),
2. for every two edges \( uv, wv \in E_H \), it holds that \( uv \in E_G \).

It is straightforward to verify that conditions 1 and 2 can be written in Monadic Second-Order Logic (MSOL); see Courcelle and Engelfriet [6] for an introduction to MSOL. Then by Courcelle’s Theorem [5] we may immediately conclude that \text{Square Root} can be solved in time \( O(f(k)n) \) for \( n \)-vertex graphs of treewidth (or pathwidth) at most \( k \). Alternatively, it is possible to give a faster and direct dynamic programming algorithm. As this is a relatively standard algorithm, we only sketch the main idea behind it below.

Let \( (T, X) \) be a tree decomposition of \( G \) where \( X = \{ X_i \mid i \in V_T \} \). Let \( r \) be the root of \( T \). For each \( i \in V_T \), let \( G_i \) be the subgraph of \( G \) induced by the vertices in \( X_i \) and all bags \( X_h \), for which \( h \) is descendant of \( i \) (with respect to \( r \)). Let \( (A, B, C, U, W) \) be a 5-tuple, where \( (A, B, C) \) is a partition of the edge set of \( G[X_i] \) and \( (U, W) \) is a partition of \( X_i \) (some sets in these partitions may be empty). We define a partial solution for \( G_i \) corresponding to \( (A, B, C, U, W) \) as a set of edges \( R \subseteq E_{G_i} \) with the following properties:

i) \( R \cap E_{G_i[X_i]} = A \),

ii) for every edge \( uv \in E_{G_i} \setminus C \), it holds that \( uv \in R \) or there exists a vertex \( w \in V_{G_i} \) such that \( uw, wv \in R \).
iii) for every $uv \in C$, there is no vertex $w \in V_G$ such that $uw, vw \in R$,

iv) for every two edges $uv, wv \in R$, it holds that $w \in E_G$,

v) $U$ consists of all vertices of $X_i$ that are incident to an edge in $R$ whose other end-vertex is in $V_{G_i} \setminus X_i$.

In other words, the graph $H = (V_{G_i}, R)$ is a subgraph of $G_i$ such that $H^2$ is a subgraph of $G_i$ that contains all the edges of $E_{G_i} \setminus C$ and no edge of $C$. In order to extend $R$, the idea is to make use only of information provided by the tuple $(A, B, C, U, W)$.

If $uv \in E(G_i) \setminus E_{G_i[X_i]}$, then by ii), $uv \in R$ or there exists a vertex $w \in V_{G_i}$ such that $uw, vw \in R$. By definition, $A$ is the set of edges of $R$ with both end-vertices in $X_i$. Note that ii) implies that for each edge $uv \in B$, there are $uw, wv \in R$ for some $w \in V_{G_i}$, whereas i) implies that $C \cap R = \emptyset$. Hence $C$ is the set of edges of $G[X_i]$ that need to be joined by a path of length 2 in any solution for $G$ and by iii), this path must be outside $G_i$. Observe also that if $uv$ is an edge of a square root of $G$ in an extension of $R$ for some $u \in X_i$ and $v \in V_G \setminus V_{G_i}$, then $u \in W$; otherwise, because of v), $E_G$ contains an edge $vw \in E_G$ for some $v \in V_{G_i} \setminus X_i$, which violates the definition of a tree decomposition. In particular, this implies that both end-vertices of every edge in $C$ belong to $W$ if a partial solution $R$ exists. Moreover, by definition, if a vertex of $W$ is incident to an edge of $R$, then this edge must belong $A$. Hence, $W$ consist of those vertices of $G_i$ that may be used to extend $R$ and the bag $X_i$ provides us indeed with complete information about the edges of $R$ incident to the vertices of $W$.

There might be more than one partial solution $R$ corresponding to $(A, B, C, U, W)$ or none. However, as shown above, any two distinct partial solutions corresponding to the same 5-tuple $(A, B, C, U, W)$ are equivalent in the sense that if we can extend one of them to a square root of $G$ by adding some edges of $E_G \setminus E_{G_i}$, then the addition of the same edges to the other partial solution also gives us a square root of $G$.

We now construct for each $i \in V_T$ a table containing all 5-tuples $(A, B, C, U, W)$ that correspond to a partial solution, starting from the leaves of $T$ and following a bottom-up approach (which is a standard dynamic programming method for graphs of bounded treewidth; see, for example, the recent book of Cygan et al. [2]). Since for each $i \in V_T$ the table contains at most $3(|X_i| - 1)!|X_i| / 2 \cdot 2^{2|X_i|} \leq 2^{O(k^2)}$ partial solutions, we can show that the running time is $2^{O(k^2)} \cdot n$. \hfill \□

We now prove the key result of this section.

**Lemma 3.** If $G$ is a graph with $\Delta(G) \leq 5$ that has a square root, then $pw(G) \leq 27$.

**Proof.** Without loss of generality we assume that $G$ is connected; otherwise, we can consider the components of $G$ separately. Let $H$ be a square root of $G$. Let $u \in V_G$. In $H$ we apply a breadth-first search (BFS) starting at $u$. This yields the levels $L_0, \ldots, L_s$ for some $s \geq 0$, where $L_s = \{v \in V_G \mid dist_G(u, v) = i\}$
for \( i = 0, \ldots, s \). Note that \( L_0 = \{u\} \) and that \( L_0 \cup \cdots \cup L_s \) is a partition of \( V_H = V_G \). Let \( T \) be the corresponding BFS-tree of \( H \) rooted in \( u \). Note that \( T \) also defines a parent-child relation on the vertices of \( G \).

We prove the following two claims.

**Claim A.** Let \( i \geq 2 \). Then \( x \in L_i \) implies that

i) \( x \) has at most three children in \( T \), and

ii) for any \( j \in \{i+1, \ldots, s-1\} \), \( x \) has at most four descendants in \( L_j \cup L_{j+1} \).

![Forbidden subgraphs for square roots of graphs of maximum degree at most 5.](image)

**Figure 1:** Forbidden subgraphs for square roots of graphs of maximum degree at most 5.

We prove Claim A as follows. First we show i) by observing that if \( x \) had at least four children in \( T \), then \( H \) contains the subgraph shown in Figure 1 a) and, therefore, \( d_G(x) \geq 6 \), which is a contradiction.

We now prove ii). First assume that \( x \) has exactly one descendant \( y \in L_j \). Then \( y \) has at most three children in \( L_{j+1} \) due to i), and hence the total number of descendants of \( x \) in \( L_j \cup L_{j+1} \) is at most 4. Now assume that \( x \) has at least two descendants in \( L_j \), say \( y_1 \) and \( y_2 \). Let \( v \) denote the lowest common ancestor of \( y_1, y_2 \) in \( T \). Note that \( v \) is a descendant of \( x \) or \( v = x \), so \( v \in L_k \) for some \( i \leq k \leq j-1 \). Suppose \( k < j-1 \). Then \( H \) contains the subgraph shown in Figure 1 b) and hence \( d_G(v) \geq 6 \), a contradiction. Hence, \( v \in L_{j-1} \) and, moreover, we may assume without loss of generality that \( v \) is the parent in \( T \) of all the descendants of \( x \) in \( L_j \) (as otherwise there exists a vertex \( v' \in L_{j-1} \) with a neighbour \( y_3 \in L_j \), which means that the lowest common ancestor of \( v \) and \( v' \) has six neighbours in \( G \)).

By i), we find that \( v \) has at most three children. Hence, \( x \) has at most three descendants in \( L_j \). To obtain a contradiction, assume that \( x \) has at least two descendants \( z_1, z_2 \) in \( L_{j+1} \). If \( z_1, z_2 \) have distinct parents we again find that \( H \) contains the forbidden subgraph shown in Figure 1 b). If \( z_1, z_2 \) have the same parent, \( H \) contains the subgraph shown in Figure 1 c) and hence \( d_G(v) \geq 6 \), a contradiction. Hence, \( x \) has at most one descendant in \( L_{j+1} \). We conclude that the total number of descendants of \( x \) in \( L_j \cup L_{j+1} \) is at most 4. This completes the proof of ii). Consequently we have proven Claim A.

**Claim B.** \( \text{pw}(G) \leq \max\{|L_i \cup L_{i+1} \cup L_{i+2}| \mid 0 \leq i \leq s\} - 1 \).

We prove Claim B as follows. Let \( P \) be the path on vertices 0, \ldots, s \) (in the order of the path). We set \( X_i = L_i \cup L_{i+1} \cup L_{i+2} \) for all \( i \in \{0, \ldots, s\} \) and define \( X = \{X_1, \ldots, X_s\} \). We claim that \( (X, P) \) is a path decomposition of \( G \).
This can be seen as follows. Since the sets $L_0, \ldots, L_s$ form a partition of $V_G$, we find that $\bigcup_{i=0}^{s} X_i = V_G$. Moreover, for every edge $xy \in E_G$ with $x \in L_i$ and $y \in L_j$ we see that $|i - j| \leq 2$. Hence, for each edge $xy \in E_G$, $x, y \in X_i$ for some $i \in \{0, \ldots, s\}$. Finally, if $x \in X_i \cap X_j$ such that $i + 1 < j$, then $i + 2 = j$ and $x \in L_{i+2} \subseteq X_{i+1}$. Therefore, the set $\{i \mid x \in X_i\}$ induces a subpath of $P$ for each $x \in V_G$. It remains to observe that the width of $(X, P)$ is $\max\{|L_i \cup L_{i+1} \cup L_{i+2}| \mid 0 \leq i \leq s\} - 1$. This completes the proof of Claim B.

Because $d_G(u) \leq 5$, $|L_1 \cup L_2| \leq 5$ and thus $|L_2| \leq 4$ and $|L_0 \cup L_1 \cup L_2| \leq 6$. By Claim A, each vertex of $L_2$ has at most three children in $T$ and at most four descendants in $L_3 \cup L_4$. Hence, $|L_1 \cup L_2 \cup L_3| \leq 17$ and $|L_2 \cup L_3 \cup L_4| \leq 20$. For $j \in \{3, \ldots, s\}$, each vertex of $L_2$ has at most four descendants in $L_j \cup L_{j+1}$ and also at most four descendants in $L_{j+1} \cup L_{j+2}$ by Claim A ii). Therefore, each vertex of $L_2$ has at most seven descendants in $L_j \cup L_{j+1} \cup L_{j+2}$. As $|L_2| \leq 4$, this means that $|L_j \cup L_{j+1} \cup L_{j+2}| \leq 28$. We conclude that $|L_i \cup L_{i+1} \cup L_{i+2}| \leq 28$ for all $i \in \{0, \ldots, s\}$. Consequently, Claim B implies that $\text{pw}(G) \leq 27$.

We are now ready to prove the main theorem of this section.

**Theorem 1.** *Square Root* can be solved in time $O(n^4)$ for $n$-vertex graphs of maximum degree at most 5.

**Proof.** Let $G$ be a graph with $\Delta(G) \leq 5$. By Lemma 1 we can check in $O(n)$ time whether $\text{pw}(G) \leq 27$. If $\text{pw}(G) > 27$, then $G$ has no square root by Lemma 3. Otherwise, we solve *Square Root* in $O(n)$ time by using Lemma 2.

**Remark 1.** The above approach cannot be extended to graphs of maximum degree at most 6. In order to see this, take a wall (see Figure 2) and subdivide each edge, that is, replace each edge $uv$ by a path $uvw$ where $v$ is a new vertex. This gives us a graph $H$, such that $H^2$ has degree at most 6. A wall of height $h$ has treewidth $\Omega(h)$ (see, for example, [7]). As subdividing an edge and adding edges does not decrease the treewidth of a graph, this means that the graph $H^2$ can have an arbitrarily large treewidth.

4. Graphs of Maximum Degree at Most 6

In this section we show that the *Square Root* problem can be solved in $O(n^4)$ time for $n$-vertex graphs of maximum degree at most 6. In order to do this we need to consider the aforementioned generalization of *Square Roots*, which is defined as follows.
**Square Root with Labels**

**Input:** a graph $G$ and two sets of edges $R, B \subseteq E_G$.

**Question:** is there a graph $H$ with $H^2 = G$, $R \subseteq E_H$ and $B \cap E_H = \emptyset$?

Note that Square Root is indeed a special case of Square Root with Labels: choose $R = B = \emptyset$.

The main idea behind our proof is to reduce to graphs with a bounded number of vertices by using the reduction rule that we recently introduced in [11] (the proof in [3] used a different and less general reduction rule, namely, the so-called path reduction rule, which only ensured boundedness of treewidth).

In order to explain the reduction of [11] we need the following definition. An edge $uv$ of a graph $G$ is said to be recognizable if $N_G(u) \cap N_G(v)$ has a partition $(X, Y)$, where $X = \{x_1, \ldots, x_p\}$ and $Y = \{y_1, \ldots, y_q\}$, for some $p, q \geq 1$, such that the following conditions are satisfied:

a) $X$ and $Y$ are disjoint cliques in $G$;

b) $x_i y_j \notin E_G$ for $i \in \{1, \ldots, p\}$ and $j \in \{1, \ldots, q\}$;

c) for any $w \in N_G(u) \setminus (X \cup Y \cup \{v\})$, $w y_j \notin E_G$ for $j \in \{1, \ldots, q\}$;

d) for any $w \in N_G(v) \setminus (X \cup Y \cup \{u\})$, $w x_i \notin E_G$ for $i \in \{1, \ldots, p\}$;

e) for any $w \in N_G(u) \setminus (X \cup Y \cup \{v\})$, there is an $i \in \{1, \ldots, p\}$ such that $w x_i \in E_G$;

f) for any $w \in N_G(v) \setminus (X \cup Y \cup \{u\})$, there is a $j \in \{1, \ldots, q\}$ such that $w y_j \in E_G$.

We refer to the left part of Figure 3 for an example of a recognizable edge.

---

Figure 3: (i) The example from [11] of a graph $G$ with a recognizable edge $uv$ and a corresponding $(u, v)$-partition $(X, Y)$. (ii) A square root of $G$. The edge $uv$ together with the edges between $u$ and $X$ and between $v$ and $Y$ are shown by thick lines: they belong to the set $R$, that is, are included in any square root of $G$. The edges between $u$ and $Y$ and between $v$ and $X$ are shown by dashed lines: they belong to the set $B$, that is, are excluded from any square root of $G$. Edges which may or may not belong to the square root are shown by neither thick nor dashed lines.

Recognizable edges have been introduced in [11] to be able to recognize, besides graphs with a unique square root, also graphs with more than one square
Lemma 4 ([11]). For an instance \((G, R, B)\) of SQUARE ROOT WITH LABELS where \(G\) has \(n\) vertices and \(m\) edges, it takes \(O(n^2m^2)\) time to either solve the problem or to obtain an instance \((G', R', B')\) that has no recognizable edges and that is a yes-instance if and only if \((G, R, B)\) is a yes-instance.

Remark 2. The graph \(G'\) in the instance \((G', R', B')\) in Lemma 4 is a subgraph of \(G\). Hence, if we apply Lemma 4 on an instance \((G, R, B)\), where \(G\) has maximum degree at most 6, then the graph \(G'\) of the resulting instance \((G', R', B')\) has maximum degree at most 6 as well.

Lemma 5 ([11]). Let \(H\) be a square root of a graph with no recognizable edges. Then every non-pendant edge of \(H\) lies on a cycle of length at most 6.

We are now ready to prove the aforementioned structural result on graphs of maximum degree at most 6 with no recognizable edges. Its proof relies on Lemma 5.

Lemma 6. Let \(G\) be a connected graph with \(\Delta(G) \leq 6\) that has no recognizable edges. If \(G\) has a square root, then \(G\) has at most 103 vertices.

Proof. Let \(G\) be a connected graph with \(\Delta(G) \leq 6\) that has no recognizable edges. Assume that \(G\) has a square root \(H\). We select a vertex \(u\) for which there exists a vertex \(v\), such that \(\text{dist}_H(u, v) = \text{diam}(H) = s\). We apply a breadth-first search on \(H\) starting at \(u\) to obtain levels \(L_0, \ldots, L_s\), where \(L_i = \{w \in V_G \mid \text{dist}_G(u, w) = i\}\) for \(i = 0, \ldots, s\). Note that \(L_0 = \{u\}\) and that \(L_0 \cup \cdots \cup L_s\) is a partition of \(V_H = V_G\). We say that a vertex \(y\) is a child of a vertex \(x\), and that \(x\) is a parent of \(y\) if \(xy \in E_G\), \(x \in L_i\) and \(y \in L_{i+1}\) for some \(i \in \{0, \ldots, s - 1\}\). It is worth mentioning that this parent-child relation differs from the relation defined by the corresponding BFS-tree. In particular, a vertex may have several parents. We also say that a vertex \(z\) is a grandchild of a vertex \(x\) and that \(x\) is a grandparent of \(z\) if there is a vertex \(y\) such that \(x\) is a parent of \(y\) and \(y\) is a parent of \(z\). A vertex \(y\) is a descendant of a vertex \(x\) if \(x \in L_i\), \(y \in L_j\) for some \(i, j\) with \(i < j\) and there is an \((x, y)\)-path of length \(|j - i|\).
We now prove a sequence of claims.

**Claim A.** Let \( i \geq 2 \) and \( x \in L_i \) such that \( x \) has at least two grandchildren. Then \( x \) has a child that is the parent of all grandchildren of \( x \), while no other child of \( x \) is the parent of a grandchild of \( x \).

![Figure 4: The configuration for \( x \) and its relatives in the graph \( H \) of the proof of Claim A.](image)

We prove Claim A as follows. For contradiction, assume there exists a vertex \( x \in L_i \) for some \( i \geq 2 \) that has two distinct children \( y_1, y_2 \) such that \( y_1 \) and \( y_2 \) have distinct children \( z_1, z_2 \) respectively, as shown in Figure 4. Notice that possibly \( z_1 \) (\( z_2 \) respectively) is a child of \( y_2 \) (\( y_1 \) respectively) as well. As \( i \geq 2 \), \( x \) has a parent \( v_2 \), and \( v_2 \) has a parent \( v_1 \). By Lemma 5, \( xv_2 \) is contained in a cycle \( C \) of \( H \) of length at most 6. If \( v_2 \) is adjacent to a vertex \( z \notin \{v_1, x\} \) in \( H \), then \( z \in L_{i-2} \cup L_{i-1} \cup L_i \) and hence \( z \notin \{y_1, y_2, z_1, z_2\} \). Consequently \( d_G(x) \geq 7 \); a contradiction. Therefore, \( d_H(v_2) = 2 \) and thus \( v_1v_2 \in E_G \). If \( x \) has a neighbour \( r \notin \{v_2, y_1, y_2\} \) in \( H \), then \( d_C(x) \geq 7 \), because \( r \in L_{i-1} \cup L_i \cup L_{i+1} \) and hence \( r \) is distinct from \( v_1, z_1, z_2 \). This is again a contradiction. Therefore \( C \) contains one of \( xy_1, xy_2 \), say \( C \) contains \( xy_1 \). Hence \( C = v_1v_2xy_1w_2w_1v_1 \) for some \( w_1 \in L_{i-1} \) and \( w_2 \in L_i \); see also Figure 4. However, then \( x \) is adjacent to \( v_1, v_2, w_2, y_1, y_2, z_1, z_2 \) in \( G \). Hence \( d_G(x) \geq 7 \), a contradiction. This completes the proof of Claim A.

**Claim B.** Let \( i \geq 2 \) and \( x \in L_i \). Then the number of descendants of \( x \) in \( L_j \) is at most four for every \( j > i \).

We prove Claim B as follows. Note that for all \( i \geq 2 \), every vertex \( x \in L_i \) has at least two neighbours in \( G \) that belong to \( L_{i-1} \cup L_{i-2} \). Hence the fact that \( d_G(x) \leq 6 \) implies that \( x \) has at most four neighbours in \( G \) belonging to \( L_{i+1} \cup L_{i+2} \). In other words, the total number of children and grandchildren of \( x \) is at most four.

We use induction on \( i \). Let \( i = s - 1 \) or \( i = s - 2 \), As the total number of children and grandchildren of \( x \) is at most four, the claim holds. Let \( i < s - 2 \). Recall that \( x \) has at most four children. Hence the claim holds for \( j = i + 1 \). Let \( j > i + 1 \). If \( x \) has no grandchildren the claim holds. Now suppose that \( x \) has exactly one grandchild \( z \). If \( j = i + 2 \), then the number of descendants of \( x \) in \( L_j \) is one. If \( j > i + 2 \), then by the induction hypothesis the number of descendants of \( x \) in \( L_j \) is at most four, since these vertices are descendants of \( z \).
as well. Finally suppose that \( x \) has at least two grandchildren. Then, by Claim A, there is a unique child \( y \) of \( x \) that is the parent of all grandchildren of \( x \), and no other child of \( x \) has children. By the induction hypothesis, the number of descendants of \( y \) in \( L_j \) is at most four. As all descendants of \( x \) in \( L_j \) are descendants of \( y \), the claim holds. This completes the proof of Claim B.

Recall that \( v \) is a vertex that is of distance \( s \) of \( u \).

**Claim C.** Let \( P = x_0 \cdots x_s \) with \( x_0 = u \) and \( x_s = v \) be a shortest \((u,v)\)-path in \( H \). Then for every \( i \in \{3, \ldots, s - 4\} \), \( x_{i+1} \) is the unique child of \( x_i \).

We prove Claim C as follows. To obtain a contradiction, we assume that \( x_1 \) has another child \( y \neq x_{i+1} \) for some \( i \in \{3 \ldots s - 3\} \), so \( y \in L_{i+1} \). Since \( G \) has no recognizable edge, Lemma 5 tells us that in \( H \) every non-pendant edge is contained in a cycle of length at most 6.

Let us first assume that there is no cycle of length at most 6 in \( H \) that contains both \( x_{i-2}x_{i-1} \) and \( x_{i-1}x_i \); this case will be studied later. Let \( C_1 \) and \( C_2 \) be two cycles in \( H \) of length at most 6 that contain \( x_{i-2}x_{i-1} \) and \( x_{i-1}x_i \), respectively. As \( x_{i-1}x_i \notin E_{C_1} \) and \( x_{i-2}x_{i-1} \notin E_{C_2} \), \( C_1 \) has an edge \( x_{i-1}w \) and \( C_2 \) has an edge \( x_{i-1}w' \) for some \( w, w' \notin \{x_{i-2}, x_i\} \). Note that \( w \) and \( w' \) both belong to \( L_{i-2} \cup L_{i-1} \cup L_i \). If \( w \neq w' \), then in \( G \) we see that \( x_{i-1} \) is adjacent to \( x_{i-3}, x_{i-2}, x_i, x_{i+1}, w, w' \) and \( y \). Hence \( d_G(x_{i-1}) \geq 7 \) contradicting \( \Delta(G) \leq 6 \).

It follows that \( w = w' \).

Let \( z_1w \) be an edge of \( C_1 \) and let \( z_2w \) be an edge of \( C_2 \), such that \( x_{i-1} \notin \{z_1, z_2\} \). If \( z_1 \) or \( z_2 \) does not belong to \( \{x_{i-3}, x_{i-2}, x_i, x_{i+1}, y\} \), then \( d_G(x_{i-1}) \geq 7 \), a contradiction. Hence, \( \{z_1, z_2\} \subset \{x_{i-3}, x_{i-2}, x_i, x_{i+1}, y\} \). Recall that there is no cycle of length at most 6 that contains both \( x_{i-2}x_{i-1} \) and \( x_{i-1}x_i \). This implies that \( z_1 \notin \{x_i, x_{i+1}, y\} \) (in \( C_1 \) remove \( w \) in the first case and replace \( w \) by \( z_1 \) in the latter two cases) and \( z_2 \notin \{x_{i-3}, x_{i-2}\} \) (in \( C_2 \) replace \( w \) by \( x_{i-2} \) in the first case and remove \( w \) in the second case). As both \( z_1 \) and \( z_2 \) are adjacent to \( v \), this implies that \( w \in L_{i-1} \) and \( z_1 = x_{i-2} \) and \( z_2 = x_i \). However, this means that \( x_{i-2}x_{i-1}x_iwz_{x_{i-2}} \) is a cycle of length 4 in \( H \) that contains both \( x_{i-2}x_{i-1} \) and \( x_{i-1}x_i \), a contradiction. Consequently, we may assume that there is a cycle \( C \) in \( H \) of length at most 6 that contains both \( x_{i-2}x_{i-1} \) and \( x_{i-1}x_i \). Since \( x_{i-2} \in L_{i-2} \), we need to distinguish three cases.

**Case 1.** \( x_ix_{i+1} \in E_C \).

Then \( C \) has an edge \( x_{i+1}w \) for some \( w \in L_i \) such that \( w \neq x_i \) (see Figure 5). Then, \( C \) has an edge \( wz \) for some \( z \in L_{i-1} \). However, then we obtain \( d_G(x_{i+1}) \geq 7 \), a contradiction.

**Case 2.** \( x_iy \in E_C \).

Then \( C \) has an edge \( yw \) for some \( w \in L_i \) such that \( w \neq x_i \) (see Figure 6). Similarly to Case 1, \( C \) has an edge \( wz \) for some \( z \in L_{i-1} \). Note that \( zx_{i-2} \in E_C \) as \( C \) has length at most 6. Hence, \( C = x_{i-2}x_{i-1}x_iywz_{x_{i-2}} \) (note that this is not in contradiction with Claim A as \( i - 2 = 1 \) may hold).

If \( x_{i+1}w \in E_H \), then \( d_G(x_{i-1}) \geq 7 \), a contradiction. If \( x_{i+1}w \in E_H \), then \( d_G(x_{i+1}) \geq 7 \). If \( x_{i+1}y \in E_H \), then \( d_G(y) \geq 7 \). If \( x_{i-1}z \in E_H \) or \( x_{i}z \in E_H \), then \( d_G(x_{i}) \geq 7 \). Hence, \( x_iw, x_{i+1}w, x_{i+2}y, x_{i-1}z, x_{i}z \notin E_H \).
The edge $x_{i+1}x_{i+2}$ is non-pendant and thus included in a cycle $C'$ of length at most 6 by Lemma 5. Assume that $C'$ is a shortest cycle of this type. Let $x_{i+1}y$ be the other edge in $C'$ incident with $x_{i+1}$. We distinguish three subcases.

**Case 2a.** $h \neq x_i$.
If $h \neq y$, then $d_G(x_i) \geq 7$, a contradiction. Hence, $h = y$. Then, $C'$ has an edge $yg$ for some $g \neq x_{i+1}$. As $C'$ is a shortest cycle with $x_{i+1}x_{i+2}$, we find that $g \neq x_i$ (as otherwise the cycle obtained from $C'$ after removing $y$ would be shorter). Recall that $x_{i+2}y \notin E_H$. Hence $g \neq x_{i+2}$. If $g \neq w$, this means that $d_G(x_i) \geq 7$, a contradiction. Therefore, $g = w$. Let $f$ be the next vertex of $C'$, so $wf \in E_{C'}$. As $C'$ has length at most 6, $f \notin L_i$, so $f \notin \{x_i, z\}$. Recall that $x_iw$ and $x_{i+1}w$ are not in $E_H$, thus $f \notin \{x_i, x_{i+1}\}$ either. As $w \in L_i$, $z \neq x_{i+2}$. Hence, $d_G(y) \geq 7$, a contradiction.

**Case 2b.** $h = x_i$ and $x_ig \in E_{C'}$ for some $g \notin \{x_{i-1}, x_{i+1}\}$.
Recall that $x_iw$ and $xz$ are not in $E_H$. Hence $g \notin \{w, z\}$ either. If $g \neq y$, this means that $d_G(x_i) \geq 7$. Hence, $y = y$, that is, $xy \in E_{C'}$. Let $f$ be the next vertex of $C'$, so $yf \in E_{C'}$. Recall that $x_{i+2}y \notin E_H$. If $f \neq w$, this means that $d_G(x_i) \geq 7$. It follows that $f = w$, that is, $yw \in E_{C'}$. Let $f'$ be the next vertex of $C'$, so $w^f \in E_{C'}$. As $C'$ has length at most 6, we find that $f' \in L_{i+1}$. As $C'$ has length at most 6, we find that $f'x_{i+2} \in E_H$ and thus $C' = x_{i+2}x_{i+1}xywf'x_{i+2}$ (see Figure 7).

If $x_{i+2}$ has a neighbour in $H$ distinct from $x_{i+1}, x_{i+3}, f'$, then $d_G(x_{i+2}) \geq 7$, a contradiction. Hence, $N_H(x_{i+2}) = \{x_{i+1}, x_{i+3}, f'\}$. If $x_{i+1}$ has a neighbour in $H$ distinct from $x_i$ and $x_{i+2}$, then that neighbour cannot be in $\{y, w, f'\}$, as $C'$ is a shortest cycle containing $x_{i+1}x_{i+2}$. Consequently, we find that $d_G(x_{i+1}) \geq 7$, a contradiction. Hence, $N_H(x_{i+1}) = \{x_{i+2}\}$. Recall that $xz \notin E_H$. Moreover, as $C'$ is a shortest cycle containing $x_{i+1}x_{i+2}$, we find that $x_iw, x_if' \notin E_H$. Consequently, if $x_i$ has a neighbour in $H$ distinct from $x_{i-1}, x_{i+1}, y$, then $d_G(y) \geq 7$, a contradiction. Hence, $N_H(x_i) = \{x_{i-1}, x_{i+1}, y\}$. As $C'$ is a shortest cycle containing $x_{i+1}x_{i+2}$, we find that $yf' \notin E_H$. Consequently, if $y$ has a neighbour in $H$ distinct from $x_{i}, w$, then $d_G(y) \geq 7$, a contradiction. Hence,
$N_H(y) = \{ x_i, w \}$. If $w$ has a neighbour distinct from $y, z, f'$, then $d_G(y) \geq 7$, a contradiction. Hence, $N_H(w) = \{ y, z, f' \}$. If $f'$ has a neighbour distinct from $w, x_{i+2}$, then $d_G(w) \geq 7$, a contradiction. Hence, $N_H(f') = \{ x_{i+2}, w \}$.

Now consider the (non-pendant) edge $x_{i+2}x_{i+3}$, which must be in a cycle $C''$ of length at most 6 due to Lemma 5. As $x_{i+3} \in L_{i+3}$ and $|E_{C''}| \leq 6$, we find that $C''$ contains no vertex of $L_{i-1}$. Now, by traversing $C''$ starting at $x_{i+2}$ in opposite direction from $x_{i+3}$, we find that $C''$ contains the cycle $x_{i+2}x_{i+1}x_iyw'f'x_{i+2}$. Hence $d_{C''}(x_{i+2}) \geq 3$, which means that $C''$ is not a cycle, a contradiction.

![Figure 7: Case 2b.](image)

**Case 2c.** $h = x_i$ and $x_ix_{i-1} \in E_{C'}$. Let $g$ be the next vertex of $C'$, so $x_{i-1}g \in E_{C'}$. As $C'$ has length at most 6, we find that $g \in L_i$. Recall that $x_{i-1}w \notin E_H$. Then we find that $d_G(x_i) \geq 7$, a contradiction.

**Case 3.** $x_ix_{i+1}, x_iy \notin E_C$.

Then $C$ has an edge $x_iw$ for some $w \notin \{ x_{i-1}, x_{i+1}, y \}$ (see Figure 8). Let $z$ be the next vertex of $C'$, so $wz \in E_{C'}$. As $C$ has length at most 6, we find that $z \notin L_{i+1} \cup L_{i+2}$. Hence, if $z \neq x_{i-2}$, then $d_G(x_i) \geq 7$, a contradiction. This means that $z = x_{i-2}$, and consequently $C = x_{i-2}x_{i-1}x_iw, x_{i-2}$ and $w \in L_{i-1}$.

Again let $C'$ be a shortest cycle amongst all cycles that contains $x_{i+1}x_{i+2}$. Recall that the length of $C'$ is at most 6 by Lemma 5. Let $x_i+1h$ be the other edge in $C'$ incident with $x_{i+1}$. As in Case 2, we distinguish three subcases.

![Figure 8: Case 3.](image)

**Case 3a.** $h \neq x_i$.

If $h \neq y$, then $d_G(x_i) \geq 7$. Hence, $h = y$, that is, $x_{i+1}y \in E_{C'}$. Let $g$ be the next vertex of $C'$, so $yy \in E_{C'}$. As $C'$ is a shortest cycle containing $x_{i+1}x_{i+2}$, we find that $g \neq x_i$ (otherwise remove $y$ from $C'$ to obtain a shorter cycle). As $yx_{i+2} \notin E_H$ due to Claim A, we find that $g \neq x_{i+2}$. Since $y \in L_{i+1}$ and $w \in L_{i-1}$, we find that $g \neq w$ either. Then $d_G(x_i) \geq 7$ holds, a contradiction.
**Case 3b.** $h = x_i$ and $x_i,g \in E_{C'}$ for some $g \notin \{x_{i-1}, x_{i+1}\}$.

If $g \notin \{w,y\}$, then $d_G(x_i) \geq 7$. First suppose $g = w$, so $x_iw \in E_{C'}$. Let $f$ be the next vertex of $C'$, so $wf \in E_{C'}$. As $w \in L_{i-1}$ and $C'$ has length at most 6, we find that $f \in L_i$. However, then $d_G(x_i) \geq 7$, a contradiction. Now suppose, $g = y$, so $x_iy \in E_{C'}$. Let $f'$ be the next vertex of $C'$, so $yf' \in E_{C'}$. Recall that $yxi+2 \notin E_H$ due to Claim A. Then $d_G(x_i) \geq 7$ holds, a contradiction.

**Case 3c.** $h = x_i$ and $x_ix_{i-1} \in E_{C'}$.

As $C'$ has length at most 6, we find that $h \in L_i$. Then $d_G(x) \geq 7$, a contradiction.

We considered all possibilities, and in each case we obtained a contradiction. Hence we have proven Claim C.

**Claim D.** Let $P = x_0 \cdots x_s$ with $x_0 = u$ and $x_s = v$ be a shortest $(u,v)$-path in $H$. Then for every $i \in \{4, \ldots, s - 3\}$, $x_{i-1}$ is the unique parent of $x_i$.

To prove Claim D, it suffices to run a breadth-first search in $H$ from $v$, to consider the resulting levels $L'_0, \ldots, L'_s$, where where $L'_i = \{w \in V_G \mid \text{dist}_G(v,w) = i\}$ for $i = 0, \ldots, s$, and to apply Claim C.

We are now ready to complete the proof. We do this by first showing that $s \leq 8$.

To obtain a contradiction, assume that $s \geq 9$. By Lemma 5, $H$ has a cycle $C$ of length at most 6 that contains $x_5x_6$. As $x_0$ is the unique child of $x_5$ by Claim C and $x_5$ is the unique parent of $x_6$ by Claim D, we find that $C$ has an edge $yz$, where $y \in L_5$, $z \in L_6$, such that $C$ contains an $(x_5,y)$ path $Q$ of length at most 3 with $V_Q \subseteq L_4 \cup L_5$.

Suppose that $x_5y \in E_Q$. Then $y$ has a parent $h \in L_4$. By Claim C, $h \neq x_1$. Therefore, $d_G(x_5) \geq 7$, a contradiction. Hence $x_5y \notin E_Q$. Suppose that $V_Q \subseteq L_5$. Then $Q$ has edges $x_5w, wh$ such that $w, h \in L_5$. Again, $w$ has a parent $g \in L_4$ and $g \neq x_4$ due to Claim C. It follows that $d_G(x_5) \geq 7$; a contradiction. Hence, $Q$ has a vertex of $L_4$.

As $Q$ contains a vertex of $L_4$, $Q$ has length at least 2. If $Q$ has length 2, then $Q = x_5x_4y$. However, this is a contradiction, as $x_5$ is the unique child of $x_4$ by Claim C. Hence, $Q$ has length 3, which implies that $Q = x_5x_4zy$ for some $z \in L_4$ or $Q = x_5ww'y$ for some $w \in L_5$ and $w' \in L_4$.

First suppose that $Q = x_5x_4zy$ for some $h \in L_4$. Let $g \in L_3$ be a parent of $h$. As $x_4$ is the unique child of $x_3$ by Claim C, we find that $g \neq x_4$. Then $d_G(x_4) \geq 7$, a contradiction. Now suppose that $Q = x_5ww'y$ for some $w \in L_5$ and $w' \in L_4$. Note that $w' \neq x_4$, as $x_5$ is the unique child of $x_4$ by Claim C. As $C$ has length at most 6, we find that $C = x_6x_5ww'yzx_6$. This means that in $G$, $x_5$ is adjacent to $x_3, x_4, x_6, x_7, w, w', z$, so $d_G(x_5) \geq 7$, a contradiction. We conclude that $s \leq 8$.

As $L_0 = \{u\}$, we find that $|L_0| = 1$. Since $d_G(u) \leq 6$, $|L_1 \cup L_2| \leq 6$. As $|L_1| \geq 1$, this means that $|L_2| \leq 5$. If $|L_2| = 5$, then $L_1 = \{v\}$ for some $v \in V_H$ and each vertex of $L_2$ is a child of $v$. As $d_G(v) \leq 5$, this means that $V_G = V_H = L_0 \cup L_1 \cup L_2$, so $|V_H| = 1 + 1 + 5 = 7$. Suppose $|L_2| \leq 4$.

By Claim B, $|L_i| \leq 4|L_2| \leq 16$ for $i \geq 3$. Because $s \leq 8$, $|V_G| = |V_H| = |L_0| + |L_1 \cup L_2| + |L_3| + \cdots + |L_8| \leq 1 + 6 + 6 \cdot 16 = 103$. ~$\square$
We are now ready to prove our main result. Its proof uses Lemmas 4 and 6.

**Theorem 2.** \textsc{Square Root} can be solved in time $O(n^4)$ for $n$-vertex graphs of maximum degree at most 6.

**Proof.** Let $G$ be a graph of maximum degree at most 6. We construct an instance $(G, R, B)$ of \textsc{Square Root with Labels} from $G$ by setting $R = B = \emptyset$. Then we preprocess $(G, R, B)$ using Lemma 4. In this way we either solve the problem (and answer no) or obtain an equivalent instance $(G', R', B')$ of \textsc{Square Root with Labels} that has no recognizable edges. In the latter case we do as follows.

Recall from Remark 2 that $G'$ is a subgraph of $G$ and thus has maximum degree at most 6 as well. Hence, we may apply Lemma 6 and find that if $G'$ has a square root, then each component of $G'$ has at most 103 vertices. Hence, if $G'$ has a component with at least 104 vertices, then we stop and return no. Otherwise, we solve the problem for each component of $G'$ in constant time by brute force. Applying Lemma 4 takes time $O(n^2m^2) = O(n^4)$, as $\Delta(G) \leq 6$. The remainder of our algorithm takes constant time. Hence, its total running time is $O(n^4)$.

\hfill \Box

5. Conclusion

We showed that \textsc{Square Root} can be solved in polynomial time for graphs of maximum degree at most 6. We pose two open problems.

Q1. Is \textsc{Square Root} polynomial-time solvable for graphs of maximum degree at most 7?

Q2. Does there exist an integer $k$ such that \textsc{Square Root} is \textsc{NP}-complete for graphs of maximum degree at most $k$?

Observe that we cannot obtain an analog of Lemma 6 for graphs of maximum degree at most 7. In order to see this, let $H_n$ denote the ladder on $2n$ vertices, that is, the graph obtained from two paths $u_1, \ldots, u_n$ and $v_1, \ldots, v_n$ by adding the edge $u_iv_i$ for $i \in \{1, \ldots, n\}$ (see Figure 9). Notice that $G = H_2$ has no recognizable edges while $\Delta(G) = 7$. However, its size $|V_G| = |V_H| = 2n$ can be arbitrarily large. Nevertheless, we do note that $\text{pw}(G) \leq 5$. In fact, we conjecture that the class of graph of maximum degree at most 7 with no recognizable edges has bounded treewidth. If this is true, then we can solve \textsc{Square Root} in polynomial time for graphs of maximum degree at most 7 as follows.

First, we apply Lemma 4 to either solve the problem or obtain in polynomial time an equivalent instance of the (labeled) problem with no recognizable edges. Then we can solve the problem directly using the approach for graphs of maximum degree at most 5, that is, by applying Lemma 1 and a straightforward generalization of Lemma 2 tailor-made for the labeled problem variant.

We are also not aware of any examples of families of graphs of maximum degree at most 8 that have no recognizable edges and whose treewidth is not bounded by any constant. However, if we consider maximum degree 9, we can...
take the family of squares of walls as an example. These graphs are indeed of maximum degree 9 and have no recognizable edges, while their treewidth can be arbitrarily large (see Remark 1).

![Figure 9: The ladder on 2n vertices.](image)
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