Cutting Barnette graphs perfectly is hard

Édouard Bonnet[1][0000−0002−1653−5822], Dibyayan Chakraborty[1][0000−0003−0534−6417], and Julien Duron[1][]

Univ Lyon, CNRS, ENS de Lyon, Université Claude Bernard Lyon 1, LIP UMR5668, France
{edouard.bonnet,dibyayan.chakraborty,julien.duron}@ens-lyon.fr

Abstract. A *perfect matching cut* is a perfect matching that is also a cutset, or equivalently a perfect matching containing an even number of edges on every cycle. The corresponding algorithmic problem, PERFECT MATCHING CUT, is known to be NP-complete in subcubic bipartite graphs [Le & Telle, TCS '22] but its complexity was open in planar graphs and in cubic graphs. We settle both questions at once by showing that PERFECT MATCHING CUT is NP-complete in 3-connected cubic bipartite planar graphs or *Barnette graphs*. Prior to our work, among problems whose input is solely an undirected graph, only DISTANCE-2 4-COLORING was known NP-complete in Barnette graphs. Notably, HAMILTONIAN CYCLE would only join this private club if Barnette's conjecture were refuted.

1 Introduction

Deciding if an input graph admits a perfect matching, i.e., a subset of its edges touching each of its vertices exactly once, notoriously is a tractable task. There is indeed a vast literature, starting arguably in 1947 with Tutte's characterization via determinants [?], of polynomial-time algorithms deciding PERFECT MATCHING (or returning actual solutions) and its optimization generalization MAXIMUM MATCHING.

In this paper, we are interested in another containment of a spanning set of disjoint edges –perfect matching– than as a subgraph. As containing such a set of edges as an induced subgraph is a trivial property[1] (only shared by graphs that are themselves disjoint unions of edges), the meaningful other containment is as a *semi-induced subgraph*. By that we mean that we look for a bipartition of the vertex set or *cut* such that the edges of the perfect matching are "induced" in the corresponding cutset (i.e., the edges going from one side of the bipartition to the other), while we do not set any requirement on the presence or absence of edges within each side of the bipartition.

This problem was in fact introduced as the PERFECT MATCHING CUT (PMC for short) problem[2] by Heggernes and Telle who show that it is NP-complete [?].

---

[1] Note however that the induced variant of MAXIMUM MATCHING is an interesting problem that happens to be NP-complete [?].

[2] The authors consider the framework of (k, σ, ρ)-partition problem, where k is a positive integer, and σ, ρ are sets of non-negative integers, and one looks for a vertex-

As the name PERFECT MATCHING CUT suggests, we indeed look for a perfect matching that is also a cutset. Le and Telle further show that PMC remains NP-complete in subcubic bipartite graphs of arbitrarily large girth, whereas it is polynomial-time solvable in a superclass of chordal graphs, and in graphs without a particular subdivided claw as an induced subgraph [?]. An in-depth study of the complexity of PMC when forbidding a single induced subgraph or a finite set of subgraphs has been carried out [?,?].

We look at Le and Telle's hardness constructions and wonder what other properties could make PMC tractable (aside from chordality, and forbidding a finite list of subgraphs or induced subgraphs). A simpler reduction for bipartite graphs is first presented. Let us briefly sketch their reduction (without thinking about its correctness) from MONOTONE NOT-ALL-EQUAL 3-SAT, where given a negation-free 3-CNF formula, one seeks a truth assignment that sets in each clause a variable to true and a variable to false. Every variable is represented by an edge, and each 3-clause, by a (3-dimensional) cube with three anchor points at three pairwise non-adjacent vertices of the cube. One endpoint of the variable gadget is linked to the anchor points corresponding to this variable among the clause gadgets. Note that this construction creates three vertices of degree 4 in each clause gadget, and vertices of possibly large degree in the variable gadgets. Le and Telle then reduce the maximum degree to at most 3, by appropriately subdividing the cubes and tweaking the anchor points, and replacing the variable gadgets by cycles.

Notably the edge subdivision of the clause gadgets creates degree 2-vertices, which are not easy to "pad" with a third neighbor (even more so while keeping the construction bipartite). And indeed, prior to our work, the complexity of PMC in cubic graphs was open. Let us observe that on cubic graphs, the problem becomes equivalent to partitioning the vertex set into two sets each inducing a disjoint union of (independent) cycles. The close relative, MATCHING CUT, where one looks for a mere matching that is also a cutset, while NP-complete in general [?], is polynomial-time solvable in *subcubic* graphs [?,?]. The complexity of MATCHING CUT has further been examined in subclasses of planar graphs [?,?], when forbidding some (induced) subgraphs [?,?,?,?], on graphs of bounded diameter [?,?], and on graphs of large minimum degree [?]. MATCHING CUT has also been investigated with respect to parameterized complexity, exact exponential algorithms [?,?], and enumeration [?].

It was also open if PMC is tractable on planar graphs. Note that Bouquet and Picouleau show that a related problem, DISCONNECTED PERFECT MATCHING, where one looks for a perfect matching that contains a cutset, is NP-complete on planar graphs of maximum degree 4, on planar graphs of girth 5, and on 5-regular bipartite graphs [?]. They incidentally call this related problem PERFECT MATCHING CUT but subsequent references [?,?] use the name DISCONNECTED PERFECT MATCHING to avoid confusion. We will observe that PMC is

---

partition into k parts such that each vertex of each part has a number of neighbors in its own part in σ, and a number of other neighbors in ρ; hence, PMC is then the $(2, \mathbb{N}, \{1\})$-partition problem.

equivalent to asking for a perfect matching containing an even number of edges from every cycle of the input graph. The sum of even numbers being even, it is in fact sufficient that the perfect matching contains an even number of edges from every element of a cycle basis. There is a canonical cycle basis for planar graphs: the bounded faces. This gives rise to the following neat reformulation of PMC in planar graphs: is there a perfect matching containing an even number of edges along each face?

While MATCHING CUT is known to be NP-complete on planar graphs [?,?], it could have gone differently for PMC for the following "reasons." NOT-ALL-EQUAL 3-SAT, which appears as the *right* starting point to reduce to PMC, is tractable on planar instances [?]. In planar graphs, perfect matchings are *simpler* than arbitrary matchings in that they alone [?] can be counted efficiently [?,?]. Let us finally observe that MAXIMUM CUT can be solved in polynomial time in planar graphs [?].

In fact, we show that the reformulations for cubic and planar graphs cannot help algorithmically, by simultaneously settling the complexity of PMC in cubic and in planar graphs, with the following stronger statement.

Theorem 1. PERFECT MATCHING CUT *is NP-hard in 3-connected cubic bipartite planar graphs.*

Not very many problems are known to be NP-complete in cubic bipartite planar graphs. Of the seven problems defined on mere undirected graphs from Karp's list of 21 NP-complete problems [?], only HAMILTONIAN PATH is known to remain NP-complete in this class, while the other six problems admit a polynomial-time algorithm. Restricting ourselves to problems where the input is purely an undirected graph,[3] besides HAMILTONIAN PATH/CYCLE [?,?], MINIMUM INDEPENDENT DOMINATING SET was also shown NP-complete in cubic bipartite planar graphs [?], as well as P_3-PACKING [?] (hence, an equivalent problem phrased in terms of disjoint dominating and 2-dominating sets [?]), and DISTANCE-2 4-COLORING [?]. To our knowledge, MINIMUM DOMINATING SET is only known NP-complete in *subcubic* bipartite planar graphs [?,?].

It is interesting to note that the reductions for HAMILTONIAN PATH, HAMILTONIAN CYCLE, MINIMUM INDEPENDENT DOMINATING SET, and P_3-PACKING all produce cubic bipartite planar graphs that are *not* 3-connected. Notoriously, lifting the NP-hardness of HAMILTONIAN CYCLE to the 3-connected case would require to disprove Barnette's conjecture[4] (and that would be indeed sufficient [?]). Note that hamiltonicity in cubic graphs is equivalent to the existence of a perfect matching that is *not* an edge cut (i.e., whose removal is not disconnecting the graph). We wonder whether there is something inherently simpler

---

[3] Among problems with edge orientations, vertex or edge weights, or prescribed subsets of vertices or edges, the list is significantly longer, and also includes MINIMUM WEIGHTED EDGE COLORING [?], LIST EDGE COLORING and PRECOLORING EXTENSION [?], k-IN-A-TREE [?], etc.

[4] which precisely states that every polyhedral (that is, 3-connected planar) cubic bipartite graphs admits a hamiltonian cycle.

about *3-connected* cubic bipartite planar graphs, which would go beyond hamiltonicity (assuming that Barnette's conjecture is true).

Let us call *Barnette* a 3-connected cubic bipartite planar graph. It appears that, prior to our work, DISTANCE-2 4-COLORING was the only *vanilla* graph problem shown NP-complete in Barnette graphs [**?**]. Arguing that DISTANCE-2 4-COLORING is a problem on *squares* of Barnette graphs more than it is on Barnette graphs, a case can be made for PERFECT MATCHING CUT to be the first natural problem proven NP-complete in Barnette graphs.

Provably tight subexponential-time algorithm. Note that our reduction together with existing results and a known methodology give a fine-grained understanding, under the Exponential-Time Hypothesis[5] (or ETH) [**?**], on solving PERFECT MATCHING CUT in planar graphs.

On the algorithmic side, there is a $2^{O(\sqrt{n})}$-time algorithm for PMC in n-vertex planar graphs, as a consequence of a $2^{O(w)}n^{O(1)}$-time algorithm for n-vertex graphs given with a tree-decomposition of width w, and the fact that tree-decompositions of width $O(\sqrt{n})$ always exist in planar graphs and can be computed in polynomial-time [**?**]. The $2^{O(w)}n^{O(1)}$-time algorithm can be obtained directly or as a consequence of a result of Pilipczuk [**?**] that any problem expressible in Existential Counting Modal Logic (ECML) admits a single-exponential fixed-parameter algorithm in treewidth. ECML allows existential quantifications over vertex and edge sets followed by a counting modal formula to be satisfied *from every vertex*. Counting modal formulas enrich quantifier-free Boolean formulas with $\Diamond^S \varphi$, whose semantics is that the current vertex v has a number of neighbors satisfying φ in the ultimately periodic set S of non-negative integers. One can thus express PERFECT MATCHING CUT in ECML as

$$\exists X \subseteq V(G), \forall v \in V(G), \ G, X, v \models X \to \Diamond^{\{1\}}(\neg X) \ \wedge \ \neg X \to \Diamond^{\{1\}} X,$$

which states that there is a set X such that every vertex in X has exactly one neighbor outside X, and vice versa.

On the complexity side, the Sparsification lemma [**?**], the folklore linear reductions from bounded-occurrence 3-SAT to bounded-occurrence MONOTONE NOT-ALL-EQUAL 3-SAT and to MONOTONE NOT-ALL-EQUAL 3-SAT-E4 [**?**], and finally our quadratic reduction, imply that $2^{\Omega(\sqrt{n})}$ time is required to solve PMC in n-vertex planar graphs. Our reduction (as we will see) indeed has a quadratic blow-up as it creates $O(1)$ vertices per variable and clause, and $O(1)$ vertices for each of the $O(n^2)$ crossings in a (non-planar) drawing of the variable-clause incidence graph.

Outline of the proof. We reduce the NP-complete problem MONOTONE NOT-ALL-EQUAL 3-SAT with exactly 4 occurrences of each variable [**?**] to PMC. Observe that flipping the value of every variable of a satisfying assignment results in another satisfying assignment. We thus see a solution to MONOTONE NOT-ALL-EQUAL 3-SAT simply as a bipartition of the set of variables.

---

[5] the assumption that there is a $\lambda > 0$ such that no algorithm solves n-variable 3-SAT in time $\lambda^n n^{O(1)}$

As we already mentioned, NOT-ALL-EQUAL 3-SAT restricted to planar instances (i.e., where the variable-clause incidence graph is planar) is in P. We thus have to design *crossing* gadgets in addition to *variable* and *clause* gadgets. Naturally our gadgets are bipartite graphs with vertices of degree 3, except for some special *anchors*, vertices of degree 2 with one incident edge leaving the gadget.

The variable gadget is designed so that there is a unique way a perfect matching cut can intersect it. It might seem odd that no "binary choice" happens within it. The role of this gadget is only to serve as a baseline for which side of the bipartition the variable lands in, while the "truth assignments" take place in the clause gadgets. (Actually the same happens with Le and Telle's first reduction [?], where the variable gadget is a single edge, which has to be in any solution.)

Our variable gadget consists of 36 vertices, including 8 anchor points; see Figure 1. (We will later explain why we have 8 anchor points and not simply 4, that is, one for each occurrence of the variable.) Note that in all the figures, we adopt the following convention:

- black edges cannot (or can no longer) be part of a perfect matching cut,
- red edges are in every perfect matching cut,
- each blue edge e is such that at least one perfect matching cut within its gadget includes e, and at least one excludes e, and
- brown edges are blue edges that were indeed chosen in the solution.

Let us recall that PMC consists of finding a perfect matching containing an even number of edges from each cycle. Thus we look for a perfect matching M such that every path (or walk) between v and w contains a number of edges of M whose parity only depends on v and w. If this parity is even v and w are on the *same side*, and if it is odd, v and w are on *opposite sides*. The 8 anchor points of each variable gadget are forced on the same side. This is the *side of the variable*.

At the core of the clause gadget is a subdivided cube of blue edges; see Figure 2. There are three vertices (u_1, u_8, u_{14} on the picture) of the subdivided cube that are forced on the same side as the corresponding three variables. Three perfect matching cuts are available in the clause gadget, each separating (i.e., putting on opposite sides) a different vertex of $\{u_1, u_8, u_{14}\}$ from the other two. Note that this is exactly the semantics of a not-all-equal 3-clause. We in fact need two copies of the subdivided cube, partly to increase the degree of some subdivided vertices, partly for the same reason we duplicated the anchor vertices in the variable gadgets. (The latter will be explained when we present the crossing gadgets.) Increasing the degree of all the subdivided vertices complicate further the gadget and create two odd faces. Fortunately these two odd faces have a common neighboring even face. We can thus "fix" the parity of the two odd faces by plugging the sub-gadget D_j in the even face. We eventually need a total of 112 vertices, including 6 anchor points.

Let us now describe the crossing gadgets. Basically we want to replace every intersection point of two edges by a 4-vertex cycle. This indeed propagates black edges (those that cannot be in any solution). The issue is that going through such a crossing gadget flips one's side. As we cannot guarantee that a variable

"wire" has the same parity of intersection points towards each clause gadget it is linked to, we duplicate these wires. At a previous intersection point, we now have two parallel wires crossing two other parallel wires, making four crossings. The gadget simply consists of four 4-vertex cycles; see Figure 3. Check in Figure 7 that the sides are indeed preserved. This explains why we have 8 anchor points (not 4) in each variable gadget, and 6 anchor points (not 3) in each clause gadget.

2   Preliminaries

For a graph G, we denote by $V(G)$ its set of vertices and by $E(G)$ its set of edges. If $U \subseteq V(G)$, the *subgraph of G induced by U*, denoted $G[U]$ is the graph obtained from G by removing the vertices not in U. $E_G(U)$ (or $E(U)$ when G is clear) is a shorthand for $E(G[U])$. For $M \subset E(G)$, $G - M$ is the spanning subgraph of G obtained by removing the edges in M (while preserving their endpoints). A connected component of G is a maximal set $U \subseteq V(G)$ such that $G[U]$ is connected. A graph G is *cubic* if every vertex of G has exactly three neighbors. A graph is *bipartite* if it contains no odd cycles. We may use *k-cycle* as a short-hand for the k-vertex cycle.

Given two disjoint sets $X, Y \subseteq V(G)$ we denote by $E(X, Y)$ the set of edges between X and Y. A set $M \subseteq E(G)$ is a *cutset*[6] of G if there is a proper bipartition $X \uplus Y = V(G)$, called *cut*, such that $M = E(X, Y)$. Note that a cut fully determines a cutset, and among connected graphs a cutset fully determines a cut. When dealing with connected graphs, we may speak of *the* cut of a cutset. For $X \subseteq V(G)$ the set of *outgoing edges of X* is $E(X, V(G) \setminus X)$. For a cutset M of a connected graph G, and $u, v \in V(G)$, we say that u and v are on the *same side* (resp. on *opposite sides*) of M if u and v are on the same part (resp. on different parts) of the cut of M.

A *matching* (resp. *perfect matching*) of G is a set $M \subset E(G)$ such that each vertex of G is incident to at most (resp. exactly) one edge of M. A *perfect matching cut* is a perfect matching that is also a cutset. For $M \subseteq E(G)$ and $U \subseteq V(G)$, we say that M is a *perfect matching cut of G[U]* if $M \cap E(U)$ is so.

A graph is *planar* if it can be embedded in the plane, i.e., drawn such that edges (simple curves) may only intersect at their endpoint (the vertices). A *plane graph* is a planar graph together with such an embedding. Given a plane graph G, a *face* of G is a connected component of the plane after removing the embedding of G. A *facial cycle* of a plane graph G is a cycle of G that bounds a face of G. We say that two plane graphs G and H are *translates* if the embedding of G is a translate of the embedding of H.

---

[6] We avoid using the term "edge cut" since, for some authors, an edge cut is, more generally, a subset of edges whose deletion increases the number of connected components.

3   Proof of Theorem 1

Before we give our reduction, we start with a handful of useful lemmas and observations, which we will later need.

3.1   Preparatory lemmas

Lemma 1. *Let G be a graph, and $M \subseteq E(G)$. Then M is a cutset if and only if for every cycle C of G, $|E(C) \cap M|$ is even.*

Proof. Suppose that M is a cutset, and let (A, B) be a cut of M. Every closed walk (and in particular, cycle) contains an even number of edges of M, since the edges of M go (along the walk) from A to B, and from B to A.

Now assume that every cycle of G has an even number of edges in common with M. We build a cut (A, B). For each connected component H of G, we fix an arbitrary vertex $v \in V(H)$, and do the following. For each vertex $w \in V(H)$, put w in A if there is a path from v to w taking an even number of edges from M, and in B if there is a path from v to w taking an odd number of edges from M. It holds that $A \cup B = V(G)$. By our assumption on the cycles of G, $A \cap B = \emptyset$. Hence (A, B) is indeed a cut. The cutset of (A, B) is, by construction, M. $\square$

Lemma 2. *Let G be a plane graph, and $M \subseteq E(G)$. Then M is a cutset if and only if for any facial cycle C of G, $|E(C) \cap M|$ is even.*

Proof. The forward implication is a direct consequence of Lemma 1. The converse comes from the known fact that the bounded faces form a cycle basis; see for instance [**?**].

If H is a subgraph of G, let $\tilde{H}$ be the vector of $\mathbb{F}_2^{E(G)}$ with 1 entries at the positions corresponding to edges of H. Thus, for any cycle C of G, we have $\tilde{C} = \Sigma_{1 \leqslant i \leqslant k} \tilde{F}_i$ where F_i are facial cycles of G. And $|M \cap E(C)|$ has the same parity as $\Sigma_{1 \leqslant i \leqslant k} |M \cap E(F_i)|$, a sum of even numbers. $\square$

Lemma 3. *Let M be a perfect matching cut of a cubic graph G. Let C be an induced 4-vertex cycle of G. Then, exactly one of the following holds:*

(a) $E(C) \cap M = \emptyset$ and the four outgoing edges of $V(C)$ belong to M.
(b) $|E(C) \cap M| = 2$, the two edges of $E(C) \cap M$ are disjoint, and none of the outgoing edges of $V(C)$ belongs to M.

Proof. The number of edges of M within $E(C)$ is even by Lemma 2. Thus $|E(C) \cap M| \in \{0, 2\}$, as all four edges of $E(C)$ do not make a matching.

Suppose that $E(C) \cap M = \emptyset$. As M is a perfect matching, for every $v \in V(C)$ there is an edge in M incident to v and not in $E(C)$. As G is cubic, every outgoing edge of $V(C)$ is in M.

Suppose instead that $|E(C) \cap M| = 2$. As M is a matching, the two edges of $E(C) \cap M$ do not share an endpoint. It implies that all the four vertices of C are touched by these two edges. Thus no outgoing edge of $V(C)$ can be in M. $\square$

Corollary 1. *Let M be a perfect matching of a cubic graph G. Let C_1, C_2 two vertex-disjoint induced 4-vertex cycles of G such that there is an edge between $V(C_1)$ and $V(C_2)$. Then $E(C_1) \cap M \neq \emptyset$ if and only if $E(C_2) \cap M \neq \emptyset$.*

Proof. Suppose $E(C_1) \cap M \neq \emptyset$. By Lemma 3 on C_1, no outgoing edge of $V(C_1)$ is in M. Thus, there is an outgoing edge of $V(C_2)$ that is not in M. Applying Lemma 3 on C_2, we have $E(C_2) \cap M \neq \emptyset$. We get the converse symmetrically. $\square$

Lemma 4. *Let M be a perfect matching cut of a cubic graph G. If a 6-cycle has three outgoing edges in M, then all six outgoing edges are in M.*

Proof. Let C be our 6-cycle. Remember that, as M is a perfect matching cut, $|E(C) \cap M|$ is even. This means that $|E(C) \cap M|$ is either 0 or 2. If $|E(C) \cap M| = 2$, four vertices of C are touched by $E(C) \cap M$, which rules out that three outgoing edges of $V(C)$ are in M. Thus $E(C) \cap M = \emptyset$ and, G being cubic, every outgoing edge of $V(C)$ is in M. $\square$

Lemma 5. *Let M a perfect matching cut of a cubic bipartite graph G. Suppose C is a 6-cycle $v_1 v_2 \ldots v_6$ of G, such that $v_2 v_3$, $v_3 v_4$, $v_5 v_6$ and $v_6 v_1$ are in some induced 4-cycles. Then $M \cap E(C) = \emptyset$.*

Proof. By applying Lemma 3 on the 4-cycle containing $v_2 v_3$, and the one containing $v_6 v_1$, it holds that $v_1 v_2 \in M \Leftrightarrow v_3 v_4 \in M \Leftrightarrow v_5 v_6 \in M$. Thus none of these three edges can be in M, because C would have an odd number of edges in M. Symmetrically, no edge among $v_2 v_3$, $v_4 v_5$ and $v_6 v_1$ can be in M. Thus no edge of C is in M. $\square$

Observation 1 *Let G be a graph and M be a perfect matching cut of G. Let u, v be two vertices of G. Then for any path P between u and v, $|E(P) \cap M|$ is even if and only if u and v are on the same side of M. Note that implies that for any paths P, Q from u to v, $|E(P) \cap M|$ and $|E(Q) \cap M|$ have same parity.*

3.2   Reduction

We will prove Theorem 1 by reduction from the NP-complete MONOTONE NOT-ALL-EQUAL 3SAT-E4 [**?**]. In MONOTONE NOT-ALL-EQUAL 3SAT-E4, the input is a 3-CNF formula where each variable occurs exactly four times, each clause contains exactly three distinct literals, and no clause contains a negated literal. Here we say that a truth assignment on the variables *satisfies* a clause C if at least one literal of C is true and at least least one literal of C is false. The objective is to decide whether there is a truth assignment that satisfies all clauses. We can safely assume (and we will) that the variable-clause incidence graph $\mathrm{inc}(I)$ of I has no cutvertex among its "variable" vertices. Indeed the reduction from MONOTONE NOT-ALL-EQUAL 3-SAT to its four-occurrence variant does not create such cutvertices if they do not exist originally. Now if there is a "variable" cutvertex v in a MONOTONE NOT-ALL-EQUAL 3-SAT-instance J, one can split J into J_1 made of one connected component X of $\mathrm{inc}(J) - \{v\}$ plus v, and J_2

made of $inc(J) \setminus X$. One can observe that J is positive if and only if J_1 and J_2 are positive. As $inc(J_1)$ and $inc(J_2)$ sum up to one more vertex than $inc(J)$, such a scheme is a polynomial-time Turing reduction to subinstances without "variable" cutvertices.

Let I be an instance of MONOTONE NOT-ALL-EQUAL 3SAT-E4 with variables $x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_n$ and clauses $m = 4n/3$ clauses $C_1, C_2, \ldots, C_m$. We shall construct, in polynomial time, an equivalent PMC-instance $G(I)$ that is Barnette.

Our reduction consists of three steps. First we construct a cubic graph $H(I)$ by introducing *variable gadgets* and *clause gadgets*. Then we *draw $H(I)$* on the plane, i.e., we map the vertices of $H(I)$ to a set of points on the plane, and the edges of $H(I)$ to a set of simple curves on the plane. We shall refer to this drawing as $\mathcal{R}$. Note that, this drawing may not be planar, i.e., two simple curves (or analogously the corresponding edges) might intersect at a point which is not their endpoints. Finally, we eliminate the crossing points by introducing *crossing gadgets*. (Recall that if the variable-clause incidence graph of a NOT-ALL-EQUAL 3-SAT instance is planar, then its satisfiability can be tested in polynomial time [?]; hence, we do need crossing gadgets.) The resulting graph $G(I)$ is Barnette, and we shall prove that $G(I)$ has a perfect matching if and only if I is a positive instance of MONOTONE NOT-ALL-EQUAL 3SAT-E4. We now describe the above steps.


Fig. 1: Variable Gadget $\mathcal{X}_i$ corresponding to the variable x_i appearing in the clauses C_j, C_k, C_p, C_q with $j < k < p < q$.

1. For each variable x_i, let $\mathcal{X}_i$ denote a fresh copy of the graph shown in Figure 1. Note that the variable x_i appears in exactly four clauses, say, C_j, C_k, C_p, C_q with $j < k < p < q$. The *variable gadget* $\mathcal{X}_i$ contains the special vertices $t_{i,j}$, $b_{i,j}$, $t_{i,k}$, $b_{i,k}$, $t_{i,p}$, $b_{i,p}$, $t_{i,q}$, $b_{i,q}$ as shown in the figure. We recall that red edges are those forced in any perfect matching cut, while black edges cannot be in any solution. An essential part of the proof will consist of justifying the edge colors in our figures.

   For each clause $C_j = (x_a, x_b, x_c)$ with $a < b < c$ let $\mathcal{C}_j$ denote a new copy of the graph shown in Figure 2. The *clause gadget* $\mathcal{C}_j$ contains the special vertices $t'_{a,j}$, $b'_{a,j}$, $t'_{b,j}$, $b'_{b,j}$, $t'_{c,j}$, $b'_{c,j}$, as shown in the figure. Then for each variable x_i that appears in the clause C_j, introduce two new edges $E_{ij} =$

Fig. 2: Clause gadget $C_j = (x_a, x_b, x_c)$ with $a < b < c$. A red edge is selected in any perfect matching cut. A blue edge is selected in some perfect matching cut. A black edge is never selected in any perfect matching cut.

$\{t_{i,j}t'_{i,j}, b_{i,j}b'_{i,j}\}$. Let $H(I)$ denote the graph defined as follows.

$$V(H(I)) = \bigcup_{i=1}^{n} V(\mathcal{X}_i) \cup \bigcup_{j=1}^{m} V(\mathcal{C}_j)$$

$$E(H(I)) = \bigcup_{i=1}^{n} E(\mathcal{X}_i) \cup \bigcup_{j=1}^{m} E(\mathcal{C}_j) \cup \bigcup_{x_i \in C_j} E_{ij}.$$

We assign to each edge $e \in E_{i,j}$ its variable as $\mathrm{var}(e) = i$. Note that, for a variable gadget $\mathcal{X}_i$, there are exactly eight outgoing edges of $V(\mathcal{X}_i)$.

(a) Crossing quadruples.   (b) Replacement of step 3 (b).

Fig. 3: Replacement of a crossing by a crossing gadget.

2. In the next step, we generate a drawing $\mathcal{R}$ of $H(I)$ on the plane according to the following procedure.
   (a) For each variable x_i, we embed $\mathcal{X}_i$ as a translate of the variable gadget of Figure 1 into $[0, 1] \times [2i, 2i + 1]$.
   (b) For each clause C_j, we embed $\mathcal{C}_j$ as a translate of the clause gadget of Figure 2 into $[2, 3] \times [2j, 2j + 1]$.
   (c) Two edges incident to vertices in the same variable gadget or same clause gadget do not intersect in $\mathcal{R}$. For two variables $x_i, x_{i'}$ and clauses $C_j, C_{j'}$ with $x_i \in C_j, x_{i'} \in C_{j'}$, exactly one of the following holds:
      i. For each pair of edges $(e, e') \in E_{ij} \times E_{i'j'}$, e and e' intersect exactly once in $\mathcal{R}$. When this condition is satisfied, we call $(E_{ij}, E_{i'j'})$ a *crossing quadruple*. Moreover, we ensure that the interior of the subsegment of $e \in E_{ij}$ between its two intersection points with edges of $E_{i'j'}$ is not crossed by any edge;
      ii. There is no pair of edges $(e, e') \in E_{ij} \times E_{i'j'}$ such that e and e' intersect in $\mathcal{R}$;

3. For each crossing quadruples $(E_{ij}, E_{i'j'})$ replace the four crossing points shown in Figure 3a by the crossing gadget shown in Figure 3b.

   Let $G(I)$ denote the resulting graph. We shall need the following definitions.

Definition 1. *Any edge of $G(I)$ whose both endpoints are not contained withing the same gadget (variable, clause, or crossing) is a* connector edge. *Any endpoint of a connector edge is called a* connector vertex. *For a connector edge e incident to a crossing gadget, $var(e)$ is the index of the variable gadget it was originally going to. To each connector edge uv, we associate the variable $var(uv)$ to both u and v, denoted $var(u), var(v)$.*

Now we shall distinguish some 4-cycles of $G(I)$.

Definition 2. *An (induced) 4-cycle C of $G(I)$ is a* crossover *4-cycle if it belongs to some crossing gadget.*

Definition 3. *An (induced) 4-cycle C of $G(I)$ is* special *if C it some F_i or F_i' of some C_j.*

The special 4-cycles of a particular clause gadget C_j are highlighted in Figure 2. In the next section, we show that $G(I)$ is indeed a 3-connected cubic bipartite planar graph.

3.3 $G(I)$ is Barnette

We shall show that the constructed graph is Barnette.

Lemma 6. *The graph $G(I)$ is 3-connected.*

Proof. Observe that, for any two adjacent gadgets $\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{Y}$, there are two disjoint connector edges from $\mathcal{X}$ to $\mathcal{Y}$. We consider $G(I)$ after the removal of two vertices u, v.

First assume that u and v are not both connector vertices. Thus two gadgets $\mathcal{X}$ and $\mathcal{Y}$ are adjacent in $G(I)$ if and only if they are adjacent in $G(I) - \{u, v\}$. And in particular, each pair of gadgets are then connected in $G(I) - \{u, v\}$.

Then $G(I) - \{u, v\}$ can only be disconnected if there exists, inside a same gadget, two vertices that are disconnected in $G(I) - \{u, v\}$. In particular, this gadget is disconnected by the removal of u, v, which forces both u and v to be picked inside it. Indeed every gadget is 2-connected. We go through the three kinds of gadgets.

– If it is a variable gadget $\mathcal{X}_i$, then $\mathcal{X}_i$ is split in two components each containing a connector vertex. Let a (resp. b) be a connector vertex in the first (resp. second) component. As no "variable" vertex is a cutvertex in $\mathrm{inc}(I)$, there is a path P in $\mathrm{inc}(I) - \{x_i\}$ from "clause $C_{a'}$" to "clause $C_{b'}$", where $C_{a'}$ and $C_{b'}$ are the clauses corresponding respectively to a and b (i.e., with the notations of Figure 1, a', b' are the second indices of a, b respectively). Thus a and b are connected in $G(I) - \{u, v\}$.
– If it is a clause gadget C_j, it is split in two connected components such that one contains a connector vertex $t_{i,j}'$ and the other contains $b_{i,j}'$. Thus we can simply follow the path from $t_{i,j}'$ to $t_{i,j}$, then to $b_{i,j}$ and finally back to $b_{i,j}'$ to connect the two parts of the clause gadget.
– If it is a crossing gadget X, then the split separates X in two connected components, but note that there exists a gadget $\mathcal{Y}$ incident to both components. Thus, as $\mathcal{Y}$ is connected, the subgraph induced by their union, and hence $G(I) - \{u, v\}$, is connected.

We now deal with the case when both u and v are connector vertices. Observe that every gadget remains connected by removing up to two connector vertices inside it. Therefore every gadget is connected in $G(I) - \{u, v\}$. By the first paragraph, the only interesting case is when u and v are the endpoints of two distinct connector edges between the same pair of gadgets. Then, the effect of removing u, v is to remove the link between the two gadgets.

However $\mathrm{inc}(I)$ cannot have a bridge, for otherwise it would have a "variable" vertex that is a cutvertex. In turn, one can see that this implies that the gadget adjacency graph is bridgeless. □

Lemma 7. *The graph $G(I)$ is Barnette.*

Proof. By the plane embedding of the crossing gadgets, $G(I)$ is planar. One can check that $G(I)$ is cubic, by observing that within each gadget (variable, clause, crossing), all the vertices have degree 3, except vertices of degree 2, which are exactly those with an incident edge leaving the gadget. By Lemma 6, $G(I)$ is 3-connected.

We shall thus prove the bipartiteness of $G(I)$. Recall that our construction had three main components: variable gadgets, clause gadgets and crossing gadgets. For a particular gadget H, observe that, all the outgoing edges of H lie in the external face of H. Circularly order the outgoing edges of H by $e_1, \ldots, e_p$, when going, say, clockwise. Take any two consecutive outgoing edges e_i, e_{i+1}. Let $a_i(H), a_{i+1}(H)$ be the vertices of H that are also incident to e_i and e_{i+1}, respectively. We can observe from our construction that the path from a_i to a_{i+1}, denoted as $P(H, a_i, a_{i+1})$ along the external face of H in clockwise order always has an even number of vertices.

We call the path $P(H, a_i, a_{i+1})$ an *exposed path* of H. (Observe that a particular gadget has several exposed paths.) Let F be a bounded face of $G(I)$. If F is a finite face of a variable, clause, or crossing gadget, then $|V(F)|$ is even because H is bipartite. Otherwise, F is a union of exposed paths, and the previous arguments imply that $|V(F)|$ is even. □

3.4   Properties of variable and crossing gadgets

Lemma 8. *Let M be a perfect matching cut of $G(I)$. Then for any variable gadget $\mathcal{X}_i$, $M \cap V(\mathcal{X}_i)$ is the matching formed by the red edges in Figure 1. In particular, M does not contain any connector edge incident to a variable gadget.*

Proof. Consider the variable gadget $\mathcal{X}_i$. By applying Lemma 5 on the 6-cycle S_i^2 (which satisfies the requirement of having four particular edges in some 4-cycles), we get that all outgoing edges of $V(S_i^2)$ are in M. We can thus apply Lemma 4 on the 6-cycles S_i^1 and S_i^3, and obtain that all outgoing edges of these cycles are in M.

Now there is an outgoing edge of the 4-cycle S_i^4 that is in M, hence by Lemma 3, all of them are. We can finally apply Lemma 4 on the 6-cycle S_i^5, and get that all the red edges of Figure 1 should indeed be in M. In particular, as all the vertices of $\mathcal{X}_i$ are touched by red edges, the connector edges incident to a variable gadget cannot be in M. □

Now we prove a property of the crossover 4-cycles.

Lemma 9. *Let M be a perfect matching cut of $G(I)$ and F be a crossover 4-cycle. Then $|E(F)| = 2$.*

Proof. Say that a *path of 4-vertex cycles* is a sequence $C_1, \ldots, C_k$ of vertex-disjoint 4-cycles such that C_i is adjacent to C_{i+1}. Considering step 3 of the construction, observe that for every crossover 4-cycle C, there is a path of 4-vertex cycles starting at C and ending at a crossover 4-cycle adjacent to a variable gadget.

By Lemma 8, no edge incident to a variable gadget is in M. Thus any crossover 4-cycle adjacent to a variable gadget contains an edge of M. Repeated applications of Corollary 1 imply that C contains an edge of M, and we conclude with Lemma 3 applied on C.   □

Corollary 2. *For any perfect matching M of $G(I)$, M contains no connector edges.*

Proof. We know that any connector edge incident to a crossing gadget or to a variable gadget is not in M by Lemmas 8 and 9.   □

3.5   Properties of clause gadgets

Observe that D_j is an induced subgraph of the variable gadget $\mathcal{C}_j$.

Lemma 10. *Any perfect matching cut of $G(I)$ contains the edges of D_j drawn in red in Figure 2.*

Proof. Observe that the same proof for the variable gadgets already contained all the arguments.   □

We prove a property of the special 4-cycles of a clause gadget.

Lemma 11. *Let M be a perfect matching cut of $G(I)$ and F be a special 4-cycle of $\mathcal{C}_j$. Then $|E(F) \cap M| = 2$, and no outgoing edge of $V(F)$ is in M.*

Proof. We know from Corollary 2 that a connector edge is not in M, and from Lemma 10 that F_5 (see Figure 2) has an incident edge not contained in M. Thus every special 4-cycle is connected by a path of 4-cycles to a 4-cycle incident to an edge not in M. By application of Lemma 3 and Corollary 1, every special 4-cycle of $\mathcal{C}_j$ contains an edge of M.   □

Lemma 12. *Let M be a perfect matching cut of $G(I)$ and $\mathcal{C}_j$ be a clause gadget. Let $U_j = \{u_1, \ldots, u_{20}\}$, and $V_j = \{v_1, \ldots, v_{20}\}$. Then no outgoing edge of U_j or of V_j is in M.*

Proof. By Lemma 11 and Corollary 2, the only edges that remain to be checked are $u_9v_9, u_{10}v_{10}, u_{12}v_{12}, u_{13}v_{13}$.

Suppose M contains u_9v_9. As u_8u_9 is not available, by Lemma 3 on $u_7u_8w_1w_5$, $w_1w_2 \notin M$. Symmetrically, $w_3w_4 \notin M$. As by Lemma 11 u_8w_1, v_8w_4 and w_2w_3 are not in M, u_9v_9 would be the only edge of $u_9, u_8, w_1, w_2, w_3, w_4, v_8, v_9$ to be in M which is absurd by Lemma 1. A symmetric argument rules out that $u_{13}v_{13} \in M$. Thus we conclude applying Lemma 3 to the 4-cycles $u_9v_9v_{10}u_{10}$ and $u_{12}v_{12}v_{13}u_{13}$. $\qquad\square$

From now on we assume that, for a clause gadget the two sets $U_j = \{u_1, \ldots, u_{20}\}$, and $V_j = \{v_1, \ldots, v_{20}\}$ are defined. Now we shall prove that for every clause gadget $\mathcal{C}_j$ and perfect matching cut M, the set $M \cap E(U_j \cup V_j)$ can be of only three types. Before we prove the corresponding lemma, we introduce the following notations. Let H denote the subgraph of $G(I)$ induced by the vertices of $U_j \cup V_j$ of the clause gadget $\mathcal{C}_j$. Let the vertices of H be named as shown in Figure 2. We define the following sets:

$$L_j^1 = \{u_1u_2, u_3u_4, u_5u_{19}, u_6u_{20}, u_7u_8, u_9u_{10}, u_{16}u_{17}, u_{18}u_{11}, u_{12}u_{13}, u_{15}u_{14}\},$$

$$L_j^2 = \{u_1u_2, u_3u_4, u_5u_6, u_7u_8, u_{19}u_{20}, u_9u_{10}, u_{16}u_{15}, u_{17}u_{18}, u_{11}u_{12}, u_{14}u_{13}\},$$

$$L_j^3 = \{u_2u_3, u_4u_5, u_6u_7, u_8u_9, u_1u_{16}, u_{19}u_{17}, u_{20}u_{18}, u_{10}u_{11}, u_{12}u_{13}, u_{15}u_{14}\}.$$

For $i \in \{1, 2, 3\}$, let R_j^i denote the set of edges $\{v_kv_l : u_ku_l \in L_j^i\}$.

Definition 4. *We say that a perfect matching cut M of $G(I)$ is of* type i *in $\mathcal{C}_j$ with $i \in \{1, 2, 3\}$, if $M \cap E(U_j \cup V_j) = L_j^i \cup R_j^i$.*

Lemma 13. *Let M be a perfect matching cut of $G(I)$ and $\mathcal{C}_j$ be a clause gadget. Then there exists exactly one integer $i \in \{1, 2, 3\}$ such that M is of type i in $\mathcal{C}_j$.*

Proof. Let H denote the subgraph of $G(I)$ induced by the vertices of $U_j \cup V_j$ of the clause gadget $\mathcal{C}_j$. Let $F = \{u_9v_9, u_{10}v_{10}, u_{12}v_{12}, u_{13}v_{13}\}$. Consider the 4-cycle C induced by $u_{17}, u_{18}, u_{19}, u_{20}$. Consider the case when $M \cap E(C) = \emptyset$. In this case, applying Lemma 3 on C, we know that $\{u_{19}u_5, u_{20}u_6, u_{17}u_{16}, u_{18}u_{11}\} \subset M$; see Figure 4a. Since no outgoing edge of U_j is in M, due to Lemma 12, it is now easy to verify that $L_j^1 \subset M$. In the case where $M \cap E(C) = \{u_{19}u_{20}, u_{17}u_{18}\}$, applying Lemma 3 on the 4-cycle induced by u_5, u_6, u_{19}, u_{20}, we infer that $u_5u_6 \in M$, and once again it is now easy to verify that $L_j^2 \subset M$; see Figure 4b. In the last case, $M \cap E(C) = \{u_{19}u_{17}, u_{18}u_{20}\}$. We again apply Lemma 3 on the 4-cycle induced by u_5, u_6, u_{19}, u_{20}, and infer this time that $u_5u_6 \notin M$. As no outgoing edge of U_j is in M, it is now easy to verify that $L_j^3 \subset M$; see Figure 4c.

Observe that in L_j^1, $u_9u_{10} \in M$ and $u_{12}u_{13} \in M$, while for L_j^2 we have $u_9u_{10} \in M$ and $u_{12}u_{13} \notin M$ and for L_j^3 we have $u_9u_{10} \notin M$ and $u_{12}u_{13} \in M$. Thus $M \cap U_j$ is determined by the containment of u_9u_{10} and of $u_{12}u_{13}$ in M. This is also the fact, by symmetry, for $V_j \cap M$, when considering the edges v_9v_{10} and $v_{12}v_{13}$.

(a) Edges of L_j^1 are in brown.

(b) Edges of L_j^2 are in brown.

(c) Edges of L_j^3 are in brown.

Fig. 4: The three types of perfect matching cuts within a clause gadget.

At this point, apply Lemma 3 to the two 4-cycles u_9, u_{10}, v_{10}, v_9 and $v_{17}, v_{18}, v_{19}, v_{20}$. We have that $u_9 u_{10} \in M$ if and only if $v_9 v_{10} \in M$, and $u_{12}u_{13} \in M$ if and only if $v_{12}v_{13} \in M$. Thus L_j^i propagates to $L_j^i \cup R_j^i$. □

As a direct consequence of Lemma 13, we get the following.

Lemma 14. *Let M be a perfect matching cut of $G(I)$ and (A, B) be the cut of M. The vertices u_1, u_8, u_{14} of a clause gadget $\mathcal{C}_j$ cannot all be on the same side of M. More precisely:*

1. L_j^1 *sets u_1 to one side of M, and u_8, u_{14} to the other;*
2. L_j^2 *sets u_{14} to one side of M, and u_1, u_8 to the other;*
3. L_j^3 *sets u_8 to one side of M, and u_1, u_{14} to the other.*

Note that for a clause gadget $\mathcal{C}_j$, if M is of type 1 (type 2, type 3, respectively) in $\mathcal{C}_j$, then the edges in $M \cap E(\mathcal{C}_j)$ are indicated in Figure 5 (Figure 6a, Figure 6b, respectively).

3.6   Relation between variable and clause gadgets

Lemma 15. *Let M be a perfect matching cut of $G(I)$. Then for a variable x_i and a clause C_j with $x_i \in C_j$, $t_{i,j}, t'_{i,j}, b_{i,j}, b'_{i,j}$ are on the same side of M.*

Fig. 5: The brown and red edges make the only intersection of a clause gadget with a perfect matching cut M such that $M \cap U_j = L_j^1$.

Proof. Let z be any vertex of the cycle S_i^2 in the variable gadget $\mathcal{X}_i$; see Figure 1. Observe that there exists a path P (resp. P') between z and $t_{i,j}$ (resp. $b_{i,j}$) such that $|M \cap E(P)|$ (resp. $|M \cap E(P')|$) is even. Hence, due to Observation 1, $t_{i,j}$ and $b_{i,j}$ are on the same side of M.

Our construction of $G(I)$ ensures that there exists an even non-negative integer k (where $k = 0$ if $t_{i,j}$ and $t'_{i,j}$ are adjacent) such that all the following holds:

- there are k crossover 4-cycles $F_1, F_2, \ldots, F_k$ and a path P between $t_{i,j}$ and $t'_{i,j}$ where

$$V(P) \setminus \{t_{i,j}, t'_{i,j}\} \subset \bigcup_{l \in k} V(F_l)$$

- for each $1 \leqslant l \leqslant k$, $E(P) \cap E(F_l)$ is a 2-edge subpath.

Now due to Lemma 9 we know that for any $1 \leqslant l \leqslant k$, $|M \cap E(F_l)| = 2$. The above arguments further imply that $|M \cap E(F_l) \cap E(P)| = 1$. This implies that $|E(P) \cap M| = k$, which is even. Hence due to Observation 1 we have that $t_{i,j}$ and $t'_{i,j}$ are on the same side of M.

(a) Edges (brown and red) implied by L_j^2.   (b) Edges (brown and red) implied by L_j^3.

Fig. 6: Same as Figure 5 for L_j^2 (left) and L_j^3 (right).

Using similar reasoning we can infer that $b'_{i,j}$ is on the same side as $b_{i,j}$. Hence $t_{i,j}, t'_{i,j}, b_{i,j}, b'_{i,j}$ are all on the same side.   □

Lemma 16. *Let M be a perfect matching cut of $G(I)$. Then for any clause gadget $\mathcal{C}_j$ corresponding to the clause $C_j = (x_a, x_b, x_c)$ with $a < b < c$, the following hold:*

(a) $t'_{c,j}$ and u_{14} are on the same side of M, and
(b) $b'_{a,j}$ and u_8 are on the same side of M.

Proof. First we prove (a). Using Figure 2 observe that there exists a path P between $t'_{c,j}$ and u_{14} such that P can be written as $t'_{c,j}\ z_1\ z_2\ d_1\ d_2\ d_3\ z_3\ z_4\ z_5\ u_{14}$ where $\{z_1, z_2\} \subset V(F_6)$ and $\{z_3, z_4, z_5\} \subset V(F_5)$. Note that F_5 and F_6 are special 4-cycles. Due to Lemma 11, we have that $|M \cap E(F_5)| = 2$ and $|M \cap E(F_6)| = 2$. This implies there exists exactly one edge $e \in \{t'_{c,j}z_1, z_1z_2\}$ such that $e \in M$. Similarly, there exists exactly one edge $e' \in \{z_3z_4, z_4z_5\}$ such that $e' \in M$. Moreover, from Lemma 10 it follows that none of $\{z_2d_1, d_1d_2, d_2d_3, d_3z_3\}$ belongs to M. Hence $M \cap E(P) = \{e, e'\}$, and $|M \cap E(P)|$ is even. Now invoking Observation 1 we conclude that $t'_{c,j}$ and u_{14} are on the same side of M.

Now we prove (b). Using Figure 2 observe that there exists a path P' between $b'_{a,j}$ and u_8 such that P' can be written as $b'_{c,j}\ z_1\ z_2\ z_3\ z_4\ z_5\ z_6\ z_7\ z_8\ z_9\ z_{10}\ z_{11}\ u_8$ where $\{z_1, z_2\} \subset V(F_1)$, $\{z_3, z_4, z_5\} \subset V(F_2)$, $\{z_6, z_7, z_8\} \subset V(F_3)$, and $\{z_9, z_{10}, z_{11}\} \subset V(F_4)$. Now arguing similarly as in (a) on the special 4-cycles F_1, F_2, F_3, F_4, we have that $|M \cap E(P)|$ is even. By Observation 1, we conclude that $b'_{a,j}$ and u_8 are on the same side of M.   □

For any crossing gadget X_j as drawn in Figure 7 we consider the two perfect matching cuts P_j^1 of Figure 7a and P_j^2 of Figure 7b on X_j.

(a) Edges of P_j^1 are drawn in brown.   (b) Edges of P_j^2 are drawn in brown.

Fig. 7: P_j^1 and P_j^2 are the only possible restrictions of M to a crossing gadget.

Lemma 17. *Let X_j be a crossing gadget of $G(I)$. For any $M \in \{P_j^1, P_j^2\}$, M is a perfect matching cut of X_j. Vertices t_a, b_a, t_a', b_a' are always on the same side of M, and t_c, b_c, t_c', b_c' are always on the same side of M. Moreover, if $M = P_j^1$, t_a and t_c are on the same side of M (in X_j), otherwise they are not.*

Proof. We refer to Figure 7 for the notations on X_j. M is a perfect matching cut of X_j by Lemma 2. Let C be the external facial cycle of X_j. We conclude by Observation 1 on subpaths of C starting at t_a or t_c. □

3.7   Existence of perfect matching cut implies satisfiability

In this section, we show that if $G(I)$ has a perfect matching cut then I has a satisfying assignment. Let M be a perfect matching cut of M and (A, B) be the cut of M. As we already observed, a potential solution to I can be seen as a partition $(\mathcal{V}_A, \mathcal{V}_B)$ of the variables. We set x_i in $\mathcal{V}_A$ if and only if $V(S_i^2) \subset A$, and we show that $\mathcal{P} = (\mathcal{V}_A, \mathcal{V}_B)$ satisfies the MONOTONE NOT-ALL-EQUAL 3SAT-E4-instance I.

Assume for contradiction that there exists a clause C_j such that all variables, x_a, x_b, x_c, of C_j are on the same side of $\mathcal{P}$. Thus all the vertices in $\cup_{i \in \{a,b,c\}} V(S_i^2)$ are on the same side of M. Assume without loss of generality that this side is A. Let z_i be any vertex of S_i^2.

Now fix an integer $i \in \{a, b, c\}$. Observe, using Figure 1, that there exists a path P between z_i and $t_{i,j}$ such that $|M \cap E(P)|$ is even. Hence, due to Observation 1, we infer that $t_{i,j}$ lies in A. Now due to Lemma 15 we have that $\{t_{i,j}, t_{i,j}', b_{i,j}, b_{i,j}'\} \subset A$. The above discussion implies that

$$\bigcup_{i \in \{a,b,c\}} \{t_{i,j}, t_{i,j}', b_{i,j}, b_{i,j}'\} \subset A.$$

Now invoking Lemma 16, we have that all three vertices in $\{u_1, u_8, u_{14}\}$ lie in A. But this contradicts Lemma 14. Hence we get the following.

Lemma 18. *If $G(I)$ has a perfect matching cut then I is a positive instance.*

3.8   Satisfiability implies the existence of a perfect matching cut

In this section, we show that given a Monotone Not-All-Equal 3SAT-E4-instance I and a partition $\mathcal{P} = (\mathcal{V}_A, \mathcal{V}_B)$ satisfying I, we can construct a perfect matching cut $M_\mathcal{P}$ of $G(I)$, as follows:

- for each variable gadget $\mathcal{X}_i$, $M_\mathcal{P} \cap V(\mathcal{X}_i)$ is the matching imposed by Lemma 8,
- for each crossing gadget X_j incident to two edges e, f, we choose P_j^1 if $\mathrm{var}(e)$ and $\mathrm{var}(f)$ are on the same side of $\mathcal{P}$, and P_j^2 otherwise,
- for each clause gadget $\mathcal{C}_j$ over variables a, b, c, we choose the matching of Figure 5 if b is not on the same side of $\mathcal{P}$ as a and c, the matching of Figure 6a if c is not on the same side of $\mathcal{P}$ as a and b, and the matching of Figure 6b in the last case.

As $M_\mathcal{P}$ is a perfect matching on each gadget, and as every vertex belongs to some gadget, $M_\mathcal{P}$ is a perfect matching of $G(I)$. By construction, $M_\mathcal{P}$ contains no connector edges. Recall that any edge that does not have both endpoints inside the same gadget is a connector edge, we call *connector vertex* a vertex v incident to a connector edge e, and that $\mathrm{var}(v) = \mathrm{var}(e)$.

Lemma 19. *For any path Q between two connector vertices u and v, we have $|Q \cap M_\mathcal{P}|$ even if and only if $\mathrm{var}(u)$ and $\mathrm{var}(v)$ are on the same side of $\mathcal{P}$.*

Proof. As $M_\mathcal{P}$ does not contain any connector edges, $|Q \cap M_\mathcal{P}|$ is defined by the parts of Q inside a gadget. Let $Q_1, \ldots, Q_k$ be spanning vertex-disjoint subpaths of Q such that for any i, Q_i lies inside a gadget and, there is a connector edge from the last vertex of Q_i to the first one of Q_{i+1}, for every $1 \leqslant i < k$. We prove the property by induction on k.

If $k = 1$, the whole Q lies inside a gadget, and the property is true by Lemma 8 for variable gadgets, Lemma 14 for clause gadgets and Lemma 17 for crossing gadgets.

Assume the property true for $i \leqslant k - 1$, let u' the last vertex of Q_{k-1} and v' the first vertex of Q_k. By induction, $\mathrm{var}(u)$ and $\mathrm{var}(u')$ are on the same side of $\mathcal{P}$ if and only if $|\bigcup_{1 \leqslant i \leqslant k-1} E(Q_i) \cap M_\mathcal{P}|$ is even, and $\mathrm{var}(v')$ and $\mathrm{var}(v)$ are on the same side of $\mathcal{P}$ if and only if $|E(Q_k) \cap M_\mathcal{P}|$ is even. As $\mathrm{var}(u') = \mathrm{var}(v')$, we know that $\mathrm{var}(u')$ is on the same side of $\mathcal{P}$ as $\mathrm{var}(v')$, moreover $u'v' \notin M_\mathcal{P}$. Thus $\mathrm{var}(u)$ and $\mathrm{var}(v)$ are on the same side of $\mathcal{P}$ if and only if $|\bigcup_{1 \leqslant i \leqslant k} E(Q_i) \cap M_\mathcal{P}|$ and $|E(Q_k) \cap M_\mathcal{P}|$ have the same parity, thus $|\bigcup_{1 \leqslant i \leqslant k} E(Q_i) \cap M_\mathcal{P}|$ is even if and only if $\mathrm{var}(u)$ and $\mathrm{var}(v)$ are on the same side of $\mathcal{P}$. $\square$

Lemma 20. *$M_\mathcal{P}$ is a perfect matching cut of $G(I)$.*

Proof. We already know that $M_{\mathcal{P}}$ is a perfect matching. Moreover, $M_{\mathcal{P}}$ is a cutset by Lemma 2. Indeed, let C be any cycle in $G(I)$. If C is contained in a gadget then, as $M_{\mathcal{P}}$ is a cutset when restricted to a gadget, $|C \cap M_{\mathcal{P}}|$ is even. Otherwise, C contains a connector edge uv, so we can see C as the concatenation of the edge uv and a path Q from v to u. We know that $uv \notin M_{\mathcal{P}}$, and $\mathrm{var}(u) = \mathrm{var}(v)$. By Lemma 19, $|E(C) \cap M_{\mathcal{P}}| = |E(Q) \cap M_{\mathcal{P}}|$ is even. $\square$

We finally get Theorem 1, due to Lemmas 7, 18 and 20.

References

1. Takanori Akiyama, Takao Nishizeki, and Nobuji Saito. NP-completeness of the hamiltonian cycle problem for bipartite graphs. *Journal of Information processing*, 3(2):73–76, 1980.
2. Paul S. Bonsma. The complexity of the matching-cut problem for planar graphs and other graph classes. *J. Graph Theory*, 62(2):109–126, 2009.
3. Valentin Bouquet and Christophe Picouleau. The complexity of the perfect matching-cut problem. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2011.03318*, 2020.
4. Chi-Yeh Chen, Sun-Yuan Hsieh, Hoàng-Oanh Le, Van Bang Le, and Sheng-Lung Peng. Matching cut in graphs with large minimum degree. *Algorithmica*, 83(5):1238–1255, 2021.
5. Vasek Chvátal. Recognizing decomposable graphs. *J. Graph Theory*, 8(1):51–53, 1984.
6. Andreas Darmann and Janosch Döcker. On a simple hard variant of Not-All-Equal 3-Sat. *Theoretical Computer Science*, 815:147–152, 2020.
7. Dominique De Werra, Marc Demange, Bruno Escoffier, Jérôme Monnot, and V Th Paschos. Weighted coloring on planar, bipartite and split graphs: Complexity and approximation. *Discrete Applied Mathematics*, 157(4):819–832, 2009.
8. Nicolas Derhy and Christophe Picouleau. Finding induced trees. *Discret. Appl. Math.*, 157(17):3552–3557, 2009.
9. Reinhard Diestel. *Graph Theory, 4th Edition*, volume 173 of *Graduate texts in mathematics*. Springer, 2012.
10. Tomás Feder, Pavol Hell, and Carlos S. Subi. Distance-two colourings of Barnette graphs. *Eur. J. Comb.*, 91:103210, 2021.
11. Tomás Feder and Carlos S. Subi. On Barnette's conjecture. *Electron. Colloquium Comput. Complex.*, TR06-015, 2006.
12. Carl Feghali. A note on matching-cut in P_t-free graphs. *Inf. Process. Lett.*, 179:106294, 2023.
13. Carl Feghali, Felicia Lucke, Daniël Paulusma, and Bernard Ries. New hardness results for (perfect) matching cut and disconnected perfect matching. *CoRR*, abs/2212.12317, 2022.
14. Michael R. Garey and David S. Johnson. *Computers and Intractability: A Guide to the Theory of NP-Completeness*. W. H. Freeman, 1979.
15. Petr A. Golovach, Christian Komusiewicz, Dieter Kratsch, and Van Bang Le. Refined notions of parameterized enumeration kernels with applications to matching cut enumeration. *J. Comput. Syst. Sci.*, 123:76–102, 2022.
16. F. Hadlock. Finding a maximum cut of a planar graph in polynomial time. *SIAM J. Comput.*, 4(3):221–225, 1975.

17. Pinar Heggernes and Jan Arne Telle. Partitioning graphs into generalized dominating sets. *Nord. J. Comput.*, 5(2):128–142, 1998.
18. Russell Impagliazzo and Ramamohan Paturi. On the complexity of k-sat. *J. Comput. Syst. Sci.*, 62(2):367–375, 2001.
19. Russell Impagliazzo, Ramamohan Paturi, and Francis Zane. Which problems have strongly exponential complexity? *J. Comput. Syst. Sci.*, 63(4):512–530, 2001.
20. Richard M. Karp. Reducibility among combinatorial problems. In Raymond E. Miller and James W. Thatcher, editors, *Proceedings of a symposium on the Complexity of Computer Computations, held March 20-22, 1972, at the IBM Thomas J. Watson Research Center, Yorktown Heights, New York, USA*, The IBM Research Symposia Series, pages 85–103. Plenum Press, New York, 1972.
21. Pieter Kasteleyn. Graph theory and crystal physics. *Graph theory and theoretical physics*, pages 43–110, 1967.
22. Christian Komusiewicz, Dieter Kratsch, and Van Bang Le. Matching cut: Kernelization, single-exponential time fpt, and exact exponential algorithms. *Discret. Appl. Math.*, 283:44–58, 2020.
23. Dmitry V. Korobitsin. On the complexity of domination number determination in monogenic classes of graphs. 1992.
24. Adrian Kosowski, Michal Malafiejski, and Pawel Zylinski. Parallel processing subsystems with redundancy in a distributed environment. In Roman Wyrzykowski, Jack J. Dongarra, Norbert Meyer, and Jerzy Wasniewski, editors, *Parallel Processing and Applied Mathematics, 6th International Conference, PPAM 2005, Poznan, Poland, September 11-14, 2005, Revised Selected Papers*, volume 3911 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 1002–1009. Springer, 2005.
25. Dieter Kratsch and Van Bang Le. Algorithms solving the matching cut problem. *Theor. Comput. Sci.*, 609:328–335, 2016.
26. Hoàng-Oanh Le and Van Bang Le. A complexity dichotomy for matching cut in (bipartite) graphs of fixed diameter. *Theor. Comput. Sci.*, 770:69–78, 2019.
27. Van Bang Le and Jan Arne Telle. The perfect matching cut problem revisited. *Theor. Comput. Sci.*, 931:117–130, 2022.
28. Richard J. Lipton and Robert Endre Tarjan. Applications of a planar separator theorem. *SIAM J. Comput.*, 9(3):615–627, 1980.
29. Ya. A. Loverov and Yury L. Orlovich. NP-completeness of the independent dominating set problem in the class of cubic planar bipartite graphs. *Journal of Applied and Industrial Mathematics*, 14:353–368, 2020.
30. Felicia Lucke, Daniël Paulusma, and Bernard Ries. Finding matching cuts in H-free graphs. In Sang Won Bae and Heejin Park, editors, *33rd International Symposium on Algorithms and Computation, ISAAC 2022, December 19-21, 2022, Seoul, Korea*, volume 248 of *LIPIcs*, pages 22:1–22:16. Schloss Dagstuhl - Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik, 2022.
31. Felicia Lucke, Daniël Paulusma, and Bernard Ries. On the complexity of matching cut for graphs of bounded radius and *H*-free graphs. *Theor. Comput. Sci.*, 936:33–42, 2022.
32. Dániel Marx. Np-completeness of list coloring and precoloring extension on the edges of planar graphs. *J. Graph Theory*, 49(4):313–324, 2005.
33. Mateusz Miotk, Jerzy Topp, and Paweł Żyliński. Disjoint dominating and 2-dominating sets in graphs. *Discrete Optimization*, 35:100553, 2020.
34. Bernard M. E. Moret. Planar NAE3SAT is in P. *SIGACT News*, 19(2):51–54, 1988.
35. Augustine M. Moshi. Matching cutsets in graphs. *J. Graph Theory*, 13(5):527–536, 1989.

36. Andrea Munaro. On line graphs of subcubic triangle-free graphs. *Discret. Math.*, 340(6):1210–1226, 2017.
37. Maurizio Patrignani and Maurizio Pizzonia. The complexity of the matching-cut problem. In Andreas Brandstädt and Van Bang Le, editors, *Graph-Theoretic Concepts in Computer Science, 27th International Workshop, WG 2001, Boltenhagen, Germany, June 14-16, 2001, Proceedings*, volume 2204 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 284–295. Springer, 2001.
38. Michal Pilipczuk. Problems parameterized by treewidth tractable in single exponential time: A logical approach. In Filip Murlak and Piotr Sankowski, editors, *Mathematical Foundations of Computer Science 2011 - 36th International Symposium, MFCS 2011, Warsaw, Poland, August 22-26, 2011. Proceedings*, volume 6907 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 520–531. Springer, 2011.
39. Larry J. Stockmeyer and Vijay V. Vazirani. NP-completeness of some generalizations of the maximum matching problem. *Inf. Process. Lett.*, 15(1):14–19, 1982.
40. Harold N. V. Temperley and Michael E. Fisher. Dimer problem in statistical mechanics-an exact result. *Philosophical Magazine*, 6(68):1061–1063, 1961.
41. William T. Tutte. The factorization of linear graphs. *Journal of the London Mathematical Society*, 1(2):107–111, 1947.
42. Salil P. Vadhan. The complexity of counting in sparse, regular, and planar graphs. *SIAM J. Comput.*, 31(2):398–427, 2001.