

Generalizing LCL Complexity Gaps to Unbounded Degree via Monadic Second-Order Properties

Chiara Piombi 

CISPA Helmholtz Center for Information Security
Saarbrücken, Germany
chiara.piombi@cispa.de

Abstract

The last decade of research on the LOCAL model has seen tremendous progress in understanding *locally checkable labeling* (LCL) *problems*, culminating in an almost complete classification of the possible complexities LCL problems can exhibit. In particular, on undirected trees, Chang and Pettie showed that there is no LCL problem with complexity between $\omega(\log n)$ and $n^{o(1)}$ [CP17] and Chang showed that, for every positive integer k , there is no LCL problem with complexity between $\omega(n^{1/(k+1)})$ and $o(n^{1/k})$ [Cha20]; additionally, which side of each *gap* a problem is found on is decidable.

While the class of LCL problems – which, roughly speaking, consists of problems for which the correctness of a solution can be described by a finite set of allowed node configurations, which in turn can be locally verified by a constant-time algorithm – includes many important problems, it has one major restriction: problems can be defined only on bounded degree graphs, which consequently restricts all the classification and gap results mentioned above.

In this work, we propose a generalization of LCL problems to unbounded degree using *Presburger monadic second-order* (PMSO) *formulas*; more specifically, we consider what we call *Local PMSO* (LPMSO) *problems*, i.e., problems whose correct solutions are both *finitely described* by a PMSO formula and *locally verifiable* by a LOCAL algorithm in constant time – this class contains many of the important problems studied in the LOCAL model but defines them on unbounded degree graphs. As our main result we prove that, on unbounded degree rooted trees, the aforementioned $\omega(\log n)$ – $n^{o(1)}$ and $\omega(n^{1/(k+1)})$ – $o(n^{1/k})$ complexity gaps (and their decidability) extend to the class of LPMSO problems.

We obtain our gap results by proving two theorems that may be of independent interest:

1. We show that computing just a solution of an LPMSO problem is asymptotically as hard as computing *both* a solution and a certificate for its correctness, if the certification is based on the minimal automaton verifying the PMSO formula.
2. By modifying the minimal verification automaton slightly, we create a so-called rational multiset tree automaton whose run on the input rooted tree encodes both a solution and a certificate for its correctness; then we show that computing a run of *any* rational multiset tree automaton on a rooted tree is asymptotically equivalent to solving the same problem on a rooted tree whose degree is bound by a constant depending only on the problem description.

Funding. This work is funded by the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft (DFG, German Research Foundation) – Project number 534005335.

Acknowledgements. I want to thank Sebastian Brandt and Gustav Schmid for insightful discussions, and Jonathan Osser and Noa Izsak for answering my questions about logical formalism and automata theory.

1 Introduction

One of the central and most fruitful areas of research in the LOCAL model in the last decade is the study of the possible complexities that problems from the class of so-called Locally Checkable Labeling (LCL) can exhibit. This class includes many interesting problems, but has the major drawback of being only defined on bounded-degree graphs. In this work, we propose a generalization of the class of LCL problems to the unbounded-degree setting based on finite model theory and automata theory, and provide *gap results* for our characterization – i.e., we show that there are intervals of the complexity landscape into which no problems from our generalized class falls.

We begin by introducing the LOCAL model and discussing the literature on LCL problems and their generalizations.

1.1 Background and previous work

The LOCAL model We consider Linial’s LOCAL model of distributed computing [Lin87], where the input is a graph $G = (V, E)$ representing a network with processors on each vertex $v \in V$ which can communicate over the edges $e \in E$. The computation proceeds in synchronous rounds where each processor sends one message to each of its neighbors; there are no limitations on message size or local computation power, and the complexity of an algorithm is the number of rounds until all nodes terminate and output their own part of a global solution.

We additionally assume that all nodes either know the graph size (the number n of vertices of the graph) or a polynomial bound on it and are equipped with some way to distinguish between nodes: in the deterministic LOCAL model, nodes are equipped with globally unique IDs composed of $O(\log n)$ bits, while in the randomized LOCAL model nodes are equipped with infinite strings of random bits generated independently. Under those assumptions, a LOCAL algorithm that runs in $T(n)$ rounds is equivalent to an algorithm that for each node v gathers the $T(n)$ -hop neighborhood of v to determine v ’s output. We then refer to the complexity of a problem in the LOCAL model as its *locality*.

Locally Checkable Labelling problems A problem is truly *local* when its locality is a constant which does not depend on the size of the input graph; local problems are considered to be efficiently solvable in the LOCAL model and they are, in a way, a distributed analogue of the centralised problem class P. Similarly, a natural analogue of the NP class is the class of *Locally Checkable Labelings* (LCL) problems defined by Naor and Stockmeyer [NS93]; these are problems that can be *verified* in constant time by a distributed algorithm. Explicitly, LCLs are described via a *finite* set of *configurations* (labeled r -hop neighborhoods for some finite $n \geq 0$) such that the overall solution is correct if and only if for every node v in the graph there is an isomorphism between the r -hop neighborhood of v and one of the configurations. This description naturally induces two restrictions: LCL problems are required to have finitely many input and output labels and can only be defined on graphs whose maximum degree is bounded by a constant; this is because all possible labels and degrees have to appear in the finitely many configurations.

Complexity landscape The complexity of LCL problems has been widely studied, especially in the last 10 years (see [Bal+19b; Bal+21; Bra+17] amongst others). The most interesting results to come out of this study are *gaps*, results that show no problem can have a complexity strictly between two classes; gap results are extremely powerful, as they can be used to automatically improve both upper bounds and lower bounds.

Conversely, *density* results (like the ones found in [Bal+18]) show the lack of major gaps by constructing a set of problems whose complexities form a dense set of the interval between two functions. These two types of results together form what is referred to as the *complexity landscape* of LCL problems; this complexity landscape is today almost completely understood

([Suo20] and Figure 1 for an overview). Even more information can be gathered by restricting




Figure 1: The complexity landscape of LCLs on general graphs.

the types of graphs the problem is defined on: the complexity landscape of LCL problems is fully understood for many graph classes, such as paths [Bal+19b], undirected trees [Cha20], rooted trees [Bal+21], and grids [Bra+17]. We focus especially on undirected and rooted trees; they have very similar complexity landscapes, as a problem on rooted trees can be encoded as a problem on unrooted trees with inputs on the nodes – additionally, both have the interesting property of containing *countably many discrete* complexity classes. Specifically, an LCL problem on (both rooted and undirected) trees has deterministic complexity either

$$O(1), \Theta(\log^* n), \Theta(\log n), \text{ or } \Theta(n^{1/k}) \text{ for some } k \in \mathbb{N}_{\geq 1},$$

or is unsolvable. The main difference lies in the randomized complexity: there exist problems on undirected trees with deterministic complexity $\Theta(\log n)$ and randomized complexity $\Theta(\log \log n)$, such as sinkless orientation [Bal+23] but no such problems exist for rooted trees [Bal+21].




Figure 2: The complexity landscape of LCLs on undirected trees.



Figure 3: The complexity landscape of LCLs on rooted trees; note that the randomized and deterministic landscapes are the same.

Another focus of the research on distributed complexity gaps is *decidability*, by which we mean whether an algorithm exists that for a given problem decides which side of a gap it lies on. Herein lies another difference between the complexity landscape of rooted and undirected trees: the complexity of LCLs on rooted trees is fully decidable, while only the “polynomial” gaps (the $\omega(\log n) - n^{o(1)}$ and $\omega(n^{1/(k+1)}) - o(n^{1/k})$ gaps) are known to be decidable for unrooted trees.

Generalizing LCL problems As we have seen, Locally Checkable Labeling problems have a nice and clean complexity landscape; however they are limited by the nature of their description. We focus specifically on the fact they can only be defined for *bounded degree graphs*; most natural problems, such as finding a maximal independent set (MIS) or a maximal matching, have graph-theoretic descriptions that do not depend on the problem description – and even those who do, such as $(\Delta + 1)$ -coloring, can be defined for non-constant values of the maximum degree Δ .

Our objective is to generalize LCLs in a way that preserves some of the gap results described above and contains as many problems as possible: this would allow us to use the gaps to boost upper bound and lower bounds on the complexity of a problem on unbounded degrees as well. What properties should this generalization have?

First of all, we require our problems to be *locally verifiable*: we can trivially create problems that are not locally verifiable but have complexity $T(n)$ for any sublinear function T , by requiring the nodes to output their $T(n)$ -hop neighborhood.

We could try to naturally define the class of all problems that are locally verifiable, without any restriction on having a finite description, finite labels or bounded degree; however it was shown in [Sch26, Theorem 1] that for any real number $r \in (0, 1]$ there is such a problem with complexity $\Theta(n^r)$ in unbounded degree trees. We then require our problems to have some form of *finite description* – this is also an advantage when trying to *decide* the complexity of a problem, as it allows the decidability algorithm to read the whole description.

Lastly, we observe that even these restrictions are not enough to recover *all* of the above mentioned graph results: we know that finding a MIS on unbounded degree trees has complexity $\Theta(\log n / \log \log n)$ ([BE08; Bal+19a]), which shows that the $\omega(\log^* n)$ to $o(\log n)$ gap does not hold (but a smaller one, i.e. a $\omega(\log^* n)$ to $o(\sqrt{\log n})$ or $o(\log \log n)$ could still hold). In this paper we focus on the polynomial gaps for rooted trees.

Locally Finite Labeling problems One approach towards generalising LCL problems with finite descriptions is Locally Finite Labeling problems, defined by Schmid in [Sch26]. LFL problems are described similarly to LCL problems, as a finite set of r -hop neighborhoods such that a solution is correct if every node can find a *morphism* between its own r -hop neighborhood and one of these configurations; however, LFL configurations mark some edges as “optional”: each “optional” edge can be used by the morphism arbitrarily many times (including 0). This class of problems has been shown to have decidable polynomial gaps.

Many important problems on unbounded degree graphs can be expressed in this formalism, such as finding a maximal independent set, k -coloring, and sinkless orientation; on the other hand, problems whose description depends on arithmetic cannot always be described as LFLs. One example is *degree splitting*, where each node is required to have as many blue neighbors as red neighbors [Sch26, Section 1.2].

Meta-results on the theory of graphs Could we find some other way to finitely describe a problem on unbounded degree trees? In this paper, we focus on problems whose solutions can be described by a single formula in the *monadic second-order* (MSO) logic on trees, which are assumed to be rooted, unordered and unranked. The relationship between trees and monadic second-order logic is well-documented by Courcelle’s theorem [CE12], which states that every MSO-definable property can be verified by a sequential algorithm on graphs of bounded treewidth in linear time.

Monadic second-order properties on trees and tree-like graphs have been studied before in the context of distributed algorithms: Feuilloley, Bousquet and Pierron [FBP22] showed that MSO properties for trees can be certified with constant-size certificates and verifiability radius 1, while Jauregui, Li, Montealegre and Todinca [Jau+18] showed that there is a CONGEST implementation of Courcelle’s algorithm that can verify an MSO property on graphs of bounded treewidth in $\tilde{O}(D)$ rounds, where D is the diameter of the graph. Both of these results deal with *verification* problems, meaning problems where we need to check whether a (possibly labeled) graph has a defined property – such as whether a labeling is a correct solution to a problem, or a graph has a certain structure. We will show that the relationship between MSO on trees and tree automata is strong enough to define meta-theorems on *construction* problems; that is, problem where you are required to *construct* a solution (usually a labeling) satisfying some property described by the problem – in our case, through a logical formula.

Automata theory and Presburger definitions Automata theory appears in the proofs of LOCAL complexity gaps on trees by Chang and Pettie ([CP17; Cha20]) as a way to formalize the replacement of one tree with another which has a locally similar structure. Those results use the bound on the maximum degree and constant checkability radius to construct the finite states of the automaton, and so do not trivially generalize to the unbounded degree setting. However, properties describable by MSO logic – and by some of its extensions – can be characterized as properties recognizable by selected types of bottom-up tree automata (see [BT05] for a review). We focus on the largest of these recognizable extensions: Presburger monadic second-order logic (PMSO). Presburger formulas are able to describe simple arithmetic constraints on integer variables; Presburger monadic second-order logic on rooted trees allows us to check those arithmetic constraints on the sets of *children* of a node – they can be checked by a class of automata called *rational multiset tree automata*, where rational multiset languages are roughly the multiset languages recognized by Presburger formulas.

In this paper, we show how we can use the local verifiability induced by the automata to obtain gaps for PMSO *certification* problems – meaning problems where a solution is given and we want to compute a certificate of its correctness that is locally verifiable. For automata-recognizable properties, this can be done by returning a run of the verifying automaton on the rooted tree. Additionally, we show that for *construction* problems which are both PMSO-definable and *locally verifiable*, we can find a certification problem which also encodes a valid solution – and solving this certification problem is asymptotically exactly as hard as computing a solution.

1.2 Organization

We start by giving a high-level overview of the results and proof techniques in Section 1.3, concluding with some related open questions; then in Section 2 we give precise definitions for the LOCAL model (deterministic and randomised), local verifiers, and the language of graphs. The bulk of the paper, where we prove the main result, is Section 3; the proof overview contains more specific references to its parts. Appendix A discusses the conversions between problems on rooted and unrooted trees and between node-labeling and edge-labeling problems; Appendix B contains some technical results about graph decompositions, and Appendix C contains an adaptation of the proof of the Myhill-Nerode theorem to the class of rational multiset tree automata.

1.3 A tour of the results

Presburger monadic second-order construction problems We focus on problems described by Presburger monadic second-order (PMSO) logic on rooted trees. PMSO is an extension of monadic second-order logic which allows for “linear” constraints described in terms of

basic arithmetic (only using \mathbb{N} , $+$ and \leq) on the children of a node¹; this allows us to define problems that first-order or even monadic second-order formulas cannot, such as degree splitting [HMN22] and its variants. As an example, consider a graph that is $\{B, R\}$ -labeled (colored with blue or red) – this is encoded by two unary relations (i.e. sets) B and R , so that “ x is blue” can be expressed as Bx . We can convert this unary relation to a second-order variable by the monadic second-order formula

$$\exists S_B \forall x (x \in S_B \leftrightarrow (Bx))$$

and we can do the same for the relation Rx (“ x is red”) and the variable S_R . Then the degree splitting problem “the difference between the number of blue children and red children of each node must be at most 1” (to account for nodes with an odd number of children) can be expressed by the formula

$$\forall x ((x \in S_B \leftrightarrow (Bx)) \wedge ((x \in S_R \leftrightarrow (Rx)) \wedge x/\varphi(S_B, S_R)),$$

where φ is the Presburger formula

$$\varphi(A, B) = |A| \leq |B| \leq |A| + 1.$$

We define the class of construction problems Π on rooted trees for which the property “the graph G is correctly labeled with a solution of Π ” is both describable by a PMSO formula and locally decidable; we call these Local PMSO, or LPMSO construction problems. We observe that the solutions to LCL problems can be described by first-order formulas – this is because the statement “the r -hop neighborhood of vertex x is isomorphic to the finite graph A ” can be expressed by a first-order formula with free variable x , and we can simply require each x to satisfy at least one of the finitely many isomorphism formulas to the allowed configurations. Then, any LCL problem can be defined by a PMSO formula over bounded-degree rooted trees; conversely, many unbounded-degree generalizations of natural LCLs can be described by PMSO formulas, such as finding a MIS, a maximal matching, a k -coloring or degree splitting. However, this class does not include the generalizations of problems for which the number of labels depends on the maximum degree (i.e. is potentially unbounded), such as $(\Delta + 1)$ -coloring.

The main result of this paper is that the Local PMSO class exhibits the same so-called *polynomial* complexity gaps as the class of LCL problems on rooted trees.

Theorem 1.1. *Let Π be a Local PMSO construction problem on rooted trees; then one of the following holds:*

- Π is unsolvable, or
- Π has deterministic and randomized LOCAL complexity $O(\log n)$, or
- Π has deterministic and randomized LOCAL complexity $\Theta(n^{1/k})$ for some $k \in \mathbb{N}_{\geq 1}$.

Additionally, there is a sequential algorithm that can decide based only on the PMSO description of Π which of those cases applies, and which k applies in the last case.

The proof of this theorem takes up the majority of this work. The result is achieved by solving what at first glance seems to be a harder problem: computing *both* a solution of Π and a one-round verifiable certificate of the correctness of the solution (Theorem 1.2 + Lemma 1.3); then showing that this new problem is not actually harder, as by choosing our certificates carefully, we can compute them from a valid solution with a constant-round algorithm (Theorem 1.4).

It is known that a MSO-definable property on trees can be certified with constant-size certificates [FBP22], and this can easily be extended to PMSO-definable properties on rooted trees;

¹This can be extended further to refer to all neighbors of a node on undirected general graphs; however, the rooted tree formulation is required for the automata-theoretic characterization to hold.

the certificates are the states of a specific type of bottom-up automata called rational multiset tree automata (RatMTA). These automata traverse a rooted tree from the leaves up to the root – a *run* is a labeling which assigns to each node the state the automaton was in when it reached that node. Seidl, Schwentick, and Muscholl [SSM03] proved that a property defined by a PMSO formula φ is also recognized by a rational multiset tree automaton \mathcal{A} – meaning for every tree T which satisfies φ , there is a run of \mathcal{A} on T which gives an *accepting* state at the root.

Automata certification problems As the first result, we show that *automata certification* problems on rooted trees exhibit polynomial gaps: for any RatMTA \mathcal{A} on Σ -labeled rooted trees we define the associated automata certification problem of computing a run of \mathcal{A} on any instance Σ -labeled rooted tree.

Theorem 1.2. *Let $\mathcal{A} = (\Sigma, Q, \delta, F)$ be a rational multiset tree automaton, and let $\Pi_{\mathcal{A}}$ be the problem of computing a run of \mathcal{A} on Σ -labeled rooted trees; then one of the following holds:*

- $\Pi_{\mathcal{A}}$ is unsolvable, or
- $\Pi_{\mathcal{A}}$ has deterministic and randomized LOCAL complexity $O(\log n)$, or
- $\Pi_{\mathcal{A}}$ has deterministic and randomized LOCAL complexity $\Theta(n^{1/k})$ for some $k \in \mathbb{N}_{\geq 1}$.

Additionally, there is a sequential algorithm that can decide based only on the description of \mathcal{A} which of those cases applies, and which k applies in the last case.

We give an overview of the proof of Theorem 1.2, which takes up all of Section 3.4. This proof is an adaptation of the $\omega(\log n) - n^{o(1)}$ and $\omega(n^{1/(k+1)}) - o(n^{1/k})$ gap results for undirected trees from Chang and Pettie [CP17; Cha20]; the central difference induced by the unbounded-degree setting is the definition of *classes* and *types*. We quickly review the crucial definitions from these proofs.

- A *partial Q -labeling* of a graph $G = (V, E)$ is a labeling with the symbols of $Q \uplus \{*\}$; nodes labeled with $*$ are considered unlabeled. A partial labeling $l' : V \rightarrow Q \uplus \{*\}$ can be completed (or extended to a complete labeling) if there is a labeling $l : V \rightarrow Q$ which agrees with l' on all nodes that are unlabeled; formally, if $l'(v) \neq *$ then $l'(v) = l(v)$.
- A *pole* of an undirected tree T is simply a special node; we refer to trees with one or two poles as *unipolar* and *bipolar* respectively.
- The *class* of a partially labeled unipolar or bipolar tree with respect to a LCL problem Π is the set of all labelings of the r -hop neighborhood(s) (where r is the verifiability radius of Π) of the pole(s) which can be extended to valid labelings extended to full labelings of the unipolar tree which are valid according to Π and agree with the partial labeling.
- A bipolar tree H can be interpreted as a string of unipolar trees with a path connecting their poles, where the first and last node of this path are the poles of H ; the string of types of those unipolar trees is the *type* of H . Note that two trees with the same type have the same class.

The two central properties of these definitions are: one, we can *replace* a unipolar or bipolar graph that is connected to a larger graph only by the poles by another of the same *class* without impacting whether the partial labeling can be completed. Two, there are *finitely many* classes of both unipolar and bipolar trees: this is because they are sets of Q -labelings of trees of height r and bounded maximum degree. These two properties can be used to define an *automaton* on the classes of unipolar trees, but the second one clearly does not hold in the unbounded degree setting.

However, in this proof, we are given a rational multiset tree automaton from the start: we show how we can use it and adapt it to give a new automata-theoretic definition of *types*, which act as a generalization of the concept of both types and classes defined above – satisfying both the replacement and finiteness properties.

In fact, we show another strong property of automata-theoretic types: they can be used to reduce the degree of our instance, allowing us to use results from the LCL version of the proof directly. Specifically, we can determine a value Δ (which only depends on the description of the rational multiset tree automaton we start with) such that every *type* of unipolar and bipolar trees – which in this context are called *tree types* and *context types* respectively – contains a tree of maximum degree Δ ; even stronger, for each unipolar and bipolar tree, we can find a *subtree* of maximum degree Δ of the same type.

We will use this degree reduction procedure to argue that our certification problem is not harder than the corresponding problem on graphs of maximum degree at most Δ – which is an LCL, since our certification can be verified in one round by the transition function. To do so, we apply the classification results from the Chang-Pettie proofs indirectly: if we have a $O(\log n)$ or $O(n^{1/k})$ round algorithms for the restricted LCL problem, then we have a so-called a *feasible function* of suitable strength, which allows us to precompute labels for some parts of our tree. We use this feasible function to describe a $O(\log n)$ or $O(n^{1/k})$ algorithm for the unbounded degree certification problem. This structure is robust: both the Chang-Pettie classification and the algorithms we describe can be implemented in both the deterministic and randomized LOCAL model.

We give further details on this proof in the paragraphs below.

Automata-theoretic types Throughout this paper, we refer to the *subtree rooted at a node v* of a rooted tree; this is the subtree induced by v and all of its descendants. We can interpret a subtree rooted at v as a unipolar tree with a pole at the root v – in general, in this rooted framework, we require unipolar trees to have their pole at the root.

Conceptually, we define the *type* of a node v of a rooted tree as the set of all states of v that can be extended to a valid (but not necessarily accepting) run of the subtree rooted at v – in practice, we define the type of a node v of an unlabeled tree as the state it is assigned by the deterministic and complete version of the automaton \mathcal{A} we start from, called \mathcal{A}_{det} . If the set of states of \mathcal{A} is Q , the set of states of \mathcal{A}_{det} is 2^Q , the set of all subsets of Q . Note that when we talk about “unlabeled” and “partially labeled” trees here, we are referring to output labels, i.e. automaton states: the trees might still be labeled by input labels in Σ .

We extend the definition of \mathcal{A}_{det} to work on rooted trees which are *partially labeled* with states of \mathcal{A} , such that a node that already has a label q is either assigned state $\{q\}$ (if there is a valid labeling of its rooted subtree which agrees with the partial labeling) or state \emptyset (if there is no such labeling) – we call this new automaton \mathcal{A}_{lab} , and define the *type* of a partially labeled rooted tree as the state that \mathcal{A}_{lab} assigns to its root (which is unique, as \mathcal{A}_{lab} is deterministic and complete). The full definitions of \mathcal{A}_{det} and \mathcal{A}_{lab} can be found in Section 3.4.1; the relation between this definition and the conceptual definition we provide at the start can be seen in Lemma 3.29.

What about bipolar trees? In this rooted framework, we require a bipolar tree to have a *consistently directed* path between the poles – we can then relate bipolar trees to the automata-theoretic concept of a *context*: a rooted tree with one specifically marked *leaf*, called a *variable node*. We denote a context as $C[x]$, where x represents the variable node – given a rooted tree T , we can substitute T into $C[x]$ (denoted as $C[T]$) by identifying the variable node of $C[x]$ with the root of the tree T . We can interpret a context as a bipolar tree with one pole at the root and one at the variable node.

Contexts allow us to define the *replacement* properties of types, which are discussed extensively in Section 3.3 – roughly, thanks to the \mathcal{A}_{lab} automaton for partially labeled rooted trees

we constructed, we can replace a rooted (unipolar) tree with a rooted (unipolar) tree of the same type in every context (overall graph) without affecting whether the partial labeling can be completed. For each context $C[x]$ we can find a *function* between types $\text{Type}(T) \mapsto \text{Type}(C[T])$ – the *type* of a context (bipolar tree) can be identified with this function, of which there are finitely many. We show that we can replace a context (bipolar tree) by one of the same type in every context composition (overall graph) without affecting whether the partial labeling can be completed.

Large contexts can be hard to efficiently analyze, so we restrict to *direct contexts*, meaning contexts where the variable node is an immediate child of the root; every context C can be expressed as a string of direct contexts C_1, \dots, C_k , each corresponding to a node along the directed path from root to variable node, such that $C = C_1 \circ \dots \circ C_k$. This roughly corresponds to the string of *classes* of unipolar trees which defines a bipolar trees in the Chang-Pettie definitions.

Degree reductions Rational multiset tree automata have transitions defined by *rational* sets of multisets. Rational sets of multisets can be equivalently defined as sets of multisets definable by a Presburger formula, or as *semilinear* sets of multisets – finite unions of linear sets. A linear set of multisets is a set of the form

$$L = M_0 + \mathbb{N}M_1 + \dots + \mathbb{N}M_k,$$

where M_0, M_1, \dots, M_k are multisets and $+$ represents multiset union. M_0 is the *base multiset* or *base vector*.

We focus on tree types and direct context types; the type of a partially labeled tree or direct context is fully defined by the multiset of tree types of its (non-variable) children, the input label of its root, and the partial output label of its root. We can then identify types with sets of multisets (containing all multisets that appear in some tree or context of that type) – for tree types, the set corresponding to the root input-output label pair (i, s) state q is the semilinear set $\delta_{lab}((i, s), q)$. We prove in Lemma 3.18 that the set representing a context type is also semilinear.

Semilinear sets have a useful property (Lemma 3.6): there is a value d such that for every multiset M in the semilinear set there is an element $M' \subseteq M$ also in the semilinear set of size $\leq d$ – d is simply the length of the largest base multiset of a linear component, as the base multiset of a linear set is contained in all multisets of a linear set.

By using this property a node v of a rooted tree which knows the types of all its children can compute its own tree type, and find a subset of its children that would define the same tree type of size $\leq d$. We can set Δ_R as the largest d over all possible types, and define a procedure $\text{ForgetChildren}_R(v)$ in which v “forgets” about the children which are not required to define its type, reducing its degree to $\leq \Delta_R + 1$ (as the possible edge between v and its parent is not affected) without changing its type.

Similarly, if a node v knows the types of all its children but one, it can treat itself as a context and the unknown child as a variable node; we can then repeat the procedure above for context types, define Δ_C as the maximum d over all finite context types, and define a procedure $\text{ForgetChildren}_C(v)$ in which v “forgets” about some of its children and reduces its degree to $\leq \Delta_C + 2$ (as the edges between v ’s parent, v and the unknown child are unaffected) without changing its type.

The finite representation of types in general is discussed in Section 3.3.1; while the degree reduction procedure is detailed later in Section 3.4.2.

Feasible functions Thanks to the degree reduction procedures we defined, we are able to utilize tools that were defined to solve LCL problems on bounded-degree graphs – in particular, *feasible functions*. Roughly speaking, a function is feasible on *unlabeled* (with regards to the output labeling) bipolar trees if it allows us to choose labels for the middle nodes of “long

enough” bipolar trees in a way that can always be extended to a full labeling of any *unlabeled* tree containing it. However, if we want to apply this feasible function multiple times, we need to define it on *partially labeled* bipolar trees – this is not always possible for all partially labeled bipolar trees. Intuitively, every application of the feasible function might create new types of bipolar tree – a function is k -feasible roughly if it can be applied k times in a row, and ∞ -feasible if it is feasible over all partially labeled bipolar trees. A more detailed definition can be found in Section 3.4.3.

Now, consider the problem $\Pi_{\mathcal{A},\Delta}$, which is the restriction of $\Pi_{\mathcal{A}}$ to rooted trees of maximum degree at most $\Delta = \max\{\Delta_R + 1, \Delta_C + 2\}$. Clearly, $\Pi_{\mathcal{A},\Delta}$ cannot be harder than $\Pi_{\mathcal{A}}$, as any algorithm for $\Pi_{\mathcal{A}}$ needs to solve all instances of $\Pi_{\mathcal{A},\Delta}$.

We convert $\Pi_{\mathcal{A},\Delta}$ to a problem of the same complexity on undirected trees (see Appendix A for details) and use the following results from the Chang-Pettie proofs: $\Pi_{\mathcal{A},\Delta}$ can be solved in $O(\log n)$ rounds if and only if a ∞ -feasible function exists for $\Pi_{\mathcal{A},\Delta}$, and similarly $\Pi_{\mathcal{A},\Delta}$ can be solved in $O(n^{1/k})$ rounds if and only if a k -feasible function exists for $\Pi_{\mathcal{A},\Delta}$. We argue that we can use these feasible functions to obtain $O(\log n)$ and $O(n^{1/k})$ algorithms for $\Pi_{\mathcal{A}}$ as well – this is roughly equivalent to claiming that we can use an algorithm for $\Pi_{\mathcal{A},\Delta}$ to solve $\Pi_{\mathcal{A}}$, but without being able to treat the algorithm as a black-box.

Algorithm We describe the algorithm used to solve $\Pi_{\mathcal{A}}$; the technical description, as well as correctness and complexity analysis, can be found in Section 3.4.4.

During the preprocessing step, we can compute a description of \mathcal{A}_{lab} , as well as the value of Δ by brute-force enumeration of the finitely many tree types and context types. Then we can compute the exact LCL description of $\Pi_{\mathcal{A},\Delta}$ over undirected trees, and use the results from Chang and Chang-Pettie to decide its complexity and explicitly compute a suitable feasible function f – including the value ℓ , which depends only on the description of $\Pi_{\mathcal{A},\Delta}$, such that f is feasible for all bipolar trees of length $\in [\ell, 2\ell]$.

We compute a parametrized decomposition of our unlabeled rooted tree instance $T = (V, E)$ with parameters γ, ℓ, L , which is an ordered partition of the vertex set V in

$$R_1 < C_1 < R_2 < \dots < R_L < C_L < R_{L+1}$$

with the following properties:

1. for every $i \in [1, \dots, L + 1]$, the subgraph induced by R_i is a forest of rooted tree of height at most γ such that only the parent of the roots might be in a higher layer, and
2. for every $i \in [1, \dots, L]$, the subgraph induced by C_i is a forest such that every connected component is a directed path of length $\in [\ell, 2\ell]$, and only the starts/ends might have a parent/child in a higher layer (respectively).

Aside from the parameters of this decomposition, the algorithm is the same for both the $O(\log n)$ case and $O(n^{1/k})$ case – we apply the feasible function on the layers C_i iteratively, so the number of layers cannot be higher than the “strength” of the feasible function. If f is a ∞ -feasible function (equivalently, $\Pi_{\mathcal{A},\Delta}$ has complexity $O(\log n)$) we compute a $(1, \ell, O(\log n))$ decomposition in $O(\log n)$ rounds; if f is a k -feasible function (equivalently, $\Pi_{\mathcal{A},\Delta}$ has complexity $O(n^{1/k})$) we compute a $(O(n^{1/k}), \ell, k)$ -decomposition in $O(n^{1/k})$ rounds – details on how we compute the decompositions can be found in Appendix B.

Then, we can compute the types (according to \mathcal{A}_{lab}) of all nodes going “up” the layers: we can compute the types of a layer R_i in $O(\gamma)$ rounds by brute force, as long as we know the types of all nodes in the previous layers – as we do, each node applies the procedure `ForgetChildrenR` to virtually reduce its own degree to $\leq \Delta$. When we reach a C_i layer, assuming we know the types of all nodes of previous layer, we can compute the types of nodes of C_i as direct contexts – we apply the degree reduction procedure to them as well, virtually reducing their degree to $\leq \Delta$.

Now each connected component of C_i represents a bipolar tree of length $\in [\ell, 2\ell]$ and maximum degree $\leq \Delta$: we can apply the feasible function f for $\Pi_{\mathcal{A}, \Delta}$ to assign labels to the middle nodes of the bipolar tree in a way that will not result in an unextendable labeling – which tells us their type according to \mathcal{A}_{lab} . Then we can compute the types of all nodes of the bipolar tree which are *ancestors* of the labeled nodes, while nodes which are *descendants* can wait to compute their type until the last layer, since their parents do not need to wait for them anymore. This takes $O(\ell)$ rounds, and we repeat the whole process for each layer, taking $O((\gamma + \ell)L)$ rounds.

Once we have computed the types of *all* nodes in the (now partially labeled) graph according to \mathcal{A}_{lab} , we can choose an accepting state for the root from its type (this must exist due to the feasibility of the function – see Lemma 3.30). Then all nodes that have selected a state (through the prelabeling or by being the root) can choose a label for their children, *including* the children that were temporarily “forgotten” to reduce the degree, which then choose a label for their children, and so on – we can show that every node is the $O((\gamma + \ell)L)$ -hop descendant of a prelabeled node, so this takes $O((\gamma + \ell)L)$ rounds and achieves a valid labeling. The $O((\gamma + \ell)L)$ complexity corresponds to $O(n^{1/k})$ for $\gamma \in O(n^{1/k}), \ell \in O(1), L = k$ and to $O(\log n)$ for $\gamma, \ell \in O(1), L \in O(\log n)$.

This completes the proof of Theorem 1.2.

Encoding labels as states Because every PMSO property can be recognized by a rational multiset tree automaton, we could use Theorem 1.2 to compute a certificate for an existing solution – we show that we can instead use it to compute *both* a solution and a certificate of its correctness. Specifically, we will find an automaton which does *not* certify the property “is this labeling a valid solution for Π ?” but instead “does there *exist* a valid labeling of this graph according to Π ?”. The details of this construction can be found in Section 3.5; the main result from that section that we will use to prove Theorem 1.1 is Lemma 1.3.

Lemma 1.3. *Let $\mathcal{A} = (\Sigma_{in} \times \Sigma_{out}, Q, \delta, F)$ be a rational multiset tree automaton recognising a $\Sigma_{in} \times \Sigma_{out}$ -labeled rooted tree property \mathcal{G} ; then there is a RatMTA $\mathcal{A}' = (\Sigma_{in}, \Sigma_{out} \times Q, \delta', \Sigma_{out} \times F)$ which recognises the language of all Σ_{in} -labeled rooted trees T such that there exists a Σ_{out} -labeling of T such that:*

- T labeled with the resulting $\Sigma_{in} \times \Sigma_{out}$ -labeling is in \mathcal{G} (is recognized by \mathcal{A}), and
- a valid run of \mathcal{A}' consists of a valid Σ_{out} -labeling and a run of \mathcal{A} verifying the correctness of this labeling.

Together, Theorem 1.2 and this result show that the polynomial gaps hold for problems requiring us to compute both a solution and a certificate of the correctness of this solution. This problem is at least as hard as computing *only* a solution – the last remaining step is showing that they actually have the same complexity.

Minimal automaton Note that up to this point, we have required the correctness of our solution to be described by a PMSO sentence (equivalently, certifiable by a rational multiset tree automaton), but not locally verifiable; let us now assume we have a property \mathcal{G} which is *both* PMSO-definable and locally decidable with radius r .

By the result of Seidl, Schwentick, and Muscholl [SSM03] we are guaranteed that *some* rational multiset tree automaton exists which can recognize \mathcal{G} . However, not *every* RatMTA recognizing \mathcal{G} will allow us to efficiently compute certificates – we provide an example below.

Let Π be a very simple problem: we want to label a rooted tree without inputs with the label T . No other conditions are given, and there is a 0-round LOCAL algorithm that outputs T on each node – which is trivially $O(\log n)$. We define a rational multiset tree automaton that recognises the language \mathcal{T} of T -labeled rooted trees: $\mathcal{A}_T = (\{T\}, \{0, 1\}, \delta_T, \{0, 1\})$ where $\delta(T, 0) = \mathcal{M}(\{1\})$ (all multisets composed only of 1s) and $\delta(T, 1) = \mathcal{M}(\{0\})$ (all multisets

composed only of 0s). Those sets are semilinear (in fact, they are linear) and so this is a valid RatMTA; a run of \mathcal{A}_T is a 2-coloring of the rooted tree, which always exists for every rooted tree – since the automaton accepts every state, this automaton accepts every tree. However, computing a 2-coloring of a rooted tree takes $\Omega(n)$ rounds in the LOCAL model [Bal+21]. The result we were trying to achieve – computing a solution *and* a certificate is not harder than computing *only* a solution – is then false for this specific choice of automaton.

Our example purposefully constructed a wasteful automaton, and we can see that the language \mathcal{T} could be more easily recognized by a one-state automaton – then, we could compute a run of it in 0 rounds. To avoid such wasteful constructions, we need to work on the *simplest* possible automaton; this corresponds to the automata-theoretic concept of *minimal* (by number of states) *deterministic* and *complete* automaton. For classical (ranked, ordered) bottom-up tree automata, the existence and uniqueness of the minimal automaton is guaranteed by the Myhill-Nerode theorem: we prove a version of it for rational multiset tree automata on unranked, unordered trees in Appendix C.

The states of the minimal automaton are in bijection with the equivalence classes of a relation depending only on the property, denoted $\equiv_{\mathcal{G}}$, which is the coarsest *context-free* equivalence; two trees T_1 and T_2 are equivalent iff for every context $C[x]$ we have $C[T_1] \in \mathcal{G} \Leftrightarrow C[T_2] \in \mathcal{G}$. In simpler words, $T_1 \equiv_{\mathcal{G}} T_2$ if we can replace a rooted subtree T_1 by T_2 while preserving the correctness of the labeling; as we have observed during the previous proofs, this is in general true for trees of the same *type*, meaning the same state of the root, so the coarsest (minimal number of equivalence classes) such equivalence relation corresponds to the automata with the minimal number of states.

Locally computing states This replacement property is in fact the same that underlies the proof for the bounded degree gaps; however, in that case, two partially labeled unipolar trees are equivalent roughly speaking if the $2r$ -hop neighborhoods of their poles are isomorphic *and* any partial labeling of this isomorphic neighborhood can be extended in one tree if and only if it can be extended in the other. In the unbounded degree setting, there are infinitely many equivalence classes for this relation – however, *because* it satisfies the replacement property, this neighborhood-based equivalence is a *refinement* of the relation $\equiv_{\mathcal{G}}$ defined above; by restricting to fully labeled trees, this implies that *two correctly labeled trees with isomorphic $2r$ -hop neighborhoods of the root have the same type* in the minimal automaton.

We can then build a very simple reduction from our original problem (“find a correct solution for Π ”) to the following problem: find *both* a correct solution for Π and a run of the *minimal* automaton certifying that solution. By Lemma 1.3 we know this can be expressed as a single automaton certification problem on unlabeled trees, and by Theorem 1.2 we know these problems have polynomial gaps.

Theorem 1.4. *Let $\Pi = (\Sigma_{in}, \Sigma_{out}, \mathcal{G})$ be a Local PMSO problem with checkability radius k and let $\mathcal{A} = (\Sigma_{in} \times \Sigma_{out}, Q, \delta, F)$ be the minimal deterministic and complete RatMTA recognising \mathcal{G} . Denote \mathcal{G}_Q the graph language of $(\Sigma_{in} \times \Sigma_{out} \times Q)$ -labeled rooted trees such that for each $G \in \mathcal{G}_Q$:*

1. *the underlying $\Sigma_{in} \times \Sigma_{out}$ -labeled graph of G is in \mathcal{G} , and*
2. *the underlying Q -labeled graph of G is the run of \mathcal{A} on its underlying $\Sigma_{in} \times \Sigma_{out}$ -labeled graph.*

Then given a correct solution to Π , we can compute the run of \mathcal{A} which accepts it in $2k + 2$ rounds; equivalently, Π and $\Pi' = (\Sigma_{in}, \Sigma_{out} \times Q, \mathcal{G}_Q)$ have the same asymptotic complexity.

Together Theorem 1.2, Lemma 1.3 and Theorem 1.4 form a full proof of Theorem 1.1.

1.4 Open questions

The central result of this paper is a step towards a possible generalization for LCL problems based on finite model theory and automata theory; however, the use of bottom-up tree automata forces us to restrict the results to rooted trees. In Section 2.3 we propose a generalization of the PMSO logic – usually defined only on rooted trees – to general graphs; however, without the directional input of the rooting, we cannot easily generalize the automata-theoretic characterization as well. We conjecture that by using a suitable generalization of bottom-up tree automata – possibly inspired by *alternating distributed graph automata* defined by Reiter in [Rei15] – we could extend the gap results to undirected trees. We leave this for future work.

Similarly, it is possible that our choice of assumptions on local decidability could be improved, giving us a larger class of problems exhibiting the same gaps; LD^* is the weakest notion of local decidability, which does not allow the verifier to know the total size of the graph or the values of the unique IDs. The graph size especially needs to be heavily taken into account when proving the *replacement* properties of types, which are fundamental to the proof of Theorem 1.4, especially the degree reduction procedures.

We speculate that stronger notions of local decidability might actually falsify the gap result – that is, that there is a PMSO-definable problem on rooted trees which can only be locally verified by an algorithm which is aware of the size of the graph, and which has complexity $\Theta(n^r)$ for some $r \in (0, 1)$ which is not of the form $r = 1/k$.

Additionally, this paper focuses on the so-called “polynomial” gaps – many questions about the full complexity landscape of this class are still open. Are there any Local PMSO problems of complexity between $\omega(1)$ and $O(\log^* n)$? Is there a difference between the randomized and deterministic complexities of Local PMSO problems on unbounded-degree rooted trees? Are other common techniques used to prove results on LCL problems – such as round elimination – applicable to Local PMSO problems? We speculate that many such techniques can be proven to work in suitably large classes of problems described by logical formulas, establishing a class of *meta-theorems* for the LOCAL model.

2 Definitions, notation, and assumptions

In this section we review some preliminaries on the LOCAL model and finite model theory.

2.1 Local computation

We refer to the standard LOCAL model as defined in [Lin92]. Specifically, we refer to two variants of it: the first is the *deterministic* LOCAL model, where every node of the input graph G is provided with a globally unique ID from the interval $[1, \dots, n^c]$ where n is the number of nodes of G and $c \geq 1$ is a known constant; additionally, each node is aware of the exact value of n .

The second variant is the *randomized* LOCAL mode, where nodes are *not* provided unique IDs, but instead access to a perfectly random coin toss, where each coin is independent of the others; equivalently, each node is provided an endless string of random bits. Nodes are still aware of the exact value of n , and the solution of the algorithm is required to be correct with probability at least $1 - \frac{1}{n}$ over the probability space of all possible coin results.

For most of this paper, we focus on *node labeling* problems: we assume our graph is simple trees, and that we only care about whether an edge exists or not; we do not get inputs or assign outputs to them, except for a possible orientation. This is because – up to some graph operations that can be simulated internally in the nodes – problems with inputs and outputs on edges and half-edges can be transformed into problems on nodes only. See Appendix A for a more detailed description of this construction.

Additionally, we discuss the issue of *solvability*: throughout this paper, we assume a problem is *solvable* if it can be solved on *every* instance of the considered graph class. We denote a problem as *weakly solvable* if it can be solved on all but finitely many graphs, or equivalently if there exists a constant n_0 such that it can be solved on all graphs with more than n_0 vertices – this is the definition of solvability that is often used in the literature. Observe however that a weakly solvable problem can be converted into a solvable problem at the cost of increasing both the complexity and verifiability radius (i.e. the complexity of a distributed verifier for the solution; see definition below) by n_0 , such that an algorithm can always recognize if the instance given is unsolvable and output some error. If a LOCAL problem is unsolvable for infinitely many instances – equivalently, for at least one instance of infinitely many graph sizes – we say it is *unsolvable*.

2.2 Local verifiers

We discuss local verification following the notation from [FHK12; Fra+13], with one major difference: we do not assume our instances are connected graphs. This is not relevant in the context of undirected or rooted trees, as all trees are assumed to be connected; but it is relevant to defining the class of local first-order problems. This is because connectivity is not axiomatizable by a first-order sentence; when working with monadic second-order or higher logic, connectivity can be required in the problem description itself.

Definition 2.1. An *instance* is a pair (G, \mathbf{x}) where $G = (V, E)$ is a simple graph and \mathbf{x} is a function $V \rightarrow \{0, 1\}^*$ assigning to every node a binary input string, called a *label*.

Definition 2.2. A *graph property* (or *graph language*) is a *decidable* class of instances.

Definition 2.3. We define a *generalised graph construction problem* as a tuple $\Pi = (\Sigma_{in}, \Sigma_{out}, \mathcal{G})$ where:

- Σ_{in} is a finite set of input labels,
- Σ_{out} is a finite set of output labels, and
- \mathcal{G} is a property of $\Sigma_{in} \times \Sigma_{out}$ -labeled graphs.

An *instance* for Π is a Σ_{in} -labeled graph (G, λ_{in}) , and a *solution* to Π is a Σ_{out} -labeling λ_{out} of G such that $(G, \lambda_{in} \times \lambda_{out})$ is in \mathcal{G} .

Each construction problem is naturally associated with a decision problem, that is the one that checks whether $(G, \lambda_{in} \times \lambda_{out}) \in \mathcal{G}$ (decides \mathcal{G}) as a language; however, multiple construction problems can be associated with the same decision problem.

Definition 2.4. A *distributed verifier* for a graph property \mathcal{P} is a distributed algorithm \mathcal{A} with output space $\{\text{“yes”}, \text{“no”}\}$ such that, for all graphs G we have

$$G \in \mathcal{P} \Leftrightarrow \forall v \in V \mathcal{A}(G, \mathbf{x}, v) = \text{“yes”}$$

meaning, \mathcal{A} outputs “yes” on all nodes if and only if $G \in \mathcal{L}$.

There has been a large volume of discussion about the role of identifiers and knowledge of $\text{size}(G)$ have on the class of locally decidable problems; see [FHK12; Fra+13]. We choose to restrict local verifiers in a way that is analogous to LCL problems: the allowed configurations, and so the local verifier, do not depend on the ID assignment or on the knowledge of $\text{size}(G)$. However, the algorithm can use the uniqueness of IDs (and not their value) to precisely determine the topology of the graph; this is the deterministic *anonymous* LOCAL model defined in [FHK12].

Let $t : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ be a function; we define the class of *Locally Decidable* problems in time t (denoted $\text{LD}^*(t)$) as the class of all graph properties that can be decided by a distributed verifier that takes at most $t(n)$ communication rounds, where n is the size of the graph. We define $\text{LD}^*(O(t)) := \bigcup_{c \in \mathbb{N}} \text{LD}^*(c \cdot t)$; finally, we define $\text{LD}^* := \text{LD}^*(O(1))$ as the class of all problems that can be decided by a distributed verifier in constant rounds.

2.3 Axiomatizable graph properties

To work within a logic formalism, we must first establish a vocabulary and axioms for the theory of graphs. A (finite, simple, unlabeled) graph is commonly represented as a pair (V, E) where V is a finite set of vertices/nodes and $E \subseteq V \times V$ is a set of edges; we can interpret it as a *structure* on an vocabulary containing a single binary symbol E , where $E(x, y)$ means there is a (directed) edge from vertex x to vertex y (often denoted as xEy or $\text{child}(x, y)$ when discussing rooted trees).

First-order logic (FO) allows us to build formulas using a chosen vocabulary, equality ($=$), boolean symbols (\vee, \wedge, \neg) and quantifiers (\exists, \forall) only over the elements of the “universe” V (i.e. the vertices). Conversely, *second-order logic* allows us to define second-order variables, which are sets of tuples of elements of V , and quantify over them.

Second-order logic is more powerful in the sense that it can describe many more properties of graphs; however, this expressive power comes at a cost, as full second-order logic can express enough arithmetic to fall under Gödel’s famous incompleteness theorems. Throughout this paper we instead work in *monadic second-order logic* (MSO), which is generated by the symbols of first-order logic plus quantifiers only on *sets* (i.e. 1-tuples) of variables. Importantly, this does not allow us to quantify over pairs of vertices, i.e. to define sets of edges or functions between vertices.

We say a graph property is *definable* by a type of logic if there exists a single *sentence* (a formula where every variable is defined by a quantifier) in that logic such that the property is the set of all graphs that satisfy this sentence; those are called the *models* of φ and denoted $\text{Mod}(\varphi)$. Note that as most logic formalisms are closed under conjunction, being defined by one or finitely many sentences is equivalent.

Some examples of first-order axioms are the graph being loopless, undirected, or of bounded constant degree; some more complex properties, like being connected or being a tree, can be described by monadic second-order logic but not first-order logic.

Additionally, we often work with graphs labeled by a finite alphabet Σ , which are structures on a vocabulary containing the binary symbol E and unary symbols $\{S_s\}_{s \in \Sigma}$ such that $S_s(x)$ (denoted $x \in s$) represents the vertex x being labeled s . To make this a proper labeling, a monadic second-order axiom² is required: $\text{Part}(\{S_s\}_{s \in \Sigma})$, where

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Part}(S_1, \dots, S_k) := \forall x : & \bigvee_{i \in [1, \dots, k]} x \in S_i \quad \wedge \quad (x \text{ is part of at least one set}) \\ & \bigwedge_{i, j \in [1, \dots, k], i \neq j} (x \in S_i) \rightarrow \neg(x \in S_j) \quad (x \text{ is not in two sets at once}) \end{aligned}$$

Note that this is a valid (finite) formula only if Σ is finite.

Definition 2.5. We call *Presburger* formulas over a set of integer variables \mathcal{V} those generated by $\mathcal{V}, \mathbb{N}, +, \leq$ and $\text{div}_k(p)$ for all $k \in \mathbb{Z}^+$.

Crucially, Presburger formulas can encode *linear* multiplication (i.e. multiplication by a constant) but do not allow *general* multiplication (i.e. multiplying two variables) – Presburger arithmetic is not expressive enough to fall under Gödel’s incompleteness theorems.

²As the second-order variables here are unary relations in the vocabulary and not really variables, Part can also be written as a first-order formula.

Definition 2.6. We call *Presburger MSO* (PMSO) formulas on the language of rooted trees those generated by MSO syntax augmented by propositions of the type x/φ , where φ is a Presburger formula on the set of integer variables $\mathcal{V} = \{|X| : X \text{ is a second-order variable}\}$. The formula x/φ holds in some directed graph under a valuation ρ if the valuation μ mapping each variable $|X|$ from φ to the cardinality of $\rho(X) \cap \text{children}(\rho(x))$ is a solution for φ .

In other words, PMSO can capture complex relationship between sets (defined by Presburger formulas), but those sets are restricted to the children of a given node. Presburger monadic second-order formulas are usually defined only over *rooted trees* – we propose a natural extension of their definition to general undirected graphs.

Definition 2.7. We call *undirected Presburger MSO* (uPMSO) formulas on the language of undirected graphs those generated by MSO syntax augmented by propositions of the type x/φ , where φ is a Presburger formula on the set of integer variables $\mathcal{V} = \{|X| : X \text{ is a second-order variable}\}$. The formula x/φ holds in some graph under a valuation ρ if the valuation μ mapping each variable $|X|$ from φ to the cardinality of $\rho(X) \cap \text{neighbors}(\rho(x))$ is a solution for φ .

We will specifically look at the intersection of those classes with the class of locally verifiable problems defined above.

Definition 2.8. We define the class of *Local First-Order* (LFO) problems as the set of all graph languages which are axiomatizable by a first-order sentence *and* verifiable by a LOCAL algorithm in constant-time; formally, $\text{LFO} = \text{FO} \cap \text{LD}^*$. Similarly, we define the classes of

- *Local Monadic Second-Order* problems (LMSO),
- *Local Presburger-Monadic Second-Order* problems (LPMSO), and
- *Local undirected Presburger-Monadic Second-Order* problems (LuPMSO).

3 Local monadic second-order problems

The objective of this section is to prove that the class of Local Presburger Monadic Second-Order problems on rooted trees has a complexity landscape with polynomial gaps, similar to the bounded degree case (see [Bal+21]).

Theorem 1.1. *Let Π be a Local PMSO construction problem on rooted trees; then one of the following holds:*

- Π is unsolvable, or
- Π has deterministic and randomized LOCAL complexity $O(\log n)$, or
- Π has deterministic and randomized LOCAL complexity $\Theta(n^{1/k})$ for some $k \in \mathbb{N}_{\geq 1}$.

Additionally, there is a sequential algorithm that can decide based only on the PMSO description of Π which of those cases applies, and which k applies in the last case.

We will prove this in two steps: first, in Section 3.4 we show that the related problem Π_Q of computing *both* a valid output labeling and an automata-based certificate of correctness has one of the given complexities; Π_Q is trivially harder than Π , but in Section 3.6 we show that a constant-round reduction from Π to Π_Q exists, and so they have the same asymptotic complexity.

3.1 Background: rational sets

We follow the notations from [BT05] and [CMM00]; to compare their results, we use semilinear sets. We use $\mathcal{M}(Q)$ to denote the set of multisets of elements of Q .

Definition 3.1. A subset L of \mathbb{N}^k is said to be *linear* if it is of the form

$$L = u_0 + \mathbb{N}u_1 + \dots + \mathbb{N}u_n = \{u_0 + t_1u_1 + \dots + t_nu_n \mid t_1, \dots, t_n \in \mathbb{N}\}$$

for some $u_0, \dots, u_n \in \mathbb{N}^k$. In particular, u_0 is called the *base vector* of L . A subset of \mathbb{N}^k is said to be *semilinear* if it is a finite union of linear subsets.

We can identify a multiset M over a finite alphabet Σ (with a fixed order $\Sigma = \{s_1, \dots, s_k\}$) with a vector in \mathbb{N}^k where the i -th element represents the multiplicity of s_i . This is called the *Parikh vector* of M ; we do not distinguish between M and its Parikh vector, and refer to a multiset language as semilinear if and only if its Parikh image is semilinear.

Definition 3.2. The family $\text{Rat}(\mathcal{M}(A))$ of *rational multiset languages* is the smallest subset of $\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{M}(A))$ which:

- **contains all finite languages;** every finite subset of $\mathcal{M}(A)$ is in $\text{Rat}(\mathcal{M}(A))$,
- **is closed under finite union;** if $L_1, L_2 \in \text{Rat}(\mathcal{M}(A))$ then $L_1 \cup L_2 \in \text{Rat}(\mathcal{M}(A))$,
- **is closed under finite multiset union;** if $L_1, L_2 \in \text{Rat}(\mathcal{M}(A))$ then $L_1 + L_2 = \{m_1 \cup m_2 \mid m_1 \in L_1, m_2 \in L_2\} \in \text{Rat}(\mathcal{M}(A))$, and
- **is closed under Kleene star;** for a multiset language L denote $L^0 = \{\emptyset\}$, $L^1 = L$, and $L^{i+1} = L^i + L^1$; then if $L \in \text{Rat}(\mathcal{M}(A))$ then $L^* = \bigcup_{i \in \mathbb{N}} L^i \in \text{Rat}(\mathcal{M}(A))$.

Definition 3.3. A (nondeterministic) *finite multiset automaton (FMA)* is a structure $\mathcal{A} = (\Sigma, Q, q_0, f, F)$, where:

- Σ is the input alphabet,
- Q is a finite set of states,
- q_0 is the initial state,
- f is a transition function $\Sigma \times Q \rightarrow 2^Q$,
- $F \subseteq Q$ is the set of final states.

A configuration of \mathcal{A} is a pair (q, τ) , where q is a state (the current state) and τ is a multiset (the current content of the bag). A configuration *transitions* into another (denoted $(q, \tau) \vdash (q', \tau')$) if there is an element $s \in \Sigma$ such that

- $\tau = \tau' \uplus \{s\}$, and
- $q' \in f(s, q)$.

The multisets M accepted by this automaton are the ones for which there exists a chain of transitions starting from (q_0, M) and ending at (q_f, \emptyset) where $q_f \in F$.

Note that we only defined *nondeterministic* automata; contrary to word or even tree automata, deterministic FMA are strictly weaker than their nondeterministic counterparts.

Theorem 3.4. *Let \mathcal{L} be a multiset language. The following are equivalent:*

- (1) \mathcal{L} is semilinear.

(2) \mathcal{L} is rational.

(3) \mathcal{L} is definable by a Presburger sentence.

(4) There exists a finite multiset automaton recognising \mathcal{L} .

Proof. (1) \Leftrightarrow (2) is a common result on rational sets of commutative monoids, found explicitly in [ES69, p.175].

(1) \Leftrightarrow (3) is found in [GS66, Theorem 1.3].

(1) \Leftrightarrow (4) can be found in [CMM00]. \square

Corollary 3.5. *Rational multiset languages are closed under finite union, finite intersection and complement, corresponding to the boolean disjunction, conjunction and negation operations on Presburger formulas.*

Lemma 3.6. *Let \mathcal{L} be a semilinear multiset language. Then we can compute a value $d(\mathcal{L}) \in \mathbb{N}$ such that for all $M \in \mathcal{L}$ there is $M' \in \mathcal{L}$ such that $M' \subseteq M$ and $|M'| \leq d(\mathcal{L})$.*

Proof. We can pick l_0 as the maximum length of the base vectors of the linear components of \mathcal{L} , since every element of a linear set contains its base vector. \square

3.2 Background: bottom-up tree automata

Definition 3.7. A *rational-multiset tree automaton (RatMTA)* is a tuple $\mathcal{A} := (\Sigma, Q, \delta, F)$ where:

- Σ is a finite set of labels,
- Q is a finite set of states,
- $\delta : \Sigma \times Q \rightarrow \text{Rat}(\mathcal{M}(Q))$ is the transition function, which assigns to each pair of a label and a state a rational set of multisets of Q , and
- $F \subseteq Q$ is the accepting set of states.

If for each $s \in \Sigma$ the set $\{\delta(s, q)\}_{q \in Q}$ forms a partition of $\mathcal{M}(Q)$, the automaton is called *deterministic*.

A *valid run* of \mathcal{A} on an unranked, unordered rooted tree $T = ((V, E), r, \lambda)$ is a labeling $\mu : V \rightarrow Q$ such that for each node $v \in V$ the multiset $\{\{\mu(v_c) : v_c \in C_v\}\}$ is in $\delta(\lambda(v), \mu(v))$. A rooted tree T is *accepted* by \mathcal{A} iff there is an *accepting run* on T , meaning a run on T such that the label state of its root is in F .

We say that a RatMTA $\mathcal{A} := (\Sigma, Q, \delta, F)$ is *deterministic* if for every $s \in \Sigma$, $q_1, q_2 \in Q$ we have $\delta(s, q_1) \cap \delta(s, q_2) = \emptyset$; we say that a RatMTA is *complete* if for all $s \in \Sigma$ we have $\bigcup_{q \in Q} \delta(s, q) = \mathcal{M}(Q)$. In a deterministic and complete RatMTA the family $\{\delta(s, q)\}_{q \in Q}$ is a partition of $\mathcal{M}(Q)$ for all $s \in \Sigma$.

The relationship between Presburger arithmetic and rational multisets shown in Theorem 3.4 extends to Presburger MSO formulas on trees and rational multiset tree automata: we restate [SSM03, Theorem 5] below. Note that while the authors formulation uses Presburger u-tree automata, they are simply rational multiset tree automata defined using Presburger formulas instead of rational sets, and the two are equivalent by Theorem 3.4 (also mentioned explicitly in Section 2 of their paper).

Theorem 3.8. *Let \mathcal{L} be a language of unranked, unordered rooted trees. \mathcal{L} is PMSO-definable iff there exists a RatMTA \mathcal{A} that accepts \mathcal{L} .*

Proof. Let r_1 be the run of \mathcal{A} on T_1 , r_2 be the run of \mathcal{A} on T_2 , and r be the run of \mathcal{A} on $C[T_1]$ restricted to the nodes of $C[T_1] \setminus T_1$; since $\text{Type}(T_1) = \text{Type}(T_2)$ and the transition function depends only on the states, $r \cup r_2$ is the run of \mathcal{A} on $C[T_2]$. If r is empty (C is the trivial context where the root is the variable node) then the types of $T_1, T_2, C[T_1], C[T_2]$ are all the same; else, r assigns the same state to both roots and $\text{Type}(C[T_1]) = \text{Type}(C[T_2])$. \square

Corollary 3.13. *Let $\mathcal{A} = (\Sigma, Q, \delta, F)$ be a rational multiset tree automaton recognising a graph language \mathcal{G} , and let T_1, T_2 be Σ -labeled rooted trees: then*

$$\text{Type}(T_1) = \text{Type}(T_2) \quad \Rightarrow \quad T_1 \equiv_{\mathcal{G}} T_2$$

We prove something stronger, a generalization of the Myhill-Nerode theorem (see [Com+08, p36]) for rational multiset tree automata: if a language is recognizable by any deterministic, complete RatMTA then $\equiv_{\mathcal{G}}$ has finitely many equivalence classes, and those classes form the states of a deterministic, complete RatMTA which is *minimal* (by number of states) and *unique* up to relabeling the states.

Theorem 3.14. (Myhill-Nerode) *Let \mathcal{G} be a tree language which can be recognised by a deterministic, complete RatMTA \mathcal{A} . Then:*

- (1) $\equiv_{\mathcal{G}}$ has finite index, upper bounded by the number of states of \mathcal{A} , and
- (2) there is a deterministic, complete RatMTA which recognises \mathcal{G} whose states are in bijection with the equivalence classes of $\equiv_{\mathcal{G}}$.

Proof. Found in Appendix C. \square

But what about bipolar trees? Contexts are themselves rooted trees, so we can imagine them as having one pole at the variable node (going out) and one pole at the root (going in); specifically, we are interested in *direct contexts*, which have the variable node as a direct child of the root node – in other words, bipolar trees which have both poles at the root. After accounting for the direction, these function similarly to *rooted tree types* by the definition given by Chang and Pettie in [CP17]; we can encode any context (bipolar tree) as a string of direct contexts, each corresponding to one node on the path between the root and variable node – we define a notion of *type* for them corresponding to *bipolar tree types* from [CP17].

We can interpret contexts, and more specifically direct contexts, as functions between types; by the previous lemma if $\text{Type}(T_1) = \text{Type}(T_2)$ then $\text{Type}(C[T_1]) = \text{Type}(C[T_2])$. As we have finite types, we have finitely many functions between types; these functions form our *context types*.

Definition 3.15. The *type* of a context C with respect to a deterministic, complete automaton \mathcal{A} is the function

$$\text{Type}(C) : \text{Type}(T) \mapsto \text{Type}(C[T]).$$

Context types have the same replacement properties as types: we can replace a context C_1 (directed bipolar tree) with one of the same type C_2 such that the run of \mathcal{A} is the same on all nodes outside of C_1, C_2 .

Lemma 3.16. *Let $\mathcal{A} = (\Sigma, Q, \delta, F)$ be a deterministic, complete rational multiset tree automaton, let $C[x], C_1[x], C_2[x]$ be contexts, and let T be a Σ -labeled rooted tree: then*

$$\text{Type}(C_1) = \text{Type}(C_2) \quad \Rightarrow \quad \text{Type}(C[C_1[T]]) = \text{Type}(C[C_2[T]]).$$

Proof. Trivially $\text{Type}(T) = \text{Type}(T)$; since $\text{Type}(C_1) = \text{Type}(C_2)$, we have that

$$\text{Type}(C_1[T]) = \text{Type}(C_1)(\text{Type}(T)) = \text{Type}(C_2)(\text{Type}(T)) = \text{Type}(C_2[T]),$$

and by Lemma 3.12 $\text{Type}(C[C_1[T]]) = \text{Type}(C[C_2[T]])$. \square

3.3.1 Finitely representing types

Each tree is associated to a type by a complete, deterministic rational multiset tree automaton $\mathcal{A} = (\Sigma, Q, \delta, F)$; this type is the state assigned to the root by the automaton. If we focus on the transition function, we see that there are two factors determining the possible states of children of the root: the root's *label* and its *state* – to each pair of a label and state, we naturally associate a semilinear set $\delta(s, q)$. By Lemma 3.6 we know there is a value $d(\delta(s, q))$, which we simply denote $d(s, q)$, such that every element of $\delta(s, q)$ has a subset of size $\leq d(s, q)$ that is also in $\delta(s, q)$. We define Δ_R to be the maximum value of $d(s, q)$ over all choices of $s \in \Sigma$ and $q \in Q$; we will use this property during the proof to *reduce* the number of children a node has while maintaining its state. Formally:

Lemma 3.17. *Let T be a labeled rooted tree, let $s \in \Sigma$ be the label of its root, and let $\mathcal{C}(T)$ be the set of subtrees rooted at the children of the root of T . Then there is a labeled rooted tree T' such that:*

- (1) *the root of T' is labeled s ,*
- (2) $\text{Type}(T') = \text{Type}(T)$,
- (3) $\mathcal{C}(T') \subseteq \mathcal{C}(T)$, *and*
- (4) $|\mathcal{C}(T')| \leq \Delta_R$.

Proof. Let $M(\mathcal{C}(T))$ be the multiset of states of the children of the root of T . Apply Lemma 3.6 to $M(\mathcal{C}(T)) \in \delta(s, \text{Type}(T))$; by definition of Δ_R there is a $M' \subseteq M$ such that $M' \in \delta(s, \text{Type}(T))$ and $|M'| \leq d(s, \text{Type}(T)) \leq \Delta_R$. Observe that M is a bijection between $\mathcal{C}(T)$ and $M(\mathcal{C}(T))$, and define $C := M^{-1}(M')$. Construct a tree T' with a s -labeled root and children the roots of elements of C ; then (1) and (3) hold by definition, (2) holds since $M' \in \delta(s, \text{Type}(T))$ and (4) holds since $|C| = |M'| \leq \Delta_R$. \square

We would like to define a similar procedure for context types: however, they cannot be easily represented by a single semilinear set. Instead, we restrict to contexts where the variable node is an immediate child of the root, which we call *direct contexts*. We can identify a direct context with a pair of the label of its root and the multiset of types of the other children of the root; then a direct context *type* can be represented by the set of all pairs representing its elements or as a function of types (see previous section).

Lemma 3.18. *Let $\mathcal{A} = (\Sigma, Q, \delta, F)$ be a deterministic, complete RatMTA. Then there is a value $\Delta_C \in \mathbb{N}$, computable from the description of \mathcal{A} , such that for every pair (s, M) representing a direct context type f we can compute a multiset M' such that:*

- (s, M') *represents f ,*
- $|M'| \leq \Delta_C$, *and*
- $M' \subseteq M$.

Proof. Consider a pair of states $q, q_f \in Q$; we want to show that the set $\text{contexts}(s, q, q_f)$ of all direct contexts C (represented as multisets of states) such that $\text{Type}(t) = q \Rightarrow \text{Type}(C[t]) = q_f$ and the root of C is labeled s is a semilinear set. The set $\delta_{det}(s, q_f)$ is semilinear: we iterate over its linear components $L_{s, q_f, 1} \cup \dots \cup L_{s, q_f, m}$ and remove one instance of q where possible.

Formally, let

$$L = \mathbf{b} + \mathbb{N}\mathbf{a}_1 + \dots + \mathbb{N}\mathbf{a}_w$$

where $\mathbf{b}, \mathbf{a}_1, \dots, \mathbf{a}_w$ are Q -indexed vectors of \mathbb{N} ; let π_q be the projection to the index q . Let \mathbf{q} be the q -th base vector, which is 0 everywhere except at q where it is 1. Then

$$\text{remove}_q(L) = \begin{cases} (\mathbf{b} - \mathbf{q}) + \mathbb{N}\mathbf{a}_1 + \dots + \mathbb{N}\mathbf{a}_w & \text{if } \pi_q(\mathbf{b}) \neq 0 \\ \emptyset & \text{if } \pi_q(\mathbf{b}) = 0, \forall i \leq w \pi_q(\mathbf{a}_i) = 0 \\ \bigcup_{\substack{1 \leq i \leq l \\ \pi_q(\mathbf{a}_i) \neq 0}} (\mathbf{b} + \mathbf{a}_i - \mathbf{q}) + \mathbb{N}\mathbf{a}_1 + \dots + \mathbb{N}\mathbf{a}_w & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

Then we can define $\text{contexts}(s, q, q_f)$ as the union of all the $\text{remove}_q(L_{s, q_f, i})$; this is a finite union of semilinear sets, so it is semilinear.

Given a context type as a function of types $f : Q \rightarrow Q$, we can explicitly represent it as a set of pairs $\{(q, f(q))\}_{q \in Q}$; then the set of all direct contexts of type f which have their root labeled s is the set

$$\text{contexts}(f, s) := \bigcap_{q \in Q} \text{contexts}(s, q, f(q))$$

which is a finite intersection of semilinear sets, so it is semilinear. Then by Lemma 3.6 there is a value $D(f) := D(\text{contexts}(f, s))$ such that for all $M \in \text{contexts}(f, s)$ we can find a $M' \subseteq M$ such that $M' \in \text{contexts}(f, s)$ and $|M'| \leq D(f)$. Finally, we have finitely many possible functions f and labels s , so we explicitly define Δ_C as the maximum value of $D(f)$ over all $\text{contexts}(f, s)$. \square

Corollary 3.19. *Let C be a labeled direct context, let $s \in \Sigma$ be the label of its root, and let $\mathcal{C}(C)$ be the set of subtrees rooted at the non-variable children of the root of C . Then there is a labeled direct context C' such that:*

- (1) *the root of C' is labeled s ,*
- (2) *$\text{Type}(C') = \text{Type}(C)$,*
- (3) *$\mathcal{C}(C') \subseteq \mathcal{C}(C)$, and*
- (4) *$|\mathcal{C}(C')| \leq \Delta_C$.*

3.4 Constructing automata certificates

Let $\mathcal{A} = (\Sigma, Q, \delta, F)$ be a rational multiset tree automaton, and let $\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{A}}$ be the class of all rooted trees which are labeled with an *accepting* run for \mathcal{A} . We define the *automaton certification* problem associated with \mathcal{A} as $\Pi_{\mathcal{A}} := (\Sigma, Q, \mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{A}})$, and denote the class of all problems associated to RatMTA as *automata certification problems*.

Theorem 1.2. *Let $\mathcal{A} = (\Sigma, Q, \delta, F)$ be a rational multiset tree automaton, and let $\Pi_{\mathcal{A}}$ be the problem of computing a run of \mathcal{A} on Σ -labeled rooted trees; then one of the following holds:*

- $\Pi_{\mathcal{A}}$ *is unsolvable, or*
- $\Pi_{\mathcal{A}}$ *has deterministic and randomized LOCAL complexity $O(\log n)$, or*
- $\Pi_{\mathcal{A}}$ *has deterministic and randomized LOCAL complexity $\Theta(n^{1/k})$ for some $k \in \mathbb{N}_{\geq 1}$.*

Additionally, there is a sequential algorithm that can decide based only on the description of \mathcal{A} which of those cases applies, and which k applies in the last case.

The proof of Theorem 1.2 takes up all of Section 3.4; a high level overview of it, including references to the specific sections, can be found in Section 1.3.

3.4.1 Preprocessing: partially labeled tree types

We denote the *type* of an unlabeled rooted tree as the set of all labelings of the root that can appear in a valid labeling of the rooted tree. Our choice of notation seems to conflict with the definition of *type* given in Section 3.3; however, by constructing a suitable deterministic and complete automaton \mathcal{A}_{det} which uses sets of states of \mathcal{A} as states, the two notations coincide. This construction can also be used as a proof of Theorem 3.9, as the two automata recognize the same language of rooted trees.

Let $\mathcal{A} = (\Sigma, Q, \delta, F)$; we define $Q_{det} = 2^Q$, and define an operation $h : \mathcal{M}(Q) \rightarrow 2^{\mathcal{M}(2^Q)}$ which sends a multiset M of states Q to the set of all multisets M' of sets of states 2^Q for which there is a *choice function*, a bijection $c : M' \rightarrow M$ which sends a set to one of its element. Then $F_{det} := h(F) = \bigcup_{Q \in F} h(Q)$ and for all $s \in \Sigma$ we define

$$\delta_{det}(s, H) = \bigcap_{q \in H} h(\delta(s, q)) \cap \bigcap_{q \in Q \setminus H} h(\delta(s, q))^C$$

where the complement is taken with respect to the set of all multisets of 2^Q . In simpler words, instead of labeling nodes with the states of a run, we label them with exactly the set of states they might receive in *any* run.

Observe that h sends semilinear sets to semilinear sets; the simplest way to observe that is taking the multiset automaton representation of M (see Theorem 3.4) and replacing every transition corresponding to q with transitions corresponding to all sets of states containing q – since additionally semilinear sets are closed under finite intersection and complement, $\mathcal{A}_{det} = (\Sigma, 2^Q, \delta_{det}, F_{det})$ is a rational multiset tree automaton. Formally, observe that for any $s \in \Sigma$ the family $\{\delta_{det}(s, H)\}_{H \subseteq Q}$ are the atoms of the σ -algebra generated by the family $\{h(\delta(s, q))\}_{q \in Q}$ over all multisets of 2^Q ; then they form a partition of $\mathcal{M}(2^Q)$ and \mathcal{A}_{det} is deterministic and complete.

We call a tree which is Σ -labeled *unlabeled*, in the sense that it has not been assigned an output label from Q . Then the *type* of an *unlabeled* rooted tree T by the definition above corresponds to the *type* of T according to \mathcal{A}_{det} . Recall Corollary 3.13: we can replace a rooted subtree by one of the same type without affecting the overall labeling. During the run of our algorithm, however, we want to compute the type of *partially labeled* rooted trees, for which some states have already been assigned: to do so, we further modify \mathcal{A}_{det} .

Define an automaton $\mathcal{A}_{lab} = (\Sigma \times (Q \uplus \{*\}), 2^Q, \delta_{lab}, F_{lab})$ over $\Sigma \times (Q \uplus \{*\})$ -labeled rooted trees, where $*$ represents unlabeled nodes. Explicitly, we define

$$\begin{aligned} F_{lab} &= \{Q_F \in 2^Q \mid Q_F \cap F \neq \emptyset\} \\ \forall s \in \Sigma : \delta_{lab}((s, *), Q_0) &= \delta_{det}(s, Q_0) \\ \forall s \in \Sigma : \delta_{lab}((s, q), Q_0) &= \begin{cases} \bigcup_{Q_1 \ni q} \delta_{det}(s, Q_1) & \text{if } Q_0 = \{q\} \\ \bigcup_{Q_1 \not\ni q} \delta_{det}(s, Q_1) & \text{if } Q_0 = \emptyset \\ \emptyset & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \end{aligned}$$

Since semilinear sets are closed under finite union, this is a rational multiset tree automaton; additionally, for any $(s, q) \in \Sigma \times Q$ the sets $\delta_{lab}((s, q), \{q\})$ and $\delta_{lab}((s, q), \emptyset)$ form a partition of $\mathcal{M}(2^Q)$ while the others are empty – then this is still a deterministic, complete automaton. We will define the *type* of a partially Q -labeled rooted tree T as the type of T according to the automaton \mathcal{A}_{lab} – we could equivalently define it as the set of all output labels of its root that can appear in a full labeling which is coherent with the given partial labeling, but we will leave the proof of this equivalence for Lemma 3.29. Similarly, we define context types and direct context types according to \mathcal{A}_{lab} as in Section 3.3.

3.4.2 Degree reduction by forgetting some children

We make a few remarks about the similarities and differences between the types described in the previous section and concepts used in the bounded-degree versions of this proof.

Remark. We can roughly equate *direct context types* with *rooted tree classes* from [Cha20] and *context types* with *bipolar tree types* by replacing the variable node with a pole and adding another pole at the root. In the same way as we can represent a bipolar tree as a string of rooted trees $H = (T_1, \dots, T_c)$, we can represent a context as a composition of direct contexts $C = C_1 \circ \dots \circ C_c$, and both of those operation distribute over types.

In fact, the equivalence relation induced by two contexts having the same type is a *coarsening* of the one obtained by two bipolar trees having the same type; this is necessary, as without a bound on the degree there are infinitely many bipolar tree type equivalence classes. However, this coarsening still satisfies one important property: we can replace a bipolar tree with another of the same context type without changing the types of the rest of the graph (see Corollary 3.13 and Lemma 3.16).

One result of the coarsening of the equivalence relation is that two trees can be equivalent even if they have a different topology (including input labels), specifically different maximum degrees. In fact, Lemmas 3.17 and 3.18 show that we can use the properties of semilinear sets to replace high-degree partially labeled rooted trees and direct contexts with low-degree rooted trees and direct contexts of the same types. We make this explicit by defining two versions of a procedure called ForgetChildren.

- ForgetChildren_R(v): consider a node v which is aware of the types of all of its children, and let T_v be the subtree rooted at v . By Lemma 3.17 we can find a tree T'_v of the same type, sharing the same input and partial output labels for the root, and whose children are a subset of the children of v ; note that because we are already aware of the types of all children, we can find this subset of children without any extra communication. Procedure ForgetChildren_R(v) causes the node to ignore the edges corresponding to the children which are *not* in this subset, virtually replacing itself with T'_v , until procedure Remember is called.
- ForgetChildren_C(v): consider a node v which is aware of the types of all but one of its children. Treat the unknown child as a variable node and v as the root of a direct context $C_v[x]$: by Corollary 3.19 there is a direct context $C'_v[x]$ with the same type and sharing the same input and partial output labels for the root, such that the nonvariable children of C'_v are a subset of those of C_v . Procedure ForgetChildren_C(v) causes the node to ignore the edges corresponding to the children which are *not* in this subset, virtually replacing itself with C'_v , until procedure Remember is called.

These procedures reduce the degree of a node v to either $\leq \Delta_R + 1$ (if ForgetChildren_R(v) is called – the possible incoming edge of v is not considered) or $\leq \Delta_C + 2$ (if ForgetChildren_C(v) is called – the edges going into v and to the variable node are not considered). However, we need to compute the types of almost all children of a node to apply them, which is not trivial for trees of high height; to help, we will show that we can *precompute* certain labels to “split” our tree into pieces of more manageable size.

3.4.3 Feasible functions

We define $\Pi_{\mathcal{A}, \Delta}$ as the natural restriction of $\Pi_{\mathcal{A}}$ to the family of rooted trees of maximum degree $\leq \Delta := \max\{\Delta_R + 1, \Delta_C + 2\}$ (which we call the *reduction degree* of $\Pi_{\mathcal{A}}$). This is a LCL with checkability radius 1 on rooted trees, which we can convert into a problem on unrooted trees with inputs by encoding the direction in the input labels³; see Appendix A for details.

³To make sure the input labels are on nodes, the conversion splits every edge in four parts; so $\Pi_{\mathcal{A}}$ has checkability radius 1 on rooted trees, but 4 on unrooted trees. Note, however, that a feasible function labeling

Ideally, we would like to apply the ForgetChildren procedures we just described to the whole tree instance, so that we can apply the algorithm for $\Pi_{\mathcal{A},\Delta}$ directly. However, as observed above, computing the types of every node in the graph is not efficient, as in general we cannot find the type of a parent node before its child.

Instead of treating the algorithm for $\Pi_{\mathcal{A},\Delta}$ as a black-box, we use to extract a *feasible function*, which allows us to precompute some labels for nodes that know the types of all their children but one – by the way the partially labeled type automaton \mathcal{A}_{lab} is defined, assigning a state (output label) q to a node fully determines its type as $\{q\}$ as long as the label was chosen in a way that can be extended to a valid labeling; otherwise its type will be \emptyset . Computing the type of a parent node before its child in this way is necessary to break up long directed paths, where we cannot afford to wait to label the start of the path until all the other nodes have chosen a label one by one.

Definition 3.20. Let H be a partially labeled bipolar tree with core path (v_1, \dots, v_x) of length $x \geq \ell$ (where ℓ is a constant value depending only on the description of $\Pi_{\mathcal{A},\Delta}$). Let e be the middle edge between $v_{\lfloor x/2 \rfloor}$ and $v_{\lfloor x/2 \rfloor + 1}$, and assume that $N^{r-1}(e)$ is unlabeled; let f be a function assigning labels to the elements of $N^{r-1}(e)$. Then f is a *feasible function* for H if for every partially labeled graph (G, l) which contains H as a subgraph and for l' the labeling obtained by extending l with the labels of f , if l can be extended to a full solution then l' can be extended to a full solution.

A function is ∞ -feasible if it is feasible for every partially labeled bipolar tree H .

Lemma 3.21. For a LCL problem Π on undirected trees, the following are equivalent:

- (1) Π is solvable in $n^{o(1)}$ rounds in the randomised LOCAL model,
- (2) Π is solvable in $O(\log n)$ rounds in the deterministic LOCAL model, and
- (3) there is a ∞ -feasible function for Π .

Additionally, whether (3) holds is decidable.

Proof. This statement is a summary of Lemmas 14,15,16 from [CP17]. □

For problems of higher complexities, we require a weaker concept of feasibility. We say that a function f is 1-feasible if it is feasible for any *unlabeled* bipolar tree; observe that applying f to a bipolar tree can (and often will) change its type, and even create trees of types that are never realized by unlabeled trees; but those types can be accounted for and computed by the partially labeled tree automaton \mathcal{A}_{lab} .

We say a partially labeled tree has *labeling layer* k if it can be obtained by applying f in parallel to arbitrarily many bipolar subtrees of labeling layer $k - 1$, where unlabeled trees have labeling layer 1. Then a function is k -feasible if it is feasible on all trees of labeling layer k . Note that up to replacing subtrees with some of the same type, trees of labeling layer k correspond to trees in \mathcal{H}_k from [Cha20].

Lemma 3.22. For a LCL problem Π on undirected trees, the following are equivalent:

- (1) Π is solvable in $o(n^{1/(k-1)})$ rounds in the randomised LOCAL model,
- (2) Π is solvable in $O(n^{1/k})$ rounds in the deterministic LOCAL model, and
- (3) there is a k -feasible function for Π .

Additionally, whether (3) holds is decidable.

Proof. This statement is a summary of Lemmas 15, 17, and 18 from [Cha20]. □

the 3-hop neighborhood of an edge in the unrooted tree version will label the 0-hop neighborhood of the related edge in the rooted tree version.

3.4.4 Algorithm

We state two theorems formalising the relation between the complexities of $\Pi_{\mathcal{A}}$ and $\Pi_{\mathcal{A},\Delta}$; note that the theorems treat $\Pi_{\mathcal{A},\Delta}$ as both a problem on rooted trees and on undirected trees interchangeably – this is justified in Appendix A.

Theorem 3.23. *Let $\Pi_{\mathcal{A}}$ be an automaton certification problem, and let $\Pi_{\mathcal{A},\Delta}$ be its LCL restriction to the reduction degree. Then the following are equivalent:*

- (1) $\Pi_{\mathcal{A},\Delta}$ is solvable in $O(\log n)$ rounds in the deterministic or randomised LOCAL model,
- (2) there is a ∞ -feasible function for $\Pi_{\mathcal{A},\Delta}$;
- (3) $\Pi_{\mathcal{A}}$ is solvable in $O(\log n)$ rounds in the deterministic and randomised LOCAL model.

Theorem 3.24. *Let $\Pi_{\mathcal{A}}$ be an automaton certification problem, and let $\Pi_{\mathcal{A},\Delta}$ be its LCL restriction to the reduction degree. Then the following are equivalent:*

- (1) $\Pi_{\mathcal{A},\Delta}$ is solvable in $O(n^{1/k})$ rounds in the deterministic or randomised LOCAL model,
- (2) there is a k -feasible function for $\Pi_{\mathcal{A},\Delta}$;
- (3) $\Pi_{\mathcal{A}}$ is solvable in $O(n^{1/k})$ rounds in the deterministic and randomised LOCAL model.

We prove Theorems 3.23 and 3.24 at the same time; in both cases, (1) \Leftrightarrow (2) by the previous section and (3) \Rightarrow (1) since any algorithm for $\Pi_{\mathcal{A}}$ also solves $\Pi_{\mathcal{A},\Delta}$. We need to prove (2) \Rightarrow (3): the algorithms we present are identical save for the choice of graph decomposition.

We work on (γ, ℓ, L) -decompositions; their definition for unbounded degree undirected trees are provided in [Sch26], but we give a slightly stronger definition which requires the orientation of the layers to be consistent with the direction of the rooted tree.

Definition 3.25. A (γ, ℓ, L) -decomposition of a rooted tree is a partition of the nodes into $2k + 1$ ordered layers $R_1 < C_1 < R_2 < C_2 < \dots < R_k < C_k < R_{k+1}$ which satisfies:

1. every R_i induces a subgraph where every connected component is a rooted tree of height $\leq \gamma$, and only the root can have a neighbor in a greater layer (with respect to $<$),
2. every C_i induces a subgraph where every connected component is a *consistently directed* path of length $\in [\ell, 2\ell]$, and only the endpoints can have a neighbor in a greater layer.

The important parameter here is the number of layers L , as each new layer will require a stronger feasible function. If we have a ∞ -feasible function this is not a problem: we can compute a $(1, \ell, L)$ decomposition with $L \in O(\log n)$ for any n (where ℓ is the same parameter that appears in the feasibility definition).

Lemma 3.26. *For any positive integer ℓ there is a $L(n) \in O(\log n)$ such that we can compute a $(1, \ell, L)$ -decomposition in $O(\log n)$ rounds.*

If instead we have a k -feasible function, we compute a (γ, ℓ, k) -decomposition where $\gamma \in O(n^{1/k})$.

Lemma 3.27. *For any positive integers k, ℓ and $\gamma = n^{1/k}(2\ell)^{1-1/k}$ we can compute a (γ, ℓ, k) -decomposition in $O(n^{1/k})$ rounds.*

The proofs of Lemmas 3.26 and 3.27 are simple adaptations of the existing ones to the unbounded degree rooted setting and can be found in Appendix B.

From here, the steps are the same; we iterate through the layers, starting from R_1 , compute the type of all nodes according to \mathcal{A}_{lab} , and apply ForgetChildren_R to all vertices of R_1 . Then

we reach C_1 : each connected component is a directed path, and each node knows the types of all its children but one (which may be in C_1 itself or, for the last vertex, in a higher layer). We apply ForgetChildren_C to all of its vertices; now $C_1 \cup R_1$ is a bipolar tree of degree $\leq \Delta$ and core path length $\in [\ell, 2\ell]$ – we apply the feasible function f for $\Pi_{\mathcal{A}, \Delta}$ to assign labels to two of the central nodes. Because f is 1-feasible (and equivalently, $\Pi_{\mathcal{A}, \Delta}$ is solvable) then the labeling computed can be extended to a valid labeling; then the type of nodes that were assigned a label state $q \in Q$ are of type $\{q\}$.

Nodes that are *ancestors* of the prelabeled nodes can now compute their own types one after the other (this takes at most ℓ rounds) while nodes which are *descendants* of the prelabeled nodes join R_2 , delaying their type computation to the next step. We repeat the steps above for each layer: compute all types and reduce degree for R_i ; compute context types, reduce degree, precommit some labels, compute types for C_i , until we have computed types for all nodes of the input graph.

To complete the algorithm, every node applies Remember to return to the full tree, then the root chooses an accepting state from its type and labels itself with it; then every node that already has an assigned state (root and prelabeled nodes) chooses labels for its children. We repeat this until the tree is fully labeled, which we show also takes $O((\gamma + \ell)L)$ rounds in Lemma 3.32. We prove that this choice is possible and leads to a correct labeling in Lemmas 3.29 and 3.30.

Lemma 3.28. *Let $\Pi_{\mathcal{A}}$ be the problem associated to the rational multiset tree automaton $\mathcal{A} = (\Sigma, Q, \delta, F)$. Let $\mathcal{A}_{lab} = (\Sigma \times (Q \uplus \{*\}), 2^Q, \delta_{lab}, F_{lab})$ be the partially labeled type automaton of \mathcal{A} . Given a run r of \mathcal{A}_{lab} on a Σ -labeled and partially Q -labeled rooted tree (G, l) which does not label the root with \emptyset we can find a run r'^4 of \mathcal{A} on the underlying unlabeled rooted tree G such that for all nodes v of G , $r'(v) \in r(v)$ and $r(v)$ extends the partial Q -labeling of G .*

Proof. First of all, observe that by definition of $\mathcal{A}_{lab} = (\Sigma \times (Q \uplus \{*\}), 2^Q, \delta_{lab}, F_{lab})$ if any node receives state \emptyset , so does its parent (since no set $h(\delta(s, q))$ can contain \emptyset); by transitivity, if any node receives state \emptyset , so does the root – we can assume no node receives state \emptyset , and in particular every node that has an assigned label q is of state $\{q\}$.

Arbitrarily choose an element from the state assigned to the root. We show that for every node that has chosen a state of \mathcal{A} from its assigned state of \mathcal{A}_{lab} , there is a way to choose an element for each of its children from their assigned state of \mathcal{A}_{lab} such that the resulting transition is valid for \mathcal{A} .

Let v be a node with Σ -label s , let H be its assigned state of \mathcal{A}_{lab} and $q \in H$ be its assigned state of \mathcal{A} . We distinguish two cases:

- v was labeled in G with a state q' : then $H = \{q'\}$ and since $q \in H$, $q = q'$. Then the multiset M of states of \mathcal{A}_{lab} of its children is in $\delta_{lab}((s, q), \{q\})$; observe that it is the union of $\delta_{det}(s, Q_i)$ where the Q_i s are all states containing q , so in particular $\delta_{det}(s, Q_i) \subseteq h(\delta(s, q))$ and then $M \in \delta_{lab}((s, q), \{q\}) \subseteq h(\delta(s, q))$.
- v is unlabeled in G : then the multiset M of types (according to \mathcal{A}_{lab}) of its children is in $\delta_{lab}((s, *), H) = \delta_{det}(s, H) \subseteq h(\delta(s, q))$.

In either case, $M \in h(\delta(s, q))$; by definition there is a choice function c from M to an element $M' \in \delta(s, q)$ such that for every state $Q_0 \in 2^Q$ in M we have $c(Q_0) \in Q_0$: we assign states of \mathcal{A} to the children of v according to c .

We can then use top-down tree induction – the base case is the root, where we can choose arbitrarily – to prove that every node v can choose the labels of its children such that the transition function of \mathcal{A} at v is respected; then the result is a valid run of \mathcal{A} . Additionally, since every node labeled q is of type $\{q\}$, the run we obtain is an extension of the Q -labeling of G . \square

⁴Note that those runs need to be valid, ie respect the transition function, but not necessarily accepting, ie have an accepting state at the root.




Figure 5: Using ForgetChildren and the feasible function to label bipolar trees.

Lemma 3.29. *Let $\Pi_{\mathcal{A}}$ be the problem associated to the rational multiset tree automaton $\mathcal{A} = (\Sigma, Q, \delta, F)$. Let $\mathcal{A}_{lab} = (\Sigma \times (Q \uplus \{*\}), 2^Q, \delta_{lab}, F_{lab})$ be the partially labeled type automaton of \mathcal{A} . Then for any Σ -labeled and partially Q -labeled rooted tree G with root r the following statements are equivalent:*

- (1) *the type assigned by \mathcal{A}_{lab} to r contains an accepting state of \mathcal{A} ,*
- (2) *G is accepted by \mathcal{A}_{lab} ,*
- (3) *the partial Q -labeling of G can be extended to an accepting run of \mathcal{A} on the underlying unlabeled graph.*

Proof. This statement and proof is just a formalization of the statement “ \mathcal{A}_{lab} assigns to each node a state corresponding to the set of states of \mathcal{A} that can appear in a run of \mathcal{A} which extends the partial labeling”.

- (1) \Leftrightarrow (2) since F_{lab} is defined as any set of states 2^Q that contains at least one state of F .

(1) \Rightarrow (3): by the previous lemma, we can select an accepting state q of \mathcal{A} to the root that is contained in the type assigned by \mathcal{A}_{lab} and then compute a valid run of \mathcal{A} that assigns q to the root and extends the Q -labeling of G .

(3) \Rightarrow (1): let r be the accepting run of \mathcal{A} that extends the Q -labeling of G , and let r' be the run of \mathcal{A}_{lab} on G ; we show that for every vertex v we have $r(v) \in r'(v)$. We work by bottom-up tree induction: for the base case, let l be a leaf, and observe that $\emptyset \in \delta_{lab}((s, *), r'(l)) = \delta_{det}(s, r'(l))$ (r' is valid in l) implies $\emptyset \in \delta(s, r(l)) \Leftrightarrow r(l) \in r'(l)$; then since $r(l)$ is a valid label of l according to \mathcal{A} , $r(l) \in r'(l)$. If l was labeled by $r(l)$ in G , this still holds; let H be the state that \mathcal{A}_{lab} would have assigned it if it was unlabeled, then $r(l) \in H$ by the same reasoning and $\emptyset \in \delta_{lab}((s, *), H) \subseteq \delta_{lab}(r(l), \{r(l)\})$. Then \mathcal{A}_{lab} assigns $\{r(l)\}$ as a state to l , which obviously contains $r(l)$.

For the inductive step, let M be the set of states of children of v according to r and let M' be the set of states of children of v according to r' ; by induction we have a bijective choice function $c : M' \rightarrow M$ which sends a set of states to one of its elements. Then $M' \in h(M)$ and since $M \in \delta(s, r(v))$ we have $M' \in h(\delta(s, r(v)))$; assume v is unlabeled, then $M' \in \delta_{lab}((s, *), r'(v))$; since $\delta_{lab}((s, *), r'(v)) = \delta_{det}(s, r'(v))$ has nonempty intersection with $h(\delta(s, r(v)))$ we have $r(v) \in r'(v)$. Assume v is labeled with $r(v)$, and let H be the state that \mathcal{A}_{lab} would have assigned it if it was unlabeled, then $r(v) \in H$ and $M' \in \delta_{lab}((s, *), H) \subseteq \delta_{lab}(r(v), \{r(v)\})$; then \mathcal{A}_{lab} assigns $\{r(v)\}$ as a state to v , which obviously contains $r(v)$. \square

Lemma 3.30. *Let G be a Σ -labeled (not labeled with Q) rooted tree with root r . Then the type that the above algorithm assigns to the root r contains at least one accepting state.*

Proof. Recall that our assumption is that there is a feasible function (equivalently, that $\Pi_{\mathcal{A}, \Delta}$ is solvable) – we first need to show that G is solvable by $\Pi_{\mathcal{A}}$, or equivalently (by Lemma 3.29) that G is accepted by \mathcal{A}_{lab} .

Assume we had computed the types of all nodes of G according to \mathcal{A}_{lab} without ever prelabeling nodes through a feasible function; then applied the procedure `ForgetChildrenR` to every node and completely removed the “forgotten” edges. This procedure leaves the types of all nodes unchanged by definition, in particular it will leave the type of the root unchanged – it also disconnects the graph, so we only consider the connected component G' containing the root, which is a rooted tree of maximum degree $\leq \Delta$. Because $\Pi_{\mathcal{A}, \Delta}$ is solvable, G' is solvable as an instance of $\Pi_{\mathcal{A}, \Delta}$; which means G is accepted by \mathcal{A}_{lab} , as the two problems are described by the same automaton \mathcal{A} . Then the type of the root of G and G' (without any prelabeling) contains an accepting state.

Let us now look at the algorithm; we show that every step of the algorithm preserves at least one of the equivalent definitions in Lemma 3.29. We only need to focus on the steps that change the topology of the graph: the virtual removal of edges in the `ForgetChildren` procedures and the partial labeling by the feasible function. As we have already observed, either `ForgetChildren` preserves the types of all nodes; then it preserves (1). Additionally, by definition the feasible function always extends the labeling l of G to l' such that if l could be extended to a valid labeling then so can l' ; then it preserves (3). \square

Lemma 3.31. *Every node of G is the $\gamma \cdot (L + 1) + \ell$ -hop descendant of either the root or a node that was preassigned a label.*

Proof. Assume this node v is in layer R_i . Then it is at most distance γ from the root of its layer. The root is the child of a node in a higher layer; if this layer is C_j for some $j \geq i$, then the middle node of it has been prelabeled and v is the $\gamma + \ell$ -hop descendant of it. If this layer is R_j for some $j > i$, then v is the 2γ -hop descendant of its root; we can at most repeat this once for every layer R_1, \dots, R_{L+1} until we reach the root of G . \square

Lemma 3.32. *Applying the above algorithm using a (γ, ℓ, L) -decomposition takes $O((\gamma + \ell)L)$ rounds to terminate.*

Proof. For the \mathcal{A}_{lab} type labeling step: each $i \in [1, \dots, L]$, R_i is composed of rooted trees of depth at most $\gamma + \ell$ (as at most ℓ nodes can be promoted from C_{i-1} to R_i during the algorithm) so computing all types by brute-force takes $O(\gamma + \ell)$ rounds. Similarly, C_i is composed of paths of length at most 2ℓ , and labeling them takes $O(\ell)$ time; at the end, labeling R_{L+1} takes a further $O(\gamma + \ell)$ rounds. In total, this takes $O((\gamma + \ell)L)$ rounds.

For the \mathcal{A} state labeling step: at each round, each node that has already decided on a label chooses labels for its children and communicates them. Since by Lemma 3.31 every node is the $\gamma \cdot (L + 1) + \ell$ -hop descendant of a node that has chosen its label during the first part, this takes $O((\gamma)L + \ell) \subseteq O((\gamma + \ell)L)$ rounds. \square

Then the overall algorithm takes $O((\gamma + \ell)L)$ rounds. By applying it with a ∞ -feasible function and a $(1, \ell, O(\log n))$ -decomposition (which we can compute in $O(\log n)$ rounds by Lemma 3.26), we prove Theorem 3.23; by applying it with a k -feasible function and a $(O(n^{1/k}), \ell, k)$ -decomposition (which we can compute in $O(n^{1/k})$ rounds by Lemma 3.27), we prove Theorem 3.24. A simple corollary to Theorem 3.24 covers the case where both problems are unsolvable.

Corollary 3.33. *Let $\Pi_{\mathcal{A}}$ be an automaton certification problem, and let $\Pi_{\mathcal{A}, \Delta}$ be its LCL restriction to the reduction degree. Then $\Pi_{\mathcal{A}, \Delta}$ is unsolvable if and only if $\Pi_{\mathcal{A}}$ is unsolvable.*

Proof. Because $\Pi_{\mathcal{A}, \Delta}$ is a restriction of $\Pi_{\mathcal{A}}$, if $\Pi_{\mathcal{A}, \Delta}$ is unsolvable so is $\Pi_{\mathcal{A}}$.

For the converse, assume $\Pi_{\mathcal{A}, \Delta}$ is solvable: then there is a $O(n)$ algorithm to solve it; by Theorem 3.24, there is a $O(n)$ algorithm to solve $\Pi_{\mathcal{A}}$, which is not unsolvable. \square

Together with the classical classification results for LCL problems from [CP17; Cha20] this proves Theorem 1.2.

3.5 Interlude: labels and certificates

Throughout the proof of Theorem 1.2, we worked under the assumption that our graph was Σ -labeled and computed a certificate (a Q -labeling) of the correctness of the Σ -labeling. When talking about a Local PMSO labeling problem $\Pi = (\Sigma_{in}, \Sigma_{out}, \mathcal{G})$ we could use the algorithms from Theorem 1.2 to *certify* a solution (Σ_{out} -labeling) we have already computed: we instead want to use it to compute *both* a solution and a certificate of its correctness.

We can do this with a little trick: instead of using the automaton which verifies the correctness of a solution directly – by checking whether a $\Sigma_{in} \times \Sigma_{out}$ -labeled rooted tree has the property \mathcal{G} – we modify it into an automaton that verifies if a Σ_{in} -labeled rooted tree *can* be Σ_{out} -labeled according to \mathcal{G} ; additionally, this automaton encodes valid Σ_{out} labeling in its accepting runs.

Lemma 1.3. *Let $\mathcal{A} = (\Sigma_{in} \times \Sigma_{out}, Q, \delta, F)$ be a rational multiset tree automaton recognising a $\Sigma_{in} \times \Sigma_{out}$ -labeled rooted tree property \mathcal{G} ; then there is a RatMTA $\mathcal{A}' = (\Sigma_{in}, \Sigma_{out} \times Q, \delta', \Sigma_{out} \times F)$ which recognises the language of all Σ_{in} -labeled rooted trees T such that there exists a Σ_{out} -labeling of T such that:*

- T labeled with the resulting $\Sigma_{in} \times \Sigma_{out}$ -labeling is in \mathcal{G} (is recognized by \mathcal{A}), and
- a valid run of \mathcal{A}' consists of a valid Σ_{out} -labeling and a run of \mathcal{A} verifying the correctness of this labeling.

Proof. The only thing that needs to be defined in \mathcal{A}' is δ' ; given a multiset M of states we define as $X_{\Sigma}(M)$ the set of multisets of $\Sigma \times Q$ such that projecting all their elements to the second component gives M . Essentially, we allow every possible combination of labels as long as the states respect M , since the transition function does not depend on the labels of the children nodes; then for every state $q \in Q$ and pair $(s_i, s_o) \in \Sigma_{in} \times \Sigma_{out}$ we define

$$\delta'(s_i, (s_o, q)) := X_{\Sigma}(\delta((s_i, s_o), q)).$$

Its correctness is trivial, as the transition function depends only on the state, but we need to prove that it is a rational multiset tree automata; the easiest way to see that $\delta'(s_i, (s_o, q))$ is a rational set is using the finite multiset automaton characterization. Given a multiset automaton $\mathcal{A}_M := (Q, Q_A, q_0, f, F_A)$ for $\delta((s_i, s_o), q)$ (note that its alphabet is the states of \mathcal{A}) we can replace the alphabet with $\Sigma_{out} \times Q$ and the transition function by

$$f_{\Sigma_{out}} : (\Sigma_{out} \times Q) \times Q_A \rightarrow 2^{Q_A} \quad f_{\Sigma_{out}}((s_o, q), q_A) := f(q, q_A)$$

ignoring $s \in \Sigma$ completely; visually, we replaced every transition arrow associated to a symbol q with multiple arrows corresponding to all elements of $\Sigma \times \{q\}$. \square

Note that even if we start from a deterministic, complete automaton \mathcal{A} (as we do in the next section), the resulting automaton \mathcal{A}' might be nondeterministic; this does not matter for applying Theorem 3.4.

Conceptually, this step is equivalent to taking a PMSO sentence φ on $\Sigma_{in} \times \Sigma_{out}$ -labeled graphs with out-label sets $\{S_{s_o}\}_{s_o \in \Sigma_{out}}$ to a PMSO sentence of the form

$$\exists_{s_o \in \Sigma_{out}} S_{s_o} \text{Part}(\{S_{s_o}\}_{s_o \in \Sigma_{out}}) \wedge \varphi$$

where $\text{Part}(\{S_s\}_{s \in \Sigma})$ is the first order sentence expressing “ $\{S_s\}_{s \in \Sigma}$ is a partition” (see Section 2.3 for details) and φ uses the second-order variables S_{s_o} in place of the unary relations representing the Σ_{out} -labeling – so it is defined on Σ_{in} -labeled graphs.

In other words, we accept every Σ_{in} -labeled tree for which a valid Σ_{out} -labeling *exists* instead of every graph which is already correctly labeled. This is only a valid formula if Σ_{out} is a finite set, for the same reason as to why \mathcal{A}' is only a valid finite state automaton if Σ_{out} is a finite set.

3.6 Bridging the verification gap

To conclude, we show that *any LPMMSO problem is asymptotically as hard as an automaton certification problem*. Theorem 3.8 guarantees that for any PMSO property \mathcal{G} describing a LPMMSO problem Π , there is *some* rational multiset tree automaton certifying \mathcal{G} ; however, not *every* such RatMTA will allow us to prove the desired result. We give an example: let $\Pi = (\{*\}, \{T\}, \mathcal{G}_T)$ be the trivial problem of labeling an unlabeled rooted tree with T everywhere. Clearly, \mathcal{G}_T is locally verifiable in 0 rounds; additionally it can be described by the simple PMSO formula $\forall x x \in S_T$ (“every node is labeled T ”). We define a rational multiset tree automaton that recognises the language \mathcal{G}_T of T -labeled rooted trees: $\mathcal{A}_T = (\{T\}, \{0, 1\}, \delta_T, \{0, 1\})$ where $\delta(T, 0) = \mathcal{M}(\{1\})$ (all multisets composed only of 1s) and $\delta(T, 1) = \mathcal{M}(\{0\})$ (all multisets composed only of 0s). A valid run of \mathcal{A} is a 2-coloring of the rooted tree with $\{0, 1\}$; since all states are accepting, every valid run is an accepting run. Solving the automaton certification problem associated with \mathcal{A}_T is equivalent to 2-coloring a rooted tree, which is known to take $\Omega(n)$ rounds [Bal+21].

We need to choose our automata carefully so that we are not forced to do extra work: for this purpose we choose the deterministic and complete RatMTA which is *minimal* with respect to the number of states, which is given to us by Theorem 3.14 (restated below).

Theorem 3.14. (Myhill-Nerode) *Let \mathcal{G} be a tree language which can be recognised by a deterministic, complete RatMTA \mathcal{A} . Then:*

- (1) $\equiv_{\mathcal{G}}$ has finite index, upper bounded by the number of states of \mathcal{A} , and
- (2) there is a deterministic, complete RatMTA which recognises \mathcal{G} whose states are in bijection with the equivalence classes of $\equiv_{\mathcal{G}}$.

Recall that $\equiv_{\mathcal{G}}$ is the coarsest possible “replacement” relation: we can replace a rooted subtree with an equivalent one without impacting the overall correctness of the labeling. In particular, the equivalence relationship between multipolar trees based on isomorphisms of the k -hop neighborhood of the poles (where k is the local checkability radius of our problem) which is defined in [CP17] has the same property, and so is a refinement of $\equiv_{\mathcal{G}}$; we will use this fact to compute a certificate for a valid solution in constant rounds.

Theorem 1.4. *Let $\Pi = (\Sigma_{in}, \Sigma_{out}, \mathcal{G})$ be a Local PMSO problem with checkability radius k and let $\mathcal{A} = (\Sigma_{in} \times \Sigma_{out}, Q, \delta, F)$ be the minimal deterministic and complete RatMTA recognising \mathcal{G} . Denote \mathcal{G}_Q the graph language of $(\Sigma_{in} \times \Sigma_{out} \times Q)$ -labeled rooted trees such that for each $G \in \mathcal{G}_Q$:*

1. *the underlying $\Sigma_{in} \times \Sigma_{out}$ -labeled graph of G is in \mathcal{G} , and*
2. *the underlying Q -labeled graph of G is the run of \mathcal{A} on its underlying $\Sigma_{in} \times \Sigma_{out}$ -labeled graph.*

Then given a correct solution to Π , we can compute the run of \mathcal{A} which accepts it in $2k + 2$ rounds; equivalently, Π and $\Pi' = (\Sigma_{in}, \Sigma_{out} \times Q, \mathcal{G}_Q)$ have the same asymptotic complexity.

We say that a $(\Sigma_{in} \times \Sigma_{out})$ -labeled rooted tree is k -away from happy with respect to a locally verifiable (in k rounds) problem $\Pi = (\Sigma_{in}, \Sigma_{out}, \mathcal{G})$ if, by running the k -round verification algorithm for Π , every node at distance $\geq k + 1$ from the root (which is too far away to communicate with the root) returns “yes”.

Definition 3.34. Let $\Pi = (\Sigma_{in}, \Sigma_{out}, \mathcal{G})$ be a problem whose solution can be locally checked in k rounds. We define an equivalence relation on $(\Sigma_{in} \times \Sigma_{out})$ -labeled rooted trees \equiv_{Π} as follows: $t_1 \equiv_{\Pi} t_2$ if and only if

1. $N^{2k+2}(r(t_1)) \cong N^{2k+2}(r(t_2))$ (the $2k + 2$ -radius neighborhoods of their roots are isomorphic), and
2. t_1 is k -away from happy iff t_2 is k -away from happy (with respect to Π).

Lemma 3.35. *For any $\Pi = (\Sigma_{in}, \Sigma_{out}, \mathcal{G})$ we have $t_1 \equiv_{\Pi} t_2 \Rightarrow t_1 \equiv_{\mathcal{G}} t_2$.*

Proof. Let $t_1 \equiv_{\Pi} t_2$ and let C be any context; we want to show that $C[t_1] \in \mathcal{G} \Leftrightarrow C[t_2] \in \mathcal{G}$, since the order is arbitrary it suffices to show $C[t_1] \notin \mathcal{G} \Rightarrow C[t_2] \notin \mathcal{G}$.

Assume $C[t_1] \notin \mathcal{G}$, and run the r -rounds verification algorithm on $C[t_1]$ and $C[t_2]$. The algorithm returns “no” on at least one node v of $C[t_1]$; this can happen in three cases:

1. v is not a member of t_1 : all nodes of $C[t_2] \setminus t_2$ have the same view to the corresponding nodes of $C[t_1] \setminus t_1$, so the corresponding node in $C[t_2]$ will also return “no” and $C[t_2] \notin \mathcal{G}$;
2. v is a member of t_1 which is $\leq k$ steps away from the root: since the $2k + 2$ -hop neighborhoods of the roots are isomorphic, the corresponding nodes have isomorphic k -hop views, so the corresponding node in $C[t_2]$ will also return “no” and $C[t_2] \notin \mathcal{G}$;
3. v is a member of t_1 which is $> k$ steps away from the root: then t_1 is not k -away from happy, so neither is t_2 , then there is a node in t_2 and $C[t_2]$ which will return “no” and $C[t_2] \notin \mathcal{G}$.

□

In essence, we have proven that \equiv_{Π} (which has infinitely many equivalence classes) is a refinement of $\equiv_{\mathcal{G}}$, which for PMSO-definable languages has finitely many equivalence classes (which are up to renaming the states of the minimal automaton). In other words, knowing the $2k + 2$ -hop neighborhood of a node and whether it is k -away from happy is sufficient to determine its exact state in the minimal automaton; we show this correspondence is computable.

Lemma 3.36. *Let $\Pi = (\Sigma_{in}, \Sigma_{out}, \mathcal{G})$ be a Local PMSO problem on rooted trees whose solution can be locally checked in k rounds. Then there exists a computable function*

$$f : \mathcal{T}(\Sigma_{in} \times \Sigma_{out}) / \equiv_{\Pi} \rightarrow \mathcal{T}(\Sigma_{in} \times \Sigma_{out}) / \equiv_{\mathcal{G}}$$

which for every $(\Sigma_{in} \times \Sigma_{out})$ -labeled rooted tree t maps $[t]_{\Pi}$ to the equivalence class $[t]_{\mathcal{G}}$.

Proof. f exists and is well-defined by Lemma 3.35; we just need to show that it is computable.

We represent an equivalence class $T_{\Pi} \in \mathcal{T}(\Sigma) / \equiv_{\Pi}$ as a pair $(N^{2k+2}(r), b)$ where $N^{2k+2}(r)$ is a $2k + 2$ -height rooted tree (considered as a $2k + 2$ -hop neighborhood centered at the root) and b is a bit representing whether the trees of this class are k -away from happy or not; note that this representation might lead to empty classes, but the function is defined on nonempty classes (alternatively, it can be defined as sending empty class to empty class).

We do a preprocessing step on Π : for every equivalence class q of \mathcal{G} (corresponding to the states of the minimal automaton) and every label pair (s_i, s_o) in $\Sigma_{in} \times \Sigma_{out}$ we want to compute a finite representative t whose root is labeled (s_i, s_o) and which is of class q . We show that every pair has a finite representative of maximum degree Δ and maximum height $|\Sigma_{in}| \cdot |\Sigma_{out}| \cdot h$, where h is the number of equivalence classes of \mathcal{G} . Let t be any element of class $T_{\mathcal{G}}$; we can compute the type of all its nodes and apply the procedure `ForgetChildren` to reduce its maximum degree to Δ without affecting the type of the root.

Now let us only consider trees of maximum degree Δ and initialize a set \mathcal{Q} containing all possible $\Sigma_{in} \times \Sigma_{out}$ -labelings of a leaf. We define a recursive function g which constructs all trees of maximum degree Δ of height 1 where the root is $\Sigma_{in} \times \Sigma_{out}$ -labeled and the leaves are labeled with trees of \mathcal{Q} – then, for each leaf node labeled by a tree t_1 we replace the leaf with the tree t_1 . We iterate over the finitely many trees that are created this way, and compute a run of the minimal automaton on it; if the tuple of the root state q and root labels (s_i, s_o) of t does not appear in any element of \mathcal{Q} , we add the tree t to \mathcal{Q}' – once we have iterated over all trees constructed this way, we set $g(\mathcal{Q}) := \mathcal{Q} \cup \mathcal{Q}'$. We remark on the properties of g :

- g is deterministic (as long as we process the trees in a deterministic order),
- \mathcal{Q} starts with one element and is weakly increasing ($\mathcal{Q} \subseteq g(\mathcal{Q})$),
- \mathcal{Q} does not contain two trees with the same state and root label pair: in other words,

$$|\mathcal{Q}| \leq |\Sigma_{in} \times \Sigma_{out}| \cdot |\mathcal{T}(\Sigma) / \equiv_{\mathcal{G}}| = |\Sigma_{in}| \cdot |\Sigma_{out}| \cdot h,$$

- if h_0 is the maximum height of a tree in \mathcal{Q} , then $h_0 + 1$ is the maximum height of a tree in $g(\mathcal{Q})$.

Since g is a deterministic monotone (in the set inclusion sense) function with an upper bound $|\Sigma_{in}| \cdot |\Sigma_{out}| \cdot h$ on size, it reaches a fixed point after at most $|\Sigma_{in}| \cdot |\Sigma_{out}| \cdot h$ iterations; at that point, we have found a representative of maximum degree Δ and maximum height h for every state and label pair which *can* have a representative.

Finally, we describe the process for computing f : given a pair $(N^{2k+2}(r), b)$, we consider every possible assignment of states to the leaves of $N^{2k+2}(r)$, which are $\Sigma_{in} \times \Sigma_{out}$ -labeled. Then for every state and label pair assigned to a leaf, we replace the leaf with the finite representative that we precomputed; then we can check if this tree is k -away from happy. If the pair we are given represents a nonempty class, we show that we will find at least one tree of this form that represents it: simply take any tree of this class, compute a run of the minimal automaton, and then replace the subtrees rooted at nodes $2k + 2$ -away from the root with the corresponding representatives.

We have finitely many assignments of states to the leaves of $N^{2k+2}(r)$; we can iterate through all of them, and if we find a valid representative (a tree which is k -away from happy if $b = 1$,

one who is not if $b = 0$) we compute its equivalence class; we set this class as the result of $f((N^{2k+2}(r), b))$ – if we cannot find any tree of this class, the class is empty and we can set $f(\emptyset) = \emptyset$. \square

We can now prove Theorem 1.4:

Proof. We describe an algorithm that starts from a correct solution of Π and computes a correct solution of Π' in $2k + 2$ rounds. Since the solution is correct, every rooted subtree is in particular k -away from happy; then every node can gather its $2k + 2$ -hop descendants and determine its own state by computing $f(N^{2k+2}(r), 1)$, then output the pair of its original label and state. \square

References

- [Bal+18] Alkida Balliu et al. “New classes of distributed time complexity”. In: *Proceedings of the 50th Annual ACM SIGACT Symposium on Theory of Computing, STOC 2018, Los Angeles, CA, USA, June 25-29, 2018*. Ed. by Ilias Diakonikolas, David Kempe, and Monika Henzinger. ACM, 2018, pp. 1307–1318. DOI: 10.1145/3188745.3188860. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1145/3188745.3188860>.
- [Bal+19a] Alkida Balliu et al. “Lower Bounds for Maximal Matchings and Maximal Independent Sets”. In: *60th IEEE Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science, FOCS 2019, Baltimore, Maryland, USA, November 9-12, 2019*. Ed. by David Zuckerman. IEEE Computer Society, 2019, pp. 481–497. DOI: 10.1109/FOCS.2019.00037. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1109/FOCS.2019.00037>.
- [Bal+19b] Alkida Balliu et al. “The Distributed Complexity of Locally Checkable Problems on Paths is Decidable”. In: *Proceedings of the 2019 ACM Symposium on Principles of Distributed Computing, PODC 2019, Toronto, ON, Canada, July 29 - August 2, 2019*. Ed. by Peter Robinson and Faith Ellen. ACM, 2019, pp. 262–271. DOI: 10.1145/3293611.3331606. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1145/3293611.3331606>.
- [Bal+20] Alkida Balliu et al. “Classification of Distributed Binary Labeling Problems”. In: *34th International Symposium on Distributed Computing, DISC 2020, Virtual Conference, October 12-16, 2020*. Ed. by Hagit Attiya. LIPIcs. Schloss Dagstuhl - Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik, 2020, 17:1–17:17. DOI: 10.4230/LIPIcs.DISC.2020.17. URL: <https://doi.org/10.4230/LIPIcs.DISC.2020.17>.
- [Bal+21] Alkida Balliu et al. “Locally Checkable Problems in Rooted Trees”. In: *PODC '21: ACM Symposium on Principles of Distributed Computing, Virtual Event, Italy, July 26-30, 2021*. Ed. by Avery Miller, Keren Censor-Hillel, and Janne H. Korhonen. ACM, 2021, pp. 263–272. DOI: 10.1145/3465084.3467934. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1145/3465084.3467934>.
- [Bal+23] Alkida Balliu et al. “Sinkless Orientation Made Simple”. In: *Symposium on Simplicity in Algorithms (SOSA)*. Society for Industrial and Applied Mathematics, 2023, 175–191. ISBN: 9781611977585. DOI: 10.1137/1.9781611977585.ch17. URL: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1137/1.9781611977585.ch17>.
- [BE08] Leonid Barenboim and Michael Elkin. “Sublogarithmic distributed MIS algorithm for sparse graphs using nash-williams decomposition”. In: *Proceedings of the Twenty-Seventh Annual ACM Symposium on Principles of Distributed Computing, PODC 2008, Toronto, Canada, August 18-21, 2008*. Ed. by Rida A. Bazzi and Boaz Patt-Shamir. ACM, 2008, pp. 25–34. DOI: 10.1145/1400751.1400757. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1145/1400751.1400757>.

- [Bra+17] Sebastian Brandt et al. “LCL Problems on Grids”. In: *Proceedings of the ACM Symposium on Principles of Distributed Computing, PODC 2017, Washington, DC, USA, July 25-27, 2017*. Ed. by Elad Michael Schiller and Alexander A. Schwarzmann. ACM, 2017, pp. 101–110. DOI: 10.1145/3087801.3087833. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1145/3087801.3087833>.
- [BT05] Iovka Boneva and Jean-Marc Talbot. “Automata and Logics for Unranked and Unordered Trees”. In: *Term Rewriting and Applications, 16th International Conference, RTA 2005, Nara, Japan, April 19-21, 2005, Proceedings*. Ed. by Jürgen Giesl. Lecture Notes in Computer Science. Springer, 2005, pp. 500–515. DOI: 10.1007/978-3-540-32033-3_36. URL: https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-540-32033-3_36.
- [CE12] Bruno Courcelle and Joost Engelfriet. *Graph Structure and Monadic Second-Order Logic - A Language-Theoretic Approach*. Vol. 138. Encyclopedia of mathematics and its applications. Cambridge University Press, 2012. ISBN: 978-0-521-89833-1. URL: http://www.cambridge.org/fr/knowledge/isbn/item5758776/?site_locale=fr_FR.
- [Cha20] Yi-Jun Chang. “The Complexity Landscape of Distributed Locally Checkable Problems on Trees”. In: *34th International Symposium on Distributed Computing, DISC 2020, Virtual Conference, October 12-16, 2020*. Ed. by Hagit Attiya. LIPIcs. Schloss Dagstuhl - Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik, 2020, 18:1–18:17. DOI: 10.4230/LIPICS.DISC.2020.18. URL: <https://doi.org/10.4230/LIPICS.DISC.2020.18>.
- [CMM00] Erzsébet Csuhaj-Varjú, Carlos Martín-Vide, and Victor Mitrana. “Multiset Automata”. In: *Multiset Processing, Mathematical, Computer Science, and Molecular Computing Points of View [Workshop on Multiset Processing, WMP 2000, Curtea de Arges, Romania, August 21-25, 2000]*. Ed. by Cristian Calude et al. Lecture Notes in Computer Science. Springer, 2000, pp. 69–84. DOI: 10.1007/3-540-45523-X_4. URL: https://doi.org/10.1007/3-540-45523-X_4.
- [Col02] Thomas Colcombet. “Rewriting in the partial algebra of typed terms modulo AC”. In: *4th International Workshop on Verification of Infinite-State Systems (CONCUR 2002 Satellite Workshop), Infinity 2002, Brno, Czech Republic, August 24, 2002*. Ed. by Antonín Kucera and Richard Mayr. Electronic Notes in Theoretical Computer Science 6. Elsevier, 2002, pp. 40–54. DOI: 10.1016/S1571-0661(04)80532-2. URL: [https://doi.org/10.1016/S1571-0661\(04\)80532-2](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1571-0661(04)80532-2).
- [Com+08] Hubert Comon et al. *Tree Automata Techniques and Applications*. HAL, 2008, p. 262. URL: <https://inria.hal.science/hal-03367725>.
- [CP17] Yi-Jun Chang and Seth Pettie. “A Time Hierarchy Theorem for the LOCAL Model”. In: *58th IEEE Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science, FOCS 2017, Berkeley, CA, USA, October 15-17, 2017*. Ed. by Chris Umans. IEEE Computer Society, 2017, pp. 156–167. DOI: 10.1109/FOCS.2017.23. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1109/FOCS.2017.23>.
- [ES69] Samuel Eilenberg and M.P Schützenberger. “Rational sets in commutative monoids”. In: *Journal of Algebra* 13.2 (Oct. 1969), 173–191. ISSN: 0021-8693. DOI: 10.1016/0021-8693(69)90070-2. URL: [http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/0021-8693\(69\)90070-2](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/0021-8693(69)90070-2).
- [FBP22] Laurent Feuilloley, Nicolas Bousquet, and Théo Pierron. “What Can Be Certified Compactly? Compact local certification of MSO properties in tree-like graphs”. In: *PODC '22: ACM Symposium on Principles of Distributed Computing, Salerno, Italy, July 25 - 29, 2022*. Ed. by Alessia Milani and Philipp Woelfel. ACM, 2022, pp. 131–140. DOI: 10.1145/3519270.3538416. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1145/3519270.3538416>.

- [FHK12] Pierre Fraigniaud, Magnús M. Halldórsson, and Amos Korman. “On the Impact of Identifiers on Local Decision”. In: *Principles of Distributed Systems, 16th International Conference, OPODIS 2012, Rome, Italy, December 18-20, 2012. Proceedings*. Ed. by Roberto Baldoni, Paola Flocchini, and Binoy Ravindran. Lecture Notes in Computer Science. Springer, 2012, pp. 224–238. DOI: 10.1007/978-3-642-35476-2_16. URL: https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-35476-2_16.
- [Fra+13] Pierre Fraigniaud et al. “What can be decided locally without identifiers?” In: *ACM Symposium on Principles of Distributed Computing, PODC '13, Montreal, QC, Canada, July 22-24, 2013*. Ed. by Panagiota Fatourou and Gadi Taubenfeld. ACM, 2013, pp. 157–165. DOI: 10.1145/2484239.2484264. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1145/2484239.2484264>.
- [GS66] Seymour Ginsburg and Edwin Spanier. “Semigroups, Presburger formulas, and languages”. In: *Pacific Journal of Mathematics* 16.2 (Feb. 1966), 285–296. ISSN: 0030-8730. DOI: 10.2140/pjm.1966.16.285. URL: <http://dx.doi.org/10.2140/pjm.1966.16.285>.
- [HMN22] Magnús M. Halldórsson, Yannic Maus, and Alexandre Nolin. “Fast Distributed Vertex Splitting with Applications”. In: *36th International Symposium on Distributed Computing, DISC 2022, Augusta, Georgia, USA, October 25-27, 2022*. Ed. by Christian Scheideler. LIPIcs. Schloss Dagstuhl - Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik, 2022, 26:1–26:24. DOI: 10.4230/LIPICs.DISC.2022.26. URL: <https://doi.org/10.4230/LIPICs.DISC.2022.26>.
- [Jau+18] Benjamin Jauregui et al. *Distributed Treewidth Computation and Courcelle’s Theorem in the CONGEST Model*. 2018. DOI: 10.48550/ARXIV.1805.10708. URL: <https://arxiv.org/abs/1805.10708>.
- [Lin87] Nathan Linial. “Distributive Graph Algorithms-Global Solutions from Local Data”. In: *28th Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science, Los Angeles, California, USA, 27-29 October 1987*. IEEE Computer Society, 1987, pp. 331–335. DOI: 10.1109/SFCS.1987.20. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1109/SFCS.1987.20>.
- [Lin92] Nathan Linial. “Locality in Distributed Graph Algorithms”. In: *SIAM J. Comput.* 21.1 (1992), pp. 193–201. DOI: 10.1137/0221015. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1137/0221015>.
- [NS93] Moni Naor and Larry J. Stockmeyer. “What can be computed locally?” In: *Proceedings of the Twenty-Fifth Annual ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing, May 16-18, 1993, San Diego, CA, USA*. Ed. by S. Rao Kosaraju, David S. Johnson, and Alok Aggarwal. ACM, 1993, pp. 184–193. DOI: 10.1145/167088.167149. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1145/167088.167149>.
- [Rei15] Fabian Reiter. “Distributed Graph Automata”. In: *2015 30th Annual ACM/IEEE Symposium on Logic in Computer Science*. 2015, pp. 192–201. DOI: 10.1109/LICS.2015.27.
- [Sch26] Gustav Schmid. *LCLs Beyond Bounded Degrees*. 2026. arXiv: 2602.02340 [cs.DC]. URL: <https://arxiv.org/abs/2602.02340>.
- [SSM03] Helmut Seidl, Thomas Schwentick, and Anca Muscholl. “Numerical document queries”. In: *Proceedings of the twenty-second ACM SIGMOD-SIGACT-SIGART symposium on Principles of database systems*. SIGMOD/PODS03. ACM, 2003, 155–166. DOI: 10.1145/773153.773169. URL: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1145/773153.773169>.

- [Suo20] Jukka Suomela. “Landscape of Locality (Invited Talk)”. In: *17th Scandinavian Symposium and Workshops on Algorithm Theory, SWAT 2020, Tórshavn, Faroe Islands, June 22-24, 2020*. Ed. by Susanne Albers. LIPIcs. Schloss Dagstuhl - Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik, 2020, 2:1–2:1. DOI: 10.4230/LIPICS.SWAT.2020.2. URL: <https://doi.org/10.4230/LIPICS.SWAT.2020.2>.

A Converting between problem types

Throughout the proof of Theorem 1.2, we treat $\Pi_{A,\Delta}$ alternatively as a problem on bounded degree *rooted* trees (with or without inputs) and as a problem on bounded degree *undirected* trees with inputs; this encoding is often mentioned as a trivial result without detail [NS93; Bal+21]. In this section we formalize this result as two lemmas: one showing the immersion (encoding) of rooted trees in unrooted node-labeled trees (Lemma A.1) and a more general result showing that we can encode *locally verifiable requirements* on the graph structure or input labels of *trees* as part of a problem description without changing the overall complexity (Lemma A.6).

A.1 Edge labels to node labels

Lemma A.1. *Let $\mathcal{T}(\Sigma)$ be the class of Σ -labeled undirected trees and let $\mathcal{T}_d(\Sigma)$ be the class of Σ_{in} -labeled directed trees; let \mathcal{E} be the set $\{h, t, e\}$ then for any Σ there is a function $c : \mathcal{T}_d(\Sigma) \hookrightarrow \mathcal{T}(\Sigma \uplus \mathcal{E})$ with the following properties:*

- (1) *c is an immersion (it is injective, but not surjective),*
- (2) *for each $T_d \in \mathcal{T}_d(\Sigma)$ there is an immersion c_{T_d} from the vertices of T_d to the vertices of $c(T_d)$ which preserves Σ -labels, and such that $d_{c(T_d)}(c(v_1), c(v_2)) = 4d_{T_d}(v_1, v_2)$,*
- (3) *for any $T \in \mathcal{T}(\Sigma \uplus \mathcal{E})$ the statement “does there exist a Σ -labeled directed tree T_d such that $c(T_d) = T$?” is locally decidable, and*
- (4) *for any $T \in \mathcal{T}(\Sigma \uplus \mathcal{E})$ the statement “does there exist a Σ -labeled rooted tree T_r such that $c(T_r) = T$?” is locally decidable.*

Proof. This proof is inspired by similar encodings found in distributed graph algorithms literature, for example in [Bal+20].

We begin by observing that we can encode an edge orientation as a labeling on half-edges, where one half of edge e receives label h (head) and the other half receives label t (tail). This encoding can be checked in one round: each node sends the label of each half-edge over that edge, and receives the same message from each neighbor, then checks that over each edge the messages sent and received exactly form the set $\{h, t\}$. Additionally, each node can check that the number of h labels it is adjacent to (its own indegree) is at most one; if this is true for every node of a graph *which we know to be a tree*, then the tree is rooted.

Let $T_d = (V, E)$ be a node and half-edge labeled graph as above. We define its *incidence graph* (also known as the Levi graph of the associated incidence structure) as the bipartite graph $L(T_d) = (V \uplus E, inc)$ which has a node for each node and edge of the original graph, where $v \in V$ and $e \in E$ are adjacent if they are incident in the original graph. Visually, we add a node splitting each edge of the original graph in half.

We repeat this operation once more: let hE be the set of half-edges of T_d , then $c(T_d) := L(L(T_d)) = (V \uplus E \uplus hE, inc)$ is a tree with one node for each node, edge and half-edge of T such that each edge is adjacent to exactly its two halves, each half-edge is adjacent to its edge and incident node, and each node is adjacent to all of its incident half-edges. All nodes in V keep their Σ labels, all nodes in E are labeled e , and nodes in hE are labeled h or t according to their orientation. In one round, each node can check whether the orientation is locally consistent:

- nodes labeled h or t check that they have exactly one neighbor labeled e (originally an edge) and exactly one labeled with a label in Σ (originally a vertex),
- nodes labeled e check that they have exactly one neighbor labeled h and exactly one labeled t ,
- nodes with a label in Σ check that all their neighbors are labeled with h or t ; if we are checking that the original tree was rooted, they additionally check that they have at most one h -labeled neighbor.

Since each edge has been split in 4, we have $d_{c(T_d)}(c(v_1), c(v_2)) = 4d_{T_d}(v_1, v_2)$.

Finally, we observe that the operation is bijective over its codomain; we can contract the nodes with labels in \mathcal{E} (which have degree 2) back to edges which we orient towards the node nearest to the h label. \square

In the above statement, property (1) ensures we can convert between the two types of graphs freely; property (2) ensures that if we have a LOCAL algorithm to solve *any* problem Π on directed/rooted trees (even on directed trees, and outside the PMSO-verifiable classes) in $T(n)$ rounds, we can run the same algorithm on their image through c in $\leq 4T(n) + 1$ rounds, where the $+1$ accounts for gathering half-edge information at the boundary (note that this requires knowledge of n or at least some bound on $T(n)$). Finally, properties (3) and (4) ensure we can properly define a problem on *all* undirected trees which is only hard on the trees that are encoding a valid directed/rooted tree structure.

A.2 Expanding graphs

We show how to expand *any* problem defined on a subset of trees to a problem defined on all trees, as long as membership in the subset is locally verifiable. Observe that a local verifier for a problem can give “false positives”: since decision problems are made *by consensus*, as long as one node in every false instance outputs “no”, the instance will be rejected regardless of the amount of “no”s it outputs. We can require our verifier to be *minimal* – meaning it will always reject a neighborhood that does not appear in any valid instance.

Definition A.2. Let \mathcal{V} be a k -round local verifier for property \mathcal{G} . We say \mathcal{V} is *minimal* if for every k -hop neighborhood N that is accepted by \mathcal{V} there is $G \in \mathcal{G}$ such that N is isomorphic to the k -hop neighborhood of a node in G .

Remark. If we have a k -round local verifier \mathcal{V} for a property \mathcal{G} and we allow our verification algorithm to compute uncomputable functions, we can always find a minimal verifier \mathcal{V}' ; we define \mathcal{V}' as follows: return “yes” on neighborhood N if and only if \mathcal{V} does *and* there exists a $G \in \mathcal{G}$ such that N appears in G .

Minimal verifiers for tree languages have an *extension* property, meaning we can extend neighborhoods of *any* size which are accepted by the verifier into valid graphs.

Lemma A.3. Let \mathcal{V} be a k -round minimal local verifier for a (directed or undirected) tree property \mathcal{G} . Let G be a tree, and let W be a set of nodes of G such that:

- \mathcal{V} returns “yes” on every node of W , and
- the subgraph induced by W of G is connected.

Then the subgraph induced by W and every node that is k -away from W in G is isomorphic to an induced subgraph of a tree $G' \in \mathcal{G}$.

Proof. If $|W| = 1$, this is trivially true since \mathcal{V} is minimal. Conversely, if $W = V(G)$ this is trivial since every node of G is accepted and $G \in \mathcal{G}$.

Let v be a node on the boundary of W , that is, a node which is in W but has a neighbor in G which is not in W . Let $N^k(v)$ be its k -hop neighborhood in G – we classify the edges incident to v into nonempty sets $E_W(v)$ (edges between v and a node of W) and $E_N(v)$ (edges between v and a node *not* in W). Then by the minimality of \mathcal{V} , let H_v be the tree $H_v \in \mathcal{G}$ such that $N^k(v)$ is isomorphic to the k -hop neighborhood of a node $v' \in H$.

We “glue” H_v and G together – recall that both H_v and G are trees, so for each node $x \in G$ there is a unique shortest path from x to v . For every $x \notin N^k(v)$, if this shortest path passes through an edge of $E_N(v)$, we remove x – conceptually, we remove all nodes that are “on the other side” of v from W and more than k -away from v . Similarly in H_v , for every $x' \notin N^k(v')$ if the shortest path between x' and v' passes through the isomorphic image of an edge of $E_W(v)$ we remove x' ; now, we join H_v and G by identifying the two isomorphic neighborhoods. Observe that this operation does not affect the k -hop neighborhood of any node in W .

We repeat this operation on every node v on the boundary of W , and claim the resulting graph G' is in \mathcal{G} : we run \mathcal{V} on every node v of G' , which has to be either:

- a member of W – its k -hop neighborhood is isomorphic to its neighborhood in G and we know that \mathcal{V} outputs “yes” on all nodes of W , so it outputs “yes” for v in G' as well, or
- not a member of W – let w be the node of W which v is closest to, which is unique since the subgraph induced by W is connected, and let H_w be the graph that was glued at w . Then the distance between w and any node that does not correspond to a node in H_w is at least the distance between w and v (at least 1) plus the distance between w and this node (which is outside $N^k(w)$, so at least k) – in other words, $N^k(v)$ in G' is isomorphic to $N^k(v)$ in H_w , and since $H_w \in \mathcal{G}$ the verifier \mathcal{V} outputs “yes” for v in G' as well.

Then \mathcal{V} accepts all nodes of G' so $G' \in \mathcal{G}$. □

Observe that this “extension” graph G' might be much larger or smaller than the graph G we start from; this makes applying a LOCAL algorithm for G' (whose complexity depends on graph size) on G difficult. We can solve this by requiring an even stronger property from our verifier: the extension G' we find has to be at least as big as G , but bigger by at most a constant multiplicative factor.

Definition A.4. Let \mathcal{V} be a k -round local verifier for a tree property \mathcal{G} . We say \mathcal{V} has *bounded expansion* if there is a function $f : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ such that $n \leq f(n) \in O(n)$ (the *expansion function*) for every tree G and every $W \subseteq V(G)$ such that:

- W is not empty,
- $N^1(W) \subsetneq G$,
- \mathcal{V} returns “yes” on every node of W , and
- the subgraph induced by W of G is connected.

Then the subgraph induced by W and every node that is k -away from W in G is isomorphic to an induced subgraph of a tree $G' \in \mathcal{G}$ of size $|G'| = f(|G|)$.

Once again, we show that the verifier from Lemma A.1 has this property.

Proposition A.5. *The 1-round verifier \mathcal{V} for encoded rooted trees defined in the proof of Lemma A.1 has bounded expansion with expansion function $f(n) = 4n - 3$.*

Proof. Observe that the encoding of a rooted tree T with k vertices is a undirected tree with k Σ -labeled vertices and 3 vertices for each edge of T : then the encoding of T is a tree with $3(k-1) + k = 4k - 3$ nodes.

If $W = V(G)$ this is trivial since every node of G is accepted and $G \in \mathcal{G}$.

We show how to extend the graph induced by $N^1(W)$ to a valid encoded tree. Let v be a node *immediately outside* the boundary of W , meaning a node of $G \setminus W$ which has a neighbor in W ; since W induces a connected subgraph, v has exactly one such neighbor, which we call w . Let $l : \Sigma \uplus \{h, t, e\}$ be the labeling of G ; one of the following cases has to be true:

- (1) $l(w) \in \Sigma, l(v) = h$: we can extend $N^1(W)$ by appending a path of length 3 to v , such that the path $w - v - v_1 - v_2 - v_3$ is labeled $l(w) - h - e - t - l(w)$; then every vertex in this path is accepted by \mathcal{V} .
- (2) $l(w) \in \Sigma, l(v) = t$: the same as the previous case, but the path is instead labeled $l(w) - t - e - h - l(w)$.
- (3) $l(w) = h, l(v) = e$: we can extend $N^1(W)$ by appending a path of length 2 to v , such that the path $w - v - v_1 - v_2$ is labeled $h - e - t - s$ and s is an arbitrary element of Σ ; then every vertex in this path is accepted by \mathcal{V} .
- (4) $l(w) = t, l(v) = e$: the same as the previous case, but the path is labeled $t - e - h - s$ instead.
- (5) $l(w) = e, l(v) \in \{h, t\}$: we can extend $N^1(W)$ by appending a single vertex to v and labeling it by an arbitrary element $s \in \Sigma$.
- (6) $l(w) \in \{h, t\}, l(v) \in \Sigma$: we do not need to extend $N^1(W)$, as v is already accepted by \mathcal{V} .

Let n be the number of vertices of G . This procedure adds at most 3 new vertices every time it is used, and has to be run once for every vertex on the boundary of W , of which there are at most n ; then the new graph G' has at most $4n$ vertices. Let n' be its actual number of vertices: since G' is a valid instance (every node of G' is accepted by \mathcal{V}) there is a k such that $n' = 4k - 3$, then $4k - 3 = n' \leq 4n \implies k < n$.

G' is an encoding of a tree T with k vertices; since $W \subseteq N^1(W) \subsetneq G$, there is at least one leaf of G which is not in W – then there is also a leaf v of G' which is not in the isomorphic image of W , either because it was in $N^1(W)$ (case (6) above) or because it was added at the end of a path (cases (1)-(5)). We can append a directed path of $n - k$ vertices to the degree 1 node corresponding to v in T ; the resulting rooted tree T' has n vertices, and its encoding is an undirected tree with $4n - 3$ vertices which contains $N^1(W)$ as an isomorphic subtree. \square

A.3 Extending problems

Under the strong assumptions we proved in the previous section, we can extend a locally verifiable problem on a locally decidable class of graphs to a larger class of graphs – specifically, we can extend encodings of rooted tree problems to all undirected labeled trees.

Lemma A.6. *Let Π be a locally verifiable (with radius r) problem defined on a class \mathcal{G} of Σ_{in} -labeled trees. Let \mathcal{G}' be a class of trees such that:*

- $\mathcal{G} \subseteq \mathcal{G}'$,
- \mathcal{G}' is Σ'_{in} -labeled for some finite Σ'_{in} (clearly $\Sigma_{in} \subseteq \Sigma'_{in}$),
- $\mathcal{G} \in \text{LD}^*(k)$ for some $k \in \mathbb{N}$ over \mathcal{G}' ; in other words, the statement “ $G \in \mathcal{G}$ ” is locally decidable in k rounds for any $G \in \mathcal{G}'$, and

- the k -round local verifier for \mathcal{G} has bounded expansion.

Then we can define a locally verifiable problem Π' on \mathcal{G}' such that:

1. any valid solution of Π' for a graph $G \in \mathcal{G}$ is also a valid solution of Π for G , and
2. Π and Π' have the same asymptotic complexity.

Proof. We describe the locally verifiable problem Π' by its verification algorithm: Π is a tuple $(\Sigma_{in}, \Sigma_{out}, r, \mathcal{A})$ where $\Sigma_{in}, \Sigma_{out}$ are finite sets of input and output labels respectively, r is the checkability radius and \mathcal{A} is a r -round anonymous-LOCAL algorithm on $\Sigma_{in} \times \Sigma_{out}$ -labeled graphs such that a Σ_{out} labeling of a Σ_{in} -labeled graph G is a valid solution to Π if and only if \mathcal{A} returns “yes” on every node of G .

We define $\Pi' = (\Sigma'_{in}, \Sigma_{out} \uplus \{err, err_0, err_1, err_2\}, \max\{r, k\}, \mathcal{A}')$: we only need to define \mathcal{A}' . Let \mathcal{V} be the minimal k -round local verifier of membership in \mathcal{G} ; we define \mathcal{A}' to accept if and only if:

- the center is out-labeled with err if and only if \mathcal{V} outputs “no” at the center (looking at its k -hop neighborhood), and
- if the center is out-labeled with err_1 (resp: err_2) then it is accepted if and only if it has a neighbor labeled with err_0 (resp: err_1), and
- if the center is out-labeled with err_0 then it is accepted if and only if it has a neighbor labeled with either err_2 or err , and
- if the center is out-labeled with an element of Σ_{out} and there is *any* error label (err, err_0, err_1 , or err_2) in its r -hop neighborhood, it is accepted, and
- if the center is out-labeled with an element of Σ_{out} and there is *no* error label in its r -hop neighborhood, it is accepted if and only if \mathcal{A} returns “yes” at the center (looking at its r -hop neighborhood).

We prove that Π' has the required properties. First, let $G \in \mathcal{G}$: we solve Π' on G , and show that all out-labels are in Σ_{out} . Assume by contradiction there is a err out-label on some node: then the local verifier has output “no” on that node, which would imply $G \notin \mathcal{G}$, but this is false by hypothesis. Assume then that there is a err_i for some $i \in \{0, 1, 2\}$: since there are no err out-labels, every err_i out-labeled node is adjacent to an $err_{i-1 \bmod 3}$ out-labeled node: we can follow a path in the tree which is out-labeled $err_2, err_1, err_0, err_2 \dots$ – this path will never contain a cycle, as T is by definition a tree, but it can also never end (as it can only end at an err label), so it will eventually contain more nodes than G itself, which is a contradiction. Finally, since all nodes are out-labeled from Σ_{out} , their r -hop neighborhood has to be accepted by \mathcal{A} , so the solution is correct for Π .

Second, we show that Π and Π' have the same asymptotic complexity: let $f \in O(n)$ be the expansion function of \mathcal{G} over \mathcal{G}' , and assume we have a $T(n)$ algorithm to solve Π ; since $T(n)$ and $f(n)$ are at most linear there is $c > 0$ (WLOG, we assume $c \geq 1$) and $n_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that for every $n' \geq n_0$ we have $T(f(n')) \leq cf(T(n'))$. We can assume without loss of generality that $T(n)$ is weakly increasing, as if $T(n) > T(n+1)$ we can find a $T(n)$ -round algorithm for graphs of size $n+1$ as a $T(n)$ -round algorithm which does not use the extra information it gathers.

Let n be the number of nodes of our input instance G : if $n < n_0$, we gather the whole graph and run the verifier algorithm \mathcal{V} on every node: if any nodes output “no”, the algorithm out-labels them with err , and every other node out-labels itself with $err_{d-1 \bmod 3}$ where d is the shortest distance between itself and an error.

Assume $n \geq n_0$, and so $T(f(n)) \leq cf(T(n))$: let $T'(n) := cf(T(n)) \in O(T(n))$. Each node gathers its $(2T'(n) + k)$ -hop neighborhood and runs the k -round verifier \mathcal{V} for every node of its

$2T'(n)$ -hop neighborhood. Let E the set of nodes for which \mathcal{V} returns “no”. If there are any such nodes in the $2T'(n)$ -hop neighborhood of v , let d be the minimum distance between v and a node of E : if $d = 0$, v is out-labeled with err , else it is out-labeled with $err_{d-1 \bmod 3}$.

Assume no nodes in the $2T'(n)$ -hop neighborhood of v return “no”, and there is a node in the tree that can see n nodes (the whole graph) in its $T'(n)$ -hop neighborhood: then any two nodes are at most $2T'(n)$ distance from each other, and every node has gathered the whole graph, which is a correct instance since no nodes have been rejected – then each node can use the $T(n) \leq f(T(n)) \leq cf(T(n))$ algorithm for Π to compute a full solution and choose the out-label for v accordingly.

Assume no nodes in the $2T'(n)$ -hop neighborhood of v return “no”, and there are no nodes in the tree that can see n nodes (the whole graph) in their $T'(n)$ -hop neighborhood: then by the bounded expansion property of \mathcal{V} , there is a graph with at most $f(n)$ nodes which contains the $T'(n) + k$ -hop neighborhood of v as a isomorphic induced subgraph – we then run the $T(n')$ -round algorithm for Π while pretending that the real number of nodes is $n' = f(n)$, since $T(n') = T(f(n)) \leq cf(T(n)) = T'(n)$, and choose the out-label for v accordingly.

We verify that this results in a correct solution: let v be a node of G' . Then

- v is out-labeled err if and only if it is at distance 0 from a node rejected by \mathcal{V} – meaning it is rejected itself;
- if v is out-labeled err_i , then there is a $m \in \mathbb{N}$ such that the minimum distance between v and a node v_e labeled err is $3m + i + 1$; let v' be the neighbor of v along the minimum path between v and v_e , then v' is at distance $3m + i$ from v_e and it is labeled either err (if $m = i = 0$) or $err_{i-1 \bmod 3}$;
- if every node in the r -hop neighborhood of v is out-labeled with an element of Σ_{out} , then the $(T(n) + r)$ -hop neighborhood of v is accepted by \mathcal{V} – there is a graph $G \in \mathcal{G}$ which contains an induced subgraph isomorphic to the $(T'(n) + r + k)$ -hop neighborhood of v , and the algorithm for Π has to be correct on G , meaning the r -hop neighborhood of v has to be accepted by \mathcal{A} , and
- if none of the above apply, v is out-labeled with an element of Σ_{out} and has a r -hop neighbor which is labeled with an error label, which is correct.

The runtime of this algorithm for Π' is $\max\{n_0, 2T'(n) + k\}$; since $2T'(n) + k \in O(T(n))$, Π and Π' have the same asymptotic complexity. \square

Since we have shown that the verifier for the set of undirected graphs encoding rooted trees has a bounded expansion verifier, we can convert a problem on rooted trees to a problem on unrooted trees; specifically, we can convert a LCL on rooted trees (with or without input labels) to a LCL on undirected trees with input labels. Then, classification results which apply to all problems on undirected trees with inputs (such as the classification results of [CP17; Cha20]) apply to problems on rooted trees as well, making the statements of Theorem 3.23 and 3.24 well-defined.

B Graph decompositions

We provide a more detailed proof of Lemmas 3.26 and 3.27. Both proofs are standard for bounded degree graphs, and their proofs do not strongly rely on the bounded degree; they are included purely for completeness. We define two shared steps for the two algorithms:

Rake: a Rake step takes one round – each node which is a leaf joins the current layer, then removes itself from the graph by communicating its removal to its parent.

Compress(l): a Compress step takes a parameter l , and takes $l + 1$ rounds – each node that has indegree=1 and outdegree=1 checks whether it is part of a directed path of nodes with the

same degrees of length $\geq \ell$. If it is, it joins the current layer and removes itself from the graph by communicating its removal to both its parent and child.

Lemma B.1. *Let ℓ be a constant and P be a path of length $n \geq \ell$. Then in $O(\log^* n)$ rounds in the randomized or deterministic LOCAL model we can construct a (ℓ, ℓ) -ruling set R such that $P \setminus R$ has connected components of length $[\ell, 2\ell]$.*

Proof. We start by computing a $(\ell + 1)$ -hop $(2\ell + 1)^2$ -coloring – since ℓ is a constant, this is possible in $O(\log^* n)$ rounds using Linial’s algorithm [Lin92]. Then, we use this coloring to greedily compute a (ℓ, ℓ) ruling set of the graph: nodes can choose by looking at their ℓ -hop neighborhood whether to join the ruling set, and no nodes that are $\leq \ell$ apart make the choice at the same time. The nodes of the ruling set split the path in parts of length $[\ell, 2\ell]$, except for the first and last part, which have length $[0, \ell]$. In 2ℓ rounds, the first and last nodes of the ruling set can reposition themselves: this results in first and last parts of length $x \in [\ell, 3\ell]$. If $x \leq 2\ell$, we are happy; if $x \in (2\ell, 3\ell]$ we add the node at position $\lceil x/2 \rceil$ to the ruling set. Every part is now of size $[\ell, 2\ell]$; the overall complexity is $O(\log^* n)$. \square

We can now give complete proofs of Lemmas 3.26 and 3.27.

Lemma 3.26. *For any positive integer ℓ there is a $L(n) \in O(\log n)$ such that we can compute a $(1, \ell, L)$ -decomposition in $O(\log n)$ rounds.*

Proof. Assume $n \geq 2$; we do a **Rake** step and a **Compress**(ℓ) step at the same time, adding the **Rake** vertices to R_i and the **Compress**(ℓ) vertices to C_i – this is possible as no vertex can be removed or even considered by both **Rake** and **Compress**(ℓ) at the same time. We show that overall, we remove at least $\frac{n}{4\ell}$ vertices. Denote:

$$\begin{aligned} n_1 &= \text{size of } V_1 := \{\text{vertices with indeg} = 1, \text{outdeg} = 0\} \\ n_2 &= \text{size of } V_2 := \{\text{vertices with indeg} = 1, \text{outdeg} = 1\} \\ n_3 &= \text{size of } V_3 := \{\text{vertices with indeg} = 1, \text{outdeg} \geq 2\} \\ n_A &= \text{size of } A := \{\text{vertices in } V_2 \text{ that are removed with } \text{Compress}(\ell)\} \\ n_B &= \text{size of } B := \{\text{vertices in } V_2 \text{ that are not removed with } \text{Compress}(\ell)\} \end{aligned}$$

Observe that the root is not counted in any of these sets, as it has indegree 1; then $n_1 + n_2 + n_3 = n - 1$. We denote by d_r the outdegree of the root, then by adding the outdegrees:

$$n_2 + 2n_3 \leq 0n_1 + 1n_2 + 2n_3 + d_r \leq n - 1 = n_1 + n_2 + n_3 \Rightarrow n_1 \geq n_3. \quad (1)$$

Consider the vertices of B : their connected components are directed paths of length $\leq \ell - 1$ where both endpoints are connected to a vertex in $V_1 \cup V_3$ or the root. By contracting these paths to a single edge and removing the vertices of A , we obtain a forest with $n_1 + n_3 + 1$ vertices and $\leq n_1 + n_3$ edges: then

$$\begin{aligned} n_B &\leq (\ell - 1)(n_1 + n_3) \\ n_A = n_2 - n_B &\geq n_2 - (\ell - 1)(n_1 + n_3) = \ell n_2 - (n - 1)(\ell - 1) \\ n_2 &\leq \frac{n_A}{\ell} + (n - 1)\frac{\ell - 1}{\ell} \end{aligned} \quad (2)$$

We apply inequalities (1) and (2) to obtain:

$$\begin{aligned} 2n_1 + \frac{n_A}{\ell} + (n - 1)\frac{\ell - 1}{\ell} &\geq n_1 + n_2 + n_3 = n - 1 \\ 2n_1 + 2n_A &\geq 2n_1 + \frac{n_A}{\ell} \geq \frac{n - 1}{\ell} \\ n_1 + n_A &\geq \frac{n - 1}{2\ell} \geq \frac{n}{4\ell} \end{aligned}$$

for $n \geq 2$. Since n_1 is the number of vertices removed by **Rake** and n_A is the number of vertices removed by **Compress**, we remove at least $\frac{n}{4\ell}$ vertices at each step until we have at most 2 vertices left; they are removed by two extra **Rake** steps. Then in

$$L = \lceil \log_{\frac{4\ell}{4\ell-1}}(n) - \log_{\frac{4\ell}{4\ell-1}}(2) + 2 \rceil \in O(\log n)$$

steps we remove all the vertices.

The resulting R_1, C_1, \dots, R_L is not yet a valid $(1, \ell, L)$ decomposition, as paths in C_i might be longer than 2ℓ . We use Lemma B.1 on each connected component of each C_i *separately* and *in parallel*; this is possible even if the overall graph has unbounded degree, since each component is a path. Then for each C_i , we promote all nodes that are in the ruling set to R_{i+1} : these nodes are happy since they have no neighbors in higher layers and the remaining components of C_i have length $[\ell, 2\ell]$, so we now have a valid $(1, \ell, L)$ decomposition.

Overall, it takes $\ell + 1 \in O(1)$ rounds to do **Rake** and **Compress** (ℓ) and we repeat them for $O(\log n)$ times; the postprocessing step takes $O(\log^* n)$ rounds, so the overall complexity is $O(\log n)$. \square

Lemma 3.27. *For any positive integers k, ℓ and $\gamma = n^{1/k}(2\ell)^{1-1/k}$ we can compute a (γ, ℓ, k) -decomposition in $O(n^{1/k})$ rounds.*

Proof. In this proof, we do γ **Rake** steps and one **Compress** (ℓ) step for each pair of layers R_i, C_i ; however, we cannot do them at the same time as repeated instances of **Rake** can remove vertices that started with outdegree= 1, which affects the **Compress** step. We add all vertices removed by the i th iteration of applying **Rake** γ times to R_i , and all vertices removed by the i th iteration of **Compress** (ℓ) to C_i .

Let S_i be the vertices left after performing the above operations for $i-1$ times, and S'_i be the result of applying **Rake** γ times – note that $S_1 = V$. We want to prove that $|S_k| \leq \gamma$, meaning that all vertices will be removed by the last application of γ **Rake** steps.

Let A_i be the vertices of S'_i that have indegree = 1 and outdegree = 1 but are not removed by the i th **Compress** (ℓ) ; let B_i be the vertices of S'_i which have either indegree = 0 (the root) or outdegree $\neq 1$; then $|S_{i+1}| = |A_i| + |B_i|$. The connected components of the subgraph induced by A_i are directed paths of length at most $(\ell - 1)$: if we contract them in S_{i+1} , we obtain a forest with vertices in B_i – then $|A_i| \leq (\ell - 1)(|B_i| - 1)$.

Let B_i^1 be the set of vertices that have outdegree = 0 at the beginning of the i th **Compress**; by adding outdegrees, we find that

$$\begin{aligned} 0|B_i^1| + 2|B_i \setminus B_i^1| &= 2|B_i \setminus B_i^1| \leq |B_i| \\ |B_i \setminus B_i^1| &\leq |B_i|/2 \\ |B_i^1| &\geq |B_i|/2 \end{aligned}$$

Additionally, each element of B_i^1 had to have been adjacent to a connected component of $S_i \setminus S'_i$ (removed in the i th **Rake** step) of size at least γ : therefore

$$|B_i|/2 \leq |B_i^1| \leq |S_i|/\gamma$$

Finally, we show

$$|S_{i+1}| = |A_i| + |B_i| \leq (\ell - 1)(|B_i| - 1) + |B_i| \leq \ell|B_i| \leq \frac{2\ell}{\gamma}|S_i|$$

By applying this to every layer from 1 to $k-1$, we get

$$|S_k| \leq \left(\frac{2\ell}{\gamma}\right)^{k-1} n \leq \gamma,$$

and all vertices get removed by the k th Rake step.

The resulting R_1, C_1, \dots, R_k is not yet a valid (γ, ℓ, k) decomposition, as paths in C_i might be longer than 2ℓ . We use Lemma B.1 on each connected component of each C_i *separately* and *in parallel*; this is possible even if the overall graph has unbounded degree, since each component is a path. Then for each C_i , we promote all nodes that are in the ruling set to R_{i+1} : these nodes are happy since they have no neighbors in higher layers and the remaining components of C_i have length $[\ell, 2\ell]$, so we now have a valid (γ, ℓ, k) decomposition.

Overall, it takes $\ell + \gamma \in O(n^{1/k})$ rounds to do **Rake** γ times and **Compress** (ℓ) and we repeat them for $k \in O(1)$ times; the postprocessing step takes $O(\log^* n)$ rounds, so the overall complexity is $O(n^{1/k})$. \square

C Myhill-Nerode

Theorem 3.14. (Myhill-Nerode) *Let \mathcal{G} be a tree language which can be recognised by a deterministic, complete RatMTA \mathcal{A} . Then:*

- (1) $\equiv_{\mathcal{G}}$ has finite index, upper bounded by the number of states of \mathcal{A} , and
- (2) there is a deterministic, complete RatMTA which recognises \mathcal{G} whose states are in bijection with the equivalence classes of $\equiv_{\mathcal{G}}$.

Proof. (1): let $\delta(t)$ denote the state of the root of t ; observe that $\delta(t_1) = \delta(t_2) \Rightarrow t_1 \equiv_{\mathcal{G}} t_2$, so the number of congruence classes of $\equiv_{\mathcal{G}}$ is bounded by the number of states, which is finite.

(2): let $\mathcal{A} = (\Sigma, Q, \delta, F)$ and let Q' be the set of congruence classes of $\equiv_{\mathcal{G}}$ (defined equivalently over all trees or over the set of states; see (1)). Consider the quotient projection $h : Q \rightarrow Q'$; we can define \dot{h} which applies h to multisets pointwise, and \ddot{h} which applies \dot{h} to multiset languages pointwise. \dot{h} sends semilinear (rational) sets to semilinear (rational) sets, as in any vector defining a linear set we can find the index of $h(q)$ by adding the indices of all elements of $h(q)$. We define a transition $\delta_{min} : \Sigma \times Q' \rightarrow \text{Rat}(\mathcal{M}(Q'))$ as $\delta_{min}(s, h(q_1)) = \dot{h}(\delta(s, q_1))$. Recall that \mathcal{A} is complete and deterministic, so we can define an inverse function $\gamma : \Sigma \times \mathcal{M}(Q) \rightarrow Q$ where $\gamma(s, M) = q \Leftrightarrow M \in \delta(s, q)$. Similarly, we define

$$\gamma_{min}(s, \dot{h}(M)) = h(q) \Leftrightarrow \dot{h}(M) \in \delta_{min}(s, h(q)) = \ddot{h}(\delta(s, q_1))$$

and observe that δ_{min} is well-defined and induces a deterministic and complete RatMTA iff γ_{min} is well-defined and total.

Let M_1, M_2 such that $\dot{h}(M_1) = \dot{h}(M_2)$: we show that for all $s \in \Sigma$ we have $h(\gamma(s, M_1)) = h(\gamma(s, M_2))$. Consider rooted trees t_1, t_2 with $|M_1| = |M_2|$ children to the root, such that the children of t_1, t_2 have sub-root states corresponding to the elements of M_1, M_2 respectively. Clearly $\delta(t_1) = q_1$ and $\delta(t_2) = q_2$. Since $\dot{h}(M_1) = \dot{h}(M_2)$, we can find a one-to-one correspondence $f : M_1 \rightarrow M_2$ such that $h(q) = h(f(q))$ for all $q \in M_1$. Let $C[x]$ be a context, and consider $C[t_1]$. We replace each child tree of the root of t_1 of type q with the corresponding child tree of the root of t_2 of type $f(q)$: this operation is equivalent to replacing t_1 with t_2 . Each step of this replacement preserves membership of the overall tree in \mathcal{G} , so $C[t_1] \in \mathcal{G} \Leftrightarrow C[t_2] \in \mathcal{G}$ and $t_1 \equiv_{\mathcal{G}} t_2$. Then γ_{min} is well defined; since h, \dot{h}, \ddot{h} are surjective it is also total.

Finally, we define $\mathcal{A}_{min} = (\Sigma, Q', \delta_{min}, F' = F / \equiv_{\mathcal{G}})$. We need to show that \mathcal{A}_{min} correctly recognises \mathcal{G} : given a rooted tree (V, E, r) any accepting run $l : V \rightarrow Q$ of \mathcal{A} corresponds to an accepting run $h \circ l$ of \mathcal{A}_{min} . Conversely, for each accepting run \dot{l} of \mathcal{A}_{min} , we can label \mathcal{A} by exploring the tree root-to-leaves and letting each subroot (with label s and state q) choose a valid multiset of children states $M \in \delta(s, q)$ such that $\dot{h}(M)$ is the set of states of its children in \dot{l} ; then, for each child subtree t_1 with $\delta(t_1) = q_1$ which was wrongly labeled q_2 , we can replace it with t_2 with $\delta(t_2) = q_2$ since $q_1 \equiv_{\mathcal{G}} q_2$. The result is a tree T' labeled with an accepting run of \mathcal{A} such that $T \in \mathcal{G} \Leftrightarrow T' \in \mathcal{G}$. \square