

Boxicity and Cubicity of Asteroidal Triple free graphs

Diptendu Bhowmick ^{*}, L. Sunil Chandran ^{**}

Abstract. An axis parallel d -dimensional box is the Cartesian product $R_1 \times R_2 \times \cdots \times R_d$ where each R_i is a closed interval on the real line. The *boxicity* of a graph G , denoted as $\text{box}(G)$, is the minimum integer d such that G can be represented as the intersection graph of a collection of d -dimensional boxes. An axis parallel unit cube in d -dimensional space or a d -cube is defined as the Cartesian product $R_1 \times R_2 \times \cdots \times R_d$ where each R_i is a closed interval on the real line of the form $[a_i, a_i + 1]$. The *cubicity* of G , denoted as $\text{cub}(G)$, is the minimum integer d such that G can be represented as the intersection graph of a collection of d -cubes.

An independent set of three vertices is called an asteroidal triple if between each pair in the triple there exists a path which avoids the neighbourhood of the third. A graph is said to be Asteroidal Triple free (AT-free for short) if it does not contain an asteroidal triple. The class of AT-free graphs is a reasonably large one, which properly contains the class of interval graphs, trapezoid graphs, permutation graphs, cocomparability graphs etc. Let $S(m)$ denote a star graph on $m + 1$ nodes. We define *claw number* of a graph G as the largest positive integer k such that $S(k)$ is an induced subgraph of G and denote it as $\psi(G)$.

Let G be an AT-free graph with chromatic number $\chi(G)$ and claw number $\psi(G)$. In this paper we will show that $\text{box}(G) \leq \chi(G)$ and this bound is tight. We also show that $\text{cub}(G) \leq \text{box}(G)(\lceil \log_2 \psi(G) \rceil + 2) \leq \chi(G)(\lceil \log_2 \psi(G) \rceil + 2)$. If G is an AT-free graph having girth at least 5 then $\text{box}(G) \leq 2$ and therefore $\text{cub}(G) \leq 2 \lceil \log_2 \psi(G) \rceil + 4$.

Key words: Boxicity, Cubicity, Chordal Dimension, Asteroidal Triple free Graph, Chromatic Number, Claw Number.

1 Introduction

Let \mathcal{F} be a family of non-empty sets. An undirected graph G is the intersection graph of \mathcal{F} if there exists a one-one correspondence between the vertices of G and the sets in \mathcal{F} such that two vertices in G are adjacent if and only if the corresponding sets have non-empty intersection. If \mathcal{F} is a family of intervals on the real line, then G is called an *interval graph*. An interval graph G is said to be a *unit interval graph* if and only if there is some interval representation of G in which all the intervals are of the same length.

Notations: Let $G(V, E)$ be a simple, finite, undirected graph on n vertices. The vertex set of G is denoted as $V(G)$ and the edge set of G is denoted as $E(G)$. For any vertex

^{*} Computer Science and Automation Department, Indian Institute of Science, Bangalore- 560012 Email: diptendubhowmick@gmail.com

^{**} Computer Science and Automation Department, Indian Institute of Science, Bangalore- 560012 Email: sunil@csa.iisc.ernet.in

$v \in V(G)$ let $N_G(v) = \{w \in V(G) \mid (v, w) \in E(G)\}$ be the set of neighbors of v . For each $S \subseteq V(G)$ let $G[S]$ denote the subgraph of G induced by the vertices in S . In this paper we shall use the notation $G \setminus S$ to denote $G[V \setminus S]$. The *girth* of a graph is the length of a shortest cycle in the graph.

Let G' be a graph such that $V(G') = V(G)$. Then G' is a *super graph* of G if $E(G) \subseteq E(G')$. We define the *intersection* of two graphs as follows: if G_1 and G_2 are two graphs such that $V(G_1) = V(G_2)$, then the intersection of G_1 and G_2 denoted as $G = G_1 \cap G_2$ is a graph with $V(G) = V(G_1) = V(G_2)$ and $E(G) = E(G_1) \cap E(G_2)$.

1.1 Boxicity and Cubicity

A d -dimensional box is a Cartesian product $R_1 \times R_2 \times \cdots \times R_d$ where each R_i is a closed interval of the form $[a_i, b_i]$ on the real line. A k -box representation of a graph G is a mapping of the vertices of G to k -boxes such that two vertices in G are adjacent if and only if their corresponding k -boxes have a non-empty intersection. The *boxicity* of a graph G , denoted as $\text{box}(G)$, is the minimum integer k such that G can be represented as the intersection graph of k -dimensional boxes. Clearly, graphs with boxicity 1 are precisely the *interval graphs*.

A d -dimensional cube is a Cartesian product $R_1 \times R_2 \times \cdots \times R_d$ where each R_i is a closed interval of the form $[a_i, a_i + 1]$ on the real line. A k -cube representation of a graph G is a mapping of the vertices of G to k -cubes such that two vertices in G are adjacent if and only if their corresponding k -cubes have a non-empty intersection. The *cubicity* of G is the minimum integer k such that G has a k -cube representation. Clearly, graphs with cubicity 1 are precisely the *unit interval graphs*.

Let G be a graph. Let I_1, I_2, \dots, I_k be k interval (unit interval) graphs such that $G = I_1 \cap I_2 \cap \cdots \cap I_k$. Then I_1, I_2, \dots, I_k is called an *interval graph representation* (*unit interval graph representation*) of G . The following equivalence is well known.

Lemma 1. (Roberts[25]) *The minimum k such that there exists an interval graph representation (unit interval graph representation) of G using k interval graphs (unit interval graphs) I_1, I_2, \dots, I_k is the same as $\text{box}(G)$ ($\text{cub}(G)$).*

Fact 1. (Roberts [25]) *If $G = G_1 \cap G_2 \cap \cdots \cap G_r$ then $\text{cub}(G) \leq \sum_{i=1}^r \text{cub}(G_i)$.*

The concept of boxicity and cubicity was introduced by F. S. Roberts [25] in 1969. Boxicity finds applications in fields such as ecology and operations research: It is used as a measure of the complexity of ecological [26] and social [20] networks and has applications in fleet maintenance [23]. Boxicity and cubicity has been investigated for various classes of graphs [14,27,28,8] and has been related with other parameters such as treewidth [9] and vertex cover [4]. Computing the boxicity of a graph was shown to be NP-hard by Cozzens [14]. This was later strengthened by Yannakakis [30], and finally by Kratochvíl

[19] who showed that deciding whether boxicity of a graph is at most 2 itself is NP-complete. Boxicity has been generalized in several ways like rectangle number [11], poset boxicity [29], grid dimension [3], circular dimension [16], boxicity of digraphs [10] etc. Recently Chandran et al. [7] showed that for any graph G , $\text{box}(G) \leq 2\chi(G^2)$ where G^2 is the square of graph G and $\chi(G)$ is the chromatic number of the graph. From this they inferred that $\text{box}(G) \leq 2\Delta^2$, where Δ is the maximum degree of G . Very recently this result was improved by Esperet [15], who showed that $\text{box}(G) \leq \Delta^2 + 2$. Let n be the number of vertices in G . In [5] Chandran et al. have shown that for any graph G , $\text{box}(G) \leq \lceil (\Delta + 2) \log_2 n \rceil$. In [6] they have shown that for any graph G , $\text{cub}(G) \leq \lceil 4(\Delta + 1) \log_2 n \rceil$.

1.2 Chordal Graph and Chordal Dimension

An undirected graph is said to be *chordal* if every cycle of length four or more contains a chord i.e. an edge joining two nonconsecutive vertices in the cycle. The *chordal dimension* of a graph G denoted as $\text{chord}(G)$, is the minimum integer k such that G can be represented as the intersection graph of k chordal graphs. Scheinerman and Mckee [21] have shown that for any graph G , $\text{chord}(G) \leq \chi(G)$ and also $\text{chord}(G) \leq \text{treewidth}(G)$ where $\chi(G)$ is the chromatic number of G . Since any interval graph is a chordal graph we have the following observation:

Observation 1. *For any graph G , $\text{chord}(G) \leq \text{box}(G) \leq \text{cub}(G)$.*

1.3 Claw Number

Let $S(k)$ denote a star graph on $k + 1$ vertices. (Note that $S(k)$ is the complete bipartite graph $K_{1,k}$). The *center* of a star is that vertex which is connected to all other vertices in the star. An induced $S(3)$ in a graph is usually known as a *claw*.

Definition 1. *The claw number of a graph G is the largest positive integer k such that $S(k)$ is an induced subgraph of G and is denoted as $\psi(G)$.*

Recently Adiga et al. [1] have given an almost tight bound for the cubicity of interval graphs in terms of its claw number.

Theorem 1. (Adiga et al. [1]) *If G is an interval graph with claw number $\psi(G)$ then $\lceil \log_2 \psi(G) \rceil \leq \text{cub}(G) \leq \lceil \log_2 \psi(G) \rceil + 2$.*

1.4 AT-free graphs

An independent set of three vertices is called an *asteroidal triple* if between every pair of vertices there is a path which avoids the neighbourhood of the third. A graph is called *asteroidal triple free* (AT-free for short) if it does not contain an asteroidal triple.

They form a large class of graphs since they contain interval, permutation, trapezoid, cocomparability and many other graph classes. Corneil, Olariu and Stewart have studied many structural and algorithmic properties of AT-free graphs in [12,13].

A graph is called *claw-free AT-free graph* if it is AT-free and does not contain $K_{1,3}$ (i.e. $S(3)$, the claw) as an induced subgraph. Kloks et al. [18] have given a characterization of claw-free AT-free graphs.

1.5 Our Results

In this paper we will show that

1. If G is an AT-free graph with chromatic number $\chi(G)$ then $\text{box}(G) \leq \chi(G)$ and this bound is tight.
2. If G is a claw-free AT-free graph with chromatic number $\chi(G)$ then $\text{box}(G) = \text{cub}(G) \leq \chi(G)$ and this bound is tight.
3. If G is an AT-free graph having girth at least 5 then $\text{box}(G) \leq 2$ and this bound is tight. We also show that $\text{cub}(G) \leq 2 \lceil \log_2 \psi(G) \rceil + 4$.
4. If G is an AT-free graph with chromatic number $\chi(G)$ and claw number $\psi(G)$ then $\text{cub}(G) \leq \text{box}(G)(\lceil \log_2 \psi(G) \rceil + 2) \leq \chi(G)(\lceil \log_2 \psi(G) \rceil + 2)$.

Remark on previous approach to boxicity and cubicity of AT-free graphs:

In [9] it has been shown that for any graph G , $\text{box}(G) \leq \text{treewidth}(G) + 2$. It has also been shown that if G is an AT-free graph then $\text{treewidth}(G) \leq 3\Delta - 2$, hence $\text{box}(G) \leq 3\Delta$ where Δ is the maximum degree of G . But the result shown in this paper is much stronger. (Recall that $\chi(G) \leq \Delta + 1$ for any graph, but in general $\chi(G)$ can be much smaller.)

In [6] Chandran et al. have studied the relationship between cubicity and bandwidth of a graph. As a corollary they have also shown that if G is an AT-free graph then $\text{cub}(G) \leq 3\Delta - 1$ since for AT-free graphs bandwidth is at most $3\Delta - 2$. Using the technique of [6], this upper bound cannot be improved much since $\lceil \frac{\Delta}{2} \rceil$ is a lower bound for bandwidth of any graph. In this paper we show that for any AT-free graph G , $\text{cub}(G) \leq \text{box}(G)(\lceil \log_2 \psi(G) \rceil + 2) \leq \chi(G)(\lceil \log_2 \psi(G) \rceil + 2)$. Clearly this result can be much stronger than that of [6] in some cases.

2 Upper bound on boxicity of AT-free graphs and cubicity of claw-free AT-free graphs

In this section we will show an upper bound on boxicity of AT-free graphs and cubicity of claw-free AT-free graphs. A *triangulation* of a graph G is a chordal graph H on the same vertex set that contains G as a subgraph i.e. $V(G) = V(H)$ and $E(G) \subseteq E(H)$. H is said to be a *minimal triangulation* of G if there exists no other chordal graph H'

on the same vertex set as G and H such that $E(G) \subseteq E(H') \subset E(H)$. Möhring studied minimal triangulation of AT-free graphs in [22]. Parra and Scheffler have shown relations between minimal separators of a graph and its minimal triangulations in [24].

From the definition of chordal dimension and boxicity we know that for any graph G , $\text{chord}(G) \leq \text{box}(G)$. Now we will show that when G is an AT-free graph, $\text{box}(G) \leq \text{chord}(G)$. For this we need the following theorem:

Theorem 2. (Möhring [22]) *If G is an AT-free graph then every minimal triangulation of G is an interval graph.*

Let $\text{chord}(G) = k$ and $G = \bigcap_{i=1}^k G_i$ where G_i is a chordal graph for $1 \leq i \leq k$. It is easy to see that if we replace each G_i by another chordal graph G'_i such that $V(G_i) = V(G'_i)$ and $E(G) \subseteq E(G'_i) \subseteq E(G_i)$, we still will have $G = \bigcap_{i=1}^k G'_i$. It follows that there exists G'_1, G'_2, \dots, G'_k such that $G = \bigcap_{i=1}^k G'_i$ where each G'_i is a minimal triangulation of G . By Theorem 2, G'_i for $1 \leq i \leq k$ is an interval graph. It follows that $\text{box}(G) \leq k = \text{chord}(G)$. Thus we have the following Observation:

Observation 2. *If G is an AT-free graph then $\text{chord}(G) = \text{box}(G)$.*

Scheinerman and Mckee have shown the following upper bound on chordal dimension of a graph G in terms of its chromatic number $\chi(G)$.

Theorem 3. (Scheinerman and Mckee [21]) *For any graph G with chromatic number $\chi(G)$, $\text{chord}(G) \leq \chi(G)$.*

Combining Observation 2 and Theorem 3 we get the following upper bound on boxicity of AT-free graphs:

Theorem 4. *If G is an AT-free graph with chromatic number $\chi(G)$ then $\text{box}(G) \leq \chi(G)$.*

In general $\chi(G) \leq d + 1$, where d is the degeneracy of the graph. It follows that $\text{box}(G) \leq d + 1$. Though it is known [7] that $\text{box}(G) \leq 2\chi(G^2)$ for any graph G , $\text{box}(G)$ need not always be less than equal to $\chi(G)$: For example it is shown in [4] that there exists bipartite graphs with boxicity $\frac{n}{4}$. It is also shown in [2] that almost all balanced bipartite graphs (with respect to a suitable probability distribution) have boxicity $\Omega(\frac{n}{\log n})$.

Theorem 5. (Parra and Scheffler [24]) *A graph G is claw-free AT-free if and only if every minimal triangulation of G is a unit interval graph.*

By a similar argument given for Observation 2, we get the following:

Observation 3. *If G is a claw-free AT-free graph then $\text{chord}(G) = \text{cub}(G)$.*

Thus if G is a claw-free AT-free graph we have $\text{chord}(G) = \text{box}(G) = \text{cub}(G)$. Combining Theorem 3 and Observation 3 we get the following upper bound on cubicity of claw-free AT-free graphs:

Theorem 6. *If G is a claw-free AT-free graph with chromatic number $\chi(G)$ then $\text{cub}(G) \leq \chi(G)$.*

2.1 Tightness of Theorem 4 and Theorem 6

Let G be a complete k -partite graph on n vertices (We will assume that n is multiple of k and $n > k$). It is easy to see that this is an AT-free graph. Since the chromatic number of this graph is k , we have $\text{box}(G) \leq k$ by Theorem 4. But it was shown by Roberts [25] that $\text{box}(G) = k$. So the upper bound for boxicity given in Theorem 4 is tight for complete k -partite graphs.

Let $G = \overline{(\frac{n}{2})K_2}$, the complement of the perfect matching on n vertices (We will assume that n is even and $n > 3$). It is easy to see that this is a claw-free AT-free graph. Since the chromatic number of this graph is $\frac{n}{2}$, we have $\text{cub}(G) \leq \frac{n}{2}$ by Theorem 6. But it was shown by Roberts [25] that $\text{cub}(G) = \frac{n}{2}$. So the upper bound for cubicity given in Theorem 6 is tight for $\overline{(\frac{n}{2})K_2}$.

3 Upper bound on boxicity of AT-free graphs having girth at least 5

In this section we will show an upper bound on boxicity of AT-free graphs having girth at least 5. Let G be an AT-free graph having girth at least 5. Since an induced cycle of length at least 6 contains an AT, G is either acyclic or all induced cycles of G are of length exactly 5. Recall that diameter of a graph is the maximum of $\text{distance}(u,v)$ over all pairs of vertices $u, v \in V(G)$. A set of vertices S of a graph G is said to be *dominating* if every vertex in $V(G) \setminus S$ is adjacent to some vertex in S . A path joining vertices x and y is said to be a x - y path. A pair of vertices x, y is said to be a *dominating pair* if all x - y paths in G are dominating sets. Corneil, Olariu and Stewart have shown the following fundamental property of AT-free graphs:

Theorem 7. (Corneil et al.[12]) *Every connected AT-free graph contains a dominating pair.*

They have also proved the following theorem which we shall use to show the upper bound on boxicity:

Theorem 8. (Corneil et al.[12]) *In every connected AT-free graph there exists dominating pair x, y such that $\text{distance}(x, y) = \text{diameter}(G)$.*

Let x, y be a dominating pair in G and let P be a shortest x - y path of length equal to the diameter of G . Let d be the diameter of G and $V(P) = \{u_1, u_2, \dots, u_d\}$ where $x = u_1$ and $y = u_d$. Let $V(\overline{P}) = V(G) \setminus V(P)$.

Lemma 2. For each vertex $v \in V(\overline{P})$, $|N_G(v) \cap V(P)| = 1$.

Proof. Since x, y is a dominating pair and P is a x - y path, $V(P)$ is a dominating set. Hence for every vertex $v \in V(\overline{P})$ we have $|N_G(v) \cap V(P)| \geq 1$. We will show that for each vertex $v \in V(\overline{P})$, $|N_G(v) \cap V(P)| \leq 1$. If possible let $w \in V(\overline{P})$ such that $|N_G(w) \cap V(P)| \geq 2$. Let $u_i, u_j \in N_G(w) \cap V(P)$ be such that $1 \leq i < j \leq d$ and for all k , $i < k < j$, $u_k \notin N_G(w)$. We consider the following cases

Case 1: When $j \leq i + 2$. If $j = i + 1$ then u_i - w - u_j - u_i forms an induced cycle of length 3 in G , a contradiction. Similarly if $j = i + 2$ then u_i - w - u_j - u_{j-1} - u_i forms an induced cycle of length 4 in G , a contradiction.

Case 2: When $j \geq i + 3$. Let P_1 denote the path u_1 - u_2 - \dots - u_i and P_2 denote the path u_j - u_{j+1} - \dots - u_d . Clearly $P_1 w P_2$ forms a x - y path say P' in G . Now $|V(P')| = i + 1 + (d - j + 1)$. If $j \geq i + 3$ then $|V(P')| \leq d - 1$. Recall that P is a shortest x - y path. But P' is a shorter x - y path than P , a contradiction.

Therefore for each vertex $v \in V(\overline{P})$, $|N_G(v) \cap V(P)| = 1$. □

Let $S_i = \{v \mid v \in V(\overline{P}) \text{ and } u_i \in N_G(v)\}$ for $1 \leq i \leq d$. From Lemma 2, it follows that S_1, S_2, \dots, S_d is a partition of the vertex set $V(\overline{P})$. In other words,

Observation 4. Let $u \in V(P)$ and $v \in V(\overline{P})$. Suppose $u = u_i$ and $v \in S_k$ where $1 \leq i, k \leq d$. Then $(u, v) \notin E(G)$ if and only if $i \neq k$.

Lemma 3. Let $v \in S_i$.

1. $|N_G(v) \cap S_i| = 0$ where $1 \leq i \leq d$.
2. $|N_G(v) \cap S_{i+1}| = 0$ where $1 \leq i \leq d - 1$.
3. $|N_G(v) \cap S_{i+2}| \leq 1$ where $1 \leq i \leq d - 2$.
4. $|N_G(v) \cap S_j| = 0$ where $i + 3 \leq j \leq d$ and $i \geq 1$.

Proof(1): If possible let $w \in S_i$ such that $(v, w) \in E(G)$. Now v - u_i - w - v forms an induced cycle of length 3 in G , a contradiction.

Proof(2): If possible let $w \in S_{i+1}$ such that $(v, w) \in E(G)$. Then u_i - v - w - u_{i+1} - u_i forms a cycle of length 4 in G , a contradiction.

Proof(3): If possible let $u, w \in S_{i+2}$ such that $(v, u) \in E(G)$ and $(v, w) \in E(G)$. Then $v-w-u_{i+2}-u-v$ forms a cycle of length 4 in G , a contradiction.

Proof(4): If possible let $w \in S_j$ such that $(v, w) \in E(G)$. Since $(v, u_i) \in E(G)$ according to Lemma 2 we have $(v, u_k) \notin E(G)$ for all $k \neq i$. Similarly since $(w, u_j) \in E(G)$ we have $(w, u_k) \notin E(G)$ for all $k \neq j$. Since $j \geq i + 3$, $u_i-v-w-u_j-u_{j-1}-u_{j-2}-\dots-u_i$ forms an induced cycle of length at least 6 in G . But G is an AT-free graph, a contradiction.

From Lemma 3 we have the following observation:

Observation 5. *If $u, v \in V(\overline{P})$, $u \in S_i$, $v \in S_j$ and $(u, v) \in E(G)$ then $|j - i| = 2$.*

Lemma 4. *Let $u \in S_i$ and $v \in S_{i+2}$ where $1 \leq i \leq d - 2$. If $(u, v) \in E(G)$ then for any $p \in S_i \setminus \{u\}$, $q \in S_{i+2} \setminus \{v\}$ we have $(p, q) \notin E(G)$.*

Proof. Suppose not. Let $p \in S_i \setminus \{u\}$ and $q \in S_{i+2} \setminus \{v\}$ such that $(p, q) \in E(G)$. Since $u, p \in S_i$, according to Lemma 3 part (1), $(u, p) \notin E(G)$. Similarly $(v, q) \notin E(G)$. According to Lemma 2, $(u, u_{i+2}) \notin E(G)$, $(p, u_{i+2}) \notin E(G)$, $(q, u_i) \notin E(G)$ and $(v, u_i) \notin E(G)$. Also we have $(u, q) \notin E(G)$ and $(v, p) \notin E(G)$ by Lemma 3 part (3). Moreover $(u_i, u_{i+2}) \notin E(G)$ since P is a shortest $x-y$ path. Therefore $u-u_i-p-q-u_{i+2}-v-u$ forms an induced cycle of length 6 in G and hence $\{u, p, u_{i+2}\}$ forms an AT in G , a contradiction. \square

A vertex $v \in V(\overline{P})$ is said to be *non-pendant* if $N_G(v) \cap V(\overline{P}) \neq \emptyset$. Note that if $N_G(v) \cap V(\overline{P}) = \emptyset$ then v has to be a pendant vertex by Lemma 2.

Lemma 5. *S_i can contain at most 2 non-pendant vertices for $1 \leq i \leq d$.*

Proof. If $v \in S_i$ is non-pendant then according to Observation 5, either $N_G(v) \cap S_{i-2} \neq \emptyset$ or $N_G(v) \cap S_{i+2} \neq \emptyset$. By Lemma 3 part (3) and Lemma 4, at most one vertex in S_i can be connected to some vertex in S_{i+2} . Similarly at most one vertex in S_i can be connected to some vertex in S_{i-2} . Therefore S_i can contain at most 2 non-pendant vertices. \square

Observation 6. *If S_i contains two non-pendant vertices say u, v then one of the following statements is true (by Lemma 3 part (3) and Lemma 4)*

1. $N_G(u) \cap S_{i-2} = \emptyset$ and $N_G(v) \cap S_{i+2} = \emptyset$.
2. $N_G(u) \cap S_{i+2} = \emptyset$ and $N_G(v) \cap S_{i-2} = \emptyset$.

3.1 Interval Graph Construction

We shall construct two interval graphs I_1 and I_2 such that $G = I_1 \cap I_2$. In the interval graph I_j where $j = 1, 2$, let $l_j(u)$ and $r_j(u)$ denote the left and right endpoint of the interval corresponding to vertex $u \in V(G)$ respectively. Let S be the set of non-pendant

vertices in $V(\overline{P})$. To construct I_1 we map each vertex $v \in V(G)$ to an interval on the real line by the mapping:

$$\begin{aligned}
g_1(v) &= [i, i + 1] && \text{if } v \in V(P) \text{ and } v = u_i \text{ for } 1 \leq i \leq d \\
&= [i + \frac{2j-1}{2n}, i + \frac{2j}{2n}] && \text{if } v \in S_i \setminus S, 1 \leq i \leq d \text{ and } 1 \leq j \leq |S_i| \\
&= [i - \frac{1}{2}, i + \frac{3}{2}] && \text{if } v \in S_i \cap S, N_G(v) \cap S_{i-2} \neq \emptyset \text{ and } N_G(v) \cap S_{i+2} \neq \emptyset \\
&= [i + 1, i + \frac{3}{2}] && \text{if } v \in S_i \cap S, N_G(v) \cap S_{i-2} = \emptyset \text{ and } N_G(v) \cap S_{i+2} \neq \emptyset \\
&= [i - \frac{1}{2}, i] && \text{if } v \in S_i \cap S, N_G(v) \cap S_{i-2} \neq \emptyset \text{ and } N_G(v) \cap S_{i+2} = \emptyset
\end{aligned}$$

Lemma 6. I_1 is a supergraph of G .

Proof. Let $(u, v) \in E(G)$. We shall show that $g_1(u) \cap g_1(v) \neq \emptyset$. We consider the following cases:

Case 1: When either $u \in V(P)$ or $v \in V(P)$. Without loss of generality we can assume that $u \in V(P)$. Let $u = u_i$ where $1 \leq i \leq d$. If $v \in V(P)$ then either $v = u_{i-1}$ or $v = u_{i+1}$. Now if $v = u_{i-1}$ then $i \in g_1(u) \cap g_1(v)$. On the other hand if $v = u_{i+1}$ then $i + 1 \in g_1(u) \cap g_1(v)$. If $v \in \overline{P}$ then according to Observation 4, $v \in S_i$. Now if $v \in S_i \setminus S$ then $i = l_1(u) < l_1(v) < r_1(u) = i + 1$ and hence $g_1(u) \cap g_1(v) \neq \emptyset$. If $v \in S_i \cap S$ then we consider the following cases: If $N_G(v) \cap S_{i-2} \neq \emptyset$ then $i \in g_1(u) \cap g_1(v)$. Otherwise if $N_G(v) \cap S_{i+2} \neq \emptyset$ then $i + 1 \in g_1(u) \cap g_1(v)$.

Case 2: When $u, v \in V(\overline{P})$. By definition of non-pendant vertices $u, v \in S$. Let $u \in S_i$. According to Observation 5, either $v \in S_{i-2}$ or $v \in S_{i+2}$. If $v \in S_{i-2}$ then $l_1(u) = r_1(v) = i - \frac{1}{2}$. Otherwise if $v \in S_{i+2}$ then $r_1(u) = l_1(v) = i + \frac{3}{2}$. In both cases we have $g_1(u) \cap g_1(v) \neq \emptyset$. \square

To construct I_2 we map each vertex $v \in V(G)$ to an interval on the real line by the mapping:

$$\begin{aligned}
g_2(v) &= [1, 2] && \text{if } v \in V(P), v = u_i \text{ and } i \bmod 2 = 1 \\
&= [2, 3] && \text{if } v \in V(P), v = u_i \text{ and } i \bmod 2 = 0 \\
&= [\frac{5}{4}, \frac{7}{4}] && \text{if } v \in S_i \setminus S \text{ and } i \bmod 2 = 1 \\
&= [\frac{9}{4}, \frac{11}{4}] && \text{if } v \in S_i \setminus S \text{ and } i \bmod 2 = 0 \\
&= [0, 1] && \text{if } v \in S_i \cap S \text{ and } i \bmod 2 = 1 \\
&= [3, 4] && \text{if } v \in S_i \cap S \text{ and } i \bmod 2 = 0
\end{aligned}$$

Lemma 7. I_2 is a supergraph of G .

Proof. Let $(u, v) \in E(G)$. We shall show that $g_2(u) \cap g_2(v) \neq \emptyset$. We consider the following cases:

Case 1: When either $u \in V(P)$ or $v \in V(P)$. Without loss of generality we can assume that $u \in V(P)$. Let $u = u_i$ where $1 \leq i \leq d$. If $v \in V(P)$ then $2 \in g_2(u) \cap g_2(v)$. If $v \in V(\overline{P})$ then according to Observation 4, $v \in S_i$. Now if $v \in S_i \setminus S$ then $l_2(u) < l_2(v) < r_2(v) < r_2(u)$ and hence $g_2(u) \cap g_2(v) \neq \emptyset$. If $v \in S_i \cap S$ we consider the following cases: If $i \bmod 2 = 1$ then $l_2(u) = r_2(v) = 1$. On the other hand if $i \bmod 2 = 0$ then $r_2(u) = l_2(v) = 3$. In both cases we have $g_2(u) \cap g_2(v) \neq \emptyset$.

Case 2: When $u, v \in V(\overline{P})$. By definition of non-pendant vertices $u, v \in S$. Let $u \in S_i$ and $v \in S_j$ where $1 \leq i, j \leq d$. According to Observation 5, $|i - j| = 2$ which implies that $i = j \bmod 2$. Hence $g_2(u) = g_2(v)$ and thus $g_2(u) \cap g_2(v) \neq \emptyset$. \square

Lemma 8. For any $(u, v) \notin E(G)$ either $(u, v) \notin E(I_1)$ or $(u, v) \notin E(I_2)$.

Proof. Let $(u, v) \notin E(G)$. We consider the following cases:

Case 1: When $u, v \in V(P)$. Let $u = u_i$ and $v = u_j$ where $1 \leq i, j \leq d$. Since $(u, v) \notin E(G)$ we have $|j - i| \geq 2$. Therefore $|l_1(u) - l_1(v)| \geq 2$. Since in I_1 , the intervals corresponding to vertices in $V(P)$ are of length 1 we have $g_1(u) \cap g_1(v) = \emptyset$ and hence $(u, v) \notin E(I_1)$.

Case 2: When $u \in V(P)$ and $v \in V(\overline{P})$. Let $u = u_i$ where $1 \leq i \leq d$. According to Observation 4, $v \in S_k$ where $k \neq i$. Now if $v \in S_k \setminus S$ then $k < l_1(v) < r_1(v) < k + 1$. Since $g_1(u) = [i, i + 1]$ and $i \neq k$ we have $g_1(u) \cap g_1(v) = \emptyset$. Hence $(u, v) \notin E(I_1)$.

When $v \in S_k \cap S$ we consider the following cases:

Subcase 2.1: When $|k - i| \geq 2$. Now $g_1(u) = [i, i + 1]$ and $k - \frac{1}{2} \leq l_1(v) < r_1(v) \leq k + \frac{3}{2}$. If $i \leq k - 2$ then $r_1(u) \leq k - 1 < k - \frac{1}{2} \leq l_1(v)$ and hence $g_1(u) \cap g_1(v) = \emptyset$. If $i \geq k + 2$ then $l_1(u) \geq k + 2 > k + \frac{3}{2} \geq r_1(v)$ and hence $g_1(u) \cap g_1(v) = \emptyset$. Therefore $(u, v) \notin E(I_1)$.

Subcase 2.2: When $|k - i| \leq 1$. Since $k \neq i$ we have $k \bmod 2 \neq i \bmod 2$. If $i \bmod 2 = 0$ then $g_2(u) = [2, 3]$ and $g_2(v) = [0, 1]$. Hence $g_2(u) \cap g_2(v) = \emptyset$. If $i \bmod 2 = 1$ then $g_2(u) = [1, 2]$ and $g_2(v) = [3, 4]$. Hence $g_2(u) \cap g_2(v) = \emptyset$. In both cases we have $(u, v) \notin E(I_2)$.

Case 3: When $u, v \in V(\overline{P})$. We consider the following cases:

Subcase 3.1: When $u, v \in S$. Let $u \in S_i$ and $v \in S_j$. If $i = j$ then according to Observation 6, either $N_G(u) \cap S_{i-2} = \emptyset$ and $N_G(v) \cap S_{i+2} = \emptyset$ OR $N_G(v) \cap S_{i-2} = \emptyset$ and $N_G(u) \cap S_{i+2} = \emptyset$. If $N_G(u) \cap S_{i-2} = \emptyset$ and $N_G(v) \cap S_{i+2} = \emptyset$ then $r_1(v) = i < i + 1 = l_1(u)$. Hence $g_1(u) \cap g_1(v) = \emptyset$. If $N_G(v) \cap S_{i-2} = \emptyset$ and $N_G(u) \cap S_{i+2} = \emptyset$ then $r_1(u) = i < i + 1 = l_1(v)$. Hence $g_1(u) \cap g_1(v) = \emptyset$.

If $i \neq j$ then we consider the following cases. Without loss of generality we can assume that $j > i$.

Subcase 3.1.1: When $(j - i) \bmod 2 \neq 0$. It is easy to see that $g_2(u) \cap g_2(v) = \emptyset$.

Subcase 3.1.2: When $(j - i) \bmod 2 = 0$. We consider the following cases:

Subcase 3.1.2.1: When $j = i + 2$. We will show that either $N_G(u) \cap S_{i+2} = \emptyset$ or $N_G(v) \cap S_i = \emptyset$. If possible let $N_G(u) \cap S_{i+2} \neq \emptyset$ and $N_G(v) \cap S_i \neq \emptyset$. Let $p \in S_i$ and $q \in S_{i+2}$ be such that $(u, q) \in E(G)$ and $(v, p) \in E(G)$. Since $(u, v) \notin E(G)$ we have $u \neq p$ and $v \neq q$. But then we get a contradiction to Lemma 4. Therefore either $N_G(u) \cap S_{i+2} = \emptyset$ or $N_G(v) \cap S_i = \emptyset$. If $N_G(u) \cap S_{i+2} = \emptyset$ then $r_1(u) = i < i + \frac{3}{2} = j - \frac{1}{2} \leq l_1(v)$. Therefore $g_1(u) \cap g_1(v) = \emptyset$. On the other hand if $N_G(v) \cap S_i = \emptyset$ then $r_1(u) \leq i + \frac{3}{2} < j + 1 = l_1(v)$. Therefore $g_1(u) \cap g_1(v) = \emptyset$.

Subcase 3.1.2.2: When $j \geq i + 4$. Then $r_1(u) \leq i + \frac{3}{2} < (i + 4) - \frac{1}{2} \leq j - \frac{1}{2} \leq l_1(v)$. Therefore $g_1(u) \cap g_1(v) = \emptyset$.

Subcase 3.2: When $u \notin S$ and $v \notin S$. According to the construction of I_1 , it is easy to see that $\bigcup_{i=1}^d (S_i \setminus S)$ induces an independent set in I_1 . Therefore $g_1(u) \cap g_1(v) = \emptyset$.

Subcase 3.3: When $u \notin S$ and $v \in S$. In I_2 , $g_2(v)$ is either $[0, 1]$ or $[3, 4]$ and $g_2(u)$ is either $[\frac{5}{4}, \frac{7}{4}]$ or $[\frac{9}{4}, \frac{11}{4}]$. In all the four possible cases it is easy to see that $g_2(u) \cap g_2(v) = \emptyset$. \square

Combining Lemma 6,7 and 8 we have the following Theorem

Theorem 9. *If G is an AT-free graph having girth at least 5 then $\text{box}(G) \leq 2$.*

3.2 Tightness of Theorem 9

Let G be a cycle of length 5. It is easy to see that G is an AT-free graph having girth at least 5. According to Theorem 9, $\text{box}(G) \leq 2$. But clearly $\text{box}(G) = 2$, since G is not an interval graph. Therefore the upper bound given by Theorem 9 is tight.

4 Upper bound on cubicity of AT-free graphs

In this section we will show an upper bound on cubicity of AT-free graphs in terms of its boxicity and claw number. This in turn will give an upper bound in terms of chromatic number and claw number. Let G be an AT-free graph with chromatic number $\chi(G)$ and claw number $\psi(G)$. We need some results shown by Parra and Scheffler [24].

For any graph $G(V, E)$ and for a given pair of nonadjacent vertices $a, b \in V$, a subset $S \subset V \setminus \{a, b\}$ is a *a-b vertex separator* (*a-b separator* for short) if when S is removed from G , a and b belong to different connected components of $G \setminus S$. S is said to be a *minimal a-b separator* if no proper subset of S is an *a-b separator*. A separator S in G is said to be a *minimal separator* of G if there exists a pair of vertices $a, b \in V(G)$ such

that S is a minimal a - b separator. It is well-known that a graph is chordal if and only if all its minimal separators induce cliques [17].

Let S and T be two minimal separators of G . S is said to *cross* T if there are two components C, D of $G \setminus T$ such that S intersects both C and D . Parra and Scheffler [24] have shown that if S crosses T then T crosses S also. S and T are said to be *parallel* if they do not cross each other. Let \mathcal{S}_G denote the set of minimal separators in G . For $\mathcal{T} = \{S_1, S_2, \dots, S_k\} \subseteq \mathcal{S}_G$, let $G_{\mathcal{T}}$ denote the graph obtained by making each separator S_i for $1 \leq i \leq k$ a clique. The following Theorem is proved in [24].

Theorem 10. (Parra and Scheffler [24])

1. Let $\mathcal{T} = \{S_1, \dots, S_k\}$ be a maximal set of pairwise parallel minimal separators in G . Then $H = G_{\mathcal{T}}$ is a minimal triangulation of G and $\mathcal{S}_H = \mathcal{T}$.
2. Let H be a minimal triangulation of G . Then \mathcal{S}_H is a maximal set of pairwise parallel minimal separators in G and $H = G_{\mathcal{S}_H}$.

Let T be a minimal separator of G . A component C of $G \setminus T$ is called a *full component* if every vertex in T is adjacent to some vertex in C . The following property of minimal separator is shown in [17].

Theorem 11. (Golumbic [17]) *A separator T in graph G is minimal if and only if there are at least two full components in $G \setminus T$.*

Lemma 9. *Let X be a minimal separator in a graph G and C, D be two full components in $G \setminus X$. Let $x \in X$, $c \in C$ and $d \in D$. Let Y be another minimal separator of G such that $c \in Y$ and $x, d \notin Y$. If X is parallel to Y then x, d belongs to the same connected component in $G \setminus Y$.*

Proof. Suppose x and d lies in different connected components in $G \setminus Y$. Since D is a full component in $G \setminus X$, there exists a x - d path say P in $G[D \cup \{x\}]$. Now according to assumption, x and d lie in different components in $G \setminus Y$. Therefore Y must contain at least one vertex from P . But since $x \notin Y$ and all the vertices in P except x lie in D we have $Y \cap D \neq \emptyset$. Again $c \in Y \cap C$ and therefore $Y \cap C \neq \emptyset$. Hence Y crosses X , a contradiction. \square

Lemma 10. *If G is an AT-free graph and H is a minimal triangulation of G with claw number $\psi(H)$ then $\psi(H) \leq \psi(G)$.*

Proof. Suppose $\psi(H) > \psi(G)$ and $\psi(H) = p$. An edge $(u, v) \in E(H)$ is said to be an old edge if $(u, v) \in E(G)$ and is said to be a new edge otherwise. Among all the claws of maximum size in H , let $U = \{s, x_1, x_2, \dots, x_p\}$ induce the one with maximum number of old edges in it. Let s be the center of the claw. Since $\psi(H) > \psi(G)$ at least one of the edges in U has to be new. Without loss of generality let us assume that (s, x_1) is a

new edge. Let $\mathcal{T} = \{S_1, S_2, \dots, S_k\}$ be the collection of minimal separators of H . From part (2) of Theorem 10, \mathcal{T} is a maximal set of pairwise parallel minimal separators of G and $H = G_{\mathcal{T}}$. In other words if $(u, v) \in E(H) \setminus E(G)$ then there exists an $S_j \in \mathcal{T}$ such that both $u, v \in S_j$. Thus the vertices s, x_1 must belong to some minimal separator, say $X \in \mathcal{T}$ of G . Let \mathcal{C} be the set of full components in $G \setminus X$. According to Theorem 11, $|\mathcal{C}| \geq 2$. We consider the following two cases:

Case 1: *There exists a full component $C \in \mathcal{C}$ such that $C \cap \{x_2, x_3, \dots, x_p\} = \emptyset$.* Since C is a full component of $G \setminus X$ and $s \in X$ there is at least one vertex in C , say a such that $(s, a) \in E(G)$. Since $E(G) \subseteq E(H)$ we have $(s, a) \in E(H)$. Note that $(a, x_i) \notin E(G)$ for $2 \leq i \leq p$ because $C \cap \{s, x_1, x_2, \dots, x_p\} = \emptyset$ by assumption and $x_i \notin X$ for $2 \leq i \leq p$ since $x_1 \in X$ and X induces a clique in H . Then it is easy to see that $\{s, a, x_2, \dots, x_p\}$ forms a claw of size p in H having more old edges than in U since (s, x_1) is a new edge and (s, a) is an old edge. But by assumption U was a maximum sized claw having maximum number of old edges in it, a contradiction.

Case 2: *Every full component in \mathcal{C} contains at least one x_i where $2 \leq i \leq p$.* According to Theorem 11, $|\mathcal{C}| \geq 2$ and hence there exists two full components $C, D \in \mathcal{C}$. Let $x_i \in C$ and $x_j \in D$ where $2 \leq i < j \leq p$. We will show that the triplet $\{x_1, x_i, x_j\}$ forms an AT in G , leading to a contradiction. Since C is a full component of $G \setminus X$, $x_i \in C$ and $x_1 \in X$ there exists a x_i - x_1 path in $G[C \cup \{x_1\}]$ and this path does not intersect $N_G(x_j)$ since $x_j \in D$. Similarly since D is a full component of $G \setminus X$, $x_j \in D$ and $x_1 \in X$ there exists a x_j - x_1 path in $G[D \cup \{x_1\}]$ which does not intersect $N_G(x_i)$. Now we want to show that there exists a x_i - x_j path in G which does not intersect $N_G(x_1)$. For that we need the following claim:

Claim:

1. There exists a x_i - s path in G that does not intersect $N_G(x_1)$.
2. There exists a x_j - s path in G that does not intersect $N_G(x_1)$.

Proof. We prove only part (1) since the proof of part (2) is similar. Recall that (s, x_1) is a new edge by assumption. Since $\{x_1, x_2, \dots, x_p\}$ induce an independent set in H and $E(G) \subseteq E(H)$ they induce an independent set in G also. If $(s, x_i) \in E(G)$ we have a x_i - s path in G that does not intersect $N_G(x_1)$ since $(s, x_1) \notin E(G)$ and $(x_1, x_i) \notin E(G)$. Therefore we can assume that $(s, x_i) \notin E(G)$. Since (s, x_i) is a new edge by theorem 10 there should be a minimal separator $Y \in \mathcal{T}$ such that $s, x_i \in Y$. Clearly $X \neq Y$ since $x_i \notin X$. According to Theorem 10, X and Y are parallel and each separator in \mathcal{T} induces a clique in H . Since $(x_i, x_1) \notin E(H)$, $(x_i, x_j) \notin E(H)$ and $x_i \in Y$ we have $x_1 \notin Y$ and $x_j \notin Y$. Therefore according to Lemma 9, x_1 and x_j must belong to the same connected

component say Q of $G \setminus Y$. Let Q' be a full component of $G \setminus Y$ such that $Q' \neq Q$. Note that such a full component exists by Theorem 11. Now s and x_i must be connected in G to at least one vertex in Q' and therefore there is a x_i - s path in $G[Q' \cup \{x_i, s\}]$ which does not intersect $N_G(x_1)$. \square

Since $(s, x_1) \notin E(G)$ from the previous claim it is easy to see that there exists a x_i - x_j path in G which does not intersect $N_G(x_1)$. Therefore $\{x_1, x_i, x_j\}$ forms an asteroidal triple in G , a contradiction. \square

Theorem 12. *If G is an AT-free graph then $\text{cub}(G) \leq \text{box}(G)(\lceil \log_2 \psi(G) \rceil + 2) \leq \chi(G)(\lceil \log_2 \psi(G) \rceil + 2)$.*

Proof. Let $\text{box}(G) = k$ and I_1, I_2, \dots, I_k be interval graphs such that $G = \bigcap_{j=1}^k I_j$. It is easy to see that if we replace each I_j by a chordal graph I'_j such that $V(I_j) = V(I'_j)$ and $E(G) \subseteq E(I'_j) \subseteq E(I_j)$, we still have $G = \bigcap_{j=1}^k I'_j$. It follows that there exists chordal graphs I'_1, I'_2, \dots, I'_k such that $G = \bigcap_{j=1}^k I'_j$ where each I'_j is a minimal triangulation of G . But by Theorem 2 any minimal triangulation of an AT-free graph is an interval graph. It follows that I'_1, I'_2, \dots, I'_k are interval graphs. According to Lemma 10, $\psi(I'_j) \leq \psi(G)$ for $1 \leq j \leq k$. Since $G = \bigcap_{j=1}^k I'_j$ we have $\text{cub}(G) \leq \sum_{j=1}^k \text{cub}(I'_j)$ according to Fact 1. By Theorem 1, $\text{cub}(I'_j) \leq \lceil \log_2 \psi(I'_j) \rceil + 2$ and by Lemma 10, $\text{cub}(I'_j) \leq \lceil \log_2 \psi(G) \rceil + 2$ for $1 \leq j \leq k$. It follows that $\text{cub}(G) \leq k(\lceil \log_2 \psi(G) \rceil + 2) = \text{box}(G)(\lceil \log_2 \psi(G) \rceil + 2)$. Therefore $\text{cub}(G) \leq \text{box}(G)(\lceil \log_2 \psi(G) \rceil + 2)$. By Theorem 4, we also have $\text{cub}(G) \leq \chi(G)(\lceil \log_2 \psi(G) \rceil + 2)$. \square

From Theorem 9 and 12 we get the following:

Corollary 1. *If G is an AT-free graph having girth at least 5 then $\text{cub}(G) \leq 2 \lceil \log_2 \psi(G) \rceil + 4$.*

References

1. A. Adiga, L. S. Chandran, Cubicity of interval graphs and the claw number, manuscript, <http://arxiv.org/abs/0903.1197>, an abstract to appear in eurocomb 2009.
2. A. Adiga, L. S. Chandran, N. Sivadasan, Lower bounds for boxicity, manuscript, <http://arxiv.org/abs/0806.3175>.
3. S. Bellantoni, I. B.-A. Hartman, T. Przytycka, S. Whitesides, Grid intersection graphs and boxicity, Disc. Math. 114 (1-3) (1993) 41–49.
4. L. Chandran, A. Das, C. D. Shah, Cubicity, boxicity and vertex cover., Disc. Math. 309 (8) (2009) 2488–2496.
5. L. Chandran, N. Sivadasan, Geometric representation of graphs in low dimension using axis parallel boxes., Algorithmica DOI 10.1007/s00453-008-9163-5.
6. L. S. Chandran, M. C. Francis, N. Sivadasan, Representing graphs as the intersection of axis-parallel cubes, Accepted in MCDES 2008 (Managing Complexity in Distributed World, Division of Electrical Sciences, IISc- The IISc Centenary Conference.).

7. L. S. Chandran, M. C. Francis, N. Sivadasan, Boxicity and maximum degree, *J. Combin. Theory Ser. B* 98 (2) (2008) 443–445.
8. L. S. Chandran, C. Mannino, G. Oriolo, On the cubicity of certain graphs, *Inf. Process. Lett.* 94 (3) (2005) 113–118.
9. L. S. Chandran, N. Sivadasan, Boxicity and treewidth, *J. Combin. Theory Ser. B* 97 (5) (2007) 733–744.
10. Y. W. Chang, D. B. West, Interval number and boxicity of digraphs, in: *Proceedings of the 8th International Graph Theory Conf.*, 1998.
11. Y. W. Chang, D. B. West, Rectangle number for hyper cubes and complete multipartite graphs, in: *29th SE conf. Comb., Graph Th. and Comp., Congr. Numer.* 132, 1998.
12. D. G. Corneil, S. Olariu, L. Stewart, Asteroidal triple-free graphs, *SIAM J. Discrete Math.* 10 (3) (1997) 399–430.
13. D. G. Corneil, S. Olariu, L. Stewart, Linear time algorithms for dominating pairs in asteroidal triple-free graphs, *SIAM J. Comput.* 28 (4) (1999) 1284–1297.
14. M. B. Cozzens, F. S. Roberts, Computing the boxicity of a graph by covering its complement by cointerval graphs, *Disc. Appl. Math.* 6 (1983) 217–228.
15. L. Esperet, Boxicity of graphs with bounded degree., *European Journal of Combinatorics* 30 (5) (2009) 1277–1280.
16. R. B. Feinberg, The circular dimension of a graph, *Disc. Math.* 25 (1) (1979) 27–31.
17. M. C. Golumbic, *Algorithmic Graph Theory and Perfect Graphs*, Academic Press, New York, 1980.
18. T. Kloks, D. Kratsch, H. Müller, Approximating the bandwidth for asteroidal triple-free graphs, *J. Algorithms* 32 (1) (1999) 41–57.
19. J. Kratochvil, A special planar satisfiability problem and a consequence of its NP-completeness, *Disc. Appl. Math.* 52 (1994) 233–252.
20. L.C.Freeman, Spheres, cubes and boxes: graph dimensionality and network structure., in: *Social Networks* 5, 1983.
21. T. A. McKee, E. R. Scheinerman, On the chordality of a graph, *Journal of graph theory* 17 (2) (1993) 221–232.
22. R. H. Möhring, Triangulating graphs without asteroidal triples, *Discrete Applied Mathematics* 64 (3) (1996) 281–287.
23. R. Opsut, F. Roberts, On the fleet maintainence, mobile radio frequency, task assignment, and traffic phasing problems in g., in: *The Theory and Applications of Graphs*, Wiley New York, 1981.
24. A. Parra, P. Scheffler, Characterizations and algorithmic applications of chordal graph embeddings, *Discrete Applied Mathematics* 79 (1-3) (1997) 171–188.
25. F. S. Roberts, *Recent Progresses in Combinatorics*, chap. On the boxicity and Cubicity of a graph, Academic Press, New York, 1969, pp. 301–310.
26. F. S. Roberts, *Discrete mathematical models with applications to Social, Biological and Environmental Problems.*, Prentice-Hall, Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey, 1976.
27. E. R. Scheinerman, Intersection classes and multiple intersection parameters, Ph.D. thesis, Princeton University (1984).
28. C. Thomassen, Interval representations of planar graphs, *J. Combin. Theory Ser. B* 40 (1986) 9–20.
29. W. T. Trotter, Jr., D. B. West, Poset boxicity of graphs, *Disc. Math.* 64 (1) (1987) 105–107.
30. M. Yannakakis, The complexity of the partial order dimension problem, *SIAM J. Alg. Disc. Math.* 3 (3) (1982) 351–358.