

# Boxicity of Permutation Graphs

Diptendu Bhowmick <sup>\*</sup>; L. Sunil Chandran <sup>†</sup>

## Abstract

An axis parallel  $d$ -dimensional box is the cartesian product  $R_1 \times R_2 \times \dots \times R_d$  where each  $R_i$  is a closed interval on the real line. The *boxicity* of a graph  $G$ , denoted as  $box(G)$ , is the minimum integer  $d$  such that  $G$  can be represented as the intersection graph of a collection of  $d$ -dimensional boxes: that is two vertices are adjacent if and only if their corresponding boxes intersect. Permutation graphs form a well-known subclass of perfect graphs. A permutation graph is a graph that can be represented as the intersection graph of a family of line segments that connect two parallel lines in the Euclidean plane.

Let  $G$  be a permutation graph with chromatic number  $\chi(G)$  and maximum clique size  $\omega(G)$ . We will show that  $box(G) \leq \chi(G) = \omega(G)$  and this bound is tight.

**Key words:** Boxicity, Permutation Graph.

## 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*.

A  $k$ -dimensional box or  $k$ -box is the cartesian product  $R_1 \times R_2 \times \dots \times R_k$ , where each  $R_i$  is a closed interval on the real line. The boxicity of a graph  $G$  is defined to be the minimum integer  $k$  such that  $G$  is the intersection graph of a collection of  $k$ -boxes. Since 1-boxes are nothing but closed intervals on the real line, interval graphs are the graphs having boxicity 1.

The concept of boxicity was introduced by F. S. Roberts [5] in 1969. Boxicity finds applications in fields such as ecology and operations research: It is used as a measure of the complexity of ecological [10] and social [8] networks and has applications in fleet maintenance [9]. Boxicity has been investigated for various classes of graphs [3][11][12] and has been related with other parameters such as treewidth [13] and vertex cover [14]. Computing the boxicity of a graph was shown to be NP-hard by Cozzens [7]. This was later strengthened by Yannakakis [4], and finally by Kratochvil [6] who showed that deciding whether boxicity of a graph is at most two itself is NP-complete. Recently

---

<sup>\*</sup>Computer Science and Automation Department, Indian Institute of Science, Bangalore- 560012  
Email: diptendubhowmick@gmail.com

<sup>†</sup>Computer Science and Automation Department, Indian Institute of Science, Bangalore- 560012  
Email: sunil@csa.iisc.ernet.in

Chandran et al [15] showed that for any graph  $G$ ,  $box(G) \leq \chi(G^2)$  where  $G^2$  is the square of graph  $G$  and  $\chi(G)$  is the chromatic number of the graph. From this they inferred that  $box(G) \leq 2\Delta^2$ , where  $\Delta$  is the maximum degree of  $G$ . Very recently this result was improved by Esperet [16], who showed that  $box(G) \leq \Delta^2 + 2$ . In [17] Chandran et al have shown that  $box(G) \leq \lceil (\Delta + 2) \log n \rceil$  where  $n$  is the number of vertices in  $G$ .

### Permutation Graphs:

Let  $\Pi$  be a permutation of the numbers  $1, 2, \dots, n$ . Then the graph  $G[\Pi] = (V, E)$  is defined as follows:

$V = \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$  and  $(i, j) \in E \Leftrightarrow (i - j)(\Pi^{-1}(i) - \Pi^{-1}(j)) < 0$ , i.e.  $i$  and  $j$  occurs in the permutation in the reverse order.

An undirected graph  $G$  on  $n$  vertices is called a permutation graph if there exists a permutation  $\Pi$  of the numbers  $1, 2, \dots, n$  such that  $G \cong G[\Pi]$ .

From the above definition it is easy to see that permutation graph is the intersection graph of a family of line segments that connect two parallel lines in the Euclidean plane. It is well known that permutation graphs are a subclass of perfect graphs. It is also a proper subclass of co-comparability graphs, comparability graphs and AT free graphs. An undirected graph  $G$  is a permutation graph if and only if  $G$  and  $\overline{G}$  are comparability graphs.

Permutation graphs are also a subclass of circle graphs (A circle graph is a graph whose vertices can be associated with chords of a circle such that two vertices are adjacent if and only if the corresponding chords in the circle intersect). Permutation graph is a circle graph that admits an equator, i.e. an additional chord that intersects every other chord. See Golubic[1] for a brief introduction and references on permutation graphs.

### Remark on previous approach to boxicity of permutation graphs:

In [13] it has been shown that for any graph  $G$ ,  $box(G) \leq treewidth(G) + 2$ . It has been shown in [13] that if  $G$  is a co-comparability graph then  $treewidth(G) \leq 2\Delta - 1$  and hence  $box(G) \leq 2\Delta + 1$ . Since permutation graphs form a proper subclass of co-comparability graphs we can immediately infer that if  $G$  is a permutation graph then  $box(G) \leq 2\Delta + 1$ . But the result shown in this paper is much stronger.

## 1.1 Our results

Let  $G$  be a permutation graph having  $n$  vertices and maximum clique size  $\omega(G)$ . Since permutation graphs are proper subclass of perfect graphs  $G$  is also a perfect graph. Therefore chromatic number of  $G$  namely  $\chi(G)$  is same as maximum clique size i.e.  $\chi(G) = \omega(G)$ . In this paper we will show that  $box(G) \leq \chi(G) = \omega(G)$  and this bound is tight. Since  $\chi(G) \leq d + 1$ , where  $d$  is the degeneracy of the graph, it follows that  $box(G) \leq d + 1$ . Though it is known that in general  $box(G) \leq \chi(G^2)$ ,  $box(G)$  need not be always less than  $\chi(G)$ .

## 2 Preliminaries

Let  $G$  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  $E(G)$ . 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  $E(G) = E(G_1) \cap E(G_2)$ .

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

**Lemma 2.1.** (*Roberts[5]*) *The minimum  $k$  such that there exists an interval graph representation of  $G$  using  $k$  interval graphs  $I_1, I_2, \dots, I_k$  is the same as  $\text{box}(G)$ .*

### 3 The Proof

Let  $G(V, E)$  be a simple, finite, undirected permutation graph on  $n$  vertices. Let  $V(G) = \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$ . For any vertex  $v \in V(G)$  let  $N(v) = \{w \in V(G) \mid (v, w) \in E(G)\}$  be the set of neighbors of  $v$ . Let  $\Pi$  be the permutation of the vertices corresponding to  $G$ . So  $(u, v) \in E(G)$ , if and only if  $(u - v)(\Pi^{-1}(u) - \Pi^{-1}(v)) < 0$ . Let the chromatic number of the graph  $\chi(G) = k$ .

#### 3.1 Special Coloring

**Claim 1:** There exists a  $k$ -coloring of  $G$  such that the color classes  $C_0, C_1, \dots, C_{k-1}$  satisfy the following properties:

1.  $C_0$  is a maximal independent set in  $G$ . (i.e.  $\forall v \in V(G) - C_0, N(v) \cap C_0 \neq \emptyset$ ).
2. For  $1 \leq j \leq k-1$ ,  $C_j$  is a maximal independent set in  $G_j$ , where  $G_j$  is the induced subgraph of  $G$  on the vertex set  $V_j = V(G) - \bigcup_{i=0}^{j-1} C_i$ .

*Proof.* Let  $C_0, C_1, \dots, C_{k-1}$  be the color classes of an arbitrary  $k$ -coloring of  $G$ . Let  $V_0 = V(G)$ . We can get the color class  $C_0$  using the following procedure:

```

 $C_0 = C_0.$ 
while there exists a vertex  $v \in V_0 \setminus C_0$  such that  $N(v) \cap C_0 = \emptyset$  do
     $C_0 = C_0 \cup \{v\}.$ 
end while

```

Now let the color classes  $C_1, C_2, \dots, C_{k-1}$  be modified as follows.

```

for  $i=1$  to  $k-1$  do
     $C_i = C_i - C_0.$ 
end for

```

It is easy to verify that  $C_0$  is a maximal independent set in  $G$ . Now to get  $C_1$ , we repeat the same procedure taking  $V_1 = V - C_0$  in the place of  $V_0$  and initializing  $C_1 = C_1$ . The remaining color classes  $C_2, \dots, C_{k-1}$  can be obtained in a similar way.  $\square$

We shall construct one interval graph  $I_j$  corresponding to each color class  $C_j$  for  $0 \leq j < k$ . Let  $X_j = C_0 \cup C_1 \cup \dots \cup C_{j-1}$  where  $j > 0$  and  $Y_j = C_{j+1} \cup C_{j+2} \cup \dots \cup C_{k-1}$  where  $j < k-1$ . Also let  $C_j = \{u_1, u_2, \dots, u_p\}$  where  $p = |C_j|$ . Without loss of generality we can assume that  $u_1 < u_2 < \dots < u_p$ .

**Observation 1:**  $\Pi^{-1}(u_1) < \Pi^{-1}(u_2) < \dots < \Pi^{-1}(u_p)$ .

*Proof.* Note that  $C_j$  forms an independent set. Therefore for all  $i, j$  such that  $1 \leq i < j \leq |C_j|$ , it follows that  $(u_i - u_j)(\Pi^{-1}(u_i) - \Pi^{-1}(u_j)) > 0$ . Thus the claim follows.  $\square$

### 3.2 Index Set

The *index set*  $Ind_j(v)$  of a vertex  $v \in Y_j$  with respect to the set  $C_j$  is the set of indices of vertices in  $C_j$  to which  $v$  is adjacent i.e.  $Ind_j(v) = \{t : 1 \leq t \leq |C_j| \text{ and } (v, u_t) \in E(G)\}$ . Note that by Claim 1,  $Ind_j(v) \neq \emptyset$  for  $v \in Y_j$ . For  $v \in Y_j$ , *minimum index*  $l_j(v)$  of  $v$  with respect to the set  $C_j$  is defined to be  $\min(Ind_j(v))$  and *maximum index*  $r_j(v)$  with respect to the set  $C_j$  is defined to be  $\max(Ind_j(v))$ .

**Claim 2:** For  $v \in Y_j$ ,  $Ind_j(v) = \{t : l_j(v) \leq t \leq r_j(v)\}$ .

*Proof.* Let  $l = l_j(v)$  and  $r = r_j(v)$ . In view of the definition of  $l_j(v)$  and  $r_j(v)$  we need only to show that  $(v, u_t) \in E(G)$  for all  $t$  where  $l < t < r$ . We consider the following two cases

**Case 1:** When  $v < u_l$ . Now  $v < u_l < u_t < u_r$ . Since  $(v, u_r) \in E(G)$  we have  $\Pi^{-1}(v) > \Pi^{-1}(u_r) > \Pi^{-1}(u_t)$ . Thus  $v < u_t$  and  $\Pi^{-1}(v) > \Pi^{-1}(u_t)$  and hence  $(v, u_t) \in E(G)$ .

**Case 2:** When  $v > u_l$ . Since  $(v, u_l) \in E(G)$  we have  $\Pi^{-1}(v) < \Pi^{-1}(u_l)$  and therefore  $\Pi^{-1}(v) < \Pi^{-1}(u_r)$ . Now since  $(v, u_r) \in E(G)$  we have  $v > u_r$  and therefore  $v > u_t$ . Recalling that  $\Pi^{-1}(v) < \Pi^{-1}(u_l) < \Pi^{-1}(u_t)$ , we infer  $(v, u_t) \in E(G)$ .  $\square$

**Claim 3:** If  $x, y \in Y_j$  (where  $x \neq y$ ) and  $l_j(y) > r_j(x) + 1$  then  $(x, y) \notin E(G)$ .

*Proof.* Let  $l_x = l_j(x)$  and  $r_x = r_j(x)$ . Also let  $l_y = l_j(y)$  and  $r_y = r_j(y)$ . Assume that  $(r_x + 1) < l_y$ . Suppose for contradiction  $(x, y) \in E(G)$ . We consider the following cases:

**Case 1:** When  $x < y$ . Then  $\Pi^{-1}(x) > \Pi^{-1}(y)$ . If  $x < u_{l_x}$  clearly  $x < u_{r_x+1}$ . Since  $(x, u_{r_x+1}) \notin E(G)$  we can infer that  $\Pi^{-1}(x) < \Pi^{-1}(u_{r_x+1})$ . On the other hand if  $x > u_{l_x}$  we have  $\Pi^{-1}(x) < \Pi^{-1}(u_{l_x})$  since  $(x, u_{l_x}) \in E(G)$ . We again infer that  $\Pi^{-1}(x) < \Pi^{-1}(u_{r_x+1})$ .

In both cases we have  $\Pi^{-1}(y) < \Pi^{-1}(x) < \Pi^{-1}(u_{r_x+1}) < \Pi^{-1}(u_{r_y})$ . But since  $(y, u_{r_y}) \in E(G)$  and  $\Pi^{-1}(y) < \Pi^{-1}(u_{r_y})$  we have  $y > u_{r_y} > u_{r_x+1}$ . Hence  $(y, u_{r_x+1}) \in E(G)$ . Therefore  $(r_x + 1) \in Ind_j(y) \implies (r_x + 1) \geq l_y$ , a contradiction.

**Case 2:** When  $x > y$ . Then  $\Pi^{-1}(x) < \Pi^{-1}(y)$ . If  $x < u_{l_x}$  then we have  $x < u_{r_x+1}$ . On the other hand if  $x > u_{l_x}$  then we have  $\Pi^{-1}(x) < \Pi^{-1}(u_{l_x})$  since  $(x, u_{l_x}) \in E(G)$ . It follows that  $\Pi^{-1}(x) < \Pi^{-1}(u_{r_x+1})$ . Since  $(x, u_{r_x+1}) \notin E(G)$  we have  $x < u_{r_x+1}$ . Thus in both cases we have  $y < x < u_{r_x+1}$ . But since  $(y, u_{r_y}) \in E(G)$  and  $y < u_{r_x+1} < u_{r_y}$  we have  $\Pi^{-1}(y) > \Pi^{-1}(u_{r_y}) > \Pi^{-1}(u_{r_x+1})$ . Hence  $(y, u_{r_x+1}) \in E(G)$ . Therefore  $(r_x + 1) \in Ind_j(y) \implies (r_x + 1) \geq l_y$ , a contradiction.  $\square$

### 3.3 Interval Graph Construction

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

$$\begin{aligned}
g_j(v) &= [i, i] && \text{if } v \in C_j \text{ and } v = u_i \\
&= [1, n] && \text{if } v \in X_j \\
&= [l_j(v) - \frac{1}{2}, r_j(v) + \frac{1}{2}] && \text{if } v \in Y_j
\end{aligned}$$

**Lemma 3.1.** *For each interval graph  $I_j$  where  $0 \leq j < k$ ,  $E(G) \subseteq E(I_j)$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $(x, y) \in E(G)$ . We consider the following cases

**Case 1:** *When  $x \in C_j$  and  $y \in Y_j$ .* Let  $x = u_i$  for some  $i$  where  $1 \leq i \leq |C_j|$ . Now  $l_j(y) \leq i \leq r_j(y)$ . Since  $g_j(x) = [i, i]$  and  $g_j(y) = [l_j(y) - \frac{1}{2}, r_j(y) + \frac{1}{2}]$  we have  $g_j(x) \cap g_j(y) \neq \emptyset$ .

**Case 2:** *When  $x, y \in Y_j$ .* Without loss of generality we can assume that  $l_j(x) \leq l_j(y)$ . By Claim 3,  $l_j(y) \leq r_j(x) + 1$ . Since  $g_j(x) = [l_j(x) - \frac{1}{2}, r_j(x) + \frac{1}{2}]$  and  $g_j(y) = [l_j(y) - \frac{1}{2}, r_j(y) + \frac{1}{2}]$  we have  $g_j(x) \cap g_j(y) \neq \emptyset$ .

**Case 3:** *When either  $x \in X_j$  or  $y \in X_j$ .* Without loss of generality we can assume that  $x \in X_j$ . Now since  $g_j(x) = [1, n]$ , for all  $y \in V(G)$  we have  $g_j(x) \cap g_j(y) \neq \emptyset$ .  $\square$

**Lemma 3.2.** *For any  $(x, y) \notin E(G)$ ,  $\exists j$ ,  $0 \leq j < k$ , such that  $(x, y) \notin E(I_j)$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $x \in C_j$  where  $0 \leq j < k$ . We consider the following cases

**Case 1:** *When  $y \in C_j$ .* Let  $x = u_q$  and  $y = u_s$ . Now in  $I_j$ ,  $g_j(x) = [q, q]$  and  $g_j(y) = [s, s]$ . Since  $q \neq s$  we have  $(x, y) \notin E(I_j)$ .

**Case 2:** *When  $y \notin C_j$ .* Let  $y \in C_i$ . Without loss of generality we can assume that  $i > j$  and therefore  $y \in Y_j$ . Let  $x = u_q$ . By Claim 2, either  $q < l_j(y)$  or  $q > r_j(y)$ . Recall that  $g_j(x) = [q, q]$  and  $g_j(y) = [l_j(y) - \frac{1}{2}, r_j(y) + \frac{1}{2}]$ . Now if  $q < l_j(y)$  then  $l_j(y) - \frac{1}{2} \geq (q + 1) - \frac{1}{2} > q$ . Hence  $g_j(x) \cap g_j(y) = \emptyset$ . If  $q > r_j(y)$  then  $r_j(y) + \frac{1}{2} \leq (q - 1) + \frac{1}{2} < q$ . Hence  $g_j(x) \cap g_j(y) = \emptyset$  and therefore  $(x, y) \notin E(I_j)$ .  $\square$

Combining Lemma 3.1 and 3.2 we have the following Theorem.

**Theorem 3.3.** *For a permutation graph  $G$ ,  $\text{box}(G) \leq \chi(G)$ .*

### 3.4 Tightness of Theorem 3.3

Let  $G = \overline{(\frac{n}{2})K_2}$ , the complement of the perfect matching on  $n$  vertices (We will assume that  $n$  is even). It is easy to see that this is a permutation graph. Since the chromatic number of this graph is  $\frac{n}{2}$ , we have  $\text{box}(G) \leq \frac{n}{2}$  by Theorem 3.3. But it is known that  $\text{box}(G) = \frac{n}{2}$  [5]. So the upper bound for boxicity given in Theorem 3.3 is tight for  $\overline{(\frac{n}{2})K_2}$ .

## References

- [1] Martin C Golumbic. *Algorithmic Graph Theory And Perfect Graphs*. Academic Press, New York, 1980.
- [2] Reinhard Deistel. Graph Theory. *volume 173, Springer Verlag, New York, 2 edition, 2000*, 97(5):733–744, September 2007.

- [3] E. R. Scheinerman. Intersection classes and multiple intersection parameters. Ph. D thesis, Princeton University, 1984.
- [4] Mihalis Yannakakis. The complexity of the partial order dimension problem. *SIAM Journal on Algebraic Discrete Methods*, 3:351–358, 1982.
- [5] F. S. Roberts. *Recent Progresses in Combinatorics*, chapter On the boxicity and Cubicity of a graph, pages 301–310. Academic Press, New York, 1969.
- [6] J. Kratochvíl. A special planar satisfiability problem and a consequence of its NP-completeness. *Discrete Applied Mathematics*, 52:233–252, 1994.
- [7] M.B.Cozzens and F.S.Roberts. Computing the boxicity of a graph by covering its complement by cointerval graphs. *Discrete Applied Mathematics*, 6:217–228, 1983.
- [8] L.C.Freeman. Spheres, cubes and boxes: graph dimensionality and network structure. *Social Networks* 5, 139-156, 1983.
- [9] R.J. Opsut and F.S. Roberts. On the fleet maintainence, mobile radio frequency, task assignment, and traffic phasing problems in G. *The Theory and Applications of Graphs*, Wiley New York, 479-492, 1981.
- [10] F. S. Roberts. *Discrete mathematical models with applications to Social, Biological and Environmental Problems*. Prentice-Hall, Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey, 1976.
- [11] M.B. Cozzens and F. S. Roberts. *Computing the boxicity of a graph by covering its complement by cointerval graphs*. *Discrete Applied Math.* 6 (1983) 217-228.
- [12] C. Thomassen. *Interval representation of planar graphs*. *J. Combin. Theory Ser. B* 40 (1986) 9-20.
- [13] L.S. Chandran and N.Sivdasan. *Boxicity and treewidth*. *J. Combin. Theory Ser. B* 97(5) (2007) 733-744.
- [14] L.S. Chandran, Anita Das and Chintan D. Shah. *Cubicity, boxicity and vertex cover*. To appear in *Discrete mathematics*. DOI 10.1016/j.disc.2008.06.003
- [15] L.S. Chandran, M.C. Francis and N. Sivdasan. *Boxicity and maximum degree*. *J. Combin. Theory Ser. B* 98 (2008) 443-445.
- [16] Louis Esperet. *Boxicity of graphs with bounded degree*. To appear in *European Journal of Combinatorics*.
- [17] L.S. Chandran and N. Sivdasan. *Geometric representation of graphs in low dimension using axis parallel boxes*. To appear in *Algorithmica*. DOI 10.1007/s00453-008-9163-5