

Minimal obstructions to (∞, k) -polarity in cographs^{*}

F. Esteban Contreras-Mendoza^a, César Hernández-Cruz^{a,*}

^a*Facultad de Ciencias
Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México
Av. Universidad 3000, Circuito Exterior S/N
C.P. 04510, Ciudad Universitaria, CDMX, México*

Abstract

A graph is a cograph if it does not contain a 4-vertex path as an induced subgraph. An (s, k) -polar partition of a graph G is a partition (A, B) of its vertex set such that A induces a complete multipartite graph with at most s parts, and B induces the disjoint union of at most k cliques with no other edges. A graph G is said to be (s, k) -polar if it admits an (s, k) -polar partition. The concepts of (s, ∞) -, (∞, k) -, and (∞, ∞) -polar graphs can be analogously defined.

Ekim, Mahadev and de Werra pioneered in the research on polar cographs, obtaining forbidden induced subgraph characterizations for (∞, ∞) -polar cographs, as well as for the union of $(\infty, 1)$ - and $(1, \infty)$ -polar cographs. Recently, a recursive procedure for generating the list of cograph minimal $(s, 1)$ -polar obstructions for any fixed integer s was found, as well as the complete list of $(\infty, 1)$ -polar obstructions. In addition to these results, complete lists of minimal (s, k) -polar cograph obstructions are known only for the pair $(2, 2)$.

In this work we are concerned with the problem of characterizing (∞, k) -polar cographs for a fixed k through a finite family of forbidden induced subgraphs. As our main result, we provide complete lists of forbidden induced subgraphs for the cases $k = 2$ and $k = 3$. Additionally, we provide a partial recursive construction for the general case. By considering graph complements, these results extend to (s, ∞) -polar cographs.

Keywords: Polar graph, cograph, forbidden subgraph characterization, matrix partition, generalized colouring

2000 MSC: 05C69, 05C70, 05C75, 68R10

1 Introduction

All graphs in this paper are considered to be finite and simple. We refer the reader to [1] for basic terminology and notation. In particular, we use P_k and C_k to denote the path

^{*}This research was supported by the SEP-CONACYT grant A1-S-8397, the CONACYT FORDECYT-PRONACES/39570/2020 grant and the DGAPA-PAPIIT grant IA104521.

^{*}Corresponding author

Email addresses: `esteban.contreras@ciencias.unam.mx` (F. Esteban Contreras-Mendoza), `chc@ciencias.unam.mx` (César Hernández-Cruz)

and cycle on k vertices, respectively. We also use \overline{G} and $G[X]$ to denote the complement of a graph G and the subgraph of G induced by the vertex set X , respectively.

Cographs have been independently defined by several authors since the 1970's. The original definition of cograph was introduced by Corneil, Lerchs and Stewart Burlingham in [6]; it is based on the following recursive criteria: K_1 is a cograph; if G is a cograph, then its complement \overline{G} is also a cograph; if G and H are cographs, so is their disjoint union. One of the best known characterizations of cographs is that they are precisely the P_4 -free graphs (graphs without P_4 as an induced subgraph).

Alternatively, cographs can be defined as graphs that can be constructed from single vertex graphs by means of disjoint-union and join operations. In [6] a special rooted tree was introduced to represent a cograph G : the leaf vertices are associated with the vertices of G , and each internal node is labeled 0 or 1 indicating the operation, join or disjoint-union, performed on the cographs associated with their children, respectively. Furthermore, this tree must be such that the nodes in a root-leaf path have alternating labels for ensuring that each cograph is associated with only one of these trees. Such a tree is called the *cotree* associated with G .

A graph property is said to be *hereditary* if every induced subgraph of a graph with such property also has the property. In [8], Peter Damaschke proved that every hereditary property can be characterized by a finite family of forbidden induced subgraphs when restricted to cographs. Thus, finding the family of minimal forbidden induced subgraphs characterizing a given hereditary property in the class of cographs comes as a natural problem.

A *cluster* is the complement of a complete multipartite graph, and, for a non-negative integer k , a k -*cluster* is a cluster with at most k components. Given non-negative integers s and k , we define an (s, k) -*polar partition* of a graph G to be a partition (A, B) of V_G such that A induces a complete s -partite graph and B induces a k -cluster. If a graph admits an (s, k) -polar partition, we will say that it is (s, k) -*polar*. We will use ∞ instead of s , k or both, to indicate that the number of parts in the multipartite graph, or the number of components in the cluster, respectively, is unbounded. Hence, we will say that a graph G is an (s, ∞) -polar graph if its vertex set admits a partition (A, B) where A is a complete s -partite graph, and B is a cluster; such partition is an (s, ∞) -polar partition. The concepts of (∞, k) - and (∞, ∞) -polar graphs and partitions are analogously defined. A *polar graph* is just an (∞, ∞) -polar graph.

Clearly, for $s, k \in \mathbb{Z}^+ \cup \{0, \infty\}$, having an (s, k) -polar partition is a hereditary property, and thus, as we have already mentioned, (s, k) -polar cographs can be characterized by a finite family of forbidden induced subgraphs¹. A *cograph (s, k) -polar obstruction* is a cograph which is not (s, k) -polar, and a *cograph minimal (s, k) -polar obstruction* is a cograph (s, k) -polar obstruction such that every proper induced subgraph is (s, k) -polar.

Chernyak and Chernyak proved in [7] that determining whether a graph is polar is an \mathcal{NP} -complete problem, in [13] Farrugia proved that the problem remains \mathcal{NP} -complete for $(1, \infty)$ -polar graphs, and Churchley and Huang proved in [5] that the latter problem remains

¹This observation also follows from the results in [15], in the context of matrix partitions of cographs.

\mathcal{NP} -complete even when restricted to triangle-free graphs. In contrast, the results on sparse-density partitions in [14] imply that for any fixed integers s and k , (s, k) -polar graphs can be recognized in polynomial time. Recognition and minimal obstructions for polar graphs have been studied for other graph classes, e.g., chordal graphs [10], permutation graphs [9], or graphs having a polar line graph [4]. In [18], several other families are studied for the complexity of the recognition problem for polar and $(1, \infty)$ -polar graphs; in particular, families having a polynomial $(1, \infty)$ -polar recognition problem together with a small subfamily having an \mathcal{NP} -complete polar recognition problem are presented.

In terms of minimal obstructions, for very small values of s and k the minimal (s, k) -polar obstructions are well known; a graph is $(0, k)$ -polar if and only if it is a disjoint union of at most k -cliques, it is $(s, 0)$ -polar if and only if it is a complete s -partite graph, and it is $(1, 1)$ -polar if and only if it is a split graph. It was shown by Foldes and Hammer [16] that a graph is split if and only if it is $\{2K_2, C_4, C_5\}$ -free; it is folklore that a graph is a disjoint union of at most k -cliques if and only if its independence number is at most k and it is P_3 -free, which by complementation implies that a graph is a complete s -partite graph if and only if it is $\{K_{s+1}, \overline{P_3}\}$ -free.

In this work we focus on cograph minimal obstructions for (s, k) -polarity. Ekim, Mahadev and de Werra proved in [11] that there are only eight cograph minimal polar obstructions, and sixteen cograph minimal (s, k) -polar obstructions when $\min\{s, k\} = 1$, [12]. Hell, Hernández-Cruz and Linhares-Sales proved in [17], that there are 48 cograph minimal $(2, 2)$ -polar obstructions. The exhaustive list of nine cograph minimal $(2, 1)$ -polar obstructions was found by Bravo, Nogueira, Protti and Vianna, [2]. Recently, Contreras-Mendoza and Hernández-Cruz exhibited a simple recursive characterization to obtain all the cograph minimal $(s, 1)$ -polar obstructions for an arbitrary integer s , as well as the complete list of cograph minimal $(\infty, 1)$ -polar obstructions [3].

We provide a partial recursive characterization for cograph minimal (∞, k) -polar obstructions. We also exhibit complete lists of cograph minimal (∞, k) -polar obstructions for $k = 2$ and $k = 3$. By taking complements it is trivial to obtain analogous results for (s, ∞) -polar cographs.

We say that a component of G is *trivial* or an *isolated vertex* if it is isomorphic to K_1 . Given graphs G and H , the disjoint union of G and H is denoted by $G + H$, and the join of G and H is denoted by $G \oplus H$. Thus, the sum of n disjoint copies of G is denoted by nG .

Let k, c, i be integers such that $0 \leq i < c \leq k + 2$. We say that a cograph minimal (∞, k) -polar obstruction has *type* (c, i) if it has exactly c connected components and precisely i of them are trivial. We divide the types in three main classes: type $(c, 0)$, which corresponds to obstructions without isolated vertices, type $(c, c - 1)$, associated with obstructions that have precisely one non-trivial component, and the rest of the types, that contain obstructions with at least one isolated vertex and at least one complete component of order 2.

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, we introduce some previously known results and use them to characterize connected cograph minimal (∞, k) -polar obstructions. Sections 3 and 4 are devoted to the study of the structure of $(c, 0)$ - and $(c, c - 1)$ -type obstructions, respectively; a recursive characterization for the obstructions of type $(c, 0)$ is

given. In Section 5 we establish a pleasant simple characterization for the rest of the cograph minimal (∞, k) -polar obstructions. Finally, in Section 6 we prove our main results, we exhibit complete lists of cograph minimal (∞, k) -polar obstructions for the cases $k = 2$ and $k = 3$. Conclusions and future lines of work are presented in Section 7.

2 Preliminary results

We begin this section introducing three previously-known results concerning the characterizations of $(1, \infty)$ -, (∞, ∞) -, and $(1, s)$ -polar cographs for a fixed positive integer s . Such results will be helpful in the development of various of our results.

Theorem 1 (Contreras-Mendoza & Hernández-Cruz, [3]). *A graph G is a cograph minimal $(1, \infty)$ -polar obstruction if and only if G is isomorphic to one of the graphs depicted in Figure 1.*




Figure 1: $(1, \infty)$ -polar obstructions.

Theorem 2 (Ekim, Mahadev & de Werra, [11]). *A graph G is a cograph minimal polar obstruction if and only if G or its complement is isomorphic to $P_3 + H$, where H is any cograph minimal $(1, \infty)$ -polar obstruction.*

Theorem 3 (Contreras-Mendoza & Hernández-Cruz, [3]). *Let s be an integer, $s \geq 2$.*

1. *The graph G is a connected cograph minimal $(1, s)$ -polar obstruction if and only if G is either a cograph minimal $(1, \infty)$ -polar obstruction or it is isomorphic to $K_{s+1, s+1}, \overline{K_2} \oplus (K_2 + sK_1)$, or $K_1 \oplus (2K_2 + (s - 1)K_1)$.*
2. *The graph G is a disconnected cograph minimal $(1, s)$ -polar obstruction if and only if there exists a positive integer t and non-negative integers s_0, s_1, \dots, s_t such that $G = G_0 + \dots + G_t$, where G_i is a connected cograph minimal $(1, s_i)$ -polar obstruction that is not a cograph minimal $(1, \infty)$ -polar obstruction, and $s = t + \sum_{i=0}^t s_i$.*

Note that if G is a cluster such that, either G has at most $k + 1$ components, or G has at most k non-trivial components, then G is an (∞, k) -polar graph. Hence, every cograph minimal (∞, k) -polar obstruction that is a cluster, has at least $k + 2$ components and at least $k + 1$ of them are non-trivial. In consequence, we have the following useful observation.

Remark 4. *Let k be an integer. Up to isomorphism, the graph $K_1 + (k + 1)K_2$ is the only cograph minimal (∞, k) -polar obstruction that is a cluster.*

The following lemma is a slight modification of Lemma 1 in [17]; the proof is very similar, and thus will be omitted.

Lemma 5. *Let k be a non-negative integer, and let G be a cograph minimal (∞, k) -polar obstruction. Then*

1. G has at most $k + 2$ connected components,
2. G has at least one non-trivial component,
3. G has at most $k + 1$ trivial components,
4. if G has at least one trivial component, then G has at most one non-complete component,
5. every complete component of G has order one or two.

We finish this section by characterizing connected cograph minimal (∞, k) -polar obstructions for every integer k such that $k \geq 2$. The $(\infty, 0)$ -polar cographs are precisely the complete multipartite graphs, and it is well known that the only cograph minimal $(\infty, 0)$ -polar obstruction is \overline{P}_3 . Furthermore, from Theorem 1, all the cograph minimal $(\infty, 1)$ -polar obstructions are disconnected. Thus, for $k \leq 1$, there exist no connected cograph minimal (∞, k) -polar obstructions. In contrast, for $k \geq 2$ there such minimal connected obstructions exist, and there is a fixed number of them as we show below.

Theorem 6. *Let k be an integer, $k \geq 2$, and let G be a disconnected graph. Then, G is a cograph minimal (k, ∞) -polar obstruction if and only if G is a cograph minimal polar obstruction.*

Equivalently, G is a connected cograph minimal (∞, k) -polar obstruction if and only if G is a connected cograph minimal polar obstruction.

Proof. Suppose that G is a disconnected cograph minimal (k, ∞) -polar obstruction. Note that, by the minimality of G , if K is a complete component of G , then $G - K$ is a (k, ∞) -polar graph, and thus also is G , which is absurd. Hence, every component of G is non-complete. Moreover, since G is not a $(1, \infty)$ -polar graph, then G contains a cograph minimal $(1, \infty)$ -polar obstruction G' as an induced subgraph. From Theorem 1, G' is connected, so it is completely contained in a single component of G . Thus, since G has no complete components, G contains $G' + P_3$ as an induced subgraph, but by Theorem 2, $G' + P_3$ is a not (k, ∞) -polar, so $G = G' + P_3$, which proves that G is a cograph minimal polar obstruction. The converse implication follows easily from Theorems 1 and 2. The second statement is an immediate consequence, because a graph G is a connected cograph minimal (s, k) -polar obstruction if and only if its complement, \overline{G} , is a disconnected cograph minimal (k, s) -polar obstruction. \square

3 Type $(c, 0)$ obstructions

Since we have already characterized the connected cograph minimal (∞, k) -polar obstructions, we are now only concerned within the disconnected obstructions. Recall that the cograph minimal obstructions of type $(c, 0)$ are those without isolated vertices. We begin our study of this type noticing some restrictions on their connected components.

Lemma 7. *Let k be an integer, $k \geq 2$, and let G be a disconnected cograph minimal (∞, k) -polar obstruction without isolated vertices. Then, G has at least two non-complete components.*

Proof. Let G be as in the hypothesis. From Remark 4, we have that G is not a cluster, so G has at least one non-complete component. Suppose for a contradiction that G has precisely one non-complete component. Then, by Lemma 5, for some integer $j \in \{1, \dots, k + 1\}$, $G \cong jK_2 + H$, where H is a connected non-complete graph. Note that since G is not an (∞, k) -polar graph, H is not an $(\infty, k - j)$ -polar graph.

Let v be a vertex of H , and suppose that $H - v$ is not a cluster. Thus, for every (∞, k) -polar partition (A, B) of $G - v$, $A \cap V_{H-v} \neq \emptyset$, which implies that $(A \cap V_{H-v}, B \cap V_{H-v})$ is an $(\infty, k - j)$ -polar partition of $H - v$. Hence, for each vertex v of H , $H - v$ is either a cluster or an $(\infty, k - j)$ -polar graph.

Since H is not an $(\infty, k - j)$ -polar graph, H contains a cograph minimal $(\infty, k - j)$ -polar obstruction H' as an induced subgraph. Nevertheless, by Theorem 6, if H' is connected, then it is a cograph minimal (∞, k) -polar obstruction, in contradiction with the minimality of G . Thus H' is a disconnected induced subgraph of the connected cograph H . Let v be a vertex of $H - H'$. Since H' is an induced subgraph of $H - v$, we have that $H - v$ is not an $(\infty, k - j)$ -polar graph, which implies that $H - v$ and H' are clusters. However, from Remark 4, H' is isomorphic to $K_1 + (k - j + 1)K_2$, but in such a case G properly contains $K_1 + (k + 1)K_2$ as an induced subgraph, contradicting its minimality. The contradiction arose from supposing that G has no more than one non-complete component, so G must have at least two non-complete components. \square

The following lemma characterizes a family of graphs with some properties that are common to all cograph minimal (∞, k) -polar obstructions without isolated vertices. It will be very useful for giving recursive constructions of such obstructions.

Lemma 8. *Let k be a positive integer, and let H be a cograph. Then, H is such that*

1. H is not a cluster,
2. H is $(1, k)$ -polar, but not $(1, k - 1)$ -polar, and
3. for each vertex v of H , the graph $H - v$ is either a $(1, k - 1)$ -polar graph or a cluster,

if and only if exactly one of the following statements is satisfied:

- a. H is a cograph minimal $(1, k - 1)$ -polar obstruction, that is neither a cograph minimal $(1, \infty)$ -polar obstruction nor isomorphic to kK_2 .

b. $H \cong P_3 + (k - 1)K_2$.

c. $k \geq 2$, and $H \cong (k - 2)K_2 + (K_1 \oplus 2K_2)$.

Proof. Let H be a cograph that satisfies items 1 to 3. Since H is a cograph, we have from item 2 that H contains a cograph minimal $(1, k - 1)$ -polar obstruction H' . Observe that, since H is not a cluster but it is $(1, k)$ -polar, if $H = H'$ then it satisfies item a.

Let K be a complete component of H (if any). We claim that K has order two. From item 3, for every vertex w of K , $H - w$ admits a $(1, k - 1)$ -polar partition (A, B) . If K is a trivial graph, then $(A \cup \{w\}, B)$ is a $(1, k - 1)$ -polar partition of H , which is impossible. Else, if K has order at least three, then $V_{K-w} \cap B \neq \emptyset$ (otherwise $A = V_{K-w}$ and B covers $H - K$, which cannot occur since $H - K$ is not a cluster), and then $(A, B \cup \{w\})$ is a $(1, k - 1)$ -polar partition of H , a contradiction. Therefore, every complete component of H is isomorphic to K_2 .

Suppose that H properly contains a cograph minimal $(1, k - 1)$ -polar obstruction as an induced subgraph. It implies that there exists a vertex v of H such that $H - v$ is not a $(1, k - 1)$ -polar graph, and from item 3, $H - v$ is a cluster. Note that from item 1, H has a subgraph P isomorphic to P_3 , and that v is necessarily a vertex of P , or $H - v$ would not be a cluster.

Let v and P be as described above, then we have two cases: either $d_P(v) = 1$ or $d_P(v) = 2$. Suppose first that $d_P(v) = 1$. Since H is a cograph and $d_P(v) = 1$, v is adjacent to exactly one component of the cluster $H - v$, and therefore $H \cong jK_2 + (K_a \oplus (v + K_b))$ for some positive integers a and b and some non-negative integer j . Moreover, since H is not a $(1, k - 1)$ -polar graph, $j \geq k - 1$, but if $j > k - 1$ then H contains $(k + 1)K_2$ as a proper induced subgraph, and then it is not a $(1, k)$ -polar graph, contradicting our assumptions. Thus, $j = k - 1$, and $H \cong (k - 1)K_2 + (K_a \oplus (v + K_b))$. Observe that H contains $H' \cong P_3 + (k - 1)K_2$ as an induced subgraph, and H' is neither $(1, k - 1)$ -polar nor a cluster. Therefore, by item 3, $H \cong P_3 + (k - 1)K_2$, that is, H satisfies item b.

For the second case, suppose that $d_P(v) = 2$. Note that since v is adjacent to at least two components of the cluster $H - v$, then v is completely adjacent or completely not-adjacent to each component of $H - v$, and therefore, it is completely adjacent to at least two components of $H - v$. Let K be a component of $H - v$ that is completely adjacent to v , and suppose for a contradiction that K has more than two vertices: if w is a vertex of K , then $H - w$ is not a cluster, so it admits a $(1, k - 1)$ -polar partition (A, B) and therefore $(A, B \cup \{w\})$ is a $(1, k)$ -polar partition of H , a contradiction. Hence, every component of $H - v$ that is completely adjacent to v has at most two vertices, and in consequence H is isomorphic to $qK_2 + (v \oplus (\ell K_2 + mK_1))$ for some non-negative integers ℓ, m and q such that $\ell + m \geq 2$.

Observe that if $\ell + q \geq k + 1$ then H contains $(k + 1)K_2$ as an induced subgraph, and then H is not a $(1, k)$ -polar cograph, contradicting our hypothesis. Therefore, $\ell + q \leq k$. Furthermore, since $H - v$ is a cluster that is not a $(1, k - 1)$ -polar graph, it contains a cograph minimal $(1, k - 1)$ -polar obstruction H' that is a cluster as an induced subgraph. Nevertheless, the only cograph minimal $(1, k - 1)$ -polar obstruction that is a cluster is $H' \cong kK_2$. The above observation implies that $\ell + q \geq k$, so we have that $\ell + q = k$.

It is straightforward to show that if $\ell \leq 1$, then H has $P_3 + (k-1)K_2$ as a proper induced subgraph, which is impossible as we have noted when proving the case $d_P(v) = 1$. Thus, $\ell \geq 2$. Furthermore, note that the component of H that contains v is a $(1, \ell+m)$ -polar graph that is not a $(1, \ell+m-1)$ -polar graph, which implies that H is a $(1, k+m)$ -polar graph that admits no $(1, k+m-1)$ -polar partitions. However, by hypothesis H is a $(1, k)$ -polar graph that is not a $(1, k-1)$ -polar graph, so we have that $m = 0$, and then $H \cong (k-\ell)K_2 + (v \oplus \ell K_2)$. Suppose for a contradiction that $\ell \geq 3$, and let w be a vertex of H adjacent to v . Since $H - w$ is not a cluster, it is a $(1, k-1)$ -polar graph, and therefore the component of $H - w$ that contains v is $(1, \ell-1)$ -polar, but this is impossible since such component is isomorphic to $K_1 \oplus ((\ell-1)K_2 + K_1)$ which contains the cograph minimal $(1, \ell-1)$ -polar obstruction $K_1 \oplus (2K_2 + (\ell-2)K_1)$ as an induced subgraph. Hence, $\ell = 2$ and $H \cong (k-2)K_2 + (K_1 \oplus 2K_2)$, so item *c.* is satisfied.

To prove that the graphs described in items *b.* and *c.* satisfy the sentences of items 1, 2, and 3 is a simple routine work. The analogous result for graphs described in item *a.* follows from Theorem 3. \square

It also will be useful to know when do the graphs described in the above lemma posses some specific properties. The following remark identifies some interesting cases. The proof is straightforward and thus omitted.

Remark 9. *Let k be an integer and, let H be a cograph.*

1. *Suppose that H is a cograph minimal $(1, k-1)$ -polar obstruction that is neither a cograph minimal $(1, \infty)$ -polar obstruction nor isomorphic to kK_2 . Then, H is an $(\infty, k-1)$ -polar graph if and only if H has precisely one component non-isomorphic to K_2 .*
2. *The graph H , with $H \cong P_3 + (k-1)K_2$ is a $(2, k-1)$ -polar graph, and for each vertex v of H , $H - v$ is either a $(1, k-1)$ -polar graph or it is isomorphic to kK_2 .*
3. *The graph H , with $H \cong (k-2)K_2 + (K_1 \oplus 2K_2)$ is a $(3, k-1)$ -polar graph, and for each vertex v of H , $H - v$ is either a $(1, k-1)$ -polar graph or it is isomorphic to kK_2 .*

It results convenient to divide the study of disconnected cograph minimal (∞, k) -polar obstructions without isolated vertices into two cases, depending on whether some component is isomorphic to P_3 . We start by treating the case in which the graphs have not components isomorphic to P_3 .

Lemma 10. *Let k be a non-negative integer, and let G be a graph without components isomorphic to P_3 . Then, G is a disconnected cograph minimal (∞, k) -polar obstruction without isolated vertices if and only if there exist positive integers k_1 and k_2 , and cographs H_1 and H_2 such that $G = H_1 + H_2$, and for $i \in \{1, 2\}$, the following statements are satisfied:*

1. *H_i is not a cluster,*
2. *H_i is a $(1, k_i)$ -polar graph that admits no $(1, k_i - 1)$ -polar partitions,*

3. for each vertex v of H_i , the graph $H_i - v$ is either a $(1, k_i - 1)$ -polar graph or a cluster,
4. for $j \in \{1, 2\}$ such that $j \neq i$, if H_i is not a cograph minimal $(1, k_i - 1)$ -polar obstruction, then H_j is an $(\infty, k_j - 1)$ -polar graph, and
5. $k = k_1 + k_2 - 1$.

Proof. Suppose that G is a disconnected cograph minimal (∞, k) -polar obstruction without isolated vertices. From Lemma 7, G has at least two non-complete components, say G_1 and G_2 . Let $H_1 = G_1$ and $H_2 = G - G_1$. Evidently, $G = H_1 + H_2$ and both, H_1 and H_2 , are cographs that are not clusters.

Let $\{i, j\} = \{1, 2\}$. Observe that, since G_j is a non-complete component of G and G has no components isomorphic to P_3 , there exists a vertex v of H_j such that $H_j - v$ is not a cluster. In addition, by the minimality of G , $G - v$ admits an (∞, k) -polar partition (A, B) , but $G - v = H_i + (H_j - v)$, so $G - v$ has at least two non-complete components, and therefore (A, B) is a $(1, k)$ -polar partition. Furthermore, since H_i contains P_3 as an induced subgraph, it is not a $(1, 0)$ -polar graph. The above observations imply that there exists an integer $k_i \in \{1, \dots, k - 1\}$ such that H_i is a $(1, k_i)$ -polar graph that is not $(1, k_i - 1)$ -polar. Note that G is a $(1, k_1 + k_2)$ -polar graph that is not (∞, k) -polar, which implies that $k \leq k_1 + k_2 - 1$.

Let v be a vertex of H_i , and let (A, B) be an (∞, k) -polar partition of $G - v$. If $H_i - v$ is not a cluster, and given that H_j is neither, (A, B) is a $(1, k)$ -polar partition, and since H_j is not a $(1, k_j - 1)$ -polar graph, then $(A \cap V_{H_i - v}, B \cap V_{H_i - v})$ is a $(1, k - k_j)$ -polar partition, which implies that $H_i - v$ is a $(1, k_i - 1)$ -polar graph, because $k - k_j \leq k_i - 1$. Therefore, for each vertex v of H_i , the graph $H_i - v$ is either a cluster or a $(1, k_i - 1)$ -polar graph.

Suppose that H_i is not a cograph minimal $(1, k_i - 1)$ -polar obstruction. Since H_i is not a $(1, k_i - 1)$ -polar graph, it follows from Lemma 8 and Remark 9 that there exists a vertex v of H_i for which $H_i - v \cong k_i K_2$. Let (A, B) be an (∞, k) -polar partition of $G - v$. The graph H_j is not a cluster, so we have that $A \cap V_{H_j} \neq \emptyset$, and then $(A \cap V_{H_j}, B \cap V_{H_j})$ is an $(\infty, k - k_i)$ -polar partition of H_j , and therefore H_j is an $(\infty, k_j - 1)$ -polar graph, because $k - k_i \leq k_j - 1$. Hence, if H_i is not a cograph minimal $(1, k_i - 1)$ -polar obstruction, then H_j is an $(\infty, k_j - 1)$ -polar graph.

So far, we have only shown that $k \leq k_1 + k_2 - 1$. To prove the equality, we will show that G is not a cograph minimal (∞, j) -polar obstruction for $j \leq k_1 + k_2 - 2$, which implies that $k \geq k_1 + k_2 - 1$.

It follows from Lemma 8 that $k_i \geq 2$, and by construction we have that $k_i \leq k - 1$. The above observations imply that if $k \leq 2$, then there exist no (∞, k) -polar obstructions without isolated vertices or components isomorphic to P_3 , so we can assume that $k \geq 3$. Suppose, to reach a contradiction, that $k < k_1 + k_2 - 1$, in which case at least one of k_1 and k_2 is greater than or equal to three. Let us assume without loss of generality that $k_1 \geq 3$.

Since $k_1 \geq 3$ we have from Theorem 3 and Lemma 8 that H_1 contains, as a proper induced subgraph, a cograph H'_1 which is not a cluster and such that it is a $(1, k_1 - 1)$ -polar graph but it is not $(1, k_1 - 2)$ -polar. Observe that the cograph $G' = H'_1 + H_2$ is not an $(\infty, k_1 + k_2 - 2)$ -polar graph, because since neither H'_1 nor H_2 are clusters, every $(\infty, k_1 + k_2 - 2)$ -polar partition of G' is a $(1, k_1 + k_2 - 2)$ -polar partition, which is impossible

since H_1 is not $(1, k_1 - 2)$ -polar and H_2 is not $(1, k_2 - 1)$ -polar. Therefore G has a cograph $(\infty, k_1 + k_2 - 2)$ -polar obstruction as a proper induced subgraph, and then G is not a cograph minimal (∞, j) -polar obstruction for $j < k_1 + k_2 - 2$. As we have mentioned, it proves that $k = k_1 + k_2 - 1$, which is absurd since we are supposing that $k < k_1 + k_2 - 1$. Thus, $k = k_1 + k_2 - 1$ as we intended. This finalizes the proof of the first implication of the proposition.

For the converse implication let us suppose that $G = H_1 + H_2$ is a cograph without components isomorphic to P_3 such that, for some positive integers k_1 and k_2 and any election of $i, j \in \{1, 2\}$, $i \neq j$, the graphs H_i and H_j satisfy the enumerated items of this lemma's statement.

Suppose for a contradiction that G admits an (∞, k) -polar partition (A, B) . Since H_1 and H_2 are not clusters and $k = k_1 + k_2 - 1$, (A, B) is a $(1, k_1 + k_2 - 1)$ -polar partition of G , but this is impossible since for hypothesis H_i is not a $(1, k_i - 1)$ -polar cograph for any $i \in \{1, 2\}$. Thus G is not an (∞, k) -polar graph.

Let v be a vertex of G , let us suppose without loss of generality that $v \in V_{H_1}$. If $H_1 - v$ admits a $(1, k_1 - 1)$ -polar partition (A_1, B_1) , then, for any $(1, k_2)$ -polar partition (A_2, B_2) of H_2 , $(A_1 \cup A_2, B_1 \cup B_2)$ is a $(1, k)$ -polar partition of $G - v$. Otherwise, if $H_1 - v$ is not a $(1, k_1 - 1)$ -polar graph, by item 3 we have that $H_1 - v$ is a cluster, and by Lemma 8 and Remark 9 it has exactly k_1 components. In addition, by item 4, H_2 is an $(\infty, k_2 - 1)$ -polar graph. Thus, if (A_1, B_1) is a $(0, k_1)$ -polar partition of $H_1 - v$ and (A_2, B_2) is an $(\infty, k_2 - 1)$ -polar partition of H_2 , then $(A_1 \cup A_2, B_1 \cup B_2)$ is an (∞, k) -polar partition of $G - v$. Hence, G is a cograph minimal (∞, k) -polar obstruction. Evidently, G is a disconnected graph, and it follows from Lemma 8 that G has no isolated vertices. \square

Based on Lemma 8, Remark 9, and Lemma 10 it is straightforward to deduce the following recursive construction of cograph minimal (∞, k) -polar obstructions without isolated vertices nor components isomorphic to P_3 .

Theorem 11. *Let k be a positive integer, and let G be a graph without components isomorphic to P_3 . Then, G is a disconnected cograph minimal (∞, k) -polar obstruction without isolated vertices if and only for some positive integers k_1 and k_2 , and some cographs H_1 and H_2 ,*

1. $G = H_1 + H_2$,
2. $k = k_1 + k_2 - 1$,
3. for $i \in \{1, 2\}$, H_i is either a cograph minimal $(1, k_i - 1)$ -polar obstruction that is neither a cograph minimal $(1, \infty)$ -polar obstruction nor isomorphic to $k_i K_2$, or $k_i \geq 2$ and $H_i \cong (k_i - 2)K_2 + (K_1 \oplus 2K_2)$, and
4. if $H_i \cong (k_i - 2)K_2 + (K_1 \oplus 2K_2)$ and $G - H_i$ is a cograph minimal $(1, k_i - 1)$ -polar obstruction, then $G - H_i$ has exactly one component non-isomorphic to K_2 .

We now turn our attention to cograph minimal (∞, k) -polar obstructions without isolated vertices that have some component isomorphic to P_3 . We begin with a technical characterization of such family of graphs, followed by two lemmas that treat with specific subcases, and finalize with a recursive construction for these obstructions. It is worth noticing that, by Lemma 12, any cograph minimal (∞, k) -polar obstruction with a component isomorphic to P_3 has no isolated vertices.

Lemma 12. *Let k be a positive integer, and let G be a graph with at least one component isomorphic to P_3 . Then G is a cograph minimal (∞, k) -polar obstruction if and only if $G \cong P_3 + H$, where H is a cograph that satisfies the following statements:*

1. H is not a $(1, k - 1)$ -polar graph,
2. H is not a cluster,
3. H is an $(\infty, k - 1)$ -polar graph,
4. H is either a $(1, k)$ -polar graph or an $(\infty, k - 2)$ -polar graph, and
5. for each vertex v of H , the graph $H - v$ is either a $(1, k - 1)$ -polar graph or a k -cluster.

Proof. Suppose that G is a cograph minimal (∞, k) -polar obstruction with a component isomorphic to P_3 , and let H be such that $G \cong P_3 + H$. Note that H can not be a $(1, k - 1)$ -polar graph, because P_3 is a $(1, 1)$ -polar graph, and then G would be a $(1, k)$ -polar graph.

To prove that H is not a cluster we will first prove by means of a contradiction that H has no isolated vertices. If H has at least one isolated vertex, we have from Lemma 5 that for some positive integers p and q , G is isomorphic to $pK_1 + qK_2 + P_3$, but in such a case G is a $(1, q + 1)$ -polar graph, which implies that $k \leq q$. Furthermore, for each integer $j \in \{2, \dots, q\}$, G contains the cograph minimal (∞, j) -polar obstruction $K_1 + (j + 1)K_2$ as a proper induced subgraph, which implies that $k \leq 1$. But it is impossible, since the cograph minimal (∞, k) -polar obstructions for $k \leq 1$ have no components isomorphic to P_3 . Hence, H has no isolated vertices, and if H is a cluster, then for some positive integer q , $G \cong qK_2 + P_3$. We have that $q \geq k + 1$ because G is not an (∞, k) -polar graph, but then G contains the cograph minimal (∞, k) -polar obstruction $K_1 + (k + 1)K_2$ as a proper induced subgraph, in contradiction with the minimality of G . This contradiction arose from supposing that H is a cluster, so it is not.

Items 3 to 5 can be easily proved by considering (∞, k) -polar partitions of $G - v$ when v is either a vertex of $G - H$, or when v is a vertex of H . We have used similar arguments before, so the details of these arguments are omitted. Also, the proof of the converse implication is very similar to the proof of the converse of Lemma 10, so it will be also omitted. \square

Lemma 13. *Let k be a positive integer, and let $G \cong P_3 + H$ be a cograph minimal (∞, k) -polar obstruction. If H is not a $(1, k)$ -polar graph, then H is a connected non-complete graph.*

Proof. Let k, G and H be as in the hypothesis. By Lemma 12, H is not a cluster, so H has at least one non-complete component. Moreover, it also follows from Lemma 12 that H is an $(\infty, k-1)$ -polar graph that is not $(1, k-1)$ -polar, which implies that H cannot have more than one non-complete component. Therefore, H has precisely one non-complete component. In addition, since H is an induced subgraph of G , it follows from Lemma 5 that every non-complete component of H is isomorphic to K_1 or K_2 . Moreover, it also follows from Lemma 5 that H has no isolated vertices, otherwise G would have at most one non-complete component, which is not the case. Hence, for some non-negative integer ℓ , $H \cong \ell K_2 + H'$, where H' is a connected non-complete graph.

Suppose that $\ell \geq 1$, and let $v \in V_{H-H'}$. Note that since $H' \leq H - v$, we have that $H - v$ is not a cluster. Hence, by Lemma 12, we have that $H - v$ admits a $(1, k-1)$ -polar partition (A, B) . But in such case, $(A, B \cup \{v\})$ is a $(1, k)$ -polar partition of H , which is impossible from our original hypotheses. The contradiction arose from supposing that $\ell \geq 1$, so $\ell = 0$ and then $H = H'$, which proves that H is a connected non-complete graph. \square

The next trivial observation will be helpful in some of the following results. It is immediate from the cotree representation of cographs.

Remark 14. *Let H be a connected cograph, and let H' be a disconnected induced subgraph of H . Then $K_1 \oplus H'$ is also an induced subgraph of H .*

Lemma 15. *Let k be a positive integer, and let G be a graph with at least one component isomorphic to P_3 .*

1. *If $k = 2$ then, G is a cograph minimal (∞, k) -polar obstruction of type $(2, 0)$ if and only if $G \cong P_3 + C_4$ or $G \cong P_3 + (K_1 \oplus 2K_2)$.*
2. *If $k \geq 3$ then, G is a cograph minimal (∞, k) -polar obstruction of type $(2, 0)$ if and only if $G \cong P_3 + H$, where H is any connected cograph minimal $(1, k-1)$ -polar obstruction.*

Proof. We prove only the second statement, the case $k = 2$ can be treated in a very similar way. Suppose that H is any connected cograph minimal $(1, k-1)$ -polar obstruction. Since $k \geq 3$, we have from Theorems 1 and 3 that H is isomorphic to one cograph in the set

$$\{K_1 \oplus C_4, K_2 \oplus 2K_2, \overline{2P_3}, K_1 \oplus (K_2 + P_3), K_{k,k}, \overline{K_2} \oplus (K_2 + (k-1)K_1), K_1 \oplus (2K_2 + (k-2)K_1)\}.$$

It is straightforward to check that in any case H satisfies the items enumerated in Lemma 12, which implies that $P_3 + H$ is a cograph minimal (∞, k) -polar obstruction of type $(2, 0)$.

Conversely, let suppose that G is a cograph minimal (∞, k) -polar obstruction of type $(2, 0)$. From Lemma 12, $G \cong P_3 + H$ where H is a connected non-complete cograph that contains a cograph minimal $(1, k-1)$ -polar obstruction H' as an induced subgraph. As we just mentioned, if H' is connected, then $P_3 + H'$ is a cograph minimal (∞, k) -polar obstruction, so $H = H'$. Otherwise, if H' is disconnected, it follows from Remark 14 that H contains $K_1 \oplus H'$ as an induced subgraph. Nevertheless, from Theorem 3 and Lemma 12, $H' \cong kK_2$, but in this case H contains properly the connected cograph minimal $(1, k-1)$ -polar obstruction $K_1 \oplus (2K_2 + (k-2)K_1)$ as an induced subgraph, which contradicts the minimality of G . \square

Theorem 16. *Let k be an integer, $k \geq 2$, and let G be a graph with at least one component isomorphic to P_3 . Then, G is a cograph minimal (∞, k) -polar obstruction if and only if $G \cong P_3 + H$ and one of the following statements is satisfied:*

1. $H \cong P_3 + (k - 1)K_2$.
2. $H \cong (k - 2)K_2 + (K_1 \oplus 2K_2)$.
3. *for some integer $j \in \{1, \dots, k - 1\}$, $H \cong (k - j - 1)K_2 + H_j$, where H_j is a connected cograph minimal $(1, j)$ -polar obstruction that is not a cograph minimal $(1, \infty)$ -polar obstruction.*
4. $k \geq 3$, and H is any cograph minimal $(1, \infty)$ -polar obstruction.

Proof. Suppose that $G \cong P_3 + H$ is a cograph minimal (∞, k) -polar obstruction. From Lemmas 8 and 12, and Remark 9, we have that if H is a $(1, k)$ -polar graph, then H satisfies one of the following statements:

- a. $H \cong P_3 + (k - 1)K_2$.
- b. $k \geq 2$, and $H \cong (k - 2)K_2 + (K_1 \oplus 2K_2)$.
- c. H is a cograph minimal $(1, k - 1)$ -polar obstruction, that is neither a cograph minimal $(1, \infty)$ -polar obstruction nor isomorphic to kK_2 , and such that exactly one of its components is not isomorphic to K_2 .

Furthermore, from Theorem 3 we have that the graphs described in item c are precisely the graphs H such that, for some integer $j \in \{1, \dots, k - 1\}$, $H \cong (k - j - 1)K_2 + H_j$, where H_j is a connected cograph minimal $(1, j)$ -polar obstruction that is not a cograph minimal $(1, \infty)$ -polar obstruction.

Suppose then that H is not a $(1, k)$ -polar graph. It follows from Lemma 13 that H is a connected non-complete graph, and then G is a cograph minimal (∞, k) -polar obstruction of type $(2, 0)$, and then it follows from Lemma 15 that H satisfies item 3 or item 4 of the theorem statement.

The converse follows easily from Lemmas 8, 12, 15, and Remark 9. □

4 Obstructions of type $(c, c - 1)$

So far, we have obtained a recursive characterization of cograph minimal (∞, k) -polar obstructions without isolated vertices. Next, we focus on the special case of cograph minimal (∞, k) -polar obstructions such that all its components, except one, are trivial. We begin giving a technical characterization of these obstructions. The proof of this result is omitted since it is very similar to that of Lemma 12.

Lemma 17. *Let j and k be integers such that $0 \leq j + 1 \leq k$. Then, G is a cograph minimal (∞, k) -polar obstruction of type $(k - j + 1, k - j)$ if and only if $G \cong (k - j)K_1 + H$, where H is a connected non-complete cograph that satisfies the following statements:*

1. H is not a $(1, k)$ -polar graph,
2. H is not an (∞, j) -polar graph,
3. H is an $(\infty, j + 1)$ -polar graph,
4. for each vertex v of H , $H - v$ is either $(1, k)$ -polar or (∞, j) -polar.

The following result provides a pleasant recursive characterization of cograph minimal (∞, k) -polar obstructions of type $(2, 1)$.

Theorem 18. *Let k be an integer, $k \geq 2$, and let G be a graph with precisely two connected components, one of them trivial. Then G is a cograph minimal (∞, k) -polar obstruction if and only if $G \cong K_1 + (K_1 \oplus H')$, where H' is a disconnected cograph minimal $(\infty, k - 1)$ -polar obstruction that is $(1, k)$ -polar.*

Proof. Let $H = K_1 \oplus H'$, where H' is a disconnected cograph minimal $(\infty, k - 1)$ -polar obstruction that is $(1, k)$ -polar, and let $G = K_1 + H$. Observe that by the election of H' , H is an (∞, k) -polar graph that is not $(1, k)$ -polar, and for each vertex v of H , the graph $H - v$ is either $(1, k)$ - or $(\infty, k - 1)$ -polar.

Let us suppose for a contradiction that G admits an (∞, k) -polar partition (A, B) . Since H is not $(1, k)$ -polar, $G[A]$ must be a non-trivial connected graph. Thus, since H is not complete, $A \subseteq V_H$ and H is an $(\infty, k - 1)$ -polar graph, which is impossible. Therefore G is not an (∞, k) -polar graph.

Let v be a vertex of G . If v is the only isolated vertex of G , then $G - v = H$, and H is an (∞, k) -polar graph, so $G - v$ is. Otherwise $v \in V_H$ and, as we have noted above, $H - v$ is either $(1, k)$ - or $(\infty, k - 1)$ -polar, so $G - v$ is an (∞, k) -polar graph. Hence, $G \cong K_1 + (K_1 \oplus H')$ is a cograph minimal (∞, k) -polar obstruction whenever H' is a cograph minimal $(\infty, k - 1)$ -polar obstruction that is $(1, k)$ -polar.

Conversely, suppose that G is a cograph minimal (∞, k) -polar obstruction with precisely two connected components, one of them trivial. By Lemma 17, $G \cong K_1 + H$ for some connected cograph H that is not $(\infty, k - 1)$ -polar, and such that for every vertex v of H , $H - v$ is either $(1, k)$ - or $(\infty, k - 1)$ -polar. Note that H contains a cograph minimal $(\infty, k - 1)$ -polar obstruction H' as an induced subgraph, but from Theorem 6, H' can not be connected, or H' would be a proper induced subgraph of G that is not an (∞, k) -polar graph, an absurd. Thus, H' must be disconnected, and from Remark 14, $K_1 \oplus H' \leq H$. But in such a case G contains the cograph minimal (∞, k) -polar obstruction $K_1 + (K_1 \oplus H')$ as an induced subgraph, so $G \cong K_1 + (K_1 \oplus H')$. \square

Notice that, by Lemma 17, a graph G is a cograph minimal (∞, k) -polar obstruction of type $(k + 2, k + 1)$ if and only if $G \cong (k + 1)K_1 + H$, where H is a connected non-complete cograph minimal $(1, k)$ -polar obstruction that is a complete multipartite graph. Moreover, from Theorem 3, for any integer k , $k \geq 2$, the only cograph minimal $(1, k)$ -polar obstructions that are complete multipartite graphs are $K_{k+1, k+1}$ and $K_1 \oplus C_4$. Thus, the following result follows immediately from Lemma 17.

Theorem 19. *Let k be an integer, $k \geq 2$. Thus, G is a cograph minimal (∞, k) -polar obstruction of type $(k + 2, k + 1)$ if and only if $G \cong (k + 1)K_1 + H$, where H is isomorphic to $K_{k+1, k+1}$ or to $K_1 \oplus C_4$.*

Unfortunately, obtaining explicit lists of disconnected cograph minimal (∞, k) -polar obstructions with precisely one non-trivial component is a very difficult task. As we have shown above, a simple recursive construction of $(2, 1)$ - and $(k + 2, k + 1)$ -type obstructions is possible, but as we show below, it is not enough for covering the general case.

The following three lemmas are auxiliary results that will be the cornerstone for obtaining explicit lists of cograph minimal (∞, k) -polar obstructions of types $(k + 1, k)$ and $(k, k - 1)$. The three of them are based on the same proof technique: we consider all the distinct ways in which a connected cograph can be generated from another connected cograph whose cotree has specific characteristics. For the sake of length, we only sketch the proof of the first proposition, the other two are very similar.

Lemma 20. *Let k be an integer, $k \geq 2$, and let H be a complete multipartite graph with at least two parts and such that each part has at least $k + 1$ vertices. If H' is a connected cograph of order $V_H + 1$ that contains H as an induced subgraph, then exactly one of the following sentences is satisfied:*

1. *H' is a complete multipartite graph with at least two parts and such that each part has at least $k + 1$ vertices.*
2. *H' contains $\overline{K_2} \oplus (K_2 + kK_1)$ or $K_1 \oplus C_4$ as an induced subgraph.*

Proof. Let k, H and H' be as in the hypotheses.

Note that the cotree of H is a rooted tree (T, r) of height two, such that r is labeled 1, r has at least two children, and each of them is the parent of at least $k + 1$ leaves. Then, by the properties of cotrees, the cotree of H' is a rooted tree (T', r) with exactly one more leaf than T , that contains T as an induced tree.

It can be verified that a tree T' as described above is necessarily the result of one of the following modifications on T : (a) adding a new leaf x as a child of r , (b) adding a new leaf x as a child of a child of r , (c) for a child c of r , deleting a child ℓ of c , adding a child c' to c , and adding to c' the leaf ℓ and a new leaf x , (d) for a child c of r with t children, and $s \in \{2, \dots, t - 1\}$, deleting the children ℓ_1, \dots, ℓ_s of c , adding a child c' to c , adding a new leaf x as a child of c' , adding a child c'' to c' , and adding the leaves ℓ_1, \dots, ℓ_s as children of c'' , or (e) supposing r has t children, for an integer $s \in \{2, \dots, t - 1\}$, deleting the children c_1, \dots, c_s of r (each with its own children), adding a child c' to r , adding a new leaf x to c' , adding a child c'' to c , and adding the vertices c_1, \dots, c_s (with its children) as children of c'' .

It is straightforward to corroborate that such modifications on T correspond to the following modifications on H :

- a. Add a universal vertex to H .
- b. Add a false twin to a vertex of H .

- c. Add a true twin to a vertex of H .
- d. Add a vertex v to H in such a way that v is completely adjacent to every part of H , except for a part P , and v is adjacent to at least two vertices in P but it is not adjacent to every vertex of P .
- e. Add a vertex v to H in such a way that v is completely non-adjacent to at least two parts of H , and it is completely adjacent to at least one part of H .

Then, if H' corresponds to the operation described in c, then H has $\overline{K_2} \oplus (K_2 + kK_1)$ as a proper induced subgraph, while if H corresponds to an operation described in items a, d, or e, then H' contains $K_1 \oplus C_4$ as an induced subgraph, and if H' is obtained from the operation described in item b, then H is a complete multipartite graph with at least two parts and such that each part contains at least $k + 1$ vertices. \square

Lemma 21. *Let H be a complete multipartite graph with at least three parts and such that at least two of them have more than one vertex. If H' is a connected cograph obtained by adding a new vertex to H , then exactly one of the following conditions is satisfied:*

1. H' is a complete multipartite graph.
2. H' contains, as an induced subgraph, at least one of the following cographs: $K_1 \oplus (K_1 + C_4)$, $\overline{K_2} \oplus (K_1 + P_3)$, or $K_1 \oplus (\overline{P_3 + K_2})$.

Lemma 22. *Let k be an integer, $k \geq 3$, and let H be a connected $(1, k)$ -polar cograph that contains $K_1 \oplus (2K_2 + K_1)$ as an induced subgraph. If H' is a connected cograph obtained by adding a new vertex to H , then some of the following sentences is satisfied:*

1. H' is a $(1, k)$ -polar cograph.
2. H' contains some of the following cographs as an induced subgraph: $K_1 \oplus (2K_2 + (k - 1)K_1)$, $K_2 \oplus (2K_2 + K_1)$, $K_1 \oplus (P_3 + \overline{P_3})$, $K_1 \oplus (K_2 + \overline{K_1 + P_3})$, or $K_1 \oplus (K_1 + (K_1 \oplus 2K_2))$.

Now we are ready to give explicit lists of cograph minimal (∞, k) -polar obstructions of types $(k + 1, k)$ and $(k, k - 1)$. As we have mentioned above, these lists are directly based on the previous lemmas.

Corollary 23. *Let k be an integer, $k \geq 2$. Then, G is a cograph minimal (∞, k) -polar obstruction of type $(k + 1, k)$ if and only if $G \cong kK_1 + H$, where H is isomorphic to some cograph of the set:*

$$\{\overline{2P_3}, (P_3 + K_2) \oplus K_1, 2K_2 \oplus K_2, K_1 \oplus (C_4 + K_1), K_1 \oplus \overline{P_3 + K_2}, \overline{K_2} \oplus (P_3 + K_1), \overline{K_2} \oplus (K_2 + kK_1)\}.$$

Proof. By Lemma 17, it is routine to verify that if H is isomorphic to some of the listed graphs, then $kK_1 + H$ is a cograph minimal (∞, k) -polar obstruction. For the converse, let us consider G , a cograph minimal (∞, k) -polar obstruction of type $(k + 1, k)$. By Lemma 17 we have that $G \cong kK_1 + H$, where H is a connected non-complete cograph that contains

a cograph minimal $(1, k)$ -polar obstruction H' as an induced subgraph, and such that for each vertex $v \in V_H$, $H - v$ is either a $(1, k)$ -polar graph or a complete multipartite graph. In addition, by Theorem 3 we know that every disconnected cograph minimal $(1, k)$ -polar obstruction is not a complete multipartite graph, which implies from Remark 14 that H' can not be disconnected. Then, since $k \geq 2$, we have that H' is either isomorphic to some graph of the set $\{K_{k+1, k+1}, K_1 \oplus (2K_2 + (k-1)K_1), \overline{K_2} \oplus (K_2 + kK_1)\}$, or it is isomorphic to some $(1, \infty)$ -polar obstruction, that is, to some graph of the set $\{K_1 \oplus C_4, K_2 \oplus 2K_2, \overline{2P_3}, K_1 \oplus (P_3 + K_2)\}$.

We observed at the beginning of this proof that if H' is isomorphic to $K_2 \oplus 2K_2, \overline{2P_3}, K_1 \oplus (P_3 + K_2)$ or $\overline{K_2} \oplus (K_2 + kK_1)$, then $kK_1 + H'$ is a cograph minimal (∞, k) -polar obstruction, so in this cases $H = H'$. Furthermore, since $k \geq 2$, Lemma 17 implies that $G' \cong (k-1)K_1 + K_1 \oplus (2K_2 + (k-1)K_1)$ is a cograph minimal (∞, k) -polar obstruction. In consequence, $H' \not\cong K_1 \oplus (2K_2 + (k-1)K_1)$, or G would contain G' as a proper induced subgraph, a contradiction.

Thus, we have only two remaining cases, $H' \cong K_1 \oplus C_4$, or $H' \cong K_{k+1, k+1}$. Note that in both cases, H' is a complete multipartite graph, and by Lemma 17 H is not a complete multipartite graph, so H' must be a proper induced subgraph of H . Furthermore, by Theorem 19, in both cases, $G' \cong (k+1)K_1 + H'$ is a cograph minimal (∞, k) -polar obstruction, which implies that for each vertex $v \in V_{H-H'}$, v is adjacent to some vertex of H' .

Suppose that $H' \cong K_1 \oplus C_4$. As we have mentioned before, it is straightforward to show that $kK_1 + K_1 \oplus (C_4 + K_1)$, $kK_1 + K_1 \oplus \overline{P_3 + K_2}$ and $kK_1 + \overline{K_2} \oplus (P_3 + K_1)$ are all cograph minimal (∞, k) -polar obstructions, so, if H contains as an induced subgraph a graph H^* that is isomorphic to either $K_1 \oplus (C_4 + K_1)$, $K_1 \oplus \overline{P_3 + K_2}$, or $\overline{K_2} \oplus (P_3 + K_1)$, then $kK_1 + H^*$ is a cograph minimal (∞, k) -polar obstruction contained as an induced subgraph in G , and then $G \cong kK_1 + H^*$ and $H \cong H^*$. Moreover, from Lemma 21, H must contain as an induced subgraph a graph H^* as described before, or H would be a complete multipartite graph, a contradiction.

For the last case, suppose that $H' \cong K_{k+1, k+1}$. Then, from Lemma 20 and since H is not a complete multipartite graph, H either contains $K_1 \oplus C_4$ as an induced subgraph, or it contains $\overline{K_2} \oplus (K_2 + kK_1)$ as a proper induced subgraph. Since we have already treated both cases before, we conclude that the only cograph minimal (∞, k) -polar obstructions of type $(k+1, k)$ are the listed one in the statement of the corollary. \square

Corollary 24. *Let k be an integer, $k \geq 3$. The graph G is a cograph minimal (∞, k) -polar obstruction of type $(k, k-1)$ if and only if $G \cong (k-1)K_1 + H$, where H is isomorphic to some cograph of the set*

$$\{K_1 \oplus (C_4 + 2K_1), K_1 \oplus 2P_3, K_1 \oplus (K_1 + \overline{P_3 + K_2}), K_1 \oplus (K_2 + \overline{P_3 + K_1}), K_2 \oplus (K_1 + 2K_2), K_1 \oplus (K_1 + K_2 + P_3), K_1 \oplus (K_1 + (K_1 \oplus 2K_2)), K_1 \oplus ((k-1)K_1 + 2K_2)\}.$$

Proof. Based on Lemma 17, it is routine to verify that if H is isomorphic to some of the listed graphs, then $(k-1)K_1 + H$ is a cograph minimal (∞, k) -polar obstruction.

Conversely, let G be a cograph minimal (∞, k) -polar obstruction of type $(k, k-1)$. By Lemma 17 we have that $G \cong (k-1)K_1 + H$, where H is a connected cograph that contains a

cograph minimal $(\infty, 1)$ -polar obstruction H' as an induced subgraph. Thus, from Theorem 1 and Remark 14, there exists a cograph H' isomorphic to some graph in the set

$$\{K_1 \oplus (K_1 + 2K_2), K_1 \oplus (2K_1 + C_4), K_1 \oplus 2P_3, K_1 \oplus (K_1 + \overline{K_2 + P_3})\}$$

contained as an induced subgraph of H . As we have observed at the start of this proof, if H' is isomorphic to either $K_1 \oplus (2K_1 + C_4)$, $K_1 \oplus 2P_3$ or $K_1 \oplus (K_1 + \overline{K_2 + P_3})$, then $(k-1)K_1 + H'$ is a cograph minimal (∞, k) -polar obstruction, and then $H = H'$. Suppose then that $H' \cong K_1 \oplus (K_1 + 2K_2)$. It follows from Lemma 17 that H is not a $(1, k)$ -polar graph, which implies from Lemma 22 that H contains a graph H^* in the set

$$\{K_1 \oplus (2K_2 + (k-1)K_1), K_2 \oplus (2K_2 + K_1), K_1 \oplus (P_3 + \overline{P_3}), K_1 \oplus (K_2 + \overline{K_1 + P_3}), \\ K_1 \oplus (K_1 + (K_1 \oplus 2K_2))\}$$

as an induced subgraph. Since we have proved that in every such case $(k-1)K_1 + H^*$ is a cograph minimal (∞, k) -polar obstruction, we have that $H = H^*$, which finishes the proof. \square

5 The remaining types

In contrast with the obstructions with precisely one non-trivial component, we show in the following proposition that cograph minimal (∞, k) -polar obstructions that have at least one trivial component, and at least one complete non-trivial component, can be nicely obtained from the cograph minimal $(\infty, k-1)$ -polar obstructions with at least one isolated vertex.

Theorem 25. *Let j, k and p be non-negative integers such that $1 \leq p \leq k - j$. The graph G is a cograph minimal (∞, k) -polar obstruction of type $(k - j + 2, p)$ if and only if $G \cong K_2 + G'$ where G' is a cograph minimal $(\infty, k - 1)$ -polar obstruction of type $(k - j + 1, p)$ which is a $(1, k)$ -polar graph.*

Proof. Suppose that G' is a cograph minimal $(\infty, k - 1)$ -polar obstruction that is a $(1, k)$ -polar graph, and let $G = K_2 + G'$. Note that since G' is not an $(\infty, k - 1)$ -polar graph, G is not an (∞, k) -polar graph. Moreover, for $v \in V_{G-G'}$, since G' is a $(1, k)$ -polar graph, $G - v$ is also a $(1, k)$ -polar graph, while for $w \in G'$, since $G' - w$ is an $(\infty, k - 1)$ -polar graph, we have that $G - w$ is an (∞, k) -polar graph. Thus, G is a cograph minimal (∞, k) -polar obstruction.

Conversely, let G be a cograph minimal (∞, k) -polar obstruction of type $(k - j + 2, p)$, so $G \cong pK_1 + (k - j - p + 1)K_2 + H$, where H is a connected non-trivial graph. Thus, for $G' = pK_1 + (k - j - p)K_2 + H$, we have that $G \cong K_2 + G'$. Observe that since G is not an (∞, k) -polar graph, G' is not an $(\infty, k - 1)$ -polar graph.

Let $v \in V_{G-G'}$, and let w be the only neighbour of v in G . Let (A, B) be an (∞, k) -polar partition of $G - v$. Note that w must belong to A , or else G would be an (∞, k) -polar graph. Thus (A, B) is a $(1, k)$ -polar partition of $G - v$, and then G' is a $(1, k)$ -polar graph. Hence, since G' is not $(\infty, k - 1)$ -polar but it is $(1, k)$ -polar, G' contains a cograph minimal $(\infty, k - 1)$ -polar obstruction G^* that is $(1, k)$ -polar as an induced subgraph, but we have

shown at the beginning of the proof that in such a case $K_2 + G^*$ is a cograph minimal (∞, k) -polar obstruction, so we have that $G' = G^*$, which finishes the proof. \square

A somewhat surprising consequence of the previous results is that for $c \in \{k, k+1, k+2\}$ and $i \in \{1, \dots, c-2\}$, there exists exactly one cograph minimal (∞, k) -polar obstruction of type (c, i) . We conjecture that the same is true for any integer k and every integer c such that $3 \leq c \leq k+2$. In the following proposition we specify the known cases.

Corollary 26. *Let p and k be non-negative integers.*

1. *If $1 \leq p \leq k+1$, then the graph $pK_1 + (k-p+1)K_2 + K_{p,p}$ is a cograph minimal (∞, k) -polar obstruction. Moreover, for $p \leq k$, up to isomorphism, this is the only cograph minimal (∞, k) -polar obstruction of type $(k+2, p)$.*
2. *If $1 \leq p \leq k$, the graph $pK_1 + (k-p)K_2 + (\overline{K_2} \oplus (K_2 + pK_1))$ is a cograph minimal (∞, k) -polar obstruction. Moreover, for $p \leq k-1$, up to isomorphism, this is the only cograph minimal (∞, k) -polar obstruction of type $(k+1, p)$.*
3. *If $1 \leq p \leq k-1$, the graph $pK_1 + (k-p-1)K_2 + (K_1 \oplus (2K_2 + pK_1))$ is a cograph minimal (∞, k) -polar obstruction. Moreover, for $p \leq k-2$, up to isomorphism, this is the only cograph minimal (∞, k) -polar obstruction of type (k, p) .*

Proof. Let k and p non-negative integers such that $1 \leq p \leq k+1$. It is routine to show that $pK_1 + (k-p+1)K_2 + K_{p,p}$ is a cograph minimal (∞, k) -polar obstruction that admits a $(1, k+1)$ -polar partition.

Suppose that $p \leq k$. We proceed by mathematical induction on k to show that the only cograph minimal (∞, k) -polar obstruction of type $(k+2, p)$ is isomorphic to $pK_1 + (k-p+1)K_2 + K_{p,p}$.

The base case, $k=1$, follows from Theorem 1. For the inductive step, suppose that $k \geq 2$, and let G be a cograph minimal (∞, k) -polar obstruction of type $(k+2, p)$. Theorem 25 implies that $G \cong K_2 + G'$, where G' is a cograph minimal $(\infty, k-1)$ -polar obstruction of type $(k+1, p)$ that admits a $(1, k)$ -polar partition. If $p \leq k-1$, the induction hypothesis implies that $G' \cong pK_1 + (k-p)K_2 + K_{p,p}$, where the result is immediate. In a similar way, if $p = k$, Theorem 19 implies that $G' \cong pK_1 + (k-p)K_2 + K_{p,p}$, which ends the proof of the first item. The proof of items 2 and 3 are analogous to the proof of item 1, but using Corollaries 23 and 24 instead of Theorem 19. \square

6 Main results

Now, we are ready to state our main results.

Theorem 27. *Let G be a cograph minimal $(\infty, 2)$ -polar obstruction. Then*

1. *G is connected if and only if $\overline{G} \cong P_3 + H$, where H is isomorphic to $K_1 \oplus C_4$, $\overline{2P_3}$, $K_2 \oplus 2K_2$, or $K_1 \oplus (K_2 + P_3)$,*

2. G is disconnected and has no isolated vertices if and only if G is isomorphic to $P_3 + C_4$, $P_3 + (K_1 \oplus 2K_2)$, or $2P_3 + K_2$,
3. G has exactly 4 connected components if and only if G is isomorphic to $3K_1 + (K_1 \oplus C_4)$, or $pK_1 + (3 - p)K_2 + K_{p,p}$ for some integer p with $p \in \{1, 2, 3\}$,
4. G has exactly 3 connected components and at least one isolated vertex if and only if G is isomorphic to $2K_1 + \overline{2P_3}$, $2K_1 + (K_1 \oplus (P_3 + K_2))$, $2K_1 + (K_2 \oplus 2K_2)$, $2K_1 + (K_1 \oplus (C_4 + K_1))$, $2K_1 + (K_1 \oplus \overline{P_3 + K_2})$, $2K_1 + (\overline{K_2} \oplus (P_3 + K_1))$, or $pK_1 + (2 - p)K_2 + (2K_1 \oplus (K_2 + pK_1))$ for some integer p with $p \in \{1, 2\}$,
5. G has exactly 2 connected components and one isolated vertex if and only if G is isomorphic to $K_1 + (K_1 \oplus (K_1 + 2K_2))$, $K_1 + (K_1 \oplus (2K_1 + C_4))$, $K_1 + (K_1 \oplus 2P_3)$, or $K_1 + (K_1 \oplus (K_1 + \overline{K_2 + P_3}))$.

In conclusion, a graph G is a cograph minimal $(\infty, 2)$ -polar obstruction if and only if it is isomorphic to some of the 23 cographs listed before.

Proof. Item 1 follows from Theorems 2 and 6, item 2 follows from Theorems 11 and 16, items 3 and 4 follow from Theorem 19, Corollaries 23 and 26, and item 5 follows from Theorem 18.

By Lemma 5 we have that every cograph minimal $(\infty, 2)$ -polar obstruction has at most 4 connected components, so the listed graphs are all the cograph minimal $(\infty, 2)$ -polar obstructions. \square

Theorem 28. *Let G be a cograph minimal $(\infty, 3)$ -polar obstruction. Then*

1. G is connected if and only if $\overline{G} \cong P_3 + H$, where H is isomorphic to $K_1 \oplus C_4$, $\overline{2P_3}$, $K_2 \oplus 2K_2$, or $K_1 \oplus (K_2 + P_3)$,
2. G is disconnected and has neither isolated vertices nor components isomorphic to P_3 if and only if G is isomorphic to $2C_4$, $2(K_1 \oplus 2K_2)$, or $C_4 + (K_1 \oplus 2K_2)$,
3. G is disconnected and has at least one component isomorphic to P_3 if and only if $G \cong P_3 + H$, where H is isomorphic to $P_3 + 2K_2$, $K_2 + (K_1 \oplus 2K_2)$, $K_2 + C_4$, $K_{3,3}$, $2K_1 \oplus (K_2 + 2K_1)$, $K_1 \oplus (K_1 + 2K_2)$, $K_1 \oplus C_4$, $\overline{2P_3}$, $K_2 \oplus 2K_2$, or $K_1 \oplus (K_2 + P_3)$,
4. G has exactly 5 connected components if and only if G is isomorphic to $4K_1 + (K_1 \oplus C_4)$, or $pK_1 + (4 - p)K_2 + K_{p,p}$ for some integer p with $p \in \{1, 2, 3, 4\}$,
5. G has exactly 4 connected components and at least one isolated vertex if and only if either $G \cong K_1 + H$, where H is isomorphic to $\overline{2P_3}$, $K_1 \oplus (P_3 + K_2)$, $K_2 \oplus 2K_2$, $K_1 \oplus (C_4 + K_1)$, $K_1 \oplus \overline{P_3 + K_2}$, or $\overline{K_2} \oplus (P_3 + K_1)$, or G is isomorphic to $pK_1 + (3 - p)K_2 + (2K_1 \oplus (K_2 + pK_1))$ for some integer p with $p \in \{1, 2, 3\}$,

6. G has exactly 3 connected components and at least one isolated vertex if and only if either $G \cong 2K_1 + H$, where H is isomorphic to $K_1 \oplus (C_4 + 2K_1)$, $K_1 \oplus 2P_3$, $K_1 \oplus (K_1 + \overline{P_3 + K_2})$, $K_1 \oplus (K_2 + \overline{P_3 + K_1})$, $K_2 \oplus (K_1 + 2K_2)$, $K_1 \oplus (K_1 + K_2 + P_3)$, or $K_1 \oplus (K_1 + (K_1 \oplus 2K_2))$, or G is isomorphic to $pK_1 + (2-p)K_2 + (K_1 \oplus (2K_2 + pK_1))$ for some integer p with $p \in \{1, 2\}$,
7. G has exactly 2 connected components and one isolated vertex if and only if $G \cong K_1 + (K_1 \oplus H)$, where H is isomorphic to $P_3 + C_4$, $P_3 + (K_1 \oplus 2K_2)$, $2P_3 + K_2$, $K_1 + 3K_2$, $2K_1 + K_2 + C_4$, $3K_1 + K_{3,3}$, $K_1 + K_2 + (2K_1 \oplus (K_2 + K_1))$, $2K_1 + (2K_1 \oplus (K_2 + 2K_1))$, or $K_1 + (K_1 \oplus (K_1 + 2K_2))$.

In conclusion, a graph G is a cograph minimal $(\infty, 3)$ -polar obstruction if and only if it is isomorphic to one of the 49 cographs listed before.

Proof. Item 1 follows from Theorems 2 and 6, item 2 follows from Theorem 11, item 3 follows from Theorem 16, items 4, 5 and 6 follow from Theorem 19, and Corollaries 23, 24 and 26, and item 7 follows from Theorems 18 and 27.

From Lemma 5 we have that every cograph minimal $(\infty, 3)$ -polar obstruction has at most 5 connected components, so the listed graphs are all the cograph minimal $(\infty, 3)$ -polar obstructions. \square

7 Conclusions

Exact lists of cograph minimal (∞, k) -polar obstructions are known when $k \leq 1$. In this work we present many results focused on the recursive construction of cograph minimal (∞, k) -polar obstructions for an arbitrary integer k . After introducing a simple classification of the obstructions based on their number of connected components (c) and isolated vertices (i) into types (c, i) , we provided several structural results from which we established recursive characterizations for many types in the classification. More specifically, we know, by Lemma 5, that every cograph minimal (∞, k) -polar obstruction satisfies the constraint $0 \leq i \leq c - 1 < k + 2$, and we provided recursive characterizations for every possible type (c, i) but $(c, c - 1)$, where $c \in \{3, \dots, k - 1\}$. Although our results are not enough to describe all the cograph minimal (∞, k) -polar obstructions for an arbitrary k , we used them to exhibit complete lists for the cases $k = 2$ and $k = 3$. It seems that our techniques might not be enough to produce an easy recursive formula to construct the missing obstructions, but we still think it might be possible to have a general formula.

Problem 1. For a positive integer k , find a recursive characterization for the cograph minimal (∞, k) -polar obstructions.

As we observed in Section 5, for some specific values of c and i it can be proved that there exists exactly one cograph minimal (∞, k) -polar obstruction of type (c, i) . We believe that our result can be extended in the following way.

Conjecture 1. *Let k, c and i be integers such that $1 \leq i \leq c - 2 \leq k$. Then, there exists exactly one cograph minimal (∞, k) -polar obstruction of type (c, i) .*

Additionally, our results on exact lists of cograph minimal $(\infty, 2)$ - and $(\infty, 3)$ -polar obstructions support the following assertion.

Conjecture 2. *For every cograph minimal (∞, k) -polar obstruction G , the order of G is at most $3(k + 1)$.*

A complete solution of problems like the one addressed in this work might give us a better understanding of the minimal obstructions for hereditary properties in the class of cographs, which in turn, might lead to efficient algorithms to produce such obstructions directly (as opposed to making exhaustive searches through all the cographs).

References

- [1] J.A. Bondy and U.S.R Murty, Graph Theory, Springer, Berlin, 2008.
- [2] R.S.F. Bravo, L.T. Nogueira, F. Protti and C. Vianna, Minimal obstructions of $(2, 1)$ -cographs with external restrictions, in: Annals of I ETC - Encontro de Teoria da Computação (CSBC 2016) (2016) Porto Alegre, <http://www.pucrs.br/edipucrs/>, ISSN 2175-2761 (In Portuguese).
- [3] F.E. Contreras-Mendoza and C. Hernández-Cruz, Minimal obstructions to $(s, 1)$ -polarity in cographs, Discrete Applied Mathematics 281 (2020) 111–117.
- [4] R. Churchley and J. Huang, Line-Polar Graphs: Characterization and Recognition, SIAM Journal on Discrete Mathematics 25(3) (2011) 1269–1284.
- [5] R. Churchley and J. Huang, On the Polarity and Monopolarity of Graphs, Journal of Graph Theory 76(2) (2014) 138–148.
- [6] D. G. Corneil, H. Lerchs and L. Stewart Burlingham, Complement reducible graphs, Discrete Applied Mathematics 3(3) (1981) 163–174.
- [7] Z.A. Chernyak and A.A. Chernyak, About recognizing (α, β) -classes of polar graphs, Discrete Math. 62 (1986) 133–138.
- [8] P. Damaschke, Induced subgraphs and well-quasi-ordering, Journal of Graph Theory 14(4) (1990) 427–435.
- [9] T. Ekim, P. Heggernes, D. Meister, Polar Permutation Graphs, In: J. Fiala, J. Kratochvíl, M. Miller (eds) Combinatorial Algorithms. IWOCA 2009. Lecture Notes in Computer Science, vol 5874. Springer, Berlin, Heidelberg.
- [10] T. Ekim, P. Hell, J. Stacho and D. de Werra, Polarity of chordal graphs, Discrete Applied Mathematics 156(13) (2008) 2469–2479.

- [11] T. Ekim, N.V.R. Mahadev and D. de Werra, Polar cographs, *Discrete Applied Mathematics* 156 (2008) 1652–1660.
- [12] T. Ekim, N.V.R. Mahadev and D. de Werra, Corrigendum to “Polar cographs”, *Discrete Applied Mathematics* 156 (2014) 158.
- [13] A. Farrugia, Vertex-partitioning into fixed additive induced-hereditary properties is *NP*-hard, *Electron. J. Combin.* 11 (2004) #R46.
- [14] T. Feder, P. Hell, S. Klein and R. Motwani, List Partitions, *SIAM J. Discrete Math.* 16(3) (2003) 449–478.
- [15] T. Feder, P. Hell and W. Hochstättler, Generalized Colourings (Matrix Partitions) of Cographs, in: *Graph Theory in Paris*, Birkhauser, 2006, 149–167.
- [16] S. Foldes and P.L Hammer, Split graphs, in: *Proc. 8th Sout-Eastern Conf. on Combinatorics, Graph Theory and Computing*, 1977, 311–315.
- [17] P. Hell, C. Hernández-Cruz and C. Linhares-Sales, Minimal Obstructions to 2-polar cographs, *Discrete Applied Mathematics* 261 (2019) 219–228.
- [18] V. B. Le and R. Nevries, Complexity and algorithms for recognizing polar and monopolar graphs, *Theoretical Computer Science* 528 (2014) 1–11.