

Minimal obstructions for polarity, monopolarity, unipolarity and $(s, 1)$ -polarity in generalizations of cographs*

Fernando Esteban Contreras-Mendoza^{†1} and César Hernández-Cruz^{‡1}

¹Facultad de Ciencias, Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México, Av. Universidad 3000, Circuito Exterior S/N, C.P. 04510, Ciudad Universitaria, CDMX, México

Abstract

Every hereditary property can be characterized by finitely many minimal obstructions when restricted to either the class of cographs or the class of P_4 -reducible graphs. In this work we prove that also when restricted to the classes of P_4 -sparse graphs and P_4 -extendible graphs (both of which extend P_4 -reducible graphs) every hereditary property can be characterized by finitely many minimal obstructions.

We present complete lists of P_4 -sparse and P_4 -extendible minimal obstructions for polarity, monopolarity, unipolarity, and $(s, 1)$ -polarity, where s is a positive integer. In parallel to the case of P_4 -reducible graphs, all the P_4 -sparse minimal obstructions for these hereditary properties are cographs.

1 Introduction

All graphs in this paper are simple and finite; we refer the reader to [1] for basic terminology and notation not explicitly defined. For a graph G , we denote its vertex set by V_G , and its complement by \overline{G} . For graphs G and H , we denote by $G + H$ the disjoint union of G and H , and by $G \oplus H$ the join of G and H , i.e., the graph $\overline{\overline{G} + \overline{H}}$. Naturally, the disjoint union of n copies of a graph G is denoted by nG . Two subsets V_1 and V_2 of V_G are said to be *completely*

*The authors gratefully acknowledge support from grants SEP-CONACYT A1-S-8397, DGAPA-PAPIIT IA104521, and CONACYT FORDECYT-PRONACES/39570/2020

[†]esteban.contreras@ciencias.unam.mx

[‡]chc@ciencias.unam.mx

adjacent if every vertex of V_1 is adjacent to any vertex of V_2 . Analogously, V_1 is *completely nonadjacent* to V_2 if no vertex in V_1 is adjacent to a vertex in V_2 .

If G and H are graphs, we write $H \leq G$ to denote that H is an induced subgraph of G . We say that G is an *H -free graph* if G does not have induced subgraphs isomorphic to H . Given a family of graphs \mathcal{H} , we say that G is *\mathcal{H} -free* if it is H -free for every $H \in \mathcal{H}$. A *k -cluster* is the complement of a complete k -partite graph, and a *cluster* is a k -cluster for some integer k . Clusters are characterized as P_3 -free graphs, while k -clusters are precisely the $\{P_3, (k+1)K_1\}$ -free graphs. Complementarily, complete multipartite graphs are precisely $\overline{P_3}$ -free graphs, and complete s -partite graphs are precisely $\{\overline{P_3}, K_{s+1}\}$ -free graphs.

A property \mathcal{P} of graphs is said to be *hereditary* if it is closed under taking induced subgraphs. Given a hereditary property of graphs \mathcal{P} , a *\mathcal{P} -obstruction* is a graph G that does not have the property \mathcal{P} ; if in addition G is such that any proper induced subgraph of G has the property \mathcal{P} , then G is said to be a *minimal \mathcal{P} -obstruction*.

For nonnegative integers s and k , an *(s, k) -polar partition* of a graph G is a partition (A, B) of V such that $G[A]$ is a complete multipartite graph with at most s parts and $G[B]$ is a k -cluster. A graph G is said to be *(s, k) -polar* if V admits an (s, k) -polar partition. When we replace s or k with ∞ , it means that the number of parts of $G[A]$ or $G[B]$, respectively, is unbounded. A graph is said to be *monopolar* or *polar* if it is a $(1, \infty)$ - or an (∞, ∞) -polar graph, respectively. A *unipolar partition* of a graph G is a polar partition (A, B) of G such that A is a clique. Naturally, a graph is said to be *unipolar* if it admits a unipolar partition. Unipolar and monopolar graphs are particularly interesting because many recognition algorithms for polar graphs on specific graph classes first check whether the input graph is either unipolar or monopolar.

In the much larger context of matrix partitions, it was shown that for any pair of fixed nonnegative integers, s and k , there are only finitely many minimal (s, k) -polar obstructions [23], and therefore the class of (s, k) -polar graphs can be recognized by a brute force algorithm in polynomial time. Also, unipolar graphs have been shown to be efficiently recognizable [10, 20]. In contrast, the problems of deciding whether a graph is polar and deciding whether a graph is monopolar have been shown to be NP-complete [6, 21] even when restricted to triangle-free planar graphs [8, 31]. Such results encouraged the study of polarity and monopolarity in many graph classes as cographs [19], chordal graphs [18, 32], permutation graphs [16, 17], trivially perfect graphs [33], line graphs [7], triangle-free and claw-free graphs [8, 9], comparability graphs [10], and planar graphs [30, 31], just to mention some of the most outstanding classes.

Cographs were introduced in [13], where it was proved that such graphs are precisely the P_4 -free graphs, and also the graphs that can be obtained from trivial graphs by disjoint union and join operations. Thus, for any nontrivial cograph G , either G or \overline{G} is disconnected. A rooted labeled tree uniquely representing G (the *cotree* of G) can be constructed in $O(|V| + |E|)$ -time using LexBFS [5]. It follows from the uniqueness of the cotree representation of a cograph that many algorithmic problems which are difficult for general graphs can be efficiently solved on cographs by using its cotree [13]. Additionally,

cographs inherit efficient algorithms for some superclasses they belong to, like distance hereditary, permutation, and comparability graphs.

Cographs possess many desirable structural properties, and they are also particularly interesting since real-life applications quite often involve graph models where paths of length four are unlikely to appear. For the above reasons, the study of cographs was naturally followed by the introduction of a wide variety of cograph superclasses having both few induced P_4 's and a unique tree representation. For instance, a graph is said to be a P_4 -sparse graph if any set of five vertices induces at most one P_4 , and a P_4 -extendible graph is a graph such that, for any vertex subset W inducing a P_4 , there exists at most one vertex $v \notin W$ which belongs to a P_4 sharing vertices with W .

Ekim, Mahadev and de Werra found the complete list of cograph minimal polar obstructions as well as the exact list of cograph minimal (s, k) -polar obstructions when $\min\{s, k\} = 1$ [19]. In the past few years, the study of (s, k) -polarity in cographs has continued with the following main results. In [27], Hell, Hernández-Cruz and Linhares-Sales provided a full characterization of cograph minimal $(2, 2)$ -polar obstructions. Bravo, Nogueira, Protti and Vianna exhibited the exhaustive list of cograph minimal $(2, 1)$ -polar obstructions [4], and Contreras-Mendoza and Hernández-Cruz proved a simple recursive characterization for all the cograph minimal $(s, 1)$ -polar obstructions for any arbitrary integer s , as well as the complete list of cograph minimal monopolar obstructions [11]. The authors of the present work provided in [12] complete lists of cograph minimal (∞, k) -polar obstructions for $k = 2$ and $k = 3$, as well as a partial recursive characterization for arbitrary values of k .

In this paper we study (s, k) -polarity on two cograph superclasses, namely P_4 -sparse and P_4 -extendible graphs. We give complete lists of minimal $(s, 1)$ -polar obstructions, minimal unipolar obstructions, minimal monopolar obstructions, and minimal polar obstructions on such cograph superclasses. Additionally, we prove that any hereditary property has only finitely many minimal obstructions in the classes of P_4 -sparse and P_4 -extendible graphs. A summary of our main results is included in Section 8.

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, we review some families of graphs generalizing cographs, emphasizing P_4 -sparse and P_4 -extendible graphs by their relevance in this paper. Section 3 is devoted to prove that any hereditary property has finitely many minimal obstructions when restricted to P_4 -sparse or P_4 -extendible graphs. Complete lists of P_4 -sparse and P_4 -extendible minimal unipolar obstructions are given in Section 4. In Sections 5 and 6 we provide complete lists of disconnected minimal $(s, 1)$ - and $(\infty, 1)$ -polar obstructions for general graphs, as well as technical results we need to characterize connected P_4 -sparse and P_4 -extendible minimal $(s, 1)$ - and $(\infty, 1)$ -polar obstructions. Finally, in Section 7 we prove our main results about polarity on cograph generalizations: we give complete characterizations for P_4 -sparse and P_4 -extendible minimal $(s, 1)$ -, $(\infty, 1)$ -, and (∞, ∞) -polar obstructions. Conclusions, work in progress, and some open problems and conjectures are presented in Section 8.

2 Two families generalizing cographs

In [13], eight characterizations of cographs were presented; the most relevant for this work are summarized in the following proposition.

Theorem 1 ([13]). *Let G be a graph. The following statements are equivalent.*

1. G can be constructed from trivial graphs by means of disjoint union and complement operations (it is a cograph).
2. G can be constructed from trivial graphs by means of join and disjoint union operations.
3. G is a P_4 -free graph.
4. For any nontrivial induced subgraph H of G , either H or \overline{H} is disconnected.

Clearly, the family of cographs is an auto-complementary and hereditary class of graphs. Moreover, it follows from the structural characterizations of cographs that they can be uniquely represented by a rooted labeled tree, its cotree [13]. Cographs can be recognized and its cotree can be constructed in linear time by a certifying LexBFS algorithm [5]. In addition, many algorithmic problems which are difficult on general graphs can be efficiently solved on cographs using bottom-up algorithms on their cotrees.

Some real life applications involve graph models which are unlikely to have more than some few induced paths on four vertices [14]. From this point of view, cographs are the most restrictive class (P_4 -free), so a natural question is whether some cograph superclass with weaker restrictions on the amount of induced P_4 's has similar properties, i.e., allows us to develop efficient algorithms for problems which are difficult in general graphs. Below, we introduce some graph classes with few induced paths of length three, which have the property of having a constructive characterization from simple primitive graphs and using simple graph operations. Such characterizations imply that these graph classes can be recognized in linear time and a tree representation (similar to the cotree) can be efficiently computed. Before introducing such families, we give some necessary definitions.

A $(1,1)$ -polar partition of a graph G is commonly called a *split partition* of G . The graphs admitting a split partition are the *split graphs* and they are characterized as the $\{2K_2, C_4, C_5\}$ -free graphs [24]. The $\{2K_2, C_4\}$ -free graphs are known as *pseudo-split graphs*. A graph G of order at least four is said to be a *headless spider* if there exist a split partition (S, K) of V and a bijection $f: S \rightarrow K$ such that either $N(s) = \{f(s)\}$ for any $s \in S$, or $N(s) = K \setminus \{f(s)\}$ for every $s \in S$. Given a graph G and an induced path P of length three, a *partner* of P is a vertex v of G such that $V_P \cup \{v\}$ induces some of C_5, P_5, P, F or its complements (see Figure 3). Now, we introduce some cograph generalizations.

A graph G is said to be:

1. P_4 -*reducible* if any vertex belongs to at most one induced P_4 .

2. A (q, t) -graph if no set of at most q vertices induces more than t distinct P_4 's. The $(5, 1)$ -graphs are called P_4 -sparse graphs.
3. *Extended P_4 -reducible* if both, G and \overline{G} , are $\{P_5, F, P, \text{net}\}$ -free graphs (see Figure 1).
4. *Extended P_4 -sparse* if both, G and \overline{G} , are $\{P_5, F, P\}$ -free graphs.
5. P_4 -lite if every induced subgraph of order at most six is either isomorphic to a headless spider, or it contains at most two induced P_4 's.
6. P_4 -extendible if for any vertex subset W inducing a P_4 , there exists at most one vertex $v \notin W$ which belongs to a P_4 sharing vertices with W .
7. P_4 -tidy if any induced P_4 has at most one partner.
8. P_4 -laden if any induced subgraph of G of order at most six either is a split graph or it contains at most two induced P_4 's.
9. *Extended P_4 -laden* if any induced subgraph of G of order at most six either is a pseudo-split graph or it contains at most two induced P_4 's.




Figure 1: The net graph.

It is worth emphasizing that we are not really interested in general (q, t) -graphs, but in $(q, q - 4)$ -graphs. This is due to, for any fixed q , $(q, q - 4)$ -graphs are known to have simple enough tree representations, while it remains unknown whether (q, t) -graphs have such representations for arbitrary values of q and t .

Giakoumakis and Vanherpe [25] observed that P_4 -reducible graphs are the graphs which are both P_4 -sparse and P_4 -extendible graphs. Some other relations between the graph classes introduced above can be established from their definitions or using diverse characterizations for them. We represent the containment relationships between these classes in Figure 2, where an arc from a class \mathcal{G} to a class \mathcal{H} means that $\mathcal{H} \subseteq \mathcal{G}$. We remark that any graph class represented in Figure 2 can be recognized, and a tree representation can be obtained, in polynomial time. Moreover, in most cases this can be done in linear time.

In the following sections we state constructive characterizations for P_4 -sparse and P_4 -extendible graphs which will be the cornerstones for most of the work in this paper.




Figure 2: Relations between some graph classes with just a few induced P_4 's.

2.1 P_4 -sparse graphs

A graph is defined to be P_4 -sparse if any vertex subset with at most five vertices induces at most one P_4 . It follows directly from this definition that a graph G is a P_4 -sparse graph if and only if both, G and \overline{G} , are $\{C_5, P_5, P, F\}$ -free graphs (see Figure 3). Additionally, Jamison and Olariu gave a connectedness characterization of P_4 -sparse graphs based on spiders which we now introduce.

A graph G is a *spider* if its vertex set partitions into S, K and R in such a way that $G[S \cup K]$ is a headless spider with partition (S, K) , R is completely adjacent to K and completely nonadjacent to S . For a spider $G = (S, K, R)$ we say that S is its *legs set*, K is its *body*, and R is its *head*. A spider is called *thin* (respectively *thick*) if $d(s) = 1$ (respectively $d(s) = |K| - 1$) for any $s \in S$. Notice that the complement of a thin spider is a thick spider, and vice versa, and that a headless spider is precisely a spider with an empty head.

Theorem 2 ([29]). *Let G be a graph. Then, G is a P_4 -sparse graph if and only if for every nontrivial induced subgraph H of G , exactly one of the following statements is satisfied*

1. H is disconnected.
2. \overline{H} is disconnected.
3. H is a spider.

2.2 P_4 -extendible graphs

Let G be a graph, and let W be a proper subset of its vertex set. Denote by $S(W)$ the set of vertices $x \in V - W$ such that x belongs to a P_4 sharing vertices with W . In case $S(W)$ contains at most one vertex, we will say that W has a *proper extension*. A set D of vertices is said to be an *extension set* if $D = W \cup S(W)$ for a set W which induces a P_4 and has a proper extension. An extension set D is said to be *separable* if no vertex of D is both an endpoint of some P_4 in $G[D]$ and a midpoint of some P_4 .

In the above terms, P_4 -extendible graphs are the graphs such that every set inducing a P_4 has a proper extension. Notice that any extension set must induce one of the eight graphs depicted in Figure 3, namely P_4, C_5, P_5, P, F or their complements. We call these graphs *extension graphs*. In addition, separable extension sets must induce one of P_4, P, F or their complements. These graphs are called *separable extension graphs*.




Figure 3: The eight extension graphs. Black vertices are the midpoints of separable extension graphs.

Let G be a separable extension graph. We define a G -*spider* as an (induced) supergraph H of G such that $V_H - V_G$ (denoted R) is completely adjacent to the midpoints set of G (denoted K), and $V_H - V_G$ is completely nonadjacent to the endpoints set of G (denoted S). If H is a G -spider, we say that (S, K, R) is a G -*spider partition* of H , and we refer to K, S and R as the *body*, the *legs set*, and the *head* of H , respectively. Along this text we will say that a given graph is an S -spider if it is a G -spider for some arbitrary separable extension graph G .

Observe that every extension graph is trivially a P_4 -extendible graph but the headless spiders on six vertices are examples of minimal P_4 -extendible obstructions. Thus, since any headless spider is a P_4 -sparse graph and all the forbidden P_4 -sparse graphs are P_4 -extendible, the classes of P_4 -sparse graphs and P_4 -extendible graphs are incomparable.

Jamison and Olariu gave the following connectedness characterization for the class of P_4 -extendible graphs in [28].

Theorem 3 ([28]). *If G be a graph, then G is a P_4 -extendible graph if and only if, for every nontrivial induced subgraph H of G , precisely one of the following conditions is satisfied:*

1. H is disconnected.
2. \overline{H} is disconnected.
3. H is an extension graph.
4. There is a unique separable extension graph G such that H is a G -spider with nonempty head.

The class of $(6, 2)$ -graphs clearly is another superclass of cographs which is incomparable with P_4 -sparse graphs. As the following result states, P_4 -extendible graphs are closely related to $(6, 2)$ -graphs. With the help of this theorem, analogous results for $(6, 2)$ -graphs can be obtained for each proposition about P_4 -extendible graphs. For the sake of length, we will not explicitly state such results.

Theorem 4 ([2]). *If G is a graph, then G is a $(6, 2)$ -graph if and only if G is a C_5 -free P_4 -extendible graph.*

3 Well-quasi-orderings

Throughout this section, we show that any hereditary property has a finite number of minimal obstructions when restricted to P_4 -sparse or P_4 -extendible graphs. We will often use the following observation in the rest of the text without mentioning it explicitly.

Remark 5. *Let \mathcal{P} be a hereditary property of graphs, and let H be a \mathcal{P} -obstruction. If G is a minimal \mathcal{P} -obstruction such that $H \leq G$, then $G \cong H$.*

A poset (M, \leq) is called a *well-quasi-ordering* (WQO) if any infinite sequence of elements $\{a_i\}_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$ from M contains an increasing pair, that is to say, a pair $a_i \leq a_j$ such that $i < j$. Equivalently, (M, \leq) is a WQO if and only if M contains neither an infinite decreasing chain nor an infinite antichain.

Let \mathcal{G} be a graph class ordered by the induced subgraph relation, and let \mathcal{P} be a hereditary property on \mathcal{G} . By Remark 5, the family of minimal \mathcal{P} -obstructions is an antichain. Moreover, any antichain in (\mathcal{G}, \leq) is the family of minimal \mathcal{Q} -obstructions for a hereditary property \mathcal{Q} . Then, since graphs ordered by the induced subgraph relation do not have infinite decreasing chains, \mathcal{G} is WQO by the induced subgraph relation if and only if it contains no infinite antichain, or equivalently, if every hereditary property on \mathcal{G} has only finitely many minimal obstructions. Peter Damaschke used the following theorem in [15] to prove that cographs and P_4 -reducible graphs are WQO under the induced subgraph relation.

Theorem 6 ([15]). *Let \mathcal{G} be a family of graphs, and let Σ and Π be sets of unary and binary graph operations, respectively. Define partial orderings on Σ and Π as follows:*

$$\sigma \preceq \sigma' \text{ if and only if } \sigma(G) \leq \sigma'(G) \text{ for all graphs } G.$$

$$\pi \preceq \pi' \text{ if and only if } \pi(G, H) \leq \pi'(G, H) \text{ for all graphs } G, H.$$

Suppose that the following assertions are satisfied:

1. \mathcal{G} is WQO by the induced subgraph relation.
2. Any $\sigma \in \Sigma$ is monotonous (that is, $H \leq G$ implies $\sigma(H) \leq \sigma(G)$), and extensive (that is, for any graph G , $G \leq \sigma(G)$).
3. Any $\pi \in \Pi$ is commutative, associative, and satisfies:
 - (a) if $G \leq G'$ and $H \leq H'$, then $\pi(G, H) \leq \pi(G', H')$, and
 - (b) $G, H \leq \pi(G, H)$.
4. (Σ, \preceq) and (Π, \preceq) are WQO.

Then, the class $\Gamma(\mathcal{G}, \Sigma, \Pi)$ of all graphs obtained by start graphs from \mathcal{G} using operations from Σ and Π , is WQO under the induced subgraph relation.

In the following sections we provide new characterizations for both, P_4 -sparse and P_4 -extendible graphs, in order to show that Theorem 6 can be used to prove that such graph families (which are P_4 -reducible superclasses), are WQO under the induced subgraph relation.

3.1 Hereditary properties on P_4 -sparse graphs

Jamison and Olariu gave a constructive characterization for P_4 -sparse graphs starting with trivial graphs and using three binary operations [29]. Next, we establish a different constructive characterization for P_4 -sparse graphs that is more appropriate for our purposes. Our characterization starts with trivial graphs, and headless spiders and it involves two binary operations as well as two infinite families of unary graph operations. We start with the following straightforward observation.

Remark 7. *Disjoint union and join operations preserve P_4 -sparse graphs.*

Let H be a graph, and let j be an integer, $j \geq 2$. The graph $\sigma_j(H)$ is the thin spider $G = (S, K, R)$ such that $|S| = |K| = j$ and $G[R] = H$. Analogously, the graph $\tau_j(G)$ is the thick spider $G = (S, K, R)$ such that $|S| = |K| = j$ and $G[R] = H$. Notice that $\sigma_2(H) = \tau_2(H)$ for any graph H . The following observation follows directly from the definition of P_4 -sparse graphs.

Remark 8. *Let j be an integer, $j \geq 2$. The graphs $\sigma_j(H)$ and $\tau_j(H)$ are P_4 -sparse graphs if and only if H is a P_4 -sparse graph. In addition, any headless spider is a P_4 -sparse graph.*

Let Π be the set of binary operations whose only elements are the disjoint union and join graph operations, and let $\Sigma = \{\sigma_j\}_{j \geq 2} \cup \{\tau_j\}_{j \geq 3}$. Let us define the following partial order on Σ :

$$\sigma \preceq \sigma' \text{ if and only if } \sigma(H) \leq \sigma'(H) \text{ for all graphs } H.$$

It is straightforward to show that $\sigma_2 \preceq \sigma_3 \preceq \sigma_4 \preceq \dots$ and $\sigma_2 \preceq \tau_3 \preceq \tau_4 \preceq \tau_5 \preceq \dots$, so it follows trivially that Σ is WQO by \preceq . Analogously, it is easy to show that the family of graphs \mathcal{G} whose only elements are the trivial graph and all headless spiders is WQO under the induced subgraph relation. Now we give our characterization of P_4 -sparse graphs.

Theorem 9. *Let G be a graph. The following statements are equivalent.*

1. G is a P_4 -sparse graph.
2. G is obtained from trivial graphs by a finite sequence of Σ - and Π -operations.

Proof. We have from Theorem 2 and Remarks 7 and 8 that 2 implies 1. The converse implication can be easily proved proceeding by induction on the order of G and using Theorem 2. \square

The theorem above shows that $\Gamma(\mathcal{G}, \Sigma, \Pi)$ is precisely the class of P_4 -sparse graphs. As we pointed before (\mathcal{G}, \leq) and (Σ, \leq) are WQO and, since Π is a finite set, (Π, \leq) is too, so the following corollary is a simple application of Theorem 6.

Corollary 10. *The class of P_4 -sparse graphs is WQO under the induced subgraph relation. Equivalently, any hereditary property on P_4 -sparse graphs admits a finite forbidden induced subgraph characterization.*

3.2 Hereditary properties on P_4 -extendible graphs

A constructive characterization for P_4 -extendible graphs starting with trivial graphs and using 4 binary operations was given in [28]. Now, we establish another constructive characterization for this class of graphs which, in contrast, starts from a set of nine basic graphs and involves two binary operations as well as five unary operations. The purpose of this new characterization is to prove that the class of P_4 -extendible graphs is WQO under the induced subgraph relation by using Theorem 6.

Let \mathcal{G} be the set of graphs whose elements are the trivial graph K_1 and the eight extension graphs, that is, $\mathcal{G} = \{K_1, P_4, C_5, P_5, \overline{P_5}, P, \overline{P}, F, \overline{F}\}$. For each separable extension graph S and any graph G , we define the graph $\sigma_S(G)$ as the graph with vertex set $V_S \cup V_G$ and edge set

$$E_S \cup E_G \cup \{xy \mid x \text{ is a midpoint of } S \text{ and } y \in V_G\}.$$

For each separable extension graph S , the unary operation σ_S is its associated *separable extension operation*. Let Σ be the set of the five separable extension operations σ_S , and let Π be the set of binary operations whose only elements are the disjoint union and join operations.

Remark 11 ([28]). *Let G be a graph whose vertex set partitions into two nonempty disjoint sets V' and V'' such that no P_4 in G contains vertices from both V' and V'' . Then G is P_4 -extendible if and only if the subgraphs of G induced by V' and V'' are.*

Observe that, from the remark above, P_4 -extendible graphs are clearly closed under join and disjoint union operations. Now we use such remark for proving that separable extension operations also preserve P_4 -extendible graphs.

Lemma 12. *The class of P_4 -extendible graphs is closed under separable extension operations, that is to say, for any P_4 -extendible graph G and any separable extension graph S , $\sigma_S(G)$ is a P_4 -extendible graph.*

Proof. By definition of σ_S , the vertex set of $\sigma_S(G)$ partitions into V_S and V_G , and by hypothesis the graphs induced by these sets are P_4 -extendible. Now, by Remark 11 we only need to prove that no P_4 has vertices in both V_S and V_G . Assume the contrary to obtain a contradiction.

Let M be the set of midpoints of S , and let W be a vertex set inducing a P_4 such that $W \cap V_S \neq \emptyset \neq W \cap V_G$. It is an easy observation that, since W induces a P_4 , $|W \cap V_G| = 1$, $|W \cap V_S| = 3$, and $|W \cap M| \leq 2$. So we have only two possible cases, either $|W \cap M| = 1$ or $|W \cap M| = 2$. Let u be the only vertex in $W \cap V_G$.

First, assume that W has only one endpoint x of S and that y and z are both midpoints of S . Let E be the edge set of $\sigma_S(G)$. By definition of σ_S we have that $uy, uz \in E$ and $ux \notin E$. Moreover, since W induces a P_4 , we have that $yz \notin E$ and x is adjacent to exactly one of y and z . But this is impossible, because the only separable extension graph with two nonadjacent midpoints is P , but no endpoint of P distinguishes between its nonadjacent midpoints.

Otherwise, W has two endpoints, y and z , and one endpoint, x , of S . By definition of σ_S we have that $ux \in E$ and $uy, uz \notin E$. Moreover, since W induces a P_4 , we have that $yz \in E$ and x is adjacent to exactly one of y and z . Here we have a contradiction, because the only separable extension graph with two adjacent endpoints is \bar{P} , but no midpoint of P distinguishes between its adjacent endpoints. \square

Theorem 13. *Let G be a graph. The following statements are equivalent.*

1. G is a P_4 -extendible graph.
2. G is obtained from \mathcal{G} by a finite sequence of Σ - and Π -operations.

Proof. The fact that 2 implies 1 follows easily from Lemma 12, the observation after Remark 11, and since \mathcal{G} is a subset of P_4 -extendible graphs. For the converse implication we proceed by induction on the order of G . From Theorem 3 we have that, if G is not trivial, one of the following cases is satisfied:

1. G is disconnected.
2. \bar{G} is disconnected.

3. G is an extension graph.
4. there is a unique separable extension graph S such that $G = \sigma_S(H)$ for some graph H .

In the first (second) case, G is the disjoint union (join) of two P_4 -extendible graphs G_1 and G_2 , which by induction hypothesis can be constructed from \mathcal{G} by a finite sequence of Σ - and Π -operations, so the result follows in this case. The remaining cases are immediate. \square

The theorem above shows that $\Gamma(\mathcal{G}, \Sigma, \Pi)$ is precisely the class of P_4 -extendible graphs. In addition, considering that \mathcal{G}, Σ and Π are finite sets, it is easy to justify the following consequence of Theorem 6.

Corollary 14. *The class of P_4 -extendible graphs is WQO under the induced subgraph relation. Equivalently, any hereditary property on P_4 -extendible graphs admits a finite forbidden subgraph characterization.*

The rest of the paper is devoted to the characterizations by forbidden induced subgraphs of properties associated with polarity in P_4 -sparse and P_4 -extendible graphs. We start with the characterization of minimal unipolar obstructions on the mentioned graph classes.

4 Minimal unipolar obstructions

In this section we provide complete lists of minimal unipolar obstructions which are P_4 -sparse or P_4 -extendible graphs. With that purpose in mind we introduce some minimal unipolar obstructions that do not necessarily belong to the mentioned graph classes.

A *hole* is a cycle of length at least 5. An *antihole* is the complement of a hole. Holes and antiholes are said to be *even* or *odd* accordingly to their order.

Proposition 15. *The graphs depicted in Figure 4 are minimal unipolar obstructions.*




Figure 4: Some minimal unipolar obstructions.

Proof. To prove that these graphs are not unipolar, it is enough to observe that for any clique K , $G - K$ has an induced P_3 , so $G - K$ is not a cluster. It is also easy to verify that any vertex-deleted subgraph of these graphs is a unipolar graph, so the result follows. \square

The following two lemmas completely characterize minimal unipolar obstructions G (on general graphs) such that either G or \overline{G} is disconnected. We use such characterizations as the base for providing complete lists of minimal unipolar obstructions for cographs, P_4 -sparse graphs and P_4 -extendible graphs.

Lemma 16. *If G is a graph, then G is a disconnected minimal unipolar obstruction if and only if $G \cong 2P_3$.*

Proof. Let G be a disconnected minimal unipolar obstruction. By the minimality of G , any of its components is a unipolar graph. In consequence, G has at least two components which are not complete graphs, otherwise G would be unipolar. Then, G has $2P_3$ as an induced subgraph, so $G \cong 2P_3$. The converse implication follows from Proposition 15. \square

Lemma 17. *Let G be a graph. If \overline{G} is disconnected, then G is a minimal unipolar obstruction if and only if $G \cong K_{2,3}$.*

Proof. First, suppose that G is a minimal unipolar obstruction. Notice that \overline{G} is not a bipartite graph, or G would admit a partition into two cliques, so it would be a unipolar graph, which is impossible. Hence \overline{G} contains an odd cycle as an induced subgraph. Moreover, since odd antiholes are minimal unipolar obstructions and \overline{G} is disconnected, \overline{G} does not contain odd cycles of length greater than three as induced subgraphs. Thus, \overline{G} contains a triangle. In addition, since minimal unipolar obstructions do not have universal vertices, \overline{G} does not have isolated vertices, and any component of \overline{G} has order at least two. Therefore, since \overline{G} has at least two connected components, it contains $K_2 + K_3$ as an induced subgraph, so $G \cong K_{2,3}$. The converse implication follows from Proposition 15. \square

Since the complement of any nontrivial connected cograph is a disconnected cograph we have the following direct consequence of Lemmas 16 and 17.

Corollary 18. *If G is a cograph, then G is a minimal unipolar obstruction if and only if $G \cong 2P_3$ or $G \cong K_{2,3}$.*

Now, we use the characterization of P_4 -sparse graphs given in Theorem 2 to give the explicit list of P_4 -sparse minimal unipolar obstructions.

Lemma 19. *If $G = (S, K, R)$ is a spider, then G is a unipolar graph if and only if $R = \emptyset$ or $G[R]$ is unipolar.*

Proof. Since unipolarity is a hereditary property, we have that $G[R]$ is unipolar whenever G is. Conversely, for any unipolar partition (A, B) of $G[R]$, $(K \cup A, S \cup B)$ is a unipolar partition of G . \square

Corollary 20. *If G is a P_4 -sparse graph, then G is a minimal unipolar obstruction if and only if $G \cong 2P_3$ or $G \cong K_{2,3}$. In consequence, any P_4 -sparse minimal unipolar obstruction is a cograph.*

Proof. The first statement follows from Lemmas 16, 17 and 19, since we have by Theorem 2 that any connected P_4 -sparse graph with connected complement is a spider. The second statement follows directly from Corollary 18. \square

We end this section by proving a result analogous to Corollary 20 for P_4 -extendible graphs. Notice that, for any extension graph but P , its midpoints are a clique while its endpoints induce a cluster (see Figure 3). Then, the proof of the following proposition is exactly the same as the proof of Lemma 19. The case of P -spiders is covered in Lemma 22.

Lemma 21. *Let $H \in \{P_4, \overline{P}, F, \overline{F}\}$. If $G = (S, K, R)$ is an H -spider, then G is a unipolar graph if and only if $R = \emptyset$ or $G[R]$ is unipolar.*

Lemma 22. *If $G = (S, K, R)$ is a P -spider, then G is a unipolar graph if and only if either R is an empty set or a clique. In consequence, if G is a P -spider, then it is not a minimal unipolar obstruction.*

Proof. Let w be the only vertex of $G[S \cup K]$ of degree 2 which is not adjacent to a vertex of degree three, and let u and v be its neighbors. If R has two nonadjacent vertices x and y , then $G[\{u, v, w, x, y\}]$ is isomorphic to $K_{2,3}$. Therefore, if G is a unipolar graph, then $R = \emptyset$ or R is a clique. Conversely, if R is a clique and z is the only vertex of $G[S \cup K]$ of degree three, then $(R \cup \{z, u\}, (S \cup K) \setminus \{z, u\})$ is a unipolar partition of G . Hence, if G is not a unipolar graph, R contains two nonadjacent vertices and G properly contains $K_{2,3}$, so G is not a minimal unipolar obstruction. \square

Corollary 23. *Let G be a P_4 -extendible graph. Then, G is a minimal unipolar obstruction if and only if $G \in \{2P_3, K_{2,3}, C_5\}$.*

Proof. We have from Theorem 3 that any connected P_4 -extendible graph with connected complement is either an extension graph, or an S -spider for some separable extension graph S . It is easily to verify that the only extension graph which is a minimal unipolar obstruction is C_5 , so the result follows from Lemmas 16, 17, 21 and 22. \square

Now, we study $(s, 1)$ -polarity, monopolarity and polarity in P_4 -sparse and P_4 -extendible graphs. We start by giving complete lists of disconnected minimal $(s, 1)$ -polar obstructions for general graphs in Section 5, followed by some technical results in Section 6 directed to provide complete lists of P_4 -sparse and P_4 -extendible minimal $(s, 1)$ - $(\infty, 1)$ -, and (∞, ∞) -polar obstructions in Section 7.

5 Disconnected minimal $(s, 1)$ -polar obstructions

The following four lemmas completely characterize disconnected minimal $(s, 1)$ -polar obstructions for general graphs. They are simple generalizations of Lemmas 2 to 5 from [11], so we will only sketch the proofs.




Figure 5: Some minimal $(\infty, 1)$ -polar obstructions.

Lemma 24. *The seven graphs depicted in Figure 5 are minimal $(s, 1)$ -polar obstructions for every integer s , $s \geq 2$. Hence, these graphs are minimal $(\infty, 1)$ -polar obstructions.*

Proof. It is routine to verify that, for each graph G in Figure 5, the following assertions are satisfied: For any maximal clique K , $G - K$ contains an induced $\overline{P_3}$, and for any vertex v , $G - v$ is a $(2, 1)$ -polar graph. The result follows easily from here. \square

Lemma 25. *Let s be an integer, $s \geq 2$. Every minimal $(s, 1)$ -polar obstruction different from $K_1 + 2K_2$ and $2K_1 + C_4$ has at most two connected components.*

Moreover, if a minimal $(s, 1)$ -polar obstruction G distinct to the graphs depicted in Figure 5 has two connected components and it is not $2K_{s+1}$, then $G \cong K_r + H$, where $r \in \{1, 2\}$ and H is a connected graph that is not a complete s -partite graph.

Proof. Let G be a minimal $(s, 1)$ -polar obstruction different from the graphs depicted in Figure 5. Assume for a contradiction that G has at least three connected components. Since $s \geq 2$, G is not a split graph, so it contains $2K_2$, C_4 or C_5 as an induced subgraph. Having at least three connected components, G contains some of $K_1 + 2K_2$, $2K_1 + C_4$ or $K_1 + C_5$ as an induced subgraph. This results in a contradiction, because these graphs are minimal $(s, 1)$ -polar obstructions. Thus, G has at most two components. The rest of the statement was previously proved in [11]. \square

The proof of the following lemma has the same spirit than the proof of Lemma 4 in [11], but it has been rewritten for the sake of clarity.




Figure 6: The only minimal $(s, 1)$ -polar obstruction different from $2K_{s+1}$ with exactly two connected components one of them being isomorphic to K_2 .

Lemma 26. *Let s be an integer, $s \geq 2$. If H is a connected graph such that $G = K_2 + H$ is a minimal $(s, 1)$ -polar obstruction other than $2K_{s+1}$, then H is isomorphic to $2K_1 \oplus K_s$.*

Proof. It is routine to verify that $K_2 + (2K_1 \oplus K_s)$ is a minimal $(s, 1)$ -polar obstruction. From Lemma 25 we know that H is not a complete s -partite graph, so H contains a copy of either $\overline{P_3}$ or K_{s+1} as an induced subgraph. Nevertheless, H is a $\overline{P_3}$ -free graph, for otherwise G would contain $K_1 + 2K_2$ as a proper induced subgraph. Thus, H contains a copy of K_{s+1} as a proper induced subgraph. Let K be a maximum clique in H , and let $v \in V_H - K$. As we argued above, H is a $\overline{P_3}$ -free graph, so v is adjacent to all but one vertex w in K . Hence, for any s -subset V' of $K \cap N(v)$, the graph $H[V' \cup \{v, w\}]$ is isomorphic to $2K_1 \oplus K_s$, so $G \cong K_2 + (2K_1 \oplus K_s)$. \square

The following lemma is a slight generalization of Lemma 5 in [11]. Since the main ideas of the proof are very similar, we will only explain the significant differences.




Figure 7: The only minimal $(s, 1)$ -polar obstruction different from those on Figure 5 with exactly two connected components one of them being isomorphic to K_1 .

Lemma 27. *Let s be an integer, $s \geq 2$. If H is a connected graph such that $G = K_1 + H$ is a minimal $(s, 1)$ -polar obstruction isomorphic to none of the graphs depicted in Figure 5, then G is isomorphic to $K_1 + (C_4 \oplus K_{s-1})$.*

Proof. The graph H cannot be a split graph, so it contains an induced copy of either $2K_2, C_4$ or C_5 . Nevertheless, by the minimality of G and since $G \not\cong K_1 + C_5$ we know that H is $\{2K_2, C_5\}$ -free, so it contains an induced cycle on four vertices, $C = (c_1, c_2, c_3, c_4)$. Let v be a vertex in $H - V_C$, which must exist since H is not a complete bipartite graph. Observe that, since G contains no graph depicted in Figure 5 as an induced subgraph, v only could be adjacent to either two nonadjacent vertices of C or to every vertex of C .

Let V_1, V_2 and V_3 be the subsets of vertices of H that are not in C and that are adjacent to c_1 and c_3 , to c_2 and c_4 , and to c_i for every $i \in \{1, 2, 3, 4\}$, respectively. Notice that since H contains no induced $\overline{K_2 + P_3}$, V_1 and V_2 are both independent sets, and V_3 is completely adjacent to $V_1 \cup V_2$. In addition, since H is P -free, we have that V_1 and V_2 are completely adjacent. From here it is straightforward to notice that $H - V_3$ is a complete bipartite graph.

Hence, H is the join of the complete bipartite graph $H - V_3$ with $H[V_3]$, which implies that $H[V_3]$ is not a complete $(s - 2)$ -partite graph. One more time, since $\overline{K_2 + P_3}$ is not an induced subgraph of H we have that H is a $\overline{P_3}$ -free graph, so $H[V_3]$ is too. Therefore, $H[V_3]$ contains a copy of K_{s-1} as an induced subgraph, so the result follows. \square

So far, we have characterized all disconnected minimal $(s, 1)$ -polar obstructions, which are a constant number for any choice of s . We summarize this result as follows.

Theorem 28. *Let s be an integer, $s \geq 2$, and let G be a disconnected minimal $(s, 1)$ -polar obstruction. Then G satisfies one of the following assertions:*

1. G is isomorphic to one of the graphs depicted in Figure 5.
2. $G \cong 2K_{s+1}$.
3. $G \cong K_2 + (2K_1 \oplus K_s)$.
4. $G \cong K_1 + (C_4 \oplus K_{s-1})$.

For any nontrivial cograph G , either G or its complement is disconnected [13], so the complement of any nontrivial connected cograph is disconnected. This fact was used in [11] to give a recursive characterization of all cograph minimal $(s, 1)$ -polar obstructions. After giving a complete characterization of the disconnected cograph minimal $(s, 1)$ -polar obstructions, the authors provided a recursive construction for the disconnected cograph minimal $(1, s)$ -polar obstructions (which are precisely the complements of connected cograph minimal $(s, 1)$ -polar obstructions).

In the following section we will present very similar results for P_4 -sparse graphs and P_4 -extendible graphs. In particular we will prove that all P_4 -sparse minimal $(s, 1)$ -polar obstructions are cographs, which turns out to be similar in

flavor to a result obtained in [26], stating that all P_4 -sparse minimal obstructions for (k, ℓ) -coloring are cographs.

6 Connected minimal $(s, 1)$ -polar obstructions

Theorem 28 characterizes disconnected minimal $(s, 1)$ -polar obstructions for general graphs. Thus, to completely characterize minimal $(s, 1)$ -polar obstructions for a given class of graphs it suffices to characterize connected minimal $(s, 1)$ -polar obstructions. To this end, in order to follow the strategy described in the previous paragraphs for P_4 -sparse and P_4 -extendible graphs, we notice that the following lemma, which was stated and proved in [11] for the special case of cographs, is also valid for general graphs.

Lemma 29. *Let t be an integer, $t \geq 2$, and for each $i \in \{1, \dots, t\}$, let G_i be a minimal $(1, k_i)$ -polar obstruction that is a $(1, k_i + 1)$ -polar graph. Then, for $k = t - 1 + \sum_{i=1}^t k_i$, the graph $G = G_1 + \dots + G_t$ is a minimal $(1, k)$ -polar obstruction that is a $(1, k + 1)$ -polar graph.*

In the following sections we show that the converse of Lemma 29 holds for P_4 -sparse and P_4 -extendible graphs, that is to say, that any disconnected minimal $(1, k)$ -polar obstruction on such classes is the disjoint union of minimal $(1, k_i)$ -polar obstructions for some integers $k_i < k$.

6.1 Connected P_4 -sparse minimal $(s, 1)$ -polar obstructions

The induced path on three vertices is a minimal $(0, k)$ -polar obstruction for any integer $k \geq 2$ so, if a graph G contains P_3 as a proper induced subgraph, then G is not a minimal $(0, k)$ -polar obstruction. Similarly, if G contains $\overline{P_3}$ as a proper induced subgraph, then G is not a minimal $(s, 0)$ -polar obstruction. From here, the following observation follows easily.

Remark 30. *Let G be a spider. If G is a headless spider or the head of G induces a split graph, then G is a split graph that has both, P_3 and its complement, as proper induced subgraphs. Hence, G is not a minimal (s, k) -polar obstruction for any election of s and k .*

The following two propositions provide the basis for showing that any connected P_4 -sparse minimal $(k, 1)$ -polar obstruction has a disconnected complement.

Proposition 31. *Let k be a positive integer, and let $G = (S, K, R)$ be a spider with nonempty head. Then, G is not a minimal $(1, k)$ -polar obstruction.*

Proof. Suppose for a contradiction that G is a minimal $(1, k)$ -polar obstruction, and let $\sigma \in S$ be a leg of G . Let (A, B) be a $(1, k)$ -polar partition of $G - \sigma$. Notice that $|K \cap A| \leq 1$ because K is a clique and A is an independent set. Therefore, since K has at least two vertices, $K \cap B \neq \emptyset$. Moreover, since B

induces a cluster, R is completely adjacent to K , and $K \cap B \neq \emptyset$, $R \cap B$ is a clique. Also notice that either $K \cap A = \emptyset$ or $R \cap A = \emptyset$.

Now, if $K \cap A \neq \emptyset$, then R is a clique, G is a split graph, and therefore G is a $(1, k)$ -polar graph, which is impossible. Otherwise, if $K \subseteq B$, then $(A \cup \{\sigma\}, B)$ is a $(1, k)$ -polar partition of G , a contradiction. \square

Since the complement of a spider is also a spider, and any minimal $(\infty, 1)$ -polar obstruction is a minimal $(k, 1)$ -polar obstruction for some positive integer k , we have the following simple consequences of the previous proposition.

Corollary 32. *Let k be a positive integer. If G is a spider, then G is neither a minimal $(k, 1)$ -polar obstruction nor a minimal $(\infty, 1)$ -polar obstruction.*

Corollary 33. *Let k be a positive integer. If G is a P_4 -sparse minimal $(k, 1)$ -polar obstruction, then G or its complement is disconnected.*

Proof. Since G is a P_4 -sparse graph, if G and \overline{G} are connected, we have from Theorem 2 that G is a spider, but that is impossible by Corollary 32. Therefore, either G or its complement is disconnected. \square

The next two results, together with Lemma 29, provide us with a complete structural characterization for disconnected P_4 -sparse minimal $(1, k)$ -polar obstructions.

Lemma 34. *Let t be an integer, $t \geq 2$, and for each $i \in \{1, \dots, t\}$, let G_i be a connected P_4 -sparse minimal $(1, k_i)$ -polar obstruction which is a $(1, k_i + 1)$ -polar graph. If $G = G_1 + \dots + G_t$, then G is a minimal $(1, k)$ -polar obstruction if and only if $k = t - 1 + \sum_{i=1}^t k_i$.*

Proof. Let $k = t - 1 + \sum_{i=1}^t k_i$. We have from Lemma 29 that G is a minimal $(1, k)$ -polar obstruction which is $(1, k + 1)$ -polar, so we just need to show that G is not a minimal $(1, \kappa)$ -polar obstruction for any $\kappa < k$.

Let G be a connected P_4 -sparse minimal $(1, k_i)$ -polar obstruction which is $(1, k_i + 1)$ -polar. By Corollary 33, \overline{G} is a disconnected minimal $(k_i, 1)$ -polar obstruction which is a $(k_i + 1, 1)$ -polar graph. Then, it follows from Theorem 28 that, for any nonnegative integer κ_i such that $\kappa_i < k_i$, G contains a proper induced subgraph G' that is both, a P_4 -sparse minimal $(\kappa_i, 1)$ -polar obstruction and a $(\kappa_i + 1, 1)$ -polar graph. From here on, the proof follows as the proof of Lemma 8 in [11]. \square

Lemma 35. *Let k be a nonnegative integer. If G is a disconnected P_4 -sparse minimal $(1, k)$ -polar obstruction with components G_1, \dots, G_t , then there exist nonnegative integers k_1, \dots, k_t such that for each $i \in \{1, \dots, t\}$, G_i is a connected minimal $(1, k_i)$ -polar obstruction that is a $(1, k_i + 1)$ -polar graph, and $\sum_{i=1}^t k_i = k - t + 1$. (Notice that $k_i < k$ for any $i \in \{1, \dots, t\}$, and G is a $(1, k + 1)$ -polar graph.)*

Proof. This is a generalization of Lemma 9 in [11], which states the same result for cographs. As in the original proof, it is easy to argue that each component G_i is a minimal $(1, k_i)$ -polar obstruction that is $(1, k)$ -polar, where k_i is the maximum integer such that any proper induced subgraph of G_i is $(1, k_i)$ -polar.

Then, by Corollary 33, \overline{G}_i is a disconnected minimal $(k_i, 1)$ -polar obstruction that is $(k, 1)$ -polar, and we have from Theorem 28 that \overline{G}_i is a $(k_i + 1, 1)$ -polar graph, so G_i is $(1, k_i + 1)$ -polar. Finally, the result follows from Lemma 34. \square

Analogous results to those obtained in this section for P_4 -sparse will be given for P_4 -extendible graphs in the next section. As the reader can notice, the technique used to obtain the results for both classes is the same, the differences come from the connectedness characterizations for said families.

6.2 Connected P_4 -extendible minimal $(s, 1)$ -polar obstructions

We begin with some easily verifiable facts, stated without proof and bundled to facilitate future references.

Remark 36. *Let s, k be either in \mathbb{N} or equal to ∞ .*

1. P_4 and F are split graphs but they are neither $(0, \infty)$ - nor $(\infty, 0)$ -polar graphs.
2. C_5, P_5 , and P are $(1, 2)$ - and $(2, 1)$ -polar, but they are neither $(1, 1)$ -, $(\infty, 0)$ - nor $(0, \infty)$ -polar graphs.
3. An extension graph G is a minimal (s, k) -polar obstruction if and only if $G \cong C_5$ and $s = k = 1$.

The following proposition allows us to show that any connected P_4 -extendible minimal $(1, k)$ -polar obstruction, other than C_5 , has a disconnected complement.

Lemma 37. *Let k be a nonnegative integer, and let G be a separable extension graph. If $H = (S, K, R)$ is a G -spider with nonempty head, then H is not a minimal $(1, k)$ -polar obstruction.*

Proof. The proof is divided in three cases, depending on G . If G is isomorphic to P_4, F or \overline{F} then the midpoints set of G form a clique with at least two vertices, while its endpoints set is an independent set, in which case the proof is the same as Proposition 31.

Now, assume that $G \cong P$. Let v be the only vertex of G of degree one, and let w be the support vertex of v ; notice that w is a midpoint of G . Assume for a contradiction that H is a minimal $(1, k)$ -polar obstruction, and let (A, B) be a $(1, k)$ -polar partition of $H - v$. If $w \in A$, then there are two midpoints of G in B , but in such a case $R \cap A$ and $R \cap B$ are both empty sets, which is impossible. Then, $w \in B$ and $(A \cup \{v\}, B)$ is a $(1, k)$ -polar partition of H , a contradiction. Hence, H is not a minimal $(1, k)$ -polar obstruction.

Finally, assume that $G \cong \overline{P}$, and let v and w as in the previous paragraph. Suppose for a contradiction that H is a minimal $(1, k)$ -polar obstruction, and let (A, B) be a $(1, k)$ -polar partition of $H - v$. If $w \in A$, the other midpoint of G , w' , is in B and at least one of the endpoints of G that is adjacent to w' is also in B . Therefore, $R \cap B = \emptyset$. But $w \in A$, so also $R \cap A = \emptyset$, which is impossible. Hence, $w \in B$ and $(A \cup \{v\}, B)$ is a $(1, k)$ -polar partition of H , a contradiction. Then, H is not a minimal $(1, k)$ -polar obstruction. \square

Corollary 38. *Let k be a nonnegative integer, and let H be a P_4 -extendible minimal $(1, k)$ -polar obstruction. If $H \not\cong C_5$, then H or its complement is disconnected.*

Proof. Since H is a P_4 -extendible graph, we have from Theorem 3 that, if H and \overline{H} are connected, then H is either an extension graph or a G -spider (with nonempty head) for some separable extension graph G . Nevertheless we have from Item 3 of Remark 36 and Lemma 37 that this is not the case, so either H or its complement is disconnected. \square

In the last two results of this section we provide a complete structural characterization for disconnected P_4 -extendible minimal $(1, k)$ -polar obstructions. It is worth noticing that statements in Lemmas 39 and 40 are the same that those in Lemmas 34 and 35, respectively, except by the obvious difference of the graph class.

Lemma 39. *Let t be an integer, $t \geq 2$, and for each $i \in \{1, \dots, t\}$, let G_i be a connected P_4 -extendible minimal $(1, k_i)$ -polar obstruction which is a $(1, k_i + 1)$ -polar graph. If $G = G_1 + \dots + G_t$, then G is a minimal $(1, k)$ -polar obstruction if and only if $k = t - 1 + \sum_{i=1}^t k_i$.*

Proof. Let $k = t - 1 + \sum_{i=1}^t k_i$. We have from Lemma 29 that G is a minimal $(1, k)$ -polar obstruction which is $(1, k + 1)$ -polar, so we just need to show that G is not a minimal $(1, \kappa)$ -polar obstruction for any $\kappa < k$.

Let G_i be a connected P_4 -extendible minimal $(1, k_i)$ -polar obstruction which is $(1, k_i + 1)$ -polar. By Corollary 38, we have that either $G_i \cong C_5$ or \overline{G}_i is a disconnected minimal $(k_i, 1)$ -polar obstruction which is a $(k_i + 1, 1)$ -polar graph. However, it follows from Theorem 28 that, for any nonnegative integer κ_i such that $\kappa_i < k_i$, G_i contains a proper induced subgraph G'_i that is both, a P_4 -extendible minimal $(1, \kappa_i)$ -polar obstruction and a $(1, \kappa_i + 1)$ -polar graph. From here on, the proof follows as the proof of Lemma 8 in [11]. \square

Lemma 40. *Let k be a nonnegative integer. If G is a disconnected P_4 -extendible minimal $(1, k)$ -polar obstruction with components G_1, \dots, G_t , then there exist nonnegative integers k_1, \dots, k_t such that for each $i \in \{1, \dots, t\}$, G_i is a connected minimal $(1, k_i)$ -polar obstruction that is a $(1, k_i + 1)$ -polar graph, and $\sum_{i=1}^t k_i = k - t + 1$. (Notice that $k_i < k$ for any $i \in \{1, \dots, t\}$, and G is a $(1, k + 1)$ -polar graph.)*

Proof. This is a generalization of Lemma 9 in [11], which states the same result for cographs. As in the original proof, it is easy to argue that each component G_i is a minimal $(1, k_i)$ -polar obstruction that is $(1, k)$ -polar, where k_i is the maximum integer such that any proper induced subgraph of G_i is $(1, k_i)$ -polar.

Then, by Corollary 38, $\overline{G_i}$ is either C_5 or a disconnected P_4 -extendible minimal $(k_i, 1)$ -polar obstruction which is $(k, 1)$ -polar. However, it follows from Theorem 28 and Item 3 of Remark 36 that $\overline{G_i}$ is a $(k_i + 1, 1)$ -polar graph, so G_i is a connected P_4 -extendible minimal $(1, k_i)$ -polar obstruction which is a $(1, k_i)$ -polar graph. Finally, the result follows from Lemma 39. \square

The next section is devoted to the most meaningful results of this paper, including complete characterizations of minimal $(s, 1)$ - $(\infty, 1)$ - and (∞, ∞) -polar obstructions on both, P_4 -sparse and P_4 -extendible graphs.

7 Main results

In order to analyze the minimal obstructions for polarity in the classes of P_4 -sparse and P_4 -extendible graphs we need a final lemma. Notice that it holds for general graphs.

Lemma 41. *If G is a graph, then G is a disconnected minimal polar obstruction if and only if $G \cong P_3 + H$ where H is a minimal monopolar obstruction which is not a minimal polar obstruction.*

Proof. First, assume that H is a minimal $(1, \infty)$ -polar obstruction which is not a minimal polar obstruction, and let $G = P_3 + H$. Assume for a contradiction that G has a polar partition (A, B) . Notice that $G[A]$ is not an empty graph because H is not a $(1, \infty)$ -polar graph. Then $G[A]$ is completely contained in a component of G . Moreover, since any component of G is either P_3 or a component of H , and $G[B]$ is a P_3 -free graph, we have that $A \cap V_H = \emptyset$ so H is a cluster, a contradiction. Hence, G is not a polar graph.

Let $v \in V_G$. If $v \in V_H$, let (A, B) be a $(1, \infty)$ -polar partition of $H - v$, and let $w \in V_G - V_H$ be a vertex of degree 1. Then $(A', V_G - (A' \cup \{v\}))$, where $A' = A \cup \{w\}$, is a $(1, \infty)$ -polar partition of $G - v$. Now, let $v \in V_G - V_H$. Then, since H is a polar graph and $P_3 - v$ is a cluster, $G - v$ is a polar graph. Therefore G is a disconnected minimal polar obstruction.

For the converse, assume that G is a disconnected minimal polar obstruction. Notice that, if all the components of G are $(1, \infty)$ -polar graphs, then G is also a $(1, \infty)$ -polar graph, so G has a component H' that contains a minimal $(1, \infty)$ -polar obstruction H as an induced subgraph. Notice that by the minimality of G , H is a polar graph. In addition, G has no complete components, so any component of G contains an induced P_3 , and therefore G contains the disjoint union of P_3 with a minimal $(1, \infty)$ -obstruction that is a polar graph (H). Together with the minimality of G , this implies that $G \cong P_3 + H$. \square

7.1 P_4 -sparse graphs

The following result provides a complete recursive construction of P_4 -sparse minimal $(s, 1)$ -polar obstructions.

Theorem 42. *Let s be an integer, $s \geq 2$. If G is a P_4 -sparse graph, then G is a minimal $(s, 1)$ -polar obstruction if and only if G satisfies exactly one of the following assertions:*

1. G is isomorphic to one of the four cographs depicted in Figure 5.
2. G is isomorphic to some of $2K_{s+1}$, $K_2 + (K_s \oplus 2K_1)$ or $K_1 + (K_{s-1} \oplus C_4)$.
3. The complement of G is disconnected with components G_1, \dots, G_t , each G_i is a minimal $(1, s_i)$ -polar obstruction whose complement is different from the graphs in Figure 5, and $s = t - 1 + \sum_{i=1}^t s_i$.

Proof. If G is disconnected, it follows from Theorem 28 that G is a minimal $(s, 1)$ -polar obstruction if and only if G is either a P_4 -sparse graph depicted in Figure 5 (which can easily be checked to be a cograph), or it is isomorphic to some of $2K_{s+1}$, $K_2 + (K_s \oplus 2K_1)$ or $K_1 + (K_{s-1} \oplus C_4)$. Otherwise, if G is connected, Corollary 33 implies that \overline{G} is a disconnected P_4 -sparse minimal $(1, s)$ -polar obstruction, and the result follows from Lemma 35. \square

Corollary 43. *There are exactly nine P_4 -sparse minimal $(2, 1)$ -polar obstructions; they are the graphs E_1, \dots, E_9 depicted in Figures 5 and 8.*




Figure 8: Some minimal $(2, 1)$ -polar obstructions.

For any hereditary property \mathcal{P} and any graph classes \mathcal{G} and \mathcal{H} such that $\mathcal{G} \subseteq \mathcal{H}$, the set of minimal \mathcal{P} -obstructions in \mathcal{G} clearly is a (possibly proper)

subset of the set of minimal \mathcal{P} -obstructions in \mathcal{H} . The class of P_4 -sparse graphs has been observed to have a behavior which is very similar to cographs when computing their minimal obstructions with respect to some hereditary properties. For example, Hannebauer [26] proved that every P_4 -sparse minimal obstruction for (k, ℓ) -coloring is a cograph. The following results show that the same phenomenon occurs when we deal with $(s, 1)$ -, $(\infty, 1)$ -, (∞, ∞) -polarity.

Theorem 44. *Let s be a nonnegative integer. Any P_4 -sparse minimal $(s, 1)$ -polar obstruction is a cograph.*

Proof. Let G be a P_4 -sparse minimal $(s, 1)$ -polar obstruction. We proceed by induction on s . The statement is clearly true for $s \leq 1$. Let $s \geq 2$. It follows from Corollary 33 that G is not a spider, hence G or its complement is disconnected.

If G is disconnected, it follows from Theorem 28 that G is a cograph. Otherwise, if \overline{G} is disconnected, Lemma 35 implies that any component H of \overline{G} is a P_4 -sparse minimal $(1, k_i)$ -polar obstruction for a nonnegative integer k_i with $k_i < k$. Thus, \overline{H} is a P_4 -sparse minimal $(k_i, 1)$ -polar obstruction, and by induction hypothesis \overline{H} (hence H) is a cograph. Since the disjoint union of cographs is also a cograph, \overline{G} (hence G) is a cograph. \square

Corollary 45. *If G is a P_4 -sparse graph, then G is a minimal $(\infty, 1)$ -polar obstruction if and only if G is one of the four cographs depicted in Figure 5.*

Proof. Let G be P_4 -sparse minimal $(\infty, 1)$ -polar obstruction. Then G is a minimal $(s, 1)$ -polar obstruction for some nonnegative integer s . Moreover, by Theorem 44 we have that G is a cograph minimal $(\infty, 1)$ -polar obstruction. Then, from Theorem 12 in [11] we have that G is isomorphic to one of the cographs depicted in Figure 5. The converse is proved in Lemma 24. \square

Theorem 46. *If G is a P_4 -sparse minimal polar obstruction, then G is a cograph.*

Proof. First, assume for a contradiction that G is a spider, say $G = (S, K, R)$. Since headless spiders are split graphs, and thus polar graphs, R is not an empty set. Moreover, by the minimality of G , $G[R]$ admits a polar partition (A, B) , and then $(A \cup K, B \cup S)$ would be a polar partition of G , contradicting the election of G . Therefore G is not a spider. Thus, by Theorem 2, G or its complement is disconnected. However, in both cases Lemma 41 and Corollary 45 imply that G is a cograph. \square

7.2 P_4 -extendible graphs

The following result is analogous to Theorem 42; it provides a complete recursive construction of P_4 -extendible minimal $(s, 1)$ -polar obstructions. Notice that, since C_5 is a P_4 -extendible minimal $(1, 1)$ -polar obstruction, there are P_4 -extendible minimal $(s, 1)$ -polar obstructions which are not cographs for each positive integer s .

Theorem 47. *Let s be an integer, $s \geq 2$. If G is a P_4 -extendible graph, then G is a minimal $(s, 1)$ -polar obstruction if and only if G satisfies exactly one of the following assertions:*

1. G is isomorphic to one of the seven graphs depicted in Figure 5.
2. G is isomorphic to some of $2K_{s+1}, K_2 + (K_s \oplus 2K_1)$ or $K_1 + (K_{s-1} \oplus C_4)$.
3. The complement of G is disconnected with components G_1, \dots, G_t , each G_i is a minimal $(1, s_i)$ -polar obstruction whose complement is different from the graphs in Figure 5, and $s = t - 1 + \sum_{i=1}^t s_i$.

Proof. If G is disconnected, it follows from Theorem 28 that G is a minimal $(s, 1)$ -polar obstruction if and only if G is either a graph depicted in Figure 5, or it is isomorphic to some of $2K_{s+1}, K_2 + (K_s \oplus 2K_1)$ or $K_1 + (K_{s-1} \oplus C_4)$. Otherwise, if G is connected, Corollary 38 and Item 3 of Remark 36 imply that \overline{G} is a disconnected P_4 -extendible minimal $(1, s)$ -polar obstruction, and the result follows from Lemma 40. \square

Corollary 48. *There are exactly 13 P_4 -extendible minimal $(2, 1)$ -polar obstructions; they are the graphs E_1, \dots, E_{13} depicted in Figures 5 and 8.*

Unlike P_4 -sparse graphs, there are P_4 -extendible minimal monopolar and polar obstructions which are not cographs. We give complete lists of such minimal obstructions in the next results.

Corollary 49. *If G is a P_4 -extendible graph, then G is a minimal $(\infty, 1)$ -polar obstruction if and only if G is one of the graphs depicted in Figure 5.*

Proof. Let G be a P_4 -extendible minimal $(\infty, 1)$ -polar obstruction. Then G is a minimal $(s, 1)$ -polar obstruction for some integer s , $s \geq 2$. By Lemma 40 and Theorem 47 we conclude that G is isomorphic to one of the seven graphs depicted in Figure 5. The converse is proved in Lemma 24. \square

Theorem 50. *If H is a P_4 -extendible minimal polar obstruction, then H or its complement is the disjoint union of P_3 with the complement of one of the graphs depicted in Figure 5.*

Proof. First, let assume for obtaining a contradiction that H is a G -spider for some separable extension G , say $H = (S, K, R)$. By Items 1 and 2 of Remark 36, we have that $R \neq \emptyset$, and by the minimality of H , $H[R]$ admits a polar partition (A, B) . But, no matter what separable extension G is, its midpoints induce a complete multipartite graph while its endpoints induce a cluster, so $(A \cup K, B \cup S)$ is a polar partition of H , contradicting the assumption that H was a G -spider. Thus, by Theorem 3, either H or its complement is disconnected, and the result follows from Lemma 41 and Corollary 49. \square

8 Conclusions

In the present work we generalize some results related to hereditary properties in cographs, providing similar results for two superclasses of P_4 -free graphs, namely P_4 -sparse and P_4 -extendible graphs. The following five theorems summarize the main contributions of this paper. Let \mathcal{G} be any subclass of either P_4 -extendible or P_4 -sparse graphs which is closed under both graph complements and induced subgraphs.

Theorem 51. *Let G be a graph in the class \mathcal{G} . Then G is a minimal unipolar obstruction if and only if $G \in \{2P_3, K_{2,3}, C_5\}$.*

Theorem 52. *Let G be a graph in the class \mathcal{G} , and let s be an integer, $s \geq 2$. Then G is a minimal $(s, 1)$ -polar obstruction if and only if G satisfies exactly one of the following assertions:*

1. G is isomorphic to one of the graphs depicted in Figure 5.
2. G is isomorphic to some of $2K_{s+1}, K_2 + (K_s \oplus 2K_1)$ or $K_1 + (K_{s-1} \oplus C_4)$.
3. The complement of G is disconnected with components G_1, \dots, G_t , each G_i is a minimal $(1, s_i)$ -polar obstruction whose complement is different from the graphs in Figure 5, and $s = t - 1 + \sum_{i=1}^t s_i$.

Theorem 53. *Let G be a graph in the class \mathcal{G} . Then G is a minimal monopolar obstruction if and only if \overline{G} is one of the graphs depicted in Figure 5.*

Theorem 54. *Let G be a graph in the class \mathcal{G} . Then, G is a minimal polar obstruction if and only if either G or its complement is the join of $\overline{P_3}$ with one of the graphs depicted in Figure 5.*

Theorem 55. *Any hereditary property \mathcal{P} on the class \mathcal{G} has only a finite number of minimal \mathcal{P} -obstructions.*

Throughout this work we showed that any P_4 -sparse minimal obstruction for unipolarity, monopolarity, polarity, and $(s, 1)$ -polarity is a cograph. In addition, Hannebauer [26] showed the following interesting result that generalize its analogue for cographs, which was previously proved in [22].

Theorem 56 ([26]). *Let H be a P_4 -sparse minimal (s, k) -polar obstruction. Then H has at most $(s + 1)(k + 1)$ vertices.*

The observations above make us propose the following questions.

Problem 1. *For any positive integers s and k , is every P_4 -sparse minimal (s, k) -polar obstruction a cograph?*

Problem 2. *Can we establish an $O(sk)$ upper bound for the order of the P_4 -extendible minimal (s, k) -polar obstructions?*

It was independently shown in [3] and [26] that any P_4 -sparse minimal obstruction for (k, ℓ) -coloring is a cograph too, so we propose the following problem generalizing Problem 1.

Problem 3. *Which hereditary properties \mathcal{P} satisfy that every P_4 -sparse minimal \mathcal{P} -obstruction is a cograph?*

With the help of an interesting graph operation called partial complementation, Hell, Hernández-Cruz and Linhares-Sales [27] gave the complete list of cograph minimal $(2, 2)$ -polar obstructions. In a work in progress, we provide analogous results for P_4 -sparse and P_4 -extendible graphs, as well as efficient algorithms for finding maximal unipolar, monopolar, and polar subgraphs on these families. Such algorithms are based on the unique tree representations for the mentioned classes and they generalize those given in [19] for cographs.

As a future line of work, we propose to extend the results in this paper to more general graph classes having few induced P_4 's, for instance, P_4 -tidy graphs or extended P_4 -laden graphs, any of which contains both P_4 -sparse and P_4 -extendible graphs. Another line of work is to characterize some other hereditary properties on cograph superclasses (see Figure 2) by their sets of minimal obstructions. For example, it remains unknown whether the P_4 -extendible minimal (k, ℓ) -obstructions admit a simple structural characterization as their analogous in cographs and P_4 -sparse graphs.

References

- [1] J.A. Bondy and U.S.R Murty, Graph Theory, Springer, Berlin, 2008.
- [2] L. Babel and S. Olariu, On the p -connectedness of graphs - a survey, Discrete Applied Mathematics 95(1-3) (1999) 11–33.
- [3] R. de S.F. Bravo, S. Klein, L.T. Nogueira and F. Protti, Characterization and recognition of P_4 -sparse graphs partitionable into k independent sets and ℓ cliques, Discrete Applied Mathematics 159(4) 2011 165–173.
- [4] R. de 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).
- [5] A. Bretscher, D. Corneil, M. Habib and C. Paul, A simple linear time LexBFS cograph recognition algorithms, SIAM Journal on Discrete Mathematics 22(4) (2008) 1277–1296.
- [6] Z.A. Chernyak and A.A. Chernyak, About recognizing (α, β) classes of polar graphs, Discrete Mathematics 62(2) (1986) 133–138.
- [7] R. Churchley and J. Huang, Line-polar graphs: characterization and recognition, SIAM Journal on Discrete Mathematics 25(3) (2011) 1269–1284.

- [8] R. Churchley and J. Huang, List monopolar partitions of claw-free graphs, *Discrete Mathematics*, 312(17) (2012) 2545–2549.
- [9] R. Churchley and J. Huang, On the polarity and monopolarity of graphs, *Journal of Graph Theory* 76(2) (2014) 138–148.
- [10] R. Churchley and J. Huang, Solving partition problems with colour-bipartitions, *Graphs and combinatorics* 30(2) (2014) 353–364.
- [11] F. E. Contreras-Mendoza and C. Hernández-Cruz, Minimal obstructions to $(s, 1)$ -polarity in cographs, *Discrete Applied Mathematics* 281 (2020) 111–117.
- [12] F. E. Contreras-Mendoza and C. Hernández-Cruz, Minimal obstructions to (∞, k) -polarity in cographs, *Discrete Mathematics* 344(7) (2021) 112407.
- [13] D.G. Corneil, H. Lerchs and L. Stewart Burlingham, Complement reducible graphs, *Discrete Applied Mathematics* 3(3) (1981) 163–174.
- [14] D.G. Corneil, Y. Perl and L.K. Stewart Burlingham, A linear recognition algorithm for cographs, *SIAM Journal on Computing* 14(4) (1985), 926–934.
- [15] P. Damaschke, Induced subgraphs and well-quasi-ordering, *Journal of Graph Theory* 14 (1990) 427–435.
- [16] T. Ekim, P. Heggernes and D. Meister, Polar permutation graphs, in: *International Workshop on Combinatorial Algorithms* (pp. 218–229), Springer, Berlin, Heidelberg, 2009.
- [17] T. Ekim, P. Heggernes and D. Meister, Polar permutation graphs are polynomial-time recognisable, *European Journal of Combinatorics*, 34(3) 576–592.
- [18] T. Ekim, P. Hell, J. Stacho and D. de Werra, Polarity of chordal graphs, *Discrete Applied Mathematics* 156(13) (2008) 1593–1598.
- [19] T. Ekim, N. V. R. Mahadev and D. de Werra, Polar cographs, *Discrete Applied Mathematics* 156(10) (2008) 1652–1660.
- [20] E.M. Eschen and X. Wang, Algorithms for unipolar and generalized split graphs, *Discrete Applied Mathematics* 6(3) (2014) 309–321.
- [21] A. Farrugia, Vertex-partitioning into fixed additive induced-hereditary properties is NP-hard, *The electronic journal of combinatorics* 11(1R) (2004) 1–9.
- [22] T. Feder, P. Hell and W. Hochstatler, Generalized Colourings (Matrix Partitions) of Cographs, in: *Graph Theory in Paris, 2006*, 149–167
- [23] T. Feder, P. Hell and W. Xie, Partitions with finitely many obstructions, *Electronic Notes in Discrete Mathematics* 28 (2007) 371–378.

- [24] S. Foldes and P. L. Hammer, Split graphs, in: Proc. 8th Southeastern Conf. on Combinatorics, Graph Theory, and Computing, 1977, 311–315.
- [25] V. Giakoumakis and J. M. Vanherpe, On extended P_4 -reducible and extended P_4 -sparse graphs, Theoretical Computer Science 180(1-2) (1997) 269–286.
- [26] C. Hannebauer, Matrix colorings of P_4 -sparse graphs, Doctoral dissertation (2010), FernUniversität in Hagen.
- [27] P. Hell, C. Hernández-Cruz and C. Linhares-Sales, Minimal obstructions to 2-polar cographs, Discrete Applied Mathematics 261 (2019) 219–228.
- [28] B. Jamison and S. Olariu, On a unique tree representation for P_4 -extendible graphs, Discrete Applied Mathematics 34 (1991) 151–164.
- [29] B. Jamison and S. Olariu, A tree representation for P_4 -sparse graphs, Discrete Applied Mathematics 35(2) (1992) 115–129.
- [30] V.B. Le and R. Nevries, Complexity and algorithms for recognizing polar and monopolar graphs, Theoretical Computer Science 528 (2014) 1–11.
- [31] V.B. Le and R. Nevries, Recognizing polar planar graphs using new results for monopolarity, In International Symposium on Algorithms and Computation (pp. 120–129), Springer, Berlin, Heidelberg, 2011.
- [32] J. Stacho, Complexity of generalized colorings of chordal graphs, Doctoral dissertation (2008), School of Computing Science at Simon Fraser University.
- [33] M. Talmaciu and E. Nechita, On polar, trivially perfect graphs, International Journal of Computers Communications & control 5(5) (2010) 939–945.