

HITTING ALL MAXIMUM STABLE SETS IN P_5 -FREE GRAPHS

SEPEHR HAJEBI ^{*}, YANJIA LI ^{**}, AND SOPHIE SPIRKL ^{*†}

ABSTRACT. We prove that every P_5 -free graph of bounded clique number contains a small hitting set of all its maximum stable sets (where P_t denotes the t -vertex path, and for graphs G, H , we say G is H -free if no induced subgraph of G is isomorphic to H).

More generally, let us say a class \mathcal{C} of graphs is η -bounded if there exists a function $h : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ such that $\eta(G) \leq h(\omega(G))$ for every graph $G \in \mathcal{C}$, where $\eta(G)$ denotes smallest cardinality of a hitting set of all maximum stable sets in G , and $\omega(G)$ is the clique number of G . Also, \mathcal{C} is said to be *polynomially η -bounded* if in addition h can be chosen to be a polynomial.

We introduce η -boundedness inspired by a question of Alon (asking how large $\eta(G)$ can be for a 3-colourable graph G), and motivated by a number of meaningful similarities to χ -boundedness, namely,

- given a graph G , we have $\eta(H) \leq \omega(H)$ for every induced subgraph H of G if and only if G is perfect;
- there are graphs G with both $\eta(G)$ and the girth of G arbitrarily large; and
- if \mathcal{C} is a hereditary class of graphs which is polynomially η -bounded, then \mathcal{C} satisfies the Erdős-Hajnal conjecture.

The second bullet above in particular suggests an analogue of the Gyárfás-Sumner conjecture, that the class of all H -free graphs is η -bounded if (and only if) H is a forest. Like χ -boundedness, the case where H is a star is easy to verify, and we prove two non-trivial extensions of this: H -free graphs are η -bounded if (1) H has a vertex incident with all edges of H , or (2) H can be obtained from a star by subdividing at most one edge, exactly once.

Unlike χ -boundedness, the case where H is a path is surprisingly hard. Our main result mentioned at the beginning shows that P_5 -free graphs are η -bounded. The proof is rather involved compared to the classical ‘‘Gyárfás path’’ argument which establishes, for all t , the χ -boundedness of P_t -free graphs. It remains open whether P_t -free graphs are η -bounded for $t \geq 6$.

It also remains open whether P_5 -free graphs are polynomially η -bounded, which, if true, would imply the Erdős-Hajnal conjecture for P_5 -free graphs. But we prove that H -free graphs are polynomially η -bounded if H is a proper induced subgraph of P_5 . We further generalize the case where H is a 1-regular graph on four vertices, showing that H -free graphs are polynomially η -bounded if H is a forest with no vertex of degree more than one and at most four vertices of degree one.

Keywords: Induced subgraphs, Independent sets, Ramsey Theory

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1. Background and motivation. Throughout this paper, all graphs have finite vertex sets and no loops or parallel edges. We denote by \mathbb{N} the set of all positive integers. Let $G = (V(G), E(G))$ be a graph. A *stable set* in G is a set of pairwise non-adjacent vertices. The

^{*}DEPARTMENT OF COMBINATORICS AND OPTIMIZATION, UNIVERSITY OF WATERLOO, WATERLOO, ONTARIO, CANADA

^{**}SCHOOL OF MATHEMATICS, GEORGIA INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY, ATLANTA, GA 30332, USA

[†] WE ACKNOWLEDGE THE SUPPORT OF THE NATURAL SCIENCES AND ENGINEERING RESEARCH COUNCIL OF CANADA (NSERC), [FUNDING REFERENCE NUMBER RGPIN-2020-03912]. CETTE RECHERCHE A ÉTÉ FINANCÉE PAR LE CONSEIL DE RECHERCHES EN SCIENCES NATURELLES ET EN GÉNIE DU CANADA (CRSNG), [NUMÉRO DE RÉFÉRENCE RGPIN-2020-03912]. THIS PROJECT WAS FUNDED IN PART BY THE GOVERNMENT OF ONTARIO.

Date: January 18, 2024.

THIS IS AN ACCEPTED MANUSCRIPT. THE PUBLISHED VERSION APPEARED IN JOURNAL OF COMBINATORIAL THEORY, SERIES B, VOLUME 165, MARCH 2024, PAGES 142-163, [HTTPS://DOI.ORG/10.1016/J.JCTB.2023.11.005](https://doi.org/10.1016/J.JCTB.2023.11.005).

cardinality of the largest stable set in G is denoted by $\alpha(G)$, and a *maximum stable set* in G is a stable set in G of cardinality $\alpha(G)$. By a *hitting set* for G , we mean a set $X \subseteq V(G)$ which intersects every maximum stable set in G , or equivalently, satisfies $\alpha(G \setminus X) < \alpha(G)$. We denote by $\eta(G)$ the smallest cardinality of a hitting set for G . Bollobás, Erdős and Tuza raised the following conjecture, that in any graph G with a stable set which is larger than $V(G)$ by at most a constant factor, there exists a hitting set which is much smaller than the entire vertex set.

Conjecture 1.1 (Bollobás, Erdős and Tuza [5, 8]). *For every real $\delta > 0$, every graph G with $\alpha(G) \geq \delta|V(G)|$ satisfies $\eta(G) \leq o(|V(G)|)$.*

This is still open, and might be true as far as we know. In fact, a result of Hajnal [13] (see also [17]) shows that Conjecture 1.1 holds for all $\delta > 1/2$. Also, the following recent result of Alon [3] complements Conjecture 1.1, providing a construction of infinitely many graphs G with $\alpha(G)$ linear in $|V(G)|$ and $\eta(G)$ arbitrarily large.

Theorem 1.2 (Alon [3]). *For every integer $n \geq 1$, there exists a graph G_n with $|V(G_n)| > n$, $|V(G_n)|/2 > \alpha(G_n) > |V(G_n)|/4$ and $\eta(G_n) > \sqrt{|V(G_n)|}/2$.*

One approach to understand Conjecture 1.1 is to examine it for special classes of graphs with α linear in the number of vertices, where the most natural candidates are graph classes of bounded chromatic number (the chromatic number of a graph G is denoted by $\chi(G)$; recall that every graph G satisfies $\alpha(G) \geq |V(G)|/\chi(G)$). As a starter, Hajnal's result [13] mentioned above implies that every graph G with $\chi(G) \leq 2$ satisfies $\eta(G) \leq 2$. But the train already stops here; as highlighted by Alon [1], it is not known whether 3-colourable graphs satisfy Conjecture 1.1. Although bounded η is not expected anymore, as Alon [2] shared with us, in private communication, a proof of the following result:

Theorem 1.3 (Alon [2]). *For every integer $h \geq 1$, there exists an 8-colourable graph G_h with $\eta(G_h) > h$.*

Note that the complete graph K_t satisfies $\chi(K_t) = \eta(K_t) = t$. Inspired by χ -boundedness as the study of graph classes in which complete graphs are the only (induced subgraph) obstructions to bounded chromatic number, we look into classes in which η can be upper bounded by a function of the clique number.

1.2. η -boundedness vs. χ -boundedness. We begin with a brief digression about χ -boundedness. For graphs G and H , we say H is an *induced subgraph* of G if H can be obtained from G by removing vertices, and that G is *H -free* if no induced subgraph of G is isomorphic to H . A class \mathcal{C} of graphs is said to be *hereditary* if \mathcal{C} is closed under isomorphism and taking induced subgraphs. A *clique* in a graph G is a set of pairwise adjacent vertices. The cardinality of the largest clique in G is denoted by $\omega(G)$, and a *maximum clique* in G is a clique in G of cardinality $\omega(G)$. A class \mathcal{C} of graphs is said to be *χ -bounded* if there exists a function $f : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ such that every graph $G \in \mathcal{C}$ satisfies $\chi(G) \leq f(\omega(G))$. This is a heavily studied notion of interest in structural and extremal graph theory (see [18] for a survey), mainly due to the following three reasons.

- First, χ -boundedness has its roots in the theory of perfect graphs (that is, graphs G with $\chi(H) \leq \omega(H)$ for every induced subgraph H of G). In fact, the systematic study of χ -boundedness was initiated in a 1987 paper by Gyárfás [11] entitled “Problems from the world surrounding perfect graphs”.
- Second, it has an intriguing connection to a well-known conjecture of Erdős and Hajnal. Let us say that a hereditary class \mathcal{C} of graphs has the *Erdős-Hajnal property* if there exists $\varepsilon > 0$ such that every graph $G \in \mathcal{C}$ satisfies either $\alpha(G) \geq |V(G)|^\varepsilon$ or $\omega(G) \geq |V(G)|^\varepsilon$. While the class of all graph is known not to have the Erdős-Hajnal property, the Erdős-Hajnal conjecture [9, 10] asserts that *all* other hereditary classes have the Erdős-Hajnal property, or equivalently, for every graph H , the class of all H -free graphs has the

Erdős-Hajnal property. This remains out of reach even when H is the five-vertex path P_5 . Back to the connection to χ -boundedness, one may observe that a hereditary class of graphs \mathcal{C} has the Erdős-Hajnal property if \mathcal{C} is *polynomially- χ -bounded*, that is, \mathcal{C} is χ -bounded where the function $f : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ from the definition can be chosen as $f(x) = x^d$ for some positive integer d . As expected, it is not known whether P_5 -free graphs are polynomially- χ -bounded.

- Third, despite the tremendous advancement in χ -boundedness over the past 10 years, there remains an open problem at its heart, the Gyárfás-Sumner conjecture [12, 21], asserting that the class of all H -free graphs is χ -bounded if H is a forest. This is easy to verify when H is the star $K_{1,t}$ (on $t + 1$ vertices), and was proved by Gyárfás [11] when H is the path P_t (on t vertices) for all t . Also, the Gyárfás-Sumner conjecture would be sharp in the sense that forests are the only graphs that may possibly satisfy this conjecture; this is evidenced by a well-known result of Erdős [7] that there are graphs with arbitrarily large girth and arbitrarily large chromatic number.

Let us now define “ η -boundedness” formally. We say a class \mathcal{C} of graphs is η -bounded if there exists a function $f : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ such that every graph $G \in \mathcal{C}$ satisfies $\eta(G) \leq f(\omega(G))$, and *polynomially η -bounded* if in addition we have $f(x) = x^d$ for some positive integer d . Our interest in η -boundedness is sparked by the fact that it shares with χ -boundedness the three reasons mentioned above for being a compelling notion.

First, the class of perfect graphs can be viewed as the point of origin for η -boundedness, more or less in the same way it is so for χ -boundedness. To see this, we need an easy lemma, which we leave to the reader to prove.

Lemma 1.4. *Let $d, h \in \mathbb{N}$ and let G be a graph such that $\eta(G') \leq h$ for every induced subgraph G' of G . Then there exists $D \subseteq V(G)$ with $|D| \leq dh$ such that $\alpha(G \setminus D) \leq \alpha(G) - d$. In particular, we have $\alpha(G) \geq |V(G)|/h$.*

Theorem 1.5. *Let G be a graph. Then G is perfect if and only if we have $\eta(H) \leq \omega(H)$ for every induced subgraph H of G .*

Proof. Lovász [16] proved that a graph G is perfect if and only if we have $\alpha(H)\omega(H) \geq |V(H)|$ for every induced subgraph H of G . This in particular implies that a graph G is perfect if and only if the complement of G is perfect.

Now, assume that G is a perfect graph and H is a non-null induced subgraph of G ; then H is perfect, too. By Lovász’s result, the complement of H is perfect. It follows that $V(H)$ can be partitioned into cliques C_1, \dots, C_s where $\alpha(H) = s \geq 1$. Thus, for all $i \in \{1, \dots, s\}$, every maximum stable set of H intersects C_i in exactly one vertex. But then C_1 is hitting set for H , and so $\eta(H) \leq |C_1| \leq \omega(H)$.

Conversely, assume that G is a graph with $\eta(H) \leq \omega(H)$ for every induced subgraph H of G . Let H be an arbitrary induced subgraph of G . It follows that $\eta(H') \leq \omega(H') \leq \omega(H)$ for every induced subgraph H' of H . Thus, by Lemma 1.4 applied to $G = H$ and $h = \omega(H)$, we have $\alpha(H)\omega(H) \geq |V(H)|$. But then by Lovász’s Theorem, G is perfect. This completes the proof of Theorem 1.5. ■

Our second motivation for introducing η -boundedness is its connection to the Erdős-Hajnal conjecture, which is identical to that of χ -boundedness.

Theorem 1.6. *Let \mathcal{C} be a hereditary class of graph which is polynomially η -bounded. Then \mathcal{C} satisfies the Erdős-Hajnal conjecture.*

Proof. Since \mathcal{C} is polynomially η -bounded, there exists $d \in \mathbb{N}$ such that every graph $G \in \mathcal{C}$ satisfies $\eta(G) \leq \omega(G)^d$. We claim that for $\varepsilon = (d + 1)^{-1}$, every graph $G \in \mathcal{C}$ satisfies either $\alpha(G) \geq |V(G)|^\varepsilon$ or $\omega(G) \geq |V(G)|^\varepsilon$. To see this, note that since \mathcal{C} is hereditary, for every graph $G \in \mathcal{C}$ and every induced subgraph G' of G , we have $\eta(G') \leq \omega(G')^d \leq \omega(G)^d$. Thus, by

Lemma 1.4 applied to G and $h = \omega(G)^d$, we have $\alpha(G)\omega(G)^d \geq |V(G)|$, which in turn implies that either $\alpha(G) \geq |V(G)|^{(d+1)^{-1}}$ or $\omega(G) \geq |V(G)|^{(d+1)^{-1}}$, as desired. ■

The third reason why we find η -boundedness interesting is a direct analogue of the Gyárfás-Sumner conjecture, attempting to characterize all graphs H for which H -free graphs are η -bounded. The result below shows that this holds only if H is a forest. This can be proved using a direct adaption of Erdős' proof [7] for the existence of graphs with large girth and large chromatic number, which we omit.

Theorem 1.7. *For every $h \in \mathbb{N}$, there exists a graph G_h with girth more than h and with $\eta(G_h) > h$.*

In view of Theorem 1.7, we propose the following analogue of the Gyárfás-Sumner conjecture for η -boundedness.

Conjecture 1.8. *For every forest H , there exists a function $f : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ such that every H -free graph G satisfies $\eta(G) \leq f(\omega(G))$.*

The main content of this paper is the proof of Conjecture 1.8 for an assortment of special forests. Like the original Gyárfás-Sumner conjecture, Conjecture 1.8 is easily seen to hold when H is star, which we prove next. Let us first mention the following quantified version of Ramsey's theorem. A similar result with a slightly different bound and an almost identical proof has also appeared in [20]; we include a proof though for the sake of completeness.

Theorem 1.9. *For all $c, s \in \mathbb{N}$, every graph G on at least c^s vertices contains either a clique of cardinality c or a stable set of cardinality s .*

Proof. The proof is by induction on s for fixed c . The cases $c = 1$ and $s = 1$ are easily seen to hold. So we may assume that $c, s > 1$. Let G be a graph on at least c^s vertices with no clique of cardinality c and no stable set of cardinality s . Let K be a maximum clique in G ; thus, we have $|K| \leq c - 1$. For each $x \in K$, let M_x be the set of all vertices in G which are non-adjacent to x . It follows from the maximality of K that $V(G) = \bigcup_{x \in K} (M_x \cup \{x\})$. Now, for every $x \in K$, $G[M_x]$ contains no clique of cardinality c (as neither does G) and no stable set of cardinality $s - 1$ (or otherwise $M_x \cup \{x\}$, and so G , contains a stable set of cardinality t). Consequently, by the induction hypothesis, we have $|M_x| < c^{s-1}$. But then $|V(G)| \leq (c - 1)c^{s-1} < c^s$, a contradiction. This proves Theorem 1.9. ■

Note also that for every vertex v in every graph G , every maximum stable set of G contains either v or a neighbour of v . In other words:

Theorem 1.10. *Let G be a graph and $v \in V(G)$ be a vertex of degree at most d in G . Then we have $\eta(G) \leq d + 1$.*

Combined with Theorem 1.9, this immediately yields Conjecture 1.8 for stars:

Theorem 1.11. *Let $s \in \mathbb{N}$ and G be a $K_{1,s}$ -free graph. Then every vertex of G has degree less than $\omega(G)^s$. Consequently, we have $\eta(G) \leq \omega(G)^s$.*

We remark that Theorem 1.10 also implies that every graph class in which the degeneracy is bounded by some function of the clique number is η -bounded. Proper minor-closed classes are well-known to have this property. Other examples include, for every positive integer s and every forest H , the class of all $K_{s,s}$ -free H -free graphs [19] (in fact, the main result of [19] yields polynomial η -boundedness in this case), and for every positive integer s and every graph H , the class of all $K_{s,s}$ -free graphs with no induced subgraph isomorphic to a subdivision of H [15]. The latter in particular includes the famous class of “even-hole-free” graphs. Another another result from [4] shows that every even-hole-free graph G has a vertex of degree at most $2\omega(G) - 2$, which along with Theorem 1.10 implies that $\eta(G) \leq 2\omega(G) - 1$.

But this concludes the list of forests for which Conjecture 1.8 can be proved easily: for all forests apart from induced subgraphs of stars (for which Conjecture 1.8 follows from Theorem 1.11) and induced subgraphs of P_4 (for which Conjecture 1.8 follows from Theorem 1.5, as P_4 -free graphs are perfect), Conjecture 1.8 seems to be much harder to prove than the Gyárfás-Sumner conjecture. The case of paths on five or more vertices is particularly tempting as there is a short and elementary proof of the Gyárfás-Sumner conjecture for all paths [11].

Our main result verifies Conjecture 1.8 when H is the five-vertex path:

Theorem 1.12. *The class of P_5 -free graphs is η -bounded.*

The proof of Theorem 1.12 is substantially longer and harder than its χ -boundedness counterpart. It remains open whether P_t -free graphs are η -bounded for $t \geq 6$.

Conjecture 1.13. *For every integer $t \geq 6$, the class of P_t -free graphs is η -bounded.*

Similarly, in the case of disconnected forests, the Gyárfás-Sumner conjecture appears to be more approachable than Conjecture 1.8. It is straightforward to show that a forest H satisfies the Gyárfás-Sumner conjecture if and only if all its components do so. We do not know whether the corresponding statement holds for Conjecture 1.8; in fact, it remains open whether the disjoint union of two stars satisfies Conjecture 1.8. But we can prove the following weakening:

Theorem 1.14. *Let H be a graph in which some vertex is incident with all edges. Then H -free graphs are η -bounded.*

Moreover, the Gyárfás-Sumner conjecture is known to hold for all trees of radius two [14]. In contrast, Conjecture 1.8 remains open even for trees of diameter three, but we can come close:

Theorem 1.15. *Let H be a tree which is obtained from a star by subdividing at most one edge, exactly once. Then H -free graphs are η -bounded.*

Finally, concerning the connection to the Erdős-Hajnal conjecture, we would like to propose the following strengthening of Conjecture 1.8. We remark that the corresponding extension of the Gyárfás-Sumner conjecture remains open, too (although it is known that there are χ -bounded graph classes which are not polynomially χ -bounded [6]).

Conjecture 1.16. *For every forest H , there exists $d \in \mathbb{N}$ such that every H -free graph G satisfies $\eta(G) \leq \omega(G)^d$.*

Note that by Theorems 1.5 and 1.11, Conjecture 1.16 holds when H is either a star or an induced subgraph of P_4 . The case where H is the five-vertex path remains open; this is particularly interesting because by Theorem 1.6, it would imply the Erdős-Hajnal conjecture for P_5 -free graphs. Let us state it separately:

Conjecture 1.17. *There exists $d \in \mathbb{N}$ such that every P_5 -free graph G satisfies $\eta(G) \leq \omega(G)^d$.*

Indeed, the bound obtained in Theorem 1.12 is super-exponential, and it would be interesting even to bring it down to a singly exponential bound.

On the bright side, we were able to prove the following:

Theorem 1.18. *Let H be isomorphic to a proper induced subgraph of P_5 . Then H -free graphs are polynomially η -bounded.*

For each $t \in \mathbb{N}$, let M_t be the unique (up to isomorphism) 1-regular graph on $2t$ vertices. Then M_2 is isomorphic to a proper induced subgraph of P_5 , and so by Theorem 1.18, M_2 -free graphs are polynomially η -bounded. In this case, we can prove more:

Theorem 1.19. *Let H be a graph with no vertex of degree more than one and at most four vertices of degree one. Then H -free graphs are polynomially η -bounded.*

We would also like to conjecture a natural strengthening of Theorem 1.19, that M_t -free graphs are polynomially η -bounded for all t , though it is not even known (stikingly enough) whether M_3 -free graphs are η -bounded.

Conjecture 1.20. *For every integer $t \geq 3$, M_t -free graphs are polynomially η -bounded.*

This paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, we introduce the required notation and terminology to be used in our proofs. Sections 3 and 4 are devoted to the proof of Theorem 1.12. In Section 5, we prove Theorems 1.14 and 1.15. Finally, in Section 6, we prove Theorems 1.18 and 1.19.

2. NOTATION AND TERMINOLOGY

Let $G = (V(G), E(G))$ be a graph. For a set $X \subseteq V(G)$ we denote by $G[X]$ the subgraph of G induced by X . For $X \subseteq V(G) \cup E(G)$, $G \setminus X$ denotes the subgraph of G obtained by removing X . Note that if $X \subseteq V(G)$, then $G \setminus X$ denotes the subgraph of G induced by $V(G) \setminus X$. In this paper, we use induced subgraphs and their vertex sets interchangeably.

For every $x \in G$, we denote by $N_G(x)$ the set of neighbours of x in G , and write $N_G[x] = N_G(x) \cup \{x\}$ (we omit the subscript G if there is no ambiguity). For an induced subgraph H of G (where x does not necessarily belongs to H), we define $N_H(x) = N_G(x) \cap H$ and $N_H[x] = N_G[x] \cap H$. Also, for $X \subseteq G$, we denote by $N_G(X)$ the set of all vertices in $G \setminus X$ with at least one neighbour in X , and define $N_G[X] = N_G(X) \cup X$.

Let $X, Y \subseteq G$ be disjoint. We say X is *complete* to Y if all edges with an end in X and an end in Y are present in G , and X is *anticomplete* to Y if there are no edges between X and Y . For $x \in V(G) \setminus Y$, we also say x is *complete* (*anticomplete*) to Y if $\{x\}$ is complete (anticomplete) to Y .

An *induced path in G* is an induced subgraph of G that is a path. If P is an induced path in G , we write $P = p_1 \cdots p_k$ to mean that $V(P) = \{p_1, \dots, p_k\}$ and p_i is adjacent to p_j if and only if $|i - j| = 1$. We call the vertices p_1 and p_k the *ends* of P , and say that P is *from p_1 to p_k* . The *interior* of P , denoted by P^* , is the set $P \setminus \{p_1, p_k\}$. The *length* of a path is its number of edges (so a path of length at most one has empty interior).

3. CRADLES IN P_5 -FREE GRAPHS

We now plunge into proving Theorem 1.12. Roughly, the proof consists of the following two steps. First, we show that in every P_5 -free graph G of bounded clique number, one may always find a small hitting set for all maximum stable sets of G which are “restricted to” a configuration in G that we call a “cradle”. The second step then is to show that in every P_5 -free graph of bounded clique number, one may “pack” only a few cradles such that every maximum stable set of G is restricted to at least one of the cradles from the packing. This, in particular, is done starting with a maximum clique K in G along with a linear order of the vertices in K , and then hitting maximum stable sets in G intersecting K and those not intersecting K separately. The former is easily handled since K has bounded cardinality. For maximum stable sets not intersecting K , we further group them based on the first, if any, vertex v in the linear order of K with a “private” neighbour in the stable set, and show that the stable sets in each group are restricted to a specific cradle corresponding to v .

In this section, we take the first step, and the second one is postponed to the next section. The main result is Theorem 3.4, but we need some preparation before we state and prove it.

Let G be a graph. By a *cradle* in G we mean a pair (X, Z) of disjoint subsets of $V(G)$ such that either $|X| \leq 1$, or the following hold.

- Every vertex in $N_Z(X)$ has a neighbour in $G \setminus N[X]$.
- For every two vertices $z, z' \in N_Z(X)$, there exists an induced path P in G from z to z' such that $P^* \subseteq G \setminus N[X]$.

In particular, for every $X \subseteq V(G)$, (X, \emptyset) is a cradle in G . The following lemma is immediate from the above definition:

Lemma 3.1. *Let G be a P_5 -free graph and let (X, Z) be a cradle in G . Then the following hold.*

- *For all distinct vertices $x, x' \in X$ and $z, z' \in Z$, we have $E(G[\{x, x', z, z'\}]) \neq \{xz, x'z'\}$.*
- *For every vertex $z \in Z$, there is at most one component of $G[X]$ in which z has both a neighbour and a non-neighbour.*

Proof. Suppose the first bullet does not hold. Since (X, Z) is a cradle, there exists an induced path P of length at least two in G from z to z' such that $P^* \subseteq G \setminus N[X]$. But now x - z - P - z' - x' is an induced path in G on at least five vertices, a contradiction.

To see the second bullet, suppose for a contradiction that there exist distinct components D, D' of $G[X]$ and induced paths z - a - b and z - a' - b' in G such that $\{a, b\} \subseteq D$ and $\{a', b'\} \subseteq D'$. But now b - a - z - a' - b' is an induced P_5 in G , which is impossible. This proves Lemma 3.1. ■

Given a cradle (X, Z) in a graph G , by a *rocker* for (X, Z) we mean a pair $(\mathcal{I}, \mathcal{J})$ of collections of components of $G[X]$ with the following specifications.

- \mathcal{I} “minimally represents” all components of $G[X]$ which are anticomplete to some vertex in Z . More precisely, for every vertex $z \in Z$ which is anticomplete to some component of $G[X]$, there exists $D \in \mathcal{I}$ such that z is anticomplete to D , and subject to this property, \mathcal{I} is minimal with respect to inclusion.
- \mathcal{J} is the collection of all components D of $G[X]$ for which there exists a vertex $z \in Z$ such that z has a neighbour in each component of $G[X]$, and z has a non-neighbour in D .

It follows that there exists a rocker for every cradle in G . Also, we deduce:

Lemma 3.2. *Let G be a P_5 -free graph. Let (X, Z) be a cradle in G and let $(\mathcal{I}, \mathcal{J})$ be a rocker for (X, Z) . Then $|\mathcal{I}|, |\mathcal{J}| \leq \omega(G)$.*

Proof. First, we show that $|\mathcal{I}| \leq \omega(G)$. By the minimality of \mathcal{I} , for every $D \in \mathcal{I}$, there exists a vertex $z_D \in Z$ such that z_D is anticomplete to D but z_D has a neighbour $x_{D, D'}$ in D' for each $D' \in \mathcal{I} \setminus \{D\}$. It follows that the vertices in $Z' = \{z_D : D \in \mathcal{I}\}$ are pairwise distinct, and so $|\mathcal{I}| = |Z'|$. Also, for all distinct $D, D' \in \mathcal{I}$, from the first bullet of Lemma 3.1 applied to (X, Z) and $x = x_{D, D'}, x' = x_{D', D}, z = z_D$ and $z' = z_{D'}$, we deduce that z_D is adjacent to $z_{D'}$. Therefore, Z' is a clique of G and so $|\mathcal{I}| = |Z'| \leq \omega(G)$.

The proof of $|\mathcal{J}| \leq \omega(G)$ is similar. For every $D \in \mathcal{J}$, let $z'_D \in Z$ be a vertex with a neighbour in every component of $G[X]$ and with a non-neighbour x_D in D . For distinct $D, D' \in \mathcal{J}$, it follows from the second bullet of Lemma 3.1 applied to (X, Z) that $z'_D, z'_{D'}$ are distinct, z'_D is adjacent to $x_{D'}$ and $z'_{D'}$ is adjacent to x_D . In particular, assuming $Z'' = \{z'_D : D \in \mathcal{J}\}$, we have $|\mathcal{J}| = |Z''|$. Now, by the first bullet of Lemma 3.1 applied to (X, Z) and $x = x_D, x' = x_{D'}, z = z'_{D'}$ and $z' = z'_D$, z'_D is adjacent to $z'_{D'}$. Therefore, Z'' is a clique of G and so $|\mathcal{J}| = |Z''| \leq \omega(G)$. This completes the proof of Lemma 3.2. ■

Let G be a graph and let $S \subseteq V(G)$. We say S is (X, Z) -restricted if $S \subseteq X \cup Z$ and $S \cap X \neq \emptyset$. Next we prove a lemma about (X, Z) -restricted maximum stable sets in G (although it remain true for “maximal stable sets” as well).

Lemma 3.3. *Let G be a P_5 -free graph. Let (X, Z) be a cradle in G such that some vertex in Z is not complete to X . Let $(\mathcal{I}, \mathcal{J})$ be a rocker for (X, Z) . Then for every (X, Z) -restricted maximum stable set S of G , we have $S \cap Q \neq \emptyset$ for some $Q \in \mathcal{I} \cup \mathcal{J}$.*

Proof. Suppose that S is an (X, Z) -restricted maximum stable set of G such that $S \cap Q = \emptyset$ for all $Q \in \mathcal{I}$. Our goal is to show that $S \cap Q \neq \emptyset$ for some $Q \in \mathcal{Q}$. The assumption that some vertex in Z is not complete to X , along with the second bullet of Lemma 3.1, implies that $\mathcal{I} \cup \mathcal{J} \neq \emptyset$. Also, for every $Q \in \mathcal{I}$, since S is a maximum stable set of G which is disjoint from Q , it follows

that there exists a vertex $z_Q \in S \setminus X = S \cap Z$ with a neighbour $x_Q \in Q$. In particular, we have $S \cap Z \neq \emptyset$. We claim that:

(1) *There exists $z \in S \setminus X = S \cap Z$ with a neighbour in each component of $G[X]$.*

Suppose not. Let $z \in S \setminus X = S \cap Z$ be a vertex which has a neighbour in as many of the components of $G[X]$ as possible. Then z is anticomplete to some component of $G[X]$. It follows from the choice of \mathcal{I} that z is anticomplete to some component $Q \in \mathcal{I}$. Note that since $z_Q \in S \cap Z$ is adjacent to $x_Q \in Q$, z and z_Q are distinct. Also, by the choice of z , there exists a component Q' of $G[X]$ such that z has a neighbour x in Q' and z_Q is anticomplete to Q' . It follows that Q and Q' are distinct. But now, assuming $x' = x_Q$ and $z' = z_Q$, we have $E(G[\{x, x', z, z'\}]) = \{xz, x'z'\}$, which violates the first bullet of Lemma 3.1. This prove (1).

Let $z \in S \setminus X = S \cap Z$ be as promised by (1). Since $S \cap X \neq \emptyset$, it follows that there exists a vertex $z' \in S \cap Q$ for some component Q of $G[X]$. But then z has a non-neighbour (namely, z') in Q , and so $Q \in \mathcal{J}$. This, along with $z' \in S \cap Q$, implies that $S \cap Q \neq \emptyset$ for $Q \in \mathcal{J}$, and completes the proof of Lemma 3.3. \blacksquare

Let us now prove the main result of this section:

Theorem 3.4. *For all integers $c, d, h \in \mathbb{N}$, there exists $\Gamma(c, d, h) \in \mathbb{N}$ with the following property. Let G be a P_5 -free graph with $\omega(G) \leq c$. Let (X, Z) be a cradle in G with $\omega(X) \leq d$ and $\eta(X') \leq h$ for every $X' \subseteq X$. Then there exists $W \subseteq G$ with $|W| \leq \Gamma(c, d, h)$ which intersects every (X, Z) -restricted maximum stable set of G .*

Proof. We define $\Gamma(c, d, h)$ recursively, as follows. Let $c, h \in \mathbb{N}$ be arbitrary yet fixed. Let $\Gamma(c, 1, h) = 2c$, and for every $d \geq 2$, let

$$\Gamma(c, d, h) = 2c(h + (c + 1)^{c+1}\Gamma(c, d - 1, h)).$$

We prove by induction on d , with c, h fixed, that $\Gamma(c, d, h)$ satisfies Theorem 3.4.

Let \mathcal{S} be the sets of all (X, Z) -restricted maximum stable sets of G . Let $(\mathcal{I}, \mathcal{J})$ be a rocker for (X, Z) . By Lemma 3.2, we have $|\mathcal{I} \cup \mathcal{J}| \leq 2c$. For each $Q \in \mathcal{I} \cup \mathcal{J}$, let \mathcal{S}_Q be the set of all (X, Z) -restricted maximum stable sets of G with $S \cap Q \neq \emptyset$. By Lemma 3.3, we have $\mathcal{S} = \bigcup_{Q \in \mathcal{I} \cup \mathcal{J}} \mathcal{S}_Q$.

To launch the induction, consider the base case $d = 1$. Then X is a stable in G , and so every component of $G[X]$ is a singleton. But now $W = \bigcup_{Q \in \mathcal{I} \cup \mathcal{J}} Q$ is a set of at most $2c = \Gamma(c, 1, h)$ vertices which intersects every (X, Z) -restricted maximum stable set of G , as desired.

From now on, assume that $d \geq 2$, and so $|X| \geq 2$. Note that if every vertex in Z is complete to X , then every set $S \in \mathcal{S}$ is contained in X . But then we are done as $\eta(X) \leq h \leq \Gamma(c, d, h)$. Thus, we may assume from now on that some vertex in Z is not complete to X . Moreover, since $\mathcal{S} = \bigcup_{Q \in \mathcal{I} \cup \mathcal{J}} \mathcal{S}_Q$, in order to prove Theorem 3.4, it suffices to show that for every $Q \in \mathcal{I} \cup \mathcal{J}$, there exists $W_Q \subseteq V(G)$ with $|W_Q| \leq h + (c + 1)^{c+1}\Gamma(c, d - 1, h)$ which intersects every set $S \in \mathcal{S}_Q$. Henceforth, let $Q \in \mathcal{I} \cup \mathcal{J}$ be fixed.

By the assumption, we have $\eta(Q) \leq h$, and so there exists a hitting set $W_0 \subseteq Q$ for $G[Q]$ with $|W_0| \leq h$. Let us call a set $S \in \mathcal{S}_Q$ is *mischievous* if $S \cap W_0 = \emptyset$. We deduce:

(2) *For every mischievous set $S \in \mathcal{S}_Q$, we have $S \cap N_Z(Q) \neq \emptyset$.*

Note that since S is mischievous, it follows that $S \cap Q$ is not a maximum stable set of $G[Q]$. Therefore, since S is an (X, Z) -restricted maximum stable set of G , we have $S \cap N_{X \cup Z}(Q) \neq \emptyset$. But Q is component of $G[X]$, and so $N_X(Q) = \emptyset$. This yields $S \cap N_Z(Q) \neq \emptyset$, and so proves (2).

Next, let $Y \subseteq N_Z(Q)$ be chosen such that Y “minimally represents” all vertices in $N_Z(Q)$ which are not complete to Q . More precisely, let Y be a minimal subset (with respect to inclusion) of $N_Z(Q)$ such that every vertex in Q with a non-neighbour in $N_Z(Q)$ has a non-neighbour in Y . It turns out that Y is small:

(3) We have $|Y| < (c+1)^{c+1}$.

Suppose for a contradiction that $|Y| \geq (c+1)^{c+1}$. Since $\omega(G) \leq c$, it follows from Theorem 1.9 that Y contains a stable set Y' of cardinality $c+1$. Also, note that by the minimality of Y , for every $y \in Y$, there is a vertex $q_y \in Q$ such that y is the only non-neighbour of q_y in Y . Therefore, again since $\omega(G) \leq c$, there exist two distinct vertices $y, y' \in Y'$ such that q_y and $q_{y'}$ are non-adjacent. But now $x = q_y, x' = q_{y'}, z = y'$ and $z' = y$ violate the first bullet of Lemma 3.1 applied to (X, Z) . This proves (3).

Now, for every $y \in Y$, let

$$\begin{aligned} X_y &= Q \setminus N_Q(y), \\ Z_y &= (X \setminus X_y) \cup Z. \end{aligned}$$

It follows that:

(4) For every $y \in Y$, (X_y, Z_y) is a cradle in G .

From the definition of X_y and Z_y , it follows immediately that $X_y \cap Z_y = \emptyset$, and $N_{Z_y}(X_y) \subseteq N_Q(y) \cup Z$. Note that every vertex in $N_Q(y)$ is adjacent to $y \in G \setminus N[X_y]$. Also, since (X, Z) is a cradle in G , every vertex in $N_Z(X)$ has a neighbour in $G \setminus N[X] \subseteq G \setminus N[X_y]$. We conclude that every vertex in $N_{Z_y}[X_y] \subseteq N_Q(y) \cup N_Z(X)$ has a neighbour in $G \setminus N[X_y]$. It remains to show that for every two distinct vertices $z, z' \in N_{Z_y}[X_y] \subseteq N_Q(y) \cup N_Z(X)$, there exists an induced path P in G from z to z' such that $P^* \subseteq G \setminus N[X_y]$. If $z, z' \in N_Q(y)$, then there exists an induced path P in G from z to z' with $P^* \subseteq \{y\} \subseteq G \setminus N[X_y]$. Also, if $z, z' \in N_Z(X)$, then since (X, Z) is a cradle, it follows that there exists an induced path P in G from z to z' with $P^* \subseteq G \setminus N[X] \subseteq G \setminus N[X_y]$. So we may assume that $z \in N_Q(y)$ and $z' \in N_Z(X)$. Since (X, Z) is a cradle in G and $y, z' \in N_Z(X)$, there exists an induced path P' in G from y to z' with $P'^* \subseteq G \setminus N[X]$. Moreover, y, z are adjacent in G . Now $P = z-y-P'-z'$ is an induced path in G from z to z' with $P^* \subseteq (G \setminus N[X]) \cup \{y\} \subseteq G \setminus N[X_y]$. This proves (4).

We also need to investigate how mischievous sets interact with the cradles found in (4). For every $y \in Y$, let \mathcal{S}^y be the set of all mischievous sets $S \in \mathcal{S}_Q$ which are (X_y, Z_y) -restricted.

(5) For every mischievous set $S \in \mathcal{S}_Q$, there exists $y \in Y$ such that $S \in \mathcal{S}^y$.

Since S is (X, Z) -restricted, it follows that $S \subseteq X \cup Z = X_y \cup Z_y$ for all $y \in Y$. We now need to show that $S \cap X_y \neq \emptyset$ for some $y \in Y$. Since $S \in \mathcal{S}_Q$, we may choose $q \in S \cap Q$. Also, since S is mischievous, by (2), there exists a vertex $z \in S \cap N_Z(Q)$. It follows that $q \in S \cap Q$ has a non-neighbour in $N_Z(Q)$ (namely z), and so by the definition of Y , q has a non-neighbour $y \in Y$. As a result, we have $q \in (S \cap Q) \setminus N_Q(y) = S \cap X_y$, and so $S \cap X_y \neq \emptyset$. This proves (5).

Recall that the proof is by induction on d . In order to apply the induction hypothesis, we need the following two statements.

(6) Let $y \in Y$. Then for every $q \in N_Q(y)$ and every component D of X_y , q is either complete or anticomplete to D .

For otherwise, there is an induced path $q-a-b$ in G with $a, b \in D$. Since $y \in Z$ is adjacent to $q \in Q \subseteq X$, we have $y \in N_Z[X]$. Thus, since (X, Z) is a cradle in G , it follows that y has a neighbour in $u \in G \setminus N[X]$. But now $u-y-q-a-b$ is an induced P_5 in G , a contradiction. This proves (6).

(7) For every $y \in Y$, we have $\omega(X_y) \leq d-1$.

Suppose not. Let K be a clique of cardinality d in X_y . Let D be the component of X_y with $K \subseteq D$. Since Q is connected, there exists a vertex $q \in Q \setminus X_y = N_Q(y)$ with a neighbour in D .

By (6), q is complete to D . But then $K \cup \{q\}$ is a clique in $Q \subseteq X$ of cardinality $d + 1$, which violates the assumption $\omega(X) \leq d$. This proves (7).

(8) For every $y \in Y$, there exists $W^y \subseteq G$ with $|W^y| \leq \Gamma(c, d - 1, h)$ which intersects every set $S \in \mathcal{S}^y$.

By (4), (7), and the fact that $X_y \subseteq X$, (X_y, Z_y) is a cradle in G with $\omega(X_y) \leq d - 1$ and $\eta(X_y) \leq h$. Therefore, by the induction hypothesis applied to (X_y, Z_y) , there exists $W^y \subseteq G$ with $|W^y| \leq \Gamma(c, d - 1, h)$ which intersects every mischievous set $S \in \mathcal{S}_Q$ which is (X_y, Z_y) -restricted. In other words, W^y intersects every set $S \in \mathcal{S}^y$. This proves (8).

The proof is almost concluded. Let $W_Q = W_0 \cup (\bigcup_{y \in Y} W^y)$, where W^y is as in (8). Then by (3), we have $|W| \leq h + (c + 1)^{c+1} \Gamma(c, d - 1, h) = \Gamma(c, d, h)$. Let $S \in \mathcal{S}_Q$ be arbitrary. We need to show that $S \cap W \neq \emptyset$. If $S \cap W_0 \neq \emptyset$, then we have $S \cap W \neq \emptyset$ as $W_0 \subseteq W$. So we may assume that $S \cap W_0 = \emptyset$, that is, S is mischievous. By (5), there exists $y \in Y$ such that $S \in \mathcal{S}^y$. By (8), we have $S \cap W^y \neq \emptyset$, which along with the fact that $W^y \subseteq W$, implies that $S \cap W \neq \emptyset$. This completes the proof of Theorem 3.4. \blacksquare

4. CRADLE PACKING AND PROOF OF THEOREM 1.12

Here we complete the proof of Theorem 1.12. First, note that for every maximum stable set in a graph G and every connected component G' of G , $S \cap G'$ is a maximum stable set of G' . This immediately yields the following.

Lemma 4.1. *For every graph G and every connected component G' , we have $\eta(G) \leq \eta(G')$.*

Let G be a graph. For a cradle $\xi = (X, Z)$ in G , we write X_ξ for X and Z_ξ for Z . A *cradle packing in G* is a collection Ξ of distinct cradles in G such that every maximum stable set of G is ξ -restricted for some $\xi \in \Xi$. We also define $\eta(\Xi) = \max\{\eta(X') : X' \subseteq X_\xi, \xi \in \Xi\}$. Then we have:

Lemma 4.2. *For all $c, h, t \in \mathbb{N}$, there exists $\Phi(c, h, t) \in \mathbb{N}$ with the following property. Let G be a P_5 -free graph with $\omega(G) \leq c$. Assume that there exists a cradle packing Ξ in G with $|\Xi| \leq t$ and $\eta(\Xi) \leq h$. Then we have $\eta(G) \leq \Phi(c, h, t)$.*

Proof. Let $\Gamma(\cdot, \cdot, \cdot)$ be as in Theorem 3.4 and let $\Phi(c, h, t) = t\Gamma(c, c, h)$. It follows from Theorem 3.4 that, for every $\xi \in \Xi$, there exists $W_\xi \subseteq G$ with $|W_\xi| \leq \Gamma(c, c, h)$ which intersects every ξ -restricted maximum stable set of G . Now, let $W = \bigcup_{\xi \in \Xi} W_\xi$. Then since $|\Xi| \leq t$, we have $|W| \leq t\Gamma(c, c, h) = \Phi(c, h, t)$. It remains to show that W is a hitting set for G . Let S be a maximum stable set of G . Since Ξ is a cradle packing in G , it follows that S is ξ -restricted for some $\xi \in \Xi$. But then we have $S \cap W_\xi \neq \emptyset$, which along with the fact that $W_\xi \subseteq W$, implies that $S \cap W \neq \emptyset$. This completes the proof of Theorem 4.2. \blacksquare

Here comes the proof of Theorem 1.12, which we restate:

Theorem 4.3. *For every $c \in \mathbb{N}$, there exists $\Psi(c) \in \mathbb{N}$ such that every P_5 -free graph with $\omega(G) \leq c$ satisfies $\eta(G) \leq \Psi(c)$.*

Proof. Let $\Psi(1) = 1$, and for every $c \geq 2$, let $\Psi(c) = \Phi(c, \Psi(c - 1), 2c + 1)$, where $\Phi(\cdot, \cdot, \cdot)$ is as in Lemma 4.2. We prove by induction on c that every P_5 -free graph with $\omega(G) \leq c$ satisfies $\eta(G) \leq \Psi(c)$. The result is easily seen to hold for $\omega(G) \leq 1$. Thus, writing $\omega(G) = k$, we may assume that $c \geq k \geq 2$. Also, by Lemma 4.1, we may assume that G is connected.

Let $K = \{v_1, \dots, v_k\}$ be a maximum clique in G . For every $i \in \{1, \dots, k\}$, let us define $\zeta_i = (\{v_i\}, G \setminus \{v_i\})$; then ζ_i is a cradle in G because the first set in the pair ζ_i is a singleton (roughly, these cradles will be used to hit the maximum stable sets of G which intersect K).

We now define another set of cradles in G . Let X_0 be the set of all vertices in $G \setminus K$ which are anticomplete to K . For each $i \in \{1, \dots, k\}$, let X_i be the set of all vertices in $G \setminus K$ which

are adjacent to v_i and non-adjacent to v_j for all $j \in \{1, \dots, k\} \setminus \{1, \dots, i\}$. It follows that X_0, X_1, \dots, X_k is a partition of $G \setminus K$. For every $i \in \{0, 1, \dots, k-1\}$, let $Z_i = \bigcup_{j=i+1}^k X_j$, and let $Z_k = \emptyset$. Define $\xi_i = (X_i, Z_i)$ for each $i \in \{0, 1, \dots, k\}$. We claim that:

(9) For all $i \in \{0, 1, \dots, k\}$, ξ_i is a cradle in G .

The assertion is trivial for $i = k$ as $Z_k = \emptyset$. Also, for each $i \in \{0, 1, \dots, k-1\}$, note that $K_i = \{v_{i+1}, \dots, v_k\}$ is a clique in G with $K_i \subseteq G \setminus N[X_i]$, and every vertex in Z_i has a neighbour in K_i . This proves (9).

From (9) and the definition of X_0, X_1, \dots, X_k , it is immediately seen that for every non-empty subset $S \subseteq V(G)$, either $S \cap K \neq \emptyset$, or S is ξ_i -restricted where $i = \min\{j : i \in \{0, \dots, k\}, S \cap X_j \neq \emptyset\}$. As a result, every non-empty subset of $V(G)$ is either ζ_i -restricted for some $i \in \{1, \dots, k\}$ or ξ_i -restricted for some $i \in \{0, 1, \dots, k\}$. Consequently, defining

$$\Xi = \{\zeta_i : i \in \{1, \dots, k\}\} \cup \{\xi_i : i \in \{0, 1, \dots, k\}\},$$

it follows that Ξ is a cradle packing in G with $|\Xi| \leq 2k + 1 \leq 2c + 1$. Moreover, we deduce:

(10) $\eta(\Xi) \leq \Phi(c - 1)$.

From the definition of ζ_1, \dots, ζ_k , we only need to show that for every $i \in \{0, 1, \dots, k\}$, and every connected component D of $G[X_i]$, we have $\eta(D) \leq \Phi(c - 1)$. To that end, using the induction hypothesis, it suffices to show that $\omega(D) \leq c - 1$. Suppose for a contradiction that there exists a clique K' in G of cardinality c with $K' \subseteq D$. Then we have $i = 0$, as otherwise $K' \cup \{v_i\}$ would be a clique of cardinality $c + 1 > \omega(G)$ in G . Since G is connected and $K' \subseteq X_0$ is anticomplete to K , there exist an induced path P in G with (not necessarily distinct) ends x and x' such that x has a neighbour y in K , x' has a neighbour y' in K' , $P \setminus \{x\}$ is anticomplete to K' and $P \setminus \{x'\}$ is anticomplete to K . Since both K and K' are maximum cliques of G , it follows that x has a non-neighbour $z \in K$ and x' has a non-neighbour $z' \in K'$. But now $z'-y'-x'-P-x-y-z$ is an induced path in G on at least five vertices, a contradiction. This proves (10).

To sum up, for the P_5 -free graph G with $\omega(G) \leq c$, we proved that Ξ is a cradle packing in G for which we have $|\Xi| \leq 2c + 1$, and, by (10), $\eta(\Xi) \leq \Psi(c - 1)$. But then Lemma 4.2 implies that $\eta(G) \leq \Phi(c, \Psi(c - 1), 2c + 1) = \Phi(c)$. This completes the proof of Theorem 4.3. \blacksquare

5. MORE THAN STARS

In this section, we prove Theorems 1.14 and 1.15, beginning with following lemma.

Lemma 5.1. *Let G be a graph and let $k \in \mathbb{N}$. For every $i \in \{1, \dots, k\}$, let d_i, h_i be two positive integers, and let A_i, A'_i be two subsets of $V(G)$, such that the following hold.*

- We have $A_i \cup A'_i = V(G)$ for all $i \in \{1, \dots, k\}$.
- For each $i \in \{1, \dots, k\}$ and every $X \subseteq A_i$, we have $\eta(X) \leq h_i$.
- For every maximum stable set S of G , we have $|S \cap A'_i| < d_i$ for some $i \in \{1, \dots, k\}$.

Then $\eta(G) \leq \sum_{i=1}^k d_i h_i$.

Proof. From Lemma 1.4 applied to $G[A_i]$, d_i and h_i , we deduce that:

(11) For each $i \in \{1, \dots, k\}$, there exists $D_i \subseteq A_i$ with $|D_i| \leq d_i h_i$ and $\alpha(A_i \setminus D_i) \leq \alpha(A_i) - d_i \leq \alpha(G) - d_i$.

Now, let $D = D_1 \cup \dots \cup D_k$. We claim that D is a hitting set for G . Suppose for a contradiction that there exists a maximum stable set S of G with $S \cap D = \emptyset$. By the third bullet of Lemma 5.1, we have $|S \cap A'_i| < d_i$ for some $i \in \{1, \dots, k\}$. On the other hand, we have $S \cap A_i \subseteq A_i \setminus D \subseteq A_i \setminus D_i$. Thus, from (11), it follows that $|S \cap A_i| \leq \alpha(A_i \setminus D_i) \leq \alpha(G) - d_i$. But then from the first bullet of Lemma 5.1, we deduce that $|S| \leq |S \cap A_i| + |S \cap A'_i| < \alpha(G)$, a contradiction. The

claim follows. Moreover, by (11), we have $|D| \leq |D_1| \cdots + |D_k| \leq d_1 h_1 + \cdots + d_k h_k$. This proves Lemma 5.1. \blacksquare

Let us now prove Theorem 1.14, restated as follows. For all integers $s \geq 1$ and $t \geq 0$, let $S_{(s,t)}$ denote the unique graph (up to isomorphism) on $1 + s + t$ vertices with a vertex of degree s , s vertices of degree one and t vertices of degree zero. Note that $S_{(s,0)}$ is isomorphic to the star $K_{1,s}$ (see also Figure 1 for a depiction of $S_{(2,2)}$).

Theorem 5.2. *For all integers $c, s \geq 1$ and $t \geq 0$, there exists $\Psi(c, s, t) \in \mathbb{N}$ such that every $S_{(s,t)}$ -free graph G with $\omega(G) \leq c$ satisfies $\eta(G) \leq \Psi(c, s, t)$. Moreover, for all $c, s \in \mathbb{N}$, we have $\Psi(c, s, 1) \leq c^{2s+1}$.*

Proof. Let $s \geq 1$ be fixed. For every $c \geq 1$, let $\Psi(c, s, 0) = c^s$, and for every $t \geq 0$, let $\Psi(1, s, t) = 1$. For every $c > 1$ and $t > 0$, let

$$\Psi(c, s, t) = t\Psi(c-1, s, t) + (s+1)\Psi(c, s, t-1).$$

We prove by induction on $c+t$ that every $S_{(s,t)}$ -free graph G with $\omega(G) \leq c$ satisfies $\eta(G) \leq \Psi(c, s, t)$. The result is trivial for $c = 1$, and follows from Theorem 1.11 for $t = 0$; thus, we may assume that $c > 1$ and $s > 0$. Let $x \in V(G)$ be arbitrary. Let us define $A_1 = N(x)$, $A_2 = G \setminus N[x]$, $A'_1 = G \setminus N(x)$, $A'_2 = N[x]$. We deduce:

(12) *The following hold.*

- We have $A_1 \cup A'_1 = A_2 \cup A'_2 = V(G)$.
- For every $X \subseteq A_1$, we have $\eta(X) \leq \Psi(c-1, s, t)$, and for every $X \subseteq A_2$, we have $\eta(X) \leq \Psi(c, s, t-1)$.
- For every maximum stable set S of G , we have either $|S \cap A'_1| < t$ or $|S \cap A'_2| < s+1$.

The first bullet is immediate. The second bullet follows directly from the induction hypothesis and the fact that $\omega(A_1) < \omega(G) \leq c$ and $G[A_2]$ is $S_{(s,t-1)}$ -free (as otherwise $G[A_2 \cup \{x\}]$ contains an induced $S_{(s,t)}$). To see the third bullet, suppose for a contradiction that there exists a maximum stable set S of G with $|S \cap A'_1| \geq t$ and $|S \cap A'_2| \geq s+1 \geq 2$. It follows that $x \notin S$, and so $|S \cap (G \setminus N[x])| \geq t$ and $|S \cap N(x)| \geq s+1$. Consequently, we can choose $A''_1 \subseteq S \cap (G \setminus N[x])$ and $A''_2 \subseteq S \cap N(x)$ with $|A''_1| = t$ and $|A''_2| = s$. But now $G[A''_1 \cup A''_2 \cup \{x\}]$ is isomorphic to $S_{(s,t)}$, a contradiction. This proves (12).

Now, (12) allows an application of Lemma 5.1 to $d_1 = t, d_2 = s+1, h_1 = \Psi(c-1, s, t), h_2 = \Psi(c, s, t-1)$, $G, (A_1, A'_1)$ and (A_2, A'_2) . But then we have

$$\eta(G) \leq t\Psi(c-1, s, t) + (s+1)\Psi(c, s, t-1) = \Psi(c, s, t).$$

Finally, let us show that $\Psi(c, s, 1) \leq c^{2s+1}$ for all $c, s \in \mathbb{N}$. The proof is by induction on c for fixed s . Note that $\Psi(1, s, 1) = 1$. For $c \geq 2$, we have $s+1 \leq 2^s \leq c^s$. Combining this with the induction hypothesis and the definition of $\Psi(\cdot, \cdot, \cdot)$ yields:

$$\Phi(c, s, 1) = \Psi(c-1, s, 1) + (s+1)\Psi(c, s, 0) \leq (c-1)^{2s+1} + c^{2s} < (c-1)c^{2s} + c^{2s} = c^{2s+1}.$$

This completes the proof of Theorem 5.2. \blacksquare

Next comes an easy lemma; we omit the proof (note also that this extends Theorem 1.10).

Lemma 5.3. *Let G be a graph, let $C \subseteq G$ and let G' be a component of $G \setminus C$. Then $\eta(G) \leq |C| + \eta(G')$.*

We can now restate and prove Theorem 1.15. For every $t \in \mathbb{N}$, let F_t be the graph obtained from the star $K_{1,t+1}$ by subdividing an edge, exactly once. Equivalently, F_t is the unique graph (up to isomorphism) on $t+3$ vertices with $t+1$ vertices of degree one, one vertex of degree two and one vertex of degree $t+1$ (see Figure 1 for a depiction of F_3).

Theorem 5.4. *For all $c, t \in \mathbb{N}$, there exists $\Psi(c, t) \in \mathbb{N}$ such that every F_t -free graph G with $\omega(G) \leq c$ satisfies $\eta(G) \leq \Psi(c, t)$.*

Proof. Let $t \geq 1$ be fixed. Let $\Psi(1, t) = 1$ and for every integer $c > 1$, let

$$\Psi(c, t) = 3(c+1)^{2t+1} + 2t\Psi(c-1, t).$$

We prove by induction on c that the above value of $\Psi(c, t)$ satisfies Theorem 5.4. The result is trivial for $c = 1$; thus we may assume that $c > 1$.

Let $x_1 \in V(G)$ be a vertex with at least one neighbour in G . Let $N = N_G(x_1)$ and $M = G \setminus N_G[x_1]$. Let $x_2 \in N$ be chosen with $|N_M(x_2)|$ as large as possible. Let $P = N_M(x_2)$ and $Q = M \setminus P$. We begin with the following two statements, which have similar proofs.

(13) *We have $|N_Q(P)| < (c+1)^{2t+1}$.*

Suppose not. Let $P' \subseteq P$ be minimal such that every vertex in $N_Q(P')$ has a neighbour in P' . Assume that $|P'| < (c+1)^{t+1}$. Then there exists a vertex $p \in P'$ such that $|N_Q(p)| > (c+1)^t$. Since $\omega(G) \leq c$, it follows from Theorem 1.9 that there exists a stable set $A \subseteq N_Q(p)$ with $|A| = t$. But now $G[A \cup \{p, x_2\}]$ is isomorphic to F_t , a contradiction. We deduce that $|P'| > (c+1)^{t+1}$. Again, since $\omega(G) \leq c$, by Theorem 1.9, there exists a stable set $A' \subseteq P'$ with $|A'| = t+1$. Let $p' \in A'$ be arbitrary. By the minimality of P' , there exists a vertex $q \in N_Q(P)$ such that $N_{A'}(q) = \{p'\}$. But now $G[A' \cup \{q, x_2\}]$ is isomorphic to F_t , a contradiction. This proves (13).

(14) *We have $|N_Q(N)| < 2(c+1)^{2t+1}$.*

Suppose not. Let $Q' = N_Q(N) \setminus N_Q(P)$. By (13), we have $|Q'| > (c+1)^{2t+1}$. Let $N' \subseteq N$ be minimal such that every vertex in Q' has a neighbour in N' . Assume that $|N'| < (c+1)^{t+1}$. Then there exists a vertex $y \in N'$ such that $|N_{Q'}(y)| > (c+1)^t$. Since $\omega(G) \leq c$, it follows from Theorem 1.9 that there exists a stable set $A \subseteq N_{Q'}(y)$ with $|A| = t$. By the choice of x_2 , there exists a vertex $p \in P$ which is not adjacent to y . Also, by the definition of Q' , p is anticomplete to Q' . Now if x_2, y are adjacent, then $G[A \cup \{p, x_2, y\}]$ is isomorphic to F_t , and if x, y are not adjacent, then $G[A \cup \{x_1, x_2, y\}]$ is isomorphic to F_t , a contradiction. It follows that $|N'| > (c+1)^{t+1}$. Again, since $\omega(G) \leq c$, by Theorem 1.9, that there exists a stable set $A' \subseteq N'$ with $|A'| = t+1$. Let $y' \in A'$ be arbitrary. By the minimality of N' , there exist a vertex $q' \in Q'$ such that $N_{N'}(q') = \{y'\}$. But now $G[A' \cup \{q', x_1\}]$ isomorphic to F_t , which is impossible. This proves (14).

Let us define $A_1 = N_G(x_1) = N$, $A_2 = N_G(x_2)$, $A'_1 = N_G(x_2) \setminus N_G(x_1)$, $A'_2 = N_G(x_1) \setminus N_G(x_2)$ and $G' = A_1 \cup A'_1 = A_2 \cup A'_2$. We deduce:


(15) *The following hold.*

- For each $i \in \{1, 2\}$ and every $X \subseteq A_i$, we have $\eta(X) \leq \Psi(c-1, t)$.
- For every maximum stable set S of G , we have either $|S \cap A'_1| < t$ or $|S \cap A'_2| < t$.

The first bullet follows directly from the induction hypothesis and the fact that $\omega(A_1), \omega(A_2) < \omega(G) \leq c$. To see the second bullet, suppose for a contradiction that there exists a maximum stable set S of G with $|S \cap A'_1|, |S \cap A'_2| \geq t \geq 1$; consequently, we can choose $A''_1 \subseteq S \cap A'_1$ and $A''_2 \subseteq S \cap A'_2$ with $|A''_1| = t$ and $|A''_2| = 1$. In addition, since x_1 is complete to A'_1 and x_2 is complete to A'_2 it follows that $x_1, x_2 \notin S$. But now $G[A''_1 \cup A''_2 \cup \{x_1, x_2\}]$ is isomorphic to F_t , a contradiction. This proves (15).

To finish the proof, note that in view of (15), we can apply Lemma 5.1 to $d_1 = d_2 = t$, $h_1 = h_2 = \Psi(c-1, t)$, $G'(A_1, A'_1)$ and (A_2, A'_2) , which yields $\eta(G') \leq 2t\Psi(c-1, t)$. Furthermore, assuming $C = N_Q(P) \cup N_Q(N)$, it follows that G' is a component of $G \setminus C$, and from (13) and (14), it is immediate that $|C| \leq 3(c+1)^{2t+1}$. Hence, by Lemma 5.3, we have

$$\eta(G) \leq |C| + \eta(G') \leq 3(c+1)^{2t+1} + 2t\Psi(c-1, t) = \Psi(c, t).$$

FIGURE 1. Graphs L_2 (top), F_3 (middle) and $S_{(2,2)}$ (bottom).

This completes the proof of Theorem 5.4. ■

6. PROPER INDUCED SUBGRAPHS OF P_5

In this last section, we prove Theorems 1.18 and 1.19 in reverse order. We need the following result of Wagon [22]; recall that M_t denotes the unique (up to isomorphism) 1-regular graph on $2t$ vertices.

Theorem 6.1 (Wagon [22]). *For every $t \in \mathbb{N}$, every M_t -free graph G satisfies $\chi(G) \leq \omega(G)^{2t-2}$.*

We also need the following.

Lemma 6.2. *Let $s \geq 2$ be an integer and X_1, \dots, X_s be sets. Then we have*

$$\left| \bigcup_{i=1}^s X_i \right| \geq \sum_{i=1}^s |X_i| - \sum_{1 \leq i < i' \leq s} |X_i \cap X_{i'}|.$$

Proof. We induct on s . The case $s = 2$ follows from the inclusion-exclusion formula. For $s \geq 3$, by the inclusion-exclusion formula and the union bound, we have

$$\left| \bigcup_{i=1}^s X_i \right| = \left| \bigcup_{i=1}^{s-1} X_i \right| + |X_s| - \left| \bigcup_{i=1}^{s-1} (X_i \cap X_s) \right| \geq \left| \bigcup_{i=1}^{s-1} X_i \right| + |X_s| - \sum_{i=1}^{s-1} |X_i \cap X_s|.$$

Now the result is immediate from the induction hypothesis. ■

Next we give a proof of Theorem 1.19, restated below. For every $t \in \mathbb{N}$, let L_t be the unique graph (up to isomorphism) on $t + 4$ vertices with t vertices of degree zero and four vertices of degree one (see Figure 1 for a depiction of L_2).

Theorem 6.3. *For all $c, t \in \mathbb{N}$, every L_t -free graph G with $\omega(G) \leq c$ satisfies $\eta(G) \leq c^{7t+7}$.*

Proof. The assertion is trivial for $c = 1$; assume that $c > 1$. Let G be an L_t -free graph with $\omega(G) \leq c$. Since M_{t+2} contains L_t as an induced subgraph, by Theorem 6.1, we have $\chi(G) \leq c^{2t+2}$, that is, $V(G)$ can be partitioned into k stable sets C_1, \dots, C_k where $k \leq c^{2t+2}$. For each $i \in \{1, \dots, k\}$, let Z_i be the set of all vertices in $z \in V(G) \setminus C_i$ with $k|C_i \setminus N(z)| \geq |C_i|$.

(16) *Let $i \in \{1, \dots, k\}$ such that $|C_i| \geq 4k^2t$. Then there exists a non-empty subset D_i of C_i with $|D_i| < 2k^2$ such that every vertex in Z_i has a non-neighbour in D_i .*

Suppose not. Note that since $C_i \neq \emptyset$, every vertex in Z_i has a non-neighbour in C_i . Let $D_i \subseteq C_i$ be minimal such that every vertex in Z_i has a non-neighbour in D_i . Then $D_i \neq \emptyset$, and so we have $|D_i| \geq 2k^2$. From the minimality of D_i , it follows that for every vertex $u \in D_i$, there

is a vertex $z_u \in Z_i$ which is non-adjacent to u and adjacent to all other vertices in D_i . Also, since $|D_i| \geq 2k^2$ and C_1, \dots, C_k partition $V(G)$ into k stable sets, it follows that there are $2k$ pairwise distinct vertices $u_1, \dots, u_{2k} \in D_i$ such that $z_{u_1}, \dots, z_{u_{2k}} \in C_{i'}$ for some $i' \in \{1, \dots, k\} \setminus \{i\}$; in particular, $\{z_{u_1}, \dots, z_{u_{2k}}\}$ is a stable set in G . Now, for every $j \in \{1, \dots, 2k\}$, assuming $B_j = C_i \setminus N(z_j)$, it follows from the definition of Z_i that $|B_j| \geq |C_i|/k$. Also, for all distinct $j, j' \in \{1, \dots, 2k\}$, we have $|B_j \cap B_{j'}| < t$, as otherwise we may choose $A \subseteq B_j \cap B_{j'}$ with $|A| = t$, and then $G[A \cup \{u_j, u_{j'}, z_j, z_{j'}\}]$ is isomorphic to L_t , which is impossible. But now by Lemma 6.2, we have

$$|C_i| \geq \left| \bigcup_{j=1}^{2k} B_j \right| \geq \sum_{j=1}^{2k} |B_j| - \sum_{1 \leq j < j' \leq 2k} |B_j \cap B_{j'}| > 2k \left(\frac{|C_i|}{k} \right) - 4k^2 t,$$

which in turn implies that $|C_i| < 4k^2 t$, a contradiction. This proves (16).

Next, we define \mathcal{S}_i , for each $i \in \{1, \dots, k\}$, to be the set of all maximum stable sets S of G with $k|S \cap C_i| \geq |C_i|$. The following is immediate from this definition and the fact that $k\alpha(G) \geq \sum_{i=1}^k |C_i| = |G|$.

(17) *Every maximum stable set of G belongs to \mathcal{S}_i for some $i \in \{1, \dots, k\}$.*

Moreover, we have:

(18) *Let $i \in \{1, \dots, k\}$ such that $|C_i| \geq 4k^2 t$. Let $D_i \subseteq C_i$ with $|D_i| < 2k^2$ be as promised by (16). Then for every $S \in \mathcal{S}_i$, we have $S \cap D_i \neq \emptyset$.*

Suppose not. Let $S \in \mathcal{S}_i$ with $S \cap D_i = \emptyset$. Since $D_i \neq \emptyset$, it follows that $S \not\subseteq C_i$ (as otherwise C_i is a stable set of G of cardinality more than $\alpha(G)$). Also, for every $z \in S \setminus C_i$, we have $C_i \cap S \subseteq C_i \setminus N(z)$, which along with the definition of \mathcal{S}_i , implies that $k|C_i \setminus N(z)| \geq k|C_i \cap S| \geq |C_i|$. We conclude that $S \setminus C_i$ is a non-empty subset of Z_i . Now, let $z \in S \setminus C_i \subseteq Z_i$ be a vertex with as many neighbours in D_i as possible; then by (16), z has a non-neighbour $u \in D_i$, as well. Also, since S is a maximum stable set of G disjoint from D_i , it follows that u has a neighbour $z' \in S$. From this and the fact that C_i is a stable set of G , it follows that $z' \in (S \setminus C_i) \setminus \{z\}$. By the choice of z , there must be a vertex $u' \in D_i$ which is adjacent to z and non-adjacent to z' ; it follows that u and u' are distinct. Observe that $G[\{u, u', z, z'\}]$ is isomorphic to M_2 . Moreover, since $S \in \mathcal{S}_i$, we have $|S \cap C_i| \geq |C_i|/k \geq 4kt > t$, and so we may choose $A \subseteq S \cap C_i$ with $|A| = t$. Note that since both C_i and S are stable sets of G and $S \cap D_i = \emptyset$, it follows that A and $\{u, u', z, z'\}$ are disjoint and anticomplete. But then $G[A \cup \{u, u', z, z'\}]$ is isomorphic to L_t , a contradiction. This proves (18).

Let us now put everything together. For every $i \in \{1, \dots, k\}$, define W_i as follows. If $|C_i| < 4k^2 t$, then let $W_i = C_i$, and if $|C_i| \geq 4k^2 t$, let $W_i = D_i$, where $D_i \subseteq C_i$ with $|D_i| < 2k^2$ is as in (16). It follows that $|W_i| < 4k^2 t$. Let $W = \bigcup_{i=1}^k W_i$. Observe that $t \leq 2^{t-1}$ (which can be proved by an elementary induction on t). Also, since $c > 1$, we have $2^{t+1} \leq c^{t+1}$. This yields:

$$|W| \leq 4k^3 t \leq 4tc^{6t+6} \leq c^{7t+7}.$$

It remains to show that W is a hitting set for G . Let S be a maximum stable set of G . By (17), we have $S \in \mathcal{S}_i$ for some $i \in \{1, \dots, k\}$; in particular, we have $|S \cap C_i| \geq |C_i|/k > 0$. If $|C_i| < 4k^2 t$, then $S \cap W_i = S \cap C_i \neq \emptyset$. Otherwise, by (18), we have $S \cap W_i = S \cap D_i \neq \emptyset$. In conclusion, we have shown that W_i , and so W , intersects S . This completes the proof of Theorem 6.3. \blacksquare

Now Theorem 1.18 becomes immediate:

Theorem 6.4. *Let H be a proper induced subgraph of P_5 . Then every H -free graph G satisfies $\eta(G) \leq \omega(G)^{14}$.*

Proof. It is easy to check that H is isomorphic to an induced subgraph of P_4 , $S_{(2,1)}$, or L_1 . But then the result follows from Theorems 1.5, 5.2 and 6.3. ■

7. ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

Our thanks to the anonymous referees for suggesting a number of improvements, and to Kaiyang Lan for pointing out an error in the proof of (16) (which is now fixed in this version).

REFERENCES

- [1] N. Alon, appeared in open problems of Oberwolfach 2022. <https://www.ucw.cz/kral/ow22-openproblems.pdf>.
- [2] N. Alon, private communication, 2023.
- [3] N. Alon. “Hitting all maximum independent sets.” *arXiv:2103.05998*, (2021).
- [4] M. Chudnovsky and P. Seymour. “Even-hole-free graphs still have bisimplicial vertices.” *J. Combinatorial Theory Ser. B*, **161** (2023), 331-381.
- [5] F. Chung and R. L. Graham. “Erdős on Graphs, His Legacy of Unsolved Problems.” *A. K. Peters, Ltd., Wellesley, MA*, (1998), xiv+142 pp.
- [6] M. Briański, J. Davies, B. Walczak. “Separating polynomial χ -boundedness from χ -boundedness.” *arXiv:2201.08814*, (2022).
- [7] P. Erdős. “Graph theory and probability.” *Canad. J. Math.* **11** (1959), 34-38.
- [8] P. Erdős. “Problems and results on set systems and hypergraphs, Extremal problems for finite sets.” (*Visegrád, 1991*), 217–227, *Bolyai Soc. Math. Stud.*, **3**, *János Bolyai Math. Soc., Budapest*, (1994).
- [9] P. Erdős and A. Hajnal. “On spanned subgraphs of graphs.” *Graphentheorie und Ihre Anwendungen* (Oberhof, 1977).
- [10] P. Erdős and A. Hajnal. “Ramsey-type theorems.” *Discrete Applied Mathematics*, **25** (1989), 37-52.
- [11] A. Gyárfás. “Problems from the world surrounding perfect graphs.” *Proceedings of the International Conference on Combinatorial Analysis and its Applications, (Pokrzywna, 1985)*, *Zastos. Mat.* **19**, (1987), 413–441.
- [12] A. Gyárfás. “On Ramsey covering-numbers.” *Infinite and finite sets (Colloq., Keszthely, 1973; dedicated to P. Erdős on his 60th birthday)*, Vol. II, pp. 801 – 816. *Colloq. Math. Soc. Janos Bolyai* **10**, North-Holland, Amsterdam, (1975).
- [13] A. Hajnal. “A theorem on k -saturated graphs.” *Canadian J. Math.* **17** (1965), 720-724.
- [14] H. Kierstead and S. Penrice. “Radius two trees specify χ -bounded classes.” *J. Graph Theory*, **18** (1994), 119-129.
- [15] D. Kuhn and D. Osthus. “Induced subgraphs in $K_{s,s}$ -free graphs of large average degree”, *Combinatorica* **24** (2004), 287-304.
- [16] L. Lovász. “A characterization of perfect graphs.” *J. Combinatorial Theory Ser. B*, **13** (1972), 95-98.
- [17] L. Rabern. “On hitting all maximum cliques with an independent sets.” *Journal of Graph Theory*, **66** (2011), 32-37.
- [18] A. Scott and P. Seymour. “A survey of χ -boundedness.” *Journal of Graph Theory* **95**, 3 (2020), 473-504.
- [19] A. Scott, P. Seymour and S. Spirkl. “Polynomial bounds for chromatic number I: Excluding a biclique and an induced tree.” **102**, 3 (2023), 458-471.
- [20] A. Scott, P. Seymour and S. Spirkl. “Polynomial bounds for chromatic number II: Excluding a star-forest.” *Journal of Graph Theory* **101**, 2 (2022), 318-322.
- [21] D. P. Sumner. “Subtrees of a graph and chromatic number.” in *The Theory and Applications of Graphs*, (G. Chartrand, ed.), John Wiley & Sons, New York (1981), 557-576.
- [22] S. Wagon. “A bound on the chromatic number of graphs without certain induced subgraphs.” *J. Combin. Theory Ser. B*, **29** (1980), 345-346.