

# More on discrete convexity

Vladimir Gurvich

vladimir.gurvich@gmail.com

National Research University Higher School of Economics,  
Moscow, Russian Federation,  
RUTCOR, Rutgers University, Piscataway, NJ, United States;

Mariya Naumova\*

mnaumova@business.rutgers.edu

Rutgers Business School, Rutgers University, Piscataway, NJ, United States

February 5, 2024

## Abstract

In several recent papers some concepts of convex analysis were extended to discrete sets. This paper is one more step in this direction. It is well known that a local minimum of a convex function is always its global minimum. We study some discrete objects that share this property and provide several examples of convex families related to graphs and to two-person games in normal form.

**AMS subjects:** 91A05, 94D10, 06E30.

**Keywords:** Convex, connected, graph, perfect graphs, kernel, game, two-person game in normal form, saddle point, Nash equilibrium.

## 1 Hereditary and Convex Discrete Families

The similarity between convex functions and submodular discrete functions is actively studied since 1970s; see for example, [9, 37, 39, 47, 72, 77, 84, 91, 87, 88]. Also in several recent papers some concepts and ideas of convex analysis were applied to discrete sets and functions [32, 40, 68, 78, 79, 74]. In both cases matroids play an important role.

The present paper is another step in this direction. It is well known that each local minimum of a convex function is always its global minimum. We study some discrete sets that have the same property and provide several examples related to graphs and two-person games in normal form.

A *partially ordered set (poset)*  $(\mathcal{P}, \succ)$  is defined by a set  $\mathcal{P}$  and a binary relation  $\succ$ . The latter is assumed to be asymmetric,  $P \not\succeq P$  for any  $P \in \mathcal{P}$ , and transitive,  $P \succ P'$  and  $P' \succ P''$  imply  $P \succ P''$  for any  $P, P', P'' \in \mathcal{P}$ . Furthermore,  $P'$  is called a *successor* of  $P$  if  $P \succ P'$  and an *immediate successor* of  $P$  if  $P \succ P'$  but  $P \succ P'' \succ P'$  holds for no  $P'' \in \mathcal{P}$ .

---

\*Corresponding author

Respectively,  $P$  is called an (*immediate*) *predecessor* of  $P'$  if  $P'$  is an (immediate) successor of  $P$ . Notation  $P \succeq P'$  means that either  $P \succ P'$  or  $P = P'$ .

Consider an arbitrary *finite* poset  $\mathcal{P}$  and its subset (family)  $\mathcal{F} \subseteq \mathcal{P}$ . An element  $F \in \mathcal{P}$  is called a (*local*) *minimum* of  $\mathcal{F}$  if  $F \in \mathcal{F}$  but  $F' \notin \mathcal{F}$  whenever  $F'$  is an (immediate) successor of  $F$ . We denote by  $\mathcal{M}(\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{P}, \succ)$  and by  $\mathcal{LM}(\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{P}, \succ)$ , respectively, the set (class) of all minima and local minima of  $\mathcal{F}$  in  $(\mathcal{P}, \succ)$ . Furthermore, we waive some or all arguments of  $\mathcal{M}$  and  $\mathcal{LM}$  when they are uniquely determined by the context.

By the above definitions, containment  $\mathcal{M} \subseteq \mathcal{LM}$  always holds.

A family  $\mathcal{F} \subseteq \mathcal{P}$  is called:

- *convex* if  $\mathcal{M}(\mathcal{F}) = \mathcal{LM}(\mathcal{F})$ ;
- *strongly convex* if  $\mathcal{F}$  is convex and for any  $F \in \mathcal{F}$  and  $F' \in \mathcal{M}(\mathcal{F})$  such that  $F \succ F'$  there exists an immediate successor  $P$  of  $F$  such that  $P \in \mathcal{F}$  and  $F \succ P \succeq F'$ .
- *hereditary* if  $P \in \mathcal{F}$  whenever  $P$  is a successor of some  $F \in \mathcal{F}$ .
- *weakly hereditary* if  $P \in \mathcal{F}$  whenever  $F \in \mathcal{F}$ ,  $F' \in \mathcal{M}(\mathcal{F})$ , and  $F \succ P \succeq F'$ .

In accordance with the above definitions, the following implications hold:

$$\text{hereditary} \Rightarrow \text{weakly hereditary} \Rightarrow \text{strongly convex} \Rightarrow \text{convex},$$

while all inverse implications fail, as we will show in this paper. Note that the last two concepts become equivalent if  $\mathcal{F}$  and  $\mathcal{P}$  have the same unique minimum and the first two are equivalent whenever  $\mathcal{M}(\mathcal{F}) \supseteq \mathcal{M}(\mathcal{P})$ , or more precisely,  $\mathcal{M}(\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{P}, \succ) \supseteq \mathcal{M}(\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{P}, \succ)$ .

**Remark 1.** *The last concept can be “slightly” modified as follows:*

- *A family  $\mathcal{F}$  is called very weakly hereditary if  $P \in \mathcal{F}$  whenever  $F \in \mathcal{F}$  and  $F \succ P \succeq F'$  for some  $F' \in \mathcal{M}(\mathcal{F})$ .*

*Then, to the above chain of implications we can add the following one:*

$$\text{hereditary} \Rightarrow \text{weakly hereditary} \Rightarrow \text{very weakly hereditary} \Rightarrow \text{convex}.$$

*Yet, we consider this modification only in Subsections 2.2.1, 2.3, and 2.5.1. since we have few “natural” examples of very weakly but not weakly hereditary families, although many “formal” such examples are not difficult to construct.*

In the next three sections we consider several examples related to directed and non-directed graphs, complete edge-chromatic graphs, and two-person game forms and normal form games, respectively. We survey known results and obtain several new ones.

## 2 Graphs and digraphs

### 2.1 Definitions and preliminaries

Given a finite (directed) graph  $G$ , we denote by  $V(G)$  and  $E(G)$  the sets of its vertices and (directed) edges, respectively. Multiple edges are allowed but loops are forbidden.

A (directed) graph  $G$  is called: *null-graph* if  $V(G) = \emptyset$  and *edge-free* if  $E(G) = \emptyset$ . The null-graph is unique and edge-free, by definition, but not vice versa.

We will consider two partial orders: related to vertices  $\succ_V$  and to (directed) edges  $\succ_E$ . In the first case,  $G \succ G'$  if  $G'$  is an induced subgraph of  $G$ , that is,  $V(G') \subseteq V(G)$  and  $E(G')$  consists of all (directed) edges of  $E(G)$  whose both ends are in  $V(G')$ . In the second case,  $G \succ G'$  if  $G'$  is a subgraph of  $G$  defined on the same vertex-set, that is,  $V(G') = V(G)$  and  $E(G') \subseteq E(G)$ .

Given a graph  $G$ , which may be directed or not, and a set of its (induced) subgraphs  $G_1, \dots, G_n$ , define a family  $(\mathcal{F}(G), \succ_E)$  (respectively,  $(\mathcal{F}(G), \succ_V)$ ) that consists of all subgraphs  $G'$  of  $G$  containing as a (induced) subgraph at least one of  $G_i, i = 1, \dots, n$ .

**Lemma 1.** *Both families are weakly hereditary. Furthermore,  $(\mathcal{F}(G), \succ_V)$  (respectively,  $(\mathcal{F}(G), \succ_E)$ ) is hereditary if and only if  $n = 1$  and  $G_1$  is the null-graph (respectively, the edge-free graph).*

*Proof.* Consider a subgraph  $G' \in (\mathcal{F}(G), \succ_V)$ , (respectively,  $G' \in (\mathcal{F}(G), \succ_E)$ ) that contains (as an induced subgraph)  $G_i$  for some  $i \in [n] = \{1, \dots, n\}$ . Obviously, the above property is kept when we delete a vertex from  $V(G') \setminus V(G_i)$  (respectively, an edge  $e \in E(G') \setminus E(G_i)$ ) if any. Obviously, such a vertex (respectively, an edge) exists unless  $G = G_i$ . Thus, in both cases family  $\mathcal{F}(G)$  is weakly hereditary. Obviously, it is hereditary if and only if  $G_i$  cannot be reduced.  $\square$

## 2.2 Connected graphs

A graph  $G$  is called *connected* if for every two distinct vertices  $v, v' \in V(G)$  it contains a path connecting  $v$  and  $v'$ . In particular, the null-graph and the one-vertex graphs are connected, since they do not have two distinct vertices.

Recall that  $G'$  is a *spanning tree* of  $G$  if  $V(G') = V(G)$ ,  $E(G') \subseteq E(G)$ , and  $G'$  is a *tree*, that is, connected and has no cycles.

### 2.2.1 Order $\succ_V$

As usual,  $\mathcal{F} = \mathcal{F}(G)$  denote the family of all connected induced subgraphs of a given graph  $G$ . Family  $\mathcal{F}(G)$  is strongly convex for any  $G$ . In other words, every connected graph  $G$  has a vertex  $v \in V = V(G)$  such that  $G[V \setminus \{v\}]$  is connected. Indeed,  $v$  can be any leaf of a spanning tree of  $G$ . Furthermore,  $\mathcal{F}(G)$  is hereditary if and only if  $G$  is complete. Otherwise,  $\mathcal{F}(G)$  is not even weakly hereditary.

**Example 1.** *Consider 2-path  $G = (v_1, v_2), (v_2, v_3)$ . It is connected, but  $G[\{V \setminus v_2\}] = G[\{v_1, v_3\}]$  is not. Thus, family  $\mathcal{F}(G)$  is not even very weakly hereditary.*

*Let us modify our convention and assume now that the null-graph is not connected. Then,  $\mathcal{M} = \mathcal{M}(G) = \mathcal{LM}(G)$  and  $G' \in \mathcal{M}$  if and only if  $V(G')$  is a single vertex. In this case the 2-path  $(v_1, v_2), (v_2, v_3)$  becomes very weakly (but not weakly) hereditary. Indeed, the target vertex may be  $v_2$  but not  $v_1$  or  $v_3$ . To obtain a not very weakly hereditary family  $\mathcal{F}(G'')$ , consider the 3-path  $G'' = (v_1, v_2), (v_2, v_3), (v_3, v_4)$ . In this case, each target vertex can be obtained by a vertex-eliminating sequence that does not respect connectivity.*

### 2.2.2 Order $\succ_E$

Given a connected graph  $G$ , family  $\mathcal{F} = \mathcal{F}(G)$  consists of all connected subgraphs  $G'$  of  $G$  with  $V(G') = V(G)$ .

By definition, all spanning trees of  $G$  are in  $\mathcal{F}$  and, obviously, they form class  $\mathcal{M} = \mathcal{LM}$ . By Lemma 1, family  $\mathcal{F}$  is weakly hereditary.

**Remark 2.** Let  $G$  be a connected graph with weighted edges:  $w : E(G) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ . It is well known [21, 22, 69] that one can obtain a spanning tree of  $G$  of maximal total weight by the greedy algorithm, as follows. Delete an edge  $e \in E(G)$  such that (i)  $e$  belongs to a cycle of  $G$ , or in other words, the reduced graph is still connected on  $V(G)$ , and (ii)  $e$  has a minimal weight among all edges satisfying (i). Proceed until such an edge exists.

## 2.3 Disconnected graphs

### 2.3.1 Order $\succ_V$

In this case  $\mathcal{F} = \mathcal{F}(G)$  is the family of all disconnected induced subgraphs of a given graph  $G$ . By convention, the null-graph and one-vertex graphs are connected. Hence, class  $\mathcal{M}(\mathcal{F})$  consists of all subgraphs of  $G$  induced by pairs of non-adjacent vertices. In particular,  $\mathcal{F} = \emptyset$  if and only if there is no such pair, that is, graph  $G$  is complete.

**Proposition 1.** For every graph  $G$ , family  $\mathcal{F}(G)$  is strongly convex.

*Proof.* Consider a not connected induced subgraph  $G'$  of  $G$  and any pair of non-adjacent vertices  $v', v'' \in V(G')$ . Then, either  $V(G') = \{v', v''\}$ , in which case  $G' \in \mathcal{M}(\mathcal{F}(G))$  is minimal, or we will show that there exists a vertex  $v \in V(G') \setminus \{v', v''\}$  such that subgraph  $G''$  induced by  $V(G') \setminus \{v\}$  is still not connected. In other words,  $\mathcal{F}(G)$  is strongly convex. Assume that  $G'$  is not connected and choose  $w \in V(G')$  such that  $w$  and  $v'$  are from distinct connected components of  $G'$ . Then, delete  $v \in V(G') \setminus \{v', v'', w\}$ , if any. The obtained induced subgraph still contains  $v'$  and  $v''$ . Furthermore, it is not connected, because it still contains  $w$ . It remains to consider the case when  $V(G') = \{v', v'', w\}$ . Then, we just delete  $w$  to obtain a not connected induced subgraph.  $\square$

**Proposition 2.** For every graph  $G$ , family  $\mathcal{F}(G)$  is very weakly hereditary.

*Proof.* Consider a not connected induced subgraph  $G'$  of  $G$  and choose any two vertices  $v', v'' \in V(G')$  from distinct connected components of  $G'$ . Then, obviously, every induced subgraph  $G''$  of  $G$  containing both  $v'$  and  $v''$  is in  $\mathcal{F}$ , that is, not connected.  $\square$

However, family  $\mathcal{F}(G)$  is not weakly hereditary for some  $G$ .

**Example 2.** Consider graph  $G$  that consists of a 2-path  $(v_1, v_2), (v_2, v_3)$  and an isolated vertex  $v_0$ . This graph is disconnected, that is,  $G \in \mathcal{F}(G)$ , but, by deleting  $v_0$ , we obtain a connected graph  $G' \notin \mathcal{F}(G)$ . Yet,  $v_1, v_3 \in V(G')$  and, hence, graph  $G''$  induced by these vertices is in  $\mathcal{F}(G)$ , moreover,  $G'' \in \mathcal{M}(\mathcal{F}(G))$ . Thus,  $\mathcal{F}(G)$  is not weakly hereditary.

Note that strong convexity holds for  $\mathcal{F}(G)$ , because one can delete  $v_2$  rather than  $v_0$ .

### 2.3.2 Order $\succ_E$

Given a graph  $G$ , family  $\mathcal{F} = \mathcal{F}(G)$  consists of all disconnected graphs  $G'$  such that  $V(G') = V(G)$  and  $E(G') \subseteq E(G)$ . Then, obviously, family  $\mathcal{F}$  has a unique minimum:  $\mathcal{M}(\mathcal{F})$  consists of a unique graph, which is the edge-free graph on  $V(G)$ . Obviously, deleting edges and keeping the vertex-set respects the non-connectivity. Thus, family  $\mathcal{F}$  is hereditary.

## 2.4 Strongly connected directed graphs

A directed graph (digraph)  $G$  is called *strongly connected* (SC) if for every two (distinct) vertices of  $v, v' \in V(G)$  there is a directed path in  $G$  from  $v$  to  $v'$ .

### 2.4.1 Order $\succ_V$

In this case  $\mathcal{F} = \mathcal{F}(G)$  is the family of all SC induced subgraphs of a given digraph  $G$ . This family is not convex for some digraphs.

**Example 3.** Consider a digraph  $G$  that consists of two directed cycles of length at least 3 with a unique common vertex. It is not difficult to verify that  $G \in \mathcal{LM} \setminus \mathcal{M}$ .

### 2.4.2 Order $\succ_E$

In this case  $\mathcal{F} = \mathcal{F}(G)$  is the family of all SC subgraphs  $G'$  of a given digraph  $G$  such that  $V(G') = V(G)$  and  $E(G') \subseteq E(G)$ . Note that  $\mathcal{F}(G) = \emptyset$  if and only if  $G$  is not SC. Obviously, SC subgraphs form a monotone non-decreasing subset of  $2^E$ . In other words, for any subgraphs  $G'$  and  $G''$  of  $G$  such that  $V(G') = V(G'') = V(G)$  and  $E(G') \subseteq E(G'') \subseteq E(G)$ , we have:  $G''$  is SC on  $V(G)$  whenever  $G'$  is. Thus, by Lemma 1, family  $\mathcal{F}(G)$  is weakly hereditary but not hereditary.

## 2.5 Not strongly connected directed graphs

### 2.5.1 Order $\succ_V$

In this case  $\mathcal{F} = \mathcal{F}(G)$  is the family of all not SC induced subgraphs of a given digraph  $G$ . It is easily seen that  $\mathcal{M}(\mathcal{F})$  consists of all pairs of vertices  $v, v' \in V(G)$  such that at least one of two arcs  $(v, v')$  or  $(v', v)$  is missing in  $G$ . There are no such pair in  $G$  if and only if  $\mathcal{F}(G) = \emptyset$ .

An induced subgraph  $G'$  of  $G$  is not SC (that is,  $G' \in \mathcal{F}$ ) if and only if there exist two (distinct) vertices  $v, v' \in V(G')$  such that there is no directed path from  $v$  to  $v'$  in  $G'$ . Furthermore,  $G'' \in \mathcal{M}(\mathcal{F})$  if and only if  $G'' = G[v, v']$  is induced by distinct two vertices  $v, v' \in V(G)$  such that either  $(v, v') \notin E(G)$ , or  $(v', v) \notin E(G)$ , or both.

Hence, we can reduce  $G'$  to  $G[v, v']$  deleting its vertices, except  $v$  and  $v'$ , in any order.

Thus, considered family  $\mathcal{F}$  is very weakly hereditary and, hence, convex.

Yet, obviously, it is not hereditary, since an induced subgraph of a not SC digraph can be SC. The simplest examples are two isolated vertices or one arc.

Moreover,  $\mathcal{F}$  is not even weakly hereditary. Consider, for example, a directed 3-cycle and one isolated (or pending) vertex  $v$ . This digraph is not SC, but after deleting  $v$ , we obtain a SC digraph. Meanwhile any 2 vertices of the 3-cycle induce a not SC digraph.

**Proposition 3.** Family  $\mathcal{F}$  is strongly convex.

*Proof.* Consider a not SC digraph  $G'$  and any its induced subgraph  $G'' \in \mathcal{M}(\mathcal{F})$ . As we know,  $G'' = G[\{v, v'\}]$  for some  $v, v' \in V(G')$  such that either  $v, v'$ , or  $v', v$ , or both are not in  $E(G')$ . Since digraph  $G'$  is not SC, there is a vertex  $w \in V(G')$  such that there exists no directed path either from  $w$  to  $v$ , or from  $v$  to  $w$ , or both. Let us delete vertices of  $G'$ , except  $v, v'$  and  $w$ , one by one in any order, getting  $G''' = G[\{v, v', w\}]$  at the end. All obtained digraphs remain not SC, since they contain  $v$  and  $w$ . Finally, delete  $w$  to obtain  $G'' = G[\{v, v'\}] \in \mathcal{M}(\mathcal{F})$ .  $\square$

### 2.5.2 Order $\succ_E$

In this case  $\mathcal{F} = \mathcal{F}(G)$  is the family of all not SC subgraphs  $G'$  of a given digraph  $G$  such that  $V(G') = V(G)$  and  $E(G') \subseteq E(G)$ . Obviously, all these subgraphs are not SC whenever  $G$  is not SC. Thus, family  $\mathcal{F}$  is hereditary.

## 2.6 Ternary graphs

A graph is called *ternary* if it contains no induced cycle of length multiple to 3.

By definition, family  $\mathcal{T}$  of ternary graphs is hereditary in order  $\succ_V$ . In contrast, in order  $\succ_E$  this family is not even convex, as the following example shows.

**Example 4.** From [30] we know that “D. Král asked (unpublished): Is it true that in every ternary graph (with an edge) there is an edge  $e$  such that the graph obtained by deleting  $e$  is also ternary? This would have implied that all ternary graphs are 3-colourable, but has very recently been disproved; a counterexample was found by M. Wrochna. (Take the disjoint union of a 5-cycle and a 10-cycle, and join each vertex of the 5-cycle to two opposite vertices of the 10-cycle, in order.)” In other words, consider the standard model of the Petersen graph, with two 5-cycles, as in the Figure 1. Then, subdivide every edge of the “outer” cycle by a vertex and connect it with the “opposite” vertex of the “inner” 5-cycle.




Fig. 1. Wrochna’s example

**Remark 3.** In [30] it was proven that chromatic numbers of all ternary graphs are bounded by a constant. Yet, it is much larger than 3.

**Remark 4.** Consider the skeleton graph of the cube. Obviously, an induced 6-cycle appears whenever we delete an edge. However, this graph itself contains two induced 6-cycles.

Also, an induced 6-cycle appears whenever we delete an edge of icosidodecahedron - a polyhedron with twenty triangular faces and twelve pentagonal faces, which has 30 identical vertices, with two triangles and two pentagons meeting at each, and 60 identical edges, each separating a triangle from a pentagon (see Fig. 2. Yet, this graph itself contains triangles and induced 9-cycles.

## 2.7 Non-ternary graphs

By definition, non-ternary graph contains an induced cycle of length multiple to 3 (a ternary cycle, for short). Given a graph  $G$ , denote by  $\mathcal{C}_3(G)$  (respectively, by  $\mathcal{IC}_3(G)$ ) the




Fig. 2. Icosidodecahedron. Illustration for Luca Pacioli's "Divina proportione" by Leonardo da Vinci

set of its (induced) ternary cycles and by  $\mathcal{F}(G)$  the family of its non-ternary subgraphs. From Lemma 1 we will derive that, with respect to (wrt) both orders  $\succ_V$  and  $\succ_E$ , family  $\mathcal{F}(G)$  is weakly hereditary but not hereditary.

### 2.7.1 Order $\succ_V$

In this case,  $\mathcal{M}(\mathcal{F}(G)) = \mathcal{IC}_3(G)$ . Given an induced subgraph  $G'$  of  $G$  that contains a ternary cycle  $C \in \mathcal{IC}_3(G)$ , one can delete a vertex  $v \in V(G') \setminus V(C)$  such that the reduced graph  $G''$  still contains  $C$  as an induced subgraph unless  $G' = C$ . This exactly means that family  $\mathcal{F}(G)$  is weakly hereditary. Obviously, it is not hereditary, since deleting a vertex might destroy all ternary cycles of  $G'$ .

### 2.7.2 Order $\succ_E$

In this case,  $\mathcal{M}(\mathcal{F}(G))$  is in a one-to-one correspondence with  $\mathcal{C}_3(G)$ . Recall that  $V(G') = V(G)$  for each subgraph  $G' \in \mathcal{F}(G)$ . Hence,  $G'$  consists of a cycle  $C \in \mathcal{C}_3(G)$  and several isolated vertices from  $V(G) \setminus V(C)$ .

Given a non-ternary subgraph  $G''$  of  $G$  such that  $V(G'') = V(G)$  and  $G''$  contains a (not necessarily induced) ternary cycle  $C \in \mathcal{C}_3(G)$ , one can delete an edge  $e \in V(G'') \setminus V(C)$  such that the reduced graph still contains  $C$  unless  $G'' = C$ . By Lemma 1, family  $\mathcal{F}(G)$  is weakly hereditary. Obviously, it is not hereditary, since deleting an edge might destroy all cycles in  $G''$  of length multiple of 3.

## 2.8 Perfect and imperfect graphs

### 2.8.1 Definitions and preliminaries

Given a graph  $G$ , as usual,  $\chi = \chi(G)$  and  $\omega = \omega(G)$  denote its chromatic and clique numbers, respectively. Recall that  $\chi$  is the minimum number of colors in a proper vertex-coloring of  $G$  and  $\omega$  is the number of vertices in a maximum clique of  $G$ . Obviously,  $\chi(G) \geq \omega(G)$  for every graph  $G$ .

Graph  $G$  is called *perfect* if  $\chi(G') = \omega(G')$  for every induced subgraph  $G'$  of  $G$ .

Thus, by definition, in order  $\succ_V$  the family of perfect graphs is hereditary.

This concept was introduced in 1961 by Claude Berge [5] (see also [6] for more details) who made the following two conjectures:

**Perfect Graph Conjecture:**  $G$  is perfect if (and only if) the complementary graph  $\overline{G}$  is perfect. It was proven in 1972 by Laslo Lovász [70, 71] and since then is called the *Perfect Graph Theorem (PGT)*.

A *hole* is a cycle of length at least 4 and an *anti-hole* is the complement of a hole.

**Strong perfect graph conjecture:** graph  $G$  is perfect if and only if it contains no induced odd holes and anti-holes, In other words, odd holes and odd anti-holes are minimal imperfect graphs in order  $\succ_V$ . This conjecture was proven by M. Chudnovsky, N. Robertson, P. Seymour, and R. Thomas in 2002 and published in 2006 [29]. Since then this statement is called the *Strong Perfect Graph Theorem (SPGT)*.

A polynomial recognition algorithm for perfect graphs was obtained by M. Chudnovsky, G. Cornuéjols, X. Liu, P. Seymour, and K. Vušković in 2002 and published in 2005 [28].

### 2.8.2 Perfect graphs

**Order  $\succ_V$**  This family  $\mathcal{F}$  is hereditary and  $\mathcal{M}(\mathcal{F})$  contains only the null-graph.

**Order  $\succ_E$**  An edge of a perfect graph  $G$  is called *critical* if deletion of it results in an imperfect graph. For example, six edges  $(v_1, v_2), (v_2, v_3), (v_3, v_4), (v_4, v_5), (v_5, v_1)$ , and  $(v_1, v_3)$  form a perfect graph in which  $(v_1, v_3)$  is a unique critical edge. This concept was introduced by Annegret Wagler [94]. With Stefan Hougary, she proved that a perfect graph has no critical edges if and only if it is *Meyniel*, that is, every its odd cycle of length 5 or more (if any) has at least two chords [94, Theorem 3.1].

There are perfect graphs in which all edges are critical. Some examples were given in [14, Figures 2 and 3] and called *Rotterdam* graphs. Clearly, these graphs are in  $\mathcal{LM}(\mathcal{F}) \setminus \mathcal{M}(\mathcal{F})$  and, hence, the considered family, of perfect graphs in order  $\succ_E$ , is not convex.

Furthermore, [14, Theorem 4] claims that every edge of the complement of a Rotterdam graph is critical too. In other words, a Rotterdam graph becomes imperfect whenever we delete an edge from it or add an edge to it.

Let us note finally that no efficient characterization of the non-critical-edge-free perfect graphs is known, in contrast to the critical-edge-free ones, which are Meyniel. The main result of [28] provides a polynomial recognition algorithm for the former family.

### 2.8.3 Imperfect graphs

**Order  $\succ_V$**  In this case, by the SPGT,  $\mathcal{M}(\mathcal{F}) = \mathcal{LM}(\mathcal{F})$  and this set contains only odd holes and odd anti-holes. Again, by Lemma 1,  $\mathcal{F}$  is weakly hereditary but not hereditary.

**Order  $\succ_E$**  In 1972 Eleferie Olaru characterized minimal graphs of this family. He proved that it is convex and  $G \in \mathcal{M} = \mathcal{LM}$  if and only if  $G$  is an odd hole plus  $k$  isolated vertices for some  $k \geq 0$  [82]; see also [14, 83]. Thus, by Lemma 1, family  $\mathcal{F}$  is weakly hereditary but not hereditary.

Note that the odd anti-holes, except  $C_5$ , are not in  $\mathcal{LM}$ , since each one has an edge whose elimination would result in a graph with an induced odd hole.

### 2.8.4 Graphs with $\chi = \omega$

It is easily seen that  $\mathcal{M} = \mathcal{LM}$  for both orders  $\succ_V$  and  $\succ_E$ ; in other words, both families are convex.

Indeed, for  $\succ_V$  (respectively, for  $\succ_E$ ) sets  $\mathcal{M}$  and  $\mathcal{LM}$  are equal and contain only the null-graph (respectively, the edge-free graphs) see Propositions 2 and 3 in [14].

Yet, obviously, deleting a vertex or an edge may fail the equality  $\chi = \omega$ . Thus, both considered families are not hereditary.

### 2.8.5 Graphs with $\chi > \omega$

**Order  $\succ_V$**  By SPGT, every graph with  $\chi > \omega$  contains an odd hole or odd anti-hole as an induced subgraph; in other words, class  $\mathcal{M}$  contains only the odd holes and odd anti-holes.

Class  $\mathcal{LM}$  is wider; it consists of all so-called *partitionable* graphs defined as follows: Graph  $G$  is partitionable if  $\chi(G) > \omega(G)$  but  $\chi(G') = \omega(G')$  for each induced subgraph  $G'$  of  $G$  such that  $V(G') = V(G) \setminus \{v\}$  for a vertex  $v \in V(G)$ . Such definition is one of many equivalent characterizations of partitionable graphs; this follows easily from the pioneering results of [10, 85] and it is explicit in [15].

Thus, the considered family is not convex.

**Remark 5.** *The above characterization of  $\mathcal{M}$  is based on SPGT, which is very difficult, while the case of  $\mathcal{LM}$  is simple. In contrast, partitionable graphs are much more sophisticated than the odd holes and anti-holes. Although very many equivalent characterizations of partitionable graphs are known (see, for example, [10, 4, 27, 64, 85]) yet, their structure is complicated and not well understood. For example, the fact that each partitionable graph contains an induced odd hole or anti-hole is equivalent with the SPGT.*

*The following two questions about partitionable graphs are still open. In addition to the odd holes and odd anti-holes, there is one more partitionable graph  $G_{17}$  that has 17 vertices and has no: (i) small transversals and (ii) uncertain edges. It is open whether (i) or (ii) may hold for other partitionable graphs. The conjecture that (i) cannot, if true, would significantly strengthen SPGT; see [4, 15, 27, 64] for the definitions and more details.*

**Order  $\succ_E$**  By Lemma 1, the corresponding family  $\mathcal{F}$  is weakly hereditary: class  $\mathcal{M} = \mathcal{LM}$  consists of odd holes with  $k$  isolated vertices, for some  $k \geq 0$ . This follows from Olaru's Theorem [82]; see also [83] and [14, Proposition 1]. Family  $\mathcal{F}$  is not hereditary, since obviously, inequality  $\chi > \omega$  may turn into equality after deleting an edge.

## 2.9 Kernels in digraphs

### 2.9.1 Definitions and preliminaries

Given a finite digraph  $G$ , a vertex-set  $K = K(G) \subseteq V(G)$  is called a *kernel* of  $G$  if it is (i) independent and (ii) dominating, that is,

- (i)  $v, v' \in K(G)$  for no directed edge  $(v, v') \in E(G)$  and
- (ii) for every  $v \in V(G) \setminus K(G)$  there is a directed edge  $(v, v')$  from  $v$  to some  $v' \in K(G)$ .

This definition was introduced in 1901 by Charles Bouton [23] for a special digraph (of the popular game of NIM) and then in 1944 it was extended by John Von Neumann and Oskar Morgenstern for arbitrary digraphs in [80].

It is not difficult to verify that an even directed cycle has two kernels, while an odd one has none. This obvious observation was generalized in 1953 by Richardson [86] as follows:

A digraph has a kernel whenever all its directed cycles are even. The original proof was simplified in [67, 66, 81, 42, 8, 36].

**Remark 6.** *It is not difficult to verify that a digraph has at most one kernel whenever all its directed cycles are odd [13]. This claim combined with the Richardson Theorem imply that an acyclic digraph has a unique kernel. The latter statement is important for game theory, allowing to solve finite acyclic graphical zero-sum two-person games. Of course, it has a much simpler direct proof [80].*

Already in 1973 Vásek Chvátal proved that it is NP-complete to recognize whether a digraph has a kernel [26].

## 2.9.2 Kernell-less digraphs

### Order $\succ_E$

In this case, given a digraph  $G$ , family  $\mathcal{F}(G)$  contains only the digraphs  $G'$  such that  $V(G') = V(G)$ ,  $E(G') \subseteq E(G)$ , and  $G'$  has no kernel. By Richardson's Theorem,  $G' \in \mathcal{M}(\mathcal{F}(G))$  if and only if  $G'$  is a directed odd cycle in  $G$  (plus the set of isolated vertices  $v \in V(G) \setminus V(G')$ ).

In 1980 Pierre Duchet [35] conjectured that every kernel-less digraph  $G'$  has an edge  $e \in E(G')$  such that the reduced digraph  $G'' = G' - e$  (that is,  $E(G'') = E(G') \setminus \{e\}$ ) is still kernel-less unless  $G''$  is an odd cycle plus  $k$  isolated vertices for some  $k \geq 0$ ; in other words, family  $\mathcal{F}$  of kernel-less digraphs is convex,  $\mathcal{M}(\mathcal{F}) = \mathcal{LM}(\mathcal{F})$ . This statement, if true, would significantly strengthen Richardson's theorem. Yet, it was shown in [3] that a circulant with 43 vertices is a counter-example, a locally minimal but not minimal kernel-free digraph.

Let us recall that a circulant  $G = G_n(\ell_1, \dots, \ell_q)$  is defined as a digraph with  $n$  vertices,  $V(G) = [n] = \{1, \dots, n\}$  and  $nq$  arcs,  $E(G) = \{(i, i + j) \mid i \in [n], j \in [q] = \{1, \dots, q\}\}$ , where standardly all sums are taken  $\pmod n$ .

**Example 5.** ([3]) *It was shown that a circulant  $G_n(1, 7, 8)$  has a kernel if and only if  $n \equiv 0 \pmod 3$  or  $n \equiv 0 \pmod{29}$ . Hence,  $G_{43}(1, 7, 8)$  is kernel-less. Yet, a kernel appears whenever an arc of this circulant is deleted. Due to circular symmetry, it is sufficient to consider only three cases and delete one of the arcs  $(43, 1)$ ,  $(43, 7)$ , or  $(43, 8)$ . It is not difficult to verify that, respectively, the following three subsets become kernels:*

$$\begin{aligned} K_1 &= \{1, 5, 10, 14, 16, 19, 25, 28, 30, 34, 39, 43\}, \\ K_7 &= \{7, 9, 11, 13, 22, 24, 26, 28, 37, 39, 41, 43\}, \\ K_8 &= \{3, 5, 8, 14, 17, 19, 23, 28, 32, 34, 37, 43\} \subseteq \{1, \dots, 43\} = V. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, the set of edge-minimal kernel-free digraphs is a proper subset of the locally edge-minimal ones. Although, only one digraph from the difference is known, it seems that the latter class, unlike the former one, is difficult to characterize. For example, it is not known whether a circulant  $G_n(\ell_1, \ell_2)$  can be a locally edge-minimal kernel-less digraph, but it is known that it cannot if  $n \leq 1,000,000$  [3].

### Order $\succ_V$

In this case also family  $\mathcal{F}$  of the kernel-less digraphs is not convex. Although it seems difficult to characterize (or recognize in polynomial time) both classes  $\mathcal{M}(\mathcal{F})$  and  $\mathcal{LM}(\mathcal{F})$  of the (locally) vertex-minimal kernel-less digraphs, yet, some digraphs from  $\mathcal{LM} \setminus \mathcal{M}$  can

be easily constructed; see for example, [36, 41, 42, 43]. For completeness we provide one more example.

**Example 6.** *Circulant  $G = G_{16}(1, 7, 8)$  is kernel-less, since 16 is not a multiple of 3 or 29. Yet, a kernel appears whenever we delete a vertex from  $G$ . Due to circular symmetry, without loss of generality (wlog) we can delete “the last” vertex, 16, and verify that vertex-set  $\{1, 3, 5, 7\}$  becomes a kernel. Hence,  $G \in \mathcal{LM}$ , but  $G \notin \mathcal{M}$ , since  $G$  contains a directed triangle,  $1 + 7 + 8 = 16$ , which is kernel-less.*

### 2.9.3 Digraphs with kernels

We will show that in each order  $\succ_V$  or  $\succ_E$  the corresponding family  $\mathcal{F}$  is strongly convex but not weakly hereditary.

Given an arbitrary digraph  $G$ , obviously, class  $\mathcal{M}(\mathcal{F})$  contains a unique digraph in both cases: the null-graph for  $\succ_V$  and the edge-free graph with vertex-set  $V(G)$  for  $\succ_E$ . Thus, by Lemma 1, both families are not weakly hereditary.

**Proposition 4.** *Both families  $(\mathcal{F}, \succ_V)$  and  $(\mathcal{F}, \succ_E)$  are strongly convex.*

*Proof.* Fix a digraph  $G$  with a kernel  $K \subseteq V(G)$ .

In order  $\succ_V$  delete all vertices of  $V(G) \setminus K$ , if any, one by one. By definition,  $K$  remains a kernel in every reduced digraph. This reduction results in an independent set, which is a kernel itself. Now we can delete all vertices one by one getting the null-graph at the end.

In order  $\succ_E$ , first, we delete all arcs within  $V(G) \setminus K$ , then all arcs from  $V(G) \setminus K$  to  $K$  (if any, one by one, in both cases). By definition,  $K$  remains a kernel in every reduced digraph. This reduction results in the edge-free digraph on the initial vertex-set  $V(G)$ .  $\square$

### 2.9.4 On kernel-solvable graphs

A graph is called *kernel-solvable* if every its clique-acyclic orientation has a kernel; see [11, 12, 13] for the precise definitions and more details. In 1983 Claude Berge and Pierre Duchet conjectured that a graph is kernel-solvable if and only if it is perfect. The “only if part” follows easily from the SPGT (which remained a conjecture till 2002). The “if part” was proven in [11]; see also [12, 13]. This proof is independent of SPGT. The family of perfect graphs is hereditary, by definition.

As we know, the family of kernel-less digraphs is not convex wrt order  $\succ_E$ , in contrast with the family of not kernel-solvable graphs, which is convex [12, Theorem 1].

## 3 Complete edge-chromatic graphs

### 3.1 Definitions and preliminaries

A  $d$ -graph  $\mathcal{G} = (V; E_1, \dots, E_d)$  is a complete graph whose edges are colored by  $d$  colors  $I = [d] = \{1, \dots, d\}$ , or in other words, are partitioned into  $d$  subsets some of which might be empty. These subsets are called *chromatic components*. For example, we call  $\mathcal{G}$  a 2- or 3-graph if  $\mathcal{G}$  has only 2, respectively, 3, non-empty chromatic components. According to this definition order  $\succ_E$  makes no sense for  $d$ -graphs, so we will restrict ourselves by  $\succ_V$ .

The following 2-graph  $\Pi$  and 3-graph  $\Delta$  will play an important role:

$\Pi = (V; E_1, E_2)$ , where  $V = \{v_1, v_2, v_3, v_4\}$ ,  $E_1 = \{(v_1, v_2), (v_2, v_3), (v_3, v_4)\}$ , and  $E_2 = \{(v_2, v_4), (v_4, v_1), (v_1, v_3)\}$ ;

$\Delta = (V; E_1, E_2, E_3)$ , where  $V = \{v_1, v_2, v_3\}$ ,  $E_1 = \{(v_1, v_2)\}$ ,  $E_2 = \{(v_2, v_3)\}$ , and  $E_3 = \{(v_3, v_1)\}$ .




Fig. 3. 2-graph  $\Pi$  and 3-graph  $\Delta$

Note that both chromatic components of  $\Pi$  are isomorphic to  $P_4$  and that  $\Delta$  is a 3-colored triangle.

Let us also remark that, formally,  $d$ -graphs  $\Pi(d)$  (respectively,  $\Delta(d)$ ) defined for every integer  $d \geq 2$  (respectively,  $d \geq 3$ ), while  $d - 2$  (respectively,  $d - 3$ ) of their chromatic components are empty. We will omit argument  $d$  assuming that it is a fixed parameter.

Both  $d$ -graphs  $\Pi$  and  $\Delta$  were first considered, for different reasons, in 1967 by Tibor Gallai in his fundamental paper [45].  $\Delta$ -free  $d$ -graphs are sometimes called *Gallai's* graphs.

The  $\Pi$ - and  $\Delta$ -free  $d$ -graphs have important applications to  $d$ -person positional games and to read-once Boolean functions in case  $d = 2$  [13, 14, 16, 17, 46, 50, 51, 52, 53, 56, 57].

### 3.2 Substitution for graphs and $d$ -graphs

Given a graph  $G'$ , a vertex  $v \in V(G')$ , and graph  $G''$  such that  $V(G') \cap V(G'') = \emptyset$ , substitute  $G''$  for  $v$  in  $G'$  connecting a vertex  $v'' \in V(G'')$  with a vertex  $v' \in V(G')$  if and only if  $v$  and  $v'$  were adjacent in  $G'$ . Denote the obtained graph by  $G = G'(v \rightarrow G'')$  and call it the *substitution* of  $G''$  for  $v$  in  $G'$  or simply the *substitution* when arguments are clear from the context.

Substitution  $\mathcal{G} = \mathcal{G}'(v \rightarrow \mathcal{G}'')$  for  $d$ -graphs is defined in a similar way. We will see that many important classes of graphs and  $d$ -graphs are closed wrt substitution. This will be instrumental in our proofs. See Section 3.9 for more details.

### 3.3 Complementary connected $d$ -graphs

We say that a  $d$ -graph  $\mathcal{G}$  is *complementary connected (CC)* if the complement of each chromatic component of  $\mathcal{G}$  is connected on  $V$ , in other words, if for each two vertices  $u, w \in V$  and color  $i \in [d] = \{1, \dots, d\}$  there is a path between  $u$  and  $w$  without edges of  $E_i$ .

By convention, the null- $d$ -graph and one-vertex  $d$ -graph are not CC. It is easily seen that there is no CC  $d$ -graph with two vertices and that  $\Delta$  (respectively,  $\Pi$ ) is a unique CC  $d$ -graph with three (respectively, four) vertices.

It is also easily seen that  $\Pi$  and  $\Delta$  are minimal CC  $d$ -graphs, that is, they do not contain induced CC subgraphs. Moreover, there are no others.

**Theorem 1.** ([51, 53]). *Every CC  $d$ -graph contains  $\Pi$  or  $\Delta$ .* □

**Remark 7.** *In case of  $\Pi$ , that is, for  $d = 2$ , the result was obtained earlier [31, 89, 92, 93]. It was one of the problems on the 1970 Moscow Mathematics Olympiad, which was successfully solved by seven high-school students [44].*

This theorem can be strengthened as follows:

**Theorem 2.** ([14]). *Every CC  $d$ -graph  $\mathcal{G}$ , except  $\Pi$  and  $\Delta$ , contains a vertex  $v$  such that the reduced  $d$ -graph  $\mathcal{G}[V \setminus \{v\}]$  is still CC.  $\square$*

This statement was announced in [51, 53] and proven in [14], see also [56]. It implies that, by deleting vertices one by one, we can reduce every CC  $d$ -graph to a copy of  $\Pi$  or  $\Delta$ .

In other words, family  $\mathcal{F} = \mathcal{F}^{CC}$  of CC  $d$ -graphs is convex and the class  $\mathcal{M} = \mathcal{LM}$  contains only 2-graph  $\Pi$  and 3-graph  $\Delta$ . Let us show that  $\mathcal{F}_d = \mathcal{F}_d^{CC}$  is not strongly convex, already for  $d = 2$ . Since chromatic components of a  $d$ -graph may be empty, this also shows that  $\mathcal{F}_d^{CC}$  is not strongly convex, for any  $d$ .

It is both known and easily seen [56] that the family of CC graphs, as well as CC  $d$ -graphs, is closed wrt substitution. Moreover,  $\mathcal{G} = \mathcal{G}'(v \rightarrow \mathcal{G}'')$  is CC if and only if  $\mathcal{G}'$  is CC.

**Example 7.** *Consider 2-graph  $\Pi$  on the vertex-set  $\{v_1, v_2, v_3, v_4\}$  and substitute for  $v_4$  another 2-graph  $\Pi'$  on the vertex-set  $\{v'_1, v'_2, v'_3, v'_4\}$ . Obtained 2-graph  $\mathcal{G} = \Pi(v_4 \rightarrow \Pi')$  is CC, since  $\Pi$  and  $\Pi'$  are CC and family  $\mathcal{F}_d$  is closed wrt substitution. Furthermore, it is easy to verify that the CC property disappears if we delete  $v_1, v_2$  or  $v_3$  from  $\mathcal{G}$ . Thus, we cannot reduce  $\mathcal{G}$  to  $\Pi'$  keeping CC, which means that family  $\mathcal{F}_2^{CC}$  of the CC 2-graphs is not strongly convex.*

*However, we can reduce  $\mathcal{G}$  to  $\Pi$  keeping CC, in agreement with convexity of  $\mathcal{F}_2^{CC}$ .*




Fig. 4. 2-graph  $\mathcal{G} = \Pi(v_4 \rightarrow \Pi')$

### 3.4 Not CC $d$ -graphs

Let us denote this family by  $\mathcal{F}_d = \mathcal{F}_d^{not-CC}$  and show that it is strongly convex but not weakly hereditary if  $d > 1$ . Of course,  $\mathcal{F}_1$  is hereditary.

A two-vertex  $d$ -graph, that is, a single edge, is CC only if  $d = 1$ .

**Proposition 5.** *Assume that  $d > 1$  and  $|V| \geq 2$ . Each not CC  $d$ -graph  $\mathcal{G} = (V; E_1, \dots, E_d)$  contains a vertex  $v \in V$  such that the sub- $d$ -graph  $\mathcal{G}[V \setminus v]$  is still not CC.*

*Proof.* Since  $\mathcal{G}$  is not CC, there is a color  $i \in [d]$  such that graph  $\overline{G_i} = (V, \overline{E_i})$  is not connected. As we know, one can eliminate vertices of  $V$  one by one keeping this property until  $V$  is reduced to two vertices. However, the obtained not CC  $d$ -graph is still not minimal, since by convention, the null- $d$ -graph and a one-vertex  $d$ -graph are not CC either. Thus, the null- $d$ -graph is the only (locally) minimal CC  $d$ -graph. So, by the last two steps, we reduce the obtained two-vertex not CC  $d$ -graph to a one-vertex  $d$ -graph and then to the null- $d$ -graph. Both are not CC. Thus, family  $\mathcal{F}_d$  is strongly convex for all  $d$ .  $\square$

Yet, it is not weakly hereditary whenever  $d > 1$ .

**Example 8.** *Let us add a vertex  $v_0$  to  $\Pi$  or  $\Delta$  and connect it to all other vertices by edges of the same color. Clearly, the obtained  $d$ -graph is not CC if  $d > 1$ . Yet, deleting vertex  $v_0$  from it we obtain  $\Pi$  or  $\Delta$ , which are both CC. Thus, family  $\mathcal{F}_d$  is not hereditary. Moreover, it is not weakly hereditary, by Lemma 1 unless  $d = 1$ .*

### 3.5 CIS property of $d$ -graphs

Given a  $d$ -graph  $\mathcal{G} = (V; E_1, \dots, E_d)$ , choose a maximal independent set  $S_i \subseteq V$  in every graph  $G_i = (V, E_i)$  and denote by  $\mathcal{S} = \{S_i \mid i \in [d] = \{1, \dots, d\}\}$  the obtained collection; furthermore set  $S = \bigcap_{i=1}^d S_i$ . Obviously,  $|S| \leq 1$  for every  $\mathcal{S}$ . Indeed, if  $v, v' \in S$  then  $(v, v') \notin E_i$  for all  $i \in [d]$ , that is, this edge has no color.

We say that  $\mathcal{G}$  has the CIS property and call  $\mathcal{G}$  a *CIS  $d$ -graph* if  $S \neq \emptyset$  for every selection  $\mathcal{S}$ . CIS  $d$ -graphs were introduced in 2006 in [1]; see also [14, 17, 20, 33, 34, 53, 56, 57, 96, 97].

For  $d = 2$ , a 2-graph consists of two complementary graphs  $G_1$  and  $G_2$  on the same vertex-set  $V$ . In this case CIS property means that in  $G_i$  every maximal clique  $C$  intersects every maximal stable set  $S$  for  $i = 1, 2$ . (This explains the name CIS.) Obviously,  $C$  and  $S$  may have at most one vertex in common.

### 3.6 Not CIS $d$ -graphs

It is easy to verify that  $d$ -graphs  $\Pi$  and  $\Delta$  are not CIS, while every their sub- $d$ -graph is CIS, in other words,  $\Pi$  and  $\Delta$  are minimal not CIS  $d$ -graphs. Moreover, they are also locally minimal and there are no other.

**Theorem 3.** ([2]). *Every not CIS  $d$ -graph  $\mathcal{G} = (V; E_1, \dots, E_d)$ , except  $\Pi$  and  $\Delta$ , has a vertex  $v \in V$  such that the reduced  $d$ -graph  $\mathcal{G}[V \setminus \{v\}]$  is not CIS.*  $\square$

In other words, for any  $d \geq 2$ , family  $\mathcal{F}_d = \mathcal{F}_d^{\text{not-CIS}}$  of not CIS  $d$ -graphs is convex and class  $\mathcal{M}(\mathcal{F}_d) = \mathcal{LM}(\mathcal{F}_d)$  consists of only of  $\Pi$  if  $d = 2$  and of  $\Pi$  and  $\Delta$  if  $d > 2$ .

Interestingly, family  $\mathcal{F}_d^{CC}$  of CC  $d$ -graphs with  $d > 1$  has the same properties: it is convex and class  $\mathcal{M}(\mathcal{F}_d^{CC}) = \mathcal{LM}(\mathcal{F}_d^{CC})$  contains only  $\Pi$  and  $\Delta$ . However, these two families differ,  $\mathcal{F}_d = \mathcal{F}_d^{CC} \neq \mathcal{F}_d^{\text{not-CIS}} = \mathcal{F}'_d$ . Moreover, both differences  $\mathcal{F}_d \setminus \mathcal{F}'_d$  and  $\mathcal{F}'_d \setminus \mathcal{F}_d$  are not empty, already for  $d = 2$ .

**Example 9.** *Consider the bull-graph (also called A-graph) is self-complementary; hence, the corresponding bull 2-graph  $\mathcal{B}$  given on Figure 5 is both CC and CIS. Thus,  $\mathcal{B} \in \mathcal{F}_2 \setminus \mathcal{F}'_2$ .*

Consider 2-graph  $\Pi$  colored by colors 1 and 2; add to it a new vertex  $v_5$  and connect it to four vertices of  $\Pi$  by four edges of the same color, say 1. It is easily seen that the obtained 2-graph  $\mathcal{G}$  is not CC and not CIS. Thus,  $\mathcal{G} \in \mathcal{F}'_2 \setminus \mathcal{F}_2$ .

The above two examples also show that both set-differences are not empty for every  $d \geq 2$ , since chromatic components may be empty.




Fig. 5. 2-graphs  $\mathcal{B}$  and  $\mathcal{G}$

For each  $d \geq 2$  both families  $\mathcal{F}_d$  of CC  $d$ -graphs and  $\mathcal{F}'_d$  of not CIS  $d$ -graphs are convex, and  $\mathcal{F}_d$  is not strongly convex, already for  $d = 2$ . It remains only to prove that  $\mathcal{F}'_2$  not strongly convex. It was shown in [2] that CIS  $d$ -graphs are closed wrt substitution.

**Example 10.** Consider the bull 2-graph  $\mathcal{B}$  defined by the edges

$(v_1, v_2), (v_2, v_3), (v_3, v_4), (v_2, v_5), (v_3, v_5)$  of color 1,

$(v_2, v_4), (v_4, v_1), (v_1, v_3), (v_1, v_5), (v_4, v_5)$  of color 2.

Note that vertices  $\{v_1, v_2, v_3, v_4\}$  induce a  $\Pi$ . As we already mentioned,  $\mathcal{B}$  is a CIS 2-graph, while  $\Pi$  is not. Let us substitute  $v_5$  in  $\mathcal{B}$  by 2-graph  $\Pi'$  defined by the edges:

$(v'_1, v'_2), (v'_2, v'_3), (v'_3, v'_4)$  of color 1,

$(v'_2, v'_4), (v'_4, v'_1), (v'_1, v'_3)$  of color 2.

The resulting 2-graph  $\mathcal{B}' = \mathcal{B}(v_5 \rightarrow \Pi)$  is not CIS. Indeed, it is easily seen that two disjoint vertex-sets  $C = \{v_2, v_3, v'_2, v'_3\}$  and  $S = \{v_1, v_4, v'_1, v'_4\}$  form in  $\mathcal{B}'$  maximal cliques of colors 1 and 2, respectively.

In contrast, we obtain a CIS 2-graph, by substituting  $v_5$  in  $\mathcal{B}$  by a proper sub-2-graph  $\mathcal{G}$  of  $\Pi'$ . Indeed  $\Pi'$  is minimal not CIS, hence,  $\mathcal{G}$  is CIS,  $\mathcal{B}$  is CIS too, and CIS  $d$ -graphs are closed wrt substitution.

Summarizing, we conclude that 2-graph  $\mathcal{B}'$  is not CIS, but one obtains a CIS sub-2-graph by deleting any vertex  $v \in \{v'_1, v'_2, v'_3, v'_4\}$  from  $\mathcal{B}'$ . Hence, if we want to stay in  $\mathcal{F}'(\mathcal{B}')$ , we can only delete a vertex from  $V(\Pi) = \{v_1, v_2, v_3, v_4\}$ , keeping  $\Pi'$  but destroying  $\Pi$ . Thus,  $\mathcal{B}'$  cannot be reduced to  $\Pi$  within  $\mathcal{F}'(\mathcal{B}')$ , which means that family  $\mathcal{F}'_2$  is not strongly convex.

However, in agreement with convexity of family  $\mathcal{F}'_2(\mathcal{B}')$ , one can reduce  $\mathcal{B}'$  to  $\Pi'$  staying within this family.

Similarly, we can substitute  $v_5$  in  $\mathcal{B}$  by  $\Delta$ , on vertices  $v'_1, v'_2, v'_3$  edge-colored arbitrarily. In particular, we can use colors 1, or 2, or any other. Again, it is not difficult to verify that the resulting  $d$ -graph  $\mathcal{B}'' = \mathcal{B}(v_5 \rightarrow \Delta)$  is not CIS. (No CIS  $d$ -graph with  $\Delta$  is known, see Section 3.10.) Yet, deleting a vertex of  $\Delta$  from  $\mathcal{B}''$  we obtain a CIS sub- $d$ -graph of  $\mathcal{B}''$ . Indeed,  $\Delta$  is minimal not CIS, hence, any its sub- $d$ -graph is CIS, bull 2-graph  $\mathcal{B}$  is




Fig. 6. 2-graph  $\mathcal{B}'$

*CIS too, and CIS  $d$ -graphs are closed wrt substitution. Hence, if we want to stay in  $\mathcal{F}_3(\mathcal{B}'')$  then  $\mathcal{B}''$  can be reduced to  $\Delta$  induced by  $v'_1, v'_2, v'_3$ , but not to  $\Pi$ , induced by  $\{v_1, v_2, v_3, v_4\}$ . This disproves the strong convexity of  $\mathcal{F}_3(\mathcal{B}'')$ .*




Fig. 7. Three versions of 3-graph  $\mathcal{B}''$

### 3.7 $\Pi$ - and $\Delta$ -free $d$ -graphs

Clearly, the family of  $\Pi$ - and  $\Delta$ -free  $d$ -graphs is hereditary; class  $\mathcal{M} = \mathcal{LM}$  contains only null- $d$ -graph.

We know that for two different convex families, CC and not CIS  $d$ -graphs, class  $\mathcal{M} = \mathcal{LM}$  contains only  $d$ -graphs  $\Pi$  and  $\Delta$ . Hence, the following three properties of a  $d$ -graph  $\mathcal{G}$  are equivalent:

- (i)  $\mathcal{G}$  is  $\Pi$ - and  $\Delta$ -free;

- (ii)  $\mathcal{G}$  contains no CC sub- $d$ -graph;
- (iii)  $\mathcal{G}$  contains only CIS subgraphs.

This result allows us to construct one-to-one correspondences between

- (j)  $\Pi$ - and  $\Delta$ -free  $d$ -graphs;
- (jj) vertex  $d$ -colored rooted trees;
- (jjj) tight and rectangular game forms of  $d$  players.

For examples, see [56, Figures 1-6], and [1, Figures 11-13]. In its turn, this result enables us to characterize read-once Boolean functions, when  $d = 2$ , [46, 50, 51, 53, 55] and normal forms of graphical  $d$ -person games modelled by trees [1, 51, 52, 53, 56, 57].

### 3.8 More on CIS $d$ -graphs

Several examples of CIS  $d$ -graphs can be found in [1, Section 1.1, Figures 1,2,6]. For example, each  $\Pi$ - and  $\Delta$ -free  $d$ -graph is CIS. (Furthermore, according to  $\Delta$ -conjecture, no CIS  $d$ -graph contains  $\Delta$ ; see Section 3.10 below.)

We have no efficient characterization or recognition algorithm for CIS  $d$ -graphs, even for  $d = 2$ . The problem looks difficult because family  $\mathcal{F}_2^{CIS}$  of CIS 2-graphs is not hereditary. For example, bull 2-graph is CIS, but deleting its “top vertex” we obtain sub-2-graph  $\Pi$ , which is not CIS. Moreover, family  $\mathcal{F}_2^{CIS}$  is not even convex.

**Example 11.** *For any integer  $n > 2$ , we will construct a 2-graph  $\mathcal{G}_n$  such that  $\mathcal{G}_n \in \mathcal{LM}(\mathcal{F}_2^{CIS}) \setminus \mathcal{M}(\mathcal{F}_2^{CIS})$ . To do so, consider complete bipartite  $n \times n$  graph  $K_{n,n}$ , its line graph  $G_n = L(K_{n,n})$ , and its complement  $\overline{G_n}$ . These two complementary graphs on the same vertex-set form the required 2-graph  $\mathcal{G}_n = \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{K}_{(n,n)})$  for each  $n > 2$ ; see [1, Figure 1.4] as an example for  $n = 3$ .*

*It is easy to verify that  $\mathcal{G}_n$  is a CIS 2-graph, but for each  $v \in V(\mathcal{G}_n)$  the reduced sub-2-graph  $\mathcal{G}_n[V \setminus v]$  is not CIS. Due to symmetry, it is enough to check this claim for just one arbitrary  $v \in V(\mathcal{G}_n)$ . Thus,  $L(\mathcal{G}_n)$  is a locally minimal CIS 2-graph. Yet, it is not minimal, since only the null-2-graph is. (Moreover, every 2-graph with at most 3 vertices is CIS and the only minimal not CIS 2-graph is  $\Pi$ .)*

No efficient characterization of locally minimal CIS  $d$ -graphs is known. However,  $\Delta$ -conjecture, if true, would allow us to reduce arbitrary  $d$  to  $d = 2$ ; see subsection 3.10 below.

Let us note finally that a 2-graph  $\mathcal{G} = (V; E_1, E_2)$  is CIS whenever each maximal clique of its chromatic component  $G_i = (V, E_i)$  has a simplicial vertex, for  $i = 1$  or  $i = 2$  [1]. Hence, every 2-graph  $\mathcal{G}$  is a subgraph of a CIS 2-graph  $\mathcal{G}'$ . This is easy to verify [1, Proposition 1 and Corollary 1]. Note, however, that the size of  $\mathcal{G}'$  is exponential in the size of  $\mathcal{G}$ .

Thus, CIS  $d$ -graphs cannot be described in terms of forbidden subgraphs, already for  $d = 2$ . This is not surprising, since this family is not hereditary.

Given a CIS  $d$ -graph  $\mathcal{G}$  and a partition  $\mathcal{P}$  of its colors  $[d] = \{1, \dots, d\}$  into  $\delta$  non-empty subsets such that  $2 \leq \delta \leq d$ , merging colors in each of this subsets we obtain a  $\delta$ -graph  $\mathcal{G}' = \mathcal{G}'(\mathcal{G}, \mathcal{P})$ , which we will call the *projection* of  $\mathcal{G}$  wrt color-merging  $\mathcal{P}$ . It is not difficult to verify (see [1] for details) that:

- if  $\mathcal{G}$  is CIS then  $\mathcal{G}'$  is, but not vice versa;
- if  $\mathcal{G}'$  contains a  $\Delta$  then  $\mathcal{G}$  does, but not vice versa;

- if  $\mathcal{G}'$  contains a  $\Pi$  then  $\mathcal{G}$  contains a  $\Pi$  or  $\Delta$ .

We can reformulate the first two claims as follows:  $\mathcal{G}'$  is CIS or, respectively, Gallai's whenever  $\mathcal{G}$  is.

For  $\delta = 2$  the first claim implies that merging an arbitrary set of chromatic components of a CIS  $d$ -graph results in a CIS graph.

### 3.9 Modular decomposition of Gallai's ( $\Delta$ -free) $d$ -graphs

The operation of substitution  $G = G'(v \rightarrow G'')$  for graphs and  $\mathcal{G} = \mathcal{G}'(v \rightarrow \mathcal{G}'')$   $d$ -graphs was already defined above. It can be similarly introduced for multi-variable functions and for many other objects; see [75] for more details; In this paper  $G''$  and  $\mathcal{G}''$  are referred to as *modules* and substitution as *modular decomposition*.

We say that a family  $\mathcal{F}$  of graphs or digraphs is exactly closed wrt substitution if  $G \in \mathcal{F}$  if and only if  $G', G'' \in \mathcal{F}$  and, respectively,  $\mathcal{G} \in \mathcal{F}$  if and only if  $\mathcal{G}', \mathcal{G}'' \in \mathcal{F}$ . It is both known and easy to verify that the following families are exactly closed wrt substitution: perfect, CIS, and  $P_4$ -free graphs; CIS, CC, Gallai ( $\Delta$ -free),  $\Pi$ - and  $\Delta$ -free  $d$ -graphs.

Recall that  $\mathcal{G} = \mathcal{G}'(v \rightarrow \mathcal{G}'')$  is CC if and only if  $\mathcal{G}'$  is CC.

Recall that a graph  $G$  is called *CIS* if  $C \cap S \neq \emptyset$  for every maximal clique  $C$  and maximal stable set  $S$  of  $G$ . Given a CIS (respectively, CC) 2-graph  $\mathcal{G} = (V; E_1, E_2)$ , each of its two chromatic components  $G_i = (V, E_i)$ ,  $i = 1, 2$  is a CIS (respectively, CC) graph. See more about CIS and CC graphs in [1, 2, 14, 17, 20, 33, 34, 53, 56, 57, 96, 97].

Perfect graphs are closed wrt complementation, by the Perfect Graph Theorem [70, 71]. Obviously, CIS, CC, and  $P_4$ -free graphs also have this property, just by definition.

Let  $\mathcal{F}$  be a family of Gallai  $d$ -graphs  $\mathcal{G} = (V; E_1, \dots, E_d)$  such that the family  $\mathcal{F}'$  of their chromatic components  $G_i = (V, E_i)$ ,  $i \in [d] = \{1, \dots, d\}$  is (i) closed wrt complementation and (ii) exactly closed wrt substitution. For example, family  $\mathcal{F}'$  that contains only perfect, or CIS, or CC, or  $P_4$ -free graphs has properties (i) and (ii).

Every  $d$ -graphs  $\mathcal{G} \in \mathcal{F}$  with  $d \geq 3$  can be decomposed by two non-trivial  $d$ -graphs, that is,  $\mathcal{G} = \mathcal{G}'(v \rightarrow \mathcal{G}'')$ , where  $d$ -graphs  $\mathcal{G}'$  and  $\mathcal{G}''$  are distinct from  $\mathcal{G}$  and from the trivial one-vertex  $d$ -graph.

As a corollary, we conclude that Gallai's  $d$ -graphs whose chromatic components have properties (i) and (ii) can be decomposed by the 2-colored such  $d$ -graphs. In other words, for Gallai's  $d$ -graphs, the case of arbitrary  $d$  can be reduced to  $d = 2$ . This statement follows from the results of Gyárfás and Simonyi [65], which, in their turn, are based on the results of Cameron, Edmonds, and Lovasz [24, 25], Möring [75], and Gallai [45]; see more details in [1, 2] and [56, Section 4].

For example, the modular decomposition of  $\Pi$ - and  $\Delta$ -free  $d$ -graphs has important applications in theory of positional (graphical)  $n$ -person games modelled by trees; in particular, it is instrumental in characterizing the normal forms of these games [1], [49, Remark 3], [51, Chapter 5], and [52, 53, 56].

### 3.10 $\Delta$ -conjecture

All CIS  $d$ -graphs are Gallai's, or in other words,  $d$ -graphs containing  $\Delta$  are not CIS.

This conjecture was suggested in [51, remark on page 71, after the proof of Claim 17] and it remains open. Some partial results were obtained in [51]. In particular:

- (i) Every  $\Pi$ - and  $\Delta$ -free  $d$ -graph is CIS.
- (ii) It is sufficient to prove  $\Delta$  conjecture for 3-graphs; then, it follows for  $d$ -graphs with arbitrary  $d$ .

The second claim was proven by Andrey Gol'berg (private communications) in 1975 as follows: Consider the projection  $\mathcal{G}' = \mathcal{G}'(\mathcal{G}, \mathcal{P})$  of  $\mathcal{G}$  wrt a color-merging  $\mathcal{P}$ . As we know,  $\mathcal{G}'$  is CIS whenever  $\mathcal{G}$  is. Suppose  $\Delta$ -conjecture fails for  $\mathcal{G}$ , in other words,  $\mathcal{G}$  is CIS but not Gallai, that is, it contains a  $\Delta$ , say  $\Delta_0$ . Consider a color-merging  $\mathcal{P}$  with  $\delta = 3$  such that three colors of  $\Delta_0$  are still pairwise distinct in  $\mathcal{P}$ . Then, projection  $\mathcal{G}' = \mathcal{G}'(\mathcal{G}, \mathcal{P})$  still contains a *Delta*, but  $\mathcal{G}'$  is a CIS 3-graph. Thus,  $\Delta$ -conjecture fails for 3-graphs too.

According to the previous subsection, each CIS  $d$ -graph is a modular decomposition (that is, a superposition of substitutions) of CIS 2-graphs, modulo  $\Delta$ -conjecture. If it holds, studying CIS  $d$ -graphs is reduced to studying CIS graphs. Yet, the latter is still difficult.

Let us note that in case of perfect, CC or  $P_4$ -free chromatic components of a  $d$ -graph, we still have to require that it is  $\Delta$ -free; yet, in case of CIS this requirement may be waved, modulo  $\Delta$ -conjecture; see more details in [1, 20, 33, 34, 56, 57].

## 4 Finite two-person normal form games and game forms

In this section we consider matrices, that is, mappings  $M : I \times J \rightarrow R$ , whose rows  $I = \{i_1, \dots, i_n\}$  and columns  $J = \{j_1, \dots, j_m\}$  are the strategies of Alice and Bob, respectively, while  $R$  may vary: it is real numbers  $\mathbb{R}$  or their pairs  $\mathbb{R}^2$  in case of matrix and bimatrix games, respectively, and  $R = \Omega = \{\omega_1, \dots, \omega_k\}$  is a finite set of outcomes in case of game forms. In all cases,  $\mathcal{P} = \mathcal{P}(M) = I \cup J$  is the ground set and *succ* is the containment order over  $\mathcal{P}$ ; in other words,  $\mathcal{P}(M)$  consists of all submatrices of  $M$ . By convention, we identify all elements of  $\mathcal{P}$  with  $I = \emptyset$  or  $J = \emptyset$ : they correspond to the empty submatrix, which is the unique minimum in  $(\mathcal{P}, \succ)$ .

### 4.1 Saddle points and Nash equilibria

#### 4.1.1 Saddle point free matrices

In this case  $R = \mathbb{R}$  is the set of real numbers. We assume that Alice is the maximizer and she controls the rows, while Bob is the minimizer and he controls the columns.

An entry of  $M$  is a *saddle point* (SP) if and only if it is minimal in its row and maximal in its column (not necessarily strictly, in both cases). It is well known that a matrix has a SP if and only if its maxmin and minmax are equal. Obviously, a  $2 \times 2$  matrix  $M$  has no SP if and only if one of its diagonals is strictly larger than the other, that is,  $[r_{i_1, j_1}; r_{i_2, j_2}] \cap [r_{i_1, j_2}; r_{i_2, j_1}] = \emptyset$ .

In 1964 Lloyd Shapley [90] proved that a matrix has a SP if (but not only if) every its  $2 \times 2$  submatrix has a SP. In other words, for the family  $\mathcal{F}$  of all SP free matrices, class  $\mathcal{M}(\mathcal{F})$  of the minimal SP free matrices consists of the  $2 \times 2$  SP free matrices. This result was strengthened as follows:

**Theorem 4.** ([16]). *Every SP free matrix of size larger than  $2 \times 2$  has a row or column such that it can be deleted and the remaining matrix is still SP free.* □

In other words,  $\mathcal{LM}(\mathcal{F}) = \mathcal{M}(\mathcal{F})$ , that is, family  $\mathcal{F}$  is convex. Yet, it is not strongly convex, as the following example shows.

**Example 12.** Consider the following  $4 \times 4$  0,1-matrix  $M$ :

$$\begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 1 & 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 1 & 1 & 0 \end{bmatrix}$$

The following observations are easy to verify:

Matrix  $M$  is SP free and it contains two (locally) minimal SP free  $2 \times 2$  submatrices: the first one,  $M_1$ , upper left, is determined by the first two rows and columns of  $M$ , while the second one,  $M_2$ , lower right, is determined by the last two rows and columns of  $M$ .

Furthermore, if we eliminate one of the last (respectively, first) two rows or columns of  $M$ , then a SP appears (respectively, it does not) in the obtained submatrix. Hence, keeping SP freeness one can reduce  $M$  to  $M_2$  but not to  $M_1$ . The first claim is in agreement with convexity, while the second one disproves strong convexity of the family of SP free matrices.

Moreover, no SP appears when we delete the first two rows and columns from  $M$  in an arbitrary order, thus reducing  $M$  to  $M_2$ . In other words, family  $\mathcal{F}(M)$  is very weakly hereditary, not only convex. We leave open, if this hold for property  $\mathcal{F}$  in general.

#### 4.1.2 Matrices with saddle points

**Proposition 6.** Given a matrix  $M$  with a SP, family  $\mathcal{F} = \mathcal{F}(M)$  of all submatrices of  $M$  with a SP is strongly convex and very weakly hereditary.

*Proof.* Obviously, class  $\mathcal{M} = \mathcal{M}(\mathcal{F}(M))$  consists of all  $1 \times 1$  submatrices (that is, entries) of  $M$ . By assumption  $M \in \mathcal{F}$ . Let  $(i^*, j^*)$  be a SP in  $M$ . Obviously, it remains a SP when we delete from  $M$  a row distinct from  $i^*$  or a column distinct from  $j^*$ . Thus, family  $\mathcal{F}$  is very weakly hereditary and, hence, it is convex,  $\mathcal{M} = \mathcal{LM}$ .

To prove strong convexity, fix an arbitrary entry  $(i_0, j_0)$  in  $M$  and reduce  $M$  deleting successively its rows, except  $i_0, i^*$ , and columns, except  $j_0, j^*$ . As we already mentioned,  $(i^*, j^*)$  remains a SP. Consider three cases:

If  $i_0 = i^*$  and  $j_0 = j^*$ , we arrive to the  $1 \times 1$  submatrix  $(i_0, j_0) = (i^*, j^*)$ .

If  $i_0 \neq i^*$  and  $j_0 \neq j^*$  we arrive to the  $2 \times 2$  submatrix formed by these two rows and columns. Note that  $(i^*, j^*)$  is still a SP. Then delete row  $i^*$  getting a  $1 \times 2$  submatrix. Clearly, it has a SP, which may be not  $(i^*, j^*)$ , yet. Finally, we delete column  $j^*$  getting  $(i_0, j_0)$ .

If  $i_0 = i^*$  or  $j_0 = j^*$  but not both, then we arrive to a  $1 \times 2$  or  $2 \times 1$  submatrix that consists of  $(i_0, j_0)$  and  $(i^*, j^*)$ . Note that  $(i^*, j^*)$  is still a SP. Then we delete it getting  $(i_0, j_0)$  in one step.  $\square$

However, family  $\mathcal{F}(M)$  is not weakly hereditary.

**Example 13.** Consider matrix

$$\begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix}$$

It has two saddle points, both in the first column, but, by deleting this column, we obtain a SP free matrix.

### 4.1.3 Absolutely determined matrices

A matrix is called *absolutely determined* if every its submatrix has a SP. By Shapley's theorem [90], it happens if and only if each  $2 \times 2$  submatrix has a SP. This condition can be simplified in case of symmetric matrices [59, 60, 61]. By definition the considered family is hereditary.

### 4.1.4 Nash equilibria free bimatrices

A bimatrix game  $(A, B)$  is defined as a pair of mappings  $a : I \times J \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  and  $b : I \times J \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  that specify the utility (or payoff) functions of Alice and Bob, respectively. Now both players are maximizers.

A situation  $(i, j) \in I \times J$  is called a *Nash equilibrium* (NE) if no player can improve the result by choosing another strategy provided the opponent keeps the same strategy, that is, if  $a(i, j) \geq a(i', j) \forall i' \in I$  and  $b(i, j) \geq b(i, j') \forall j' \in J$ .

In other words,  $i$  is a best response to  $j$  for Alice and  $j$  is a best response to  $i$  for Bob.

Clearly, Nash equilibria generalize saddle points, which correspond to the zero-sum case:  $a(i, j) + b(i, j) = 0$  for all  $i \in I$  and  $j \in J$ .

However, unlike SP free games, the minimal NE-free bimatrix games may be larger than  $2 \times 2$ . Let us recall an example from [60]. Consider a  $3 \times 3$  bimatrix game  $(A, B)$  such that

$$\begin{aligned} b(i_1, j_1) &> b(i_1, j_2) \geq b(i_1, j_3), \\ b(i_2, j_3) &> b(i_2, j_1) \geq b(i_2, j_2), \\ b(i_3, j_2) &> b(i_3, j_3) \geq b(i_3, j_1); \\ \\ a(i_2, j_1) &> a(i_1, j_1) \geq a(i_3, j_1), \\ a(i_1, j_2) &> a(i_3, j_2) \geq a(i_2, j_2), \\ a(i_3, j_3) &> a(i_2, j_3) \geq a(i_1, j_3). \end{aligned}$$

Naturally, for situations in the same row (respectively, column) the values of  $b$  (respectively,  $a$ ) are compared, since Alice controls rows and has utility function  $a$ , while Bob controls columns and has utility function  $b$ .

It is easy to verify that:

$b(i_1, j_1)$  is the unique maximum in row  $i_1$  and  $a(i_1, j_1)$  is a second largest in the column  $j_1$ .

$b(i_2, j_3)$  is the unique maximum in row  $i_2$  and  $a(i_2, j_3)$  is a second largest in column  $j_3$ ;

$b(i_3, j_2)$  is the unique maximum in row  $i_3$  and  $a(i_3, j_2)$  is a second largest in column  $j_2$ ;

$a(i_2, j_1)$  is the unique maximum in column  $j_1$  and  $b(i_2, j_1)$  is a second largest in row  $i_2$ ;

$a(i_1, j_2)$  is the unique maximum in column  $j_2$  and  $b(i_1, j_2)$  is a second largest in row  $i_1$ ;

$a(i_3, j_3)$  is the unique maximum in column  $j_3$  and  $b(i_3, j_3)$  is a second largest in row  $i_3$ .

Consequently, this game is NE-free, since no situation is simultaneously the best in its row wrt  $b$  and in its column wrt  $a$ . Yet, if we delete a row or column then a NE appears. For example, let us delete  $i_1$ . Then the situation  $(i_3, j_2)$  becomes a NE. Indeed,  $b(i_3, j_2)$  is

the largest in the row  $i_3$  and  $a(i_3, j_2)$  is a second largest in the column  $j_2$ , yet, the largest,  $a(i_1, j_2)$ , was deleted. Similarly, situations  $(i_1, j_1), (i_2, j_3), (i_1, j_2), (i_3, j_3), (i_2, j_1)$  become NE after deleting lines  $i_2, i_3, j_1, j_2, j_3$ , respectively.

Thus,  $(A, B)$  is a locally minimal NE-free bimatrix game. Moreover, it is also minimal. Indeed, one can easily verify that all  $2 \times 2$  subgames of  $(A, B)$  have a NE and, of course,  $1 \times 2$ ,  $2 \times 1$ , and  $1 \times 1$  games always have it.

In general, the following criterion of local minimality holds:

**Theorem 5.** ([16, Theorem 3]) *A bimatrix game  $(A, B)$  is a locally minimal NE-free game if and only if it satisfies the following four conditions:*

- (i) *it is square, that is,  $|I| = |J| = k$ ;*
- (ii) *there exist two one-to-one mappings (permutations)  $\sigma : I \rightarrow J$  and  $\delta : J \rightarrow I$  such that their graphs,  $gr(\sigma)$  and  $gr(\delta)$ , are disjoint in  $I \times J$ , or in other words, if  $(i, \sigma(i)) \neq (\delta(j), j)$  for all  $i \in I$  and  $j \in J$ ;*
- (iii)  *$a(\delta(j), j)$  is the unique maximum in column  $j$  and a second largest (though not necessarily unique) in row  $\delta(j)$ ;*
- (iiib)  *$b(i, \sigma(i))$  is the unique maximum in row  $i$  and a second largest (though not necessarily unique) in column  $\sigma(i)$ .  $\square$*

Thus, we have a simple explicit characterization of the class  $\mathcal{LM}$  of the locally minimal NE-free bimatrix games. However, not each such game is minimal. Indeed, mappings  $\sigma$  and  $\delta$  define  $2k$  entries of a  $k \times k$  bimatrix locally minimal NE-free game. Yet, it may contain some smaller  $k' \times k'$  NE-free subgames; see [16, Section 3] for more details.

Thus, the family of NE-free bimatrix games is not convex. Interestingly, in this case class  $\mathcal{M}$  is more complicated than  $\mathcal{LM}$ . In contrast to the latter, no good characterization of the former is known.

It is not difficult to verify that in the zero-sum case  $k$  cannot be larger than 2.

In contrast, bimatrix games with NE are similar to matrix games with SP. This family is weakly hereditary but not hereditary. The proof from the previous subsection can be applied in this case.

## 4.2 Tightness

Given a finite set of outcomes  $\Omega$ , let  $X$  and  $Y$  be finite sets of strategies of Alice and Bob, respectively. A mapping  $g : X \times Y \rightarrow \Omega$  is called a *game form*. One can view a game form as a game without payoffs, which are not given yet.

A game form is called *tight* if its rows and columns form dual hypergraphs. Several equivalent definitions of tightness can be found, for example, in [62, 63]. Nine examples of game forms are given in Figure 1; the first six are tight, the last three are not.

Tightness is equivalent with SP-solvability [38, 48] and with NE-solvability [49, 54, 63].

### 4.2.1 Not tight game forms

Since tightness and SP-solvability are equivalent, the Shapley Theorem implies that all minimal not tight game forms are of size  $2 \times 2$ . Two sets of outcome corresponding to two diagonals are disjoint. There are three such game forms:

<table border="1" style="border-collapse: collapse; text-align: center;"> <tr><td><math>\omega_1</math></td><td><math>\omega_1</math></td></tr> <tr><td><math>\omega_2</math></td><td><math>\omega_3</math></td></tr> </table>	$\omega_1$	$\omega_1$	$\omega_2$	$\omega_3$	<table border="1" style="border-collapse: collapse; text-align: center;"> <tr><td><math>\omega_1</math></td><td><math>\omega_1</math></td><td><math>\omega_2</math></td><td><math>\omega_2</math></td></tr> <tr><td><math>\omega_3</math></td><td><math>\omega_4</math></td><td><math>\omega_3</math></td><td><math>\omega_4</math></td></tr> </table>	$\omega_1$	$\omega_1$	$\omega_2$	$\omega_2$	$\omega_3$	$\omega_4$	$\omega_3$	$\omega_4$	<table border="1" style="border-collapse: collapse; text-align: center;"> <tr><td><math>\omega_1</math></td><td><math>\omega_1</math></td><td><math>\omega_3</math></td></tr> <tr><td><math>\omega_1</math></td><td><math>\omega_2</math></td><td><math>\omega_2</math></td></tr> <tr><td><math>\omega_3</math></td><td><math>\omega_2</math></td><td><math>\omega_3</math></td></tr> </table>	$\omega_1$	$\omega_1$	$\omega_3$	$\omega_1$	$\omega_2$	$\omega_2$	$\omega_3$	$\omega_2$	$\omega_3$
$\omega_1$	$\omega_1$																						
$\omega_2$	$\omega_3$																						
$\omega_1$	$\omega_1$	$\omega_2$	$\omega_2$																				
$\omega_3$	$\omega_4$	$\omega_3$	$\omega_4$																				
$\omega_1$	$\omega_1$	$\omega_3$																					
$\omega_1$	$\omega_2$	$\omega_2$																					
$\omega_3$	$\omega_2$	$\omega_3$																					
$g_1$	$g_2$	$g_3$																					

<table border="1" style="border-collapse: collapse; text-align: center;"> <tr><td><math>\omega_1</math></td><td><math>\omega_1</math></td><td><math>\omega_3</math></td></tr> <tr><td><math>\omega_1</math></td><td><math>\omega_1</math></td><td><math>\omega_2</math></td></tr> <tr><td><math>\omega_4</math></td><td><math>\omega_2</math></td><td><math>\omega_2</math></td></tr> </table>	$\omega_1$	$\omega_1$	$\omega_3$	$\omega_1$	$\omega_1$	$\omega_2$	$\omega_4$	$\omega_2$	$\omega_2$	<table border="1" style="border-collapse: collapse; text-align: center;"> <tr><td><math>\omega_1</math></td><td><math>\omega_2</math></td><td><math>\omega_1</math></td><td><math>\omega_2</math></td></tr> <tr><td><math>\omega_3</math></td><td><math>\omega_4</math></td><td><math>\omega_4</math></td><td><math>\omega_3</math></td></tr> <tr><td><math>\omega_1</math></td><td><math>\omega_4</math></td><td><math>\omega_1</math></td><td><math>\omega_5</math></td></tr> <tr><td><math>\omega_3</math></td><td><math>\omega_2</math></td><td><math>\omega_6</math></td><td><math>\omega_2</math></td></tr> </table>	$\omega_1$	$\omega_2$	$\omega_1$	$\omega_2$	$\omega_3$	$\omega_4$	$\omega_4$	$\omega_3$	$\omega_1$	$\omega_4$	$\omega_1$	$\omega_5$	$\omega_3$	$\omega_2$	$\omega_6$	$\omega_2$	<table border="1" style="border-collapse: collapse; text-align: center;"> <tr><td><math>\omega_1</math></td><td><math>\omega_1</math></td></tr> <tr><td><math>\omega_1</math></td><td><math>\omega_2</math></td></tr> </table>	$\omega_1$	$\omega_1$	$\omega_1$	$\omega_2$
$\omega_1$	$\omega_1$	$\omega_3$																													
$\omega_1$	$\omega_1$	$\omega_2$																													
$\omega_4$	$\omega_2$	$\omega_2$																													
$\omega_1$	$\omega_2$	$\omega_1$	$\omega_2$																												
$\omega_3$	$\omega_4$	$\omega_4$	$\omega_3$																												
$\omega_1$	$\omega_4$	$\omega_1$	$\omega_5$																												
$\omega_3$	$\omega_2$	$\omega_6$	$\omega_2$																												
$\omega_1$	$\omega_1$																														
$\omega_1$	$\omega_2$																														
$g_4$	$g_5$	$g_6$																													

<table border="1" style="border-collapse: collapse; text-align: center;"> <tr><td><math>\omega_1</math></td><td><math>\omega_2</math></td></tr> <tr><td><math>\omega_2</math></td><td><math>\omega_1</math></td></tr> </table>	$\omega_1$	$\omega_2$	$\omega_2$	$\omega_1$	<table border="1" style="border-collapse: collapse; text-align: center;"> <tr><td><math>\omega_1</math></td><td><math>\omega_1</math></td><td><math>\omega_2</math></td></tr> <tr><td><math>\omega_3</math></td><td><math>\omega_4</math></td><td><math>\omega_3</math></td></tr> </table>	$\omega_1$	$\omega_1$	$\omega_2$	$\omega_3$	$\omega_4$	$\omega_3$	<table border="1" style="border-collapse: collapse; text-align: center;"> <tr><td><math>\omega_1</math></td><td><math>\omega_1</math></td><td><math>\omega_2</math></td></tr> <tr><td><math>\omega_4</math></td><td><math>\omega_5</math></td><td><math>\omega_2</math></td></tr> <tr><td><math>\omega_4</math></td><td><math>\omega_3</math></td><td><math>\omega_3</math></td></tr> </table>	$\omega_1$	$\omega_1$	$\omega_2$	$\omega_4$	$\omega_5$	$\omega_2$	$\omega_4$	$\omega_3$	$\omega_3$
$\omega_1$	$\omega_2$																				
$\omega_2$	$\omega_1$																				
$\omega_1$	$\omega_1$	$\omega_2$																			
$\omega_3$	$\omega_4$	$\omega_3$																			
$\omega_1$	$\omega_1$	$\omega_2$																			
$\omega_4$	$\omega_5$	$\omega_2$																			
$\omega_4$	$\omega_3$	$\omega_3$																			
$g_7$	$g_8$	$g_9$																			

Fig. 8. Nine game forms. Forms  $g_1 - g_6$  are tight, forms  $g_7 - g_9$  are not.

<table border="1" style="border-collapse: collapse; text-align: center;"> <tr><td><math>\omega_1</math></td><td><math>\omega_2</math></td></tr> <tr><td><math>\omega_2</math></td><td><math>\omega_1</math></td></tr> </table>	$\omega_1$	$\omega_2$	$\omega_2$	$\omega_1$	<table border="1" style="border-collapse: collapse; text-align: center;"> <tr><td><math>\omega_1</math></td><td><math>\omega_2</math></td></tr> <tr><td><math>\omega_3</math></td><td><math>\omega_1</math></td></tr> </table>	$\omega_1$	$\omega_2$	$\omega_3$	$\omega_1$	<table border="1" style="border-collapse: collapse; text-align: center;"> <tr><td><math>\omega_1</math></td><td><math>\omega_2</math></td></tr> <tr><td><math>\omega_3</math></td><td><math>\omega_4</math></td></tr> </table>	$\omega_1$	$\omega_2$	$\omega_3$	$\omega_4$
$\omega_1$	$\omega_2$													
$\omega_2$	$\omega_1$													
$\omega_1$	$\omega_2$													
$\omega_3$	$\omega_1$													
$\omega_1$	$\omega_2$													
$\omega_3$	$\omega_4$													

Fig. 9. Three not tight  $2 \times 2$  game forms

This result was strengthened in [16], where it was shown that these three game forms are the only locally minimal not tight ones. In other words, family  $\mathcal{F}$  of not tight game forms is convex and class  $\mathcal{M}(\mathcal{F}) = \mathcal{LM}(\mathcal{F})$  consists of the above three game forms.

Here we will strengthen this result further as follows.

**Theorem 6.** *Family  $\mathcal{F}$  of not tight game forms is strongly convex but not weakly hereditary.*

*Proof.* Obviously, a game form with a single outcome is tight.

Consider game forms with two outcomes  $\omega_1 = a$  and  $\omega_2 = b$ . Obviously, such game form  $g$  is tight if and only if one of the following cases holds:

Case (rca): Game form  $g$  contains an  $a$ -row and an  $a$ -column, that is, there exists an  $x_0 \in X$  and  $y_0 \in Y$  such that  $g(x, y) = a$  whenever  $x = x_0$  or  $y = y_0$ .

Case (rcb): Game form  $g$  contains a  $b$ -row and a  $b$ -column.

Case (rab): Game form  $g$  contains an  $a$ -row and a  $b$ -row.

Case (cab): Game form  $g$  contains an  $a$ -column and a  $b$ -column.

**Example 14.** *Family  $\mathcal{F}$  is not weakly hereditary, consider the following  $4 \times 4$  game form:*

$a$	$b$	$a$	$b$
$b$	$a$	$a$	$b$
$a$	$a$	$a$	$b$
$b$	$b$	$b$	$a$

*Obviously, it is not tight but becomes tight if we delete the last rows or column (or two last rows or columns). In contrast, every other, not last, row or column can be deleted and the the obtained reduced game form remains not tight.*

This example proves that family  $\mathcal{F}$  is not weakly hereditary, yet, it does not disprove strong convexity. Actually, family  $\mathcal{F}$  is strongly convex. To show this, consider a not tight game form  $g : X \times Y \rightarrow \Omega$  of size larger than  $2 \times 2$  and fix a  $2 \times 2$  not tight subform  $g^* : X^* \times Y^* \rightarrow \Omega$  in it, that is,  $|X^*| = |Y^*| = 2$ ,  $X^* \subseteq X$ ,  $Y^* \subseteq Y$ , and at least one of these two containments is strict. Wlog, we can assume that  $g^*$  is formed by the first two rows and columns of  $g$ .

It is enough to show that one can delete a row  $x \in X \setminus X^*$  or a column  $y \in Y \setminus Y^*$  such that the reduced game form  $g'$  is still not tight.

It is both obvious and well-known that merging outcomes respects tightness. Hence, wlog, we can assume that  $\Omega = \{\omega_1, \omega_2\} = \{a, b\}$  consists of two outcomes, and that  $g^*$  is

$a$	$b$
$b$	$a$

It is also clear that adding an  $a$ -row or  $a$ -column to a tight game form respects its tightness. In other words, deleting an  $a$ -row or an  $a$ -column from a not tight game form  $g$  respects its non-tightness. By symmetry, the same holds for  $b$ -rows and  $b$ -columns as well.

Assume for contradiction that after deleting a row  $x \in X \setminus X^*$ , or a column from  $y \in Y \setminus Y^*$  from  $g$ , the obtained reduced subform  $g'$  is tight. Then, as we know, one of the cases: (rca), (rcb), (rab), (cab) holds. Assume wlog that we delete a column (rather than a row) and consider all four cases.

In case (rca)  $g'$  has an  $a$ -column  $x \in X \setminus X^*$ . Deleting this column from  $g$  we obtain a not tight game form, which is a contradiction. By symmetry, case (rca) resolved too.

Case (cab) is trivial, since then both  $g'$  and  $g$  are tight, which is a contradiction.

Thus, only case (rab) remains, and we can assume that after deleting each column  $y \in Y \setminus Y^*$  from  $g$  the obtained reduced submatrix  $g'$  has both  $a$ - and  $b$ -rows. This is possible (only) when  $g$  contains 4 rows and 3 columns.

Yet, by symmetry, we can also assume that after deleting each row  $x \in X \setminus X^*$  from  $g$  the obtained reduced submatrix  $g''$  has both  $a$ - and  $b$ -columns.

This is already impossible. To see it, consider the  $4 \times 4$  game form shown in Fig. 10 in which we can assign  $a$  or  $b$  arbitrarily to every symbol  $*$ . It is not difficult to verify that every such assignment results in contradiction: the obtained subform is either tight, or not tight and among its last two rows and columns there is at least one deleting which results in a subform that is still not tight.  $\square$

$a$	$b$	$a$	$b$
$b$	$a$	$a$	$b$
$a$	$a$	$*$	$*$
$b$	$b$	$*$	$*$

Fig. 10. Case (rab), a contradiction.

### 4.2.2 Tight game forms

Tightness is not hereditary. For example, game form  $g_3$  is tight but after deleting the last column one obtains  $g_8$ , which is not tight.

Moreover, it was shown in [16] that the family  $\mathcal{F}$  of tight game forms is not convex. Class  $\mathcal{M}(\mathcal{F})$  contains only  $1 \times 1$  game forms, while  $\mathcal{LM}(\mathcal{F})$  is a complicated class, which seems difficult to characterize; only some necessary and some sufficient conditions are obtained in [16]. Note that  $g_3 \notin \mathcal{LM}(\mathcal{F})$ , since deleting its row keeps tightness.

### 4.2.3 Totally tight game forms

A game form is called *totally tight (TT)* if every its subform is tight; for example,  $g_3$  in Figure 8 is TT.

**Proposition 7.** ([19]). *Tightness of all  $2 \times 2$  subforms already implies total tightness.*  $\square$

Sketch of the proof. This result is implied by the following two criteria of solvability [48, 90]. The first states that a game has a SP if (but not only if) every its  $2 \times 2$  subgame has a SP [90]. The second claims that a game form is *zero-sum-solvable* if and only if it is tight [48]; see more details in [54, 62, 63]. Let us note that the second result is implicit already in [38].  $\square$

It is easily seen that the next three properties of the  $2 \times 2$  game forms are equivalent:

- (i) tightness, (ii) total tightness, (iii) presence of a constant row or column.

As we know, there are only three not tight  $2 \times 2$  game forms; they are given in Figure 9.

Thus, family of the TT game forms is characterized by these three forbidden subforms. Hence, this family is hereditary.

It is also known that a game form is TT if and only if it is *acyclic*, that is, for arbitrary payoffs of two players the obtained game has no *improvement cycle*; see [19] for the proof and precise definitions.

An explicit recursive characterization of the TT game forms is also given in [19].

### 4.2.4 Not totally tight game forms

As we already mentioned, a game form is not TT if and only if it contains at least one of the three not tight  $2 \times 2$  subforms given in Figure 9. Thus, family of not TT game forms is weakly hereditary. Obviously, it is not hereditary. Indeed, by deleting a row or column from a  $2 \times 2$  game form one obtains a  $1 \times 2$  or  $2 \times 1$  game form, which is tight.

## Acknowledgements

This research was supported by Russian Science Foundation, grant 20-11-20203, <https://rscf.ru/en/project/20-11-20203/>

## References

- [1] D.V. Andrade, E. Boros, and V. Gurvich, On graphs whose maximal cliques and stable sets intersect, RUTCOR Research Report RRR 17-2006 and DIMACS technical report DTR-2006-16, Rutgers University, in "Optimization Problems in Graph Theory"; Boris Goldengorin ed.; Springer, Optimization and Its Applications 139 (2018) 3–64.
- [2] D.V. Andrade, E. Boros, and V. Gurvich, Not complementary connected and not CIS  $d$ -graphs form weakly monotone families, *Discrete Math.* 310:5 (2010) 1089–1096.
- [3] A. Apartsin, E. Ferapontova, and V. Gurvich, A circular graph-counterexample to the Duchet kernel conjecture, *Discrete Math.* 178 (1998) 229–231.
- [4] G. Bacso, E. Boros, V. Gurvich, F. Maffray, and M. Preissmann, On minimal imperfect graphs with circular symmetry, *J. Graph Theory* 29:4 (1998) 209–224.
- [5] C. Berge, Sur une conjecture relative au problème des codes optimaux, Comm. 13-ème Assemble Generale de l'URSI, Tokyo, 1961.
- [6] C. Berge, Perfect graphs, in: D. Fulkerson (Ed.), *Studies in Graph Theory, Part I*, in: M.A.A. Studies in Math., vol. 11, Math. Assoc. Amer., Washington (1975) 1–22.
- [7] C. Berge and P. Duchet, Problème, *Seminaire MSH*, Paris, 1983.
- [8] C. Berge, and P. Duchet, Recent problems and results about kernels in directed graphs, *Discrete Math.* 86 (1990) 27–31.
- [9] E. Boros, K. Elbassioni, V. Gurvich, and L. Khachiyan, An inequality for polymatroid functions and its applications, *Discrete Applied Math.*, 131 (2) (2003) 255–281.
- [10] R.G. Bland, H.C. Huang and L.E. Trotter Jr., Graphical properties related to minimal imperfection, *Discrete Math.* 27 (1979) 11–22.
- [11] E. Boros and V. Gurvich, Perfect graphs are kernel-solvable, *Discrete Math.* 159 (1996) 35–55.
- [12] E. Boros and V. Gurvich, A corrected version of the Duchet kernel conjecture, *Discrete Math.* 179 (1998) 231–233.
- [13] E. Boros and V. Gurvich Perfect graphs, kernels, and cores of cooperative games, *Discrete Math.* 306:19-20 (2006) 2336–2354.
- [14] E. Boros and V. Gurvich, Vertex- and edge-minimal and locally minimal graphs, *Discrete Math.* 309:12 (2009) 3853–3865.
- [15] E. Boros, V. Gurvich, and S. Hougardy, Recursive generation of partitionable graphs, *J. Graph Theory* 41:4 (2002) 259–285.
- [16] E. Boros, V. Gurvich, and K. Makino, Minimal and locally minimal games and game forms; *Discrete Math.* 309:13 (2009) 4456–4468.
- [17] E. Boros, V. Gurvich, and M. Milanič, On CIS circulants, *Discrete Math.* 318 (2014) 78–95.

- [18] E. Boros, V. Gurvich, and M. Milanič, On equistable, split, CIS, and related classes of graphs; *Discrete Applied Math.* 216 (2017) 47–66.
- [19] E. Boros, V. Gurvich, K. Makino, and D. Papp, Acyclic, or totally tight, two-person game forms, a characterization and main properties, *Discrete Math.* 310:6-7 (2010) 1135 – 1151.
- [20] E. Boros, V. Gurvich, and I. Zverovich, On split and almost CIS-graphs, *Australas. J. Combin.* 43 (2009) 163–180.
- [21] O. Borůvka, O jistém problému minimálním (About a certain minimal problem), *Práce Mor. Přírodověd. Spol. V Brně III* (in Czech and German) 3 (1926) 37–58.
- [22] O. Borůvka, Příspěvek k řešení otázky ekonomické stavby elektrovodních sítí (Contribution to the solution of a problem of economical construction of electrical networks), *Elektronický Obzor* (in Czech) 15 (1926) 153–154.
- [23] C. L. Bouton, Nim, A game with a complete Mathematical theory, *Annals of Math., Second Series* 3:1-4 (1901–1902) 35–39.
- [24] K. Cameron and J. Edmonds, Lambda composition, *J. Graph Theory* 26 (1997) 9–16.
- [25] K. Cameron, J. Edmonds, and L. Lovász, A note on perfect graphs, *Period. Math. Hungar.* 17:3 (1986) 441–447.
- [26] V. Chvátal, On the computational complexity of finding a kernel, Report No. CRM-300, Centre de Recherches Mathématiques, Université de Montréal, 1973.
- [27] V. Chvátal, R.L. Graham, A.F. Perold, and S.H. Whitesides, Combinatorial designs related to the perfect graph conjecture, *North-Holland Math. Studies* 88 (1984) 197–206.
- [28] M. Chudnovsky, G. Cornuéjols, X. Liu, P. Seymour, and K. Vušković, Recognizing Berge graphs, *Combin. archive* 25:2 (2005).
- [29] M. Chudnovsky, N. Robertson, P. Seymour, and R. Thomas, The strong perfect graph theorem, *Ann. Math.* 164 (2006) 51–229.
- [30] M. Chudnovsky, A. Scott, P. Seymour, and S. Spirkl, Proof of the Kalai-Meshulam conjecture, *Israel Journal of Math.* 238 (2020) 639–661.
- [31] D. Corneil, H. Lerchsand, and L. Burlingham, Complement reducible graphs, *Discrete Appl. Math.* 3 (1981) 163–174.
- [32] V. I. Danilov, G. A. Koshevoy, and C. Lang, Gross substitution, discrete convexity, and submodularity. *Discret. Appl. Math.* 131:2 (2003) 283–298.
- [33] X. Deng, G. Li, and W. Zang, Proof of Chvátal’s conjecture on maximal stable sets and maximal cliques in graphs, *J. Combin. Theory Ser. B* 91:2 (2004) 301–325.
- [34] X. Deng, G. Li, and W. Zang, Corrigendum to: “Proof of Chvátal’s conjecture on maximal stable sets and maximal cliques in graphs”, *J. Combin. Theory Ser. B* 91:2 (2004) 301–325, (2005) 352–353.

- [35] P. Duchet, Graphes noyaux parfaits, *Ann. Discrete Math. Part II* 9 (1980) 93–101.
- [36] S. Dyrkolbotn and M. Walicki, Kernels in digraphs that are not kernel perfect, *Discrete Math.* 312:16 (2012) 2498–2505.
- [37] J. Edmonds, Submodular functions, matroids, and certain polyhedra, in *Combinatorial structures and their Applications*, Gordon and Breach, New York (1970) 68–87.
- [38] J. Edmonds and D.R. Fulkerson, Bottleneck extrema, *J. of Combinatorial Theory*, 8 (1970) 299–306.
- [39] S. Fujishige, *Submodular functions and optimization*, Elsevier, 2005.
- [40] S. Fujishige, G. A. Koshevoy, and Y. Sano, Matroids on convex geometries (cg-matroids). *Discret. Math.* 307:15 (2007) 1936–1950.
- [41] H. Galeana-Sánchez, A counterexample to a conjecture of Meyniel on kernel-perfect graphs, *Discrete Math.* 41:1 (1982) 105–107.
- [42] H. Galeana-Sánchez and Victor Neumann-Lara, On kernels and semikernels of digraphs, *Discrete Math.* 48:1 (1984) 67–76.
- [43] H. Galeana-Sánchez and Mucuy-kak Guevara, Kernel perfect and critical kernel imperfect digraphs structure, *Electronic Notes in Discrete Math.* 28 (2007) 401–408.
- [44] G. Galperin and A. Tolpygo, *Moscow Mathematical Olympiads*, A. Kolmogorov, ed., *Prosveschenie (Enlightenment)*, Moscow, USSR, 1986, Problem 72 (in Russian).
- [45] T. Gallai, Transitiv orientierbare graphen *Acta Math. Acad. Sci. Hungar.*, 18:1–2 (1967) 25–66; English translation by F. Maffray and M. Preissmann, in: J.L.R Alfonsin and B.A. Reed, (Eds.), *John Wiley and Sons, Perfect Graphs*, 2002 (Chapter 3).
- [46] M. Golumbic and V. Gurvich, Read-once Boolean functions, Chapter 10 in Y. Crama and P. L Hammer eds. *Boolean Functions: Theory, Algorithms, and Applications*, Cambridge University Press (2011) 448–486.
- [47] M. Grotschel, L. Lovász, and A. Schrijver, Geometric methods in combinatorial optimization. In *Silver Jubilee Conf. on Combinatorics* (1984) 167–183.
- [48] V. Gurvich, On theory of multistep games, *USSR Comput. Math. and Math. Physics* 13:6 (1973) 143–161.
- [49] V. Gurvich, The solvability of positional games in pure strategies, *USSR Comput. Math. and Math. Physics* 15:2 (1975) 74–87.
- [50] V. Gurvich, On repetition-free Boolean functions, *Uspechi Mat. Nauk (Russian Math. Surveys)* 32:1 (1977) 183–184 (in Russian).
- [51] V. Gurvich, Applications of Boolean functions and networks in game theory (Chapter 2, Nash- solvability in pure strategies, Chapter 5, Repetition-free Boolean functions and normal forms of positional games) Ph.D. Thesis, Moscow Inst. of Physics and Technology, Moscow, USSR, 1978 (in Russian).

- [52] V. Gurvich, On the normal form of positional games, *Soviet Math. Dokl.* 25 (3) (1982) 572–575.
- [53] V. Gurvich, Some properties and applications of complete edge-chromatic graphs and hypergraphs, *Soviet Math. Dokl.* 30:3 (1984) 803–807.
- [54] V. A. Gurvich, Equilibrium in pure strategies, *Soviet Math. Dokl.* 38:3 (1989) 597–602.
- [55] V. Gurvich, Criteria for repetition freeness of functions in the algebra of logic, *Russian Acad. Sci. Dokl. Math.* 43:3 (1991) 721–726.
- [56] V. Gurvich, Decomposing complete edge-chromatic graphs and hypergraphs: Revisited, *Discrete Appl. Math.* 157 (2009) 3069–3085.
- [57] V. Gurvich, On exact blockers and anti-blockers,  $\Delta$ -conjecture, and related problems, *Discrete Appl. Math.* 159 (2011) 311–321.
- [58] V. Gurvich and G. Koshevoy, Monotone bargaining is Nash-solvable, *Discrete Appl. Math.* 250 (2018) 1–15.
- [59] V. Gurvich and L. Libkin, Quasilinear set-functions and absolutely determined matrices, *Avtomatika i Telemekhanika* 12 (1989) 113–117 (in Russian); English transl. in *Automation and Remote Control*.
- [60] V. Gurvich and L. Libkin, Absolutely determined matrices, *Math. Social Sciences* 20 (1990) 1–18.
- [61] V.A. Gurvich and L.O. Libkin, Quasi-convex analysis for semi-lattices and absolutely determined matrices; *Russian Acad. Sci. Dokl. Math.* 44:1 (1992) 20–25.
- [62] V. Gurvich and M. Naumova, Polynomial algorithms computing two lexicographically safe Nash equilibria in finite two-person games with tight game forms given by oracles, <https://arxiv.org/abs/2108.05469> , 2021; *Discrete Appl. Math.*, to appear.
- [63] V. Gurvich and M. Naumova, Lexicographically maximal edges of dual hypergraphs and Nash-solvability of tight game forms, <https://arxiv.org/abs/2204.10213> , published: 19 October 2022 in *Annals of Math. and Artificial Intelligence*, 2022.
- [64] V. Gurvich and A. Temkin, Berge’s conjecture holds for rotational graphs, *Russian Acad. Sci. Dokl. Math.* 48:2 (1994) 271–278.
- [65] A. Gyárfás and G. Simonyi, Edge coloring of complete graphs without tricolored triangles, *J. Graph Theory* 46 (2004) 211–216.
- [66] F. Harary, R.Z. Norman, and D. Cartwright, *Structural Models: An Introduction to the Theory of Directed Graphs*, Wiley, 1965.
- [67] J. R. Isbell, On a theorem of Richardson, *Proceedings of the AMS* 8:5 (1957) 928–929.
- [68] G. A. Koshevoy, Discrete convexity and its applications, *Combinatorial Optimization - Methods and Applications* (2011) 135–163.
- [69] J. B. Kruskal, On the shortest spanning subtree of a graph and the traveling salesman problem, *Proceedings of the American Math. Soc.* 7:1 (1956) 48–50.

- [70] L. Lovász, Normal hypergraphs and the perfect graph conjecture, *Discrete Math.* 2 (1972) 253–267.
- [71] L. Lovász, A characterization of perfect graphs, *J. Combinatorial Theory B*13 (1972) 95–98.
- [72] L. Lovász, Submodular functions and convexity, in: A. Bachem, M. Grötschel, B. Korte (Eds.), *Math. Programming: The State of the Art, Bonn 1982*, Springer, Berlin (1983) 235–257.
- [73] R.M. McColled and J.P. Spinrad, Modular decomposition and transitive orientation, *Discrete Math.* 201 (1999) 189–241.
- [74] S. Moriguchi, K. Murota, A. Tamura, and F. Tardella, Discrete Midpoint Convexity, *Math. Oper. Res.* 45:1 (2020) 99–12.
- [75] R. Möring, Algorithmic aspects of the substitution decomposition in optimization over relations, set systems, and Boolean functions, *Ann. Oper. Res.* 4 (1985-6) 195—225.
- [76] J. Muller and J. Spinrad, Incremental modular decomposition, *J. ACM* 36:1 (1989) 1–19.
- [77] K. Murota, *Discrete Convex Analysis*, Math. Programming, 2003.
- [78] K. Murota, A survey of fundamental operations on discrete convex functions of various kinds, *Optim. Methods Softw.* 36:2-3 (2021) 472–518.
- [79] K. Murota, On basic operations related to network induction of discrete convex functions, *Optim. Methods Softw.* 36:2-3 (2021) 519–559.
- [80] J. von Neumann and O. Morgenstern, *Theory of games and economic behavior*, Princeton University Press, 1944.
- [81] V. Neumann-Lara, Seminúcleos de una digráfica, Technical Report, Anales del Instituto de Matemáticas II, Universidad Nacional Autónoma México, 1971.
- [82] E. Olaru, Beitrage zur Theorie der perfekten Graphen, *Elektronische Informationsverarbeitung und Kybernetik (EIK)* 8 (1972) 147–172.
- [83] E. Olaru and H. Sachs, Contributions to a characterization of the structure of perfect graphs, in: C. Berge, V. Chvátal (Eds.), *Topics on Perfect Graphs*, *Ann. Discrete Math.* 21 (1984) 121–144.
- [84] J. Orlin, A faster strongly polynomial time algorithm for submodular function minimization, *Math. Programming* 118:2 (2009) 237–251.
- [85] M. W. Padberg, Perfect zero-one matrices, *Math. Programming* 6 (1974) 180–196.
- [86] M. Richardson, Solutions of irreflexive relations, *Ann. Math.*, 2nd Ser. 58:3 (1953) 573–590.
- [87] A. Schrijver. A combinatorial algorithm minimizing submodular functions in strongly polynomial time. *Journal of Combinatorial Theory, Series B*, 80:2 (2000) 346–355.

- [88] A. Schrijver, Combinatorial optimization, Springer, §44, p. 767, ISBN 3-540-44389-4, 2003.
- [89] D. Seinsche, On a property of the class of  $n$ -colorable graphs, *J. Combin. Theory B* 16 (1974) 191–193.
- [90] L.S. Shapley, Some topics in two-person games, in: M. Drescher, L.S. Shapley, A.W. Tucker (Eds.), *Advances in Game Theory*, in: *Annals of Math. Studies*, vol. AM52, Princeton University Press, 1964, pp. 1–28.
- [91] L.S. Shapley, Cores of convex games, *International Journal of Game Theory* 1 (1971) 11–26.
- [92] D.P. Sumner, Indecomposable graphs, Ph.D. Thesis, Univ. of Massachusetts, Amherst, 1971.
- [93] D.P. Sumner, Graphs indecomposable with respect to the  $X$ -join, *Discrete Math.* 6 (1973) 281–298.
- [94] A. Wagler, Critical and anticritical edges in Perfect Graphs, 27th International Workshop on Graph-Theoretic Concepts in Computer Science, LNCS 2204 (2001) 317–327.
- [95] W. Zang, Generalizations of Grillet’s theorem on maximal stable sets and maximal cliques in graphs, *Discrete Math.* 143:1-3 (1995) 259–268.
- [96] Y. Wu, W. Zang, and C-Q. Zhang, A characterization of almost CIS graphs, *SIAM J. on Discrete Math.* 23:2 (2009).
- [97] W. Zang, Generalizations of Grillet’s theorem on maximal stable sets and maximal cliques in graphs, *Discrete Math.* 143:1-3 (1995) 259–268.