

Graphs Identifiable by Degree Sequence and Chromatic Number

Rebecca Whitman

Department of Mathematics

University of California, Berkeley

Berkeley, CA 94720

rebecca.whitman@berkeley.edu

June 7, 2024

Abstract

Unigraphs are graphs identifiable up to isomorphism from their degree sequences. Given a class \mathcal{A} of graphs, we define the class of \mathcal{A} -unigraphs to be graphs identifiable from degree sequence and membership in \mathcal{A} . While these classes are often not hereditary, we provide characterizations of the largest hereditary subclass contained in the bipartite-unigraphs, the k -partite unigraphs, the perfect-unigraphs, and the chordal-unigraphs. We also characterize the largest hereditary subclass contained in the bipartite-unigraphs in terms of structure, degree sequence, and a partial order on degree sequences due to Rao. Lastly, we show that all unigraphs G satisfy the bound $\chi(G) \leq \omega(G) + 1$ and are hence apex-perfect graphs.

1 Introduction

In this paper we consider a series of hereditary families related to unigraphs. All graphs are finite and simple. Given a graph $G = (V(G), E(G))$, the degree sequence d of G is the list of the degrees of the graph's vertices, written in non-increasing order. Where terms are repeated, we often denote their multiplicity with an exponent; for instance, $(3, 2, 2, 2, 2, 1)$ and $(3, 2^4, 1)$ are the same degree sequence. We say that G *realizes* d or is a *realization* of d . Frequently, a degree sequence d has numerous realizations, such that knowing d is insufficient for determining much about a realization G . Where d has exactly one realization up to isomorphism, we call d *unigraphic* and G a *unigraph*.

Unigraphs have been studied for about fifty years, with structural and degree sequence characterizations by Tyshkevich and Chernyak (see [12, 13, 14, 15] and the English translation [10]). The class of *split graphs* - graphs for which the vertex set $V(G)$ can be partitioned into a subset K inducing a clique and a subset S inducing a stable set - is an important tool in these characterizations of the class of unigraphs. Specifically, both characterizations rely on an operation defined by Tyshkevich that decomposes a graph into n split graph components and one unspecified component [9] [10]. The authors are then able to classify exactly the indecomposable components of a unigraph by structure and degree sequence. We summarize results pertaining to unigraphs here, and defer a fuller treatment of the decomposition operation to Section 3.

Theorem 1.1. [10] *A graph G is a unigraph if and only if each component of its decomposition is a unigraph.*

Given a graph G , we denote its complement by \overline{G} . Given a split graph G , a *KS-partition* is a partition of $V(G)$ into subsets K inducing a clique and S inducing a stable set. We write (G, K, S) to




Figure 1: The 16 forbidden induced subgraphs of the hereditary unigraphs.

indicate a split graph G with KS -partition $K \cup S$. Given (G, K, S) , the *inverse* G^I is the split graph obtained from G by removing all edges with both endpoints in K and adding all edges with both endpoints in S (thus switching the clique and stable set of the graph). Note that the inverse depends on the choice of KS -partition.

Neither complementation nor inversion changes a graph's status as a unigraph. As a result, indecomposable unigraphs can be characterized as follows.

Theorem 1.2. [10] *A graph G is an indecomposable unigraph if and only if G, \overline{G} , or, if split, G^I or $\overline{G^I}$ are isomorphic to K_1 or C_5 or belong to one of seven infinite families of graphs.*

Included in these seven families of unigraphs are all graphs isomorphic to the union of a star and nK_2 , $n \geq 0$, and split graphs where all vertices in the stable set are of degree 1. We refer the reader to [10] for the complete list.

A class \mathcal{A} of graphs is *hereditary* if it is closed under taking induced subgraphs of its members. All hereditary classes can be characterized by a set of forbidden induced subgraphs. For any class \mathcal{A} of graphs, we define two closely related hereditary classes. Let $H(\mathcal{A})$ be the *hereditary subclass* of \mathcal{A} , the largest hereditary class contained within \mathcal{A} . For example, the perfect graphs are the hereditary subclass of the set of graphs with equal clique and chromatic numbers. The set $H(\mathcal{A})$ is equivalently the subset of elements of \mathcal{A} for which all induced subgraphs are also elements of \mathcal{A} . We call a graph G in $H(\mathcal{A})$ a *hereditary \mathcal{A} -graph* (e.g., hereditary unigraph). Let $HC(\mathcal{A})$ be the *hereditary closure* of \mathcal{A} , the smallest hereditary class containing \mathcal{A} . For example, the class of forests is the hereditary closure of the class of trees. The set $HC(\mathcal{A})$ is equivalently the set of all graphs induced in an element of \mathcal{A} .

The class \mathcal{U} of unigraphs contains a number of important hereditary classes, including threshold [5], matroidal [6], and matrogenic graphs [11], but is not itself hereditary. The smallest counterexample is the unigraphic degree sequence $(3, 3, 3, 3, 3, 1)$: its realization contains two non-isomorphic realizations of $(3, 2, 2, 2, 1)$. Barrus [1] [2] studied the hereditary subclass of the unigraphs and characterized them in terms of their degree sequences, their structure, and a finite list of forbidden induced subgraphs for the class. Specifically, there are sixteen forbidden induced subgraphs, each containing five to seven vertices, which are shown in Figure 1. Let $\mathcal{F}_{H(\mathcal{U})}$ be the set of these graphs. The graphs R, S , and their complements, defined as shown in Figure 1 are the four split graphs in this set.

Theorem 1.3. [1] *A graph G is a hereditary unigraph if and only if G contains no element of $\mathcal{F}_{H(\mathcal{U})}$ as an induced subgraph.*

Barrus, Trenk, and Whitman [3] similarly characterized the hereditary closure of the unigraphs, in terms of degree sequences, structure, and a finite list of forbidden induced subgraphs. They also provide a




Figure 2: A family of k -partite graphs that are not k -partite-unigraphs.

characterization of $H(\mathcal{U})$ and $HC(\mathcal{U})$ in terms of minimally forbidden degree sequences, in accordance with Rao [7].

In this paper, we identify unique realizations within a number of important classes of graphs. In other words, what graphs - within the restricted universe of a particular graph class - are the only realizations of their degree sequences? Define an \mathcal{A} -unigraph to be a graph $G \in \mathcal{A}$ such that its degree sequence d has exactly one realization that is an element of \mathcal{A} . We call d \mathcal{A} -unigraphic. Note that \mathcal{A} -unigraphs and \mathcal{A} -unigraphic degree sequences are not necessarily unigraphs and unigraphic degree sequences without qualification. For example, P_5 is a bipartite-unigraph, since the only other realization of $d(P_5) = (2, 2, 2, 1, 1)$ is $K_3 + K_2$, which is not a bipartite graph, but P_5 is not a unigraph writ large.

We generalize bipartite-unigraphs to the families \mathcal{U}_k of k -partite-unigraphs for $k \geq 2$. Each is the set of graphs exactly determinable from degree sequence and an upper bound k on the chromatic number χ of the graph. For example, P_5 is not a k -partite-unigraph for $k \geq 3$, since $K_3 + K_2$ is also k -partite. While k -partite graphs form a hereditary class, \mathcal{U}_k does not. For $k = 2$, consider the two realizations G and G' of degree sequence $(4, 2^6)$, both shown in Figure 2. Since G' contains K_3 , G is a bipartite-unigraph. However, G contains $2P_3$, which is not a bipartite-unigraph (the other realization of its degree sequence is $P_4 + K_2$, which is also bipartite), so G is not a hereditary bipartite-unigraph. For $k \geq 3$, consider the degree sequence $d_k = (k^{k+1}, 1, 1)$. The sequence has exactly two realizations: one, the graph H_k shown in Figure 2, is k -partite, and the other, $K_{k+1} + K_2$, is not. However, H_k contains P_5 as an induced subgraph, so H_k is not a hereditary k -partite-unigraph.

We provide a partial forbidden induced subgraph characterization of $H(\mathcal{U}_k)$, the hereditary subclass of the k -partite-unigraphs. For $H(\mathcal{U}_2)$, we give exact structural, degree sequence, and forbidden induced subgraph characterizations. In particular, we show that hereditary bipartite-unigraphs are closely related to complete bipartite graphs. We also characterize a set of forbidden partitioned degree sequences for $H(\mathcal{U}_2)$, à la Rao [7].

From here we turn to a more general discussion of coloring unigraphs. In fact, unigraphs also have excellent graph coloring properties. Let $\omega(G)$ and $\chi(G)$ denote, respectively, the clique number and chromatic number of a graph G . For a hereditary class \mathcal{A} , $f : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ is a χ -bounding function on \mathcal{A} if for all $G \in \mathcal{A}$, $\chi(G) \leq f(\omega(G))$. For perfect graphs, the function $f(x) = x$ is χ -bounding, and this is of course best possible. See [8] for a survey of hereditary classes with known χ -bounding functions. We show that the class \mathcal{U} of unigraphs is bounded by $f(x) = x + 1$, pointing to a strong relationship between graph realization and graph coloring.

In the final section of the paper, we expand on this relationship to consider two other families of hereditary \mathcal{A} -unigraphs, again with stronger coloring properties: the hereditary perfect-unigraphs $H(\mathcal{U}_P)$ and the hereditary chordal-unigraphs $H(\mathcal{U}_C)$. We provide a forbidden induced subgraph characterization of each class.




Figure 3: The class of hereditary bipartite-unigraphs has twelve forbidden induced subgraphs.

2 Hereditary k -partite-unigraphs

We begin with four equivalent characterizations of the hereditary subclass of bipartite graphs, $H(\mathcal{U}_2)$: by degree sequence, by graph structure, by forbidden induced subgraphs, and by Rao-forbidden partitioned degree sequences.

Before presenting these characterizations in Theorem 2.2, we construct a partial ordering of degree sequences of bipartite graphs.

An unordered pair $\{d_1, d_2\}$ is a *bipartitioned degree sequence pair* if there exists a bipartite graph G with bipartition $V(G) = A \cup B$ such that $d(A) = d_1$ and $d(B) = d_2$. Thus $d(G) = d_1 \cup d_2$.

Given bipartitioned pairs $\{d_1, d_2\}$ and $\{e_1, e_2\}$, we say that $\{d_1, d_2\}$ *bipartite-Rao-contains* $\{e_1, e_2\}$ (and write $\{d_1, d_2\} \succeq \{e_1, e_2\}$) if and only if there exist bipartite graphs G and H such that (i) $V(G) = G_1 \cup G_2$ and $V(H) = H_1 \cup H_2$ are bipartitions of G and H , respectively, with $d(G_1) = d_1$, $d(G_2) = d_2$, $d(H_1) = e_1$, and $d(H_2) = e_2$, and (ii) there exists an injective homomorphism $\phi : V(H) \rightarrow V(G)$ with $\phi(h) \in G_1$ if and only if $h \in H_1$. We also say that a degree sequence d bipartite-Rao-contains a bipartitioned pair $\{e_1, e_2\}$ if there exists a bipartition $\{d_1, d_2\}$ of d with $\{d_1, d_2\} \succeq \{e_1, e_2\}$.

A bipartitioned pair is a *forbidden pair* if any bipartite realization of the sequence is not in $H(\mathcal{B}_2)$. Among forbidden pairs, a forbidden pair is *bipartite-Rao-minimal* if it does not bipartite-Rao-contain any other forbidden pair. Forbidden pairs and forbidden induced subgraphs are related per the following lemma.

Lemma 2.1. *A forbidden pair is bipartite-Rao-minimal if and only if all its realizations are forbidden induced subgraphs.*

Proof. Suppose that $\{d_1, d_2\}$ is a forbidden pair. If $\{d_1, d_2\}$ is not bipartite-Rao-minimal, then there exists a forbidden pair $\{e_1, e_2\}$ bipartite-Rao-contained in $\{d_1, d_2\}$. Thus, there exist bipartite realizations E, E' of $\{e_1, e_2\}$ and D of $\{d_1, d_2\}$ with E induced in D , and we conclude that D is not a forbidden induced subgraph.

If instead $\{d_1, d_2\}$ has a realization D that is not a forbidden induced subgraph, it follows that D contains some forbidden induced subgraph E . The forbidden pair corresponding to E is thus bipartite-Rao-contained in $\{d_1, d_2\}$, which we conclude is not bipartite-Rao-minimal. \square

We will thus be able to characterize $H(\mathcal{U}_2)$ by its forbidden pairs. Let $\mathcal{F}_{H(\mathcal{U}_2)} = \{K_3, C_5, P_4 + K_2, 2P_3, C_4 + K_2, P_6, A_1, A_2, A_3, A_4, A_5, A_6\}$, as shown in Figure 3. Let $\mathcal{R}_{H(\mathcal{U}_2)} = \{\{(2, 2), (1, 1, 1, 1)\}, \{(2, 1, 1), (2, 1, 1)\}, \{(2, 2, 1), (2, 2, 1)\}, \{(3, 1, 1), (2, 2, 1)\}, \{(3, 2, 1), (3, 2, 1)\}, \{(4, 3, 1), (2, 2, 2, 2)\}, \{(4, 2, 2), (3, 3, 1, 1)\}\}$. We show, among other characterizations, that $\mathcal{F}_{H(\mathcal{U}_2)}$ is the set of forbidden induced subgraphs of $H(\mathcal{U}_2)$, and that $\mathcal{R}_{H(\mathcal{U}_2)}$ is the set of bipartite-Rao-minimal pairs.

Note that a graph G is a hereditary bipartite-unigraph if and only if for any $v \notin V(G)$, $G \cup \{v\}$ is a hereditary bipartite-unigraph. Hence we assume in the following characterization that G contains no isolated vertices.

Theorem 2.2. *The following are equivalent for a graph G containing no isolated vertices:*

- (i) G is a hereditary bipartite-unigraph.
- (ii) G contains no element of $\mathcal{F}_{H(\mathcal{U}_2)}$ as an induced subgraph.
- (iii) G is bipartite and there exists a vertex $v \in V(G)$ such that either G or $G - \{v\}$ is isomorphic to $K_{a,b}$ for some $a, b \geq 0$.
- (iv) G is bipartite and its degree sequence d is equal to $(a^c, (a-1)^{b-c}, b^{a-1}, c)$ for some $a, b, c \geq 0$.
- (v) G is bipartite and its degree sequence d does not bipartite-Rao-contain any element of $\mathcal{R}_{H(\mathcal{U}_2)}$.

Proof. (i) \rightarrow (ii):

Suppose $G \in H(\mathcal{U}_2)$. Since G is bipartite, it contains no K_3 or C_5 . The pairs of graphs $P_4 + K_2$ and $2P_3$, $C_4 + K_2$ and P_6 , A_1 and A_2 , and A_3 and A_4 realize the same degree sequences, so are not themselves bipartite-unigraphs and cannot be induced subgraphs of G . The degree sequences $(4, 3, 2, 2, 2, 2, 1)$ of A_5 and $(4, 3, 3, 2, 2, 1, 1)$ of A_6 each also admit multiple bipartite realizations, so neither A_5 nor A_6 is contained in G .

(ii) \rightarrow (iii):

Suppose G contains no element of $\mathcal{F}_{H(\mathcal{U}_2)}$ as an induced subgraph. Note that all indecomposable unigraphs which are bipartite, as identified in Theorem 1.2, satisfy (iii).

If G is disconnected, then since $2P_3$ and K_3 are forbidden, at most one component, which we call H , has 3 or more vertices. All other components are isomorphic to K_2 , so H cannot contain P_4 or C_4 as an induced subgraph. If H has only two vertices, then G is isomorphic to nK_2 and is a unigraph by 1.2. If H has at least three vertices, then H contains an induced P_3 , on, say, vertex set $\{a, b, c\}$ with edges ab and bc . All other vertices in H must have neighbor set exactly $\{b\}$, else P_4 , C_4 , or K_3 is produced as an induced subgraph. Thus H is isomorphic to a star, and G , comprising a star and nK_2 , is a unigraph by 1.2.

Otherwise, suppose G is connected, and has at least 8 vertices (it is trivial to check that all graphs on 7 or fewer vertices contain no induced subgraph from $\mathcal{F}_{H(\mathcal{U}_2)}$). If G contains no P_3 as an induced subgraph, then G is isomorphic to K_2 , for a contradiction.

If the longest path in G has three vertices, let $\{a, b, c\}$ with edges ab and bc induce such a path. Either all additional vertices in G have neighbor set $\{b\}$ and G is a star and hence a unigraph by 1.2, or G contains some vertex adjacent to a and c but not b . Let AC be the set of vertices in $V(G) - \{b\}$ adjacent to a and c but not b , and B be the set of vertices in $V(G) - \{a, c\}$ adjacent to b but not a or c . If AC and B are complete to one another or missing at most one edge, then G meets condition (iii). If $|AC| \leq 1$ and B contains at least two vertices not adjacent to a vertex in AC , then G meets condition (iii). If $|AC| \geq 2$ and B contains at least two different vertices not adjacent to the same vertex in AC , then G contains an induced A_6 . If $|AC| \geq 2$ and B contains at least two different vertices not adjacent to different vertices in AC , then G contains an induced A_4 . If $|AC| \geq 2$ and B contains only one vertex not complete to AC , but said vertex is non-adjacent to at least two vertices in AC , then G meets condition (iii). Hence if the longest path in G has three vertices, G is a bipartite-unigraph.

If the longest path in G has four vertices, let $\{a, b, c, d\}$ induce such a path with edges ab, bc , and cd . By excluding P_5 , K_3 , and C_5 , G may contain a set B of vertices adjacent to b but not a, c , or d ; a set C

of vertices adjacent to c but not a , b , or d ; a set AC of vertices adjacent to a and c but not b or d ; and a set BD of vertices adjacent to b and d but not a or c . Since G contains no induced A_3 , B is complete to AC and anti-complete to C , and C is complete to BD . If $|AC| \geq 2$, it is complete to BD and if $|BD| \geq 2$, it is complete to AC , else G contains an induced A_2 or A_4 . If B and C are non-empty, then AC and BD are both empty lest G contain A_3 . Now, however, G is a unigraph by Theorem 1.2. Otherwise assume without loss of generality that C is empty. Since $B \cup \{a, c\} \cup BD$ is complete to $AC \cup \{b\}$, G meets condition (iii).

If the longest path in G has five vertices, let $\{a, b, c, d, e\}$ induce such a path with edges ab, bc, cd and de . Since G contains no $K_3, C_5, P_6, A_1, A_2, A_3$, or A_4 , G may contain a set AC of vertices adjacent to a and c but not b, d , or e ; a set CE of vertices adjacent to c and e but not a, b , or d ; a set AE of vertices adjacent to a and e but not b, c , or d ; and a set ACE of vertices adjacent to a, c , and e but not b or d . The set $AC \cup CE \cup AE \cup ACE$ is a stable set. If $|AC| \geq 2$, then G contains an induced A_5 . If $|CE| \geq 2$, then G contains an induced A_5 . If $|AE| \geq 2$, then G contains an induced A_4 . If $|ACE| \geq 2$, then G contains an induced A_4 . If AC and AE are both non-empty, or CE and AE are both non-empty, then G contains an induced A_2 . If AE and ACE are both non-empty, then G contains an induced A_4 . If AC, CE , and ACE are all non-empty, then G contains an induced A_2 . Hence $|G| \leq 8$, for a contradiction.

(iii) \rightarrow (iv):

Assume G has no isolated vertices. If G is isomorphic to $K_{a,b}$, then its degree sequence is (a^b, b^a) , meeting condition (iv) with $c = b$. Otherwise, there exists $v \in V(G)$ such that $G - \{v\}$ is isomorphic to $K_{a,b}$ for some $a, b \geq 0$. Let $G - \{v\}$ have bipartition $V(G) - \{v\} = A \cup B$, where the vertices of A are of degree b and the vertices of B are of degree a . Let $\deg(v) = x$. Since G is bipartite, the neighbor set of v is a subset of either A or B ; we assume B , without loss of generality. Thus the degree sequence of G is $((a+1)^x, a^{b-x}, b^a, x)$, meeting condition (iv) (substituting $a+1$ for a).

(iv) \rightarrow (i):

Let G be bipartite and have degree sequence $d = (a^c, (a-1)^{b-c}, b^{a-1}, c, 0^e)$. If $c = 0$, then $d = (a^b, b^a)$ for some $a \geq b \geq 0$. Let v_1, \dots, v_b have degree a , and v_{b+1}, \dots, v_{a+b} have degree b . Up to symmetry, suppose $v_1 \in X$. Thus there are at least a vertices in Y ; since $a \geq b$, some vertex in Y must have degree b . Thus there are at least b vertices in X . Hence $|X| = b$ and $|Y| = a$. If $a > b$, it follows that $X = \{v_1, \dots, v_b\}$ and $Y = \{v_{b+1}, \dots, v_{a+b}\}$, and if $a = b$, then both X and Y contain a vertices of degree a . In either case, the bipartition is unique, and all edges of the graph are fixed.

If G is a complete bipartite graph with one additional vertex v_1 of degree $1 \leq x \leq a$, then either $d = (a^x, (a-1)^{b-x}, b^{a-1}, x)$ or $a > b$ and $d = (a^{b-1}, x, b^x, (b-1)^{a-x})$.

In the first case, let a vertex v_2 of degree a be in X . Thus there are at least a vertices in Y , so some vertex in Y has degree at least b . (This assumes $a \geq 2$; if $a = 1$, then $|V(G)| \leq 2$ and the proof is trivial.) Hence $|X| = b$ and $|Y| = a$. If $a = b$, then up to symmetry $v_1 \in X$, so X contains v_1 and $a-1$ vertices of degree a , and Y contains x vertices of degree a and $a-x$ vertices of degree $a-1$. Since all vertices of degree a are complete to the opposite partition, there is exactly one way to realize the sequence as a bipartite graph.

If $a > b$, then all x vertices of degree a are in X . Since $\sum d = 2ab + 2x - 2b$, it follows that $\sum_{v \in X} \deg(v) = ab + x - b$, so the remaining $b-x$ vertices of X must have total degree $ab - ax + x - b$. We conclude each has degree $a-1$, so Y then contains $a-1$ vertices of degree b and one vertex, v_1 , of degree x . The vertices of degree b in Y are complete to X , so v_1 must be adjacent exactly to the vertices of degree a , such that there is exactly one bipartite realization.

In the second case, we assume $a > b$ and that some vertex v_2 of degree a is in X . With at least a vertices in Y , one must have degree at least b , so $|X| \geq b$. This implies $|X| = b$ and $|Y| = a$. Thus all $b-1$ vertices of degree a are in X . Since $\sum d = 2ab + 2x - 2a$, it follows that $\sum_{v \in X} \deg(v) = ab + x - a$, so the remaining vertex of X has degree x . Thus Y contains exactly the x vertices of degree b and the $a-x$

vertices of degree a . As above, there is exactly one realization of this bipartitioned degree sequence.

If G is a bipartite graph which is complete together with up to one additional vertex, then the same is true of all induced subgraphs H of G . By the above argument all such H are bipartite-unigraphs, and we conclude that G is a hereditary bipartite-unigraph.

(v) \rightarrow (iii):

Suppose that G contains a graph from $\mathcal{F}_{H(\mathcal{U}_2)}$ as an induced subgraph. If G contains K_3 or C_5 , then it is not bipartite, for a contradiction. Otherwise, if G contains P_4+K_2 or $2P_3$, then $d(G)$ bipartite-Rao-contains $\{(2, 2), (1, 1, 1, 1)\}$ and $\{(2, 1, 1), (2, 1, 1)\}$. If G contains $C_4 + K_2$ or P_6 , then $d(G)$ bipartite-Rao-contains $\{(2, 2, 1), (2, 2, 1)\}$. If G contains A_1 or A_2 , then $d(G)$ bipartite-Rao-contains $\{(3, 1, 1), (2, 2, 1)\}$. If G contains A_3 or A_4 , then $d(G)$ bipartite-Rao-contains $\{(3, 2, 1), (3, 2, 1)\}$. If G contains A_5 , then $d(G)$ bipartite-Rao-contains $\{(4, 3, 1), (2, 2, 2, 2)\}$. If G contains A_6 , then $d(G)$ bipartite-Rao-contains $\{(4, 2, 2), (3, 3, 1, 1)\}$.

(iii) \rightarrow (v):

Suppose G is bipartite and its degree sequence $d(G)$ bipartite-Rao-contains a sequence in $\mathcal{R}_{H(\mathcal{U}_2)}$. Thus there exists a bipartite graph H realizing a bipartitioned degree sequence in $\mathcal{R}_{H(\mathcal{U}_2)}$, with H induced in a bipartite realization G' of $d(G)$. By Lemma 2.1, all realizations of a sequence in $\mathcal{R}_{H(\mathcal{U}_2)}$ are forbidden induced subgraphs, which we showed above are precisely the graphs in $\mathcal{F}_{H(\mathcal{U}_2)}$. Hence G' contains a graph from $\mathcal{F}_{H(\mathcal{U}_2)}$ as an induced subgraph. Every realization of the degree sequence of a graph in $\mathcal{F}_{H(\mathcal{U}_2)}$ itself contains an induced subgraph from $\mathcal{F}_{H(\mathcal{U}_2)}$. This implies G contains an element of $\mathcal{F}_{H(\mathcal{U}_2)}$ as an induced subgraph, completing the proof. \square

Given a hereditary class \mathcal{A} of graphs, the class of apex- \mathcal{A} graphs is the set of graphs G that induce an element of \mathcal{A} on all but one vertex. Characterization (iii) is equivalent to stating that hereditary bipartite-unigraphs are apex-complete-bipartite.

We now turn to the study of $H(\mathcal{U}_k)$ for $k \geq 3$. These classes are not as interesting as $H(\mathcal{U}_2)$, and in fact hereditary k -partite-unigraphs are exactly hereditary unigraphs that are also k -partite.

Theorem 2.3. *A graph G is a hereditary k -partite-unigraph for $k \geq 3$ if and only if G is k -partite and a hereditary unigraph.*

Proof. Suppose G is a hereditary k -partite-unigraph. Of course G is k -partite. The graphs of \mathcal{L} are each k -partite for $k \geq 3$. Furthermore, they and all other realizations of their degree sequences are non-unigraphs by Theorem 1.3, so G cannot contain any as an induced subgraph, so G is a hereditary unigraph. We note the same does not hold for bipartite-unigraphs.

If G is not a hereditary k -partite-unigraph, then either G is not k -partite, or G is k -partite but not a hereditary k -partite-unigraph. Thus some induced subgraph H of G is k -partite but not a k -partite-unigraph. This implies H is not a unigraph, so G is not a hereditary unigraph. \square

Let \mathcal{F}_k be the set of forbidden induced subgraphs of the set of k -partite graphs. No known characterization exists for \mathcal{F}_k , but its smallest element is K_{k+1} . For $H(\mathcal{U}_k)$, we give a partial forbidden induced subgraph characterization, dependent on knowing \mathcal{F}_k .

Corollary 2.4. *A graph G is a hereditary k -partite-unigraph for $k \geq 3$ if and only if G contains neither a graph from \mathcal{F}_k nor a graph from $\mathcal{F}_{H(\mathcal{U})}$ as an induced subgraph.*

3 Coloring Hereditary Unigraphs

Given a graph G_0 and a split graph G_1 with a partition of $V(G_1)$ into a clique K and a stable set S , the composition of (G_1, K, S) and G_0 , denoted $(G_1, K, S) \circ G_0$, is the graph G with vertex set $V(G_1) \cup V(G_0)$ and

edge set $E(G_1) \cup E(G_0) \cup \{kv | k \in K, v \in V(G_0)\}$. Here G is the union of the original graphs together with all edges from G_1 's clique to G_0 . Note that the composition may vary depending on the choice of partition of $V(G_1)$ into a clique and stable set. Where G_1 admits exactly partition into a clique and a stable set, we write $G_1 \cup G_0$ for convenience.

Composition is associative, so the multipart composition $(G_n, K^n, S^n) \circ \dots \circ (G_1, K^1, S^1) \circ G_0$ is well-defined where G_n, \dots, G_1 are split graphs with the given KS -partitions.

Clique numbers and chromatic numbers behave predictably with respect to graph composition.

Proposition 3.1. *Let $G_i, 1 \leq i \leq n$ be a split graph with fixed KS -partition $K^i \cup S^i$ and G_0 be a nonempty graph. Given $G = (G_n, K^n, S^n) \circ \dots \circ (G_1, K^1, S^1) \circ G_0$, it holds that $\omega(G) = |K^n| + \dots + |K^1| + \omega(G_0)$ and $\chi(G) = |K^n| + \dots + |K^1| + \chi(G_0)$.*

Proof. We prove the base case $n = 1$; the full result holds by induction.

Let A be a maximum clique in G_0 . The set $K \cup A$ induces a clique in G , so $\omega(G) \geq |K| + \omega(G_0)$. Any maximum clique including $s \in S$ contains at most $|K| + 1$ vertices, which is not greater than $|K| + \omega(G_0)$, and any maximum clique including $v \in V(G_0) - A$ still contains at most $|K| + \omega(G_0)$ vertices. Hence $\omega(G) = |K| + \omega(G_0)$.

A proper coloring of G_0 must use at least $\chi(G_0)$ colors, and a proper coloring of G must give every vertex in K a color distinct from one another and from the colors used on G_0 . Hence $\chi(G) \geq |K| + \chi(G_0)$. All vertices in S can be colored with any color used on G_0 , since G_0 is non-empty. This produces a proper coloring of G using $|K| + \chi(G_0)$ colors, so we conclude that $\chi(G) = |K| + \chi(G_0)$. \square

Where G_n, \dots, G_1 each have exactly one split partition, $\omega(G) = \omega(G_n) + \dots + \omega(G_0)$ and $\chi(G) = \chi(G_n) + \dots + \chi(G_0)$.

Recall that a graph is apex-perfect if and only if there exists $v \in V(G)$ such that the induced subgraph $G - \{v\}$ is perfect.

Theorem 3.2. *The hereditary closure of the unigraphs is a subset of the apex-perfect graphs; hence the class is χ -bounded by the function $f(x) = x + 1$.*

Proof. All indecomposable unigraphs are perfect except for C_5 , which is apex-perfect. Let G be a unigraph, and write G as the composition $G_n \circ \dots \circ G_1 \circ G_0$ for some set of indecomposable unigraphs G_0, \dots, G_n . Per [10], all indecomposable split unigraphs have exactly one split partition, so the composition is well-defined. As split graphs, all of G_1, \dots, G_n are perfect. The graph G_0 is either perfect or isomorphic to C_5 , such that $\chi(G_0) \leq \omega(G_0) + 1$. Thus $\chi(G) = \chi(G_n) + \dots + \chi(G_0) \leq \omega(G_n) + \dots + \omega(G_1) + \omega(G_0) + 1$, by Proposition 3.1.

Since the set of apex-perfect graphs is hereditary, we conclude that any graph induced in a unigraph is apex-perfect. Hence the hereditary closure of the unigraphs is a subset of the apex-perfect graphs. \square

4 Hereditary Perfect- and Chordal-Unigraphs

While all unigraphs are apex-perfect, not all are perfect (C_5 is the most notable counterexample). In this section we attempt to identify “better” related classes of graphs by considering hereditary perfect-unigraphs and hereditary chordal-unigraphs. The characterization of the former class is straightforward.

Theorem 4.1. *A graph G is a hereditary perfect-unigraph if and only if G contains none of the graphs in $\mathcal{F}_{H(U)}$ nor C_5 as an induced subgraph.*




Figure 4: Three of the thirteen forbidden induced subgraphs of the hereditary chordal-unigraphs.

Proof. Suppose G is a hereditary perfect-unigraph. Of course it cannot contain C_5 ; moreover, all graphs in $\mathcal{F}_{H(\mathcal{U})}$ are perfect but not hereditary unigraphs, so G contains none of them as an induced subgraph.

For the reverse, suppose G contains no element of $\mathcal{F}_{H(\mathcal{U})}$ nor C_5 as an induced subgraph. Thus G is a hereditary unigraph, and since $\{P_5, \overline{P}_5\} \subset \mathcal{F}_{H(\mathcal{U})}$, it follows that G is perfect. Since $\mathcal{F}_{H(\mathcal{U})}$ is closed under degree sequence realizations, it follows that G is a hereditary perfect-unigraph. \square

We provide two standard theorems about split graphs in advance of their use in the following theorem characterizing $H(\mathcal{U}_C)$.

Theorem 4.2. [4] *A graph G is a split graph if and only if it contains none of C_4 , C_5 , or $2K_2$ as an induced subgraph.*

Theorem 4.3. [5] *A graph G is a split graph if and only if all other realizations of its degree sequence are split graphs.*

Let R, S be as defined before Theorem 1.3. Let B_1, B_2, B_3 be as shown in Figure 4. Let $\mathcal{F}_{H(\mathcal{U}_C)} = \{C_4, C_5, P_5, K_3 + K_2, 2P_3, P_4 + K_2, R, \overline{R}, S, \overline{S}, B_1, B_2, B_3\}$.

Theorem 4.4. *A graph G is a hereditary chordal-unigraph if and only if G contains none of $\mathcal{F}_{H(\mathcal{U}_C)}$ as an induced subgraph.*

Proof. Suppose G is a hereditary chordal-unigraph. Since G is chordal, it contains neither C_4 nor C_5 as an induced subgraph. The graphs P_5 , $K_3 + K_2$, $2P_3$, $P_4 + K_2$, R , \overline{R} , S , and \overline{S} are all chordal and minimal non-unigraphs, so G can contain none of these. The graphs B_1 and B_2 are both chordal realizations of $(4, 3, 2, 2, 2, 1)$. The sequence $(3, 3, 2, 2, 1, 1)$ has two chordal realizations - one is B_3 and the other contains P_5 as an induced subgraph - so G cannot contain B_3 as an induced subgraph.

Suppose G contains none of $\mathcal{F}_{H(\mathcal{U}_C)}$ as an induced subgraph. Since G cannot contain C_4, C_5 , or P_5 , G is chordal. If G is a split graph, then all realizations of its degree sequence are split by Theorem 4.3, and G is a hereditary chordal-unigraph if and only if G is a hereditary unigraph. Since G contains none of R, \overline{R}, S , or \overline{S} , it follows that G is a split hereditary unigraph by Theorem 1.3. If G is a chordal-unigraph and contains an isolated or dominating vertex v , then $G - \{v\}$ is also a chordal-unigraph, since v is isolated or dominating in every realization, and cannot be induced in a cycle. Hence we assume that G contains neither isolated nor dominating vertices.

Hence we assume G is not a split graph, and therefore must contain a copy of $2K_2$ as an induced subgraph by Theorem 4.2. Suppose vertices a, b, c, d of G induce $2K_2$ with edges ab and cd . If another vertex $v \in V(G)$ is adjacent, up to symmetry, to a and b but not c or d , then $\{a, b, c, d, v\}$ induces $K_3 + K_2$, for a contradiction. If another vertex $v \in V(G)$ is adjacent, up to symmetry, to a and c but not b or d , then $\{a, b, c, d, v\}$ induces P_5 , for a contradiction. Hence no vertex in G is adjacent to exactly two vertices out of a, b, c , and d .

If other vertices $v_1, \dots, v_k \in V(G)$ are adjacent to exactly one vertex from $\{a, b, c, d\}$, the resulting graph contains P_5 , $P_4 + K_2$, or $2P_3$ unless v_1, \dots, v_k are all adjacent to the same vertex (say, a) and not adjacent to one another. The resulting graph is isomorphic to the disjoint union of a star and K_2 , and is unigraphic by Theorem 1.2.

If other vertices $v_1, \dots, v_k \in V(G)$ are adjacent to exactly three vertices from $\{a, b, c, d\}$, then v_1, \dots, v_k are all adjacent to one another and each is adjacent to a, d , and either b or c , up to symmetry; otherwise, G contains C_4 or C_5 as an induced subgraph.

Suppose v_1, \dots, v_k are adjacent to a, b , and d , and vertices w_1, \dots, w_m are adjacent to a, c , and d . The degree sequence of G is thus $((k + m + 2)^{k+m}, (k + m + 1)^2, k + 1, m + 1)$. We claim no other chordal realization G' of this sequence exists. First, such a realization cannot contain C_4 or C_5 . Since G is not a split graph, G' cannot be split, so it must contain $2K_2$ as an induced subgraph. Since vertices of degree $k + m + 2$ are adjacent to all but one other vertex in G' , none can be part of an induced $2K_2$, so the four lower-degree vertices must form this $2K_2$. Second, if two vertices p, q of degree $k + m + 2$ are not adjacent to one another, then they must be complete to the remaining vertices. Together with any two non-adjacent vertices r, s , the set $\{p, q, r, s\}$ induces C_4 in G' , for a contradiction. Hence the vertices of degree $k + m + 2$ are complete to one another, and each is non-adjacent to exactly one more vertex. Third, if $k \geq 0$, $m \geq 0$, and the vertex of degree $k + 1$ is adjacent to the vertex of degree $m + 1$, then each is non-adjacent to some vertex of degree $k + m + 2$, which must be distinct. These four vertices then induce C_4 , for a contradiction. If $k = 0$ or $m = 0$, then there is only one possible induced $2K_2$, up to symmetry. Hence one vertex of degree $k + m + 1$ is adjacent to the vertex of degree $k + 1$, and the other is adjacent to the vertex of degree $m + 1$, inducing $2K_2$. The vertices of degree $k + m + 1$ are by necessity complete to the vertices of degree $k + m + 2$, each of which is adjacent to either the vertex of degree $k + 1$ or the vertex of degree $m + 1$, but not both, producing G .

If there exist v adjacent to one of $\{a, b, c, d\}$ and w adjacent to three of $\{a, b, c, d\}$, then G must contain one of P_5 , C_4 , B_1 , B_2 , or B_3 as an induced subgraph. Hence G cannot contain vertices with both one and three edges to vertices in $\{a, b, c, d\}$, aside from a, b, c , and d .

If there exists a vertex $v \in V(G)$ adjacent to all of $\{a, b, c, d\}$, then since G has no dominating vertices, there exists $w \in V(G)$ not adjacent to v . If w is adjacent to one of $\{a, b, c, d\}$, then G contains B_1 as an induced subgraph. If w is adjacent to three or four of $\{a, b, c, d\}$, then G contains C_4 as an induced subgraph. Hence w is adjacent to none of $\{a, b, c, d\}$, and so there exists x adjacent to w and none of $\{a, b, c, d, v\}$. If x has any other neighbor in G , then G contains $2P_3$ or $K_3 + K_2$ as an induced subgraph, so instead $\{w, x\}$ is a disconnected component of G . Thus G contains $K_3 + K_2$ as an induced subgraph, for a contradiction.

If there exists a vertex $v \in V(G)$ adjacent to none of $\{a, b, c, d\}$, then since G has no isolated vertices, there exists $w \in V(G)$ adjacent to v . If w is adjacent to one of $\{a, b, c, d\}$, then G contains $P_4 + K_2$ as an induced subgraph. If w is adjacent to all of $\{a, b, c, d\}$, we use the argument in the above paragraph to show G contains $K_3 + K_2$ as an induced subgraph. If w is adjacent to none of $\{a, b, c, d\}$, then G is isomorphic to nK_2 and is a hereditary unigraph by Theorem 1.2.

Suppose instead, then, that w is adjacent to three of $\{a, b, c, d\}$, then it must be the only vertex adjacent to three of $\{a, b, c, d\}$, else G contains R or \bar{R} as an induced subgraph. If more than one vertex of G is not adjacent to w , then G contains either B_3 or P_5 as an induced subgraph. The graph $G - \{w\}$ contains several disconnected components; since one of them, $\{a, b\}$, induces K_2 , the others cannot contain an induced P_4 or K_3 . Hence each is isomorphic to K_1, K_2 , or P_3 , and at most one is isomorphic to P_3 . Should the one vertex not adjacent to w be in a component isomorphic to P_3 , G contains either B_1 or C_4 as an induced subgraph. The result is a unigraph: w is adjacent to all vertices but one of degree 1; there is

at most one vertex of degree 3, which forms an induced P_3 in $G - \{w\}$ together with two vertices of degree 2, and all remaining vertices of degree 1 and 2 induce the unigraph $xK_2 + yK_1$ in $G - \{w\}$, for $x \geq 2$ and $y \geq 0$. \square

References

- [1] M. D. Barrus, On 2-switches and isomorphism classes, *Discrete Math.* **312** (2012), no. 15, 2217–2222.
- [2] M. D. Barrus, Hereditary unigraphs and the Erdős-Gallai equalities, *Discrete Math.* **313** (2013), no. 21, 2469–2481.
- [3] M. D. Barrus, A. N. Trenk, and R. Whitman, The hereditary closure of the unigraphs. Submitted.
- [4] S. Földes and P. Hammer, Split graphs, *Congr. Numer.* **19** (1977), 311–315.
- [5] P. Hammer and B. Simeone, The splittance of a graph, *Combinatorica* **1** (1981), 275–284.
- [6] P. Marchioro, A. Morgana, R. Petreschi, and B. Simeone, Degree sequences of matrogenic graphs, *Discrete Math.* **51** (1984), 46–61.
- [7] S.B. Rao, Towards a theory of forcibly hereditary P-graphic sequences, *Combinatorics and Graph Theory: Proceedings of the Symposium Held at the Indian Statistical Institute, Calcutta, February 25–29*. Springer-Verlag, *Lecture Notes in Mathematics* **885** (1980), 441–458.
- [8] A. Scott and P. Seymour, A Survey of χ -boundedness, *J. Graph Theory* **95** (3) (2020), 473–504.
- [9] R. Tyshkevich, The canonical decomposition of a graph, *Dokl. Akad. Nauk. BSSR* **24** (1980), 677–679 (in Russian).
- [10] R. Tyshkevich, Decomposition of graphical sequences and unigraphs, *Discrete Math.* **220** (2000), 201–238.
- [11] R.I. Tyshkevich, Once more on matrogenic graphs, *Discrete Math.* **51** (1984), 91–100.
- [12] R. Tyshkevich and A. Chernyak, Unigraphs, I, *Vesti Akademii Navuk BSSR* **5** (1978), 5–11 (in Russian).
- [13] R. Tyshkevich and A. Chernyak, Unigraphs, II, *Vesti Akademii Navuk BSSR* **1** (1979), 5–12 (in Russian).
- [14] R. Tyshkevich and A. Chernyak, Unigraphs, III, *Vesti Akademii Navuk BSSR* **2** (1979), 5–11 (in Russian).
- [15] R. Tyshkevich and A. Chernyak, Canonical decomposition of a unigraph, *Vesti Akademii Navuk BSSR* **5** (1979), 14–26 (in Russian).