

Characterization of Double-Arborescences and their Minimum-Word-Representants

Tithi Dwary and K. V. Krishna

Indian Institute of Technology Guwahati
tithi.dwary@iitg.ac.in; kvk@iitg.ac.in

Abstract. A double-arborescence is a treelike comparability graph with an all-adjacent vertex. In this paper, we first give a forbidden induced subgraph characterization of double-arborescences, where we prove that double-arborescences are precisely P_4 -free treelike comparability graphs. Then, we characterize a more general class consisting of P_4 -free distance-hereditary graphs using split-decomposition trees. Consequently, using split-decomposition trees, we characterize double-arborescences and one of its subclasses, viz., arborescences; a double-arborescence is an arborescence if its all-adjacent vertex is a source or a sink. In the context of word-representable graphs, it is an open problem to find the classes of word-representable graphs whose minimum-word-representants are of length $2n - k$, where n is the number of vertices of the graph and k is its clique number. Contributing to the open problem, we devise an algorithmic procedure and show that the class of double-arborescences is one such class. It seems the class of double-arborescences is the first example satisfying the criteria given in the open problem, for an arbitrary k .

Keywords: Distance-hereditary graphs; treelike comparability graphs, split decomposition; arborescences; minimum-word-representants.

1 Introduction

This work aims at characterizing a special class of comparability graphs, viz., double-arborescences, and also finding their minimum-word-representants. The graphs in this work are simple and connected. In this section and Section 2, we present the requisite background material and fix the notation.

A graph $G = (V, E)$ is called a comparability graph if it admits a transitive orientation, i.e., an assignment of direction to the edges of G such that $\vec{ab} \in E$ and $\vec{bc} \in E$, then $\vec{ac} \in E$. Based on a given transitive orientation, every comparability graph G induces a partially ordered set (in short, poset), denoted by P_G . If G admits a transitive orientation such that the Hasse diagram of the poset P_G is a tree, then G is called a treelike comparability graph and the corresponding orientation is called a treelike orientation. It was shown in [10] that a treelike orientation of a comparability graph, if exists, is unique up to isomorphism and reversing the whole orientation. A treelike comparability graph G with an all-adjacent vertex is called a double-arborescence, i.e., there is a vertex r such that




Fig. 1. Examples of treelike comparability graphs in terms of transitive reductions

$V = \{r\} \cup N_G(r)$, where $N_G(r)$ is the neighborhood of r in G . We consider r as the root of G . In addition, under the treelike orientation, if the root r is a source (or a sink), i.e., the indegree (respectively, outdegree) of r is zero, then G is called an arborescence. The treelike orientation of a (double-)arborescence is called the (double-)arborescence orientation. Note that every arborescence is a double-arborescence but not conversely. We call a double-arborescence as a strict-double-arborescence if it is not an arborescence. A treelike comparability graph G is called a path of k double-arborescences (or simply, a path of double-arborescences) if G (precisely) consists of k number of double-arborescences and a path connecting their roots. The smallest possible k such that G is a path of k double-arborescences can be determined in linear time [10]. These graphs are well depicted and understood by their Hasse diagrams or the digraphs of transitive reductions¹. For example, refer Fig. 1 for these types of graphs given by their transitive reductions, in which (b) is a strict-double-arborescence. For details on the arborescences and related graphs, one may refer to [21] and the references thereof.

The arborescences were first studied by Wolk in [28,29] and characterized them as (C_4, P_4) -free graphs, i.e., the graphs in which none of P_4 and C_4 is present as an induced subgraph, where C_n is a cycle on n vertices and P_n is a path on n vertices. Further, Golumbic characterized the arborescences as trivially perfect graphs, i.e., the graphs in which for every induced subgraph the size of a largest independent set equals the number of maximal cliques [20]. Based on the aforementioned characterizations, linear-time algorithms for recognizing the arborescences are presented in the literature (see [30,7]). The arborescences

¹ The transitive reduction of a transitive orientation is obtained by deleting the transitive edges.

were further generalized and studied in [23]. In [10], Cornelsen and Di Stefano proved that a graph is a path of double-arborescences if and only if it is a treelike permutation graph. However, no characterization is available for double-arborescences in the literature.

A word over a finite set of letters is a finite sequence written by juxtaposing the letters of the sequence. A subword u of a word w is a subsequence of the sequence w , denoted by $u \ll w$. For instance, $abcabb \ll abcacbbba$. Let w be a word over a set A , and B be a subset of A . We write w_B to denote the subword of w that precisely consists of all occurrences of the letters of B . For example, if $w = abcacbbba$, then $w_{\{b,c\}} = bcbcb$. We say that the letters a and b alternate in w if $w_{\{a,b\}}$ is of the form either $ababa \cdots$ or $babab \cdots$, which can be of even or odd length. A word w is called k -uniform if every letter occurs exactly k times in w . A graph $G = (V, E)$ is called a word-representable graph if there is a word w with the symbols of V such that, for all $a, b \in V$, a and b are adjacent in G if and only if a and b alternate in w ; such a word w is called a word-representant of G . If a graph is word-representable, then it has infinitely many word-representants [25]. A word-representable graph G is said to be k -word-representable if a k -uniform word represents it. It is known that every word-representable graph is k -word-representable, for some k [25]. For a comprehensive introduction to the topic of word-representable graphs, one may refer to the monograph [24] by Kitaev and Lozin. Further, a minimum-word-representant of a word-representable graph G is a shortest (in terms of its length) word-representant of G . The length of a minimum-word-representant of G is denoted by $\ell(G)$. Note that a minimum-word-representant of a word-representable graph need not be uniform. Let G be a word-representable graph on n vertices. It is evident that $\ell(G) \geq n$. It is known that the class of circle graphs² characterizes the 2-word-representable graphs [22]. Thus, an obvious upper bound for $\ell(G)$ of a circle graph is $2n$. In the seminal work [17], Gaetz and Ji considered the subclasses, viz., cycles and trees, of circle graphs and provided explicit formulae for both the length and the number of minimum-word-representants. In [26], Srinivasan and Hariharasubramanian proved that there is no circle graph G with $\ell(G) = 2n$ and an edgeless graph G is the only circle graph having $\ell(G) = 2n - 1$. Moreover, they showed that $\ell(G) = 2n - 2$ for a triangle-free circle graph G containing at least one edge. However, they established through an example (see [26, Example 2.15]) that $\ell(G)$ need not be $2n - k$ for a word-representable graph G with clique number³ k . In this connection, they posed an open problem to find classes of word-representable graphs G with clique number k such that $\ell(G) = 2n - k$. So far, no examples of such graph classes are available in the literature for an arbitrary k .

In this work, we employ the notion of split-decomposition trees and characterize double-arborescences as well as arborescences. Further, we find the minimum-word-representants of double-arborescences and show that this class of graphs serves as an example for the above-mentioned open problem from [26]. In Sec-

² A circle graph is an intersection graph of chords of a circle.

³ A clique is a complete subgraph. The size of a maximum clique in a graph is its clique number.

tion 2, we recall the notion of split-decomposition trees and present relevant results from the literature. In Section 3, we first provide a forbidden induced subgraph characterization of double-arborescences, where we prove that double-arborescences are precisely P_4 -free treelike comparability graphs. Also, using split decomposition we obtain an alternative proof for the well-known characterization of arborescences given in [29, Theorem 3] (also see [28]). Next, we consider a more general class of treelike comparability graphs, viz., distance-hereditary graphs. We introduce a notion called s-leaf-path in the minimal split-decomposition tree of a distance-hereditary graph, and using this notion we characterize the class of P_4 -free distance-hereditary graphs. Consequently, we obtain characterizations of arborescences and double-arborescences with respect to their minimal split-decomposition trees. Finally, in Section 4, we note that arborescences and double-arborescences are word-representable graphs and devise an algorithm based on breadth-first search to construct minimum-word-representants of arborescences. Moreover, using the algorithm, we also obtain minimum-word-representants of double-arborescences. We prove that if G is a double-arborescence on n vertices with clique number k , then $\ell(G) = 2n - k$.

2 Split-Decomposition Trees

In this section, we recall the concepts of split decomposition of a connected graph (from [4]) and graph-labelled trees (from [19]), and present them in a unified framework for fixing the notation of split-decomposition trees.

The concept of split decomposition was introduced by Cunningham in [11,12] and it was used to recognize certain classes of graphs such as circle graphs [4], parity graphs [8], and distance-hereditary graphs [18]. Recently, split decomposition is also used in the context of word-representable graphs [15]. Let $G = (V, E)$ be a connected graph. A split of G is a partition $\{V_1, V_2\}$ of V such that each of V_1 and V_2 contains at least two vertices, and every vertex in $N_G(V_1)$ is adjacent to every vertex in $N_G(V_2)$, where, for $A \subseteq V$, $N_G(A) = \bigcup_{a \in A} N_G(a) \setminus A$, called the neighborhood of A . A prime graph is a graph without any split.

A split decomposition of a graph $G = (V, E)$ with split $\{V_1, V_2\}$ is represented as a disjoint union of the induced subgraphs $G[V_1]$ and $G[V_2]$ along with an edge $e = \overline{v_1 v_2}$, where v_1 and v_2 are two new vertices such that v_1 and v_2 are adjacent to each vertex of $N_G(V_2)$ and $N_G(V_1)$, respectively. We call v_1 and v_2 as marked vertices and e as a marked edge. By deleting the edge e , we obtain two components with vertex sets $V_1 \cup \{v_1\}$ and $V_2 \cup \{v_2\}$ called the split components. The two components are then decomposed recursively to obtain a split decomposition of G . A minimal split decomposition of a graph is a split decomposition whose split components can be cliques, stars⁴ and prime graphs such that the number of split components is minimized. While there can be multiple split decompositions of a graph, a minimal split decomposition of a graph is unique [11,12].

⁴ A star is a tree on n vertices with one vertex, called the center, of degree $n - 1$.




Fig. 2. A tree T

We now recall the concept of graph-labelled tree introduced by Gioan and Paul [19] and its relation with a split decomposition of a graph. Let T be a tree and \mathcal{F} be a family of vertex disjoint graphs. A graph-labelled tree, denoted by $T_{\mathcal{F}}$, is the graph obtained from T by labelling (in fact, by inserting) every internal vertex α of degree k (≥ 2) by a graph $G_{\alpha} \in \mathcal{F}$ on k vertices such that there is a bijection from the edges of T incident to α to the vertices of G_{α} (and by replacing the end point α of a tree edge with the corresponding vertex of G_{α}). Note that the set of pendant (degree one) vertices of $T_{\mathcal{F}}$ is precisely the set of leaves of T . Given a graph-labelled tree $T_{\mathcal{F}}$ and the family \mathcal{F} , we can determine the underlying tree structure T . For clarity, we encircle the graphs G_{α} in $T_{\mathcal{F}}$ that are replacing the internal vertices α of T . For instance, for the tree given in Fig. 2, a graph-labelled tree is depicted in Fig. 3(b). The edges of $T_{\mathcal{F}}$ in the encircled portions are called \mathcal{F} -edges and the remaining edges are called T -edges, as they correspond to the tree edges of T . A path in $T_{\mathcal{F}}$ is called an alternated path if it alternates between T -edges and \mathcal{F} -edges. A maximal alternated path is an alternated path that cannot be extended by adding more edges while maintaining the alternatedness. The accessibility graph of a graph-labelled tree $T_{\mathcal{F}}$ is the graph, denoted by $T_{\mathcal{F}}^A$, in which the vertex set is the set of pendant vertices in $T_{\mathcal{F}}$ and any two vertices a and b in $T_{\mathcal{F}}^A$ are adjacent if and only if there is an alternated path between a and b in $T_{\mathcal{F}}$.

Let \mathcal{H} be a split decomposition of a graph G . Extend \mathcal{H} by adding one new pendant vertex a' for each non-marked vertex a of \mathcal{H} such that a and a' are adjacent. The graph thus extended can be viewed as a graph-labelled tree $T_{\mathcal{F}}$, called a split-decomposition tree of G , where \mathcal{F} consists of the split components of \mathcal{H} . If the split components of a split-decomposition tree are cliques (called clique components) and stars (called star components), then it is called a clique-star tree. We rewrite the uniqueness result by Cunningham in terms of graph-labelled trees in the following theorem and call such a graph-labelled tree as a minimal split-decomposition tree. For example, refer Fig. 3 for a graph and its minimal split-decomposition tree.

Theorem 1 ([1,11,19]). *For every connected graph G , there exists a unique split-decomposition tree $T_{\mathcal{F}}$ of G such that*

- (i) *the accessibility graph $T_{\mathcal{F}}^A$ is isomorphic to the graph G ,*




Fig. 3. (a) A graph, and (b) its minimal split-decomposition tree

- (ii) every split component is a clique, a star, or a prime graph,
- (iii) every split component has at least three vertices,
- (iv) there is no marked edge with end points in two clique components, and
- (v) there is no marked edge between the center of a star component and a leaf of another star component.

Treelike comparability graphs were characterized using split decomposition in [10, Theorem 4]. In view of the algorithm provided in [10, Theorem 5], we rewrite the characterization of treelike comparability graphs in the setting of graph-labelled trees.

Theorem 2 ([10]). *Let G be a graph and $T_{\mathcal{F}}$ be the minimal split-decomposition tree of G . Then G is a treelike comparability graph if and only if*

- (i) $T_{\mathcal{F}}$ is a clique-star tree,
- (ii) each clique component has at most two marked vertices, and
- (iii) there is no marked edge between the centers of two star components.

A graph G is called a distance-hereditary graph if the distance between any two vertices in any connected induced subgraph of G is same as the distance in G . The class of distance-hereditary graphs is more general and includes treelike comparability graphs [10]. In [2], a multiple characterizations of distance-hereditary graphs were obtained based on various parameters. The distance-hereditary graphs were characterized as the graphs whose minimal split-decomposition trees are clique-star trees [5]. Further, certain subclasses of distance-hereditary graphs were characterized in terms of their minimal split-decomposition trees in [1]. In particular, C_4 -free distance-hereditary graphs were characterized as per the following result.

Theorem 3 ([1]). *Let G be a distance-hereditary graph with the minimal split-decomposition tree $T_{\mathcal{F}}$. Then G is C_4 -free if and only if $T_{\mathcal{F}}$ does not have any*

center-center path (i.e., an alternated path whose endpoints are the centers of star components, and it does not contain any edge from either of star components).

In this work, we characterize the class of P_4 -free distance-hereditary graphs in terms of their minimal split-decomposition trees (see Theorem 6). In this connection, we need the following properties of maximal alternated paths in split-decomposition trees.

Lemma 1 ([1]). *Let $T_{\mathcal{F}}$ be the minimal split-decomposition tree of a distance-hereditary graph G and G_{α} be a split component of $T_{\mathcal{F}}$. We have the following properties of maximal alternated paths in $T_{\mathcal{F}}$.*

- (i) *There exists a maximal alternated path from any vertex of G_{α} but does not contain any edge of G_{α} .*
- (ii) *Any maximal alternated path starting from a vertex of G_{α} ends in a pendant vertex of $T_{\mathcal{F}}$.*
- (iii) *Let P and Q be two maximal alternated paths from distinct vertices of G_{α} . If P and Q do not contain any edge of G_{α} , then they end at distinct pendant vertices of $T_{\mathcal{F}}$.*

3 Characterizations

In this section, we aim to characterize double-arborescences and arborescences in terms of their split-decomposition trees. For these subclasses, first we provide forbidden induced subgraph characterizations. Further, we obtain a necessary and sufficient condition to identify a more general class, viz., P_4 -free distance-hereditary graphs. Consequently, we give one more characterization each for double-arborescences and arborescences.

Lemma 2. *Suppose G is a path of k double-arborescences for some $k \geq 2$ such that k is the smallest possible. Then G contains P_4 as an induced subgraph.*

Proof. Let D be the digraph corresponding to the treelike orientation of G . Further, let D' be the transitive reduction of D , i.e., the spanning subgraph of D obtained by deleting the transitive edges. Let G_i with root r_i , $1 \leq i \leq k$, be the k double-arborescences in G such that $\langle r_1, r_2, \dots, r_k \rangle$ is the root-path of D' .

Suppose the edge $\overrightarrow{r_1 r_2}$ is oriented as $\overrightarrow{r_1 r_2}$ in D' . We claim that there exists a vertex a_1 in G_1 such that $\overrightarrow{r_1 a_1}$ is in D' . On the contrary, suppose $\overrightarrow{a r_1}$ in D for all vertices a in G_1 . Hence, we have $\overrightarrow{a r_2}$ in D for all vertices a in G_1 . Then, G is a path of $k - 1$ double-arborescences, viz., $G_1 \cup G_2, G_3, \dots, G_k$ with the root-path $\langle r_2, r_3, \dots, r_k \rangle$ in D' ; a contradiction to the minimality of k . Further, there exist a vertex a_2 in $\bigcup_{2 \leq i \leq k} G_i$ such that $\overrightarrow{a_2 r_t}$ is in D' , for some $t \geq 2$, as shown in the

following cases:

- Case-1: $\overrightarrow{r_{i+1} r_i}$ in D' for some $i \geq 2$. Let t be the least such that $\overrightarrow{r_{t+1} r_t}$ in D' . Then we choose a_2 to be r_{t+1} .

- Case-2: $\overrightarrow{r_i r_{i+1}}$ for all $i < k$ in D' . For each $i \geq 2$, if $\overrightarrow{r_i a}$ in D for all vertices a in G_i , then $\overrightarrow{r_1 a}$ in D for all vertices a in $\bigcup_{2 \leq i \leq k} G_i$. In which case, G is a double-arborescence with the root r_1 ; a contradiction to the minimality of k . Hence, there exists a_2 in G_t , for some $t \geq 2$, such that $\overrightarrow{a_2 r_t}$ is in D' .

The path $\langle a_1, r_1, r_t, a_2 \rangle$ is an induced P_4 in G . Indeed, other than these three edges, there will not be any more edges between a_1, r_1, r_t and a_2 in G as there is no directed path between a_1 and r_t ; a_1 and a_2 ; or r_1 and a_2 in D' .

Similarly, one can observe that if $\overrightarrow{r_1 r_2}$ is oriented as $\overrightarrow{r_2 r_1}$ in D' , then there exist vertices a_1 in G_1 and a_2 in $\bigcup_{2 \leq i \leq k} G_i$ such that $\overrightarrow{a_1 r_1}$ and $\overrightarrow{r_t a_2}$ are in D' for some $t \geq 2$ so that $\{a_1, r_1, r_t, a_2\}$ induces a P_4 in G . \square

We now give a forbidden induced subgraph characterization for double-arborescences within treelike comparability graphs.

Theorem 4. *A graph G is a double-arborescence if and only if G is a P_4 -free treelike comparability graph.*

Proof. Suppose G is a double-arborescence with a root r . Since G is a treelike comparability graph, by Theorem 2, G is distance-hereditary. If G contains a P_4 induced by, say, $\{a_1, a_2, a_3, a_4\}$, then clearly $r \neq a_i$, for all $1 \leq i \leq 4$, as r is an all-adjacent vertex of G . Note that the graph induced by $\{r, a_1, a_2, a_3, a_4\}$ is the complement of $K_1 \cup P_4$ (see Gem in Fig. 7). But, by [13, Theorem 3.1], it is a forbidden induced subgraph for a distance-hereditary comparability graph. Hence, G is P_4 -free.

Conversely, suppose a treelike comparability graph G is P_4 -free. Note that P_4 -free graphs are permutation graphs (cf. [3]). Thus, by [10, Theorem 6], G is a path of k double-arborescences such that k is the smallest number of double-arborescences in G . If $k \geq 2$, then by Lemma 2, G induces a P_4 ; which is not possible. Hence, $k = 1$ so that G is a double-arborescence. \square

Lemma 3. *Suppose G is a strict-double-arborescence with a root r . There exist two non-adjacent vertices a_1 and a_2 in G such that $\overrightarrow{r a_1}$ and $\overrightarrow{r a_2}$. Similarly, there exist two non-adjacent vertices a_3 and a_4 in G such that $\overrightarrow{a_3 r}$ and $\overrightarrow{a_4 r}$.*

Proof. Suppose $G = (V, E)$ is a strict-double-arborescence with a root r . Let D be the digraph corresponding to the treelike orientation of G and D' be the transitive reduction of D . Let $A_1 = \{a \in V \mid \overrightarrow{r a} \text{ in } D\}$ and $A_2 = \{a \in V \mid \overrightarrow{a r} \text{ in } D\}$. Note that $A_1 \neq \emptyset$, $A_2 \neq \emptyset$, and $V = \{r\} \cup A_1 \cup A_2$. Moreover, if $a, b \in A_1$ are adjacent in G , then they are on a directed path from r in D' . Accordingly, if the vertices of A_1 form a clique in G , then the vertices of A_1 are on a directed path from r in D' . In that case, G can be seen as an arborescence whose root would be the end point, say a' , of the above mentioned directed path, i.e., $V = \{a'\} \cup \{a \in V \mid \overrightarrow{a a'} \text{ in } D\}$; a contradiction to G is a strict-double-arborescence. Hence, there exist two vertices $a_1, a_2 \in A_1$ such that a_1 and a_2 are not adjacent in G . Similarly, there exist two non-adjacent vertices in A_2 . \square



Fig. 4. Strict-double-arborescence.

Theorem 5. *Let G be a treelike comparability graph. Then G is C_4 -free if and only if G does not contain a strict-double-arborescence as its induced subgraph.*

Proof. Let D be the digraph corresponding to the treelike orientation of G . Suppose G is C_4 -free and contains a strict-double-arborescence, say H with root r , as its induced subgraph. Then, by Lemma 3, there exist two pairs of non-adjacent vertices a_1, b_1 and a_2, b_2 in H such that $\overrightarrow{ra_1}, \overrightarrow{rb_1}, \overrightarrow{a_2r}$ and $\overrightarrow{b_2r}$ exist in D . Then $\{a_1, b_1, a_2, b_2\}$ induces a C_4 , viz., $\langle a_1, a_2, b_1, b_2, a_1 \rangle$, in H and hence in G ; which is a contradiction.

Conversely, suppose G does not contain a strict-double-arborescence as its induced subgraph. If G contains a C_4 induced by $\{a_1, b_1, a_2, b_2\}$, then by [14, Proposition 4.2], $N_G(a_1) \cap N_G(b_1) \cap N_G(a_2) \cap N_G(b_2)$ induces a complete subgraph of G . Let a be a vertex in $N_G(a_1) \cap N_G(b_1) \cap N_G(a_2) \cap N_G(b_2)$, then observe that the graph induced by $\{a, a_1, b_1, a_2, b_2\}$ is a strict-double-arborescence as shown in Fig. 4; a contradiction. \square

The following corollary is evident from Theorem 4 and Theorem 5.

Corollary 1. *A graph G is an arborescence if and only if G is a (C_4, P_4) -free treelike comparability graph.*

We now characterize the class of P_4 -free distance-hereditary graphs through the notion of s-leaf-paths in their minimal split-decomposition trees. Let G be a distance-hereditary graph with the minimal split-decomposition tree $T_{\mathcal{F}}$. We call a leaf of a star component in $T_{\mathcal{F}}$ as s-leaf. An s-leaf-path in $T_{\mathcal{F}}$ is an alternated path P such that the endpoints of P are s-leaves of two star components and P does not contain any edge from either of star components (e.g., refer Fig. 5).

Theorem 6. *Let G be a distance-hereditary graph and $T_{\mathcal{F}}$ be the minimal split-decomposition tree of G . Then G contains an induced P_4 if and only if there exists an s-leaf-path in $T_{\mathcal{F}}$.*

Proof. Since G is isomorphic to the accessibility graph $T_{\mathcal{F}}^A$ (see Theorem 1(i)), we prove that $T_{\mathcal{F}}^A$ contains an induced P_4 if and only if there exists an s-leaf-path in $T_{\mathcal{F}}$. Let P be an s-leaf-path between two star components G_α and G_β in $T_{\mathcal{F}}$. Let $c_1 \in G_\alpha, b_1 \in G_\beta$ be the endpoints of P . Since $T_{\mathcal{F}}$ is the minimal split-decomposition tree, both G_α and G_β have at least three vertices each




Fig. 5. A portion of some $T_{\mathcal{F}}$ with an s-leaf-path P and its accessibility graph P_4

(see Theorem 1(iii)). Thus, there are at least two s-leaves in each of the star components G_α and G_β . Then, by Lemma 1(i), there are at least two maximal alternated paths from G_α that do not use any edge of G_α and, by Lemma 1(iii), these maximal alternated paths end at distinct pendant vertices of $T_{\mathcal{F}}$. Of these paths, suppose one path, say $P_{a'}$, is from an s-leaf a_1 in G_α to a pendant vertex a' of $T_{\mathcal{F}}$, and the other path, say $P_{b'}$, is from the center c_α of G_α to a pendant vertex b' of $T_{\mathcal{F}}$. Similarly, there are at least two maximal alternated paths from G_β one, say $P_{c'}$, is from its center c_β to a pendant vertex c' of $T_{\mathcal{F}}$, and the other, say $P_{d'}$, is from an s-leaf, say d_1 , in G_β to a pendant vertex d' of $T_{\mathcal{F}}$, as shown in Fig. 5.

We show that $\langle a', b', c', d' \rangle$ is an induced path in $T_{\mathcal{F}}^A$. As shown in Fig. 5, note that the path consisting of $P_{a'}$ followed by the edge $\overline{a_1 c_\alpha}$ and then $P_{b'}$ is an alternated path from a' to b' in $T_{\mathcal{F}}$ so that a' and b' are adjacent in $T_{\mathcal{F}}^A$. Further, the path consisting of $P_{b'}$ followed by the edge $\overline{c_\alpha c_1}$, the path P , the edge $\overline{b_1 c_\beta}$, then the path $P_{c'}$ is an alternated path from b' to c' in $T_{\mathcal{F}}$. Thus, b' and c' are adjacent in $T_{\mathcal{F}}^A$. Similarly, the vertices c' and d' are adjacent in $T_{\mathcal{F}}^A$. Consider the underlying tree T of $T_{\mathcal{F}}$ and note that there is a unique path between a' and c' in T that should pass through the vertices α and β of T . Thus, any path between a' and c' in $T_{\mathcal{F}}$ should pass through G_α and G_β , and by construction, that path must use two edges of G_α so that it cannot be an alternated path. This shows that a' and c' are not adjacent in $T_{\mathcal{F}}^A$. Similarly, one can show that $\overline{b'd'}$ and $\overline{a'd'}$ are not in $T_{\mathcal{F}}^A$. Hence, $T_{\mathcal{F}}^A$ contains an induced P_4 .

Conversely, suppose $T_{\mathcal{F}}^A$ has an induced P_4 , say $\langle a', b', c', d' \rangle$. Since $\overline{b'a'}$, $\overline{b'c'}$ are edges of $T_{\mathcal{F}}^A$, there exist alternated paths, say $P_{b',a'}$ and $P_{b',c'}$, which begin at the pendant vertex b' of $T_{\mathcal{F}}$ and end at the pendant vertices a' and c' of $T_{\mathcal{F}}$, respectively. Similarly, there exists an alternated path $P_{c',d'}$ between the pendant vertices c' and d' of $T_{\mathcal{F}}$.

Let G_α be the split component of $T_{\mathcal{F}}$ until which the paths $P_{b',a'}$ and $P_{b',c'}$ have the common segment and they split thereafter. Let $c_\alpha \in G_\alpha$ be the vertex at which the common segment ends, and a_1 and c_1 be the vertices of G_α at which the paths $P_{b',a'}$ and $P_{b',c'}$ exit G_α , respectively. We now show that a_1 and




Fig. 6. A center-center path.

c_1 are not adjacent in G_α so that G_α is a star component. Otherwise, we can have an alternated path between a' and c' , viz., P_{a',a_1} followed by the edge $\overline{a_1c_1}$ of G_α and then $P_{c_1,c'}$, where P_{a',a_1} is the segment of $P_{b',a'}$ between a_1 and a' , and $P_{c_1,c'}$ is the segment of $P_{b',c'}$ between c_1 and c' . Thus, a' and c' are adjacent in $T_{\mathcal{F}}^A$, a contradiction. Hence, G_α must be a star component. It is evident that c_α is its center and a_1, c_1 are its s-leaves.

Let G_β be the split component of $T_{\mathcal{F}}$ until which the paths $P_{c',d'}$ and $P_{b',c'}$ have the common segment and they split thereafter. Let $c_\beta \in G_\beta$ be the vertex at which the common segment ends, and b_1 and d_1 be the vertices of G_β at which the paths $P_{b',c'}$ and $P_{c',d'}$ exit G_β , respectively. As shown above, observe that G_β is a star component, in which c_β is the center and b_1, d_1 are s-leaves.

Note that the alternated path $P_{b',c'}$ passes through the split components G_α and G_β . We observe that the pendant vertex b' is nearer to G_α than G_β on the path $P_{b',c'}$. On the contrary, suppose G_β is nearer to b' . Then, clearly, G_α would be nearer to c' . Since the path $P_{b',c'}$ exits G_α at c_1 towards the pendant vertex c' , the vertex c_1 is closest in G_α to c' . Similarly, the vertex b_1 is closest in G_β to b' . Accordingly, the vertices $b', c', c_1, b_1, c_\alpha, c_\beta$ will appear in the following sequence on the path $P_{b',c'}$:

$$b', b_1, c_\beta, c_\alpha, c_1, c'$$

Thus, the segment of $P_{b',c'}$ between c_α and c_β is a center-center path in $T_{\mathcal{F}}$, as shown in Fig. 6. Then by Theorem 3, $\langle a', b', c', d', a' \rangle$ forms a C_4 in $T_{\mathcal{F}}^A$; a contradiction to induced P_4 over these vertices. Hence, the pendant vertex b' is nearer to G_α than G_β on the path $P_{b',c'}$ so that the vertices $b', c', c_1, b_1, c_\alpha, c_\beta$ will appear in the following sequence on the path $P_{b',c'}$:

$$b', c_\alpha, c_1, b_1, c_\beta, c'$$

Evidently, the segment of $P_{b',c'}$ between c_1 and b_1 is an s-leaf-path between G_α and G_β in $T_{\mathcal{F}}$. \square

Using the split decomposition, we now present an alternative proof for the well-known characterization of arborescences given in [29, Theorem 3] (also see [28]).




Fig. 7. Forbidden induced subgraphs for distance-hereditary comparability graphs.

Theorem 7. *A graph G is an arborescence if and only if G is (C_4, P_4) -free.*

Proof. Suppose G is an arborescence. Then, by Corollary 1, G is a (C_4, P_4) -free graph.

Conversely, suppose G is a (C_4, P_4) -free graph. Using Theorem 2, we show that G is a treelike comparability graph so that it is an arborescence (again by Corollary 1). Note that G does not contain any of the graphs given in Fig. 7, as each of them has C_4 or P_4 as an induced subgraph. Thus, by [13, Theorem 3.1], G is a distance-hereditary comparability graph so that the minimal split-decomposition tree $T_{\mathcal{F}}$ of G is a clique-star tree. As G is (C_4, P_4) -free, note that $T_{\mathcal{F}}$ has neither a center-center path (by Theorem 3) nor an s-leaf-path (by Theorem 6). In particular, there is no marked edge between the centers of two star components; otherwise, we will have a center-center path in $T_{\mathcal{F}}$.

Finally, we claim that each clique component of $T_{\mathcal{F}}$ has at most two marked vertices. On the contrary, suppose there is a clique component in $T_{\mathcal{F}}$ with three marked vertices say a_1, a_2 and a_3 . For $1 \leq i \leq 3$, let e_i be the marked edge in $T_{\mathcal{F}}$ with one end point a_i and the other end point, say, b_i . Since $T_{\mathcal{F}}$ is the minimal split-decomposition tree of G , by statement (iv) of Theorem 1, each b_i ($1 \leq i \leq 3$) is a vertex of a star component. Note that not all b_i 's can be centers of the respective star components; otherwise, $T_{\mathcal{F}}$ will have a center-center path, e.g., $\langle b_1, a_1, a_2, b_2 \rangle$. Also, not all b_i 's can be s-leaves of the respective star components; otherwise, $T_{\mathcal{F}}$ will have an s-leaf-path, e.g., $\langle b_1, a_1, a_2, b_2 \rangle$. Hence, one of b_i 's will be the center (or a s-leaf), without loss of generality assume that it is b_1 , and the other two will be s-leaves (or the centers, respectively) of the respective star components. In any case, $\langle b_2, a_2, a_3, b_3 \rangle$ is an s-leaf-path or center-center path in $T_{\mathcal{F}}$, which is not possible in $T_{\mathcal{F}}$. Thus, there will be at most two marked vertices in any clique component of $T_{\mathcal{F}}$. Hence, by Theorem 2, G is a treelike comparability graph. \square

We consolidate the following characterizations of double-arborescences and arborescences in terms of their minimal split-decomposition trees, as a consequence of the work presented so far.

Corollary 2. *Let G be a graph and $T_{\mathcal{F}}$ be its minimal split-decomposition tree. Then G is a double-arborescence if and only if the following statements hold.*

- (i) $T_{\mathcal{F}}$ is a clique-star tree.
- (ii) Each clique component has at most two marked vertices.
- (iii) There is no marked edge between the centers of two star components.
- (iv) $T_{\mathcal{F}}$ does not have any s -leaf-path.

Proof. Suppose G is a double-arborescence. Then, by Theorem 4, we have G is a P_4 -free treelike comparability graph. Thus, we have the statements (i), (ii) and (iii), using Theorem 2. Further, since $T_{\mathcal{F}}$ is a clique-star tree (statement (i)), it is evident that G is a distance-hereditary graph. Hence, we have G is a P_4 -free distance-hereditary graph so that the statement (iv) holds by Theorem 6.

Conversely, using the first three statements, we have G is a treelike comparability graph, by Theorem 2. Further, in view of Theorem 6, G is P_4 -free distance-hereditary graph using the statements (i) and (iv). Hence, G is P_4 -free treelike comparability graph, i.e., G is a double-arborescence by Theorem 4. \square

Corollary 3. *Let G be a graph and $T_{\mathcal{F}}$ be its minimal split-decomposition tree. Then G is an arborescence if and only if the following statements hold.*

- (i) $T_{\mathcal{F}}$ is a clique-star tree.
- (ii) $T_{\mathcal{F}}$ does not have any center-center path.
- (iii) $T_{\mathcal{F}}$ does not have any s -leaf-path.

Proof. Suppose G is an arborescence. Then, by Theorem 7, we have G is a (C_4, P_4) -free graph. Since G is a treelike comparability graph, the statement (i) holds (by Theorem 2). Further, using the fact that every treelike comparability graph is a distance-hereditary graph, we have G is a (C_4, P_4) -free distance-hereditary graph so that the statements (ii) and (iii) hold by Theorem 3 and Theorem 6, respectively.

For proof of the converse, first note that the statement (i) implies that G is distance-hereditary. Thus, using statements (i) and (ii), G is C_4 -free (by Theorem 3) and using statements (i) and (iii), we have G is P_4 -free (by Theorem 6). Hence, G is a (C_4, P_4) -free graph so that G is an arborescence (by Theorem 7). \square

4 Minimum-Word-Representants

In [5], it was established that the class of distance-hereditary graphs are circle graphs. Thus, being a subclass of distance-hereditary graphs, the double-arborescences are 2-word-representable. Hence, if G is a double-arborescence on n vertices, the length of its minimum-word-representants $\ell(G) \leq 2n$. In this section, we devise an algorithm to find minimum-word-representants of arborescences and extend it to double-arborescences. Moreover, contributing a class to the open problem in [26], we prove that for a double-arborescence G on n vertices with clique number k , $\ell(G) = 2n - k$. We refer to [27], for the concepts and notation related to posets used in this section.

4.1 Word Construction

Let $G = (V, E)$ be an arborescence on n vertices with clique number k . Note that a maximum size clique in a comparability graph can be found in quadratic time [16]. Suppose C_{long} is a maximum clique in G . As G is a treelike comparability graph, the treelike orientation of G as well as the transitive reduction (hence, the Hasse diagram) can be found in linear time [10, Theorem 5]. Recall that the Hasse diagram of the induced poset P_G with respect to the arborescence orientation of G is a rooted tree and the root r is the least element or the greatest element of P_G . Without loss of generality, we assume that r is the greatest element. Note that the elements of C_{long} form a longest chain in P_G and $r \in C_{\text{long}}$. In what follows, let \prec be the partial order on the poset P_G and \prec : be the corresponding covering relation, i.e., $a \prec$: b means $a \prec b$ and there is no element between a and b .

In Algorithm 1, we give a procedure based on breadth-first search (BFS) of P_G to construct a word of minimum length representing G . For BFS, one may refer to [9]. In what follows, w refers to the output of Algorithm 1. We have the following remarks on w .

Algorithm 1: Constructing minimum-word-representant of an arborescence.

Input: The Hasse diagram P_G of an arborescence G and a longest chain C_{long} of P_G .
Output: A word w representing G .

- 1 Initialize w with the root r .
- 2 Append r in Q (where Q is the queue used in BFS)
- 3 **while** Q is not empty **do**
- 4 Remove the first element of Q , say a .
- 5 **if** a is not a leaf **then**
- 6 Let a_1, a_2, \dots, a_t be the children of a and append them in Q .
- 7 **if** $a \in C_{\text{long}}$ **then**
- 8 Without loss of generality let $a_1 \in C_{\text{long}}$ and update w by
 $a_1 a_2 \cdots a_t w a_t a_{t-1} \cdots a_2$.
- 9 **end**
- 10 **else**
- 11 Replace the first occurrence of a in w by $a_1 a_2 \cdots a_t a$ and the
second occurrence of a in w by $a_t a_{t-1} \cdots a_1 a$.
- 12 **end**
- 13 **end**
- 14 **end**
- 15 **return** w .

Remark 1. If G is an arborescence on n vertices with clique number k , the length of the word w is $2n - k$, as each element of C_{long} appears exactly once and the remaining elements of V appear twice in w .

Remark 2. The word w is of the form w_1rw_2 such that the elements of C_{long} appear exactly once in w_1r and each element not in C_{long} has one occurrence in w_1 and the other occurrence in w_2 .

We now prove that the word w represents the arborescence G through the following lemmas.

Lemma 4. *For $a, b \in V$, if a and b are adjacent in G , then a and b alternate in w .*

Proof. Without loss of generality, suppose $b \prec a$ in P_G . Let $b = a_s \prec a_{s-1} \prec \dots \prec a_0 = a$ be the path from a to b in P_G . As the root r is the greatest element of P_G , according to the construction of w , a is visited first then a_1, a_2, \dots, a_{s-1} and lastly b is visited.

- Case-1: Suppose $a \notin C_{\text{long}}$. Then $a_i \notin C_{\text{long}}$ for all $0 \leq i \leq s$ and consequently all of them occur twice in w . For $1 \leq t \leq s$, using induction on t , we show that $w_{\{a, a_t\}} = a_taa_t a$. Hence, in particular for $t = s$, $w_{\{a, b\}} = baba$ so that a and b alternate in w .

For $t = 1$, since a_1 is a child of a , as per Step 11 of Algorithm 1, we have $a_1aa_1a \ll w$ and both a and a_1 appear exactly twice in w . Hence, $w_{\{a, a_1\}} = a_1aa_1a$. For $t = p$ suppose $w_{\{a, a_p\}} = a_paa_p a$. For $t = p + 1$, since a_{p+1} is a child of a_p , both the occurrences of a_p in w are replaced by a word containing $a_{p+1}a_p$ as a subword. Hence, $a_{p+1}a_paa_{p+1}a_p a \ll w$ so that $w_{\{a, a_{p+1}\}} = a_{p+1}aa_{p+1}a$.

- Case-2: Suppose $a \in C_{\text{long}}$. If b is also in C_{long} , then both a and b occur exactly once in w so that they alternate in w . If $b \notin C_{\text{long}}$, then let m be the smallest possible index with $1 \leq m \leq s$ such that $a_m \notin C_{\text{long}}$. For $m \leq t \leq s$, using induction on t , we show that $w_{\{a, a_t\}} = a_taa_t$. Hence, for $t = s$, we have a and b alternate in w .

Since $a_{m-1} \in C_{\text{long}}$, note that a_{m-1} appears exactly once in w . If $m = 1$, clearly $a_maa_m \ll w$. For $m > 1$, note that $w_{\{a, a_{m-1}\}} = a_{m-1}a$. Since a_m is a child of a_{m-1} , in view of Step 7 of Algorithm 1, a_m appears twice in w such that $a_m a_{m-1} a a_m \ll w$. Thus, for $t = m$, $w_{\{a, a_m\}} = a_m a a_m$. For $t = m + p$ suppose $w_{\{a, a_{m+p}\}} = a_{m+p} a a_{m+p}$. For $t = m + p + 1$, since a_{m+p+1} is a child of a_{m+p} , both the occurrences of a_{m+p} in w are replaced by a word containing $a_{m+p+1}a_{m+p}$ as a subword. Hence, $a_{m+p+1}a_{m+p}aa_{m+p+1}a_{m+p} \ll w$ so that $w_{\{a, a_{m+p+1}\}} = a_{m+p+1}aa_{m+p+1}$.

Hence, in any case, a and b alternate in w . □

Lemma 5. *For $a, b \in V$, if a and b are not adjacent in G , then they do not alternate in w .*

Proof. Note that a and b are incomparable elements in P_G . As P_G is a rooted tree with r as the greatest element, there exists c in P_G such that c is the least upper bound of $\{a, b\}$. Let $a = a_s \prec a_{s-1} \prec \dots \prec a_1 \prec c$ be the path from c to a , and $b = b_{s'} \prec b_{s'-1} \prec \dots \prec b_1 \prec c$ be the path from c to b in P_G . Hence, c is visited first and then a_i, b_j are visited in Algorithm 1. Note that a_1, b_1 are children of c and let a_1 is visited before b_1 in the algorithm.

- Case-1: One of a and b is in C_{long} but the other is not; say, $a \in C_{\text{long}}$ and $b \notin C_{\text{long}}$. Then $c \in C_{\text{long}}$, $a_i \in C_{\text{long}}$, for all $1 \leq i \leq s$, and $b_j \notin C_{\text{long}}$, for all $1 \leq j \leq s'$. For $1 \leq t \leq s$, using induction on t , we first show that $w_{\{a_t, b_1\}} = a_t b_1 b_1$.

For $t = 1$, since a_1, b_1 are children of c and $a_1 \in C_{\text{long}}$, as per the algorithm, we have $a_1 b_1 c b_1 \ll w$. Hence, $w_{\{a_1, b_1\}} = a_1 b_1 b_1$. For $t = p$, suppose $w_{\{a_p, b_1\}} = a_p b_1 b_1$. For $t = p + 1$, since a_{p+1} is a child of a_p and both a_p and $a_{p+1} \in C_{\text{long}}$, as per the algorithm, we have $a_{p+1} a_p b_1 b_1 \ll w$ so that $w_{\{a_{p+1}, b_1\}} = a_{p+1} b_1 b_1$. Hence, in particular for $t = s$, we have $w_{\{a, b_1\}} = a b_1 b_1$.

Now for $1 \leq t \leq s'$, using induction on t , we show that $w_{\{a, b_t\}} = a b_t b_t$. For $t = 1$, we have $w_{\{a, b_1\}} = a b_1 b_1$. For $t = p$, suppose $w_{\{a, b_p\}} = a b_p b_p$. For $t = p + 1$, since b_{p+1} is a child of b_p , both the occurrences of b_p in w are replaced by a word containing $b_{p+1} b_p$ as a subword. Thus, we have $a b_{p+1} b_p b_{p+1} b_p \ll w$ so that $w_{\{a, b_{p+1}\}} = a b_{p+1} b_{p+1}$. Hence, in particular for $t = s'$, we have $w_{\{a, b\}} = a b b$ so that a and b do not alternate in w .

- Case-2: Both a and b are not in C_{long} . Then we have the following cases.
- Case-2.1: Suppose $a_1 \notin C_{\text{long}}$ and $b_1 \notin C_{\text{long}}$. Then note that $a_i \notin C_{\text{long}}$ for all $1 \leq i \leq s$ and $b_j \notin C_{\text{long}}$ for all $1 \leq j \leq s'$.

For $1 \leq t \leq s$, using induction on t , we first show that $w_{\{a_t, b_1\}} = a_t b_1 b_1 a_t$. Note that a_1, b_1 are children of c and both a_1 and b_1 are not in C_{long} . Hence, if $c \in C_{\text{long}}$, as per the algorithm, we have $a_1 b_1 c b_1 a_1 \ll w$ and if $c \notin C_{\text{long}}$, as per the algorithm, we have $a_1 b_1 c b_1 a_1 c \ll w$. Hence, in any case, for $t = 1$, we have $w_{\{a_1, b_1\}} = a_1 b_1 b_1 a_1$. For $t = p$, suppose $w_{\{a_p, b_1\}} = a_p b_1 b_1 a_p$. For $t = p + 1$, since a_{p+1} is a child of a_p , both the occurrences of a_p in w are replaced by a word containing $a_{p+1} a_p$ as a subword. Thus, we have $a_{p+1} a_p b_1 b_1 a_{p+1} a_p \ll w$ so that $w_{\{a_{p+1}, b_1\}} = a_{p+1} b_1 b_1 a_{p+1}$. Hence, in particular for $t = s$, we have $w_{\{a, b_1\}} = a b_1 b_1 a$.

Now for $1 \leq t \leq s'$, using induction on t , we show that $w_{\{a, b_t\}} = a b_t b_t a$. For $t = 1$, we have $w_{\{a, b_1\}} = a b_1 b_1 a$. For $t = p$, suppose $w_{\{a, b_p\}} = a b_p b_p a$. For $t = p + 1$, since b_{p+1} is a child of b_p and both the occurrences of b_p in w are replaced by a word containing $b_{p+1} b_p$ as a subword, we have $a b_{p+1} b_p b_{p+1} b_p a \ll w$ so that $w_{\{a, b_{p+1}\}} = a b_{p+1} b_{p+1} a$. Hence, in particular for $t = s'$, we have $w_{\{a, b\}} = a b b a$ so that a and b do not alternate in w .

- Case-2.2: One of a_1 and b_1 is in C_{long} but not the other; say, $a_1 \in C_{\text{long}}$ and $b_1 \notin C_{\text{long}}$. Then $c \in C_{\text{long}}$ and $b_j \notin C_{\text{long}}$ for all $1 \leq j \leq s'$. Let $m (> 1)$ be the smallest positive interger such that $a_m \notin C_{\text{long}}$. Therefore $a_i \notin C_{\text{long}}$ for all $m \leq i \leq s$.

For $m \leq t \leq s$, using induction on t , we show that $w_{\{a_t, b\}} = a_t b b a_t$. Hence, in particular for $t = s$, we have $w_{\{a, b\}} = a b b a$. As shown in Case-1, we can have $w_{\{a_{m-1}, b\}} = a_{m-1} b b$. For $t = m$, since a_m is a child of a_{m-1} but $a_m \notin C_{\text{long}}$, as per the algorithm, we have $a_m a_{m-1} b b a_m \ll w$. Thus $w_{\{a_m, b\}} = a_m b b a_m$. For $t = m + p$, suppose $w_{\{a_{m+p}, b\}} = a_{m+p} b b a_{m+p}$. For $t = m + p + 1$, as a_{m+p+1} is a child of a_{m+p} and both the occurrences of a_{m+p} in w are replaced by a word containing $a_{m+p+1} a_{m+p}$ as a subword, we have

$a_{m+p+1}a_{m+p}bba_{m+p+1}a_{m+p} \ll w$. Thus $w_{\{a_{m+p+1}, b\}} = a_{m+p+1}bba_{m+p+1}$. Hence in particular for $t = s$, we have $w_{\{a, b\}} = abba$.

Hence in any case a and b do not alternate in w . \square

We now conclude in the following theorem that the word w produced by Algorithm 1 on an arborescence G is a minimum-word-representant of G .

Theorem 8. *If G is an arborescence on n vertices with clique number k , then $\ell(G) = 2n - k$.*

Proof. Let w be the word obtained by Algorithm 1 on an arborescence G . From lemmas 4 and 5, it is evident that w represents G . In view of Remark 1, the length of the word w is $2n - k$ so that $\ell(G) \leq 2n - k$. Further, as the size of a maximum clique in G is k we have $2n - k \leq \ell(G)$ (cf. [26, Theorem 2.9]). Hence, w is a minimum-word-representant of G and $\ell(G) = 2n - k$. \square

We now prove a more general theorem for the minimum-word-representants of double-arborescences.

Theorem 9. *Suppose G is a double-arborescence on n vertices with clique number k . Then $\ell(G) = 2n - k$.*

Proof. Let r be a root of a double-arborescence $G = (V, E)$ and P_G be the induced poset of G with respect to its double-arborescence orientation. If C_{long} is a longest chain in P_G , then note that the size of C_{long} is k .

Let $A = \{a \in V \mid a \prec r \text{ in } P_G\}$ and $B = \{a \in V \mid r \prec a \text{ in } P_G\}$ so that $A \cap B = \{r\}$ and $A \cup B = V$. Let P_A and P_B be the subposets of P_G on the vertex sets A and B , respectively. Then the Hasse diagrams of both P_A and P_B are rooted trees with root r . Note that r is the greatest element of P_A and it is the least element of P_B . Let G_A and G_B be the induced subgraphs of G on the vertex sets A and B , respectively. It can be observed that both G_A and G_B are arborescences.

Let $C_{\text{long}}^A = C_{\text{long}} \cap A$ and $C_{\text{long}}^B = C_{\text{long}} \cap B$ so that C_{long}^A and C_{long}^B are longest chains in P_A and P_B , respectively. We run Algorithm 1 separately on P_A and P_B by considering the respective longest chains C_{long}^A and C_{long}^B . Let u and v be minimum-word-representants of G_A and G_B , respectively, obtained from Algorithm 1. Suppose that $u = u_1ru_2$ and $v = v_1rv_2$. Note that the reversal of u , $u^R = u_2^Rru_1^R$ also represents G_A . We show that the word $w = u_2^Rv_1ru_1^Rv_2$ represents the graph G .

First note that $w_A = u_2^Rru_1^R$. Hence any two vertices a and a' of G_A are adjacent in G if and only if a and a' alternate in w . Also $w_B = v_1rv_2$ so that any two vertices b and b' of G_B are adjacent in G if and only if they alternate in w . We now show that r alternates with any $a \in V \setminus \{r\}$ in w in the following cases:

- $a \in A \setminus \{r\}$ such that $a \in C_{\text{long}}^A$: Then a occurs exactly once in u^R as well as in w . Moreover, since r occurs exactly once in w , we have a and r alternate in w . Similarly, if $a \in B \setminus \{r\}$ such that $a \in C_{\text{long}}^B$, then both a and r occur exactly once in w so that they alternate in w .

- $a \in A \setminus \{r\}$ such that $a \notin C_{\text{long}}^A$: Then a occurs exactly twice in u^R as well as in w . Further, in view of Remark 2, we have $w_{\{a,r\}} = ara$. Similarly, when $a \in B \setminus \{r\}$ but $a \notin C_{\text{long}}^B$, then $w_{\{a,r\}} = ara$.

Finally, let $a \in A \setminus \{r\}$ and $b \in B \setminus \{r\}$. In view of Remark 2, the positions of a 's in u_1 and u_2 and the positions of b 's in v_1 and v_2 are evident as shown in the following cases so that a and b alternate in w .

- If $a \in C_{\text{long}}^A$ and $b \in C_{\text{long}}^B$, then $w_{\{a,b\}} = ba$.
- If $a \in C_{\text{long}}^A$ and $b \notin C_{\text{long}}^B$, then $w_{\{a,b\}} = bab$.
- If $a \notin C_{\text{long}}^A$ and $b \in C_{\text{long}}^B$, then $w_{\{a,b\}} = aba$.
- If $a \notin C_{\text{long}}^A$ and $b \notin C_{\text{long}}^B$, then $w_{\{a,b\}} = abab$.

Hence, the word w represents the graph G . Note that the elements of C_{long} appear exactly once in w while the rest of the elements of V appear twice in w so that the length of the word w is $2n - k$. Further, since the size of a maximum clique in G is k , we have $\ell(G) = 2n - k$. \square

5 Conclusion

The characterizations of (double-)arborescences given in this work may be useful in addressing various enumeration related problems of double-arborescences. In [6], the arborescences were enumerated both exactly and asymptotically. However, no such results are available for double-arborescences. Considering the characterizations based on split decomposition for certain subclasses of distance-hereditary graphs, some grammars enumerating the subclasses were produced in [1]. As our characterizations given in Corollary 2 and Corollary 3 for double-arborescences and arborescences are using the split-decomposition trees, taking a clue from the work in [1], one may produce grammars to enumerate the (double-)arborescences. Moreover, the recognition algorithm for treelike comparability graphs given in [10, Theorem 5] may be customized to both double-arborescences and arborescences, using the characterizations given in this work.

Considering the open problem given in [26], we established that the length of a minimum-word-representant of a double-arborescence on n vertices with clique number k is $2n - k$. Based on our observations, we conjecture that the length of minimum-word-representants of a path of double-arborescences is also $2n - k$. Note that a minimum-word-representant of a double-arborescence or an arborescence need not be unique. In fact, the minimum-word-representant produced by Algorithm 1 on a double-arborescence may differ depending on the maximum size clique chosen. It is also interesting to enumerate all minimum-word-representants of double-arborescences and arborescences, in line with the work in [17].

References

1. M. Bahrani and J. Lumbroso. Enumerations, forbidden subgraph characterizations, and the split-decomposition. *Electron. J. Combin.*, 25(4):Paper No. 4.47, 45, 2018.

2. H.-J. Bandelt and H. M. Mulder. Distance-hereditary graphs. *J. Combin. Theory Ser. B*, 41(2):182–208, 1986.
3. P. Bose, J. F. Buss, and A. Lubiw. Pattern matching for permutations. *Inform. Process. Lett.*, 65(5):277–283, 1998.
4. A. Bouchet. Reducing prime graphs and recognizing circle graphs. *Combinatorica*, 7(3):243–254, 1987.
5. A. Bouchet. Transforming trees by successive local complementations. *J. Graph Theory*, 12(2):195–207, 1988.
6. R. Castelo and N. Wormald. Enumeration of P_4 -free chordal graphs. *Graphs Combin.*, 19(4):467–474, 2003.
7. F. P. M. Chu. A simple linear time certifying LBFS-based algorithm for recognizing trivially perfect graphs and their complements. *Inform. Process. Lett.*, 107(1):7–12, 2008.
8. S. Cicerone and G. Di Stefano. On the extension of bipartite to parity graphs. *Discrete Appl. Math.*, 95(1-3):181–195, 1999.
9. T. H. Cormen, C. E. Leiserson, R. L. Rivest, and C. Stein. *Introduction to algorithms*. MIT Press, Cambridge, MA, third edition, 2009.
10. S. Cornelsen and G. Di Stefano. Treelike comparability graphs. *Discrete Appl. Math.*, 157(8):1711–1722, 2009.
11. W. H. Cunningham. Decomposition of directed graphs. *SIAM J. Algebraic Discrete Methods*, 3(2):214–228, 1982.
12. W. H. Cunningham and J. Edmonds. A combinatorial decomposition theory. *Canadian J. Math.*, 32(3):734–765, 1980.
13. G. Di Stefano. Distance-hereditary comparability graphs. *Discrete Appl. Math.*, 160(18):2669–2680, 2012.
14. M. P. Dobson, M. Gutierrez, and J. L. Szwarcfiter. Treelike comparability graphs. In *Latin-American Conference on Combinatorics, Graphs and Applications*, volume 18 of *Electron. Notes Discrete Math.*, pages 97–102. Elsevier Sci. B. V., Amsterdam, 2004.
15. T. Dwary and K. V. Krishna. Word-representability of graphs with respect to split recomposition. *Discrete Applied Mathematics*, 357:310–321, 2024.
16. S. Even, A. Pnueli, and A. Lempel. Permutation graphs and transitive graphs. *J. Assoc. Comput. Mach.*, 19:400–410, 1972.
17. M. Gaetz and C. Ji. Enumeration and extensions of word-representants. *Discrete Appl. Math.*, 284:423–433, 2020.
18. C. Gavaille and C. Paul. Distance labeling scheme and split decomposition. *Discrete Math.*, 273(1-3):115–130, 2003.
19. E. Gioan and C. Paul. Split decomposition and graph-labelled trees: characterizations and fully dynamic algorithms for totally decomposable graphs. *Discrete Appl. Math.*, 160(6):708–733, 2012.
20. M. C. Golumbic. Trivially perfect graphs. *Discrete Math.*, 24(1):105–107, 1978.
21. M. C. Golumbic. Why are they called trivially perfect graphs? *Cadernos do IME-Série Informática*, 47:40–45, 2022.
22. M. M. Halldórsson, S. Kitaev, and A. Pyatkin. Alternation graphs. In *Graph-theoretic concepts in computer science*, volume 6986 of *Lecture Notes in Comput. Sci.*, pages 191–202. Springer, Heidelberg, 2011.
23. H. A. Jung. On a class of posets and the corresponding comparability graphs. *J. Combinatorial Theory Ser. B*, 24(2):125–133, 1978.
24. S. Kitaev and V. Lozin. *Words and graphs*. Monographs in Theoretical Computer Science. An EATCS Series. Springer, Cham, 2015.

25. S. Kitaev and A. Pyatkin. On representable graphs. *J. Autom. Lang. Comb.*, 13(1):45–54, 2008.
26. E. Srinivasan and R. Hariharasubramanian. Minimum length word-representants of word-representable graphs. *Discrete Appl. Math.*, 343:149–158, 2024.
27. W. T. Trotter. *Combinatorics and partially ordered sets: Dimension theory*. Johns Hopkins Series in the Mathematical Sciences. Johns Hopkins University Press, Baltimore, MD, 1992.
28. E. S. Wolk. The comparability graph of a tree. *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 13:789–795, 1962.
29. E. S. Wolk. A note on “The comparability graph of a tree”. *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 16:17–20, 1965.
30. J.-H. Yan, J.-J. Chen, and G. J. Chang. Quasi-threshold graphs. *Discrete Appl. Math.*, 69(3):247–255, 1996.