

# A Graph Polynomial from Chromatic Symmetric Functions

William Chan, Logan Crew\*

April 18, 2022

## Abstract

This paper describes how many known graph polynomials arise from the coefficients of chromatic symmetric function expansions in different bases, and studies a new polynomial arising by expanding over a basis given by chromatic symmetric functions of trees.

Keywords: graph polynomials, chromatic polynomial, chromatic symmetric function, algebraic graph theory, algebraic combinatorics

## 1 Introduction

The chromatic symmetric function  $X_G$  of a graph  $G$  was introduced by Stanley in the 1990s [11] as a generalization of the chromatic polynomial, defined as

$$X_G := \sum_{\substack{\kappa: V(G) \rightarrow \mathbb{N} \setminus \{0\} \\ \kappa \text{ proper colouring}}} x_{\kappa(v_1)} \cdots x_{\kappa(v_{|V(G)|})}.$$

In particular, while  $[x^k]\chi_G$  counts the number of proper  $k$ -colourings of  $G$  for each  $k$ , if  $\lambda = (\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_k)$  with  $\lambda_1 \geq \dots \geq \lambda_k > 0$  is such that  $\lambda_1 + \dots + \lambda_k = |V(G)|$  is an integer partition, then when expanding in the monomial symmetric function basis the coefficient  $[m_\lambda]X_G$  gives (up to a constant factor) the number of proper  $k$ -colourings of  $G$  such that colour  $i$  is used  $\lambda_i$  times. The study of  $X_G$  is currently an active area of research due to its connections to other areas of mathematics, including algebraic geometry [3, 10] and knot theory [4, 9].

If  $l(\lambda)$  is the number of distinct integers in the partition  $\lambda$ , Stanley showed that when the chromatic symmetric function of a graph  $G$  is expanded over the elementary symmetric function basis  $\{e_\lambda\}$ , mapping each  $e_\lambda \rightarrow x^{l(\lambda)}$  yields a polynomial  $p(x)$  such that  $[x^k]p(x)$  is the number of acyclic orientations of  $G$  with  $k$  sinks ([11] Theorem 3.3); this polynomial and its generalizations have recently been further studied by Hwang et. al. [8]. Similarly, expanding  $X_G$  into the power-sum symmetric function basis  $\{p_\lambda\}$  and setting each  $p_\lambda \rightarrow x^{l(\lambda)}$  yields  $\chi_G(x)$ , and doing the same with the augmented monomial symmetric function basis  $\{\tilde{m}_\lambda\}$  yields a polynomial  $q(x)$  such that  $[x^k]q(x) = \chi_G(k)$ .

In recent work [7], Spirkl and the second author extended  $X_G$  to graphs with vertices weighted by positive integers to give the function a deletion-contraction relation, and Aliniaiefard, Wang, and van Willigenburg [1] showed that if  $\{G_i\}_{i=1}^\infty$  is a family of connected, vertex-weighted graphs

---

\*Department of Combinatorics & Optimization, University of Waterloo, Waterloo, ON, N2L 3E9.  
Emails: w47chan@uwaterloo.ca, lcrew@uwaterloo.ca

such that  $G_i$  has weight  $i$ , then their chromatic symmetric functions are algebraically independent, and so may be used to form a basis  $\{X_{G_\lambda}\}$  by letting  $G_\lambda$  be the disjoint union of  $G_{\lambda_1}, \dots, G_{\lambda_k}$ ; for instance, the aforementioned  $p$  and  $e$  bases arise in this way where  $G_i$  is a single vertex of weight  $i$  and an unweighted clique of size  $i$  respectively.

In this work, we show that for every (possibly weighted) graph  $G$ , if  $\{T_i\}_{i=1}^\infty$  is a family of unweighted trees such that  $T_i$  has  $i$  vertices, the polynomial obtained by mapping  $X_{T_\lambda} \rightarrow x^{l(\lambda)}$  in  $X_G$  is independent of the choice of the  $T_i$ . We call this polynomial the *tree polynomial* of  $G$ , and we study its properties, noting especially a kind of duality with the chromatic polynomial for vertex-weighted graphs.

In Section 2 we provide the necessary background in symmetric functions and colouring. In Section 3 we introduce the tree polynomials described above, and give a combinatorial interpretation for their coefficients. In Section 4 we find further relationships between the chromatic polynomial and tree polynomial, as well as an interpretation for the evaluation of the tree polynomial on positive integers. Finally, in Section 5 we investigate further directions for research.

## 2 Background

We take the natural numbers to contain 0. We define the interval  $[a, b] = \{a, a + 1, \dots, b\}$  where  $a, b \in \mathbb{N}$ .

A *partition*  $\lambda$  of  $n \in \mathbb{N} \setminus \{0\}$  is a weakly decreasing tuple  $(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_k)$  of positive integers such that  $\sum_{i=1}^k \lambda_i = n$ . We write  $\ell(\lambda) = k$  to be the *length* of  $\lambda$  and  $|\lambda| = n$  to be the *size* of  $\lambda$ . We write  $\lambda \vdash n$  to mean  $\lambda$  is a partition of  $n$ . When we say a partition (without specifying its size) we mean a partition of some  $n \in \mathbb{N} \setminus \{0\}$ .

We take all graphs  $G$  to be simple. In particular, we take the edge-contraction graph  $G/e$  with  $e \in E(G)$  to not have any loops or multi-edges. A *weighted graph* (as defined in [7]) will be denoted as  $(G, \omega)$  where  $\omega : V(G) \rightarrow \mathbb{N} \setminus \{0\}$  is a weight function. We define the contraction of a weighted graph  $(G, \omega)$  by an edge  $e = v_1 v_2 \in E(G)$  to be the graph  $(G/e, \omega/e)$ , where  $(\omega/e)(v) = \omega(v_1) + \omega(v_2)$  if  $v$  is the vertex obtained from contracting  $v_1 v_2$  and  $(\omega/e)(v) = \omega(v)$  otherwise. We say the *total weight* of  $(G, \omega)$  is  $\sum_{v \in V(G)} \omega(v)$ , and the *excess weight* of  $(G, \omega)$  is  $(\sum_{v \in V(G)} \omega(v)) - |V(G)|$ , that is, the total weight minus the number of vertices.

We will always assume there is an implicit total ordering on the edges of  $G$  (implicit because the results that follow do not depend on the choice of ordering). Where  $e$  and  $f$  are edges of  $G$ , we say  $e < f$  if  $e$  is less than  $f$  in this ordering. We let  $C(G) = \{G_1, \dots, G_k\}$  denote the set of connected components of  $G$ , where each component  $G_i$  is a subgraph of  $G$ . We write  $H \leq G$  where  $H$  and  $G$  are graphs to mean  $H$  is a subgraph of  $G$ . A spanning subgraph  $H \leq G$  is called *maximally connected* if  $C(H) = \{H_1, \dots, H_k\}$  and  $C(G) = \{G_1, \dots, G_k\}$  with  $\{V(H_1), \dots, V(H_k)\} = \{V(G_1), \dots, V(G_k)\}$ . Note that this is equivalent to  $E(G) \setminus E(H)$  containing no bridges for  $H$ .

If  $F$  is a spanning forest of  $G$  we say an edge  $e \in E(G) \setminus E(F)$  is *externally active* if  $F \cup e$  is not a forest and  $e$  is the minimal edge in the unique cycle in  $F \cup e$ . We say  $F$  is *internal* if no edges  $e \in E(G) \setminus E(F)$  are externally active. For  $S \subseteq E(G)$ , we let  $\mathcal{G}(S) = (V(G), S)$ . That is,  $\mathcal{G}(S)$  is the spanning subgraph induced by  $S$ .

**Definition 2.1.** Let  $G$  be a graph. An edge set  $S \subseteq E(G)$  is a *broken circuit* if it contains all the edges of some cycle of  $G$  other than its smallest one.

**Definition 2.2.** The *broken circuit complex*  $B_G$  is the set of all  $S \subseteq E(G)$  which do not contain (all the edges of) a broken circuit.

We note that the elements of  $B_G$  are subsets of  $E(G)$  and thus  $B_G$  has an induced partial order arising from the partial order on  $E(G)$  with respect to inclusion. From the definition of  $B_G$ , we note that for each element  $F \in B_G$  that  $\mathcal{G}(F)$  is acyclic and hence a forest, as the existence of a cycle means the existence of the broken circuit contained in that cycle. Moreover, we note that for each  $S \in B_G$ , it follows that  $\mathcal{G}(S)$  is internal, as an externally active edge would imply the existence of a broken circuit. Conversely, it is clear that the edge set of every internal forest is an element of  $B_G$ , so  $B_G$  consists precisely of the edge sets of internal forests of  $G$ .

For  $S \in B_G$  and  $C(\mathcal{G}(S)) = \{H_1, \dots, H_k\}$ , we write  $\lambda(S)$  to be the integer partition with parts  $|V(H_1)|, \dots, |V(H_k)|$ .

**Lemma 2.1.**  $S \in B_G$  is (inclusion-wise) maximal if and only if  $\mathcal{G}(S)$  is maximally connected.

*Proof.* If  $\mathcal{G}(S)$  is maximally connected then  $E(G) \setminus S$  contains no bridges for  $\mathcal{G}(S)$ . So if  $E(G) \supseteq \pi \supset S$  then  $\mathcal{G}(\pi)$  contains a cycle. But for  $\sigma \in B_G$ , we must have  $\mathcal{G}(\sigma)$  a forest. So  $\pi \notin B_G$  which shows  $S \in B_G$  is inclusion wise maximal.

Conversely, suppose  $\mathcal{G}(S)$  is not maximally connected with  $S \in B_G$ . Then there exists a set of bridges  $\{f_1, \dots, f_k\} \in E(G) \setminus S$  for  $\mathcal{G}(S)$  with each  $f_1 < \dots < f_k$  in the implicit total ordering on  $E(G)$ . Consider  $S' := S \cup \{f_1\}$ . Suppose  $S'$  contains broken circuit  $W$ , which is the cycle  $C$  with the smallest edge removed. Note that because  $S \in B_G$ ,  $W$  must contain  $f_1$ . Suppose the smallest edge in  $C$  is  $\tilde{f}$ . As  $\tilde{f} \notin W$  and  $f_1 \in W$ , it follows that  $\tilde{f} \neq f_1$ . We note that  $S \cup \{\tilde{f}\} = (S' \cup \{\tilde{f}\}) \setminus \{f_1\}$  contains no cycle as  $S' \cup \{\tilde{f}\}$  contains exactly one cycle and  $f_1$  is in that cycle. So  $\tilde{f}$  is a bridge for  $\mathcal{G}(S)$  which contradicts the minimality of  $f_1$ .  $\square$

With this lemma as motivation, we say  $F$  is an *internal preserving forest* if  $E(F)$  is in  $B_G$  and is maximal in  $B_G$ .

**Definition 2.3.** Let  $G = (V, E)$  be a graph. We say  $S \subseteq E$  is a  $k$ -cutset if  $|C((V, E \setminus S))| = k$ , that is, if removing  $S$  yields  $k$  connected components.

Let  $W$  be a vector space and let  $A \subseteq W$  be linearly independent. For  $f \in \text{span}(A)$  and  $a \in S$ , we write  $[a]f$  to mean the coefficient attached to  $a$  when uniquely writing  $f$  as a linear combination of elements in  $S$ .

For  $u, v \in V(G)$  we write  $u \sim v$  to mean  $u$  is adjacent to  $v$ , i.e.  $uv \in E(G)$ . A *proper  $k$ -colouring* of  $G$  is a function  $f : V(G) \rightarrow \{1, \dots, k\}$  such that  $u \sim v \implies f(u) \neq f(v)$ . A *proper colouring* is a function  $g : V(G) \rightarrow \mathbb{N} \setminus \{0\}$  is a proper  $k$ -colouring for some  $k \in \mathbb{N} \setminus \{0\}$ . Let  $\chi_G(x)$  be the *chromatic polynomial* of  $G$ , defined such that for each  $k \in \mathbb{N} \setminus \{0\}$ ,  $\chi_G(k)$  is the number of proper  $k$ -colourings of  $G$ .

**Proposition 2.1.**  $\sum_i [x^i] \chi_G = 0$  if  $E(G) \neq \emptyset$  and 1 if  $E(G) = \emptyset$

*Proof.* If  $E(G) = \emptyset$  then  $\chi_G = x^{|V(G)|}$  and we're done. Suppose  $|E(G)| \geq 1$ , and pick  $e \in E(G)$ . By the well-known deletion-contraction relation of the chromatic polynomial,

$$\chi_G = \chi_{G \setminus e} - \chi_{G/e}.$$

Note that  $E(G \setminus e) = \emptyset$  if and only if  $E(G) = \{e\}$  if and only if  $E(G/e) = \emptyset$ . So  $\sum_i [\chi_{G \setminus e}] x^i = \sum_i [\chi_{G/e}] x^i$  and the result follows.  $\square$

Let  $\Lambda$  be the algebra of symmetric functions over  $\mathbb{Q}$  in variables  $x_1, x_2, \dots$ . Let  $\{b_\lambda : \lambda \vdash n \geq 0\}$  be a basis for  $\Lambda$ . We say  $\{b_\lambda : \lambda \vdash n \geq 0\}$  is a *multiplicative basis* if each  $b_\lambda = b_{\lambda_1} \cdots b_{\lambda_{\ell(\lambda)}}$ . We define the *power-sum* basis  $\{p_\lambda : \lambda \vdash n \geq 0\}$  to be the multiplicative basis with each  $p_n = \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} x_i^n$ . For more information regarding symmetric functions, we defer to [12].

For a family of weighted graphs  $\{(G_n, \omega_n)\}_{n=1}^\infty$  and a partition  $\lambda$ , we define the weighted graph  $(G_\lambda, \omega_\lambda)$  to be the disjoint union of weighted graphs

$$(G_\lambda, \omega_\lambda) := (G_{\lambda_1}, \omega_{\lambda_1}) \cup \cdots \cup (G_{\lambda_{\ell(\lambda)}}, \omega_{\ell(\lambda)}).$$

Similarly, if  $\{G_n\}_{n=1}^\infty$  is a family of graphs, we define  $G_\lambda$  to be the disjoint union of graphs

$$G_\lambda = G_{\lambda_1} \cup \cdots \cup G_{\lambda_{\ell(\lambda)}}.$$

In [11], the chromatic symmetric function of  $G$  with  $V(G) = \{v_1, \dots, v_{|V(G)|}\}$  is defined as

$$X_G := \sum_{\substack{\kappa: V(G) \rightarrow \mathbb{N} \setminus \{0\} \\ \kappa \text{ proper colouring}}} x_{\kappa(v_1)} \cdots x_{\kappa(v_{|V(G)|})}$$

as a symmetric function analogue to the chromatic polynomial. With this definition,  $X_G$  is homogeneous of degree  $|V(G)|$  so the function does not satisfy a simple deletion-contraction relation, as contraction reduces the number of vertices. Spirkl and the second author thus generalized the chromatic symmetric function to the weighted chromatic symmetric function defined by [7]

$$X_{(G, \omega)} := \sum_{\substack{\kappa: V(G) \rightarrow \mathbb{N} \setminus \{0\} \\ \kappa \text{ proper colouring}}} x_{\kappa(v_1)}^{\omega(v_1)} \cdots x_{\kappa(v_{|V(G)|})}^{\omega(v_{|V(G)|})}$$

which does satisfy the deletion contraction relation ([7] Lemma 2) for  $e \in E(G)$ ,

$$X_{(G, \omega)} = X_{(G \setminus e, \omega)} - X_{(G/e, \omega/e)}.$$

Aliniaefard, Wang, and van Willigenburg showed that one can form bases of  $\Lambda$  which come from weighted chromatic symmetric functions, generalizing the work of [5] for unweighted graphs:

**Theorem 2.1** ([1] Theorem 5.4). *Let  $\{(G_n, \omega_n)\}_{n=1}^\infty$  be a family of connected weighted graphs such that the total weight of each  $G_n$  is  $n$ . Then  $\{X_{(G_\lambda, \omega_\lambda)} : \lambda \vdash n \geq 0\}$  is a multiplicative basis for  $\Lambda$ .*

Such bases for  $\Lambda$  are called *chromatic bases*. For instance, among the five classical symmetric function bases [12], the  $m$ -,  $e$ -, and  $p$ - basis are chromatic, while the  $h$ - and  $s$ - basis are not [6, 7].

**Corollary 2.1.** *Let  $\{T_n\}_{n=1}^\infty$  be a family of trees with each  $T_n$  having  $n$  vertices. Then*

$$\{X_{T_\lambda} : \lambda \vdash n \geq 0\}$$

*is a multiplicative basis for  $\Lambda$ .*

We will call such bases *tree bases*. In particular,  $\{X_{P_\lambda} : \lambda \vdash n \geq 0\}$ ,  $\{X_{S_\lambda} : \lambda \vdash n \geq 0\}$ , and  $\{X_{C_\lambda} : \lambda \vdash n \geq 0\}$  where  $P_n, S_n, C_n$  are the paths, stars, and cycles on  $n$  vertices respectively are multiplicative bases for  $\Lambda$ . In the same paper, it was found that there is a peculiar relation between certain chromatic bases and the power-sum basis.

**Theorem 2.2.** *[Chromatic Reciprocity, [1] Theorem 6.3] The maps  $p_\lambda \rightarrow X_{P_\lambda}$  and  $p_\lambda \rightarrow X_{S_\lambda}$  are automorphisms of  $\Lambda$  that are also involutions.*

### 3 Tree Coefficients

We begin with some definitions. By Corollary 2.1 we can give the following definition,

**Definition 3.1.** For a symmetric function  $f = \sum_{\lambda} a_{\lambda} X_{P_{\lambda}}$ , define  $\tau_f(x)$  to be the polynomial with

$$[x^k]_{\tau_f} = \sum_{\ell(\lambda)=k} a_{\lambda}.$$

**Definition 3.2.** For a symmetric function  $f = \sum_{\lambda} a_{\lambda} p_{\lambda}$ , define  $\chi_f(x)$  to be the polynomial with

$$[x^k]_{\chi_f} = \sum_{\ell(\lambda)=k} a_{\lambda}.$$

Note that  $\tau : \Lambda \rightarrow \mathbb{Q}[x]$  and  $\chi : \Lambda \rightarrow \mathbb{Q}[x]$  are the linear transformations which extend  $X_{P_{\lambda}} \rightarrow t^{\ell(\lambda)}$  and  $p_{\lambda} \rightarrow t^{\ell(\lambda)}$ . In general,

**Definition 3.3.** Let  $B = \{b_{\lambda} : \lambda\}$  be a basis for  $\Lambda$ . The  $B$ -polynomial of  $f = \sum_{\lambda} a_{\lambda} b_{\lambda} \in \Lambda$  is the polynomial  $p(x)$  with

$$[x^k]p(x) = \sum_{\ell(\lambda)=k} a_{\lambda}$$

**Lemma 3.1.** Let  $f_1, f_2$  be symmetric functions. Let  $B$  be a multiplicative basis for  $\Lambda$  and let  $\theta_{f_i}$  denote the  $B$ -polynomial of  $f_i$ . Then  $\theta_{f_1 f_2} = \theta_{f_1} \theta_{f_2}$ . That is  $\theta : \Lambda \rightarrow \mathbb{Q}[t]$  is also an algebra homomorphism.

*Proof.* For  $k \in \mathbb{N}$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} [x^k]_{\theta(f_1 f_2)} &= \sum_{\ell(\lambda)=k} [b_{\lambda}] f_1 f_2 \\ &= \sum_{t=1}^k \sum_{\ell(\alpha)=t} [b_{\alpha}] f_1 \sum_{\ell(\beta)=k-t} [b_{\beta}] f_2 \\ &= \sum_{t=1}^k \left( \sum_{\ell(\alpha)=t} [b_{\alpha}] f_1 \right) \left( \sum_{\ell(\beta)=k-t} [b_{\beta}] f_2 \right) \\ &= \sum_{t=1}^k [x^t]_{\theta_{f_1}} [x^{k-t}]_{\theta_{f_2}} \\ &= [x^k]_{\theta_{f_1} \theta_{f_2}} \end{aligned}$$

The result follows □

**Lemma 3.2.** Let  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ . Then the set of polynomials  $x^k(x-1)^{n-k}$  for  $k \in [0, n]$  are linearly independent in  $\mathbb{Q}[x]$ .

*Proof.* Note that each  $x^k(x-1)^{n-k} = \sum_{m=0}^{n-k} (-1)^{n-k-m} \binom{n-k}{m} x^{m+k}$ . Suppose  $\sum_{k=0}^n r_k x^k (x-1)^{n-k} = 0$ . Note that  $r_0 = 0$  because it is the only  $x^k(x-1)^{n-k}$  which has a constant term. Suppose that  $r_0 = \dots = r_t = 0$  for some  $t \in [0, n-1]$ . Note then that  $r_{t+1} = 0$  as it is the only remaining  $x^k(x-1)^{n-k}$  with a term of  $x^{t+1}$ . It follows that  $r_k = 0$  for each  $k \in [0, n]$ .  $\square$

This lemma will allow us to prove results (Proposition 4.2, Theorem 4.1) using the chromatic equivalence of trees.

**Proposition 3.1.** *Let  $G$  be a graph. Then  $\chi_G = \chi_{X_G}$ .*

*Proof.* Follows from the formulae ([11], Theorems 2.9 and 1.3 respectively)

$$X_G = \sum_{S \in B_G} (-1)^{|S|} p_{\lambda(S)}$$

and

$$\chi_G = \sum_{S \in B_G} (-1)^{|S|} x^{|V(G)| - |S|}$$

Indeed, as each  $(V(G), S)$  is a forest, the number of components  $k$  of  $(V(G), S)$  satisfies  $|S| = |V(G)| - k$  or  $k = |V(G)| - |S|$  and hence  $\ell(\lambda(S)) = |V(G)| - |S|$ .  $\square$

We let  $\tau_G := \tau_{X_G}$  and  $\tau_{(G, \omega)} := \tau_{X_{(G, \omega)}}$ . As a result of the above proposition, we more generally adopt the notation that if  $\{b_\lambda : \lambda \vdash n \geq 0\}$  is a multiplicative basis and  $\theta : \Lambda \rightarrow \mathbb{Q}[t]$  is the map  $b_\lambda \mapsto t^{\ell(\lambda)}$ , we say  $\theta_G := \theta_{X_G}$  and  $\theta_{(G, \omega)} = \theta_{X_{(G, \omega)}}$ . Indeed,  $\chi_G$  the chromatic polynomial and  $\chi_G$  the power-sum basis polynomial are the same by the above proposition.

**Proposition 3.2.** *Let  $F$  be a forest of order  $n$  with  $m$  parts. Then  $\tau_F = t^m$ .*

*Proof.* Write  $X_F = \sum_{\lambda \vdash n} a_\lambda X_{P_\lambda}$ . Note that  $\chi_{P_\lambda} = x^{\ell(\lambda)}(x-1)^{n-\ell(\lambda)}$ . Applying  $\chi$  to both sides,

$$x^m(x-1)^{n-m} = \chi_F = \chi_{X_F} = \sum_{\lambda \vdash n} a_\lambda \chi_{X_{P_\lambda}} = \sum_{\lambda \vdash n} a_\lambda x^{\ell(\lambda)}(x-1)^{n-\ell(\lambda)}$$

Because the  $x^t(x-1)^{n-t}$  are linearly independent, the result follows by comparing coefficients.  $\square$

**Corollary 3.1.** *For a tree  $T$ ,  $\tau_T = x$ .*

**Theorem 3.1.** *Let  $\{T_n\}_{n=1}^\infty$  be a family of trees with each  $T_n$  having  $n$  vertices and  $\{X_{T_\lambda} : \lambda \vdash n \geq 0\}$  its corresponding tree basis. For any weighted graph  $(G, \omega)$  and  $k \in \mathbb{N}$ ,*

$$\sum_{\substack{\lambda \\ \ell(\lambda)=k}} [X_{T_\lambda}] X_{(G, \omega)} = \sum_{\substack{\lambda \\ \ell(\lambda)=k}} [X_{P_\lambda}] X_{(G, \omega)}$$

*Proof.* Write  $X_{(G, \omega)} = \sum_\lambda a_\lambda X_{P_\lambda} = \sum_\lambda b_\lambda X_{T_\lambda}$ . Letting  $N$  be the total weight of  $(G, \omega)$ , we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \chi_{(G, \omega)} &= \sum_\lambda a_\lambda \chi_{X_{P_\lambda}} \\ &= \sum_\lambda a_\lambda x^{\ell(\lambda)}(x-1)^{N-\ell(\lambda)} \\ &= \sum_\lambda b_\lambda x^{\ell(\lambda)}(x-1)^{N-\ell(\lambda)} \\ &= \sum_\lambda b_\lambda \chi_{X_{T_\lambda}} \end{aligned}$$

The result follows by the linear independence of  $x^{\ell(\lambda)}(x-1)^{N-\ell(\lambda)}$  and comparing coefficients.  $\square$

With Theorem 3.1 as motivation, we call  $\tau_f$  the *tree polynomial* of  $f$  since  $\tau_f$  is independent of the family of trees chosen. For a graph  $G$  we say  $\tau_G$  is the tree polynomial of  $G$  and  $\tau_{(G,\omega)}$  the tree polynomial of  $(G,\omega)$ . Using the chromatic reciprocity of  $p_\lambda$  and  $X_{P_\lambda}$  (Theorem 2.2), we obtain the formula

**Theorem 3.2.** *For a graph  $G$  of order  $n$ ,*

$$[x^k]\tau_G = (-1)^{n+k} \sum_{m=1}^k \binom{n-m}{k-m} [x^m]\chi_G$$

*Proof.* Writing  $X_G = \sum_{\lambda \vdash n} a_\lambda p_\lambda$  we calculate,

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{\substack{\lambda \vdash n \\ \ell(\lambda)=k}} [X_{P_\lambda}]X_G &= \sum_{\lambda \vdash n} a_\lambda \sum_{\substack{\Delta \vdash n \\ \ell(\Delta)=k}} [X_{P_\Delta}]p_\lambda \\ ([1] \text{ Thm 6.3}) &= \sum_{\lambda \vdash n} a_\lambda \sum_{\substack{\Delta \vdash n \\ \ell(\Delta)=k}} [p_\Delta]X_{P_\lambda} \\ &= \sum_{m=1}^k \sum_{\substack{\lambda \vdash n \\ \ell(\lambda)=m}} (-1)^{n-k} a_\lambda \binom{n-m}{k-m} \\ &= (-1)^{n-k} \sum_{m=1}^k \binom{n-m}{k-m} \sum_{\substack{\lambda \vdash n \\ \ell(\lambda)=m}} a_\lambda \\ &= (-1)^{n-k} \sum_{m=1}^k \binom{n-m}{k-m} [x^m]\chi_G \end{aligned}$$

□

We may use this formula to interpret the tree polynomial's coefficients. We introduce some further definitions and lemmas.

**Definition 3.4.** Let  $G$  be a graph and  $H \leq G$ . Let  $C(H) = \{H_1, \dots, H_m\}$ . Define  $\nabla_G(H) := \bigcup_{i=1}^m \delta_G(H_i)$  where

$$\delta_G(H_i) = \{uv \in E(G) : u \in V(H_i), v \in V(G) \setminus V(H_i) \text{ or } u \in V(G) \setminus V(H_i), v \in V(H_i)\}$$

In other words,  $\delta_G(H_i)$  is the cut of  $H_i$  calculated in  $G$ .

**Definition 3.5.** Let  $G$  be a graph. For a subset of the edges  $E$ , we let  $\mathcal{G}(E)$  denote the spanning subgraph of  $G$  induced by  $E$ . We also define  $\ell(E) := |C(\mathcal{G}(E))|$  and  $C(G) = C(\mathcal{G}(E))$ .

**Definition 3.6.** For a graph  $G = (V, E)$  and  $S \subseteq E$  we write  $\nabla_G(S) = \nabla_G(\mathcal{G}(S))$ .

**Definition 3.7.** Let  $G$  be a graph and  $F$  a subforest of  $G$ . Let  $e \in E(G) \setminus E(F)$ . If  $F \cup e$  produces a cycle, then the cycle is unique and we call it the *fundamental cycle* of  $e$ .

**Lemma 3.3.** *Let  $G$  be a graph and  $\sigma \in B_G$  with  $C(\sigma) = \{D_1, \dots, D_k\}$ . Let  $S = \nabla_G(\mathcal{G}(\sigma))$ . If  $\hat{e}$  is the minimal edge in  $S$  then  $\sigma \cup \hat{e} \in B_G$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $e \in E(G) \setminus \sigma$ . If  $e$  is externally active in  $\sigma \cup \hat{e}$  it must have one end in  $D_i$  and one end in  $D_j$  with  $i \neq j$  (if it didn't, it would have both ends in  $D_t$  which would contradict  $\mathcal{G}(\sigma)$  having zero external activity). The fundamental cycle of  $e$  must then contain  $\hat{e}$  which is smaller than  $e$ . So  $e$  cannot be externally active in  $\mathcal{G}(\sigma \cup \hat{e})$ . The result follows.  $\square$

The following lemma is the crux in understanding the tree polynomial's coefficients.

**Lemma 3.4.** *Let  $G$  be a graph with  $n$  vertices and fix  $\pi \in B_G$ . Then,  $\sum_{\substack{\sigma \supseteq \pi \\ \sigma \in B_G}} (-1)^{\ell(\sigma)}$  is  $(-1)^{|C(G)|}$  times the number of maximal  $T \supseteq \pi$  in  $B_G$  such that the minimal edge in  $\nabla_G(\pi)$  is not contained in  $T$  and for every other edge  $e \in \nabla_G(\pi) \cap T$ ,  $e$  is contained in the fundamental cycle of some smaller edge in  $\nabla_G(\pi)$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $m := |\nabla_G(\pi)|$  and  $\nabla_G(\pi) = \{e_1, \dots, e_m\}$  where  $i < j$  if and only if the edge  $e_i$  is less than the edge  $e_j$ . Construct sets  $S_0, S_1, \dots, S_m$  recursively. Let  $S_0 := \{\sigma \in B_G : \sigma \supseteq \pi\}$ . Say an edge  $e \in E(G) \setminus \sigma$  is dead in  $\sigma$  if  $\sigma \cup \{e\}$  contains a cycle. Let  $S$  be a set of edgesets in  $B_G$ . Say  $S$  is  $t$ -ordered with respect to  $\pi$  if for all  $\sigma \in S$ ,

For  $i \in [2, n]$ ,  $e_i$  is either dead or  $e_i \in \sigma$  and there exists  $j < i$  with  $e_j \notin \sigma$  with  $e_i$  in the fundamental cycle of  $e_j$ . (\*)

Note that  $S_0$  is a 0-ordered edgeset. It is also an inclusion wise maximal 0-ordered edgeset in  $B_G$  containing  $S_0$  because it is  $S_0$ . Suppose  $S_t \in B_G$  is an inclusion-wise maximal  $t$ -ordered edgeset contained in  $S_0$ . Construct  $S_{t+1}$  by removing  $\sigma, \sigma \cup e_{t+1}$  for each  $\sigma$  where  $e_{t+1}$  is not dead. Note that  $\ell(\sigma) \equiv 1 + \ell(\sigma \cup e_{t+1}) \pmod{2}$ . Therefore  $\sum_{\sigma \in S_{t+1}} (-1)^{\ell(\sigma)} = \sum_{\sigma \in S_t} (-1)^{\ell(\sigma)}$ . For the remaining  $\sigma \in S_{t+1}$  either  $e_{t+1}$  is dead in  $\sigma$  or  $e_{t+1} \in \sigma$ . In the latter case,  $\sigma \setminus e_{t+1} \notin S_t$  as otherwise,  $\sigma \setminus e_{t+1}$  would have been an element in  $S_t$  with  $e_{t+1}$  alive. Hence,  $\sigma \setminus e_{t+1}$  violates (\*). Let  $e_s$  violate (\*) in  $\sigma \setminus e_{t+1}$ . If  $e_s$  is alive (that is,  $e_s \notin \sigma \setminus e_{t+1}$  and  $e_s$  is not dead) then  $e_s$  is dead in  $\sigma$ . If  $e_s$  is no longer dead in  $\sigma \setminus e_{t+1}$ , then it must be the case that  $e_{t+1}$  was in the fundamental cycle of  $e_s$ . Otherwise,  $e_s \in \sigma \setminus e_{t+1} \subseteq \sigma$ . In particular,  $e_s$  satisfies (\*) in  $\sigma$ . So  $e_s$  is contained in the fundamental cycle of  $e_r$ ,  $r < s$ . If  $e_s$  is not contained in the fundamental cycle of  $e_r$  in  $\sigma \setminus e_{t+1}$  then  $e_{t+1}$  must have been part of the same fundamental cycle. So  $S_{t+1}$  is  $t+1$ -ordered.

To show maximality, consider  $\sigma \supseteq \pi$  which satisfy (\*) for  $t+1$ . Then  $\sigma$  satisfies (\*) for  $t$  so that  $\sigma \in S_t$ . By (\*), either  $e_{t+1}$  is dead in  $\sigma$  or  $e_{t+1}$  is in the fundamental cycle of  $e_q$ ,  $q < t+1$  in which case  $e_q$  is not dead in  $\sigma \setminus e_{t+1}$  (as otherwise,  $e_q$  would be the missing edge of two cycles in  $\sigma$  and thus  $\sigma$  would contain a cycle, a contradiction) so  $\sigma \setminus e_{t+1} \notin S_t$ . In particular, there exists no  $\alpha \in S_t$  with  $e_{t+1} \notin \alpha$  and  $e_{t+1}$  alive in  $\alpha$ . So  $\sigma$  is not removed from  $S_t$  and is therefore in  $S_{t+1}$ . It follows  $S_{t+1}$  is also maximal. By induction it follows that  $S_m$  is a maximal  $m$ -ordered set. Let  $\sigma \in S_m$  and let  $f \in E(G) \setminus \sigma$  and write  $C(\sigma) = \{D_1, \dots, D_k\}$ . If both ends of  $f$  are in the same component of  $\mathcal{G}(\sigma)$  then adding  $f$  creates a cycle. If  $f \in \nabla_G(\sigma) \subseteq \nabla_G(\pi)$  then  $f = e_j$  for some  $j$ . But then because  $S_m$  is  $m$ -ordered and  $e_j \notin \sigma$ , we have  $e_j$  dead in  $\sigma$  and hence adding  $f$  also creates a cycle. It follows that each  $\mathcal{G}(\sigma)$ ,  $\sigma \in S_m$  is maximally connected because there are no bridges in  $E(G) \setminus \sigma$ , hence  $S_m$  contains only maximal elements in  $B_G$ . For a maximal element in  $\sigma \in B_G$ , an edge  $e$  dead in  $\sigma$  is equivalent to  $e \notin \sigma$ . All maximal elements  $\sigma \in B_G$  have the same number of connected components because they are maximally connected. So we have

$$\sum_{\substack{\sigma \supseteq \pi \\ \sigma \in B_G}} (-1)^{\ell(\sigma)} = \sum_{\sigma \in S_0} (-1)^{\ell(\sigma)} = \dots = \sum_{\sigma \in S_m} (-1)^{\ell(\sigma)} = (-1)^{|C(G)|} |S_m|.$$

$\square$



Using the formula for the tree polynomial in terms of the chromatic polynomial lets us apply the above lemma.

**Theorem 3.3.** *Let  $G$  be a graph. The coefficient  $[x^k]\tau_G$  is  $(-1)^{|C(G)|+k}$  times the number of pairs  $(E, T)$  where  $E = \{e_1, \dots, e_m\}$  is a  $k$ -cutset,  $e_1 < \dots < e_m$  and  $T$  is maximal in  $B_G$  such that  $e_1 \notin T$  and for every  $e_j \in E(T)$  there exists  $i < j$  such that  $e_j$  is in the fundamental cycle of  $e_i$ .*

*Proof.* Note that  $\binom{n-m}{k-m}[x^m]\chi_G$  is  $(-1)^{|C(G)|+|V(G)|}$  times the pairs  $(A, B)$  where  $B \in B_G$  with  $\ell(B) = m$  and  $A \subseteq B$  with  $\ell(A) = k$ . We can then write

$$\begin{aligned} (-1)^{|V(G)|+k} \sum_{m=1}^k \binom{n-m}{k-m} [x^m]\chi_G &= (-1)^{|V(G)|+k} \sum_{\substack{\pi \in B_G \\ \ell(\pi)=k}} \sum_{\substack{\sigma \in B_G \\ \sigma \supseteq \pi}} (-1)^{\ell(\sigma)+|V(G)|} \\ &= (-1)^k \sum_{\substack{\pi \in B_G \\ \ell(\pi)=k}} \sum_{\substack{\sigma \in B_G \\ \sigma \supseteq \pi}} (-1)^{\ell(\sigma)} \end{aligned}$$

So by Lemma 4.4,  $[x^k]\tau_G$  is  $(-1)^{k+|C(G)|}$  times the number of pairs  $(A, B)$  where  $A \in B_G$  with  $\ell(A) = k$ , and  $A \subseteq B \in B_G$  is maximal such that when writing  $\nabla_G(A) = \{e_1, \dots, e_m\}$  (ordered), then  $e_1 \notin B$  and if  $e_i \in B$  for  $i > 1$  then there exists  $j < i$  such that  $e_i$  is in the fundamental cycle of  $e_j$ . This is in bijection with the pairs  $(E, T)$  described in the theorem statement via the pair of mutually inverse bijective functions,

$$\begin{aligned} (A, B) &\mapsto (\nabla_G(A), B) \\ (E, T) &\mapsto (T \setminus E, T) \end{aligned}$$

□

**Theorem 3.4.** *Let  $G$  be a graph with  $n$  vertices. Then*

$$\sum_{\lambda \vdash n} [X_{P_\lambda}]X_G = 1$$

*Proof.* For any graph  $H$ ,  $\sum_{\lambda \vdash m} [p_\lambda]X_H = \sum_i [x^i]\chi_H = 0$  if  $H$  has edges, and 1 if  $H$  does have edges by Proposition 2.1. Write each  $[p_\lambda]X_G = a_\lambda$ . By [11] Theorem 2.9, we have  $a_{1^n} = 1$  as the only  $S \in B_G$  with  $\lambda(S) = 1^n$  is  $S = \emptyset$ . We have  $X_G = \sum_{\lambda \vdash n} a_\lambda p_\lambda$  so we have by Chromatic Reciprocity ([1] Theorem 6.3),

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{\lambda \vdash n} [X_{P_\lambda}]X_G &= \sum_{\lambda \vdash n} a_\lambda \sum_{\Delta \vdash n} [X_{P_\Delta}]p_\lambda \\ &= a_{(1^n)} + \sum_{\substack{\lambda \vdash n \\ \lambda \neq 1^n}} a_\lambda \sum_{\Delta \vdash n} [p_\Delta]X_{P_\lambda} \\ &= a_{(1^n)} + \sum_{\substack{\lambda \vdash n \\ \lambda \neq 1^n}} a_\lambda (0) \\ &= a_{(1^n)} \\ &= 1 \end{aligned}$$

□

This provides additional combinatorial information when used with Theorem 3.3. In general,

**Theorem 3.5.** *Let  $\{G_i\}_{i=1}^\infty$  be a family of connected graphs with each  $G_i$  having  $i$  vertices. Let  $G$  be a graph with  $n$  vertices. Then,*

$$\sum_{\lambda \vdash n} [X_{G_\lambda}] X_G = 1$$

*Proof.* Write  $X_G = \sum_{\lambda \vdash n} a_\lambda X_{G_\lambda}$ . Note that

$$\begin{aligned} 1 &= \sum_{\lambda \vdash n} [X_{P_\lambda}] X_G \\ &= \sum_{\lambda \vdash n} a_\lambda \left( \sum_{\Delta} [X_{P_\Delta}] X_{G_\lambda} \right) \\ &= \sum_{\lambda \vdash n} a_\lambda (1) \\ &= \sum_{\lambda \vdash n} a_\lambda \end{aligned}$$

□

This similarly provides further combinatorial information for general chromatic bases derived from unweighted families of graphs.

## 4 Tree Polynomials

Define the function  $\phi : \mathbb{Q}[x] \rightarrow \mathbb{Q}[x]$  by

$$\phi(p(x)) = \sum_{k=1}^{\deg(p(x))} (-1)^{n+k} \left( \sum_{m=1}^k \binom{n-m}{k-m} [t^m] p(t) \right) x^k$$

In particular,  $\phi(\chi_G) = \tau_G$ .

**Proposition 4.1.** *For graphs  $G, H$ ,  $\phi(\chi_G \chi_H) = \phi(\chi_G) \phi(\chi_H)$*

*Proof.*

$$\phi(\chi_G \chi_H) = \phi(\chi_{G \cup H}) = \tau_{G \cup H} = \tau_G \tau_H = \phi(\chi_G) \phi(\chi_H)$$

□

It is important to note  $\phi$  is not a homomorphism on all of  $\mathbb{Q}[x]$ . However, because it multiplies over chromatic polynomials, we may carry over some of their results to tree polynomials. For example, the well-known clique-gluing formula for the chromatic polynomial also applies to the tree polynomial.

**Corollary 4.1.** *Let  $G_1, G_2$  be graphs containing a  $k$ -clique. Let  $K_1 \leq G_1$  and  $K_2 \leq G_2$  be  $k$ -cliques respectively and write  $V(K_1) = \{u_1, \dots, u_k\}$  and  $V(K_2) = \{v_1, \dots, v_k\}$ . Define graph  $H$  to have vertex set  $V(G_1) \cup (V(G_2) \setminus V(K_2))$  and contain edges  $u_i w \iff u_i w \in E(G_1)$  or  $v_i w \in E(G_2)$  and the edges  $xy$  with  $x, y \in E(G_1)$  or  $x, y \in E(G_2)$ . That is,  $H$  is the graph obtained by gluing  $G_1, G_2$  at a  $k$ -clique,  $K$ . Then,*

$$\tau_H = \frac{\tau_{G_1} \tau_{G_2}}{\tau_K}$$

**Corollary 4.2.** *Let  $G$  be a graph and let  $H$  be  $G$  with a tree glued to a vertex of  $G$ . Then  $\tau_G = \tau_H$ .*

The tree polynomial of a weighted graph also remembers the amount of excess weight in a graph (that is, the difference between the total weight and the number of vertices).

**Theorem 4.1.** *Let  $(G, \omega)$  be a weighted graph with  $N$  total weight and  $n$  vertices. Let  $k$  be the largest integer such that  $(x - 1)^k | \tau_{(G, \omega)}$ . Then  $k = N - n$ . Moreover,  $\tau_{(G, \omega)} = (x - 1)^k \tau_G$ .*

*Proof.* Proceed by induction on  $N - n$ . If  $N - n = 0$  then  $\tau_G(1) = 1 \neq 0$  by Theorem 3.4 and the result holds. Suppose the result holds for all weighted graphs with excess weight  $m \in \mathbb{N}$  and suppose  $N - n = m + 1$ . Pick a vertex  $v_0$  with weight greater than 1. Consider graph  $G'$  with vertex set  $V(G) \cup \{w\}$  and edgeset  $E(G) \cup \{wv_0\}$ . Let  $\omega'$  be defined by  $\omega'(w) = 1$ ,  $\omega'(v) = \omega(v)$  for  $v_0 \neq v \in V(G)$  and  $\omega'(v_0) = \omega(v_0) - 1$ . Note that  $(G'/v_0w, \omega'/v_0w) = (G, \omega)$ . So by weighted deletion-contraction ([7] Lemma 2) and using the diagrams as stand ins for their chromatic symmetric functions,

$$\bullet \text{---} \bigcirc (G, \omega') = \bullet \bigcirc (G, \omega') - \bigcirc (G, \omega)$$

Taking tree polynomials and rearranging,

$$\tau_{(G, \omega)} = x\tau_{(G, \omega')} - \tau_{(G', \omega')}$$

By the inductive hypothesis,  $\tau_{(G', \omega')} = (x - 1)^m \tau_{G'} = (x - 1)^m \tau_G = \tau_{(G, \omega')}$  where the second last equality follows from Corollary 4.2 (our construction of  $G'$  is the same as gluing a path of length 2 to  $v_0$ ). So,

$$\tau_{(G, \omega)} = x\tau_{(G, \omega')} - \tau_{(G, \omega')} = (x - 1)\tau_{(G, \omega')} = (x - 1)(x - 1)^m \tau_G = (x - 1)^{m+1} \tau_G$$

and the result follows. □

There is also a deletion-contraction relation for the tree polynomial.

**Theorem 4.2** (Unweighted Deletion Contraction). *Let  $G$  be a graph and  $e$  an edge of  $G$ . Then*

$$\tau_G = \tau_{G \setminus e} - (x - 1)\tau_{G/e}$$

*Proof.* Follows from weighted deletion contraction of chromatic symmetric functions and Theorem 4.1. □

**Proposition 4.2.**  $\tau_{p_\lambda} = x^{\ell(\lambda)}(x - 1)^{|\lambda| - \ell(\lambda)}$

*Proof.* By chromatic reciprocity, each  $[X_{P_\Delta}]p_\lambda = [p_\Delta]X_{P_\lambda}$ . So

$$[x^k]\tau_{p_\lambda} = \sum_{\Delta \ell(\Delta)=k} [X_{P_\Delta}]p_\lambda = \sum_{\Delta \ell(\Delta)=k} [p_\Delta]X_{P_\lambda} = [x^k]\chi_{P_\lambda}$$

Therefore,

$$\tau_{p_\lambda} = \chi_{P_\lambda} = x^{\ell(\lambda)}(x - 1)^{|\lambda| - \ell(\lambda)}$$

□

Definitions 4.2 and Proposition 4.1 means we can extend the chromatic polynomial to weighted graphs; however, unlike the tree polynomial, the excess weight is forgotten when taking the chromatic polynomial.

**Theorem 4.3.** *Let  $(G, \omega)$  be a weighted graph. Recall that  $\chi_{(G, \omega)} := \chi_{X_{(G, \omega)}}$ . We have*

$$\chi_G = \chi_{(G, \omega)}$$

*Proof.* Let  $G$  have  $n$  vertices and total weight  $N$ . Proceed by induction on  $N - n$ . If  $N - n = 0$  we're done. Otherwise, pick vertex  $v_0$  with weight  $\omega(v_0) > 1$ . Define graph  $G'$  to have vertex set  $V(G) \cup \{w\}$  and edgeset  $E(G) \cup \{wv_0\}$ . Define  $\omega'(v) = \omega(v)$  if  $v_0 \neq v \in V(G)$ ,  $\omega'(w) = 1$  and  $\omega'(v_0) = \omega(v_0) - 1$ . Note that  $(G'/wv_0, \omega'/wv_0) = (G, \omega)$ . So by weighted deletion contraction of symmetric functions,

$$X_{(G', \omega')} = X_{(G' \setminus wv_0, \omega')} - X_{(G'/wv_0, \omega'/wv_0)}$$

Using diagrams as stand-ins for their chromatic symmetric functions,

$$\bullet \text{---} \textcircled{(G, \omega')} = \bullet \text{---} \textcircled{(G, \omega')} - \textcircled{(G, \omega)}$$

Rearranging,

$$\textcircled{(G, \omega)} = \bullet \text{---} \textcircled{(G, \omega')} - \textcircled{(G, \omega')}$$

Each of the terms on the right-hand side has less excess weight. Taking power-sum basis polynomials on both sides yields

$$\chi_{(G, \omega)} = \chi_{(G' \setminus wv_0, \omega')} - \chi_{(G', \omega')}$$

By the inductive hypothesis and deletion-contraction for chromatic polynomials,

$$\chi_{(G, \omega)} = \chi_{G' \setminus wv_0} - \chi_{G'} = \chi_{G'/wv_0} = \chi_G$$

so the result follows by induction. □

Thus, the chromatic polynomial tells you how many vertices a graph has but not its vertex weights, whereas the tree polynomial can tell you how much excess weight a graph has, but not how many vertices (recall that  $\tau_T = x$  for any tree  $T$ )! Hence these polynomials are in a natural sense dual with respect to the information they carry on vertex-weighted graphs.

As another link between the chromatic polynomials and tree polynomials, we have

**Theorem 4.4.** *Let  $(G, \omega)$  be a weighted graph with  $n$  vertices and total weight  $N$ . Then,*

$$(1) \chi_G = (x - 1)^N \tau_{(G, \omega)} \left( \frac{x}{x-1} \right)$$

$$(2) \tau_{(G, \omega)} = (x - 1)^N \chi_G \left( \frac{x}{x-1} \right)$$

*Proof.* Write  $X_{(G,\omega)} = \sum_{\lambda \vdash N} a_\lambda X_{P_\lambda}$ . Then taking  $\chi$  of both sides,

$$\begin{aligned}
\chi_{(G,\omega)} &= \sum_{\lambda \vdash N} a_\lambda \chi_{X_{P_\lambda}} \\
&= \sum_{\lambda \vdash N} a_\lambda x^{\ell(\lambda)} (x-1)^{|\lambda|-\ell(\lambda)} \\
&= \sum_{k=0}^N \left( \sum_{\substack{\lambda \vdash N \\ \ell(\lambda)=k}} a_\lambda \right) x^k (x-1)^{n-k} \\
&= \sum_{k=0}^N [t^k] \tau_{(G,\omega)}(t) x^k (x-1)^{n-k} \\
&= (x-1)^N \sum_{k=0}^N [t^k] \tau_{(G,\omega)}(t) \left( \frac{x}{x-1} \right)^k \\
&= (x-1)^N \tau_{(G,\omega)} \left( \frac{x}{x-1} \right)
\end{aligned}$$

Which shows (1). Write  $X_{(G,\omega)} = \sum_{\lambda \vdash n} b_\lambda p_\lambda$ . Then,

$$\begin{aligned}
\tau_{(G,\omega)} &= \sum_{\lambda \vdash N} b_\lambda \tau_{p_\lambda} \\
(\text{proposition 4.2}) &= \sum_{\lambda \vdash N} b_\lambda x^{\ell(\lambda)} (x-1)^{|\lambda|-\ell(\lambda)} \\
&= \sum_{k=0}^N \left( \sum_{\substack{\lambda \vdash N \\ \ell(\lambda)=k}} b_\lambda \right) x^k (x-1)^{N-k} \\
&= \sum_{k=0}^N [t^k] \chi_G(t) x^k (x-1)^{N-k} \\
&= (x-1)^N \sum_{k=0}^N [t^k] \chi_G(t) \left( \frac{x}{x-1} \right)^k \\
&= (x-1)^N \chi_G \left( \frac{x}{x-1} \right)
\end{aligned}$$

Note that the last line follows because by Theorem 4.3,  $[t^k] \chi_G(t) = 0$  for  $k > n$ .  $\square$

Thus, given  $\tau_{(G,\omega)}$  and the number of vertices of  $G$  (or equivalently the total weight of  $G$ ) we can recover  $\chi_G$  and vice-versa. In particular, it follows that if  $G$  is an unweighted graph with  $n$  vertices and no edges that  $\tau_G = \chi_G = x^n$ .

A natural question is whether evaluating the tree polynomial at positive integers has a natural combinatorial meaning, as is true for the chromatic polynomial. From the computation of Theorem 4.4 (in particular, (2)), for a graph  $G$  on  $n$  vertices,

$$\tau_G(x) = \sum_{k=0}^n [t^k] \chi_G(t) x^k (x-1)^{n-k}$$

We can combinatorially interpret this formula. From Whitney's Broken Circuit Theorem [13],  $[t^k]\chi_G(t)$  is  $(-1)^{n-k}$  times the number of elements  $E \in B_G$  with  $C(E) = k$ . As  $\mathcal{G}(E)$  is a forest with  $k$  components,  $x^k(x-1)^{n-k}$  is the number of proper  $x$ -colourings of  $\mathcal{G}(E)$  when  $x$  is a positive integer. So we can interpret this sum as enumerating all properly  $x$ -coloured internal forests with a sign based on number of components:

**Theorem 4.5.** *Let  $x$  be a positive integer, and let  $G$  be a graph with  $n$  vertices. Define  $S$  to be the set of properly  $x$ -coloured internal forests  $F$  of  $G$ . Then*

$$\tau_G(x) = (-1)^n \sum_{F \in S} (-1)^{|C(F)|}$$

## 5 Further Directions

There are many other avenues of exploration for interpreting the tree polynomial. For a graph  $G = (V, E)$  and a set partition  $\pi = \{B_1, \dots, B_k\}$  of  $V$ , we say  $\pi$  is a *connected partition* if the induced subgraph of each  $B_i$  by  $G$  is connected. The *lattice of contractions of  $G$*  (denoted  $L_G$ ) is the poset of connected partitions of  $V$  ordered by refinement (that is  $\{D_1, \dots, D_\ell\} \leq \{B_1, \dots, B_k\}$  if each block  $D_i$  is contained in some  $B_j$ ). Note that the  $\hat{0}$  element is the partition in which each vertex has its own block. We write  $\ell(\pi) = k$  to denote the number of blocks in the set partition.

**Theorem 5.1** ([13]). *The chromatic polynomial of a graph  $G$  can be written as*

$$\chi_G(x) = \sum_{\pi \in L_G} \mu(\hat{0}, \pi) x^{\ell(\pi)}.$$

With this result, we see that for a graph  $G$  on  $n$  vertices,

$$\begin{aligned} \tau_G(x) &= \sum_{k=0}^n [t^k] \chi_G(t) x^k (x-1)^{n-k} \\ &= \sum_{\pi \in L_G} \mu(\hat{0}, \pi) x^{\ell(\pi)} (x-1)^{n-\ell(\pi)} \\ &= \sum_{\substack{\pi \geq \hat{0} \\ \pi \in L_G}} \mu(\hat{0}, \pi) x^{\ell(\pi)} (x-1)^{n-\ell(\pi)} \end{aligned}$$

Which motivates the definition

**Definition 5.1.** Let  $G$  be a graph and let  $\pi \in L_G$ . Then,

$$\tau_G(\sigma, x) := \sum_{\substack{\pi \geq \sigma \\ \sigma \in L_G}} \mu(\sigma, \pi) x^{\ell(\pi)} (x-1)^{n-\ell(\pi)}.$$

We note that  $\tau_G(\hat{0}, x) = \tau_G(x)$ . By Möbius Inversion,

$$x^{\ell(\pi)} (x-1)^{n-\ell(\pi)} = \sum_{\sigma \geq \pi} \tau_G(\sigma, x)$$

so we can interpret  $\tau(G)$  in terms of  $L_G$  if we can reverse engineer  $\tau_G(\sigma, x)$ . Another approach is to try to reverse engineer the unweighted deletion contraction relation (Theorem 5.2).

Theorem 3.4 provides us with new information regarding the coefficients when expanding a chromatic symmetric function over tree bases. Due to the fact that the stars and paths are the only families of unweighted graphs that satisfy a reciprocity relation with respect to the  $p$ -basis ([1] Proposition 6.2), a further direction would be to find interpretations for the individual coefficients in the corresponding bases. A useful direction would be to try and find a more “tame” simplification of the interpretation given in Theorem 3.3/Lemma 3.4.

Finally, the contents of Theorem 4.4 involve fractional evaluations of the chromatic and tree polynomials. There are two ways to look at this; the first is that the formulas remind us of species composition. Is it then the case that some  $B$ -polynomials preserve plethystic composition? Another perspective that if tree polynomials are related to a certain family of fractional evaluations of the chromatic polynomial, does this suggest there are reasonable interpretations of other fractional evaluations of the chromatic polynomial?

## 6 Acknowledgments

The authors would like to thank Sophie Spirkl for helpful discussions and comments.

This research was sponsored by the National Sciences and Engineering Research Council of Canada.

## References

- [1] Farid Aliniaefard, Victor Wang, and Stephanie van Willigenburg. “Extended chromatic symmetric functions and equality of ribbon Schur functions”. In: *Advances in Applied Mathematics* 128 (2021), p. 102189.
- [2] George D Birkhoff. “A determinant formula for the number of ways of coloring a map”. In: *The Annals of Mathematics* 14.1/4 (1912), pp. 42–46.
- [3] Patrick Brosnan and Timothy Y Chow. “Unit interval orders and the dot action on the cohomology of regular semisimple Hessenberg varieties”. In: *Advances in Mathematics* 329 (2018), pp. 955–1001.
- [4] SV Chmutov, SV Duzhin, and SK Lando. “Vassiliev knot invariants III. Forest algebra and weighted graphs”. In: *Advances in Soviet Mathematics* 21 (1994), pp. 135–145.
- [5] Soojin Cho and Stephanie van Willigenburg. “Chromatic Bases for Symmetric Functions”. In: *The Electronic Journal of Combinatorics* 23.1 (2016), P1–15.
- [6] Soojin Cho and Stephanie van Willigenburg. “Chromatic classical symmetric functions”. In: *Journal of Combinatorics* 9.2 (2018), pp. 401–409.
- [7] Logan Crew and Sophie Spirkl. “A deletion–contraction relation for the chromatic symmetric function”. In: *European Journal of Combinatorics* 89 (2020), p. 103143.
- [8] Byung-Hak Hwang et al. “Acyclic orientation polynomials and the sink theorem for chromatic symmetric functions”. In: *Journal of Combinatorial Theory, Series B* 149 (2021), pp. 52–75.
- [9] Steven D Noble and Dominic JA Welsh. “A weighted graph polynomial from chromatic invariants of knots”. In: *Annales de l’institut Fourier*. Vol. 49. 3. 1999, pp. 1057–1087.
- [10] Radmila Sazdanovic and Martha Yip. “A categorification of the chromatic symmetric function”. In: *Journal of Combinatorial Theory, Series A* 154 (2018), pp. 218–246.

- [11] R.P. Stanley. “A Symmetric Function Generalization of the Chromatic Polynomial of a Graph”. In: *Advances in Mathematics* 111.1 (1995), pp. 166–194. issn: 0001-8708.
- [12] Richard P. Stanley. *Enumerative Combinatorics*. Vol. 2. Cambridge University Press, 1999.
- [13] Hassler Whitney. “A logical expansion in mathematics”. In: *Bulletin of the American Mathematical Society* 38.8 (1932), pp. 572–579.